MAR 15 1957

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 102—PART 3

FEBRUARY 20, 1956, TO MARCH 7, 1956

(PAGES 2827 TO 4254)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1956

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O thou God of our salvation, eternal, immortal, invisible, for whose presence our restless spirits ever yearn—we would hush our busy thoughts to silence as we wait for Thy word and seek to discern Thy will.

"Mid all the traffic of the ways,
Turmoils without, within,
Make in our hearts a quiet place,
And come and dwell therein."

For void of Thee, all is vanity, and life itself barren, joyless, robbed of its wonder, its dignity, and its beauty.

Even as draining duties, tied to the Nation's welfare, demand the utmost in time and energy of Thy servants here, in the fellowship of the world unseen more real than the tangible things about us, may there come to our questing spirits light out of darkness, peace out of discord, strength out of struggle, forgiveness out of guilt, and faith out of fear. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 17, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 18, 1956:

S. 1261. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Caven Point Terminal and Ammunition Loading Pier, N. J., to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority; and

S. 2624. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Base to the city of Newark, N. J., and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936, as amended.

On February 20, 1956:

S. 1352. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; and

S. 1584. An act for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner and Lulu Stanley Beckner.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura reclamation project, California;

H. R. 8787. An act to provide for a pro rated stationery allowance in the case of a Member of the House of Representatives elected for a portion of a term;

H. R. 8796. An act to increase the amount of telephone and telegraph service furnished to Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution relating to Maryland tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; and

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BARRETT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for an indefinite period because of a death in his family.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet on Friday next during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXPENSES OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the fourth quarter of 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO COINAGE OF SUBSIDIARY SILVER COINS, ETC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

IMPROVEMENT OF CHILD WELFARE PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and improve the child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, to authorize special project grants to institutions of higher education or research in connection with maternal and child health and crippled children's services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FUNDS RELATING TO UNCLAIMED PAYMENTS ON SAVINGS BONDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer to the fund for the payment of Government losses in shipment of certain amounts representing

unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commissioner of Education, dated June 30, 1955, on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Resolution 11

"Resolution requesting the President of the United States to veto the gas bill

"Whereas the Congress of the United States recently has passed the Harris-Fulbright bill, more generally referred to as the gas bill, for the purpose of exempting natural-gas producers from direct Federal regulation; and

"Whereas the enactment of this bill would be definitely prejudicial to the best interest of the people of the State of Maryland; and

"Whereas in the judgment of the members of the House of Delegates of Maryland, the bill should be promptly vetoed by the President: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland,* That President Dwight D. Eisenhower be respectfully urged and requested promptly to veto the Harris-Fulbright bill for the exemption of natural-gas producers from direct Federal regulation; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"By the house of delegates, February 10, 1956.

"JOHN C. LUBER,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Adolfina Skudzinskas, Miami, Fla., relating to Lithuanian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., relating to the activities of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Mrs. A. R. Todd, and sundry other citizens of Eunice, La., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by LaSalle Council No. 454, Knights of Columbus, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and Mother Cabrini Council No. 2655, of Long Island, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Oceanside-Carlsbad Realty Board, California, favoring the enactment of legislation to protect against beach erosion at Oceanside, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Oceanside, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, favoring the rehabilitation of the Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Boat Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to restore the 90-percent rigid price support on certain farm products

"Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina is vitally interested in the economic welfare of the farmers of this country; and

"Whereas the discontinuance of the 90-percent rigid price support on certain farm products is threatening the livelihood of the farmers of this and other States; and

"Whereas the entire Nation is dependent on the farmers for food and other essential products; and

"Whereas it is not only important to the farmers but to the Nation as a whole that their standards of living are not lowered: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to restore the 90-percent rigid price support on all farm products which were formerly supported by 90-percent rigid price support; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of Congress from South Carolina."

UKRAINE INDEPENDENCE RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on January 22, 1956, resolutions were adopted at the Minneapolis, Minn., annual celebration commemorating the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Ukraine. The Very Reverend Stephen Bilak, of the St. Michael's Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Minneapolis, has just furnished me with a copy of the resolutions. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred. I commend the resolutions to the reading and attention of the Members of Congress, from whom I know they will receive a sympathetic reception. Certainly the observations made are deserving of the most thoughtful consideration of every citizen of our free land.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED IN MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., ON JANUARY 22, 1956, BY THE AMERICANS OF UKRAINIAN DESCENT AT THE ANNUAL CELEBRATION, COMMEMORATING THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent, residing in the State of Minnesota, who have assembled today under the auspices of the local branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for the purpose of observing the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian national republic by our kinsmen on January 22, 1918, have unanimously passed the following declarations:

"We all, sincerely and deeply, without any reservation, respect and adhere to the Constitution of the United States and to the principles of democracy of our new homeland, to which we are loyal and faithful citizens. At the same time, we desire and we are morally obligated to help the Ukrainian people, our kinsmen, in their unabated and courageous struggle for regaining the lost national statehood and democratic liberties on the Ukrainian ethnic territories, which now are under the aggressive military occupation by Soviet Russia.

"We confirm that the historic acts of January 22, 1918, and January 22, 1919, which respectively declared the independence of Ukraine and united all of the ethnic Ukrainian lands into the United Sovereign Ukrainian National Republic, took place by the deeply seated will of the Ukrainian nation, as expressed by its duly and legally elected representatives from all of the ethnographic provinces of Ukraine.

"We declare, that no one has any legal basis to deny or to minimize the full measure of the importance of the content or the meaning of these two great historic acts, or the inherent rights of the Ukrainian nation to its completely sovereign and independent Ukrainian state. As such, it has full rights to belong, with privileges and responsibilities to the United Nations Organization, as its charter member, and to have duly designated representatives, by the will of the Ukrainian people, as their rightful spokesman in Washington, the capital of a truly democratic state, toward which, at this time, the peoples of the entire world, regardless whether they are free or subjugated, look upon with hope and faith for dynamic leadership and maintenance of national security, whether large or small, strong or weak national states.

"We have undeniable facts and proof that the Ukrainian people, as historic inhabitants of their ethnic lands, were the first to offer heroic resistance to the Red Russian colonial imperialism, and even though the freedom-loving Ukrainian forces were overpowered by the numerically stronger Russian Communist hordes, the Ukrainian people were not silenced, conquered, or subdued in this uneven struggle by their historic foe. Ukraine fights on now, as she did yesterday, and will continue to fight for her state sovereignty and freedom by all her means, using passive and active resistance, including the underground or open armed struggle against the Russian Communist regime which was forced upon Ukraine by military occupation. This struggle will continue against any usurper upon the Ukrainian ethnic lands until the establishment of the completely sovereign and independent Ukrainian state.

"We appeal to the American people, to their representatives, and to the Government of the United States of America to give long awaited aid to the Ukrainian people in their valiant struggle and efforts for the rebirth of the Ukrainian state, without which no peace in the world is possible, neither the security of the United States nor other democratic states.

"We believe that when the free nations of the world will understand the importance and the meaning of the Ukrainian problem, they will extend their friendly aid for the rightful solution in the interest of the principles of human freedom and in the interest of the national independence of the peoples of the globe. The Ukrainian people have only one determined desire—to live free in their own national state in friendly cooperation with the rest of the peoples of the world.

"We stress again that the Russian Empire, regardless of her rulers, always was, is now, and will always be the standard bearer of the imperialistic aggressive tendencies with colonial designs and policies for the conquest of the world. For that reason we warn the

American people not to trust the deluding Russian smiles, for behind them is hidden unchanged Russian imperialism, the basic ground for the colonial policies of the Moscow regime, using ruthless ideology of Russian communism as an expedient tool with the zest of fanatical religion.

"We are grateful to the freedom-loving American people, the Government, and the President of the United States for all of the privileges, freedom, opportunities, with responsibilities, which we enjoy as legal citizens of this free land. We are also grateful for the apparently growing, better understanding, by the leading men of America, of the meaning and value of the Ukrainian problem. Free and independent Ukraine in Eastern Europe is absolutely essential in the interest of peace and security of the entire world. The struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States may continue for centuries, and free Ukraine is essential in the interest of the United States of America, against which the Soviet Union directs all of its destructive efforts.

"Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Minneapolis Branch; Very Rev. Stephen Bilak, President; Mykola Derbush, Secretary; Prof. A. A. Granovsky; Hilari Papish; Gen. Constantine Smowsky; Peter Anderson; Anton Romanenko; Dmytro Danylenko; Paul Fedorciw, Resolutions Committee."

RESOLUTIONS OF WILLISTON (N. DAK.) COOPERATIVE CREDIT UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the Williston (N. Dak.) Cooperative Credit Union.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I

We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, request our Congressmen to keep the control of gas within the Interstate Commerce Commission, in order to protect the consumer.

II

We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, do hereby believe our economy may be likened to a poker game. When all the stakes of a poker game get into one hand the game is over.

In our economy when huge holdings get into the hands of a few there is not enough left for the common people to buy the production of the masses, creating the present surplus.

Therefore, we recommend a tax exemption of $1,000. An additional exemption of $400 for 160 million people would be a buying power of $64 billion. That in itself would take care of much of the expensive surplus on hand, as well as raise the standard of living of low-income groups.

III

We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled in this 28th day of January 1956, oppose the soil-bank plan proposed by the present administration and are in favor of 100 percent of parity price for all farm commodities actually produced on the farm up to the limit of the family farm production. Parity formula should be designed to maintain a purchasing power of farm commodities at a level equal to that 1910–14 with a goal of full parity farm income.

IV

We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, favor ever-normal storehouse. Our Nation, and indeed all the governments of the world, should develop an ever-normal storehouse of storable farm commodities and products equal to at least one full year's domestic consumption and exports. A copy of this resolution to be sent to our Congressmen and Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator MORSE, of Oregon.

V

We, the members the the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, favor the compensatory or production payments as the preferable method for carrying out price support or income programs. We believe such payments should be limited to the production of the family type farms and such payments be limited to $2,500 for any single family farm unit.

VII

Whereas the present Federal administration has demonstrated repeatedly and continuously an attitude of utter disregard for the welfare and best interests of the American public through an unprecedented giveaway program, of giving our Nation's resources away for personal gain of a few individuals, as evidenced by the tidelands oil giveaway, timber resources giveaway, dam site giveaways such as Hells Canyon and others, power development giveaways or attempts thereat such as Dixon-Yates, Clark Hill Dam in Georgia and others, to cite only a few; and

Whereas we believe that any administration has a sacred trust to safeguard and to develop the Nation's resources for the fullest benefit of the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, urge all candidates for national office in the coming election to take a clear public stand on this issue.

VIII

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture, headed by Secretary Ezra T. Benson, has publicly endorsed and approved magazine articles which hold the American farmers up to public ridicule, calling them "country slickers" and making other derogatory remarks about them; and

Whereas this is but further and additional evidence that Mr. Benson is woefully lacking in the qualifications necessary to properly administer the office of the Secretary of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, respectfully request the administration and Congress to remove Mr. Benson from his position as Secretary of Agriculture forthwith.

PAYMENT OF SUBSIDY CHECKS TO FARMERS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Ransom County, N. Dak., Farmers' Union relating to the payment of subsidy checks to farmers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the cost-price situation for agriculture is getting so severe that more and more farmers are finding it difficult to finance their production operations for the year of 1956; and

Whereas the sliding scale and the Department of Agricultural Economics is promising still further decline in agricultural prices and still higher operating costs in 1956, which will drive hundreds of thousands of farmers to the brink of bankruptcy; and

Whereas all of society and the President of the United States have repeatedly acknowledged that farmers are entitled to and, for the good of all economic segments of society, and with no ifs, ands, or buts, must have their full 100 percent of parity income; and

Whereas the present situation and outlook for agriculture in the coming years is getting desperate for the Nation's farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Ransom County Farmers' Union, assembled this 19th day of January 1956, do petition and demand that Congress immediately enact emergency legislation and make available appropriation of funds to pay farmers subsidy checks representing the difference between the prices received in the market place and 100 percent of parity, such emergency payments to be made retroactive for all farm commodities sold since May 1, 1955, and to be effective until such time as Congress can enact permanent legislation that will provide security for farmers at 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities; be it further

Resolved, That we will welcome marketing quotas and production and marketing controls if and when it becomes necessary to keep production in line with consumption but not to a point of scarcity; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the congressional Committees on Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President of the United States.

RANSOM COUNTY FARMERS' UNION,
PETER FOG, *Meeting Secretary*.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the petition of R. H. Power, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to the road construction program.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR: In consideration of the road-building program, here are a few salient facts to remember:

First. Who is responsible for the breakdown of our roads? Ninety percent of those who have studied this problem say heavy freight is the sinner and they refer to the Maryland test as proof.

Second. Cost of construction: It costs three times as much to build a road to support 20 tons of freight as it would to build roads for the average automobile.

Third: Method of taxing freight loads the weight plus distance.

With these results:

1. Save our roads from unnecessary breakdown.

2. Freer flow of traffic, separating freight and passenger traffic, long since done by the railroads.

3. Safety: Avoid numerous accidents between the slow-moving truck and the fast-moving auto.

4. Shift heavy freight from road to rail: Making popular the piggy-back system now used in many States.

Freight is the lifeblood of both trucks and the railroads. The truck business has become big business employing more men than

the railroads. They are both essential carriers and they both need regulation and the Federal Government is the only system so situated to do the job.

Sincerely yours,

R. H. POWER.

Who should pay the bill, and how?

COMPLETION OF FORT YATES HIGH SCHOOL, NORTH DAKOTA—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from J. Dan Howard, chairman, Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council, Fort Yates, N. Dak., enclosing a resolution adopted by that council, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the completion of the Fort Yates High School. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDING ROCK SIOUX TRIBAL COUNCIL,
Fort Yates, N. Dak., February 13, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is tribal resolution No. 4–56 for your review and consideration. The education facilities described in our resolution are badly needed at Standing Rock. The business council are now in the process of working out an educational-grant program for our Standing Rock children who graduate from high school this spring.

These grants will be paid from rehabilitation funds. We need your help. Without the needed additions to our school the educational career of many of our children will be badly hindered.

Every year counts and we cannot afford to lose any time. We hope you will be able to favorably recommend the awarding of the requested funds for the construction of school facilities at Standing Rock. We also wish you would give this matter favorable recommendation to the proper committees.

The Standing Rock Sioux and Tribal Council and

Most sincerely,

J. DAN HOWARD,
Chairman, Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council.

RESOLUTION No. 4–56

Whereas the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe is an unincorporated tribe of Indians having accepted the Indian Reorganization Act of June 1934, and the recognized governing body of the tribe is known as the Standing Rock Sioux Business Council; and

Whereas it is recognized by members of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe that the education and health of their children provides the soundest approach to a successful economic and social future of the Standing Rock Tribe; and

Whereas it is the plans of the business council to provide on a grant basis an opportunity for the eligible and qualified high school graduates of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe to obtain a higher education in the colleges and universities of the United States with funds set aside for that purpose under the terms of congressional legislation for payment of claims arising from the construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir; and

Whereas the present educational facilities at the Fort Yates community schools are inadequate to provide the desired type of elementary and high school education for the students in attendance; and

Whereas the Fort Yates Community High School is located near the center of the reservation and attended by students of North and South Dakota; and

Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs have requested the Congress of the United States to provide $285,000 for the purpose of adding four extra classrooms, an assembly or study hall, a science laboratory, home economics kitchen, dining and sewing room, school cafeteria, gynasium complete with showers, lockers and dressingroom facilities; and

Whereas without these essential additions to the school plant it will not be possible to provide the high school students with the education needs as generally required by most State institutions of higher learning: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the business committee acting for and in behalf of the future of the children of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe do request the Members of Congress from North and South Dakota, the honorable governors and members of their staff from North and South Dakota to contact the Budget and Appropriation Committees of Congress recommending favorable consideration of an appropriation in the amount of $285,000, which is the amount necessary to complete the additions to the Fort Yates High School as needed; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman and secretary of the business council be authorized and directed to sign this resolution.

Dated this 1st day of February 1956.

ARTHUR BYINGTON,
Secretary, Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council.

Attest:

J. DAN HOWARD,
Chairman, Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council.

BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received from W. E. Cole, commandant, Department of North Dakota, the American Legion, a letter enclosing a resolution adopted that that Department, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1643) to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed services who suffer disability or death incident to active duty, active duty for training, or inactive-duty training, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA SOLDIERS HOME,
Lisbon, N. Dak., February 15, 1956.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I am enclosing herewith a resolution which was adopted at the Midwinter Conference of the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, held at Fargo, February 12–14, 1956. I thought this might be helpful to you in your work in connection with these companion bills, S. 1643 and H. R. 6408.

The primary effort in connection with the passage of these bills is being made in the Senate and pending action taken by the Senate, intensive work will be instituted in the House.

I feel sure that you will lend every effort toward passage of these bills and I wish to take this opportunity of thanking you for any and all activities you may take in connection with the successful passage of this legislation, which, of course, is aimed at fairness and justice to Reserve and National Guard officers who were in our armed services during World War I. The estimated expense of this legislation is approximately $8 million per annum, which will rapidly decrease, as most of us have reached a point where we cannot expect many more years of survival.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

W. E. COLE,
Commandant, Colonel, USAR, retired.

Whereas the American Legion has long supported the principle of equalization of rights and benefits for the Reserve components of the various services as compared with the Regulars of those services; and

Whereas S. 1643 and its companion bill, H. R. 6408, introduced by Senator SPARKMAN and Representative HUDDLESTON, respectively, incorporate the substance of the most needed readjustments in law to accomplish this long-established congressional intent to grant equal treatment as to retirement and other benefits to both Regulars and Reserves under comparable circumstances; and

Whereas these twin measures have received the wholehearted support of our last national convention, meeting at Miami, Fla.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department Executive Committee of the North Dakota Department of the American Legion, meeting at Fargo, N. Dak., this 12th day of February 1956, That we vigorously support Senate bill 1643 and H. R. 6408 in full, to the end of achieving full parity of treatment for Regular and Reserve officers of the various services, having particularly in mind the desirability of enactment of section 8 of those bills, embodying the principle of equalization of benefits as applied to retired officers with World War I service; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senator SPARKMAN and Representative HUDDLESTON, to the Senators and Congressmen from this State, and to the Members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees of the National Congress.

FEDERAL BUILDING AT WILLISTON, N. DAK.—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Williams County Bar Association, of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2971, to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building in Williston, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the secretary of the Williams County Bar Association be directed to extend thanks to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER and the Honorable MILTON YOUNG for their action in introducing Senate bill S. 2971; further

Resolved, That a request also be made to the Honorable Congressman USHER L. BURDICK and the Honorable OTTO KRUEGER to introduce into the United States House of Representatives a companion bill to Senate bill S. 2971, and to press for its passage with all possible vigor; and further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be forwarded to the United States congressional delegation from North Dakota, and to the Federal judges of North Dakota.

A. T. HACKENBERG,
Secretary, Williams County Bar Association, Williston, N. Dak.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 4376. A bill to exempt from duty the importation of certain handwoven fabrics when used in the making of religious vestments (Rept. No. 1487).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H. R. 3653. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite (Rept. No. 1488).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 885. A bill for the relief of Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks (Rept. No. 1489);

S. 1111. A bill for the relief of Eric A. Cummings (Rept. No. 1490);

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of Jose Arriaga-Marin (Rept. No. 1491);

S. 1525. A bill for the relief of Serojini Dongre Harris (Rept. No. 1492);

S. 1552. A bill for the relief of Mikie Woodard (Rept. No. 1493);

S. 1560. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Joon Sik Chung (Rept. No. 1494);

S. 1619. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Ventura (Rept. No. 1495);

S. 1814. A bill for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Giuseppe Corrado Cilli (Rept. No. 1496);

S. 1831. A bill for the relief of Panteles Kerkos (Rept. No. 1497);

S. 1883. A bill for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin (Rept. No. 1498);

S. 1950. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fu-Chuan Chao (also known as Fuk Kun Chiu) and his wife, Chui Lai Yuk (also known as Lai Yuk Chao) (Rept. No. 1499);

S. 1953. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Mary Florescu (Sister John Baptist) (Rept. No. 1500);

S. 1970. A bill for the relief of Kim Boksoon (Rept. No. 1501);

S. 2035. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Hernandez-Valencia (Rept. No. 1502);

S. 2037. A bill for the relief of Adele Knoff and her minor child, Hans Knoff (Rept. No. 1503);

S. 2052. A bill for the relief of Demetrios K. Georgaras (Rept. No. 1504);

S. 2077. A bill for the relief of Abdullah Ibrahim Hakim (Rept. No. 1505);

S. 2104 A bill for the relief of Charlotte Muhlefeldt (Rept. No. 1506);

S. 2138. A bill for the relief of Dorothy May Ackermann (Rept. No. 1507);

S. 2155. A bill for the relief of Jose Torres (Rept. No. 1508);

S. 2156. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. Ros (Rept. No. 1509);

S. 2201. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wei-Chi Liu (Rept. No. 1510);

S. 2249. A bill for the relief of Pil Nyi Kwak (Rept. No. 1511);

S. 2264. A bill for the relief of Yu Heng Gee (Rept. No. 1512);

S. 2284. A bill for the relief of Domingo Lim (also known as Lim Eng Kok and Domingo Lim Chay Seng) (Rept. No. 1513);

S. 2349. A bill for the relief of Miss Pilar A. Garcia (Rept. No. 1514);

S. 2358. A bill for the relief of Renate Karolina Horky (Rept. No. 1515);

S. 2445. A bill for the relief of Knar Carmen Ives (Rept. No. 1516);

S. 2590. A bill for the relief of Paula Edith Reynolds (Rept. No. 1517);

H. R. 930. A bill for the relief of John Daniel Popa (Rept. No. 1519);

H. R. 1014. A bill for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung (Rept. No. 1520);

H. R. 1074. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee) (Rept. No. 1521);

H. R. 1097. A bill for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane (Rept. No. 1522);

H. R. 1104. A bill for the relief of Guenther Kaschner (Rept. No. 1523);

H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of Harry John Wilson (Rept. No. 1524);

H. R. 1209. A bill for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay (Rept. No. 1525);

H. R. 1323. A bill for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo) (Rept. No. 1526);

H. R. 1544. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Molo (Mali) Sobel (Rept. No. 1527);

H. R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Jose Canencia-Castanedo (Rept. No. 1528);

H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich (Rept. No. 1529);

H. R. 1923. A bill for the relief of Kevin Murphy (Rept. No. 1530);

H. R. 2054. A bill for the relief of Induk Pahk (Rept. No. 1531);

H. R. 2072. A bill for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak) (Rept. No. 1532);

H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur (Rept. No. 1533);

H. R. 2285. A bill for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien (Rept. No. 1534);

H. R. 2345. A bill for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet (Rept. No. 1535);

H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Wolfgang (Rept. No. 1536);

H. R. 3057. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido L. Balingit (Rept. No. 1537);

H. R. 3201. A bill for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis (Rept. No. 1538);

H. R. 3265. A bill for the relief of Alkista Sfounis (Rept. No. 1539);

H. R. 3375. A bill for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee (Rept. No. 1540);

H. R. 3501. A bill for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan and Virgin Giritliyan (Rept. No. 1541);

H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Freda H. Sullivan (Rept. No. 1542);

H. R. 3845. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza (Rept. No. 1543);

H. R. 3857. A bill for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David (Rept. No. 1544);

H. R. 3869. A bill for the relief of Esther Ledea Escobedo (Rept. No. 1545);

H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of Ashot Mnatzakanian and Ophelia Mnatzakanian (Rept. No. 1546);

H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of Max Moskowitz (Rept. No. 1547);

H. R. 4185. A bill for the relief of Zabel Vartanian (Rept. No. 1548);

H. R. 5866. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich (Rept. No. 1549); and

H. R. 6363. A bill for the relief of Edward Barnett (Rept. No. 1550).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Zaferatos (Rept. No. 1551);

S. 1465. A bill for the relief of Audrey Jean Younkers (Rept. No. 1552);

S. 1664. A bill for the relief of Balbina Borenstein (Rept. No. 1554);

S. 2143. A bill for the relief of Manda Pauline Petricevic (Rept. No. 1553);

S. 2289. A bill for the relief of David Hayes (Rept. No. 1555);

S. 2357. A bill for the relief of Nenita Santos and Elizabeth Santos (Rept. No. 1556);

S. 2570. A bill for the relief of Maximilien Beauvois (Rept. No. 1557);

S. 2744. A bill for the relief of Harold Manly Stewart (Rept. No. 1558); and

H. R. 1005. A bill for the relief of Alice Duckett (Rept. No. 1518).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1122. A bill for the relief of Szloma Kleidermacher and his wife, Sarah Kleidermacher, and their children, Ruchla, Abram, and Toba Kleidermacher (Rept. No. 1559);

S. 1846. A bill for the relief of Dr. Howard Seeming Liang (Rept. No. 1560);

S. 1889. A bill for the relief of Maria Guardalupe Shockley and her minor daughter, Evangeline Vega Shockley (Rept. No. 1561);

S. 1939. A bill for the relief of Victorne (Vicky) Shalam, John Shalam, and Claude Shalam (Rept. No. 1562);

S. 1987. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Peter Chou-Yuen Tchen (Rept. No. 1563);

S. 2304. A bill for the relief of Mary Tarlich Goldstein (Rept. No. 1564);

S. 2495. A bill for the relief of Anna Abbene (Rept. No. 1565); and

H. R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, J. Lizardo (Rept. No. 1566).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 3235. A bill for the relief of Cleopatra Vasiliades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3236. A bill to permit unmarried annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to elect survivorship annuities upon subsequent marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3237. A bill to provide for continuance of life insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3238. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 3239. A bill for the relief of the Board of National Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3240. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall select a site to which the naval magazine at Port Chicago, Calif., may be moved and report to the Congress thereon, and to suspend the acquisition of land in the vicinity of such naval magazine pending the making of such a report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3241. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3242. A bill to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3243. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3244. A bill for the relief of C. H. Abrams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3245. A bill for the relief of Koriku Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JENNER):

S. J. Res. 147. Joint Resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1956, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUANCE OF LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE IN CERTAIN CASES UNDER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a serious technical deficiency in the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, has come to light and should be corrected as quickly as possible.

The problem is quite simple. An employee who becomes disabled through no fault of his own and who, as a result of the disability is unable to perform his duties, is eligible for disability compensation. Technically, when this occurs he no longer is an employee because he is not carried on his agency's payroll, but instead is carried on the disability roll of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation. The Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act provides that an employee's insurance will not continue in effect for more than 12 months "after discontinuance of his salary payments." Therefore, if a disabled employee should die within 12 months after being removed from the payroll of his agency and being placed on the disability roll of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, his insurance is valid, but if his death occurs after 12 months, his insurance is not valid.

I introduce for proper reference a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Insurance Act to provide that the insurance of an employee receiving disability benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall be continued in effect as long as he is held by the Department of Labor to be unable to return to duty. Further, the bill would become effective August 29, 1954, the date on which the Insurance Act became effective in order to reinstate the insurance of a limited number of employees who since that date have been on the disability rolls for longer than 12 months. In a small number of cases, employees died during their 13th, 14th, or 15th month on the disability roll. Their widows did not get the insurance they should have received. The bill I am introducing would restore their insurance policies and give them the benefits they did not receive because of a technical deficiency in the law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3237) to provide for continuance of life-insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. This bill is a companion bill to H. R. 8804, introduced by Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, on January 25, 1956.

Since the enactment of the original legislation, many States have had some very definite experience in dealing with this program, and the construction and operation of pilot projects has demonstrated the need for certain amendments to this act, in order that it may be of greater value to our farmers and our Nation.

Previous to the enactment of the Hope-Aiken Act of 1954, I had introduced a bill in the Senate which was similar to the one which was enacted by the Congress.

Personally, I feel the amendments proposed in the bill I have just introduced are vital to the expanded and successful operation of the program.

It is important that the soil-conservation districts of our Nation be permitted to function without interference in watershed-protection and flood-prevention programs. The soil-conservation districts under the able leadership of qualified personnel are cooperating with national farm, business, labor, and wildlife organizations to further our mutual objectives of upstream watershed treatment and management to protect and wisely use our precious soil and water resources.

After 18 months of experience with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, it can be truly stated that there are certain limitations in this law that seriously hamper full implementation of it.

There is no doubt in my mind but what Congress wanted to provide for Federal aid to local organizations in carrying out their own locally initiated and executed programs of watershed protection and flood prevention.

It is with this thought that I believe we need to secure approval of the amendments included in the bill that I have introduced, in order that we may obtain help for all types of improvements for better soil and water management. This should include, where needed, not only soil conservation practices on the land and structures for flood prevention, but such other improvements as storage and distribution of water to increase the efficiency of farming by irrigation, disposal of excess water by drainage for the same purpose, storage and release of water into small streams during dry periods to provide stock water, maintain good fishing and dilute downstream pollution. It should permit a good dam site to be used for both flood prevention and municipal water supply or any other useful purpose. In fact, we should provide for the most beneficial uses of water as they are needed and demanded by the community where it falls.

One of the problems that must be resolved is where to draw the line between the size of the projects that should be built and controlled under the supervision and direction of the Chief of Civil Works and the Corps of Engineers. I have no doubt there are some of the larger size reservoirs that could be built under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. They would be of immeasurable value for flood control as well as many other phases of the control of water run-off.

It is my opinion that these projects constructed under the soil conservation district programs should not be under the supervision of any other agency, but should be left strictly under the control of the States and their subdivisions.

The soil conservation districts should maintain the right to conserve our rainfall, prevent disaster of floods and at the same time provide for expanded beneficial uses of water for our growing agricultural, industrial, wildlife, and municipal needs.

The projects already constructed and those on the design tables have been constructed on a cost-sharing basis as between Federal, State, and local interests. With this type of program, the control and management in the use of these impounded waters should be in the hands of local people once the structures are completed.

In the pilot watershed projects already constructed, local organizations have put up substantial sums in cash and other considerations for the construction of the project.

I am informed that the cost-sharing basis has been about 50–50 in the pilot watershed program. The local people apply the needed land treatment measures, acquire all lands, easements and rights-of-way, contract for all structures and guarantee their operation and maintenance while the Federal Government pays for the actual cost of construction for flood prevention.

It has been the policy of the Federal Government for years to provide construction costs for works for flood control. Our Nation has spent billions of dollars on our major rivers to protect cities and main stream flood plains.

I am not suggesting that Congress reverse this policy, but I firmly believe that we should give consideration to any additional Federal support to projects on upstream watersheds.

The national benefit which would result from the work farmers and ranchers

are doing to conserve and improve the lands of this Nation for our children and grandchildren would more than offset a 100-percent Federal contribution to construction costs.

The bill I have introduced would provide several amendments and recommended changes, but I want to call attention to and discuss four of them.

DEFINITION OF AUTHORIZED WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT

The bill would delete the phrase "agricultural phases of" under definition of "Works of improvement" in section 2 of Public Law 566. This would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to assist local organizations to plan and carry out improvements, as a part of a total watershed plan, not only for irrigation, drainage, and flood prevention, but also for such purposes as improved municipal and industrial watersupply, recreation, fish and wildlife improvement, pollution abatement by streamflow regulation, and saline water intrusion control. It would provide local organizations with assistance in carrying out a multiple-purpose water and land management program, instead of one confined to flood prevention and agricultural water management. This amendment would broaden Public Law 566 to include all the purposes contained in the conference committee print of the small projects bill, H. R. 5881.

LIMITATION ON CAPACITY IN STRUCTURES

The bill would permit inclusion in a watershed work plan of a structure providing more than 5,000 acre-feet of total capacity if, first, the structure is proposed to be constructed by a local organization as an integral part of a watershed plan; second, any capacity in excess of 5,000 acre-feet is for purposes other than flood prevention; and, third, the construction cost of such excess capacity is to be borne entirely by the local organization.

AUTHORITY FOR FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION

The bill would eliminate the date July 1, 1956, after which the Secretary of Agriculture may not enter into any contract for construction. The act would continue to prohibit the Secretary from entering into contract for construction if there is a local organization which has such authority under State law.

In most States soil-conservation districts as well as other types of local organizations have such authority.

REQUIREMENTS FOR REVIEW OF PLANS

The bill would provide that no plan for works of improvement need be submitted for review to the Secretaries of the Interior and Army, or transmitted to the Congress through the President, unless the estimated Federal contribution to the construction cost of works of improvement exceeds $250,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3243) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

C. H. ABRAMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Mr. C. H. Abrams, of Portland, Oreg.

Mr. Abrams was one of many people in the State of Oregon who worked with determination and for exceptionally long hours in the construction of Vanport City during the early days of the World War II emergency.

Mr. Abrams performed work of the highest importance on the Vanport project. In his communications with me he has indicated that he was an investigator for the Federal Government; that he performed the work of an auditor in the employ of the Government; that when he entered into this employment he signed the standard Form 57 for civil-service employees of the Federal Government. He further advises me that at one time he was interviewed by agents of the FBI who were then gathering facts concerning the operations of some of the contractors and subcontractors engaged in constructing the Vanport project. On this latter occasion the FBI appears to have been concerned as to certain practices being followed under the construction contract. Mr. Abrams was interviewed because of his special work in checking payrolls and performing similar services.

During the course of construction of the Vanport project, the President issued a directive on overtime which appears to have been addressed to all Government employees in defense areas. Mr. Abrams states that he was requested to initial a copy of this directive.

Despite the issuance of the presidential overtime directive, Mr. Abrams was not paid for the many hours of overtime work he performed on the Vanport project. In due course of time he presented his claim to the appropriate Federal Government agency, asking that he be compensated for overtime. Such compensation was denied and in a detailed letter of December 16, 1953, the Administrator of the House and Home Finance Agency expressed the view that Mr. Abrams and others similarly situated were not Federal employees, but were in fact employees of the local housing authority, and that there was no privity of contract between such employees and the Federal Government which would permit payment of overtime compensation by the Federal Government. Mr. Abrams' displeasure over this ruling is quite understandable.

Despite the adverse reports of Federal Government agencies, it appears to me that Mr. Abrams has made a strong prima facie case in support of his claim of entitlement to overtime compensation. I think his case deserves serious and thorough consideration by an appropriate committee of the United States Senate. If the committee finds, as I believe it should, that equity and justice call for the payment of this claim, I hope the committee will make its recommendation promptly because the claimant his waited almost 14 years for what he believes is honestly due him from his Government.

Mr. President, I have just received a very strong supporting letter from Mr. Wayne A. Anderson, of Salem, Oreg., who was familiar with Mr. Abrams' initial employment on the Vanport project. Mr. Anderson's straightforward statement has impressed me, and I believe it deserves the attention of the committee to which this bill is referred. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with Mr. Anderson's letter of February 6, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3244) for the relief of C. H. Abrams, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. H. Abrams, of Portland, Oreg., the sum of $580.80. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the said C. H. Abrams against the United States for compensation for overtime work performed by him during the period from November 1942 through June 1943 while he was employed as an auditor for the Federal Government in connection with the construction of the Vanport City project, Multnomah County, Oreg.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent hereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The letter presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

SALEM, OREG., *February 6, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in response to your letter of February 1, 1956, concerning conditions surrounding the employment of Mr. C. H. Abrams, 1116 S. E. Nehalem Street, Portland, Oreg., and his subsequent claim against the Federal Government for overtime services.

There are apparently no specific written records of an employer order or a referral of Mr. Abrams as they were destroyed by a fire occurring in the Portland local office of the United States Employment Service (then also known as the War Manpower Commission office). However, it is my understanding that any remaining records of the WMC were shipped to Washington, D. C.

At the time of the referral of Mr. Abrams it was my impression that the position was that of a Federal inspectional type of auditor with wartime temporary indefinite civil-service status. I am confident that this was also the impression obtained by Mr. Abrams. There was no indication to me that the operation or administration of this function was to be delegated to the State or to any subdivision.

I am glad to authorize you to present my statements in behalf of Mr. Abrams. The claimant has been an acquaintance for about 15 years and I have always found him to be sincere and honest.

Yours very truly,

WAYNE A. ANDERSON.

IMPROVED FARM PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DISPERSAL OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2879) to promote the dispersal of industrial facilities in the interest of national defense, which was introduced by me on January 9, 1956.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WILLMORE ENGINEERING CO.—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement I have prepared, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

On July 30, 1955, I introduced the joint Resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to amend Private Law 495, 83d Congress, as amended, for the relief of Willmore Engineering Co. Senate Joint Resolution 102 has since been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Since the introduction of the joint resolution certain facts and information have come to my attention which lead me to the conclusion that no further action should be taken on the measure.

As the sponsor of the proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 102 be postponed indefinitely and that no further action be taken on it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have made this request because I found, after introducing the joint resolution, that the matter was pending in the courts in the District of Columbia; and the courts are amply able to decide the matter without the necessity of passing the joint resolution. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) will be indefinitely postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS OF HEARINGS BY THE TOBACCO SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE USE OF PROCESSED TOBACCO

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, information recently presented to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry clearly indicates that the growers of some, and possibly all, types of leaf tobacco in the United States are facing a very uncertain future market for their product as a result of new patented processes, now in use, which permit the manufacture of substitutes for natural leaf tobacco, which substitutes are generally referred to in the tobacco trade as manufactured tobacco leaf. These processes carry various names, such as homogenized leaf, reconstituted leaf, unified leaf, et cetera; and for the most part they appear to have had their known beginning uses in connection with the manufacture of binders for cigars. One of these new patented processes is at the present time being nationally advertised as a replacement for natural tobacco leaf binders on one of our large selling brands of cigars. The advertising claims that the synthetic product is better than binders heretofore used on the cigars, which were made from natural leaf tobacco. On the basis of data available to date, it appears that consumers are quite indifferent to this new development, and that therefore there is passive acceptance of this new product for use as cigar binders.

Very simply stated, all of these natural leaf substitutes are somewhat similar, in that they are manufactured by processes which involve the grinding or crushing of the entire leaf, including stems, into minute particles which, in turn, are combined with some binding or cohesive agent, and then, through intricate processes, are formed into thin, pliable sheets of manufactured tobacco having the desired width and thickness. It would seem that the processes involved may, in their final form, be roughly compared to the procedures involved in the manufacture of paper and newsprint.

Present information indicates that from several viewpoints these new developments may be attractive to many manufacturers of cigars and cigarettes. The most important is that of a distinct saving in labor and natural leaf tobacco costs.

Our American cigarette, which has gained favor through the world, is manufactured from a blend of several types of natural leaf tobacco, each of which is especially selected by the manufacturer for its quality, flavor, aroma, and burning quality. Natural leaf tobacco used in our cigarettes is processed to remove the heavy midrib in each tobacco leaf through an action known in the trade as stemming. The heavy, coarse stems which are removed represent a sizeable portion of the weight of each leaf of tobacco and are generally considered a byproduct of cigarette manufacturer for subsequent use in other ways by the industry. Since these new substitute processes would apparently permit the use of the entire tobacco leaf the costly stemming process involved in natural leaf would be eliminated.

The substitute processes also would appear to permit an absolute manufacturing control of the previously mentioned desirable characteristics found in natural leaf tobacco, such as color, burning quality, flavor, and aroma. It further appears that these desirable factors found previously only in natural leaf may now be obtained through these substitute manufacturing processes through the use of a much lower quality of natural leaf than some manufacturers have previously purchased for cigarette purposes.

One of the new patented processes involves an additional intriguing procedure whereby the substitute tobacco sheet, after manufacture, may be increased in volume by 60 to 70 percent through the application of heat, which causes air cells to appear and remain in the finished product. This procedure, of course, would in turn permit the manufacturer of cigarettes to produce many more cigarettes per pound than would be possible if only natural leaf tobacco were used.

Rumors are quite widespread in the cigarette tobacco industry and among growers that these substitute processes are now in use by some of our larger cigarette companies and the recent tobacco markets just ending would seem to substantiate the fact that a distinct shift has taken place in the buying habits of some of our larger manufacturers with particular interest and emphasis in a desire for lower quality, less costlier natural leaf tobacco.

In view of the already known impact of these developments upon the cigar tobacco growers and the possible drastic upheaval which may occur in the future as it relates to growers of cigarette tobaccos it seems highly desirable that immediate steps be taken to obtain as much information as is possible regarding the future use of these substitute products in cigarettes.

I am sure you are aware that the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with its experiment stations throughout the tobacco area has for a number of years been conducting extensive research work in tobacco, as in other crops, looking toward the development of finer, more desirable types of tobacco which were apparently desired by the cigarette manufacturing industry. It seems entirely possible that the development of these new manufactured substitutes may well necessitate a complete change in our research as well as our current production programs for our tobaccos.

For this reason, and in the interest of some 800,000 farm families who make their living through the production of cigarette tobaccos, I, as Chairman of the Tobacco Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have requested and received permission from the Chairman of that Committee for the Subcommittee to hold hearings on this vital matter.

The objective of these hearings will be to receive testimony from all available sources in the tobacco trade from which we could determine the following:

First. The extent to which these processes are now being used by cigarette manufacturers.

Second. The extent of and possible uses in the future.

Third. What changes, if any, are likely to result in manufacturers' buying patterns in the future.

Fourth. What changes, if any, will be needed in our current production and research programs.

Fifth. Indications as to the reaction of consumers to utilization of substitute tobaccos in cigarettes.

I consider this subject to be one of exceedingly vital importance, and I sincerely hope that our subcommittee will have the full cooperation of everyone concerned in obtaining the answers to these important questions.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA:

Statement by him relative to the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him before the Decalogue Society in Chicago, Ill., on February 18, 1956.

By Mr. BEALL:

Excerpts from address delivered by Senator CASE of New Jersey at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Alexander Hamilton Club and the Republican City Committee, of Baltimore, Md.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Statement prepared by him on the 35th anniversary of Armenian independence.

THE FARM PROBLEM: WHAT IS IT?—ADDRESS BY HON. W. R. POAGE, OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as the Senate prepares to begin consideration of farm legislation, I should like to call the attention of Senators to a penetrating address The Farm Problem: What Is It? delivered recently in San Antonio, Tex., by the Honorable W. R. POAGE, of Waco, Tex., who is Representative of the 11th Congressional District of Texas, in the House of Representatives.

Mr. POAGE, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, knows his subject. His thoughtful analysis of the nature of the farm problem is worthy of close study.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. POAGE's address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In September 1929 it was my pleasure to visit this great and historic city. At that time I thought I was "doing pretty well." I stayed at the Saint Anthony Hotel. I had served two terms in the Texas Legislature, although at that moment I held no public office. I was reasonably well established as a lawyer. I had been buying equities in property both rural and urban. I held title to more different pieces of property and I owed more money than I have at any time before or since. The future looked good. I talked with friends right here in San Antonio. We told each other: "Don't sell America short." "There is no limit to American development." Yes, the future looked good, but we could not ignore the fact that, as industrial wages and prices had been steadily climbing for 8 years, farm prices had been sinking ever lower and lower. But we told ourselves, "American business is sound."

I confess I did not understand just what was happening. I did not understand just what happened a few weeks later when the bottom fell out of the stock market. I couldn't find that prosperity President Hoover told us was just around the corner. I don't claim to understand all that is involved today, but today I do have the experience of the past and my hindsight is much better than my foresight.

I tell you of my 1929 visit to San Antonio to point out that the next time I visited this city about 2 years later, I stayed at a tourist court. I had lost most of the equities I had held. In short, I had been through the crash.

Since that time I have had a keen respect for the economic warning signs of declining farm income. Since then I have realized that no matter how many automobiles and silk shirts we made—no matter how high factory wages and stockmarket prices might go—no matter how many people were employed by industry and how many new corporations were organized, that unless American farmers were able to make a reasonable net profit that our entire economic structure was but a house of sand.

Maybe we are not now facing a situation similar to that which confronted us in 1929. Maybe we will be able to avoid the pitfalls which so nearly destroyed us at that time. I hope so—but I think we would be living in a fools' paradise if we failed to take stock from time to time.

Mr. President, it is because I sincerely believe that the most serious threat to our national prosperity is to be found in the steadily falling net income of our farmers that I unhesitatingly name the farm price problem as America's number one economic problem.

Surely it is not necessary to describe the problem. With the average per capita farm income from all sources at $865 as against a national average for non-farm people of $1,913 we can see what is happening to farm buying power. With farmers getting only 38 cents out of each dollar the consumer spends for food where they got 53 cents just 10 years ago we can see little justification for consumer criticism of farmers. With gross national production up 50 percent since 1947, with wages up 60 percent, with corporate profits up 74 percent in the same period, it is little comfort to the farmer to be told that gross farm income has almost held its own.

Holding one's own in dollar volume of sales would hardly be a basis for great rejoicing for a businessman when others are making 60 and 70 percent gains but when one's costs are constantly rising static income spells bankruptcy. To make these statistics even worse from the farmers' standpoint, we must remember that nearly one-third of the total of what is known as farmer income is derived from non-farm sources. In other words, a great many farmers are able to stay on the farm only because some of the family works off the farm.

At the same time nearly a million farmers per year are leaving the farm. This means that even though the pieces of gross income distributed to each individual have (along with the addition of non-farm income) remained nearly constant the distribution is being made to a progressively smaller number of people. The pie is no larger—there are just fewer children to share it. Can the grocer at Elmendorf or the hardware dealer at Seguin afford any further reduction in the number of his customers? And if the process continues, what happens to the wholesale house in San Antonio?

I think it is clear that the prosperity of every businessman in the United States is ultimately dependent on the prosperity of our farmers. Maybe I am wrong but I just can't believe that we can ever build a sound and lasting prosperity on anything less than on mother earth herself. I believe our foundations must rest on the soil. That is what was lacking in the 1920's. I wonder if it could be lacking today.

If we can agree that we all have a stake in the prosperity of the farmer, let us look just a little further into his condition. Have we any cause for alarm, or are our farmers actually pampered tyrants as Harper's magazine charges? Surely we need not waste much time on this question. You gentlemen know too much about farms and farmers to indulge in any illusions of farmers riding in Cadillacs, etc., even though there actually are millions of Americans who don't honestly know any better.

I have already given you the average net per capita income of farm people, $865 per year, considerably less than one-half of the average of nonfarm people. But such average figures don't mean much. There are, of course, a few large farmers, about 2 percent of the total. Some of these have money. Very few of these are making money, farming. There are many small farmers, even in Texas. Most of these are not making enough to maintain their families, but they spend every dime they do make with local businessmen. They are essential to the general prosperity.

Farmers are dependent on price times volume of products for their gross income. We have, heretofore, been able to hold the price of cotton up to 90 percent of parity. Therefore, some will say the cotton farmer must be doing pretty well. Before you jump to that conclusion ask yourself, how have we maintained that cotton price? I'll tell you. We have maintained it by reducing production—the oil men call it "proration." We have reduced our cotton acreage from an all-time high of nearly 45 million acres down to just over 17 million, a cut of about 66 percent. Even as late as 1953 we planted 25,244,000 acres of cotton. Of course, the cut in bales has not been so severe, but it has been so drastic that the income of cotton farmers was barely holding static before the flexible cuts hit. Flexibles are now the law for the 1956 crop. No one knows just how far the new program will drop price, probably $15 or $20 per bale, and without any increase in the number of bales. So let's write off the cotton farmer as a prospective buyer of that new living-room rug.

What about the cattleman? We have heard lots about the money he was making. Some people have said that it was the fixed 90 percent support which got cotton farmers into trouble, the cattleman has never had any direct-price supports, so let's see how well he has done and is doing. Within the last 3 years, the price of live cattle has dropped more than 50 percent. In fact, the cowman has supplied feed and care for more than 90 million cattle without a penny of profit, given the packers 7 million head of young animals and has taken an average inventory loss of better than $100 per head, and now holds his stock at just under $100 around. If that cowman doesn't have a good oil lease, you are wasting your time trying to sell his wife a new suite of dining room furniture.

Of course, the hogman had some flexible supports a few years ago. In spite of flexibility, he has taken a 38 percent drop in the price of his hogs in the last year. He is not likely to buy a new insurance policy.

The peanutmen never could buy a television but with better than a 50 percent cut in his acreage, you are not likely to sell him a radio now.

So far, I have just talked about what these producers have lost in gross returns. If they have been able to reduce their costs maybe they are better off than I have made it appear. What has happened to their costs and therefore, to their net income? Let's take an example of a reasonably well fixed farmer who grossed $10,000 in 1947. At that time he had expenses of $7,000 and netted $3,000. Since then, the price of machinery has doubled. Labor has gone up. Supplies are much higher. By 1955 this man's gross had gone down to $8,600, a considerable drop, but

not necessarily fatal. What really puts him out of business is the fact that his costs have gone up to $8,190. This left him a net of $510 for his year's work and as a return on his $20,000 or better investment. The interest on his invested capital has remained static. That's what we mean by the farm income squeeze, which you hear so much about.

To understand the reasons for our overgenerous farm production we must look back to the war or even before. Actually when World War II broke out, we had a full generation of first-class but unused research and scientific knowledge neatly cataloged and filed. All during the twenties and thirties farm income had been so low that farmers had not been able to apply the practices they knew were desirable. We were farming as well as we could afford, not as well as we knew how. Crop yields weren't much higher in 1940 than they were in 1920.

Then came the war. The world needed food and fiber. Prices shot up. So did our patriotic fervor. Farmers were urged to produce as a patriotic duty. Food will win the war and write the peace. Farmers believed this. They went to work determined to do their full part.

The same war gave a tremendous impetus to the production of nitrates for explosives. Shortly, those new cheaper nitrates were showing up as fertilizers. Farmers poured them into the soil. Production zoomed. Farmers, short of help, invested in all kinds of new machinery, till the investment per worker in American agriculture is today $14,389, compared with an investment of only $13,000 per worker in industry.

Of course, industry tooled up also, but when the war ended the Government never looked back. It paid our industries about $41 billion for losses on contracts which were never completed because the need no longer existed. A few years later when the Korean war broke out, we gave many of these same industries accelerated tax writeoffs to encourage them to complete much of the work which was discontinued in 1945 and 1946. This decrease in tax liability is presently running at the rate of more than $800 million per year. I am not criticizing, but I have heard some of the beneficiaries of this arrangement condemn the agricultural adjustment payments.

But after the farm plant was expanded; after our farmers had mechanized; after they had adopted the new techniques, we offered them no termination payments. The best we offered any farmer was 90 percent of a fair price if he would agree to reduce his production to that point which the Secretary of Agriculture felt would equal our needs. In both 1952 and 1953, Mr. Brannan and then Mr. Benson overestimated our needs—or rather they played safe (not knowing what turn the Korean war might take) and refused to invoke marketing quotas. Again I am not criticizing, but it was 1954 before we actually applied the production breaks the law provided.

By that time, our surpluses had indeed become burdensome. Since that time we have had a rash of hysterical statements about our terrible agricultural problem. One would get the impression that adequate food and fiber was an unmitigated evil. Of course, I would like to reduce our surpluses but they may not be entirely bad. In 1941 we had 2 million more bales of cotton in the Government loan than we have today. Within 3 years we were out of cotton. During the Korean war, we actually embargoed the exportation of cotton, and forced American producers to sell for about 45 cents per pound while the world price went to twice that figure. We used price controls to keep the price of American wheat down to $3 per bushel at the very time Mr. Peron sold it for $5. The American farmer has consistently been denied the peaks of world prices in order to protect the American public. Does not justice suggest that he should be protected from price valleys by that same public?

Admit that our farm price-support program has been expensive. It has never reached more than a fraction of the payments made to industry to enable it to reconvert after the war. And, believe it or not, some of our programs have not cost the taxpayers a penny. Here is the report of the Department of Agriculture issued by Mr. Benson. I don't believe that you will fear that he would try to picture the 90 percent support programs in any more favorable light than the facts justify; yet, his report of December 31, 1955, the latest yet available, shows that rather than having cost the taxpayers, the cotton-support program has actually made a profit of over a quarter of a billion dollars—267 billion to be exact.

Maybe we ought to see just how the consumer has fared?

I know that there are all too many people who have been led to believe, and today do believe that, in spite of their low incomes, farmers are imposing an unfair burden on consumers. Since we are all consumers we are all interested in this charge. I have already pointed out the fact that the farmer is receiving a constantly declining share of the consumers' food dollar, 38 cents today as against 53 cents in 1946.

But that tells only part of the story, in many instances, there is simply no relationship between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays. The price of live hogs has dropped 38 percent during the past year. The retail price of pork has dropped only 14 percent during the same time. Ten years ago wheat was bringing $3 per bushel, and was worth 60 percent more on the world market. Bread sold for an average of 13.8 cents per pound. Today wheat is bringing about $2 per bushel and bread is bringing an average of about 18 cents per pound. Surely price supports on wheat cannot be blamed for the increase in the price of bread. This shirt cost me $4.95. Twenty years ago it would have cost about $1.50. At today's prices it contains about 25 cents worth of cotton. The farmers' 90 percent price support could hardly account for the 300 percent increase in the price of the shirt.

Thirty years ago, the average man did not have to spend as much for food as he must today, but today he has lots more to spend. The percentage of his disposable income has remained almost constant for that period, it was, and is, just about 25 percent, but today he has approximately three times as much left for other uses. If we go back to the founding of this country, we find that our people had to spend approximately 75 percent of their disposable income for food. Even today most people of the world spend more than one-half, and many of them more for food of greatly inferior quality. I ask you businessmen what it would do to your business if our people had to spend one-half to three-fourths of their income for food. It might knock quite a hole in the jewelry or the ladies' ready-to-wear business.

All anyone has with which to buy the products of another's labors is his own efforts or the accumulated efforts of others which have been passed along by purchase, trade, or inheritance. Putting this accumulation of past efforts into the present tense, we can say that all man has with which to buy is time.

The American farmer is feeding the American city dwellers in exchange for just one-fourth of that city man's time. The farmer has never increased his prices in terms of your time. Not only that, but within the past 30 years we have almost doubled the amount of food the average consumer actually gets for that 25 percent of his disposable income or of his time, and we have infinitely increased its quality and attractiveness. In most cases this price includes built-in maid service. All foods are attractively packaged, they don't come in barrels and tow sacks any more. But all these conveniences are available to today's consumer without any increase whatsoever in the percent of income required to pay the bill.

It may be all right to talk about the good old days when you could buy a round steak for a dime—if you had the dime—but who wants to go back to those days when industrial wages also averaged 16 cents per hour? It is true that in 1890 a loaf of bread cost only a nickel, but it took 19 minutes of work—today it takes only 6. In 1890 a pound of butter cost only two bits but it required an hour and a half's work to get the two bits. Today it takes just over 20 minutes' work to buy the butter. And that steak which now costs 90 cents per pound only takes 30 minutes as against 46 minutes in those good old days.

We could draw similar comparisons to show that the American consumer pays far, far less in working time for the food he eats than practically any consumer of the world today.

In other words, our city people are getting good food, adequate food, and cheap food. They need a prosperous agriculture and they should be the last to complain when the farmer asks only for parity—parity is simply that price which will enable the farmers to just maintain the same purchasing power for each unit of his products which he received during the last period during which his prices were unaffected by war, price controls, or inflation. It should be understood that parity is thus tied to a free market. It goes down any time the prices farmers must pay for the goods and services he must buy goes down. It goes up only after farmers' costs have gone up.

That, my friends, is, as I see it, the essence of the great debate about farm prices. It is an attempt to gear farm income, and therefore farm purchasing power, to the level of our general economy. If we succeed in doing this, our entire economy will be the stronger. The methods whereby this may be done are varied and are subject to bitter debate. I am not here to tell you that I have some patent medicine which will cure all the ills of agriculture. I am only here to say that agriculture must have help. That in our efforts to expand our markets and to move our surpluses we must never overlook the fact that unless the producer gets enough to leave him some reasonable net income there is little reason for expanding the market. I am here to say that everyone has a selfish stake in our ability to retain farm buying power. If we fail, our entire economy is, in my opinion, certain, sooner or later, to collapse just as it did in 1929.

WES SANTEE: LOSS OF AMATEUR STANDING

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, our Nation, and I think probably the world, were shocked this morning to read of the decision of a committee of the Amateur Athletic Union barring Wes Santee from amateur standing for life. I ask, Mr. President, how cruel can we get?

Wes Santee is a Kansan, a graduate of Kansas University, and presently a proud member of the United States Marine Corps.

This cruel, unfair decision by an autocratic body of an agency that can destroy not only the hopes of our Nation at the Olympics in Melbourne, Australia, in the 1500-meter or mile run, but also place a blight on the entire life of a young man, must come as a shock to every fairminded citizen.

Kansas as a State has given to the country such mile runners as Glenn Cunningham, San Romani, and presently Wes Santee. We are proud of all of them.

I have personally visited with Wes Santee about this matter and he has, I am informed, presented vouchers and certified statements as to the amounts of money he has drawn in the meets in which he has participated. He submitted the records without perjury or falsification.

I would be less than frank if I did not state I think he has taken more money than is allowed under the decadent rules of the AAU for amateur standing, but let us be practical about this matter. Here is one of the Nation's outstanding athletes who is in demand by promoters all over the Nation, urging him to attend meets, if for no other reason than as a drawing card. When he attends as a participant, the meet is an assured success.

In all fairness I suggest that the AAU review its rules in regard to payments which may be made to athletes of amateur standing without violation of their rules, or the loss for life of the opportunity to participate in amateur contests, the sentence just rendered against Wes Santee.

Mr. President, I think I should mention that this matter was considered by the board of managers of the Missouri Valley Association last year and Wes Santee was acquitted of any charges of professionalism by a 21-to-7 vote.

Mr. President, I regret to make this statement, but I sincerely believe that the sports-loving and patriotic American people do not share the views of the members of the AAU.

Wes Santee was our one big hope in the mile run at the Olympics. By such actions as that just taken, in my opinion the stage is being set for one of the most telling Russian propaganda coups ever knowingly and unnecessarily encouraged.

There are no restrictions on athletes in Russian competition, and, as a matter of fact, I am advised they are subsidized by the Government.

Last December I appeared on a State telethon with Wes Santee, held for the purpose of raising funds to send our athletes to the Olympics. Similar programs were held in practically every State in the Union.

It is blows like the one directed against Wes Santee that destroy the morale of our athletes who have an opportunity to place in the Olympics.

Again I say, Mr. President, does the AAU intend to blacken for life the career of an outstanding, clean-cut young American?

INTERDICTION OF ASSETS BY ARGENTINE GOVERNMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, an Argentine Government mission is now in the United States to complete arrangements for an Export-Import Bank loan.

I know that the mission wil be courteously and generously received. All Americans have been impressed by the efforts of the Argentine people to reestablish the democratic tradition of their country. All of us want to see the development of the Argentine economy into a sound foundation for lasting democratic government.

Argentina and the United States now have an unparalleled opportunity to develop the most friendly relations with each other. On the United States side, this involves measures of financial assistance to help Argentina over its present economic crisis. On the Argentina side, it involves continued efforts to maintain a climate in which private American capital will be encouraged to participate in the financial and industrial growth of the nation.

As a friend of Argentina, I feel compelled to express my disquiet concerning recent steps taken by the present government of that country against American and other foreign companies, which have recently invested there. Argentina has recently "interdicted," or frozen, the assets of a number of firms with private American and other foreign interests, which began manufacturing operations in Argentina under the former government.

The ground of the interdiction is that these firms, apparently because they engaged in business under the former Government, are suspected of improperly acquiring their assets and of unjust enrichment. There appears to be a presumption that no foreign company could have dealt honestly with the former regime. The firms have been asked to submit proof that their assets were legitimately acquired, without being informed of the charges made against them or the identity of their accusers. In fact, some firms have been told by the interdiction authorities that these authorities do not know what the specific charges are.

While the interdiction remains in effect, some of the firms are being asked by the Agentine Government to negotiate changes in existing contracts with the Government, even though the validity of the existing contracts is not challenged.

If any American firm has violated any Argentine law, it should, of course, be tried and punished. But with the greatest respect for the good intentions of the present Argentine Government, and with full understanding of the problems that arise in the wake of a revolution, I have strong doubts whether it is consistent with the principles of any democratic country to seize the assets of business firms without charges and without hearing, or to reach judgments before the parties accused have been furnished with a statement of the charges, the identity of their accusers, and an opportunity for rebuttal. This sounds very much like the procedure of the Queen of Hearts at the trial of Alice: "Punishment first, trial later."

It is my hope that the Argentine Government will reexamine this situation, and in the very near future will take steps to remove the interdictions.

1958 COMMEMORATION OF FIRST CONFERENCE OF STATE GOVERNORS—LETTER FROM C. R. GUTERMUTH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have just received from C. R. Gutermuth, secretary of the Natural Resources Council of America.

Mr. Gutermuth's letter announces that the 37 national conservation and scientific organizations which make up the council are in full support of Senate Joint Resolution 139. The resolution provides for commemoration in 1958 of the first conference of State governors, which was on natural resource and conservation problems, and was held 50 years previously, in 1908.

The 37 organizations comprising the Natural Resources Council are listed following the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL
OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1956.

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: The 37 national conservation oragnizations and scientific societies enrolled in membership in the council are delighted to see that 60 other Senators joined with you in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 139. A companion measure, House Joint Resolution 525, was introduced in the House by the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey, and we are pleased that such a large number of Congressmen have introduced similar bills.

There is widespread belief that adequate provision should be made for the proper obesrvance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors. That conference was an important landmark in the conservation movement for the protection of the Nation's invaluable natural resources, and it is worthy of commemoration.

It is a pleasure to assure you that in the recent annual meeting of the council, the member organizations indicated that full support would be given to this commendable proposal.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Secretary.

MEMBERSHIP LIST, OCTOBER 1, 1955

1. American Fisheries Society, Thomas Langlois, delegate, P. O. Box C, Put-in-Bay, Ohia.
2. American Forestry Association, Lowell Besley, executive director-forester, 919 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
3. American Geographical Society, Charles B. Hitchcock, director, Broadway at 156th Street, New York, N. Y.
4. American Museum of Natural History, Richard H. Pough, curator, Central Park West at 79th Street, New York, N. Y.
5. American Nature Association, Harry E. Radcliffe, vice president, 1214 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
6. American Nature Study Society, Stanley Mullak, editor, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

7. American Ornithologists' Union, Samuel R. Madison, 18 Oakwood Place, Delmar, N. Y.

8. American Planning and Civic Association, Miss Harlean James, executive-secretary, 901 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

9. American Society of Limnology and Oceanography, Thomas H. Langlois, delegate, P. O. Box C, Put-in-Bay, Ohio.

10. American Society of Range Management, Kenneth Parker, delegate, U. S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

11. American Society of Zoologists, Thurlow Nelson, delegate, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.

12. Conservation Foundation, Samuel H. Ordway, Jr., vice president, 30 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

13. Ecological Society of America, James A. Macnab, delegate, 3440 N. W. Thurman Street, Portland 10, Oreg.

14. Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, Edgar Wayburn, President, 490 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

15. Forest Conservation Society of America, Charles H. Stoddard, executive secretary, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

16. Friends of the Land, Ollie E. Fink, executive secretary, Route 3, Zanesville, Ohio.

17. Grassland Research Foundation, Theodore M. Sperry, secretary, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kans.

18. Izaak Walton League of America, J. W. Penfold, national conservation director, 702 Mining Exchange Building, Denver, Colo.

19. Mountaineers, The, Mrs. Pauline Dyer, secretary, 116 J Street NE., Auburn, Wash.

20. National Association of Biology Teachers, Richard L. Weaver, project leader, P. O. Box 2073, Ann Arbor, Mich.

21. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Nolen J. Fuqua, president, Duncan, Okla.

22. National Audubon Society, John H. Baker, president, 1130 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

23. National Fisheries Institute, Charles E. Jackson, general manager, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

24. National Parks Association, Fred M. Packard, executive secretary, 2144 P Streeet NW., Washington, D. C.

25. National Wildlife Federation, Charles H. Callison, conservation director, 232 Carroll Street NW., Washington, D. C.

26. Nature Conservancy, George B. Fell, executive director, 4200 22d Street NE., Washington, D. C.

27. New York Zoological Society, Fairfield Osborn, president, 30 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

28. North American Wildlife Foundation, C. R. Gutermuth, secretary, 709 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

29. Pacific Northwest Bird and Mammal Society, Mrs. Maratha R. Flahaut, librarian, Washington State Museum, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

30. Sierra Club, David R. Brower, executive director, 1050 Mills Tower, San Francisco, California.

31. Society of American Foresters, Henry Clepper, executive secretary, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

32. Soil Conservation Society of America, Edward H. Graham, delegate, Shreve Road, Rural Route No. 1, Falls Church, Va.

33. Sport Fishing Institute, Richard H. Stroud, executive vice president, Bond Building, Washington, D. C.

34. Wild Flower Preservation Society, P. L. Ricker, president, 3740 Oliver Street, Washington, D. C.

35. Wilderness Society, Howard Zahniser, Executive Secretary, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

36. Wildlife Management Institute, Ira N. Gabrielson, president, 709 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

37. Wildlife Society, Daniel L. Leedy, Delegate, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

HONORARY MEMBERS

1. Dr. Robert F. Griggs, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburg, Pa.

2. Dr. Alfred C. Redfield, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, Mass.

3. Dr. Paul B. Sears, Yale University, 77 Prospect Street, New Haven, Conn.

4. Mr. Tom Wallace, Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky.

5. Dr. Charles G. Woodbury, 1801 Hoban Road, Washington, D. C.

Conservation News Service, Carl D. Shoemaker, editor, 4920 Earlston Drive, Westgate, Md.

NONMEMBER, SUBSCRIBER-CONTRIBUTOR

Field and Stream magazine, Mr. Hugh Grey, editor, 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

(Purchases Conservation News Service.)

Not eligible to council membership. Harold Titus, conservation editor, Traverse City, Mich., receives service.

SENATOR McMAHON'S PEACE PLAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on February 6, an Associated Press dispatch from Norwich, Conn., reported that Joseph P. Lyford, of Westport, had asked for revival of a peace plan proposed in this Chamber 6 years ago by our late, most distinguished, and beloved colleague, Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut.

I was deeply impressed with this news story; and as one of the many Members of this body who congratulated Senator McMahon on his statesmanlike proposal, I feel it appropriate at this time to reinsert in the RECORD the full text of Senator McMahon's address.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1950]

THE HYDROGEN BOMB—SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTROL OF SUPERWEAPONS

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the President of the United States has now given orders to build the hydrogen bomb—to create, in deliverable quantities, those chunks of the sun technically known as thermonuclear weapons.

Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point the statement made by the President of the United States in making known his decision. I invite attention to the last sentence in that statement, wherein he said:

"We shall also continue to examine all those factors that affect our program for peace and this country's security."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"It is part of my responsibility as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to see to it that our country is able to defend itself against any possible aggressor. Accordingly, I have directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work on all forms of atomic weapons, including the so-called hydrogen or superbomb. Like all other work in the field of atomic weapons, it is being and will be carried forward on a basis consistent with the overall objectives of our program for peace and security.

"This we shall continue to do until a satisfactory plan for international control of atomic energy is achieved. We shall also continue to examine all those factors that affect our program for peace and this country's security."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in line with the President's intention of continuing that examination, I shall make my remarks today with the hope that the thoughts which are expressed may be somewhat helpful in the situation.

The scientists feel more confident that this most horrible of armaments can be developed successfully than they felt in 1940 when the original atomic bomb was under consideration. The hydrogen development will be cheaper than its uranium forerunner. Theoretically, it is without limit in destructive capacity. A weapon made of such material would destroy any military or other target, including the largest city on earth.

The President's decision was dictated by the severe realities of the world which we inhabit today. He had no choice, and his decision under present circumstances is right.

American renunciation of the hydrogen bomb would mean embracing the folly of disarmament by example. Our friends abroad would shrink away from us, seeing that we had lost power to defend the United States, much less to help defend Europe. Kapitza, the great Soviet physicist, and German scientists imported into Russia are noted for their special competence in the technical problems relating to hydrogen weapons. Densely populated American cities are made to order for an explosive that will level hundreds of square miles. Communism suffered a defeat in prestige when our democracy completed the earliest atomic bombs,but this prestige defeat would be more than recouped, assuming that Russia were to complete hydrogen bombs soonest. Furthermore, if the Kremlin believes that it cannot outproduce us in ordinary atomic weapons—imagine calling the destroyers of Hiroshima and Nakasaki ordinary—its logical strategy is to excel in the thermonuclear field. All such factors as these serve to warn America against complacency.

Voluntary acceptance of the idea of being less well armed than other nations in this era of our greatest vulnerability runs completely counter to the traditions of our leaders—and, I might add, to good common sense. In my judgment, a failure to press ahead with the hydrogen bomb might mean unconditional surrender—in advance—by the United States to alien forces of evil.

But please note my insistence that we possess no monopoly upon the hydrogen-bomb idea. If we win the race to build this weapon first, it will be only a matter of time—and possibly a short time—before the Kremlin achieves success also. Let me warn, with all the solemnity at my command, that building hydrogen bombs does not promise positive security for the United States; it promises only the negative result of averting for a few months or years well-nigh certain catastrophe. Do not for a moment overlook the obvious—that Soviet Russia broke our atomic-bomb monopoly sooner than we had expected, and she would break any hydogen-bomb monopoly we enjoyed with equal or greater speed. Mr. President, I have the idea that in discussing this subject we are dealing with something which is extremely important. We are plunged into a truly terrible arms race.

What are we going to do about it?

There are really, I suggest, no more than two broad policies from which to choose. One consists in resigning ourselves to a generation of waging the cold war—that is, striving endlessly to contain Russia's outward pressure, pouring out our substance to stay ahead in the weapons competition even after the Kremlin becomes armed with

hydrogen bombs, and cherishing indefinitely the hope that Soviet tyranny will somehow see the evil of its ways and reform itself from within. Arrayed against the choice of such a policy is 5,000 years of recorded history, which teaches again and again and again that armaments races lead to war—under today's conditions, hydrogen war.

But even if this policy could enable us to avoid armed conflict for a whole generation, it would undermine and corrupt that which we prize more highly even than the absence of hostilities: I refer to liberty. How is it possible for free institutions to flourish or even to maintain themselves in a situation in which defenses, civil and military, must be ceaselessly poised to meet an attack that might incinerate 50 million Americans—not in the space of an evening but in the space of minutes?

Consider what sustained fear does to the individual—especially to the individual enterpriser. It constricts his imagination, paralyzes his initiative, and even affects his personal morality. It constitutes the most subtle and potent of poisons. Consider the crushing burdens already imposed upon our private-enterprise economy. Consider, too, the restrictions on freedom already brought about by the atomic bomb and by its pressures upon us to accept loyalty checks, espionage countermeasures, and widening areas of official secrecy. For a preview of the future if the armaments race continues, multiply the effect of these factors by something like 1,000 times—to allow for the 1,000-times greater energy release of the hydrogen bomb—and if you are candid and realistic, I believe you will find it is difficult indeed to see a dominant role for freedom in such a picture. To stay alive we will find ourselves more and more compelled to imitate the totalitarian rival.

The other broad policy which we may choose consists in moving heaven and earth to stop the atomic armaments race, to establish worldwide atomic peace, and to make possible atomic-created abundance among all men. In pursuing that policy we would tap to the roots the resources of our ingenuity and imagination; we would regard no suggestion as too startling or unconventional for careful consideration; and we would be guided, disciplined, and inspired by our code of ethics and democratic, peace-loving decencies.

It was from this kind of philosophy that we generated our original proposal for international control—a proposal which should constitute a source of pride to every citizen of our land. When the atom was split for destruction during the recent war, a transcendent moral problem came into being; and the responsibility for moral leadership on an equal order of magnitude rested upon us, since we had made the first bomb. There were those who advised us to advance no special or unusual peace plan, and who hewed to the same pseudo logic that now sees us waging the cold war for another generation. Fortunately, a wiser counsel prevailed and we rose to the moral challenge. We have written a page of history, Mr. President, that will live as long as history is read, and will reflect its glory upon those who formulated our program to serve God and mankind.

In essence we offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, and we asked only for the minimum safeguards, as operative upon ourselves as upon others, that would prevent the evil in atomic energy from being used to destroy us. We proposed that men of all countries, including Russians, come to America under the auspices of the United Nations and inspect our atomic activities and share in the control of our atomic raw materials and the operation of our atomic plants—all for the purpose of assuring themselves, to their own complete satisfaction, that we had honored our promise to exploit the atom for peace, and peace alone. Equally, we proposed that the same just and necessary protective measures be made effective throughout the globe.

More than 3½ years have elapsed since Bernard Baruch, as spokesman for the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, presented our official plan to the United Nations. He delivered one of the greatest addresses known to the English language, saying:

"We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead.

"That is our business.

"Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction."

We may as well bluntly recognize, here and now, that in the ledger of life and death, the ledger of world peace and world destruction, there is only one entry on the hopeful side: the study, the improvement, and finally the endorsement of the American proposal by an overwhelming majority of the United Nations. On the death side of the ledger, on the side of world destruction, there have been repeated entries, a succession which began when Mr. Gromyko, as the Soviet delegate, stated that our plan is unacceptable either in whole or in part. For the sake of confusing world opinion, the Kremlin has retreated somewhat from that statement, using phrases too vague to define; but basically Mr. Gromyko's words reflect the Soviet attitude as accurately today as when they were uttered.

It is my intense conviction that our decision, born of necessity, to build the hydogen bomb must be accompanied by the immediate initiation of a moral crusade for peace having far greater potential effect than any physical weapon, even chunks of the sun.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MCMAHON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Before the Senator leaves the point he has just mentioned, I should like to inquire whether it is correct that our offer of 3½ years ago, the plan of Mr. Baruch, is still just as good today as it was when it was made.

Mr. MCMAHON. I say to the Senator that because it was objectively right, because it was based fundamentally on the scientific facts, which are inherent in this problem, the American plan, which now has ceased to be the American plan and is the plan of the United Nations, is as objectively correct today in its essentials as it was on the day when it was formulated.

Mr. President, if we should fail in the business of working in a crusade for peace, we would deal a severe blow both to our moral position and to our fervent hopes for a secure future. The people of the United States want harmony among nations infinitely more than they want a new bomb. A fresh proposal for atomic peace, as dramatic as it is sincere, impresses me as urgently desirable.

Yet, through Bernard Baruch's immortal address of more than 3 years ago, we have already undertaken one major peace effort—and it was unsuccessful in that today we remain as far distant from atomic agreement as when we started. Why did this honest peace effort fail to impact successfully upon all mankind?

The answer is obvious and may be summarized in three words: Russia's Iron Curtain. The people of Russia, thanks to the Iron Curtain, have been prevented from knowing the true and desperate nature of the atomic crisis. They have been kept from learning, due to the Iron Curtain, how we extend toward them the hand of friendship and offer a just atomic control plan for their protection and incalculable benefit as well as our own. Any information on the subject that reaches the Russian people is first twisted and distorted into the red focus of the Kremlin's official line.

We all know why the Soviet elite members maintain their curtain. It is because, using Churchill's phrase, "they fear our friendship more than they fear our enmity." A prison cannot be operated with too many doors and windows unguarded and unlocked. The men of the Kremlin do not want us to look in. Above all, they do not want their own people to look out. This explains not only the Soviet clinging to the curtain but also to the Soviet rejection of an atomic inspectorate and other essential controls.

It is completely accurate to say that, in final analysis Russia's Iron Curtain is responsible for our enormously reluctant decision to make hydrogen bombs, for the curtain prevents the Russian people from appreciating that we want and seek atomic peace; they, therefore, bring no effective pressure upon their rulers to accept atomic peace; the rulers maintain their absolute sway through popular ignorance; and the atomic armaments race rushes madly onward.

But though we may justly blame the Iron Curtain, we must also blame ourselves for failing to bring our message of peace and conciliation adequately to the attention even of those peoples who enjoy reasonably free access to information. Few of our own leaders have recognized that global control of atomic energy is the heart question of all foreign policy and that the German dilemma, the Austrian treaty, the status of Japan, and like matters are relatively insignificant compared to the overriding issue of whether or not more atomic weapons shall enter into existence with each month and year which passes.

If a new crusade for peace is not to miss its objective, as did the peace effort which we launched with such high hopes in 1946, we must not only crack the Iron Curtain and gain the ear of the Russian people, but we must also gain the ear of people on the near side of the barrier, including the many in our own country who do not yet grasp what is at stake.

We have spent $29 million a year on what we are pleased to call the Voice of America. It should be called the whisper of America. We spend in this country over $30 million a year to advertise cosmetics, and $29 million, I repeat, to sell the most precious commodity we have to sell—freedom itself.

All over the world today, perhaps because listlessness and mediocrity have characterized our attempts to sell what American is, what America wants, and what America intends, there exists misunderstanding as to our attitude. The 30 years of vilification emanating from behind the Iron Curtain in Moscow have taken a toll on our reputation as a peaceloving and a peaceliving nation. There are millions of people abroad who observe our armaments expenditures and fail to grasp that these are for self-defense.

They should appreciate the truth, but they do not. We assume that our actual good intentions and actual good feelings must be known to them; but they see that we devote billions to guns, tanks, planes, and atomic weapons, and day and night the Communist propaganda machine hammers into them the theme that American armaments are designed for conquest. Even worse, they do not see—at least with the same clarity—the huge resources being diverted to munitions inside Russia; for the Iron Curtain conceals such activity and even enables Mr. Vishinsky to deceive multitudes by claiming that his country uses atomic energy to move mountains.

I advocate, Mr. President, a United States program of attention-arresting foreign broadcasts that would compare in size and scope

to the Soviet effort along this line and that would genuinely deserve the name, Voice of America. I favor exploring the efficacy of printing millions of leaflets for worldwide circulation explaining a new United States proposal for atomic peace. We should publicly and repeatedly challenge the Kremlin to make known the terms of the proposal to newspaper readers and also to listeners inside Russia. We should publicly and repeatedly challenge the Kremlin to permit a meeting of the United Nations in Moscow itself, so that the trend of international discussions and our own sincerity would be more likely to enter the mental horizon of the average Russian.

There are other possible methods of creating a window in the Iron Curtain. Some have already been made known to the Senate; others will occur to us if we give the problem sufficient thought; all should receive the most painstaking scrutiny. At almost any cost, we must assure that the Russian people have opportunity to consider, side by side, the atomic proposals of their own rulers and our atomic proposals, and that the Russian people act as part of the world jury which brings in a verdict covering this monumental issue.

There remains the question of what fresh atomic offer we should advance as means of igniting a moral crusade for peace. Recently some observers, quite properly conscious of the decisive position occupied by atomic energy have argued that a board should be appointed, analagous to the one which prepared the famous American report in 1946, and that such a board shall take a new look at the entire control problem—especially with a view toward reevaluating the need for certain technical phases of what is now the United Nations plan. Yet the scientific facts surrounding the hydrogen bomb more than ever render necessary the general kind of technical program which the United Nations, after exhaustive study, has approved. More than ever it is true that an ineffective agreement would be worse than no agreement at all. More than ever there is no escape from strict control of raw materials, strict control of plants and continuous inspection. We can enter into no scheme of a type which would only serve to mislead us and induce a false sense of security.

The new approach I have in mind is somewhat different. Although it flows from many weeks, and indeed months, of continuous reflection, I offer it only as an example of the bold steps which the Soviet atomic explosion, the shadow of the hydrogen bomb, and the pyramiding arms race should persuade us to consider.

We now spend about $15 billion annually for armaments. Why not offer to take two-thirds of this sum or $10 billion, and, instead of amassing sterile weapons, use it to foster peace throughout the world for a 5-year period? Why not offer to spread the annual $10 billion over three programs: President Truman's point-4 proposal, development of atomic energy everywhere for peace, and general economic aid and help to all countries, including Russia? Such a global Marshall plan might combine with the marvelous power of peacetime atomic energy to generate universal material progress and a universal cooperative spirit. In exchange for our own contribution of $10 billion annually, which we would save from the military budget, we would ask first, general acceptance of an effective program for international control of atomic energy, and, second, an agreement by all countries, enforced through inspection, that two-thirds of their present spending upon armaments be devoted toward constructive ends. Administration of the annual $10 billion which we offered to make available for 5 years would be carried out through the United Nations.

Such a proposal, if advanced by our Government, might vividly bring home to all the world's population—in a manner far more successful than we have so far used—the profundity of our desire for peace. It would accomplish this result even if it accomplished nothing else. If the proposal were actually accepted, we would have concluded the cheapest monetary bargain in the history of the world; we would have probably saved mankind from destruction by fire; and we would have paved the way toward a new era of unimagined abundance for all men, based upon atomic energy constructively harnessed.

At present only one-third of the world's 2,200 million people receive enough food to sustain life on a decent basis. The other two-thirds live continuously at the margin of starvation. Mr. President, it is atomic energy that opens up the vision of expanding material decencies until there is enough to go around for all, until every last hungry mouth is filled. Perhaps, through the expenditure of a few extra tens of millions of dollars we can conquer the riddle of photosynthesis and extract from the processes of plant growth a means of multiplying many times the world's food supply. Perhaps through atomic power for industry and agriculture we can transform the deserts of Africa, Asia, and the Americas into blooming crop-producing acres, and the arid hills of the world into gardens. It is almost impossible to overestimate what all-out concentration upon atomic energy for peace might accomplish in terms of remaking and improving the physical environment of mankind.

I might point out that we have already poured billions of dollars into foreign economic aid, asking nothing in return, and still Communist propaganda has blackened our motives in the eyes of million of men. Here, in accordance with my suggestion, we would ask effective control of the atom and substantial disarmament—which every man and woman in the world has a right to expect without any further inducement on our part. Yet we would in fact provide further inducement, in the form of $10 billion annually for 5 years, as proof of our overwhelming will to peace.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCMAHON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

At the same time it goes without saying that we would provide no such funds unless they were associated with the measures needed to rescue humanity from hell on earth, control of the atom, and disarmament.

I suppose that my suggestions will be termed impractical or theoretical in some quarters. Before they are condemned, however, I would ask that whoever condemns them produce a better proposal.

I am willing to have my suggestions today judged against the background of Mr. Baruch's words spoken more than 3 years ago—words which I have quoted and which I now repeat:

"We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead.

"That is our business.

"Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction."

Mr. President, I would write those words upon the heart and mind of every statesman in the world in the crisis in which we find ourselves today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCMAHON. I have only a brief statement to make, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

This much, Mr. President, I would add: In 1945 and 1946, when our thoughts were focused upon the Hiroshima bomb, we enjoyed an opportunity to wage atomic peace that somehow, despite the magnificence and generosity of our proposal to the United Nations, we did not fully exploit. Our present concern with the hydrogen bomb furnishes a second opportunity. I do not think a third will be given us.

I believe that every morning each Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and each high official of the executive branch of this Government should glance at the sun and reflect that what he sees there, millions of miles away, threatens to be recreated on this earth, in our own cities, in Washington, New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and New Orleans. This is a time for soul-searching, for nationwide and worldwide debate, and for the launching and maintaining of that moral crusade for peace which alone can save us and lead mankind along the righteous paths of security, abundance, and liberty.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the proposals the late Senator McMahon made in 1950 were prophetic and discerning at that time; today, they are even more significant because of the state of world affairs. I should like to call attention to the details of the Senator's plans for a multibillion dollar "Marshall global plan" for peace that would expand our point 4 program, would develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes and make it available to all nations, and would undertake a massive campaign of truth about democracy and America's desire for peace, to be directed to all corners of the world.

The principles of Senator McMahon's proposal deserve the most careful consideration. They were advanced by a man who, perhaps more than any other civilian of his time, understood both the threat and the promise of the atom. He warned, and I repeat his warning, that we cannot guarantee our national security or lasting peace by simply struggling to keep a numerical and technical advantage in the production of nuclear weapons. We must also develop a positive program for winning the friendship of other nations and for drying up the sources of economic and social unrest which are the most fertile breeding grounds of communism.

TRIBUTE TO H. CHAPMAN ROSE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the people of the United States owe a debt to a man who has served them well and faithfully, the Honorable H. Chapman Rose. Mr. Rose has recently resigned his post of Under Secretary of the Treasury, to return to private law practice.

It has been my privilege from time to time to observe Mr. Rose's performance of his duties. It is clear to me that two of his guiding principles have been fairness and a determination to find the true facts. As a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I have been impressed with his selflessness and with the contributions he has made to our Nation's economic well-being.

Mr. Rose particularly deserves high commendation for the impartial approach he displayed in settling, during his closing weeks in office, a number of long-standing and troublesome issues which had been confronting the Treasury Department. Among them were the

serious and complicated matters of customs administration affecting the importation of Swiss watch movements. The far-reaching aspects of these problems have manifested themselves in my own State of Maryland because of the grave impact which the curtailment of watch imports has had on the sale of Maryland tobacco to Switzerland.

There is little doubt that Mr. Rose has made a significant contribution to the eventual restoration of improved trade relations with Switzerland. As a result of forward-looking actions taken prior to his leaving Government service, the Treasury Department, on February 7, 1956, published a ruling clarifying and upholding its existing practices with reference to the collection of duties on adjusted watch movements. By confirming its long-standing interpretation of the Tariff Act, the Department, in effect, has rejected contentions by the domestic watch manufacturers, and others, that watch importers have avoided the payment of proper duties. It is heartening to see the Treasury Department take such a firm and justified stand on this matter, since erroneous allegations have done a great disservice, not alone to the Swiss, but also to the American watch importers.

Mr. Rose's dedicated and devoted service in behalf of the American people should not go unnoted. For this reason, I wish to commend highly the exemplary record of Mr. H. Chapman Rose. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a most fitting editorial from the Washington Post and Times-Herald, dated January 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. ROSE'S RETIREMENT

Under Secretary of the Treasury H. Chapman Rose is one of those officials who ought to be a permanent part of the Government. Like his chief, Secretary Humphrey, he is an exceedingly expert administrator who is more than capable in any situation. Any administration would be lucky to have such an official; indeed, one of Mr. Rose's strong points has been that he has had the confidence of both Democrats and Republicans in Congress. He can take pride in the fact that the Treasury has won distinction as perhaps the best-managed agency of the Government; this success has been due in no small measure to his own skill and understanding. He has played a brilliant role in both the formulation of Treasury policy and in administration. His resignation to return to the practice of law in Cleveland leaves a void in the Treasury that will be most difficult to fill.

PROPOSED DISCONTINUANCE OF DIRECT FREIGHT AND PASSENGER SERVICE BY THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD BETWEEN CERTAIN POINTS IN CONNECTICUT—RESOLUTION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has indicated that it wishes to discontinue direct freight and passenger service between Hartford, Willimantic, and Boston, via Putnam, Conn. I have before me a resolution adopted by the Development Commission of the State of Connecticut, expressing opposition to the taking of such action, and the hope that the railroad will reconsider the matter, and will not discontinue that service. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
Hartford, Conn., February 16, 1956.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: For your information I am enclosing a resolution adopted by this commission at its regular meeting yesterday.

With very kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY A. EDWARDS,
Managing Director.

RESOLUTION RE DISCONTINUANCE OF DIRECT FREIGHT AND PASSENGER SERVICE BY NEW HAVEN RAILROAD BETWEEN HARTFORD, WILLIMANTIC, AND BOSTON VIA PUTNAM

Whereas the State of Connecticut through the Governor's office, the development commission, the highway department, the water commission, the department of education, and many other State departments and agencies is bending every effort to stimulate and encourage the rehabilitation and economic development of eastern Connecticut; and

Whereas these efforts in concert with the activities of dedicated local officials, local civic groups and others are meeting with definite results and are, in fact, reversing the long-time downward trend of the area, and

Whereas the development and greater use of transportation facilities of all types is essential to the future success of such efforts; and

Whereas the announced intention of the New Haven railroad to discontinue its passenger service and direct freight service between Willimantic and Boston via Putnam, if it becomes effective, will severely handicap the rehabilitation and economic development efforts previously mentioned: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Connecticut Development Commission bring these facts to the attention of the president of the New Haven Railroad, the public utilities commission, the Governor of the State of Connecticut, the Interstate Commerce Commission and others who may be interested in the growth and prosperity of all sections of Connecticut and especially the flood-damaged areas of eastern Connecticut, in the hope that some common ground of understanding may be reached whereby the New Haven Railroad will reconsider its intended action and as a direct beneficiary accept its full share of responsibility for the continued success of these efforts.

(The above resolution was passed unanimously at the regular monthly meeting of the Connecticut Development Commission, held in Hartford, Conn., Wednesday, February 15, 1956.)

Mr. BUSH. Furthermore, Mr. President, I should like to state that eastern Connecticut is one of the most beautiful parts of our State, but it does need some economic stimulus. Certainly the discontinuance of railroad service in the area and the discontinuance of shipments of raw materials and other articles necessary for manufacturing and commerce there would be a blow to that section of the State, which has suffered more losses from the moving of mills into the South than has any other area of my State.

So I desire to express my deep sympathy with the resolution which has been adopted by the Development Commission; and I join my own expression of hope with that of theirs that the railroad will reconsider this entire matter.

THE NEED FOR ADEQUATE DEFENSE MEASURES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday last, after making some remarks in relation to the veto by the President of the natural-gas bill, I had occasion to reply to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on the need for adequate defensive measures. My remarks will be found on pages 2797–2798 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I pointed out the changed geographical conditions of today as compared with what they were when I came to Washington 17 years ago. We all realize that, just as in this changing world, we have by our ingenuity eliminated time and space, likewise, in this changing world, due to the same ingenuity and inventiveness, we are now finding new energies, new methods, and new means. We are now talking about intercontinental missiles which will travel 5,000 miles. We are talking about the fallout of an H-bomb which would cover the whole State of Wisconsin.

As appears from the press, Trevor Gardner in secret session has raised the question of our neglecting necessary military research in the field of atomic and guided missiles. I am not entering into that controversy. I am not on the committee; but, just as we were asleep at the time of Pearl Harbor—thinking it would be impossible for the Japanese to attack—so it is possible that in the field of research, we may discover that we are lagging or asleep.

This must not happen, because times are different now than they were at the time of Pearl Harbor. We had 2 years then to make good our mistakes. Now, because of the elimination of time and space, we will not have 2 hours.

A young man from my own State, a former United States marine, Russell D. L. Wirth, Jr., has prepared what he calls an open letter to our Government. In this letter he points up some of the well-known information and statements that have been made available on the floor of the Senate and in the press concerning the Russians' advance in the field of rocket and intercontinental missiles.

I ask that this statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER IN DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

(By Russell D. L. Wirth, Jr.)

OPEN LETTER TO OUR GOVERNMENT

We, the sovereign people salute your brilliant achievement over the past 3 years. For the first time in cold-war history you have maintained both freedom and security within the blessed framework of peace.

But we the people are not misled concerning the mounting Communist challenge to peace. We recognize our awesome role in history as the ultimate defender of freedom.

Along with Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Malenkov, and Khrushchev, we know the sole aim of communism is "world domination through world revolution." We know that every single 1 of 19 successful Communist revolutions depended upon military force or threat of force.

We know that our proven military superiority to communism is the absolute minimum requirement for freedom, security, and peace. That our superiority must be first, in intercontinental weapons for global warfare, and second, in tactical forces against local aggression. Only with this dual superiority can we prevent both the horror of world war III and the debacle of Korean stalemate.

We know that our tragic unpreparedness and moral indecision under Wilson before World War I, Roosevelt before World War II, and Truman before Korea misled totalitarians to aggress and forced us to the horror of war. Today, unlike the past, we are blessed with a leadership totally dedicated to peace through adequate preparedness. We are led by perhaps the greatest military team in history, in our Joint Chiefs of Staff headed by a Commander in Chief who is America's greatest living wartime leader.

Neither we the people nor political partisans among us can judge just what are the necessary levels of military strength to achieve our objectives. None of us are qualified to do this without access to secret plans and trends, without vast scientific and technical knowledge, without professional strategic training. We accept your decisions in awareness that they were made without shortsighted panic, without false regard for "critical" years, without bankrupting our economy, and without sacrificing security to domestic politics.

Yet we would summarize for you the awesome facts of Communist military challenge, as imperfectly reflected in the public press. We do this in full knowledge that these may be subject to distortion and inaccuracy. We do this because published figures indicate an ever-mounting threat and because we wish to prove our willingness to undertake whatever dollar sacrifices proves necessary to preserve peace and freedom.

In terms of commitments, we are formally obligated to defend 39 foreign nations, informally to participate in the defense of 25 more. Our total commitment then extends to 64 nations abroad, comprising over half the world's land area and about two-thirds of its population, in which we man some 950 foreign bases.

In expenditures, we have a staggering current investment of $124 billion in military goods and property. We are spending 2-out-of-every-3 dollars, over $40 billion in recent budgets, on national security expenses. But this represents only 10 percent of our national production while Soviet Russia forces its slave economy to concentrate 50–60 percent on war production.

In land forces, we face an estimated 190 infantry and 65 mechanized Communist divisions in the West, supported by 40,000 tanks and 9,000 tactical aircraft. In the East, we face Communist China's veteran 3 million-man trained army backed by 13 million Chinese militia.

Our own Army is reported at 19 divisions. Of these, 2 are static, split between Alaska and the Canal Zone, and 5 are training units. This leaves America with but 12 fighting divisions to fulfill our vast global commitment.

In land tactics, some 95 Soviet divisions are thought to be reorganized for atomic warfare. We are reported to have made but a beginning on 2 United States divisions. And the cost of "atomicizing" all 12 United States divisions is considered upwards of $3 billion.

In naval power, the Russians have advanced from seventh to second place in the world. They already surpass the United States in naval manpower. They should exceed us in total naval strength within the next 10 years at present rates. They have spent $45 billion since World War II on a cruiser, destroyer, and submarine construction program that exceeds the combined programs of all NATO powers.

By latest estimate, the Russians have a massive 400-vessel submarine fleet, more than 5 times Nazi sub strength at the outset of World War II. They are thought to have capitalized on Nazi underwater rocket launching techniques and to be outfitting their subs with rocket launchers in the Komsomolsk naval yards.

Assuming the Russians staged underwater atomic rocket raids on our coastal areas up to 40 miles inland, they could strike 5 of America's 7 largest metropolitan centers, all our major naval bases and shipyards, almost all our aircraft industry, and about half of our air bases in a single surprise blow.

In nuclear weapons, America is thought well ahead both in quantity and quality. But both sides are approaching the "nuclear saturation" point wherein adequate stockpiles of weapons exist for all available targets. Unofficial estimates place the rapidly growing Soviet stockpile at well over 500. When converted into hydrogen weapons similar to that exploded by the Soviets in the fall, this stockpile is considered capable of destroying the United States in one devastating blow.

Our Civil Defense planners believe that 50 to 60 percent of an attacking force could penetrate to deliver bombs on target. Assuming that only one-half, or 250 bombs, were so delivered, this would still be sufficient to mount major nuclear assaults on the 92 United States "critical" areas and lesser atomic raids on the additional 123 "suitable" targets.

Navy Department personnel have indicated that the Russians should be able to deliver their major assaults with, at the very minimum, 5-megaton hydrogen bombs. Even this initial 5-megaton bomb could achieve major destruction through fire and blast in a circular area of 300 square miles and could contaminate a wider area of 7,000 square miles with deadly radioactive fallout. In a major attack with such weapons, civil defense estimates that some 20 million Americans would be killed, an equal number injured, and our industrial potential crippled.

Ahead in the nuclear field lies the threat of warfare with radioactive strontium and other forms of atom ash generated in the peacetime nuclear plants of numerous nations. It has been estimated that by 1975 Britain alone will have produced 20 billion curies of atomic ash. A mere 5 percent of this, weighing only 3 tons, is reported capable of contaminating 4,000 square miles.

Today we recognize that the key to the world power balance lies, not so much in weapon stockpiles as in relative delivery, defense, and retaliation capability, and in the will to utilize weapons available. Hence the crucial race for survival shifts to air and rocket power.

In air power, published information suggests that the Soviets are taking a decisive lead in intercontinental bombers and in day and night interceptors. Only our 1,500 B–47 medium range bombers provide us with a now-challenged margin of superiority.

Within 2 years, it is thought, the Soviets will have 600 to 800 intercontinental jet TU–37 bombers and 800 to 1,000 medium jet TU–39 bombers. Our Strategic Air Command over this same period will see little improvement other than replacement of obsolete reciprocating B–36's with some 330 jet B–52's. Even this improvement would give the Soviets a 2-to-1 advantage in long-range intercontinental striking power plus the traditional advantage of the aggressor.

Our present operational interceptors are not considered adequate defense against the new Soviet bombers. Our new F–102's and F–104's are thought good enough but are not expected to fully replace present equipment by the time the Soviet bomber force reaches full strength.

Our strategic air power appears overly dependent on some 100 overseas bases over which we have little political control. Our 1,500 B–47's cannot strike from the United States itself without two-way air-to-air refueling. But we are reported lacking enough air-tankers to refuel more than one-fifth of our fleet at a time.

Our military aircraft production has fallen over recent years to an estimated 8,000 planes in 1956. This compares with an estimated Soviet figure of 10,000 to 16,000 planes per year. The Russians are reported producing their latest night fighters at 5 times, their day fighters at 3 times, their intercontinental bombers at 2 times current United States production rates.

In rocket warfare, the limited speed and human error of piloted aircraft will ultimately be replaced by the instantaneous speed and mechanical accuracy of guided missiles. The Russians have been reported working on an intercontinental guided rocket with 5,000-mile range and nuclear warhead ever since 1946. They began a top-priority program immediately after they seized 2,000 German rocket specialists, principal German rocket centers at Peenemunde and Thuringia, and plans for the A–10 German rocket designed to bombard New York from Europe.

The Russians are reported building massive rocket launching sites along their Arctic coast aimed over the Polar Cap. Marshall Bulganin boasted to the Supreme Soviet this last December that the Russians would soon have an intercontinental missile. And our top scientific Killian Committee is reported as saying the Soviets should achieve decisive superiority in intercontinental missiles within the 1960–65 period.

To date, the Russians are thought to have definitely tested a guided rocket of 1,500 milk range. This intermediate range missile, with a nuclear warhead, could strike almost all of America's 100 overseas bases. It might thereby neutralize our basic retaliation weapon, the medium range B–47.

On the other hand, our Defense Department gave the intercontinental missile low priority up until 1955. Secretary Wilson estimates we may have one in the next 5 years. With a $1.3 billion budget and a newly established coordinator, our rocket program may now have entered the life-and-death race to beat the Soviets to the so-called "ultimate weapon."

Should the Russians develop the intercontinental missile before us, the free world's entire treaty and defense structure might be imperiled. By merely demonstrating the weapon's destructive capabilities and the impossibility of effective defense, the Soviets might achieve their basic aim of destroying our allies' will to resist. Then, through a series of maneuvers, revolutions, and subversions, they might achieve the piecemeal disintegration of the free world under the awesome threat of missile warfare. There is the equal danger that the Soviets would attempt to exploit their temporary advantage by means of surprise aggression against the continental United States before America matched or countered their new weapon.

Once warfare with intercontinental missiles, thermonuclear warheads, and radioactive ash becomes generally feasible, it would appear that any side could totally destroy any other no matter which side initiated warfare. War would cease to have any relation to national policy and become a matter of mutual suicide.

At some point well before this time, it would again appear absolutely imperative that we achieve some form of inspection, disarmament, and ultimate international ban

or control of nuclear weapons. The key to disarmament would appear to be achievement of proven and clear American military superiority, involving prior development of an intercontinental missile, for thereby it would become clearly to the advantage of the Communists to disarm.

We, the people of America, wish to reassert our awareness of these grim facts and our willingness to pay whatever the price of peace and freedom may be.

FOOD SHIPMENTS TO RELIEVE EUROPEAN DISTRESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have all read with genuine sympathy the news from all parts of Western Europe concerning the tremendous damage inflicted by the cold wave, regarded by many observers as the worst such storm period in a century.

The President of the United States, acting for the people of the United States, has, as usual, responded with promptness, humanitarianism, and effectiveness.

From Thomasville, Ga., he has sent word that we are prepared to use a part of the Nation's farm surpluses to relieve the suffering in Western Europe.

Already, American relief activity has reminded the world that no Nation is more responsive to human need than is our own Nation.

Thus, American Armed Forces stationed in Europe, by means of their relief operations by airplane, by helicopter, by truck convoys, and the like, have shown once again that the only war which we Americans want to fight is the war against mankind's age-old enemies of want, disease, hunger, and other forms of suffering.

We have, of course, been particularly eager to respond to the dire needs of our friends in the Republic of Italy. They in turn have already responded through a message of thanks from President Gronchi for all our assistance activity to date.

I know that the Congress enthusiastically commends the President for his action. We earnestly hope and pray that nature's fury will relent, and that Western Europe will be spared from further suffering.

But if we may judge from the past, there will be other natural disasters, unfortunately, in time to come—floods, tornadoes, earthquakes, avalanches, and the like. So, we must and will be prepared at all times to utilize the fruit of nature's bounty, in the form of farm production, to relieve distress whenever it occurs, at home or abroad.

SENATOR HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today is a very auspicious day in the life of my senior colleague, CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona. Today he enters his 45th year as a Member of Congress. It had been my intention to make some remarks on this occasion, but yesterday I had the pleasure of reading in the Washington Star a very excellent article written by Joseph F. McCaffrey, entitled "Last Frontiersman Marks His 44th Year in Congress."

Because the article so clearly portrays the unselfish public life of my senior colleague, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAST FRONTIERSMAN MARKS HIS 44TH YEAR IN CONGRESS

(By Joseph F. McCaffrey)

The only real life frontiersman still in public life enters his 45th year as a Federal legislator today.

He is CARL HAYDEN, senior Senator from Arizona and second ranking Member of the Senate in point of service. Only his fellow Democrat, WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, has been in the upper house longer than Mr. HAYDEN, who "graduated" from the House to the Senate in 1927.

But Senator HAYDEN has a distinction that is unique. Not only does his tenure on Capitol Hill exceed even that of the timeless SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, the Arizona Democrat is the only man now living to have served his State in Congress continuously since it achieved statehood.

Arizona was only 5 days old as a State when Representative-at-Large CARL HAYDEN took his seat in the House. There still were wild Indians back home, and only 200,000 persons in his statewide constituency. The United States itself was only on the threshold of greatness.

NO DAVY CROCKETT

To say that CARL HAYDEN is the last frontiersman is not to say that he is a Davy Crockett. No blusterer, he is rather the product of the American West, A. D. 1877.

Senator HAYDEN was born in the settlement of Hayden's Ferry, now known as Tempe. The adobe house where he was born is a local landmark, though its former resident has now moved to Phoenix and spends most of his time in Washington.

His youth was that of the West, a-ridin' and a-ropin', with time set aside for as much reading as he could get in. Young HAYDEN managed to wade through all nine volumes of Ridpath's History of the World by the time he was 12.

The future Senator entered Stanford University just 3 months after Herbert Hoover graduated. He became a big man on campus in two fields—football and debating.

After college HAYDEN made his first stab at public office. He won this race, for a spot on the Tempe Town Council, after which he became county treasurer and later sheriff. During his term as sheriff, 48 years ago, he married his college sweetheart, Nan Downing. Mrs. Hayden and the Senator live today in a large apartment near the Senate Office Building.

From the sheriff's office HAYDEN went directly to Congress.

EVERYONE'S NICE

Looking back the other day Senator HAYDEN puffed on a cigar that wouldn't stay lit, and observed:

"Everyone has been very nice to me all my life.

"I remember when I first got here. I asked around some of the oldtimers how they kept getting reelected. I got a lot of advice and most of it I followed."

The key piece of advice, Senator HAYDEN said, was not to forget the home folks. He got into more work than he bargained for the first time he decided to apply this advice.

"I got hold of about 14,000 farm bulletins and sent them out with a letter. I told the folks I'd welcome any ideas they had on legislation."

The ideas rolled in. Unfortunately, most of them were from Socialists.

"I decided I had to face up to it," the Senator recalls. "So I studied up on every proposal they offered and then I'd sit down and tell them, 1-2-3, why I opposed the plan."

Senator HAYDEN's most cherished piece of advice came from Representative Frederick C. Talbott, of Maryland:

"There are two kinds of Congressmen—show horses and work horses. If you want to get your name in the papers be a show horse. If you want to gain the respect of your colleagues, keep quiet and be a work horse."

The Arizona newcomer decided on the workhorse role. As a result his name is not too often in print, but he is one of the most influential Members of the Senate.

One of the country's great authorities on Government spending, Senator HAYDEN has served on the Senate Appropriations Committee since entering the Senate and has been chairman of that committee since January 1955. He also serves as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing and as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

From the day he came to Congress, concerned with the responsibility for helping Arizona shoulder the full burdens of statehood, Mr. HAYDEN has devoted his primary efforts to developing the great Southwest. His worries today are much the same as they were in 1912: The largest Indian population of any State in the Union, mining, irrigation and reclamation, agriculture, and highways.

He made one of his most vital contributions to Arizona and the West as coauthor of the Hayden-Cartwright bill that set the formula for distribution of Federal aid to highways on the basis of area rather than population. This was followed in 1950 by Senate approval of the central Arizona project which HAYDEN had set in motion 12 years before. Its final passage was hailed as one of the greatest individual victories in Senate history, "a personal triumph for CARL HAYDEN."

"I guess I've seen a great piece of history," the Senator says. "I'd been here only a few years when we entered World War I.

"When that was over we found we had passed from a debtor nation to a creditor nation. Then followed the great depression and a revamping of our economy. Next came World War II and we emerged from that as a world leader.

"The comparison between the 1912 budget and today's budget is interesting. Today's budget reflects those two great wars and our present state of atomic-age preparedness. Give us the impossible—a guaranteed world peace—and we could slice our spending almost in half."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes being paid to our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He is an extraordinary man, and holds a unique position, inasmuch as he has served his State in the two Houses of Congress since Arizona was admitted into the Union as a State.

He has performed great service for his State and country, and I express the fervent hope and prayer that the senior Senator from Arizona will be with us in the Senate for many more years to come.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to join those who have paid tribute to our colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. President, there are only two Members of the Congress at this time who came here at the beginning of the 63d Congress, on March 4, 1913. One of them is the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and the other is the junior Senator from Kentucky, who now occupies the floor.

When we arrived, there was a young Representative from Arizona who had been elected in February 1912. His election had taken place on that unusual date because Arizona and New Mexico had both been admitted into the Union at that time, and a special election was required to elect a new Member to the House from Arizona. The amendment providing for the popular election of Senators had not yet taken effect and, therefore, the legislature elected the two new Senators, one of whom was Senator Marcus A. Smith, and the other was Senator Henry F. Ashurst. Representative HAYDEN came to the House before the legislature elected the two Senators. Therefore, he antedated their entrance into the Senate.

I think it may be said without the slightest fear of contradiction or of controversy that no more effective legislator ever served in either House of the Congress than the senior Senator from Arizona. I remember serving with him for 14 years in the House. He and I came to the Senate at the same time, on the 4th of March 1927. As a Member of the House and as a Member of the Senate, without any fanfare or noise or histrionics, CARL HAYDEN has served his State and the Nation with as much industry, intelligence, and effectiveness as can be attributed to any man who has ever served in either House, since he came to Washington at the beginning of the 63d Congress, on the 4th of March 1913.

I join with his friends in hoping that he may continue to serve his State and this Nation as he is serving and has served them for 44 years without interruption.

Mr. President, I am glad the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has had printed in the RECORD the article which was published yesterday in the Washington Star concerning the Senator from Arizona. I had intended to ask that it be printed in the RECORD, but shall not duplicate the request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe all my colleagues will join with me in best wishes to a Member of this body who is celebrating an important anniversary.

It was just 45 years ago that Arizona entered the Union as a State and CARL HAYDEN entered Congress. Both events were of tremendous significance.

The emergence of Arizona as a State ended the process of creating a nation that stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. The entry of CARL HAYDEN into the Congress brought us one of our wisest, one of our ablest, and one of our most beloved colleagues.

CARL HAYDEN brought to us the daring and the imagination that characterized the American frontier. But it was tempered with a prudence and a keen mind that has made him one of the most effective Members of either branch.

Almost every bill that passes Congress bears upon it some part of CARL HAYDEN'S stamp. Every colleague who has a project—be it big or little—stands on ground that is firmer when he has first sought CARL HAYDEN'S advice.

He is a quiet man—a modest man. He does not seek public notoriety, and he cares little for the cheers and plaudits upon which ambition feeds.

He always, I have observed, seeks the substantial, not the sensational.

He is content to go his own modest way—satisfied with the knowledge that the Congress is better and the Congress is more orderly because his effective work has shaped legislation in the path of the public interest.

Arizona is the youngest of our States. But from the very beginning, it demonstrated a wisdom beyond its years. That wisdom was expressed by the action of the people in sending CARL HAYDEN to us and returning him to our midst, year after year.

I hope that he will always be with us, and that he will always be my friend. Mr. President, no man could ask for more.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate who arrived only some 5 years ago, I know of no other Member of the United States Senate who has ever been so considerate, so helpful, and so understanding as has the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Arizona.

Senators with difficult committee loads respecting appropriations and other legislation, and other matters of tremendous importance, find it difficult, as a rule, to extend advice to fledgling Senators; but I may say that CARL HAYDEN has the reputation, among young Senators on both sides of the aisle, of always being available and helpful to them as they break into their positions in this great legislative body.

I can remember during my first days, that, busy as CARL HAYDEN was, he would come to my office, in his rounds through the Senate offices, to consult with me, to cheer me up, to give me a pat on the back, and to make many helpful suggestions based on his wide experience and understanding which had been gained over a great number of years of most constructive service in this great legislative body.

I appreciate what the distinguished majority leader has said, and I appreciate being able to join with him in this tribute to a great United States Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to concur fully in the remarks previously made by the majority leader and other Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and particularly with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma regarding the helpfulness of CARL HAYDEN to new Members of this body.

It happened to be my privilege, when I came to the Senate 11 years ago, to have an opportunity to talk with CARL HAYDEN. I felt I had an acquaintance with him that extended one additional generation before mine, because my father served in the House of Representatives with him. My father served in that body from 1903 to 1915, and CARL HAYDEN came to Congress as a Member of the House when Arizona was admitted into the Union.

As the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out, not only has CARL HAYDEN been helpful to new Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, but he has also been of assistance and most courteous to those of us on the Republican side of the aisle.

It has been my privilege to serve with CARL HAYDEN as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and to have served with him on a number of subcommittees of that great committee. In legislation affecting the Government of the United States, he has taken a keen interest, and in such matters his actions have been based not on narrow partisan lines, but on what is best for the welfare of our country.

As minority leader I am happy to join in paying tribute to a great Member of this body. It has been stated that Arizona was the last of the States to be admitted into the Union. That is true, of course. However, I hope it is not going to be the last State to be admitted into the Union, because we have knocking on our door two great Territories that have served their apprenticeship. I refer to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. I hope in the not too distant future both those great Territories may be admitted as States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to contribute a few words to the tributes which have been paid to Senator CARL HAYDEN. As one who was in Arizona at school when Arizona was still a Territory, and as one who has a slight remembrance of Mr. HAYDEN as sheriff, I recall that he won my respect at that time. Then I came to know him well as a colleague in the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to complete my statement first. As the minority leader has stated, CARL HAYDEN has been kind to new Members, not only to Democrats but to Republicans. He took us into his confidence and advised us as to the methods of procedure. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, he has always been cooperative and helpful. While we have not always agreed, we have always parted as friends, and always continued to work together as friends.

I desire to join other Senators in commending him on his anniversary, and express the hope that he will have many more years of service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask the former Massachusetts student who was in Arizona if there was any reason why, in referring to his acquaintanceship with the former sheriff in Arizona, he used the word "slight" acquaintance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I will stand by the world "slight." It is my remembrance that my colleague, Senator HAYDEN, was a sheriff and helped keep order at the ballgame in which I played, which the team of which I was a member won. There was no need for his being on duty as a guard at that time, because the feelings were friendly. The Senator from Arizona states he remembers the occasion, and I am sure he does.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts realizes that my remarks were wholly facetious.

I do not want the occasion to pass, however, without joining in the tributes which are being paid to CARL HAYDEN

upon this anniversary. I became a member of the Appropriations Committee in January 1934. It was not very long before I learned that Senator HAYDEN regarded a committee as an agency of the Senate, and not as an agency of the political party to which he belonged. I was very happy, therefore, to have the Senator from California, the very able and very skillful minority leader, agree that Senator HAYDEN operated wholly without partisanship.

Senator HAYDEN has a grasp of the affairs of this Government which, in my experience, few Members of the Senate have had. His study of requests for appropriations which come from every branch of the Government has given him a deep knowledge of the entire Government of the United States, a knowledge which he uses for the benefit of all of the people of the United States. He is a great Senator; he has rendered magnificent service to his State, the Nation, and this body as a whole, and has also given much assistance to those of us who are Members of the Senate as individuals.

I am happy, indeed, to participate in this tribute to him.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to join in the many fine tributes which have been paid to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on his 45th anniversary of service in the Congress of the United States.

Senator HAYDEN is one of the most likeable Members of the Senate. Certainly he is one of the most able Members of the Senate. I know of no one who is better informed on all matters coming before the Senate than is the senior Senator from Arizona.

He has been most helpful to me during all the time I have been privileged to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee. Like all the other members of that committee, the Senator from Arizona treats appropriations in a strictly bipartisan manner.

CARL HAYDEN has taken many hours of his own valuable time to look into the problems of Senators from other States, and at all times he has been most considerate.

CARL HAYDEN is truly an honorable man, a great Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have previously commented on my senior colleague's anniversary. But, as a citizen of Arizona—and I feel I can safely speak for the entire State of Arizona—I did not want this opportunity to pass without thanking the Members of this body for the laudatory and well-earned remarks my senior colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] has received today.

It may seem peculiar to my colleagues in this body, who would expect a Republican and a Democratic Senator from the same State to be fighting, to find them not doing so. As a Republican, Mr. President, I find myself in great sympathy with the people of my State who have eternal gratitude for the service of CARL HAYDEN in the Senate.

I merely wish to take this opportunity as an Arizonian, and in speaking for my State, to thank the Members of this body for their very generous and appropriate remarks this afternoon concerning my colleague.

FEDERAL INDIAN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Congress is aware that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana, and I have been in contact with the Department of the Interior and Bureau of Indian Affairs officials relative to Federal Indian policy on a national scale and more particularly with isolated instances in our State, Montana. To date there has been little success in moving the Department from its hard and inflexible policies toward the indigent Indians in the United States.

I want to take this opportunity to bring my colleagues up to date on my most recent correspondence with the Department and other correspondence to which I make reference. I ask unanimous consent that the following letters be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay's reply to my letter of January 6, 1956, dated February 8, 1956. The January 6 letter addressed to Assistant Secretary Wesley A. D'Ewart is printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 12, 1956, pages 381–382.

My reply to Secretary McKay, dated February 18, 1956.

An open letter addressed to Secretary McKay, by Iliff McKay, Blackfoot tribal councilman, Browning, Mont., as reprinted in the Glacier Reporter on December 30, 1956.

Assistant Secretary D'Ewart's letter to Mr. T. A. Busey, publisher, the Glacier Reporter, Browning, Mont.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1956.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: We have your letter of January 6, 1956, expressing your belief that the policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs are too restricted and do not meet the needs of Indians who live away from reservations. Although you refer to Hill 57 as an example of the problem, you express the opinion in general terms that "All indigent Indians should be the responsibility of the Federal Government, regardless of tribal affiliation or location." We should like to discuss this opinion.

At the outset, I should like to indicate that this Department and the Bureau of Indian Affairs are concerned about Indians, their needs, their economic and social adjustment, and their health. We work constantly with the Indian people themselves and with community agencies and branches of local, State, and Federal governments to meet their needs. The problem then is not whether the Indian needs should be met. There is general agreement on that subject. The problem is whether the cost and the responsibility should be assumed solely by the Federal Government or whether it should be shared by the Federal and State governments when Indians move away from reservations and take their places in non-Indian communities.

The Federal Government has enacted legislation that provides either directly or through State governments millions of dollars to be used for the benefit of all citizens who are in need of certain kinds of help. The States also contribute funds to these programs. The following is a list of only a few of them:

Old-age assistance.
Aid to the blind.
Aid to dependent children.
Aid to the totally and permanently disabled.
Veterans' benefits, of several kinds.
Unemployment compensation.
Old-age and survivors insurance benefits.
Vocational rehabilitation.

They are for the benefit of all persons who are in need, and Indians may participate regardless of whether they live on or off a reservation. It would be difficult to obtain statistics to indicate how many Indians out of the total population receive assistance under these programs, but we believe that the cash value of such benefits for Indians runs into millions of dollars a year.

If the Federal Government were to assume responsibility, as you suggest it should, for all indigent Indians regardless of tribal affiliation or location, the appropriations to the Bureau of Indian Affairs would need to be increased many millions of dollars in the community services field alone. The administrative staff in Washington would need to be augmented, and a staff would need to be provided in nearly every State.

Your proposal would apply, however, to much more than relief programs involving food, shelter, and clothing. It would also apply to the education of Indian children. The present policy is to be sure that all Indian children have an opportunity for an education on the same basis as non-Indian children. During the fiscal year 1955, 49.2 percent of all Indian children attended public schools. This was possible because the Indian people for the most part want their children to attend public schools; States and local school districts in many instances also want this; and through Federal assistance in two forms it is possible for these arrangements to be made. As you know, Federal funds have been available under title IV of Public Law 815, as amended, to assist States subject to the impact of Indian population. This act is administered by the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The second form of assistance for public schools is through Johnson-O'Malley contracts between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and States which assist school districts where need is created by large areas of nontaxable Indian lands and numbers of Indian children. Many States acting under their constitutions have taken responsibility for the education of Indian children and have not insisted upon Federal financing for Indian children. Any policy that indicates that Indians are the complete responsibility of the Bureau of Indian Affairs will result in many more millions of dollars being needed for the education of Indian children.

Your suggestion would also create an almost insurmountable administrative problem in connection with the determination of whether a person who does not live on a reservation is an Indian. In many cases the degree of Indian blood will be very small, the person will have no connection with an Indian tribe, and he will be indistinguishable from the general population. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is constantly asked to help such persons determine whether they are descendants of some particular tribal member who died years ago. The requests are stimulated by judgments recovered by some tribes in the Indians Claims Commission and in the Court of Claims. The process by which the Bureau determines the persons who are eligible to share in those judgments is as complicated as the determination of heirs. The problem of making such

determinations would be an impossible one in connection with a general program that applies to all Indians, undefined, in the United States regardless of their assimilation into the general population. When is a person living in Great Falls, for example, who has both Indian and non-Indian ancestors to be considered an Indian and when is he to be considered a non-Indian?

A few years ago a representative of the Boston (Mass.) Department of Public Welfare telephoned to inquire whether the Bureau of Indian Affairs would pay for the burial of an Indian who had lived in Boston for 18 years. It was explained that the Bureau could not do so but could advise the State on ways to locate relatives. This inquiry resulted in a report that the relatives did not want to take charge of the body or assist with funeral arrangements. This man had never been active in tribal affairs and had been a resident of Boston for years. The usual procedures applied to him as to other citizens.

As you know, the relocation program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is purely voluntary, and Indians are assisted financially to move to a new location and to obtain housing and to make other adjustments during their initial period in a new community. These communities would not agree that the Indians who have moved under the plans of the Bureau have created a financial burden. There has not been a single complaint on this score from the communities.

Your letter implies that situations such as Hill 57 are the result of our relocation program, and that the Department is "dumping" the Indian population into these communities. We assure you such is not the case. The Hill 57 situation developed long before the Department's relocation program, and it has no connection with that program. In fact, the relocation program is designed to avoid the creation of such situations, and we believe that it has.

No Indian is encouraged to leave a reservation until he is equipped to take care of himself without creating a community problem. Moreover, the Department has never questioned the right of an Indian to return to a reservation if he wishes to do so. The right of freedom of movement is one which the Department scrupulously respects.

The Department has repeatedly been accused of conducting a program for Indians that is too paternalistic and that has retarded Indian progress. We believe that one of the ways in which Indian dependency on the Federal Government can be overcome is to treat the problems of individual Indians, whenever possible, in the same manner that similar problems of the general population are treated. Any program that makes it possible for every appeal to be made to the Federal Government without regard to the responsibilities of the county and State governments tends to continue Indian dependence on the Federal Government, and is especially questionable in the case of Indians who have of their own volition moved away from reservations.

The approach suggested by you would tend to make a small segment of the total population completely dependent on the Federal Government, in perpetuity, and would give some basis to the claim frequently made that Indians are second-class citizens because they are not allowed to participate on a plane of equality in governmental programs that are available to the general population.

The proposal that all indigent Indians should be the responsibility of the Federal Government, regardless of tribal affiliation or location, is completely impractical of administration, aside from the enormous cost that would be involved, and we believe that the proper dividing line between Federal and State responsibility is residence away from a reservation. There is no way without great overlapping of agencies and duplication of services in which we can properly assist Indians who have voluntarily chosen to live away from reservations. This is not to say that such Indians should be denied any rights or be subjected to discrimination. On the contrary, we insist that they should be treated the same as all other members of the communities in which they live, and be allowed to participate in relief and assistance programs without discrimination because of their ancestry.

We believe that our proper role is to care for those Indians on reservations who are not cared for by other agencies and to continue our role of working with communities when we can be of assistance in an advisory or cooperative way for those Indians who have moved away from reservations.

One final word with respect to Hill 57. It should be noted that in the September 1955 hearings in Montana that were held by the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, a representative of the State testified that Hill 57 Indians are entitled to participate in all State and county relief programs without discrimination because of their Indian ancestry. The problem, therefore, becomes one of whether the entire cost of such programs should be shifted from the county and State governments to the Federal Government merely because of the Indian ancestry of the people involved. We respectfully suggest that if such a policy is to be adopted by Congress, it should be done only after careful deliberation, and that it should not be restricted to one isolated community such as Hill 57.

If you care to discuss this general policy problem in terms of the Nation as a whole, we shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 18, 1956.

Hon. DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in reply to your letter of February 8, answering questions raised in my inquiry of January 6 addressed to Wesley D'Ewart, Assistant Secretary. I have read with interest your declaration of the administration's Indian policies nationally as well as in isolated cases. However, there remains a wide gulf between our two viewpoints in regard to Federal Indian policy. I wish to take this opportunity to express my views on several of the statements made in your communication.

You are correct in assuming that the area in which we disagree most heartily is on the degree of Federal responsibility to the Indian. I have never felt that the Federal Government should assume the entire responsibility for all Indians, regardless of the degree of blood relationship, economic or social status. I do feel strongly that the Federal Government is not assuming enough responsibility to the indigent American Indian. There are too many sharp divisions, too little flexibility in the Department's policies. States and local governments are being asked to carry too heavy a load in welfare and relief matters. Residence on or off a reservation as criteria for Federal aid is one instance of an inflexible position.

Federal-State cooperative education programs for Indians are admirable, but they do not reach all of our Indian children. You state that "The present policy is to be sure that all Indian children have an opportunity for an education on the same basis as non-Indian children." You state further that 49.2 percent of all Indian children attended public schools; however, I would like to know what percentage of Indian children attended schools on or off the reservation? If the figures for Indian children meet the NEA advance estimates of 97.1 percent for all children in the United States for this same period, it will be indicative of equal opportunity for Indian children.

The relocation program is a worthy venture. I am sure that progress has been made where actual contact is made between the Indian and the relocation officer. Also, I assume interested Indians receive adequate preparation for the move from the reservation into another locality. However, information at my disposal indicates that many reservations are overcrowded because of increased population and restricted land holdings. Many of these reservation Indians and their families are forced to leave to seek out a more satisfactory livelihood. Many in their haste fail to take advantage of Bureau of Indian Affairs services. If all Indian families who left the reservation, in addition to those interested in relocation advice, were to descend on the Bureau officials, I am sure they would be greatly overtaxed. When they leave the reservation, they are no longer eligible for Federal aid. If this relocation program is to be a success, the number of relocation officers and workers must be increased on the reservation as well as being placed in the field to assist the Indian families in relocating.

I agree that the Indian should be treated the same as all other members of the communities in which they live, and be allowed to participate in relief and assistance programs without discrimination because of their ancestry. This can become a reality only after many Indians have been properly educated and rehabilitated. Under the present program I feel that this is not being done.

In regard to the situation among the Indians on Hill 57 in Great Falls, I need not reiterate that these people are in dire need. Adequate assistance is not available from State and local agencies. Your firm stand against aiding this Indian settlement is not consistent with a recent statement made by Assistant Secretary D'Ewart in his letter to Mr. T. A. Busey, publisher, the Glacier Reporter, Browning, Mont.

In regard to welfare policies, Mr. D'Ewart states:

"Second, * * * welfare policies * * *. The Indians as citizens of this country and of their State and county are entitled to welfare assistance of various kinds under the social-security laws and welfare laws of the States. It is our policy to work with the Indians and with the States and counties to see that this assistance is actually provided. There are, of course, many Indians who will not be eligible for the several types of welfare assistance for a number of reasons, even though they may be in great need. In order that these people will have somewhere to turn for help, the Indian Bureau obtains funds to prevent suffering by those Indians who are in real need of relief assistance and cannot obtain it from other sources. It is our policy to provide the same amount of assistance to the individual needy Indians as each State or county provides their non-Indian neighbors."

From all information I have at my disposal, the Indians on Hill 57 would qualify as "those Indians who are in need of relief assistance and cannot obtain it from other sources."

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Congressman LEE METCALF, and I have spent a great amount of effort in behalf of the Indians in Montana and the Nation in attempting to see that they get a fair break. We shall continue to do so and will welcome any additional assistance on the part of the Department of the Interior and its agencies. The Indian was the first American and should be entitled to treatment and respect accordingly.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours.

[From the Browning (Mont.) Glacier Reporter of December 30, 1955]

MCKAY ANSWERS MCKAY

BROWNING, MONT., *December 30.*

Open letter to:
Hon. DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCKAY: Being a politician like myself, you will realize the seriousness of the situation I find myself in appearing in local papers in this area. These papers are in the habit of printing your releases under big headlines, "McKay says, etc. * * *" I have been asked to explain many of these articles by people who are under the impression that I am the McKay to whom the article refers. For the most part, I have been able to either laugh at some of the comments made or have simply dismissed them as a misunderstanding.

But now, due to an article which carried the headline "McKay Defends Indian Policies" (December 16 issue of Glacier Reporter), I find myself bombarded by members of our tribe with questions like "What in the * * * do you see in Indian Bureau policies to defend?" or "What Indian Bureau policy do you know of that is doing us Injuns any good?" Well, my only defense to date has been "Me? Why I didn't even know the Indian Bureau had a concrete policy." Then they tell me that according to the newspaper, I have defended the policies of the Bureau. You can see the position that put me in. I had to read the article. (Most members of the Tribe only read the headlines of such articles.) Don't you know that after reading the article, I still don't know what the policies of the Indian Bureau are?

I certainly hope one of their policies isn't to withhold legal opinions regarding Indian affairs from the Indians concerned, all the while distributing copies to everyone in the country, as was done in the case of your letter of October 7, 1955, to a Mr. Ralph E. Becker, of Washington, D. C. For your information, this letter concerned the right of the Blackfeet Tribe to manage their own elections. Incidentally, who is this Mr. Becker? Is he a voting member of the tribe? Does he want a precinct established in Washington, D. C., so he can vote? We have some Beckers on our tribal rolls, but none named Ralph. It doesn't really matter. The thing that concerns me is that even common courtesy was disregarded when the Blackfeet Tribe was not furnished a copy of this letter about their internal affairs.

I note that when your solicitor ruled that the Blackfeet members would lose a right they have enjoyed in the past, a copy of the ruling was sent to the reservation in good time. I refer to the opinion of the solicitor which states that from now on members of the tribe will have no preference in the leasing of minerals belonging to the Blackfeet Tribe. I want to ask a question about that, too. Is this part of a new drive which will soon end in Indians even losing their right to a preference on grazing leases?

I ask this because I have been informed that Indians on the San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation recently lost their right to a preference in the issuing of labor contracts on their reservation. Is this one of the Indian Bureau policies I am mistakenly accused of defending—the policy of stripping the Indian of a preference to realize the full potentialities of their resources and enjoy the benefits themselves? It even goes further. If this is to continue to be the policy of the Indian Bureau, it will soon result in many Indians not being able to make a living on their own land.

So you see, I'm really on the spot. Like Ike, I'm up for reelection in 1956, and if something isn't done to correct this, I'm a dead duck. It won't do no good if you asked the copywriters to headline the articles "Secretary McKay Says, etc.," as I sometimes act as secretary for the tribal council, of which I am a member, and members of our tribe might still be confused. You might ask them to headline the releases "Interior Department McKay Says. * * *" Maybe that will do it. I'll do the same for you and if I ever write anything, I'll insist mine be headlined "Tribal Council McKay, etc."

To take some of the heat—and soon—though, I wish you would do the following for me: Tell me what the policies of the Indian Bureau are, specifically, and what is being done to enforce them. Please do not expound upon the virtues of love for mother, God, and country, or the great potentialities of the noble first American. Put it in good plain English that even a first American after his experience with a first reader can understand. Tell me what the policy is regarding keeping reservations as a land base for an impoverished people, what is being done to equip children and Indian youth for the problems of a complex civilization, what is the Indian Bureau policy regarding fee patents, what is your policy regarding welfare, the leasing of trust land, and so on. Then, maybe, I can do you a good turn and defend some of them, but right now and until I get some definite information I'll just have to go on playing the part of the injured party.

Sincerely,

ILIFF MCKAY,
Tribal Councilman.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. T. A. BUSEY,
Publisher, the Glacier Reporter,
Browning, Mont.

MY DEAR MR. BUSEY: There was recently brought to my attention an open letter to Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay from Mr. Iliff McKay appearing in the Glacier Reporter, on December 30, 1955. He said that as his name is also McKay, statements by the Secretary of the Interior sometimes are mistakenly attributed to him. Therefore he asked to be told in good plain English just what the policies are regarding a number of matters of concern to the Indians of this country.

As Indian affairs come under my general supervision in the Department of the Interior, as I am particularly interested in Montana, and as there should be no confusion of our names, I would like to respond to his public request.

First, "what is being done to equip children and Indian youth for the problems of a complex civilization": This administration takes special satisfaction in progress that has been made in education. We believe that one of the most inportant responsibilities we have to the Indians of this country is to see to it that they all have an opportunity for a first-rate education. I believe the Indians too understand the importance of education and are eager to have their children in school. With the cooperation and support of State and local school authorities we are encouraging the enrolment of Indian children in the public schools wherever this is possible in the belief that they should have the same kind of education as other American citizens. Also, there will be a better understanding between both the Indians and non-Indians if they attend schools together and are on an equal footing. Where local public schools are not available, the Indian Bureau itself runs boarding schools and day schools so that the Indian children may be better prepared to make a living and to be good citizens.

When this administration took office, half of the 27,000 Navaho children of school age were growing up without the opportunity of even an elementary education. That problem has been vigorously attacked in the past 2 years and for the first time in history all of the Navaho children presented for schooling are being accommodated. This was accomplished by a hard-hitting emergency-type program which involves substantial expansion of Indian Bureau school facilities on the reservation, enlarged enrollment at off-reservation boarding schools, increased use of mobile facilities such as trailers and quonset huts and the placement of Navaho students in the reservation border towns where board and room have been furnished by the Bureau.

For the benefit of those Indians who missed the advantages of school in their youth an adult education program has been started this year in five tribal areas where there is great interest in such a program—the Seminole, of Florida; Papago, of Arizona; Rosebud Sioux, of South Dakota; Turtle Mountain Chippewa, of North Dakota; and Fort Hall Shoshone-Bannock, of Idaho.

Second, "welfare policies": The Indians as citizens of this country and of their State and county are entitled to welfare assistance of various kinds under the social security laws and welfare laws of the States. It is our policy to work with the Indians and with the States and counties to see that this assistance is actually provided. There are, of course, many Indians who will not be eligible for the several types of welfare assistance for a number of reasons, even though they may be in great need. In order that these people will have somewhere to turn for help, the Indian Bureau obtains funds to prevent suffering by those Indians who are in real need of relief assistance and cannot obtain it from other sources. It is our policy to provide the same amount of assistance to the individual needy Indians as each State or county provides their non-Indian neighbors.

Third, "keeping reservations as a land base": A number of tribes such as the Blackfeet have considerable land resources which are of vital importance to them. Many other tribes are less fortunate. We in this Department are vigorously opposed to any congressional legislation or other proposed action that would sell off or liquidate the Indian lands against the wishes of their owners. Everything possible will be done to help the Indians to hold on to those lands which they need and want, and which are important to their economic welfare. More than that, we are not content to merely go on preserving the present land base. We are placing great emphasis on working with the tribal groups and with commerce and industry to promote the economic development of reservation areas and to provide employment. The lack of full opportunity for economic advancement has been one of the most basic and serious problems confronting Indian people.

Fourth, "leasing of trust land": Wherever it is practical the owners of trust land, either individuals or tribes, are encouraged to negotiate their own leases and to receive rental payments directly. Such leases, of course, have to be approved by the superintendent so that we may fulfill our obligation as trustee to assure that a fair price is being received. Where conditions are such that competitive bidding for leases is best, the superintendent arranges for the advertisement and competitive leasing. Of course, leases of the trust lands are made only with the approval of the Indian owners. Where tribal range land is being permitted, it is our policy to allow Indian owners with less than 250 head of cattle, or the equivalent of sheep, to have an allocation of range at the appraised price without competitive bidding if the tribal council wants this preference granted. A larger Indian cattle owner has to compete in the bidding to lease tribal land, but if a non-Indian offers to pay more to the tribe than he has, he may be given the privilege of meeting the higher bid, again with the approval of the tribe.

Fifth, "fee patents": We do not believe that a man who has demonstrated his competency and seeks control of his property should be denied that basic American right merely because he happens to be an Indian. Before a fee patent is issued, a thorough and conscientious examination of the applicant's background is made to be sure there is no real doubt about his competency to manage his own personal business affairs. If he plans to sell or lease the land the Indian Bureau will counsel with him in any way that seems necessary to protect his best interests. It also provides him with an up-to-date appraisal of his land. While we recognize the competent Indian's undeniable right to ask for and receive a fee patent, we also keep in mind our continuing trust responsibilities to the tribal group and to other Indian landowners whose holdings may be affected. If there is any real possibility that the disposal of a particular allotment might have a bad effect on other Indian land in trust, the Indian Bureau will take the initiative in consulting with the Indians concerned and will give them every possible assistance in working out a satisfactory solution to the problem. There are, of course, many Indians today who have no interest in agriculture or livestock operations and are eager to dispose of their allotted holdings and use the proceeds for some other purposes. In the past, land was retained in Indian ownership regardless of the ability, wishes or needs of the Indian owner himself. In many cases needy Indians live out their entire lives without realizing benefits from their allotted holdings.

Briefly and simply, these are our policies on the subjects Mr. McKay asked about. They are for the protection and help of the Indians of this country. I would like to add that this administration in many ways is making a very sincere and sympathetic effort to learn just what the Indian people have in their minds and in their hearts to work with them in doing the things which will give them the kind of life they want and that they want for their children.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary, Public Land Management.

MONEY EXPENDED BY SOME LABOR LEADERS IN BEHALF OF CANDIDATES FOR OFFICE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, David Lawrence in his typically intelligent approach to the problems of the day, has done the American people a great favor by the publication of his column Campaign Coin Has Two Sides in the newspapers of the Nation last Thursday, February 16.

In this article he points out the vast sums expended by some leaders of labor, in behalf of candidates for office. He does not imply, nor do I, by inserting this article that this money was intended to influence the voting of these men. I am hopeful that the coming investigation of pressures which are exerted on Members of Congress will entail a thorough examination of the monies spent by these few leaders of labor, as I am convinced that it will uncover the most active and influential source of pressure in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of February 16, 1956]

CAMPAIGN COIN HAS TWO SIDES—WHOLE SYSTEM OF POLITICAL DONATIONS CRITICIZED; $50 LIMIT SUGGESTED

(By David Lawrence)

What's all the fuss about the unsuccessful attempt of an oil company attorney to contribute a mere $2,500 to the campaign fund of Senator CASE, Republican of South Dakota What's so novel about it?

For the records show that approximately $2 million was actually contributed and spent by labor groups in the 1954 congressional campaign to reward Members of Congress who voted "right" and to punish those who voted "wrong" on legislative measures listed by labor unions. This list is published every campaign year as the acid test of whether certain candidates are indorsed or opposed by labor organizations having a pocketbook interest in the legislation.

The files in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives show that, in connection with the 1954 congressional campaign, AFL and CIO unions and independent labor organizations, through their own political committees, contributed these sums to the following successful candidates for Congress:

Senator DOUGLAS, Illinois	$35,500
Senator MURRAY, Montana	32,450
Senator NEUBERGER, Oregon	23,250
Senator HUMPHREY, Minnesota	20,947
Senator MCNAMARA, Michigan	19,000
Senator KEFAUVER, Tennessee	18,850
Senator O'MAHONEY, Wyoming	14,500
Senator BARKLEY, Kentucky	13,000
Senator SCOTT, North Carolina	11,000
Senator SPARKMAN, Alabama	10,250
Total	198,747

The above-mentioned Senators, like Senator CASE, are all men of integrity. Their names are given here only because the records show they received the largest total amounts from the labor union groups. Another $91,050 was spent by the labor union committees in unsuccessful attempts to elect their senatorial candidates in California, Ohio, Massachusetts, Iowa, and New Jersey.

There was, of course, a huge sum spent to try to elect certain candidates in the House of Representatives. Generally speaking, the labor money went primarily to Democratic candidates. Much of the money was contributed in an effort to defeat candidates deemed unfriendly to labor. Thus, when Senator CASE was running 6 years ago, about $5,000 was spent in trying to defeat him. There are rumors that about $10,000 will be contributed this year for the same purpose.

The same files in the House show various persons of prominence—including officials of large corporations—who contributed out of their personal funds, as the law permits, to different candidates for Congress, mostly Republicans. One cannot tell from a reading of the records how these contributions tie into any votes on specific pieces of legislation, whereas labor unions, of course, boldly publish their list of measures and are known to be active in preventing the passage of particular laws affecting them or in securing the repeal of certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley labor-management law.

The whole system is wrong in principle. Even conceding that every Senator or Representative to whom campaign contributions are made by labor unions, for instance, will vote as his conscience dictates and will try not to be influenced in the least by the amount of money spent to help elect or defeat him, the fact remains that large campaign contributions are subject to the query as to whether they do not exert some degree of influence on the legislators.

Thus, the CIO and AFL regularly maintain lobbying agents in Washington who frequently call on Members of Congress in person to endeavor to persude them to vote for certain labor legislation or to oppose the bills in which labor leaders claim to have a deep interest. These same legislative agents do not themselves offer campaign contributions. But back home in the districts and States, the local union organizations—with their affiliated political leagues—arrange this and make widely known what the record of the Congressman or Senator has been on various rollcalls.

This box score is published and, if a Senator or Representative has not voted enough times for labor's list of measures, he is opposed, whereas, if his voting record has been preponderantly favorable, he is indorsed and funds are given to his campaign. It used to be that the national labor organizations did the blacklisting or indorsing or giving of money directly but now these are left largely to the local organizations.

To get rid of the present system, campaign contributions of $50 or less would be the solution. It would, of course, be costly to canvass for small contributions. The acquisition expense would be very high. But in the long run the limitation of campaign contributions to a maximum of $50 would make it impossible for any organization of a special-interest nature—like a labor union or an employer's association—to raise enough money to influence the votes of Members of Congress. Moneyraising, moreover, would have to be limited to political committees the members of which donated their services or were paid out of the campaign funds, and who could be by law prohibited from being on the payroll of any company, or labor union, or national organization which has an interest in pending legislation.

PRESSURES TO INFLUENCE LEGISLATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in the furor that has been raised over the revelation by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] of what he thought to be the improper use of money by people interested in the passage of the Harris-Fulbright bill, we have lost sight of a source of pressure which has existed for a long time and which grows stronger as Congress repeatedly refuses to face the issue. This is the lobbying and pressure of the unions. Their resources are unlimited, their spending in Washington is far above the amount one would expect to be spent by that group, and their means of bringing pressure are not limited to the Washington level.

Two weeks ago, in Miami, Fla., these people condemned to political death 11 Republican Senators whose most heinous crime is that of being Republican. The fact that these men have voted consistently with what is good for America, have devoted years of their lives to the service of their country, have been endorsed by a majority of their voters for this office is of no meaning to this small group of leaders who would, by virtue of their very power of money, attempt the destruction of the service of these Senators. If that is not pressure of the vilest type, then I do not understand the meaning of the

word. If that type of influence is not more harmful than any we have witnessed to date, then we Americans have lost our sense of values. Its worst aspect lies in the fact that these leaders purportedly speak for their entire membership, giving in effect the power of 16 million votes to their utterances. This is not so, but these few leaders ignore the political freedoms of their members by constantly telling the country what they will do, and not asking the membership what they would do. Then they proceed with their efforts with dues money, money collected by compulsory means from a man as a condition of employment—and spend it against the stated wishes of a minority of the group.

By their very evidence contained in a report of the executive council of the AFL, this group admits that their influence extends in a powerful way onto the very floor of the Senate itself. Allow me to read from that report a statement concerning a bill that came up in the 83d Congress. I am reading from the report of the executive council on S. 2650:

When debate began in the Senate on the bill, after Chairman SMITH had made his speech in behalf of it, Senator GOLDWATER presented his very objectionable amendment. This amendment turned all labor matters back to the States. This was most objectionable to practically all Democratic and Republican Senators from Northern States as there are some 17 States, mostly in the South, who have right-to-work, non-union-shop laws, and the amendment would have given further impetus to the migration of industry to these Southern States, and we were advised that if the Goldwater amendment was adopted that all southern Senators would be obliged to vote for the bill. We, therefore, permitted the debate to continue for a couple of days and then Senators IVES and LEHMAN presented fair labor practices amendments. This, of course, put the southerners on the spot because they were obliged to oppose this and it also did the same for the Republicans who, as a party, are supposed to favor the proposal. The A. F. of L. was opposed to a FEPC proposal being added to a labor bill.

We then made arrangements with Senator HILL to offer the motion to recommit before any amendments were voted on and as all factions were fearful and more or less confused, they voted to recommit the bill, 50 to 42.

Mr. President, I have quoted that statement to show that these labor leaders flagrantly and openly report in their publication that they can control the Senate of the United States.

I suggest that in any investigation which is conducted by the Senate all sources of pressure, including that of labor leaders, be considered.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point editorials published in the Fort Lauderdale Daily News and the Washington News.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Lauderdale Daily News of February 10, 1956]

IF THIS IS JUSTICE DICTIONARIES NEED TO BE REWRITTEN

Two events of the past week, touching on the same moral issue but involving far different reactions, are deserving of a little thought today.

One event, involving a $2,500 campaign donation to Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, touched off quite a furor and now has become the subject of a special congressional investigation.

The other event, a decision by the leaders of the AFL-CIO to spend as much as $1,500,000 this year to influence the course of the presidential and congressional elections this fall, has created nary a ripple of interest from the very same groups which look with so much horror on the $2,500 donation to Senator CASE's campaign.

The $2,500 contribution was made by a Nebraska lawyer, John M. Neff, who has never met Senator CASE personally. He has stated he made the gift in good faith because he felt the Senator's record was deserving of support and there was no strings of any kind connected to the gift.

But because Mr. Neff once was registered as a lobbyist for oil interests, and because at the time the gift was made public, the Senate was embroiled in a bitter battle over a bill to exempt natural gas producers from Federal controls, it was charged that the campaign contribution was little more than an outright attempt to influence Senator CASE's vote on this bill.

Whether this was the purpose or not it didn't work as Senator CASE rejected the contribution and instead of voting for the bill as he had originally been inclined to do he voted against it on the final rollcall.

But the gist of this whole business is not the contribution, itself, but the acceptance on the theory that it is all wrong for a private individual or a business corporation to openly give financial support to political candidates while it is perfectly all right for labor unions to do it.

Our laws set up a very strange distinction in this respect. Corporations, for instance, are expressly forbidden from making contributions to political campaigns on the theory that if they were so minded they could strongly influence political campaigns to their own end by liberally contributing to the campaigns of their chosen candidates.

But labor unions, which, in effect, aren't a whole lot different than corporations, are not banned from contributing to political campaigns. In the 1954 congressional campaigns the AFL and the CIO have openly bragged about spending approximately $850,000 in an effort to secure the election of legislators friendly to their objectives. Now they have come forth with a program calling for the expenditure of almost twice as much this year in an effort to influence the upcoming presidential and congressional elections.

If it is morally and legally wrong for a businessman to spend corporation funds to help secure the election of a legislator whose attitude he admires and respects then isn't it eqaully wrong for a labor union to collect money from its members for the very same purpose?

How can conscientious legislators justify the calling of a special congressional investigation into the source and the purpose of a $2,500 donation by an individual to 1 Senator's campaign while overlooking the fact that the AFL–CIO has just announced the raising of a $1,500,000 war chest which will be used to help elect not 1, but hundreds of legislators sympathetic to organized labor's objectives?

How, in the name of heaven, can anybody with any sense at all argue that there is any difference between these two things? If one is wrong then the other is equally wrong, yet the individual who made the contribution is hailed before a congressional investigating committee to explain his actions and his motives while the AFL–CIO leaders sit back in their fancy hotel suites at Miami Beach knowing full well Congress won't have the nerve to give their political activities and their political contributions the same searching once-over.

Truly, we are getting to be a strange Nation. Wrongdoing can't be given a simple definition anymore. It is shaded with distinctions depending upon who is the wrongdoer. And in the case of organized labor, acts that are wrong for everybody else to commit have been clothed with a cloak of immunity that legislators, beholden to the hand that feeds them, won't or don't dare to remove.

For the life of us we can't get very disturbed about this $2,500 contribution to Senator CASE's campaign. That's peanuts compared to the $1,500,000 organized labor boasts it is getting ready to toss into the coming campaigns, yet Congress gets all hot and bothered about the $2,500 while ignoring the $1,500,000. In other words it isn't what you do anymore that determines wrongdoing it's who you are and how you do it that counts with Congress, and if that is justice the dictionaries need to be rewritten.

J. W. GORE.

[From the Washington News of February 13, 1956]

CASH FOR POLITICS

It is common knowledge that the laws which presume to control the collection and spending of political campaign funds are freely and rampantly violated.

It is obvious the laws themselves are full of loopholes.

It is doubtful Congress, even doing its honest best, could write an airtight law on campaign contributions and expenditures.

The most effective restraint on abuses, then, is a vocal public opinion. And that opinion can be aroused only by an ample display of the facts.

The United States Senate now has a timely opportunity to pry the lid off these facts.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, of Missouri, is a candidate for reelection this year, so he is expected to withdraw from his post as chairman of the Senate Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, the watchdog of campaign and election ethics. His place probably will be taken by Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee.

And Senator GORE has ideas about an investigation of political spending which would provide the public with some highly illuminating information—if he is permitted to go ahead.

For instance, Senator GORE would probe the so-called interstate contributions—those which come from donors outside the State where the money is spent. He would include in this a review of contributions by labor unions as well as business outfits. In fact, the whole question of the use of union funds for political purposes ought to be aired.

This is a fertile field for senatorial inquiry. Such an inquiry, if impartially and diligently conducted, could make for a healthier climate in political spending. And this is the year to do it, when campaign funds promise to be more lush than ever.

[From the Washington News of February 14, 1956]

SURE, TAKE THE LID OFF

Senator GORE, of Tennessee, has taken over as chairman of the Senate Elections Subcommittee and is eager for a full-scale investigation of lobbying and campaign contributions.

Whether by his subcommittee, or some other, there ought to be a full-dress investigation. It should add to general interest

and public enlightenment in this election year.

But let there be no sacred cows in this investigation. Public attention has been focused on slush funds by Senator CASE's revelation of an attempt made to contribute an unsolicited $2,500 to his campaign.

But the representative of the president of the Superior Oil Co. is not the only man momentarily interested in the outcome of this election.

The gas lobbies should be investigated—both of them. The producers' lobby which favored the Harris-Fulbright bill, and the distributors' lobby, which opposed it.

Nor is that the only issue before the sitting Congress. The highway bill is coming up, and the truckers' lobby is ready to try to put the major burden of the cost on the rest of us, who will use the interstate and intercity highways only occasionally—and then inconveniently—if you get stuck behind some pavement-grinding diesel monster.

There are other lobbies. Let's investigate all of 'em—

The teachers' lobby, trying to get Federal funds for school aid.

This lobby carries no little black bag, nor even an envelope filled with $100 bills. But it carries a currency more negotiable at the polls—ballots.

The union labor bosses' lobby, which at Miami Beach has just received the recommendation that the AFL-CIO amass a slush fund of $3,750,000 for the elections, not counting money spent for "political education" of union members.

That's more money than any old-time political committee ever had.

Let's investigate everything.

If Senator GORE is running the show, then obviously the first thing to look into is the contributions of those who are getting electric power for less than it is worth in the Tennessee Valley. Let's move on from there.

"THE LAST BEST HOPE OF EARTH"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I had the honor of speaking at the annual Lincoln Day dinner held in the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, on February 13, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST BEST HOPE OF EARTH

I feel very greatly honored again to be invited to speak here in Los Angeles on this occasion. Yesterday was the birthday of a noble American President, one of the great men of all the ages. It was he who saved our country from dissolution, and it was he who broke the literal chains which had enslaved a whole race of people.

Abraham Lincoln was a humble product of common American soil. His whole lifetime was full of difficulties and replete with sorrow. His sweet philosophy of life and his magnificent philosophy of free government both developed during a cruel period of American history. Both sedulously guided him into the political life of his day and, finally, through the faith of people, to the stewardship of a nation making signs of cracking up. Before he died in a little house across the street from Ford's Theater in Washington, the martyred President had preserved America for future generations, and had enunciated a new meaning of free government and freemen.

In the late 1860's, a biography of Lincoln was published. A friend of mine gave me a copy of it. I quote a few paragraphs of it:

"A little incident occurred during the campaign that illustrated Mr. Lincoln's readiness in turning a political point. He was making a speech at Charleston, Coles County, when a voice called out, 'Mr. Lincoln, is it true that you entered this State barefoot, driving a yoke of oxen?' Mr. Lincoln paused for a full half minute as if considering whether he should notice such cruel impertinence, and then said that he thought he could prove the fact by at least a dozen men in the crowd, any one of whom was more respectable than his questioner. But the question seemed to inspire him, and he went on to show what free institutions had done for himself, and to exhibit the evils of slavery to the white man wherever it existed, and asked if it was not natural that he should hate slavery, and agitate against it. 'Yes,' said he, 'we will speak for freedom and against slavery, as long as the Constitution of our country guarantees free speech, until everywhere on this wide land, the sun shall shine and the rain shall fall, and the wind shall blow upon no man who goes forth to unrequited toil.'

"From this time to the close of his life, he was almost entirely absorbed by political affairs. He still took charge of important cases in court, and practiced his profession at intervals. But he was regarded as a political man, and had many responsibilities thrown upon him by the new organization. During the summer succeeding the presidential canvass, and after Mr. Buchanan had taken his seat, Mr. Douglas was invited by the grand jury of the United States District Court for Southern Illinois, to deliver a speech at Springfield when the court was in session. In that speech, the Senator showed the progress he had made in his departure from the doctrines of the fathers, by announcing that the framers of the Declaration of Independence, when they asserted that 'all men are created equal,' only meant to say that 'British subjects on this continent were equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain.' Mr. Lincoln was invited by a large number of citizens to reply to this speech, and did so. After showing in his own quiet and ingenious way the absurdity of this assumption of Judge Douglas, telling his auditors that, as they were preparing to celebrate the Fourth of July, and would read the Declaration, he would like to have them read it in Judge Douglas' way, viz: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all British subjects who were on this continent 81 years ago, were created equal to all British subjects born and then residing in Great Britain,'—he said: 'And now I appeal to all—to Democrats are well as others: are you really willing that the Declaration shall thus be frittered away?—thus left no more, at most, than interesting memorial of the dead past?—thus shorn of its vitality and its practical value, and left without the germ, or even the suggestion, of the inalienable rights of man in it?' Then Mr. Lincoln added his opinion as to what the authors of the Declaration intended; and it has probably never been stated with a more catholic spirit, or in choicer terms:

"I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men; but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men equal—equal in certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This they said and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and, even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence—and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people, of all colors, everywhere."

Ladies and gentlemen, I venture to suggest to you that today, almost a century after Lincoln's time, we are giving new and vigorous augmentation to the principles of freedom as set forth in the Declaration of Independence. We are augmenting, in Lincoln's words, "the happiness and value of life to all peoples of all colors." Indeed, in my judgment, we have contributed more mass happiness to more Americans these last 3 years than has been accomplished in the lifetime of many here today. And, in the Lincoln tradition, we march forward under the leadership of a humble, dedicated and inspiring citizen, President Dwight Eisenhower.

"What President Eisenhower has done," said a great eastern newspaper which had not supported him in the 1952 election, "is not so much from a political motive but from deep-seated moral and spiritual convictions. Dwight Eisenhower is determined to be President of all the people."

"I am a Democrat," states a prominent Member of the House of Representatives. "I nonetheless believe that President Eisenhower is proving to be such a President, and all the peoples, Negroes and white, will be better, and America stronger, because of it."

Both as Americans and as Californians, we may be proud of the record of constructive achievement in Washington.

The 13½ million people who live in this great State of ours again and again have received complete and constructive cooperation from the Congress and the administration in solving the problems of this fast growing western territory. Since 1953, the President has signed into law over a half dozen bills authorizing the Federal Government to build dams and water works in various parts of California. Among them is the largest reclamation project in the whole history of this administration, the $230 million Trinity Dam project in Weaverville.

The Federal air pollution law authorizes a long-range program of Federal scientific and technical assistance to State and local government in a concerted campaign to overcome a menace now spreading across the Nation, of which we here in southern California are acutely aware—"smog" as it is known here, "smaze" in New York.

For years, our Federal Government has been in the habit of renting office space, in some instances paying rent for the same quarters over half a century. That is not only a costly operation but the public has not been served, in its business with Uncle Sam, with the greatest efficiency. Now, under new lease-purchase legislation, those same rental moneys may be used as periodic payments in the purchase of new buildings specifically designed to serve our citizens better. The Federal Government will now buy buildings the way you and I buy our homes. Under this program, I look forward to a new Customs House in Los Angeles and to badly needed new public structures in various parts of our State. And the construction will be undertaken by private business. New jobs will be available as a result.

In the field of flood control—so important to all sections of our State—I believe that the administration and Congress will give more Federal assistance to California than

ever before. At any rate, that will be one of the goals toward which I shall work during the remainder of this Congress.

Devastating as this winter's rains and floods have been to many sections of our State, they would have wreaked far greater damage had it not been for the flood control projects already completed in partnership between Federal and local government.

By the way, we have rapidly acted to pass legislation authorizing low-interest, long-term loans to flood-disaster victims for repair or reconstruction of their flooded homes or flooded businesses. And with Presidential recommendation, the Congress is presently considering the question of flood disaster insurance legislation, to which I want to have added the similar problem of earthquake insurance.

In our country today, more Americans are gainfully employed than ever before in our history. The national economy approaches $400 billion a year. This is essentially a time of industrial peace. Wage increases are real. Inflation has been halted and a dollar today buys about what it did in 1953 when this administration came into power. We have eliminated wage and price controls. We have given business and industry an incentive to modernize their plants, to purchase new equipment, to make capital outlays, all of which stimulate employment. Twice in 3 years the people of our country have received cuts in Federal taxes. We have reduced Federal Government spending by more than $10 billion. This year's budget will be in balance. Social security has been extended to 10 million more Americans, and unemployment insurance now covers 4 million more of our people.

"The opening of this new year," said President Eisenhower in his state of the Union Message to Congress, "must arouse in us all grateful thanks to a kind Providence whose protection has been ever present and whose bounty has been manifold and abundant. The state of the Union today demonstrates what can be accomplished under God by a free people; by their vision, their understanding of national problems, their initiative, their self-reliance, their capacity for work, and by their willingness to sacrifice whenever sacrifice is needed."

The people of this Nation, regardless of party, demand clean, strong, and honest American Government. And that is the kind of American Government we have today in this land of ours. Progress has been made, much more remains to be done. But all in all, these last 3 years have been years of steady and continuing accomplishment for all the people of the United States.

Of paramount importance to all of us, however, are the cause of freedom and the cause of peace. Our Nation's basic goal remains the security of the people of America in a just and honorable peace.

We live in an era unique in human history. Our globe is divided between free nations of free people, and Communist states together with their satellites. Communism is unchanging and changeless. Its goal remains the same: World domination. Unhappily, both sides in this ideological and psychological cleavage possess the secrets of thermonuclear energy. Thus, each side has the power to obliterate mankind and destroy the earth.

Fear of retaliation is a powerful deterrent of any outright aggression. Indeed, it must be the reason or one of the reasons for the zig and the zag of Communist policy. Direct threats of violence are now substituted by economic infiltration, continuing subversion, division, duplicity, and deceit.

At Geneva, in July, the heads of the Soviet agreed that a nuclear war would be a frightful disaster which must not occur. Yet they refused thereafter to accept the President's "open sky" reciprocal inspection proposals. And then, in September, Mr. Khrushchev commented at a Kremlin banquet that anyone who "mistakes our smile for a withdrawal from the policies of Marx and Lenin is making a mistake."

"Those who expect this will have to wait," he cynically suggested, "until Easter falls on a Tuesday."

Then, late in January, Mr. Bulganin wrote a letter to President Eisenhower. It was courteous and conciliatory. He suggested a United States-Soviet treaty of friendship and cooperation. He pointed to the need for ending a race of arms and of the need for peace.

Do you remember the tone and the words of Dwight Eisenhower's answer? Listen again to this part of our President's reply:

"The present state of international tension was not prevented by the words of the (United Nations) Charter. How can we hope that the present situation would be cured merely by repeating those words in bilateral form?

"I wonder whether again going through a treaty-making procedure, and this time on a bilateral basis only, might indeed work against the cause of peace by creating the illusion that a stroke of a pen had achieved a result which in fact can be obtained only by a change of spirit."

Once again, Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States hewed to the line of principle. "Deeds, not words," continued to be the Eisenhower condition precedent to acceptance of Soviet good faith.

Our foreign policy has been forthright and courageous. Like every other human endeavor, errors have been, and will be made in the implementation of that policy. But this Government has been motivated by high principle and by a devotion to America's security in a just and honorable peace.

At home, our defense strength has increased. Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, puts it this way: "From the standpoint of security, the country has never been better off in peacetime." And in the last analysis, there is no one in this country more qualified to make defense decisions than the soldier-statesman who now occupies the White House.

In the face of potential Communist aggression, we shall continue to maintain an effective system of collective security—a system which constitutes both a warning that aggression will be met by joint action of free nations and the collective power of those nations to make the warning unmistakably effective. And we have witnessed growing strength in our collective security system. Western Germany belongs to NATO, despite the threats and imprecations of Moscow. In Southeast Asia, SEATO is developing.

None can deny that there are sorely troubled spots around the world. Soviet power in the Middle East, through Communist arms allotments to Egypt, presents the gravest kind of threat to peace in the world. And but for the clear provisions of the Formosa resolution, many of our military experts believe that war long since would have raged between Soviet China and Nationalist China.

I am one of those who does not see all good in our own party nor all bad in the other. There is some of each in both. I am one, also, who devoutly feels that our foreign policy must be free from politics. And the proudest recollection which I have of my 3 years in the Senate of the United States is that the Senate, in considering foreign policy, has been singularly free of partisan bias. I say with pride as an American, the Senate, on every single occasion since January 1953, has upheld the President in his foreign policy recommendations, and has done so overwhelmingly, and in a bipartisan fashion.

The Senate Democratic leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, has stated that he does not expect foreign policy to be a partisan issue in the next election. I agree with him. Sure, we want full public debate on that vital subject. But the political differences which may logically and understandably divide some Democrats and some Republicans in this year's election should not and must not divide our country in the determination of what foreign policy is best for the perpetuation of freedom for all Americans and the attainment of a just peace for all the world.

President Lincoln told the country, in a message to the Congress in 1862, "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history." Neither can we in 1956. "The fiery trial through which we pass," he said, "will light us down in honor or in dishonor to the latest generation." So it is with America today. Indeed, Mr. Lincoln's words come crashing through the years: "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth." God grant us the wisdom and the courage and the vision to succeed.

AMERICAN CITIZENS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not more than 5 minutes during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last week there appeared in a national magazine a letter written by a purported Californian named Lincoln Yamamoto, which contemptuously and contemptibly libeled a great segment of patriotic and loyal Americans. On February 20, in the letter column of Newsweek magazine, there appeared the following:

THE MEANING OF TREASON

I think it was prejudice and miscarriage of justice that "Tokyo Rose," Iva D' Aquino (Newsweek, January 16), was convicted of treason. Was MacArthur guilty of treason for fighting for his country? Why then was Iva D'Aquino guilty of treason for doing her duty to hers? It's our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan, regardless of where we're born and our first allegiance is to Japan.

We niseis are proud of Iva D'Aquino and we're going to give her a heroine's welcome.

LINCOLN YAMAMOTO.

PASADENA, CALIF.

A heroine's welcome for Iva D'Aquino, "Tokyo Rose," when she arrives in California? No, not by the loyal and patriotic American people of California, certainly not by the loyal and patriotic American citizen of California who happen to be of Japanese ancestry.

Mr. President, it was a scurrilous thing for whoever Lincoln Yamamoto really is, to say, as has been said in this letter:

It's our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan, regardless of where we're born and our first allegiance is to Japan.

Mr. President, that is not so. The splendid record of American citizens of Japanese ancestry in World War I, in World War II, in Korea, and at the present, demonstrates that the latter statement is a lie, and a shameful, false indictment of people who are proud to call themselves patriotic citizens of the United States.

I have here a telegram, Mr. President, which I received this morning, and

which I wish to read to the Senate. It is from Gardena, Calif., and is addressed to me. I read:

Lincoln Yamamoto's letter is an insult to the memories of our comrades who died proving their allegiance and loyalty to America. We, the living, are proud of our accomplishments, challenge the right of anyone to load us down with customs of which we know nothing and care less. We are Americans and proud of it. We owe no allegiance to Japan. If Tokio Rose receives a welcome of any kind in Pasadena it will only be by those who enjoy the freedom and economic liberty of America without accepting any of its responsibilities. We who have served and continue to serve refute any implications that we are anything but sound solid taxpaying Americans, and we love it.

Yo Kobata, Sonny Yonezawa, Kaz Minami, Fruik Kuida, Tom Gohata, Yo Minami, George Kobayashi, Kay Muramoto, Paul Kuida, George Kobata.

Mr. President, a few days ago I had an opportunity to talk with an American citizen whose name is Soichi Fukui, who is commander of Commodore Perry Post No. 525 of the American Legion, Department of California. He wrote me a letter, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,
COMMODORE PERRY POST, No. 525,
Los Angeles Calif., February 16, 1956.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I am writing in reference to a letter to the editors of Newsweek in the February 20th issue signed by one Lincoln Yamamoto which is enclosed. In this letter Mr. Yamamoto asserts: "It is our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan, regardless of where we're born and our first allegiance is to Japan." I find it difficult to believe that Lincoln Yamamoto really exists. If he does, he has slandered thousands of second-generation Americans of Japanese ancestry, the Nisei, who have but one allegiance and that to our native country, the United States of America. I say this with the utmost confidence backed by the record set by Nisei veterans in World Wars I and II.

The famed 442d Combat Team won a total of 3,915 decorations among which was a Congressional Medal of Honor, and 2,022 Purple Hearts, a 1,000 percent casualty record to make it the most decorated unit of the United States Army in World War II.

In the Pacific area Nisei constituted a major factor in the success of military intelligence, thus hastening the defeat of their own ancestral country.

In the Korean conflict, Nisei responded wholeheartedly by entering into every branch of the service and another Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded to an American of Japanese ancestry.

Loyalty to the United States is not restricted to second-generation Japanese-Americans but is shared by first-generation immigrants who, long denied the privilege of becoming citizens of the United States by law, when given the opportunity through enactment of the Walter-McCarran Act, responded wholeheartedly and in the first 2 years in Los Angeles County alone, 2,400 became citizens of our country.

On record also in the fact that not one case of sabotage or espionage by a first- or second-generation Japanese-American has ever been perpetrated against this, our native land.

Yours sincerely,

SOICHI FUKUI,
Commander, Commodore Perry Post, No. 525, the American Legion, Department of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to quote from that letter, in part:

The famed 442d Combat Team won a total of 3,915 decorations among which was a Congressional Medal of Honor, and 2,022 Purple Hearts, a 1,000 percent casualty record to make it the most decorated unit of the United States Army in World War II.

In the Pacific area Nisei constituted a major factor in the success of military intelligence, thus hastening the defeat of their own ancestral country.

In the Korean conflict, Nisei responded wholeheartedly by entering into every branch of the service and another Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded to an American of Japanese ancestry.

Loyalty to the United States is not restricted to second-generation Japanese-Americans but is shared by first generation immigrants, who, long denied the privilege of becoming citizens of the United States by law, when given the opportunity through enactment of the Walter-McCarran Act, responded wholeheartedly and in the first 2 years in Los Angeles County alone, 2,400 became citizens of our country.

On record also is the fact that not one case of sabotage or espionage by a first or second generation Japanese-American has ever been perpetrated against this, our native land.

Mr. President, I am glad to have received a letter dated February 17, 1956, from George F. Moss, commander of the 17th District, Department of California, the American Legion, who denounces, for the veterans who reside in California, the spurious statement in the letter by Yamamoto, to which I have just alluded. I ask that the letter by Mr. Moss be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,
DISTRICT 17,
Los Angeles, February 17, 1956.

The Honorable THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am shocked by reading a letter printed in Newsweek, February 20, 1956, signed by Lincoln Yamamoto, of Pasadena, Calif. The sentence in Mr. Yamamoto's letter is, "It's our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan, regardless of where we're born, and our first allegiance is to Japan."

As commander, 17th district, Department of California, the American Legion, I have read with interest and approval the letter to you from Soichi Fukui, commander, Commodore Perry Post, one of the component posts of the 17th district.

The record of loyalty and devotion of these, our brother veterans, is such as to render as utterly ridiculous such statements as appeared in Newsweek.

Nevertheless, nationwide, many people may read the letter, and not knowing the facts, will arrive at a most erroneous conclusion concerning the American Japanese.

Therefore, understanding that you intend to read on the Senate floor the Newsweek letter and Commander Fukui's answer, in the interest of justice and fair play, may I commend you both as a United States Senator and as a fellow Legionnaire.

We in California are proud of Legionnaires of Japanese ancestry of both Wars I and II.

You may use this letter in any manner you see fit.

Sincerely,

GEORGE F. MOSS,
Commander, 17th District, Department of California, the American Legion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have also the text of an article entitled "Newsweek Rapped for Clouding Nisei Loyalty," printed in the Rafu Shimpo of February 16, 1956. This is an English language newspaper published in Los Angeles by Americans of Japanese ancestry. The article contains some comments with respect to the letter printed in Newsweek, to which I have referred, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSWEEK RAPPED FOR CLOUDING NISEI LOYALTY

SAN FRANCISCO.—Masao Satow, JACL national director, today took a news magazine to task for its irresponsibility in publishing a letter to the editor written by an alleged Lincoln Yamamoto, of Pasadena, Calif.

The Yamamoto letter stated that it was the custom "to consider ourselves citizens of Japan regardless of where we are born and our first allegiance is to Japan. We Nisei are proud of Iva D'Aquino and we are going to give her a heroine's welcome," describing the the treason conviction of Tokyo Rose as a miscarriage of justice since she was only doing her duty.

The text of JACL Director Satow's letter follows:

"In the February 20 issue of Newsweek a portion of a letter by Lincoln Yamamoto referring to Tokyo Rose was printed.

"Lincoln Yamamoto, if there is such a person, speaks only for himself in his irresponsible and fanatical outburst. The record of unswerving loyalty of Americans of Japanese ancestry, especially during World War II highlighted by our Nisei GI's who went 'for broke,' and the tremendous services rendered by thousands of our boys to this country with the United States military intelligence in the Pacific theater against the land of their ancestors completely refutes this individual who purportedly speaks for all of us.

"For more than a quarter of a century, our national organization of the Japanese American Citizens League, with its motto 'For Better Americans in a Greater America,' has operated upon the principle that we are Americans and that our first and only loyalty is to the United States of America. Not a single one of our members believes as does Yamamoto that 'it is our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan,' nor have they ever acted in such a manner.

"We feel that Newsweek does all of America a disservice in dignifying this Yamamoto letter. Apparently, you have no faith in the American way in which we have been brought up."

"MASAO SATOW,
"National Director, Japanese American Citizens League."

(According to southern California Regional Director Tats Kushida, who investigated today in Pasadena with Tom Ito, past JACL president, there is no known Lincoln Yamamoto in Pasadena to the knowledge of 7 Yamamoto families now 10-year-long resident leaders of the Japanese-American community, Kushida expressed the

opinion that the Yamamoto letter was a fraud and written by a crank or crackpot.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the glories of this country is that in its Government and in its people runs the blood of persons from almost every section of the entire globe. That is part of the strength of our devotion to freedom. I am of German extraction, but I also have within me Irish, English, and Swiss blood.

In the small town in California from which I come, I went to school with a boy named George Shigekawa. Today Shigekawa works for the United States Government. For a while, his competent and efficient daughter was a member of my staff in Washington. Now she attends Bryn Mawr College.

I think that a part of the great strength of the people of the United States is that we love liberty and love this country, regardless of what blood flows through our veins. I think it is reprehensible and contemptible for one to write the type of letter which was written by Yamamoto, who has defiled the name of Lincoln by using it as his own first name; to write for publication in a national magazine the kind of diabolical untruth which was published on February 20. I denounce Mr. Yamamoto's letter, as I know it will be denounced by the Senate and the American people, including the Americans who trace their ancestry to the country of Japan.

DISTRESSED CONDITIONS IN THE AREA OF CARDONDALE, PA.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made by the Hon. Frank P. Kelly, mayor of Carbondale, Pa., before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on February 10, 1956, in the course of a hearing held at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on the subject of unemployment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1956.

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE.

HONORABLE SIRS: The people of northeastern Pennsylvania and those of the city of Carbondale, in particular, are most fortunate that this senatorial committee has seen fit to come here to obtain first-hand information about conditions in this acutely distressed area.

As mayor of the city of Carbondale I am thankful to be offered this opportunity of telling the story of an American community that is now in the throes of death.

To acquaint you honorable gentlemen with today's facts, permit me to go back over 140 years ago, and, in a brief manner, relate the Carbondale story.

Carbondale came into existence in 1812—36 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Resolute settlers, seeking the then free land, came into this northeastern Pennsylvania valley and built their humble log cabins along the banks of the tranquil Lackawanna.

These hardy souls little suspected that they had established their farms upon a great section of the world's finest anthracite deposits—but they were not long in finding out. Less than 8 years later two engineers from Philadelphia made preliminary tests to uncover the coal. These engineers had heard other settlers tell the Indian legend about the mountains of black rock that could be sighted up where the Lackawanna began its leisurely course.

The engineers did not stay long. That autumn they went back to Philadelphia to form a mining company, aided by New York capital.

The following spring the first Carbondale coal was hauled by mule to Philadelphia and then sent by ship to New York. An exhibit of coal at the Battery in 1820 bore the legend "Removed from the ground at a junction called Ragged Island in Northeastern Pennsylvania." "Ragged Island" was the name given to Carbondale.

Shortly afterward, Philip Hone, New York financier and political leader, had the name on coal shipments changed to "Carbondale" upon the suggestion of his friend, author Washington Irving.

The name "Carbondale" has been with this great city, through prosperity and poverty, through joy and sadness, since that time.

Incorporated as a third class city in 1851, Carbondale was built around the mining industry. When anthracite prospered, as it did for 80 years, Carbondale prospered. The good people of the pioneer city never believed that the supply of coal would dwindle or that the market demand for it would drop by an amazing percentage.

Because of faith in anthracite, the people of Carbondale were lulled into becoming a one-industry community. The few plants that did come into the city were hard-pressed to match the wages being paid out to mineworkers and some of them left the scene abruptly. Others, though, stayed for some years.

Back in 1922, Carbondale began to feel the pressure of a restricted economy. In 1930 several independent mines closed. Within another year two mines of a major coal concern suspended operations.

But the worst was yet to come. In the next 6 years, the principal railroad serving Carbondale removed its car-repair yards employing 200 men; a silk throwing mill with 90 employees left Carbondale; a nationally known welding concern with 80 men left for central Pennsylvania to be near its main operation; a machine company with some 210 men was sold to a New Jersey concern; one of the community banks closed its doors.

Carbondale, as the year 1936 came to a close, believed that it had suffered enough. Efforts were made to obtain industries to replace those that had departed, but there still remained that faith in coal mining and the residents felt that the picture would brighten.

They were wrong. From 1936 to 1942 a steady decline was noted. Money from the young men serving in the Armed Forces helped ease the burden during the years 1942 to 1945 and the few local industries managed to secure some military contracts and the idle males went joyfully to work.

The year 1946 saw GI training schools mushrooming all over Carbondale. The war veterans went to shoe schools, automotive schools, plumbing schools, carpentry schools, welding schools, and machine shop schools. Even the mines seemed to enjoy a period of false prosperity from 1942 onward.

Then, all of a sudden, the dream ended. City leaders awakened to the fact that mine employment had taken another sharp drop. As the GI schools began to close the flow of money that once was a deluge became a trickle.

From 1949 to the present day has been a series of tragic happenings for the people of Carbondale. The community that boasted of being the first place where an underground anthracite mine was opened in the United States could no longer look to the coal companies.

Caves tipped once proud dwellings and the people sought aid in vain. Huge draglines and shovels appeared on the scene and strip mining, because it was cheaper, came into existence. Piles of earth, some towering 30 to 60 feet, left in the wake of such surface mining now have changed the landscape into something resembling the dire battlefields of Europe. Efforts to speak out against such conditions have been without avail.

The principal railroad serving Carbondale changed from steam to diesel in 1952 and the huge roundhouse, once employing 290 men, is now idle. A plant that started in the former machine company location went bankrupt. Passenger train service between Carbondale and Scranton was suspended. The list of railroad workers was cut by some 670 men during the past 10 years.

What has happened to all these workers, you may ask? Some of them have found meager employment in Carbondale, a few have found substantial jobs—but most of them are now working in New Jersey, District of Columbia, Maryland, Ohio, and New York. Others are scattered across the Nation.

In 1945 the needle industry came into Carbondale and this valley. Evidently they had heard of conditions and realized that there would be many women looking for work. This industry, which employees only a very few men, is now the chief source of work in Carbondale. This is a far cry from 30, 40, or 50 years ago when all men had profitable jobs and women worked only in stores.

The entire attitude of Carbondale is one of discouragement. For the past 12 years the city has been besieged by a mine fire, the scope of which forms a subterranean furnace beneath one-quarter of our community. The Federal Bureau of Mines has expended some $200,000 in a futile effort to conquer this fire and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has voted a $1 million appropriation for the task when funds are available.

In the meantime, those who reside in the mine fire area must set their alarm clocks by the hour so that the family may arise for mutual safety. Toxic gases from the fire have already claimed 2 lives and more than 20 other persons have escaped death by narrow margins.

Last January 1955, a fire costing over $425,000 swept a section of Central City in Carbondale. This was followed on February 4, 1955, by one of the Nation's biggest fires—one which gutted about one-quarter of the business district with damages running to $3,200,000. The city is still struggling to recover from this blow.

Latest unemployment figures for Lackawanna County show that approximately 12.3 percent are unemployed. A checkup with Carbondale office, Pennsylvania State bureau of employment security, indicates Carbondale's unemployment averages about 13.4 percent. If you include idled railroad workers, who are now receiving benefits through the Railroad Retirement Act, this would bring the unemployment average for the city of Carbondale to 15.2 percent.

Back in 1920, the population of Carbondale was 18,640. In 1930 it was 20,061. In 1940 it was 19,335. But in 1950 it had declined to 16,235. Today it is safe to assume that Carbondale's population has dropped to 13,000.

Carbondale, gentlemen, is a proud city. It is a patriotic city. During World War II over 2,000 of its sons and daughters served in the Armed Forces and the monument in Memorial Park contains the names of 92 war dead.

It is a city that is fighting to stay alive. The Carbondale Chamber of Commerce and

Carbondale-Lackawanna Industrial Development Co., along with other organizations, are doing all they can to save the community. I have appointed a five-man city planning commission, designed to work with the Federal Government in an effort to map out a program for the future.

We don't want to see Carbondale, a typical god-fearing American city, die. The city and its people deserve a better fate.

That is why, gentlemen, I have come before you today to appeal to you for aid. I would welcome a visit from this committee to our city so that they could see conditions for themselves * * * so that they could talk with our people * * * so that they could learn what it means to live in a great country but still live in a city that has no apparent future.

We love Carbondale very dearly. That is why we are still fighting to save all that she represents to us—a great city with great people.

I extend to you my heart-felt thanks for this opportunity of appearing before you. I have stated the case of Carbondale as briefly as possible. I trust that you will give our city every possible attention in your recommendations. All that you do for Carbondale will be remembered for generations in the prayers of a grateful populace.

FRANK P. KELLY,
Mayor of Carbondale.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS CONNECTED WITH THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate Concurrent Resolution 65 will be the unfinished business at 2 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Since it is not yet 2 o'clock, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before I suggested the absence of a quorum, I had not seen on the floor my friend the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I understand he desires to address the Senate for approximately 20 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 65 is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I think the consideration of the concurrent resolution will take only a few minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think it will take more than a few minutes. I was advised there would be a speech on the subject.

Mr. GREEN. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I am correctly informed, and if the Senator from Oregon desires to proceed with his address, I should like to accommodate the Senator. I wish to inform the Senate that at the conclusion of the speech by the junior Senator from Oregon I shall suggest the absence of a quorum before having the Senate proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS TO RELIEVE OFFICEHOLDERS OF PRIVATE OBLIGATIONS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, whenever a citizen must abandon hopes of seeking public office because he does not have a sufficient campaign treasury democracy has failed.

Whenever a citizen is defeated for public office because the opposing candidate had overwhelming superiority in campaign funds democracy has failed.

The idealists who founded this Nation fought a war of revolution against the inherited political power wielded by distant kings. Shall we, their heirs, permit political power in our own day to be dependent upon and wielded through the simple, crass expenditure of money?

This crucial question—indeed, the No. 1 problem of our political processes—has been brought home to the Nation vividly in recent weeks because of the controversy over the $2,500 contribution offered to one Member of the Senate by a representative of an oil company interested in passage of the gas bill.

All at once many millions of Americans have become aware of the fact that their representatives in Government frequently enter high office obligated for vast sums in campaign contributions.

RADIO AND TV HAVE MADE CAMPAIGNS BIG BUSINESS

These contributions, in my opinion, have become an unbearable yoke to many of the men who must accept them. They even have become onerous and objectionable to the individuals who parcel out such contributions. Yet everyone has been caught in the ensnaring web of campaign financing. It takes tens of millions of dollars to elect a President, and perhaps a million dollars to elect a Senator in a populous State. Indeed, U. S. News & World Report for February 17, 1956, lists $200,000 as the average senatorial campaign fund in even a typical State. Think of what it is in New York, Pennsylvania, or California.

These expenditures have become necessary because of the tremendous cost of reaching people through modern media of communication, particularly through radio and television. It has been a long time since a presidential or senatorial campaign could be conducted wholly by traveling from town to town and crossroad to crossroad, speaking directly to large or small groups of voters. If the debate of the issues between the parties in an election, which is the essence of the democratic choice, is to be brought to the people, it must be through these and all other modern media.

But while greatly increased expenditures for political campaigns have become necessary, the accompanying dependence of candidates and their supporters on large campaign contributions to raise these necessary funds has become a great evil. I am convinced that neither candidates nor contributors want this frenzied scramble for campaign financing to continue. I am therefore introducing today the most far-reaching bill ever proposed to strike loose the financial fetters from our democratic processes of government.

In essence, my bill would call for substituting Federal funds for large private campaign contributions in elections for Federal offices—that is, President and Vice President, Senators, Representatives, and Delegates to Congress. I am not the originator of this proposal. It originated nearly half a century ago. Its author was the 26th President of the United States, who even at that relatively early date foresaw the danger of financial domination of our electoral processes.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT ASKED CONGRESS TO ENACT THIS PROPOSAL IN 1907

Theodore Roosevelt saw that limits on campaign contributions, and complete disclosure of contributions and expenditures, were necessary—but also that they were not enough. So this is what President Roosevelt proposed in a message to the 60th Congress at the opening of its 1st session, on December 3, 1907:

> Under our form of government voting is not merely a right but a duty, and, moreover, a fundamental and necessary duty if a man is to be a good citizen. It is well to provide that corporations shall not contribute to presidential or national campaigns, and furthermore to provide for the publication of both contributions and expenditures. There is, however, always danger in laws of this kind, which from their very nature are difficult of enforcement; the danger being lest they be obeyed only by the honest, and disobeyed by the unscrupulous, so as to act only as a penalty upon honest men. Moreover, no such law would hamper an unscrupulous man of unlimited means from buying his own way into office. There is a very radical measure which would, I believe, work a substantial improvement in our system of conducting a campaign, although I am well aware that it will take some time for people so to familiarize themselves with such a proposal as to be willing to consider its adoption. The need for collecting large campaign funds would vanish if Congress provided an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties, an appropriation ample enough to meet the necessity for thorough organization and machinery, which

requires a large expenditure of money. Then the stipulation should be made that no party receiving campaign funds from the Treasury should accept more than a fixed amount from any individual subscriber or donor; and the necessary publicity for receipts and expenditures could without difficulty be provided.

Mr. President, Theodore Roosevelt looked ahead of his time. He lived in a period when a whole presidential campaign might be conducted for half a million dollars. He could know nothing, then, of TV network programs which would use up $100,000 in about half an hour. But he realized that it was becoming more costly all the time to reach the eyes and ears of the people. If this access to the voters ever could be controlled and dominated by big money, what would happen to democracy? Should a dollar sign be imprinted on the ballot box?

Ever since I became a Member of the Senate, I have worked on legislation to enact into law President Roosevelt's proposal. I have hurried its completion because of the significant events disclosed to the Senate during debate of the bill removing Federal controls from natural gas prices.

TIME HAS COME TO ENACT "TEDDY ROOSEVELT BILL"

Sometimes I call my bill the Teddy Roosevelt bill, because of its origin. The more I have studied it, the more I have become convinced that it is the most effective step we could take to free our candidates for Federal elective office from the shackles of great private campaign funds. The hour has come—nay, it is long since past—to put President Theodore Roosevelt's recommendation into the form of law. That is why I am today introducing my bill on behalf of myself, my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until the end of the week, in order to permit any other Senators who may wish to do so to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at this time I introduce the bill, request its appropriate reference; and ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3242) to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SECTION 1. Congress finds that it is in the national interest to prevent the dominance of large political campaign contributions in elections for Federal office.

Free and untrammeled representation of the public is possible only when men and women in high office are not indebted to special interests for financial donations.

Disproportionate inequality among parties and candidates, with respect to campaign financing, is a peril to democracy—particularly during an era when access to the most compelling media of public information is increasingly decisive and costly.

Government financing of the major political parties, as recommended in 1907 by the then President of the United States, offers the most practical and effective remedy for preventing private persons and groups with great wealth from influencing unduly the decisions of the ballot box.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(1) The term "major political party" means any political party whose candidate for the presidency in the election next preceding polled at least 10 per centum of the total popular vote, or whose candidates for Senator, Representative or Delegate to Congress polled at least 10 per centum of the total popular vote for all of those offices in such election.

(2) Terms defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, shall, unless the context otherwise indicates, have the meaning assigned to them in that act.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Board to be known as the Federal Campaign Contributions Board (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Board") to be composed of one member of each major political party, appointed from private life by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members of the Board shall each receive compensation at a rate not in excess of $50.00 per diem when engaged in the business of the Board, and while away from their homes or regular places of business shall be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15.00 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

(b) The Board shall without regard to the civil service laws appoint an Administrator, who shall be the chief executive officer of the Board and shall have such functions as are herein prescribed in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Board shall provide for the appointment by the Administrator, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 as amended, and for the compensation of such other officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized to make payments to the national committee of each major political party in the manner and subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth.

AMOUNT AND CONDITIONS OF PAYMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Payments authorized by this act shall be made to the national committee of each major political party in a total amount for each such committee in any 2-year period, beginning April 1 following a national election;

(1) if during that 2-year period presidential electors are to be elected, not to exceed the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the average total number of voters casting votes for candidates for the offices of presidential elector and Delegates to Congress in the last two elections for those offices; and

(2) if during that 2-year period presidential electors are not to be elected, not to exceed the amount obtained by multiplying 15 cents by the average total number of votes cast for all candidates for Representative and Delegate, in the last two nonpresidential national elections.

(b) Such payments are authorized for the purpose of enabling major political parties to make legitimate campaign expenditures, and shall be made from time to time upon application therefor accompanied by a certification of the chairman and treasurer of the national committee that they will be used to discharge lawful obligations incurred for past or future expenditures during the 2-year period in which application is made, in support of the candidacy of such party's nominees for Federal elective office. Payments shall not be made in the case of any candidate on account of obligations incurred prior to the date the candidate has been nominated.

(c) The nature and extent of such obligations shall be stated in such detail as regulations under this act may prescribe.

(d) Not more than two-thirds of the amount authorized to be allocated to any national committee during any 2-year period shall be paid prior to the national election which occurs during that 2-year period. The balance shall be payable upon completion and review of all reports required by law or regulation on all expenditures made on behalf of all candidates of that political party in connection with that election.

LIMITATION ON FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION

SEC. 6. (a) To receive any payment authorized under this act, the chairman and the treasurer of a national committee shall certify that no individual has contributed more than a total of $100 to the campaign of one or more candidates for Federal office of that major political party.

(b) If the total expenditures in any 2-year period from contributions from private sources for all candidates for Federal office of a major political party, as shown by reports required by law or regulation, exceed the amount authorized by this act to be paid to the national committee of that political party during such 2-year period, payments to that national committee under this act shall be reduced by the amount of the excess.

PENALTIES

SEC. 7. (a) No committee shall apply for or use any part of the payments authorized under this act except on the conditions and for the purpose authorized hereby.

(b) Any violation of this section by any committee shall be deemed also to be a violation by the chairman and the treasurer of such committee and by any other person responsible for such violation and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both; and, if the violation was willful, by a fine of not more than $20,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 8. The Administrator is authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, let me explain just what my bill proposes to do.

In a nutshell, it would make available Federal campaign funds, in very adequate measure, to the major political

parties, in lieu of large private contributions. Federal funds would be made available for legitimate campaign expenses on two conditions: First, that the party and its candidates for Federal office accept no more than $100 from any one private contributor; and, second, that not more than an amount equal to the authorized Federal contribution be spent from private sources on behalf of the party and its Federal candidates.

This is how the Federal contribution would be administered: An impartial, nonpartisan Administrator would be selected by a board having one member from each major political party. The Administrator would be authorized to make payments from time to time, upon application by the chairman and treasurer of the national committee of a party, for legitimate past or future campaign expenditures certified by those party officers. The total authorized Federal contribution for each party during any 2-year period would be determined by this formula: If a presidential election were to be held during the 2-year period, each party would be equally entitled to 20 cents per vote to the extent of the average of the total votes cast in the past 2 presidential elections. In the intervening 2-year periods, when nonpresidential Federal elections are held, the sum would be 15 cents per vote for the average of the total votes cast for Representative and Delegate to Congress in the past 2 nonpresidential elections.

To qualify for the Federal contribution as a major political party, a party's candidates would have to have received 10 percent of the total popular vote in the last preceding national election. Allowance would be made for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, which do not vote for President or Senators or Representatives, by including votes for Delegates to Congress in all calculations.

THIRD PARTIES MIGHT HAVE QUALIFIED ONLY TWICE IN THIS CENTURY

I believe, Mr. President, that the 10-percent rule would adequately provide for equal financial rights for any future third party which might arise, once the program or the candidates of such a party have earned the attention and the support of a substantial segment of the American people. In our modern history, two parties have won such support. In 1912, the "Bull Moose" Progressive Republican ticket, headed by Theodore Roosevelt, won 27.4 percent of the popular vote. In 1924, the Progressive Party of Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., obtained 16.6 percent. In this century, these two and no other third parties would have qualified for Federal contributions in their next subsequent election campaign, under the formula of my bill. Except for these, the high point for third parties was reached by the Socialist Party in 1920, with 3.4 percent. In 1948, the Progressive and States Rights tickets each received only 2.4 percent of the popular vote.

Mr. President, how would my bill have applied in practice to financing the 1952 election, and how would it apply in 1956? I have prepared a chart which demonstates the operation of the formula and its theoretical application to the elections of 1952, 1954, 1956, and 1958. I ask unanimous consent to have the chart printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proposed Federal contributions to elections of national candidates

Year	Total vote for President and for Delegates to Congress (Alaska, Hawaii)	Total vote for Representatives and Delegates to Congress	Average total vote of 2 preceding similar elections	Federal contribution per vote	Total Federal contribution to each major political party
1944	48,088,772				
1946		34,509,682			
1948	48,956,634				
1950		40,560,165			
1952	61,703,224		48,522,703	$0.20	$9,704,540.60
1954		42,745,018	37,534,923.5	.15	5,630,238.53
1956			55,329,929	.20	11,065,985.80
1958			41,652,591.5	.15	6,247,888.73

Mr. NEUBERGER. Thus, Mr. President, in 1951–52, for instance, each major party would have been entitled to $9,704,540.60 in Federal campaign contributions, provided it and its candidates did not spend more than an equal amount from private contributions, none of which could exceed $100. In other words, about $18½ million would have been available for campaigns on behalf of the candidates for Federal office of each of the two major parties in that election.

In 1953–54, when there was no presidential election, the Federal allocation to each party would have been $5,630,238.53, permitting total expenditures of over $11 million on behalf of all its candidates for Federal elective offices across the Nation.

Mr. President, I have explained that the main purpose of my bill is to bring about the substitution of Federal funds—with no political strings attached—for the present evil of large private campaign contributions. The mere fact that several million dollars would be made available equally to each major party, which it would not have to go out and raise from wealthy contributors, would go far toward giving access to the media of public opinion to both candidates representing major opposing viewpoints on public issues.

PLAN WOULD ENCOURAGE VOLUNTARY REDUCTION OF TOTAL CAMPAIGN SPENDING

But in addition to helping both sides to get their political message to the public, my bill would have a salutary effect toward reducing the overall size of total campaign expenditures in a national election, which now threaten to reach stratospheric proportions. Even with equal Federal contributions to both sides, democracy is still in danger if one side can finance, from private wealth, a saturation bombardment of public attention with uncounted billboards, radio talkathons, television spectaculars, newspaper and magazine advertising, skywriting, and whatever else the imagination of professional publicity and advertising men with plenty of money can offer. Thus, in legislation based on Teddy Roosevelt's plan, I would also make the Federal contribution contingent on a limitation of total spending from private contributions, as well as of the maximum contribution of any one person.

Under my bill, if there were privately collected and spent on behalf of all Federal candidates of a political party a sum more than equal to the amount of the authorized Federal contribution, the Federal contribution to that party would be reduced by the amount of the excess. In 1956, for example, each of our present two major political parties would be entitled to $11,065,985.80 under the formula of the bill. There might be spent on behalf of its candidates for Federal office another $11,065,985.80 from small private contributions. Thus the total for each party might be in excess of $22 million.

Let us assume, however, that the reported expenditures on behalf of the candidates of one party proved to be more than that—say $14 million from private sources. Then a corresponding portion of the Federal contribution would be withheld, and only about $8 million in Federal funds turned over to that party.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS SCHEME DOVETAILS WITH CORRUPT PRACTICES BILL

Mr. President, there is before the Senate at this time S. 636, a well-considered and comprehensive bill, sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri and former chairman of the elections subcommittee [Mr. HENNINGS] and reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration by the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], which would modernize the Federal elections and corrupt practices laws. My bill is entirely consistent with that proposed legislation. It is not only consistent with it, but it depends for its administration on adoption of compulsory reporting provisions such as those provided in that bill. In my bill, I have not gone over the ground covered by S. 636; I have assumed the enactment of at least its rules on reporting of campaign expenditures. My bill would not affect the legality or illegality of campaign contributions or expenditures by any person. Legal controls over these are necessary and desirable, and I am in favor of strengthening them. But so long as money continues to be essential for presenting political candidates and programs to the public, so long will efforts at enforcing limits on campaign spending by legal penalties, without anything more, be ineffective. The Teddy Roosevelt bill is needed, too.

Mr. President, I believe that the carrot of Federal campaign contributions, accompanied by the stick of losing these funds if the limits of my bill were exceeded, would furnish the extra incentives needed to keep election expenditures within reasonable bounds. If one party could raise so much money from private wealth that it would feel deprived and restricted under the Federal formula, my bill would not prohibit this party from doing so and giving up its Federal funds. I doubt that my own party would find itself in that position.

CAMPAIGN SUPPORT FROM MILLIONS OF SMALL CONTRIBUTIONS STRENGTHENS DEMOCRACY

But if, under the proposed bill, the candidates were to give up all contributions of more than $100 from one person—and they would feel better and more free by reason of doing so—the candidates of our major national parties would have no difficulty in raising matching funds from private sources to equal the Federal funds authorized for their party under the formula of my bill. Millions of men and women in the United States would gladly make modest contributions to the candidates or the party of their choice to raise the matching funds. Participation in campaign financing on this level would actually strengthen our democracy, rather than weaken it, as does our present dangerous dependence on large private donations for campaign chests.

Plans for mobilizing such small, individual contributions from millions of individual citizens have been developed by Mr. Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and by the Advertising Council of America. For 1956, these plans have unfortunately had to be abandoned because of the inability of the Republican Party to find party leaders prepared to participate in organizing such a program which would, perhaps, have meant relatively little to Republican campaign financing anyway. But, Mr. President, a Gallup poll taken only last month showed that 15 million American families would be prepared to give $5 each to the campaigns of candidates of their political party. Even though this full amount could perhaps not effectively be collected, the total would easily be enough to match the Federal allowance for Federal candidates, and finance State races all over the Nation, too. I shall ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this report by Dr. George Gallup, as it appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on January 11, 1956, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING IS CRUCIAL MORAL PROBLEM OF MODERN DEMOCRACY

Mr. President, I believe that the financing of our election campaigns stands alone as the dominant ethical question confronting our democratic political system. A campaign to elect a President of the United States, a Senator or a Representative in Congress, is of necessity a very expensive thing. It is a terrible comparison that such a campaign—the heart of our process of self-government—should have to be bought and paid for much like a campaign to sell soap, or to promote a new movie star. Yet, under present conditions, this unfortunate comparison is, tragically, inescapable. Yet I am convinced that before the end of this century, the next generation of Americans will consider this an unbelievable anachronism of our era.

Mr. President, 96 years ago, Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States with a campaign fund of $100,000. Today this sum would barely pay for one network speech over television. Treasure chests to elect one United States Senator in one of our more populous industrial States run to many hundreds of thousands of dollars. Even in my own State of Oregon, which has little more than 1 percent of our national population, more money was spent on the last congressional election than in the national election which in a time of great crisis sent Abraham Lincoln to the White House.

As a Members of the Senate who was elected after a hard campaign in a State where a member of my party had not been successful for 40 years, I think I can speak with experience about the whole matter of campaign funds. It was hard, and not always pleasant, for my supporters and me to try to raise the sums which were spent in my campaign. Inevitably, the opposition could throw against us substantially larger amounts than we were able to raise.

After the election, I reported expenditures by campaign committees on my behalf of a little more than $103,000. My opponent's committees reported total expenditures of $142,000, or almost 40 percent more. I made my report to the Secretary of the State of Oregon. It is, incidentally a telling commentary on the present Federal reporting laws that the participants in many close, hard-fought campaigns in States many times as populous as Oregon reported campaign expenditures only a fraction of those of former Senator Guy Cordon and myself in 1954. I felt that, although it would be legal not to report expenditures of different committees on my behalf, the spirit of these reporting laws would be better observed if I made a full report on these expenditures.

As reported to the secretary of state of Oregon, under Oregon's State laws, all the various Democratic Party committees in the State, including that enlisted in my behalf, spent a total of $154,938. All the various Republican Party committees in the State, including that of my opponent, reported a total of $271,431. Thus the groups supporting my opponent spent approximately 75 percent more than was spent to elect me.

As I mentioned before, the magazine U. S. News & World Report estimates the average total cost of being elected to the United States Senate to be at least $200,000. This means that the sums spent in behalf of my opponent were about average; those spent supporting my election were somewhat less than average. Although I was considerably outspent by my Republican opponent, I nevertheless had the largest campaign fund of any Democrat in Oregon in many years. Regretfully, I must admit that probably I would not have had a chance to win unless this had been the case. In a democracy, is this a happy condition of affairs?

WILL THOSE WHO ATTACK LABOR'S CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS SUPPORT THIS BILL?

Much has been said in recent weeks about spending in elections by means of the political-education funds of various trade unions. It is estimated that these funds contributed by working people added about $23,000 to the committees supporting my election effort. This is a substantial sum. Yet the owners of big business and large industry spent far more in behalf of my Republican opponent.

I am sure that mine is not at all an unusual example. I am sure that nearly every candidate for Federal office who has received a substantial share of campaign financing from labor sources has been faced by an opponent whose campaign was backed by far superior financial resoures. I suggest today, Mr. President, to those who have been pointing with the most horrified alarm at campaign funds raised by union groups that they join me in backing the Teddy Roosevelt bill, which would substitute equal Federal campaign contributions for huge, unequal funds raised by large donations from private contributors. I wonder who will be first to back this effective and long overdue reform—those whose election campaigns have been helped by the working men and women of America, or those who are loudly denouncing the political efforts of labor while holding high Federal office with the far greater campaign support of wealthy individuals and economic groups?

Mr. President, in a free country in which any citizen may be a candidate for public office, we cannot expect equality of character, integrity, and ideas as between candidates. Furthermore, these are subjective qualities not capable of tangible measurement. They, and the policies a candidate represents, are proper subjects for the decision of the electorate. But disproportion in campaign finances is something else again. An undemocratic element is introduced when one nominee can eclipse his opponent not because of any superiority of ability or of his policies, but merely through a preponderance of coin of the realm.

Yet this probably happens more often than we care to think. The kind of funds spent on our modern elections—even on the election, in a crucial district, of only 1 of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives—are of such dimensions that they simply are not available equally to all candidates. The substantial financial backing which may determine the odds in a race for Congress is likely to go preponderantly to one candidate.

WHY ARE CAMPAIGN FUNDS UNEQUAL?

What determines, under our present system, which candidate will have this advantage and which will be handicapped in his effort to present his program to the voters for their choice?

Who makes the many multi-thousand-dollar contributions which are necessary to create great financial preponderance for the campaign of a candidate for Federal office? And why?

More money is spent to elect many Members of both Houses of Congress than the Government pays them during their term of office. We would not dream of permitting our Presidents or our Senators and Representatives to draw their pay from a private payroll or in the form of private contributions; they get paid by the public for whom they act. Why, then, leave their campaigns for these offices to be lavishly financed from private sources?

The proverb, "He who pays the piper shall call the tune," may have originated in medieval England, but politically it has more relevance in this country today than in Britain, where campaign spending is firmly controlled. My speech today is not concerned with the merits of policies, to support or oppose which contributions are made to either side in our two-party system. It is concerned with conditions which create doubt—reasonable doubt—among the American people as to how these policies are judged and determined. Our political parties may and do disagree on policy; but in a free democracy no responsible party can keep one eye on the cashbox when drawing up its platform for America.

Yet if the choice before the country on election day is to be effectively presented to the people, the cashboxes of the parties must be filled somehow. In an editorial on February 17, 1956, the New York Times stated its estimates that in the 1952 election $80 million may have been spent, as against perhaps $50 million in 1948. With many more television stations and receivers, total expenditures this year may run far above $100 million. Such expenditures, resulting from the present unrestricted competition between the parties and their candidates, are far greater than what would be necessary if a reasonable equality of access to the public could be assured. Do the American people want their political parties and their candidates for the power of governing them indebted to anyone for totals exceeding $100 million? The question, once it is recognized, answers itself.

Although I have been critical of the spending of huge sums to win elections, I wish to make it abundantly clear that I believe the vast majority of men and women in political life are basically honest. These people, at heart, do not desire to enter into the mad spending spree which accompanies so many elections. I am convinced they would prefer to enter office without obligations to any individual or interest group for large donations. But the men and women in public life are caught by a system that has made colossal treasuries virtually indispensable to political success. It is the system which must be changed, Mr. President, not the individuals. The independence of the most honest person on earth can be imperiled by multimillion-dollar political campaigns. That is why I am introducing this bill today—to make it possible for people who are independent and honest, by nature, to exercise those qualities as they think best in the public interest. I know of no other adequate way to free candidates from the fetters of big contributions than to have the Federal Government take a major role in the financing of Federal election campaigns.

"TEDDY ROOSEVELT BILL" ESSENTIAL STEP FOR EQUALITY IN POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. President, I think Theodore Roosevelt's proposal to the 60th Congress, half a century ahead of its time, is the only feasible solution. The time is ripe for us, in the 84th Congress, to put it into effect. The cost of the Federal contributions I propose would be a negligible sum in the Federal budget. But the ultimate benefits to the American people, in free and unfettered representation in the halls of their Government, would be immeasurable. Theodore Roosevelt's reform is needed today as never before to bring us nearer to that ideal of all men being "created equal" of which Thomas Jefferson wrote 180 years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks, a memorandum analyzing the proposed bill; an article entitled "Public Seen Ready To Contribute $75 Million to Political Parties," written by Dr. George Gallup and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 11, 1956; an editorial entitled "Sequel to the Case Affair," published in the New York Times of February 17, 1956; an editorial entitled "Influence on Congress," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1956; an article written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1956; and an editorial entitled "What's a Bribe," published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of February 9, 1956.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED "FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS ACT"

The Federal Campaign Contributions Act proposed by Senator NEUBERGER is designed to relieve candidates for Federal elective offices of their present dependence on large, private campaign contributions to finance election campaigns. To accomplish this, it would make available Federal funds, in equal amounts to each major political party, to be used for legitimate Federal election campaign expenditures. It would not supersede or conflict with Federal corrupt practices legislation, and it is consistent with S. 636, Senator HENNINGS' bill to modernize the Federal election laws, which is now before the Senate.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Section 1 sets forth congressional findings that it is in the national interest to prevent the dominance of large campaign contributions, and disproportionate inequality among financial resources of candidates of different political parties, in Federal elections; and that Government contributions to campaign financing as suggested by President Theodore Roosevelt offer the best remedy for these conditions.

Section 2 defines a major political party which could become eligible for Federal campaign contributions as any party which has polled 10 percent of the total popular vote in the last preceding presidential or congressional election. (Votes cast for Delegates to Congress are counted in the Territories, which do not vote for presidential electors.) (Historical records show that, in modern times, only the Bull Moose Progressive ticket in 1912 (27.4 percent) and the LaFollette Progressive Party of 1924 (16.6 percent) would have qualified for Federal contributions in their next subsequent election campaign. Except for these, the high point for third parties was reached by the Socialist Party in 1920 with 3.4 percent. In 1918, the Progressive and States Rights tickets each received 2.4 percent of the total popular vote.)

Section 3 establishes the administrative machinery for handling the Federal campaign contributions. A Board of one member of each major political party, appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, serving on a per diem basis, choose one $15,000-a-year Administrator to administer the program.

Section 4 authorizes the Administrator to make the payments established by the act.

Section 5 (a) states the formula for determining the amount of the Federal campaign contribution to be allocated to each major political party:

"In 2-year periods—from April 1 to April 1 in odd-numbered years—in which a presidential election will be held, 20 cents per voter for the average total vote in the two preceding presidential elections;

"In such 2-year periods in which nonpresidential Federal elections will be held, 15 cents per voter for the average total vote in the two preceding nonpresidential Federal elections."

Section 5 (b) states that Federal contributions are to be made to the national committees of each major political party, from time to time, for legitimate campaign expenditures on behalf of the candidates nominated by that party for Federal office.

Section 5 (c) specifies that the statements certifying these expenditures shall conform to regulations under the act.

Section 5 (d) provides that not more than two-thirds of the Federal contribution authorized for a 2-year period shall be turned over prior to the election in that period; the remainder is to be withheld until all reports of all campaign expenditures for that election have been completed and reviewed in accordance with legal requirements.

Section 6 places two limits on financing from private sources:

"(a) To qualify for Federal campaign contributions, a major political party must certify that no individual has contributed more than a total of $100 to it or its candidates; and

"(b) The total of all expenditures from private contributions on behalf of Federal candidates of a political party may not exceed the amount authorized for the Federal contribution under the act, or the Federal contribution is reduced by the amount of the excess."

Sections 5 and 6 are designed to follow the familiar matching fund principle by making Federal campaign funds available as a substitute for large private campaign contributions (over $100 per person), if the major political parties will limit their expenditures from private contributions to not more than equal the Federal contribution. In the administration of these provisions, the proposed bill presumes the adoption of legal reporting requirements such as those of Senator HENNINGS' S. 636.

Sections 7, 8, and 9 provide penalties for false applications or reports and wrongful use of Federal campaign contributions; authorize the Administrator to promulgate necessary regulations; and authorize appropriations to carry out the program.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 11, 1956]

THE GALLUP POLL: PUBLIC SEEN READY TO CONTRIBUTE $75 MILLION TO POLITICAL PARTIES

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., January 10.—The American public has some $75 million ready to contribute to the campaign chests of 2 major political parties—if the parties want to work hard enough to get it.

That sum is about five times as much as was reported spent in the election of the present 84th Congress—when the GOP and Democrat candidates together spent in the neighborhood of $13.7 million.

It would also mean gathering contributions from about five times as many families as actually contributed to the campaign funds of the 1954 congressional elections.

Making a door-to-door, community-by-community type of canvass, with definite quotas set for each county in the United States, the 2 parties would find some 15 million American families willing to contribute $5 to the party of their choice.

Anything short of this type of canvass—patterned after ones that have been used successfully by organizations like the Red Cross and Community Chest—would probably result in about the same number of contributions made by families to the 1954 campaign funds. An institute survey following the November election indicated that 2.7 million families made contributions to 1 of the 2 major parties.

The parties, therefore, have a real opportunity to change from the present system of contributions from rich men who may be looking for favors in return, to one where a substantial number of voters would each chip in a small sum.

The question, by which experienced institute interviewers determined the willingness of America's 48 million families to donate to the political party they preferred, was phrased as follows:

"If you were asked, would you contribute $5 to the campaign fund of the political party you prefer?"

The results, translated into number of families:

Willing to give $5

	Percent	Families
Yes	31	15,000,000
No	56	27,000,000
Don't know	13	6,000,000

Nearly 4 out of every 10 Republicans questioned in the survey (39 percent) said they would be willing to chip in $5, but only about 3 out of 10 Democrats (29 percent) said they would contribute.

[From the New York Times of February 17, 1956]

SEQUEL TO THE CASE AFFAIR

The furor stirred up by the announcement made by Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, that an oil and gas company had offered him a campaign contribution of $2,500 came at a bad time for some politicians but at a good time for the general public in this presidential year. The special bipartisan committee of which Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, has acted as chairman found enough in the Case episode to indicate that an impropriety, at the very least, had been attempted. Most of us, regardless of party, would like to think that this kind of impropriety, or something worse, will not be repeated on a larger scale during this year's campaign.

The four-member George committee will presumably wind up its work on the Case incident next week. Another Senatorial group, a three-member subcommittee of the Rules Committee, yesterday announced its intention to undertake a broad investigation into any attempt to influence future legislation by campaign contributions. Its chairman, ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, promises a thorough study of "contributions to election campaigns, Federal elections and such evidences of corrupt practices as may be revealed." He is apparently set to begin as soon as he gets a go-ahead signal from the Senate, plus a little money for expenses.

This newspaper estimated in mid-October 1952, that the presidential campaign of that year would cost about $80 million, as contrasted or compared with about $50 million in 1948. We may compare these figures, if we like, with the total expenditures reported by the national committees of the two major parties in 1952—$17.5 million. The trouble is that many contributions in a national election are never handled by the national committees. There are many ways of promoting a candidate or a party that do not require entries in ledgers.

We may hope that the Gore committee will be less interested in putting the finger on scapegoats than in finding ways to improve the system of paying the expenses of political campaigns. We don't doubt the honesty of practically all Members of our National Legislature, but there is no sense in permitting gifts, if we can avoid it, that will even unconsciously influence their thinking and voting.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1956]

INFLUENCE ON CONGRESS

The emphatic language of President Eisenhower's veto of the gas bill should give the Senate additional incentive to press ahead with a thorough investigation. The honor and dignity of the Senate require that is expose every aspect of the efforts of the gas lobby to influence the vote through political contributions—both those made recently and those made before the bill was under active consideration.

At the same time, this newspaper hopes there will be widespread recognition that the primary purpose of such washing of dirty linen ought to be to remedy a general condition that cries for rectification. All of us are in a sense to blame for permitting a situation to arise in which the rules for political expenditures and campaign contributions are dangerously unrealistic. The activities of the gas lobby afford merely a flagrant and distasteful illustration of the dependence upon large contributions. Election to public office has become so expensive, and the means of evading the restrictions have become so complex, that honest efforts to campaign within the rules and render a complete accounting are all but impossible.

The Senate need not await a new investigation to know that this a disgraceful condition that tends to produce a kind of moral corruption even in legislators of the highest probity. Point one in effecting a remedy, in our opinion, ought to be prompt passage of the Hennings bill to amend the Corrupt Practices Act and revise expenditure limitations. It may be necessary to make some concessions and changes in order to accomplish this. Senator HENNINGS' proposed allowance for campaign expenditures of up to 10 cents per vote in the last election, with a cutoff at $250,000 for senatorial candidates and $25,000 for contestants for House seats, would be an improvement over the present absurd limits of $25,000 and $5,000, respectively. But even the revised allowances would be far, far less than what now is actually spent.

Senatorial campaigns in large States are known to cost as much as $3 million, despite the legal limit. In the recent mayoralty race in Chicago the defeated candidate, who sought to give a forthright accounting, had expenditures of nearly half a million dollars. The $12 million allowed each of the national committees under the Hennings formula of 20 cents per vote in the last election probably would not meet more than a third or a quarter of the total expenditures in the 1956 presidential campaign.

If a satisfactory formula cannot be found for making the permissible limits correspond with actual expenditures, it might be wise instead to concentrate on stringent requirements for reporting contributions. We think it important that the Hennings bill cover primaries as well as general elections. Periodic reporting of actual amounts received and spent during campaigns is the essential thing. Despite the proposed requirement that all contributions of more than $100 be listed by the donors, there probably is no way in which to cover all private activities undertaken on behalf of candidates. But if candidates and their campaign managers could honestly report all direct contributions and the sources, this would do a great deal to eliminate unsavory influence. The public itself would be the best judge of when contributions were excessive.

Two practical additional steps are imperative, it seems to us, to accompany the amendment of the Corrupt Practices Act. One is to enact the separate Hennings-Udall bill permitting donors to deduct political contributions of up to $100 for income tax purposes. This would encourage Americans to respond to their privilege and duty of supporting candidates of their choice, and it should stimulate large numbers of small contributions. The more numerous such contributions, the less any candidate would be dependent on large gifts from firms or individuals seeking favors.

The second step is to amend Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act so as to permit television and radio stations to extend free time to major candidates in presidential campaigns without being required to give equal time to fringe or frivolous candidates. With television bills in presidential campaigns now running into many millions of dollars, this amendment would make an enormous difference in the cost of campaigns—and dependence on illicit funds. Radio and TV stations are ready and willing to furnish such time provided that they can be relieved of the burden of giving time in equal amount to the Vegetarians and Prohibitionists. (There were only two real contenders for the Presidency in 1952, but technically there were 18 candidates.) A simple change permitting stations to make free time available to candidates of parties that polled, say, 1 million votes in the last election or could muster 200,000 signatures, would suffice to bring the law up to date.

None of this detracts in the slightest from the vital need for a full investigation by a Senate committee. Congress ought to recognize, however, that whatever recommendations the committee may have can be implemented and supplemented by beginning the chain of reforms now. The whole procedure will go more smoothly and will gain more cooperation if there is acknowledgment at the outset that the basic purpose is not punitive but corrective.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1956]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

PANDORA GORE

Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, Tennessee, who heads the three-man committee which will investigate the use of money in politics, is a born evangelist. The subject of money in politics is the political equivalent of Pandora's box, which released all the evils of the

world when Pandora opened it. Yet GORE is apparently determined to play the role of Pandora.

"I know I have a bear by the tail," GORE says, with evangelical fervor, "but I can't let go. The mass movement of money between the States for political purposes threatens the very foundations of our political system."

GORE plans to ask the Senate for somethink on the order of half a million dollars for his investigation. With the money he intends to have half a dozen or more trained investigators to unearth the whole story of money in politics.

As presently planned, his first order of business will be to recall the Superior Oil Co. officials who tried to slip Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, South Dakota, $2,500 in $100 bills, and find out what their other political-financial activities have been.

If he is as good as his word, he will go on from there, investigating the political use of money not only by the oil interests, but by all other industries with a big political stake. The Republican Member of the Gore committee, Senator CARL CURTIS, Nebraska, has been promised a Republican counsel and Republican staff Members, and he will concentrate on the financial contributions of labor unions. These contributions of course go almost entirely to Democrats.

Thus what is in prospect is a tremendous public washing of the dirty linen of both parties. The extreme political sensitivity of the subject to be investigated is suggested by the trouble GORE has already experienced in his search for a qualified committee counsel. He has had a number of turndowns—one prospect remarked that "any lawyer who would take on a job like that must have rocks in his head."

Even to mention campaign contributions has long been considered as bad form in the Senate as talking about sex in a Victorian drawing room. There is hardly a Senator who has not received important contributions from special interests of one sort or another. In the television era, with a single broadcast running well up into five figures, it is impossible to wage an effective campaign without such contributions.

It is also impossible to wage a winning campaign under the limitations laid down by the Corrupt Practices Act. Thus there is probably not a man in the Senate outside the safe seats in the South, who has not connived at circumventing the act by the accepted techniques. A candidate, especially in the big industrial States, who did not so connive simply could not be elected.

It is therefore not surprising that the vast majority of Senators regard the prospect of the GORE investigation with scarcely concealed loathing.

There is a strong bipartisan effort, spearheaded by both the Republican and Democratic leadership, to enlarge the committee and dilute it with reasonable men, to limit its scope, or to take the curse off it in some other way. The effort may well succeed. But it will not be easy. Since President Eisenhower, in a political master stroke, vetoed the gas bill because of arrogant use of money for political purposes, it will be politically dangerous in the extreme to be caught trying to sweep the whole unpleasant subject under the rug.

The dimensions of the subject are suggested by the results of a 2-year study of money in politics, undertaken at the University of North Carolina. After the most careful analysis, this study established that the 1952 campaign cost a staggering $150 million, give or take a few million, in straight out-of-pocket expense. A considerable proportion of this sum was certainly under-the-table money, as it is known in the trade.

It is no use trying to control the big business of politics by putting a ceiling on expenditures, since ceilings will always be broken through one way or another. What is needed is some means of bringing the business into the open, so that the voters should really know who gets what, and from whom, and so that a man can go to the United States Senate without conniving at circumvention of the law. If Senator GORE's opening of Pandora's box results in legislation to this end, it will serve a most useful purpose, despite the present anguish on Capitol Hill.

[From the Eugene Register-Guard of February 9, 1956]

WHAT'S A BRIBE?

Debate on the natural gas bill ended with a "sensational" charge by Senator FRANCIS CASE, of North Dakota. The Senator said he'd received a $2,500 campaign contribution and that there had been a string on it. The string had been that he'd vote for the bill removing gas producers from the list of businessmen whose prices the Government can control. The Senator spoke of this as a "bribe."

Probably, strictly speaking, it was not a bribe. It was just another contribution of a type that is being made every year to office holders of both parties. But the Senator's mention of the money opens up a serious problem of political ethics.

It costs money to run for office. Even here in Oregan Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER'S friends spent more than $100,000 to elect him to the Senate. And the friends of Senator Guy Cordon spent half again that much in their futile attempt to return him to the Senate. This money has to come from somewhere. It comes from people who are interested, for a variety of reasons, in seeing one man elected or another man defeated.

The interest these contributors have in the candidate's success may be described as a "string." The Senator or Congressman knows who put up the money, where the support came from. He knows how the contributors feel about natural gas, foreign aid, Taft-Hartley repeal, farm prices, and a number of other public issues. The temptation is always present to refrain from biting the hand that feeds.

That's not bribery. But it's an anything but subtle form of pressure. And it goes on all the time. The contribution to the CASE campaign is not exceptional.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished senior colleague.

Mr. MORSE. I highly congratulate my distinguished colleague, not only for the very sound bill he has introduced but also for the very able argument he has presented in support of the bill. I am proud to be one of the cosponsors of the bill under his leadership.

In addition to this particular bill, and in addition to the investigation of possible lobby evils which confront the parliamentary processes of America today, I believe it is very important that we have early consideration of another bill I have urged upon the Senate for many years. I refer to a bill which seeks to make it a requirement that Members of Congress and other high Government officials file each year for public disclosure a statement showing the sources and the amounts of their income.

I believe the American people are entitled to know the sources and the amounts of income of public officials, so that they can be their own judges as to what extent, if any, such income may influence the kind of public service they get from their elected officials.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank my senior colleague. I should like to remind him that I am a cosponsor of his proposal to provide that the various sources of income of public officials be disclosed to the public.

I wonder if the senior Senator from Oregon does not agree with me that many candidates for office, in both parties, would feel a great sense of relief if the whole matter of private contributions could be abandoned and if each of the parties were entitled by law to receive contributions from the Federal Treasury, as Theodore Roosevelt advocated, without any strings whatever being tied to the contributions?

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator's observations. I believe we must do something—and do it quickly—to reassure the American people that the financing of our political campaigns is above the level of corrupt influences.

I have said before that if I ever do any writing on the subject of politics as it is practiced in America and write a chapter on political financing, I am sure I will be discussing one of the major sources of corruption in American politics.

I believe it is very important that we proceed without delay to enact legislation which will reassure the American people that they are not the victims of a campaign financing program which results in kept politicians.

I was very much interested in my colleague's discussion of the financing of his campaign. I shall never forget what was an amusing and at the same time a rather sad incident in my 1950 campaign. It is a story which illustrates the need of another kind of legislation which should be passed very soon, namely, a complete revision of the Corrupt Practices Act. I say on the floor of the Senate today that in my judgment the Corrupt Practices Act is the cause of much corruption in American politics. The Corrupt Practices Act is an inducement to dishonesty in the reporting of campaign contributions and funds. It does not in its present provisions give the American people the truth or assure them that they will get the truth about the costs of political campaigns.

That is illustrated by an incident which occurred in my campaign in 1950. I was campaigning so fast and so hard that I forgot, as did also my staff, that 10 days before the end of the campaign it was necessary to file with the Secretary of the Senate a report of campaign contributions and expenses. I was speaking on the coast of Oregon at noon on the day which was the 10th day before the end of the campaign, when my administrative assistant rushed up to me and said, "The Oregonian is trying to find out if you have filed your report on campaign contributions and expenditures, and we have not done it; we have forgotten all about it."

To make a long story short, Mr. President, my Portland office worked in hectic fashion all afternoon to get the report into shape and brought it to me at a town in Oregon where I was speaking

that night. I asked my assistant to bring a notary public with him, because if we could get the report notarized and postmarked in the post office before midnight we would be within the law. Although the Secretary of the Senate was contacted and he said that under the circumstances if I could get the report mailed by the first of the week it would be acceptable, I nevertheless wanted it to be mailed before midnight on the day that the law required it to be mailed.

I was in the midst of an open-forum discussion at the meeting that night when my assistant and the notary public arrived. I thought it would be a good bit of political education to illustrate to the audience one of the problems we have as candidates. So I explained the situation and proceeded to notarize the report in front of the audience after my assistant assured me that in the preparation and contents it met all the requirements of the corrupt practices law. However, when my report reached Washington along with reports from other senatorial candidates it was discovered that I led the Nation in the matter of contributions and expenditures. Now of course I did not in fact but other candidates simply followed the letter of the Corrupt Practices Act and did not report all of the contributions and expenditures that they knew had been made in their behalf to their various campaign committees.

What my assistant had done was to show all my primary contributions and expenditures, all my general election contributions and expenditures, including contributions to every Morse for Senator Club in the State. As the result, I showed a total of contributions of a little over $53,000, whereas the next highest amount reported by any candidate for the Senate in the United States was a little over $7,000, in one of the most populous States; in another, a little over $5,000; in another State, a little over $4,000, and all of them were States which have several million population as compared with the small population of Oregon. The Senator can imagine what my opponent did in a statewide radio broadcast when those figures were published. He sought to give the people of my State the impression that my campaign financing was exorbitant.

What I had done was to give a full and honest report as to every dollar which had been contributed to my campaign and every dollar of expenditures of which we had any record.

What did I need to report, Mr. President? Under the corrupt practices law, I needed to report only the amount that had been contributed to me personally. I did not need to report a single cent that had been sent to any Morse for Senate committee.

The only money I had received as a candidate personally was a check for $600. I had used that money to pay my hotel, travel, and meal expenses, but, under the corrupt practices law, I did not have to report those expenditures at all. Instead of reporting contributions of a little over $53,000, I could have reported $600, without reporting any expenditures whatsoever. However that would have not given to the people of Oregon the information to which I felt they were entitled.

Mr. President, I say that any law which permits that kind of a situation is itself an inducement to corruption. I have been proposing amendments to the corrupt practices law year after year. We should rewrite it so that candidates for office will have to tell the American people the facts about the amount of money raised in their behalf and the amount expended in their behalf.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I do not have the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to say that I see on the floor the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who has been one of the great advocates of rewriting the Corrupt Practices Act to put teeth into it. She is of the opinion that a candidate should not only be compelled to report contributions, but that they should be reported on his income-tax blank by the contributor, under penalty of law, so that there would be a double check. The act should be rewritten and modernized to take care of a new method of campaigning, which, in effect, would help the electorate to understand the principles and platforms through the medium of television and radio. In that way there would be a proper recognition of what a campaign costs in connection with the program of the candidate.

Mr. MORSE. If my colleague will permit me, I may say that, so far as I am concerned, I should be perfectly willing to appoint the Senator from Maine to rewrite the Corrupt Practices Act. By her record in the Senate she has demonstrated that she believes we have the obligation to enact such legislation as will give the American people the truth about campaign funds. I think it is very important, and I hope that such legislation can be passed at a very early date.

Mr. MONRONEY. I also feel that one of the most important provisions which must be written into any Corrupt Practices Act is a prohibition against the interstate shipment of campaign funds in large amounts. I feel that campaign funds sent from one State into another should be limited to $100 per person. Otherwise, we are going to have sums of from $5,000 to $10,000 sent from New York or California or Illinois or Texas to influence the election of Senators in, for instance, the States of Montana, Maine, Oklahoma, or other States, to punish a Senator for action which he has taken on the floor, or money will be contributed by persons from outside the State to elect a candidate of their choice, through the use of huge sums of campaign money. We should consider how the interstate movement of campaign money can be used against the right of the States to have a free and open choice of candidates.

Mr. MORSE. If my colleague's bill should be enacted, the problem would be solved in even a better way.

I may say to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] that I think there is another loophole in the Corrupt Practices Act which should be plugged up. It was a great surprise to me to discover, after I ended up with a deficit in my 1944 campaign—and a substantial deficit it was, too—that when the campaign was over and the deficit was made good we did not have to report the contributions to the deficit. I insisted that they be reported, and I was rather amused when one of the persons trying to raise the campaign deficit for me said, "Wayne, I can get you plenty of money from people who will try to beat you in 1950, but who are willing to help raise your deficit now." But I said that I did not want their money. It is as important to know who contributes to a deficit as it is to know who contributes to the campaign in the first instance. However, under the present corrupt practices law a candidate can run up a deficit and then after the filing dates for reports are over the deficits can be raised and no public record of the contributions need to be filed. I think that such a policy increases the danger of corrupt practices in campaign financing. It has the potentiality of leading to some very bad practices, unless a Senatorial candidate does as I insisted on doing in 1944, namely, file a final deficit contribution statement with the same authorities with whom the original contribution statement was filed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I had not known, until the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and my colleague mentioned it, of the proposal of the distinguished senior Senator from Maine. But I believe that requiring individuals who contribute to campaigns to list their contributions on their income-tax forms might be a very useful way of seeking to solve this whole vast problem.

I was amused when my colleague spoke about our reports from Oregon. I thought I had a rather underfinanced campaign this past year of 1954. I did not have a single billboard. I was hit all over the head by superior amounts of newspaper advertising space, and so forth. But, lo and behold, when I looked into the records, I discovered I had filed an amount for campaign expenditures greater than the amounts expended in some of the most-populous States.

But the essential thing I mentioned in my remarks on the bill is this: I believe the vast majority of our candidates want to get out from under the terrible yoke of having to raise huge campaign funds. I believe the men and women in politics are the victims of this practice, rather than the masters of it. It is my opinion that no greater solution could be made toward freeing our whole political process than to do something to make it possible for men and women to run for high office, without having to turn to the agonizing problem of raising vast sums of money.

A great many speeches have been made in recent weeks about the sinister nature of the political contribution made by the political-education funds of certain trade unions. Those contributions are very obvious. They are publicized. They are the one-seventh of the iceberg which is above water.

But I shall be interested to see, when the test comes, which group of men in public life favor allowing the Federal Government to take over the financing of political campaigns, so as to outlaw

the huge contributions from big business, big industry, and the unions. Who will favor doing that? Will it be those who have been making speeches bewailing the campaign contributions made by the political-education funds of the trade unions? I shall be interested to see, because I think that will be the real test of the sincerity of some of the speeches which have been made.

It is my belief that Congress should adopt this reform, which was proposed half a century ago by Theodore Roosevelt, to free everyone from the acceptance of large contributions, whether they come from the political-education funds of labor unions or from big business or big industry. I shall be interested to see if those who are so disturbed about union contributions will vote for a bill which will also outlaw contributions made by big business and big industry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to have joined with the junior Senator from Oregon as a cosponsor of the bill which he has introduced. I think ultimately it may well prove to be necessary as a means of financing political campaigns, to take further steps in order to solve the many difficult problems of administration, of which the Senator from Oregon is well aware.

I wish to address this question to the Senator: It is sometimes said that it has now been made illegal for corporations to contribute to national political funds, and that, therefore, we need not worry about the attempts of corporate wealth to influence elections. I wondered if the Senator from Oregon would comment on that contention, which is sometimes made.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think the facts which are now being brought out before the select committee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in some measure very vividly and dramatically answer the Senator's question. While I am not wholly familiar with the operations of these big campaign funds, never having been the benefactor of them, it is my opinion that if there is to be a very extended and widespread investigation of where such huge amounts of money come from, some very interesting things will be disclosed.

I do not believe the Senator from Illinois was on the floor when I quoted from a New York Times editorial, in which that great newspaper estimated that $80 million was spent in the national campaign of 1952. Think of it—$80 million. So relatively recent as 1860, the first Republican President, a man who came from the State of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, was elected with a total campaign fund of $100,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that in a very interesting, but little noted, St. Louis case of some years back, involving certain gentlemen who have since become nationally eminent, it was discovered that a big private utility company had paid large fees to certain groups of lawyers, and that the lawyers in turn had made contributions to political candidates and to legislators, apparently with the knowledge of the directors of the company? At least, the directors of the company did not accompany their fees, or gifts, with explicit directions as to how they were not to be used.

Is there not sufficient evidence to indicate that very frequently money is given by corporations to attorneys for undisclosed purposes, which money can be called legal fees, and that the attorneys then act as middlemen to distribute sums to political candidates for the corporation's purposes?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I was not familiar with the St. Louis case cited by the Senator from Illinois, whose experience is so much greater than mine, but I am sure of this: That if a dissection were made of the $80 million cited in the New York Times editorial—where the money originated and where it went—some very interesting and significant facts would be disclosed.

I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois another question, if I may, because I know his experience, not only in active public life, but also in studying this matter as a political scientist and economist, goes back so much further than my own experience. Does not the Senator believe that if some basic reform should be adopted, whether it be the one I have proposed today or something else, it would free the people who run for office from the necessity of raising huge funds; and in greater or lesser degree would not almost everyone in public life feel a great sense of relief and a new freedom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure that is true.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy to be a cosponsor of the bill which the junior Senator from Oregon has introduced today. The Senator has stated that a recent editorial published in the New York Times estimated that $80 million was spent in the 1952 Presidential campaign. May I ask the Senator if the New York Times made any estimate as to how much money would be spent in the coming Presidential campaign?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not recall, but I believe there was some discussion of the fact that the very costly, expensive medium of television is so much more widespread today than it was in 1952 that it is logical to presuppose the amount which will be spent this year will make the $80 million spent in 1952 seem perhaps relatively trivial.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has anticipated my next remarks about television, because only this morning I heard of a senatorial candidate in Ohio, in the last general election, whose expenses for a 15-minute statewide television broadcast amounted to more than $21,000. Where are we going to get that kind of money if we are to compete on that basis?

I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon has introduced this measure. I assure him that not only am I happy to be a cosponsor of it, but, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which it will be referred, I shall do my best to see to it that it is reported.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Montana. I wish to say one word in conclusion. It is interesting to note that it was Theodore Roosevelt who made the original suggestion in 1907, at a time when the entire Presidential campaign cost about $500,000. I wonder what Teddy would say today if he were confronted with an $80 million campaign?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the fact that the St. Louis incident and other incidents have indicated that it is possible for corporations to pay what are ostensibly fees to lawyers, and for lawyers then to distribute such fees, in whole or in part, as political contributions, how does the Senator from Oregon feel about the effectiveness of barring large interstate contributions? Would it not still be possible for corporations having branch offices in a given State, although directed centrally from New York or some other location, to hire local attorneys at large fees, and to expect the local attorneys then to distribute the money to the local candidates? That would be an ostensible operating expense conducted within the State, and would not be treated as an interstate shipment of campaign funds. That could be extremely effective although in reality it would be an interstate contribution.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As I remarked to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, I am not as well acquainted as I ought to be with all the modus operandi of campaign contributions, but I believe there is one very great peril connected with what presumably is a good idea. To illustrate, that idea is that with respect to so-called interstate donations, in a Western State like that represented in part by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], or the State which the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I represent, many of the industries in the State are absentee-owned. For instance, the vast utilities in our State, and some of the largest lumber companies and some of the railroads, are perhaps from 80 to 95 percent owned outside the State of Oregon. Yet if a ban should be placed on interstate contributions, it might be possible to evade the ban by having the great absentee-owned utility, timber, and railroad corporations locally make very substantial contributions to the political life of Oregon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even though those contributions might not come from the big corporations directly, they could be made indirectly by paying them as fees to lawyers, and then having the lawyers distribute them as contributions.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Or they could be made by the local officials of large corporations that were actually under the domination and control of the absentee owners, who lived outside the State of Montana or the State of Oregon, or whatever the State concerned might be.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have been sitting here, listening. I am rather amazed by the knowledge the Senators seem to have about the way the contributions are handled. How do the Senators have so much knowledge of the subject?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have been watching our opponents.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it from experience, or observation? I am getting an education on how these things are done.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the distinguished Senator from Indiana had listened to me, he would have heard me say that I was not fully familiar with the modus operandi.

Mr. CAPEHART. Was it the Senator from Illinois who was familiar with it?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I said I was offering a bill to free all major political parties—there are two now—parties of all forms of political persuasion, whether they be liberal, conservative, or in between, from the necessity of raising the huge campaign funds which have been raised in the past. I have left the bill on the desk open for further cosponsorship. I should be extremely happy if the Senator from Indiana would care to become a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Having had no experience in these matters myself, I wondered what great experience the Senators had had.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We should be very happy if the distinguished Senator would join in cosponsoring a bill which would bring into effect an idea of a great Republican, the 26th President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As one who spent about 4 years on the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, I can say that experience shows that there is a need to revise the Corrupt Practices Act and a need to enact legislation which will prevent practices in one State which seek to influence elections in other States.

I certainly agree with the position of the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] that we ought to require donors to report their contributions on their income tax returns, so that there will be a double check on them, because if the stream of Government is polluted at its source, which is the electorate composed of the people, the whole body of the Government will be polluted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree 100 percent with what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, but I cannot conceive of a Senator being so small as to accept contributions in return for promises to vote in a way which will not be in the best interests of the Senate and the country. Perhaps it does happen, but I cannot personally conceive of it. I do not understand the workings of a mind which thinks that a Senator can be bribed, or that the things which have been referred to occur.

Mr. MONRONEY. Donations which run into thousands of dollars can be inimical to the actions of the Senate. Senators should have a right to vote on and decide questions without being subjected to any extraneous influence. I sincerely hope the proposal will move forward and that long-awaited action will be taken.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection to whatever Congress may do. I shall help in every way I can. The point I am trying to make is that we do not need to legislate against honest men. What has been indicated cannot happen if the Senate is composed of honest and honorable men. When such a proposal is made, it might carry the presumption that every Senator present, as well as every other Senator, participates in the kind of thing being talked about. I do not believe it. I do not believe Senators accept bribes. Because a person makes a contribution to a Member of Congress for his campaign, I cannot concede that there is necessarily anything evil connected with it. I do not wish to cast aspersions on my colleagues. I am not aware that the sort of thing which has been mentioned happens. That is why I wondered, as I listened, where the Senators who seemed to know so much about the operations they were describing got their experience. I, myself, cannot understand them.

Contributions have been made to my campaign. I suppose I shall receive further contributions, but I presume it will be my friends who will contribute, and I presume it will be persons who contribute because they like my record. I am certain my enemies will not contribute to my campaign, and I am certain that people who do not like my record will not contribute.

I say to the Senator that if anything can be made out of it, go ahead. I am not referring particularly to myself, but to other Senators. Everyone knows that persons do not make contributions to those they do not like and to those whose voting records they do not like.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I might say to the Senator from Indiana that possibly contributions might come into the State of Indiana from people who do not like the Senator from Indiana; people from other States might try to defeat the Senator because they do not like his voting record, and that feeling might have no relation to how people in Indiana feel.

When in his message on the natural gas bill the President of the United States stated that he based his veto on the fact that perhaps campaign contributions were influencing the vote on the bill, then I think it is high time that the Senate not wait for the White House to disturb itself about the matter, but that we, as the greatest legislative body in the world, ought to concern ourselves with modernizing a hopelessly obsolete Corrupt Practices Act which lends itself to this very type of thing.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is there any semblance of evidence that there was a contribution other than the $2,500 which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] himself said was not a bribe?

Mr. MONRONEY. The junior Senator from Oklahoma knows of none, but when the Chief Executive says a certain bill is a good piece of legislation, that it points in the right direction, that he finds no fault generally with the bill or with the industries affected by the bill, but vetoes it because of things which have just been mentioned, then I think we are getting on very thin ice, and that this body should be free to legislate without fear of Presidential veto.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel very sorry that because of the contribution of $2,500, it is said there is a need for the legislation which is being proposed to the Senate.

Let each Senator take a good look at himself in a mirror; he knows whether he has a clear conscience.

I have the highest regard and respect for all Senators, and I am not going to intimate in any way that Senators can be bribed. I do not think that can be done, and I do not think that campaign contributions necessarily are bribes.

Such contributions have been made for 170 years. How else is a candidate going to handle his campaign if he does not obtain contributions from his friends, or put up all the money himself? Who says that every contribution is made for some ulterior motive? I say shame on any Senator who makes such a suggestion.

Let us proceed with the business of the Senate; and let each Member be the sole judge of his own honesty, because that is what will have to be done in the end, anyway.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in commenting on the remarks of the Senator from Montana, I should like to say that in the New York Times of yesterday, Sunday, a very responsible correspondent, William S. White, wrote that it cost approximately $1 million for a senatorial campaign in a large, populous, industrial State. I do not know whether that is correct. Neither do I know whether the U. S. News & World Report was correct when it said, in its current issue, that it cost $200,000——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Not at this time; I shall finish this statement first.

Mr. CAPEHART. I can tell the Senator from Oregon where the figure $200,000 came from; it came from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. NEUBERGER. At any rate, the U. S. News & World Report said it cost $200,000 in a typical State. I believe that the Alsop brothers, who are responsible columnists, said today that it cost $1 million in a large industrial State. If we examine the filings of campaign contributions in the various places—whether in Washington, D. C., or in the State capitals—we find that those funds in such amounts are not listed. Yet we raise hob because some little bureaucrat receives a baked ham or a deep freeze.

I sat here and listened to speeches about Mr. Talbott and about a conflict of interest, and everything about Mr. Talbott and his various connections was out on the table. He had to resign, and

very probably he should have resigned. But how can we sit here and fail to take action when responsible publications in our country state that it costs $200,000 to be elected from a typical State, and $1 million to be elected from a large State, and no one knows where the money comes from?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Certainly.

Mr. CAPEHART. The U. S. News & World Report quoted the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as saying that it cost $200,000.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator from Indiana deny that?

Mr. CAPEHART. It was so stated in the article. So in that respect, the information came from the Senator from Illinois.

Of course, it costs money to be nominated and elected; all of us know that to be so. But my point is that the fact that a contribution is made to my campaign does not mean that I am under any obligation to the contributor, other than because of the fact that we are friends.

The Senator from Oregon tries to leave the inference that every person who makes a contribution, in some way, somehow, wants something in return for it. I do not agree at all with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Has the Senator from Indiana been on the floor when Senators on the other side of the aisle have spoken about the "iniquitous political-education funds of the trade unions"?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, and I do not agree with them. The Senator from Oregon has not heard me make such a statement.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have not heard the Senator from Indiana disagree with such statements.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am one of those who believe that the people have a right to come to Washington and that includes trade unions, manufacturers, millionaires, poor people, fat people, thin people; all the people have a right to come to Washington—to try to educate the Members of Congress. All the people have a right to be on one side or the other of proposed legislation, and all the people have a right to work for or against such measures as vigorously as they wish, so long as they do so honestly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But the general public does not know the source of every nickel that goes into those funds.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator from Oregon referring to the campaign funds?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know about Oregon; but in Indiana, statements about all such contributions are filed, and there is no secret about them. The statements regarding all contributions and expenses for senatorial campaigns are filed with the United States Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Including the funds and expenses of all committees?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; so far as I know.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is that true in the case of all the committees?

Mr. CAPEHART. In Indiana, the candidate files a statement and the committees also file statements. I do not know whether that is true in Oregon, but all the committees in Indiana file.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We filed a statement for every nickel we spent in my campaign; and, as a result, I found that I was one of the largest spenders among all senatorial candidates in the United States. Yet I come from a relatively small State in population; Oregon has 1 percent of the national population and does not even have as many people in the entire State as there are in individual cities in many of the other States. Yet I found that, on the basis of the contributions which were filed, I was one of the largest spenders, or the committees backing me were among the largest spenders.

Mr. CAPEHART. Where are contributions in Oregon listed? I do not know about the situation in all the other States; but, in my State, all the committees list their contributions and expenses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Considerable light was thrown on the situation in the 1950 campaign, particularly in the campaign in that year between the late Senator Taft and his Democratic opponent, Joseph T. Ferguson, for election as United States Senator from Ohio. Subject to subsequent correction in the RECORD, let me say that I think the testimony indicated that the various independent committees which were supporting the late Senator Taft spent over $500,000 and additional large sums were devoted to his campaign out of the receipts of the Ohio Republican Finance Committee which totaled approximately $1,250,000. It developed that even these were probably not the entire amounts, because a multitude of citizens' committees had been built up on a county basis or on a nationality basis or on an occupation basis, and reports were not made for them. I think all of us recognize that Senator Taft was an honorable man. But that Ohio situation indicated the large amounts of money which were spent in an industrial State. It was on the basis of that situation and on the basis of my knowledge of the record regarding other campaigns, that I arrived at the figure of $250,000, and believed it was a moderate overall figure.

All of us know that in practice what happens is that, whereas a Senator from a big State is limited to the expenditure of $25,000 for himself, plus travel expenses, plus certain printing and postage, and so forth, generally his friends form independent committees for him, and those committees do not have to make reports. All of us know that is what happens.

So I am surprised that my good friend, the Senator from Indiana, who has had a distinguished career in the United States Senate for 12 years, is ignorant of these facts. I had thought that what we knew as men, we should not pretend to be ignorant of as Senators.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not question the statement of the Senator from Illinois; but we shall never know how much money is spent, because we never know how much money our individual friends may spend in traveling and in participating in other ways in such campaigns.

My point is this: Why point a shotgun at every Member of the Senate, and why take the time of the Senate in this way, when so many other important matters await our consideration? If there are any bad eggs among us, why not deal with them individually? Why must we cast aspersions upon all other Senators and all Members of the House of Representatives, and try to leave the impression that everyone but ourselves is crooked?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that if he would take the time to read the remarks I made here on the floor, in introducing my bill, he would find that, in the first place, I was not throwing eggs at anyone.

I do not know why he is so concerned about this matter. What I said in my speech, in connection with the introduction of my bill—which I regard as major legislation, and I hope other Senators will similarly regard it—was that I felt the vast majority of our people are basically honest and have great integrity; but I said I thought that everyone disliked the yoke of large campaign contributions.

The Senator from Indiana has been critical about taking the time of the Senate. Yet I point out to him that a great President of his own party took the time of the 60th Congress by addressing it in a special message on this subject, at a time when campaign funds were trivial, in terms of dollars and cents, as compared to their size today.

The bill I introduced today—and in that connection, I did not throw eggs at anyone; and if the Senator from Indiana will read my speech in connection with the introduction of my bill, I believe he will find that is true—was for the purpose of carrying out that President's recommendation that the Federal Government take over the financing of the campaigns of the political parties, so that individual candidates could be relieved of the responsibility of raising such funds. What fault does the Senator from Indiana find with that bill? What is the Senator objecting to? Does he call that "throwing eggs"?

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that every Senator knows in his own heart whether or not he is legislating honestly. To me it is that simple. It is also a simple proposition that if people do not like a particular candidate, they will not contribute to his campaign. People who do like him probably will contribute. Upon one occasion when a candidate is running he may have little opposition, and little need for money or other help. The next time he runs—as was the case with Senator Taft in Ohio in 1950—the situa-

tion may be entirely different. Labor organizations all over the United States were fighting him. So I presume more money was required. Whether he spent more money than did the labor organizations and others opposed to him, I do not know. I know that both sides spent a great deal of money. No one will ever make me believe that any money spent in behalf of Senator Taft ever influenced him one iota on the floor of the Senate. No one can make me believe that any campaign contributions given to any Senater are going to influence him one iota on the floor of the Senate. I cannot conceive of such a thing. I do not believe that such a situation exists.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that he read the Life of Roy U. Cullen, of Houston, Tex. I refer to page 367 of that volume. Because 17 of us voted for the reappointment of Gordon Clapp to be head of the TVA, on page 367 of this book he states that he dedicated himself to the defeat of us 17 Senators. He sent money into North Dakota to keep the Senator from North Dakota from being reelected.

I compliment the Senator from Oregon for introducing his bill. I think it is one of the best pieces of proposed legislation that has been presented to the Senate in a long time. I do not care whether it takes a day, a week, or a month of the time of the Senate. I hope the subject will be thoroughly discussed, and that we will arrive at some legislation which will prevent millionaires such as Roy U. Cullen from sending their money into various States to defeat Senators who vote their honest convictions.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The other day I was placed on a list by labor leaders, along with nine other Republicans. They said to the world that they were going to defeat me. They were going to spend their time and money to that end. I have no particular objection to that. I wish they were for me. I wish they had not done it. It would have been much easier for me. But I do not deny them the right to do it. Everyone has a perfect right to be against me or for me. Everyone in Indiana has a perfect right to contribute to my campaign fund or not, as he chooses. If anyone in Indiana thinks he can influence me one iota by any contribution he may make to my campaign fund, he has another think coming. I feel the same way about every other Senator. I would not deny anyone the right to make a contribution or not to make a contribution.

It is true that in Indiana contributions are all listed. I do not think it ought to be possible to make them secretly. However, I would not deny any man the right to make a contribution or not to make a contribution.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Whenever a man enters the service of the Federal Government a great hullabaloo is raised about his disposing of stocks in this company or that company, if it has any dealings with his department. Apparently it is presumed that he would be unable to reach an honest decision in the Defense Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Interior Department, or some other department, if he held stock in some company which might have dealings with that department. Yet, on the other hand, it is presumed that every Member of the Senate feels no influence, inhibition, or restraint if he receives thousands of dollars in campaign contributions. Are we of superior honesty?

Mr. CAPEHART. One of the reasons why I would permit an individual to make contributions——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to complete my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

I ask, How can we set different standards of honesty for Senators than we set for others? Why should we presume that because some clerk or bureaucrat accepts a garment as a gift for his wife, a baked ham, or a trip, he is, ipso facto, dishonest, and influenced thereby to grant the minor favors at his disposal in the executive department, and, on the other hand, say that United States Senators can receive, in their campaigns, unlimited thousands of dollars without feeling any obligation? Are we a superior race of people?

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not say such a thing. I say that a man has a right to contribute or not to contribute. The main reason, in my mind, why we should permit people to make contributions to Senators' campaign is that if we do not permit it, the poor fellow who has no money cannot run for the United States Senate. How is he going to make a campaign?

Mr. NEUBERGER. My answer is to invite the Senator from Indiana to become a cosponsor of my bill. It is being left open. We want to have the Federal Government make these contributions so that the same source will be available to everyone. Everyone will have equal access to the funds.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not debating the merits or demerits of the bill. I am merely saying that we are casting aspersions on every Member of the United States Senate when we operate on the theory that a United States Senator has not enough honesty and integrity to prevent his being influenced, so that if someone makes a small or a large contribution to him, he will vote the way the contributor wishes him to vote. I think it is silly and ridiculous to argue such a proposal. I am amazed that men would spend their time thinking in such terms. The Senator's bill may be all right. I have no objection to it at the moment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator rose in his place and stated that I was throwing eggs. He admitted that he had not read the bill. He did not hear the remarks with which I introduced it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was talking about the colloquy with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in which the Senator was discussing ways and means by which people could evade whatever regulations might be established. I merely rose and said that the Senator must have had some experience along that line; otherwise he would not know anything about the subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Oregon recall my reply, to the effect that we had learned these things by observing the actions of our opponents?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that, so far as my own particular personal viewpoint is concerned, lists have been sent to the press galleries referring to various Senators who received funds from the political-education funds of trade unions. My name was on such a list. It appeared in a column the other day. I do not recall the exact sum, but I think the various committees in my behalf benefited by approximately $23,000. I had to allow my committees to take that money or I would have been completely obliterated, so far as financing in the campaign in Oregon was concerned.

Mr. CAPEHART rose.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will ask the Senator to resume his seat. I wish to finish this statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to answer the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would have become completely obliterated, so far as reaching the public is concerned, if my committees had not accepted that money. My opponent, who was a very fine, honorable man, was the beneficiary of far greater contributions, from the big lumber companies and other big businesses in my State.

Let me state my viewpoint. In the interest of good government, I do not believe that I should have had to arrive here having received $23,000 from the political-education funds of trade unions. Had I been defeated, I do not think my successful opponent should have arrived here indebted to the owners of the big lumber companies and the other big businesses in my State for large sums of money. I do not believe that is in the interest of free government. I do not believe that it is in the interest of the kind of government the American people want. I say to the Senator now, that when he stands on the floor of the United States Senate and says it is perfectly all right for one group of men to be indebted to political-education funds of trade unions and another group of men to be indebted for much larger benefactions to big business and big industry, I do not see how he can say to a minor employee of the Government—for example, to the traffic officer on the beat, that he cannot take $10 to allow a man to park in a no-parking zone.

What I think we should do is to free everyone, whether he be a liberal, a conservative, or a middle-of-the-roader, from having to take substantial benefactions from any private group, whether it be associated with labor, lumber, utilities, gas, or any other interests.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad the Senator received the $23,000. I have never

criticized him for that, and I never shall. I am certain that he does not feel under any obligation, by reason of the $23,000 contribution, to vote in favor of the labor organizations which gave it to him; and I am sure that, had his opponent won, his opponent would not have felt under any obligation to the lumber interests, which, the Senator said, contributed to his campaign fund.

In other words, I believe Senators are beyond that sort of thing. I cannot quite understand what the Senator means.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the Senator why it is that benefactions going to senatorial campaigns presumably have no influence, but that benefactions going to bureaucrats who own stock in corporations, or to assistant secretaries who are executives in certain companies, presumably do have great influence.

Mr. CAPEHART. The difference between a contribution to a campaign and the giving to a traffic policeman, as the Senator has put it, of a $10 bill, is of course, that a contribution is listed, and everyone knows about the contribution. A contribution is given for the purpose of electing a man to public office. I do not believe the Senator's comparison is very apt.

So far as the other matter is concerned, I am one who does not believe that we ought to go as far as we have gone with respect to having a person divest himself of all outside interests, and of everything he owns. I do not believe that it is possible to legislate honestly, or that when a person divests himself of such interests the Government necessarily thereby gets a better man. I have more faith in the honesty of the average person, perhaps, than most other people have. Perhaps I do have more faith in the average person. However, having been a businessman and having been in the Senate, and having been in the world for about 58 years, I must say that I have found most people honest. I like to look upon them as honest, and I do not like to cast aspersions on them by saying they are not honest. I do not go so far as the Senator from Oregon goes, in that I do not believe that persons coming into Government should divest themselves of their holdings. I do not believe that by doing so the Government necessarily gets honest people.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator mentioned contributions.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe every man in government is fundamentally honest, just as a judge is honest, in the sense that if a matter comes before him which is in conflict with his own interests and his own conscience, he will disqualify himself from taking any action on it. I believe if we put men on their honor in connection with such matters, we will get much better administration in the Government. We will get much better government. We will have much better Senators and Representatives in Congress, and we will generally have more honest people in government. As I understand, the Senator's bill would require the Government to pay the expenses of political campaigns. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is substantially correct. The Senator's statement is a simplification, but it is substantially correct. The Senator from Indiana mentioned contributions being known to all the people. If he will read the New York Times editorial of Saturday, he will find that that great newspaper said the campaign of 1952—I must recall these figures from what I read, because I do not have the editorial before me—cost approximately $80 million, but that only a total of about $17,500,000 had been reported. Therefore, that leaves a very substantial amount not reported.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. One of the things that many of us are becoming a little tired of in the United States is broad statements like that, that someone has said $80 million has been spent but that only $17 million can be accounted for. Why do people publish that sort of thing, if they cannot be specific? Why do they publish such things or say such things about someone if they cannot prove what they say or write? Why do we have so much of that sort of thing today? Why is there going on today so much tearing down of the character of people, so much assassination of character?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The New York Times is usually considered to be a very reliable newspaper.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is a reliable newspaper, but I still reserve my right to criticize it, and I do criticize it in this instance.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is obvious that the Senator from Indiana——

Mr. CAPEHART. I do criticize the New York Times for publishing anything like that. If it published what the Senator says it published, that it is estimated $80 million was spent in the 1952 campaign and only $17 million has been accounted for, I do criticize the New York Times for it. If the newspaper does not know that to be a fact, why does it arouse the people of the United States to dislike and hate their Government and their Representatives in Congress, by saying that $63 million was not accounted for although it was spent? Certainly I reserve my right to criticize anyone who makes that kind of statement.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When the President of the United States took office, he said he wanted the Government to be as clean as a hound's tooth. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that I feel Congress, which is the supreme policy-making body of the United States, is in a very difficult position when it tries to criticize the ethics of anyone in Government while huge sums of money are spent in the election of its own Members.

As I said in my speech—and the Senator from Indiana and I agree on this point certainly—I believe all Senators are honest and they all are men of integrity. I said that several times.

But I believe that the yoke of campaign contributions is a very undesirable one in the minds and hearts of many Members of Congress. I believe all of us would be relieved if it were not necessary to raise huge sums of money. However, let me ask the Senator this question: How many Representatives in Congress who received a benefaction from a certain economic group in the country would ever again receive a benefaction from that group if they voted against its desires or interests?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator were to vote against the interest of a labor organization, does he think he would get so much as another dollar in his next campaign from the labor organization?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have no way of knowing.

Mr. CAPEHART. I submit that the Senator has answered his own question.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask this question of the Senator from Indiana: Does he believe it is desirable for one man to go into office after receiving substantial contributions from a political-education fund of trade unions, and for another man to go into office after receiving even more substantial contributions from various segments of industry and business?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator's question is whether I believe that a Senator will necessarily be honest if he does not accept such contributions. My answer is that if he is an honest man and has integrity, such contributions will not influence him in any way. I do not believe they do. I do not believe anyone can buy the Senator from Oregon, or buy me. Neither do I believe that such contributions can buy any other Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator says nothing at all about——

Mr. CAPEHART. Contributions come from one's friends, and they come from people in one's own political party, and from people who, generally speaking, concur in the candidates' philosophy of government.

So far as my own experience is concerned, campaign contributions have never been given in return for a specific vote or for supporting a specific piece of legislation. If the Senator from Oregon has had any such experience, or if any other Senator has had such an experience, then they have experienced something that I definitely have not experienced.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My experience in the Senate has been very limited. However, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that I believe the entire nature of campaign contributions, particularly when they reach the size they have reached in this country, is inherently inimical to democracy, no matter from what source they may come. I believe it is not consistent with democratic government. That is not my opinion alone, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me finish this one statement. It was the opinion also, as I said earlier, of a man who was so dedicated to democracy as Theodore Roosevelt. He said that at a time when

campaign contributions were trivial, compared with what they are today.

Mr. CAPEHART. They were trivial because men running for office in those days did not have to use television or radio, and they did not have to pay the high cost of newspaper advertising. That is why they were trivial, although actually they were in proportion with today's value of money. In fact, they may have been higher than they are today, in proportion. Certainly today one gets very little time on television for $1,000, as men who ran for office recently will testify. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I am sure, can tell us about that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Theodore Roosevelt was concerned about campaign contributions as far back as 1907. Does the Senator from Indiana believe that people in public life have changed since Theodore Roosevelt's time?

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that a person can be just as crooked for $10 as for $1,000 or for $20. I am not talking about the amount of money involved. I am talking about integrity and honesty, and that it is impossible to legislate either.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Indiana is not answering my question.

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that a person is either honest or he is dishonest, and that a great deal of money or a little money will not make any difference.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Why does the Senator think Theodore Roosevelt felt concerned about it in 1907? He certainly was concerned about good government. I am sure Theodore Roosevelt understood people as well as the Senator or I understand them. Why does the Senator believe Theodore Roosevelt was so concerned about the matter?

Mr. CAPEHART. There was a great deal about Teddy Roosevelt that I never understood. I never understood, for example, why he ran in 1912, when he defeated the Republican Party. I do not care to discuss either Roosevelt, Teddy or the other one.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am sure we have used up sufficient time of the Senate, but I hope the Senator will examine my bill at the desk.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not quarreling with the Senator's bill at the moment. I shall read it and study it. I am talking about the general subject of honesty and integrity. We cannot legislate such things. Every man knows in his own soul whether he is or is not honest. I do not believe the Senator from Oregon or any other Senator can be bought.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Indiana believes that the Members of the Senate are honest and have integrity. So do I. But I wish to make it easier for them to exercise their natural honesty and integrity by freeing them from these campaign contributions. I hope the Senator from Indiana will be a cosponsor of my bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be glad to read the Senator's bill, but I will not cosponsor it.

NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the natural resource development was discussed last week before the Joint Committee on Economic Report by Secretary of the Interior McKay and his immediate predecessor, Oscar Chapman.

Inasmuch as Mr. Chapman's statement before this Joint Committee has been introduced into the RECORD by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I hereby request unanimous consent for reproduction in the RECORD of the statement made by Secretary McKay.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DOUGLAS MCKAY BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT ON FEBRUARY 17, 1956

I appear today before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President in response to your invitation, to discuss the subject of natural resources. I appreciate this opportunity to set forth our views in this field and to support the legislative recommendations included in the President's Economic Report.

In highlight, the report finds every evidence of progress and general prosperity. High levels of production, employment, and income are expected to be sustained during the coming year. Underlying conditions are expected to remain favorable to further economic growth. The report recognizes that some groups of our citizens have not enjoyed a full measure of prosperity and proposes remedies for their plight. These remedies include certain farm programs, an Area Assistance program to cope with unemployment in some communities, improving the economic status of older persons, insurance against catastrophic illness, and a flood reinsurance and indemnity program.

I believe that one of the key statements in the President's message is this: "Today, we believe as strongly in economic progress through free and competitive enterprise as our fathers did, and we resent, as they did, any unnecessary intrusion of Government into private affairs." In keeping with this policy, the administration has sought to curtail governmental activities that could be handled as well or better by private enterprise. On the other hand, we have sought just as earnestly to further those programs properly dependent on Federal support and leadership.

A number of factors are recognized as contributing to the strength of our Nation. The main spring of our economy consists of the qualities of initiative, independence, and enterprise of our American people. The President's report gives evidence that the Government's role in the past several years has stimulated our citizens, our local communities, our busnessmen, investors, workers, and consumers, to take the initiative and not wait for the Federal Government to do for them what they can do far better themselves.

The economy of the Nation is dependent in the final analysis upon the physical resource base available to our people. For this reason the Department of the Interior, which is primarily concerned with the conservation and development of natural resources, plays an important role in the maintenance of our economic stability and growth. In my remarks I shall refer to our activities in the water, land, and mineral fields, and also touch upon our responsibilities with respect to human resources. In addition, I shall mention briefly the flood control program of the Corps of Engineers, since I believe it will not otherwise be described in these hearings.

WATER RESOURCES

In the field of water resources the scope and cost of the needed development are so vast that on this count alone all interests must carry their share. Federal, State, and local Governments and private groups and individuals all have a responsibility. In many cases non-Federal interests can best carry out needed improvements. In other cases Federal participation is a necessary element in accomplishing broad national aims.

The Federal Government can contribute in a very substantial degree by undertaking those multiple-purpose projects which may not readily be undertaken by others. Where projects are of great size or complexity, or are interstate in character, or where they involve the national interest in such fields as flood control, navigation, reclamation, fish and wildlife conservation, recreation, and pollution abatement, and produce many benefits which are not always assessable against the beneficiaries, there is an excellent opportunity for the Federal Government to supplement the enterprise of others in the work of resources development.

Under the partnership policy of this administration, emphasis is placed on sharing the cost of projects with the groups receiving direct benefits from them. This approach serves to multiply the effect of Federal expenditures in the stimulation of conservation and development.

The President's Budget Message for the fiscal year 1957 carries recommendations for resources conservation and development which are expressive of this policy. Programs for flood control, reclamation, and multiple-purpose water resources development will expand over the 1956 level. In accordance with the policy of encouraging non-Federal responsibility for water resources projects, with Federal cooperation where national interests are involved, the President has supported legislation which would change certain presently authorized Federal projects to partnership projects. Funds for the Federal share of the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma were appropriated for the fiscal year 1956, and construction by non-Federal interests of this project and the Priest Rapids project in Washington is expected to be under way in the fiscal year 1957. Work on the Cougar multiple-purpose project in Oregon, begun as a Federal project in the fiscal year 1956, will continue in 1957 on a basis which, under pending partnership legislation, would permit local public interests to install power facilities and assure adaptation of the power features to the requirements of the city of Eugene.

There is no doubt that the present policy of actively encouraging local interests to assume their fair share of power development has been effective. The willingness of local groups to develop their own power sources is evidenced by the large increase in permits and licenses granted by the Federal Power Commission for the construction of hydroelectric projects since the partnership plan of this Administration started. The tremendous increase in such permits and licenses, from less than 1.2 million kilowatts in 1951 to more than 5.4 million kilowatts authorized in both 1954 and 1955, is a concrete result of our efforts to reestablish non-Federal initiative in the power field.

The President's Budget includes $20 million under proposed legislation to enable the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to participate, in 1957, in new partnership water developments, such as the Green Peter-White Bridge Reservoir in Oregon, the Bruces Eddy Reservoir in Idaho, and the John Day Reservoir in Washington and Oregon. The proposed legislation would also authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to assist local organizations by means of loans and grants for small reclamation projects.

Budget recommendations also provide for progress in the collection of basic data on hydrology, topography, and other physical factors needed in the planning and design of water development projects. Investigations of proposed projects and advance planning of authorized projects will go forward at rates which will provide for the orderly development of needed water resources.

Specific recommendations in the economic report relating to natural resources, other than those promoting agricultural readjustments which I assume were covered in your hearings on agricultural policy, are discussed briefly as your letter of invitation suggested.

1. The economic report recommends an acceleration of work on flood-control projects: The severity of the floods that occurred last year in the Northeast and the Far West has emphasized again the need for protection against the human and economic losses resulting from such catastrophes. Many private groups and individuals, as well as the Federal, State, and local governments, offered prompt and generous assistance to the communities and citizens struck by disaster. Nevertheless, needs of this type should be reduced in the future, and when they arise should be met more systematically. Toward these ends the economic report recommends that the Federal Government accelerate work on practical flood-control projects, supplemented by a flood reinsurance and indemnity program.

While public works designed for flood control are primarily the concern of the Corps of Engineers, Interior's Bureau of Reclamation includes in its multiple-purpose reservoirs the maximum economical provision for flood control by storage and river regulation. Shasta and Friant Dams, for example, performed this vital service during the recent storms in California which brought tragic floods to unprotected streams.

A supplemental appropriation has been recommended by the President to enable the Corps of Engineers to accelerate its flood-control program. I am advised by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, that in the absence of Federal works, flood damage on main rivers and major tributaries would approach $1 billion annually. Federal works already constructed serve to reduce this potential damage by about one-half.

The present Federal flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers is of comparatively recent origin, dating from 1928 in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi and from 1936 for the country as a whole. It has been expanded by various flood-control acts of the Congress through the act of 1954, until at present the active flood-control work authorized has a total estimated cost of $9.1 billion. Congress through fiscal year 1956 has appropriated $4.1 billion, leaving about $5 billion required to complete the authorized program. At the current (fiscal year 1956) rate of appropriations, completion of this authorized work would extend over about 27 years.

This program, however, does not represent a complete solution of the flood problem as current investigations are constantly developing additional practical flood control improvements. The recent act of 1954 authorized new flood-control works with an estimated cost of $300 million. And it may be anticipated that further additions to the flood-control program will result from such studies. It is evident, however, that there will always remain some residual of flood damage, even though the potential may be greatly reduced, as it will probably never be possible to eliminate all flood damage within the limits of engineering and economic feasibility.

At the present time the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army has reexamined its flood-control program for the New England and North Atlantic areas in the light of the destructive floods of 1955 which caused damage of almost $700 million in those two areas combined. This current acceleration of the flood-control program has been aimed at New England and the North Atlantic area because recent flood occurrences have emphasized the hazard to life and the very heavy physical damage to which those areas are exposed.

Recent floods in northern California, southern Oregon, and in Nevada caused damages of about $100 million, which would have been doubled without the Federal works now provided in that area.

2. The report recommends authorization of the construction of the Upper Colorado River project and other needed water resources developments: The Upper Colorado River project, which is vital to several States and which involves generation of power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, and other functions, is an outstanding example of the type of project that the Federal Government should undertake. Recommendations concerning this project, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, three other new Reclamation projects, and other needed developments of water resources were presented in the budget message. The estimated total cost of the 5 proposed Reclamation projects is about $1.1 billion, with 1957 expenditures estimated at $8.6 million.

Justification of these projects is founded on the national interest in providing economic strength to the West and to the Nation through the development of its natural resources. Water resources developments have been responsible for the settlement and stabilization of important areas of our West. The recommended extensions of this program will bring to other areas the direct and indirect benefits already being produced by the Central Valley project in California, the Columbia Basin project in Washington, the Missouri River Basin project, the Colorado-Big Thompson project, and others. These are long-range investments requiring a number of years for construction and an additional period for settlement and development, before attaining a fully productive status. By careful planning, continuation of a moderate program of long-range reclamation development can be directed to the production of nonsurplus crops so long as this problem remains. Ultimately, as population growth, higher dietary goals, and the limiting factor of water available for crop growth combine in the decades before us to tax our agricultural productive capacity, the reclamation program will complement other efforts to meet the food and fiber requirements of our country.

In addition to the specific recommendations, the Economic Report calls attention to the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 17, 1956. The report is the result of a detailed study of our water problems and of the present powers and activities of the various Federal establishments engaged in water resource development. The policies set out in the report embody a framework within which the Federal Government, with State and local governments and other non-Federal interests, may cooperate to develop our water resources.

The report recognizes fully the responsibilities of the Federal Government for leadership, guidance, and action in this field. At the same time it recognizes that there are a multitude of water developments which are more appropriate for regional, State, or local activity. The report points out that the principles which recognize water rights as property rights should be accepted, and that determinations as to disposition of water should recognize such rights. It recommends that a study be made under the leadership of the Federal Government in collaboration with the States and local entities with reference to property rights to water and the social and economic development of the Nation and the area.

Set forth in the report is a pattern for the widest possible public participation in water resources projects. Organizational changes are recommended to coordinate more closely Federal and non-Federal activity and to make possible more effective executive guidance. The intent of these proposed changes is to provide the States and local water resources agencies a more adequate voice in the planning and development of projects and facilitate joint participation by all of the affected Federal interests. By this type of cooperative effort we should be assured that all possible uses of water are adequately considered.

In summary, may I say that under our policy in the field of water resources we will encourage State and local responsibility and private enterprise; we will avoid greater demands for Federal investment than our national income will pemit; and we will strongly support the Federal Government's proper participation in developing the water resources of the Nation.

LAND RESOURCES

This section of my statement is labeled "Land Resources" because that is the name we use in Interior for one of our three general subdivisions, the second being "Water and Power Development" which I have just discussed, and the third being "Mineral Resources." I should point out, however, that in addition to our regular land management functions, land resources includes the related functions of recreation, fish and wildlife resources, Indian affairs, and territories. In a number of ways, these fuctions have a significant relationship to the national economy.

The National Park System

On February 2, I announced that the National Park Service with the approval of President Eisenhower has embarked on the most comprehensive and potententially rewarding program of protection, improvement and development in its history.

The program is outlined in a report entitled "Mission 66," which has been submitted to the Congress. The report, prepared by National Park Service Director Conrad L. Wirth and a special staff, analyzes current critical deficiencies in the park system which is equipped to handle 25 million visitors and last year was overwhelmed by twice that many. The report sets forth detailed recommendations for equipping the system to handle an expected 80 million visitors by 1966. Revised budget estimates sent to Congress by the President would provide funds to get the program under way this summer. The revised budget calls for $66,238,000 as compared with $45,029,000 appropriated for the current fiscal year.

It will take 10 years to complete the program because a lot of catching up must be done before we come abreast of current needs. Furthermore, we do not plan a patchwork, piecemeal approach to the problem.

Benefits of the Mission 66 program will spread far beyond the 181 areas of the National Park System.

Of major importance is the provision in this program for the development by 1961 of a nationwide recreation plan aimed at the ultimate establishment of systems of recreational areas and facilities for which each level of Government—Federal, State, and local—will bear its proper share of responsibility. This provides a prime partnership opportunity for keeping abreast of the healthy growing interest of the American people in the great outdoors.

Hunting and sport fishing

Public use of the national wildlife refuges, too, is increasing. The refuge areas were used by a recordbreaking total of 5,202,260 persons during the year ending June 30, 1955, compared with 4,608,909 for the year ending June 30, 1954. Reports from the various States show that there were 18,580,813 fishing licenses issued during the fiscal year 1954, an increase of nearly a million over the number issued during the preceding fiscal year. Hunting licenses issued during fiscal

year 1954 totaled 14,073,386, as compared with 13,997,115 for the preceding year. The assumption is justified that increases have occurred in 1955 over 1954.

A substantial amount of money is expended each year by these hunters and fishermen in connection with their sports. Since these expenditures are made for a variety of goods and services, they represent income to countless business enterprises throughout the United States. The exact amount of these expenditures is not known but recent surveys by a number of States indicate that more than $4 billion probably was spent on these sports during 1955. For the first time a comprehensive national survey is being conducted by the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine the importance of hunting and fishing to the Nation's economy during calendar year 1955, in terms of time and money. Results of the survey will be available during the summer of 1956.

Commercial fisheries

As far as commercial fisheries are concerned, the per capita consumption of fish increased from 10.8 pounds in 1953 to 11.1 pounds in 1954. Per capita consumption of fish in 1955 is expected to be near that for 1954. However, it must be stated that the per capita consumption was supported by increased imports because of a decrease in domestic production.

Preliminary estimates indicate that the total catch made by American fishermen during 1955 was 4.6 billion pounds, compared with 4.7 billion pounds caught during 1954. A preliminary estimate of the value indicates that the money paid the fishermen for the delivered catch will be about 10 percent below the $360 million paid last year. The value of the fishery products originating from our domestic resources during 1955 is estimated to be $522 million at the processor level, $738 million at the wholesaler level, and $963 million at the retailer level.

The capital investment in commercial fisheries increased by about $8 million in 1955 over 1954.

The productivity of the fishery industries is expected to be increased by the research work presently done under the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act; proposed improvements in skills and in technology, as well as in marketing techniques, if applied by the fishery industries, should have a favorable result on the economy of the commercial fisheries.

The Department endorses the proposal to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. In recent years the increasing pollution in numerous streams throughout the Nation has posed a serious threat to the maintenance of fish and wildlife resources in these waters.

The public lands

Our expanding economy is creating added demands for the use and development of the public lands and their resources. Individuals and corporations want to use and acquire public lands for grazing, logging, mining, farming, industry, commerce, residence, recreation, and other purposes. States and counties are showing increased interest in acquiring or using public lands for purposes such as recreation, wildlife, and forest management. Expanding Federal programs such as national defense and atomic energy create demands for large areas. The programs of the Bureau of Land Management are administered to harmonize these needs and promote multiple use wherever possible. Of special significance are substantial net revenues to the Federal Treasury. Receipts from oil and gas leasing in fiscal year 1955 were $209 million, including those from the outer Continental Shelf. Receipts from timber sales reached about $25 million, mostly from lands managed for sustained yield. Total cash receipts covered into the Treasury in fiscal year 1955 were about $240 million. Total Bureau expenditures were $14,660,000.

The work backlog of the Bureau of Land Management represents potential net revenues which can be realized only when the cases are processed. Higher work output is being sought through greater work efficiency and larger appropriations. As the program develops, greater net revenues will accrue to the Treasury than would otherwise be the case.

Territorial resources

Alaska is a great storehouse of untapped natural wealth in the form of minerals, forests, and waterpower. Tremendous acreages have been placed under mineral leases for oil exploration in Alaska during the last few years by the Bureau of Land Management and a number of test wells have been drilled. In the forestry field, the first of what is hoped will be several large pulp mills in Alaska, completed its first year of operation successfully in 1955 at Ketchikan. During the past 2 years, timber sales have been made or advertised for large blocks of timber of 3 more major timber for pulp or paper developments at Juneau, Sitka, and Wrangell. In each case the timber sales are made by the Forest Service and the investment is by private enterprise.

In the other areas under the general jurisdiction of the Department, there are some resource-development activities on a small scale which may be of interest. In American Samoa during the past year a tuna canning factory was successfully placed in operation through contract with a private canning company. This plant permits use of a substantial resource of the neighboring waters and also provides employment to many Samoans. The Virgin Islands Corporation, a wholly owned Government corporation, continues its work of stimulating agricultural development on the island of St. Croix. Of greatest interest is its program of constructing small dams to conserve the runoff of water and provide a water supply during the dry season.

Improving the Indian economy

In line with the economic report of the President which proposed area-assistance programs for communities experiencing persistent unemployment, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has initiated an economic-development program for Indian reservations. The objective of this program is to provide additional employment for Indian people by encouraging the location of private industries on or near Indian reservations. The natural resources of many reservations are inadequate, even when fully developed, to support the human population at more than a minimum subsistence level. These are quite frequently areas of chronic underemployment for which comprehensive economic development and voluntary relocation programs are essential.

Adult education is a part of this program. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has initiated an adult-education program to provide elementary schooling for adult Indians who missed the advantages of education in their youth and are now handicapped by lack of ability to read, write, speak, or understand the English language. This program is designed to help these people broaden their opportunities for employment and improve the living standards of their families.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Referring now to minerals, metals, and the minerals fuels, few people realize how essential these materials are. We are inclined to take them too much for granted, despite the fact that our mechanized economy could not exist without a long list of metals and could not run without energy obtained from coal, oil, and gas.

We have some of these things in abundance, but we should never forget that we have to find a new ton of iron ore or a new barrel of oil for every unit produced. Actually, the extractive industries must do much better than break even in finding new sources if they are to satisfy the demands of this area of phenomenal economic growth.

Because of the fact that mineral resources are nonrenewable, more and more emphasis is being placed upon methods of conserving them. The term "conservation" has been defined in many ways but to us the most intelligent concept is that of prudent use, not miserly hoarding which stunts growth. The Department of the Interior takes the position that wise utilization of our nonrenewable resources can come about only through increased knowledge in the fundamental earth sciences and their technical applications. The actual job of developing and mining minerals is one for private industry, but the Government fits prominently into the picture because of the extremely wide assortment of forces, in and out of Government, that affect the minerals economy. The matter of bringing mineral deposits into production is a long-range proposition that generally must be preceded by a tremendous amount of fundamental scientific research and appraisal.

In this connection I might say that we took a comprehensive look at our mineral position during the past year and decided that minerals research and development activities within the Department need to be greatly expanded, and I am happy to say that the President's budget for the next fiscal year proposes increases in this direction. If approved by the Congress these dollar increases will be used to accelerate topographic and geologic mapping activities, to initiate new geophysical and geochemical investigations, and to pursue much neded research in mining and metallurgy.

The Nation is now in a sounder position for meeting its minerals mobilization needs than at any time in history despite unprecedented growth in minerals consumption and increased dependence on foreign supply. This is because of a joint program of research, stockpiling, and assisting domestic minerals industries. Mobilization needs, of course, are constantly being revised as industry and trade shifts cause changes in supply.

As a whole the minerals industries enjoyed a prosperous year in 1955. Paced by strong increases in fuels, copper, and iron ore, mineral production in this country jumped approximately 11 percent to a new high of $15.8 billion. Most of this increased value was due to increases in output, although appreciably higher prices for some materials helped. The bituminous coal mining industry reversed a 7-year downtrend. Actual shortages developed for certain metals in 1955 and a few still persist. For copper, aluminium, and nickel, the Government was able to ease the shortage by diverting to industrial use materials originally destined for the stockpile. In other instances, notably in lead and zinc, it was necessary to accelerate purchases in order to fortify the stockpile position and to stimulate domestic production to levels deemed more satisfactory for mobilization purposes.

There are some trouble spots within the domestic metal mining industry. In most of these instances our resources are of marginal nature and producers must have some kind of Government assistance if they are to compete in the world market. During the Korean emergency, the Government established programs for the purchase of tungsten, manganese, chrome, and other ores at prices substantially above normal world commercial levels. What action should be taken when the present programs end? Each situation must be examined on a case-by-case basis, and we are now in the process of making these studies.

The problem on foreign competition in minerals and metals production will become more pronounced as time goes on. Commonsense tells us that we should not become too dependent upon foreign sources. On the other hand, the security and prosperity of

this country is heavily dependent upon international friendship and cooperation. Many of our neighbors and friends count strongly on the production and sale of minerals and other raw materials in order to keep their economies strong. Statesmanship of the highest order as well as good economic sense will be required if we are to keep this vexing problem in proper perspective.

No set formula, for example, can be devised to settle the petroleum supply question to everyone's satisfaction. Imports year by year are supplying more and more of our requirements. Both crude imports and domestic production were up in 1955 and the oil industry turned in another record performance in new drilling. Further, huge sums of American private capital were active abroad. Our appetite for liquid fuels is enormous, and it is my personal opinion that it cannot be fully satisfied without petroleum imported from friendly foreign nations.

The coal problem is being attacked in many ways. Research in production and marketing has been expanded and fundamental research on coal utilization continues to be a large feature of the work of the Bureau of Mines. Special projects are under way regarding the unwatering of anthracite mines, in improving production, and in the partial substitution of anthracite for coke in blast furnaces.

Federal assistance to depressed communities is especially applicable to coal-producing communities. We are confident that the major problems of the coal industry can be met by energetic action on the part of the industry assisted by reasonable action by the Government.

Increased success in exploration is necessary in expanding our minerals resources. It is our view that minerals exploration and development in a commercial sense should be carried out by private mining interests, but the Government assists these efforts by extending financial aid in the search for strategic minerals and metals. The Defense Minerals Exploration Administration processes a substantial flow of applications and has already disbursed more than $14 million on a sharing basis. More than a million dollars has been recovered in royalties. For each one million dollars invested by the Government in successful exploration projects, it is estimated that approximately $49 million worth of new potential mineral resources have resulted. The ratio is something like 30 to 1 taking into account the unsuccessful projects.

It is my feeling that the Federal Government can make its major contribution in the research field. The research policy of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey is that of doing the things that the industry cannot readily do for itself, thereby supplementing private efforts. This policy is illustrated by the recent recessing of the Bureau of Mines zirconium plant after private production was finally started, based to a large extent on Bureau research and production technology, and by similar action in titanium and oil shale pilot plant work. Zirconium is on the threshhold of becoming a new industry like titanium, in which hundreds of millions of dollars will be invested.

During 1955 we dedicated a new Bureau of Mines Rare and Precious Metals Experiment Station at Reno, Nevada. Here work will be done on a long list of rare metals which are just beginning to receive attention. Research elsewhere continued aggressively and successfully in many directions, including for example: Studies on the treatment of low-grade sources of aluminum, which are widespread in the United States; improvement of light-metal alloys; study of synthetic asbestos; development of a mechanical planer operated by remote control to be used in phosphate mining; and work on special instruments for the study of large-scale caving methods of mining ore.

Examples of research on fuels include the effects of different drilling fluids on the permeability to oil of reservoir rocks; instability of liquid fuels in storage; retorting of oil shale; hydrogenation of coal; and utilization of nuclear energy in gasification of coal.

A helium shortage was met by unprecedented increases in production and productivity. Work is proceeding in the construction of a new plant, but it appears that still another new plant will be necessary soon because of rapid increase in both civilian and military demands.

The industrial safety program for minerals has been extended, as was also research on fire-damp ignition, mineral, and industrial dusts, explosions and ignitions. A safety campaign to reduce roof-fall accidents has been launched, and safety competitions and associations have been extended appreciably.

The Geological Survey work on topograhic and geologic mapping is progressing. The Geological Survey also completed a great many investigations of mineralized areas and on the gological conditions for different degrees of mineralization. Research on methods of geological research and testing continued, with development of several new measures of test criteria and techniques.

The enactment of Public Laws 167, 213, and 359 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), have enabled the Government, before issuance of patent, to manage the surface resources of mining claims and have opened to mining location many areas previously withdrawn for power and water uses. The concept of conservation of mineral resources and their prudent use should continue to provide the Government with a substantial source of net income.

This is an optimistic note on which to conclude a brief account of our stewardship of mineral responsibility. Continuation of these policies should enable the Nation's mineral resources to become a sounder base for defense and to provide for steady growth.

In conclusion, it should be noted that in addition to their economic returns not readily expressible in monetary returns, many resource-development programs yield financial receipts of considerable magnitude. These receipts consist chiefly of power revenues, timber sales, and mineral leases on public lands including the Outer Continental Shelf. In the aggregate, such receipts by all Federal agencies managing public resources are estimated in the 1957 budget to total $810 million in the fiscal year 1957.

SOURCE OF FIGURES USED BY RAYMOND MOLEY WITH REFERENCE TO CERTAIN LANDS AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE HUMID AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in a recent Senate floor speech, I rather thoroughly discussed some claims emanating from southern California water interests relative to some allegedly low-cost lands available for development in the humid areas of the United States.

Inasmuch as these claims were tied in to reference to the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, I sent a sample of the southern California propaganda to the Soil Conservation Service Director and requested a copy of the research report from which the imposing statistical information was compiled.

SCS Administrator D. A. Williams subsequently informed me that no research report had been made by his agency on that specific matter. On the contrary, he stated that the information obviously had originated from some informal visits paid to his agency's offices by a Mr. John U. Terrell, whom I have identified as an employee of the Colorado River Association of Southern California. Mr. Williams further stated that he had told Mr. Terrell that the figures he had provided him were at least 10 years old and probably unreliable.

Mr. Williams also pointed out that reclamation of land in the area concerned would involve clearing costs of $50 to $120 an acre, drainage costs of $60 to $150 per acre, and annual fertilizer costs of $10 to $60 per acre. Furthermore, he pointed out that some of the land lies in small tracts, inaccessible for efficient use, and other areas must remain as they are until major improvements such as leveeing and mostly drainage outlets are established.

In order that my colleagues can review my remarks in connection with the text of this letter, I hereby request unanimous consent to have this letter from Mr. Williams reproduced at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington D, C., January 24, 1956.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: I am answering your letter of January 13, 1956, inquiring about substantial areas of idle land in the Midwest.

The map which was attached to your letter was new to me but apparently the figures could be identified as coming from the Soil Conservation Service as the result of Mr. John U. Terrell's visit to my office last September. At that time he asked for figures on the amount of idle land in a number of Midwest and Southern States. I advised him that in 1944 the Soil Conservation Service made a land classification of the United States, based on the use of land at that time, but that these figures were more than 10 years old and probably not too reliable. Then he asked if he could call on some of our field offices to discuss the matter of idle land. I agreed to this request and so advised our State conservationists. I stated to them that since the land facts he desired were obtained from surveys and estimates made with the use of public funds, and that this information was not confidential, they could give it to him. In my letter to them I specifically stated, "We have not agreed to supply any interpretation of those date." A copy of this letter is enclosed.

There was no reason to ask Mr. Terrell to submit the figures he obtained by visiting our State offices and he did not do so. Therefore, we had no indication as to how the data were to be used.

It is apparent, from the acreage figures on the map enclosed in your letter, there is greater variation in the figures between the States than should be the case if conditions in the different States were consistently reflected in the figures on a uniform basis. Since the estimates given were the result of verbal discussions with some 20 individuals or groups, some variation was to be expected. However, with due allowance for such differences, it would appear that in some instances, at least, quite different interpretations as to what data was desired modified the figures used. Some of the State figures are identical with the estimates made in the 1944 survey. On the other hand, we find that some of the States at-

tempted to hurriedly revise these rough, early estimates and bring them up to date based on present land use. Under these conditions the revised figures for Michigan, for example, would not be comparable to the old Wisconsin figures even if similar concepts for idle land were used which appears open to question. The present land conditions in the two States are actually much more comparable than the figures used indicate.

We were not in any way involved in any interpretation placed upon these figures or implications drawn therefrom. In fact, the Service no longer uses the term "idle land" because of the wide variations in what different people consider the term to mean. The Bureau of the Census has had a similiar experience with the term.

I am able to supply only very general information with regard to estimated cost of bringing land not now in production into agricultural use. A small acreage of land included in the figures undoubtedly is land that could be put into cultivation for less than $20 per acre. This is because it has been only temporarily abandoned. However, a much greater amount of this land will need rather extensive treatment before it can be either pastured or cultivated. The estimated cost of clearing land varies from about $50 to as much as $120 per acre depending upon the use to which it is to be put. For that land which needs drainage, and a large acreage of it does, the estimated cost would vary from about $60 to as much as $150 per acre. To these costs would need to be added, in many places, a fertilizer cost varying from as little as $10 to as much as $60 per acre depending again upon the use and kind of crop to be grown.

It should be pointed out that some of this land lies in small tracts inaccessible for efficient use. Other areas must remain as they are until major improvements such as leveling and costly drainage outlets are established.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. WILLIAMS,
Administrator.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, inasmuch as this information was made a matter of public record on the floor and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, I was surprised to see figures on this subject comparable to those of the southern California water interests injected into a statement by Columnist Raymond Moley, being distributed today, without any reference to this SCS rebuttal or to any source material. The figures are utilized in a statement entitled "The Case Against Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects," contained in a publication released today of the American Enterprise Association, the Upper Colorado Reclamation Project.

After a reference to an article of his own, which, he said, contained abundant reference to "authorities in the Department of Agriculture," Mr. Moley states:

Here I should like to call attention to another survey made from data gathered by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture. This shows that there now exists on improved farms nearly 21 million acres of good land lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States. This land is neither woodland, pasture, nor publicly owned. It is located in regions where there is plenty of rainfall, and in most States, where the growing season is much longer than in the upper Colorado region. All that might be needed to bring this land into cultivation would be an expenditure of from $50 to $150 an acre when and if there is need for more food and fiber.

Mr. Moley then goes on to list specific acreage figures in some 20 States.

At first, I thought that Mr. Moley's source for these figures and his development costs must be the minority views contained in the report of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the Colorado River storage project, but a check of these report figures, which also were not supported with any specific source reference, disclosed that radically different totals were given for the same States.

Reclamation costs per acre given in the minority views on H. R. 3383 were from $60 to $100 per acre.

Reclamation costs per acre given by Mr. Moley were from $50 to $150 per acre.

Acreage figures given in the House minority views on H. R. 3383 are as follows:

Alabama	683,000
Arkansas	1,865,000
Florida	1,970,000
Georgia	1,721,000
Illinois	69,000
Indiana	135,000
Kentucky	170,000
Louisiana	2,769,000
Michigan	690,000
Minnesota	874,000
Mississippi	1,272,000
Missouri	323,000
New York	100,000
North Carolina	1,157,000
Ohio	95,000
Pennsylvania	90,000
South Carolina	996,000
Tennessee	242,000
Texas	3,928,000
Virginia	514,000
Wisconsin	316,000

Acreage figures given by Mr. Moley were as follows:

South	
Alabama	823,564
Arkansas	2,723,547
Kentucky	671,673
Louisiana	2,487,300
Mississippi	1,270,691
Tennessee	279,563
Total	8,256,338
Southeast	
Florida	2,037,392
Georgia	972,748
North Carolina	4,264,763
South Carolina	492,309
Virginia	919,307
Total	8,686,519
State	
Illinois	627,185
Indiana	231,780
Michigan	1,761,390
Minnesota	564,702
Ohio	491,098
Wisconsin	124,133
Iowa	50,759
Missouri	143,249
Total	3,994,296
Grand total	20,937,153

If Mr. Moley will provide me with the specific source of his information on this subject, covered on pages 67 to 69 in the AEA publication, I shall be pleased to make the information available to the House Interior Committee, and to check it with the source material, if it is available in the Soil Conservation Service.

I do not wish to suggest that the source of Mr. Moley's statistics on humid land reclamation is the southern California water interests who are trying to defeat development of water in the upper basin. However, in view of my previous action to expose the questionable nature of Mr. Terrell's research on this subject—which must have escaped the attention of Columnist Moley—I feel that the matter should be thoroughly aired in fairness to everyone.

Any factual matter on this subject submitted to me will be brought to the attention of this body, inasmuch as the Members of Congress are sure to be included in the distribution of this American Enterprise Association publication, as a public information service.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is this American Enterprise Association to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. WATKINS. I understand it is a nonprofit organization which tries to do an objective job in reporting and analyzing various pieces of legislation coming before the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Does it have headquarters in Utah, Colorado, and New York?

Mr. WATKINS. I understand the headquarters are in Washington, or possibly in New York. I understand there is no one sponsoring or contributing to the organization west of the Mississippi River. The association is in an area where reclamation is not much of a problem.

REPORT ON FINANCIAL OPERATIONS OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have just received from Philip Young, Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, a report on the financial operations of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act for the first policy year ending November 19, 1955.

At a previous session, when I was chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I had the privilege of sponsoring this legislation, and I am pleased that the first year's operation has demonstrated that it is an important part of the Federal worker's program.

During the first year's operation a substantial contingency reserve has been developed, and it must be maintained and augmented to meet future increased charges for which the program is already committed.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS,
January 30, 1956.

REPORT OF FIRST POLICY YEAR OPERATIONS UNDER THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1954

The benefits specified in the Insurance Act are provided under a policy of group life and

accidental death and dismemberment insurance purchased by the Commission as authorized by the Act. The period from August 29, 1954, through November 19, 1955, is established as the first policy year. The act provides for an accounting by the insurer at the end of each policy year, showing the amounts of accrued premiums, claim charges, and expense and risk charges. Any excess of premiums over the sum of all charges is held by the insurer as a special interest-bearing contingency reserve to be used only for charges under the Federal group policy.

Premiums to the insurer are derived from (1) withholdings from the salaries of insured employees under age 65, at the rate of 25 cents biweekly for each $1,000 of group life insurance, and (2) contributions from the appropriations of employing agencies equal to one-half of employee withholdings. The premium paid to the insurer is 98⅔ percent of the sum of these amounts. The remaining 1⅓ percent is retained in the employees' life insurance fund to meet other authorized expenses.

As was fully anticipated, premiums for the first policy year exceeded all current charges by a substantial margin. Any other result would have indicated the inevitable need for an increase in premiums, a decrease in benefits, or both. The program did not provide insurance for employees retired at its inception, but grants continuing protection without further cost to employees thereafter retiring on an immediate annuity, for disability or with at least 15 years of service. As the number of insured retired employees increases, claim charges must rise well above the first year level, without a corresponding increase in premium income.

Accrued premiums for the first policy year amounted to $112,700,000, and the contingency reserve earned interest of $720,000. Against this total of $113,420,000, the following charges were made:

Life Insurance claims	$56,248,000
Accidental death and dismemberment claims	5,450,000
Conversion charges	579,000
Expense and risk charges (including taxes of $2,204,000)	3,509,000
Total charges	65,786,000

The contingency reserve at the end of the first policy year thus amounted to $47,634,000, and is available for future increasing claim charges. As previously indicated, this increase will be primarily due to the provision for continuing insurance after retirement.

We estimate that at the end of the first policy year, the liability for insurance then held by retired employees is $26,500,000. While the act does not require a segregated reserve to cover this liability, elementary prudence requires that it be recognized as a charge against the contingency reserve. No further income from withholdings and contributions is available with respect to insured retired employees.

Employees over age 65 constitute another group in respect to which no further income will accrue to the employees' life insurance fund. There are over 40,000 such insured employees, about twice the number of those retired with insurance at no further cost to them.

There is another facet of the insurance program which must not be ignored in assessing future claims on its resources. Section 10 of the act authorizes the Commission to arrange for the assumption by the fund of the insurance held by members of nonprofit associations of Federal or District of Columbia employees. In their reports on the 1955 amendment which became the present law, the Civil Service Committees of both the Senate and House cited an estimate of $33 million as the cost of this provision. While this item is not a direct charge against the contingency reserve held under the group policy, and while the impact of this cost will be spread over a period of years, nevertheless the existence of a substantial section 10 liability requires that the contingency reserve be built up to the greatest extent possible in the early years of the program. This will free a portion of future income to meet the certain costs under section 10.

In summary, the first year's operation of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act has been highly satisfactory, both as a much needed addition to the Federal personnel program and from the financial standpoint. A substantial contingency reserve has been developed; it must be maintained and augmented to meet future increased charges for which the program is already committed. The reserve is by no possible interpretation a surplus which would justify liberalization of the benefits or reduction of income from employee withholdings and agency contributions.

GOVERNMENT BEEF GRADING AND GOVERNMENT MEAT PURCHASES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have just received two letters from Mr. A. G. Pickett, secretary of the Kansas Livestock Association, in regard to action taken by the board of directors and advisory committeemen of the Kansas Livestock Association on Government beef grading and Government meat purchases.

The Kansas Livestock Association has a membership composed of most of the livestock men in our State. It has an outstanding record for constructive suggestions in behalf of the livestock industry, as well as the continuance of a sound agricultural economy.

During the past few months my office has received literally hundreds of letters from livestock producers urging that some correction be made in the Government grading of beef, and that the purchase of livestock be stepped up.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two letters to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Topeka, Kans., February 15, 1956.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CARLSON: The board of directors and advisory committeemen of the Kansas Livestock Association, at a meeting Friday, February 10, went on record as believing that present Government beef grading has been one of the greatest market depressing factors the past fall and winter.

Two points are involved:

First, many retail outlets demand United States Choice beef and unless the buyer is certain the animals will grade well up in the Choice grade when slaughtered, as much as $2 or more is taken off the price.

Second, graders have apparently tightened up on the grades. There seems to be plenty of proof that the past fall and winter it has taken from 30 to 50 days more heavy feeding to make cattle grade Choice than was true in the past. Graders seem to have forgotten that grade specifications were changed a few years ago.

Inasmuch as we have gotten to the place were the United States Choice stamp sets the price on beef, this situation has caused feeders to take a terrific beating. A little better break on this grading end would have given more actual relief to cattle feeders than any one thing.

Very truly yours,
KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
A. G. PICKETT, *Secretary.*

KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Topeka, Kans., February 15, 1956.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CARLSON: At the board meeting Friday, February 10, the Kansas Livestock Association went on record as favoring the stepped-up Government meat purchases as recommended by the river livestock market group.

Such purchases for the military, school lunches and foreign outlets should be stepped up immediately if the present depressed market situation is to be relieved.

Very truly yours,
KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
A. G. PICKETT, *Secretary.*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS CONNECTED WITH THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate Concurrent Resolution 65.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds further with the consideration of the resolution, I should like to offer an amendment. The amendment would simply provide that the expenses of the proposed joint committee, in the amount of $25,000, shall be paid entirely from the contingent fund of the Senate.

I offer this amendment at the suggestion of the financial clerk of the Senate. He has advised me that the language of Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, as it now reads on page 6, would necessitate the maintenance of duplicate accounts by the disbursing officers of both the Senate and the House. The disbursing clerk of the House of Representatives concurs in approving the proposed amendment.

I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 11, it is proposed, after the word "paid", to strike out "one-half."

On page 6, lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out "and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives."

On page 6, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "Disbursements to pay."

On page 6, it is proposed to strike out lines 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 65 was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. It was reported with the unanimous recommendation that it be agreed to. It is not a resolution which would effect any change in the Constitution or laws, but provides for a thorough investigation of a great many different subjects, about which there presently is uncertainty which should be resolved.

Under the resolution the committee would decide, in the first place, whether or not the various subjects should be resolved, and, if so, how such resolution should take place.

I trust the concurrent resolution will meet with the unanimous approval of the Senate. It provides a sound basis for the submission and promotion of remedial legislation necessary to make the statutes certain and complete concerning presidential elections, successions, and duties.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There are two principal questions immediately before the country: First, the question of Presidential workload, and, second, disability or inability on the part of the President to perform the duties of his Office.

The Senate Government Operations Committee is currently examining the problem of Presidential workload, and the Senate Judiciary Committee has pending before it proposed legislation on the subject of Presidential disability.

On the House side, a special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee is now studying the subject of Presidential disability.

In view of these activities, will the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, explain the need for creating a new and joint committee to look into these questions and into a whole series of other questions as well?

Mr. GREEN. The reason is the presence of the whole series of other questions. They are all interrelated. The committee would, I assume—it certainly should—assemble the results of the investigations by the other committees. The committee would not wish to duplicate that work. It would get its information wherever it could, and make a composite report, which would doubtless include results of the other investigations. However, the investigation would be much broader than previous investigations. It would involve all other questions which have arisen in our past history and which may arise in the future, so far as we can foresee them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. According to Senate Report No. 1462, which accompanies the pending resolution, the joint committee would examine "but not be confined to," 14 specific problems affecting presidential succession. Among the 14 areas for study are the electoral college, nominations by national political conventions, and the convention processes, the adequacy of the presidential succession law of 1947, and the roles of the Senate and the House of Representatives in choosing a President or a Vice President. The enumerated areas are so vast that a real question arises as to whether the joint committee could produce any recommendations in time for congressional action this year.

I might point out to the distinguished Senator that I believe there is on the calendar at least one of the so-called Mundt constitutional amendments, and perhaps two others. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] has a little different approach to the question dealing with the subject of the electoral college.

In view of those facts, I was wondering if the Senator did not feel there would be considerable duplication, and whether he is convinced that between now and June 30, in view of all the demands on the time of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and of other Senators, a committee would have an opportunity to hold hearings and make a report in time for Congress to act at this session.

Mr. GREEN. That is a good question. I do not know whether it would be possible, but it has seemed to me that it would be well to provide for a termination date with reference to the existence of a joint committee. For that reason the concurrent resolution itself provides that the committee shall make its final report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1956. Thereupon the existence of the joint committee would terminate. Of course, that would not prevent Congress from extending the time, when the termination date arrived, if Congress deemed it worth while to continue the committee. But I think definite progress would be made.

The recent illness of the President has brought to the fore a number of questions which are involved. They have to do not only with the death of a President, but with a great many other questions, such as the incapacity of a President at any time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, I am not unmindful of the importance of the subject matter with which the resolution deals, but I am frank to say I am very reluctant to see a joint committee created. I think there are certain fields in which a joint committee of the House and Senate is justified. It was certainly true in the field of atomic power. It was a new subject, and there was a need for a committee which could have full access to all the information available, so it could be a kind of watchdog for the Congress in dealing with that new subject. The joint committee was created by statute, and it has worked very well. I think the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has had a definite field for study.

However, I am very reluctant to have a joint committee created on the subject matter covered by the concurrent resolution, particularly when one considers the list of the subject matters involved. I do not pretend to have any crystal ball, but I think, as certainly as that I am standing here, it will be necessary to adopt a resolution to continue the joint committee. Then that might be followed by an attempt to have a permanent joint committee created, which would take much time and attention of Members of Congress. It is very difficult at times to arrive at a meeting date which is suitable for Members of both the House and the Senate, whereas that kind of problem is not involved in the case of a Senate committee.

Mr. GREEN. On the other hand, if a joint committee is established, the measure establishing it will have to be adopted by both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and thus the joint committee's recommendations will carry a great deal more weight with the Members of the House of Representatives.

This measure deals not only with the death or incapacity of the President or Vice President, but also with the failure of candidates for President to receive a majority of the electoral college votes. It is very desirable to have these questions settled. What will happen if a candidate dies shortly before the election, but after the nomination has been made? All such questions have remained unanswered.

I know the Senator from California is an ardent student of American history, and he must realize how fortunate we are that a crisis has not arisen because of our failure to provide for the steps to be taken in the event of certain very likely occurrences—occurrences perhaps in the near future. The longer we put off deciding these questions, the worse the situation may become.

From time to time in the past, efforts have been made to settle these questions and to provide for the taking of the proper steps, but those efforts never have succeeded. I have hoped that now we might make a start in the direction of making the proper arrangements. Perhaps the proposed committee could submit a partial report, and it might recommend that the remainder of the work be done at a future time or by a future committee. But I believe it important that the attention of the public be drawn to these questions which remain unanswered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully concur in the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island regarding the desirability of directing the attention of the public, as well as the attention of the Senate, to the very important questions he has raised—just as, some time ago, we directed the attention of the Senate and the attention of the House of Representatives to the constitutional problem which would be involved in the event the House

of Representatives were wiped out by atomic attack.

If the Senate were wiped out, constitutionally the Senate could be reconstituted very promptly, because practically all the States have made provision for the governor to make temporary appointments to the Senate. So the Senate could be reconstituted in a matter of days, at the most. However, that is not true in the case of the House of Representatives, because under the Constitution, appointments to the House of Representatives cannot be made in that way. Thus, in the event of such an occurrence, the Government might have only one legislative arm able to function. Although that problem was not solved, at least it was called to the attention of both Houses, by means of measures, which some of us introduced some time ago, calling for certain constitutional amendments.

Similarly, I think the questions the Senator from Rhode Island raises are very much alive.

On the other hand, the Judiciary Committee is, under the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act, supposed to have jurisdiction in the field of constitutional amendments. One of the questions involved in connection with this measure is whether, insofar as that field is concerned, it is intended that the proposed joint committee take over the functions of the Judiciary Committee, as regards constitutional amendments which might be necessary.

Mr. GREEN. I think it would be very difficult to provide for that; but I am sure that any committee which undertook to carry out the provisions of such a measure would seek to avoid any duplication of the work done by another committee.

On the other hand, I think it might be very helpful to have such investigations and advice and recommendations in connection with the conventions preceding the elections.

I now read from the committee report:

The joint committee, in its studies, also would examine, but would not be confined to, such questions as—

(1) The electoral college.

(2) Nominations by national political conventions, and the convention process.

(3) Vacancies occurring in the nominations for President and Vice President.

(4) The roles of the Senate and the House of Representatives in choosing a President or a Vice President.

(5) The necessity of a constitutional amendment to resolve by popular vote, rather than by vote by the House of Representatives, the failure of candidates for President to receive a majority of electoral college votes.

(6) The adequacy of the presidential succession law of 1947.

(7) The differences, if any, between the status, powers, and privileges of an elected President and an individual succeeding him to the office of President.

(8) The feasibility of a new presidential election to coincide with the next election of the House of Representatives, when an individual succeeds to the Presidency during the first or second year of a term for which the President had been elected.

(9) The nature, extent, and duration of the inability of a President to discharge his powers and duties, and how such inability shall be defined.

(10) The relation of the Vice President to the duties of the office of President during the inability of a President to discharge his office.

(11) Provisions to define similar inabilities affecting the Vice President, or other individuals, acting during the inability of a President.

(12) The differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President, and of any other individual executing his office during the President's temporary disability.

(13) The burdens now existing in the office of President, and whether or not the pressure of such burdens requires the establishment of an office of Executive Vice President; and

(14) Review of the act of October 31, 1951, providing generally for the delegation of Presidential functions.

These are important questions; unless they are answered, the situation might easily become very confused. Not only the safety of the parties, but also the safety of our Government itself, might be affected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the resolution, the proposed joint committee would have legislative power, would it?

Mr. GREEN. No; it would not have any legislative power.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It would not have any legislative power?

Mr. GREEN. No. It simply would have power to make an investigation and submit a report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The committee's recommendations would have to be acted on by the regular legislative committees; is that correct?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, this measure would cover the situation which would develop if a President-elect were assassinated. In that connection, let me refer to the effort which was made to assassinate Franklin Delano Roosevelt when he was in Florida. It was on that occasion that Mayor Cermak was killed. That attempt to assassinate the President-elect occurred only a few weeks before the inauguration of Mr. Roosevelt, did it not?

Mr. GREEN. Yes. This measure covers such situations both before and after presidential elections.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, this measure covers the entire field, does it?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I read this measure, I observe that it is divided into three chapters. The first deals with the manner and means of electing the President and Vice President.

Mr. GREEN. Actually, there are four.

Mr. ELLENDER. Four?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the subject dealt with by the first chapter has been fairly well investigated by the Senate, as a result of the introduction of certain bills dealing with the question of whether the electoral college should be continued?

Mr. GREEN. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand this measure, a further study would be made by the committee to be selected.

Mr. GREEN. Yes. I think the committee would invite those whom it would regard as experts, and who could be helpful to the committees, to come before it and testify and give advice.

Mr. ELLENDER. Unfortunately, many persons regard themselves as experts.

Mr. GREEN. If the Senator from Louisiana were reluctant to appear in person, he could submit his views in writing.

Mr. ELLENDER. The trouble is, I am not an expert on this question.

Since the committee is to be a joint committee, to be composed of Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate, why is it proposed that all the cost be borne by the Senate, instead of having half borne by the House of Representatives—as is usually provided in the case of such situations?

Mr. GREEN. This measure originally called for an equal division of the expense between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. Why should that proposal be changed?

Mr. GREEN. Because the financial authorities of both Houses said it would be very difficult to make such a division between the House of Representatives and the Senate. So they advised that the entire expense be borne by only one branch of the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the reason for the present proposal, is it?

Mr. GREEN. Yes. That matter was carefully studied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Monroney
Beall	Gore	Morse
Bender	Green	Mundt
Bennett	Hayden	Murray
Bible	Hennings	Neely
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bridges	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bush	Holland	Pastore
Butler	Hruska	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kerr	Sparkman
Curtis	Knowland	Stennis
Daniel	Kuchel	Symington
Dirksen	Langer	Thurmond
Douglas	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Welker
Ellender	Malone	Wiley
Ervin	Mansfield	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McCarthy	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, as amended.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President from the time of the nomination of the President and Vice President, through the time of their election and time of their inauguration until the termination of their respective terms of office, with the purpose of making the law certain and complete as to the presidential election, succession, and duties. These matters shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

I. As to the election of the President and Vice President—

(1) Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college, as at present, and if so whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

(2) Whether or not candidates for President and Vice President should be nominated by national political conventions, as at present, and, if so, recommendations which should be made to the parties for improving the convention process, and, if not, a method which would be preferable.

(3) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where before the election of presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the presidency or for the vice presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

(4) Whether or not provision should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it.

(5) Whether or not a constitutional amendment should be proposed under which failure of candidates for President and Vice President to receive a majority of the electoral votes shall be resolved by popular vote rather than by the House of Representatives.

II. As to succession to the office of President.

(1) Whether the provisions of Public Law 199 of the 80th Congress, approved July 18, 1947, relating to presidental succession, adequately provide for all possible contingencies occasioned by the removal, resignation, death, or inability of both the President and the Vice President.

(2) Whether there are, or should be any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and of any other individual succeeding to the office of President.

(3) Whether or not the term of the Vice President or other individual succeeding to the Presidency should be limited to a duration of approximately 2 years, a new presidential election to coincide with election of Members of the House of Representatives where such individual succeeds to the Presidency during the first or second year of the term for which the President was elected.

III. As to inability of the President to discharge his powers and duties—

(1) How it shall be determined whether the President is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office; and how the extent and duration of such inability shall be determined and defined.

(2) How it shall be decided that the inability requires the constitutional discharge by the Vice President of the powers and duties of the office of President, or results in the succession of the Vice President to the office of President.

(3) What provision should be made to determine a similar inability affecting the Vice President, or other individual, acting during the inability of the President.

(4) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, power, duties, and privileges of an elected President and of any other individual executing the office of President, during a period of temporary Presidential inability.

IV. As to the powers and duties of the President—

(1) Whether the heavy burdens of the Presidency necessitate the creation of an office of Executive Vice President; whether the establishment of such an office requires a constitutional amendment; and what powers and duties of the President should be assigned to such office.

(2) Whether the act of October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 712), which provided generally for the delegation of Presidential functions should be modified or extended.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, including drafts of any legislation recommended and of any proposed constitutional amendments considered necessary or desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1956, and thereupon the existence of the joint committee shall terminate.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ counsel, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, during the quorum call I was asked how the members of the committee stood, and whether they were in favor of the resolution.

By looking at the records, I am able to state that a committee meeting was held on January 25 last. On that occasion all nine members of the committee were present, and all members, regardless of party, voted for the resolution.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM AND POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1478, Senate Resolution 153.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 153) extending the time for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service System and the Postal Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an additional amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was to strike out all after *"Resolved"* and insert:

That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(2) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) procedures, (b) public relations, (c) employee relations, (d) postmaster appointments, (e) research and development, and (f) postal rates.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was on page 2, line 18, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "prior", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(2) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) procedures, (b) public relations, (c) employee relations, (d) postmaster appointments, (e) research and development, and (f) postal rates.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service met and voted unanimously to report the resolution to the Senate. It will be noted that the committee is asking for $75,000, and that in our report to the Committee on Rules and Administration we stated that last year the committee was given $75,000.

We did not finish with the investigation undertaken at that time, and we had remaining from the original appropriations from last year the sum of $49,000. Therefore we are asking this year for only $26,000 with which to conclude the investigation.

We did not get started with the investigation until very late, and at the present time we are still carrying on the studies. We have also appointed men from various sections of the United States to work with us. Many of them are giving us advice without charge, the only payments to them being payments to cover their expenses, but not on the regular per diem basis of $12 a day.

It will be noticed, also, that we are working with the Civil Service Commission in trying to ascertain how we can regulate the postal rates, procedures, and employees' relations. Research is in progress in an effort to see if we cannot economize to a greater extent in the operation of the post offices.

It must be borne in mind that the Post Office Department is not a small concern. It is the biggest business in the United States. It employs 500,000 persons regularly, and there are approximately 500,000 others who are called into service at various and sundry times. So there are approximately a million employees.

There are about 39,000 post offices in the United States, so Senators can well imagine that many requests are coming in, and we are trying to check on them. Our staff is working daily to see if we can make ends meet, or at least bring them nearer together.

There will be a deficit in the Post Office Department of somewhere in the neighborhood of $500 million during the year 1956. It will also be noted that it costs almost $3 billion to operate the Post Office Department. So, Mr. President, we are not dealing in small figures, as can be readily seen.

Mr. President, this is a very important matter. We are just in the midst of an investigation, and we feel that we have done a great deal of good work already.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to check with the distinguished Senator with reference to the figure of $26,254.16. It is true that last year we authorized $75,000, but we thought it was not unreasonable, under the circumstances, particularly in view of the fact that the money is over and above the regular allocations for standing committees under the Legislative Reorganization Act, that the amount be made $50,000, which is almost double what was used last year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I must say that we need the amount we have stated. It will be noted that every subcommittee of which I am a member has returned money to the Treasury.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, we wish to return some money to the Treasury, but we also desire to cut down the expenditures for committees which year after year have increased from a million and a half dollars some years ago to approximately $3 million, and, finally, with the amounts suggested for the special committees at this session, to over the $5-million mark. I hope we shall receive some support on both sides of the aisle in making some modest reductions which will not interfere with the work, but merely cut down the top-side level. In all cases we have suggested the amounts the committees had last year, but we are willing to go a little beyond that. I do not think that is an unreasonable request, under all the circumstances.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to answer the Senator's comment. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will verify the statement that we did not get under way until June, and then a great deal of expense was built up. We cannot figure by considering what was spent last year and say what will be spent this year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My information is that there are 977 postmasterships in connection with which even the preliminary cards have not been sent out.

It seems to me that every committee has its primary obligation to carry on the work which comes within the constitutional responsibility of Congress and carry on its normal legislative load. I do not mind committees getting off into additional fields, but it seems to me that under the circumstances we should have some cooperation. The sum which I have suggested as a possible amendment, though I have not offered an amendment yet, is not unreasonable, in view of the record of the committee

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to reply to the Senator with regard to the cards which he has mentioned. They have all been ordered out, but they were not sent out until the latter part of last week. I am sure the Senator will find his card in his office at the present time. A batch of appointments were sent down about 2 weeks ago. We always make a check to see whether the Veterans' Preference Act has been violated. We do that before we send the cards. The cards were sent out to every Senator last week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I correctly understand that all the cards have gone out for the appointments pending before the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have just been informed by the staff director to that effect. They went out last week.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us whether the subjects investigated have broadened since the investigation started?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, they have.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent? Into what other subjects is the committee looking, in addition to what was in contemplation when the resolution of last year was adopted?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. One of them is the investigation of post offices and postmasters, and we are checking into postal rates at the present time. We were waiting on the House of Representatives, and for that reason we could not move for a time.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the committee did not get under way last year until about May.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was the latter part of May before we got under way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee the same number of employees now it had from May to January last year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No. We had to search for people to come in.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice from the budget estimate that the committee expects to employ eight persons.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think that is true, including the staff director, who will be employed by the day.

That is two more than we have at the present time, and we expect to employ them. There are not that many employees now. There are two on the list whom we have not employed, because we did not know whether the money would be forthcoming, and we first wanted to make certain.

Mr. ELLENDER. The budget calls for the employment of eight persons, does it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator does not expect to employ more than that number, does he?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No more than that at any time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I was pleased that the distinguished chairman of the committee made the statement he made to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in regard to the mailing of cards by the committee in connection with the appointments of postmasters. My office during the past few days has been bombarded with calls in regard to the postmastership appointments. As I understand, the cards have been mailed, and we can anticipate some action being taken by the committee on these appointments in the very near future.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; the cards have gone out. As the Senator from Kansas knows, he having been chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, when a thousand postmaster nominations are received at one time, it is not an easy job to process them and to send out the cards. It is necessary to do certain work on the nominations prior to the time the cards are mailed.

Mr. CARLSON. I sincerely appreciate the work of the chairman and the committee staff. I know that he is giving the matter earnest attention. There are at present 977 postmaster nominations before the committee, of which 585 were renominated from last session and have been before the committee since January 25, 1956.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to serve in the minority for 14 of the 18 years I have been a Member of Congress. I have never held up a single postmaster appointment on the basis of politics to embarrass a Member of Congress or his appointments, or the people of the community from which it originated. I firmly believe in the civil-service procedures, rules, and regulations. I know that it is the policy of the chairman of the committee to follow those procedures and rules. It was the policy which was followed when I was the chairman of the committee for 2 years.

I sincerely hope that we may get action promptly on the postmaster nominations now before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I feel that the committee has done a pretty good job on the nominations.

Mr. CARLSON. I give the chairman credit for the work which has been done. There are problems to be solved, and I know the pressure the chairman receives. However, either one believes in the civil-service method of the appointment of postmasters, or he does not. So long as we have these procedures, rules, and regulations, I think that members of both the minority and the majority of the Senate should follow through on that basis.

I sincerely hope the minority leader will not press his amendment for a reduction in the amount sought. While last year the committee spent only $26,000, the committee appointed Mr. Jim Watson, director of the National Civil Service League, to assist in its work. Everyone who is familiar with the civil-service work will recognize that he and his advisory group will do an outstanding, nonpartisan job in trying to supply the committee with information which is needed in connection with the solving of civil-service problems.

On that basis, and also on the basis of the appointment of a very substantial number of outstanding citizens, whom the chairman has appointed as advisers to the Subcommittee on Post Office Affairs, I think the funds which the chairman has requested are warranted, and I sincerely hope they will be approved.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Kansas. Last year the committee considered 1,400 nominations of postmasters. Of that number, 1,100 were reported favorably by the committee, and 2 or 3 were rejected on the floor of the Senate. A good many of them were received during the last few days of the session and were held for investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator realizes, does he not, that the Senate last year made extra help available to the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was done in order to take care of situations similar to the one referred to by the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To what extra help does the Senator refer?

Mr. ELLENDER. The extra clerical help, four persons in number, which, I understand, was authorized to the committee last year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, under the Reorganization Act, as do all other committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. As in the case of other committees, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has four professional assistants.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee also has six clerical assistants.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition, the committee has a few other employees; does it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It has one, a girl stenographer; that is all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Only one?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, when the matter was considered last year—I was trying to locate in the RECORD the colloquy between us—I believe a statement was made to the effect that the committee expected to complete its special work by this year. Now the committee is asking for additional funds. I wonder if the Senator can give us an estimate of when the investigation will be completed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly hope it will be completed on time. That is what we are working toward. The matter of looking over an organization as large as the Post Office Department is an almost continuous process. I think everyone will acknowledge that, including the Senator from Louisiana. But so far as this particular kind of investigation is concerned, I hope it will cease after the present investigation has been concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean this will be the last time he will need to ask for funds?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am hoping it will be.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why cannot the Senator tell us that it will be the last time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course, the Senator knows I cannot do that. However, I shall do my best to try to bring the matter to a conclusion.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Am I properly informed that even though the request is for $75,000, approximately $25,000 is new money, with $50,000 carried over from last year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is exactly what has happened.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Actually the amount will be eleven-twelfths of the $75,000, with approximately $50,000 of the amount carried over as unexpended from last year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. We spent $25,000, and $50,000 was carried over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 18, it is proposed to insert the word "prior."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 3, line 4, to strike out "$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$60,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment. The committee needs every cent asked for in the resolution before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 2, line 14, to strike out the word "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March"; and on page 3, line 4, to strike out the figure "$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$68,750."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 14, to strike out the word "February" and insert in lieu thereof the word "March"; and on page 3, line 4, to strike out "$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$68,750."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 153), as amended, was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(2) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) procedures, (b) public relations, (c) employee relations, (d) postmaster appointments, (e) research and development, and (f) postal rates.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $68,750, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1479, Senate Resolution 154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 154) extending the time for a study of the Government employees' security program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an additional amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was to strike out all after *"Resolved"* and insert:

That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the administration of the Government employees' security program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1956, to July 31, 1956, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than July 31, 1956.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $49,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, on page 2, line 12, after the word "the," where it appears the first time, to insert "prior", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the administration of the Government employees security program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1956, to July 31, 1956, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than July 31, 1956.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $49,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it will be noted that in the resolution the committee asks for $49,000. We expect that from last year's appropriation, so we are asking for no new appropriation at all.

The reason why the committee did not complete its inquiry is that the departments were not able to furnish us with the data which the committee requested. The departments are working up the data, and will furnish them to us at a later date.

It will also be noted that a great many hearings were had concerning the subject matter of the resolution. I think a great deal of good has been accomplished. Even the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Young, stated:

I think that the work of this committee, the work of Senator HENNINGS' committee, the Humphrey Commission on the security program will all be helpful in throwing new light on developing new ideas as to how a security program can be handled.

Certainly, I am not one who has a closed mind with respect to this program or that program or that it is perfect and say it can't be improved.

He said further:

I would like to see your thinking and the thinking of this committee directed in the channel of how the program could be modified or made simpler in terms of dealing with the ordinary applicant records or screening 27,000 people coming into the Federal service a month.

The investigation disclosed that each department operated differently from the other departments. It was disclosed by the investigation that good practices engaged in by one department were unknown by other departments.

I believe the facts developed by the investigation will be of help to the people of the United States. Great cost was incurred in the firing and rehiring of employees. It was learned that in one department alone 416 employees had been fired and rehired, at a cost of $970,029.61. That was an average cost of $2,331.80 for each suspension in the system. I believe a great many employees

would not have been fired and rehired if a better system had been in effect than that which is now operating.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, during the last session of Congress the committee received $125,000 to complete its work. By reappropriating $49,000, it will mean the Senate committee will be able to complete its work on the basis of the $125,000 which has already been appropriated. In other words, this amounts to a reappropriation of unexpended balances of last year's funds. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I hope so.

Mr. ELLENDER. And a report is to be made not later than July 31 of this year. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to clear up one technical point. In considering previous resolutions which provided for committees for a year, the acting majority leader, because of the passage of time before consideration of the resolutions, reduced the amounts originally asked for by one-twelfth. Inasmuch as the committee now under discussion was established to operate for 6 months, I assume the understanding is that the amount requested will be reduced by one-sixth.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I had not discussed that matter, but I was hopeful that the committee would be able to use the $49,000 requested. The committee had to reduce its operations somewhat, and I did not know what was going to happen.

Mr. KNOWLAND. One month has elapsed even under the terms of the extension resolution. If a committee which is to serve for 1 year has its request reduced by one-twelfth, it seems to me that a committee which will serve for 6 months should have its appropriation reduced by one-sixth.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can see the Senator's point from a mathematical standpoint.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is also from a practical standpoint.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator will yield at that point, I should like to explain that originally the $49,000 item would have expired on July 31, 1957. The resolution, as proposed to be amended by the committee, calls for a termination date of July 31, 1956. Therefore, the $49,000 would have to be apportioned in such a way that it could be spent by July 31, 1956, instead of by January 31, 1957.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that. But under the continuing resolution, 1 month of that period has passed. On that basis, in the case of similar resolutions, the total amounts have been reduced by one-twelfth, if 1 month of the 12 months' period had passed. My point is that since 1 month of the 6 months' period has now passed, the amount should be reduced by one-sixth.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. Of course, on that basis, any part of the $49,000 not spent by July 31, 1956, would be returned; I think that is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, aside from the technical point involved, I wish to ask whether this resolution will call for a duplication—and perhaps an unnecessary duplication—of the study the bipartisan Commission is making of the same subject matter. That Commission was established under action taken at the last session of Congress, and the Commission is now functioning.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is difficult to answer that question. Certainly many things have happened since the Commission was appointed and since it began its work under the authority given by the resolution creating it.

Our committee began its job, but has not completed it. Certainly we shall try to complete it by July 31, and certainly it is very important that the work be completed.

As I stated a while ago, perhaps when the Senator from California was not in the Chamber, Philip Young, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, has commended our committee for the work it has done; and he has said that our work will be of a great deal of help to the Civil Service Commission, in coordinating such activities on the part of all the Government departments. The Civil Service Commission has found that each of the Government departments has been engaging in a different kind of loyalty program.

In the course of its work, our committee has been able to point out some of the difficulties which have been encountered, and has been able to contribute to a solution of the problem, with the result that the program may be able to function in a more perfect way. I think the other groups will profit by the work our committee has done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had thought that was the reason why the bipartisan Commission—established under the resolution submitted, as I recall, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], was created, namely, to do that very job. In that connection, I recognize that there is responsibility on both sides of the aisle and among Senators on both sides of the aisle in the case of the Committee on Rules and Administration, through which the resolution has to pass.

But I hope we shall avoid unnecessary duplication in the very field of activity which, so far as I recall, is precisely the one with which the bipartisan Commission was established to deal.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me read what Philip Young has said about this very matter:

> I think that the work of this committee, the work of Senator HENNINGS' committee, the Humphrey Commission on the security program will all be helpful in throwing new light on developing new ideas as to how a security program can be handled.

I think that answers that particular question.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina to the fact that the bipartisan Commission on Government Security, created under the resolution submitted and sponsored by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], has been organized and is functioning, and is at present appealing in the usual manner to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress for sufficient funds with which to conduct its work.

I would say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I am not suggesting that that is necessarily a reason for curtailing the splendid work of his committee. In fact, the hearings held by his committee have been used by, and are most valuable in connection with the work of, the Commission of which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and I happen to be members.

I should like to state for the RECORD that the Commisison on Government Security is composed of 2 Senators, 2 Members of the House of Representatives, 2 Under Secretaries or Assistant Secretaries from the Government departments, and 6 private citizens. The Commission is charged with reporting at the end of this calendar year. The Commission is working not only on the subject of studying the Government employees' security programs, but, along with that study, on the general security program of the Nation.

I repeat that the splendid work done by the Senator's committee is being made use of by that Commission, will continue to be used by it, and will be most useful to it. I assume that the money now being requested is necessary in order for the Senator's committee to be able to publish the results of its work. I hope that if we approve this resolution, we shall not embarrass or hamper the work of the bipartisan Commission. Inasmuch as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is not at present in the Chamber, let me say that I hope the granting of the funds requested by the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina will not result in a duplication of the work of the bipartisan Commission, will not militate against having the Commission receive the full support of Congress, and will not prevent the Commission from finishing its work. Certainly the Commission should not be hampered, but should complete its work. It was created by unanimous vote of the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hope there will be no interference with the work of the Commission. I trust it will make full use of our committee's records and hearings which I hope, will be very helpful to the Commission. I think the Commission has already acknowledged that they have been helpful.

The resolution under which our committee is proceeding was adopted by the Senate before the bipartisan Commission

was created. Our committee began its investigation before the Commission's investigation was begun. However, I did not object to the Humphrey resolution, calling for the creation of the Commission, because the Commission was to be bipartisan in nature, and was to be composed of Members of both Houses.

We shall be glad to have the Commission use our records. I believe it likely that the reports of the two groups will be somewhat similar. Certainly two reports of that sort will have more force and effect than only one would have.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Is the money now under discussion to be used for completing the report of the Senator's committee, or will it be used to hold further hearings?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. Last year we had $125,000. Of that amount, we spent $76,000, and had $49,000 left.

The present request is to enable the committee to finish the work it has begun. We have even limited the time to July 31.

Mr. COTTON. My question is whether it is contemplated that the funds now requested will be used to hold further hearings, or whether they will simply be used to prepare the report on the work the committee already has done.

Mr. JOHNSTON OF South Carolina. These funds are for the purpose of the preparation of the report, and also to enable the committee to digest the reports which are coming in from various governmental departments. If some other matter is brought to our attention, of course there will have to be additional hearings. No one can tell whether further hearings will be necessary; I do not know whether they will be. I hope we shall not have to have any more hearings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to discuss a little further with the Senator from South Carolina that very point, and I should also like to discuss it with the distinguished minority member of the committee. Originally the committee was to make its report, presumably, by January 1956; and now an extension is being requested in the case of the unexpended funds, amounting to $49,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have some assurance on behalf of both the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee that if such a continuation is made—particularly in view of the fact that there is a certain amount of duplication with the work of the bipartisan Commission—it will result in the completion of the work and the making of the report, so that in June or July we shall not be faced with a request for further funds and further extensions. I think it is important both to the Senator and to his committee, as well as the staff, to know that the termination date will be July 31.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can speak only for the committee. When we were drafting this resolution we knew that the termination date in all the other resolutions was January 1 of next year. The committee voted unanimously to make this termination date July 31, 1956.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may I inquire of the minority member [Mr. CARLSON] as to his understanding?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am sure the chairman will agree with me that the resolution, as originally introduced, provided for an expiration date of January 1, 1957, and that $10,000 additional was requested. Our committee, on my own motion, adopted an amendment providing that we continue to request the balance of $49,000 which was left in the fund, and that the work terminate as of July 31, 1956. As the chairman has stated—and I know he will agree with me—it was stated in committee that it was not planned to hold further hearings. However, I think he is correct in stating that if something should develop requiring the attention of the committee, it ought not to be in a position in which it could not hold additional hearings. It is not our intention to hold additional hearings. It is our intention to get together the information. As stated by the chairman, the reports from various agencies have been delayed to some extent. So I think the chairman is on solid ground.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We asked for those reports months ago.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is correct.

I, for one, feel that the termination date should be July 31, 1956; and so far as I am concerned, it will be.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank both Senators. On the basis of the discussion on the floor I withdraw the objection which I had to the resolution. When the discussion is concluded, at the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment on page 2, line 8, to change "February" to "March," since the month of February will have passed; also an amendment, in conformity with our previous colloquy, on page 2, line 22, to change "$49,000" to "$40,833.34."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Pursuant to what the Senator from California has just stated, as the resolution shows, the figure of $49,000 is for 6 months, beginning February 1. Inasmuch as the committee has already obtained money for a month from the contingent fund of the Senate, money for only 5 months of operations should be required. The appropriation would be, in round figures, about $8,000 a month. For 5 months, in round figures, the appropriation would be $40,000; no more should be needed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can see the mathematics involved. However, the work of the committee will be slightly crippled.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee has already been paid out of the contingent fund for this month.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I realize that.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I am saying. So enough money to operate for 5 months should be sufficient.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not objecting to such an amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume the minority leader will offer it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall offer it at the appropriate time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly there should be no objection to such an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the additional amendment reported from the Committee on Rules and administration.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 12, in the amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, after the word "the", at the beginning of the line, it is proposed to insert "prior."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated, to the amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the word "from", it is proposed to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on the same page, in line 22, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$49,000" and insert "$40,833.34."

The amendments to the amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as amended, were agreed to.

The amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 154), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the administration of the Government employees security program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1956, to July 31, 1956, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than July 31, 1956.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $40,833.34, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MINERALS, MATERIALS, FUELS, AND CERTAIN OTHER MATTERS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1477, Senate Resolution 183.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 183) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make a study of minerals, materials, and fuels, and certain other matters within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, after the words "with the", to insert "prior", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) minerals, materials, and fuels;

(2) irrigation, reclamation, and power development;

(3) public lands;

(4) Indians;

(5) Territories and insular affairs;

(6) national parks; and

(7) resource management and development.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $177,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SHIPMENT OF TANKS TO SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I intend to speak only very briefly—probably for not more than 7 minutes—on a subject which I think is of very great importance not only to the Senate, but to the country.

The attention of the country, and indeed of the entire world, continues to be riveted on the Middle East. We have, indeed, witnessed a most disturbing spectacle—a spectacle of indecision, a spectacle of seeming insincerity, a spectacle of apparent secretiveness on the part of the Department of State.

I refer, of course, to the shipment of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia. When the news came out, it seemed incredible. It was almost, as the New York Times called it, preposterous. And at this point, I should like to insert into the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the Sunday edition of the New York Times on this question.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON JORDAN'S STORMY BANKS

There is just one kind of adjective for the project revealed and interrupted early Friday morning to send 18 United States tanks to Saudi Arabia. We might use the word preposterous. Somebody blundered in sanctioning this arrangement. Somebody blundered in the apparent belief that the tanks had already been shipped. Somebody blundered even more egregiously in keeping the whole matter secret until it chanced to be exposed. Senator GEORGE suggests an investigation—it seems a good idea.

It is not that there is anything illegal in getting rid of some surplus military equipment. It is ingenuous rather than sinful to consider, as we seem to have considered, as the British apparently still believe and as the French may have thought, that equipment of this sort will under no circumstances be used for aggressive purposes and will somehow contribute to the cause of peace.

The tragic irony of the episode is partly in its revelation of a kind of befuddlement in our Near Eastern foreign policy. We have been hesitating to send arms or money for arms to the little State of Israel, whose Government fears the power of its Arab neighbors when that power is fortified by jet planes, tanks, guns, and submarines provided by Communist governments. But certainly we do not improve this situation when we increase the military strength of a country that can easily threaten Israel from the east as Egypt threatens it from the south and east.

The truth is that there can be no security in arming both sides in the Middle East, or even in arming one side against the other. Let us suppose that we try to keep the balance even between the Israeli and the 40-odd million Arabs whose rulers would like to see the State of Israel destroyed. Let us suppose that the Moscow-dominated Communist states have committed themselves to the opposing policy of giving the Arab States military superiority. The end of an arms race on this scale is likely to be war, and the outcome of a war in the Middle East could be the one thing we all so greatly dread, a war on a vaster scale. Out of such a conflict, whether limited or expanded, there could come no good for anybody. Israel would be wrecked. The Arab States would be less vulnerable only because they are less developed—only because of the technological backwardness which keeps their populations in poverty and which it ought to be the ambition of the Western World to relieve.

Chairman Nahum Goldmann of the Jewish Agency for Palestine indicated a more hopeful future in a statement given out toward the end of the week after his return from a trip to Israel. It is true that he pleaded for a new supply of "defensive weapons" from the United States. But he went on to say: "The desire for peaceful settlement of its outstanding issues with the Arab States and primarily with Egypt has never been stronger in Israel than it is today. * * * The establishment of good neighbor relations and creative manifold cooperation between the Arab States and Israel on the basis of equal and mutual self-respect would be a boon for all the peoples of the Near East. It would indeed provide the foundation for an unprecedented development of the entire area."

Political considerations alone stand in the way of an extensive development of the power and water of the Jordan and the Yarmuk Rivers. If peace were reasonably certain over a long period of time, if Western capital investments could be guaranteed, if Western grants could be wisely spent without interruption, if provision could be made for the permanent resettlement of nearly a million Arab refugees and their children, if these ancient lands at the eastern crossroads of the Mediterranean could be opened fully to Western civilization—if all this could be done there could be peaceful and fruitful competition between the people of Zion and their Arab neighbors.

This possible development has been indicated by Secretary Dulles of the United States and by Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold of the United Nations and by others. It stirs enthusiasm. Who could feel the same rejoicing in millions of dollars dissipated on fighting planes and other instruments of destruction? What can weapons do that an American-backed guaranty against aggression cannot do?

Of course we settle nothing by pinning down 18 tanks on the Brooklyn docks. We would settle nothing by pouring $50 millions, more or less, into armaments for Israel. But money spent and services rendered to save the water, to create power and to make the desert bloom might make a future for democracy in a large part of the world where there has been little democracy in times past.

Mr. LEHMAN. First it was suddenly disclosed that these 18 tanks were being shipped to Saudi-Arabia. This disclosure came as the tanks were on the pier, at the ship's side, ready to be shipped out of the country to Saudi-Arabia—a country which has declared its undying enmity for Israel, a country whose supreme leader and monarch has declared that it was worth the lives of millions of Arabs to destroy and extinguish Israel—to cut it out of the Middle East like a cancer, he said.

On orders from the White House, the shipment was stopped. Then on Saturday, the orders were reversed and the shipment has been allowed to go forward. When the shipment of tanks to Saudi-Arabia was stopped, our State Department apparently thought it would be a clever move to stop simultaneously the shipment of spare automobile parts and other equipment, to the value of $100,000, to Israel. This is what this administration calls a policy of impartiality.

Now the tanks are on the high seas, on their way to Saudi-Arabia, and the few crates of automobile parts and other miscellany have been allowed to proceed to Israel. This is impartiality, in the view of this administration.

I am not going to quarrel at this point—I think it is too late—about the shipment of these tanks to Saudi-Arabia. The fault for this lies in the original negotiation of the arrangement for the shipment of these tanks to Saudi-Arabia and for the continued toleration of this contract arrangement

during this period of increasing tension in the Middle East, when it has been apparent to all that the slightest spark might create a tragic conflagration in that area.

The fault further lies in the fact that the State Department had withheld information with respect to this arrangement from the American public, and had tried to guard it, and only let it out at the very last moment when these tanks were on the dock ready to go, and when news concerning the shipment had already leaked out.

This is but another illustration of the consistent policy of this administration of failing—indeed, of refusing—to take the public into its confidence. But of course the real trouble goes far deeper and involves much more than the question of shipping 18 tanks to Saudi-Arabia.

We have a tense and dangerous situation in the Middle East, a situation which threatens the peace of the entire world, and which threatens our vital interests in the Middle East—a situation in which the security of the tiny sister republic which we helped to establish, and to defend, and to launch upon the ways of nationhood, is sorely threatened. We face a situation in which the whole security of the Middle East—the whole situation in the Middle East—has been radically changed by the injection of Soviet and Communist influence into this area by the negotiation of a deal whereby vast quantities of arms have been, and are being, shipped to Egypt by the satellite state of Czechoslovakia. Great numbers of Soviet technicians now walk the streets of Cairo and Alexandria. The Soviets have arrived in the Middle East!

Egypt and Saudi-Arabia are allied by treaty. They are allied by common purpose. One of those common purposes—perhaps the chief one of those common purposes—is the destruction of Israel.

What do we do to counter this development, the shipment of arms to Egypt by the Communists? We proceed to ship tanks to Saudi Arabia.

Could anything be more preposterous? Could anything be more incredible? Could anything be more ill advised?

Instead of moving posthaste to redress the balance of forces in the Middle East by supplying arms to Israel, while at the same time moving by every means within our power to put limits on the arms race in the area and to bring this threat to the peace of the world under control, we add fuel to the fire. We increase the imbalance of forces in the area. We strengthen the forces and the temptations of Saudi Arabia and of Egypt to seek a military solution of the problem—a solution that would drag the whole free world into war.

I know the justification that is made for the supplying of these tanks to Saudi Arabia—that we have a base in Saudi Arabia and that the maintenance of our base is related to the agreement on our part to supply some equipment to Saudi Arabia.

Mr. President, I am not a great military expert. I am in no position to judge the importance of any particular base or to sit in judgment on the merits of an arrangement whose details are unknown to me, with the government of Saudi Arabia.

I do know, however, that it is extremely shortsighted to make our plans and designs on the basis of narrow strategic factors, without taking into consideration the much broader, the much more important factors of political reality.

What good will it do us to have a base in Saudi Arabia if thereby we so muddy the waters in this area that we cannot see right from wrong, nor distinguish what our real interest is?

Our real interest is in peace. Our real interest is in security for all countries in this area. Our real interest is in the preservation of the Republic of Israel, a pilot light for democracy in this entire area. Our real interest is in the economic liberation of all the peoples of this area from feudalism, poverty, hunger, and ignorance.

That is where our interest lies, Mr. President, and that is what we ought to be concentrating on. For the moment, we must supply arms to Israel. But even as we do so, we should bring to bear every available energy and resource upon the main problem—the problem of stability, the problem of peace, the problem of security, and the problem of eliminating the hostility and antagonism in this area, rather than of feeding its fires.

By such devices as this sale of tanks to Saudi Arabia, and by the Baghdad Pact—two very inconsistent policies, by the way—we do not accomplish anything which adds to our security or which resolves any central problems. We do not in this way neutralize the Soviet influence in this area.

Quite the contrary. We intensify the effects of the Soviet intervention. We attach ourselves as a tail to the Soviet kite.

We need a bold policy, a long-range policy. We need, above all, a policy. That which we are now pursuing has none of the earmarks of a policy. It has all the indications of a haphazard collection of programs, narrowly conceived and awkwardly executed. Our prestige, I am told, in the Arab countries, has fallen to a new low point. Our prestige in Israel has dropped dangerously.

I believe, Mr. President, that this whole situation needs to be investigated. I think it needs to be exhaustively reviewed, from one end to the other, by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Secretary of State, and his chief lieutenants, need to be subjected to the test of justification and cross-examination by the members of the Foreign Relations Committee in order to determine what they think we are doing in this area. They should be required to justify before our colleagues, who are experts in foreign relations, the various bits and pieces of programs now being pursued in this tense and perilous part of the world.

I hope the Foreign Relations Committee, without the loss of another minute, will undertake an investigation of the whole terrible and explosive and unjustifiable and inexcusable policy, or lack of policy. I pray that the Foreign Relations Committee will take the matter in hand without any further loss of time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], with regard to the very serious Middle East situation. I believe we ought to ponder now the statement that was reportedly made by the Secretary of State not so long ago in which he advocated taking the Middle East issues out of foreign policy debate. That statement, in my judgment, now takes on new meaning, particularly when it is remembered that the statement was made at a time when the State Department had knowledge that the shipment of tanks was in the offing and that it was only by chance that public disclosure of it was made.

I agree with the Senator from New York that the matter should be very thoroughly considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have made known to the chairman of the committee that I believe not only Mr. Dulles but also Mr. Allen and Mr. Hoover should be brought before the committee for a thorough discussion of our foreign policy in the Middle East.

I cannot accept the proposition that the tanks are being sent to Saudi Arabia in order to help keep down internal disorder, anymore than I could previously accept—and I protested at the time—the statement that the shipment of arms to Iraq was for the same purpose. I cannot escape the fact that we are dealing with totalitarian governments in these instances. Our Government ought to be supporting free nations, not totalitarian nations. We do not help the cause of freedom any by supporting Communist governments or Fascist governments or any other form of totalitarian governments. I am against supplying arms to totalitarian governments under the pretext of helping them keep down internal disorders.

When we talk about internal disorders, I have the suspicion that if I happened to be a citizen of such a country probably I would be among the dissident groups. As a liberal, I probably would be fighting for human freedom and against totalitarian procedures that keep down human freedom in such totalitarian regimes.

Therefore, I am not impressed by the argument of the State Department to the effect that arms are being shipped to the Arab States in order to assist a totalitarian government in keeping down internal disorder. We don't help the cause of freedom by supporting governments that throttle freedom. Arabian oil isn't worth such a price. Further, I fear that these military shipments to the Arab States increases the possibility of war in the Middle East.

Likewise, Mr. President, and I cannot accept the alibi of the State Department that it will lift the embargo on airplane parts and other equipment for Israel. That cannot be considered to be a course of impartiality with regard to our policy in the Middle East, particularly—if I am reliably informed—when proposed shipments of military equipment to Israel will be of a value of $100,000 and when the cost of 1 tank to Saudi Arabia is as much as $135,000.

Furthermore, I believe we need to have answers from the administration to some

questions with regard to how valuable and feasible an airbase is in Saudi Arabia. I am not particularly in favor of maintaining airbases which may not be militarily feasible. I understand that there is some question now as to the feasibility for defense purposes of this particular airbase in Saudi Arabia.

I should like to know some facts about that situation. Neither am I particularly enthusiastic about the possibility of getting into a conflict in the Middle East over British colonial economic chestnuts. I am not desirous of following a course of action which might lead to sacrificing American boys in support of British economic colonial policy.

Therefore, I believe, there are many questions that should be asked of Mr. Dulles. As I have been heard to say before, there is no substitute for full public disclosure of American foreign policy. I believe it is highly desirable that we reduce Government by secrecy in this country and that more public disclosure be made as to what our foreign policy is.

I should like to know what, if any, understandings about which we have not been informed were entered into with Mr. Eden when he was in this country in regard to the Middle East. I do not find it particularly acceptable, if the releases which have been issued are correct, that there was an understanding that the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Foreign Minister of France should get together and decide upon what they think would be a good course of action in the Middle East. I question such a procedure because it constitutes a circumvention of the United Nations. I thought we entered into the United Nations with the understanding that we were going to use it as an instrumentality for preserving peace. I hold no brief for, nor do I condone the violation of any true or any international understanding on the part of Israel. If Israel has violated any of her international commitments, I hold no brief for her. However, such issues should be adjudicated before the United Nations, through its juridical processes. Our Government should be taking the lead in raising the Middle East issues before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

What a great change would take place if the United States would use its good offices to insist that the United Nations go into a full-dress debate and consideration of the Middle East tensions which are a threat to world peace. I would have much more confidence in such a procedure than I would have in any understanding reached by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Foreign Minister of France in respect to the Middle East. I think any arrangement reached by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Secretary of State of the United States and the Foreign Minister of France would subject us to more and more criticism around the world as to our international policies.

I hope that such problems as I have discussed will be raised by the Foreign Relations Committee with Dulles, Allen, and Hoover of the State Department. I think as many public disclosures as may be possible should be made available to the people of the United States, because it is the American people who will die by the millions if Dulles stumbles off the brink and into war in the Middle East. I have no confidence in his equilibrium. I think he is following a dangerous warlike course in his foreign policy. That is why I think we need a new Secretary of State, and quickly, until such time as we can have a new administration that will follow a foreign policy that is not running the great risk of war that this administration is running. We are confronted with not only this great trouble spot in the Middle East, which is a tinderbox, but we are faced with other trouble spots. I think the American people should know all the facts about American foreign policy, including the editors of America who are prone to write so many editorials about it but who know very little about it. Nor can they know very much about it until we stop Government by secrecy in foreign policy.

Mr. President, I think one of the most terrifying experiences I have had in a long time I had a week ago Sunday night. I was a guest at the home of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. He had invited for a briefing and a discussion a former Member of this body, Bill Benton, of Connecticut, and Mr. Stewart Alsop, of the Alsop brothers, who discussed their trip to Russia this past summer. On the basis of that evening of enlightening discussion I should like to comment on a terrifying impression I carried away with me as to what is happening in Russia educationwise, when it comes to the matter of training scientists.

I am sure Mr. Benton would not object to my saying, because he said something to the same effect in a public speech downtown, that probably the greatest education need we shall have in the next 15 or 20 years will be the training of scientists—brainpower trained in the sciences. He pointed out the great emphasis in Russia, in its educational program, on training physicists, chemists, and engineers.

We know we are already suffering in this country from a great shortage of engineers and scientists. I have not had it checked by the Congressional Library, but I think it is probably a very accurate figure when I say that almost half the high schools in the United States today do not even offer a course in physics and chemistry. Yet, if we make a plea for an adequate Federal program for aid to education it is spoken of as being creeping socialism. We must recognize before it is too late that we must keep ahead of Russia in brainpower in this great struggle of the century between freedom and totalitarianism.

It was pointed out by Mr. Benton that when in Moscow he desired to find some place to put his 13-year-old son in school for a time so that he could make some observations on the Russian educational system. He wanted his son to enter a school where at least some of the courses were taught in English. The American Embassy in Russia did not know there is a school in Moscow that teaches every class from the first grade through high school, in English; that there is another school which teaches every class in German; another school which teaches every class in French; another school which teaches every class in Italian; and another school which teaches every class in Spanish. The students are selected for a long-term education program, to do what? To be trained as scientists and technicians for export into the areas of the world, where we must win this fight for freedom against Russia. Russia is planning a training program of expert personnel so that she can export them to every part of the world where she hopes to subvert the people of backward areas to communism.

What are we doing? We are falling behind already in the training of scientific brainpower.

I said at that meeting, as I have been saying for a long time, that we ought to keep ahead of Russia in brainpower. I said, "Does this mean we have reached a point where we are no longer ahead?"

The reply was that we are still ahead, because the Russian program has been going on for only 10 years. But, give Russia another 10 years, and let these students get through their scientific training program, and we shall be behind. Already there are many projects in this country that are being delayed because we do not have enough engineers to do the work on the problems involved.

So I say, Mr. President, the time has come not only for a reappraisal, not only for a reexamination, but, in my judgment, for a complete reformation of our policies in this country which are so directly connected with the future of our foreign policy.

The incident in regard to the Middle East is but a symptom of what I think is wrong. So I sincerely hope the Foreign Relations Committee will go forward, as the Senator from New York has suggested, into the kind of investigation we need, but with public disclosures made to the American people. I think it is a tremendous mistake for us to be failing to give the American people the facts about their foreign policy.

Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has just handed me an editorial published in today's Washington News, entitled "Off Again—On Again," from which I should like to quote a paragraph or two:

> Ineptness of American foreign policy in the Middle East never was more shamefully exposed than during the recent off-again, on-again, gone-again shenanigans over the shipment of 18 light tanks to Saudi Arabia.
>
> The White House panicked when advised by the press last Thursday that the tanks were being loaded on a ship in New York—yet the United States Government had made the deal with Saudi Arabia last August.

Last Thursday, when the attention of the State Department was called to the matter, the reply was that they had forgotten about it. All I want to say is that we need a State Department with a memory. Just give me a State Department with a memory, and I shall feel a little more secure. If the State Department can forget this kind of a sale. I wonder what else it is conveniently forgetting.

But, to get back to the editorial:

The President intervened personally. His press secretary called an extraordinary press conference at Thomasville, Ga., after midnight Thursday to announce a temporary embargo on all shipments in the Middle East until Mr. Eisenhower could find out what the tank sale was all about.

Friday and Saturday were crisis days at the State Department. Israel screamed that it would be a foul if the tanks were permitted to go to Saudi Arabia while the United States refused to sell major arms to Israel. The Saudi Arabians screamed foul just as loudly about the embargo and mumbled menacingly that the agreement on the American airbase at Dhahran is up for renegotiation this spring.

I think the editorial does very well to point out the vacillation which has come to characterize so much of State Department policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFF AGAIN—ON AGAIN

Ineptness of American foreign policy in the Middle East never was more shamefully exposed than during the recent off-again, on-again, gone-again shenanigans over the shipment of 18 light tanks to Saudi Arabia.

The White House panicked when advised by the press last Thursday that the tanks were being loaded on a ship in New York—yet the United States Government had made the deal with Saudi Arabia last August. The President intervened personally. His press secretary called an extraordinary press conference at Thomasville, Ga., after midnight Thursday to announce a temporary embargo on all shipments to the Middle East until Mr. Eisenhower could find out what the tank sale was all about.

Friday and Saturday were crisis days at the State Department. Israel screamed that it would be a foul if the tanks were permitted to go to Saudi Arabia while the United States refused to sell major arms to Israel. The Saudi Arabians screamed foul just as loudly about the embargo and mumbled menacingly that the agreement on the American airbase at Dhahran is up for renegotiation this spring.

At 7:30 p. m. Saturday—only 43 hours after the embargo was imposed—it was just as quickly lifted, giving a green light to shipment of the tanks.

This spectacle can only give the impression of indecision and already is provoking extremists such as Congressman CELLER, of New York, to all kinds of ridiculous charges. It can only complicate the highly dangerous situation in the Middle East—where the State Department's top expert, George V. Allen, only last Wednesday publicly declared that there was serious likelihood of war.

The belated State Department explanation of the tank deal shows that it is not something extraordinary. The United States has a military agreement with Saudi Arabia. We got the use of the huge Dhahran airbase in return for agreement to supply that country arms for training its military forces. There is a United States military mission in Saudi Arabia. The agreement to sell the tanks was part of that arrangement.

It is unfortunate that the actual shipment coincides with a crisis in the area which threatens war. It might have been prudent if United States officials had tried to postpone actual shipment at least until the current American-British-French talks on the Middle East were completed.

Eighteen light tanks are not a major arms deal and are not going to be militarily decisive—but handled as they have been, they could be psychologically decisive.

The American people properly can complain about the way their leaders have handled this incident. They have a right to hope that in event of another war in the Middle East their leaders will be more aware of what's going on and better prepared to act with decision, confidence, and dispatch—none of which qualities were evident in the tank incident.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this Middle East fiasco is somewhat on a par with the statement made by the Secretary of State about Goa. He made the statement, in effect, that he thought Goa should stay with the Portuguese, although I drew from him in examination—and it is permissible for me to say this—the admission that the overwhelming percentage of the population of Goa is Indian and is inseparably connected with India.

But when Mr. Dulles was pressed as to why the statement was made about Goa, it was found that the presence of the Portuguese Foreign Minister in the United States had something to do with it, and that we were in negotiation with him concerning the Azores.

Have we reached the point where our foreign policy, as conducted by the Secretary of State, follows the techniques and tactics of David Harum? Or is our foreign policy based upon principles conforming with the historic foreign-policy principles of the United States? I think the Committee on Foreign Relations should find out.

In foreign policy, as in every other issue, when principle is compromised, no principle is left. When an expedient course of action is adopted, ideals are sacrificed. I have no confidence in the policies which are being followed by our State Department. The last fiasco involving the Middle East is only the latest proof of what I think is the sorry record of Mr. Dulles as Secretary of State. What he has done has been backed up by the President, who, time and time again, has underwritten him and has pointed out that, in his opinion, he is a great Secretary of State. The President can have him, but I do not think the American people ought to have to suffer him.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks. I am in full agreement with them. I have watched the situation, has has the Senator from Oregon, for a very long time. I have reached the same conclusions. There is no question that the whole sorry transaction was achieved under the veil of complete secrecy. I doubt very much whether any Senator, or even any member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, had any knowledge of the proposed shipment of the tanks until they were loaded on the ship in Brooklyn. Certainly 3 or 4 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, whom I have interrogated, have told me they had no prior knowledge of it whatsoever.

I again point out what I think is one of the grave dangers to our entire system of Government, and a grave menace in the situation which is now confronting us. Every effort has been made to put a damper on—yes, to stop—any discussion with regard to the explosive situation in the Middle East. A vigorous effort has been made to keep the American people in ignorance of what the situation is, and appeals have been made to them not to discuss or to debate the issue, although no issue could be more important.

This is a serious matter. It is something which I think does irreparable harm to our form of government and to a reasonable, deliberate consideration by the American people, who, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, are the ones of main importance and who have the greater interest in this matter. The action by the State Department has kept them from knowing anything at all about the situation, from debating it, from reaching their conclusions, and from advising their representatives of their will.

I am indeed happy to note that Senators, like the senior Senator from Oregon, and others in whom I have great confidence, as I have in all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, are now interesting themselves in the situation. I hope that an exhaustive, complete, and thorough study of the entire foreign situation as it affects not only the Middle East, which is the area of immediate concern to us, but all other vital areas of the world will be undertaken without any loss of time.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York, and I am pleased to associate myself with him in this colloquy.

DEATH OF HON. WILSON McCARTHY

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, a message received last week announced the death of the Honorable Wilson McCarthy, onetime member of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and one of the West's outstanding citizens.

Mr. McCarthy was a native of Utah and made great achievements in many walks of life. He took part in many economic moves which have brought greater opportunities and prosperity to the Intermountain States.

I met Mr. McCarthy at Columbia Law School, where we were both students. We became fast friends, and several years later served together as assistant county attorneys in Salt Lake County, Utah.

I learned to admire and respect Mr. McCarthy for his integrity, ability, and loyalty to his friends, and for the kindly, gentle friendship he extended to all with whom he came in contact. As a prosecutor, he was always fair in treatment of those being prosecuted, and that was true even though he was a vigorous and efficient prosecutor. At the time Mr. McCarthy was assistant prosecutor in Salt Lake County, the late Judge Harold M. Stephens, chief justice of the District court of appeals, was also one of the assistant prosecutors of Salt Lake County. The friendship which grew up between Wilson McCarthy, Judge Stephens, and myself endured over the years.

Mr. McCarthy not only distinguished himself as a prosecutor, but he later became an outstanding State judge in Utah. His activities covered a wide range—attorney, district judge, State senator, RFC Director, and various business and livestock-company directorships. In all of these fields he distinguished himself.

Early in his career he was an active Latter-day Saints Church worker and missionary. Mr. McCarthy was greatly beloved by the people of the Intermountain West, and his passing has brought sorrow to the people of that area. Funeral services were held in Salt Lake City, Utah, where a large assemblage gathered to pay tribute to him.

Mr. President, the press of the State of Utah commented editorially upon the passing of Wilson McCarthy, and I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the Salt Lake Tribune, Deseret News-Salt Lake Telegram, and the Ogden Standard Examiner be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of February 14, 1956]

WILSON MCCARTHY, A GREAT UTAH SON, PASSES

Wilson McCarthy, a native of Utah, a distinguished citizen of the West and a man of achievement in many walks of life, has passed away at the age of 71.

A remarkable individual, Mr. McCarthy carved for himself a career that brought him renown as a lawyer, jurist, business leader and railroad executive.

To say that he enjoyed the respect of persons in all walks of life, from section hand to statesman is a compliment to which Mr. McCarthy was justly entitled, for he was as much at home in the maze of Washington's governmental affairs as he was with the little fellows for whom his concern was well known.

But for those who knew him he was Judge McCarthy, a warm, quiet, selfless man whose devotion to family and friends far outshadowed the estimable position he had earned for himself among business associates.

Although he had been adopted by Colorado as a result of his position as chief executive of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad, Mr. McCarthy's heart remained in Utah where he was born and reared and where he maintained his home and family.

His beginnings were humble, a circumstance he cherished dearly throughout his lifetime. He was reared in the livestock industry and there established the cornerstone of his diversified career. And livestock retained a consuming interest with him although his acumen carried him into many other fields, not the least of which was politics.

He had a flair for politics which means, simply, that he liked people and understood human nature. In 1914 he was appointed assistant Salt Lake County attorney, and subsequently served as third district attorney, third district judge, and in the State senate. In all these activities he won the respect and admiration for his ability and fairness. He was widely known in Washington and in government generally.

As a young man Mr. McCarthy operated extensive ranching properties in western Canada. He knew the cattle business intimately, not only its basic problems, but also the character of the men who engaged in it. In later years, as president of the Western Livestock Show, he spearheaded the drive for $3½ million coliseum in Denver where the show—in many respects the outstanding one in the country—now is held.

As a member of the Reconstruction Finance Commission, appointed by President Hoover in 1932, Mr. McCarthy played an important role in meeting the challenge of the dark days of panic by reason of his daring, courage, and realistic approach to the many problems involved. He pushed through a policy of extending loans to livestock men at a time when every other avenue was closed to them. For this service, and also for his efforts in behalf of banking institutions, the West—indeed, the whole Nation—owes him a debt of gratitude.

His work on the RFC was followed by his greatest achievement, the rehabilitation of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad which over the years had gone through a series of bankruptcies and receiverships. Appointed cotrustee of the line by the late United States District Judge J. Foster Symes, Mr. McCarthy faced almost insurmountable obstacles and powerful opposition, but he rode it through and became president when the railroad emerged from receivership in 1947. Mr. McCarthy directed the rebuilding and reequipment of the Denver & Rio Grande Western with modern motive power until today it stands as one of the country's great railroads. This he leaves as a monument to himself.

As a railroad executive, Wilson McCarthy was keenly interested in building the area which the line served. The Geneva steel plant was, in a way, the child of his brain, for in the early days of World War II he envisioned the possibility of developing local iron ore, coal and limestone deposits into a vital industry. He saw it brought to fruition when United States Steel built and operated Geneva Steel for the Government. And in the days after the war, when the issue hung in the balance, he helped influence the United States Steel Corp. to bid for the Geneva plant, thus helping establish a permanent steel industry.

Wilson McCarthy had a marvelous personality and the faculty of getting men to do their best. He was a great leader and organizer, who set his goal and then saw that it was attained. He was an indefatigable worker who never spared himself. And above all, he was a gentle, kindly man who never cared for show, preferring the simple things. He loved Utah and always maintained a residence in Salt Lake City, though business usually kept him away.

The Tribune mourns his passing. To his family, who were ever first in his mind, we extend our sincerest sympathy—we share in their loss.

[From the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, of February 14, 1956]

JUDGE WILSON MCCARTHY

Wilson McCarthy was a solid citizen of absolute integrity and of great ability. In his 71 years he became one of the foremost representatives of American railroading and also one of the foremost advocates of the unlimited potential in western industry.

In his many professional fields—attorney, district judge, State senator, RFC director, and various business and livestock company directorships—Mr. McCarthy always dignified the interests he represented. His work in bringing industry to the West was enormously effective over several decades, and under his leadership, the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad rose from a depression-bankrupted organization to become one of the important railroads of the Nation.

Despite his financial and legal genius, Mr. McCarthy's crowning trait was probably his understanding and his magnanimity toward his fellows. He never forgot a friend; he had a warmhearted interest in all of his associates; he knew well how to get along with people; he was a kindly man with an abundance of Irish wit—indeed, Judge McCarthy was human all the way. Perhaps nothing was more remarkable about him than was his gift for friendship and the ease which he did things for others.

In addition to his many business, law, and civic contributions to his own intermountain country, Mr. McCarthy had also served the LDS Church as a missionary, as a member of the Granite Stake High Council, and as a member of the Liberty Stake presidency at a time when it was perhaps the largest stake in the church with 18,000 members.

Until he was stricken 2 weeks ago, Judge McCarthy had the good fortune to work actively and in robust good health into his 72d year. That was the West's good fortune, too. A man of his caliber will be sorely missed by the community.

To his family and his unnumbered circles of friends, admirers and associates, the News extends its condolences and its appreciation for his humanitarianism and his worthwhile services.

[From the Ogden Standard Examiner]

WILSON MCCARTHY

Wilson McCarthy, native Utahan, whose leadership contributed to the solid rehabilitation of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad, died Sunday in Salt Lake City at the age of 71.

Mr. McCarthy was favorably known in several fields, including ranching, the law, and politics, but his greatest contribution to the western region was in a field totally new to him, railroading.

The rejuvenation of the D. & R. G. W. has been described as spectacular. Comparison of the road's equipment, traffic, and earnings today with the figures at the time he became cotrustee will show why the adjective is justified. The improvement began even in the severe depression days and have been continuous.

Wilson McCarthy was a man of good will who built up friendships as well as the railroad he headed. His work will have a lasting effect in this region, where he will be long remembered.

STUDY OF MINERALS, MATERIALS, FUELS, AND CERTAIN OTHER MATTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 183) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make a study of minerals, materials, and fuels, and certain other matters within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The question is in agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 16, to

strike out, "$177,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$140,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from California.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "$177,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$140,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the amendment which has been proposed is to be acted upon now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is under consideration now. It is debatable.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to make a statement.

Mr. President, this resolution would authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to, first, minerals, materials, and fuels; second, irrigation, reclamation, and power development; third, public lands; fourth, Indians; fifth, Territories and insular affairs; sixth, national parks; and seventh, the management and development of all public resources.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course the activities the Senator from Montana has stated are the activities of his committee as set forth in the Legislative Reorganization Act; and for those activities a regular allowance is made by Congress each year.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That allowance amounts to in excess of $111,000.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation coming before our committee falls into 16 different categories, as established by the Reorganization Act; and such matters are handled by 5 standing subcommittees. I may add that these subcommittees now handle the same legislative proposals which, before the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act, were the responsibility of five standing committees of the Senate. Members of the Senate are familiar with the organization and operation of the various subcommittees, and I need not dwell on the difficulties confronting the committee members in their efforts to handle expeditiously the work load on the committee level.

Last year the committee received $137,750. This year we are requesting an additional amount to increase the total to $177,000.

The committee is seeking this increase this year because we have added responsibilities during the present session. Several programs of great significance are being referred to Congress, and they will be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As an example, I cite the national water policy which President Eisenhower has submitted to Congress. It has been under consideration for more than 3 years in the executive branch, and it warrants a most thorough analysis.

The National Park Service is preparing to launch "Mission 66," a long-range operational program for our national park system. Millions upon millions of dollars will be spent to implement this program, if it is adopted. I do not think it unwise for the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to spend some extra funds in making a thorough examination of the recommendations submitted by the executive branch in connection with that program.

Our national resources are worth billions of dollars. It is the responsibility of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to see that those resources are conserved, wisely managed, and properly developed. No member of this body will be able to convince me that the expenditure of $177,000 to assist in the execution of such a program is an example of waste in Government.

Mr. President, when the pending resolution was prepared, it was submitted to each member of the subcommittee, and was studied very carefully by each of them. Then the resolution came before the full committee. The full committee approved the figure of $177,000 as being necessary for carrying on the work. Then the resolution was reported to the Senate and was then referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which approved it.

Therefore, I submit that the resolution should be adopted, as it is, by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, here is another example of a committee which has subdivided itself into many subcommittees. As I pointed out several days ago, that has become a standard practice for many of the Senate's committees.

Last year the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had five subcommittees. The resolution before us today would add 2 more subcommittees, to investigate 2 additional subjects.

As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from California, the Interior Committee has, under the Reorganization Act, certain subjects coming within its jurisdiction. In order to carry out its delegated functions, the committee receives, as a standing committee of the Senate, the usual $111,440, as I recall the figure, with which it can employ up to 4 professional assistants and 6 clerical assistants.

In the last 3 years, the Interior Committee has been obtaining from Congress, in addition to its standard allowance, the following amounts:

During the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the committee obtained $37,500.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress, the committee obtained $46,500.

Last year—as my friend, the Senator from Montana, has indicated—the amount received by the committee was increased from $46,500 to $137,750; and that amount as I have previously pointed out, was in addition to the more than $111,000 which the committee regularly obtains, as a standing committee of the Senate, for its professional staff and its clerical staff.

This year, more subcommittees are sought to be added.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the Senator from Louisiana is mistaken when he says that additional subcommittees are being added. That is not true.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am reading from the committee's report.

Mr. MURRAY. That does not refer to subcommittees; it refers to seven different divisions of the committee's jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but the Senator from Montana says, in his letter, which he has signed——

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Montana says:

> We continue to function through operating subcommittees to handle legislation in five major categories.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct—five. But the Senator from Louisiana said seven.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year the Senator's committee had five. If the Senator from Montana will examine the resolution, he will see that his committee is adding two more.

Mr. MURRAY. Where does the letter refer to two more?

Mr. ELLENDER. The letter refers to minerals.

Mr. MURRAY. But that is not in reference to subcommittees; that has reference to the different subjects over which the committee has jurisdiction, and not to subcommittees.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator proposes to add 2 more, making a total of 7.

Mr. MURRAY. Two more subjects.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are seven categories.

Mr. MURRAY. But those figures do not represent subcommittees with separate staffs. There are the same number of subcommittees, carrying on the activities which are necessary to cover new categories.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator is not proposing to create additional subcommittees, why the additional money? Why is the Senator asking for an additional $40,000?

Mr. MURRAY. Because there is additional work to be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. By the same subcommittees?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; but there must be technical staffs to do the work. Is the Senator familiar, for example, with the activities of the Subcommittee on Irrigation, Reclamation, and Power Development? Can the Senator tell me how much of a staff is necessary to handle that problem? Is the Senator familiar with minerals, materials, and fuels?

Mr. ELLENDER. To some extent.

Mr. MURRAY. How would the Senator handle the problem? How much of a staff would he have?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not so many as the Senator has suggested.

Mr. MURRAY. I will ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], what he thinks about this argument.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to make inquiry of the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Montana can occupy the floor in his own time.

I realize that a great deal of work can be found here and there to put additional employees to work. I am not arguing that point. However, I am calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Reorganization Act of 1946 has provided for every standing committee a specific amount of money with which to operate. If that amount is not sufficient, let us amend the Reorganization Act. Let us make another study of the problem, as was done by the Senate when it adopted the Reorganization Act. If the money we have provided to operate the committees of the Senate is not sufficient, let us provide more funds, but let us provide it in the regular, orderly way, not by haphazardly creating new subcommittees here and there.

It has become the custom in the past 5 or 6 years for most of the committees of the Senate to increase the number of staff members. As I have pointed out, the Committee on the Judiciary is the worst offender. During the past 2 or 3 years the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has increased the number of professionals on its staff.

The Committee on Banking and Currency is also employing additional staffs far various subcommittees.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall gladly yield in a moment. As I pointed out, the Judiciary Committee is one of the classic examples. That committee obtains $159,000 through its regular appropriations, and we are providing for $1,083,000 in addition to the sum which that committee regularly obtains.

The Banking and Currency Committee obtains $111,000 under the standard staff authorization. Last week we provided $100,000 for it to operate the housing subcommittee. In a little while it will come forward with a request for another $100,000 to operate other subcommittees.

We now have pending before us the request of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As I have pointed out, there has been a gradual increase by this committee over and beyond its standard authorization. First it obtained $37,500 additional, and then $46,500. Last year the additional amount was $137,750. For this year $177,000 is being requested. This is not for a special committee or subcommittee which is being appointed to investigate a particular subject and then will go out of existence. I presume these subcommittees will remain with us from now on.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to hear the Senator speak as he does. To add material for thought in this debate, I should like to ask the Senator if he realizes that under the Reorganization Act this committee was allowed 4 professional and 6 clerical members on its staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In addition to those, under special resolutions it has 7 more professional and 4 more clerical workers. Senate Resolution 183 seeks 3 more professional staff members at $10,734.41 a year, or a total of $32,203.23; and it asks for 1 additional stenographer at $5,323.61, a total of $37,526.84 for staff members which we do not now have. We have doubled the number of staff members required by the Reorganization Act. I say, as a member of the committee—and I say it in all fairness to the chairman of the committee—that these men are not being utilized properly, or we would not need as many as we have today. I am glad to hear the Senator from Louisiana fighting for some sense in the allocation of money for these committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out, if this appropriation is approved for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, it will have a substantially larger staff than was provided under the original Reorganization Act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. By more than double.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not that much; but there will be quite a few more.

As I have stated, there has been an increase in the committee's staff from year to year. These additional funds are not to operate special committees to make investigations of a particular subject, report to the Congress and then disband. They are to be used to finance continuing subcommittees, which will stay in business year after year, studying the same subject matter over and over. In other words, Mr. President, this is not a 1-year proposition that we are voting on. It is for a permanent corps of workers who will have to be kept on year after year. For that reason, I hope the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will be agreed to.

GROWTH OF GOVERNMENT REQUIRES APPROPRIATION INCREASES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think we could point out, if we investigated the situation from the top down, from the President of the United States on down, that there have been increases all along the line. A few years ago, as I recall, we increased the salary of the President of the United States from $50,000 to $75,000, and gave him 6 or 8 special secretaries and an assistant to the President. We did so because the job had grown.

All the Departments of Government, from the Department of State on down, have grown. No one is objecting so long as they do their work.

I do not know about the Judiciary Committee. I am not a member of that committee, but I believe that it would not ask for more money than it needed. I intend to vote for such requests, whether they be for $1 million, half a million, or $200,000.

WORK OF EASTLAND COMMITTEE PRAISED

My friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is doing grand work on his committee. I do not ask him what he proposes to spend. The question I ask him is whether or not he is doing his work. I think he is.

There was an understanding during the week of Lincoln's birthday that there would be no important votes. A day or so ago a resolution was approved providing funds for the Committee on Government Operations, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I was not present. I understand that there was no yea-and-nay vote. If there had been, I would have hoped to be paired on that vote in favor of granting his request. He is doing wonderful work. If he needs more money and submits an estimate, I intend to support it. All I ask is that he do the work and make the results available to the Senate.

FURTHER INFORMATION ON MINERALS, FUELS, AND PUBLIC LANDS NEEDED

Mr. President, I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for nearly 10 years. The Senator from Louisiana is correct in stating that this request represents an increase over the amount originally allowed. It is my business to know something about the engineering which is required in connection with minerals, oil, and public lands. In my opinion, there was never enough money available to do the job correctly, and to make available to the Senate the information it needs for the action it must take.

I am not objecting to an additional staff member or two. I shall discuss the problem with the distinguished chairman of the committee and help him in every way possible. All I insist upon is that the committee do the work which is laid out for it. I have some information in that connection.

SENATE REPORT ON STRATEGIC MATERIALS SERVED IMPORTANT PURPOSE

Until the last 3 or 4 years there had never been an investigation made of the availability of strategic minerals and materials. It must be borne in mind that there are not only minerals. There are also agricultural products and other agricultural materials. That subject is covered in a report, and the work which served as the basis for that report was begun under the chairmanship of the late Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Butler].

If the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will investigate the work that has been done by this committee and regularly presented to the departments of Government and to the President of the United States, in which report there is shown the availability of these materials, he will find that the report is worth every cent it cost. I superintended the preparation of that report, and we did the work while we were short of money.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE SELF-SUFFICIENT IN CRITICAL MATERIALS

For nearly 40 years statements have been made on the floor of the Senate in behalf of the administration that we had to cross major oceans in order to get many of the strategic materials we need. I maintain it is not necessary to cross major oceans.

As a result of the work of the subcommittee—and the report of the subcommittee was submitted to the Senate by the full committee—it is evident that we can make this hemisphere self-sufficient in every one of the critical materials if we consider substitutes and replacements. If we do that, we do not have to cross major oceans to get anything. At the same time we can protect those industries in the Western Hemisphere.

That alone is not only worth what the distinguished chairman is asking for today, but it is worth hundreds of millions of dollars. The situation is similar to my making a mistake in the law by quoting the law as it is written, but without taking into consideration an amendment that has been made in the law about which I am not familiar. The same thing is true in this situation because people failed to take into consideration laboratory experiments which are going on all the time. It is like considering an engineering report. Experiments go on all the time.

MANGANESE SUPPLY IN UNITED STATES AMPLE

For example, as a result of investigations, manganese is available in Minnesota and in Maine. At this moment it is possible to build manganese plants in this country, and if we are willing to pay the price differential between the wage standard of living in this country and that of the chief competitive countries, we can get all the manganese we need right here in the United States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. For the past 4 or 5 years the senior Senator from Nevada, both as chairman of the subcommittee and as the ranking Republican member of it, has conducted extensive hearings not only in this country but in many foreign countries to ascertain the extent of the availability of strategic materials essential to our national preparedness. The Senator from Idaho has commended the Senator from Nevada on many occasions for his work.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Idaho has been very helpful.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have commended the Senator for the extensive work he has done. I wonder whether at any time there has been a lack of funds or of staff personnel and consultants to carry on this extensive work, the results of which so far, as I understand, are presently available, in statistical and factual form, in 15 principal items. Is that correct?

INVESTIGATION OF CRITICAL AND STRATEGIC MATERIALS SHOULD CONTINUE

Mr. MALONE. The hearings are published in about 12 volumes, but the digested part is contained in one report. That report contains the conclusions and findings of fact and recommendations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Has not the investigatory work in that connection been completed by the subcommittee?

Mr. MALONE. No; it has not been completed, and I will tell the Senator from Idaho why it has not been completed. It is like many other studies, which involve laboratory work. Laboratory work and inventions constantly change the situation.

For example—and I do not know where I said this, but I said it in the right place, I am sure—several years ago I said if we treated our taxpayers half so well as we treat foreigners, uranium would be running out of our ears in two years. Everyone knows that now. However, that development was brought about through investigations. Investigations with respect to other metals are constantly taking place.

STUDIES BEHIND IRON CURTAIN CITED

I conducted investigations like that even behind the Iron Curtain. The distinguished Senator from Idaho was there. As a matter of fact, I have a picture in my office, as the distinguished Senator from Idaho knows.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. In Bulgaria there is fissionable material available. I knew that. Therefore I was interested in going behind the Iron Curtain to make sure. I went behind the Iron Curtain, even though the State Department objected very much to my going there. However, I had to know where those materials were. I had to know whether they were in the area around Russia or in Russia itself, and whether Russia could become self-sufficient in uranium. I am here to state that I believe it can become self-sufficient in uranium.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Press reports indicate that the Senator from Nevada went behind the Ural Mountains and made extensive investigations of the availability of strategic materials in the Soviet Union. Does the Senator from Nevada entertain any hope that we will be able to get any of the strategic materials in the Soviet Union for use in our preparedness program?

EUROPE MAINTAINS PIPELINE TO RUSSIA AND SATELLITES

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that not only is there little likelihood that we will get any of it under present conditions, but that if we keep on selling the material and building plants in Europe, we will furnish to Russia everything they need. I have stated many times—and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is bringing out that fact now—that everything we send to Europe is available to Communist China and to Russia.

There has been some talk about Austria, too. Trainloads of the material have gone to Austria. Of course, it is said that we must help Austria. However, sometimes a train with that material on it does not even stop in Austria.

Only a short time ago the Senator from Arkansas brought out in his committee the fact that millions of pounds of copper wire went to Russia with the consent of our State Department. I hope I am not misquoting the report. I shall read it later.

Mr. President, those shipments are not confined to copper wire.

BRITAIN'S JET ENGINE SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA RECALLED

When I was over in the northeast corner of the floor, as far as I could get away from the middle of this distinguished body, I said that England was sending jet engines to Russia in 1947. It was bitterly denied, even by the Secretary of Defense. Everybody knows it now, because the planes that fought our boys in Korea were made on the pattern of the English jets that Britain had sent over there.

UNITED STATES TRADING WITH RUSSIA THROUGH INTERMEDIARIES

Everything we send over there is available to Russia. Therefore, when we ask whether we should trade with Russia, it is already a fact that we are trading with Russia.

To say that the submission of one report is the end of the matter is like saying that no one can speak so convincingly on any subject as the person who is entirely unhampered by the facts.

I am for economy. I never voted, and I never will for the billions of dollars which are being used to build plants in Europe, and which will all be available to Soviet Russia.

When a chairman of one of our committees—whether it be the Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], as chairman of a subcommittee—asks for money, I have confidence in the Senator's integrity, and I know he will not spend money uselessly; and I also know that if his committee does not need all the money, he will turn it back.

SOME PREFER GRIM FACTS BE CONCEALED

I do not believe that we have ever fully realized the importance of the problem. When, as was the case with the Senator from Arkansas, anyone wants to make an investigation of where the materials are being sent, some of the press jumps down his throat, because they do not want anyone to find that out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to supplement the statement which the Senator has just made, which is one of the most important statements made in this debate. There is not sufficient knowledge in Congress or in the country as to what the public-land States of the United States contain. There is no knowledge of the vast acreage in this country which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Take, for example, these figures which I have jotted down:

In the State of the Senator from Nevada 84 percent of the entire area, or approximately 59 million acres, is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The Senator from Nevada knows that to be a fact, does he not?

Mr. MALONE. I think that is correct; certainly that much acreage is Government land.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Seventy-two percent of the total acreage of the State of Utah is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and that includes 37.9 million acres.

As to the State of Idaho, 65 percent of that State is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. That amounts to more than 34 million acres.

Why should not the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has the power and the jurisdiction as granted by the Constitution and by the Reorganization Act to supervise the handling of these millions of acres, have the money which is necessary to enable the committee to do the work which is involved?

In my own State 52 percent of the area is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. It amounts to 32,700,000 acres.

If Senators will open the Congressional Directory they will find that 10 pages are required merely to list the bureaus of the Department of the Interior and the names of some of the principal officials of that Department.

Either we are going to be fully equipped to enable us to handle these matters, or we are not, and the work will be carried on by the officials and employees of the Department of the Interior. If we are going to make the United States of America at all self-sufficient in minerals the committee must operate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that less than 1 percent of the area of the United States has had geological surveys made or has been investigated by geologists so that we can say with some degree of authority that there are certain minerals or that there are not certain minerals in a particular area.

FORMER INTERIOR SECRETARY ACCEPTED FALLACIOUS HAVE-NOT THEORY

We had a Secretary who for 20 years thought we were out of oil, out of tungsten, out of manganese, out of practically every mineral. He died thinking we had none of them in this country.

One of the reasons why I ran for the Senate was to assist in making information available to this distinguished body so it could intelligently judge.

I will say to the distinguished Senator that there is enough tungsten in the State of Nevada to last this country 50 years. I am not the first engineer who ever said that. Because of competition with low-cost labor throughout the world, in 1953 we tried to fix the price on titanium and certain other minerals, through the Malone-Aspinall bill, in order to make up the difference between the wage standard of living in this country and that of the chief competitive nation as to each of the minerals involved. It had to be done by a special act of Congress, because in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act we had repealed that very provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unless the committee does this necessary legislative work the work is not going to be done.

EXTENSION OF MALONE-ASPINALL PURCHASE PROGRAM ESSENTIAL

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. Not someone like the distinguished Secretary to whom I have referred, the late Mr. Ickes. I think he was one of the most honest men I ever knew, but he did not have the necessary information, and died without proper information concerning the mineral situation; at least, not so that anyone could understand it. He said we had run out or were fast running out of these minerals.

Unless the Malone-Aspinall Act is extended, and I have just introduced a bill to do that, the purchase program for tungsten authorized in the bill will end about next June. The producers of tungsten in this country, of which there are many, will be shut down, and by 1958 other producers of critical and strategic minerals will be shut down.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield further to me?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] wants to ask a question about something I have said. Am I correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was about to make a comment in reference to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, because long before it was my honor to come to the United States Senate, on numerous occasions I appeared before the committee when the Senator was chairman, and I always had great admiration for the way in which he conducted the committee.

I should like to ask the Senator if there has been any material change in the Federal ownership of lands in the Western States during the past 10 or 20 years?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not a great deal. There has been a fundamental change in the use of the land, such as the extension of oil and gas leases, of coal leases, and of other mineral leases all over the West and in other sections which has increased the work of the Department of the Interior and has increased the responsibility of the committee.

The Senator from Arizona himself joined with the speaker just a few days ago in introducing a bill to authorize a 10-year program for the development of our national parks.

There are 181 such parks and monuments throughout the United States, and more than 280,000 people are employed in the National Park Service alone. We need to be fortified with a staff to enable us to carry on the work.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall not take the floor, but I think we have made it clear that there must be a tremendous expansion of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in order to do the great work that must be performed.

With reference to the Indians, alone, I have one person on the staff to deal with that subject. There are 200 reservations in the United States. In California there are 76 rancheros. In Nevada there are 15 colonies. In New Mexico there are 18 pueblos. There are 16 assorted communities in the State of Arizona. There are very serious Indian problems.

The appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1954 was approximately $82 million. The budget estimate for the fiscal year 1957 is $89 million. We have been debating all afternoon about $40,000.

Mr. President, I feel that the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In response to the argument proposed by the Senator from Wyoming, I maintain that the situation in the Department of the Interior has not changed materially since the days when the Senator so capably served as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We had Indian problems then. At that time the Federal Government owned and operated 49 million acres in Arizona. There has not been any great amount of acreage added to what I think are too many acres owned by the Federal Government in this country. In those days the Senator from Wyoming was able to carry on a very capable administration with a staff personnel of 10.

In the last two Congresses in which it has been my pleasure to serve, that staff has been increased by 11, and the work seems to have been done.

There has been great concern about the mineral lands in this country. Under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], one of the most comprehensive surveys in the history of the United States has been completed, for all intents and purposes, with respect to the study of minerals. Yet the staff has been retained almost intact, as I understand.

I do not say that 10 persons are too many or that 21 are too many. I say that they are not being used properly if it is necessary to come before the Senate and to ask for four more now. There are plenty of persons on the staff who are capable of doing the work which is required.

I hope we have finished the hearings on the Al Sarena case. But certainly if ever there was wasted manpower in the history of the Senate, it was in connection with that investigation.

I have heard that the committee plans to investigate timber holdings. Timber, I have always understood, comes under the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I maintain, in answer to the argument made by the Senator from Wyoming, that the situation has not changed to the extent that it is necessary now to add four staff members at a cost of $37,500. There is no justification for doing so. No investigation is proposed which the present staff cannot handle in a perfectly competent manner.

I sincerely hope the amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader will be agreed to. While it is true that we are talking about $40,000, when the budget for the Bureau of Indian Affairs is $80 million, still it is the small items of $40,000, to which we pay no attention in connection with these matters, that add to the unbalanced budgets year after year.

BUDGET UNBALANCED BECAUSE FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES UNCHECKED

Mr. MALONE. I do not wish to disagree with my distinguished friend from Arizona, who comes from a neighboring State, but, in my opinion, the budget is unbalanced because of the $5 billion to $7 billion this Government has sent to Europe without any accounting whatsoever.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator from Nevada in his last statement.

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the Senator's suggestion that one report will finish the job, I maintain that it only lays the foundation. I wish to correct the Senator to that extent. It lays the foundation so that the laboratory work can be continued and encouragement can be given by the committee to inventions and discoveries each year.

FURTHER REPORT ON HEMISPHERE RESOURCES FORTHCOMING

I myself did not look at the manganese deposit in South America, but I asked one of our committee engineers to do so. It took him 11 days to get up the Amazon and to look at the biggest manganese deposit in the Western Hemisphere. We really investigated further what we knew about it at the time.

Another document will be issued soon, Senate Document No. 83, which was authorized by this Congress. It will throw additional light on why we are not producing more of the critical materials in the Western Hemisphere.

The workload has just begun. These reports are foundational reports.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I do not like to be in disagreement with my good friend from Nevada, but I think he and other Members of the Senate realize that the bulk of the staff is needed when an investigation is started. That is one of the troubles. We assemble staffs to do a special job, and they remain forevermore. They are employed to do one job, but they remain and go to something else.

We have on the staff at present a mining engineer at $12,500 a year. We have a member of the professional staff at $10,800 a year. We have three stenographers. I presume they are all working on mining, because these particular men are familiar with mining. The 3 stenographers are employed at $5,300 each. So there are total salaries of almost $40,000 in this 1 field.

The report has been completed. I agree that the work has to go on. But when these persons have finished their work in the field of mining reports, let them do some other work. The work is not so unrelated that an expert in mining cannot do something else of a similar nature.

The committee has another engineer who receives $13,600 a year. It has 4 members of the professional staff, each making more than $10,700 a year.

I do not object to those salaries if the members of the staff produce results. But why, in the name of commonsense, when we are not doing any particular investigative work at present, is it necessary to ask for four more staff members at an additional cost of $37,500? I see no justification for it. I serve on the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Every year when the committee prepares its budget, the budget is submitted to each member of the committee. Did the Senator from Arizona ever get up in a committee meeting and object to the budget?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Montana may remember that I was unable to attend the meeting at which this matter was discussed, but I sent my proxy to vote against it, and I believe my proxy was executed in that direction.

Mr. MURRAY. Every year the budget is submitted to the members of the committee, and the members of the committee go over it and approve it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. This particular budget was not approved by the junior Senator from Arizona; otherwise, he would not be arguing against it today. I asked the staff, for instance, for certain information, which I thought should have been readily available. I do not have it yet.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator will receive even less information if the committee does not obtain sufficient funds with which to carry on its studies.

It is immaterial to me whether this particular budget is approved or not. No constituent of mine is on the list of staff experts we are talking about. So far as I am concerned, whatever will happen, will not injure me, but it will injure the committee and its activities, and will prevent the committee from doing the work which is necessary to be done.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Montana and I are in complete disagreement on that point, because I feel that the present staff, if it be properly used and its duties properly outlined, is perfectly adequate to handle the work which the committee is doing today.

I wish to comment upon the remark by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] about his staff of one on the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. I see that gentleman in the Chamber. He is one of the most competent staff members on the Hill. He does his job. I have not heard him come around begging for assistants. I think that he, more than any other member of the committee staff, might use assistants. But I see no provision made for them. I say again that I believe the present staff members can do the job.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I had one of the staff members, I would send him to Arizona and California to help me in connection with the Indian problems.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The junior Senator from Wyoming himself is one of the greatest helps the Indians of this country have ever had. Coming as I do from the State having the largest Indian population in the United States, I, on behalf of the Indians, thank the Senator from Wyoming for what he has done for them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Arizona is very kind.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Arizona has complimented our good colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, who has served for many years as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and who was chairman of that committee during the 81st and 82d Congresses. We who have served under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Wyoming believe he did outstanding work.

The Senator from Wyoming has pointed out that much work remains to be done. It may be of interest to point out that in the first year of the 81st Congress, when the Senator from Wyoming was chairman of the committee, during the first 6 months the committee had 12 members on its staff, and 9 members during the remainder of the year.

In the 2d session of the 81st Congress, the committee had 10 members on its staff during the first 6 months, and 14 members during the last 6 months.

In the 82d Congress the committee had 13 members for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1951, and 16 members during the latter half of that calendar year.

In the 2d session of the 82d Congress, the committee had 13 members on its staff during the first 6 months of 1952, and 14 members during the last 6 months of 1952.

In the calendar year 1955 there were 29 members on the staff.

It seems to me that, completely ignoring all political phases—and this is a political year—we ought to be able to carry on the work of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with a staff of 29 members, which is the number we had during the past year.

I want the work to be done in an efficient manner. I think the chairman of the committee in the 81st and 82d Congresses, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, did effective, outstanding work. I do not understand why, with a staff which has already grown twice as large as it was when the Senator from Wyoming was the chairman of the committee, we must now increase our budget by $40,000. I yield to no member of the committee—and I have had the privilege of serving on it for 6 years—in my sincere desire to conduct all the necessary investigative inquires to find out what should be done to improve the operations and functions of the various agencies in the Department of the Interior. On the other hand, I do not think we can justify the wasting of any money or personnel on our staff to carry on work which could be done in a very efficient and competent manner, if we want to do the work, without increasing the budget for the next year.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The junior Senator from Nebraska is not a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but he had occasion to investigate the Al Sarena matter. To my mind, that was the most shameful waste of

the taxpayers' money one could imagine. For months the investigation strung along, and encompassed a great portion of the United States. Representatives of the Interior Department were never called as witnesses to appear and tell their case. When they did, that ended the investigation. The matter was handled according to law, and in the only way it could be handled. The Department's story could have been told in the beginning, and could have saved a lot of time and expense.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say. I yield the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask a few questions of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I ask these questions also on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], who is very much interested in the creation of new subcommittees. As I understand, the chairman of the committee has indicated there is no increase in the amount.

There is a subcommittee on minerals, materials, and fuels. Is it not true that a few years ago a subcommittee on that very subject was created?

Mr. MURRAY. That action was taken several years ago.

Mr. WATKINS. There is a subcommittee on irrigation, reclamation, and power development. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. Then there is a subcommittee on public lands.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. That subcommittee handles matters affecting the national parks and such timber as the Secretary of the Interior has under his jurisdiction. He has some O. and C. lands in the State of Oregon.

Mr. MURRAY. There are five separate subcommittees.

Mr. WATKINS. I am taking them one at a time.

The subcommittee on public lands has to do with the national parks and that part of the forests which comes under the direction of the Interior Department.

Then there is a subcommittee on Indians, and one on territories and insular affairs.

Those are the five subcommittees the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has had for years, ever since I have been in the Senate—at least 9 years—and they were created immediately after the Reorganization Act was enacted.

Is it not a fact that the money for those committees is appropriated to the Senate as a whole, and then is allocated to the committee, under the Reorganization Act?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. A subcommittee has been created by the chairman of the committee, designated as the oversight committee, which came up for discussion in the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. That subcommittee was created as a result of legislation which required the committee to follow up legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. That subcommittee was created by the chairman without action of the full committee, as I understand.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. The creation of that subcommittee was recently under discussion by the committee, and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Montana, assured us there would be no further creation of subcommittees under that kind of procedure.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Wyoming discussed the matter with me, and I explained to him that I established that subcommittee at the time because it appeared to me proper for me to do so. I had the authority. However, at his request, I have taken the position that hereafter no special subcommittee will be established except by consent of the full committee.

Mr. WATKINS. And the committee itself took that action by formal motion. Did it not?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Assurance has been given that the oversight subcommittee, when it finishes the current investigation of the Al Sarena matter, will end its existence. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is the understanding.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted that matter clear for the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I have the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am asking the Senator if he will yield for a moment, because I wish to add to what he has just said.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I talked to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] before he was unfortunately required to return to his home. This was last Saturday. He told me at that time that I was authorized to say he would support the resolution as it came from the Committee on Rules and Administration, but that it was with the understanding that only the whole committee in the future would operate on any of the so-called oversight investigative business if it should come up. So there was a complete understanding on all sides. I know that is the point of view of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is my point of view. It is the chairman's point of view. It is the point of view of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. It is the point of view of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. It is the point of view of the committee. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] agreed to that.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I had not intended to take any extended part in this discussion, but I have been on the committee since I came to the Senate 9 years ago. The committee seemed to be able to manage pretty well with the funds allocated to it by the Reorganization Act, under the chairmanship of the former Senator from Nebraska, the late Hugh Butler, and under the chairmanship of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I do not know if any extra money was allotted to the committee at that time or not, but I know that the committee did not have a large staff. As I recall, the staff was increased last year to 29. That seemed to me to be entirely unnecessary, but I did not care to disagree with the chairman and others who felt they had to have a staff of that size in order to proceed with the work. I personally could not see the necessity of having more staff members than were employed under the chairmanship of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the former Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Butler. I do not think the committee was inefficient at that time. I think it looked into every matter it had the duty to look into.

I recall that the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels did make an investigation in the 80th Congress. I was a member of the subcommittee of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. I know extensive hearings were held, and that the opinions of experts were gathered together and included in volumes. It has been done once since that time. Perhaps it ought to be done again. But when it comes to this point, it seems to me we are going too far. We have more than doubled the staff membership. Now another request is made. I have felt that increases were unnecessary, though I have been willing to extend confidence to those requesting them up to this point, but now it seems to me there ought to be some place where we should stop.

I say the additional amount asked for certainly is not justified. I think the committee did a good job under the two chairmanships prior to the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Montana. When the proposal came before the committee, I did not see why we should have extra employees. I voted against the budget of the committee.

I realize the committee has a lot of work to do. Previously I was on the Indian Subcommittee, which held hearings for about 60 days. The committee had a good staff at that time. It employed extra reporters to report the proceedings, but the committee still got along with the amount allocated to it under the Reorganization Act.

I do not think that any investigations have been held which were more extensive than the Indian investigation held during the 83d Congress. The same is true with respect to irrigation, reclamation, and other fields.

Sometime, somewhere we will have to stop our expansion, unless we want to say that every time 10,000 or 3,000 employees are added to the rolls of the Interior Department, we will have to have so many more staff members on the Hill to watch the Department. I do not believe that is the policy. We have a vast organization looking after the interior affairs of the country, in all these various fields.

That is why I opposed, in the committee, the proposed increase; and that is why I feel that I should vote against it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California. [Putting the question.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand that the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. MONRONEY. I see.

Do I correctly understand that those opposing the amendment should vote "no"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. On this question a division has been ordered.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on page 2, I offer an amendment to change "February" to "March", and to change "$177,000" to "$162,250."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out "February" and to insert "March."

On the same page, in line 16, it is proposed to strike out "$177,000" and insert "$162,250."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 183), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) minerals, materials, and fuels;

(2) irrigation, reclamation, and power development;

(3) public lands;

(4) Indians;

(5) Territories and insular affairs;

(6) national parks; and

(7) resource management and development.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $162,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the commitee.

INVESTIGATION OF ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a cloud has arisen over the Congress of the United States. That cloud consists of suspicion that undue pressure was applied to Members of Congress in connection with the recent natural gas bill, and in connection with other legislation, too. There have been innuendos and allegations that the Case incident was not an isolated one. There have been suggestions that the pressure applied was on a very large scale and took many forms—not just the crude form of alleged campaign contributions.

It has been suggested that large-scale, wholesale pressure attempting to influence the course of that proposed legislation was not confined to the weeks immediately preceding the consideration of that particular bill in the Senate, and that it has been going on for a long time.

Mr. President, the result of all this has been to place the Congress of the United States under a cloud. For the sake of the dignity and integrity of the Congress, there is no alternative, in my mind, to a thorough investigation of the entire situation, going back as far as may be desirable, and going as deep as may be justified.

Nothing should be done which could be called a whitewash. There should be no delay or impediment in the path of this investigation.

The standing subcommittee which seems to me to have unquestioned jurisdiction in this area is the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, now headed by the distinguished, able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I can think of no more dangerous or unfortunate thing than to raise in the minds of the people of this country any implication that we are trying to hobble this investigation or that we are trying to smother or impede it in any way.

If the newspaper reports are accurate, the minority leader of the Senate—and I have for him the highest regard—suggested over the weekend that another special committee, a bipartisan committee, be set up to make this investigation. I hope and trust that the minority leader will not press his proposal. As he well knows, the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee is bipartisan.

It has on it two Democrats and a Republican. The parent committee, the Rules Committee, is also bipartisan. It has on it 7 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

But, Mr. President, this is not a partisan matter at all. This question has nothing to do with Democrats or Republicans. No finger of suspicion has been pointed at any one particular Senator, or any one particular party. Both parties are involved in this situation. The Congress of the United States is involved. It seems to me that a regular standing committee of the Senate, within whose jurisdiction this problem falls, should conduct the investigation.

Is there any one among us who questions the integrity, the qualifications, and the sense of fairness of the junior Senator from Tennessee, one of the most distinguished and courageous Members of this body, with experience in both Houses of the Congress? Of course not.

Is it not a fact that of the 3 members of that subcommittee as presently constituted 2 of them voted for the natural-gas bill, and only 1, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] voted against the natural gas bill?

Yet I am willing, and I think the people of the country are willing, to leave this investigation up to that subcommittee, and to any other committee which has jurisdiction, under the rules of the Senate, in this matter.

If there is any other subcommittee or committee which clearly has jurisdiction, let that committee or subcommittee go into this subject, too. That is a question to be resolved under the Rules of the Senate.

But to create a new, special committee would raise doubts and questions in the minds of the people. It would not allay any suspicions. It would not remove the cloud that now hangs over the Congress of the United States.

The suggestion made by the distinguished and able minority leader that the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee should not conduct this investigation because that would interfere with its job of supervising the elections of 1956, is far from convincing to me. I think the minority leader, on reflection, may wish to withdraw that argument. This investigation is an essential part of the policing of the elections of 1956.

This investigation, in my opinion, is the work of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee. I hope this work will be done, as it should be done, in a fair, thorough, and proper way.

I hope nothing we do will lend color to any impression that anyone is trying to cover up anything.

I hope that nothing is done to set aside the investigation already launched by the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator GORE. I will oppose, with all my strength, anything which is undertaken in this direction unless it can be clearly shown that it is for the purpose of facilitating the investigation and expanding it, and pressing it onward. And not for any other purpose.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the con-

sideration of Calendar No. 1400, Senate Resolution 175.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 175) authorizing additional expenditures by the Select Committee on Small Business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendemnt.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, last year the funds authorized were $50,000, of which the funds spent were $28,593. I understood from the colloquy we had last week, in which this subject was discussed, that this amount was only for a 6-month period, so those figures would need some adjustment in the minds of Members of the Senate. Inasmuch as the funds spent were $28,593 for a 6-month period, I wonder if the distinguished and able chairman of the committee would be able to agree on a figure of $90,000, instead of $100,000. Then there would be the normal deduction of one-twelfth of the $90,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished minority leader that he is correct in the statement that the appropriation was on a 6-months' basis. However, in order that the record may be clear, the staff had to be organized after that. As a matter of fact, our first staff member was not employed until the early part of August. Some of the employees had perhaps less than 3 months' work. Therefore the figure given for last year does not correctly reflect the work of the committee.

Before I answer the Senator's question, let me say that the Small Business Committee does not manufacture work. The work we do comes to us from Senators. We are never able clearly to anticipate just how big the workload is to be. I will say to the distinguished Senator from California that I have checked most carefully the proposed budget for this year, and have gone over it with the staff director. We have agreed that we can tighten up the budget. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the suggestion of $90,000 on a 12-month basis, with the usual amendment of eleven-twelfths of that amount for the remainder of the year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$82,500"; and on page 1, line 4, to strike out "February" and insert "March."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with our colloquy; the sum of $82,500 represents eleven-twelfths of the $90,000 on an annual basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think my good friend from California is very liberal in suggesting that this committee receive $90,000 on an annual basis. I served as a member of this committee when it was first organized. The purpose of it was to try to assist small business. We had a great deal of work to do. At the beginning we had a very small staff, but like all other committees, it has grown, and it has become top-heavy.

The committee is now in the same category as a standing committee, so far as operating funds are concerned. It obtains the same amount of money as a standing committee obtains. In other words in addition to the $90,000 which is now being asked of the Senate, this committee obtains approximately $111,400 with which to employ 4 professional workers and 6 clerical employees. Bear in mind, too, that this committee does not consider pending legislation. It is a committee created solely to look into the problems of so-called small business.

The committee started its work by looking into the problems of companies which employed from 5 to 10 employees. The scope of the committee's jurisdiction has grown now to the point where a small business is any business which has a hundred-and-some-odd employees, and its work has increased correspondingly. That is the same situation with many committees today. Of course the Small Business Committee has turned out a great deal of work. I recall that when I was a member, special studies were made, and the printing presses were kept busy turning out special reports that were prepared, not by the committee, but by so-called experts employed by the committee. What became of those reports, I do not know, nor do I know of any good purpose they served.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this committee has no legislative business to perform. It receives the same amount of money for employing a regular staff as a standing committee gets, $111,400.

If the pending resolution is adopted it will mean that the committee will have available to spend this year a little more than $200,000, plus $5,000 for hearings. I believe that is entirely too much money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 175), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $82,500 for the purpose of discharging obligations incurred by it from March 1, 1956, through January 31, 1957, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress. Such sum shall be in addition to any other moneys available to the committee for such purpose, and shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

STUDY OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION MATTERS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1403, Senate Resolution 172.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 172) to make a study of immigration and naturalization matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this subcommittee is one of the hardest working subcommittees in the Senate. It has a caseload of private immigration bills which is constantly increasing. In the first session of this Congress approximately 2,000 bills of that character were introduced in the Senate. The committee must make an investigation of each case. In addition, there are 6,269 cases of immigrants who are entitled to an adjustment of status. Furthermore, the President of the United States has requested that the basic immigration law be rewritten. The subcommittee will have to hold hearings on that subject.

The $102,000 requested is $9,272 less than the amount asked for last year. It is a reduction of $9,272. Last year there was an appropriation of $102,000 for 11 months. This year the same amount of money is requested for 12 months. The matter has been very carefully studied. I believe it is imperative that the resolution in the sum of $102,000 be approved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is this the subcommittee which considers all the private bills dealing with immigration which are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition to that, the Senator said that the subcommittee will have to hold hearings on another subject. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The President has made recommendations to rewrite the entire immigration structure of the country. The subcommittee will have to handle that subject. In addition to that, there were 6,269 immigrants who are entitled to an adjustment of their status. A study will have to be made of that subject and a report made. The subcommittee has a staff composed of eight persons.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us what kind of investigations are made with respect to each individual case?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is necessary to go into each case to determine whether a

man is entitled to an adjustment of his status.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who does the investigative work? Is it not done by the Justice Department?

Mr. EASTLAND. The committee does a great deal of that work.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means the attorneys who are employed by the subcommittee; is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not by the Senators themselves.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course not.

Mr. ELLENDER. In fact, it is not correct to say that all the work that is done with reference to these immigration cases is done by the attorneys?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; that is not correct. I would not say that. I am privileged to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary, and I believe it is one of the hardest working committees in the Senate. Last year the facts show that 43.6 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced in the Senate were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Sixty-two and one half percent of all House bills and resolutions which reached the Senate were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. What percentage of those bills and resolutions were passed?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not remember.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator say as many as 50 percent?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know what the figure is.

I have a statement on that point. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. KILGORE] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the workload of the committee during the first session of the present Congress.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE WORKLOAD DURING THE 1ST SESSION, 84TH CONGRESS

The workload of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, summarized as of the end of the session, August 2, 1955, comprised: 43.6 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced; 62.5 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; 48.3 percent of all bills and resolutions irrespective of origin.

Not only has the Judiciary Committee received a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing committee of the Senate, it has also performed a larger share of all committee work than any other committee. Of 1,305 written reports filed on legislation in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee has filed 708, which represents 54.2 percent.

The total of reports filed with the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee has handled and disposed of more than 627 individual immigration cases, involving suspension of deportation, 682 cases involving adjustment of status under the Displaced Persons Act, and 419 cases involving adjustment of status under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended. Each case is equivalent to a bill.

As of August 2, 1955, the Judiciary Committee had received 1,340 Senate bills and resolutions and 634 House bills and resolutions, making a total of 1,974 bills and resolutions.

As of August 2, 1955, the committee had disposed of 603 Senate bills and resolutions and 377 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 980 bills and resolutions, which includes 5 bills from which the committee was discharged.

Of the bills thus disposed of 64 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 130 were private relief bills, 784 were private immigration bills, 2 were general claims bills.

Committee approval was granted to 379 Senate bills and resolutions and 344 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 723 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

It will be noted that written reports were filed by the committee with respect to all but 15 of the 723 bills and resolutions approved.

Of the bills and resolutions acted upon favorably 51 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 71 were private relief bills, 600 were private immigration bills, and 1 was a general claim bill.

Bills postponed indefinitely by the committee included 224 Senate bills and resolutions, 33 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 257 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of the bills thus acted upon unfavorably 13 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 59 were private relief bills, and 184 were private immigration bills, 1 was a general claim bill.

Measures pending before the committee as of August 2, 1955, included 737 Senate bills and resolutions and 257 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 994 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of these bills 214 are general bills other than immigration and claims, 289 are private relief bills, 449 are private immigration bills, 24 are general claims bills, and 18 are general immigration bills.

It will be noted the committee has disposed of 377 House bills and resolutions out of 634 such measures referred to it, leaving 257 House bills and resolutions pending as of August 2, 1955.

This means the committee took action on 59.4 percent of all House measures received.

In comparison, out of 1,340 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the committee acted upon 603, leaving 737 Senate bills and resolutions pending. This means that although the committee had to start from scratch by requesting departmental reports in most such cases, action was taken on 45 percent of all Senate measures received.

Suspensions of deportation by the Attorney General, adjustments of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, and under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, under authority delegated by the Congress, are reported to the Congress in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the 84th Congress, there were pending in the committee 537 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 993 additional cases submitted since the beginning of the Congress, making a total of 1,530 cases, of which 613 were approved, 5 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, and 9 cases were not approved, leaving 903 cases in process as of August 2, 1955.

At the beginning of the 84th Congress, there were pending 1,018 cases of adjustment of status under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, to which were added 287 additional cases submitted during the 1st session, making a total of 1,305 cases, of which 611 were approved, and 9 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, and 62 were not approved, leaving 623 cases in process on August 2, 1955.

At the beginning of the 84th Congress, there were pending 41 cases of adjustment of status under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, to which were added 3,393 additional cases submitted during the 1st session, making a total of 3,434 cases, of which 409 were approved, and 7 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, 3 were not approved, and 8 were held for further information, leaving 3,007 cases in process as of August 2, 1955.

During the 1st session, 84th Congress, the committee received 54 executive nominations, of which 1 was Associate Justice of the United States, 31 were Federal judges, 8 were United States attorneys, 10 were United States marshals, 1 was a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and 3 were members of the Parole Board.

As of August 2, 1955, nominations pending totaled 14.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am privileged to serve also on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is chairman. That committee is doing very outstanding and conscientious work. However, I will say that the subcommittee to which I have referred handles much more work than the whole Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means more detailed work, of course.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but it is work that must be done.

Mr. JENNER. It must be done under the law.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly; under the law. The subcommittee is taking a reduction of $9,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to insert the word "prior" between the word "the" and the word "consent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer the following amendments:

On page 1, line 10, strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March"; and on page 2, line 12, strike out "$102,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$93,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 172), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable

services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $93,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950 AND OTHER LAWS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1404, Senate Resolution 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 174) to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act of 1950 and other laws for the protection of the internal security of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the resolution requests funds for the internal security subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. It requests $285,000, which is a reduction of $7,000 from the amount the subcommittee received last year. This is a very hard-working subcommittee. It handles bills of a legislative nature and conducts investigations. I do not believe there can be any doubt that the subcommittee is entitled to this amount of money.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I beg to differ with my good friend from Mississippi. The amount appropriated last year for the subcommittee, according to the figures before me—and I have the original resolution—was $260,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, but the Senator is mistaken, because $30,000 or $35,000 had been appropriated previous to that, and there was an unexpended balance carried over from the year before.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is not included in the resolution.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was money that was unexpended at the end of 1955. Both resolutions totaled $292,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. The resolution does not so state.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have taken a $7,000 cut.

There is something else, Mr. President, to which I should refer. Last year the leadership on both sides of the aisle wanted a code of conduct governing investigations, which cost the committee $18,000 or $19,000.

Previously, some of the employees of the Internal Security Subcommittee were doing internal security work for another subcommittee, and they were transferred to this committee. I do not think, in fairness to the investigation of the Communist conspiracy, this amount should be reduced.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the same number of employees as were employed last year be on the payroll this year?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have no plans in that regard. If it is necessary to carry on the work, they will be. I cannot predict how many employees we shall have. If I remember correctly, we do not have as many employees at this time as we had last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the budget calls for 25 employees.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. A year ago there were 30 employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the number be about the same as it was last year?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think it will be, but I am not going to be held down one way or the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The amendment was, on page 2, line 13, to insert between the word "the" and the word "consent", the word "prior."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 9, to strike the word "February" and insert "March"; and on line 19, to strike out "$285,000" and insert "$261,250."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 9, it is proposed to strike the word "February" and insert "March," and on line 19, to strike out "$285,000" and insert "$261,250."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent is there cooperation between the Senator's committee and the committee on the House side? Is there any duplication?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; there is no duplication.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator's committee coordinate its work with the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $261,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON REAL PROPERTY HERETOFORE GRANTED TO THE CITY OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1508, House bill 2430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2430) to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed, upon payment by the city of Charleston, S. C., of $500,000", and insert "the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized, in exchange for a minimum 470-foot extension at the north end of the existing 1,000-foot reinforced concrete wharf of the Charleston Transportation Depot, and the installation on the extension of rail trackage with necessary adjustments to connect with the rail trackage of the existing wharf, to be constructed by the said city of Charleston, S. C., or its lessee, the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Secretary of the Army,"; after line 21, to strike out "Beginning at a point in the west harbor line of the Cooper River (which point is south 41 degrees 31 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 13.2 feet from the southernmost corner of the concrete dock, formerly the dock of

the Charleston Quartermaster Intermediate Depot; and which point is the terminal point of the 14th call in the deed dated February 24, 1950, from the City Council of Charleston to West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.); thence north 48 degrees 28 minutes 30 seconds west for a distance of 2,999.27 feet, along the property line between tract 12 and tract 2, part 1, to a point (which is distant 11.42 feet north 68 degrees 33 minutes east from an iron pipe); thence north 69 degrees 00 minutes east a distance of 104.71 feet, more or less, to a point common to this tract 12, tract 13 (leased to South Carolina State Ports Authority by West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. by indenture dated February 4, 1947), and tract 10 (leased by the City Council of Charleston to North Charleston Terminal Co.); thence along the property line separating tracts 12 and 13, north 86 degrees 45 minutes 50 seconds east 15.58 feet, north 88 degrees 32 minutes 20 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 87 degrees 23 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 82 degrees 42 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 76 degrees 46 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 70 degrees 20 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 64 degrees 09 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 56 degrees 48 minutes 30 seconds east 25.0 feet, north 86 degrees 57 minutes 50 seconds east 373.90 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 899.77 feet, south 41 degrees 32 minutes 50 seconds west 25.0 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 1,494.83 feet to a point on the east edge of the concrete dock; thence along the east edge of the concrete dock south 41 degrees 32 minutes 50 seconds west 525.0 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning and is as shown on drawing No. 799–47–1, dated August 1949, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army." and insert "Beginning at a point in the west harbor line of the Cooper River (which point is south 41 degrees 31 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 13.2 feet from the southernmost corner of the concrete dock, formerly the dock of the Charleston Quartermaster Intermediate Depot, and which point is the terminal point of the 14th call in the deed dated February 24, 1950, from the City Council of Charleston to West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.); thence north 48 degrees 28 minutes 30 seconds west 2,999.27 feet, along lands of the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. to a point which is distant 11.42 feet north 68 degrees 33 minutes east from an iron pipe; thence north 69 degrees 00 minutes east a distance of 104.71 feet to a point common to this tract, lands leased by the city of Charleston to the North Carolina Terminal Co., and lands of the South Carolina State Ports Authority; thence along lands of the South Carolina State Ports Authority north 86 degrees 45 minutes 50 seconds east 15.58 feet, north 88 degrees 32 minutes 20 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 87 degrees 23 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 82 degrees 42 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 76 degrees 46 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 70 degrees 20 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 64 degrees 09 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 30 degrees 44 minutes 40 seconds east 24.55 feet, north 86 degrees 54 minutes 06 seconds east 374.48 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 899.77 feet, south 41 degrees 32 minutes 50 seconds west 25.00 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 1,494.83 feet to a point on the eastern edge of the concrete dock; thence along the eastern edge of the concrete dock south 41 degrees 31 minutes 30 seconds west approximately 483.0 feet to the point of beginning and containing 30.75 acres, more or less."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I should like to announce that at the policy meeting today it was determined that the farm bill would be considered immediately after the completion of the Senate's action upon the money resolutions now pending on the calendar.

In addition, the policy committee cleared for consideration after completion of the farm bill Calendar No. 364, Senate Joint Resolution 31, a proposed constitutional amendment relating to the election of President and Vice President.

Also, Calendar No. 1287, Senate bill 898, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the Senate will meet and transact business on the 22d of February?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that if we start consideration of the farm bill tomorrow the debate will continue uninterruptedly until we complete it?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct, unless something of an emergency nature should interrupt it.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my belief that if we can start the debate on the bill tomorrow afternoon and continue it without other matters intervening we should be able to complete the farm bill about Friday.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will say to my friend from Louisiana that I am very hopeful that kind of a schedule can be met, but I invite his attention to the fact that there are a number of resolutions yet to be acted upon, and I think they may consume a good deal of the time tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has any effort been made before the policy committee to have the Senate sit on Saturday so that we may complete action on the farm bill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would say to my friend from Louisiana that it is the judgment of the acting majority leader that there will be no session on Saturday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whether we complete action on the farm bill or not?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1406, Senate Resolution 165.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 165) to make a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is not the intention of the leadership to have the Senate act now on the resolution which has just been made the unfinished business, but rather to take it up immediately after the morning hour tomorrow.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 20, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 926) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 21, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20, 1956:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Edward Thomas Williams, O12818, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Stevens Lawton, O14924, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Haydon Lemaire Boatner, O15641, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Edward Moore, O15650, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Armistead Davis Mead, O15767, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15842, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. George Henry Decker, O15950, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, O17676, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Gordon Byrom Rogers, O15620, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Bateman Peploe, O16246, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hobart Hewett, O12328, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Bernard Linn Robinson, O12652, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Aubrey Strode Newman, O16099, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Franklin Bird, O16179, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Patrick Cooney, O17338, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Stuart Gross Smith, O16369, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Elbert DeCoursey, O17813, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Brig. Gen. Arthur Letcher Irons, O16526, Army of the United States (colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. David Henry Tulley, O16075, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Lewis Sherrill Griffing, O16413, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Harold McDaniel, O16497, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alfred Benjamin Denniston, O17315, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Lewis Bell, Jr., O17549, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Elial Bush, O17634, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., O17730, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Francis Regis Seitz, O17734, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. George Robinson Mather, O18696, United States Army.

Col. William Jonas Ely, O18974, United States Army.

Col. Frederick William Gibb, O19222, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Creator and benefactor, inspire us during this Brotherhood Week with a clear vision of the high and helpful things that we are privileged to do together for the welfare of all mankind.

Grant that, as brothers of the Son of Man, our minds and hearts may be impervious to those attitudes and feelings of prejudice and pride, of dislike and indifference, which we know are so alien and contrary to His spirit.

We pray that, as we engage in the great enterprise of building the temple of world peace, we may seek to do Thy will and help us to hasten that glorious day of prediction when men shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks and nations shall learn war no more.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 16, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 8787. An act to provide for a prorated stationery allowance in the case of a Member of the House of Representatives elected for a portion of a term;

H. R. 8796. An act to increase the amount of telephone and telegraph service furnished to Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution relating to Maryland tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; and

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint committee to arrange for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States, January 20, 1957.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3053. An act to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia, and to provide that such Commission shall continue in existence until the construction of such auditorium shall have been completed; and

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary copies of certain hearings and reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

AMENDING NATURAL GAS ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 342)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1956.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office on February 17, 1956, and said to contain a veto message from the President on H. R. 6645, an act to amend the Natural Gas Act as amended.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am unable to approve H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended. This I regret because I am in accord with its basic objectives.

Since the passage of this bill, a body of evidence has accumulated indicating that private persons, apparently representing only a very small segment of a great and vital industry, have been seeking to further their own interests by highly questionable activities. These include efforts that I deem to be so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes.

Legally constituted agencies of Government are now engaged in investigating this situation. These investigations cannot be concluded before the expiration of the 10-day period within which the President must act upon the legislation under the Constitution.

I believe I would not be discharging my own duty were I to approve this legislation before the activities in question have been fully investigated by the Congress and the Department of Justice. To do so under such conditions could

well create long-term apprehension in the minds of the American people. It would be a disservice both to the people and to their Congress. Accordingly, I return H. R. 6645 without my approval.

At the same time, I must make quite clear that legislation conforming to the basic objectives of H. R. 6645 is needed. It is needed because the type of regulation of producers of natural gas which is required under present law will discourage individual initiative and incentive to explore for and develop new sources of supply.

In the long run this will limit supplies of gas which is contrary not only to the national interest but especially to the interest of consumers.

I feel that any new legislation, in addition to furthering the long-term interest of consumers in plentiful supplies of gas, should include specific language protecting consumers in their right to fair prices.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 17, 1956.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and the message of the President be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

FEBRUARY 20, 1956.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law for the Honorable JAMES C. HEALEY as a Representative-elect to the 84th Congress from the 22d Congressional District of New York, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Sidney A. Fine, has been received from the Secretary of State of New York, and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

Mr. JAMES C. HEALEY appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. MCCULLOCH, may have leave of absence until the end of the month while away on official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EMBARGO ON SHIPMENT OF ARMS TO SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the administration is worthy of condign criticism for lifting the embargo on the shipment of arms to Saudi Arabia. Was the administration right when it first suspended the shipment or was it right when it vetoed the suspension, or is it a question of who gets the President's ear last. The President deplores the arms race in the Middle East. He said defensive arms to Israel, surrounded by enemies, would be an arms race, but arms to Saudi Arabia, a member of the Arab League bent upon Israel's annihilation would not be contributing to the arms race.

That is like feeding beefsteaks to a tiger in the hope of making the tiger a vegetarian. Assuredly our State Department has blundered stupidly in the handling of these shipments. The administration can only exculpate itself by granting defensive arms to the little State of Israel.

Yesterday, the New York Times, editorially said:

> There is just one kind of adjective for the project revealed and interrupted early Friday morning to send 18 United States tanks to Saudi Arabia. We might use the word preposterous. Somebody blundered in sanctioning this arrangement. Somebody blundered in the apparent belief that the tanks had already been shipped. Somebody blundered even more egregiously in keeping the whole matter secret until it chanced to be exposed. Senator GEORGE suggests an investigation—it seems a good idea.
>
> It is not that there is anything illegal in getting rid of some surplus military equipment. It is ingenuous rather than sinful to consider, as we seem to have considered, as the British apparently still believe and as the French may have thought, that equipment of this sort will under no circumstances be used for aggressive purposes and will somehow contribute to the cause of peace.
>
> The tragic irony of the episode is partly in its revelation of a kind of befuddlement in our Near Eastern foreign policy. We have been hesitating to send arms or money for arms to the little State of Israel, whose government fears the power of its Arab neighbors when that power is fortified by jet planes, tanks, guns, and submarines provided by Communist governments. But certainly we do not improve this situation when we increase the military strength of a country that can easily threaten Israel from the east as Egypt threatens it from south and east.

The only excuse I can see for the bungling of the State Department lies in a quotation from John Morley: "A government must contain a ballast of mediocrity to steady the ship."

WICKERSHAM OF WASHITA

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a fine old American tradition to link the name of deeds to those who have done these deeds. In the military field, Andrew Jackson is one with the Battle of New Orleans; John J. Pershing is one to the Battle of the Meuse-Argonne. In government, Jefferson is bound to the Declaration of Independence; Madison, to the Constitution; in invention, Fulton is identified with the steamboat; Whitney, with the cotton gin.

Just such a man was born in the Third Congressional District of Arkansas, the district which I have the honor to serve in the Congress. His birthplace was a farm near Lone Rock in Baxter County. I have known, I still know, many of his family. He now serves the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma in the Congress. His name is VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

On February 9, 1956, on VICTOR WICKERSHAM'S 49th birthday, the House of Representatives passed S. 180, the Kerr-Monroney-Wickersham bill. This accomplishment represented years of planning and effort on the part of my friend and associate aided by other members of the Oklahoma delegation. This enactment is designed to give irrigation facilities to the farmers of the Washita River Basin, to provide adequate drinking water for the communities of that region, and to protect these people from the peril of floods.

VICTOR WICKERSHAM will, without doubt, be known for other services to his homefolks. He is a man of many abilities.

I might think of him as WICKERSHAM of Lone Rock. Others might think of him as WICKERSHAM of Mangum.

But—and this I sincerely believe will always be true—there will be untold thousands who will hold him in their minds and hearts as WICKERSHAM of Washita.

VETO OF THE GAS BILL

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that President Eisenhower has vetoed the natural gas bill. I compliment the President on his courage, wisdom, and consideration for the homeowners of this Nation who use natural gas. I congratulate him for his integrity in overcoming the pressure of the gas producers by his veto.

I voted against the bill to remove the natural gas producers from Federal regulation because it would have resulted in higher gas prices to the consumers. Utility services must be controlled and regulated to protect homeowners, and other consumers, against unreasonable and arbitrary price gouging.

Most of the people in my congressional district are natural gas users, who are entitled to the protection of the law. The only way they can be protected is by fair and just regulations administered by the Federal Power Commission.

Had the natural gas bill became a law, the New York area's gas bill would have been immediately increased by $1 million a month. With no regulatory agency to keep the price of natural gas fair and stable, the price could go on and on, to increases that would be astronomical

and unbearable for the consumers of this country.

This veto is one more example of the kind of integrity that the Eisenhower administration has brought to Washington.

VETO BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE NATURAL GAS BILL

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States performed a great public service in vetoing the natural gas bill. This particular bill engaged the attention of the entire Nation. I, for one, could see no public interest in the measure—either from the standpoint of the gas-producing States or let alone from the gas-consuming States.

The entire country, I am sure, is grateful for President Eisenhower's wise decision in this matter. It is difficult for me to understand those arguments that are now being advanced, and in poor taste, that the veto message is an attack upon the Congress. The President of the United States was merely echoing the sentiments of the entire Nation when he made reference to the brazen sponsors of this legislation, and when I say "sponsors" I mean those outside the Congress.

If and when this measure comes before the House in an attempt to override the President's veto, you may be assured that I will vote to sustain the President's action. If, therefore, there are those who feel that the President's veto was an attack upon the Congress, they are at liberty to test such sentiment by bringing the measure up in an attempt to override the veto, but I am certain, Mr. Speaker, they will not dare do this.

VETO BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE NATURAL GAS BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as one who voted against the natural gas bill, and who will support the veto message, if it should come up in the House for a vote—which I doubt will take place—I am disappointed in the inconsistency of the message.

The real and main reason for a veto, consumer protection, was third in point of significance in the veto message.

I am amazed, however, that the President went out of his way to cast a cloud over those who voted for the bill. I cannot believe he intended to do so, but he has done so by the language he used, and also by the order of importance of the reasons for his veto. If the President did not intend to cast a cloud, he should so publicly state and thereby clarify his message.

Just because some individuals outside of the Congress did something wrong, or illegal, if the latter, is no justification for a cloud of guilt being thrown over all the Members who voted for the bill. Such Members are justified in resenting the innuendo which, I assume and trust, was unintentionally contained in the veto message. In all fairness to such Members, there should be a clarification.

While I disagreed on the merits of the bill with those who voted for it, I want it known clearly, and distinctly, and unmistakably that as an individual, as a Member of the House, and as the majority leader, I have every confidence in the integrity and the honesty of my colleagues who voted for this measure.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my vote was cast in favor of the bill. I read the veto message 4 or 5 times. I did not—I do not—feel badly about my vote or the veto. The President has a very, very high ethical standard. It goes away beyond any law or rule of the House or any of the committees about what the Members of the House or the political committees should do in the matter of either soliciting or spending funds for political purposes. As I read that message, what he was getting at was that he was disturbed because someone might think that some Member of the Congress was unduly influenced by some contribution that was made by those favoring the bill. Nothing much has been said or printed about those who spent vast sums in opposition to its passage. As I understand the practice, for years it has been the custom—no one has considered it illegal—for Members of the House and Members of the other body to accept money for campaign purposes. The law expressly authorizes the practice. Someone thinks a Member is doing all right; they want to keep that Member here; they send money to that Member's campaign committee. A number, few at least can run a campaign himself. Where did the President fail, if he failed at all? I am not critical, but if he did fail, Mr. Speaker, it was in not saying that money was used in opposition to the bill and recognizing that those who lobbied against it were interested financially in its defeat. The President might well, as long as he was calling attention to campaign contributions to elect Congressmen that dollars by the million are contributed in every campaign to nominate and elect Presidents and Vice Presidents. Find me a man, if you can, who is qualified, who can adequately finance a campaign for the office of President—is there any reason why citizens should not contribute to the success of a cause in which they believe.

THE VETO MESSAGE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I was also one of those who were amazed and shocked when a copy of the veto message was delivered to me by one of the assistants of the President Friday afternoon. I, too, read and I reread the veto message. I tried to analyze it. I have meditated over it since.

Mr. Speaker, to me there is nothing else that I can get out of this veto message than it is a reflection and a direct attack on the Members of the Congress and one of our great industries.

The message is difficult to understand, coming from the President. I think the only way that it can be clarified as to what was intended, since the President twice in the message said he believed in the legislation; that it was the kind of legislation needed for the consumer—the only way he can clarify his position, is to present to the Congress a bill that will meet his requirements for these basic objectives. I call upon him to do so. It should be done at once.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

MEMBERSHIP BY UNITED STATES IN UNESCO, ET CETERA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5894) to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to provide for the acceptance of gifts, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi objected.

DISPOSAL OF LANDS ACQUIRED UNDER TITLE III OF THE BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6815) to provide for the orderly disposition of property acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FARM-CITY WEEK

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 317) designating the last week in October of each year as National Farm-City Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

INCREASING CERTAIN PATENT AND TRADEMARK FEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7416) to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I object.

LUMBEE INDIANS OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4656) relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the author of the bill, the gentleman from North Carolina, whether or not this bill, if enacted, would in any way whatsoever commit the Federal Government in the future to the furnishing of services or monetary sums?

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that the bill does not provide for that nor is it expected that it will cost the Government one penny.

Mr. FORD. There is no obligation involved, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, if this proposed legislation is approved?

Mr. CARLYLE. None whatsoever.

Mr. FORD. It simply provides for the change of the name?

Mr. CARLYLE. That is all.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas many Indians now living in Robeson and adjoining counties are descendants of that once large and prosperous tribe which occupied the lands along the Lumbee River at the time of the earliest white settlement in that section; and

Whereas at the time of their first contacts with the colonists, these Indians were a well-established and distinctive people living in European-type houses in settled towns and communities, owning slaves and livestock, tilling the soil, and practicing many of the arts and crafts of European civilization; and

Whereas by reason of tribal legend, coupled with a distinctive appearance and manner of speech and the frequent recurrence among them of family names such as Oxendine, Locklear, Chavis, Drinkwater, Bullard, Lowery, Sampson, and others, also found on the roster of the earliest English settlements, these Indians may, with considerable show of reason, trace their origin to an admixture of colonial blood with certain coastal tribes of Indians; and

Whereas these people are naturally and understandably proud of their heritage, and desirous of establishing their social status and preserving their racial history: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Indians now residing in Robeson and adjoining counties of North Carolina, originally found by the first white settlers on the Lumbee River in Robeson County, and claiming joint descent from remnants of early American colonists and certain tribes of Indians originally inhabiting the coastal regions of North Carolina, shall, from and after the ratification of this act, be known and designated as Lumbee Indians of North Carolina and shall continue to enjoy all rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by them as citizens of the State of North Carolina and of the United States as they enjoyed before the enactment of this act, and shall continue to be subject to all the obligations and duties of such citizens under the laws of the State of North Carolina and the United States.

SEC. 2. All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION UPON UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS TO ADJUDICATE CERTAIN CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill whether or not this proposed legislation is specifically limited to the small number of individuals and the several cases which are set forth?

Mr. WATTS. Yes, sir. I would say to the gentlemen from Michigan that it only covers those cases that have been filed prior to October 31, 1951.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind that explanation, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations, and notwithstanding section 1346 (d) (2) of title 28, United States Code, the United States district courts shall have jurisdiction of all civil actions or claims to recover fees, salary, or compensation for official services of employees of the United States which were filed prior to October 31, 1951, and were thereafter dismissed for want of jurisdiction as a result of the amendment made to such section by section 50 (b) of the act entitled "An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1951.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTILIZATION OF PRIVATELY OWNED SHIPPING IN CONNECTION WITH TRANSPORTATION OF PRIVATELY OWED VEHICLES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2286) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of certain personnel of the Department of Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to place in the RECORD an explanation of the bill and the reports on the bill.

So far as I am aware, there is no controversy with respect to the provisions of this bill. It is designed to remove a restriction in the law which probably was never meant to have the effect which it has had. Under existing law, Armed Services personnel are authorized to have their privately owned vehicles transported overseas at Government expense. But the law provides that such shipments are to be made on Government-owned vessels. The simple purpose of this bill would be to permit such shipments to be made on privately owned American-flag vessels.

The legislation was recommended by the Hoover Commission and also by the Department of Defense, and I am advised that the Bureau of the Budget knows of no objection whatever to the provisions of the bill.

However, I must advise this body that the Department of Defense has indicated to me, through Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, an objection to the language of both House Report 1686 and to Senate Report 1163, which have been filed in connection with this bill. As expressed to me, Admiral Denebrink fears that he will be subject to pressure by force of the language in these committee reports to reduce the nucleus fleet presently operated by MSTS. This, he advises me informally, will not be the result of the enactment of this legislation.

I do not believe it appropriate at this time for me to pass judgment upon the merits of the position taken by the Department of Defense. I do, however, in all fairness, wish to have included at this time a statement which they have given to me indicating their position in connection with this legislation. The statement follows:

1. In both Senate Report No. 1163 (Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce) and House Report No. 1686 (Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries) the assumption is made that passage of S. 2286 would make possible the reduction in the size of the Government (MSTS) nucleus fleet.

2. To remove the possibility of misunderstandings, it should be reiterated, on behalf of the Department of Defense, that the size and composition of the MSTS nucleus fleet is established and adjusted, in response to the determinations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide (a) immediate capability in an emergency, (b) shipping capability for

projects in remote areas beyond the customary trading warranties of commercial carriers, and (c) an adequate base for necessary expansion to meet emergency or mobilization requirements in support of approved plans for national defense.

3. The ships and personnel of the nucleus fleet under the control of the Military Sea Transportation Service provide the hard core on which necessary expansion will be effected:

(a) to guarantee extensive and rapid deployment of United States Armed Forces in the event of and during an emergency;

(b) to insure responsiveness of logistic support to command decision by providing the necessary logistic support, under military control, for the execution of strategic and tactical decisions; and

(c) to insure security, in the interests of national defense, of movements of men and materials requiring a high degree of security classification.

4. The present composition of the MSTS nucleus fleet is well within the limits set forth in the memorandum of agreement between the Departments of Commerce and Defense and concurred in by the Office of Defense Mobilization, and is consistent with our international commitments, such as those relating to the NATO pool of shipping.

5. Notwithstanding the possible passage of S. 2286, under prevailing world conditions it is not contemplated by the Department of Defense that any material adjustments can be made at this time in the composition of the nucleus fleet.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 901."; and (2) adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) (1) That notwithstanding any other provision of law, privately owned American shipping services may be utilized for the transportation at Government expense of motor vehicles owned by personnel of the Armed Forces and by civilian employees of the Department of Defense and of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force on other than temporary duty orders, except that nothing contained herein shall be construed to authorize the inland transportation of any motor vehicle within the United States. The Secretary of Defense may by regulations authorize such transportation by commercial means if available at reasonable rates and conditions or by Government means on a space available basis, and shall limit such transportation to one vehicle for the personal use of each authorized person. Transportation other than by water (unless in an overseas area as a part of a move involving transportation by water) shall not be authorized except upon approval in advance of the Secretary of Defense or such other officials as he may designate."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out everything after the enacting clause and beginning on line 4 substitute the following: "That section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(c) That notwithstanding any other provision of law, privately owned American shipping services may be utilized for the transportation of motor vehicles owned by Government personnel whenever transportation of such vehicles at Government expense is otherwise authorized by law'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned vehicles."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUNIPER DIVISION OF THE WAPINITIA FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1779) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of furnishing water for the irrigation of approximately 2,100 acres of arid land in Wasco County, Oreg., the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project in accordance with the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto).

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Juniper division $550,000, plus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indices and, in addition thereto, such sums as are required to operate and maintain the division.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, add the following new sentences:

"The Secretary is further authorized to investigate, plan, and construct the minimum basic facilities required for access by the visiting public to, and for the protection of its health and safety and of public property on, lands withdrawn or acquired for Juniper division. The costs thereof, in the amount of not more than $34,870, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable."

Page 2, line 2, strike the figure "$550,000," and insert the figure "$563,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING RECLAMATION LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6643) to amend the reclamation laws to provide that excess lands acquired by foreclosure or inheritance may receive water temporarily for 5 years.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That section 46 of the Omnibus Adjustment Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 649; 43 U. S. C. 423 (e)) is amended by adding thereto after the words "land involved in such fraudulent sales:" and before the words "*Provided further*" the following: "*Provided, however*, That if excess land is acquired by foreclosure or other process of law, by conveyance in satisfaction of mortgages, by inheritance, or by devise, water therefor may be furnished temporarily for a period not exceeding 5 years from the effective date of such acquisition, delivery of water thereafter ceasing until the transfer thereof to a landowner duly qualified to secure water therefor:".

SEC. 2. The portion of section 3 of the Act of August 9, 1912 (37 Stat. 266; 43 U. S. C. 544), reading "but any such excess land acquired at any time in good faith by descent, by will, or by foreclosure of any lien may be held for 2 years and no longer after its acquisition" is amended by deleting the word "two" and inserting in place thereof the word "five".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out all of section 2 and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of the act of August 9, 1912 (37 Stat. 266; 43 U. S. C. 544), is amended by deleting that portion reading 'but any such excess land acquired at any time in good faith by descent, by will, or by foreclosure of any lien may be held for 2 years and no longer after its acquisition;' and adding in lieu thereof 'but any such access land acquired by foreclosure or other process of law, by conveyance in satisfaction of mortgages, by inheritance, or by devise, may be held for 5 years and no longer after its acquisition, and water may be temporarily furnished during that time'."

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, upon request of any holder of an existing contract under the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), to amend the contract to conform to the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2108) to repeal certain laws relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following laws are repealed:

(1) Section 5 of the act of April 23, 1908 (ch. 150, 35 Stat. 67), as amended.

(2) The proviso under the heading "Medical Department" of the act of March 3, 1909 (ch. 252, 35 Stat. 737).

(3) The act of October 6, 1917 (ch. 101, 40 Stat. 397).

(4) The last sentence of section 24c of the act of June 3, 1916 (ch. 134, 39 Stat. 166), as added by section 24, chapter I, of the act of June 4, 1920 (ch. 227, 21 Stat. 774), as amended.

SEC. 2. The third sentence of section 24c of the act of June 3, 1916 (ch. 134, 39 Stat. 166), as added by section 24, chapter I, of the

act of June 4, 1920 (ch. 227, 41 Stat. 774), and as restated in section 507 (d) (1) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (ch. 512, 61 Stat. 894) is amended to read as follows: "Existing laws providing for the examination of officers for promotion are repealed except those relating to physical examination, which shall continue to be required for promotion to all grades below brigadier general."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING OFFICIAL REGISTERS TO BE PUBLISHED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2111) to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretaries of the military departments with the approval of the Secretary of Defense are authorized to have published, annually or at such times as they may designate, official registers containing the names of and pertinent data relating to such officers of the Regular and Reserve components of their respective services and such other lists as they may deem appropriate.

SEC. 2. All laws or parts of laws requiring the periodic publication of an official register of the Army, of the Navy, and Marine Corps, and of the Air Force, and prescribing the contents thereof, including, but not restricted to, provisions relating to lists of names, grades, pay and emoluments, and personal data inconsistent with the provisions of this section are repealed and such repeal shall include but shall not be limited to the following acts or parts of acts:

(a) Section 2 of the act of June 18, 1878 (20 Stat. 149).

(b) So much of section 1226, Revised Statutes, as reads, "The highest volunteer rank which has been held by officers of the Regular Army shall be entered, with their names respectively upon the Army Register."

(c) So much of section 1256, Revised Statutes, as reads, "continue to be borne on the Army Register, and shall."

(d) The ultimate proviso of section 1 of the act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 735).

(e) The words "and directed" in the seventh line of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1409).

(f) So much of the first sentence of section 201 of the act of June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1084), as reads "to be published annually in the official register of the service concerned."

(g) So much of section 301 (a) of the act of June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1087), as reads, "to be published annually in the official register of the service concerned."

(h) So much of section 1457, Revised Statutes, as reads "and continue to be borne on the Navy Register."

(i) So much of section 1406, Revised Statutes, as reads "and shall be entered upon the Naval Register."

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike the following language: ", with the approval of the Secretary of Defense."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to cause to be published official registers for their respective services."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECTION 9, SUBSECTIONS (D) AND (E) OF THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 101) relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we might not have just a few words in explanation of this bill.

Mr. ENGLE. I will be glad to answer any questions that the gentleman may have. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which clarifies the contracts under which irrigation and reclamation projects are repaid. There are two or three items in the bill—one relates, for instance, to the assurance that when a utility-type contract is entered into that the excess paid over and above the amount for maintenance and operations will be credited to the district against the capital cost of the project. There have been many complaints in the West that that is not presently in the law. We think the Federal Government could do it anyway.

Mr. GROSS. But this bill does not in any way change the basic Reclamation law? That is, by virtue of this bill, it would not provide for bringing more land into production?

Mr. ENGLE. No, no; this bill relates to the mechanics of the repayment contracts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in administering section 9, subsections (d) and (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1195), the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) include in any long-term contract hereafter entered into under said subsection (e) provision, if the other contracting party so requests, for renewal thereof under stated terms and conditions mutually agreeable to the parties. Such terms and conditions shall provide for an increase or decrease in the charges set forth in the contract to reflect, among other things, increases or decreases in construction, operation, and maintenance costs and improvement or deterioration in the party's repayment capacity. Any right or renewal shall be exercised within such reasonable time prior to the expiration of the contract as the parties shall have agreed upon and set forth therein;

(2) include in any long-term contract hereafter entered into under said subsection (e) with a contracting organization provision, if the organization so requests, for conversion of said contract, to a contract under subsection (d) at such time as, account being taken of the amount credited to return by the organization as hereinafter provided, the remaining amount of construction cost which is properly assignable for ultimate return by it can probably be repaid to the United States within the term of a contract under said subsection (d);

(3) credit each year to every party which has entered into or which shall enter into a long-term contract pursuant to said subsection (e) so much of the amount paid by said party on or before the due date as is in excess of the share of the operation and maintenance costs of the project which the Secretary finds is properly chargeable to that party. Credit for payments heretofore made under any such contract shall be established by the Secretary as soon after the enactment of this act as it is feasible for him to do so. After the sum of such credits is equal to the amount which would have been for repayment by the party if a repayment contract under subsection (d) had been entered into, which amount shall be established by the Secretary upon completion of the project concerned or as far in advance thereof as is feasible, no construction component shall be included in any charges made for the furnishing of water to the contracting party and any charges therefore fixed by contract or otherwise shall be reduced accordingly;

(4) provide that the other party to any contract entered into pursuant to said subsection (d) or to any long-term contract entered into pursuant to said subsection (e) shall, during the term of the contract and of any renewal thereof and subject to fulfillment of all obligations thereunder, have a first right (to which right the rights of the holders of any other type of irrigation water contract shall be subordinate) to a stated share or quantity of the project's available water supply for use on the irrigable lands within the boundaries of, or owned by, the party and a permanent right to such share or quantity upon completion of payment of the amount assigned for ultimate return by the party subject to payment of an appropriate share of such costs, if any, as may thereafter be incurred by the United States in its operation and maintenance of the project works; and

(5) provide for payment of rates under any contract entered into pursuant to said subsection (e) in advance of delivery of water on an annual or semiannual basis as specified in the contract.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate amendments to existing contracts entered into pursuant to section 9, subsection (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to conform said contracts to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "long-term contract" shall mean any contract the term of which is more than 10 years.

SEC. 4. This act shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike the word "or" and insert the word "of."

Page 2, line 12, following the word "said", strike the word "contract" and insert the words "contract, under stated terms and conditions mutually agreeable to the parties."

Page 3, line 21, following the word "for", insert the word "beneficial,"

Page 4, following line 7, insert the following new paragraph:

"(6) include a reasonable construction component in the rates set out in any long-term contract hereafter entered into under said subsection (e) prior to amortization of that part of the cost of constructing the project which is assigned to be repaid by the contracting party."

Page 4, following line 15, insert the following new section 4:

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall proceed in conformity with such laws, and nothing herein shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream or the waters thereof: *Provided,* That the right to the use of water acquired under the provisions of this act shall be appurtenant to the land irrigated and beneficial use shall be the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right."

Page 4, line 16, change "Sec. 4." to read "Sec. 5."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the eligible bills on the calendar.

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6904) to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument, which is on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by gift, purchase, or condemnation, all right, title, and interest in and to the real property located at Booker Washington Birthplace, Virginia.

SEC. 2. The real property acquired under the first section of this act shall constitute the Booker T. Washington National Monument and shall be a public national memorial to Booker T. Washington, noted Negro educator and apostle of good will. The Secretary of the Interior shall have the supervision, management, and control of such national monument, and shall maintain and preserve it in a suitable and enduring manner which, in his judgment, will provide for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to—

(1) maintain, either in an existing structure acquired under the first section of this act or in a building constructed by him for the purpose, a museum for relics and records pertaining to Booker T. Washington, and for other articles of national and patriotic interest, and to accept, on behalf of the United States, for installation in such museum, articles which may be offered as additions to the museum; and

(2) provide for public parks and recreational areas, construct roads and mark with monuments, tablets, or otherwise, points of interest, within the boundaries of the Booker T. Washington National Monument.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums not to exceed $200,000 as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ARMED SERVICES PROCUREMENT ACT OF 1947

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 393) providing for the consideration of H. R. 8710, a bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1937, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 8710) to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

At this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

House Resolution 393 provides for an open rule and 3 hours of general debate on the bill itself.

H. R. 8710 repeals the authority of the Department of Defense to use a Presidential emergency proclamation as continuing authority for negotiating contracts instead of following the practice of advertised competitive bidding or entering into contracts in conformity with the restrictions in section 2 (c) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

The bill also amends section 2 (c) to provide that formal advertised bidding processes are not necessary if the amount involved does not exceed $2,500. The amount in the present act is $1,000.

It was determined by the committee that authority should be delegated to purchase nonperishable subsistence items as well as perishable subsistence items without the use of the formal advertised competitive bidding method.

A further amendment will provide a means for carrying on programs in aid of small business, labor surplus or disaster areas when they are authorized by any act of Congress.

Section 2 of the act is amended to require that justification for the use of any exceptions provided in the act must be clear and convincing.

Section 7 (b) of the act is amended to raise the factor limiting the power of the agency head to delegate his responsibility to subordinates in the case of research and development projects from $25,000 to $100,000.

A new section is added to section 7 of the act requiring a semiannual report to the Congress upon the administration of the act to enable Congress to have a continuing look at the methods of procurement.

Section (h) of the bill would repeal section 15 of the act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 and encourage the use of the advertised competitive bidding process which this amendment might inadvertently impair.

The committee in reporting this legislation believes that such amendments to the procurement act are necessary to assure the Government, as a purchaser, the best bargain available and that it will give suppliers a fair and equal opportunity to compete for a share of the Government's business.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I hope that the membership will adopt the resolution which will make possible the consideration of H. R. 8710.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8710) to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8710, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will have the 3 hours' time for general debate divided equally between them.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is now recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 8710 is, first, to place increased emphasis on competitive bidding in military procurment; second, to restate congressional policy in this regard; and, third, to insure a greater degre of public scrutiny of those military procurement contracts which are negotiated.

The Armed Services Procurment Act became law on February 19, 1948. In that act we brought together all of the laws governing military procurement. We covered both competitive and negotiated contracts.

The committee recognized at that time, as it does today, the need for legal authority to negotiate procurement contracts. In recognition of that fact, we included the provisions of section 2 (c) of the act.

After considering the provisions of competitive bidding, we provided 17 ex-

ceptions under section 2 (c) which permitted the negotiation of military procurement contracts.

From February 19, 1948, the date of enactment, to December 16, 1950, the Defense Department had no difficulty in relying upon competitive bidding for most of its procurment contracts. Competitive bidding was then the rule and not the exception.

But on December 16, 1950, President Truman declared a national emergency. Section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act permitted the suspension of competitive bidding during a period of national emergency declared by the President, and all of the military services promptly availed themselves of that authority.

As a result, competitive bidding became the exception rather than the rule.

Even though we had provided 16 other exceptions under which military contracts could be negotiated, the departments chose not to use this specific authority.

It was far easier to use the emergency negotiating authority conferred by section 2 (c) (1) and that is exactly what they did.

Because of the importance of time, all of us understand the emphasis upon negotiated contracts during the period of a shooting war. So I am not going to be too critical over the emphasis on this type of contracting while the conflict was on in Korea.

But hostilities in Korea ceased on July 27, 1953. While we are still engaged in a cold war, we have not been engaged in a shooting war for more than 2½ years.

But the evidence conclusively shows that the emphasis upon negotiated contracts is about as great today as it was during the conflict in Korea.

As evidence of this point, I call your attention to these statistics:

Covering the period January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1955, the total dollar amount expended for procurement was $39,656,000,000.

Ninety-four percent of the Defense Department procurement money was obligated through negotiated contracts and 6 percent was obligated under competitive bidding.

In number of contracts, the percentage is almost the same, 93.7 percent in numbers being negotiated, and 6.3 percent by number being competitive.

In 1947 it was the declared policy of the Congress, clearly stated in the law, that procurement funds would be obligated under competitive bidding wherever possible. In view of the statistics which I have just quoted to you, I am sure you can appreciate our present concern.

Those statistics obviously resulted in the introduction of legislation on this subject and produced the bill which is before the House today.

After the committee began its inquiry in October of last year into this matter, the Department of Defense decided to issue a new procurement directive, to be effective on January 1, 1956.

That new directive limits the emergency powers of section 2 (c) (1) to five specified areas.

To my mind, that was an open admission that the broad authority of section 2 (c) (1) to negotiate had been abused.

During the committee hearings we fully explored the five areas which the Department of Defense wished to preserve for negotiated contracts under section 2 (c) (1). These areas were:

First. Procurements in furtherance of labor-surplus programs;

Second. Procurements in furtherance of disaster-area programs;

Third. Procurements in furtherance of small-business programs;

Fourth. Research and development contracts of $100,000 or less;

Fifth. Specific procurement programs designated by the Secretary of a military department.

It became obvious that the committee would not preserve the broad general authority proposed in point 5.

We then explored the validity of the four remaining areas.

Since the committee bill proposed to nullify negotiated procurement on the sole basis of a national emergency declared by the President, it was obvious that we would have to make specific provision for these things if any authority were to be continued.

All of us know that military-procurement contracts have been negotiated in furtherance of small business and to alleviate distressed conditions in labor-surplus areas and major disaster areas.

It has been my impression that specific authority to negotiate contracts in furtherance of these programs had been authorized in acts of the Congress, other than the Armed Services Procurement Act. But, when we inquired into the subject in detail, we failed to find this separate authority.

It exists in some degree in behalf of small-business programs, and, perhaps, for disaster areas.

But the authority, if any, to negotiate contracts in furtherance of surplus-labor programs is very nebulous. Each time we tried to trace the legal chain of authority, we ended up with the conclusion that such authority is inferred under one or more acts of the Congress.

It is not specifically granted.

I want to make it quite clear that the House Armed Services Committee is taking no position in opposition to the use of negotiated military contracts in furtherance of these programs.

The type and degree of support which these programs may warrant is not a matter within the jurisdiction of the House Armed Services Committee.

Therefore, it is entirely proper that we leave this determination to those committees of the Congress which have jurisdiction over the subject matter, according to the rules of the House.

In the bill before you we have preserved the authority to negotiate military contracts in furtherance of these programs, provided the Congress has specifically conferred such authority in appropriate legislation.

The Departments must not do by indirection those things which they cannot do by direction. This is still a government of law and not of men.

It may well be that the Congress, through its appropriate legislative committees, wishes to specifically provide this authority. If so, let that be done, in an orderly manner, by the appropriate committee.

I know that this matter is of very real concern to many of the Members of the House. But I want to point out that the action of the House Armed Services Committee is sufficiently timely to give the Congress ample opportunity to legislate in any manner it deems necessary before adjournment, which is at least 5 months away.

The committee's bill has a provision which delays its effective date until 90 days after the date of enactment.

Of course, if the House approves the bill, which I trust it will, action is still to be accomplished in the Senate. So the status quo will be preserved for at least 4 months. Surely that is time enough for the Congress to take appropriate action in this field.

In addition, the Defense Production Act expires on June 30, 1956, about 5 months from now. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that the Banking and Currency Committee consider this matter and report to the House legislation which will clearly spell out the legal authority to be granted in such cases.

If there be other committees having jurisdiction in this field, there is ample opportunity for them to take similar action.

Section 2 (c) (3) of the act permits the negotiation of contracts when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $1,000.

It has been recognized for some time by the Comptroller General that this was not a realistic limitation. As a matter of fact, the Comptroller General has allowed some latitude involving minor procurements not to exceed $5,000.

The committee wished to lighten the cost and the burden of heavy administrative overhead in this type of procurement.

It is the position of the Comptroller General that an increase from $1,000 to $2,500 would be fully justified, since the greater bulk of contracts negotiated under this provision are items of common use which are procured locally.

I am mindful of the fact that there were 318,000 procurement actions of less than $1,000 in the first quarter of fiscal year 1956. They averaged $130 each. There is no evidence that this authority has been abused and I am sure the increased authority will be helpful, rather than harmful.

Under section 2 (c) (9) of the Armed Services Procurement Act, the Departments have authority to negotiate contracts for the procurement of perishable subsistence supplies.

Subsistence supplies means food, and nothing else.

I am sure every one appreciates the necessity for negotiated contracts in the procurement of perishable foods. There has been no complaint on this point, because of the universal appreciation of the problems which are inherent in purchasing perishable food supplies.

On the other hand, there is undoubtedly less appreciation of the requirement for some type of negotiated contract in the procurement of nonperishable food supplies.

Some time ago, in the consolidation of certain activities within the Defense Establishment, the Department of the Army was granted sole authority and responsibility to procure the food for all of the military services.

In furtherance of this responsibility, the Army has established its principal office in Chicago, and has established 10 market centers which are strategically located throughout the United States.

In addition, it has established more than 20 buying stations under the 10 market centers, in order to cover the entire United States in relation to growing areas as well as distribution.

Every producer within each of these areas knows in advance the type of food supplies which are to be procured. They all have a chance to submit a quotation, and there is no secrecy about the process.

At a stated hour, in a market center, they read out the bids. The bids are not submitted in a sealed envelope, so that you cannot technically call this sealed bidding.

But in practice, it produces the widest type of competition, permits all producers to compete, and results in small business obtaining a far greater share of the dollar volume of this type of procurement than would be possible on strict competitive bidding.

As a result of this type of operation, which has never been criticized by either large or small business producers, we have amended section 2 (c) (9) of the act to permit negotiated purchases of both perishable and nonperishable items.

I think it is very pertinent to point out that the procurement of food supplies in this manner gives small business a real opportunity to participate on a successful basis.

This becomes abundantly clear when it is realized that 73 percent of the procurement actions go to small business, and 64 percent of the money involved goes to small business on the procurement of perishable subsistence supplies. A comparable situation prevails in the procurement of nonperishable items.

Most of the small-business firms which participate in supplying perishable and nonperishable food supplies to the Government do not have large legal and administrative staffs to help them in the preparation of bids under the competitive bidding process.

As a consequence, it is quite evident that most small-business firms would be forced out of this type of business if the present competitive, negotiated type of procurement were abolished in favor of competitive bidding.

The committee has further amended section 7 (b) of the act, but this amendment has no connection with competitive bidding versus negotiated bidding. The present section requires an agency head to make certain determinations on contracts for research and development. He may delegate the authority to make these determinations to a chief procurement officer if the contract does not exceed $25,000.

We find this to be an unrealistic limitation, and have therefore permitted the agency head to delegate this authority for research and development contracts which do not exceed $100,000. We are convinced that this would be more efficient and, therefore, less costly, without in any degree increasing the negotiating authority.

In addition, the statute requires that the Congress will be advised by periodic reports on this type of transaction.

Under the present method of conducting military procurement business, there is little, if any, public scrutiny of the results.

Bids let through open competition are subject to the scrutiny of the Comptroller General.

But this is not true of the negotiated contracts which are let under the provisions of section 2 (c) of the act. In addition, there is no overall report to the Congress on these negotiated transactions.

So, the healthy light of public scrutiny is wholly lacking.

We propose to remedy this situation by amending the act in a manner which will require the Department of Defense to furnish a composite report on all negotiated contracts entered into under the exceptions of section 2 (c) of the act, as amended by this bill.

This report must be furnished each 6 months, covering the preceding 6-month period.

It will give us an opportunity to scrutinize the degree in which negotiated contracts are being used.

In addition, the departments will be required to separate all contracts in excess of $10,000 into one of the 16 exceptions provided under the act.

This will give us, on a continuing basis, the same type of information which led to our inquiry and the proposed amendments to the act which are now under consideration.

It came as somewhat of a surprise to me to learn, during the course of our hearings, that the Armed Service Procurement Act has been amended by another committee of the Congress during the 1st session of this Congress.

Section 15, of the amendments to the Small Business Act of 1953, set forth certain requirements which were intended to encourage competitive bidding. But I think any fair reading of the language in that section will convince you that the language is self-defeating.

After setting forth the requirements, the language provides that any contract which fails to meet those nebulous requirements shall be invalid. The language is silent as to who will have the authority to make the decision.

Perhaps it would be the Comptroller General; maybe it would be the Court of Claims. At this point we simply do not know.

But if that language were implemented, it would simply mean that no contractor who had submitted the low bid and been awarded the contract would have any assurance that the award would be final.

Those who were perhaps 3d or 4th among the low bidders might raise the point that insufficient specifications, or drawings, or lack of other papers rendered the contract invalid.

So it is easy to see that any contracting officer who might have some remote doubt about the insufficiency of specifications or attachments would try to play it safe. The only thing he could do would be to abandon competitive bidding and attempt to find some way to negotiate the contract.

The purpose of the language which I have discussed was highly commendable. But we are of the opinion that it restricts rather than helps competitive bidding.

The Comptroller General concurs in that viewpoint, and concurs in the recommendation of the committee that the language be repealed.

There is nothing partisan in the committee's approach to this problem. We all recognize that vast sums of the taxpayers' money are being spent in military procurement.

It is our intention that the maximum use be made of competitive bidding.

When negotiation is necessary, we intend to focus the light of public scrutiny on the results.

This is all in the public interest and warrants your prompt approval.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Since what the gentleman says is so, are you not on dangerous grounds, possibly, by cutting out the legal authority which exists under the present law should a disaster occur tomorrow?

Mr. VINSON. We take care of that situation by maintaining the status quo for 90 days. We say this bill does not go into effect for 90 days, and I am perfectly willing to offer an amendment to say 4 months from this date so that the legislative committees that have the authority could deal and should deal with that question and bring it here. If legislative committees do that, then we set up the machinery in this bill so that the Department of Defense, having authority of law, can make those kinds of contracts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I regret that the committee did not write specific language into the bill dealing with that matter.

Mr. VINSON. Well, we do not have the jurisdiction to do it, because a point of order would be made against the bill, and then it is a subject matter that should be dealt with by the Committee on Banking and Currency or some other committee, and to preserve the status quo and to keep anything from happening that might be a detriment, as pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, we say that this bill does not go into effect for 90 days, and it will be at least a month from this date before it would pass through the Senate, so there will be about 4 months. But, I am perfectly willing to insure that there

will be a period of 4 months to give Congress the opportunity to legislate on this matter.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to say to the gentleman that giving any President—I do not care who he is—the power to direct contracts into what may be termed labor surplus areas is just as wrong as it can be. It is certainly subject to abuse.

Mr. VINSON. That is the reason I want free debate on the floor of the House on that specific instance and on that specific point.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. I know the chairman has made a very excellent statement on this bill on procurement, and I assume that under these negotiated contracts that we have been entering into for the past few years some benefit has inured to those labor surplus areas that the gentleman from Iowa just spoke about. Under the bill that we have before us today, is it a fact that we in those labor surplus areas, better known as depressed areas, will lose any consideration that we have been receiving in the past from these negotiated contracts?

Mr. VINSON. You will not do it for 3 months under this bill. It will continue along for 3 months.

Mr. LANE. If nothing is done by some other committee of the Congress, within 3 months we will.

Mr. VINSON. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. LANE. So we in the depressed areas are going to lose what little we have been getting if something is not done by these other committees that the gentleman referred to.

Mr. VINSON. This will pinpoint the necessity of the Committee on Banking and Currency legislating. Now, what is a labor surplus area? I hold here in my hand a statement from the Secretary of Labor, and it changes from day to day. It is changing today and changing tomorrow. Now, the Committee on Banking and Currency that has jurisdiction and the Defense Act, which expires in June, that has jurisdiction over this subject matter, should define and bring in legislation dealing with it. Here is the statement of the Secretary as to what constitutes surplus labor areas. Dr. Flemming says it is where the estimated available labor is at least 15,000, 8,000 of them nonagricultural workers.

Then under another date he says cities are 50,000 or more according to the census of 1950, and that at one time there were 149 areas and that at another time 182 major areas.

This is what I am trying to say to the Members of the House, Mr. Chairman. I know their conditions. I know how the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is disturbed about this condition. I have no opinion to express at this time as to whether or not we should do it. But I do say that whatever is done, it should be done in an orderly manner, that it should be brought here to the floor of the House and let the Congress say that a negotiated contract shall be permitted under this set of facts or that set of facts, because of a labor surplus or because an area is a distressed labor area. But as I have pointed out, there is no legal authority to do that today. But we do this under this bill, and if Congress grants that authority, then the Department of Defense may make this kind of contract.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the gentleman's committee, in the ascertainment of the $39 billion expended over the years since 1950 determine whether or not the Government got dollar-for-dollar as much under the negotiated contract as it did under the competitive-bid contract?

Mr. VINSON. We have no criticism to make. They had the legal authority to do it. They did it because it was the easy way. We have set up 16 different methods by which negotiations may occur. They could do it this way or any other of the 16 different ways. We never did go into the question of whether or not we got more for the dollar under competitive bids than by negotiated contract.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I think all Members should thoroughly understand there is not one scintilla of evidence of fraud or cheating or irregularity, nor illegality, because they were acting within the law. I am referring to these different department heads. We realize that when you have the letting of contracts shrouded in secret bureaucracy, there is always a certain amount of suspicion and oftimes it leads to corruption.

The whole purpose of this bill is to reemphasize the necessity of having sealed bids, open and free competitive bidding, wherever it is possible and less of negotiated contracts.

Mr. DONDERO. That is a double answer to the question

Mr. SHORT. Every witness before us, including the heads of the different departments said that they could live with this bill; in fact, they approved the intent of it, as shown by the directives they have issued to that effect.

Our distinguished chairman had a study made, then the bill was brought in and then the Department got busy and even changed their regulations to some extent to make more of the contracts open to competitive bidding.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the RECORD should show that I concur 100 percent in what the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has said. There is not a scintilla of evidence here that anything was wrong or that there was any corruption or fraud in connection with the negotiation of these contracts. But negotiation of contracts is not the way to do public business and we want to get back on the old, familiar principle of doing business by open competitive bids.

There is only one thing here that disturbs some of my friends from New England. They are disturbed somewhat by contracts that heretofore have been entered into in certain surplus labor areas and disaster areas.

What do we say in this bill? Let us read it. On page 2, line 9, it says, "otherwise authorized by law." That is, you may make any negotiated contract if it is authorized by law. Or that may be done when the negotiation of a contract is otherwise authorized by law in furtherance of small business or in labor surplus or major disaster areas. We say when Congress passes a law permitting contracts to be made because of labor surplus conditions or in a major disaster area that the Department of Defense can make contracts on that ground.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I point out to the gentleman that the Department of Defense today takes it upon itself not to have negotiated contracts so as to give any advantage at all to major disaster areas or surplus labor.

Mr. VINSON. We are trying to make the law definite for that very reason.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have surplus labor areas in my district as well as major disaster areas, and they are given little consideration in the negotiations of contracts to give the people a chance. In fact, I think they are encouraging new industries of the same type in other parts of the country.

Mr. VINSON. I am sorry the gentlewoman mentioned that because there is nothing of that behind this legislation at all—no; not at all. The appropriation bill carried a provision that no contract like this could have a price differential.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. You see we are suffering terribly, as the gentleman well knows. The Department should give our people a chance to meet the prices.

Mr. VINSON. We are certainly doing that, but we say to do it by law. This is a government of law and not a government of men. Now here you have a definition of a surplus-labor area. Tomorrow morning it could be changed. Tomorrow night it could be changed. That is not the way to legislate. I am asking this Congress, and I am asking the Committee on Banking and Currency to report a bill to the House dealing with the question of surplus-labor areas and dealing with disaster areas. When that has been fixed by law, then you can have negotiated contracts and the country will know what constitutes a labor-surplus area and what constitutes a disaster area.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They can change it today when an area may not any longer be a surplus-labor area.

Mr. VINSON. And to keep the gentlewoman from being disturbed, we put a provision in this bill, deliberately, that the bill does not go into effect for 90 days, and I am perfectly willing, as I said, to make it 4 months. In that time, this Congress should legislate, and I will say that with the influence of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, our leader, and the influence of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader, and with

the aid and cooperation of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and the several other gentlemen from Massachusetts who are so vitally interested in this matter, as we all are, I am satisfied that the Congress will legislate on this, but let us do it in an orderly way.

Let me point this out to you. Here under the Defense Manpower provision of November 5, 1953, there is written a declaration as to what constitutes surplus labor areas. He can change it tomorrow night—and it has been changed. It has been changed so often that it takes three pages to say what constitutes a surplus labor area. And further, that may be beneficial to you today or it may be beneficial to your district, but the interpretation of what constitutes a surplus labor area may not be beneficial to you at some other time. Is that the way the gentlewoman wants to legislate—in an air of uncertainty? Of course not.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very certain about it. I have been in the Congress for years. I have a little experience along that line.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, we understand.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If anyone can do anything for the State of Massachusetts or for my district, I am glad to see them do it, and I want to help.

Mr. VINSON. What is important is for this country to be run by law and not by men.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They do not run it by law today.

Mr. VINSON. That is what we are trying to do—run it by law.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am afraid they do not follow the law now and they will not follow it then; in other words, if this law is passed they will not have any opportunity of getting it.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. LANE. I do not intend to prolong the debate, but I assume that when the gentleman's committee was considering this bill, which is presently before us, it took into consideration the fact that there were some labor-surplus areas in this country.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. LANE. Many of such labor-surplus areas were brought about as a result of the migration of our textile industries to the gentleman's home State of Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. LANE. So that is benefiting the area in the South at the expense of the area in the North.

Mr. VINSON. I do not agree with you on that. We want to have a country where all segments are prosperous. We do not want just one segment of our country to be prosperous.

Mr. LANE. In any event, your committee did give some study to it.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. LANE. You are now speaking about 90 days or 4 months.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. LANE. I assume a 4 months' period would be better than 90 days.

Mr. VINSON. I am willing to make it 6 months. I am willing to give the Congress an opportunity to act, but I do repeat that we are here to write laws, and when we can write a law we should do it instead of having it by some rule or regulation of the Department that can be changed under pressure for this one or that one, and nobody knows where it is heading for.

Mr. LANE. Did I understand the gentleman that his committee is sending out notice to the Committee on Banking and Currency or any other committee that something should be done?

Mr. VINSON. I will appear before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I am satisfied the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will also. We will urge them to legislate in this field. That is what I am talking about today. I regret the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency is not present, but I do see the vice chairman of that committee, my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. Some years ago it was a letter that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] wrote to the Comptroller that started inquiry on the matter of how much negotiated contracts and how much competitive bidding there should be. The Armed Services Committee read with much pleasure and benefit the letter that the gentleman addressed to the Comptroller, and we put it in the record.

He is here on the floor, as he always is, and I hope the Committee on Banking and Currency will take notice that this is a field in which there should be legislation. At least, it is felt that an inquiry should be made to bring it before the House in an orderly manner.

Mr. PHILBIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. As usual, the gentleman is making a splendid statement. Would the gentleman be willing to submit an amendment to extend the effective date for 6 months?

Mr. VINSON. I am perfectly willing to offer an amendment on my own responsibility and ask the committee to agree to make this bill not effective for a period of 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not want to make that provision 6 months, because that would likely carry beyond this session of Congress. The gentleman has made a very sound statement.

Mr. VINSON. Well, we will make it when Congress adjourns, to give ample opportunity to legislate in this field.

Mr. GROSS. At this session of the Congress?

Mr. VINSON. At this session of the Congress.

Mr. PHILBIN. So that the appropriate committee can take action.

Mr. VINSON. So that the appropriate committee can take action. I hope that is satisfactory with Mr. SHORT.

Mr. SHORT. I will say to the gentleman it is. I have no objection to that.

Mr. VINSON. So we will all understand there will be an amendment offered that this bill does not go into effect until the day that Congress adjourns.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I do not mean to belabor the point, and I am sure the gentleman realizes that, but if we start out with 90 days and then 4 months and then the end of Congress, why take any action at all until the committee acts first?

Mr. VINSON. For this reason: You cannot justify to your people and I cannot justify to my people any action whereby 94 percent of these contracts of the Department of Defense is by negotiation. We want to say that we do not approve that way of doing business in this country, based on free enterprise.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I would like to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for bringing this bill out. Last year during the debate on the military appropriation bill that was passed, I expressed a great deal of apprehension about the situation of negotiated spending and immediately after the passage of the appropriation bill for the Defense Department I inserted in the RECORD that thought, and requested that the gentleman bring such legislation before the House at this session.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, while I am not authorized to speak for the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I happen to be a member, I can say to the distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee that the Committee on Banking and Currency has been alerted to this matter and I believe we will consider it. I trust we will bring it to the floor before adjournment in an appropriate bill to handle this matter.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman from New York. In view of that statement I sincerely trust that no amendment will be adopted to include the phrases "labor surplus" or "major disaster area."

Let us legislate in the orderly way; let us legislate through the Banking and Currency Committee bringing it in here and then the Congress passing it. Then we will have in this bill the matter of how the Department of Defense can negotiate the contracts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may ask a question of the distinguished gentleman from New York?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. Does the gentleman from New York believe there is good prospect of enacting legislation covering

this subject within the next 4 or 5 months or prior to the adjournment of Congress?

Mr. MULTER. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts that other colleagues of mine, and I, members of the Banking and Currency Committee, are trying to urge it and bring it forth. We certainly will urge in our committee appropriate legislation and we do hope we can bring it before the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to my colleague from Massachusetts that there is no merit in this proposition, and, of course, the Banking and Currency Committee is going to consider it on its merits.

All I am asking of this committee today is to refrain from acting on something that we have had no hearing on, and not to force this committee, by an amendment, to take jurisdiction of something about which not a member of the Armed Services Committee is informed.

Mr. PHILBIN. I think it was generally conceded that our committee had no jurisdiction over it.

Mr. VINSON. No jurisdiction at all. If such an amendment is offered and we defeat it, it is without prejudice to this issue.

Mr. PHILBIN. I may also say that I am perfectly willing to go along with the gentleman in the statement he made a while ago that ours is a government of law; but I remind the gentleman that laws are executed and carried out by men.

Mr. VINSON. At the same time we have filled this bill with such restrictions that they must report to Congress and tell Congress what they are doing.

Let me say to my good friends that I, too, have had disasters in my district and times of labor surplus; I know how you feel; I am in sympathy with you, and I will cooperate with you. I am only appealing to you not to saddle on the Armed Services Committee something on which we had no hearing, something over which we have no jurisdiction, something that should be brought to the House by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I call to the attention of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the fact that this Defense Production Act expires in June. That is the ideal place to write labor provisions, disaster area provisions, because it deals with those things. But we do not have jurisdiction of this act. This act expires on the 30th day of June, and it deals only in a very general way with certain contracts in certain areas of Banking and Currency Committee matters.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand this bill in no way has any relationship to contracts known as SAGE, which the Comptroller General has ruled the Department of Defense had no authority to enter into.

Mr. VINSON. I interpret the gentleman's question to ask if it would validate certain contracts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, could they do any stretching of the provisos of this bill to justify such contracts without getting legislative authority?

Mr. VINSON. No, they could not have that power, nor do they have any authority to interpret anything in this bill to take care of something the Attorney General has held to be illegal.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We had a great disaster, as the gentleman knows, when the Congress was not in session. I was one of those who wrote the President that a special session of the Congress should be called. Disasters do not wait for the Congress to act. Many Members were abroad, and I approve of their being abroad to find out what is going on over there, but they were not here to act and we had to wait for help.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the Defense Act of September 30, 1950, takes care of everything she has reference to except in connection with the making of a negotiated contract. There is the law right before you.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They should be negotiated in order to help the distressed areas, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. That may be true, but let the committee that wrote the Defense Act bring it to the Congress instead of our committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know how interested the gentleman is in helping.

Mr. VINSON. If a disaster occurs when the Congress is not in session, the act brought in by the Committee on Banking and Currency gives ample authority to do anything that is necessary to alleviate distress in that area.

I want to be fair, Mr. Chairman, and I am always fair with the committee. This matter disturbed my good colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] when we were considering this and he was kind enough to advise me that he would offer an amendment to include disaster areas and surplus-labor areas. But if he does offer it, may I say that the Banking and Currency Committee is cognizant of the situation, the House is cognizant of the fact there is no law to authorize these contracts. Therefore I hope you will vote that amendment down and let us legislate and pass a law that is proper.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. There is general authority under the law of today in 2–C–1 during a national emergency declared by the President, but the gentleman's bill before us now takes away that authority.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. BATES. Therefore, there will be no authority under the law.

Mr. VINSON. I may say that under a strict interpretation of 2–C–1 the Department of Defense has authority to make negotiated contracts on any ground it may see fit based on labor surplus, or based on this, that, or the other thing. We are trying to curtail that. However, there is no law anywhere to say that a negotiated contract can be made on account of a labor shortage or on account of a disaster.

Mr. BATES. Will the gentleman not agree that presently the Department of Defense is exercising powers under 2–C–1 for those very purposes?

Mr. VINSON. That is right, and we are taking that authority away. I am appealing to the House to bring in a relief measure to cover the situation involving labor and to cover disaster areas. But do not put it in a bill that has never had a hearing; do not make a committee assume responsibility that has no jurisdiction over it.

That brings me to the next point. When the House was adjourning last year, the Committee on Banking and Currency presented a bill which wrote in an amendment to this act. The objective of the amendment was fine, it was splendid, and I want to publicly commend the author of that amendment, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]; but when you analyze the amendment, it did not accomplish what was sought to be accomplished. The Comptroller General appeared before us and asked us to strike that out. That grows out of the fact that sometimes in our anxiety to legislate and to accomplish certain objectives we do not accomplish what we seek to do. That is another reason and another ground why we should not today seek to include in this bill surplus labor areas and disaster areas. So, therefore, we are asking the committee to repeal it. We thoroughly agree with the objectives of the gentleman's amendment, but on close analysis by the Comptroller General and by our committee, it would hamstring and hurt instead of being of aid.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I appreciate the compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has just paid me, and I want to take full responsibility for the mistake that was made in putting into the Small Business Administration Act that we passed in the closing days of the last session this section which will now be repealed by this particular bill being sponsored by the distinguished gentleman and his committee. I am one of those who has repeatedly risen on the floor and urged that each committee stay within its own jurisdiction.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MULTER. If I had heeded that advice which I had been giving, we would not have made the mistake that is now being corrected.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MULTER. Because if I had taken the precaution of going before the Committee on Armed Services and saying, "Here is the situation," they probably would have covered this with proper language. Instead of that, we have something now which must be taken out, and I have the assurance of the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on

Armed Services, that his committee will consider it and bring before us at the appropriate time proper language to cover the subject matter.

Mr. VINSON. In view of the statement made by the gentleman from New York, I cannot see how any member could afford to vote for an amendment now dealing with a subject matter that we do not have jurisdiction of and that we are not acquainted with. He put in this amendment in the bill during the last days of the Congress, something dealing with the Procurement Act. He wanted a good job done; his objective was fine, but the situation became confused, so we have to strike it out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to raise a new question in connection with the bill. On page 2 I find this language:

> It is the declared policy of the Congress that all procurement shall be by advertised bidding; and none of the exceptions in section 2 (c) of this act shall be used by any agency head or person herein authorized to contract for supplies and services unless the facts and the circumstances in justification thereof are clear and convincing.

My question is this: Am I correctly informed that this language does not go to the billions of dollars that are now going out in offshore procurements on negotiated bids to foreign countries?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct, because we do not have any jurisdiction over that subject matter. That is a matter that comes out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and we are not legislating in that field at all.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that he is a great power in the Congress and a great power insofar as national defense is concerned.

Mr. VINSON. As I have opposition this year, I hope those words get down to my district.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not need any help, I will say to the gentleman, in his district. But, does not the gentleman feel that this would give the War Department, which is not today taking into consideration disaster areas and surplus labor areas in negotiating contracts, more and more excuse to pay no attention to us?

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentlewoman in all kindness, we sympathize with you. I sympathize with the situation you are up against in New England or any other section of the country. There are 189 of them all over the United States in regard to labor. Now, the only thing to do is to approach it in an orderly way. Let a committee make a study of it. Let a committee define what constitutes labor surplus areas. Why, here is a letter in the file from my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], criticizing what constitutes small business. In the law they set up to define small business, but the department not having a good legal definition of it, says small business is a concern which works anywhere from 1 not to exceed 500 people. Now, tomorrow morning he could change it. I am just trying to avoid those things.

We are not going to hurt anybody, and if the Members go along with us on this measure, I guarantee that there will be another debate on the floor of this House in reference to what labor surplus means and what small business means and what disaster areas mean. So I hope that nobody will muddy the water by putting us into a field that we know nothing about, on a subject on which there have been no hearings.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct the gentleman's attention to the emergency proclamation of December 16, 1950, and point out that negotiated procurement is only one of the extraordinary powers in the executive branch of the Government which has as its foundation that emergency proclamation. There are many other laws; there are reservations in deeds; there are private contracts, and so forth.

I would like to ask the gentleman whether his committee, in hearings on this measure, gave any consideration to the propriety, at this time, of having a declaration by the President that that emergency is no longer in existence; and whether the gentleman has any information as to whether any thought is being given to repealing that proclamation by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. VINSON. In reply to that I will say that the only instance that concerns the Committee on Armed Services is what is covered in this particular bill. If we were to try to bring out a bill that would take away from the President the authority that he has under a proclamation of emergency, we would bog ourselves down. There are matters involved that would come before the Committee on the Judiciary, or before the Committee on Banking and Currency, or before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We are only dealing with what normally comes before us. We did not do that.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman did not receive any information during the course of the hearings that there was any thought being given to ending that emergency?

Mr. VINSON. That is a matter that addresses itself to the Chief Executive. We did not inquire into that except where it had relation to the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense recognizes that they have been using this section 2 (C)-1 too liberally and on January 1 they modified their requirements. Mr. Chairman, this was considered by the full committee, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] supports this proposal, the minority as well as the majority; there is nothing partisan in this. We are just trying to do business in America as business should be done, by competitive bidding, as it is done in every town, city, and county in America.

I hope this bill passes without amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing partisan in the bill which the committee has reported to the House. Though I am not boiling over with enthusiasm for it, I am in general accord with its purposes, and that is equally true of all members of the Armed Services Committee, on both sides of the aisle. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] voted "present," all other members voted to report the bill.

While it may be true that both big business and small business, in the conduct of their daily business, might find it both desirable and profitable to negotiate much of the contractual business, we must be particularly careful as to the manner in which the Government does its business because every dollar we spend comes from the taxpayers.

That is the reason this bill is here. We are trying to re-emphasize that very point, and I think no one will quarrel with that fact.

On the other hand, I think it is very easy for persons to get a misconception about the negotiation of military procurement contracts. In the procurement of items of common usage, it seems entirely proper that such contracts be by competitive bid under normal circumstances. But much of military procurement is so unique that it does not readily lend itself to competitive bidding.

In recent days the whole country has been bombarded with news about guided missiles and other complex weapons of war. In the field of guided missiles, we are confronted with such complex and difficult questions that it is utterly impossible for anyone to draw specifications which would permit competitive bidding on the end product.

Our new aircraft are in the same category. At the outset, we know the performance characteristics which we would like to see in the final product, but the engineer does not live who can at the outset write the specifications which would insure that performance. We encounter a similar problem in the field of electronics.

It is pertinent to note that these are the areas that require the expenditure of great sums of money. By far the largest amount of our procurement funds are devoted to such complex items.

There is one more area that I would like to mention. It concerns the participation of small business in military procurement. I am sure all of us agree that we must not only be considerate of small business, but we must take such action as will insure their participation in Government contracting.

In my section of the country, by far the greatest amount of manufacturing is conducted by small business, and I would do nothing to harm those people. But, in the field of military procurement, and particularly in those areas where vast sums of money are being spent, I think we must recognize that if we did not have big business there could be no small business. No small business, of 500 persons or less, could possibly undertake the manufacture of the Forrestal carriers, the Patton tanks, the supersonic jet fighters, the B-52 bombers, or items of

that character. So, small business must of necessity depend upon big business to blaze the trail in these areas.

In connection with this, I would like to give you some statistics for 1954. The aircraft industry used more than 50,000 subcontractors and suppliers in every State of the Union, paying them $4.7 billion. This was 54 percent of all industry disbursement. Of this, 43 percent went to small business. So, while small business concerns were not able to compete for the prime contracts which were negotiated, they got 43 percent of the dollars spent by the aircraft industry in 1954. This may be less than some would desire, but I think all of us will recognize that it is a pretty good record for the sharing of business between large and small concerns after the initial negotiation of the prime contract. And equally important, it puts the question of big business versus small business in a much better perspective than some would lead us to believe.

Mr. Chairman, business, big and small, has built America. All big business was once small business. How could we have won our wars without General Electric, Westinghouse, General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, United States and Bethlehem Steel, the great oil companies, and hundreds of other big businesses? And how could big business succeed or survive without the myriad number of small businesses that furnish it the raw materials and parts? Neither could exist or prosper without the other. We should, with proper regulation, preserve and encourage both.

Now, I would like to direct my remarks to one specific field of procurement. This concerns the procurement of perishable and nonperishable subsistence items.

Do we increase the number of negotiated contracts by adding nonperishables to the supplies which may be purchased by negotiation?

The answer to this suggestion is that we are merely modernizing the purchase of foodstuffs and putting the military procurement by the Army, on an up-to-date competitive basis.

Since the 1947 act, there have been a number of changes in the marketing of foodstuffs. Chainstore purchases in bulk have come into play and frozen foodstuffs are now a factor that must be dealt with in the market.

The Department of the Army has ten market centers located strategically throughout the United States. There foodstuffs are purchased for Navy, Air Force, and Army. I would recommend reading the testimony given us on the method of procurement at these ten centers. It is a fine program. In the entire time of operation of this centralized procurement, we have not had a single complaint about the buying practices of this agency.

I think it is not quite accurate to call the purchasing of perishables by this agency a "negotiated" procurement in the conventional sense. Anyone may offer to sell to this agency, big or small. These market centers publish their requirements of future purchases and then set a time at which quotations will be received. These quotations are made in the usual method in the perishable food business because of rapid price fluctuation and the need for immediate disposition. Generally, they have a limited period for acceptance. These quotations come in by letter, by telegraph, by telephone, and are recorded. Awards are announced in the most convenient way. It is a fast-moving industry and the military operation in this regard is not any different from its civilian counterpart.

Now, the present law authorizes perishables to be purchased in this way. The system is working well.

However, nonperishable foodstuffs consumed by the troops are an important item for purchase. When we speak of "nonperishables," we are really talking about perishable products which are packaged in either cans or are frozen or dehydrated for shipment and preservation in storage until used.

Military packaging is different from that of civilian packaging. For example, canned goods are bought in large containers because it is less expensive and more economical to store and to use. It would not be the kind of container that a housewife would purchase from the shelves of the groceryman. There is only a limited civilian market for this type of packaging, because only institutions such as hotels, hospitals, schools, and the like would have need for such large quantities in a single pack. It is obvious that the military does.

The same thing is true in respect to frozen dehydrated foods and other concentrates.

What has happened has been a change in the purchasing practices. Now the large users go into the fields prior to the processing, obtain prices, and make commitments for the growing produce before it is packaged or processed. They do that because it allows a more economical price and a better product.

It tends to help the small farmer or grower for these reasons: the product which he is producing for packaging grows on tree, or vine, or in the field, and it must be preserved within a stated period, otherwise it is lost. The small producer is then confronted with a decision as to whether he will package for the civilian market or pack in the hope of selling either to the military or the large consumer. Once his decision is made, it is irrevocable; and, if he fails to sell in his large pack to the military, he has a noncommercial product on his hands with the only possible outlet the institutional users.

Institutional and other large users do exactly what we propose the Army be permitted to do.

So, if the military, in this kind of a market is to have a competitive position and avail themselves of a good price from the producer and grower, commitments should be made prior to packaging.

All we propose to do by this amendment is to give the military buyer of foodstuffs for the services and the small producer and the big producer, the farmer or grower, an opportunity of obtaining a commitment prior to packaging, so that there will be a wider field of competition.

This amendment will merely modernize the whole field of foodstuff purchasing in line with present market practices.

The prices of these transactions are posted at the market centers. They change from day to day; but they are always ascertainable and there is a yardstick by which the activities of the military can be judged. Furthermore, this method allows a greater opportunity for broader participation in sale to the military by the producer.

We think the case is sound. It is a field in which the rigidity of the advertised competitive bidding process is not wholly applicable. But, insofar as broad opportunity for the producer and an equal opportunity to bid is concerned, and so far as the actual purchasing is concerned, it lacks only formalities, but has all of the elements of advertised competitive bidding. Only the documentation is different.

We, therefore, recommend this amendment upon the very convincing case and upon the proven experience of the Quartermaster Corps in the field of subsistence items consumed by the three services, both perishable and packaged nonperishables.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not so complex after all. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has stated the whole purpose well. No longer are we going to continue for years after the shooting has stopped in Korea to carry on by a delegation of wartime powers the declaration of a national emergency under a former administration. We feel that the time has now come when we should emphasize the traditional, normal method of procurement by free, open, competitive bidding or by sealed bids wherever that type of bidding is possible.

Under that system American has grown great and we have built up the mightiest industrial empire on earth. Under section 2–C–1 of the bill which we are eliminating we will withdraw that broad blanket authority that would give the heads of departments wholesale discretion to negotiate contracts. Some of them have been negotiated without, in my opinion, sufficient advertising or publicity and without some of the smaller contractors and businessmen of the Nation being given an adequate opportunity to bid with others in a particular field.

While I am on this point, may I say that we had before us this morning the Assistant Secretary of Defense on properties and installations, Mr. Franklin G. Floete, who recently has been named head of the General Services Administration. In the field of construction, only in that one field, carried on by our Army engineers and the Bureau of Yards and Docks—I want you to listen to this record carefully—of the $976,838,000 of contract awards by the Army in the past 3½ years, 98 percent were by competitive bidding. Ninety-eight percent of almost a billion dollars of these contract awards in the past 3½ years made by the Army were by competitive bidding. Of the $802,310,000 of contract awards by the Navy in the past 3½ years, 90 percent were by competitive bids and if you would withdraw the negotiated

awards made in Spain and the Philippines it would be 97½ percent competitive bids of that more than $800 million of contractual awards made by the Navy. With reference to the Air Force, because of the nature of their activities and equipment, no one could reasonably expect the percentage of competitive bids to be as high; but even in the field of construction, dealing with similar items, of $725 million in awards let by the Air Force in the past 3½ years, 70 percent of those contracts were let by open, free competitive bidding. Now, why cannot some of the other branches in our Department of Defense come somewhere near those percentages? Perhaps I should not say "near" but, certainly, they could let a much larger number of contracts and a greater percentage in dollar volume by open competitive bidding than has been let in recent months under this broad blanket authority granted by section 2–C–1.

The purpose of this bill, Mr. Chairman, is to get back to free open competitive bidding wherever it is possible and to cut down the number of negotiated contracts. No fraud, no corruption, has been unearthed, nevertheless negotiated contracts carried on under the cloak of secrecy arouses suspicion and often does lead to corruption and dishonesty.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Missouri if he will dwell on this point a moment or two. In the procurement of some items which require a great deal of research to develop, for instance, pilot items such as a new airplane or a new weapon, how would that be handled? Would that not have to be on a negotiated basis? And will the gentleman explain how under this proposed legislation these items are handled?

Mr. SHORT. There are certain types of activities and certain types of machines and implements of war that have to be negotiated. Certainly, when you enter a new field—and as I pointed out several items, the B–52, Patton tanks, electronics, jet fighters, and Forrestal carriers—these things necessarily have to be negotiated because of their very nature and the amount of the expenditures. No private concern is going to venture hundreds of millions of dollars, even billions of dollars, in developing a weapon of war unless they have some Government assistance in backing them, of course.

Mr. SCHENCK. Does the gentleman mean, then, that such items that require research and development would be on a negotiated basis and that then the production of those same items, if accepted, would still be on a negotiated basis or on a bid basis?

Mr. SHORT. Most of the research and development and most of the production of these complicated weapons I have referred to have been by negotiation and will of necessity, in my opinion, have to be by negotiation.

Mr. SCHENCK. Then, the gentleman indicates that that same type of policy will prevail in the future even under this proposed legislation?

Mr. SHORT. I think it would.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I will say to the gentleman that section 2 (c) 4, which is for personal or professional services, will take care of the situation that the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, section 2 (c) 4, if I may say to the gentleman, is not contained in the committee report. Sections 2 (c), 3, 9, and 17 are contained, under the Ramseyer rule, in the committee report, and that is the only thing I could find.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yeld?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The only reason we did not refer to the others is because we are not amending them. In the committee report we only dealt with those that will be amended.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, there is no doubt in any of our minds about that. The Government will continue in the future as it has in the past so far as spending millions of dollars in research and development is concerned, otherwise we could not get these weapons; we would be out in the cold. It would be impossible to get them. I do not know of any private concern that could or would stick its neck out or run the grave risk of bankruptcy by entering upon a new unexplored field in the manufacture of weapons without some Government assistance.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to inquire specifically about a few fields, and I would like to have the chairman indicate whether or not they are exempt under 2 (c) 4 or some other provision, namely, the so-called intermediate range ballistic missile, secondly, the intercontinental ballistic missile, and, in the third place, the work of the development of nuclear-powered aircraft. I would like to know whether all of the work concerned, in the first place the research and in the second place the design and construction of those items, is exempt under this law.

Mr. VINSON. I would say without the slightest hesitancy, under the exception dealing with research and development which authorizes negotiations, all of those types that the gentleman from California refers to would fall within the class of negotiation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then all of the research contracts would fall under negotiation?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. And at that point I think it should be pointed out—we have already done it, but we should remind Members again that the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, whom we had before us, are satisfied with this bill as it was drawn and reported.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is just fine, but are all of the people who are engaged in the research work that is being done for them, are they satisfied?

Mr. SHORT. Certainly; we could not call a whole multitude of witnesses, but this bill was considered for days and days and was thoroughly explored.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that probably in his own bailiwick, and in mine, and in that of a number of Members of this Congress, corporations are engaged in research work under contract at the present time.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. And institutions of learning are likewise so engaged.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman from Missouri would yield to me for a moment, may I say that under section 11 and section 13 they would continue to have the authority to negotiate. We recognize fully the right to negotiate. We are not trying to shut that off in certain areas as set out in the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, because I pointed out that sections 2 (C) 3, 9, and 17 are the only ones printed under the Ramseyer Rule.

Mr. VINSON. And those are the only ones we are dealing with here.

Mr. SHORT. The Members should know that they are the only ones with which we disagreed and it is assumed that they would know what the others are.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I was interested in the large number of contracts that were let out to foreign companies. I was wondering how many of those contracts were awarded under competitive bidding, under the terms of the Buy American Act.

Mr. SHORT. Our committee did not go into that very carefully, because that comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We do know that not only some weapons but some of our materials and supplies are being produced in certain countries abroad, usually with counterpart funds which, after all, are American dollars; it is our money. But in that way we can get what we need and at the same time help rehabilitate those countries and I think that is done to a certain extent. But I would refer the gentleman for an answer to that question to Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I merely wanted to point out that a great deal of that business is awarded to foreign firms, when some of our own manufacturers may be entitled to it under the Buy American Act.

Mr. SHORT. I feel just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania does about the Buy American Act, I will say.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Section 7 (b) is amended to raise the limitation on the power of the agency to delegate responsibility to subordinates from $25,000 to $100,000. There is no change, is there, in accountability?

Mr. SHORT. They are still accountable. It merely raises the amount.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, the person is still responsible for his subordinate, the same as he was before?

Mr. SHORT. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, may I say that that has no relationship to competitive bidding at all. It has a relationship to the delegation of authority.

Mr. SHORT. To delegation of authority to a subordinate, to cut down on the amount of paper work in the main office.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago we read a story of how 10 officials of North American Aviation Corp. split up more than a million dollars in salaries and bonuses over a year's time, and were guaranteed a profit on each plane they manufactured, before taxes, of some $38,000, approximately. Can the gentleman tell me whether that was a negotiated contract or a competitive-bid contract?

Mr. SHORT. I am not familiar with the case the gentleman refers to.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask some questions of the chairman or some member of the committee. I would like to talk about the matter which the majority leader has already mentioned. The chairman of the committee said in response to an inquiry by the majority leader that this bill does not authorize SAGE. Of course, that refers to the Semi-Automatic Ground Environment air defense system. As I understand it, this bill amends Public Law 413 and changes the basic law relating to the armed services contracts for supplies, equipment and services; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. METCALF. In response to an inquiry by the majority leader, the gentleman said that this bill did not authorize any long-term utility contracts such as would be negotiated or entered into in the SAGE program.

Mr. VINSON. That was not the gentleman's question. The question was: would this bill validate anything that the Comptroller General has held is illegal. I said, of course, it did not do that.

Mr. METCALF. Would there be anything in this bill which would authorize such a long-term utility contract as the SAGE program?

Mr. VINSON. We are not dealing with any particular type of contract. We are dealing with the philosophy and with the method of doing business. If it is necessary to have certain things in connection with SAGE done by competitive bidding or by negotiated contracts, then this bill sets out a standard to govern those things—if it is otherwise authorized by law. It has to be authorized by law.

Mr. METCALF. And if it is not already authorized, it would not permit such a contract?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. That is the reason I have pointed out to the House how unwise it would be to write into this bill anything concerning labor and disaster areas because that would not be authorized by law, and we have no authority to authorize it as far as the Committee on Armed Services is concerned.

Mr. METCALF. The gentleman mentioned an opinion of the Comptroller General who has said that a specific authorization would be needed for the SAGE program, and Secretary of Defense Wilson said he would see that the matter was presented to the Congress for the purpose of securing express approval as soon as practicable after the reconvening of the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. May I say for the benefit of the entire membership that we are all very much concerned about the question of SAGE. We all know what it means and how it operates. Today the Committee on Armed Services opened a hearing on public works. That subject matter will be fully explored in this hearing. We have to go into that in connection with bases that will be acquired all over the United States. We will get all the information we can on the entire subject matter, and we will bring it here before the House and give you the benefit of our information.

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to hear the chairman say that. I have had in my files correspondence from two cooperatives in Montana who have been paralleled by the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Montana Dakota Utility Co.'s lines, and they are unable to get any information on SAGE. They are unable to find out anything until some morning they may wake up to find that their line has been paralleled. I would like to have an opportunity to appear before your committee and lay this file and this whole matter before you.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Montana, it would be a pleasure to have him and it would be a pleasure to have any other Member of the House to contribute anything they can in connection with this whole subject matter. It is a very important subject matter. It involves tremendous sums of money.

Mr. METCALF. It could amount to $3½ billion; is that not correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is right, and we want all the cooperation and all the information because we are charged with this responsibility. Right now we are trying to explore a large deal where we are making inquiry into the cost of aircraft, and we are busy on that and will be busy on this too.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. That means that interested outsiders will be heard?

Mr. VINSON. I would suggest that they contact the chairman and come down and we will try to set up a calendar to hear outsiders. That does not mean that every Tom, Dick, and Harry will be heard.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I said "interested outsiders."

Mr. VINSON. Yes. We will do the best we can.

Mr. METCALF. With the assurances of the chairman that I am going to have an opportunity to present this matter before this committee, and I feel it should be presented before the committee in greater detail than I could present it here today, I will refrain from offering an amendment that I had prepared to offer to this bill in order to protect the rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives, and will appear before the committee with my full and complete file.

Mr. VINSON. It will be a pleasure for the committee to give the gentleman an opportunity to be heard, and we will appreciate it very much if you will include in your statement today, so that we will have knowledge of what information you have, so that we can study the question and be better qualified to examine these gentlemen when they come before the committee.

Mr. METCALF. I will put it in the RECORD in greater detail.

In the case of the Sheridan Electric Cooperative, Medicine Lake, Mont., last summer that company had a commercial utility come in with a parallel line under circumstances which we will develop at the hearing which we will have. We have the case of the Midrivers Telephone Cooperative at Circle, Mont. Five years ago they tried to find out where the lines were going to run that were going to parallel its own rural telephone line. The latest information I have is that they have been unable to find out how they can fit in with the overall American Telephone & Telegraph construction of the project.

I wrote to the Secretary of Defense and he referred the letter from the rural telephone cooperative to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and stated that they were the prime contractor. Later on he said it was a mistake to say that they were the prime contractors, but they were only the focal point, whatever that means. So that every cooperative, either telephone or electric, is now concerned with this authorizing legislation, and when the authorizing legislation is written it must be written to protect these little businesses that the gentleman from Missouri was talking about. For that reason I wanted to bring these cases before you, and I am sure my colleagues will have other examples. I want to bring them before the committee to protect the interests and the rights of the rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives as against the large utilities and the monopoly that might arise because of being subsidized and amortized in this program.

I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the ranking

minority member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and those members of the committee who support this bill. It is needed legislation and should have been enacted a long, long time ago.

I do regret that there is no way by which this committee can get at the noncompetitive, negotiated contracts under the off-shore procurement program. That is, the procurement of supplies and armaments from foreign countries.

Back in 1952, I asked the Pentagon and the mutual security outfit for information on negotiated bids in offshore procurement. I got from the Pentagon this list. It is 12½ feet long. It deals only with contracts involving $500,000 or more. This is offshore procurement, mind you; it does not deal with domestic procurement at all, this is part and only a small part of the foreign handout.

Let me repeat, this list deals only with contracts involving $500,000 or more and only with unclassified contracts over a period of less than 2 years, July 1, 1950 to May 31, 1952.

You are perfectly free, I may say to my colleagues, to examine this list. It is interesting to note that the letter A, representing advertised bids, appears only a very few items. The letter N, however, representing negotiated bids prevails by such a wide margin that for this purpose the letter N appears to be the only one in the alphabet.

I should like to take a few minutes to read from a newsletter I sent to my constituents on July 16, 1952, based upon this information. I said:

Despite its 12½-foot length, the list represents only partial success to lift the lid on administration censorship and secrecy, because it is confined to contracts of $500,000 or more and omits about 50 contracts, and no telling how many more, for alleged security and perhaps other reasons.

Anyway, the list reveals 142 contracts amounting to approximately $265 million let in foreign countries since the start of the Korean War through May 31, 1952. It is anybody's guess how far this list would stretch if it contained all foreign contracts, not merely those of $500,000 or more.

In a letter to then Secretary of Defense Lovett I said, "Within the bounds of bona fide national security, I want to know what is purchased (in foreign countries), in what amount, the total price, the price per unit and whether the contract is competitive, negotiated and/or cost plus."

My inquiry resulted in the 12½-foot, but only partial, list. On it, we find 142 contracts let in 25 foreign countries from Iceland to Africa and Switzerland to Persia. Materials bought in these foreign countries with your money include ammunition, guided missiles, tires, tubes, oil, radar gear, wool cloth, prefabricated arctic huts, nitro, airplanes, radio transmitters, grinding machines, stevedoring service, railway boxcars, and $680,800 in fresh beef from Ireland; $696,930 in unspecified food (probably canned beef) from Argentina; $504,237 in more unspecified food from Brazil; and $1,195,379 in butter from Denmark. Of the 142 foreign contracts listed by the Defense Department, only 10 or less than 7 percent are competitive. All the rest, 93 percent, were simply dished out expensively and many presumably cost plus at the whim of our military, with no competitive bidding. Time and again it has been clearly shown that the best if not the only chance the taxpayer has to obtain a bargain is through competitive bidding.

And to secure such free competitive bidding the gentleman from Georgia has introduced this legislation.

Continuing my July 1952 letter to constituents, I said:

But since the start of the Korean war, the administration has gone through the motion of protecting the taxpayers through competitive bidding on only 10 percent or less of all military contracts let in the United States. And now this spendthrift policy prevails on foreign contracts.

Not revealed on the 12½-foot list submitted to me are contracts of more than $200 million to France and Italy to produce F-84 jet fighter planes, a huge contract for ammunition and ordnance equipment to Fiat of Italy; and a juicy contract to Britain for tanks. Does it make sense to depend, for our military equipment, on foreign factories within Stalin's easy grasp?

And, if this isn't an international WPA, at the expense of American taxpayers, and a kick in the teeth of American agriculture, labor, and industry, what is it? But the internationalists presently running the United States have authority to let these foreign contracts with American tax dollars on a virtually unlimited basis.

Also spewing foreign contracts at your expense all over the earth, in addition to the military, is the so-called Mutual Security (foreign dole) Agency, headed by W. Averell Harriman. Replying to a letter identical to the one I sent Defense Secretary Lovett, Harriman's office sent me a 2½-page cover-up letter accompanied by an equally camouflaged report showing authorization for purchase of more than $6 billion of foreign products from April of 1948 to March 31, 1952, including wheat, oats, fats and oils, beef, pork, lamb, canned meat, cheese, wool, tobacco, fertilizer, vegetables, and eggs. The letter from Harriman's office admits that more than $1 out of every $5 spent on food and agricultural commodities for foreign aid goes to foreign producers.

In an effort to ascertain specific prices charged American taxpayers for these products bought from foreign countries, I asked Harriman for unit as well as total prices. But, astonishingly, the only unit he listed was metric tons.

Did you ever try to figure how many eggs in a metric ton?

Mr. Chairman, how did we get this way and why are we continuing on this negotiated noncompetitive contract basis, spending hundreds of millions and billions of dollars in foreign countries? Let me take you back to the 2d session of the 83d Congress, which was not so long ago, when the Congress passed this provision in the permanent foreign handout act. Let me read it to you:

SEC. 533. Waivers of certain Federal laws: Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of purposes declared in this act, the functions authorized under this act may be performed without regard to such provisions of law (other than the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended) regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of Government funds as the President may specify.

That is the power that you delegated to the President of the United States, a power that no President, whether it be Eisenhower, Truman, or any other President, should have or seek, the power to set aside the Buy America Act, the power to set aside a half dozen or more laws we have on our statute books to protect Americans. That is what you did in the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

I am glad to see action today rectifying at least some of the mistakes that have been made, but I say to you that until the Foreign Affairs Committee starts dealing in Americanism and brings out a bill to repeal this section of the law we will not have afforded the taxpayers of this country, industry, farmers, labor, and all others who make up the economic life of the country, the protection to which they are justly entitled.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, the House Armed Services Committee recently reported H. R. 8710, a bill amending the Armed Services Procurement Act, which we have under consideration today. The committee hopes that the enactment of this bill will place renewed emphasis upon competitive bidding and produce a proportionate decrease in the large number of negotiated military contracts.

We found that the Military Establishments were using the methods set forth in section 2 (c) (1) of the original act, for the procurement of military contracts amounting to billions of dollars, simply because it was an easier method. By using this provision they did not have to justify the negotiation of these tremendous contracts. It was never the intention of this committee or the Congress that this provision be used for such purposes except in extreme emergency. However, section 2 (c) (1), as amended by this bill, will confine the suspension of advertised competitive procurement to such periods of national emergency "as are declared by the Congress," instead of national emergency power being vested in the President as well.

During the hearings the question arose as to the legality of negotiating military contracts to relieve conditions in surplus labor areas. Many Members assumed that there was some separate legal authority, other than the Armed Services Procurement Act, which permitted the use of negotiated military contracts in surplus labor areas. However, upon complete investigation, we found this not to be true. As a consequence, when the committee reported the bill, it provided that military contracts could not be negotiated in surplus labor areas unless that authority had been granted by the Congress in some separate law.

The Congress in its wisdom can make whatever provision it wishes to in regard to this matter. But for my part, I can see no justification for the awarding of military contracts to alleviate economic conditions at additional cost to the taxpayers. We are charged with the responsibility of getting the most we can in military items for the expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar. That is our responsibility in connection with this matter.

I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will offer an amendment to this bill which will permit the negotiation of contracts in those sections which have been declared disaster or surplus labor areas. I am opposed to this amendment, and I hope it will be defeated. I might point out to you who

are so strongly supporting this amendment that the military has taken into consideration this surplus labor situation in the negotiation of contracts for a number of years, and you still have enormous unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this bill will pass without this proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of February 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 21) is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Section 2 (c) (1) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) determined to be necessary in the public interest during the period of a national emergency declared by the Congress;".

(b) Section 2 (c) (3) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $2,500".

(c) Section 2 (c) (9) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(9) for perishable or nonperishable subsistence supplies;".

(d) Section 2 (c) (17) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(17) otherwise authorized by law; or when negotiation of contracts is otherwise authorized by law in furtherance of small business, labor surplus or major disaster area programs."

(e) Section 2 is amended as follows:

"(e) It is the declared policy of the Congress that all procurement shall be by advertised bidding; and none of the exceptions in section 2 (c) of this act shall be used by any agency head or person herein authorized to contract for supplies and services unless the facts and the circumstances in justification thereof are clear and convincing."

(f) Section 7 (b) is hereby amended by deleting the figure of "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$100,000."

(g) Add the following new subsection to section 7:

"(e) Not later than February 15 and August 15 of each calendar year following the date of enactment of this amendatory act, the Department of Defense shall report to the Congress—

"(1) all contracts of $10,000 and over showing the dollar value and the number thereof separated as between those which were formally advertised and those which were negotiated showing as to the latter the number and dollar value of such contracts negotiated under each of the several negotiation authorities provided herein; and

"(2) the total number and dollar value of all contracts under $10,000 separated as to those which were advertised and those which were negotiated.

said report to cover the period January 1 through June 30 or July 1 through December 31, as appropriate, next preceding the date of the filing of said report."

(h) Section 15 of the act of August 9, 1955, is hereby repealed.

(i) Section 13 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(13) The provisions of this amendatory act shall become effective 90 days after the date of enactment."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 16, strike out "62 Stat. 22" and insert "69 Stat. 547."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 2 strike lines 9 through 12 and insert the following:

"(17) Otherwise authorized by law; or when in furtherance of small business it is determined that supplies or services are to be procured from small business concerns; or when negotiation of contracts is otherwise authorized by law in furtherance of labor surplus or major disaster area programs."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state briefly to the committee that after the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and I, and our staff, and members of the Small Business Committee had a conference, we agreed upon the amendment that has just been read by the Clerk. I also want to call attention to the fact that in the small business law it provides for negotiated contracts, so therefore we are carrying out in this amendment the principle that it must be authorized by law, and the Small Business Act authorizes negotiated contracts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. VINSON:

Section 2 (c) (17) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(17) Otherwise authorized by law or when in furtherance of small business, labor surplus area or major disaster area programs, the agency head determines that supplies or services are to be procured from small business concerns, from concerns which will perform the contract substantially within labor surplus areas as determined by the Secretary of Labor or from concerns which will perform the contracts substantially within areas of major disasters."

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is not adopted, the Department of Defense will have no authority to negotiate contracts, without advertising, to small business, labor surplus, or disaster areas.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is in error when he mentions small business, because the amendment deals with small business. The original language of section 17 takes care of small business.

Mr. BATES. I will correct the gentleman to this degree, that there is no authority under the law whereby, without joint determination, that that can be done unless this bill is so amended.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there have been no hearings on H. R. 8710 which we are presently considering. The committee had before it a bill which it passed out unanimously, H. R. 8499. Now, my amendment was contained in that particular bill, and the next morning when the committee convened, the chairman advised us, after due consideration, that this matter of small business and disaster areas and distressed areas did not come within the purview and jurisdiction of our committee. So we had no hearings whatsoever. Not one single witness appeared before our committee on the substance of the change offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. So, Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that we should do what the committee originally intended to do and that is to preserve the status quo.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] says we have no jurisdiction in this field. If that is so, then we have no power to take away authority, which we are doing by changing 2 (C) 1. Under the present law, negotiations without advertising may be done in the interest of the public during periods of emergency declared by the Congress or by the President. Section 2 (C) 1 as incorporated in H. R. 8710 does away with that authority in respect to the President, so there will be no authority whatsoever under which this might be done.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] indicated that all members of the committee voted for this legislation, except myself, who voted "present." Of course, I voted "present" because we had had no hearings. I asked our very able counsel, Mr. Smart, as to the net effect of this bill; what did it mean? We had no witness to testify on it. This is what he said:

I take no position as to whether or not there is such authority.

How can anybody act with intelligence when we are advised that there can be no authority on the intent, on the repercussions of the particular amendment that faces the committee?

Mr. Chairman, we have gone into this bill at some length. The chairman was in favor of the bill as it came out originally and as its purpose is incorporated in the amendment which I have offered. Here is what he said, after due deliberation, after hearing witnesses on this particular bill; here is what the chairman said:

We want to do this. We want to help small business, or where there is a labor-surplus area or a disaster area. We want to put them in the field to negotiate in that area if they think it is the proper kind of contract to make.

And the chairman went on further to say:

It is nothing but sound and right and proper to do so from my point of view.

He says further:

We have to do something for small business and the distressed areas.

That is all that my amendment proposes here. I should like the Committee to approve my amendment just as the Committee on Armed Services itself did without a dissenting vote. They approved my amendment before the question of jurisdiction came up.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the facts are before us. All of us understand what the situation is. I think we ought to maintain the status quo. Then when the Committee on Banking and Currency finally gets around to the consideration of this bill, let them act as their conscience and their judgment dictate. But in the meantime let us keep on the books the authority which the Department of Defense says they need and without which they cannot give orders by negotiated contracts to small business, disaster, and distressed areas.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the Department of Commerce and the Office of Defense Mobilization have advised us that if this language is deleted from the law they have no authority whatsoever to assist the distressed areas of this country?

Mr. BATES. I just received a phone call, before the bill came on the floor today, from the administration who are strongly in favor of this bill, with my amendment, as were all the witnesses from the administration who appeared before the committee. That is the situation. That is what the witnesses said who were given an opportunity to appear. But there was not one single witness who appeared on this particular section after it had been changed.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our committee said that it is sound and it is proper and it should be done. I ask the Committee to accept my amendment.

We have no way of knowing when a disaster might strike an area. Who knows, it could be your own.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman. I cannot see where this is controversial. I shall not attempt to paint the lily or improve upon his argument. He said everything that should be said. He said it logically. He said it in the right way.

Now, my friends, you have all said to us, who represent these distressed areas, that you want to help us. It is not that we are asking for a special privilege. We are not doing that. The gentleman from Massachusetts merely asks that you let the status quo remain until such time as the Committee on Banking and Currency see fit in their wisdom to act.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman is a little in error. The gentleman is not asking for the status quo to remain. He is asking that it become permanent law and it would be necessary to offer an amendment later on to the language of this act so that it would not take effect within 6 months, to enable the Committee on Banking and Currency to deal with this subject matter.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, I would like to answer that, but I would prefer that my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, answer.

Mr. BATES. Of course, the gentleman from Georgia knows that there is general authority in the law to do it, and the Department of Defense is, in fact, doing it today.

Mr. FLOOD. I am astounded. I love, admire, revere and kowtow to the gentleman from Georgia, as we all do—he is the oracle to which we appeal on matters dealing with defense. I cannot believe that my idol would have feet of clay. I know he wants to help us. We are not asking for largess. We feel if he could get the act amended, he would help us. We are desperate. These are not crocodile tears. There are millions of people—there are 10 men to my left and an equal number to my right from districts that are affected seriously, and there are a dozen States affected by this problem. The armed services can act and are acting as the gentleman from Massachusetts indicated. We are asking for nothing more. Please—we are having trouble enough getting anything from the Department of Defense. We are only getting crumbs as it is. Now, do not take this little bit from us. Just let us alone for the time being until by operation bootstrap, we can help ourselves—and we will. We are not asking for a WPA or for a leaf-raking program or anything like that. We want to be left alone until we can put ourselves on our feet.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey whose area is affected by this problem.

Mr. CANFIELD. I agree with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania and like him I have known the full meaning of a distressed labor area. Furthermore, it is well to point out now that during this past year we have had in New England, in the Middle West, and in the Far West, hurricanes and floods such as we have never had before. This is no time now to say to the Defense Establishment "you can no longer consider these facts of life and the human considerations involved and accord some relief through negotiated contracts." By all means, the Bates amendment should prevail.

Mr. FLOOD. I was speaking directly to the surplus labor areas, the chronic disaster areas of that kind. Now, my friends from New Jersey brings in a new disaster, the act of God, that we experienced in many sections of the country during the past summer and more recently in the far West. I cannot imagine that you an other Members here would rise to support this amendment, if we felt it was basically wrong. I am sure of that, and I am merely appealing to you in the deepest sense of just plain fairness—you want to help us—we need it badly.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who represents exactly this kind of district. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been extending himself for years trying to solve this problem.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is accepted, the general authority that the Government has today to extend aid to surplus areas, will continue?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, that is so. May I point this out. I just came from the subcommittee on appropriations for the Defense Department. We have Mr. Pike, Assistant Secretary of Defense, downstairs this very minute together with his whole staff discussing this problem. The gentleman from Massachusetts and I were talking to him when he received a telephone call from the Department that they would like to have this done. You know that they would be the last people in the world who would embrace anything like this, if they felt there was danger of harm to the program and to the defense effort. Believe me, the amendment has nothing but merit.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto, or substitute amendments, be limited to 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be controlled by the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, those who have had an opportunity to sit on this floor since the debate started would be given the idea that we who come from surplus labor areas should not get too excited about this bill, because there will be a period of 6 months in which this matter will be brought to the attention of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and knowing their fairness that they will bring out some legislation to benefit those districts in which we have surplus labor areas. We should not get excited. There is nobody in the House who can speak for that important committee, and I know any action in that direction is a long way off. I rise at this time to support the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. BATES], who I know is familiar with these labor-surplus areas in the Northeast, and who has sat in on all of the hearings on this particular bill. His amendment has been well thought out and now offered for our consideration. I feel it is an amendment that should be adopted because it has much merit.

Mr. Chairman, the administration recommends a program to help labor-surplus areas.

I am heartily in favor of such a program because I know from personal experience, the economic and human problems of those areas where too many people have been out of work for too long a time.

Part of that program requires that the Federal Government should provide assistance by routing a percentage of its procurement needs toward labor-surplus areas. This, in turn, depends upon a formula that admits the necessity of negotiation.

In considering H. R. 8710, "to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947" we seem to run into contradictions.

The basic purpose of this bill is to implement the declared policy of the Congress that all procurement shall be by advertised bidding.

This is consistent with the established practices of our competitive economy.

But the needs of labor-surplus, or disaster areas, are the exceptions that should prove the rule.

But I note one reasonable exception. Section (c) would delegate the authority to purchase nonperishable subsistence items as well as perishable subsistence items without the use of the formal competitive bidding methods.

I would like to see another reasonable exception, regarding labor-surplus areas, also stated, and stated clearly.

This bill, under section (d) and according to the report accompanying H. R. 8710, reads that it "will provide a means for carrying on programs in aid of small business, labor, surplus, or disaster areas, when they are authorized by any act of Congress."

But I believe that it should be followed by other legislation, to be incorporated in the area assistance program that will clearly spell out the authority and the propriety of using the military procurement system to aid in solving the problem of labor surplus areas.

With the recognition that H. R. 8710 shall not prejudice additional legislation to route such portion of Federal procurement toward those clearly defined areas suffering from economic dislocations.

It is indeed strange that a comparison of procurement by negotiation versus advertised competitive bidding from January 1, 1953, through June 30, 1955, is so unbalanced. By dollar value, the Department of Defense total reveals 94.19 negotiated, as against 5.81 arrived at through advertised bidding.

It is even more perplexing to discover that, with such freedom to negotiate, so little procurement has come to the aid of labor-surplus areas.

The wide discretion exercised by the Department of Defense under the dubious and extended definition of "emergency" has not helped emergency areas to the extent that it should.

Manpower directive No. 4 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as revised and amended, is obscure on this point of routing Government procurement to labor-surplus areas.

Perhaps sectional politics played a part in this planned confusion, in order to delay relief.

I am thoroughly in accord with the intent of H. R. 8710 to repeal the practice of the Department of Defense to use a presidential emergency proclamation as continuing authority for negotiating contracts instead of following the practice of advertised competitive bidding or entering into contracts in conformity with restrictions in section 2 (c) of the Armed Forces Procurement Act of 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inform the membership that when this bill first was presented here from the Armed Services Committee some members of the Small Business Committee had expressed some doubt as to whether or not the enactment of the bill as reported by the Armed Services Committee might adversely affect small business, labor surplus areas, and disaster areas. Accordingly the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, even though the bill had already been reported, convened another hearing of his committee which was attended by the members and staff of the House Small Business Committee.

It is my understanding—and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee, will correct me if I am wrong—that the language as contained within the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia is the language as agreed upon to correct the situation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. It has been applied to small business concerns, but it does not take care of present labor surplus areas.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. That is an important exception.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the distinguished gentleman from Texas tell us whether or not the language on page 2, line 9, where it specifically refers to labor surplus or major disaster area programs does not cover the situation?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going along with the language the gentleman mentioned. I promised to go along with the bill; that I will do, although I realize it does not cover disaster areas or surplus labor areas.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, what the gentleman concerned himself with was small business?

Mr. PATMAN. Just small business.

Mr. McCORMACK. If it were broader the gentleman would have been for the Bates amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want to go back on the Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. So the Committee can clearly understand the issue I may state that if authority were provided in existing law to negotiate contracts for labor or distress areas and disaster areas it would be perfectly permissible to do so.

The point that the Armed Services Committee makes, however, is that there is no law to authorize it; therefore, it is not within our jurisdiction to legislate on it. If, however, another committee, the gentleman's committee, recommends and we pass a law, then the Department of Defense would have the authority to make such negotiated contracts.

Mr. MULTER. That is precisely the point I wanted to make, whether you enact the Bates substitute, or the Vinson amendment you still would not have any basic authority enacted into law, and you would not be able to do anything that you cannot do now.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is in error.

If you adopt the Bates amendment it becomes the basic law and authorizes such contracts to be made—and it would become the basic law without any hearings or any report to the Congress. In effect it would say: "You can make a negotiated contract for or in a surplus labor area", yet you would have no foundation to stand upon.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the author of the substitute amendment.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman from Georgia is mistaken, because there is general authority here under the law. We are cutting out that authority because today we are in an emergency declared by the President and not by Congress as the amendment would provide.

Mr. MULTER. But whatever basic authority exists would continue until the provisions of this bill became effective.

Mr. VINSON. Which will be 6 months under my proposed amendment.

Mr. MULTER. Six months after enactment, if I understand the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

CONTRACT PLACEMENTS IN AREAS HAVING A SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS SHOULD BE A PERMANENT GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, my congressional district over a period of years has been classified as a distressed area because of unemployment in the coal and railroad industries.

While it is true the unemployment in my congressional district has greatly improved, we cannot afford to be unprepared for a recurrence of unemployment.

It is for that reason that I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

If this amendment is adopted it will assist in securing the maximum development and use of all of the key factors in our economy which certainly include our human resources.

The Federal agencies when scheduling production or carrying out any of the activities of the defense mobilization program have made it their policy to give full consideration to manpower supplies in the various areas. Whenever possible defense work is brought to the labor supply rather than moving the labor supply to new areas for employment.

When large numbers of workers move to already tight labor areas, heavy burdens are placed on community facilities—schools, hospitals, housing, transportation, utilities, and so forth.

If, on the other hand, jobs are not available and workers do not migrate, unemployment develops in certain areas; unemployment compensation costs increase and plants, tools, and workers' skills remain idle and unable to contribute to our mobilization program.

The policy of encouraging contract placements in areas such as central Pennsylvania where there is a substantial labor surplus was implemented by the Office of Defense Mobilization Defense Manpower Policy No. 4, dated November 5, 1953.

This policy, among other things, directed procurement agencies to negotiate portions of procurements at prices no higher than those paid on the balance of these procurements, exclusively with firms located in labor surplus areas.

During the past 2 years a considerable number of defense contracts have been negotiated in these economically distressed areas.

These contracts gave the people in these areas a much needed economical

assist and even more important a psychological lift by letting them know that their Federal Government was aware of their problems and was attempting to help within the limits inherent in this particular type of assistance.

The contracts negotiated under this program have not resulted in extra cost to the Government as the best price obtainable in each instance was determined by receiving bids for a suitable portion of the required commodity.

The general objectives of activities under the Disaster Relief Act are similar. The negotiation of contracts in major disaster areas serves to aid in the rehabilitation of the mobilization base in the ravaged areas.

The authority for negotiation procurement contracts in accordance with Manpower Policy No. 4 and for disaster relief appears to reside only in section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (62 Stat. 21) and the declaration of a national emergency by the President on December 16, 1950.

H. R. 8710 as reported out of committee would specifically amend section 2 (c) (1) of the Procurement Act and would confine suspension of advertised competitive procurement to periods of national emergency "as are declared by the Congress," thereby eliminating the authority for that part of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4.

The amendment under consideration would simply permit the procurement agencies to continue in force those programs which have operated to preserve the worker skills of our industrial manpower and assure a better utilization of the productive facilities of the entire country without increasing the cost to the Government of the material purchased.

In plain words, if this amendment is adopted it will also permit the Government to channel defense contracts to labor surplus areas where good Americans because of unemployment are not enjoying the prosperity now shared by the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment will be approved because to me it is just as important that we show interest in the labor surplus areas as well as other segments of our economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just preceded me, I, too, represent a distress area. One year ago today there were 26 such critical distress areas in the State of West Virginia. We still have some 18 or 19. Improvement in employment has eliminated a few of them, but we still have a serious situation.

A year ago 253,000 people in West Virginia, one out of every eight persons in the State, were living on surplus Federal food. At that time we had unemployment of approximately 91,000. Today our unemployment situation is somewhere around 61,000 or 62,000.

We still have distress areas and we have plenty of small industries in those distress areas that should have these Government contracts. I am for the Bates amendment because we will know positively, if that amendment is approved to this proposed legislation, that it will safeguard the interest of the small industries in those critical areas to get Government contracts so as to increase employment. I want to urge serious consideration of the Bates amendment and its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, with all deference to my distinguished colleague and member of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], I respectfully request the committee to reject his amendment because it is not sound. It is not the proper way to legislate. I would like to ask my good friend from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] who just finished speaking, What would he term a labor surplus area? There is not a definition anywhere in law to say what a labor surplus area shall be. Does anyone who is in favor of this amendment know what a labor surplus area is?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman put a question and I can answer it.

Mr. VINSON. I do not yield. What is a major disaster area? We have laws, and they define what certain words mean. Now, let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] can he tell me what constitutes a labor surplus area? Here is a labor man, the Secretary of Labor. He wrote this memorandum weeks ago. He could change it tomorrow. Now, here you are asking to write permanent law. This is not temporary; it is not temporary at all. You are asking to write something in the law to govern generations yet to be born, and you do not define what constitutes any of these things. So, therefore, I urge you to let this go to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, as I pointed out, I am perfectly willing to ask that this bill not be effective for 6 long months, until you can adjudicate this question. But, if you do this, what happens tomorrow? The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] might think that he has a labor distressed area on Friday morning and would like to get a negotiated contract. On Saturday morning the department head down here might issue a new rule, and where would his labor distressed area be? I want to legislate by law and not by men and not legislate on matters of this kind which are entirely at the whim of a Secretary when he does not know and no man knows what position he will take on one day or the next day, and yet you would write it into the permanent law of the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down, and let us do it in an orderly way. Let us go before the Committee on Banking and Currency and have a bill here defining what "labor surplus" means and what "distressed area" means and do justice and right in a legal way, fixed by statute, not fixed by any whim or any rule or regulation that can be changed any 24 hours of the day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 87, noes 68.

So the substitute to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 2, preceding line 13, insert the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That no contract in furtherance of labor surplus area programs, or major disaster area programs shall be negotiated pursuant to the provisions of this act, except pursuant to regulations to be issued by the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall clearly describe and define the terms 'labor surplus areas' and 'major disaster areas': *Provided further*, That on the 10th day of each calendar month following the date of enactment of this amendatory act, the Secretary of Defense shall file with the Congress a report on all contracts negotiated in furtherance of said programs, said report to include the date, identity, and location of the contracting parties, the type and quantity of the item being procured, and financial consideration involved, said report to cover the period of the calendar month next preceding the date on which said report is filed."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the committee desires to deal with the question of labor surplus and major disaster areas, my purpose is now to fix the responsibility on the Secretary of Defense. Let the Secretary of Defense make the rules and regulations. It is to be hoped that the rules and regulations will be of such character that the country will know exactly what they are.

In addition, I want the country to know what type of contracts are being negotiated; how much is involved, and everything concerning it. This means nothing but turning the light of day on transactions of this kind. There is no purpose in my amendment to try to destroy what the committee has already done. The purpose is not to submarine that action, but to give some validity to it and throw some light on it, so that the Secretary of Defense may issue a directive. We put the responsibility on the man who makes the contract.

So I ask that this amendment be agreed to, because it is in line with the action already taken by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 2, line 14, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8710) to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, pursuant to House Resolution 393, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 372, nays 2, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—372

Abbitt	Burnside	Engle
Abernethy	Bush	Evins
Adair	Byrd	Fallon
Addonizio	Byrne, Pa.	Fascell
Albert	Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan
Alexander	Canfield	Fenton
Alger	Cannon	Fernandez
Allen, Calif.	Carlyle	Fino
Allen, Ill.	Carnahan	Fisher
Andersen, H. Carl	Carrigg	Fjare
	Cederberg	Flood
Andresen, August H.	Chase	Flynt
	Chelf	Fogarty
Andrews	Chenoweth	Forand
Anfuso	Christopher	Ford
Arends	Chudoff	Forrester
Ashley	Church	Fountain
Ashmore	Clark	Frazier
Aspinall	Clevenger	Friedel
Auchincloss	Colmer	Fulton
Avery	Cooley	Garmatz
Ayres	Coon	Gary
Bailey	Cooper	Gathings
Baker	Corbett	Gentry
Baldwin	Coudert	George
Barrett	Cramer	Gordon
Bass, N. H.	Cretella	Granahan
Bass, Tenn.	Crumpacker	Grant
Bates	Cunningham	Gray
Baumhart	Curtis, Mass.	Green, Oreg.
Beamer	Dague	Green, Pa.
Becker	Davis, Tenn.	Gregory
Belcher	Davis, Wis.	Griffiths
Bennett, Fla.	Dawson, Ill.	Gross
Bentley	Dawson, Utah	Gubser
Berry	Deane	Gwinn
Betts	Delaney	Hagen
Blatnik	Dempsey	Hale
Blitch	Denton	Haley
Boland	Derounian	Harden
Bolling	Devereux	Hardy
Bolton, Frances P.	Dies	Harris
	Dingell	Harrison, Nebr.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Dixon	Harrison, Va.
	Dodd	Harvey
Bonner	Dollinger	Hays, Ark.
Bosch	Dolliver	Hayworth
Boykin	Dondero	Healey
Boyle	Donohue	Hébert
Bray	Donovan	Henderson
Brooks, La.	Dorn, N. Y.	Herlong
Brooks, Tex.	Dorn, S. C.	Heselton
Brown, Ga.	Dowdy	Hess
Brown, Ohio	Doyle	Hill
Broyhill	Durham	Hinshaw
Budge	Edmondson	Hoeven
Burleson	Ellsworth	Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield	Miller, Calif.	Seely-Brown
Holland	Miller, Nebr.	Selden
Holmes	Mills	Sheehan
Holt	Minshall	Shelley
Holtzman	Morano	Sheppard
Hope	Morgan	Short
Horan	Moss	Shuford
Hosmer	Moulder	Sieminski
Huddleston	Multer	Siler
Hull	Mumma	Simpson, Ill.
Hyde	Murray, Ill.	Sisk
Ikard	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Kans.
Jackson	Natcher	Smith, Miss.
James	Nelson	Smith, Va.
Jarman	Nicholson	Smith, Wis.
Jenkins	Norblad	Spence
Jensen	Norrell	Springer
Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien, Ill.	Staggers
Johnson, Wis.	O'Hara, Ill.	Steed
Jonas	O'Hara, Minn.	Sullivan
Jones, Ala.	O'Konski	Taber
Jones, Mo.	O'Neill	Talle
Jones, N. C.	Osmers	Taylor
Judd	Ostertag	Teague, Calif.
Karsten	Passman	Teague, Tex.
Kean	Patman	Thomas
Kearney	Patterson	Thompson, Mich.
Kearns	Pelly	
Keating	Perkins	Thompson, N. J.
Kee	Pfost	Thompson, Tex.
Kelley, Pa.	Philbin	Thomson, Wyo.
Kelly, N. Y.	Pilcher	Thornberry
Kilburn	Pillion	Tollefson
Kilday	Poage	Trimble
Kilgore	Poff	Tuck
King, Calif.	Polk	Tumulty
King, Pa.	Preston	Udall
Kirwan	Price	Utt
Kluczynski	Priest	Vanik
Knox	Prouty	Van Pelt
Krueger	Quigley	Van Zandt
Laird	Rabaut	Vinson
Landrum	Radwan	Vursell
Lane	Ray	Wainwright
Lankford	Rees, Kans.	Walter
Latham	Reuss	Watts
LeCompte	Rhodes, Ariz.	Weaver
Lesinski	Rhodes, Pa.	Westland
Lipscomb	Richards	Whitten
Lovre	Riley	Widnall
McConnell	Rivers	Wier
McCormack	Roberts	Wigglesworth
McDonough	Robeson, Va.	Williams, Miss.
McGregor	Robsion, Ky.	Williams, N. J.
McIntire	Rodino	Williams, N. Y.
McMillan	Rogers, Colo.	Willis
McVey	Rogers, Fla.	Wilson, Calif.
Macdonald	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson, Ind.
Machrowicz	Rogers, Tex.	Winstead
Mack, Ill.	Rooney	Withrow
Mack, Wash.	Roosevelt	Wolcott
Madden	Rutherford	Wolverton
Magnuson	St. George	Wright
Mahon	Saylor	Yates
Mailliard	Schenck	Young
Matthews	Scherer	Younger
Meader	Schwengel	Zablocki
Merrow	Scott	Zelenko
Metcalf	Scudder	

NAYS—2

Davis, Ga. Marshall

NOT VOTING—59

Barden	Gavin	Miller, N. Y.
Bell	Halleck	Mollohan
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Morrison
Boggs	Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bow	Hiestand	Phillips
Bowler	Hillings	Powell
Brownson	Hoffman, Ill.	Rains
Buckley	Jennings	Reece, Tenn.
Burdick	Johansen	Reed, N. Y.
Celler	Keogh	Riehlman
Chatham	Klein	Sadlak
Chiperfield	Knutson	Scrivner
Cole	Lanham	Sikes
Curtis, Mo.	Long	Simpson, Pa.
Davidson	McCarthy	Thompson, La.
Diggs	McCulloch	Velde
Eberharter	McDowell	Vorys
Elliott	Martin	Wharton
Frelinghuysen	Mason	Wickersham
Gamble	Miler, Md.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Hand.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Johansen.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Scrivner.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Cole.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Long with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE GROWING CRISIS IN WORLD CONDITIONS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention of the House to a growing crisis in world conditions, and particularly the effect on these conditions of the administration's off again, on again, gone again arms shipment to Saudi Arabia.

The State Department policy purportedly is to maintain a balance of shipments to the two groups which are arrayed against each other in the Near East. Assuming for the sake of argument, that such a balancing is the policy, we wonder at its practical application when it results in a shipment of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia, which we are told will be balanced by shipments to Israel of $110,000 worth of parts and communications equipments, while the embargo on arms to Israel remains firmly in effect. These tanks, incidentally, are Walker Bulldog tanks, which are worth $135,000 each.

The State Department calls this balancing. I do not agree. This balancing of shipments obviously is not designed to keep each of the two factions friendly to our country, so presumably it is intended to maintain a balance in the war potentials of the two groups. However, it is further quite obvious that such a policy cannot and does not maintain such a balance in war potentials solely on the basis of equal shipments from American shores since Arab countries receive large shipments from Britain, France, and Canada, and, Mr. Speaker, from Russia, while Israel receives little or no help from the western countries.

I do not wish to give the impression that I underestimate the magnitude of the problem of choosing a proper course for our country in a matter affecting the Near East. I am aware, as you are, Mr. Speaker, of the part this area plays in the total world picture, which seems to be becoming steadily worse. In this connection I wish to quote portions of a column by Mr. Constantine Brown which appeared in the February 13, 1956, edition of the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star:

EISENHOWER AND WORLD CONDITIONS—CRISES IN MIDDLE EAST AND FAR EAST MAY AFFECT DECISION TO RUN AGAIN

There are two storm centers which may break out simultaneously or in rapid succession—the Middle East and the Far East. The prospect of a clash in the Middle East between Israel and its Arab neighbors appears imminent despite the belated efforts of the Western Powers to prevent it.

We may have softened up somewhat Egyptian Premier Nasser's government by our pledge to help build the Aswan Dam. But the Muscovites who hope to make substantial gains from an armed clash in the Middle East have a better ace in the hole—the bitter resentment of all Arabs against the Jews and their political strength in Syria whence the clash with Israel is most likely to come. The heretofore poorly armed Arabs are being provided with the latest instruments of destruction.

In the Far East the Chinese Communists seem determined to take first the Nationalist offshore islands and ultimately Formosa, by force if necessary. The concentrations of ground, sea, and air forces in Fukien Province are almost completed.

Intelligence reports received recently in Washington indicate that the blowup may come within the next 60 to 90 days, if not sooner.

Sir Anthony Eden rendered a poor service to the Anglo-American Alliance when he stated publicly that he could not go along with our policy on Formosa. This statement, probably intended principally for home consumption, will be taken by the Chinese Communists as another indication that America is not only physically but also morally without Britain's support in the face of another Red aggression.

The situation is less explosive in Europe although the NATO alliance on which the Western defense against communism is predicated is more brittle than ever.

The main pivot, because of its geographic position, is France. Political conditions there are far from encouraging. The fate of the shaky Mollet government is in the hands of two extremist parties, the Communists and the Poujadists, who hold the balance of power in the National Assembly, composed of many splinter parties.

Both extremists are strongly anti-American and are denouncing us for all the misfortunes which now besiege France. A large majority of the population is inclined to believe this propaganda.

French neutralism is gaining momentum. There are many strong anti-Communists who see in competitive coexistence with Russia and Communist China a better chance for France's survival than a continuation of what is generally described as "the fluctuating and aggressive American policy."

Others, and they form a substantial proportion of public opinion, feel that we fulfilled our role when France's economic recovery was achieved through the Marshall plan and other aid measures and we might just as well clear out of Europe.

Conditions in Germany are equally unfavorable—though to a lesser extent. The newborn German neutralism is due to two factors—the desire of the masses for German unity which they no longer believe can be achieved through the assistance of the West but must be obtained directly from Moscow; and the reluctance of the German people to trade prosperity and bearable taxes for limited rearmament.

This appraisal, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately is a good one. I say unfortunately, because there is considerable doubt that our foreign policy is prepared to meet the conditions described. I certainly doubt it when we are confronted with this spectacle of the administration dramatically halting a shipment of tanks for Saudi Arabia, a shipment which was scheduled to be loaded and scheduled to sail, a shipment the preparations for which were made some months ago.

Are we to assume that this transaction was a surprise to responsible officials? Or are we to assume that having made a decision to enter into such a transaction they thought better of it at the last minute? Whatever the explanation, Mr. Speaker, the effect on the precarious position of our prestige which Mr. Brown has described could prove disastrous.

A few weeks ago I expressed to you my opinions with respect to what our foreign policy should be in the Arab-Israel crisis. Today I say to you the events of a few days ago indicate that continuance of the present United States policy in that area does not impede war, it spurs war between those factions.

The people who live in these areas are not fooled by our claims that we want to maintain friendship for both groups and wish to prevent war between them. One does not provide weapons to friends with which they may kill each other on the claim that he wishes that each may have an equal chance to kill the other. Would not Israel be justified in concluding that we do not favor her when she watches the Arab war potential swell by 18 tanks while her pleas for arms go unanswered.

Nor does this policy serve to offset the Soviets in their moves to discredit the United States. The leaders in the Kremlin who have the most to gain by war in the Near East need only to offer arms to the Arab States and we scurry to bid the arms market away from them. Then they sit back and watch our State Department invent conundrums to explain our motives to our friends the Israeli. This is a game which hardly is likely to win or maintain friends.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country want us to demonstrate character in our international relations. They want us to display to the world genuineness which is reflective of the character of our great people. We cannot determine our course in world affairs by a balance of iniquities, and I mean iniquities, not inequities.

In my opinion the present policy favors the Arab States and leaves Israel to a steadily worsening position. This I deplore, this I vigorously oppose. But, if this is to be the policy, let the administration say so. Let the American people know. Let the Congress know, so that we may debate the issue in this forum and resolve it. And, Mr. Speaker, a few hours before sailing time is too late.

INVESTIGATION BY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, shortly there will come before the House a request for $625,000 to be used by the Committee on Government Operations in carrying on investigations. Naturally, I am in favor of sustaining the authority of the House to make all investigations that may, in the opinion of the committee members, be necessary in order to keep the executive department on the track.

Of course, some of the Democrats at this time are engaged in a campaign to discredit the executive department. There is no question about that. Anyone who has followed some of the hearings will realize that that statement is absolutely true. They have gone a long, long way. For example, what they do is to attempt to make a mountain out of a molehill, to pick up some of the discharged employees, or some employees who have been in the departments and who are dissatisfied over policies of the administration with the way things are going, bring them up here and if there is any little petty difference of opinion down below, then they have the committee blow it up under their guidance and put it on the air as something new and bad.

They are dissatisfied because the Government is being restored to the people, because the new policy follows the law but is not in accord with the New Deal policies. For example, when the Subcommittee on Government Operations was holding investigations in connection with the President's desire to get the public out of the power business in the Northwest; who did they have as committee counsel? Who fixed up the case for them? Who went around the country and, according to the chairman of the subcommittee, asked that complaints be made and filed with him? Why it was a man named Austin who used to be in the Department here and who then went to the Colorado State Association of Rural Electric Co-Operatives as its executive officer and who representing the local associations in the Northwest who wanted to borrow money of the Federal Government to further the business interests of his clients directed the committee investigations and hearings. For example, there is one case where a local REA wanted to borrow $10 million to build transmission lines. They did not have any plant to get current from. They did not have any lines to distribute it, but they wanted that $10 million loan so that they might go into the business of generating, transmitting, and distributing electric power. The Department of the Interior said, "Sure, we will make the loan if you will enter into a partnership agreement with private capital that is already established out there so that jointly you can go in and furnish this power to the REA folks and any users it may have or get." That was not enough, they wanted the Government to

furnish the funds so that they might handle the whole business. They wanted the Government to build them a power-creating plant. They wanted the Government to give them the money or lend them the money to build the transmission lines. They wanted the Government to furnish the money for the transmission. Well, of course, the purpose of that demand really was to build up the fellows who were in back of it.

To make those who instigated and carried on the hearings and some of the committee staff members solid with certain organizations. Now there is something else about the hearings of that subcommittee. There is not a Member of the House who is here for 6 months who does not know—and it is not as bad now as it used to be—that it is the purpose of a section of the press or of certain columnists and radio commentators to attempt to discredit the Congress. We all know that. They criticize the committees, they criticize individual members of the committees, they just pour the heat on in an attempt to show either that we do not know anything or that we are crooked or that sometimes, if we know too much, and are interested in putting forth ideas and legislation desired by some particular group that we have sold out. That was emphasized by the statement of the Chief Executive when he vetoed the gas bill. What did that amount to? What did he mean? What was he saying? Well, he said the legislation was needed—all right enough. He said the consumers must be protected. There are provisions in the bill looking toward the protection of the consumer, but the President said they did not go far enough. Well, all right—I would be glad, indeed, to join with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] in asking the administration to send up a bill doing all of the good things that are necessary to be done. The President called attention to the fact that if we do not have some legislation, then the would-be producers will not drill wells. The President in effect said legislation was needed, otherwise producers would not drill—result—a possible lack of gas.

We have a false charge against the Interior Department in connection with what is known as the Al Sarena case in which the subcomittee set out to charge that patents were granted on certain mining claims because influence at a high level had been exerted to make the Secretary of the Interior grant the patents. As a matter of fact, the gentleman making the decision was the solicitor. Secretary McKay who was roundly abused during the course of the hearings really had no part in the decision. The solicitor granted the patent. The situation was pending for something like 15 years. When the Republican administration came in, it took up the case and passed on it and the merits. There was *nothing* to do under the law but to approve the granting of the patents. The facts and the law required that. The solicitor did just that. No more—no less. Yet, as soon as that was done, the Secretary of the Interior was charged with a timber steal because there was timber on the mining land. The chairman, the gentleman from the other body, because that was a joint committee, the chairman of the other body charged that the reason for the decision was the pressure brought to bear by those at higher levels. As one Member of the other body sitting on the committee said to one of the witnesses, "All you were doing was carrying out the orders of your superior."

Then along comes this column which was printed 2 or 3 times in the Washington Post and Times Herald saying—and it was our old, old friend, Drew Pearson who was the writer—that the President of the United States—now get this—you cannot get any higher level—that the President of the United States had written in his own handwriting across a letter addressed to "Dear Doug," meaning the Secretary of the Interior, a letter to put this thing across to grant the patents. And where did Drew get his information? According to the newspaper story written by him, he got it from a Mr. Redwine who was one of the counselors, or more accurately persecutors, who is one of the fifty-odd on the committee—no, he is over on the other side—we have our own fellows doing this—the committee was acting jointly in this case—he, Mr. Redwine, said according to Mr. Pearson—Redwine said that there was such a letter. Then he denied that he was referring to a "Dear Doug" letter. Then he was asked by a Member of the other body, I think it was Senator GOLDWATER, a member of the committee if I may mention the name, sir—"May we see the letter." Redwine did not have such a letter but he went out on a wild goose chase—to look for such a letter—which did not exist. How long was he gone? He was gone some 20 minutes. My colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] advises me he was gone 30 minutes to find something that it had been asserted he had in his file. Of course he did not have it out there where he went to look. He never had it. He and Pearson—one or the other or both just lied about it. It was not there. Then there was his excuse for not finding a nonexistent piece of paper. He came back a little later and according to Pearson he said the files had been rifled; somebody had been through the files.

My proposition is this, that as long as it has been charged that the decision made by the Department of the Interior in the granting of this patent——

Mr. JONAS. Did not Mr. Pearson in a subsequent column withdraw his original charge that such a letter existed?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, you tell them, because that publication of an apology is worse than the original false statement.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to ask the gentleman to inform the House if, in a second column, the columnist to whom the gentleman has referred did not quote Mr. Redwine, a committee staff member, as saying that he planned to make use of the letter later in the year when it would be more effective in the Presidential campaign? Does the gentleman believe that is a proper attitude for a committee counsel to take?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are asking me?

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, that is about the way I understood. Oh, now, wait a minute. I would be violating the rules of the House if I expressed my honest opinion of that gentleman Redwine and his associate in vilification—Pearson. Oh, no. You are not going to get me in a hole such as that. Every Member can judge that situation for himself.

Now, here is the point of the issue. Inasmuch as members of the subcommittee and the chairman of the House subcommittee and the chairman of the Senate subcommittee, the two committees acting jointly together all the time, inasmuch as they have charged that the granting of these patents was a timber steal, a dishonest act, is there any reason why, when they also charge that the decision was made because of high level influence, and then the statement comes along both from a committee employee and from this newspaper fellow that the President of the United States himself was in on it—they charge the Secretary with a lack of integrity; they charge him with dishonesty—is there any reason why those two witnesses who claim to know the facts should not be subpenaed and brought in in an effort—as the Chairman said in his November 25 statement—to learn the truth of the charge? If we have any respect for ourselves, for our committees, for the Congress, for the Secretary of the Interior or for the President of the United States, those men should be brought before the committees, before the bar of the House and under oath made to disclose the facts. If it be found that the charge is false—willfully false—then both Pearson and Redwine should be punished for contempt.

Mr. JONAS. I do not think the gentleman would like the record to show that the only response made by Mr. Redwine, when he returned from the committee room, was that his files had been rifled and that he could not produce the original letter. I ask the gentleman if Mr. Redwine did not, in answer to a half dozen questions asked by various members of the joint committee if he had ever seen such a letter, categorically deny that he ever had possession of it or had seen such a letter?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, he did that, and his later excuse was that the files had been rifled.

Having thus violated the privileges of the House—and I will bring in such a resolution even if I do not get anywhere, is there any reason why the House, as long as it is being attacked, first on one side and then on the other, should not cause those gentlemen to come in and, under oath, let us know the truth about such a thing? We know that the President never wrote such a letter. It is silly to attribute such an act to him.

That is not all. They browbeat witnesses. In one instance the chairman of the committee said to a witness, "Oh, you are lying about it." The same counsel, Redwine, said to another witness, "You are evasive." Then he said,

"You have heard that particular statement, and you 'blabbed' about it." Even a kangaroo would not run that kind of proceeding.

Then do you know what else? Here are members of the Interior Department. They are accused of participating in a timber steal. Before the committee they are defendants, accused of violations of law. What happens? The chairman of the committee said, "Stand up, you folks from the Interior Department."

I notice my distinguished and my very considerate friend from New York [Mr. KEATING] present. Listen to this and see what you think of it. Perhaps you will want to bring it before your Committee on the Judiciary, of which you are so capable a member, and ask the committee to write a rule about what the House committees should do in order to insure that a witness will be treated fairly and with respect, not abused, misused, and insulted.

They called up these gentlemen from the Department and who were so wrongfully accused of misconduct, and the Chairman said, "Sand up, you fellows from the Department of the Interior!" That was before a big crowd out there in Portland.

They stand up. He counts them: 1, 2, 3, 4, up to 13. Then he lectures them.

He asked in substance: "What are you doing in here?"

Why, they were the defendants in the case.

Even in the trials of the German war criminals, some of whom were executed, the defendants were permitted to be present to hear the sentence. These gentleman were present, as it was their duty to be ready to hear and answer to the charge that they were guilty of misconduct—that they had been party to the stealing of Government timber.

This gentleman would not go that far. No. He did not ask them to either explain or answer. He said in effect: "You ought to be out earning your money."

He asked: "How much does it cost the Government to have you around here?"

Now, listen: Six of those individuals were in one district out there which was directly affected, six in another. There was only one from Washington; an assistant solicitor. But the chairman lectures them all. By what authority does a subcommittee chairman misuse and abuse Government employees who are in no way responsible for what happened?

Then the Department took a recording; they had a sound recorder there—it was a public hearing, mind you—with the consent of one of the chairmen. There were two of them. When it got too dirty for one, the other stepped in and carried on. Permission was given to make a recording. But when it was disclosed that they were taking something down, this Mr. Ewing of the Department down here—the chairmen—both of them lectured him about that.

And what did the chairman of the Senate Committee say? In effect he said: "That is just like tapping telephones."

Now, can you imagine anyone so lacking in knowledge and good sense as to compare a public recording of a public meeting with the secret tapping of your telephone? Can you? No; there is no comparison whatsoever; and yet the chairman made that charge and kept making it.

Permit me to call that to your attention to show you that one of the committees, the better half of the committee, the House committee which was conducting that kind of hearing is the one which is asking for $625,000 to carry on hearings the rest of this year.

Do you not realize that they are attempting to discredit the Department so that they can clean us in November in the election? There is nothing that needs cleaning down there in the Interior Department that I know of or that was produced on the record.

That is the way the hearings have gone all along.

Get this: I was on the committee. Here is what I did—pardon the personal reference—because you know my love for the chairman, and hoping, of course, I could inject some element into the hearings that would induce them to do a little better, I went along. I did not go duck hunting; I did not go goose hunting; I did not go fishing. I did not go campaigning. I just went along out West, and I was the only Republican out there at those later hearings. There was only one Democrat, the gentleman from the other side. That made two of us from the House. Some of the time, most of the time there was a Member from the other body, Senator NEUBERGER, his name was, interested in the reelection of Senator MORSE and the defeat of my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], and the defeat of our worthy colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and the defeat of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], who has rendered such valuable service here over the years. All three men who know the timber business, faithful, competent public servants all, but they are Republicans, hence must be defeated, if possible.

They were the real objectives of the hearing out there; that is all the committee was seeking—their defeat and the election of their choice to the Senate.

Those gentlemen were there, but they were not members of the committee.

So I went along. To do what? To help create a quorum. They could not hold hearings without me unless they dragged in some Democrat, and apparently none wanted to be out there. So I went along not in the spirit of sacrifice, not in defense of my country—in defense of my party, perhaps—I went out there to see what was going on and insofar as now possible to protect the Department and witnesses who might be called.

Then what do you think the chairman twice said when he had a nice big audience of young men and women from the schools and colleges?

He turned to me and he said: "You are not a member of the committee."

I said: "You could not hold the hearing without me."

That, he admitted.

But he said: "You are a member ex officio."

Then in substance I asked him: "What are you going to do if I walk out?"

He said, in effect, he would quit.

He could not hold a hearing without me—he just wanted to count me in order to make a quorum and then carry on as he pleased regardless of the rules. Of course, I would not leave him holding the bag that way even though there was a lot of immaterial, crooked stuff going down in it. I would not do that.

I think the committee should have money, but when it comes up either tomorrow or next day I hope the Members of the House will take occasion to look at the record and not go along with an appropriation of better than a half million dollars to establish a record which will only reflect discredit upon the Congress. Do not misunderstand me. The Committee on Government Operations has several other subcommittees which, under the guidance of their subcommittee chairmen, are doing a very worthwhile job. But this one—this one—I will not tell you what it is. You read the record of the hearings and form your own opinion.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 1820, just 136 years ago, Susan B. Anthony was born in the village of Adams, Mass.

As the 15th of February always comes during the same week as the Lincoln's birthday celebrations it is almost impossible to commemorate it on the exact date.

It is very fitting that Susan B. Anthony's birthday was so close to President Lincoln's. She lived all through his administration and was an ardent admirer and follower.

Soon after her birth, her family moved to the State of New York, and from 1845 she lived in the city of Rochester where her activities for woman's suffrage and women's rights were started.

We who believe in equality of the sexes before the law and in Government regard her as one of our first crusaders and pioneers.

It is an interesting fact that she never saw the success of her cause, as she died in 1906, many years before women obtained the right to vote. But it is thanks to her firm leadership, industry, and faith in the justice of her cause, that we of the modern world know the equality we now have.

We will not have achieved our dream or the dream of Susan B. Anthony until we have equal rights under the Constitution. This proposed amendment has been completely misunderstood and willfully misinterpreted in some quarters. Some of my more humorous colleagues have said with sly smiles: "If this amendment goes through I think I will introduce an equal rights for men."

Well, they will not have to bother, because House Joint Resolution 82 achieves that purpose. Nowhere in the amendment is there any mention of women or females. All that is said is that no rights under this amendment shall be abridged on account of sex. This certainly applies to all our citizens, male and female.

It is a gratifying thing to see the objection to offering this amendment to the States for ratification gradually dwindling, and to see the straw bogeymen raised against it by some who fear the competition and equality of women gradually vanishing.

Just as Susan B. Anthony in her day saw women slowly coming into many professions previously barred to them. Yes, she and others even spoke on public platforms, although at their first meeting for the advancement of suffrage they were obliged to call upon one of the husbands present to do the speaking for them. Indeed times have changed, we believe for the better, and are very sure that the gentlemen of this House will not contradict us.

Susan B. Anthony, in a letter dated February 15, 1900, a facsimile of which hangs in the National Women's Party Club here in Washington, said:

> Perfect equality of rights for women—civil and political—is today, and has been for the past half-century the one demand of—
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> SUSAN B. ANTHONY.

That is what we are pledged to today. We know that Rome was not built in a day, that true and lasting progress is only obtained through patience, education, and enthusiasm. This we have, and the 219 of us who sponsor this amendment are heartened by the progress made so far.

Mr. Speaker, many of the 219 sponsors are here at this time, and I insert their names at this point in the RECORD.

No finer way could be found to celebrate the birthday of Susan B. Anthony than to inscribe these names on a roll of honor in the RECORD of the House of Representatives.

SPONSORS OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—TOTAL 219

Alabama: FRANK W. BOYKIN; CARL ELLIOTT; GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

Arizona: JOHN J. RHODES, STEWART UDALL.

Arkansas: WILBUR D. MILLS, OREN HARRIS, W. F. NORRELL.

California: HUBERT B. SCUDDER; JOHN E. MOSS, JR.; WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD; JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.; JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER; CHARLES S. GUBSER; B. F. SISK; CHARLES M. TEAGUE; HARLAN HAGEN; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH; DONALD L. JACKSON; CARL HINSHAW; EDGAR W. HIESTAND; CLYDE DOYLE; GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB; JAMES ROOSEVELT; HARRY R. SHEPPARD; JOHN PHILLIPS; ROBERT C. WILSON.

Colorado: BYRON G. ROGERS, WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

Connecticut: THOMAS J. DODD; HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.; ALBERT W. CRETELLA; ALBERT P. MORANO; JAMES T. PATTERSON.

Delaware: HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR.

Florida: WILLIAM C. CRAMER; BOB SIKES; DANTE B. FASCELL; A. S. HERLONG, JR.; DWIGHT L. ROGERS; JAMES A. HALEY; D. R. MATTHEWS.

Idaho: GRACIE PFOST.

Illinois: WILLIAM L. DAWSON, WILLIAM E. MCVEY, RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, CHARLES A. BOYLE, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, LESLIE C. ARENDS, SID SIMPSON, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, CHARLES W. VURSELL, KENNETH J. GRAY.

Indiana: E. ROSS ADAIR, JOHN V. BEAMER, CECIL M. HARDEN, WILLIAM G. BRAY, EARL WILSON.

Iowa: FRED SCHWENGEL, HENRY O. TALLE, H. R. GROSS, KARL M. LECOMPTE, PAUL CUNNINGHAM.

Kansas: WILLIAM H. AVERY, MYRON V. GEORGE, CLIFFORD R. HOPE, WINT SMITH.

Kentucky: WILLIAM H. NATCHER, BRENT SPENCE, CARL D. PERKINS, EUGENE SILER.

Louisiana: F. EDWARD HÉBERT, OTTO E. PASSMAN, GEORGE S. LONG.

Maine: ROBERT HALE, CHARLES P. NELSON.

Maryland: EDWARD T. MILLER, JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, GEORGE H. FALLON, RICHARD E. LANKFORD, DEWITT S. HYDE, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

Massachusetts: EDWARD P. BOLAND, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, DONALD W. NICHOLSON.

Michigan: GERALD R. FORD, JR.; DON HAYWORTH; ALVIN M. BENTLEY; RUTH THOMPSON; VICTOR A. KNOX; CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS.

Minnesota: EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, COYA KNUTSON.

Missouri: GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER; W. R. HULL, JR.; A. S. J. CARNAHAN; MORGAN M. MOULDER.

Montana: ORVIN B. FJARE.

Nebraska: PHIL WEAVER, ROBERT D. HARRISON, A. L. MILLER.

Nevada: CLIFTON YOUNG.

New Hampshire: CHESTER E. MERROW.

New Jersey: FRANK S. THOMPSON, JR.; PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.; WILLIAM B. WIDNALL; FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.; T. JAMES TUMULTY.

New Mexico: ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, JAMES J. DEMPSEY.

New York: STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT; FRANK J. BECKER; HENRY J. LATHAM; ALBERT H. BOSCH; LESTER HOLTZMAN; VICTOR L. ANFUSO; ABRAHAM J. MULTER; JOHN H. RAY; ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR.; FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.; ARTHUR G. KLEIN; IRWIN D. DAVIDSON; HERBERT ZELENKO; SIDNEY A. FINE; ISIDORE DOLLINGER; CHARLES A. BUCKLEY; PAUL A. FINO; RALPH W. GWINN; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE; J. ERNEST WHARTON; LEO W. O'BRIEN; DEAN P. TAYLOR; BERNARD W. KEARNEY; WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS; HAROLD C. OSTERTAG; WILLIAM E. MILLER; EDMUND P. RADWAN; JOHN R. PILLION; DANIEL A. REED.

North Carolina: THURMOND CHATHAM, F. ERTEL CARLYLE.

North Dakota: USHER L. BURDICK, OTTO KRUEGER.

Ohio: GORDON H. SCHERER; JAMES G. POLK; THOMAS A. JENKINS; A. D. BAUMHART, JR.; WILLIAM H. AYRES; JOHN E. HENDERSON; FRANK T. BOW; J. HARRY MCGREGOR; WAYNE L. HAYS.

Oklahoma: PAGE BELCHER, ED EDMONDSON, TOM STEED, JOHN JARMAN, VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

Oregon: SAM COON, HARRIS ELLSWORTH.

Pennsylvania: WILLIAM A. BARRETT; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN; JAMES A. BYRNE; EARL CHUDOFF; BENJAMIN F. JAMES; JOSEPH L. CARRIGG; IVOR D. FENTON; SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR.; ALVIN R. BUSH; RICHARD M. SIMPSON; JAMES M. QUIGLEY; JAMES E. VAN ZANDT; JOHN P. SAYLOR; CARROLL D. KEARNS; FRANK M. CLARK; THOMAS E. MORGAN; JAMES G. FULTON.

South Carolina: L. MENDEL RIVERS, ROBERT T. ASHMORE.

South Dakota: HAROLD O. LOVRE, E. Y. BERRY.

Tennessee: JOE L. EVINS, CLIFFORD DAVIS.

Texas: BRADY GENTRY, BRUCE ALGER, OLIN E. TEAGUE, JOHN DOWDY, CLARK W. THOMPSON, FRANK IKARD.

Utah: HENRY ALDOUS DIXON.

Vermont: WINSTON L. PROUTY.

Virginia: RICHARD H. POFF, HOWARD W. SMITH, PAT JENNINGS, JOEL T. BROYHILL.

Washington: THOMAS M. PELLY, JACK WESTLAND, RUSSELL V. MACK, HAL HOLMES, WALT HORAN, THOR C. TOLLEFSON.

West Virginia: ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, M. G. BURNSIDE, ELIZABETH KEE, ROBERT C. BYRD.

Wisconsin: GARDNER R. WITHROW, WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, LESTER JOHNSON.

Wyoming: E. KEITH THOMSON.

Alaska: E. L. BARTLETT.

Hawaii: MRS. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON.

Puerto Rico: ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding this time to me. I would like to take this opportunity to commend her for her superlative leadership in the fight we are now waging to pass the equal-rights amendment. She is an inspiration to all of us. I am proud to work with her as one of the 220 sponsors of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, without question one of the greatest women in American history was Susan B. Anothony. She was born 136 years ago in this month which has seen the birth dates of so many of the country's noblest guardians of human liberty. But Susan B. Anthony fought most of her economic and political battles alone.

Everything was done to discourage her. She was mocked. She was caricatured. Her speeches were hissed and booed. Her own sex was hostile to her in many instances. She was accused by them of aping men. She was denounced as a betrayer of womanhood. But she did not falter.

Her life is a heroic story of devotion, singleness of purpose and unbelievable persistence that made her the driving force of the woman's rights movement, and led eventually to the enfranchisement of women.

Susan B. Anthony was, however, no narrowminded reformer. Her interests were wide, and in addition to directing State and national campaigns for woman suffrage, she never lost an opportunity to speak, write and work for the advancement of women in education, in the professions, in business and to try to win for them full civil rights. She knew that citizenship for women, as for men, would be a full-time job.

It was during Susan B. Anthony's lifetime that the women of Idaho became voting citizens. Six years after Idaho was admitted to the Union, in 1896, our State gave women suffrage. During these 60 years women have made a mighty contribution, working as western women do, shoulder to shoulder with the men to improve our State and Nation.

In 1897, Susan B. Anthony wrote with pride concerning the adoption of woman suffrage by Idaho and three other Western States. She said further:

> With this central group, standing on the very crest of the Rocky Mountains, the spirit of justice and freedom for women cannot fail to descend upon all Western and Northwestern States.

For 40 years Susan B. Anthony traveled over the United States calling women's conventions, lecturing, debating

with legislators. She traveled in Europe, her reputation making way before her, and discussed women's suffrage with the crowned heads of Germany and England.

When she died at the age of 86, hundreds of columns were written, praising her work and thought. A few editors wrote:

She was the champion of a lost cause. Her peculiar views on this question will soon be forgotten.

But no doubt if Susan B. Anthony could have replied in a letter to the editors she would have referred to her favorite motto, "Failure is impossible."

Susan B. Anthony has been called the most unselfish woman in all the world. When she died flags flew at half mast across the entire Nation. Then thousands of people passed by her bier to pay her homage. Those who had attacked her work during her lifetime were silenced by the record of her achievement.

Two years after her death, hundreds of American colleges were admitting women to the courses. Women had broken the boundaries of the medical and legal professions and the ministry. Women's organizations were discussing issues of the day.

One hundred years after her birth, Susan B. Anthony's dream was realized—American women were enfranchised.

Today, only a generation away from that enfranchisement, women are securely established in the arts, in science, in the professions and in the business world. They have proved themselves in city and county government, in State office, in the Congress and in policy-making posts in the executive branch of the Federal Government. A few have achieved diplomatic positions and seats at international conferences.

And women's horizons are still widening. We can only guess what's ahead for the sex who were so long denied the simple right to vote.

It is with pleasure, and with deep gratitude, that I join today in this salute to Susan B. Anthony, who was indeed an apostle of freedom.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker—American women today are playing a constantly-increasing role in the activities of our two great political parties and in our Government, from the local level to the Federal Government in Washington.

Women voters, in fact, outnumber men in this country. Women serve in Congress, in the executive department, in State and municipal governments, in legislatures, on important commissions—in fact, in just about every governmental capacity.

It is, therefore, fitting that we today honor the woman who, above all others, awakened this Nation to the necessity of granting to all Americans, regardless of sex, the privilege of the ballot and the right to participate in government.

I refer, of course, to Susan B. Anthony. No woman in our illustrious history contributed so much to the fulfillment of the American dream.

I commend my good friend the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] for her untiring efforts in behalf of the equal rights amendment, and I trust her efforts will be rewarded soon by the adoption of the amendment by this Congress.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman; I certainly hope that her wish comes true.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with deep appreciation to the tributes that have been paid to this great woman, one of the greatest leaders our Nation has ever produced. It would be unfortunate if all of the attention were given to her work in the field of widening the rights of suffrage. I am sure the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] would agree with me that hers was a career that was colored by achievement in many fields. As few other leaders in American history, she fought from her youth for justice in every realm of American life. It would be easy for a contemporary student of her life, I presume, to judge her to be someone who was just against things. She was against slavery. She was against the liquor traffic. She was against a narrow suffrage. But if she were here to speak for herself she would say she was for things. She was for emancipation and freedom. She was for temperance. She was for democracy. And it is a sad commentary that when the 15th amendment was adopted, she was unable to secure acceptance of a vital principle; that is, that the prohibition against discrimination in suffrage should extend not only to race but also to sex.

It is hard for us to understand how men could have been so unreasonable as not to grant that appeal that she made so vigorously in behalf of women. But again let me say as one who has studied her career, not as closely as has the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] and others, but as one who appreciates very much her contribution to human advancement, that I am grateful that she pled so eloquently for these ideals of equality and justice.

There are many monuments to this career that included one of the temperance and other good causes. This service justifies the wonderful tributes that are being paid her some 136 years after her birth.

Here was a woman who withstood not only verbal but actual physical abuse. So it would be impossible to say too much in praise of this great American.

I appreciate the courtesy of the gentlewoman from New York in giving me this time that I might join in the things that are being said, in humility and in gratitude for what this great woman did for our country.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that very fine contribution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my good friend from New York, from the city of Rochester.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as the gentlewoman has said, Susan B. Anthony was a resident for many years of the city of Rochester.

Our friend from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has outlined so ably her fight in many fields for good causes. She is today remembered as one of the great women and most distinguished citizens of the State of New York. It is, indeed, appropriate that this occasion should be commemorated by one whom we, in New York, look upon as on of the great women of today, KATHERINE ST. GEORGE.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. He is altogether too kind.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want so much to thank my colleague the gentlewoman from New York, whom we all admire, reverence, and respect for the fine work she does here for her people and for people everywhere, for taking this time and making it possible for us to add our mite to what is being said in commemoration of one of the very finest of American women.

In order not to take the time of the House, I will not go over all the fine things that have already been said of Susan B. Anthony, but I would like to add just a little something which may give a new note to the picture. When I was in Africa this fall, the first thing that I found as I sat down with groups of Africans was their longing to have education for their wives. They said, "We cannot expect to have Africa rise up, as we want her to rise, and as she will rise, until our women can have education and can share our problems with us. It is a difficult thing to go to Oxford or Cambridge, to Paris or Antwerp, and then come back to a traditional home. We hope that the women of America will help us in this task that we have set for ourselves." It would seem as if knowledge of the work Susan B. Anthony did for American women could well be made known to the people of Africa. It would have a heartening effect upon them and give them greater courage to go forward as they are determined to do. They know that the woman sets the standard for the home. They know that she holds the fate of the Nation in her hands. They look to us and I am happy that they can look to a country that has in its history such women as Susan B. Anthony. I thank my colleague the gentlewoman from New York so much.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Thank you for this very fine tribute to Susan B. Anthony. We are glad, indeed, to know the principles of Susan B. Anthony can

stand for an inspiration to peoples all over the world.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gracious and brilliant *gentlewoman* from New York in tribute to the memory of Susan B. Anthony on this 136th anniversary of Miss Anthony's birth. I commend the gentlewoman from New York for bringing to the attention of the House a birthday anniversary that never should be forgotten. I commend the gentlewoman for her fine remarks on this occasion as also do I commend others of my colleagues who have spoken with such eloquence and with such feeling.

I am especially happy to have this opportunity to speak on this occasion because it was in my own State of Illinois that the work of Susan B. Anthony in the field of equal sufferage had its first fruition 7 years after her death in the enactment by the General Assembly of Illinois of what was know as the Partial Sufferage Act. Miss Anthony died in 1906. During a long span of years she had set a pattern for that which we now have accepted and which has contributed more than any other factor to the successful functioning of our system of representative democracy. Miss Anthony advocated and she fought with the zeal of a crusader and the spirit of a tigress for the right of women to share with men the determination of policies of government through participation on an equality with men in the selection of public officials.

No man or woman in the history of our great Republic ever battled more valiantly for a righteous cause than did Susan B. Anthony. Yet it was not given her during her lifetime to have the happy satisfaction of knowing that her valiant battle had resulted in success. During the later part of her lifetime another devoted woman was working in Illinois, Catherine Waugh McCulloch, whose brilliant son is now the administrative assistant to the senior Senator from Illinois. Year after year Mrs. McCulloch, one of the first outstanding woman lawyers of the Nation and a woman of brilliant mind and gracious personality, had gone to the legislature in Springfield, Illinois, urging that the dream of Susan B. Anthony be made to come true by the enactment of legislation permitting the women of Illinois to vote for all public offices not having their origin in the State constitution.

In 1913 this great daughter of Illinois was joined at Springfield by Grace Wilbur Trout, Harriet Taylor Treadwell, Antoinette Funk, and Ruth Hannah McCormick, daughter of Mark Hanna, wife of the late Senator Medill McCormick and herself a Representative from Illinois in the 71st Congress, a great coterie of women devoted to making come true the dream of Susan B. Anthony.

That year of 1913, 7 years after the death of Miss Anthony, the first suffrage act in this country was enacted by the General Assembly of Illinois. The vote in the Senate was very close. I shall never forget the thrill that I felt when it was my privilege and happiness, as the president of the State Senate, to announce that the bill had carried by a majority of one vote. I had spent the night before, into the wee hours, debating the issue with the then State Senator Neils Juul, later a Member of this body in the 65th and 66th Congresses, who had entertained strong convictions that a woman's place was in the home and not in the polling places. When I left him in the early morning he was undecided, but assured me he would go to bed with an open mind. When his name was called he voted aye. It was his vote that won the victory for the dream of Susan B. Anthony and started women's suffrage on its way to a complete triumph. He told me many times afterward that he never regretted his vote, that time and the experience of the trial years proved that it was the best vote he ever cast either in the legislature of Illinois or in the Congress of the United States. He was a great American, long since passed to his reward. On this anniversary day of Susan B. Anthony his service to the cause of women's suffage I think should be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I trust it has not been inappropriate that on this anniversary occasion when we are affectionately observing the birth anniversary of Susan B. Anthony that mention should have been made of some of the great women who carried on her work shortly after the turn of the century and finally brought triumph to the cause so dear to the heart of Miss Anthony. Included in this list of course should be the name of Miss Emmeline Pankhurst, who had carried on the war for a righteous cause in England and later had come to this country to contribute magnificently to the effort here.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the lady from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] for her eloquent remarks, with which I would like to associate myself, and also compliment her for her leadership and interest in this great amendment which I hope will be adopted by this House.

The equal-rights amendment is too long overdue. The aim of its adherents have too long been circumvented and avoided by those who refuse to accept the just and liberal aspect of this question. The women of this country want this amendment. There is no sensible reason to deny them their desire. Certainly they have proven themselves in every field, they have the vote, they have achieved much, they should be further recognized by an equal-rights amendment. Opposition to this amendment is weak, floundering, unreasonable, and misled.

Much of the credit for this movement goes to Susan Brownell Anthony, 1820 to 1906, the daughter of a Quaker abolitionist, Daniel Anthony of Adams, Mass. As a rural schoolteacher of 17 years Susan B. Anthony began her battle for equal pay for female teachers in elementary schools. She went on to advocate coeducation in all branches with special emphasis on the opening of college training to women. When the Sons of Temperance refused to admit women to their ranks she answered the challenge by founding the Daughters of Temperance. In 1851 she began her long and successful association with Elizabeth Cady Stanton and they worked together for their sex until Mrs. Stanton's death in 1902. In 1872 Miss Anthony was arrested and fined for daring to vote in Rochester, N. Y. Her voice and the voices of her friends and followers grew into a mighty chorus for recognition of the rights of women. But the battle she began is not yet over. Perhaps it is a continuing battle for rights and privileges. Surely this amendment is but another step in the crusade which this fearless woman began over a century ago.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that as many of the sponsors and Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleague [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] as one of the sponsors in support of an amendment to the Constitution to provide equal rights for women.

I have continuously favored this amendment because I believe that on the basis of freedom and equality for all, an amendment that women should not be discriminated against in their civil rights and their right to hold public office is necessary, and also that what constitutes such discrimination should be clarified with an appropriate amendment to the Constitution.

It is true that the United States was founded on the principles of freedom and individual liberty. And American women under our Government have enjoyed many privileges not accorded to their sex in other parts of the world. But freedom and liberty have degrees, and in many sections of our Nation, local and State laws have been enacted which restrict the rights of women and to a degree encroach upon their freedom and liberty as individuals.

At this time when the United States of America stands as a beacon light in the world dedicated to the cause of freedom and individual rights, it is essential that these same rights be protected within the United States for every citizen. And the only means by which discrimination against women in whatever form it may exist and wherever it may be found within the borders of our Nation can be ferreted out and eliminated is through enactment of the equal rights amendment to our Constitution which will establish that "equality under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

The struggle of the American woman for equality with the men of this coun-

try is well known. They were barred from business and the professions. They were not permitted to hold public office, and were not expected to hold opinions on affairs of state.

But the women of America were not satisfied to accept such restrictions upon their individual liberty, and during the past half century have made great strides to achieve their goal of equality with the men of the Nation.

Under the leadership of Susan B. Anthony, the pioneer crusader for equal rights, the campaign for women's suffrage was launched, and American women finally gained the right to vote with ratification of the 19th amendment to the Constitution in 1920.

Today, carrying on in the tradition of Miss Anthony, the women of the United States are once again crusading for another amendment to the Constitution which will finally grant them full equality with men and will end discrimination against women wherever it exists.

This week, February 20 to February 27, has been inaugurated Susan B. Anthony Week, and commemorates the 136th anniversary of her birth. With ratification of the equal rights amendment, her dream of equally for women would be realized, and the United States would have established individual liberty for all citizens, regardless of sex, under our Constitution.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I wish to add a few words to the tributes paid today to a great lady, Miss Susan B, Anthony. She was born February 15, 1820, in Adams, Mass., of Quaker ancestry. Her father, Daniel Anthony, was a teacher and also was one of the early cotton manufacturers of Massachusetts—leader of temperance movement in Battenkill, Washington County, N. Y., where he moved in 1826 to manage a large cotton mill. He educated his daughters so that each might be able to earn her own living and this in a day when education of women was considered unnecessary. Furthermore, he permitted them to teach when at the age of 15 they had completed their schooling. For this he was criticized as in those days no women worked for wages except under extreme necessity. When she was 18 years old on account of the failure of her father's business the Anthony home was lost and the family moved from Battenkill to Hardscrable—name of town later changed to Center Falls, of which her father became the first postmaster. Susan traveled by steamboat down the Hudson to New Rochelle, where she became a teacher in Miss Kenyon's boarding school. Here she met some colored school girls from Oneida who attended meetings at the Friends' Meeting House. These girls were not allowed to sit even on the back seat but were sent to a seat in the dusty gallery. Her comment was "What a lack of Christianity is this." Later in a letter to her family she writes of her "unspeakable satisfaction of visiting four colored people and drinking tea with them." She added, "To show this kind of people respect in this heathen land affords me a double pleasure."

At the age of 18 her consideration for those of lower estate than her own was balanced by lack of adulation for those of higher place. In later years her interest in justice for the Negro led her to membership and work in the American Antislavery Society. In a letter to her brother-in-law she regretted that the whole village of New Rochelle was in an uproar over a visit from the President, Martin Van Buren and deplored the fact that the people of Battenkill were "possessed of so little sound sense as to go 20 miles to shake hands with the President at Saratoga Springs." Her refusal to toady to high position was again manifested in 1899 when at the age of 79 she went to London to address the International Council of Women. She was invited to a luncheon to meet the Queen's daughter, the Princess Christian. After shaking hands with the Princess, Miss Anthony sat down. Her breach of etiquette has been ascribed to fatigue or old age, but she was able to stand for 2 or more hours if she was making a suffrage speech. The truth most probably is that in her was the Quaker spirit of her forefathers which made them face death rather than take off their hats to a king.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 136th anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony—the Quaker maiden who eventually changed the mind of a nation.

Every President from Lincoln to Theodore Roosevelt clasped her hand. She spoke from more public platforms than any other woman in history. She lived to see many of her proposed reforms written into the laws. During her lifetime full citizenship for women was nearer than she herself realized.

It is difficult to express in these brief moments our true gratitude, not only for what she accomplished for the members of her own sex, but for the whole Nation.

In her life time Susan B. Anthony was arrested, tried, and convicted of conspiring against the peace and dignity of the United States for merely attempting to vote under the authority of the 14th amendment. History has made a huge joke of that trial and its verdict.

Her influence lives on in every State in our Union through her life work which culminated after her death when on August 26, 1920, the 19th amendment to the United States Constitution was proclaimed in effect, granting the right of suffrage without regard of sex.

Miss Anthony grew up in a time which was distraught by the economic and political elements which culminated in the Civil War. Born of Quaker parentage February 15, 1820, she was nurtured and reared in the atmosphere of those surroundings; impressed with humble virtues of right thinking, right living, fair play, thrift, and industry. She had the advantage of a thorough education, in accordance with the conditions of the times, and made the best possible use of her training. After graduation she became a teacher and as a young woman she determined to give her life to champion the cause of women's rights.

It is perhaps difficult for our generation to realize that eighty-some years ago women had no rights regarding their own children; that a married woman had no legal right to the money she might earn; that married women could not own property; that women could not enter hotels or restaurants unless accompanied by a man; that a married woman could not collect damages for injury to her person or reputation; that only one college admitted women and that women could not vote or hold public offict.

As early as 1870 and 1871 Miss Anthony and others lectured on women suffrage in our own State capital, Richmond. There was, however, in those early years very little organized effort concerning women suffrage in our State, although the movement had many individual advocates. Virginia was represented at the national conventions and in 1893 a State association was organized. The Richmond Star is especially mentioned as a champion of the enfranchisement of women.

In 1875 Miss Anthony, then president of the National American Suffrage Association, on her way home from convention in Atlanta, addressed a large audience at the opera house in Culpeper.

Today we can be grateful to the efforts of Susan B. Anthony and her fellow workers for the restrictions which have been removed from the lives of the women of Virginia.

In each generation, there are certain men and women who stand out among the mass of our people—men and women who not only have more than ordinary talents—but who are willing and eager to use those talents and sacrifice their very lives in order to give their country and the world certain contributions that will live through generations to come. Such a person was Susan B. Anthony.

She did not begin the struggle for women suffrage nor did she end it, but she left upon the whole movement the stamp of her imperishable personality. America is different, is ennobled and enriched, because of the indelible influence of her character. I feel that I honor the women of Virginia and the Nation, in paying tribute to Miss Anthony's life of public service.

It is certain that if she were here today, she would be astonished at how completely her dreams have come true. But she would still be crusading, for progress was to her a path that had no end. Surely she would want women to accomplish one more big task—to stand shoulder to shoulder with men in replacing war with international cooperation and world peace. Surely she would urge the women of Virginia, as so often she urged her associates, never to be discouraged at how slowly progress is made. She would say: "There seems to be nothing to do but to press on."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I want to state that on January 13, 1955, I introduced House Joint Resolution 129, proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. I want to join today with the many other Members of Congress, who have sponsored such legislation, in commemorating the birth of Susan B. Anthony.

Susan B. Anthony was born of a Quaker family in Adams, Mass., on February 15, 1820. For over 60 years, despite prejudice and popular apathy, she devoted her life and effort to the cause of political and social reform: the abolition of slavery, the temperance movement, and her greatest work, political equality for women.

After 1854 her efforts were almost entirely devoted to the movement for the emancipation of women. It was her belief that attainment of the franchise through a constitutional amendment was the key to full political equality for women, and a necessary step to their economic independence.

From 1868 to 1870 Susan B. Anthony was copublisher of a weekly newspaper in New York, The Revolution, advocating women's rights. A founder of the National Woman Suffrage Association in 1869, Miss Anthony served as its vice president until 1892, when she became president of the association at the age of 72.

Miss Anthony was a tireless campaigner, speaker, and organizer. She directed eight State campaigns for the adoption of a constitutional amendment enfranchising women.

Susan B. Anthony, at the time of her death in 1906, had gained wide recognition as an advocate of women's rights both in the United States and in Europe. Unfortunately, she did not live to see the fulfillment of her life's work and the acceptance of those principles for which she had so long fought. Legal recognition in the form of a constitutional amendment, permitting women to vote, was not adopted until 1919, 13 years after her death.

Susan B. Anthony will always be remembered for her undaunted belief in social justice and as an example of womanly courage.

The Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, who is the chief sponsor of the equal-rights amendment legislation, stated in an address on the floor of the House during the 82d Congress:

> It is the last step on the long road toward freedom for women in the United States. We want equality, not protection. We want justice, not privilege.

Referring further to the equal-rights amendment she was proposing, Mrs. ST. GEORGE said:

> If women have the right to vote they certainly have the right to be considered equal under the Constitution.

OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT IS THREATENED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this country was largely settled by people who left Europe because governments tried to force individual conformance in religion, in military matters, and in many other fields. The governments of Europe demanded conformance to governmental decrees in all sections, by all individuals, just as did Hitler and Stalin in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that the Revolution was fought because the colonists would not accept the dictates of the British Government.

I would remind you that the Founding Fathers, in forming our Government, recognized that if it were to long endure, provision must be made for local differences. If such fact had not been recognized, the Constitution doubtless would never have been approved.

We find such recognition in our Constitution. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the Founding Fathers intended and thought they had provided a government of checks and balances so that neither branch could commit the mistakes of the European countries, and become all powerful.

Throughout our history, our history books have been consistent in teaching that these truths are embodied in our Constitution.

I would point out in recent years this Nation has opposed colonialism in many places throughout the world, because it was said it was not right for a central government to impose its will on other peoples.

I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, about the necessity of segregation, in which the great majority of both races in the South believe, if our people are to get along in harmony as they have for years.

I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, having been in the great cities of the North where segregation has been and is substantially maintained by economic and territorial lines, that here is an effort to force all others to conform to what those areas preach but largely do not practice. I firmly believe that for the United States Central Government to impose its will on all the States in the matter of segregation will lead to strife and bloodshed, as it has in a few instances already.

What disturbs me even more, however, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe the action of the Supreme Court leads to the breakdown of our form of government. I believe it leads to totalitarianism by one branch of our government. Since politics will always be with us under our form of government, in view of this political decision where will the next step be to get political advantage?

No, Mr. Speaker, as serious as the antisegregation decisions are, as serious as the effects of the efforts at enforcement are proving and threatening to be, the major threat is to our form of government.

The action of the nine men on our Supreme Court, speaking through the Chief Justice, if permitted to stand, shows that we no longer have a strong central government with certain rights but with other rights remaining in the States. This decree of these nine men shows we do not have a Federal Government of coordinate and equal branches as the history books have taught us, but to make it worse, the decree shows we do not have men on that Court who have the balance essential to preserve our form of government.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that Hitler in Germany and Stalin in Russia first took over the courts. There as here the court issued orders. There as here the court reserved the right to issue such further orders as might be necessary. There as here the penalty for nonconformance was confinement in jail for contempt, with the only appeal to the men whose order confined the individual to jail in the first instance. The course followed by Germany and Russia, and now by the United States, are so closely parallel as to frighten all who study the action of the United States. Unfortunately, so many people are blinded by what they consider a moral issue that few stop to consider the actions objectively.

Truly we face a most serious situation, which goes much deeper than the effect on the people of the South, a minority itself.

If the court can do what it did in these cases and the States do not stop it; it can take the same action to strike down anything and everything of substance in our Government. It can place the economic and moral views of five men, a majority of the Supreme Court, as a substitute for the Constitution.

Political considerations will run rampant, as Mr. NIXON indicates they have. Many people have said Vice President NIXON sank politics to an all time low when he referred to the antisegregation decision as political. As to that, I do not know. If he had referred to the decision itself as politics reaching an all time low, I am sure the charge could be proven.

For the Vice President, RICHARD M. NIXON, told the truth when in his recent speech he said Chief Justice Earl Warren was a Republican Chief Justice. He told the truth when he implied the decision was a political one. If he had said that Chief Justice Warren went on the Supreme Court for the purpose of using the power of his position as Chief Justice to carry out the platform of the Republican Party, there is much evidence to indicate he would have told the truth; and to prove my statement I quote from Chief Justice Warren himself, as presented in an interview which appears in the May 2, 1952, issue of the U. S. News & World Report. Mr. Warren at that time was Governor of California, having been elected by Democrats and Republicans. I quote:

> CIVIL RIGHTS
>
> Question. How do you stand on the Fair Employment Practice Commission—are you in favor of it?
>
> Answer. Yes; and I take that from our party platform of 1944—you will remember that was the platform that was put through by Senator Taft, as chairman of the platform committee, without a dissenting vote of any kind in the convention. And this is what it said:
>
> "We pledge an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes who are in our Armed Forces are impairing morale and efficiency and the adoption of corrective legislation. We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a

permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission."

And then in the 1948 convention, they reiterated it in the platform. In that year Senator Lodge, who is the campaign manager for General Eisenhower, was the chairman of the platform committee. That platform also went through without dissent of any kind. This is what it said:

"One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic."

Gentlemen, that's a solemn mandate to anybody who claims to be a Republican officeholder. I have followed it.

Question. Governor, there have been two interpretations of the FEPC; one, the voluntary FEPC, which would be set up by Federal legislation and which would require companies to appear before it and explain their practices but without a penalty, and the other, which is called the compulsory FEPC, where there would be penalties if they discriminated in hiring people or firing people.

Answer. The platform makes no distinction, and I think the fair import of both of these planks in our platforms of 1944 and 1948 is to the effect that the intention is to rid the country of the evil that presents itself, and that our party proposes to do it by effective means, whatever means might be necessary.

I have no way of knowing what further assurances were made or needed when the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Brownell, called on Governor Warren before the President sent his name to the Senate of the United States for confirmation as Chief Justice.

Be it said, however, that Mr. Warren, who according to the records was confirmed as Chief Justice on March 1, 1954, had already served notice that he carried his politics into public office; for while Governor of California he referred to himself as "a Republican officeholder."

Never in history has any judge of any court of last resort had to reach deeper in the hat to pull out a rabbit than Chief Justice Warren did in justifying his antisegregation ruling; but here again he had publicly served notice to the people of the United States, for in the public interview I mention he said:

Our party proposes to do it by effective means, whatever means may be necessary.

In the antisegregation decisions, the Supreme Court, acting through this man, amended the Constitution in violation of the rights of the States. Speaking for the Court through this man, rights of the Congress were usurped, and the right to pass additional legislation to implement the Court's amendment to the Constitution was declared. Truly, Governor Warren meant lots when he said as a Republican officeholder he was obligated to act by effective means, "whatever means might be necessary."

Is it any wonder that Southern States have brought out the old, old doctrine of interposition? Is there any other appeal from the action of such a man and such a Court?

This usurpation of the rights of the States, of the rights of the Congress, and of the American people, provides for no appeal except for the States to declare that such actions are in violation of the Constitution and in contravention of the rights retained to the States in the Constitution. How can they do other than say such action of the Court is of no force and effect in the States.

The riots, bloodshed, and other extreme difficulties following from this action of the Supreme Court are happening in my area this time; but the next irresponsible action of the Court may well destroy the peace and good will existing among people of other sections. If this power of the Court to amend the Constitution goes unchallenged, property rights could be abrogated, and a dictatorship by these nine men on the Supreme Court established. You say not. Let us look at what Justice Holmes, long a member of the Supreme Court had to say when berating his fellow members for freely using their judical power to upset State laws. I quote:

As the decisions now stand I see hardly any limit but the sky to the invalidating of those rights (the constitutional rights of the States) if they happen to strike a majority of this Court as for any reason undesirable. I cannot believe that the (14th) amendment was intended to give us carte blanche to embody our economic or moral beliefs in its prohibitions.

Justice Stone later exclaimed, and I quote:

The only check upon our own exercise of power is our own sense of restraint.

Thomas Jefferson had earlier seen this weakness and this danger in our Government when he thought the Court was in wrong hands, for he said, and I quote:

Our Constitution * * * intending to establish three departments, coordinate and independent, that they might check and balance one another * * * has given, according to this opinion, to one of them alone the right to prescribe rules for the government of the others and, to that one, too, which is unelected by and independent of the Nation. * * * The Constitution, on this hypothesis, is a mere thing of wax in the hands of the judiciary, which they may twist and shape into any form they please.

It is a serious indictment of our times that many people like the present Chief Justice, seem to feel the end justifies the means.

Mr. Speaker, I say here and now that in different times and other conditions such actions likely would have led to impeachment.

While Chief Justice Warren served notice as to what he would do as a Republican officeholder before his appointment, and while the record now shows he did in truth use all the power at his command, I respectfully submit that those States who believe in the Constitution as conceived and accepted by the people at the time of its adoption, as expressed long ago, "have the right and are duty-bound to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining in their separate limits the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them. Failure to interpose would be construed as acquiescence, and the surrender of one State right 'would lead to the surrender of all.'"

All States should follow the lead of Southern States—for while other States may differ in their feelings on the segregation issue, involved here is the question of whether nine men shall set themselves up as all powerful, completely irresponsible dictators, with the announced purpose as expressed by the Chief Justice, who said that as a Republican officeholder he believed he would be morally obligated to use whatever means might be necessary to carry out the party platform.

Unless such actions are successfully challenged, the next decision may place the Charter of the United Nations as taking precedence over the rights of the American people as set out in the Constitution of the United States. All it would take is for a majority of these nine powerful and irresponsible men, the Supreme Court, to determine that such action was for any reason desirable; that the end justifies the means, for the Court has demonstrated it has the means, unless we do something. A reading of the Court's decision in the antisegregation school decisions will show that the authorities mentioned and the reasoning used could just as well support a finding that the Charter of the United Nations should be superimposed over the Constitution of the United States "to prevent a feeling of inferiority on the part of citizens of other nations."

I know voices will be heard to say that we need not worry about that, for these nine men would not think of doing that. The point I make is they could. There is the danger.

Truly, in my opinion, our danger goes much deeper than many seem to realize. The action taken by the Supreme Court threatens the very bedrock on which the permanence of our Government rests.

Mr. Speaker, though the people of other States differ with the people of the South, where both races overwhelmingly believe in segregation, it is time for all States to join the South in interposing their rights as States, if we are to save our form of government.

MAILING OF UNSOLICITED ARTICLES, GAMBLING DEVICES, AND OBSCENE MATERIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Post Office and Postal Operations, of which I have the honor to be chairman, on last Friday voted to hold hearings beginning February 27, 1956, to explore another of the fields covered by House Resolution 304, directing the investigation of "the mailability of articles and printed matter generally,

including among other things, the mailing of unsolicited articles with requests for payments or contributions."

This is not only big business, it is high-pressure business and takes many forms. It has grown to tremendous proportions grossing hundreds of millions of dollars a year. All over the country, post office patrons are being flooded with unsolicited articles coupled with requests for payment. Unsuspecting citizens who unwittingly pay for some of the items find themselves placed on a preferred list which causes them to be bombarded with a still greater volume of this material. Other patrons who do not pay for the items—which, in most instances, are overpriced and of cheap, shoddy materials—are often harassed by dunning letters demanding payment. There is a similar practice of stamp sales organizations and books and record sales groups which refuse to cut off orders brought about by misleading statements contained in advertisements.

Use of the United States mails to distribute gambling devices has been a serious problem over the years, and is subject to a criminal penalty. Complaints have been received that punchboards or pushcards are being sent through the mails—in many cases to children and youths. If we find that these or any other gambling or lottery devices are still moving through the mails, we will take all possible steps to close any loopholes in the law and prevent such mailings.

It is intended, also, to develop information and evidence at these hearings which will enable the committee to recommend legislation to strengthen the laws prohibiting mailing of vile, indecent, or obscene material and to bring about better enforcement of these laws. It is a matter of general public knowledge that a great deal of indecent and obscene literature, such as photographs and drawings of unclothed persons, together with offers to sell them, is going through our post-office system—much of it to young people in their teens. This vile and poisonous literature, which can ruin young people's lives, is as close as your own letter box. The Post Office Department, through its inspection service, is doing its best to keep the mails clean, but the fact is that the Federal Government does not now seem to have the legal weapons enabling it to cope with this situation.

During the last Congress this committee reported a bill that would have done much to help the Post Office Department in its efforts to stop this traffic, and the bill passed the House unanimously. It was not acted upon by the other body and so did not become law.

Along with other Members of Congress I have been deeply shocked, and I know that millions of American fathers and mothers share my concern, at the breadth and viciousness of this practice. The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency some months ago announced its "discovery" that production and sale of pornography and obscenity is big business in America today. This so-called discovery is old-hat with our committee. We have been developing information and evidence over several years which long ago conclusively proved the need for militant action to cut the ground from beneath the practitioners of these vicious schemes. I served on the subcommittee in the last Congress which reported legislation to strengthen laws designed to prevent such a situation.

Unfortunately, although convincing evidence is before our eyes, apparently it is not—as the record of this legislation demonstrates—conclusive enough as yet to persuade everyone concerned as to the exact content of the necessary legislation. The objective of my subcommittee is to gather together and correlate all pertinent evidence and to present it in such form that there will be no further impediment to the enactment of truly remedial legislation. Our youth is our greatest national resource. We enact laws to preserve our forests, to control our watersheds, and to protect the public from the physical damage that can come from harmful foods and drugs. Certainly we should do as much for our youth.

No one should be surprised at the current disclosures. They are merely symptoms of an underlying condition which is growing like a cancer in our social structure. It has become a national scandal in many cases. There is a continuous bombardment of obscene and lascivious materials that should be barred from the mails if we are to maintain our high standards of morality and decency. We cannot escape the fact that weaknesses of the laws or the administration thereof to some extent reflect the moral climate in which the public lives. The great majority of American people, themselves being of high moral character, find it difficult to grasp the hard fact that there are always a few who will stoop to any shady practice for personal gain—unless the hard fact is laid at their own doorstep.

It is a comparatively small group of exceptions to the rule, a ruthless gang of fly-by-night purveyors of filth, that must be stamped out. They are permitted to exist only by public sufferance. It is a public duty—in which you must take the lead—to root up and stamp out the evil they do. A few rotten apples may not contaminate the barrel, but they certainly can make it smell.

These promoters of filth were given a shot in the arm when a loophole cropped up in the law and largely deprived the Post Office Department of the means to take prompt and effective preventive action. The Department has encountered countless impediments and delays which permit the unscrupulous promoters to reap their profits, fold their tents, and move on to try again in some other similar field. Whole schools have been circularized with lurid advertisements to entice adolescents and even children to help distribute their wares. I urge every father and mother to join and support us in our efforts to develop information as a basis for strengthening the law so that our children will have a greater measure of protection.

The continuing efforts of the Post Office Department to bar this material from the mails have caused the peddlers to use first-class mail, under seal, for their offerings. It is more difficult for the investigating agencies to identify and intercept these writings and pictures when they are not sent in the open mail. Therefore, your mailman becomes an unwitting and unknowing agent for this traffic, and every American home becomes a target for these breeders of immorality and perversion.

Mr. Speaker, before setting dates for public hearings our subcommittee reviewed the Post Office Department display of many items of unsolicited merchandise. This review disclosed that with the exception of the pornographic material, which has been diverted to first-class mail, practically all of the unsolicited merchandise is transmitted as third-class mail on which there is a multi-million dollar loss to the Government. The committee is deeply concerned over the fact that the Post Office Department is being called upon to subsidize these questionable business practices. Such a condition is intolerable.

The subcommittee also intends to look into other phases of illegal or improper use of the mails, in order to help the Post Office Department in its intensive drive to prevent such use. Just recently, for instance, there was brought to light a racket in which swindlers send unordered "c. o. d." parcels addressed to recently deceased persons. The scheme is to take advantage of the grief and suffering of those who have lost loved ones. Inexpensive items are sent at exorbitant prices because these ghoulish racketeers know the bereaved family usually will accept them, believing they were ordered by the deceased. The operators scan obituary notices and the like to find their victims.

I hope that the actions of our subcommittee will cause all parents to realize their responsibilities. If any of the mail about which I here speak, comes to you, if you cannot send it to me, turn it over to your local postmaster and ask him to forward it to me or to the Post Office Department. The more people that take part in this effort, the sooner we will drive the filth peddlers back into their rat holes.

Often good citizens are reluctant to report the receipt of advertisements and unsolicited articles as they are at a loss to know how their names were secured by the senders. The mailing list used by the promoters of such operations are gathered from telephone books, city directories, and in many other ways. Therefore, no citizen need be ashamed that he is listed among those who receive such material. The important thing is for fine men and women everywhere who are trying to protect their sons and daughters from these schemers to cooperate to the fullest extent with this committee and with the Post Office Department, and I invite all citizens to forward to me anything that you or members of your family receive which you feel is objectionable. It will be your per-

sonal contribution in this effort to clean up the mails.

In this, as in all things, I am seeking your assistance, so we can all work together for the improvement of our country.

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House of Representatives two very pertinent comments on the suppression of news by agencies of the Federal Government. One of these is a speech delivered to the annual convention of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association by Mr. T. T. Hunt, managing editor of the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise.

Mr. Hunt is one of the many examples in the newspaper field of men who have spent most of their lives serving their readers. From a background of studying law, he has covered political stories for the Enterprise in city hall, the county courthouse and at the State level—doing a consistent, responsible and reliable job for the readers of southeast Texas.

Since this country was founded, it has grown and prospered on the premise that the people—all the people—have an inherent right to know what their Government is doing. We have followed the principles set forth by Thomas Jefferson that the real strength of our democracy lies in the decisions of a majority of the people who know the facts. And I believe the people, when they have known the facts, have lived up to their responsibility.

Hand in hand along with this responsibility of the people is the responsibility of our newspapers, radio and television stations to make the facts about our government known to their readers, listeners and viewers. I believe the press, when they could get the facts, have lived up to their responsibility.

But getting these facts for an honest and full report to the taxpayers of our country is sometimes a very difficult job—not only for the working press, but for congressional committees charged with the responsibility of overseeing the activities of these agencies as well.

Our very able Democratic colleague, the Honorable JOHN E. MOSS, Jr., of California, has done a great deal of work for the Congress, the press, and for our people in pointing up the marked tendency among Federal agencies to deliberately withhold information from the public about public business through loose official classifications.

Congressman Moss' fine work is praised in these comments from the Beaumont Enterprise, and at this point I would like to include Mr. Hunt's speech along with this editorial by the editor of the Enterprise, Mr. Robert W. Akers, both of which I commend to the House as representative thoughts of able and professionally objective newspapermen:

SUBSTANCE OF TALK MADE BY T. T. HUNT, MANAGING EDITOR, THE BEAUMONT (TEX.) ENTERPRISE, AT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF ASSOCIATED PRESS MANAGING EDITORS ASSOCIATION, INC., AT COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., ON NOVEMBER 18, 1955, AS A MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATION'S WASHINGTON NEWS STUDY COMMITTEE

In our discharge of an obligation that is only a trust and not a priority, we of the APME are encouraged in our defense of the principle of freedom of information by a recent reinforcement from other representatives of the Fourth Estate.

We are all cognizant of the continuing campaign in this duty by such organizations, in addition to ours, as the American Society of Newspaper Editors and Sigma Delta Chi. Now comes word that the Inter-American Press Association has increased the scope of its policy for protection of the people's right to know throughout the Western Hemisphere. The National Press Photographers Association, the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, among others, are moving toward the same objective.

There can be no doubt that the increase in this tempo of effort is in direct ratio to the growth of a philosophy in Government that information on the acts of public officials should be screened, edited, and censored before it is given to the people. This philosophy, in turn, undoubtedly has gained stature and official acceptance in proportion to the increase in size of Government itself. For this basic reason the problem naturally heads up in Washington.

The record clearly shows that this concept among our elected and appointed authorities is strictly nonpartisan. This widespread practice neither accepts, nor has it borne, a party stamp. It is much more fundamental than that.

This is a new kind of Washington confidential. This time it's official.

Even the most casual student of the conduct of state affairs today should acknowledge that the people of this Republic—cast in a titanic struggle with the forces of suppression from abroad—are themselves being kept in the dark concerning much of their own business. They, who are inherently charged with making the ultimate decisions concerning the course of the Nation they comprise, are being denied the means with which to intelligently form these conclusions.

The excuse? It is usually patent. With the ostensible aim of shielding from the foreign enemy information which might be useful to him in his war against us, government has spread a veil in the name of security whose motives often are ill defined and whose bounds appear to be limitless.

In the name of security thus are committed what crimes against the peoples' right to know.

But, however unfortunate that condition may be, it is far overreached by some who honestly believe there are matters of government, in fields of activity where security does not enter, which the people have no right to know. Certain high public officials have stated that position quite frankly.

This is the most serious facet of the problem. It, in fact, underscores the biggest job we have—we, and other interested citizens. It spells out the cold fact that there is a primary need for education among some of our most upright and intelligent citizens to the danger embodied in this philosophy.

Let it be emphasized this is not by any means alone our fight. The rights involved belong no more to you and me than to the most humble citizen. The newspapers, the radio, the television, the magazines, the book publishers, have no more priority to freedom of information than anyone else. The public media for the dissemination of information would suffer, contrary to some misguided or misleading opinion, no more materially and no quicker than a thousand other enterprises or the individual himself. All would fall together, if in this country the control of information on Government should be claimed ultimately by any force or forces.

In this connection, we have an immediate and preliminary duty to perform: To conduct ourselves so that we may not be justifiably held to be merely selfish in this fight for information. This was pointed up in a statement by Robert Cutler, formerly President Eisenhower's special aid for national security affairs, when he said on May 14, 1955, at Cincinnati in a prepared speech before the associated Harvard clubs that free speech and free press must justify themselves.

That statement was significant. So was the rest of it. Mr. Cutler added that the press can't run wailing to the Constitution; that only chiefs of Government have the right to know; and that the people should be told only after the decisions have been made.

Of still greater significance was the later statement by David Lawrence's United States News & World Report, in its weekly Washington Whispers column: "The President is letting White House aids know that, in his opinion, the ideal attitude to take in dealing with newspapermen is that of his former aid, Robert Cutler. Mr. Cutler simply refused to discuss matters with reporters, telling them he had a 'passion for anonymity.' "

But the representatives of the public information media have the same duty as that of the pastor to his parishioners. The preacher has no more claim upon the eternal promises and verities than any member of his flock, but he certainly cannot evade the responsibility for consistently championing the cause which he espouses.

So, let us be done with the cries of the ill-advised, the shortsighted, the uninformed, and the intellectual charlatans when they say all this to-do about press prerogatives is a purely selfish action on the part of a few greedy persons. Freedom of the press, all thinking men know, is a time-honored slogan of independent people who, in coining it, meant nothing more and nothing less than the people's right to know.

Of recent time, this crusade to hold the key battlement in a free people's fortress has received reinforcement from an able ally. Congress, itself, has contributed in the Moss committee a potent force toward flushing out the untruths and the dangers of the situation. Even the initial findings of this subcommittee of the House have been enlightening, and astounding, to at least a portion of our citizenship.

The people have come to understand, from this House study, that all sorts of notions have been bred up in the various departments of Government around the shiboleth of information covering-up, censoring, and withholding. Public officials have taken laws and upper echelon directives conceived in the name of security, and have adapted them to all sorts of schemes and dodges for obscuring their own selfish, or devious, actions.

There are some who don't make any pretense about the use of the terms "official" and "confidential" in order to submerge information which might be uncomplimentary to them. All of them spend tax money to

hire agents to tell the people just what it is considered they should be allowed to know. For permitting this latter practice to exist we, the taxpayers, should—to use an old but expressive western phrase—be bored for the hollow horn.

This business is not a trend. This is a deliberate thesis which even some good public servants are constrained to pursue in the mistaken belief they are doing the right thing. That is the most dangerous phase of it.

This condition has grown with the growth of Government, beginning with the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration and mushrooming through the Truman and Eisenhower administrations. It was accentuated by the apathy of the press and the people during the days of depression and war, when men's interest was centered on other, more immediate things.

That is not true today, as far as the public information media are concerned. More and more of their representatives are crying out against it. Commenting publicly on it last year, John C. O'Brien of the Philadelphia Inquirer said: "The failure of newspapers to give all the Government news lies with Government officials who seem to regard the public business as strictly their own business."

Russell Wiggins, of the Washington Post and Times Herald, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights that there are officials in Federal Government who withhold information about Government at the source, who censor the press, and who impose penalties after publication so severe citizens hesitate to write or speak of what they know.

Con Ecklund, Washington correspondent for the Milwaukee Journal, wrote V. M. Newton, Jr., chairman of the Sigma Delta Chi committee on freedom of information: "It might be as long as 10 years before somebody discovers by roundabout ways what has been suppressed."

James "Scotty" Reston, of the New York Times, wrote the same SDX committee that "Civil servants now feel that it is unwise and detrimental to their careers to get involved with reporters in any way." That statement followed his sizeup of the "overall climate for atmosphere in which the Federal Government now operates."

On January 14, 1955, William G. Ludwick, chief of the Department of Agriculture Foreign Service, while being interviewed in connection with the Wolf Ladejinsky security case, was asked if Government business is not public business. He replied: "It is not and you know it."

On February 5, interviewed by the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune on Mr. Ludwick's statement, Secretary Benson said: "We give the public information, but there are times when it is not to the public benefit to make certain announcements concerning governmental functions."

To my way of thinking, there is no difference between that pronouncement and that of a county judge who once told me: "We can't let the people know about all the business we conduct; it's too rich for their blood."

And that point needs emphasizing. The practice of concealment of facts concerning government business seeps rapidly down from Big Government in Washington to all the little subdivisions of government far away. Your small town official catches on fast. He sees the big-time official quoted as having refused to reveal certain official activities, and he takes the cue. He gladly follows the fashion of covering up.

We all know by sad experience what the upshot of this kind of thing is. A cycle passes and there is an upheaval in the courthouse or the city hall or the school system, or the State government. One kind of covering up has led to another, until the stench overwhelms the people in such a wave of nausea that they revolt, and clean out the mess. But who has profited? Only some inefficient or dishonest public servants. Certainly not the public.

This business of security sometimes leads to ludicrous lengths. There was the official who would not divulge the amount of peanut butter bought for the Armed Forces on the devious reasoning that an enemy might thereby be enabled to figure the numerical complement of the forces—a figure many other sources had long since revealed.

George Dixon, the King Features columnist, summed it up this way:

"The head man and some of his franking minions are so security conscious they won't issue a statement that February comes after January without clearing it at the White House. The result is that the press 'information' staffs in most of the departments are about as spontaneously informative as the secret-leaking desk at the Soviet Embassy." (Newton's SDX report.)

These conditions can lead to but one conclusion. I am constrained, with no remote aim at the dramatic, to declare it high time for the representatives of the public media of information to stand up and take a concerted, permanent, unqualified, intelligent swing at secrecy in Government. The press of America sometimes, I fear, has let its boasted independence keep it from doing a united job of stewardship which it, in all right, cannot shirk.

Let us join with all similar orders and agencies in an honest and earnest movement to acquaint the people of this danger, and to keep at it until it has been dissipated. Let us enlist in our efforts the active aid of every far-seeing citizen.

We have, if any be needed, ample precept and authority for such a crusade. During the Constitutional Convention debate on the proposed American Bill of Rights, in 1787, James Madison said:

"A popular government, without popular information or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps both."

Judge Walter B. Jones, in the recent Phenix City, Ala., vice trials, gave this opinion of a modern-day jurist upon throwing out motions of the defense to exclude the press:

"The courts touch the lives and firesides of the people more than any branch of government. That being so, it is vitally essential that the people know what goes on in the courts without censorship from some self-appointed guardian of their morals. * * *

"The Nation's very security demands that there shall be no break, however small, in the constitutional dam that holds back the floodwaters of tyranny and dictatorship. Censorship in the courtroom or anywhere else in government could be that small break."

Then let us, with Washington, raise a standard to which all dedicated private citizens and public officials may repair.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise of December 19, 1955]

IT'S LIKE THIS

(By Robert W. Akers)

Americans were appalled when they discovered, 10 years after Yalta, the commitments that had been made in their name but kept secret from them.

More appalling is the fact that even greater secrecy surrounds Government operations today and that it may be 10 years from now before the citizens find out what their officials have been doing in the year 1955.

The truth is that never since our Government began in 1787 has the public been held in such ignorance of its own business as prevails in the supposedly enlightened mid-20th century.

An unhealthy Washington philosophy has grown up that the bureau becomes the personal property of the bureaucrat and that the taxpayers who hire him have no right to inquire what goes on in his office. It was bad enough under Roosevelt and Truman; it is worse under Eisenhower.

What I am reporting to you is no abstract protest, but is based on a thorough, painstaking investigation by a committee of newspaper editors appointed by the professional journalistic fraternity, Sigma Delta Chi, to inquire into freedom of information.

Get this straight at the outset—the opening of channels of information is no favor to the newspapers. It only means more work. It's easier for a reporter to sit around the press room of any public building waiting for mimeographed handouts of what the bureaucrat is willing for the public to know. When the records are open to the people, as they should be, the reporter has to get up off the chair and dig for information.

Mimeographed releases would, in fact, be the ideal way for newspapers to cut expenses. Just lay off three-fourths of the reporters and print what the officials want printed—and no more.

Last September 16, Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Jr., head of a congressional committee on Government information, reported the uncovering of 100 specific cases wherein the Federal Government had withheld legitimate news from the people.

The refusal to be aboveboard has resulted in the constantly contradictory headlines that we have a bigger air force than Russia and that Russia has a bigger air force than America; that atomic fallout is a serious health menace and that atomic fallout poses no danger at all; that the Dixon-Yates contract will be backed to the hilt by the President and that the President will not go through with the Dixon-Yates contract; that the Salk polio vaccine was safe and that the Salk polio vaccine was not safe.

The Government is being furtive. It has found a quick and easy alibi for keeping everything secret. Bureaucrats only need scream "security" and the curtain of secrecy is drawn on any kind of bungling, dishonesty, and political chicanery.

To what silly extremes this "security" may be carried is illustrated by the recent "peanut-butter affair." One Federal agency declined to reveal the amount of peanut butter purchased by the military on the grounds that this would allow the enemy to deduce the number of men in our armed services.

At the same time another Government agency in an adjoining office was busily handing out press releases on the exact number of men in our Armed Forces.

Why the secrecy then? When any public official wants to keep something from the people, he is almost invariably thinking in terms of his own welfare, not the public security.

For example, the White House let it be known that it approved secrecy for pensions paid Congressmen. But Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, speaking on the floor of the Senate, revealed that one former Congressman, by paying in $10.22, had been enabled to add $444 a year to his pension figure. This is the taxpayers' money and it's the taxpayers' business, yet both the White House and the Civil Service Commission tried to hide it.

There's something spine-chilling, too, in an incident connected with the case of Wolf Ladejinsky, a Department of Agriculture expert whose security record was questioned. When William G. Ludwick, chief of the Department's foreign service, was asked if Government business is not the public's business, he answered:

"It is not and you know it."

So brazen the bureaucrats have become.

Anxiety to keep things from the people reached such a ridiculous stage in the State

Department that a digest of newspaper opinion from the day before was stamped to be held secret.

Secretary of Commerce Weeks had a hot exchange of correspondence with Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, over the St. Lawrence Seaway. When asked by the Detroit News about the letters, Secretary Weeks denied they existed, whereupon the News ran his written denial alongside photos of the very letters whose existence he denied.

After the Alsop brothers revealed in a Saturday Evening Post article that the Department of Defense was concealing facts about atomic fallout which the Russians knew, but of which Americans were kept in ignorance—in the name of "security"—Admiral Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, hurriedly let his own people in on the news.

But the point had already been made: Citizens of poor, benighted Russia knew more of what was going on than did the "enlightened" Americans.

Congress itself hasn't done much to inspire public confidence, either: The people were barred from more than one-third of committee meetings in 1955.

Scotty Reston, brilliant Washington correspondent of the New York Times, has put it in these words:

"There has been a growing tendency in Washington since the war for the Government to put out not what it knows to be true, but what it wants the people to believe is true."

That's a dangerous condition and it's one which Thomas Jefferson warned against 170 years ago when he said:

"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance. And a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives. A popular government, without popular information or the means of acquiring it, is but a prolog to a farce or tragedy, or perhaps both."

THE PLIGHT OF THE FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, America is indebted to its farmers for much in the way of benefits which have come about through increased productivity. Through peace, emergency, and war, our farmers have responded to the needs of their Government and the needs of the consumers. The inventories of agricultural commodities which we have had on hand at the beginning of emergencies and war have served us well. Not only have we had these raw materials to convert into goods essential to the conduct of war, but these inventories of commodities have served the further purpose of stabilizing market prices and of making manpower available for other defense purposes. Inventories of commodities have also served the further purpose of making certain essential materials available for the production of ammunition and related purposes, such as anhydrous ammonia.

It appears to me that the planning for agriculture has not gone forward in the same efficient manner in the sale of these products and in the research for new uses, but that the farmer is now being penalized for the efficient manner in which he has increased agricultural productivity. We are living in an age of change. This realization did not come about overnight. There has been time for planning, research for new uses, and the establishment of programs to meet the changing conditions. The Congress has passed much legislation which has not been utilized to the fullest.

Too much has been said and too little done toward finding new uses for agricultural commodities, while existing markets have been allowed to diminish and new markets have not been developed. The question arises as to why the production of agricultural commodities in a growing economy should be approached with a defeatist attitude at the same time that optimistic statements are issued with respect to the overall economy, and at the same time that research in other fields is producing results unequaled in our history. What has been done to delve into possible new uses and new discoveries with respect to agricultural commodities?

Let us not make the mistake of planning our agricultural programs for peacetime while we plan the remainder of our economy for possible future emergencies. Agriculture has had a very vital role in past emergencies, and there is no indication that it will have a lesser role in the event of a future emergency. Careful consideration should first be given to the quantities of each agricultural commodity which will be required in the event of a future emergency or in less productive years. If it is then determined that there are surpluses beyond our agricultural requirements under emergency conditions, such surpluses should be disposed of in an orderly manner.

The Government is stockpiling strategic and critical materials so that we will have at least a year's supply. Food and fiber are just as important in case of a nuclear attack, so why not stockpile some of our surplus food and fiber?

In considering the quantities of agricultural commodities which may be surplus, in what terms are such surpluses being considered? Are these surpluses being viewed in the light of our peacetime requirements? If so, why is our industrial economy being planned on the basis of a possible future emergency while we think in terms of a peacetime agricultural inventory? Has adequate consideration been given to the effect of radiological fallout on crops in the event of an emergency? Has adequate consideration been given to the farm machinery factories or the fertilizer plants which would be available in the event of an emergency? Agricultural commodities in adequate supply, with adequate consideration given to locating such supplies in normally deficit food areas, could provide for the immediate needs of the population, release manpower at such time for other requirements, and at the same time lessen the requirements for machinery and equipment, petroleum, rubber products, iron, steel, and chemicals.

The Secretary of Agriculture has been given wide discretionary authority to barter surplus agricultural commodities, yet during the 18-month period ending November 30, 1955, I am advised that deliveries of strategic and critical materials for which we have exchanged agricultural commodities has totaled only $107 million. While there is always the excuse that the sale of agricultural commodities, or the bartering of agricultural commodities, in foreign markets would be dumping, it appears that the farmer has assumed the main burden in the American economy in connection with the limitation on exports.

It is generally assumed that our industrial workers are entitled to a part of the benefits which result from the increased productivity in industry. By the same token, our farmers are entitled to fair prices and a share of the benefits which result from increased productivity on the farm. Yet, we find that these benefits which would normally flow to the farmer on the basis of standards existing elsewhere have inured to the benefit of the processors and the middle men, or at least to persons other than the farmers.

We have a complex economy which operates to a considerable degree by Government regulation, and agriculture still remains an important segment of that economy as free from Government benefits as other segments of the economy generally. Many of the actions which are taken with respect to other segments of the economy by the Government vitally affect the cost of doing business in the agricultural economy. Increased labor costs at industrial facilities which supply the farmer, increased transportation costs, and other direct and indirect costs have been passed on to the farmers in the form of higher prices. These higher prices mean higher costs for producing farm products and higher living costs on the farm. The farmer is entitled to a fair price for his labor and a fair return on his investment in the form of fair prices for the products which he produces for sale.

In conclusion, I believe that the public is entitled to more definite information as to the total cost of the agricultural programs as it relates to the six basic commodities, and to be made aware of the benefits which the Government and the public have enjoyed during periods of scarcity as a result of these agricultural inventories; that it is essential that our future agricultural economy be planned on the same basis as the remainder of our economy as it relates to a possible future emergency; that existing legislation be utilized to carry forward a positive and dynamic program of export trade which is not secondary to other segments of the economy; that a determined effort be started immediately to carry forward a broad research program equal to that in other segments of the economy; that an optimistic approach be adopted which gives recognition to the needs of our increasing population; that agriculture be viewed in the light of long-range objectives; that only such inventories are surplus as may be in excess of our needs for a future emergency with adequate consideration at such time to the destruction of crops through radiological fallout and other emergency hazards.

The loss on the price-support program is not nearly as much as some people would have you believe.

Exclusive of administrative costs, the entire price-support program for the 6 basic agricultural commodities during the past 23 years has been very small among our huge Government expenditures. In fact there has been a profit of $237,058,762 on cotton, a profit of $8,084,916 on rice, and a profit of $243,559 on tobacco. There has been some loss on wheat, corn, and peanuts. When the profit on cotton, rice, and tobacco is subtracted from the losses on wheat, corn, and peanuts, the cumulative total loss on the entire program for the 6 basic agricultural commodites for the last 23 years has amounted to $473,278,879.

TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK DOUGLASS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the death of one of the great figures in American history, Frederick Douglass. Although more than six decades have elapsed since his death, his influence is still a powerful factor in the promotion of an improved status for his race and for enlightened government. We would do well today to pause and reflect on the example of courage and tenacity this man showed in his struggle to gain freedom for his people in the dark days prior to the Emancipation Proclamation.

I feel especially honored to salute him today because Frederick Douglass made Rochester his home for many years. He was born a slave in Maryland in 1817. From this obscure and humble origin, he rose to become the greatest Negro abolitionist, a brilliant orator, a successful journalist, and one of the greatest advocates of liberty in this Nation's history. He preached the gospel of liberty with a fervor given only to those who have known the absence of liberty.

Because he was born in Maryland, Douglass never experienced the worst brutalities of slavery as practiced in the deep South. But in the 21 years he lived as a slave he learned fully the degrading effect of the slave system both on slave and on master.

After an unsuccessful attempt, he escaped to the North in 1838. He learned to read while a slave and he continued his education when he reached freedom. As a slave his search for knowledge had led him into constant trouble but when he gained his freedom, his intelligence and quest for betterment enabled him to become a great force for good. As soon as he reached the North, he became interested in the abolitionist cause and addressed some of the numerous conventions that the abolitionist societies promoted. At one of these meetings in 1841, William Lloyd Garrison, the great abolitionist leader, heard him speak. Garrison was greatly impressed and the two men became fast friends. On Garrison's recommendation, the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society asked Douglass to become a paid lecturer in the cause and Douglass accepted—although with great hesitation because he doubted his own adequacy.

That decision marked the second great turning point in Douglass' life. In 1838 he had escaped from slavery and freedom. In 1841 he decided that his freedom must be dedicated to the liberation of the other members of his race. Douglass worked hard at his lecturing and soon became an accomplished orator and creative thinker in the abolitionist ranks.

One of his great contributions to the cause was a newspaper he published to support the rights of the Negro. He chose to publish this paper in Rochester because it was, as he said:

> The center of a virtuous, intelligent, enterprising, liberal, and growing population. Its people were industrious and in comfortable circumstances—not so rich as to be indifferent to the claims of humanity, and not so poor as to be unable to help any good cause which commanded the approval of their judgment.

He published his paper, the North Star, later called Frederick Douglass' Weekly, for 17 years. During that period it was a great factor in the fight for Negro rights.

His house in Rochester became an important terminal station in the Underground Railway that smuggled fugitive slaves into Canada. One of his greatest victories over discrimination in the North occurred in Rochester. He had sent his daughter to a private school there, but because of the opposition of a single parent she was excluded. Douglass refused to send her to the segregated Negro school that was at the far end of town from where he lived. After a long campaign of agitation led by Douglass, segregation was abolished in the Rochester schools.

Frederick Douglass, I am proud to state, was a staunch member of my party and he performed many services in the cause of the Republican Party. He was given many official appointments, including that of United States Minister to Haiti.

He died on February 20, 1895. On this, the 61st anniversary of his death, we are again in the throes of a struggle to insure the rights of various segments of our population. It is indeed a good time for all of us to look back to the example and work of Frederick Douglass for proof of what is possible for any man, regardless of his humble beginnings, to accomplish with the aid of determination and grit. It is fitting to honor this son of Rochester this month—along with those other great emancipators, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Susan B. Anthony.

AN ADEQUATE AIR FORCE IS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR PEACE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address by Maj. Gen. William E. Hall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, the fearful aspect of the challenge that faces the United States today is that Soviet technology has achieved a momentum rivaling our own that has been channeled in such a way as to confront us with the greatest military threat we have ever faced. Fortunately for this Nation, there are leaders who recognize the gravity of the challenge and who are consistently bold in reminding the American people what they must do to meet it.

Last weekend in Washington one such leader, Maj. Gen. William E. Hall, United States Air Force, delivered a distinguished address to a group of responsible, experienced officers who make up the national council of the Reserve Officers Association. General Hall, as assistant chief of staff for Reserve Forces, is in a position to formulate, support, and implement an Air Force policy that will provide adequate security for our Nation.

In accordance with that policy, the Air Force is building a Regular Air Force of 137 wings and a Reserve Force prepared to supplement the 137 wings in a national emergency. The total force of 188 wings is conceived of as a force strong enough to prevent a war or, if necessary, to fight one.

After providing a brief picture of our progress in building the 137-wing Air Force, General Hall touched on the problem of providing the bases, people, and weapons required by this force. All must be ready not merely to meet an emergency that may break out today, but to meet the sort of challenge that may come 5 or 10 years from now. Our weapons, no matter how scientifically advanced they are, will provide a base for confidence only if they are better than the weapons that have been developed by a potential enemy. And what is true of weapons is also true of bases and personnel.

Air Force leaders and planners in no way neglect the Air Force Reserve Forces in their planning to meet all sorts of threats. The overriding consideration in the Air Force Reserve program today is the attainment of operational readiness. Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard personnel gave an outstanding performance in the Korean conflict. The acceleration of weapon development since 1950 imposes a greater burden on Air Reserve and Air National Guard personnel. As of today, the Reserve forces are making real progress toward that combat capability required of integral components of the Air Force team. Mr. Speaker, General Hall's well organized, forcefully presented, and inspired address is one I take pride in calling to the attention of my colleagues. The closing paragraph of his address, which I wish to quote, clearly presents the challenge that faces the American people and this Congress.

For almost 50 years—

General Hall said—

> the Air Force has been characterized by constant transition and progress. It has always operated close to the boundaries of scientific advance and the limits of human skill and endurance. It has changed in the past and will change in the future, but its mission re-

mains constant—to deter or defeat a threatening or attacking force with the greatest power that we possess. This deterrent power is the indispensable requisite for our ability to use limited weapons in suppressing limited wars. By denying an aggressor the alternative of full-scale war as a means of achieving political aim, it provides a continued opportunity for nonviolent adjustment toward peace.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge to this Congress is to make sure that this opportunity for peace should be continuously provided. It cannot be continuously provided if we fail in any way to maintain the strength and the deterrent power of the United States Air Force. Because General Hall's speech so clearly presents the problem and so clearly states the solution, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM E. HALL, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR RESERVE FORCES AT THE NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING, RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1956

Admiral LaBarge, members of the National Council, distinguished guests, I am greatly honored by this opportunity to report to you on the status of the United States Air Force and on its progress toward vital defense goals. In selecting this area of discussion I have been guided by what I know to be the paramount interest and aim of your organization—to support a military policy that will provide adequate security for our Nation.

To you gentlemen, and to all Americans, this task presents a greater challenge today than ever before in the history of our Nation. The character of this challenge is determined in part by the fact that our diversified and on rushing technology now offers the broadest and most expensive set of choices we have ever had to evaluate in the development and production of weapons for land, sea, and air forces.

However, the gravest feature of this challenge is that Soviet technology has achieved a momentum rivaling our own, and it has been channeled in such a way as to confront us with the greatest military threat we have every faced. I refer to the growing capability of the Soviet's nuclear air arm which is the first offensive striking force to bring our Nation within range of a major surprise attack.

These are disturbing facts. They are facts that call for vigorous and resolute support of a military policy that provides the best prospect for preventing an all-out nuclear war and that will enable us to win if we are forced to fight.

In approaching the security problem from this standpoint of first-things-first, we come initially to the question of deterrence and to the type weapons and forces that are needed to dissuade a potential enemy from attacking our Nation.

Since the late forties this deterrent power has consisted primarily of the air atomic striking forces of the Strategic Air Command. This was true in the period of United States monopoly of atomic weapons and it is equally true as we approach the era of atomic parity. the strategic targets of the Soviet, which have long been encircled by Strategic Air Command's intercontinental and medium bomber forces, are now also within striking distance of light bombers and long-range fighters of the Tactical Air Command.

The ability of the Continental Air Defense Command to protect our northern approaches and flanks against bomber attacks is a factor of increasing importance to our overall deterrent capability. This command, which comprises Army, Navy, and Air Force units, is making dramatic improvements in its warning net, interceptor aircraft and guided missiles. Any would-be attacker is thus confronted with an increased probability of heavy losses.

The political leaders of U. S. S. R. know as fully as we do the effects of high yield nuclear weapons. They must also know that even a surprise attack against the United States with their improved bomber force could not forestall destruction of their war-making potential unless they wiped out our capacity for retaliation in their initial strike. Their knowledge of these facts is our best guarantee against all-out war.

We may therefore hope that enlightened self-interest will compel aggressor nations to abandon the use of military force as a means of achieving political aims. We must still, however, be prepared for the possibility of full-scale atomic war and for the new pattern of military action it would introduce. Such a conflict would differ from previous wars chiefly in these respects:

Always in the past our armies and navies have first resisted attack and have then counterattacked. The task of creating the necessary level of force for the final and decisive counterattack has dragged out over many months and even years. It has required the stockpiling of weapons, ammunition, fuel, and other stocks in vast quantity. It has involved the mobilization and training of millions of men—all of this for the purpose of applying a decisive volume of military pressure at the right place at the right time.

In World War II we defeated the Axis Powers by overwhelming them—by putting more men in a position to fight with rifles, tanks, ships, and airplanes. Our military power was then roughly a matter of manpower and material.

Let's compare this formula of operations with an atomic war. Here the chief measure of power would be megatons rather than in men and materiel. The decisive application of power would occur in the first few hours or the first few days of the conflict, not as the climax of several years of buildup behind the shield of holding actions.

Of course there are some who expect that after a brief exchange of nuclear weapons by the opposing air forces the war would be fought in the usual manner with conventional weapons. This view is difficult to reconcile with the fact that even a limited trade of atomic weapons would unleash more destructive power than all the wars of history.

Considering the resultant destruction of transport, communications, stockpiles, and human life, it is inconceivable that land and sea forces could be employed in the traditional manner; that is, to fight prolonged campaigns at the end of extended supply lines until a buildup for decisive surface action could be completed.

Now this does not mean that an atomic war would be short. No responsible Air Force spokesman has ever claimed that a future war would be short. We do say that the first phase, lasting only a few weeks may well be the decisive phase, but the war could last much longer.

There is another point to be emphasized at this juncture. Although we believe that the first violent hours of combat will be dominated by intense air action, no responsible Air Force spokesman has ever implied that foot soldiers or sailors have become obsolete.

When the peak of the atomic exchange has been passed, the surface forces that can exercise and exploit control of land and sea will begin to play an important part in the combat.

However, while at atomic exchange is going on, the land and sea arms of both sides will be primarily occupied by attempts to survive.

The fact that other Services are augmenting their air elements indicate their recognition of aviation's increasing importance in military operations.

Thus far we have considered in general terms the nature of the Air Force's role in preventing a war—or, if necessary, in fighting one. Let's turn now to the matter of specific weapons we are using and developing and the level of strength we are building to achieve the kind of airpower and the amount of airpower we need.

Naturally the basis for our air strength is the size of the defense task we might be called on to perform. Today, of course, we estimate that job in relation to Soviet airpower and its offensive potential. The drill goes something like this. As a potential enemy builds more bombers, we need more fighters and radar warning devices to stop him. As he builds more fighters we will need to increase our bomber force to make sure we can get enough planes over the target. The number of interceptors we have in relation to enemy interceptors is unimportant because interceptors do not fight interceptors.

In short, we need enough defensive weapons to stop a potential enemy and enough offensive weapons to penetrate his fighter defenses and defeat him if he attacks.

We are now working to build our regular Air Force to 137 wings. You will want to know if this will provide enough airpower to meet the estimated Soviet threat. The answer is a conditional "Yes". It is "Yes", provided they are effective wings; provided they are equipped with superior aircraft; provided they have an adequate base system from which to operate; and provided they have adequate Reserve Forces in being to supplement them in a national emergency.

We have a long way to go to achieve that goal, but we have made good progress. With a present total of 127 wings in the active establishment we are scheduled to reach 131 wings by June of this year and 137 by July 1957.

Included in our current total of 127 wings are 48 Strategic Air Command Wings. Several of these are heavy bomber wings equipped with the B–36 which is now being replaced by the all-jet B–52. Our medium bomber wings are equipped with the B–47 Stratojet which can be refueled for intercontinental strikes from stateside bases, or which can operate from forward bases against any nation that threatens our security.

In our Tactical Air Command, which represents a sizable portion of our deterrent capability, we now have 34 wings of combat aircraft. Some of these are equipped with the F–100—which set the world's speed record at more than 820 miles per hour. Also included in the Tactical Air Command are 13 wings of troop carriers which add greatly to the mobility of airborne army units.

Today's interceptor aircraft now include the F–86D, F–89, and F–94, which are armed with air-to-air rockets and machine guns. The F–100, F–101, and F–102 will soon be added to our air defense elements.

The extensive radar warning and control system which enables interceptor aircraft and air-defense missiles to locate and destroy attacking aircraft are still under construction. When completed, we expect them to provide several hours warning of any attack coming over the northern approaches.

This provides a brief picture of our progress in building a 137-wing Air Force.

I shall now touch on some of our problems—present and future. These problems have to do chiefly with bases and people.

Our airbase problem has become more acute as our combat wings increased. For example, in 1950 we had a force of 47 wings and 122 bases in the United States. Although our number of wings has increased

by 160 percent, our bases have increased by only 40 percent. As a result, many of the bases we do have are temporarily crowded with buildings, aircraft, and people. Since most of them were built during World War II to last for 5 years, their runways, taxiways, and shops have to be rebuilt. Ideally, the construction should be completed before they are put back in use, but the pressure of the world situation frequently compels us to start flight operations while the rehabilitation process is underway.

Family housing facilities at most of these bases are inadequate and many of our people have to rent or buy homes at a considerable distance from their work. Although our Government has taken some steps to provide more houses, a serious shortage will remain, and this makes it harder for us to keep our trained people in the service. This personnel problem is further aggravated by a lack of medical care for dependents, and the curtailment of so-called fringe benefits. While the recent pay raise has helped our reenlistment rate, we must provide additional incentives to retain our people who have been trained at high cost to perform critical duties in the maintenance and operation of complex air weapons.

Until these base and personnel problems are solved we cannot operate at peak efficiency now or in the future.

Looking now to the future, our chief concern is for the quality of our weapons systems. How do we evaluate them? We measure them against the competition. Judged in this way our weapons in 1960 or 1965—no matter how scientifically advanced they are—will provide a basis for confidence only if they are better than the weapons that have been developed by a potential enemy.

Examples of critical research and development projects now in progress are the missile program and the nuclear powered aircraft. Included in the missile project are the small air-to-air weapons now in our air defense elements, the tactical Matador missiles, which figure importantly in the defense of Western Europe, and intercontinental missiles.

When developed, these intercontinental weapons, together with nuclear powered aircraft of almost unlimited endurance, will add greatly to the speed and flexibility of our long-range striking power.

We come now to an area of compelling interest to you and to me—the Air Force Reserve Forces. Current war planning has established a firm mobilization requirement for these forces. As I told your Air Force Affairs Committee, an indication of where the Reserve program stands in the Air Force scheme of things came from Secretary Quarles in a talk before the Bond Club of New York on January 25. He explained what the new Air Force budget will buy in the following words:

"First, we will have a Strategic Air Command capable of delivering on an aggressor, in 1 week, 1,000 times as much explosive force as hit Germany in all of World War II.

"Second, we will have air defenses of the United States capable of inflicting such losses on attacking bombers that, even by a surprise attack, they cannot hope to destroy our retaliatory forces before they are launched.

"Third, we will have tactical air forces capable of striking blows against enemy forces in the field which exceed by many orders of magnitude the total tactical air effort in World War II.

"Fourth, we will have a logistic air fleet in MATS capable of executing the airlift necessary to support the combat operations I have described, and troop carrier airlift for swift deployment of Army forces.

"Fifth, we will have research and development activities sufficient to insure, so far as human judgment can insure anything, that the capabilities outlined above will remain capabilities in the years to come, though the equipment we use may undergo radical changes.

"Sixth, we will have Reserve forces ready to to carry out their essential roles in time of national emergency."

Secretary Quarles, in those quoted paragraphs, covered the six broad areas of Air Force activity. In so doing, he emphasized beyond possible doubt the position of the Reserve forces as vital elements of Air Force strength.

Let me emphasize that the overriding consideraiton in the Air Force Reserve program today is the attainment of operational readiness. As you all know, Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard personnel gave an outstanding performance in the Korean conflict. Some units achieved the virtually impossible by becoming fully manned and equipped and into combat within 6 weeks. But such a time-lag is no longer acceptable. Our Ready Reserve forces in the future will be needed in a matter of minutes. By the word "ready" I mean just that—completely manned, equipped, trained, and available. This requirement has had a vitalizing effect on our whole program and at the same time has imposed on the Air Reserve forces a heavier responsibility than ever before.

The 27 combat wings of the Air National Guard are presently comprised of 23 fighter-interceptor wings, 2 tactical reconnaissance, and 2 tactical bomber. They are equipped with such aircraft as F-94's, F-89's, and F-86's, among others. The composition of the guard has recently been enlarged to include 8 flying support units: 4 air supply groups and 4 air transport squadrons.

In the Air Force Reserve there are 9 fighter-bomber wings, 2 tactical bomber, and 13 troop carrier. They are equipped with such aircraft as F-84's, B-26's, C-119, and C-46 transports. The Reserve will also be composed of many support-type units—such as air depot, communications, weather, aerial support, armament, and so on—plus more than 100,000 skilled individuals who in emergency would augment the active Air Force Establishment.

In all, the Air Force Reserve Forces will be manned by over 300,000 officers and airmen. Training of both units and individuals is now at an all-time peak level. We have problem areas that have been discussed with your Air Force Affairs Committee. The obstacles are by no means insurmountable, however, and I am sure that with the continuing support of the Congress and such patriotic organizations as your own, they will soon be overcome. As of today, the Reserve Forces are making real progress toward that combat capability required of integral components of the Air Force team.

Gentlemen, this is the status and the direction of our Air Force program. For almost 50 years it has been characterized by constant transition and progress. It has always operated close to the boundaries of scientific advance and the limits of human skill and endurance. It has changed in the past and will change in the future, but its mission remains constant—to deter or defeat a threatening or attacking force with the greater power that we possess. This deterrent power is the indispensable requisite for our ability to use limited weapons in suppressing limited wars. By denying an aggressor the alternative of full-scale war as a means of achieving political aims, it provides a continued opportunity for nonviolent adjustment toward peace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Bow (at the request of Mr. McGregor) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Davidson (at the request of Mr. Zelenko), for Monday, February 20, 1956, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Forrester (at the request of Mr. Davis of Georgia), on Thursday of this week for 90 minutes.

Mr. Gathings, on Thursday for 45 minutes.

Mr. Whitten, today for 30 minutes.

Mr. Dowdy, for 15 minutes today.

Mr. Brooks of Texas, for 15 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bailey, for 30 minutes on Thursday.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Multer in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Zelenko and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Granahan and include an address.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Kluczynski.

Mr. Rodino and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Natcher and to include an editorial.

Mr. Moulder.

Mr. Hess and to include a speech by General White of the Air Force.

Mr. Metcalf.

Mr. Hiestand (at the request of Mr. Arends).

Mr. Hosmer in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Miller of Nebraska in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. Rees of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Utt.

Mr. Quigley.

Mr. Wolverton and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDonough and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ford.

Mr. Holifield in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois and to include related matter.

Mr. Canfield and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Martin.

Mr. Hébert.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were

taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3053. An act to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia, and to provide that such Commission shall continue in existence until the construction of such auditorium shall have been completed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary copies of certain hearings and reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8787. An act to provide for a prorated stationery allowance in the case of a Member of the House of Representatives elected for a portion of a term;

H. R. 8796. An act to increase the amount of telephone and telegraph service furnished to Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution relating to Maryland tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; and

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura reclamation project, California.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 21, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1535. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $278,678,596 for the legislative and judicial branches of the Government and for various departments and agencies of the executive branch (H. Doc. No. 341); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1536. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 34th Quarterly Report on Export Control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1537. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1538. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, as amended, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements, for the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1955, pursuant to subsection 7 (c) of Public Law 874 and subsection 208 (c) of Public Law 815; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1539. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting the Fifth Semiannual Report of the United States Information Agency covering the period from July 1 to December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1540. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer to the fund for the payment of Government losses in shipment of certain amounts representing unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1541. A letter from the Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the 10th Annual Report of Operations Under the Federal Airport Act, pursuant to section 18 of the Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 170); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1542. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Russell Lenz, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, will authorize the concessioner to sell firewood to the general public at the Chimneys public campground in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn., during a 1-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1543. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Seaborn Bradley, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, will authorize the concessioner to sell firewood to the general public at the Smokemont public campground in Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn., for a 2-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1544. A letter from the Acting Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to promote the interests of national defense through the advancement of the aeronautical research programs of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1545. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 18, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Pecks Creek, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1546. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 18, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a letter report on Jules Creek, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1547. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 17, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on McKanes Bay, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1548. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1549. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1550. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1551. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissable into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1552. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to the case of Chen Sie Wei, 0300–463867, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, now pending before the Congress, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1553. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1554. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1555. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the

Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1556. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1557. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1558. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1559. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend and improve the child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, to authorize special project grants to institutions of higher education or research in connection with maternal and child health and crippled children's services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 16, 1956, the following bill was reported on February 17, 1956:

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 9390. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1772). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted February 20, 1956*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committtees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1529. An act to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1773). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5299. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1774). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8728. A bill to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 16, 1956, the following bill was introduced on February 17, 1956:

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 9390. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[*Introduced and referred on February 20, 1956*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 9391. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 9392. A bill to provide educational benefits for children of veterans of World War II or of the Korean conflict where, because of a permanent and total service-connected disability, the veteran was unable to complete the education for which he was eligible under programs administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 9393. A bill to provide that cadets at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed for midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 9394. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to define mothers for purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 9395. A bill to correct an inequity resulting from the setting of the effective date of Public Law 68 of the 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 9396. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 9397. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy or his designee to acquire certain property in Virginia and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 9398. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law exempting labor organizations from the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 9399. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 9400. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Construction Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to extend the benefits thereof to certain individuals by removal of the date limitation on the citizenship requirement contained therein; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 9401. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 9402. A bill to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 9403. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the manufacturers excise tax on mechanical lighters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 9404. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 9405. A bill to promote the interests of national defense through the advancement of the aeronautical research programs of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 9406. A bill to provide an income-tax deduction for taxes paid by an employer on the wages of an employee who performs domestic or other personal or nonbusiness services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 9407. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 9408. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 9409. A bill to provide an income-tax deduction for taxes paid by an employer on the wages of an employee who performs domestic or other personal or nonbusiness services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 9410. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9411. A bill to amend section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9412. A bill to amend section 270 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 9413. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the administration of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 9414. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for more equitable distribution of cotton acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 9415. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to restrict the payment of authorized fees or charges in connection with loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9416. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to prevent the payment of unauthorized fees or charges in connection with loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9417. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 9418. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9419. A bill to authorize the disposal of the U. S. S. *Hartford*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 9420. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic

Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9421. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 9422. A bill to repeal section 3 of the act of June 30, 1945 (59 Stat. 265), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 9423. A bill to provide that coverage under the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System for self-employed farmers and ranchers shall be on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 9424. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 9425. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 9426. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. R. 9427. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 9428. A bill to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9429. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 9430. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with reference to furnishing of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. J. Res. 551. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution expressing the friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Italy and expressing the hope that Italy will remain one of the free and democratic nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York relative to taking Census of Citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting veto of the "gas" bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting amendment of the Organic Act of Guam to provide a Resident Commissioner for this Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 9431. A bill for the relief of Joseph Rusk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 9432. A bill for the relief of Sam A. Reeks, Jr.; to the Committee on the judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 9433. A bill for the relief of Albert Svarc, his wife, Tikvah Svarc, and their daughter, Sulamit Svarc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 9434. A bill for the relief of Friederike Schmitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 9435. A bill for the relief of Deborah Marie Menard and Laura May Menard (also known as Irmgard Ruppert-Williams and Ingrid Ruppert-Williams); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 9436. A bill or the relief of Mrs. Grace C. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9437. A bill for the relief of Col. Filbert L. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 9438. A bill for the relief of Felicia de Diamondstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 9439. A bill for the relief of Yu Siu Liang Kou Shimogawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9440. A bill for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 9441. A bill for the relief of Dorin Ursulesku Baron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9442. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Efriede Herpel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 9443. A bill for the relief of Cornelia Minus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9444. A bill for the relief of Max Karl Roder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 9445. A bill for the relief of Martinus Johannes Antonius Maria Verheijen, his wife, Christina Maria Verheijen, and his two children, Maria Margaretha Petronella Janet and Franciscus Theodorus Adrinus Maria Verheijen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

539. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of citizens of Oakland County, Mich., urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

540. Also, petition of citizens of Pontiac, Mich., and Oakland County, Mich., asking the enactment of legislation to provide retirement income of at least $100 a month to all persons 60 years of age and over, regardless of whether or not such persons may own a home or other property, as well as free medical and hospital care dispensed through public hospitals or other institutions similarly as free education is now dispensed through the public schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

541. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the Rhode Island Wildlife Federation urging the support of Congress in the passage of H. R. 5306 and S. 2101, which provides for the conserving of wildlife and preserving inviolate wildlife refuges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

542. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by Menno Swartzentruber and 16 other citizens of Yamhill County, Oreg., urging repeal of the social-security laws for farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

543. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Dillie Vandeventer and other citizens of Taney County, Mo., urging the passage of the Langer bill, S. 923, and the Siler bill, H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

544. Also, petition of Mrs. Chas. Stockton and other citizens of Lawrence and Barry Counties expressing their opposition to alcoholic beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

545. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Marcum and other citizens of El Dorado Springs, Mo., protesting legislation permitting alcoholic beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

546. Also, petition of Mrs. Stella D. Plummer and other citizens of Aurora, urging the passing of bills S. 923 and H. R. 4627, banning the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

547. Also, petition of Mrs. F. S. Whipple and other citizens of Springfield, Mo., protesting alcoholic beverage advertising on television and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

548. Also, petition of H. L. Briggs and other citizens of Aurora, Mo., urging the support of S. 923 and H. R. 4627, legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising on radio or television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

549. Also, petition of Mrs. C. W. Mahan and other citizens of Bates County, Mo., urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

550. By Mr. TAYLOR: Petition relative to prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

551. By the SPEAKER: Petition of manager, legislative department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to stating that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is convinced that continued support of the International Labor Organization by the taxpayers and by the Government of the United States should be questioned seriously at this time, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

552. Also, petition of grand knight, Knights of Columbus, Mother Cabrini Council, No. 2655, Rego Park, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

553. Also, petition of grand knight, Knights of Columbus, LaSalle Council, No. 454, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1955 were received after October 20, 1955, too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, P. O. Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $303.50. E. (9) $447.54.

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $590.62.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,399.14. E. (9) $1,399.14.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, CIO, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $797.38.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $11,165.27. E. (9) $9,865.27.

A. American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,805.74. E. (9) $19,963.79.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $40. E. (9) $4,075.70.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $649.93. E. (9) $649.93.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York. N. Y.
E. (9) $9,341.

A. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,405.

A. John R. Arant, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $38.

A. H. M. Baldrige, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph K. Ball, 303 State Bank Building, Evanston, Ill.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $35.

A. R. H. Barry, 121 15th Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.
B. American Seed Trade Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $480.50.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Harold E. Benson, 3621 Newark Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Monument Builders of America, 20 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,629.76. E. (9) $2,629.76.

A. Hudson Biery, 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 3026 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $17.33.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,460.13. E. (9) $2,460.13.

A. Warren B. Bledsoe, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $562.93. E. (9) $12.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Boykin & De Francis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen E. V., Contrescarpe 46, Bremen, Germany.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $747.35.

A. Clark L. Brody, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Farm Bureau, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
D. (6) $484.62. E. (9) $19.88.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,875. E. (9) $8.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Central Labor Union, Metal Trades Council, AFL, Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $2,692. E. (9) $2,840.

A. Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,304.75. E. (9) $1,304.75.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Cuban Sugar Mills Owners Association, Habana, Cuba, and The Cuban Sugar Cane Growers Association, Habana, Cuba.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $30,105.49.

A. Warren A. Clohisy, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John G. Coffey, 742 Hospital Trust Building, Providence, R. I.
B. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $435. E. (9) $364.38.

A. Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $29.67.

A. Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., 104 East 52d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $8.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Communications Workers of America, 1508 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $407,438.14. E. (9) $5,089.89.

A. Julien D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $24.13.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $247.75.

A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, 122 East 42d Street, New York Ctiy, N. Y.
D. (6) $750.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $22,500.97. E. (9) $18,631.74.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 5601 River Road, Washington, D. C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $28.75.

A. Robert A. Crichton, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $59.31.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. R. Ammi Cutter, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $208.78.

A. William L. Daley, 912 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $155.98.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $650.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee.
E. (9) $1,379.11.

A. Delaware River Valley Association, Riverton, N. J.
D. (6) $55. E. (9) $24.39.

A. Casimir deRham, Jr., 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,814.47.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Adin M. Downer, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $47.85.

A. Wm. H. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $10.10.

A. John W. Edelman, 811 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,163.95. E. (9) $538.95.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $530.06. E. (9) $10.

A. Emergency Conservation Committee, 767 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,103.50. E. (9) $464.50.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 188, Route 2, Vienna, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. John R. Foley, 753 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $1,304.75.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers' Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Mark W. Frawley, Jr., 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley Gewirtz, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $89.50.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $31.95.

A. Carroll A. Gunderson, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $466. E. (9) $60.

A. Carl O. Gustafson, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $9,746.05.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $35.36.

A. Morton I. Hamburg, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Jack A. Haner, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William A. Hanscom, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,055. E. (9) $180.

A. Hardboard Association, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $10,762.19.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Edward S. Hartman, R. F. D. 2, Delavan, Wis.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $167.92.

A. Mrs. A. Paul Hartz, Waverly, Va.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 601 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Wood Fabric Institute, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Institute, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert N. Hawes and John A. Gosnell, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Plywood Corp., 55 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. F. Cleveland Hedrick, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motorola, Inc., 4545 Augusta Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Laurance G. Henderson, 1138 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. North American Airlines, Burbank, Calif.
D. (6) $2,925. E. (9) $2,767.18.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3,200.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $75.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,552.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $909.87. E. (9) $1,327.59.

A. Thomas W. James, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. The Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.
D. (6) $12.50. E. (9) $2,173.44.

A. Robert C. Keck, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Hardboard Association, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,937.50. E. (9) $9.14.

A. Edmund H. Kerr, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $268.50.

A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. D. B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $380.85.

A. G. E. Leighty, 10 Indepedence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald Linville, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. Hardboard Association, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $5,315.55.

A. Leon Lipson, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Norman M. Littell and Charles J. Alexander, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navaho Tribe of Indians, Window Rock, Ariz.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $10.

A. A. E. Lyon, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association.
D. (6) $750.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $1,097.72.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,625.78. E. (9) $34.60.

A. Jay R. Martin, 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,775. E. (9) $483.91.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1209 Rippon Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $150.32.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $16.80.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Maryland Railroad Association, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $27.71.

A. Motorola, Inc., 4545 Augusta Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $12,038.87. E. (9) $1,580.47.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, Its Public Relations Department and Its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $26,799.13. E. (9) $32,424.26.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $275.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $26,038.43. E. (9) $22,231.02.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council Against Conscription, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,392.21. E. (9) $1,311.16.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $358.58.

A. National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc., 80 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,556. E. (9) $413.78.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,659.19. E. (9) $1,217.71.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,482.52. E. (9) $7,482.52.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $13,137.50. E. (9) $6,746.48.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,433.78. E. (9) $6,910.16.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $6,383.11. E. (9) $2,076.32.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $7.80.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers' Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $13.55.

A. Francis A. O'Connell, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Division, Transport Workers' Union, 80–07 Broadway, Elmhurst, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,755. E. (9) $694.94.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $160.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $243.85. E. (9) $555.21.

A. George W. Overton, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Charles A. Parker, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $440.68. E. (9) $571.75.

A. Maurice G. Paul, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motorola, Inc., 4545 Augusta Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $211.90.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N. J.
D. (6) $2,557.66. E. (9) $2,317.61.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,072.90.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $843.75. E. (9) $107.43.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, United Cerebral Palsy Association, 369 Lexington Avenue, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $8,199.97. E. (9) $5,945.72.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Nicolas Reisini, 11 West 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $285.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $90.75.

A. Walter S. Rothschild, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York., N. Y., and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk and Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
E. (9) $54.50.

A. James J. Saxon, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Rosario Scibilia, 378 Avenue T, Brooklyn, N. Y.
B. Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E (9) $328.10.

A. Paul R. Scott and George F. Gilleland, 627 Ingraham Building, Miami, Fla.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $77.88.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $169.09.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D .C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $151.11.

A. John H. Sharon, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William F. Sharon, 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington D. C.
D. (6) $3,775. E. (9) $775.96.

A. Paul Sifton, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,890. E. (9) $95.85.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 West Moreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,202.33.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $5,279.49. E. (9) $6,602.04.

A. Spence & Hotchkiss, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ernest F. Staub, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,175.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Rental Trailer Association, Chicago, Ill.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 519 South Broadway, Wichita, Kans.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,652.79. E. (9) $8,720.16.

A. Mrs. Joseph Mills Stoll, 4001 61st Street, Brookmont, Washington, D. C.
B. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $90.12.

A. Dale I. Stoops, 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,775. E.(9) $835.52.

A. Dale I. Stoops, 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE, Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $637.50.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, Winnebago, Nebr.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Gordon M. Tiffany, 88 North Main Street, Concord, N. H.
B. Committee on Imports for the American Pulpwood Industry, 320 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,219.10. E. (9) $916.27.

A. The Townsend Plan, Inc. and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California, post office box 901, Redding, Calif.
E. (9) $2.

A. Hugh S. Williamson, 1621 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,568.87. E. (9) $206.71.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc.
D. (6) $208.58. E. (9) $208.58.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
D. (6) $6,065.65. E. (9) $843.95.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,067.94. E. (9) $1,067.94.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clark de Brabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $41.57.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $16,296.29. E. (9) $4.05.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,955.47. E. (9) $1,955.47.

Herbert P. Wilkins, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William Zimmerman, Jr., 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 48 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,416.64. E. (9) $769.76.

A. Edgar A. Zingman, 300 Marion E. Taylor Building, Louisville, Ky.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,625.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1955:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER: 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" as answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) description; (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution; (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this Item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value.
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during the Quarter.
12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures
9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Bank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $393.75.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $2.25.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,023.08. E. (9) $4,023.08.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Hill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $422.42.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $77.95.

A. Joseph Amann, 343 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,430.31. E. (9) $1,274.87.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York City.
E. (9) $6,924.06.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $2,763.02. E. (9) $,2763.02.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,708.99. E. (9) $7,708.99.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $20,626. E. (9) $27,053.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $18,570.32.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $10,144.25.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $153,137.29.

A. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2,784.10.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $475.15. E. (9) $475.15.

A. American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,142.04.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $26,488.33. E. (9) $29,446.02.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $15,515.77. E. (9) $5,347.50.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $17,153.90. E. (9) $3,108.37.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., Development Fund (Legislative), 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $540.65. E. (9) $540.65.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $9,814.19.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $131. E. (9) $11,853.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $120.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $85,108.12. E. (9) $12,231.90.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,780.91. E. (9) $1,780.91.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $85.

A. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $3,459.01.

A. American Trucking Assoications, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $12,567.30.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $13,068.12. E. (9) $7,959.33.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,760. E. (9) $2,773.83.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,249.99.

A. John R. Arent, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $3.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class 1 railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 47th Street, New York City.
E. (9) $1,686.24.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $14,457.45. E. (9) $14,457.45.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,865.31. E. (9) $1,865.31.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 126, Vienna, Va.
D. (6) $147. E. (9) $26.30.

A. George B: Baker, 808 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John A. Baker.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers' Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,584.96. E. (9) $133.32.

A. H. M. Baldrige.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,437.50.

A. Hartman Barber, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,957.71. E. (9) $823.79.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co., Ltd., 500 Royal Bank Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, et al.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $133.67.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $792.50. E. (9) $132.86.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. R. H. Barry, 121 15th Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.
B. American Seed Trade Association, 30 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $346.25.

A. F. W. H. Beauchamp, 26 O'Farell Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Transportation Association of America, 26 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,672.79.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Berge, Fox & Arent, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The G. B. Macke Corp., 212 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Automatic Canteen Company of America, Merchandising Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.; National Automatic Merchandising Association, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1306 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Tell Berna, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,685.03. E. (9) $2,685.03.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,122. E. (9) $297.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Companies engaged in the business of marine insurance and as members of the American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.
E. (9) $15.24.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.
E. (9) $15.23.

A. Henry Bison, Jr., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $173.77.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 4664 Reservoir Road, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,550 E. (9) $176.81.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry W. Blalock, Sr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Electric Power Cooperative, Jefferson City, Mo.; Northwest Electric Power Cooperative, Cameron, Mo.; Western Farmers Electric Cooperative, Anadarko, Okla.
D. (6) $250.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,511.40. E. (9) $2,511.40.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Blum, Lindsey & Powell, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Borax Cartel Story, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $52.20. E. (9) $52.20.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle E. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert F. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Eletcric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $169.25.

A. R. B. Bowden, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C., and 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Bozell & Jacobs, Inc., 205 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,793.20.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William A. Bresnahan, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $225.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street New York, N. Y.

A. Clark L. Brody, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Farm Bureau, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
D. (6) $415.38. E. (9) $37.80.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $350.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Derek Brooks, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Export Credits, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $141.38.

A. Derek Brooks, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Board of Trade, Inc., 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,140. E. (9) $131.73.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,251.71. E. (9) $3,251.71.

A. Brown, Lund and Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,400. E. (9) $3,786.92.

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $10.73.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John N. Brunn, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,374.98. E. (9) $57.95.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $24.03.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. Robert R. Neal, Resident Counsel, 1701 K Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $84.92.

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.; National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $107.50. E. (9) $18.50.

A. Harold Burke.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,495. E. (9) $962.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $10,097.65. E. (9) $6,642.43.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $63.32. E. (9) $63.32.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Bernard N. Burnstine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 50 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,874.99.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $2.16.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,875. E. (9) $19.

A. Lawrence V. Byrnes, 401 Third Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,313.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $16.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,692.41. E. (9) $269.23.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,631.13.

A. Chauncey P. Carter, Jr., 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers' Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. Clarence B. Carter, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. William L. Carter, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Larry Cates, 861 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clarence N. Sayen, president, Air Line Pilots' Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,550.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers' Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,817.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,902.62. E. (9) $4,590.18.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $191.46.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,792.32.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,025.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $137.50.

A. Joseph H. Colman, 1300 First National-Soo Line Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. First Bank Stock Corp., 400 First National-Soo Line Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $1,580.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $9,015.85.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $600.21.

A. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $609.48. E. (9) $7,393.81.

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $17,263.30.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $23,607.17.

A. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,004,216.50. E. (9) $5,196.43.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Conference for Inland Waterways, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $676.

A. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $16.468.34. E. (9) $16,468.34.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,625.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 512 South Market Street, Wichita, Kans.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $17.77.

A. Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,025.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York. N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $1,525.06.

A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, 122 East 42d Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $850.

A. Cotton, Brenner & Wrigley, 225 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Martin Aloysius Madden, 27 West 96th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2.21.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council of Local Gas Companies, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $6,561.25.

A. A. M. Crawford, 718 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $17,618.89. E. (9) $552.

A. Robert A. Crichton, 1701 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $61.40.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,375.

A. John C. Cuneo, Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,740.71. E. (9) $1,791.59.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $525.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. R. Ammi Cutter, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $10.42.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 519 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,050.

A. R. Harvey Dastrup, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,407. E. (9) $23.33.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $650.

A. Joan David, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joan David, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bertram G. Davis, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,515.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Clearing Industrial District, Inc., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Ontario Land Co., 807 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.
E. (9) $73.38.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $149.54.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Tony T. Dechant, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Farmers Education and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $750.

A. Delaware River Valley Association, Riverton, N. J.

A. Richard A. Dell, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $787.50.

A. Casimir DeRham, Jr., 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,300.

A. George J. Dietz, 425 13th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $583.33. E. (9) $2.14.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, 312 Courthouse, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,710.50. E. (9) $85.50.

A. Disabled American Veterans National Headquarters, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $6,145.56.

A. Disabled Officers' Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $2,750.

A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $695.65. E. (9) $695.65.

A. District Lodge, No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $16,259.64. E. (9) $16,889.12.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $9,092.47.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $348.12.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 236 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $119.23.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Co., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,347.68. E. (9) $58.

A. John E. Dougherty, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,600.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

A. Adin M. Downer, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $36.75.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, State Office Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $225.

A. Ben DuBois, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minnesota.
D. (6) $2,869.50.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5-141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. R. Dunkerley, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $462.50. E. (9) $85.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp., 444 West 56th Street, New York City, et al.
D. (6) $20,897.62. E. (9) $6.91.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,276. E. (9) $485.86.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8.13. E. (9) $30.27.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West 39th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $10.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Counsel of Business Schools, Homer Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $910.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,050. E. (9) $196.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $37.69.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $36.06.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,972.50. E. (9) $21.31.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

A. Robert B. Ely 3d, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Emergency Conservation Committee, 767 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $117.25. E. (9) $4,602.64.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $241.65.

A. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
E. (9) $791.42.

A. Charles J. Fain, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $274.50.

A. Edward Falck & Co., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bridgeport Gas Light Co., 815 Main Street, Bridgeport, Conn., et al.
D. (6) $6,156.25. E. (9) $3,823.28.

A. Far East Group, Inc., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,025. E. (9) $1,004.66.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $27,290.52. E. (9) $20,382.21.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corporation, Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.
D. (6) $4,150.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kasser Distillers Products Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $48.20.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $270.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $325.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $11.97.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $150.45.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (legislative fund), Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,540.57.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,374.03.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $2,530.95.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,048.75. E. (9) $278.97.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $14.25.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,423.12.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $15.60.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2209 Pinecroft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
B. National Tax Relief Coalition, 2309 Pinecroft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
D. (6) $680. E. (9) $680.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $2,396.

A. C. H. Frazier, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council of Local Gas Companies, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Walter Freedman, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Patchogue-Plymouth Mills Corp., 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $18.23.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $15,772.96. E. (9) $18,014.42.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
D. (6) $625.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,450.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Railroads.
D. (6) $500.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $72.79. E. (9) $2,249.85.

A. Gus F. Geissler, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $750.

A. General Gas Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $14,575. E. (9) $7,254.28.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. George, Brehmer, and McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Gerhard A. Gesell, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transamerica Corp., 4 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $2,103.33.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,509.38. E. (9) $67.05.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hugh V. Gittinger, Jr., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Henry W. Goodall, 28 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $162.49. E. (9) $12.78.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employes Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,287.09. E. (9) $5,625.89.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $70.60.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $12,170.20. E. (9) $7,853.37.

A. Robert A. Grant, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
B. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $791.42.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ernest W. Greene, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Francis T. Greene, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $203.09.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $839.68.

A. I. J. Gromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,519.96. E. (9) $346.86.

A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,669.98. E. (9) $506.76.

A. Frank E. Haas, 260 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $41.67. E. (9) $49.73.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1.000. E. (9) $4.87.

A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,047.50.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,395.80. E. (9) $162.97.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,526.50. E. (9) $401.50.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. William A. Hanscom, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union—CIO, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,055. E. (9) $180.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,284.31.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. H. E. Harris 2d, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $406.25. E. (9) $9.14.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. Wade Harrison, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,710.50. E. (9) $7.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $502.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $26.25.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 808 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $23.39.

A. Health and Accident Underwriters' Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $94.92.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents' Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners' Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $218.15.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $99.75. E. (9) $99.75.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $29.44.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Postoffice Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $98.40.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $553.33.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $187.50.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. W. E. Himsworth, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council of Local Gas Companies, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,363.70. E. (9) $113.70.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3,200.

A. Charles M. Holloway, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $228.75.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Victor Hood, 4200 Clagett Road, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Bridge and Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $149.54.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jesse V. Horton, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Postoffice Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,562.50. E. (9) $80.86.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers' Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,213.56. E. (9) $1,213.56.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Harold K. Howe, 2480 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,640.44.

A. Harold K. Howe, 207 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 207 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $256.63. E. (9) $183.47.

A. W. C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,556. E. (9) $324.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $825.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $14,755. E. (9) $12,669.08.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $20,765.67. E. (9) $7,575.

A. Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $179.

A. Kenneth W. Ingwalson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $256.25. E. (9) $2.73.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $597.18.

A. International Trade Section, New York Board of Trade, Inc., 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $401. E. (9) $1,182.99.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $7.32.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $812.50. E. (9) $154.38.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 541 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale Pour Participatione Industrielles Et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Merianstr 19, Basle, Switzerland.
E. (9) $232.03.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.
E. (9) $2,206.99.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,250.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, Jr.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,534.96. E. (9) $176.75.

A. W. D. Johnson, 401 Third Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Grandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Grandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $1,041.69.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $5.25.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $296.03.

A. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists and Proprietors International Union of America, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Robert I. Kabat, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $87.15.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $474.33.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $395.65.

A. Arthur C. Keefer, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. War Department Beneficial Association, United States Department of Labor Beneficial Association, and United States Departments of Commerce and Justice Beneficial Association, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Joseph Duff Kelly.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $220.42.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Tariff Committee of the Woven Felt Industry, care of Albany Felt Co., Albany, N. Y.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $10.

A. I. L. Kenen, 302 Beechwood Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $974.99. E. (9) $386.79.

A. William J. Kennard, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $59.91.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $210.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,100. E. (9) $691.04.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $235.70.

A. Jeff Kibre, 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $652.23. E. (9) $683.46.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875.01. E. (9) $280.29.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $130.50. E. (9) $60.27.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $12.47.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $32.50.

A. Thomas R. Kingsley, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Movers Conference of America, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Bill Kirchner, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $2,124.96.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $12.80.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $6.20.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $5.05.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Alden Lown, receiver of the joint venture of Barrett & Hilp, McDonald and Rutherford, 600 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Catherine G. Kuhne, 1701 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. J. M. DeW. (Jack) Kyle 2d, Post Office Box 1520, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $400.12. E. (9) $638.48.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,140. E. (9) $4,915.32.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. A. M. Lampley, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $249.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. William C. Lantaff, 916 du Pont Building, Miami, Fla.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $307.10.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,560. E. (9) $11.70.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,749.98. E. (9) $9.45.

A. John G. Laylin and Edward G. Howard, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $442.16.

A. Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $573.45.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $5,505.23.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,544.97. E. (9) $44.97.

A. James R. Lee, 605 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Heater Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $180.96.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. G. E. Leighty, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Dr. William N. Leonard, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Artemas C. Leslie, 416 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Cross Commission of the American Hospital Association, 425 North Michigan, Chicago, Ill.

A. Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,281.24. E. (9) $3,281.24.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,529. E. (9) $804.90.

A. Leo F. Lightner, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
D. (6) $375.

A. Miss Esther Lipsen, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $71.20.

A. Walter J. Little, 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,999.66. E. (9) $5.30.

A. John M. Littlepage, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipeline Companies, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Charles E. Lofgren, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,450. E. (9) $199.27.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, I. A. of M., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,750.02. E. (9) $15.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car and Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $12.02.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. S. A. Healy Co., 61 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N. Y.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Sydney Lubarr, 9202 Chanute Drive, Bethesda, Md.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $9.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $5.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $83.35.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place South, New York, N. Y.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,532. E. (9) $18.30.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,115.54. E. (9) $101.84.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., public relations counsel to Aircraft Industries Association.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,956.36. E. (9) $14.15.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $93.31.

A. Angus McDonald, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,680. E. (9) $258.33.

A. McDonnell and Slattery, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Edwin McElwain, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $125.

A. Charles T. McGavin, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, U. S. A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. C. McKerched, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis Mo.
B The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. V. McLaughlin, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,722.50. E. (9) $301.11.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $268.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $4.60.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.75.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $470.97.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (7) $1,800.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $143.20.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, Post Office Box 1170, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $375.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $2,375.

A. Mrs. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,625.78. E. (9) $97.63.

A. R. W. Markley, Jr., 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $80. E. (9) $14.80.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112–18 19th Street N.W., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kasser Distillers Products Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1.21. E. (9) $6.96.

A. John M. Martin, Jr., 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1217 Hurley-Wright Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1217 Hurley-Wright Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens' League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,122. E. (9) $228.

A. P. H. Mathews, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,317.75. E. (9) $500.30.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $55.09.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, State Office Building, Montgomery, Ala.
E. (9) $2,025.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William R. Merriam, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $8,715.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L & N Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $147.51.

A. James C. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $245.67.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. The Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $23.58.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $2,200. E. (9) $1,296.83.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $309.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $1,621.45.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Robert K. Eifler, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. John H. Davis, Harriett O. Davis, Harry Handley Cloutier, Elinor S. Cloutier, Estate of Henri M. Cloutier, deceased, Harry M. Cloutier, Executor, Margaret S. Cloutier, Seattle, Wash.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifler, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $51.52.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. F. E. Mollin, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Joseph Molnar, 512 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Unemployed Service Association, 512 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $27.85.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
B. Silok, Inc., Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $55.47.

A. George W. Morgan, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Metz Brewing Co., Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $2.08.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Group Health Dental Insurance, Inc., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pickett Development Committee, Blackstone, Va.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Sperry and Hutchinson Company, 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,005. E. (9) $4.70.

A. Morris Plan Corporation of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,642.21.

A. Giles Morrow, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,374.99. E. (9) $100.42.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $451.25.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corporation, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Movers Conference of America, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3.09. E. (9) $3.09

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. Music Publishers' Association of the United States, 47 West 63d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $768.21.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers' Association Cooperative, P. O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6.20. E. (9) $6.20.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $427.30. E. (9) $262.48.

A. National Association of Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Field Officers, 402 Fourth Avenue, New Kensington, Pa.
D. (6) $660.95. E. (9) $313.27.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,943.75. E. (9) $34.98.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $24,178.94.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $113.94. E. (9) $113.94.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,148.25. E. (9) $5,211.23.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,350.53. E. (9) $1,554.92.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,834.46. E. (9) $5,199.76.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 307 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $31,428.65.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $22,519.16. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $374,267.52. E. (9) $1,913.03.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $1,150.93.

A. National Committee of Shippers and Receivers, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $21.55.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $18.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,136.01. E. (9) $1,136.01.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,197.32. E. (9) $2,197.32.

A. National Council for Export Credits, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $201.

A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5.05. E. (9) $5.05.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $47.53. E. (9) $100.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150,173.28. E. (9) $10,345.92.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,307.30. E. (9) $1,307.30.

A. National Housing Conference, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $16,420.79. E. (9) $16,818.46.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $45.08. E. (9) $1,137.72.

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $502.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $294.67. E. (9) $383.65.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $570. E. (9) $570.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.
E. (9) $830.89.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $76,018.78. E. (9) $3,306.40.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $565.01. E. (9) $570.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $4,626.46.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $4,658.33.

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,169.92. E. (9) $1,013.95.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $5,872.93.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $36,754.56. E. (9) $2,114.

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $516.30. E. (9) $1,636.06.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $28,845.50. E. (9) $1,165.40.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $27,650. E. (9) $10,089.08.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y., and Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $157.27.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 198 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,504.26.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $7.25.

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,751.

A. Blake T. Newton, Jr., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,937.49.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $3,873.75.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Wei-Kuan Chang and wife, Su Chun Wei Chang, 825 West End Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $485.01. E. (9) $65.15.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
D. (6) $100.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $72.25.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,592.80.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 576, Of. 504, Lima, Peru.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $28.60.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert Oliver, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., and 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., and AFL–CIO, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,154.08. E. (9) $1,439.05.

A. Clarence H. Olson, care of the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,370.

A. Samuel Omasta, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $160.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,677.01.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Thomas R. Owens, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Hill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $366.70.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $44. E. (9) $44.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,625.

A. Irving R. M. Panzer, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Steckler, Frank and Gutman, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $136.22.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland Electronic Manufacturing Co., College Park, Md.; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Record Industry Association of America, Inc., New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $51.12.

A. James G. Patton.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. S. Gumbel Realty and Security Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $16.88.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,461.25. E. (9) $198.63.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,650. E. (9) $746.17.

A. Hugh Peterson, Ailey, Ga.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $415.06.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Howard L. Shannon, acting trustee for Color Legislative Fund, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $21.73.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $40.57.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Tomoka Land Co., Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $612.96. E. (9) $30.32.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, Bond Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N. J.
D. (6) $2,557.78. E. (9) $1,699.74.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $250.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $60.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $5.45.

A. Walter C. Ploeser, 50 South Bemiston Avenue, Clayton, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Milton Plumb, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations and American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,149.69. E. (9) $485.14.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,300.

A. Poole, Shroyer & Denbo, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,939.84.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Oliver & Donnally, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, National City Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $72.77.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Devalin Corp., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $45.72.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $843.75. E. (9) $172.01.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street; United Cerebral Palsy Association, 369 Lexington Avenue; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $7,800.01. E. (9) $6,013.09.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, post-office box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $2.40. E. (9) $18.01.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. D. C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250.01. E. (9) $270.49.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3537 Haynie Avenue, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, post-office box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $3.75.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Joint Committee of the National Creameries Association and the American Butter Institute, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $2,317.94.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,441.06. E. (9) $4,441.06.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $44.08.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $40,329.41.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,396.64. E. (9) $9,191.93.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $2.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $127.50.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $1,741.91.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,122. E. (9) $228.

A. John J. Riley, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.05.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, post-office box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $724.30.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $90.75.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Watson Rogers, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. James F. Rowan, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Movers Conference of America, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $138.46. E. (9) $127.23.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $114.11.

A. M. C. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $264.69.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $60.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 705 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co., Ltd., 500 Royal Bank Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, et al.

A. John T. Sapienza and Walter A. Slowinski, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago and North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $191.25.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,250.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Schoene and Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Jack Garrett Scott, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Howard L. Shannon, acting trustee for Color Legislative Fund, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $34. E. (9) $55.75.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $36.35.

A. John H. Sharon, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,545.99.

A. Marcellus C. Sheild, 3 East Irving Street, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $597.67.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York. N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $447.97.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Manly Sheppard, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission, 24 Branford Place, Newark, N. J.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. The Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,350.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $8,553.35.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,021.31.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,890. E. (9) $2.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $606.12. E. (9) $159.20.

A. T. W. Smiley, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $3,675.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $253.65.

A. J. D. Snyder, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $29,481.75. E. (9) $26,055.10.

A. Southwestern Peanut Sheller's Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $153.75.

A. Spence & Hotchkiss, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $161. E. (9) $335.95.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $3,548.51.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Samuel Elliot Stavisky, 9307 Singleton Drive, Bethesda, Md.
B. Asociacion de Colonos de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba, and Asociacion Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $7,545.75.

A. Nell F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Utility Trailer Rental Association, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Rental Trailer Association, Chicago, Ill.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 519 South Broadway, Wichita, Kans.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,588.69. E. (9) $838.69.

A. Erskine Stewart, 808 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,215.59. E. (9) $565.59.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Paul A. Strachen, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,769.23.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,875.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, Winnebago, N br.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $5.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Box 2084 Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $987.98.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Barrett Godwin Tewresey, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.
D. (6) $618. E. (9) $661.69.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Jay Taylor, 712 First National Bank Building, Amarillo, Tex.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. John U. Terrell, 407 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,150. E. (9) $2,600.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th Street, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $7,040. E. (9) $8,393.65.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) $800.

A. W. M. Thomas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $111.05.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,531.04.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,662.50. E. (9) $24.43.

A. Gordon M. Tiffany, 88 North Main Street, Concord, N. H.
B. Committee on Imports for the American Pulpwood Industry, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $4.70.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. William B. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 16th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Solano County, Calif.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $317.97.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Tomoka Land Co., Sebring, Fla.

A. Touche, Niven, Bailey & Smart, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,074.99. E. (9) $659.72.

A. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,969. E. (9) $44.96.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, Post Office Box 423, Balboa, C. Z.
D. (6) $109.48. E. (9) $441.48.

A. Union Producing Co., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $527.93.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,384.83.

A. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $27,025.72. E. (9) $15,312.94.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $12,471.59.

A. R. G. Van Buskirk, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,062.51.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $25.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley W. Vogt, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,534.96.

A. H. Jerry Voorhis, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300.

A. Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $46.75.

A. Claude R. Wallace, 1453 Harvard Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Woollen H. Walshe, 3423 Joseph Street, New Orleans, La.
B. California Commercial Co., Inc., 635 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $427.49.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $298.75. E. (9) $41.54.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Quaife M. Ward, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 1728 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,496.72. E. (9) $1,729.72.

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $12,881.25. E. (9) $38.64.

A. J. R. Watson, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City, N. Y.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N. Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bigham, Engler, Jones, & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $161.15.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association and the Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $230.49.

A. William S. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,391.60. E. (9) $755.65.

A. Wei-Kuan Chang and Su Chun Wei Chang (wife), 825 West End Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,425.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $904.94.

A. Robert V. Westfall, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio Corporation of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $85.33.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Myron Wiener, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Far East Group, Inc., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Anna Kelton Wiley, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C.
B. The Women's City Club, 1733 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., et al.

A. Herbert P. Wilkins, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker, & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California, care of Clyde F. Thompson, Post Office Box 901, Redding, Calif.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oreg.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 120 Danbury Street SW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Fort Duchesne, Utah.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, Bronx, N. Y.
D. (6) $1.50. E. (9) $7.74.

A. Hugh S. Williamson, 1621 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John C. Williamson, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $1,514.71.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc.
D. (6) $51. E. (9) $51.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $490.72.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $77.93.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $417.89.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
D. (6) $5,550.53. E. (9) $868.71.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $10,472.48. E. (9) $784.07.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,344. E. (9) $11.25.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $108.

A. William Zimmerman, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 48 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,499.96. E. (9) $1,063.56.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, et al.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1955:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "4," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	QUARTER				
		P	1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed).

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

A. American Superphosphate Institute, Inc., Postoffice Box 405, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.

A. Carlisle Bargeron and Associates, 614 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads.

A. Charles J. Bloch, 520 First National Bank Building, Macon, Ga.
B. Pacific National Fire Insurance Co., San Francisco, Calif., and Atlanta, Ga.

A. Bozell & Jacobs, Inc., 205 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Frank P. Brannan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Derek Brooks, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Export Credits, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Frederick W. Burnside, Jr., 302 Short Hills Avenue, Springfield, N. J.
B. Burke Dowling Adams, Inc., 203 Bellevue Avenue, Upper Montclair, N. J.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Chauncey P. Carter, Jr., 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. Alex M. Clark, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Joint Committee of Consumers and Small Producers of Natural Gas, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.

A. Council of Local Gas Companies, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago and North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transamerica Corp., 4 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Danzansky & Dickey, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Skrod & Co., Inc., 99 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Trustees under the will of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, Care of the Northern Trust Co., 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. George J. Dietz, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Far East Group, Inc., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. C. H. Frazier, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council of Local Gas Companies, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Thurston Greene, 30 Mason Street, Torrington, Conn.
B. Ilse Only, Assenhausen 2, United States Zone, Am. Starnbergersee Bayern, Germany.

A. Daniel M. Gribbon, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transamerica Corp., 4 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

A. R. B. Bowden, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Council of Local Gas Companies, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N. Y.

A. Nelson P. Jackson, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.

A. Joint Committee of Consumers and Small Producers of Natural Gas, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.

A. Orrin G. Judd, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Dr. Ching-Lin Hsia and wife, Wai Tsung Hsia, 21 Park Place, Great Neck, Long Island, N. Y.

A. David K. Kadane, 250 Old Country Road, Mineola, N. Y.
B. Long Island Lighting Co., 250 Old Country Road, Mineola, N. Y.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Gas Light Co., 11th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. H. Kittrell, Commercial Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. West Central Texas Oil & Gas Association, F. & M. Bank Building, Abilene, Tex.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Frank W. Kuehl, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Catherine G. Kuhne, 1701 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Harold M. La Font, 419 Skaggs Building, Plainview, Tex.
B. Grain Sorghum Producers Association, Box 77, Bushland, Tex.

A. Dillard Brown Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. U. G. Lewellen, 628 Jefferson Street, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Bus and Truck Association, 628 Jefferson Street, Jefferson City, Mo.

A. Hal Leyshon, 292 Madison Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

A. Robert W. Lishman, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert H. McNeill, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Tax Council, Inc., First National Bank Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
B. Silok, Inc., Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.

A. Fisher Muldrow, Post Office Box 983, Oklahoma City, Okla.
B. Associated Motor Carriers of Oklahoma, Inc., Box 983, Oklahoma City, Okla.

A. National Council for Export Credits, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph L. Nellis, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Transporters Association, 2627 Cadillac Tower, Detroit, Mich.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ada E. Pruitt, 5814 Nevada Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Devalin Corp., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Little & Christman, 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 740 11tl. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Manly Sheppard, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission, 24 Branford Place, Newark, N. J.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.

A. Spencer, Moore & Whalen, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Edward Martin Hinsberger, 55 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Utility Trailer Rental Association, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. P. K. Ward, 219 Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Joint Committee of Consumers and Small Producers of Natural Gas, room 219, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.

A. Myron Weiner, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Far East Group, Inc., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Anna Kelton Wiley, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C.
B. The Women's City Club, 1733 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., et al.

A. A. E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Thirty-fifth Anniversary of Armenian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared on the anniversary of Armenian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY

On February 18, 1921, 35 years ago, the people of Armenia waged the only successful revolution in history against an established Soviet Government.

In the years just prior to this revolt, and following the Second World War, the Communists took over Armenia and subjected that country to a vicious reign of terror, killing, jailing, and exiling thousands of people. Finally, on February 18, 1921 the people of Armenia rose, as a man, and drove out the Communist tyrants. To be sure, Armenian independence was short-lived. Before long, Red Army hordes once again invaded this little country, and put the Armenian people back in chains. But February 18, 1921, will live in history as a stirring example of man's devotion to freedom, and of his willingness to fight for that freedom against insuperable odds. The Armenian people still, to this day, live under the heel of the most brutal tyranny ever known; but they live and hope and pray for the day when they will regain their freedom.

I think it is fitting that we in the United States today, on the anniversary of the heroic Armenian uprising, pay tribute to the Armenian people. It is fitting that we once again dedicate ourselves to the reestablishment of freedom in this oppressed land.

On August 12, 1941, the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain met together aboard an American warship in the Middle Atlantic, and signed a document that was later to be known as the Atlantic Charter. In the Atlantic Charter, the United States proclaimed to the world that: "[We] respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and . . . [We] wish to see soverign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

After the war, at Yalta and Teheran, the Roosevelt administration callously forsook the high principles on behalf of which millions of young men died. It is a matter of national honor that we reestablish these principles today as the objectives of American foreign policy. We dare not rest until the blight of communism has been erased from the face of the earth; until freedom and independence is restored to all of those people who are now in slavery.

Armenia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 each year nationality groups over large portions of the globe should pause to thank the Almighty that their lands offer a present and ever available opportunity for free individual expression. The inhabitants of many nations do not share these same opportunities as we in America and other members of the free world. The brave Armenian people represent one such group whose geographical boundaries have been swallowed into the Soviet orbit of domination.

February 18 is a day to remind us of Armenia. For it was just 31 years ago that the Armenian people staged the only successful full-scale uprising against established Soviet Government. This hard-won freedom was soon blotted out, for it did not take Red terrorists long to again flow into this small country, absorbing it into an unnatural state of totalitarian domination where it has remained.

Although the small Armenian country later lost her independence as a self-governing political state, she represents more than a match against the godless materially minded rulers in the Kremlin. Animal and selfish ambitions continue to guide the Soviet rulers in their domination of Armenia.

But Armenia offers more than an equal match against the Soviet imperialists if other qualities are taken into account. For within the hearts of these brave people rest qualities which the Soviets unwisely disclaim, but qualities freedom-loving nations know to be indispensable to their lasting and ultimate peace, progress, and freedom. These are the mighty spiritual and moral forces provided by faith in God and proved by a look into history. The lesson of history shows quite vividly that whenever a nation uses sheer material force as a weapon of conquest, that nation does not long endure.

And history illustrates, as it will again, that the power of right and spiritual wisdom turns the tide against an alleged sense of godless materiality. The tide will turn again in favor of the Armenians and other Soviet-dominated countries when vigilant hopes and dreams of the vanquished take actual form in a return to their rightful national identity of freedom and independence.

Nineteenth District Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks,

I include the tabulated results of a poll of opinion I have conducted in the congression district which I represent.

Late in December I mailed questionnaires to every 10th name appearing on the voting lists in the 3 counties of the 19th district. The response has been most excellent, running about 12 percent. I think it reflects well the intelligence and interest of the voters of this area. Those who responded had to furnish their own envelope and stamp. The comments which accompanied so many of the returns are indicative of the careful thinking with which the respondents approached their answers.

Members may read some significance in the results of this particular poll insofar as they reflect the thinking of President Eisenhower's new neighbors. The President and Mrs. Eisenhower recently became official, voting residents of the 19th district when they registered at the Adams County Court House in Gettysburg.

Questions	19th district		Adams		Cumberland		York	
	Percent yes	Percent no	Percent yes	Percent no	Percent yes	Percent no	Percent yes	Percent no
1. Do you favor, at this time, a reduction in Federal taxes?	58	42	54	46	55	45	60	40
If your answer was "yes" indicate which of the following methods would be fairest:								
(a) Increase in personal exemptions	72		58		80		81	
(b) Eliminate excise taxes	6				3		9	
(c) Curtail excise taxes	5		5		4		7	
(d) Decrease corporate tax rate only	2				3		2	
(e) Across-the-board rate reduction	24		5		24		30	
2. Does the present farm crisis require Federal action?	56	44	53	47	62	38	68	32
If your answer was "yes" indicate the proposals which appear to offer the best solution:								
(a) Fixed price supports	22		8		18		30	
1. 90 percent of parity	17		8		17		23	
2. 100 percent of parity	5				1		7	
(b) So-called soil fertility bank	17		15		25		15	
(c) Direct farm subsidies on all crops, similar to present program for wool	8				6		9	
(d) Increased market research	34		19		35		36	
(e) Use of present surpluses to feed world needy	71		53		68		75	
(f) Combination of all above	17		10		26		41	
If your answer was "no" indicate whether we should:								
(a) Abolish all farm aid programs	37		39		43		35	
(b) Continue with present flexible price support program	63		32		57		53	
3. Do you favor a program of Federal aid to education?	75	25	80	20	73	27	78	22
If your answer was "yes" indicate the programs you believe most justifiable:								
(a) Grants to States for school construction	35		42		29		45	
(b) Aid to teacher-training institutions	14		13		10		16	
(c) Grants to help defray teacher salary costs	24		25		32		22	
(d) Grants to help defray administrative costs	6		4		3		7	
(e) Federal guaranties of local school bonds	13		2		10		16	
(f) Combination of all above	48		33		31		54	
4. Should the Federal Government concern itself with the problem of rising costs of medical services and care?	64	36	57	43	54	46	67	33
If your answer was "yes" indicate your preference of the following suggested programs:								
(a) Health insurance modeled along lines of social security	58		42		45		63	
(b) Increase funds available for hospital construction	14		19		14		16	
(c) Provide grants to operate hospitals	13		14		16		14	
(d) Grants to medical and nursing schools	17		16		19		17	
(e) Medical and nursing scholarships	23		22		33		21	
(f) Federal guaranties against losses to private health insurance and hospitalization plans	11		12		11		11	
(g) Combination of all of the above	24		17		22		25	
5. Should we continue to have Federal housing programs?	65	35	67	33	70	30	64	36
If your answer was "yes" are you satisfied that present policy is providing an adequate program?	49	51	31	69	60	40	48	52
If not, indicate whether any of the following moves are necessary for improvement:								
(a) Permitting FHA to insure cooperative projects	21		42		16		21	
(b) Increasing direct loans to veterans	31		68		34		26	
(c) Expanding public housing programs	40		100		60		28	
(d) Combination of all above	59		20		55		65	
6. Are you satisfied with present foreign policy programs?	39	61	53	47	46	54	36	64
If your answer was "no" indicate whether you favor the following:								
(a) Continue to support United Nations	57		74		46		58	
(b) Withdraw from United Nations	7		15		5		6	
(c) Withdraw from all overseas commitments	11		15		11		12	
(d) Strive to strengthen United Nations	63		95		46		63	
(e) Continue foreign economic aid programs as is	10		27		9		8	
(f) Increase tempo of foreign economic aid	14		15		11		15	
(g) Further emphasize point 4 program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas	44		73		34		43	
7. In the light of existing world tensions, should we:								
(a) Increase our military strength	44		42		54		43	
(b) Continue military establishment at present levels	50		54		45		50	
(c) Make further national defense cuts	6		4		1		7	
(d) If you checked (a) above, do you then believe we should adopt universal military training?	73	27	63	37	84	16	72	28
8. Do you feel that the Taft-Hartley Act provides the fairest basis for Federal supervision of labor-management relations?	49	51	58	42	52	48	47	53
If your answer was "no" indicate whether it should be:								
(a) Repealed with no replacement	8		7		10		8	
(b) Repealed and replaced with a perfected version of the Wagner Act	56		47		55		57	
(c) Amended to meet the objections of labor	36		32		24		40	
(d) Amended to meet the objections of management	22		20		20		23	
9. Both major political parties have recommended amendments to McCarran-Walter immigration law. Do you agree?	75	25	71	29	80	20	74	26
If you answered "yes" indicate whether:								
(a) Quota system should be abandoned	8		17		4		8	
(b) Unused quotas should be transferred to countries where they are oversubscribed	35		28		36		35	
(c) Temporary adjustments should be made by extension of and amendments to Refugee Relief Act	62		63		60		62	

A Bill To Make Labor Organizations Subject to the Antimonopoly Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, for some years the Federal Government has been unable to prosecute labor organizations for violations of the antimonopoly laws. Labor organizations can merge or combine, or their leaders can conspire without restrictions, whether or not they conspire in restraint of trade or against the freedom of the worker.

The document most important to the worker and the individual citizen is the Constitution of the United States—and the Bill of Rights. That is the last protection of his freedom. If our Federal laws specifically exempt the worker from that protection, they deny it to him. He is being discriminated against, and I don't think it is fair to him—or right.

Why should the labor racketeers, without the support of the workers, be above the law? Why should they make rules and regulations and issue mandates to the workers without the workers' knowledge and consent?

That is not our free America as our forefathers founded it. It is not the much praised freedom of the individual which made our country great. It is

a tyranny over the individual and that tyranny is now condoned by law.

I am now introducing a bill to free millions of workers of the United States from that tyranny. I propose to make labor organizations subject to the antimonopoly laws protecting the individual citizen against any other form of monopoly.

The great prosperity we have built has provided 3 million more jobs and the highest wages in history. We have checked the inflation and held the cost of living level for these 3 years. The American workingman and his family are now better off than ever, financially. We must protect this standard by all means.

My bill would restore to the individual worker the protection of the Federal courts.

I am for the American workingman. But he has been tricked, swindled and coerced into doing things in which he does not believe, simply to get or hold his job and provide for his family.

Specifically, my bill repeals two sections of the Clayton Anti-Monopoly Act, section 17, which at present exempts labor organizations from compliance with the act by stating that nothing in the act shall be construed as making labor organizations illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade.

The other one is section 52 which provides that Federal courts at present cannot restrain either side in a labor dispute unless there is imminent danger or irreparable injury for which there is no adequate remedy at law and which lists a number of activities which may not be considered in violation of any Federal law. In effect, it restores the protection of the courts in such cases.

Repealing the exemption of labor organizations from Federal antimonopoly laws would make them obey the laws that other organizations have to obey. Any labor organization which is sincerely opposed to monopolies, and which is truly representing the best interests of the American workers, I believe surely should welcome this legislation.

I am sure the adoption of this monopoly measure will be for the best interests of America and its vast groups of workers and citizens.

Upper Colorado Project's Terrific Costs Would Be Borne by Nation's Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, 98 percent of the upper Colorado River project's cost would be borne by the taxpayers of the 44 States in which the project is not located. This hidden subsidy for the four States benefited is unconscionable. Total direct and hidden costs run to $5 billion. It cannot and would never be repaid from project revenues and would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers. The percent of the Federal tax burden by States as computed by the Tax Foundation shows that less than 2 percent of this required Federal subsidy would be borne by the taxpayers of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the chief beneficiaries of the projects. For example, the State of New York would pay over 12 percent, Ohio about 6 percent, Illinois and Pennsylvania about 7 percent each, and so forth. It will be a burden on all of the taxpayers for generations to come.

Based on repayment schedules presented to the House and Senate Interior Committees by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, and the percentage of Federal taxes paid by each State, as computed by the Tax Foundation of New York City and Washington, D. C., here in tabular form are the costs, State by State:

Cost to the States of the Colorado River storage project

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Alabama	0.93	$10,164,900	$13,280,400	$15,354,300	$31,889,700
Arizona	.41	4,481,300	5,854,800	6,769,100	14,058,900
Arkansas	.48	5,246,400	6,854,400	7,924,800	16,459,200
California	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,600	152,222,200	316,153,800
Colorado	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Connecticut	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200
Delaware	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000
Florida	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300
Georgia	1.30	14,209,000	18,564,000	21,463,000	44,577,000
Idaho	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400
Illinois	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,975,600
Indiana	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500
Iowa	1.21	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900
Kansas	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300
Kentucky	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Louisiana	1.09	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100
Maine	.38	4,153,400	5,426,400	6,273,800	13,030,200
Maryland	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500
Massachusetts	3.23	35,303,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700
Michigan	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,196,200
Minnesota	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200
Mississippi	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400
Missouri	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200
Montana	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
Nebraska	.73	7,978,900	10,424,400	12,052,300	25,031,700
Nevada	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,611,600	5,486,400
New Hampshire	.27	2,951,100	3,855,600	4,457,700	9,258,300
New Jersey	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
New Mexico	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
New York	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
North Carolina	1.38	15,083,400	19,706,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
North Dakota	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Ohio	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,900	219,113,100
Oklahoma	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Oregon	.95	10,383,500	13,566,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Pennsylvania	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	258,203,700
Rhode Island	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
South Carolina	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
South Dakota	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Tennessee	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Texas	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Utah	.34	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Vermont	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
Virginia	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,800	50,749,200
Washington	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
West Virginia	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Wisconsin	2.05	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Wyoming	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Total	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000

Total direct construction costs of the overall project of $1,651,000,000 when added to the interest on irrigation phases of $3,429,000,000 totals $5,080,000,000.

This, of course, dictates the defeat of the proposal.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence was celebrated and observed on February 16. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have prepared in that respect.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HRUSKA

Mr. President, it is again an honor to salute the gallant nation of Lithuania and Lithuanian people everywhere on the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Although it was short-lived, snuffed out in the clash of totalitarian giants in the Baltic, Lithuania's freedom has been a particular inspiration to freedom-loving peoples everywhere. That Lithuania still fights against heavy odds for her freedom is a monument to the courage and determination of her people and to the eternal attraction of the torch of liberty.

Since the 16th century, Lithuanians have worked tirelessly for their freedom. But

located in a strategic corner of turbulent Europe, Lithuania became a prize for the aggressive drives of land-hungry governments.

Hard-won independence, declared on February 16, 1918, ended in the now-familiar treachery of Communist dictators who casually added more peace treaties and nonaggression pacts to the waste pile as they forced another 3 million people under their yoke.

Perhaps most significant to the people of my State of Nebraska are the well-documented reports of the ordeal of enslaved Lithuanians, are those dealing with the collectivization of a once prosperous agricultural economy. The drive for collectivization of Lithuania's traditional family farms began in 1947. It was ruthless oppression culminating in collectivization of 99 percent of the farms into the kolkhozes—the Soviet collective farm.

Testimony before the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression in the 83d Congress painted a tragic picture of the deterioration of Lithuanian agriculture in the kolkhoze system.

The efficiency of the collectivized farmer dropped sharply. Production per hectare of Lithuania's basic crops fell off—in wheat from 24 bushels per hectare to 10, and in rye from 25 bushels to 11. Lithuania's livestock population has declined—from 1,200,000 head of sheep to only 260,000 and from more than 1 million head of hogs to 315,000.

The achievements of our free enterprise farmer stand in stark contrast.

The select committee concluded in its report to the House, "The expropriation of private property destroyed the very foundation of the Lithuanian economy and turned her prosperous population into paupers."

The iron control of Lithuania by the Kremlin appears complete. But, as free men everywhere know, it is not. The determination of once independent nations and peoples to regain their freedom can never be stamped out.

As long as we continue to remind these enslaved people that they are not forgotten and as long as we continue to reassert in ourselves our determination to protect our own freedom, we can confidently look forword to the day when these indomitable Lithuanians will again achieve the right of self-determination.

Third Anniversary of the Farmer's Betrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago on January 20, 1953, the Eisenhower Big-Business-Benson Administration was inaugurated. The ensuing 3 years have witnessed a steady downward drift of farm prices and purchasing power. The decline in net incomes of farmers have been even more severe because farmers' operating and living costs have not decreased; in fact, the cost of many items have increased.

The total net incomes of farmers in 1952, the year Mr. Eisenhower was elected President, was $15 billion. By the third quarter of 1955, the total annual net income was reduced to $10 billion. This represents a decrease of 33⅓ percent or a one-third cut in the net income of the farmers of America and their families since the year 1952, and during the past 6 months the farm income picture has grown much worse.

Although the total farm production for the year of 1955 was 12 percent greater than in 1947, gross farm income was 9.4 percent below 1947 and net farm income was down 38 percent. During the same period national income from nonagricultural sources increased about 68 percent and farm production expenses increased 11.4 percent. The parity ratio, which measures the relationship between prices received by farmers and prices paid by farmers, dropped from 115 in 1947 to 80 in January of this year.

The farmers are the victims of a cost-price squeeze, and while the farmers' income has steadily declined, big business corporation profits have gone up higher and higher. Big business manufacturers, processors, commodity markets, packers, stock markets, transportation carriers, et cetera, have more than doubled and redoubled their net profits. General Motors Corp. reported a net income of more than a billion dollars for last year.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the Republican publicized Eisenhower "prosperity and peace program" is a gross misrepresentation, and a grave danger to our national economy when it is revealed in the light of the fact that one of many big profiteering corporations—General Motors—reaped a profit last year equal to one-tenth of the total combined annual net income of 22 million loyal American farm people.

Another example of the Eisenhower "boom-prosperity and peace" program is the profits of Armour Packing Co. Profits of this company increased 600 percent in the year 1955. All other packing companies and processors report the greatest profits ever known in their operations.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America do not object to big business profits—we favor such profits if not unreasonable. The farmers do not wish to injure or prevent anyone's prosperity but they are entitled to their rightful share of the profits from our national resources and prosperity.

During this phony "boom" period, the Eisenhower Administration has consistently followed a course of action designed to force farm prices down. On every occasion when the so-called flexible price support law permitted, the administration has reduced the support price when and if it was above the free market level.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed and voted against the flexible or sliding scale farm price support bill when presented by the Republican Leadership and passed here by the Eisenhower Administration and Republican Congress 2 years ago. Instead I favored a 100-percent parity price for all farm products, and I supported and voted for a continuation of 90-percent parity price support program as was presented for a vote on the floor of the House at that time.

The Eisenhower Administration of our agriculture programs has opposed and continues to oppose 100-percent parity protection for the farmers. The farmers are not willing to accept and must not be compelled to accept the controls of the soil-bank program without rigid 100-percent parity price support protection. The main opposition presented by opponents to parity price support protection for the farming industry is an exaggerated complaint against accumulated farm surpluses.

Mr. Speaker, for all of the 8 years from 1947—the first year after demobilization—through 1954, the average annual "surplus" of this type, for all farm products lumped together, has been only 1.6 percent of annual production, with an excess production in 5 years and a deficiency in the other 3.

According to the official figures from the Commodity Credit Corporation, December 31, 1955, we have a surplus supply of corn which would last 3 months and 19 days; present supply of wheat would last 13 months and 10 days; butter, 1 month and 14 days; milk, 1 month and 27 days; barley, 4 months and 14 days; oats, 24 days; and soybeans, 29 days.

Quite aside from the fact that accumulated farm "surpluses" could be used advantageously both at home and abroad, they are not in the aggregate excessively large as an emergency reserve. If war should break out or a national catastrophe occur, a total accumulation of farm products amounting to less than one-third of 1 year's normal production would be a minimum safeguard. Indeed, we would be more safe if we had more surplus farm products in reserve storage. We now have an inventory of over $100 billion worth of military equipment and supplies. How large, in comparison, is the $8 billion our Government has invested in surplus stores of food and fiber, and which could at any time be liquidated for sale at world markets outside the United States?

Mr. Speaker, there would be no farm surpluses if home consumption was expanded and exports of farm products enlarged. But unfortunately for the farmers of America, the Republican Administration now in power protects foreign agriculture from American farm exports in order to increase the exports of the manufacturing industries.

Big business and big industry are protected by the Eisenhower Administration by Government subsidies and special tax privileges to enable them to maintain certain price charges and limit output. Farmers are compelled to buy in a protected administered price market asking, "What is your price I am compelled to pay?" Farmers must sell in competition with millions of other farmer sellers to a monopolistic-type market, taking what they are offered as set by the monopolistic market price.

Mr. Speaker, big business corporation profits, after taxes, have increased by more than 36 percent since 1952. During this same period farmers' net income has decreased by more than 30 percent. The consumers of food and farm products are not deriving any benefits from falling farm prices. The average prices received by farmers for all products are now 26 percent lower than in 1951, but the food prices paid by consumers are about the same as in the year 1951. For example,

prices received by producers of beef cattle in mid-December 1955 were equivalent to only 67.1 percent of the 1947–49 average, but the cost of beef to the consumer has not decreased.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad state of affairs when farmers are becoming worse off while others are prospering. It shocks human instincts and commonsense to see cutbacks in production and hear talks of "surpluses" while millions of American families lack adequate diets and hundreds of millions of people elsewhere in the world fear starvation. We all know enough of our economic history to be worried when agriculture is rolling downhill, because all general depressions have started on the farms, and conditions on the farms today threaten the lasting prosperity of all.

Mr. Speaker, the farm situation demands immediate adjustment and emergency action by the Eisenhower Administration in order to prevent a complete collapse and bankruptcy of the farmers of America. Laws now in effect permit and authorize such action by the executive branch of the Government to protect and improve farm income, and the failure and refusal of the Eisenhower Administration to effectively administer the farm laws now in effect makes it even more necessary for the Congress of the United States to enact mandatory farm income protection legislation. The practices of monopolistic market manipulations which are circumventing the operations of free markets and enriching the few to the end of destroying the producer must be stopped. An immediate investigation should be conducted along the line provided for in my resolution, House Resolution 371, which I introduced January 12 of this year.

What agriculture needs at this time is a blood transfusion, such as a production payment plan, as advocated by Fred Heinkel, President of Missouri Farmers Association. A production payment plan could be put into effect in a very short time, and would not disrupt normal channels of trade. Such a plan should be made retroactive through and for the year of 1955 as well as for 1956 and subsequent years or until the farm surplus problem is worked out.

Mr. Speaker, I favor and will vigorously support and vote for farm legislation as outlined and proposed by the National Farmers' Organization. The Department of Agriculture should immediately establish a price floor of not less than $20 per hundredweight on butcher hogs and approximately $30 per hundredweight on good to choice cattle. He has existing authority by law to do so; however, if we need more specific mandatory legislation, then we must enact such legislation, and also provide mandatory income protection for family farm production of all commodities at 100 percent of fair parity, by means of production payments in workable combinations with price support loans, purchase agreements and purchases. We must revitalize and expand Federal crop insurance, expand use and demand for farm commodities, through domestic consumption expansion, such as milk for school lunch programs, and we must vigorously expand and increase export of farm products.

Mr. Speaker, the only action that will solve the problem is legislation that will stop the fall in farm family income and raise it to a level commensurate with a fair opportunity for farmers in an otherwise expanding and prosperous national economy. Existing law permits and authorizes in general, but does not compel the executive branch to take the necessary actions required to protect and improve farm income. However, the executive branch has not used this authority. On the record, there is no reason to believe or hope that the Eisenhower-Benson executive branch of our Government will extend or administer adequate farm income protection programs as now authorized by laws in effect. Passage of mandatory farm income protection legislation will make the intent of Congress crystal clear; the absence of such mandatory legislation may give the executive branch some further excuse for its timidity and failure to act.

Mr. Speaker, our great United States has survived the tests of time, economic depressions and wars. From obscurity and small beginnings four centuries ago, America has emerged into history as the most powerful and resourceful free nation in the world. A nation only 400 years old, against the 5,000 years of India; 400 years against the days of Egypt that dates back centuries before the birth of Christ; 400 years against the life of China known by records to date back as far as 2205 B. C. The 400 most enlightened and liberty-laden years of mankind, which we have achieved by and through a philosophy of government that the welfare of all the people is paramount to that of a privileged few.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America were the founders and pioneers of our great Nation. It was indeed their lives and epochs that laid the convenient stepping stones which led to the industrial development, and the high standard of living and security the people of America enjoy. And the farmers of America are not only entitled to share in our national prosperity, their income, standard of living and opportunities must be equalized with other segments of our economy or a national economic depression with bankruptcy and bread lines will surely be upon us again.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, Before the Decalogue Society of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I made before the Decalogue Society, in Chicago, on February 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I accept your award and thank you for it. It means a great deal to me to receive this evidence that the struggles some of us have been waging in Washington are approved and supported here in the heartland of America.

I have long known of this distinguished society, with its noble name enshrining in a word the basic rules of goodness and godliness.

I have the high privilege of knowing almost all the eminent persons who have received this award before me, and I am proud, indeed, to be included in that great company.

At least one of your Members is an old friend, or rather a young friend of mine. I am glad to greet him here in his hometown as a rising star in the public firmament, a man in whom brilliance of intellect is aptly joined with integrity of character—Congressman SIDNEY YATES. It has been a privilege to know and to cherish this dedicated young man. The Decalogue Society and the community should be proud of him.

Tonight I propose to discuss with you a subject in which many of you, I am sure, share a great interest with me—our immigration and citizenship laws.

I am going to assume that there are none present whom I need to convince that these laws require amendment and modification tonight. I want to give you my judgment as to the kind of modification that is needed and the effort it will take to secure that kind of modification.

It should be unnecessary for me to point out that this is not a partisan matter. The support for the McCarran-Walter Act was and is bipartisan. The opposition to it was and is bipartisan.

Any successful effort to modify the present law in a significant and meaningful manner can only be a bipartisan effort. Indeed, this issue is one of those which clearly cuts across party lines and disregards political affiliations.

But this is not to say that political considerations do not enter into the question at all. There are political considerations involved, in a very healthy and democratic way. Today, unlike the situation 4 years ago, there is an aroused and vigilant citizenry in some parts of the country, demanding changes in the law. So it becomes necessary for the President and Members of Congress to take cognizance of the question, and to take a position on it. It now becomes politically impossible to ignore the question. That is the way democracy functions—thank God for that.

I anticipate that reform of our immigration and citizenshp laws will be an important issue in the national elections of 1956, but not because all the members of one party are clearly for, and the others clearly against. No, nationally it will be a question of which party has contributed and can contribute most to the substantial revision of present law. It will also be a question, nationally, of what kind of revision will be pledged by each party.

In many districts of the country, there will be lively and intensive discussion of this issue by candidates for Congress, and even for local office. There will be some districts, of course, where this will not be an issue, where no candidate will espouse a change in the law, and where there will be little interest in the subject. But the number of such districts will be far fewer in 1956 than in 1952.

And by this we will be able to measure the great progress that has been made on this front in the past 4 years.

Yes, we have made great progress in stimulating public interest in this question compared to the situation exactly 4 years ago, when this act was before the Congress. At that time there was no general public interest whatever in this subject.

I remember the vain efforts some of us made in the Senate to engage in debate with the proponents of the McCarran-Walter bill. For days we spoke to a chamber empty of all Senators except the handful of us opposed to the bill. The sponsors of the bill gave us the silent treatment. The late Senator Pat McCarran made only 2 or 3 appearances on the floor in behalf of his bill. And on those occasions, he spent most of his time quoting excerpts from the pages of the Daily Worker to show that the Communist Party was opposed to the legislation, and to suggest that we who fought the McCarran-Walter Act were dupes of the Communist Party.

Today, that is still the main line of supporters of the McCarran-Walter Act—the same tired, threadbare arguments.

Well, those arguments do not attract as much support as they did a few years ago. It is no longer possible for any but the fanatic and the blind to charge that the chief inspiration for the reform of our immigration and citizenship laws comes from the Communist Party.

President Eisenhower has officially recommended to the Congress a series of amendments to the McCarran-Walter Act. Attorney General Brownell and the Justice Department drafted the President's recommendations. It will be interesting to see if the supporters of the McCarran-Walter Act now undertake to show that Mr. Brownell is a dupe of the Communist Party.

Let us get down to specifics. What do we mean by substantial revision of the McCarran-Walter Act? What is wrong with the act? Do the recommendations made by President Eisenhower cure those defects?

The worst thing about the present law is its spirit—the spirit of fear and suspicion directed against every alien and even against naturalized citizens. It is hard to dig this spirit out of the law by a few amendments. It is a spirit which shows through every title and chapter of the law.

Now, I don't want to leave the impression that I think there was nothing good in the McCarran-Walter Act. It had some good provisions, by which I mean that some few improvements over preexisting law were made in the 1952 act. But for every constructive change made in 1952, a score or more of new restrictions were added. The preexisting law was already cruel and vicious consisting of a long succession of antialien measures adopted by Congress from 1872 to 1952. Some of the worst of these provisions were added in 1950 as part of the blunderbuss McCarran Internal Security Act.

It is sometimes forgotten that the Internal Security Act was originally introduced in Congress as the Mundt-Nixon bill. In 1950 it was taken over by the late Senator McCarran who proceeded to use it as the vehicle for a comprehensive set of drastic antialien proposals, all of which became law in the summer of 1950, over President Truman's veto.

The bad provisions of present law are beyond listing in a single speech. They number in the hundreds. There are so many that they can only be covered by category.

There is the national origins quota system, and the invidious racial and national discrimination which it bespeaks.

There are the impossible and endless requirements for admission. There are over 700 separate grounds for refusing admission to an alien. Some requirements are literally impossible to fulfill. Some are purely mystical, depending on the clairvoyance of the Consular Officer or the Immigration Inspector.

Then there are the many cruel, heartless and unjust provisions for deportation, retroactive in most cases, post facto law in some. There are today 125 separate grounds for deportation.

There are scores of harsh and unreasonable punishments for relatively minor misdemeanors. The dread penalty of banishment for resident aliens is provided as casualty as a $5 fine.

There is no review or appeals procedure for aliens who are denied visas. A consul's decision is final and nonreviewable by any higher officer, board, or court.

These are just some of the categories of evils in the immigration provisions of the law.

There is also the nationality title of the act. That title, too, is a Pandora's Box.

There are the distinctions between naturalized and native-born citizens.

There are the encroachments on the status of citizenship acquired even by birth.

There are the provisions for revocation of citizenship by judgment, without even the requirement of personal service.

This listing is but a rough and almost random selection.

You who are lawyers know that it takes cases and court decisions to give life to the law. Well, I wonder if you know that large sections of the McCarran-Walter Act were drafted after a careful study of every court decision which the Immigration and Naturalization Service had lost over a 20-year period.

In every case in which a court had given life to the law, the McCarran-Walter Act applied an axe to remove every legal handrail to which an alien might possibly cling if the Immigration Service wanted to deport him; and to close every crack and crevice in the law through which an alien might possibly enter, if the Consular Service and the Immigration Service, for whatever reason, didn't want him to enter.

This is the kind of law we now have on our statute books, and have had for the past 4 years.

This law is one of the greatest talking points against America which the Communist International has. We are held up to ridicule because of this law—a powerful country like ours—sound, prosperous, and stable—but afraid to admit a Polish violinist because he once signed a peace petition, or an Italian shoemaker, because he once belonged to a Communist-dominated labor union.

We have lost more prestige abroad than we can compensate for with the Voice of America. This law, which the Daily Worker criticizes for its own purposes here, is priceless grist for the Communist propaganda mill abroad.

In this law we sacrifice our international dignity. We gain nothing. We lose much.

But what are we to do about it? What amendments do we seek?

I have had a bill pending in Congress for 3 years, proposing a wholesale revision of the law, eliminating the national origins quota system, wiping out the distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens, restoring citizenship status to what the Founding Fathers conceived it to be, and establishing standards of justice and equity for the treatment of all aliens, those seeking admission here, and those already resident here. I have 12 cosponsors on my bill in the Senate. The same bill has been introduced in the House by Congressman CELLER, and by 20 or 30 other Members of Congress.

I must tell you frankly that it may be very difficult to get my comprehensive bill enacted at this session of Congress. What about President Eisenhower's proposals?

I was greatly gratified by the President's recommendations. They came a long way in the direction I have been pointing for 4 years. They were better than I had expected.

But the President's proposals were expressed in general terms. They were fine words, as far as they went. The specific bills which have been introduced to carry out the President's general proposals, the Watkins-Keating bills, fall rather short of the mark set by the President's message.

The President sharply criticized the national origins quota system. But the Watkins-Keating bills retain the national origins quota system. The Watkins-Keating bills still discriminate against Asians, against Jamaicans, and against natives of Trinidad and other islands in the Caribbean. The administration proposals discriminate against Africans. This discrimination is on the basis of race and national origin.

I cannot, for the life of me, see why we should hold back, why the Watkins-Keating bills hold back, from repealing outright the national origins quota system.

Those who oppose the elimination of the national origins quota system will similarly oppose, with all their might, the limited pooling of unused quotas as provided in the Watkins-Keating bills. These bills will be characterized as an attack on the national origins quota system. If they are going to have the name, why not the game?

The Watkins-Keating bills make no change in the second-class status now forced on naturalized citizens. Except for a partial exemption from automatic denaturalization on accident of residence abroad, provided for certain veterans of war-time military service, the unjustifiable distinctions between naturalized and native-born citizens are left intact in the law. To this continued acceptance by President Eisenhower of the concept of second-class citizenship I cannot and will not agree.

The same type of limited advance characterizes other aspects of the Watkins-Keating proposals. They do not go far enough. They do not remedy some of the major evils in the present law. Some are of questionable merit.

But I shall not discuss them in detail tonight. I have just begun my own intensive study of them. I commend the President again, and the Attorney General, too, for the forward strides they do make in this field. It is a pity that the administration isn't yet ready to recognize, publicly, the chief evils in the law.

Speaking for myself, I will go along with the President as far as his recommendations go but at the same time press for further advance.

I will not cease to fight for the complete elimination of the racist and bigoted national origins quota system.

I will not cease to fight for the elimination of all distinctions between native and naturalized American citizens.

I will not cease my efforts to remove the unnecessary harshness and injustice from all sections of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The opposition is going to be overwhelmingly strong. The fight is not going to be over at the end of this session. It is just going to get under way. As a great President said of other legislation, "We have only just begun to fight."

But we can look forward to a joining of the issues. There will be public debate and discussion. I hope that we can get some action in Congress. We must try our hardest, but temporary failure must not discourage us.

Here in Illinois, the home State of Abraham Lincoln, with the echoes of Lincoln Day speeches still resounding, I would like to read an excerpt from a letter which Abraham Lincoln wrote to a friend of his, Joshua Speed more than a hundred years ago.

"As a Nation," wrote Abraham Lincoln, "we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.'

"We now practically read it, 'all men are created equal except Negroes.' When the

know-nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' "

That was what Abraham Lincoln wrote, more than a century ago. The know-nothings were only a passing political threat in those days—a lunatic fringe. But their modern-day successors are more than a threat today. They have made their mark upon our statute books. They have written some of their philosophy into our laws. What Abraham Lincoln conceived as the worst that could happen has actually happened.

But today we are on the road back. We are moving forward. We are no longer on the defensive. We are the ones who are attacking, laying siege to the strongholds of fear and prejudice.

We face a long and hard struggle—a stubborn and entrenched enemy. They will not easily surrender. They are not the kind that compromise.

We must not rest nor relax until the McCarran-Walter Act is completely overhauled and until the hostile and suspicious spirit of that law is replaced with one consistent with the spirit of America. As I understand that spirit, it is the same as that described ages ago to the Prophet Moses by Him who gave Moses the Tablet. As written, in Leviticus, the Lord said:

"And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself."

Yes, to win the fight to humanize and liberalize our immigration and citizenship laws will be a victory to reward all efforts. It will be a victory in the cause of freedom, justice, and humanity. We will all be able to lift our heads higher, when once more we will be able to say:

"Here in America is the home of justice, of asylum for the oppressed, of refuge for the persecuted, of opportunity and challenge for the worthy seeking life and freedom in the new world. This is the America we know and love."

We lift up the lamp again beside the Golden Door.

Hon. Chauncey W. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I was out of the city on the day that the House received the sorrowful news of the death of our beloved colleague and friend, Chauncey W. Reed. Consequently I could not join with our colleagues who paid tribute to the service and to the character of this distinguished legislator at that time. And so I avail myself of this opportunity to express my deep regret at the death of one of our ablest colleagues and one of my dearest friends.

I had known for some time that Chauncey Reed was seriously afflicted and that his days among us were numbered. But this knowledge did not soften the sadness with which we received the news of his passing from this world.

He possessed a keen, intelligent mind. His judgments were sound and reliable. It was a pleasure to work with him because one knew he had given most careful study and thought to any problem to which he addressed himself. The solution was bound to have had the benefit of his great wisdom and experience. A lawyer of fine attainments, he was a tower of strength in the deliberations of the great Judiciary Committee, of which he had been chairman and which he served with great distinction.

The Congress and our country have lost one of the ablest legislators of our times. Those who, like myself, were privileged to enjoy his friendship have lost a real and valued friend. His death is a real personal loss to me.

To Mrs. Reed and his children, I extend my deepest sympathy in their great bereavement.

In Salute to the Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this means of saluting the Future Farmers of America.

I am in accord with the sentiment expressed in the creed of the FFA, "I believe in the future of farming," and since being elected a Representative in Congress, have exerted every effort to see that those in our district and State who are engaged in agricultural pursuits are afforded a standard of living commensurate with the contributions they make to the national economy. It is an undeniable fact that this great country of ours cannot be sound economically unless we have prosperous and expanding agriculture. Therefore, it is to the Future Farmers of America that we look for our successful farmers of tomorrow. By virtue of their study of vocational agriculture, their practice of farming programs, their various activities and their good citizenship, I am certain they can meet this challenge.

Since the number of people working on farms has declined almost steadily since 1910, I was particularly pleased to note that the membership of the Future Farmers of America is 380,000. Through their training and practice, it will be up to them to adjust themselves to marked changes in the demand for specific commodities, and thereby be able to develop more outlets at home and abroad. Sound foreign commerce is essential to the well-being of this country, and especially so in agriculture.

It seems to me most appropriate that National Future Farmers of America Week should be observed during the week of the anniversary of George Washington's birth. Our first President was not only a great general, an outstanding engineer, but a farmer as well. On the farm he called Mount Vernon, he practiced crop rotation and soil conservation methods. Some of the methods he advocated found practice many years after his death. Had George Washington been a youth of today I have no doubt that the FFA could number him among its membership. Like the Father of our Country, many of our great leaders have been farmers, or have been interested in some form of agriculture. Thomas Jefferson retired to his beautiful Monticello, and, to come down to more modern times, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in some degree, used his estate at Hyde Park to experiment in agricultural projects.

Even if none of the members of the FFA should become President of the United States—though there is a chance that one of their number might be so chosen—still each individual in that organization who conscientiously carries out the aims and purposes of the Future Farmers of America, as set forth in their creed, will indeed have done his full share toward making this country a better place in which to live, as well as to insure future happiness and prosperity for generations to come.

Had I been a Member of Congress on August 30, 1950, the vote of my congressional district would have been cast for the passage of Public Law 740, which granted a Federal Charter to the Future Farmers of America organization. The rapid, but healthy, expansion of this organization has been a source of gratification to many people, and to me personally. I cannot say too much in praise of the young people of which the FFA is comprised. Their achievements have been outstanding. They are developing a trained leadership and a farm citizenry which exerts an influence for good in our communities. I am proud of them individually and collectively.

Again I salute the Future Farmers of America. May they always enjoy good fellowship of one another.

The Brand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 317 (a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921.

The purpose of this bill is to close up loopholes that have existed for many years. With the growth of the industry, and the increased interstate movement of cattle and other livestock, it has become more and more apparent that a somewhat uniform method of identifying and establishing ownership of livestock is necessary to protect buyers and marketing agencies against spurious transactions.

Through brand registration and inspection laws and regulations, many States or livestock associations have established a means for determining the title to livestock. In Nebraska, a "brand State," the law requires that livestock brands must be inspected and ownership established before the animals are moved into areas where such formalities

are not prescribed. Purchasers are hereby protected. If the animals are not branded or marked, or if they bear a brand that is not registered to the shipper, he must produce a bill of sale or other document establishing his right to them. Marketing agencies are authorized to impound sale receipts until title has been perfected.

Unfortunately, these regulations have not been adopted in several large livestock producing States and, as a result, there has been no satisfactory way by which interstate livestock sales may be safely expedited or innocent purchasers protected.

This bill amends the existing law and removes some of its deficiencies. It provides for inspection of livestock shipped into a "brand" State and consequent determination of title or right of possession as a prerequisite of sale. The inspection must be made prior to the time the livestock are removed from the market, when required by State law or regulation, or when requested by the purchaser. Fees for the inspection service will be established by the Secretary of Agriculture, and he will designate the agency or agencies authorized to make the examination.

This bill will help to remove the hazard and the uncertainty that has many times imposed undue burdens upon the interstate movement of livestock. It has the support of the American National Cattleman's Association, the Nebraska Stockgrower's Association and similar groups from South Dakota, Montana, and other livestock-producing States.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I call the attention of our colleagues to the following letter which I have sent to the American Lithuanian American Information Center:

FEBRUARY 15, 1956.
LITHUANIAN AMERICAN INFORMATION CENTER,
New York, N. Y.
(Attention Mary M. Kizis, director.)

DEAR MISS KIZIS: I wish to take this opportunity to salute the freedom loving Lithuanian people on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania. The Lithuanian American Information Center is to be commended for its diligent and perservering effort to alert the peoples of the world of the sad condition of your former homeland.

You may be assured of my sincere and complete support of all efforts and movements directed toward the eventual and final liberation of Lithuania from the yoke of the oppressor. I look forward to the day when Lithuania will again take its place among the great nations of the world.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT ZELENKO,
Member of Congress.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, at the Lincoln Day Dinner of the Alexander Hamilton Club and the Republican City Committee of Baltimore, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] at the Lincoln Day Dinner of the Alexander Hamilton Club and the Republican City Committee of Baltimore, Md.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On April 14, 1865, an assasin's bullet cut down a man who through 4 years of bitter and heart-rending internal strife had emerged as the symbol of union and democracy. Abraham Lincoln was a great and compassionate man whose respect for the sanctity and the innate dignity of the human being, the child of God, gave us some of the most beautiful and enduring passages we have in the English tongue.

Coming at a time when there was never more need of compassion and understanding to heal the wounds inflicted by fratricidal strife, his death was a tragic loss to the whole Nation. It is ironic and saddening indeed that nearly 91 years later we are confronted by happenings which in their ugly implications threaten to return us to the bitterness and rancor he had hoped to avoid and which we thought was now long since behind us.

I refer in particular to recent events at the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa.

A week ago on Friday, a young woman eager to improve her education and make herself a better citizen, began attending classes at the university. Within hours, this young woman became the target of rowdyism, wild tempers and mob action, newspapers in this area have reported. The president of the university pleaded for calmness and humane consideration, but the lawless mobs—apparently in large part composed of persons from outside the campus—took over and the university's board of trustees felt obliged to suspend the young woman for her own protection.

Now, why this threat to her security of person, why this virulence and utter contempt for lawful and orderly processes? The answer, as you readily recognize, is that she was the first Negro person to be admitted to this institution of higher learning.

Like Lincoln and others in our history who were willing to make great personal sacrifices to gain learning, she has reiterated her desire to return to the university. Let me read you part of her statement:

"I want to be an acceptable librarian and I have no other interest in this than that I want to get a good education. I don't think I'm asking for anything I am not entitled to. I am proud of the university and I will be proud to be a student there."

It would be difficult for any American to quarrel with this frank statement. It is in the spirit of reasonableness which should prevail on a university campus.

Now since this is a Republican meeting, it probably would not be amiss to point out that this unhappy situation has developed in a State which has a Democratic administration from top to bottom. It is sometimes useful to remind some of my northern Democratic colleagues about such failures of State responsibility.

There are other denials of basic rights to Negroes in the South which are deeply troubling. The right to vote is a cornerstone of the whole practice of democracy, yet year after year reports come out of such States as Mississippi about various strategems aimed at denying this right.

This State, too, has a Democratic administration from top to bottom.

I do not mean to imply that the problems involved in assuring equality of educational opportunity, equality before the law, equality of economic opportunity are easy and can be solved overnight by the right stroke of the pen. Extremism, dogmatic overbearance on any side will not right the wrongs or achieve the results we seek. But I do suggest that there must be a real will to make progress and to do so, steadily step by step, in orderly ways that will avoid violent disruption and unnecessary affront. This is what the Eisenhower administration has been trying to do. And under the President's leadership we have been making steady progress, the more impressive and lasting because it has been largely accomplished without incitement to racial passion and demagoguery.

Let us frankly recognize that the ending of segregation in all our public schools does mean a real break with the long traditional pattern in many States. The adjustments that it requires, however right and needed, are nonetheless difficult for some to make. Those States and communities now striving to bring their school systems into conformity with the Supreme Court decision need and should have the understanding and sympathetic support of all of us.

But let us not forget either that the basis of our whole system of government is the assumption that all citizens will abide by the will of the majority arrived at and by lawfully constituted process. We are used to taking it for granted that, once an issue has been resolved, we will all "go along" with it and whatever our view refrain from attempts to subvert or frustrate the majority will.

That is what is so deeply troubling about the outbreak of violence at the University of Alabama. That is what, in more subtle form, is so disturbing about the attempts of some States to nullify a judicial decision by our highest court. They are using means that may stop short of violence but that nonetheless clearly indicate a determination not to accept that decision for even a moment on any terms.

Let me illustrate by what might be called A Tale of Two States.

One is your own great Free State headed by Gov. Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, and the one on the other side of our Nation's Capital, the State of Virginia, the Mother of Presidents. This State is headed by a Democrat, Gov. Thomas B. Stanley.

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court declared segregation in the public schools unconstitutional—more than 20 months ago. In Maryland, Governor McKeldin met the announcement of the decision with these simple words, "Maryland has always been a law-abiding State." He said the State would "proceed in an orderly manner to bring an end to racial segregation." And it has done so. The law of the land is being carried out in Maryland. This is a tribute to the Governor's great leadership and the intelligence and patience of his constitutents. A wholehearted supporter of the Eisenhower approach, he has been taking a step at a time, knowing this is the only true way to success.

Meanwhile, on the other side of the Potomac River, in this land of the great giants of American history—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and James

Madison, leaders of the State have been working steadily to find ways of nullifying the Supreme Court decision. At first, the Virginia attorney general and officials of other Southern States appeared before the Supreme Court pleading for time for a gradual adjustment to the ruling and asked that the cases be remanded to the Federal district courts. The Supreme Court's decree of May 31, 1955, was substantially in accordance with this request.

Then what happened—did Virginia begin integration of public schools? No; it did not. Instead, the strategy of interposition was developed—an attempt to enact an amendment to the Constitution directing integration of public schools. This is an ironic goal for those opposed to integration and obviously they are not sincere in putting forward the proposal. They believe that three-fourths of the States would not ratify the amendments. This to them would be proof that, no matter what the Supreme Court says, segregation is constitutional.

There was one immediate obstacle on this road to disregard of the law of the land—this was the action by the Arlington County School Board to begin gradual integration of the schools. When this was decided, what did the Virginia leaders and professed champions of local rights do? Did they acknowledge the right of Arlington County to take action in accord with the Supreme Court decision?

The answer again is "No." Instead, several State leaders introduced a bill aimed at ending the elected school board and replacing it by an appointed body. This, mind you, would not only mean a probable change in the school-integration program, but would also spell the end of a unit which has won national recognition for the quality of its educational program.

When next you hear the Democrats shouting their devotion to civil rights, public-school education, and the welfare of the Negroes of our Nation, remind them of this Tale of the Two States. We in Washington have an excellent vantage point to see how a Republican governor and a Democratic governor go about carrying out the law of the land.

Upper Colorado Scheme's True Cost Exceeds $5 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation authorization of $760 million is misleading. The direct cost of the projects authorized by section 1 of the bill alone would amount to $933,468,300 based on Bureau of Reclamation estimates. The construction costs of all the projects covered in the bill amount to about $1.6 billion. The figure of $760 million in the pending bill hides from Congress the true cost of the development, which, when interest costs on its extensive noninterest returnable irrigation features are added to the $1.6 billion, total in excess of $5 billion. This is an unconscionable burden for Congress to place on the United States taxpayers to irrigate land to produce more crop surpluses to further burden the taxpayers.

The upper Colorado proposal should be defeated.

Address of Hon. Percy Priest, Member of Congress From the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee, at the Launching of the U. S. S. "John Willis," at Camden, N. J., February 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1956, our colleague, the Honorable PERCY PRIEST, made an outstanding and memorable address at the launching of the U. S. S. *John Willis*, at the yard of the New York Shipbuilding Corp., located at Camden, N. J.

There have been many naval vessels constructed at the New York Shipbuilding Corp. that carry the names of distinguished naval heroes. There has been no one with a more commendable record of heroism than Pharmacist Mate (1c.) John Harlan Willis, who was a platoon corpsman serving with the Third Battalion, 27th Marines, Fifth Marine Division. The State of Tennessee is proud of the illustrious service of John Harlan Willis that was so vividly and forcibly set forth in an address by our distinguished colleague, Hon. PERCY PRIEST, a Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee.

Under a unanimous consent request that was granted, I herewith submit a copy of the address of Congressman PRIEST as part of these remarks. It reads as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Wolverton, Rear Admiral Von Heinberg, General Hansen, Mr. Teale, and distinguished guests, I am deeply grateful for the honor you have done by inviting me to say a few words on this very significant occasion.

I am happy that it was possible for my friend and colleague, the Honorable CHARLES WOLVERTON to be here today. He has represented this district with ability and distinction for many years during which time he has demonstrated a devotion to the public good.

I am aware, as you are, that words are weak and only deeds and acts are great.

As we assemble here today to launch this new destroyer escort we are aware that above the sound of the surf and the whine of the winds we can hear some overtones of history; the thrilling undertones of gallantry and heroism; some muted notes of sorrow and sadness; and the challenging call to duty in the service of our country.

On the tough, steel-ribbed sides of this new unit of the greatest Navy in the world is the name U. S. S. *John Willis*. He was a sturdy and stalwart son of the Volunteer State. And in giving his name to this new destroyer escort, the Navy and the Nation do fitting honor to a young man who, in going far beyond the call of duty, exemplified and reemphasized the treasured traditions of the United States Navy and of the inland State of Tennessee where his gallantry and sacrifice shall, through the years, be cherished by the people of that State as hallowed memories.

John Willis was born in the same county in which I was born and attended the same high school, although several years later. Maury County, his birthplace, was named for Matthew Fontaine Maury, known to every seaman, to every navigator of the oceans, as the pathfinder of the seas. And from his native Tennessee came David Farragut the first person ever to be commissioned as an admiral of the United States Navy. These are some of the historical overtones we hear today.

John Willis grew to manhood near the banks of Duck River, a small, nonnavigable stream. I was informed by Congressman Ross Bass, who represents that district, that a new bridge over Duck River, near Columbia, has been named the "John Harlan Willis Bridge." But when time came for him to answer his country's call, he came to my hometown of Nashville and volunteered for service in the Navy. You of the seaboard and others will find all the proud annals of the United States Navy crowded with records of valor made by men from all our States who never saw the ocean until they enlisted in the Navy.

That is as it should be. The Navy is not limited to seaboard States alone. It is the Navy of all the States and has carried the flag of our country to honor and glory around the world.

I have had an opportunity to read within recent days the citation which conferred upon John Willis the greatest military honor the Nation can bestow, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

And on this occasion I deem it to be only fitting and proper that we look back to February just 11 years ago when a raging battle took place on the Island of Iwo Jima.

Pharmacist's Mate First Class John Harlan Willis was a platoon corpsman serving with the 3d Battalion, 27th Marines, 5th Marine Division. Pillboxes and caves covered hill 362 in the cross-island defense of the Japanese forces. Marines were falling, wounded and dying on all sides, in fierce close-in fighting.

Willis administered first aid to the many wounded until he was hit by shrapnel and was ordered back to battle aid station. There, where he might have received treatment for his own wounds, he refused to tarry and hurried back to his company.

During savage hand-to-hand enemy counterattacks, he advanced to the extreme front lines under mortar and sniper fire to aid a badly wounded marine lying in a shellhole.

The fury and frenzy of the enemy attack was intensified until it became a dread barrage of unleashed lightning. Under that withering fire Willis calmly continued to administer blood plasma to his patient. Then an enemy grenade landed in the shellhole. Willis threw it back. They continued to land in the hole and he continued, even while attending the wounded marine, to throw them back. Finally after tossing eight of them back into the teeth of the enemy who threw them, the ninth one exploded in his hand, killing him instantly.

He had made the greatest sacrifice a man can make, and by his personal valor in sacrificing himself to save others, and by his example of fortitude and courage, he inspired his companions to launch a determined counterattack and repulse the enemy force.

Even with this brief recital of those events, I am sure you will agree with me when I said in the beginning that words are weak and only deeds and acts are great.

This occasion today is significant also because it underscores the continuing progress that is making the United States Navy stronger and better able anywhere in the world and under any circumstances to defend this country.

The U. S. S. *John Willis* is the first of four destroyer escorts to be launched here. Others will follow at intervals. And in other shipyards around our coastline naval craft of other classifications are being constructed, launched, given shakedown cruises, and taking their places in a magnificent fleet in near and remote areas of the world.

It is essential that we continue to build, because the great battle in which John Willis and thousands of others have died has not been won. Fervently we hope and pray that the free world can win that battle without another shot being fired. Ardently we plan, confer, and study in a zealous quest for a stabilized peace built on law and order and decency and justice.

We must continue that search for a peaceful solution of the problems that are rooted so deeply in the blood-soaked soil of a fearful and frustrated world. We must press with unabated ardor toward the goal of a world in which the dignity of man once more is a sacred thing, and in which all men may look up to God rather than bow down to the dictators of a totalitarian state.

But until such time as the light of real brotherhood and mutual respect breaks through the overcast of suspicion, hatred, and deceit, we must see to it that our aims, ideals, and aspirations for peace are backed by strength on the sea, the land, and in the air.

So let us launch this fleet and sturdy vessel. As she slides into the sea let us cherish the hope that always her officers and crew shall be inspired and upheld by the challenge that comes like a clarion call from a shellhole on Iwo Jima.

To you, Mr. and Mrs. Duke, as you share in the future the privilege and responsibility of training and educating John Willis Duke, may I remind you that his is a great heritage and may God richly bless you.

The Federal Home Loan Bank System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Congress set up the Federal Home Loan Bank System with regional banks located in strategic parts of the country for the purpose of assisting homeownership. These reserve banks were designed to furnish credit to savings and loan association members throughout the country when their own funds were not adequate to take care of the home-financing demand. They were first created at a time when money for home financing was scarce and the need was extreme for this source of funds. These savings and loan member associations are the largest single source of home-mortgage financing in the country and account for over one-third of the home-mortgage lending each year.

Although the administration has proclaimed its support of homeownership, in practice the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has discouraged the financing of homes through private sources. I pointed this out recently when I commented on the action of the Board in restricting credit to the member savings and loan institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank System at a time when there was strong demand for home-mortgage funds. This demand was so strong that after the credit curb, money could be obtained only at a high premium. The Rains Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee has just rendered a report calling attention to these restrictions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and I commend its reading to you.

Congress has made it very apparent that funds for the financing of homeownership should be made available without restriction. If the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the administration see fit to continue their policy of curbing the use of private funds for financing, in my opinion, Congress should take action to see that these funds are made available.

A United Nations Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the lack of a United Nations police force for carrying out United Nations decisions in cases of aggression has long been a serious cause of criticism of the United Nations.

Collective measures to maintain peace and security and to suppress acts of aggression are envisaged in the first article of the United Nations Charter. However, due mainly to Soviet obstruction, a permanent United Nations force which would give effect to this article has never been established.

Impetus to the idea of a United Nations force was given by the General Assembly in 1950 when it passed the uniting-for-peace resolution, which aimed at promoting reliable collective protection against aggression and thereby contributing to the achievement of international peace. This resolution recommended that the United Nations members earmark trained, organized, and equipped forces that could be called promptly, in accordance with each nation's constitutional provisions, to meet aggression immediately anywhere in the world. The earmarked units would constitute the United Nations police force. Unfortunately, the resolution has never been implemented to any great extent.

The experience of the Korean war has underscored the necessity for the United Nations to have immediately available forces from many countries in order that no one nation may be burdened with excessive responsibility in countering aggression. The United States carried by far the major burden in the fight against Communist aggression in Korea, despite the fact that all members have an equal responsibility under the charter in maintaining collective security.

Various blueprints have been suggested for the type of international contingent that would be most effective. Some have recommended a force made up of individual volunteers trained and armed by a special United Nations Command and always ready for duty. Others have proposed a plan by which the United Nations members would "earmark" certain units of their individual armed forces for on-call duty, if requested by the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations. Still others feel that a legion made up of volunteers already serving in national armed forces, that is, servicemen who indicate their willingness to serve under the United Nations in any case of aggression, would be the most effective force.

Any plan for a United Nations police force, however, should seek the greatest possible contribution from each member so that the combined effort against aggression could be brought to a maximum as equitably as possible.

Perhaps the solution to the establishment of a United Nations police force would be to make the provisions of the "Uniting for Peace" resolution more authoritative by incorporating it in the United Nations Charter by an amendment. The General Assembly, as well as the Security Council, would then have permanent authority, solidly grounded in the charter, to recommend the use of armed forces to meet aggression anywhere in the world. The ability of the Assembly to act immediately would counteract Soviet Russia's flagrant abuse of the veto which has prevented the Security Council from effectively discharging its responsibilities under the charter.

However, the type of police force is perhaps not as important as the recognition by members of the United Nations that the continuance of international tensions makes the organization of an international police force a matter of urgency, and that they should make a determined effort, immediately, to take the necessary steps to establish a ready-for-combat international contingent under the auspices of the United Nations, a contingent which could make a prompt contribution to halt aggression wherever it should erupt. For only through advance preparations can we be assured that the burden in any future conflict will be shared equitably and effectively by the greatest number of member states.

Upper Colorado Project's Financial Scheme Wholly Unsound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the proposed upper Colorado River project's financial scheme is wholly unsound. None of the irrigation reclamation projects are financially sound. The irrigation water users on the average would be able to repay only about 12 percent of the direct irrigation investment, which, including storage costs, would range from $750 to $900 per acre varying with the number of projects included. The power dams are supposed to provide the revenues to pay for themselves as well as 88 percent of the irrigation investment.

The project repayment provisions contemplate an overall repayment period of at least 100 years. This is unrealistic and economically indefensible. The

hearings make it clear that the repayment plan might work for only a minimum number of projects and that with additional projects there would be no possibility of payment within 100 years unless the power rate were increased substantially above the 6-mill rate contemplated in the Bureau's report. Furthermore, it is extremely doubtful that a market for the power even at the 6-mill rate would continue for 100 years. The approaching availability of atomic electric power will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete. In fact, the market area is not now in need of the power which would be provided. The power dams are in the bill because they are the only hope of making the overall project appear feasible.

The project is not self-liquidating as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Studies show that simple interest alone on the investment would be greater than the estimated net revenues.

The upper Colorado project as now proposed deserves a "no" vote.

So-called New Upper Colorado Bill Contains All Vices of the Original Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in a rather unusual step, a majority of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee considered and approved amendments to H. R. 3383 on February 8, 1956, some 7 months after a rule had been obtained on a bill which had been vigorously put forward as being a measure which would satisfy all interests and endanger none.

A principal amendment carves up excess revenues expected to be produced from the power dams and apportions them among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to be used in repaying construction costs of participating projects within those States. This totally new concept constitutes in effect a new bill. It and all the other amendments had less than 2 hours before your committee. It had no time at all before the Rules Committee. There was no executive department comment at all, with the exception of a brief letter from the Reclamation Bureau, which gave no substantiating information. This action is contrary to the orderly processes of the House. It should not be permitted.

The new H. R. 3383 contains all of the vices of the original, and more, such as the direct apportionment of project revenues. In addition, geological material has come to light since the end of the first session of this Congress which requires most urgent consideration by qualified people. It has received none. Furthermore, the administration's soil bank proposal is now before the Congress. It will require taking presently cultivated land out of production to cut down surpluses. H. R. 3383 would put new lands into cultivation and provide more water for lands already in crops (some of which may well be placed in soil bank reserve) to grow more surpluses. It simply does not make sense.

Freedom of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the Inter-American Council of Jurists is a technical agency of the Organization of American States which meets every 2 years to study the technical aspects of international law as they affect the relations among the republics of this hemisphere.

On the agenda of its meeting concluded earlier this month at Mexico City, the Council of Jurists had the item "System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions: Preparatory Study for the Specialized Inter-American Conference Provided for in Resolution LXXXIV of the Caracas Conference."

The Council did not make such a study. Instead a resolution on the subject had been drafted in secrecy by a number of delegates which covered not only legal, but economic, political, and scientific subjects with which the delegates at this technical conference were not competent to deal. This resolution was drafted in such a manner as to appeal to the narrow, nationalistic feelings of the delegates. It was then railroaded through without study or debate over the opposition of the United States without giving the delegate from this country opportunity to have his points of opposition discussed.

Among the provisions of the resolution which was thus adopted were these:

1. The distance of 3 miles as the limit of territorial waters is insufficient, and does not constitute a rule of general international law. Therefore, the enlargement of the zone of the sea traditionally called territorial waters is justifiable.

2. Each State is competent to establish its territorial waters within reasonable limits, taking into account geographical, geological, and biological factors, as well as the economic needs of its population, and its security and defense.

Among the nations who sponsored this resolution are three who have already made individual claims to a minimum distance of sovereignty extending 200 marine miles from their coasts. Another has already made claim to sovereignty over a belt of sea which at some points extends as much as 500 miles from its coast. This is what they mean by the word "reasonable."

Such extensions of sovereignty into the high seas by individual countries simply cannot be accepted by the community of nations. The high seas are not free for common use by mankind because of the selfish aspirations of the big maritime nations. They are free for such use because this is a requirement of our civilization. These seas and the air spaces above them carry the commerce of the world. Raw material comes to manufacturers along these highways, manufactured goods radiate out of these avenues from factories to users; and food travels them from the harvester to the consumer.

Many of these highways of the sea, which are so vital to this world's ability to feed, clothe, and house its thronging millions, come close to land either where island and mainlands concentrate them or where lee shores give protection to seafarers from local storm areas. For instance all avenues of normal approach to the Pacific Ocean from the Indian and Atlantic Oceans skirt near to some point of land.

It is not compatible with the needs of nations that individual countries can, at their will, extend their sovereign territory out over these lanes of free passage. It does not matter what protestations are made by such sovereign country that free passage through this territory will be guaranteed by it to all other countries, because whatever rights a sovereign can grant for passage through its territory it can later modify or withdraw. This is a far different matter than existing international law which permits every sovereign to use these vital traffic lanes of its own free right without asking or being granted that right by another.

The objectives of security, defense, and conservation of resources which these countries seek are sought equally avidly by the United States and the other maritime countries. They can be attained by international cooperation through means now under study in the United Nations without possible disruption of the world's commerce and, in fact, its defenses.

The United States, which has had thrust upon it such a heavy burden of responsibility for defending and aiding the smaller nations of the free world, cannot adequately fulfill those responsibilities if its ability to do so is restricted by great broadenings of the territorial area of nations into the high seas.

These overwhelming aspects of the problem obviously were not given consideration by the delegates at Mexico City who were technically trained juridical personages. As the United States delegate said in recording the contrary vote of this country:

In addition, the United States delegation wishes to record the fact that when the resolution, in the drafting of which the United States had no part, was submitted to committee I, despite fundamental considerations raised by the United States and other delegations against the resolution, there was no discussion of those considerations at the one and only session of the committee held to debate the document.

Mr. Speaker, the Organization of American States serves a most useful function in providing a forum where the republics of this hemisphere can study, debate, and work out problems of common concern. But when technical bodies of that organization pass resolutions on such fundamental and basic subjects without study and in such a glib, lighthearted manner it shakes faith in the whole organization. We sincerely hope

that the parent Organization of American States will take much more serious consideration of this matter before it proceeds to further action on it.

Upper Colorado Scheme Runs Into Geologic and Engineering Difficulties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, there are physical and geological difficulties in connection with the Glen Canyon storage unit which cast doubt on the engineering and financial feasibility of the entire upper Colorado River storage proposal.

Section 1 of the original H. R. 3383 was amended in committee so as to require the Secretary to take adequate measures, as a part of the Glen Canyon "cash register" unit, to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. This calls up a series of questionable aspects with respect to Glen Canyon.

(a) There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam. In October 1954, Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer wrote that the Bureau's design specialists were "quite concerned" as to whether or not the foundation characteristics of the Glen Canyon site were capable of safely supporting a 700-foot dam. No further tests were made by the Bureau between 1954 and March 1955. Nevertheless, Commissioner Dexheimer testified at that time before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that a dam of 700 feet could be safely built. At 700 feet Glen Canyon would be the second highest dam in the world, second only to Hoover Dam, which is 726 feet high. Yet the foundation rock at Hoover Dam is at least three times as strong as the sandstone formation at Glen Canyon. This formation is nothing more than a weakly cemented sand dune. It was created geologically by the wind depositing one sand dune on top of another.

(b) There is doubt as to the adequacy of the plans for Glen Canyon Dam upon which the Bureau's cost estimates are based. These plans on which costs have been estimated are set forth in House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, which is the Bureau's basic planning report on the upper Colorado River project. These plans reveal that the cross section of the dam, which would be about the same height as Hoover Dam, is materially slimmer than Hoover Dam—this in the face of the fact that the foundation rock at Glen Canyon, as testified to by Bureau engineers and geologists, is only about one-fifth as strong as the rock at Hoover. It appears, therefore, that if a safe dam can be built at Glen Canyon, it will require a much more massive structure than the plans set forth in House Document No. 364, and that the construction cost will be substantially greater than estimated.

(c) The construction at Glen Canyon will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge. Although the new H. R. 3383 now provides in section 1 that the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, so far there are no plans, and hence no assurance that protective measures can be provided which will be adequate, nor is there evidence that the cost of protection has been included in the cost estimates. As presently planned, the reservoir would back up close to the foundations of the Rainbow Natural Bridge, which is a fragile structure of soft sandstone. The Bureau has indicated that a dam would be built in the canyon below the bridge to keep out the reservoir water, but it appears that water would seep through the dam and also collect from natural drainage and back up under the Rainbow arch, thus jeopardizing this marvelous monument. The opinion of an independent consulting geologist given to one member of the Interior Committee, Mr. HOSMER, is that "regardless of the cost expended this low area will be subject to flooding by seepage of water from the proposed reservoir" through the porous and permeable Navaho sandstone.

(d) Large quantities of water may be absorbed into the formations surrounding the Glen Canyon Reservoir. Geologic reports show that the Kaiparawits and Henry Mountains' basins, both adjacent to the reservoir site, contain tremendous formations of pervious sandstone which have a combined capacity of 350 million acre-feet. The reports indicate that these formations at the present time are practically empty of water. Thus, as the reservoir fills, these formations could absorb tremendous quantities of water making it impossible to accomplish the storage and regulation of water and the production of power contemplated by the project. Since these basins have a capacity some 14 times greater than the proposed reservoir, it would appear absolutely essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and thus free to drain water from the reservoir.

(e) The Chinle shale problem must be satisfactorily investigated and explained. One member of the Interior Committee [Mr. HOSMER] visited the Glen Canyon Reservoir site in company with a consulting geologist in December 1955. The trip showed that there exists along some 50 miles of the canyon sides of the reservoir a formation designated as Chinle shale, which is overlain by massive formations of sandstone. The Chinle is not thin. Neglected U. S. G. S. reports show that it has a thickness of 300–1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River, and its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the Colorado River appears similar. Its importance to the reservoir area lies in the fact that it immediately underlies the canyon-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstones and, in areas of exposure of this shale provides the only foundation support for these overlying cliff-forming rocks. This Chinle formation, when subjected to water, immediately disintegrates into mud. As a result, the entire overburden mass of sandstone could crumble and be precipitated into the reservoir basin with untold adverse effect on the functioning of the reservoir.

The foregoing engineering problems are not of first impression. Surveys of the area now three decades old indicated the Glen Canyon site to be an impressive one but possessed of formation difficulties needing the most exhaustive tests. If $421,270,000—the Bureau estimate—is to be spent here the record on Glen Canyon must be unassailable. Congress should demand a thorough evaluation by an independent board of engineers before authorizing this key structure.

The Yalta Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago, in the early part of this month, a group of men arrived at Yalta, the famous Russian Riviera, to decide the future and shape of the postwar world. Famous statesmen, politicians, counsels, and advisers, military leaders, and even some members of their families arrived there by plane, by ships and trains from distant places, in order to participate in a joint meeting aiming to organize a better and happier world and to determine upon the punishment of those responsible for the worldwide catastrophy.

They brought with them briefcases full of legal data, memoranda, technical books, historical documents, maps, and dictionaries. The teams occupied the premises of the Livadia Palace, the former summer residence of Czar Nicolaus II and his family.

For 6 days, American, British, and Soviet teams were debating, while in between sessions, receptions for the visitors were given. In old-fashioned Russian style, caviar was being consumed by the pound, while vodka and other liquors were freely dispensed. Each round was accompanied by long and weary toasts "To our great alliance," "To the father of our beloved motherland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," "Batiushka Stalin," "Long live our great victorious, invincible Red Army," "Death to the Fascists," and to the Hitler dictatorship.

While this was going on, in other parts of Soviet Russia there were countless human wrecks, representing almost all nationalities who were digging coal, chopping wood in the vast forests of Siberia, laying rails for the widely publicized Trans-Siberian Railroad. There were millions of people, securely guarded by entire divisions of members of the NKVD, dying by the thousands every day, and for each one of them who were relieved from their sufferings, there were many others being shipped as replacements in cattle trains. All of them were

slaves. At the same time, in still another part of Russia, a new army was being created. It was an army of former SS men led by General Von Paulus, who only 2 years before that had tried to capture Stalingrad.

On February 4, 1945, at 5:17 p. m., the first formal meeting convened in the grand ballroom of the Livadia Palace. Among those present who were occupying seats around the large table were men of outstanding character, brilliant and well trained for their position, public servants with years of experience, who received their formal education at such outstanding colleges and universities as Oxford, Cambridge, Yale, and Harvard. It is felt that some who sat at the table were lacking in courage. There were also men who were shrewd and clever, who had grown up in one of the bloodiest revolutions history has known, men who had never traveled beyond the borders of Soviet Russia, educated in institutions operated by the party and the NKVD. There were others, great military leaders who have led armies to victory, and generals who knew how to administrate millions of slaves from their offices in the Kremlin.

Among them were lawyers, who were members of college fraternities where open discussions had been encouraged. There were men raised on America's main streets where differences could be settled by the courts and where rallies of all kinds and expressions of political opinions were permitted. Across the table were others, graduates of Soviet law schools. They sat there with grim faces, carefully observing their counterparts. To them the law was Stalin. Their experience was chiefly in purge trials held in the late thirties. Their weapon was prisons and slave-labor camps. Thus for the first time West met East at close hand.

After 6 days of long and tiresome discussions a mutual agreement was signed. Among the problems that were discussed and agreed upon were the future of the World Organization, the question of a free Poland, the release of war prisoners, postwar Germany, the war in Japan, and undoubtedly other questions. The documents signed 11 years ago contained eloquent words such as "a Poland liberated by the Red army" or "the Soviet Union shall enter into war against Japan on the side of the Allies on conditions that."

I do not believe for one moment that the above sentences need any commentary from any sound person. For that matter, neither do the Yalta meetings need commenting. The results of the Yalta conference we have experienced for the past 11 years are indeed unfortunate and we probably are still far away from the end of our experience. So far an entire continent has been swallowed by Russia. Part of eastern and central Europe is gone and what is more the threat of another world war has never ceased to harass us.

Eleven years ago those who dared to oppose the decisions mutually agreed upon at Yalta were called warmongers, which is a term out of the Soviet dictionary. But those who did oppose it, and I am proud to say that I was one of them, realized then the drastic consequences we would have to face. Mankind is facing it now.

The Segregation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a statement I made during October 1955 on the segregation problem. I also expressed my opinion on the Supreme Court's ruling on the subject of segregation and hope that every Member of Congress has an opportunity to read same.

We people in South Carolina feel that the Supreme Court went completely beyond its jurisdiction in reinterpreting the Constitution of the United States as this subject has been interpreted by previous Supreme Court Judges and the schools throughout the country were of the opinion, during the past 50 years, that they were operating under the provisions of the Constitution by having separate school facilities for colored and white children in the United States.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT

The following statement is my personal opinion on the recent Supreme Court decision relative to school segregation.

First, I would like to state that it is my sincere opinion that the Supreme Court made a serious error by rendering their decision on the basis of social reforms instead of the legal facts in the cases. I have always been of the opinion that it was the intention of the framers of our Constitution that the public schools in the individual States be controlled, supported, and administered by the individual States. I certainly feel that if the individual States are not permitted under the Constitution to handle their own school affairs, they had just about as well dissolve their charter. I can't see where the States have any rights at all if they do not possess the authority to control their public school affairs. I have talked with colored people residing in practically every county in my district, and I have not found a single colored man who is insistent or even interested in having his children attend white schools. I have found each person whom I have interviewed to be only interested in having good schools and good teachers for his children and not any more interested in having his children enter white schools than the white people are in having their children enter colored schools.

I fully realize that we have in our midst a number of agitators who are not residents of the State of South Carolina or any other Southern State. These people are here under the guidance of the NAACP, whose expenses are paid in a great part by the nontaxable Ford Foundation funds.

From all the information that I have been able to secure during the brief time I have been at home since Congress adjourned, it seems that the Citizens Council committees now being formed in the individual towns may be the answer to this problem, since these councils are made up of the leading citizens of the towns and people who are permanent residents and well acquainted with school problems. I was delighted to read where our Governor and State legislature had created a school committee to study the school-integration problem. I have purposely refrained from making any public statements on this subject for the simple reason that this is a State problem and should be settled in a calm manner by the school authorities with the assistance of the Citizen Committees and also the colored and white leaders here in our State without any interference from the NAACP or any other agitators from outside the boundaries of our State.

I fully realize that some people are interested in getting this subject mixed up with politics, and I, for one, do not care to have any part in making this serious problem a political football. I certainly do not feel that the people of South Carolina elected the Members of the United States Congress to tell them how to vote or to tell them how to handle their school affairs here in the State of South Carolina. My simple belief is that the Federal Government should not interfere with our public-school system, and this includes the members of the Supreme Court, the President, and the Congress of the United States. We all know that the Supreme Court completely bypassed the Congress in making its decision in school integration. I am fully aware of the fact, and I think every thinking person realizes, that when the Supreme Court makes a decision it is the law of the land, and I certainly will be the last person to advise any person in the State of South Carolina to ignore the Supreme Court's decision. However, I am just as completely satisfied, on the other hand, that the thinking people of South Carolina, both colored and white, can solve this problem within the State and continue to have good relations between the races.

It is difficult for me to believe that there will be any integration of races in the southern schools without the consent and desire on the part of the colored and white people within the Southern States. As I have previously stated, there must be some calm thinking on the part of both colored and white leaders. I am perfectly willing to leave this matter, as much as possible, in the hands of the individual school boards and superintendents in our State to work out plans whereby colored children will continue to attend their schools and the white children will continue to attend separate schools without any compulsion by either side. I am certain that 90 percent of the colored people in South Carolina desire to have their children continue to attend colored schools and the few agitators in the State can be outlawed and overruled by the good colored people themselves.

I have had more experience with this problem than the average person in South Carolina since I have been chairman of the District Committee in Washington, which has jurisdiction over schools and business establishments in the District of Columbia, which is the Nation's Capital. Congress passed a law many years ago calling for equal facilities and separated schools for colored and white children in the District of Columbia. However, when the Supreme Court rendered its decision for integration in the public schools in all States, they also declared the congressional act calling for segregated but equal schools in the District of Columbia illegal. Up until the recent Supreme Court decision, the colored and white people attended segregated schools, segregated theaters, segregated hotels, and segregated eating establishments the same as we do in the State of South Carolina. There was a drive on the part of certain agitators from New York and other States to break down the segregation in the District of Columbia during the 10 years prior to the Supreme Court decision. However, they were unsuccessful

with the exception of when the Interior Department, who had jurisdiction over the swimming pools in the District of Columbia, with the assistance of President Truman, did away with segregation in all the Washington swimming pools. There were a number of colored agitators from New York who insisted on swimming in the white pools and they caused a great deal of disturbance in the District. I feel that this is the same type of agitators we have visiting South Carolina under the name of NAACP.

I was born and reared on a farm with colored people and feel that I understand them and their problems. No race or class of people in the world has advanced so much as the colored race in the United States during the past 50 years under the supervision of the white people. I feel that the majority of the colored people prefer to continue to have equal facilities and separate schools.

The State of South Carolina has built some of the finest school buildings in the United States during the past 10 years and the majority of these buildings have been assigned to the colored people. I am making this statement in order to give the people of my State my opinion on this problem and to plead with the press, the school officials, our Governor and our State officials to do everything possible to prevent this serious problem from becoming a political football. There is a strong suspicion on the part of numerous people in this country that the Supreme Court's decision was motivated from a social or political viewpoint.

Upper Colorado Project; Like an Iceberg, Hides Much From View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, save for the extraordinary provision apportioning power revenues among the four States in which the projects will be built, the so-called new upper Colorado bill remains substantially the same as the old one and continues all its vices. The only change in projects enumerated has been in section 2. Here Woody Creek has been eliminated and San Miguel and Yellow Jacket substituted, all in Colorado.

Since we are dealing with the same hulk, all of the objections already voiced on this bill hold good. These objections have been set forth in detail beginning at page 25 in House Report No. 1087, 84th Congress, 1st session.

The $1½ billion project approved by the Senate and the ostensibly smaller House bill are one and the same thing. Like an iceberg, the House bill displays only a part of its mass to view, but the remaining bulk nevertheless exists and must be reckoned with.

This includes such things as billions in added burdens on United States taxpayers, an increase in the national debt, invasion of national parks, more surplus crops and a host of other undesirable consequences.

The upper Colorado storage project as presently proposed should be roundly defeated. That will clear the way for a revised plan which will produce results, not merely consequences.

Address of Hon. A. J. Multer, of New York, Before Kings Highway Democratic Club, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1956, it was my privilege to address the Kings Highway Democratic Club at the dinner held at the Hotel St. George in Brooklyn on the occasion of its 40th anniversary. The text of my address follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends, it is fitting at functions like this to talk about our great American way of life and the contribution to it of our Democratic Party and its workers and leaders.

For many years Republican campaigns have been based on untruths, half-truths, and vilification, mixed with high-sounding slogans. An intensification of that low type of appeal is now underway.

Among the myths that have been given credence in our country is the illusion, created, nourished, and propogated by Republicans that Tammany is synonymous with Democrat and that that means bad government. We have done much to overcome that malicious propaganda and more recently with greater success. Much of the credit therefore, is due to our own great national committeeman, whom you will hear tonight, Carmine G. De Sapio.

Unlike many leaders of the past, who remained men of mystery to the general public, He has traveled wide and far, has been accessible to all who sought him out, and most important, has carried the message of our party, eloquently and effectively.

Wherever he has been, people say: "This man is all right. He is truly American. He makes sense." At all times, he brings us credit.

Permit me to point up the moral bankruptcy in the Republican Party, which is being reflected in the executive department of our Government.

We have just had further evidence thereof when the President vetoed the natural-gas bill. He said it was a good bill with a good purpose, but he must veto it because of the arrogance of some people—obviously the oil producers—as evidenced by a $2,500 contribution to a Republican Senator up for reelection.

I ask the President and his Republican campaigners of 1952 and of 1956, to tell us what is the difference in arrogance and in morality between that and the millions of oil dollars contributed to his compaign in 1952 and which brought about in 1953 the enactment into law, with his signature of approval, of the give-away of the vast United States tidal oil lands.

No doubt that comes under his description of Conservatism with property rights.

Let us look for a moment at his policy of liberalism with human rights. I know he meant liberalism in saving human life. It is being implemented, however, by his State Department to mean liberalism in sacrificing human life.

Everybody in this world knows that the situation is so tense in the Middle East that any day we may be propelled into world war three. American oil money, British stupid colonialism, and Russian imperialism vie with each other there in stirring up antagonisms among the Arab States and by them against the outside world.

With Russia and Britain falling over each other in an arms race to see who can supply more arms to the Arabs, our State Department issues releases saying: "No arms to the Middle East." All the time that our State Department has been saying to Israel: No arms to you, because we want no arms race, it has been approving the sale and shipment of United States arms to Saudi Arabia, who in turn has been transshipping them to Jordan, Syria, and Egypt.

During this same period, while the United States has been following Britain's urging that we sell no arms to Israel, Britain has been selling arms to Jordan, Syria, and Egypt.

Our State Department exhibits surprise at the consummation of an agreement by Czechoslovakia to send arms to Egypt, when for more than 3 years the Arabs have been getting Russian arms.

No wonder Republicans would like us not to talk about foreign policy. But from now until election day we will expose them on both fronts, the foreign and the domestic.

Now, my good friends, it is my extreme pleasure to give you our great leader, the Honorable Joseph B. Whitty.

No Cause for Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Thomas D. White, Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, spoke at the General Electric dinner in my home city of Cincinnati on Thursday, February 9. General White was a logical choice of speaker for this dinner and the dinner was a proper place for General White to warn that Russia has almost closed the airpower gap by beating the United States at the game in which we think we excel—production. The total research and development effort of the United States Armed Forces is not sufficient to insure our survival. We need the help of private industry added to Government sponsored efforts to keep us ahead technologically. General Electric is one American industry using private funds for research designed to keep the United States ahead. If we are to survive, more industries must follow the lead of General Electric.

I have observed that General White has for some time been alarmed by the fact that in Russia the technical training for young men and women long ago outdistanced our own efforts, numerically speaking. In his speech at Cincinnati, General White warned that this intensive training effort is bringing results. As General White said, the Communist leaders resent the limitation that American airpower imposes upon their freedom of action. They have set about to neutralize our superiority. "They have not attained this goal, yet, but I say that with little pride and less comfort."

We believe that we have a better Air Force, but our superiority no longer rests on the superiority of American production. It rests today almost entirely upon our better system of world-wide bases

and upon our better, more experienced crews. The Soviets are presently beating us at production. They have halved our lead-time on the heavy jet bomber and in developing and producing all other aircraft, their lead-time is considerably less than ours. Soviet achievements derive in large part from the fact that they can put not one but several projects on a crash basis. They can exert the iron rule of dictatorship. They can direct bright young Communists into scientific and technical careers by no choice of their own. They can determine to build the weapons of war rather than the luxuries of peace. They can keep the standard of living down and the standard of mililtary power high.

Since ours is not a totalitarian form of government, we must face the fact that the defense of this Nation is not just the concern of our own Government. Defense is everybody's business. That is both the price and privilege of democracy.

Private industries must devote ever increasing attention to research. The taxpayer and the legislator quite understandably prefer to see our national income spent on success, not failure. In our democracy, it is all but impossible to devote enough of the budget to research and development to insure our survival. Furthermore, if our Government paid for and therefore controlled all the research necessary to keep us ahead, there would be little difference between our Government and that of the Soviet Union. As General White said, "Private initiative would become stifled as it is in Russia." Mr. Speaker, if we are to keep the United States ahead in the air and be able to prevent war by being able to win one, our industries must roll up their sleeves and pitch in even harder to add to the effort of the Armed Forces to assure the technological superiority of our weapons of combat.

General Electric has a motto quoted by General White which might well become the motto for the Nation in this arms race which has been forced upon us. That motto is, "Progress is our most important product." The private citizen, private industry, and the Armed Forces must work together to insure this progress.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that General White recognized the contribution of General Electric and of the citizens of Cincinnati to the defense effort. I am proud to ask the consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD his important speech, which follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AT THE GENERAL ELECTRIC DINNER, CINCINNATI, OHIO, FEBRUARY 9, 1956

A little over a month ago, General Hansell dropped in on General Twining in Washington. He told him of this affair and asked if he could come out to see it. General Twining said yes.

Then General Hansell very casually asked if General Twining would mind saying a few words to a small group at an informal gathering. Without thinking, General Twining said yes again.

A few days later came the joker. Jack Parker wrote enclosing a schedule of events. On that schedule General Twining found himself listed as guest speaker at the dinner. I do not know whether that scared him, or whether it was the fact that he had unexpected demands for his presence in Washington.

All I can say is, here I am.

Actually, General Twining was extremely disappointed when he found he could not be here. He was really looking forward to this event.

In this case his misfortune is my gain. I am extremely pleased to be here and to be able to talk with you.

This has been a very interesting day. I am sure that those who saw today's displays and demonstrations are much heartened by this evidence of scientific ingenuity and progress. We are going to need a lot more of this same kind of effort to maintain for the United States its present position in the world. The position I speak of is not only one of world leadership, with the great partnership of free nations, but also one of relative safety and security.

From this position we have been able to play a paramount role in opposing the spread of militant communism.

To insure our safety and security, and to discourage Communist aggression, the United States has used its outstanding strength—our technological leadership.

We are dealing with potential aggressors who care little for public opinion, neither are they bound by any moral or ethical codes. They have lied, cheated, and stolen their way through history. Past performances also show that the Communists are likely to start a fight only when they are sure they can win.

We have translated our technology into instruments of such power that we have been able so far to convince the Soviets of the futility of aggression. I refer primarily to American airpower.

There is no question about it. The ready-to-go pressures of the United States Air Force has discouraged the Communists from attempting to achieve their goals by war.

We must depend on our airpower to continue exerting this beneficial influence. Certainly military forces on land or water are little threat to the rulers of the vast Eurasian land mass. It is the ability of our Air Force to retaliate—to stab directly at the Communist heart and brain that has convinced the Soviets that it is better to use words instead of weapons. Furthermore, the increasing continuity of this airpower pressure remains our best hope that the Soviets will always find peace more prudent than brutal aggression.

Obviously, the Communist leaders resent the limitation that American airpower imposes upon their freedom of action. They have set about to neutralize our superiority. During the past several years, they have expended great effort to make Soviet airpower equal or superior to our own.

They have not attained this goal, yet, but I say that with little pride and less comfort.

Consider these four factors: The Soviet war-ravaged economy right after World War II, their production base, their technology, and the resources readily available to them.

The distance they have come in 10 years is remarkable. When one compares these four factors to like factors in the United States, the fact that the Soviets have almost closed the airpower gap is more than remarkable.

Were the Communist leaders truly peaceful and friendly, we could take pleasure in their progress—and we would be happy to help them progress even more. Certainly it is to our own advantage when technology advances and living standards go up in any friendly nation.

But the Communists have not demonstrated their friendliness or peaceful intentions. Therefore, we must view the airpower products of their technology as weapons designed for possible use against us.

You are familiar with the latest weapons in the Soviet arsenal. They now have a swept-wing heavy jet bomber, the Bison. In many respects it equals our new B–52 which is the best that American technology has yet been able to produce.

They have a long-range turboprop bomber, the Bear. The Bear is their longest range airplane, comparable to our B–36. The B–36 is gradually moving into retirement.

The Soviets also have a medium jet bomber very similar to our B–47. We still have a big lead on them in medium jet bombers.

They have several thousand fighters which are better than our F–86's and F–84's. They also are producing newer fighters which compare to our F–100.

I could go on and on. In airplane after airplane they are approaching us in quality and surpassing us in quantity.

We believe we have a better Air Force—but that superiority now rests almost entirely upon our better system of worldwide bases and upon our better, more experienced crews.

Let us now examine the implications of the Soviet achievements in airpower.

Facing high performance airpower is not a new problem to us.

The United States has never held a monopoly in quality of equipment. During World War II, for instance, both our allies and our opponents brought forth top-notch aircraft. So although the apparent technological progress in Soviet aircraft and engines may startle us, it does not present us with a problem that we have not met and overcome before.

During the last few decades, we Americans have had a talent in which we reigned supreme. I refer to our talent for production—mass production. When challenged by aggressors, we have always depended upon our mass production methods to bail us out.

Here, gentlemen, is the area of deep concern—the Soviets are presently beating us at our own grame—production. They have halved our lead-time on the heavy jet bomber, and in developing and producing all other aircraft, their lead-time is considerably less than ours.

Furthermore, it is useless to debate whether or not their production engineering is as sophisticated as ours. The fact is that they have been and are outproducing us in all categories but medium jet bombers.

No strategist or planner has ever advocated that we must match a potential enemy fighter for fighter, bomber for bomber, and bomb for bomb. What the Soviets think they need may be different from what we think we need. For instance, they have far greater area and a longer border. They are vulnerable to retaliatory attack from all directions. Therefore, the Communist defensive problem is bigger than ours. In their defense-offense equation—they would need far more fighter interceptors than we.

Of course we can outproduce the Communists. There is no question about that. Our production potential is not the reason we are falling behind.

One of the reasons that we are dropping behind is that the Communists are making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we.

The fact that the Communists can put not one, but several projects on a crash basis indicates a tremendous capacity for research and development. I add that this also indicates a disregard for cost and for safety factors, and a willingness to gamble.

There are other reasons for Communist success. They achieved their gains in weapons by exerting the iron rule of a ruthless dictatorship. Bright young Soviets are directed into scientific and technical careers—by no choice of their own. They build trucks instead of automobiles, submarines instead of commercial vessels, bombers at the cost of refrigerators and radar instead of

television sets. The Soviet standard of living is forced down and kept low so that their standard of military power may be kept high.

Most significantly, every action and decision affecting research, development, or production of anything is made by the dictatorship. By quotas, schedules, norms, and plans, the Soviet government controls everything right down to the last nut and bolt.

This is the Soviet brand of communism in action. It is a system of life in competition with our own, and a system which threatens our own. It is up to us to win this competition. It is important to our own safety that we keep strong enough to discourage aggression. If we fail to prevent aggression, it is important that we have enough strength to defeat the aggressor.

But it seems to me that there is something even more important in the long run. Whether our way of life be thought of as capitalism, democracy, or simply freedom, we must be able to save it against a way of life we know is bad. If our system were to allow itself to run second in strength to communism, or any other degrading political and economic system, how strong then would be the argument for free enterprise?

We must realize that the defense of this Nation is everybody's business, not just our own Government's. That is both the price and privilege of democracy. The products of American capitalism, our great corporations, must accept, along with their comparative freedom of action, their share of our national responsibility to provide our own defense.

Since force levels, numbers of aircraft and weapons are necessarily decided by our political and military leaders, no one could expect our private industries to seize the initiative in production. Our great corporations can best volunteer increased efforts to the area of research and development.

I am speaking specifically of the research and development efforts necessary to keep our weapons superior to weapons in the hands of potential enemies.

The United States Government does not have to pay for all the research and development necessary to insure our survival. Furthermore, research is characterized by success only after many failures. It is a business in which failure is routine and success extraordinary. The taxpayer and the legislator quite understandably prefer to see our national income spent on success, not failure. This makes the research and development dollar hard to get.

This is one reason that our private industries must devote ever increasing efforts to research.

There is another reason. Research, especially basic research, is best accomplished by unfettered initiative working in an environment of complete freedom. Governmental projects are accountable to too many people to be able to operate in a completely free environment.

There is a third reason that we should depend, in part, upon private efforts. If our Government paid for, and therefore controlled, all the research necessary to keep us ahead—there would be little difference between our Government and that of the Soviet Union. Private initiative would become stifled, as it is in Russia.

This presents large corporations with three alternatives:

One, they can sit back and wait for Government research and development money to come their way. This would eventually allow the Communists to get so far ahead of us that our Nation would lose its freedom of action.

Two, our Government, in desperation and emergency, could step in and control the research and development and all the other activities of our industries. This, of course, would be similar to the very way of life we are trying to defend against.

Third, our industries can roll up their sleeves and pitch in even harder to add to governmental sponsored efforts to keep us ahead technologically. Only in this way can we keep the United States ahead in the air and able to prevent war by being able to win one.

Actually, this leaves little choice, and the third alternative is being accepted by our leading industries. In my opinion, privately sponsored research and development is far from sufficient yet. However, several companies are making encouraging moves in the right direction.

General Electric is one of these companies using private funds for research designed to keep the United States ahead. The facility that is going to be here in Cincinnati will be a valuable addition to the Nation's research effort. Other companies are building up their research potential.

These actions are the results of patriotism and good business. Our military forces must stay ahead. Therefore, if any manufacturer comes up with a significantly better piece of equipment, we have no choice but to buy it.

It is good business to survive—and I am convinced that our survival depends on our technological progress.

From what I have said, you can see why I was so glad to see today's evidence of technological progress. All I can say to General Electric, and to all our other great companies is—keep it up.

If you do not mind I will borrow General Electric's motto. In achieving security for the United States, "Progress is our most important product."

New Mexico Governor Wrong, Wrong, Wrong on Upper Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from the Governor of New Mexico soliciting support for the monstrous upper Colorado proposal. The inaccuracies contained in the letter were appalling.

Had the letter been originated by anyone other than a governor of one of our 48 States, and had its inaccuracies not been apparently broadcast to all Members of Congress, I would have ignored it. Under the circumstances, I have written the governor, taking up his letter point by point, and am having my reply reproduced below so that my colleagues may have the correct information:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1956.

Hon. JOHN F. SIMMS, Jr.,
Governor of New Mexico,
State Capitol, Santa Fe., N. Mex.

MY DEAR SIR: I have in hand your February 11 letter concerning the proposed upper Colorado storage project which apparently was broadcast to all Members of Congress.

It is inaccurate both in substance and detail. You are therefore requested promptly to advise all the letter's addressees to disregard it.

As Governor of the State of New Mexico, you certainly must be aware that H. R. 3383 provides not one single drop of water for the Atomic Energy Commission's Los Alamos atomic laboratory or its Sandia special weapons center. As a former employee at Los Alamos, I am completely familiar with the situation. I am at a loss to understand why you, the Governor of the State in which these installations are located, would say otherwise.

Taking the conclusions of your letter in their order, let me say this: Simple justice demands defeat of the project.

Like an iceberg, the House bill displays only part of its bulk to view. Beneath the surface are, amongst other things: destruction of Rainbow Natural Bridge; billions of dollars of increased burdens on the United States taxpayers to pay the interest on construction costs alone and 98 percent of this would be borne by the taxpayers of 44 States in which the project is not located; more agricultural land at a time when the Government proposes to spend billions of dollars to put land in soil banks; eventual invasion of Dinosaur National Monument with Echo Park Dam; a possible "billion dollar mud puddle" at Glen Canyon, etc., etc.

The same engineer-scientist, Raymond A. Hill, employed by the State of Colorado to assess its water resources, says that construction of the project would leave southern California's Metropolitan Water District, serving 67 cities and 6 million southern Californians, with only half the Colorado River water to which it has rights. Hill says this would be disastrous. Is that justice?

The project will not be self-liquidating.

The project's financial scheme is wholly unsound. None of the irrigation reclamation projects are financially sound. The irrigation water users on the average would be able to repay only about 12 percent of the irrigation investment, which, including storage costs, would range from $750 to $900 per acre varying with the number of projects included. The power dams are supposed to provide the revenues to pay for themselves as well as 88 percent of the irrigation investment.

The project repayment provisions contemplate an overall repayment period of at least 100 years. This is unrealistic and economically indefensible. The hearings make it clear that the repayment plan might work for only a minimum number of projects and that with additional projects there would be no possibility of payment within 100 years unless the power rate were increased substantially above the 6-mill rate contemplated in the Bureau of Reclamation's report. Furthermore, it is extremely doubtful that a market for the power even at the 6-mill rate would continue for 100 years. The approaching availability of atomic electric power will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete. In fact, the market area is not now in need of the power which would be provided. The power dams are in the bill because they are the only hope of making the overall project appear feasible. The project is not self-liquidating as you claim. Studies show that simple interest alone on the investment would be greater than the estimated net revenues.

Furthermore, the ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project total at least $5 billion (probably a low figure because based on the Bureau of Reclamation cost estimates which have proved notoriously short of actual construction costs).

Even if the original construction cost were to be repaid as claimed in a repayment period of 100 years, the cost to the Federal Government in the form of a hidden subsidy in interest charges on the funds borrowed and advanced for construction of the projects named in the bill would amount to at least $4 billion. This would be some $5,000 per acre on the total area to be serviced. In comparison the irrigated lands when fully developed would have an average sale value of about $150 an acre.

No defense requirements, urgent or otherwise, would be met by the project.

As set forth above, H. R. 3383 provides not one drop of water for Sandia or Los Alamos.

The Navahos receive nothing from H. R. 3383, and the only direct benefits that could be added would benefit only 1,100 Navaho families at a cost of $200,000 each.

This bill would not assist the Navaho Indians. It provides for the Navaho Dam and Reservoir, but not for the present construction of the Navaho project. However, the construction of the dam would have the effect of committing Congress to constructing the irrigation project works. The cost of the dam is estimated at $36,500,000; the irrigation project an additional $175 million. There are some 1,100 Navaho families involved, meaning a construction cost of close to $200,000 for each Navaho farm. This is just to bring water to the land and does not account for assistance which will undoubtedly be necessary for equipment to get the land in production. This astounding cost should be most carefully considered before Congress acts, particularly since H. R. 3383 as recently amended now provides that costs allocated to Indian lands which such lands cannot repay shall be nonreimbursable (sec. 6). This amendment was advertised as a gift to the Indians by newspapers reporting on recent upper-basin conferences which led to the amending of H. R. 3383. It is a gift Congress might well inspect closely. Certainly some more realistic and more economic method of providing for the Indians can be considered. By this gift the upper basin shows its unwillingness to have the costs of Navaho project paid for by the power revenues, as all the other costs are supposed to be. Instead, this money will go into the funds to be apportioned among these States, leaving the taxpayers in the rest of the country to carry the load.

Therefore, sir, since your previous letter was wrong, wrong, wrong, I reiterate my request that you advise its addressees to disregard it.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress,
18th District, California.

Ventura River Reclamation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I heartily support S. 926—also an identical bill by Mr. TEAGUE of California, H. R. 3488—which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura reclamation project, California.

When the bill was considered in the House on Thursday, February 16, 1956, I was in California meeting with numerous persons who had been injured by the great flood which did so much damage in our State. I learned firsthand of their difficulties. I visited the flooded areas in my district and am and will continue to do everything possible to help the victims of these floods.

Before leaving I handed the pair clerk my proxy to vote for the bill. He was unable to use the proxy as a rollcall was not demanded and consequently there was no specific record of my attitude on this bill. Had I been present I would have voted for the bill and will do all I can to help bring the project to completion.

The Kelley Flood Insurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, following the disastrous east-coast floods of last August, it struck me that, in addition to more effective flood-control protection, homeowners and businessmen in areas subject to floods also needed a reasonable-cost flood insurance system. This is a field private enterprise has never felt it could enter, because the premiums would have to be so tremendously high in order to protect the insurance company against loss and also return a profit that few customers could afford to buy such a policy.

Consequently, I suggested a Federal national flood insurance program, in which the Federal Government would either reinsure the private companies or else issue the policies directly to the public. Other Members of Congress also got interested in this idea, particularly those from the flooded New England areas, and the House Committee on Banking and Currency has been holding hearings on the various proposals.

After suggesting enactment of flood-insurance legislation last summer, I looked into the matter further and found that President Truman in 1952 actually had a proposed bill drafted by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this very purpose. With necessary changes to bring it up to date, I introduced that bill early this year.

In urging the House Banking Committee to adopt my proposal, I pointed out the inability of private firms to sell such insurance on their own, citing the position of the National Board of Fire Underwriters that—

> Because of the virtual certainty of the loss, its catastrophic nature, and the impossibility of making this line of insurance self-supporting * * * companies could not prudently engage in this field of underwriting.

My bill therefore has as its purpose:

> To promote the national welfare by alleviating the widespread economic distress suffered from time to time within the United States * * * as a result of floods, and the attendant impairment of the free flow of interstate and foreign trade and commerce, by providing direct governmental insurance of certain flood risks or by making insurance of such risks available through private insurance companies by means of governmental reinsurance.

PROVISIONS OF KELLEY FLOOD INSURANCE BILL

My bill, H. R. 8142, provides for a maximum amount of insurance for any one person or business of $250,000, which would not cover the losses of a really big firm but which would certainly cover the homeowner and small-business man who need this protection most—who in the past in Westmoreland County and elsewhere, have seen their properties—on which they may have owed substantial debts—washed away and wiped out—but with the debt still to pay. It is hard enough to pay a mortgage off under any circumstances. To pay it on a house which no longer exists, which has been destroyed, is an intolerable burden.

Also provided is a limitation of 90 percent on the amount of any loss which would be covered, thus assuring that each policyholder would have an incentive to help keep down his own losses.

The bill requires that the program be operated without loss to the Government, which means that premiums would have to be realistic. But to assure that, some experience would be necessary, so the bill calls for a maximum of $500 million of insurance in effect in the first year, doubling at the end of the second year, and tripling to $1,500,000,000 at the end of the third year. This would enable the Government to amass reliable cost figures.

Private insurance facilities would be used to the greatest extent possible. The Government would issue policies directly only if private companies did not participate.

Further, other Government agencies operating loan or loan-guaranty programs, like FHA and VA home mortgage insurance, and so on, could require that flood insurance be carried by the purchaser just as they now require that fire insurance be carried. This is predicated on the assumption that the flood insurance would be available at reasonable cost.

Such a program, going hand-in-hand with better flood control, would protect people who have, in the past, seen everything they owned wiped out by rampaging flood waters, terrible disasters to all who ever experienced them.

Upper Colorado Project: More Cost, Less Acreage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 20 million acres of undeveloped land are available in areas with adequate rainfall for crops. These acres can be developed and fertilized for a portion of the cost necessary to bring into cultivation the arid acres of the upper Colorado area project.

The Bureau of Reclamation presented cost figures for initial participating projects. Costs allocated to irrigations varied from $210 to $794 per acre, or an unweighted average of over $400 per acre. Little of this land even with sufficient water would command a fair market value as high as this. Costs estimated for some 22 other possible participating projects, on the basis of only partial investigation, run as high or

higher, and up to $1,530 per acre in one instance. We deem these costs excessive and economically unsound.

There exist at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project.

The Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage. Development costs would be from $60 to $100 an acre for such land. The cost involved to taxpayers of the Nation in developing new and supplemental water for the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado project, which amounts in all to only about 600 square miles of new land, would range up to 50 times as much for each acre developed.

As an example, the Department of Agriculture lists acreage available for low-cost development in these 21 States as follows:

	Acres
Alabama	683,000
Arkansas	1,865,000
Florida	1,970,000
Georgia	1,721,000
Illinois	69,000
Indiana	135,000
Kentucky	170,000
Louisiana	2,769,000
Michigan	690,000
Minnesota	874,000
Mississippi	1,272,000
Missouri	323,000
New York	100,000
North Carolina	1,157,000
Ohio	95,000
Pennsylvania	90,000
South Carolina	996,000
Tennessee	242,000
Texas	3,928,000
Virginia	514,000
Wisconsin	316,000

Can We Be Neutral in Such a Fight?—Remarks on the Middle East Crisis and a Declaration on Behalf of 25,000 Residents of the Wynnefield-Overbrook Park and Main Line Areas of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, several night ago, before the simply incredible — unbelievable — developments over those Walker tanks assigned to Saudi Arabia, I had the honor of addressing a large and sincerely concerned group of Philadelphians gathered at Har-Zion Temple to discuss the alarming situation in the Middle East.

I told the group that I would be pleased and honored to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the attention of this body and of the Senate as well, the declaration and resolutions adopted that night by representatives of 25,000 members of major Jewish organizations in the Wynnefield-Overbrook Park and Main Line areas.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I therefore send to the desk for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the declaration and resolutions adopted at the meeting, followed by my own talk that night:

DECLARATION AND RESOLUTIONS

At the call of the leaders of 17 major American-Jewish organizations in the Wynnefield-Overbrook Park and Main Line areas, representing some 25,000 American citizens, this community meeting has been convened at Har-Zion Temple on February 16, 1956, to consider the deepening crisis in the Middle East which threatens the peace and security of America and the free world, and directly menaces the future of Israel.

1. THE BALANCE OF ARMS

Soviet imperialism has now moved into the Middle East. The Czech-Egyptian arms agreement exposes the entire area to penetration by Communist arms, agents, technicians, and propagandists. This is a violation of the Tri-partite declaration of 1950 by which the United States, the United Kingdom, and France committed themselves to prevent aggression and to maintain the military balance in the Middle East. This military balance has now been destroyed.

Israel has appealed to the United States for arms to restore that balance so that she may defend herself from aggression long and publicly threatened by the Arab States. This is vital if war is to be averted in the Middle East: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Government to grant Israel's request to buy arms for defense without delay.

2. A SECURITY GUARANTY

Our Government has entered into security pacts with 44 nations in Europe and Asia to unite the peoples of the free world in the preservation of peace. It should extend this system of collective security to Israel. Such an undertaking would be a logical development of the tripartite declaration: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge our Government immediately to negotiate a security treaty with Israel, and with such of the Arab States as are ready to join therein.

3. A PEACE SETTLEMENT

Israel's repeated offers to enter into peace negotiations have been rebuffed by the Arab States which have made impossible demands on Israel for territorial and other concessions. We are opposed to any efforts to force unacceptable conditions which violate the integrity and sovereignty of the parties. We urge our Government to decline to advocate peace on such terms and conditions, and to reject the threats made in the last few days by Russia in an attempt to disrupt the efforts of our Government to seek a peaceful settlement.

To aid in the defense of Israel at this critical hour is to strengthen America's own best interests: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Government to exert its best efforts to promote an honorable peace settlement in the Middle East, using as the basis for the negotiations the present boundaries of Israel.

REMARKS BY HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT COMMUNITYWIDE RALLY OF MAJOR JEWISH GROUPS ON THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, HAR-ZION TEMPLE, FEBRUARY 16, 1956

I appreciate very much the invitation to speak to such a dedicated group of West Philadelphians who have room in their hearts for concern for others and not just themselves. It is, to me, a wonderful thing the way Americans generally show concern for their fellow man. But I think Americans of the Jewish faith are truly outstanding in that respect. I admire you for it, and I salute you for it.

True, your concern for Israel and its survival is understandable in view of the long history of persecution of Jews which made the establishment of Israel so vital. But I know it goes much deeper than that. The Jew in America has never been under real danger—I mean the kind of brutal, beastlike attacks which happened in many other countries. Yet you have given so much of yourselves to help in the building of that Nation, and you have a right to be proud of your great and unselfish achievement.

I would say I am proud to be on the same platform here with a past national president of Hadassah, Judith Epstein. Every one I know who has visited Israel has come back with the most extravagant praise of what Hadassah has meant to that country, in hospitals, in health, in welfare, and well-being.

But we didn't come here tonight to hear us pat each other on the back for what has been done in the past to help fellow human beings to live in decency instead of in dread and in degradation. These rallies which you are holding all over the city, leading to a Philadelphiawide affair next month, are not parties or socials; they are deadly serious affairs based on a deadly serious international problem.

All of you who know me or who know anything about me, know that I have joined you over the years in your great humanitarian concern for the establishment of Israel and for its survival. As a neighbor living three blocks from here, and who has had many occasions to visit this temple and others in the Second Congressional District at bar mitzvahs and weddings and funerals and social affairs—and as a Member of Congress since 1945—I have worried along with you over the tragic period when we were afraid the hope of a homeland in Palestine might be destroyed before it ever became a reality. There was that tense period when the British suddenly pulled out, and left chaos behind them, after having stood in the way of a real Jewish national homeland for so long. There was the fighting to secure the country. There was the issue of American recognition, and of American economic help.

Now we are back to the tense dangers of another period, as once again Israel stands menaced and her existence—her survival—threatened by envious and aggressive neighbors.

Can we be "neutral" in such a fight? Can we stand idly by and watch lawless aggressors try to murder a whole nation of innocent people who desire only to live in peace? Of course not. We are not "neutral" as between those who believe in peace and those who believe in achieving their ends by aggression.

I say "we are not neutral" but sometimes there is a question of whether we can speak in that respect for some of our officials in high governmental office—particularly some of those who feel that the Arab States, with their millions of acres, need more land at the expense of tiny Israel.

Of course it is not a need for more land which stimulates Arab threats to Israel. It is an envious desire to capture and exploit what others have labored so hard to cultivate and bring into flower. It is fear of Israel as a dynamic force for democracy and freedom in the Near East. It is the suspicion, perhaps, that Israel may demonstrate to the people of the neighboring states that the rank and file of the people do not have to live in near slavery to a few rich and powerful leaders, but through democracy and enlightenment can improve living standards for all.

The Communists talk in those terms, but have failed miserably to make good on them. Israel, following in the path of the United States, has already shown how even a country under constant military danger can dream big dreams and carry through on the hard work of making good on those dreams. But the drain of defense costs is obvious.

I say we must guarantee the survival of any nation with such a spirit of progress and decency. I say we must make sure no aggressor or combination of aggressors can push Israel into the sea and destroy her. I say we must not base our strategy simply on counteracting Soviet moves in the Near East the way you would play a checker game. Instead, we must proceed on the basis of what is right for the free world, and what is right for humanity. And that means assuring a free, independent, secure Israel—just as we have the duty to use our influence in foreign affairs to accomplish that same goal for every free and decent nation.

Many of you may remember my letter to the Jewish Times some time ago in answer to an editorial in that paper asking Members of Congress direct questions about the high dam projected on the Nile River in Egypt. Here was a case where our Government apparently was being panicked into meeting any offer the Soviets made. As I said then:

"I for one will certainly want to know what steps, if any, our Government is taking to use our foreign aid programs, including those in the Middle East, as a means of promoting world peace. Naturaly, prompt settlement of the situation in the Middle East is fundamental to any real peace, since the tensions there could easily explode into a world conflict."

Events since then have certainly borne that out, I would say. I also stated then:

"It is unfortunate that the countries who seek to destroy Israel have now discovered that in dealing with Mr. Dulles it seems to help them a great deal to flirt openly with the Soviet bloc, and then watch this country's State Department fall all over itself trying to compete with Russia for their favor."

It is not just unfortunate that we have seen this happen; I would say it is rather tragic.

All of you, I know, welcomed the statement by Mrs. Roosevelt, by former President Truman, and others, including many of us in the House of Representatives in the Congress in Washington, that we dare not sit idly by and see Israel destroyed by Communist arms in the hands of Egyptian troops. I am pleased that my position on this has right along been the one which now has such general support from such distinguished Americans. Let us press on, then, for a happy conclusion to this serious problem. Thank you.

Anniversary of Marines Landing on Iwo Jima February 19, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, amid the pressures and selfish concerns of daily living an important anniversary in this Nation's history slipped by almost unnoticed yesterday.

But the marines of the 7th Fleet, now engaged in peacetime maneuvers on the scarred beaches of Iwo Jima, remembered and kept faith with their comrades whose blood once crimsoned the blackened sands and rocky slopes of that lonely island.

With bared heads and reverent hearts they gathered at the crest of Mount Suribachi. It was just 11 years earlier, on February 19, 1945, that other valiant marines had first raised the flag of freedom with aching battle-weary hands.

Navy jets whined a requiem and Old Glory billowed against a bright blue sky while Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Wornham delivered an unforgettable memorial tribute.

Those who fought here would want no eulogy.

He said:

These men were not martyrs. They represented all races and creeds. Each had a job to do.

To those who died, may you rest in peace. To those who were maimed, may your pain be eased. To those who survived, may we never forget.

And to the newcomers in the corps, he had this to say:

May you be as worthy if put to the test.

General Wornham's words were wrung from his own experience. As a marine colonel 11 years before he had led his men in the bloody assault on Iwo Jima, and had seen 6,000 die before victory was attained.

Less than a year after that historic hour, I traveled the tortuous road to the top of Mount Suribachi. Below me the sun glistened on the marked graves of those who, in the proud tradition of the Marine Corps, had given uncomplainingly and willingly of that "last full measure of devotion." I felt both humbled and proud to be part of a nation whose ideals and principles could inspire her children to such dedication, such sacrifice. It is a moment I shall never forget and never want to forget.

May those blood-drenched sands of Iwo Jima and wherever brave men have fought and died for freedom be forever held sacred in our hearts. May we be inspired by such sacrifices to hold ever more dearly those things for which so great a price was paid.

A Tribute to Frances Willard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, under the auspicies of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, services were held in Statuary Hall commemorating the date of the death of a great American woman, Frances Willard. I am including herewith a brief address I made on that occasion:

We meet here this afternoon at a hallowed spot in the Nation's Capitol to honor and pay tribute to the memory of a great soul. She has been likened to George Washington in that she was first in peace, not first in combat war, but moral war against the liquor traffic and kindred evils that were sapping the vitality of her country. Certainly she was first in the hearts of her countrywomen.

Frances Elizabeth Willard was born in Churchville, N. Y. She was reared in Janesville, Wis. She received her early education in Evanston, Ill., where she later became the first president of the first women's college in this country.

One of the foremost women of her day said at the time of her death: "The home-going of no other woman would have made so many women feel as though the sun had set."

Frances Willard was honored by the great and near great of two continents. A grateful people of the State of Illinois reared this statue in her memory. She is the only woman so honored in the Hall of Fame of the Nation's Capitol. Miss Willard requested that the date of her death, which is February 17, be celebrated as what she described as "her heavenly birthday."

I am honored in joining with you in this ceremony in paying tribute to the memory of a great character, a great soul.

I want at this moment to pay tribute to you, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and to the membership of your organization for your efforts in carrying on the work of the organization established and founded by Frances Willard. I wish there were sufficient time during which I could name some of the people who are gathered here this afternoon on this occasion. Each of you gathered here this afternoon is a distinguished person. Kansas, my home State, is proud to claim the president of your organization, Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, as one of the daughters of your union. Incidentally, the Women's Christian Temperance Union and its associates are extremely fortunate to be represented in Washington by Miss Elizabeth Smart. You have good reason to be proud of her and her work.

Frances Willard was not only the founder of your great institution. She was a leader in a continuous battle against the use of intoxicating liquors. She was also a great teacher. As an instructor in high school and college, she had opportunity of getting acquainted with the lives of people at first hand. At the age of 17 Frances Willard attended what was described as "the Milwaukee Female College." On examination day she was honored when she read her essay on the subject "Originality of Thought and Action."

Miss Willard was elected president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in 1879. She held this position during the years that followed. It would only be repetitious for me to recount the growth of the organization and its influence in this country and in Europe. The record, with which you are familiar, speaks for itself.

And so, we, who survive, are engaged in a great crusade, a greater and more important one than most of us realize or appreciate. Miss Willard has submitted a challenge to you and to the American people that we can't escape even if we choose to do so.

Of course, it is impossible to measure the cost in money and misery that has been caused by the use of intoxicating liquors. There are figures that are somewhat revealing. Reports of major crimes committed in the United States during the year 1954 indicated a new high of 2,267,000. Of these 1,690,000, or almost 60 percent of the total, were attributed either directly or indirectly to the use of alcoholic liquor. This is a report from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The high cost of drunkenness is difficult to estimate. It should be observed, however, the liquor bill for last year in the United States amounted to $9,700,000,000. This amount, if applied on our Federal expenditures, would pay for all the employment in Government which means the salaries of more than 2 million employees during the year. As a matter of fact, it would

pay one-sixth of the total amount of the Federal expenditures, including defense costs.

These are only cold figures. The number of deaths on our highways caused by drunken driving is mounting every year and the greatest cost of all, which cannot be measured, is the cost of broken homes, human misery, and poverty all because of the use of intoxicating drink.

My friends, you are facing one of the greatest challenges of our time dealing with a hydra-headed monster most difficult to destroy. If you and I are convinced that the thing is wrong, then we have a responsibility we cannot escape. It is to combat this thing to the best of our ability and strength.

Frances Willard has handed the torch to you and to me and to all thinking American citizens. May you hold it high. The battle has just begun. May it be said of Frances Willard, "She did the best she could. No one could do more." May we join in the great crusade so it will be said of us, "We too did the best we could."

Illinois Support of H. R. 4470

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I appeared before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, ably chairmaned by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], in support of H. R. 4470. I am extending my remarks to include my statement to the subcommittee, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, a number of my constituents in the Second District of Illinois own summer homes in the dunes of Indiana and on the shores of the lake in southern Michigan in the district represented by our colleague, the Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN. They have suffered great loss because of erosion.

On June 1, 1955, I introduced H. R. 6605 to provide for a survey by the Corps of Army Engineers to determine the feasibility of construction projects for the protection of both public and private properties on the shores of the United States against erosion, by waves and currents. My bill defines the word "shores" to include all the shorelines of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes, and lakes, estuaries and bays directly connected therewith.

Among my constituents who had alerted me to the urgent need of legislation in this field was Dr. Jerome G. Kerwin, a distinguished and nationally renowned educator, a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago holding the professorship of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation for the Study of American Institutions.

On February 8, 1956, I wrote Dr. Kerwin that in view of the fact that H. R. 4470 had had a favorable report from the Army engineers and enjoyed the support of many Members from the eastern seaboard, and moreover covered damage both to public and private property, I thought it advisable that we should join forces in its support. I requested his evaluation of the bill.

Dr. Kerwin in his reply said: "As I read the Auchincloss bill, it provides for action by local public authorities such as cities, counties, and the like. This has its merits. It may, however, be difficult to get action in many localities, since the number of people owning lake-front or ocean-front property is often small compared with the whole population of the local area. They might have difficulty getting action. I find that to be true along the Michigan shore. Nevertheless, the bill deserves support."

Therefore, I am appearing before your subcommittee today in support of H. R. 4470. Its enactment is urgently required and I trust the committee will take prompt and favorable action.

In fairness to the subcommittee I think I should state that while the enactment of H. R. 4470 would be of great benefit, and in the public interest, it alone will not meet in full measure the emergency that erosion has brought to my constituents owning homes on the shores of Lake Michigan. In his letter to me Dr. Kerwin further said:

"I had heard that as a result of flood conditions in the East a form of Federal disaster insurance was being considered. This might well apply to us unfortunates along Lake Michigan. We cannot even deduct these losses from our income taxes, because losses from 'erosion' are not considered."

A number of bills providing for Federal disaster insurance are now under consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee of which I have the honor to be a member. I hope and believe that when and if the committee reports out a disaster insurance bill it will give disaster insurance coverage to properties endangered by erosion.

IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 4470

Imagine. Mr. Chairman, how you would feel if you should learn that you must move your family and furniture within the next few hours before your front yard is washed away and the foundations of your house crumble. Perhaps I am asking too much for you to imagine this happening to you. But since the late summer of 1949, it has happened to many home owners along the shores of the Great Lakes. This particular case happened on the shore of Lake Michigan, a little east and north of Chicago. There had been a prolonged spell of rain with high winds off the lake. In the evening, as the homeowner returned from his work, he heard the roar of the waves and watched the lake with some feeling of apprehension. But the first realization of danger to his property came when he entered the house and his wife called attention to expanding cracks in the living room. Even as she spoke, the waves were pounding on the edge of his property and great chunks were tumbling off the lot for whose purchase he had saved and scrimped. Immediately, he began phoning for a mover to come and get the furniture, and then arranged with a friend to provide temporary shelter for his family.

Only to the extent that I am trying to put you in the picture am I drawing on my imagination, Mr. Chairman. This has happened, not only to the family I have in mind, but with minor changes to numbers of my friends and constituents in the region around Chicago, and to hundreds, if not thousands of people with property fronting on the Great Lakes. Those of my personal acquaintance are Chicago residents, many of them my constituents. They have sought refuge from a confining life in the city by building summer homes among the dunes of Indiana, or topping the bluffs along the southwestern shores of Michigan. They are neighbors of the constituents of my colleagues who represent the 1st and 3d Congressional Districts of Indiana, and the 4th District of Michigan. No doubt you will hear from them, as well as the many Representatives of other congressional districts in the seven States that front on one or more of the Great Lakes.

HOW LAKE LEVELS FLUCTUATE

Because my home is in Chicago I have an especial interest in Lake Michigan. Being connected with Lake Huron by the open water of the Straits of Mackinac, the two have the same level above the sea. Accordingly, they are considered a single body by the United States Lake Survey of the Corps of Army Engineers. For the other lakes, however, each has its own level. All are measured in relation to the mean tide of the sea at New York. The levels fluctuate with the seasons. Their high stages are in the summer, usually in June, July, or August. Thereafter, the levels drop away to the low stages which occur in winter.

The engineers have a way of describing these fluctuations in simple, direct language. During the fall and early winter the outflow from the lakes, plus evaporation from their vast surfaces, is greater than the combined normal inflow, plus the rain and snow that fall upon their surfaces. But in the spring, rains merge with the melting snow from the tributaries of the Great Lakes to reverse the process. This continues until mid-summer when it reaches a peak. From year to year this normal pattern of rise and fall varies with the differing amounts of rain and snowfall in the surrounding region.

LAKE LEVELS SINCE 1860

Records of the lake levels have been kept since 1860. They indicate an average of 580.58 feet above sea level for Lakes Michigan and Huron. This has varied through the past 95 years from a record high of 583.68 feet in June 1886, to a record low of 577.35 feet in February 1926. The extreme from the high level to the low level is thus 6.33 feet. As shown by the following records of the United States Lake Survey, the water level of Lake Michigan and Lake Hurton rose a total of nearly 3 feet (2.94 feet) during 3 years from July 1949, to August 1952.

Selected levels of Lake Michigan-Huron, 1860–1955

	Feet
Average level, 1860–1953	580.58
Highest monthly average, June 1886	583.68
Lowest monthly average, February 1926	577.35
Spread between extremes	6.33

Recent high water levels

	Feet
Highest monthly average, July 1948	580.85
Highest monthly average, July 1949	579.76
Highest monthly average, August-September 1950	579.96
Highest monthly average, 1951	[1] 581.46
Highest monthly average, August 1952	582.70
Highest monthly average, July 1953	582.14
Highest monthly average, July 1954	581.66
Highest monthly average, July 1955	581.38
Rise from July 1949 to August 1952	2.94
Subsidence from high of August 1952 to July 1955	1.32
Difference between level of August 1952 and 94-year average	2.12
Difference between level of July 1955 and 94-year average	.80

[1] Annual Report of the Lake Carriers' Association, 1951: "* * * during 1951, Lakes Huron and Michigan (averaged) 1.5 feet above the level of 1950." (p. 51.)

All levels are above mean tide at New York, 1935 datum.

Source: United States Lake Survey, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Detroit, Mich.

DAMAGE REACHES $61 MILLION

The most recent high level record of 582.70 feet was recorded in August 1952. Since then a moderate subsidence has occurred. But during the 12 months ending in June 1952 damages of some $61 million were reported by the Corps of Engineers. This is the total suffered by the shore owners on the entire Great Lakes system, from Lake Superior to the St. Lawrence River. Approxi-

mately $50 million was the result of wave action, and some $11 million represented losses from inundation of property. Since 1952 water levels have abated slightly, but they are still nearly a foot above the average of the past 95 years.

The cause of all this damage, according to the Corps of Engineers, is several years of rain and snowfall above normal on the country tributary to the Great Lakes. It is as simple as all that, and cannot be credited to any of the man-made changes of the past quarter century. Neither is it the result of any combination of man's actions. This frees the city of Chicago from the charges that it stems back to the limit of 1,500 cubic feet per second now being diverted from the lake for sanitary purposes. Such diversions have been limited to this amount since 1938, following a decision of the United States Supreme Court. Before that as much as 9,000 cubic feet per second were being taken from Lake Michigan to flush out the Chicago Drainage Canal. With the added amount being diverted to supply water for the Chicago area, the current total is only 3,100 cubic feet per second. This amount is credited with lowering the level of Lakes Michigan and Huron less than a quarter of a foot.

Even were the diversion stepped up as high as 10,000 cubic feet per second, the Army engineers estimate the levels of the two lakes would be reduced by no more than a third of a foot in 3 years. Were it continued for 10 years, they estimate the level would be lowered only a little more than a half foot. At the same time the levels of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario would be lowered about a third of a foot.

PEAK REACHED IN 1952

Current reports can lead to an assumption that the lake level reached a peak in 1952 and is now receding. Therefore, why worry? It may never happen again. This, Mr. Chairman, is an argument for which there is no basis in fact. In all probability the recent high water stages will be repeated again and again.

A more important question is whether new records of high water can be expected. Twice during the past 95 years the level of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron exceeded 585.5 feet, and once during this period it equalled this level. Curves plotted by engineers with the Michigan Department of Health indicate a little more rain or snow in the region, or a cooler summer with reduced evaporation, could have raised the levels of the lakes to similar heights two or three times additional to those recorded during that same period. Fortunately, the combination of natural phenomena did not occur and our people were spared the inevitable losses. But all the records and all the observations point to the conclusion that the high and destructive lake levels prevailing since 1948 and 1949 will be repeated at indefinite intervals in the future.

This being the case, Mr. Chairman, a final question comes to mind. What can be done to meet this recurring and accelerating hazard? Of all the authorities on lake levels, no organization is so well versed on this as the Corps of Engineers. They offer two lines of attack. Both deserve consideration. They compensate one another, but do not compete. Only one can be considered at this time. The other would involve the possibility of international action with our neighbor to the north—the Dominion of Canada. It consists of lowering the high stages of the lakes by permitting greater outflow. I mention it because it has been proposed by responsible officers of the Corps. However, it is not contemplated in H. R. 4470, and is outside the jurisdiction of this committee.

IMMEDIATE CONSTRUCTION DEMANDED

More imperative and at the same time more local is the Corps' recommendation that protective devices be constructed as rapidly as practicable. This is just what is contemplated in the bill before this committee. The bill is specific in that it proposes the possibility of Federal aid to the States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of the States in carrying out the ideas and recommendations of the Corps of Engineers. Basic to this is the assumption that the States, municipalities, and political subdivisions want to do something permanent and worthwhile, but that they need help.

In this regard I would remind you that the city of Chicago, whose 2d district I have the honor to represent, is already going far to meet the hazards created by the high lake levels. In the spring of 1952, at the height of the most recent onslaught from Lake Michigan, the city bonded itself in the amount of nearly $7 million to carry out the beginnings of a program with which to meet the problem. This has resulted in relocating some 4 miles of our Lake Shore Drive, and the expenditure of nearly a million dollars for structures designed to protect the shore from pounding waves resulting from the high-water levels. No one realizes better than the engineers connected with the city of Chicago, and those serving the nearby municipalities, that this is only a beginning. Much more remains to be done. More engineering structures must be constructed as the changing water levels make other shore properties vulnerable to wave attacks. And once constructed, they must be maintained. All of this costs money.

COSTLY RELOCATION OF TRACKS

During the first years of this current spell of high lake levels, the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad was forced to spend no less than $2½ million to relocate the tracks and protect the right-of-way of the road that serves Chicago and much of western Michigan. Similarly, costly projects were undertaken by the States and municipalities along the shore. As with the city of Chicago, these improvements must all be maintained and new ones planned if the taxpaying properties are to be adequately protected.

I opened this important discussion with a description of what has happened to the home of one of my constituents. That story could be duplicated dozens of times and it would still be limited to citizens who are residents of my congressional district. They are a small part, however, of those who have suffered losses. From Chicago to northern New York, where the waters of Lake Ontario enter the St. Lawrence River, and on down the river, property owners have found themselves face to face with similar situations. Individuals and corporations, municipalities and States throughout that entire area, and across on the shores of Canada, began in 1949 to install protective devices against the onslaughts of the high water. And as the high levels continued, many of them have continued their costly investments.

Fortunately for all concerned the Federal Government was reasonably quick to provide assistance. As early as May 1952, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation began making loans for repair of the damage, and the Corps of Engineers has been of invaluable service. But after nearly 6 years the situation remains imperative and many local political subdivisions are finding their responsibilities burdensome.

Reasons for prompt action

This, Mr. Chairman, brings me to direct consideration of the bill before this committee. Early enactment of H. R. 4470 will go far to encourage the States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of the States to construct the necessary seawalls and other structures to protect the shores. At the same time, it will relieve those same governmental groups from part of the oppressive burdens incident to their construction.

It will hasten the necessary planning of future structures for continuous protection of the lake shores. Planning of this sort is no less vital than the immediate work because of the probability that lake levels will again and again assume dangerous proportions. Such plans for the future assume greater and greater importance as the shore property values increase and as the population of our country grows.

By no means the least important consideration in this bill is the opportunity it provides for clarifying the responsibilities and cooperative possibilities of the Corps of Engineers, with particular reference to the United States Lake Survey. The history of the corps is a long record of service to the States. Under the impetus of this bill the corps can do even more to serve the several affected States and unify their programs. Thus, it will strengthen our internal defenses against the forces of nature.

These, Mr. Chairman, are but a few of the reasons why this bill deserves prompt approval and early enactment. As compared with the needs for comparable and concerted action to protect the shores of our great Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf of Mexico coasts, the needs of this interior "heartland of America" are relatively small. But they are not inconsequential. And together with those of our ocean fronts they present a combination of problems for whose solution concerted action is long overdue. I urge, therefore, that no time be lost in giving this bill the consideration that will permit this committee to approve it and recommend its early enactment by the Congress.

Shore Erosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1956, Representative EMANUEL CELLER and I submitted a statement to the House Committee on Public Works, which is presently holding hearings on the bills H. R. 3093 and H. R. 6205, which would amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property" so as to extend such aid to privately-owned property as well. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, the problem of the erosion of our beaches is not new. Some of our shores have been subject to continuous erosion throughout the period of recorded history. State and local governments have attempted to deal with the problem of erosion control. In the past years, however, it became abundantly clear that help from the Federal Government was necessary, and in 1946, a law was passed authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property. H. R. 3093 and H. R. 6205 would extend this aid to privately owned property as well.

Many of us remember the hurricane of 1938 and the storm of September 1944, but all of us well recall the storm of November 1953 and that veritable holocaust of hurricanes in 1954 and 1955—Carol, Edna, Hazel, Connie, and Diane. In each year following 1938, a substantial part of the budget of each of the villages that make up the Great South Bay of Long Island, had to be devoted to hurricane and erosion protection projects. Experience has demonstrated, however, that no community has the resources to furnish complete protection against the ravages of

the ocean and the destruction of storms. The exposed condition of these communities demonstrates beyond question the imperative, compelling necessity of immediate short-term protective measures, as well as a long-term program to preserve the existence of the beaches involved. The extremely short intervals between the hurricanes of 1954, caused shattering losses to public and private property. Before the debris of one storm could be cleared away, another followed, and successive evacuations from the communities had to be ordered by the Coast Guard. In computing losses, it was found to be impossible to distinguish between the damage caused by one storm as differentiated from another. Similar experiences were encountered during hurricanes Connie and Diane of 1955.

The problem continues inexorably. On Janauary 27, 1956, in the wake of the January storms, the Fire Island Erosion Control Committee stated as follows in a letter to the Suffolk County Board of Supervisors: "In view of the severe damage caused by recent storms, we wish to reiterate to the board the immediacy of our need for beach feeding and dune rebuilding if we are to prevent a catastrophe. Houses in several communities are now undermined and these properties, together with the houses behind them, are in danger of being destroyed in the next storm tide. There are several places where breakthroughs are imminent."

In any discussion of this area, it is important to consider the need for improvement of Fire Island Inlet. This inlet provides the only means for boats of reasonable draft to enter the Great South Bay. Commercial fishing vessels must make daily trips to and from the Atlantic Ocean via the inlet, and the skippers of these vessels have had to contend with the hazardous conditions encountered in the inlet as a result of the constant shoaling which has taken place during the last few years. It is difficult to tell the number of fishing men actually affected by Fire Island Inlet. A fair estimate of persons wholly or partially dependent upon fish and fish only, which are transported through the inlet, is well over 3,000 persons. While we are on the subject of these fishing vessels, it is well to remember that this fishing fleet was used in the defense of our country, as demonstrated during World War II. Because the Navy felt that these vessels could be advantageously used as an advance guard against enemy submarines, it supplied each vessel with sealed radio-telephones to be used if and when suspicious craft were sighted. In this manner the fishermen gave important information to the Coast Guard and the Navy, and in one case, one such ship saved some 20 persons from a watery grave when their cargo ship was torpedoed by the enemy.

Although we are not now involved in a shooting war and our hopes are pledged to continued peace, one look at the world situation and the menace posed by the Soviet Union, brings immediately to mind the problem of civil defense. If there were to be an attack on the metropolitan area of New York City, the Great South Bay area could care for evacuees by the thousands and give them shelter. But, if motor transportation were disrupted and railroads rendered impotent, it would be waterborne vehicles to which we would have to turn for supplies; medical, food, clothing, fuel, etc., and Fire Island Inlet is the entrance to the Great South Bay.

The south shore of Long Island is the only coastline enjoyed by the State of New York. Its natural advantages should be maintained, and it should be the responsibility of both the State and Federal Government to maintain all natural channels that can accommodate craft of any reasonable size, for the protection of life and property.

When speaking of Long Island, most people are inclined to overlook the fact that while the counties of Queens and Kings (coterminous with the Boroughs of Queens and Brooklyn) are wholly within the City of New York, they nevertheless geographically are also wholly within Long Island.

The same storms and the same ocean waters that cause damage along the southern shores of Long Island, which are part of Nassau-Suffolk Counties, also cause tremendous damage to Manhattan Beach, Brighton Beach, Coney Island, and Sea Gate. All of those places also are part of Long Island.

During World War II the United States Government maintained important military installations in Manhattan Beach and in Sea Gate. Large training stations were maintained in Manhattan Beach.

The United States Coast Guard maintained very important installations at Manhattan Beach.

Land based military installations, coast artillery gun emplacements and antisubmarine installations were maintained in Sea Gate because it is directly at the mouth of the entrance to New York Harbor. It provided military and defensive installations in aid of Fort Hamilton and Fort Wadsworth. It is a convenient line of direct communication with Fort Hamilton, which is across from it on Gravesend Bay, and with Fort Wadsworth, which is opposite it on the Narrows. The United States still maintains a radar and fire-control station in Sea Gate, as well as a lighthouse at Norton's Point in Sea Gate. All of these areas require the protection which this bill would help provide.

As is obvious from the above, it is impossible to separate, in consideration of the problem of erosion control, the losses incurred by publicly owned or privately owned property. Both are involved equally in the same storms. H. R. 3093 and H. R. 6205, and many other similar bills, recognized this fact in their provisions. Passage of this legislation is vital to our own national interest.

We appreciate the opportunity afforded to us by the committee to submit this statement in support of these bills.

Domestic Point 4 Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation before this Congress is the domestic point 4 bill principally sponsored by the senior Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS.

It is designed to focus the attention of Government on, and bring the resources of appropriate Federal agencies to the aid of, depressed areas left out of the "prosperity" which is being claimed for this Nation.

Cosponsors of S. 2663 are the senior Senator from West Virginia, Senator KILGORE; the senior Senator from Tennessee, Senator KEFAUVER; the junior Senator from Michigan, Senator MCNAMARA; the junior Senator from Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY; the junior Senator from West Virginia, Senator NEELY; the senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY; and the junior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY.

Two weeks ago, the senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY, the junior Senator from Montana, Senator MANSFIELD, and I wrote the senior Senator from Illinois. We suggested that his S. 2663 be amended to include Indian reservations, many of which have been depressed areas since the day they were established, others having comparatively recently come into that category.

Our letter and his reply follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1956.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: For many years we have been deeply concerned over the numerous complex problems facing American Indians, including, in particular, their acute poverty and lack of opportunity for advancement. As we see the situation, the economies of most reservations now are strained to the breaking point and simply cannot support our rapidly growing Indian population.

Our observations recently were corroborated by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, which stated in an interim report that as a cause of juvenile delinquency among Indians "the importance of the economic factors can scarcely be overemphasized."

The subcommittee recommended that an effort be made to improve economic conditions for Indians through a plan of relocation as well as a program of assistance to those who continue to reside on reservations. With regard to the latter, it was recommended, among other proposals, that a comprehensive loan program and a program to locate Federal and State work projects near Indian reservations be developed. In addition, Senators KEFAUVER and LANGER have introduced a bill, S. 2632, providing that the Secretary of Commerce conduct surveys to determine the feasibility of locating manufacturing plants near Indian reservations.

Upon studying your bill for the relief of depressed areas, S. 2663, we find that this measure proposes to extend to depressed areas generally the very types of assistance which have been suggested for Indian reservations. We find further that only two minor changes would have to be made in the text of S. 2663 in order to make certain that Indian reservations can qualify for its benefits.

The first change concerns section 7 of the bill, which deals with local industrial development committees. We are afraid that on many Indian reservations it will be difficult to find a group of citizens who could do the work envisaged for these committees without some assistance and guidance. It would seem to us, therefore, that a small group of experts could be attached to the staff of the Administrator who could pay periodic visits to Indian reservations to help the local committees. It may very well be that other depressed areas would be in need of similar assistance. It could, of course, be made clear that such expert help would be given only on request.

The second change which we would propose is in section 9 (b), on page 6, line 8. Following "(including municipalities)," we would add "Indian tribes."

Equally as important as making these minor changes in the bill, however, would be an effort to make the Bureau of Indian Affairs aware of the opportunities which S. 2663 offers. During recent years the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs has spoken a good deal about the possibilities of attracting industry to reservation areas. Thus far his efforts have been unsuccessful. Here, however, would be a chance to translate his words into action. We hope, therefore, that the Bureau of Indian Affairs will be asked by

your committee to testify on S. 2663 and to make suggestions on how the benefits of the bill can be extended to Indian reservations.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senator.
LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE,
February 14, 1956.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD.
Hon. LEE METCALF.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: May I thank you for your good letter of February 9, suggesting that the pending legislation to provide Federal assistance to depressed areas, S. 2663, might be amended to include Indian reservations among areas entitled to receive such assistance.

I believe your suggestions have definite merit and will discuss the question with the Subcommittee on Labor which is considering the bill.

We will, of course, be happy to invite the Bureau of Indian Affairs to present testimony on the bill with relation to possible aid for Indian reservations. At such a hearing, I would like to invite all of you to appear personally, or to present statements for the record. I am sure that the subcommittee would welcome the testimony of spokesmen of Indian interests, including, of course, members of particular tribes.

I appreciate deeply your interest in this problem and assure you of my desire to cooperate in every possible way in securing information to support the need for the amendments you have jointly proposed.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor.

Upper Colorado Project: Supreme Court Decision First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman from southern California, I deem it my duty to oppose the upper Colorado River project, not in a spirit of antagonism to my colleagues from that area, but in view of the threat which this project would constitute against more than a half-billon-dollar investment of the 27 cities in the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

We believe that a suit for clarification of the meaning of the Colorado River compact, which is now before the Supreme Court of the United States, should be settled before further diversion of water is authorized by Congress.

Once that clarification is made I am sure that no southern California Congressman would object to feasible projects in either the southern or northern compact States. Of course all such projects should be justified on an economic basis.

The project would critically impair operations at Hoover Dam and lose $187 million in revenues to the Federal Treasury.

During the 25-year period of filling the dams contemplated by the bill, firm power output at Hoover Dam would be reduced by 25 percent. Secondary energy would be wiped out entirely. This shortage would cost the lower basin about 200 additional millions of dollars for replacement power and cost the Federal Treasury about $187 million in lost revenues.

To say the least, this is a strange power policy for the Federal Government to follow. First it builds Hoover Dam on the lower reaches of the Colorado River. The power can be produced very cheaply so the Secretary of the Interior enters into contracts to sell certain quantities of power at rates of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour and less. Then the Federal Government builds additional dams upstream. Here power cannot be produced so cheaply. But in order to generate power at these upstream dams to be sold at 6 mills, it cuts back the production of 2-mill power at Hoover Dam, which is already constructed and operating efficiently. This is Government waste with a vengeance.

Essentially, the Colorado River storage project implies the destruction or impairment of 25 percent of the value of the Boulder Canyon project to help make possible the construction of a new project upstream, to furnish power at over twice the cost and water at several times the cost of that which would be taken away from the lower basin, in violation of the covenant of the Government in the Boulder Canyon Project Act and in the power and water contracts made under that act.

Moreover, the Federal Government will be in breach of solemn contractual obligations if it curtails energy output at Hoover by intercepting water for creating powerheads at the upstream dams. The project may not legally impound water for power purposes if needed to generate electrical energy at the lower basin dams. If the Federal Government breaches its contracts with power contractees in the lower basin by cutting back power deliveries at Hoover Dam, it will be subject to suit for hundreds of millions of dollars in damages.

The National Guard: An American Institution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an address delivered by me before the annual convention conference of the Louisiana National Guard held in the city of Shreveport, La., Saturday, February 18, 1956. I am told that the National Guard is causing this to be printed but in the meantime I am extending this in the RECORD:

Gentlemen, I am extremely pleased that you have given me the opportunity to come here and talk to you about the National Guard. It is not only a privilege for me to participate with you at this convention—it is an honor. I say this because it is an honor for any American to be associated with an organization that is so close to the heart of the people of our Nation. I feel a close kinship to the National Guard, inasmuch as I am the senior Democratic member of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives—and as such, I am in almost daily contact with officers and members of the National Guard Association, and I am continually working upon National Guard problems and legislation.

Our country would not be so great, its people would not be free, if it were not for the guard's proud record of service for over 300 years. And the Louisiana National Guard has played its full and valiant part in that record. The Louisiana Guard's participation has been earned the hard way—not only on the battlefronts around the world but in its service to our State.

In all the wars that have been fought by this country, the struggles have been won because they were backed up by the fighting sinews of the American people. The military muscles that packed the invincible wallop was in large part made up of National Guard troops. And, an important part of these troops have been the officers and men of the Louisiana National Guard. I know of no other organization in the country that hews closer to the line of American beliefs, that is dedicated more completely to American principles, than our own National Guard.

Today, with all our military forces taking new or expanded roles, both at home and around the world, it is important to understand the background and aims of America's oldest military organization. This is especially true since, more than any other military component, the guard is vested with the deep personal pride of our communities. It is supported by local effort, encouraged by the tradition of our home States, and staffed with officers and men who are friends and neighbors.

In front of the Archives Building in Washington there is a stone statue and at the base of this statue is an inscription which reads, "What is past is prologue." It is true that the Washington taxicab driver has interpreted this to mean, "You ain't seen nothing yet." I have never read this inscription, "What is past is prologue," without pondering the wisdom of its full meaning. It is simply that we must look to the past to get an indication of what the future has in store for us. It is, therefore, important that we remember the history of the guard, for by remembering its history we can gain an impression of its future.

Actually, the National Guard is older than the Nation. It antedates the Revolutionary War and the Constitution. The oldest regiment in the United States is the 182d Infantry of the Massachusetts National Guard, which was organized as a Middlesex County Militia in 1636. Such early patriots as Paul Revere were active members of the Massachusetts Militia, a forerunner of our own National Guard. I think that we should continually reacquaint ourselves with the long evolution through 175 years of our history which has slowly resulted in the general acceptance of the philosophy first expounded by George Washington, that we need on a continuing basis, a relatively small, able, standing regular establishment backed by a militant and trained organization of civilian volunteers.

George Washington recognized the need for the militia. He planned an organization composed of the younger men of the

community, who should be properly officered and periodically trained under uniform supervision.

The debates during the Constitutional Convention reflect the widespread fears of large standing armies. The Constitution finally adopted was therefore a compromise in this field. A standing army was provided, but so was a militia. It was to be organized, armed and disciplined (that is to say, trained) by Congress, but, except when in Federal service was to be governed by the States. The President was made Commander in Chief of the Army, and of the militia—but only after it was in the Federal service.

Furthermore, when the Bill of Rights was made a part of the Constitution, the militia was protected by the second amendment, which reads:

"A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

The first militia law was enacted in 1792. It was the only permanent legislation for the militia existing for over a century. Under that law, every ablebodied man between 18 and 45 was enrolled in the militia and required to arm and equip himself at his own expense. In that year, also, the Congress provided by statute for the calling forth of the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions. It was under this law that the Whiskey Insurrection was quelled by the militia. It was the only campaign in American history to be led by the President in person.

In 1903, the Congress enacted the Dick Act, which organized the militia to be known as the National Guard; and in 1916 the National Defense Act provided the backbone of Federal legislation pertaining to the National Guard.

And so the efforts and faith placed in the National Guard, and our own Louisiana Guard, proved to be invaluable when the end product was tested by fire. The record of the guard in all of the wars of our history—in both world wars, and more recently in the Korean emergency, fills many pages in our Nation's history.

Now speaking of the guard as a whole, I want to remind you that in 1917 the guard furnished 18 divisions to the country, composed of some 380,000 guardsmen who served in that war. They won honors and distinction in every battle. As a matter of fact, the German General Staff recorded for posterity its opinion of allied forces. It rated 8 American divisions superior or excellent, and mark you, 6 of those 8 were guard divisions.

We hardly have to turn back the clock to show the contribution of the National Guard to our victory in World War II. At this time, the guard gave 19 divisions to the country. Ten were in action in the Pacific, 9 were in Europe. Other nondivisional guard units were in service in every major theater of the war.

At the end of World War II, the most important step in the history of the National Guard was taken. The guard was completely demobilized. All enlistments had expired during the war and all equipment had been diverted to Federal use. In fact, there was no National Guard. But this was far from the end of the citizen army. Rather, it was only the beginning. Immediate plans were begun for the formation of the new National Guard—a guard that would carry on the traditions of the service—would be geared to play a more vital role in our national defense. The new guard was given a vital M-day mission of immediate action in case of aggression and was made a first-line integral part of our defense team.

Starting with a personnel list that totaled zero, in a little over 4 years the new National Guard built an organization of more than 400,000 officers and men, in over 5,000 units strategically located in the 48 States, Territories, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

You all know what happened when Korea broke. The President knew where to turn when he needed trained and ready manpower. He called forth the guard and the guard responded as it always has done when the Nation needed help—in war or peace. More than 2,000 units and 150,000 guardsmen were ordered into service and performed a magnificent task.

Thus far, I have only touched on the guard's record of service in war and I would be remiss if I failed to mention its peacetime State service. This 100 percent organization is always ready to give help to fellow citizens when help is most needed. And again, using the past as a basis for an impression of the future—a future which may bring atomic war to our homeland—it is well that we remember the functions of the National Guard at home.

Wherever disaster strikes—wherever life and property are threatened, you will find the National Guard an immediately available force in all of the States—trained, equipped, and ready. Yesterday it may have been an explosion at Texas City—a hurricane in Florida—starving cattle in the Midwest. It may be a flood along the Mississippi, a tornado, a forest fire, or an epidemic. Whatever it is, wherever it occurs, the National Guard is there to help reenforce a levee, to set up emergency communications, to evacuate and care for refugees, to patrol and guard stricken areas.

It is not only for this devastation, caused by man or nature, but because of the possibility of sudden, dreadful atomic warfare brought to our own communities that we must look to the guard in the future. For the guard has the organized manpower, equipment, and facilities for such emergencies. It has the communications, the blankets, tools, medical supplies. It has the aircraft, trucks, boats; it has the tents and all that is necessary to save lives and relieve suffering. The National Guard is always ready to serve.

There have been many attempts to destroy the guard as we know it today. Nearly all of these attempts have been made by attempting to reorganize this citizen volunteer army, and, for all intents and purposes, to make of it the National Guard of the United States, under Federal control. All of these attempts have met with failure, and if this monster rears it ugly head in the future, the Congress must see that any plan which advocates the federalization of the National Guard is defeated.

I will remind you that, among other arguments, there is a moral issue involved here. The framers of the Constitution deliberately subordinated the military to civilian control. The military must serve the people, not be served by the people, and for a very good reason. History is filled with the dangers inherent in building a military monster at the expense of the civilian population. You have but to look to Germany and Japan for the most recent examples of the disasters that befall a nation when military power replaces civilian authority.

And would the creation of a federalized National Guard violate the principle of States rights? I say that it certainly would. The framers of the Constitution contemplated a standing army as the only Federal force. Complete federalization would violate the principle upon which the States bargained when deciding upon the provisions of the Constitution, by giving to the Federal Government, in addition to its standing army, a militia over which the States would have no power or control whatever. Nowhere in the Constitution is there any power given to the Federal Government to do other than raise and support armies—and only standing armies were contemplated. There is no authority to raise and support a Federal militia.

The Governors of each State have the right to commission the officers of the National Guard. They have control over the guard. I recall very definitely during the course of the Congress last year that I stood on the floor of the House and battled the vicious and insidious efforts to completely federalize the guard in time of peace by those more interested in politics than in our national defense. The guard constitutes a citadel of States' rights. It is one of the checks and balances provided by our Constitution to maintain States' rights. It is the one military organization in our country which in time of crisis will be available to prevent military usurpation or military dictatorship, which pray God may never come to this land.

To federalize the guard would place all military power in the Central Government—a mistake made by our friends and neighbors in Central and South America and often resulting in the overthrow of civilian government in those countries.

Last year we met with an early defeat in the Congress when we were battling efforts of selfish interest to expand Federal controls so as to take over completely our State-controlled National Guard. Later I presented another bill to Congress to provide for our military reserves and our National Guard, and, after terrific efforts, we were victorious, and the National Guard remains today, as it has remained during its 300 years of history, still under State control.

Today America faces an emergency unique in our history. This is not the first time that a potential danger threatens our land; but it is the first time that war could come to our country swiftly and devastatingly by guided missiles and by atomic weapons delivered by jet aircraft.

I want to make myself clearly understood. I do not say that war is imminent; but we cannot overlook the fact that danger exists. This is true because of Russia and of a coalition of armed totalitarian states which continue to create tenseness that maintains the world in a state of uneasy peace. This is true despite the meetings at the summit and Russian smiles and handshakes. It is true despite the release of prisoners by Russia and Red China, the offer of a propaganda peace treaty, the return of a Finnish naval base wrongfully seized and other seemingly peaceful overtures.

Our country has a long history of being misled by such apparently kind actions. In my opinion, we must again look to the past and realize that our natural desire for peace has often closed our eyes to the facts of the present. So long as Russia, Red China, and their satellites continue to trouble the world by propaganda and infiltration—so long as these nations remain armed to the teeth—then free nations have no choice but to look to their own security.

Of course, I don't want to leave the impression that we are without adequate defenses at the present time. Our active forces are the largest we have ever had in times short of actual war. They are in a high state of readiness and are equipped with the latest weapons, but, because we cannot ever know the detailed plans of the Communist dictators, we cannot precisely gage their intentions. It would be folly, therefore, if we overlooked a single area of our defenses which should be strengthened in planning against the possibility of a surprise attack.

During the last 17 years, I have sponsored practically every bit of legislation which has passed our Congress having for its purpose the building up of our military Reserves and our National Guard. I am proud of the fact that almost every one of these bills were introduced by me. The latest measure, of course, was the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, which passed the Congress last year after the bitterest battle in the Congress. This bill seeks to provide for far better training and

for higher standards for our National Guard and our military Reserves. Enemies of national defense and misguided reformers fought us from all sides. Hardly had the bill been signed by the President before these same forces which had made an all-out effort in the Congress to wreck this legislation, began to proclaim its failure. Within 20 days after the law had gone into effect, I read speeches reported in the press and received letters from people condemning the act because of its inadequacy and saying that it would not work. Recently, I heard a radio address by our own Chief of Staff of the Army, in which he stated the draft would be necessary because of the failure of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 to produce the number desired.

We have heard witnesses before my committee—the Armed Services Committee—in the Congress, testify about our military Reserves and our National Guard as to how this program is working. I placed figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to show how the program is working under the new act—I tell you today that the act is working and that the results thus far have been most encouraging. If the entire act were implemented as of today, I am satisfied the National Guard and the active portion of our Army Reserve would in a short time exceed 700,000 men, and these men, outside of some of the guard members, would have the benefit of active training in the regular establishment followed by an active period of training in the Reserves.

This Nation must have an adequate force of trained civilian manpower. Without it, we will have no organized Reserve strength. Find me a military expert who will seriously argue against the concept of the properly balanced defense forces—land, sea, and air, all with strong citizen volunteer Reserve units, together with a strong supporting economy. You will look in vain.

What we need is a flexible and dynamic program, taking full advantage of our native genius for mechanics, and based on a healthy, expanding economy. This country will never subject its citizens to a subhuman living standard in order to maintain a vast military structure which devours the productive wealth of an entire nation. This is a practice in which the present rulers of Russia and Red China excel. We can answer the threat to our security implied in their enormous military machines by continuing to make our active forces the finest anywhere, and by backing them up with a strong and potent Reserve and National Guard—one that is able to move into action swiftly.

Our Reserve installation program is moving forward nicely at the present time. Several years ago we provided $250 million for the purpose of building armories and air installations for our guard and our Reserves. This money has been expended; and only recently we provided an additional $250 million to continue this program. I am pleased to report to you that the program is now approaching the point that we can soon say it is one-half completed. To provide the matching funds for the States for guard armories and the money needed for the Reserve armories, we will require a total of $1 billion. While we have had some trouble in obtaining the release of some of this money by the executive department after it has been appropriated, I can say that the Congress is enthusiastically behind this program of providing installations for guard and Reserve training.

The Farrington bill to allow certain employees of the National Guard to enter State-operated retirement systems is a good bill and should pass the Congress. It will give retirement advantages to some 24,000 employees of the National Guard throughout the country.

Another measure pending in the Congress is a bill to provide readjustment pay to guard and Reserve officers who have served a time on active duty and who are returned to inactive duty through no fault of their own and without their request. This measure should, in my judgment, be extended to cover enlisted men in the same status. In this event it will provide the needed financial assistance to enable them to readjust themselves in civilian life when their active-duty period is terminated.

And now, let me speak briefly of the history of Louisiana's Militia, now the Louisiana National Guard. This history dates back more than 200 years.

When the first colony of New Orleans in the Province of Louisiana was established by France in 1717, Governor Bienville found it necessary to call upon a local militia to assist the inadequate garrison of French troops required to preserve the peace and security of the colony.

When Napoleon Bonaparte reclaimed Louisiana from Spain in 1803 and then almost immediately sold the vast territory to the United States, it was the militia, called the volunteer battalion and consisting of well over 300 American and French citizen soldiers, which was called upon to take over at New Orleans until the arrival of United States troops. At the Place d'Armes in New Orleans marking the official transfer of Louisiana from France to America, this volunteer battalion stood at attention as the Fleur de Lis of France was replaced by the Stars and Stripes of the United States.

On October 6, 1814, the Governor of Louisiana received from the President of the United States orders to hold in readiness for immediate service a corps of 1,000 militia infantry.

This regiment of 1,000 was divided into 2 battalions which were organized and equipped without delay, and 9 days later Gen. Andrew Jackson asked Governor Claiborne for this entire force.

In the memorable Battle of New Orleans in 1815 the forces of Jean Lafitte and his pirates joined with the Regulars and the militia in routing the British.

A regiment of Louisiana Militia Infantry was among those units participating with General Taylor's forces in Texas in 1846, which action finally drove all the Mexican forces out of the Lone Star State.

At the beginning of the War Between the States, newly organized units of the Louisiana Militia were soon on the field of battle. The units of the Louisiana Militia have gone down in history. Do you remember these? The Washington Artillery, Louisiana Grays, Louisiana Cadets, Sarsfield Rifles, Orleans Cadets, Crescent Rifles, and the Zouaves to name only a few.

Many of these famed companies such as the Washington Artillery fought with honor and distinction from Bull Run in 1861 to Appomattox in 1865.

Upon the declaration of war with Spain in 1898, Louisiana Militia units were among the first to respond to President McKinley's call for volunteers.

Following the war with Spain, the Louisiana Militia was reorganized and largely as a result of excellent training and equipment received thereafter the Louisiana Guard was among the first called upon when President Wilson called General Pershing to command a punitive expedition on the Mexican border against Pancho Villa.

Even before the declaration of hostilities in World War I, the Louisiana National Guard went into action. The Washington Artillery was called out a week before the declaration of war to patrol both facilities and the levees at New Orleans.

Troops of the Louisiana National Guard thereafter served in eight major campaigns in France from Luneville to the Meuse-Argonne.

Again in World War II, the Louisiana National Guard responded to a call to duty and its units served with distinction in both Europe and the Pacific.

What was once considered to be our favorable geographic location now has become meaningless. Today, distance between potential enemies has literally been annihilated. Ocean barriers and distance vanished as protective factors with the arrival of the intercontinental jet bomber. Today war could come to us unannounced, traveling on the wings of supersonic speed. If such a war ever does come upon us, we will be courting disaster if we cannot mobilize effectively and relatively smoothly. In the shock of such a conflict, we would not have time for picking and choosing our way to readiness. We must be as close to 100 percent ready as we can get—without being on a full wartime footage.

In terms of today, we require a clear understanding, once and for all, that we shall never again have an opportunity to take our time in mobilizing. Time may well become the key to this Nation's survival. Both our manpower and our industrial power must be geared to this fact. As the first line of national defense, the National Guard must be supported by all of our efforts. We must make sufficient appropriations available so it will not lack in equipment or facilities. And as I have said, we must continue with our education of the American youth so that volunteers for the Guard will not be wanting.

When I come back to my home State and meet with the members of the Louisiana Nation Guard, when I travel to other parts of the country and visit with other National Guard members and, above all, when I recall the glorious history of the National Guard, I have no fear for the future of America. What is past is prologue.

California's Opposition to Upper Colorado Boondoggle Based on Protection of Her Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a football field is slightly more than an acre of ground. Cover it a foot deep with water and you would have about an acre-foot of water. Cover it with a tower of water 11,000 miles high, and you have an idea of the amount of water parched southern California will lose if the upper Colorado Basin storage project is built as now planned.

Imagine a canal wide enough and deep enough to float the world's biggest ship, the Navy's new aircraft carrier *Forrestal*. Imagine that canal stretching from New York City to Los Angeles. During just 1 year, enough of the Colorado River's water to fill it could be stopped from flowing downstream at the project's gigantic Glen Canyon Dam.

That is water that could not be used by southern California, Arizona, and Nevada because it would be withheld upstream and never reach them.

All this is true because the multibillion-dollar project is designed to put approximately 48 million acre-feet of water in storage behind dams in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Another 10 million acre-feet of water

would be dissipated into thin air by evaporation during storage. The bill before this Congress seeks to authorize a substantial portion of the overall project. Authorization of additional phases would be sought later.

In all, 58 million acre-feet of water would not flow down the Colorado River from the upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado to the lower basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California.

Yet so vital is this water in the lower basin that even today arid Arizona and California are before the United States Supreme Court litigating their rights to it.

California agrees that the upper basin is entitled to use some of that 58 million acre-feet, but contends that most of it must be left flowing down to the lower basin under provisions of a solemn contract entered into by these seven States in 1922 known as the Colorado River compact.

California's basic position is that she conforms to the compact and must insist that the States of the upper basin and the Federal Government do likewise in the planning and administration of the storage project. California thus is fighting only to preserve rights to water she already has and not for any new and additional water rights.

Relying on these existing rights, California carefully invested between one-half and three-quarter billion dollars of local money, not Federal money, for water projects calculated to make maximum use of her share of the Colorado River. Thereby, southern California was transformed from a semidesert into an oasis constituting one of the Nation's key economic and agricultural regions, supporting millions who migrated to her borders from less hospitable climates.

As southern California continues to grow, her need for water becomes greater, not less. Should the bleak day ever come when her Colorado River water supply is cut off, on that day the jobs of the millions she supports will vanish and the value of everything they own that cannot be transported to another part of the country will be lost completely and forever.

That is why Californians in Congress are fighting so hard to prevent spending billions from the United States Treasury to build the upper Colorado project in such a manner as merely to transport the oasis of southern California to Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. In the process, financial ruin would be imposed on almost 6 million southern Californians. These States can plan their projects without this disastrous result and California demands that they do so.

The reason they have failed so far to do it is clear. To find a common ground for agreement amongst themselves, each of the upper basin States had to accept every project, good, bad, or indifferent, any of the others asked for. They ended up with a monstrosity that did not fit the interpretations and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Rather than recede, they adopted a technique of twisting, straining, and distorting the compact in an attempt to stretch it over the monstrosity.

The reason they have adopted this technique is not so clear. To understand it requires some knowledge of the Colorado River compact and the situation that produced it.

Early in this century southern California already had begun its miraculous expansion in population, agriculture, and industry. A water shortage was faced, and Los Angeles began reaching up into the Owens Valley for water to be transported through an aqueduct over 100 miles long. Even then, men of vision foresaw water needs beyond those satiable from the Owens Valley and began talk of more ambitious plans—plans which one day would result in such great works as Hoover Dam, Davis and Parker Dams, the All-American Canal, and the Metropolitan Water District's vast Colorado River aqueduct with its extensions reaching even as far as San Diego.

Meanwhile the upper-basin States were experiencing little growth or progress. A Supreme Court decision had laid down a rule of law respecting use of river waters which said that whoever first begins using them obtains a right to continued use that cannot be taken away by someone who later wants to use the same water. The upper States foresaw burgeoning southern California acquiring first rights to almost all the river's water before they were able to appropriate uses themselves.

In this circumstance, according to the language of Delph Carpenter, Colorado's negotiator of the compact:

> The upper States had but one alternative, that of using every means to retard development in the lower States until the uses within the upper States have reached their maximum.

And that exactly is what they did. The Boulder Canyon Project Act authorizing Hoover Dam was stalled in Congress for almost 10 years by the obstructive tactics of upper-basin Senators and Congressmen. It was passed only after tribute had been extracted from California and the lower basin in the following manner:

First, imposing the Colorado River compact, which removed at least 7½ million acre-feet of water from appropriation by them; and

Second, requiring the California Legislature to pass a law further limiting the amount of water to which the State could acquire first rights.

The net effect was to place on California a limit of slightly less than 5½ million acre-feet of water per year that she could use. Thus limited, the State had to jettison many desirable projects. Nevertheless, California went to work and tailored her developments on the river strictly to the limitations and to the intent and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Even with only a portion of the great dreamed-of projects built, no place in time or history has experienced developments of water resources comparable in scope and magnificance to those of southern California.

It is the water rights which underlie those developments that Californians seek to protect when they oppose the upper Colorado River storage project and charge that it tramples these rights.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, who amidst the shifting sands of time standest sure and whose throne is forever steadfast, though often obscured by earthborn clouds, from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God. O Thou Light that followest all our way, we would yield to Thee the flickering torch of our doubts, our fears, our willfulness, and our moral failure. At this high altar in the temple of public service, maintain in us, we beseech Thee, fidelity to our possible best, knowing that of those to whom much has been given much will be required. Lift us to greatness to match these days. In Thy providence may this dear land of liberty, with all its privilege and power, be the quarry whence shall be fashioned the white stones of a new order whose alabaster cities shall gleam undimmed by human want and woe. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 20, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2286) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of certain personnel of the Department of Defense, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 101. An act relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 2108. An act to repeal certain laws relating to professional examinations for

promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 2111. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to cause to be published official registers for their respective services;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 5862. An act to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation;

H. R. 6643. An act to amend the reclamation laws to provide that excess lands acquired by foreclosure or inheritance may receive water temporarily for 5 years;

H. R. 6904. An act to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; and

H. R. 8710. An act to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 101. An act relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 6643. An act to amend the reclamation laws to provide that excess lands acquired by foreclosure or inheritance may receive water temporarily for 5 years; and

H. R. 6904. An act to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2108. An act to repeal certain laws relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 2111. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to cause to be published official registers for their respective services; and

H. R. 8710. An act to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5862. An act to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Security of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY THE COAST GUARD IN EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts executed or negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, by the Coast Guard, for the period July 1, 1955, through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF AUDIT OF SONS OF UNION VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR

A letter from the commander in chief, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Ridgewood, N. J., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of audit of that organization, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRAINING OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AT PUBLIC OR PRIVATE FACILITIES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, within recent days the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of both the House and the Senate have held hearings on the subject of transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I have received many petitions relating to this subject, signed by literally thousands of people in my State.

A few days ago I received a petition from one of the outstanding citizens of Birmingham, Mrs. J. E. Dillard, with a relatively short list of signers, but including some of the most outstanding citizens of the Birmingham area.

I ask unanimous consent that the petition and list of names be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increase the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

Mrs. J. E. Dillard, L. Frazer Banks, R. H. Hurlbert, Mrs. L. M. Gunter, C. V. Swindle, Dorothy Phillips, Mrs. E. L. McRee, Mrs. H. W. Wilkins, Mrs. H. G. Jahnsey, Mrs. J. D. Williams, Mrs. W. K. Wilson, Mrs. Nancy M. Stover, Mrs. Wm. C. Brannan, Mrs. J. L. Guyton, Mrs. Walter J. Bryant, Mrs. J. B. Sansing, Mrs. W. H. Sharp, Edgar Keenon, Mrs. T. P. Chapple, Mrs. J. H. Tribble, Mrs. Fred O. Key, Mrs. Hayden McCain, Mrs. J. M. Breckenridge, Mrs. Robert D. Elby, Mrs. John B. Vaughn, Jr., Mrs. Anita P. Murphy, Cynthia Rice, Jane M. Palmer, Mrs. John Blakely, May Grace Douglas, Estele Whorton, Katie C. Williams, Lucille Rucker, Mrs. J. A. Tower, Birmingham.

RESOLUTIONS OF TRUCK-TRAILER MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the Truck-Trailer Manufacturers' Association at Edgewater Park, Miss., favoring the construction of an atom-powered trailership and the enactment of legislation to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION III, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 8289

Whereas a bill, H. R. 8289, calling for the Federal Government to construct an atom-powered trailership, as requested by the President of the United States in his annual state of the Union message, has been introduced in the Congress by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, State of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas the mission of this trailership would be to cruise the ports of the world and demonstrate to peoples in foreign countries the peacetime applications of atomic energy being developed in the United States; and

Whereas this exhibition ship would be constructed as a trailership, with exhibits housed in truck trailers that could be ramped ashore or aboard at any port, regardless of port facilities; and

Whereas the membership of the Truck-Trailer Manufacturers' Association views this proposal as a powerful, positive force for maintaining world peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Truck-Trailer Manufacturers' Association, assembled this 25th day of 1956 in Edgewater Park, Miss., for their 15th annual convention, do hereby respectfully urge Members of Congress to lend their support to H. R. 8289.

RESOLUTION IV, IN SUPPORT OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Whereas the Hoover Commission has made a diligent study of economy in the Federal Government; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission's 18 specific reports contain 314 recommendations that can be put into effect in part through administrative and in part through congressional action; and

Whereas the functioning of our Government will be strengthened by the adoption of these recommendations; and

Whereas the moneys saved through the economies recommended by the Hoover Commission can be used either to reduce the national debt, provide the basis for a downward adjustment of taxes, or for needed improvements such as highways, schools, and other desirable public works: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the wish of the Truck-Trailer Manufacturers' Association, assembled at Edgewater Park, Miss., this 25th day of January 1956, that various recommendations of the Hoover Commission be adopted by either administrative action, when possible, and by congressional action, when required.

ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL—RESOLUTION OF ALASKA BOARD OF HEALTH

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Alaska Board of Health, Juneau, Alaska, favoring the enactment of the so-called Alaska mental health bill.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY ALASKA BOARD OF HEALTH RE H. R. 6376 (ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL)

Whereas the Alaska Board of Health is deeply and vitally concerned with the health problems of the Territory; and

Whereas the Federal Government, under the organic act of the Territory, is responsible for the care and treatment of the mentally ill in Alaska; and

Whereas the commitment and hospitalization procedures now in use are dangerously antiquated; and

Whereas the Alaska Department of Health, the Alaska Legislature, and the peoples of the Territory have demonstrated their desire for corrective legislation from Congress; and

Whereas there is now a bill before Congress, H. R. 6376, providing for the establishment of modern legal commitment and hospitalization procedures; administration of the act, and gradual assumption of financial responsibility for the mental health program, by the Territorial government; and provision for the construction and equipping of hospital and related facilities; and

Whereas this bill will authorize Alaska to administer her own mental health programs: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Alaska Board of Health urges that this legislation, so badly needed, be passed and approved without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of health directs the commissioner of health to forward copies of this resolution to the Department of Justice, Department of the Interior, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Governor of Alaska, Delegate E. L. BARTLETT, Bureau of the Budget, and each Senator and Representative of the 84th Congress concerned.

Adopted at Juneau, Alaska, board of health meeting, October 12, 1955.

ASA MARTIN, M. D.,
Chairman, Member, Third Division.
A. B. PHILLIPS,
Member First Division.
BYRON A. GILLAM,
Member, Fourth Division.
A. J. SCHAIBLE, M. D.,
Member-at-Large.

RESOLUTIONS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DENTAL SOCIETY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I present, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the New Hampshire Dental Society, relating to appropriations for the National Institute of Dental Research.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DENTAL SOCIETY

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the amount of money allotted for dental research has in the past been inadequate; and

Whereas the funds recommended for the next year by the Bureau of the Budget for the National Institute of Dental Research is less than 2½ percent of the money recommended for general health research; and

Whereas the incidence of dental disease is almost universal: Be it

Resolved, That the amount of Federal funds allotted to dental research be increased to an amount in keeping with its importance.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas the present quarters for the Dental Research Institute is greatly overcrowded; and

Whereas the Congress authorized the construction of a Dental Research Building 8 years ago; and

Whereas funds for such a building have not been appropriated: Be it

Resolved, That sufficient funds be appropriated for the construction of a National Institute of Dental Research Building.

DR. FLOYD E. WILLIAMS,
Secretary.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM—RESOLUTIONS FROM MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 31, 1956, I placed in the RECORD a list of county officials in all parts of Minnesota who had sent me resolutions regarding the urgent need for a comprehensive, large-scale, and long-term highway program. I wish to add to this list five additional resolutions I have received endorsing Federal-aid highway legislation during this session of Congress.

Three of these resolutions, from the Moorhead Chamber of Commerce, and the Koochiching and Cottonwood County Boards of Commissioners, specifically endorse the Gore bill, S. 1048, or the Fallon bill, S. 8836.

Two other resolutions, from Lac qui Parle County Board and Mower County Board, do not specifically support any bill, but do urge an expanded highway construction program on National, State, and local levels. A similar resolution has been received from the Owatonna, Minn., Central Labor Union, and the Village Council of Rothsay, Minn.

PRICE SUPPORTS ON HONEY—EXCERPTS FROM RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, four excerpts from resolutions passed by the American Beekeeping Federation, Inc., of Cannon Falls, Minn., endorsing legislation necessary to maintain price supports on honey at their present level.

There being no objection, the excerpts were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

10

Be it resolved, That the American Beekeeping Federation in convention assembled this 26th day of January 1956, recognizing the great need for research in the marketing of honey, petition the proper United States Department of Agriculture officials regarding the establishment of a research program on honey marketing and refer this matter to the council for their approval and support.

11

Whereas since the parity price of honey has gradually decreased during the past few years, the members of the American Beekeeping Federaiton in order to maintain the same monetary level of the price support received for honey, do hereby instruct their officers to petition the proper officials of the United States Department of Agriculture to support honey at the rate of 80 percent of parity.

12

Since the marketing pattern of west coast and intermountain honey has changed during the past few years, thus making the price differential between eastern and western honey in the United States Department of Agriculture support price program unnecessary: Be it

Resolved, That the American Beekeeping Federation in convention assembled this 26th day of January 1956, go on record as favoring the discontinuance of this price differential and furthermore, that the officers of this organization be instructed to petition the proper United States Department of Agriculture authorities concerning the removal of this differential.

14

Whereas the export-subsidy program for honey has been of inestimable value in the removal of surplus honey in the past: Be it

Resolved, That the officers of this organization be instructed to petition the proper United States Department of Agriculture officials for the reinstatement of this program, when and if a surplus of honey is apparent and further that the program contain restrictions providing for restrictions to prevent speculation.

FOREST HYDROLOGIC LABORATORY, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League, giving their support for the establishment in Minnesota of a Forest Hydrologic Laboratory.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED OCTOBER 14, 1955, AT THE ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION OF THE MINNESOTA DIVISION OF THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FOREST HYDROLOGIC LABORATORY

Whereas the importance of scientific knowledge is fundamental to the proper and wise use of the forest and water resources of Minnesota; and

Whereas research to determine the relation of forest cover to the availability, quality, and quantity of water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural use is lacking and can be obtained only by initiating a broad and comprehensive research program; and

Whereas Minnesota is the headquarters of a nationally and regionally recognized research organization, the Lake States Forest Experiment Station: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Izaak Walton League of America, the Minnesota Division, endorses the need for the establishment of a Forest Hydrologic Laboratory in Minnesota; and that the League take the initiative in urging Federal and State financial support for such a laboratory to be established in Minnesota by the Lake States Forest Experiment Station.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT RELATING TO RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Agra Lite Cooperative of Benson, Minn., expressing their opposition to the enactment by the Congress of any legislation that would carry out, in whole or in part, any of the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission Report, as it pertains to the Rural Electrification Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Hoover Commission Report, as it pertains to REA, advocates drastic changes in the existing law which governs the relationship between the United States Government and borrowers that qualify to borrow money from the Government as provided in the Rural Electrification Act; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of this board of directors, representing nearly 4,000 farmer members, that the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission Report for changes in the Rural Electrification Act are inimical to the future welfare of the rural-electrification program and will, if adopted, create a financial burden upon borrowers which would result in their eventual financial failure; and

Whereas rural electric cooperatives and other qualified borrowers, will long need the security afforded by their present ability to borrow money on a long term basis at a relatively low rate of interest in order to carry out the obligation placed on them by Congress to adequately supply electric power to rural residents: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of Agra Lite Cooperative hereby express their complete opposition to the enactment of any legislation by the Congress that would carry out, in whole or in part, any of the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission Report as it pertains to the Rural Electrification act; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, and that they be requested to firmly oppose any legislation that may be introduced which shall be designed to revise the Rural Electrification Act in any way as recommended in the Hoover Commission Report.

EXTENSION OF SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the board of managers of the Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., endorsing the school milk program, and recommending the extension of the program through June 30, 1958.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE MINNESOTA CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, INC., AT THEIR MEETING JANUARY 23, 24, 1956

Resolved, That the Congress make immediately available sufficient additional funds to insure full reimbursement for the entire fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to all schools participating in the widely accepted special school milk program; further

Resolved, That Congress extend the life of the special school milk program through June 30, 1958, increasing the present yearly appropriation from 50 to 75 million dollars; further

Resolved, That the proposed $83 million appropriation for the national school lunch program is woefully inadequate in the light of increased participation: on prevailing food and labor costs and recommend an increase to $130 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

EXPANDED FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—STATEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a statement issued by the Minnesota Department of Highways on the importance to Minnesota of an expanded Federal aid highway program.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT RE IMPORTANCE OF EXPANDED FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM TO MINNESOTA

Every State highway department, and specifically the State highway department and the county and municipal road and street authorities of Minnesota, are vitally concerned with the enactment at this session of Congress of an expanded Federal highway financing program comparable in magnitude to that proposed in either the Gore bill or the Fallon bill which failed in the closing hours of the last session of Congress.

Public support for a program of this kind is evidenced by the fact that more than one-half of the county boards of commissioners in the State have already adopted supporting resolutions, as individual boards, and the State Convention of the Minnesota Association of County Commissioners, held in Minneapolis on January 27 and 28, unanimously adopted a resolution demanding early action on this issue.

Doubtless, as Minnesota's Representatives in Congress, you are already aware of the close link that exists between the adoption of the proposed Federal highway program and the State constitutional amendment which will be submitted to popular vote in November.

At the outset, I might point out that long-range planning for the kind of highways our people and our industries simply have to have in the very near future calls for a commitment by Congress, not only to an expanded annual authorization for highway construction, but for a commitment to provide such highway construction funds over a longer continuing period than the customary 2 or 3 years for which Federal aid highway authorizations have been made in the past. These long-range commitments are essential not only to justify the necessary plant expansion, or production expansion, of the producers of such critical materials as steel and cement, but also in order to make it possible for the States to proceed with the procurement of right-of-way and the preparation of plans which will be vitally necessary for the carrying out of such a long-range program.

Recently when the State highway department, for the first time in its history, was able to announce, project by project, a tentative but relatively firm program by which it hopes to put $37 million worth of trunk highway construction under contract within the next 6 months, the announcement rated headlines in every daily newspaper in the State. Scores of weekly papers also gave it prominent display. Our people are rapidly awakening to the fact that congressional enactment of such an expanded highway-improvement program as has been proposed will step up their achievements, State and local, by approximately an equivalent amount every year.

In other words, I believe that our farm, industrial and civic groups are rapidly being alerted to the fact that they have within their grasp, provided they get the uniform bipartisan support of their congressmen, a highway program which for once in a lifetime can be in step with our mounting traffic requirements. These requirements apply to the marketing of virtually every product of our farms or our factories. They apply to the distribution of practically everything we make, or sell, or consume. And they apply with equal force to the safety and convenience of every man or woman who drives a motor vehicle, or owns a motor vehicle, or sends his children to school on a school bus.

The several plans for financing the highway program that have been advanced by the American Association of State Highway Officials, the American Road Builders Association, the Associated General Contractors of America, the National Highway Users, and lastly, but among the most important because it reflects the willingness of the average motorist to pay his share of the expense, the American Automobile Association—all of them proof that the expanded highway program can be financed, and willingly will be financed, by the people who want the roads and who will save more by having good highways to travel on than they are now paying in the cost of inadequate highways.

It is the earnest belief of the staff of the Minnesota State Highway Department, and the openly expressed belief of our county highway engineers and county commissioners, that if the additional sums that have been proposed for highway construction at State, municipal and county levels are authorized by the present Congress, and the Federal Government is committed to a long-range program of commensurate magnitude, there will be little if any question as to the adoption of our State Constitutional Amendment No. 2 at the fall election. There would be little likelihood of any successful organized opposition to this State constitutional amendment because the adequacy of funds to finance the necessary improvements on main arterials and State trunk routes, rural and urban, would appear to be assured over a continuing period of years.

The proposed amendment No. 2 to our State constitution would, as you doubtless know, allot some $7 million more of road user funds annually to the improvement of county highways and also would provide upward of $7 million a year to meet the road and street needs of cities of over 5,000 population. Both the counties and cities are in urgent need of additional funds, and I believe that if the way were cleared, by such Federal legislation as has been proposed, for the adoption of the State Constitutional Amendment No. 2, we would end once and for all the unhealthy conflict that has been going on for the past decade between urban and rural groups over various proposals for redistribution of road user funds.

I am sure that I speak for the people and the industries of our State, and for the best

interest of its future economy, when I urge your support for the expanded Federal aid highway program that is now taking shape in Washington.

NIAGARA PORT AUTHORITY—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, Minn., endorsing immediate passage of the Lehman-Davidson bills authorizing United States development of the Niagara by the Power Authority of the State of New York.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF RURAL COOPERATIVE POWER ASSOCIATION, ELK RIVER, MINN.

Whereas we believe in the immediate development of the United States share of Niagara power by the Power Authority of New York at the lowest possible cost, in accordance with the treaties between the United States and Canada concerning the waters of the Niagara River; and

Whereas we believe all power developed by said power authority should be disposed of in strict compliance with the existing preference laws relative to sale of power to rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and other nonprofit distributors of electricity within economic transmission distances: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we favor immediate passage of the Lehman-Davidson bills authorizing United States development of the Niagara by the Power Authority of the State of New York, and an immediate and public announcement of the Niagara-St. Lawrence power marketing plan by the power authority; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators and Congressmen from the State of Minnesota encouraging their support in the passage of the Lehman-Davidson bills or similar legislation to accomplish the foregoing.

J. MAURITZ NELSON, *Secretary*.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Douglas Maxwell Moffat, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Australia.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 3246. A bill to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BENDER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. IVES, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania):

S. 3247. A bill to simplify, broaden, and consolidate the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to making loans to farmers and stockmen in cases of disaster and severe production losses, and to broaden his authority with respect to loans made under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3248. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3249. A bill to facilitate the payment of any lump-sum payment payable under the Railroad Retirement Act on account of the death of Henry James; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3250. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to make the applicability of State water laws to applicants for a license under that act independent of any reservation or classification of lands of the United States, to revoke the Federal Power Commission's license for the Pelton project No. 2030, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3251. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Georges Zacharias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. IVES, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 3252. A bill to provide a 5-year program of Federal construction grants for the purpose of assisting medical and dental schools to expand and improve their research and teaching facilities, and of assisting other public and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical or dental research to expand and improve their research facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. PURTELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3253. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Tominaga Beckmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. Res. 216. Resolution providing for the revision and printing of a compilation of Federal laws relating to regulation of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BUTLER, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. Res. 217. Resolution to investigate problems relating to the preservation of life from the effects of nuclear explosions; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. GEORGE):

S. Res. 218. Resolution amending Senate Resolution 205, agreed to February 7, 1956, relative to attempts to influence the vote of Senator CASE, of South Dakota, on the then pending gas bill; considered and agreed to.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. Res. 219. Resolution to investigate campaign expenditures, lobbying, and certain other activities affecting the Senate or any Member thereof; ordered to lie over under the rule.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING FOR NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which has as its objective the prompt carrying out of the declared intention of the Congress to construct among the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda a building to house the National Institute of Dental Research. While I believe this legislation is quite important to the American people and to the dental profession in our country, it is nonetheless very simple and uncomplicated in its contents. It would simply increase the existing authorization for such construction from $2 million to $5 million.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare unanimously recommended and the Congress in passing the National Dental Research Act of 1948 approved and authorized the construction of a building to house the activities of the National Institute of Dental Research. In that legislation we authorized an appropriation of not to exceed $2 million for the construction of that building. Subsequently the Congress appropriated $100,000 which was used to develop building plans and specifications for the dental institute. The Korean war intervened, however, and, of necessity, the construction work had to be postponed. Subsequently, and despite the fact that plans for the building have been drawn at great cost, there has been no appropriation to begin its construction. The explanation is very simple. It lies in the fact that building costs have advanced considerably since 1948, and while the sum of $2 million was undoubtedly sufficient at that time, to construct the Dental Institute Building in accordance with the already approved plans would, it is estimated, cost more than double the

amount originally estimated. Failure to initiate the construction of the Dental Institute Building at the time the Congress authorized the project has proved a most costly postponement. If this construction should be further postponed, it will be still more wasteful. More important than the monetary aspects of this situation, however, is the fact that lack of proper facilities for the Dental Institute's program poses a serious threat to this Nation's progress toward the effective control and prevention of dental disease. I would remind the Members of Congress, Mr. President, that dental disease afflicts more than 98 percent of our population in the course of their lifetimes.

I am happy to announce that Senators ALLOTT, BENDER, DOUGLAS, HILL, IVES, KENNEDY, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, and NEELY have joined me in cosponsoring this worthy measure. We are in complete agreement that the amount authorized for the National Institute of Dental Research Building should be increased to $5 million. It is my conviction that the increased authorization should and will be promptly approved on a bipartisan basis and that the Congress will restate its conviction that the construction of the Institute Building be postponed no longer.

Members of the Congress will find that their State, county, and district dental societies, as well as the American Dental Association, are wholeheartedly supporting the passage of this bill. In so doing America's dentists are once again proving that they are indeed members of a great profession, that now as always in the past they regard the interests and the well-being of the American people as more important than their own immediate self-interests. This is the distinguishing mark of a true profession. For this the American people are once again indebted to America's dentists, and because of this I want to express my thanks to the members of the dental profession and to assure them that I shall do all that lies in my power to see to it that this legislation becomes law and that the National Institute of Dental Research becomes a physical reality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, which is very brief, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3246) to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the National Dental Research Act, approved June 24, 1948 (Public Law 755, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out "$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,000,000."

PROPOSED FARMERS AND STOCKMEN'S EMERGENCY LOAN ACT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to simplify, broaden, and consolidate the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to making loans to farmers and stockmen in cases of disaster and severe production losses, and to broaden his authority with respect to loans made under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, explaining its purposes, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3247) to simplify, broaden, and consolidate the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to making loans to farmers and stockmen in cases of disaster and severe production losses, and to broaden his authority with respect to loans made under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Farmers and Stockmen Emergency Loan Act." As used in this act, "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized, in any area designated as an emergency area pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to make loans to bona fide farmers and stockmen for any agricultural purposes, including but not limited to, the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

(b) The Secretary may designate any area as an emergency area if he finds—

(1) that there exists in such area a general need for agricultural credit which cannot be met for temporary periods of time by private, cooperative, or other responsible souces (including loans the Secretary is authorized to make or insure under any other act of Congress) at reasonable rates, and on terms and conditions which farmers and stockmen could be expected to meet under the circumstances; and

(2) that the need for such credit in such area is the result of natural disaster or severe production losses.

SEC. 3. (a) Loans made or insured by the Secretary under the provisions of this act shall—

(1) be made to farmers and stockmen (A) who have a reasonable prospect for successful operation with the assistance of such loan, and (B) who cannot secure the credit they need from other sources on reasonable terms and conditions;

(2) be made at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent per annum; and

(3) be secured (A) in the case of any individual farmer or stockman, by the personal obligation and available security of the farmer or stockman, and (B) in the case of corporations or other business organizations, by the personal obligation and available security of each person holding as much as 10 percent of the stock or other interest in the corporation or organization.

(b) Such loans shall be subject to an agreement that if at any time it shall appear to the Secretary that the borrower may be able to obtain a loan from a production credit association, a Federal land bank, or other responsible cooperative or private source, at reasonable rates and terms for loans for similar purposes and periods of time prevailing in the area, the borrower will, upon request by the Secretary, apply for and accept such loan in sufficient amount to repay the Secretary or the insured lender, or both, and to pay for any stock necessary to be purchased in the cooperative lending agency in connection with such loan.

(c) Such loans shall be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 4 (a) The Secretary is authorized, in any area designated by him pursuant to subsection (b) of section 2 of this act as an emergency area, to furnish bona fide farmers and stockmen with feed for livestock or seeds for planting.

(b) The Secretary shall furnish such feed and seeds for such period or periods of time and under such terms and conditions as he may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the emergency in any such designated area.

(c) The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for carrying out the purposes of this section and shall reimburse such Corporation for the value of any commodities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or stockmen, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in performing such functions.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. sec. 1148a), (hereinafter referred to as the 'fund") for carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) All sums received by the Secretary from the liquidation of loans made under the provisions of this act and the act of April 6, 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 43), and the act entitled "An act to provide emergency credit," approved August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 999), and from the liquidation of any other assets acquired with money from the fund shall be added to and become a part of the fund.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the fund such additional sums as the Congress shall from time to time determine to be necessary.

SEC. 7. The act of April 6, 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 43), and the act entitled "An act to provide emergency credit," approved August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 999), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. The repeal of any provision of law made by section 7 of this act shall not—

(1) invalidate any action taken, or affect the validity of any obligation incurred, under any such provision; or

(2) prejudice the application of any farmer or stockman, with respect to receiving assistance under the foregoing provisions of this act, solely because any such farmer or stockman is obligated for assistance received under any such repealed provision.

SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of the foregoing provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. Title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C., sec. 1007–1009), is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—REFINANCING AND GENERAL FARM LOANS

"SEC. 21. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make and insure loans to farmers and stockmen who are citizens of the United States for any agricultural purposes, except as provided in subsection (a) (4) of section 44 of this act, including but not limited to, the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the cost of reorganizing the farming enterprise or changing farming practice to accomplish more diversified or more profitable farming operations, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

"(b) (1) No additional loan shall be made or insured under the provisions of this title to a borrower for an amount in excess of $21,000.

"(2) No additional loan shall be made or insured under the provisions of this title to a borrower if the total amount of such borrower's indebtedness (including accrued interest, taxes, and other obligations properly chargeable to the account of the borrower), for loans made under the provisions of this title, is in excess of $30,000.

"(c) The term of any loan made or insured under the provisions of this title, including any renewal or extension thereof, shall not exceed 15 years from the date the original loan was made.

"(d) Any borrower (1) who has failed for a period of 15 consecutive years to liquidate indebtedness incurred by him under the provisions of this title, or (2) who has failed for a period of 15 consecutive years to liquidate indebtedness incurred by him for any other production-type loan which is being serviced and collected by the Farmers Home Administration, shall be ineligible for loans hereunder until he has paid such indebtedness in full.

"SEC. 22. The Secretary may assist in the voluntary adjustment of indebtedness between farm debtors and their creditors and may cooperate with State, Territorial, and local agencies, and committees engaged in such debt adjustment. Services furnished by the Secretary under the provisions of this section may be without charge to the debtor or creditor.

"SEC. 23. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this title."

The statement presented by Mr. ALLOTT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

There has been in this Congress, and deservedly so, a great amount of attention given to the Nation's farmers. The President's farm message was an excellent one. The administration has been working diligently on the problem. The Committee on Agriculture has literally been working night and day on the farm problem and I feel certain that there is much in the legislation proposed, upon which we can all agree. Suffice it to say that this 2d session of the 84th Congress will work for the long-range improvement of the farmers' position in the Nation's expanding economic picture and face the issue squarely.

One great problem of the farmer, however, receives no attention in the omnibus farm bill (S. 3139) to provide an improved farm program, as presented. That is the problem, faced by many farmers today, of obtaining suitable and adequate financing at the time it is needed. That is the problem dealt with by the bill which I now introduce.

The general problem of farm credit is one which, in the past, has received the diligent attention of the Congress. In fact, it has received such extensive attention, particularly in the areas of emergency loans and production and subsistence loans, that a patchwork of laws has developed which, too often, tends to defeat the purpose for which the various laws were provided. There exists special provisions for fur raisers, farmers, stockmen, etc., under different sets of rules depending upon whether the President declares a disaster, or the Secretary finds that there is a need for emergency credit * * * etc. The matter has become so complicated that the farmer and stockman do not know what is available, and those charged with the administration of credit often cannot honestly answer them.

I have had many conversations with, and letters from, farmers and stockmen and their organizations. During the past few months, the subject of farm credit has been discussed with hundreds of farmers personally. On December 16, 1956, the Secretary of Agriculture called a meeting at Denver which was attended by Mr. K. L. Scott and Robert McLeaish and at which 200 persons were present to discuss this problem.

The entire farm-credit picture is unnecessarily complicated. It now requires altogether too much time to determine whether an applicant is qualified for one of the various farm loans. I have been advised of emergency-loan applications left pending for as long as 6 months. If there is a need for an emergency loan, and that need has been recognized by a substantial amount of legislation, then there is a need for processing these loans with reasonable speed. The same thinking applies for general farm-operation loans. The present emergency situation in farm credit cannot be attributed to either party but is due to the unprecedented demand and the archaic patchwork under which the local administrators must operate.

These, then, are the problems to which this bill is addressed:

1. Consolidation of existing farm-loan provisions.

2. Simplification of existing farm-loan provisions.

3. Broadening the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make farm loans.

4. Easing current restrictions on duration and amount of farm loans.

Farm credit needs desperately to be made less complicated and the fears of farmers in a financial crisis must be allayed. This legislation would go far toward doing just that. The only changes in the existing laws on the subject are those necessary to accomplish those purposes.

Under some circumstances the Secretary of Agriculture is now empowered to make emergency-type loans to some agricultural people, but under other circumstances action by the President is first necessary. By the provisions of this bill the Secretary would need only to determine (1) that there is a need for credit not being met by other credit sources, and (2) that this need is the result of natural disaster or severe production losses in order to proceed.

Presently, the Secretary may furnish seed and livestock feed only after Presidential declaration of a disaster. Under this bill he would be able to do so under the same circumstances as those in which he is authorized to make emergency loans.

The provisions concerning (1) rate of interest, (2) security, (3) termination of the loan when emergency no longer exists, and (4) persons to whom such loans may be made are substantially the same as the current provisions for disaster loans.

The Secretary of Agriculture currently has restricted authority to refinance existing indebtedness in a disaster situation. Specific authority to do so would be granted him under this bill. This bill would not affect existing law established for the purpose of assisting farmers and stockmen to acquire land under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or the provisions for the acquisition and maintenance of water under the Water Facilities Act. All other current emergency-loan provisions for farmers are repealed by the act. Of course, loans previously made under any provision repealed by this bill would not be affected by this bill. It is my sincere belief that by virtue of the consolidation and simplification provided in this bill, the Department of Agriculture will be able to provide credit to farmers quickly under a reasonably simple program where an emergency is found to exist.

The second part of this bill is a broadening of the old title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act which authorizes loans for farmers and stockmen for production and subsistence. This authority currently is restricted to a maximum of $7,000 for an original loan and $10,000 total indebtedness and a maximum length of 7 years. This bill would authorize loans up to $21,000 and a total indebtedness of loans under this title up to $30,000. The Secretary would also be able to insure loans and is still specifically authorized to refinance existing indebtedness. The length of loans under this title, as well as the time in which a loan must be paid off to qualify for any futher loans, would, by this bill, be extended from 7 to 15 years. As under the old title II, these loans would be available only to family-type farms.

There can be no question that there is a need for a liberalization of the restrictions on these general farm loans.

In Colorado alone there are about 200 families who are adversely affected by the present limitations. Many have had 5 successive years of drought, and they could not be expected to pay their obligations within the additional 2 years. These are substantial families. The ones the law was designed to protect. They have everything they own tied up in their land, improvements, and equipment. They have the ability to repay and the will to do so with the help of normal rainfall. However, these people will soon reach the end of the road under the present Farmers' Home Administration law if these limitations are not changed. These provisions benefit only the family-type farmer. He is the person I am anxious to save.

The purposes for which these general farm loans could be made would be broadened to include, but not be restricted to: The purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the cost of reorganizing the farming enterprise, or changing farming practice to accomplish more diversified or more profitable farming operations, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

There is no doubt that the need exists for a less complicated system for extending emergency credit to the farmers and stockmen. The consolidation and simplification provided for in this bill will be of inestimable value to those of our agricultural people who have good workable units but who are temporarily in need of assistance.

These problems of emergency farm credit and general farm loans should, I believe, receive the immediate attention of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP TO COMMEMORATE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF DISCOVERY OF COMSTOCK LODE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev.

There is no more colorful page of American history than that surrounding the discovery of what was probably the country's greatest boom mining camp in the shadows of the Sierra Nevada Range of mountains in western Nevada. The people of my State are planning a statewide celebration commemorating Nevada's silver centenary and the 100th anniversary of the discovery of precious metal at Virginia City.

Without the contribution of Virginia City, American history would be much less colorful. Its fabulous veins of gold and silver are responsible for some of the great achievements of the most famous families of America.

For example, Clarence McKay built the Postal Telegraph System out of silver from the Comstock Lode. The Sharon, Newlands, O'Brien, and Stewart fortunes made in Nevada helped develop the cities of San Francisco and Washington, D. C.

The Comstock Lode at Virginia City is not of historical importance regionally, but nationally. It was the wealth taken from the earth beneath Virginia City that played a role second to none in saving the Union in the calamitous War Between the States.

To dip back into history, it might be said that Nevada's birthright was Virginia City's gold and silver.

President Abraham Lincoln not only wanted another State in the 1860's to pass the 13th amendment, but he wanted this gold and silver to help the Union's great cause.

While miners dug gold and silver on the Comstock Lode in the 1860's, Nevada's Constitutional Convention passed an enabling act permitting Nevada to become a State. The constitution previously proposed had failed because a heavy tax had been imposed on the territory's mines. After this was changed, speedy passage followed and Nevada's constitution was telegraphed to President Lincoln at a cost of $3,416.77. President Lincoln immediately proclaimed Nevada the 36th State of the Union and it still bears proudly the name of "The Battle Born State" for its great role in preserving the Union.

My bill will permit this country—North, South, East, and West—to commemorate in a proper manner this 100th anniversary of the opening page in a great chapter of American history.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3248) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev., introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, our Nation is presently entering a cycle of its greatest population growth—a trend which foreshadows unprecedented pressures on our storehouse of natural resources. Perhaps no more delicate task confronts us than the problem of putting these resources to their best use to meet the demands of the present generation without forever impairing their availability to those who will follow us.

This conflict has been brought dramatically into focus in my home State of Oregon where a power company has received a Federal Power Commission license for a hydroelectric project, despite efforts of the Oregon State government to prevent it. The State of Oregon contends that the power company's high dam will destroy the runs of anadromous fish which spawn in the Deschutes River, a stream held in high esteem by anglers for the number, size, and quality of its fish.

On March 16, the Portland General Electric Co. will open bids for the dam which will forever form a barrier across this source of enjoyment for sportsmen and source of a livelihood for scores of commercial fishermen. When the concrete is poured for the dam's foundation and powerhouse, and unless Congress acts, a final and unhappy chapter will be written to what has become known as the Pelton Dam case. The steel and concrete of the dam will bring to an end the inspiring fish runs which, since some time in the misty past, have coursed each year up the Deschutes River to spawn. If this depredation is permitted to occur, we will again have turned our backs on the obligation to preserve and protect natural resources for the benefit of future generations. It will also stand as a symbol of private power company arrogance and disregard of State law for management of its resources.

STATE OF OREGON SOUGHT TO PRESERVE FISH RUNS

The battle to preserve the fisheries resource of the Deschutes has been long and involved. In 1949, the Northwest Power Supply Co., of Portland, Oreg., predecessor company of Portland Central Electric, applied for a Federal Power Commission license to construct, operate, and maintain a hydro-electric plant designated as Pelton Project No. 2030. The State of Oregon, the Fish Commission of Oregon, the Oregon State Game Commission, and the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League, intervened before the Commission. They objected to the Commission's authority to grant a license opposed by the State government and to the suitability of the fish-passing facilities.

In 1953, seeking to eliminate the legal objections of the State, the power company attempted to have the Oregon Legislature enact a measure which would have nullified State laws on water rights and usages. The attempt failed, and after the Federal Power Commission license was granted, an appeal was taken by the State of Oregon to a Federal court. Last June, the United States Supreme Court held that the FPC was within its authority in granting the license.

Taking refuge behind the Supreme Court decision, the power company has moved to start construction of the project. Despite the fact that the license stipulated the company work out plans for passing fish over the structure with State and Federal fisheries agencies, this has not been done. The authority of the State has been disregarded.

Because of this situation, I am introducing a bill today to revoke the license of the Portland General Electric Co. for the Pelton Dam project. But it is also necessary to correct the deficiency in water law which made the Pelton decision possible. In explaining the effect of this section of the bill, I would like to outline the background which makes its enactment necessary.

RIVER FLOWS WHOLLY WITHIN STATE OF OREGON

Mr. President, the entire length of the Deschutes River lies in the State of Oregon. It is a wholly intrastate stream. The Federal Power Commission made no finding of navigability on the Deschutes—in granting the license it proceeded on the assumption either that it is nonnavigable, or at least that it made no difference whether or not the Deschutes is navigable. The Pelton Dam license, then, represents a case of a project licensed to be built on lands of the Federal Government across a wholly intrastate stream, assumed to be nonnavigable.

The State of Oregon, having objected to this project, took its case from the Federal Power Commission to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in San Francisco. That court set aside the Commission's order, on the ground that the public lands legislation of the Congress had long ago made the use of nonnavigable waters on Federal lands subject to State control, and that licensees would have to receive their water rights under the water law of the State concerned.

The Federal Power Commission took the case to the Supreme Court of the United States. Several other Western States, which, like Oregon, find a large proportion of the land—and, even more important, the water—within their borders owned by the Federal Government, joined Oregon in the litigation by submitting briefs amici curiae.

SUPREME COURT'S HOLDING JEOPARDIZES ALL WESTERN STATES

The Supreme Court reversed the court of appeals. It held, in brief, that

whatever might have been true on public lands of the United States under the Desert Land Act, those rules were made inapplicable by the fact that the proposed project would be built on Federal lands which have been reserved for power purposes—that is to say, on "reservation" rather than "public lands." Both terms are used in the Federal Power Act, under which the license is granted.

Mr. President, the apparent implication of this decision is that—whatever may be the water rights of a State and its citizens under other Federal public land laws—these State water laws may be superseded by a simple decision by the Federal Government to create a "reservation" for some purpose. Already, I understand, Federal military reservations all over the West are relying on the Supreme Court's decision as proof that they are beyond any requirement of compliance with State water law.

Mr. President, the decision in Federal Power Commission against Oregon—the Pelton Dam case—is thus of incalculable significance for all western States, including Oregon, in which water is more precious than gold, and in which the Federal Government holds much of the land. The people in these States believe that the implications of this holding go far beyond any reasonable requirement of Federal control over water on its own land. I think the Senate will agree this is a reasonable belief. To negate these implications, and to reverse the decision which gave rise to them, I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to make the applicability of State water laws to applicants for a license under that Act independent of any reservation or classification of lands of the United States, to revoke the Federal Power Commission's license for the Pelton Project No. 2030, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3250) to amend the Federal Power Act to make the applicability of State water laws to applicants for a license under that Act independent of any reservation or classification of lands of the United States, to revoke the Federal Power Commission's license for the Pelton project No. 2030, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Federal Power Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 27" and by inserting at the end of the section the following new subsection:

"(b) In any case where a license is required under the provisions of this act because the project, or a part thereof, for which such license is required is to be constructed upon lands of the United States, any reservation or classification of such lands shall not affect the applicability or nonapplicability of the laws of any State, relating to the control, appropriation, use, diversion, or distribution of water to the applicant seeking the license."

SEC. 2. Pending any future proceedings in accordance with law as amended by section 1 of this act, the license granted by the Federal Power Commission to Portland General Electric Co. to construct, operate, and maintain a hydroelectric plant, known as Pelton Project No. 2030, in and along the Deschutes River in Oregon, is revoked.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, section 1 of this bill simply provides that the creation of reservations on Federal lands shall not affect the rules governing State water laws and their application to Federal lands under existing public-lands legislation. In other words, it reverses the Pelton Dam decision and returns the law exactly to the point where it was prior to that decision.

Section 2 of the bill revokes the license granted to the Portland General Electric Co. to proceed in disregard of the objections of the State of Oregon, so that if there is ever any future consideration of projects on the Deschutes River, it will proceed in accordance with the law as amended by my bill, and as it was before the decision of the Supreme Court upholding the license on the ground that the project was located on a reservation rather than on the public lands of the United States.

Other bills have been introduced, Mr. President, which seek to institute a tremendous reconsideration and redefinition of all water laws and water rights as between the States and the National Government in our Federal system. Such a redefinition might take years to work out and to enact, and in the meantime the Deschutes would be blockaded for all time.

My bill has no such extreme ambition. It is a simple bill, and it does a simple job. It returns the law to the point where it was, or where all parties thought it was, before the recent decision that has given rise to the presently brewing crisis in western land and water law. Whatever may be later done with other bills, this bill can be studied and acted on very rapidly. I hope that we may be able to complete this action during the present session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, an editorial and an article from the Oregonian, dated February 17, 1956, and a resolution from the Estacada Rod and Gun Club, dated November 17, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial, article, and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON BE DAMNED

Portand General Electric Co.'s refusal to respect the laws of the State of Oregon in the Pelton Dam matter can scarcely be termed less than arrogant. It is, in addition, contrary to the previously expressed policy of the company.

In 1953, PGE tried to pressure through the Oregon Legislature a fantastic bill which would have nullified the long-standing State statutes governing water rights and usages. The legislature killed the bill in the house, despite a power lobby of formidable intensity.

In 1955, the legislature adopted a State water code and authorized the governor to appoint a water resources board to rule on the use of State waters. PGE had complained that the State fish commission had veto power over its proposed dam on the Deschutes River. The new water law removes this veto power—if it could be said to have existed. PGE now has the right to appeal the State hydroelectric commission's denial of a license for Pelton Dam—based on harm to the fishery—to the State water board. The latter would be the final authority, and it would be expected to base its ruling on the greater public interest.

But PGE has made no move to proceed under the new State law. It chooses to rely entirely on a license granted by the Federal Power Commission and upheld by the United States Supreme Court. This Court ruling, which nullifies the long-established legal rights of Western States to control much of their non-navigable waters, has resulted in legislation in Congress to restore State authority. But hearings have not yet been held on the several bills directed to this end.

Blessed with a certificate of defense necessity permitting tax amortization in 5 years instead of the life of the project—a hangover from the Korean war which amounts to a Federal subsidy—and a Federal license which nullifies State authority, PGE has called for bids for the main structures of the project. This raises another interesting point.

The utility will open bids March 16 on the main dam and powerhouse and spillway structures, the reregulating dam 2½ miles downstream, and a single fish ladder on the east bank of the river from below the regulating dam to above the main dam.

The FPC license requires that PGE work out with the State fish and game commissions and the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service plans to pass migrating fish. But if the fishery agencies will not agree, the FPC would act as arbiter. Since the FPC's interest is power, it is obvious that there is no assurance, under the Federal license, of even moderate consideration of the great recreational and food-fish values of the Deschutes River.

But PGE has not even waited to see if agreement can be reached with the fishery agencies. It intends to build the dam first and leave the fish departments to make the best of it. It appears that PGE has not even met the minimum terms of the FPC license in the matter of fish conservation, in that is has no proper plans for downstream passage of young salmon and steelhead spawned in the gravel beds of the Deschutes, Squaw Creek and Metolius Rivers over a dam behind which the water will fluctuate drastically each day because of a peaking operation.

These are some of the reasons why we say that Portland General Electric Co. is proceeding in an arrogant manner against the public interest of the people of Oregon.

GAME MEN HIT AGAIN AT PELTON—TWO SEND VIEWS TO COMMITTEE, OPPOSING PROJECT

Oregon's State Game Commission Thursday took vigorous issue with Portland General Electric Co.'s proposed construction of Pelton Dam on the Deschutes River.

In letters to the Save the Deschutes Committee, which is organizing State-wide opposition to PGE's proposed dam, Don M. Mitchell, chairman of the game commission, and P. W. Schneider, director, set forth the opposition of the agency.

"It is a matter of public record that the game commission has opposed the Pelton project because this body is responsible to

the people of the State for the preservation of natural and wildlife resources," Mitchell's letter declared.

MOST SPORTSMEN OPPOSED

Sportsmen's groups generally have opposed construction of high dams on the Deschutes on grounds they would destroy one of the State's most important fish streams.

PGE has called for construction bids on Pelton Dam under a Federal license which was granted after Oregon authorities refused the company a license.

Said Mitchell: "The position of the commission remains unchanged even though a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court ruled that a Federal Power Commission permit is valid right to construct the dam.

"It must be conceded by all," his letter said, "that the high dam in the Deschutes River certainly would destroy the enormous runs of anadromous salmonoids which are now indigenous to this stream. * * * Engineers and fisheries biologists have not yet devised a way for the safe passage of adult fish over high dams and the transmission of downstream migrants safely past spillways and diversions. * * * The Pelton issue is one involving the choice of but one result: Power or fisheries resource. Not both."

MAIN OBJECTIVES LISTED

Schneider said the Commission's main objections to Pelton Dam were:

1. It would obstruct runs of migratory steelhead trout and Chinook salmon.

2. Runs could not be maintained by artificial propagation because of difficulties of handling steelhead and spring Chinook.

3. A substantial area of "excellent and productive" fishing water would be replaced by a deep, narrow reservoir with low productive potential, which also would provide an environment for trash fish.

4. It violates the spirit and concept of the lower Columbia River fishery development program and other accepted plans for basin development.

RESOLUTION OF THE ESTACADA, OREG., ROD AND GUN CLUB

Whereas the legislative history of the Federal Power Act clearly indicates that it was never the intention of the Congress to invest the Federal Power Commission with the authority, either expressed or implied, to usurp or encroach on the sovereign powers of the States to regulate the use of the waters of their nonnavigable streams; it being expressly provided in section 9 (b) (16 U. S. C. A. 802b) of said Federal Power Act that said Federal Power Commission shall, before issuing a license, require proof of the applicant that he has complied with the State laws with respect to the use of the water and the bed and banks of streams; and

Whereas the actions of the Federal Power Commission and the courts in this respect have and will continue to jeopardize and to curtail the States in their development of stream utilization and is likely to cause irreparable damage to the water, wildlife, fishery resources, agriculture, and industry and to create havoc in the administration of the water laws in the States, all in contravention of long established public policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners on this 13th day of September 1955, hereby does urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Federal Power Act so as to compel the Federal Power Commission to require proof that applicants for a license have obtained prior approval of the several States in respect to the use of the waters and the beds and banks of streams, notwithstanding the fact that the project sought to be licensed is to be located on public lands or reservations of the United States which have been withdrawn for power purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That such legislation shall impose on the Federal Power Commission the duty to require such proof, as above mentioned, whether or not the project shall have an adverse effect on the navigable flow or the navigable capacity of any navigable stream.

FRANK MARSHALL,
President.
ALICE E. CARTER,
Secretary.

FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM OF FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an administration bill to carry out the President's recommendation that Congress enact legislation authorizing a 5-year program of grants to assist in the construction of medical and dental research and teaching facilities. The physical facilities for research and teaching in the health field are most inadequate. We cannot continue to make progress in strengthening the Nation's health until these necessary facilities are improved.

As President Eisenhower noted in his health message:

> Physical facilities of medical research and teaching institutions are inadequate to meet the human needs of the Nation. As we strive to achieve better health for the people, we must help to provide the needed laboratories and teaching facilities.

The bill I am introducing today would authorize Federal construction grants of $250 million to be spent during a 5-year period to assist accredited schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health in expanding and improving their research and teaching facilities. It would also help other private and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical or dental research to expand or improve their research facilities. Federal grants made under this program would have to be matched at least equally by the institution being aided.

One of the most important features of this proposal is its primary focus on the intimate interrelationship of the research and teaching functions in our great centers of medical learning. It is the only proposal of its type—to the best of my knowledge—which clearly reflects the ever-increasing interdependency of the research and teaching functions in the health sciences.

This bill, in brief, will combine the best features of the various research construction and medical school aid bills which previously have been introduced.

Mr. President, there is ample evidence that the medical and dental schools of the country are in serious need of improved facilities. Evidence previously presented to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has borne out the need for prompt action to strengthen medical education and research by providing Federal assistance in the construction and renovation of research and teaching facilities. The Association of American Medical Colleges for several years has been pointing out the serious financial problems faced by the medical schools. They have made it abundantly clear that Federal financial assistance is needed if the physical plant of the schools is to be made adequate to the demands of modern medical research and education. The American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Public Health Association, and other equally well-informed organizations favor Federal action of the type proposed in this bill.

The bill as drafted provides ample safeguards against Federal domination of medical and related education. It provides for a 16-man National Advisory Council, appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise and assist the Surgeon General in important policy matters arising in administration of the program.

It provides, also, for close coordination of the health and the education aspects of the program. Furthermore, it specificially prohibits any Federal official from exercising any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curricula, methods of instruction, research, or administration of any institution involved in the program.

Mr. President, we in the Senate have been studying ways and means of improving the public health, and we have taken many steps to strengthen health services throughout the Nation. The proposal I am introducing today clearly takes its place among the most important and well-conceived health measures with which we have dealt. As I have said, this bill is unique, in that it combines and strengthens the best features of various earlier proposals to improve medical and dental research and teaching—without Federal domination.

Mr. President, I urge that the Senate act promptly and favorably on this bill to provide Federal matching grants for the construction and improvement of private and other nonprofit medical and dental research and teaching facilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD and that it be held at the desk until the end of the week, to enable any other Senators who may wish to do so, to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 3252) to provide a 5-year program of Federal construction grants for the purpose of assisting medical and dental schools to expand and improve their research and teaching facilities, and of assisting other public and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical or dental research to expand and improve their research facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PURTELL (for

himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Medical and Dental Research and Teaching Construction Act of 1956."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(a) Improved health is essential to individual well-being and to the Nation's economic growth.

(b) Full exploitation of new developments and promising avenues of investigation in medicine, dentistry, and related scientific fields, and adequate numbers of physicians, dentists and professional public health personnel, are essential for the improvement of health services and for more effective prevention and disease-control measures.

(c) Research institutions and medical and dental schools have serious unmet needs for additional and improved space for research and for teaching.

(d) Despite increasing support for medical and dental research and teaching institutions, from individuals, private funds and foundations, the professions, industry, and State and local governments, the cost of providing adequate facilities is so high and capital funds for physical plant are so limited that these institutions need additional assistance to finance essential improvements or additions to existing facilities and needed new facilities.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 3. The Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. ch. 6A) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VII—ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL RESEARCH AND TEACHING FACILITIES

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 701. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, such sums as the Congress may determine for grants, as provided in this title, to assist in the construction of new or improved facilities for medical or dental research or teaching, except that the aggregate appropriations during such period for grants for medical research and teaching facilities may not exceed $210 million and the aggregate appropriations during such period for grants for dental research and teaching facilities may not exceed $40 million.

"(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

"ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible to apply for a grant to assist in the construction of any facility under this title, the applicant must be a public or nonprofit school or other institution, must be accredited or approved as provided in subsection (b), and, in the case of a teaching facility or a facility for both teaching and research, must be a medical or dental school.

"(b) To be accredited or approved for purposes of this title—

"(1) Medical schools, dental schools, universities, and other educational institutions must be accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, except that a new school or other academic institution, which (by reason of no, or an insufficient period of operation) is not, at the time of application for a grant to construct a facility under this title, eligible for accreditation by such a recognized body or bodies, shall be deemed accredited for purposes of this title if the Commissioner of Education finds, after consultation with the appropriate accreditation body or bodies, that there is reasonable assurance that the school or other institution will, upon completion of such facility, meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies.

"(2) Other institutions must be determined by the Surgeon General, in accordance with standards established by regulation, to be competent to engage in the type of research for which the facility is to be constructed.

"(c) No institution shall be eligible for a grant under this title to assist in the construction of a hospital or other facility for which Federal grants may be made under title VI unless the Surgeon General determines that such facility is specially designed for and will be principally used for medical or dental research or teaching and does not constitute a project or part of a project with respect to which a Federal grant has been approved under title VI.

"APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 703. (a) No grant may be made under this title with respect to any facility except upon an application therefor filed in accordance with regulations (but not later than June 30, 1961) and approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that:

"(1) The applicant meets the eligibility conditions set forth in section 702.

"(2) The application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than 10 years after completion of construction, the facility will be used for the research purposes for which it is to be constructed or, in the case of a medical or dental school, the facility will be used for medical or dental research or teaching, and (B) sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility and, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the research or teaching for which it is being constructed.

"(3) Construction of the facility will expand the applicant's capacity for medical or dental research or teaching or is necessary to improve or maintain the quality of the applicant's medical or dental research or teaching.

"(b) In determining the order in which applications shall be approved, the Surgeon General shall take into consideration the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in expanding medical or dental research or teaching capacity, in improving the quality of such research or teaching, or in promoting a more effective geographical distribution of such research or teaching, and other factors relevant to the purposes of this title, as may be prescribed by regulation.

"AMOUNT OF GRANT; PAYMENTS

"SEC. 704. The Surgeon General, in approving an application with respect to any facility, shall determine the amount of the grant to be made with respect to such facility; except that, in no event may such amount exceed 50 per centum of the necessary cost of construction of such facility, as determined by him. Upon such approval, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount so determined, and shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. Such payments shall be made through the disbursement facilities of the Department of the Treasury. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon his approval of an amendment of the application or upon his revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"RECAPTURE OF PAYMENTS

"SEC. 705. If, within 10 years after completion of any facility for which funds have been paid under this title,

"(a) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

"(b) unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so, the facility shall cease to be used for the research purposes for which it was constructed, or, in the case of a medical or dental school facility, for medical or dental research or teaching,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States District Court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON MEDICAL RESEARCH AND TEACHING FACILITIES

"SEC. 706. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Council on Medical Research and Teaching Facilities consisting of the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Education, both of whom shall be ex officio members, and 16 members appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil-service laws. The 16 appointed members shall be leaders in any of the fields of the fundamental sciences, medical sciences, education, or public affairs and not less than 8 shall be selected from among leaders in the fields of medical, osteopathic, dental, or public health research or education. The Secretary shall designate one of the members as chairman of the Council.

"(b) The Council shall advise and assist the Surgeon General in the preparation of regulations pertaining to the establishment of criteria for determining the eligibility of institutions, for allocating available funds among various types of applicants, and for approving applications (including criteria for determining the relative priority among applicants), and in the review of applications, and shall advise and assist him in other important policy matters arising in the administration of this title.

"(c) Appointed members of the Council, while attending conferences or meetings of the Council or while otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"CONSULTATION ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS

"SEC. 707. The Secretary, pursuant to the authority vested in him by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 (67 Stat. 631), and by section 201 of this act, shall make appropriate provision for consultation between the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Education on educational matters arising in the administration of this title.

"NONINTERFERENCE WITH ADMINISTRATION OF INSTITUTIONS

"SEC. 708. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this title, nothing contained in this title shall be construed as authorizing any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirement or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, research, or administration of any institution.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 709. For the purposes of this title—

"(a) The term 'medical school' means a school which provides training leading to a

degree of doctor of medicine or osteopathy, or a graduate degree in public health;

"(b) The term 'dental school' means a school which provides training leading to a degree of doctor of dental surgery, or an equivalent degree;

"(c) The terms 'construction' and 'costs of construction' include construction of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, initial equipment and architects' fees, but do not include the cost of acquisition of land and off-site improvements.

"(d) The term 'nonprofit institution' means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

SEC. 4. Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read:

"SECTION 1. Titles I to VII, inclusive, of this act may be cited as the 'Public Health Service Act'."

SEC. 5. The act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), as amended, is further amended by changing the number of title VII to title VIII and by changing the numbers of sections 701 to 714, inclusive, and references thereto, to sections 801 to 814, respectively.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF LAWS RELATING TO CARRIERS SUBJECT TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 216), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is requested (1) to prepare such material as it may deem necessary in order to bring as closely to date as possible the set of volumes entitled "Compilation of Federal Laws Relating to the Regulation of Carriers Subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, with Digests of Pertinent Decisions of the Federal Courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Text of or References to General Rules and Regulations," and (2) to transmit such material to the Secretary of the Senate in manuscript form suitable for printing.

SEC. 2. Such material when received by the Secretary of the Senate shall be printed as a Senate document.

IMPROVED FARM PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. BARKLEY) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them jointly, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 28, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Justin C. Morgan, of New York, to be United States district judge, western district of New York, Vice John Knight, deceased; and

Richard H. Levet, of New York, to be United States district judge, southern district of New York, vice John C. Knox, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROSS RIZLEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committe on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 24, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, vice Edgar S. Vaught, retiring. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and myself as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address delivered by him before Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, at Washington, D. C., on February 16, 1956.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him on the World Health Organization, and excerpts from an article on the subject of nursing, published in the WHO newsletter.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief announcement for the information of the Senate.

I invite the attention of the distinguished minority leader to the fact that the treaty designated Executive Q, of the 83d Congress, 1st session, relating to an international convention to facilitate the importation of commercial samples and advertising material, will be taken up on Wednesday immediately following the reading of the Washington Farewell Address by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. On the treaty there will be the customary yea and nay vote. I should like to have all Senators on notice that that is the plan of the leadership.

In addition, as previously announced, as soon as the Senate completes action on the resolution which is the unfinished business, it is planned to proceed with the farm bill.

The Senate will be in session tomorrow and will be in session every day through Friday. I do not contemplate that there will be a Saturday session, or that there will be any late evening votes. I hope the Senate may complete action on the farm bill by the weekend, but, if it does not, the bill will go over until the early part of next week.

Mr. President, I had expected that there would be a call of the Executive Calendar today, but I am informed that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is out of town, and he has asked that the nominations to the United States Tariff Commission not be considered this week. Those nominations have been on the Executive Calendar since the middle of January, and I have been pressed on occasions by the minority leader for an executive session to deal with them.

I hope the minority leader will be as patient with me as he usually is in his understanding of what is proposed. There is nothing that makes a Senator more patient than to be majority leader himself, as the Senator from California was. I shall attempt to have the Senator from Illinois be prepared to permit a discussion of the nominations with his consent; otherwise the Senate will proceed to consider them in the early part of next week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader, because, as he has pointed out, we have had considerable discussion with him and, in his absence, with the acting majority leader. We feel that, in view of the fact that the nominations were reported on January 12, and we are now in the latter part of February, it is not unreasonable to have the nominations considered and acted upon. In conformity with the distinguished Senator's statement, I hope that early next week there will be consideration of the executive calendar, and, if there is to be any debate on the Tariff Commission nominations it can take place at that time.

STEPS LEADING TO CONSIDERATION OF THE NATURAL GAS BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while we are on that subject, if the Senator from California will permit me, I should like to express my very deep appreciation to the very able minority leader for his remarks on the occasion of the statement by my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], with reference to bringing a certain piece of proposed legislation to the floor.

I think the RECORD should show that at the last session for more than 5 weeks after the natural gas bill was ordered reported, the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California did not ask that a report be filed or the bill be considered. We felt we should not ask the Senate to consider controversial proposed legislation at that time, unless the House was going to act on it. Our Policy Committee was unanimous, not on the merits of the bill, but on the principle that a bill reported by a standing committee by at least a majority vote had merit and should be debated. But, at the insistence of the Senator from Texas, the gas bill was not scheduled for 5 long weeks.

In the interim the Senator from Texas was stricken, and the bill was brought up in the House. Then a request was made by proponents of the bill, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and others, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill. The then acting majority leader, after consulting with the Policy Committee, recognized the fact that there were opponents of the bill who desired to be heard, and felt they had to talk about it for at least 2 weeks. And it was desired not to delay the adjournment of the Senate. So it was then unanimously agreed, when the Senator from Texas was in the hospital and had no direct communication concerning what had taken place, that the bill would be carried over with the understanding that it would be taken up at this session.

I should like to add that at this session I took up every other bill on the calendar which was ready and which the sponsors thought should be considered. When we got to the gas bill I asked what was the pleasure of the policy committee. The minutes of the meetings of that committee, although they are not usually public property, in this instance, I think, should be made public because of gross misrepresentation in the press, and perhaps by some of our own colleagues.

The minutes of the meeting when the gas bill was discussed show that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], as acting majority leader, said it had been agreed that the proposed legislation would be considered early in this session. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said that was his understanding. Neither of those Senators favored the bill.

After a discussion the senior Senator from Texas said, "Is there objection to scheduling the bill for consideration?"

The Senator from Missouri stated, "I will not object, but I want to say it will be very unfortunate in my State."

There was no objection raised.

So, Mr. President, I stated at a press conference immediately thereafter that the bill was reported for discussion and for vote, just as in the case of the proposal to report on yesterday the electoral college bill and the truck trip-leasing bill—both of which I may vote against or vote for—in order that the Senate itself may not have proposed legislation bottled up.

The Senator from Texas is not apologizing or defending any action he has taken. He is explaining to people who want to know the truth what the truth is. He is happy he lives in an environment and associates with company and is helped in his work by persons such as the minority leader, who, in the absence of the Senator from Texas, had the courage to rise and say, "I take my full share of responsibility," because there has never been a bill brought before the Senate, since Senator Taft and I were leaders, and since the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and I were leaders, without the consent of both policy committees. If I am incorrect, I should like to have the Senator from California correct me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the Senator from Texas is not incorrect.

Let me say that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that has been the policy which has been followed when either of the two parties was in the majority, and when the late Senator Taft, as well as I, myself, served in the capacity of majority leader, and for as long as the distinguished Senator from Texas has served as majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hold in my hand the calendar. To the first bill on the calendar, objection has been raised. On the second one, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] desires to have notice. To the third one, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has a substitute. On the fourth one, a request has been made for more time for the minority to consider it—and so forth and so on. These notations are in the handwriting of the minority leader; and that has been true in the case of every measure.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish the Senator from Texas to understand that I do not regard as culpable the act of bringing from the policy committee a bill with which every member of the committee does not agree, because I, myself, frequently vote to report bills to which I make the reservation that I shall oppose them on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall not attribute such a motive to my friend, the Senator from Vermont. But the press has referred to such instances—stating, in one instance at least, that five members were against the bill, and that in another instance, at least, the Senator from Texas had an implied protest about it.

I want the record to be straight. I want the country to know that it is very pleasing to me to be associated in the leadership of this body with a man whose character and courage are such that, when the bombs are bursting, he will stand up and defend his colleague and will tell the truth.

Mr. AIKEN. Also, Mr. President, let me say that in the opinion of the Senator from Vermont, it was not entirely the opponents of the measure across the aisle who induced the veto of the bill by the President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me also add—and I think this should be stated in the RECORD——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will permit me to interrupt him at this point——

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not intend to discuss the veto; but inasmuch as the press has discussed it, I should like to say this about the veto: The President has exercised his constitutional authority. I did not agree with the President's judgment—as, obviously, he did not agree with the judgment I had. However, so far as I am aware, that will have no effect whatsoever on our relations. No statement of mine ever indicated it, and there is no justification for any such assumption.

Mr. WILEY. That is wonderful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not pass on proposed legislation on the basis of personalities or on the basis of parties. I try to put my country first, and act accordingly. Sometimes my judgments may be bad, but my intent is nevertheless good.

Mr. AIKEN. That statement and that position are in full keeping with the character of the Senator from Texas.

I think perhaps it should also be a matter of record that the natural-gas bill was not—to the best of my recollection—ever officially acted upon by the Republican policy committee. I assume that the minority leader was acting in his own individual capacity in agreeing with the Senator from Texas; and he had every right to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think it is the custom for the minority policy committee—at least, that was true when we were in the minority—not to schedule the proposed legislation to be considered. The majority leader does that; and the majority leader looks to his policy committee for the schedule. But the majority leader never schedules any measure for consideration without informing the minority—at least, that has been true up to now, although tomorrow morning he may oppose a motion to proceed to consider some measure or may refuse to join in giving unanimous consent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for whatever time may be necessary in order to set the record straight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Texas may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is important for the people of the country and the press of the country to understand the mechanics of Senate procedure. It is the majority policy committee which has the responsibility of scheduling proposed legislation. Normally in the procedures, the majority leader is guided by the majority policy committee in deciding what legislative proposals shall be scheduled.

The Senator from Texas is correct, and has been correct, in saying that no legislative proposal is taken up without advance consultation and advance notice to the minority leader. There may be scheduled many times—the last bill was not one of them—proposed legislation to which the minority leader himself is quite opposed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And frequently there is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And that situation might be reversed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And frequently that is the case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But when I receive notice, I inform—and did in this case—the minority policy committee as to the scheduling of the proposed legis-

lation; and the records of the minority policy committee will so indicate—just as I shall report today on the scheduling of the measures the majority is proposing for Senate consideration as soon as the farm bill is disposed of.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out that it is highly probable that some of our friends across the aisle, who are on the opposite side of the question from the Senator from Texas, although they may have been elated over the veto, were in no sense responsible for it. That was my purpose in rising to speak, the other day; but I was very sorry to read in the press, the next day, that I had been needling the Senator from Texas, because that was the farthest thing from my mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the privilege of the Senator from Vermont; and I did not interpret his remarks as constituting needling at all.

Mr. President, I exercised no influence on the Members on this side or on the President in connection with that proposed legislation. I realized that my State had a vital interest in it, and I think most Senators felt that their States had an interest in it.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Once the natural-gas bill was scheduled, I asked my colleague [Mr. DANIEL] at the end of a 1½-hour speech, to yield to me. He yielded to me for about 10 minutes and at that time I made some observations. I left, that afternoon, and went to Florida, in accordance with the instructions of my physicians. I remained there for 11 days. I did not return during the remainder of the debate, until the acting majority leader called me and told me that the opponents were ready to vote—that they had debated the bill for about 3 weeks, and that they would like to have me return, and would like to have a unanimous-consent agreement entered, and were ready to vote on Monday.

So we let them select the day and the hour and the conditions. Although the Senator from California felt that we had wasted some time, and should vote earlier, nevertheless we were so considerate of the opponents that we let them select the time for the vote.

While I was in Florida, I kept reading newspaper articles and magazine stories saying that the Senator from Texas was wielding an unusual influence and was determined to ram the bill down the Senate's throat. Mr. President, I am not a child; I have been in these situations before. My daddy used to tell me, "Don't get on the firing line unless you expect to get shot at."

So I expect a certain amount of punishment to go with the leadership; but I do not expect people to be unfair and unjust, although frequently the uninformed are.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is a common practice that when one State finds itself in the possession of a valuable natural resource, it tries to get as much as possible from that resource. The other day, I stated on the floor of the Senate that if I were from one of the gas-producing States, undoubtedly I would be in favor of the natural-gas bill. However, being on the other end of the transaction, it seemed to me that, even though the gas-producing States had tried to get everything possible to be obtained for their resource, we had an equally great obligation to undertake to protect the people in our consuming States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas left no doubt about his deep convictions in this matter.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On the other hand, the Senator from Texas attempted to be as discreet as he could and should be in the position he occupied. If the Senator from Vermont or any other Senator was overlobbied, it was not done by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Texas is quite correct. I do not think he ever asked me to vote for the bill, although I think he expressed disappointment when he learned that I was going to vote against it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sure that I ever knew how the Senator intended to vote.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. This is the loveliest "wake" I have ever attended in the Senate. I assure the Senator from Texas that in my humble opinion the ideas which he has expressed are the finest expressions I have heard in the Senate.

We learn in life that one's perspective is largely governed by what we may call his background. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has just reminded us of the fact that geography has played a part. One's background educationally, racially, religiously, and economically—and I think, above everything else, geographically—determines one's perspective with respect to legislative measures. But there is something else that determines perspective, something that is more important than all the things I have mentioned. I refer to an understanding mind. The Senator from Texas has demonstrated that quality here today. I think he has taught us all a lesson.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate for consuming so much time. I had merely intended to express to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] the appreciation of a grateful heart.

GOVERNMENT STORAGE OPERATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 23 there appeared on pages 1020 and 1021 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] under the caption "Need for Facts Regarding Surplus Versus Inventory for Nation's Needs."

In connection with this statement there also appears in the RECORD a letter from the Senator from Minnesota to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, dated January 21, 1956. That letter in its entirety reads as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1956.

The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALLEN: In view of the issue raised before our committee Friday about the extent to which one of our Minnesota grain cooperatives was benefiting from Government storage operations, I believe it only fair to ask that the record be completed by requesting the Department of Agriculture to provide full information on storage payments to all warehousemen in Minnesota, private as well as cooperative.

For that purpose, I urge you to have the committee staff obtain from the Department of Agriculture a complete listing which shows:

1. All the storage facilities in Minnesota approved by the Department for storage of CCC-owned commodities;
2. The total amount of storage utilized in each during the calendar year 1955;
3. The total payment to each for storage purposes during the same period;
4. Designation of which facilities have been given guaranteed occupancy contracts for such storage and which have not;
5. The amount of payment to each holder of such guaranteed occupancy contract covering space unused for storage purposes;
6. The extent to which each approved storage facility has been granted tax amortization benefits of accelerated depreciation.

Only in this way do I believe proper comparisons can be made to judge whether there is any validity to charges entered in our record pertaining to the storage benefits accruing to the Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, one of our great Midwest cooperatives.

Furthermore, I believe the hearing transcript will show requests were made for further information about the total extent of the grain operations of this cooperative. Because it is a major competitor in the grain trade with other private firms, I do not believe it fair or just to ask the GTA to make any report of its operations not similarly requested of all its major competitors in the grain business.

To the extent that the same information is asked from any other grain handlers or dealers, I am sure officers of the GTA will be happy to provide detailed data on any of its operations to our committee.

As long as this subject of grain storage has been raised, I believe the committee should go further, looking carefully into what policies the Department of Agriculture has been following.

During the previous administration, a vigorous crackdown was made on grain handlers defrauding farmers and the Government through theft of grain. You, as chairman of our committee, were largely instrumental for exposing these thefts, and full cooperation of the Department of Agriculture was given in bringing charges against these crooked dealers. If I recall rightly, charges were filed against more than 300 grain handlers, involving some $7 million. More than 50 convictions were obtained, many others subsequently settled out of court, and some charges are still unresolved.

It is my understanding today that practically all of these same warehousemen have once again been approved by the Department for handling of Government-owned grain. The Department of Agriculture is again doing business with them. Of course, some of them went through mock reorganizations or name changes, but basically the same people are involved.

In my opinion, this situation calls for a full-scale investigation as soon as the farm

bill is out of the way, either by our committee or, if you deem advisable, by the Senate's Permanent Investigating Committee.

If the information I have received is correct, it seems deplorable to me that men who defrauded the Government are now rewarded with new contracts at nearly double the previous storage fees.

It is more than deplorable when, in the face of such a situation, spokesmen for this administration have the effrontery to publicly criticize a farmer-owned cooperative on the ground that its primary interest is making money through grain storage.

Testimony of Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the GTA, flatly called such charges a lie. From my own knowledge of the situation in Minnesota, I support him most vigorously. The GTA's primary interest at all times has been the highest possible returns for its farmer members, and its dealings with the Government have at all times been as clean as a whistle.

If such charges are to be bandied about, however, it would be constructive to get the facts on the table for all to see.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Several paragraphs in this letter are certainly of more than ordinary interest; and I invite particular attention to the paragraphs beginning midway in the letter, which read as follows:

As long as this subject of grain storage has been raised, I believe the committee should go further, looking carefully into what policies the Department of Agriculture has been following.

During the previous administration, a vigorous crackdown was made on grain handlers defrauding farmers and the Government through theft of grain. You, as chairman of our committee, were largely instrumental for exposing these thefts, and full cooperation of the Department of Agriculture was given in bringing charges against these crooked dealers. If I recall rightly, charges were filed against more than 300 grain handlers, involving some $7 million. More than 50 convictions were obtained, many others subsequently settled out of court, and some charges are still unresolved. * * *

In my opinion, this situation calls for a full-scale investigation as soon as the farm bill is out of the way, either by our committee or, if you deem advisable, by the Senate Permanent Investigating Committee.

If the information I have received is correct, it seems deplorable to me that men who defrauded the Government are now rewarded with new contracts at nearly double the previous storage fees.

I could not imagine that these observations would stand without some response from the Department of Agriculture; and accordingly I made inquiry as to the answer the Department might have made.

I learned that on February 10 the Secretary did make a reply; and at my request a copy of his letter has been supplied to me. It reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: My attention has been directed to your accusation that the Department of Agriculture is doing business with warehousemen who have been convicted of thefts of Government-owned grain. This matter has been examined by this Department and we have found that the facts do not support this charge.

When I assumed office I found in effect a set of regulations concerning the investigation and approval of warehousemen who desired to store Government-owned commodities. Unfortunately, the regulations were not issued by my predecessor until the Government had already lost millions of dollars as a result of thefts of Commodity Credit Corporation grain by warehousemen. Their issuance, therefore, to an extent represented "locking the barn after the horse had been stolen."

We are doing business with some 14 country warehousemen in Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota who sold flaxseed owned by CCC for seed and later replaced it with other flaxseed shipped in from Texas. These operators settled their civil claims with CCC by accounting for their gross profits in the transactions, and although two were indicted no convictions were ever obtained. The decision to resume doing business with these warehousemen was made during the last administration and the matter has never been subsequently reopened. There are also a very few cases where we are doing business with organizations which were short and the shortage was the result of the default of an official or employee who was subsequently replaced and we have assurance that the management of the organization is now on a sound basis.

If you have knowledge of any case where a convicted thief has been able to conceal from us and from State warehousing authorities his past record and as a result has been able to reenter the grain warehousing business I hope that in the interest of good administration you will inform me promptly in order that I may take corrective action at once. Please understand that I have no objection to an investigation of this matter, but I see no reason for delay if you have any information which you are willing to supply.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

This letter speaks for itself. In my judgment it is a complete refutation of the allegations which were made to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RUSSIA'S REQUEST FOR A FRIENDSHIP PACT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD one paragraph of a letter from Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, dated February 4. Dr. Morgan is a former president of Antioch College and a former head of the TVA. He has a long list of public services to his credit. The excerpt from the letter reads as follows:

My other conviction relates to our day-to-day policy. Take the case of Russia's recent request for a friendship pact. Why can we not say in specific terms how actions speak louder than words? Wars are built in the minds of peoples. So long as Russia indoctrinates her people with the ideas that American labor is oppressed and coerced, that lynchings are usual, and that America is a servile country dominated by plutocracy, what is the use to talk about friendship. Why not begin by asking her to cooperate in honest effort to establish or to publicly repudiate certain propaganda charges, and offer to do the same with reference to our charges, as about slave camps. A constant reiteration of our desire for honest friendship, with constant repetition of our willingness to make honest examination of charges on either side, and this is in spirit of restraint rather than of name calling, would, I believe, make a deep impression. Insofar as such a program should be carried out it would tend to remove suspicion and hatred that are based on false propaganda. Russia has left herself wide open to such proposals, and would have difficulty in rejecting them without loss of prestige. But we would have to do the job honestly, and not just as clever moves for prestige purposes.

CARGO PREFERENCE AS APPLIED TO SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to keep the record straight.

With all the furor about the cargo preference bill and the allegation that our merchant marine does not need to have the 50–50 principle applied to the surplus agricultural commodities, it might be well to bear in mind the following discouraging facts concerning our merchant fleet which have just come to my attention.

According to a report issued on February 13 by the American Merchant Marine Institute, as of September 1955, only 21.8 percent of United States oceanborne foreign trade is being carried aboard American flag vessels, exclusive of trade with Canada and trade in military controlled vessels.

What alarms me is not the fact that even with our cargo preference law we are still not carrying the substantial portion of our foreign commerce envisioned by those who wrote the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; but rather the fact that in September 1954, our ships were carrying 27.2 percent of such cargoes.

Thus, it is clear that our vessels, even with cargo preference assistance, have suffered almost a 20 percent decline—think of that, almost a 20 percent decline, from 27.2 percent to 21.8 percent—in cargo carriage within 1 year.

How anyone recognizing the importance to our economy and national defense of our merchant marine could recommend the weakening, let alone the repeal of our cargo preference law, is beyond me. It would make a great deal more sense to me, and I am sure to many other Senators, if we were to change the 50–50 principle so as to require that 100 percent of such government-financed cargoes as those covered by Public Law 480 were carried entirely aboard American flag ships.

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER ON THE NIAGARA RIVER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there is a piece of proposed legislation in which the people of my State are vitally interested, which I have been urging and advocating in the Senate since 1950. It is legislation which is urgently and vitally needed to prevent an extravagant and unjustifiable waste which has been going on for many years. I am referring to the legislation providing for the public development of hydroelectric power on the Niagara River.

Mr. President, at long last this legislation was acted upon by the Public Works Committee of the Senate. That action was taken on January 16, more than a month ago. I understand that a report was prepared by the majority of the committee and made ready for

filing some weeks ago. That report is being held up, because the minority of the committee, which does not favor the bill which was reported by the majority, has not completed its work on the minority views.

I understand that minority views have been written but the Senators favoring them have not gotten around to approving them or filing them.

This is very unfair to the people of my State. It is unfair, in my judgment, to the Senate.

The majority leader of the Senate has included the Niagara power development bill on his list of "must" legislation. It is "must" legislation for New York State and for the people of the northeastern section of the United States. It is my fervent hope that this proposed legislation can be called up shortly for debate, consideration, and a vote. Before that can happen, however, the report must be made public. It must be made available to the other Members of the Senate so that they may study it and give it consideration. It must be made available to the general public so that they may consider it and indicate their interest in this legislation to the Members of the Senate.

I, therefore, urge upon those members of the Senate Public Works Committee who are in opposition to the bill introduced by me in association with 16 other Members of the Senate—Senate bill 1823—to complete their work upon the minority views and to file them so that there may be no undue delay in bringing this measure before the Senate for debate and vote.

I hope and trust that this is not an indication of a desire to postpone action—to delay and put it off—until the last possible moment. Consideration should be given to this bill at the earliest possible time. It has been waiting a long time for consideration.

The people of New York State are entitled to have this vital project considered by the Senate and by the House.

Every day hundreds of thousands of potential kilowatt-hours of power are going to waste, so far as the United States is concerned. Canada is picking up a great part of the water which is rightfully ours, and it is entitled to do this, under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Canada, until we get ready to use this water.

I hope that the advocates of private development in this area are not going to play the part of dog in the manger. I hope they are not going to try to delay action on this proposed legislation merely because they cannot get their own proposal for a private development enacted. I want them and the general public to know that we are alerted and we shall continue to insist on consideration being given to this proposed legislation at the earliest possible date.

INTEGRATION OF NEW ORLEANS ROMAN CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an encouraging development in the bigotry we recently have been following in some sections of the Nation is the magnificent letter by Archbishop Joseph Francis Rummel that he intends to integrate the New Orleans Roman Catholic parochial schools. All honor to Archbishop Rummel for recognizing courageously that all children, regardless of the color of their skins, are children of the same God. This is a most heartening episode amidst the intolerance we have witnessed elsewhere concerning different races in school systems. Archbishop Rummel deserves great credit, and I ask that a story from the New York Times of February 20, 1956, headlined "Prelate To Press Integration Plan," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRELATE TO PRESS INTEGRATION PLAN—ARCHBISHOP OF NEW ORLEANS DENOUNCES SEGREGATION IN A STRONG PASTORAL LETTER

NEW ORLEANS, February 19.—Archbishop Joseph Francis Rummel in a strongly worded pastoral letter denounced racial segregation today as "morally wrong and sinful." He gave clear indication he intended to integrate New Orleans Roman Catholic parochial schools.

His letter was read at all masses in all churches throughout the archdiocese. It is the largest in the Deep South and has a Catholic population of 524,157. About 25 percent are Negroes.

It was the first time New Orleans Catholics had heard integration plans discussed in a public letter from the archbishop. The reading at most churches commanded rapt attention.

Church spokesmen previously had announced that plans were under way to integrate the Catholic schools sometime after 1956, but this was the archbishop's first public denunciation of segregation as a sin.

LARGEST SCHOOL UNIT

The New Orleans parochial school system is the State's largest single school unit. New Orleans is one of the few cities in the country where more children attend parochial than public schools.

Archbishop Rummel did not say when integration would come, but pleaded "that the decision when made will be accepted in the spirit of Christian charity and justice. * * *

"This is a problem which should be worked out not in an atmosphere of wrangling or contention or discord or hatred but in a spirit of conciliation and with a desire to achieve peace through justice and charity."

He said the plans still were under study.

The New Orleans public school system already is under Federal district court order to begin carrying out the Supreme Court decision of 1954 ending public school segregation.

The court order came Wednesday after a special 3-man Federal court had declared all Louisiana school segregation laws unconstitutional.

SEGREGATION MORALLY WRONG

Earlier this week three Catholic State legislators announced they would ask the May legislature to include Catholic schools in these State segregation laws. Catholic schools were deleted from the original bills in 1954 at the urging of Archbishop Rummel.

More than 50 percent of the South's Catholics live in Louisiana, but the archbishop's letter had no effect on Louisiana's two other dioceses, Lafayette and Alexandria.

In his letter the German-born archbishop said racial segregation "is morally wrong and sinful because it is a denial of the unity and solidarity of the human race as conceived by God in the creation of man in Adam and Eve."

He added that "difficult indeed is the approach to a propitious solution according to the Christian principles of justice and charity of the problem of racial integration in our schools, especially in the Deep South where for more than a century and a half segregation has been accepted without serious question and challenge."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDY OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the resolution (S. Res. 165) to make a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "prior", and in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$115,000" and insert "$100,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 165 is sponsored by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if he wishes to speak on the resolution at this time.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who is the acting majority leader of the Senate. I shall undertake, briefly as I can, to cover such ground as may be pertinent

to the question of the appropriation sought in the resolution.

Senate Resolution 165, submitted by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], to provide an appropriation of $100,000 to cover the staff salaries and other expenses of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, was first reported by the unanimous vote of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in turn was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration with one dissenting vote.

It might not be inappropriate at this time to make a brief statement, first, of the work done by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights since last May, and second, of the work proposed to be done by the subcommittee during the current year. I might say, too, that the reason for my being the chairman of the subcommittee is that I was assigned to that responsibility; I did not apply for it.

In addition to being the chairman of this subcommittee, I am also the chairman of another subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, namely, the subcommittee on improvements in the judicial machinery; I am a member of 8 subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, and a member of 3 special subcommittees of the standing committee, making a total of 9—6 standing subcommittees and 3 special subcommittees. I mention this only as an indication of the work load of the Committee on the Judiciary, which, in addition to the work of its subcommittees, handles all private immigration and claims bills, of which there are many hundreds. Furthermore, the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, by specially appointed subcommittees, undertake to pass upon the qualifications of nominees to the Federal judiciary, including United States district attorneys, United States marshals, and other officers of the judicial or quasi-judicial agencies.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights began its work last May and had $50,000 as its appropriation beginning at that time. The subcommittee has turned back, as unallocated funds, about 10 percent of its appropriation, or $4,785.44.

I may say, parenthetically, that the subcommittee has been able to function with a relatively small staff, due largely to the fact that I have had to press some of my own staff into service during the period of the recess of the Senate, when, commencing on Constitution Day, September 15, 1955, and ending about December 1, 1955, the subcommittee held rather extensive hearings, covering a considerable number of days and in excess of 100 hours of the hearing of witnesses.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is not a select committee of temporary duration, but is a standing subcommittee of the Senate, charged with the responsibility for continuous observation of the execution of laws dealing with civil liberties and constitutional rights.

The task of this subcommittee was defined by Chief Justice Earl Warren in his celebrated address on February 19, 1955, when he recalled that "the men of our First Congress knew, as we may be in danger of forgetting, that each element of the Bill of Rights was a painfully won acquisition. They knew that Government must be neither too strong nor too weak; that whatever form it may assume, Government is potentially as dangerous a thing as it is a necessary one. They knew that power must be lodged somewhere to prevent anarchy within and conquest without, but that this power could be abused to the detriment of their liberties."

The abuses arise not out of the laws themselves, but out of their administration by men, and the Chief Justice appreciated the temptation to abuse which springs from the tensions of our troubled times when he said:

> Periods of domestic dissension and of foreign war are especially liable to produce tendencies to disregard established rights in the name of national safety. * * * In our time, we have seen the greatest of wars give way to a decade of chronic tension and crisis, in which it is to be expected that new encroachments upon traditional liberties may have to be countered. I have suggested that if there has been damage done to our traditional rights, it has been accomplished by a process of erosion.

The Chief Justice very clearly saw the necessity of a continuing struggle against this subtle wearing away of our constitutional rights, saying:

> The fact remains, however, we do have a battle today to keep our freedoms from eroding just as Americans in every past age were obliged to struggle for theirs. Many thoughtful people are of the opinion that the danger of erosion is greater than that of direct attack.

At the end of May, following the voting of the appropriation, the subcommittee hired a small staff to make preliminary studies as to what topics and fields especially required subcommittee investigation. In July the subcommittee obtained the services of a distinguished lawyer from Missouri, Mr. Lon Hocker, who is a strong Republican by political faith, and a former president of the St. Louis Bar Association.

He came to Washington at a personal sacrifice to his own private practice, and stayed for about 6 months, helping to conduct and prepare for the hearings. It was not because Mr. Hocker hailed from Missouri, or because he was a Republican, that I invited him to come, but because, after canvassing the field, he seemed to be a man who had long been imbued with a desire to maintain the principles involved, and because he had an interest in the preservation of individual liberty. We were certainly sorry to lose him, but the understanding when he came was that he would stay for 6 months. He fulfilled that commitment in spite of great personal sacrifice. I wanted to pay tribute to Mr. Hocker today for the work he did for the subcommittee during those 6 months.

The inquiries of the subcommittee began with an examination of the rights guaranteed by the first amendment. From the very first approach to the problem it became apparent that the greatest danger of erosion of the first amendment was in the operations of our various loyalty-security programs. The majority of the cases studied by the committee involved instances in which American citizens were being dismissed from Government employment, dishonorably discharged from the Armed Forces, or deprived of their right to travel—not because they were Communists, but because of allegations that either they or their relatives had at some time held opinions which are offensive to most of us, or belonged to organizations now discredited.

On the basis of these complaints, the committee held a series of public hearings beginning on November 14, 1955, and ending on November 29, 1955.

The principal accomplishment of the recent hearings by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has been to reveal the snowballing nature of the Government's loyalty-security programs, and their extension to areas having no genuine relation to the Nation's security.

We know that when the Nation is imperiled, the interest of our national security must override individual rights, but our hearings have revealed that too often the rights of citizens have been sacrificed needlessly and recklessly without regard to the national security. One instance of such reckless sacrifice is involved in the treatment of American soldiers caught in the complexities of the Army security program.

In many instances, boys are called into the Army and then given menial duties until they are discharged under conditions less than honorable because of something they did or said or something their parents or relatives did or said prior to the soldiers' Army service. It is important to remember that under present law, no Communist—indeed, no man about whom there is "creditable derogatory information of Communist membership"—can be inducted into the Army, so that every case involves not a Communist, but an American soldier. Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson has justified this phase of the Army program not in the name of security, but of discipline. It is so obvious that the Army has no power to discipline a man for anything done before he enters the service that the Defense Department announced a change in policy designed to minimize the practice of giving less than honorable discharges for preinduction conduct even before our committee held its hearings.

A few weeks ago, the subcommittee received a letter from the Defense Department's General Counsel, Mansfield D. Sprague, making certain clarifications of the new policy announced November 16, 1955.

I want to make it very clear that this policy was announced after the subject matter of the hearings had been determined and the hearings were underway.

The testimony before the Subcommittee on the State Department Passport Policy tended to establish that the right to travel was being taken away from American citizens even where no question of national security existed. We learned from the testimony of Scott McLeod, head of the State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs,

that while the Department's regulations do provide a hearing for a Communist who is denied a passport, they do not provide a hearing for the citizen who is not a Communist and who is denied the right to travel.

This is a very singular and strange anomaly, indeed. Under the regulations, Communists have a right to a hearing, but a citizen who is not a Communist does not have that right.

Inasmuch as it is the Communists who threaten the national security, I do not see how we make ourselves safer by giving more rights to Communists than we do to other citizens.

While I do not want to burden the Senate with voluminous case notes, I believe that the Linus Pauling case illustrates how seriously damaging to individual rights the passport program can be, and how far it has strayed from the requirements of national security. In our hearing we found that this world-famous scientist applied for a passport in 1952, without success, until strong protests from eminent scientists resulted in the issuance of a limited passport to Mr. Pauling. On 3 occasions the limited passport was thereafter renewed, and then on 3 later occasions refused. In 1954, Mr. Pauling's application for a passport was finally and definitely rejected on the grounds that the State Department had secret information that Mr. Pauling was a concealed Communist. Despite all the evidence that Mr. Pauling was not a Communist, concealed or otherwise, the State Department persisted in its refusal to issue his passport until Mr. Pauling was honored with a Nobel prize. Immediately following this distinguished award, Mr. Pauling was given, not a restricted passport, as in days past, but a full and unrestricted permit to travel. Mr. McLeod explained the sharp reversal of the State Department by saying, and I quote his testimony in the hearing:

> We in the State Department do not operate in a complete ivory tower down there. And when the announcement of the Nobel prize was made, I think that the question of his passport was then considered at a high level.

We of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Mr. President, feel that our Constitution requires that every American citizen, no matter how humble, must receive consideration at the same high level that seems now to be reserved, as in this case, exclusively for Nobel prize-winners.

Only the most compelling national security considerations, Mr. President, can justify any abridgment of the individual rights afforded to all of us by our Constitution. The possibilities of injustices within the national security program were exposed in frightening detail in the case of Clifford J. Hynning, who was disgraced last year when he was dismissed by the Treasury Department as a security risk, after 15 years of Government service. Under Secretary of the Treasury H. Chapman Rose testified before our committee that the charges against Mr. Hynning were not based on the specific paragraphs—the so-called security-risk criteria—of the President's security order, and admitted that at his hearing Mr. Hynning had successfully rebutted any inference of sympathetic association with communism. Nevertheless, Mr. Hynning was condemned as a security risk, and on the basis of an accusation made for the first time at the very close of his hearing. The offense charged against Mr. Hynning was that he was not candid when he said that he failed to recollect a 10-minute interview with an FBI agent which had taken place 12 years before, and in regard to another man. This accusation, if it can be termed such, was not developed into a specific charge, and the accused was not given adequate opportunty to defend himself, although these basic protections form the concept of due process of law under our system of jurisprudence. I am happy to tell you, Mr. President, that following our hearings, Mr. Hynning was restored to duty in the Treasury Department. Remembering his long ordeal, it came as no surprise that having vindicated himself, Mr. Hynning then resigned from the Government service.

Mr. President, I believe that it would be unfair if I left you with the impression that those charged with administration of our security programs habitually refuse to admit error. As a matter of fact, Frank Campbell Waldrop, consultant to the Secretary of State on security matters, and a distinguished journalist and former editor of the Washington Times Herald, told our committee that he thought the Hynning case "was a terrible thing to happen in the Government of the United States, and other cases like it were terrible things."

Other alarming testimony as to the far-reaching impact of the security program was provided by Mr. Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. His testimony developed two highly significant facts. The first is that the Commission maintains some two million dossiers or files of derogatory information, in addition to an index file of some 5 million names. The derogatory information, which is completely unevaluated is assembled by clipping newspapers and getting names from petitions and mailing lists of various organizations. Later, this unevaluated information may be considered as evidence of disloyalty in security-board proceedings conducted without the safeguards of due process. Moreover, numerous classes of persons, such as applicants for Government employment and probationary employees, are not even entitled to hearings. In their cases they may find themselves condemned as a result of the mere fact of permitting their names to get into the newspapers.

Mr. Young's testimony also disclosed the novel interpretation put upon President Eisenhower's security order. Mr. Young testified that in compiling the figures on security-risk terminations, the Commission adds to the number of those dismissed under the Presidential security order the far greater number of those who were dismissed under regular civil-service procedures without having been charged with being security risks.

Now I should like to outline briefly the present plans of the subcommittee for the coming year.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains evidence of the growing concern of Members of Congress over the practice of the Foreign Claims Commission in depriving American soldiers of the money which Congress has, by law, declared they should have in token payment for their long, agonizing days of imprisonment in Communist prison camps. We have in the files of our committee indignant letters from Members of Congress, from veterans' groups, from lawyers, and from former prisoners of war, relating to American soldiers who have been deprived of the money that Congress has, by law, declared that they should have as only a small payment for their days of imprisonment in Communist camps. We have been urgently requested, and are being so requested to hold open hearings to determine just what the practice of the Claims Commission is; and we are now engaged in the necessary preparations for these hearings.

Last year, Chief Justice Warren posed the question:

> Have there not been enough invasions of the freedom of the press to justify a concern about the inviolability of that great right?

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, in addition to its other tasks in the coming year, will seek an answer to the question asked by the Chief Justice. Our investigations and studies in this field will have particular reference to the constitutional aspects of the problems created by the growing tendency of the executive branch—any executive branch, under any administration—to withhold from the public information which needs not be suppressed because of national security or because of the safety of our country. The maintenance of the people's right to freedom of information certainly transcends any partisan considerations. I believe that all of us agree about that.

Ever since World War II, we have witnessed an increasing secrecy cloaking the operations of the Federal Government. This secrecy within the executive branch has been quite properly the subject of criticism by newspaper editors and other thoughtful men and women throughout the country. We plan a thorough study of this problem, insofar as it touches the basic constitutional right of freedom of the press, which, certainly, by implication, includes as a part and parcel of it the right of the American public to be informed.

The subcommittee is also charged with the responsibility of making recommendations concerning all bills and resolutions referred to it on the general subject of civil rights. That, of course, pertains among other things, to the question of racial minorities. Many such measures are before us. They require very careful study and consideration. As the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will bear witness, we met only last week to consider a number of such measures affecting civil rights.

There are a number of such measures on the agenda. Some of them will require public hearings. They will require

that witnesses be brought from some distance, perhaps, for the enlightenment and information of the committee.

The subcommittee has already requested the opinion of the Attorney General and of various other executive agencies with respect to these measures.

It is always important that specific injustices be remedied. We may easily fall into a routine way of doing things, because we are so busy and so concerned with many problems affecting not only our own country, but the rest of the world. It is easy to lose sight of the fact that the most important thing in this country is the individual man and woman, and the protection of their God-given constitutional rights and privileges. A government should ever be solicitous to safeguard and protect their rights.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I ask my distinguished colleague whether or not it is true that we have received hundreds of complaints from individuals who have been deprived of their rights by police officers or the courts, and whether or not we have investigated such cases to the best of our ability, so as to indicate examples which should be followed all over the country.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from North Dakota is correct. He is a very hard working and invaluable member of the subcommittee.

As indicative of the workload, during the past 6 months public hearings have been held to the extent of more than 100 hours, beginning September 15 and running until the first of December. Telephone inquiries average approximately 500 each week. With respect to the correspondence load, the average number of letters each week is 200. This workload is handled by a staff of 6 professional and 3 clerical members.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that complaints have come from every State in the Union, as well as from Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and even from soldiers stationed in various parts of the world?

Mr. HENNINGS. Even from soldiers stationed overseas, both in the Asiatic and European theaters. The Senator is entirely correct. I think the prisoner-of-war problem is one which this committee certainly should take up as one of the first orders of business. There are some 250 former prisoners of war who, for grounds which seem less than substantial, have been given honorable discharges in some cases, but no payment for their term of service spent in Communist prison camps.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that this is the one committee to which any citizen, regardless of race, color, or creed, no matter how humble he may be, no matter how rich he may be, can come to see that his constitutional rights are preserved under the Bill of Rights?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator well knows that he is entirely correct. As I recall, in one instance he himself made a trip to a Federal penitentiary in my own State, and thereafter conducted hearings in California, relating to two ex-service men who had found themselves in great difficulty because of what may have been excessive zeal on the part of certain prosecuting officers.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. I was interested in the exchange with regard to what may be done by this committee in connection with certain prisoners of war who have appeared before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in order to justify their rights, which may be threatened. The question involved is whether they are to be sustained and permitted to collect the benefits to which they would be entitled in the normal process, or whether they are to lose such rights. Am I correct in understanding that the committee is acting under the law which Congress enacted some time ago, and which, by its very wording, makes it essential that every one of such cases come before that Commission before any decision may be reached?

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to the Senator, as I have already indicated, that as a result of the hearings the Department of Defense changed its policy with respect to giving some men less than honorable discharges, in cases in which they had properly completed their term of service and performed the duties assigned to them.

Our interest is not to supersede any other Government agency, or to encroach upon the legal functions of any other Government agency or board, quasi-judicial or otherwise. However, we are very much interested in cases which seem to indicate that the administration has been faulty, that the spirit of the law has not been complied with, and that injustice has been done to any man, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. My reason for asking the question is that recently a young man from my State, who was in the service for a considerable period of time, appealed to me. He was a prisoner of war in Korea. This young man's legs were frozen from his feet to a point above his knees. He was compelled to walk some 300 miles back and forth across the northern part of Korea before he finally landed in a prison camp. He was in the prison camp for a long period of time.

Some time after he was released, he was given an honorable discharge. Prior to that time he was given an advance in rank. At that time he was given disability benefits.

Time went on, and then suddenly, out of the blue, came a charge against this man, because what someone said about his conduct in a prisoner of war camp, which reflected against him to such an extent that his rights to obtain benefits under the Prisoner of War Act were challenged. It became necessary for that young man to defend his rights. I doubt very much indeed whether he could have done so had he not known me personally and had I not known the young man and his background. After checking with me, he came to Washington, and was accompanied to the hearing before the Commission. I must say that in that instance certainly—I am not qualified to speak about others—he was given most courteous consideration by the Commission. Finally it resulted in the clearing of his name and the removal of any charge that he was disloyal in any way. He had his rights restored.

However, my concern is not now for that young man, because that incident is over. My concern is for young men in similar situations who may not know to whom to appeal in order to have their rights safeguarded and to have their records cleared.

Therefore, if the committee did nothing else other than to assure persons—and I care not whether the number of cases be 1 or 2 or 5 or 10—have a hearing before the Commission, and in that way have their rights safeguarded, and thus make it possible for young men to know that they have somewhere to turn in their attempt to have their rights protected, then I would say that any expense of the committee would be justified in my mind. I hope that the Senator from Missouri will be able to carry out his efforts along that line.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine for his statement and his contribution and his evident understanding of the work we are doing.

So far as I know, we have about completed our work on the loyalty security program, because most agencies have revised and changed their programs.

However, I should like to say to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Maine, that the case which he has so graphically described and cited is typical of the vast majority of the other cases we have had before us.

Those are the things we are concerned with. We are concerned particularly with men who may not be able to employ counsel, or may not have the means or the opportunity of understanding their rights. Those are the things we propose to set right, bearing in mind that we do not give any aid or comfort to any Communist or subversive, but do seek to protect the rights of loyal American soldiers and sailors. Such effort is worth $100,000 a year in appropriations, or even $100 million, if necessary.

That has been the slow and laborious approach which our committee has undertaken. We have endeavored to screen some of the cases. Of course, we get a great many letters from irresponsible people who believe their constitutional rights have been violated. I dare say we have had some letters from Communists and former Communists. However, I want to make this statement very clear for the RECORD, that in no instance has a Communist or a former Communist appeared as a witness during the hear-

ings, so careful and meticulous have been the investigations and screenings preceding the hearings.

Our concern has been with the decent and blameless loyal American whose rights have been subverted and, indeed, whose reputation and, in some instances, his entire career, may have been ruined.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. PAYNE. In the case to which I have referred, I happen to know that the information which was forwarded to the Commission and which resulted in this particular situation, was unsubstantiated by anyone who was willing to show his face and to make the charge publicly. It was purely on the basis of hearsay or idle gossip and rumor. It was thrown out the window after the young man was able to state the facts. I had a chance to review his testimony. Certainly after reading the revelations this young man gave in connection with his having been a prisoner of war, any real American would wonder why this young man ever happened to fall into the situation of having his loyalty to his country challenged by anyone.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maine. I should like to say that the committee is just as much concerned with the humblest of the former soldiers as it is with the highest echelon Government employee whose rights may have been violated.

We get down now to the business of the informer, so-called. Of course, in my experience as a district attorney in a large city, I have used so-called informers in murder cases and bank robberies, and in all manner of criminal prosecutions. But in such cases the testimony is evaluated and corroborated and, what is most important of all, the accused is confronted by his accusers. The accused has the opportunity of cross-examination to determine, upon the anvil of cross-examination, in a tribunal of law, the truth or falsity of the testimony and the credibility of the witness.

Far from trying to impair or impede the loyalty security program, the record is replete with statements from hard-working and conscientious men from the Department of Defense, the Department of the Treasury, the Army, and other such agencies that the committee has helped to clarify their thinking and that they have been grateful for the opportunity to appear before the committee.

Many of them have returned to their offices and made a restudy, as in the Hynning case, to which I have referred, and made a complete reversal and restored a person to full and honorable status. In the Hynning case the situation arose solely because Mr. Hynning said he did not remember having had an interview with an FBI agent 12 years ago about someone else during a field check.

In a few minutes I shall complete my preliminary statement, if the Senate will indulge me.

It is important always that specific injustices be remedied, and the committee is proud of its record in this respect. But of even greater importance is the function of this committee in preventing abuses of a necessary but dangerous system of security. In his testimony, Mr. Waldrop said in refreshing language:

> As a friend of the system, I think it is very good for the system to get hit over the head a bit and find out what it's like, if I may just advance an opinion. A kick in the pants sobers the head, I think. This is too serious not to be treated with deadly seriousness all the time by everybody involved with it and not played with, I feel.

Mr. Waldrop perhaps says spontaneously what Justice Warren said deliberately when he warned that "the liberties thus written into our Federal law have not gone unassailed in the course of our national history, for men in office are still men. Whether men derive their authority from hereditary right or from popular election, they remain prone to overstep constitutional limitations and invade legal immunities."

Despite Mr. Waldrop's invitation, we have no desire to knock heads or to kick pants, but if through ceaseless study we can continue to inform the people as to the health of the precious liberties given them by the Constitution to the end that they may protect them from abuse, and be protected from it, then, Mr. President, I believe the committee will have served, indeed, the cause of all America.

Mr. President, I should like now to offer for the RECORD a complete statement of expenditures——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he offers his statement?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if the distinguished Senator has not forgotten the fact that the committee has taken under its protection the 21,500 inmates of Federal penitentiaries. These men are poor and forlorn, and the committee is interested in seeing to it that if a man in a penitentiary, no matter how humble or poor he may be, wishes to consult a lawyer, the rules and regulations shall be such that a lawyer can go and see him. The committee is interested in seeing that a man in a penitentiary has an opportunity to appeal to judges or to Senators. It may be that in 99 cases out of 100 the man is guilty and may deserve everything he is getting, but the committee is interested in the one hundredth case, in seeing to it that no innocent man is deprived of his constitutional rights, even though he may be an inmate of a penitentiary. He is still a human being.

Mr. HENNINGS. In reply, I should like to say that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has been notable and outstanding in his own interest in this special phase of the problem. I have had the pleasure and privilege of serving with him on another subcommittee relating to national penitentiaries, which, of course, pertains more to the functioning of the institutions as institutions, and has not this particular field under its jurisdiction.

Mr. President, last year the committee turned back 10 percent of its appropriation. However, it took us from May 11, 1955, until several months thereafter to assemble a staff and to begin working on the subject matter of the first hearing, which was the first amendment to the Constitution. So that in presenting both the expenditures and the projections for the next year, I believe we are abundantly justified in asking for the appropriation which the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously recommends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table of expenditures of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights from May 11, 1955, to and through January 31, 1956.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Expenditures—Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights from May 11, 1955, to Jan. 31, 1956

	Payroll	Stationery	Telephone and telegraph	Reporting	Witnesses	Staff travel	Incidental expenses
May	$742.51	$3.86	$41.70				$4.20
June	2,628.26	13.01	59.67	$23.68			18.75
July	3,792.54						8.00
August	4,400.24		97.59	142.01			26.68
September	4,076.03	153.66	138.20	649.96	$85.05		72.20
October	4,300.03	79.89	197.36	1,779.90	123.08	$746.58	184.16
November	4,639.72	13.33	272.67		3,816.01	425.90	61.55
December	2,564.40	49.53	170.33				17.67
January 1956	5,169.24	608.79				230.82	1,211.70
Total	33,312.97	922.07	977.52	2,595.55	4,024.14	1,402.40	1,604.91

Total expenditures	$44,839.56
Estimated telephone and incidental expenses to Jan. 31, 1956	375.00
Unallocated funds	4,785.44
Total	50,000.00

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that I do not in any way impugn the motives or the honesty of the able Senator from Missouri. I think his motives are of the best. I think he is completely honest in his investigation, and I should like to commend him at the outset for his statement that he is going to investigate Government secrets. I think that is something which needs attention. In the Committee on Government Operations we have been faced with the question of government by secrecy. I think the Senator's committee can do something along that line. It is certainly entitled to some appropriation.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I first wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his suggestion that our motives certainly are not subject to question.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I also wish to assure the Senator that the first big undertaking, in addition to the investigation of the cases which have been described by the Senator from Maine, will be freedom of the press. That will be the next major project. The important aspect of that right is the free access to information which should not be secret or classified when it has no effect upon the security of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to say to the Senator that I had prepared a rather extensive speech, but in view of the Senator's statement that he intends to investigate the question of governmental secrecy—keeping secret from the American people information which they should have—and will try to expose the facts and do something about it, and inasmuch as that is going to be one of his major aims, and because of his statement that he has practically finished the investigation of the security program, I shall desist from making the speech I had intended to make. I do think the Senator has done a great deal of damage to the security program, but if that phase of his investigation is ended, if he is going into the other things which he has mentioned, I shall not oppose the appropriation which is requested.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his understanding of this problem and for the statement he has made. I think it is certainly characteristic of a body of men such as we have in the Senate to differ on questions of principle, but I believe that most, if not all of us, are open to reasonable conviction, and I am very glad if the assurances I gave the Senator this morning have set to rest some of the points which I know were disturbing him.

The committee wants to do an honest and thorough job, a job which no other committee has the jurisdiction or the authority or the power to do. The committee is one which is easily misunderstood, perhaps, because it deals somewhat, possibly, with abstractions of law on constitutional questions, but, nonetheless, I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin and I can join in the general proposition that every individual American, if he is loyal and is a decent American, is entitled to the full protection of the Constitution.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Mexico may yield to me, so that I may question the Senator from Missou · about his statement, with the understanding that the Senator from New Mexico will not lose the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Louisiana may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Missouri state the progress which has been made in the study that was started last year, and whether the appropriation he is now seeking will be sufficient to permit his subcommittee to conclude the hearings on the subject which is now being investigated?

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is a standing subcommittee. I believe the Senator was not on the floor when I undertook to state what it has done thus far.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I was here, and I listened to the Senator's statement.

Mr. HENNINGS. The progress which has been made is as I undertook to outline it. Would the Senator be more specific in his question? I am afraid I do not understand the nature of the information the Senator is seeking.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Missouri has stated that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is a standing subcommittee. Does that mean the Senate will have to provide for the subcommittee as much as $100,000 each year in order to sustain the subcommittee's present staff?

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, I cannot commit future chairmen or future committees. Presumably I shall be a candidate for reelection myself this fall, and I may not be here next year to have anything to do with the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain the Senator from Missouri will be here. I think that is a safe assumption.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator for his expression of confidence and heartening encouragement.

I do not wish to be frivolous in responding to the Senator's questions, but I am trying to understand what the Senator is asking me.

Mr. ELLENDER. I pointed out in the debate last week, and this week, as well, that among many committees of the Senate it is the practice to divide the main committee into subcommittees. This is true of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, in particular, the Committee on the Judiciary, because the Committee on the Judiciary is where the practice of subdividing into many subcommittees really began. As I have pointed out, the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary are now receiving a total of more than $1,080,000 each year. That sum is in addition to the regular amount paid to each of the standing committees.

In addition to the amount paid to the standing Committee on the Judiciary, and aside from the $1,080,000 paid to the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on the Judiciary maintains another little group of employees consisting of 2 professional and 3 clerical employees at a cost of $49,000 a year. So, the Committee on the Judiciary has now obtained for all the operations of that committee in excess of $1,200,000 a year.

As I understand, the work now being done by the subcommittee which is headed by the Senator from Missouri is the work of one of the standing subcommittees.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I must assume, then, that it is contemplated that subcommittee will continue to receive each year approximately the amount which is now being sought for its operation this year.

Mr. HENNINGS. At the outset last year, in May—the Senator from Louisiana was present at the time, and we had some discussion of the matter—an appropriation of $50,000 was asked for. At that time I suggested that the subcommittee had determined to study the first 10 amendments to the Constitution in the light of their modern application—in other words, to have a look at the Bill of Rights, to see whether the Bill of Rights was, in fact, not being eroded, or was being eroded, as the Chief Justice of the United States saw fit to express it.

As to future appropriations, I can only say that the subcommittee has this year turned back 10 percent of the amount granted the subcommittee last year; and I used many members of my own office staff during the greater part of the hearings, because we started in the summer to get ready for the hearings, we commenced the hearings on September 15, and continued with them through December. So the membership of the staff fluctuated. There are now 10 members of the staff, including clerical and professional personnel—a chief counsel, a staff director, lawyers, and so on. I do not know whether the Senator from Louisiana was on the floor and heard me read the data with reference to the workload.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is outlined in the report.

Mr. HENNINGS. The subcommittee has received 500 telephone calls a week; the correspondence load has averaged 200 letters a week; and the subcommittee has been holding public hearings.

I appreciate the fact that it is not pleasant for the Senator from Louisiana to do what he has undertaken to do every year for some years past, namely, to discuss the appropriations. I know he is doing it as a matter of duty or of deep conviction; otherwise he would not continue to make his inquiries. But I am certain the Senator will agree with me when I say it is very difficult to tell exactly what another fellow needs in doing his job.

The Committee on the Judiciary, for example, handles 43.6 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced. It handles 62.5 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented to the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not want to get away from the subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. Before the passage of the Reorganization Act, I happened to be the chairman of the committee which handled all claims against the Government.

Mr. HENNINGS. I wish the Senate now had another committee to handle them. The Committee on the Judiciary is swamped with such bills all the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. At that time, the small committee of which I was the chairman handled 52 percent of all the bills passed by the Senate. The Sena-

tors did the work themselves, with the assistance of two clerks.

Mr. HENNINGS. Sometimes in the Committee on the Judiciary, when we should be considering legislative proposals of the greatest importance to the country, bills involving constitutional questions and all manner of other subjects within our very particular compass, we sit as though we were holding a justice of the peace court, passing on claims and immigration cases. Often we sit day and night on some of these matters, to the neglect, in my judgment, of very important questions, some of which are required to abide the next session of Congress, simply because the committee has not the time to consider them.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my understanding that the way in which these immigration and claims cases are being handled before the Senator's committee is that the work is done by lawyers hired by the committee; the Senators do not go into the details.

Mr. HENNINGS. I beg to differ with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. None of the Senators takes the claims and studies them, as was done in the former Committee on Claims, which was in operation prior to 1946.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is entirely conceivable that some of us are not so diligent or studious as is my friend, the Senator from Louisiana. I know he is a scholar, and I know he is diligent; but I do not know, either quantitatively or qualitatively, the nature of the work he may have done in studying claims.

Some Senators got their backs up in the committee 2 years ago and said they were not going to sit there and pass upon claims about which they did not know anything. So bills relating to immigration and claims against the Government are now parceled out among the Senators.

In my own case, I serve not only as a member of the full committee, but also on nine subcommittees, and, in addition on special subcommittees whose work relates to the confirmation of nominations for Chief Justice of the United States and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. The last nomination to the Supreme Court on which we held a hearing was that of Associate Justice Harlan. We consider also the nominations of district judges and United States attorneys.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why are all bills reported to the Senate in the name of the chairman?

Mr. HENNINGS. I assume that has been the custom, and always will be.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was not the case in the old Claims Committee. Each Senator who considered a particular claim made the report and was ready to answer any questions asked about the claim. But I assume the custom has changed.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will come to my office, I will show him my stack of claims and immigration bills, and I should be glad to have him spend a few hours on them with me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think I have been patient; I know the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Louisiana are not going to agree, so I wish the Chair would recognize me and let me proceed for a few minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall conclude my questioning in a few minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, personally, I wish to thank the Senator from Missouri for the fact that he still talks of civil rights. So long as we have men in the Senate who are willing to consider civil rights of the humble and the rich alike, the country is in pretty good shape. I wish to thank the Senator from Missouri for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO PRESERVATION OF LIFE FROM EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read and referred to the appropriate committee. I desire to have a few minutes in order that I may discuss the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 217), as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee composed of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full, complete, and continuing study and investigation of all problems relating to the preservation of life from the effects of nuclear explosions. The committee shall from time to time report to the Senate the results of its study and investigations together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of the Senate for a few minutes during times when the headlines of our Nation's press, radio newscasts, and television news broadcasts are filled to the brim with questions such as the health of our President, his exploits as a hunter, and the $64 question, "Will he run?" I hesitate at the moment to discuss the equally momentous question as to the result of the expose by our beloved colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in regard to the Natural Gas bill and certain influences which, apparently, were used in behalf of that measure. However, the Senator from New Mexico does have a tremendous responsibility in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Department of Defense.

Mr. President, the defense budget for this year is $35 billion, $5 billion more than the cost of all the other branches of the Government, so it is quite a responsibility. The horrible and devastating weapons with which we are arming our services for destruction of any enemy are, naturally, of very grave concern; but it seems to me it is of equal concern that the civilian population of the United States, which, since the Civil War, has not undergone the destruction and terror of war such as was known by the civilian population of Japan, Germany, England, and Russia, be informed of the danger, and that study be given by the Congress toward devising ways and means of protecting the civilian population.

I do not wish to intrude on the jurisdictional responsibilities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the field of military or industrial uses of the atom, but I have submitted a resolution which concerns itself with the destructive effects of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons on American civilians. This matter has been discussed with such eminent scientists as Dr. Edward Teller of the University of California, the inventor of the hydrogen bomb, and Dr. L. R. Hafstad, director of research of General Motors. Without presuming to speak for them, I feel confident that they represent the views of most American scientists. They created these weapons. They performed their tasks and developed the weapons in the same patriotic fashion in which Stephen Decatur fought for our country in the first years of the Republic.

These outstanding Americans are interested in the peaceful and industrial developments of atomic energy, but at the moment, knowing the capabilities and the horrible and apocalyptic effects of the weapon which they have helped create, they would like to lend their scientific knowledge toward the task of protecting our civilian population, and softening, if possible, the blows of the bomb. They are concerned with the civilian population of our country, and it is for this purpose, Mr. President, that I am submitting the resolution. In the light of the weekend announcement by the Soviet Marshal and Minister of Defense, Georgi K. Zhukov, that the Soviet Union is prepared to wage atomic warfare against the mainland of the United States and that they have developed an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching our bases abroad and our shores, the resolution is most timely.

I am not an alarmist, but, on the contrary, I do not believe that the American public should be treated as children and that the facts of life should be withheld from them. The difference of opinion between the Department of Defense and the ex-Secretary of the Air Force, Trevor Gardner, is of no concern to me other than to ponder the question, "What if Mr. Gardner is right?" After all, the man who controlled the German Reich, Hitler and his gang of paranoidal desperadoes, used every weapon they could lay their hands on. The Japanese did not wait for a Declaration of War to destroy the main part of our fleet at Pearl Harbor, and I doubt very much if

the men in the Kremlin, if they considered themselves prepared and capable of winning, would hesitate for one minute to use the horrifying weapons they claim to be producing.

I believe that the Congress must interest itself in this matter, and that the time to act is now and not after H-bombs have knocked out our major cities.

Mr. President, I had prepared by Dr. Teller and Dr. Hafstad, both of whom are scientists, a documentation and statement as to what the horrible H-bomb would do to the American people, especially the civilian population. In order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the statement prepared for me by Dr. Teller and Dr. Hafstad.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Within the last 60 days the Soviet Union has detonated a multimegaton H-bomb.[1] This has been fully confirmed by Western scientists. In fact the fallout from this bomb still continues.[2] Last fall the Geneva Conference [3] failed and while I, like everyone else, earnestly hope that peace will prevail, nevertheless I think it is but common prudence that while we have the opportunity we provide for the safety of the lives of our citizens.

The element of surprise in warfare has always been a tremendous advantage to an unprincipled aggressor. We have only to think back to December 7, 1941, for confirmation. However, heretofore while such surprise could strike at best a crippling blow, it is a hard fact that with nuclear weapons, such a surprise attack could actually win a war. In short, the advantages of a sneak attack have been increased a thousandfold.[4]

In these remarks, I wish to emphasize that this is under no circumstances a criticism of the preparedness steps taken by our military services. In fact aside from the extent to which these services run parallel to what I am discussing, I am not here concerned with either our defensive, or retaliatory steps taken after a sneak attack. What I am concerned with is the horrible effect of such an H-bomb attack upon our civilian population. The old concept of far-reaching frontlines of defense, of land, sea, and air, behind which the country itself lies relatively secure, literally no longer exists. In modern warfare our vast centers of population and our entire industrial might are the striking points and will be under attack simultaneously with the firing of our first defensive shot. Much has been done to provide us with some warning time. The radar warning networks of Canada and Alaska, the civil defense ground observer corps (air watchers), the "Texas towers" off the east coast, our radar-equipped station ships and planes are all for this purpose. But it is now as imperative to provide "defense in depth" for the civilian population as it is for the military. At present we are so vulnerable that the time granted can save little human life.

With piloted conventional bombers most military authorities agree that despite our interceptor squadrons, Nike installations, and other defense measures, a well-planned, well-coordinated air attack cannot be stopped once it gets underway. Enough of the enemy bombers would get through to make the attack disastrously effective.[5] It should be needless for me to add that there are other methods of attack open to the enemy now or will be in the future where the element of surprise will be greater. In any event, the enemy force that would reach their destination is sufficient to wreak untold havoc and disaster upon our civilian population.

In my opinion the average citizen regards the so-called H-bomb as a sort of super A-bomb. I say so-called advisedly. Actually the H-bomb, as first publicly discussed, has been superseded by a new and far more terrible weapon, the thermonuclear (fission-fusion-fission) bomb which uses elements of both the original A- and H-bomb wrapped finally in natural uranium (U–238) to create the most ghastly weapon of destruction ever conceived by the mind of man. The fact that natural uranium, not the tremendously expensive isotopes uranium 235 and plutonium 239 is used for this bomb makes it far cheaper to make and easier to produce. This is an implication of ominous significance. The A-bomb is measured in thousands of tons of TNT, the new bomb in millions. One such bomb falling on a city would create a fireball over 3 miles in diameter in which all things animate or inanimate would be vaporized. There would be no survivors and no man-structure could resist the heat effect or the blast force.

Within an 8-mile circle, destruction would be nearly total from the shock waves and heat and suction caused by the burst. Within a possibly 50-mile diameter, destruction, fire damage and casualties would be extensive.[6] This, however, would vary depending on the kind of protective action and nature of the terrain. Besides the foregoing visible effects, far more diabolical are those of fallout. They may be an even greater hazard as fall-out deadliness can vary according to the composition of the bomb, the point of detonation, and prevailing weather conditions. The fall-out effects of an H-bomb by taking advantage of weather conditions can be "tailored" to inflict the greatest damage on densely populated areas or on vast stretches of the Wheat Belt, the cattle country, or our forest lands.[7] It is possible with the H-bomb, the right burst position and the right wind condition to spread a deadly fallout downwind over thousands of square miles. This might not only be lethal to all animate unprotected beings but it could poison much vegetation. Besides all of this, it is believed by many scientists that the fall-out where it doesn't kill can have a disastrous mutative effect upon the genes of all animal life and produce monsters and still-born children in succeeding generations.[8]

There is the ravening force of evil now loose in the world and, alas, in the hands of those we dare not trust.

There has never been a problem which faced our Nation that has not been solved. This is as true today as it has always been. To assume that because the warning time is short, or, even that there will be no warning time, and to claim therefore that there is no defense is not only suicidal apathy, it is mass murder and at total variance with the spirit that makes this country so great.

I believe there is a defense against the H-bomb. Not only is it the immediate and instant flight from the centers of great cities as now officially proposed by our Government, but also and equally important a place to flee to and means of getting there. The prospect of our urban populations fleeing aimlessly without food, shelter, clothing, or medical attention and searching vainly for the members of their families is too horrible to contemplate. There must be points of refuge [9] where all these necessities can be provided and where great masses of people can be sheltered from deadly radiations and fallout for 4 weeks or longer.[10] If this be true, and it certainly appears so, then I can see no other pratical solution. But the exits of our great city are woefully inadequate for such an evacuation.[11] It will be necessary to create a system of escape routes for our citizens. Such routes can also be used in times of peace, but obviously there is no use in evacuating if there are no facilities by which it can be done and no provision for caring for our citizens afterwards. I am aware of the effort being made by Federal, State, and local officials to find an answer to this problem. But I am convinced that fallout from these superweapons requires an approach far beyond simply canvassing the Nation to see what facilities are available. I am convinced facilities for the people who evacuate our target cities must be created. These facilities, or evacuation centers, would serve as rallying and supply points, giving our people a definite objective toward which to flee and having the means to transform the refugees back into our greatest asset—and aroused citizenry vowed to stamp from the earth the malignant forces that have attempted to overwhelm them. In modern war, productive effort is a tremendous factor. The great percentage of skilled workers are concentrated in our cities. Their contribution is as necessary to all-out war as is that of the military, and aside from the prime consideration of safeguarding the lives of our people war production will be the difference between victory or defeat.

Warning time at present is estimated to be, under the most favorable conditions, not over 30 minutes to 1 hour.[12] With the development of improved missiles, there is no reason to anticipate that such warning time will ever materially increase. All evacuation to be practical must be based on immediate flight by everyone from where they are at the moment of the alert. In fact it will never be possible for families to attempt to unite before leaving. There is some informed opinion which believes that it would be impossible to evacuate our citizens because of the stampede of panic-stricken mobs blocking every exit. I do not believe this. There have been too many instances in American life of courage and resolution when faced with great danger. Panic stems from fear. Fear, in this case, would come from the incredible horrors of the H-bomb. An uninformed and untrained public would panic precisely as untrained soldiers will flee the battlefield, but it is my conviction that if the average American knows the truth, what he is to do, where he is to go, and means are provided for him to get there, even under an H-bomb attack a minimum of panic will result. However, it is essential that we have prepared places to go and that the citizens themselves are trained in what to do to get

[1] Announced by AEC (December 3, 1955) classified in power of megatons, Life magazine, December 5, 1955, states 10 to 20 megatons.

[2] Press reports (Washington Evening Star, November 29, 1955).

[3] Confirmation of the failure of the Geneva Conference, Dulles' report, November 18, 1955.

[4] Facts About the H-Bomb, Civilian Defense pamphlet. General LeMay interview, U. S. News & World Report, December 9, 1955.

[5] General LeMay, U. S. News & World Report, December 9, 1955.

[6] Life Magazine, April 19, 1954, June 27, 1955, December 5, 1955. Recent pamphlet titled "Facts About the H-Bomb" Civil Defense (cost, 5 cents).

New York Times, June 13, 1955—Civil defense article with geographic map.

[7] Dr. Ralph E. Lapp—June 1955 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

[8] AEC releases—February 15, 1955, June 3, 1955, November 3 and 17, 1955.

[9] Exchange of letters, Dr. Hafstad and Dr. Teller.

[10] Dr. Ralph E. Lapp; Life magazine, June 27, 1955. June 1955 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

[11] East River project and other metropolitan studies.

[12] Mr. Willard Bascom, Attack Warning System of Washington, October 1, 1955.

there. This is the essence of the program which appears to me to make common sense.

That the program I have so briefly outlined is not fantastic can be proved by the precautions already taken by other nations. Sweden has its vital industries underground and has hewn berths for some of her navy out of solid rock. Denmark and Norway have taken similar precautions. Bomb-proof shelters underground have already been provided by Canada for its power sources. The astounding thing is that none of these nations is the primary target. The primary target for Red aggression is the United States and we, unlike other countries, have taken no such bold and positive steps to protect our industries or the lives of our citizens.

There is another most sobering thought which I should like to leave with you. In our past wars our tremendous industrial capacity and our vast agricultural resources have been a prize eagerly sought by our enemies. In the present case this is not true. Our probable enemies have more undeveloped land than have we. Should they eliminate our industrial might, all of the world's remaining industrial facilities would fall within their grasp. There is, therefore, no reason for them to spare any phase of our country's life. Logically, if any of their reasons can be considered logical, it would be advisable if possible to erase our country including its citizens, its industry and its agriculture from the face of the earth as we are their sole deterrent to world-wide domination.

We have spent billions upon billions for our own military defense and offense and billions upon billions for the protection and benefit of the distressed peoples of the world.[13] It is high time that we now look to the protection of our own citizens. If we reduce these expenditures to the simplest terms, we have spent billions in an effort to protect our way of life, and from the military viewpoint to carry the war to an aggressor while defending our own shores. Yet, we are told by our military experts that a determined attack will succeed to some degree. We know that even a handful of H-bombs would create devastation and loss of life beyond measuring. Yet, we have done nothing adequate to preserve the very lives of the people for whom—in the end—all these billions have been spent. What the cost of adequate protection will be I do not know, but I will forestall any arguments on expense by asking how is it possible to evaluate the lives of our citizens in terms of dollars and cents.

Over a considerable period I have devoted much time and thought to the need for a new program that will guarantee the survival of our people. There is, in my opinion, nothing whatever in the present world situation to make me feel that the protection of the lives of our citizens should not be one of the primary concerns of this session of Congress. In fact the peril comes so close to the words of Holy Scripture as to be frightening. Let me quote: "He that is on the housetop, let him not come down to take his coat out of his house. Pray that his flight be not in the winter" and "Woe to them that are with child in those days."[14] These Bibical injunctions to flee could have been written for the very situation which confronts us. Our very survival depends upon immediate action.

Our peril is real. It could happen today, it could happen next month or next year. I pray to God it may never happen, but it is as true now as it was in the days of Washington that in time of peace prepare for war. No prudent man would propose that we embark upon such a national venture as I suggest without first having made a most exhaustive study and investigation of every phase of it. The program I have discussed today appears to me as most practical in view of the situation confronting us and also appears to have the approval of practically all of our leading experts including the scientists who designed the bomb itself. There may be other solutions. What I wish to emphasize here and now is that a solution must be found and once found must be put into effect without further delay. For the purpose, therefore, of studying the program of evacuation and shelter and all other related programs which appear to have merit, I have submitted a resolution for the establishment of a Senate Committee for the Preservation of Human Life.

[13] Total expenditures abroad, $51 billion.

[14] Matthew 29: 16–20.

EXPLANATION OF FOOTNOTES

Footnote 1: History of Russian development of nuclear weapons is as follows:

September 24, 1949: United States discloses first atomic explosion in Russia.

October 3, 1951: United States announces Russia exploded second atomic bomb.

August 20, 1953: Russia announces explosion of H-bomb August 12.

September 17, 1954: Russia announces new atomic weapon explosions.

October 26, 1954: United States AEC confirms new series Russian nuclear tests.

November 25, 1955: Russians announce explosion of H-bomb at high altitude.

December 3, 1955: United States AEC confirms explosion as multimegaton bomb.

In AEC release of November 23, 1955, Chairman Lewis L. Strauss stated: "This explosion was the largest thus far in the U. S. S. R. and was in the range of megatons." (A megaton represents the explosive equivalent of 1 million tons of TNT.)

Special Washington dispatch of November 26, 1955, published in the New York Times of November 27, 1955, stated under heading "Views of United States Experts" that the "Soviet had tested a hydrogen bomb substantially more powerful than 1 million tons of TNT."

Footnote 2: Special Tokyo dispatch of November 26, 1955, published in the New York Times of November 27, 1955, stated that Kyoto University's earth shock experts "estimated the shock center to have been on Wrangel Island, off the northwestern coast of eastern Siberia. Wrangel Island is only 750 miles from the northwestern tip of Alaska." The dispatch describes highly radioactive rainfall on the northern and western areas of the main Japanese island of Honshu and at Tori Island, southwest of Okinawa. Tori Island is more than 3,600 miles southwest of the estimated point of the H-bomb detonation. The Washington Evening Star of November 29, 1955, published a similar account of fallout observations, including other reports of increased atmospheric radioactivity by scientists in Paris and other European points.

The Soviet announcement of the H-bomb test included the statement that "in the interests of avoiding fallout the explosion was carried out at a great height. At the same time wide research was conducted on questions of the defense of peoples." AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray stated in AEC release of November 17, 1955, that "rainfall speeds its (radioactive strontium as released in a large thermonuclear weapon) descent, but it comes down slowly; only a fraction of it is deposited on the earth during the course of a year. Hence the contamination continues to be deposited on the earth for years after the blast of the weapon has died away."

Footnote 3: Secretary of State Dulles, report to President Eisenhower in the Washington Evening Star of November 18, 1955, gave a detailed account of the failure to reach any agreement with the Soviet Union on German unification, European security, disarmament, and improved East-West relations. The official doctrine of the Communist Party which caused the cold war was confirmed.

Mr. Dulles stated "Our military strength must be based upon the capability of the Soviet bloc."

Footnote 4: Federal Civil Defense Administration pamphlet Facts About the H-Bomb states:

1. Atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs do exist as deliverable weapons of war. The Russians are known beyond any doubt to possess a growing stockpile of such weapons.

2. Even the small atomic weapons now make 1 plane able to deliver as much destruction as could be carried by about 1,000 airplanes using conventional bombs in World War II.[1] No absolute military defense exists today or is likely to exist in the foreseeable future. A determined aggressor could deliver atomic or hydrogen bombs on our cities, should he decide to attack our country.

Footnote 5: United States Newsweek, December 9, 1955.

The editors of U. S. News & World Report interviewed Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief, United States Strategic Air Command, at Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.

A portion of the interview, as subsequently cleared by the appropriate authorities in Washington follows:

"Question. Many people have been wondering whether, if the enemy struck the first blow, we wouldn't be at a disadvantage. Is there any way in which air power can intercept that first blow before it reaches us?

"Answer. We have our air defense system and certainly it is efficient enough to intercept some enemy attacks. However, I think most authorities agree that you cannot stop a well-planned, well-coordinated air attack once it gets underway. Some of the bombers are going to get through. The percentage of the bombers that are shot down versus the percentage that get through is a flexible figure that depends upon the relative effectiveness of the offense versus the defense at that particular time.

"Question. We used to read that about 1,000 bombers going across to Germany from England to make a raid—could all that be done with, say, 1 bomber today?

"Answer. One bomber can carry even more destructive force, and if you put 1,000 World War II bombers on one target, yes, you get better results with the latter."

Footnote 6: Life magazine, April 19, 1954, illustrates first release on Eniwetok H-bomb test, describes "fireball of more than 3 miles in diameter, containing expanding gases of 1,000,000° heat, 5 times hotter than sun's center."[2]

Life magazine, June 27, 1955, article by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, page 48, refers to AEC Commissioner Libby's speech of June 3, 1955, that "Dr. Libby makes clear that this new superbomb is a revolutionary weapon—a breakthrough in explosive art comparable to the development of the original A-bomb." Dr. Lapp states that "the H-bomb can derive most of its power from ordinary uranium, U–238. U–238 costs only $20 a pound."

Life magazine, December 5, 1955, page 54, article Why the H-Bomb Is Called the 3–F illustrates the composition of the new type H-bombs, states that "United States, Russians appear to use fission-fusion-fission principle." Although this weapon is described in Dr. Lapp's previous Life article in the June 27, 1955, issue as deriving most of its power from ordinary uranium, Life refers to "a new theory which scientific observers have evolved concerning the way the H-bomb works, and a speech by AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, which gave a clue as to the materials used in building them." This clue appears to have been given in AEC Commissioner Willard's speech of June 3, 1955,

[1] Nuclear scientists regard this estimate as being too low.

[2] Also described in official Government film Operation Ivy.

in which he cites a nuclear explosion releasing 10 megatons of fission energy or 1,100 pounds of fission products. In fact, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated at a news conference in Washington, D. C., on February 15, 1955, that the "United States has developed fission bombs many times as powerful as the first atomic weapons, and hydrogen weapons in the ranges of millions of tons (megatons) of TNT equivalent."

Confirmation of the blast force of the new-type H-bombs and the effects inside the fireball are difficult to obtain. The heat effect, given by scientists as several times greater than that of the sun's center, will vaporize all objects within its more than 3-mile-diameter area. The Eniwetok test explosion, at ground level, destroyed the island of Elugelab completely and created a crater roughly 1 mile in diameter, 175 feet deep, through many fathoms of water. The new-type H-bomb may be exploded approximately a mile above ground level to inflict maximum effects of heat, blast, and fallout, the latter effect to result in the poisonous radioactive contamination of many thousand square miles of land.

Footnote 7: Bulletin of atomic scientists article, June 1955, page 207, on radioactive fallout by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, includes reference to pattern bombing, "to maximize the areas subjected to fallout." One bomb might thus effectively pin down and immobilize several target cities—contiguous metropolitan areas might well be blanketed with fallout radioactivity so that escape to "cool" (uncontaminated) areas would be difficult.

Footnote 8: AEC releases on radioactive fallout:

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of AEC, stated at a news conference in Washington, D. C., on February 15, 1955, that "the United States has developed fission bombs many times as powerful as the first weapons, and hydrogen weapons in the range of millions of tons (megatons) of TNT equivalent." On February 16, 1955, this statement was published in the Washingt n Evening Star, together with a map diagram showing the "H-bomb's deadly swath of contamination," reaching from Washington, D. C., to New York City. Admiral Strauss also stated that "the staff of the AEC was studying the subject of fallout and expressed the hope that information about it would be made public at a later date."

Other releases by AEC on the subject of The Radioactive Fallout have been the published remarks of Commissioner Willard F. Libby, under dates of June 3 and November 3, 1955, and those of Commissioner Thomas E. Murray under date of November 17, 1955. The release of June 3 is in the form of a speech delivered at the Alumni Reunion, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., and constitutes the first realistic public notification on fallout phenomena to be expected from the new-type H-bombs.

Commissioner Libby uses 100,000 square miles as an assumed dissemination area of 1,100 pounds of fission products resulting from a nuclear explosion releasing 10 megatons of fission energy. In same report, under Genetic Considerations of Atomic Weapons Test, Dr. Libby states, "The genetic effects of a generalized nuclear war would be one of the catastrophic consequences of such a disaster."

The release of November 3 is in the form of a speech delivered at the annual meeting of the National Association of State Civil Defense Directors at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C. The persistence of fallout in a contaminated area, length of denial to such areas, and methods of decontamination are described.

The release of November 17 is in the form of a speech delivered at the golden jubilee dinner of Fordham Law School, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City. Commissioner Thomas E. Murray proposed to convene a meeting at the atomic summit—at Eniwetok—of representatives of all the nations of the world to witness a thermonuclear explosion. The following description of the H-bomb exploded by the United States at Eniwetok atoll is given: "Then came the thermonuclear explosion of November 1, 1952. This device taught us not only that we had a new weapon, but that we had a different kind of weapon. We had unleashed a different kind of power.

"The thermonuclear bomb crosses the threshold into a separate category of power by reason of the sheer force and reach of its blast. Its explosion is so tremendous that it must be reckoned as a different kind of explosion. But this is not the more important difference. The thermonuclear bomb not only blasts and burns more acreage, more buildings, more people; it also releases dangerous radioactive fission products into the atmosphere. True the 'A' bomb also releases these fission products, but on a small scale. However, the atmospheric contamination that results from large thermonuclear explosions is serious. In fact, it is so serious that it could be catastrophic. A sufficiently large number of such explosions would render the earth uninhabitable to man. This is a plain fact.

"There is another aspect to the insidious destructiveness of thermonuclear weapons. The radioactive products they release have an effect on human genetics. The sheer fact of this effect is certain. The new power we have in hand can affect the lives of generations still unborn."

Referring to the widespread release by thermonuclear weapons explosions of radiostrontium, Commissioner Murray states that this highly toxic fission product diffuses "throughout the whole envelope of atmosphere that surrounds the earth—that this contamination continues to be deposited on the earth for years after the blast of the explosion has died away."

Footnote 9: Exchange of letters, Dr. L. R. Hafstad and Dr. Edward Teller.

Excerpt from letter, November 18, 1954, to Dr. Edward Teller from Dr. L. R. Hafstad:

"Planning for recovery after attack must be firmly geared to the provision of rallying points which give a frightened populace a place to run to."

Excerpts from letter, November 24, 1954, to Dr. L. R. Hafstad from Dr. Edward Teller:

"The state of mining makes it possible to construct quite deep underground shelters which can be made self-contained for the requisite period and could provide refuge for upward of 1,000 people.

"Within a small number of years we must be prepared to cope with an attack which may involve countrywide radioactive contamination. * * * Above-ground shelters will be, however, insufficient under these circumstances."

New York Times article, January 8, 1956, Overhead Less Below Ground states that "Industrialists are showing increased interest in building plants underground," and that "many companies are reportedly conducting preliminary studies of underground installations." Data is given on American and European underground projects, indicating that "the renewed activity has been motivated by the economies offered by subterranean plants."

Footnote 10: Life magazine, June 27, 1955, article by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp states that "even after having been evauated from the blast area of the superbmob, millions of escapees will need shelter for a considerable period. Each major city must be surrounded with a vast cordon of safe shelters to which metropolitan dwellers, 8 million in New York City, can flee on short notice.

"Thus fallout emerges as a triple-threat weapon: A vast area is affected; the lethality persists for days, weeks, and months; and toxic, if not fatal, effects may endure for years."

Footnote 11: East River project and other metropolitan studies.

Much of the evacuation planning with respect to civil defense done prior to the advent of the H-bomb is regarded today as obsolete. This includes competent studies such as project East River made for the New York City area, and evacuation plans for Milwaukee, St. Louis, Los Angeles, Portland, Oreg., and others. The vital need for the reduction of urban vulnerability was stressed under planning criteria which applied much smaller weapon power yields, and particularly to the greatly minimized hazards of radioactive fallout.

The expansion of existing highway systems, including the provision of additional escape routes by all known methods of rapid transport, including rail, air, and water routes, and possibly underground adjunct routes designed to serve as emergency shelters.

Footnote 12: Mr. Willard Bascom, attack warning system of Washington, October 1, 1955.

No evacuation plan for Washington has ever been completed, although much discussion has taken place, as a result of limited civil-defense budgets. In a report by the National Academy of Sciences' Advisory Committee on Civil Defense of October 1, 1955, prepared by Mr. Willard Bascom and Mr. Kenneth Brickner, an examination was made of the means by which the civil-defense warning alerts are transmitted to the various civil-defense agencies and to the public. This is a thorough, but inconclusive, effort which indicates the warning time may be estimated, the most favorable conditions, not to be over 30 minutes to 1 hour.

Operation Alert, held on June 15, 1955, proved the many inadequacies that would be involved in a mass evacuation of Washington, D. C., including the hazards of removing the President, the Cabinet, the Congress, and high officials, to temporary safe headquarters.

[Excerpts from letter of Dr. L. R. Hafstad, vice president, General Motors Corp., to Dr. Edward Teller, professor of physics, University of California]

NOVEMBER 18, 1954.

DEAR EDWARD: Since our discussions last winter, I have continued to spend my spare time thinking about the problems of civilian defense and the rather obvious inadequacies of our present approaches to this problem. In my own mind it is essential to establish a few basic principles on which there is agreement and then to begin to take steps, however small, to begin to move and to keep moving in the right general direction. Lack of decision, in this regard, can be incredibly expensive. Figures I have been given indicate that United States industry has expanded by 60 percent since the war and almost all of this expansion is in the wrong places, from a civil-defense point of view. If instead, this new construction had been in the right places, we would soon be in a position where our vulnerability was cut in half.

The basic principles, which emerge in my thinking, are the following:

1. It should be recognized as being impossible to get appropriations for civilian defense on a scale which would permit moving industries or populations bodily to dispersed areas.

2. Information on the destructiveness of the new weapons should be made available on an increasing scale, but only in proportion to the consummation of plans to neutralize the dangers, in order to avoid a feeling of hopelessness and panic.

3. Plans for the neutralization of the destructiveness of new weapons should begin with a realistic acceptance of the destruction and demoralization of all of our normal day to day operating agencies in and around any target area.

4. Moneys made available to civilian defense should be used primarily as catalysts to encourage dispersion of industries and population centers.

5. Planning for recovery after attack must be firmly geared to the provision of rallying points, which give a frightened populace a place to run to, after the period of panic in running from has passed.

It seems to me that it is on the last point that our present thinking has been so utterly inadequate. The signs I see on the roads around Washington saying that this road is reserved for civil defense traffic, presumably after a bomb has fallen on Washington, seem to me to be pathetically unrealistic. With a million panic-stricken people running away from point zero, all the traffic policemen in the world couldn't stop them from using any road they chose. It is for this reason that I feel that the concept of strong rallying points, known to the general public and well advertised in advance, would give these people a direction in which to move and, furthermore, if a staff at the rallying points was trained in advance and prepared to accommodate just such a wave of desperate humanity, a beginning might be made to bring order out of chaos.

I have discussed these problems, at some length, with certain selected friends here in Washington. Among many of my engineering friends, I find that the thinking turns more or less automatically to large bomb-proof structures in dispersed locations, all obviously to be financed ultimately by the taxpayer. Personally, I cannot develop much enthusiasm for this approach, for with ingenuity it should be possible to carry most of the cost by private financing. I have, therefore, taken another path in our approach to the problem, based on the following considerations.

Our thinking starts with the concept of a bomb being dropped in the center of the city, disrupting all normal services, including telephones, utilities and transport. We assume a panic-stricken wave of humanity fleeing in all directions away from the center of destruction. Many of the people will be suffering from obvious injuries. Others, apparently uninjured, will have suffered fatal doses of radiation. All will be frightened and, after a few hours, all will be hungry, tired and desperate. The immediate and basic needs will be decontamination from fall-out, medical attention, food, shelter, and sanitation facilities.

Our thinking, therefore, begins with the concept of a hospital facility and a food storage facility in active day to day use, thus insuring a nucleus of experienced personnel, available 24 hours per day, and fresh supplies at all times. Since these facilities are conceived as active working units, they should be privately financed. Against the obvious argument that such a setup is uneconomic, our reply is that it would be a proper function and, in fact, should be specifically the duty of Civilian Defense to provide Government funds, as necessary, to cover the narrow margin between economic and uneconomic operation of such facilities. This, in our opinion, would represent just such a case as was listed above where Government funds would be used as a catalyst.

Once this hurdle is passed, other possible steps fall into place quite naturally. First, the facilities, particularly the hospital facilities, should be provided with water-spray protection against fallout and should be over designed with excess capacity for beds. Removable partitions for individual rooms, for example, with layouts such that in emergency all space could be converted to open wards, with tightly spaced cots, is an obvious design feature. Similarly, stockroom facilities should be greatly over designed with capacity to handle the emergency, rather than the normal day to day work. Plumbing, electrical, and other services should be similarly over designed so that on short notice many, rather than few, rooms for surgery could be provided. Excess capacity for ambulances and an excess supply of ambulances and perhaps even helicopters should be maintained against the emergency, but again by utilization of the concept of an operating facility during peacetimes, the nucleus of a staff will be available.

Again basic to the entire concept would be the fact that the first ablebodied people to arrive at such a rallying point would be pressed into service, according to plan, as truckdrivers, guards, orderlies, nurses, or whatever else might be necessary. A dogtag or identification card distributed to all individuals in advance, might be helpful in making proper selection.

In an entirely analogous manner, the food storage facility should be over designed to provide both excess food and excess space. As food stocks were utilized, the space would became available, first as hospital space, and later, as living space. To permit this, an over designed water supply and sewage disposal system would be necessary. Again, for peacetime operations, this would be uneconomic, but the margin would represent a very proper expenditure of civil-defense funds. For live storage this center should be both a reception center and a distribution center for food supplies. Department of Agriculture experts could help in the proper planning of such a facility and at very little added expense could arrange for considerable storage for their surplus supplies. Private operators, on the other hand, notably the big chain-store systems, might be persuaded to utilize these facilities, either from patriotic motives, or by sufficient economic concessions. Tax concessions, which might be influential in this regard, while requiring action by Congress, are not at all inconceivable, for it is my impression that Congress is entirely willing to act in the matter of civilian defense, if only a rational overall plan, leading to some concrete results, is proposed.

The fundamental concept in our thinking is, therefore, the provision of a number of such rallying points around each major city. With only a minimum of discretion in choosing, such rallying points might easily be made behind a hill out of the line of sight of the fireball. Ideally, a number of such rallying points would be at the ends of spokes of the wheel radiating from the city, the spokes being either existing improved roads or new-road programs.

In concept this plan would be moving gradually, but surely, toward the "annular city" concept which was discussed seriously in 1945 and 1946, but since has been dropped apparently as impractical. If one or more such rallying points, as I have described, could be started now, it seems to me entirely conceivable that we might start a chain reaction such that the nature of our cities would gradually change. It is conceivable that they would, over the years, be essentially turned inside out, with an airport and parks at the center, a residential area part way out, rallying points still further out, and industry perhaps on the outer fringe. If this should eventually come about, the atom bomb development may come to be looked at in historical perspective as what I refer to as nature's slum-clearance program.

Whether or not the trend goes as far as that, it seems to me that with the resources at the disposal of this Nation, it is sheer stupidity not to use the foresight and relatively small amount of funds necessary to insure that future construction and real-estate developments are in the direction of making us less vulnerable, rather than more vulnerable to the destructive forces of the new weapons.

As I indicated above, I have discussed this plan with a few selected individuals and, so far, find no basic holes in the arguments. I would greatly appreciate your comments and advice as to whether or not, in your opinion, this is an approach which should be brought to the attention of civil-defense authorities along with the development of adequate political pressures to insure implementation.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE R. HAFSTAD.

[Excerpts from letter of Dr. Edward Teller, professor of physics, University of California to Dr. L. R. Hafstad, vice president General Motors Corp.]

NOVEMBER 24, 1954.

DEAR LARRY: It is very good to hear from you. As you know, I am most interested in the contents of your letter and no matter what else is going on I keep interested in this problem.

Among your points I particularly strongly agree with the suggestion that civilian defense should act as a catalyst, and that the main burden of the work should be shouldered by private enterprise. It is clear that this will be not easy to accomplish, but the whole job never had appeared easy.

I similarly agree with your suggestion that we need places to run to rather than to run from. On this particular point, I had quite a few discussions and I would like to describe some of these to you in the following:

Within a small number of years, we must be prepared to cope with an attack which may involve countrywide radioactive contamination. The most dangerous phase of this contamination will not last longer than a week or two. Aboveground shelters will be, however, insufficient under these circumstances. The state of art of mining makes it possible to construct quite deep underground shelters, which can be made self-contained for the requisite period and could give refuge to upward of 1,000 people. The cost would be not unreasonably high, but would, of course, be quite an important consideration. It would seem to me most important to give thought to the question: how such deep underground locations could be made usable in peacetime so that their construction by private means may be undertaken without delay. Your idea of hospitals or food depots might help, but there is still another point which clearly must be taken into consideration.

An atomic attack will probably wreck the country's economic potential. We must be in a position where we can survive such an attack and where we can recuperate rapidly. We must, therefore, have consumer goods stored for a period like a year, and we must furthermore store facilities like machine tools, machine parts, and powerplants in some form so that at least a reasonable fraction of our economic potential should be rebuilt within a year. This might open up additional uses for the underground installations which in peacetime may be used for some of the vital industries, with some excess space to house people—even though in most crowded conditions—for a short period.

In addition to all this, a different line would have to be explored. It seems to me that in an atomic duel, that side may come out on top which has the best techniques for decontaminating and generally for dealing with the radiation hazards. This seems to me to require both extensive research and some technical preparedness.

You see from all this that my ideas on the subject are by no means fixed and firm. But I agree with you fully that it would be sheer stupidity on our part not to make the necessary funds available which would make national survival a probability. Perhaps the most powerful reason is that if we are sufficiently prepared, the attack will probably never come. It may sound strange, but I really believe that the possibilities of defense by procedures along the lines described in

your letter and in this reply are more hopeful than defense by bringing down the attacking planes. That latter type of defense is too strongly subject to chance and becomes obsolescent quite rapidly.

Please let me know if you think I can be of any real help in the discussions and the plans. I hope you will go ahead with them with full energy.

With best wishes and kind regards,

EDWARD TELLER.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the Senator from New Mexico is familiar with the fact that there is a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if it would not be within the province of that committee to make such studies as have been suggested by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So long as the study is made, I care not which committee makes it. There is no pride of authorship involved. The destruction caused by an H-bomb would be catastrophic. We are thinking of sending bombs to Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, but what are we doing to take care of the civilian population? What would we do about the people who would have to evacuate Washington, if that necessity should arise? The consequences of the bomb are horrible to contemplate, and it is only for that reason that I made my statement and had the document prepared by the two scientists.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in full agreement with the objective the Senator from New Mexico is discussing, but instead of setting up an additional committee, it strikes me that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would have jurisdiction over the subject matter now being discussed by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senate decides to refer the resolution to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, well and good; all I want is action. Because certain Senators may be on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does not prevent my being concerned about the welfare of the American people, especially the civilian population.

I do not wish to have any jurisdiction taken from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but certainly Congress should be alerted, and the American people should be informed as to what Congress is doing in order to save their lives.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, let me say to the senior Senator from New Mexico that I have listened with great interest to his address; and, as always, he illuminates the subject and gives us some basis for thought and action. I also wish to thank him for his very complimentary reference to the chairman of the Civil Rights Subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 217) submitted by Mr. CHAVEZ was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 165) to make a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and I were having a discussion.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are several other questions which I should like to ask my friend, the Senator from Missouri, about the resolution. From the investigation made thus far, does the Senator from Missouri believe that legislation may be necessary in order to carry out any of the proposals the committee has been studying?

Mr. HENNINGS. I should say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that we are still on article I of the Bill of Rights. The Senator from Louisiana knows there are many clauses to article I.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Our report is now in preparation, piecemeal. I would say that, of course, it is possible that some legislative proposals may result, in terms of some of the administrative agencies.

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as the Senator from Missouri knows at this time, that would not involve any amendment to the Constitution, particularly in respect to the Bill of Rights, would it?

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to my learned friend that I have been charged with being a great reactionary when it comes to making amendments to the Constitution. I believe the Founding Fathers did a good job with the Constitution; and I, for one, am most reluctant to tinker with it. At this time I can foresee no reason for doing so. At this time I have no conviction or predilection in favor of amending the Constitution. When it is suggested that amendments be made to the Constitution, my view is quite to the contrary. As my colleagues on the Judicary Committee will attest, I am one of those who are in favor of being very slow to amend that basic document.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can my good friend tell me whether, from the studies made, he would suggest the enactment of any legislation of any character?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have not reached that point, let me say to the Senator from Louisiana; I have not arrived at any determination regarding it. It seems to me that the value of the hearings, if they have any value—and many of us entertain a deep conviction that they have—is to let the public know the facts and, indeed, to help some of the governmental agencies. Many of the very fine gentlemen who have very rough jobs in connection with the security-loyalty program, with which we are about completed, have said to us, after the hearings, "You have helped clarify our thinking. Now we see that we should not induct a man into the Armed Forces and give him some restricted or menial duties, and finally give him less than an honorable discharge if his conduct in the Armed Forces has been good."

In that connection let me say that, of course, the law contains a definite prohibition against the induction into the Armed Forces of a Communist. However, in one case the mother of an inductee had belonged to an organization which, I believe, was on the Attorney General's list; in other words, it was one of the guilt-by-kinship cases, of which I know the Senator from Louisiana has heard a great deal. These difficulties and problems and, indeed, these disabilities have made second-class citizens of such young men. They did their duty while in the Armed Forces, but they received discharges less than honorable.

Those were the things we undertook to correct; and the Department of Defense and other departments agreed that we had given them some enlightenment in some of these cases.

Mr. ELLENDER. A continuation of the hearings will not, then, necessarily result in legislative proposals, but, instead, will result in the exposure of how some of these matters were handled administratively; is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; how they were handled administratively. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is entirely possible, is it not, that from the hearings sufficient data will be gathered to give guidance to the administrators of certain laws as to how best to administer them? Is that about the case?

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to my friend that is exactly it, and that has already occurred, to the admitted benefit of several of the governmental departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 1, before the word "consent", it is proposed to insert "prior."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McNamara
Allott	Gore	Monroney
Barkley	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hruska	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Payne
Butler	Ives	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Duff	Lehman	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Welker
Ervin	Mansfield	Wiley
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Young
Fulbright	McCarthy	
George	McClellan	

Mr. JOHNSON. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICE (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 1.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. What is the status of the resolution which is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 1, to insert the word "prior" before the word "consent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "$115,000" and insert "$100,000."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President. I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 2, line 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$91,666.67."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kentucky whether the amendment relates to the unanimous-consent agreement that all present committee funds be continued for 1 month, and that the total amount remains the same, excluding the appropriation made for the present month?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct. The net effect of the amendment is that the amount appropriated will be eleven-twelfths of the $100,000 appropriation.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 1, line 9 of the bill, to strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 165), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $91,666.67, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF ANTITRUST LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1409, Senate Resolution 170.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 170) to make a study of the antitrust laws of the United States and their administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor); and

H. R. 2430. An act to release certain restriction on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency additional copies of hearings entitled "Stock Market Study";

S. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on automation and technological change for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; and

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the joint committee print entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability," for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

ILLINOIS FARMERS ARE REALISTIC ABOUT PRESENT FARM PROBLEMS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday, February 20, 10,000 farmers met in Peoria, Ill. Such a meeting could have been explosive, but it was not.

These farmers' restraint and devotion to simple and basic principles embodies a lesson for Congress as it wrestles with farm legislation. From long experience our farmers know things.

They know that the carryover of corn by October of this year will probably be well over a billion bushels. That will be the largest carryover on record. As this pile of corn grows, their acreage allotments must be reduced to the point where their livelihood from farming is, frankly, jeopardized. In fact, the allotment for the coming crop year of 1956 would be 43 million acres. That is 6½ million acres under last year's allotment and 13 million acres less than what was actually planted. That is not merely a drop for our Midwest farmers. It is a real jolt.

I believe our farmers also know that they are losing their feed market under high rigid supports. Two years ago about 75½ million tons of corn were used for feed. Last year this dropped to about 71½ million. The reason is simple. Cheaper feeds moved in. The production of such cheaper feeds, like oats, barley and grain sorghums, increased by 10 million tons. The reason for this increase is also very simple. Acres diverted from wheat and cotton were planted to feed grains. If this continues corn acreage might be further reduced and corn prices will drop further. I think our farmers know that.

I believe our farmers know something else, and that is that as acreage allotments for corn are reduced compliance will drop also. That is not hard to understand. Reducing a farmer's producing plant simply imperils his livelihood, especially when prices are well below parity. Moreover such reductions in acreage allotment are a challenge to every farmer.

Last year 60 percent of the acreage in the commercial corn belt was overplanted. That meant that only 40 percent of the acreage was eligible for price supports. Arithmetic is the greatest of the sciences, so let us apply it. If last year's corn allotment was 50 million acres and only 40 percent was in compliance, that meant that only 20 million

acres had the benefit of price supports. It meant also that more than 30 million acres produced for the market and aggravated the present problem. If acreage allotments for corn are further reduced it is a fair assumption that there will be even less compliance. That is not difficult to understand nor need anyone be blamed. The task before us is to take these human factors into account.

The net of all this is that high rigid supports gradually surrender the Corn Belt farmers' feed market to cheaper grains. That in turn means that acreage allotments will drop further, compliance will drop, prices will drop and the end result will be real disaster.

If then rigid high level supports drive down allotments and invite noncompliance, it can only serve to drive down corn prices, encourage weakness in the livestock market and bring on demoralization. I believe our farmers know this.

They are realistic and realize full well that a workable program must take all this into account and consider the consumer as well, so that all parties in interest will be fairly and equitably treated.

I believe, therefore, that the new program with some modification is the hope of the Corn Belt.

The first thing we must do is to go back to a normal base corn acreage of 56 million or some other reasonable figure and work from there. If the base acreage for corn was set at 56 million, it would be 13 million acres above the 1956 allotment.

Secondly, the corn farmer should be urged to underplant his base acreage. That is another way of saying that he should be urged to come into the acreage reserve program.

Under this program he would receive a certificate which is redeemable in cash or in surplus commodities somewhere equal to what he did not produce. If then the value of the certificate is high enough it will be a real incentive for our corn farmers to come into the program, bring about a reduction in production and move toward the goal which we must achieve.

There should be some type of control, whether direct or indirect, of the diverted acres if the objective of reduced production is to be achieved.

I believe it only fair to compensate the corn farmers one way or another for the feed grains which are produced on the acres which are diverted from cotton and wheat. These cheaper feeds produced on diverted acres in the form of oats, barley, and grain sorghums when measured in terms of corn would amount to 800 million bushels. Equity demands that this be offset. This could be contrived by retaining the acreage allotments on other basic commodities, like cotton and wheat, or by some other type of control. In any event, this is the fair approach and would be the answer to the problems of the corn farmer. It does not lie in rigid high-level supports. These in the long run can only aggravate his problems and do not constitute a durable solution.

I allude to this today, Mr. President, because if we can get 10,000 Corn Belt farmers under 1 roof and have a meeting, where they restrain themselves, where tempers do not get out of hand, and they maintain a wholly constructive and cooperative approach, that would really be a good undertaking in the face of the problem which currently besets the Corn Belt. The farmers do not ask for too much. They ask only for that which is fair. I believe corn is rather in a separate category from the other basic commodities, for the very simple reason that in times past, if the diverted acres from other basic commodities were planted to feed grains, which are cheaper than corn, it simply meant that the corn would be forfeited and surrendered.

I can well understand the interest there has been in rigid, high-level supports, but, in my considered judgment, they will not serve the purpose, and, in due course, as I look down the road, the problem will become more and more aggravated and will finally lead to a demoralized situation in the ten-odd States which are included in the commercial corn area.

I bring the matter up because we stand on the threshold of consideration of the farm bill. I salute the members of the committee for the diligence and devotion with which they have addressed themselves to the bill. I believe that one of the weaknesses of the bill is its provisions with respect to corn. So, Mr. President, I ought to announce at this time that an effort is being made to contrive the necessary amendatory language in order to cure what I esteem to be a weakness in the farm bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Illinois has spoken as he has this afternoon, and I wish to assure him that I, for one, will be very glad to cooperate in seeing to it that the corngrower receive a fair break in connection with the soil-bank proposal. Over the years the corngrower has been very levelheaded. He has not asked for the moon, but has been content to go his way. He has not been insistent that the Government do everything for him. He is now caught, however, by reason of other programs for other commodities. I refer particularly to wheat and cotton as to which the farmers were induced to produce to such an extent that the acreage had to be cut back some 30 million acres, and it was only natural that a great deal of the land taken out of wheat and cotton was planted to other crops which lent themselves to very heavy meat production, and thereby cut the income the farmers of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa would have received from the production of hogs and other meat animals.

So, in view of the fact that the corngrower has, in effect, been willing to stand on his own feet, for the most part, with only a few exceptions, I think he should have a fair break in the soil-bank program which is included in the bill which we shall probably have before us tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the assurance given by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I am glad he sees the problem in that light. I concur in the observations he has made about the independence of the corn farmer, his desire to cooperate particularly with the present program, and his agreement that here is a weakness which must have a remedy. When all is said and done, we are all moving in the direction of the two principal objectives of the bill, namely, to reduce production so that less comes in the front door than goes out the back door, and to have an expeditious program for the disposal of surpluses which have accumulated up to this time.

Mr. AIKEN. I might point out that the trouble has been in connection with the increased production of feed grains on land which has been taken out of production of wheat and cotton.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It simply means that the corn farmer's normal market has been preempted and he finds himself helpless in the face of that condition.

Mr. AIKEN. That is why it is so important to do something now to prevent conditions from getting worse. We can make them much better this year if we act in time.

I see the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on his feet. I know he has been extremely anxious to have legislation enacted which will help to correct at the earliest possible date some of the unfortunate situations which exist. That is why I hope, with him, that a week from now, perhaps, we can have a farm bill passed by the Senate and on its way to the House and to conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I say to my good friend from Illinois that during all our hearings on the farm problem, both in the field and in Washington, there was very little evidence offered, in fact, no special program was offered, pertaining to corn. It was only after the committee got to working on the bill in executive session that the need for special treatment for corn was brought up. I am sure my good friend from Vermont will agree with me that we devoted more discussion and thought in the executive sessions to proposals to assist the corn farmers than we did in reference to other commodities.

On several occasions the committee voted on proposals to fix a more reasonable national allotment of corn acreage. As the Senator knows, the allotted acreage for corn this year is 42 million plus, whereas the historic planting in the commercial corn area is approximately 56 million acres. It strikes me that if we could agree upon a reasonable corn-allotment base of between 49 million and 50 million acres, we may be able to accept such an amendment on the floor and take it to conference. The Senator from Vermont well knows that we took a vote on making 49 million acres the minimum, and as I recall the motion failed to carry by only 1 or 2 votes.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that when we were giving final consideration to the bill, the question of corn came up.

There were 3 or 4 different ideas as to what should be done, but none of them had quite enough votes to support a special provision relating to corn in this bill. Nevertheless, I think there was an agreement in the committee that we should work out something. There was a deadline. It was getting on to midnight then, and we reported the bill on the assumption that some proposal would be made by the time it reached the floor of the Senate.

I think it is only right that some special consideration be given to corn, since corn is in difficulty, not because of any wrongdoing or overplanting on the part of corngrowers. Fifty-six million acres of corn have been planted consistently, but the amount has been reduced to 49 million acres, and then to 43 million acres in this year, because of the acres diverted from wheat, and possibly other crops, thus overloading the feed market. That is why the corn-producing section of the country, which has consistently produced 3,100,000,000 bushels a year, has kept itself well within bounds and is now in the role of an innocent bystander, who gets the worst end of it by reason of someone else getting out of bounds.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that if he contemplates offering any amendments to the farm bill pertaining to corn, he should present them as soon as possible, so that the committee can study them beforehand. We would like to be able to submit them to the legal staff, as well as to the Department of Agriculture, in an effort to work out a satisfactory program for corn and have the Senate act upon it before the farm bill comes to a final vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am certainly grateful to the chairman and to the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the cooperative spirit which they have manifested in this matter. I assure them of my own personal desire to go along with the program, insofar as I can. All my proposal is designed to do is to keep corn planting consonant with the farm objectives of the bill.

If the farmer's plantings are reduced to a point where it becomes a challenge to his livelihood to give only 40 percent or 30 percent compliance, we shall be, in effect, defeating, then and there, one of the important, basic purposes of the act itself.

So I express my gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Vermont for their contributions to the discussion and their willingness sympathetically to consider the amendments we have in mind.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am very much interested in the statement which the Senator from Illinois has made with reference to corn. Corn constitutes one of the most troublesome agriculture problems, as was brought out by the chairman of our committee in our conference sessions, previous to reporting the measure to the Senate.

I was especially interested in the statement made by the Senator from Illinois to the effect that corn is in a special category or class. I think he means that that is largely because most of the corn is fed on farms.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator stated that by reason of its competition with other feed grains, he believes sorghum and other feed grains have somewhat contributed to the dilemma in which the corngrowers find themselves. I am certain the Senator is aware of the fact that there are certain sections or areas of the country—I refer, of course, to sections of my own State, also—which depend, especially in the upland areas, upon probably the two crops, wheat and sorghum grains. We are now limited to 55 million acres of wheat, it having been cut from 77 million acres to 62 million, and then to 55 million. We are now hearing reports that it will be necessary to cut to a lower acreage figure.

If that situation prevails as to wheat, I doubt seriously whether there will be full compliance on the part of wheatgrowers in the future, because they will find themselves in the position which the Senator from Illinois says is prevalent and applicable to and is facing the corn-growing States, of which his State is one of the greatest.

Does the Senator from Illinois believe, however, there should be some definite consideration or some determination made by the Secretary of Agriculture as to the relative feed value of, say, corn and certain of the grain sorghums?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the matter were not difficult to accomplish, and if it could be encompassed within legislation, that might be done. I am certain the determination probably could be made by a regulation of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Illinois, because studies show that the feed value of sorghum grains is a very small fraction under the feed value of corn in a great many instances. Especially are we confronted by a very important problem in those areas which generally grow only wheat or grain sorghums, because of the climatic condition in the upland areas in the Midwest, and which pertain to a part of my State, to Colorado, the Dakotas, Oklahoma, and into the Texas area.

I recognize that great surpluses are beginning to build up in sorghum grains. If we could feel that the Department of Agriculture would give some fair consideration to the relative feed value of the sorghum grains, as related to corn, we might be in a position to consider the matter more objectively. I am certain we shall anyway, but it must be considered on a fair basis, because if special concessions are permitted to be given corn, and then the acreages for wheat continue to be reduced, there is only one other crop to plant in certain of the historical sorghum-producing areas, and we shall be confronted in those areas with much pressure for some consideration to be given sorghum grains in the same ratio as we shall probably be asked to give to the corn growers.

I am certain the Senator from Illinois understands that situation, because we have a very definite problem on our hands in those limited two-crop areas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The comment I would make would be almost in the form of a question addressed to the Senator from Vermont. It occurs to me that, if it is proposed to recite in the law something in the nature of a conversion formula between grain sorghums and corn, we would almost be compelled to do so for wheat which is not of a milling quality, wheat which is known as feed wheat; and we would be compelled to do it for oats and for barley. That might offer some difficulty. That, then, would be a determination which could best be spelled out in the authority granted to the Secretary of Agriculture.

That is a statement which is almost in the form of a question, which I address to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Illinois may recall that in his agriculture message to Congress the President suggested that Congress might want to consider putting corn and all other feed grains on a similar basis. The Department of Agriculture has stated its determination of the feed value of sorghum to be 99.58 percent of the feed value of corn.

The western Kansas farmers who were raising wheat simply went over to raising sorghum, in order to maintain a reasonable income on which to support their families, when the very severe slashes in acreage of wheat were made.

It is hoped that through the soil bank program some of those farmers will be helped to maintain their income over a 1-, 2-, 3-, or 4-year period, until the time comes when they may again be producing a more nearly normal acreage of wheat. Under the soil bank program, they will not have the incentive to grow crops which compete with the corn grown in the corn belt.

I have been very favorably impressed with the idea of putting corn on the same support basis that applies to other feed grains, or of putting them all on a similar level, according to their feed value.

Of course, barley and oats do not have the feed value that sorghum bears in relation to corn. The could not be placed on exactly the same level.

But the best thing to do is to help maintain the income of the farmers in some way, until the principal grain producing area of the country can begin to produce more of the crop which it produces better than it can be produced in any other part of the country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Vermont intend to propose a support price for oats and barley?

Mr. AIKEN. There is a support price for oats and barley now.

Mr. LANGER. In the new bill?

Mr. AIKEN. It is not mandatory, and it never has been. I believe it is very well supported at 70 percent of parity.

Mr. LANGER. Has not the effect been to use oats and barley for feed, while corn has been under loan?

Mr. AIKEN. I presume so. Oats and barley have a value of, roughly, about 84

percent and 88 percent, respectively of the feed value of corn, whereas sorghum has 99 and a fraction percent of the feed value of corn.

Mr. LANGER. Is not the reason for the huge corn surplus the fact that oats and barley are being used as feed?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. There has been heavy production of oats and barley on lands which were diverted from wheat in the Dakota Territory. That is what North and South Dakota were called—a Territory—when I was 10 years old. In Kansas it was found that sorghum was a better crop to raise on diverted acreage. In every case a crop competitive to corn has been planted for the purpose of maintaining a fairly good level of income. It is what any human being would have done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, the whole problem simply stems from the fact that the normal outlet for corn is feed for livestock. That is the way it goes to market. In a 2-year period 4 million tons of corn for feed have actually been preempted by cheaper feed. The increased production over a 2-year period of cheaper feed was 10 million tons. Obviously, that can become a progressive agricultural movement. That is why I indicated in the statement I made that the ultimate end of that road would be disaster.

Mr. AIKEN. There has been a heavy increase in the use of feed grain this year as compared with last year. That resulted in the production of more milk, hogs, and beef. The hog market has been crowded for that reason. The milk market has not been so much affected as yet, but if we do not make some provision for the acres diverted from wheat and corn, it is possible that millions of acres so diverted will be put to the production of milk and other crops which compete with nonsupported crops, and that will make it difficult for them as well as for the basic crops.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It all adds up to the inescapable and somewhat ghastly fact that, according to the Department of Agriculture, it is estimated that in October 1956, there will be 1,150,000,000 bushels of corn carried over. That is an all-time record, and one need not live in the Corn Belt to evaluate the depressing effect of that kind of carryover, in the face of other feeds competitive to corn.

Mr. AIKEN. If we can accept a base acreage of 56 million acres of corn, it is anticipated that there will be a reduction of about 5 million acres planted this year. That would be a reduction in the crop of about 250 million bushels.

If wheat acreage can be reduced 12 million acres, there will be a substantial reduction effected in that crop.

If acreages of other crops can be reduced somewhat, for 1, 2, 3, or 4 years, depending on how long it takes to bring production into line with requirements, then, as I have indicated, each part of the country can go back to raising the crop which it produces better and more efficiently than does any other part of the country.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, with respect to the meeting held yesterday by the large group of farmers who are interested in the corn situation, it is most commendable that that type of meeting was held and that such a large number was in attendance. Did that meeting go on record or was the tenor of that meeting to the effect that farmers should be permitted to have 56 or 57 million acres of corn in their overall allotted acreage?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no particular account of what may have happened at the meeting so far as any resolutions are concerned. I understand that resolutions were adopted. Whether the resolutions contain a precise figure for corn acreage, I do not know, but that will be disclosed in good time.

Mr. President, I should like to touch on two other matters before I close these informal remarks. First, I salute the corn farmers who came together in the circumstances, and who are so constructive and so patient with the problem before them. I think that is a great testimony to the American farmer.

Secondly, I would pay testimony to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and also to all the members of the committee. I know they have been beset by at least 100 plans, and perhaps more. I think over a period of time at least 50 plans have come to my desk. Many of them I have submitted to the Department of Agriculture for an evaluation. The committee has been very patient, very kind, and very diligent.

I have just one other statement. As I recall, it was in the latter part of January that I wired every member of the committee from Chicago. I pointed out the fact that corn planting normally begins about the first of April, sometimes later, depending on the weather; but if it was to be expected that the lush and fertile soil of the area known as the Corn Belt was to come into the acreage reserve, it was necessary that as expeditious action as possible should be taken to bring a bill to the Senate.

I salute the chairman for having done so, and I am grateful to every member of the committee for the reply I received. I hope, therefore, that there will be a fair and proper consideration of the bill and that, without undue delay, it can be brought to a vote, with the necessary modifications incorporated in it, so that farmers in more than 800 counties in the commercial Corn Belt can make their plans and regulations may be worked out.

STUDY OF ANTITRUST LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 170) to make a study of the antitrust laws of the United States and their administration, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 13, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, insert "prior."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the amendment which the clerk has just read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on page 1, line 13, inserting the word "prior."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What calendar number is the Senate considering? Is it Calendar No. 1409?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to make a brief statement before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the amendment. The study of antitrust and monopoly is really one of the most important subjects that can come before the Senate.

I am never at ease talking to empty benches, Mr. President, and I therefore venture to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I have sent for the leaders of the majority and the minority, and therefore I shall not insist upon having a quorum call, because I desire merely to make an explanation of the resolution now before the Senate.

This resolution provides funds for the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Antitrust Laws and Monopoly. I think the words used give a wholly incorrect impression as to what the study is about.

The subcommittee is not working for the punishment of any individual or any group. Instead, it is working for the establishment of a system of law under which a free economy can be maintained. The study was not undertaken by the Committee on the Judiciary because of any desire on its part to have a hearing and to call witnesses before it. The committee undertook to make the study because it was recognized in a wholly nonpartisan way that the time has come in the development of business in interstate and foreign commerce to adjust existing laws to the conditions which now exist.

One of the first acts of the Attorney General of the United States under this administration—Mr. Herbert Brownell—upon assuming office was to appoint a commission of approximately 60 members, including lawyers, professors, and economists, to study antitrust and monopoly conditions in the United States and, particularly, the laws which have been enacted by Congress during the past 60 or 70 years to protect, to stimulate, and to conserve free business. That report took more than a year to prepare. It was submitted to the Senate, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, for its examination and study.

But, Mr. President, that was not all. The Congress of the United States, recognizing the serious character of the problem of adjusting modern government to modern conditions, has four times, I believe, established commis-

sions to study ways and means of bringing about economy in the handling of the Government of the United States; to bring together under one head policies, procedures, and activities which belong under one head; to abolish useless boards and commissions, and altogether to attempt to gear the Government to the modern world in which we live.

Twice, Mr. President, former President Herbert Hoover was made chairman of such a commission. Once, he was appointed by President Truman to head a commission on Government reorganization. On July 10, 1953, the 83d Congress, the first Congress under the Eisenhower administration, passed a law—Public Law 108 of that Congress—to create the Commission on Organization of the executive branch of the Government. On April 11, 1955, almost 2 years after the appointment of the Commission, it submitted its report upon legal services and procedure. According to the reports available to any Senator, that Commission cost the Government of the United States $2,848,534.

Mr. President, was that money wasted? Who will say it was wasted? The former President of the United States gathered about him some of the most distinguished persons in American business and professional life; and in carrying on his study on legal services and procedure in the Government, he had a task force which was presided over by Mr. James Marsh Douglas, chairman of Washington University, of St. Louis, and formerly chief justice of the Supreme Court of Missouri.

I mention these two studies—one, by the group of 60 experts called together by the Attorney General of the United States of this administration; and the other, by the group called together by former President Hoover, under the authority of a law of Congress, to study the great problem of legal procedure in the modern age. How can anyone say that the Congress of the United States can safely delegate the power to legislate, under the recommendations which are made to us, without ourselves undertaking the studies which must go into the formulation of the proposed legislation? Recommendation No. 50 of the Hoover Commission, as found on page 85 of House Document No. 128, 84th Congress, 1st session, reads as follows:

> Congress should look into the feasibility of transferring to the courts certain judicial functions of administrative agencies, such as the imposition of money penalties, the remission or compromise of money penalties, the award of reparations or damages, and the issuance of injunctive orders, wherever it may be done without harm to the regulatory process.

Here is a recommendation by the Hoover Commission that Congress should undertake the particular kind of study which the Judiciary Committee of the Senate has been conducting with the appropriation given to the committee last year.

Recommendation No. 51 of the Hoover Commission reads as follows:

> An Administrative Court of the United States should be established with three sections as follows:
>
> (a) A tax section which should have the limited jurisdiction in the field of taxation now vested in the tax court of the United States;
>
> (b) A trade section which should have the limited jurisdiction in the trade regulation field now vested in the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Reserve Board, the United States Tariff Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture; and
>
> (c) A labor section which should have the jurisdiction now vested in the National Labor Relations Board by the National Labor Relations Act over the adjudication of cases involving unfair labor practices.
>
> It is further recommended that the Congress study and determine whether the Trade Section and the Labor Section of the Administrative Court should have original or appellate jurisdiction.

It is only necessary to read these recommendations to see how important it is that this committee should not be hampered in the work which it has undertaken. I am very happy to say to the Senate, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who unfortunately is detained by illness, that the work of this committee has been carried on with complete cooperation among the members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, and in complete cooperation with the Department of Justice, and with others whom we have called before the committee to testify.

The committee named as its chief counsel Mr. Joseph Burns, of New York City. He was formerly an expert in the Department of Justice. He worked in the Tax Division. He was an assistant United States district attorney in the southern district of New York, and he was successful in handling the cases which were assigned to him in that connection.

Among those who were members of the staff were Dr. Arthur John Keefe, formerly a professor of law at Cornell University, and now a professor of law at the Law School of Catholic University; Mr. Donald McHugh, a practicing lawyer in the District of Columbia, formerly on the staff of the Department of Justice; Mr. Garrett Neville, formerly of the Department of Justice, and now a practicing lawyer in the District of Columbia; Mr. Joseph Seeley, who is on loan to the committee from the Federal Trade Commission, because of his experience and ability; and Mr. Jesse Friedman, an economist. As I recall, there are 29 members on the staff. The Department of Justice created a commission numbering 60 persons to carry on a part of the work which has been submitted to us for our examination. There is much work still to be done.

The report which was filed by the Department of Justice represents a very excellent study of cases which had been decided by the courts in the past. It is a very fine analysis of existing case law, as found by the courts; but it does not contain many recommendations, if any, dealing with the remedies which should be applied to gear Government to the modern world in such a manner as to preserve free enterprise. How often do we use that phrase, and how often do we think we are serving free enterprise when we appoint a Committee on Small Business.

I well remember that the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed by the 78th Congress in the belief that Congress should be reorganized in order better to perform the task before it. The provision was written into that law that no special committees should be appointed. That included the Committee on Small Business. The next session had hardly met before that provision of the law was abandoned, because small business needed spokesmen in Washington to see what was going on.

Would Senators like to know why? The record was made clear in a recent issue of Fortune magazine, in the supplement to the issue of July 1955. This document contains Fortune's directory of the 500 largest United States industrial corporations. I obtained this copy from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I am sure it will be amazing to those who listen to me, or who may read my remarks, to know that some of the great corporations are larger, in financial assets, than most of the States and most of the cities in the entire United States.

This directory was not prepared by this committee. It was not prepared by any left-wing organization or by any subversive group. It was prepared by Fortune magazine. What are we to say, for example, when we read, at the top of the list, that the largest company, in terms of assets, is the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey? Its assets amount to $6,614,743,000.

Mr. President, we talk about the Middle East. We talk about shipping tanks to that area. We talk about the danger of a third world war which would involve every family in the United States, if it should come about. Who stops to think that Standard Oil of New Jersey has oil interests not only in the United States but all through the world, including the Middle East?

We know that the Constitution of the United States prohibits any State from entering into any compact with any foreign country without the consent of Congress. But these giant corporations, created by States, do that which the States, their creators, are forbidden by the Constitution to do, namely, enter into compacts with foreign governments.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not correct to say that testimony before the committee showed that some of the large corporations could borrow money at a much cheaper rate of interest than the United States Government could borrow money?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is my recollection. The corporations which I shall name now are more powerful in their financial assets than 90 percent of all the nations who are members of the United Nations. Let me read the list of the first 10 corporations:

Standard Oil of New Jersey, $6,614,743,000; General Motors, $5,130,094,000; United States Steel, $3,348,659,000; Du Pont de Nemours, $2,747,404,000; Socony-Vacuum Oil, $2,256,691,000. That corporation is also interested in

the Middle East. Standard Oil of Indiana, $2,187,358,000; Gulf Oil, $1,969,052,000; the Texas Co., $1,945,509,000; General Electric, $1,691,000,000; Standard Oil of California, $1,677,000,000; Bethlehem Steel, $1,613,000,000; Westinghouse Electric, $1,329,000,000; Union Carbide and Carbon, $1,251,000,000; Sinclair Oil, $1,186,000,000; Phillips Petroleum, $1,092,000,000; Western Electric, $1,073,000,000; Cities Service, $1,053,000,000; Shell Oil, $1,041,000,000; Chrysler, $1,034,000,000; International Harvester, $940,000,000.

Side by side with that list, I have a list of corporations which rank highest in sales.

In a few days the Senate will consider a farm bill. Armour, one of the big packers, ranks seventh among all the corporations of America in the amount of annual sales as of the year 1954.

In that year Armour sold $2,056,149,000 worth of products. We are dealing here, as these figures show, with a gigantic new system of economy. Let me make it clear that in reciting these figures I do not do so in the slightest sense of criticism. I am merely pointing out that in the economy of the United States, organizations created by the States are carrying on businesses throughout the United States and throughout the world which are, so to speak, in the stratosphere, above the eyes and ears of the people who are affected thereby.

If Congress is unwilling to undertake studies which are necessary to bring about an adjustment of these great disparities, who will do it? The drift will continue without any obstacle at all, untill the totalitarian program of business government will spread to political government. It was the centralization of economic power which brought about fascism and communism in Europe. We have before us the recommendations, as I have already stated, of two commissions which undertook serious studies. I assure the Senate that we are also undertaking serious studies.

I hand to the reporter the list of the 20 largest industrial corporations in terms of amount of sales and in terms of assets, and I ask unanimous consent that the list may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Fortune magazine of July 1955]

Ranking corporations by sales

1.	General Motors	$9,823,526,000
2.	Standard Oil (N. J.)	5,661,382,000
3.	United States Steel	3,250,369,000
4.	General Electric	2,959,078,000
5.	Swift	2,510,805,000
6.	Chrysler	2,071,598,000
7.	Armour	2,056,149,000
8.	Gulf Oil	1,705,329,000
9.	Socony-Vacuum Oil	1,703,575,000
10.	Du Pont de Nemours	1,687,650,000
11.	Bethlehem Steel	1,667,377,000
12.	Standard Oil (Ind.)	1,660,343,000
13.	Westinghouse Electric	1,631,045,000
14.	Texas Co	1,574,370,000
15.	Western Electric	1,526,231,000
16.	Shell Oil	1,312,060,000
17.	National Dairy	1,210,329,000
18.	Standard Oil (Calif.)	1,113,343,000
19.	Goodyear Tire	1,090,094,000
20.	Boeing Airplane	1,033,176,000

Ranking corporations by assets

1.	Standard Oil (N. J.)	$6,614,743,000
2.	General Motors	5,130,094,000
3.	United States Steel	3,348,695,000
4.	Du Pont (E. I.) de Nemours	2,747,404,000
5.	Socony-Vacuum Oil	2,256,691,000
6.	Standard Oil (Indiana)	2,187,358,000
7.	Gulf Oil	1,969,052,000
8.	Texas Co	1,945,509,000
9.	General Electric	1,691,980,000
10.	Standard Oil of California	1,677,849,000
11.	Bethlehem Steel	1,613,444,000
12.	Westinghouse Electric	1,329,120,000
13.	Union Carbide & Carbon	1,251,636,000
14.	Sinclair Oil	1,186,771,000
15.	Phillips Petroleum	1,092,745,000
16.	Western Electric	1,073,600,000
17.	Cities Service	1,053,527,000
18.	Shell Oil	1,041,886,000
19.	Chrysler	1,034,529,000
20.	International Harvester	940,052,000

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As was stated by my distinguished friend from Wyoming, a study was conducted in the Attorney General's office and the study lasted for several years. I understand that a report on that study was made to the Committee on the Judiciary. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me that with that report in hand all that remains to be done is for an analysis to be made and to follow through on the suggestions made as a result of that study. Is that not correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee has already done a part of it, I was about to say. We had splendid cooperation from the Department. Assistant Attorney General Barnes appeared before the committee and testified. In order that I may make clear to the Senator from Louisiana the gravity and the breadth of the problem, let me recite one or two small instances which happened. Mr. Barnes testified that the Justice Department had told four automobile companies, for example, that the Department would not prosecute them if they merged. This was the merger of Nash and Willys and the merger of Packard and Hudson. The Department of Justice held private hearings and listened to the arguments for and against the mergers, and came to the conclusion that it would not be injurious to competition, but would be an aid to competition if the mergers were permitted.

The companies went ahead and merged. About the same time the Bethlehem Steel Co. sought to merge with Youngstown Sheet & Tube. They appeared before the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. There the answer was: "No. If you merge, we shall prosecute."

So they have not attempted to merge. But it is obvious that the decisions to favor merger in two instances and to oppose it in the other were made not according to any rule of law which Congress had laid down, but according to the judgment of the officials, men of great intelligence, of great ability, and of great knowledge—I do not challenge that at all—and I point out that in the case of Bethlehem and Youngstown one could easily have made the argument that the merger of those two companies might have produced better competition against the United States Steel Corp. than to forbid them to merge. I am passing no judgment on the matter; I am only saying what happened, in order to illustrate the gravity of the problem and how we work together with the Department of Justice. We could spend many days in hearings.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact, though, that in determining whether a merger should be made or should not be made, reference is made to the same antitrust laws?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Hoover Commission has reported to us that there is great overlapping of laws, and that there is no certainty whether a particular matter should be taken up by the Department of Justice or by the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. ELLENDER. But a study of the antitrust laws was made and as a result suggestions were submitted?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Recommendations were not made. The report is an analysis of the case decisions. The magnitude of this study, I will say to the Senator from Louisiana, is so great that it is impossible for the Judiciary Committee, loaded as it is with claims, with immigration matters, with the appointment of judges, with patents, and all its other functions, to handle these matters without having the excellent sort of staff which we have had. The committee has the largest jurisdiction of any committee of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out to the Senate last week, this able committee obtains from the Senate as much money for its operations as is obtained by all the other Senate committees combined.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Hoover Commission obtained $2,500,000, which is more than all the committees of the Congress obtained; and Congress is charged with the enactment of legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I say it does not make it right if one committee gets 2 or 3 times as much as it should get——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I agreed with the Senator that we were getting too much I would not be on my feet. I do not agree with him. I believe Congress is starving itself. It would not be necessary for the Attorney General to appoint a commission of 60 experts, it would not be necessary to have a Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization, if Congress were equipped to do the job.

As I pointed out the other day, the total appropriations for the Congress is only $69 million, while the appropriations for the various departments and agencies of the Government are in the hundreds of millions and thousands of millions of dollars. In the case of the Department of Agriculture, as none knows better than does the Senator from Louisiana, the appropriation last year was in excess of $7½ billion.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is a matter which is under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is up to the Appropriations Committee to obtain sufficient help to look into these matters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. With all the work the Judiciary Committee is called upon to do, I cannot for the life of me see how 15 Senators can do it all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. That is the reason why we are asking for assistants.

Mr. ELLENDER. The trouble is that the attorneys will do the work and the Senators will not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. The Senator is not reflecting upon his colleagues in that manner. The Senators do the work. They sit as judges. If the Senator from Louisiana would take an hour tonight to write up the events of his official activity today, the number of people he met, the number of Senators with whom he had to talk, the number of problems presented to him, and put the notation into the RECORD, he would demonstrate by his own activity what the burden is upon the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have talked much longer than I had expected to talk. I see the genial and able minority leader on the floor. I note he is about to leave the Senate floor. That is not because he prefers to go to the lobby of the Senate, but because he has duties to perform. I know the Senator, and I know how hard he works. I was very much complimented that the acting minority leader left his chair to come to this side of the aisle to listen to what was being said about the gravity of this problem. We are dealing with the basic economy of the United States and the protection of the economic freedom of individuals. I wish to say to the minority leader, briefly, what I have already said at greater length, hoping he would enter the Chamber.

The Antitrust Subcommittee started on its work because of the report of the Attorney General's Commission, composed of 60 lawyers, chemists, and other professional men, for which Commission a substantial appropriation was made, and because of the report of the Hoover Commission, which recommended certain changes in the court system of the United States. For the Hoover Commission Congress appropriated $2,500,000.

I say without any hesitation whatsoever that the Judiciary Committee has done a very substantial work with the appropriation given to it last year, and there is much work remaining to be done which affects not only the United States, but the entire world.

I am sorry to have to detain the Senator. I know there is important business awaiting him, and I thank him for remaining to listen.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I have had to attend a number of conferences. I am familiar with the work which the committee has done, and I know the Senator from Wyoming is handling the matter for a Senator who is not present at this time.

The figures we had prepared indicated—and I am sure it has been brought out by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—that last year $260,000 was appropriated and $167,000 was unexpended. I was going to inquire of the distinguished Senator whether he feels that the committee could proceed, without its work being handicapped, with the sum of $200,000, which is approximately the amount which was available last year. There has been some suggestion that since the committee expended only $167,000, perhaps $175,000 might be a reasonable sum. But I understand there have been some adjustments in the matter of salaries, and so forth, and that might not be an adequate sum for the committee.

We do not wish to handicap the work which is being done by any of the committees, and this is an important committee. We want the committee to be able to function.

But again I point out that the appropriations now being provided for committees are all over and above the amounts provided by the Legislative Reorganization Act. Some 3 Congresses ago, $1,500,000 was being spent on special committees. In the 83d Congress, the amount for special committees was increased to $3 million. In the 84th Congress, the amount has gone over the $5 million mark.

If the committees find they need the funds because they are essential to the operations of the committees, I certainly want the legislative branch of the Government to be properly equipped and armed to do the job.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are members of the subcommittee. I have heard no objection to the appropriation from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. LANGER. One reason why the Senator from California might be confused is that the subcommittee was unable to get into operation for several months.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We did not begin functioning until May.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not confused; I think I have the figures. I have tried to inquire why there has been the constant necessity of getting up to as high an amount as has been reached in some of the committees.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator stated that $250,000 was requested, but that we got along last year with $150,000. That was because the subcommittee did not operate for several months.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I emphasize that we have been operating at the rate of $240,000 a year, and it is expected that we will continue at that rate.

It is necessary to have the funds in order to enable investigators to travel in the course of their work, and the amount necessary for that purpose we can only estimate. But this I particularly wish to stress: These subcommittees exist on a year-to-year basis. Every year it is necessary for us to go before the Committee on Rules and Administration. We have had a staff consisting of some of the most brilliant antitrust lawyers in the United States. Our fund became exhausted on January 31, under the rule. We could not pay salaries beyond that date. The Senate, realizing that situation, agreed to an extending resolution for a period of 1 month.

It is undignified to call men of great ability, men who are capable of serving in Congress, to the service of the public, and then not to be certain of retaining their services.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is not proposed that the authorization be continued on a month-to-month basis. We are trying to provide an appropriation for the full year, minus the amount for 1 month, which the committee has already received. I am certain there is no desire on the part of any Senator, on either side of the aisle, to have the committees function on a month-to-month basis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it is agreed that the subcommittee may have the full amount for the year, minus 1 month, then I have no objection. We have already received funds for that month.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Wyoming is so eloquent that I am trying to see if we can arrive at some area of agreement. Would the Senator be prepared to accept $225,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am acting on behalf of the chairman of the committee, who is ill. I have advised client after client to settle rather than to fight. If the Senator from California will offer his amendment to reduce the appropriation by $25,000, I will take it upon myself to accept that reduction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 2, line 23, to strike out "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$225,000."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have sent to the desk may be read. I am very much interested in the monopoly which controls the production of farm machinery. Before the Senator from Wyoming agrees to the reduction to $225,000, I ask that my statement, a petition, and a telegram may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

(The legislative clerk read as follows:)

Mr. President, I rise to support the appropriation of $275,000 for the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the United States Senate, although I believe the amount to be entirely inadequate. It is similar to sending a boy with a slingshot to fight a man with a cannon.

For some reason or other, it has been impossible to secure enforcement of the Antitrust Acts passed as far back as 1890. As I said in a previous speech, a man responsible for buying up all the important dairies in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota in 1 day and joining them into the Dairy Trust, instead of being put in the penitentiary for violating the antitrust laws, was appointed an Ambassador, and that seems

to have been the general attitude of both the Democratic and Republican administrations through the years.

Robert La Follette, Sr., while a Member of this body, made desperate attempts to secure proper antitrust legislation and enforcement of the laws on the statute books. He was defeated in these attempts. We have seen thousands of mergers and the buying of assets of one corporation by another with the result that thousands of small-business men have been wiped out. Some of the large corporations are so powerful today that they can borrow money cheaper than the United States Government can itself. Any attempt to get a law passed to provide for long terms in the penitentiary for those violating the antitrust statutes and fining them up to $1 million on each count has been met by failure. Yet nearly 30 years ago Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis fined the Standard Oil Co. $29 million, and had the overwhelming support of the progressive-minded people all over the United States in that action.

Two years ago, when I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and after the committee unanimously had provided for a budget of a mere $75,000, the Republican policy committee did what the Democratic policy committee apparently had done previously; namely, refused to appropriate the money to investigate even the price of farm machinery and kindred trusts.

We gave away that year nearly $12 billions to foreign countries, but Congress refused to appropriate $7,000 to find out why everything the farmer and laboring man have to buy is going higher and higher and higher while what the farmer has to sell has been gradually declining in price.

One of the Senators on my committee, living in a farming community, in 1944 invested $1,100 in stock in a large wholesale grocery concern. Shortly thereafter there was a split of 2 to 1, and this gave him 200 shares for the 100 he purchased; then it was split later, and a short time ago he found he had 600 shares. The quotation on that stock today is $25 a share, or his stock has a value of $15,000. But, when I wanted to investigate the high cost of living, which is in the hands of the monopolists, I was refused the appropriation.

All that a Senator has to do is to go to any farmer to learn how during the last 15 years the price of farm machinery has risen and risen and risen and risen, until today it is practically impossible for our young citizens, including the veterans, to go into the farming business on even a small scale.

When out of the funds of my office and private funds I investigated the price a farmer was getting for his grain, I found the flax monopoly. The farmer was being systematically robbed at the exchange in Minneapolis. It developed that almost overnight one outfit had bought 140 elevators in Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota, wiping out competition in some of the small towns in these States, and later rules were promulgated by the Department of Agriculture which systematically robbed the farmers.

Although Attorney Wayne Smithey, of the Judiciary Committee, and I made a good start on this investigation, it has not been proceeded with since I left that chairmanship.

Guy Gillette, the former Senator from Iowa, upon this floor described the oil and gasoline monopoly in a much better way than I could possibly do it. Fixing of price by these monopolies has become such a scandal that the Department of Justice had to do something about it, but after much fanfare and big headlines the cases were dismissed just before Christmas, to the great disgust of the judge, who remarked, "This is certainly a fine Christmas present to the oil company."

There is the drug monopoly, as a result of which, for example, if we buy insulin from any of the four large manufacturing companies we find that the price is the same to a penny. Yet, Congress has sat idly by without lifting a finger to protect the consumer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there are a telegram and a petition, which was signed by hundreds of farmers in Illinois, which I want the clerk to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read the telegram and petition.

The legislative clerk read the telegram, as follows:

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Complying with your request am quoting prices Minneapolis Moline Machinery f. o. b. Minneapolis, Minn., 1944 and 1955 UTU tractor with 12 by 38 tires $1,427–$2,723. GD×4 harvester combine $1,470–$2,908, AFB plow 3 bottom $172.00–$395.50, 12-foot press drill $394.00–$956.50, 15-foot disc harrow $165.50–$319.50, 6-section harrow with drawbar $82.50–$178.75. These prices do not include freight and North Dakota State sales tax.

MAYRO TROM.

The legislative clerk read the petition, as follows:

To the Honorable Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS and WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Whereas propagandists have blamed higher prices of farm equipment to high labor costs and thus tried to turn farmers against town and city workers; and

Whereas the per-unit labor costs of making farm equipment is decreasing due to the increased productivity of farm-equipment workers; and

Whereas in spite of lower per-unit costs, John Deere & Co. and other companies have steadily raised prices of farm equipment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the undersigned, respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States investigate the spread between lower per-unit labor cost and higher prices of farm equipment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that in 1944 the prices to the farmer for the sale of grain were much higher than they are today. Yet, in some instances the cost of repairing farm machinery has tripled. It is no wonder that the farmer is disturbed, when he has to pay double and triple the price he had to pay, while his products sell for less.

When I was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary I tried desperately to have investigated the matter of trusts and monopolies in farm machinery. Costs of farm machinery and repairs are so high as to be exorbitant. All a Senator has to do in order to ascertain the true facts is write any farmer in his own State who buys parts for farm machinery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was in line 23, on page 2, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$275,000" and insert "$250,000."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, after consulting with the acting minority leader, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], in line 23, page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in behalf of the minority leader, we accept the suggestion, and no objection is made to it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 23, to strike out "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$207,250."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment on page 2, line 23.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 9, to strike out the word "February" and insert in lieu thereof the word "March."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I simply cannot let this opportunity go by without paying tribute to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If he had done nothing else but investigate General Motors, all the appropriation which was provided last year would have been amply justified. Thousands and thousands and thousands of automobile dealers wrote to the committee, particularly to the distinguished chairman. As a result there was a meeting, which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming addressed. The Senator did a job of which every citizen of the United States can be proud. He did a remarkable job as chairman of the subcommittee. So far as I am concerned, I want every Senator to know it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from North Dakota is very kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Have all committee amendments been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All committee amendments have been adopted.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 170), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete and comprehensive study and investigation of the antitrust laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable to (a) clarify existing statutory enactments, and eliminate any conflicts which may exist among the several statutes comprising such laws; (b) rectify any misapplications and misinterpretations of such laws which may have developed in the administration thereof; (c) supplement such statutes to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of such statutes; and (d) improve the administration and enforcement of such statutes.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $207,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1407, Senate Resolution 167.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 167) to examine the administration of the Patent Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the patent system of the United States is in sad need of revision. For years nothing has been done except to codify the existing law. The subcommittee has received the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration for an appropriation of $110,000. There has already been filed and published Senate Report No. 1464 of the 84th Congress, 2d session, which indicates some of things which have been accomplished. There is much still to be done.

At the request of the committee, the following distinguished and nationally known experts in patent law and in invention and in modern technology are cooperating with the committee by the preparation of a special monograph outlining what, in their opinion, is the need for American patent law.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, retired president of Carnegie Institution, whom everybody knows was one of the prime figures in the atomic energy development. He testified before us. He is writing for us a monograph such as only he could write.

Nathaniel Sage, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the director of the office of sponsored research, division of department of industry cooperation.

Dr. Walton Hamilton, former professor of law at Yale University.

P. J. Federico, Examiner in Chief of the Patent Office.

Mr. John Schulman, practicing attorney in New York City.

Prof. Leonard Emmerglick, of Georgetown University Law School.

Dr. Archie Palmer, national research council, former Chairman of the Government Patents Board.

Prof. Seymour Melman, department of engineering for Columbia University.

Prof. Murray Friedman, department of economics, Queens College, New York City.

Raymon Vernon, vice president, Hawley & Hoops, Inc.

These and other gentlemen are so convinced of the necessity for this study that they are cooperating with the committee.

Because of the inability to secure space after the appropriation was allowed, last year, we were not able to get into operation until about the 11th of May, as I recall.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's committee received an appropriation of $50,000, last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of which approximately $24,000 was returned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Has the study advanced sufficiently to indicate the desirability of making any changes in the patent laws?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. The committee already has recommended that there be a single Court of Patent Appeals. Judge Learned Hand, retired, one of the greatest of all the jurists in the United States, who has passed upon many patent-law cases, testified before our committee, and urgently sought to persuade us to continue the work, pointing out how necessary he believed it to be.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the total amount called for by the committee amendment to the resolution is $110,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator from Wyoming tell us whether that amount will be sufficient for the completion of the study of this subject?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe it will, and I shall make every effort to have the study completed. I want it completed. That is why I already have on file, and on sale at the Government Printing Office, our interim report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the subcommittee one of the standing subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is; it is the Standing Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights, and Trademarks.

Mr. ELLENDER. After the study is completed, I assume that the subcommittee will be dispensed with, and also the staff connected with it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. After we have ended the study, the special staff will leave; yes, indeed. We do not intend to keep it.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the Senator from Wyoming thinks this amount will be sufficient for completion of the work?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do, indeed.

Mr. President, I hope the committee amendments will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 3, before the word "consent", it is proposed to insert "prior."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 13, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$128,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$110,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, in line 13.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is my belief that we should decrease the amount so as to allow for operation on an 11-month basis, rather than a 12-month basis, as is contemplated in the committee amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, to this committee amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated; it will reduce the amount to $100,833.34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, in line 13, it is proposed to strike out "$110,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$100,833.34."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 11, it is proposed to strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 167), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,833.34, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me express my gratitude to the Members of the Senate for adopting this resolution and the one previously agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, before making a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of another measure, I wish to say to the Senator from Wyoming that the action of the Senate expresses the feeling of the membership of this body for the fine service rendered on the Judiciary Committee by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and particularly expresses their views with reference to the appropriations for these two subcommittees, in connection with the matters the Senator from Wyoming has presented to this body today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky is very, very generous.

INVESTIGATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1405, Senate Resolution 155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 1405, Senate Resolution 155, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate certain matters, and authorizing expenditures therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 155) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate certain matters, and authorizing expenditures therefor, which was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make in explanation of the resolution.

On January 5, 1956, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and I submitted Senate Resolution 155. The resolution was unanimously agreed to by the Committee on Banking and Currency on January 10. It was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration on January 16.

For many years resolutions similar to this have been approved on an annual basis for the Committee on Banking and Currency. The amount of $100,000 would be used because of our need to obtain additional personnel to supplement the regular permanent staff of the committee and to cover other expenses incident to exercising our committee responsibilities.

The workload of the committee is extremely heavy, as can be shown by this summary: During the last session of Congress, there were 150 working days. The Senate was in session 105 days, and this committee or one of its subcommittees was engaged in hearings or executive sessions on 91 days. Many of those hearings or executive sessions were carried on both morning and afternoon. This is exclusive of conference committee sessions. This workload has made it necessary to operate primarily through subcommittees, and this, in turn, has required a large staff.

We anticipate a workload at least as heavy, and possibly heavier, at this session of Congress. Practically every major legislative matter handled by the committee during the last session will have to be handled again at this session. In addition, we shall have many new studies, which may or may not result in legislative proposals. Some of them are as follows:

First. The administration's depressed areas bill, which has been referred to our committee.

Second. A study of Government policies toward industrial dispersal, which has been proposed by a bill introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Third. Newsprint shortages.

Fourth. The increase in volume of installment credit.

Fifth. Federal disaster insurance.

Sixth. Extension of export controls.

Seventh. A proposal to guarantee exports against certain political risks.

Eighth. A proposal to permit commercial banks to deal in State and local government revenue bonds.

Ninth. Bank mergers.

Tenth. Steel shortage.

In addition, a number of matters which grew out of last year's study of the stock market are still pending, and we hope they may be continued. Some of these relate to corporate proxy contests, institutional investments, so-called penny stocks, and fraudulent sales by Canadians to United States citizens.

These are, as I say, in addition to legislative proposals which were handled by the committee in the last session, and which must be handled again, such as amendments to the Defense Production Act, banking legislation, savings and loan legislation, rubber and tin legislation, Federal Reserve policies legislation, securities legislation, and nominations.

These matters, of course, are extremely complex. I should think that our committee's jurisdiction encompasses some of the most difficult matters considered by the Congress. This, of course, increases our need for expert staff assistance.

The amount we are requesting is the same as that which the Senate authorized last year under Senate Resolution 23. However, in actuality, we shall have authority to spend $10,000 less. The reason for this is that the $10,000 authorization for housekeeping for the 84th Congress has now been exhausted, and we expect to pay for these expenses out of the $100,000 fund under Senate Resolution 155.

As of January 31, 1956 our unexpended balance under our previous resolution was $17,648.85. However, approximately $6,400 of this amount may be paid out as reimbursable to the Library of Congress for special research work, thus leaving a balance of $11,248.55.

Last week the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] stated that the Banking and Currency Committee had 43 employees. This is incorrect, as the Senator later stated. The committee has 24 employees, plus 3 on loan from other agencies, making a total of 27. This includes all the employees on the regular committee staff, under the housing resolution, and under the resolution preceding the one which we are now considering. The budget under this resolution calls for employment of 9 persons. The budget for the housing resolution would provide for 11. These, with the regular committee staff of 10, make a total of 30.

Last week the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] referred to the expenditures last year as compared to those of the 83d Congress. So far as the Banking and Currency Committee is concerned, our total expenditures last year amounted to $163,246.51. This compares with an amount of $268,909.11 expended in 1954, the preceding session in the Republican 83d Congress.

I certainly think that the work of the regular committees should be supported. One of the reasons why there has been such an expansion in special investigations by select or special committees is

that many of the regular committees have not had the staff which the volume of their work would justify.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the Senator realizes that the Senate has already provided $100,000 for the Subcommittee on Housing headed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator also realizes that, in addition, the committee receives the standard $111,400 allotment for its regular staff, which consists of 4 professional and 6 clerical workers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Also a standard allotment of $5,000 a year for supplies in connection with investigations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That, I may say, has been expended already.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The committee came back for more.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; we did not come back for more. We will take care of the housekeeping out of this $100,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. If this resolution is approved, the Committee on Banking and Currency will end up with more than $300,000 being allotted to it for its operations this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have said to the Senator that that is correct. I do not think the $100,000 for housing is too much. Aside from defense, that is one of the largest programs carried on by the Government today. Of course, if we do not think we can afford it, we can abandon the program. The Senator is well aware of many of the difficulties which arose in connection with the Housing Agency. It is an expensive agency, and it requires competent supervision. It is not wise economy to cut down on supervision over that agency.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not question the necessity for checking on housing. I did not raise any objection when the Housing Subcommittee appropriation came up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator mentions it. I think it is a justifiable expenditure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I simply wish to point out the total amount of money which is allotted to the Banking and Currency Committee.

I notice that the committee is divided into eight subcommittees, one of which is the Subcommittee on Small Business. To what extent does that conflict with the Small Business Committee, headed by my good friend from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], which obtained from the Senate a little more than $200,000 for its operations in 1956?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Historically the Committee on Banking and Currency has had such jurisdiction. The Small Business Administration, which, as the Senator knows, is a sort of successor to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was created by the Congress. It is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I am not here to defend the separate committee, or to comment on the separate Small Business Committee. However, the Committee on Banking and Currency has had this jurisdiction for many years. This activity does not constitute a very large part of the committee's responsibility. However, the Small Business Administration, and also small business industries under the Defense Production Act, are under the jurisdiction of this committee, and require our attention.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that the Select Committee on Small Business has no legislative jurisdiction?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that legislative jurisdiction is in the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, as the Senator has stated, this particular subcommittee is a small subcommittee, and no special funds are requested for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. No investigations are being undertaken.

Mr. ELLENDER. The $100,000 which is being requested is to take care of all the subcommittees.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, the major responsibilities of the committee are very extensive. In connection with the banking system of the country, a great many questions are constantly arising in that field, involving such subjects as bank mergers and others. At present, there is on the calendar a highly controversial bill, namely, the bank holding company bill. Last year we spent a great deal of time on it. We are still conducting hearings on it. That is an illustration of one of the major fields.

Already at this session we have dealt with the rubber bill. The rubber bill is an illustration of the technical nature of many of the activities of the committee, with respect to which we must have competent staff members who understand such subjects, if we are properly to perform our task. Of course, we could get along with $5,000, but that would only mean that we would not do anything, and the activity of the committee would be turned over entirely to the executive. This body could not perform its function. If we are properly to perform our function, we must have adequately trained personnel.

I think we have an excellent staff. We could let them go, but in the long run we would be sacrificing the welfare of the country and the efficiency of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would it not be well to name some of the special functions which have been carried on by the Committee on Banking and Currency, all of which entail expense? For example, I refer to the stockmarket hearings and the hearings conducted with respect to the securities market.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee obtained a separate appropriation of $50,000 for that purpose, as I recall.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was paid for out of this same appropriation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was taken out of this same appropriation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Out of this appropriation, about $50,000 was spent on those hearings. I happen to believe that they were very beneficial. At that time the Federal Reserve Board increased its requirements with respect to the stockmarket. I think the hearings had a beneficial effect upon the market, and helped to create the stability which we still enjoy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The hearings were rather extensive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They were.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me develop one further point. More recently, following the floods in New England and in the Northwest, were not rather extensive hearings held, which could not have been held if it had not been for the availability of this special fund?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. That occurred during the recess. If we had not had this appropriation last year, we could not have held the hearings, which were demanded by Members on both sides of the aisle in this body. Senators from Connecticut, New York, and Oregon, were very much interested in the subject. We could not have held those hearings if it had not been for the availability of this fund. That is where some of the money has gone. We are still holding hearings on that subject.

That is an illustration of an extremely difficult subject. We need the very best advice we can possibly get in the development of legislation in that field. I am frank to say that I do not know whether we can develop satisfactory legislation or not.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Reverting to the sum which was appropriated to hold the hearings on the stock market, as I recall, the year before this sum was asked for, the committee had a special appropriation of $50,000, and the argument was made that another $50,000 was needed to investigate the stock market, and thereby the appropriation was increased to $100,000. Now that the Senator has completed his investigation of the stock exchange, why should he continue to ask for the full $100,000? Why does he not reduce his request to $50,000, the amount he received before? During the second session of the 83d Congress, that was the amount the committee received. The great trouble, I find, is that once a committee gets a special appropriation for 1 year, it does not willingly give it up the next year. If the Senator will look back to Senate Resolution 248 of the 83d Congress, second session, he will note that his committee received $50,000 in additional funds. Under Senate Resolution 42, 84th Congress, first session, his committee was given $50,000. Of that amount, $27,000 was carried over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That shows how careful we are in spending money.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand, but my good friend is going beyond the original $50,000 asked for and received

in prior years. Just because his committee received $100,000 last year, which included $50,000 to investigate the stock exchange, he returns this year and asks for the same amount of money received last year for a special job. There is no effort being made to cut back. That is why I would suggest, inasmuch as his committee has completed its investigation of the stock exchange, that my good friend should, at least, be willing to reduce this year's request to the amount that was originally made available, namely, $50,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to point out that last year we received $100,000, and last year's total was $163,246. The preceding year it was $268,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the committee undertook a housing investigation that year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The housing investigation is included in both figures.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's committee had $200,000. He had $100,000 for housing and $100,000 for investigations, making $200,000.

I would not urge any objection to the committee receiving this year the same amount of money that it received in the past, less the special amount of $50,000 received last year with which to conduct the investigation of the stock exchange.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would it appeal to the Senator more if we were to say that we need more money for the new matters that come up? For instance, there is disaster insurance, which is a very complicated matter, a new subject. The Senator cannot tie the appropriations down in the way he suggests. The emphasis shifts from year to year. Last year there was a stock market investigation. This year we have the subject of newsprint shortage. That has developed recently, and we are asked to look into it, to determine if something cannot be done about it. Then there is disaster insurance, in connection with which there is a great deal of pressure. Then there is the installment credit matter, which the President has mentioned. He has asked the Federal Reserve to look into it. Our committee will cooperate with the Federal Reserve System in writing any proposed legislation along that line.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I certainly believe that the Senator's committee is one of the most important committees of the Senate. I am in favor of giving the committee the money its chairman requests. The investigation of bank mergers, which the Senator has so ably undertaken, will have to go further, and I am sure he will need a considerable amount of money for that purpose.

In the Senator's study of the operation of the Federal Reserve banks, I suppose he has been concerned with the fact that in the past 2 years we have been exporting more gold than has come into this country. That subject needs the continuing attention of the Senator's committee. I realize that this country is no longer on the gold standard, but there is a relationship, I am sure, between gold and our currency. Could the Senator explain that situation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. Our constant supervision of the Federal Reserve System and of the banking system of the country is one of the most important functions of the committee. That is directly related to the whole question of the stability of our economy. It is another aspect of the whole picture with which we are concerned.

It is a part of what we were concerned with in our investigation of the stock exchange. In that connection, we were not interested merely in the stocks on the New York Stock Exchange, but, rather, how the whole situation was related to our economy and its stability.

The same consideration applies to the gold supply. It is an indicator with regard to our balance of payments, our export-import policies, our tariff policies, and so forth. Eventually it affects the stability of our whole economy.

That is extremely important. Such a study requires competent people. We cannot hire hacks to study this subject, because the subject is very difficult to understand and to present, and to explain what it is all about.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am certain the Senator's committee will have much more work to do along that line.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNAMARA. Perhaps the pressure on our supply of gold will increase during the next year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let us consider for example the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank. Matters relating to those institutions come under the jurisdiction of our committee. Those matters are extremely important.

Mr. McNAMARA. They are highly technical, too.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. Those institutions are constantly expanding in their operations, and they need sympathetic understanding and consultation on the part of our committee. I did not begin to exhaust the subjects which come under our jurisdiction.

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not understand how the Senator's committee can get along with the small amount he asks for. The whole subject of the gold reserve is tied in with our national defense. Undoubtedly we should have a proper study made of what the situation is with respect to any change in the price of gold. It certainly will not help the farmer if we have a revaluation of the dollar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's comments. He is entirely correct. There is another aspect to this matter. If our standing committees are scaled down and are unable to do their work, then of course there is created such a situation that special investigations have to be made by special committees, with a large appropriation being given to them every 2 weeks. We think nothing of spending 2 or 3 or 4 hundred thousand dollars on investigations of that kind. Yet we think nothing of cutting down support for a standing committee, whose primary responsibility is to prevent the development of abuses.

Mr. McNAMARA. I agree with the Senator. Only a few years ago we had in reserve 50 percent of the world's supply of gold. We are losing that. Our gold reserve is decreasing every year. Is it not also true that much of our gold is earmarked for other nations and that they can take possession of it at any time, and is there not also the danger that we may get below the necessary reserve of gold required to maintain the value of the dollar?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At the present time our currency is sound, but an increase in the export movement of gold would be dangerous, of course.

Mr. McNAMARA. Especially if there were to be an international emergency or war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say that, as always, my good friend from Arkansas can find good subjects for special investigations. He never seems to run out of them. However, I want to emphasize again that for 3 successive years, beginning with the 82d Congress, second session, his committee was able to operate efficiently with $50,000 additional each year, but in the first session of the 84th Congress it was found necessary to increase the amount by $50,000, in order to take care of a special situation, namely, the investigation of the stock market in New York. A total of $100,000 was asked for that year—last year. This work has been now completed. However, it seems that because the Senator asked for $100,000 and received $100,000 last year, he now returns and asks for the same amount for this year.

It demonstrates the fact that once a request is made and approved for a certain amount, the same request is made in succeeding years, and there is no end to it. This is just another example of how, once a committee makes a start and obtains a certain amount of money for special investigations, that amount is asked for year after year, whether or not the same special circumstances prevail in succeeding years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator generalizes. I do not wish my silence to be accepted as affirmation of what he says. I could cite, for example, a special appropriation our committee received, for a study of the RFC. That study was completed, and the subcommittee ceased to function. There are occasions when that happens.

If the stock market investigation were the only investigation conducted by the committee, there would be some force to the Senator's argument; but what does he propose to do about the study of the very complex question of disaster insurance? There is no denial of the pressure for it. Everyone agrees the investigation should be conducted. I should not be surprised if the time and effort involved would be as great as that involved in the study of the farm bill, because there is no precedent for it ex-

cept the wartime type of insurance. It is an example of a new thing which takes the place of an old thing.

I agree with the Senator that our Government has constantly been showing an expansion. Our troubles and our businesses are not getting any less. There are more activities and our expenses are greater. Fortunately, our national income is greater, or we would have been bankrupt by this time. I think the problems of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry do not grow less by the year. I suspect the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry spent more money in the hearings this year than was spent in the year before, and the chances are it will spend more next year.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee of which I am chairman did spend more in hearings, but we did not employ a corps of special investigators, as other committees have done. As I pointed out last week, my committee is entitled to select 4 professional assistants, but we have been able to get by with 1. We have only 3 clerical assistants instead of 6.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has a very fine committee, which operates in the restricted field of agriculture, as compared with the Banking and Currency Committee which covers a great many fields.

Mr. ELLENDER. My committee covers a great many subjects.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the sugar bill which should have been referred to the Senator's committee was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish it had been referred to my committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the record of the Committee on Banking and Currency has been a good one. I believe its responsibilities have been adequately discharged. In my best judgment, the points which we present are good ones. I hope the Senate will adopt the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The amendment was on page 2, line 14, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "prior."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 10, to strike out "February" and insert "March", and in line 20, on page 2, to strike out "$100,000", and insert "$91,667.67."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 155), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(4) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(5) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(6) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(7) securities and exchange regulation; and

(8) disaster insurance or indemnity.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $91,667.67, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SENATE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "HOW TO OBTAIN BIRTH CERTIFICATES"

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1394, Senate Resolution 144.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 144) to print as a Senate document a revised edition of a document entitled "How To Obtain Birth Certificates."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution (S. Res. 144) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the revision of the document entitled "How To Obtain Birth Certificates" (H. Doc. No. 821, 77th Cong.), prepared by the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document.

GIFT OF WORLD WAR II PAINTINGS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NEW ZEALAND

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1507, H. R. 8101.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8101) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Government of New Zealand, without compensation therefor, 25 German war paintings depicting New Zealand troops in World War II. The proposal would not authorize the expenditure of any funds of the United States to defray any costs of transportation or handling incident to the proposed transfer of the paintings to the New Zealand Government.

The enactment of this bill would not involve the expenditure of any Federal funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8101) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF AID TO CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1506, Senate bill 1135.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1135) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish civil air patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this is a bill which came from the Armed Services Committee without objection from either side of the table. Its purpose is to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to senior members of the Civil Air Patrol who are injured or disabled, and to the survivors of those who are killed while engaged in activities authorized by the Air Force for the benefit of the United States.

Eligibility for benefit under this bill would be made retroactive to the organization of the Civil Air Patrol in 1941, but payments based on entitlement to FECA benefits would be authorized only after the date of enactment of this bill. No retroactive payments, however, are authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1135) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved May 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 274), entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for

other purposes," is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"SEC. 3. (a) Volunteer civilian members of Civil Air Patrol, except Civil Air Patrol cadets, shall, for the purpose of administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, be deemed to be civilian employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 40 of that act, and the provisions of that act shall apply to them in all respects, subject to the remaining provisions of this section.

"(b) In the administration of that act in such cases the following shall apply: (1) The monthly pay of such members for the purpose of computing compensation for disability or death shall be deemed to be $300; and (2) as applied to such members, the term 'performance of duty,' as used in that act, shall mean only active service, and travel to and from such service, rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol, under direction of the Department of the Air Force, and under written authorization by competent authority covering a specific assignment and prescribing a time limit for such assignment.

"(c) When a claim is filed, the Secretary of Labor or his designee may inform the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee, who shall advise, if so requested, the Secretary of Labor concerning the facts with respect to the injury, including the question whether at the time of injury the member of the patrol was rendering service, or engaged in travel to or from such service, in performance or support of an operational mission of the patrol: *Provided*, That this shall not be construed to dispense with the reports of the member's immediate superior required under section 24, or other reports agreed upon under section 28a of that act.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall be applicable as of May 20, 1941, in the cases of members of the Civil Air Patrol as it existed under and pursuant to Executive Order 8757 of May 20, 1941, as amended by Executive Order 9134 of April 15, 1942, and Executive Order 9339 of April 29, 1943: *Provided*, That the time limitations in that act, in respect to notice of injury and claim for compensation, shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits under that act shall accrue or be payable in any case for any period prior to the date of this act, but this provision shall not bar the payment or reimbursement of medical and other expenses as authorized by sections 9 and 11 of that act, if not otherwise paid or furnished by the United States: *Provided further*, That, with respect to services rendered prior to the enactment of this act, the term 'performance of duty,' as used in that act, shall mean only active service, and travel to and from such service, rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol, under direction of the Office of Civilian Defense, the Department of the Army (War), including the Army Air Forces, or the Department of the Air Force: *And provided further*, That the entitlement of any person to receive benefits from the United States under any other provision of law in effect prior to the date of enactment of this act for an injury or death for which benefits are authorized by this act is hereby terminated.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed to confer military or veteran status upon any person."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CORRUPT PRACTICES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished minority leader and of other Senators.

For myself and on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, I am about to submit a resolution in which I think the Senate has a vital interest. I shall ask that the clerk read the resolution for the information of the Senate, so that it may appear at the proper place in the RECORD. When the resolution has been read, I shall ask that it go over, under the rule.

For the further information of the Senate, it is expected that the Senate will vote tomorrow on the international convention to facilitate the importation of commercial samples and advertising material, but it is my understanding that the resolution I am about to submit will be laid before the Senate in the morning hour, since it will go over, under the rule. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now submit the resolution, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 219) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a special committee which is authorized and directed to investigate the subject of attempts to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices.

SEC. 2. (a) The special committee shall consist of 8 members to be appointed by the Vice President, 4 each from the majority and minority Members of the Senate, and shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the Vice President, select a chairman and vice chairman.

(b) Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 3. (a) The special committee shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1957, and shall include in its report specific recommendations (1) to improve and modernize the Federal election laws; (2) to improve and strengthen the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and related laws; and (3) to insure appropriate administrative action in connection with all persons, organizations, associations, or corporations believed to be guilty of wrongdoing punishable by law.

(b) Upon the filing of its report the special committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the special committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive-branch personnel as it deems advisable.

(b) For the purpose of taking testimony the special committee may provide that fewer than 5 but not less than 2 members shall constitute a quorum, providing that both the majority and minority are represented.

SEC. 5. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed $350,000 and shall be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the special committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Under the rule, the resolution will go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that I shall make a detailed statement, at the appropriate time tomorrow, explaining the resolution, the various provisions it contains, and the reasons therefor.

I should like to say only a few words at this time. The question has been asked whether or not the January 31, 1957, date means that will be the earliest date of any report. The date on which the committee will expire, unless extended, will be January 31, 1957.

It is anticipated, contemplated, and hoped that the committee can organize as soon as the present select committee makes its report, and proceed diligently, on a full-time basis, to make its investigation and studies, and from time to time, and certainly during this session, file interim reports and make recommendations, and perhaps cause to be introduced for consideration proposed legislation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 205

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the select committee, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution which would amend Senate resolution 205. That resolution provides for an expiration date of March 1. The resolution I submit would change the date to March 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 218), as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 205, agreed to February 7, 1956, establishing a select committee to investigate efforts to influence the vote of Senator CASE, of South Dakota, be, and the same is hereby, amended

by striking out in section 3 thereof "March 1, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 10, 1956."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution I have just submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 218) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. As a part of one of the standing committees of the Senate, there now exists a standing Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, within whose jurisdiction, as I understand it, under the rules of the Senate, a matter of this character ordinarily falls.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from New York will yield at that point, I think he is not entirely correct. Only a portion of that matter could be within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee. For instance, that subcommittee has no jurisdiction over matters arising under the Corrupt Practices Act. Legislation affecting that subject would go before the Committee on the Judiciary. The Privileges and Elections Subcommittee has no jurisdiction over the Lobbying Act. That subject would go before the Committee on Government Operations.

The reason for creating the special committee is to keep four committees from doing work which one committee can do, and which committee it is hoped will comprise some of the finest minds and brains and some of the best men from all four of the committees mentioned.

The Committee on Government Operations, of course, would be responsible for presenting any recommendations which the special committee might find necessary in the field of lobbying and lobbying legislation. Of course, the Committee on Government Operations may want to conduct its own hearings after the special committee makes its recommendations.

The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over matters relating to the Corrupt Practices Act, and the distinguished chairman of that committee, or any subcommittee, may want to cover that.

The Committee on Rules and Administration has specific jurisdiction over Federal elections and campaigns, and it has delegated that function to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

The purpose of the special committee is to incorporate all those matters for the jurisdiction of one committee. We hope to be able to draw Senators from all those committees. We do not say that the membership will be confined only to those members, but it is hoped to have at least one member from each of those committees, so that we can expect them to say, "Here is what we expect to have done."

It is not the intention to have the special committee displace the Government Operations Committee at all. That committee will be supreme in the field of legislation affecting lobbying. Under the Reorganization Act, no other committee has that jurisdiction.

The majority leader has had submitted to him three separate legal opinions on these questions.

I repeat, the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over matters arising under the Corrupt Practices Act.

If the Senate wishes to ignore lobbying, and give no attention to corrupt practices, if it is not concerned with strengthening the election laws or other related acts, the Senate could confine the matter to 1 committee or 1 subcommittee; but because the whole question has been raised, and because the attention of the country has been arrested by the so-called Case incident, I will say to my friend that the special committee will have the authority, for instance, to go into any of these matters which may be under the jurisdiction of the Labor Committee, involving, for example, provisions of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, and the committee properly might want to propose an amendment affecting conventions or elections affected thereby. The Senate could have 4 or 5 separate committees looking into those questions.

It was felt by those who had the responsibility, and the majority leader and the Democratic policy committee, and the minority leader, and I think every member on the minority side, that, rather than have 4 or 5 committees going off in all directions, seeking perhaps the sensational instead of substantial, it would be the wiser and more prudent course if the Senate could trust itself—and we certainly think we can—to pick out eight of the best Members of this body and have them operate in a bipartisan atmosphere, and dedicate themselves to uncovering any wrongdoing of any kind, with a view to accomplishing something constructive and perhaps bring up to date our archaic election laws, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and the Lobbying Act.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. For the 7 years I have been a Member of the Senate, so far as I know there have been only two select committees appointed for purposes that have had any relation to a situation of this kind. One was in connection with the proposed censure resolution of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

At that time I believed, and I think I was right, there was no committee of the Senate which was authorized to go into such a charge against a Member of the Senate. That was the first case of the appointment of a select committee. The second case was in connection with——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I disagree with the Senator. There were committees that had jurisdiction. It was determined by the leadership at that time, by the distinguished Senator from California and the Senator from Texas, that the fairer and better procedure was to have a bipartisan committee go into the matter; but existing committees had jurisdiction.

Mr. LEHMAN. At the time I understood that one of the reasons given for the establishment of the select committee was that, under the rules of the Senate, there was no committee having jurisdiction over a case of that sort.

The second instance of a select committee being appointed was in the case with which we have been confronted, namely, the charges or statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield, but the Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know, but I do not wish to interrupt my friend unless he is agreeable to having me do so.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York will remember that another select committee was appointed in the case of a mail cover. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was one member of that select committee; and the then Senator from Michigan, Mr. Ferguson, was the other member.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not recall that, but I have no doubt that the statement of the majority leader is entirely accurate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York will remember that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] charged that a cover had been placed on his mail by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and he desired to have that matter investigated. The Committee on Rules and Administration met, and the leaders discussed the matter; and it was decided that it should be investigated, and that the investigation should be handled in a bipartisan manner. The Republicans were then in the majority, and they appointed the then Senator Ferguson, of Michigan; and the Democrats recommended the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; and those two Senators made a very prompt report.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader another question. As he knows, and as I stated yesterday on the floor of the Senate, I believe very strongly that a vigorous, fair, thorough, and nonpolitical investigation should be made of this entire situation. Certainly that is necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am glad to hear my friend say that. If he will permit me to do so, I wish to associate myself with his statement, and to say to him that he has no monopoly on the desire to have the Senate proceed in that way.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have never claimed to have a monopoly on virtue, believe me, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand.

Mr. LEHMAN. But I have that feeling, and I believe that an investigation is necessary for many reasons, chiefly, to make it very clear that the Senate is not going to pussyfoot in any way on this situation, and will not attempt to whitewash anyone, but will, for the sake of its

own dignity and the respect in which it should be held by the people of the United States, make an investigation such as I believe could be made by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree with the general statement the Senator from New York has made in regard to what the Senate should do. I hope the Senator from New York does not insinuate that the Senate is not doing it by means of this resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not read the whole resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me state the purpose of it.

Mr. LEHMAN. But what worried me particularly, among other things, was the statement which was carried yesterday on one of the news tickers in the Senate lobby—and I wish to make it very clear that I do not believe everything I read in the press or everything I see on the news ticker—that on the committee, as a part of it, there should be, in addition to representation of some of the committees the majority leader has enumerated, also representation from the Senate Republican and Democratic campaign committees. That gave me a great deal of concern, because I believe that if this were done, it would immediately raise doubts as to the nonpolitical aspects of the investigation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield at this point——

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say that I assume that the statement the Senator from New York read is the one I made in my press conference. I think it was correctly quoted. I do not have the statement before me now; but at that time I had in mind that if we were going into the field of limiting campaign contributions and their amount, and whether any contributions at all should be made in interstate commerce, and whether limits should be placed on contributions in connection with presidential elections and senatorial elections and elections in New York, Texas, and other States, the committee would want to have the judgment of some of the men who had had experience in that field. To be frank with the Senator from New York, I had in mind the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who serves on both the Democratic senatorial campaign committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration. Because a Senator serves on a campaign committee, I do not think he is automatically disqualified from participating in such an investigation. As a matter of fact, I think he is extremely well qualified to hear evidence and reach conclusions and determine a course of action for this body.

I have great confidence in every Member of this body. I just pointed out that it would be of little avail if, after lengthy hearings and 6 or 8 months of work, we decided we wanted to amend the Corrupt Practices Act in this respect, or wanted the Senate to place a limitation on campaign contributions and the operations of campaign committees in this respect, and wanted to have certain action taken in respect to lobbying, if no member of those committees knew anything about the report or had been in on the decision or had been consulted. My experience tells me that then we would have a report which, as a practical matter, would merely be good for the Archives.

It is the purpose of the Senator from Texas—and, although I cannot speak for the minority leader, I believe it also to be his purpose—to encompass a twofold objective: First of all, to ascertain whether there has been any wrongdoing by any Member of the Senate or whether any person has attempted to influence improperly a Member of the Senate; and I should like to have a catchall phrase, so no one would say I had narrowed it. We want such matters exposed and brought to light. Second, we want the investigation to be constructive. We want to obtain from the investigation some constructive action which can be taken in the public interest.

At the present time we have colonial election procedures in a jet age, and we want to bring them up to date. So probably we shall have to amend the Corrupt Practices Act; and probably action of that sort will be taken before the special committee acts, because amendments to the Corrupt Practices Act are now pending before the Judiciary Committee.

So those are our purposes: First, to expose any wrongdoing; second, to have the committee submit in the form of interim reports any recommendations it may make to strengthen the laws to protect the public interest in the field of public elections.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield at this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I share the hope that, as a result of this discussion and the unfortunate situation reflected in the incident which was described by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], we shall take steps, through whatever committee may be designated, to look into the matter and ascertain the extent of wrongdoing. Of course, that must be the sincere hope of every Member of the Senate.

I think it is also true that we should do everything possible to bring about a necessary and a very belated strengthening of our election laws, which of course in many particulars have become a farce.

But I repeat that one of the things that caused me very great concern on yesterday, and resulted in the speech I made on the floor of the Senate on yesterday—unfortunately, the distinguished majority leader was not in the Chamber at the time—was the fact that I could see no reason whatsoever for designating as members of the proposed select committee, members of the Republican and Democratic campaign committees of the Senate, in their capacity as members of those committees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit——

Mr. LEHMAN. That was what the distinguished majority leader said, as he has stated. It was recorded on the ticker yesterday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have never stated that there would be designated from any specific committee any specific member. I said it was hoped that the total membership of the committee could draw upon the experience of Senators who have operated in these fields, in the hope that we could obtain legislation which would be acceptable to the entire Senate.

I told the Senator—and I repeat—that I had in mind specifically the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is an experienced member of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. He was very active in the campaign 2 years ago. At present he is chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. I do not know how many other such Members there would be on the committee, but I rather suspect that there would be at least one other Member on our side of the aisle who would either have served on the campaign committee or would have had experience in either the House or Senate on one of those committees. I think that is important if we are to write an entirely new election code.

Mr. LEHMAN. The majority leader knows that I have a very high regard for him. I have not always agreed with him, but I have a high regard for him. I need not add that I also have a very high regard for the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is now chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. I feel that whatever my course of action may be when this question is brought up for further discussion and a vote tomorrow, it would be a very serious mistake to designate to help conduct this investigation anyone who would be identified as a representative of the campaign committee of either of the two great parties.

I think we are trying to do two things——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit an interruption, I do not wish to prolong this discussion. We shall have all day tomorrow, if we wish to discuss the subject.

I have tried to make clear to the Senator my purpose. I should like to ask him a question. Would the Senator from New York disqualify the Senator from Tennessee from serving on the special committee because he happens to be one of the most effective members of our Senatorial Campaign Committee?

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly would not have him go on the committee as a representative of the campaign committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No member is appointed as a representative from any campaign committee. Members with experience on the various committees will represent the Senate. They will not represent any committee. However, their service on various committees will contribute to the collective wisdom which will bring about a judgment which I hope will be acceptable to the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. In answer to the question of the distinguished majority leader, let me say that I have full confidence

in the Members of the Senate, just as he has.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is not what I asked. I asked if the Senator from Tennessee should be disqualified because he is at present serving on the Senatorial Campaign Committee.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator from Tennessee would be eminently qualified to serve on this committee as the chairman of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee. Indeed I can think of no one I would rather see both on the committee and presiding over it. But I do not think Senator GORE should serve on this committee as a representative of the Senatorial Campaign Committee of the Democratic Party.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator mistakes my intent. The Senator from Texas has never said that it is proposed to have the Senator from Tennessee serve as a representative of anyone except the people of the United States and the United States Senate. He would serve as the agent of the entire Senate. However, the fact that he has had experience in the field of election reform, election campaign requirements, and other subjects coming within the scope of the Corrupt Practices Act or the Lobbying Act, and has served on committees which dealt with such subjects, is a circumstance which I think would be generally helpful. I do not believe it would disqualify the Senator from Tennessee. I have not considered such experience as a disqualification.

I appreciate the Senator's advice. In accordance with the terms of the resolution as it is drawn, I shall make recommendations from our side of the aisle. I appreciate any counsel the Senator from New York may desire to give me. I am sure that when the committee is named he will not have any misgivings. I remember that he had considerable misgivings about the last select committee which was named. I think such misgivings as he had at that time disappeared to a great extent as the deliberations proceeded. I have no doubt that the quality of the membership of this committee will be satisfactory not only to other Members of the Senate, but also to the Senator from New York.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe that in the development of this discussion between the distinguished Senator from New York and the majority leader it should be made abundantly clear to all that Senate bill 636, a bill to reform election procedures and to amend the Corrupt Practices Act, which has not been amended since 1925, is in nowise to be foreclosed from consideration, or inhibited from coming before the Senate for consideration and action.

I have discussed the subject with the majority leader and have received assurance from him, as I understood him to give the Senator from New York assurance this afternoon, that it is of the utmost importance to report and pass now some legislation relating to cleaning up a situation which we all know has gotten out of hand, and in which, under the law, elections are being conducted under obsolete and archaic conditions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. HENNINGS. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not the slightest hesitancy in saying to the Senator from Missouri in public what I said to him in private.

Mr. HENNINGS. My statement was not for the purpose of putting the majority leader on record in public. I accept his word as given to me in private.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I make the statement because I think it is important that the public know the facts.

The Senator from Missouri introduced a bill, which has been reported by a standing committee of the Senate. That bill has not been cleared by either policy committee. Certain questions have been raised about the bill in its present form, and there is substantial opposition to it, as the Senator from Missouri well knows.

The Senator from Texas has said to the Senator from Missouri that if he can draft certain suggested amendments so as to bring the measure into line and obtain the approval of the majority of the policy committee, the Senator from Texas will be one of the majority—if there be that many—who will vote to submit the measure to the Senate and permit the Senate to take the proper action.

The Senator from Texas does not believe in bottling up legislation in committee, although he has been severely criticized for not holding up the gas bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. There was no question in my mind as to the purposes or intentions of the majority leader. However, I wished to emphasize, for the benefit of those who may not have a full and complete understanding of the question, that the essence of the pending bill, which was drafted following extensive hearings covering a good part of last year, is the reporting of all contributions, so that the people may know from what sources the money comes, and, with the capacity to judge, may determine, from such reporting, the extent, if any, to which any predilection or bias may be ascribed or implied.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would say to my good friend from Missouri that I heartily favor such a provision, as he well knows, but that is not the controversial provision.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is correct. There are other provisions which are controversial.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My State has such a provision in its law, and every dime that is spent must be reported. The Senator from Texas has had drawn various amendments to various acts which he plans to offer for himself and perhaps for other Senators in the near future. The Senator from Texas should like to have every Member of the Senate on notice that the measure proposed by the Senator from Missouri, which has already been reported to the Senate, and other measures which may be proposed during this period when all of us are so interested in this subject, may be acted upon by the Senate before the special committee submits its final report. I have made it clear to everyone I have talked to on the subject of the special committee, that there is nothing in the special committee resolution which hinders the Committee on Government Operations from reporting any amendment to the Lobbying Act which that committee in its judgment feels is in the public interest. The same thing is true with respect to the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee. The same thing is true with respect to the Judiciary Committee. The same thing is true with respect to any other committee which may have jurisdiction in this field.

However, if Congress should act on legislation prior to the final report of the special committee, it might very well be that the special committee would say, "Well, we think this is about as good a lobbying act as we can get," or it may say "This is about as good a Corrupt Practices Act as we can get," and so forth.

However, we do not want to be subject to the charge—and I know that my colleagues do not participate in this—that I have been subjected to. I have on my desk a collection of 15 or more newspaper columns which were sent to me during the last 10 days, when I was in my home State. Most of the columns state that the Senator from Texas was trying to avoid an investigation; that the Senator from Texas had bottled up the resolution of the Senator from Missouri; that the Senator from Texas was trying to keep the Senator from Tennessee from doing this or that, or trying to prevent his conducting an investigation.

Nobody knows better than the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Missouri that the Senator from Texas had no such purpose. The Senator from Texas stated to the Senator from Missouri on that Monday, "You let me get this resolution adopted, to investigate the CASE incident, which I believe is my responsibility to have adopted as quickly as possible, and then if you offer your resolution, I will not object to it and I hope that it will be approved." Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. HENNINGS. I very well remember that. I am glad that the Senator has offered his resolution, which comports with the resolution I offered following his on that Monday when the Senate voted on the gas bill. In substance, it has the same objective and the same purport, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With that statement I cannot agree. I think it is in equal balance with respect to members of both parties, whereas the Senator from Missouri has confined his resolution to one industry. My resolution pertains to the whole field. As I remember, the Senator's resolution was rather narrow and limited. This resolution goes to all lobbying activities. It covers labor unions and manufacturing associations and chambers of commerce, and any impropriety of any kind. The Senator from Texas does not want to be identified, as he said on that day, and does not want to be the author of a

resolution while the gas bill was pending, which would investigate only one industry and one episode.

Mr. HENNINGS. My memory may not serve me correctly, but I recall that my resolution provided that we were to investigate all improprieties relating to any efforts at all to influence a vote in the Senate of the United States, either for or against the pending business, which at that time was the so-called natural gas bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There was nothing in the resolution which confined it to any bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not believe it spoke about the oil industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it did not, I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HENNINGS. In terms of the Senator's original resolution, it was an effort to extend and broaden the jurisdiction, so as to look into all possible elements of influence, whether it be an attempt to influence a vote for the bill or against the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas never objected to the Senator's resolution. The Senator's resolution is on the table by the Senator's request, not by the request of the majority leader.

Mr. HENNINGS. Nor did the Senator from Missouri object to the resolution of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. However, the Senator from Missouri has not been blamed for that. I have been blamed unfairly, unjustly, and almost unmercifully for bottling up the Senator's resolution. The Senator's resolution is on the table at the Senator's request. That is what I want the country to know. I do not say that the Senator from Missouri contributed to that. That has been done by a part of the press of this country and by some columnists. I am sure the Senator has read Marquis Child's column and the various Drew Pearson columns, and a number of other columns, in which the Senator from Texas is charged, in effect, with trying to hinder the Senator from Missouri from offering the resolution, when, as a matter of fact, the majority leader said, and the minority leader said, that they would offer no objection whatever, even if unanimous consent were required, to the Senator's resolution. I want the country to know that. I have already informed the Senator, although I did not have to do so, because he already knew it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure there is no useful purpose served in going over that ground again, except——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Missouri will understand the need, I am sure, after he gets about 15 columns of the kind I have received.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am referring to my lack of intent to go into any of these matters again, but I should like to say that the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee met in good faith, and at that time we were told by the distinguished majority leader and by the distinguished minority leader and other Senators that they thought we had jurisdiction of the matter. However, be that as it may, the main point I wanted to discuss with the majority leader—and I am glad he brought out the point and clarified it—is that this resolution, irrespective of what other resolutions may have provided or failed to provide as to scope or breadth, or inhibitions, does not in any way have as its intent to postpone or unnecessarily delay prompt action upon an elections bill, which has been considered by the committee and reported by the committee, as well as reported by a majority of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and which is on the calendar, having been placed there on June 22 last, as I recall. On that point I believe the majority leader and I understand each other, but I did want the Senate to understand that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from Missouri again that we have that understanding. Whenever the Senator from Missouri can obtain, by his great persuasive powers and his reasoning and logic, a majority of the Policy Committee or a majority of the Senate to consider his bill, there is nothing in the resolution which prevents that being done.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to ask the majority leader this question, inasmuch as the majority leader has a bill which he proposes to introduce. We had a number of hearings and invited every Senator to appear before the subcommittee. We wrote a letter to every Member of the Senate to appear before the subcommittee and to give to the subcommittee his views upon this very vexing and complex question of regulating contributions and the reporting and spending of money in political campaigns.

Now that the distinguished majority leader has a bill—and he has indicated that he has—I would be very happy to cooperate with him. The bill to which I refer is coauthored with me by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. It seems to me that we might all get together with the distinguished minority leader and other Senators who have concern in this matter and who have been thinking about this question for many years, I know, and discuss legislation which can give us some relatively quick results, and that we might, even before we go into another campaign, get some action to regulate the inordinate contributing and spending of moneys and the lack of reporting and the withholding, in effect, from the people of the United States the sources of money that goes into campaigns. I say again that that is the heart of the proposed legislation.

I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Missouri, and I will assure him that as soon as the proposed legislation comes from the drafting service, I shall send a copy to him. There is nothing I desire more than the Senator's support of the proposed legislation. If this discussion has done nothing more, it has put the Senator from Missouri and me in complete agreement. I hope the Senators across the aisle will follow the example we have set, and I hope we can all join in a bipartisan move to get the sort of legislation we desire.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, unfortunately, I was not on the floor when the resolution was read. I have the greatest personal confidence in the two leaders of this body, the very able Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the very able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I am very much disturbed however, Mr. President, by the situation which might develop from the introduction of the resolution and its consideration. There is no question that the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, under the Reorganization Act, has full power to deal with corrupt practices, and has full power to report legislation having to do with the suppression of corrupt practices and the control of contributions to political campaigns, or for any other purpose, whether those contributions are made by way of cash from the personal account of the president of a corporation who thus evades the direct prohibition of law regarding contributions, or whether they are made by check, or by any other method, direct or indirect.

Mr. President, I have been a Member of the Senate since the 1st of January 1934, and in every campaign I have waged for reelection, campaign contributions from the East have been poured into my State in an effort to bring about my defeat. I was always quite willing to trust my fortunes to the intelligence of the voters of my State. I was reelected upon every occasion I presented myself, except one. That was the campaign of 1952. I am happy to be able to state that my failure to win that election was not due to the contributions which came from the gigantic corporations of the East who tried to bring about my defeat.

I know several other Senators who have suffered from the same sort of attempts upon the part of gigantic lobbies to bring about the defeat of Senators who had the courage to stand upon the floor of the Senate and speak their own minds.

Whatever we say today or whatever we do today will not change the record which is before us. That record is that the Committee on Rules and Administration, on the 22d of June 1955, reported a bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes. The bill was sponsored by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. The Committee on Rules and Administration reported the bill. I have the report in my hand, and I see that with the exception of the few pages of minority views, which apparently are detailed—I have not read them—the majority of the committee favored the bill which now stands upon the calendar of the Senate as the fifth measure on the calendar. There are only four measures ahead of it.

The first is Calendar No. 1, Senate Resolution 17, by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], to amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The second is Calendar No. 235, Senate bill 300, to authorize the construc-

tion, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Frying Pan-Arkansas project, Colorado. That bill was introduced by the two Senators from Colorado.

The next is Calendar No. 364, Senate Joint Resolution 31, by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and other Senators, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

The next one is Calendar No. 579, Senate bill 63, introduced by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], to provide for the appointment of the heads of regional and district offices of the Post Office Department by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Then comes Calendar No. 629, Senate bill 636, sponsored by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and other Senators, to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

It is obvious that a motion may be made on the floor at any time to call up that bill. It can easily be amended to cover the case of a person who by cash or check or any other method contributes to any Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives any money or thing of value to influence the result of a vote. Such an amendment may be presented and may be adopted. If it should be adopted it would settle this whole business within a few moments. I have no doubt that the measure can be passed.

The special committee which is to be created has no power to present a bill of any kind to the Senate. It has no power to submit proposed legislation. It may recommend, but it may not submit proposed legislation. Any recommendation which comes from the special committee, if it is established, must go to some standing committee.

The report of the special committee, according to the terms of the resolution, is to be made some time in January 1957—after the general election. I want to see action on Calendar No. 629, S. 636, the fifth item on the calendar of measures reported by committees as ready for action, taken before the month of March is out. I think the Senate owes it to itself and to its own dignity to take action upon S. 636.

The Senate has just gone through many days of debate about the appropriations for the standing committees of the Senate. The measures have been debated on the floor for at least 3 days. But there is not as yet a line in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas to suggest the amount of money which the new investigating committee may have in order to carry on its operations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Louisiana tells me that the resolution provides for $350,000. I am very happy to know that amount is included.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I submitted the resolution, and, under the rule, it will go over. But for the information of all Senators who are interested, either by being present or by reading the RECORD, I submitted the resolution and asked that it be read. That was done. The resolution provides for an appropriation of $350,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator place the resolution in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It has already been read into the RECORD. That was done so that all Senators could be aware that it would be considered tomorrow.

My information is that the measure to which the Senator from Wyoming is addressing himself, the bill to revise the Federal election laws, introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and other Senators, was reported, I believe the Senator from Missouri said, on June 22, 1955.

The Senator from Wyoming will recall that that was a short time——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh yes, of course; it was a short time before the adjournment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That was not what I intended to say. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That was 8 or 9 days before I went to the hospital on July 2. That bill, S. 636, was reported by a 5-to-4 vote of the committee. The Senate is divided 49 to 47. Every Democrat on the committee was for the bill; every Republican was against it.

The bill was discussed by the policy committee, which has the responsibility for scheduling proposed legislation on the floor, in the 9-day interim before the Senator from Texas went to the hospital. Many questions were raised about changes that should be made, which I think appealed even to the author of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought the Senator from Wyoming would like to have that information.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I want the information; certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think I speak correctly when I say that not only a majority, but a substantial majority, of the policy committee thought the bill in its present form should be considered further before being sent to the floor.

Early this session, I met with the assistant majority leader, the Democratic whip, and the secretary of the conference, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. We reviewed some of the objections. The Senator from Missouri was told at that time that if he wanted to schedule the bill in the form in which it was, so far as I was concerned, he had my vote, not for the bill, but for the consideration of the bill by the Senate, and the Senate in its wisdom could take whatever action it saw fit to take.

The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] agreed, just before I left for Texas, that the staff of the policy committee and the staff of the Senator from Missouri would meet to try to answer some of the questions which had been raised by the opponents of the measure. They have done so. Many of the questions have not been completely answered even yet, because the staffs do not know the answers. They do not know the interpretations which will be given.

There has been great concern by the labor unions as to how they are affected; there is uncertainty whether the term "committee" applies to a political committee; and whether the limitation is sufficient in a State as large as the State of New York.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may say to the Senator——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit me to finish——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have every confidence in the Senator from Texas. I know of the concessions he has made upon the floor. I know he wants to dispose of this matter as much as does any other Member of the Senate. Nothing I say casts the slightest reflection upon the Senator from Texas or the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who has joined in submitting the resolution. I am merely pointing out the difficulties which present themselves to me as I look at the situation.

The 1956 election will soon be upon us. The bill which was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, in the functioning of its authority under the law, is before the Senate, ready for action and for amendment in any way the Senate desires to do so. It is my judgment——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I beg the Senator's pardon. The bill is not before the Senate. The membership of the policy committee has not scheduled it, and the minority policy committee has refused to clear it for consideration until some of the language can be clarified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Texas misunderstands me. The bill is before the Senate in the sense that it is on the calendar of reported measures. Of course, it has not been taken up; that I grant. I know that as well as the Senator does. But the bill is before the Senate because it is on the calendar, and a majority of the Senate could take it up tomorrow, if it wished to do so.

I do not wish to displace the farm bill; I think that is an important measure. But, in my judgment, S. 636 should be made the unfinished business immediately after the disposition of the farm bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. First, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Wyoming for his very lucid and clear exposition of the circumstances as they are. It is true that we are concerned with having appropriate legislation enacted. We wish to bring before the Senate a bill which has a fair chance of passage. As the learned Senator has already suggested, the proposed legislation is susceptible of amendment. Extensive hearings were held. The subcommittee tried to do an honest job. It

reported its efforts to the Committee on Rules and Administration. That committee, by a majority vote, reported the bill to the Senate. The Senator from Wyoming is exactly correct about that.

I realize that many considerations affect some Senators which do not affect others. Some Senators, for example, contend that primary elections should not be included. I do not hold to that view. It seems to me that primary elections are exceedingly important; and in one-party States they are virtually the final elections.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not wish to prolong the debate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall take only a moment longer, if the Senator will yield further.

Without going into the terms, so far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that, in keeping with the distinguished Senator's suggestion, we can come before the Senate, with the concurrence, and I hope with the assent and approval, of the majority leader and the policy committee, with a bill which is a respectable one, a bill which will be reasonable, sensible, and practical, and will afford a basis upon which the Senate may begin to consider the subject matter. There are minor differences of opinion. Many persons say the bill is too cumbersome. But, for my part, I am willing to let that question be the subject of discussion and debate, to see what can be done about amending the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My point is this: I have no objection to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California; but I do not want to see that resolution be made the peg upon which postponement of action can be taken with respect to the bill of which the Senator from Missouri is the main sponsor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's having said that. I so tried to express myself to the distinguished majority leader. I believe he has given us the assurance that that will not be the case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have given that assurance to the Senator from Missouri, and I have given it also to the policy committee. I have given that assurance to the Senator from Missouri every time I have talked with him. I gave it to him at least 2 or 3 times before the Senator from Wyoming raised the question. I again repeat my assurance.

But at any time the Senator from Wyoming or the Senator from Missouri desires to proceed to the consideration of the bill in which they are interested, they will be perfectly within their rights to make such a motion; and if a majority of the Senate supports them, the Senate can then proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are in complete agreement on that. I only say to the Senator from Texas that we do not enact legislation by assurances; we do it by votes.

The President of the United States, in the veto message which he sent to the Congress on the natural gas bill, for which bill I voted, castigated the lobby which was operating here for that bill, and used the word "arrogant" in describing the activities of that lobby.

I agree that when the president of an oil company has a personal fund from which he makes—or attempts to make, I should say—cash contributions through an agent, who asks of a Member of the Senate, "How are you going to vote upon the natural gas bill?" that is a corrupt practice and highly deserves the appellation of arrogance as applied to it by the President.

I should say to my friends in the Senate that we can defend our own integrity and our own dignity only by proceeding at once with respect to the matters of which we have knowledge. There is not a Member of Congress in the House or the Senate who does not know how campaign contributions are used these days. The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Clerk of the Senate have evidence now of the contributions which were made.

So, Mr. President, I could not let this evening pass without having the RECORD contain a statement of my position, which is in favor of immediate action upon a pending bill which is on the calendar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have felt that because of the pendency of the work of the select committee, I should refrain from commenting on the matters which have been presented at this time. Therefore, I trust that my failure to make a statement at this time will be understood, and not misunderstood.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8320) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF FARM BILL

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, previous announcement was made of the scheduling of Executive Q, 83d Congress, 1st session, for consideration following the reading of Washington's Farewell Address by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that following the consideration of that convention, Calendar No. 1503, S. 3183, to provide an improved farm program, be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ARMS FURNISHED TO COUNTRIES OF THE NEAR EAST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is now clear that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will hear from the Secretary of State on the middle eastern question. I hope, however, that our investigation into our Near East policy will not be confined to an inquiry into the sending of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia. The disclosure of this action in itself is a matter of serious concern. It raised serious doubts as to the sincerity of our desire to prevent an arms race in the Near East. In addition, the off-again on-again performance of the administration showed vacillation, equivocation, and a lack of a clear and firm policy.

We should investigate why we are sending arms to Iraq as well as to Saudi Arabia—and how much—and why we insist on strengthening forces in the Near East which are not committed to democracy, but are at war with democracy. We should review our policy toward Egypt in the light of Nasser's increasing drift toward Moscow. We should ask why the administration has not yet agreed to sell arms to Israel, which is a democracy with whom we have the closest ties. We should ask whether our continued hesitancy to grant Israel's request is costing us the friendship of the people of Israel and the respect of other democratic peoples throughout the world. We must ask whether our policy is not having a boomerang effect. Are we not heightening the threat of a new Arab attack on Israel?

What we do on this issue may weaken our cause if other nations come to believe that we are not firmly determined to strengthen democratic elements in the resistance to Communist aggression.

We should investigate fully our Government's attitude toward the Arab boycott and blockade as they affect American business and the rights of American citizens. We should ask how long the Johnston plan will be delayed through Arab refusal to accept it, and whether it is the intention of our Government to proceed with the Aswan Dam in Egypt while deferring action indefinitely on the Johnston Jordan development plan.

These are only a few of the issues which must be thoroughly canvassed and explored by Congress. Our Near East policy has been changed several times within the last few years. We must know what it is and whether we have really developed a carefully planned policy which will lead to peace, economic development, and democratic strength in the Near East.

I have brought these questions to the attention of the Senate this evening because I desire that they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that when the Secretary of State appears before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations he will know something of the scope of

interest and of the inquiries which may be directed to him.

It is my intention, Mr. President, to question the Secretary, within the limits of the time available, very definitely and in detail about these particular matters, as well as other subjects to which I have addressed myself from time to time in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two editorials concerning the shipment of arms to the Middle East. One, entitled "Arms to the Middle East," appeared in the New York Times on February 18, 1956, and the second, entitled "Over the Oil Barrel," appeared this morning in the Washington Post and Times Herald. I commend them both to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1956]

ARMS TO THE MIDDLE EAST

The blunder of the State Department in at first authorizing the shipment of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia is one of those inexplicable abberations that sometimes hit the official mentality. Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota (not to mention the Israeli Embassy), called the decision "incredible" and that was a good word for it. In stepping in to cancel the shipment, President Eisenhower was doing only what he had to do, but the mystery is why he was put in such a position.

Since it is an ill wind that does not blow some good, this incident may at least force the administration to stop floundering around on the business of arms to the Middle East. The original decision to hold back on the sale of arms to Israel was understandable. It was and is important to avoid an arms race, if possible. In addition, public opinion here and throughout the free world was shocked by the brutal reprisal raid of the Israelis against the Syrians on December 11. If that was what arms were going to be used for, we certainly wanted to have no part of it.

However, the situation today is different. Our policy, which is shared by Britain and France, is to try to keep a rough balance of armed strength in the Middle East as a deterrent to both sides. As it happens, the balance has now been upset by the large shipments of Iron Curtain arms to Egypt. While it is true that the Egyptians have not had time yet to master these arms, the fact remains that they have a potential edge on Israel, especially in the air. The twin jet IL–28 bombers supplied by the Communists, for instance, are much the most powerful striking weapons today on either side. Israel has nothing comparable, and it is arguable that she should be sold bombers for defense.

The danger of a conflict started by either side is still great, and the United States, Britain, and France must quickly take measures to be ready to stop a conflagration or even prevent one. Sending tanks to Saudi Arabia would have been like pouring oil on a fire.

[From the Washington Post of February 21, 1956]

OVER THE OIL BARREL

Well, the State Department is back over the barrel in the shipment of tanks to Saudi Arabia. In the circumstances there may have been no reasonable alternative to lifting the export ban temporarily imposed by the President. The decision to let the shipment go after all certainly has given an on-again-off-again cast to American diplomacy; but the ban did permit exploration of the facts after an instance of seemingly remarkable forgetfulness in the State Department. Examination disclosed (1) that the 18 tanks had already been paid for by Saudi Arabia under a legitimate contract executed last summer in conformity with the 1951 arms agreement and (2) that the ban also was holding up shipment of spare parts and logistic supplies to Israel.

Saudi Arabia was not to blame for the confusion; indeed, the Saudis behaved with restraint. The question was whether this country would honor a commitment in good faith. The State Department had to consider whether a refusal to send the tanks would induce the Saudis to accept one of the proffers of Communist arms in the fashion of Egypt—proffers which the Saudis so far have declined. And, though the question of oil did not immediately arise, no one could remain indifferent to the strategic consideration that Europe is almost totally dependent for its oil on the Arab countries of the Middle East.

At the same time there is no disgusing the fact that this shipment and the vacillation in American policy will increase the sense of insecurity in Israel. That in itself is dangerous. The episode has damaged this country's moral position in seeking to calm the tension, and it will increase the demand for arms to Israel. This is the fruit of a practice of throwing arms indiscriminately around the globe, especially in areas where there is no peace and arms do not furnish an answer.

In the immediate situation, if this country is not to discriminate against Israel and at the same time is not to abet the arms race, some diversion must be found. We return to a suggestion we made on this page last week—that this country in company with Britain and France establish an arms for peace stockpile at a NATO base on the island of Cyprus, the arms to be made available by airlift to the victim of aggression if Arab-Israeli war should start. Approval of the United Nations Assembly could be sought for such a stockpile as an essential supplement to the 1950 tripartite border guaranty.

Efforts are now in process to expand the neutral zones between Israel and her Arab neighbors. If more of a neutral belt could be established, the danger of an accidental clash would be diminished. Any foray across the neutral belt in all probability would be deliberate aggression. General Burns, the U. N. truce supervisor, might well be entrusted with the task of determining when there had been aggression.

Obviously there are some shortcomings in such an approach. Israel fears air bombardment by Egyptian jets. Although this probably is not an immediate worry, it could become a threat within a few months. Perhaps the fears could be assuaged by affording Israeli (as well as Arab) crews training in jet planes that would be made available promptly in the event of aggression; or perhaps the stockpile could be augmented by a declaration that air units of the Sixth Fleet would intervene to repel air attack. But the important thing, it seems to us, is to place emphasis on maintaining the peace by making it clear to both sides that the injured party could count on immediate aid against aggression.

THE NEW CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an illuminating article by Walter Lippmann which appears in this morning's Washington Post. Mr. Lippmann canvasses the new challenge to American foreign policy. His analysis covers the Saudi Arabian tank affair, our failures in the Middle East, the administration's lack of coordinating State Department and Defense Department policies, last week's revision of Soviet doctrine, and the new, broad-gaged challenge which Soviet policy is giving us in the uncommitted areas of the world.

It is an important and significant article, and I hope my colleagues will consider it carefully.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A REVEALING BLUNDER

The affair of the Saudi Arabian tanks is a ludicrous but damaging example of what can happen in a big and complicated government when it is not clearly led and firmly administered from the top. For months, this Government has been faced with the dangerous problem of arms shipments to the Middle East. On this subject there has recently been a conference at the highest level between the President and the British Prime Minister. There have been many pronouncements about arms for the Middle East. How then could it happen that the State Department had forgotten about its own approval of the sale of the Saudi Arabian tanks, that the Defense Department was operating without realizing what a mess the shipment of these arms would now cause, once the facts became known?

The reason for this incident must be that there is no high policy for the Middle East which comes from the top and is administered all the way down the line from the policymaking officials to the operating officials. The President has not, of course, been truly in command, certainly not since his illness, in fact not really since he went to Denver last August. Yet it is only the President who can effectively coordinate two great Departments like State and Defense. He can coordinate them only if at Cabinet meetings and elsewhere he makes the heads of these Departments understand clearly what the policy is. It is only too obvious that nothing of the sort has happened during the past 6 months, or could have happened.

The lack of a high command has been aggravated by the way Mr. Dulles conceives the office of Secretary of State. He thinks of himself as a roving negotiator, who represents the President's constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs. He works out high problems by personal negotiation, and then leaves the policies to be administered and operated in his absence by officials who do not know at first hand what they are. Mr. Dulles is not in Washington long enough or continuously enough to command the operations of his Department. The effect, as the Saudi Arabian tanks illustrate, is to leave the immediate business of the Government to be operated by bureau chieftains on their own notions without overhead directions from the top.

The administrative confusion is not the only, or indeed the most serious, consequence of the way our affairs have been conducted during the past 6 months. There has been nobody at the top whose business it has been, or who was able, to face up to the new Soviet challenge which has confronted us since the first Geneva meeting. The President has been too ill to deal with it, and Mr. Dulles has been to preoccupied with his travels, his negotiations, and his speeches. In these past 6 months we have suffered the biggest and most serious setback since the Communist victory in China.

The fundamental cause of the setback is that the Soviet Union has been developing a new foreign policy since Geneva whereas

we have remained frozen and inflexible in the policy of the pre-Geneva period. That is why there is scarcely a country from France and Italy and Germany and Greece to India and beyond where the pro-Western and pro-American parties and politicians are not in trouble. With nobody at the top in Washington who can and will take new decisions, our diplomacy is almost everywhere fighting unattractive rear-guard actions.

It would be interesting to know who, in the high places where decisions can be taken, has been putting his mind on the speeches delivered last week at the Communist Party Congress in Moscow. They are very long speeches. But they are exceedingly important. Their common theme is that within the Communist world, they have an industrial system which is, in the terms of national power, not only in arms but also in the means of capital development, already reaching equality with the West. The Soviet leaders have been declaring that the rate of economic growth in the Soviet Union surpasses that of all countries, and that, therefore, they will become a more and more formidable competitor in the economic and political markets of the world.

I do not know whether all the statistics that were put out last week are correct. But the world will not doubt the great fact that the Soviet Union is now the strongest power in Eurasia. It is this economic fact which accounts for the extraordinary tone of confidence that pervaded all the speeches made in Moscow last week. It also explains the ideological and political declarations about how Khrushchev and his people expect to win the cold war without revolutionary violence. They believe that in the competition with us for influence in the uncommitted countries they can make more attractive offers than we are likely to make.

Even if they cannot offer as much economic aid as we could, they will be able to offer more than Congress will allow us to offer. Moreover, whatever they offer, they can offer on terms which are politically more attractive than the terms which Congress insists that we should impose.

They are in a stronger bargaining position in the uncommitted nations, for they do not ask, they do not need to ask, for military pacts or their equivalent. They are able to identify themselves with the popular longing to remain unentangled. What is more, in the underdeveloped countries, which are by definition without capital resources, the governments must necessarily play the principal role in capital formation. This suits the Socialist ideology of the Russians. It runs at cross purposes with our own anti-Socialist ideology.

The new challenge of the Soviet Union is very formidable, indeed. If we are to meet it, we shall have to reverse ourselves on a number of things which are strongly believed in here. We shall have to be willing to export capital on a considerable scale. We shall have to be willing to do that without insisting on military terms, without penalizing political neutrality, and without expecting the underdeveloped but old and crowded countries to adopt all the principles of the American free enterprise system. We shall, in other words, have to be willing to contribute capital to countries which, as neutrals and as Socialists, will be unlike the United States.

The alternative, I believe, is to go on losing our influence in the uncommitted world.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order of the Senate, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 22, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, help us daily to sense the privilege and opportunity of sharing in the glorious task of bringing the members of the human family into a peaceful and happy relationship.

We penitently confess that we are frequently very selfish and self-centered and very thoughtless and indifferent toward a world that has in it so many desperate needs and longings.

Make us more eager to cultivate and speak the language of the heart, the language of understanding and appreciation, of considerateness and kindness, of brotherhood and good will.

Inspire us to think and act in terms of humanity and to make a helpful contribution to the welfare and blessedness of men and nations everywhere.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2430. An act to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

MISAPPROPRIATION OF GOVERNMENTAL INFORMATION

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Under Secretary of Commerce is guilty of misappropriating governmental information which came to him by virtue of his high public office and applying it to his own personal use and benefit.

Yesterday, Mr. Louis Rothschild admitted he furnished a list of Federal airport grants, totaling some $38 million to the Republican National Committee before he released the information to the rest of the country. This may make Mr. Rothschild a big man with the Republican Party. These airport grants are public funds and do not belong to him personally. Nor are they the property of the Republican Committee.

It may be argued that this information is of only slight value. Perhaps that is so. But, I ask, if a sub-Cabinet officer is so weak he cannot resist the temptation to misappropriate governmental information of slight value, does this demonstrate traits of character which will protect him against weakness when greater temptations come before him by virtue of his high public office?

BROUGHT TO TASK

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read an editorial entitled "Brought to Task," which appeared in the February 14, 1956, edition of the Leavenworth (Kans.) Times.

I call this article to the attention of Congress because I feel that all too often we tend to take for granted the decent things in life, including wholesome attributes of our young people, and pay disproportionately large concern to the weaknesses in our fellow men. Certainly we must not disregard the many reports of juvenile delinquency so prevalent in these times, but we should also not overlook the inherently good characteristics of the majority of our young people.

The more I see of modern youth the more convinced I become that the future of this Nation will be in good hands. It has been my pleasure to meet many intelligent young persons since I have been in public life, and they have furthered my faith in the future. I think my colleagues will agree the actions of these young citizens lend a refreshing note to an otherwise staid and trite adult existence. May American youth always be as imaginative, impartial, and impromptu as they are today.

The editorial follows:

BROUGHT TO TASK

The editor of the Times has been brought to task by students of the American history class of Leavenworth High School about statements made in two recent editorials.

The points they bring out are well taken and we feel complimented rather than resentful of the criticism, because an editor seldom knows if anybody takes the trouble to read his columns. It is especially pleasing and encouraging to discover that there are readers of high-school age. Here is the letter:

"DEAR SIR: We have discovered an error in your editorial of January 31, entitled 'Constitution Is Restrictive.' It was stated that 'Under the guidance of Thomas Jefferson, the Constitution was designed to restrict the power of Federal Government.' We would like to inform you that Thomas Jefferson had nothing to do with the writing of the Constitution since he was away in

France at the time, and furthermore, his first impression of it was of disapproval.

"We have acquired this information from our study of the Constitution last fall in our American history class and would like to offer this as proof that high-school students are not 'woefully ignorant about the simplest aspects of national and world affairs,' as was stated in the December 4, 1955, issue of the Leavenworth Times. If there are 'glaring weaknesses in our vaunted system of education,' as was stated, they are not of recent origin.

"Very truly yours,
"BETTY ANN JOHNSON.
"SUE TINSLEY."

Of course we had to give an answer in self-defense. In our answer, we pointed out that the statement concerning "glaring weaknesses" was not the Times' statement but a direct quotation, and so indicated in the editorial, by a prominent Ohio educator, the president of Miami University.

We may have used an unfortunate choice of words about Thomas Jefferson. Instead of "guidance" it might have been better to have used some such phrase as "influenced by." The actual writers of the Constitution could not have helped but be influenced by Jefferson's ideas. He helped write the Declaration of Independence and subsequently expressed himself through articles, letters, and speeches about his ideas on the requirements of a satisfactory Constitution, even though he had no actual part in the writing of the document.

A newspaper editor needs more criticism like this. It will remind him to keep on his toes.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENT REGULATIONS ON WHEAT

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents are small farmers. Some of them have protested from time to time because of the application of the acreage allotment regulation on wheat. It prevents them from planting sufficient wheat to be used exclusively for feeding livestock on their small farms.

This is an utterly ridiculous situation, particularly in view of the fact that the Members of Congress on both sides of the House continually speak about the small farmer, and helping the small farmer, and how desirous they are of assisting him solve his problems.

Maintenance of the existing law is solely in the interest of the big farmer. The tradition of the American farmer has been one of independence, one of trying to help himself. To think that today if you are raising chickens or if you are raising livestock you are not permitted to grow enough on your own farm to take care of feed requirements. Many are forced to buy in the market, although historically they have been in a position to raise sufficient feed for consumption on their own farm. It poses a question that I think should be corrected by the Congress immediately.

Recently, members of the New Jersey Farm Bureau meeting in Washington with their congressional representatives, urged a change in the law. They strongly support the exemption from acreage control of farmers who grow feed only for consumption on their own farm.

Just this week, one of the farmers in the Seventh Congressional District wrote me in protest of the application of acreage allotments. His name is Paul C. Wirtz, and his farm lies near Lebanon in Hunterdon County, N. J. I am quoting from his letter to me, in order to more forcibly bring home to you the problem faced by small farmers, who certainly merit the serious consideration of the Congress and prompt favorable action on their behalf. Mr. Wirtz stated in his letter:

In regard to the farm-subsidy program, I was deeply shocked to learn that hundreds of thousands of dollars were paid annually to individual wheat farmers, while a few cotton farmers were paid over $1 million each. No wonder we have surpluses.

When in 1954 I protested our 17-acre wheat allotment on a total of 300 acres, I was shunted from one paid committee to another; finally was ordered to appear in the Flemington Courthouse before a State committee to state my case. Mind you, all I wanted was to plant feed grains on our own land to feed to our own livestock. None of the wheat would be sold. When I explained this to the office manager administering this program, he told me that the wheat acreage law applied to wheat and its byproducts, and since eggs and chickens were byproducts of wheat, the law applied also to wheat consumed on the farm.

In the courthouse I was made to wait for several hours together with a number of other farmers, who had committed the terrible crime of overplanting their wheat quota by 2 or 3 acres, and for which they had been or expected to be fined $50 or $60.

What a mockery. On the one hand Congress insists on making millionaires out of a handful of operators—showering money on them to buy more land, more machinery, and more fertilizer to grow more surpluses for the taxpayer to pay for—while on the other hand it hauls the small farmers, who are just trying to raise enough feed for their own livestock into court like common criminals. I have no objections to large farms, efficiently run by ingenious individuals, but I do object when these giant operations are set up in business with the taxpayers' money.

I feel confident that the membership of this House would overwhelmingly support this suggested exemption, and if the Agriculture Committee refuses to report out such an amendment, it is decidedly acting against the best interests of our small farmers. I intend to support favorable action for this exemption until simple justice is accomplished for the farmer seeking to produce for his own needs. The small farmers in this category have not contributed to the huge surpluses overhanging and depressing the farm economy. It has been the large subsidized farmer who has with every acreage allotment plan intensified his production on the remaining acreage, because he has been assured of Government protection.

LET OUR FARMERS GO

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], who just called attention to the situation which confronts our farmers should not get discouraged because some day some time, they will be released from these restrictions which one Member of the House describes as similar to those imposed on farmers in Russia. Accepting the invitation of the Committee on Agriculture, some Members of the House went over there yesterday, but we did not get anywhere. They take care of the boys who grow, sell, and chew tobacco and the fellows who grow and eat peanuts and the fellows who grow, wear, and sell cotton, and the rice boys, and let me see—I think the corn growers—they take care of them—you can grow corn, as I understand it, and make it into moonshine, but you cannot grow wheat and feed it to your poultry. Now, I hope some day the Members of the Congress will realize this legislation of which we complain is class legislation. The gentlemen on the other side try to say that the Republicans are to blame for the present ruinous farm policy. So far as the farmers in my district are concerned and so far as the wheat-growing business goes, for the injustice that affects them, the Democrats are directly responsible. I hope everybody in the House on our side will tell our farmers about it, place the blame where it belongs on the Democratic Congress.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I called to the attention of the House the conduct of Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Louis S. Rothschild, when he prematurely released the Federal aid to airport list of projects. Yesterday, upon questioning in the other body, Mr. Rothschild admitted it. So it is a proven fact now. But when the charge was made several days ago, the National Republican Committee flatly denied it. But I call to the attention of the House the fact that it is established as true despite the denial of the National Republican Committee.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 372) to provide additional expense to conduct the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 114, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 114 of the 84th Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the problems of small business, not to exceed $160,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such study and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I would like to ask the gentleman to make a short statement as to how much funds are presently available for use of the committee.

Mr. BURLESON. The sum of $170,000 was appropriated in the 1st session of the 84th Congress. As of February 1 there was an unexpended balance of $28,352. The committee appeared before the Subcommittee on Accounts with a justifying budget which was, in turn, submitted to the full committee, and satisfied the committee that these funds were necessary to carry on their activities during the remainder of this session of the 84th Congress.

Mr. ARENDS. I have no desire to hinder the activities of the committee. They likely require additional money. One disturbing fact came to my attention the other day. I believe I have my figures correct in that this committee, presently asking for additional funds, now have employed personnel on that committee which, in numbers and in aggregate monthly expenditure of money, exceeds the numbers employed and the total amount of money used by the great Committee on Armed Services of this House of Representatives. In other words the Small Business Committee now has more employees at more money per month than does the Committee on Armed Services of the House. That raises a question in my mind as to how far we are going in this matter of providing these additional funds.

Mr. BURLESON. I can assure the gentleman those questions were raised before the Committee on House Administration. Although new employees have been recently added they did state to the committee that in their activities and in the scope of their investigations the added employees were necessary.

Mr. ARENDS. I hope the gentleman will in the future pay the closest attention to such requests for additional funds for this committee. We want to give the committee what they need but not more than what they can constructively use.

Mr. BURLESON. I agree with the gentleman and will assure him that such has been the practice in the past and will be so in the future. I further assure him that this will be done not only insofar as the Small Business Committee is concerned, but all other committees as well.

THE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE SHOULD HAVE SUFFICIENT APPROPRIATIONS TO CONTINUE ITS PRESENT HELP TO SMALL BUSINESS IN 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, these are difficult days for small business. Like the farmers, they are not enjoying prosperity. Their big brothers are receiving the favors of desirable trade winds. Therefore, Congress must be more alert than ever before to the problems of small business and there is a greater need today than ever before for a strong and adequately financed Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives.

Your Small Business Committee can be of enormous help to small business. We need help by putting the facts of particular problems before the Members of the House. Reporting the facts usually goes a long way in bringing about the case. In addition to our investigations, we have a continuing volume of business in trying to help out individual small-business men and groups of small-business men. This is what we call our case load.

When small-business people come to see or write to the Members of the House about problems that are especially knotty and take a lot of time and work to get straightened out, our committee usually gets those problems. These are problems, for the most part, where the small-business firm is being mistreated or has gotten snarled up in some procedure of the executive agencies, such as when a defense contract has gone haywire or a loan application is fouled up in a backlash of redtape. All of these cases require a great deal of time in conferences.

In a period of about 7 months since June 21 of last year, the committee has received from Members of the House 313 inquiries, from 155 different Members of the House, about problems of small business. In each of those instances in which a small-business man was involved and needed help, our committee responded in assisting the member in getting the needed help for his small-business constituent. In a great many of these instances our staff participated in conferences and investigations regarding actions by the agencies of the Government and in getting reports thereon to the Members for their use in advising their constituents. These instances have included Members on both sides of the aisle. Our staff is devoted to the cause of assisting all Members in dealing with the small-business problems.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES

While we have carefully coordinated our work with the work of other committees, where we impinge upon the same matters, we have also cooperated with and lent our assistance to other committees where they have been engaged in work that is particularly important to small business.

For example, I have myself testified three times before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, on matters which are vitally important to small business.

Our committee has likewise assisted the Committee on Banking and Currency, with its consideration of two bills revising the Small Business Act. We assisted in drafting the revised law which passed last August, which created a greatly improved and more liberal loan program for small business.

Similarly we have cooperated with the Committee on Armed Services, and provided them with such information as we had which we thought would be helpful in that committee's current study of defense contracting methods.

INVESTIGATIONS HELP SMALL BUSINESS

I do not want to claim for our committee credit for things whch may be mere coincidence, but I might point to a striking record.

In the 24 months between the time Mr. Howrey became Chairman of the FTC, until our committee began investigating that Agency, the FTC issued 6 complaints charging price discriminations in violation of section 2 (a) of the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman act. Most of these complaints were issued shortly after Mr. Howrey took over, and may be assumed to have been already in the works. In the second full 12 months after Mr. Howrey took over, the FTC issued only one such complaint. In the 9 months since our committee first began investigating the FTC, the FTC has issued 12 complaints charging price discriminations in violation of section 2 (a).

There is a similar record with reference to cease and desist orders issued under this section of the law. In the first 2 years after Mr. Howrey took over, his FTC issued no such orders in contested cases. Since our committee started investigating 9 months ago the FTC has issued 4 such cease and desist orders.

As this committee may know, price discrimination is the most serious and most deadly thing militating against small business in our economic system. It is a pure abuse of power which results in the bigger firms destroying the smaller firms without respect to efficiency or any other merits, and the problem is not limited to any one industry.

In our investigations of SBA, beginning early last year, we have called attention in the House to the very small disbursements which SBA has made on small business loans. It may be coincidental, but the fact is that SBA's disbursements to small business in the past year were 1½ times as great as its disbursements in the preceding year and a half. These disbursements are still small, but it is true that some improvements have been made.

CEMENT

When our committee began investigating the cement shortage last year, it was plain that there was need for a substantial expansion of cement capacity. Cement was generally short throughout the United States, and in many sections of the country, there were acute shortages. Small distributors could not get cement and small contractors could not get enough cement to finish projects

they had under way. We called attention to this matter, and we sent questionnaires to cement users which called the attention of the cement companies to the amount of unfilled demand.

Here again it may be coincidental, but after we got this investigation under way, there was a rapid increase in the cement companies' expansion program. I suspect that we may have helped make these companies aware of the need for expansion. At least several of the companies wrote to the committee telling us about their decisions to expand, even before they announced them publicly.

What I have said about cement is more particularly true of aluminum. On two occasions after one of our subcommittees investigated the aluminum shortage, and showed the difficulties small fabricators were having in obtaining aluminum, the Office of Defense Mobilization cut back on deliveries scheduled for the stockpile, in order to make more aluminum available for civilian uses.

RUBBER

Early last year our committee analyzed the plan for selling the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants. We called attention to the fact that this plan did not meet the standards laid down in the Rubber Disposal Act of 1953, in that it would not create a free competitive industry, and that the sales contracts did not provide assurance that small rubber fabricators would receive a fair share of available supplies. We further pointed out that the world shortage of rubber, natural and synthetic combined, was such that the buyers of the synthetic plants would be in a position to raise prices. While the Government had held the price of synthetic rubber at 21 cents a pound, and was making a good profit at that price, the price of natural rubber was then about 30 cents a pound.

During the debate, and as a result of our objections, the big rubber and oil companies purchasing these plants gave Members of Congress firm assurances of good behavior, if they were allowed to have the plants.

After the plants were sold, the price of natural rubber continued to rise. The price averaged better than 42 cents per pound during the last 9 months of 1955, and synthetic rubber could have been raised to that level. But the new owners have, so far at least, held the price at not much above 21 cents a pound. If they had raised prices of synethetic rubber up to the going price of natural rubber, which would have meant doubling the price, then the 1.6 billion pounds they sold in the last 9 months of 1955 would have cost consumers at least $337 million more.

Several Members of the House have told us it was our factfinding last year that saved consumers this $337 million. I would hesitate to accept full credit, but I am inclined to think we were in part responsible.

I am also happy to report that to date, there have been very few complaints that small fabricators could not get supplies of synthetic rubber, although the shortage has continued since the plants were sold. The few complaints about being denied supplies have been in situations where the small fabricators have made some new inventions which were about to take business from the big rubber companies, so I can say that in general the rubber companies' behavior in sharing the available supplies with the small fabricators has, so far, been good too.

Perhaps it is not claiming too much credit to say that our committee was at least in part responsible for saving consumers $337 million in the cost of synthetic rubber last year, and in helping small fabricators obtain a share of available supplies of such rubber.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE SHOULD BE MUCH BIGGER

We are mindful that our efforts to help small business in the respects we have enumerated have not pleased some people. Some big businesses have objected to our efforts to help small business. However, those objections have not deterred us when we were right. In our hearings we have carefully considered all objections from all sources, including big business. We gave weight and credit to those we found to be sound and well made. We rejected all others and proceeded with our help to small business even in the face of the objections. So you can expect to be urged to cut us down and tie our hands. You will hear excuses, such as that we have gotten out of our bailiwick or that we are duplicating the work of other committees, and so on. The fact is that there are so many things needing to be done, that are vitally important to small business, and are not even being touched upon, we do not need to look afield for things to do. What we can actually do, with our limited time and resources, compared to the things that are crying to be done, is like trying to bail out the ocean with a teaspoon.

In fact, it is obvious that the Small Business Committee should be enlarged to include 25 members and that appropriations should be approximately a half a million dollars. Money spent in this way would amount to very, very small crumbs as compared to the tens and hundreds of millions of dollars which the work of such a committee would save consumers. But, at the moment I do not know of another 14 Members of the House whose present work schedules would permit them the time to serve on the Small Business Committee. So I am not asking that the committee be expanded during this session of Congress.

Despite the opposition and the quibbling which we expect, our request contains no padding. We do not wish to try to jockey with this committee, and we think the correct thing to do is to put before you our best estimate of the exact amount we actually need and expect to spend.

Our resolution calls for $160,000 plus our unexpended balance from last year. The unexpended balance as of December 31, 1955, was $39,823, making our total request for the year 1956 $199,823. This is the amount we actually need and expect to spend for essential things.

Last year we had total appropriations amounting to $170,000. Our initial appropriation was $135,000 and we received a supplemental appropriation of $35,000 in August of last year.

When we asked for the supplemental appropriation last year we expected to have hearings during the fall on two subjects which—as it turned out—we were unable to do. When we debated this supplemental appropriation in the House on August 1, I then told the House that this money would be spent only for absolutely necessary things and if it turned out that the money was not actually needed for such things, it would not be spent. It was not spent.

Our committee was reorganized last year, and we built up almost a completely new staff. Consequently, we were slow in obtaining a full staff. We proceeded cautiously, to make sure we got especially competent people. The committee may note the amounts of salary payments month by month, which are shown in the report I submitted to the chairman on January 10. The total funds which our request would make available from January 1, 1956, will cover 12 months salaries at our present salary rates plus $35,000 for travel.

I would like to describe briefly, the principal projects in which we are engaged.

IRON AND STEEL SCRAP INDUSTRY

One new project which we have undertaken is to make a thorough investigation of the iron and steel scrap problem. As the committee may know, tremendous tonnages of scrap are now being exported to foreign countries. These exports are now at a much higher rate than ever before in history. With the resulting shortage in the United States, prices have risen to neighborhood of prices for new metal.

We have been receiving complaints from the small semi-integrated steel companies and from the steel and iron foundries. These companies are caught in the squeeze. The semi-integrated steel companies, for example, use a very high proportion of scrap in making steel. Many of these mills are designed to use scrap exclusively.

Of course, the big integrated mills use some scrap too, but they use a small proportion of scrap; their main raw material is their iron ore.

The scrap shortage also raises problems for all kinds of small steel users. It contributes to the steel shortage and when there is a shortage small steel users in all lines of business tend to be squeezed. For example, we have complaints that only the big steel companies can bid on construction projects on the St. Lawrence Seaway, for the reason that small contractors cannot get structural steel. The big steel companies now have their own erecting crews who operate in competition with local contractors, and when steel is generally short the big companies can and do refuse to let the construction companies have steel, so they are eliminated from the bidding on construction projects.

We have a big project ahead to get all the facts and figures on this problem and

make an appraisal which will really be sound. Our foreign policy may be involved in the problem.

ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY

Another new investigation which has been undertaken is in the electronics industry. As the committee may know, this is a relatively new industry which has sprung up and mushroomed, mostly during and since World War II. It is a coming industry. And it is almost unique in that the industry is made up of a great many small manufacturers. These small firms have been progressive, highly competent, and they have made most of the inventions that have been made in the electronics field.

Our committee has recently, however, been receiving a number of very serious complaints about one thing or another in this industry. There seem to be some serious problems developing in the Armed Services with reference to the procurement of the communications equipment of some of these manufacturers. The complaint is that a few of the big boys seem suddenly to have tied up the business at the Armed Services, although the indications are that the Armed Services previously found the equipment of some of the smaller makers to be superior. I do not want to go into this fully at the moment.

AUTO PARTS INDUSTRY

Another new investigation which we have undertaken involves auto parts. We are receiving complaints from the auto parts wholesalers and retailers about the pricing and contracting methods in the industry. The complaints are to this effect: The automobile manufacturers buy parts from the parts manufacturers at a much lesser price than the independent auto parts distributors can buy them. Then the automobile manufacturers sell these parts to retailers at a price less than the independent distributor can get. On the other hand the independent distributors and wholesalers could sell to franchise auto dealers at a lesser price than these dealers are paying the auto manufacturer for the same part, except that the auto manufacturer has the franchise dealers sewed up. I do not want to prejudge these complaints. We have enough allegations to indicate, however, that a serious problem exists, and we plan to make a full investigation.

AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

Another investigation which we have had on our agenda since the beginning of last year, but which we are just now getting seriously into, is the aircraft industry.

I suspect this committee knows the broad lines of the problem in that industry. The big aircraft assembly companies are, in effect, subsidiaries of the Federal Government, except that they enjoy most of the benefits of Government with few of the responsibilities of Government. Up until about a year ago the Government let prime contracts for most of the parts, subassemblies, instruments, and so on, that are assembled into the completed aircraft. But a little over a year ago this longstanding practice was changed and given one of the new fancy names, which is called the weapons system concept. This simply means that the Department of the Air Force turned over to the aircraft assembly firms the privilege and responsibility for contracting with the parts makers. Most of these parts and instrument makers are, as the committee may know, small companies, and there are many of them. Here again we have a new industry which is very efficient and progressive and has not yet become monopolized. It is time to find out now, I think, how the new contracting methods are working out and whether or not the weapons system concept is a concept of favoritism or possibly a monopoly concept.

NICKEL INDUSTRY

We have been gathering information for making a preliminary appraisal of the problems in nickel, and we expect to start holding hearings on this industry soon.

Lest the committee be under any misapprehension, I might state we are not interested in the management of the Niciaro project; and we are not interested in whether Mr. Mansure has done a good job or a bad job of managing that project. We are interested in the economics of the nickel industry—the supply and demand outlook for nickel and the allocation systems being used by the Government and the private companies.

As this committee may know, the International Nickel Co. supplies the great bulk of all the nickel available in this hemisphere. It appears that this company is able to determine who can use nickel and who cannot, which steel companies, for example, can make nickel steel and which cannot, and which of the little electroplaters can have nickel and how much.

There is an increasing black market, or gray market, in nickel, with electroplaters reported to be paying as much as $3 a pound for nickel.

In addition to these things we expect to continue with our more mature investigations.

ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

The hearings on the alumnum problem are now complete, unless some new development occurs, and we are in the process now of drafting our report. This will be a very complete and extensive report and one which I hope will make some important recommendations. The problem in this industry grows out of two important conditions: First, not enough aluminum to go around; and, second, the producers of primary aluminum going into competition with their fabricator-customers and squeezing them out when they no longer need them as customers.

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY AGENCIES

Our investigations of the independent regulatory agencies will continue. We have virtually completed with the Federal Trade Commission and are taking up the other regulatory bodies, with investigation of the FCC and the CAB actively underway.

The other regulatory agencies for the most part are engaged in handing out privileged monopolies. In a sense, their grant of a license to do business is just like the Royal Charters that were handed out to the king's favorites back in the days before the American Revolution. These agencies decide who can have the monopoly privileges and who cannot.

Of course they are supposed to be independent agencies, making their decisions on the basis of policy standards laid down in the law. But they are of course under pressures; and the Hoover Commission reorganization plans have tended to lift these agencies out of their independent status and put them under control of the White House. The best safeguard we can provide against these agencies being pressured into favoring big business and discriminating against small business applicants, is to have them know that they are being investigated and being investigated thoroughly by the Small Business Committee.

SBA AND GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

One other continuing job which we have to do deals with the Small Business Administration and the activities of the Federal procurement and the surplus property disposal agencies. This job is so big and difficult I fear that we can never accomplish what ought to be accomplished. As to procurement activities, drastic revisions in law are badly needed, in my view, both to make the policy of the law more specific and to require more informative accounting by the armed services for their handling of the vast funds appropriated to them. Until such new legislation is passed, however, we are compelled to do what we can do to try to find out what is going on.

One of the most serious items we have discovered is that the armed services are handing out about a billion and a half dollars a year in subsidies for industrial research and development. They even allow the companies who make inventions on the use of this money to take out patents on the inventions. Substantially all of this money is being given to the very big corporations. Less than 7 percent of it is being given to firms having 500 or less employees. We plan to investigate this matter, provided we succeed in getting the Department of Defense to give us any information about it.

PX AND SHIP STORES

We plan also to begin a new investigation of purchasing methods being used by PX and ship stores services. The committee is receiving complaints about favoritism and noncompetitive purchasing methods. These services are neither quite fish nor fowl—they are neither official agencies of the Government nor unofficial agencies of the Government—and they raise peculiar problems, but these are important problems because the volume of business runs into staggering sums.

CONCLUSION

Agencies in the Federal Government and the national committees of the major political parties have a growing awareness of difficulties now being faced by small businesses. They are reporting statistics which show that for the first 9 months of 1955 the net profits, after taxes, of manufacturing corporations with assets of $250,000 or less,

dropped more than 39 percent below what they were for the first 9 months of 1952. During that same period, the net profits, after taxes, of corporations with assets of $100 million or more increased more than 27 percent.

Last year, a year of great business boom, business failures were at a rate of 42 for each 10,000 firms. This compares with an average rate of 20 failures for 10,000 firms in the 10 years prior to 1953.

On April 13, 1955, the Committee on Appropriations submitted to the House, Report No. 417 regarding an appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary and related agencies for fiscal year 1956. An item in that appropriation bill provided for an increase for the Offices of Referees in Bankruptcy. At page 13 of the report on the bill this statement appears:

The committee was advised that approximately 65,000 bankruptcy cases will be filed in 1955, that a total increase to 75,000 in 1956 can be expected. This would be the highest number of bankruptcies recorded in the history of the country.

Those statistics reflect conditions. No one can deny that the conditions are causing small-business men to cry out for assistance. Their crying out for assistance gives rise to an issue when their cries go unheeded. Now we are told that small business failures rates as 1 of the 10 top issues before the American people in 1956.

We are asking for an adequately financed Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, not for the purpose of creating or enhancing a political issue over failure to help small business. We are asking for proper financing of such a committee in order to help small business. Simple justice requires us to act in the behalf of small business.

I am confident that you and the distinguished and able members of your committee will agree that the sum we ask for small business is indeed a modest sum with which to tackle the enormous job before us.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 373) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 203, 84th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000 in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such studies, investigations, and inquiries, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$75,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE PRINTING OF A COMPILATION OF VETERANS' LAWS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 64 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a compilation of laws pertaining to veterans, enacted during the 82d, the 83d, and 84th Congresses, to be prepared by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, be printed as a House document, as a supplement III to House Document 78 of the 82d Congress.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 206 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held by said committee during the 84th Congress, 1st session, on the national highway program.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES FOR 1955

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 387 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed 10,000 additional copies of the report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the year 1955" (H. Rept. No. 1648, 84th Cong., 2d sess.), for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT REGARDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 398 authorizing the printing of the 34th annual report of the board of actuaries of the civil service retirement and disability fund together with the Comptroller General's report on audit findings relating to civil service retirement and disability fund, United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, as a House document, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the 34th annual report of the board of actuaries of the civil service retirement and disability fund together with the Comptroller General's report on audit findings relating to civil service retirement and disability fund, United States Civil Service Commission, for fiscal years 1954 and 1955, and that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF STOCK MARKET STUDIES

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 to print for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency, additional copies of hearings entitled "Stock Market Study," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency 1,000 additional copies of the hearings entitled "Stock Market Study," held before the above committee during the 84th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 60, authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on automation and technological change for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 1,000 additional

copies of the hearings on automation and technological change, held before said joint committee during the 84th Congress, 1st session.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF JOINT COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "FEDERAL TAX POLICY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND STABILITY"

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, authorizing the printing of additional copies of the joint committee print entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability," for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report 1,000 additional copies of the joint committee print, entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability."

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. TSI AU LI ET AL.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1887) for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor) with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor)."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "fees" and insert "fee."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "aliens" and insert "alien."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "four numbers" and insert "one number."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2430), to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out all after "act", down to and including "$500,000," in line 5 and insert, "the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized, in exchange for a minimum 470-foot extension at the north end of the existing 1,000-foot reinforced concrete wharf of the Charleston Transportation Depot, and the installation on the extension of rail trackage with necessary adjustments to connect with the rail trackage of the existing wharf, to be constructed by the said city of Charleston, S. C., or its lessee, the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Secretary of the Army,".

Page 2, strike out all after line 10 over to and including line 2 on page 4 and insert "Beginning at a point in the west harbor line of the Cooper River (which point is south 41 degrees 31 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 13.2 feet from the southernmost corner of the concrete dock, formerly the dock of the Charleston Quartermaster Intermediate Depot, and which point is the terminal point of the fourteenth call in the deed dated 24 February 1950 from the City Council of Charleston to West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.); thence north 48 degrees 28 minutes 30 seconds west 2,999.27 feet, along lands of the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. to a point which is distant 11.42 feet north 68 degrees 33 minutes east from an iron pipe; thence north 69 degrees 00 minutes east a distance of 104.71 feet to a point common to this tract, lands leased by the city of Charleston to the North Carolina Terminal Co., and lands of the South Carolina State Ports Authority; thence along lands of the South Carolina State Ports Authority north 86 degrees 45 minutes 50 seconds east 15.58 feet, north 88 degrees 32 minutes 20 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 87 degrees 23 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 82 degrees 42 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 76 degrees 46 minutes 40 seconds each 50.00 feet, south 70 degrees 20 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 64 degrees 09 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 30 degrees 44 minutes 40 seconds east 24.55 feet, north 86 degrees 54 minutes 06 seconds east 374.48 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 899.77 feet, south 41 degrees 32 minutes 50 seconds west 25.00 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 1,494.83 feet to a point on the eastern edge of the concrete dock; thence along the eastern edge of the concrete dock south 41 degrees 31 minutes 30 seconds west approximately 483.0 feet to the point of beginning and containing 30.75 acres, more or less."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am authorized by the Armed Services Committee to state that in a meeting this morning these amendments were agreed to. The first amendment simply provides that in lieu of getting $500,000 for the release the Government will have built for the Army a concrete warehouse costing $500,000 under jurisdiction of the proper authorities. The second amendment is a correct description of the boundaries and area of the property.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

GRANTING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the first bill (S. 101) for the relief of Fernanda Milani.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fernanda Milani shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fernanda Milani, Spirodon Karousatos, Romana Michelina Serini, Mojsze Hildeshaim, Ita Hildeshaim, Angel Feratero Madayag, Jirair Mazartzian, Gertrude Mazartzian, Mario Mazartzian, Santiago Landa Arrizabalaga, Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Tsin Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens."

GRANTING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 117) for the relief of Ana P. Costes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana P. Costes shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana P. Costes, Wolodymyr Krysko, Rosa Tomasina Maria Puglisi (Rosa Tomasina Maria Sano), Shima Shinohara, Hsi-Lin Tung, Ruth Min-Kwong Leung Tung, Sumie

Legasse, Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, Sympcha Shpak, Richard Karl Hoffman, Marcelina Anderson, Gerassimo Troianos, Markos Demetrius Spanos, Maria Gabriella Byron (Maria Gabriella Michon), Dolores Maria Gandiaga, nee Seijo, Chang Ho Cho, Chia-Yi Jen (also known as Charles Jen), Catherine Samouris, Kerson Huang, Cirilo Jose, Meliton Topacio Tapawan, Alvaro A. Jose, Hedi Gertrude Spiecke, Vaclav Majer, Irma Majer, Vaclav Majer, Jr., and Chocura Yoshida, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens."

DR. LINCOLN ROY MANSON-HING ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1212) for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 202 (b) shall be held not to apply to the case of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson Hing, who was born in British Guiana.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", strike out the balance of the line and lines 5 and 6 and insert the following: "sections 201 (a) and 202 (b) shall be held not to be applicable in the cases of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing, Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing, and Collin James Manson-Hing."

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTS to the committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after the name "Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing", strike out the word "and."

On page 1, line 9, after the name "James Manson-Hing", strike out the period and add the following: ", and Jennifer Lynn Manson-Hing."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The following amendment to the title, recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, was considered:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing, Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing, and Collin James Manson-Hing."

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute to the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTS for the committee amendment: "Amend the title so as to read: 'An act for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing, Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing, Collin James Manson-Hing, and Jennifer Lynn Manson-Hing.'"

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

FACILITATING THE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 396) for the relief of Theresa Pok Lim Kim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Theresa Pok Lim Kim, the fiancée of Anthony F. Pampalone, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Theresa Pok Lim Kim is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Anthony F. Pampalone, and (2) that she is found otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Theresa Pok Lim Kim, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Theresa Pok Lim Kim, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Theresa Pok Lim Kim as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "visitor", insert the following: "and may be admitted to the United States."

On page 2, at the end of the bill, add new sections 2, 3, and 4, to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edith Kalwies, the fiancee of William H. Crandall, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor and may be admitted to the United States for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Edith Kalwies is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said William H. Crandall and that she is found to be otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of that act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited and prescribed by section 213 of the said act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Edith Kalwies, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Edith Kalwies, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Edith Kalwies as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Concetta Speranza Tapp, widow of Floyd William Tapp, shall, if otherwise found admissible to the United States, be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant.

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Rosa Roppo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Michael Roppo and Julia Roppo, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens."

LAND CONVEYANCE, PHELPS COUNTY, MO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7723) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Phelps County, Mo., to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described lands, comprising a portion of a tract of land previously donated to the United States by such Chamber of Commerce in connection with the program of the Civilian Conservation Corps: Parcel of land in Phelps County, Mo., described as the south half of lot 118 of the railroad addition to the town of Rolla, Mo., being the same as the south half of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 10, township 37 north, range 8 west.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF CERTAIN PATENTS WITHIN THE BLACKFEET INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4604) relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE BOARD OF NATIONAL MISSIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6990) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land designated as follows: Lot 5, block 20, of the Indian Village of Neah Bay, Wash.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "United States", insert "and the Makah Indian Tribe."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO DAVID PETERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8607) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to David Peters, an Indian of the Hoopa Valley Reservation, or to his heirs or assigns, title to 18⅔ acres of land in California which is held by the United States in trust for him and which is described as follows:

The northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 15, 10 acres; that part of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15 lying east of the center of the south fork of the Trinity River, approximately 7 acres; that portion of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of secion 15, described as follows: Beginning at the northwest quarter corner of the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, thence due west 120 feet, thence due south 660 feet, thence due east 120 feet, thence due north 660 feet to the point of beginning, approximately 1⅔ acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9390, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we bring before you today the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1957. There is more contained in this bill today for the Forest Service than at any time in the history of the Congress. There is more money in it for the parks than at any time or in any annual bill presented to the Congress. The bill carries a total amount of approximately $416 million, which is $10 million below the budget estimate, and there is a difference of only $25 million between the appropriation figure and the income received from the agencies. I again repeat, there is just a difference of $25 million. There are only about 5 agencies that make up the sum of $79 million over last year: Museum of History, $31 million; Federal aid to highways, $14 million; construction of facilities in parks, $10 million; Indian education and welfare, $8 million; and forest management, about $6 million.

Every year this bill is brought to the floor of the House I have made this statement: My only regret is that the bill is not for a billion dollars. I again repeat here today, with our great forests, our soil conservation, our great parks all the work of God, our minerals, our water, geological survey and everything else, all we are spending on America, this great country, in this bill is only $25 million more than we receive coming back to the Treasury of the United States.

It was my privilege after we adjourned last summer to drive 5,000 miles throughout this country. I traveled through the State of Arkansas, and it was very warm, in the month of August. I traveled all the way down to Florida, and it was very warm. I visited various projects and parks. I went through the Smoky Mountains, which last year had more visitors than at any time in its history. From what I understand the utilities and the services of the parks are only capable of taking care of 20 million people, yet 50 million people went into them last year. I remember attending a theater there in the evening; a fine performance in the hills. It was a fine amphitheater, a good cast and everything, and the next morning driving with the supervisor of the park I saw men, women, and children coming out of the brush, and I asked the supervisor, "Are they thinking about getting a new play or something to impersonate Braddock trying to take Fort Pitt?" Then they explained that was not so, that they had been camping there during the night, that there was no place for them to stay. There were no sanitary facilities.

To my surprise, with all the knowledge that these people had of conditions in their own department, they could not persuade the Bureau of the Budget to approve more than $5 million for the parks for purposes of construction. I have heard a good deal about Mission 66. That has a beautiful title—Mission 66. They have distributed a great many pamphlets about it, and so forth. But money is needed for the parks this year, not 3 years from now. Money is needed for the parks in 1956 to repair the damage that has been done in the parks through the years.

When the Director of the Park Service appeared before us I asked him, "Can you use $10 million for construction in the parks?" He did not want to answer, because his superior was present. But finally he admitted that he could. When I said, "I will double what the budget approved," somebody called the White House. They had a special meeting of the Cabinet. The Director of the agency appeared before the Cabinet and they sent up a supplemental estimate for something like $8 or $9 million. The committee, in its wisdom, never recognized that supplemental estimate. They had a job to do to help put those parks in proper condition. Every member of the committee agreed to make the total $15 million for construction in the parks for the benefit of the people who visit the parks.

I know we all have a bleeding heart for a pine tree, for the parks of the country, for the Forest Service, and so forth. This is a good bill. It took the full Committee on Appropriations only 18 minutes to approve this bill. Not a single member of the full committee asked a question, either from the Republican or the Democratic side, indicating they were satisfied with this bill.

As I said, there is more money in this bill than any similar bill that was ever presented to the House for the Park Service and the Forest Service. So I am asking the Members of the House to pass this bill and pass it quickly. I do not mean that we are in a hurry to get out of here, but this is a good bill, one of the best ever presented to the House.

I think of how we have neglected our parks and our forests and our natural resources as a whole in this country, how we have permitted them to be robbed and looted for almost 300 years, and how little we have spent on America when we are spending billions for the rest of the world. If we are going to continue to spend a great deal of money surely we can afford to spend some money on this country to keep abreast of developments in research, to preserve and develop our mineral resources, and so forth.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman has said that this is a good bill and scolded the Bureau of the Budget somewhat because there was not enough money in the bill. I note that the bill carries $10,785,000 less than was recommended by the Budget. How does the gentleman reconcile those two facts? The gentleman said he would like to have this bill appropriate a billion dollars and yet, as Chairman of the committee, he comes in here with a bill that is approximately $11 million below the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KIRWAN. We have not eliminated anything from this bill. Some years ago the Congress in its wisdom passed a bill to build Jones Point Bridge across the river here. Under the terms of the act the Secretary of the Interior was to be responsible for the construction of that bridge.

On Sunday, the Washington Evening Star in an editorial said that this committee refused to approve $13 million for Jones Bridge until they did what the act called for. A new bill is going to be introduced for the consideration of the Committee on Public Works, to put the jurisdiction of that project where it belongs, and take it from this committee.

The bill we are presenting calls for more money than the Bureau of the Budget approved. But the elimination of the item for Jones Bridge makes the total amount less.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this is a good bill and I hope that the House, in its wisdom, will approve it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as our good chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has just told you, this is the largest recommended appropriation for the different agencies that come under this Interior Department Appropriation bill that has ever been requested by the President of the United States. The Budget has approved a larger amount than has ever been requested before. The committee has gone along very closely with the President and the Budget.

As the chairman has just stated, there is no controversy in this bill so far as the regular subcommittee is concerned. We agreed on every item in this bill before it left the subcommittee and went to the full Appropriations Committee, and the full Appropriations Committee without a dissenting voice approved the action of the subcommittee.

The revenue which is derived and covered into the Treasury of the United States from the several agencies under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department amounts to $390,395,000, which is only $25,568,200 less than the total we recommend in this bill. Most of that revenue is derived from the Bureau of Land Management in grazing fees, in mineral leases, and the like. Also there is considerable revenue derived from the Forest Service from the sale of timber, so it is almost a self-supporting agency of this Government now under the management of Secretary Douglas McKay who is doing better than a good job of running this important Department of Government for the American taxpayer. We have an item in this bill of $550,000 for research in the utilization of saline water. I am happy to say that progress is being made in that field. We have a number of research pilot plants which are showing considerable progress in the desalting and demineralization of water to make it fit for commercial use. We hope at some future time to have the cost of desalting and demineralization reduced to such a point that ocean water may be used for irrigation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am interested in the comments the gentleman made about the desalting of water. In the city in which I live we bore down several hundred feet to get water. Since Stockton is only about 12 feet above sea level, although 80 miles from the Golden Gate, we are fearful that the water might get brackish. Is this research going far enough so that it will be adequate to prepare the water for human consumption as drinking water?

Mr. JENSEN. The experiment has not yet arrived at the point where it is economically feasible for that purpose. However, as I said, progress is being made quite rapidly in that direction. We hope that in a very few years, possibly within a couple of years, a new process will be developed to the point where a municipality will be able to purchase a plant which will desalt ocean water so economically that it can be used for municipal and commercial uses.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. About 3 or 4 years ago, as I recall it, the Navy made a thorough investigation of this matter also, and since that investigation scientific studies have been going on in that subject and great progress has been made up to the present time; is that not a correct statement?

Mr. JENSEN. Indeed, that is correct. We are already desalting ocean water cheaper than the Navy is doing it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to thank the committee for putting this provision in the bill. It will prove to be a very useful provision in many parts of the country.

Mr. JENSEN. We appropriated $150,000 more this year than we did last year for that purpose. So you can see the committee is quite encouraged with the progress that is being made.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. BATES. I compliment the gentleman for the fine work he has done on the problem of desalting water. He has blazed the trail in this field and is to be highly commended for it. I have a question which I would like to ask the gentleman, and I believe he is familiar with the Maritime installation at Salem, Mass. It is a national park, but when you look at it you are more likely to come to the conclusion that it is a national disgrace. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] was there this summer as well as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. Both of them concur that something should be done about it. I understand now there are some $10 million in this bill provided to take care of projects along that line?

Mr. JENSEN. $15 million is provided in this bill for such purposes.

Mr. BATES. $15 million. The gentleman is familiar, I believe, with the site that I mention, Derby Wharf at Salem. Does he not believe with me that something should be done to clean it up?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, indeed, I do.

Mr. BATES. Either that or give it back to the local people who can clean it up themselves.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, and I shall be happy to go to the Director of Parks, as I know the gentleman from Massachusetts will do. You know the old saying—the wheel that squeaks the loudest gets the most grease.

Mr. BATES. Well, let us do a little greasing on this one.

Mr. JENSEN. You will talk to the Director of Parks?

Mr. BATES. I already have, but I wanted the RECORD to show the situation and also I wanted to have the benefit of the point of view of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman; he is very generous.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The gentleman is well aware of the very great interest I have had in our State concerning the blackbird menace which destroys hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of crops in New Jersey each year as well as in the States of Delaware and Maryland.

I am appreciative of the interest that the committee has taken in this subject in the past. May I ask if they have made provision for that in this present bill.

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased to say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] that I took up that matter with the Fish and Wildlife Service when they appeared before the committee. I asked them if there would be funds available in fiscal year 1957, comparable to the amount that has been appropriated for blackbird control in New Jersey during the past several years. They assured me there would be. We all recognize the problem in New Jersey and you may rest assured that the Fish and Wildlife Service will carry on the program of blackbird control in New Jersey as they have done in the past several years.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I thank the gentleman for the interest he has taken; also the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee who have been so willing to help us in this matter.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say that every member of the committee has been greatly interested in your problem, and they all want to be of assistance to you whom we hold in the highest esteem, and to the people you represent so ably and well.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wish the gentleman would say something about

"Construction Costs: For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings and utilities," I note they allow $4 million and the request is for $7½ million. I am wondering if that is sufficient to carry on the program of the Department.

Mr. JENSEN. The language in the report under "Construction" reads: "For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems" is $7,500,000. The committee has allowed $4 million, or a reduction of $3,500,000 in the budget estimate. The program as set forth in the justification is approved. The amount allowed plus the unobligated balance of previously appropriated funds which will be available on June 30, 1956, will be sufficient to continue the construction program without delay.

That is the best answer I can give the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It seemed to me a somewhat larger reduction than some of the other departments; about a 40 percent reduction.

Mr. JENSEN. There was a carryover in this fund, and the committee felt, after hearing the testimony of the officials, that $4 million plus the carryover, would be sufficient to carry on without any delay whatsoever.

We have increased the "Soil and Moisture Conservation" item on Indian lands above the budget request by the sum of $100,000. I do not have to tell any Member of Congress of the great need for soil and moisture conservation on all of our public domain, including the Indian lands. I, and I am sure every member of the committee, feel that it is money well spent to conserve our priceless topsoil, whether it be on private land or on the Government domain. So each year the committee has found it necessary to increase by a modest amount the budget request for soil and moisture conservation on our public domain.

If you will take the time to go into the Western States, you would see with your own eyes the great benefits which have been derived from the comparatively small amounts that the Congress has appropriated for soil and moisture conservation on our public domain.

Mr. Chairman, I can only say that I was happy to go along with the other members of the regular subcommittee for an increase of $9,800,000 for our national parks for utilities, roads, and dwellings for park employees.

The President recommended a supplemental request for $10 million more than was requested in the regular budget which would have made a total of $15,200,000 for this purpose for fiscal year 1957.

The Bureau of the Budget approved $8,350,000 of the $10 million requested by President Eisenhower.

The committee raised that to $9,800,000 which is only $200,000 less than the President requested, making a total of an even $15 million for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, unless there are further questions I will yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has consumed 16 minutes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, as many of the Members know, the St. Louis delegation in the House, along with other Members from Missouri and both of our Senators, assisted and supported by Members from adjoining States, have been working over a period of years for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the St. Louis waterfront.

The purpose of the memorial is not merely to give St. Louis a dramatic attraction in our riverfront area. Instead, it is to commemorate one of the great events of our national development—the Louisiana Purchase and the opening of the western wilderness. No event in American history has had greater significance in terms of our present day greatness.

The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial has been in the process of construction since 1934. But to this day it is still little more than a parking lot—a vast open wasteland. The reason for this situation is, that the Federal Government has not up to now provided the very modest sum of $5 million to carry out its share of the agreed-upon, authorized project. Its formal authorization was in a law enacted in 1954—a bill which I had the honor to introduce. This was the formal authorization. Actually, the Government was committed to this project in 1934 by action of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I am not taking the time of the House today to give the history of the project. A number of us have spoken about it previously—spoken about it frequently here in the House. I am taking the time today merely to make clear why the Members from St. Louis are withholding an amendment which we have had prepared for the Interior Department appropriation bill now before the House. It was our judgment in view of special circumstances that we would not submit the amendment today.

At the same time, however, I want it clearly understood by the Interior Department that this decision on our part is based on a desire to give the Interior Department an opportunity to bring this matter before Congress in the regular manner. If we do not get action in this respect in the very near future, then we will follow whatever steps we feel are necessary to assure appropriation of the necessary funds this year whether or not the Interior Department and the President cooperate with us in that objective.

I might explain to the Members of the House that we have been assured that a supplemental budget request covering work on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial is en route to the Congress—that it is somewhere between the National Park Service, the Interior Department Budget Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the White House. We have been assured there will be a request, but so far I have not been able to find out the exact amount which administration officials have in mind for the project. I have put in a bill for a $5 million appropriation to cover the full cost of the Federal Government's authorized share of the work. At least $3 million would be necessary for a substantial start on the work.

The suggestion has been made to us by the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee that we wait on this matter for a supplement if one is on the way to the Congress. We have been advised that if we were to try to amend the bill without such a supplemental request we would have the opposition of the subcommittee at this time. Yet we know that if there is a supplemental budget request, the subcommittee will look favorably upon this project, for it is a great project commemorating a great event in which the entire West is vitally concerned.

I am sorry to see this bill go through the House today without definite earmarking of funds for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. But I think in a situation of this kind it is more important not to risk and jeopardize the project than it is to make gestures of seeking to amend the bill when that might only hurt us. I do not want a record of the House vote against this project in case the appropriation of funds should hinge on House concurrence to a Senate amendment.

I appreciate the courtesy of the subcommittee in discussing this matter with me so often in the last few weeks. I am disturbed that it has taken the administration so long to make the formal request for this appropriation. If it does not come up very shortly, then we will have to proceed outside the regular order, either through amendment of this bill in the Senate or through a provision inserted in another appropriation measure.

We are tired of waiting for action on this project. Twenty-two years is too long. The amount at issue is modest indeed. The event which would be commemorated deserves greater respect.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am again deeply concerned because of what may be termed the blackbird menace that has caused such great losses to the farmers of south Jersey located in those counties that border on the lower Delaware River.

A survey has shown that flocks of blackbirds come at a certain time each year to Gloucester, Salem, Cumberland, and Cape May Counties. They come by the millions from the South. They devour certain crops, particularly corn. In one county last year it was estimated the loss was as high as $100,000.

For several years I have brought this situation to the attention of the Interior Department Appropriation Committee and requested funds to combat the menace. The chairman of the committee, Mr. KIRWAN, and Mr. JENSEN, the ranking Republican member on the committee, have been very helpful. They have again this year listened sympathetically to my plea. The result is a substantial amount allotted to Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior

to continue its efforts to control the situation.

To accomplish all that is necessary there must be cooperation between the States and the Federal Government. There are aspects that must have State assistance, and, certainly it is necessary to have Federal assistance as the birds are of a migratory character. They are a growing menace in South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware, as well as New Jersey.

It is encouraging to realize that this problem that causes the farmers such great losses is recognized by the Congress. The problem has become so bad that through the influence of the farmers of New Jersey other States are being interested. They are at last realizing that this is not the battle of just New Jersey. Consequently, they are entering into the fight. With this added help we can reasonably expect to make more progress next year in the matter of appropriations that are so necessary.

This bill now before us has many more excellent features, but none more important than that which gives assistance to the farmers of New Jersey in their effort to eradicate the blackbird menace. Without such help our farmers were becoming discouraged. They could not adequately handle the problem as individuals. It had to be attacked on a large scale, hence the appeal to the Federal Government.

I ask that the bill have the full support of the Congress, House and Senate.

As part of these remarks I have sundry documents I wish to insert in order that there may be a more full understanding of the matter and what is being done by interested parties:

JANUARY 4, 1955.

A meeting of the Wild Life Committee was called on the above date by Vice Chairman Lloyd W. Yeagle at 2 p. m., in Seabrook conference room.

Those present were: Lloyd W. Yeagle, William P. Watson, Charles C. Butler, R. B. Harris, Laurence Bohn, G. W. Mingin, Lee Towson, J. T. Linehan, Robert T. Mitchell, Alvin String, P. G. MacNamara, F. B. Schuler, J. M. Pancoast, Sr., E. S. Harvey, R. B. Harris, Jr., W. M. Runk, Joseph Hancock, James Mecum, Ken Roberts and G. I. Ball.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.

Robert T. Mitchell presented a report of research work done during 1954 by J. T. Linehan and himself in New Jersey and Delaware. This report included results of the use of bomb exploders used in Delaware, 12 and 18 grain bull dog salutes in New Jersey, poison bait, corn variety tests, etc. It was reported that the area of damage in New Jersey had widened out because of the use of scare devices.

Several farmers remarked that some method of control of bird numbers is necessary to lessen the damage in New Jersey and Delaware.

Trig Holme discussed and demonstrated a carbide exploder developed at Seabrook Farms in 1954. This exploder has great possibilities as a scare device with certain improvements. One tank of gas lasted about 7 days and covered an area of 10 acres.

It was reported by Towson and Ball that an amendment to the I. C. C. interstate shipment of fireworks had been proposed to increase the charge from 12 to 18 grains. This change had been strongly suggested by this committee.

The fireworks law passed by New Jersey in 1954 and placed in the labor department for administration, along with the rules and regulations as compiled by this department, was discussed thoroughly.

The fees set up by the labor department were felt to be exorbitant especially for selling and storing. Only 3 dealers were reported handling salutes in New Jersey, 1 being the manufacturer. The fees required by the department pushed the price per gross to the farmer much too high, thus reducing the amount used on the farm.

A motion was made, seconded and carried that a meeting be arranged with Mr. Krueger of the labor department and the fees be readjusted. W. P. Watson to arrange for meeting with Mr. Krueger and a committee of Yeagle, Towson and Ball to represent this group.

The matter of financing the work for 1955 was brought up for discussion. Mr. Schuler, representing Mr. Gascoyne, stated that his department did not know what had been requested as this was a policy of the national director, J. L. Farley, to figure out.

W. P. Watson introduced Mr. C. T. Butler, National Farm Bureau, Director of Land and Water Use, Washington, D. C. Mr. Butler stated he had been assigned the job of investigating the blackbird situation and would be glad to work with the committee on this problem. He was requested to contact Mr. Farley regarding appropriation for blackbird control work in 1955. He also was given the names of agricultural agents in Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Georgia, where corn was grown in large areas.

Messrs. Yeagle and Ball reported on a meeting of Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey committees held in Newark, Del. At this meeting it was agreed that a sum of $30,000 was needed by fish and wild life department in order to do a job of control.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p. m.

G. I. BALL, *Secretary.*

SEPTEMBER 13, 1954.

A meeting of the South Jersey Blackbird Committee was called by chairman, Dr. Frank App, at 8 p. m., in Seabrook office annex.

Those present were: Dr. App, Lee Towson, Larry Bohm, Alvin String, Lloyd Yeagle, George Lamb, Wilbur Runk, George Ball, Robert Mitchell, Al Gallino, Jack Linehan, J. Troisi, Al Jones, and H. Greenwald.

A letter was read from J. L. Farley, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, stating the viewpoint of his Department on various methods of blackbird control.

A report from Lee Towson on the meeting with Federal Fish and Wildlife Service at Washington, was given and is attached to minutes. Project to be conducted under Robert Mitchell.

Alfred Jones, game supervisor for southern New Jersey, stated that the State had assigned J. Troisi to assist Mitchell in this project.

Harry Greenwald, Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, has been assigned to this project to assist Mitchell. Greenwald cited previous experiences with fox, skunk, etc., in Pennsylvania.

Work to be done this fall with farmers who request service and are willing to cooperate.

Lee Towson reported on gas chamber perfected at Seabrook during summer which shows promise as a scare device. One machine could protect 10 or more acres.

A letter received from Underhill was read stating there was no law preventing the use of poison bait in New Jersey. He pledged cooperation of his department in the proposed control measures.

It was suggested that we use the term "experimental control" in any correspondence or news release.

Meeting adjourned 10:15 p. m.

GEORGE I. BALL, *Secretary.*

MAY 24, 1955.

A meeting of the Blackbird committee was called at 7:30 p. m. by Chairman Frank App at Seabrook conference room.

Those attending were: Dr. App, George C. Onkst, H. E. Greenwald, George W. Mingin, Lawrence Bohm, L. W. Yeagle, A. L. Towson, Paul Hickie, J. T. Linehan, Robert T. Mitchell, Robert J. Hawley, J. R. Patrick, J. M. Pancoast, F. P. Sowers, R. B. Harris, Sr., N. E. Harris, Jr., W. F. Saunderlin, William Driscoll, Arthur H. Lange, E. H. Brothers, J. B. Gross, and G. I. Ball.

Minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.

Lloyd W. Yeagle reported on meeting with Mr. Krueger of the Labor Department regarding fees to be paid for firecracker usage in 1955 to prevent damage to corn by blackbirds. The fees proposed are $1 for farmers permits, $2 for dealer permits, and $15 for manufacturer permit.

A. Lee Towson reported on proposed committee substitute for S. 104 which would include the term "as pest control bomb." This change would bring the New Jersey law in line with ICC regulations and allow the manufacture of 18-grain salutes in New Jersey.

Mr. Lange, Southern Oxygen Co., Vineland, demonstrated two types of exploders which his company has experimented with at Seabrook Farms. One machine operated on regular battery and the second on dry battery plus alarm clock works. Acetylene gas is used on both machines.

Paul Hickie, Chief, Research Division, Fish and Wildlife Service, explained that finances to run his Department came from various sources as well as direct grant from Congress. The amount of $10,000 allocated by Congress for blackbird control in New Jersey is apparently not a cash grant but a transfer of moneys within the Department. This statement led to discussion from the floor as to the most efficient method of carrying out the work to reduce the number of birds rather than more research on scare devices. It was pointed out from the farmers standpoint that they were more interested in reducing the number of birds than in scaring them from one farm to another.

Robert T. Mitchell, biologist, Research Division, who conducted the research work in 1953–54 and will continue in 1955, presented the proposed program for 1955. Mitchell outlined a program of banding nestlings in the spring (April–June), more extensive program of use of poison baits (sweet corn fields), comparative tests of firecrackers, bombs, exploders, etc., corn variety test using three distinct planting dates to coincide with wild rice feeding of birds (before, during, and after).

This discussion led to various questions from the floor regarding the advisability of putting more emphasis on reduction of numbers of birds not only in New Jersey and Delaware but in Virginia and Carolina. Growers feel that the reduction in flocks is more essential than continuance of scare devices. It was pointed out by both Hickie and Mitchell that scare devices are essential regardless of reduction in numbers because of the roving feeding habits of red wings and grackle.

A motion was made by R. B. Harris, Sr., seconded and carried that a small committee of four be formed in New Jersey to cooperate with R. T. Mitchell in forming a program of research more in line with needs. This committee, appointed by Chairman App, is Lloyd W. Yeagle, chairman, A. Lee Towson, Russell B. Harris, Sr., and Norman Harris, Jr.

Motion was made, seconded, and carried that a committee be formed to cooperate with similar committees from Delaware and Maryland to form policies both legislative, research, and game management, whereby a constructive policy can be carried out to relieve the amount of damage being done to

crops by red wing blackbirds in the various States mentioned.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p. m.

G. I. BALL, *Secretary.*

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
Salem, N. J., January 18, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. WOLVERTON: In order to keep you informed on the blackbird situation in Salem County and south Jersey, the following data is enclosed. In November a delegation of farmers attended a board of freeholders meeting and insisted that they (freeholders) appoint a committee to investigate the work being done by Federal Fish and Wildlife Service in their endeavor to reduce numbers.

This past year there was a tremendous number of red wing blackbirds in August and September. Even though 2,850 gross of firecrackers were used the damage to sweet and field corn was greater than ever before.

The freeholders appointed a five-man committee and our Salem board of agriculture invited them to a meeting to acquaint them with the facts. Out of this meeting a resolution was drawn up by the group, presented to the whole board on December 28. This resolution passed and will be distributed to all legislators in New Jersey, New Jersey Senators and Representatives, fish and game commission, sportsman groups, Ducks, Inc., Audubon Society, and other interested bodies. The main issue is asking that redwing blackbirds and grackle be removed from the international agreement with Mexico and put in the unprotected category. (Resolution enclosed for your file.)

The county board of agriculture passed a similar resolution on January 13, 1956 and will circulate it to all those mentioned.

I am also enclosing my report on conditions in Virginia and North Carolina and our viewpoint on combined efforts to control this predator.

We feel very strongly that a program should be carried on by the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service to reduce the number of redwing blackbirds and grackle all along the eastern coast of the United States of America if we are to have reduced damage. We also feel that any moneys appropriated for this work should be turned over to game management. Research has accomplished a great deal but our group feel the job should now be carried on by game management because of the wider scope and a greater number of Federal men in the field.

We will supply you with any future data which may be agreed on.

The Farm Bureau has arranged a meeting with legislators in Washington for January 31. We expect to have 3 or 4 fellows attend this meeting. I know they will be prepared to see you on this occasion and brief you on all phases of the situation.

Very truly yours,

G. I. BALL, *Agricultural Agent.*

P. S.—Those who will attend the January 31 meeting in Washington will be Russell B. Harris, Sr., David Grier, Samuel Crystal, and Roland DeWilde.

RESOLUTION

"Whereas red-winged blackbirds have been protected as a migratory song bird since 1933 by an act of Congress under an international agreement with Mexico whereby the Country of Mexico agrees to protect ducks migrating from the United States in exchange for the United States protecting red-winged blackbirds; and

"Whereas by order of the Department of Interior of the United States dated May 13, 1948, farmers in the United States were permitted to shoot red-winged blackbirds when they caused or were about to cause damage to crops with the provision that said birds could not be sold; and

"Whereas since 1933 the number of blackbirds have increased in alarming numbers so that they have become a detriment rather than an asset; and

"Whereas crop damage from said birds has increased in New Jersey to a point where farmers have a serious problem in carrying out crop rotation; and

"Whereas the greatest damage is to sweet corn and field corn and small grains which are all grown in the State of New Jersey and especially in Salem County, N. J.; and

"Whereas reliable reports have been received informing this body that tremendously large flocks of red-winged blackbirds cover an area of the five States, namely, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina; and

"Whereas additional reports have been received that large concentrations of red-winged blackbirds are now found in the States of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Ohio, Indiana, New York, Michigan, and all of the New England States; and

"Whereas it has been reliably reported that in Salem County, N. J., the wild oats and wild rice in the tidal meadows have been almost entirely destroyed by the said red-winged blackbirds thereby destroying most of natural duck food; and

"Whereas the damage to the crops in Salem County, N. J., has mounted steadily until it is now estimated to be over $100,000 annually; and

"Whereas the use of scare devices to disburse the concentration of said birds has proved expensive and very unsatisfactory; and

"Whereas the research work performed by the research division of the Federal Fish and Game Life Service, Department of the Interior of the United States, during the past 3 years has failed to solve the serious problem: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Salem, That due to the tremendous numbers of red-winged blackbirds and the increasing amount of damage to field crops in Salem County, N. J., and in the State of New Jersey, the said board does hereby petition the Legislature of the State of New Jersey to pass necessary resolutions or other appropriate acts requesting the Congress of the United States to withdraw protection of red-winged blackbirds so that the citizens of Salem County and of the State at large may take appropriate action to destroy this damaging predator; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the body be and he is hereby authorized to send a certified copy of this resolution to each member of the Senate and House of Assembly of New Jersey, New Jersey Department of Fish and Game, Research Division of Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior of the United States, Ducks Unlimited, Inc. (the New Jersey chapter), and the Audubon Society of New Jersey and to the appropriate committees of the State governments of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina.

"Dated: December 21, 1955."

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the county of Salem at its regular meeting held on the 21st day of December 1955 in the Salem County Courthouse, Salem, N. J.

CLIFFORD A. SWEETEN, Sr.
Clerk.

REPORT ON RED-WINGED BLACKBIRD SURVEY

(By George I. Ball, Salem County agricultural agent)

During a recent vacation in North Carolina and Virginia, enough time was taken to make a suvey of the migratory habits of the red-winged blackbird. For a long time it has been the thought of the wildlife committee of the Salem County Board of Agriculture that the birds which have done so much damage in our county and State, must winter in the Carolinas and Virginia. With this thought in mind, the committee felt that they would like more information and requested such a survey be made. Seven days were spent in North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland interviewing agricultural agents, biologists, wildlife patrolmen, farmers, and others to determine the habits of this predator.

One very interesting day was spent with Dr. Thomas Quay, biologist at North Carolina State College, Raleigh. Dr. Quay outlined the areas of the State where known roosts of redwing were located, gave pertinent information as to the range inland and facts regarding the feeding habits. He also expressed an interest in our problem, and furnished leads for future studies.

Discussions were carried on with Walter E. Price at wildlife refuge, Hoffman, N. C., and Agricultural Agent Garrison, at Carthage, N. C. (Monroe County) reported a flock of grackle was located at Vass, N. C., but no damage report in that area.

The areas affected in North Carolina extended roughly from Wilmington, N. C., north to northeast to the border and into Suffolk and Princess Anne Counties, Va.

Individuals were interviewed in the area around Wilmington, N. C. The consensus of opinion there was that birds ranged in small flocks about 20 miles inland. Very little damage to crops reported. Birds arrived in late September and left in April. Average size of flocks, 2,000 and not too many here.

The large concentration of redwings is located in the area around Lake Mattamuskeet (Hyde County) and Elizabeth City in North Carolina. This concentration is in the millions and growing larger each year. No serious damage is reported from New Bern, Edentown (Chowan County), Hertford (Perquimano County), Camden (Camden County). Agrcultural Agent S. L. Lowery, Elizabeth City, stated that late corn received small damage in his and adjoining counties. There are large areas of meadow land in the sections mentioned, affording natural roosting places for redwings. Some birds stay all year but 90 percent leave in April and return in September.

In Princess Anne and Suffolk Counties, Va., the same picture exists. Large concentration of redwings are located in the two counties. Here we seem to have damage to peanuts in shock during October and November. However, the amount of damage is reported small at this time. The range of activities seems to be from 20 to 40 miles inland at this point. Some small damage to sprouting grain and corn has been reported here.

Maryland is right in the path of migration both to and from New Jersey and comes in for more crop damage than either Virginia or North Carolina.

SUMMARY

It is the opinion of this writer that red-winged blackbirds leave New Jersey and Delaware in September, journey south to Virginia and North Carolina for the winter months and return in April and May. This time table fits in exactly with the appearance and disappearance of redwings in New Jersey and Delaware. From all reports in the area covered in this survey, comparatively little damage is done except for peanuts. All agreed that the concentration of red-winged blackbirds had increased over a period of years to a point where they are a serious factor.

The range inland in all States visited appears to be about 30 to 40 miles. Flocks of grackle are reported in areas of North Caro-

lina but these are thought to be migrants from Ohio, western Pennsylvania and other Midwest States.

If this problem is to be solved, cooperative work in the States of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina is called for both from a local, State, and National level.

It is also suggested that further studies be made by interested States toward a common solution, and brought to the attention of Wild Life Department at the national level.

GEORGE I. BALL,
Agricultural Agent.

(The above surevy was carried on in April 1955. In October the agent visited three counties in Virginia while peanuts were in stacks. Agent from Nansemond County, Va., reported later on damage from $3 to $52.50 per acre (peanuts). He quoted farmers' viewpoint that more damage by redwinged blackbirds this year than ever before.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], a member of the committee.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, it has indeed been a pleasure to have served on this subcommittee for the past 10 years.

In that time we have seen the membership of this committee change almost every session of Congress, with the exception of the 2 ranking majority members and the 2 ranking minority members. Consequently, we have enjoyed a fine working relationship.

Congressman KIRWAN, our present chairman, has indeed been very fine and courteous to the members of his committee.

The same goes for Congressman JENSEN when he was chairman.

Both those men are, in my opinion, well versed in the affairs of the Interior Department.

The gentleman—and he is a gentleman—from Arkansas, our colleague [Mr. NORRELL] has always been a keen observer and adviser in our deliberations and in our hearings in this subcommittee.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] have also contributed much as members of our subcommittee.

Over the past several years great emphasis has been placed on development and conservation of our natural resources in the United States, together with rehabilitation of our present facilities and methods.

Never before in our history has it become so necessary and an obligation for the Congress to recognize these facts and provide the money to take care of the resources of this country.

If we are to continue as a leader in worldwide affairs and give all the aid possible to friendly nations, then it becomes certain that we must take care of our own resources.

It is with those things in mind that we have approached the amount of money allocated to the Interior Department for fiscal year 1957.

The budget estimate for 1957 for the Interior Department and related agencies was $426,748,200, and your committee allowed $415,963,200—a reduction of $10,785,000.

As has been pointed out the revenues that will be derived from the agencies in this bill amount to $390,395,000 for 1957, about $25 million less than the full appropriated amount.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been doing a very outstanding job as far as the Indian children are concerned.

Several years ago there was a condition existing in which 28,000 or 30,000 Indian children had never been to school.

Under this appropriation it will permit the placing of 5,000 more children in schools which will make an enrollment of almost 80,000 Indian schoolchildren, in contrast to 66,822 in 1955 and 74,225 in 1956.

The relocation services which are to assist the Indian population to settle and secure permanent employment in non-Indian communities away from the reservation, and to adjust to the new living and working conditions encountered are having some success.

For instance, 3,459 individuals were relocated in 1955 and it is expected that 5,000 will be relocated in the current fiscal year and 10,000 in fiscal 1957.

The committee allowed the full budget estimate of $31,602,000 for the Geological Survey.

With the increased volume of requests for mapping of all sorts, topographic, geologic, and mineral and water resources, it is quite apparent that this fine agency must have the funds to do the necessary work.

I thoroughly agree with the new Director of the Geological Survey in his statement:

> Although the several phases of the work are described in the justifications, I do want to mention the principles and the assumptions we have used in developing the programs. First of all, only insofar as they either directly or indirectly support the well-being of the Nation do they merit your support. I believe they do.

The Geological Survey has done a magnificent job under Dr. W. E. Wrather. Dr. Wrather has just retired and Dr. Thomas B. Nolan, his able Assistant Director, has been advanced to the directorship.

BUREAU OF MINES

The budget estimate for fiscal 1957 was $23,697,300 and the committee allowed $21,697,300—a decrease of $2 million.

This decrease of $2 million was taken from the conservation and development of mineral resources item although there will remain a net increase of $1,270,000 over the 1956 appropriations.

One million dollars of the decrease developed from conditions existing in the research work in mining on oil shale at Rifle, Colo.

Also $200,500 from the programed research work at Laramie, Wyo., on oil shale.

The $1 million decrease at Rifle stems from the fact that a fall of roof occurred at the oil shale mines and the committee is of the opinion that the Federal Government has gone far enough in financing this type of research and that private industry could pick it up. There will still be available $307,000 to continue basic research on oil shale.

The item "Minerals Research, Unclassified" was reduced to $300,000 from $751,500 as has the research on construction material from $486,426 to $244,626.

From the collection analysis and distribution of statistical and informational material programs, there is a reduction of $286,200.

The health and safety program budget estimate was not touched—neither was the general administration expenses item.

Before adjournment last year the Congress appropriated $8,500,000 for a cooperative mine drainage program with the State of Pennsylvania.

I am informed that the Federal Goverment through the Bureau of Mines are all set to proceed with the project and just as soon as the State of Pennsylvania puts up their $8,500,000 the project will get started.

The accident rate in the coal mines of the United States while reduced in numbers since the Coal Mine Inspection Acts is still high and the most prevalent cause of the accidents is falls of roof.

It would seem to me that any research done in mining should be directed towards making the mine roof safe.

NATIONAL PARKS

The budget estimates for 1957 for the National Park Service was $71,713,000. However the committee reduced this figure by striking out the item $13,825,000 for Jones Point Bridge. This was done because of current representations to the Legislative Committee on H. R. 7228 which alters the design and cost of the bridge together with our understanding that firm commitments have not yet been secured to assure the participation of the States of Virginia and Maryland in connection with the approaches to the bridge.

The final figure of $67,688,000 was arrived at by increasing the budget estimate of $5,200,000 in construction to $15 million an increase of $9,575,000.

With the increase in the number of visitors each year, we believe the recommendations of the Park Service people and the administration should be adopted.

Our parks and the facilities therein need to be rehabilitated and new roads and trails developed.

From an estimated number of visitors in 1946 of 21,752,315 there has been a rapid increase each year. It is estimated that there will be 54 million in fiscal 1957. It is also estimated that 10 years from now there will be 80 million people visiting the parks.

It is because of this increasing of the parks' visitors that it will be necessary to adopt such a plan as mission 66—a 10-year plan proposed by the Park Service and the Interior Department—as presented to the administration.

FISH AND WILDLIFE

The Fish and Wildlife Service received the full amount of the budget estimate.

TITLE 11, RELATED AGENCIES

The Commission of Fine Arts, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, Indians Claims Commission, Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission, Smithsonian Institute, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission have all been granted the various estimates of the Bureau of the Budget.

FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The full budget estimate of $96,773,000 for the Forest Service has been allowed by the committee which is an increase of $6,157,871 over the appropriations for fiscal 1956.

FOREST SERVICE

The Forest Service budget request was not cut and the 1957 fiscal amount is an increase of $6,300,000 over the current year.

THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

The National Capital Planning Commission budget requests were decreased by $275,000. The request for salaries and expenses was $210,000—the committee allowed $185,000. The estimate for land acquisition was $1,500,000—the committee allowed $1,250,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I would particularly like to commend the committee for increasing funds for construction in our national parks as was recommended by President Eisenhower. This is sometimes referred to as the buildings and utilities appropriation. The committee has recognized that an increase in this appropriation is necessary to bring about an expansion of public use facilities, both as furnished by the Park Service and as furnished by the concessionaires. The committee is to be commended for recognizing this need, and recommending an appropriation of $15 million for this purpose. A continuing appropriation at this level or above will be necessary for the next several years to take care of the demand.

One reduction in budget requests has been made in the bill which I think further consideration will show should be restored. The budget request for the Bureau of Mines research laboratory at Laramie, Wyo., has been reduced $200,500. I believe that as additional information is made available to the committee in the other body concerning this research program, and the effect of the reduction, the funds should be and will be restored. The continuing source of petroleum, with adequate standby reserves, is essential to the civilian and security needs of our Nation. A research program must be continuous. We will reap the benefits of today's research in future years. We cannot hold back on research until we are actually in a distressed condition. The funds allowed will permit the continuation of fundamental research, but will result in the elimination of any applied research. Applied research is directed toward the development of technical knowledge that will make possible the improvement and development of better retorting and refining processes for shale oil. The effect of the restriction will be to freeze all progress in future process development. This research is essential if this source of fuel is to be available in time of need.

Besides the oil shale research, many other valuable research programs are conducted at the laboratory. Some of these activities include improvements of production methods of crude oil, research in secondary recovery methods, and research on other minerals, including coal. The importance of this to the national economy can be appreciated when we recall that secondary recovery programs have usually resulted in the recovery of as much, or more, oil than was recovered by primary means.

Funds for the operation of such a facility as this cannot be placed in separate categories with mathematical certainty. Heat, light, equipment, maintenance, and personnel, etc., necessarily overlap. Such a cut as has been made with regard to one program necessarily affects the others.

I am confident that as the Bureau of Mines makes available additional information with regard to this problem, it will appear that the funds should be restored, and the full budget recommendation allowed. I am sure that this fine committee will give proper attention to this additional information as they have always done when the matter is again considered in conference.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], for his success in presenting this bill to the Committee today despite earlier opposition to it.

Today, in Europe, one beholds the discomfort that overwhelms its people in the cold wave. Our Department of Defense in Europe has answered the call to relieve the cold, the hungry, and the needy. The airlift of food to Italy by our flyers is a case in point.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to a point in this country where, in or out of war, in an emergency, the National Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Department of Defense must assume close liaison to feed, clothe, and shelter some 60 million of our people that might of a sudden be thrown in flight and need from an act of nature or an act of man.

We have some 18 to 23 great clusters of population in this country. In the event of a disaster, we have no standby plans, to my knowledge, to receive people from them thrown in flight. The conference of mayors the other day brought that out. Our civil-defense plans are outmoded. Plans to move a person from one street to another or from one suburb to another is not enough. It seems that the present scope of our thinking on this is inadequate; the Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Department of Defense must be ready to receive millions of civilians in modern bivouac; plans for this and funds to do it must keep current with plans and funds for H-bombs, electronics, Operation Sage, and intercontinental bombing missile. If our people are destroyed, what then do we defend? God will, as he always has, take care of His globe with its oceans and continents. But if He gives man the chance to provide for man's salvation and man muffs it, should one wonder at trying the Creator's patience? Right now Defense, Parks, and Forest Service are not able to do that. They are not set up to bivouac, clothe, and feed, if need be, 60 million Americans suddenly thrown upon them. Our standby facilities are absolutely shameful. Little has been done to accommodate people in the big parks since the CCC improved picnic tables and cooking facilities in the early thirties. Congress has been tightfisted with its funds on this front. I repeat, if we were suddenly caught in some disaster in this country, in or out of war, especially in the great metropolitan areas and wanted to lessen plague and disease and keep as many as possible of our people alive, we stand absolutely flatfooted in being able to handle their survival. That is why Mission 66 must come about and be brought into being in 3 years if possible. Otherwise our plea for funds for intercontinental missiles, for Operation Sage, for atomic weapons, and Armed Forces will ring hollow. The test should be from home plate to the outfield and the bleachers. If a pop bottle breaks through and "conks" the batter he is out. The same with us. A lateral or overhead missile from the bleachers would "conk" out the city it struck. It would cause other cities to be promptly emptied. Where would the Pied Piper lead our people then? To the drink? To Canada? To Mexico? The Department of Defense, the Park Service, and the Forest Service should have an answer. I trust they will. From them should come plans for our counterattack in survival. I trust those plans will be in being when this bill comes before the House next year. This is a good bill. It should pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, as one who has in his district a large number of Indian people, I do not want to pass this opportunity to express to the great Committee on Appropriations, to its chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the deep appreciation which all Members from districts having large numbers of Indian people feel for this committee for the breadth of vision and for the understanding which they reflect in a bill which shows an increase for Indian education and for the placement of Indian families in communities where they can become self-sufficient. I deeply appreciate this consideration of the problem that we have in the Indian areas of our country, and it is a welcome thing to see American money being spent for Indians here inside the United States and not in a distant continent. I also appreciate very much the appropriation of $200,000 to finance distribution of funds to the Creek Indians. Some Creek Indians have been waiting for approximately 50 years for funds due to them which have been resting in the Treasury of the United States without drawing interest. I think it is a recognition of this problem, and the provision of funds for it is a forward-looking and a generous act on the part of this committee. I want to express my appreciation and the appreciation of the people of the Second District of Oklahoma to this committee, and I hope the bill will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask some member of the committee 2 or 3 questions concerning the Rifle demonstration plant for the processing and mining of oil shale. The synthetic fuels research program as originally authorized called for an expenditure of some $87,600,000. During the last 2 or 3 years we have had considerable difficulty securing committee approval of the expenditure of substantial funds for the particular facility at Rifle, Colo.

I notice that the Bureau of the Budget has requested for fiscal 1957 an appropriation of $1,507,500 which the committee has reduced to $307,000. Will some member of the committee advise me what the recommended $307,000 is to be expended for?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The remaining funds, I might say to the gentleman from Colorado, are for fundamental research in oil shale petroleum.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand my good friend from Washington then, no moneys are to be expended at all at the Demonstration Plant at Rifle; is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. That means that that portion of the $87 million plus which was placed into the installation at Rifle, will have been expended on a plant that is left standing high, wide and handsome, so to speak, without any returns?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was the feeling of the committee that research in the mining field had been carried along far enough by the Government and that private industry perhaps should pick it up from here.

Mr. ASPINALL. Was that the feeling of those representing the Bureau before the gentleman's committee? I have read the hearings and I think the answer is "Yes," is it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I ask my friend what has been provided to take care of the facility at Rifle to see that it is properly policed and kept in a proper standby condition so that the physical values that are there are not wasted?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The balance of the $1 million that they had for the current fiscal year is available for that purpose.

Mr. ASPINALL. Are not those funds already pledged to carry on research in mining operations that were begun with the approval of that appropriation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not as I understand it, if this action of the subcommittee is ratified by the House today.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my colleague very much. I do not approve the action that has been taken. I think we have practically thrown away the money we have spent to date on the Demonstration Plant for the synthetic fuel program. We might just as well admit that we have no answers and one of the reasons why the committee has seen fit to take the action it has taken is because of the fact that the Bureau has been unable to come up with answers which the committee at least and perhaps I, too, feel should be available to us at this time. But as far as accomplishing the purpose for which the authorization was originally intended, we have accomplished very little, in my opinion.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the subcommittee, under its distinguished chairman [Mr. KIRWAN], especially on its foresight and forward-looking provisions for the National Park Service. It has been my pleasure over a term of years to have visited every national park in our country.

I have been especially interested in the recreational facilities of the parks; or shall I say, the absence of adequate picnic, camping, and other recreational facilities in these parks.

In some parks in the last few years I have observed an absolute need for available sanitary facilities and have also observed picnic tables in dilapidated conditions, and these conditions have prevailed too often in the very areas where thousands of people attend and other thousands would like to attend.

It should be crystal clear to all of us that with the shortening of the workweek and the workday there is a rapidly increasing national problem confronting us with what to do with our leisure time. Too much leisure is not less dangerous than too much overwork. And a man who has nothing to do is not unlikely to waste his resources—mental, physical, and spiritual.

Every year the distance between the great centers of population and our national parks is growing less and less on account of the rapidity of automobile transportation to these areas, and the increasingly good roads which are available. This improved method of transportation means that whole families seek the inspiration and joy of going to these great national park areas. The attendance in all of them rapidly increases from year to year; yet, we have not kept the physical properties and facilities in these areas up to keeping to meet this rapidly increasing use by the increasing thousands. I have always found the National Park personnel courteous, resourceful, and willing to work to make the visitors to their respective national park areas happy and contented, pleased and proud. But, they cannot do something with absolutely nothing. This increased amount of approximately a million dollars for strengthening the national park management and park and recreation programs will not meet the entire need. But, it is a beginning of a change of philosophy by our Budget Bureau and by this Congress which will, in my judgment, work wonders for the good and happiness and health and the solidarity of American families.

I believe it to be literally true that a family which has opportunity to play together, and does so, will stay together and the improvement to these recreational facilities and programs in our national parks will make it more possible for hundreds of thousands of American families to play together. During the time they are in these magnificent park areas they will have increasing inspiration and happiness together. Such experiences in a national park logically result in their going home more solidly and soundly an American family; more happy and cordially respecting each other's opinions and more helpfully cooperating in their homelife as a result of their happy, cooperative experiences in our national park areas.

Recently I was asked by a fellow Member of this great legislative body why I claimed so much of value for adequate playgrounds, parks, and recreational areas, and I related to him I had had the experience, as a layman and nonprofessional, of serving as president of a municipal recreational organization—without pay—for about 15 years before I first came to Congress nearly 10 years ago. He then said he understood my vigorous expression in support of keeping our playground and park areas well equipped and the facilities therein adequate and in good condition.

I hope that this splendidly prepared bill will be unanimously approved.

I again wish to compliment the subcommittee on its recognition of the place and value and power toward the strengthening of the sinews of our beloved Nation, as result of more rapidly making our national park areas adequate in their respective park facilities and programs.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to impose upon the House by taking this time, but I want to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and the other fine members of the subcommittee, for the courtesies extended to me in allowing me to come before their committee with projects so important to the citizens of southern Illinois. I was shown the utmost of courtesy and I appreciate it very much. I certainly hope this bill passes without a dissenting vote.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the statement made by my distinguished colleague [Mrs. SULLIVAN] in connection with the appropriation for the Jefferson National Memorial in St. Louis. This bill contains $150,000 for this project. It is understood that the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department have agreed to request an additional appropriation which did not get down here in time to be included in this bill. I should like at this time to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not he can give us assurance that when this does come down with budget approval and the approval of the National Park Service it will be included in the supplemental bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Speaking for myself, and I think the rest of the committee may feel the same way, I will be happy to do so if it has Budget approval.

Mr. KARSTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I certainly want to join my colleague [Mr. KARSTEN] and my colleague [Mrs. SULLIVAN] in support of this measure which has for so many years remained dormant right in the center of the city of St. Louis.

Mr. KARSTEN. I wonder if at this point the ranking minority member of the committee will give us assurance that this project will be given consideration in the supplemental bill if this item comes down with the approval of the Budget Bureau and the National Park Service.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, I could not commit myself or any member of the whole committee or the subcommittee. You just do not do that, because you may run afoul of someone on the committee that may not agree with you.

Mr. KARSTEN. I certainly appreciate that. I would not want the gentleman to commit the whole committee. However, I wonder if he would speak for himself and give us assurance that he will go along with the Budget Bureau and the National Park Service.

Mr. JENSEN. My answer can only be that if and when the supplemental bill comes up for consideration I shall give this item my personal attention. I shall listen to the justification and I shall then make up my mind, which I hope will be favorable on this matter.

Mr. KARSTEN. Knowing the gentleman's great sense of fairness, I am going to let the case rest there.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Research in the utilization of saline water

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the act of July 3, 1952, as amended (66 Stat. 328 and 69 Stat. 198), authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, $550,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to congratulate this subcommittee and to thank them as well for their treatment of the forestry appropriation, which is in the Interior Subcommittee at this time.

As many of you know, I have felt rather strongly that the forest-cooperative program, the forest fire fighting, and the various things that are interrelated with agriculture, particularly in the present bill, should be handled jurisdictionally along with the agricultural program. I think there are very sound reasons for that; but if they saw fit to give that jurisdiction to Mr. KIRWAN's committee, they could not put it in better hands. However, they should be considered together.

So far as the Forest Service is concerned, that is another matter, but these are decisions that are beyond my reach. They were not decided by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] or myself. But I want to say that no one could handle this program any better than this subcommittee has. They have given excellent attention to the forestry programs. I know those who are interested in those programs appreciate it, as I do.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Minerals Mobilization

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities, including cooperation with the metals and minerals industry, with respect to the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including solid fuels, $300,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of this time to inquire with regard to an item contained in the Department of Interior budget in connection with a report on the advisability of establishing a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y., in the amount of $10,000. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that there is included in this bill the money for this purpose and honoring the 256 Maryland heroes who fell in combat during the Battle of Brooklyn on August 27, 1776; is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the distinguished chairman and the members of his subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The clerk read as follows:

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law; $16,000,000, and in addition, $350,000 of the Revolving Fund for Loans, Bureau of Indian Affairs, shall be used in connection with administering loans to Indians.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question in connection with some correspondence I have received from one of my constituents asking me to find out, if I can, what has happened to the revolving fund which is now supposed to have a sum in excess of $6 million for tribal loans. The information given to me in this letter is that there has not been one loan out of this fund since 1952; that the Indians have used this fund ever since it was established in 1934 for the purpose of helping themselves develop new resources and new business projects. Can the Chairman tell me what the status of that fund is?

Mr. KIRWAN. The fund is still there and the Indians are drawing money from it.

Mr. YATES. Is the money available and are they using it?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, it is available the same as it always has been.

Mr. YATES. The criticism is made in this letter that because of the high-interest rate and the opposition of the Secretary of the Interior, the Indians are not able to use this fund. Can the Chairman tell me whether that is so or not?

Mr. KIRWAN. It is not so. The fund is there and is being used the same as it always has been used.

Mr. YATES. I thank the chairman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL: On page 15, after line 17, insert "Jones Point Bridge: For expenses necessary for the construction of a bridge over the Potomac River authorized by the act of August 3, 1954 (68 Stat., 963–964), $13,825,000."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I have no serious quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations for postponing the appropriation of this $13,825,000 by deleting it from the Department of the Interior appropriation bill even though it was recommended and requested by the Bureau of the Budget. I say that I have no serious quarrel or disagreement with the committee because I understand that based on the information that they have received, there is some confusion as to which agency has jurisdiction over the construction of this bridge and in fact there is a bill now pending before Congress to change that jurisdiction. Furthermore, I understand that there has been some confusion as to whether or not the States of Virginia and Maryland have made the necessary commitments in regard to providing their share of the cost of approaches to the bridge.

Therefore, it is my understanding that the committee is not objecting to the appropriation of these funds as such but merely to the question of whether or not this is a proper bill in which to include it and whether or not the States involved have fulfilled their obligation as required by the basic law. Because most certainly there should be no real objection to the appropriation as such for Congress has recognized their responsibility and the need for this bridge and, therefore, authorized it in the 83d Congress. In addition, the planning money of $600,000 has been appropriated and the plan is underway. The necessary land has been acquired and this appropriation is essential in order to carry out its completion in an orderly and economical manner.

The purpose of my offering this amendment is not to flatter myself into thinking that I can get the House to approve the amendment over the objection of the Committee on Appropriations because as I stated before, in the light of the information that the committee has received, their reasons for postponing this appropriation could possibly be justified. However, I am attempting to appeal directly to the Committee on Appropriations as well as to the House in the light of more up-to-date and accurate information as to the

two points that the committee considered as their reasons.

First of all, it is true that there is a bill pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia to transfer the jurisdiction for the construction of this bridge from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce where it should be. The Committee on the District of Columbia acted on that bill this morning and I can assure you that there is certainly nothing controversial about it. As I stated before, the authority for the construction of this bridge should have been delegated to the Department of Commerce and their Bureau of Public Roads in the beginning. In addition, the pending bill referred to as stated by the Committee on Appropriations also authorizes a slight change in design by lowering the elevation of the bridge and changes the type of drawspan which will mean an estimated savings of approximately $500,000.

There certainly should be no objection to this bill and it should be passed by the Congress in due course in the very near future. The bill was requested by the Department of Commerce during the last session of Congress but due to our crowded legislative schedule, we were unable to get to it prior to the adjournment.

In regards to the States of Virginia and Maryland not yet having made the necessary commitments insofar as approaches to the bridge are concerned, I would like to point out that there definitely must be some misunderstanding. There was testimony brought up in the meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia this morning stating that sufficient plans and commitments have been made in regard to approaches to facilitate sufficient traffic getting onto the bridge to justify its construction. In fact, the approaches on the Virginia side are almost exclusively within the city limits of Alexandria and under the jurisdiction of the city of Alexandria. The city of Alexandria has officially committed itself to all the costs of the approaches necessary to justify the construction of the bridge and reaffirmed their position before the Committee of the District of Columbia once again this morning.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman not agree that the Maryland part of the bargain is being fulfilled?

Mr. BROYHILL. Oh, yes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman further agree that in the hearings there was nothing brought out to show that Maryland and Virginia had not lived up to their part of the bargain?

Mr. BROYHILL. That is correct.

Mr. LANKFORD. And I am sure the gentleman will also agree with me that the Jones Point Bridge is badly needed, not just for the residents of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia, but for all of the thousands of visitors that we have in our Nation's Capital, because of the traffic problem we have.

Mr. BROYHILL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I appreciate his observations as well as his assistance in helping to clear up this confusion.

Now the language referred to in the basic authorizing legislation which the committee referred to in regard to the approaches is language which I, myself, proposed as an amendment to the bill. I do not state this with any pride of authorship but I felt at the time as did other Members of Congress that the States of Virginia and Maryland should be required to meet their obligation of providing adequate approaches before the bridge was constructed. Most certainly I feel and I think the Bureau of Public Roads also feels that the basic intent of this legislation has been complied with in that there are adequate approaches provided for in the plans provided by the States to sufficiently justify the construction of the bridge

I repeat that if the Committee on Appropriations feels that this pending legislation transferring the authority for construction from the Department of Interior to the Department of Commerce makes it improper to include this appropriation in this particular appropriation bill, I will not quarrel with them. I do feel, however, that since we have previously appropriated money for the plans which are now being drawn and due to the urgent need for the construction of the bridge, we should remove these elements of confusion and uncertainty in order that the appropriation will be forthcoming this year. I call to the attention of the committee that it will take from 2½ to 3 years to construct the bridge after we get the money and the plans are completed. So, I do hope that the committee will be a little more lenient and allow the appropriation to be included in this particular bill rather than to delay it until the Department of Commerce bill is before the House which will be at a later date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, there is $600,000 still available for planning. They have not got the plans completed. I do not think anybody in the Congress could condemn the Committee on Appropriations for not wanting to appropriate for something that has not been completed as far as the planning is concerned. They had the money last year for the plans. We gave them a full year to go ahead. They requested $600,000 for plans last year and they have not completed it. So I do not think the Committee on Appropriations, speaking for the members of that committee, would want to give construction money under the circumstances. As the gentleman said, they reported out a bill this morning. When that is cleared up and it goes to the proper place, in the Department of Commerce, if they will hurry a little, they will get it over on the other side. But I do not think this body should appropriate for something for which the plans are not yet finished.

I hope this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask someone whether the only obligation of the States of Virginia and Maryland is to build the approaches to this bridge?

Mr. KIRWAN. That may be, but it was not the Committee on Appropriations that authorized the building of the Jones Point bridge in the first place.

Mr. GROSS. This proposed bridge does not touch the District of Columbia at any point.

Mr. KIRWAN. That was discussed on the floor when it was passed.

I am not arguing with the gentleman; all I am trying to say is that it is not the duty of the Appropriations Committee to appropriate money for something where the plans are not yet ready.

Mr. GROSS. I will go farther than my friend from Ohio, and say that it is not the obligation of Congress to build a bridge over the Potomac for the benefit of the States of Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will not the gentleman agree with me that this is the Federal District, that what we are now doing benefits all the people of the United States, and that it is up to this body to provide transportation, roads, and bridges for the people of the Federal District and the people of the Nation so they can get through the Federal District or go around it? This is not just a bridge for the use of Maryland and Virginia; it is for the use of the millions of people who come here to the Nation's Capital, and to relieve congestion in the downtown area.

Mr. GROSS. Following that argument to its logical conclusion, then a bridge across the Mississippi River from Iowa to Illinois is for the direct benefit of people traveling to Washington, but not one person coming here on a direct route from my hometown can cross that bridge without paying a toll. Why not make this a toll bridge at Jones Point? Let private industry build it.

Mr. LANKFORD. Because the Congress thought otherwise; and, the crossing over the Mississippi is not within the Federal District.

Mr. GROSS. Neither is this proposed bridge within the confines of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANKFORD. It is to be used for the benefit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Is it?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. It is also to be used for the particular benefit of the States of Maryland and Virginia. I am opposed to this business of building a six-lane highway bridge across the river at Alexandria, Va., connecting the States of Maryland and Virginia at the expense of all the taxpayers. Let these States build their own bridges. That is what we have to do out in our part of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I can readily understand the anxiety of our colleague [Mr.

BROYHILL], who would like to have an appropriation for this bridge in this bill, but the fact of the matter is, as the chairman has said, the plans and specifications for the bridge have not yet been completed. Also jurisdiction over the bridge will soon be taken away from the Interior Department, and lodged in the Bureau of Public Roads.

I have always held my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, in the highest regard in subscribing to the needs he thinks justify the people of his district in asking assistance from the coffers of the Treasury of the United States. No one will ever accuse him of not fighting for the welfare of his people.

But there are times such as this when a committee, this committee in the present instance, simply is not justified in providing the appropriation he would like in this bill. I would, of course, like very much to be in a position where I could say "Yes" to my friend, and yield to his pleadings, but it just cannot be done under present circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. Mr. Chairman, this is just a small matter, but I like to see consistency in our bills.

If the gentleman will look on page 36 he will notice we allow a per diem for expenses for Members serving without compensation. For the members of the Jamestown - Williamsburg - Yorktown River Commission a per diem of $20 is allowed, but on the same page for the National Capital Planning Commission a per diem under like circumstances of only $15 per day is allowed. It seems there should be some uniformity and particularly since both of these rates are in excess of what are allowed other people in the Government service for subsistence. Unless there is some very good reason for this I shall offer an amendment to make the two rates uniform.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, the per diem allowed is what was approved by the Bureau of the Budget according to the needs of the members of these commissions. We felt that we could rely on their judgment and that is what we approved.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think there should be some uniformity? In other words, they are serving in comparatively the same positions; they both have to eat, they both have to sleep, they both have to do all of these things and it seems to me we are making a difference between the two. If there is no other reason than that the Bureau of the Budget recommended it, I shall offer an amendment to reduce the $20 to $15 a day so that the rates will be uniform within the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 36, line 2, strike out "$20" and insert "$15."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 21, noes 44.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO INSERT CERTAIN STATEMENTS AND EXCERPTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain statements and excerpts immediately preceding the passage of a resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] today, authorizing funds for the Select Committee on Small Business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, southern California spokesmen had adopted the attitude of the arrogant Marie Antoinette in their attempt to prevent the four States of the upper Colorado River Basin from using water rightly theirs.

Southern California's new reply to the thirsty residents of four sovereign States is: "Let them make rain."

I have here a copy of a report published February 14, 1956, in the Los Angeles Times. My hope is that the Members of the House will receive the "let them make rain" advice as the French peasant did Marie's famed "let them eat cake" dismissal of their starvation. The article to which I refer reads as follows:

STUDY SPURS APPEAL FOR DAM DELAY—CLOUD SEEDING IN UPPER COLORADO AREA TERMED PRACTICAL

Delay by Congress in the controversial billion-dollar upper Colorado River project was urged yesterday as the result of a Presidential committee's just released report.

The report is that of President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Weather Control.

It stated that production of additional rainfall by cloud seeding is a practical and established scientific fact.

As a result, an urgent appeal was made in California yesterday that Congress hold off an impending vote on the upper Colorado River project until the possibilities of creating additional rain in the Colorado Basin are studied.

REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE

The plea came from Jacqueline Cochran Odlum, of Indio, aviatrix and Republican candidate for Congress in the 29th Congressional District, which includes Imperial and Riverside Counties—an area that would be tremendously hard hit by the upper Colorado River project. Present United States Representative of the district is JOHN PHILLIPS who is retiring after this term.

Great interest in the report of the President's committee was voiced in Washington yesterday by Representative PHILLIPS.

"It has been the view of many western Congressmen that the amount of water available is a key factor in the Colorado River situation," he said.

HAPPY SOLUTION

"That is why we have wanted a determination of many factors in the Supreme Court before attempting a decision on the upper Colorado River matter. Now, from the report on the President's Committee on Weather Control, it appears that the upper Colorado River Basin States are offered a happy solution through scientific additions to their rainfall.

"Therefore, it appears that action on any upper Colorado River bill should be deferred pending a full investigation of this possibly advantageous solution which would be welcomed by all of us."

Strong endorsement of the request for delay came yesterday afternoon from Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of Long Beach, who was in New Jersey for a Lincoln Day dinner. HOSMER said he will present the matter to Congressmen in Washington today and urge further studies of the cloud-seeding idea as a preliminary to any consideration of the upper Colorado River measure.

PAUL WAMSLEY

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, Paul Wamsley will be sorely missed, not only by us in Buffalo, but by advocates of the principles of Americanism throughout the Nation. Here was a man hailed as the ideal American, a man nationally recognized for his leadership in the

American Legion's fight against communism.

Best of all, he practiced his precepts of Americanism from a vantage point unequaled for effectiveness, because Paul Wamsley was for 32 years prior to his untimely death, principal of our School 51. Who can gage the value of his contributions to the youth of our area from that important point of influence? His programs of Americanism brought national recognition to both himself and the school.

His Know Your America Week, which he originated in Buffalo in 1951, is observed today in hundreds of communities. This is but one of countless contributions which Paul Wamsley made, but he will probably be best remembered for his genial and friendly personality, and his warm and ready smile.

It is rare that we are privileged to know a man who contributed so significantly to the public awareness of the ideals of Americanism, which we all hold so dear.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, upon several occasions President Eisenhower has made the remark that the overseas information job was too great for Government to do alone. Victory in this battle for men's minds demands the cooperation of individual American citizens, of business groups, and of all our many private organizations.

In line with this thinking, the United States Information Agency has created an Office of Private Cooperation, with the specific assignment of helping individuals and groups who wish to carry on such programs, and of stimulating widespread interest in such activities.

The projects already in operation include letterwriting, overseas advertising, mail inserts, exhibits, town affiliations, book and magazine collections, and tourist orientation.

The Information Agency feels, however, that as yet it has scratched only the surface in this field. American know-how in public relations has yet to make the contribution it can and should.

The Agency hopes this year to step up this program, and will launch a vigorous campaign to interest potential participants. It is my personal belief that there are a great number of persons and groups who need only to be reminded of their responsibilities in this field. And it is a responsibility. All Americans have a stake in the issue. It could well mean their personal survival. It certainly concerns the survival of freedom, as we know it, not only in this country but the world.

It is my hope that the United States Information Agency will go ahead with its plans, and the means to do so will be provided.

It seems very obvious that Communist leaders have decided that they do not now want a war in which their people would be directly involved. I say now, because they, undoubtedly, would be willing to risk a war if they were certain they could win. The uncertainty of success, however, holds them back. Communists are not gamblers. They may be fanatics, but it is a calculating fanaticism. They never attack unless the odds are on their side.

It seems equally clear, however, that they have not abandoned their ambitions. Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet Communist Party boss, for one, has been very frank upon that point. You will remember him saying last September, "If anyone believes our smiles"—they were still smiling at the time—"involve abandoning the teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he deceives himself but poorly."

Other Communist leaders have been, and are, equally candid. The struggle between international communism and the free way of life will not be relaxed for one moment.

Having abandoned force, and the threat of force, the Communists are placing their hopes on ideological tactics. The greatest "war for men's minds" in all history is now on.

The Communists think they can win this kind of war. They are today highly confident. They have had forty-odd years of experience in the field and they think their opponents either cannot or will not make the effort necessary for victory. Frankly, they believe, and I think honestly believe, we just haven't got what it takes to make the sacrifices demanded.

It is up to us to show them that we have. And I know we have if we will only face the facts. President Eisenhower, however, put it very aptly when he said in the state of the Union message that we would win this struggle only if we were willing to devote to the effort the same resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency, that we in the past had mustered in times of war.

The increased appropriation asked by the President will give the United States Information Agency the support it must have. Half measures in this struggle will not win. It is an all-out fight and we must take all-out measures.

If we face the fact that this is a war, I do not think we will hesitate one moment. Our weakness, as the Communists know well, is that we are not facing this fact.

I do not believe that we can afford not to give the President what he has asked.

WE SHOULD INVITE MORE ITALIANS TO SETTLE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Italian people contribute some of the best qualities in the making of our common American citizenship.

We, in Massachusetts, know this to be true from our own personal experience.

All of us have cherished friends, whose ancestors came from Italy. Their hospitality, their loyalty, their expressive intelligence ranging over all the arts, and their true devotion to religion and democracy warm our hearts.

We would like to welcome more of their friends and relatives from the old country. For we know that they would find happy fulfillment here. In so doing, they would also enrich our American way of life, as we make progress, hand in hand.

But there is a law on the book that prevents us from inviting more Italians to come across the ocean and to live here with us.

It is known as the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

That law was passed during the Korean war.

In its concern for shaping an immigration policy that would protect our national security, it naturally reflected some of the high-tension fears and prejudices of that period.

It also failed to revise the old-fashioned and unfair quota system that was established in 1924.

Under this quota system only 154,657 immigrants from all countries are permitted to take up residence in the United States each year.

This formula is based upon the 1920 population of the United States.

Even in 1924, it was heavily weighted in favor of immigrants from the countries of northern Europe.

But the people from these countries do not want to come to the United States. Year after year, their quotas are not used up.

Furthermore, these balances are not transferred to other countries whose quotas are oversubscribed.

It is my belief that the people of Italy, Greece, Poland, and Lithuania should be given the opportunity to emigrate to the United States under these unused quotas.

In addition, the total quota should be increased, based upon the 1950 census, because our country is much richer and stronger than it was in 1924 and is thus able to provide more opportunities for immigrants.

The President, in his special message to Congress on this subject February 8, 1956, recommended improvements in our immigration law. Among other points, he emphasized the advisability of admitting 65,000 more quota immigrants each year, bringing the total to about 220,000 admissions annually.

Furthermore, he recommended that the Congress provide, separately from the increased annual quota, for the admission of 5,000 aliens annually without regard to nationality or nation origin.

Use of these numbers would enable us to meet some of the needs of this country

which develop from time to time for persons with special skills and cultural or technical qualifications.

Finally, he advised a change in the private bill system of handling and providing relief for individual immigration cases. In the last session of Congress, out of a total of 880 bills passed, 413 dealt with private immigration measures. This interferes with the consideration of more urgent national problems. The President recommends that the Attorney General be given the administrative authority to pass these hardship cases. Such discretion should be limited to aliens with close relatives in this country, to veterans, and to functionaries of religious organizations, regardless of the technical statutory ground on which the alien is inadmissible, or subject to deportation.

My good friend on the Republican side of the House Judiciary Committee introduced several bills covering these improvements for the administration.

On the Democratic side, I have filed identical bills.

Italy is overcrowded.

Despite great efforts by the Italian Government, with some assistance from the United States, over 10 percent of the population is unemployed.

There are beautiful shops and apartments in Rome, but in southern Italy a man considers himself lucky if he can earn $150 a year.

Emigration is the only answer.

The United States, traditional friend of Italy, and indebted to her for a great religious and democratic and cultural heritage, must open her arms to friends in need.

We must work for a more liberal and humane immigration law.

That will permit more Italians to come to the United States today to strengthen our American society of tomorrow.

AN APPEAL FOR THE MIDDLEWAY ON THE SCHOOL BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, events of the last 10 days have demonstrated unmistakably that the paramount domestic issue confronting us is not the income of farmers, but the more momentous problem of furnishing wise guidance and leadership which will preserve our Constitution and ensure the gradual but orderly integration of our schools as decreed by the Supreme Court.

It is plain now that the Congsess itself must face up to this issue when the school construction—Kelley—bill is placed on our agenda. I know that many Members are sorely perplexed by the dilemma posed by this bill and the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. Speaker, compromise is the indispensable working tool of this body, and I have asked to address the House today in order to ask if there is not an honorable, middle-ground alternative to our colleague's amendment—some proposal which might enable us to simultaneously build the schools our children so desperately need and implement the mandate of the Court.

Last week the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] suggested in a speech on the floor that my bill, H. R. 6803, has the essential features of such a compromise. If on further thought I am convinced that this measure can win support it will be my purpose to offer it at the propert time as a middleway alternative.

First, let me say that I did not conceive this legislation as a vehicle for compromise. It was prepared and submitted last June as separate legislation without regard for the Kelley bill. However, shortly after it was introduced, our colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL] discerned its worth and at one time ht agreed to withdraw his amendment if the House Committee on Education and Labor would incorporate this idea into the Kelley bill. Unfortunately, such a compromise was not consummated, and the committee bill did not take cognizance of the school desegregation question.

AID TO INTEGRATION VS. POWELL AMENDMENT

Subsequently, our colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL] undertook to broaden his amendment to include some of the concepts embodied in H. R. 6803. However, I have carefully studied his amendment and it is plain that its aid-to-integration features are largely meaningless and unworkable in the context of the Kelley bill itself. Therefore, I believe Members should have an opportunity to consider H. R. 6803, slightly amended, as an alternative to the Powell amendment.

I think my colleague and I are agreed that Congress cannot ignore decisions of the Supreme Court in writing school construction legislation. We differ only in our concepts of the role that the legislative arm of government should play.

As I read his amendment, in essence my colleague would deny school construction funds to States that are unable to affirm compliance with the requirements of the Supreme Court. On the other hand, my aid-to-integration amendment would set up a special program to provide massive aid for communities affected by the Court's decision; further, it would fix responsibility on the Federal Government to construct outright all new school facilities required by school districts which are carrying out, or are prepared to carry out, integration programs. My amendment would contain no prohibition, and the eligibility of noncomplying areas would be left for determination by the courts acting within the framework of the Supreme Court decisions.

But let me explain more fully the philosophy which underlies the program embodied in H. R. 6803:

THE PHILOSOPHY OF H. R. 6803

First of all, this amendment would incorporate and put to use the well-tested Federal impact principle which is already imbedded in the policies of the Congress. Even more important, it adopts the major premise that local communities are sovereign in school matters, and that integration will succeed best on a school district by school district basis.

For more than a half a century many of our States—including my own—legally maintained dual-school systems under explicit sanction by our highest court. This constitutional interpretation was reaffirmed many times over the years and school boards built separate school facilities under its shelter. When, after 58 years, the Supreme Court declared the legal illegal, much of these capital expenditures were thereby wasted, and more, urgent new requirements for school housing were created.

And as a result of this decision, southern communities face a task of tremendous scope. They must reorganize and unify their entire school systems—a most difficult and expensive assignment. Unquestionably, this expense and the tremendous attendant social problems, are directly the result of Federal action—the decisions of the Supreme Court. These communities should not be expected or required to implement these decisions unaided. I propose that the entire country assist in the task.

A COMPARISONS PUBLIC LAW 815

Clearly these decisions of the judicial arm of our Government produce a Federal impact equal to, or greater than, the defense activities recognized by Congress when Public Law 815—our existing school-aid legislation—was passed. Is it fair or just to expect those who erected physical facilities relying in good faith on existing constitutional law to bear the burden alone of revising their physical plant to conform to the new constitutional requirements? We must agree that there is a national duty arising out of these facts. Federal aid will lift a large portion of this crushing tax burden from local communities and will strengthen the hand of those good citizens who have the courage and statesmanship to tackle the onerous task of making integration work.

Indeed, the case for Federal aid here is far stronger than under the defense-impact program, for our national-defense activities have carried with them certain long-range compensating factors—payrolls, and eventually a larger tax base—which are wholly absent in the impact of integration.

This national duty is emphasized, too, by the fact that under dual school systems many of the schools for Negro children have been markedly substandard. If we are really interested, then, in successfully implementing the Court's decisions, we should guard against any program which would result in a leveling down of our schools. It is obvious that only under a substantial Federal-aid program such as I have outlined can we ensure that the standards of the whole system will be raised, and thus protect the integrity of our educational enterprise.

Following the Public Law 815 pattern, this program would consist of outright grants without a matching requirement, and local school districts ready to carry out integration programs would apply for aid directly to Washington free from hindrance by State, or other, officials. This amendment would become title V of Public Law 815, and would thus employ the proven administrative machinery and personnel of a going program.

COOPERATION AND NOT COMPULSION

Most important, the enactment of this legislation would be warm-hearted testimony to the communities concerned that the entire country is sympathetically interested and is willing to bear a major part of the entailed financial burden. Instead of engendering bitterness by taxing southern citizens to build schools in other States, as the Powell amendment would do, the reverse principle would apply as testimony of national concern.

Those southern leaders who are driven by fear of punitive Federal action would be disarmed by such a program as this. In short, I propose that instead of self-righteous criticism, the rest of the country would hold out a helping hand. Instead of threats, we would use understanding. In place of compulsion, we would offer cooperation.

These, then, are some of the middle-way principles which form the framework of H. R. 6803.

DESEGREGATION PATTERNS: FALL OF 1955

Integration programs were voluntarily initiated last fall in school districts of nine States, and the most striking fact which emerges from a study of these successful desegregation efforts is that final decisions were invariably left to local school officials, and were frankly dealt with as problems of educational management. In all of the nine States the issue was utterly divorced from politics. In my opinion, too few words of praise have been said for the wise restraint exercised by the holders of public office in these States: they did not protest, most did not intervene in any way, they simply honored and acquiesced in the decision of our highest tribunal.

It is clear, if last fall's experience is any guide, that success will follow wherever local sovereignty is recognized and politics is kept out. It is this district-by-district approach which H. R. 6803 seeks to foster.

Lastly, in all earnestness, I should like to raise one remaining, grave question. I do not profess to know the answer to this inquiry, and I propound it only to encourage a rethinking of a central issue.

SOME UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

I should like with all respect to ask the gentleman from New York this question: Will the cause of school integration, as contemplated by the Supreme Court, be served by the passage of his amendment?

I know some advocates have argued that placing his directive in the school construction bill would break the defiance of the dissident Southern States. Perhaps so. But others argue, with equal force, that such action would inevitably breed defiance and delay action. I submit that these two points of view should be weighed with care.

Other related questions must also worry the conscientious Congressman:

First. Will the enactment of punitive legislation at this time strengthen or weaken the moderates in the communities of the South?

Second. In the months to come, will the deep-seated attitudes and emotions which lie at the root of this problem respond most readily to the human-relations approach, or the legislative approach?

Third. Is there anything which will do more to seal the ultimate defeat of the opponents of integration than quiet, orderly desegregation programs carried out in neighboring States or counties?

Fourth. Will moderate, constructive action by Congress tend to relax or intensify the growing tensions in some southern areas? It is a singular fact, I think, that the two leading middle-way spokesmen on this issue—the President and Mr. Stevenson—are criticized severely by the extremists on both sides.

CONCLUSIONS

It is my belief that what we need in our land today is a fresh uprising of that spirit of moderation which has always been the saving quality of our American way of life. This spirit partakes of patience and tolerance, and above all it seeks to understand and work with the minds and hearts of men.

In times not unlike our own, at an earlier stage of this identical controversy, an immortal American expressed this spirit in these simple words: "With malice toward none, with charity for all."

Can we recapture that spirit today? I fear we may miscalculate unless we recognize that an honorable solution of our present impasse in the days to come may rest more on the answer to this question than on edicts or laws that this body may enact.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. At the outset, I should like to say I deeply appreciate the gentleman's approach to this problem, but I want to point out also that I fear that other problems arise with the adoption of his amendment. Unless I misunderstand it, I question how the funds are going to be disbursed. Are they going to go through the department of education in a State, or are they going to go directly from the Federal Government to the school district that is cooperating?

Mr. UDALL. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. Let me clarify it, if I can. Under the Kelley bill the State educational agencies would handle the funds, as I know the gentleman is aware. Under my bill we would earmark a portion of the funds appropriated by the Kelley bill, perhaps $25 to $50 million annually. These funds would then be administered under Public Law 815, with which I am sure the gentleman is familiar. Application for funds would be made in accordance with the present practice, directly to the Commissioner of education, and the local school districts would deal, as they now do, directly with the Federal Government, as far as these funds were concerned.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Then in effect with the adoption of the gentleman's amendment you could override an organization set up by any State?

Mr. UDALL. It would have this effect, to use an example. The people across the river in Arlington, Va., for instance, and in Fairfax County, where I happen to live, are apparently ready to go ahead with integration programs. However, the officials in their State appear at the moment to be heading in another direction. Those people under the Kelley bill—and if the amendment of the gentleman from New York were passed—would not be able to get any funds. Under my bill they would apply directly to the commissioner of education for assistance. So, we would treat it on a district-by-district basis instead of treating it as a State problem which, in my opinion, it is not. If we are going to solve this problem, I believe it will be solved by people sitting down together in the communities affected and producing workable programs, not by legislation that we may pass. However, the Congress can assist in some ways, and that is what this program proposes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. My whole point is that you would be bypassing the State department of education in any State.

Mr. UDALL. That is true so far as this supplemental program is concerned.

To supplement my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to append the following factual data and commentaries: A Report Card—Progress of the States Toward School Desegregation, from Time magazine of September 19, 1955; a progress report on school desegregation, from U. S. News & World Report of September 9, 1955; a column by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 18, 1956; and an editorial published in the New York Times today.

[From Time magazine of September 19, 1955]

REPORT CARD—PROGRESS OF THE STATES TOWARD SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

As the new school year began, 17 Southern and border States had widely varying records of compliance with the Supreme Court's order to enforce desegregation with all deliberate speed. The States' report cards:

Alabama, grade F: "Not one of the school boards has made any move to try to work out anything," a top Negro attorney correctly reports. The Alabama State Legislature recently enacted a placement bill, over the veto of Gov. James ("Kissin' Jim") Folsom, empowering local school boards to place pupils in schools upon such considerations as "the psychological qualifications of the pupil for the type of teaching and associations involved * * * the possibility of breaches of peace or ill will or economic retaliation within the community."

Arkansas, grade C plus: "It is a problem that must be left to the people of the local districts to solve," said Gov. Orval E. Faubus. Four of the State's 228 interracial school districts are integrating this fall, moving 49 Negro childen in, along with about 2,170 whites. Little Rock (population 102,213) will integrate its 24 percent Negro student population in the high schools in 1957, the junior high schools in 1958. The University of Arkansas held its first integrated summer session this year.

Delaware, grade C: In Wilmington (population 110,356), 13 city schools will integrate this fall; 900 Negro students will attend formerly all-white schools, while 50 whites will attend all-Negro schools. In New Castle County (Wilmington), 14 out of 20 school boards intend to integrate. But in Kent and Sussex Counties, officials of only 1 (the city of Dover) out of 27 white school districts intend to heed the Supreme Court.

Florida, grade D: State law prohibits the mixing of races in schools, but on three bases of the United States Air Force, white

and Negro pupils will integrate this fall. Negro parents have filed petitions for integration in four counties.

Georgia, grade F: No desegregation anywhere.

Kentucky, grade B plus: Gov. Lawrence Wetherby and his education officials promise to enact the Supreme Court mandate. Out of 224 school districts, including that of Lexington, 20 or 25 will integrate this fall. Louisville (pop. 369,129), where Jim Crow barriers are fast crumbling, will integrate in 1956. Segregation bars are down at all the State colleges and most private colleges and universities.

Louisiana, grade F: State schools will not be integrated this fall, or in the forseeable future. New Orleans Catholic authorities will not integrate their parochial schools this year. The Louisiana State legislature voted $100,000 to hire attorneys to contest integration lawsuits at every level.

Maryland, grade B minus: In Baltimore (pop. 949,708), formal integration of the city schools is 1 year old, although only about 4 percent of Negro pupils are actually in mixed schools. Statewide, 8 out of 22 counties with mixed populations plan to integrate this fall; several others will integrate next year. Maryland will also integrate its five State teachers' colleges before the end of 1955. Last week in Washington County, where the Union won the victory at Antietam that encouraged President Lincoln to publish his Emancipation Proclamation, 73 Negro children registered for all-white schools. Maryland's Eastern Shore, however, contrives to preserve segregation by devious means; e. g., two counties run school buses only along last year's routes so that Negroes have to attend their old segragated schools or walk.

Mississippi, grade F: No move to desegregate.

Missouri, grade A: State education authorities estimate that 55,000 (80 percent of Missouri's Negro children are now studying alongside 550,000 whites; there has been no friction.

North Carolina, grade C minus: Gov. Luther Hodges' idea is that whites and Negroes should combine to make what he calls "a voluntary choice of separate schools"; he threatens to close public schools rather than desegregate them. Some industrial cities—Charlotte, Greensboro, Durham—have appointed committees to study the Supreme Court decision. A Federal court ruled last week that the University of North Carolina must process the applications of three Negro undergraduates.

Oklahoma, grade B plus: "I think without question we are in advance of any other [southern] State," said a Negro newspaper editor in Oklahoma City, adding: "I am utterly surprised." At least 88 out of 1,802 school districts will integrate in Oklahoma this week, including Oklahoma City and Tulsa. All 18 of the State universities and colleges plan to integrate this fall. Much of this impetus comes from Gov. Raymond Gary, who insists that his State will not defy the Supreme Court, and from Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Oliver Hodge. Says Hodge: "Our attitude is that they're all just children." One Oklahoma problem: Most integrated classes are awarded to white teachers, throwing about 200 Negro teachers out of work.

South Carolina, grade F: South Carolina's general assembly is on record to the effect that (1) school districts permitting integration will be denied State funds, (2) races must not intermingle in public buildings. The NAACP has filed 17 petitions asking school districts to carry out the full intent of the United States Supreme Court decree.

Tennessee, grade C: On October 17, a Federal court in Memphis (population 396,000), will try an NAACP test lawsuit designed to admit 5 Negro undergraduates to Memphis State College, about 85 percent of whose students are said to favor the move. Tennessee intends gradually to integrate all six of its State-supported colleges. Nashville has a committee studying integration; Chattanooga recently voted for integration, but not this year. Federal-run Oak Ridge (population 30,229) has the only integrated school system in the State.

Texas, grade C plus: San Antonio (population 408,442), where 2 Negro slaves survived the siege of the Alamo, opened its 94 schools to 5,995 Negro children this week. More than 60 out of the State's 2,000 school districts—including El Paso, Corpus Christi, and Austin—will begin to integrate this fall; Dallas (population 434,462), plans to integrate at an indefinite date. Houston (population 596,163), indicates an intent to comply. Every branch of the University of Texas will be open to Negroes in the fall of 1956.

Virginia, grade D plus: Gov. Thomas B. Stanley says that he will "use every legal power at my command to continue segregated schools." His State Commission on Public Education is examining legal ways of preventing integration. Prince Edward County operates white schools on a month-to-month funding basis, ready to shutdown rather than desegregate. Norfolk (population 213,513), proclaims that it intends to uphold the Supreme Court decision, but State law forbids it. Richmond recently dropped a pilot plan to integrate a few Negroes into white junior high schools.

West Virginia, grade A minus: About 35 of the State's 55 counties will begin to integrate this fall. Ten counties have no Negroes, and nine continue to run segregated all-white and all-Negro schools. Charleston (population 73,501), integrated its schools' 1st, 2d, and 7th grades last week, reported that all went well.

[From U. S. News & World Report of September 9, 1955]

Delaware: 15 of 62 school districts plan to integrate this autumn. State board of education is pressing for integration.

Maryland: Baltimore mixed schools last year. Seven Maryland counties plan partial integration this year.

West Virginia: 29 counties have integrated, in whole or part. Five others are desegregating this year. Of remaining 21 counties, 10 have no Negroes and 11 have not started integrating.

Kentucky: At least 10 counties and 4 cities are integrating this year. State policy is to mix schools elsewhere as soon as possible.

Tennessee: Only Oak Ridge, Federal town, is desegregating this year. State is leaving integration of schools up to local communities.

Missouri: 80 percent of Negro pupils are to be in integrated school districts this autumn. Integrated districts will include Kansas City and nearly all of St. Louis.

Arkansas: Four communities are mixing schools voluntarily. Problem is being left to local communities.

Oklahoma: State policy is to integrate. Eighty-eight school districts plan some degree of integration. Oklahoma City is to mix schools completely.

Texas: More than 60 districts have ordered a start toward integration. No immediate plans in east Texas, where most Negroes live.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 18, 1956]

EXPLOSIVE SCHOOL ISSUE

(By Marquis Childs)

The widening breach over integration of the races in the public schools is now seen to threaten not only the proposed Federal school construction bill but many current programs under which much-needed aid goes to the States.

It can extend so far as to halt many functions of Government considered essential to the Nation's welfare.

With the growing bitterness fostered by extremists on both sides, there is talk of legislative action to prevent funds for current grant-in-aid programs going to the five Southern States refusing to comply with the Supreme Court's order. This could mean a stop to the aid to vocational education, the school lunch program and the federally supported hospital construction program.

Pushed to even further extremes, the ever increasing hostility could block Federal support for highway construction. After all, in the South segregated buses run on the highways and on construction jobs there is racial discrimination.

The gravity of what can happen should serve as a warning to politicians who would exploit this issue for their own political purposes.

The Republicans can put the Democrats on the spot but at the same time they can help to set race against race and region against region in an atmosphere that has begun to generate something like the hatreds that led to the terrible tragedy of civil war a century ago.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and Gov. Averell Harriman may serve their own political ends by their recent use of the school-race issue, but they do the country a deep disservice by bringing it up at this time.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr., Democrat, New York, who is pressing his amendment to the school-construction bill, which would deny funds to school districts that fail to initiate integration, suggests that it may be necessary to take similar action with current aid programs.

After all, he points out, the five Southern States that set their State rights above Federal authority on this issue, get about $75 million a year in grants-in-aid for education and hospital construction. This is more than the estimated $68 million a year they would get under the school-construction bill.

So while POWELL has not made a final decision, he may feel compelled to offer prohibiting amendments to appropriations for these purposes.

The political pattern of response to the Powell amendment has been set by the Republican leaders in the House. Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, and CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, declared for the amendment to the school-construction bill. Having taken this stand, they could hardly, in all logic, refuse to follow POWELL if he decides to try to stop current funds going to States practicing segregation.

That is the easy political out. The southerners, led by such violent extremists as Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, respond with a filibuster and the legislation is killed.

But a compromise solution can be found if there is any real desire to get Federal help in building desperately needed schools. A proposal has been put forward by Representative STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, Arizona, which, he says, he will reintroduce on the floor when the Powell amendment is brought up.

The Udall amendment provides that part of the money voted for school construction be earmarked for direct aid to areas where the problem of integration is especially costly and difficult because of a large Negro population and where integration has been initiated.

It recognizes that most Negro schools have been substandard and that to raise or even maintain the level of education under integration funds must be spent for new classrooms.

Under the Udall proposal, this would be done by amending Public Law 815, which has served to cushion the effect in defense-impact areas where huge Government installations

put a heavy and uninvited burden on local facilities.

This middle-ground solution contains no prohibition against Federal funds going to districts that refuse to integrate. But legal action could be taken to challenge the right of the Government to send Federal money into areas that deny the jurisdiction of the integration order. The courts then could pass on the question.

The Eisenhower administration has held that it does not have the power to withhold funds without either a ruling by the courts or a specific prohibition written into the law as is proposed under the Powell amendment.

The political battle lines in this explosive issue are clear enough. At the end of the road is a frightening kind of showdown that can only mean more hatred and violence and a reversal of the progress achieved in recent years.

What is not clear, perhaps because it has received so little consideration either in or out of Congress, is the course of a reasonable compromise which should draw the support of all men of good will.

[From the New York Times of February 21, 1956]

MR. POWELL'S AMENDMENT

The unhappy confusion between the Federal-aid-to-schools program and the Supreme Court's desegregation decision continues to block the former without advancing the latter. The two questions are separate and they ought to be treated separately. If they are not, only the children of our country will be the losers.

The board of directors of the National Education Association has just unanimously expressed its agreement with this view. While endorsing the need for Federal appropriations "to help relieve the critical school-building shortages throughout the country," the board at its Atlantic City meeting firmly opposed the Powell amendment, which would deny Federal funds to any locality that failed to integrate its schools. The practical reason is clear: If the Powell amendment is adopted in the House, as it may be, the chances for any Federal aid to education to get through the Senate are considered nil.

There are other reasons, too. As we have previously stated, we believe the Powell amendment represents the wrong approach to the integration problem. In a message in an adjoining column Mr. POWELL takes exception to our suggestion that the purpose of his amendment might be achieved through a suit in the Federal courts. He cites a 1923 Supreme Court decision rejecting the effort of a taxpayer to prevent the appropriation of Federal funds to enforce an allegedly unconstitutional law (to help the States reduce infant mortality). But the present situation is so different from that one—not to mention the fact that the Court is so different—that we cannot share Mr. POWELL's certainty that a suit in this case would be thrown out. Furthermore, there are many other ways of attacking the problem.

Representative METCALF, former justice of the Montana supreme court, suggests that it would be the duty of the administration to withhold school-aid funds from States that had clearly and unequivocally expressed their defiance of the Supreme Court; and with this would go the corollary that the officers of a State so affected could sue for its share of the funds. A different approach is that of Representative UDALL, of Arizona, who instead of barring Federal funds from segregated States would give extra and direct Federal help to those areas that are conscientiously making an effort to integrate their schools. In any case, if there is to be a Federal school-aid program at all, it ought to contain no such punitive features as are embodied in the Powell amendment.

RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, unless the Interstate Commerce Commission rules otherwise, another increase in railroad freight rates will go into effect on Saturday, February 25. That increase will injuriously affect a number of United States industries, but the impact will be greatest on our farms and in our coal mines and on the people who work in these industries.

At the start, let me explain that the so-called record level of business activity, about which we are hearing so much, has not by any means gravitated into all of our mining communities and agricultural areas. There is ample evidence, in Department of Labor statistics, of widespread unemployment in sections of our industrial States. These conditions may not be generally understood, but members of the House who represent coal-producing areas have evidence of serious economic distress that is going to persist unless Congress does something to alleviate the situation.

I have introduced H. R. 7902, a bill to provide Federal assistance to labor surplus areas and I am hopeful that action can be taken on this legislation as expeditiously as possible in order that the impoverishment to which our people in these areas are subjected will be terminated without delay. Meanwhile Congress should acquaint itself with the factors that contribute to the hold-down of industrial activity, so that we may be in a better position to make whatever recommendations are necessary. We must also be ready to enact legislation where feasible, in cases where the executive department is deficient in providing for the welfare of the people.

The case of increasing freight rates has in the past several years assumed mounting significance. The coal industry, as you know, after declining to a 20-year low in production for 1954, experienced an encouraging upturn last year. The rise in output immediately prompted most economists and fuel experts to predict that the coal industry had definitely hit bottom and would continue its upward spiral long into the future. There is no basis for challenging these prognostications as far as coal's job of supplying its share of the energy load is concerned. We who represent coal-producing States have said many times that the coal industry will move forward under its own power if inequitable competitive practices are eliminated.

For a number of years following World War II foreign residual oil began to encroach upon the Nation's coal markets to the extent that losses were eventually felt as far west as the Mississippi River. Coal which normally moved into the east coast began to back up into other marketing areas and resulted in depressed conditions throughout the top coal-producing States.

Last year Congress finally took one remedial step by incorporating into the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act a provision ordering the executive department to hold oil imports at a level in proportion to 1954 figures. While this legislation has proved to be inadequate, it nevertheless served notice on importing companies that Congress would not tolerate a continued grab of the United States fuel markets. As a consequence, coal has returned to a number of the electric utilities and heavy industrial plants that had begun to look to sources abroad for fuel supplies. It is my hope that we shall at the current session adopt an import quota that will be less vague and flexible than the proviso now in effect. Meanwhile, though production has risen, there still are 51,000 persons in my congressional district receiving Government surplus food and a greater percentage of these recipients are unemployed coal miners and their families. This is an era of presumed general prosperity. What is America going to do to enable these unemployed citizens to return to gainful employment?

I consider it extremely unfortunate that the railroads found it necessary to petition for a rate increase at this time. The new rates come within a few months of the Interstate Commerce Commission's decision to make permanent a substantial rate increase that was originally scheduled to expire on the last day of last year. Obviously, under the burden of higher delivered prices brought about by a greater tariff on coal transportation, the coal industry could lose many of the gains attained in the past 12 months. What is more, any anticipated further progress is in danger of immediate liquidation as a result of the higher price in freight traffic.

Perhaps the time has come when the Congress should draw up a directive to the Interstate Commerce Commission emphasizing our disappointment at the Commission's failure to find some means of meeting railroad demands for increased revenue other than through ever-rising assessments on the coal industry. My own feeling, after preliminary examination is that we must come to grips with that phase of railroad economics responsible for continuance of costly services that now should be classified as anachronistic. Many of the railroad people themselves agree that tradition alone has forced the roads to retain some services which produce only greater and greater deficits.

On January 20 an item in the Wall Street Journal reported that a Midwest railroad had been denied authority to halt passenger service on a 267-mile line, in intrastate traffic, which accounted for a loss of more than $700,000 annually. Permission to stop this service has been sought by the railroad for the past 15 months, yet day after day, week after week, month after month, the road has been forced under law to continue these services so devastating to the operational budget.

The $700,000 per annum loss must of necessity be made up elsewhere. If such were not the case, the railsoad would not long be in business. The line is thus forced, in effect, to collect subsidies from other services, and on any line which penetrates a mining or farm district, coal and agricultural products necessarily become the fall guy. It is a

strange way to run a railroad, but the company presumably has no alternative so long as the State commission persists in inflicting parochial opinions on our transportation system.

While the Interstate Commerce Commission cannot be held responsible for the particular case which I have just cited, I feel that the Commission could contribute toward an alleviation of this situation if it were required by law to take cognizance of the injurious influence of the present rate structure on the coal and agricultural industries and on areas of the country dependent upon them for economic survival.

Action should be taken now by changing its order and disallowing the freight-rate increase scheduled to go into effect on February 25, 1956.

ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP CUSHING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an address by Archbishop Cushing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, here is the address by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, before the brotherhood dinner of the Lowell B'nai B'rith, Benjamin S. Pouzzner Lodge, at the Lowell Hebrew Community Center:

My dear friends, with emotion too deep for utterance, with mingled gratitude and pride, I receive this award with sincere humility.

For tonight doing me this great honor—you do yourselves greater honor; because truly all the kind things that have been said of me tonight describe me more graciously than accurately, more generously than exactly. Tonight you have been describing me not indeed just as I am, but with a moving generosity of spirit, as I wish I were, as I pray daily and try daily to be. But in thus too generously picturing me—you have portrayed yourselves as you are. This award is indeed an idealized painting of me, but of you who have made it, and whose presence here tonight approve it, it is in deepest reality as a clear mirror wherein your true selves are reflected.

For as no man can talk about another without revealing to an intelligent listener much of himself, so in describing me, you have truly revealed yourselves. Every kind and magnanimous word said here about me, said more the speaker, and of all of you whose applause endorsed and approved the generous sentiments so eloquently phrased and written. For in invisible yet indelible ink, between the lines of this tribute, is written for angels to read the bigness of heart and the broadness of mind, the dynamic and inspiring Americanism, the true Godliness, of those who voted for and prepared this award; and of all here assembled, men of all faiths, who have come here in support and approval of this Hebrew community's most gracious gesture.

VERY SAME VIRTUE

Nominating, as it has this year, a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, a priest and servant of God—naming me as its choice, as man of the year, for exemplary and outstanding good will and good service to men of all creeds—this Hebrew Brotherhood has not nominated—but proved itself, the Hebrew community group of the year, for the very same virtues. This award you have bestowed upon me tonight, I firmly believe, God gives to each and every one of you in the Book of Eternal Life.

Surely in Heaven before the throne of your God and mine, the erudite Master of the Talmud sings your praises. He once said of the good man, as written in that inspiring book, In Time and Eternity, edited by Nahum Glatzer, a great Jewish scholar, and rendered into noble English by Olga Marx, another Jewish scholar of note, "Let the good man increase peace with his brothers, with his relatives, and with every man, even with the stranger in the market place, that he may be beloved above and desired below, and well received by all creatures."

In all this anxious, war-weary, confused, and care-burdened world are there any men more futile and stupid than those who clamor for world peace, and whisper for discrimination and discord in their own neighborhoods? The roads to world peace is the street where we ourselves live. The first steps to world peace are steps to the stranger in need or the sorrowful next door, be his race or religion what it may.

There is a pathetic story of an unemployed Negro wearily filling out still another application for employment. When he came to the question. What is your race?, with unconscious irony he wrote down, Human. We have all of us heard—and some of us preached hour-long sermons that said less. For there is one word in the heart of the matter. Since our beginning is in God and our end; since in love He created all men and nations—to hate any person or people or nation is to hate God their Father, and our Father.

WHAT IT MEANS

Three centuries ago Samuel Laniado, great spiritual writer of Judaism, wrote: "Love your neighbor just as you do yourself. And this means that just as a man who has hurt himself with his hand, will not hurt in return the hand that has hurt him; so it is, if a neighbor inflicts pain or the like on him, he will not seek vengeance, because he regards his neighbor as himself, as his very self. Since God created his soul and the soul of his neighbor, he knows both alike—each an infinitesimal part of God's creation."

All the antimovements that lead to discord, and strife, that have led to the mass murders we call wars, have their roots in the rejection of the commandment of Christ. "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them." He, the Son of God made man, understood how difficult it is to wipe out national, racial, and religious enmities; nevertheless He refused to appease or compromise in this. He would accept no co-existence with hatreds or discriminations, but proclaimed, "You have heard that it was said: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy.' But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you."

That is the one answer. We must learn it and soon, lest in blasting atoms the world commit suicide.

"The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart,
Still stands Thy ancient sacrifice,
A humble and a loving heart."

A humble and a loving heart—God's guided missile for the winning of peace. Men with such hearts, with God's help, will yet save the world. Paratroopers of the Lord, captains for Christ. The history of your people, my Jewish friends, and mine, of your religion and mine, is beautiful with the records, the words, and the deeds of such men. Conquerors, though defeated; forgiving their enemies, they have no enemies; but they make of the conquerors captives of God.

Thus tonight, being so kind to me, you have in essential reality been true to yourselves and your own religion—loyal at once to your Jewish tradition and to your American tradition; obedient to God Who three centuries ago inspired a Syrian rabbi, Samuel Ben Abraham Laniado to write, that the love of one's neighbor shall be considered in Heaven as if God himself had received it. Yes, and long before that, nearly 20 centuries ago, that same God Incarnate said, "Amen I say unto you—as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to Me."

And myself, one of His least brethren, the stranger to whom you have opened the door of your hearts, will never forget your kindness tonight, nor cease in my efforts to be worthy of it; to nourish and increase that awareness of brotherhood here manifest tonight, a blessed warmth and a holy light in us and upon us. Nor shall I cease while I live to oppose all movements and men who through ignorance or malice would infect us with the spiritual disease of bigotry, the contagious germs of racial hatreds. To such men who, knowingly or not, serve the enemies of God and country I would say:

"Whoever degrades another degrades Me,
And whatever is said or done against another
Returns in the end to hurt Me."

A REALIST

Though the years of my priesthood have not dimmed my ideals, they have made me a realist. That is why even now, while I speak rejoicing, a shadow falls on my happiness, as I realize that some among you may be silently thinking. "But is the archbishop unaware that Protestants and Jews may be disliked and distrusted by some of his Catholics?" To that silent question, if anyone here present be in thought asking it now, in sadness and humility I must answer, I know. Among my own people, my own children in Christ, there may be those who offend you—and their God. A splinter minority of my flock may be prejudiced and intolerant, only a comparatively few—yet if there were but 3 such, that would be 3 too many. There may be indeed intolerant Catholics; but—I beg of you please believe and remember what I tell you now—if they are bigoted it is not because of their Catholic faith, but in spite of it, in betrayal of it.

My friends, I have broken bread with you this night, and have talked with you, as a fellow American neighbor and friend. But in this matter I voice no mere personal opinion, but with the consecrated authority of my holy office as a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church and priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek, I declare to you that no Catholic can despise a fellow man and remain a true follower of his Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and an obedient son of his church. Any Catholic who reviles or wrongs a brother because of the color of his skin, because of race or religion, or who condemns any racial or religious group because of the mistakes or sins of a few individuals in that racial or religious group, ceases in that condemnation to be a Catholic and an American. He becomes a disobedient son of mother church and a disloyal citizen of these United States. The Catholic who fails to take a stand against racial or religious persecutions is at once a slacker in the army of the church militant and a deserter from the battle of Christian democracy. Turning his back to a brother of different color, race, or religion, wittingly or not, he turns his back to the flag and to the cross of Mount Calvary.

Such a man was gentle St. Francis of Assisi. Such is that great priest whose parish is the world, because he loves the world, our holy father, Pius XII. Such a man was St. Stephen the Levite, who, stoned to death, with

his last breath begged forgiveness for his murderers, and in the beautiful Scripture phrase, "fell asleep in the Lord."

CITES NORTH ADAMS MAN

Such men serve my church in many lands and are praying this hour for their Communist jailers. Nor need we go to the distant past or far lands for examples of the courage born of love. Such a man is Harry Melcher, of North Adams, Mass., of whom I read in the Boston papers of February 3, when for the second time in 25 years, mindless of self, he braved a fiery death to save the sacred scrolls of his synagog, nobly proving again that as hatred is weakness, fear in action, courage is love in action. As St. John, the beloved disciple, proved in life and death, and in these deathless words, "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear." And thus casting out fear will bring peace to men in their hearts and their homes, in their communities and countries throughout the whole world.

For centuries now we've tried everything else; the powers of wealth, of mighty armies and navies, and combinations of nations, machinations of diplomats. All have failed. Before it's too late, and time is running out, let us turn from trust in the chain reactions of exploding atoms to faith in the chain reaction of God's love. Love—love of God and fellow men—that is God's formula for peace. Peace on earth to men of good will.

This night, here assembled, you have lit a beacon for peace, a spark which could with God's help start a fire of enthusiasm to God who alone is peace in time and eternity. This night you are doing just that. You have kindled a flame of divine fire which might, indeed, with God's help, start a chain reaction for brotherhood, a spreading conflagration of love withering to ashes all bigotries and fears, making bright the path to our loving Father in whom alone is peace in this world and the next, today and forever.

A half century ago when the British Empire was first among nations, as we are now, Kipling warned his people, and warns us now:

"Far called, our navies melt away;
On dune and headland sinks the fire;
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!

"If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Lord God of Hosts be with us yet
Lest we forget, lest we forget!"

You have not forgotten, nor will He forget you, nor I in my prayers—but one gift I would rejoice in more than your magnanimous award, a prayer, though it be but a mumbled phrase—that all men may love God and love one another. Every day and frequently throughout every day, let each one say: "Oh, my God, I love you and I love my neighbor as myself." That is God's guided missile to peace.

Mr. Speaker, among others the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] attended the Brotherhood dinner to which I have referred. Later he is going to ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include a very fine address by Mr. Firestone, one of his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks following his and include the acceptance of President Eisenhower of the award given by the Brotherhood organization. It is a very fine address. I also ask that I may include the remarks of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, regarding President Eisenhower when he read the President's acceptance. They were both very fine speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. METCALF (at the request of Mr. MAGNUSON), for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. GARMATAZ).

Mr. TUCK and to include a speech.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a speech.

Mr. HIESTAND (at the request of Mr. HOSMER) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include a speech.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. UTT (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER).

Mr. WILSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. UDALL).

Mr. CRAMER.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 20, 1956, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 8787. An act to provide for a prorated stationery allowance in the case of a Member of the House of Representatives elected for a portion of a term;

H. R. 8796. An act to increase the amount of telephone and telegraph service furnished to Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution relating to Maryland tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; and

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 22, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1560. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 involving a net decrease of $65,000 for several agencies, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1561. A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report showing contracts that have been negotiated for experimental, development, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, the amount of the contract, and a description of the work required to be performed thereunder for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1562. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting the monthly report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress, which amended section 211 of the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1563. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report which supplements a report dated February 9, 1956, pursuant to section 708 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended by Public Law 295, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1564. A letter from the commander in chief, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting a report of audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, and the Annual Report of Activities of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 605, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1565. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the following claim: *Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, Plaintiff, v. United States of America, Defendant* (docket No. 11), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 372. Resolution to provide additional expenses to conduct the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 114; without amendment (Rept. No. 1776). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 373. Resolution to provide additional funds for expenses of conducting studies, investigations, and inquiries incurred by the House Committee on Banking and Currency; with amendment (Rept. No. 1777). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 64. Resolution to provide for the printing of a compilation of veterans' laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 1778). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 206. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1779). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 387. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the 1955 Annual Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities (H. Rept. No. 1648, 84th Cong. 2d sess.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1780). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 398. Resolution authorizing the printing of the 34th Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund together with the Comptroller General's Report on Audit Findings Relating to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1781). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 51. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency additional copies of hearings entitled "Stock Market Study"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1782). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 60. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on automation and technological change for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; without amendment (Rept. No. 1783). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the joint committee print entitled, "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability," for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; without amendment (Rept. No. 1784). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2423. A bill for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 1785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7062. A bill providing for payment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 578. An act for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis); with amendment (Rept. No. 1788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1242. An act for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte; with amendment (Rept. No. 1789). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1483. An act for the relief of Irfan Kawar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1905. An act for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and the J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Durham; with amendment (Rept. No. 1792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1500. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Brickell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2473. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham; with amendment (Rept. No. 1794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3960. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Gago Santana; with amendment (Rept. No. 1795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4504. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle F. Brocki; without amendment (Rept. No. 1796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4899. A bill for the relief of Helmut Klestadt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6126. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6321. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Popwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7403. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Milton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7487. A bill for the relief of Irmgard S. King; without amendment (Rept. No. 1801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 9446. A bill to provide vocational training for adult Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 9447. A bill to provide temporary disability insurance benefits for employees in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 9448. A bill to provide that public lands of the United States shall not be withdrawn or reserved for defense purposes except by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 9449. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to issue to the Joe Graham Post No. 119, American Legion, a deed to certain lands within the Ship Island Military Reservation removing certain conditions heretofore made a part of the conveyance thereof, and providing for the conveyance of a portion of such lands to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE (by request):

H. R. 9450. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 9451. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Seminole Indians and to provide that certain lands shall be designated as a reservation for Seminole Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 9452. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to convey to the County of Los Angeles, Calif., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain portions of a tract of land heretofore conditionally conveyed to such county; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9453. A bill to allow amounts paid for the institutional care and training of a mentally retarded child of a taxpayer to be deducted for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 9454. A bill to amend chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the 30-percent withholding tax with respect to the income of certain nonresident aliens and foreign corporations shall not apply in the case of rentals derived from the exhibition of motion pictures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 9455. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Mills Creek, Fla., for drainage, flood control, and navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 9456. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 9457. A bill to provide an improved farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 9458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for refund or credit of internal-revenue taxes and customs duties paid on distilled spirits, wines, beer, tobacco products, and cigarette papers and tubes lost, rendered unmarketable, or condemned by health authorities as a result of a fire, hurricane, flood, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 9459. A bill to amend section 77 (c) (6) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. J. Res. 552. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER (by request):

H. R. 9460. A bill for the relief of Jan M. Hoegfeldt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 9461. A bill for the relief of Hanna Rezmovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 9462. A bill for the relief of Raimundo Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 9463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hayguhi (Kedesyan) Kudis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 9464. A bill for the relief of Robert Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9465. A bill for the relief of Joseph Aboudi or Joe Abood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 9466. A bill for the relief of Antoni Klimowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 9467. A bill for the relief of Ludwik Kwasniewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9468. A bill for the relief of Jo-Soon Duk and Lee Won Duk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 9469. A bill for the relief of Francisco Carapia Gaytin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9470. A bill for the relief of Miguel Gonzales-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9471. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jadwiga Stefaniak and daughter, Christina Stefaniak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 9472. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pauline Zweimueller Barkovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

554. By Mr. BROWNSON: Petition of Mrs. Luck Burkhart and 20 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

555. Also, petition of Mr. W. A. Thomas and 40 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act so as to provide retirement at age 60 after 30 years of service or after 35 years of service regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

556. Also, petition of Mrs. Marguerite Dice, J. R. Morgan, and 54 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging early passage without change of Bricker amendment, enforcement of McCarran-Walter Act, adoption of Hoover Commission recomemndations, end deficit spending, balance budget, cut taxes, withdrawal from International Labor Organization, keep out of Atlantic Union and World Government, terminate Status of Forces Treaty, advance no Federal aid to education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

557. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Mrs. L. M. Jorgensen, of the First Methodist Church, Mishawaka, Ind., and 166 other signers, protesting the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

558. By Mr. MUMMA: Petition signed by Mrs. S. Miriam Crist, of Rexmont, Pa., and some 20 other residents of Lebanon County, urging the enactment of legislation prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

559. Also, petition signed by Mrs. May W. Brandreth and 39 other residents of Cornwall, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

560. By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York: Petition of residents of the villages of Poland, N. Y., and Cold Brook, N. Y., in support of H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

561. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the director, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging that the House of Representatives rescind the appropriation of funds for the work of the Un-American Activities Committee and direct that the committee terminate its investigations as initially proposed by the present chairman of the committee, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Upper Colorado Project Means More Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, this means all of us, now has more than $8 billion in surplus farm products stored in warehouses around the Nation.

Storage costs alone are $1 million a day.

These surpluses are steadily increasing.

On the one hand, Congress is proposing to take 40 million acres of land out of production and put it in a so-called soil bank.

The Government would pay farmers $1 billion or more a year to remove this land from production to help decrease the huge surpluses.

But, on the other hand, there is an incredible proposal before Congress called the upper Colorado River storage project to irrigate 580,000 new acres of arid mountain land in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming at a cost to the Government, this means all of us, of $4 billion. And these lands would grow more surplus crops.

If you are confused, here is the answer: Defeat the upper Colorado project, which would create an additional $4 billion tax burden and also add to the huge pile of farm surpluses.

Gamma Sigma Fraternity—Workshop in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago a group of students at Rutgers University organized a fraternity in which persons of all colors, creeds, and nationalities were eligible for membership. This was an experiment in social living, designed to test the principle of broad fraternity participation.

The nonsectarian fraternity, Gamma Sigma, began at the university in the fall

of 1947 when 12 undergraduates, 9 of whom were ex-service men, decided that the existing fraternities were not in keeping with the democratic traditions of our Founding Fathers. They wanted a fraternity that did not have arbitrary restrictions concerning race, creed, or color. So they organized their own fraternal group without any restrictions whatsoever, except character and the appreciation of one individual for another.

During the 1947–48 college term, when universities were bulging with veterans, national fraternities sought new chapters all over the Nation. Several sent representatives to Rutgers, where Gamma Sigma was one of three new fraternal groups in the process of organization. When the fraternity pledged two Negro boys, the national fraternity representatives immediately lost interest.

When classes began in September 1949, it was discovered that the new fraternity had achieved the highest academic average of any fraternity chapter on the campus. The following year Gamma Sigma rented from the university the yellow house in fraternity row which it now occupies. It became evident that the organization was on the campus to stay. The heterogeneous group was welded into a strong unit.

Membership is pretty evenly divided among members of the three major faiths. The evening bull sessions are often equivalent to many courses aimed at explaining the religious beliefs subscribed throughout the world. Many nationalities are in the fraternity—Chinese, a Japanese student, the son of a Cuban educator, a Greek, and a Dutch boy.

The fraternity president, Richard Cogan, a history student, feels that Gamma Sigma has shown that all sorts of people can live together.

On Saturday evening, February 11, 1956, the young men of Gamma Sigma gave a testimonial dinner at the Somerville Inn, Somerville, N. J., to Mrs. Elin Johnson, the fraternity housemother. Mrs. Johnson, who came to the United States from Sweden 32 years ago, typifies the spirit of brotherhood of the group. She has by her devotion to the principle of the brotherhood of man inspired all those around her.

On the ninth birthday of Gamma Sigma Fraternity I wish to salute them and commend them for exemplifying the American tradition of equality. It is my hope that this workshop in democracy will have many years of continued success.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD various messages, a letter from Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and a newspaper editorial concerning Gamma Sigma.

The messages are as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, September 30, 1955.

DEAR MR. COGAN: May I congratulate your fraternity, Gamma Sigma, on its 9th anniversary. The objectives with which your group was organized are certainly commendable. I wish you future success.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1955.

DEAR MR. COGAN: I wish to commend the men of Gamma Sigma Fraternity for their fine efforts on behalf of the true spirit of democracy at one of our leading universities. Fraternities should be founded in the belief of the brotherhood of man. Unfortunately, on some of our college campuses, the fraternity system has been perverted by policies of discrimination and exclusion.

Gamma Sigma, by its example, upholds that most fundamental precept of our Nation that all men are equal without regard to race, religion, or national origin. My own experience while mayor of Minneapolis in working to solve these problems of human relations has convinced me that much more can be done to level the barriers of prejudice and hate than we sometimes think when confronted with them in all their ugliness. It can be done through just such forthright action as yours.

The practice of toleration and good will as exemplified by Gamma Sigma has its influence far beyond your own fraternity. As you begin your ninth year of democratic living together, I hope you will be encouraged by the knowledge that others look to your example with respect and hope. Keep up the good work, I pray you.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., September 30, 1955.

Mr. RICHARD COGAN,
President, Gamma Sigma Fraternity,
Rutgers University,
New Brunswick, N. J.:

Would you extend my congratulations to the members of the Gamma Sigma Fraternity of Rutgers University upon the opportunities that await them during the current academic year.

It is my understanding through mutual friends that this particular fraternity came into being 9 years ago because of a need felt upon your own campus for a fraternity into which persons of all colors, creeds, and nationalities could come and share in the common life and benefits of associating one with another. You who are members of this fraternity today inherit the high purposes with which this organization was founded and the current year offers you an opportunity to add to that history.

I again congratulate you on the opportunity and wish you a challenging and eventful year.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, October 4, 1955.

DEAR MR. COGAN: I have recently heard of your experiment in democratic living which is now past the experiment stage, having reached the 8-year mark.

As Gamma Sigma enters its ninth season, I wish for it good fortune and long life.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

FEBRUARY 4, 1956.

DEAR MR. KRUGER: I am happy to send my good wishes to the Gamma Sigma Fraternity on the occasion of their annual alumni dinner. I think it is nice that you have this independent, nonsectarian fraternity and it must add greatly to the democratic way of life on your campus.

My best wishes to Mrs. Johnson for her good work with the fraternity members.

With all good wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

MESSAGE FROM CONGRESSMAN HUGH J. ADDONIZIO TO GAMMA SIGMA FRATERNITY

As Gamma Sigma gathers for its second annual alumni dinner, I wish to take this opportunity to extend, both to its members and to Mrs. Elin Johnson, who is being especially honored on this occasion, my most sincere congratulations and best wishes.

It has been 9 years now since a group of young men at Rutgers determined to enter upon an experiment in democratic living. The fraternity they organized has lived up to the finest traditions of American life. Nonsectarian, nondiscriminatory, Gamma Sigma has been a living demonstration that democracy can thrive on a college campus. Too often college fraternities are charged, and often rightly so, with raising discriminatory barriers. Yet college years are the time when such barriers should be broken down, when students should learn to know the peoples of all nations, all creeds, all races with which we share this land and this shrinking world. What better way to do this than by sharing the experiences of everyday living, by working together, or by long talks over that last cup of coffee at dinner? The fraternal spirit can and should do much to lift the barriers of discrimination and prejudice. For this is the spirit of brotherhood in its truest sense.

It is most fitting that Mrs. Johnson should be your honored guest. Her position as housemother to your fraternity is one that requires tolerance and wisdom and discretion, as well as a firm belief in the principles for which you stand. On her depends some measure of the success of your undertaking.

It is my sincere hope that Gamma Sigma's crusade will meet with ever-increasing success, so that one day, the fraternal spirit having conquered, discrimination will have vanished.

May Gamma Sigma enjoy many long years of success.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of April 22, 1952]

If all fraternities operated on the same basis as Gamma Sigma at New Jersey's Rutgers University, there would be far less room for criticism of the fraternity system on the grounds that it produces unwholesome social byproducts in the form of snobbery, race, and religious prejudice.

In 1947, 12 Rutgers undergraduates, of whom 9 were ex-servicemen, organized Gamma Sigma without any membership restrictions whatever on race, creed, or color. The only criteria were character and individual appreciation. Its members today include a Chinese who came to the United States from Indonesia with his family, a Japanese student from Tokyo, an Albanian, a German youth who arrived here via England, and the son of a Cuban educator.

The fraternity has achieved a high scholastic average. It is permanently established in a house on the university's fraternity row. * * *

One suspects that Gamma Sigma's members have received an education from one another as valuable as anything they have been taught in the classroom. They are certainly far better equipped to live in a world in which, if it is to survive, whole nations must revise their concept of fraternity.

Russia Invokes Help of Security Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, well, anything can happen. Russia now warns that the United States and Great Britain

will have to notify them of any move we make in the Far East. They say our intended plan of liberating countries is a direct violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and that before we can make any move we shall have to get a permit from the Security Council of the United Nations. What has happened? All at once the Russians have an urge to bring the power and authority of the United Nations to the front. They did not take this attitude while stirring up their underlings to start in on aggression. We have such positive evidence of this that simply to state the situation is proof enough.

We agreed with Russia that we would pull out of Korea, with the provision that she would do likewise. We kept our promise and did pull out. Knowing the dictators of Russia as we must have known them, we never should have taken their word for anything. We got out, but the Russians, through the Red Chinese, came in and started a huge aggressive movement that would have swept the South Koreans into the seas. We intervened and went through all the expense in lives and property necessary to get back in to stop their aggression. Did Russia then think of the terms of the Charter of the United Nations that they now say we are violating? No; she did not. She carried out the principal of the manifesto of Karl Marx that any agreement with capitalistic nations is all right as long as it helps the Kremlin; but when the agreement bars the path to its further aggression, scrap it. That is what Russia did in Korea, but now when we merely talk about aiding helpless people, Russia points her finger at us and shouts, "You are violating the terms of the United Nations Charter. We will attend to peace in the Far East. That is our orbit."

For outright duplicity, deceit, perfidy, and degraded diplomacy, this is the worst history has ever recorded. The Russians know what the Charter of the United Nations is; they were instrumental in writing it. It is for them to use when they want it, when it complacently submits to the dictates of Russia, but to be in all things rejected when its terms may conflict with the program of the Kremlin for world domination.

After this recent blast of the Soviets are we going to play country dog, and with our tail between our legs streak for home? Or shall we finally make a stand so that these intriguing propagandists will have something to chew over before they take it upon themselves to run our business before we ask for it?

Since Russia now complains that we are making moves not authorized by the Security Council of the United Nations, we should ask just what authority this Council has bestowed upon them to take charge of the peace in the Far East. The Security Council has not yet spoken on this subject. Is Russia so sure of having the support of that Council that they can act with impunity, while demanding that we conform to their interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations? They may be right, for they were openly active in framing that charter, and they would not approve anything that would not accrue to their advantage.

Questionnaire to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the 4th District of California have again shown an alert interest in their Government by responding in large numbers to the most recent of my yearly questionnaires. One out of every six voters was asked to participate. To this date, almost 20 percent have answered.

I am greatly encouraged by this response. It is an indication of the vitality of our form of government. The following tabulation may be of interest to my colleagues:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent		
1. If the Federal budget is balanced this year, would you favor some reduction in the national debt before taxes are lowered?	68	30	2
2. Do you favor increased appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enlarge the Government's program of medical research?	70	27	3
3. (*a*) Recognizing that United States aid to Europe is dwindling, would you favor more economic assistance to areas such as the Middle East and Asia?	43	53	4
(*b*) Do you believe the administration should be given authority to enter into long-range commitments for economic assistance needed in these areas?	27	65	8
4. The administration is again recommending a limited program of public housing for urban redevelopment. Do you believe some of these public housing units should be set aside for occupancy by aged citizens?	80	16	4
5. Although it is generally agreed that our Federal highway system should be modernized, a controversy has developed over the method of financing. Do you favor (*a*) Using the Government's credit to obtain money now and pay off the debt over a long period; or (*b*) increasing the fuel, tire, license and other highway-user taxes to provide the money on a pay-as-you-go basis? [1]	(*a*) 39	(*b*) 55	5
6. In view of the continuing depressed level of farm income, several proposals have been made for assistance to farmers. Do you favor (*a*) Government payments to farmers for keeping part of their acreage out of production, coupled with flexible price supports; or (*b*) return to rigid farm price supports at 90 percent of parity? [1]	(*a*) 45	(*b*) 27	14
7. Would you favor a Federal program to reinsure private voluntary health insurance plans to make these plans available to more people at lower rates?	64	33	3
8. Would you be willing to pay increased social-security payroll deductions in order to finance liberalization of benefits, such as raising minimum social-security payments, lowering the age at which payments can be received, etc.?	63	33	4
9. President Eisenhower has recommended "that the number of persons admitted to this country annually be based not on the 1920 census but on the 1950 census. Provision should be made to allow for greater flexibility in the use of quotas so if one country does not use its share, the vacancies may be made available for the use of qualified individuals from other countries." Do you agree?	59	38	3
10. Among those who favor a Federal program to assist in school construction, a controversy has developed. Do you favor (*a*) Using Federal credit to assist school districts in raising their own money; or (*b*) direct grants by the Federal Government? [1]	(*a*) 68	(*b*) 23	5

[1] The difference between 100 percent and the totals in Nos. 5, 6, and 10 is attributable to those who rejected both alternatives or offered solutions of their own.

Address of United States Representative James C. Davis, of Georgia, to Joint Session of the General Assembly of Georgia, January 24, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 24, 1956, our colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, a Representative in the Congress from the State of Georgia, delivered a masterful address before a joint session of the General Assembly of Georgia in the capitol at Atlanta. The invitation extended to Judge DAVIS to speak in that forum is evidence of the high esteem in which he is held by the people of Georgia. It constitutes an appropriate recognition of his integrity, character, and ability by the citizens of his own State, a compliment which he richly merits and deserves.

I have read, studied, and considered the address carefully. It is a dignified, yet forceful, and able discussion of a subject very close to the heart of every true American. The fundamental principles upon which our country was established and which we cherish are being threatened and jeopardized by flagitious influences. At such a time as this we are fortunate to have Judge DAVIS and others like him in the public life of America. He has talent and courage. He is unafraid to express his convictions and to inveigh against these evils whether speaking to the General Assembly of Georgia or the Congress of the United States.

I am proud to have the privilege of knowing the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS. Under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks, I am glad to include in the RECORD his address hereinbefore referred to. I commend it to every thoughtful American who appreciates and prizes our liberty and freedom.

The address is as follows:

Lieutenant Governor Vandiver, Speaker Moate, and members of the house and senate, I deeply appreciate the high privilege and great honor which you bestowed upon me in extending the invitation to address this honorable assembly.

This is the 10th year I have represented my district and State in Congress. There I have been duly impressed with the magnificence of our Capitol city and with the greatness of our Government. Yet I have never lost sight of the fundamental truth

that the strength of our great Government lies not in the size of its buildings, the hugeness of its appropriations, or the pomp and ceremony with which its affairs are conducted.

Rather the strength of our Government lies in the individuality of the citizenry all across this broad land of ours who maintain this Government; in our love of liberty, our devotion to freedom, our capacity for self-government and self-support, and the maintenance of strong State and local governments, the principle upon which this Nation was founded, and upon which it has become great.

In the resolution extending the invitation to my colleague, Congressman FLYNT, and to me, you have expressed your concern regarding pending legislation in the United States Congress on the subject of Federal aid to education. Your concern is justified. This is a subject which needs and deserves the prayerful thought and study, not only of the Congress, but of all the people, especially those officials who, like yourselves, administer the affairs of our State and local governments.

On the one hand we see the rapidly growing population of our country, having increased from 150½ million in 1950 to 165½ million in 1955 with an increase in children of school age during that same period of 6,158,000. This has brought to many sections overcrowded schools, and a great need for more school construction. The Federal Government has in some degree, where increased school population has resulted from operation of Federal Government agencies, contributed to the cost of school construction, and in small measure to maintenance and operation expense. In those areas with which I am familiar, however, this Federal contribution has been inadequate. Because of the smallness of these contributions no great voice in the control of our school systems has been sought by the Federal Government.

Now, however, the President has proposed the sizable contribution of $1¼ billion for school construction and the bill reported out by the committee calls for $1.6 billion. As the time draws near for consideration of this legislation, and its passage or rejection, threats are being made by those who traditionally have displayed hostility to our section who traditionally have sought to meddle in the conduct of our affairs, that they will attach conditions to the use of this money which we in Georgia could under no circumstances accept or tolerate. There is not a scintilla of doubt in my mind as to what will be the proper course of action if acceptance of Federal money means also acceptance of Federal control. If the only way we can obtain Federal school funds is to accept them with strings attached, then I say with no hesitation whatsoever, the answer is "No." That would be my answer and my vote in the Congress, and I am confident that would be your answer and your vote here in the Georgia Legislature upon this resolution now pending before you.

We face a very serious question in this respect: If the bill is voted, and either now or next year a condition is imposed that none of this money will be allotted to a State where segregated schools are maintained, the taxpayers of Georgia will be in the unfortunate position of having to pay our part of the taxes to raise the money, without getting a dollar of it for our own use. It would go to States willing to accept it with conditions attached, and be denied to us because we will not accept it with conditions attached, which to us are repulsive, unacceptable, and intolerable.

The conditions placed in the pending bill by the committee call for too much Federal control. Our Georgia member on the committee, Congressman PHIL LANDRUM, voted against the bill in the committee. As the bill now stands, I believe a majority of the Georgia delegation in the House will vote against it because of too much Federal control. In approving or disapproving the State plans for spending the money, the Federal Commissioner of Education, under the bill, has almost unlimited discretion. How would that discretion be exercised?

As we seek the answer to this and other questions involved, what are the facts? What is the attitude of the Federal Government toward this question, the legislative department, the executive department, and the judicial department? We must be realistic as we answer these questions.

Our present dilemma and the threat to our public school system is not the result of Federal legislative action. The United States Congress has consistently refused to join in the unconstitutional illegal efforts which have been made to take away from the States control of our own local affairs.

But the executive department, headed by the President, and the judicial department headed by the Supreme Court, have joined hands to bypass Congress, and to bring about changes in our Constitution and laws through irregular and unconstitutional means—changes which they have not been able to induce Congress to make through regular and constitutional legislative action. The Supreme Court in the past few years has been usurping the power to make laws and to amend the Constitution. The Court does not possess either of those powers.

The United States Attorney General, of course, with the approval of the President, filed a brief in the Supreme Court, urging that segregation be declared unconstitutional.

The people and the States are being made the victims of a conspiracy of radical-thinking individuals and organizations, many of whom are subversive. The spearhead of this conspiracy is the radical organization, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, many of whose officers have had long records of association with subversive and Communist-front groups, which has been thoroughly exposed through material from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This radical group has been aided and abetted by other loud, noise-making minority pressure groups.

While the great majority of the right-thinking, right-living men and women of the United States have been carrying on the necessary daily functions of paying the taxes which support all of the governments of this Nation, cities, counties, States, and Federal, supporting our schools, growing the crops which must feed and clothe our population, operating our factories, financing our banks, and carrying on the myriad tasks necessary for our great Nation to maintain its rightful place in the world, this radical organization, conniving with other radical groups such as the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, and allied radical pressure groups have been pushing that conspiracy to bypass Congress and amend our Constitution and change our laws through fraudulent court decisions and dictatorial Executive orders from the White House.

Political blackmail is the chosen method through which these radical groups have sought and are with great success seeking to impose their will upon a protesting, unwilling people.

All over this country vigorous protests are being made by white people who intend to remain white, and to keep our white institutions free from forced intermingling with other races.

It is shameful to note the extent to which those who seek political power in this country are willing to pander and capitulate to noisy minority pressure groups, whose political influence actually has been magnified far beyond its actual strength.

It is shameful that the President of the United States for political expediency has permitted these radical pressure groups to influence him to issue orders creating a new FEPC Commission, and other similar orders to destroy and tear down wise customs and practices which are as old as civilization itself, and which in fact, do not represent the real attitude of the President himself.

In his present efforts to pander to the Negro voters of this country, he now boasts that he has eliminated the last vestige of segregation in all of the branches and departments of our Armed Forces. Yet in 1948 when he was a General in the Army, and not a candidate for any elective public office he testified before a congressional committee that he was in favor of keeping the Negro soldiers in small units of their own; that they could not compete successfully with white soldiers for promotions and that "if we attempt merely by passing a lot of laws to force someone to like someone else, we are just going to get into trouble." (P. 996, Senate UMT hearings, Apr. 2, 1948.)

The President boasts that he and the Republican Party have been instrumental in turning the vast hordes of Negro pupils in upon the white children in the classrooms of Washington, D. C., where the Negroes constitute two-thirds of the school population of that city. Yet at the very moment he makes this boast that he has imposed this radical change upon the white children of our Nation's Capital, his own grandson is carried by automobile to an Episcopal school in Alexandria, Va., where tuition must be paid for his schooling, although his son, Maj. John Eisenhower, resides upon the post at Fort Belvoir, Va., where his son is in easy walking distance of a nonsegregated school, attended by both whites and blacks, and which the Eisenhower child could also attend without the necessity of transportation, and without paying any tuition whatever.

Yet the President is using his great power as the Chief Executive of this country to force our boys and girls in the various branches of our Armed Forces to live, eat, and sleep with Negroes, and to force our children into integrated schools with them, a practice in which he does not believe, and which his own flesh and blood do not follow. There are mothers and fathers in Georgia today who know their sons are being forced to live with Negroes against their will in the armed services. There is no wonder that the armed services are having a hard time getting men to enlist and reenlist.

The apostles of integration and mongrelization, the Communist Party, the NAACP, the American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action, and other radical organizations and individuals of the same stripe and odor are busy endeavoring to create the impression that segregation is being voluntarily abandoned, and that integration is being voluntarily accepted.

Nothing is further from the truth. Integration of the races is not voluntary. On the contrary segregation is voluntary. Wherever integration has taken place, it has been forced upon the people. Wherever segregation has been abolished, it has been over the vigorous protest of those affected. It is not voluntary in the Army. It was put into effect by Executive order, and men have to render at least 2 years military service. It is not voluntary in our political primaries. That came by a court order.

Time and time again where people in various States have had the opportunity to vote upon FEPC proposals, FEPC laws have been rejected.

Throughout this Nation for generations property owners have protected themselves and their communities against invasion by colored hordes through restrictive clauses in their deeds to real estate. The Supreme Court struck down those clauses. Where there have been any sizable groups of Negroes, it has been the almost unvarying custom for whites to live in white sections and Negroes to live in Negro sections. White people have maintained white schools

and white colleges and universities. White people have also maintained Negro schools and Negro colleges and universities. The contributions of Negroes to their own institutions of learning and their own public schools have been negligible. In 1950 I obtained from the records of DeKalb County the cost of operating the Negro schools in that county and the amount of taxes paid for school purposes by the Negroes of that county. The figures showed that the property-owning Negroes of DeKalb County paid a total amount of schools taxes of $1,925.35, or less than $1 per school year for the 2,042 Negro children who attended the county public schools. Yet DeKalb County spent that year an average of $85.33 per pupil. DeKalb County paid $2,000 each to operate four Negro school buses to haul Negro children to the county public schools, a total school bus expense for them of $8,000. The amount of school taxes paid by the Negroes was not enough to haul even one-fourth of their children to the schoolhouse door, and nothing for operating the schools themselves.

The white people have carried this burden, and have carried it uncomplainingly. It has been well known that the Negroes could not and would not provide educational facilities through their own efforts. Had their school opportunities and facilities been limited to such as they would have provided for themselves, it is doubtful if provision would have been made for Negro children, as a whole, to finish the first grade.

Over half the States of this Union have laws upon their statute books preventing the intermarriage of whites and blacks. In many of the States of this Union our political systems were built upon a system of white primaries, in which the white people of the States, the counties, and the cities could express their choice as white Democrats. The bar associations, the medical societies, and the professions have generally followed a policy of segregating themselves according to races. This is the custom which has been followed in schools, in politics, in residential developments, in industry, religion, and society in general. As far back as history goes, this has been the recorded pattern upon which civilization has been based. America grew to be the greatest country following this pattern. Under it our churches have grown and prospered, and we now have missionaries in practically every land on this globe which is populated by a colored race or a mongrel race trying to keep alive a spark of the Christian religion in those lands where colored and mongrel populations have demonstrated that they do not have the stamina to perpetuate and keep alive the Christian religion and it has lived through the centuries only by the efforts of the white race.

Yet these noisy advocates of integration and mongrelization have within the past 20 years successfully organized a conspiracy to thwart the will of the great majority of the people in this country through bypassing the legislative department of our Government, the Congress, and through the connivance of the executive department and the Supreme Court, have step by step, through so-called judicial decisions and Executive orders endeavored to destroy the accepted practices of our people and to force this repulsive pattern upon an unwilling people.

The people in Chicago, Ill., do not want to live among Negroes any more than the people in Atlanta, Ga., and proved it by staging a riot which lasted for more than a year when radicals behind the integration movement there arranged for a Negro to move into an all-white residential section. In Los Angeles, Calif., which boasts that it is broad-minded, a long-standing custom was broken and a few Negro firemen were moved into white firehouses. This was so repulsive and disagreeable to the white firemen, who were unwilling to sleep and eat with the Negro firemen, that the fire chief of Los Angeles reestablished the all-white firehouses, and told the mayor and council they could fire him if they saw fit, but he would not order the Negroes back into the white firehouses.

President Eisenhower, in his efforts to make a second Harlem out of Washington, D. C., has, through his three appointed City Commissioners ordered a few Negro firemen into some of the white firehouses there. It is meeting with the same protest and resistance.

So diligent have the integrationists and mongrelizers become in Washington that an announcement has been made by officials of the Federal and city governments that the doors of all federally owned property will be closed to the boys' clubs of the Nation's Capital if they continue to operate as white boys' clubs and Negro boys' clubs. These clubs have been financed to the extent of $330,000 principally by white people through voluntary contributions, although there are 14,000 Negroes enrolled in the boys' clubs and only 8,000 whites. The clubs have taken boys off the streets with recreational activities in winter, and camps in summer. Yet one church in Washington has already closed the doors of a meeting place formerly used by a white boys' club, and thus deprived a group of fine white children the benefit of the wholesome influences of the boys' club program because the club and its board of governors refused to have this unacceptable intermingling forced upon them. What a fine demonstration of Christianity.

In Delaware where a school board announced mixed schools would be ordered another near riot occurred and separate schools were restored. In Washington, D. C., the mixed school order is deeply resented. White people are moving out of Washington into nearby Virginia in great numbers. In June 1955, the exodus of white people from Washington had resulted in a public school system composed of 61 percent Negro pupils and 39 percent white. These figures were reported in the U. S. News & World Report of June 10. The same article reported that white people who could afford it were moving out of predominantly Negro school districts. There is still another deplorable consequence. The article also reported, and I quote verbatim from it:

"Washington educators expressed shock at learning how far the general educational level of the Capital's Negroes is below that of the whites.

"The result, many school principals say, has been that the learning pace within most of the mixed schools has been slowed down to keep step with the general run of Negro pupils."

Thus one of the immediate and obvious results of mixing the schools in Washington is that white children will be held back because the Negro children have shown they cannot keep the pace.

This exodus of white people from Washington to avoid the mixed schools reported in June last year was not a temporary flare-up. It has not only continued; it has increased. The U. S. News & World Report 6 months later, in its November 25 issue reported as follows, and I quote verbatim from the article entitled "Mixed Schools—Second Year," as follows:

"More and more white pupils leave Washington.

"Negroes are pouring into Washington, white families leaving in droves. Result: A basic change in the population in the Nation's Capital.

"In schools 64 percent of students now are Negroes. In some residential areas, Negroes take over.

"Twenty years ago, 64 percent of the pupils in the city's public schools were white, 36 percent Negroes. Today this is reversed—64 percent Negroes, 36 percent whites. These figures are disclosed by new official count.

"Washington now has a greater proportion of Negroes in the public schools than any other large United States city."

This article also pointed out what everyone familiar with Washington knows, that the rush of white people to get out of Washington has been stepping up since 1948 when the Supreme Court, as a part of its program of usurping legislative functions, changed the law to invalidate restrictive covenants in deeds to real estate. This permitted Negroes to move into white neighborhoods, making them less desirable, and running down the value of the property.

Proof that white people do not intend to mix with Negroes, and cannot be forced to do so, is the manner in which the white people of Washington treated the order of the Federal Government abolishing segregation in federally owned swimming pools. Washington is a hot city in the summertime, and prior to the issuing of this order by the Federal Government, the white swimming pools have been crowded. When the order was issued in 1949 and 1950, it did not result in whites and Negroes swimming together, it simply resulted in the previously white swimming pools becoming Negro swimming pools, as the white people abandoned them to the Negroes.

Resentment of white people manifests itself in every section of our country—North, East, and West, as well as South over these efforts to force the unnatural practice of mixing the races. In Chicago, in many sections, a determined white population has successfully resisted forcible efforts to destroy their residential segregation pattern. This has been done although Illinois has had a governor, and Chicago has had a mayor who have sought by forcible means to ram this integration policy down their unwilling throats.

In Chicago on August 11, 1953, 1,500 persons rioted in protest over a Negro family being moved into Trumbull Park Homes in the South Deering section of the city.

The police commissioner had to send 3 shifts of 250 policemen, or 750 per day to keep down the violent rioting. On one occasion 1,250 policemen were called out.

The commissioner was quoted 16 days later, on August 27 as saying that racial disturbances had required the service of 12 percent of his 6,889 man force—in other words 826 policemen spent all of their time working with racial trouble.

Under these circumstances the battle was carried on in Trumbull Park Homes for more than a year. The Negro family was finally moved out, and then brought a damage suit against the Chicago Housing Authority. In 1 year there was more racial trouble in Chicago than in the whole South put together, and it resulted from efforts to force intermingling between whites and blacks.

Thank Almighty God that we do not have that kind of governor in Georgia willing to join hands with a packed Supreme Court and an appeasement-minded Chief Executive in destroying our Constitution. I thank Him that we have in Georgia a governor who has said:

"I speak for the people of Georgia when I say that we accept this challenge. We accept it with the firm assertion that we shall not surrender to this Court the inalienable rights of our sovereign State. We shall not surrender our right to conduct and regulate our own educational institutions. The State created them. The State built them. The State finances them. The State shall run them."

I am thankful that we have a lieutenant governor who is holding up the hands of the Governor in this crisis.

I am grateful that we have in Georgia filling the high office of attorney general an official who has the intelligence and ability to recognize this fraudulent scheme for the sorry thing it is, and the energy and courage to expose it and its backers not only to our people here at home, but in areas where hotbeds of radicalism exist in other sections of

the country. I am grateful for the determined attitude of Georgia people who voted by a substantial majority to amend our Constitution so that if worst comes to worst, and the public schools in Georgia could only be operated as nonsegregated and mixed schools, this intolerable thing can be avoided by elimination of public schools entirely and the teaching of our children in private schools.

I am grateful for this legislature and its officials who are resolutely and determinedly enacting a program of legislation to keep within our own hands the conduct of our own affairs.

I am grateful for the chief justice of the Georgia Supreme Court, who wrote the opinion, and for the six associate justices who joined with him in a unanimous opinion by that court in the case of *Williams* v. *State of Georgia* in which the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia said to the Supreme Court of the United States:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. * * * (Constitution of the United States, 10th amendment). Even though executives and legislators, not being constitutional lawyers, might often overstep the foregoing unambiguous constitutional prohibition of Federal invasion of State jurisdiction, there can never be an acceptable excuse for judicial failure to strictly observe it. This court bows to the Supreme Court on all Federal questions of law but we will not supinely surrender sovereign powers of this State."

This was a courageous declaration by the highest court of our State warning the United States Supreme Court to stay out of our State affairs—a declaration to one and all that the State of Georgia knows her rights, and will have them. It was a stinging and merited rebuke.

This same group of sociologists on the Federal Supreme Court, of whom only 2 out of the 9 ever had judicial experience before going on the Supreme Court bench, are throwing up some trial balloons to test public opinion upon the important question of invalidating State marriage laws, as they threw up trial balloons to test public opinion upon the segregated school issue, and to acclimatize public opinion to it before the blow was finally struck.

In Virginia the law prohibits interracial marriages, which is the case in 28 of the States of this Union. The Virginia Supreme Court, pursuant to that law, declared invalid a marriage between a Chinese seaman and a white woman, and annulled the marriage. The Chinaman appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court an ' asked that Virginia's marriage law be declared in violation of the 14th amendment.

I do not think the Federal Supreme Court would hesitate to strike down the marriage laws of Virginia and 27 other States if these sociologist experts felt that public opinion would accept such a shocking decision. They know that public opinion will not accept it, and they want to kick the case back and forth for a while between Washington and Richmond to give the Communist Daily Worker, the so-called liberal press, the NAACP, the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the other integrationists and mongrelizers some time in which to condition the public mind for a judicial decision striking down the last legal barrier which stands in the path of mongrelization. The Supreme Court entered an order vacating the judgment, and sending the case back to the State court, for further action, saying that it wanted additional evidence as to whether Virginia's courts had jurisdiction in the case.

In rejecting this further attempt of the Federal Supreme Court to meddle in affairs belonging exclusively to the State, the Supreme Court of Virginia joined the Supreme Court of Georgia in refusing to recognize the right of the Federal tribunal to remand cases to the State courts "for further action" where no ground for reversal is shown in the record. The Virginia Supreme Court on January 18, last Wednesday notified the Federal Supreme Court that it refused to take further action.

It is a deplorable thing that the highest Court in our land, charged more than any other agency of our Government with the duty of preserving our Constitution, has so departed from its proper function that it now must be rebuked by State courts resisting its illegal efforts to guide them into wrong channels.

So repugnant are its sociological theories becoming that when a Federal court of appeals, following the Supreme Court's school opinion, ordered a United States district judge in Ohio to issue an order ending segregation in the grade schools at Hillsboro, Ohio, the district judge refused to issue the order, and demanded that he himself be given a hearing before the Supreme Court, and that the case be carried there in his own name.

It is a deplorable situation indeed when our people and our State courts must fight for the preservation of constitutional rights with the very agency of Government to whom we should be able to look with confidence as the ultimate guardian and protector of those rights.

But such is the situation.

As we survey the situation today we see that we in Georgia do not stand alone. We have led in this fight, and I believe the bold and courageous stand which we have taken in Georgia has been an inspiration to those in other States to brand this unconstitutional decision as an unwarranted invasion of the rights of States and of the people, and to take steps to effectively resist it.

We know that the Constitution is not, as some would have us believe, what the judges say it is. It has no such unstable or uncertain meaning. The Constitution, and all of its amendments, is the compact of the sovereign States who consented to its operation. It is the document under which we live—which we understand, and which the courts have understood for years and generations. Its meaning has been proclaimed again and again. It is the document which every public official is sworn to uphold, and to which the loyalty of every public official is due. And let us never lose sight of this fact—that our loyalty is to the Constitution itself—not to a perverted opinion of nine men who happen for the moment to be occupying seats in the Supreme Court, and who seek because of that fact to change the true meaning, the established and accepted meaning of our Constitution. That authority does not belong to these nine men. It belongs to two-thirds of the membership of Congress and to three-fourths of the States, joining in concurrent action.

As we assert our position in this fight for our rights, determined people of other States are standing shoulder to shoulder with us.

In May of 1954 the Louisiana Legislature adopted a resolution by a vote of 84 to 3 in the house and 32 to 1 in the senate calling the Supreme Court action an unwarranted and unprecedented abuse of power, and declaring among other things that racial integration in schools is "clearly intolerable, impractical, and in the ultimate sense of the word, unenforceable upon the free people of the sovereign State." They followed that up in July 1954 by the passage of three bills by an overwhelming vote enabling Louisiana to use its inherent police power to continue public-school segregation despite the United States Supreme Court's decision. The people of that State have just elected a governor pledged to continue segregation of schools in the State.

The Legislature of Florida in July 1955 adopted a resolution proclaiming that the end of segregation in its schools would jeopardize the public health and safety; that it would tend to encourage the abhorrent, execrable, and revolting practice of miscegenation which is a criminal offense in Florida; that it would create a mongrel breed. The resolution asserted the aim of the Florida Legislature to provide equal facilities for maintaining the system of segregation in Florida's public schools and deplored any effort of the United States or any agency thereof to invade and usurp the rightful powers of the State of Florida by fostering integration of the two races in the public-school system.

The people of Virginia have voted 2 to 1 for the Gray Commission plan to retain segregated schools in Virginia. South Carolina and Mississippi have taken affirmative steps to join the increasing list of States determined to resist the unconstitutional usurpation of authority by the Supreme Court.

There is another matter which your honorable body may consider during the present session, and that is whether the Georgia Legislature wishes to adopt a resolution similar to the one which 34 of Virginia's 40 senators sponsored and introduced in that body last Thursday. The resolution provides that Virginia for its part asserts it has never surrendered its powers to maintain racially segregated schools. Secondly, Virginia challenges "the usurped authority that would inflict incalculable harm to the public schools," and would disrupt the education of her children. Thirdly, Virginia appeals to her sister States to join in applying to Congress to call a constitutional convention to oppose an amendment "designed to settle the issue of contested power here asserted."

The resolution further provides that until the question is settled "by clear constitutional amendment, we pledge our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably, legally, and constitutionally available to us to resist this illegal encroachment on our sovereign powers."

This is a fight in which there is no halfway ground and no middle course. Halfway measures will not win this fight. Vigorous, aggressive, and continuing action is required. There are suits pending now in Savannah asking that Negroes be admitted to white public-housing projects. Federal courts have already admitted them in other jurisdictions. Suits are pending to admit them to the university and grammar and high schools. But this school segregation issue is only a part of the problem. The ultimate aim of the NAACP and its allied radical organizations is not merely to abolish segregation in the schools of the Nation. The ultimate aim is to pressure the Supreme Court into declaring our marriage laws unconstitutional, and require all States to recognize intermarriage between the races as legal.

One of the Negroes who claims to represent the views of the NAACP stated in a magazine article as long ago as 1952 that the aim of the Negro is intermarriage with white people. It is a blind person indeed who is not now aware of that purpose. Unless we reject this school decision in toto, another Supreme Court decision holding that our marriage laws violate the 14th amendment is as certain to follow as night follows the day.

In conclusion let me say to you with all the sincerity and earnestness of which I am capable that the answer to this monstrous threat we face is organization. Too long we have permitted those who plot our downfall aided by some of our own false leaders, to deceive us and lull us to sleep with assurances that Negroes only wanted equal facilities and fair treatment. They have advised the white people against taking organized action to prevent destruction of our institutions and our way of life. Events of the past few years have shown the wrongness of that attitude. The time is here now to view the situation

with realism. The time is here now to organize—not for violence—not for lawlessness, but to organize to combine into one strong, unified, determined group to retain our State sovereignty which we have never surrendered; to unite with other States, their officials, and their people; to keep within our own hands the right to conduct our own affairs; and to resist vigorously, aggressively, and successfully this and any other attempt on the part of a perverted court to take from us these sacred rights which are ours—the right to conduct our own affairs in the manner we choose and the right to protect and preserve our own ways—rights which were given to us by our own parents and forebears, and which we are dutybound to hand to our children and our descendants.

Upper Colorado River Bill Before Congress Not Approved by Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado River storage project bill now before the House does not represent the bill approved by the administration. The bill's projects are different—the administration recommended authorization of 2 storage units, Glen Canyon and Echo Park, and 11 participating reclamation projects, at an estimated construction cost of $930 million.

The House bill authorizes 4 storage units—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho—and 11 participating projects recommended by the Secretary. It also in section 2 provides what is tantamount to an advance commitment of the Congress to authorize 23 additional reclamation projects.

The Bureau of the Budget definitely recommended against authorization at this time of Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho. In addition, the administration recommended that the legislation provide that authorization of the 11 participating projects be conditioned on a new finding of favorable economic justification and of financial feasibility under specified financial requirements, with reports submitted to the Congress on each project; and that new studies of direct agricultural benefits be made jointly with the Department of Agriculture.

The bill contains no provision whatever for the reevaluation so specified by the administration and hence ignores this important requirement set forth as a condition precedent to administration approval.

Financial repayment features are basically contrary to those approved and recommended by the administration. The administration set up as a requirement that all reimbursable costs of the project should be repaid in 50 years, together with interest on the unamortized balance of the investments in power and municipal water supply features.

The bill departs materially from the specified repayment criteria. It would attempt to adhere to repayment of the irrigation investment in 50 years, but would do so by the device of extending the repayment period for the power investment to not exceed 100 years, or twice the 50-year repayment period specified by the administration.

Upper Colorado Storage Scheme Cries for Additional Hearings Before Presentation to House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the proposed upper Colorado River storage scheme should have much more study by the House Interior Committee on testimony of witnesses, and upon reports from the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget before it ever comes before the House.

The projects proposed to be authorized, the repayment provisions of the bill, and the economic and financial aspects thereof have never been fully reported upon by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget.

On the contrary, the reports received from those agencies recommended authorization of only 2 storage units, Glen and Echo—1 of which, Echo, has been excluded from the pending bill, H. R. 3383, although it is included for authorization in the bill, S. 500, passed by the Senate—and 11 reclamation projects. However, with respect to the 11 reclamation projects, the draft of legislation recommended by the Secretary of the Interior specified that their economic justification should be reexamined before construction should proceed. This request is ignored and omitted from H. R. 3383.

The bill proposes authorization of three storage units, Flaming Gorge, Navaho, Curecanti, which were not approved for authorization by the Secretary and the Budget Bureau.

Moreover, the Secretary and the Budget Bureau have never reported upon or approved the proposed repayment provisions of H. R. 3383, particularly the 100-year repayment period proposed for power features of the project. On the contrary, a 50-year repayment of the power investments was specified by these agencies, with interest on the unamortized investment.

In the recent report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy transmitted to the Congress by the President, it was concluded and recommended that the economic life of reclamation projects should not be considered to exceed 50 years for evaluation purposes. Of course, the proposal in the pending bill of 100 years' repayment is totally unrealistic and unsound.

There are many unresolved questions as to engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the proposed projects which demand further study and report before Congress acts on this proposal. Even in the case of the major storage unit proposed for authorization, Glen Canyon, which is estimated to produce some 85 percent of the prospective power revenues, the evidence available indicates that there are serious questions with respect to the geologic formations of the reservoir affecting the functioning of this unit which demand further investigation before authorization. Moreover, the plans for the dam itself and its probable cost have not been adequately determined, lending uncertainty to the financial soundness of this unit which is set up to be the cash register of the upper basin development.

All these unresolved questions affecting the engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the projects proposed in H. R. 3383 should be reviewed by an impartial board of qualified engineers and experts and reported upon before Congress takes any further action. Such a board of review and procedure is recommended by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy for all water resources projects. The proposed upper Colorado River storage project, with its intricate web of engineering and financial arrangements, cries out for such a review.

Michigan's Neglected Gem: Isle Royale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of Congress to one of the most beautiful spots in America, Michigan's Isle Royale. This national park, located 600 miles from Detroit, and 450 miles from Chicago, is the second largest island in the United States.

This island park, located within driving distance of 35 million people, should be one of the most popular spots in America and yet less than 5,000 persons visited Isle Royale in 1955. Why?

The situation is a result of inadequate accommodations for tourists on the island and lack of transportation to and from the mainland. Somewhat of a frustrating cycle exists in this instance, for until more cabins and hotels are constructed to house tourists, it will not be profitable to operate expanded boat service to Isle Royale. It is regrettable that, for want of funds, our citizens are denied access to one of Nature's finest playgrounds.

Some of the sights to be seen in this park are not to be found anywhere else in the Midwest. A herd of 300 moose roam the island; wolves and coyotes are heard after the moon comes up, and the fishing along virgin shores and inland lakes is a caster's delight.

What is needed to make Isle Royale the vacationland it should be? Living quarters, such as hotels, motels, and

shelters for campers are needed, plus docking facilities for private boats and a seaplane for summer patrol.

I hope that the Park Service, which has fared well this year at the hands of the Appropriations Committee, will not be unmindful of Isle Royale and its needs for the benefit of the lovers of the great outdoors.

Upper Colorado River Project—Weather Control Makes It a White Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there has been an important scientific development since the upper Colorado River project was conceived which makes such project, if possible, even less economic and more unfeasible than ever before.

The development is weather modification or control, commonly known as rainmaking.

The President's Advisory Committee on Weather Control has just made its report to the President. Additional precipitation of water through cloud seeding and similar weather modification methods has been proven, and acceptable methods of measurement of the degree of success of obtaining precipitation over normal have been found.

The President's Advisory Committee has studied the possibilities of additional water for the Colorado River through weather control operations in the upper Colorado watershed and has stated that if the precipitation can be brought to 20 percent above the normal—that is, what it would be for a given year without such weather control—the upper river basin runoff for dry years would be increased by approximately 3 million acre-feet; for normal years by approximately 4,500,000 acre-feet; and for wet years by approximately 5,700,000 acre-feet.

Dr. Irving Krick, meteorologist of Denver, Colo., who has carried out many such weather modification projects including studies and test work in the Upper Colorado watershed, states that a 20 percent increase in precipitation is an exceedingly conservative estimate and that the average increase of precipitation over normal in other projects has approximated 50 percent. If the 50 percent figure were used for the upper Colorado Basin, the additional runoff in dry seasons would be about 7 million acre-feet and for normal seasons would be more than 11 million acre-feet.

The upper Colorado River project now before Congress creates no additional water. It merely impounds water that is in the river anyway. It actually causes the available water to be decreased because it is admitted even by the proponents of the project that close to 1 million acre-feet would be evaporated into the air annually from the proposed reservoirs.

The water that would be brought to the Colorado River by weather control—rain-making—in the upper Colorado River watershed is more than the needs of the upper basin area. It can be used on its way down to the main river from the snowpacks, rainfalls, and so forth, to give moisture to pasture lands. It can be impounded here and there near its sources in small reservoirs to take care of the needs of present or proposed irrigation projects in the upper basin and then it can go down to the river for use below Lees Ferry.

The cost of such small impounding dams above various points of use would be small compared with the nearly $1 million for the project as proposed in the bill.

The cost of obtaining this added runoff would approximate—according to the President's Advisory Committee—less than 50 cents per acre-foot or about $1 million per year. On Dr. Krick's estimate of a greater precipitation the annual cost per acre-foot would be much less than 50 cents.

This added water, as it passes into Lake Mead and through the Hoover powerplant, would be worth at least 50 cents per acre-foot for electric generation alone. But it then goes down the river where it can be used by various irrigation districts and water districts such as the Imperial and Coachella irrigation districts and the Metropolitan and San Diego water districts. The water for these purposes is worth more than $2 per acre-foot.

Thus, on a more than self-sustaining basis from the start and with an expenditure of approximately $1 million per year, all the nonpower objectives of the upper Colorado River project are met without the expenditure of nearly a billion dollars.

Furthermore, this increased precipitation will cause the water as it reaches points of use in the lower Colorado areas to have less salt content, whereas the evaporation of 1 million cubic feet a year resulting from the carrying through of the upper Colorado River project would admittedly cause the salt content of the water to increase materially. The water already carries about a ton of salt per acre-foot of water. Any increase of this salt content would require more water by the irrigator for leeching purposes and if the salt content increases greatly it would render such irrigator's soil worthless for purposes for which now used.

Weather modification in the upper Colorado Basin, in view of the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, should be tested for a few years before commitment is made for a billion-dollar project. The billion-dollar project will merely impound water already in the river and destroy part of its usefulness through evaporation. Weather modification at almost insignificant expense—which will be self-sustaining from the start—will create additional available water through increased precipitation and increased runoff.

The potential deficit of water in the Colorado River Basin is indicated by the President's Advisory Committee to be 9 or 10 million acre-feet per year. This cannot be produced by the project covered by the bill because no water is created. It can be produced without such project by simple and inexpensive weather control by cloud seeding, and so forth.

Dr. Krick has indicated his willingness to undertake such weather modification at actual out-of-pocket cost estimated at not to exceed $1 million per year and to take his fee for services on a contingent basis at the rate of a certain number of cents per acre-foot of water produced over normal for the year in question.

From the above it is clear, based on the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, that the Colorado River project cannot be justified from the standpoint of irrigation and domestic needs in either the upper or lower river basins.

Few who have considered in Congress the bill for the upper Colorado River project have known much about weather modification—rainmaking—and its possibilities in the upper Colorado Basin. What has been accomplished in this new field has been known only by a few. But the recent findings of the President's Advisory Committee change all this.

The upper Colorado River project bill should be sent back to the Interior Committee and carefully restudied in the light of this new development. It points the way to greater benefits for the areas and populations involved at far less cost.

Senator Langer Spent $2,400 Government Funds Making Trips Back to North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the reporter who took out after Senator LANGER for charging up an expense of $2,400 for trips to North Dakota really started something. LANGER is the luckiest politician I know of. He gets more publicity than anyone here, and invariably the charges against him are trivial. Several of his trips I know about, and each time he was doing a service to the people of North Dakota. His trip out in the mud to view the mistakes of the Army engineers who flooded 60,000 acres of the best land in Ramsey County unnecessarily was one trip, and all the others had to do with performing a service for the people of North Dakota. What about the other Senators and Representatives who traveled all over the known face of the earth this last summer and several summers before to view foreign countries to see what aid they could bring to people in Africa, India, Tasmania, Timbuktu, Greece, Italy, and the rest of Europe? These trips cost the Government for each Member many times LANGER'S bill for attending to the people of North Dakota. Probably half of the Congress made these foreign trips, and I haven't seen any statement of what it cost the people. But let a Sen-

ator spend his time at home looking after the people of this country and the newspapers have a spasm and go into a fit of apoplexy.

While we are in this frenzy over LANGER'S expense account, I am going to attempt to place before the people all the bills of the Members of the Senate and House who thought it necessary to look after the people of foreign countries. If I can do this LANGER'S expense account will look like a flyspeck on the map of North Dakota.

A Blank Check

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement based on information contained in a minority report on the Colorado River storage project bill. The bill is scheduled for the floor during the week beginning February 27.

Total costs of this Colorado River boondoggle are unknown. Therefore the bill in its proposed form amounts to a blank check to a Government construction agency which has been treated overgenerously already in the past.

Interest charges alone for the full period allowed for repayment are estimated at between $320 million and $1,153 million, or from 30 percent to more than 100 percent of the original estimated construction cost. This, of course, will be subject to revision upward should more participating projects be added, and there are many being talked of. They are of dubious value, to say the least.

Extension of the repayment period to the year 2032 is a departure from precedent and means that it is entirely probable that the year will be beyond the economic life of some of the units.

Almost complete dependence for repayment of the costs of the project upon a system of high-cost hydro projects amounts, in my mind along with the minds of the minority members of the committee, to fiscal necromancy.

There is much doubt that a ready market can be found for this high-cost power—at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. Sufficient evidence to justify dependence upon this source of revenue for repayment costs has not been presented. It is indeed doubtful that consumers will pay the high rates that will be needed for the liquidation of the cost of this project. These rates would necessarily be far above established rates at other reclamation projects.

It is strange, too, to have such dependence placed on hydropower near the center of the largest coal reserves in the Nation. These reserves need only to be mined to produce steam-generated power to the full extent of any foreseeable demand. The oil-shale deposits of the Colorado Plateau are another potential source of energy to compete with this high-cost hydropower.

I submit that this blank check project amounts to no more than the wildest of wild dreams to spend Government money for a wholly unnecessary source of power. This proposed project not only is financially unsound, but also is not reconcilable with the interests of common sense.

Export of Tanks to Saudi Arabia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in a very difficult dilemma as a result of halting and then approving the export of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia. This situation points up a need for clarification of our position in the tug of war in the Middle East.

The State Department should review its entire foreign policy with a view to reducing the cold war tensions that have been aggravating the Middle East for several years.

Far more caution would appear to be indicated. Certainly the evidence points to employment of such arms shipments in this struggle for power.

Even granting that we have made certain commitments to Saudi Arabia for assistance in return for permitting us to utilize an air base at Dhahran on Saudi Arabia's east coast, and granting that this base is of great strategic importance to the free world's maintenance of its security, it seems to me we are endangering the world's security by shipments of arms to nations which have openly demonstrated their readiness to go to war with each other.

War in any form must be avoided. Within our own lifetime we should have learned the bitter lesson that little wars grow inevitably into big wars.

Certainly there must be some other form of compensation we can make to Saudi Arabia than actual shipment of relatively modern armed tanks, these to a nation engaged in a grim struggle for power within an orbit that is patently in a powder-keg state.

In addition, the protests from Israel and other nations in the Middle East make it amply clear that concessions, such as this shipment of tanks, only place us in a position where other concessions must be made to nations adversely affected by the shipment.

The arms race between the Arab States and Israel already has resulted in armed clashes. Shipment of materials that could be converted to wartime use and outright assistance both from the Soviet Union and the United States have seemed to encourage these skirmishes.

History repeatedly has demonstrated the folly of such arms competition. In fairness, it must be admitted that we are today facing the uncomfortable fact that if we do not assist the Arab States, the Soviet Union will. In fact, the Soviet Union is now supplying some Arab States regardless of what action we may take.

Most of us are aware that the East-West rivalry has resulted from the simple fact that 75 percent of the Free World's proven oil reserves are held by Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, Bahrein, and Qatar. Western Europe receives most of its oil supplies from this area.

The benefits to the Soviet bloc from curtailing or disrupting this flow of oil from the Middle East are all too obvious. Most of these countries, while under the complete domination of hereditary rulers, are subject from day to day to Communist pressures.

In the face of this background of great riches and unrest, the United States has on the high seas a shipment of tanks. These 18 war machines undoubtedly will make a big difference in the balance of power between Israel and the Arab States.

We must consider carefully the consequences of such shipments.

I am not trying to hold any brief for or against the quarrels that have created this situation between the Arab States and Israel.

It is my conviction that we are courting world conflict if we continue a policy of shipping arms to nations, which in fact already are fighting each other.

Nothing for the Navahos in Upper Colorado River Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado storage project bill, H. R. 3383, would not assist the Navaho Indians.

It provides for the Navaho Dam and Reservoir, but not for the present construction of the Navaho project. However, the construction of the dam would have the effect of committing Congress to constructing the irrigation project works. The cost of the dam is estimated at $36,500,000; the irrigation project an additional $175 million. There are some 1,100 Navaho families involved, meaning a construction cost of close to $200,000 for each Navaho farm. This is just to bring water to the land and does not account for assistance which will undoubtedly be necessary for equipment to get the lands in production. This astounding cost should be most carefully considered before Congress acts, particularly since H. R. 3383, as recently amended, now provides that costs allocated to Indian lands which such lands cannot repay shall be nonreimbursable—section 6. This amendment was advertised as a gift to the Indians by newspapers reporting on recent upper basin conferences which led to the amending of H. R. 3383. It is a gift Congress might well inspect closely. Certainly some

more realistic and more economic method of providing for the Indians can be considered. By this gift, the upper basin shows its unwillingness to have the costs of the Navaho project paid for by the power revenues, as all the other costs are supposed to be. Instead, this money will go into the funds to be apportioned among these States, leaving the taxpayers in the rest of the country to carry the load.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by me on February 16, 1956, before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, at Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE OPENING DINNER OF THE WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 16, 1956

It is a great honor and a real inspiration for me to be here this evening. The women's patriotic organizations represented in this important conference have earned the gratitude of every loyal American.

They exemplify devotion to the ideals of our free Republic. They work for a strong America—a God-fearing, righteous America—a Republic of spiritual and cultural power, dedicated to the highest standards of honor and justice.

I am proud to salute the members of this conference and its participating organizations as loyal and courageous soldiers in the battle to defend and preserve the American system of government.

In the gracious invitation for me to address you this evening it was suggested that I discuss the Bricker amendment and the dangers that arise from what has come to be known as treaty law.

In that connection I think it is appropriate to review the nature of the American plan of government and the reasons for our greatness as a nation.

First, let me point out that we Americans are a peace loving people. It is our proud boast that we are the most powerful Nation in all history—yet we have never imposed tyranny upon any people of the earth. We have never fought a war of conquest. We have never sought territorial gain by force of arms.

Whenever we have been forced into armed conflict we have fought on the side of honor, justice, and freedom. We have made terrific sacrifices in blood and treasure to liberate oppressed and persecuted people. American heroes have suffered and died to repel aggression that would rob free people of their liberty and would enslave them under savage cruelty.

Our sole objective in war has been to uphold the integrity of free nations, to preserve the principle of individual freedom and to protect the right of free people to live under the form of government chosen by their own free will.

For 150 years we have been able to keep our shores free from armed invaders. Of all the world's great nations we are the only one that has escaped the desolation and destruction of war.

In two world wars we gained great military victories. Our fighting men covered themselves with everlasting glory. But the peace for which they offered their lives was not achieved. Secret deals at the conference table sabotaged American power for peace and opened the way for Communist dictatorship over one-third of the world.

As we look back to the reasons for our national greatness we must turn to the foundations upon which the Founding Fathers erected the structure of American freedom.

First, and most important, we have the ideals of Americanism so eloquently expressed in the Declaration of Independence:

"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Those rights are the essence of our individual freedom. They are not granted by government. They come from God.

Government that attempts to restrict or curtail them, or to take them away, transgresses against the divine law, to which the Founding Fathers gave their firm allegiance.

Next we turn to the Constitution of the United States, the charter of our liberties, which has been described as the greatest state document ever produced by the hand and brain of man.

Under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights there was created a government that has demonstrated its capacity and fitness to serve the people for generations far into the future.

For the first time in world history it gave recognition to the individual. For the first time in world history there was brought forth a new concept of government which derived its just powers from the consent of the governed. Never before had there been a government whose powers were specifically defined as grants from the people and limited within the bounds of a written Constitution.

And it is important to remember that in adopting the Bill of Rights the Founding Fathers did not propose to establish freedom of speech, press, assembly, religion, or to protect the rights of property. They recognized these rights as God-given rights, bestowed upon all mankind by the Creater of the universe. They set forth in language of biblical simplicity, the areas of human dignity and individual freedom upon which government was forbidden to encroach.

Under that plan in less than 200 years, Americans, living in freedom, have built the richest, the soundest, and the strongest nation in all history.

We hold the Constitution in the greatest reverence but that great State document, within itself, provides the method by which it can be amended to conform with changing conditions. I need not stress the point that proposed amendments should be approached with utmost caution. I think every good American will agree that the test of any proposed change is whether it will strengthen the fundamental principles of free government laid down by those whose vision and wisdom gave us the Constitution.

I submit, my fellow Americans, that the Bricker amendment meets that test.

I believe it to be one of the most important pieces of legislation now before Congress. Its importance, as you know, grows out of the various interpretations that have been given regarding article 6 of the Constitution which reads, in part, as follows:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

We who support the Bricker amendment regard it as most unfortunate that there is so much difference of opinion, even in the courts, regarding the meaning of this article. For that reason we believe it should be amended and spelled out in the same simple language that we find in the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights.

It should be amended so as to give added force to article 1, section 1, which provides:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Please note the words "all legislative powers herein granted." They make no exception. They confer no legislative powers upon the executive branch of government and certainly none on any foreign government.

Furthermore, in support of this exclusive grant of legislative power the 10th amendment states:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In the 2d session of the 83d Congress the Bricker amendment was debated in the Senate at great length. Every word was examined with extreme care. A great many decisions of the Supreme Court were quoted. Legal technicalities were brought forth and ably expounded with force and eloquence by proponents of the proposed amendment and by those who were opposed. Substitute proposals were offered and on the final vote the proposed amendment failed to pass by the margin of 1 vote less than the required two-thirds.

I shall not attempt to go into further detail of the legislative record. But to my mind one thing is very clear. We are confronted with one of the most fundamental principles that has to do with the stability, if not the permanence, of the American form of government. Unless legislation is limited by the Constitution we destroy one of the mightiest safeguards for the preservation of liberty. We place in danger every sacred right for which brave men have fought, suffered and died in their striving for freedom.

The Founding Fathers were strong in their determination to restrict the powers of Government. I cannot accept the conclusion that they would make a grant of unlimited power over foreign and domestic affairs.

I am opposed to the use of international treaties for making domestic laws for the people of the United States. I am opposed to overriding the Constitution without the consent of the people.

For many years of our history the dangers of treaty law did not become apparent. Treaties between the United States and foreign countries dealt with international subjects such as alliances, war and peace, boundaries, trade agreements and so forth. It never occurred to the average American that a treaty could interfere in the domestic life of our Nation. It did not seem conceivable that a treaty could in any way infringe upon our individual rights as American citizens.

The Bricker amendment is needed to safeguard the right of the American people to make their own laws within the framework of the Constitution through their elected Representatives in Congress. It is needed to protect the American people from the will of a super-government to which they have not given their consent. It is needed to preserve the system of checks and balances which have served us so well in separating the functions and powers of the three branches of our Government. It is needed to prevent the

unwarranted encroachment of executive authority upon the legislative branch of Government.

I do not question the high integrity or sincere purpose of President Eisenhower in his opposition to the Bricker amendment. I do not fear that he will lead us into national peril.

But I can look back to the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam which were conceived in secrecy and withheld from Congress and the American people. I need not remind you that by these agreements we committed our country to make tremendous concessions to Russia and helped extend the power of the Communist conspiracy.

I can look forward with apprehension to the future when unprincipled men, ambitious for power, may seek to enlarge Federal authority over the American people by means of treaties and executive agreements.

If treaty law can override the Constitution it can deprive people of the rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the sentiment expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], when he introduced his proposed amendment in the 83d Congress.

Addressing his colleagues, Senator BRICKER said, and I quote:

"The fight for the protection against treaty law has only just begun. This fight to prevent the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States from being undermined by treaties and executive agreements will be carried on in elections, in national organizations, and in Congresses until it is settled to the satisfaction of the overwhelming majority of the American people. That majority would rather live without fear under a government of constitutional restraints than live in jeopardy under a government of men."

Therefore I say to you that the responsibility for freedom rests not in Washington but in the hearts of the people.

It is a responsibility so grave that it must not be assumed without solemn rededication to freedom of the individual as the keystone of our national faith.

The fight for the Bricker amendment can be won if we can reach the hearts of the people. It can be won if organizations like yours take leadership in old fashioned patriotism.

Love of country and loyalty to its ideals are the great and indispensable virtues of American citizenship.

Just a few days ago we celebrated the birthday anniversary of one of the greatest of all Americans, Abraham Lincoln.

Let us, in his immortal words, here highly resolve "that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday marked the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence and I take this opportunity to salute American citizens of Lithuanian descent. We join with them in their wishes—that their people, the freedom-loving people of Lithuania, will again be free. In 1918, after 138 years of Russian rule, they achieved independence. During this period of independence they experienced a rebirth of their national culture and political freedom. Yet only 27 years later they found themselves helplessly within the Soviet orbit and today they suffer the severest form of Soviet occupation.

I think that today we all realize our commitment not only to the people of Lithuania but to those people in all areas of the globe under Soviet tyranny—a commitment to keep uppermost in our minds the goal that they will again be free. Therefore, we resolve it to be our duty to see that political freedom again takes its proper place in the world scene.

California Opposes Upper Colorado Scheme Because It Tramples Her Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress seeks the construction of 11 irrigation projects in the so-called upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. These would irrigate about 200 square miles of new land and supply supplemental water to about 400 square miles of land irrigated inadequately at present. They are known as participating projects.

According to Government experts, they would cost about $300 million, and that amount would be repaid to the United States without interest over a 50-year period as required by reclamation law and precedent.

The participating projects would use an estimated 400,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water a year for irrigation, domestic and industrial purposes. This amount is well within what the upper basin is entitled to use and California cannot object on that score.

There is, however, a "but" to the proposal and it is a big one. It is that revenues from the sale of water from the 11 participating projects during the 50 years would bring in only about 15 percent of the money needed to repay the Government for its investment.

As a consequence the proponents of the projects had to look elsewhere for an additional source of revenue to pay the remaining 85 percent of the price tag within the time limit. They seized on the idea of building vast power dams and utilizing the revenues from the sale of power for this purpose. In the proposals before Congress, these are called storage projects to obscure their true cash register nature.

As a starter three power projects are proposed—one at Glen Canyon, one at Flaming Gorge, and one, conditionally at Curecanti, costing respectively: $421,270,000, $82,942,000, and $88,500,000. Total: $592,712,000. Other power projects would follow later.

The power projects are unrelated in any way to the 11 participating projects, except as cash registers. The latter could function to supply water entirely without them. Yet Congress is being asked to spend about $600 million additional for the power features for the sole purpose of paying the $300 million participating projects' cost.

It is little wonder that alert citizens throughout the Nation, concerned over the Federal debt and high taxes, have voiced opposition to the scheme. Federal taxpayers would be better off if Congress makes an outright gift of the 11 participating projects to the Upper Basin States and forgets the power features completely.

It is with these power features that Californians have also a special concern. They would hold back, for power use, most of the 48,000,000 acre-feet of water to be stored by the project. In the storage process, another 10,000,000 acre-feet of water would disappear by evaporation. Thereafter, they would evaporate another 600,000 acre-feet of water per year, enough to supply the needs of a city of 3 million people. The magnitude of the evaporation is apparent when compared with the 400,000 acre-feet figure that is to be put to beneficial use by all 11 participating projects. It is 150 percent of that amount.

That is mostly water that thirsty southern Californians claim they are entitled to have flow downstream to their State and which cannot legally be withheld from them because of their prior right to it established by contract, appropriation, and the Colorado River compact.

The Colorado River compact was negotiated at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1922 by the seven States bordering on the river. It is a contract between these States and authority for such interstate agreements is found in the United States Constitution. Herbert Hoover, then winding up his affairs as World War I food administrator for starving Europe, acted as chairman during the negotiations.

The compact did not attempt to divide up water in the river as such, nor did it make any specific allocations of water as such to the States involved. Rather, it proceeded by regarding the river as consisting of three parts:

First. The upper basin: Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah.

Second. The lower basin: California, Arizona, and Nevada.

Third. That part of the river which crosses the international boundary and flows in the Republic of Mexico.

The dividing line between the upper and lower basins was fixed at a point called Lee Ferry in northernmost Arizona, near the Utah border.

Thereupon the negotiators proceeded to apportion "beneficial consumptive use" of the river's waters between the basins. The compact nowhere defines "beneficial consumptive use," and its meaning is one of the issues in the

pending Supreme Court suit by Arizona against California. In general, it amounts to use of water for irrigation, industrial, or domestic purposes.

That kind of "use" of water in the amount of 7½ million acre-feet yearly was apportioned to each basin by the compact's article III (a). This totals 15 million acre-feet; and since that was not all the water the negotiators believed available, by article III (b) they permitted the lower basin to make use of an additional 1 million acre-feet of "surplus" water.

Having no authority to cut Mexico out of water to which she might legally be entitled, they wrote article III (c), saying Mexico was to have whatever might be determined by a later treaty. This again was to come out of "surplus," but, if need be, equally out of each basin's III (a) apportionment. A subsequent treaty fixed Mexico's entitlement at 1½ million acre-feet a year.

At this point the negotiators had disposed of 17½ million acre-feet of water a year, but they thought there was even more in the river, so in article III (f) they set up machinery for "a further equitable apportionment" of remaining water at a later date. Subsequent experience with the river has shown not only that this additional water is nonexistent, but also that part of the apportioned water likewise is nonexistent. The river, in fact, averages a critical deficiency of almost 2½ million acre-feet a year.

Unless she desires to enter into a one party "suicide pact" California must resist to the utmost the upper basin's bold attempt, by means of the upper Colorado Basin storage project as now planned, to charge almost all this deficiency against California's preexisting water rights.

Unfortunately, this is only one of many ingenious ways in which the attempted invasion of California's water rights is being conducted. There are about a dozen other provisions in the compact on which upper basin proponents are placing weird interpretations trying to deny California and the lower basin even more water. Illustrative is the dispute involving article III (d).

Since the flow of the river varies widely from year to year, lower-basin negotiators *insisted* on guaranties preventing the upper basin from manipulating its uses between wet and dry years to the disadvantage of the lower basin. This turned up as article III (d) prohibiting the upper basin from depleting the amount of water flowing past Lee Ferry below a total of 75 million acre-feet in any period of 10 consecutive years.

In their desperate water grab, project proponents now contend this proviso, rather than amounting to a minimum guaranty to the lower basin, amounts to the maximum amount of water they are required to turn down the river. They say they can keep everything in excess, storing it for power purposes or making any other use or nonuse they desire.

They persist in this contention even in the face of an interpretation of the compact made by Herbert Hoover at the time it was negotiated in his words as follows:

> The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above what cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes.

In the past, California has not opposed upper basin developments. Many projects in Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado have passed Congress without an objection from the Golden State. But when schemes are proposed such as this that cut deeply into the vital water supply, like a man attacked in his own home, Californians must command their every means and skill for self-preservation.

The Attack on Veterans' Medical Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, February 18, 1956.

My remarks follow:

There is a move underway to cut down medical services for veterans under the cloak of economy.

Memory and gratitude can be very short when some people see the opportunity of saving on taxes by forgetting human obligations.

The Hoover Commission has made excellent recommendations on other phases of Government operations, but on the question of reducing medical services to veterans, many of us believe that it is going too far.

The Commission advises the cancellation of all present outstanding authorizations and appropriations for construction of additional veterans' general hospitals, except for those now under construction or under contract.

And that the Veterans' Administration dispose of by sale or otherwise, any hospital which, in its judgment can no longer be operated effectively and economically.

The VA replies that this would present a question for legislative consideration, since the Congress has authorized the construction of two proposed 500-bed general medical hospitals as replacements, one at Washington, D. C., and the other at Cleveland, Ohio. In both instances, these hospitals are necessary and are located in areas of large patient demand.

Insofar as the closing of existing hospitals is concerned, the VA believes that any determinations which are made along this line should be followed by notice to the appropriate committees of the Congress well in advance of the proposed closing dates. This appears to be a proper and advisable step, in view of the fact that the acquisition and construction of hospitals operated by the VA was pursuant to congressional authority. In commenting on this proposal by the Commission, may I say that it vests too much power in government by directive. In recent years there has been a tendency for the executive branch to take over powers that properly belong to the Congress, thus upsetting the balance upon which a free and representative government depends. Committees and administrators without any direct mandate from the people are assuming authority that was vested in duly elected Senators and Representatives. As the Federal Government becomes larger and more complex, power must be delegated but supervised. Administrators can never be a law unto themselves. The VA is correct in reminding the Hoover Commission that the Congress must have the final say in these matters. The living veterans of the Korean war number 4,346,000, and their average age is 27 years.

A PASSING THOUGHT

The Commission further recommends "that the statement of a veteran of his inability to pay for hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities, should be subject to verification; and that the Veterans' Administration be authorized to collect in case such a statement is not substantiated."

For one thing, this would require changes in the existing law. The present law provides that the statement of the veteran "shall be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses." No other verification is required and the statute does not permit the conditioning of free hospitalization upon verification thereof, pursuant to investigation.

In 1953, after hearings conducted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, it was decided to require a veteran to state his assets on the hospital application form (VA form 10–P–10). But, irrespective of the facts reflected by the statement of assets, hospitalization may not be denied if the applicant makes the required statement under oath of his inability to defray the expenses of hospitalization. It was felt that this additional procedure would serve as a deterrent to abuses.

Since that time, out of more than one-half million applications that have been forwarded to central office up to December 1955, only 200 cases revealed that the applicant could have paid for his necessary hospital and medical care. This is only one twenty-fifth of 1 percent, a trifling percentage of the whole. It is believed that the relatively insignificant number of questionable cases which have been turned up by this procedure does not justify the apparent views of the Commission that the present system is subject to widespread abuses.

The VA seriously questions the wisdom and practicability of a verification procedure such as that contemplated by the Hoover Commission.

The second part of the recommendation to the effect that collection should be made where the statement is not substantiated is inconsistent with the first part. If the oath were subject to verification the applicant would not be admitted to the hospital in the first place. This also brings up a serious question of policy. Neither the VA, nor any other governmental agency should enter into the business of providing hospital care for pay, in competition with private, public, or charitable institutions.

Remember, there are 15,391,000 living veterans of World War II, whose average age is 36½ years.

Another Hoover recommendation would provide, and I quote: "That the veteran should assume a liability to pay for care of his non-service-connected disability if he can do so at some reasonable time in the future. Such a debt should be without interest. Congress should pass appropriate laws for the collection of such obligations."

Hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities was authorized as far back as 1933. This basic law contemplates the furnishing of hospital care and treatment on a free basis, to veterans who are eligible under its provisions. In this respect, the program of hospitalization, both for service-connected

and non-service-connected cases, is part of the overall pattern of benefits, including compensation, pensions, and readjustment aids for veterans, which has been established for the assistance and relief of eligible veterans as a measure of the Government's obligation and therefore at the expense of the Government.

It may be mentioned also, that the proposal to pay back in the future, would be administratively expensive and unwieldy. The follow-up procedures, both with respect to determination of when the veteran might have attained an economic position enabling him to make payment and with respect to collection procedures, could be most cumbersome. It would tend to emphasize the commercial aspects of a governmental activity in behalf of a large group of persons hitherto regarded as having a special claim on the Government by reason of their service in time of war in the Armed Forces.

How about this fact? There are 68,000 living veterans of the Spanish-American War whose average age is 78½ years.

It should be noted that the Commission's comments with respect to collecting from insurance companies, are rather misleading and unrealistic. The insurance companies have very largely written their policies to exclude reimbursement for hospital care afforded at public expense. The Commission's recommendation would not affect this nonassumption of liability, and it is beyond the power of the Congress to require change of these insurance policies on this matter, or to prohibit private persons from entering into such contracts.

The Hoover Commission also recommends:

"A. That the responsibility and authority to establish and maintain medical criteria for disability, both initial and continuing, should be transferred from the Compensation and Pension Branch of the Department of Veterans' Benefits, to the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

"B. That the Department of Medicine and Surgery should also develop and maintain a mechanism for review of disability allowances based on the possibility of increase or decrease in disabilities."

The law provides that ratings shall be based, as far as practicable, upon the average impairments of earning capacity resulting from such injuries in civil occupations. Thus, the impairment of earning capacity is not that of the individual, but rather "average impairment" as related to a large class of individuals. This, therefore, does not permit the reduction of percentage rating in an individual case where the veteran has been successful in overcoming the handicap.

It may also be noted that the one example used by the Commission of an excessive disability rating in the lower brackets is described in such a way as to reflect a misunderstanding. It stated that amputation of a great toe is rated at 30 percent, for which the veteran is entitled to a minimum of $50 per month, regardless of his other income. In fact, the uncomplicated amputation of the great toe entitles to a rating of only 10 percent. When it is associated with removal of the metatarsal head, and consequently with the loss of muscle tone of both arches of the foot, it entitles to 30 percent. This is not high in relation to 10 percent for the simple loss of the toe, or 40 percent for the loss of the foot. The question of whether such a rating is realistic can be determined only by a survey of the resultant average impairment in earning capacity, and not solely on the basis of medical opinion, no matter how well informed.

As to section B of the recommendation, the Hoover Commission states that there is a tendency to regard disabilities as continuing and progressive, and to avoid reexaminations.

The fact is, that unless examinations by medical personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery indicates that the disability is static, reexaminations are required until the disability has remained at the same level as shown by examination over a period of 5 years.

In my opinion, the Veterans' Administration has effectively answered these implied criticisms by the Hoover Commission.

It appears that the Commission is probing for an opening in the defenses we have established to protect the rights of veterans.

Under the guise of saving money, the economy skirmishers would undermine the whole program of veterans' benefits.

By emphasizing the few abuses, they would try to void the Nation's obligations to the men and women whose health was impaired in service to our country.

Behind the quiet words and the dull legalism is the intent to reduce veterans' benefits to the minimum.

Educational, and on-the-job-training programs for the veterans of World War II have already expired, insofar as beginning such courses is concerned.

The men of World War I never had such opportunities.

Now we must concentrate on maintaining suitable programs for the sick and aging veterans.

This is no time to economize at their expense.

I hope that the American public will insist on continuing medical care for all deserving veterans.

Remember this fact, there are 3,105,000 living veterans of World War I, whose average age is 62 years.

Speech Prepared for Delivery by Hon. J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland, Before a Lincoln Day Dinner of Pinellas County Republicans in Clearwater, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech prepared for delivery by Senator J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland, before a Lincoln Day dinner of Pinellas County Republicans in Clearwater, Fla.

The speech follows:

Abraham Lincoln died 91 years too soon.

Unfortunately, he never had the opportunity to see how effective and able the women of this great Nation can be when they take a direct part in politics.

Men have always suspected, of course, that women would be a wonderful adornment to the political scene. But now they have found that you women are much more than that. You women have shown without question that your active participation in politics is essential to good government. And we men need you.

We need you as loyal and understanding wives, and that is especially true on those many occasions when dinner gets cold while we are out politicking.

We need some of you as candidates, for a government without a direct voice from women can get to be like a symphony orchestra without a violin section.

And finally, we need millions of you as volunteer workers, for there is always that very practical matter of winning elections.

As you probably realize, there is one major, and all-important point which we have in our favor in this business of winning elections.

We have popular opinion on our side.

I realize the limitations of statistics, but I'd like to quote some fairly overwhelming figures which, I think, show just how strong we really are.

These results were announced by the American Institute of Public Opinion (which is better known as the Gallup Poll) several months ago.

First of all, citizens of this country were asked point blank: "Do you approve or disapprove of the way Eisenhower is handling his job as President?"

A tremendous 73 percent of the people said "Approve."

Only 14 percent said that they disapprove.

The other 13 percent indicated they had no opinion on the matter.

Now let's take a look at a breakdown of those figures in regard to the South.

When the poll takers reported their findings on a regional basis we found that in the South, 68 percent of the people said they approve of the way Mr. Eisenhower is doing his work;

A mere 18 percent disapproved, and 14 percent said they had no opinion.

Here's another point which I found extremely interesting.

The question this time was: "If the President's doctors say it is all right, and if he decides he wants to run in 1956, would you vote for him?"

The answers were: 56 percent, "Yes;" 31 percent, "No;" and 13 percent undecided.

Comparing that survey with another one which was taken prior to the President's attack, the Gallup men discovered that the drop in the ranks of those who said they would cast their ballots for reelection was only 5 percent.

As I said, we definitely do have popular opinion on our side.

Here are some of the reasons why that is true.

At the national level of government, officials of the Eisenhower administration have faced up to the grave issues and the problems of these years with faith and with courage—and success has attended our labors.

We can also point with equal pride to many men and women of the administration who serve the public in official capacities in various localities of our Nation.

Since the glorious birth of this Nation, many fine men of outstanding character, unusual wisdom and unquestioned devotion to the great principles of our heritage, have served in the highest office that our free people can bestow, the Presidency of the United States.

But until the present time two have towered above the others on heights rarely reached by others in the entire history of the world.

George Washington strode with giant steps to the stage of great events in the crisis of the colonial rebellion against the tyranny of a distant monarch.

With ragged volunteers from the 13 colonies he welded together an Army which helped forge the greatest Nation on earth.

The other was Abraham Lincoln, whose memory we honor this weekend.

Although many persons were in honest disagreement with the policies of Lincoln, they never had the slightest thought that his actions were ever marred by cowardice or greed or pettiness.

Now, at last, another man has attained the stature of those other forthright Americans.

As history brings these troubled and dangerous times into the perspective of the whole, literate people in all of the civilized world will associate with Washington and

Lincoln, as representatives of all the timeless greatness of America, the name of their new, great partner, the incumbent leader of the people, the President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

Yes, Dwight Eisenhower, born to our magnificent traditions of freedom and human dignity, trained in love and respect for God and for his fellow men, and tested in the terrible trials of massive war, was drawn to the full height of his great stature, like Washington and Lincoln, in time of crisis—crisis for this Nation and for the world.

He came to the Presidency in the midst of a stalemate in a cruel and costly war, a stalemate which his opponents said could not be broken—a war which they said could not be ended.

He moved with dispatch.

He acted with decision.

He brought into play the skills of the great soldier that he is, and the intellect of the great statesman that he is.

The stalemate was ended at the conference table.

The shouting, suffering, and slaughter were stopped in the hills and across the plains of Korea.

Dwight Eisenhower moved into the White House while the tyrants, the would-be conquerors of the world, were rattling their sabers with new vigor, when the initiative was all on their side, when confidence was lacking among our allies and those who should be our allies in the event of war.

Under the wise leadership of Dwight Eisenhower, our Nation has taken the initiative, not the boastful, blustering initiative of warmongers, not the threatening initiative of those who would enrich themselves through the conquest of the lands and goods of others, but the calm, courageous, directional initiative of enlightened, civilized people who are as proud in their pursuit of a permanent peace as they were courageous in conflict.

Our policies and our purposes have been stated clearly by President Eisenhower.

The mist of doubt has been removed.

The confidence of allies has been strengthened, and the power of our defenses and of our weapons of offense, if necessary, has grown in mighty steps.

Our internal economy never was basically better.

The calm that has replaced near-hysteria within the Government has been transmitted to the people.

The fear that seemed normal prior to the Eisenhower administration has disappeared.

The economic recession which men of little faith had called inevitable never developed.

Make no mistake * * * the troubles and the dangers of the world have not yet been brought to an end.

They never could have been brought to an end under the directionless course we have known in the recent past.

They can, and I am confident will, be brought to an end with the leadership of Dwight Eisenhower.

"To protect our nations and our people from the catastrophe of nuclear holocaust," said this great President of ours, "free nations must maintain countervailing military power to persuade the Communists of the futility of seeking to advance their ends through aggression.

"If Communist rulers understand that never shall we buy peace at the expense of honor or faith, they will be powerfully deterred."

Yes; these are the words of Dwight Eisenhower, and the Communists have been powerfully deterred.

But the grand results—the final victory of peace—cannot be accomplished overnight, or even in the short period of 4 years.

We have found in Dwight Eisenhower, I believe with all my heart, the master of the crisis in the world.

We must, in the name of humanity, in the cause of decency, for the generations of today and for the sake of the generations to come keep Dwight David Eisenhower in his great job through a second term if he chooses to run.

I can understand his yearning for the quiet of his home in Gettysburg.

I can sympathize with him, too.

But I know his great love for his country and for humanity.

I know of his great faith in God and of his conviction that the search for a just and lasting peace is far from hopeless.

I feel that if he is convinced that he is needed, he will yield to the wishes of the people.

If the prayers of the people are answered, and Dwight Eisenhower heeds their rising call for him to continue his great crusade for peace and justice, he cannot be defeated.

Let the disciples of doubt raise their cries of fear and confusion.

When the chips are down and the sovereignty of the citizens is exercised again at the voting machines and ballot boxes across the land, the decision again will be, more overwhelming than before, that Dwight D. Eisenhower continue as President of the United States.

It could not be otherwise, because no other man since Washington and Lincoln has earned so well and kept so completely the confidence and faith of his fellow citizens.

I've been dwelling at length on the President himself.

Now let's consider the administration in general.

It has gained its strength, not only from the regular members of the GOP, but also from the many thousands of Americans who have become disgusted with Trumanism and its heir, Stevensonism.

Take my own Free State of Maryland, for instance.

In Maryland, as in Florida, the members of the President's party are in the minority.

Yet, today, because of the profound beliefs of the people of Maryland in individual liberty and the principles of the Eisenhower administration, Maryland has a Republican Governor, Theodore R. McKeldin, who had the honor of placing President Eisenhower's name in nomination at our national convention in 1952.

Maryland is also represented by two Republican Senators of which I have the honor to be one, together with Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER.

In addition, Maryland is represented by 3 GOP Representatives out of 7 for the State.

How is this possible?

Because the people of Maryland have voted their convictions that they are better represented by the ideals and principles of this administration.

These convictions were not lightly arrived at, just as they were not in the case of the voters of Florida.

But knowing that when the philosophies of the two parties are brought home to the people they will vote for truly liberal government, I look forward to even greater gains in Florida this fall.

You have already gained national recognition by electing such a worthy Representative as BILL CRAMER, and now you will be expected to live up to the great promise you have shown.

I've done quite a bit of talking about BILL CRAMER since I arrived in your State, and I'm going to keep it up.

In the first place, BILL CRAMER has the bigwigs of the opposition plenty worried.

Personally, I don't blame them.

I'm just very glad that he's on our side.

On Capitol Hill, BILL CRAMER has made a reputation for fighting for what he wants.

Furthermore, he gets what he wants—and that is a real trick.

Just look at the $11 million harbor project he got for the Tampa area, and the appropriations he has gotten for your post offices, sponge industry, fish business and other activities.

It isn't easy getting things like that in Washington—I know.

I was in the House of Representatives for 10 years myself, but perhaps I could still take lessons from BILL CRAMER.

If anybody ever wants to know about a two-party system in the South, just point to Bill.

Florida can be proud of him, as we all are.

One of Bill's biggest jobs as part of the Eisenhower administration is to give the United States a liberal representative government.

Liberalism is a word that is being lightly tossed around these days.

The New Deal-Fair Deal Party and its supporters have claimed to be liberals.

But what is the true meaning of liberalism?

Does it mean excessive taxation, a flagrant spending of the resources of the American people for brazen political purposes—the placing of more and more controls and restrictions on the lives and economy of the Nation?

If that is true liberalism, then the New Deal-Fair Deal Party has been liberal.

But that is not true liberalism. It is liberality, liberality with the American people's money, freedom, initiative, and heritage.

The Eisenhower administration does not confuse liberalism with liberality.

Our true liberalism has respect for tradition, and it has vision of the progress in the future.

Our liberalism is based on the principle of individual freedom and liberty which permits each man and woman to be the maker of his or her own destiny.

It is a liberalism which stands by to aid in times of distress but exacts no tribute in the form of control over the people's economy or pocketbooks.

President Eisenhower himself has said, "This administration is committed to a program of progressive moderation, liberal in its human concerns, conservative in its economic proposals, constructively dynamic and optimistic in its appraisal of the future.

"This program, I firmly believe, merits the endorsement and support of thinking, confident, forward-looking Americans.

"For our national economy, we seek a dependable stability in our present assets, a vigorous expansion in our future growth.

"These can be best achieved, we believe, by giving the private citizen the greatest possible opportunity—consistent with the rights of others—to contribute to the development of the economy and to share in its abundance."

Since this present administration has been in power, we have made the following key policy changes:

1. In place of a stalemate war in Korea—a truce.

2. In place of reaction in foreign affairs—action.

3. In place of peak target dates in defense—the long pull.

4. In place of softness toward communism—firmness.

5. In place of planned deficits in finance—a balanced budget.

6. In place of increases in taxation—reductions.

7. In place of a shrinking buying power of the dollar—stability.

8. In place of unchangeability in agriculture—flexibility and adaptability.

9. In place of misguided favoritism in labor—fairness.

10. In place of antagonism to business—encouragement.

11. In place of Government paternalism in natural resources—partnership.

12. In place of promises on housing—better housing.

13. In place of wardships in social security—a cushion against shock.

14. In place of socializing medicine—improving private care.

15. In place of corruption—integrity.

16. In place of monopoly in atomic development—sharing.

Today there are more than 65 million persons at work at the highest wages in history.

Construction has set a record at $42 billion in 1955.

American businessmen sold $14 billion worth of goods abroad.

Inflation has been halted.

Government spending has been reduced, taxes cut, and we are approaching a balanced budget.

These accomplishments are but a prelude of those to come in the dynamic program which the Eisenhower administration has presented to the American people.

Confident of the integrity, the honesty, and the belief in the American people and constitutional government, which this administration represents, the Nation can go forward to even greater heights in the future.

For the first time after two decades of New Deal-Fair Deal administrations, the American people now have the Federal Government back in their own hands—a Government which represents them—not a Government of a chosen few who would direct and regiment this American Nation.

Don't forget how long it has been that the South has had to fight against becoming stagnant under one-party rule.

It reminds me of the story of the young wife who nagged her husband with the following:

"What's the matter with you?" she asked.

"Monday you liked baloney.

"Tuesday you liked baloney.

"Wednesday you liked baloney.

"Now, Thursday, all of a sudden, you don't like baloney."

Well, now, all of a sudden, the South is fed up with baloney, too.

I'm sure you will keep doing something about it.

Thank you.

Government Bodies and Organizations Offically Opposed to Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the following list of governmental bodies and organizations which officially have recorded their opposition to the proposed upper Colorado River storage proposal. It undoubtedly is an incomplete list, but even as such, the imposing number of important groups included should give serious pause to anyone inclined to favor the project:

1. Engineers Joint Council.
2. American Society of Civil Engineers.
3. American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.
4. The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
5. The American Water Works Association.
6. American Institute of Electrical Engineers.
7. The Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.
8. American Society for Engineering Education.
9. American Institute of Chemical Engineers.
10. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers.
11. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
12. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.
13. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
14. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.
15. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
16. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
17. Order of Railroad Telegraphers.
18. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.
19. Sheet Metal Workers International Association.
20. Railway Employees Department, AFL.
21. American Public Power Association.
22. Colorado River Board of California.
23. Imperial Irrigation District.
24. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.
25. Los Angeles City Council.
26. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles.
27. Anaheim City Council.
28. Anaheim Chamber of Commerce.
29. Calexico City Council.
30. Calexico Chamber of Commerce.
31. El Centro City Council.
32. El Centro Chamber of Commerce.
33. Holtville City Council.
34. Holtville Chamber of Commerce.
35. Imperial City Council.
36. Imperial County Board of Supervisors.
37. Imperial County Farmer Bureau.
38. American Legion, District 22, San Diego and Imperial Counties.
39. Burbank City Council.
40. Los Angeles Clearing House Association.
41. Chula Vista City Council.
42. Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce.
43. Otay Municipal Water District.
44. San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce.
45. Property Owners Association of California.
46. California State Grange.
47. Glendale City Council.
48. Hemet City Council.
49. Hemet Chamber of Commerce.
50. Los Angeles City Council.
51. Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.
52. Los Angeles Central Labor Council.
53. Orange County Board of Supervisors.
54. Pasadena Board of Directors.
55. Riverside County Board of Supervisors.
56. Santa Ana City Council.
57. San Diego County Board of Supervisors.
58. San Diego City Council.
59. San Diego County Water Authority.
60. Rainbow Municipal Water District, San Diego County.
61. San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors.
62. San Marino City Council.
63. Agricultural Council of California.
64. Calavo Growers of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
65. Calcot, Ltd., Bakersfield, Calif.
66. California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
67. California Asparagus Growers Association, Stockton, Calif.
68. California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., Stockton, Calif.
69. California Canning Peach Association, San Francisco, Calif.
70. California Cattle Feeder's Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
71. California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif.
72. California Date Growers Association, Indio, Calif.
73. California Fig Institute, Fresno, Calif.
74. California Fruit Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
75. California Lima Bean Growers Association, Oxnard, Calif.
76. California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, Bakersfield, Calif.
77. California Prune and Apricot Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
78. California Turkey Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
79. California Vegetable Growers, Santa Barbara, Calif.
80. California Wool Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
81. Central California Berry Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
82. Challenge Cream & Butter Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
83. Consolidated Milk Producers for San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.
84. Farmers Cooperative Exchange, Inc., Santa Cruz, Calif.
85. Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative, San Francisco, Calif.
86. Fontana Producers Egg and Supply Co., Fontana, Calif.
87. Hayward Poultry Producers Association, Hayward, Calif.
88. Imperial Grain Growers, Inc., Brawley, Calif.
89. Imperial Grain Growers, Inc., Brawley, Calif.
90. Milk Producers Association of Central California, Modesto, Calif.
91. Poultrymen's Cooperative Association of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
92. Poultry Producers of Central California, San Francisco, Calif.
93. Qualitee Dairy Products Association, San Diego, Calif.
94. Ranchers Cotton Oil, Fresno, Calif.
95. Rice Growers Association of California, Sacramento, Calif.
96. San Diego Cooperative Poultry Association, San Diego, Calif.
97. San Joaquin Valley Poultry Producers Association, Fresno, Calif.
98. Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union, Sebastopol, Calif.
99. Sunkist Growers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
100. Sun-Maid Raisin Growers of California, Fresno, Calif.
101. Tri-Valley Packing Association, San Francisco, Calif.
102. Turlock Cooperative Growers, Modesto, Calif.
103. Coachella Valley County Water District.
104. California State Chamber of Commerce.
105. Brawley City Council.
106. Brawley Chamber of Commerce.
107. City of Calipatria.
108. Calipatria Chamber of Commerce.
109. City of Beverly Hills.
110. Westmorland City Council.
111. San Jacinto City Council.
112. Torrance City Council.
113. Costa Mesa City Council.
114. Laguna Beach City Council.
115. City of Chino.
116. City of Compton.
117. Newport Beach City Council.
118. County Supervisors Association of California.
119. City of Fontana.
120. City of Fullerton.
121. City of Long Beach.
122. City of Ontario.
123. Perris City Council.
124. City of Pomona.
125. Santa Monica City Council.
126. Upland City Council.
127. California Academy of Sciences.
128. Citizens Public Expenditures Survey, Inc., Albany, N. Y.
129. Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council.
130. Whittier City Council.
131. City of Gardena, Calif.
132. City of Lakewood, Calif.
133. City Council of the City of El Segunda, Calif.
134. Seal Beach City Council, California.
135. City of La Habra, Calif.
136. National Avenue Business Men's Association, Chula Vista, Calif.

137. South Bay Irrigation District, Chula Vista, Calif.
138. City Council of Oceanside, Calif.
139. City Council of City of Escondido, Calif.
140. Escondido Chamber of Commerce.
141. City Council of the City of National City, Calif.
142. National City Chamber of Commerce.
143. La Mesa Chamber of Commerce.
144. City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach.
145. City Council of the City of Lynwood.
146. Fullerton Chamber of Commerce.
147. City Council of the City of El Cajon.
148. El Cajon Valley Chamber of Commerce.
149. Santee Chamber of Commerce.
150. California Taxpayers Association.

The World Health Organization and Nursing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the outstanding organizations working throughout the globe is the World Health Organization.

When the history of this era is written, when the substantial developments have been separated from the trivial items of our times, when the wheat has been separated from the chaff, it will be found that the World Health Organization has written one of the finest chapters of this era.

For the first time in the history of mankind, the human community, acting on the basis of its collective conscience, and its humanitarian instinct for its fellow human beings, has conducted a global assault against mankind's age-old scourges.

I send to the desk a further statement which I have prepared on this subject, along with supplementary material regarding the "heroines in white"—the nurses of the world—who are helping to spearhead this effort. I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and other material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

In the February 1956 issue of the World Health Organization Newsletter there is a great amount of inspiring information concerning the fight by organized medicine under the banner of the United Nations and, in particular, the WHO, to improve mankind's health.

The overall report of the issue concerns WHO activities in the Western Pacific region in 1954–55.

There is an article concerning the battle against malaria on Taiwan. It reports, for example, how 5½ million people in Taiwan's malarious areas have been protected by DDT spraying.

There is a review of a new book, Mankind Against Killers, by James Hemmings, published by Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. As Dr. Brock Chrisholm, former Director-General of WHO states, "It is the first time, to my belief, that a book dealing with health on a world scale has been attempted with the aim of interesting young people."

Continuing with the battle against disease in the Western Pacific, there is a report, on the efforts for maternal and child health, for environmental sanitation, against communicable diseases, against tuberculosis, yaws, and for education and training.

One of the phases which inevitably comes up is the matter of necessarily expanding the reservoir of nurses in the area. Indeed, almost any discussion of the improvement of mankind's health brings up the question of increasing the availability of the heroines in white, the tireless women who devote years of their lives, indeed often their entire lives, to the healing of men, women, and children.

ARTICLE ON MEETING AT TEACHERS COLLEGE

Coincidentally enough, I noted in last Sunday's New York Times a report concerning a veritable international meeting at the spring session of the Division of Nursing Education of Teachers College, Columbia University. It brought out clearly the continued serious shortage of nurses throughout the world, a shortage which our own Government and our own private nursing schools have been diligently trying to help relieve.

The need is acute. Thus, for example, it was noted that in our sister Republic of Brazil, a great and promising land, there are unfortunately fewer than 5,000 nurses, for the country's vast and increasing population of 60 million. In our sister Republic of Haiti, which has been making laudable progress in many fields, it was reported that nurses unfortunately still are so scarce that a new hospital, built by American philanthropy, could not be opened because it lacked qualified nurses to staff it.

Other instances of shortages, especially in what has come to be known as underdeveloped areas, could be cited. But these should not prove discouraging to us. On the contrary, we have a right to be proud of the wonderful progress which has been made toward relieving the shortages. Thus, the republics of Latin America have become increasingly aware of this problem. Despite often meager financial resources, they are exerting ever larger efforts to meet the problem, by attracting their finest young womanpower into this magnificient profession and training them in modern scientific ways.

Lest we ourselves in North America take too superior an attitude, let us realize that even in our own country, with its great wealth and resources, we have faced a shortage of nurses. This situation has given deep concern to our medical profession, to Members of Congress, like the ever active Congressman FRANCES BOLTON, as well as to many laymen throughout the land. Of course, with our tremendously high American standard of living, we have come to expect and to receive the finest and most abundant medical and nursing care in the world.

But we know that to reach the still higher standards which we desire for ourselves, we must have still more nursing schools, more modern facilities for them, higher enrollments, more financial assistance and more inducements to our women to enter and remain in this esteemed career, particularly specialized phases of it, where shortages are especially severe, as in the instance of psychiatric nursing.

Of course, by comparison, the shortage elsewhere in the world is infinitely more serious, because there, the fight is to reach not top standards but the most minimal health standards with at least a minimal number of qualified nurses.

And so, I wish the best of good luck to the World Health Organization and to all the individuals and groups associated with it, including of course UNICEF, in the fight to make available the blessing of nursing and medical care to ill peoples throughout the world.

THE WORLD NEEDS MORE NURSES

Fifty-one nurses from 20 different countries and territories of the western Pacific attended the second nursing education seminar of WHO held in Suva, Fiji Islands. They had come to study and discuss the many problems connected with the training and education of nurses for whose services there exists still a desperate need in many parts of the world.

For instance, it has been estimated that while in New Zealand there is 1 professionally trained nurse to 400 of the population and in Japan 4 to 530, the figure for the Philippines is 1 to 5,400, while for India it is 1 to 55,000.

Commenting on the seminar, Miss Alice Reid, regional nursing adviser to the WHO Western Pacific Regional Office writes:

"Living and working together in close proximity and sharing opportunities for leisure time enjoyment made it possible for nurses from many different countries to come to know one another really well, to realize that people in any country are very much alike and that the nurses everywhere have similar jobs to do and similar problems to resolve.

"The task of problem solving went on, not only in organized study groups, but in informal and earnest groups of people sitting on mats, on bedroom floors, or gathered in corners of the recreation room.

"In the beginning, differences in terminology and methods were a source of irritation: later they became a subject of good-natured banter and finally, with the development of greater understanding, were replaced by feelings of real respect and a desire to learn from one another.

"A Filipino nurse wrote in her report, 'Truly, there is much to learn from the British system of nursing,' and at least two British nurses expressed their intention of studying in the United States."

During the seminar the real problems faced in carrying on the training of nurses and staffing of medical and health services were brought out of the experience of the participants. Groups then took up specific areas to study and to plan for ways to develop methods of solving these problems.

Group 1 worked together on the training of the community nurse, including her services to the public as a health worker and midwife.

Group 2 worked on the problems of carrying on general public health education, infant welfare, and teaching better ways of nutrition by using local materials and local foods.

Group 3 had the large field of the basic-nursing curriculum and set up 3 smaller groups to study clinical teaching, the need of helping to prepare nurses in the art of teaching, and the teaching of public health throughout the student nurses learning experience.

Group 4 studied problems of postgraduate nursing education and gave particular attention to programs for international students.

The notes on this page, contributed by some of those attending the seminar, give a picture of nursing life and conditions in various countries of the western Pacific region.

(By Mrs. Felicidad D. Elegado, principal, School of Nursing, North General Hospital, Manila, P. I.)

The Philippines has an area of 114,000 square miles with a population of about 22 million. A study of nursing resources done by Filipino Nurses' Association, Department of Health, and other agencies, revealed that

there are 8,857 people able to do nursing, but how many are actually in practice we do not know, for there is as yet no effective system of registration.

Every province has graduate nurses, but many provinces do not have enough to meet the health needs of the people.

Nursing is actually rendered in hospitals, health departments, and homes by the graduate nurses, licensed midwives, and attendants, with little distinction between them.

There is a marked difference in preparation of these workers. Some have no training, some have several years of nursing education, yet all these persons give general bedside nursing care.

One of the serious problems facing nursing education in the Philippines is the increasing number of students who finished 1 year liberal arts courses (being a requirement for entrance to a school or college of nursing) who seek accommodation in schools and colleges of nursing that have no room for them.

Because of lack of faculty, clinical and physical facilities, many hundreds of young girls cannot be accommodated even after spending money and time in college.

In this seminar we have exchanged ideas and experiences and our minds have been opened to various possible solutions of our nursing problems.

(By Mrs. Laura Yergan, nursing education consultant for Vietnam, U. S. International Cooperation Administration)

My job, as one of the American nursing education consultants for Vietnam, is carried out in Saigon at the main branch of the National School of Nursing.

Before the division of Vietnam my work was chiefly at Hanoi, where the North Vietnam branch of the school was situated. After July 1953, however, all American technical assistance had to be withdrawn from that area.

When I left North Vietnam some of the nursing students also evacuated to South Vietnam and continued their studies at the Saigon School, so we had the consolation that all of our previous work was not entirely lost.

In Saigon the nursing education consultants all have Vietnamese counterparts who are being trained to take over the teaching positions as soon as they are qualified.

Since there are no schools in Vietnam for university-level study to prepare nurses for positions as educators and administrators, the United States Operations Mission to Vietnam, for whom we work, gives scholarships to Vietnamese nurses of outstanding ability for training outside Vietnam, usually in America.

One such nurse has just completed her studies at Syracuse University in New York and is returning as nursing director of the National School of Nursing. In 1956 we hope to send 3 or 4 more nurses who are now teaching under my supervision for advanced study abroad.

It is my belief that the standards of nursing education, professional nursing and health service to the people of Vietnam will eventually achieve a level of which any country might well be proud.

(By Miss Doris Cowsill, acting matron, General Hospital, Singapore)

Singapore is a rapidly expanding colony heading toward self-government. Expansion in the medical services program is taking place to meet the ever-increasing demands of the population of Singapore, which now has 1,165,000 people over an area of 217 square miles.

To serve this population there is only 1 general hospital of 900 beds. There is a maternity hospital of 240 beds, with an average of 60 births a day, and there are also tuberculosis, mental, leprosy, infectious diseases, and children's hospitals.

As regards nurse training, we have 464 student nurses, of whom 43 are men, 110 student assistant nurses, and 72 student midwives.

The 10-year medical plan which was devised in 1950 has gone ahead with great success. This year has seen the opening of a surgical block consisting of 10 theaters and 50 postoperative beds. Also nearing completion is a pediatric unit of 200 cots.

The next stage of the building program includes the building of a new 1,000-bed general hospital, district hospitals, health clinics, accommodation for staff, and a nursing school.

(By Miss M. H. Paton, principal, Central Nursing School, Tamavua, Suva, Fiji)

There are two nursing schools in Fiji, 1 at Tamavua and 1 at Lautoka. At the end of the preliminary period of a month's training time, 8 nurses are sent to Labasa Hospital from the Central Nursing School for 1 year.

I am stationed at the Central Nursing School, Tamavua, but my duties include supervision of the Lautoka School and regular visits to Labasa Hospital, at which places discussions on education and student supervision take place.

At present there are 207 student nurses in the schools, both Fijian and Indian, and a comprehensive curriculum is presented.

At the completion of 3 years and 3 months training students sit for the qualifying examination under the Nurses' and Midwives' Board of Fiji.

After registration, an endeavor is made to keep qualified nurses in the hospitals for 1 year's postbasic experience before being transferred as district health nurses, or to staff rural hospitals.

At regular intervals I visit schools in the Suva area to aid recruitment, also in the Lautoka area, where I am assisted by the Lautoka tutor sister.

(By John Waterer, WHO nurse educator, Penang, Malaya)

I am a male nurse, a nurse-educator in the ranks of the nurses of the World Health Organization. I trained in England just before the last war. I served in the war in the ranks, and as an officer of the Royal Army Medical Corps.

After the war, I attended the University of Manchester and obtained a diploma qualifying me as a nurse tutor. After a period of service in that capacity in London, I entered the service of the World Health Organization as their first male nurse-educator.

The program in which I am working is in Penang, Malaya. At the end of hostilities the Government of Malaya established schools of nursing and young Malayan men and women are admitted for a period of 3 years and 4 months nurse training.

These young Malayans are anxious to serve their people in the true spirit of service.

Today the Malayan hospital and health services are expanding with the ever-increasing number of available trained workers. The World Health Organization has been assisting in this education program since 1950.

At the moment, in Penang, we have a team leader who specializes in postgraduate training and comes from Canada, an educator specializing in Public Health nursing who comes from New Zealand, and myself.

I assist the Government's education staff lecturing and demonstrating to both male and female nurses. In addition, I, of course, take an especial interest in the male nurses and their training.

The nurses represent all the peoples of Malaya: Malay, Indian, Chinese and Eurasian. It is a wonderful experience to work with these enthusiastic young people and alongside trained nurses from different parts of the world.

(By Miss Wilhelmina Visscher, WHO nursing education consultant in Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos)

In December 1951, two nurses of the World Health Organization went to Cambodia as the first members of a nursing education team to help the Government establish modern nursing and midwifery educational programs.

Cambodia is situated between Thailand and Vietnam and has a population of 4 million people of whom 600,000 live in Phnom-Penh, the capital.

Life is peaceful for the Cambodians and nature is good to them. The normal temperature varies from 30° to 33° centrigrade and the provision of clothing for children is not a problem. Rice is a staple food and the Mekong River provides enough fish.

Most of the education in the past has been given by the bonses, who are the Buddhist priests, and formerly only boys were allowed to attend classes. Education for girls was not thought to be very necessary. Some changes have taken place: Girls are now attending the public schools and, under the leadership of a few educated ones, women have begun to take part in a very small measure in community affairs.

The infant mortality rate is very high and it is not unusual to have a mother tell you that from the 10 or 12 children she has had, only a few are alive.

Two Cambodian nurses, 1 man and 1 woman, were assigned as national counterparts to the World Health Organization nurses. We started to work with them in an informal way and slowly introduced them to the concept of modern nursing. A health center called a dispensaire, which gives outpatient service, was made available by the Government to be used as a demonstration center for all public-health activities.

Well-baby and prenatal clinics were started. The nurses were given a special course in public health and home visits were started.

The giving away and adoption of babies are common practices and are treated very casually by all concerned. A mother will tell us that the baby is not growing too well. After we have heard that she does not nurse her baby, the value of breast feeding is explained. She listens very patiently.

After the explanation has gone on for 10 minutes, we then discover that the baby is not her own baby but has been adopted from one of her neighbors.

In the hospital we helped with the opening of a children's ward and the nurses had to be trained to care for the babies.

Nursing as it is known in most countries has been unknown in Cambodia in the past. Treatment as prescribed by the doctor would be given, but the actual bedside nursing care was left to the relatives.

The patient was taken to the hospital as a last resort. Many "cures," such as drinks compounded of different herbs, were first given, so that by the time the patient was admitted he was often in a critical condition.

Slowly the people have begun to realize that the hospital is there to help them get better.

The nurses have been taught how to care for babies, how to bathe them, how to prepare the feeds and how to feed them. They have learned that milk should be given to a baby after being heated, and that a hot water bottle should be placed next to the premature baby rather than on top of the child. The mothers have been encouraged to stay with the babies they have brought to the hospital and this has helped to increase their confidence in the hospital staff. It has also given excellent opportunities for them to learn how better to care for their babies.

The World Health Organization nursing team has grown and now consists of four nursing and midwifery educators. Each of us has a national counterpart working with

us, who will gradually take over more and more responsibility for the program.

At present prefabricated buildings are serving as school buildings and a basic nursing course is being given to 13 selected students.

With the help of American funds, a nursing school is being built. Teaching materials have already arrived. We hope that the status of nursing in Cambodia will be raised and that better-educated girls and boys will be attracted to take up nursing.

(By Miss Aya Maeda, professor, St. Luke's Junior College of Nursing, Tokyo, Japan)

I completed my basic training and postgraduate course in the College of Nursing in Tokyo, and took advanced study at the Teachers' College, Columbia University and at the University of Toronto in Canada. I have worked as a public health nurse for many years.

After World War II, with the help of the American nurses, the status of the Japanese nurse improved remarkably. Nursing education has also improved a great deal.

Our problem at present is that there are not enough qualified people to take teaching positions. There are 160 schools of nursing in Japan where candidates must be high-school graduates. There is only one school of nursing which has a women nurse director.

The Japanese Nursing Association is one of the strongest women's groups in Japan. It has about 50,000 members including midwives, clinical nurses, and public health nurses.

The Spirit of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1956, Mr. Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., acting in the capacity as national chairman for Brotherhood Week, addressed the National Conference of Christians and Jews held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D. C.

I believe you will agree with me after reading Mr. Firestone's speech that he has grasped the true meaning of brotherhood.

The gold medal brotherhood award was to be presented to President Eisenhower. Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, received the award on behalf of the President, and read his remarks.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, our colleague, attended the brotherhood dinner and has included her observations in today's RECORD:

THE SPIRIT OF BROTHERHOOD—TALK BY HARVEY S. FIRESTONE, JR.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very great pleasure for me to be with you this evening and to talk with you about brotherhood in our Nation's Capital which possesses a rich heritage of our country's past and people whose leadership encompasses the high hopes for the future of the free world. In a world where disarmament is a dream of the future, and frightening weapons are the realities of the moment, it is comforting to know that there are enough men of good will to sustain and to develop continuously the idea of brotherhood.

For without brotherhood among men, both in word and in deed, our way of life loses much of its substance and much of its strength. Brotherhood is the firm foundation of the personal liberty we so strongly cherish.

If there is one seed from which our way of life may be said to have grown, it is the seed of personal liberty. And at the root of this liberty is a profound respect for the rights of others, as individuals, without regard to their race, their color, or their creed.

Brotherhood does not mean that every man is the captain of the team. But it does mean that there is a team, and that every man, if properly qualified, has a right to be its captain.

The concept of teamwork is fundamental in the development of America's greatness. We have discovered that one secret of success is working together as a team in running our businesses, in conducting our civic endeavors, in participating in our government and in giving our leadership to the world. We, of course, are well aware that teamwork does not mean complete uniformity of opinion. That's the kind of so-called teamwork found behind the Iron Curtain.

Our kind of teamwork is based on the recognition of the right of men to choose freely to work together for the accomplishment of a common aim. Each individual is not forced to join with others. But when he does, he helps accomplish the objective by working for it with other individuals. In other words, our kind of teamwork carries with it explicitly the roots of personal and individual freedom.

Every freedom brings with it a duty and an obligation. If we want to be free, we must see to it that others are free. If we want our rights respected, we must see to it that the rights of others are respected. In the last analysis, we can defend our own rights and freedoms best by defending the rights and freedoms of others. That concept, of course, is a fundamental one of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Although the National Conference of Christians and Jews was founded only 72 years ago, its objectives are centuries old. They are woven into the very fabric of American tradition. Indeed, the spirit of brotherhood is the spirit of our American way of life, just as the concept of free private enterprise is its body. To recognize the truth of that statement, we have only to recall the motives which impelled people to come to this country.

Among the first settlers in America were the Pilgrims who landed on historic Plymouth Rock 335 years ago. This small group of courageous pioneers left their homes across the sea to escape religious persecution. Rather than sacrifice the principles in which they so deeply believed, they risked their lives and their fortunes in a frail ship buffeted by winter winds and waves. They faced the danger of savage enemies to carve out with gun and sword, and scythe and plow, a new home in the New World.

As the years went by, they were followed by many other groups who sought over here the freedom which they were denied at home. And, ever since, America has been the refuge of all who thirst for liberty and justice, whether they be Protestants, Catholics or Jews.

In 1776, when the Liberty Bell pealed forth its message of freedom, men of all faiths became united, as never before, in the common cause of independence. They fought side by side in bloody defeat and in glorious victory.

In later years, during both World Wars, in Korea and other places where Americans have had to fight, they have fought together, not as Protestants, Catholics, or Jews, but as brothers all in a crusade for freedom.

The cold war in the tense world today is fundamentally a war of ideas that is being waged in the minds and hearts of men everywhere. There is only one way to defeat a bad idea, and that is with a good idea.

Fortunately, in this country we have that good idea. Freedom will always be more attractive than bondage. But we must be sure that our own house is in order. We must stand together on behalf of human rights. By so doing, we can strengthen the spiritual foundation upon which our society is based. We can defend the dignity of man as an individual and thereby take from our enemy one of his important weapons, which is the exploitation he makes of every crisis in human relations and of every denial of human rights.

America stands before the world today as a living example of the power of freemen. Never before has there been such an opportunity for us to demonstrate what freedom means and how vital it is to the peace and security of the world. And there is one thing we know: We must do more than merely preach freedom. We must practice it.

Freedom is priceless because it endows each individual with personal rights and privileges. Brotherhood is equally important because it is opposed to any violation of these personal prerogatives.

Naturally, most Americans are aware that America was settled by people who fled from religious persecution. They recall that this issue was so important that generations later, when the United States became an independent nation, freedom of religion was incorporated into the Constitution and became a basic law of the land. They recognize that no man should be judged by the color of his skin, the land of his origin, or the precepts of his faith. They realize it is the individual, the man himself, who counts.

They know that only by working in harmony in the bonds of brotherhood have generations of Americans been able to make the United States the most powerful, the most prosperous, and the most successful nation on earth. They know that the spirit of brotherhood has been the irresistible force which has made it possible for our country to grow, in the relatively short space of 180 years, from a small, impoverished group of independent colonies to the position of world leadership which it occupies today.

And yet, there are some people with prejudices so deeply rooted in their minds and hearts that they deny the reality of these facts. By word and by deed they practice persecution here in the land which owes its very existence to those who fled from persecution. There are others who are merely thoughtless. Unintentionally, they say and do things which wound and offend.

The real danger in both prejudice and thoughtlessness lies not only in the resentment which they create, but also in the grist which they feed the mills of our enemies. For example, Communists and their fellow travelers pick up cases of religious prejudice, magnify them all out of their true proportion, and shout them from the housetops. They fan the sparks of resentment into the flames of vengeance. Then, with lying tongues, they paint a picture of life under communism in which they claim that no such discriminations exist.

Many forget that conditions in countries behind the Iron Curtain belie this claim. They do not remember that in Russia, and in her satellite countries, religion is condemned and that those who try to practice it are shipped off to labor camps, persecuted, starved, tortured and murdered. Under communism there can be on freedom of religion, no freedom of thought, no freedom of speech. Any departure from the party line is punishable as treason. Yet these wily subversives have the bold effrontery to criticize our way of life and our treatment of our fellow men.

Therefore, it is important that we strive to eliminate baseless prejudice and thoughtless criticism not only because of the individual resentment which they cause, but also because of the individual resentment which they cause, but also because they add fuel to the fire with which our enemies are trying to destroy the American way of life.

You are all aware, I am sure, of the ways in which the National Conference of Christians and Jews carries on its positive program. But perhaps it will bear some brief repetition just to show how complete and how realistic it is.

The basic concept of the conference program is participation of people of all religious and racial groups. It calls upon educators to work with it through the schools and colleges of which they are a part. It seeks the cooperation of religious leaders to work in their churches and synagogues to make brotherhood a living reality. It asks leaders of all civic organizations to take its methods and materials into every civic organization in the community. It calls for the help of labor and management to put across its program in industry. And it asks the professionals of radio, theater, press and advertising to make the brotherhood concept a part of their every-day work.

Many thousands of Americans take part in conference programs as leaders, reaching millions of their fellow citizens seven days a week 52 weeks in the year, with a message of good will, harmony and understanding among men, a message of brotherhood that is realistic, down-to-earth and of immense importance to the survival of freedom in the world.

To my mind, a word which is often overrated is the word "tolerance." To me, it implies a mental reservation. It is negative. It connotes a grudging acceptance of a person who is not really regarded as an equal.

Brotherhood, on the other hand, implies no limitations. It is positive in every respect. It connotes recognition of every man as the brother of every other man and, therefore, an equal.

Let us realize the simple fact that Christians and Jews alike acknowledge God to be their Heavenly Father. Obviously, therefore, they must all be brothers. How, then, can any thinking person whose fundamental faith includes the Fatherhood of God ignore the brotherhood of man?

When a child first comes into the world, he arrives completely free from conscious dislikes of people. It is only in the days and years of growing up that he may come down with the disease of prejudice, and the principal carriers of the germ are apt to be the adults who mold his life.

Contemplating the innocence of a baby, we can realize the awesome power that parents, teachers, and adults in general have in shaping the world of tomororw through the children of today.

Because children are naturally without prejudice, we should make a conscious effort to instill in their hearts the positive worth of brotherhood as a way of life. Brotherhood is not a cure-all for the ills and disturbances of a grownup world, but it is a medicine that can do nothing but good provided it is prescribed early enough and taken consistently.

The idea of brotherhood suggests to former children the better world this might have been if we had been able to hold on tightly and completely to the mutual kindness and love for each other that is our birthright and our natural heritage as children of the one God.

Brotherhood does not mean we have to open our hearts and our homes to everyone we meet. We have the right to select our friends because we like them or our associates because we have interests in common. Nobody wants to spend his time with a bore or open his home to a thief. Brotherhood does not say that we should or we must. It asks only that we look upon others on the basis of their individual worth rather than on the basis of the accidental factors of their race, their color, or their creed. In short, it asks that we observe the Golden Rule: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

The cornerstone of brotherhood is the individual. By its very nature it must be personal. Like charity, it begins at home. It begins with you and with me. Unless we recognize that personal level of brotherhood, we shall weaken and dilute the effectiveness of our efforts.

While brotherhood is personal, it can have a profound effect on the international, interracial, and interreligious misunderstandings which exist in the world today. Brotherhood is like ripples in a lake, starting at one place but spreading gradually to the far edges of the water. We never know how widespread are the effects of a good act.

Brotherhood Week gives to us as Americans an opportunity to reaffirm our belief in the individual freedom of our fellow men. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that Brotherhood Week is only 1 week out of 52. It is important as a symbol, as a spotlight to focus attention on the day-to-day year-round operations of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Brotherhood Week does not mean that we start loving our fellow men with great intensity on 1 day in February, keep it up for 7 days straight, and then stop.

No; Brotherhood Week simply is a means of rising to a peak and obtaining widespread public rededication to the week-in and week-out work with which we are all concerned. The year-round work is what counts.

If the freedom we cherish is to survive in the world, we must find ways to eliminate the frictions, the tensions and the distrusts that turn man against man and nation against nation. We must first eliminate these irritations at home if we are to have hope of eliminating them throughout the world.

As a nation, we owe our position of leadership in the world today to the achievements of people of many racial and religious backgrounds who believe in brotherhood. Brotherhood is the belief of men and women who are confident of our country's continuing greatness. It is the belief of those who face the future with fearless hearts and abiding faith.

In Brotherhood we have an atomic idea whose chain reaction can spread to the hearts and minds of people everywhere. Let us use this powerful force widely and wisely. Let us believe in it. Let us live it. Let us support it.

By so doing, we can bring greater personal happiness to ourselves and our loved ones and help to achieve the goal of all men of good will: The brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God.

And now it is a very great honor and a real pleasure for me to present a well-deserved award to an outstanding American.

He believes there is "no alternative to peace" and has dedicated himself to that belief before the world. He has exercised the great moral force of his leadership to bring about notable progress in human relations and increased personal dignity for all men throughout our land. His leadership has served as an inspiration to those dedicated to the cause of greater understanding among people who differ in race, in color or in creed.

He has translated the words of his beliefs into the deeds of his leadership. In his personal and in his public life, he has truly enlarged the areas of our human understanding of each other.

This 1956 Gold Medal Brotherhood Award, the highest honor given by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, is being bestowed upon President EISENHOWER for his outstanding contributions to better understanding; to the improvement of human relations internationally, nationally and in the Nation's Capital; and for advancing the objectives of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, namely, the promotion of justice, amity, understanding and cooperation in all human relationships.

I would like to read to you the text of the citation accompanying this award:

"The National Conference of Christians and Jews World Brotherhood. The National Conference of Christians and Jews acclaims for his devotion to increased human understanding and his service to human need, Dwight D. Eisenhower. He has been ever ready to render that service be it at the call of the Government of the United States, the world community, or its humblest citizen. His sympathetic understanding of the spiritual as well as the economic needs of his fellow man is making an outstanding contribution to the survival of freedom.

"EVERETT R. CLINCHY,
"President.
"BENJAMIN F. FAIRLESS,
"National Cochairman.
"ROGER W. STRAUS,
"National Cochairman.
"JAMES F. TWOHY,
"National Cochairman.
"WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 20, 1956.*"

It is my privilege to present to you this gold medal brotherhood award on which is inscribed: "To Dwight D. Eisenhower, February 20, 1956. For outstanding contributions to the cause of brotherhood."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.

To the Brotherhood Dinner, the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

The gold medal brotherhood award which you have given to me is a high honor indeed. The medal symbolizes a most noble purpose, a rewarding peace among men through a common understanding of their common aspirations. I am deeply touched by your choice of me for this distinction. Most sincerely, I thank you.

The principles on which the Republic is founded, that all men are created equal in dignity and in inalienable rights, underscore the brotherhood of man.

Our faith that we can achieve among all peoples a mutual understanding and a mutual recognition of our common brotherhood, is fortified by the progress we have made at home by the practice of those principles in the last few generations—a brief span of time compared to the ages in which prejudice and misunderstanding have accumulated.

As we look forward now to the challenges of the atomic age in a world made small by rapid transportation and communication, we must with our fullest effort put brotherhood into practice by giving to others the rights and respect we want for ourselves.

In our efforts, we must maintain a sense of balance, a sense of perspective, and a capacity to listen as well as to speak. We must work for freedom and equality. In the words of President Washington, we must give "to bigotry no sanction—to persecution no assistance," and in the words of President Lincoln, we must act "with malice toward none, with justice toward all."

I congratulate the National Conference of Christians and Jews for its continued educational efforts toward better understanding in all human relationships and again express my deep appreciation for the brotherhood award.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

FEBRUARY 15, 1956.

The Spirit of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Permission was granted to extend my remarks immediately after the remarks from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]. I was greatly privileged to attend the brotherhood dinner and to hear the very fine speech of Mr. Firestone and the splendid statement of the President of the United States, and Secretary Wilson's moving remarks.

The President's statement and the remarks of Hon. Charles E. Wilson follow:

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

To the Brotherhood Dinner, the National Conference of Christians and Jews:

The gold medal brotherhood award which you have given to me is a high honor, indeed. The medal symbolizes a most noble purpose, a rewarding peace among men through a common understanding of their common aspirations. I am deeply touched by your choice of me for this distinction. Most sincerely, I thank you.

The principles on which the Republic is founded, that all men are created equal in dignity and inalienable rights, underscore the brotherhood of man.

Our faith that we can achieve among all peoples a mutual understanding and a mutual recognition of our common brotherhood is fortified by the progress we have made at home by the practice of those principles in the last few generations—a brief span of time compared to the ages in which prejudice and misunderstanding have accumulated.

As we look forward now to the challenges of the atomic age in a world made small by rapid transportation and communication, we must with our fullest effort put brotherhood into practice by giving to others the rights and respect we want for ourselves.

In our efforts, we must maintain a sense of balance, a sense of perspective and a capacity to listen as well as to speak. We must work for freedom and equality. In the words of President Washington, we must give, "to bigotry, no sanction, to persecution, no assistance," and in the words of President Lincoln, we must act "with malice toward none, with justice toward all."

I congratulate the National Conference of Christians and Jews for its continued educational efforts toward better understanding in all human relationships and again I express my deep appreciation for the brotherhood award.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES E. WILSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, AT BROTHERHOOD DINNER, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

Mr. Riley, Mr. Firestone, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be here this evening and have a part in your program in celebration of Brotherhood Week. I am doubly honored to represent our President and accept for him the gold medal brotherhood award. I know he regrets that he could not be here this evening and bring a personal message to you under the inspiration of the occasion and of this wonderful audience.

I did not have in mind to say anything myself but I have a few things in my heart and on my mind that perhaps would be in order for me to say. President Eisenhower is a living example—a symbol of good will and brotherhood. Not only is that recognized in our country but it is recognized throughout the world.

I thought I might tell you about a little incident that happened when he first started to improve on the road to health.

Admiral Radford and I went to Denver to see him for just a few minutes. He had been out on the sun porch. They brought him back in and he was reclining there in bed. The only thing he had on his mind that he wanted to talk about was whether he was going to recover to the degree that he could carry out the responsibility that he feels he has, not only to our country but in the whole world—perhaps a unique opportunity to personally contribute to peace and good will in the world and all he wanted to talk about was that and whether even if he didn't recover to the point of where he could carry on his duties as President, that he would at least recover to a point where, in some other capacity, he could still fulfill that opportunity, and I'm frank to confess to you, ladies and gentlemen, that had I been a woman I would have broken out in tears and cried.

Of course, I don't know any more than the rest of you do—whether he's going to run again or not. We have an express in the military business of "need to know" and I don't quite "need to know" up to now, but the time is getting a little short.

My particular assignment as Secretary of Defense is to make certain that our country is strong in a military sense and I would like to say that there is a fine group of dedicated men—military and civilian—in what is commonly called the Pentagon that are working diligently at that. We call it the defense team and in spite of what you may read in your papers from time to time we're making some progress with the job.

The purpose of our country in maintaining great military strength is in the hope that thus we will maintain peace in the world. Our military strength is not for aggression. Science, technology, and the mechanical production has been so phenomenally successful in the last few decades that science now has the clear promise of being able to raise the standard of living and the well-being of all the peoples in the world.

The progress in this area has been phenomenal and we all hope and pray that through strength we can maintain peace in the world until men and women of good will—men and women who recognize the responsibility of brotherhood have time to catch up in the sense of establishing better understanding among all human beings throughout the world so that the world will avoid another great catastrophe of war and that's why I'm so pleased and honored to be here this evening and accept for the President this award.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1956

Rev. Howard F. Newman, Th. D., minister of the Lewinsville Presbyterian Church, of McLean, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, on this significant anniversary we would pause to pray for the perspective of history, the spiritual power of Valley Forge, and the persistence to carry through the vision and faith of our Founding Fathers. Balance our gratitude for the heritage of the past with our contribution to the welfare of the future.

May the mounting pressures of the present never push us loose from our ideals. Give to us a clarity of vision and a consecration of purpose that will enable us to rise above the evils of blackness and the temptations of grayness to serve with devotion and honor.

May the benediction of Thy providence guide each decision this day to the good of the Nation and to the glory of God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 21, 1956, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, prior to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I think a quorum should be present, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Farewell Address of George Washington will now be read by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has been heretofore designated to perform that duty.

Mr. HUMPHREY advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the

number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold

this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of

his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had

passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 101. An act for the relief of Fernanda Miliani;

S. 117. An act for the relief of Ana P. Costes;

S. 396. An act for the relief of Theresa Pok Lim Kim; and

S. 1212. An act for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7723. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Phelps County, Mo., to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo.;

H. R. 8607. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him; and

H. R. 9390. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 206) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States to America; and

H. R. 8607. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7723. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Phelps County, Mo., to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 9390. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 206) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held by said committee during the 84th Congress, 1st session, on the national highway program.

BOARDS OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the following appointments:

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy, pursuant to title 34, United States Code, section 1084, Mr. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas; Mr. DWORSHAK, of Idaho; and Mr. BUTLER, of Maryland.

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1056, Mr. CHAVEZ, of New Mexico; Mr. ALLOTT, of Colorado; and Mrs. SMITH, of Maine.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplement to his report dated February 9, 1956, relating to changes to be made in the Foreign Petroleum Supply and Contribution of Tanker Capacity Voluntary Agreements (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CLAIM OF OTOE AND MISSOURIA TRIBE OF INDIANS VERSUS UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the proceedings in the claim of the *Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians* v. *United States* had been concluded (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Third Guam Legislature, 1956 (second) regular session; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 143

"Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for a resident commissioner for Guam

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas this legislature has heretofore adopted resolutions respectfully requesting the Congress of the United States to provide for a resident commissioner for Guam through amendment of the Organic Act of Guam to accomplish this result; and

"Whereas the need for such commissionership is continually growing as the problems of the Territory become more complex and more legislation is considered by the United States Congress affecting Guam: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide a resident commissioner for this Territory; and be it further

"Resolved, That the executive secretary be and she hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and to the House of Representatives of the United States.

"F. B. LEON GUERRERO,
"Speaker.

"A. S. N. DUENAS,
"Legislative Secretary."

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Lemon Cove, Calif., Ditch Co., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the construction and completion of the Terminus flood-control dam on the Kaweah River, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

INCREASED INTEREST RATES ON LOANS TO RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES—RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are now engaged in considering legislation aimed at helping the American farmer gain his rightful share of the general prosperity.

As we work to relieve the farmer of the economic forces now pressing so cruelly on him, I think it appropriate to note that certain other proposals now being made might well achieve the opposite effect. I speak of Hoover Commission recommendations calling for increases in interest rates on loans to REA electric cooperatives. Such increases could be very injurious to the REA system in Texas.

Before REA, less than 5 percent of Texas farms had electricity. Today, 88 percent of Texas farms have electricity. The REA's task now is to expand vertically—to provide more and more electricity for these connected farms. There are grave doubts as to whether this can be done if interest rates are increased.

I call the attention of Senators to a resolution on this subject adopted recently by the Board of Directors of the Deaf Smith County, Tex., Electric Cooperative. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That since the growth of rural electrification program in Texas shows that in 1935, 2.3 percent of the farms had electricity and in 1954, 88.1 percent of the farms had electricity, and that the cooperatives are often compared with the commercial power companies when in reality the comparison is:

	Commercial power companies	Texas co-ops
Members per mile of line	33	2.3
Revenue per mile of line	$5,479	$185

And further that the economic status of the cooperatives in Texas show:

Net operating margin 1954 [1] (debt to REA [1] $157,430,000)	$4,793,000
Principal payments (assumed 1/35 of debt)	4,500,000
Margin after debt service	293,000

[1] Source: 1954 Statistical Report, REA.

And still further that if 1 percent higher interest rate were put into effect:

Margin 1954 after debt service	$293,000
Cost of 1 percent higher interest rate on $157,430,000 debt	1,574,300
Deficit each year	1,281,300

NOTE.—Interest increase would apply only to future loans. This figure merely demonstrates what would have been effect of higher rate on past loans.

And further the effect of a 3/10-mill increase in wholesale power rate would indicate:

Margin, 1954, after debt service	$293,000
Kilowatt-hours purchased 1954, 1,048,176,000, cost of 3/10 mill increase	314,451
Annual deficit	21,451

The board of directors of the Deaf Smith County Electric Cooperative, Inc., believes that the Hoover Commission report dealing with power, particularly parts 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 would in effect be disastrous to the rural-electrification program. We respectfully ask that our Congressmen and Senators use their influence to prevent acceptance of the Hoover Commission's Report on Water Resources and Power.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress (Rept. No. 1567);

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress (Rept. No. 1568);

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress (Rept. No. 1569); and

H. J. Res. 517. Joint resolution changing the date for the counting of the electoral votes in 1957.

MARY ROYALL BROWN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 220) to pay a gratuity to Mary Royall Brown, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Royall Brown, widow of Jonathan H. Brown, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3254. A bill to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 3255. A bill for the relief of Amin Habib Nabhan;

S. 3256. A bill for the relief of Johannes Sukevainen; and

S. 3257. A bill for the relief of Georgiana Ching Hsien (Liang) New; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 3258. A bill for the relief of Margaret Kwei Chang (Margaret Hua-Chen Kwei); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 3259. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 3260. A bill to asure the accurate labeling and advertising of macaroni and spaghetti products with respect to their durum wheat flour or semolina content; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. BARKLEY):

S. 3261. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 3262. A bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mrs. SMITH of Maine when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3263. A bill for the relief of Chyn-Duog Shiah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3264. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3265. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States;

S. 3266. A bill to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska;

S. 3267. A bill to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for experimental operation and testing of vessels owned by the United States;

S. 3268. A bill to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases, and for other purposes; and

S. 3269. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3270. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S 3271. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 in order to promote scientific education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was reported and placed on the calendar:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. Res. 220. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Mary Royall Brown, reported by Mr. GREEN from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. GREEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

QUALITY REQUIREMENTS FOR IRISH POTATOES

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week to permit any Senator who may so desire, to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 3262) relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes, introduced by Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. PAYNE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO PROMOTION OF SCIENTIFIC EDUCATION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 in order to promote scientific education, the purpose of the bill being to provide an incentive for the teaching of science, mathematics, and engineering in the high schools and public schools of our country, and making it a part of the activities under the Vocational Education Act. An appropriation of $10 million a year would be authorized to finance the program.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain on the desk for 48 hours, in order that any Senator who wishes to do so may become a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the

bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 3271) to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 in order to promote scientific education, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MCNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk three amendments which I intend to propose to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program. I ask that they be printed and lie on the desk until called up for consideration.

The first amendment provides that price support shall not be made available with respect to the products of any one farm of a total value, determined on the basis of support prices, in excess of $50,000.

The second amendment, would require the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain from processors certification that they had paid producers not less than the support price, or in the case of commodities for which no support price has been established not less than 75 percent of parity, of any agricultural commodity for which price support or surplus removal operation is carried out through purchases from or loans or payments to processors.

The third amendment would—

First. Permit the Secretary of Agriculture to require, as a condition of eligibility for price support under the Agricultural Act of 1949, that farmers participate in the acreage reserve program.

Second. Require farmers to participate in the acreage reserve program in order to be eligible for payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program if they produce basic commodities, except peanuts.

Third. Render any farmer who knowingly harvested any acreage of a basic commodity in excess of the farm acreage allotment for that farm ineligible for payments under the agricultural conservation program, with four minor exceptions.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"PRICE SUPPORTS—LIMITATION

"SEC. 107. Title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such title a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 421. Price support shall not be made available under this act during any calendar year with respect to the products of any one farm of a total value, determined on the basis of support prices, in excess of $50,000.' "

On page 4, line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT OF SUPPORT PRICES BY PRODUCERS

"SEC. 107. Section 401 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" '(e) Whenever any price support or surplus removal operation for any agricultural commodity is carried out through purchases from or loans or payments to processors, the Secretary shall obtain certifications from such processors that the producers of the agricultural commodities involved have received not less than the support price therefor or, in the case of commodities for which no support price has been established, such price, not less than 75 per centum of the parity price, as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to provide a reasonable return to such producers.' "

On page 4, line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

On page 25, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"PARTICIPATION IN ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM AS CONDITION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PRICE SUPPORT AND SOIL CONSERVATION BENEFITS

"SEC. 225 (a) Section 401 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'prescribed by the Secretary', the following: 'and participation in the acreage reserve program under subtitle A of the Soil Bank Act.' "

(b) Section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof a new sentence as follows: "Participation in the acreage reserve program under subtitle A of the Soil Bank Act shall be required as a condition of eligibility for payments under this section in the case of producers of the commodities referred to in section 203 of such act."

On page 36, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"COMPLIANCE WITH ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AS A CONDITION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SOIL CONSERVATION BENEFITS

"SEC. 406. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 347 a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 348. (a) Any person who knowingly harvests any acreage of any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for such year under this title shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended. For the purposes of this section, no person shall be deemed to have harvested any acreage of any basic agricultural commodity in excess of his farm acreage allotment by reason of harvesting corn for ensilage, harvesting wheat in an amount not in excess of 15 acres, harvesting a commodity or a crop with respect to which producers have rejected marketing quotas in a marketing quota referendum, or harvesting peanuts for seed to be used for the raising of peanuts to be hogged off.

" '(b) Persons applying for any payment of money under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be required to establish their eligibility for such payment under this section in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation'."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a series of five amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table. I ask unanimous consent that a general statement, prepared by me, in support of the amendments, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement, presented by Mr. LANGER, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Section 101 of the farm bill (S. 3183), as reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, omits wheat from the mandatory 90 percent of parity provision covering corn, peanuts, and cotton. Amendment of the bill to remove the restrictive language would mean that all wheat would be supported at 90 percent of parity by direction of the Congress of the United States. Wheat would thus stand on the same footing along with the other basic commodities.

Section 102 of the farm bill, as reported by the committee, sets up a special formula for determining the support level for wheat. In 1956, most wheat probably would be supported at 90 percent of parity. But in 1957 and later years, there is no way to tell at what level wheat would be supported. The only mandatory provision is that all wheat price levels must be maintained at 75 percent of parity. The bill provides that some type of wheat should be supported at 90 percent of parity and certain other types at a competitive relationship with the feed value ratio with corn support levels.

The determination of which kinds of wheat and how much shall be supported at 90 percent of parity; and which kinds and how much shall be supported at the corn loan level is left entirely to the tender mercies of the Secretary of Agriculture, whomever he might be at that future time, as advised by a committee, two-thirds of whose members would not be wheat farmers.

This direct weakening of the wheat price support program is bad enough in and of itself. But as it could operate to destroy the support programs for all basic commodities, it is even more dangerous and invidious.

Section 102, in its entirety, should be removed from the bill. And wheat could be restored to its full status as a basis along with cotton, corn, peanuts, and tobacco by

striking out the exclusion of wheat in section 101.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments, together with a statement, prepared by me, relating to each amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendments and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beginning with line 3, on page 1, strike out over through line 24, on page 4, and insert the following:

"TITLE I—FAMILY FARM INCOME PROTECTION

"SEC. 101. Title I, title II, and title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 102. The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) is authorized and directed to make available through loans, purchases, parity payments, production payments, marketing premium payments, purchase agreements and other operations farm income protection programs to cooperators up to the limit of family-farm production for any crop or year's marketings of any agricultural commodity, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas, marketing orders, or prescribed marketing practices for such crop or year's marketings, at a level not less than 100 percent of the parity price of the commodity.

"SEC. 103. The parity price of any commodity shall be the price determined by the Secretary to be required, when multiplied by the average annual marketings of the commodity during the immediately preceding 3 years, to provide the parity income for the commodity, as defined in section 301 (a) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

"SEC. 104. For purposes of this title the term 'upper limit of family farm production' means the total volume of farm marketings that in terms of 1954 technology and farm prices, will enable a typical single-unit family farm to earn a net family income, after paying all production costs, of not more than $6,000, except that if the operator can show by attested certification that he has not employed during the year more hours of hired farm labor than was performed by the operator and members of his immediate family, such unit shall be eligible for income protection to the full extent of its farm marketings.

"SEC. 105. Parity payments, production payments, and marketing premium payments shall be the primary method of carrying out family farm income protection programs under this title with such payments used in workable combinations, as may be determined by the Secretary to be applicable to the different commodities, with loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other methods.

"SEC. 106. Section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'corn, wheat, cotton, rice or tobacco' and substituting therefor the words 'any agricultural commodity' and by striking out the words 'parity price' and substituting therefor the words 'parity income'.

"SEC. 107. To carry out the purposes of this title, the Secretary is authorized and directed to make use of any or all price support funds, heretofore or hereafter made available to him. Expenditures made to carry out the purposes of this title by the Commodity Credit Corporation, as directed by the Secretary, shall be reported to the Treasurer of the United States who shall order the cancellation of an equivalent value of Commodity Credit Corporation notes held by the Treasury.

"SEC. 108. The total of parity payments, production payments and marketing premium payments made to any single farm operator or farm family shall not exceed $2,500 in any one calendar year.

"SEC. 109. The words 'production payments' means the making of payments directly to producers equal to the extent by which average market price received by farmers augmented by such marketing premium payments and parity payments as may have been made for the commodity is less than the parity price therefor.

"SEC. 110. Marketing premium payments as used in this title mean payments made to producers, where required, in connection with special marketing programs for such commodities as may be designated by the Secretary to encourage the marketing of high quality commodities in a volume better balanced with consumer demand than would be the case in the absence of such marketing premium payments program."

The statement by Senator LANGER, relating to his amendment numbered 1, is as follows:

The amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota would substitute a comprehensive full parity farm-income program for the partial-parity provision of Members of the Senate fully understand that we live in an almost completely legislated economy.

Interest rates are established under authority of Federal law by the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. This is price or income support for banks and other lending institutions.

Freight and passenger rates are established by the Interstate Commerce Commission under authority of Federal law. This is price or income support for the transportation industry.

Depletion allowances are income supports for the oil and certain other industries.

Accelerated tax amortization privileges extended by the Office of Defense Mobilization are price or income supports for a wide range of business and industry.

Military procurement cost-plus contracts are price or income supports and Government guarantees of minimum levels of profit for that group of manufacturers.

Tax dollars used for the strategic materials stockpile have been used deliberately to support prices and incomes of high cost (or inefficient) producers of many minerals.

Appropriations are made annually to support the merchant marine—this is price or income support for private ship owners.

Industrial tariffs are effective price or income supports for the manufacturing business community.

This is only a small part of the list of direct and indirect subsidies or price and income supports provided by our Government for a major part of our so-called free-enterprise economy.

Minimum-wage laws and protection of collective bargaining are income supports for workingmen.

Every major segment of our economy has specifically designed income support provided by the Federal Government. Why should farmers be picked out as the only important segment required to survive on a go-it-alone, get-yours-in-the-free-market basis.

Yet Secretary Benson and his big-business advertising men have been drumming for 3 years, trying to sell these ideas:

That farm programs are bad.

That subsidies are very bad for farmers.

That supports for farmers are destructive of our free-enterprise system.

That if for political reasons it is necessary to have them at all, they should be very low (at disaster levels) and that the level at which disaster overtakes farmers should be entirely in the discretion of the administration.

That surpluses of food are a very bad thing and not in the public interest.

That the cost of farm programs is an unjustifiable and unneeded burden on the taxpayers and that such programs are directly responsible for the high cost of food at retail.

And, finally, great effort has been made to convince the public that price supports at any level, higher than desired by the administration, whatever that level is, have only one purpose and effect, namely, to subsidize high-cost or inefficient farmers.

Everybody has been told there is six or seven billion dollars invested in CCC inventories of farm products. But how many people know the amount of money tied up in the strategic materials stockpile? Judging from the appropriation thus far requested, it is probably nine or ten billion dollars. More than a year ago the Wall Street Journal reported our buying policy was to offer prices high enough on all strategic materials to insure a fair margin of profit to the high cost or inefficient producers. And I'm not opposed to that—I'm pointing it out to get this discussion in proper focus.

What is the cost to the Treasury in uncollected taxes of the 27½-percent depletion allowance for the producers of oil and certain other minerals. Who knows? The annual cost to other taxpayers probably exceeds the cost of the farm program.

What is the cost to the Treasury in uncollected taxes of the accelerated tax amortization certificates? The House Appropriations Committee's reports places the figures at more than $40 billion from 1950–54.

In these unsettled times everyone wants our country to be strong enough to cope with any situation which could conceivably arise. Our military is now reported to have in inventory $140 billion of military equipment.

Now, military equipment has an acknowledged rate of obsolescence that runs close to 33⅓ percent annually, with many of the highly expensive items in the inventory like planes, guns, and radar equipment completely out of date by the time they are delivered to the military. This obsolescence amounts to billions of dollars each year and is borne by the taxpayer, not by the manufacturer.

In agriculture, farmers and farm programs are charged with the total cost of carrying inventories and the cost of spoilage.

Wouldn't it then seem reasonable to charge General Motors, Du Pont, Douglas Aircraft, and other producers of military goods with the comparable cost of carrying military inventories and the loss incurred from obsolescence? What is proper for one should be proper for the other. Yet, of course, no intelligent person would seriously make such a suggestion. Let's get this farm debate into perspective.

If we are really concerned with national defense and the public interest, why isn't it just as important to have adequate—yes, more than adequate—stockpiles of food and fiber, as to have stockpiles of military equipment and strategic materials—and why isn't it equally sound to charge the cost of such food inventories not against farmers and their farm program but where they belong in the defense budget?

But let's continue with the record of this big-business administration. And remember its their record—they made it.

According to the Wall Street Journal, business borrowers are paying the highest interest rates in 22 years. Since January 1, 1955, the Treasury Department has tripled interest rates on some issues of Government securities.

These general increases in interest rates were started early in 1953. Farmers are, of course, caught in this interest-rate game as are other users of credit. Farm mortgage debt increased 7 percent in 1954 over 1953 and in 1955 was 10 percent higher than in 1954.

Here are some of the results accruing to big business from Government price and income supports. Comparing with the comparable figures for 1952—

Corporate profits before taxes are up 20 percent.

Corporation profits after taxes are up 34 percent.

The price of corporation stocks is up 71 percent.

During the first 9 months of 1955 General Motors sales were 10 billion and profits after taxes were 1 billion. Kraft cheese (a processor of dairy products) 1952 profit 27 million; 1953, 30.8 million; 1954, 37.4 million and thus far in 1955 their profits are at an annual rate of 40 million.

Railroads have had 13 permanent rate increases since 1946. According to the American Association of Railroads their 1955 profits are expected to be at least 20 percent greater than 1954 or more than $1 billion.

Government reports show the following increases in profits for 1955 adjusted to an annual basis over the levels of 1954:

Ten textile companies up 78.1 percent.

Twenty-three steel companies up 105.9 percent.

Six rubber companies up 34 percent.

Twenty-one chemical companies up 28 percent.

Seven farm-equipment companies up 24 percent.

Thirty utility companies up 13 percent.

Now how do these figures compare with the situation in which farmers find themselves?

The average price of all farm products for 1955 adjusted to was down 19 percent from the level of 1952. Yet farm income was down 12 percent from 1954 and down 27 percent from 1952.

Copper even during the most critical period of World War II was being price supported and purchased by the Government at 12 cents per pound. I remember the discussions and this figure was determined to be adequate to keep even the high cost producers in business. Now, copper is being price supported and purchased for the strategic materials stockpile at 36 cents per pound, three times as high and a very similar situation is true with respect to lead and zinc.

Farmers and the farm program are deliberately being made the public whipping boy, so as to keep public attention diverted from the great giveaway programs which appear to be a basic policy of this administration. Tidelands oil, Dixon-Yates, Hells Canyon, our $16 billion investment in atomic energy, our publicly owned grazing lands, large areas of our national forest, and our publicly owned hydroelectric powerplants. Perhaps slogans like regimentation as applied to farm programs, and creeping socialism as applied to TVA and our 50-year-old public-power policy have been carefully designed to blind the public to a new policy of galloping giveaway of our remaining public domain.

These are the essentials of the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment provides for a parity formula which will accomplish these objectives.

1. Establish parity prices that would provide parity income for farmers—that was the goal Congress set in the 1948 Farm Act.

2. Establish a fair relationship between the parity price of the various farm commodities.

3. Result in a level of parity prices on all commodities high enough to enable farmers to operate and maintain their farms and to earn per person incomes equivalent to those that can be earned by people in other walks of life.

My amendment repeals the so-called modernized parity formula, dual parity, and transitional parity because all these formulas will, year after year, create an unpredictable distortion in a fair parity price relationship, among farm commodities.

Existing parity formulas come out with prices on most commodities at levels too low to enable farmers year after year to meet their operating costs and maintenance of their plant and equipment.

The so-called modernized formula insures that bad luck 1 year by producer of a commodity becomes bad luck for 10 years.

It has a built-in factor which will mathematically create a lower parity price, year after year, for all commodities whose market prices fall below parity.

There are some requisites that must be taken into account when you speak of controls. Farmers must pay their bills out of gross income. Gross income is derived from bushels times price, or pounds times price, or gallons or whatever they produce times the unit price of that commodity. So when total production is reduced it naturally follows that the unit price must be high enough so that the multiplication will result in sufficient income for the farmer to pay his bills, otherwise bankruptcy will follow quickly. It's just that simple.

It seems a bit silly to take the time of the Senate with this primer grade arithmetic but it is evident that many of the Senators do not understand it. Advocates of the sliding scale of price supports allege that lower price on all nonbasic commodities and to the limit permitted by law, has reduced acreage of basic crops. Total production has not been reduced, it has increased on everything but allotment crops—but, the lowered price on the nonbasic commodities and the sharply reduced production of allotment crops has resulted in a cost-price relationship that closely approaches that of 1933.

The Senators will agree that 1933 was a bad time for the entire Nation? Do the Senators know that using the same parity formula so that the figures are truly comparable—the national average price of wheat was 70 percent of parity in 1933 and only 77 percent on October 21, 1955—

On barley it was 58 in 1933 and only 51 now.

On flaxseed it was 81 in 1933 and only 57 now.

On oats it was 71 in 1933 and only 50 now.

On rye it was 73 in 1933 and only 43 now.

On corn it was 68 in 1933 and is 69 at the present time.

These are national averages. The average price in North Dakota on some of these crops is lower than these national average figures.

It is said, in disregard of the truth, that the sliding scale has not yet had a chance to work—that it started only this year. Let the Senators review the facts known to all who haven't forgotten.

The sliding scale law with its new parity formula became law in 1948. It was amended in 1949—to raise the bottom of the sliding scale from 60 percent to 75 percent of parity; it was further amended so that the sliding scale could not be applied to the six basic crops and so that both parity formulas should be used in calculating the parity price of the 6 basic commodities and that whichever parity price was higher on any of the 6 basic commodities was the one to be used—it was renewed from time to time and finally expired in 1954. Therefore, the new parity formula and the sliding scale of price supports were in effect for the first time on the 1955 crop of the six basic commodities—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. All other crops have been under the new parity formula and subject to the sliding scale of price supports since 1949. This administration has used the sliding scale of price supports on a reducing basis as rapidly and drastically as it could on everything except the six basic crops of which only wheat is a principal cash crop in North Dakota. Must the Senator from North Dakota remind anyone of the sliding-scale application to oats, barley, flaxseed, and rye in the past 3 years? Does any Senator need a reminder of the application of the sliding scale to dairy products on April Fool's Day in 1954?

The sliding scale has also been used on cottonseed, soy beans, and grain sorghums. The present law authorizes price supports, and the money is available for them on hogs, cattle, sheep, lambs, chickens, eggs, and many other additional commodities. Yet, despite this authority, no action was taken by the Eisenhower administration last year when eggs hit a low of 6 cents a dozen. No action was taken 2 years ago when cattlemen by the thousands were bankrupt, and the Senators know the story of hog prices.

The amendment before you makes adequate supports mandatory in law. As a nation we believe in a government of law, administered by men, not a government of men, administering by edict. Second, no industry of the size and complexity of agriculture can afford to have its operations subjected annually to the caprice, the attitude, or the just plain ignorance of an individual who may from time to time be Secretary of Agriculture. As to the level of supports, we want price supports at, as the amendment provides for, 100 percent of parity farm income protection.

Experience has proved that the only time the so-called free market will yield 100 percent of a fair parity to farmers is when there is an actual and serious shortage of a particular commodity. When that happens, most farmers have little or nothing to sell and consumers are required to pay ridiculous prices for that commodity. And, finally, for the reason that if a fair parity price, means what it says: A fair price, a necessary price, in relation to a farmer's cost, then any price less than 100 percent of parity is less than a fair price and less than a necessary price.

There is no ethical, moral, nor economic justification for fractional support prices. The only difference between 90 percent of a fair price and 60 percent of a fair price, is that a farmer can stay in business a little longer with 90 percent of a fair price than he can with 60 percent of a fair price.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota provides for mandatory 100 percent of parity farm income. The parity price formula provided in the pending amendment starts with the parity farm income definition in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, that the average income per person of people on farms should be equivalent to that of nonfarm people. The existing law then defines parity income for each commodity as being its part of parity farm income. The amendment provides that parity price of a commodity shall be the price which if multiplied by the average volume of marketing for that commodity over the preceding 10 years will give the parity income for that commodity.

PARITY PRICE FORMULA

In 1948, the Congress enacted a provision relating to parity farm income. The proposed amendment now on the desk introduced by the Senator from North Dakota would put some teeth into the parity income promise of the successful presidential candidate in 1952 who evidently had read the 1948 farm act. The amendment takes the parity income definition in the 1948 act that has been on the books for 8 years and uses it to calculate parity prices for the different commodities.

Section 301 (a) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended in 1948, defines parity farm income as that gross income that will enable farm operator families to have a standard of living equivalent to that of people in other gainful occupations.

The standard is the income of nonfarm people. The per person income of nonfarm people in 1955 was approximately $1,960. The average per person family income from farm sources of commercial farm operator families was about $860; this is exclusive of about $270 of income per farm person from nonfarm sources. Parity farm income would thus be $1,690, or $530 per person higher than was actually the case

in 1955. Actual farm operator family income in 1955 was only 51 percent of parity farm income.

To provide a parity farm income, national farm operators total net income would have had to have been $21.6 billion instead of the $11 billion actually attained.

Holding production expenses at the same level, this would mean an increase in farm operators gross income from the 1955 figure of $33.3 billion to $43.9 billion and increase of cash receipts from marketings from the 1955 figure of $29.2 billion to approximately $39.2 billion.

This $39.2 billion figure would be established by the Secretary of Agriculture as the parity equivalent cash receipts from farm marketings and the $43.9 billion figure as the 1955 parity farm gross income.

The parity equivalent cash receipts from farm marketings for 1955 is thus just about one-third greater than the 10-year average of cash receipts from farm marketings from 1945 through 1954. In accordance with section 301 (a) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the commodity parity income of any commodity would be the same relationship to the 10-year average. Thus the parity income for what in 1955 would be 133 percent of the average annual farm value for the 10-year-base period. The same calculation would be made for any commodity. The following calculations of commodity parity income and parity price are indicated in the attached table for illustrative purposes only. Exact calculations by the Department of Agriculture statisticians might vary a few cents one way or another from the parity prices I have shown in the table. But the table does illustrate quite accurately the effect of the amendment that has been introduced by the Senator from North Dakota.

CALCULATION OF LANGER PARITY PRICES

A. Ten-year average cash receipts from farm marketings, $30 billion (1945–54 average).

B. Parity equivalent cash receipts from farm marketings, $39.2 billion.

Commodity	Ratio (B divided by A)		Plus 131 percent		Modernized parity
	1945–54 marketings	Parity income	1945–54 volume sold	Langer parity price	
	Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*		
Hogs (hundredweight)	$3,751	$4,914	191	$25.70	$21.00
Wheat (bushels)	2,310	3,026	1,164	2.59	2.38
Rye (bushels)	32	42	21	2.00	1.66
Barley (bushels)	331	434	266	1.63	1.33
Cotton (pounds)	2,114	2,769	6,516	.42	.35
Flaxseed	156	204	38	5.38	4.41

The Senator from North Dakota never has seen any justification for limiting price supports to the six basic commodities.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota provides 100 percent of parity farm income protection for all important farm commodities. This would provide, first, equitable treatment of all farmers, whatever they produce. Second, it establishes the only basis upon which it is possible to secure, democratically, the annual reallocation of agricultural resources necessary to meet the Nation's food needs, while yet dealing factually with the problems of weather, soil, climate, and geography, all of which affect a farmer's ability to shift his production emphasis. These are problems peculiar to and inherent in agriculture.

The amendment is designed to protect, preserve, and strengthen the family-type farmer in American agriculture.

In line with this objective we want minimums established of either acreage or marketing allotments as the case may be so that family-type farmers will not be forced out of business.

In line with this same objective the amendment sets a maximum in line with the normal production of an "adequate family farm," above which no farm income protection would be available to any operator. This was recommended by President Eisenhower. His supporters among the Senators will no doubt support the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota authorizes and directs the use of parity payments, production payments, and market premium incentive payments.

Let's see how production payments work out for a commodity the Senators are all interested in—milk.

The price problems in fluid milk areas are more difficult than those for most other farm commodities. The production standards necessary to meet health requirements of milk are exacting. Milk is a highly perishable product and must be moved daily. Dairymen, in most cases, must sell to one or a few buyers. Price stability is necessary to assure a dependable day-to-day supply of milk in urban markets.

In the interests of both dairy farmers and the general public, the farm income protection program must treat milk as a basic comomdity. The dairy farmer must have price assurance which is just as definite and adequate in amount as that provided any other producer.

In order to carry out the program, all the available tools should be used.

Dairy cooperatives enable farmers to do better bargaining, stimulate competition, and provide a maximum of self-help.

Marketing agreements and orders help to maintain orderly marketing and otherwise aid in evening out the peaks and valleys of supply and price.

In particular circumstances and at particular times, the Government purchase method of supporting prices works well. When a surplus situation is likely to last only a short time, and when desirable outlets such as the school lunch program are available, it makes sense to buy and provide a use for milk that might otherwise demoralize markets and go to waste.

The Secretary of Agriculture has been using all these methods, however, and they have done a completely adequate job. In addition, the production-payment method should be used. This method allows producers to go on producing and consumers to go on consuming past the point where surpluses would otherwise begin to cause trouble. It is a simple method. If prices averaged less than the parity-support level, producers would receive a payment for the difference between the market average and the support price. It offers the producer an opportunity to sell more milk at reasonable prices, instead of selling less milk at higher prices. It is a price-support method which keeps the Government out of business channels and gives the consumer the chance to use the abundance that the farmer produces.

Production payments make sense. The rank and file of consumers think so, too. Taxpayers are justifiably alarmed at the money they are spending to take milk and other commodities off the market. They recognize the need of farm-income protection, but they don't see much point in buying farm commodities for uneconomic uses.

Maybe the opponents of production payments can tell you how the Government can put these commodities to good use—how they can use them under existing legislation to improve the diets of the American people.

In view of the remarkable hue and cry by the Eisenhower administration against the use of production payments, you might be interested in the recommendation of the Dairy Industry Committee over 10 years ago.

This committee, by the way, represented the following: The American Butter Institute, National Cheese Institute, American Dry Milk Institute, Evaporated Milk Association, International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, International Association of Milk Dealers, and the Dairy Industries Supply Association.

In discussing possible methods of price support after the war the committee came out solidly for what it called "compensatory payments to producers" which it described as follows:

"The prices of dairy products, left free to find their level on the basis of supply and demand, coupled with a direct Government payment to the farmer in addition to his return under a free market price, if necessary, to maintain the support.

"This form of support"—still quoting the Dairy Industry Committee—"would tend to promote maximum consumption consistent with demand and supply conditions. * * * The Dairy Industry Committee recommends this method to Government and has committed itself to work for its adoption."

The purchase method discourages consumption by raising prices to consumers.

It takes away from consumers the foods they want and places those foods in Government warehouses.

It puts the Government in business in a big way, buying, storing, and trying to dispose of perishable commodities.

It is expensive and wasteful.

It makes a difficult disposal problem, because the products can seldom be sold back into domestic markets. Instead, they must generally be given away or sold abroad at prices much lower than American consumers are paying.

The amendment provides an alternative support method. Whenever a commodity requires support the national ever-normal storehouse is full and there are no further satisfactory outlets such as the school lunch program, the Government should stop buying and start making production payments directly to producers.

The Senator from North Dakota firmly believes that the only real purpose—the sole and only justification for a farm program of any kind is to assure to farm families an income, adequate to meet annual cost of operation, necessary maintenance, and improvement of plant and equipment, and to maintain a level of consumption and use of goods and services, commensurate with the dependence of the rest of our highly integrated economy upon an adequate level of farm family purchasing power. Any suggested farm program or any suggested part of a farm program which does not meet this test has no value and no justification.

Those who believe the principal consideration in a farm program is "How much does it cost?" would do well to recall the years 1920 through 1929. In those years there were no tax dollars spent for a farm program; there were no difficult administrative problems; and there were no farm programs to affect in any way our so-called free-enterprise economy.

But there were a million and a half farmers who were bankrupt and most of the rest were so deeply in debt that it took the

best part of 20 years for even a part of them to get their heads above water.

Those who disagree as to the need and purpose of a complete farm program should review the period 1930 through 1935. The hundreds of thousands of small-business men who were bankrupt—business executives committing suicide—bank failures the length and breadth of our land; the entire economy almost at a standstill; 16 million men unemployed.

There were difficult administrative problems then. There were tax dollars spent then. Our free-enterprise economy which then was sick unto death was glad to have "Dr. Government" prescribe the medicine and pay for both the doctor and the hospital bill.

Government guaranties of bank deposits, RFC, RACC, NRA, PWA, WPA, propping up insurance companies, bailing out creditors, making work, so as to feed the unemployed. No one cried creeping socialism then. No one shouted about regimentation then. No one objected to the use of tax dollars. No one insisted on a balanced budget then. No one alleged then that Government programs were destroying the free-enterprise system. Everyone then agreed that Government action was imperative to save the free-enterprise system. And all of this, because farmers, in our highly legislated, highly subsidized economy, had found it impossible to keep their price and income in sound relationship to their costs and their loss of purchasing power had the cumulative effects upon the entire economy with which you are all familiar.

The total cost to the Nation, of not having a strong and adequate family farm income protection program during the decade of the twenties and the first part of the thirties was so staggering, and present level of Government subsidies both direct and indirect, which are price and income support programs for big business, is so high that the Senator from North Dakota has no hesitation whatsoever in suggesting an adequate family farm income protection program with the total net cost to be borne by the Government. All of the lessons of history plus the whole body of public experience provide adequate evidence than any lesser alternative will in the end be unthinkably more costly.

The amendment numbered 2, submitted by Mr. LANGER, is as follows:

On page 7, beginning with line 3, strike out over through line 22 on page 11.

On page 11, line 23, strike out "Subtitle B" and insert "Subtitle A."

On page 21, line 12, strike out "Subtitle C" and insert "Subtitle B."

On page 25, beginning with line 15, strike out over through line 17 on page 30, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III—NATIONAL EVER-NORMAL STOREHOUSE AND CONSERVATION RESERVE

"SEC. 301. Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954 is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 302. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall set aside within its inventories at least one year's normal domestic consumption and exports of all storable farm commodities and storable products of perishable and semiperishable farm commodities, as rapidly as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be feasible with due regard to not reducing any year's market volume of farm commodities and their products below the quantity that will be taken by consumer demand and exports in a full employment economy at 100 percent of parity prices. Such set-aside commodities and products shall be called the 'national ever-normal storehouse.'

"SEC. 303. The ever-normal storehouse shall be adequately dispersed within the geographic area of the United States in relation to population distribution to serve the needs of civilian defense, as determined by the Civil Defense Administrator and within the geographic area of friendly free domestic nations as required for collective security as determined by the President upon recommendations of the National Security Council.

"SEC. 304. The national ever-normal storehouse shall not be reduced except (1) by order of the President at any time when in his judgment such reduction is required for purposes of the common defense or to relieve acute shortages of food or fiber in case of widespread national disaster, declared by the President, or (2) in time of war or during a national emergency with respect to the common defense proclaimed by the President, on order of such agency as may be designated by the President.

"SEC. 305. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to advance not to exceed $750 million annually, in addition to the authorization in section 209 (c), to expand the scope of the conservation reserve program in a manner that will contribute to establishment of a national conservation safety reserve of soil fertility and improved soil, water, and related resources, and reduce the volume of total agricultural production in any year to the volume that will be marketable in a year of full employment at 100 percent of parity prices. Allocation of these funds to the several commodities will be determined by the extent to which the gross income from the sale of each fails to reach the parity income as defined in section 301 (a) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

"SEC. 306. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed through use of funds available to it to extend loans for adequate periods at an interest rate equal to the average net cost of funds to the Federal Government and technical services to farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperatives to build storage, processing, and distributing facilities required to handle the national ever-normal storehouse and to make binding occupancy agreements to utilize at least 75 percent of such storage space for a period of not less than 10 years."

The statement by Senator LANGER, relating to amendment numbered 2, is as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota has submitted an amendment, which, if enacted, would establish a national safety reserve of food and fiber for civilian defense and military security of the free democratic friendly nations of the world.

The amendment would require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish within the Commodity Credit Corporation, a national security ever-normal storehouse of storable farm commodities and storable products of perishable and semiperishable farm commodities equal to 1 full years' domestic consumption and exports. This national-security storehouse of commodities would be widely dispersed within the United States in accordance with directions of the Administrator of Civilian Defense and throughout the friendly free democratic nations of the world in accordance with the recommendations of the National Security Council. I realize that the general public has not been informed of the very great danger to our country of hydrogen bombs and cobalt bombs carried by intercontinental bomber planes. And the intercontinental ballistic missile with a hydrogen bomb warhead is just around the research corner. I know the Administrator of Civilian Defense would feel that our urban populations, particularly, would be safer if we had a stockpile of stored food and fiber to meet the emergency that we hope never comes.

The proposed amendment would direct that three-fourths of the ever-normal storehouse in the United States should be processed and stored by farmer-controlled and farmer-owned processing and marketing cooperatives.

The amendment also provides that subtitle A of the Soil Bank Act would be eliminated from the bill and the money transferred to the conservation reserve so that we can build up a completely adequate reserve of soil fertility without putting an undue hardship on wheat and cotton farmers who have already been forced to take 25 to 50 percent cuts in their cash crop acreages.

The amendment numbered 3, submitted by Mr. LANGER, is as follows:

On page 28, at the end of line 5, add the following: "No expenditure shall be made from this fund except for marketing premium payments or production payments except where the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the purposes of this act and improved national nutrition will be furthered by purchases made from processors or other vendors who certify that the producers of the commodities from which the products are made received payment for the commodities at the support price equivalent specified by the Secretary of Agriculture."

The statement by Senator LANGER, relating to amendment numbered 3, is as follows:

I have submitted an amendment to require use of section 32 funds to help farmers rather than processors.

The Senator from North Dakota examined the authorities which are available for hog price support operations under existing legislation and the committee bills. The only alternatives now open are to purchase either live hogs or finished pork. For obvious reasons, the Government would be in no position to handle live hogs. This leaves purchase of pork and pork products as the only reasonable alternative method under existing authorizations which are not enforced by the committee bill.

There are several serious disadvantages in supporting hog prices by purchase of pork and pork products:

1. It is virtually impossible to assure support levels for products. There is no assurance that the purchase program will maintain prices of hogs at support levels for all producers. Certainly the purchase program now in operation has done nothing to maintain adequate levels to producers throughout the entire country. Hogs are sold by farmers at hundreds of points, away from central public markets, and the differentials between prices in different areas are constantly changing. This has to be taken into consideration in directing the purchase program. Even so, the program is supporting prices received by packers, while producers are not getting any established hog price-support level. Furthermore, Government purchases of pork necessarily are made only from federally inspected slaughterers; otherwise, the pork could not be moved across State lines or into foreign shipment. In addition, there frequently are temporary gluts at markets and no amount of Government buying of pork or pork products will maintains prices at support levels during those periods.

2. It is difficult and costly to handle, store, and dispose of the pork products acquired. The question of disposal of products acquired by a purchasing program would become very serious if the Secretary really tried to use them to raise hog producers income. After the products are acquired they must be held in cold storage, with the resulting high handling costs and spoilage risks. In a purchase program of sufficient size to help farmers, eventual disposal would have to be arranged primarily outside of the United States, since return of these products to the domestic market would at most times weaken the price—the very thing we would be trying

to prevent by our purchases. Exports, however, could only be arranged at greatly reduced prices, and in some cases probably almost on a fight basis. The net result would be very little return on the disposal of the pork stockpiles. The money used in such price support could be very nearly a total loss.

3. Complex administrative machinery is required. The difficulties involved in handling large quantities of fresh and cured pork are quite apparent. There is the problem of setting up an adequate staff of experts in meat procurement to carry out the buying, storing, and selling operations required by a purchase program. The Department does not now have a large enough staff to man an effective program and would face considerable difficulty in recruiting one.

4. Maintaining more nearly adequate pork prices would discourage increased domestic consumption. The other disadvantage of a purchase program—lack of incentive for expansion of consumer purchases—is extremely significant. Under the purchase method, operations should be geared to holding or raising market prices to the support levels. This undoubtedly would result in an increase, or at least a maintenance, of retail prices for pork products with the resulting discouragement to increased consumption. The Senators could not overemphasize this point. A large part of the thinking back of the production-payment idea is to make possible greater domestic consumption of the perishable products that come off our farms.

In contrast to the difficulties of purchasing operations, a marketing premium payment plan for hog supports would be relatively simple in operation. It would also avoid the chief weaknesses of a purchase program.

Definite support can be given to all hog producers throughout the country if hog prices are supported by market premiums payments. Whenever the market price for a certain period averaged below the announced support, the difference between the average market price and the support level would establish the rate of payment to producers who sold hogs for slaughter during that period. All producers who sold hogs for slaughter within the period would receive the same rate of payment per 100 pounds liveweight if he marketed his hogs at less than a specified rate. And under this plan, each individual hog producer would have full incentive to get the highest possible price for his hogs on the market.

The problems of disposal would be eliminated as to all hogs moving directly into market.

No highly technical staff would be required under the marketing premium payment program. The work would be handled by the field force to ASC farmer committees, and the administrative expense to the Government for making premium payments would be relatively small.

Under the premium payment method, prices of pork and pork products would seek the level determined by domestic and export demand, without governmental action. As a result, the entire output from the slaughter of hogs would move into domestic consumption channels at lower weights and into such export markets as would be available. Retail prices would be at levels which would increase consumer purchasing, broadening the demand for hogs.

If the Secretary determines, however, to use Government purchases from section 32 funds as a means to protect the income of hog raisers or other farmers, the pending amendment would require him to specify the exact support-level price to producers and require him to obtain a certification from the packer or other vendor that such support prices have in fact been paid to the farmers.

The amendment numbered 4, submitted by Mr. LANGER, is as follows:

On page 36, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"SEC. 406. Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'SEC. 394. Nothwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, whenever he finds that the total supply of any farm commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year exceeds the reserve supply thereof, to proclaim the amount of the total supply, and beginning on the first day of the marketing year next following and continuing throughout such year a national marketing quota shall be in effect for that commodity marketed during such marketing year: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall cause to be held a referendum by secret ballot of the producers of that commodity and if more than one-third of the producers of that commodity voting in such referendum oppose the quota, as proclaimed by the Secretary, the quota shall be ineffective from the date of the proclamation: *Provided further*, That subsequent to the proclamation of the total supply but prior to the date of the referendum the Secretary of Agriculture shall apportion the national marketing quota among the several States, counties, and individual producers in relation to the volume of farm marketings of the commodity by each in the immediately preceding 3 years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law the marketing quota of any producer shall not be reduced below that required for an adequate family living from the production of that commodity in combination with other commodities produced on the farm and the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish an appropriate schedule of marketing quota percentage reductions from the 3-year base for individual producers such that larger producers will be required to take appropriately larger percentage cuts than smaller producers: *And provided further*, That the Secretary shall make known to every producer his individual marketing quota at least 10 days prior to the date of the referendum. In administration of programs initiated to carry out this section the Secretary shall utilize the services of the farmer committees established pursuant to section 8 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.'"

The statement by Senator LANGER, relating to amendment No. 4, is as follows:

I have submitted an amendment to S. 3183, which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to set farm marketing quotas, when they are in effect, on a specific bushelage or poundage base for each farmer instead of on an acreage base, for crops other than tobacco and peanuts. This quota would govern the volume a grower could sell without penalty in a given year, regardless of how many or how few acres he used to produce it. For tobacco and peanuts the acreage-allotment procedure appears to have worked fairly satisfactorily, and therefore should not be changed.

However, in high-risk wheat and cotton areas the producer never knows when he plants his acreage allotment what his production and sales might be. If his marketing quota is established as the production from allotted acres there is no basis, either nationally or on the individual farm, to know how much volume of sales will move into the commercial market.

A wheat farmer in North Dakota never knows when he plants whether his yield will be nothing, 2 bushels per acre, 15 bushels, or 22 or 30. With a 200-acre allotment, his marketing quota might thus vary from as little as 0 or 200 bushels to as much as 6,000 bushels from year to year. This is a most unstabilizing and completely unnecessary result of existing marketing quota laws for wheat, cotton, and rice.

The purpose of marketing quotas is to regulate the volume of sales of a commodity by charging a heavy penalty on sales over quota. A national determination is made as to what volume of the commodity will be needed for domestic and export needs in the year ahead. This is expressed in bushelage or poundage terms. This national marketing quota should not be translated into a national acreage allotment but should be distributed to States and counties and individual farmers as a specific marketing quota. If no producer exceeded his marketing quota the volume actually marketed would equal the national marketing quota.

Under existing law, the volume actually marketed from allotment acres may be substantially below or substantially above the national marketing quota, depending upon acreage yields. In crops and areas where yields do not vary greatly from year to year this poses no great difficulty. But as droughts in recent years, reaching even into Georgia and Virginia, have indicated, the acreage allotment device is a blunt and clumsy method at best, even in humid areas.

For the individual producer, except for tobacco and peanuts, basing marketing quotas on acreage allotment simply does not make much sense, nor does it allow him to fit the program effectively into his farm-management plan. If the individual wheat producer, for example, knew before planting time that his quota was 4,000 bushels, he would be able to choose the acres on which he wants to try to produce it. One year he might choose to use 200 acres of his most fertile land and another year to use 400 acres of his less fertile soil. If growing conditions looked especially promising, he might wish to plant 500 acres of his land into wheat, knowing full well that at average yields his total production that year would greatly exceed his marketing quota. He would market his quota volume and would store on the farm the excess production for sale in a later year when due to weather, disease, or pests his yields might be greatly reduced.

A determination is made as to the volume of the commodity which is marketed will fill export needs, if any, preserve an adequate national stockpile of safety reserve of the commodity, and fill the expressed needs of domestic United States consumers at a price that will be consistent with the continued production of a sustained abundance of the commodity, and consequently will prevent farm bankruptcy, reduced farm-family living standards, and the development of a condition of chronic poverty on American farms.

Under a farm-marketing quota system each farmer is apprised, well before planting or breeding time, of the amount of the commodity he is authorized to market at the higher or parity price, determined by legislation or agreement as being a price that is fair to both producers and consumers. If the farmer sells only this volume of the commodity he can do so at support price. If he wants to produce and sell more than the determined volume he may do so, but only by selling all of his marketings of that commodity at a much lower average price. The lower average price in this case results from two factors: first, any sales above the marketing quota must be made subject to the payment of a fee, or penalty, for the privilege of selling above quota. This fee or penalty is deducted from whatever price the farmer receives. Moreover, the entire marketings of that commodity by the farmer who exceeds his marketing quota must be sold at the market price, which may be lower than determined support price owing to the operation of production payments as a method of support or because market price has fallen below the announced support price available through

Government loans, purchase agreements, or purchases.

Marketing quotas, with or without acreage allotments, are not a system of federally imposed farm production controls. Any farmer can produce and sell any amount of the commodity that he wishes. But to do so he must be willing to accept a lower return per unit than that made available to the farmer who holds his annual marketing within his agreed upon quota. First, somebody must decide under the law the total national quota that fits the circumstances of the particular year. Second, somebody must make known to each farm family the information as to its share of the national quota. Third, somebody must hold a referendum or vote to determine whether the producers of that commodity wish to impose marketing quotas upon themselves that year. Fourth, if quotas are approved by producers, somebody must administer the machinery that makes provisions effective with respect to the marketings of each producer. Fifth, maintenance of the higher or support price or return requires the operation of a Federal farm price-support program. Sixth, enforcement of the lower of the two prices requires both withholding of support-program eligibility and the imposition and collection of fees or penalties on over-quota marketings of individual producers.

It is entirely possible that all of these needed functions could be performed by an organization of producers to which certain governmental powers were granted by the Federal Government. However, experience, logic, and commonsense all indicate that the first three functions listed above can most efficiently be performed by the United States Department of Agriculture and that the latter three involve the exercise of the spending and police powers of government, which probably should not be transferred by the Government to any private group. Moreover, since the effective operation of marketing quotas contribute to the national welfare by maintaining farm income at a level where farmers can make their pro rata contribution to an expanding full-employment economy, can conserve and improve their soil and water resources and farm equipment and thus insure a continuing ability to produce a sustained abundance of food and fiber, the administrative cost of the marketing-quota program is a just charge upon the general Federal revenues and not upon the producers of a single farm commodity.

Representative BURDICK and the Senator from North Dakota have been trying for many long years to bring about enactment of legislation that would substitute bushelage and poundage marketing quotas for acreage allotments. We were gratified, though surprised, when our President joined us after all these years in this recommendation. I urge my colleagues in our party to join with our President on this. When the Senator from North Dakota and Secretary Benson agree on something as improvement in the farm program, you certainly should not oppose it. Here you can demonstrate the broadest kind of party unity. I urge you and welcome you to join President Eisenhower and me in giving to farmers the kind of marketing-quota program they want and which makes the most sense from a national standpoint, too.

The amendment, No. 5, submitted by Mr. LANGER, is as follows:

On page 4, after line 24, add the following:

"SEC. 108. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'SEC. 421. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the maximum value of price-support loans that may be extended to any one farm-operator family in any year shall not exceed $35,000.' "

The statement by Senator LANGER, relating to amendment No. 5, is as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota hopes to have the attention of the Senators of his own party. The head of our party, the President of the United States, has urged us to put a dollar limitation on price support loans. Our own campaign committees have put advertisements, carrying the President's picture, in all the farm magazines in the Middle West. All these full page advertisements reiterate the President's recommendation that a dollar limit be placed on price support loans.

The pending amendment, introduced by the Senator from North Dakota, would set $35,000 as the maximum amount of support loan for any one operator in 1 year. Less than 1 percent of the farm units in the Nation would be affected by this limitation.

Yet establishing this limitation would stop using the power of the Federal Government to subsidize competition of our largest factories-in-the-field against family farmers. I urge my colleagues on this side of the aisle to follow our President and enact this limitation on eligibility for price support loans of $35,000 as incorporated in the pending amendment.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 3091, TO AMEND THE RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held by the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency on the bill (S. 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act so as to permit the sale or lease of the alcohol butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky. The hearing will be held on February 28, 1956, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, Chief Clerk, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 303 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., telephone, National 8-3120, extension 865, as soon as possible, and, in any event, before the close of business on Monday, February 27, 1956.

CENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF WOODROW WILSON — ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR CONNALLY BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a remarkably fine speech made by former Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, before a joint session of the General Assembly of Virginia, in the hall of the house of delegates at Richmond, in commemoration of the centennial year of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

House Joint Resolution 12

Joint resolution inviting former Senator Tom Connally to address a joint session of the General Assembly

Whereas the year 1956 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, the Virginia-born President of the United States during the time of the First World War, and it is fitting that this centennial should be observed by the General Assembly of Virginia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring), That the Honorable Tom Connally, of Texas, for many years an illustrious representative of that State in the Senate of the United States, is hereby cordially invited by the Senate and the House of Delegates of Virginia to address a joint session of the general assembly to be held in the hall of the house of delegates at the capitol on February 21, 1956, at 2 p. m., in commemoration of the centennial year of Woodrow Wilson; and

Resolved, further, That the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, senior Senator from Virginia in the Congress of the United States, is hereby invited to accompany former Senator Connally on this occasion and to introduce him to the joint session of the General Assembly of Virginia; and

Resolved, further, That the clerk of the house of delegates is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to former Senator Connally and Senator BYRD.

Agreed to by the house of delegates, January 19, 1956.

E. GRIFFITH DODSON,
Clerk of the House of Delegates.

Agreed to by the senate, January 20, 1956.

E. R. COMBS,
Clerk of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR TOM CONNALLY, OF TEXAS, BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Congress of the United States by Joint Resolution 147 established a Commission to be known as the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

The General Assembly of Virginia also established a commission to plan a centennial celebration of the birth of Woodrow Wilson and to invite all the people of the United States to join therein.

I feel greatly honored to appear before the General Assembly of the State of Virginia and to address this distinguished body in its observance of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson in Staunton, Va., and to remind the people of the United States and of the world of the sublime achievements and the great life and service of Woodrow Wilson.

I first saw Woodrow Wilson in the fall of 1911 at Dallas, Tex., where he delivered an address. This was before his nomination for the Presidency while he was on a tour through the country. I came from Texas to attend his first inauguration and heard his magnificent address at his installation. I saw him again on March 4, 1917, at his second inauguration. I also, of course, saw him in 1917 when he addressed Congress advocating United States entrance into the World War. In Paris in 1919 during the Peace Conference, I, along with a number of other Congressmen, saw him where he received us at his residence and freely and widely conversed with us regarding the progress of the conference. I saw him again when he returned to Washington from Paris for a short time, and conferred with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Of course, I saw him on a number of occasions at state dinners and other functions.

Woodrow Wilson was the son of a Presbyterian minister, his mother was the daughter of a Presbyterian minister in England. His undergraduate education was in Davidson College, North Carolina, and Princeton, New Jersey. Later, at the University of Virginia, he studied law, and at Johns Hopkins University he studied jurisprudence and politics. Most of his college career was in Southern States. He attained a reputation for clear and definite interest in and knowledge of government and public affairs. When 29

years of age his career as a college student came to an end. For 1 year he practiced law in Atlanta, Ga. He then began the profession of teaching American youth politics and government at Bryn Mawr College, Wesleyan College, Johns Hopkins University, and Princeton University. He became a profound and distinguished student of history and government and a renowned author in those fields.

He became the author of seven books on political and historical subjects. The first was his outstanding volume on Congressional Government. His literary productions attracted the admiration of scholars and students and received wide popularity among the public. As a boy it is said that his ambition was to become a Senator from the State of Virginia. He became the president of Princeton. His widened prestige embraced all the fields of university life and institutions of liberal culture. As president of Princeton he stood for democracy and tolerance, against snobbery, and for liberalism.

Woodrow Wilson's political career began in 1910 when he left Princeton and accepted the Democratic nomination for Governor of New Jersey. In the campaign he announced that he opposed political machines and championed a rededication to the liberties of the American people. He announced that those who sought high office must assume responsibility for leadership. Upon that platform he was elected Governor of New Jersey. Upon his record in that high office he became in 1912 the nominee of the Democratic Party for President. At the Baltimore convention the Texas delegation supported him and fought valiantly for his nomination from beginning to end. He was elected and became President of the United States on March 4, 1913. In 1916 he was renominated and reelected. In that campaign his opponent was Charles Evans Hughes, who resigned from the Supreme Court to become a candidate. I heard Hughes speak in San Diego, Calif., in his campaign. He was aggressive and vigorous. For the first day after the election the Republicans claimed that Hughes had been elected. However, the California vote when finally counted gave California to Wilson and made his election secure. It was a tense and exciting period in our public life.

As President, Wilson demonstrated outstanding leadership. A splendid program of liberalism and reform distinguished legislation under his guidance. Many of the reforms inaugurated by him are upon the statute books today. Among the important measures were the establishment of the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Reserve banking system, and other outstanding policies.

The European war burst upon the world in 1914 with tremendous shock and carnage. The reckless and barbarous submarine warfare of Germany upon the shipping of neutral nations as well as its enemy resulted in the murder of American citizens and was a supreme challenge to the doctrine of the freedom of the seas as championed by the United States over the years. It was a war upon peaceful nations and their citizens while engaged in lawful pursuits on the high seas. More than that, it was a supreme challenge to free peoples and free nations by autocracy and tyranny.

President Wilson, fortressed by his sublime convictions and sustained by the united sentiments of the people of the United States, on April 2, 1917, stood in the House of Representatives and addressed a joint session of the Congress. He spoke inspired words. He marshaled the opinion not only of his countrymen but of freemen everywhere. He led our Republic into war and laid before the public opinion of Europe and America the tremendous issues which our Nation championed. He thrilled the hearts of our Allies. He was heard round the world. As a new Member of Congress I sat in the House Chamber and witnessed his calm courage and firmness and heard his challenging words. Wilson, a liberal statesman and guardian of his country's honor, was urging the American people to take up the sword against arrogant tyranny and the violation of American rights on the seas and on the land. He was speaking for the righting of wrongs, he was pleading for the reconsecration and the rededication of the liberties of the American people. He was declaring for the rights of nations and free people. He was conscious of the responsibility resting upon the United States. He had always been an advocate of peace with justice and honor but when the infamous violations of the liberties and safety of the people of the United States were thrust upon us he spoke in clarion tones.

When the outrageous and malignant submarine warfare convinced him that it must be resisted by military might, that resistance alone could preserve the peace and safety of the free world, he declared that America must retaliate with all of its strength and power. He asked the Congress to adopt a declaration of war against Germany.

I was a new member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to which was referred the resolution to declare war. My membership imposed upon me a terrible responsibility. To me it was a solemn and overwhelming decision. On my knees I sought guidance and direction. A few days later the committee voted for reporting a declaration of war and I was among the members who supported the resolution. It was adopted. It later was adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate. The United States was at war.

The President at once sent an armed force under the command of Gen. John J. Pershing to France to join our Allies.

In early 1918 President Wilson appeared before Congress and submitted his famous "14 points of peace." This great state paper deserved a place among the historic charters that have advanced the liberties of mankind through the ages. His speeches and state papers inspired our soldiers at the front and advanced our battlelines. His voice became the voice of free peoples. His words impressed the world with the grandeur of his aims and high purposes.

The progress of the war and Wilson's superb leadership guaranteed that kings and emperors would abdicate and under allied triumph the war would come to an end. An armistice was declared followed by a peace conference. Under the President's leadership, and the unity of our people, and the courage and bravery of its armies, victory had come to the cause of the United States and its allies.

In December 1918 President Wilson landed on French shores and took part in a conference assembled to chart and guarantee the peace following the war. It seemed to Wilson that it was his duty to go to Europe, heedless of the dangers which might face him. High was his hope for the establishment of a council among free and democratic nations which might result in a parliament of nations.

At Paris he fought for his ideals and hopes. He wanted to see brute force disenthroned as the rule among nations and peoples. He labored bravely for these noble sentiments and principles. He wanted the League of Nations to administer the principles of international justice. Wilson was faced by the leaders, not only of our allies, but of the enemy. Tremendous problems stared him in the face. Not alone a peace treaty to end the war, but future problems in international affairs challenged him at every step that he took. He secured all that was possible. The liberal features of the Versailles Treaty had his support and championship. His great spirit was revealed in those aspects of the treaty. The American people wanted the treaty to embrace some kind of project to guarantee the peace in future years. There was latent a small group who opposed any sort of international treaty with regard thereto. Wilson returned to the United States with wide acclaim. He returned to America offering his country's leadership in the noble cause of peace.

During the pendency of the Peace Conference President Wilson returned to the United States for a short time to attend to Presidential duties. He had a conference at the White House. He invited the members of the Committees on Foreign Relations of the Senate and Foreign Affairs of the House. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs I attended that Conference. The President related to those assembled the matters with which the Conference was struggling. He outlined his own views and purposes. He was clear and firm. He was highly hopeful. He was frank and gave a detailed report of the progress of the Conference. He then returned to Paris to engage again in the labors of the Conference.

While he was in Europe he visited several countries. He was enthusiastically and widely acclaimed in Italy, France, and in other areas wherever he went. The people of Europe in tremendous numbers welcomed him as their deliverer from tyranny and aggressive war. They looked upon him as the champion of a new order that would guarantee their safety and the peace of the world.

Upon the adjournment of the Conference and the signing of the peace treaty he returned to Washington. He was faced with enemies bent upon his defeat. The treaty of peace as finally signed was appropriately submitted to the Senate of the United States. Here a battle was to be fought in committee and later on the floor. Here the opponents of the treaty, organized and militant, were to begin an attack particularly upon the clauses regarding the League of Nations. Opponents submitted involved and confusing reservations to the League's provisions to weaken and destroy it. They were designed to alarm the people and to arouse their prejudices and to inflame their fears and passions. Political agitation and bewildering debate were broadcast throughout the land.

The League was never proposed as a partisan or Democratic political maneuver. It was an appeal to all of the American people. But all the wiles and devices of partisanship were brought forward to condemn it and to denounce Wilson. The miners and sappers were at work overtime. Some of his most bitter opponents were prominent public figures who theretofore had advocated a "league to enforce peace." Some of them had toured the country in support of such an international agency. The public records will today reveal their support and promotion of such a project. But their overpowering political and personal hatred of Wilson drove them into the camp of his enemies and the League which he had helped to write.

The President soon was aware of the tremendous and bitter forces that were marshalled against the treaty and against him. He believed that the people of the United States wanted a League of Nations. He believed they hungered for world peace. He believed that they wanted international treaties binding the nations to resort to the League to settle quarrels and to prevent war. He felt it his duty to lay before the American people the issues involved and to secure their approval of his conduct at the peace conference. There followed a long and bitter debate in the United States Senate over the treaty and particularly those clauses relating to the League.

In September 1919 he undertook a western tour seeking approval of his work in Europe. Woodrow Wilson was stricken as though in battle at Pueblo, Colo., on September 25, 1919. The United States Senate on March 20, 1920, rejected the treaty. Without the United States as a member the League was fore-

doomed to failure. After a few years of ineffective and spasmodic effort it ceased to exist. It was superseded not directly but in fact by the United Nations.

Though it was widely asserted that Wilson failed in his efforts for an international organization to preserve peace, it must be remembered that finally in 1945 the United Nations Charter, which embraced the ideal that was in his heart, was adopted at San Francisco and later formally ratified by the United States Senate. In 1945 I was the ranking delegate next to the Secretary of State to the International Conference at San Francisco for the consideration of the Charter of the United Nations. It was generally and definitely recognized that the organization created there was a reflection of the high purposes of Woodrow Wilson. Though in detail it differed from his conception it may be stated that his inspiration prompted its adoption by the United States Senate and the American people. Though his cold and pulseless form rested in the Washington Cathedral his spirit, his noble purpose, his high concept of an agency for world peace marched on and revived in anxious hearts the desire for a world organization. Today, notwithstanding its weakness in some respects and its shortcomings in others, the United Nations is the best hope of the world to prevent wars and to safeguard and guarantee peace. It may be amended and strengthened. It embodies in essence the concept of Woodrow Wilson for the establishment and preservation of international peace.

Woodrow Wilson was devoted to democracy. He believed in the rights of the weak and underprivileged. He was against autocracy in industry and business. He was against monopoly and financial tyranny. He believed that the common man had rights that must be protected. He had a towering intellect. He had indomitable courage and energy.

He was a superb leader. His ambition to serve his country was gigantic and compelling.

Woodrow Wilson was a colossal world figure. Had he lived in 1776 he would have stood by Thomas Jefferson when he wrote the Declaration of Independence. Had he lived in 1787 he would have supported George Washington as president of the convention which adopted the Constitution of the United States. Had he lived in 1815 he would have applauded Andrew Jackson as he triumphed in the Battle of New Orleans.

The 4 closing years of the life of Woodrow Wilson were saddened by his affliction. He endured his sufferings in patience and quietude. In those dark hours he adhered to the noble principles for which he had stood. His enemies did not hesitate to assail him and denounce him but his great heart did not respond to calumny and vituperation. The courageous warrior had to lay down his arms and suffer in silence and quiet.

On February 3, 1924, all that was mortal of Woodrow Wilson passed into the shadows. His cold and inert form was entombed in the Washington Cathedral. The people of America were plunged into grief and sorrow. The lovers of peace all over the world were saddened and moved to tears.

Woodrow Wilson was a gigantic figure among men. He was a titanic captain in the battle for international action for the establishment of agencies to preserve the peace. He was a superb leader in government. He was a devoted patriot and a leader of a free world. In the field of statesmanship in the United States he stood like a blazing star. In international affairs he was a towering figure. His memory forever will survive. It is emblazoned upon the pages of the history of the world's great events.

How great is the poverty of phrase and the feebleness of tongue to bring to you a message of the majesty of his life. Where is bronze stout enough; where is granite firm enough; where is marble white enough in chiseled figure of molded form to portray the grandeur of his life. Where can literature find a pen powerful enough; where can oratory find a tongue eloquent enough; where can the poet find lines lofty enough; where can history find a page bright enough to tell the story of the heroic life, the sublime patriotism and the commanding purposes of the great man, Woodrow Wilson.

EDITORIAL COMMENT FROM ALASKA ON SPEECH BY SENATOR LANGER RELATIVE TO CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY OF GERMAN AND JAPANESE NATIONALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week I delivered a speech dealing with the subject of confiscation of private property of German and Japanese nationals, and of American nationals in this country. Very few Senators were in the Chamber at that time.

I have before me an editorial entitled "Langer's Talk Full of Meat," published in the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News of February 14, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANGER'S TALK FULL OF MEAT

The press has noted with casual amusement that Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, sat in the Senate Chamber in solitary state for more than 2 hours the other day listening to his own speech which was read by the Chief Clerk, because of the Senator's visual difficulties.

But the press failed to tell us what was in the speech, making it as derelict in duty as the Senators who could have learned much, had they cared to listen. What they all missed was one of the best-documented, most complete histories yet presented on the communistic influence exerted on the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower administrations. It related, step by step, how both parties were hoodwinked by Soviet agents and led blindfolded to confiscation of alien property as part of the conspiracy to destroy property rights throughout the world.

Senator LANGER named former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau and his aids, Harry Dexter White and Laughlin Currie, as those who foisted the Moscow-written doctrine of confiscation on this country. He quoted two secret orders of Secretary Morgenthau that gave White the purse-strings—and hence control—over the State Department and the Army and Navy in all foreign operations.

"As early as 1951," Senator LANGER reminded us, "I charged that Harry Dexter White * * * was a Communist agent." He went on to point out that this was "almost 3 years before the Attorney General * * * repeated what I said."

The Senator blamed both parties for the legislation permanently confiscating the property of German and Japanese nationals, but said, "White, Glasser, Coe, and Hiss, with the help of the Office of Alien Property, got that done by trickery and deceit."

Of the confiscation of Swiss property in the United States, he declared: "I say it was not the United States but Communist spies and agents in our Government who gave us a sordid reputation with a nation whose honor and integrity we have always admired. I say it is time to reverse these policies by returning all confiscated private property. Only in that way can we purge ourselves of the terrible implications."

More specifically, Senator LANGER's recipe for removing the tarnish from our national honor calls for immediate passage of the Dirksen-Kilgore bill, plus two bills of his own that would remove the Office of Alien Property from control of the obstructionist Justice Department and place it under the State Department.

The least we can hope for is that his fellow solons will regard Senator LANGER's speech—which came to them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—as important homework * * * and that when action is taken on the Langer recommendations the Capitol press corps will be paying attention.

NATIONAL ART CONTEST FOR HANDICAPPED AMATEUR PAINTERS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, during the fall of 1955, I was asked to serve as one of the honorary sponsors for the national art contest for handicapped amateur painters. Chairman of our committee is the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl G. Warren, who is chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art. Other honorary sponsors include Mrs. Eisenhower, Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, and, in all, 13 top persons from private industry and from Government.

The purpose of this contest, the first of its kind anywhere, is to further and encourage the careers of talented amateur artists who are handicapped, to dramatically illustrate the employment and rehabilitation potential of the handicapped, and to increase public awareness of the contribution to be made to our society by the handicapped.

I am pleased to report that this contest has met with fine public acceptance and is now progressing at a most satisfactory rate toward the May 1, 1956, contest closing deadline. Information on the joint sponsors, contest judges, and contest rules is contained in the following two news stories: The first is from the New York Times for November 6, 1955, announcing the opening of the contest, and the next is from the Washington Evening Star for January 22, 1956, announcing the judges.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of November 6, 1955]

HANDICAPPED VIE IN ART CONTEST—FIRST OF ITS KIND IN NATION—MRS. EISENHOWER IS AMONG THE SPONSORS—TWENTY-TWO PRIZES TO BE GIVEN—COMPETITION TO END NEXT MAY—PAINTINGS BY WINNERS TO HANG IN MUSEUMS

WASHINGTON, November 6.—A national art contest for the handicapped, first of its kind, was opened here today.

Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, one of the sponsors, said in a message that she and the President supported any effort "to foster the employment of the handicapped and an understanding of their problems."

She said the President also shared her views on the need for dramatically illustrating the employment and rehabilitation potential of the handicapped.

Jointly sponsoring the 6-month contest are the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Veterans' Administration, and the Morris Morgenthau Foundation of New York City, a philanthropic organization, which is financing it.

THREE THOUSAND AND FIFTY DOLLARS IN PRIZES SET

Twenty-two prizes, totaling $3,050, will be awarded in the contest closing May 1, 1956. They range from a first prize of $1,000 to 10 consolation prizes of $50 United States savings bonds. The winners, who will be announced July 31, will have their paintings hung in museums across the country.

The first entry came today at a luncheon from Mrs. Alverda L. Kae, a housewife from Shenandoah, Pa., an arthritis victim confined to a wheelchair.

In accepting the entry, Melvin J. Maas, chairman of the President's committee, said the contest gives handicapped artists "the chance to prove again, that with the handicapped it is ability that counts, not disability."

Mr. Maas, former Republican Representative from Minnesota and a retired Marine Corps major general, is blind. He noted a purpose of the contest was to point out the possibilities for future rehabilitation of handicapped given the proper opportunity. The contest is open to all handicapped amateur artists in the territorial United States.

Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, told the luncheon meeting that "art has assumed the status of a full-fledged rehabilitation agent in veterans' hospitals throughout the country."

FIFTY GUESTS AT LUNCHEON

"In many cases, it is actually being prescribed for patients by our doctors," he added. "It is expected that scores of handicapped veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals as well as additional thousands of the handicapped in private life will compete."

Arthur Larson, Under Secretary of Labor, said his Department long had believed that employment of persons with physical handicaps was essential to the national interest. The teaching of art to the handicapped, he added, is sometimes a steppingstone to a productive career in the fields of commercial art or related fields.

The 50 guests at the luncheon, held in the National Art Gallery here, also heard Bradshaw Mintener, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Mary Switzer, Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation; Thomas M. Beggs, director of the National Collection of Fine Arts; and Morris Morgenstern, 73-year-old New York philanthropist who heads the foundation that bears his name.

Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, accepted the chairmanship of the honorary sponsors' committee.

Contest details may be obtained from the Morris Morgenstern Foundation, 119 West 57th Street, New York City.

[From the Washington Star of January 22, 1956]

FIVE EXPERTS TO JUDGE HANDICAPPED ART ENTRIES

Five artists will judge entries in the National Art Contest for handicapped amateur artists, the first of its kind to be held in this country.

Twenty-two prizes totaling $3,050 will be awarded winners in the event which began November 6 and continues until May 1. It is open to all handicapped amateur artists in the territorial United States.

The contest is sponsored jointly by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped; the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Veterans' Administration, and the Morris Morgenstern Foundation of New York.

THE JUDGES LISTED

Ernest W. Watson, particularly distinguished for print making and editor-in-chief of American Artist, is chairman of judges.

Others are Miss Isabel Bishop, painter, etcher, and art teacher; Frank J. Reilly, mural painter and illustrator; E. Franklin Wittmack, commercial illustrator, and Andrew Newell Wyeth, painter, whose father was the artist, N. C. Wyeth.

Application blanks for the event are available at the offices of State vocational rehabilitation agencies and at Veterans' Administration hospitals. They also may be obtained by writing to the Morgenstern Foundation, 110 West 57th Street, New York.

To be eligible, an entrant must not earn the major portion of his income as an artist, and must be handicapped, his ability to function in everyday activity substantially impaired by disease, congenital condition, or injury.

Only original entries in oil, water color, guache or tempora, on canvas or paper, will be accepted, each not larger than 50 inches on any side. Heavy and bulky frames should be avoided and glass frames are not acceptable.

Prepaid entries, which will be returned on completion of the contest, should be sent to the foundation in New York.

The sponsors so far have received letters from some 1,000 handicapped amateur painters asking for entry blanks. Paintings already have commenced arriving in New York.

MANY ORGANIZATIONS AIDING

Cooperating with the President's Committee are many large organizations, and veterans, union, employer, fraternal, and service organizations are helping to distribute entry blanks and are supporting the event in trade papers and house organs.

Chief Justice Warren is chairman of a group of 12 honorary sponsors. Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower is a sponsor. Others are George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Folsom; Veterans' Administrator Harvey V. Higley; Secretary of Labor Mitchell; A. Boyd Campbell, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; William Faricy, president of the Association of American Railroads; Harold E. Fellows, president of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters; Earl Gammons, consultant; Representative Kelley, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; Senator Potter, Republican, of Michigan, and Adm. DeWitt Ramsey, president of the Air Transport Association.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY, ESSAY BY JAN HOGENDORN

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, this week marks the culmination of the annual I Speak for Democracy contest. This year students from 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii entered the contests. There were over a million and a half entries. From that field four winners were selected.

I am privileged to note that 1 of these 4 winners is a fine boy from Iowa, Jan Hogendorn, of Oskaloosa, Iowa. The Oskaloosa High School has distinguished itself by producing a national Voice of Democracy winner for the second straight year. During the 1954–55 contest, Dwight David Walker, of Oskaloosa, was one of the national winners.

Iowa is very proud of its most important asset—its young people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the prize-winning script of Jan Hogendorn be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY, 1956

(By Jan Hogendorn, Oskaloosa, Iowa)

It stands on a solid granite foundation, its long white shaft rising into the peaceful Virginia countryside. It is continually guarded by a uniformed sentry, whose rifle is carried at the military salute. Yes, it is a tomb. But it is not the tomb of a President, nor of a great general. And yet it holds the greatest martyr to the spirit of democracy that this world will ever know. For in that tomb lies the body of the Unknown Soldier.

He lived, he slept, he loved just as all of us. He may have come from a sprawling eastern city, or a quiet tree-shaded southern town, or a midwestern farm. But from whence he came, or how well he lived, he knew democracy, and he loved it. He loved it so much that he gave more than his own life. He gave his whole identity.

What is there in a word that drove this man to the supreme sacrifice? Just beyond the tomb of the Unknown Soldier stands a red brick building. It stands apart from other buildings because of four words cut deep into the stone above the doorway. Fairfax County High School. In its halls walk the youth of America. Youth free to study and work as it chooses. There is no fear here. No fear of political crimes or regimented instruction.

This is what he fought for. This is what he died for. This is democracy. He died that no totalitarian creed would be taught in that school.

About a mile down the road stands another building, not so much different from the schoolhouse. This building is the Fairfax County Court House. Here is transacted the business of America, the administration of civil matters and of justice itself. A government of the people.

Here each day go scores of officials, elected to their positions by an intelligent citizenry. Certainly, a government by the people.

And here is centered that indispensable code of human behavior, law. Laws to protect, laws to insure, and laws to maintain our high standard of decency. Irrefutable government for the people.

This, too, is what we fought for, and died for. This, too, is democracy.

But look again. Look past the pacing sentry and the garlands of flowers, past the high gate and the valley, until you see the top of the next hill. A weatherbeaten white frame building stands there, exposed to nature. Surmounting it is a small white cross, a sort of symbol to this mechanized day and age that we are a God-loving and a God-fearing people.

But no one is forced to attend that church, and no one is forced to stay away. A solid, indisputable freedom of religion that nothing may challenge.

If he could but speak, his cold lips might tell with the eloquence of eternity the unending principles and ideas for which he fought.

He would tell of our God-given rights of freedom of speech, which gives us the privilege to criticize, to express our conscientious opinion on any question, without being harshly silenced by a secret police.

He would say that freedom and democracy are great gifts, which can be maintained and continued only through the unending vigi-

lance of us all, who are the guardians of this great heritage.

He would say that we, who keep the precepts of democracy, are all unknown heroes.

It is not necessary that we all die as he did in the defense of our rights and liberties, but it is very important that we don the hero's mantal by daily practice of the principles which have made our democracy the hope of the world. He would plead with us to keep our democracy a living thing.

We must work for it, speak for it, fight for it, and even die for it, so that democracy will exist long after the tomb of the unknown soldier has crumbled.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION TO FACILITATE THE IMPORTATION OF COMMERCIAL SAMPLES AND ADVERTISING MATERIAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Q, 83d Congress, 1st session, which appears on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention Executive Q (83d Cong., 1st sess.), an International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material, dated at Geneva, November 7, 1952.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that I understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE] has a brief statement to make about the convention. I want all Senators to know, however, that before a yea-and-nay vote on the convention is taken, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention will be read.

The convention was read the second time, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION TO FACILITATE THE IMPORTATION OF COMMERCIAL SAMPLES AND ADVERTISING MATERIAL

The Governments signatories to the present Convention,

Believing that the adoption of uniform regulations regarding the importation of samples of goods of all kinds (whether natural products or manufactured articles) and of advertising matter will promote the expansion of international trade,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Definitions

For the purposes of the present Convention:

(a) The term "import duties" means Customs duties and all other duties and taxes payable on or in connexion with importation, and shall include all internal taxes and excise duties chargeable on imported goods, but shall not include fees and charges which are limited in amount to the approximate cost of services rendered and do not represent an indirect protection to domestic products or a taxation of imports for fiscal purposes; and

(b) The term "persons" means both natural and legal persons; and

(c) References to the territory of a Contracting Party include its metropolitan territory and any territory for whose international relations it is responsible and to which the Convention extends in accordance with article XIII.

ARTICLE II

Exemption from import duties for samples of negligible value

1. Each Contracting Party shall exempt from import duties samples of goods of all kinds imported into its territory, provided such samples are of negligible value and are only to be used for soliciting orders for goods of the kind represented by the samples with a view to their importation. In determining whether samples are of negligible value, the Customs authorities of the territory of importation may consider the values of individual samples or the aggregate value of all the samples in one consignment. The values of consignments sent by a consignor to different consignees shall not be aggregated for the purpose of this paragraph even though the consignments are imported at the same time.

2. The Customs authorities of the territory of importation may require that, as a condition of their being exempted from import duties in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article, samples shall be made useless as merchandise by marking, tearing, perforation or other treatment, but not, however, so as to destroy their usefulness as samples.

ARTICLE III

Temporary duty-free admission of other samples

1. For the purpose of this article, the term "samples" means articles which are representative of a particular category of goods already produced or are examples of goods the production of which is contemplated, on condition that they:

(a) are owned abroad and are imported solely for the purpose of being shown or demonstrated in the territory of importation for the soliciting of orders for goods to be supplied from abroad; and

(b) are not sold or put to normal use except for purposes of demonstration or used in any way for hire or reward while in the territory of importation; and

(c) are intended to be reexported in due course; and

(d) are capable of identification on reexportation;

but does not include identical articles brought in by the same individual, or sent to a single consignee, in such quantity that, taken as a whole, they no longer constitute samples under ordinary commercial usage.

2. Samples which are chargeable with import duties shall, when imported from the territory of another contracting party, with or without the intervention of a commercial traveler, by persons established in the territory of any contracting party, be temporarily admitted into the territory of any of the contracting parties free of import duties, subject to the amount of the import duties and any other amount that may be payable being deposited or security being given for payment if necessary. Any deposits taken (other than those required in virtue of article VI of this Convention) shall not, however, exceed the amount of the import duties by more than 10 percent.

3. To obtain the facilities provided for in this article, the persons concerned must comply with the relevant laws and regulations prescribed by the authorities of the territory of importation and the customs formalities in force in that territory. As regards vehicles and industrial and agricultural machinery or equipment of a value for customs purposes exceeding 1,000 United States dollars (or the equivalent in other currencies), importers may be required to declare the place of destination of such machinery, equipment, or vehicles; they may also be required by the customs authorities of the country of importation to establish, at any time, that the machinery, equipment, or vehicles are at the declared places. The customs authorities of the country of importation may seal such machinery, equipment, or vehicles or otherwise preclude their operation during the time in which temporary duty-free admission is allowed and limit the places where these goods may be operated for demonstration purposes.

4. The customs authorities of the territory of importation shall, as a general rule, recognize as sufficient for the future identification of samples the marks which have been affixed by the customs authorities of a contracting party, provided that the said samples are accompanied by a descriptive list certified by the customs authorities of the latter contracting party. Additional marks may be affixed to the samples by the customs authorities of the territory into which they are imported only if they are necessary, in the opinion of those authorities, to ensure the identification of the samples on reexportation. Any mark affixed to samples shall not be such as to destroy their usefulness.

5. The period allowed for reexportation of samples which qualify for exemption from import duties under this article shall be not less than 6 months. When the period allowed for reexportation has expired, the amount of the import duties and any other amount due may be charged on samples which have not been reexported. These amounts may also be charged, before the expiry of the period, on samples which cease to satisfy the conditions of paragraph 1 of this article.

6. On the reexportation within the permitted time of samples imported under this article, the refund of any amount deposited or the release of any security given on importation in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article shall be effected without delay at any of the customs offices situated at the frontier or in the interior of the territory which possesses the necessary authority, subject to the deduction of the duties and any other amount payable on samples not produced for reexportation. When special circumstances exist deposits may, however, be returned by other means, provided the return is effected promptly. Each contracting party shall publish a list of the customs offices on which the said authority has been conferred.

ARTICLE IV

Duty-free admission of advertising material

1. Each contracting party shall exempt from import duties catalogs, pricelists, and trade notices relating to

(a) goods offered for sale or hire, or

(b) transport of commercial insurance services offered,

by a person established in the territory of another contracting party, when such documents are imported from the territory of any

contracting party, provided that each consignment imported either:

(i) Consists of not more than one document, or

(ii) if it consists of more than 1 document, does not include more than 1 copy of any 1 document, or

(iii) irrespective of the number of documents or copies, does not exceed 1 kilogram in gross weight.

Simultaneous dispatch of a number of consignments to different addresses in the territory of importation shall not debar such consignments from this exemption, provided that not more than 1 consignment is sent to any 1 consignee.

2. Notwithstanding paragraph 1 of this article, a contracting party shall not be obliged to exempt from import duties on importation into its territory:

(a) Catalogs, pricelists, and trade notices which do not clearly indicate the name of the foreign concern producing, selling or renting the goods, or offering the transport or commercial insurance services, to which such catalogs, pricelists or trade notices relate; or

(b) Catalogs, pricelists, and trade notices which are entered to customs in the territory of importation in packets grouped together for subsequent dispatch to separate addresses in that territory.

ARTICLE V

Temporary duty-free admission of advertising films

Each contracting party shall accord the facilities provided by article III of the present Convention, subject to the conditions laid down in that article, to positive cinematograph advertising films of a width not exceeding 16 millimeters shown to the satisfaction of its customs authorities to consist essentially of photographs (with or without sound track) showing the nature or operation of products or equipment whose qualities cannot be adequately demonstrated by samples or catalogs, provided that the films:

(a) relate to products or equipment offered for sale or for hire by a person established in the territory of another contracting party; and

(b) are of a kind suitable for exhibition to prospective customers but not for general exhibition to the public; and

(c) are imported in a packet which contains not more than one copy of each film and which does not form part of a larger consignment of films.

ARTICLE VI

Temporary waiver of import prohibitions and restrictions

1. No contracting party shall apply import prohibitions or restrictions (other than import duties), whether made effective through quotas, import licenses, or other measures, on the importation from the territory of another contracting party of goods:

(a) which qualify (or would qualify if they were dutiable) for exemption from import duties by virtue of the provisions of article II or article IV of this Convention; or

(b) which qualify (or would qualify if they were dutiable) for temporary duty-free admission by virtue of the provisions of article III or article V of this Convention; provided that the importation of such goods does not give rise to any payment other than for freight or insurance or for services provided in the territory of importation by a person established in that territory.

2. In the case of goods which qualify (or would qualify if they were dutiable) for temporary duty-free admission by virtue of the provisions of article III or article V, this waiver of import prohibitions or restrictions shall extend only to the period for which temporary duty-free admission is allowed (or would be allowed if the goods were dutiable). In the case of non-re-exportation of such goods within the period during which the application of any import prohibitions or restrictions has been waived under paragraph 1 of this article, the authorities of the importing country may apply such measures as would have been applicable if the import prohibitions or restrictions had not been so waived. To this end, the authorities of the territory of importation may require appropriate guaranties, such as the deposit of a special security over and above any security deposited against payment of import duties.

3. The provisions of this Convention shall not prevent a contracting party from applying import prohibitions or restrictions:

(a) necessary to protect public morals or essential security interests;

(b) Necessary to protect human, animal, or plant life or health;

(c) Relating to the importation of gold or silver;

(d) Necessary to secure compliance with laws or regulations relating to customs enforcement, the enforcement of state monopolies, the protection of patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

(e) Necessary to prevent deceptive practices;

(f) Relating to the products of prison labor;

(g) Necessary to the application of standards or regulations for the classification, grading, or marketing of commodities in international trade.

ARTICLE VII

Simplification of formalities

1. Each contracting party shall keep to a minimum the formalities required in connection with the facilities accorded by the present Convention.

2. Each contracting party shall publish promptly all regulations introduced in this respect in such a manner as to enable persons concerned to become acquainted with them and to avoid the prejudice which might result from the application of formalities of which they are unaware.

ARTICLE VIII

Settlement of disputes

1. Any dispute between any two or more contracting parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention shall so far as possible be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred to a person or body agreed between the contracting parties in dispute, provided that if they are unable to reach agreement, any of these contracting parties may request the president of the International Court of Justice to nominate an arbitrator.

3. The decision of any person or body appointed under paragraph 2 of this article shall be binding on the contracting parties concerned.

ARTICLE IX

Signature and ratification

1. The present Convention shall be open for signature until June 30, 1953 by the Governments contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, by the Governments of all States Members of the United Nations and by the Government of any other State to which the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall have communicated a copy of the Convention for this purpose.

2. The Convention shall be subject to ratification or acceptance by the signatory Governments in accordance with their constitutional procedures, and the instruments of ratification or acceptance shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE X

Accession

1. The present Convention shall be open for accession by the Governments of any of the States referred to in paragraph 1 of article IX.

2. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XI

Entry into force

When 15 of the Governments referred to in article IX have deposited their instruments of ratification, acceptance or accession, the present Convention shall come into force between them on the thirtieth day after the date of the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession. It shall come into force for each other government on the thirtieth day after the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession.

ARTICLE XII

Denunciation

1. After the present convention has been in force for 3 years, any contracting party may denounce it by notification of denunciation to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

2. Denunciation shall take effect 6 months after the date of receipt by the Secretary General of the United Nations of the notification of denunciation.

ARTICLE XIII

Territorial application

1. Any government may at the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession or at any time thereafter by notification addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations declare that the present convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible, and the convention shall extend to the territories named in the notification as from the 30th day after the date of receipt of the notification by the Secretary General of the United Nations or on the date on which the convention comes into force under article XI, whichever is the later.

2. Any government which has made a declaration under paragraph 1 of this article extending the present convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible may denounce the convention separately in respect of that territory in accordance with the provisions of article XII.

ARTICLE XIV

Reservations

1. Any State may at the time of its signature or of the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, or accession declare that it shall not be bound by specified provisions of this Convention.

2. Any State may at the time of making a notification under article XIII that the present Convention shall extend to any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible make a separate declaration in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article in respect of all or any of the territories to which the notification applies.

3. If any State submits a reservation to any of the articles of this Convention at the time of signature, ratification, acceptance, or accession, or at the time of making a notification under article XIII, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall communicate the text of such reservation to all States which are or may become parties to this Convention. Any State which has signed, ratified, accepted, or acceded before the reservation is made (or, if the Convention has not entered into force, which has signed, ratified, accepted, or acceded by the date of its entry

into force), shall have the right to object to any reservation. If no objection is received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations from any State entitled to object by the ninetieth day from the day of his communication (or from the date of entry into force of the Convention, whichever is the later), the reservation shall be deemed to be accepted.

4. In the event of an objection being received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations from any State entitled to object, he shall notify the State making the reservation of such objection, and request it to inform him whether it is prepared to withdraw the reservation or whether it prefers to abstain from ratification, acceptance, or accession or from extending the Convention to the territory or territories to which the reservation applies, as the case may be.

5. A State which has made a reservation in regard to which an objection has been presented in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article shall not become a party to this Convention unless the objection has been withdrawn or has ceased to have effect as provided in paragraph 6; neither shall a State have the right to claim the benefits of this Convention in respect of any territory for the international relations of which it is responsible and in respect of which it has made a reservation if any objection has been made to the reservation in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article, unless the objection has been withdrawn or has ceased to have effect as provided in paragraph 6.

6. An objection by a State which has signed but not ratified or accepted the Convention shall cease to have effect if, within a period of 12 months from the date of making its objection, the objecting state has not ratified or accepted the Convention.

ARTICLE XV

Notification of signatures, ratifications, acceptance and accessions

The Secretary General of the United Nations shall notify all signatory and acceding States, and all other states which so request, of all signatures, ratifications, acceptances and accessions of the present Convention and of the date on which the Convention comes into force and of every notification received by him under article XII or XIII.

In witness whereof the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done at Geneva, this 7th day of November 1952, in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations. The Secretary General of the United Nations shall transmit certified copies thereof to all signatory and acceding states.

Certified true copy.

For the Secretary General:

C. S. STAVROPOULOS,
Principal Director in Charge of the Legal Department.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the samples convention now before us is a relatively simple treaty of primary interest to the business community. Its purpose is to simplify regulations governing the admission of samples and advertising materials into the territory of the parties thereto.

In general, samples and advertising material of negligible value are to be admitted duty free, if they conform to certain standards. Samples of more than negligible value and advertising films are to be admitted duty free for a minimum period of 6 months provided, however, that the importer deposits the necessary security which will be forfeited if these materials are not reexported within the stated period. Certain other import restrictions are to be waived in the case of samples and advertising materials, and the parties agree to keep to a minimum the customs formalities in connection with such items. The provisions of the convention are summarized in the committee's report.

For some years, international trade has suffered great inconvenience because of widely varying practices with respect to the treatment of samples sent abroad to promote sales. The suggestion that a convention be negotiated to alleviate such difficulties came from the International Chamber of Commerce. In consultation with interested private organizations and citizens in the United States, the pending convention was negotiated.

The committee has heard of no objections to the treaty. It has received numerous letters from chambers of commerce and similar organizations urging its approval.

The treaty is already in force for 17 nations that have ratified it. As one of the major trading nations in the world, it is clearly in the interest of the United States to make it possible for our citizens to share the advantages offered by this treaty. For this reason, the Committee on Foreign Relations voted to report the treaty favorably to the Senate, and urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification thereof.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to concur in the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. This matter was gone into very thoroughly in the committee. Certain questions were raised. The committee was fully satisfied with the replies it received in response to those questions.

I urge an affirmative vote on the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). If there is no objection, the convention will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to the point of agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive Q, 83d Congress, 1st session, an International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material, dated at Geneva, November 7, 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to the resolution of ratification, have they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], The Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76; nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—76

Aiken	George	Monroney
Allott	Goldwater	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Barkley	Hennings	Murray
Bender	Hill	Neely
Bennett	Holland	Neuberger
Bible	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Humphrey	Pastore
Bridges	Ives	Payne
Butler	Jackson	Potter
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Carlson	Kennedy	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Saltonstall
Clements	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Daniel	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thurmond
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Mansfield	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McClellan	
Fulbright	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—20

Barrett	Gore	Millikin
Beall	Green	Schoeppel
Bush	Hickenlooper	Scott
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Smathers
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Wiley
Douglas	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 76, the nays none. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the ratification of the convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will return to legislative session.

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of Senate Resolution 219, to investigate campaign expenditures and other activities, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 3183, better known as the farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, LOBBYING, AND CERTAIN OTHER ACTIVITIES AFFECTING THE SENATE OR ANY MEMBER THEREOF

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that there be laid before the Senate the resolution coming over from the previous day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the resolution (S. Res. 219) to investigate campaign expenditures, lobbying, and certain other activities affecting the Senate or any Member thereof.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the resolution, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the minority leader, there has been called up the resolution to establish a special committee which will have broad authority to investigate any improper or illegal influence that may bear upon the Senate. The resolution represents the combined thinking of the leadership on both sides of the aisle. It comes to the Senate with the unanimous approval of both the majority and the minority policy committees. It has been carefully checked with the distinguished chairman of the present select committee and with other distinguished chairmen involved in the jurisdictional question. It is our hope that the investigation will have the active support and the full approval of the entire United States Senate.

Mr. President, the subject matter affects the Senate as a whole, and it is the Senate as a whole that must finally determine the response.

The form of the investigation can be stated simply. It would be conducted by an 8-member special committee, with membership equally divided between the 2 parties. The committee would have every power needed to investigate campaign contributions, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices designed to influence the Senate improperly.

Mr. President, this is not intended to require a predetermination of impropriety or illegality before the committee can proceed to investigate any given matter. Such a determination might or might not follow the examination, in the judgment of the committee.

At the present time we are proposing that $350,000 be provided to finance the work which is to be done. It was our understanding that the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections—and his subcommittee—agreed that the initial budget for the subcommittee alone should be $300,000.

In view of the fact that the proposed special committee will consider matters under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and perhaps other committees, it was felt, after consultation, that $350,000 should be provided.

Mr. President, it is our purpose to be unstinting in our efforts to guarantee to the Nation that every relevant fact is exposed to the broadest and brightest light of day.

The origin of the resolution, of course, lies in the incident which related to the Senate by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] on February 3. I should like to refresh the memory of my colleagues on the events which took place on that day.

On Friday evening, February 3, just before the debate was to close on the gas bill, the junior Senator from South Dakota told the Senate of an incident in which a man interested in the gas bill had proffered $2,500 to his campaign fund.

The distinguished minority leader and the senior Senator from Texas recognized immediately the possible implications of that statement. We met within the hour with the junior Senator from South Dakota. Early Saturday morning we met again, and continued to meet most of that morning. We met again on Sunday.

We came to the conclusion, after consultation with many of our colleagues, including the Senator from South Dakota, that the incident was such as to warrant the creation of a select committee. This committee, we believed, should be divided equally between the members of the two parties and between the opponents and supporters of the bill, if that were possible. It seemed to us that these were the most rigid standards of fair play which we could apply to an incident that concerned the entire membership of the Senate.

At the very earliest opportunity on Monday, the majority leader asked the unanimous consent of the Senate for immediate consideration of the resolution creating the select committee. At the time the senior Senator from Texas stated that "if there are any other instances, involving any other Senators, and they will rise in their places and call attention to them, I shall be glad to have the episodes they relate included within the scope of this resolution."

At the time, however, there was only one set of allegations before the Senate, and it was my belief that they should be investigated as thoroughly, as expeditiously, as fairly, and as judiciously as might be possible.

At that time the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] arose and proposed an investigation of "campaign contributions by persons connected directly or indirectly with any interest opposing or favoring the passage of legislation touching on or involving the oil and gas industry of the United States."

That is a portion of an amendment which he offered to the resolution.

At that time, Mr. President, I stated to the Senator from Missouri and to the Senate that I had no objection to his request. I went further than that, Mr. President, and said:

> I would be very glad to have the Senate consider the resolution of the Senator from Missouri, and I hope the Senate will grant the authority he seeks.

To my knowledge, this has never been published, and I repeat it only that those who seek the truth may have it. I asked only that the Senate first consider my resolution, because I felt it was the responsibility of the majority leader of this great deliberative body to see to it that the incidents related by the junior Senator from South Dakota were considered as soon, as quickly, and as fairly

as might be possible. Allegations had been made, and even though they were not criminal allegations, they had to be settled.

An objection prevented the immediate consideration of our resolution and the resolution offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

On the following day, as soon as the parliamentary situation permitted, and as I had announced I would on the previous day, I called up the resolution which bore my name and the name of the distinguished minority leader. The yeas and nays were requested, and the resolution was adopted by a vote of 90 to 0, which I interpreted as a clear and satisfactory expression of the opinion of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Missouri then asked unanimous consent himself that his resolution lie on the table. Consent was granted, and his resolution is on the table before us today.

Mr. President, in recommending the appointment of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who served for many years on the highest court of his State and for many years was chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and is the senior Member of this body, and in recommending the former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, now the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, it was the viewpoint of the senior Senator from Texas that he had selected from his side of the aisle men of maturity and seniority, who had the public interest at heart and had great concern, as demonstrated by their public acts, for the people of this Nation.

The investigation is still proceeding, but I believe authority was extended to it yesterday that it file its report by March 10.

It is the opinion of the majority leader that the committee has developed sufficient facts to indicate that a much broader inquiry should be undertaken.

Mr. President, those who are sponsoring the resolution which we have called up today are aware that there are two problems involved in the inquiry. The first is that we are going into an investigation of the rules which govern the selection and the conduct of the people's representatives in the greatest deliberative body in the world. Since this is a two-party Nation, it means that each party has an equal stake in the outcome.

The second is that investigation alone is not enough. It is one thing to expose any evil or wrongdoing which may exist; it is another, and a far more important thing, to write legislative safeguards against any evil or wrongdoing which may be found. It is essential to expose misconduct from any source, but our actions will be satisfying only if we move to correct any abuses that may exist.

Mr. President, I returned from my State this past weekend. On Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, I conferred with the minority leader. The legislative draftsmen had worked into the evening searching the precedents and examining the jurisdiction of some 5 or 6 committees of this body, and I think it is fair to say that so far as the majority leader and the minority leader are concerned, they are trying to meet both of the problems head on. An investigation of Democrats by Republicans, or of Republicans by Democrats, would not serve the interests of this Nation.

The usual type of investigation is quite rightly conducted by committees which are divided according to the partisan division of the Senate, but when the rules of political life are under scrutiny, a bipartisan investigation is strongly indicated.

The subject matter of this investigation is necessarily broad. The genesis of the inquiry is an incident which intermingled both lobbying practices and campaign contributions. We cannot investigate one, Mr. President, without investigating all. For this reason the minority leader and I are in complete agreement that the legislative committees which may have jurisdiction over these subject matters should be represented on the special committee.

Historically the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections have jurisdiction over campaign contributions. The Government Operations Committee has jurisdiction over the Lobby Act. The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over the Corrupt Practices Act. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has jurisdiction over the Taft-Hartley Act. The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections has jurisdiction over election practices. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may have jurisdiction concerning other related laws. We must either request each committee to conduct independent investigations, or we must seek to combine the interests of each of the committees into one investigation. The dictates of efficiency and thoroughness, in my opinion, call for the latter course. On the basis of the facts that are revealed, such an investigating committee could make recommendations for legislation that should govern this Nation for many years to come.

Mr. President, I have complete confidence in my colleagues. I have served with most of them for many years, and I believe the integrity of the United States Senate is still intact. I think the overwhelming sentiment favors a truly searching and truly objective investigation of the circumstances which surround the Senate's activities, and I should like to appeal to my colleagues for their complete and positive support of this proposal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in complete concurrence with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Texas, the majority leader, and to affirm and testify to the facts as he stated them on the floor as to the steps which were taken with regard to the existing select committee and the steps which have been taken since that committee was created.

I believe the resolution is necessary. I hope it will have the unanimous approval of the Senate. Certainly every Member of this body, on either side of the aisle, will want to know if anything has been done improperly or illegally to affect the vote of any Member of the Senate. Certainly we want to know if there have been improper activities on the part of any lobbies, and of the necessity, if any, for changes in the so-called Lobbying Act.

We are not unmindful that under the Constitution the people retain the right to petition their Government. We are not unmindful that throughout the Nation there are fine organizations of citizens. They may be school boards; they may represent educational institutions; they may represent farm groups; they may represent labor organizations; they may represent business organizations; all of them having a proper job to do in bringing their views before Congress. No one would wish in any way to interfere with the right of petition and the right of the people to submit their legitimate views to the Senate and House of Representatives. Indeed, I doubt if constitutionally one could do so, even if he desired. But that, of course, is an entirely different consideration from that of improper or illegal activities.

It may well be that certain additional changes will be made in the election laws and several of the other statutes which have been cited by the majority leader. If that be so, the special committee will be free to make recommendations to the Senate.

I believe that in a matter of this kind, which vitally affects the Senate as an institution, it is fitting and proper that both parties in the Senate should be equally represented. Therefore, I hope there will be an overwhelming vote of approval of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the distinguished minority leader, because I desire to make a brief modification of the resolution.

In line 4, after the word "thereof", it is proposed to insert "or any candidate therefor."

To explain the modification very briefly, the minority leader and I think the resolution is clear as it is now drawn, but some Senators have raised the question that the committee would be authorized to investigate the subject of attempts improperly to influence Members of the Senate, but not of their opponents in a campaign.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My personal belief is that the term "political activities" is broad enough to cover the point raised by the Senator from Texas; but I would have no objection to clarifying the matter, as I understand it is the desire of a number of Senators to do, by having the words "or any candidate therefor" included.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I share the viewpoint of the distinguished minority leader, as does our counsel; but no harm can be done by including in the amendment, and it would satisfy some of our colleagues to have it embodied in the resolution. I think it should be made clear beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the special committee not only has

the authority to investigate any improper or illegal influencing of any Member of the Senate, but of any improper or illegal influencing of any candidate for election to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution is modified as indicated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, first, I wish to commend the Senator from Texas upon the way in which he has handled this matter. I support him strongly in the effort to establish a bipartisan committee.

I recall that when the matter involving the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] was before the Senate, a select committee, bipartisan in nature, was proposed. At that time I had a grave reservation about it; in fact, I did not favor it. It appeared on the surface that perhaps the creation of such a committee would result in delay; and for that and other reasons I was not in favor of it. But, contrary to my expectations, that committee functioned, under the able leadership of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], in an extremely fair manner. Its work was so well done that the entire Senate and the country accepted its decisions in good faith and with complete confidence. I consider that the result achieved by that committee is a good illustration of the effectiveness and wisdom of the suggestion now made by the Senator from Texas. I hope the Senate will support the pending resolution.

The matter which is proposed to be investigated is one that has plagued our Government for a long time. It is not new. Some years ago—in 1950, I believe it was—I introduced a joint resolution. Substantially the same resolution was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on October 9, 1951. From the report I wish to read a sentence or two:

> If the Congress should act by concurrent resolution, not only would full executive participation not be invited, but such action would lead to the inference that the executive branch is not willing to participate, a conclusion which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are unwilling to accept.

So I wish to suggest an amendment to the pending resolution in the same spirit in which this statement in the report was made. My resolution was in pursuance of my effort to have established a Commission on Ethics to study every type of activity the one which has now resulted in the new investigation, and in the demand made for it, in effect, by the President's veto message.

I think this is a very necessary undertaking. I believe the procedure which the Senator from Texas has followed is the only real, effective way to get at the situation so that it will not be considered as a partisan matter.

The same report to which I have referred had this to say:

> The commission must deal with the basic dilemmas, pressures, and moral conflicts of present day life, that is, with causes and with fundamentals.

If the investigation is to be of any benefit, it must deal with the fundamentals. We all know there are many rather hypocritical provisions in the election laws, and that we are placed in the position of having to accept assistance in running our campaigns, and then be subject to criticism for having accepted the assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the body of the report which accompanied Senate Joint Resolution 107 of the 82d Congress.

There being no objection, the report (No. 933, 82d Cong. 1st sess.) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) to establish a commission on ethics in the Federal Government for the purpose of "assisting in the establishment of higher moral standards in the official conduct of the executive and legislative branches of the Government," and the substitute joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) for substantially the same purpose, having held hearings and considered the same, report favorably the substitute resolution (S. J. Res. 107) printed below and recommend that the resolution do pass.

The purpose of the resolution is to establish a commission (1) to make a thorough study of the problem of morals and ethics in Government, (2) to recommend constructive measures which will assist in establishing and maintaining high moral standards, and (3) to report its findings and recommendations to the 83d Congress during the 1st session.

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

In hearings covering a period of 3 weeks, extensive testimony was taken from a broadly representative group of witnesses. The list of those who appeared is as follows:

"Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, United States Senator, Arkansas.

"Hon. William Benton, United States Senator, Connecticut.

"Hon. Robert Jackson, Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

"Hon. Learned Hand, United States Court of Appeals, Second Judicial Circuit.

"Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States.

"Hon. Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior.

"Hon. Frederick J. Lawton, Director, Bureau of the Budget.

"Hon. CARL ALBERT, United States Representative, Oklahoma.

"Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT, United States Representative, Florida.

"Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, United States Representative, New York.

"Hon. Robert Ramspeck, Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission.

"Hon. Wayne Coy, Federal Communications Commission.

"David Lilienthal, former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

"Benjamin V. Cohen, attorney, former counsel in various Federal agencies.

"Joseph O'Connell, former Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

"Jerry Voorhis, Director, Cooperative League of United States; former United States Representative, California.

"Edwin D. Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor.

"Eugene Meyer, chairman, board of directors, Washington Post.

"Marquis Childs, journalist.

"Drew Pearson, journalist.

"Dr. Theodore M. Greene, professor of philosophy, Yale University.

"Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., professor of political science, Catholic University.

"Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, professor of applied Christianity, Union Theological Seminary.

"Rabbi Philip J. Bernstein, president, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

"Thurman Arnold, attorney, former Justice, United States Court of Appeals.

"Morris Ernst, attorney.

"D. A. Hulcy, president, United States Chamber of Commerce.

"Louis Browniow, former director, Public Administration Clearing House.

"Dr. Paul Appleby, dean, Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University.

"Walter White, executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

"Dr. Jasper Shannon, University of Kentucky.

"Anna Lord Strauss, former president, National League of Women Voters.

"Benton J. Stong, National Farmers' Union.

"Frank H. Weitzel, Assistant to the Comptroller General of the United States.

"Michael Straight, publisher; national chairman, American Veterans' Committee."

Thus it may be seen that representatives of all three branches of Government were heard, as well as leaders in religion, political science, journalism, public affairs, and industry. In addition to the oral testimony, significant written statements were submitted to the subcommittee by Cabinet members, agency heads, and representatives of a wide variety of interested groups.

The heavy preponderance of the opinions expressed to the subcommittee was in favor of the proposal for a commission on ethics. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, the author of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, which was the basic proposal before the committee, and the sponsor also of the substitute joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107), in testifying said:

"I believe a commission of eminent citizens, free from prejudices and influences which surround public life, can make a real contribution to the task of improving the ethical standards of our national life and particularly our Government."

In his address to the Senate upon introduction of the resolution, Senator FULBRIGHT had stated:

"The Commission would evaluate the conditions which have been exposed, and drawing upon its combined wisdom would restate again, or formulate anew, principles which, it is to be hoped, would strengthen the faith of all decent men in our democratic society. * * *

"Further investigations, as instructive as they may be, are not nearly as important as an understanding of what has already been exposed and action to remedy the situation."

Many others supported this view.

The Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller of the United States, supported the creation of a commission on ethics in the following language:

"I believe consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21 can do much to focus the attention of leaders in and out of Government on the problem. Important disclosures already have been made through public-spirited efforts of the Committees on Expenditures under Chairmen MCCLELLAN and DAWSON, the Hoey investigating committee, the Fulbright Subcommittee on the RFC, and the Kefauver Crime Committee, and through the Bonner hearings on surplus property and the Hardy investigation of the Maritime Commission. These nonpartisan probes have informed and aroused our citizens. Constructive measures for strengthening the moral fiber of our Government must receive wholehearted public support."

The Honorable Frederick J. Lawton, Director of the Budget, lent his support to the creation of a commission in saying:

"I do not believe that any right-thinking citizen, particularly any person who has been in Government for any length of time, can

do anything but applaud the objectives of the resolution. * * *

"The purpose of this resolution is the reexamination and reevaluation of those standards which in part have been enacted into law, and in part have become a question of custom and practice in order to determine what is the best method of evaluating the moral standards and the ethical conduct of Government in its three branches. This technique of reexamination and reevaluation is a tried and proven one. It is the reason we have had a Hoover Commission in the field of Government organization. It is the reason that we have established a National Science Foundation in the field of physical research. It can serve the same useful purpose in the field of public morality."

Mr. Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board of directors of the Washington Post, was among the others who endorsed the Fulbright proposal for the creation of a Commission. He testified that:

"Obviously, it has always been important to have higher moral standards in the official conduct of the executive and legislative branches of the Government. But now that we have become in many ways the most powerful country in the world from a material point of view, it is more important than ever, in my opinion, that our strength in natural resources, in well educated manpower, in technological progress, and in production, should be matched by correspondingly high standards in the conduct of public affairs. Our very strength and leadership in the free world—and our responsibility, I may add—causes us to be examined with reference to our character as a Nation. If we do not match our material strength by our moral strength, our material strength will not alone be sufficient to win the battle of freedom."

Reactions of department and agency heads to the proposed Commission were somewhat varied. Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall wrote:

"I can see no objection to establishment of such a commission on ethics in the Federal Government, along the general lines proposed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 21. I should like to suggest that the success of the work of such Commission would depend very largely on the attitude taken by the Commission and by the witnesses who are called before it. A commission which develops a broad and helpful attitude toward the investigation would inspire considerable confidence and frankness on the part of the witnesses. Such a commission could do much to develop and consolidate the basic facts with respect to the proper conduct of Government officials and permit the development of a code of conduct which could be used as a yardstick for all officials of the Government.

"As now drafted, the resolution provides for the appointment of all members of the Commission from private life. It seems to me that it would be helpful to have on any such Commission representation from both private and public sources."

On the other hand, Secretary of Commerce, Charles Sawyer, in his letter to the subcommittee chairman, stated:

"I do not favor the establishment of any more commissions or agencies in the Federal Government. I am not one of those who believe that the solution of every problem lies in the organization of another alphabetical agency. I have opposed the establishment of new commissions and agencies in the executive branch and recently testified to the same effect with reference to a commission to be established by the Congress dealing with foreign aid."

A few others expressed similar doubts.

The committee agrees with the views expressed by most witnesses, that the establishment of such a commission is highly desirable.

WHY A BROADLY REPRESENTATIVE COMMISSION IS NEEDED

The ethical standards which govern public officials are of basic importance to the strength and unity of the Nation. A thorough study of the problem is needed at this time to recommend constructive measures, to increase public understanding of the problem, and to avoid the exaggeration and distortion which tend to occur in the absence of an impartial and authoritative appraisal. In these views the committee, as noted above, is supported by the great weight of testimony received from informed persons.

There is no doubt of public concern and responsibility for the problem. Satisfactory standards of conduct in public affairs are the products of much more than the official behavior of men in public office. The morals of the public are involved as well as the morals of public officials, and the moral tone of society at least partially determines the moral tone of government.

Since the public is so directly involved, and has become so interested, it should be strongly represented on the investigating commission. The resolution recommended for adoption provides for a commission of 15, with 9 members who are private citizens and 6 who are in public office or employment, including 2 Members of the Senate, 2 Members of the House of Representatives, and 2 administrators. All members should, of course, be persons of recognized integrity, judgment, and experience in public or civic affairs.

In addition to what is being done or may be done by committees of Congress, investigation by such a Commission is desirable because of the essential nature of the inquiry which is required. Practices and standards of the public, executive officials, and the Congress will be subject to criticism. A Commission representing all three groups will have a broader perspective, will be less subject to a charge of bias than a legislative committee, and can be forthright in pointing out improper standards, wherever found. Interpretation is needed, perhaps more than additional fact finding, and for this, the more broadly representative Commission is better qualified. The Commission will also have time to make a thorough study and to mature its recommendations (2 years if necessary), whereas committees of the Congress tend to work under great pressure.

The problem can be dealt with in part by legislation, and in part by Executive or administrative orders, but only in part. An important phase of the Commission's function is educational. Findings must commend themselves to the public as well as to the President and Congress. The broadly representative character of the Commission is intended to further this educational objective.

Although Senator FULBRIGHT's original proposal (S. Con. Res. 21) would have limited the Commission membership to persons not now in the Government, the committee believes that the principal objective of that aspect of the proposal can be attained by keeping the private citizens in a majority, as the recommended resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 107, provides. It is also clear that members with current Government experience can contribute important insights to the Commission's study.

WHY THE ACTION SHOULD BE BY JOINT RESOLUTION

The committee recommends that the Commission on Ethics in Government be established by joint resolution rather than by concurrent resolution. The standards of conduct of administrators as well as legislators and private citizens will be subject to review and criticism. The inquiry should be a joint inquiry, and the action recommended should be followed up on as wide a front as possible. If the Congress should act by concurrent resolution, not only would full executive participation not be invited, but such action would lead to the inference that the executive branch is not willing to participate, a conclusion which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are unwilling to accept.

THE GOVERNMENT'S GOOD NAME AND THE PUBLIC'S GOOD NAME

The Government's good name and the public's good name are already at issue. They have been challenged, not by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, whose subcommittee directed their inquiry toward corrective measures, but by the findings of numerous committees of the Senate and House of Representatives in the course of specific investigations over a period of several years, by the normal processes of criminal prosecution, by the basketball and football "scandals," by increasingly unfavorable public comment on legislative as well as administrative conduct, and by charges in the press. Nothing less than a thorough investigation and appraisal of the situation can clear the air, and put substandard conduct, which already has been disclosed, in its proper perspective. The report of a wise and objective commission can be most helpful to the public and to officials alike. Failure to clear the air by such an inquiry would be most unfortunate. Rumor is more dangerous than reality.

A feature of American politics which has amazed foreign observers is willingness to indulge in open self-criticism. Although the intemperance of political controversy is frequently to be regretted, and there is disregard for the facts all too often in the heat of domestic disputes, there is no doubt that the vitality of critical faculties and traditions is a source (and also evidence) of strength in American life. People are not perfect, and institutions are not perfect, but imperfection is to be feared most in political institutions when governments lay claim to perfection and dare not permit public criticism. An official and objective inquiry into the ethical standards of public life is something which only a strong and free nation may undertake. The committee have no hesitation in recommending such an inquiry.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION AND ITS FUNCTION

The President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House, according to the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 107, will each appoint five members to the Commission on Ethics in Government. The President will appoint 3 from private life and 2 from within the administration. The Vice President will appoint 3 from private life and 2 from the Senate. The Speaker will appoint 3 from private life and 2 from the House of Representatives. Appointments from the Congress are required to be divided equally between the Democratic and Republican Parties. Some consultation among the appointing authorities to secure a representative selection of persons from private life is probably desirable. The members should be chosen for their personal ability to contribute to the work of the Commission, however, and should not serve as representatives of organized groups. The Commission should not be partisan in its inquiry; and the committee believe that this requirement should be and will be considered in making appointments.

The Commission is directed to report to the President and to Congress during the first session of the 83d Congress, but has 2 years from the date of its establishment in which to complete its work. This schedule will allow sufficient time for a thoroughness in inquiry and for reaching a considered judgment as to recommendations. It will also avoid entanglements in the 1952 elections.

The Commission is directed:

(1) To make a thorough and complete study and investigation of the moral standards of official conduct of officers and employees of the United States; the effect thereon of the moral standards in business and political activity of persons and groups doing business with the Government or seeking to influence public policy and administration; and, in relation thereto, the moral standards generally prevailing in society which condition the conduct of public affairs or which affect the strength and unity of the Nation.

(2) To make recommendations for the improvement and maintenance at a high level of the moral standards of official conduct of officers and employees of the United States and of all persons who participate in or are responsible for the conduct of public affairs.

In the testimony taken by the committee there was strong emphasis upon the need for a broad, rather than narrow, assignment for the Commission. It was insisted that the Commission must consider public morals broadly defined, insofar as they affect public affairs, as the ethical standards of officialdom. The Commission must deal with the basic dilemmas, pressures, and moral conflicts of present-day life, that is, with causes and with fundamentals. This should be its emphasis rather than individual failures, large or small, if it is to be successful in recommending corrective and preventive action.

The subcommittee which conducted the hearings on this resolution has prepared a much fuller report on Senator FULBRIGHT'S proposal of an ethics commission and on many other related questions for the use of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and for the information of the Senate. The fundamental character and the very number of the proposals submitted to the subcommittee and summarized in its report indicate that a significant agenda is ready for the study and action of the Commission on Ethics.

UNTAPPED MORAL RESOURCES

The fact that a study of ethics in government is needed is not grounds for pessimism or cynicism. The very healthy trait of self-criticism which we have noted as characteristic of American life, must be salted with objectivity and fairness. The tendency to assume that because some men are moved chiefly by thought of personal advantage and nearly all are strongly influenced by economic motives, therefore, no other forces are effective, is as dangerous as naive confidence in automatic progress. The committee are convinced that among the greatest assets of American life are its moral resources which, if understood, conserved, and developed, can give the Nation unprecedented moral force and vitality, not only for its own benefit but for the benefit of the world.

The full text of the recommended resolution is as follows:

"[S. J. Res. 107, 82d Cong., 1st sess.]

"Joint resolution to establish a Commission on ethics in Government

"Resolved, etc.—

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to strengthen the faith and confidence of the American people in their Government by assisting in the establishment and maintenance of high moral standards in the official conduct of officers and employees of the Government.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1, there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission on Ethics in Government (hereinafter referred to as the Commission).

"MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 15 members as follows:

"(1) Five appointed by the President of the United States, of whom one shall be an employee of the United States holding a position not above grade GS–16, or equivalent grade, and one shall be an officer or employee of the United States holding a position above such grade;

"(2) Five appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom two shall be Members of the Senate; and

"(3) Five appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of whom two shall be Members of the House.

"(b) Of the Members of the Senate appointed under subsection (a) (2) and the Members of the House appointed under subsection (a) (3), not more than one such Member in each instance shall be from the same political party. Except as provided in subsection (a), all members of the Commission shall be appointed from private life.

"(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(d) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

"(e) A quorum of the Commission shall consist of eight members, except that the Commission may establish a lower number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission—

"(1) To make a thorough and complete study and investigation of the moral standards of official conduct of officers and employees of the United States; the effect thereon of the moral standards in business and political activity of persons and groups doing business with the Government or seeking to influence public policy and administration; and, in relation thereto, the moral standards generally prevailing in society which condition the conduct of public affairs or which affect the strength and unity of the Nation.

"(2) To make recommendations for the improvement, and maintenance at a high level, of the moral standards of official conduct of officers and employees of the United States and of all persons who participate in or are responsible for the conduct of public affairs.

"(b) The Commission shall, from time to time during the 1st session of the 83d Congress, report the results of its study and investigation and submit its recommendation to the President and the Congress and shall submit a final report not later than 2 years after the appointment of all members of the Commission.

"POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 5. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this joint resolution, sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, administer such oaths, have such printing and binding done, and make such expenditures as the Commission deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or any member of the Commission designated by him and shall be served by any person designated by the Chairman or any such member. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission.

"(b) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation for comparable duties prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. (a) The members of the Commission who are Members of the Congress shall serve without additional compensation. The members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without additional compensation, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. All other members of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(b) All members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

"EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 8. The Commission shall cease to exist 30 days after the submission of its final report."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished and very able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency showed the majority leader his proposed amendment before the resolution was laid before the Senate. I have conferred with the coauthor of the resolution, the distinguished minority leader, and we both think the suggestion made by the Senator from Arkansas is a constructive one. We are delighted to have the resolution amended accordingly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Texas. With that change, I think the resolution should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arkansas send his amendment to the desk, so that it may be stated?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The CHIEF CLERK. Following the modification of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, it is proposed to insert: ", or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no doubt that the resolution will be agreed to. As it has been written, it has the full support of the leadership, both of the majority party and the minority party. I believe also that the resolution has been passed upon by the policy committees of the two parties. So I am not deluding myself thinking that the resolution can be defeated. I am certain that when the vote is taken, there will be very few neg-

ative votes, because the other Members of the Senate, like myself, understand the necessity for and are desirous of having a thorough, exhaustive investigation of the charges of corruption, both to establish whatever instances of corruption have taken place, and also to obtain information which will result in the consideration and enactment of more adequate election laws.

But the Senate now has a readymade subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration, a subcommittee in which every Senator has always had and today has full confidence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator if he desires additional time. Since the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be extended until the conclusion of consideration of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

So far as the enactment of other legislation is concerned, whatever bills are submitted, whether they be submitted by the proposed special committee or by any Member of the Senate, would still have to go to the appropriate standing committees for their consideration and report, and then to the Senate. The proposed special committee would not be called upon to report until January 31, 1957. Mr. President, this is an urgent matter. We cannot wait until January 31, 1957.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The legislative record of this matter is very clear. As shown by the discussion of the distinguished majority leader of yesterday, the special committee would have full authority to make reports to the Senate from time to time. The date of January 31, 1957, is merely the terminal date of the special committee.

I want to say to the distinguished Senator from New York that he is no less interested in having a complete and full investigation than is the senior Senator from California, who happens to be the minority leader, or the senior Senator from Texas, who is the majority leader of this body. There is going to be a full and complete investigation of all phases of this problem, which is confronting the Senate of the United States and the country.

I hope the Senator's implication is not that there is any desire or any interest on the part of any Senator, certainly not of the authors of the resolution, to postpone any action to January of next year, beyond the election date. To the contrary, I want the special committee to get all the facts. In the judgment of the committee, when it feels it has facts which should be reported to the Senate of the United States, its reports to this body will be welcome.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from California that section 3 of the resolution reads as follows:

> The special committee shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1957.

I know full well, as every other Member of the Senate knows, that a committee may report at any time, when it considers it to be in the interest of the Senate to file a report; but there is no mandate in the resolution that the committee shall report until January 31, 1957, and that is what I was referring to.

Mr. President, this whole matter was injected into the deliberations of the Senate by reason of the statements made by the action of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] when he related certain facts which had come to his attention, and which to some extent involved him. At the time the natural-gas bill was under consideration, I urged that the bill be not passed at that time, because I felt that the measure itself and also the Senate of the United States were under a cloud—a cloud that should be dissipated before final action was taken.

I brought that argument up at the time the motion to recommit was before the Senate. I brought it up during the final consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, the President of the United States, in his message vetoing the natural-gas bill, H. R. 6645, after expressing regret that he could not sign the bill, although he was in accord with its basic objectives, said the following:

> Since the passage of this bill, a body of evidence has accumulated indicating that private persons, apparently representing only a very small segment of a great and vital industry, have been seeking to further their own interests by highly questionable activities. These include efforts that I deem to be so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes.

Mr. President, that is not my language; that is the language of the President of the United States. I think we are justified in, and are under the necessity of, giving careful consideration to that statement in the veto message.

The creation of a new special committee will raise new doubts and questions, at least, in my opinion, and in the minds of the people. It will not in any way allay the suspicions or doubts which have been created by the present situation. The situation should be resolved. I am talking now about the oil lobby, which was so much in evidence and so clearly referred to in the President's message. It should be investigated and considered before any other aspect of this whole subject is brought up.

In my opinion, the creation of a new committee—and I know one will be created by the Senate this afternoon, and I shall vote for it, because I am not willing to vote against any proposal to investigate the acts of any Member of the Senate or of any private citizen who may wish to bring pressure to bear on the Senate—is unwise; it is bad government, in my opinion. It will not satisfy the people, and I believe it will only intensify doubts.

Mr. President, I wonder if I may address a question to the distinguished majority leader on this subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may address a question to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have already described the situation which was created in connection with alleged pressures, possibly alleged bribes, possibly other alleged illegal acts, in connection with the natural-gas bill. That is the matter which has brought up this whole discussion.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Texas whether he will agree to write into the resolution a direction to the Special Committee, if created, that the very first order of business before that committee shall be to investigate the subject of attempts in the case of the natural-gas bill to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, and other activities and practices of the oil lobby.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have great confidence in the membership of this body and the committee that will be set up. I do not seek, Mr. President, to direct that committee as to the organizations or individuals or subjects it shall consider at its initial meeting. I believe the membership of the committee will be composed of Senators of the highest integrity who are highly trusted by their colleagues.

I have no objection whatever to the Senator from New York himself offering any amendment he may care to offer; but the resolution appears as it is after days and nights of draftsmanship, after discussing it with the minority—and there are some 40 members on their policy committee—with the majority, with the nine members of our policy committee, and after reviewing the resolution carefully word by word, line by line, after considering every comma, semicolon, and period, after discussing it with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections [Mr. GORE], after going over it yesterday morning for an hour or so with the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and we all felt we had a resolution under which a committee could do the job the Senate wanted done.

If the resolution is unacceptable to the Senator from New York, he is perfectly within his rights if he offers an amendment. Although it is becoming popular here, of late, to accept amendments. I do not think the Senator from Texas wants to start a practice of accepting such an amendment as this one, containing directions to a committee which has not yet been named.

I believe that the chairman of the committee and the membership of the committee will be glad to hear any evidence the Senator from New York may produce; and they can determine what they should consider first and what they should consider last. As a matter of fact, I think they will be an honest and

as honorable as any other Members of this body.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that certainly I have no question regarding the members of the committee, when they are appointed——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then why cannot we trust them to proceed with their deliberations?

Mr. LEHMAN. Any more than I have regarding the other Members of the Senate. But I hope the Senator from Texas will not take offense when I say the committee will be a hand-selected committee, and will displace a legally constituted subcommittee of a standing committee. I do not believe that will satisfy the people of the United States; I believe that the doubts and suspicions regarding what has happened will continue.

I have made the suggestion to the distinguished Senator from Texas. Of course, obviously there is no object at all——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have the floor; and when the Senator from New York reaches the end of the sentence he has begun, I wish to express my resentment at his implication.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no object at all in offering an amendment of the character of the one I have suggested that the Senator from Texas accept, because I know, of course, what the outcome of the consideration by the Senate of that amendment would be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in reply to what the Senator from New York has said, I wish to say that apparently he has an amendment which he wishes some other Senator to offer for him. The Senator from New York has a right to offer the amendment. If he chooses to offer it, it can be acted on promptly by the Senate.

Every committee of this body is, in a measure, a hand-picked committee; the committees are selected by the chairman of the Steering Committees, who happen to be the majority leader, for one side, and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for the other side. The tradition of this body has always been that the committees are selected upon the nominations of the respective leaders.

When the present Congress was organized under the present Vice President, I said to him that if he chose to ask the then minority leader for recommendations from this side of the aisle, I would be glad to submit them, after consultation with my colleagues on the Democratic side, and if he did not desire to follow those recommendations, the first one he failed to follow would be the last one I would make. I must say, in paying my respects to the Vice President, that every recommendation the Democratic leader has made has been followed since the Vice President took office.

Let me say to the Senator from New York that I have no doubt that the oil lobby will be thoroughly investigated. I do not know whether the investigation of it will begin on the first Monday when the committee meets or on the following Tuesday.

I can also assure the Senator from New York that many Senators want other lobbies investigated. I believe that the Members selected for the committee will do their jobs in their own way, according to their best judgment; and I am hopeful that the job they do will meet with the approval of all fair-minded, patriotic, nonpolitical Senators.

Mr. LEHMAN. I want all lobbies investigated, but I think the oil lobby should be the first one to be investigated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am perfectly willing to have the oil lobby investigated, or I would not be submitting the resolution; and the other day I was perfectly willing to have the oil lobby investigated.

When the resolution to investigate the oil industry was submitted, the Senator from Texas said, "I will not object. I hope the Senate will accept the resolution."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from New York, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the Senator from New York this question: Does he, himself, have any knowledge or any information regarding any lobby or any unfair advantage which anyone took or attempted to take in connection with the vote on the natural gas bill?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that I have no knowledge of the offering of any bribe. I have submitted to the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration certain facts which developed in the State of New York and came to my attention. Whether they constitute corruption, I do not know; and I made no charges.

Mr. CAPEHART. My question was whether the Senator from New York of his own knowledge knows of any corruption or any bribe offering or any illegal activities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that is the purpose of the committee. So I wish to ask for the regular order, if the Senator from Indiana will indulge me.

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely wondered whether the Senator from New York had any knowledge of his own about such matters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York has said he will support the resolution, and has made his statement. So I should like to ask for the regular order.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from New York said he wanted the oil lobby investigated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is going to be investigated.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wanted to know whether the Senator from New York had any knowledge on his own part.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to answer the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought the Senator from New York had answered.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think I have. I simply refer the Senator from Indiana to the message of the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the distinguished majority leader: While the resolution, of course, covers a much greater area than did the one involved in the recent controversy, I find no objection to that. But it occurs to me that the resolution itself should perhaps include words which would justify or even require the filing of temporary reports prior to this year's elections, in the event that any such reports should prove to be needed to take care of situations and charges which might arise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has asked a very pertinent question. It has been considered and discussed. The counsel of the Legislative Drafting Service has prepared the resolution; and the question has been raised here by the Senator from New York, and it was raised yesterday.

On yesterday the majority leader said, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 3030.

> I should like to say only a few words at this time. The question has been asked whether or not the January 31, 1957, date means that will be the earliest date of any report.

I may say that I talked with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections; and we had discussed the same question, too.

I read further from yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> The date on which the committee will expire, unless extended, will be January 31, 1957.
>
> It is anticipated, contemplated, and hoped that the committee can organize as soon as the present select committee makes its report—

That is, March the 10th—

> and proceed diligently, on a full-time basis, to make its investigation and studies, and from time to time, and certainly during this session, file interim reports and make recommendations, and perhaps cause to be introduced for consideration proposed legislation.

That is the intention. I ask the majority leader whether he will confirm it, if it is his opinion. But that is the intention of the majority leader and the minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, who reviewed it, when the question was raised; and that opinion is supported by the counsel who prepared the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will permit me to say a word at this point——

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say that I fully concur in the statement the ma-

jority leader has made. I believe that January 31, 1957, is the termination date of the committee, unless otherwise extended; and I believe that the committee will have ample authority to make reports in its discretion at such times as it may determine, starting after its organization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to say that the same question was brought up when the select committee on the McCarthy matter was created. I think the distinguished Senator from Minnesota discussed at some length the question of when the reports would be made, and the circumstances.

I merely wish to emphasize, so that the legislative history may be clear, that the January 1957 date is a termination date, unless extended by the Senate. It is hoped by the authors of the resolution—and I trust by every other Member of the Senate who supports or opposes it—that the committee will proceed expeditiously and diligently, and that when it is prepared to file a report with the Senate on any subject or person, or any piece of legislation, it will do so in the form of an interim report. It was necessary that there be a cutoff date. The cutoff date with respect to the select committee was March 1. The cutoff date for this committee is January 31, 1957, because we felt that after the election there might be some matters upon which the committee might wish to report.

Mr. HOLLAND. I very much appreciate the reassuring statements made by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader.

It occurs to me—and I am sure it has occurred to every other Senator—that this may prove to be a handmade vehicle for possible misuse by those who would seek to besmirch a Senator who is necessarily running, because of the expiration of his term, in this year's primaries and elections.

So long as the actual legislative record shows clearly that not only would the committee not be volunteering something that was not intended, but that instead, it is the opinion of the Senate at the time it is considering this resolution that in such a case the committee would and should go as quickly as possible to the bottom of any such charges, the situation becomes clear. If the charges are false, the committee can issue a statement to that effect, without being placed in the position of having volunteered something ahead of time. If the charges are not false, the committee can regretfully and clearly state what the facts are. I think the legislative record should clearly show—and I believe it will now show clearly—that no limitation is to be placed upon the duty of this committee to act speedily and effectively upon charges which are brought before it; and that that duty applies with particular strength in the case of charges brought against Senators who may be candidates for reelection this year. I believe that such charges should be handled as speedily as may be consonant with obtaining and announcing the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the majority leader entirely agrees with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized no one except the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am seeking recognition so that I may yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the distinguished Senator from Washington wish me to yield to him?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to express agreement with what the Senator from Florida has said. If what he says were not true, and if the appropriate legislative record were not made at this point, surely availability for membership on this committee would be limited to 66 Members of the Senate instead of 96.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. For that reason, when the resolution was presented yesterday, particular attention was called to this specific point, so that it would be a part of the legislative history.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my question to the majority leader concerning this resolution is one which involves the basic matter of jurisdiction. In order that the RECORD may be entirely clear, it is my understanding that during the coming election the responsibilities of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration will not be superseded by those of the special committee. In other words, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections will still have the right to review election practices and procedures which are being followed, will it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is a fair interpretation. I have discussed the question with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections; and it is the opinion of the Senator from Texas that if the Senate were to approve this resolution it would perhaps expect the special committee to take precedence and proceed diligently. If there were a conflict between the two committees on a certain day or at a certain hour, it would be hoped that the committees could resolve the conflict.

We are not seeking by this resolution—and we did not seek in two similar resolutions in the previous Congress—to abolish or circumvent the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration, or the Committee on Rules and Administration itself. All of them have jurisdiction of a kind. We hope that on this general subject representatives from this body who have interests and knowledge in this particular field will diligently apply themselves and make recommendations to the Senate, which, in turn, can implement such recommendations with remedial legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is equally true, is it not, that the special committee will not possess what we call legislative jurisdiction? It will have powers of recommendation, advice, and counsel; but when it comes to the question of modernizing Federal election laws or improving and strengthening the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, the Federal Lobby Regulation Act, the Taft-Hartley law, or whatever other law may be involved, the responsibility will still rest with the duly established committees under the Reorganization Act of 1946—namely, the Subcommittee on Reorganization with relation to the Lobbying Act; the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as related to the Taft-Hartley Act; the Committee on the Judiciary, as related to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and so forth. Am I correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the opinion of the majority leader, and that is the opinion he has expressed to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the chairman of the subcommittee under the Lobbying Act, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and other Senators with whom he has discussed this subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am asking these questions so that whatever private conversations may have been held with responsible leaders of the committees and subcommittee chairmen will now become a matter of public record.

I ask these questions because I do not think it is fair to infer that as a result of the approval of this resolution any committee is to be bypassed or any subject covered up. I think we would be doing a disservice to this body if we so indicated.

The majority leader and the minority leader are to be complimented for drafting this particular proposal. The first I heard of it was yesterday. The first time I held a copy of it in my hand was within the past 2 hours. I have read its language. I point out that section 3 is just about as all-encompassing and comprehensive a provision as we could hope to draft. If anyone could suggest a larger structure in which to house an investigation, he would indeed be an amazing architect and engineer.

Under the provisions of the resolution, any lobby can be investigated. Amendments could be considered with respect to any law which pertains to Federal elections, and revisions could be perfected and suggested. I am sure it will be clearly understood that there is to be no restriction in terms of investigation of lobbying activities. I, for one, want the oil lobby investigated. I can hear someone else say he wants the labor lobby investigated. I think we should be very frank. There is no doubt as to what will happen. Every activity will be subject to an airing. There will be an opportunity to ventilate the activities of everyone. Anyone or any organization engaged in lobbying or contributing to candidates or political parties may be investigated. There is general and specific authority in this resolution for a thorough inquiry, study, and examination of election practices and lobbying.

We should be perfectly clear as to what we are doing. We are authorizing a special or select committee to go into a very difficult, sensitive, and all-important subject; and the Members who are to serve on this committee will have a responsibility second to none. It is the same kind of responsibility which other men have had to assume, under equally controversial conditions and during equally difficult times in the past. I only hope that the job will be done judiciously, temperately, thoroughly, carefully, and objectively.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] that this committee will undertake a great responsibility, in particular with respect to the coming elections. No committee of this Congress should be used to besmirch friend or foe, candidate or incumbent; but any committee of the Congress should be required to dig out the facts. If charges are made, they should receive priority treatment before the select committee or any subcommittee. The committee should go to the bottom of such charges, and not leave them dangling in mid-air.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the concurrence of the Senator from Minnesota in the thought I had previously expressed. As I listened to the debate a while ago, there came to my mind the fact that in my State, entries for the primary began to be made yesterday. I understand that my distinguished colleague entered his name for reelection. I believe he is as "clean as a hound's tooth," and can stand investigation from any and every source and quarter.

However, early in May will come the first primary, and if he has opposition and has to have a second primary, that likewise will come in May.

It is very clear in that case—and I am sure in other States as well—that it will be essential that the committee give priority and preferential handling to matters that arise which have such early time limits as the ones I have described.

I believe the RECORD now shows very clearly that the Senate intends that the special committee should give such priority and preferential treatment, from the point of time, as may be necessary to explore thoroughly but quickly any charge that may be made against one who is a candidate at this time, so that announcement of the findings may come, not at the last moment, when it might be too late to correct a false impression that had been given, but at such time as to do justice, not only to the man now running for reelection, but to his opponents as well.

I believe that the RECORD will now show that we intend—and certainly the Senator from Florida in voting for this measure and in giving it his support intends to make it thoroughly clear—that we expect the special committee to give priority and preferential treatment to charges that involve Senators standing for reelection whose primary or election comes at a very short period in the future, so that the matter can be determined and publicly announced in time to get full circulation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that he reassures me by his statement and that his observations give me great strength. I am sure his statements are also deeply appreciated by the minority leader, as they are by me.

I have no doubt that the committee that will be appointed under the terms of the resolution, if the resolution is adopted, will reflect great credit on the Senate and will conduct itself in a manner that will be thoroughly approved by the Senate.

I now yield again to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I had not intended to speak on this subject at all, but I have been very much disturbed by the cloud of uncertainty and distrust which has been thrown over the Senate.

I should like to observe that I do not believe either political party is without sin, or that either political party is a repository of all virtue or wisdom.

The Senator from Texas and the minority leader have acted with dispatch, vigor, and determination. I wish to commend them for moving into this situation and coming forth with an effective program. The only way we can objectively, wholeheartedly, enthusiastically, and determinedly investigate lobbying and corrupt practices, indiscretions, evil doing, and violations of law in an election year—and that is what we are faced with—is a bipartisan committee such as this. Let us face the fact and not try to kid ourselves. Otherwise we will be confronted with confusion compounded and a political madhouse.

We have an obligation to the citizens of this country. We must remember that the election laws are inadequate, antiquated, and very much need revision. That is true of all cognate laws. Everyone who has ever campaigned knows that those laws need complete revision. Every Senator knows of the very powerful lobbies which are at work, and many of us are becoming sick and tired of them. They ought to be investigated. Outmoded election and lobbying laws should be rewritten, so that there will be greater responsibility in Congress and greater respect by the people for Congress. I submit the only way it can be done is in the way in which we are proceeding today. No authority is denied to any standing committee, but new authority is added to the Senate to get this job done like gentlemen and men, and not like partisans. That is the way we ought to do it. The Senate will by this resolution give a mandate—a directive—to proceed forthwith.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana. Then I shall yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota asked some questions which I had expected to propound. I express the hope that the special committee will in no way supersede the regularly appointed Privileges and Elections Subcommittee of the Rules Committee. It was my privilege to serve on an elections subcommittee, and that subcommittee performed some valuable work.

Are we to understand that it is not the intention of the Senate that the special committee shall supersede the regularly appointed Elections Subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I reaffirm the Senator's understanding in that regard.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the distinguished majority leader. Last week, a political newspaper which calls itself the Non-Partisan Leader, published at Bismarck, N. Dak., carried this headline concerning the junior Senator from North Dakota, "YOUNG Sells Out Again."

The subheadline reads, "CASE Bribe Recalls $5,000 MILTON YOUNG Got From Dutchman."

I should like to ask whether the special committee will have authority to investigate a matter of this kind. If it will have such authority, I should like to have this vicious charge made the first item of business before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to set myself up as an authority on what the committee will do. However, I believe if the Senator will make available to the committee that matter, or any other question he may have, that under the political activities phrase of the resolution perhaps the committee in its wisdom would take up such a matter.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to get a promise at this time that as soon as the committee organizes the matter to which I have referred will be the first one this committee will investigate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] suggested an item that the committee should undertake first. I believe the question of precedence is one the committee would have to determine itself. Neither the minority leader nor the majority leader would endeavor to prevent the committee from taking any course it might desire to take.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas a question, although I do not wish to keep him on his feet too long.

For 20 years, beginning about 1926, until 1946, when the Congressional Reorganization Act was passed, every 2 years in a congressional and senatorial election year, the Senate appointed a special committee to investigate campaign practices and contributions or anything of that kind pertaining to the right of a Senator to take his seat.

After the Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed, no such special committee was appointed. However, the Committee on Rules and Administration took over jurisdiction which had theretofore been exercised by the special committees.

In this instance the special committee will have the mandate of the whole Senate behind it for whatever it sees fit to do, not only from a nonpartisan standpoint, but from the standpoint of the authority of the Senate, in looking into such matters.

I congratulate the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California and all other Senators who have had anything to do with the formulation of this program.

I suppose it is not impossible to anticipate that anything developed in an investigation which might involve the right of a Senator-elect, when he comes here, after the election in November, to claim his seat, might bring in question his right to the seat.

My question is whether the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections would still have jurisdiction to determine and report to the Senate whether such man had a right to take his seat.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the opinion of the majority leader, which he believes is strengthened by the observations of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who has had such wide experience. I might say I believe that to be also the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], because I have previously discussed this matter with him.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May the RECORD show that the Senator from Tennessee agrees?

Mr. GORE. That is my interpretation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am no match for the Senator from Kentucky when it comes to anything, particularly humor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will not confine my ability to humor. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not. But the incident I am about to relate refers to humor. Let me say that I have made no commitments to any Senator. I think it is generally known that several Senators have been unusually diligent in this field and have manifested an interest and have exercised some authority. We might conceivably be confronted with a situation where the chairman of one committee would be writing a member of another committee, and be writing memorandums to himself. In other words, the Senator from Tennessee is chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, and if I can prevail upon him, he will be assigned to the special committee, and he could be writing a memorandum to himself. But I do not think there will be any great conflict. We have at least understood that the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, or any other committee which may be involved, are giving up none of their authority in their particular fields, but the special committee will proceed, as a result of the so-called CASE incident, in the general public interest, to try to avoid conflicts with the other committees, and not go in different directions.

Mr. BARKLEY. If anything should develop from this particular investigation which would cast some reflection upon the right of any Senator who may come to the Senate as the result of the next election, the standing committee having jurisdiction of the subject would not be deprived of its jurisdiction.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the feeling of the majority leader and of the minority leader.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from New York for the purpose of his asking a question of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator from New York asks his question, I should like to point out that the Senate has approved the normal $50,000, which year in and year out the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee has had, to enable it to conduct its normal operations relative to the elections in 1956.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall read to the Senate the first paragraph of Senate Resolution 219:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a Special Committee which is authorized and directed to investigate the subject of attempts to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee if there is any function provided for in that paragraph, which is the one which establishes the special committee and prescribes its authority, that could not be carried out by the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the original statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas as to the extent of the investigative authority which would be conferred upon the special committee created as a result of this resolution. Whether that authority is on all fours with all the powers and jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections is a different matter. The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections is spelled out in the rules of the Senate. It refers to presidential elections and to some matters not covered in this particular resolution, in my opinion; but I concur in the statement of the senior Senator from Texas that the language of the resolution is sufficiently broad to permit the committee to examine into political activities, into campaign contributions, into lobbying for the purpose of influencing votes in the Senate, or improperly or illegally to influence legislation. The Senator from Texas has gone further and said it was not intended to require a predetermination on the part of the special committee that the activities to be investigated are improper or illegal. He has said that it is presumed that, after the committee makes its examination, it may or may not, in its wisdom, determine that such activity as has been investigated is improper or illegal.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator from Tennessee has misunderstood my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, in my prepared statement, with which the Senator is familiar, after receiving the opinions of the Parliamentarian, the Legislative Counsel, and the Democratic policy committee counsel, I made this statement:

For this reason, the minority leader and I are in complete agreement that the legislative committees which have jurisdiction over these subjects should be represented.

Historically, the Senate Rules Committee, and its Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, has jurisdiction over campaign contributions. The Government Operations Committee has jurisdiction over the Lobby Act. The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

We must either request each committee to conduct independent investigations or we must seek to combine the interests of each of the committees into one investigation. The dictates of efficiency and thoroughness, in my opinion, call for the latter course.

I assume that is the question which the Senator from New York is asking.

Mr. LEHMAN. No. Let me propound my question, because I am afraid the Senator from Tennessee may have misunderstood my inquiry. My question is whether there are any investigatory powers given to the special committee—and I emphasize the words "investigatory powers"—which are not inherent in the powers of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee.

Mr. GORE. I believe so. I believe the investigatory powers which would be conveyed to the special committee by the pending resolution are considerably broader than is the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. For instance, the subject of lobbying would come clearly under the jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committee. The subject of elections and corrupt practices would come clearly under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. As I understand the terms of the resolution, they cover a merging of those authorities, and give a mandate to the special committee to make a thorough investigation.

I had not intended to take part in the debate, but since I have been called upon, I may say that it is my earnest hope that the principal purpose and aim of the study will be corrective rather than punitive. The future is more important than is the past. As I envision the procedure, the disclosure of existing conditions is a necessary foundation for corrective action. When we understand the problem we face, and when the American people understand what those of us who seek to make a career of public service must contend with, I believe there will be sympathetic understanding and a basis for corrective action. I think the special committee will have greater jurisdiction and authority than has the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may

yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the able Senator from Tennessee agree with me that it will be far more difficult for anyone under investigation on any phase of the resolution to raise a question about the jurisdiction of the special committee than to raise such a question as to his subcommittee?

Mr. GORE. I think it would be far more difficult, in view of the record as to the legislative intent which has been made on the floor by the statements of both of the coauthors of the resolution. I think it would be almost impossible for a witness to raise a question of jurisdiction.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Whereas, if the Senator's Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, alone, were undertaking to cover the entire field, is it not true that the subcommittee most likely would meet with many challenges to its jurisdiction?

Mr. GORE. That is very probable.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to congratulate the majority leader and the minority leader on the resolution. I shall vote for it.

But I am a candidate for reelection. I welcome contributions. I hope my friends will not forget me.

I wish to say also that if any of my friends otherwise offer me any contributions by means of which they try to bribe me or to get me to vote for any specific legislation, they and I will settle the matter; we will not bother the Senate with it. I will take care of the matter myself.

I welcome also the help and assistance of all lobbyists. I welcome the assistance of anyone who can help me to make up my mind on the merits of any proposed legislation. I want people to write to me. I want them to come to see me whenever they are in Washington. That goes for the labor organizations, the farm organizations, the gas organizations, the sugar organizations, and all the rest of them, because they have been very, very helpful to me, as I know they have been to other Senators.

I hope what the Senate does today will not discourage the American people from contributing to their favorite candidates for Senator, Representatives, and Governor; and that it will not discourage the American people from coming to Washington and expressing their thoughts and ideas to their Senators and Representatives, because we in Congress today deal with every phase of everyone's life.

The Government is spending about $65 billion a year. The Government has both hands in the pockets of the people. The Government is running just about everything that has to do with the lives of the American people.

So the people have to come to Washington to talk with us. They have to do it in order to protect themselves. If they do not, only the Lord knows what the Government in Washington might do to them in the way of taxation and otherwise. So we as their representatives in Congress must know their views in order to protect them from their own Government.

I am about to sit down. But before I do, I express the hope that my friends will not forget me. I assure that fellow who may try to bribe me that he and I will settle the matter ourselves.

I welcome all lobbyists, I welcome everyone in the United States who thinks he might like to talk to me, either for or against any piece of proposed legislation, to come and see me, or write, or wire me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, is the Senate operating under the 2-minute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not operating under the 2-minute rule.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not like the resolution we are discussing. Time and again upon the Senate floor I have made a plea for the direct election of the President and Vice President by the people of the United States, in the same way in which Senators, Representatives, governors, and mayors are elected. Why should not the people vote for them directly? Why not trust the people instead of the politicians?

What is taking place today is not at all new; it is as old as the hills. There is not upon the floor a Senator of mature years who does not know about the bribery of 3 delegates at the Republican National Convention in which the nominations of Frank Lowden and Gen. Leonard Wood were contested and $102,000 changed hands.

There is not upon the floor a Senator of mature years who has not read the book by Mr. Sparks, in which he related the incident at the Republican convention in which the delegation from Arizona was offered $75,000, merely to give the right to the delegation of another State to vote in its place, and not to have Arizona vote when its name was called.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that Arizona is not first alphabetically.

Mr. LANGER. This incident occurred some years ago, before the junior Senator from Arizona was in politics. I am casting no aspersions upon my friend from Arizona.

A SENATOR. Vote!

Mr. LANGER. I had not intended to speak at length; but now I shall speak a little longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Consider the last Republican convention. The Dewey forces were claiming delegations in various States had been purchased. Charges and countercharges were made throughout that convention. The Senators knew about it. They have let 3 long years go by.

Then along came the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] with his bill. It was placed on the calendar on June 22, 1955. Congress did not adjourn until August 3.

It is true that the distinguished majority leader became ill and left Washington; but the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] ably represented him, acting in his place. There need not have been any compunctions about Congress going home in August or September, because we had just raised our salaries to $22,500 a year. For $22,500, Senators should be willing to work all year. Nevertheless, Congress went home.

We met again in January. Nothing has been done about the Hennings bill. I agree with the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who yesterday afternoon said there was not a thing in the pending resolution which necessitated any phase of the subject going to the Committee on the Judiciary, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or to any other committee.

The Hennings bill has been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. Hearings have been held on the bill; all the testimony has been received. When debated, it can be amended to include lobbying, the Corrupt Practices Act, or any other germane subject dealing with elections. Why cannot the Senate act on the Hennings bill and debate it on the floor, without the necessity of spending $350,000 to get more evidence, when hearings already have been held?

So far as the pending resolution is concerned, a report does not have to be made under the resolution until January 31, 1957. In other words, the next presidential election will have been held. As the New York Times said last Sunday, the national election might be bought and paid for by that time, and that includes the two national conventions. And the New York Times said $80 million was spent in the last national election.

So it is proposed that we shall start in again after the next election, Congress will go home this year, no matter what the special committee does. It will make its report and probably will recommend legislation. But we very likely will be going home about July 31 this year. So nothing will be done by the Senate on the resolution in August, September, October, November, or December—nothing at all.

We will then return next January. At that time the election will have taken place. Whatever report the special committee makes will be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration of proposed legislation. That committee then will make a report to the Senate, and the entire matter will be debated all over again, and very likely will be referred to all the committees the majority leader has mentioned for more and more hearings. I want action now before the next national election, as alleged by the New York Times, is bought and paid for.

I want the people of North Dakota and the country to know my attitude on this subject, because I shall vote against the resolution. I cannot in good conscience vote for it. I want the people of North Dakota and the country to know that I am as much opposed to corrupt practices and lobbying and bribery as any Senator upon this floor, but I believe the Hennings bill covers everything which is contained in the pending resolution and if not it can be amended so as to include it. I agree with the statement made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that there is absolutely no reason why the Hennings bill cannot be taken up and considered at this time.

Perhaps the Senate will want to wait until after the farm bill is disposed of by March 15, and take the matter up right after that. I think proper legislation should be proposed so that it may be enacted before the next presidential election and the conventions take place.

If the resolution is agreed to today, what are the people all over the country going to say? They are going to think that the month of next January was selected because the next presidential election and the elections of the Representatives and Senators will be over then, as the New York Times pointed out last Sunday.

Mr. President, as I have stated before, this is nothing new. The fact that $2,500 was placed in an envelope in South Dakota has been thoroughly investigated by the appropriate committee. I voted for that resolution. The committee will make a report by March 10 and that matter will be disposed of. There is no reason for the delay in promptly taking up the Hennings resolution that the senior Senator from North Dakota can possibly see unless it is to avoid legislation to affect the coming election of President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives. I believe in prompt action to protect the people, Mr. President. There will be sufficient time to act after the farm bill is disposed of, and to enact proper laws to take care of lobbying the Corrupt Practices Act and kindred matters before the next presidential election.

I might add, Mr. President, that so far as the Corrupt Practices Act and the Lobbying Act are concerned, the Judiciary Committee has full jurisdiction over questions arising under those acts. The committee can make any recommendation it cares to and amend the Hennings bill now pending on the calendar and where it has been since last June 1955. I repeat, sooner or later, whatever the recommendations are, the proposal has to come to the floor and be adopted. We might as well do it now and not in 1957, after, as the New York Times said last Sunday, the elections have been bought and paid for and another $80 million spent by the big boys to fool the people.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, because the Senator from Massachusetts is chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, which has jurisdiction over the Lobbying Act, I should like to clarify the position of the subcommittee with respect to that act.

The present lobbying law is completely unsatisfactory, ambiguous, and contradictory. It has been held so by the court in its decision in the Harris case. The minority or Republican members of the committee agree and concur with the report of the committee. The Subcommittee on Reorganization had a bill before it last summer. The amount of money reported as spent by lobbyists last year was only half what was reported in 1950, and less than what was reported in 1946. That is indicative that the law as it exists today is being evaded and is completely unsatisfactory.

Therefore, unless the Senate objects, it is the intention of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization to continue to consider the matter, in an attempt to bring forth some proposed legislation designed to improve the present law before the end of the present session, unless it meets the opposition of the special committee. I shall support the special committee, since there is involved a jurisdictional question involving four committees, but I think the appropriate standing committee has responsibility in this field.

If the Senate or the special committee does not disagree when the proposal is submitted, I hope it will be possible for our subcommittee to take affirmative action in this field, and perhaps, when the special committee reports in January, further action can be taken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am a member of the Senator's subcommittee. We discussed this question somewhat as members of the subcommittee. Am I to understand that what the Senator is asking for in this instance is cooperation of the special committee in offering any material to the subcommittee with legislative jurisdiction, so that the subcommittee of which the Senator from Massachusetts is chairman, for instance, can proceed with proposals which he has before his subcommittee, and some proposals of which he himself is author? Is that what I am to understand?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; it is. I think the Subcommittee on Reorganization will have to consider the program of the special committee, but it is my hope the subcommittee will prepare some tentative recommendations to submit on the matters now before it, so that they will not be put over for 1 year. It is my understanding that program is not in conflict with the statement of the majority leader of yesterday or with his statement of today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is not in conflict, but in accord with everything I said to the Senate several times, and I concur.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the views of the Senator from Massachusetts. Those are the views I take. I assure him of my wholehearted cooperation in his legislative program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Massachusetts has made the statement, we have just heard, and that the majority leader has concurred in his remarks. It has been my understanding all along that so far as regular committees and subcommittees are concerned, their prerogatives will in no way be abolished or eliminated, and it will be perfectly satisfactory for the regular committees and subcommittees to proceed with their work. That includes measures relating to lobbying, as the Senator from Massachusetts has indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent by leave of the Senate, because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Duff	Ives
Allott	Dworshak	Jackson
Anderson	Eastland	Johnson, Tex.
Barkley	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Beall	Ervin	Kennedy
Bender	Flanders	Kerr
Bennett	Frear	Knowland
Bible	Fulbright	Kuchel
Bricker	George	Lehman
Bridges	Goldwater	Long
Butler	Gore	Magnuson
Byrd	Green	Malone
Capehart	Hayden	Mansfield
Carlson	Hennings	Martin, Iowa
Case, S. Dak.	Hickenlooper	Martin, Pa.
Clements	Hill	McClellan
Cotton	Holland	McNamara
Curtis	Hruska	Monroney
Daniel	Humphrey	Morse

Mundt	Purtell	Thurmond
Murray	Robertson	Thye
Neely	Russell	Watkins
Neuberger	Saltonstall	Welker
O'Mahoney	Schoeppel	Williams
Pastore	Smith, Maine	Young
Payne	Sparkman	
Potter	Stennis	

NAYS—1

Langer

NOT VOTING—16

Barrett	Jenner	Smathers
Bush	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Case, N. J.	Kilgore	Symington
Chavez	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirksen	Millikin	
Douglas	Scott	

So the resolution (S. Res. 219), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a special committee which is authorized and directed to investigate the subject of attempts to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof, or any candidate therefor, or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices.

SEC. 2. (a) The special committee shall consist of 8 members to be appointed by the Vice President, 4 each from the majority and minority Members of the Senate, and shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the Vice President, select a chairman and vice chairman.

(b) Any vacancy shall be filed in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 3. (a) The special committee shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1957, and shall include in its report specific recommendations (1) to improve and modernize the Federal election laws; (2) to improve and strengthen the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, and the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and related laws; and (3) to insure appropriate administrative action in connection with all persons, organizations, associations, or corporations believed to be guilty of wrongdoing punishable by law.

(b) Upon the filing of its report the special committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the special committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

(b) For the purpose of taking testimony the special committee may provide that fewer than 5 but not less than 2 members shall constitute a quorum, providing that both the majority and minority are represented.

SEC. 5. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed $350,000 and shall be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the special committee.

NATURE'S INTERNATIONAL FOOD BANK—A PERPETUAL INSURANCE AGAINST HUNGER

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, before the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the Senate, proceeds with his profound debate on the agricultural bill, let me say to the Senate that in a few days, at a convenient time, when the issue is timely, I shall address the Senate on the subject of what can be done in the Antarctic to establish nature's food bank. In my opinion, there will be presented an interesting and unique proposal which I think might very well do away with our farm surplus problem, be of tremendous financial saving to our taxpayers and do away with the basic cause of the depressed farm income.

I shall have something to say with respect to the very fine article written by Adm. Richard E. Byrd, who wrote favorably on this subject under date of January 29, 1956. He is the brother of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is present in the Senate at this minute.

Prior to addressing the Senate on that subject, I ask my distinguished colleague from Louisiana to study the remarks made by Admiral Byrd, and to help me, if he can, upon the all-important problem of farm surpluses. I have already had the benefit of the experience and wisdom of Admiral Byrd, who is now on his fifth mission to the Antarctic. The senior Senator from Virginia informs me that Admiral Byrd is on his return to Washington, and that I can renew my acquaintance with him and further learn of the suggested plan to use nature's Antarctic as a perpetual deep freeze for our Nation's farm surplus.

As I said in the beginning, this is a revolutionary plan. I ask all Senators to await my presentation of this plan.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Admiral Byrd, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star magazine for January 29, 1956, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMIRAL BYRD SAYS THE SOUTH POLE CAN BE THE WORLD'S ICEBOX

(By Adm. Richard E. Byrd, as told to A. E. Hotchner)

Question. Mr. Richard B. Shoemaker, of Los Angeles, writes: "Dear Admiral Byrd, I realize that the Antarctic has scientific and perhaps strategic value, but can it ever have any really practical significance for us?"

Answer. The fact that the Antarctic is of importance scientifically, automatically means that it has practical significance. The comprehensive scientific program to be carried out during world science's international geophysical year (1957–58) will, I am confident, yield information of incalculable value.

Just how much it would be worth to agriculture, to aviation, to radio communications, and other phases of the overall world economy if, as a result of our studies, we are able to predict weather with, let us say, a 20 percent greater accuracy.

The Antarctic has economic significance, too, because we have found coal there and indications of other minerals. In my opinion, it is an untouched reservoir of natural resources.

But apart from these considerations, and perhaps more immediately, there is one very practical use to which we could put the Antarctic. In my opinion it would be entirely feasible to employ the Antarctic as a vast freezer where we could store the enormous food surpluses we now have in this country. I offer this plan for discussion, knowing that it presents legal and practical problems which have to be solved. It, of course, reflects my personal views and does not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Defense or any other Government agency.

FIRST AID FOR FAMINE

Today our storage facilities are adequate—but barely adequate. And quite possibly there may come a day when the Government will decide to stockpile much more food against the possibility of military or natural disasters.

Also such a stockpile could be made available through the years to any other country hit by famine or disaster.

Actually the solution of the problem of what to do with surplus food is important to our economy and to the world's general welfare. In the fiscal year of 1955, the United States Government spent $332,929,579 to store surplus foods in warehouses in this country. Many more millions are spent annually to hold down the rate of food production. Our warehousing facilities, especially for food requiring refrigeration, are taxed to capacity, and we may soon be faced with the necessity of spending more millions to build new storage plants.

This may be a needless waste because Antarctica is an uncomplicated, unlimited freezer, as scientifically perfect as you could ask. In 1934, on my second expedition, we dug down to a Little America hut where we found some food that had been left on the table when the first expedition departed in early 1930. The food had been there for almost 5 years. There was part of a roast beef, potatoes, bread, butter, and other foods. We unfroze them and had a fine meal. The roast beef was probably as good as the day it was cooked.

In 1947, on our fourth expedition, we again had an adequate meal of food we took to Little America in December 1928. On the same expedition a group of men came upon a cache of kippered herrings and biscuits which had been left at Shackleton's old base on his 1914 expedition, and the men who ate that 33-year-old food reported it was in perfectly good condition.

Food deterioration and bacteriological activity go hand-in-hand. Dr. Paul A. Siple, who has been with me on all my expeditions to the Antarctic, made a study of the amount of bacterial life present in the snow. He came up with the startling result that, on an average, there is only one bacterium per pint of snow. In its frozen state these bacteria would have been completely inactive. When you consider that there are millions, perhaps billions of bacteria in a pint of the water which we use in our refrigeration warehouses, you can see why the Antarctic is a vastly superior icebox.

SNOWBALLS ARE OUT

Below the snow line, as far south as Little America, temperatures never get above freezing. Contrary to popular belief, the temperature within the Antarctic Circle averages about 40 degrees colder than in the areas within the Arctic Circle. During my solitary winter vigil at Advance Base in 1934, I succeeded in recording a temperature of 83 degrees below zero.

It is this consistently cold climate, plus the presence of névé, that makes the Antarctic so ideal for food storage. Névé, which covers Antarctica, is partly ice, partly snow, a granular substance that crumbles in your hand and doesn't pack into a snowball. It is an ideal cover for foodstuffs, for it does not pack down and become a crushing force.

As far as the physical process of storing the food is concerned, the Navy has a piece of equipment which would be ideal for the job. It is a machine that digs a continuous trench in snow. In 1 day it can dig a trench 12 feet wide, a half-mile long and 6 feet or

more in depth. Equipment for unloading and loading the food is also available or could easily be adopted from existing devices. The Navy's Flying Fox is a mechanically driven loop of rope that could automatically haul the food along the trenches and deposit it wherever desired. Wheat and other grains could be blown into the trenches through air tubes. Winds would take care of covering the trenches with névé.

As you can see, the cost of storing the foods would be negligible. The only big expense in connection with the project would be the transportation of the food from the United States to the Antarctic Continent. Some of the food could possibly be hauled by Navy transports, some of it could be let out to private shipping concerns. But let's just see how expensive an operation this would be.

We have now, for example, approximately 280 million pounds of surplus butter in storage, with an estimated value of $175 million. The Government paid $8,500,000 for the storage of this butter in 1955. The United Fruit Co. estimates it could haul all this butter in 35 refrigerated ships, at a cost of something like $250,000 a ship. This adds up to $8,750,000 which is slightly more than the Government spends in 1 year to store that butter in this country. When you consider that once the butter is put underground at Antarctica there are no charges on it for the 5 or 10 or 15 years it may remain there, you will appreciate why I feel that the Antarctica freezer proposal at least warrants serious consideration. The cost of transporting other foodstuffs, as compared to the cost of storing them in the United States, follows the butter example.

ONE-HUNDRED-YEAR EXPERIMENT

Last year it cost the Government $185 million to store wheat, $54 million to store corn, $6 million to store cheese, $13 million to store barley. Altogether, we have almost $6 billion worth of surplus crops in storage in the United States, and we are paying a whopping annual fee for their upkeep.

I have already discussed this proposal with some Congressmen and Government officials, and they have all shown interest in its possibilities. I intend to recommend to the National Security Council that we undertake the necessary scientific and economic investigations preliminary to such a program. During my current expedition to Antarctica, my associates and I will continue our research on the subject. Among other things, we plan to bury a cache of 100 loaves of bread; every year over the next 100 years, 1 loaf will be dug up and examined for flavor, nutrient, vitamin content, and other factors. We won't be here to finish the experiment, but our great-grandchildren will.

It is my strong conviction that if we could create a permanent icebox for our food surpluses in Antarctica, it would not only save us much money and take pressure off the entire problem of surpluses, but it would also turn out to be a great act of international good will.

This is one of several reasons why I believe the Antarctica is important to our national future and to the whole of mankind.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the special order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3183, to provide an improved farm program.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hesitate to start the debate on the important measure now pending so late in the afternoon, and on Washington's Birthday. However, I think it is of such importance that we conclude the debate on the bill at an early date that I am willing to start this afternoon.

Mr. President, I express the hope that the Senate will continue to debate this measure without too much interruption. It is incumbent upon us to have a farm bill on the President's desk by March 5, or at least by March 10. I may be overly optimistic, but if the bill is to bring any benefits to our farm economy during the 1956 crop year, it should be enacted into law and signed by the President not later than March 15. All farmers are now waiting on the Congress to act before determining what they should do in order to comply with the requirements of the 1956 Farm Act.

Mr. President, first I wish to present to the Senate a general statement on the bill. I shall reserve a section-by-section analysis of the bill until after I have completed my general statement. I wish to state that I shall welcome interruptions at any time, and I also wish to inform my colleagues that I shall be available at my desk at all times during the debate on this measure, so that I may answer any questions which Senators desire to propound to me, whether or not I have the floor.

The bill before the Senate for consideration today represents months of detailed study, lengthy hearings, and much midnight-oil-burning by individual members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, as well as its staff. This is, truly speaking, a bipartisan bill. It represents the best judgment of a majority of the members of the committee.

I wish I could tell Senators that the bill under consideration has the unanimous and unqualified support of every one of the 15 members of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Unfortunately, that is not the case. On many of the proposals contained in the bill, the committee members voted unanimously in support of them. On the other hand, there are other items within the bill that are highly controversial and on which the committee membership split widely, some of the sections of the bill having been retained by the narrow margin of one vote. I am glad to state, however, that partisan politics played no part in the voting on any issue. A primary example of the nonpartisan nature of the voting is the 8 to 7 committee approval of the provision calling for 90 percent of parity price supports on the basic commodities for the years 1956 and 1957. On this highly controversial issue, 5 Democratic members voted for a return to rigid price supports, with 3 Democratic members voting against them; while 3 Republican members of the committee voted for the 90 percent provision, with 4 Republican members voting against it.

As Members of the Senate will recall, the House of Representatives last year passed a bill reinstating mandatory 90 percent price supports on the basic commodities—that is, on corn, wheat, rice, cotton, and peanuts. Tobacco is now supported at 90 percent of parity. When the bill came to the Senate, it was considered carefully by the Senate Agriculture Committee, and after thorough discussion and debate among the members of the committee, we decided—by a vote of 8 to 7—to not report the bill favorably to the Senate, but, instead, to hold extensive hearings in the fall of 1955 after the Congress had adjourned, with a view toward drafting a new farm program for submission to the Congress early in 1956. I was one of the members of the committee who voted for holding hearings in the fall, and against reporting to the Senate for consideration in 1955, H. R. 12, the 90 percent price support bill.

Mr. President, last October the Senate Agriculture Committee hit the road. We traveled throughout the length and breadth of this great land of ours, holding hearings in all of the important agricultural centers of the country. We met in 17 cities and we heard testimony from approximately 1,000 witnesses, with all States of the Union but 4 represented. We encouraged and received an abundance of testimony from grassroots farmers. As chairman of the committee, I tried to keep the hearings on a strictly nonpartisan and nonpolitical basis and to hear representatives and witnesses from all sections of the country and all segments of agriculture, regardless of their political or farm organization affiliations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MUNDT. As a minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I should like to say that our chairman not only tried to keep the hearings on a strictly nonpartisan basis, but that he succeeded 100 percent in keeping politics completely out of the hearings, not only as he conducted them throughout the length and breadth of the country during the summer and fall, but throughout the deliberations we had during the many long weeks of the current session before we finally voted, at the mystic hour of midnight, approval of the present pending farm bill.

I believe it should be recorded in the record for all to know that there was not a single straight party line vote on any of the many issues involved in the consideration of the farm bill at any time during the current deliberations, and that although the result sometimes was a vote of 8 to 7, sometimes 9 to 6, sometimes 10 to 5, there never was a straight party line vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank my good friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should not like to have this opportunity pass without expressing my commendation and appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the other members of the committee who were kind enough to hold a meeting in Hutchinson, Kans. I can say very sincerely that the distinguished chairman [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator

from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], not only conducted the hearings in a fine manner, but the chairman was extremely patient. There were more than a hundred witnesses, and he continued the session until 8 o'clock. I wish to commend him and the other members of the committee for the fine way in which the hearings were handled.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say to my good friend from Kansas that it was a pleasure for me to do that. On one occasion witnesses had come as far as 800 miles to be heard, and I, for one, would have remained all night in order to hear them, if that had been necessary.

There is one other thing I wish to say to my good friend, namely, that the hearings pointed up, through the testimony of many of the witnesses who appeared before us, the many facets of the difficulties which confront us, and which have made it impossible to report a bill that would please everyone. I hope the work of the committee will meet with the approval of the majority of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I feel rather proud of the record which we made. The first hearing was held in St. Paul, Minn., on October 24, and the last one took place in Utica, in the State of New York, on November 19.

The schedule which our committee undertook was a rugged one; it was backbreaking, to say the least, yet, all the members of the committee cooperated wonderfully, and, as a result, I feel safe in saying that the hearings which we conducted were some of the most successful and most informative that have been held on farm legislation during my tenure of over 19 years on the committee.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that never in my experience in the Senate has a committee spent so much time to inquire into any subject as has the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in this instance. Long hearings were held in the West, and hearings were also held in Washington, which ran until late in the afternoons. I know of no chairman of any committee at any time who has been more diligent in pursuing his duty than has the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I marveled oftentimes at the ruggedness of the Senator from Louisiana which enabled him to stand such long hours.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank my good friend from North Dakota.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Coming from a far distant part of the Nation, as does the Senator from North Dakota, I wish to echo his sentiments fully by saying that I have never seen such a devoted job done by any one Senator in the many years I have been a Member of the Senate, as was performed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the course of the hearings, not only last year and this year in Washington, but also throughout the country.

I am proud to be associated with him and the committee. I felt the work done was so clearly nonpartisan and bipartisan as to command the confidence of the agricultural public wherever the hearings were held. I wish to say for the record that in my judgment the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana has rendered outstanding service to the Senate and to the people of the United States in connection with the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I know it must be very satisfying to the chairman to hear the testimonials given to him, particularly in a year when he is not even up for reelection so they must come straight from the heart.

I should like to add my testimonial to those of the other members of the committee. I know how anxious the Senator is to have the proposed legislation come to a successful conclusion. I simply wish to say that I share with him the very earnest hope that we shall be successful in getting really constructive legislation through the Congress in time to have it effective at an early date.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I submit an amendment consisting of several items, so that it may be printed and lie on the table in order that every Senator may have a chance to study it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the amendment relate to corn?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It relates to corn. There may be other Senators who desire to join in sponsoring the amendment, and I should like to afford an opportunity for any Senator who wishes to cosponsor it to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I can testify to the heroic work and the heroic efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. ELLENDER]. I have never known a chairman of any committee who has worked harder or has devoted more time and greater effort to bring together divergent views on the very troublesome farm problem. I say that without any disrespect to other chairmen. I sincerely honor his efforts in this regard. While there are one or two little matters on which the chairman of the committee and I do not completely agree, I should like to say that he has approached his duties not only with the utmost sincerity, but with the utmost thoroughness. I appreciate the opportunity of serving with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk the amendment to which I have referred, containing several items which I hope may eventually be considered en bloc, because they go to the same situation, namely, that affecting corn. My amendment I believe will correct what I think are the deficiencies in the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it will give the diversified agriculture of the Midwest an opportunity to participate on an equality with other sections of the country in the so-called soil bank and conservation reserve.

I wish to say, also, that there are other Members of the Senate who have asked to join in the amendment. I have not had time to submit the amendment to them, but I ask that those who care to join in the amendment may be permitted to add their names as soon as they have had an opportunity to examine it in final form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Speaking in behalf of some of the witnesses who appeared at the hearings in Montpelier and other places in New England, I wish to testify that they are most appreciative of the manner in which the hearings were conducted.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, with whom I have the privilege of serving on the committee, that in arranging the schedule for hearings on the bill, I think, in his good judgment, he chose the sections of the United States which more nearly typified the problems involved. As the Senator has indicated, the committee held a great many hearings. It was a pleasant experience for me to participate in those hearings, conducted as they were in a fine manner and in a most impartial way. The printed record of the hearings, which is available to all Senators, will reflect the source of information which we received. Many, many views were expressed. I am sure that there was not a witness who appeared at any of the hearings who did not recognize the painstaking effort of the chairman of the committee to hear all the witnesses, even though the hearings ran into the early and sometimes the late hours of the night.

I wish to associate myself with the other members of the committee, and on behalf of those who appeared in my own State and who had the opportunity to testify, in expressing my appreciation for the manner in which the hearings were held.

I know that the chairman and the majority of the committee, in their wisdom and judgment, hold certain views, as to many of which some Senators might

have some shades of difference in our initial approaches to the bill.

I am at present giving consideration to 3 or 4 amendments I may wish to offer, by request, for printing and for consideration, because I feel that as to certain of the amendments offered there should be an opportunity afforded the Senate to pass upon them one way or the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Speaking not as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, but speaking as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Chair knows that our chairman must have a feeling of satisfaction after hearing all the commendations which have been bestowed upon him today, which were well deserved.

At one time during the hearings it seemed to me that the chairman was almost a slave driver, because he kept us at work many hours each day and worked us overtime so much. We did not work merely a 40-hour week. Not only did we work until midnight on one occasion but on some of the other nights we worked until 9 or 10 o'clock, trying to solve the problems presented to us in order to report the bill promptly. The Senator from Louisiana is highly to be commended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope all the fine statements which have been made about me will result in the passage of the bill as it was reported.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators who are not members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I wish to express very deep appreciation for the splendid work of the chairman. I join in every word of tribute which has been uttered about him.

Also I desire to pay tribute to and to thank every individual member of this very important, hard-working committee. I do not know of any parallel to the work which has been done on the farm problem, especially during the last year.

I wish the people of the United States, who are so vitally dependent on agriculture, could fully realize, as we do in the Senate, the committee's deep concern and anxiety about and their unstinting devotion to the problems of agriculture. I wish the people could know of the sincere efforts of Senators to understand fully those problems and of their attempts to solve them. This is true of the entire membership of the committee. I commend and thank them.

At the same time, I wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the committee for his persistence and his willingness to work. He is one of the most valuable Members of the Senate, not only in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but also as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. Because of his unselfishness and his capacity for work, he is a great asset wherever he serves.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, provided the Senator from Louisiana did not interpret them as a commitment on the part of the Senator to vote as the Senator from Louisiana will vote on every amendment. Even if he did so interpret them, I would still want to express my genuine appreciation for the diligent work the chairman has done, and also to say that I hold him in the highest admiration. I have never heard any of his colleagues, upon discussion or mention of the Senator from Louisiana, fail to do likewise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank my good friend. These compliments are very encouraging. I hope that when I present myself for reelection in 1960, I will be able to use all these tributes in my campaign.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, although I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I wish to express my commendation of the chairman of the committee. I have consulted with him quite often recently in respect to proposed farm legislation and other farm matters, and he certainly has been most cooperative. I appreciate it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Louisiana will be a candidate for reelection not only in 1960, but also in 1966, 1972, 1978, and 1984.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, the committee received a wealth of information, recommendations, and criticisms. One thing stood out clearly as a result of the hearings: There was an urgent need for immediate and effective action to restore to the American farmer a reasonable share of the consumer dollar, and to increase his income. The grass-roots farmers told us in no uncertain terms that they were worried and, in some cases, frantic because of the predicament they found themselves in. They were worried because they were caught in a squeeze, Mr. President, in a price squeeze, and were helpless, on their own, to combat it. They complained to us that the prices of the things they have to buy have gone up steadily in recent years, while, on the other hand, the prices of the things they have to sell, and on which their livelihood is dependent, have gone down substantially. Farm profits, they told us, have decreased in recent years to the vanishing point, and, in too many cases, operating losses were sustained. Faced with a drastic decline in their gross and net income, our farmers have, of course, been forced to tighten up in their purchases of farm equipment, household goods, and other consumer items. Thus, there has been not only a decline in the prosperity of the farmers, themselves, but the impact is being felt right on down the line amongst the merchants, the laboring people, the service trades, and other segments of our population.

As I have stated, Mr. President, the field hearings that the Senate Agriculture Committee conducted were concluded late in November of last year. After our hearings I wrote letters to the leading farm organizations, asking for their help and suggesting that they try to agree on some of the programs outlined by the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a form letter which the committee sent to various organizations.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
November 21, 1955.

DEAR ———: The Agriculture and Forestry Committee of the Senate, of which I am chairman, has just concluded extensive hearings on the farm situation at the grassroots, and I am happy to say that these hearings were very fruitful and conducted, I believe, in a manner that was more or less satisfactory to all parties concerned. All witnesses who asked to be heard were given attention, and an opportunity to present either a written or verbal statement. A mass of evidence was gathered, and it is my hope that the committee will be in a position by early January to present a bill to the Senate for its consideration.

As you may recall, the House of Representatives enacted H. R. 12, providing for reinstatement of 90-percent price supports, the details of which I am sure you are familiar with. The Senate committee postponed action and instead proceeded to order the hearings to which I have just referred. Many suggestions were made as to how best to solve the problems confronting agriculture. The preponderance of evidence points to the necessity of finding some ways and means of disposing of some of our surplus commodities to the point where they will not be a drag on the market. Many witnesses have indicated that our agricultural production plant has grown too large, and that some method should be found to reduce its capacity by way of acreage reductions. Others have proposed a soil-bank program to conserve and preserve the fertility of the soil, whereas others expounded on a two-price system, and many have suggested a continuation of price supports in some form or other. It is my belief that the preponderance of evidence would indicate that neither flexible nor rigid supports in themselves would do the job, and that some kind of program in addition to either of those methods is necessary.

May I earnestly suggest that the major farm organizations of our country put their heads together in the hope that agreement can be attained on some of the plans or solutions suggested to meet the present challenge to agriculture. There is no question but that many farmers are in a precarious financial situation, particularly those who have embarked in farming in recent years as a means of livelihood. The evidence disclosed that many veterans started out and have incurred many debts they are now unable to pay because of the sagging income that farmers now receive. Much evidence has been given us indicating that the small farmer is gradually being eliminated and is having to seek work in industry. The chief complaint, I find, has been the price squeeze wherein the farmer obtains less and less for what he produces and pays higher and higher prices for what he requires in his operations. He is not statisfied with the reduction of his share in the consumer dollar which is at an almost all-time low. As you may be aware, the farmers' share of the consumer dollar was, as of August 1955, only 40 cents, in contrast to 52 cents in 1946.

A similar letter is being addressed to the farm organizations which I have indicated at the bottom of this letter, and may I suggest that as many leaders of your respective organizations as possible get together in the hope of at least getting unanimity on a program touching some or all of the following topics:

1. Surplus disposal: We have had for some time a program to dispose of some of our surpluses. There are laws now on the statute books providing for ways and means

of selling, disposing and bartering our surplus commodities. An effort should be made to give us a plan whereby we can obtain a fair return on what we sell.

2. Soil fertility bank: Some of the proposals submitted favor control of diverted acres, with or without rental payments or payments for conservation practices on diverted acres; while others favor a soil bank or conservation acreage reserve plan, under which the total agricultural plant would be reduced by the total number of acres in excess of that required to meet the demand for all crops. It is my belief that the consensus of opinion among the witnesses who testified is that some incentive should be provided to the farmers for setting aside a certain percentage of their acreage which would constitute the so-called soil bank. Suggestions have been made for graduated payments depending on the size of the farm and its location as well as the commodities that can be produced thereon.

3. Two-price plans: Suggestions were made that two-price plans be enacted for wheat, rice, and cotton, with the accent on rice. It is my belief that the vast majority of the rice growers desire a two-price system. There was much divided opinion as to wheat as well as cotton. The Northwest, where practically all of the soft wheat for the production of flour for baking and cracker making is produced, has strongly suggested a two-price system. Your views as to whether or not it will be feasible to work out a plan whereby a two-price system could be provided for the Northwest wheat growers, with some provision to prevent the extra wheat being used for feed in any other place than in the Northwest, will be appreciated. Many suggested that a two-price system could be attempted on one crop so as to determine whether such a plan would work.

4. Price supports: It is my belief that the majority of the witnesses who testified desire rigid price support of, say 90 percent of parity on the basics, with emphasis on quality products as a basis for payment; in other words, on commodities such as cotton, rice, wheat, tobacco, corn, and peanuts that are readily salable and merchantable. In that connection may I suggest the feasibility of, say, rigid price support so as to encourage the production of desirable and salable basic commodities, and flexible supports on such of the basic commodities as do not meet the standard that may be proposed as herein suggested.

Another suggestion made as to price supports is that they should be on a graduated basis; that is, take care of the smaller farmers so as to encourage them to remain on the farm.

5. Quality commodities: As suggested in No. 4—a plan to encourage the development of quality and readily merchantable basic commodities. I realize the difficulties in drafting legislation to accomplish this purpose. In order to assist you, I am sending a copy of this letter to organizations representing grain dealers, millers, cotton ginners and manufacturers, canners and other processors in an effort to assist in drafting language to place in the bill.

6. Marketing quotas: Recommendations were made that allotments be put on a bushel, bale, or pound basis; that they be put on a producer instead of an acreage basis; that allotments be given to cover all field crops instead of individual crops; and that moderate marketing penalties on a graduated basis be imposed on the first 25 percent of excess acreage, the proceeds of those penalties to be used for research.

7. Marketing orders: Extension of marketing order authority to fruits and vegetables for canning was requested. Authority to permit deductions for promotional programs under milk orders also was recommended.

8. Dairy products: Various and sundry programs were offered to assist milk producers. Very few witnesses outside of the Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Dakota area proposed price supports for dairy products above the present level. Most agreed that the marketing agreement and order provisions of the law should remain as they are. There was some support in the area just described, and in other sections of the country, for the so-called self-help program now pending before Congress.

I hesitate to write you such a lengthy letter, but I thought it was advisable to acquaint you with the thinking and the views of the witnesses who appeared before us. I am sure that I speak for the committee as a whole when I say that if you men can get together and agree on some of the proposals that I have suggested above, it would be much appreciated and would, of course, be of great benefit to the committee.

It is my hope that the problem will be studied on a nonpartisan, nonpolitical basis, and that the leaders of the various organizations will do their best to reach agreement on one or more of the proposals above stated, particularly with respect to surplus disposal (No. 1), a soil-fertility bank (No. 2), and two-price plans (No. 3). Time is of the essence, and I urge you to contact each other at your earliest possible convenience so that you can get together and try to reach accord so that we can have the benefit of your views in the early part of January when Congress convenes.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

(Similar letters to Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Herschel Newsom, master, National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Mr. R. S. Waltz, president, National Milk Producers Federation, 635 Elliott Avenue West, Seattle, Wash.; Mr. John G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; Mr. Homer L. Brinkley, executive vice president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, between the time when this communication was dated and the convening of Congress on January 3, the committee had its staff members working around the clock to digest and analyze the recommendations that were obtained during our field hearings, and as a result of these letters referred to.

I do not believe there is in the Senate a committee which has a more devoted staff than has the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Our staff worked night and day, and they are certainly to be commended to the same extent, and perhaps more so, than the chairman of the committee has been commended this afternoon.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to my good friend from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to join in the remarks of commendation of the staff of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There has never been a time when I have called upon the staff for assistance when I have not had an immediate response, or a response as soon as the information could be obtained. They have always given factual information. They have been a great help to me. I am glad I was in the Chamber to hear the Senator's words of commendation of the staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Thus, when the Congress convened last month, the committee was ready to consider specific legislation for the relief of agriculture. We had all of the background information that we needed on which to formulate some kind of plan to help bail the farmers out of the serious condition in which we found them.

Then on January 9, the President submitted his agricultural message to the Congress. It contained specific recommendations for the relief of the farm economy; most of the recommendations, I may state, had been suggested to the committee, in varying forms, during the course of our field hearings.

It has been my fervent hope, Mr. President, for the past several months, that somehow and in some way, the Senate Agriculture Committee could prevail upon the leaders of the Nation's major farm organizations to put their heads together and agree upon some sound program that we could present to the Congress this session and obtain enactment of it without too much controversy and delay.

With that in mind, soon after I got back to Washington on January 1, I again urged the leaders of the major farm organizations to hold one or several meetings amongst themselves and try to work out some kind of plan that was agreeable to them and which they could support, if not wholeheartedly, at least in its essentials.

I am informed that, in line with my recommendations, two meetings were held, but, unfortunately, it was not possible to get all of the representatives of the major farm organizations to attend. Nor was there any substantial area of agreement among the representatives of the farm organizations who did attend the two meetings. The sad and sorry truth, Mr. President, is that among our major farm organizations today there is no agreement as to what should be done to restore our farmers' purchasing power. They stand divided, and seem to be vying with each other as to the best approach to meet the challenge.

Confronted with such a divergence of views among farm leaders, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held a series of open hearings in Washington in early January, at which we received the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture and other representatives of the Department of Agriculture; we also heard testimony from the leaders of the major farm organizations, and from other representatives of agriculture. Once again, it was apparent that there was no substantial agreement amongst the farm leaders as to the kind of farm program we should report to the Senate.

The committee staff prepared a bill based on suggestions that were received from the farmers. The administration submitted its own version of what should be done. The committee then sat for days, and finally came out with the bill now before the Senate for consideration.

It was no easy task, Mr. President, as is eloquently shown by the divided votes within the committee on the various sections of the pending farm bill.

The problem we had to solve was, of course, how to put more dollars into the farmers' pockets without delay. We were faced with the stark fact that an agricultural crisis was on our hands. Net farm income has dropped $5 billion since 1951, and is still falling; the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has fallen from 52 cents in 1946 to about 38 cents today; and there is no indication that the downward trend has been spent. In spite of the fact that total farm production in 1955 was 12 percent greater than it was in 1947, gross farm income in 1955 was 9.4 percent below that of 1947, and net farm income was down 38 percent. Measured another way, the parity ratio, which indicates the relationship between prices received by farmers and prices paid by farmers, dropped from 123 in October of 1946 to 80 in January of this year, a loss of 43 points.

It is significant, too, that during the same period, when the farmer was watching his share of the consumer dollar being whittled away and his operating profit wiped off the books, the national income from nonagricultural sources had increased about 68 percent. In other words, while the rest of our economy has been prospering, the farmer has gradually been going broke.

In spite of the rosy predictions by the Secretary of Agriculture for the past 2 years, our committee could not escape the melancholy fact that farm prices and farm income are still on the way down. We were faced, too, with the stark reality that there was nothing in the farm program submitted by President Eisenhower which held out any hope of increased income to the farmers in 1956, except a possible stiffening of the prices of some farm commodities due to less production on acres that may be placed in the soil-bank program. We were all in agreement that something had to be done immediately—early in 1956—to improve the plight of the farmer.

I can state, Mr. President, that the President's farm program received very careful and sympathetic study by the entire membership of the committee. As all of my colleagues know, it called primarily for a continuation of the so-called flexible price supports, plus the inauguration of a soil bank, and the continuation and enlargement of some of the existing programs. As I have just stated, and as I shall point out in more detail a little later, there is nothing in the President's farm program that offers the farmers additional revenue in the immediate future for 1956. Under the program called for by the President, and in support of which the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, is presently beating the bushes around the country, flexible price supports will be the order of the day in 1956 and thereafter.

Let us consider for a moment the full impact of Mr. Benson's recommendations.

The price of wheat, which was supported in 1954 at 90 percent of parity, and in 1955 at 82½ percent of parity, would be supported in 1956 at 76 percent of parity. In other words, in the space of 2 years, the price supports on wheat, under Mr. Benson's plan, would be dropped 14 points. This means that wheat, which was supported at an average of $2.24 a bushel in 1954, would be, under Mr. Benson's program, supported at an average of $1.81 a bushel in 1956.

Cotton, under Mr. Benson's plan, would be supported in 1956 at somewhere between 75 and 90 percent—the exact level of support has not yet been determined, but undoubedly it will be not greater than 80 percent of parity, and probably as low as 75 percent—compared with 90 percent support levels in 1954, and 90 percent support levels in 1955.

Mr. Benson's program calls for supporting the price of corn in 1956 at 81 percent of parity, or $1.40 a bushel, compared with a support level in 1954 of 90 percent of parity, or $1.62 a bushel, and 87 percent of parity, or $1.58 a bushel in 1955.

Support prices on rice in 1956 would drop to 75 percent of parity, or $4.04 a hundredweight, compared with 90 percent of parity, or $4.92 a hundredweight, in 1956, and 86 percent of parity, or $4.66 a hundredweight, in 1955.

The support level for peanuts in 1956 has not yet been announced, but in 1954, peanuts were supported at 90 percent of parity, or 12.2 cents per pound, and in 1955, at the same rate. Under the sliding scale formula, they may be supported in 1956 at levels ranging between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity.

It is only with respect to tobacco, among the basics, that the support level for 1956 will be continued at the same levels as in 1954 and in 1955. As Senators will recall, this special advantage to tobacco producers occurs because the Congress, in 1954, in passing the so-called flexible price-support program, continued the exception for tobacco and directed that price supports for this commodity be maintained at 90 percent of parity, the same as had prevailed for all basic commodities prior to the enactment of the administration's flexible price-support program.

Mr. President, it does not take a mathematical genius to figure out that under the Benson program for 1956 the general level of farm income is bound to drop further. Mr. Benson can predict and prophesy all he pleases, and he can prate with all his might about what his program will do for the farmers, but he cannot talk away the startling fact that all the while he is promising to raise the income of the farmer his departmental policies are lowering still further the price the farmer receives for his products. I doubt that many farmers will be taken in by the blandishments of this great soothsayer who promises increased farm income while he hacks away at the very foundation of farm income—the prices of farm products. No, Mr. President, the farmers of America who produce our basic crops understand and realize that a continuation of the flexible-price-support program into 1956 and 1957 means only one thing to them—lower prices for what they produce.

The Secretary of Agriculture argues that high price supports will create bigger surpluses, while lower price supports will make the surpluses disappear. I submit, Mr. President, that this argument does not hold true. Those who put forth this argument overlook the fact that the basic commodities are under strict acreage controls and marketing allotments, and, as to the allotted acres that are made available to a farmer for planting, the level of price supports will not affect in the least the quantities of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, or tobacco that are produced from those allotted acres. The facts and figures that are on record in the files of the Department of Agriculture prove conclusively that lower price supports do not bring about a reduction in the number of bales of cotton or bushels of wheat that will be produced from allotted acres. And, conversely, high price supports will not increase the total production from allotted acres. The reason is simple: When a farmer's money crop is cut back by reason of acreage allotments, he has to plant every acre that is allotted to him, because he has to get enough gross return in order to make interest payments on his mortgage, meet the installments due on farm-equipment purchases, pay the cost of living expenses of himself and his family, and other items of fixed costs.

Let us look at the record in this respect. Let us take a look at what has occurred among the basics immediately before and after the enactment of the sliding-scale formula.

The rice industry provides an interesting study. In 1954, with 90 percent price supports, the acreage planted to rice totaled 2,600,000 acres. With 1955 came acreage allotments and marketing quotas, and the national acreage allotment for rice was established at 1,859,000 acres—a cut of almost 30 percent below 1954. Along with it, the price support for rice, under the Benson formula, was dropped from 90 percent, as in 1954, to 85 percent. In money, this gave the rice farmers a price support of $4.66 per hundred pounds in 1955, compared with $4.92 in 1954—or 26 cents less. Did the drop in price supports discourage the rice farmers and persuade some of them to drop out of the picture, thereby alleviating to some extent the carryover problem? The answer is "no." The rice farmers in 1955 planted 1,842,000 acres, or 99 percent of their total national acreage allotment. Plainly, Mr. Benson's theory that lower price supports bring less production does not hold true, at least where one of the basic crops—one of the farmer's major money crops—is involved.

For 1956, the Secretary has established a national acreage allotment for rice of 1,639,000 acres, with a support price of 75 percent of parity—a further drop in price supports from the $4.92 in 1954 and the $4.66 in 1955, to $4.04 in 1956. Here is a very substantial drop in price—a drop of 88 cents per hundred pounds over a 2-year period. Yet I cannot find in the Department of Agriculture anyone who will predict that anything less than 99 percent of the national acreage allotment will be planted to rice in 1956.

Let us take a look at another one of the basic crops—wheat. In 1954 the national acreage allotment for wheat

amounted to 62 million acres, with a support level of 90 percent. The total acres planted to wheat in 1954 amounted to 62,569,000 acres—or 101 percent of the acreage allotment.

In 1955, the national acreage allotment for wheat was dropped back to 55 million acres, and the support price was lowered to 82½ percent of parity—a drop from $2.24 per bushel in 1954 to $2.08 in 1955. Did this drop in the support price discourage the wheat farmers from producing wheat in 1955? No, it did not. The records of the Department of Agriculture reflect that in 1955 the wheat farmers of America planted a total of 58,284,000 acres to wheat—or 106 percent of the national acreage allotment. In other words, with a support price for 1955 that was 16 cents per bushel less than the support price for 1954, the nation's wheat farmers planted, not only right up to their national acreage allotment, but 6 percent beyond it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair.) Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the extra 6 percent cover the acreage planted in the winter-wheat area for cover crops which later are plowed under?

Mr. ELLENDER. It might well have done so. Also, as the Senator from North Dakota will recall, some durum wheat was planted during that period.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

But it is a fact, is it not, that the wheat farmers have abided by their quotas?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, certainly; there is no doubt about that. I did not mean to insinuate, I say to my good friend, the Senator from North Dakota, that the wheat farmers did not abide by their quotas. As he knows, under the law, as I understand it, if there is overplanting of the allotment, the farmer can put the amount of overproduction under lock and key, and can keep it until the following year, if he desires; and it is probable that in many cases that was done.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in thorough accord with the view of the Senator from Louisiana that flexible parity does not result in a reduction of production. The surpluses nationally were not decreased by the flexible parity, but would have been increased much greater if there had not been the crop failure which occurred as a result of the drought. The drought was severe; in fact, in my State we produced the second smallest wheat crop in our history, whereas we would have increased the surplus by between 80 million and 100 million bushels, if we had had a normal crop. That is true also of the neighboring States of Oklahoma and Texas, and probably Nebraska.

Even with the acreage allotments, which we follow very closely, as a matter of fact, my State has reduced the area devoted to wheat production from 18 million acres in 1953 to less than 11 million acres—in fact, approximately 10,800,000 acres—this year; and because of the drought which occurred last year, we had a wheat crop of only 128 million bushels, in the face of a normal crop of 240 million bushels, and a record crop of 304 million bushels. So a drop in the price support simply does not bring about a reduction in production.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that the wheat producer is subject to a severe penalty if he does not observe his allotment, whereas that is not true in the case of the producers of corn?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Furthermore, as the Senator from Vermont knows, there is another difference in the case of corn allotments: They are simply promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture, under certain rules and regulations that he follows, without submitting the allotments to the corn producers in a referendum. That is another difference which I wish to point out, as compared with the allotments for the wheat farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that the Senator implies that the flexible parity formula is responsible for the large drop in income suffered by our farmers this year. Is it not a fact that practically all basic commodities, with the exception of wheat, have been supported at or near 90 percent, for the crop year 1955? Wheat, of course, was supported at 82½ percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I was about to suggest to my friend.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that while corn is supported at 87 percent, on January 15 the average farm price received was only 67 percent?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is because the corn producers did not take advantage of the price-support program. They planted all they could and took their chances as to price. I believe that only 38 or 39 percent of the farmers complied with acreage allotments.

Mr. AIKEN. Thirty-six percent, counting all corn producers in the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Thirty-six percent of them complied with acreage allotments. They were the only ones who were able to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and get loans at the support level previously fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that the commercial corn grower has been planting about the same acreage year after year, which is, roughly, 56 million acres, but that this year he found some new competition in the form of feed grains produced on several million acres which had been taken out of wheat production, and some out of cotton production, but largely wheat production? I refer to such items as sorghum, barley, oats, and possibly some lesser commodities in certain places.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe that situation was peculiar to 1955. I think it was true many years before that.

Mr. AIKEN. No; because under the rigid support program, the wheat growers and the cotton growers were required to cut back severely in their acreage. Naturally they did not want the diverted lands to lie idle; they needed the additional income, so they produced about 800 million bushels of feed grains, which came into direct competition with corn. The corn producers had been going along on a more or less even plane, planting 56 million acres a year. Consequently, when 800 million bushels of feed grain are dumped on the market, such a circumstance is bound to depress the price of something. In this case it happened to be hogs, and to a lesser extent beef cattle. Under the law the corn grower could observe his allotment or not. He chose not to do so, because he markets most of his corn in the form of animals. I do not believe that the corn grower, who had been producing the same sized crop running from 3 billion to 3,100,000,000 bushels a year, should be penalized because producers of other basic commodities saw fit to plant diverted acres to crops which came into direct competition with the corn grower.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think we should keep in mind that the 56 million acres of which we speak do not represent all the acres planted in corn. That figure represents only the quota acres. I think the total acreage runs up to 87 million.

Mr. AIKEN. The national acreage allotment for corn was 49 million acres last year, but the corn grower in the commercial area has been planting, usually, about 56 million acres a year. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina. There has been some increase in corn production outside the commercial area. However, I believe it is small in comparison with the tremendous amount of feed grains produced on diverted acres which came into the picture.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I intend to discuss this subject a little later when I speak on my amendment. However, to keep the record straight, it is true that the producers on approximately 36 percent of the acreage in the commercial corn area originally indicated an intention to conform to the allotment of 49 million acres out of 56 million. A very much smaller percentage actually went ahead and sealed their corn. In my State, with respect to the 1954 crop, the percentage was about 23. Originally approximately 40 percent had agreed to conform. They were not necessarily violating any obligations when they did not, but many of them later decided that they would not go to seal; they would not take advantage of the sealing operation. Of course, at least 85 percent of the corn in this country is fed. It goes into animals. By the very nature of diversified farming, 56 million acres in the commercial corn area is about the acreage which diversification in that area will permit.

I do not think it is quite an accurate statement to say that a corn farmer or one in the commercial corn area will plant all the corn he can. The nature of the situation is such that he will plant only about so much corn on his farm. He conducts a diversified operation. Corn production is a feeding operation. He will have a certain amount of corn, a certain amount of beans, some alfalfa, perhaps some oats, and other crops. He diversifies from year to year. It all adds up, year in and year out—and the statistics prove it—to approximately 56 million acres, whether there are allocations or not. We have had allocations with respect to corn only in 1954 and 1955. They are proposed for 1956. We had them in the late 1930's, but they never really proved satisfactory and they were abandoned.

So, regardless of whether we have acreage allocation with respect to corn or not, we shall have about 56 million acres in the commercial area. Those seem to be the facts of nature in the diversified area. There are some problems with respect to the increase in corn production outside the commercial area, upon land which has been diverted, but we can discuss that subject a little later.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is it not true that if we had had the soil bank, or a provision comparable to the soil bank, so that we could have had a place to put the diverted acres, and some just compensation had been allowed the producer for placing his acres in the soil bank, the situation would have been different?

No young man who is paying cash rent for an acre of land can afford to allow that acre to lie idle. He must crop it. Also, an owner is subjected to taxes, and he has an investment in that particular acre. He must crop it. However, for the first time the soil bank offers a realistic approach to the problem of reducing agricultural surpluses. Never in history have reduced prices reduced the total overall production of the land. Such a result has not been brought about in connection with milk; and milk has taken the full flex, from 90 down to 75. Production is increasing, and it will continue to increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. I plan to discuss that question a little later.

Mr. THYE. For that reason the soil bank, for the first time, offers a realistic approach to the problem of reducing agricultural surpluses. The question I should like to ask is this. If a farmer reduces his acreage allotments on wheat or cotton or corn, he must put that acreage into some idle operation, such as a soil bank.

Mr. ELLENDER. An acreage reserve; that is correct.

Mr. THYE. Yes; an acreage reserve. He must do that before he is qualified to obtain an acreage reserve payment. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. That provision is contained in the bill.

Mr. THYE. There is a question involved here, however. He is not mandatorily bound to put the acreage into idle acreage. In order to qualify, I would say that a great percentage of the farmers would put their land, diverted from cotton, wheat, or corn, into a soil bank. That applies as well to the arid acres of the Southwest, so far as the soil bank or soil conservation practice is concerned. Therefore we would not have what we had in the past 2 years, namely, a shift from cotton to corn, particularly near the Corn Belt, and a shift from wheat to sorghums in the Southwest. Sorghums are almost the equivalent of corn in feed value. In that way there has been in the past a nullification of everything which was done in the commercial corn area. For example, a farmer producing wheat in the Northwest would go into the production of barley or some other feed grain.

What we have done in the past is to shift the surpluses from one crop to another, and from one geographical area to another. However, this time we come forth with a soil bank provision, which promises the producer an opportunity to reduce his plantings and at the same time not go bankrupt while he is doing it. We are also developing a program which will reduce surpluses.

We know it will take a year and a half to get the soil bank into full operation. The farmers in the South are already going into their planting season, and therefore it is only in the northern part of the country where we will be able to get the full application of the soil bank provision. It seems to me that the 90 percent of parity provision is almost a necessity in order to prevent a slump in agriculture until we get into the soil bank operation fully and thereby reduce our surpluses.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has expressed my views and my hopes for the soil bank. I believe, if properly administered, the soil bank can be a very effective instrument in bringing about a reduction of the commodities and thereby alleviating the surplus problem.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. This is the first realistic approach to a solution of the problem. It is unfortunate indeed for the Nation's economy, particularly for agriculture, that we did not write such a soil-bank provision into the 1954 revision of the Agricultural Act.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to put some figures into the RECORD to show what has happened to the planting of corn and other feed grains during the past 2 years.

The total planting of corn for 1955 was 81,600,000 acres. That includes both commercial and noncommercial plantings.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of that total was planted in the commercial corn area?

Mr. AIKEN. About 56 million acres of it is in the commercial area.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I thought.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the lowest acreage planted since 1937. It is 100,000 acres lower than the next lowest year of 1953, when 81,700,000 acres were planted.

During the time, from 1953 to 1955, when the acreage of corn was decreasing, the acreage of oats increased from 43,900,000 acres to 48 million, or by 4,100,000 acres. The acreage of barley increased from 9,700,000 acres to 16,100,000 acres, or by 6,400,000 acres.

The acreage of sorghums increased from 6,200,000 acres to 12,400,000 acres, or an increase of 6,200,000 acres.

While corn was decreasing its acreage—and of course it is true that it was increasing its yield—the feed grains coming in competition with corn were being planted on 16,900,000 more acres. I believe that corresponds very well to the acreage which was required to be taken out of the production of wheat. For the moment I forget how much was taken out of wheat planting, but——

Mr. ELLENDER. For what year was that?

Mr. AIKEN. From 1953 to 1955. I am taking 1953 plantings and 1955 plantings, to show what happened during that time. At the same time perhaps 17 million acres of new feed grain came into competition with the Corn Belt, which had been holding its production fairly stable, because from 80 to 85 percent of the crop was used on the farms.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield so that I may make a brief comment on the figures put in the RECORD by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will be glad to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has put his finger on the exact problem with which agriculture has been faced. In 1954 some of us endeavored to have a soil-bank provision written into the act. Anyone who has had any experience with agriculture knows very well that a young man who is paying $10 or $12 or $15 an acre cash rent cannot allow an acre of land to lie idle and still be able to pay his cash rent.

For that reason we said a program must be initiated for an orderly diversion of such acreage. We said if that were not done we would merely shift the surplus from one commodity to another, and we would merely divert the headache, so to speak, from the Southwest into the Central West, for example, so far as the production of feed grain is concerned.

I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture in January 1954, in which I informed him that he would not resolve the surplus problem, but would only head for additional trouble, because, I said, neither the Secretary nor I would advise a young man to increase his pork production, for it was inevitable that pork would be produced far beyond the consumptive needs of the country.

Within the course of the next 18 months, my predictions proved to be accurate, in the light of what happened

in 1955 in connection with pork production.

Therefore I wish again to say that we are approaching the surplus problem now for the first time in a realistic manner, by providing a soil bank, into which to draw surplus acreage, and thereby reduce the total overall harvest in the coming year.

That will not be accomplished in the calendar year 1956. The educational program connected with it will require many months before it will be possible to have the program completely understood, and it will be well into the calendar year 1957 before we shall have established an administrative practice which will materially reduce the overall productive capacity of the Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why I suggested that the farmers of the country need not expect any bonanza from the soil bank during the first year, because it will take time for the benefits to reach the producers. Some results may flow from it this year only if there are sufficient acres diverted to bring about less production of some of the grain crops and other crops. However, that remains to be seen. As my good friend from Minnesota has just said, unless we provide for an increase in price supports this year, farmers cannot expect to get any benefits out of the bill in 1956.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Recently, I found it necessary, in order to convince myself of what has happened in the dairy industry, to go back and check the price of fluid milk in the Central West. When I checked the figures I found that the price paid in 1952 for fluid milk was, on an average, just about $1 higher than the price which was paid for the same butter-fat-content milk in the month of January 1956.

Has the production been decreased? No. Positively, the figures show that there is a 4-billion pound increase in total milk production for the calendar year. The same thing applies to wheat.

Let us picture what is going to happen next August when the farmers begin to make applications for a commodity loan. They are going to take the difference between $2.08 and $1.81. They are going down 18 cents on corn.

Let us try to place ourselves in the position of the farmer taking such a reduction on corn and wheat, when every index figure on cost is rising, and at every turn he is faced with a greater expense in operation, including taxes, insurance, and interest. I cannot go back to the Midwest and tell the farmers to accept this program and work it out for another 2 years until the soil bank has effectively reduced the overall production. I know that some of them will not be there to enjoy it when prosperity returns to agriculture.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator form Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to concur in the statement just made by the Senator from Minnesota. He has described the situation exactly as I see it in the entire farm picture. We are confronted with a soil-bank program which I think is a very good program, but if anyone believes we shall be able to get any of the money out into the winter-wheat belt this year, he is looking forward farther than I can. I am a wheat farmer in my own right, and I think I know my own farm. If the price is not such as will give the farmers some increase in income, they will be no better off this year than they were last year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think we all recognize the situation of the farmers. Their net income has been reduced from $17.2 billion to $10.2 billion. So we all realize that we cannot permit it to be further reduced. That is why we come in with a soil-bank proposal. We are going to pay the farmers something for taking acres out of production. We know that in the past they have cut down the acreage of corn and have planted wheat or rye or barley, or some other crop, so that the only way to prevent building up surpluses in other fields is to follow the proposal made in the bill. I am one who believes that if we do not keep the prices up on the small amount of acreage the farmers are going to have, the farmers will be doomed.

Mr. President, I have a table which shows the farmer's net income from 1952 through 1955. During most of this period the farmer's income has been going down. I should like to have the table printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In billions]

1952:	
1st quarter	13.4
2d quarter	14.1
3d quarter	15.9
4th quarter	12.8
1953:	
1st quarter	13.6
2d quarter	13.6
3d quarter	13.2
4th quarter	13.2
1954:	
1st quarter	13.2
2d quarter	11.3
3d quarter	11.4
4th quarter	11.3
1955:	
1st quarter	11.2
2d quarter	10.7
3d quarter	10.2
4th quarter	10.2

Source: USDA Farm Income Situation, Dec. 16, 1955.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to pursue the subject a bit further.

The modernized parity formula contained in the act of 1949, which has been permitted to go into effect, reduces the parity price for wheat approximately 13 cents a bushel a year, until it reaches approximately $2.19 a bushel, and support at 75 percent of this parity price would be only $1.65 a bushel.

In addition to that, there is deducted from the price-support loan an additional 10 cents a bushel, so that when the full program is effective we shall get down to approximately $1.55 a bushel. Obviously a wheat farmer cannot live under that kind of a program. There has also been a cut of one-third in acreage.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think there is some misunderstanding about the benefits of the soil-bank plan not being made available this year, because it is provided in the bill that when it has been determined that a producer of a certain commodity has not planted his full allotment this year, under the acreage reserve he will be entitled to receive the payment which would be due him for not planting that acreage immediately, as soon as it has been determined that he has not planted it. So he will be eligible for payment this year if the bill is passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think there was another suggestion made by the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that if the bill is passed early enough it would be possible for some wheat farmers who had already planted their wheat to plow up some of their acreage if they wished to do that. Whether they would do so remains to be seen.

Mr. AIKEN. They would be eligible. If they prefer to carry through their crop of winter wheat thinking they will get more than that, they can do so, and if they wish to come under the soil bank early enough they will be eligible to do so. I do not know exactly what they would be paid, but we were talking in terms of around 90 cents or $1 a bushel for the crop which they might reasonably expect to raise. I hope that wheat farmers will take advantage of it generously. We have provided $750 million. I do not think the entire $750 million could be used this year. If we use two-thirds of it we shall probably be doing pretty well. We have to consider that surpluses do not apply alone to the United States. It is a worldwide situation at this time.

The prospects for wheat on the world market are dim enough so that the United Kingdom has refused to consider going into the wheat program, evidently anticipating the purchase of wheat for less than the minimum of $1.55 a bushel. That is getting down pretty low. We subsidized wheat last year to the extent of approximately 75 cents a bushel. So it strikes me that speed is of the essence in order that the wheatgrower and the cotton and corngrower may come under the program this year, and not only receive the benefit of payments, but the benefit that may accrue from a strengthened market.

Mr. ELLENDER. Along that line, it is my hope that we can get the majority leader and the minority leader to try to reach an agreement to vote on this bill not later than next Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know when we can get a vote on it. I know there are some amendments in process of preparation. I would say, not later than the first of March.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be too late.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator from Louisiana tell us what the level of payment will be for acres coming within the soil-bank provision?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill does not provide any particular amount. It is left entirely to the Secretary of Agriculture to fix the levels of the payments. As the Senator will note from the committee report on the bill, preliminary estimates have been made as to what can be expected per acre for various commodities. The estimates were made by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the bill provide any maximums and minimums?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; except in funds. The bill provides for a maximum of $750 million for the so-called acreage reserve program, and $350 million for the conservation reserve.

Mr. CURTIS. But from the standpoint of the individual farmer, will he be paid as much as he could ordinarily cause those acres to earn, or will he be paid a lesser amount?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the plan.

Mr. CURTIS. Which? As much as he could earn, or less?

Mr. ELLENDER. The plan is to pay enough to induce him to divert his acres, and not to plant the allocated acres.

Mr. THYE. I wish to concur in the remarks of the distinguished chairman, because the Secretary of Agriculture, in appearing before the committee, made the statement that he thought we should err on the liberal side, so as to get compliance in the soil-bank program.

When the Secretary was further asked to explain his position, he stated that a farmer, in harvesting a crop, had had the expense of seeding and harvesting, and would have the expense of delivery of the grain to the bins or to the market. On the other hand, under the soil-bank program, the farmer would, first, have the privilege of building the fertility of his land, of being compensated, and then of having no expensive harvest. So what the farmer would have would be the equivalent of the net crop plus a little on the liberal side. That was the way the Secretary explained the plan to the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. How will the payment be divided between the landlord and the tenant, where they operate on a share basis?

Mr. ELLENDER. We have written into the bill a provision whereby it will be the duty of the Secretary to provide rules and regulations which will treat tenants fairly, not with the idea of putting them off the farms, but of giving them a just share of whatever payments will be made.

On page 15 of the report is an estimate, which is purely tentative, made by the Secretary of Agriculture. As to cotton, let us say, assuming that the national average yield per acre is 303 pounds, 50 percent of the loan level would make the payment to a cotton farmer $50 an acre.

Assuming that the national average yield per acre for wheat is 15.8 bushels, the approximate payment per acre would be $17.

The Secretary has the right, under the bill, to go above that amount if he wishes to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. He can go below it, too?

Mr. ELLENDER. He can also go below it—either above or below. But the idea is that if he wants to get acres out of cultivation, particularly allotted acres, he would have to make the proposal attractive enough and the incentive big enough so that the farmers would be willing to cooperate.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Louisiana has been in the Senate for a long time and has played a very definite part in the shaping of agricultural legislation for many years. I wish he would tell me what, basically, is the difference between this plan of paying the farmer not to produce and previous plans which have been tried.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are tremendous surpluses at present. Marketing quotas cause farmers to divert their acreage from one crop to another.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that. I refer to the operation of the plan so far as the individual farmers are concerned.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman yield to me momentarily with reference to the question which has been asked?

Mr. CURTIS. My question is, What does this program propose which has not been tried heretofore?

Mr. THYE. My question is, To what years does the distinguished Senator from Nebraska refer?

Mr. CURTIS. To all of them.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator refer to 1955 or to 1954? Those were the only years since the Korean crisis in which there were quotas on corn.

Mr. CURTIS. No; I am referring to all the years since 1933. What is the basic difference between this plan and other plans of paying farmers? I do not ask my question argumentatively; I am seeking information. What is the basic difference between this plan and some of the other plans which have been tried at times?

Mr. ELLENDER. The basic difference is simply that in the past farmers have been given support prices at a given percentage of parity so long as they complied with their acreage allotments.

Mr. CURTIS. I am aware of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Farmers were able to plant all of their allotted acres, and they were able to obtain loans through whatever agency offered them.

Mr. CURTIS. I am aware of that. I am referring to the original AAA Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator refer to the soil bank?

Mr. CURTIS. It was not called a soil bank. I am talking about the system of paying farmers not to produce. How does this plan differ from other plans which have been tried throughout the years Congress has been engaged in considering agricultural legislation?

Mr. ELLENDER. We have never had this type of plan before. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, farmers entered into contracts to reduce acreage in specified surplus crops in return for benefit payments financed chiefly by processing taxes on the commodity concerned. The processing tax was declared void in 1936.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it that this plan probably is constitutional, while the other plan, which involved processing taxes, was declared to be unconstitutional?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one of the differences. The situation is somewhat different now, too, since acreage is already controlled by marketing quotas and allotments. The purpose of the bill is to obtain a further reduction.

Mr. THYE. I believe this is the first realistic approach to reducing farm planting. The individual farmer cannot be induced to reduce his farm planting at his own expense, when he does not know what the producer in the next county will do. Excellent cooperation in the reduction of planting might be achieved in a given area, while in another area the planting will be expanded. Therefore, the soil-bank program affords an orderly Federal program which proposes to bring into the soil bank the surplus acres of land which have added to the feed supply, which, in turn, has overproduced livestock, dairy products, and poultry.

It is also proposed now that when a farmer diverts his land from wheat planting, instead of putting the land into some sort of feed crop, the land will go into the soil bank. Instead of reducing the cotton acreage and planting the diverted acres with corn or soy beans, as the hearings last fall disclosed was the case throughout the northern region of the Cotton Belt, that land will be placed in the soil bank.

Mr. CURTIS. I am aware of all of that, and I am not arguing about it. What I am trying to find out is, What is the basic difference between the proposed system and the system which existed under the original AAA Act, admitting that that act was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court because of financing and other factors concerned with paying farmers not to produce?

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest that one basic difference is that the old program to which the Senator from Nebraska refers had to do with reimbursing for acreage which was cut out before the allotted acreage was determined. This particular program of acreage reserve is an effort to cut out from the allotted acres some of the very best acreage that a farmer has.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, what the Senator is saying is that throughout the years the farmer has had to cut down his acreage, and now it is proposed to pay him to have additional acres lie idle. In the beginning, we merely offered him some reimbursement for letting the acres lie idle, even though there were no quotas or acreage restrictions.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are two different programs contained in this one program.

The first program, that of the acreage reserve, seeks to retire from production some of the most highly productive

acreage the farmers have, by inducing them, through special payments, to cut out some of their allotted acreage no matter how low the allotments get. That, of course, will require a real inducement. When the reduction takes place, it will be very real; and because it will be very real, and in some instances will hurt, it is important that the producer be able to turn to the surpluses to be reimbursed in kind, instead of in funds, for instance, for feed on his farm, if that is what he has to have.

One part of the program, the conservation reserve, is much more like what has been called, up to now, the ACP program. It is designed to take out of cultivated acreage—not out of allotted acreage, but out of cultivated acreage—that acreage which can be best spared by the grower. That will not be his best acreage at all, but more frequently will be his marginal acreage, that acreage which will profit most from a storing up of fertility through the practicing of conservation methods with reference to it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have the floor.

Mr. THYE. I merely wanted to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for pointing out the importance of the two phases of the soil bank and soil fertility program. The so-called less productive land can go into trees. Land could be definitely retired over a period of many years. That could be done under contract for possibly 10 or more years. So, for example, in the western part of Nebraska, there may be some land in crops which should go back into grass. A contract can be entered into covering 3 or 4 or 10 years, not only that the land will go to grass, but into trees, in that area, if it is so desired.

It is the first positive realistic approach to resolving the problem of surpluses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from Nebraska that he anticipated me far in advance. I expect to speak about the difference between the methods of the operation of the soil bank.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator has been very kind. Will he yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator anticipate it will be necessary to continue the soil bank for a number of years in the immediate future? I refer to both parts of the proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. The proposal deals with acreage reserves. It may be possible to end that in 2 years. In most cases, it may be possible later to balance our production with our consumption requirements, but that phase of the bank program cannot go beyond 4 years.

Mr. CURTIS. Without further legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the proposed legislation now being considered by the Senate.

In regard to the conservation reserve, that program provides for contracts covering not less than 3 and not more than 10 years, unless trees are planted, in which case the contract may cover as much as 15 years. Contracts could be entered into through 1960, and would have to expire by December 31, 1974, at the latest.

Those are the limitations we have written in the bill with respect to that. I hope to discuss that fully during the course of my presentation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I apologize to the able Senator from Louisiana, because I am sure he treats these matters better in the course of his argument than I am able to deal with them here; but if I may address the Senator from Nebraska, in order to complete my answer to him, I thought he was worried a moment ago, as shown by his questions, about the amount.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not worried; I merely have an inquiring mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say that if he is anxious about the amount involved, the amounts shown in the chart printed on page 15 of the report are the average amounts for each of the commodities; but the bill and the report both make it very clear that the land and its productivity and the value of the production from the land stand on their own bottom. For instance, if cotton-producing land from one State which was marginal land—and always had been, or had been for years—were put under the acreage reserve, and at the same time some land in the Mississippi delta were placed under the acreage reserve, it would not mean that the same amount would go to each, but the value of the productivity and the value produced by each would be reflected by the actual payments and allowed to those who retired their acreage.

I am of the firm belief that instead of having the payments postponed until the second year, there would be very sizeable payments the first year because of the inducements to be offered. The whole program would fall flat unless inducements were offered to retire acreage in this year we are about to enter. The whole purpose would be ineffective as to this year unless such reduction could be made in this year. There are some crops already planted, but there are others which have not been planted. There are others which have been planted and which might be replanted to grass or the like.

If the Senator will look at the plat, he will see that even when the payments in effect are 50 percent of the gross profit of the soil, in most instances they will be well above the net profit of the soil. It would be profitable, and it is designed to be profitable, to the growers who operate under the acreage reserve, to retire to it, from their allotments for this year and for subsequent years, some of their precious allotted acreage. The inducement offered would be that to do so would be to their advantage and would be money in their pockets—either money in their pockets or payments in kind which would give them a profit above what they could make ordinarily.

It is intended to be a quick method of balancing our present surpluses and production against the consumers needs.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, so that I may reply to some of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Florida has said that he supposed we will get compliance this year. I point out that the winter wheat in the States of Washington and Oregon is planted. Winter wheat in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, and Wyoming is planted. Therefore there would have to be a tremendous inducement to have a plowing down of grain which is in some areas already 7 or 8 inches high. The same thing is true with respect to some of the summer crops.

No matter how speedily the Senate may act, there still has to be action taken by the House, and then there must be a conference between the two Houses, and then the administrative functions in the States must take place, in order to get the county committees as well as the State committees acquainted with the program.

If we get from 30 to 40 percent of the soil-bank program in operation the first year, we will be exceedingly lucky. That is not going to reduce the surpluses much. There must be a positive reduction in surpluses before we will start getting any benefits from the soil bank, except the cash rental which will be obtained from diverted acreage. But, psychologically, legislation will not firm up the market; it is going to be evidence of the disappearance of surpluses which will strengthen the market.

I fear we will we well into the calendar year 1957 before the full effects of the surplus disappearance, through the operation of the soil bank, will be reflected in a firmed national market of the various grains involved in the acreage which will go into the soil bank. That is my only argument on the question of the 90 percent versus reduced or lower supports on commodities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is thoroughly correct when he states that there will not be maximum employment of acreage reserves in the first year. No one could seriously contend otherwise. No one can say what percentage of the maximum will be in effect. It is our belief that if the bill is passed quickly, a very large percentage of it will be in effect.

I call attention to the point the Senator makes so well. He refers to winter wheat. If he will look at the plat on page 15, he will see the whole wheat program involves only one-third, $250 million, of the annual program of $750 million, which is planned for the first year.

Then let me say to my distinguished friend that, from my experience in something like this, but not exactly like this—because I do not believe there has been anything exactly like this—in my State we have found that the minute there is in effect a firm plan to retire surpluses from circulation, and to take that overhanging cloud out of the way, the very fact that the trade knows there is such a program, and that it is underway, has

a very stimulating effect and greatly builds up morale.

One year we had in the State of Florida a great surplus of grapefruit; and we asked the Government to inaugurate a purchase program—I believe it was for the school-lunch program or for a similar program. That was announced, and it strengthened and stiffened the market to such an extent that it was not necessary to purchase a single grapefruit. So the result hoped to be achieved from that program was achieved without making a single purchase.

Therefore, I wish to make the point that immediate good will come from having our agricultural population embark upon a program which will not continue the heartless, year-by-year overstimulation and piling up of more and more surpluses—which is what we have been doing—but, instead, finally will have their efforts addressed to a reduction of the surpluses.

Although, of course, later I shall speak in my own time, if my throat permits me to do so, about the 90 percent of parity situation, the reason why I so strongly oppose a return to the concept of 90 percent price supports is that I think it would cause us to try to move in opposite directions at the same time. The cart would be in one place, and one powerful horse would be trying to run to the north, and another powerful horse would be trying to run to the south at the same time—if we were to have price supports reinstituted at a fixed 90 percent level, and if at the same time the soil-bank plan were in effect.

I realize that this matter may be controversial. However, since I must leave the Chamber at this time, I wished to refer briefly to that point.

I also wish to say that I have been most interested in what my able friend, the Senator from Louisiana, has said. His remarks have been most ably presented. At the same time, however, I wish to state that I do not agree with the concept of running in both directions at the same time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida leaves the Chamber, I wish to say that he is answering his own argument in regard to 90 percent price supports. He feels very strongly that the psychological effect will be such that the national markets will reflect full parity, which is what all of us are endeavoring to achieve. If that happens, Mr. President, the entire matter of supports will be forgotten, and supports will no longer be needed—any more than a man would continue to need crutches if his feet and legs were in sound condition. So if prices of 100 percent of parity are reached, price supports can be thrown out immediately.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say that, judging from our experience over a long period, nothing that I can see indicates in the slightest measure that a return to 90 percent price supports will mean that we shall no longer have surpluses and that the market will build up to 100 percent. As a matter of fact, to the extent that we have had 90 percent price supports, we have mined our soil and have built up the enormous supplies in the storehouses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during my presentation of the bill, I hope to show that the so-called Steagall amendment and related emergency legislation, with which I am sure my friend, the Senator from Florida, is familiar, were placed on the statute books, not to offer increased full incentive in order to increase production, but to do the very things we are now attempting to do, namely, to bolster farm income, and to protect farmers against having to sell in bottomless markets at the end of the war. Those amendments were placed on the statute books during World War II. I have some data regarding that matter, and in due course I shall present them.

As I said in my opening remarks, the only provision of the pending bill that gives the farmer hope for an immediate increase in his income is the provision increasing price-support levels; that is all. Otherwise, nothing substantial will come through until possibly next year. Of course, it is possible that some slight effect on farm income may be registered this year if the soil bank can be put into effect soon. In other words, by decreasing the acreage to be planted to wheat and to other grain crops, the result may be a slight increase in the prices of those commodities. But aside from that, no immediate relief is to be expected under the soil bank.

I believe that another part of the bill, which I shall discuss later, will assist the farmers in getting a little better price, particularly for perishables and for livestock. As my good friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], knows we provide in the bill for an increase in the amount of money which can be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase perishable commodities. Those purchases can be made in the same manner as section 32 funds are now used. For that purpose, in the bill we have provided an authorization of a quarter of a billion dollars. If that amount of money, together with the $462 million which we now have on hand in section 32 funds, is administered with the hands of an angel, and in the manner which we intend, we can get somewhere. But we must have someone administering the law who is in sympathy with it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the majority and minority leaders desire to have a quorum call. I wonder how long the remainder of the address by the Senator from Louisiana will require.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not quite completed half of my prepared statement, and there are other matters which I should like to place into the RECORD, in connection with my presentation.

If Senators will bear with me, if I can proceed for perhaps 10 more minutes, I shall reach a point where I can suspend, if that is agreeable; we can then resume on tomorrow—provided, however, that I can obtain unanimous consent to have the floor when the Senate convenes on tomorrow.

So, Mr. President, in anticipation of the Senate recessing before I conclude my presentation, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets tomorrow, I may be permitted to have the floor, at the conclusion of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, I simply wish to take this opportunity to invite the other Members of the Senate to be present tomorrow to listen to the presentation of this interesting report by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I note that with the single exception of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], every Member now present on the floor of the Senate is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. So I extend this invitation, in behalf of the chairman of the committee, because he is too modest to do so himself.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend that I express the hope that on tomorrow more Senators will be present. However, I am not surprised or disappointed at the attendance at this time, because today is a legal holiday. We simply wished to start the ball rolling and begin the presentation of the bill today.

However, I have not yet reached the meat of the bill. On tomorrow we shall have an opportunity to do that.

Mr. MUNDT. I simply wish to have all Senators know that they are welcome, and that we hope they will be present to hear the discussion of the farm bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course.

I also hope that on tomorrow we shall have at least as many members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry present as we have had today, because I am sure the chairman of the committee will not be able to answer all the questions which will be asked. He will be very glad to have all members of the committee present. Whenever the chairman of the committee gets bogged down, he hopes the other members of the committee will speak up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the senior Senator from Louisiana that when the Senate convenes tomorrow he shall be entitled to the floor at the conclusion of the morning business? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. To continue with my prepared statement, I was discussing wheat, and I shall continue on that subject.

For 1956 the Secretary has retained the same 55 million acre national allotment for wheat as prevailed in 1955, but he has permitted the price support of wheat to flex downward to 76 percent of parity, or $1.81 a bushel—43 cents a bushel less than it was in 1954, and 27 cents a bushel less than it was in 1955. Does anyone here in the Senate, or in the Department of Agriculture, for that matter, expect that the total plantings to wheat in 1956 will be less than the national acreage allotment of 55 million acres? I doubt that there will be any to predict that this will occur. The record already shows that the 1956 plantings of

winter wheat—which comprises 75 percent of the total wheat crop—will amount to 45,203,000 acres compared to 44,393,000 in 1955—an increase in 1956 of almost 1 million acres over 1955. And yet, according to Mr. Benson's reasoning, and on which he bases his opposition to 90 percent parity price supports, lower price supports will bring about a shrinkage in production. Obviously, Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture is either woefully ignorant of what is going on today in American agriculture, or he is talking through his hat.

Mr. President, I know of no better example to rebut the Secretary's argument that lower price supports will bring about reduced production, than what has happened in the dairy industry over the past several years. Now here is a nonbasic commodity—a highly perishable commodity—over which there are no production controls whatsoever. The laws of supply and demand, upon which our Secretary seems to rely so heavily, should surely operate in this industry, so that with a lower price to the producer, total production should drop in direct relation to the amount of the price reduction.

In 1953, Mr. President, we had 90 percent price supports for milk products—a continuation of the 90 percent support level that had prevailed under the prior administration. Total milk production on all farms for the year 1953 amounted to 121,149,000,000 pounds.

Then came 1954. Mr. Benson dropped the support level for milk to 75 percent of parity, and what happened? Total production on all farms, instead of dropping off sharply due to the impact of lower prices, climbed up instead to a new record high of 123,502,000,000 pounds.

In 1955 there was a further opportunity to prove the accuracy of our Secretary's premise that lower prices mean lowered production. Mr. Benson established 1955 price supports on butterfat at 76 percent of parity, and on manufacturing milk he fixed price supports at 80 percent of parity. Was there any dropping off of total milk production last year? Not only was there no reduction in total milk production, but once more the opposite trend set in, with milk production for the United States stepped up to another new record of 124,500,000,000 pounds. So, Mr. President, under 2 years of experimentation by the Secretary of Agriculture with flexible price supports, during which he dropped price supports on milk products from 90 percent of parity to a range of 76 to 80 percent of parity, we find that dairy farmers produced 3½ billion additional pounds of milk over the 1953 figure. And this, mind you, is with respect to a nonbasic, noncontrolled perishable commodity.

The estimates for 1956 milk production are at an all-time high.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator that the figures show that when the support price of milk was dropped from 90 to 75 percent of parity, the following year production went up 3½ billion pounds. However, I point out that while production was going up 3½ billion pounds, consumption went up 10 billion pounds. I, for one, do not claim any great reduction in production when the parity level is changed. The difference comes in consumption.

Mr. THYE rose.

Mr. AIKEN. I see the Senator from Minnesota on his feet. I know that we cannot mention the word "milk" without bringing him to his feet. [Laughter.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I point out that although there was a reduction in the income of the dairy farmer for the first year which was 1954, last year in 1955 there was an increase of about $200 million in the income of the dairy farmer over the previous year. Unfortunately the State of Minnesota did not share in that increase, and I presume that is the reason why the Senator from Minnesota is now on his feet.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont may recall that another reason was offered by the Secretary of Agriculture in support of lower support levels, namely, that lower price supports would mean lower milk prices, and that lower prices would have the tendency of causing consumers of fluid milk to use more of it. It is true that they used more milk, but the average cost to the consumer went up. The Senator knows that.

Mr. AIKEN. The consumption of milk has increased.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The consumption went up, notwithstanding the fact that it cost the consumer more.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In order that the RECORD may be informative, if the Senator from Vermont, who gave the figures with respect to the increased consumption, could place in the RECORD the information as to how much of the disappearance of dairy products went into feed mixes, and what percentage went into human per capita consumption, our RECORD would be crystal clear. However, the 10 billion pound disappearance, in itself, is not crystal clear, because there was a disappearance of powdered milk into feed mixes, which accounted for a great deal of that milk. There is not the increase in consumption by humans which the figures might lead one to believe.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am familiar with what the Senator from Minnesota has said. As a matter of fact, a great deal of the powdered milk that was left over from prior years was disposed of for little or nothing. Butter was sold by the CCC in some instances, I am told, at 3 cents a pound.

Mr AIKEN. No; that was disposed of in the year 1954. The increase of 10 billion pounds from 1953 took place in 1955, and it is largely accounted for by the fact that in about 18 months the dairy organizations of the country got busy and sold the milk in greater quantities. The other increase was accounted for largely by the increase in population.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. What I wanted to ask the Senator from Vermont was to make that statement in the RECORD, because in 1954 much of the product went into feed mixes. Another reason was that in 1955 we had one of the hottest summers in the history of our country. In that time there was the greatest fluid-milk and ice-cream consumption that ever occurred. It was not due to the price factor, because that was not reflected to the consumer. The price of fluid milk remained the same, or about the same. The fact was that the producers assessed themselves so much a pound for their production and went into a campaign to sell the milk. They engaged in an advertising campaign, not only in the magazines and the newspapers but also over the radio and on television. That is what brought about an increase in consumption. It was not due to any drop in the price of milk.

The RECORD must be absolutely clear in that regard, because the farmer in the Midwest, who is in a surplus-producing area, did not get any benefit from the increased consumption of milk. His price has been dropping consistently, and he has been getting about 8 cents less than in 1955.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator has stated, during the hearings it was pointed out that the method of advertising milk was changed. The milk producers had hired Bob Hope to advertise the sale of milk. Bob Hope might be a good salesman of women's lingerie, but that does not mean that he is a good salesman of milk. The milk producers soon realized this, and they hired Hopalong Cassidy and other cowboys, and they were able to get the children of America to drink more milk. They changed their method of advertising, and they got results. I hope they will continue to do so, and I hope that more and more of the milk which is being produced in unprecedented quantities will be disposed of in the raw state.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The producers had lost 14 percent of their per capita milk sales in the few years when they were depending on the Government to buy their milk. When the Government ceased to buy the milk at a high price, the producers started to sell more milk. They have so far recovered nowhere near what they lost during the high-support years, but a good share of it has been recovered. What they have done by way of advertising has been good business practice, and they are continuing that practice. As the Senator from Minnesota has stated, the reason more people are using more milk is that the dairy

people have been putting it up in more attractive packages and making it in more attractive flavors. It is possible to buy almost any flavor of cheese, and it is possible to have any kind made to order.

Through their advertising campaign they have recovered a great deal of what they lost, although they have not quite caught up yet. They have recovered sufficiently so that the total received from dairy products in 1955 was about $200 million more than in 1954.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to state to my good friend from Vermont that I cited these figures merely to show that lower farm prices for milk did not bring about a lowering of production, as has been contended by Mr. Benson. That has been the basis of his argument. He also stated, as I remember, that a lower price support would mean cheaper merchandise, and that it would be bought in greater quantities by the consuming public because of the cheaper price.

So far as the price of milk is concerned, I believe we have evidence in the RECORD to show that where milk-marketing agreements were in effect the price to the consumer did not diminish. On the contrary, in most cases, the prices went up.

Mr. AIKEN. That was unfortunately true.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is diametrically opposed to the contentions of the Secretary of Agriculture. Let us not forget this fact, too. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has pointed out, the milk people have in a measure benefited by the Government's disposing of a great deal of accumulated butter and cheese and powdered milk, which had been in storage.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; butter and powdered milk.

Mr. ELLENDER. The loss which has been sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation since 1954 in disposing of surplus dairy products amounts to about $700 million. The record shows that.

Mr. AIKEN. We will be fortunate if it does not amount to a billion dollars before we get through with it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not complaining about it. I am merely pointing to these figures to show how this factor has influenced the change in the milk consumption.

Mr. AIKEN. At the present time there are fewer dairy products in storage, both in Commodity Credit Corporation storage and in private storage.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is because the products have been frequently given away.

Mr. AIKEN. There is less in storage than in many years. The Commodity Credit Corporation has sold most of its butter. I believe 30 million pounds are left. Most of what is left is in powdered milk, and there is a considerable quantity of cheese left also.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has pointed out, millions of pounds of powdered milk went into feed for hogs.

Mr. AIKEN. It is unfortunate that when the price to the farmer goes down, the consuming public does not get the benefit of it, and somebody else always steps in to take the difference in the price. However, when the price to the farmer goes up the price to the consumer also goes up.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall take the time of the Senate to cite just one more example of the confused thinking of our Secretary of Agriculture on the subject of what makes the American farm economy tick. In 1954, the national acreage allotment for corn, in the commercial corn-producing area, amounted to 46,996,000 acres. The support level was established at 90 percent of parity. As Senators know, the corn price-support program works somewhat differently from the support program for the other basics, in that marketing quotas are not invoked in the Corn Belt. Thus, a farmer may elect to either comply with his individual acreage allotment and thereby become eligible to participate in the price-support loan and purchase features of the program, or he can disregard his acreage allotment, plant all the corn he wishes, and dispose of it on the market at whatever price he can get, and without any penalty whatever. Under this type of program, in 1954, corn farmers in the commercial area planted 57,173,000 acres of corn. The average price received by the farmer on the market for corn in 1954 was $1.43, compared with a support price of $1.62.

Now, in 1955, the Secretary established the national acreage allotment for corn at 49,843,000 acres, with a support price of 87 percent of parity, or $1.58 per bushel. Faced with the prospect of even less Government assistance in maintaining a price at or around parity, did the corn farmers of the commercial belt reduce their acreage, as should occur if the philosophy of the Secretary of Agriculture is sound? No, they did not. In 1955, they planted 57,209,000 acres to corn—just slightly over the amount they planted in 1954. Bear in mind that in 1955, the corn farmers of the United States received an average of $1.31 per bushel, compared with the announced support price of $1.58.

Again, in 1956, what will the corn farmers of the commercial area do, when the Secretary has lowered the national acreage allotment to 43,281,000 acres, and flexed the support price downward a full 6 points, to 81 percent of parity, or $1.40 per bushel? If the Secretary's reasoning is correct, corn acreage in the commercial belt should drop, in direct relation to the anticipated price the commodity will bring on the market. Yet we find Department of Agriculture officials, in testifying before the Senate Agriculture Committee just a short while ago, predicting that unless something is done, over and beyond the incentives contained in the pending bill, to encourage corn farmers to participate in the soil-bank program, we can expect another huge planting in the commercial Corn Belt—at least 56 million acres.

I repeat, Mr. President—either our Secretary of Agriculture is woefully ignorant of what is going on today in American agriculture, or he continues to whistle in the dark in the hope that lightning will strike.

Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD at this point several statements made by the Secretary of Agriculture in some of the reports which emanated from the Department since he took office. For instance, in his report in 1953 Mr. Benson said:

> As for price and income, the outlook indicates that most of the price adjustments have been made and the situation has now become fairly stabilized. Farm prices in 1954 may decline slightly, but costs are also expected to dip downward. Of course, we are not satisfied with the present level of farm income. It is not enough that prices be stable if they do not give farmers their rightful share of the national income. Our goal is a farm program that will enable farmers to obtain their rightful share.

The Secretary stated that the retreat of farm prices and farm income had been stopped. Remember, that was a statement made in 1953. But prices and income have gone down further and further.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At what time in 1953 was that statement made?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1953. I cannot find the exact time, but, evidently, it was made in the early part of 1954, because it is the Secretary's annual report for 1953.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At that time the national net income of farmers was $13.2 billion, according to the Secretary's own report. For the fourth quarter of 1955 it was $10 billion. It did not remain stabilized; it dropped quite a bit. So that report is incorrect.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is incorrect. But it is my hope that things will really get better in the months ahead. The Secretary of Agriculture, in my humble opinion, has been not very sympathetic to the price-support program. It is my hope that if the bill is passed, as we are presenting it, he will be either more sympathetic to it or that the President will get someone in his place who will be sympathetic in administering the program.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take too much of the time of the Senate, but I have other such statements by Mr. Benson which I should like to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point, and I ask unanimous consent that they be so incorporated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

STATEMENTS OF SECRETARY BENSON

January 1954, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"In the year ahead, the realized net income of farm operators is likely to hold near the 1953 level of $12.5 billion."

Comment: Net farm income in 1955 was $10.6 billion.

April 21, 1954, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"I say categorically that the farmers' share of the consumer's dollar has not declined under this administration nor have retail food prices moved upward."

Comment: Farmers' share of consumers' dollar in April of 1954 was 44 cents. By December of 1955, it had dropped to 38 cents.

Other statements:

Date	Benson said:	Parity ratio	Date reported [1]
Feb. 11, 1953	"* * * analysis leads us to expect no major changes (in farm price) during the next several months."	94	Feb. 15
Apr. 7, 1953	"Our analysts * * * anticipate that prices of farm products during the spring and summer will be steady."	92	Apr. 15
Oct. 21, 1953	"It's my belief that the major price declines are behind us."	90	Nov. 15
June 30, 1954	"It (last month's 4 percent farm price decline) does not indicate a general weakening in the farm price structure."	88	July 15
Jan. 7, 1955	"I am convinced that for agriculture the road ahead will be smoother than the one we have been traveling."	86	Jan. 15
June 15, 1955	"I am confident that we have seen the worst of the transition which agriculture goes through following every major war."	84	July 15

[1] The parity ratio is reported as of the 15th of each month.

Comment: The parity ratio on January 16, 1956, was 80.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, my good friend from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] asked a moment ago whether I wished to complete my statement tonight. It is now quarter of six, and I know I cannot complete it tonight. I am a little over halfway through. It is my hope that tomorrow there will be more Senators present. I express the hope that as many members of the committee as we have had present this afternoon will be on the floor tomorrow, so we can engage in a debate to make crystal clear, if possible, what the bill proposes to do, in the hope that we can vote on the measure not later than Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. I am sure my good friend from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] will assist us in trying to attain that aim.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I will say to my good friend from Louisiana that his suggestion that we may get a vote on the bill in the early part of next week is encouraging. I certainly recognize the fact that it is a measure of such importance that it should be discussed fully and completely, in every detail, on the floor. I should think that Tuesday or Wednesday of next week would probably afford the time needed on this place of proposed legislation. I ask my distinguished friend from Louisiana if he believes that much time will be required to bring the bill to a vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. From the conversations I have had with Senators who are desirous of offering amendments, I would say it would hardly be possible to vote on the bill before Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. I express the hope that some working arrangement can be made between the majority leader and the minority leader toward trying to get a limitation of debate after this week so that we can fix a day certain on which to vote, and have the Senators who desire to express themselves in the meantime take the floor. By fixing a date certain, I am sure we can make a good deal of progress toward completing the consideration of the bill and having it in conference by the middle of next week.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it the chairman's view that no request is likely to be made for a limitation of time until Monday of next week?

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope we can fix a date before that time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Even if it is fixed before that time, am I to understand the Senator's view to be that he would not want the vote to be taken before Tuesday?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to see the bill voted on by Friday, but I am a realist and I doubt, with the many amendments that are being proposed, that I can be so optimistic as to suggest we can get through the bill tomorrow or next day.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There will be no session on Saturday.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has already indicated that. It strikes me that if we debate the bill through Friday afternoon, and if Senators remain and ask such questions as they may desire to propound, we can get through with a discussion of the bill this week. It is not very complicated, so far as the matters at issue, including the 90 percent price support, are concerned. I do not suppose that many Senators can be prevailed upon to change their minds on any of the basic issues embodied in the bill. I think many of them have already changed their minds, and I hope they will remain that way.

I want to be realistic. I realize that many Senators may have to leave Washington over the weekend. Therefore, they wish to be assured that no serious business will be transacted on Friday. I hope Senators can be given assurance that there will be a vote on the bill on, let us say, next Tuesday, or on Wednesday at the latest. It should be possible to complete action on the bill by that time and then to proceed with other matters.

I urge my good friend from Kentucky not to let anything interfere with the debate on the farm bill. Let us continue with its consideration until we have finished with it. Let us try to get Senators to talk about the farm bill, and to forget about everything else for the time being. Since last October I have devoted the major portion of my attention to this legislation. Since I returned to Washintgon on January 1, I have left nothing undone in an all-out effort to have it on the President's desk sometime in the early part of March—not later than the 15th. If we set that date as the goal, I am certain we can achieve it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator is unusually modest when he speaks about this measure having occupied his time since last October. If my memory serves me correctly, a vote was taken in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last May which charted the way for the bill to be taken up at this time rather than to be considered at the close of the last session. It has been my understanding, and certainly my observation, that the Senator from Louisiana has been very active in working on the proposed legislation from that time until now.

Mr. ELLENDER. I made a slight error of about 5 months.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I felt certain the RECORD ought to be cleared to that extent.

I appreciate what the Senator from Louisiana has said. There is no way whereby assurance can be given as to when a measure will be voted on, unless a time certain has been set to do so. I was very much interested in having the Senator's views as to whether he thought it was possible to have an agreement to limit debate considered prior to Monday. From what the Senator has said, with only 2 days remaining of this week, with the great interest there is in the Senate and throughout the country in the bill, and important as the bill is to the people of the country, I am taking it for granted that probably the limitation of debate will not be asked for until Monday.

I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if that is not probably in line with his thinking.

Mr. AIKEN. That is generally in line with my thinking. We know that several amendments, probably important amendments, are in process of preparation now. I hope Senators who intend to submit amendments will have them printed this week at the latest, so that the committee will have a chance to study them.

We realize, also, that there are always some Senators who are out of town, and who should have notice of when an important vote it to take place. It is my thought that probably by Monday it would be possible to secure a unanimous-consent agreement, thus giving the absent Senators time in which to return to Washington, even if it be necessary to shorten the debate after the voting starts on the various amendments.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I could not agree more with the Senator from Vermont, and I, too, urge Senators who have had an opportunity to study the bill to submit the amendments they intend to propose and to have them printed at the earliest possible date. I am certain that any Senator who intends to offer an amendment to the bill will also come to the Senate prepared with what seems to him to be a good, sound argument for it.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know why the Senate should spend much time in debating 90-percent rigid supports or dual parity, or possibly 1 or 2 other amendments. But there are some amendments in which all Senators are interested, one way or the other, and which should be

explained and debated fully on the floor. I hope those amendments will make their appearance promptly, and that their sponsors will make their arguments for the amendments as soon as they have them prepared.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator mentioned a very important segment of the bill when he spoke of the 90-percent supports. I trust the Senator from Louisiana was referring to that part of the bill a while ago when he said he thought there had been some change in sentiment among the Members.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope so, too.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was not wishful thinking, either.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Louisiana heartens me, for I now believe that a sufficient number of Senators realize the great hurt that came to agriculture through the passage of the legislation which is now on the statute books.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me assure my friend from Kentucky that my remarks were not intended to hearten him in that respect.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I can assure my friend from Vermont that I wanted to be heartened, and this is the only way I know of in which I can get any encouragement for the farmer in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers, we thank Thee for this day in the calendar of our national history, commemorating the birth of one whom we affectionately call the Father of Our Country.

We are seeking to pay honor and tribute to the memory of that noble patriot who stood like a giant among his contemporaries and made an indelible impression upon his own and succeeding generations.

Grant that the memory of his illustrious qualities of character, his lofty idealism, his sturdy commonsense, his skill in statesmanship and diplomacy, his fidelity to the principles of righteousness and justice, and his faith in divine providence may never become eclipsed or pass into oblivion.

May this not only be a day of commemoration but of consecration when we are resolving to give wholehearted devotion to those ideals which were resident and regnant in the soul of George Washington.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8101. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 8320) entitled "an act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes."

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 7, 1956, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations

in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such

they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting in a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that

morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. * The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or pref-

erences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly on one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes,"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1566. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a letter requesting the case of Min-Sun Chen, A-6848005, be returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1567. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting nine copies of recent publications for the information of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8675. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; without amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9429. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9428. A bill to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 9473. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 9474. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 9475. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 9476. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 9477. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 9478. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 9479. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9480. A bill to amend title II of Public Law 480 (83d Cong.) so as to increase the amount of surplus commodities available thereunder and permit payment under certain circumstances of ocean freight; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 9481. A bill declaring the inundation of property because of, or aggravated by, wind, waves, or tidal effects on the Great Lakes to be property within the flood-control activities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 9482. A bill to increase the amount authorized for the erection of adequate facilities for use of National Institute of Dental Research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9483. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 9484. A bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of, Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 9485. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Construction Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to extend the benefits of such act to certain individuals by change of the date limitation on the citizenship requirement contained in such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9486. A bill to provide equitable compensation for Saturday, Sunday, holiday, and overtime duty in the Federal Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9487. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9488. A bill to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 9489. A bill to recognize and confirm the authority of arid and semiarid States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their geographic boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9490. A bill to provide a 10-year program for the construction and improvement of roads, trails, buildings, and utilities in national park and monument areas and other areas administered by the National Park Service and for the construction and improvement of parkways authorized by acts of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 9491. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 9492. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 9493. A bill for the relief of John Kousoumbris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9494. A bill for the relief of Joseph David (Jerry) Malamud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9495. A bill for the relief of Gerald Augustine Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 9496. A bill for the relief of Kiki Monoyioudes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 9497. A bill for the relief of Antonio Quijano, Lilia Quijano, and Aurora Quijano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. Res. 402. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 5918 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

562. By Mr. RIEHLMAN: Petition signed by Mr. Ivan M. Cash and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the enactment of H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

563. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive secretary, American Mosquito Control Association, Inc., Selma, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their support of S. 2870 with certain amendments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1956

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1956

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who dost overarch our fleeting years with Thine eternity and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength, in the midst of the pressures of another day, as we face its vast concerns, we pause with bowed heads and hearts at this shrine of our spirits. Without Thee even our wistful hopes for humanity are like winter's withered leaves, once verdant and bright—now brown and crumpled ruins blown upon a bitter wind.

Above all else we pray Thee save us from succumbing to the terrible temptation to become cynical and to be men of lost faith. Join us in kinship to those who in other times that tried men's souls went on believing in beauty and love and God in the midst of ugliness, hatred, and horror. For as with deep craving for reality we turn now to Thee we remember that we date this day's deliberation from the lowly cradle of One who died on the gallows of his day—mocked, reviled, insulted, outraged—yet that torturing cross of defeat sways the future. By its crimson sign which towers o'er the wrecks of time may we conquer. In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 22, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker pro tempore, during the absence of the Speaker.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor);

H. R. 2430. An act to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, South Carolina, by the United States of America; and

H. R. 8101. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for action on the nomination on the Executive Calendar, under the heading "New Report."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the Presi-

dent of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Earl Freeman Hastings, of Arizona, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, vice A. Jackson Goodwin, Jr., resigned.

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

Franklin G. Floete, of Iowa, to be Administrator of General Services, vice Edmund F. Mansure, resigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar, under "New Report," will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas Maxwell Moffat, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nomination today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, with a limitation on statements of not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Min-Sun Chen from a report transmitted to the Senate on April 15, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by Joan of Arc Council, No. 1992, Knights of Columbus, Port Jefferson, Long Island, and Corpus Christi Council, No. 2502, Knights of Columbus, Mineola, both in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a comprehensive national highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS OF SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., FINLEY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Finley, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Whereas the Rural Electrification Act was passed by the Congress of the United States in 1935 to promote the general establishment of electricity in the rural areas of America; and

Whereas through diligent, honest, efficient direction by the various Rural Electric Administrators, this program has developed into one of the greatest achievements by the partnership of the people and their Government in the history of our Nation; and

Whereas the results of a Rural Electrification Administration has given our Nation an abundance of food and fiber together with other technical developments that are so necessary to the progress and well being of our Nation; and

Whereas the application of electricity on the farm has lessened the burden of the farm people and reduced human drudgery to the extent that rural America bears the torch guiding the people of other countries less fortunate in the way rural life can and should be enjoyed by all: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, sincerely want rural electrification to continue to exist and expand. We are fully aware of the detrimental effect that the Hoover Task Force proposal to the Congress of the United States will have upon this great program. We, therefore, urge our Senators to do all in their power to defeat this proposal; now, be it further

Resolved, That we, the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, urge and insist that our Senators inform their colleagues in the Senate and urge them to use their influence to defeat this proposal; be it further

Resolved, That our Senators check the background of those who are behind the task force proposal as we think they are picked men historically known to be opposed to rural electrification and public-power development.

Respectfully submitted.

SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
JULIUS ANDERSON,
President, Board of Directors.

GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION

Whereas the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have worked together and constructed the Garrison Dam incorporating within its structure generation facilities, flood control, irrigation, and navigation; and

Whereas a great deal of energy generated at the Garrison site will be secondary and dump power which will be sold at a very low price; and

Whereas this cheap power can only be utilized by the rural electric cooperatives through a system of firming plants: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, respectfully urge the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota to do all in their power to bring about legislation to appropriate funds for the Bureau of Reclamation, to be used to construct generation plants sufficiently large to firm up all dump and secondary power; be it further

Resolved, That this firmed secondary and dump power be made available to the cooperatives and municipalities according to the preference clause now in effect; be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota work toward the construction of transmission lines wherever necessary in order that this cheap power can be made available to the majority of the people in North Dakota.

Respectfully submitted.

SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
JULIUS ANDERSON,
President, Board of Directors.

MISSOURI BASIN DEVELOPMENT

Whereas this development must be carried out to the fullest extent in order that it may help the largest number of people in the area adjacent to the Missouri River; and

Whereas the following developments in conjunction with the various dams now in progress of being developed and those that can be developed in the future should employ the following resources incident to total development:

1. Irrigation is a very important part of our economy when taking into consideration the increased production necessary to feed our Nation in the future and yet be able to carry our share of the food burden of those less fortunate nations who have peoples starving.

2. Navigation is an important phase in the cost of production and distribution of the various commodities raised in the areas adjacent to the Missouri River. This should be developed to its fullest extent.

3. Flood control: Flooding has been and still is one of nature's most destructive methods of taking human lives and destroying property unnecessarily. Many floods have occurred in the past along this great river resource, all of which would be prevented.

4. Reforestation is one of nature's most effective methods of preventing upland runoff erosion by water and wind. This is again a great natural resource and should be developed wherever conditions permit to the fullest extent.

5. Afforestation: Many acres of rugged barren land exist along the Missouri River as well as in its drainage area which should be planted to trees adapted to the soil and

climatic conditions, thus holding back additional water that would ordinarily go down the streams at flood stage.

6. Wildlife can be protected and developed by making wise use of the above-mentioned areas and should be protected so that the future generations can enjoy it in its wild state as has the past generations: Now, threfore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., urge our Senators and Representatives of North Dakota to give their support to the full development of the Missouri Basin. Keeping in mind at all times, the welfare of all of the people and the necessity of the full development of the basin embodying the above-mentioned resources.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
JULIUS ANDERSON,
President, Board of Directors.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT PARITY FOR FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by patrons of GTA Grain Elevator Line, relating to 100 percent of parity for farm products.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF PATRONS OF GTA GRAIN ELEVATOR LINE

Whereas it is a well known and an undisputed fact, that the purchasing power of the farmer is way down to a point where he could be squeezed out of existence. Farming is an enterprise with a profit and loss statement like any other business and should be recognized as such. We ask for an income based on a 100 percent parity base, and urge that the GTA use every resource at its command to make the Congress of the United States conscious of this fact.

It is our desire as producers of food and fiber to enjoy all the rights and benefits equal to other business and segments of society.

By resolutions committee for GTA Elevator Line meeting.

FRANK LASSEY.
T. J. THORSON.
SEVERT SPONHEIM.

DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER, MADISON, WIS.—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received today from Columbia County, which is a large producer of dairy products, a resolution, urging among other things that a bill which I introduced in relation to the establishment of a dairy research building in Madison, Wis., be passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution

To the Honorable Board of Supervisors of Columbia County:

Whereas Columbia County is a great producer of dairy products; and

Whereas 80 percent of all dairy products produced in Wisconsin must be sold outside the State and competing dairy producers are paid at least $2 per hundred more than is received by Wisconsin producers producing Grade A milk; and

Whereas Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has introduced a bill to establish a dairy research building at Madison, Wis.; and

Whereas such research center would attempt to find new uses for and techniques to handle dairy products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we commend Senator WILEY for his efforts in attempting to establish said dairy research center and authorize the county clerk to advise Senator WILEY of our action; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY and Representative GLENN DAVIS and request that they support Senator WILEY's bill.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; with amendments; (Rept. No. 1570).

Mr. HAYDEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a statement of my individual views with reference to the report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The individual views will be received and printed.

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 7201. A bill relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies; with amendments (Rept. No. 1571).

REVIEW OF AUDIT REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1572)

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, a report entitled "A Review of the Audit Reports of the Comptroller General." The report contains information developed by the General Accounting Office in 378 audit reports referred to Congress and to the designated agencies over the past 10 years. It also contains an outline of the comprehensive audits of the various departments and agencies of the Government, and a résumé of the progress made in auditing the financial transactions and activities of the Federal Government since the enactment of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. In recommending enactment of this legislation, the Committee on Government Operations pointed out that it would be its continuing responsibility to keep in close contact with the activation and administration of the fiscal program of the Government, as approved by the Congress. This act provided the legislative impetus for the changes that have taken place in auditing the fiscal operations of the Government, and the report covers an outline of the improvements that have been achieved.

The Committee on Government Operations is required, under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to give special attention to the reports of the Comptroller General and to the work of the General Accounting Office. The staff of the committee examines the information and recommendations contained in the reports, and frequently discusses the contents with the agencies involved. When necessary, conferences are held with representatives of the General Accounting Office with regard to further action that may be indicated on the more important recommendations, with the view of having the information and suggestions utilized, when approved by Committees of the Congress.

The committee has observed, from its review of the audit reports, that the better the internal controls of the agency the more attention the General Accounting Office is able to give to higher levels of operations rather than to detailed tests of transactions. The report stresses the importance of agencies in the executive branch adopting policies to increase their efforts to improve their own internal audits and controls, in order to enable the General Accounting Office to devote more of its efforts to broader fiscal studies and examinations of Government-wide activities and to further its effectiveness in serving the needs of the Congress.

The report cites many instances of savings that have resulted from recommendations of the General Accounting Office, either by agency actions or through the committees of the Congress, of which the following are cited as examples.

The General Accounting Office audit disclosed a large over-procurement of jet engines. When this was brought to the attention of the Department of the Air Force, an outstanding contract was reduced to the extent economically possible, with an estimated saving of between $50 and $60 million, and planned procurement was decreased by approximately $10 million. Further examination of requirements for spare engines phasing out of production revealed other instances of over-procurement and resulted in further cutbacks by the Air Force.

The General Accounting Office also made a review of certain procurement practices of the Army Ordnance Corps, encompassing a review of more than 700 negotiated contracts, involving expenditures of $9,700,000,000. The General Accounting Office reports that important matters were brought to the attention of administrative officials at the time they were observed, and many questionable practices were corrected, resulting in savings reported to be in excess of $2,700,000, as well as other savings from the strengthening of managerial controls which are not susceptible of measurement in dollar figures.

During the audit of one of AEC's large prime contracts, the General Accounting Office observed that a purchasing office was being maintained at Chicago, Ill., and that warehousing and accounting functions were being performed at Los Alamos, N. Mex. The Comptroller General recommended to the Commission that the functions be consolidated at

Los Alamos. As a result, all accounting functions were consolidated at Los Alamos and the Chicago purchasing office was closed. This is expected to reduce costs about $200,000 annually.

The General Accounting Office recommended that the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration be dissolved, and that its activities be liquidated by other agencies of the Federal or Insular Government in Puerto Rico. The Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously recommended enactment of legislation to accomplish an accelerated liquidation, and legislation was enacted granting the Secretary of the Interior broad powers to liquidate this organization. Officials of the Department of the Interior estimated that this action would result in an overall saving to the Government of $7 million to $8 million after payment of all expenses of liquidation.

The audits outlined in the analyses also include recommendations for the improvement of many other types of agency activities, which have resulted in reducing Federal expenditures, such as the reduction in the number of motor vehicles being operated in excess of agency needs; the assessment of fees for special services; and improvements in contract procedures, which accord with programs initiated and policies approved by the Committee on Government Operations. The report is replete with specific citations of savings resulting from the audits, which aggregate millions of dollars.

The audit reports, in themselves, are considered only as a medium by which information is transmitted or recommendations are made for improvement or corrective action. They provide a basis for action or decisions by the agencies or by the Congress. The committee recognizes that not all recommendations contained in these reports will be agreed to or accepted in their entirety by officials of the agencies or by the committees having oversight jurisdiction, but they form a basis for an independent appraisal of agency expenditures and activities.

The committee believes that the review of the audit reports of the Comptroller General should be of special interest and assistance to the appropriate jurisdictional committees of the Congress in their examination of agency programs and activities. The facts submitted in summary form should prove to be more readily adapted for committee use than would be possible through the study of all of the details contained in the 378 separate audit reports which have been submitted to the Congress by the Comptroller General, beginning with the 80th Congress and extending through January 15, 1956.

I ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. IVES, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania):

S. 3272. A bill to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorizations for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 3273. A bill to provide authorization for emergency flood-protection projects in areas of the United States where such projects are needed for the protection of life and property; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 3274. A bill for the relief of Marcos Go; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 3275. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3276. A bill for the relief of Jan Hovorka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a sound national minerals policy, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to take certain action in furtherance of such policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to provide for a survey and study of the potential capacity of the harbors and ports of the United States for the repair and maintenance of atomic-powered vessels; to the Committee on Public Works.

URGENTLY NEEDED SMALL FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948. The purpose of the bill is to break through the bottleneck of time in the construction of urgently needed flood-protection projects. The bill would give the Corps of Engineers needed flexibility in pressing forward with construction of small, but vital flood-control works for the protection of communities in the State of Connecticut and elsewhere throughout the Nation, which have been so sorely afflicted by flood disasters in recent months.

Joining me in sponsorship of the bill are my colleagues the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on January 5, I introduced a bill, S. 2853, to authorize the construction of flood-protection measures in the Northeastern States affected by the August and October 1955 floods which caused such great loss of life, human distress, and property damage. This was a companion bill, identical in all major respects, to H. R. 7870, introduced by the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

There is ample justification for giving priority to the need for flood protection in the Northeast. The reasons why we face a greater emergency than other parts of the country were recently summarized by Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, before the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

First. There is a great chance that the hurricanes and storms that produce floodwaters in the Northeast are much more frequent than we had contemplated heretofore.

Second. Only 22 percent of the authorized flood-control program in New England has been accomplished to date, which is the lowest in any part of the country.

Third. The areas that are affected by floods in New England are extremely highly populated, highly developed and industrialized and developments are concentrated in a small area and a narrow valley, and therefore when they are affected by floods the result is extremely disastrous per unit of area.

Although we must, therefore, regard the Northeast's need for flood-control work as most urgent, it also should be recognized that floods are a national problem. This has been tragically demonstrated very recently by the disastrous

floods on the west coast. The records of our chief disaster relief agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, show that major flood disasters have affected the following States within the past 3 years: Texas, Florida, Indiana, West Virginia, California, Iowa, New Mexico, South Dakota, Colorado, Nevada, California, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Connecticut. Accordingly, the bill being introduced today proposes to deal with this problem on a national basis.

The need for the proposed legislation arises from the restrictions placed on flood-control work under existing law. The law now requires that flood-control dams and reservoirs and other large projects must be specifically authorized by statute and that appropriations for each undertaking must be voted by the Congress before planning and construction can begin.

This is a necessary and proper procedure, essential for protection of the taxpayers' interests, when flood-control works requiring large expenditures are involved. But it is time consuming, usually requiring the passage of many years.

The Congress has recognized that in the case of small flood-control projects the laborious process of specific authorizations and appropriations can safely be omitted. The Flood Control Act of 1948 provides a general authorization for projects of this kind, with limitations on the cost of any single project of $150,000 and of $3 million on the total amount of expenditures in 1 fiscal year.

The recent flood disasters have demonstrated that these limitations are too restrictive, and are preventing much work which is urgently needed in the light of the emergency conditions confronting my State and other States, not only in the Northeast but on the west coast and in other areas of the Nation.

The bill would correct this defect in present law by raising the limitations in the Flood Control Act of 1948 to $500,000 for single projects, and $15 million for total expenditures in 1 fiscal year.

Local, State, and congressional authority over flood-control works would be safeguarded by the following conditions:

Concurrence must be obtained from the affected State, or political subdivision, prior to the commencement of each proposed project.

In the case of projects which would cost in excess of $150,000, justifications must be submitted to the Committees on Public Works of the House and Senate before work is commenced.

Additional safeguards include provisions requiring compliance with the provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended; and that the work must be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation, except as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of preliminary examination and survey works.

In a recent inspection trip through the Naugatuck Valley, the worst devastated area in my State, I visited a number of locations where the proposed authority would be invaluable.

In cleaning the river, under the limited authority conferred by Public Law 875, the engineers have deposited earth, gravel, and rock spoil on the banks in the form of dikes. These could be made permanent by reinforcement, rip-rapping, and so forth, and could be tied in with concrete flood walls and other flood-control structures to provide more adequate protection for the communities which were so adversely affected this past year. Moreover, unless these dikes are protected, another flood may wash them down the river, resulting in a waste of the money already spent.

In addition to locations in the Naugatuck Valley communities, opportunities for providing this kind of essential flood protective work at small cost exist in the flood-affected communities in the Thames River Basin in eastern Connecticut, in the Farmington River Valley in north-central Connecticut, and in Fairfield County in the southwestern part of my State. I am sure that similar work could be accomplished under the authority of the proposed legislation in many other States.

This Congress has recently voted, and President Eisenhower has approved, an urgent deficiency bill providing appropriations for an accelerated flood control program in the Northeastern States. At this time I should like to express publicly my appreciation to my colleagues in the Senate, especially the distinguished chairman and members of the Appropriations Committee, for their sympathetic treatment of our needs. This action will permit a savings in time, as much as a year in the case of some projects, in getting this work underway.

The President has, additionally, requested funds for the accelerated northeastern program in his budget for the coming fiscal year. In all, 19 flood control projects in Northeastern States are included in the accelerated program, involving a total Federal cost of $135,580,000.

Tables listing the construction projects included in the accelerated program for the Northeast follow:

Five projects included in fiscal year 1956 supplemental request for initial construction funds

	Estimated Federal cost
1. Barre Falls Reservoir, Mass	$2,680,000
2. Buffumville, Reservoir, Mass	2,820,000
3. Otter Brook Reservoir, N. H	4,800,000
4. Bear Creek Reservoir, Pa	17,900,000
5. Ball Mountain Reservoir, Vt	16,600,000
Subtotal	44,800,000

Fourteen additional projects included in fiscal year 1957 budget for initial construction funds

1. Thomaston Reservoir, Conn	$16,000,000
2. East Brimfield Reservoir, Mass	5,700,000
3. Hodges Village Reservoir, Mass	4,350,000
4. Worcester, Mass	5,030,000
5. Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y	4,840,000
6. Dyberry Reservoir, Pa	$7,630,000
7. Stillwater Reservoir, Pa	9,200,000
8. Prompton Reservoir, Pa	5,860,000
9. East Barre Reservoir (modif), Vermont	3,750,000
10. North Springfield Reservoir, Vermont	9,900,000
11. Townshend Reservoir, Vt	10,800,000
12. Waterbury Reservoir (modif), Vermont	860,000
13. Wrightsville Reservoir (modif), Vermont	2,660,000
14. Woonsocket, R. I.[1]	4,200,000
Subtotal	90,780,000
Grand total	135,580,000

[1] Fiscal year 1956 supplemental includes request for authority to use $150,000 of available construction funds for preparatory work on this project.

In addition to these projects, all authorized by law, other flood-control work in my State and region will be needed. The Corps of Engineers is presently engaged in studies to determine ways of plugging the gaps in the Northeast's flood-control plan which were disclosed by the 1955 floods. This work is being done under authority of a resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works, at my request, on September 14, 1955, and I am informed that good progress is being made. Additional studies are being made under the so-called Bush Act (Public Law 71, 84th Cong., 1st sess.) to determine methods of preventing hurricane damage along the eastern seaboard.

However, the projects included in the accelerated program are dams and reservoirs and other large protective works, all of which cannot be completed before a considerable lapse of time. It is probable that a number of new projects arising from recommendations based on the studies now under way will require specific authorizations and appropriations. Again, a considerable amount of time must pass before these protective works can come into being.

Although we must wait for the completion of dams and reservoirs and other large protective works, smaller, but vitally needed flood-control measures can be undertaken in the coming months if the bill being introduced today is promptly enacted into law.

We dare not delay. Time is the bottleneck we must overcome to the maximum possible extent. We have been warned, on very responsible authority, there is grave danger of new flood disasters in this very year.

It is my hope that the Committee on Public Works will hold prompt hearings on the proposed legislation. The Corps of Engineers needs the flexibility in flood control work which it would furnish. The people in the stricken river valleys, not only in my State but throughout the Northeast and other parts of the country, need the protection it would provide. We must break through the bottleneck of time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3272) to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed $15 million for any one fiscal year for the construction of flood-control projects not specifically authorized by law when, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, such work is warranted, subject to the following conditions:

"(1) Not more than $500,000 shall be allotted for this purpose for any single project for expenditure during any 1 fiscal year;

"(2) The provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended, shall apply;

"(3) Concurrence shall be obtained from the affected State or political subdivision, or both, prior to the commencement of construction of each proposed project; and

"(4) The work shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation except as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of preliminary examination and survey reports.

"(b) (1) Before work is initiated under this section on any flood-control project or other flood protective measure which the Secretary of the Army estimates will cost in excess of $150,000 for any 1 fiscal year, he shall submit to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives a report outlining the proposed plan of protection together with an analysis of the justification therefor. The report shall be delivered to both committees on the same day and while each House is in session. No work shall be initiated on any project or other measure with respect to which such a report is made until the expiration of the first period of 30 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the report is transmitted to the committees.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(B) in the computation of the 30-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain."

EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECTS IN CERTAIN AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide authorization for emergency flood protection projects in areas of the United States where such projects are needed for the protection of life and property. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement, prepared by the Senator from New Mexico, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3273) to provide authorization for emergency flood protection projects in areas of the United States where such projects are needed for the protection of life and property, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. CHAVEZ), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) in view of the urgent need for the immediate construction in many areas of the United States of flood-protective works which otherwise might be unduly delayed awaiting investigation and authorization under regularly established procedures, the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of the Army may accomplish flood-protective projects not specifically authorized by law in any area of the United States where, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, such projects are necessary and should be accomplished without delay for the protection of life and property. Flood-protective projects initiated under this act shall be subject to the conditions specified in sections 2 and 3 of this act.

(b) The authority provided in this act shall be in addition to that provided in section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended.

(c) No expenditures shall be made under the authority of this act after June 30, 1960.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed $20 million for any one fiscal year for the construction of flood-protective projects under the provisions of this act. Such construction shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not more than $500,000 shall be allotted for any single project for expenditure during any one fiscal year;

(2) The provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended, shall apply to such projects;

(3) Concurrence shall be obtained from the affected State or political subdivision, or both, prior to the commencement of construction of each proposed project; and

(4) The work in each project shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation except as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of preliminary examination and survey reports.

SEC. 3. (a) Before work is initiated under this act on any flood-protective project which the Secretary of the Army estimates will cost in excess of $150,000 for any one fiscal year, he shall submit to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives a report outlining the proposed plan of protection together with an analysis of the justification therefor. The report shall be delivered to both committees on the same day and while each House is in session. No work shall be initiated on any project or other measure with respect to which such a report is made until the expiration of the first period of 30 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the report is transmitted to the committees.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

(2) in the computation of the 30-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

I have introduced a bill to provide for emergency flood-protection projects in areas of the United States where such projects are needed for the protection of life and property.

We now have acts which provide for small flood-control projects in areas where projects are not specifically authorized and not within areas intended to be protected by projects so authorized; we have acts which provide for emergency activities by the Corps of Engineers in connection with flood fighting and repairs to flood-control works threatened or damaged by floods; we have acts which authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administration to assist in restoring essential public services and cleanup work after a flood, but we do not have authorizations which would allow for the construction of emergency works which would temporarily take care of flood problems and prevent widespread damage and suffering until permanent flood-control works can be planned and constructed.

In the State of New Mexico, particularly in Albuquerque, we have had several disastrous floods but no agency of the Federal Government could provide needed assistance in the form of emergency flood-control works. I understand that this is true in the New England, California, and other areas which also experienced great suffering during their recent disastrous floods. The bill which I am introducing is designed to provide for such emergency needs.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—NOTICE OF INTENTION TO SUBMIT AMENDMENT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that I expect to submit an amendment to the agricultural bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which is now under consideration. The amendment would add a new section at the end of title III of the bill.

I am not asking that my amendment be printed as such. My reason is, it has already been printed as a separate bill, and I wish to avoid the added cost of reprinting it. For the information of the Senate, I wish to say that my amendment will be identical with the bill (S. 2940) to establish a Commission to prepare legislation providing for increased industrial use of agricultural products, introduced by me on January 16, 1956. A copy of Senate bill 2940, and my statement in reference thereto, can be found on page 518 of the RECORD for January 16, 1956.

INDUSTRIAL USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on January 16, 1956, on behalf of myself and other Senators, I introduced the bill (S. 2940) to establish a commission to prepare legislation providing for increased industrial use of agricultural products. If and when Senate bill 2940 is reprinted, I ask unanimous consent that the name

of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] may be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. STENNIS:

Address on the conservatism of George Washington, delivered by Senator BRICKER on February 22, 1956, before the American Good Government Society, Washington, D. C.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on International Security and Disarmament in the Light of Present Day Circumstances, delivered by him before the Interparliamentary Union meeting in Helsinki, Finland, in August 1955.

SENATOR MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON, AND CANCER RESEARCH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the March issue of the National Eagles' magazine contains an article which will be of considerable interest to us in the Senate, as well as to every citizen of this Nation.

The article deals with a subject of universal interest—cancer research and the progress being made at the National Cancer Institute under the direction of Dr. John R. Heller. It also graphically and chronologically tells the part the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has played in creating the National Cancer Institute and in getting this great research study under way.

A member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles for many years, the Senator from Washington stands for and has consistently worked for the humanitarian legislation which this great American fraternal organization advocates. He has been outstanding in many fields, but has achieved a special recognition for his work in the field of cancer research.

In addition to publishing the article, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, on behalf of its more than 1 million members, went a step further and presented the Senator from Washington its international civic award. The exact wording of that award, which took the form of a wall plaque, is this:

Presented to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON in recognition of his humanitarian efforts and achievements in behalf of cancer research and establishing the National Cancer Institute.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article carried in the March issue of the National Eagles' magazine. I make this request, Mr. President, because of my great admiration and affection for the senior Senator from Washington, who has consistently, in his many years of service in the Congress of the United States, successfully worked and voted for those measures which the Fraternal Order of Eagles stands for in the field of social security, pensions, workmen's compensation, and better schools. The courage and integrity of the Senator from Washington have been proved on many occasions, and he has never forgotten that it is his job to do the best he can for the people of his State and the Nation at all times.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to the insertion which the Senator from Montana requests—I want to associate myself with the sentiments of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, the award, and with the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], one of the ablest and most beloved Members of this body. For many years I have served with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. We were desk mates, so to speak, on a committee in the House of Representatives for some 12 years. We have served in the Senate together several years. I know of no greater humanitarian, and I am familiar with no efforts made by anyone of greater value in the field of medical research. His work has been effective not only in cancer research, but in research on polio, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, tuberculosis, heart ailments, and many other dreaded diseases. The Senator from Washington has always led the fight for such research in the committee and on the floor. I should like the privilege of associating myself with the very fine tribute paid to him by a very fine organization and by our mutual friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Montana, my distinguished senior colleague.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to be associated with my distinguished colleague from Montana and with the distinguished majority leader in their expressions of appreciation and commendation of the work done by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in the field of national health. As chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, which has jurisdiction of matters pertaining to national health, I wish to say that I know personally the important contributions and results which have been accomplished through the efforts of the Senator from Washington. He has always been in the front line, working with his well-known ability and energy for these humanitarian purposes.

So, Mr. President, I am very happy to join with my colleague in these comments and in expressing my personal appreciation of the excellent work accomplished by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANCER FIGHTER: EAGLE SENATOR WARREN MAGNUSON HAS BEEN FIGHTING FOR AN ENLARGED CANCER RESEARCH PROGRAM SINCE 1937, AND HE HAS BEEN VICTORIOUS

(By David Devlin)

On August 2, 1937, a youthful, taffy-haired Congressman from the State of Washington arose on the floor of Congress to make his maiden speech. Ordinarily such an event is of less interest than the results of a tiddlewinks tournament, but this time it was different. The House was full, and the galleries were jammed.

The occasion: WARREN GRANT MAGNUSON, a 31-year-old Eagle solon from Seattle, was presenting the case for his legislation to establish a National Cancer Institute, which was before Congress for passage. It was a big challenge for a freshman legislator, but MAGNUSON's words, ringing through the vast congressional chamber, aroused his colleagues to attention.

"It is a sad commentary," he declared, "that our Government today is spending only $100,000 a year to combat cancer—far less than the millions it is spending to fight disease among animals. We are actually spending less than $1 for each new case of cancer discovered.

"Yet cancer, that dread killer, is the modern menace of civilized nations. It kills more of our American citizens than all our wars combined. And the menace is growing each year."

Congress listened to the broad-shouldered young man from the West. Later that year the Magnuson bill was signed into law by Eagle President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the National Cancer Institute was established. In gratitude MAGNUSON arose to thank his colleagues.

"The Congressmen who have aided me in the passage of this bill," he said "have joined forces in one of the most impressive movements of modern times. We have made a real contribution to those noble scientists who have labored so long and hard in their endless search for truth. The altars of experiment can now be warmed by the fuel which you have provided."

His words were prophetic. Today, 19 years after passage of the Magnuson bill, the first blow of America's broad-scale war against cancer, the United States Government is spending $25 million a year—250 times as much as it was in 1937—in cancer research. It is working closely with private groups such as the FOE-backed Damon Runyon Cancer Fund and the American Cancer Society to curb the Nation's second biggest killer. These joint efforts have saved countless thousands from cancer through early detection.

"One of the things I've appreciated most during my 25 years as an Eagle," says MAGNUSON today, "has been the fraternity's unceasing work in the war against cancer. The Eagles' wonderful contributions to cancer research have stimulated the Government's effort in this field, and we have worked in perfect harmony together."

During his 2 decades in the House and Senate, WARREN MAGNUSON has been so closely identified with the campaign for expanded cancer research that his colleagues call him, Old Cancer Killer. Chuckles his fellow Eagle Senator, BILL LANGER, of North Dakota:

"Every time 'Magie' comes up to me and hands me a good cigar I figure he's after more money for cancer research. And we usually give it to him, too."

MAGNUSON's zeal has not, however, always been appreciated. Once a crusty elder colleague asked him why he was "wasting

time trying to promote money for a silly bunch of long-haired scientists to play around with test tubes at taxpayer expense."

"Senator," replied the Eagle solon, "we spend billions for bombs, battleships, and buildings. I see no reason why we should scrimp when it comes to the health of our citizens."

Later, when a close relative of the complaining Senator was afflicted with cancer, the man became a supporter of MAGNUSON'S efforts to increase the scope of medical research.

The Eagle Senator developed his initial interest in cancer research when a boyhood friend of his in Moorhead, Minn., was stricken with the dread disease. There was another reason, too.

"A lot of the human misery I saw as a youngster was caused by the disease," recalls MAGNUSON. "I saw healthy men and women in the prime of life suddenly fold up and die or waste away—and no one knew why. It just made good sense to do everything we could to find the answers—and the cures."

MAGNUSON'S interest in this kind of social issue—applied Christianity, he calls it—was reflected at an early age. Not long after his arrival into Seattle on a Great Northern freight train, he won election to the State legislature at the age of 27.

Despite his youth, Magie (as he's called by his friends) was named legislative floor leader for the most important piece of legislation before the body: the Eagles' old-age assistance bill.

MAGNUSON, a member of Seattle Aerie No. 1, handled the legislative infighting that piloted the bill through. "That fight taught me," says Magie today, "that you could do a lot of good for people in the legislative arena."

Later MAGNUSON returned from wartime service in the United States Navy under Admiral "Bull" Halsey. He found another opportunity to further America's program of medical research.

During World War II the research started by the National Cancer Institute was expanded to meet the needs of wartime medicine—and it did a magnificent job. So impressed was Eagle President FDR that he called in MAGNUSON and other congressional leaders to confer with Dr. Vannevar Bush, then the Nation's atomic head. "We have shown that the mobilization of medical and scientific research can produce real results," said FDR. "If possible, it should be carried over into peacetime."

The result was (1) the Bush report, Science, the Endless Frontier, which strongly recommended continuation of "the war of science against disease," and (2) a new Magnuson bill advocating creation of a National Science Foundation.

"If we are to maintain the medical progress of the last 25 years," declared the Eagle Senator, "the Government must expand its financial support to include research in cancer, polio, multiple sclerosis, and other so-called uncurable diseases."

The campaign for the National Science Foundation took 5 long years, due to intracongressional disputes over the scope and nature of the proposed foundation.

Finally, in May 1950 all the bugs were ironed out, and Eagle President Harry Truman signed the Magnuson bill into law. With a flourish he handed the pen to the beaming Washington Senator. "No one has done more to achieve this than you, Warren," said the President.

In the meantime MAGNUSON and other farsighted Senators—among them Eagle solons MIKE MANSFIELD, ALEXANDER WILEY, and "BILL" LANGER—continued the campaign for increased research funds for four categories of national health: cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and dental care. When economy-minded colleagues attempted to slash these appropriations, MAGNUSON rose to answer.

"I am convinced," he told the Senate, "that more money for research now will save this Nation millions of dollars in the years to come. To those who would pursue a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, I say, 'You may not only lose your pennies, but the very heritage of democracy itself.' Our best exhibit of our democratic experiment lies, not in talking about human welfare, but in continually practicing it. Our fight to save thousands of Americans from death at the hands of these chronic killers is the most accurate barometer I know of our real concept of human values. It is our firm answer to the totalitarianism which holds that the individual is insignificant, particularly the weak and the sick."

The ultimate effect of MAGNUSON'S unceasing campaign for more funds for research in cancer and other dread diseases can be found in the United States appropriations figures. In 1946, the National Cancer Institute was granted $548,700 for its work.

Today, in 1956, the Institute is receiving $24,828,000—an increase of 4,600 percent in 10 years—for its farflung efforts to find the cause of cancer.

What has this expanded Federal support of medical research accomplished? A recent survey lists these tangible benefits: (1) Reduction in death rates from all causes of over 10 percent; and (2) increase in the average United States life expectancy of over 5 full years. In terms of statistics this has meant the saving of approximately 1 million American lives in the last 10 years. For the fiscal minded, this saving in human life has more than paid for the expenditures because it has increased the national income by over $1 billion.

Paradoxically, WARREN MAGNUSON is far from satisfied. "We've come a long way in cancer research in almost 20 years," he says. "But we've still got a long way to go. A recent survey made by the National Cancer Institute indicates that 34 out of every 100 Americans born in 1956 will eventually die of cancer.

"This is no time to be smug. Every year there are more than 500,000 new cases of cancer reported in the United States. At these rates, the number of cancer victims will increase by more than 50 percent during the next 25 years because both our population and our proportion of older citizens is expected to increase.

"This is an unhappy fact that all of us—the Government, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and individual citizens—must do something about. We must continue to apply the rules of Christianity to this fight."

Judging from the inspiring record of the last decade, it appears that something will be done about it—thanks to many unsung scientists working tirelessly in their laboratories, public officials like WARREN MAGNUSON, and organizations such as the Fraternal Order of Eagles. Together they are closing the net around cancer.

THREATS TO NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the first President of the United States loved wildlife. Thus the season of the anniversary of George Washington's birth, on February 22, is an appropriate time to call to the attention of the Senate the lack of protection which wildlife is suffering under Secretary of the Interior McKay.

I think that recent events make it necessary to examine all the factors which might underlie this trend away from sound resource policies.

It is recognized that privileges can accrue to large corporations through passage of legislation. But this also can occur by administrative act. Whether benefit is dispensed to a special interest by enactment of a law or by order of a governmental agency, the net effect is the same.

The President, in his veto of the natural gas bill, suggested that atmosphere which surrounded enactment of that bill has given rise to a questioning of the manner in which special interests such as the oil and gas industry obtain their objectives.

He said that he could not sign the bill without creating "doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes."

If, by his veto message, the President has intended to ask Congress to examine what, if any, pressures influenced an enactment by Congress, then it seems in order to also review recent administrative actions favoring the same industry.

I have no reason to believe that undue or improper pressures had any effect on congressional passage of the natural gas bill. But, if we are to inquire into the possibility that the gas and oil lobby wielded unseemly pressure on Congress, then the same cloud hangs over Executive acts which have also resulted in giving of benefits to these interests.

Recently, the Secretary of the Interior granted a 5-year renewable lease for oil drilling on the Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge. Because of the cloud which, according to the Presidential gas bill veto, hangs over resource management, I urge the President to suspend the lease agreement for a full restudy of that administrative decision.

I note from the testimony before a House committee on February 21 that Secretary McKay's office arranged a meeting between Interior Department officials and the president of the Seagram whisky distilleries. Two weeks after that meeting, the Interior Department agreed to a scheme of the Seagram company for oil drilling on 12,000 acres of the Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge in Louisiana.

The day after this agreement, Mr. McKay, according to the Washington Post and Times Herald, "revoked a 28-month-long stop order on refuge leasing and issued new regulations making the Lacassine lease possible."

The House committee also heard testimony from the Wildlife Management Institute that 577 oil leases have been issued on national refuges, not 82 or 89 as the Interior Department previously reported. About 50 of these were issued during the 28 months of Secretary McKay's stop order when such leases were presumably not to be granted. It is also obvious from the testimony that many were granted without consent or knowledge of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. President, the Lacassine refuge is important to the survival of valuable

waterfowl flying between the Arctic and the Tropics. The favoritism of the order to permit oil drilling on the Lacassine Wildlife Refuge to the Seagram distilleries is of a piece with Mr. McKay's favoritism to the Idaho Power Co.—a favoritism which may result ultimately in the wrecking of the steelhead-trout runs and the elk range of the Clearwater River system, as an alternative to Hells Canyon. It is comparable with Secretary McKay's complete willingness to see passed such legislation adverse to conservation as the Ellsworth-Cordon timber-exchange bill, a measure opposed by virtually every leading outdoor group in America.

Mr. President, I am contrite over the fact that Mr. McKay is a former Governor of my State. I shall do everything possible to halt the oil and gas depredations on national wildlife refuges, which he has set in motion.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 22, by Mr. Warren Unna, entitled "Interior Aid Is Quizzed on Refuge Oil Grant," and an article from the February 1956 issue of Sports Afield magazine by Mr. Michael Hudoba, entitled "Refuges Doomed?"

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 22, 1956]

INTERIOR AIDE IS QUIZZED ON REFUGE OIL GRANT

(By Warren Unna)

An Interior Department official told Congress yesterday he started processing an oil lease on a national wildlife refuge after the Secretary's office had set up an appointment between him and Frank R. Schwengel, president of Seagram distilleries.

J. Clark Salyer, Chief of the Fish and Wildlife Service's refuge branch, said Schwengel, whose company owns the Frankfort Oil Co., visited him last August 30 and phoned him with final details November 15.

Repeated Salyer: "He said he was very much interested in wildlife—in fact he and his wife maintain a private sanctuary in New York—but he was also interested in oil too."

Two weeks after Schwengel's call, Salyer declared, Interior wrote Samuel Nicasian, Schwengel's Washington attorney, declaring the company's operating plan for developing oil on 12,000 acres of Louisiana's Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge was acceptable.

This was last December 1. On December 2, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay revoked a 28-month-long stop order on refuge leasing and issued new regulations making the Lacassine lease possible

Salyer told the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee the lease was formally issued December 6 and backdated for bookkeeping purposes of Schwengel's Frankfort Oil Co. to December 1.

Salyer said he had twice denied previous applications for the Lacassine land—but "then we had a visit from President Schwengel."

Schwengel, a retired major general and World War I colleague in arms of President Eisenhower, could not be reached for comment. Neither could Nicasian.

The 5-year-long, 5-year-renewable Frankfort Oil lease was issued on a noncompetitive contract at the minimum 50-cent-per-acre fee and 12½ percent royalty. Salyer was careful to point out that Schwengel's company "agreed to increase their costs some $1 million" in order to meet conservation standards.

Committee Chairman HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, North Carolina, wondered: "Why were you in such a hurry" to issue the new refuge leasing regulations?

Salyer said some 300 applications for similar leases had been awaiting processing since Secretary McKay's August 1953 stop order. He added Lacassine has been the only lease granted in the 2½ months since the new regulations, but two others are being considered.

C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, a conservation group, testified 577 oil leases on national refuges have been issued since 1920, all but 11 of them during the 28 months of Secretary McKay's stop order, when no leases supposedly were being granted.

Interior has said a total of either 89 or 82 leases have been granted in refuge history and on one occasion said all but 25 of these were granted during the stop order period.

[From Sports Afield of February 1956]

REFUGES DOOMED?

(By Michael Hudoba)

This is it. Sports Afield, alarmed over the immense power in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, last June warned: One man can wipe out our wildlife refuges. Now it has happened. One man has proven that he has the power to defeat the very purpose of the entire refuge system.

With the plaudits of sportsmen still ringing in his ears for saving the 10,700 acres of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay has thrown the 17 million acres of national wildlife refuges wide open to exploitation.

Secretary McKay has made the lands of the national wildlife refuge system available to oil and gas leases. He has encouraged oil and gas drilling operations on these lands, reserved for wildlife restoration and vital to the future of our wildlife.

McKay has done what other interior secretaries have stoutly resisted over the years. He has reversed a long-standing policy to preserve the integrity of the wildlife refuges for wildlife conservation needs. He has put the Fish and Wildlife Service back on the sacrificial spot to try to defend every acre of national wildlife refuge lands against oil and gas exploitation.

In the past only several refuge areas acquired with public funds were potentially subject to oil and gas exploitation because the landowners who sold the lands to the Government reserved the mineral rights. McKay's action cancels the 2-year stop on any leasing of refuge lands and offers an invitation to exploit the refuge lands.

We can't charge an outright giveaway. While applications for oil and gas leases flooded the Fish and Wildlife Service the minute the gates were flung open, applicants will have to pay fees to the Government for the leases. Some 10 of the 272 refuges were exempted from leases. Among these were the ones conservationists defended with individual battles: Wichita, the Aransas whooping crane refuge, the Red Rock Lakes trumpeter swan refuge. And the leasers may be required to spend some money to do some things to prevent undue damage to the refuge land and protected wildlife in the oil- and gas-drilling areas. They won't be allowed to pollute the waters of the refuge area. Theoretically, the land will still be reserved for wildlife conservation.

But the fact that these national wildlife refuges are now open to oil and gas leasing applications will force refuge personnel who should be allowed to continue devoting their time to improvement of refuge lands for wildlife restoration, to become oil and gas experts. They will have to match wits with the exploiters to try to suggest ways exploring and drilling operations may be carried on to ease expected damage to the wildlife refuge purposes.

McKay's order, which had the approval of Assistant Secretary D'Ewart's office, piously says that wildlife values will be given first consideration in making leases for oil and gas operations. We thought all along that the refuge purpose was for wildlife. The order also sets up a code that gives the Fish and Wildlife Service the right to require the oil and gas lessees to submit proposed plans for drilling and operations on refuge lands to soften the damage to wildlife of the refuge area.

On the face of it, this seemed enough for the Interior Department and the administration to do for the public's national wildlife refuge system. Secretary McKay and those who got him into this may feel he should be commended for making the Fish and Wildlife Service the agency to monitor the oil and gas lease program plans by the drillers and exploiters. No thinking conservationist will be kidded by this token sop of conscience salve, however.

In reality, this order, opening the refuge lands to exploitation for the highly profitable mineral leases and fortified by Government tax incentive to do a lot of drilling, defeats and nullifies the basic refuge purposes. The refuges can now be only partially managed for the primary reason for which they were established. The refuge managers who represent the public interest must now divide their work and wildlife programs to save and salvage wildlife values on the lands which were specifically set aside for the primary wildlife needs. The management of the refuges for the public interest is now prostituted.

While we appreciate the secretary's seeming concern to have wildlife values protected on the refuges, it is little comfort to have the order outline details for the Fish and Wildlife Service to examine proposed drilling and exploitation operations for refuge lands. The effect of McKay's order openly invites the leasing of every acre of refuge land with but several exceptions.

We dislike to point out that the powerful pressures which forced the Interior Department under this administration to open up the refuge system (and which coincidentally got into the choice oil leases real early), have other points in their favor which could so easily nullify the intent of the wildlife protection factors in the oil and gas order.

Sports Afield readers will recall our serious concern over one of the first actions of this administration in taking office. That was to take the directorship and assistant directorships of the Fish and Wildlife Service from under the protection of career civil service and making these subject to political appointment, with all the vulnerability that such appointments have to face, especially when concerned with protecting public interest values holding valuable resources in their programs.

In the face of the oil- and gas-leasing order, it would be almost too much to ask protection for national wildlife refuges by administrators who had the backing of civil service. Even at that, no human being should be required to try to insist on wildlife values in the refuge system while subject to all the torments that political pressure can apply, especially when big money is at stake, as it is in this oil- and gas-lease operations program.

With McKay's signature on the order, the Fish and Wildlife Service was almost immediately swamped with applications for oil and gas leases. The Service now has to prove the value of the wildlife and the wildlife restoration lands against each oil- and gas-lease application and against each proposed drilling operation.

Prior to Secretary McKay's order, it was the other way round. It has been a long-standing policy that the 17½-million acres of refuge land—those bought with sportsmen's duck-stamp dollars, those with ap-

propriations by Congress for specific and primary wildlife conservation needs, and even those signed over from unwanted public lands—should be maintained as the last remnants of lands needed to hold hope for wildlife futures.

Where do we go from here?

Conservationists felt that Congress had taken steps to protect wildlife refuges when a last-ditch and last-minute effort brought amendments into the Atomic Energy and Mineral Leasing Acts during the last hours of the 83d Congress. These provided that any leases for national park, monument and wildlife land could be made only when the President, by executive order, finds and declares that such action is necessary in the interest of national defense.

Is Secretary McKay's order legal in view of this intent of Congress?

Is there any integrity in the administration that can rise to defend the limited lands reserved for the public interest?

Is it too much to hope that Secretary McKay will see the damage he has wrought and take steps to repair it?

Was this done with President Eisenhower's approval and will the President take the necessary prompt steps to save the national wildlife refuge system?

We can only hope that Congress will take a hard look at this order, and that the sportsman-conservationists of the country will take a harder look—with articulate expression.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

I should like to inform attachés of the Senate that we shall proceed with the quorum call and that I do not expect to ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Barkley	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Chavez	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Sparkman
Cotton	Knowland	Stennis
Curtis	Kuchel	Symington
Daniel	Langer	Thurmond
Duff	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent in order to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are also necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

CRITICISM BY L. BRENT BOZELL OF HEARINGS ON SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am not a regular reader of the new, widely advertised, self-styled "conservative" magazine, the National Review. From what I have seen for it, I do not consider it either required or recommended reading.

I have seen enough of it, however, to be aware of its misstatements of fact, particularly when these misstatements concern my own activities. The issue of the National Review for February 22, 1956, is a case in point. In it Mr. L. Brent Bozell devotes a paragraph to the subcommittee on Government security which conducted hearings last year.

Mr. Bozell's misstatements are the kind that could be easily checked. Hence I can only conclude that they were written with a deliberate intent to deceive. The pertinent paragraph occurs in an article by Mr. Bozell called National Trends, appearing on page 17:

> A subcommittee that looked into the Humphrey resolution for setting up a special security commission had the first crack, and called as its star witness one Joseph L. Rauh, Jr. Rauh obligingly set forth the criteria for a good security program (arguing, generally, that the less security the better the program); whereupon the subcommittee called a spate of lesser personages (discharged Government employees) who obligingly proved with tales of their own "persecution," that by Rauh's standards the administration's program was very bad indeed.

Mr. President, these statements about the work of the Humphrey subcommittee are demonstrably false. Mr. Rauh did testify, but he was by no means a "star witness." The star witnesses were in fact high-ranking officials of a number of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and the bulk of the testimony heard by the subcommittee was from such officials.

Mr. Rauh's complete testimony, including his prepared statement, consumed only 18 pages of the 1,350 pages of the published hearings. A number of witnesses from private life testified at much greater length. For example, the testimony of the representative of Douglas Aircraft Co. consumed 32 pages; the testimony of the representatives of the University of Chicago consumed 21 pages; the testimony of the representative of the Federation of American Scientists consumed 20 pages; the testimony of the representative of the CIO consumed 25 pages; the testimony of the representatives of Engineers and Scientists of America consumed 21 pages; and the testimony of the representatives of the American Civil Liberties Union consumed 22 pages.

In addition, contrary to Mr. Bozell's statement, the subcommittee did not call a single discharged Government employee and did not receive testimony concerning any cases of persecution or abuse or specific abuses of the security program. A scrupulous effort was made at all times to avoid bringing into the hearings any reference to specific loyalty-security cases or any particular situations of alleged abuse.

Mr. President, I am sure that this kind of journalistic distortion will not be countenanced by any of the other Members of the Senate or of the subcommittee, to whose attention I am bringing this matter. I think we can expect more honest treatment even from those journalists who disagree with us and even in the columns of the National Review. I hope that the editors of that publication will feel obligated to bring the comments I have just made to the attention of their readership.

Mr. President, I assure the Senate that this statement has been sent to the editor of the National Review, and I am looking forward to an appropriate retraction, because the comments in the article are unfair, biased, distorted, and do anything but justice to the diligence of the members of the subcommittee which reported unanimously on the security commission, and the measure was adopted unanimously by the Senate. The hearings were conducted in line with the most friendly, considerate, and objective points of view.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

MAJOR QUESTIONS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the New York Times yesterday and today, Mr. James Reston has contributed two long and thoughtful articles on the major questions facing us on the international scene. These columns were written in anticipation of the appearance tomorrow of the Secretary of State before the Foreign Relations Committee. I should like to say that I consider Mr. Reston's questions precisely to the point, and I hope the examination which the Foreign Relations Committee will conduct tomorrow will be as searching an inquiry as Mr. Reston suggests.

Mr. President, it is my intention, at the meeting of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations tomorrow, to question Mr. Dulles in considerable detail on many of the points Mr. Reston has raised, as well as on other points about which I have made public comment from time to time in the Senate and in the press.

I am very definitely disturbed by what I consider to be the deterioration of

American foreign policy and by the failure of the Secretary of State and the administration to make clear to the American people what our foreign policy is in many of the crucial areas of the world.

I can think of no more important meeting than the hearing which will take place tomorrow afternoon before the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is my hope that it will be a public hearing. I think the business of the Government should be public, especially when the destiny of the Nation is at stake, and when great policies relating to the life and well-being of the Republic are to be discussed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles written by Mr. Reston may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 21, 1956]

DULLES TO FACE AN INVESTIGATION ON FOREIGN POLICY—FUROR ON ARMS FOR MIDEAST SPURS CONGRESSIONAL DEMAND FOR CLEARER PROGRAM—CHANGING STAND SCORED—LACK OF STRATEGY TO MEET SOVIET BID FOR EXPANSION FEARED IN WASHINGTON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 21.—Secretary of State Dulles will return from his vacation tomorrow to face a full-scale congressional investigation of the administration's foreign policy.

The investigation was called for Friday by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Walter F. George of Georgia. It will inquire into the twistings and turnings of the administration's arms policy in the Middle East.

It will range well beyond that region, however, for there is more apprehension in the Capitol today about the conduct of foreign policy than at any time since the Korean war.

This apprehension has been caused primarily by the Communist political and economic offensive in the Middle East and south Asia, and by the fear, which has been growing steadily here in the last few months, that the administration has miscalculated Communist strategy and has no effective policy to meet it.

THIRD CONTROVERSY OF KIND

During the last few days the sense of uneasiness in the Capitol about the conduct of foreign policy has been inflamed by the administration's discovery that it was about to ship 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia, by the sudden announcement from the President's headquarters in Georgia of an embargo on all such shipments of arms to the Middle East and the lifting of that embargo the following afternoon.

This is the third time that the administration has become involved in a major international controversy while Mr. Dulles was on vacation. The last time, the State Department issued a formal statement characterizing the decision to open diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and West Germany as a victory for the West, though this was widely regarded elsewhere as a dangerous defeat.

The time before that, the State Department, in Mr. Dulles' absence, rebuffed Communist China's offers of talks on the Taiwan (Formosa) crisis and had to be reversed when the Secretary of State returned.

These considerations have given rise to the question of who runs the foreign policy of the United States when Mr. Dulles and the President are away. The Saudi Arabian tank deal is coming in for special attention because it has followed fairly closely upon what are widely regarded here as a number of other foreign policy blunders.

FACTORS IN QUESTIONING MOOD

Among these are the following:

The Secretary of State's interview with Life magazine in which he created an international controversy by asserting that the Nation had been carried three times in the last three years to the "brink" of war.

Mr. Dulles' characterization of Goa as a "province" of Portugal, a statement that contributed to what Ambassador John Sherman Cooper is back in Washington describing as "the steady deterioration of United States relations with India."

The long and fruitless arguments between the United States and the so-called uncommitted nations of Asia over a number of issues at the last meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in New York.

Official assertions in Washington that the Soviet Union was being forced into a more reasonable policy by American "initiative" and by an economic crisis in the Soviet Union.

Finally, the failure of the President and the Secretary of State to make an issue of Communist maneuvering in the Middle East at the Big Four meeting in Geneva last July, though the Government had official knowledge at that time that the Arab States were in negotiation for Communist arms long before that time.

LOSS OF INITIATIVE SEEN

These factors have contributed to a widespread feeling here that Communist doctrine and Communist tactics have undergone a radical change since the death of Stalin, and that in the last year, particularly since the illness of the President, the United States has lost the initiative in the world struggle with the Communists.

Congress has heard solemn testimony in recent days that the Soviet Union has surpassed the United States in some aspects of the race for the development of long-range guided missiles.

It is particularly upset by official testimony that Moscow may well be the first to produce a 1,500-mile guided missile that would place many vital United States overseas air bases in danger and greatly strengthen the Soviet Union's power of diplomatic blackmail.

Reports from West Germany of the weakening of the pro-Western Adenauer coalition, reports of growing weakness in Turkey, and of misuse of American economic aid in South Korea have all led to widespread demands, not merely for an investigation of the Middle Eastern situation, but for a searching inquiry into the whole purpose and machinery of American foreign policy.

EARLIER DIFFICULTIES RECALLED

The atmosphere here today is much like that of the periods before the adoption of the Marshall plan and the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty shield for Western Europe.

Before these fundamental political decisions there was a general realization here that the policies that were being followed at the time were not working, that the Western nations were losing ground, and that conditions in the world were forcing the adoption of new concepts and new policies.

There was a period before the Marshall plan, similar to that today, when officials differed in their estimates of the danger and, therefore, in their recommendations of what should be done.

Then, as now, officials ran into the difficulty of slowing down the heavy and complicated machinery of Government; legitimate policy criticism became involved in partisan debate; and, as always, officials with vested interests in past decisions found pretexts for doing nothing.

All these elements are involved in the present situation. There is a general realization that the past emphasis on military alliances will not deal with the Communist economic and political offensive from the eastern Mediterranean to the Sea of Japan. There is agreement, too, that the main objective of Soviet policy now is to destroy Western connections and influence in this vast Asian circle, and that this must be blocked at any cost.

NO AGREEMENT ON PROGRAM

There is no agreement, however, about what should be done. Some United States naval and air power has been moved into the eastern Mediterranean to demonstrate that the West does not intend merely to be pushed out of that area, but the Government is divided about whether, and how much, and what kind of aid should be given to the Israelis.

It is this uncertainty that has contributed to so many contradictory acts by the United States in the Middle East and south Asia and even to the feeling in the Saudi Arabian deal that each department was acting on its own, without any strong leadership from the top, or even any check to see whether contracts signed long ago conformed with American policy at the moment of shipment.

The Democrats, of course, have tried to exploit these difficulties in the last few months, and one result of this has been to give many people the impression that the criticism is just so much political maneuvering in the presidential campaign.

The situation here is far too serious, and the criticism far too widespread within the executive branch of the Government, however, to be dismissed as campaign carping.

Officials here concede that never has there been such a note of confidence in Soviet utterances as in the last week; never so much evidence that the Russians do have an explorable surplus of some capital goods that they are exchanging for much needed food, and never since World War II a more subtle or complex international challenge for the United States.

A NEW SET OF CONDITIONS

In Europe, during the Marshall plan crisis the United States was dealing with industrial societies and with social systems that were familiar. It was not difficult to get good well-trained personnel to go into those areas.

In the Middle East and in south Asia and the Far East, however, the problem is much more difficult. Able personnel willing to work for years amid the pestilence of many of these areas are not easy to find. The fund of information and of good judgment about these areas in the Government here is not impressive, and the nature of the crisis itself is difficult to make clear to a vast electorate or even to Congress.

There is no military attack to dramatize the crisis, as in Korea. There is no established industrial system in any of these countries to be restored. Government, industrial, and even agricultural skill is in short supply throughout the region, and Congress in Washington is oriented to granting military rather than economic or political aid.

Thus Mr. Dulles has his work cut out for him. Many Senators are sure the cold-war policy of the United States is losing ground, but they have no clear idea about what should be done, and they have heard little from the administration in recent months to give them a sense of clear imaginative direction.

Consequently, they are demanding answers from the Secretary of State before the Secretary has even discussed some of the problems with the President.

[From the New York Times of February 23, 1956]

GEORGE FEARS LAG IN COLD WAR PLAN—SENATOR SEES UNITED STATES INITIATIVE WAVERING—IS DISTURBED BY CAPITAL'S UNCERTAINTY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said today he was afraid the Western nations had temporarily lost the initiative in the cold war.

He is "disturbed," he added about what seems to be the uncertainty of American actions in the Middle East and South Asia in the last few months.

However, he noted, he does not have sufficient information on which to base a definitive judgment on the present world situation, partly because, he said, there has been a noticeable decline in his contacts with administrative leaders since the President's heart attack last September.

Mr. GEORGE said he intended to question Secretary of State Dulles as soon as possible on the present trend of United States and Soviet policy. An appointment has been scheduled for Mr. Dulles with the full Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on Friday.

These comments, made in a conversation with this reporter, are typical of many others being heard here these days, not only on Capitol Hill but among well-informed officials in the departments and agencies charged with the formulation and operation of foreign policy.

There is general agreement in the capital about the reasons for the uneasiness expressed by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Among these are the following:

Both United States and Soviet foreign policy are in transition. Both the United States and the Soviet Union retain their same objectives, but their leaders agreed at the Big Four meeting in Geneva last July to rule out war as a means of achieving these objectives.

There is a crisis of leadership in the Western World. Sir Winston Churchill has retired, leaving his successor, Sir Anthony Eden, to deal with another perplexing economic squeeze. France is paralyzed by political instability, and President Eisenhower has been out of action or out of Washington most of the time since last August.

These conditions have coincided with a revolution in modern weapons, which has upset all the strategic calculations of the North Atlantic Treaty powers. They have also coincided with an arms race in which the Soviet Union has made much more rapid progress in the guided missile field than official Washington's estimates have indicated.

Meanwhile, the Western alliance has been weakened by the loosening of ancient ties with Egypt, the growing nationalism of the Middle East and South Asia, and the decline of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's political authority in West Germany.

COLD WAR STRATEGY LAGS

In addition to the Communist initiative in Asia, the revolution in weapons, the crisis of leadership in the West, and the decline of Dr. Adenauer's power in Germany, another familiar complaint is being widely discussed in Washington.

This is that the United States Government has still not developed an effective cold war strategy, or even an efficient Government apparatus for developing such a strategy.

It is now agreed that a new phase of the cold war is on, and that under the Geneva Big Four Agreement it will be fought out in the fields of political, economic, and psychological warfare. Yet no one here professes that the Government is properly set up to conduct effective economic and psychological warfare, or that it has a clear policy that its economists or propagandists can follow in the Middle East and South Asia.

For example, responsibility for conducting the administration's foreign aid program has been steadily dispersed in the last 2 years. The military-aid program is now in the Pentagon; the distribution of agricultural surpluses, which could be an effective foreign policy asset, is in the Agricultural Department, and even officials at the Cabinet level concede that foreign economic policy is so widely distributed through the Government that it does not have the coordinated direction it needs.

This is one reason for the off-again, on-again performance of the Government on Middle East arms policy in the last few days.

A shipment of tanks for Saudi Arabia was authorized months ago. The Pentagon recommended it and the State Department authorized it, but nobody followed the order through to see whether it conformed with United States national interests at the point, months later, when the tanks were ready for shipment.

When the shipment was discovered and publicized, there was a hullabaloo here, and no one knew for a while whether this was actually a Government-authorized deal or whether someone was shipping tanks without a valid export license.

Consequently, with the Secretary of State out of the city, the decision was passed on to the President at Thomasville, Ga., where no one knew anything about the deal and an embargo was merely slapped on to give time to find out. The embargo was lifted the next day.

FACTIONS DISPERSE POLICY

In the foreign economic aid field, the Cabinet is divided, with one faction feeling that the United States should dramatize a much more ambitious program for the Middle East and Asia, while another faction is inclined to believe that the emphasis should be kept on military aid and that foreign economic aid should be kept at the present level.

Meanwhile, the post of Presidential Assistant for Psychological Warfare Questions has been vacant since Nelson Rockefeller left in December. William H. Jackson, of Princeton, N. J., will take over the job March 1, but there is still no agreement in the Government about what the job is.

This is an old Washington problem. Early in 1931, during the Korean war, there was strong feeling in the Government that a major effort should be made to develop a strategic concept that would put more order and drive into the Nation's worldwide struggle with the Communists.

At that time it was proposed that a chief of staff for the cold war be established, with responsibility under the President for developing and supervising a coordinated strategy.

This ran into opposition from the established departments of Government, which felt that their prerogatives and authority might be weakened, so a compromise Psychological Strategy Board was established under Gordon Gray, now Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

In the Eisenhower administration, the men who have tried to carry on the same kind of work—C. D. Jackson and Nelson Rockefeller—have run into constant trouble with members of the Cabinet who resented their interventions.

THE FINANCING OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts devotes an interesting column to two proposals which have originated in Minnesota and which affect a major question now before the Senate and the country, namely, the question of the financing of political campaigns. Mr. Byron G. Allen, presently State commissioner of agriculture in Minnesota, and formerly Democratic national committeeman in Minnesota, has been instrumental in promoting both of these proposals,

The first of them has actually reached the statute books. Last April, Minnesota altered its income-tax laws to permit deductions for political contributions and for the campaign expenses of candidates for office. In his column this morning, Mr. Roberts discusses the details of this Minnesota law and its applicability elsewhere.

I might suggest at this point, Mr. President, that the statute or public law of Minnesota relating to tax deductions for political contributions is one which merits the immediate attention of Congress. It surely legitimatizes and regularizes the matter of campaign funds, and makes each and every one of them a matter of public record.

In the same column, Mr. Roberts discusses a more sweeping proposal, which has also been made by Mr. Allen. It would involve a congressional charter for a new nonpartisan foundation to collect funds for campaign contributions. I am certain this proposal, too, will be of interest to the Senate, particularly in the wake of the new bill, S. 3242, introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], which has attracted considerable attention here during the past few days.

It is my intention, in cooperation, I hope, with other of my colleagues in the Senate who will join me, to introduce a bill along the lines which Mr. Allen has discussed in his excellent article. I have known Mr. Allen for many years. He has spent years of his time in a study of the particular subject on which I now address the Senate.

I am confident that Mr. Allen and other Minnesota officials would welcome an opportunity to discuss both the Minnesota law and this second proposal for Federal legislation before appropriate committees of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Roberts may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMPAIGN DONATIONS: AUTHOR OF MINNESOTA CURBS HAS PLAN FOR NATION

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

If the coming senatorial investigation of lobbying and election practices is to have any lasting value, it must lead to major changes in the methods of financing political campaigns. Minnesota offers suggestions on what might be done.

Last April Minnesota altered State income tax laws to permit two new sets of tax deductions: for political contributions and for campaign expenses of candidates for office.

Any citizen may deduct up to $100 for his contribution "to a political party, candidate or political cause." County chairmen may deduct up to $150; congressional district committeemen up to $350 and national committeemen and State chairmen up to $1,000 each. (The $100 exemption idea applied to Federal income tax has been proposed by

Representative STEWART L. UDALL (Democrat, of Arizona) and Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, Jr. (Democrat, of Missouri), but nothing has been done about it so far.)

The Minnesota law also provides that candidates may deduct "unreimbursed campaign expenditures personally paid" by the candidate up to these levels: candidates for governor or United States Senator, $5,000; for other State office or United States Representative, $3,500; for State senator, State representative, presidential electors at large, $500; for presidential electors chosen by congressional districts, $100; for "any other public office," one-fourth of that office's annual salary, a provision covering mayors, councilmen and so forth.

The Minnesota law is the baby of Byron G. Allen, State Commissioner of Agriculture and former Democratic national committeeman. Allen has said that "as a working politician, I know the subterfuges that are used" to get around the current campaign expenditure limitations of the Federal Corrupt Practices Acts. "I know," he said, "that the realities require money which must be passed under the table."

Allen would like to see the Minnesota law serve as a model for a new Federal deductions plan. But he also has a more sweeping idea which he recently brought to Washington.

He wants to raise money, big money in total, but made up to small contributions, this way: Have Congress grant a Federal charter, such as that to the American Red Cross, to a new foundation for campaign contribution collections. The foundation would be run by a broadly representative board of directors not packed with practical politicians, as Allen puts it. It would seek contributions from 10 cents up with some unspecified limitation to be set.

Up to this point Allen's proposal is somewhat similar to the one the advertising council was prepared to take on for the 1956 presidential election.

But Allen goes further. He also proposes to distribute the money collected this way: 25 percent each to national committees, State committees, congressional committees, and county committees. But not on a 50–50 basis between the two major parties.

Allen suggests that of each 25 percent share half the money go to the majority party, as judged by the last election returns. The other half would be divided among opposition parties in proportion to their share of the minority vote at the last election. This would mean small amounts for Socialists, Prohibitionists, or splinter groups in various States and counties as well as on a national level. Of course, it also means that a Democrat's $10 contribution might end up helping the GOP or vice versa.

Allen would have the money paid out this way: The party committees would spend it as they see fit, drawing funds from the foundation on vouchers and accounting in detail on the public record.

If the scheme worked well, Allen figures State legislators could then charter State foundations to take over State and local contributions—or the Federal foundation might be limited to funds for Federal office, leaving to State foundations the job of raising funds for use in State and local campaigns. A good many variants on these ideas are possible. One point is important: A lot of people would contribute to a nonpartisan foundation who would not contribute to either party.

In Minnesota the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party sponsors the Minnesota Foundation for Political Education, modeled on European party fund-raising tactics and experiences. This foundation has begun to collect contributions from $1 to $100 and gets 1 percent of the net proceeds of such party affairs as the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners and congressional dinners for its endowment fund.

The idea of this foundation, in Allen's words, is to improve political ethics in the State to the end that campaigns in Minnesota will be educational in value rather than merely biennial emotional binges. The word "educational" includes the idea of lecture courses, political reading rooms on the Swedish model, schools for candidates, fellowships for youthful and impoverished candidates, and political internships such as some colleges and other groups now annually conduct in Washington Government and congressional offices.

Allen's ideas are certain to run into a lot of practical objections from practical politicians who would prefer to let things remain as they are. But the $2,500 campaign contribution to Senator FRANCIS CASE (Republican, of South Dakota) already has opened up the contributions issue despite the practical men in Congress who would have preferred to keep the lid on. If the future investigation turns out to be meaningful, such ideas as those Allen offers may serve as models for cleaning up one of the least odoriferous phases of the democratic process.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hope the special committee which was authorized by the resolution agreed to yesterday will most carefully and in considerable detail consider the suggestions which have been made by Mr. ALLEN. If only we would seek it, there is a great fund of information to be obtained from many of the nonpartisan and thoroughly profesional groups throughout the country, which would contribute to the deliberations of the special committee.

At a later time I shall address myself in greater detail to this all-important subject matter. I commend the present Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], upon the introduction of his bill. I think it is a very constructive proposal and one which merits the utmost consideration by Congress.

PROPAGANDA AGAINST COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I regret to say that in the propaganda now being circulated by organized opposition to the Colorado River storage project, some of which has appeared in the RECORD from time to time, there is a great deal of misinformation and distortion of fact.

Mr. Barnet Nover, a veteran correspondent and chief of the Denver Post Washington bureau, in his column of February 19 in the Denver Post, has ably pointed out some of these falsehoods and distortions. I ask unanimous consent to have the column printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROUNDUP ON THE POTOMAC

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON.—As the day nears when the House of Representatives will begin taking up the bill authorizing the upper Colorado storage project, the shrieking and shouting, the calculated distortions and out-and-out prevarications of the southern California water lobbyists are reaching new highs.

The theory they are operating on is the one dreamed up by Hitler and perfected by the Kremlin, namely, the greater the lie the more people are likely to believe it, particularly if the lie is repeated often enough and loudly enough.

A good example of this southern California "big lie" technique is to be found in the latest folder the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles has now begun to distribute literally by the millions.

The point of the folder is that it makes no sense to be taking "40 million acres of land out of production and put it in a so-called soil bank 'while adding' 580,000 new acres of arid mountain land in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico and Wyoming at a cost to the Government (you) of $4 billion."

"And these lands," the folder continues "would grow more surplus crops."

This contention would make sense if it were true. It happens that there is not a shred of truth in it, as the southern California water lobbyists know perfectly well.

They come from a State which has benefited more from the 54-year-old reclamation program than any other State in the Union.

They knew—since the figures are abundantly available—that only a negligible percentage of the irrigated crops produced in California or in any other reclamation State is in the surplus category.

In fact, their own propaganda bears this out.

On the front page of this particular leaflet are pictures of a bulging bin marked "butter, milk, cotton, wool," and a bursting crib marked "corn, wheat, rice, grains." These are the surpluses costing the Government $8 billion which are horrendously portrayed on the front page of the folder, aside from grains, which presumably would include feedstuffs grown on irrigated lands and not in surplus, not a single one of these products is produced in any considerable quantities on reclamation lands.

This fact was pointed out for the umptieth time by W. A. Dexheimer, United States Commissioner of Reclamation, in a speech in New York last week.

Paying his respects to what he described as "the scattergun attack" launched on the upper Colorado project by southern California, and to the "apparently limitless war chest" which "has enabled this opposition to take a one-sided story to the far corners of the country," Dexheimer recalled some of the extraordinary economic benefits the Nation has derived from reclamation projects.

He cited the Boulder Canyon project, the Imperial Dam, the All-American Canal, the Colorado-Big Thompson.

With the exception of some cotton acreage, he said, none of the millions of dollars of agricultural products produced by those projects was in surplus.

"Most of it," Dexheimer explained, "was high priced specialty crops such as head lettuce and carrots for your winter salads. The same holds true of our other projects as well. Only a small tonnage of price-supported crops is grown on reclamation projects."

Then there is this matter of cost. The leaflet in question uses again that wholly discredited figure of $4 billion as the alleged cost of the upper Colorado scheme.

The House measure, soon to be voted on, has a price tag of only $760 million. But what is a 500 percent plus distortion to the sun-tanned Goebbelses of Smogland? The bigger the lie * * *

Also, nowhere in the leaflet is there the slightest suggestion that any of the money to be appropriated for the construction of the storage plan will be repaid, even though most of it will; that it will take 20 to 25 years to complete the project; and that repayments will begin long before the project has been finished.

The further thought occurs that since President Eisenhower favors the project, as

he has repeatedly made clear, he, like its other advocates, is trying to perpetuate a fraud on the American taxpayer.

Is this what the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles wants the country to believe?

SUSPENSION OF WES SANTEE BY AMATEUR ATHLETIC UNION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Monday morning I called the attention of the Senate to what I described as the cruel and unfair treatment given one of our Kansas boys, Wes Santee, by the Amateur Athletic Union.

I can report that there is general indignation throughout the Nation over this incident. The American people believe in fair play, and the autocratic attitude of the AAU in suspending Wes Santee from amateur standing for life is more than they are going to take without moral indignation and resentment. They are expressing themselves in no uncertain terms.

Typical of the correspondence and telegrams I have received from all over the Nation are some of the messages I have received from Kansas, and I ask unanimous consent that they be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT BEND, KANS., *February 21, 1956.*
The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: We are shocked and disturbed at the AAU-Santee ruling which in effect places the 1956 United States Olympic team at the mercy of the known professional athletes of Russia.

We request the Congress of the United States protect the distinguished reputation of this country's Olympic team, and protect the citizens of the United States from the humiliation of a Russian propaganda. Introduce corrective legislation if need be, to rectify this shameful undeserved abuse of our Nation's top miler from Kansas.

Respectfully,
THE GREAT BEND ROTARY CLUB,
WILLIAM C. COOK, *President.*

GREAT BEND, KANS., *February 21, 1956.*
The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The suspension of Kansas mile king Wes Santee strikes us as an outrage—ruinous to Wes, crippling to this Nation's 1956 Olympic hopes.

As one of the clubs of the national Jaycee organization pledged to help raise a million dollars for the Olympics, we feel the AAU owes this Nation and us an answer. We respectfully urge a Senate inquiry of this shocking affair, hopeful that any and all steps will be taken to protect the rights of the American citizen not be humiliated before the world next summer by the salaried professional athletes of the U. S. S. R.

Respectfully,
GREAT BEND JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
CHRIS HILDENBRAND, Jr., *President.*

LAWRENCE, KANS., *February 22, 1956.*
Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building:

We wholeheartedly commend and endorse your interest and efforts on behalf of our fellow Kansan, Wes Santee. We feel confident that the entire State of Kansas joins us in strenuous protest against the gross injustice and despicable treatment meted out by the AAU to Santee. It is suggested that you contact Vincent X. Flaherty, sports editor, Los Angeles Examiner, who has publicly stated in his column, that he has definite knowledge of one track athlete who accumulated $2,000 on four amateur track appearances, and further states that he has additional ammunition for Santee.

You are assured that you will gain the enduring gratitude and appreciation of all Kansans for your continued efforts in rectifying the base injustice done to a western Kansas boy.

SPORTS COMMITTEE, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, LAWRENCE, KANS.

GREAT BEND, KANS., *February 22, 1956.*
Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: Argonne Post, No. 180, American Legion of Great Bend, Kans., by proper motion unanimously and respectfully urges you to initiate a Senate inquiry into the shocking and disgusting AAU-Santee incident, and that corrective legislation be enacted if need be to free our athletes from such prejudiced and petty tyrannies so abhorrent to the American way of life. We appeal to you to help insure all of our American athletes fundamental fairness and freedom from such reprehensible and irresponsible attacks.

We feel action imperative not only because of the vicious, undeserved, and isolated crucifixion of our greatest United States distance runner, Kansas athlete, United States marine, and Legionnaire, but most of all because the final effect of this AAU hypocrisy might well be to bar every United States athlete of prominence from any competition, and to set the stage for the humiliating defeat of our heretofore distinguished Olympic team this summer.

We don't think the United States, because of AAU stupid and outmoded ideas of amateurism should be placed at the mercy of the known salaried professional athletes of Russia, and our citizens and way of life undergo another humiliating Communist propaganda defeat before the eyes of the world.

Respectfully,
ARGONNE POST, No. 180, AMERICAN LEGION. BOYD, ADJUTANT.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald in regard to the suspension of Wes Santee by the Amateur Athletic Union. The article was written by Shirley Povich, who is one of the outstanding sports writers in the Nation.

There have been thousands of articles written in regard to the Santee suspension, and this one is not only typical, but is a correct statement of the situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MORNING
(By Shirley Povich)

Always more or less present in the editorialists' precincts is the temptation to rear back and stomp on the AAU. Maybe that is because the AAU is an outfit with a high quota of badge-wearing stuffed shirts who come out of the woodwork at intervals and nibble at the edges of the fame of the athletes they have enrolled.

Usually, the deterrent is that it isn't a very sporting contest and sometimes is compared to shooting fish in a barrel, because there is no escape for the AAU people from their own entrapment. In fact, if it were not for the damage they sometimes do, they could be called career chumps.

However, in the Wes Santee case the other day in which they came up with the decision that there was cause for lifetime expulsion from amateur ranks, the AAU action had considerable merit. Too bad they bungled it by singling out the wrong defendant.

They should have brought not only Santee but those 22 conniving rules-breaking badge-wearing AAU track meet promoters before the bar of AAU justice. Theirs were the greater sins. Santee admitted taking more money than the rules allowed for his appearances in meets, but says he was baited into it by the AAU's own pious members.

Unless the AAU follows up the disbarment of Santee with similar action against every one of its officials involved in the mess, its decree against the Kansas miler must stand as an unconscionable thing more reprehensible than anything he has been accused of.

Santee told this bureau yesterday that he did not deny the allegations that he received more expense money than the rules allow, except in one instance when he denied knowledge of a $400 payment to his father-in-law.

"Here's the way it worked, though," Santee said.

"These people who run the AAU meets would phone me and ask me to run in their meets. I guess they wanted me because I've run the mile faster than any other American and would help their gate receipts.

Always, they asked me how much I wanted for expenses. They knew the rules put a limit of $15 a day and transportation on the expenses, but that didn't stop them from asking me my price.

"I never gave them a price. I never held out for any figure. They were the ones who always asked me if I would take, say, $200 for the trip. I'd say 'Yes' and I knew it was more than I was allowed. But so did the AAU promoters, and they were the ones who instigated the overpayment."

Certainly there are some questions to be asked of the AAU, as Senator CARLSON, of Kansas, has said he will ask in a congressional investigation of AAU tactics. The first one that pops into mind is, was it Santee's responsibility to keep in line those AAU track people who, in effect, bribed him to enter their special, favorite meets? That would be tantamount to reminding the enforcers to obey the law.

And how come the AAU did not show the same vigorous interest in investigating those AAU promoters who propositioned Santee into violating the rules? Their sins are down in black and white on the financial statements of the meets they conducted, yet all they drew was a wrist-slapping reminder not to do it again.

Oh, there were a couple of expulsions besides Santee's that were handed out. Two California AAU officials were given the heave; also a man described as a publicity director for one of the meets. In the case of the publicist, however, the AAU was tossing out a fellow who wasn't even an AAU member, it was later learned. But the big body of AAU promoters who offered the money that Santee accepted were given only a mild reprimand.

The overpayments to Santee added up to a sum something less than colossal, about $1,500 for the 22 meets in which he engaged. Granted that it was not the size of the payments but the principle of them, the action against Santee appears to be excessively harsh, particularly in view of the lack of action against the equally sinful AAU promoters.

It's rough on a lad who for 11 years has dreamed of winning the equivalent of the Olympic mile and now is branded for life. The tragic thing is that life ban, by itself, is a powerful association of words in the

public mind. It could leave a man undeservedly marked even if his sin were no more than picking violets out of season, which might earn him ban for life from the Great Eastern Region Horticultural Society Accreditation Department.

The treatment given Santee might be more easily condoned if it were not an AAU action. That outfit's contributions to amateurism are often suspected, particularly in terms of those expensive Olympic junkets on which badge-wearing officials are almost as numerous as the athletes. "Oceangoing hitchhikers," the articulate Phog Allen, Kansas University coach, once called them in what was, for Allen, mild disgust.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order entered on yesterday, the Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on yesterday during the course of the debate on the farm bill, I pointed out that only two provisions in the bill would give immediate help to the farmers of the United States during 1956. One of those provisions is an increase in the support levels; the other is an authorization of a quarter of a billion dollars to supplement section 32 funds. It will be recalled that under section 32, only one-fourth of the funds available can be spent for any one commodity. On the other hand, the $250 million provided for in this measure has no restrictions attached; all of it or half of it or one-fourth of it can be spent for any particular commodity.

On yesterday, Mr. President, I also pointed out that, contrary to the position taken by Mr. Benson, lower price-supports do not decrease the production of farm commodities. I think I demonstrated that fact in referring to what has happened in the last 3 years with respect to our basic commodities. I documented the fact that lowered support levels do not bring decreased production, or decreased plantings of allotted acres. On the contrary, as price-support lands have dropped, farmers have increased their per acre production and have planted all, or practically all of their acreage allotments.

At this time I wish to continue with my main address, which as I indicated yesterday, is a general statement of the provisions of the bill. I invite any Senator to ask questions at any time he may desire; and if I can answer them, I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. President, before the hearings on the farm program began, I had high hopes that any new farm legislation would contain a formula whereby the Government could support the prices of readily merchantable commodities—that is to say, farm commodities for which a ready demand exists—at high levels, and could permit supports for less desirable commodities to flex downward to lower levels. I felt that by so doing we could stimulate the production of grades and kinds of farm commodities which could flow into channels of consumption, which would better meet the actual market requirements, and discourage production of less desirable types and grades of commodities.

Unfortunately, this idea had to be abandoned. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was informed by the experts of the Department of Agriculture that it would be impossible to write into law any standard which could be applied to determine which commodities are readily salable. In other words, the Department officials took the position that if we attempted to follow through on the theory of basing support levels for farm commodities on the desires of the market, we would place the administrators of the law in an impossible position. We were told that one grade of a commodity which is in demand today may not be in demand tomorrow. In addition, grades of commodities vary from region to region, from State to State, and from farm to farm. All in all, it seemed that it would be impossible to reach an agreement as to how to define, for price-support purposes, which commodities are readily salable and which are not.

I may add, Mr. President, that soon after we concluded the hearings last November I wrote to many millers, to spinners of cotton throughout the country, and to others who handle and process our basic commodities; I asked for their suggestions, ideas, and views as to whether or not we could write a formula to carry out the thought I had in mind. I was told by them that it would be a practical impossibility. Therefore, as I have said, the committee abandoned that proposal.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I offered an amendment—and it was approved by the committee—which would provide 90 percent supports on a quality basis for wheat. It would go only part way in that direction of quality. It would provide that 90 percent supports would be available to producers who plant wheat seed which normally would produce a good quality of wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. That would afford a limited provision based on quality.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. It would provide 90 wheat which normally produce good percent supports for all varieties of quality.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my hope that the yardstick, outlined by my good friend from North Dakota, will work. However, he will remember that members of the staff of the Secretary of Agriculture stated that 95 percent of the wheat produced would come within the 90 percent support price.

Mr. YOUNG. I do recall that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my recollection.

Mr. YOUNG. The proposal which I offered would provide 90 percent for most of the wheat produced, but it would also provide lower support levels for a great deal of wheat of poor quality which is being produced today.

I think the Senator from Louisiana has reference to the 23 varieties of wheat which the Secretary of Agriculture this year discounts 20 cents a bushel. I think those are the varieties to which the Senator is referring.

Mr. ELLENDER. It might be entirely possible to devise a formula on the basis of the proposal which my distinguished friend from North Dakota offered, and which was written into the bill. I hope it will work.

Mr. YOUNG. Mine is a simple approach to the problem. If we attempt to go a step further, as we planned last fall, and base price support on the quality of wheat marketed by the farmer, we will run into a great deal of trouble. It is a slow process, for example, to test the protein and gluten content of each load of wheat which may be delivered to a country elevator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to add that the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota has been considered by the Department of Agriculture for many years. The Department has been endeavoring to determine how to devise a formula to provide higher supports for good quality and lower supports for poor quality. One proposal which was made—I think it came from the State of the Senator from North Dakota—was that the support be based upon the salability of the variety. However, it turns out that that formula does not work either.

If we base the salability on the proportion of the crop which is turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation by the producers as unsold, we find that under that formula the Eastern and Southern States would get the highest support level.

For the 4 years from 1950 to 1953, the States of Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming turned over 29 percent of the crop to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Montana turned over 20 percent of the crop. Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky turned over 13.8 percent. Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arkansas turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation for those 4 years 31 percent of the wheat crop. Idaho, Washington, and Oregon turned over 23½ percent. California, Arizona, Nevada, and Utah turned over 3.6 percent. Virginia and the States north of Virginia turned over 9½ percent. The States south of Virginia, including the

Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, turned over 22½ percent. So we cannot judge the quality by the percentage of the crop which each State turns over to the Commodity Credit Corporation. So that formula was not practicable. I use that merely as an illustration of an effort to devise a formula under which higher support levels could be given to the better quality.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that in response to a question propounded by me to the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Morse, and his assistant, we were informed that the Department had been working for 20 years in an attempt to find a salability formula applicable to various crops. However, up to now they have not found such a formula. I suggested to them that they continue their studies, and perhaps they might come up with something.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I was greatly interested in the figures just submitted by the Senator from Vermont. I wish to be sure I understood him correctly. I wonder if he meant to have us infer that the quantity of wheat turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation in a State would be determinative of quality. Is it not more reasonable to assume that the greater the production in a community, the greater the amount which would be turned over? Would that be a reliable basis for determining quality?

Mr. AIKEN. I read these statistics to show that we could not judge the quality by the percentage of the crop turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming are grouped together. Kansas is a large wheat-producing State. I am sure the Senator knows how eastern Kansas compares with western Kansas. Missouri has become a large producer of wheat. Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming are grouped together. Some of the States in which very little was turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation are not noted for producing large quantities of the highest quality of wheat. Nevertheless, the wheat had a ready market, presumably, in chicken feed and other types of feed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. For instance in 4 of the States mentioned only a little more than 3 percent of the production was put into the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That 3 percent may be wheat that was not adapted to milling purposes but could be used for chicken feed.

Mr. AIKEN. In some States, however, production has gone up with respect to certain varieties of wheat; for example, a good hard wheat, which has the same analysis as wheat from western farms, but which for milling purposes is considered decidedly inferior. It may have a moisture content of 12 percent, and a protein content of 13 percent, just as is the case with wheat from another area, but nevertheless one wheat is good for milling purposes and the other type is not. They both weigh from 58 to 60 pounds to the bushel. It makes the situation very difficult but millers do make a distinction and they say that one is good and the other is not good.

In other words, the wheat that is used as a filler will still run to 60 pounds to the bushel and 12 percent moisture and 13 percent protein, but that wheat is not desirable.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Vermont has made a very accurate statement with regard to quality milling wheat. There is no question that quality is not based on test weight. The wheat grower in Kansas is interested in producing good milling quality wheat. We like to boast that we grow the best wheat in the world. We regret sincerely that in the last 2 or 3 years there has been some complaint about our wheat, and we are trying to correct the situation. The Secretary's statement last year that there would be a differential in payments brought about a shift in the production into higher quality plantings. In the next harvest we will have greatly improved the quality of wheat.

As I read the bill, it would set up a commission to work with the Department of Agriculture to assist the Department in determining the quality of wheat. That is the purpose of creating the commission as I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the Commission is to determine which varieties of wheat are the best, and the farmers who plant that variety will get 90 percent.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe I am correct in my understanding. That is the intention, as I understand it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture, working with those engaged in research experiment stations, millers, and bakers, determines the quality.

Under the provision the Senator has referred to we would set up a commission consisting of an agricultural research expert, a miller, and a farmer. There would be three members from each of the principal wheat producing areas of the United States. This would be the first time that farmers would be given a voice in determining the quality of wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. The commission would work from year to year, as I understand.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. The Secretary makes that determination all alone at the present time. The committee would be advisory in nature.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say that in my own State of North Dakota there are varieties of wheat which should not be grown. Ninety-eight percent of the wheat grown in North Dakota is of good quality. However, we have a few varieties that should not be planted. Among them are Golden Ball, Peliss, Pentad, and Premier, and 2 or 3 others. I do not see any reason why we should provide the top level of support to farmers who seed that kind of wheat which rarely, if ever, produces good quality.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wonder whether the chairman of the committee would object if I were to refer to another feature of the bill which was mentioned indirectly by him. I refer to the noncommercial wheat-producing areas which are to be set forth in the bill. For the moment I cannot find that particular section in the bill. As I remember reading it, each State would be given a quota of 240,000 acres of noncommercial wheat. There are States which would not have 240,000 acres. What would happen in such a case?

Mr. AIKEN. Any State that did not produce 240,000 acres would be taken out of the commercial area.

Mr. CARLSON. I want to be sure that we are not increasing acreage allotments for wheat in noncommercial areas up to 240,000 acres, and finding the wheat some place else in commercial areas.

Mr. AIKEN. Any State that has an acreage allotment of less than 240,000 acres would be put into the noncommercial area, and if it chose to go into the program, it would get only 75 percent of the support price in the commercial area.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Presumably 90 percent of the production would go into feed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was what the testimony before the committee indicated, as I remember.

Mr. President, the committee also voted down the proposal to place a limitation on price supports—either a gross limitation or a limitation based on total production of a given farm. In his special farm message, the President recommended that we consider placing limitations on price support payments; however, careful examination of the problem convinced us that it would be unwise to do so.

Any limitation on price supports would, in effect, mean that market prices would stabilize at or just around the support level in effect on the majority of the crop.

Under the President's proposal, a gross cash limitation would be placed on price support payments. This would mean that the great bulk of our agricultural production could be marketed with no support levels in effect, depending on the amount of the limitation imposed. As to that portion, the fluctuations of the markets would, alone, affect farm prices. As to that portion of the crop which would be supported—and this would be production primarily from the small farms—the commodities would flow into Government storage. The proposal for a gross cash limitation on price support payments would, in practical effect, amount to a cash subsidy paid to the small farmers with the Government taking over their total production in return.

Under the alternative of placing a sliding scale support level in effect, and basing supports on the size of a farm or its volume of production, it was shown that market prices would tend to stabilize at, or just around, the support level in effect for the majority of a crop. Since any such limitation would fix support levels

for large producers at relatively low levels, and since larger farmers supply the majority of our production, this alternative, too, would mean that small farmers would produce almost exclusively for Government warehouses.

Under either proposal, that is, either a gross limitation on support payments or a limitation based upon support levels flexing in line with per-farm production volume, the small farmer would find himself unable to compete on the farm markets; the Government, on the other hand, would find itself the only purchaser for small-farm production. Neither result is desirable, and the committee voted to eliminate any provisions for limitation on supports.

Let me emphasize, again, Mr. President, that the result of an attempt to limit price supports would mean that the small farmer would be producing for the Government. Price supports were never intended as a subsidy. They are means by which a farmer may borrow money on what he produces so that he will not be compelled to dump his crop on the market all at once, and thereby depress prices.

I cannot believe that anybody will argue seriously that the administration sliding-scale formula, which is now the law of the land, will stimulate the farm economy and bring about increased income to the American farmer in 1956. On the contrary, I believe that it will further decrease farm income, and push the parity ratio down to a new low, and shrink still smaller the farmer's share in the consumer's dollar.

Mr. Benson, however, argues that the sliding-scale formula, plus the soil bank, will bring about a reversal of the present-day trend toward a major farm depression, and result in happier days for the farmer. I must disagree with the Secretary. There is no more rational basis for his optimism in this respect than there has been for the assurances of better times for the farmer that have come forth from his lips with such regularity over the past 2 years. I placed some of the now-discredited statements made by the Secretary in the RECORD yesterday. They demonstrate that the Secretary has frequently been so wrong in the past in his economic prognostications that I believe his forecast in this instance would be best disregarded.

When a farmer participates in the acreage-reserve program, the first phase of the soil bank, as is contemplated in the bill now before the Senate, he must agree to take out of production a designated number of acres allotted to him for one of the basic crops of corn, wheat, rice, cotton, and certain types of tobacco. For instance, a cotton farmer with 100 acres of land, on which he now plants 40 acres of cotton, 30 acres of corn, and 30 acres in hay or other crops, might be permitted to share in the acreage-reserve program up to, let us say, 10 acres. On this 10 acres, which otherwise he would plant in cotton in 1956, he must agree to plant no crops at all, neither cotton nor other crops, and to not even graze the land during 1956. Thus, aside from the payments he is to receive from the Department of Agriculture for diverting these 10 acres of cotton land, he will reap no harvest whatsoever in 1956. His only income from the 10 diverted acres will be the incentive payment the Department makes to him, which for the sake of argument we will say amounts to 50 percent of the support price for 1956 cotton, based on the normal yield of cotton per acre for this particular farm. The exact amount of the incentive payments under the acreage-reserve program will be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, under the terms of the committee bill; irrespective of what the price-support levels for the basic crops may be, he is given the widest discretion to make the incentive payment high enough to yield the farmer a net return on the 10 diverted acres which will be slightly larger than the return the farmer would otherwise get by planting it to cotton. But it will not represent any additional income to the farmer in 1956—it will be only a payment in lieu of what he would otherwise have made from the cotton he could have grown on the land.

The same holds true of the conservation-reserve payments to be made to farmers under the second phase of the soil-bank program. Under this feature of the soil-bank program, any farmer will be eligible to participate, who is willing to divert some of his cultivated acres from production and put them into either grass or trees or other conservation programs, and in addition agree not to graze them. This program is for a minimum period of 3 years, or as much as 10 years, to be agreed upon by the Secretary and the farmer. If trees are planted the contract can be for as long as 15 years. The Secretary is authorized to reimburse the landowner for the cost of establishing the grass or trees on the diverted acreage, and, in addition, to pay him annually the fair rental value of the land so diverted during the life of the contract.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. A few years ago we planted shelter belts. There was an agreement that the Government would pay the farmer so much an acre for the shelter belts, but payment was not made.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean for the cost of planting?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. Farmers did not receive payment for the planting of the shelter belts, and I am wondering what assurance the farmers will have under this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The shelter-belt plan came under the agricultural conservation program, as the Senator well remembers, which differs considerably from the soil-conservation programs contained in this bill. Only cultivated acres will go into either of these new programs—either the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve.

Mr. LANGER. I planted a certain number of acres for shelter, and the Government reneged on its agreement to pay so much an acre.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the pending bill as it is written, the farmer will enter into a binding contract with the Government to set aside so many acres. If the farmer should decide to participate in the acreage reserve, a contract would be entered into probably for 1 year, but it could be entered into for as many as 4 years. The only acres which could be diverted would be allotted acres on basic crops. For that program we are providing a $750 million appropriation for payments on each year's crops.

Mr. LANGER. But, supposing the Congress 2 years from now does not make such an appropriation?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have said, it will depend on the Congress to carry out the program; but I am sure that if my good friend from North Dakota is still a Member of the Senate, the Congress will vote for such an appropriation. I know I would. These appropriations are to be made each year.

If the bill is passed and becomes law on March 15, the farmer who enters into a contract on his allotted acres could receive payment before the planting season is over. If he agrees to comply by setting aside so many of his allotted acres in wheat, corn, rice, or cotton, he receives a certificate from the Department of Agriculture payable either in cash or in commodities. In order to encourage the holder of the certificate to obtain commodities for it rather than cash, there is a further inducement offered to him. That inducement is that the value of the certificate increases by 10 percent if the farmer agrees to take commodities which are in storage. The Commodity Credit Administration then sells to him at either the market price or 105 percent of the support price, whichever is the higher.

So, as I have said, there is full protection for the farmer, because he will be able to obtain his certificate, which is negotiable, before the end of the year. It is not a question of waiting for a full year, but he may get payment upon giving assurance that the contract has been carried out by him.

Of course, the conservation reserve acres are in a slightly different category, because the requirement in that phase of the soil-bank program is that the contract must be entered into for not less than 3 years nor more than 10. As I said a while ago, that period can extend as long as 15 years, if the acreage is used to plant trees. In that case, the farmer will also be compensated by the Secretary of Agriculture. In fact, under the bill, the Secretary has the power to make the proposal very attractive, so as to get out of cultivation the total number of acres which he determines should go into the conservation reserve program. As to those acres, the farmer will receive financial assistance in the planting of grass, other soil-building crops, or trees on them. In addition, the farmer will be paid a rental each year for the land he takes out of cultivation and puts into the conservation reserve.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator was a Member of the Senate, was he not, when the shelter belt bill was passed by Congress?

Mr. ELLENDER. That was in about 1933, was it not?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it was about that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was a little before I became a Member of the Senate. But I do not think the Senator from North Dakota need worry. This is an entirely different program.

Mr. LANGER. At that time the assurance was given to the farmer that, if he would plant trees, he would receive so much an acre for the shelter belt. The Government reneged on that proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think the same situation will prevail this time; at least, I hope it will not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may have already covered the point I have in mind, or he may do so later. But in reading the bill, I was somewhat disturbed by the limitation of $100 an acre which the farmer is to be paid for land withdrawn from cultivation. With respect to a good many crops, that would be adequate, but there are some crops as to which it would not be much of an inducement.

Mr. ELLENDER. The limitation of $100 applies only to tobacco.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the crop to which I am applying it. The average farmer who produces burley tobacco will get a thousand pounds an acre, which is a very conservative estimate. If the price were 40 or 50 cents a pound, he would receive $400 or $500 an acre for the production of the tobacco. If he were to be limited to receiving $100 an acre on acreage from which he could receive, $400, $500, or $600, that would not be any inducement to withdraw his land from production.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Let me state the reason why that provision was included. The committee received reports from growers of cigar binder tobacco, which is used for cigar making. It seems that type of tobacco is produced in only two States—Connecticut and Wisconsin. A recent process makes it possible to take almost any kind of tobacco leaf, homogenize it, and remake it into a leaf which looks exactly like the binder tobacco. It is tobacco which is ground up, as it were, and pressed back into usable shape, so that it can be used in the making of cigars.

The committee found that the cigar binder tobacco producers were in bad circumstances, and it was agreed that if tobacco were included in the bill, the payments would have to be limited to $100. We understood that those growers would be satisfied with such a payment. It was subsequent to that action that the committee voted to include flue-cured and burley tobacco. I understand other tobaccos, also, probably will be added.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the committee omitted dark-fired tobacco, because the committee was under the impression that the dark-fired tobacco producers did not want to be included. But I think that is a mistake. My colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and I have offered, or will offer, an amendment to include dark-fired tobacco in the program.

What I have in mind is that the bill as it is written, as I understand, does not differentiate among the types of tobacco which are to be limited to the $100 an acre.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would not be any inducement to a producer of burley or flue-cured tobacco. I doubt if it would be an inducement even in the dark-fired tobacco region, because in that area the average production is a thousand pounds to the acre; many acres produce more. Some acres produce a couple of thousand pounds. At the prices which have been prevailing since the farm program was inaugurated, $100 by itself would hardly be an inducement to any tobacco grower.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason why the tobacco producers the Senator has in mind were left out was that the Department felt that the acreage planted in tobacco was so small that very few farmers, if any, could be induced to accept a payment, because the majority of the farmers have a half acre or an acre, and we had no requests for inclusion from such producers. For those reasons, it was decided to leave them out.

Furthermore, although the supply of tobacco is quite large, tobacco can be stored and readily preserved. It does not deteriorate. That was another reason why this basic crop was omitted originally.

Peanuts also were omitted from the acreage reserve. The acreage in that category is, I think, about 1,600,000, which is small in comparison to the acreage devoted to corn, cotton, and wheat, for instance. The supply of peanuts is not too far in excess of requirements. Therefore, that basic crop also was left out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to take the Senator's time now to discuss this question, because we shall probably discuss it at length when that point is reached in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator asked the question about the $100 limitation. Tobacco was placed in the bill primarily to assist the growers of Connecticut and Wisconsin, who were in a very distressed condition. Many of them were on the verge of going out of business. They felt that rather than get nothing at all, they would accept a $100 per acre maximum. It was only when the bill was about to be reported that the other two kinds of tobacco were added. The limitation as to the amount per acre to be paid was left in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. We can discuss the question further when that point is reached in the bill; I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that although the $100 limitation probably would help the growers of the particular type of tobacco to which the Senator has referred, the wrapper tobacco produced in Connecticut and Wisconsin—and I am all for that—it would not be any inducement at all to the producers of tobacco grown in Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, and many other States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in agreement with the Senator.

Now, Mr. President, it cannot possibly be argued that these payments under the conservation reserve program will result in more money being put into the farmers' pockets during 1956, because once again, it is just a matter of the Government giving the farmer money to take the place of the income the farmer would have obtained had he planted, cultivated, harvested, and marketed a food or fiber crop off the land he agrees to put in the conservation reserve program.

I repeat, Mr. President, that in both programs, whether the land be put in the acreage or conservation reserve, the acres which are to be set aside must be acres which are or which recently have been used in producing some kind of crop. The provision does not apply to just any land or to new land of any kind. The main purpose of the soil bank is to take out of cultivation the acres which are now producing crops which are in surplus.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot quite agree with my colleague that taking out of wheat production 12 million of the 55 million acres will not have an effect on the market price of the remainder of the crop. One of the purposes of the soil-bank proposal is to reach that situation. If reduction of planting by, say, 25 percent will not have any effect on the market price of the rest of the crop, then the soil-bank program will be a failure before it is started.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. The Senator knows there is enough wheat on hand now for more than a year. I believe the amount on hand is over 1 billion bushels. We consume about 658 million bushels a year. The acreage-reserve program may bring about some slight rise in the wheat market by the end of the year. That is possible. But I am speaking primarily of 1956.

I may say to my good friend from Vermont there is no doubt that in 1957, if the program works as we contemplate it will, and if enough land can be taken out of production—say, 10 million acres of allotted wheat acreage, 3 million acres of allotted cotton acreage, reducing cotton production by, say, from 3 to 4 million bales—prices of crops next year are bound to be affected to some extent, but there will be but little benefit, if any, for the farmers this year by way of the acreage-reserve program, standing alone.

Mr. AIKEN. Not only would cotton and wheat be affected pricewise by taking some 20 million acres out of production, but producers of meats and vegetables, dairy products, and other commodities, would also be strengthened pricewise in the open market.

I think the estimates of a $2 billion increase in farm income this year, if the soil bank takes effect early in the season, are not very far out of line. Nobody can guarantee that, but I think that is as good a guess as it is possible to make, because we hope that it will redivert the extra land now used for other commodities whose prices are depressed as a result of planting and grazing on acres

diverted from the basic crops. Thus, the prices of those commodities will be strengthened on the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. At least $1 billion of the amount the Senator has mentioned would come out of the Treasury and be paid to the farmers; those payments would be made in lieu of the value of crops the farmer himself could produce on the acres if he had planted them.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct to a certain extent.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I say that if the farmer got 20 percent more in net income for not planting his crops than he would receive if he did plant them, that would be a substantial increase, but it would not reach the figure of the increased income which would come about largely from a strengthening the market and the elimination of some of the keen competition in the market which producers are meeting as a result of production from diverted acres.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that under the bill the conservation reserve program applies to all cultivated acres, even though a part of them may be temporarily planted to some grass?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. I thought that was a little at variance with what the Senator said a moment ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point is that the first part of the soil bank program—the acreage reserve—is to be used exclusively to reduce the planting of basic crops which are now in surplus. The idea is to reduce those surpluses. That is the real purpose of the acreage reserve program. As a matter of fact, that is why the program is to be carried forward on a year-to-year basis. This year we may have farmers divert, say, 12 million acres of wheat, 3 million acres of cotton, 4 or 5 million acres of corn land into the acreage reserve. Perhaps we might have a bad crop year. If so, we could cancel out the acreage reserve program for next year, because supply and demand would more nearly approximate a fair balance.

Mr. YOUNG. We have gone a long way toward equalizing or bringing into line production and use of wheat. For instance, this year the crop amounted to a little over 900 million bushels, and the domestic use plus exports amounted to a little over 900 million bushels.

Mr. ELLENDER. That result came about under the wheat agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the Senator from Louisiana was interrupted, he was saying that the land withdrawn would be land which would ordinarily be cultivated, that it would not be land which would lie idle, anyway.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who would determine whether the land withdrawn was or was not land which would have been cultivated?

Mr. ELLENDER. I meant to say land that was in production. I meant cultivated acreage. In the bill we sought to define cultivated acres to mean acres whereon a crop is grown. Cultivation need not take place every year. As the Senator knows, tame hay or alfalfa can be grown without much cultivation. In my State alfalfa is planted only every 3 years, but the land is cultivated, it is disked, and then the alfalfa seed is drilled, and there are 2 or 3 crops of alfalfa in a year. Land of that kind would be considered cultivated acreage and could be placed in the conservation reserve acreage.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us take another crop besides a 3-year crop like alfalfa and certain grasses. A farmer usually rotates his crops. He will plant one field in corn 1 year and maybe next year he will plant it in wheat or grass, and then in a year or 2 he will go back to corn. Would such acreage as would temporarily lie idle in any given year, which is cultivated in most part from 1 year to another, be eligible for retirement under the program, so the farmer would receive benefits for the retirement of that particular acreage?

Mr. ELLENDER. The farmer will be eligible if that is a regular practice in which he engages.

If the Senator will look at page 12 of the bill, section 207 reads in part:

> To establish and maintain for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses on a specifically designated acreage land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops. * * *

Mr. BARKLEY. "Regularly used" would not be interpreted to mean a farmer had to do it every year; would it?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It would not, however, mean new land which the farmer had permitted to lie idle for years.

Mr. BARKLEY. And which perhaps he had no intention to cultivate at any time soon. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Such land would not be eligible for withdrawal benefits, would it?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would not.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. For the benefit of the Senator from Kentucky, I should like to call his attention to the fact that the Senator from Louisiana stopped reading before he reached the end of the sentence, which reads:

> acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops (including crops, such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage).

That would permit the farms in Kentucky, Ohio, Vermont, and other States to participate in the conservation program.

Mr. ELLENDER. I say to my friend from Vermont that I did not read the sentence through because I had previously explained that portion of it to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. AIKEN. Tame hay is included, but not land over the fence.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not include land in wild hay or other wild grasses.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are provisions in the bill pertaining to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Reforestation requires a so much longer period of time than the 3-year grasses that a longer period of time would be necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a provision pertaining to that subject.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to raise this point because I did not have an opportunity to hear all the Senator's presentation. He may have covered it in his statement, but when we use the term "soil bank," or bank, or putting something into a bank, we ordinarily think of putting something in a place of security, so that it will not be lost and will be preserved. When we speak of putting land in a soil bank, what is going to be done to preserve the idle acreage? What is going to be done to insure that there will not be deterioration of the acres? If the acres deteriorate, we may lose more than we gain.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, as to the acreage-reserve program, that will be left to the farmer to decide, in connection with his allotted acres; on those allotted acres he might also receive payments from the ACP program.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. He could put cover crops on such acreage, if he wanted to. But if he did that, he would have to follow certain practices, in order to obtain payments.

The idea in the first prong of the soil-bank program is not so much to conserve land as it is to prevent the planting of a crop which already is in surplus—so as not further to aggravate the surpluses we now have.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me before he proceeds?

Mr. ELLENDER. First, let me say, in regard to the other prong of the soil-bank program—that is to say, the conservation reserve acres—that in that regard the contract must be for not less than 3 years, and the farmer may plant on that acreage grasses which will preserve or enrich the land, or he may plant trees, or he may use it for any other purpose which would conserve the soil. He could even build a fish pond on it, if he wished to do so. But, as I have said, that land must be comprised of cultivated acres or land which produces crops, in order to be eligible.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. As to the first prong of the program, then it will be left entirely to the landowner to decide as to what, if anything, he will do to cover the land so as to preserve it. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator from Louisiana think it would be wise to tie this down in some way, so as to insure that those acres will not be abandoned and permitted to deteriorate or be neglected even for 1 year? Would not it be necessary to tie it down in some way, and make that a condition of the payment? Otherwise, in the areas where there is heavy rainfall and where the land is not level, but, instead, is hilly and subject to rapid erosion unless it is cared for, will not there be a terrific loss of land as a result of erosion, and a consequent loss in the value of the land? Of course, the Senator's State of Louisiana is different from the hilly land I have in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the south Louisiana area, where I reside, grass grows wild; and so far as erosion is concerned, I do not think we have any there.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; the State of Louisiana is blessed in that way. But other areas are not so blessed.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the committee's view that the farmer will receive—by means of the payments for participating in this program—quite an inducement. In other words, the Secretary will have to give the farmer quite an inducement to persuade him to curtail his production.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition, if the farmer qualifies for them, he can obtain ACP payments.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree, and many of them no doubt will.

This is not in criticism of the suggested program as a whole; but my point is that this should be tied down, by way of a condition precedent to obtaining these payments. Some provision would have to be made by the landowner, so that at the end of the year the land would not have less value and would not be in a deteriorated condition, as compared with its condition at the beginning of the year—because in part the purpose of the plan is to preserve the land.

I do not mean to press the Senator from Louisiana about this point now; but if he has a recommendation about it, he can make it to the committee staff, and perhaps they can prepare a provision to cover it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure that if the Secretary of Agriculture found it necessary in some areas, he could include that as a part of the contract, if he desired to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is a splendid suggestion, and I hope the Senator from Louisiana will include it as one of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me refer to page 8 of the bill:

> The acreage reserve program may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds on the reserve acreage, as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act and to facilitate the practical administration of the acreage reserve program.

Mr. STENNIS. Do those provisions apply to both prongs of the program to which the Senator from Louisiana has been referring?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; this provision applies only to the acreage-reserve program. The Secretary would have the right to incorporate conditions in the agreement into which he entered with the farmer.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion. At this time I shall not ask him to yield further in regard to this matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize to my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, that the acres which were taken out of the allotted acres of the farmer, could still be put by him into cover crops, and no doubt he could obtain ACP payments if he wished to do so; and no doubt any good farmer would do so.

Mr. STENNIS. I feel sure he would. But some would take this money and would neglect the land. So that would be a serious matter, and that is a point which should be covered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Louisiana stated that a farmer could put a fishpond on this land.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Could the farmer raise fish for commercial purposes on that land, without restriction?

Mr. ELLENDER. That possibility was not brought up in committee, but I do not believe the amount of money which would be paid on a per-acre basis would permit any large areas to be used in that way. The larger the area, the greater the cost of the dam would be; and the size of the dam to hold back the water probably would be regulated according to the dollars received and the acres to be covered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to make a brief statement, let me say that a number of people in my State have approached me about this matter. They have found that putting water upon the land is an excellent way to enrich the land, and that it adds great strength to the land; and, of course, once water is put on the land, fish can be put into the water. These people are contemplating doing that very thing.

If they took acres out of their cotton or rice acreage, and put those acres under water and raised fish—of course, they would buy fingerlings—would such an operation qualify under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, riceland is included in the acreage reserve—that is to say, in the case of allotted acres.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the farmer turned that land into a fishpond, it would be eligible, would it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Eligibility could be extended to any soil-conservation or water-conservation program.

Let me read the requirement which appears at the bottom of page 12, under paragraph (3):

> (3) Not to harvest any crop from the acreage established in protective vegetative cover, excepting timber (in accordance with sound forestry management) and wildlife or other natural products of such acreage which do not increase supplies of feed for domestic animals.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Could that farmer still raise fish in the pond thus established?

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that it is my understanding that any kind of wild crop could be harvested—for instance, the farmer, if he wished, could raise frogs, so as to market frogs' legs, or raise berries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But would fish qualify? I do not know whether fish are wild or not, but I know there are many fish farms in the area I have in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. The provision includes the words "wildlife or other natural products."

That would certainly include fish in a wild state.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was hoping to make such legislative history here as to clarify that point.

The Senator from Louisiana will recall that one of the witnesses from my State suggested—and I also submitted the suggestion to the committee—that this matter be covered or included; and I wish to make sure that it is included.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe fish would furnish increased supplies of feed for domestic animals, other than in the case of a cat or possibly in the case of a dog. As a rule, domestic animals do not eat fish. I will say for the RECORD that I think this provision is intended to cover fish.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure it is.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is intended to cover recreational fishing, and probably commercial fishing as well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Fish could be raised commercially?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wished to make clear what the farmer would recover. He would receive the regular payment for taking the land out of production. That is the No. 1 payment. Can the Senator tell us whether or not he would receive anything for soil-conservation practices resulting from covering the land with water? I am told that that is a very fine way to build soil.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator has just indicated, the only payments would pertain to farm land, cultivated acres. What the farmer would receive on those acres would be the cost of putting them in grasses, if he used grass, the cost of building a levee to retain the water, if he chose to do so——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would it include that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes. In addition, he would receive an annual rental per acre for as many years as he might contract. With respect to this conservation-reserve acreage, the contract could not be for less than 3 years, and might be for as long as 10 years, at a yearly rental.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very glad to make it clear that he would receive 80 percent of the cost of building levees on the land to hold the water.

Mr. ELLENDER. The proportion is left to the Secretary. The Secretary could make it 100 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought it would be 80 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has reference to what is in the report. The language of the bill, as found on page 14, under subparagraph (1) is as follows:

(1) To bear such part of the cost (including labor) of establishing and maintaining vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses, on the designated acreage as the Secretary determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, but not to exceed a maximum amount per acre or facility prescribed by the Secretary for the county or area in which the farm is situated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is clear. I had not noticed the phrase "or water storage facilities," although I was looking for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The 80 percent to which the Senator refers appears on page 16 of the report, but it is not written into the bill. Under the proposed measure, the Secretary is granted broad powers, in order that he may make the contracts attractive enough to induce farmers to carry out the soil bank program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say for the record that from what I have learned in my State, the building of water storage facilities is not only an excellent method of providing water supply, but is one of the finest ways to enrich the soil. In many respects it builds the soil more rapidly than any other practice.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think it is important that we try to make a legislative record, so that the record will show what will be included in the conservation acreage, based upon cultivated acreage. Most good farmers have a soil conservation rotation program of planting legume crops. Let us assume that a farmer has 40 acres in alfalfa or clover. It is already planted. Would that acreage be a part of the new acreage program? Could the farmer draw payments on that acreage?

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it cultivated?

Mr. CARLSON. He planted alfalfa on it 5 years ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that is his practice, he is entitled to place it in the conservation reserve. For example, in Idaho and other States tame hay is planted over 4 or 5 years, and crops are obtained each year. In order to maintain those crops, the land is harrowed after each cutting. As I understand the provisions of the bill, those acres could be used in the program, because crops are produced upon what we term cultivated acres. In other words, the crops do not grow wild. The crops are planted. That is really the difference.

Mr. CARLSON. I think that is a very important statement. For example, there are areas where the land is already planted to alfalfa. It may have been planted for 5 years. It will grow 2 or 3 or 4 crops a year. What will be the basis of payments? As I understand the application of the bill to alfalfa, for example, the farmer is not permitted to harvest any of it after he has placed the acreage under the conservation reserve.

Mr. ELLENDER. The payments with respect to such acres are not on the basis of the value of the crop, but on the rental value of the land. Much will depend on what the rental value of the land is in the particular area, and how much the land produces in dollars and cents. The Secretary will have broad powers to fix the rental values. He will also have broad powers to fix the cost of putting the acreage into grasses, if that is the conservation method agreed upon by the Secretary and the farmer.

The situation with respect to trees is similar. The payment will depend upon the cost of the trees, and the labor entailed in planting them in the area where the land is located.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding, from talking with the Department of Agriculture officials, that they expect the annual rental will be approximately 10 percent of the value of the land. If the land is worth $50 an acre as crop land, the rental will be $5. If it is worth $100 an acre, the rental each year will be $10. If the land is worth $200 an acre in a particular county, the rental will be $20 an acre for the term of the contract. That scale may not hold exactly true in every case.

If trees were set out, payments would extend over a period up to 15 years, and might be smaller. However, the same amount of money, overall, would be paid. Contracts for planting legumes and enriching the soil would normally run for a period of from 3 to 10 years, depending upon the probable future need of the land for crop production, and other circumstances.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend from Kansas that a while ago I explained the factors the Secretary would have to consider. Let me read from the bill itself. I turn to page 14, under subparagraph (2), beginning with the second sentence:

The rate or rates of the annual payment to be provided for in the contracts shall be established on such basis as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable annual return on the land established in protective vegetative cover or water-storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest-conserving uses, taking into consideration the value of the land for the production of commodities customarily grown on such kind of land in the county or area, the prevailing rates for cash rentals for similar land in the county or area, the incentive necessary to obtain contracts covering sufficient acreage for the substantial accomplishment of the purposes of the conservation-reserve program, and such other factors as he deems appropriate. Such rate or rates may be determined on an individual farm basis, a county or area basis, or such other basis as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program.

In other words, the door is wide open for the Secretary of Agriculture to offer such an attractive inducement that the farmer cannot help wanting to enter into a contract. The first part of the soil bank—that is, the acreage reserve—is to alleviate, and not further to aggravate, our present surpluses. No doubt that is the part of the program which will cost the most. It will probably include some of the best land in our country—land which is usually planted to the basic crops. Insofar as the conservation acres are concerned, land of less value—productive and otherwise—will be used for that purpose.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, in order to make the program work, the Secretary has the authority to make it very attractive.

I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Is there any limitation as to the amount of acreage a farmer can take out on his farm?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is left to the Secretary. Under the bill before the Senate, the Secretary will utilize the services of soil-conservation workers and experts from the land-grant colleges, Federal and State agencies. In other words, he will use the services of people engaged in agriculture throughout the country—people who are now under the Department of Agriculture or who work cooperatively with it. What will happen is that a survey will be made, let us say, in certain areas of the country. For instance, let us take prong 1 of the soil-bank proposal. There is no doubt that in a few weeks the Secretary could ascertain pretty well, merely by going around and talking to the farmers, how many acres of cotton, let us say, in the various cotton States would be put into the program. In other words, an average of how much would be put into the program could be quickly obtained.

By the same token, he could come to some determination with respect to the conservation feature, because under the pending bill the estimation must be made by February 1 of each year. The program would then be worked out as to how many acres he could put into either of the programs.

Of course, the number of acres that he would be able to put into conservation would depend on the report he got, and of course it would have to come within the limitation of the money provided by Congress.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think that is a very important point. I have received letters from farmers who are greatly concerned with this provision. There are some people who live in cities and own farms, who are glad to let the Government take over land. That brings up two problems. The first is with respect to people who have been farming the land; they will run into difficulties. The second point is that if in a given community too much land is taken out of cultivation and made unproductive, it will affect the whole community and all the people who live there. That is something to which we must pay attention, or we will get into some difficulty.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee gave a good deal of thought to that subject. That is why we placed in the bill a provision to the effect that the program would have to be first worked out by the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to find out how many acres the farmers throughout the country would be willing to contract to place in the soil bank. From the data to be gathered in that way the Secretary can tell pretty well how

much money will be required. He can also tell, should the acreage be far in excess of what he desired, whether he will have enough money to spend. The amount of money he has available will depend on how much Congress gives him.

The Secretary would not have to go personally into any particular area. He would have very wide authority to take out of production that number of acres that would best meet the problem.

For instance, let us take cotton. It might be that in some parishes in my State the Secretary would not be able to get more than 2 or 3 or 4 farmers interested. Perhaps in other parishes he might get half the farmers interested. He would not have to require each county to reduce its acreage by a certain amount. He could theoretically, at least get the entire amount of land in one county. From the survey which will be made he can judge where contracts should be entered into so as to carry out the program to the best advantage. I say that because the main purpose of the acreage reserve is to get a great many acres out of cultivation, so as not further to aggravate our existing surpluses.

Insofar as the conservation reserve is concerned, the problem will be much easier to handle because in the acreage reserve the Secretary will have to be guided primarily by how much of a reduction in production he desires. Under the conservation reserve, about the only limitation will be the amount of money available for payments.

We have also included in the bill a provision to protect tenants and sharecroppers. It reads as follows:

> In the administration of the conservation reserve program, the Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm.

Throughout the bill we have included provisions which, we believe, will adequately take care of tenants and sharecroppers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished chairman has been very generous with his time in answering questions. Yesterday he announced he would answer questions propounded by any Senator if he could do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I could; yes.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota receives many letters, and he would like to ask a favor of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I hope the Senator will be able to answer the question I am about to ask him, so that I can use his answer in replying to my correspondents.

Let us take, for example, a farmer in Minnesota or in North Dakota or in Montana. He writes, "I have 320 acres of land. It is worth $100 an acre." He wants to take full advantage of the plan in the bill, and he wants me to figure out for him in dollars and cents just what he will get. Can the Senator do that for me?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I certainly cannot do that. It would depend, first, on the total number of acres which the program would cover in a given year. Let us assume that the Secretary decides that the $350 million provided in the conservation reserve program is sufficient to pay benefits on 25 million acres, in round figures. Let us say that, after he makes his survey, he finds that farmers all over the country are desirous of putting 50 million acres of land into this phase of the program.

With that information before him, the Secretary will have to consider where the requests come from and try to give each vicinity and each county and farm in a State or in each area a just and realistic share of the acreage to be put into the program.

Therefore I could not say to a farmer in Minnesota, for example, who has 320 acres in his farm, or a farmer in Louisiana, or one in North Dakota, that he would get so much under the program.

As a matter of fact, until the plan is prepared and drafted and everyone who applies is considered, the Secretary himself cannot do so. He must first see how far the money made available will go and fit it in with the demands and requests of the farmers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose a farmer had a 320-acre farm and took out 40 acres. How much would he get for the 40 acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us assume that the acres which the Senator has mentioned are allotted to wheat.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will refer to page 17 of the report he will find an example for North Dakota, by the way, Ward County, N. Dak.

The county normal yield is 13.2 bushels per acre. The size of the farm is 320 acres. The acreage allotment is 120 acres. The acreage put into reserve is 30 acres.

Mr. LANGER. Let us make my example 30 acres, then.

Mr. ELLENDER. The county loan rate per bushel is $1.80.

The payment rate per acre would be $13.50. Therefore, the entire payment on the 30 acres would amount to $405.

If the Senator will look through the report he will note that several tentative estimates have been made. I wish to make it plain that they are only tentative. It may be that the Secretary will have to pay a little more than he suggests in these preliminary figures in order to get the job done.

Mr. LANGER. That is the first part.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that is the acreage reserve.

Mr. LANGER. What is the second part?

Mr. ELLENDER. The second is the conservation reserve—acres on which the farmer agrees to plant grasses, and to otherwise engage in soil-conservation practices.

Mr. LANGER. Thirty more acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Will the Senator tell me the average rental that would apply?

Mr. LANGER. It is $30. The 30 acres cannot be used for stock or anything else; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. When the farmer signs his contract for the conservation practice which is agreed to by the farmer and the Secretary, if he agrees to plant grasses, the Secretary will agree to pay all or the greater part of the cost of planting grasses in that area, or planting trees, if they are more adaptable.

In addition to the acres planted to grass or trees, the Secretary will agree to pay the farmer during the length of the contract—and it must be for not less than 3 years—$10 or $15 an acre, if that happens to be a fair rate in the area under the formula from which I read a moment ago.

Mr. LANGER. I have received letters from the Stockmen's Association saying that they do not want the land used for anything.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it is used, the farmer violates his contract and loses not only his payment, but will be in debt to the Government for the payments already made.

Mr. LANGER. So the farmer would be almost compelled to fence the land, would he not? If it is not going to be used for anything, in order to prevent cattle or sheep from wandering onto it, it would have to be fenced.

Mr. ELLENDER. The farmer would have to keep out stock in some way.

Mr. LANGER. I think that answers my question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the bill which we are now considering, it is my judgment that the Secretary could even go so far as to help the farmer to pay a part of the cost of the fence. In other words, the Secretary is given, I would say, almost carte blanche authority to make the program effective. He must make inducements great enough to take in as much of the acreage as may be possible.

Mr. LANGER. Even going to the extent of helping to build a part of the fence?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. There is nothing in the bill to prevent it.

Mr. LANGER. If the Department could build a part of the fence, it could build all of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. That might be used as one of the incentives.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The questions propounded by the Senator from North Dakota are exceedingly helpful, because they pinpoint typical situations. I did a little figuring while the Senator from North Dakota was discussing with the Senator from Louisiana the situation of one 30-acre piece of land, and I find that under the present loan rate available in the particular county mentioned, the total gross income from that farm would have been $729. There would be 405 bushels, the average yield being 13.2 bushels per acre. The amount of money available for payment under the acreage reserve benefits would be $405, but that

would be the net amount. The gross take under the loan rate would be $729. The net would be $405.

So, what we tried to do in the bill—and the chairman, more than anyone else, continued to insist upon it—was to give to the Secretary as much authority and as much opportunity as might be possible under the terms of the bill to pay as large benefits as he could and to do everything possible to make the program work.

Mr. ELLENDER. To make it attractive.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. If we are going to have the voluntary principle in the bill, the attitude of the majority of the committee, and, in this instance, I believe, all the members of the committee, was to make the program so attractive that it would be economically desirable for the farmer to take out of his allotted acres a certain number of acres for purposes of extra crop reduction.

Mr. LANGER. Which amount should the farmer take—$729 or $405?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think I would take $405, because there would be no cost of seeding, no cost of harvesting, or other items involved. It would be $405 for doing one thing, namely, being willing to take out of production 30 acres of land with no risk in terms of weather, in terms of hail, or in terms of any kind of insect infestation. There would be no cost for fertilizer, for seed, or for threshing. In other words, it would seem to me to be a pretty good net. I think if Mr. Farmer figures $729 as his gross, if he could make $405 net, he would be doing fairly well.

It appears to me that we should recognize that the formula we are talking about is something which the Department has said it is their intention to follow. It is not written, per se, in the bill, but the chairman, in order to fulfill the intention and make the intention as binding as might be possible, has placed it in the legislative history in the report of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since we are discussing that feature of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the report dealing with the tentative suggestions made by the Secretary of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with the debate.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1484) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENTATIVE PROPOSALS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE SOIL BANK ACT

ACREAGE RESERVE

The acreage reserve plan is designed to induce farmers to leave unplanted a portion of their allotment acreages for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and certain types of tobacco. Tentative plans are as follows: The county ASC committees would set a farm yield rating for each farm for each of these allotment crops based on the average or normal yield for the last 5 years except for wheat for which the last 10 years would be used. The local ASC committee would advise each farmer of the dollar payment per acre he might receive for underplanting one or several of his allotments. The rate of payment would be based on a percentage of the loan rate times the approximate normal yield. The farmer would have to designate lands to be placed in the acreage reserve of equal quality to those used for the crop and agree that the acres so designated would not be harvested or grazed.

In the case of small farms, under the tentative plans, the farmer would be permitted to participate in the acreage reserve to the full amount of his acreage allotment up to 30 acres for grain and 10 acres for cotton. For large farms, the maximum would be 50 percent of the allotment. There would also be a minimum acreage which could be placed in either the conservation reserve or the acreage reserve. Provisions would be included in the program requiring protection of the rights of tenants and sharecroppers.

CONSERVATION RESERVE

The conservation reserve plan is designed to take lands out of the production of crops for periods of 3 to 15 years and place such lands in conservation uses such as grass, trees, and other approved conservation practices. The establishment of vegetative cover, water storage facilities, improving and expanding forest cover and other conservation measures which will be obtained under the conservation reserve program, will contribute to flood prevention by retarding runoff of rainwater, prevention of soil erosion, and by providing storage of water. Water storage will be accomplished both by increased soil storage capacity and by water storage structures. These same measures, coupled with the less intensive use provided for, will conserve and rebuild soil fertility and retard soil depletion.

It is tentatively planned that in each county, the ASC committee would offer to enter into contracts specifying (1) the acreage to be placed in the program; (2) the payments to be made; and (3) the use to be made of the acres. Nationally, the annual payment on such lands would probably average about $10 per acre. Rates within a county would vary with the quality of the land. Payment rates would be determined by areas. In addition, it is tentatively planned that the contract would provide that the Government pay up to 80 percent of the cost of applying the agreed-upon conservation practices on such lands. So far as practicable, the conservation practices which would qualify for cost-sharing payments would be the same and at the same rates as under the ACP program.

To provide further detail there follows background material developed in the Department to illustrate how the proposed soil bank program would work, what administrative regulations might have to be made, suggested rates of payment for participation, and other pertinent information. This material (amended to include tobacco) was presented to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, February 3, and has been made public by it. The Department emphasizes that the information included in the attached statement is necessarily very tentative and should be treated accordingly. Extensive checking with farmers in the field will be needed. Final arrangements for carrying out the soil bank will of course, depend upon the final form of legislation involved. The Department of Agriculture will welcome continued suggestions and recommendations from farmers.

PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE SOIL BANK (TENTATIVE)

These are the types of administrative regulations which might be needed assuming the legislative proposals which have been made.

1. ACREAGE RESERVE—OBJECTIVE: REDUCE PRODUCTION OF ALLOTMENT CROPS

A. Establishment of yields to serve as a basis of payment:

1. Follow this procedure:

(a) Use check yields during 1951–55 as a base.

(b) Break the national yield figure down by States and counties.

(c) County committeemen determine normal yields for community (these weight out to county normal yields).

(d) Community committeemen establish a normal yield for each farm in the community which grows the allotment crop concerned. Each such farm will be placed in one of 5 or 7 yield categories, ranging above and below the community average. Adjustment procedures will be used to line yields with community average. (Up to this point everything can be done in the county office and will move rapidly.)

(e) Individual farmers will be invited to offer land for the acreage reserve which is equal in productivity to land which has been used for the given crop on their farms. Thus they can be quoted a dollar figure per acre for typical land for the allotment crop on the farm. With the possible exception of the first year, farmers should indicate their intention to participate prior to planting time. Farmers may sign up for land better than average for the farm in which case they will receive payments based on a higher yield. If below average, a lower per acre payment will be made.

B. Preliminary payment rates, minimum and maximum participation and cost:

1. Payment rates, the extent to which these rates need to be varied according to quality, location, and other factors is still under study (these figures are preliminary and are being checked in the field):

(a) Cotton, 50 percent of the average support price.

(b) Wheat, 50 percent of the support price (legislation may not be forthcoming in time to make a program this year on winter wheat practical).

(c) Corn, 50 percent of the support price. Discussions continue on the serious difficulties of including corn in this program.

(d) Rice, 50 percent of the support price.

2. Maximum and minimum participation (these should be administrative matters, not specified in the law; also there should be discretion to take care of farmers who for reasons of sickness or disability may not wish to operate their farms):

(a) Maximum: Grain, 30 acres or 50 percent of allotment, whichever is larger; cotton, 10 acres or 50 percent of allotment, whichever is larger.

(b) Minimum: Grain, 10 acres or allotment, whichever is smaller; cotton, 2 acres or allotment, whichever is smaller.

3. Participation and cost, national basis (highly tentative):

	Acres which might come in millions	National average yield per acre	Rate of payment based on normal yield	Approximate cost per acre	Total cost (in millions)
Cotton	3– 5	303 pounds	50 percent of loan level	$50	$150–$250
Wheat	[1] 12–15	15.8 bushels	do	17	200– 250
Corn	4– 6	44.2 bushels [2]	do	38	150– 220
Rice	.3	2,500 pounds	do	60	18– 20
Tobacco	.1	1,250 pounds	do	100	10
Total	19.4–26.4				528– 750

[1] Based on both winter and spring crop.
[2] Commercial corn area yield.

NOTE.—These are based on 90-percent supports and optional parity.

C. Agreement—landlord-tenant relationship:

1. Compensation is to be divided among interested landlords and tenants on the farms in the same proportion as they would have shared in the crop in the absence of a reserve acreage program, unless division on another basis is agreed upon by landlords and tenants and their agreement is approved by the county committee in accordance with standards prescribed by the State committee.

II. CONSERVATION RESERVE—OBJECTIVE: TAKE OUT THE LESS PRODUCTIVE CROPLAND

A. Conservation reserve rental rates:

1. Establishment costs, $19 per acre, national average:

(a) Pay 80 percent of costs, not to exceed a maximum of $25 per acre for either forage or trees.

(b) Keep incentives alined with ACP so as not to upset the ACP program.

2. Rental rates:

(a) $10 per acre, average for the United States.

(b) State rental rates established on basis of land values, productivity, and other factors.

(c) County rental rates would vary on the basis of such factors as county yields and value of farmland. County rates would be adjusted so that the weighted average did not exceed the State rate. No county rate would exceed $20 per acre.

(d) Farm rental rates would be established on the basis of specified acreage placed in conservation reserve. Rates would be based on relative productivity of specified acreage.

(e) Rental rates would need to be adjusted if grazing is permitted within the contract period.

B. Practices:

1. Eligible land should be land which was used for the production of row crops or small grain during at least 1 of the last 3 years.

2. Forage (enough seed to plant about 14 million acres in 1956):

(a) Prefer perennials.

(b) Annuals satisfactory when seeded with perennials.

(c) Annuals satisfactory alone when no perennial seed available and appropriate practices can be followed. Due to seed limitations, some latitude may be needed regarding soil protective practices during the first year or two.

3. Trees (enough stock to plant about half a million acres in 1956):

(a) Adapted forest trees.

(b) Shrubs when interplanted for shelterbelt purposes.

4. Water storage:

(a) Cost of water retention dams shared.

III. OPERATING PROCEDURE

A. We are now checking our tentative inducements and procedures in the field.

B. Develop data as soon as legislative action permits.

C. Hold educational meetings, perhaps on a county basis.

D. Arrange for signup dates and meetings.

E. Minimize the number of farm visits by handling as many things at one time as can conveniently be done.

F. There are no funds for administrative work until and unless the Congress acts.

G. If legislative action is not taken prior to April 15 it will be extremely difficult to get a program this year, except for wheat seeded in the fall of 1956.

IV. THE CERTIFICATES

A. Draw them in terms of dollars.

B. Redemption, if the farmer elects it, to be accomplished by purchase of the relevant commodity at specified rates.

C. Interest rate probably 3½ percent.

D. Maturity date probably at the time the loan normally would mature. Loans for the various commodities might all be matured at the same date.

Cotton

Bolivar County, Miss.:	
County normal yield (pounds per acre)	389
Size of farm (acres)	240
Acreage allotment (acres)	70
Acres put into reserve (acres)	15
Farm normal yield (pounds per acre)	450
Payment rate per acre	$67.50
Payment	$1,012.50
Orangeburg County, S. C.:	
County normal yield (pounds per acre)	323
Size of farm (acres)	60
Acreage allotment (acres)	15
Acres put into reserve (acres)	5
Farm normal yield (pounds per acre)	300
Payment rate per acre	$45
Acreage reserve payment	$225
Conservation reserve acreage (acres)	20
Cost of establishing grass	$500
Payment at 80 percent of cost	$400
Annual payment	$140
Conservation reserve payment, 1st year	$540
Soil-bank payment, 1st year	$765

Wheat

Ward County, N. Dak.:	
County normal yield (bushels per acre)	13.2
Size of farm (acres)	320
Acreage allotment (acres)	120
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	30
County loan rate (approximately) (per bushel)	$1.80
Farm normal yield (bushels per acre)	15
Payment rate per acre	$13.50
Payment	$405
Cheyenne County, Kans.:	
County normal yield (bushels per acre)	20.7
Size of farm (acres)	240
Acreage allotment (acres)	90
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	15
County loan rate (approximately) (per bushel)	$1.80
Farm normal yield (bushels per acre)	19
Payment rate per acre	$17.10
Payment	$256.50

NOTE.—If 40 acres were put in the reserve, payment would be $684.

Corn

Blue Earth County, Minn:	
County normal yield (bushel per acre)	56.8
Size of farm (acres)	160
Acreage allotment (acres)	50
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	10
County loan rate (approximately (per bushel)	$1.30
Form normal yield (bushels per acre)	70
Payment rate per acre	$45.50
Payment	$455.00
Marshall County, Iowa:	
County normal yield (bushels per acre)	58.4
Size of farm (acres)	320
Acreage allotment (acres)	140
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	40
County loan rate (approximately) (per bushel)	$1.32
Farm normal yield (bushels per acre)	58.4
Payment rate per acre	$38.54
Payment	$1,541.60

NOTE.—If he elects to put 25 acres into the reserve his payment would be $1,137.50.

Rice

Arcadia Parish, La.:	
Parish normal yield (pounds per acre)	2,177
Size of farm (acres)	400
Acreage allotment (acres)	100
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	20
Parish loan rate (per hundredweight)	$4.16
Farm normal yield (pounds per acre)	2,400
Payment rate per acre	$49.92
Payment	$998.40
Plus	
Cotton-acreage allotment (acres)	40
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	10
Farm normal yield (pounds)	400
Cotton payment	$600
Total payment	$1,558.40
Colusa County, Calif.:	
County normal yield (pounds per acre)	3,084
Size of farm (acres)	280
Acreage allotment (acres)	90
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	10
County loan rate (per hundredweight	$3.50
Farm normal yield (pounds per acre)	3,000
Payment rate per acre	$52.50
Payment	$525.00

Conservation reserve

1. Farm in western Kansas:	
960 acres.	
100 acres put into conservation reserve.	
Total cost of establishing grass cover at $7 per acre	$700
Payment to farmer at 80 percent of the cost	560
Yearly rental, based on productivity of the specific acres at $5 per acre	500
Payment to farmer the 1st year, $560 plus $500	1,060
Payment in subsequent years for duration of the contract	500
2. Farm in the Piedmont:	
120-acre farm.	
Takes out 60 acres, puts 30 in grass, 30 in trees.	
Total cost of establishing 30 acres of grass at $30	$900
Total cost of establishing 30 acres of trees at $12	360
Payment to farmer equal to 80 percent of costs	1,008
Annual payment, based on productivity of the reserve acres, at $8 per acre	480
Payment 1st year, $1,008, plus $480	1,488
Payment in subsequent years for duration of the contract	480
3. Farm in New England:	
150-acre farm.	
Puts 30 acres into conservation reserve.	
Total cost of establishing grass cover at $35 per acre	$1,050
Payment to farmer at 80 percent of the costs but not to exceed $25 per acre	750
Rental at $10 per acre	300
Total payment, 1st year, $750 plus $300	1,050
Payment in following years for duration of the contract	300
4. Farm in the Corn Belt:	
320-acre farm.	
Puts 20 acre hill field into conservation reserve.	
Total cost of establishing grass cover at $25 per acre	$500
Payment to farmer at 80 percent of the cost	400
Rental at $15 per acre	300
Total payment, 1st year, $300 plus $300	700
Payment in following years for duration of the contract	300

Corn and wheat

Montgomery County, Ill.:	
Size of farm (acres)	320
County corn yield (bushels)	56.1
Corn acreage allotment (acres)	100
Farm normal yield (bushels per acre)	60
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	50
County loan rate (approximate)	$1.42
Payment rate per acre	$42.60
Payment	$2,130
County wheat yield (bushels)	24.4
Wheat acreage allotment (acres)	40
Farm normal yield (bushels per acre)	25
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	20
County loan rate (approximate)	$1.90
Payment rate per acre	$24.75
Payment	$495
Total acreage reserve payment	$2,625

For reference purposes there follows a statement showing data on planted acreages, production and CCC loan and inventory stocks of the commodities eligible under the acreage reserve program.

United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Stabilization Service—Acreage, production, CCC stocks, and CCC loan operations, principal crops

All cotton:	
Acreage in cultivation July 1, 1955 (acres)	17,489,000
Production 1955 (bales)	14,476,000
CCC-owned stocks Feb. 8, 1956 (bales)	7,115,816
Under CCC loan Feb. 3, 1956 (bales)	6,602,887
Corn:	
Acreage planted 1955 (acres)	81,577,000
Production 1955 (bushels)	3,184,836,000
CCC-owned stocks Jan. 18, 1956 (bushels)	745,377,000
Under CCC loan Jan. 15, 1956 (bushels)	200,300,000
Wheat:	
Acreage planted 1955 (acres)	58,284,000
Production 1955 (bushels)	938,159,000
CCC-owned stocks Jan. 18, 1956 (bushels)	857,471,000
Under CCC loan Jan. 15, 1956 (bushels)	256,480,000
Rice (rough):	
Acreage planted 1955 (acres)	1,842,000
Production 1955 (hundredweight)	53,420,000
CCC-owned stocks Jan. 18, 1956 (hundredweight)	18,532,000
Under CCC loan Jan. 15, 1956 (hundredweight)	14,925,000
Tobacco: [1]	
Cigar binder, type 51—	
Acreage harvested 1955 (acres)	7,900
Production (pounds)	12,401,000
CCC-owned stocks Dec. 31, 1955	None
Under CCC loan through associations, types 51 and 52, Dec. 31, 1955 (pounds)	7,660,000
Cigar binder, type 52—	
Acreage harvested (acres)	5,700
Production 1955 (pounds)	10,117,000
CCC-owned stocks Dec. 31, 1955	None
Under CCC loan Dec. 31, 1955. (Included with 51 above.)	
Cigar binder, type 54—	
Acres harvested 1955 (acres)	4,700
Production 1955 (pounds)	6,815,000
CCC-owned stocks (pounds)	95,000

United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Stabilization Service—Acreage, production, CCC stocks, and CCC loan operations, principal crops—Continued

Tobacco—Continued	
Under CCC loan through associations, types 54 and 55, Dec. 31, 1955 (pounds)	5,541,000
Cigar binder, type 55—	
Acres harvested 1955 (acres)	9,700
Production 1955 (pounds)	12,778,000
CCC-owned stocks	None
Under CCC loan. (included with 54 above.)	
Burley—	
Acres harvested 1955 (acres)	322,300
Production 1955 (pounds)	509,835,000
CCC stocks	None
Under CCC loans Dec. 31, 1955, of which 72,800,000 lbs. is 1955 crop (pounds)	476,100,000
Flue cured—	
Acres harvested 1955 (acres)	991,700
Production 1955 (pounds)	1,504,075,000
CCC-owned stocks	None
Under CCC loan Dec. 31, 1955, including practically all of 1955 that will be covered (pounds)	597,500,000

[1] All tobacco data except acreage are on farm-sales-weight basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that these are only tentative suggestions advanced by the Secretary. In our discussion of the matter with his assistants, it was made plain to us that if the suggestions were not sufficient to do the job, the inducements could be made more attractive, as my good friend from Minnesota has said. That is why the committee gave the Secretary the power to proceed to prepare a program which would be so attractive that the farmers would accept it.

When we discussed the matter at first, I was one who thought that the best way to accomplish the first phase of the program—namely, the reduction in planting of allotted acres—would be to pay a fair rate and make the reduction compulsory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. But when the Secretary appeared before the committee and suggested that he could make a voluntary plant so attractive that compulsion would not be necessary, all of us agreed to give the Secretary the power and to let him proceed to do it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the record ought to be made perfectly clear that the intent of the committee, as I interpret it, at least, was to say, "Mr. Secretary, you have asked for a voluntary program. We are providing in the bill an authorization of funds which is very generous. You have the authority; it is unrestricted."

I do not think there is any restrictive language in the bill in terms of payments, except as to minimums, and, as I recall, a maximum of $100 an acre on tobacco. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But we have said to the Secretary, in effect, "If you want to get acreage reduction in an acreage reserve program on a voluntary basis, you will have to make it so attractive that any farmer figuring what he can produce on the land on the basis of the average production will find it more desirable to go into the program than to stay out of it." That means the Secretary will have to act on the generous side, because every farmer will feel that he will get a bumper crop this year on the 30 acres.

Mr. LANGER. That is what I was coming to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thought I saw the gleam in the Senator's eye.

Mr. LANGER. The greatest gambler in the world is the farmer. In that respect he has everybody in Wall Street beat. The farmer will plant his 30 acres. He will say, "This year I am going to get 30 bushels to the acre." Does the Senator from Louisiana think the farmer will voluntarily go into the program?

Mr. ELLENDER. My hope is that the farmer will cooperate. He must realize that so long as heavy surpluses dangle over the market, he can expect to receive depressed prices. I am quite certain the farmers are realists; and if the amount to be paid to them is made attractive, as is contemplated, I really believe they will cooperate to the fullest extent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It appears to me that if the farmer in his wisdom and judgment, and, as the Senator from North Dakota says, in accordance with his well known and well established gambling spirit, in terms of the productivity of his soil, decides not to go into the program, he still will have allotted acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He will still receive price support only on his commodities produced on allotted acres. The worst that could happen would be that the Department of Agriculture estimates, based on expert opinion with regard to allotted acres, would be fulfilled. The number of acres allotted is according to the best judgment of the Department of Agriculture as to the needs of production for a particular year in a particular commodity.

The only reason why the acreage reserve idea was injected into the program was, as I gathered, so that the Department could empty its warehouses by cutting down on the production of allotted acres below what the domestic expert opinion would figure for a particular year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think we have made that very plain during the course of the debate this afternoon.

Mr. LANGER. So instead of getting cash, the farmer will receive a commodity.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. He can take the commodity instead of cash.

Mr. LANGER. If he gets a commodity, will it mean that he can get wheat? Is that 10 percent more than cash?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In order to encourage the farmer to use some of the surpluses, he can buy the commodities and get a 10-percent increase in the value of the certificate.

Mr. LANGER. What can the farmer do with the wheat if he gets it from surplus?

Mr. ELLENDER. He can feed it, or use it in any other way he pleases.

Mr. LANGER. Can he sell it on the open market.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Who will handle the program when it goes into effect? If the bill shall be passed, who will administer the program?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, with the assistance of all the State committeemen and those handling the technical phases of the soil conservation program, including the land-grant colleges. I read section 218 of the bill:

> In administering this act in the continental United States, the Secretary shall utilize the services of community, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Section 219 provides:

> SEC. 219. With respect to conservation aspects of any program under this act, the Secretary shall consult with the soil-conservation districts, State foresters, land-grant colleges, and other appropriate agencies of State governments in the formulation of program provisions at the State and county levels. The technical resources of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the land-grant colleges, the State foresters, and other appropriate technical services shall be utilized, so far as practicable, to assure coordination of conservation activities and a solid technical foundation for the program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That means, does it not, that in the States, the State ASC committees will have the primary authority within the States to execute the law in accordance with the specifications issued by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ELLENDER. They will assist in formulating and administering the program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator from Louisiana believe that the program should be administered at the grassroots; that is, that the county committees should have something to say? Or should the program be operated by the State committees?

Mr. ELLENDER. The program will be operated, so far as possible, from the grassroots. Those in the field certainly will insist not only in administering the program, but in formulating the plans.

The State foresters will be consulted. As the Senator knows, the reason is that for many years there has been a cooperative program between the States and the Federal Government in effect with reference to forestry. I think title VI of the bill has a special provision for afforestation and reforestation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not want to labor the point, but does the Senator feel that the county committees in the various States are important in the execution of the program?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are very important.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator feel that the office managers of the various county committees should report to the county committees, or that the county committees should report to the office managers?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is something I would prefer not discussing now. I am familiar with what the Senator has in mind, but I would not care to engage in a debate on it now. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is, I think, looking into that matter so far as it pertains to Missouri. Let us hope the problem can be settled in some way.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question on this matter, which I consider to be important?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I suggest that the Department of Agriculture has now issued a directive to the effect that the office manager can approve the payroll of himself and those who work for him without any reference to the county committee. Does not that really mean that the office manager is now working independently of the county committee, and under the direction of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ELLENDER. If I am to judge by the case cited by the Senator from Missouri, I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I want to support the Senator in obtaining the passage of the bill to the best of my ability and in every way I can, but I am wondering if there are adequate safeguards in the bill as to its execution. After all, a bill in itself means literally almost nothing. It is whether or not the bill will be administered properly in accordance with the wishes of Congress that really counts.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Secretary is given ample opportunity to administer the bill along the lines which we are now speaking. It is my sincere hope that it will be administered in that manner. As I said yesterday, and again this afternoon, it is my hope that whoever will administer the bill after it has been passed will be sympathetic with what Congress is trying to do. If he is not, the President ought to get somebody who is.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. He has covered the point.

Will the Senator yield so that I may make inquiry regarding another aspect of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The president of the National Farm Organization, a new farm organization, told us, in a meeting of the Missouri delegation, that in some parts of the country he represented 25 percent of the farmers would go bankrupt in the next 60 or 90 days, because the banks had stated they could not continue to accept obsolete farm equipment as collateral for loans, and the farmers do not have the money with which to pay off the loans. Therefore, the farm people were anxious that the bill give them some immediate relief.

Will the Senator from Louisiana tell us whether he thinks the pending bill will at least in part answer that request?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I indicated yesterday and again today, the only immediate income relief provided in the bill will be through adoption of the 90 percent of parity support provision. The rest of the bill relates to long-term benefits. It is entirely possible that next year may bring better prices for grain, and, in fact, even cattle, poultry, and dairy products. This may occur because grains will cost more. There will probably be a shorter supply of grains. That possibility will help stabilize the livestock industry.

It is my judgment that if as much as 25 million acres are put into the conservation reserve, there will be less oats, barley, and grain grown. Those crops are now in surplus because of diversion of other acres to those crops.

On the other hand, under the acreage reserve program, whereby acres which are allotted to basic crops are to be taken out of production, if a sufficient number of those acres can be taken out of production, there will be a tendency not to aggravate further our surpluses. If that occurs, it is bound to increase the prices of the commodities next year, because there will be less production.

That, however, as I said, would come about on a long time basis. It might take 2 years, or perhaps 3 years, to get rid of the surpluses which are now glutting our market and which are so destructive to the price structure.

There is another provision in the bill which could give immediate assistance, if properly utilized. As the Senator knows, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use section 32 funds to purchase perishable commodities and to stabilize markets. Those funds are equal to 30 percent of customs duties. The Secretary had about $462 million available from the source as of July 1, 1955. He could spend no more than 25 percent of that amount for any 1 commodity.

Mr. SYMINGTON. How much did the Secretary have on hand last year at this time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not recall. It was a little over $400 million. For this fiscal year he had about $460 million. That sum will be supplemented by $250 million in this proposal.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator think, based on the record and past history, the Secretary of Agriculture is prone to utilize funds of that character in order to help the farmer?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, it is my hope that he will do so. If the Secretary will not, it is my hope he will be made to do it, or that the President will get somebody who will.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If Congress does not approve of the 90 percent of parity support provision of the bill, and the other component parts of the bill are

passed, how long does the Senator think a farmer who is in bad condition, so far as his bank is concerned, will have to wait before he will receive any tangible relief under the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. It all depends on what shape he is in. If he is in bad shape, he might not be able to wait until next year. Next year he may be a little better off, because the prices of commodities which he produces may go up. By taking acres out of production, a little scarcity will be created. As I said, however, since the program is on a voluntary basis, nobody knows how many farmers will participate in it. It is my hope that, with the power the Secretary of Agriculture has, he will make it so attractive that the goal set by the committee will be reached. If that goal is reached, it is my judgment that some farmers may benefit in the latter part of 1956, but only farmers who have something to plant and sell and cultivate will benefit.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, the primary possibility of assistance for the farmer this year lies in the 90 percent of parity provision of the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. In high price supports; that is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If these supports are not provided, the farmer will probably have to wait until next year to receive appreciable benefits under the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, if he can get enough credit.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If he cannot get any credit, he will go broke. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] desires to follow me in my remarks. I have been kept very busy answering questions; I requested that Senators propound questions as my address proceeded, and I am not complaining.

(At this point Mr. ELLENDER yielded, first to Mr. WILLIAMS, who addressed the Senate on the subject of tax delinquencies, and then to Mr. YOUNG, who addressed the Senate on the subject of the agricultural bill. On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. YOUNG were ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the speech of Mr. ELLENDER.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the soil-bank program is not going to put extra dollars into the farmers' pockets in 1956, then just how does the Secretary of Agriculture propose to get agriculture out of the depressed state in which we now find it? As I have pointed out, the Secretary is not offering the farmers higher price levels in 1956 as compared to 1955. On the contrary, while he talks about increasing the farmer's income on the one hand, we find him hacking away at price-support levels on the other.

Wheat, corn, and rice producers have already felt the pinch in support prices for this year, and no doubt cotton and peanuts will be the next to feel the impact of lower price supports, unless we return to 90 percent price supports as the committee has suggested.

The trouble with the Secretary of Agriculture these days is that he is behaving like a bull with a red flag waved before him. Whenever 90 percent price supports are mentioned around him, he immediately sees red and runs around in circles. He has become so obsessed with the idea that 90 percent price supports have brought about high production, that he has overlooked the rather obvious fact that his own Department of Agriculture, under the splendid research programs which have been carried on over the years, is primarily accountable for the present era of agricultural abundance. You can examine the Agriculture Department's crop-production records, and the one fact stands out that for every major crop there has been a steady upward swing in yields per acre over the years, commencing in the early 1930's but becoming especially accelerated since World War II.

New varieties, better cultivation methods, more efficient fertilizers, insect- and weed-control formula, mechanical harvesters—these and other 20th century innovations have played their part in increasing the quantity of food and fiber that can now be produced from an acre of ground. The record shows that during the past 14 years the same number of acres planted on our farms have produced 42 percent more food and fiber.

The evidence is abundant that, certainly with respect to the basic crops, the major portion of today's agricultural surpluses have come from increased yields per acre and not from increased acres devoted to the crops. It is true that during the Korean war, when our Government was sorely pressed for food and fiber and our war planners thought that huge quantities of these commodities were needed in reserve to cope with the uncertainties of the future, the American farmers were urged by the President of the United States and by the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, to plant and produce to the upmost.

I read from the President's emergency proclamation issued on December 16, 1950:

> I summon our farmers, our workers in industry, and our businessmen to make a mighty production effort to meet the defense requirements of the Nation and to this end to eliminate all waste and inefficiency and to subordinate all lesser interests to the common good.

Farmers were urged at this time to take every available acre into cultivation and to devote it to cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and other crops that, in times of all-out war, have become even more necessary than guns and airplanes. It was during this period, when farmers were doing their utmost to comply with the wishes of their Government, and thereby contribute to the security and well-being of the Nation, that our surplus problems began to aggravate the farm economy. It was during this period particularly that yields per acre continued to increase phenomenally. Then when the Korean war ended, the Government took steps to bring agricultural production back in line with demand. The gates of flood-tide production had already been opened wide, however, and surpluses were building up.

Our Nation's mighty agricultural plant, which had produced such an abundance of products in wartime, could not be turned off overnight. Nor did the Government try to turn off overnight its mighty industrial plant. It should be remembered that after Korea, our Government has continued to spend billions to keep our defense plants operating, not only to build up our own defenses, but also the defenses of our allies throughout the world. Our agricultural plant was not accorded equal treatment, however. Instead of continuing to produce food and fiber products in this country in order to supply our allies, our Government's policy instead was to encourage our allies to become self-sufficient in food production. We spent millions in that direction over the years.

Mr. President, we have heard considerable debate during the past few years about the evils of 90 percent of parity—how high, fixed-support levels were wartime incentives, designed to spur the production of farm commodities. The inference has been that 90 percent of parity supports were the equivalent of a high price for farm commodities—that they were shining goals, sitting atop some agricultural mountaintop, toward which the farmers of America were to strive.

In view of this, Mr. President, I think it is time we looked back a few years and examined the precise situation which confronted the Congress during World War II and the months immediately preceding Pearl Harbor.

In May of 1941, when the clouds of war hovered over our Nation, the Senate and the House both voted separate legislation raising the support levels for the basic commodities. Now, this was not done to increase production, as the debate on the bills involved so pointedly demonstrate. Rather, agriculture was in the doldrums; farm prices were sluggish, and our export markets were vanishing. Wages and corporate profits were going up, but there was little raising trend shown in the agricultural economy of our Nation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that the Government itself asked that the farmers produce, in order that there might be on hand surplus commodities in case of a third world war?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that during the war certain industries were making war materials, and that the Government paid those industries for making the war materials and also paid for a great many war materials which the Government never even received? The Government paid for them because it had contracts outstanding, and when companies which had been manufacturing war materials converted back to manufacturing domestic goods, the Government paid those

companies billions upon billions of dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend it was excess of $41 billion.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. More than $41 billion was paid to industries throughout the Nation. What was paid to agriculture? The only cost to the Government resulted from the Commodity Credit Corporation's buying commodities and selling them at a loss. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. As the record will show and I feel confident it will be brought out during this debate, from 1933 to November of 1955, the loss on all the basic commodities, which are the commodities we are discussing, was less than a half billion dollars.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If my memory serves me correctly, I believe Russia has been sending its citizens to this country to see how we are producing so much. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Russia has sent delegations to this country, and I hope she will continue to send them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But Russia is not producing surpluses, so far as food is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. On my visit to Moscow last year I saw lines of people blocks long waiting to buy small pieces of meat. I remember very well standing in line to see what was going on. Pork was selling at the equivalent of $2.40 a pound in our money. One could not buy boiled ham for less than the equivalent of $4 a pound in our money.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If Russia had the surpluses we have today in America, what does the Senator think would be Russia's attitude? Would not she be a little more willing, probably, to start another war, because she had those surpluses?

Mr. ELLENDER. I dislike making such assumptions. I would hate to say such would cause a war, but I am sure Russia would be more willing, probably, to give the free world trouble than would be the case if she did not have the food.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is certainly true that no nation would want to go to war when it does not have any surpluses of the materials she would need during a war.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am referring particularly to food.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I am to judge from what I saw in Russia last year, there is a severe food shortage. When I say food shortage, I mean that, from what I saw, I do not believe Russia has enough food stored up to wage war for very long. I may be in error about that, but that is the judgment I have to offer, after spending only 10 days in that country. I talked to quite a few people. I visited many of their farms. In many places production on some farms had been far below par.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So it could be that the surpluses in wheat, oats, and corn, as well as cotton, which is one of the materials we have to have in time of war, may be a blessing in disguise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not doubt that.

Mr. President, the May 1941 amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which increased support levels to 85 percent of parity for the basic crops, was designed not to stimulate production, but to attempt to infuse into the agricultural economy of our Nation just a little of the prosperity which other segments—principally labor and industry—were experiencing.

In this connection, let me read from some of the debate in the House of Representatives on the conference report on this legislation.

Mr. HOPE is a very prominent Member of the House. He is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. He is a very able Member of Congress, and has served his people well and for a long time. This is what Mr. HOPE stated back in 1941, when 85 percent of parity price supports on basics were placed on the statute books. As the record will show, this was done first and foremost, to bring farmers up to the point where they could obtain a little more income, income in line with that being received by other segments of our economy.

By the same token, that is what we are doing here in asking the Senate to reinstate 90 percent of parity price-supports. The purpose is merely to give the farmers of the United States immediate income relief.

This is what Representative HOPE had to say:

I would certainly not want to be understood as urging that loans as high as 85 percent of parity were a permanent solution of the agricultural problem. I think, as far as cotton in particular is concerned, such would be a ruinous policy to follow over a long period; but I believe that for this year, with the emergency that is staring agriculture in the face—

Mind you, Mr. President, that was in May 1941, a few months preceding Pearl Harbor, which occurred in December of that year—

with our export markets at least temporarily gone for cotton and wheat, this provision offers the best method that we can devise to give the farmer an opportunity to secure a price which will be fairly commensurate with the price of the things he has to buy.

This report, if adopted, will likely make unnecessary the acceptance of the Russell amendment, which increases the amount appropriated for parity payments this year by $150 million and also increases the amount appropriated for parity payments next year from $212 million, as provided in the House bill, to $300 million.

Representative FULMER, one of the House conferees on the bill, said:

The other amendment increases the 75-percent loan as carried in the House bill to an 85-percent loan. This loan is for 1 year to take care of this year's crop. There is an amendment on the appropriation bill known as the Russell amendment increasing amount for parity payments from $212 million to $450 million, which would be helpful to increase parity payments which would increase purchasing and debt-paying power of farmers. We realized the opposition to this amendment and therefore agreed upon the 85-percent loan so as to give to farmers that which they are clearly entitled to, especially so because of the high prices they have to pay for everything they have to buy at this time. As a matter of fact, farmers are not getting any advantage or help from the defense program in line with other groups, and the assurance of these prices will enable them to pay these advanced prices on what they have to buy.

Thus, Mr. President, 85 percent of parity in the May 1941 amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, represented an attempt then to achieve much the same goals, price-wise, as the ones the bill of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry today attempts to achieve. Its purpose was, not to stimulate production, but to raise farm income and permit the farmer to share in the wartime boom of the early 1940's.

Mr. President, the story does not end here. In July of 1941 the Steagall amendment, which provided price support at 85 percent of parity for the nonbasic commodities, was adopted.

The act of July 1, 1941, which contains the so-called Steagall amendment, increased the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it also fixed the support level for both basic and nonbasic commodities at 85 percent of parity. Mr. President, the language of the Steagall amendment is this:

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage the expansion of production of any nonbasic agricultural commodity, he shall make public announcement thereof and he shall so use the funds made available under section 3 of this act or otherwise made available to him for the disposal of agricultural commodities, through a commodity loan, purchase, or other operation, taking into account the total funds available for such purpose for all commodities, so as to support a price for the producers of any such commodity with respect to which such announcement was made of not less than 85 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this section if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities. Any such commodity loan, purchase, or other operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient public announcement to permit the producers of such commodity to make a readjustment in the production of the commodity. For the purposes of this section, commodities other than cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice shall be deemed to be nonbasic commodities.

Note well, Mr. President, that this language was confined to the nonbasic commodities; and its purpose was to assure producers of nonbasics, who complied with any production encouragement initiated by the Secretary of Agriculture, that they would not wake up some morning and find themselves with no need for their production; it was assurance to the producers of perishables that should wartime demand suddenly terminate, they would not have to sell on a bottomless market. The incentive of

the Steagall amendment was the knowledge that farmers would have assurance that if they did heed the cries of our Government to increase production, they would not find themselves in the same fix the farmers were in at the end of World War I.

If further evidence is required in order for us to discern the true purpose of this legislation, let us turn to the statement of none other than Representative Steagall himself, when he presented his committee's bill to the House of Representatives. Mr. Steagall said:

Congress has enacted labor laws which fix minimum wages for most employees of the Nation. We just recently passed laws which will permit industrial plants handling defense contracts to amortize their investments for new construction over a shorter period and in that way we have almost guaranteed them a profit on defense contracts. We have given industry the tariff, we fix minimum freight rates, and so forth, so that the income of practically every segment of our population is governmentally protected in one way or the other by law. But we are just now getting around to assuring something nearer reasonable minimum prices and minimum income for farmers.

The indexes of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on April 30 showed that general farm prices stood at 110 in relation to the so-called base period of 1909–14, but the price of things the farmer buys has increased to a ratio of 129. Thus, even with the increase in farm prices and income, farm prices are still 15 percent below a parity with the prices of things the farmer must buy to carry on his business.

The loan provisions which the Congress has included in the agricultural legislation represent an attempt and promise to give the farmer a guaranty of at least a reasonable minimum return for his crop. Even with loans at 85 percent of parity for the major crops, the farmer is still far behind the parade when it comes to equality of income.

Last year the Congress increased the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation by $500 million, and I think those who have studied the matter will agree with this power to lend funds on the 1940 crops literally saved cotton, tobacco, and wheat farmers from disaster in the past year. Last summer crops were going to harvest and the world markets, which normally absorb 40 percent or more of our cotton, 50 percent of our flue-cured and dark-fired tobacco, and from 15 to 20 percent of our wheat crop, were almost completely closed. Farmers could not have sold their crops last fall at any reasonable price save for the fact that the Department of Agriculture, through Commodity Credit Corporation, placed a bottom under the markets by making nonrecourse loans available. The wheat and corn and cotton dammed back by lack of exports flowed into the loan and the income of farmers was maintained. Due to the large accumulation of these products in the loan, however, it took nearly all of the borrowing power to meet the needs of the current year.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will simply enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue its functions of stabilizing prices on basic crops and will provide the necessary funds to do the job.

Now, Mr. President, let us turn to the first time in our history when the Congress voted mandatory 90-percent-of-parity price supports for the basic commodities. It is important to note that this legislation is not found in a general farm bill, but in the Stabilization Act of 1942. This legislation was an outgrowth of a special message sent to the Congress by President Roosevelt on September 7, 1942. He cited increased living costs and outlined the dangers of runaway inflation. He reviewed the earlier emergency legislation enacted by the Congress to control prices and wages, but he pointed to two gaps in this anti-inflationary dike. They were: Failure of the Congress to tax heavily in order to keep the costs of living from spiraling upward, and the failure of Congress to stabilize the prices received by growers for the products of their lands.

In the autumn of 1941, the concern of our President with respect to agriculture was directed not at assuring our farmers a fair share of national prosperity, but controlling the contantly increasing prices they were receiving. The President stated that farmers were the beneficiaries of unfair privilege. He pointed out that some farm prices had shot up to 150 percent of parity, and he called for ceilings on farm products, to be placed at or about 100 percent of parity.

At the same time, he called for price floors. This is what he said:

As a part of our general program on farm prices, I recommend that Congress in due time give consideration to the advisability of legislation which would place a floor under prices of farm products, in order to maintain stability in the farm market for a reasonable future time. In other words, we should find a practicable method which will not only enable us to place a reasonable ceiling or maximum price upon farm products but which will enable us also to guarantee to the farmer that he would receive a fair minimum price for his product for 1 year or even 2 years, or whatever period is necessary after the end of the war. Every farmer remembers what happened to his prices after the last war. We can, I am sure, if we act promptly and wisely, stabilize the farmers' economy so that the postwar disaster of 1920 will not overtake him again.

This, Mr. President, the Congress did. It gave the Nation's price stabilizer power to clamp price ceilings on farm prices which exceeded 100 percent of parity to the producer, subject to an "escape clause" with respect to some commodities. At the same time, it voted 90 percent of parity price supports—not as a present price incentive, but as a guaranty that farmers who heeded their Government's cry to produce more food and to produce more fiber, would not find themselves at some future date with an abundance of production and a dearth of markets.

The claim of those who proclaim that 90 percent of parity for the basics was a wartime price stimulus is in error. Ninety percent of parity came into our agricultural picture as the result of two separate and distinct objectives. The first of these was to assure our agriculture a rightful share of increasing national prosperity; the second was to assure the American farmer that should he increase his production, as his Government requested, he would be insured against a repetition of the farm depression of the 1920's.

Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate by reciting all of the mechanisms by which our Government has come to the aid of business, labor, and other segments of our economy. I presented all these facts to the Senate in 1954, when we debated this very same issue of 90 percent price supports on the basic commodities, as opposed to a flexible price support program. At that time the majority of the Senate voted against 90 percent price supports, and I predicted that within a year or two, when the Benson flexible price support program had fully flexed, our farmers would be faced with distressingly lower incomes. During the extensive field hearings our committee conducted throughout the United States last fall we found ample evidence that my prophecy has been fulfilled. Everywhere we went, farmers begged for help. They asked us to do something to relieve their situation immediately. Most of them stated that they could not withstand another year of depressive prices similar to those of 1955. Yet, here we are faced today with an administration farm program that not only calls for a continuation of the disastrous farm prices that existed in 1955, but contemplates even lower prices in 1956.

To be frank, Mr. President, I could not in good conscience support the Secretary of Agriculture's farm program and still look the farmers of America straight in the face.

I repeat, there is nothing in Mr. Benson's program that will give the farmers any immediate relief in 1956. The soil bank is a more or less long-range program, which gives hope of ridding ourselves of burdensome surpluses in 2, 3, or perhaps 4 years, but there is no prospect of relief in 1956. On the other hand, the program which the majority of the Committee has recommended, a program calling for 90-percent price supports on the basic commodities, plus inauguration of the soil bank program, will, I believe, afford relief and a possible solution to the problem. It will give our farm economy the shot in the arm that is so urgently needed, and it will give that shot in the arm today, and not at some time in the distant future. It will breathe new life into agriculture at a time when the economic life blood of the farmer is fast ebbing away. Contrary to Mr. Benson's views, 90-percent price supports on the basic commodities would not bring about increased production of those commodities. It would not stimulate production of the basics because, as Mr. Benson well knows, he has in his hands all the tools he needs with which to control production of the the basics. He has already called for acreage allotments during 1956 on all of the basic crops. Irrespective of whether we have 75-percent price supports or 90-percent price supports for the basics in 1956, practically every acre that it allocated to farmers for planting of these crops in 1956 will actually be planted to them. Therefore, when Mr. Benson says that the 90-percent parity support feature of the committee bill would stimulate production, the Secretary is in ef-

fect stating either that he is incapable of carrying out the wishes of the Congress in administering this farm program, or that he is unwilling to carry out the wishes of the Congress.

In any event, Mr. President, I say with all sincerity that if the Congress will adopt the program which the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has recommended—a program embracing both the soil bank provisions and the 90-percent parity support provision—and if the President will sign the bill and let it become law; and if, in addition, he will place the administration of the law in the hands of one who will earnestly and conscientiously try to make the program work, we can once more lead American agriculture back to a prosperous state.

Mr. President at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the report of the committee on the pending bill, which excerpts explain the various sections of the bill. I had intended to do that, but during the course of the debate, we have covered practically every subject, with the exception perhaps of the two-price plan for rice, and I am sure that will be fully discussed later.

Furthermore, I believe several Senators desire to speak at this time. Therefore I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana to have certain excerpts printed in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 1484) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides for immediate assistance to farmers in the form of increased support prices; reduced production of surplus commodities and increased soil, water, wildlife, and forest conservation through acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs; increased disposal or removal of surplus commodities; needed changes in marketing quota and allotment legislation; a two-price plan for rice; assistance to States for tree planting and reforestation; and price reporting and research on forest products.

TITLE 1—PRICE SUPPORT

Section 101. Basic commodities except wheat

Section 101 provides for price support for the basic commodities, except wheat, at 90 percent of parity for the 1956 and 1957 crops. This would apply principally to cotton, corn, and peanuts since (1) the provisions contained in title V of the bill, if approved, would supersede this section with respect to rice; and (2) tobacco is required by existing law to be supported at 90 percent of parity whenever marketing quotas are in effect. Cotton, corn, peanuts, and rice are required under existing law to be supported at between 75 and 90 percent of parity. The support prices for rice and corn of the 1956 crop have been announced at $4.04 per hundredweight for rice (75 percent of parity) and $1.40 per bushel for corn (81 percent of parity). Price support levels for the 1956 crops of cotton and peanuts have not yet been announced. The minimum support level provided by this section for cotton, rice, corn, and peanuts (on the basis of January 15 data) is shown in the last column of the following table:

TABLE 1.—*Support prices on basis of various support levels and various parity prices: Cotton, rice, corn, and peanuts as of Jan. 15, 1956*

Commodity	Unit	Effective parity price Jan. 15, 1956	75 percent of effective parity	90 percent of effective parity	Parity price prescribed by sec. 106 of S. 3183	90 percent of parity price prescribed by sec. 106 of S. 3183
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Cotton, upland	Pounds	[1] $0.3484	$0.2631	$0.3136	$0.3522	$0.3170
Rice	Hundredweight	[1] 5.42	4.04	4.88	5.42	4.88
Corn	Bushels	[2] 1.73	1.30	1.56	1.82	1.64
Peanuts	Pounds	[2] .129	.0968	.116	.136	.122

[1] New formula parity price.
[2] Transitional 95 percent of old.

Section 102. Wheat

Section 102 provides price support for milling quality wheat at 90 percent of parity and support for other wheat at such levels as will preserve its competitive relationship with corn on the basis of respective feed values, the average support price for all wheat to be not less than 75 percent of parity. Milling quality wheat would be wheat produced in any area from seed of a variety which in such area normally produces wheat of a quality desired for milling purposes. Wheat of the 1956 crop is deemed to be milling quality unless of a variety designated as undesirable by the Secretary of Agriculture prior to the time such wheat is planted. In determining milling quality wheat, the Secretary would consult with a committee on which there will be 3 representatives from each of the principal wheat-producing areas, of whom 1 would be a wheat farmer, 1 a wheat miller, and 1 a person experienced in research on wheat varieties. This section would be applicable only to the 1956 and 1957 crops.

The announced support price for wheat of the 1956 crop is $1.81 per bushel (76 percent of parity). On the basis of January 15 data and the parity formula provided by section 106, 90 percent of parity would be $2.26 per bushel.

Under this section, a national average support level representing 90 percent of the parity price for wheat, would be established and, after the adjustments for location, grade, quality, and other factors called for by section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, this would be applied to milling quality wheat. The support level for other wheat would be established at a price for each county which represents its feed value relationship to corn. The feeding value of wheat to corn (pound for pound) based on USDA Circular No. 836 is 105.

The Department has had some experience in preparing a program of the type contemplated by this section.

On August 12, 1955, it announced that under the 1956 wheat price-support program 23 designated undesirable varieties would be discounted 20 cents per bushel in addition to any other discounts, and that protein premiums would not be applicable to these varieties. Following is a listing of the designated undesirable varieties, by classes and the States in which they are designated:

HARD RED WINTER

Purkof: Indiana, Michigan.
Red Chief: Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico.
Red Jacket: Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico.
Kanking: Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Nebraska.
Kanqueen: Missouri, Colorado.
Chiefkan: Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Colorado, New Mexico.
Stafford: Nebraska, Kansas.
Early Pawnee (Sel. 33): Kansas.
Early Blackhull: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Colorado.
New Chief: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico.
Yogo: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas.

SOFT RED WINTER

Kawvale: Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska.

HARD RED SPRING

Henry: Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana.
Sturgeon: Wisconsin.
Progress: Wisconsin.
Spinkcota: Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota.
Premier: Montana, North Dakota.

WHITE

Rex: Idaho, Washington, Oregon.
Sonora: California.
Galgalos: Nebraska.

DURUM

Golden Ball: Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana.
Peliss: North Dakota, Montana.
Pentad: North Dakota.

The August 12 announcement contemplated that a producer certification plan would be used. Each producer applying for price support in States with any of the listed undesirable varieties would be required to certify (1) that the wheat he harvested was not of the undesirable varieties listed for his State, or (2) that the wheat he harvested was from one or more of the undesirable varities but none of such wheat was being tendered for price support, or (3) that the wheat on which he requested price support contained wheat of an undesirable variety listed for his State and such wheat was identified by variety, and bin number (if farm stored) or warehouse receipt number.

It was estimated that the total 1954 production of the 23 varieties listed as undesirable by the Department in its announcement of August 12, 1955, amounted to 31 million bushels, as compared with the total 1954 crop of 985 million bushels.

Section 103. Cottonseed and soybeans

Section 103 provides that whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other shall be supported at such level as will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. The oil and meal produced from cottonseed and soybeans generally compete for the same markets, both in the United States and abroad. The purpose of this provision is to assure that the support levels established for the two commodities will not result in one being withdrawn into Government store, while the other takes over the market.

Support prices for the 1951–56 crops of cottonseed and soybeans were as follows:

TABLE 2

Crop	Cottonseed		Soybeans	
	Support price (per ton) [1]	Percent of parity	Support price (per bushel)	Percent of parity
1951	$63.90	90	$2.45	90
1952	66.70	90	2.56	90
1953	54.20	75	2.56	90
1954	54.00	75	2.22	80
1955	46.00	65	2.04	70
1956	48.00	70	2.15	75

[1] Loan rate basis grade (100).

Section 104. Cotton

Section 104 repeals the special provision of law designating Middling ⅞-inch cotton as the standard grade and staple of parity calculations and price support and would result in the average grade and staple being utilized for such purposes as in the case of other commodities. This change for cotton would aid in establishing more realistic differentials under the support program and would result in slightly lower support prices than would result from using Middling ⅞ as the standard grade and staple, since Middling ⅞ is below the actual average grade and staple. The amount they would be lower would depend on the particular schedule of premiums and discounts used in the calculations. If the 1955 loan schedule were used, support prices would be 1.36 cents per pound lower if based on average grade and staple than they would be if based on Middling ⅞. The average quality of the cotton produced in 1954 was as follows: Grade 95.4 (Middling white equals 100) and staple lengths 33.2 thirty-seconds of an inch. Through January 15, 1956, the 1955 crop was as follows: Grade 93.4 and staple length 32.6 thirty-seconds.

Section 105. Dairy products

Section 105 provides price support for whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities at not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent of parity, and provides for using a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive (the period originally used in computing the parity equivalent). On the basis of data now available, this would result in a parity equivalent of 88 percent of the parity price for all milk sold wholesale by farmers, instead of 83.3 percent as now results from using the most recent 10-year period.

The effect of this section on support prices is illustrated by the following tables:

TABLE 3.—*Minimum and maximum support prices of manufacturing milk*

(a) Under present method:	
Parity for all milk per hundredweight: Jan. 15, 1956	$4.61
Parity equivalent price of manufacturing milk:	
83.3 percent of parity for all milk [1]	3.84
Maximum support 90 percent	3.46
Minimum support 75 percent	2.88

[1] July 1946–December 1955 average relationship between prices of manufacturing milk and all milk wholesale (revised series).

(b) Under sec. 105:	
Parity for all milk	4.61
Parity equivalent of manufacturing milk:	
88 percent of all milk [2]	4.06
Maximum support 90 percent	3.65
Minimum support 80 percent	3.25

[2] July 1946–December 1948 average relationship between prices of manufacturing milk and all milk wholesale (revised series).

NOTE.—Present support price of $3.15 is 80 percent of the parity equivalent price of manufacturing milk as of Apr. 1, 1955, the beginning of the current marketing year, but is 82 percent of the parity equivalent price as of January 1956.

TABLE 4.—*Minimum and maximum support prices of butterfat*

	Cents per pound
(a) Under present method:	
Parity price, Jan. 15, 1956	71.9
Maximum support 90 percent	64.7
Minimum support 75 percent	53.9
(b) Under sec. 105:	
Parity price, Jan. 15, 1956	71.9
Maximum support 90 percent	64.7
Minimum support 80 percent	57.5

NOTE.—Present support price of 56.2 cents per pound is 76 percent of parity as of Apr. 1, 1955, the beginning of the current marketing year, but is 78 percent of the parity price as of January 1956.

The parity equivalents which have been used heretofore and the periods for which they were applicable are set out in the following table:

TABLE 5.—*Parity equivalent*

Period:	Percent
January 1949–March 1954	88.5
April–December 1954	84.1
January–December 1955	83.7
January–December 1956	83.3

The method currently used in computing and applying the parity equivalent is described as follows:

METHOD CURRENTLY USED TO COMPUTE AND APPLY THE PARITY EQUIVALENT FOR MANUFACTURING MILK

Current procedure for computing the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk as approved by the Secretary of Agriculture provides that (1) the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk shall be determined on the basis of the relation of (a) the average price received by farmers for all milk sold at wholesale to plants and dealers for the period July 1946 through the December preceding the date of computation to (b) the average price paid f. o. b. plant by processors for all milk sold by farmers for use in production of American cheese, evaporated milk, and butter and byproducts during the same period; (2) data for each year are to be added annually until 10 full calendar years are included in the comparison; (3) thereafter the parity equivalent during any calendar year will be determined on the basis of the relation between the averages of the respective series for the 10 calendar years immediately preceding.

The factor to be used during a particular calendar year is computed in January of that year using price data available at the date of computation. The factor to be used during 1956 is 83.3 percent, which compares with 83.7 percent, the factor used during 1955. The parity price for all milk wholesale, $4.61 per hundredweight on January 15, 1956, multiplied by 83.3 percent, results in $3.84 per hundredweight, the parity equivalent for milk for manufacture for January 15, 1956. This parity equivalent applies to the national average price for all milk of average butterfat content used for the principal manufacturing purposes calculated on an annual basis. It should be noted that the parity equivalent for milk for manufacturing is not in itself a parity price but is rather an administrative determination of an operating differential which is subject to revision as additional data become available or as experience indicates that the same purpose might better be achieved by calculating and applying revised differentials.

Section 106. Parity formula

Section 106 would require the Secretary in the case of the basic commodities to use the old parity price or the modernized parity, whichever is higher. This section also directs the Secretary to make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and report thereon within 6 months after enactment of the act.

A brief description of "old," "new," and "transitional" parity prices, and a table illustrating the effect of this section, is set out below:

1. Old parity prices are calculated by multiplying base-period prices by a parity index. In the case of the basic commodities, except tobacco, the base period is August 1909 to July 1914. Hence, the base-period prices for the individual commodities are the average prices received by farmers for those commodities during that period. The parity index is the unrevised index of prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes.

2. Transitional parity prices are the old parity prices decreased by 5 percent for each calendar year since 1955 in the case of basic commodities and 5 percent for each calendar year since 1949 in the case of nonbasic commodities. For 1956 transitional parity prices are 95 percent of old parity prices for basic commodities and 65 percent of old parity prices for nonbasic commodities.

3. New parity prices are computed in much the same manner as old parity prices, using the parity index based on 1910–14, but the pattern of price relationships among the various commodities that existed in the immediately preceding 10 calendar years is used to determine the pattern of relationships among the parity prices of the individual commodities.

TABLE 6.—*New, old, or transitional and effective parity prices for selected basic and nonbasic commodities, Jan. 15, 1956*

Commodity	Unit	New parity price	Old parity price	Transitional parity price [1]	Effective parity price [2]	Parity price prescribed by sec. 106 of S. 3183
Basic commodities:						
Corn	Bushel	$1.64	$1.82	$1.73	$1.73	$1.82
Cotton, American upland	Pound	.3484	.3522		.3484	.3522
Wheat	Bushel	2.19	2.51	2.38	2.38	2.51
Rice	Hundredweight	5.42	5.14		5.42	5.42
Tobacco:						
Flue-cured, types 11–14	Pound	.534	.522		.534	.534
Burley, type 31	do	.520	.506		.520	.520
Peanuts	do	.114	.136	.129	.129	.136

[1] Transitional parity is not shown where the new parity price is the effective parity price. Transitional parity price in 1956 was 95 percent of the old parity price.

[2] The effective parity price is the new parity price or the transitional parity price, whichever is higher.

TITLE II—SOIL BANK ACT

Title II of the bill provides for a soil-bank program composed of two parts: (1) An acreage reserve program; and (2) a conservation reserve program.

ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM

Sections 203–206 authorize and direct the Secretary to compensate producers for voluntarily reducing their 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, flue-

cured tobacco, burley tobacco, and cigar-binder tobacco, types 51, 52, 54, and 55, below their acreage allotments. Cotton would include American upland cotton and extra-long-staple cotton. To be eligible for such compensation the producer is required to reduce his acreage of the commodity below his farm acreage allotment within such limits as the Secretary may prescribe, to specifically designate such acreage, and not to harvest any crop from or graze the reserve acreage unless the Secretary, after certification by the governor of the State, determines that it is necessary to permit grazing to alleviate hardship caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster. It is anticipated by the committee that, beginning with the 1957 crop, the program would require the producer to underplant his acreage. It is recognized that in 1956, particularly in winter wheat areas, unless producers are permitted to adjust acreage already planted, some producers would not be able to participate in the program during 1956. The Secretary is directed to establish a national reserve acreage goal for each of the crops and to establish the limits within which individual farms may participate in a manner which is reasonably calculated to achieve the national reserve goal, and give producers a fair and equitable opportunity to participate.

Compensation of producers for participating in the acreage reserve program would be made through the issuance of certificates redeemable in cash by Commodity Credit Corporation or in the commodity, at the option of the producer, in the case of certificates issued with respect to grains and cotton. If the certificate is redeemed in the commodity, it is redeemable at not more than 110 percent of the cash value of the certificate, and the grain or cotton delivered in redemption of the certificate is to be valued at 105 percent of the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges or the market price, whichever is higher. If, as of the beginning of any marketing year, the total supply does not exceed the normal supply of the commodity, certificates thereafter issued or certificates then outstanding would no longer be redeemable in the commodity. Certificates redeemed in cash may be redeemed by the producer or by any holder in due course, but certificates redeemed in the commodity may be redeemed only by the producer. Certificates shall not be redeemed in commodities other than the commodity for the reduced production of which the certificate was issued, except that certificates for corn or wheat may be redeemed in any feed grain including wheat for feed on such basis as may be mutually agreed upon between the producer and CCC.

The amount of the compensation to producers for reducing their crops below their acreage allotments would be established by the Secretary at such rates as would provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for the acreage withdrawn from production and with a sufficient incentive to achieve the reserve acreage goal.

The compensation paid any producer for participation in the acreage-reserve program with respect to any crop of tobacco is limited to $100 per acre.

The total compensation which may be paid producers for participating in the acreage-reserve program with respect to any year's crops is limited to $750 million, and it is expected that this amount would be allocated among the various crops so as to provide for a fair reduction of acreage for each.

The Secretary is directed to provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing on a fair and equitable basis the certificates issued for participating in the program, and including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm.

Participation in the acreage reserve program by a producer would not reduce his future acreage allotments and quotas.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

Sections 207–214 provide for a conservation reserve program. In carrying out the conservation reserve program, the Secretary would be authorized to enter into long-term contracts under which producers would agree to devote to conserving uses a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops (including crops such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage). The Secretary would, however, have discretion in determining the type of land to be designated in connection with particular contracts, and in making such determination he could consider the needs of the various crop-producing regions of the country.

Section 207 sets forth certain matters that are to be covered in such contracts. Under the contract, the producer would be required to establish and maintain the conservation use on the designated acreage; not to reduce the amount of acreage on the farm normally devoted to conserving uses or allowed to remain idle; not to harvest any crop from the land established in protective cover; not to pasture the acreage prior to January 1, 1959, or such later date as prescribed in the contract except upon a finding by the Secretary, after certification of the governor of the State, of a need for grazing to alleviate hardship caused by flooding, drought, or other natural disaster; not to adopt any practice tending to defeat the purposes of the contract; and to forfeit further payments and refund all payments already received, for violating the contract if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to accept such adjustments or forfeit price support benefits as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract.

The contracts would require the Secretary:

1. To bear such part of the cost (including labor) of establishing and maintaining the protective cover or other authorized use on the designated acreage as he determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act, not to exceed a maximum for the county or area where the farm was located; and

2. To make an annual payment for the term of the contract to the farmer who fulfills the provisions of the contract. This payment would represent a fair and reasonable return on the land in protective cover or other authorized use, taking into consideration the value of the land for producing commodities customarily grown on such kind of land in the area, the prevailing rates of cash rentals in the area, necessary incentive to obtain contracts, and other appropriate factors.

While the bill contains specific provisions relating to matters to be covered in such contracts, the specific provisions in the bill are not necessarily to be incorporated verbatim in each contract. While it is intended that the contracts contain provisions which give effect to the matters required to be covered, such provisions may be worded so as to give more detailed treatment to such matters or to adapt them to the particular area, type of farming, conserving use, or other matter covered by the contract.

The cost of all direct and significant factors in the establishment of the vegetative cover could be shared. For grasses and legumes these factors would include, but would not be limited to—

1. Land preparation, including summerfallowing the area and planting a go-down crop in areas where needed;
2. Seed;
3. Inoculation;
4. Seeding;
5. Liming;
6. Fertilizing; and
7. Fencing the seeding area where needed.

For trees these factors would include, but not be limited to—

1. Land preparation (including summerfallowing), if needed;
2. Tree seedlings, seed, cuttings, and shrubs;
3. Cultivation following planting (where needed); and
4. Fencing the planted area (where needed).

In a similar way, direct and significant factors of cost could be shared in connection with the establishing and maintaining of water storage facilities and other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses.

Advertising and bid procedures could be used in determining the lands in any area to be covered by the contracts.

The Secretary could not terminate a contract unless he determined that the nature of the violation was such as to defeat or substantially impair the purposes of the contract. Before termination the Secretary would have to give written notice to the producer who, if he requested such an opportunity within 30 days after the mailing, or serving of the notice, would have an opportunity to show cause why the contract should not be terminated. A hearing, formal or informal as provided for under regulations issued by the Secretary, would be held to determine whether to terminate the contract. If termination was determined, the producer would receive written notice thereof and would have 90 days after the mailing or service of the notice to appeal to the appropriate United States district court for a de novo determination of the facts in the case and judicial relief with respect thereto. The Secretary's determination on termination would become final and conclusive if the producer failed to avail himself of the opportunity for a hearing within the 30-day period or for appeal to the court within the 90-day period.

A national conservation reserve goal would be proclaimed each year not later than February 1. Such goal would represent that percentage which the Secretary determines would be practicable to cover by contracts during such year of the number of acres by which (1) the acreage needed for the production of agricultural commodities during the preceding year, plus any acreage then in the acreage or conservation reserve program or retired from production because of acreage allotment or marketing quota programs, exceeds (2) the acreage needed during the year for which the determination was made for the production of commodities for domestic and export use and for adequate carryover allowances. The 1956 national goal would be determined as soon as practicable after the enactment of the bill.

In distributing the national goal among States and major crop production regions, due regard is to be given to the need for flood control, drought control, and other conservation benefits; the desires of producers in particular States or regions to participate; diversion of acreage under acreage allotment and marketing quota programs; and the need to assume adequate production of agricultural commodities and crops not in surplus and to discourage the production to those in surplus. Other relevant factors could of course be taken into consideration by the Secretary in the distribution of the national goal.

The criteria for determining the national conservation reserve goal, and for distributing the goal among the States and major crop production regions, are intended only as general guides to the Secretary and not as a rigid formula.

The Secretary would annually report to Congress the scope of the program for that year and the basis for participation in such program in the various States and major crop production regions.

Contracts would be entered into during the 5 years 1956 through 1960. The minimum contract period would be 3 years. The maximum contract period would be 10 years except that contracts for tree cover could extend for 15 years.

The Secretary could not enter into contracts calling for payments to producers (including the cost of materials and services furnished to producers) in excess of $350 million in any calendar year.

Any contract could be terminated by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determined that such termination would be in the public interest. Provision is also made for the modification of contracts previously entered into. In view of the long-term contracts authorized, the Secretary is given broad authority to agree to such modifications, without obtaining technical consideration therefore, as he determines to be desirable either to carry out the purposes of the act or to facilitate the practical administration of the conservation reserve program.

Authority similar to that in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for programs under that act would be provided to make conservation materials and services available to producers under the conservation reserve program. The Secretary could produce as well as purchase such materials and services under the conservation reserve program. It is likely that the facilities of Forest Service nurseries would be needed to produce some of the tree seedlings needed in carrying out the program. The Secretary would be authorized to reimburse any Federal, State, or local government agency for materials or services furnished by such agency and to pay expenses necessary in making such materials and services available, including costs incident to the delivery, application, or installation of the materials and services.

Authority similar to that in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act would be provided to use regular dealers in the furnishing of conservation materials and services and to make payments to such dealers in advance of determination of performance by producers. If the Secretary determined it to be necessary to protect the interests of producers and the Government fair prices for furnishing such materials and services could be established.

The bill would provide that the acreage of cropland on any farm would not be decreased during the term of any contract for the purposes of determining acreage allotments and marketing quotas by reason of the establishment of protective cover or other use of land covered by contract under the conservation reserve program. The acreage of cropland on a farm may directly affect the size of the cotton allotment for the farm and may have a bearing indirectly in the size of the farm acreage allotments for other commodities.

Likewise the acreage determined to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out a contract entered into under the conservation reserve program would be considered to have been devoted to the production of the commodity for the purposes of determining future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

Many producers would be unwilling to participate in the conservation reserve program without these safeguards to preserve their acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

The Secretary is directed to take adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm.

The conservation reserve program would be applicable to the continental United States, and could be extended, if the Secretary determined it to be in the national interest, to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO ACREAGE RESERVE AND CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAMS

As a condition of eligibility for payment under either the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program the producer must comply with all farm acreage allotments established under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, except that in the case of wheat the wheat acreage must not exceed the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment or 15 acres. Noncompliance would be determined only when the producer knowingly exceeded the acreage allotment, or, in the case of wheat, 15 acres, if larger than the allotment.

No acreage diverted from the production of any commodity by reason of participation in either the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program may be reapportioned or allotted to any other farm.

Payment of compensation authorized under the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program could be made upon the basis of the claimant's certification that he had complied with all requirements for such payments. It is intended by this provision to authorize the Secretary to provide for payments prior to the end of a program year and without waiting for a check of compliance. The producer would, of course, be expected to agree to refrain from any action which would result in his not being in compliance at the end of the program year.

The Secretary would be directed to use in administering the programs in the continental United States the community, county, and State committees established under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The Secretary would be required to consult with soil conservation districts, State foresters, land-grant colleges and other appropriate State agencies in formulating at the State and county levels the conservation aspects of the programs. He would be required also to utilize, so far as practicable, the technical resources of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, land-grant colleges, State foresters, and other appropriate technical services to assure coordination of conservation activities and a solid technical foundation for the program.

The Secretary would be directed to utilize as fully as practicable land use capability data in carrying out the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs; and to carry forward to completion as rapidly as possible the basic land inventory of the Nation (now about one-third completed). However, land use capability work would continue to be financed from funds otherwise made available for such work and not from any funds made available for the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs.

In financing the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs, including administrative costs, the Secretary would be authorized to utilize the facilities, services, authorities, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Necessary sums to pay the CCC its actual costs would be authorized to be appropriated.

The Secretary may transfer funds to agencies of the Federal or State Governments who are requested to cooperate or assist in carrying out the programs and for technical assistance in connection therewith. Such payments may be made in advance of the time that the agency renders such assistance.

Determinations by the Secretary of (1) the facts constituting the basis for any payment, and (2) the person entitled to certain payments, would be conclusive, in the same way that similar determinations are made conclusive for other programs by section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The Secretary would be authorized to deny any producer all or any part of the benefits under the soil bank programs if the Secretary determines that (1) the producer had displaced any tenant or sharecropper, or reduced the acreage of any commodity farmed by any tenant or sharecropper, on any farm owned or controlled by such producer; (2) such displacement or reduction was made in contemplation of, or on account of participation by such producer in either the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program; and (3) such displacement or consent was not consented to by the tenant or sharecropper.

Cost-sharing under the regular agricultural conservation program could also be made available for establishing and maintaining protective vegetative cover and other practices and facilities authorized on lands in the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs. However, where payment is earned for carrying out any such practice under the conservation reserve program, a duplicate payment for carrying out the same practice will not be made under the agricultural conservation program.

The Secretary would be given broad discretion in the administration of the acreage and conservation reserve programs as to lands to be retired, incentives to be paid, and other matters. This discretion is necessary to the efficient administration of the programs, and its exercise will require consultation with field agencies and others interested in the programs.

TITLE III—SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Section 301. Authority to add corn to set-aside

Section 301 gives the Secretary discretionary authority to add not to exceed 250 million bushels of corn to the set-aside established pursuant to section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The Agricultural Act of 1954 provided for the insulation from commercial markets of up to $2,500 million worth of commodities held or thereafter acquired from 1954 and prior year's production. The maximum and minimum quantities specified in the law and the actual quantities set aside as of December 31, 1955, are as follows:

TABLE 7

Commodity	Maximum quantity	Minimum quantity	Quantity in set-aside as of Dec. 31, 1955
Wheat.....bushels..	500,000,000	400,000,000	420,286,393
Upland cotton.....bales..	4,000,000	3,000,000	2,632,456
Cottonseed oil.....pounds..	500,000,000	----------	----------
Butter.....do....	200,000,000	----------	----------
Nonfat dry milk solids.....do....	300,000,000	----------	----------
Cheese.....do....	150,000,000	----------	----------

The price-support level for corn has been announced for the 1956 crop at 81 percent of parity, or $1.40 per bushel, based on the indicated supply situation and the January 15, 1956, parity. Had 250 million bushels of corn been included in the set-aside at the time these determinations were made, the change in supply data would have resulted in a support price of 84 percent of parity, or $1.45.

Section 302. Program of orderly liquidation

Section 302 requires the Secretary to submit to Congress within 60 days after the enactment of the act a detailed program for the disposition of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by CCC and to report annually thereafter on operations undertaken to dispose of such stocks.

There follows a statement showing the quantity and value of commodities pledged for outstanding CCC loans and commodities in price-support inventory of the CCC as of December 31, 1955, with a comparison in total as of December 31, 1954. (Quantity data shown include the quantities in the set-aside inventory as of the respective dates.)

TABLE 8.—*Quantity and value of commodities pledged for outstanding loans and commodities in price-support inventory as of Dec. 31, 1955 and total investment as of Dec. 31, 1954*

[All figures in thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Investment as of Dec. 31, 1955 [1]						Total investment as of Dec. 31, 1954 [1]	
		Pledged for loans		In inventory		Total			
		Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Basic commodities:									
Corn	Bushels	180,159	$277,579	757,612	$1,300,323	937,771	$1,577,902	757,756	$1,237,164
Cotton, extra long staple	Bales	13	3,566	93	33,975	106	37,541	84	29,519
Cotton, upland	do	5,422	893,034	7,921	1,437,071	13,343	2,330,105	8,424	1,428,692
Peanuts, farmers' stock	Pounds	290,746	32,856	6,033	668	296,779	33,524	12,968	1,351
Rice	Hundredweight	12,115	64,158	15,387	175,902	27,502	240,060	15,369	84,701
Tobacco	Pounds	1,053,976	597,808	231	92	1,054,207	597,900	725,891	346,279
Wheat	Bushels	221,241	455,343	888,542	2,399,042	1,109,783	2,854,385	1,106,257	2,756,649
Total basic commodities			2,324,344		5,347,073		7,671,417		5,884,355
Designated nonbasic commodities:									
Honey	Pounds	986	105			986	105	1,725	218
Milk and butterfat:									
Butter	do			166,399	100,685	166,399	100,685	451,541	292,678
Butter oil	do			23,980	20,613	23,980	20,613		
Cheese	do			333,002	131,250	333,002	131,250	437,706	175,109
Milk, dried	do			161,714	28,216	161,714	28,216	268,259	43,642
Whey	do			8,180	503	8,180	503	85,122	3,471
Tung oil	do			22,988	5,850	22,988	5,850	38,516	9,459
Wool	do			140,059	94,156	140,059	94,156	145,445	96,657
Total designated nonbasic commodities			105		381,273		381,378		621,234
Other nonbasic commodities:									
Barley	Bushels	69,152	61,147	31,261	43,966	100,413	105,113	94,694	109,142
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	2,284	15,005	1,865	14,755	4,149	29,760	3,210	24,870
Cottonseed and products:									
Cotton linters	Pounds			495,830	47,771	495,830	47,771	663,989	64,560
Cottonseed	Tons	(2)	7				7	(2)	2
Cottonseed meal	Pounds			53	2	53	2	4,773	71
Cottonseed oil	do			17,878	2,801	17,878	2,801	604,489	107,551
Flaxseed	Bushels	6,685	18,925	438	1,517	7,123	20,442	6,153	19,649
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	43,483	75,828	26,452	77,379	69,935	153,207	51,260	126,438
Linseed oil	Pounds			57,256	8,385	57,256	8,385	130,828	22,306
Naval stores:									
Rosin	do			280,234	21,517	280,234	21,517	348,570	26,367
Turpentine	Gallons			1,846	1,059	1,846	1,059	2,873	1,576
Oats	Bushels	56,237	34,493	35,258	29,988	91,495	64,481	84,810	66,305
Olive oil	Gallons							365	934
Rye	Bushels	8,988	9,595	3,306	5,390	12,294	14,985	7,579	10,720
Seeds, hay and pasture	Pounds			26,718	15,198	26,718	15,198	38,181	20,273
Seeds, winter cover crop	do							26,753	3,772
Soybeans	Bushels	22,342	44,680	410	986	22,752	45,666	23,177	50,148
Total other nonbasic commodities			259,680		270,714		530,394		654,684
Exchange commodities: Strategic and critical materials					83,120		83,120		10,952
Total			2,584,129		6,082,180		8,666,309		7,171,225

[1] Book value before deduction of reserve for losses.

[2] Less than a thousand.

Section 303. Reestablishment of historic share of world cotton market

Section 303 directs Commodity Credit Corp. to use its existing powers and authorities to reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton. Under this authority the Secretary would be directed to initiate immediately an export program for cotton so that it will move into export channels at competitive world prices. The program developed could provide either for the sale of CCC cotton for export at competitive world prices or for a cash export subsidy on United States cotton sufficient to make it competitive in world markets. The section also provides that cotton made available by CCC under section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 shall be sold at competitive world prices. Cotton made available is intended to include cotton sold from its stocks by CCC as well as cotton made available for export under the program through CCC financing of exportations from private stocks.

The Department initiated a special cotton export program January 1, 1956, and 723,469 bales were sold during the first 6 weeks of the program. The cotton has been sold at prices averaging about $45 per bale under the minimum price at which it could have been sold for unrestricted use under section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

Section 304. Extra-long-staple cotton

Section 304 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to provide sufficient incentive to domestic users of extra-long-staple cotton to assure domestic utilization of a minimum of 30,000 bales of such cotton annually and authorizes appropriations for such purpose.

Section 305. Section 32 funds supplemented

Section 305 of the bill authorizes an annual appropriation of $250 million, free of the existing 25-percent limitation on the expenditure of funds with respect to any one commodity, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32.

There follows a statement of the section 32 funds available for the fiscal year 1956:

Carried forward from 1955	$300,000,000
Appropriated (30 percent of customs receipts)	166,807,174
Total available under sec. 32	466,807,174
Deduct transfer to Interior Department	—4,322,879
Total available to USDA	462,484,295

Section 32 enacted in August 1935, appropriates for each fiscal year an amount equal to 30 percent of the previous calendar year's customs receipts for the purpose of encouraging the domestic consumption and expor-

tation of agricultural commodities. The Agricultural Act of 1948 provides that up to $300 million of unused prior year balances remain available for use.

Section 32, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c), provides that the amount that may be devoted during any fiscal year to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof shall not exceed 25 percent of the funds available under this section for such fiscal year and also that the funds shall be devoted principally to nonbasic perishable agricultural commodities other than those receiving price support under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

Public Law 393, 76th Congress (53 Stat. 1411 and 1412), as amended by Public Law 466, 83d Congress, provides that section 32 funds in an amount equal to 30 percent of customs receipts collected on fishery products shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior. Also, Public Law 311 of August 9, 1955 (84th Cong.) authorizes the use of $15 million to meet commodity program costs in each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 for the purchase and donation of wheat flour and cornmeal to needy persons without regard to the requirement relating to the amounts to be devoted to perishables. In addition to these limitations and requirements for section 32 funds, their use is also authorized by section 392 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1392 (b)), for operating expenses and administration of other laws such as the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

The use of section 32 funds for program operations varies from year to year, depending upon economic conditions with respect to particular commodities as well as the outlets which may be available for commodities purchased. Based on total funds available under section 32 for fiscal year 1956, the largest amount that can be devoted to commodity program costs for any one commodity or product thereof is $116,701,793. This would include the direct program costs of purchasing, processing, packaging, transporting, etc. Administrative expenses of the Department in connection with section 32 programs are not included in the calculation of the amount devoted to any one commodity. The largest amount previously devoted to any one commodity was in the fiscal year 1954 when $87,129,232, or the equivalent of 18.3 percent of total funds available, was used for commodity program costs for the purchase and donation of dairy products.

Section 306. Transfer of barter materials to supplemental stockpile

Section 306 provides for the transfer to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 of materials acquired by CCC under the barter program unless such materials were acquired for the national stockpile or were acquired for other purposes, and authorizes appropriations to reimburse CCC for the value of any materials so transferred. This section also provides that strategic materials acquired by CCC as a result of barter may be imported free of duty as in the case of strategic materials imported for the national stockpile. Although it would appear that materials imported by CCC are already exempt under the provisions of 15 United States Code 713a–5, which exempts CCC from all taxation except real estate taxes, it is understood that the Bureau of Customs has raised a question whether this exemption extends to import duties. The present section will make it clear that materials entered by CCC are exempt from duties.

Section 307. Sales for foreign currency exempted from cargo preference

Section 307 removes sales for foreign currency under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 from the requirement of the cargo preference statute, Public Law 664, 83d Congress, that at least 50 percent of commodities transported on ocean vessels under certain foreign aid programs and other Government programs shall be transported on privately owned United States-flag vessels.

From the inception of the title I program under Public Law 480 through January 31, 1956, agreements have been entered into with 22 countries providing for the sale of approximately $517 million worth of commodities at export market value. The cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation of financing these sales will be about $769 million. Ocean freight costs involved in moving these commodities and financed by the United States will amount to about $53 million. The export market value of the commodities plus the amount of ocean freight financed, except for differentials absorbed by the United States, is paid by the importing countries in their own currencies.

In applying the cargo preference law to the program, at least 50 percent of each commodity to each country is required to be moved on United States-flag vessels, if available. Also, at least 50 percent of shipments in each of the categories, liner, tramp, and tanker are required to move on United States-flag vessels, if available. Compliance with these requirements is assured through prior approval by the Department of all vessel charters and liner bookings.

The Commodity Credit Corporation finances ocean transportation costs on United States vessels when such vessels are required to be used in order to assure compliance with the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act. The amount by which freight costs on such vessels exceed the prevailing rate on foreign flag vessels is absorbed by the United States. Ocean transportation costs on United States vessels over and above that necessary to comply with the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act and on third country vessels is financed only to the extent that the importing country is unable to pay such costs. Transportation costs on vessels of the importing country are not financed under the program.

Approximately 53 percent of the total tonnage was approved for shipment on United States-flag vessels. Tramp tonnage was about 81 percent of the total, liner tonnage about 18 percent, and tanker tonnage about 1 percent. The 18 percent liner tonnage breaks down, 13 percent United States flag and 5 percent foreign flag. Tramp tonnage divided about 40 percent United States and 41 percent foreign, the 1 percent in favor of foreign tramps being the result of the shortage of United States-flag tramps to carry wheat to Yugoslavia during February of 1955. Since that time no appreciable difficulty has been experienced in the chartering of sufficient United States-flag vessels.

Your committee is firmly convinced that the maintenance of our merchant marine fleet is essential to national welfare and security. However, such governmental support as is necessary for maintenance should be directly provided and should not be at the expense of the farm program. The word "expense" is used in this connection to connote not so much monetary expense as the expense of curtailed dispositions of surpluses under the program and hampered efforts to obtain the liberalization of restrictions against the commercial importation of United States agricultural products into maritime nations.

The Department reported favorably on S. 2584, a bill to exempt the title I program from cargo preference, for the following reasons:

First, we have lost opportunities to move commodities to a number of countries. Only one country, Denmark, has definitely rejected the possibility of negotiating a title I program because of cargo preference. Difficulties in securing acceptance of cargo preference by three other maritime nations have delayed negotiations for extended periods. These negotiations have not been terminated, however, and efforts are being continued to overcome this resistance. It is impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the value of commodity movement lost because of this problem.

Second, the cargo-preference requirement has resulted in added cost to the farm program. It is necessary to provide dollar financing of ocean freight charges on United States-flag vessels required to be used. Total freight approved for financing during 1955 was about $31 million. About $12 million of this was on United States vessels required to be used in programs with maritime nations which carried all or substantially all of the non-United States-flag tonnage in their own vessels. In the absence of the United States-flag requirement these countires could be expected to participate in the program without any financing of ocean freight by the United States.

In addition to financing the freight charges on United States-flag vessels required to be used, it is necessary for the United States to absorb the differential resulting from use of such vessels where shipment would be cheaper on foreign-flag vessels. On vessels approved during 1955 differentials amounting to about $3 million will have been paid by CCC. This amount will not be covered by foreign-currency payments of the importing countries.

Third, the cargo-preference requirement is hampering efforts to obtain trade liberalization on agricultural commodities. Many importing countries discriminate against imports of United States commodities through quotas, exchange controls, and other restrictions. The Departmnet of Agriculture is making a determined effort to obtain liberalization of such restrictions as part of its overall program to expand exports of United States farm commodities. Obviously, it is difficult for the United States to argue for the lifting of restrictions while imposing restrictions of its own. Maritime nations argue that the freedom of their merchant fleets to compete in the world market is as important to them as the freedom of our farmers to compete in the world market is to us.

Section 308. Surplus Disposal Administrator

Section 308 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an Agricultural Surplus Disposal Administrator at a salary rate of not exceeding $15,000 per annum. This authority is needed in order to secure the best qualified person available. Under present legislation, Department final authority to determine compensation for this position is limited to GS–15, with a base rate of $11,610. The possibilities of having the position established in GS–18 ($14,800) through Civil Service Commission channels are quite remote under present numerical restrictions of the Classification Act.

Section 309. State contribution in disaster relief

Section 309 of the bill provides that after March 1, 1957, the States must contribute at least 15 percent of the cost of feed or seed made available for disaster relief.

During the fiscal year 1955 there were two programs of this nature in effect. Under the 1955 emergency-feed program, eligible farmers received purchase orders enabling them to buy from established dealers at reduced prices, certain designated surplus feed grains, such as barley, corn, wheat, grain sorghums, and oats, or approved mixed feed containing a high percentage of the surplus feed grains. Dealers received a certificate representing the value of the reduction in the price of the feed and used it to buy replacement stocks which eventually came from CCC inventories. The cost of this program to the Government during the fiscal year 1955, represented by the value of CCC

inventories released in satisfaction of dealer's certificates was approximately $61,200,000. Had the States been required to contribute 15 percent of the cost of this program during the fiscal year 1955 their contribution would have amounted to $9,180,000. The emergency-feed program was operative as of January 31, 1956, in Colorado, Kansas, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming.

A second program conducted during the fiscal year involved the execution of agreements with States to assist them in furnishing hay to eligible farmers. Under these agreements the Department contributed a definite sum to the State to defray one-half the cost of transportation of the hay (not to exceed $10 per ton). The total of such contributions during the fiscal year 1955 was $4,684,839. Since the States assumed at least half of the transportation costs for hay, as well as the costs incident to the purchase and distribution of such hay, they would not have to make any additional contributions in a program such as this. North Carolina is the only State with which the Department has a hay agreement at the present time.

TITLE IV—MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Section 401. Extension of surrender and reapportionment

Section 401 extends to the 1956 and 1957 crops of wheat the provisions of section 334 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, whereby wheat producers who do not plant all their wheat allotments can release the unused portion of the allotment. The amount released would be deducted from the allotment for the farm from which released and would be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county. If not needed in the county, the county committee could surrender the acreage to the State committee for the purposes of establishing new farm allotments. In establishing future allotments, acreages so released and reapportioned are credited to the releasing farms rather than to the farms to which surrendered. Provision for permanent release of allotments is made.

Since release and reapportionment to be effective must be accomplished prior to planting time, extension of the provision to cover the 1956 crop would be applicable only in areas where spring wheat is grown and not in areas where only winter wheat can be grown.

Section 402. Commercial wheat producing area

Section 402 would amend the provision in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 for determining the noncommercial wheat-producing area. Under present law any State may be excluded from the commercial wheat-producing area for any year if its State allotment for such year is determined to be 25,000 acres or less. As amended, the Secretary would be required to exclude any State from the commercial area for any year if the State allotment for the immediately preceding year is determined to be 240,000 acres or less. By basing the determination on the size of the allotment for the preceding year and making the action of the Secretary mandatory, States will be able to know well in advance whether they will be in the commercial area.

The States which would be included in the noncommercial wheat area under the proposal to include all States with 240,000 acres or less in the State wheat allotment, based on 1956 State wheat allotments, are as follows:

(a) 12 States included on the basis of the present "25,000 acres or less" provision:

	Acres
Alabama	14,505
Arizona	17,533
Connecticut	626
Florida	1,329
Louisiana	3,184
Maine	1,347
Massachusetts	687
Mississippi	21,143
Nevada	11,616
New Hampshire	71
Rhode Island	603
Vermont	432
Total	73,076

(b) 11 additional States which would become noncommercial under the proposed "240,000 acres or less" provision:

	Acres
Arkansas	47,433
Delaware	36,370
Georgia	105,624
Iowa	139,443
Kentucky	219,495
Maryland	187,546
New Jersey	55,141
South Carolina	133,488
Tennessee	199,261
West Virginia	42,956
Wisconsin	45,174
Total	1,211,931

The total 1956 allotment acreage involved in the proposed "240,000 acres or less" provision is 1,285,007 or 2.2 percent of the national allotment of 55 million acres. There follows a statement of the acreage allotments for the 36 States included in the commercial area under the "25,000 acres or less" provision:

1956 allotment

	Acres
Arkansas	47,433
California	455,719
Colorado	2,702,237
Delaware	36,370
Georgia	105,624
Idaho	1,159,816
Illinois	1,381,461
Indiana	1,166,484
Iowa	139,443
Kansas	10,587,206
Kentucky	219,495
Maryland	187,546
Michigan	969,478
Minnesota	726,503
Missouri	1,163,686
Montana	4,002,138
Nebraska	3,200,332
New Jersey	55,141
New Mexico	465,924
New York	312,175
North Carolina	283,395
North Dakota	7,321,263
Ohio	1,594,233
Oklahoma	4,860,057
Oregon	819,522
Pennsylvania	620,185
South Carolina	133,488
South Dakota	2,749,275
Tennessee	199,261
Texas	4,227,136
Utah	314,994
Virginia	261,043
Washington	2,009,033
West Virginia	42,956
Wisconsin	45,174
Wyoming	303,725
Total commercial area	54,871,924
Total noncommercial area	73,076
National reserve	55,000
Grand total	55,000,000

Section 403. Small farm allotments for cotton

Section 403 would amend section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for reserving not to exceed 1 percent of the national acreage allotment to assist in establishing minimum farm allotments. The State committee would be required to reserve as much as 3 percent of the State allotment, if needed, to supplement the acreage allocated to the State from the national reserve. Under existing law, the county allotment is used first to establish minimum farm allotments at the smaller of 5 acres of the highest acreage planted on the farm in the preceding 3 years, in all counties where farm allotments are established on the "cropland factor" basis and in other counties where allotments are established on the "historical" basis and the county committee elects to establish such minimum farm allotments. The proposed amendments to section 344 of the act would change the fixed acreage portion of the minimum allotment provision from 5 acres to 4 acres and would require minimum farm allotments to be established in all counties regardless of the allotment basis used. The Secretary would determine, on the basis of data available in connection with past allotment programs and such surveys as he deems necessary to obtain additional data on which to base estimates, the additional acreage which would be required to establish minimum farm allotments (assuming that allotments were first made on a cropland or history basis). The acreage so determined would be used as a basis for allocating the national acreage reserve to States and for allocating such reserve, as well as acreage from the State reserve for minimum allotments, to counties.

The national acreage allotment announced for the 1953 cotton crop is 17,391,304 acres. One percent of this total would be 173,913 acres.

Section 404. Minimum State acreage allotments for 1956 rice crop

Section 404 would amend section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide minimum State rice acreage allotments for 1956 equal to 85 percent of the final allotment established for 1955. Any acreage apportioned to farms in the State from the national reserve acreage would be included in determining the minimum allotment. The final allotment for 1955 would include the State allotment originally determined plus the increased acreages allotted in the State through legislation enacted after State allotments were originally determined.

In States having county allotments the increase in State allotments would be apportioned among counties on the same basis as the State allotment had theretofore been apportioned among counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends in acreage.

The additional acreage apportioned to each State by this section is shown in the last column of the following table:

TABLE 9.—*Rice: Additional allotment acreage that would be apportioned to State under Sec. 404 of S. 3183*

State	Total rice acreage apportioned to State for 1955	85 percent of total rice acreage apportioned to State for 1955	Total rice acreage apportioned to State for 1956	Additional acreage required for 1956 to provide allotment equal to 85 percent of final allotment for 1955
Arkansas	453,850	385,772	399,084	0
California	352,729	299,820	297,174	2,646
Louisiana	558,934	475,094	465,773	9,321
Texas	496,929	422,390	421,360	1,030
Mississippi	54,921	46,683	46,267	416
Arizona	269	229	227	2
Florida	1,126	957	949	8
Illinois	24	20	20	0
Missouri	5,388	4,580	4,557	23
North Carolina	34	29	29	0
Oklahoma	175	149	147	2
South Carolina	3,350	2,847	2,783	64
Tennessee	605	514	517	0
United States total	1,928,334	1,639,084	1,638,887	13,512

Section 405. Preservation of unused acreage allotments

Section 405 would provide that with respect to the 1956 and subsequent crops of any commodity for which acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, were in effect, the entire acreage allotment for the farm would be considered for purposes of future farm acreage allotments as having been planted to the commodity in such year if the owner or operator of the farm notified the county committee prior to the 60th day preceding the beginning of the marketing year of his desire to preserve the farm acreage allotment of the commodity. This provision would not be applicable to any farm on which no acreage of the commodity was planted for 4 successive years or in any case in which the amount of the commodity of any previous crop stored to postpone or avoid payment of penalty had been reduced because the allotment was not fully planted. No other farm would be permitted to use the acreage of which notice was given under the section.

TITLE V—RICE

Section 501. Two-price plan for rice

Section 501 provides that the national acreage allotment of rice for 1957 shall not be less than the national acreage allotment for 1956, including any acreage allotted under section 404 of the bill. The 1957 allotment will be apportioned among the States in the same proportion as in 1956. The effect of this provision on 1957 State acreage allotments is shown in the last two columns of the following table.

TABLE 10.—*Rice: Indicated 1957 State acreage allotments under S. 3183 as compared with indicated 1957 State allotments under the present law and 1956 State allotments now in effect*

State	1956 State acreage allotment	Additional acreage apportioned to State from 1956 national reserve	Total acreage apportioned to State for 1956	Total acreage apportioned to State for 1956, adjusted for increase under sec. 404 of S. 3183	Indicated 1957 State allotment under present law [1]	Indicated 1957 State allotment under S. 3183
Arkansas	399,084	0	399,084	399,084	402,852	399,084
California	297,100	74	297,174	299,820	296,691	299,820
Louisiana	470,704	5,069	465,773	475,094	463,416	475,094
Texas	421,360	0	421,360	422,390	419,479	422,390
Mississippi	41,422	4,845	46,267	46,683	42,555	46,683
Arizona	10	217	227	229		229
Florida	887	62	949	957	888	957
Illinois	11	9	20	20	14	20
Missouri	3,673	884	4,557	4,580	4,005	4,580
North Carolina	27	2	29	29	23	29
Oklahoma	38	109	147	149	63	149
South Carolina	1,958	825	2,783	2,847	2,040	2,847
Tennessee	517	0	517	517	502	517
Total, United States	1,626,791	12,096	1,638,887	1,652,399	1,632,528	1,652,399
National reserve	12,293	(197)	(197)	(197)	[2] 6,556	(197)
National allotment	1,639,084	12,293	1,639,084	1,652,596	1,639,084	1,652,596

[1] Assuming the national acreage allotment to be the same as in effect for 1956 and the 1956 planted and diverted acreage of rice to be the same as determined for 1955.
[2] To be apportioned among the minor rice-producing States receiving inadequate State or county allotments such as Mississippi, Missouri, South Carolina, etc.

Two-price plan

Eection 501 also provides for a 2-price plan for rice of the 1956 and 1957 crops. A primary market quota for rice is to be determined and proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture for each marketing year. This primary market quota is to be determined on the basis of the quantity of processed rice (expressed in terms of hundredweights of rough rice) which the Secretary determines will be consumed in the United States (including its Territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) or exported to Cuba during the marketing year, taking into consideration the historical consumption of United States rice in these markets and any expected increase in consumption. In determining the primary quota, rough rice used for feed or seed would be excluded, since it is not intended that the primary quota would include rice which is not milled. For 1956, the primary market quota is to be apportioned among the States on the basis of the 1955 production of rice in each State. For 1957, the primary market quota is to be apportioned among the States on the basis of the average yield per acre of rice in each State during 1955 and 1956, multiplied by the acreage allotment for the State. Each State quota is to be apportioned among farms in the State on the basis of the acreage allotment established for each farm, multiplied by the normal yield per acre for the farm. The estimated 1956 primary market quota and its apportionment among the States is shown in the following tables:

TABLE 11.—*United States milled rice consumed in primary markets (on rough-rice basis)*

[Thousand 100-pound bags]

Marketing year	Food	Industry	Total consumed	Exports to Cuba	Total primary market
1950–51	18,252	4,866	23,118	10,066	33,184
1951–52	16,756	4,750	21,506	7,131	28,637
1952–53	17,750	4,577	22,327	7,039	29,366
1953–54	17,950	4,560	22,510	6,850	29,360
1954–55	18,000	5,700	23,700	4,914	28,614
1955–56 [1]	18,500	5,500	24,000	4,748	28,748
1956–57 [2]	18,500	5,700	24,200	4,750	28,950

[1] Preliminary. [2] Estimated.

TABLE 12.—*Rice: Apportionment of the estimated 1956 primary market quota among the several States*

[100-pound bags]

State	1955 production [1]	1956 State primary quota
Arkansas	12,694,000	6,854,007
California	11,694,000	6,039,777

[1] Production for the 5 major rice-producing States are official estimates of the Department of Agriculture while production for the 7 minor States was determined by multiplying the 1955 measured acreage in each such State by the 1955 State average yield per acre as reported by the Southern Rice Millers Association.

TABLE 12.—*Rice: Apportionment of the estimated 1956 primary market quota among the several States*—Continued

[100-pound bags]

State	1955 production	1956 State primary quota
Louisiana	13,150,000	7,100,220
Texas	14,880,000	8,034,318
Mississippi	1,510,000	815,310
Arizona		
Florida	16,750	9,044
Illinois	550	297
Missouri	120,350	64,982
North Carolina	350	189
Oklahoma	3,900	2,106
South Carolina	43,400	23,433
Tennessee	11,700	6,317
United States total	53,617,000	28,950,000

Price support will be made available by Commodity Credit Corporation to cooperators through loans, purchases, or other operations on the 1956 crop of rice at 55 percent of the parity price of rice as of the beginning of the marketing year. On the 1957 crop, the level of support is to be at such level as the Secretary of Agriculture determines will not discourage or prevent exportation of rice produced in the United States, but such level is not to be less than 50 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price.

Certificates will be issued by the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperators each marketing year for farms having primary market quotas. Such certificates will be issued for a quantity of rice equal to the primary market quota for the farm but not more than the normal yield for the acreage planted to rice on the farm. The value of each certificate will be equal to the difference between 90 percent of the parity price of rice as of the beginning of the marketing year and the level of price support for rice for such marketing year (to be calculated to the nearest cent) multiplied by the quantity of rice for which the certificate is issued. The landlord and his tenants or sharecroppers will share in the certificates in the same proportion as they share in the rice produced on the farm or the proceeds therefrom. Commodity Credit Corporation will redeem at its value any certificate not used to cover the processing or importation of rice.

Assuming the parity price of rice on August 1, 1956 (the beginning of the 1956–57 marketing year), to be the same as the January 15, 1956, parity price of $5.42 per hundredweight, the unit value of the certificate for 1956 crop rice would be computed as the difference between $2.98 per hundredweight (55 percent of parity), and $4.88 per hundredweight (90 percent of parity), or $1.90 per hundredweight.

Beginning August 1, 1956, each person processing rough rice in the United States (excluding Puerto Rican or Hawaiian rice processed in Puerto Rico or Hawaii) will be required to acquire certificates in an amount sufficient to cover the quantity of rough rice processed. Each person importing processed rice into the United States on or after August 1, 1956, will also be required to acquire certificates covering the rough rice equivalent of such processed rice. Such certificates may be acquired from producers by the processor or importer, or he may purchase certificates from Commodity Credit Corporation. Upon the exportation to any country other than Cuba of processed rice with respect to which certificates were acquired, Commodity Credit Corporation will pay the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the rough rice equivalent of the processed rice.

The provisions of this section will not be applicable to nonirrigated rice produced on any farm on which the acreage planted to

nonirrigated rice does not exceed 3 acres or to rice grown in Puerto Rico or Hawaii.

Inventory adjustment payments

In order to facilitate the transition to the two-price plan, inventory adjustment payments will be made to all persons owning rough rice located in the continental United States as of July 31, 1956, except that payments will not be made with respect to 1956-crop rice, imported rice, or rice acquired from Commodity Credit Corporation. Such payments will be in amounts equal to 35 percent (the difference between 90 and 55 percent) of the parity price of rice as of August 1, 1956, multiplied by the quantities of such rough rice. An appropriation to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for such payments is authorized.

Transfer of rice to the set-aside

The Secretary is given discretionary authority to transfer to the commodity set-aside, established pursuant to section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954, all rough and processed rice in the inventories of Commodity Credit Corporation as of 60 days after the beginning of the 1956 marketing year for rice, not exceeding 20 million hundredweight of rough rice or its equivalent in processed rice.

The proportion of United States rice used for domestic consumption and export is shown by the following table:

TABLE 13.—*Rice: Percentage, domestic consumption and exports (in rough rice equivalent) is of total production during the marketing years 1939–40 through 1955–56*

Marketing year	Production [1]	Domestic consumption		Exports	
		Total	Percent of production	Total	Percent of production
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1939–40	24,328	20,046	82.4	4,484	18.4
1940–41	24,495	21,138	86.3	5,651	23.1
1941–42	23,095	19,571	84.7	6,552	28.4
1942–43	29,082	20,266	69.7	6,961	23.9
1943–44	29,264	21,316	72.8	7,069	24.2
1944–45	30,974	20,001	64.6	10,201	32.9
1945–46	30,668	19,613	64.0	11,469	37.4
1946–47	32,497	20,162	62.0	12,291	37.8
1947–48	35,217	22,037	62.6	13,055	37.1
1948–49	38,275	22,092	57.7	14,378	37.6
1949–50	40,784	23,423	57.4	16,224	39.8
1950–51	38,757	25,693	66.3	13,167	34.0
1951–52	45,853	24,121	52.6	24,058	52.5
1952–53	48,260	25,121	52.1	25,122	52.1
1953–54	52,761	25,764	48.8	22,708	43.0
1954–55	64,414	27,839	43.2	14,385	22.3
1955–56 [2]	53,617	27,917	52.1	23,000	42.9

[1] Production for the marketing years 1949–50 through 1955–56 includes estimated production in the minor rice-producing States.
[2] Preliminary.

TITLE VI—FORESTRY PROVISIONS

Tree planting and reforestation

Section 601 provides for assistance to States for tree planting and reforestation. The objective of this section is to step up nationwide the present rate of reforestation on all land in need of such planting irrespective of ownership. This would be accomplished through a cooperative plan of action between the individual States and the Secretary of Agriculture. The plan would originate in the States through the State foresters or equivalent State officials and after approval by the Secretary would be put into effect by a State agency. The major provisions of this section would:

1. Establish a policy of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture should assist the States in undertaking needed programs of tree planting.

2. Permit a State to draw up a plan of reforestation that would further this purpose and submit such plan to the Secretary of Agriculture for his consideration and approval.

3. When the Secretary has approved the plan, authorize and direct him to assist the State in carrying out the plan which assistance may include furnishing advice, technical assistance and financial contributions up to an amount equal to the State expenditure for the same purpose during the same fiscal year.

4. Require the Secretary to obtain cooperation and assistance of other Federal agencies and the appropriate State foresters in the approval and carrying out of the plan when it includes forest lands under such other Federal agencies' jurisdiction.

The committee believes that more money should be made available for tree planting and recommends that the Appropriations Committees consider providing $50 million to carry out the provisions of this section.

Forest products

Section 602 provides for price reporting and research with respect to forest products. This section would direct the Secretary to: (1) establish a price reporting service for basic forest products such as standing timber, sawlogs, and pulpwood; (2) conduct and stimulate research aimed at developing the efficiency of marketing forest products; and (3) study price trends and relationships for basic forest products and within 2 years report thereon to the Congress.

TAX DELINQUENCIES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on June 2, 1955, I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report furnished by the Treasury Department showing the total tax delinquencies as of December 31, 1954, in the amount of $1,614,494,280.

At the same time I incorporated in the RECORD a statistical breakdown by districts, amount and type of tax, and the number of accounts involved in each instance.

This was the first inventory which had formation, and it had been complied upon my request on the basis that such ever been assembled providing such ininformation should be assembled annually in order that the Treasury Department and the country would know the extent of these outstanding obligations, as well as the progress being made toward their collection. It would also help the Department to spot the trouble areas in their agency by showing which offices and which regions were making progress or losing ground.

I have just received the second annual report, which shows that the total delinquencies as of December 31, 1955, are $1,646,383,974.

This represents an increase of $31.9 million over the same comparable statistics for December 31, 1954.

The Department does claim that this increase is somewhat offset by the fact that it has reduced by nearly $200 million the number of accounts remaining to be assigned to the field; however, it should be noted that in using the same comparable figures for comparison, the total delinquencies as of December 31, 1955, were $31.9 million greater than the number in the preceding year.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of the Department's letter of February 20, 1956, followed by the insertion of two charts, exhibits No. 1 and 2.

There being no objection, the letter and charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 20, 1956.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In accordance with my letter to you of February 1, 1956, there are enclosed tabulations of all accounts as of December 31, 1955, which were delinquent and which have been formally transferred to our field collection force for collection action. Exhibit No. 1 shows that as of December 31, 1955, we had a total of 1,596,615 delinquent accounts in the amount of $1,646,383,974 in this status. These accounts were divided in the following general categories of tax:

Class of tax	Number	Amount
Income tax	1,139,658	$1,268,101,723
Employment tax	399,269	284,803,237
All other	57,688	93,479,014
Total	1,596,615	1,646,383,974

The tabulations we furnished you as of December 31, 1954, broke the accounts into seven categories of tax. These consisted of the following: Individual income, corporation income, taxes withheld, excise taxes, estate and gift taxes, unemployment taxes, and carriers taxes. During the past year, in order to simplify our reporting load, we consolidated these 7 categories into the 3 listed above. Under income tax, we have included the individual income and corporation income taxes; under employment tax, we have included taxes withheld, unemployment and carriers taxes; and under all other, we have included the excise taxes and estate and gift taxes.

In addition to the delinquent accounts which have been formally transferred to the field collection force for collection action, we had on hand on December 31, 1955, 26,853 accounts in the amount of $12.9 million which were of delinquent age but which had not been transferred to the field collection force.

Exhibit No. 2 shows the number of delinquent accounts that have been transferred to the field collection force that are in an inactive status. These are accounts on which collection activity has been deferred pending the outcome of court decision, audit examination or other contingent action. Of the total delinquent accounts in the hands of the field collection force, 14 percent or 222,845 are such inactive accounts, representing $667,437,626, or 40.5 percent of the total delinquent tax liability. On these accounts collection action is not being pursued pending consummation of the contingent action.

During the year the number of delinquent accounts assigned to our field collection force was reduced by 128,859 (from 1,725,474 to 1,596,615), but the amount outstanding increased approximately $31.9 million (from $1,614.5 million to $1,646.4 million). On the surface, in respect to the amount outstanding, this would indicate an unfavorable trend. However, considerable progress is in-

dicated when consideration is given to the following:

1. While the amount outstanding on accounts assigned to the field collection force increased by $31.9 million, the increase occurred in our inactive category, as illustrated by the following table:

Delinquent accounts assigned to field collection force

[Amounts in millions]

As of—	Active		Inactive		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Dec. 31, 1954	1,448,888	$1,062.3	276,586	$552.2	1,725,474	$1,614.5
Dec. 31, 1955	1,373,770	979.0	222,845	667.4	1,596,615	1,646.4
Difference	−75,118	−83.3	−53,741	+115.2	−128,859	+31.9

2. A substantial reduction was made in the number of accounts which were of delinquent age but which had not been transferred to the field collection force. This number was decreased from 382,510 accounts in the amount of $207.1 million as of December 31, 1954, to 26,853 accounts in the amount of $12.9 million as of December 31, 1955. Simply stated, there has been a net reduction of 484,516 delinquent accounts in the amount of $162.3 million during calendar year 1955, as shown in the table which follows:

Delinquent accounts	Number	Amount
On hand, Dec. 31, 1954:		
Assigned to field collection force	1,725,474	*Millions* $1,614.5
To be assigned to field collection force	382,510	207.1
Total	2,107,984	1,821.6
On hand, Dec. 31, 1955:		
Assigned to field collection force	1,596,615	1,646.4
To be assigned to field collection force	26,853	12.9
Total	1,623,468	1,659.3
Net reduction	484,516	162.3

Very truly yours,

O. GORDON DELK,
Deputy Commissioner.

EXHIBIT 1.—*Taxpayer delinquent accounts by type of tax, quarterly (December 1955) inventory*

[Source: Form 1955 Detail Sheets, December 1955]

Regions	Income tax, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		Employment tax, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		All other, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
101 Atlanta:								
102 Atlanta	17,784	$12,936,603.26	5,889	$3,572,771.07	1,306	$2,300,004.85	24,979	$18,809,469.18
103 Birmingham	11,476	13,903,164.32	3,655	1,965,215.06	872	1,678,440.28	16,003	17,636,819.66
104 Columbia	8,700	5,119,028.20	3,318	822,119.84	954	570,281.24	12,972	6,511,429.28
105 Greensboro	10,310	18,145,271.06	4,318	1,998,267.92	1,059	875,141.11	15,687	21,018,680.09
106 Jackson	3,351	1,874,233.74	1,526	596,553.02	354	487,144.53	5,231	2,957,931.29
107 Jacksonville	21,291	40,704,504.77	8,239	4,996,151.87	1,388	3,661,040.47	30,918	49,361,697.11
108 Nashville	9,133	11,096,319.81	3,181	1,601,697.63	657	521,994.88	12,971	13,220,012.32
Total	82,045	103,869,215.16	30,126	15,552,776.41	6,590	10,094,047.36	118,761	129,516,038.93
201 Boston:								
209 Augusta	1,751	1,360,301.41	1,119	489,363.35	148	66,296.52	3,018	1,915,961.28
210 Boston	27,307	26,532,013.87	11,122	10,000,411.94	1,294	1,302,930.45	39,723	37,835,356.26
211 Burlington	713	180,911.18	441	145,096.27	91	83,963.04	1,245	409,970.49
212 Hartford	15,627	11,478,332.91	5,079	3,298,977.26	513	570,825.76	21,219	15,348,135.93
213 Portsmouth	1,432	1,744,258.25	840	310,676.22	75	124,096.57	2,347	2,179,031.04
214 Providence	4,612	5,892,874.38	1,259	894,222.10	114	386,708.77	5,985	7,173,805.25
Total	51,442	47,188,692.00	19,860	15,138,747.14	2,235	2,534,821.11	73,537	64,862,260.25
301 Chicago:								
315 Chicago	93,511	64,654,342.36	22,891	15,915,033.71	3,420	7,274,133.27	119,822	87,843,509.34
316 Detroit	63,011	55,281,810.11	16,325	10,808,182.55	2,233	2,814,232.78	81,569	68,904,225.44
317 Milwaukee	10,145	13,448,227.83	3,781	2,087,500.52	396	743,876.44	14,322	16,279,604.79
318 Springfield	8,859	6,048,445.22	3,381	1,627,535.26	645	1,047,875.59	12,885	8,723,856.07
Total	175,526	139,432,825.52	46,378	30,438,252.04	6,694	11,880,118.08	228,598	181,751,195.64
401 Cincinnati:								
419 Cincinnati	20,348	9,541,182.70	3,630	1,947,441.26	445	1,197,285.25	24,423	12,685,909.21
420 Cleveland	36,632	28,109,544.75	8,720	5,523,283.73	1,194	1,915,010.25	46,546	35,547,838.73
421 Columbus	9,543	5,807,403.95	1,290	657,347.06	177	160,050.14	11,010	6,624,801.15
422 Indianapolis	16,768	16,103,896.72	4,767	2,953,720.13	738	1,702,634.07	22,273	20,760,250.92
423 Louisville	9,258	11,067,358.51	2,934	1,228,281.32	771	877,329.31	12,963	13,172,969.14
424 Parkersburg	8,398	8,979,751.48	2,257	1,376,158.66	439	271,193.30	11,094	10,627,103.44
425 Richmond	23,065	17,529,876.86	5,147	2,663,135.29	1,120	1,688,817.26	29,332	21,881,829.41
426 Toledo	3,976	2,421,443.93	785	393,421.06	94	82,108.95	4,855	2,896,973.94
Total	127,988	99,560,458.90	29,530	16,742,788.51	4,978	7,894,428.53	162,496	124,197,675.94
501 Dallas:								
527 Albuquerque	2,774	1,843,031.53	1,994	853,894.55	310	263,803.54	5,078	2,960,729.62
528 Austin	11,018	9,088,606.03	6,580	2,702,774.57	793	962,625.15	18,391	12,754,005.75
529 Dallas	14,738	11,780,058.08	6,816	3,608,220.71	866	948,788.69	22,420	16,337,067.48
530 Little Rock	2,678	1,674,826.09	1,259	319,961.69	245	113,650.40	4,182	2,108,438.18
531 New Orleans	9,097	9,531,536.77	4,261	2,260,578.68	867	1,821,473.72	14,225	13,613,589.17
532 Oklahoma City	5,803	6,619,900.95	3,123	1,825,878.19	529	975,285.27	9,455	9,421,064.41
Total	46,108	40,537,959.45	24,033	11,571,308.39	3,610	5,085,626.77	73,751	57,194,894.61
601 New York City:								
633 Albany	8,822	7,241,533.66	4,770	3,454,402.53	654	578,994.65	14,246	11,274,930.84
634 Brooklyn	59,960	101,497,850.39	37,482	24,523,884.76	3,490	7,318,051.77	100,932	133,339,786.92
635 Buffalo	12,830	8,525,442.69	4,756	2,916,655.39	617	616,219.15	18,203	12,058,317.23
636 Lower Manhattan	25,056	143,922,610.48	25,952	20,573,162.41	2,333	4,981,076.42	53,341	169,476,849.31
698 Puerto Rico	1,391	306,561.69	1,853	252,580.38	5	63,102.58	3,249	622,244.65
638 Syracuse	6,275	3,391,748.40	2,565	1,664,304.71	468	339,795.74	9,308	5,395,848.85
637 Upper Manhattan	72,545	151,566,563.70	31,922	32,691,187.54	5,100	10,841,024.02	109,567	195,098,775.26
Total	186,879	416,452,311.01	109,300	86,076,177.72	12,667	24,738,264.33	308,846	527,266,753.06
701 Omaha:								
739 Aberdeen	1,765	1,267,833.94	604	248,973.89	119	97,169.23	2,488	1,613,977.06
740 Cheyenne	1,309	674,142.90	727	256,547.69	179	413,539.81	2,215	1,344,230.40
741 Denver	6,245	5,921,413.58	3,056	1,642,399.55	447	396,857.75	9,748	7,960,670.88
742 Des Moines	3,317	7,199,169.93	1,596	749,072.00	294	251,940.91	5,207	8,200,182.84
743 Fargo	895	636,150.12	578	217,937.13	134	157,049.40	1,607	1,011,136.65
744 Kansas City	5,326	7,963,158.06	2,030	1,146,641.36	259	323,677.84	7,615	9,433,477.26
745 Omaha	1,901	2,582,942.88	638	480,083.97	158	301,419.06	2,697	3,364,445.91

EXHIBIT 1.—*Taxpayer delinquent accounts by type of tax, quarterly (December 1955) inventory*—Continued

[Source: Form 1955 Detail Sheets, December 1955]

Regions	Income tax, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		Employment tax, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		All other, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Omaha—Continued								
746 St. Louis	6,958	$8,407,369.43	2,686	$1,323,248.26	355	$355,033.21	9,999	$10,085,650.90
747 St. Paul	6,019	6,126,248.49	3,110	2,093,897.27	487	1,050,554.65	9,616	9,270,700.41
748 Wichita	6,986	5,481,358.34	2,912	1,018,508.27	381	257,992.29	10,279	6,757,858.90
Total	40,721	46,259,787.67	17,937	9,177,309.39	2,813	3,605,234.15	61,471	59,042,331.21
801 Philadelphia:								
849 Baltimore	84,492	54,989,772.38	9,577	5,773,385.50	1,792	1,734,066.57	95,861	62,497,224.45
850 Camden	12,727	13,211,643.15	3,684	2,657,984.25	547	1,027,080.35	16,958	16,896,707.75
851 Newark	58,625	51,713,451.67	23,673	22,244,526.78	2,585	5,835,964.16	84,883	79,793,942.61
852 Philadelphia	66,620	53,746,591.42	17,918	17,060,134.24	3,056	3,937,611.07	87,594	74,744,336.73
853 Pittsburgh	26,882	23,957,182.16	6,651	5,079,938.43	1,358	1,107,207.14	34,891	30,144,327.73
854 Scranton	4,739	4,614,994.23	1,743	2,324,223.08	177	294,050.88	6,659	7,233,268.19
855 Wilmington	3,834	3,117,064.18	683	327,924.93	69	194,939.62	4,586	3,639,928.73
Total	257,919	205,350,699.19	63,929	55,468,117.21	9,584	14,130,919.79	331,432	274,949,736.19
901 San Francisco:								
956 Boise	1,682	1,405,988.43	1,099	472,819.51	168	109,486.17	2,949	1,988,294.11
957 Helena	1,930	1,961,348.95	831	333,265.41	151	280,889.25	2,912	2,575,503.61
958 Honolulu	2,399	3,266,212.22	1,196	876,086.14	240	203,320.95	3,835	4,345,619.31
959 Los Angeles	79,839	57,859,349.68	22,429	19,796,004.78	2,771	6,113,982.52	105,039	83,679,336.98
960 Phoenix	4,696	3,502,403.19	2,059	1,327,348.74	268	228,005.77	7,023	5,057,757.70
961 Portland	7,134	9,027,537.39	3,950	2,281,809.97	552	1,119,794.93	11,636	12,429,142.29
962 Reno	2,394	4,836,130.51	1,195	1,470,181.47	193	391,641.58	3,782	6,697,953.56
963 Salt Lake City	2,985	2,584,690.27	1,491	809,124.82	192	167,038.32	4,668	3,560,853.41
964 San Francisco	52,516	73,660,760.70	17,509	11,951,569.42	3,220	3,370,887.18	73,245	88,983,217.30
965 Seattle	15,455	11,345,352.83	6,417	5,409,549.97	762	1,530,507.05	22,634	18,285,409.85
Total	171,030	169,449,774.17	58,176	44,637,760.23	8,517	13,515,553.72	237,723	227,603,088.12
Grand total	1,139,658	1,268,101,723.07	399,269	284,803,237.04	57,688	93,479,013.84	1,596,615	1,646,383,973.95

EXHIBIT 2.—*Analysis of taxpayer delinquent accounts in DARB pending on Dec. 31, 1955*

Regions	Military cases				Foreign cases				Proof of claim cases				Audit adjustment cases			
	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent
101 Atlanta:																
102 Atlanta	1,450	44.4	$146,443	2.1	4	0.1	$1,365	------	847	25.9	$2,806,272	40.5	405	12.4	$895,813	12.9
103 Birmingham	1,320	38.1	123,867	1.2	8	.2	1,583	------	1,278	36.8	972,667	9.2	163	4.7	4,067,815	38.5
104 Columbia	694	43.8	57,408	2.1	4	.3	1,140	------	379	23.9	468,821	16.9	133	8.4	145,290	5.2
105 Greensboro	1,803	41.4	156,870	1.0	11	.3	2,081	------	594	13.6	620,104	3.9	655	15.0	474,386	2.9
106 Jackson	417	53.6	38,667	3.7	3	.4	450	------	171	22.0	253,730	24.5	51	6.6	19,550	1.9
107 Jacksonville	1,253	30.3	144,972	.8	15	.4	6,592	------	1,710	41.3	5,415,021	29.0	532	12.9	540,465	2.9
108 Nashville	1,281	43.4	119,102	2.7	8	.3	2,030	------	636	21.6	1,481,875	33.9	441	14.9	510,334	11.7
Total	8,218	40.0	787,329	1.3	53	.3	15,241	------	5,615	27.3	12,018,490	19.9	2,380	11.6	6,653,653	11.0
201 Boston:																
209 Augusta	211	35.6	17,540	1.5	6	1.0	688	0.1	237	40.0	176,747	15.1	63	10.6	285,602	24.5
210 Boston	1,240	17.5	103,965	.6	8	.1	2,497	------	2,741	38.8	5,956,663	36.7	1,278	18.1	889,993	5.5
211 Burlington	53	29.6	4,557	2.9	2	1.1	319	.2	65	36.3	95,600	61.4	29	16.2	43,302	27.8
212 Hartford	327	12.2	28,084	.4	9	.3	5,598	.1	556	20.8	905,095	11.8	632	23.6	1,838,931	23.9
213 Portsmouth	216	34.2	16,352	1.0	4	.6	3,026	.2	154	24.4	136,438	8.4	101	16.0	46,872	2.9
214 Providence	674	45.8	58,454	1.6	------	------	------	------	492	33.4	1,093,785	29.0	81	5.5	34,354	.9
Total	2,721	21.6	228,952	.7	29	.2	12,128	------	4,245	33.6	8,364,328	27.3	2,184	17.3	3,139,054	10.2
301 Chicago:																
315 Chicago	6,628	27.3	364,181	1.0	------	------	------	------	2,545	10.5	12,867,464	36.8	12,095	49.8	9,789,444	28.0
316 Detroit	2,581	29.1	223,866	.7	50	.6	82,716	.3	2,001	22.5	7,028,103	21.6	2,717	30.6	17,787,296	54.7
317 Milwaukee	680	20.6	58,125	.6	11	.3	1,835	------	1,178	35.7	3,569,273	36.3	1,082	32.8	1,617,035	16.5
318 Springfield	1,757	46.6	140,947	3.4	4	.1	1,169	------	668	17.7	1,122,224	27.0	908	24.1	671,008	16.1
Total	11,646	28.9	787,119	1.0	65	.2	85,720	.1	6,392	15.9	24,587,064	30.2	16,802	41.8	29,864,783	36.6
401 Cincinnati:																
419 Cincinnati	532	30.6	51,652	.9	4	.2	2,792	------	545	31.3	1,078,529	19.0	320	18.4	194,503	3.4
420 Cleveland	1,329	22.0	119,967	.7	47	.8	123,105	.8	1,731	28.6	3,950,882	21.6	2,226	36.8	3,918,354	21.4
421 Columbus	640	46.5	56,250	2.9	1	.1	117	------	416	30.3	734,506	37.6	180	13.1	100,392	5.1
422 Indianapolis	2,941	63.5	264,751	1.9	12	.3	4,721	------	745	16.1	2,421,302	17.6	223	4.8	2,723,950	19.8
423 Louisville	1,174	30.2	145,183	1.7	------	------	------	------	485	12.5	1,950,108	23.3	1,859	47.9	2,790,092	33.4
424 Parkersburg	1,183	56.3	105,372	1.8	11	.5	9,172	.2	520	24.8	1,233,471	21.6	194	9.2	2,853,307	50.0
425 Richmond	1,091	35.3	107,784	1.2	7	.2	3,127	------	775	25.1	3,298,738	37.1	541	17.5	218,396	2.5
426 Toledo	383	46.7	35,592	2.0	1	.1	65	------	199	24.3	452,968	26.0	131	16.0	52,312	2.9
Total	9,273	39.2	886,551	1.4	83	.4	143,099	.2	5,416	22.9	15,120,504	23.5	5,674	24.0	12,851,306	19.9
501 Dallas:																
527 Albuquerque	147	24.7	13,011	1.7	6	1.0	3,022	.4	220	37.0	182,679	23.8	87	14.6	174,880	22.8
528 Austin	920	36.2	83,233	1.9	42	1.7	29,451	.7	413	16.3	816,511	18.4	569	22.4	477,463	10.8
529 Dallas	1,498	49.9	127,482	2.4	15	.5	16,199	.3	331	11.0	2,340,432	43.3	590	19.7	833,295	15.4
530 Little Rock	388	37.6	34,958	3.8	3	.3	464	.1	182	18.6	149,187	16.4	277	28.3	175,361	19.2
531 New Orleans	359	13.6	38,040	.5	10	.4	7,656	.1	672	25.4	1,297,758	16.7	805	30.4	749,597	9.7
532 Oklahoma City	377	25.3	34,689	.8	19	1.3	99,411	2.2	374	25.1	497,431	10.9	200	13.4	442,721	9.7
Total	3,669	32.6	331,413	1.4	95	.8	156,203	.7	2,192	19.5	5,283,998	22.2	2,528	22.5	2,853,317	12.0
601 New York City:																
633 Albany	508	25.8	43,187	1.2	32	1.6	74,716	2.0	639	32.4	995,872	27.3	324	16.4	133,977	3.7
634 Brooklyn	636	11.0	61,999	.2	------	------	------	------	1,174	20.4	8,725,620	32.1	1,637	28.4	2,267,915	8.3
635 Buffalo	137	9.5	12,451	.3	13	.9	2,984	.1	542	37.4	699,250	17.4	315	21.7	127,704	3.2

EXHIBIT 2.—*Analysis of taxpayer delinquent accounts in DARB pending on Dec. 31, 1955*—Continued

	Regions	Military cases				Foreign cases				Proof of claim cases				Audit adjustment cases			
		Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent
	New York City—Continued																
636	Lower Manhattan	171	3.0	$23,847	------	19	.3	$132,373	.2	3,084	53.8	$14,787,874	25.1	303	5.3	$7,629,965	12.9
698	Puerto Rico	29	4.0	3,064	1.0	4	.5	1,377	.4	151	20.6	87,910	28.1	506	68.9	89,889	28.7
638	Syracuse	525	35.7	49,057	2.0	9	.6	1,595	.1	395	26.9	1,381,967	56.4	210	14.3	185,882	7.6
637	Upper Manhattan	198	1.3	16,613	------	47	.3	844,379	1.3	4,640	31.4	24,279,268	36.1	5,404	36.6	12,761,782	19.0
	Total	2,204	6.9	210,218	.1	124	.4	1,057,424	.6	10,625	33.3	50,957,761	31.1	8,699	27.3	23,197,114	14.1
701	Omaha:																
739	Aberdeen	317	63.4	26,952	7.2	1	.2	34	------	6	1.2	2,347	.6	75	15.0	67,799	18.0
740	Cheyenne	79	21.5	6,562	1.1	8	2.2	5,339	.9	97	26.4	95,703	16.4	102	27.7	355,355	60.7
741	Denver	249	19.1	25,525	.6	6	.5	1,113	------	256	19.6	383,297	9.6	363	27.8	1,059,779	26.5
742	Des Moines	380	33.5	35,091	.7	6	.5	896	------	295	26.0	579,705	10.8	159	14.0	1,608,086	30.0
743	Fargo	94	37.6	7,001	2.0	------	------	------	------	35	14.0	59,638	16.7	48	19.2	76,598	21.5
744	Kansas City	244	15.7	20,002	.3	1	.1	233	------	498	32.1	428,300	7.4	526	33.9	3,136,603	54.5
745	Omaha	214	28.9	17,948	.7	1	.1	403	------	98	13.2	325,607	12.8	245	33.1	333,405	13.1
746	St. Louis	352	23.4	29,764	.5	2	.1	136	------	394	26.2	1,908,242	33.1	357	23.7	986,942	17.1
747	St. Paul	403	21.0	43,135	1.0	28	1.5	11,292	.3	683	35.7	1,283,703	30.0	369	19.3	531,809	12.4
748	Wichita	525	30.2	53,094	1.3	6	.3	2,764	.1	445	25.6	447,759	10.7	389	22.4	2,357,766	56.3
	Total	2,857	25.9	265,074	.8	59	.5	22,210	.1	2,807	25.5	5,514,301	16.6	2,633	23.9	10,514,142	31.7
801	Philadelphia:																
849	Baltimore	6,682	46.6	862,484	2.6	3,417	23.8	2,496,420	7.5	1,911	13.3	20,592,461	62.2	1,273	58.9	1,921,275	5.8
850	Camden	427	30.0	36,802	.4	11	.8	2,053	------	271	19.0	202,744	2.0	360	25.3	6,366,492	62.3
851	Newark	936	14.1	94,512	.4	24	.4	11,594	------	1,906	28.8	8,875,138	32.9	693	10.5	1,241,357	4.6
852	Philadelphia	2,471	27.6	220,299	.9	23	.3	117,651	.5	2,173	24.2	9,054,038	36.3	3,017	33.6	3,724,791	14.9
853	Pittsburgh	1,013	32.5	82,893	.5	124	4.0	16,166	.1	779	25.0	2,368,721	14.3	464	14.9	1,185,277	7.1
854	Scranton	590	41.1	52,874	1.4	2	.1	2,066	.1	241	16.8	746,107	19.7	310	21.6	395,523	10.5
855	Wilmington	42	12.4	3,195	.2	------	------	------	------	73	21.5	694,172	40.2	144	42.4	53,661	3.1
	Total	12,161	33.5	1,353,059	1.2	3,601	9.9	2,645,950	2.3	7,354	20.3	42,533,381	36.3	6,261	17.3	14,888,376	12.7
901	San Francisco:																
956	Boise	178	43.3	34,509	4.1	5	1.2	955	.1	113	27.5	93,345	11.2	46	11.2	53,166	6.4
957	Helena	107	22.3	10,287	.6	7	1.5	522	------	71	14.8	57,317	3.3	129	26.9	83,559	4.8
958	Honolulu	160	24.4	16,436	1.2	8	1.2	1,679	.1	82	12.5	158,096	11.1	261	39.8	86,420	6.1
959	Los Angeles	3,206	21.0	355,029	1.6	138	.9	851,861	3.9	3,570	23.4	9,181,676	42.0	7,237	47.3	6,498,052	29.7
960	Phoenix	348	36.2	32,744	1.9	7	.7	2,038	.1	222	23.1	219,337	12.7	134	13.9	146,829	8.5
961	Portland	833	38.2	87,196	1.9	10	.5	2,809	.1	631	28.9	1,149,326	25.4	455	20.8	844,862	18.7
962	Reno	51	16.3	5,218	.2	31	9.9	223,485	10.6	127	40.7	579,346	27.5	36	11.5	70,007	3.3
963	Salt Lake City	215	30.4	18,695	1.7	2	.3	803	.1	328	46.4	375,248	33.8	34	4.8	23,813	2.1
964	San Francisco	2,188	23.4	204,322	.4	136	1.5	41,809	.1	3,144	33.7	6,820,504	13.3	2,727	29.2	32,557,393	63.6
965	Seattle	2,582	51.7	210,375	3.8	64	1.3	78,506	1.4	913	18.3	1,422,769	25.7	1,064	26.3	1,630,870	29.5
	Total	9,868	22.9	974,811	1.1	408	1.2	1,204,467	1.3	9,201	26.0	20,056,964	21.8	12,123	34.3	41,994,971	45.6
	Grand total	62,617	28.1	5,824,526	.9	4,517	2.0	5,342,442	.8	53,847	24.2	184,436,791	27.6	59,284	26.6	145,956,716	21.9

NOTE.—Owing to rounding, components shown do not always add to totals.

EXHIBIT 2.—*Analysis of taxpayer delinquent accounts in DARB pending on Dec. 31, 1955*—Continued

	Regions	Postponement bond and escrow agreements				Tax Court cases pending				Offers in compromise				Total inventory in DARB pending	
		Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Amount
101	Atlanta:														
102	Atlanta	1	------	$30,173	0.4	55	1.7	$286,255	4.1	505	15.5	$2,758,765	39.9	3,267	$6,925,087
103	Birmingham	28	.8	228,478	2.2	247	7.1	2,753,527	26.0	425	12.3	2,430,762	23.0	3,469	10,578,697
104	Columbia	22	1.4	31,399	1.1	29	1.8	710,340	25.6	324	20.4	1,365,714	49.1	1,585	2,780,110
105	Greensboro	20	.5	18,877	.1	377	8.7	6,487,440	40.3	894	20.5	8,338,958	51.8	4,354	16,098,716
106	Jackson	2	.3	37,417	3.6	11	1.4	244,049	23.5	123	15.8	442,996	42.7	778	1,036,860
107	Jacksonville	42	1.0	872,226	4.7	135	3.3	9,319,338	49.9	453	10.9	2,385,759	12.8	4,140	18,684,372
108	Nashville	8	.3	89,447	2.0	22	.7	318,825	7.3	554	18.8	1,846,689	42.3	2,950	4,368,302
	Total	123	.6	1,308,017	2.2	876	4.3	20,119,774	33.3	3,278	16.0	19,569,643	32.4	20,543	60,472,144
201	Boston:														
209	Augusta	29	4.9	529,062	45.3	------	------	------	------	47	7.9	157,540	13.5	593	1,167,179
210	Boston	9	.1	38,684	.2	77	1.1	2,313,599	14.3	1,715	24.3	6,928,788	42.7	7,068	16,234,189
211	Burlington	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	30	16.8	11,910	7.6	179	155,688
212	Hartford	------	------	------	------	18	.7	246,830	3.2	1,135	42.4	4,660,763	60.6	2,677	7,685,302
213	Portsmouth	1	.2	107,045	6.6	------	------	------	------	156	24.7	1,318,074	81.0	632	1,627,807
214	Providence	18	1.2	351,433	9.3	------	------	------	------	208	14.1	2,227,932	59.2	1,473	3,765,958
	Total	57	.5	1,026,224	3.3	95	.8	2,560,429	8.4	3,291	26.1	15,305,007	50.0	12,622	30,636,123
301	Chicago:														
315	Chicago	------	------	------	------	93	.4	4,304,829	12.3	2,928	12.1	7,668,275	21.9	24,289	34,994,193
316	Detroit	3	------	30,297	.1	153	1.7	1,262,660	3.9	1,378	15.5	6,097,318	18.8	8,883	32,512,256
317	Milwaukee	------	------	------	------	38	1.2	1,590,365	16.2	310	9.4	2,984,310	30.4	3,299	9,820,942
318	Springfield	14	.4	57,118	1.4	40	1.1	692,427	16.6	378	10.0	1,475,270	35.5	3,769	4,160,162
	Total	17	------	87,415	.1	324	.8	7,850,281	9.6	4,994	12.4	18,225,173	22.4	40,240	81,487,553
401	Cincinnati:														
419	Cincinnati	------	------	------	------	124	7.1	3,769,585	66.4	214	12.3	579,644	10.2	1,739	5,676,705
420	Cleveland	1	------	259	------	191	3.2	7,895,132	43.2	524	8.7	2,268,344	12.4	6,049	18,276,041
421	Columbus	3	.2	4,834	.2	114	8.3	944,049	48.4	21	1.5	111,639	5.7	1,375	1,951,786
422	Indianapolis	26	.6	1,545,936	11.2	193	4.2	2,893,861	21.0	488	10.5	3,923,601	28.5	4,628	13,778,122
423	Louisville	23	.6	201,646	2.4	138	3.6	2,037,036	24.4	203	5.2	1,235,559	14.8	3,882	8,359,624
424	Parkersburg	5	.2	249,485	4.4	------	------	------	------	187	8.9	1,254,342	22.0	2,100	5,705,148
425	Richmond	------	------	------	------	141	4.6	2,285,299	25.7	536	17.3	2,977,263	33.5	3,091	8,890,606
426	Toledo	------	------	------	------	42	5.1	1,145,467	63.3	64	7.8	124,164	6.9	820	1,810,567
	Total	58	.2	2,002,160	3.1	943	4.0	20,970,429	32.5	2,237	9.4	12,474,556	19.4	23,684	64,448,599

EXHIBIT 2.—*Analysis of taxpayer delinquent accounts in DARB pending on Dec. 31, 1955*—Continued

Regions	Postponement bond and escrow agreements				Tax Court cases pending				Offers in compromise				Total inventory in DARB pending	
	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Amount
501 Dallas:														
527 Albuquerque	1	.2	$8,044	1.0	2	.3	$98	-----	132	22.2	$386,298	50.3	595	$768,033
528 Austin	65	2.6	374,639	8.4	19	.7	558,164	12.6	513	20.2	2,100,584	47.3	2,541	4,440,044
529 Dallas	1	-----	119,083	2.2	34	1.1	428,685	7.9	533	17.8	1,535,563	28.4	3,002	5,400,740
530 Little Rock	2	.2	2,524	.3	4	.4	26,537	2.9	143	14.6	523,188	57.4	979	912,220
531 New Orleans	6	.2	1,763	-----	101	3.8	3,581,934	46.2	693	26.2	2,074,386	26.8	2,646	7,751,134
532 Oklahoma City	5	.3	150,489	3.3	47	3.1	1,738,178	38.2	471	31.5	1,584,624	34.8	1,493	4,547,544
Total	80	.7	656,542	2.8	207	1.8	6,333,596	26.6	2,485	22.1	8,204,643	34.4	11,256	23,819,715
601 New York City:														
633 Albany	16	.8	58,192	1.6	43	2.2	895,885	24.6	410	20.8	1,446,896	39.7	1,972	3,648,725
634 Brooklyn	1	-----	17,722	.1	102	1.8	7,131,789	26.2	2,214	38.4	9,012,225	33.1	5,764	27,217,271
635 Buffalo	1	.1	128,847	3.2	58	4.0	1,665,971	46.4	383	26.4	1,388,482	34.5	1,449	4,025,689
636 Lower Manhattan	-----	-----	-----	-----	246	4.3	23,227,717	39.4	1,907	33.3	13,211,795	22.4	5,730	59,013,572
698 Puerto Rico	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	44	6.0	130,730	41.8	734	312,970
638 Syracuse	23	1.6	384,766	15.7	13	.9	14,404	.6	295	20.1	434,609	17.7	1,470	2,452,280
637 Upper Manhattan	-----	-----	-----	-----	112	.8	1,272,018	1.9	4,384	29.7	28,150,465	41.8	14,785	67,324,525
Total	41	.1	589,527	.4	574	1.8	34,207,784	20.9	9,637	30.2	53,775,202	32.8	31,904	163,995,032
701 Omaha:														
739 Aberdeen	-----	-----	-----	-----	7	1.4	156,890	41.6	94	18.8	122,789	32.6	500	376,810
740 Cheyenne	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	82	22.3	122,068	20.9	368	585,027
741 Denver	13	1.0	24,556	.6	59	4.5	911,123	22.8	360	27.6	1,598,678	39.9	1,306	4,004,071
742 Des Moines	17	1.5	362,758	6.8	32	2.8	336,454	6.3	247	21.7	2,432,441	45.4	1,136	5,355,431
743 Fargo	-----	-----	-----	-----	26	10.4	158,931	44.5	47	18.8	54,601	15.3	250	356,770
744 Kansas City	-----	-----	-----	-----	32	2.1	242,813	4.2	252	16.2	1,929,486	33.5	1,553	5,757,436
745 Omaha	11	1.5	130,832	5.2	30	4.0	1,301,916	51.3	142	19.2	425,957	16.8	741	2,536,068
746 St. Louis	-----	-----	-----	-----	27	1.8	357,311	6.2	373	24.8	2,487,286	43.1	1,505	5,769,681
747 St. Paul	11	.6	374,558	8.8	61	3.2	837,923	19.6	359	18.8	1,198,020	28.0	1,914	4,280,440
748 Wichita	53	3.1	226,272	5.4	23	1.3	247,613	5.9	296	17.0	854,609	20.4	1,737	4,189,876
Total	105	1.0	1,118,976	3.4	297	2.7	4,550,974	13.7	2,252	20.5	11,225,935	33.8	11,010	33,211,610
801 Philadelphia:														
849 Baltimore	4	-----	262,543	.8	-----	-----	-----	-----	1,059	7.4	6,957,206	21.0	14,346	33,092,388
850 Camden	28	2.0	607,636	5.9	14	1.0	669,193	6.5	314	22.0	2,333,922	22.8	1,425	10,218,842
851 Newark	3	-----	110,486	.4	203	3.1	5,010,973	18.6	2,864	43.2	11,606,550	43.1	6,629	26,950,610
852 Philadelphia	8	.1	192,624	.8	33	.4	1,323,596	5.3	1,242	13.9	10,291,648	41.3	8,967	24,924,646
853 Pittsburgh	-----	-----	-----	-----	99	3.2	7,347,080	44.3	638	20.5	5,596,350	33.7	3,117	16,596,487
854 Scranton	-----	-----	-----	-----	52	3.6	155,091	4.1	240	16.7	2,428,330	64.2	1,435	3,779,990
855 Wilmington	-----	-----	-----	-----	31	9.1	908,561	52.7	50	14.7	65,680	3.8	340	1,725,269
Total	43	.1	1,173,289	1.0	432	1.2	15,415,494	13.1	6,407	17.7	39,279,686	33.5	36,259	117,288,232
901 San Francisco:														
956 Boise	3	.7	4,263	.5	35	8.5	338,013	40.4	31	7.5	312,487	37.3	411	836,738
957 Helena	9	1.9	978,619	56.1	-----	-----	-----	-----	157	32.7	612,688	35.2	480	1,742,992
958 Honolulu	9	1.4	135,437	9.5	17	2.6	538,348	37.8	119	18.1	487,504	34.2	656	1,423,919
959 Los Angeles	4	-----	51,553	.2	86	.6	630,421	2.9	1,048	6.9	4,280,013	19.6	15,289	21,848,605
960 Phoenix	2	.2	3,600	.2	41	4.3	355,399	24.5	207	21.5	973,566	56.2	961	1,733,514
961 Portland	-----	-----	-----	-----	84	3.8	1,459,344	32.3	170	7.8	981,024	21.7	2,183	4,524,561
962 Reno	-----	-----	-----	-----	29	9.3	1,132,487	53.7	38	12.2	96,527	4.6	312	2,107,070
963 Salt Lake City	21	3.0	90,818	8.7	23	3.3	402,950	36.3	84	11.9	191,684	17.3	707	1,110,011
964 San Francisco	2	-----	18,337	-----	149	1.6	4,857,389	9.5	987	10.6	6,714,019	13.1	9,333	51,213,773
965 Seattle	1	-----	154	-----	68	1.4	1,467,071	26.5	303	6.1	727,690	13.1	4,995	5,537,435
Total	51	.1	1,288,781	1.4	532	1.5	11,181,422	12.1	3,144	8.9	15,377,202	16.7	35,327	92,078,618
Grand total	575	.3	9,250,931	1.4	4,280	1.9	123,189,183	18.5	37,725	16.9	193,437,047	29.0	222,845	667,437,626

NOTE.—Owing to rounding, components shown do not always add to totals.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, chart No. 1 gives a statistical breakdown of the outstanding delinquencies in each of the collection districts by showing the number of accounts and the amounts involved.

Chart No. 2 shows the number of delinquent accounts that have been transferred to the field collection force that are in an inactive status. This is a further breakdown of a portion of the items appearing in exhibit No. 1.

I now ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a third chart, which is a summary showing the amount of both 1954 and 1955 delinquent taxes charged to each of the collection districts, along with a percentage computation showing the increase or decrease as compared to 1954.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Region	1954 delinquent taxes	1955 delinquent taxes	Percent of increase, 1955 over 1954	Percent of decrease, 1955 over 1954
Atlanta region:				
Atlanta	$20,972,739	$18,809,469.18	-----	10
Birmingham	19,488,687	17,636,819.66	-----	9
Columbia	7,201,701	6,511,429.28	-----	9
Greensboro	26,395,319	21,018,680.09	-----	20
Jackson	4,717,712	2,957,931.29	-----	37
Jacksonville	47,883,435	49,361,697.11	3	-----
Nashville	12,463,047	13,220,012.32	6	-----
Boston region:				
Augusta	2,582,660	1,915,961.28	-----	25⅛
Boston	41,306,294	37,835,356.26	-----	8⅜
Burlington	644,129	409,970.49	-----	36½
Hartford	15,271,158	15,348,135.93	½	-----
Portsmouth	3,252,731	2,179,031.04	-----	33
Providence	7,389,895	7,173,805.25	-----	3
Chicago region:				
Chicago	$81,659,860	$87,843,509.34	7½	-----
Detroit	44,787,225	68,904,225.44	53¾	-----
Milwaukee	16,592,839	16,279,604.79	-----	1⅞
Springfield	9,101,127	8,723,856.07	-----	4
Cincinnati region:				
Cincinnati	15,128,835	12,685,909.21	-----	16
Cleveland	42,963,755	35,547,838.73	-----	17
Columbus	6,652,735	6,624,801.15	-----	½
Indianapolis	19,133,272	20,760,250.92	7	-----
Louisville	11,834,161	13,172,969.14	11	-----
Parkersburg	12,931,609	10,627,103.44	-----	18
Richmond	20,986,659	21,881,829.41	4	-----
Toledo	3,317,067	2,896,973.94	-----	12

Region	1954 delinquent taxes	1955 delinquent taxes	Percent of increase, 1955 over 1954	Percent of decrease, 1955 over 1954
Dallas region:				
Albuquerque	$2,824,810	$2,960,729.62	4	
Austin	20,202,903	12,754,005.75		36
Dallas	23,748,778	16,337,067.48		31
Little Rock	2,315,863	2,108,438.18		8
New Orleans	17,472,965	13,613,589.17		22
Oklahoma City	9,043,216	9,421,064.41	4	
New York City:				
Albany	15,061,055	11,274,930.84		25
Brooklyn	106,522,490	133,339,786.92	25	
Buffalo	12,368,574	12,058,317.23		2
Lower Manhattan	171,309,518	169,476,849.31		1
Puerto Rico	273,843	622,244.65	127⅛	
Syracuse	5,650,017	5,395,848.85		4
Upper Manhattan	158,538,468	195,098,775.26	23	
Omaha region:				
Aberdeen	1,255,504	1,613,977.06	28½	
Cheyenne	1,629,689	1,344,230.40		17½
Denver	7,552,576	7,960,670.88	5¾	
Des Moines	9,737,729	8,200,182.84		15⅞
Fargo	1,353,482	1,011,136.65		25
Kansas City	9,021,864	9,433,477.26	4⅝	
Omaha	4,180,447	3,364,445.91		19½
Omaha region—Con.				
St. Louis	$12,267,505	$10,085,650.90		17¾
St. Paul	9,725,868	9,270,700.41		4¾
Wichita	7,316,879	6,757,858.90		7⅛
Philadelphia region:				
Baltimore	68,663,284	62,497,224.45		9
Camden	10,638,780	16,896,707.75	58⅝	
Newark	92,962,952	79,793,942.61		14⅛
Philadelphia	63,450,420	74,744,336.73	17⅝	
Pittsburgh	28,955,774	30,144,327.73	4	
Scranton	7,948,754	7,233,268.19		9
Wilmington	22,009,168	3,639,928.73		83½
San Francisco region:				
Boise	2,083,834	1,988,294.11		4½
Helena	2,863,290	2,575,503.61		10
Honolulu	4,620,939	4,345,619.31		5
Los Angeles	88,047,147	83,679,336.98		5
Phoenix	5,510,061	5,057,757.70		8⅛
Portland	15,351,352	12,429,142.29		19
Reno	6,043,359	6,697,953.56	10⅔	
Salt Lake City	4,649,780	3,560,853.41		23¼
San Francisco	66,858,096	88,983,217.30	33	
Seattle	19,804,603	18,285,409.85		7⅝

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call particular attention to the fact that the Philadelphia-Camden area, which has been under criticism recently, show delinquent tax increases of 17 percent and 58 percent, respectively. This further confirms my contention that a long overdue examination of these two offices is in order.

There has been a 53-percent increase in delinquencies in Detroit, 127-percent increase in Puerto Rico, 33-percent increase in San Francisco, and increases of somewhat lesser extent in other areas.

Many other districts have shown progress in reducing the amount of delinquent accounts, and it is a pleasure to call special attention to the fact that the Wilmington, Del., district has made the outstanding record for the country by reducing its tax delinquencies by 83 percent during the calendar year 1955.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the pending farm legislation.

It is not necessary to restate here the adverse financial situation in which almost every farmer finds himself today. Most people realize that if present farm prices were permitted to continue, they would break the average farmer.

A very high percentage of our farmers are in bad shape financially. This is particularly true of the small farmers and the young World War II and Korean war veterans who, during the past 10 years, have just gotten started in the farming business.

The Eisenhower administration recognizes that farmers are in dire financial straits. Otherwise the administration would not be requesting authority of Congress to spend more than $1.3 billion a year in payments to farmers for a soil-bank program in addition to the costs of the flexible price support program.

The farm bill now before the Senate has three major provisions—the soil-bank program; the restoration of 90-percent supports for basic farm commodities, an increase in dairy supports from 75 to 80 percent of parity; and a provision to reinstate the dual parity formula.

The soil-bank proposal embodies two separate and important programs—the conservation reserve program and the acreage reserve program.

The conservation reserve program applies to all cultivated acres. Cooperation by farmers in both the conservation reserve and acreage reserve programs would be strictly on a voluntary basis.

Farmers would be paid approximately $19 an acre on a national average to reimburse them for the expense of placing their land under the conservation reserve program. The rate in North Dakota would be slightly less.

All the figures I will use in connection with the soil-bank program are those given to the Senate Agriculture Committee by the Secretary of Agriculture and are subject to some revision.

The land placed under this program would be on a 3- to 10-year lease basis and in North Dakota farmers would be given an annual payment of approximately $5.70 per acre.

The acreage reserve program affects only allotted acres of wheat, corn, cotton, and other basic commodities. Farmers may voluntarily take up to 30 percent of their allotted wheat and corn acres out of production and place it under this program.

All they must do to comply is keep the land idle for 1 year. The payment per acre in North Dakota would average about $13.50. This is a tentative figure.

The following is an example of how the acreage reserve program would be applied to a farm in Ward County, N. Dak., for wheat:

County normal yield bushels per acre	13.2
Size of farm acres	480
Acreage allotment do	120
Acreage put into reserve do	30
Payment rate per acre	$13.50
Payment to farmer	$405.00

If this farmer also participates in the conservation reserve program, he could earn additional money as follows: If he places 70 acres of any of the rest of his cultivated acres under the conservation reserve program, he would be paid approximately $17 per acre for the expense involved in placing the land under conservation practices.

Seventy acres times $17 per acre would be $1,190. In addition, he would earn approximately $5.70 per acre, or 70 times $5.70, $399.

Thus, for the first year he would earn $1,589 on the conservation reserve program plus the $405 on the 30 acres he placed in the acreage reserve program, or a total of $1,994.

The committee has written strong language in the legislation to assure equitable sharing of the payments under this program as between landlords and tenants.

The second and most important provision in the bill, in my opinion, has to do with price supports. It would restore 90 percent supports for basic farm commodities and raise price supports for dairy commodities from 75 to 80 percent of parity.

On both cotton and wheat the bill provides that there shall be mandatory price differentials to reflect the quality of the commodity. The Secretary of Agriculture now has discretionary authority to establish price differentials, and for years a very limited program of this nature has been in effect.

With respect to wheat, this bill provides that all varieties which normally produce a good quality wheat would be supported at 90 percent of parity. This means that every farmer who seeds a variety of wheat which normally could be expected to produce a good quality wheat would receive 90 percent price supports.

Less than 2 percent of all the wheat seeded in North Dakota in 1955 consisted of varieties which would not qualify for 90 percent supports.

There has been considerable misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the provisions of this section of the farm bill which pertain to price supports for wheat on a quality basis.

One of the worst misrepresentations appeared in the National Farmers Union's Washington newsletter dated

February 10, 1956. A part of this newsletter reads as follows:

Wheat price levels are left in great—and serious—doubt by the committee bill's provisions. An enormous power of discretion is granted to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The mandatory limits that would be established are only that some wheat must be supported at 90 percent; the lowest level of wheat support must be at its feed equivalent value to corn, and the support price of all wheat must average 75 percent of parity.

This means price-support floors for wheat ranging, at today's price levels, from $1.72 per bushel—90 percent of the corn parity equivalent for wheat—if the bill passes.

If the wheat provision is adopted without winning the rest of the bill, it would set price support floors for wheat down as low as $1.36 per bushel.

It is left up to the Secretary of Agriculture, with the advice of a committee comprised of one-third processors, one-third farmers, and one-third professors, all appointed by the Secretary to determine which wheat is to be supported as "milling quality" wheat at 90 percent, and which is to be supported only at feed value.

This bill virtually insures that high-quality wheat producers would lose the premiums which they usually get above the support level.

It also opens up the danger that millers will buy "feed wheat" to dilute their flour mixes, putting further downward pressure on high-quality wheat premiums.

Obviously, the writer of this newsletter did not read the pending bill, or else he does not understand farm legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of section 102 of the agriculture bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the section of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 102. Section 101 (d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(8) if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for the crop, (A) the support price to cooperators for milling quality wheat shall be established upon the basis of a support level for the crop of 90 percent of the parity price for wheat, and (B) the support price to cooperators in any area for any other wheat shall be established, without regard to paragraph (7) of this subsection, at such level as the Secretary determines will preserve the competitive relationship between such wheat and corn on the basis of their respective feed values; but in no event shall the average support price to cooperators for all wheat (based upon anticipated production) be less than 75 percent of its parity price. For the purposes of this paragraph milling quality wheat shall be wheat produced in any area from seed of a variety which in such area normally produces wheat of a quality desired for milling purposes. In determining milling quality wheat, the Secretary shall consult with a committee appointed by him and composed of three representatives from each of the principal wheat-producing areas. Of the 3 representatives from each area, 1 shall be a wheat farmer, 1 shall be a wheat miller, and 1 shall be a person experienced in research on wheat varieties. At least one of the millers on the committee shall have had experience in producing semolina flour. Wheat of the 1956 crop planted in any area shall be milling quality wheat for the purposes of this paragraph, unless such wheat is of a variety which was designated as undesirable in such area by the Department of Agriculture prior to the time such wheat was planted. This paragraph shall be applicable only to the 1956 and 1957 crops."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the explanation in the report accompanying the bill as to how Members of the Senate Agriculture Committee feel this quality wheat provision would be applied.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 102. WHEAT

Section 102 provides price support for milling quality wheat at 90 percent of parity and support for other wheat at such levels as will preserve its competitive relationship with corn on the basis of respective feed values, the average support price for all wheat to be not less than 75 percent of parity. Milling quality wheat would be wheat produced in any area from seed of a variety which in such area normally produces wheat of a quality desired for milling purposes. Wheat of the 1956 crops is deemed to be milling quality unless of a variety designated as undesirable by the Secretary of Agriculture prior to the time such wheat is planted. In determining milling quality wheat, the Secretary would consult with a committee on which there will be 3 representatives from each of the principal wheat-producing areas, of whom 1 would be a wheat farmer, 1 a wheat miller, and 1 a person experienced in research on wheat varieties. This section would be applicable only to the 1956 and 1957 crops.

The announced support price for wheat of the 1956 crop is $1.81 per bushel (76 percent of parity). On the basis of January 15 data and the parity formula provided by section 106, 90 percent of parity would be $2.26 per bushel.

Under this section, a national average support level representing 90 percent of the parity price for wheat would be established and, after the adjustments for location, grade, quality, and other factors called for by section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, this would be applied to milling quality wheat. The support level for other wheat would be established at a price for each county which represents its feed value relationship to corn. The feeding value of wheat to corn (pound for pound) based on USDA Circular No. 836 is 105.

The Department has had some experience in preparing a program of the type contemplated by this section.

On August 12, 1955, it announced that under the 1956 wheat price support program 23 designated undesirable varieties would be discounted 20 cents per bushel in addition to any other discounts, and that protein premiums would not be applicable to these varieties. Following is a listing of the designated undesirable varieties, by classes and the States in which they are designated:

Hard Red Winter:

Purkof: Indiana, Michigan.

Red Chief: Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico.

Red Jacket: Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico.

Kanking: Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Nebraska.

Kanqueen: Missouri, Colorado.

Chiefkan: Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Colorado, New Mexico.

Stafford: Nebraska, Kansas.

Early Pawnee (Sel. 33): Kansas.

Early Blackhull: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Colorado.

New Chief: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico.

Yogo: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas.

Soft Red Winter:

Kawvale: Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska.

Hard Red Spring:

Henry: Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana.

Sturgeon: Wisconsin.

Progress: Wisconsin.

Spinkcota: Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Premier: Montana, North Dakota.

White:

Rex: Idaho, Washington, Oregon.

Sonora: California.

Galgalos: Nebraska.

Durum:

Golden Ball: Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana.

Peliss: North Dakota, Montana.

Pentad: North Dakota.

The August 12 announcement contemplated that a producer certification plan would be used. Each producer applying for price support in States with any of the listed undesirable varieties would be required to certify (1) that the wheat he harvested was not of the undesirable varieties listed for his State, or (2) that the wheat he harvested was from one or more of the undesirable varieties but none of such wheat was being tendered for price support, or (3) that the wheat on which he requested price support contained wheat of an undesirable variety listed for his State and such wheat was identified by variety, and bin number (if farm stored) or warehouse receipt number.

It was estimated that the total 1954 production of the 23 varieties listed as undesirable by the Department in its announcement of August 12, 1955, amounted to 31 million bushels, as compared with the total 1954 crop of 985 million bushels.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I think the bill is very plain as to how this provision would be applied. I wish to read just a few lines of section 102 of the bill starting on line 20:

For the purposes of this paragraph milling quality wheat shall be wheat produced in any area from seed of a variety which in such area normally produces wheat of a quality desired for milling purposes.

Exactly the same language is carried forward in the committee report. It should be obvious to anyone that these provisions specifically provide that any farmer seeding wheat which normally produces a good quality wheat would be given 90 percent supports. How can any other interpretation be placed upon it?

In North Dakota more than 98 percent of all the wheat seeded is of varieties which normally produce good quality. There is no reason in the world why wheat producers in any section of the United States should not plant wheat which normally produces good quality if they expect to get 90 percent supports.

It does not make sense to provide top level supports to producers who intentionally plant varieties of low quality wheat just because they are highly resistant to rust and other diseases and produce heavy yields per acre. Continuance of this practice would break any price support program, whether it is based upon 90 percent supports or 70 percent supports.

Why should any farmer in North Dakota be given top level supports for producing such wheat as Premier when it is recognized to be a poor quality. Or why would he be given top level supports for producing Golden Ball, Peliss,

or Pentad durum—varieties which are recognized to be of very poor quality?

As late as last year these varieties of wheat received the same support level as the best wheat produced in our area.

Every variety of wheat released by the North Dakota experiment station has been of very good quality and is so recognized by the millers and bakers. Unfortunately, we cannot say as much for some of the experiment stations in other parts of the United States. Unfortunately, from time to time some have released varieties of wheat which are big yielders, but of very poor quality.

We have many many varieties of both spring wheat and durum wheat which over the years have been recognized for their top qualities.

They include Rival, Mida, Thatcher, Lee, Selkirk, Mindum, Sentry, and numerous others.

The Farmers Union Washington newsletter states:

> The lowest level of wheat support must be at its feed equivalent value to corn, and the support price of all wheat must average 75 percent of parity.

Now this is not in accord with the facts. The bill reads—and I quote again from section 102 line 17 on page 2:

> But in no event shall the average support price to cooperators for all wheat (based upon anticipated production) be less than 75 percent of its parity price.

That is a far cry from what is claimed in the newsletter as to the provisions of the bill. This provision means exactly what it says—that the average support price could not be less than 75 percent of parity. It does not mean it must be 75 percent of parity.

Section 102 does provide that the support level for feed wheats shall be established at a price in each county which represents its feed value in relationship to corn. Certainly varieties of wheat which can only produce wheat of feed value should not have a price support higher than its value as a feed grain equivalent.

For years there have been varying degrees of price support differentials based on the quality of wheat. The quality determination, however, was left entirely to the Secretary of Agriculture working with agriculture research people, millers, and bakers.

The new legislation provides that the quality determination will be made by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with an advisory committee which will include farmers from every principal wheat-producing area of the United States. This is the first time farmers will be given a voice in determining the quality of various varieties of wheat to receive price supports. This, too, is a step in the right direction.

Mr. President, if all the wheat farmers of the United States could be encouraged through such legislation as we are considering today to plant only varieties which would normally produce a good quality milling wheat, it would result in a reduction in production of at least 50 million to 100 million bushels per year.

There is another claim in the newsletter which is absolutely untrue. It states that premiums for the most part would no longer be available to farmers. That is not so. This argument is the one usually used by the proponents of flexible or lower supports.

Mr. THYE. To what newsletter does the Senator refer?

Mr. YOUNG. It is the National Farmers Union Newsletter of February 10, 1956.

As I have stated previously, good quality wheats invariably produce less per acre. There would be many additional benefits. It would be much easier, for example, to find new markets for good quality wheat both at home and abroad. We have lost many foreign markets because all too often we have shipped inferior quality wheat.

Statements by the Secretary of Agriculture and other opponents of the reinstatement of 90-percent supports that this would greatly increase production are just not in accord with the facts.

All of the basic commodities, for which this bill would reinstate 90-percent supports, are now under the strictest kind of acreage allotments or quotas. This has meant a more than one-third cut in their acreage.

The reinstatement of 90-percent supports, as provided in this bill, does nothing to increase acreage or production. Actually, placing price supports on a quality basis, as this bill does, will tend to decrease production.

The present flexible price-support program, if continued, will break most wheat farmers.

I have already said that the wheat farmer has had to cut his acreage by more than one-third. In addition to this, he is required to take a drastic reduction in price supports.

When the Farm Act of 1954 is in full effect, the cut in price supports will be more than one-third. Anyone conversant with the world wheat-supply situation, and more particularly that of Canada and the United States, knows full well that cash prices for most grades of wheat have little chance of rising above support levels in at least the next 2 or 3 years.

Mr. President, permit me to give you an example of how this flexible price-support program, together with the modernized parity formula, affects wheat farmers.

The support price for wheat in 1954 was $2.26 a bushel on the national average. The support price in 1955 was $2.08. The support price for this year, 1956, unless Congress approves the present legislation, will drop to $1.81 a bushel.

The following year, 1957, because of the application of the modernized parity formula, there will be a still further drop in the price support to approximately $1.70 a bushel. In 1958, because of the modernized parity formula, the price support would drop to $1.60 a bushel or lower.

In addition to this, any farmer who does not store his grain on the farm takes a further reduction of an average of 10 cents a bushel as his payment for advance storage costs. That is, if he hauls his grain to town and gets his loan through his regular marketing channels. Thus, by 1958, if the Agricultural Act of 1954 is permitted to go into effect, the actual support price paid to farmers would be $1.50 a bushel or less.

Mr. President, this approximately one-third cut in acreage and the one-third cut in price is more than the wheat farmer can take. Certainly, few business firms could survive such a cut in income.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Perhaps it might be well, if the Senator does not object, to refer to the method of figuring parity under the new basis. Do I understand that the committee is recommending a study of the parity formula?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. The committee bill provides for a reinstatement of the dual parity formula, but with the request to the Department of Agriculture to make a study of the parity formulas, in the hope that they can come up with one that is more fair and equitable to all producers.

Mr. CARLSON. May I ask this question? Do I understand from a reading of the report that we have three types of parity formulas, namely, the old, the new, and the transitional? Or am I confused about it?

Mr. YOUNG. There are actually only two, the old parity formula and the modernized parity formula. Under the provision of the law at the present time, parity cannot drop more than 5 percent a year. That is called the transitional parity formula. In the transitional period when we are moving from the old parity formula to the modernized parity formula, it is provided that the parity price cannot drop more than 5 percent a year. That is the transitional period.

Mr. CARLSON. Am I to understand that if we do not adopt the 90 percent formula so far as wheat is concerned, the supported price of wheat in 1956 will drop from $2.04 or $2.06 a bushel to $1.81 a bushel?

Mr. YOUNG. In 1956; yes.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand the Senator's statement, on the basis of the modernized parity formula, we can expect further reductions in the next 2 or 3 years. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. The reductions will be at least 20 cents a bushel, and perhaps 22 cents a bushel more.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe that is a very important point, and I sincerely hope that we will take some time and look into it.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator.

Reinstating price supports for basic farm commodities will automatically raise the cash market price of practically all other grains. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a news story with a Chicago dateline of February 10, 1956, which gives ample proof of what I am saying. Let me read a part of it:

> Two bearish items greeted grain traders at the opening. First, a letter by President Eisenhower to Senator AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, in which the President said he was gravely concerned over the prospect new farm legislation would set price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic crops. Sec-

ond, an Agriculture Department announcement of a steep cut—from 87 percent to 81 percent of parity—in the price support level for 1956 crop corn. Fairly heavy selling hit the market in the first half hour on these developments. But it dried up before that first hour was over. After that, prices climbed. Traders noted President Eisenhower did not definitely say he would veto a farm bill containing the 90 percent of parity support provision.

I think that is the best proof that if 90-percent parity were restored, prices would immediately climb.

Throughout the testimony of farmers during the month-long hearings last fall held in practically every part of the United States, most cattle and hog feeders stated frankly that lower feed grain prices had encouraged too much feeding of cattle and hogs, thus creating burdensome surpluses and depressed prices.

The pending legislation will go a long way toward stabilizing grain prices at a higher level which would be of benefit not only to the producers of grain but to almost every other segment of our agriculture economy.

Farmers produce the most important things necessary to the health and happiness of everyone—food and fiber. The prices farmers receive now, according to Government statistics, are approximately only 80 percent of parity or a fair price. Certainly reinstatement of 90 percent supports would be the least we could do to relieve the desperate farm price situation—and at a time when the Nation as a whole is enjoying unprecedented prosperity.

The third major provision in this bill has to do with reinstating the dual parity formula for basic farm commodities. The modernized parity formula uses as its major provision in determining parity the average price farmers received for the previous 10-year period.

Thus, if farm price supports are lowered—as is being done under the flexible price-support program—and if cash prices are at a depressed level—which they are—the future parity for basic farm commodities will be reduced accordingly. Just because we may have a 5- or 10-year period of depressed prices, it should not follow that this 10-year average of low prices should represent a fair price for parity in future years.

That is exactly what the modernized parity formula does. The lowering of price supports through the modernized parity formula is particularly hard on farmers at this time when the prices of everything they have to buy are increasing sharply. I believe the dual parity formula should be continued until the Department of Agriculture can work out a more fair and equitable parity formula.

Mr. President, I am not unaware of the threat of reprisals by some proponents of the administration-farm program to those of us who will vote to keep 90-percent supports as a part of our present farm program and thus, as they say, invite a possible Presidential veto.

They say they propose to advise the people of this country who then would be responsible for the loss of the soil-bank program. Such threats will not deter me in voting for what I think is a fair and reasonable agricultural bill.

In my opinion, the provision of this bill to reinstate 90-percent supports is of far greater importance than the soil-bank provision. It will immediately raise farm prices and it will immediately raise the value of most of the farm commodities that the Federal Government now holds in its CCC stocks.

The 90-percent provision will do far more to raise farm prices at less cost to the Federal Government than will the soil-bank program.

I think the soil-bank program has considerable merit and should be approved by Congress. Unless very carefully and wisely administered, however, this program has some potentially dangerous aspects. Under this program, we will spend $1.3 billion a year—most of which will be for purposes to enrich the soil. Certainly, this more fertile soil will have the potential of greatly increasing production rather than decreasing it in future years.

There are some highly questionable practices being proposed under this soil-bank program. The provision to pay farmers to destroy a good wheat crop seeded last fall does not meet with my approval. It is repulsive to the thinking of a great many people in this Nation. We tried this kind of program back in the thirties.

We tried a flexible price-support program back in the thirties and it, too, failed to establish a good price for farm commodities and almost doubled the carryover of wheat and corn during the years it was in operation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a table which contains figures obtained from the United States Department of Agriculture to substantiate my point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table indicates price-support level, average price farmers received, carryover as of July 1 of year indicated, and amounts of direct payments made to farmers

[Information from U. S. Department of Agriculture]

	1938	1939	1940
Price support of wheat (percent)	52	56	57
Average farm price farmers received (per bushel)	$0.56	$0.68	$0.67
Carryover in bushels (millions of bushels)	153	259	280
Price support of corn (percent)	70	69	75
Average farm price received	$0.47	$0.54	$0.60
Carryover in bushels (millions of bushels)	361	584	688
A. C. P. class I payments made to farmers in partial compensation for their proportionate acreage adjustment for soil-depleting crops	*Millions* $217.4	*Millions* $350.7	*Millions* $380.2
Parity payments to producers, principally of corn, wheat, and cotton	----------	----------	211.7
A. C. P. class II payments for soil-conservation practices	88.8	119.8	202.0
Total	306.2	470.5	793.9

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, we had flexible price supports ranging from 52 to 75 percent of parity from 1938 until the start of World War II. During the crop years of 1938, 1939, and 1940, the price support for corn, as noted in this table, ranged from 69 to 75 percent of parity.

During this same 3-year period the carryover of corn increased from 361 million bushels in 1938 to 688 million bushels in 1940, or approximately double. It will be noted that the national average farm price for corn in these 3 years were as follows: In 1938, 47 cents a bushel; in 1939, 54 cents a bushel; in 1940, 60 cents a bushel.

Certainly these low price supports and low cash prices did nothing to decrease production—in fact, the carryover during this 3-year period was practically doubled.

The price support for wheat from 1938 to 1940, as noted in this table, ranged from 52 to 57 percent of parity. During this 3-year period we increased our wheat carryover from 153 million bushels to 280 million bushels, or nearly double. The average cash prices received by wheat farmers for these years were as follows: In 1938, 56 cents a bushel; in 1939, 68 cents a bushel; in 1940, 67 cents a bushel.

I may add, Mr. President, that those who claimed they got the farmers out of the financial wilderness in the 1930's should take a look at the average cash prices received by farmers in the 1930's.

These were bankrupt prices, yet, as is always the case, farmers at that time tried to offset losses in income from low prices by increasing their production.

During this 3-year period from 1938 to 1940 we had in connection with this flexible price-support program another program not too unlike that of the President's soil-bank provision in the pending bill. In 1938 the Federal Government made payments to farmers for soil-conservation practices and other closely associated programs totaling $306,200,000.

In 1939 the total payments were $470,500,000 and by 1940 these direct payments to farmers—mostly for soil-conserving practices—had reached a total of $793,900,000.

This $793 million, in terms of prewar purchasing power, would bring far more soil conservation than is proposed under the present bill for $1.3 billion.

Mr. President, we have had another and more recent experience in flexible or lower prices which the proponents claim will control surpluses.

From February of 1951 to the present time the average overall farm prices have dropped approximately 28 percent. We have had flexible price supports in operation the past year. In spite of these lower price supports, and in spite of a drastic drop in cash prices, we witnessed in 1955 the greatest overall farm production in the history of the United States.

I do not see how any student of the production of field crops could escape the conclusion that flexible price supports will do nothing to curtail surpluses.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will approve the price support provision of the bill substantially as it was reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee. We should maintain the 90 percent price support program until a better way is found to maintain fair farm prices.

I do not now and never have claimed that 90 percent supports is the complete answer to all farm-price problems. All I am saying is that it will do far more to help farmers than any flexible price-support program yet devised.

Farmers need help immediately. They cannot wait any longer.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the Senator for the very fine statement which he has so ably presented to the Senate, in regard to some of the problems in the great wheat-producing sections of the Nation. He has painted a very accurate picture of the situation, and I was especially interested in that part of it which indicated that the further we reduce the price of a commodity grown by a farmer, the more of it he tries to produce in order to get his cash income up to the point where he can take care of farm machinery costs, labor costs, and utility costs.

Mr. YOUNG. First, I should like to thank my friend from Kansas for his kind remarks. I know the Senator from Kansas has had a great interest in agriculture as long as I have known him.

To answer the Senator's question, I think farmers try their best to offset any loss of income by increasing production.

Mr. CARLSON. May I inquire further if that is not basic in the farmer's problem, namely, to produce enough to carry on an economic operating unit and live as he should live?

Mr. YOUNG. Especially now, when he has a tremendous investment. He must do the only thing he knows how to do best, that is to produce more, and hope that prices will be better.

Mr. CARLSON. We have heard many complaints on the Senate floor as to the gross production. Some 23 million acres of wheat land have been withdrawn from wheat cultivation, and on it farmers have produced forage crops and grains which have upset the livestock market. That is the result of being forced to go into such production in order to make a profitable economic unit of the farms.

Mr. YOUNG. That is true. The more price-supports are lowered for one commodity the farmer can raise, the more he tries to offset his loss by raising something else.

Mr. CARLSON. I will say to the Senator that I do not see how we can work out any other program at the present time than that which has been presented in the Senator's statement to the Senate this afternoon. I think that is the formula which we must follow in the wheat belt of the Nation.

Mr. YOUNG. I have just finished conducting a poll of the people of North Dakota. I received almost 5,000 returns from 20,000 questionnaires which I sent out. The returns from nonfarmers are about 2 to 1 in favor of 90-percent price supports. The farmers favor price supports by about 10 to 1.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I commend the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota for having made a very able presentation of the farmer's plight and the farmer's problem caused by decreasing farm income on the one hand, and, on the other hand, constantly rising expenses, including taxes, insurance on buildings, the cost of replacing machinery, and all the other costs incidental to farm operations. The Senator has very clearly outlined the problems of the farmers.

I was intrigued by the Senator's remarks when he stated that the farmer would not necessarily reduce his production simply because prices were becoming lower. Commonsense should teach anyone that that would be true. It would be applicable even to the members of the press in the gallery. If the cost of their writing per line were reduced, and if they could increase their income by increasing the number of lines they wrote, I would venture a guess that they would increase their writing in order to increase their earnings.

That is true of the farmer. He will increase his units of production if he can realize another dollar by such an increase. He will not decrease his production simply because a bushel of grain is 10 cents less in value or in the price he receives. He will not decrease the number of tons of hay he puts up merely because the price of hay has dropped $10 or $5 a ton. He will first put up the hay which is on the ground. That is the first act of a good farmer. Second, he will till the land and try to produce the maximum. He must do that.

This is most evident so far as the producer of milk is concerned. The support price of milk was dropped in 1954 from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity. But that did not discourage either the flow of milk from the cow or the efforts of the producer. Today there is an increase of almost 4 billion pounds of fluid milk in the United States, even though the price is less.

It stands to reason that the farmer must have income with which to pay his obligations. It is almost second nature for the farmer to produce the maximum amount that his acreage will grow.

So we return to the very simple proposition that the soil bank is the only real answer to a reduction of farm production in the United States. The soil-bank program proposes an orderly lay-aside of tillable acres into a soil-building project.

The soil bank is the real approach to reducing surpluses. The price factor has never accomplished this purpose in the past, and it will not do so in the future, because production will be obtained from the land so long as man is able to scratch or till the land.

I commend the Senator from North Dakota for having presented the Senate with his views on the problem, which he so well understands. Not only is he a farm operator in his own State, together with the aid of his sons as share operators, but he also is a man who has had many years of practical farm-operation experience. He knows the problems of farmers better, probably, than does any other Senator. I shall not even refer to myself.

But, Mr. President, it is simply human nature for a man to try to produce and to try to earn. It makes no difference whether he does it with a pen or pencil, or in the production of crops in farm operations.

The junior Senator from North Dakota is to be commended for an able address on a very complex problem, one which is of grave concern to agriculture at this time.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his kind statement.

Mr. President, when there is a surplus of labor it is not suggested that labor work fewer hours for less money. Labor proposes that it work fewer hours and receive a little more pay. Some persons propose to do just the opposite for the farmers.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I know the pending business, the farm bill, is important and the Senate wishes to get along with its consideration. Therefore, I am a bit reluctant to interrupt the debate on that measure, but I feel that I should bring to the attention of the Senate at this time a matter of information that is, in my opinion, vital to the deliberations of this body, and to the welfare and security of our country.

I wish to discuss briefly what we term East-West trade—that is, trade between the Communist-bloc countries and our allies, principally NATO countries.

As Senators may know, during the past several weeks the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee has been exploring in both executive and public hearings the relaxation of that trade that occurred in August 1954, as a result of the COCOM, the Coordinating Committee, meeting in Paris, in which our Government participated. Prior to that time, there were some 450 items that were completely embargoed or otherwise controlled by us and our Western allies. At that meeting, however, action was taken which resulted in the disembargoing and downgrading of approximately 200 of the 450 items, leaving only about 250 items under embargo or otherwise controlled.

Immediately following that meeting and the disembargoing and downgrading of these some 200 items, our Government, through its representative at COCOM, Mr. Harold Stassen, issued a statement in which, among other things, he said:

I am convinced that this revision, which has been made with the concurrence of the

Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, and Commerce, and approved by the President, will result in a net advantage to the free world of expanded peaceful trade and more effective control of the war potential items. It is a move in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, the facts which the subcommittee has uncovered in the course of these hearings completely refute the validity of that statement. They reveal that most astounding secret concessions were made by our Government in that conference to our allies, whose governments and merchants want to do business as usual with the Communist-bloc countries.

Mr. President, I used the term "most astounding secret," and I mean just that, for this information, as to what occurred at the COCOM conference and the truth about the relaxation of trade controls with the Communist countries, was not told to the Congress, or to the American people. I believe the facts should be made known to every American citizen, and certainly the Members of this body should know. It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I now undertake briefly to give to the Congress, to the press, and, I trust through them, to the public, some of the facts and information thus far developed in public hearing by the subcommittee. I believe Senators will agree that this is a matter about which the people of the United States have a right to know.

I intend to give only a few examples of the character, nature, and description of some of the goods, materials, and equipment which were disembargoed or otherwise downgraded with the concurrence of our Government, and in which our allies are now free to trade in and sell to the Communist countries.

First, I shall discuss the category of machine tools—tools which are absolutely essential in the manufacture of the munitions and armaments necessary in modern warfare. I shall refer only to a few of them.

No. 1: Horizontal boring mills, costing between $200,000 and $500,000 each, and which the Defense Department expert testified are essential in the manufacture of armaments such as tanks, artillery weapons, aircraft, heavy ordnance, ship transmission parts, heavy dies for aircraft, forging presses, catapult parts on aircraft carriers, and even for the manufacture of the atom reactors such as those on the submarine *Nautilus*.

No. 2: Vertical boring mills, which the Defense Department expert testified are essential in the manufacture of jet engines.

No. 3: Dynamic balance machines, which the Defense Department expert testified are used for balancing shafts on engines for jet airplanes and guided missiles. Without this machine guided missles which would remain on a true course could not be produced.

No. 4: External cylindrical grinding machines, which the Defense Department expert testified are esssential in the manufacturing of engine parts, guided missiles, and radar.

Mr. President, we had before us some machine tool experts. One of them, who, as I recall, had been in that business all his life, testified before the subcommittee, after he had reviewed the list of machine tools still under embargo, that the list was not worth the paper on which it was written. He further stated that many of the machine tools removed from the embargoed list had greater strategic importance than those remaining under embargo. He further pointed out that the precision boring machine which does work on a multiple scale can be sent to the Soviet bloc while the jig borer, which does the same work on a single scale was left under embargo. He also found that the description of machine tools presently under embargo is often so ambiguous and misleading that the individual or individuals who drew up the list apparently had no technical knowledge in this field and did not understand the nature of machine tools and their respective uses.

In these conclusions the witness was supported by the Defense Department's expert on machine tools. Both pointed out that by permitting the newest machine tools to be sent to the Soviet bloc we allowed them to save from 3 to 5 years in engineering research and development that would have been required of the Soviets to design and produce many of them.

In other words, Mr. President, it simply means that we allow them to get the latest methods in this country, and they do not have to go through the engineering, designing, testing, and revision periods which are required to get a machine to the point where it will operate efficiently.

It was emphatically stated that it would be better for the United States to permit shells, guns or guided missiles to be disembargoed and sent to the Soviet Union, for they could be used against us only once while these machine tools could and will be used to make armaments of war which could be used against us many times.

Now, let us take a look at metals.

The testimony showed that certain metals and minerals which we are stockpiling in the United States, because they are critical and essential in times of war, were removed from the embargo list and can now be sent to the Soviet bloc.

Let me give you some examples in this category.

Copper is deemed to be one of the most important single strategic metals aside from fissionable materials. Congress was officially informed in the Fifth Battle Act Report, December 23, 1954, that copper remained under embargo. This was a gross misstatement of a material fact. It served to mislead Congress and the public. Testimony has been received by the subcommittee that copper wire was in fact removed from the embargo list. Furthermore, we find that since August, 1954, our Allies in Europe have sent over 250 million pounds of copper to the Soviet Union and its European satellites. I point out that during this same period of time, because of shortages of copper within this country, the United States was forced to divert 143 million pounds of copper to industry from our war reserve stockpile.

We have learned that certain types of aluminum, easily convertible to the manufacture of shells, ammunition, and airplanes, are exportable to the Communist nations. The metal expert from the Defense Department stated, as we all know, that aluminum is essential to build a war machine. He stated that if the decision had been his, aluminum still would be under embargo.

Other minerals stockpiled by the United States and which were either disembargoed or downgraded with the concurrence of the United States, are: asbestos, used in the insulation of cables; talc, used as a spacer in electronic tubes; corrundum, essential as an abrasive in the manufacture of all types of military hardware; beryllium alloys and cobalt alloys, both essential in the atomic energy program, and even certain nickel alloys.

Other items removed from embargo were induction furnaces. With the use of certain crucibles and refractories not under embargo, high heat-resistant metal alloys for sonic and supersonic planes and guided missiles, where high speed friction heat becomes a problem, can be made. The chief metallurgist of the Bureau of Mines testified that he could think of no explanation for removing such an important and strategic item from the embargo list.

The committee heard testimony that railroad tank cars used for the transportation of petroleum, flatcars used for carrying tanks or heavy trucks, railroad well cars used for carrying heavy and bulky equipment, rails, and even steam and diesel locomotives were also removed from the embargo list and can be sold to the Soviet Union by our allies abroad.

These are merely examples of some 200 items which were removed or downgraded, with the United States Government concurrence, from the international embargo lists in August 1954. Furthermore, immediately following the international meetings in Paris, the Battle Act Administrator tailored the Battle Act lists, which are solely a United States responsibility, to conform to the international lists, and thus has permitted our allies to ship strategic materials with impunity. The Battle Act has become a mockery; the intent of Congress has been circumvented.

Mr. President, the subcommittee became concerned about the actions taken at the COCOM Conference shortly after its completion. During 1954 and through 1955, it made inquiries in an effort to ascertain the nature of the approximately 200 items which were either completely disembargoed or downgraded, with a view of determining whether they were strategic or critical, and whether they were either indispensable or essential to the Communist build-up of a war machine.

The Government agencies acting in concert are doing everything to hinder and hamper the subcommittee's efforts to ascertain the facts concerning the relaxation of these controls. In addition to many oral requests, 13 letters have been written to various Government agencies requesting documents and pertinent information. Except for some cooperation from the Department of Defense, the information has not been forthcoming.

The facts the subcommittee has developed thus far, and which I report to the Senate today, have not been made available or furnished to the subcommittee by the executive agencies of our Government.

The information we have has been secured from documents and publications of foreign governments, where the information is being freely given out by our allies. That same information in the United States is being withheld by the executive branch of the Government from both the Congress and the American people. Let me give the Senate an example. The executive branch of our Government has declared even the Battle Act list to be classified, and therefore not available to the people of the United States. But classified and suppressed from whom? Not from the Communist or the Communist bloc countries. They know what they can buy; they know what they do buy and have bought.

Furthermore, the British Government, in an official publication by the Board of Trade, has published substantially the same list of items which the executive department heads have refused to give to the American people.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand samples of the photostatic documents. It has been only through such unnecessary labor that the committee has been able to get the information so as to make it available to Congress and the people of the country. This is information which Congress is entitled to have, and information which the American people are entitled to know about.

We had the incongruous situation of Government witnesses appearing before the subcommittee and, upon instructions from their superiors, refusing to answer questions as to whether certain items—critically strategic items of machine tools and materials, some of which I have named—have been removed from the embargo list, even though the subcommittee had shown to the witnesses the British Government's publication giving this very information.

Mr. President, it is becoming quite clear that this material and the documents which the subcommittee has requested from the executive branch of the Government in the course of the investigation is being withheld from the United States Congress and the American public to prevent them from knowing what has happened, what has been done; to prevent them from knowing to what extent trade with the Communists in strategic things has been relaxed with the concurrence of the United States Government. Can it be, Mr. President, this classification, this policy of secrecy, this suppression or withholding of the truth, is a process or an action designed for the hiding of errors, inefficiency, and bad judgment of Government officials? I am convinced it is. If not, then why not give the Congress the information and let the American people know the truth.

Mr. President, the United States Export Control Act expires June 30 this year. I am sure we will be asked to extend it. We will also be asked, Mr. President, to appropriate $4.9 billion for foreign aid for fiscal 1957. Mr. President, I cannot vote for such appropriations so long as this vital information is suppressed by the executive branch of the Government.

I will tell the Senate why. If we are providing these funds to our allies for the purpose of enabling them to develop their military power and strength as a defense against communism, then how inconsistent is it for the same allies, for the sake of trade and profit, to place in the hands of the Communist bloc the machines, materials, and other essentials of the war potential in a war effort? Is not the advantage we are trying to gain and for which we are trying to provide being offset by the making of such machines, tools, and materials available to a potential enemy?

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. Our Government is now, I am advised, in the course of discussions with our allies regarding the embargo on exports to Red China. The China embargo is presently far more stringent than are the controls of trade with Russia and the European Soviet bloc.

In view of this, I insist, Mr. President, that until Congress gets the information we have requested and to which we are entitled from the executive branch of the Government on trade with the Soviet bloc, it should withhold action on the appropriation for foreign assistance for our allies.

Are we not entitled to have that information as we deliberate and as we consider appropriating billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money which will be expended on the pretext and for the purpose of aiding and assisting our allies to develop superior strength, or strength which will enable them to resist Communist aggression? Are we not entitled to know what kind of cooperation we are getting from those allies, or the lack of cooperation we are getting? I think we are entitled to know. I think we are entitled to know what effect the Battle Act is having today. In my opinion it is very effective.

Mr. President, the work of the subcommittee in this inquiry is not finished. We shall soon hear testimony regarding the decontrol or downgrading of items in the electronic and electrical equipment categories. We will not be deterred in this investigation. We shall do everything in our power to obtain the information and to get the truth to the American people.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, to me the statement which has just been made by the Senator from Arkansas reveals a most startling state of affairs. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the Government of the United States, through its duly accredited representatives, has agreed to the shipment of tools, which he rightly says are more important than merely guns or ammunition, to the Soviet bloc by our allies, while still placing restrictions on such shipments from American citizens?

Mr. McCLELLAN. We do not sell any such material to the Soviet bloc. We have an embargo on shipments to the Soviet bloc of all the equipment and materials to which I have referred. We do not sell, and we do not permit our people to sell them, and I think rightly so. But obviously we agreed to or concurred in such shipments by our allies. I do not know whether we did it reluctantly; I certainly think we did it reluctantly; but, reluctantly or otherwise, the results are the same. Our allies obviously insist upon this sort of trade. As I pointed out, according to the evidence before the committee, some of the tools and machines referred to, which were to be downgraded, are modern. As I pointed out, in one particular instance, one tool and boring machine was the kind that would make several patterns at one time, whereas a jig-boring machine which makes only one boring at a time remained under embargo.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are going to make sure the Communists do not get any obsolete tools, and make sure that the ones they get are the most modern and effective.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot quote the exact language, but one of the witnesses, an expert in tool equipment and tool machinery, who operates a mill, and whose father operated one before him, said that with what the Soviet bloc can now obtain, they can build a whole machine shop.

Another thing I should like to point out is that whenever a Soviet bloc country gets one of these modern tools, all it has to do is duplicate it. It can be duplicated over and over again. They do not have to spend 2 to 5 years time doing the engineering, the designing, and the testing and experimenting to get the machinery to operate efficiently.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, I should like to say that it may be that we have no power to control the trade relations of our allies, but if the Congress has made one thing clear in passing foreign aid bills, it is that representatives of this Government should exert every effort at their command to see to it that tools which are so vital to our war machine, and that which the Soviet bloc conspiracy is now forging, would not, with our approval, get into the hands of the Communists.

I do not understand exactly why the executive branch of our Government should undertake to classify the tools that come under the Battle Act. I do not see why we should keep it as secret as possible, but agree that such tools may go to the Communist nations.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I asked Mr. Hollister, who administers the Battle Act program, why the list was classified. He has been in charge of the program for more than 6 months. His answer to me was—and I think the chairman of the committee was present—that he did not know why. He was in charge of administering the program He had a classified list, but he could not give us a single reason why the list was classified. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what Mr. Hollister stated. He had been there only 6 months; therefore he did not know.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Hollister apparently was not our representative when we agreed to this provision.

The man who made the classification was probably the one who agreed that all these tools should go to the Communist government. Naturally, he would want to keep the American people in the dark as much as possible, when he was flying in the face of what I am sure is the will of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

We will never learn anything from experience. We had scrap iron, which was sold to Japan, fired back at us by the Japanese in the form of munitions. Now we are consenting to the sale to the Communists of the most delicate and modern tools necessary for the forging of engines of war.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What we are sending is not scrap.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not want to monopolize all the time, but I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his persistence in pursuing the matter. I do not know that I can commend his apparent calm and patience. I think, from the state of facts he has presented, we have a very shocking picture of the failure of cooperation with the Congress in a field in which we have as direct a responsibility or a greater responsibility than the executive department in attempting to maintain a superiority in arms, in order that we may defend our country. It shows a great abuse of the power of classifying documents, but I cannot blame the individuals who are responsible for this matter for attempting to keep it from the American people. I hope the Senator from Arkansas and the Senate will pursue it until the whole picture is brought into the open.

Mr. McCLELLAN. While perhaps I may appear to be calm, I am not quite so calm in my emotions and in my feelings about this matter, but I have reached the conclusion that this is something which is the responsibility of all of us. With the help of my fine colleagues on the committee, we have been trying to obtain this information. No one can substantiate the statement which was made at the time, namely, that this would help control the shipment of vital war materials. Its effect has been just the opposite; it has made it possible for such materials to flow, and that is not in the interest of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Instead of making any such statement as that, we might as well ship directly to Moscow the 44,000 pounds of uranium which are to be sent overseas, and then say that thereby we are contributing to the superiority of American arms.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I certainly wish to commend my distinguished friend, the able Senator from Arkansas, for this disclosure, once again made on the floor of the Senate, to those of us whose duty it is to represent the American people. Let me say that we have heard this matter discussed by Senators on both sides of the aisle; and I know that Senators on both sides have assisted the distinguished chairman and the other members of his committee in the work which now has resulted in bringing this matter to light.

Let me ask a question of the chairman of the committee: Is it fair to assume that certain of the foreign aid we are giving annually to foreign countries is, by an indirect route, to be used to purchase tools and machinery which are being shipped to the Communist countries?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, I cannot say that; but we do know that as we provide this aid to countries which wish to trade, they are trading in some of the strategic materials the Russians are short of; and thus we provide them with an opportunity to sell something else.

Mr. WELKER. They can sell these materials and this equipment anywhere they wish to sell it; is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

I wish to say—as perhaps the Senator knows—that the committee, as I have pointed out, began to look into this matter under the preceding administration. The inquiry has been nonpartisan; both sides have tried to pursue the matter, and we are pursuing it now harder than ever before. If there is anything wrong in this case, we should know it. If it is proper for our allies to sell such materials or equipment to Communist countries, it is not wrong for Americans to sell such things to those countries. We should put the matter on that basis.

Mr. WELKER. Let me say that five or six members of the Senate Armed Services Committee are now on the floor of the Senate, and they are vitally interested in the work the able Senator from Arkansas has done. In the last number of months it has been the obligation of those of us who serve on the committee to listen to some rather shocking testimony which has been adduced.

The United States must be prepared. It is the duty of the Armed Services Committee to see that our Nation is prepared. Now that this information has been brought out by the Senator from Arkansas, I hope and pray that America will awaken to the dangers of false security. Mr. President, again I desire to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to say that now that Mr. Dulles has returned, I think it would be appropriate for him to come before our committee and explain—if he has a reason—why this information is being withheld.

I shall be called upon, as will all other Members of the Senate, to vote on a large foreign-aid bill. I wish to know the facts. As one who has consistently voted for foreign aid, I believe we have a right to know the facts.

Mr. Dulles is now back from his vacation; and I think it is high time that he appeared before our committee and gave us the facts, without further delay. Otherwise, he is inviting complete jeopardy of the foreign-aid program. We have no other course but to oppose requests for further foreign aid, if we are not going to get from the executive branch of the Government any more information than we have been getting.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The point is that if there is any information which needs to be classified or needs to be kept secret, and if it actually serves the security of our country to keep it classified or secret, then I do not wish to have such information supplied. But if it is a matter of knowing whether our allies are selling to our potential enemy, I cannot understand the kind of reasoning which holds it is vital that such information be kept secret, and that the publishing of such information would affect the security of our Nation—other than affect it adversely.

Mr. President, why should not the American people know it, and why should not the Congress have complete information about it, so Congress can use the information intelligently, both as regards appropriations and in connection with strengthening the Export Control Act and also the Battle Act. In my judgment, Mr. President, as the Battle Act is operating now, it is almost a farce.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I believe the great Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the other members of his committee are to be congratulated by all other Members of the Senate on the great, patriotic service they are rendering on this issue, as well as on other issues.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made today by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and also by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I desire to commend them for the nonpartisan position they are taking on this issue. Certainly it is proper that a nonpartisan position be taken, because when we are dealing with a matter of patriotism, there can be no partisanship.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course there cannot be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield further to me, I wish to refer to several points which I think need to be reemphasized; I think some of them have already been emphasized by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. I wish to point out that what our allies do in regard to supplying strategic materials to Russia happens to have a great effect on every man, woman, and child in the United States, and creates a great danger for all the American people. We cannot ignore that, and we cannot consider it separately from foreign aid.

When the Congress comes to consider the foreign-aid program this year, we shall have to take a long, hard look at its ramifications, because if we are giving

foreign aid, let us say, to England, in order to build up her economic and productive power, we must determine the use to which that productive power is being put. If that productive power is to be used to manufacture machine tools which will be sent to Russia—as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out today—then that foreign aid threatens the security of American boys, in case of another war.

Mr. President, I serve notice now that I do not intend to vote for a foreign-aid program when there is concealed from me what is happening in regard to the use to which that foreign aid is being put by alleged allies.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. We have a right to know what goods foreign-aid countries ship to Russia. We are not asking for the disclosure of secrets which involve the war plans of our country, which should be kept secret—although on that point let me say that I think that in the United States we have gone a long way in keeping from the chairmen of the appropriate committees defense information which should be known to those leaders of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I believe it is silly to think that the security of our Nation is violated in some way if, for example, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the ranking Republican on that committee are taken into confidence; and the same is true of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I speak as a member of that committee. The same is true of the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. Regardless of what administration may be in power—whether Republican or Democratic—we must see to it that we really put into effect the system of checks under our Constitution.

If the list of goods being sold to Russia by our allies referred to is being kept from the Senator from Arkansas on the claim that it is classified, I say that such concealment is not in keeping with the spirit of the checks provided by our Constitution on the executive branch of our Government. I am concerned with what is being done in regard to keeping from the Congress these so-called secret matters.

My second point is that I believe the American people must get their eyes open quickly—but they cannot get them open if they do not have the facts—about what Russia is doing in terms of heavy industry.

I cannot say here everything that I should like to say, and at the same time keep faith with the trust that is reposed in my keeping confidences. But I can say that at a recent briefing I was very much concerned about the Russian steel output. There was information presented that last year the Russian steel output was approximately 53 million tons. If some persons think we should take a great deal of comfort from the fact that in the same year the steel production in the United States was approximately twice that amount they are sadly mistaken.

The question is, What did Russia do with her 53 million tons, and what did we do with our 100 million tons, more or less? That makes all the difference in the world. If we could get a correct analysis, I fear—and I tremble with fear about this—that it would show that the 53 million tons of steel produced in Soviet Russia last year went into war equipment to a greater extent than did the total of 100 million tons of steel produced in the United States. I fear that the 53 million tons of steel produced in Russia did more to hurry Russia forward in the construction of a war machine than the steel produced in the United States did to assist our defense program.

I believe that our two great committees, the Armed Services Committee, of which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and other Senators present are members, and the Foreign Relations Committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is chairman, and which includes other Senators who are present, besides myself, must work together on the matter of foreign aid this year. We must find out the facts about what is being done indirectly through foreign aid to increase the war potential of Russia. It is going along at such a rapid pace that, nonpartisanly and nonpolitically, all we patriots had better call the attention of the Government and the people of our country to the great danger of Russia's warmaking power. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas should let go his hold on this subject. I think he must make it clear to this administration that we have the right to know what our allies are doing with foreign aid.

I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his calmness and objectivity, but I think we must be tenacious. I think the time has come to ask the officials of the Government to give us the facts, and not hide behind secret classification, secret classification, secret classification.

In the presence of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I make this last point: I think a prima facie case has been made on the floor of the Senate to show that we are falling far behind Russia in our air defense and air power. We cannot afford to continue in that direction. The same is true of the missile program. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to say to Mr. Dulles this afternoon from this floor that I do not intend to let him separate foreign aid from the defense program of my country. The Senator from Arkansas is dealing with the defense of my country when he is dealing with this problem; and I assure him of my complete support in the great patriotic fight he is making on this issue.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I will say to him that I do not retreat from a stand I have taken quickly or easily. I have tried to make it very clear to the executive officials—I have done it courteously and politely, but I trust I have also done it firmly—that we are going to get this information if it is within the power of the committee or the United States Senate to get it. I cannot do more than that.

I thought I should report to this body this afternoon on what had been developed and the hindrances which we are encountering. If the officials of the executive department are right, they can sustain their position. If they are wrong, they must take the responsibility for their action.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]? He made a pertinent observation on the question of whether or not we were giving aid to countries which were, in effect, shipping materials made with that aid to the Communists. It is true that is what we have been doing. For example, we have given foreign aid to countries in order that they might develop copper mines. Those countries are shipping copper to the Communists, despite the fact we have not yet completed our own stockpile of copper to the point considered essential for our own security, and also despite the fact that, not too long ago, we were paying a premium price for copper on the world market as against domestic price.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. If I may interrupt the Senator from Missouri, of course I do not intend to shed any crocodile tears over Members of the United States Senate who have been voting for foreign aid as long as I have been in the Senate. I have always voted against it. However, I certainly appreciate the kind tribute to me from the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I voted for some foreign aid, and shall continue to vote for some foreign aid, provided we get into the record the fact we do not intend to have that aid used, directly or indirectly, to increase the war machine of the Communists.

Does the distinguished chairman of the committee remember that at one point a Government consultant on machine tools was asked the following question: "In other words, we can say, can we not, that we continue to embargo practically everything they do not want, and have lifted the embargo on just about everything they do want?"

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is almost verbatim what took place in the committee.

I can tell this body—and I know my colleagues will verify the statement—that the people upon whom the Defense Department depends for advice and counsel with respect to strategic materials know the seriousness of the situation. We can read their distress in their faces. They are greatly distressed by reason of the fact that these things are happening. They do not hesitate to tell us so privately. When they are before the committee and on the witness stand, and their bosses are sitting there, under such restrictions they are a little reluctant. However, we can read the message in their countenances. They

tell us that what has happened is almost tragic.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it true that under the present regulations the most modern machine tools can be shipped for 6 months before any question arises as to whether these new machine tools should or should not be embargoed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it takes about that long to get them on the list.

Mr. SYMINGTON. So, if one of our allies desired to take an order on the side, it could build the equipment, not say anything about it, then ship the item for 6 months after it was built.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that among the products put up in payment for these war materials by the Communists were butter, cotton, and corn?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The testimony before the committee was that many of these strategic materials were paid for in the very things of which we have great surpluses. Cotton is one.

Mr. SYMINGTON. They include as I remember eggs, butter, cotton, corn, and, incidentally, gold.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Gold is one item.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me ask the distinguished chairman this question: If an American corporation desired to ship any of these products to the Communists, would it not be refused the right to do so on the ground our national security would be impaired?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is my understanding. I do not see how it could be refused on any other ground. That would be the only justification for it, so far as I know.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that rubber is being shipped in quantity to Russia, despite the fact rubber cannot be shipped to the Chinese Communists?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that is true. I do not think that has developed as yet in the public hearings. I tried to confine my remarks this afternoon to those things which we have developed in public hearings. Certain other facts have been developed in executive sessions, which I hope and expect the committee to bring out in public hearings, possibly next week.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I close my comments on this subject by reading a brief quotation from one of the highest military officials of this Government.

> In airplane after airplane, the Soviets are approaching us in quality and surpassing us in quantity. * * * The fact is they have been and are outproducing us in all categories, but medium jet bombers. * * * One of the reasons that we are dropping behind is that the Communists are making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we.

Many people question that type and character of statement, on the ground the Communists have not the materials with which to produce those airplanes, or the technology with which to develop such items as jet engines.

It is a fact, is it not, that the testimony brought out by the Senator from Arkansas, and the able counsel of the committee, and the committee's staff, has developed evidence that we are shipping war materials to the Communists, plus technological knowledge through the shipment of latest machine tools, to a point where they should not have too much difficulty in making these airplanes. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is certainly providing aid to them of that character. When the Senator says we are shipping the material, I should like to point out that it is not the United States, but our allies. They are shipping those things with our Government's concurrence.

Mr. SYMINGTON. When I say "We" I mean we, because it is my understanding—and I am asking whether or not it is also the distinguished Senator's understanding—that the free world is operating in a partnership understanding against communism.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the purpose of the aid. If we were not parties to it we would not be granting aid, certainly not aid of a military character. We might give some humanitarian assistance and perhaps some economic aid, but certainly we would not be granting military aid.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the able Senator from Arkansas if the excuse given is that disclosure of such information might reveal some transactions with a foreign nation which might be of a confidential nature. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I may say to the Senator that perhaps sometimes the request of the committee was so broad that it might have included documents pertaining to other countries which were of a confidential nature, but we have tried to make clear in conversations and in letters that we were not trying to get any confidential documents which related to some other country. What we have been trying to get is a list, the Battle Act list, declassified, so that we can make it public. We have been trying to get the list of items together with the recommendations made by the so-called JOC committee, so that we might make some comparisons as to how far our representatives went beyond perhaps the very liberal action which was taken when we were trying at that level to hold the line on these things.

Mr. ERVIN. That is the matter I wanted to draw attention to in my second question. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas if evidence taken before the subcommittee has not disclosed the fact that approximately 100 different items were recommended to be de-embargoed by the JOC committee, and if the JOC committee is not entirely a committee composed of Americans operating within the departments of the Government, and if the committee has not been refused documentary evidence concerning actions of the JOC committee in making these recommendations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; our committee has been refused all those documents, and even the recommendations. I should think there would be a list of items. We have been told that there is not even a list of items that JOC considered. Of course there may not be an actual list, but certainly there is a record, because recommendations were made, and those recommendations related to some specific items.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Arkansas, from the standpoint of believing that our country should take every reasonable and every proper precaution to prevent shipments behind the Iron Curtain of any materials useful to their war machine.

So that my position may be made very clear on the record, I may say that I made the motion in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which was approved by the committee, to strike out of the farm bill a section which would have relaxed the arrangements whereby additional foodstuffs could be sent behind the Iron Curtain.

I did that even though I come from a farm State and despite the magnitude of the problem of surpluses, because I recognize the fact that anything that feeds an enemy is a disservice to the Republic.

Having said that, I must also say that, while I associate myself with what the chairman has said, and although I commend him, because I know he is approaching the matter on a nonpartisan basis, I am a little disturbed by some statements made during the colloquy to which I have listened, and which certainly would remind anyone of the fact that 1956 is a political year.

There is one statement which seems to need comment by me. I refer to the chairman's statement:

> Can it be, Mr. President, this classification, this policy of secrecy, this suppression or withholding of the truth, is a process or an action designed for the hiding of errors, inefficiency, and bad judgment of Government officials? I am convinced it is.

I certainly wish to dissociate myself from that conclusion. I think at the moment it is purely a political deduction.

I believe we will find out whether there is inefficiency and I think we should—and I believe we will find out whether there were errors—and I think we should—and I believe we should find out whether there was bad judgment—and I think we will find that out, too.

However, at this stage of uncompleted hearings, before we have even asked Governor Stassen to testify before us—and he should testify before our committee—I do not believe we can conclude now that there was error, inefficiency, or bad judgment. That should be something that should come at the conclusion of the hearings, not before they have actually started.

In that connection, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to the committee through our distinguished chairman, on February 20, by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., in which he sets forth the position of

the State Department and lists those items which in his opinion our committee should have in public session, those items which in his opinion the committee should have as a classified list, and those items which in his opinion might do jeopardy to our international relationships if they were made public in any way.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: During the course of the current inquiry by the subcommittee into East-West trade controls, the subcommittee has made a number of requests for information and documents from the executive branch, some to the International Cooperation Administration, and others to the Departments of Defense and Commerce. The specific requests as to documents relate to the international lists, the Battle Act lists, and the working papers and minutes of the Joint Operating Committee which was set up as an advisory group in the executive branch with relation to the negotiations with our allies in 1954 concerning the international lists. In addition, the International Cooperation Administration has been specifically requested to supply information as to the certain recommendations of the Joint Operating Committee.

This letter relates to all such requests.

In relation to these requests, it should be stated what the agencies involved have supplied and have offered to supply to the subcommittee. The International Cooperation Administration has furnished to you the various Battle Act lists from 1952 to 1955 with a notation as to the items decontrolled or downgraded on or about August 25, 1954. As recognized by the subcommittee in its request, these documents and related information were supplied necessarily on a classified basis.

On February 14, I discussed with the subcommittee the overall policy considerations involved in the whole subject of the control of trade in strategic materials, and for the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce and the International Cooperation Administration requested, in view of considerations given to the subcommittee, first, that hearings on the subject of strategic controls be held in executive session and, second, that the appropriate officials at the policymaking levels be permitted to come before the subcommittee to fully explain our policy and actions in the negotiations with our allies in 1954.

I further referred to the matter of the documents involved; most of these documents are classified and highly sensitive; many of them involve our relations with other governments; and almost all of them are working-level papers of the executive branch showing internal advice and recommendations.

In that connection, I stated that if the subcommittee decided to pursue its investigation along the lines suggested, the agencies involved were prepared to review the question of what documents could appropriately be turned over to the subcommittee in the light of the developing testimony, with proper consideration for the safeguarding of those that are confidential and sensitive.

It is my understanding that the subcommittee has denied these requests, at least insofar as holding the hearings in executive session is concerned, and has renewed its request for the documents involved. However, the executive branch has certain responsibilities and duties under the Constitution and our laws which it is bound to fulfill. These relate to the conduct of our foreign relations and to the effective and efficient administration of the executive branch.

As to East-West trade controls the present international system has existed on a voluntary basis between the United States and the nations friendly to it since 1948. The group of nations participating in this system of controls does not have a formal agreement which subordinates their actions to rule by majority. The system of controls depends for its very existence on the good faith of the participating nations. Any of these nations is free to take unilateral action at any time if for any reason it does not wish to abide by the suggested control list. Cooperation, therefore, is the only way in which the objectives of effective international control of strategic materials can be accomplished. In many instances participation of a particular nation in this program has been obtained only on the specific commitment that the details of such participation would be kept secret.

Thus any revelation on our part of the details of this program would constitute a breach of trust on the part of the United States, and by jeopardizing the voluntary basis upon which the program rests, would endanger our national security.

Because of this, the international lists cannot be revealed by the executive branch. We are, however, prepared through responsible officials to (1) furnish the subcommittee in open session information as to items deleted from the 1952 list in the 1954 revision, and (2) furnish the subcommittee in executive session on a classified basis information as to items downgraded, upgraded, or added to the list in the 1954 revision.

Apart from the Battle Act list, which already has been supplied to the subcommittee on a classified basis, and the international lists referred to above, the remaining documents in the executive branch relating to East-West trade controls consist of discussions and communications of an advisory nature among the officials and employees of the executive branch, highly sensitive intelligence information, and communications with our delegation and other representatives abroad containing recommendations, information regarding the position of other governments, and comments thereon. It is contrary to the public interest that their conversations or communications or any documents or reproductions concerning such advice be disclosed. May we refer you to the position of the President on the subject in his letter of May 17, 1954, to the Secretary of Defense. We are, therefore, required to deny to this subcommittee any documents that would violate this principle.

We recognize the right of the Congress to investigate the operations of the Government and we continue to stand ready to cooperate with this committee by having the officials who were charged with the responsibility for the negotiations with the cooperating nations to appear before you to explain the considerations which guided their actions during these negotiations. We can advise you that Governor Stassen, who was charged with the chief responsibility involving these negotiations, will appear before the committee on a date mutually satisfactory to the committee and him.

We feel sure that your subcommittee in this manner can obtain an accurate picture of Government policy and actions in the area of international strategic controls.

I am authorized to state that this letter has the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the International Cooperation Administration.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT HOOVER, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to say just one more thing.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota wishes to speak in his own right, he may do so. I have concluded my remarks.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator, but I believe the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] desires to speak and I can conclude in 2 or 3 more minutes. I have made this suggestion before, and since the matter has been tossed into the arena of public debate, I shall make the suggestion publicly now.

I believe the method by which our committee might most properly proceed to get down to the facts in this matter—and I want to get down to the facts, because I believe Congress may decide to tighten foreign-aid legislation, so as to make certain that our allies, who receive assistance from us, do not in turn transmit war materials to the enemy—would be to ask Governor Stassen to appear before our committee, because he was in charge of the decontrols and in charge of the international conferences at the time the decisions were reached. Until that is done, I submit any deductions are premature, to say the least.

I believe that next we should bring before our committee jointly, in executive session, Mr. John Hollister, the Administrator of ICA, and Mr. Weeks, the Secretary of Commerce, who has had much to do with the decontrol of items on the Battle list. At the same time we should also bring in Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., to state the view of the State Department.

In that way we can find out for ourselves, first, which branch of this coordinate activity and information our committee wants and, second, what will serve the public interest to make available in public print. I know that no member of our committee wants to do jeopardy to our international policy. We are not seeking to get information which will be of comfort and aid to the enemy. I believe all of us are seeking, and rightly so, information which clearly does not do anything to help the enemy's cause. By bringing those three officials before the committee we will at least have information before us to show who has the information we want and what their reasons are, if any, for believing that some portion of that information should not be made available.

After hearing them, I think our committee will be able to act rationally, dispassionately, and without political motive, and try to render the service to the country which I know is the ultimate desire of every member of the committee.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, after watching the State Department encourage the Department of Commerce not to give us any information, and the Department of Commerce insisting that the State Department should not give us any information, I am inclined to the conclusion that they were actuated by the motives which actuated a teen-age couple in my section of the country. On one occasion John was at a party and was compelled by force of circumstances to see Mary home. It was the first time he had ever seen a girl home, and, when he reached her home, he said, "Mary, do

not tell any of the boys that I saw you home tonight, because they might tease me about it."

She said, "You need not worry. I am just as much ashamed of it as you are."

So, Mr. President, when I see the Department of Commerce insisting that the Department of State withhold information from the Congress of the United States and the American people, and the Department of State insists that the Department of Commerce do the same, I begin to suspect that they are both ashamed of what has been going on in this field.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, apropos the remarks made earlier today by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, a letter which was addressed to him by Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., Acting Secretary of State.

Without objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: During the course of the current inquiry by the subcommittee into East-West trade controls, the subcommittee has made a number of requests for information and documents from the executive branch, some to the International Cooperation Administration, and others to the Departments of Defense and Commerce. The specific requests as to documents relate to the international lists, the Battle Act lists, and the working papers and minutes of the Joint Operating Committee, which was set up as an advisory group in the executive branch with relation to the negotiations with our allies in 1954 concerning the international lists. In addition, the International Cooperation Administration has been specifically requested to supply information as to the certain recommendations of the Joint Operating Committee.

This letter relates to all such requests.

In relation to these requests, it should be stated what the agencies involved have supplied and have offered to supply to the subcommittee. The International Cooperation Administration has furnished to you the various Battle Act lists from 1952 to 1955, with a notation as to the items decontrolled or downgraded on or about August 25, 1954. As recognized by the subcommittee in its request, these documents and related information were supplied necessarily on a classified basis.

On February 14, I discussed with the subcommittee the overall policy considerations involved in the whole subject of the control of trade in strategic materials, and for the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce and the International Cooperation Administration requested, in view of considerations given to the subcommittee, first, that hearings on the subject of strategic controls be held in executive session and, second, that the appropriate officials at the policymaking levels be permitted to come before the subcommittee to fully explain our policy and actions in the negotiations with our allies in 1954.

I further referred to the matter of the documents involved: most of these documents are classified and highly sensitive; many of them involve our relations with other governments; and almost all of them are working level papers of the executive branch showing internal advice and recommendations.

In that connection, I stated that if the subcommittee decided to pursue its investigation along the lines suggested, the agencies involved were prepared to review the question of what documents could appropriately be turned over to the subcommittee in the light of the developing testimony, with proper consideration for the safeguarding of those that are confidential and sensitive.

It is my understanding that the subcommittee has denied these requests, at least insofar as holding the hearings in executive session is concerned, and has renewed its request for the documents involved. However, the executive branch has certain responsibilities and duties under the Constitution and our laws which it is bound to fulfill. These relate to the conduct of our foreign relations and to the effective and efficient administration of the executive branch.

As to East-West trade controls the present international system has existed on a voluntary basis between the United States and the nations friendly to it since 1948. The group of nations participating in this system of controls does not have a formal agreement which subordinates their actions to rule by majority. The system of controls depends for its very existence on the good faith of the participating nations. Any of these nations is free to take unilateral action at any time if for any reason it does not wish to abide by the suggested control list. Cooperation, therefore, is the only way in which the objectives of effective international control of strategic materials can be accomplished. In many instances participation of a particular nation in this program has been obtained only on the specific commitment that the details of such participation would be kept secret.

Thus any revelation on our part of the details of this program would constitute a breach of trust on the part of the United States, and by jeopardizing the voluntary basis upon which the program rests, would endanger our national security.

Because of this the international lists cannot be revealed by the executive branch. We are, however, prepared through responsible officials to (1) furnish the subcommittee in open session information as to items deleted from the 1952 list in the 1954 revision, and (2) furnish the subcommittee in executive session on a classified basis information as to items downgraded, upgraded, or added to the list in the 1954 revision.

Apart from the Battle Act list, which already has been supplied to the subcommittee on a classified basis, and the international lists referred to above, the remaining documents in the executive branch relating to East-West trade controls consist of discussions and communications of an advisory nature among the officials and employees of the executive branch, highly sensitive intelligence information, and communications with our delegation and other representatives abroad containing recommendations, information regarding the position of other governments, and comments thereon. It is contrary to the public interest that their conversations or communications or any documents or reproductions concerning such advice be disclosed. May we refer you to the position of the President on the subject in his letter of May 17, 1954, to the Secretary of Defense. We are, therefore, required to deny to this subcommittee any documents that would violate this principle.

We recognize the right of the Congress to investigate the operations of the Government and we continue to stand ready to cooperate with this committee by having the officials who were charged with the responsibility for the negotiations with the cooperating nations to appear before you to explain the considerations which guided their actions during these negotiations. We can advise you that Governor Stassen, who was charged with the chief responsibility involving these negotiations, will appear before the committee on a date mutually satisfactory to the committee and him.

We feel sure that your subcommittee in this manner can obtain an accurate picture of Government policy and actions in the area of international strategic controls.

I am authorized to state that this letter has the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of International Cooperation Administration.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT HOOVER, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield in order that I may place several items in the RECORD?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

CABINET COMMITTEE'S REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, much has been said and will be said about the so-called Cabinet Committee's Report on Transportation, the recommendations of which are embodied in S. 1920, a bill which is now pending before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Until now most emphasis has been placed upon how the railroads and the common carrier truck will fare under the proposed legislation.

On February 10 of this year the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, delivered a speech before the Private Truck Council of America, Inc., at the group's Cleveland, Ohio, convention, wherein he touched upon another phase of the matter that also deserves attention.

The Senator from Washington spoke of the importance of maintaining a strong private trucking industry in America and how that picture could be easily changed unless every safeguard is taken to insure continuance of the industry.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that his Cleveland speech entitled "Trends in Transportation in Congress" be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Cabinet Committee report has created more interest and more controversy than any other matter before my committee. I know of your interest.

The Cabinet Committee report states that common carriers are unfairly treated by the present regulatory laws because laws were first passed to regulate railroads as monopolies. Today, these laws are out of date because new forms of transportation offer stiff competition but the restrictive legislation remains, so the report claims.

The Committee claims that putting its recommendations into the law would give a better break to all common carriers.

I should point out that originally regulation was placed on transportation not only because of monopoly conditions but also to correct the evils of too much competition. The Cabinet Committee does not make this entirely clear.

The report was based on the idea that because there is now a great deal of competition between carriers, the Interstate Commerce Act should be changed to recognize such competition. Further, the laws should be changed to serve the public interest by preventing common carriers from having too much unregulated competition. The recommendations of the Committee have been put in a bill, S. 1920, which would make the changes in the Interstate Commerce Act that the Cabinet Committee considers necessary to strengthen common carriers.

You are aware that the national transportation policy now provides that all the parts of the act be administered in such a way as to encourage reasonable charges for transportation services without unfair or destructive competition. The Cabinet Committee would strike this from the law and replace that policy by one calling for full competition between different forms of transportation.

To bring about more competition, several changes in the Interstate Commerce Act concerning rate regulation are proposed by the Cabinet Committee. These changes would give the regulated carriers greater freedom in making rates by cutting down the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission over rates. Supposedly each carrier could then begin to perform the transportation for which it is best suited. The present power of the Commission to instruct the carriers to charge precise rates would be taken away. The Commission would be left the limited authority to determine only just and reasonable minimum or maximum rates. Much confusion, however, exists concerning changes that would actually result if this new suggestion were put into the law.

The Interstate Commerce Commission can now prevent rates of doubtful legality from going into effect for as long as 7 months. During this time the Commission can investigate to determine whether the proposed rates are lawful. The Cabinet Committee would have this power whittled down so that suspension and investigation of proposed rates would be allowed only in very special cases. The suspension period would be made 3 months instead of 7 months.

S. 1920 would change the long-and-short-haul portion of the Interstate Commerce Act. This clause of the law will not allow a carrier to charge less for a long haul as compared with a shorter haul over the same line and in the same direction unless the Interstate Commerce Commission gives permission. The proposal is that rail and water carriers not be required to get approval in advance by the Commission to depart from this section of the law. The carrier could justify a departure by showing that such action was necessary to meet competition and that the lower rates for the longer haul than for the shorter haul are compensatory, that is, cover out-of-pocket costs. Further, large volumes of traffic could be given lower rates than smaller volumes under the terms of S. 1920. Again it must be shown by the carrier that such rates are based on lower costs and are necessary to meet competition.

The bill would do other things in the name of a better deal for common carriers. The present definition of private carriers would be changed. The same would be done for motor and water contract carriers. Water carriers that are now allowed to carry three or less commodities in bulk without regulation would be regulated. The purpose of all these, of course, is to give increased regulation to private and contract carriers in order to help common carriers.

Along the same line, the Interstate Commerce Commission would be empowered to veto service requirements placed on common carriers by States. Under this proposal the ICC could order a passenger train discontinued even though the State commission thought it rendered a necessary service. This power would apply where such requirements unduly burden interstate and foreign commerce; other reasonably adequate service must be available.

The report recommends that the exemption from regulation now given the hauling of farm products be looked over by the Congress for the purpose of deciding exactly what exemptions should be continued. Finally, the Cabinet Committee suggests that the authority to give Federal, State, and municipal governments special rates without regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act be taken away from the carriers. Instead, these rates would be subjected to nearly all of the provisions of the law.

I cannot predict which of the more controversial recommendations of the Cabinet report will reach the Senate floor during the 84th session of Congress.

But—I would like to make it clear that every group affected by the Cabinet report will be given an opportunity to make their objections or voice their approval before hearings on this subject have ended.

I will talk briefly about the recommendation of the Cabinet Committee to change the definition of a private carrier by motor vehicle. As members of the Private Truck Council of America, this is of special significance to you. The law now defines a private carrier as one not included in the term common or contract carrier, who transports in interstate or foreign commerce freight of which the person is the owner, lessee, or bailee, when such transportation is for the purpose of carrying on a commercial enterprise. The purpose of this definition of private carriers is to indicate those, other than common or contract carriers, that are subject to safety regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

According to the ICC's comment on S. 1920, those excluded from the private carrier definition proposed by this bill would be merely relieved from the Commission's safety regulations. This is true, says the Commission, because the bill does not bring within the definition of either common or contract carriers those excluded as private carriers.

S. 1920 would change the definition of private carriage by dropping the requirement that the transportation must be for "furtherance of any commercial enterprise." Without the requirement that the transportation must be for commercial purposes anyone who transports in interstate commerce goods which he owns or leases would be a private carrier subject to ICC safety regulation. This would be true even though the transportation is carrying one's own camping equipment or taking one's clothing to the cleaners in a private automobile. Thus, enormous numbers of additional people would be brought under safety regulation by the ICC by the change in definition. The Cabinet Committee, as I read the report, wanted additional economic regulation of private and contract carriers that now compete with common carriers. I doubt that the Committee has accomplished what it intended by vastly increasing safety regulation. This seems to be unnecessary legislation in any event.

The Committee further would add a proviso that would limit the new definition of private carriers to those whose "ownership, lease, or bailment was not undertaken for the purpose of such transportation."

The proviso would have the effect of taking out from the definition of private carriers and thus relieving from safety regulations those whose ownership, lease, or bailment was undertaken for the purpose of such transportation, whatever the term may mean. I doubt that the Cabinet Committee intended such a result, but there it is. You, I understand, are firmly set against this or other changes in the definition of private carriage. This is another of the many areas of disagreement stirred up by the report, one on which your organization will undoubtedly be heard when hearings are held on S. 1920.

As I understand the law, the rule that is now applied to distinguish private carriage from common or contract carriage was set forth when the courts considered in one proceeding the Lenoir Chair and Schenley cases. The courts upheld the Commission and laid down a simple, commonsense rule known as the primary business test, which I would state as follows:

"You're a regulated, for-hire carrier if you're really engaging in the transportation business as such, but not if you're operating trucks only as a bona fide incident to your own nontransportation enterprise. Which of these you are doing is to be determined from the total facts in each case."

I understand this rule applies even though a charge for transportation is included in the selling price or is billed to the customer as a separate item. Thus, the Cabinet Committee recommendation that a new definition be made for private carriers would probably start action in the courts all over again to determine what the new law means.

I further understand the primary business test would be changed by some, including some of the common carriers. The new rule proposed would be this: when compensation, direct or indirect, has been received for hauling freight, the one receiving the compensation for hauling his own goods would be either a contract or a common carrier. To avoid receiving compensation that would make one a contract or common carrier, apparently one would have to at least deliver his own goods at a loss.

I can understand that most of you will wish to continue the primary business test. You will oppose any proposed change.

I should like to assure you that I believe that the right to carry your own goods in your own vehicle free from economic regulation is a basic fundamental right. I do not want to see it changed because of S. 1920 or in any other way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if I had known what I was yielding to my friend from Florida for, I would have yielded with much more alacrity.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am glad I have earned that good grace on the part of the Senator from Washington.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. JOSÉ LUIS CRUZ-SALAZAR, AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES FROM GUATEMALA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent and enlightening address delivered at Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., on January 21 by the Honorable José Luis Cruz-Salazar, Ambassador to the United States from Guatemala. The speech deals with the case of the recent Communist threat to Guatemala, its impact on the Americas and suggested ideas to keep before us in the continuing fight against the imperialistic tactics of the Communist conspiracy in this hemisphere. I strongly recommend to the Members of the Congress its careful reading.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY LT. COL. JOSÉ LUIS CRUZ SALAZAR, GUATEMALAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, AT ROLLINS COLLEGE

Ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate most deeply the honor you have paid my country,

by inviting its Ambassador to address such a select audience.

I cannot say, however, that I take any pleasure in discussing the topic that is before us. No sane man can derive the slightest pleasure in reviewing the subversion of his country by a ruthless, imperialistic foreign power, in collaboration with local dupes and traitors. To we Guatemalans the subject before us is a painful one.

Nevertheless, the case of Guatemala, when presented in its true perspective, contains some valuable lessons; lessons which, if they are studied well by the peoples of the Americas, will surely contribute to the safety of our hemisphere.

Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, even though the task is an unpleasant one, I must welcome the opportunity to discuss with you briefly, and attempt to analyze, the Guatemalan case.

Let me first try to put the topic in perspective. In recent years many thoughtful Latin Americans have become increasingly concerned at three factors prevalent throughout the hemisphere, which, we feel, threatens the welfare of all of us. This concern is particularly felt by those of us in Guatemala, who participated in the liberation movement.

1. In many of the Amercan nations there is a serious lack of understanding by the great majority of the people, as to the benefits and the responsibilities incurred by the individual in a democratic society. To most of us, I am sad to say, democracy is a subject that evokes much emotion, but too little thought.

2. It is equally true that in many of our countries there is among all classes of people, a lack of knowledge as to the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, of its peculiar techniques and tactics devised for this hemisphere, and especially, of its imperialistic aims.

3. Many of us are too little aware of the very real threat that communism poses to the freedom and security of our hemisphere, and of the truly alarming progress it has made. Ironically, we are better informed on developments in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, than we are of those right here in the Americas.

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe any objective analysis of the case of Guatemala, must lead to the conclusion that the existence of those three factors enabled a small handful of ruthlessly efficient Communist agitators to gain control of my country, and to exercise that control, almost unnoticed by the rest of the American nations, for nearly a decade.

Guatemalans, in our country located in the very heart of the Americas, have enjoyed political freedom in only a few brief periods of our history. We have had little experience with democracy—except as a catch-phrase by demagogic politicians. Most of our experience has been with the old-fashioned type of personal dictatorship.

As the Second World War drew toward a close, Guatemala was caught in a tide of political, social and economic unrest which swept most of Latin America, and which still prevails in many countries. Jorge Ubico, the last of the old school dictators, who had ruled for 14 years, was forced out of office by public pressure in 1944. A few months later, his successor, Gen. Federico Ponce Vaides, was unseated after a brief, but bloody revolution, when it appeared that he, too, was following the policy of dictatorship.

General Ponce followed his predecessor, Ubico into exile, on October 20, 1944. And that date opened the gates for new hope by the people of Guatemala. But unfortunately, it also opened a new opportunity for international communism to secure a foothold in the Western Hemisphere, after years of patient preparation, and careful testing and revising of its subversive tactics.

Please note, ladies and gentlemen, that at that time, our people had no real knowledge of democracy—we merely had the desire to possess it. Even our intellectuals lacked any real concept of the responsibilities that democracy invokes on all classes of individuals—private citizens as well as public officials. It is equally true that we were utterly lacking in knowledge of the Communist conspiracy, and of the real threat it presented to the achievement of our democratic aspirations. All three of the factors that I listed a few moments ago, were prevalent. And the Communists immediately seized the advantage. They knew precisely what they wanted, and had careful plans as to how they would achieve it. In Europe the Communists used as the tool for expansion, the presence or the threat of the powerful Red Army. In Asia they armed local masses, and organized them into trained armies under Red instructors and advisers. But in Latin America, in Guatemala, they were forced to rely on guile, conspiracy, demagogery and subversion.

So, in accordance with what was obviously a careful plan to exploit any similar opportunity, presenting itself anywhere in the hemisphere, the Communist leader concentrated on Guatemala.

With almost unbelievable speed, they swung into action. Guatemalan Communists who had been living in exile, returned to their homes, and engaged in tireless, carefully coordinated political activity. They were joined by comrades from all over Latin America, and even from Spain.

I believe it is important that only a few of these, in the beginning, acknowledged their Communist beliefs. Most of them sailed under the false colors of liberals, or Marxian Socialists, or even the new spiritual socialism invented by President Arévalo.

Their early tactics have since become standard Communist practices throughout the hemisphere. They allied themselves with all of the revolutionary parties, and immediately set about winning the confidence of the more radical elements in our intellectual and working classes. And they succeeded so well, that they were able to secure the nomination of Juan José Arévalo for the presidency, by all of the revolutionary parties. And Arévalo, if he was not an actual card-carrying Communist at that time, was certainly a true Communist sympathizer.

Needless to say, Arévalo was elected by an overwhelming majority. Then came the second phase of the Communist program, a phase that was already well underway before the elections—the organization of the workers under Communist leaders. At the invitation of Arévalo, Vincente Lombardo Toledano came to Guatemala to supervise the organization of the unions. Toledano maneuvered into leadership of the labor movement a young Communist intellectual, Victor Manuel Gutiérrez. Later Gutiérrez selected as his lieutenant a man whom many observers believes was the No. 2 Communist of Guatemala, Carlos Manuel Pellecer. The direct tie-in between the Guatemalan labor leaders and Moscow, was clearly revealed in 1951, when Louis Saillant, of France, head of the notorious World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) came to Guatemala to personally supervise the organization of a central labor body, the Confederación General de Trabajadores (CGTG), which, of course, became affiliated with the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) and Lombardo Toledano's Communist-controlled Latin American labor organization, Confederación de Trabajadores de América Latina (CTAL).

Meanwhile the peons and the small farmers were also being organized into the Rural Confederation of Guatemala, under Leonardo Castillo Flores, an ardent advocate of communism, who made his pilgrimage to Moscow and to various so-called peace conferences. It was Castillo Flores who attempted to combat the Liberation movement directed by Colonel Carlos Castillo Armas, by organizing the rural workers into armed militia, and at one time even dared to give orders to the army's chief of staff.

Meanwhile the Communists were moving at top speed along three other highly important fronts. They were maneuvering controlling positions in the important government agencies, the educational system, and the political parties.

In the government they obtained control of the propaganda agencies, including the government-owned and subsidized newspapers, and the National Broadcasting System; the Social Security Institute; the Electoral Tribunal; the Labor Courts; the President's General Secretariat; and finally even the Congress. They put through a Communist-designed agrarian reform program, and staffed its administrative agency with Communists. They took over the Foreign Office, and perverted the Guatemalan diplomatic corps into a Communist courier service. And finally, when a decision of the Supreme Court displeased the party leaders, at the request of a single Communist deputy the entire court was impeached by a fellow traveling Congress, and sympathetic judges were appointed to replace them.

In the educational field, Mario Silva Jonama, a fanatic Communist teacher, became virtually a dictator of the men teachers' school; María de Sellarés, another Communist became director of the School for Women Teachers; Virginia Bravo Letelier, a Chilean Communist, headed the rural educational system; Rafael Tischler, a notorious Communist, became director of the Labor Union for Workers in Education. A Communist front was organized to penetrate San Carlos University, and with typical Communist irony, it was called the Democratic University Front. Thus, in our educational system, we soon found that the Communists were in control not only of the hiring and firing of teachers, but also of the selection of curricula.

And in the political field, using their control over the important labor and agrarian vote as a weapon, the Communists soon gained controlling positions in all of our major political parties.

I believe it is highly significant that through this period of securing control of the important fields of our political, social, and economic life, the Communists either remained in the background or maintained the disguise of liberals. From the very beginning, however, a few of us knew, they were actively recruiting the young intellectuals and workers, organizing them into cells, and indoctrinating them in Marxist principles and tactics.

Then, shortly before the election of Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán, the party came out into the open. In 1950 the Communist Party of Guatemala made its public appearance under the leadership of José Manuel Fortuny. About the same time another branch of the party came into being, apparently for the purpose of evading article 32 of the constitution, which, in effect, outlaws the Communist Party. This branch was called the Labor Revolutionary Party and was headed by Gutiérrez. After a trip to Moscow by Gutiérrez, however, the two parties were united into the Guatemalan Workers Party, under the leadership of Fortuny. An interesting aspect is that the Guatemalan Government directly subsidized the party's official newspaper, Octubre, which carried as its motto, "For a strong, large Communist Party," by placing complimentary ads in its issues.

I think that another highly significant aspect of the political tactics of the Communists in Guatemala, is that even after they came out in the open, with their own official party and candidates, the Communists continued their dominant positions in the other political parties. On more than

one occasion, they supported their hand-picked candidates from the other parties, over their own official party candidates.

After the election of Arbenz, the Communist tactics became increasingly bolder, and more apparent to the public. In Arbenz the Communists had a disciple who declared, shortly before his inauguration, and I quote: "The world is divided into two groups; on the one side the United States and the nations of the capitalistic system, with their great economic power; and on the other side the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics controlling a group of nations with the almost mystic ideology opposed to a decadant imperialistic system". And he added, "Perhaps we, the men of the present generation will not see it, but in this fight the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is going to win". This, of course, is the typical Leninist formula of reducing the political problems of the world into the over-simplification of the "inevitable" fight between communism and capitalism. Arbenz, on assuming office, named as his principal adviser, the Communist leader, Fortny. It is small wonder that the Communist conspirators, in order to secure the election of Arbenz went even to the lengths of contriving the assasination of his popular opponent, Coronel Francisco Javier Arana, and an outspoken anti-Communist.

I regret deeply, that I do not have the time to go into detail on the second aspect of the Guatemalan case, one in which I as all loyal Guatemalans can view with real pride—our liberation from the Communist tyranny. And ladies and gentlemen, it was a tyranny—of the most ruthless sort. From the very beginning of the Arévalo regime, the secret police resorted to search without warrant, and arrests without formal charges or trials. Hundreds of opponents to the Communists were forced into exile. After the murder of Arana and the election of Arbenz the oppressive tactics became increasingly harsh, and finally culminated in the reign of terror that preceded the liberation, a reign of terror during which hundreds of anti-Communists were seized, brutally tortured, mutilated and finally murdered.

It is not only lack of time, but my main purpose here is to analyze the tactics the Communists followed in Guatemala, and the factors that made them successful. In the discussion of these factors, I believe there is one aspect of the Liberation Movement which must be considered. For it was by attacking these factors that Colonel Castillo overthrew the Communist regime. It was ideas that won in Guatemala—not guns and tanks and planes. For months preceding the revolution, Colonel Castillo and his followers bombarded the people of Guatemala with a systematic barrage of pamphlets and newspapers published by groups in exile, and with broadcasts over the clandestine radio. All of these were aimed at exposing to the people of Guatemala the true nature of the Communist controlled government and its ties with the Kremlin, and at convincing them of the superior advantages of democracy. So when the final test came, Arbenz and his Communist mentors found that not only were they unable to command the army and air force, but even the workers and the Campesinos deserted them. The people had become convinced, and in Castillo Armas they had found a leader. Permit me, for the sake of emphasis, repeat those factors briefly; first, the lack of real understanding of the political and philosophical meaning of democracy; second, the lack of understanding of the tactics and imperialistic aims of communism; and third, the unawareness of the danger that communism presents, and the headway it has already made. To these I could add a fourth factor, although it is of a slightly different nature, the spirit of political, social and economic unrest. I did not list this in the beginning, because it is to a considerable degree, Communist inspired. The principal tactic being used by the Communists throughout the hemisphere today, is the fomenting of discontent and unrest, in an obvious plan to create a chaotic situation they will be able to exploit.

Those are the factors that made the Communist control of my country possible. And, also let me repeat, for emphasis, those factors are prevalent today in many nations in this hemisphere.

We in Guatemala do not believe that our fight against communism is won, by any means. That is why we are so determined to prove to our people that democracy, once properly understood and applied, offers to all individuals willing to accept its responsibilities, the better way of life. However, even then, we shall not feel secure. We know that we are part of this hemisphere. And as long as a single nation remains vulnerable, we in Guatemala, too, are vulnerable.

Therefore, speaking entirely unofficially, I should like to propose for your discussion and consideration, an idea that is provoking considerable thought in my country. Not a detailed solution—but at least an idea.

I am convinced that we must find a way to mobilize the anti-Communist thought in this hemisphere, into an effective force to cope with these prevailing ignorances that endanger our freedom. I suggest a movement on a hemispheric basis, which would:

A. Educate all clases of people, in all of our countries, in the full political and philosophical meaning of democracy; not only in the benefits that it offers the individual, but also in the duties, the responsibilities that it imposes on him if those benefits are to be enjoyed.

B. Educate all classes of our people in the true nature of communism, and particularly its tactics and its imperialistic aims.

C. Acquaint our peoples with the day-to-day, week-to-week, and year-to-year activities of the Communist conspiracy, so that we can better evaluate its gains, and so that our governments can devise methods to counterbalance them.

I present this idea not as a cure-all. But simply as one step to be taken in the continuing fight, which I fear will outlast our lives, between the two great ideological forces, democracy and communism. Surely the knowledge—not only of what we are fighting against, but also of what we are fighting for, is an indispensable weapon in this historic struggle. And since all of us in the hemisphere are the objects of Communist attack, and all are to a greater or lesser degree, vulnerable, I propose a defense on a hemispheric scale. I limit this particular program to this hemisphere, because, as I already pointed out, the imperialistic tactics of the Communist conspiracy here, differ from those followed in other critical areas of the world.

If this were possible, if we should team our resources in a common effort and bring the whole truth to the peoples of our hemisphere, we would have taken a long and sure step toward the goal of true freedom that only democracy can bring.

I once again thank Rollins College for the opportunity given me to address you here today and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your attention.

A NATIONAL POLICY WITH RESPECT TO MANAGEMENT, CONSERVATION, AND WELFARE OF FISHERIES RESOURCES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the hour is late, but I have a matter of great importance which I wish to discuss briefly today, and I also desire to introduce a bill which now lies on the desk. It seems to me quite appropriate that I take the matter up at this time, because the Senate is in the throes of discussing the so-called agricultural bill. My bill, Mr. President, deals with another problem which relates to the farmers of the sea.

It is with regard to a sad state of affairs that I come before the Members of the Senate today to offer a form of relief and security for an important segment of our national economy.

It is in the interests of our domestic commercial and sport fisheries of the United States, of Alaska, of our other Territories and possessions, and of the fisheries on the high seas, that I wish to inform the Senate of the serious plight of the fisheries industry and to explain the purpose of a bill which I am introducing, on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] to give our domestic fisheries the rightful recognition they deserve.

During the interim between the last session of Congress and the present time, I have conducted hearings of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, along with my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], in Alaska and in the principal fishing centers of the Pacific coast.

At the hearings held in various cities, our committee members were joined by other Members of Congress from both the Senate and the House of Representatives, including the Honorable Delegate E. L. BARTLETT of Alaska, and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

I might say that all the Members of Congress present at the hearings showed a profound interest in hearing what the various witnesses had to say about conditions prevailing in our domestic fisheries industry.

I would like now briefly to summarize the testimony and ideas of more than 200 witnesses engaged in or closely associated with commercial fisheries, who testified at the hearings. Among those witnesses were the Honorable B. Frank Heintzleman, Governor of Alaska, members of State and Territorial legislatures, mayors of cities, members of local chambers of commerce, fishermen, fish packers, shipbuilders, and representatives of marine supply houses, and other allied industries.

First of all we were informed that our Alaska salmon industry is in bad financial condition and practically out of business. There are no longer great runs of salmon returning to the 2,000 rivers and streams of the territory.

The total annual salmon pack for Alaska during the past 10 years has dwindled to less than one half the average yield maintained for the previous 20 years—with the 1955 season's catch the lowest in 48 years.

This means an annual loss to our fisheries industry of over $45 million and the possibility of a complete curtailment of all salmon fishing in many areas in order to bring the runs back.

The declining stocks of salmon in Alaska have shown a decided downward trend since 1950, when a sudden drop of 25 percent in production occurred. The decilne since then indicates fewer salmon are returning to the streams.

From the thoughts expressed by the many interested persons contacted dur-

ing our Senate investigation, there is but one answer as to how the present crisis in the Alaskan salmon industry came about. We have failed in our management of this valuable resource.

We have harvested too many and allowed too few salmon to ascend unmolested to the spawning streams required by nature to reproduce the runs.

In addition to our robbing the streams of the seed to reproduce the runs, we have done nothing to protect and assist the salmon and their spawn against the natural predators and environmental conditions. This accounts for a 99 percent mortality in the species from the egg status to the seaward migrating stage.

I believe that in addition to the millions of pounds of food lost annually through our careless management in allowing these valuable fisheries to decline we have created a far more grievous error. We have failed to give to the many problems affecting our domestic food fisheries resources the rightful attention they should have on a national level in Government.

In contrast, land farmers of the Nation over the past 20 years have made wonderful progress in increasing the production and quality of food on their farms; and in this connection they have had the assistance of an independent and respected agency of our national Government.

I am now placing before Congress a bill that will provide for a more practical manner of managing our domestic fisheries in cooperation with the States, Territories, and international agencies in which we participate.

In addition to the salmon crisis in Alaska I find, through our lack of sound fisheries management, that the Government has inflicted severe handicaps upon our own fishermen and fish handlers up and down the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and also along the gulf coast, while helping fishermen and producers in other countries. This is somewhat similar to what was brought out by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] in our discussion today.

Through our national policy in permitting duty-free fish imports to flood domestic markets in competition with our own fishermen and packers, we have practically forced a major portion of our food fisheries enterprises out of business.

This does not mean that anyone is speaking against the reciprocal trade agreements; but in this case, these products come into our country absolutely duty-free.

During the period between 1935 and 1954 edible fish imports alone have increased from an annual rate of 325 million pounds to 803 million pounds, with dollar values increasing from $27,500,000 to $203,600,000. Most of this increase has been in direct competition with domestically produced fish; and in 1953 foreign fish imports comprised 35.2 percent of all fish food available on the domestic market.

Tunafish imports, including processed and unprocessed fish, from 1949 to 1954, increased from an annual rate of 14,500,000 pounds to 170 million pounds, with imports totaling 40.1 percent of all available tuna sold on our domestic market during 1954.

The result of this impact of excessive tuna and other fish imports upon our domestic fisheries has been to deprive United States citizens of their market and the opportunity of fulfilling the fisheries needs of the Nation with supplies which they might readily obtain on the high seas and in coastal areas.

They have been forced to curtail their efforts and to sell their catches at prices comparable to those quoted by foreign producers, whose fishermen receive a standard wage of one-fifth to one-tenth the earnings of an average American laborer. During 1954, trawler-caught bottom fish imports amounted to over 52 percent of domestic consumption.

With this open-door policy permitting low tariff and duty-free fish imports to enter our country, every fish-producing nation in the world has its eyes on United States markets to sell its fish. Almost daily we read accounts of trade organizations being formed in foreign countries to promote the sale of their fish. They have been encouraged to do so by our own State Department officials—while our Government fisheries people sit by and, so far as I can ascertain, say nothing.

I have been concerned for some time over the attitude of our State Department and the administration in surrendering our domestic market to foreign fish producers.

In the May 1951 issue of United States Fish and Wildlife Commercial Fisheries Review, Mr. William C. Herrington, fisheries adviser for the State Department, made a statement in which he related in detail how necessary it is to have American support in advancing and building up Japanese fisheries operations even though our own fishermen would have to restrict their operations.

In summarizing his comments Mr. Herrington made, the following statement regarding the United States fisheries industry's position in relation to fish imports:

> In face of this situation, what course should the United States fishery industry adopt? With no protection there is very little doubt that the United States tuna fishery would greatly decline if not practically disappear. On the other hand, to ask for complete protection would be attempting to fly directly into the face of basic United States policy—and remember—that there is plenty of evidence that most people believe this policy is in the overall national interest. To find a course which will fit in with United States policy and win public support, it appears that the tuna industry must work out a position intermediate between complete protection and no protection.

Of course, there is now no protection at all.

There is much evidence today in the tuna industry, 5 years after Mr. Herrington's statement, that he was correct that "With no protection the American tuna industry would disappear," for today they are on the very edge of complete bankruptcy. Every tuna ship is now tied up. This represents millions of dollars of investment and thousands of persons unemployed.

During the past 4 years the tuna industry has struggled in vain for a program such as that suggested by Mr. Herrington, namely, some middle ground between complete protection and no protection of their market. But the administration and the State Department have failed to act—in fact, they have refused to act.

During my 20 years in Congress I have always been sympathetic to and interested in helping to provide funds to carry out the studies and programs advocated by our Wildlife Service people to aid our fisheries.

I have felt that any program or proposal offered to aid the fisheries was in the best interest of the people in the industry.

I am of the opinion now that not only have we poorly managed our fisheries, but we are far behind time in applying modern methods of water farming to foster the growth of marine foods. The evidence produced at the hearings was unanimous on this point. I believe it is time to act, not to study.

At our Seattle hearings last fall we heard from one of our Nation's most successful fish farmers, the head of the applied laboratory at the University of Washington School of Fisheries.

Dr. Lauren R. Donaldson gave a very convincing account of how it is possible to increase our Alaskan salmon fisheries to about any productive level we wish through proper regulatory measures, predator control, and stream and lake fertilization. He also stated—and he is an expert in this field—that the concrete results of any fisheries program can be evaluated only in numbers of fish in the water or landed by the fishermen.

Following Dr. Donaldson, Mr. Clarence Pautzke, Chief of the Fisheries Division of the Washington State Game Department, told how under his direction more than 260 lakes in Washington State had been poisoned out to eliminate all forms of undesirable marine life, and then restocked with trout from their hatcheries. The net results of this program have been a 1,000-percent increase in available fish for Washington sportsmen over a period of 7 years.

These men are not just fussing around making studies, they are producing fish. I think it is time something was done about the problem on a national scale.

One other factor regarding our Alaska salmon industry is that many fishermen and packers believe the tremendous increase in the Japanese catch of salmon on the high seas has a direct bearing upon the sharp decrease of salmon on our side of the Pacific.

Many fishermen claim that net-marked salmon have appeared in their catches in Bristol Bay, even though no fishing is conducted in front of that bay. They say that this is a sure sign that the Japanese are catching our fish. If that be true, it would be in violation of the treaty concluded between the United States and Japan after the war.

Our scientists assigned to the job of finding out about the possibility of Asian and North American stocks of salmon intermingling on the high seas appear to doubt the idea that Japanese fishermen

are taking salmon headed for Alaskan streams.

We do know, however, that taking salmon on the high seas a considerable distance offshore is a wasteful, destructive practice. There is no way under such operations to secure adequate escapement to replenish the runs.

We know that fisheries studies all take time and a considerable amount of funds. The Government Wildlife Service has given considerable attention to this problem, but apparently they have not found the answers.

If the Japanese fishermen are taking North American fish, as the fishermen indicate, and if our Alaska salmon runs continue to decline as they have in the past 3 years, our Alaska salmon fisheries may be wiped out before our services have determined the true cause.

In addition to Alaska salmon, tuna, and other fish problems on the Pacific coast, from Maine to Florida our Atlantic coastal fisheries are becoming less productive each year, especially on the New England Banks.

The once proud trawler fishing fleets of New York and Boston are becoming outmoded with the times.

During the past 20 years the annual trawler bottom fish landings at Boston alone have dropped from 300 million pounds to approximately one-half that amount. No new ocean trawlers have been built to continue these operations.

Other nations are expanding this type of fishing operation for the reason that they have a market for their fish, a good share of it right here in our United States. This is possible because we are sacrificing our own fishermen's markets by turning them over to foreigners.

Established marine- and fishing-gear suppliers throughout the country are also faced with serious handicaps in their trade through the competition of low-priced imports. Some items arriving from factories abroad are financed by American capital to take advantage of low-cost labor in the manufacture of their products, which they sell at high United States prices.

There is a peril point in these enterprises as a result of which our industries can be forced out of business. No one seems to be applying the brakes.

The seriousness of the problems of our domestic fisheries that I have outlined today can hardly be emphasized in this brief message.

The astonishing fact brought out at our hearings with the industry is that not one employee in our Government has raised his voice at a national or international level to protect and defend the position of United States fishermen in the security of their markets and in their inherent rights to accustomed fishing areas.

I hope that all the Members of Congress will join with me in supporting this bill and other necessary legislation to follow in providing relief and averting the crisis that now faces our domestic fisheries.

The United States, with our increasing population, cannot afford to allow our fisheries resources and enterprises to deteriorate and become an unimportant segment of our national economy.

We must no longer be content with pretentious stories about the need for continued studies about the life and habits of fish. We must direct our efforts toward farming our streams and water areas to create a healthy condition in all fisheries.

It is in the Nation's best interests that we direct our attention toward giving the fisheries of the country the recognition they should have, and that we hereafter employ experienced, competent personnel to manage, defend, and promote the welfare of our fisheries.

Mr. President, I might take just a moment or two to say briefly, that the bill provides for the abolition of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior and creates an independent commission of five members, which will be the Fisheries Commission of the United States, and establishes a fishing policy for the whole United States. That is long overdue. The bill puts fisheries in the right perspective in our Nation's economy. It puts our fisheries problem, both international and domestic, in the right perspective in regard to our dealings with other countries in this matter. This country has been making fisheries treaties, many of which have gone through the committee headed by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is now occupying the Chair. In the negotiation of those treaties United States fishing interests have been at a disadvantage. We have been dealing with men at Cabinet level from other maritime and fisheries countries, while subheads of subdepartments have represented this country.

The bill would create an independent commission, free it from the politics and necessity of making yearly regulations, and offer a hope that we may rehabilitate an industry which is fast declining. I have sat on the Appropriations Committee and have seen millions of dollars voted for conservation of our fisheries resources, but apparently that has been of no avail, because the whole industry has been dropping and dropping and dropping. As one fisherman put it to me, "We have no place to go but up."

Surely it is high time that we took hold of the problem and put our fisheries on such a level in the national Government that immediate steps could be taken to rehabilitate our depleted runs and the almost economic bankruptcy facing the fishermen of the Nation.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriatedly referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3275) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Fisheries Act of 1956."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that fish and shellfish resources make a material contribution to the health and well-being of our citizens and constitute an important part of the food-producing segment of the national economy, and that a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management, and maximum use of such resources, the prevention of excessive exploitation thereof, and the promotion and maintenance of prosperous and productive conditions in both the commercial and the sport and recreational fisheries industries is essential in the public interest. The Congress further declares that the provisions of this act are necessary in order to accomplish such objectives, and that this act shall be administered with due regard to the inherent right of every citizen and resident of the United States to engage in fishing for his own pleasure and enjoyment.

UNITED STATES FISHERIES COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created an independent agency of the Government to be known as the United States Fisheries Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate. One of such members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission at the time of nomination. Each such member shall hold office for a term of 6 years; except that the terms of office of the members first appointed shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of nomination, as follows: 1 on January 1, 1958, 1 on January 1, 1959, 1 on January 1, 1960, 1 on January 1, 1961, and 1 on January 1, 1962. A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining members to exercise the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as is the case of the original appointment. Not more than 3 members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum, and each of the other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $18,000 per annum.

(b) Not less than three members of the Commission shall have general knowledge of commercial and sport fishing conditions and of the problems confronting the domestic and international fisheries.

(c) In addition to exercising the functions transferred to it by this act and otherwise provided by law, it shall be the duty of the Commission (1) to assist and advise the appropriate agencies of the several States which have the primary responsibility of managing fisheries, and any international agencies having similar official responsibilities, (2) to promote, conserve and manage any fisheries in the territories and possessions of the United States that remain the sole responsibility of the Federal Government, and (3) to construct, maintain and operate fish cultural stations relating to fish and shellfish, either independently or in cooperation with State, Territorial, and private agencies, to the extent authorized by the Congress and by law.

(d) It shall also be the duty of the Commission to prepare and submit to the Congress such programs, policies, and directives relating to the advancement, management, regulation, and portection of fisheries as the Commission deems necessary to carry out

the purposes of this act or as may be required by law.

(e) The Commission shall conduct continuing studies, shall prepare and disseminate information, and shall make periodical reports and recommendations to the public, to the President and to the Congress, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The production and flow to market of fish and fishery products domestically produced;

(2) The production and flow to market of fish and fishery products produced by foreign producers which affect domestic commercial fisheries;

(3) The trends in production of the various kinds of fish and shellfish;

(4) The measures which are appropriate to assure the maximum sustainable production of fish and fishery products and to prevent unnecessary and excessive fluctuations in such production;

(5) The measures that are necessary to prevent the excessive and harmful exploitation of the fisheries resources;

(6) The methods and practices used in matching and taking fish and shellfish that are wasteful and that have the effect of diminishing the fisheries resources in the waters of the Continental Shelf and the high seas;

(7) The competitive economic position of the various fish and fishery products with respect to each other and to competitive fish and fishery products produced by foreign producers.

(8) The market conditions, amount of production, and general economic position of fish and fishery products in the countries in which such products constitute an important part of the food supply; and

(9) Any other matters which in the judgment of the Commission are of public interest in connection with any phases of fisheries operations.

(f) The Commission shall cooperate to the fullest practicable extent with the Secretary of State in providing representation at all meetings and conferences relating to fisheries in which representatives of the United States and foreign countries participate. The Secretary of State shall, wherever possible, designate at least one member of the Commission to the negotiating team in all matters relating to international fisheries.

(g) The Secretary of State and all other officials having responsibilities in the fields of technical and economic aid to foreign nations shall consult with the Commission in all cases in which the interests of domestic commercial and sport fisheries are involved with a view to assuring that such interests are adequately represented at all times.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission shall be represented in all international negotiations conducted by the United States pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in any case in which domestic commercial and sport fisheries are directly affected by such negotiations.

(i) The Commission shall make such studies and investigations relating to fishing operations on the high seas as it deems necessary for the welfare and protection of domestic fisheries, and shall make reports and recommendations to the Congress and to the Secretary of State with respect to any practices, operations, or conditions or any other matters that it deems to be detrimental to, or vital to the security and welfare of, such fisheries.

(j) The Commission is authorized, in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(k) The Commission may request and secure the advice or assistance of any department or agency of the Government, and any such department or agency which furnishes advice or assistance to the Commission may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement from the Commission as may be agreed upon between the Commission and the department or agency.

(l) The Commission shall consult periodically with the various governmental, private nonprofit, and other agencies which have to do with any phase of noncommercial fishing with respect to any problems that may arise in connection with such fishing.

(m) The Commission may make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and all such rules and regulations shall be published in the Federal Register as in the case of those of any other agency.

(n) The Commission shall make an annual report to the Congress with respect to its activities under this act.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Commission all the functions of the Department of the Interior (including the functions of the Secretary thereof and of the Fish and Wildlife Service) relating in any manner to fisheries, and the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection thereof.

(b) In addition, the functions of the Secretary of the Interior (1) relating to the protection of fur seals, and to the supervision of the Pribilof Islands and the care of the natives thereof, and (2) relating to the Whaling Convention Act of 1949 (Public Law 676, 81st Cong.) and any other functions of the Secretary relating to hair seals, sea lions, whales, and other mammals, are hereby transferred to, and shall hereafter be exercised by, the Commission.

(c) There are hereby transferred to the Commission all functions of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the head of any other department or agency, which are now exercised by them or provided for under any act of Congress and which relate in any manner to fisheries; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to interfere with or modify the authority of the Department of State or the Secretary thereof to negotiate or enter into any international agreements or conventions with respect to the development, management, or protection of any fisheries resources.

(d) There are hereby transferred to the Commission so much of the personnel, property, facilities, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be necessary in connection with the exercise of the functions transferred to the Commission by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. Close cooperation shall be established and maintained between the United States and Canada, and between the United States and Mexico, through fisheries agreements, in the interest of conserving and utilizing to the fullest practicable extent the stocks of food fish and shellfish which inhabit the waters of the Continental Shelf. Such cooperation shall also be established and maintained between the United States and other nations through fisheries agreements relating to the conservation and use of the stocks of food fish which inhabit the waters of the high seas.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere in any manner with the rights of any State under the Submerged Lands Act (Public Law 31, 83d Cong.) or otherwise provided by law.

SEC. 7. (a) It shall be unlawful for any citizen of the United States—

(1) to catch or take any salmon, trout or other fishes on the high seas (except as authorized by the Commission for experimental or sport fishing purposes) with any form of net, gear or other appliance which the Commission finds would prevent or interfere with the conservation of such fishes; and

(2) to fish for or catch any species of shellfish in the waters of either the Atlantic Ocean or the Pacific Ocean by means of tangle nets or any other device or gear which the Commission finds would have the unavoidable result of taking immature and female shellfish at the same time that marketable male shellfish are taken.

(b) The Commission is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enforce the provisions of this section.

(c) Any person who violates any provision of this section, or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Commission pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, shall be fined not more than $____ or imprisoned for not more than _____ years, or both.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, LOBBYING, ETC.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement, before the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, makes certain recommendations:

Mr. President, I am recommending for membership on the Special Committee created yesterday the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

These recommendations represent the combined judgment of the many Members I have consulted on this side of the aisle. We were seeking certain qualities of experience, temperament, and interest that are essential for the type of investigation that is to be conducted. In these four Senators, we believe those qualities are combined to the highest degree. These selections have the approval of the majority policy committee and the majority steering committee.

We felt the need of men experienced in the work of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee. It has an important jurisdiction in this matter.

We felt the need of men experienced in the work of the Government Operations Committee. It has jurisdiction over the lobby laws.

We felt the need of men experienced in the work of the Judiciary Committee. It has authority over many features of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

But we knew that our objective would not be attained merely by finding a representative from each Committee. The assignment called for men who were

experienced in the techniques of investigation, who were mature and prudent, who were vigorous and enthusiastic for the assignment, who had some background in the fields which would be explored.

To my mind, these four men do not represent committees. They represent the entire Senate and, beyond the Senate, the people of the United States, who have the basic interest in this investigation.

I first approached the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and his equally respected and beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I asked them whether they desired to serve on the expanded inquiry which grows out of the fine work they have done.

Both carry heavy burdens—in fact, some of the greatest responsibilities of the Senate. Both are candidates for reelection. They felt that the additional burden of an investigation which will last for many months would be too great.

The question was explored further. In a short time, the pattern became clear.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] who has served in Congress since the 76th Congress and in the Senate since 1953, is one of our most vigorous and effective members. Furthermore, he is the chairman of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, which has an important responsibility in this matter. His reputation rests upon distinguished service with the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, the Rules and Administration Committee, and the Senate Democratic Campaign Committee. He is a thorough man, a fair-minded man, a man of boundless energy. We are confident that he will conduct himself in the spirit of our highest traditions.

In his quiet, effective way, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has covered himself with as many laurels as has any other man in public life. His conduct as an investigator has set standards of fairness and fearlessness which will stand unchallenged throughout the years. His very presence on this group will be reassuring to all Americans who look for a thorough and nonpartisan investigation that will be bound by one standard—the national interest.

It would be difficult to find a better qualified man for this task than the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. He is now the chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee—a group representing both branches of Congress in a field that goes to the very heart of our country's security. As chairman, he has distinguished himself by a breadth of vision and a nonpartisanship that have placed the safety of our Nation above any other consideration. He has been through this type of investigation in the past. During the 78th Congress, he was chairman of the House Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures. His conduct in that position is still cited as a model of integrity, thoroughness, and patriotism.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is a studious, careful, cautious man whose prudence and keenness enhance any congressional project. His patriotism is beyond question, and is backed by a distinguished war record second to none. He has served in the Congress since 1947, and is the author of one of the best-known books in recent years on the Congress. It is characteristic of the junior Senator from Massachusetts that this book is a sensitive and perceptive study of the highest standards of congressional activity. He is the chairman of a Government Operations Subcommittee which likely will have jurisdiction over any remedial legislation that involves lobbying. He also serves on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which has a responsibility in this field.

Mr. President, I believe all of us are aware of the difficult and sensitive nature of the investigation which is before us. It goes to the hard core of our form of Constitutional Government—the confidence of our people in their institutions. It is an investigation that may have many aspects—some of which cannot now be foreseen. Already, we have charges which the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are preparing to present. The committee has a tremendous task cut out for it.

The majority believe that the four Senators we are recommending represent the best possible combination of intelligence, experience, and background to insure a complete and thorough investigation. They come from the Northeast and the Southwest; from the South and the border. They represent different points of view, but all are men who have demonstrated a capacity for understanding the views of those who disagree with them. Two of them are senior Members of the Senate; two of them are junior Members of the Senate. But all four share a proven love for our institutions and a proven devotion to duty.

They will be partisans only for the public interest. And the public interest calls for one of the most searching investigations in our history—an investigation that will leave no relevant fact uncovered.

We are entrusting to these men one of the most vital functions of the Senate. Their colleagues, I know, are confident that it is lodged in safe hands.

They are the kind of men who can concentrate on the substantial, can place the trivial in proper perspective, and can aim for the constructive goal of meeting the problems of the modern age.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement, prior to the announcement: After consultation on this side of the aisle, the leadership on this side have recommended the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is the senior Republican Member, is a former President pro tempore of this body, and now is serving on the Select Committee; the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], a former Governor of that State, who also at present is serving on the existing Select Committee; the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who has resigned his position as Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee; and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL].

First of all, we have determined that no Member who is a candidate for election in 1956 should be a member of this committee.

Second, we have felt that, because of the developments growing out of the so-called Harris-Fulbright bill, we wanted to balance the representation between those who have supported the proposed legislation and those who have opposed it. That was done in this case.

On this committee we have 2 of our more senior Members from this side of the aisle, and, as is the case on the other side of the aisle, 2 of our more junior Members. I believe that they will approach this problem in the proper spirit, to develop the facts for the Senate. They are to represent not individual committees, but the Senate of the United States, in one of the most important tasks ever assigned in this body to eight Members of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield before he concludes his remarks, I should like to add that the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] were, until today, members of the Senate Campaign Committee. Earlier in the day, when I notified them that the leadership desired to have them serve on this important select committee, they submitted their resignations. The resignations have been accepted, and in due course their successors will be appointed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle for the caliber of the membership of the committee which has been selected. I am satisfied that a fair and judicial hearing will be held by this committee.

I wish to say to the chairman of the committee that, as I have worked with him, I have observed his work in the Senate. I consider him a great legislative judge. By that I mean that I consider ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, to be of such judicial temperament, and to be such an able lawyer, that I know of no post in our Government which he would not be qualified to fill. Whenever I find that type of temperament in the chairman of any committee, I look forward to a judicial operation of the committee.

I may have been a little previous in my remarks with regard to the chairmanship of the committee. I assumed, from what I had read, that it was contemplated that the Senator from Tennessee would be chairman of the committee. In any event, I wish to have my comments regarding his character remain in the RECORD. I have complete confidence in his judiciousness, and in that of the other members of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should say that some suggestions have been made with respect to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] being made chairman of the committee. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon knows, that is a matter entirely for the decision of the membership of the committee. The committee will receive no recommendations or suggestions from

anyone except the eight members of the committee. Under the terms of the resolution, the membership of the committee will select a chairman, a vice chairman, and such other officers as they may wish to select.

Mr. MORSE. I was acting under the mistaken assumption that it was contemplated that the Senator from Tennessee would become chairman of the committee. I hope that nothing I have said in my commendation of the Senator from Tennessee will cause any embarrassment to anyone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator with respect to the selections made by the majority and minority.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to state for the record that it is also my understanding that the committee of eight members will select its chairman, based upon the judgment of the members themselves. There certainly has been no understanding in advance on this side of the aisle, and I believe there has been none on the other side of the aisle, relative to the chairmanship. It has been made perfectly clear that the eight members of the committee will meet and arrive at their own judgment as to the selection of a chairman and vice chairman of the committee, and such other officers as they feel are necessary to carry on the work of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California may be assured that I have reached no secret understanding with anyone on that subject.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am delighted to hear the nominations for membership on a committee which I consider to have one of the most important assignments ever given to a committee. The members of the committee will keep in mind the aim of good government, and the preservation of the right of the Senate to enjoy the title of the greatest deliberative body in the world. I know of no finer men who could have been chosen than those who have been named by the majority and minority leaders.

I know that the committee will pursue its investigation with diligence and thoroughness, and with a sense of justice and fairness to all. I know that the aim of the committee will be to bring about corrective results, so that no question can ever again be raised with respect to the proprieties involved in legislative debates.

I have had the great pleasure of serving with many members of the committee, both those on the minority side and those on the majority side. It was my pleasure to serve with the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for 18 years in the Congress. I know of no man who has shown greater courage, firmer determination, or broader vision in performing any task assigned to him during his experience both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate than has my distinguished friend and colleague from Tennessee. He has a great understanding of the electoral processes, gained from his service in the House of Representatives, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

I am delighted at the appointment of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who, perhaps to a greater extent than any other Member of the Senate, possesses an understanding of the operation of the Lobbying Registration Act, which I had the privilege of helping to place on the statute books, along with the distinguished late Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette. That act operates in conjunction with the Legislative Reorganization Act. Those two statutes should be geared together, because it is impossible to tell where election campaign contributions leave off and lobbying activities begin, unless they are both placed under the same microscope. I am sure this will be done by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, who has a wide knowledge of the subject.

I am pleased also by the appointment of certain distinguished senior Members of this body, including the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who possesses a fine judicial mind.

I am pleased at the appointment of our great colleague, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Both the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Arkansas are men of wide experience, men who will go to the limit in developing all the facts, letting the chips fall where they may.

We can be justly proud of the representation from our side of the aisle.

I am delighted with the appointment of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], whose interest in clean politics and clean government is well known. I am pleased also with the appointment of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who has an intimate knowledge of election processes, and is as dedicated as is any other Member of this body to keeping them pure and undefiled.

It seems to me that we are most fortunate in the appointment of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as one of the senior members of this committee. His appointment will enable us to enjoy the benefit of the vast experience which comes from service over a long period of time.

In the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] we also have a man with a judicial mind, who is dedicated to the task of finding the facts.

No committee has been given an assignment of such importance in many years. When these appointments are considered in the light of the wise action, taken by almost unanimous decision of the Senate, I think it will be found that a bipartisan committee with wide jurisdiction in this field can do a great deal toward writing a ticket for clean government.

I congratulate both the majority and the minority leadership on the wise choice in this case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank my able friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and my devoted and dear friend, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, for their very generous remarks. I believe, however, that in response to their remarks I should say—and I believe the distinguished majority leader will agree with me—that from the beginning I have stated to him that I would be happier if he would assign another Senator to the task of membership, and that I would be even happier if the committee would find someone else to serve as chairman. I still feel that way.

However, this is a job which I have said repeatedly should be done. I am in no position to run from a task which I believe is a necessary one. Therefore, I told the distinguished majority leader that I would serve as a member of the committee. I would be very happy, indeed, if the committee should choose one of my distinguished colleagues to serve as chairman. If so, I would work in the ranks as diligently as possible.

It is an enormous task, one which will require long work and devoted effort, but I hope that out of this study will come basic remedial legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee, when he first talked to me about it on Monday, told me he thought it was much more important that the job be done than that he should be selected to do it, and that if I insisted that he become a member, he would be glad to serve. However, he said he would not be offended in the slightest if another member were selected and he were not. As a matter of fact, he said he would be pleased if that did happen.

It was only late this afternoon that I finally told the Senator the composition of the committee and notified the other members.

I appreciate the Senator's attitude. He will have the full cooperation, as he usually does on all legislative matters, of the leadership on the majority side. I am proud of the good work done by the minority leader in the selections he has made. I am sure those Senators will be equally cooperative with the members of the committee. From here on out it is largely a matter of judgment of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise only to say that as a member of the Steering Committee it was my privilege and responsibility to be consulted on the assignments from the majority side.

I believe the RECORD should show that the members of the Steering Committee present—and there was a substantial majority present—were in full agreement with the selections announced by the majority leader.

I feel that the majority leader's selections are excellent. I have had the privilege of talking with two of my colleagues who are seat mates of mine, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], about this very difficult assignment. As one who sits close to them and as one knows them equally well, I should like to say that no two finer selections could have been made. That also applies to our colleague, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator

from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], both of whom have demonstrated their great knowledge of the processes of government and great personal integrity. I wish to commend again, as I have already done, both the majority and minority leaders on one of the most difficult assignments that they have had to make.

I feel that the program will now be under way in good hands and will lead toward constructive results. It surely needs it. I should like to say to my colleagues that a tremendous responsibility is vested in the chairman of the special committee. If the chairman is to be the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], as I have heard, then I wish to say we are very fortunate indeed, because he has demonstrated again and again the kind of intellectual and moral courage and the sort of brilliant and yet understanding knowledge of the responsibilities of Government and officials of the Government that will stand well with the country in the days ahead.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observations. He is always very generous and understanding of the majority leader. I wish the record to be crystal clear that the election of the chairman of the committee is entirely within the jurisdiction of the members of the committee. I agree with the Senator's statement, that if the members decide that the Senator from Tennesee [Mr. GORE] is the best-equipped member of that committee to serve as its chairman, that is a matter for it to decide. If I were a member of the committee, I should be very happy to have the Senator from Tennessee act as chairman of the committee. Likewise, I believe that any member of that committee would make a distinguished chairman. I do believe that the record should be made abundantly clear that it is entirely a matter for the committee, and that there are no pressures or suggestions or attempts to decide the matter for the committee in advance.

I know that is the way the Senator from Tennessee wants it, and that is certainly the position of both the majority and the minority leaders.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the following assignments to the special committee established by Senate Resolution 219:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to address the Senate, and if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 24, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 23 (legislative day, February 22), 1956:

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii, for a term of 4 years, vice Edward A. Towse whose term has expired.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Herbert G. Curtis, Glenwood, Ala., in place of F. T. Bryan, removed.

ALASKA

Glenda A. Cobb, Annette, Alaska, in place of D. V. Richard, resigned.

John F. Connery, Barrow, Alaska, in place of D. K. Brower, removed.

Edna Peratrovich, Klawock, Alaska, in place of E. F. Demmert, deceased.

Evelyn L. Conwell, Krotzebue, Alaska, in place of A. G. Francis, resigned.

Jenabe E. Caldwell, Unalaska, Alaska, in place of C. H. Hope, resigned.

Alice R. Brusich, Ward Cove, Alaska, in place of M. D. Crawford, removed.

ARIZONA

Cathryn A. Pulsifer, Camp Verde, Ariz., in place of Olive Tompkins, resigned.

Nancy R. Caldwell, San Simon, Ariz., in place of A. M. Hall, retired.

ARKANSAS

Wendell R. Kimbrough, Alicia, Ark., in place of A. M. Matthews, deceased.

Ted M. Anderson, Batesville, Ark., in place of E. F. Crutchfield, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Ethel M. Stott, Diablo, Calif., in place of Helen Cooper, retired.

Eugene M. Freitas, Herlong, Calif., in place of B. K. Geiger, removed.

George P. Ashmun, Hughson, Calif., in place of M. A. Brophy, retired.

Harry L. Smith, Perkins, Calif., in place of William Lais, retired.

COLORADO

George R. Newmyer, Center, Colo., in place of W. B. Sutley, resigned.

Charles Herman Klipfel, Pueblo, Colo., in place of R. H. Talbot, deceased.

Ralph A. Nielson, Sanford, Colo., in place of A. J. Reed, retired.

HAWAII

Satoshi Ishimoto, Lihue, Hawaii, in place of M. D. Drier, deceased.

IDAHO

Leo G. Huguenin, Mullan, Idaho, in place of C. W. Bentley, removed.

ILLINOIS

Arlynn M. Price, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.

Ernie R. Rightmyer, Fairfield, Ill., in place of J. C. Stanley, removed.

John Paul Smothers, Marion, Ill., in place of A. O. Ledbetter, removed.

William I. Anderson, Metropolis, Ill., in place of L. L. Taylor, transferred.

Elizabeth R. Ervin, Pesotum, Ill., in place of H. F. Lieb, deceased.

William C. Hallock, Tilden, Ill., in place of C. H. Lindsay, retired.

Harry L. Crawford, Yorkville, Ill., in place of M. N. Beecher, removed.

INDIANA

Wilfred M. Bedel, Batesville, Ind., in place of C. H. Andres, deceased.

James L. Conwell, Greensburg, Ind., in place of C. D. Samuels, resigned.

Bill R. Davidson, Princeton, Ind., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.

IOWA

Richard R. Kraus, Ryan, Iowa, in place of J. L. Magirl, resigned.

KANSAS

Ralph R. Johnson, Vermillion, Kans., in place of S. L. Becker, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Robert S. Smallwood, Beattyville, Ky., in place of C. P. Hall, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edwin L. Naylor, Dunstable, Mass., in place of L. M. Brow, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Arthur J. Jackson, Benton Harbor, Mich., in place of A. C. Parsal, retired.

Charles A. Fisher, Bergland, Mich., in place of Esther Geroux, removed.

Harriet H. Tuttle, Comstock, Mich., in place of A. J. Price, retired.

Mary M. Schlichting, Haslett, Mich., in place of Mary Elliott, retired.

Earl E. Secor, Imlay City, Mich., in place of W. C. Schoof, retired.

Walter L. Parrott, Jr., Kingston, Mich., in place of Rhea Henderson, deceased.

Daniel G. Picot, Lexington, Mich., in place of Henry Matthews, deceased.

Arthur G. Jenkins, Livonia, Mich. Office established April 1, 1954.

Alice L. Thompson, Trout Creek, Mich., in place of J. C. Vaughan, retired.

Edward C. Hudson, Trout Lake, Mich., in place of W. H. Mullins, retired.

MINNESOTA

Lester H. Egerstrom, Murdock, Minn., in place of J. R. Kavanagh, deceased.

Rodger A. McRae, Swanville, Minn., in place of D. B. Clabaugh, transferred.

MISSOURI

Vance A. Meares, Reeds, Mo., in place of N. T. Lambeth, transferred.

Jesse O. Weaver, Steele, Mo., in place in M. L. Kelley, deceased.

Clyde R. Muller, Sweet Springs, Mo., in place of H. F. Nelson, retired.

MONTANA

Ivan W. Small, Alder, Mont., in place of N. B. Conway, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Theodore R. Butler, Portsmouth, N. H., in place of F. J. Rowe, transferred.

George W. Carr, Winnisquam, N. H., in place of W. F. Cohan, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Jacob Fetzer, Grenloch, N. J., in place of A. B. Williams, retired.

John V. Zoppel, North Bergen, N. J., in place of F. A. Hynes, deceased.

Joseph Kain, Kenvil, N. J., in place of J. F. Bird, resigned.

Laura A. Bradley, Monmouth Beach, N. J., in place of W. H. Kittell, resigned.

William C. Conner, South Bound Brook, N. J., in place of M. A. Carroll, deceased.

NEW YORK

Joseph R. Iadarola, Elmsford, N. Y., in place of T. F. English, retired.

Oliver K. Palm, Jamestown, N. Y., in place of R. C. Gifford, deceased.

Ronald M. MacKenzie, Lake Placid, N. Y., in place of F. M. Dennin, retired.

James C. Browne, Mahopac, N. Y., in place of J. W. Clark, retired.

Vincent J. Behm, Nedrow, N. Y., in place of P. P. McGuire, resigned.

George Conrad Sauer, Port Jervis, N. Y., in place of J. F. Harrison, resigned.

Edna C. Yaple, Rock Hill, N. Y., in place of P. L. Rice, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ivan O. Wick, Brocket, N. Dak., in place of A. C. Connelly, retired.

Carl Raymond Culver, Dickinson, N. Dak., in place of A. C. Pagenkopf, retired.

Gerald D. Davis, Mooreton, N. Dak., in place of F. L. Gerou, resigned.

Ruby E. Omvig, Mylo, N. Dak., in place of M. V. Andersen, retired.

OHIO

Ruben E. Spurrier, Buffalo, Ohio, in place of James Blair, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Thornton J. Lucado, Jr., Blanchard, Okla., in place of T. C. Anthony, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Richard S. Chesonis, Lucernemines, Pa., in place of D. M. Turify, resigned.

Henry R. Heintz, Perkiomenville, Pa., in place of N. B. Becker, retired.

Richard J. Griffith, Trucksville, Pa., in place of Gwilym Evans, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Jessie W. Jenkins, Wadmalaw Island, S. C., in place of M. P. Boykin, transferred.

B. George Price, III, Walterboro, S. C., in place of Stacy Kearse, deceased.

TEXAS

Buster Fleming, Emory, Tex., in place of J. B. Chastain, transferred.

Billy G. Williams, Freer, Tex., in place of E. C. Kelly, removed.

Joe C. Cobb, Lewisville, Tex., in place of M. S. Donald, retired.

Gilbert R. Thayer, Port Lavaca, Tex., in place of M. B. McConnico, retired.

Frederick H. Pearce, Sr., Thorndale, Tex., in place of V. F. Norris, resigned.

VERMONT

Harvey A. Dix, Brattleboro, Vt., in place of J. H. McKinnon, transferred.

VIRGINIA

George Guy Farrar, Afton, Va., in place of L. C. Dawson, retired.

Jane D. Nottingham, Carrollton, Va., in place of L. M. Latimer, deceased.

Clinton Lewis Epperson, Lawrenceville, Va., in place of T. E. Warriner, deceased.

WASHINGTON

John C. Nowadnick, Chehalis, Wash., in place of L. K. Sullivan, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Kenneth B. Rouzee, Kingwood, W. Va., in place of J. T. Spahr, retired.

Guy S. Holliday, Layland, W. Va., in place of W. A. Johnson, deceased.

Charles C. Workman, Red House, W. Va., in place of L. E. Ambler, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Michael J. Stieber, Colby, Wis., in place of A. X. Umhoefer, resired.

Benjamin F. Goehring, Random Lake, Wis., in place of E. H. Toepfer, resigned.

Francis Mattis, Stone Lake, Wis., in place of J. C. Reinke, removed.

WYOMING

Bruce L. Bartholomew, Dayton, Wyo., in place of J. C. Adams, retired.

LeRoy Williams, Grass Creek, Wyo., in place of G. C. Burrier, resigned.

Iduma Slagowski, Mountainview, Wyo., in place of R. C. Taylor, resigned.

Noreen C. Hopkins, Story, Wyo., in place of A. A. Raycher, deceased.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 23 (legislative day, February 22), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Douglas Maxwell Moffat, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, to Australia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, who hast been our shield in the stillness of the night, guide us now by Thy divine wisdom and gird us with Thy strength as we set our minds and hearts to the tasks of this new day.

May this Lenten season upon which we have entered daily become richer and more glorious in the culture and deepening of our spiritual life.

Cleanse our souls of all unrighteousness and grant that through self-examination and self-discipline we may gain the mastery over those desires and habits which are contrary to Thy holy will.

Help us to grow in the grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, from whom to turn away is to fall but in whom to abide is to stand fast forever.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week and the following week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, March 15, at any time, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving the Prime Minister of Ireland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 403) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as Speaker pro tempore.

MUST CONGRESS SURRENDER ITS POWERS TO OTC?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5550 is such a short and innocent-looking bill.

Providing that "the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation."

That is the sum and substance of it.

So disarming.

For who could object to the vague but pleasant generalities of Organization for Trade Cooperation?

But, wait a moment.

What is this OTC?

First, let us refresh our memory of the Constitution of the United States. Under article I, section 8, we note that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost, and excises" and "to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

The State Department of today, in its zeal to acquire arbitrary control over tariffs and trade, has the effrontery to expect that Congress shall sign its powers away, in violation of the trust reposed in Congress by the people, and in contempt of constitutional procedures.

How?

By transferring authority from Congress to the State Department, via legislative approval of OTC.

H. R. 5550 is the instrument by which they would have Congress abdicate its responsibilities, upset the balance of representative government, and vest far greater power in the executive branch than the people ever intended that it should have.

For some years the State Department has been inching toward this goal.

OTC is the final and most subtle maneuver.

By this sidestepping technique, the regulation of our foreign commerce would be taken out of the hands of Congress, placed under the control of the State Department, and then come within the jurisdiction of an international trade organization known as the OTC, leading inevitably to control by a specialized agency of the United Nations of the type and amount and price of foreign goods that would flood the United States to the detriment of our own workers, industries, wage levels, and standard of living.

The attempt to sugarcoat OTC as a mere forum is not honest. OTC would be organized as an assembly, to gain compliance with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Assemblies of this nature are not merely debating societies. They are lawmaking bodies.

Implicit in the OTC is the power to affect markets within the United States;

to control production, profits, and employment here.

It would place us at the mercy of low-wage countries, and all the rest of the world would have an advantage over us in this respect.

We would have nothing to gain and everything to lose right here in the United States.

The announced objective of OTC is the "substantial reduction of tariffs." Even though in 1955 more than 200 trade associations and unions in the United States officially reported serious injury by cheap imports.

Furthermore, since the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, we have cut tariffs by as much as 75 percent. In return we got nothing but promises, which were betrayed when foreign countries increased their tariffs anywhere from 6 to 76 percent.

Due to imports of cheap cotton goods, the American textile industry alone has lost 200,000 jobs in the last 3 years.

Does the State Department show any concern over plight of these, and other jobless Americans whose livelihood has been traded away?

No nation has ever done more to help other nations than the United States. But there is a limit. We cannot give ourselves away.

Already, by imports and expenditures abroad we are putting $20 billion a year into the hands of foreign buyers. What are they doing with this purchasing power? Through tariffs, embargoes, and quotas, they are limiting their purchases of American goods.

We already take a lot of their products, the things that we need, such as tin, coffee, rubber, manganese, and so forth, have long come in duty free. Together with other foreign products that pay only nominal duties, they account for two-thirds of our imports.

But the State Department is not satisfied.

It wants to play international politics, using American industries and American workers as pawns in the game.

This is the same State Department that is considering the recognition of Red China, even though that outlaw government had killed tens of thousands of American boys by naked aggression, and is completely faithless to every moral precept.

This is the State Department that is supposed to protect American interests first.

Fortunately, the Congress of the United States, directly representative of the people, and responsive to their wishes, is alert to this ill-concealed giveaway that the State Department proposes, and will reject it.

H. R. 5550 is unfair to the United States.

INCREASE IN FREIGHT RATES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to learn that the railroads and other carriers which are presently petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission for authority to increase their freight rates and charges by 7 percent, effective February 25, 1956, have, upon the request of the Commission, decided to postpone the effective date of their new tariffs until March 7, 1956, in order to give the Commission more time to study the testimony and render a decision on this important problem.

This latest request by the carriers is the fifth time during the last 10 years that they have petitioned for a general rate increase. Each of the prior requests has been granted in whole or in part. The present level of rates, resulting from such increases, is approximately 80 percent above the level of rates that were in effect on June 30, 1946.

While I recognize that the carriers are entitled to just and reasonable rates, I believe that the shippers and the general public, which ultimately pays the freight, must also be protected. The only way to be sure that justice is done to all is to give the Interstate Commerce Commission all the time that it needs to weigh all the factors carefully, and to arrive at a decision that is fair to all parties concerned. At a later time, I expect to make a more complete statement on this subject.

AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES FOR NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday, February 27, for the Committee on Armed Services to call up the bill (H. R. 8675), to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; that general debate continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not, as I understand, this bill was before our committee before a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from North Carolina. The bill has had ample consideration. It was unanimously reported by the full Committee on Armed Services. It is an important bill and certainly should be disposed of as quickly as possible. I am glad the gentleman has submitted this request for its consideration next Monday.

Mr. VINSON. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the Rules Committee, and it is satisfactory to him that we submit this request instead of going before the Rules Committee and obtaining a rule.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

TVA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, this is the year of decision for the TVA. The administration has sharply reduced appropriation requests for facilities necessary to have kept TVA in position to meet growing demands for power within its area. This year the administration has demanded that TVA greatly increase amortization payments to the Treasury. This demand is fiscally unsound and is a breach of faith with the people of the TVA area.

The failure to request new appropriations for additional facilities, which will soon be desperately needed, was based by this administration on the expectation that in this session of Congress provision would be made authorizing the TVA to issue its own bonds and thereby provide funds for additional facilities without resource to the Public Treasury.

I have long advocated that this be done, provided it is done in a way which would not artificially force up costs and hamstring the agency with redtape.

At the outset I will say that by demanding an abnormal increase in TVA's amortization payments to the Treasury, this administration is stripping the agency of resources which might be essential to the prompt and economical issuance of bonds.

If this proves to be the case, on analysis, the administration again must be condemned for lack of good faith such as was demonstrated in the ill-fated Dixon-Yates contract.

I wish to plead, however, that the Congress act with more speed in making provision for TVA self-financing.

This Congress, as all Members are aware, has been working diligently. We are moving along in consideration of measures of major concern to the Congress and the Nation. Yet in the matter of TVA self-financing, it does not seem to me that we are making the progress hoped for or expected by the people of the Tennessee Valley area.

This is an election year and as such it poses extra problems for Members. As is customary, every effort will be made by both Houses to perform work promptly and to adjourn at a relatively early date.

I fear that if we do not move more expeditiously with TVA matters, they may be left hanging fire, or in the rush of final business we may not be able to give full attention and consideration to this matter which is of such deep concern to the people of my district and the Tennessee Valley.

Some fears have been expressed that if additional facilities are provided, the TVA would somehow break out of its boundaries. This is not the case, and I do not think it ever will be.

What the people of my area wish to assure themselves of is a normal and natural growth in the TVA's ability to serve the growing power demands of its

present area. Any doubt about the ability of the TVA to do so would be a damper on the expansion of business, industry, and agriculture in the entire valley.

This area has made rapid progress in the last 15 years. Much of it can be attributed to the abundance of power generated by TVA. Economic growth of the valley has increased its social stability remarkably. I submit that this has been good for the Nation as a whole. The establishment of and economic stability in any region strengthens the whole. In payment of Federal taxes alone, there has been a marked increase over the past decade and a half.

For every passing day in which TVA is unable to meet the increasing needs for power, the growth of the valley is inhibited just that much. In penalizing, or attempting to penalize, TVA for being the success that it has been, the real victim is not the TVA but the people of the Tennessee Valley. They are an industrious people. They are hard-working people. They are hopeful people. They are fine Americans.

I can see no justification for saying to these people: "You may have no hope. You may make no plans for growth and progress. You must limit your industry." But, in failing to provide for the normally growing power needs of these people, that is just what we are doing.

The people of my district and of the Tennessee Valley, having had experience with the TVA, have been and are now willing to support development projects for many other sections of the Nation. They believe in progress. I ask the Members of this House to keep progress going in the Tennessee Valley. I ask that we act promptly so that the people of my district and the entire Tennessee Valley may know what to expect and what to plan for.

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 9473, which I introduced yesterday embodies the provisions of S. 2875 introduced by the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and other similar bills. But those bills, which have for a primary purpose a long-needed overhauling of the Civil Service Retirement Act, except for one or two very minor provisions, would not benefit present annuitants but only those who are yet to retire.

The several rounds of salary increases which have occurred since 1948 have already produced a wide and only partially bridged gap in benefits between those who retired before that year and those who have retired since. The enactment into law of the provisions of S. 2875 as it stands would widen that gap.

The passage of Public Law 369 during the closing days of the 1st session of the 84th Congress removed for some annuitants a part of the inequities to which those who retired several years ago have been subjected, but it specifically excluded all those whose annuity increases under the law would, when added to the then existing annuity, bring the total to $4,104 or more. H. R. 9473 proposes to eliminate this discriminatory feature of Public Law 369.

Whenever the Congress determines that a cost-of-living increase is warranted for active employees in order that they may enjoy a decent standard of living, it is believed that in all fairness Congress should, at the same time, recognize the plight of the aged, the sick, and the disabled civil service retirees and grant them a similar increase. The principle has been recognized and approved by industry and also by the Kaplan committee. It has solid precedent in our Government, as it has been followed for years by the Navy, Army, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marines, Public Health Service, and some other Government agencies.

To remedy the foregoing deficiencies, H. R. 9473 accordingly includes the following provisions for present retirees which are not in S. 2875. A new section, as follows:

(a) The annuity of any person who now is receiving an annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following the eactment of this act, by $100 plus $10 per each 2 full months elapsed between the commencing date of the annuity and the date of enactment of this act: Provided such increases shall not in any case exceed $300.

(b) The annuity of any person whose annuity was not increased by reason of the limitation contained in Public Law 369, 84th Congress, 1st session, is increased effective on the first day of the second month following the enactment of this act, by an amount in excess of $360; and the limitation in Public Law 369 is repealed as of the date of the enactment of this act.

(c) Section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding: "Annuities shall be adjusted simultaneously with general adjustments in salaries of employees on the same average percentage: Provided no annuitant's annuity shall be decreased by reason of this amendment."

(d) The annuity of any survivor (except as provided in subparagraph (e)) who on the date of the enactment of this act is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity based on the service of an annuitant shall be increased by $80, effective on the first day of the second month following the date of the enactment of this act.

(e) The annuity of any child who on the date of enactment of this act is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity based on the service of a parent annuitant shall be increased by $50, effective on the first day of the second month following the date of the enactment of this act: Provided the annuity of each such child shall not exceed $1,200 divided by the number of children of such parent-annuitant then receiving annuity.

It is fully recognized that the increases covered by H. R. 9473 will not nearly equalize the annuities of employees heretofore retired with the annuities of employees who will retire after January 1, 1957, but it will, to a degree, give them some deserved consideration. A considerable part of the salary deductions collected during their Government career from the employees already retired was in 100-cent dollars, and they are now being paid in 50-cent dollars. Unless there is a decided change in the future value of the dollar, these retired Government servants will continue to be paid in 50-cent dollars.

Other provisions in H. R. 9473 which are different from S. 2875 are as follows:

Annuities are computed at present under a formula using the employee's average annual basic salary for any 5 consecutive years. I believe the average salary period should be based on a 3-year period rather than a 5-year period, and I have so provided in my bill.

Present law provides that certain employees whose duties are hazardous and involve primarily the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the Federal criminal laws may, at age 50 and with 20 years of service, elect to retire, subject to the recommendation of the agency head. This has been interpreted to include FBI agents, customs agents, narcotic agents, port patrol officers, and so forth. S. 2875 would include employees in the field service of the Bureau of Prisons in this category. I have further broadened the provisions of this section to include customs inspectors whose duties I would classify as hazardous since these employees are charged with the preventing of smuggling, and frequently apprehend known or suspected criminals, narcotics peddlers, and so forth.

Under S. 2875 a reduction would be made in the ceiling on annuities from a maximum of 80 percent to 75 percent. I believe it should remain at 80 percent. It seems to me the reduction would be unfair to career employees with long service.

Another provision in S. 2875 is that annuities shall not be assignable, either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process. My bill broadens this to include taxation. Employees pay income taxes on all their yearly earnings, including the amount deducted from their salaries for the retirement fund. There is no reason why they should pay taxes again on the same money that they have put into the retirement fund. Therefore, I am suggesting a $3,000 limitation on which there will be no taxation. Precedence for this has been established in the railroad retirement and social-security systems under which annuities, without limitation, are not subject to taxation.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the

majority whip if he will kindly inform us as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority whip for bringing this matter to the attention of the House at this time.

Monday is District day, but there is no business on the District Calendar. On Monday, under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore obtained, the bill (H. R. 8675) dealing with the National Advisory Committee for aeronautical equipment will be considered.

On Tuesday House Resolution 356, concerning the Government Operations Committee, and H. R. 3383, the Colorado River storage project, will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. The President of Italy will be the guest of the Congress at that time.

Also on Wednesday, the bill H. R. 3383, the Colorado River storage project matter will be further considered.

On Thursday an appropriation bill for general Government matters for 1957 will be considered.

There is the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 404) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 405) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES C. HEALEY, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARE WE LOSING A CONTINENT?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, are we losing a continent? That is a question asked by Adm. Richard Byrd in an article published by him in January 1954. He raised the question because, while other nations have been claiming parts or all of the Antarctic Continent, the United States has not. As he has put it:

> The rest of the world has stuck their finger in the Antarctic pie while Uncle Sam is still sucking his thumb.

Yet, the United States has done more exploratory work in the Antarctic than all those other nations put together. Great Britain, Argentina, Chile, Australia, Norway, and France each have claimed parts. Russia has claimed all of it. She has sent a force to Antarctica to participate in the coming geophysical year activities. She has already planted her flag on the continent and clearly indicates through publicity releases that she intends to press her claims.

The Soviet action and statements have caused some concern in Great Britain. Dr. C. H. M. Waldock, professor of public international law at Oxford University, recently urged Britain to emphatically stake out her claims to the Antarctic before Russia takes over. He disagreed with a Soviet claim that Russia had discovered Antarctica, and said that Britain should maintain its claims with "absolute distinctness."

Argentina has zealously pressed her claims. In 1952, a group of Englishmen sailed toward the Palmer Peninsula, a 750 mile toe which stretches up toward South America. As they approached the shore they were greeted by a volley of shots overhead. It was a warning not to land on Argentine territory. Three days later a 4-gun British Navy frigate appeared on the scene, and an Argentine apology followed. The incident pointed up the competing claims of Argentina and Britain. Palmer Peninsula was named after Nathaniel Palmer, a Yankee sealer who was credited with its discovery in 1821. But Britain, Argentina, and Chile claim it. The latter has buried her claims under a military building constructed there.

Antarctica is a continent of 6 million square miles of land—about as large as the United States and Europe combined. Glacial ice covers most of it except where the mountains rise above the ice. On the fringes there are ice-free areas. Admiral Byrd found one oasis—a green valley protected by high cliffs. He saw fresh water mountain lakes warmed by ocean currents.

Admiral Byrd is now on his fifth expedition to the south polar region. Captain Finne Ronne and Lincoln Ellsworth are two other Americans who have done tremendous exploratory work there. The reports of these three intrepid men indicate quite clearly that the frozen real estate at the bottom of the world is actually a storehouse of fabulous riches. Byrd says he saw a vein filled with enough coal to supply the whole world. He brought back to America evidence that invaluable deposits of oil, copper, silver, molybdenum, iron, gold, and uranium lie beneath the ice waiting to be tapped. Atomic energy and new mining techniques can uncover these vast resources.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the valuable resources in the Antarctic, which could be made available to us when those in the United States become depleted, there is the strategic value of that region to be considered. It could serve as a possible naval or airplane base in the future. Admiral Byrd has said that if the Panama Canal were knocked out in some emergency then naval and commercial vessels would be compelled to sail around the southern tip of South America. It would be vitally important then to have the control of the Palmer Peninsula in our own or friendly hands.

Mr. Speaker, it seems imperative that we delay no longer in asserting our claims to that portion or portions of Antarctica where we have concentrated our exploratory efforts. The National Security Council fully realizes the strategic importance of that region. Congress should act at an early date upon my measure, House Joint Resolution 25, which would declare our sovereignty over those areas. Congress as far back as about 1830 has authorized expeditions to the Antarctic. Whenever the subject of pressing our claims have arisen the State Department has stated that it would not act without congressional direction. But Congress has always failed to act. I think it should act now—in this session. There is no question of colonialism or imperialism involved. There are no people yet living in Antarctica—only penguins. I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which my bill has been referred, will hold early hearings upon it.

IRRIGATION AND POWER PROJECTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I will insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete information relative to the number of irrigation and power projects this country is sponsoring in foreign lands. The RECORD will show there are 139 projects in 32 foreign countries. The International Cooperation Administration, which is a continuation of the Marshall plan and the FOA, sent me a report which shows that from April 3, 1948, to March 31, 1955, we were obligated to spend $288,600,000 on projects in Europe, the Far East, the Near East, Africa, and South Asia.

I know some of my colleagues hesitate to support irrigation or power projects in our own country. They, at the same time, do not hesitate to support similar projects all over the world. Some of these projects are in areas whose names not only mystify, but defy pronunciation. It is my opinion that $288 million plus for these projects is just the beginning. When a project is once started, it must be completed. This will take a good many millions more of the taxpayers' dollars. I have never voted for this giveaway program, which to date has drained the taxpayers of about $50 billion.

I do hope my colleagues will be tolerant when the upper Colorado River project comes up for consideration next week. I hope they will be tolerant and understanding when other good reclamation and power projects are presented for their consideration. In my opinion these projects are nothing more than an investment in the resources of this country. They repay every dollar which is invested in them. On the contrary the Foreign Aid reclamation and power projects pay back not one penny. In some countries they help to produce the very crops that are in surplus here at home. It makes it impossible for us to support our agricultural products. In many of the 32 foreign countries, the good will of this country is at its lowest ebb, in spite of all the dollars poured into these foreign lands. I commend a reading of the report which I will insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SENATOR PAUL DOUGLAS OPPOSES UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished Members of this body just a few moments ago asked your favorable consideration of the upper Colorado scheme. I would ask the Members also in their deliberations to consider the statements of a member of the other body, a distinguished economist, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, who describes it as a lavish, extravagant, and unjustified program, and stated his opposition to it on the basis that, "This project is not good for the Nation. That is why I oppose it."

Other elucidating statements made by Senator DOUGLAS during debate on the project April 20 last year in the other body include the following:

The area covered by this bill is the worst place in the country at which to develop hydroelectric power. * * *

The cost of installing power capacity in the area covered by this bill will be over $500 per kilowatt, or 4 to 5 times the cost on the Tennessee River, and more than 5 times the cost of most dams on the Columbia River. * * *

If we were to pick out one of the worst places in the United States at which to erect a public power project, we would pick out this one. * * *

I doubt that this sum—the appropriation for power—will be paid out, for power from coal oil and shale oil in this region can probably be produced at the same or a lower cost. Furthermore what about atomic energy? Will not that be ready for use in 60 years?

* * * so if we add the hidden interest costs, which will amount to more than $1,100,000,000, the cost of the irrigation features will come to more than $2 billion and the total cost of all features to probably close to $3 billion or more.

The average cost of construction, let alone interest, for the project as a whole would be $952 an acre * * * if we include interest, the cost per acre will be $2,142. The cost for the central Utah project with interest will be $3,953. These are fantastic figures. The most fertile land in the country * * * is not worth more than $600 or $700 an acre. Here we are proposing to spend more than $2,000 an acre for land which, when fully irrigated, will not be worth more than $150 an acre. On a big project, we will be spending approximately $4,000 an acre.

We must remember that these irrigation projects are not in low altitudes * * * (at which) the average temperature is high and the growing season long. They are, instead, in the mountains, at altitudes from 4,500 to 7,500 feet, where the growing season is short, where the winters are long, and where the crops produced will be, by the admission of the proponents of this bill, primarily alfalfa, hay, and some corn, for the feeding of livestock. These are costs which cannot be borne. Irrigation can better be used to put water on the more fertile land of the Midwest to raise the yields per acre there. This would be at a very low cost instead of at the astronomical costs of this project.

* * * who then will pay for this gigantic project? The interest is forgiven, and borne by the taxpayer. Eighty-five percent of the principal is not to be paid by those who own the land, but is supposedly to be saddled on the power revenues. If we examine the costs and the power revenues, we find that it would be almost impossible for the power system to earn the money necessary to meet the 85 percent of direct irrigation costs. * * *

This is a lavish, extravagant, unjustified program.

MISUSE OF WELFARE AND UNION FUNDS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an article in the current March 6 issue of Look stresses the necessity of legislation which will prevent the embezzlement and misuse of welfare funds collected from employers, dues and other funds collected from employees.

The management of Look should be universally commended, especially by the officers of unions and those who are interested in union welfare, for giving wide publicity to the activities of a few dishonest extortionists and racketeers. Some are graphically exposed by Clark Mollenhoff and Fletcher Knebel of Look's Washington bureau. Both Mr. Knebel and Mr. Mollenhoff are well-known fact-finders, whose exposé in this issue of Look is documented and factual.

Unless the warning conveyed in the current issue of Look is heeded, money contributed by employers to a trust fund to be used only for the welfare of employees will continue to be embezzled, wasted, and misspent by individuals who should not go unwhipped of justice.

Unless the public, alerted by this and similar articles, insists upon remedial legislation, union dues and special assessments arbitrarily taken from the employee's pay check will be used to advance the political ambitions of union officers who do not represent the rank and file of organized labor.

The article to which reference is made reads as follows:

CAN BIG LABOR CLEAN HOUSE?

(By Fletcher Knebel and Clark Mollenhoff)

On the crisp December day last year when the AFL and CIO were married, some members of the wedding arrived for the ceremony only one step ahead of the sheriff.

Fifteen million workers entered the new temple of labor. At their head walked 68,000 local leaders. Most of these men came in the honored tradition of trade-unionism, but some came in the name of power and plunder. What distressed those who desired a bright future for the new AFL–CIO was not that a minority had come with unclean hands, but that nobody challenged them at the door.

For 2 years before the merger of the AFL and CIO, congressional investigators had spread upon the record a story that should have shamed every honest champion of labor.

Local union chiefs had played fast and loose with health and welfare funds. One insurance pool was looted of $1 million. Bombings, beatings, and vandalism beat a tattoo on the jukeboxes of the Midwest. Men who dared risk the wrath of labor thugs had their faces smashed.

The cynical self-interest of some labor bosses was bared to public view. Some claimed the fifth amendment privilege before congressional committees on the handling of funds of their own union members. Others got rich while paying lip service to the workingman. One leader bought diamond rings with union money and gave them to fellow labor bosses.

The handling of the $11 billion worth of new union-welfare insurance became a big business. In some places, it also became a big racket, spawning kickbacks, exorbitant commissions to pals of union chiefs and lucrative undercover deals that were cloaked from rank-and-file union members. In some locals, corruption rode into office with allies of the underworld.

The big issue with some labor czars was not how to boost the wages of the men, but how to keep themselves out of the clutches of the internal-revenue agents.

The stench finally became so great in one union, the International Longshoremen's Association, that George Meany, then president of the old AFL, booted that crime-ridden organization out of the AFL. But in the shadows of that expulsion, many officers of other unions who had battened on the wages of labor went unchastised and unrebuked by their superiors in the bureaucracy of labor.

From outside the big AFL–CIO merger, white-crested John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, bellowed a warning to his union contemporaries that human jackals were feeding on these welfare funds.

The new labor merger took account of the mounting criticism. It urged Congress to provide criminal penalties for officers who tamper with union-welfare funds or fail to file financial reports. It also denounced dishonest, corrupt, unethical conduct by union leaders and established a committee on ethical practices.

Al J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists, heads the new five-man committee on ethical practices, which went to work early this year under wide authority to investigate racketeering and corruption.

The big question is not what the committee will find, but what it will do about it. Thus far, precious little has been done. Labor's hierarchy finds it easy to pass the buck. As a sample, the 1,250,000-member Brotherhood of Teamsters, largest union in the AFL–CIO, has been pockmarked with crime and terror, but President Dave Beck has failed to move against the culprits.

When AFL–CIO President George Meany was asked on a CBS-TV panel show if he had delivered Beck an ultimatum to cleanse his union, Meany demurred. "We do not have an FBI," he said. "We do not have an investigating department. We don't have that kind of money. The job of cleaning these things up is in the hands of the international union. They are supposed to watch these things."

One place where these things have been watched is Congress. Here, from the hearings and reports of Senate and House investigative committees, are glimpses of nine men of labor who remained uncensured months after their public testimony:

Eugene C. (Jimmy) James, secretary-treasurer, Laundry Workers International Union:

Senator IRVING M. IVES. "Is there any question that we can possibly ask you here, the answer to which will not incriminate you?"

Mr. JAMES. "I respectfully refuse to answer the question on the ground that the answer may tend to incriminate me."

Jimmy James may have set a record for reluctant witnesses before the Senate subcommittee on welfare and pension plans, headed by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois. He invoked the fifth amendment no less than 229 times at one hearing. He even refused to answer when asked his union connection.

The big question was a $1 million one. A total of $1,008,500 had disappeared in 4 years from money collected to buy insurance premiums for the laundry workers. Through an intricate system of financial juggling, much of the money, according to Senate investigators, went through the hands of Louis B. Saperstein, a favored Newark, N. J., insurance broker, and wound up in a bank account controlled by the handsome, well-tailored Jimmy James.

Seldom has a Senate committee's official report used such words as "embezzled" and "looted," the verbs attached to the shrunken insurance pool of the laundry workers. "It is equally clear," declared the Douglas subcommittee, "that through James and/or Saperstein $900,000 in premiums and $82,500 in special service fees, and $26,000 in proceeds of the local 46 hotel-division funds were embezzled."

The report also stated that "James, who did not have any direct connection with the welfare fund, must bear the ultimate blame for having looted it of substantial money rightfully belonging to the beneficiaries, his own fellow union members."

Jimmy James had come a long way since the day, 15 years ago, when he was running a Detroit pool hall at a loss. He had bulled his way up through the echelons of professional labor organizers with obvious profit. Today, he can afford a limousine, a 10-room ranch house on 35 acres near Wheaton, Ill., 6 horses in the corral and a fine wardrobe of suits with matching accessories.

Jimmy James was cited by the United States Senate for contempt. He still serves as secretary-treasurer of the laundry workers. President Sam J. Byers made no move to unseat him. In fact, Byers missed the hearing on his union's welfare fund. A doctor's certificate excused him from appearing.

Angelo Inciso, president, Local 286, UAW (AFL), Chicago:

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS. What was the purpose of this trip?

Mr. INCISO. I went to Europe to see how the living conditions were and also to see how the situation was.

Senator DOUGLAS. In other words, you were conducting a——

Mr. INCISO. Good-will tour.

Senator DOUGLAS. To whom were you spreading good will?

Mr. INCISO. Myself.

From a general account containing regular union dues and assessments, as well as health- and welfare-insurance funds, the 42-year-old Chicago labor boss financed a $3,400 tour of Europe. Inciso lived high on the hog from the union contributions of his 3,500 members. What's more, he had no apologies to make to nosy Senators. "I fight for them to get them the best of everything, and I am sure that when I travel they should give me the best of everything," he said. Inciso apparently felt, however, that this mutual regard was not shared universally. He arrived for the hearing with two bodyguards, who were requested to check their firearms at the door.

His lush junkets on union funds included trips to South America, with stopovers in Jamaica and Mexico; and to Puerto Rico, Europe, and California. Inciso insisted that these trips were on union business, but Senator DOUGLAS told Inciso's superior: "The only conclusion we can draw is that they are pleasure junkets paid for by relatively low-paid workers." Inciso also sought relaxation in a $45-a-day hotel suite in Las Vegas.

From the $350,000 to $400,000 a year that pours into his union pools, Inciso dispenses largesse to friends as freely as to himself. When a Chicago employer ran low on cash, Inciso loaned him $40,000. He believes he gave one $1,200 "gent's diamond ring" and another $1,100 "gent's diamond ring" to officials of the teamsters' union. Reason: "When you are on strike, it is wonderful to have friends who will * * * help you * * * and the teamsters * * * have done me many such favors." Inciso bought $360 diamond money clips from union funds, gave one to a teamsters' official and another to an attorney.

From his expensive trips abroad, Inciso always returned with an enormous love for the United States, despite past convictions for bootlegging and thievery. "Conditions are so terrible," said Angelo, of South America, "that I tried to forget it."

Inciso is not the only one who manages to forget his trips and easy spending of union funds. The president of the AFL International Union of United Automobile Workers of America, Earl Heaton, has yet to demand that Inciso give an accounting of his personal welfare.

N. Louis (Babe) Triscaro, president, Excavating and Building Materials Local 436, Teamsters Union, Cleveland:

Representative CLARE HOFFMAN. "Did you report the $200 a week, for example, as administrator of the welfare fund?"

Mr. TRISCARO: "I refuse to answer on the ground it may tend to incriminate me."

Babe Triscaro ruled as boss of a welfare fund for his union. He told the House Antiracketeering Subcommittee that he set aside 15 percent of these collected moneys for "administration." From this administrative budget, he promoted the welfare of his teamsters in curious ways—with the approval of union executives, he testified.

He spent $430 for cases of whisky as Christmas gifts to fund officials and gave them $96 worth of fight tickets. He also anted up $250 for a Bill Presser testimonial dinner. Luncheons, baseball tickets, and raffle chances flowed from the insurance pool's "administration."

In 2 years, Triscaro's local collected $790,000 for welfare, but under his rule, only about 20 percent had been used to buy insurance premiums for the workers.

What was he doing with the remainder? The Babe said he intended to build a clinic as a monument to himself.

"There is people," he said, "that are worried about their families. There is people that want to get them free benefits and have those benefits for a fact. And I felt that it would have been a sort of monument to me and the papers would have to throw flowers at me instead of dirt as they have been doing for the last 23 or 24 years. So I felt that it would be a monument to me and my membership."

As for his own income during the years when the welfare of his members nestled so close to his heart, Triscaro invoked a brand of welfare for himself and sought refuge behind the fifth amendment when questioned about matters in his income-tax returns.

Triscaro still rules his union roost; President Dave Beck of the International Teamsters has made no move to dislodge him.

Edward J. Gallagher, president, Pointers, Cleaners & Calkers Union, Local No. 52, Chicago.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT: "And there is no appeal to any person from your decision as to how funds shall be spent?"

Mr. GALLAGHER: "No, sir."

Ed Gallagher operated one of the fanciest vanishing union welfare funds of our era, a hearing before a Senate subcommittee on welfare and pension funds indicated. A 7½-cent-per-hour levy on employers yielded the Pointers, Cleaners & Calkers' welfare fund $215,752 in 4 years. At the end of that period, the fund had shriveled to $7,339, with hardly a scrap of documentary evidence to show that union members had received any benefits from it. Part of the money was transferred by check into the union's "defense" fund, whence it went out on drafts which were cashed in spots ranging from a Chicago bar and grill to a Florida motel.

Gallagher stoutly maintained that he doled out the cash in "welfares" to members who needed it for ailments, births, funerals, etc. But he admitted he had scant written proof to show the nature of the welfare. Even his attorney, Nathan Cohen, conceded that Senators might properly term Gallagher's method of operation: "How Not To Operate a Welfare Fund."

Endorsements on some of the checks seemed to indicate transactions far from the realm of hospitals and clinics: a $1,166 repair bill for Gallagher's new Cadillac; a $347.07 check to an airline for tickets to Miami; a $1,700 payment on a Chrysler for a union official.

One $500 check through a furrier was explained by Gallagher as probably a 10-week disability payment to a member who used it to buy something for a "sweetheart" or "whatever you might call it."

The Senators were not impressed by Gallagher's protest of virtue in connection with the vanishing welfare fund. Their report concluded "that a great portion of the welfare fund and, for that matter, the other fund created by deductions from employees' wages went to the benefit of Gallagher."

The Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union, presided over by Harry C. Bates, has taken no action on Ed Gallagher of its Chicago affiliate.

Anthony Doria, international secretary-treasurer, UAW (AFL).

Mr. DORIA: "I think labor representatives today are entitled to the position they hold."

Senator DOUGLAS: "To diamond rings?"

Mr. DORIA: "If the man sitting across the table from me wears a diamond ring, I think I am entitled to the same thing. I represent my people on the same level."

President Angelo Inciso's fast and loose spending of union funds of a local under Doria's jurisdiction troubled the international secretary-treasurer not a whit. In fact, he was at pains to explain to investigating Senators that a new day of plush comfort had downed for labor leaders. Diversion of money collected for the benefit of the rank and file to the high living of union officials received his tacit approval. He declined to plunge into the icy water of ethics.

Senator DOUGLAS denounced as highly improper, if not illegal, the practice of expensive junkets from union funds by the men entrusted with the money. Doria believed DOUGLAS had missed the point.

"Senator, to the contrary," he said. "It is expenditures such as these that expand the horizon of labor leaders to the point

where they can more adequately compete with what is sitting across the table from them that has been doing this for 100 years."

This attitude toward the custodians of these funds has brought no public reprimand from Doria's immediate superior, Earl Heaton, international president of the AFL auto workers.

William Presser, president, Ohio Conference of Teamsters.

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN: "Didn't you withdraw from the Cleveland Trust Co. during 1952 something like $46,829.88?"

Mr. PRESSER. "I refuse to answer that question on the ground it may tend to incriminate me."

In the course of one session before a House antiracketeering subcommitte, headed by Representative GEORGE H. BENDER, Republican, of Ohio, Presser used that phrase or its equivalent 55 times, even refusing to answer the simple inquiry as to what compensation he received from his teamsters' union.

Presser is lord of a jukebox and cigarette-vending machine empire that sprawls over northern Ohio. The nickels and quarters yield a rich harvest. A typical location for a vending machine is valued at $300. In 1953, Presser was fined $1,500 on a Federal charge of conspiring to create a monopoly in the candy and cigarette business.

A criminal record is no bar to employment under Presser. According to witnesses and the report of the Bender subcommittee, this is the pattern of operations in Presser's domain: Employers are forced to join the union. Operators outside the association risk stench-bombings, beatings, picketings, and wrecked machines. Distributors who sell to operators on the union blacklist learn what enforcement means. One distributor who tried it was bombed 2 days later. Another operator who was stench-bombed 3 times now carries a .38 for protection.

Although Presser disclaimed liability for violence in his territory, the subcommittee found that it "must of necessity be the responsibility of Presser." More than a year has passed since the congressional report, but International President Dave Beck of the teamsters has taken no action on Presser.

Paul Dorfman, secretary-treasurer, local 20467, Waste Material Handlers' Union, Chicago:

William F. McKenna, general counsel of House Committee on Government Operations:

Mr. MCKENNA. "Mr. Dorfman, do you report part of the income of the Union Insurance Agency of Illinois on your returns as personal income each year?"

Mr. DORFMAN: "I decline to answer the question. The answer might tend to incriminate me."

House investigators received 70 similar answers from Paul Dorfman. Most of the investigative interest centered about Dorfman's connection with the Union Insurance Agency of Illinois, which handled lucrative union welfare-fund accounts of the Union Casualty and Life Insurance Company of Mount Vernon, N. Y.

Dorfman admitted that his wife Rose and his son Allen were partners in Union Insurance, but declined to answer questions about his wife's cut of the profits. However, a committee investigator presented a breakdown. It showed that in fiscal 1952, Allen Dorfman got $31,000 or one-fourth of the net profits, while Rose Dorfman received three-fourths, or $94,000. The following year, the investigator said, they split the net profits 50–50, or $118,500 for each.

Commissions and expenses received by the agency in a 4-year period totaled $791,000, according to the investigators, the bulk of it in connection with two teamsters' welfare funds and a fund of local 1031 of the electrical workers.

Paul Dorfman testified he knew both James Hoffa of the teamsters and Frank Darling of the electrical workers, but declined to answer when asked if he discussed insurance with them.

Allen Dorfman, the son, invoked the fifth amendment 64 times while appearing before the House committee.

Paul Dorfman still rules as secretary-treasurer of the Waste Material Handlers' Union, which operates on a direct charter from American Federation of Labor headquarters. President George Meany has taken no action in the matter.

James R. Hoffa, vice president, Brotherhood of Teamsters;

WILLIAM F. MCKENNA: "How many Cadillacs do your business agents use?"

Mr. HOFFA: "Well, I'll tell you, we have, let's see, in our particular local union I guess maybe about 11 Cadillacs, or 12. We have a couple of Fords and maybe a Mercury. * * * We change them every year."

When Jimmy Hoffa, labor's little Napoleon, meets one of his teamsters, he likes to fling a "Hiyuh, capitalist!" greeting. As a servant of the workingman, Hoffa has become quite a capitalist himself. His individual and family ventures show no lack of vision.

They included, according to testimony before a House Subcommittee on Welfare Funds and Labor Racketeering, headed by Representative WINT SMITH, Republican, of Kansas, an outfit known as Test Fleet, Inc., which leased equipment to a company hauling automobiles. Hoffa's wife and Mrs. Owen Bert Brennan, wife of another Detroit teamster official, established the business for $4,000. Within 4 years, the subcommittee said, it had returned the ladies $62,000 in dividends, although their only work was to ask that a dividend be declared now and then.

Hoffa said he owned a $10,000 chunk of Northwestern Oil Co. in North Dakota. Others with a $10,000 interest included an officer and an agent of the insurance company which held the teamsters' welfare-insurance business, with a fat profit for the company.

Other past Hoffa enterprises were half of a $25,000 stock interest in a realty company, a share of the Columbus Trotting Association, which operated a racetrack, and a $3,500 share of Jack-O-Lantern Lodge, a Wisconsin girls' camp. Other investors in the girls' camp included insurance agents for the firm that handled the teamsters' welfare account. Hoffa also said he lost $20,000 in a "little syndicate" that included a brewery.

For a time, Mrs. Hoffa drew $100 a week on the payroll of the jukebox local in Detroit, but never went near the office. Hoffa said this was really a method to repay him money he loaned to the union.

At the time House investigators quizzed him in 1953, Hoffa also swore that he owed more than $38,000 to individuals, although none of the sums were formalized in notes or other evidence of intention to repay.

House probers were interested in Hoffa's capitalistic ventures primarily because some of them involved mutual investments with Dr. Leo Perlman, head of Union Casualty and Life, and Allen Dorfman, head of Union Insurance Agency, which handled huge teamster welfare funds under Hoffa's influence. Hoffa said he received no money for swinging the insurance to the Dorfmans and Perlman, but he insisted on his right to draw a normal profit from joint business enterprises with these same people.

Hoffa, twice convicted of labor-law violations, still retains his official teamster positions. International President Dave Beck has made no move to oust him. Some people think Beck couldn't—that Hoffa has more power than Beck.

M. Frank Darling, President and business manager, Local 1031, Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Chicago:

Representative PHIL M. LANDRUM: "You think he just paid you $42,000 to have his name spread out over the air?"

Mr. DARLING: "I think he felt the advertising for a new company competing against older companies for insurance, and particularly advertising that would reach factory workers that he was trying to reach, that he thought it was worth it."

In addition to his chores for the Chicago electrical workers' local, Frank Darling had active financial dealings of his own.

One of them was an 80-percent interest in a short-lived girls' baseball league. For one team, he obtained a $42,000 sponsor, Allen Dorfman's Illinois agency. In return, the girls advertised the insurance firm on their uniforms. What interested House investigators in this deal was the fact that Dorfman's agency handled the rich welfare fund of Darling's Local 1031 of the electrical workers, which in 4 years paid premiums totaling $2,500,000. In 4 years, Allen Dorfman's commissions on the deal totaled $250,000, the Smith subcommittee reported. Dorfman's partner in the agency was his mother.

Admiral Corp., which employed five or six thousand members of Darling's union, also anted up $20,000 for sponsorship of one of Darling's girl baseball teams. The Smith subcommittee noted that girl baseball was a "personal enterprise of Union President Darling" and "totally unrelated" to collective bargaining between the company and Darling's union.

Darling's union office sweetened his financial life in other directions. He received commissions from a furniture and appliance store which gave discounts to his union members. He received about $1,000 in 1952 from check-cashing companies which cashed paychecks of his union members at a profit. Darling said he arranged with company officials to permit the check cashers to park outside the plant's gates.

If some of Darling's ventures seemed to indicate a conflict of interest, officials at international headquarters were not disturbed. Neither the late International President J. Scott Milne nor his successor, Gordon M. Freeman, made any move to oust or censure Darling.

These are but nine men of labor. There are scores of other Pressers, Dorfmans, Gallaghers, and Jameses ruling unions throughout the land. Some have been investigated by Congress, Others have not. The question before labor's new house is what the Hayes committee on ethical practices will do about them.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 8750.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

TREE PLANTING ON SURPLUS CROPLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in 1949, 16 of my distinguished colleagues in the House from both sides of the aisle joined me in introducing legislation to provide cooperative forest management advice and assistance to farmers and other owners of small woodlands. The proposed bill became law in 1950 and now some 270 technically trained foresters are employed by 41 States which are

cooperating with our Federal Forest Service in this woodland management endeavor. Each year now some 30,000 small owners are helped to do a better job of growing, harvesting, and marketing their tree crop.

Mr. Speaker, the tree crop is one that is not in surplus. It never has been in surplus. A recent review of our timber resource status for the next 50 years indicates increasing needs for the products of our forests—particularly pulp and paper products. We know that there are some 60 million acres of denuded, overcut and depleted forest land in need of regeneration to trees. Tree planting is therefore truly a subject of great importance and of national interest.

We are fortunate today that the general public, and more particularly our farmers, realize that trees can be used for many purposes. Tree seedlings can be planted on open lands, grown for a various number of years, harvested for pulpwood or lumber, or just left to grow as insurance against a time when national needs in an emergency may require huge quantities of wood and cellulose derivatives such as were required in World War II.

In the proposals to create a national soil bank there are millions of acres of surplus croplands which can be planted to trees. However, the farmer who diverts such land needs Federal aid in the form of tree seedlings and technical help to get them planted and tended for the several years it takes to establish the new plantation. There are many such acres in the South that can be diverted to trees, for whatever period desirable, then if conditions demand, the better acres could be converted back to the growing of crops.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today will make it possible to give farmers the tree seedlings needed to plant open lands that have been declared surplus for the growing of crops. The bill also provides the additional technical forest management assistance necessary to insure a good job of planting and care of the seedlings being done by the farmer. It will help get surplus croplands in the South into trees; it will do this same job anywhere in the Nation where incentives are needed to get the tree planting job on diverted acres underway.

One feature of the bill calls for the State forestry commissions to appoint a county forestry or tree planting committee to act as an advisory group to counsel with the other State and Federal agencies in the counties in the preparation of a coordinated tree planting plan.

Since there are some 90 forest tree nurseries now being operated by 43 States in cooperation with the United States Forest Service, a local county advisory group familiar with tree planting procedures as to the procurement of seedlings will be essential to help plan and carry out the tree planting activities at the county level.

Mr. Speaker, the planting of forest tree seedlings on designated surplus croplands is a sound idea. It would not solve the problem of huge crop surpluses now on hand, but it will help to prevent the further accumulation of these surpluses.

It is my hope that the Congress will give serious attention to this matter of the careful and calculated use of trees in any program of Federal aid and assistance to farmers in the wise use of their surplus cropland. Land in a national soil bank that is put to work growing trees will be a capital investment that will produce attractive annual interest rates. Well stocked forests return up to 15 percent per year interest on the investment. At the same time the land will be protected from deterioration while growing a crop that never has been in surplus.

I feel that sound and substantial progress is being made in the great field of forestry conservation and improvement in the United States. We are fortunate in having an able and dedicated Forest Service. It is headed by Richard E. McArdle, one of the greatest foresters this Nation has produced. He is joined in this work by an outstanding corps of capable and conscientious experts on forestry. The Nation is fortunate also in the caliber of the State foresters who are spearheading effective work in their respective States. Representative of this group are Joseph Kaylor, of Maryland, and H. C. Coulter, of Florida. Through the efforts of the State and National leaders like these, America can truly rejoice in the efforts which are being made to save her forests. Even so, we are barely holding our own. The great work of education in conservation must be stepped up and forest conservation must be improved if we are to meet the demands of the future. The proposal set forth in my bill is only one step, but I believe it is an important step and I hope it will receive the endorsement of my colleagues.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished colleague who has always been outstanding in this important field.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I compliment the gentleman for his outstanding work in behalf of forestry in this country. Would the gentleman's bill furnish free seedlings to those who have already reduced their acreage? Is the gentleman's bill broad enough to cover that?

Mr. SIKES. It is broad enough to cover that phase also.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has expired.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after coming to Congress, I had the privilege of attending a banquet honoring Captain Carlson, the brave commander of the *Enterprise*, which he rode for 13 days while it floated on its side in a turbulent and stormy sea. That act of loyalty, bravery, and devotion captured the interest of good people everywhere. After many eulogies, Captain Carlson was presented and afforded an opportunity to speak, and the following is almost verbatim what he said:

> I deserve no honor nor praise. I am only a plain seaman who was entrusted with a little piece of America, and my only regret is that I failed to bring it safely home.

Mr. Speaker, it was men like Captain Carlson who gave us this country for our home, and every Member of Congress is peculiarly given the responsibility of guiding the destiny of this Nation for the purpose that it shall always remain our home, strong and undivided. In humble recognition of that trust and accompanying responsibility, it is sometimes hard to determine when to speak and not speak. This much I do know: if my uttered thoughts will add to the confusion of the moment, then I owe it to my God and country the duty to remain silent. On the other hand, when I see this great country of ours torn with strife and confusion, if I can add a single word of counsel, or furnish any information to the end that peace, friendship, and understanding can prevail over our land, even though that counsel is not accepted, and my feeble efforts come to naught, I am constrained to believe that I owe the duty to the present and to posterity to speak out.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled and sorely grieved over the strife and bitterness aroused over our land at a time when everyone knows, or should know, that we are facing the most critical era in all of human history. Never has it been so important that the true and loyal citizens of this country stand agreed and united. I do not like strife; neither do my people. I do not like the idea of stirring section against section, as apparently some do, and neither do the people whom I represent. There is nothing romantic in fighting or the drawing of blood, and no one knows this better than I or my people. Some have said in the past few days, and there is substance to those sayings, that internal strife in this country has mounted to such alarming proportions that the present is comparable to the days of 1860. God grant that these statements are wrong. The War Between the States constitutes the blackest pages of our history. Fire-eaters and agitators both North and South brought about that tragic era. Good men both North and South worked fervently and prayerfully for a peaceful solution then, but the voice of reason was drowned out by demagogues and the ignorant of that day. During those terrible and trying days preceding that gigantic war—and it was a horrible war, some of the battles still being comparable to the major battles of World Wars I and II, snuffing out the lives of the cream of our young manhood both North and South—a kinsman of mine stood on the floor of Congress, and though the atmosphere was charged with hatred and prejudice, quoted the Biblical statements of Abraham to Lot, saying:

> Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee. Is not the whole land before us? * * * If we cannot agree, let us divide it.

Those were the words of Alexander H. Stevens, of Georgia. Perhaps the

strongest friendship existing in the Congress at that time was a strange paradox, because that friendship was between Stevens of Georgia and Abraham Lincoln of Illinois. As then, so it is now; the agitators did not do the fighting, and it was the quiet, peaceful boys of the North who died by the thousands in Virginia, Mississippi, Georgia, and other Southern States, and the identical type of beardless boys from the South, many of whom now sleep in unmarked graves in the Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania hills. Mr. Speaker, simply as a matter of history and probably in explanation of my present position, my mother's father spoke out against secession at the secession convention in Georgia. My grandfather said then:

> Let us not grow weary in seeking a peaceful solution. Even the agitators, both northern and southern, are mortal. The grave will claim them, if good people will postpone their grievances to a more convenient time.

He recommended against secession, but said that if that was the act of his State, then he would offer his life to his State, and as captain of the 11th Georgia Regiment under Longstreet, though always small and never strong physically, he participated in all of the battles of northern Virginia, beginning with Manassas, including Gettysburg, and was with General Lee when he surrendered at Appomattox.

Mr. Speaker, I know war, and I know the result of strife. Beginning with the Revolution, young men by my name and by my mother's name have given their lives in battle. In the district I represent is Andersonville Cemetery. Thirteen thousand northern prisoners died and are buried there. Many times have I walked through the cemetery and read the names of those who sleep there. They are American names, they were American boys, just as the southerners were American boys, and I always shuddered over the realization that both sides lost thousands of men that this country could ill afford to spare. Disloyal people agitate, Mr. Speaker, but only the loyal fight and die.

Mr. Speaker, a sad situation exists over my section today. Of a truth, it exists in every section. This condition is not caused by the old-fashioned Yankee, or by the old-fashioned southerner. This confusion and strife lie directly at the door of the arch enemies of the church, and the human race. This condition was started by Lenin, carried on by Stalin, and furthered by the Communist Party International. That I want to burn into the heart of every person who loves this country. I know whereof I speak. I am weighing my words carefully, for who knows but what someday all of our remarks on this floor will be scrutinized carefully by future generations, and that we will be judged by what we have said and done here. We must tell the truth and the truth only, for only truth can stand through eternity.

Mr. Speaker, the House Un-American Activities Committee has repeatedly furnished to us and to the public unassailable and unimpeachable evidence that the Communists began years ago to stir up racial strife in America. Sad to relate, but completely true. This conspiracy could have been wiped out years ago, but the United States Supreme Court, by the reversal of a conviction in Georgia rendered it impossible to destroy that conspiracy. In the 175th Georgia Supreme Court report, pages 832–869, will be found the case of Herndon against the State. Herndon was indicted in Fulton County, Ga., for the offense of attempting to incite insurrection, and the Fulton County jury did its duty and convicted Herndon, and the court did its duty and sentenced Herndon to the penitentiary for not less than 5 and not more than 20 years. In that report, the evidence in that case is found. It was proven that Herndon joined the Communist Party in Kentucky and was sent to Atlanta as an organizer for that party; that he held meetings in vacant houses and in private homes; that the Communist Party was declaring that this country must be overthrown by force and violence, and that he was teaching this doctrine at those meetings; also, that they must accept the Communist Party decisions, irrespective of their own opinions; that the Communists were planning for the Negro of the South a territory known as the Black Belt, containing portions of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and Georgia, and thence up the coast through several States, and that in this territory the Negroes would be given the complete rights of self-determination, including the right to set up their own government in this territory, and the right to separate from the United States; that all of the lands in that territory would be taken from the whites and given to the Negroes. It appeared quite plainly that this territory was to be acquired only through successful revolutionary struggle, and by force and violence.

Mr. Speaker, in volume 301, United States Code Reports, pages 242–264, will be found the majority opinion of the United States Supreme Court reversing the conviction of Herndon in Georgia. Some of the so-called tired old men who sat upon that Court dissented, thinking that Herndon's conviction should stand. Those men were not tired, but disgusted over the failure of our highest court to sustain the principles on which this country must exist. God bless those so-called tired old men.

Mr. Speaker, had the United States Supreme Court called a halt then, communism could have been snuffed out as easily as passing your hand over a candle to extinguish its flame. The House Un-American Activities Committee has repeatedly told us how Communist organizations would bring Negroes from the South up to large cities in the North, indoctrinate them with communism, and send them back South to sow the seeds of discontent. I personally know this to be true. Before coming to Congress, as prosecuting attorney I tried the cases known as the Ingram cases. A Negress and her 3 sons ambushed and methodically killed a white man 65 years of age and weighing 125 pounds. This man was murdered with a rifle, claw hammer, hoe, and rake by all 4 of the Ingrams as he lay helpless upon the ground. These persons were tried and convicted, having every constitutional right accorded them. The sentences were for life imprisonment. The next afternoon, while sitting in my room at home, I was startled to hear a radio broadcast emanating from California wherein it was charged that this Negress and her sons had been railroaded to prison. Within 24 hours my judge was literally deluged with telegrams from all sections of this country, all using practically identical language and expressions of hatred, some of which contained the names of Communists, with their Communist lodge numbers, as they had not gone underground at that time. This identical language told me, and should tell everyone, that they were simply the result of instructions from headquarters. Millions of dollars were raised over this country ostensibly for the defense of the Ingrams, and this I can prove.

The House Un-American Activities Committee has previously taken notice of the fact that millions of dollars have been raised for the Communists by these campaigns. The NAACP entered into the Ingram case. The Civil Rights Congress distributed leaflets all over Chicago denouncing the South. When the motion for new trial was heard in Americus, approximately 250 persons from other sections of the country descended upon that little town. They did everything they could to incite a riot. They invaded the jail and the private home of the sheriff. I was there and well understood what they wanted to accomplish. They wanted one southerner to strike them so they could wire Congress that civil-rights legislation must be enacted against the barbarians of the South. I restrained the southerners, but no one could restrain those shock troops. They were not looking for the truth and they did not want the truth. They did not want the truth then, and they do not want the truth now. They did not think nearly as much of the Ingrams as you do, and they simply used that incident to promote their cause. I have the complete file of that case, Mr. Speaker, including the telegrams, and I will be delighted to show them to any congressional committee. As a sample of what some of the Negro newspapers did, I have a newspaper published by one of the largest, wherein it tells of them sending a reporter to Georgia to see the Ingrams, and that he was tied to a lamppost in Atlanta, severely beaten, and was told that was the way we treated Yankees. The paper goes on to say that this brave, loyal, and truthful reporter did finally get to Americus, went to the old wooden jail, and talked with the Ingrams. The truth is that the reporter never got any further than Atlanta, inasmuch as he became enamored over a colored female in Atlanta, spent his money in debauchery, and wrote that terrible lie. Instead of the jail being a wooden jail, it is and was completely of brick construction and built about the year 1900. Then you might want to see an edition from another large Negro newspaper, wherein it published the photograph of the Negress defendant holding up a sweater which had been torn to shreds, and above that photograph in

boxcar headlines, was this statement: "He Tried To Go With Me." So, that paper spread to the four corners of this country the lie that she and her children killed the white man in defense of her honor.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the visit of that reporter, I had personally held that sweater in my hand many times. I tell you. and all the officers working on this homicide will tell you that the sweater was not torn until the visit of that reporter. I also tell you that I had repeatedly discussed this homicide with that defendant and she had repeatedly told me that the white man had never made any improper advances or suggestions to her, but contended to the officers and to me that the killing was done to prevent the white man from shooting her with a rifle. The evidence of course showed that no self-defense was involved, and that the white man was ambushed and chased 200 yards before he was caught from behind and methodically beaten to death.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the South has, for all practical purposes, been invaded. The case that I have related my personal experience with has been repeated time and time again in my section. The United States Court has destroyed our white primary. To destroy that primary, you would have to decide that a straw vote held by southern white people was illegal. Now, under the United States Supreme Court edict, despite the fact that before that decision virtually every Negro in Georgia claimed to be a Republican, they are now voting as Democrats in our primary, and then voting en bloc in the general election, without any regard whatsoever for their obligation to support the candidate nominated in the primary. So, they are getting 2 votes to 1 vote for the white man. I could tell you for days and days wrongs that have been inflicted upon the white people of the South, but I shall only attempt to tell enough now that would cause an honest person to see the situation in its true light. I well know that there are groups in America which positively do not intend to believe. The Communist conspiracy was that the fight against us would be first waged on the grounds of equality, but denying that intermarriage and integration was sought or desired. That lasted only for a season. They are now demanding in unmistakable terms social equality and intermarriage. In fact, they are now contending that their race is the greatest in all history, and that they are only displaced Africans. I have never read in history where all of the native Africans were displaced, but I suppose the Communists could prove that as easily as they do that the Wright brothers did not build the first airplane.

In the South, the Negroes incited by outsiders first started the boycott and the bringing of economic pressure. I had hoped that they would not. I hope now that they will quit. They cannot win an economic boycott, and I will tell you why. No matter how low you reduce a white man in poverty, the white man will rise again from his own efforts. There is very little in history that would justify the Negro in feeling that he would do so by his own efforts. The economic pressure groups formed in the South by white people were simply in answer to the economic pressure put into practice by the Negro. Since the economic pressure and boycott theory they inaugurated did not turn out so well for the Negro, the NAACP and the Antidefamation League of the B'nai B'rith would pass a Federal law making it a felony for white people to join any such organizations, and they ask this legislation knowing full well that they are the ones who set these practices into motion.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that any State in the Union has finer school buildings for the Negroes than does my State of Georgia. They were built for the Negroes by the white man's tax dollars, in the full faith that the United States Supreme Court would hold that separate but equal school facilities would satisfy all constitutional concepts. Now, this so-called superior race does not wish to be left to themselves. Strange, isn't it. Only the inferior could possibly insist upon mixing with a group when they know they are not wanted.

Now, a great hue and cry is heard over the land about the trouble at the University of Alabama and the troubles in Mississippi. Just why some people in other sections want to regulate our conduct from our cradle to our graves, I will never know. Never have we tried to regulate other sections of this country except our own. It is not because we do not know of many more grievous circumstances that have occurred in other sections than have occurred in our section. We know that in New York City gangs of Negroes are running wild on the streets, shooting, stabbing, robbing, and raping. We have heard of the wolf gangs in Harlem. We know about the terrible race riots in Detroit. We know about the race riot in Cicero. Some of us have even read the book by Camille DeRose, in which she tells how this race riot was planned by the NAACP, and how she was betrayed by her disloyal colored friends. We know the charges that were made in her book about corrupt courts, and the unfaithful officers in those courts. We also know that the only way we could properly judge what the facts were in any of these instances we would have had to have been on the ground and witnessed them first hand. Consequently, we do not indict and convict those cities. We leave those matters strictly to them, to be determined in the manners that their consciences dictate. All that we ask, and I think it is a reasonable request, is that they quit indicting and convicting us when they should know that they are incapable of knowing the facts.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago my State was gratuitously insulted by the United States Department of Justice. That Department ordered the FBI to investigate the jury system of Cobb County. That investigation cannot be justified, for if the jury system had been illegally set up, every defendant would have had the right to challenge that jury system before going to trial in any case. Everyone knows that upon any kind of showing of any irregularity in a jury panel in Georgia, that the United States Supreme Court will set aside the verdict of that jury.

Mr. Speaker, there is another problem that I wish to discuss, which I think is or should be of much concern to our country. That problem is that in our military, some of our southern boys are being mistreated because they are imbued with our southern traditions, and even their right of expression of their views is being denied them. Has the time come in this country that a man cannot express his opinion while serving his country? If so, when did that time come about? Mr. Speaker, for some reason, maybe economic, the exact reason I do not know, our southern people have liked the military. The South and the West furnished this country practically all of the admirals and generals that led our armies to victory in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to remind the public that Gen. Courtney Hodges, the commander of the First Army, and the first army that penetrated into Germany, was from the little town of Perry, Houston County, Ga., and in the district that I have the honor to represent. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that General Hodges believed in our southern traditions, but he was a wonderful fighting man, wasn't he? Mr. Speaker, Captain Dixon, that intrepid young flyer that thrilled the world in the early days of World War II by his simple announcement to his commander, "Scratch off another flattop," was born and reared in the little city of Richland, Stewart County, Ga. The world was glad to hear that news, Mr. Speaker, because up to that time our forces in the Pacific were faring badly indeed. His father and his family still live in Richland, and I apprehend, Mr. Speaker, that every one of them is completely southern, but unalterably a loyal citizen of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the district that I have the honor to represent will always remember with pride that young Luther Story, Americus, Ga., weight 125 pounds, was probably the greatest hero in that so-called police action in bleak and mountainous Korea. Luther Story has not been aggrandized, but his record and the citation accompanying the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously awarded to his mother tells eloquently what he did. He was Private Story, Company A, 9th Infantry Regiment, a weapons squad leader. The citation says that Story observed a large group of the enemy crossing the river to attack Company A, and that he seized a machine gun from his wounded gunner and killed an estimated 100 enemy soldiers. And, facing certain encirclement, the company commander ordered a withdrawal, but Private Story noticed the approach of a truck loaded with enemy troops and towing an ammunition trailer. Alerting his comrades to take cover, he fearlessly stood in the middle of the road throwing grenades into the truck; out of grenades, he crawled to his squad, gathered up additional grenades, and again attacked the vehicle. Private Story was wounded in this action, but disregarded his wounds and rallied the men about

him and repelled the attack. Realizing that his wounds would hamper his comrades, he refused to retire to the next position, but remained to cover the company's withdrawal. When last seen by his withdrawing comrades, he was firing every available weapon and fighting off another hostile assault. Mr. Speaker, Private Story, his mother and father, sisters and brothers, and all of his people were and are complete adherents to our southern sentiments. We have many others in our district that are made from the same kind of mold, who will fight for our Republican form of government, and I do not believe there is anyone here so naive that he would not welcome this assistance. I know, however, that there are some in our country who would deny such people any right of voice whatever in this Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to read and hear people arguing that my people have rebelled against our Government, because my people say that the United States Supreme Court decision concerning segregated schools was wrong. Those people do not know history, or else they feel that my people occupy a colonial status and should not be permitted to express their opinion. I think it well at this time to give our critics the benefit of some history. I want to tell those critics that one of the motivating causes of that unfortunate War Between the States was that the North and East refused to accept a United States Supreme Court decision.

I am referring to the Dred Scott decision. Beveridge, in his book Abraham Lincoln, IV, page 158, has this statement:

> Not until Republican leaders in the Senate next year, as a matter of party strategy, concentrated their attacks on the complicity of the Supreme Court in a crafty scheme to spread slavery over the whole country, did Lincoln take up that indictment.

On pages 157, 158, same volume, we read:

> The Dred Scott decision, cried Trumbull, was an "odious and infamous opinion of a slave driving court which must be wholly and totally revolutionized."

Consequently it appears, Mr. Speaker, that an entire political party in the year 1857 not only criticized a Supreme Court decision, but demanded that the decision be revolutionized. That helped bring about a war, but I doubt that any southerner disputed their right to oppose the decision, although they did not agree on the dispute.

President Abraham Lincoln vigorously denounced the Dred Scott decision, and I think, whether he was right or wrong, he had the right as an American citizen to do it, it being an American privilege. In Springfield, Ill., June 26, 1857, Mr. Lincoln said:

> We think the Dred Scott decision is erroneous. We know the Court that made it has often overruled its own decisions, and we shall do what we can to have it to overrule this.

Also:

> Judicial decisions are of greater or less authority as precedents according to circumstances. That this should be so accords both with commonsense and the customary understanding of the legal profession. If this important decision had been made by the unanimous concurrence of the judges, and without any apparent partisan bias, and in accordance with legal public expectation, and with the steady practice of the departments throughout our history, and had been in no part based on assumed historical facts which are not really true; or, if wanting in some of these, it had been before the court more than once, and had been affirmed and reaffirmed through a course of years, it then might be, perhaps would be, factious, nay, even revolutionary not to acquiesce in it as a precedent. But when, as is true, we find it wanting in all of these claims to the public confidence, it is not resistance, it is not factious, it is not even disrespectful, to treat it as not having yet quite established a settled doctrine for the country. But Judge Douglas considers this view awful.

In that speech, Mr. Lincoln referred to the fact that this same Supreme Court once decided a national bank would be constitutional, but General Jackson, as President, disregarded the decision and vetoed a bill for a recharter, partly on constitutional grounds, using this as an argument to buttress his contention that objections did not constitute rebellion. Also, in that same address, Mr. Lincoln said:

> That all there ever was in the way of precedent up to the Dred Scott decision, on the points therein decided, had been against that decision.

And again in the same speech, Mr. Lincoln said:

> Again and again have I heard Judge Douglas denounce that bank decision and applaud General Jackson for disregarding it. It would be interesting for him to look over his recent speech, and see how exactly his fierce philippics against us for resisting Supreme Court decisions fall upon his own head.

Also:

> I have said, in substance, that the Dred Scott decision was in part based on assuming historical facts which were not really true, and I ought not to leave the subject without giving some reasons for saying this: I therefore give an instance or two, which I think fully sustain me.

Then, Mr. Lincoln proceeded to point out statements made by Justice Taney which he said were not historically true, and cited statements by Judge Curtis, who said that Justice Taney had erred in the recitation of historical facts.

Mr. Speaker, all of these quotations from Mr. Lincoln have been taken from Lincoln Works I, Nicolay and Hay, pages 226 to 230, which I obtained from the Library of Congress. So we say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Lincoln did exactly what my people are doing. My people have not rebelled against this Government because of the school case decision, although they have criticized that decision. Criticism of that decision has not been restricted to the South, but actually is common amongst the legal fraternity in every section of the United States. Everything Mr. Lincoln said about the Dred Scott decision applies equally to the school decision, except in one particular; maybe the Supreme Court was conscious of Mr. Lincoln's criticism that the Dred Scott decision was not unanimous. I say, and I believe Mr. Lincoln would have said, that the school case decision was contrary to all precedents, and that a unanimous decision was indicative of political or partisan bias, as he used that language in the Dred Scott case. Certainly Mr. Lincoln would have said that the school decision was based upon a false assumption of historical facts. I feel certain also, that Mr. Lincoln would have said that the school case decision was based on sociology instead of law, and would have repudiated that decision on that ground also.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes it appears that some people in this country willfully distort the views and the acts of Mr. Lincoln. Every historian knows that the Emancipation Proclamation was not conceived or designed for the freeing of all slaves. Every historian knows that Mr. Lincoln termed it a war measure, and contended that he had the power as Commander in Chief to do everything that he deemed expedient to defeat the enemy. Mr. Lincoln explained that the freeing of the slaves in States of rebellion would weaken the abilities of those States to wage war. Mr. Lincoln excepted States and portions of States which had slaves but which were not a part of the Confederate States of America, and had not taken part in the War Between the States. It is common knowledge that Robert E. Lee, who voluntarily freed all of his slaves, fought against generals on the battlefield who had their slaves with them during those conflicts.

While citing statements from Mr. Lincoln, it might be well for the people to be reminded again what Mr. Lincoln said concerning the Negro race. In that same Springfield, Ill., speech, he said:

> There is a natural disgust in the minds of nearly all white people to the idea of indiscriminate amalgamation of the white and black races; and Judge Douglas evidently is basing his chief hope upon the chances of his being able to appropriate the benefit of this disgust to himself. If he can, by much drumming and repeating, fasten the odium of that idea upon his adversaries, he thinks he can struggle through the storm. He therefore clings to this hope as a drowning man to the last plank. He makes an occasion for lugging it in from the opposition to the Dred Scott decision.

The last two quotations, Mr. Speaker, are taken from pages 230–231 of the volume heretofore referred to. Page 234 of that same volume quotes Mr. Lincoln as follows:

> But Judge Douglas is especially horrified at the thought of the mixing of blood by the white and black races. Agreed for once—a thousand times agreed. There are white men enough to marry all the white women, and black men enough to marry all the black women; and so let them be married.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lincoln was a segregationist no matter what any wild-eyed leftwinger says. I ask that volume IV, "Abraham Lincoln," by Albert J. Beveridge, be read. Page 155 of that volume quotes Mr. Lincoln in his Springfield, Ill., address, saying:

> The only "perfect preventive of amalgamation," Lincoln insisted, was the separation of the races; but since that could not be done at once, "the next best thing is to keep them apart where they are not already together." For instance, if whites and blacks "never get together in Kansas, then they will never mix blood in Kansas."

And the same page says:

Colonization of Negroes in Africa was the only way to bring it about, declared Lincoln; and he bemoaned the fact that no political party was doing anything for colonization. It was a hard job; "but where there is a will there is a way, and what colonization needs most is a hearty will." When the people should come to see that it was morally right and also to their interest or, at least, not against it, "to transfer the African to his native clime, we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be."

Mr. Speaker, any student of history knows that Mr. Lincoln was not considering the abolition of slavery in the slaveholding States, but was objecting to the extension of slavery in the new States, such as Kansas, Nebraska, but those who do not know can find for themselves on page 216 of the last-quoted volume that Mr. Lincoln's purpose was not to extend. According to the last-quoted volume, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lincoln spoke at Charleston, and on page 312 he is quoted, saying:

"While I was at the hotel today," began Lincoln, "an elderly gentleman called upon me to know whether I was really in favor of producing a perfect equality between the Negroes and white people. [Great laughter.] * * * I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races [applause]; that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people. * * * And, inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, the 147th birthday of Mr. Lincoln was observed by much speechmaking, some temperate, but many being highly inflammatory and completely inconsistent with anything Mr. Lincoln ever said or stood for. The executive secretary of the NAACP stood at Springfield, Ill., on that day and urged that our schools be immediately desegregated under the principles of Mr. Lincoln. I do not think that Mr. Lincoln ever did or said anything that could sustain any such position.

Mr. Speaker, some of the Southern States, including the State that I was born in, still live in, and will be a resident of so long as I live, have seen fit to exercise their undoubted right to dispute the correctness of the United States Supreme Court decision concerning public schools. None of those States have rebelled or suggested rebellion. They think that they have a right to dispute that decision, and I think so, too. To dispute that decision, or even abolish public schools and substitute private schools, could not constitute rebellion in any sense of the word. Nevertheless, we have read in the papers, heard over television and radio, and even on this floor, that because we have disputed the correctness of that decision that we should not be allowed to receive one cent of any school-construction money that might be provided under the pending legislation for school-construction purposes. On February 6, 1956, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] posed this question:

Are these defiant States entitled to school lunch money for segregated schools? Are they entitled to money under Public Laws 815 and 874 for construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas?

Since that time, another Member of this House has suggested that the farmers in the States disputing that Supreme Court decision are not entitled to receive support prices for their farm products.

Mr. Speaker, we know only too well that there are some who would be completely willing to compel the southern taxpayers to pay into that school construction fund and deny them 1 cent of their own money. We also know that there are some who would deny our States any money whatever for schools in federally impacted areas, although they know that the impact is due solely to our defense installations in our section of the country. Many of the children that they would deny this education would not be southern or of southern extraction. They are the children of the workers from the four corners of this Nation, engaged in building airplanes, ships, atomic energy projects, and the like. There are too many who would starve the people of our section by denying the benefit of the support prices on farm products, simply because our people do not believe that the Supreme Court should go unchallenged when it assumes a dictatorial role.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few days my people have read with much apprehension statements from Mr. Nixon, Mr. Harriman, Mr. Kefauver, and others. In California, Mr. Adlai Stevenson told a Los Angeles Negro audience that he would not cut off Federal funds from segregated schools nor use Federal troops to enforce segregation. Mr. Stevenson was asked the blunt question as to whether he would use the Army and Navy to enforce the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in public schools. Mr. Stevenson wisely said:

That is exactly what brought on the Civil War. It can't be done by troops or bayonets.

Mr. Stevenson said that he would not deny Federal aid to Southern States that refused to integrate their schools, adding:

You should not cut off your nose to spite your face.

Mr. Stevenson explained that he was for integration, but that he would not have anything to do with dividing this country at the most serious time this country has ever faced. Make no mistake about it, these agitators wanted bloodshed, for the newspaper article concerning these questions and answers also said when Mr. Stevenson gave those answers:

There was a murmur of protest in the crowd, and one tall Negro standing next to this correspondent said flatly: "I think he is a phony."

And also that Mr. Stevenson's stand was not one that pleased many in his audience of 200 at the Watkins hotel. Thank God that there is one man soliciting the nomination for President who is not willing to throw this country into confusion, strife, and bloodshed. Can that man's position fail to appeal to our noblest and Christian instincts? Has the lust for power and high office developed to such an extent that a man would array section against section and brother against brother? Can it be that aspirants for the high office of President would cause confusion when we are told that Russia has developed missiles that penetrate 1,500 miles? Can any man who has the interests of this country at heart sow seeds of disruption when it is so vitally necessary now that we remain united? Can any northerner or southerner approve the demagogic statement of Governor Harriman to the effect that he would cut off all Federal funds to all States which refused to desegregate schools and proposed immediate Federal enforcement of the Supreme Court's desegregation ruling?

Mr. Speaker, can anyone approve the various statements attributed to Mr. KEFAUVER, particularly when the statements attributed to him in secret meetings are completely contrary to his public utterances?

Mr. Speaker, can any sound mind believe that it would be conducive to peace for the Federal Government to tax the Southern States for school construction, assistance to schools in federally impacted areas, school lunch money, and the benefits of the farm program? Do they believe that this issue is one of dollars and cents? It would be a tragedy indeed for such punitive action to be taken. I hope that it will not be taken. Do not agitators know that they are kindling hatred, do not they remember the story of Aesop? Dr. Holley, perhaps the greatest Negro educator in the United States, does remember that story, and he commends it to the consideration of Mr. Harriman, Mr. KEFAUVER, and their like. Here is what Dr. Holley said:

Aesop understood how men's minds work. He has a story about the North Wind, the South Wind, and the man with a cloak. The swift harshness of the one merely drove the man to gather his garment closer about him, while the gentleness and warmth of the other gradually prevailed upon him to take the garment off. This is the same truth that the modern minstrel offers: You can push me, but don't shove me.

There are too many people shoving us, and they are wittingly or unwittingly making the job of preserving the peace harder for temperate people everywhere.

A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, a Negro schoolteacher in Fort Gaines, Ga., made a speech to a Negro audience, and told them that they had mighty good schools built with white people's money, and that it was in their best interests to forget integration "and remember that they had not learned how to pool their resources and build even a recreation hall for their children"; that everything they had came from the white people and without assistance from the Negro race. He also told them that "we still want that which we either do not deserve or that which we are not ready for. I have noted from time to time that every time something happens to Negroes, it is stated that it is because of his color. I say 99 or more percent of what happens

to Negroes as well as others is because of what he has done to warrant it." A few days later, that Negro schoolteacher advised the school authorities at Fort Gaines that threats made upon him, his wife, and family, by Negroes in that community had forced his resignation; that he was hastily leaving town, knowing that his life was not safe.

Mr. Speaker, outsiders have fanned the flames of hatred in our section to such an extent that that Negro schoolteacher was absolutely correct, for the chances were good that those Negroes would have killed him, and that cool heads might not have been able to control the situation.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much said about the unfortunate trouble at the University of Alabama. The NAACP has not left a stone unturned to agitate in that instance. A few days ago the Washington newspapers carried a story to the effect that two Negro soldiers waylaid a white student on that university campus, and although they did not know the student, they assaulted him, saying only that their savagery was because of the treatment accorded the Negress student. I had hoped that the NAACP would change its tactics, and would come to the defense of a white person for a change, but it did not, and they do not intend to do so. The truth is, the NAACP does not accord a white man any civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, February 20, 1956, issue, page 3, carried an article entitled "Civil Rights Parley Aims To Bar Leftists." That article says that there is to be a 3-day meeting here in Washington beginning on March 4, and that the organizer of that meeting has warned that leftwing groups are attempting to infiltrate it, and that he has pledged every effort to keep Communists from influencing the gathering. The executive secretary of the NAACP is described in that article as writing a letter to the NAACP branches warning against leftwing infiltration among delegates to that meeting.

Mr. Speaker, does not this warning excite our interest? Can it be that Communists may attend that meeting? Evidently so. Now I ask that organizer, were you not warned way back in 1948, and was not the NAACP warned back in 1948 by George S. Schuyler in his article appearing in the Pittsburgh Courier, and did he not tell you then to quit playing footsie with the Communists? Is it news to these leaders that the Pittsburgh Courier, July 31, 1948, page 19, carried an article by Marjorie McKenzie, wherein it was stated that the indicting of 12 Communist leaders on charges of conspiracy to overthrow the United States Government by force was a direct attack on civil rights? Did that reflect the opinion of these organizations then, and does it now?

I well understand, Mr. Speaker, that some ministers are contending that to dispute the recent Supreme Court decision in the school case is a sin against God. I note that in Mr. Lincoln's speech he was regretting the fact that several ministers in his section were saying that slavery was ordained by God. We find ministers on both sides of this issue now. Some say that God has told them that to dispute that decision is wrong. I wonder why God did not tell George W. Truett, Spurgeon, and even Paul the Apostle that. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that God would tell everybody of good will that, including me, for if I know my heart, I would accept anything that he told me. As a matter of fact, all of the lawbooks that I have ever read on the Bible tell me that God Almighty never approved the brotherhood of man, and that the only brotherhood was that established through the brotherhood of Christ, and the indispensable ingredient of that brotherhood was that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and that he died as our substitute. If anyone cares to show me where the Bible endorses any other brotherhood, I will welcome that information.

Mr. Speaker, the Communists are still holding out to the Negroes the establishment of the black belt, to be composed of Southern States. See hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, July 14, 1949, 81st Congress, 1st session, and particularly see hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, 80th Congress, 1st session, July 21, 1947, and see the picture of the proposed black belt on page 90 thereof. In view of that history, I think every Congressman should read the recent book by Theodore Browne, entitled "The Band Will Not Play Dixie." That book was published about 6 months ago and is now in the Library of Congress. That book tells about a Negro reporter who was interested in one Solomon Morehouse, who was interested in establishing the black belt in the South. According to the book, that reporter, when he was not being intimate with every female he met, was seeking Solomon Morehouse, and according to the book, this reporter discovered that a Georgia Senator had kidnaped Morehouse, carried him to Georgia, turned him over to the Ku Klux Klan, and wrecked Morehouse mentally, on the direction of the Georgia Senator, Mr. Salter; that Morehouse escaped Senator Salter and the Ku Klux Klan, and that this reporter, after risking his life to help Morehouse, went to Atlanta, and while there, Atlanta was burned to the ground and the black belt established. Of course everyone knows that there was never a Georgia Senator by the name of Salter, and all of those sayings concerning Georgia were tissues of lies. But how well that fits in with the situation today. Have they abandoned the idea of the black belt? Are the agitators willing to listen to reason? I doubt it, unless we can have the help of the Members of this great body in trying to preserve peace and unity. There is a fact that we southerners realize, and all police departments recognize, and all people had better recognize in this country. That is that there is scarcely a Negro dwelling anywhere that does not contain an assortment of deadly weapons, consisting of shotguns, rifles, pistols, knives, razors, ice picks, and so forth. On the other hand, there are few white homes over this land containing those deadly weapons. It would surprise the white people of Washington, New York, Chicago, Detroit, and other large metropolitan cities if they knew that virtually every Negro home is practically an arsenal. I think that their police could tell them this was so.

Mr. Speaker, all of these things I have said have been simply for the reason that I want other sections to know our side. My section needs the help of good people now, and I solicit the help of the Congress of the United States in their behalf. I think we deserve that help. We deserve your sympathy. I hope we are going to have your sympathy and your assistance. We do not wish to see the white gentile race disappear, and we do not intend for it to disappear. If you will sympathize with us now to the end that we shall have peace, I promise you that we will return that friendship, and if the struggle comes between godless communism and our form of government, that every southerner will take his position in the ranks and give an account of his citizenship and loyalty that will be an inspiration to coming generations.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. If the gentleman will just wait a few minutes until I have concluded my remarks.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I trust that in the spelling in your manuscript your pronunciation of the word "Negro" is not followed, that is, that the word in the printed record of these proceedings will not be spelled as the gentleman pronounces it.

Mr. FORRESTER. I will be happy to pronounce it for the gentleman, and I will be glad to accept anything he says in that respect.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Then, sir——

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield any further.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] would like for the gentleman from Georgia to put it in capital letters and pronounce it "K-n-e-e-g-r-o-w."

Mr. FORRESTER. Now, I will take up where I left off. I am quoting Mr. Lincoln now.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do I construe the gentleman's remarks at this point as a commentary on what Archbishop Rummel, of New Orleans, said? He has stated publicly that segregation is a sin. Does the gentleman imply he is a member of the Communist Party; that he is carrying on Communist propaganda?

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me say to the gentleman now he was not listening.

Mr. TUMULTY. I was listening.

Mr. FORRESTER. Oh, no; you were not. I will say to the gentleman and I will say it to the churches: "No; I never said any such thing."

Mr. TUMULTY. Will the gentleman tell me what his opinion is with regard to what the archbishop said?

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not even know that the archbishop said anything.

Mr. TUMULTY. He has said that segregation is a sin. That was announced publicly. I wonder if the gentleman has any opinion about that.

Mr. FORRESTER. I say that is one man's opinion. I do not yield to the gentleman further.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Did not the newspaper article also say that the archbishop's own flock down in Louisiana was not accepting his statement; that they were proceeding to do as they have been doing about advocating segregation in the schools?

Mr. FORRESTER. Unfortunately, I did not know about that incident. I had not read that incident. But I am sure that whoever said it is going to have a division in his congregation. I am certain about that.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I read it and the article stated that his congregation is not accepting his dictum in that respect. I insert herewith a news item from the Atlanta Journal of February 20, 1956, captioned "Catholic Solons Ignore Prelate on Race Plea":

CATHOLIC SOLONS IGNORE PRELATE ON RACE PLEA

NEW ORLEANS, February 20.—A group of Catholic lawmakers Monday proceeded with plans to prevent integration of Louisiana Catholic schools, despite a pastoral letter from Archbishop Joseph Rummel condemning segregation as morally wrong and sinful.

The 6-page letter was read at all masses Sunday in the 120 churches throughout the archdiocese of New Orleans and clearly indicated the archbishop intends to end segregation in church and school facilities as soon as a special committee completes its study of the problem.

The archbishop gave no hint when that would be, but church spokesmen previously have used the target date of sometime after September 1956.

Representative E. W. Gravolet, Jr., of Plaquemines Parish said the pastoral letter would have no effect on his group's plans to restore parochial schools to Louisiana's 1954 school segregation laws when the legislature meets in May.

The State's segregation laws were declared unconstitutional last Wednesday by a 3-judge Federal appeals court, which ordered New Orleans public schools to begin carrying out the 1954 United States Supreme Court decision banning school segregation.

"We're going to appeal that decision," said Gravolet in behalf of other Catholic lawmakers supporting his proposed bill to head off parochial school integration. "If the appeal fails then we'll come up with some new segregation laws. Catholic schools definitely will be included.

"It's a matter of justice. Catholic schools should be treated the same as public schools. Why discriminate against Catholic parents and children?"

Parochial schools were removed from the State's segregation plans at the insistence of Archbishop Rummel.

The archdiocese is the largest in the Deep South with a Catholic population of more than a half million. More than half of the South's Catholics and about one-fifth of the Nation's Negro Catholics live in Louisiana.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I have heard the story that when these people came to Lincoln, some of the ministers from Chicago came and told him that God had sent them to tell him that he ought to free all of the slaves. Mr. Lincoln said:

Now, that is rather strange.

He said:

God has never said anything like that to me and it seems very strange that he would send that message to me through the wicked city of Chicago.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I have listened with attention to the very able statement that the gentleman from Georgia has made. Since he honored me by mentioning a discussion in which I participated on the floor the other day, I would like to go a little further into the matter that I was discussing at that time. The gentleman, I know, has read my speech, because he put the questions I posed, whether or not, as a matter of law, under the decision of the Supreme Court and without any further legislation such as the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. POWELL], these funds should not be withheld. Now, I was intrigued by the statements made about Mr. Lincoln, especially those where Lincoln criticized the Dred Scott decision and suggested that perhaps he had a right, oftentimes a duty, as a lawyer and as a citizen to oppose a Supreme Court decision in which he did not believe but that after one, two, three, or several decisions then it would be somewhat revolutionary to suggest that they should not be followed.

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not have too much time to yield, but I thank the gentleman for catching what I said.

Mr. METCALF. May I continue for a moment?

Mr. FORRESTER. My time is very limited.

Mr. METCALF. I understand it is, but the gentleman was kind enough to mention my discussion, and I would like to put it in the right order and the right perspective. I want to say to the gentleman from Georgia that I agree wholeheartedly with the statements that were made by Mr. Stevenson that this is a matter that should not be handled by force, and I hope that the administration will clarify, by probing the Supreme Court's decision, some of the matters surrounding it before we even use executive or administrative orders. And, I hope this Congress will leave it to the administration and to the courts to work the question out before Congress tries to adopt any such legislation as the Powell amendment whether on the school bill, on the agricultural bill, Public Law 815 or any of these other acts before the Congress.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman for that statement, and I am glad the gentleman was listening. And, I am glad the gentleman said he posed the question; that the gentleman was not saying it was his opinion but simply posed it as a legal question.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing up this matter that is fraught with so much difficulty, and is a matter that I know the gentleman realizes is not at all pleasant. But as a great American, as a great Congressman from a great State, he has sensed it to be his duty to inform this Nation of this great problem that we have, especially now, in our beloved Southland.

Mr. Speaker, to those who are not familiar with the problems of the Southland may I say it is very difficult to explain—and I believe the gentleman would agree with me—when I say that there is an indignation over this attempt to solve these great problems on the basis of a Supreme Court decision.

Those of us who believe in the Jeffersonian principle of States rights feel innately that this great problem of the administration of our schools should rest with our States and I think those of us from the South are doing this Nation a disfavor if we do not point out a fact, however unpleasant it may be, which is that our people are not in sympathy with this Supreme Court decision. We feel that the administration of our schools is a matter that should rest with our States.

Specifically I want to congratulate the gentleman for introducing legislation that would keep the Federal courts from the administration of our schools. The gentleman will recall that I have introduced similar legislation. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Georgia if he knows whether or not we will have an opportunity of an early hearing on his bill which I think is a very good bill.

Mr. FORRESTER. That I am not prepared to answer now, but I do want to take this time to thank the gentleman for introducing a companion bill and for the splendid assistance he has rendered me in the preparation of my bill, and getting it into the House.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to my distinguished colleague from Georgia that I deeply appreciate the erudite speech he has made here today. My only regret is that every Member of this House is not present.

The gentleman has gone into this subject with such complete understanding and such a great show of intelligence that I feel there is nothing more that any of us could add to complete the statement he has made. But with respect to his appeal, at the conclusion of his speech, to all the Nation for sympathetic understanding of the situation in the South, may I say that sympathetic understanding of the situation means

sympathetic understanding of ourselves no matter what part of this Nation we come from. The day has long passed when we can afford to substitute irresponsibility for clear facts. We cannot be politically irresponsible any more.

Yesterday I had the great pleasure of spending the day in Georgia. I appeared at the 100th anniversary celebration of the county of Berrien. I spoke there to thousands of people for some 45 minutes. I dwelt on the great love of the South not just for the South but for this Union, this country of ours. I warned the colored citizens of our State that they must not listen to the voices of false idols that are tempting them to destroy completely the terrific advance they have made in their own welfare, in their relations with one another, and in their relations with us, their white friends, in the past number of years.

At the conclusion of that speech there were hundreds of people who came up to me with tears streaming down their cheeks and said, "We are with you. Take the message back to the other Representatives in Congress to tell the other people in this Nation for heaven's sake not to sacrifice principle, the principles of this great Government, for political expediency in any section of this Nation. Let us all stand together united, as we have tried to do so valiantly since the unfortunate War Between the States."

I thank the gentleman for his wonderful speech and for the opportunity he has given me to comment upon it.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia, and I want her to know that I receive much confidence and satisfaction out of her statement that she endorses the remarks I have made, because in my heart what I want to do is reflect the sentiments of my people and the people all over the United States of America.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia who has just addressed the House that I appreciate the message he has brought us. I know of my own personal knowledge that the gentleman is a former solicitor general with a great record of service to the people of his judicial circuit in that capacity. I know that the gentleman is a close student of the law and of the Constitution of the United States. I know also that he is not a man who by nature is quarrelsome. He is a man who, when the occasion requires it, will rise to his feet and state his convictions and will do it in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman for the facts he has brought to us today about the speeches of Abraham Lincoln. The speeches of Mr. Lincoln have been quoted out of context in many instances to support positions which Mr. Lincoln actually did not support. I appreciate that the gentleman has done the research necessary to bring to us today with reference to some of these issues the true position of Mr. Lincoln. I think it will be worthwhile to the Congress and to the country that these facts have been brought forth today. I want to thank the gentleman also for the courage he has displayed at this particular time in stating the facts relating to some of the issues which plague us to such an extent today. There were some of us who as long as 5 years ago took the floor in this body to point out that the Supreme Court of the United States was preparing to usurp legislative functions; was preparing to change the law, which function belongs exclusively to Congress, and was preparing to amend the Constitution, which function belongs only to this Congress and to the States. What we are seeing take place today, which the gentleman has pointed out to us, is merely the result of that unwarranted action on the part of the Federal Supreme Court. The people of this country do not intend to let the Supreme Court of the United States become a dictator. The people do not intend to have the rights of the States taken away from them by any unwarranted action of the Supreme Court. If this policy is persisted in, you are going to see even more tumult and turmoil than has occurred up to this time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for what he has said and I commend him for making this learned speech to us today.

Mr. FORRESTER. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that I do not know of anyone who has more courageously faced up to these issues than the gentleman from Georgia? If my colleague approves of anything that I have said or done here today, it is a source of much satisfaction to me.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. I commend my colleague for his splendid presentation of the position of the South. I wish that the people of other sections of the country could realize just how difficult our problem is. I wish they could realize that we are not trying to keep the negro in subservience; that we believe they should have all their legal rights; but we do object to the mingling of the races socially and in our schools because we know it is going to mean a mongrel race. I commend the gentleman for the way he has presented the facts this afternoon. The gentleman was an able solicitor general in his State. He knows about the prosecution of the three cases that he has told you about today. I agree with my colleague from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] that as bad as that decision was and as wrong as it was on the matter of segregation in our schools, it is realized by legal minds everywhere that it was fundamentally wrong in a deeper legal sense in that it was legislative in nature and a usurpation of the powers of the Congress by the Supreme Court. A couple of weeks ago, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial taken from the Wall Street Journal in which that most conservative newspaper criticized the Supreme Court not for this recent decision with reference to segregation, but for the decision in which they held that the Federal Government had the right to regulate the collection of natural gas at the wellhead. Now I know nothing about the soundness of that decision because I have not studied it, but the Wall Street Journal made the point that the Supreme Court was usurping the legislative power of the Congress. That is the fundamental issue in this whole problem. A very distinguished former judge of the United States circuit court of appeals, Judge Sibley, who is retired now but whose mind is as keen as ever, recently made this statement to me: "The older judges are concerned because the present-day judges tend to decide the law not as it is but as they think it ought to be."

As this fine old southern gentleman said to me, "whatever judge or court does that is legislating." It seems to me that like all of our problems in the South—and this problem will pass as all others have passed—this problem will be solved by the understanding, calm people, by moderate people of our Nation, and it will be settled properly. I do not know what the solution is, myself, but eventually it will be settled. But if the Supreme Court continues to usurp the power of Congress, then our way of life is doomed.

Mr. FORRESTER. I certainly thank the gentleman. The gentleman is a splendid lawyer, a man of fine reputation and standing, and I get much comfort out of the fact that he agrees with me in what I have attempted to say.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the genleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. I want to commend my distinguished and courageous colleague from Georgia for bringing this matter to the floor of the House. I know he did so after careful preparation. I know he did so after carefully weighing and studying the words with which he brought this message to the floor. I would like to add, if I may by way of emphasizing some of the things that the gentleman has said: The Supreme Court decision handed down on Black Monday, the 17th of May 1954 did more to destroy the progress that had been made in race relations in the South than anything that has happened in the past 80 years. The U. S. News & World Report, in a current issue, carries an article based on questions asked and answers given by 15 newspaper editors and publishers of the South, including white newspaper editors and publishers and Negro editors and publishers alike, and without exception each of them said that the progress which had been made toward an early solution of this problem is worse now than it was 2 years ago. Every one of them placed the blame for this worse situation on the decision of the Supreme Court. Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer, as a man whose adult life has been devoted to the practice of law, I am of the firm opinion that the decision in the school cases, handed down on May 17, 1954, may be marked as the beginning of the decline and fall of the United States of America, because it was most definitely

the beginning of the end of constitutional law on the basis of legal precedents heretofore established. It is the first time in the history of that great Court that it ever completely disregarded 80 years of judicial precedents and admittedly based that decision on the sociological writing of a Swede by the name of Gunnar Myrdahl. The Court in that case could not quote any legal precedents for the decision which it handed down. They had to go outside of the judicial precedents from the Supreme Court of the United States and the court of last resort of every State in the Union. They had to completely overturn 80 years of established judicial precedents, and base that decision on sociological and psychological grounds.

Mr. Speaker, if the time ever comes that our laws are disregarded and cast into the discard in order that the Supreme Court of the United States, or any other court can usurp the powers of legislation, then, when that day comes our sacred form of constitutional government which we love, which we respect, and which we revere will be gone and will be gone forever. It will be like the tomb and the grave: Once it receives its victim it never returns him or gives him back.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman himself was a prosecuting attorney just as I was, and he also served as president of the Georgia Bar Association. I appreciate the fine contribution he has made.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House that Lincoln also said that those who remain silent when they should speak out makes cowards of men, or something along that line; so I want to compliment the gentleman from Georgia for so ably expressing his convictions and speaking out.

I can say to the gentleman from Georgia that the people of South Carolina, the vast, overwhelming majority of them agree with the statements expressed by my distinguished and able colleague from Georgia. And at this point I want to take the opportunity to congratulate the entire American people of all of the 48 States of this great Union for not solving its racial and religious differences as the racial and religious differences of the Middle East are being solved today by mass killings, strife, and threat of general war. I was told when there a few years ago that a hundred thousand people have been killed and many more wounded in the Near East in the last 10 years because of racial and religious differences.

I was told in Karachi, Pakistan, that 1 million people have been killed since the close of World War II because of religious differences between the Moslems and the Hindus. My driver in Karachi told me that his own wife and children were burned to death before his very eyes because he differed with the other crowd in religion.

I am glad that America is not today solving its religious and racial problems as are being solved in that area of the world.

Also I could point out South Africa where a thousand people have been killed recently—purely on racial grounds.

I think the United States of America can point to its record with pride. Every single American State and every American city, should be proud of and advertise, this record in America, but the South should be particularly proud. Let us continue our record of racial tolerance, of respect for the other man's religion and respect for the other man's rights. We have made in America both North and South, East and West, a better record along that line than any other country, or any other region of the world that I know of, and I hope and pray we will not resort to the methods being adopted and resorted to in the Near and Middle East at this very moment because of racial belief and religious prejudice. The South can well point to our splendid record with pride. I hope all Americans who really believe in our country will let us and help us continue to solve our problems as the South has so wonderfully been doing for many years.

Again I commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for pointing out this insidious threat to American unity and our national well-being.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman very much. I now want to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], a gentleman who has been in this fight in the heat of the day. I am happy and proud to be able to yield to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia has spoken with candor and courage. He has told the truth, in spite of the fact that he knows that it will bring down upon his head vilification, abuse, slander, libel, and every form of smear from the radical and left-wing press of this country.

I think the gentleman might well point out that those who are farthest removed from this problem and who are the most ignorant about it are the first to come forward with solutions for it.

They think that we, who are closest to the problem and who know most about it, should be forced to accede to their desires, even if it means our own self-destruction, the mongrelization of our people, and the end of constitutional government.

I want to congratulate the gentleman also for pointing up the illegality of the recent Supreme Court decision. Of course, I can add nothing to what the gentleman has said on the subject, but I would like to point out that it is a sad day in this country when the United States Supreme Court is so irresponsible that its decisions can be attacked by reputable lawyers who, in brief after brief, show the illegality of their decisions and not have one single eminent or reputable attorney rise to defend the legality of the decisions which they rendered. I challenge anyone in this House or in the other body to come forth with a legal defense of the Black Monday Court decisions. They cannot be supported or defended on the basis of law or judicial precedents.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to command the gentleman for his fine statement. I share the view he has of our Supreme Court. I believe I can correctly say that 90 percent of the good lawyers of American men who have studied law, today have no respect for the ability of the members of the Supreme Court. I have been in the Congress for 12 years. We have spent half the time since I have been here correcting the illegal, unwise decisions rendered by the Supreme Court. Now we are concerned with the decision in the school case. Two years ago we were concerned with the tidelands oil case. That Court since 1935 has knocked down literally scores of old legal precedents that have been the law of this land for a hundred or more years.

One of the Justices of that Court—he is not on the bench now—made this statement with reference to one of the decisions in a dissenting opinion. He said that the thing that disturbed him most about the Court was the trend that the Court was following, namely, repealing or knocking down old legal precedents. He said it was impossible for a man to tell from day to day what the law was and that the opinion in that particular case reminded him of a railroad ticket that had stamped on it: "Good for this day and this train only."

What is the hope of those of us who believe in States rights, who believe in the Constitution, who believe we should have a country of laws and not a country of men? The only hope I see is for the majority of those members of the Court to fade away and for the appointees in the future to be better than they have been in the past, especially the Chief Justice; according to the testimony of the Vice President of the United States, the school decision was political. It has been my opinion all along that that decision in the school case was a political decision. There is not one single legal authority cited in that case to uphold their final conclusion. It is politics headed by a master politician, a man who was able to carry water on both shoulders in his own State and get the nomination of both parties. Is that not a politician?

I want to commend the gentleman for the courageous speech he has made and say that it will take more than a Supreme Court decision to make your people and mine violate their own laws and customs and do things in our schools that no member of the Court does in his own family. Again I want to commend the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. I certainly thank my colleague.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I see that my colleague's time is about up and I do not want to trespass upon it at the present time. It seems as if the Su-

preme Court has been pretty well taken care of today. I do want to say to my colleague that we in Alabama have the same problem that he has in Georgia. It is going to take time and patience to work it out. We are having some trouble at the present time which has been brought about in my own district largely by a man not too far removed from this Chamber today. The people who are suffering are those whom he says he wishes to help. In discussing this decision of the Supreme Court, other sections might laugh at our plight today, but tomorrow it will be some other sections of our country who are, I am sure, dedicated to States rights and the principles of self-government the same as we. I just want to say that I approve of every word that the gentleman has spoken and congratulate and commend him upon this great address.

Mr. FORRESTER. I certainly appreciate that statement from my friend.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I, too, wish to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] on the wonderful speech he has made here today. He is one of the most able and conscientious Members of the House. I just hope that the solid thinking people from all sections of our country will recognize the truth of the statement he made here today. I concur with what he had to say and he certainly speaks the sentiment of the vast majority of the white people not only in Georgia and Mississippi but in other Southern States.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who took part in this debate with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. METCALF]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] may extend his remarks at this point.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia mentioned in the fine statement he has just made the recent disturbances that took place at the University of Alabama. This institution is located in the congressional district that I have the privilege to represent.

Reports concerning the admittance of two Negro women to the University of Alabama have not always presented the complete record.

Let me cite a specific instance relating to Pollie Anner Myers Hudson, one of the two who recently sought admittance to the University of Alabama. In the February 20 issue of Time magazine, on page 40, it is stated that Pollie Anner Myers Hudson was denied admission "on grounds of 'her conduct and marital record' (she is involved in a divorce action), . . ."

This statement, to say the least, omits many of the pertinent facts in her case. Let me now quote to you from the February 13 issue of the news magazine South:

Pollie Anner Myers, unmarried and pregnant, applied for admission the third week in September 1952. Two months later, November 14, 1952, she married Edward Hudson, whose 3-year sentence for burglary had been revoked in Jefferson County in 1948. Six months and 4 days after the marriage Pollie Anner Myers Hudson gave birth on May 18, 1953, to a male child. It was a normal birth, length of pregnancy was 40 weeks.

Henry Myers, the woman's father, was sentenced from Elmore County on September 26, 1938, for 1 year and a day for possession of a still and manufacture of whisky. Edward Hudson, from whom the Associated Press reported she was separated and seeking a divorce, was sentenced to 3 years in the penitentiary February 14, 1947, for daytime burglary of an uninhabited dwelling in Jefferson County. Probation was revoked October 8, 1948, and sentence was imposed. He was sentenced for a year and a day on August 28, 1948, on another charge of burglary of an uninhabited dwelling.

To substantiate these facts, the magazine South printed in the same issue a photostatic copy of the marriage license of Pollie Anner Myers Hudson and her husband, Edward Hudson, as well as a photostatic copy of the birth certificate of her child.

I regret to say that I have never seen these unpleasant but significant facts published by the press at large.

The University of Alabama, now in its 125th year of operation, has a proud and distinguished record in the field of education. From its halls have graduated many men and women of distinction.

I am quite certain the University of Alabama is only one of many great institutions in this country which would not have admitted a student, white or colored, under the same conditions that existed in the case of Pollie Anner Myers Hudson.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] on the able speech he has just made. It shows that he has given a lot of study to the subject he discussed. I hope all the Members who are not present today will read his remarks in the RECORD because, as he has plainly pointed out, the Supreme Court in the segregation case and many other cases in recent years failed to follow judicial precedent and the Constitution in its decisions.

The Supreme Court should interpret the law as what it is and not what they think it should be, as someone has said.

Our Founding Fathers believed not only in a balance of powers between different branches of the Federal Government, but also believed in a restriction on the abuse of Federal power through the exercise of certain governmental functions by the various States.

I hope that the people in other sections of the country besides the South will appreciate the danger of interfering with States rights as was done in the segregation case.

SUBVERSIVE CHARACTER OF NAACP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include citations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and other pertinent data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. SPEAKER, on February 3, the Memphis Commercial Appeal carried an article written by Paul Malloy quoting from an interview with Thurgood Marshall, Negro special counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In the article it was stated, and I quote:

The meeting sponsored by the Memphis NAACP chapter heard Marshall angrily deny claims his organization is Communist tainted.

Marshall said:

Edgar Hoover, boss of the FBI, says we are not subversive. Our conventions have been addressed by Harry Truman, and President Eisenhower and Vice President Richard Nixon.

Subsequently, on Tuesday, February 21, 1956, Frederick Woltman, Scripps-Howard staff writer, writing in the Washington Daily News, stated, and I quote:

The country's largest Negro organization, which has been accused of working in league with Communists by white citizens councils in the South, has taken steps to head off the move.

Each of the 1,300 local branches and youth councils of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) has received a stern warning that the Communists are making intensive efforts to infiltrate the nationwide civil rights assembly here in Washington March 4–6.

Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary, directed units of his organization to exercise special care in selecting delegates to avoid any possibility that the assembly will be captured by leftwing individuals and groups.

"Otherwise," Mr. Wilkins said, "The whole civil rights movement will receive a black eye and we will get very little attention, if any, by Congress."

The Communist Party in the Daily Worker last week officially called for support of the mass lobby.

Which of these statements are we to believe—the statement of Thurgood Marshall, made in Memphis on February 3, which would lead the people of the country to believe that the NAACP is free of subversive influences, or are we to believe the article of Mr. Woltman dated February 21? It seems to me that

if the NAACP is free of subversive influences on February 3, there would be no need to issue a warning about intensive efforts to infiltrate on February 21.

The issue of the Daily Worker which Mr. Woltman refers to in his article is dated Tuesday, February 14. In it an editorial appears, and I quote:

The great debate will go on. But the Negro people and other democratic forces will not lose sight of the primary requirement for action: Demand that Eisenhower and Brownell act to enforce civil rights in the South. Support the mass lobby for civil rights in Washington March 4, 5, and 6.

Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary, would have the people of the Nation believe that the NAACP has just been marked as a Communist target for infiltration.

In 1925 the Communist line as published by the Daily Worker Publishing Co. in the official report of the American Communist Party's fourth national convention held in Chicago, Ill., August 21–30, the party was directed to penetrate the NAACP.

Even in this organization (NAACP), under present circumstances, it is permissible and necessary for selected Communists (not the party membership as a whole) to enter its conventions and to make proposals calculated to enlighten the Negro masses under its influence as to the nature and necessity of the class struggle—

The report reads.

Now, let us look at this fellow Wilkins. He seems to be greatly disturbed about this issue of Communist infiltration of the NAACP because of its effect being the whole civil-rights movement will receive a black eye. Here is the record from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Roy Wilkins, national administrator and executive secretary, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of July 15, 1949 (p. 5), in an article datelined Los Angeles, July 14, reported that "Roy Wilkins, acting secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, told a press conference * * * he voted for Benjamin J. Davis, Negro Communist, at the last election. Davis is now on trial for his Communist beliefs, along with 11 other national Communist Party leaders in New York City. Wilkins, however, refused any comment on the trial itself." The same information appeared in the Daily People's World of July 13, 1949 (p. 1).

Mr. Wilkins was a member of the national committee, International Juridical Association, as was shown on the leaflet entitled "What is the IJA?" and a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1942; he was identified as being from New York State. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as having "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line" (report dated September 17, 1950, p. 12).

A letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy dated November 16, 1938, contains the name of Roy Wilkins in a list of sponsors of that group, cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Conference as a Communist-front organization which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in report dated June 25, 1942).

According to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1937 (p. 6), Roy Wilkins was one of the sponsors of a joint meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American Friends of Chinese People.

The American League Against War and Fascism was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954); it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as a "Communist-front organization" (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and as "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League * * * as "completely under the control of Communists" (reports of March 29, 1944; January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942). American Friends of the Chinese People was also cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944).

The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 8), reported that Roy Wilkins spoke for the International Labor Defense in Brooklyn. The International Labor Defense was cited by the Attorney General as the legal arm of the Communist Party and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446; and press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the ILD as the legal arm of the Communist Party (reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the group in a report released September 2, 1947.

Roy Wilkins spoke at a New York State convention of the Workers Alliance, as reported in the Daily Worker of February 11, 1939 (p. 1), and February 7, 1939 (p. 5). The Workers Alliance was cited as a Communist-penetrated organization and later as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7443, and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the Workers Alliance as among the successes in the Communist-front movements (report dated January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

In an article by Blaine Owen which appeared in the Daily Worker of June 17, 1936 (p. 1), entitled "1936 Communist Party Convention Significant to Negroes," he stated: "The greatest significant undoubtedly attends the 1936 convention of the Communist Party," Roy Wilkins, assistant national secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and editor of the Crisis, said today. "It must be patent to anyone who has kept track of the news that the political leftwing—and especially the Communist program—has been an important factor in bringing the plight of the Negro people, along with other underprivileged groups, more sharply to the attention of those parties which have been in power. * * * Nevertheless, there is no doubt in my mind that the program and demands of the Communists have had a very wholesome effect of the Negro people themselves. They have been emboldened by the basic and basically right demands put forth." This, it was pointed out to Wilkins, is what the Communist Party means when it bases its entire campaign on the proposal for and toward the realization of the broad People's Front. He nodded.

To understand the civil rights movement as propagated by the NAACP, I feel that a person must know something of the history and development of the American Negro movement here in the United States subsequent to the reconstruction period.

In 1895, Booker T. Washington, president of Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, was selected to speak for the southern Negro at the Atlanta Exposition. Dr. Washington stated his position clearly and with great effect. I would like to quote several paragraphs from Booker T. Washington's address which I feel sum up the entire philosophy enunciated by him and his group:

The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercises of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house.

Also:

Cast it down in agricultural, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man's chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this exposition more eloquent than in emphasizing this chance. Our greatest danger is that in the great leap from slavery to freedom we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands, and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labor and put brains and skill into the common occupations of life; shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities.

There was an entirely different school of thought, however, which was headed by Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, of Atlantic University. Dr. DuBois was a very bitter critic of the Washingtonian movement, which he referred to as "the Tuskegee machine." Dr. DuBois was the leader

of the left-wing element of American Negro Society which, in 1905, met at Niagara Falls, N. Y., and devised plans whereby complete social equality could be attained. This group was subsequently called the Niagara movement.

The Niagara movement was not very effective, because it was hampered by lack of funds. However, in 1908, a race riot occurred in Springfield, Ill., the home of Abraham Lincoln, which aroused the interest of the dormant abolitionist movement in the North. As a result of the feeling which was aroused by the Springfield race riots, William English Walling made a strong appeal for the emancipation of the American Negro in the fields of political and social equality. This appeal later became the clarion for the formation of a new organization, called National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which joined the white liberals of the northern abolitionist traditions with the Negro liberals of the Niagara movement.

Dr. DuBois was one of the founding fathers of the present-day NAACP, which was founded in 1909. This Dr. DuBois, who broke away from the Booker T. Washington group, was the leader of the Niagara movement. His record of citations from the House Committee on Un-American Activities takes up nine pages single-spaced:

FEBRUARY 21, 1956.

Subject: Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, founder NAACP, leader Niagara movement.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Worker (Sunday edition of the Communist publication, the Daily Worker) on April 27, 1947, reported that "almost 100 Negro leaders, headed by W. E. B. DuBois, Paul Robeson, and Roscoe Dunjee, last week called upon President Truman 'to repudiate decisively' steps to 'illegalize the Communist Party.' * * * As Negro Americans * * * we cannot be unmindful that this proposal to outlaw the Communist Party comes precisely when our Federal Government professes grave concern over the democratic rights of peoples in far distant parts of the world" (p. 8 of the Worker).

Dr. DuBois sponsored a statement attacking the arrest of Communist Party leaders (Daily Worker, August 23, 1948, p. 3); he sponsored a "Statement by Negro Americans" on behalf of the Communist leaders (the Worker of August 29, 1948, p. 11); he filed a brief in the Supreme Court on behalf of the 12 Communist leaders (Daily Worker, January 9, 1949, p. 3); he signed statements on behalf of Communist leaders, as shown in the following sources: Daily Worker, January 17, 1949 (p. 3); February 28, 1949 (p. 9); Daily People's World, May 12, 1950 (p. 12); Daily Worker, September 19, 1950 (p. 2); and in 1952, he signed an appeal to President Truman, requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, p. 4); also an appeal on their behalf addressed to President Eisenhower (Daily People's World, November 17, 1954, p. 2). Dr. DuBois was one of the sponsors of the National Non-Partisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist leaders, as shown on the back of their letterhead dated September 9, 1949.

A statement on behalf of Eugene Dennis, a Communist, contained the signature of Dr. DuBois, identified as an educator (Daily Worker of May 5, 1950, p. 2); he signed a telegram of the National Commitee To Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims, greeting Eugene Dennis on his 48th birthday (Daily Worker, August 11, 1952, p. 3); Eugene Dennis was formerly secretary general of the Communist Party.

The Daily Worker of August 2, 1949 (p. 2), disclosed that Dr. DuBois endorsed Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., well-known Communist leader; he was honorary chairman of the Committee To Defend V. J. Jerome, chairman, cultural commission of the Communist Party, United States of America (letterhead dated June 24, 1952). A leaflet of the Civil Rights Congress (dated March 20, 1947) named Dr. DuBois as having defended Gerhart Eisler, Communist. He was one of the sponsors of the Committee To Defend Alexander Tractenberg, former member of the national committee of the Communist Party (Daily People's World of April 17, 1952, p. 7; and the Daily Worker of April 18, 1952, p. 6).

The Daily Worker of February 16, 1948 (p. 16), reported that some "80 leading New York civic leaders, trade unionists, and professionals yesterday joined Dr. William Jay Schieffelin, president emeritus of the citizens union, to demand the prompt seating of Simon W. Gerson to the city council seat made vacant by the death of Councilman Peter V. Cacchione, Brooklyn Communist. * * * The civic leaders' statement is directed to Mayor O'Dwyer and city council majority leader Joseph T. Sharkey. It is a reprint of a letter to the New York Times by Dr. Schieffelin in which he charges that the real reason for the refusal to seal German (sic. Gerson) is 'the current anti-Communist hysteria.'" Dr. DuBois was named as having signed the statement. (See also advertisement in New York Times of February 19, 1948, p. 13.)

Dr. DuBois was a member of a committee formed to protest the arrest of Pablo Neruda, Communist Chilean senator and world famous poet; he signed a statement of the organization in support of Neruda. (Daily Worker of April 7, 1948, p. 13, and April 10, 1950, p. 2, respectively.) He was sponsor of a reception and testimonial for Harry Sacher, defense attorney for the Communist leaders. (Daily Worker of December 5, 1949, p. 2.)

When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder (special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Attorney General of the United States had cited the Citizens' Committee as Communist (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447, and press release of Apr. 27, 1949). Dr. DuBois was a member of the Citizens' Committee * * * in 1942, as shown on their letterhead dated February 11, 1942; he sponsored a dinner of the group, according to the Daily Worker of February 5, 1942, and signed the call to the National Free Browder Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 25, 1942, pages 1 and 4.

A 1950 letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born carries the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a list of sponsors of that organization; the same information appears on an undated letterhead of the group, distributing a speech of Abner Green at the conference of December 2–3, 1950; a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born dated April 30, 1951, names him as a national sponsor of the organization. He signed the group's statement opposing the Hobbs bill (Daily Worker, July 25, 1950, p. 4); he signed their statement opposing denaturalization (Daily Worker of August 10, 1950, p. 5); and signed a telegram prepared and dispatched by the organization to the Attorney General of the United States, protesting holding nine noncitizens without bail under the McCarran Act. (Daily Worker of November 24, 1952, p. 3.) He was also listed in the Daily Worker of October 21, 1954 (p. 2) as one of 95 sponsors of the National Conference to Defend the Rights of Foreign Born Americans, to be held December 11 through 12 in New York City by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

The special committee cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (report of March 29, 1944: also cited in report of June 25, 1942); the Attorney General cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to executive order 10450, see consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

"For years, the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party but outside of New York City, they have been unable to win control" (Special Committee's Report 1311 of March 29, 1944). Dr. DuBois spoke at a State conference of the American Labor Party (Daily Worker of December 12, 1950, p. 5); he spoke at a dinner, April 18, opening the presidential campaign in New York City (Daily Worker of April 14, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and the Daily Worker of April 21, 1952, p. 1); he spoke at an election rally in Madison Square Garden, May 13, held under the auspices of the American Labor Party (Daily Worker of May 8, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and May 14, 1952, p. 1); and he spoke at an election rally in Madison Square Garden, October 27 (Daily Worker of October 22, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and October 29, 1952, p. 2).

The Daily Worker of March 29, 1948 (p. 7), named Dr. DuBois as a member of the Executive Board and of the Policy Committee, Council on African Affairs; he signed the council's petition to the United Nations as shown in the Daily Worker of June 5, 1950 (p. 4); drafted their statement against the policy of the United States in Korea (Daily Worker of July 25, 1950, p. 3) and spoke at the Council's conference on April 24 at Friendship Baptist Church in New York City (Daily Worker, April 23, 1954, p. 8 and April 26, 1954, p. 6). The Attorney General cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

The Attorney General cited the Jefferson School of Social Science as an "adjunct of the Communist Party" (press release of December 4, 1947); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the Special Committee reported that "at the beginning of the present year, the old Communist Party Workers School and the School for Democracy were merged into the Jefferson School of Social Science." (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.) Dr. DuBois was honored at the Jefferson School, as shown in the Daily Worker on February 1, 1951 (p. 2); it was announced in the Daily Worker on January 2, 1952 (p. 7), that Dr. DuBois was scheduled to conduct a seminar on "Background of African Liberation Struggles" at the Jefferson School; the January 26, 1952, issue of the same publication (p. 7), named him as a faculty member of that school, as did the Worker, October 4, 1953 (p. 10) and the Daily Worker, October 14, 1953 (p. 8)—advertisement. He signed statements on behalf of the Jefferson School as shown in the Daily Worker, November 25, 1953 (p. 2) and the Daily People's World, July 6, 1954 (p. 7).

In a report of the special committee, dated March 29, 1944, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as having been, in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian (report dated March 29, 1944); the organization has been cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated consolidated list of April 1, 1954). Dr. DuBois signed a statement of the national council in 1947 (Daily Worker, October 17, 1947, p. 4); he signed the organization's statement protesting the Iron Curtain, as reported in the Daily People's World on May 20, 1948 (p. 5); he signed a statement of the council, praising Henry Wallace's Open Letter to Stalin in May 1948 (from a pamphlet entitled "How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace," p. 9); he signed their statement calling for a conference with the Soviet Union (Daily Worker, June 21, 1948, p. 3); he signed their Roll Call for Peace (Daily Worker of August 31, 1948, p. 5); he sent greetings through the national council on the 31st anniversary of the Russian Revolution (Daily Worker, November 10, 1948, p. 11); he signed the council's appeal to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled "End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace," dated December 1948); he spoke at the Congress on American-Soviet Relations, December 3–5, 1949, arranged by the national council and signed the council's letter to the American people, urging that a unified democratic Germany be established (Daily People's World, August 13, 1952, pp. 4 and 6).

A letterhead of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, dated August 21, 1949, lists the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois as having signed an open letter of the organization, addressed to Senators and Congressmen, urging defeat of President Truman's arms program; he answered a questionnaire of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy in favor of recognition of Chinese Communist Government, as shown in Far East Spotlight for December 1949–January 1950 (p. 23).

The Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact was cited as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949, to be held in Washington, D. C., and as having been instigated by "Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign" (Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 378 on the Communist "Peace" Offensive dated April 1, 1951). The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy has been cited as Communist by the Attorney General (press release of April 27, 1949); also redesignated-consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

A page of signatures from the Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union, "sponsored by American friends of the Soviet Union, and signed by hundreds of thousands of Americans," was published in the November 1937 issue of Soviet Russia Today (p. 79); the Golden Book was to be presented to President Kalinin at the 20th anniversary celebration. The page carried the title, "I hereby inscribe my name in greeting to the people of the Soviet Union on the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Republic," and a facsimile of the name, W. E. B. DuBois, appeared on that page.

The Golden Book of American Friendship was cited as a "Communist enterprise" signed by "hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

A letterhead of the New York Committee To Win the Peace, dated June 1, 1946, contains the name of W. E. B. DuBois in a list of New York committee members. The National Committee To Win the Peace, with which the New York committee is affiliated, was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General. (Press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated consolidated list of April 1, 1954.)

Dr. DuBois sponsored a petition of the American Council for a Democratic Greece, as disclosed by the Daily People's World of August 23, 1948 (p. 2); he signed a statement of the same organization, condemning the Greek Government, as reported in the Daily Worker of September 2, 1948 (p. 7). The American Council for a Democratic Greece has been cited as subversive and Communist, an organization formerly known as the Greek-American Council (Attorney General of the United States in press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

Dr. DuBois was a sponsor of a conference of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, October 9–10, 1948, as shown in a leaflet entitled "To Safeguard These Rights," published by the Bureau of Academic Freedom of the National Council; a letterhead of the National Council (received for files January 1949) named him as a member-at-large of that organization; he was named as vice chairman of the group on the leaflet, Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950; a letterhead of the same organization's southern California chapter, dated April 24, 1950, lists him as a member-at-large of the national council; he was elected vice chairman of the group in 1950 (Daily Worker, May 1, 1950, p. 12); a letterhead of the group dated July 28, 1950, names him as vice chairman of the group; he endorsed a conference on equal rights for Negroes in the arts, sciences, and professions sponsored by the New York Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (Daily Worker, November 9, 1951, p. 7); the call to the conference contained the same information. A letterhead of the national council, dated December 7, 1952, named him as vice chairman.

The call to a Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, issued by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions for New York City, March 25–27, 1949, as well as the conference program (p. 12), and the Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (p. 9), named Dr. DuBois as one of the sponsors of that conference; he was a member of the program committee of the conference, honorary chairman of the panel at cultural and scientific conference (program, p. 7), and spoke on the Nature of Intellectual Freedom at that conference (p. 78 of the edited report of the conference entitled "Speaking for Peace").

The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, released April 19, 1949; in the same review, the Scientific and Cultural Conference was cited as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

The Daily People's World of October 28, 1947 (p. 4), named Dr. DuBois as one of the sponsors of a national conference of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago, November 21–23, 1947; he sponsored their Freedom Crusade (Daily Worker, December 15, 1948, p. 2); the Call to a Bill of Rights Conference, called by the Civil Rights Congress, for July 16–17, 1949, in New York City, named him as one of the sponsors of that conference; the program of the National Civil Rights Legislative Conference, Janauary 18–19, 1949, called by the Civil Rights Congress, lists him as one of the conference sponsors; he was chairman of a conference of the Congress, as reported in the Worker of January 2, 1949 (p. 5); Dr. DuBois was defended by the Civil Rights Congress (Daily Worker, February 13, 1951, p. 3); he signed the organization's open letter to J. Howard McGrath, United States Attorney General, on behalf of the four jailed trustees of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York (advertisement "paid for by contributions of signers" which appeared in the Evening Star on October 30, 1951, p. A–7); he participated in the organization's sixth anniversary dinner in New York City, March 26, 1952 (Daily Worker, March 28, 1952, p. 4).

The Civil Rights Congress was formed in 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; it is "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Rept. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated September 2, 1947); the Attorney General cited the congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

Dr. DuBois spoke in Washington, D. C., on May 9, 1947, under the auspices of the Washington Book Shop, as shown by a leaflet of the Book Shop, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General; it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as follows: "Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organization" (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954; and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The special committee cited the Washington Book Shop as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944).

The Workers Book Shop catalog for 1948 (p. 5), advertised Dr. DuBois' The World and Africa for sale; the 1949–50 catalog (p. 11) advertised his Black Folk Then and Now; the Worker for March 1, 1953 (p. 16), carried an advertisement of Dr. DuBois' books, The Battle for Peace and Black Reconstruction on sale at the Workers Bookshop, New York City. The Workers Book Shops are a chain of Communist bookshops which are official outlets for Communist literature.

As shown on the following sources, Dr. DuBois was a member of the Advisory Council of Soviet Russia Today: Letterhead of the publication dated September 8, 1947; a letterhead of September 30, 1947; and an undated letterhead received April 1948. The Daily People's World of November 6, 1952 (p. 7), reported that Dr. DuBois had written an article for the November issue of New World Review; and his article entitled "Normal United States-China Relations" appeared in the issue of August 1954 (pp. 13–15). He was also shown by the Daily Worker of October 20, 1954 (p. 7), as one of those who attended the annual banquet held by New World Review on October 14 at which special tribute was paid to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Robeson. Soviet Russia Today has been cited as a Communist-front publication by the special committee in reports of March 29, 1944, and June 25, 1942; the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited it as a Communist-front publication in a report dated October 23, 1949. Soviet Russia Today changed its name to New World Review, effective with the March 1951 issue.

The Daily Worker of July 6, 1951 (p. 7), reported that Dr. DuBois was author of the pamphlet, I Take My Stand for Peace, published by the New Country Publishers, official Communist Party publishing house which has published the works of William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, Communist Party chairman and executive secretary, respectively. (Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of May 11, 1948).

In 1947 and 1948, Dr. DuBois was contributing editor on the staff of New Masses magazine and later of Masses and Mainstream. (New Masses, July 22, 1947, p. 2; Masses and Mainstream, March 1948, vol. 1, No. 1; and issue of August 1950, p. 1; June 1954, inside front cover.) He contributed articles to the following issues of New Masses and Masses and Mainstream: New Masses for September 10, 1946 (p. 3) and June 10, 1947 (p. 20); Masses and Mainstream for April 1951 (pp. 10–16); and February 1952 (pp. 8–14).

In 1940, Dr. DuBois signed New Masses letter to President Roosevelt as shown in New Masses for April 2, 1940 (p. 21); he was honored at a dinner in New York City, January 14, 1946, arranged by New Masses and at which awards were made for greater interracial understanding (Daily Worker of January 7, 1946, p. 11, cols. 1 and 2); the endorsed New Masses, as reported in the Daily Worker of April 7, 1947 (p. 11); he sponsored a plea for financial support of New Masses, as disclosed in the issue of that publication for April 8, 1947 (p. 9); he received the New Masses award for his contribution in promoting democracy and interracial unity at the publication's second annual awards dinner (New Masses of November 18, 1947, p. 7); the February 1953 issue of Masses and Mainstream carried a chapter from Dr. DuBois' book, The Soul of Black Folk, written 50 years ago (Daily Worker, February 23, 1953, p. 7); he was author of In Battle for Peace, described as the story of his 83d birthday, and which was published by Masses and Mainstream (the Daily Worker of June 18, 1952, p. 7; Daily People's World of September 17, 1952, p. 7; the Daily Worker of September 23, 1952, p. 7; and the Worker of December 21, 1952, p. 7).

The Attorney General of the United States cited New Masses as a Communist periodical (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448); the special committee cited it as a nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party. (Report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942.) Beginning with the March 1948 issue, New Masses and Mainstream (Marxist quarterly) consolidated into what is now known as Masses and Mainstream, with the announcement that "here, proudly, in purpose even if not in identical form, is a magazine that combines and carriers forward the 37-year-old tradition of New Masses and the more recent literary achievement of Mainstream. We have regrouped our energies, not to retire from the battle but to wage it with fresh resolution and confidence" (Masses and Mainstream for March 1948, p. 3).

A letterhead of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, dated March 15, 1952, carried the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a list of sponsors; he joined in a request of that committee for a new trial for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg (Daily Worker of June 12, 1952, p. 6); he participated in a rally October 23 in New York City, to demand clemency for the Rosenbergs (Daily Worker, Oct. 27, 1952, p. 8); he signed an amicus curiae brief presented to Supreme Court in Washington, D. C., urging a new trial for the Rosenbergs (Daily Worker of November 10, 1952, p. 3; and the Daily People's World of November 13, 1952, p. 8). He wrote an article entitled "A Negro Leader's Plea To Save Rosenbergs" (The Worker of November 16, 1952, p. 3M); and the Daily Worker of January 21, 1953 (p. 7), reported that he had urged clemency for the Rosenbergs.

The Daily Worker of April 11, 1949 (p. 5), reported that Dr. DuBois was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the World Peace Congress in Paris; he was cochairman of the American Sponsoring Committee of the Congress, as disclosed on a leaflet entitled "World Congress for Peace, Paris," April 20–23, 1949, he was proposed as a candidate for the World Peace Prize, awarded by the World Peace Congress (Daily People's World of December 7, 1951, p. 4); he was a member of the Executive Committee of the World Peace Congress (Daily Worker of September 14, 1950, p. 5); he was one of the sponsors of the Second World Peace Congress in Sheffield, England (Daily Worker of October 19, 1950, p. 3); he was elected to the Presiding Committee of the World Peace Congress (Daily Worker of November 17, 1950, p. 1); he was a member of the World Peace Council of that Congress (Daily Worker of November 24, 1950, p. 9); a mimeographed letter dated December 1, 1950, contains his name in a list of sponsors of the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress.

Dr. DuBois was a member of the United States Sponsoring Committee of the American Intercontinental Peace Conference (Daily Worker of December 28, 1951, p. 2, and February 6, 1952, p. 2); the Peace Conference was called by the World Peace Council, formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw; he was awarded the International Peace Prize for "six world figures" by the World Peace Council (Daily People's World of January 29, 1953, p. 7; the Worker of February 8, 1953, p. 5; and Daily People's World, November 25, 1953, p. 4). He awarded the Stalin Peace Prize for 1953 to Howard Fast in ceremonies held in the Hotel McAlpin in April 1954. (See Daily Worker, April 26, 1954, pp. 3 and 6 and the Worker, May 9, 1954, p. 9.)

The Daily Worker of June 20, 1950 (p. 2), reported that Dr. DuBois signed the World Peace Appeal; the same information appears on an undated leaflet of the enterprise, received by this committee September 11, 1950. A mimeographed list of individuals who signed the Stockholm World Appeal To Outlaw Atomic Weapons, received for filing October 23, 1950, contains the name of Dr. DuBois. He was Chairman of the Peace Information Center where the Stockholm peace petition was made available. (Daily Worker of May 25, 1950, p. 2; and Aug. 16, 1950, p. 5.)

The World Peace Congress which was held in Paris, France, April 20–23, 1949, was cited as a Communist front among the "peace" conferences which "have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense Pact" (Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of April 19, 1949; July 13, 1950; and April 1, 1951). The World Peace Council was formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw and was "heralded by the Moscow radio as the expression of the determination of the peoples to take into their own hands the struggle for peace." (Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated April 1, 1951.)

The World Peace Appeal was cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; it "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy" and was "lauded in the Communist press, putting every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal.'" (Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of April 1, 1951.)

The American Peace Crusade, organized in January 1951, was cited as an organization which "the Communists established as a new instrument for their 'peace' offensive in the United States" (Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of February 19, 1951, and April 1, 1951); Dr. DuBois was one of the sponsors of the crusade (Daily Worker of February 1, 1951, p. 2); minutes of the sponsors meeting which was held in Washington, D. C., March 15, 1951 (p. 4), named him as one of the initiators of the crusade and also as having been proposed as cochairman of that meeting; he was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, which was held in Chicago, June 29–July 1, 1951, called by the American Peace Crusade to advance the theme of world peace (Daily Worker, April 22, 1951, p. 2; May 1, 1951, p. 11; the American Peace Crusade, May 1951, pp. 1 and 4; the Daily Worker of May 9, 1951, p. 4; Daily Worker of June 11, 1951, p. 2; a leaflet of the congress; Daily Worker of July 1, 1951, p. 3; a leaflet entitled "An Invitation to American Labor to Participate in a Peace Congress"; the call to the American People's Congress; the Daily Worker of July 3, 1951, p. 2). He signed a petition of the crusade, calling on President Truman and Congress to seek a big-power pact (Daily Worker, February 1, 1952, p. 1); he attended a meeting of Delegates Assembly for Peace, called by the crusade and held in Washington, D. C., April 1 (Daily Worker, April 3, 1952, p. 3); he was one of the sponsors of a peace referendum jointly with the American Peace Crusade to make the end of the Korean war a major issue in the 1952 election campaign (Daily People's World of August 25, 1952, p. 8).

Dr. DuBois issued a statement on the death of Stalin which read in part as follows: "Let all Negroes, Jews, and foreign-born who have suffered in America from prejudice and intolerance, remember Joseph Stalin" (Daily Worker of March 9, 1953, p. 3); the Daily Worker of January 18, 1952 (p. 8), reported that he had renewed his fight for a passport in order to attend the American Intercontinental Peace Conference in Rio de Janeiro; it was reported in the Washington Evening Star on May 10, 1952 (p. B–21), that Dr. DuBois was refused admission to Canada to attend the Canadian Peace Congress because he refused to undergo an examination by the Canadian Immigration Service. On September 14, 1952, the Worker (p. M6), reported that Dr. DuBois had experienced passport difficulties when leaving the United States; and on May 4, 1953 (p. 2), the Daily Worker reported that United States delegate, Betty Sanders, told the opening session of the Continental Cultural Congress in Santiago, Chile, that DuBois would have attended in person "as well as in spirit," if he had not been denied a passport.

According to Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, "subversion" means "act of subverting, or a state of being subverted; overthrow; utter ruin; destruction. That which subverts."

The time element would prevent my reading all of these citations on the various individuals who compose the high echelon of this organization. I will, however, read excerpts from some of them and would like to ask later for permission to incorporate each of them in full in the RECORD.

OCTOBER 13, 1955.

Subject: Arthur B. Spingarn, national president, member of board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Arthur B. Spingarn is listed as an individual participation in the Conference on Africa, held by the Council on African Affairs in New York City, April 14, 1944, according to the Council's pamphlet, For a New Africa (p. 37).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

An undated leaflet, The Only Sound Policy for a Democracy and the Daily Worker of March 18, 1945 (p. 2), listed Arthur Spingarn, president NAACP, New York, N. Y., as one who signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions * * * to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party. An advertisement in the New York Times, April 1, 1946 (p. 16), listed Arthur B. Spingarn as a signer of a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties opposing use of injunctions in labor disputes.

The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation * * * as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

An undated letterhead of the Public Use of Arts Committee listed Arthur B. Spingarn as a sponsor of the organization. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112), cited the Public Use of Arts Committee as a Communist front which was organized by the Communist-controlled Artists Union.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Channing H. Tobias, chairman of the Board of Directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

An undated leaflet, "The South Is Closer Than You Think," named Channing Tobias as a member of the executive board and as cochairman of the New York committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare. The "Southern Patriot" for December 1946 (p. 8) named him as an advisory associate for 1947–48 of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. This organization has been cited as a Communist front by the special committee on Un-American Activities (Report of March 29, 1944, p. 147); and, was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities (Report No. 592, June 12, 1947) wherein it was cited as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

Channing H. Tobias was shown as a member of the Council on African Affairs, Inc., in the pamphlets, "Eight Million Demand Freedom" (back cover). "For a New Africa" (p. 36), "Africa in the War" (inside back cover), and "Seeing Is Believing"; the leaflets, "The Job To Be Done," and "What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World?" all issued by the organization; and a letterhead of the council dated May 17, 1945. In this connection, it should be noted that the New York Times reported on May 29, 1948 (p. 6) that Channing H. Tobias had resigned from the Council on African Affairs. The Council on African Affairs has been cited as a subversive and Communist organization by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450 in Attorney General's memorandum to heads of departments, April 29, 1953).

The call to a dinner forum on "Protestantism Answers Hate," which was held in New York City, February 25, 1941, named Channing H. Tobias as one of the sponsors of the forum, arranged by the Protestant Digest Associates; he was a member of the editorial advisory board of the Protestant Digest, as shown on a letterhead of the publication dated October 7, 1941; and the June-July 1942 issue of the Protestant named him as an editorial adviser. The Protestant Digest, later known as The Protestant and published by Protestant Digest Associates, was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as "a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal." (Report of March 29, 1944, p. 48.)

A letterhead of the People's Institute of Applied Religion, dated April 9, 1942, named Channing H. Tobias as one of the sponsors of that organization. The United States Attorney General has cited the People's Institute as subversive and Communist. (Letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450 in Attorney General memorandum of April 29, 1953.)

The Daily Worker of March 4, 1939 (p. 2) reported that Channing Tobias endorsed the fifth New York City Conference of the American League for Peace and Democracy; and a letterhead of the organization, dated June 12, 1939, showed him as a member of the executive board. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "The largest of the Communist front movements in the United States" and added, "The league contends publicly that it is not a Communist-front movement, yet at the very beginning Communists dominated it. Earl Browder was its vice president." (See Report of January 3, 1939, pp. 69–71 and March 29, 1944, p. 37; also cited in Reports, January 3, 1941, June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943.) The Attorney General, in 1942, cited it as being established in 1937 "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7443–7444); and later, the Attorney General cited the ALPD as a subversive and Communist organization. (Letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948 and September 21, 1948; also redesignated in Attorney General memorandum, April 29, 1953.)

Identified as being from New York City, Channing H. Tobias was named as one of those who signed the January 1943 message of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties addressed to the United States House of Representatives (leaflet containing the message attached to an undated letterhead of the organization). He sponsored the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7–9, 1940 in Washington, D. C., as shown by the call to the conference, in which source his address was shown as New York City. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, Reports of March 29, 1944, p. 50; June 25, 1942, p. 20; and January 2, 1943, pp. 9 and 12); as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, astensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communist attempts to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (Attorney General Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446); and as subversive and Communist (Attorney General letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also redesignated April 29, 1953). The organization "was established as a result of a conference on constitutional liberties held in Washington, D. C., June 7–9, 1940." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446, and the report of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, p. 102.)

Dr. Channing H. Tobias, National Council, YMCA, was listed in the call for a New York State Conference on National Unity to be held in New York City, December 6, 1941, as a signed of the call. This conference was cited as a Communits front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities. (Report of March 29, 1944, p. 133.)

Dr. Tobias was shown as a sponsor of the United Nations in America dinner, April 17, 1943, in New York City, in the invitation to that dinner issued by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. This organization was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (reports of March 29, 1944, p. 155, and June 25, 1942, p. 13), and as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated, April 29, 1953).

The call to a Win-the-Peace Conference, an official letterhead of the conference, dated February 28, 1946, and the Daily Worker of March 5, 1946, listed Dr. Tobias as a sponsor. The National Committee To Win the Peace, which was formed at that conference in Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946, has been cited as a subversive and Communist organization by the Attorney General. (Letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated by the Attorney General, April 29, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order 10450.)

On a letterhead dated August 6, 1945, the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief listed Dr. Channing H. Tobias as a member of its sponsors committee. The Attorney General has listed this organization as being subversive and Communist. (Letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated, April 29, 1953.)

The hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate on nomination of Channing H. Tobias to be Alternate Representative of the United States at Sixth General Assembly of the United Nations, shows Dr. Tobias testified as follows relative to some of the information outlined above:

"Now, gentlemen, I come directly to the question at issue. In the first place, let

me say that my political affiliations have been as follows: I have never supported other than the two major parties, Republican and Democratic; I have always been a political independent.

"So far as communism is concerned, in its ideology and as a system of government, it has always been repugnant to me for the very obvious reason that it is godless, and I am a Christian. It is at variance with the Christian religion in which I so firmly believe, and to which I have devoted my life.

"Now as to the charges that I had presented to me this morning, I want to be as frank as I can. There is a statement that the Daily Worker of March 4, 1939, reported that I had endorsed the Fifth New York City Conference of the American League for Peace and Democracy, and there are other committees like that that appear on the list.

"The answer is that in that day of hectic anxiety to win the war and to improve relationships among our people there were few people who were thinking about what might be the possible standing of these groups in the minds of American people. As one by one they have been debunked and their true purposes have been made known, I, along with all decent Americans, have withdrawn signatures and withdrawn from participation, which was very meager at the best. I make no wholesale denial concerning any of these. I may have given my signature for membership or for sponsorship. Most of them I do not recall except as names, and you must admit that they all had very good names, high-sounding names.

"SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE

"There are 1 or 2, however, that I recall, in which I had working relationships. First of all, reference is made to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. I was a member of that group, because as it was organized and as it first operated, it had the support of some of the finest people in America. I do not need to call names. The record is available. The purpose as outlined and the work done by the New York committee challenged support of people of both races in New York until the time came when it was quite evident that some of its leaders were using it to enhance the party line. Then, along with others, I withdrew from affiliation with it.

"COUNCIL ON AFRICAN AFFAIRS

"The Council on African Affairs is mentioned, and I am very glad that that is mentioned, because it happens to be one of the few things on which I have a little documentation. I was a member of the Council on African Affairs from its beginning, because its director had been a faithful secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association. As a matter of fact, I had helped to bring him into association work and was instrumental in having him assigned during the First War to a field of service in Africa under a British command, and after that for 15 or 16 years, he served as a representative of the YMCA in South Africa. It was during his experience down there that he became embittered and came back home.

"He organized a group to try to bring the facts of African life before the public. We thought it worthwhile to do that. As the years passed by, it was quite evident that there was Communist infiltration and it got so strong that this young man, who had himself very largely followed the line against the advice of his best friends, was threatened with expulsion from the directorship of the council.

"There was a memorable meeting on February 3, 1948, a meeting at which I made a simple motion at the beginning, which resulted in a discussion that lasted 5 hours.

"Dr. Yergan, who had been the director of that organization and who is now so completely convinced of the treachery of the Communist leadership and its program, is being used by loyalty organizations that find him helpful in exposing those treacheries. He was up for expulsion. A group of us * * * tried to wrest the organization from the hands of that group.

"I made a motion at the very beginning that the simple statement that had been made after the Department of Justice declared the group subversive, that it was neither Communist, Fascist, nor subversive, a very simple statement, be made declaring the sentiment of the council. That motion was never put.

"After 5 hours of wrangling and delaying tactics, common to the group that was then in the ascendency of the council, I arose and offered my resignation, and said that I could no longer have any part with the group when it was quite plain what was happening there." (Pp. 9 and 10.)

At this point in the hearing (pp. 11–13), Dr. Tobias quoted from an article in the New York Times of February 4, 1948, headed, "Tobias Firm in Stand Opposing Leftists," and a similar article in the New York World-Telegram of the same date; and the articles were entered in the record together with one from the New York World-Telegram of October 13, 1948, headed, "Dr. Yergan Denounces Commies as Wreckers." Then testimony was continued:

"PROTESTANT MAGAZINE

"Dr. TOBIAS. Reference is made here to the Protestant magazine. I am glad that it is here. This is a magazine that was founded a few years ago by Mr. Kenneth Leslie, who I did not know at the time. He sent a sample copy of it which seemed to be legitimate, or furnished the material for a legitimate organ of Protestantism. He asked for my signature, and, if you will look at any copy of that magazine and view the names of those who agreed to serve on the advisory board, you will see a practical who's who of the Protestant ministry of this country. They believed at the beginning that it was legitimate. Pretty soon it showed that it was not, and when that came out, along with others * * * I wrote and asked that my name be left off of all communications and off the published list of advisers of the committee. A principal reason for my disgust with it was that I found after a short while that it was definitely meant for one purpose, and that was to sound an anti-Catholic note. I am a Protestant but I am interfaith believer. * * *

"So that connection with that was connection with something that, at the beginning we regarded as legitimate, and found out was not, and when we found out that it was not, discontinued relationships.

"PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE OF APPLIED RELIGION

"There is mention here of the People's Institute of Applied Religion. Many of us were taken in on that. It was largely on the ground of the fact that a man by the name of Claude Williams published a book of his struggles and hardships in the South, in the interest of race relationships.

"At the beginning it looked like a perfectly worthwhile movement. I gave it some support, made contributions to it, until I found out that it was plainly being dominated by leftists and I had no more to do with it and have had no more to do with that or any of the rest of these organizations that are referred to here.

"I mention those because I happen to know what the record is about them. As I have said, many of the others I have no recollection of except as names, and I am perfectly willing to answer questions, but I want to say this final word before I have finished, and I want to put this into the record also. It is a little difficult when one gets attacked from the right and left to know the answer. I never read the Daily Worker, never have read it, but a friend of mine put this copy of it into my hands, and I want to read from it. This was on Thursday, January 25, 1951:

"'Six prominent Negroes have taken it upon themselves to attempt to mobilize the Negro people behind the war program of Wall Street and Washington. They are * * * Channing H. Tobias, only United States Negro director of a Wall Street bank, and one of the two Negro directors of a Wall Street cartel set up to exploit Liberian resources and peoples; * * * With the exception of Dr. Mays, these individuals have long been go-betweens through whom the billionaires who own and run the United States try to lead and control the main organization of Negro struggle.'

"I want that, Mr. Chairman, included in the record.

"Senator SPARKMAN. Without objection, it will be done" (pp. 14 and 15).

Dr. Tobias concluded his statement with this paragraph:

"I want to say in all frankness and candor that whether or not I go on this delegation is not too important. What is important, however, is whether or not 15,000,000 loyal Negro Americans get the impression that its leadership is being crucified because of innuendoes, allegations, and associations. The answer to that question is more important than any word that I could possibly say at Paris.

"Thank you" (p. 16).

During the questioning which followed his statement, Dr. Tobias testified, "I have never been, am not now, a member of the Communist Party" (p. 23). In answer to a question on the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties he replied: "That is also a name organization. I happened to know the principal leader in that. That was Mr. George Marshall who was a brother of James Marshall, of the Board of Education of New York, and the son of the late Louis Marshall. Other than that, I know nothing about it. I had no activity in it whatever" (p. 25).

Regarding the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, Dr. Tobias said, "That is also just a name," that he had no other activity in it other than joining in the invitation of sponsoring a dinner, that he did not know at the time it was subversive, and added: "The very fact that it was supposed to be interested in foreign-born citizens—I was interested in them, too, and assumed that it was a good cause" (p. 25).

When questioned about the Win-the-Peace Conference and the New York State Conference on National Unity, Dr. Tobias answered that he knew nothing about either and did not remember them. However, he replied to questions on the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief: "Yes; I remember that. They gave a dinner at which Mrs. Roosevelt, I think, was one of the principal speakers. Everybody was interested in trying to help that cause at that time. * * * I don't know whether it has been placed on the subversive list or not, but at that time it was regarded as a perfectly respectable organization. * * * I don't remember membership in it at all. Sponsorship, I think is all" (from pp. 26 and 27).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Allan Knight Chalmers, national treasurer, member of the board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

In connection with his public testimony on August 17 and 18, 1937, before the special

Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Walter S. Steele furnished additional information which was printed in the hearings following his testimony and from which the reference below is taken:

"A good example of one of the united fronts in the United States is the Scottsboro Defense Committee * * *. The national chairman of this committee is the Reverend Allan Knight Chalmers, head of the Church League for Industrial Democracy; member of the advisory board of the National Religion and Labor Foundation; executive committee of the War Registers League; sponsor of the Emergency Peace Campaign, and a member of the sponsoring committee for the testimonial dinner given in honor of Norman Thomas in 1936." (Public hearings, vol. 1, p. 628.)

Except for the Scottsboro Defense Committee, none of these organizations has been cited in any manner either by the Committee on Un-American Activities or the Attorney General of the United States. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Scottsboro Defense Committee as a Communist-front organization in reports of January 3, 1939 (p. 82), and March 29, 1944 (p. 177).

Rev. Allan Knight Chalmers was listed among the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights in the program of that conference held February 12, 1940. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 96, 129). The Committee on Un-American Activities cited it as being among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (report of September 2, 1947, p. 3).

A leaflet entitled "Protestantism Answers Hate" contains the name of Dr. Allan Knight Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle, New York, in a list of sponsors of the call to a dinner forum in New York City, February 25, 1941, under auspices of Protestant Digest Associates. The Protestant Digest was cited by the special committee as "a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line * * *." (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Grace B. Fenderson, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The pamphlet, "For a New Africa" (p. 37), proceedings of the Conference on Africa held under auspices of the Council on African Affairs, April 14, 1944, named Mrs. Grace B. Fenderson as a conference participant.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Willard S. Townsend, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

One Willard Townsend was a signer of a plea for the release of Earl Browder from prison, according to an advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post, March 12, 1942. He was identified as international president of the United Transport Service Employees of America (CIO).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: A. Philip Randolph, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of September 12, 1950 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph, president, AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, opposed the jailing of the Communist leaders.

The Attorney General of the United States reported that A. Philip Randolph, president of the National Negro Congress, refused to run in April 1940 "on the ground that it was 'deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists'" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

Walter S. Steele, in testimony in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 92), referred to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"A. Philip Randolph, one-time president of the National Negro Congress, resigned his position because of the Communist control thereof. At the time of his resignation, at a meeting held in Washington, D. C., he charged that the congress was controlled by the Communist Party, through which he found it was chiefly financed."

George K. Hunton testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 13, 1949 (p. 451), concerning the Communist infiltration of the National Negro Congress with reference to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"In the National Negro Congress they did make progress. That was a sound, constructive organization started about 10 years ago. It was a good organization, with a sound, constructive program, and the Commies moved in, and within a year and a half the white Communist members completely outnumbered the Negro members and took over. Be it said to his credit that the then president, A. Philip Randolph, roundly denounced them and then resigned, and said no longer would the National Negro Congress represent the feeling of the Negro people who organized it * * * ."

Manning Johnson testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 14, 1949, as follows concerning the National Negro Congress and A. Philip Randolph:

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was the relationship of that commission (Negro Commission of the Communist Party) to the American Negro Labor Congress, the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, and the National Negro Congress?

"Mr. JOHNSON. The Negro League was formed by the Communist Party, and its program was identical with the program of the Communist Party for the Negro.

"The majority of members of the American Negro Labor Congress were Communists or fellow-travelers. It was a very narrow, sectarian organization, and the party decided to change its name and broaden its activities, so the name was changed to the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. * * *

"The League of Struggle for Negro Rights was never successful in penetrating any broad sections of the Negro people. It remained a very narrow and sectarian organization. So the party, after having received the open letter, which was really drawn in Moscow and called for breaking away from narrow organizations, in line with this open letter, at a meeting of the national committee which, as I recall, was in the latter part of 1934 or early part of 1935, we discussed the general situation among Negroes, and the conclusion was that there was considerable unrest among them and that the time was historically right for the formation of a broad and all-inclusive organization.

"As a result of that discussion and that conclusion, the national committee of the party, upon the recommendation of one of the members of the Negro commission present at that meeting, decided to set up the National Negro Congress. The national committee gave James W. Ford the responsibility, along with the Negro commission of the national committee, to form that congress.

"We were fishing around for someone to head the congress, and we found there was no finer person to get who was not a member of the party than A. Philip Randolph. He was approached and agreed.

* * * * *

"The third—and fatal—National Negro Congress was held in Washington, D. C. The Communists had become so drunk with power, and they felt they had such strong control over the congress, that they thought they could walk roughshod over the liberals, and they antagonized A. Philip Randolph and he began to fight James W. Ford and others.

"James W. Ford and others insisted I fight A. Philip Randolph, and I refused to do so, and at that time I predicted they were on the road to breaking up the congress.

"The fight widened to such an extent that Randolph began to speak openly against Communist domination. I used to wonder how Randolph could be so naive as to not know it was a Communist-front organization.

"Before the third congress met, we got wind that Randolph was going to resign. We had Communists go to that congress representing various paper organizations so as to give them control in voting.

"When Randolph saw the congress was packed with Communists, Randolph resigned and walked out * * *." (Pp. 510–512.)

A. Philip Randolph supported a statement to Congress issued by the American League Against War and Fascism against neutrality measures as reported by the Daily Worker of February 27, 1937 (p. 2). The Daily Worker of April 22, 1938 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph was one of the signers of a letter urging open hearings on the neutrality act which was sent to Congress under auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy. A. Philip Randolph was nominated as a member of the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the American Congress for Peace and Democracy held in Washington, D. C., January 6–8, 1939, as shown by the pamphlet, "7½ Million * * *" (p. 32). Lettersheads of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated May 18, 1938, and June 11, 1938, name him as a sponsor of the council. He was a sponsor of the Easter drive of the China Aid Council of the American League * * *, as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 2). A photostatic copy of a letterhead of

the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939 listed A. Phillip Randolph as a national sponsor of that organization.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as "organized at the First United States Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. * * * It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before."

The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the group previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union. * * * The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7442–7473). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States."

A letter head of the organization, Commonwealth College, dated January 1, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the National Advisory Committee. He endorsed the reorganization plan of Commonwealth College, as shown by the August 15. 1937, issue of Fortnightly, a publication of the college (p. 3).

The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Commonwealth College as a Communist enterprise in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 76 and 167). The Attorney General cited the Commonwealth College as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

An undated leaflet of the League for Mutual Aid listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the executive committee of that organization. He was a guest of honor at the 17the annual dinner of the League for Mutual Aid held February 1, 1937, as shown by New Masses, January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

The League for Mutual Aid was cited as a Communist enterprise by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 76).

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, as shown by letterheads of the organization dated July 6, 1938, and February 2, 1939. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1938 (p. 5), reported that A. Philip Randolph was a supporter of a meeting of the Medical Bureau * * *.

"In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for in support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations." Among these was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 82.)

New Masses for October 26, 1937 (p. 11), reported that A. Philip Randolph was chairman of the National Negro Congress. A. Philip Randolph was president of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the Daily Worker of January 1, 1938 (p. 4), January 13, 1938 (p. 3), April 19, 1938 (p. 3), and the pamphlet, Second National Negro Congress, October 1937. He was president of the Third National Negro Congress, as reported by the June 1940 issue of the Communist (p. 548). The official proceedings of the 1936 National Negro Congress (p. 41), listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the national executive council of the organization. He spoke at a gathering of the congress, as reported by the Daily Worker of March 8, 1938 (p. 3). The Daily Worker of February 15, 1938 (p. 7), reported that A. Philip Randolph contributed to the official proceedings of the Second National Negro Congress.

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

A. Philip Randolph was a consultant of the Panel on Citizenship and Civil Liberties of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown by an official report of the organization, dated April 19–21, 1942. The call to the second conference, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, April 14–16, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of that conference.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The Daily Worker, issues of March 28, 1938 (p. 3) and April 4, 1938 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of the World Youth Congress. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 183), cited the World Youth Congress as a Communist conference held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College.

A. Philip Randolph signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy."

A. Philip Randolph is listed as a sponsor on a letterhead of the American Relief Ship for Spain dated September 3, 1938. The American Relief Ship for Spain was cited as "one of the several Communist Party front enterprises which raised funds for Loyalist Spain (or rather raised funds for the Communist end of that civil war)." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities Report, March 29, 1944, p. 102.)

The proceedings of the Congress of Youth of the American Youth Congress, July 1–5, 1939 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a signer of the call to the congress.

A. Phillip Randolph was a sponsor of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy (letterhead, November 16, 1938). The booklet, These American Say, published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named him as a representative individual. He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (program of conference, February 12, 1940).

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), cited the Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was cited as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (special committee report, March 29, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general, but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as shown by the back cover of a pamphlet, Children in Concentration Camps. He signed the call to a United May Day conference, according to the Daily Worker of March 17, 1937 (p. 4). An undated letterhead of the United May Day Committee listed him as chairman.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Spanish Refugee Campaign as a Communist-front organization (report, January 3, 1940, p. 9).

The United May Day conference was cited as "engineered by the Communist Party for its 1937 May Day demonstrations" and also organized by the party in 1938 (special committee report, March 29, 1944, pp. 124 and 139).

The Attorney General cited the United May Day Committee as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks "to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means." (Letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.)

The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 3), announced that A. Philip Randolph was scheduled to speak at the Southern Negro Youth Congress, Richmond, Va., February 12–14. "The People Versus H. C. L." listed him as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation. He was shown as a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee on an undated letterhead of that organization.

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means. (Attorney General, letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on April 1, 1954, consolidated list.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League.

The Consumers National Federation was cited as a Communist-front group by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155).

Public Use of the Arts Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112).

Subject: T. G. Nutter, national vice president, member of national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The call to the National Negro Congress, Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936, listed T. G. Nutter, Charleston, W. Va., as an endorser.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General cited the group previously as a Communist front as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7447. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in the report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: L. Pearl Mitchell, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of April 18, 1936 (p. 3), named L. Pearl Mitchell, identified as national director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, as chairman of a committee for a benefit dance which was held by the Joint Scottsboro Defense Committee, Cleveland, Ohio, for the purpose of raising money to be sent to New York.

The Scottsboro Defense Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of January 3, 1939 (p. 82); and March 29, 1944 (p. 177).

Miss L. Pearl Mitchell, of Cleveland, Ohio, was one of the endorsers of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the call for National Negro Congress, Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities stated that "the officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, January 3, 1939, p. 81; also cited, reports, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 20; March 29, 1944, p. 180; and included in the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Eric Johnston, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

On March 27, 1947, Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Association of America, appeared before this committee as a witness in public hearings on H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122, bills to curb or outlaw the Communist Party of the United States (Committee on Un-American Activities, hearings and reports, vol. 1, pp. 288–307).

On October 27, 1947, Eric Allen Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, again appeared as a witness before the committee in public hearings regarding Communist infiltration of the motion-picture industry (committee hearings and reports, vol. 1, pp. 305–328).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Bishop W. J. Walls, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

As shown in Soviet Russia Today for December 1942 (p. 42), W. J. Walls was a sponsor of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship. He was named as a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship on a letterhead of the group dated March 13, 1946, and a memorandum issued by the organization March 18, 1946.

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Council * * * (in a report dated March 29, 1944) as having been "in recent months, the principal front" of the Communist Party.

Bishop W. J. Walls, Chicago, Ill. supported the National Negro Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 3, 1936 (p. 2). The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the Attorney General had previously cited the National Negro Congress as "sponsored and supported by the Communist Party" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The special committee cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes" (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

A petition to the United Nations, drafted and circulated by the Council on African Affairs, contained the signature of Bishop W. J. Walls, according to the Daily Worker of June 5, 1950 (p. 4). The Attorney General cited the council as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Bishop Walls also signed a statement of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt (anti-Communist) Bill, according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4). The national committee * * * was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation" (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, released December 7, 1950).

Identified as secretary of the board of bishops, A. M. E. Zion Church, Bishop W. J. Walls was named as having endorsed the World Peace Appeal (undated leaflet received by the committee September 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker of August 14, 1950 (p. 2). The World Peace Appeal was cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy"; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal'"; and as having "received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. * * *" (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951).

Bishop Walls was one of the sponsors of the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress, as shown on a mimeographed letter of December 1, 1950; he was a delegate to the World Peace Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 7, 1950 (p. 2); he signed a protest made by the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress (Daily People's World of November 20, 1950, p. 2). The protest was made against exclusion by the British Government of more than 50 Americans, five-sixths of the United States delegation to the World Peace Congress. In the latter two sources, he was identified as secretary of the board of bishops of A. M. E. Zion Church.

The World Peace Congress was cited as a Communist front among the "peace conferences" which "have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense Pact" (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated April 1, 1951).

According to the Daily Worker of October 28, 1949 (p. 2), Bishop W. J. Walls, of Chicago, endorsed Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., Communist, and urged his reelection to the New York City Council. Benjamin J. Davis was 1 of the 11 leaders of the Communist Party on trial.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: John Haynes Holmes, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Rev. John Haynes Holmes was shown to be a member of the advisory board of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born on a letterhead of the organization dated April 27, 1938, on a letterhead dated January 1940, and in the call to the third annual conference. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (report, March 29, 1944, p. 155; also cited in report, June 25, 1942, p. 13).

In a bulletin, Spot News (p. 1), John Haynes Holmes was listed as a sponsor of the American Committee to Save Refugees, which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944 (pps. 49, 112, 129, 133, 138, 167, 180).

A letterhead dated November 18, 1936, showed John Haynes Holmes to be a member of the general committee of the medical bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy. "New Masses" (January 5, 1937, p. 31) also listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the general committee of that organization. "In 1937-38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy" (special committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 82).

The Daily Worker (January 11, 1937, p. 2) reported that John Haynes Holmes was a sponsor of the New York City Conference Against War and Fascism. The Daily Worker (February 23, 1938, p. 2) reported that he signed a letter which was sponsored by the American League for Peace and Democracy. A contribution from him appeared in Fight (September 1935, p. 2), a magazine published by the American League Against War and Fascism; he was identified as minister, Community Church, New York. The following is quoted from an editorial comment on the article:

"In a recent sermon Dr. Holmes made an eloquent appeal for unity of Christians and Communists in opposition to the forces of reaction driving toward war and fascism, and in struggle for the achievement of a better world based on brotherhood and cooperation among men.

"If churchmen will unite with Communists, Socialists, trade unionists and everyone else opposed to war and fascism, our forces will be tremendously strengthened, and war and fascism will not be inevitable. Already the American League Against War and Fascism has brought together in its ranks people of diverse political and religious beliefs, liberals, radicals and revolutionists, of all races and creeds * * *.

"The American League Against War and Fascism was organized at the First United States Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26-28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. There was, however, no fundamental change in the character of the organization. It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before" (special committee report, March 29, 1944, p. 53; also cited in reports, January 3, 1939, pp. 69 and 121; January 3, 1940, p. 10; June 25, 1942, p. 14). The Attorney General of the United States cited the league as subversive and Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The Attorney General cited it as a "Communist-front organization" in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942 (p. 10) and said it was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442).

The Daily Worker (September 24, 1940, p. 5) reported that an open letter sponsored by the Communist Party and the American Civil Liberties Union, demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston counties, was signed by John Haynes Holmes.

The Daily Worker of February 13, 1937 (p. 2), reported that "aroused by the Fascist tactics displayed by the Brazilian Government in its treatment of hundreds of political prisoners held without trial since November 1935, outstanding among them Luiz Carlos Prestes, leader of the liberation movement of the Brazilian people, and Arthur Ewert, ex-deputy in the German Reichstag, outstanding Americans have signed their names to a cable of protest forwarded to President Vargas of Brazil." Among those named as signers was Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Community Church. A letterhead dated November 16, 1938, of the conference on Pan American Democracy, listed John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor. The Attorney General cited this organization as subversive and Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report, March 29, 1944, pp. 161 and 164; also cited in report, June 25, 1942, p. 18).

The Daily Worker of February 13, 1939 (p. 2), reported that Dr. John Haynes Holmes was a member of the Descendants of the American Revolution. The Daily Worker (January 21, 1938, p. 2), also referred to him as a sponsor and as a member of the advisory board of that organization. A pamphlet, Descendants of the American Revolution (back page), listed him as a member of the advisory board of the organization. The special committee (report, June 25, 1942, pp. 18 and 19) cited the Descendants of the American Revolution as "a Communist-front organization set up as a radical imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The descendants have uniformly adhered to the line of the Communist Party. * * * The educational director * * * is one Howard Solzam, an instructor at the Communist Party's Workers School in New York."

A program of the conference (February 12, 1940), named John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights. This conference was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (report, March 29, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). It was also cited by the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities (report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 3).

An open letter to the United States Senate, initiated and distributed by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, in protest of the Dempsey deportation bill and the McCormack rider attached to the Walter espionage bill, was signed by the Reverend John Haynes Holmes (photostat of open letter). "It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi Pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties" (Committee on Un-American Activities, report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 12). The special committee cited the National Emergency Conference * * * as a Communist front in the report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 102).

The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 7), reported that John Haynes Holmes was contributor to a booklet published by the League of American Writers. The league was cited as a Communist-front organization in three reports of the special committee (report, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 19; March 29, 1944, p. 48). It was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). Previously, the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445) stated that the overt activities of the league "leave little doubt of its Communist control."

An undated letterhead listed John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor of the New York Tom Mooney Committee, which was cited as a Communist front by the special committee (report, March 29, 1944, p. 154).

An undated leaflet published by the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder named Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Community Church, New York City, among those who appealed to President Roosevelt for justice in the Browder case. The Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the United States Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447; letter to Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). "When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder * * * (special committee report, March 29, 1944).

Soviet Russia Today for December 1933 (p. 17) listed John Haynes Holmes among the endorsers of the National Committee, Friends of the Soviet Union. A pamphlet issued by the Friends of the Soviet Union entitled "Welcome! 'Land of Soviets' Moscow-New York 1929" listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the Reception Committee for the Soviet Flyers. The Attorney General cited Friends of the Soviet Union as Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited it as "one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States" whose purpose "is to propagandize for and defend Russia and its system of government" (report, January 3, 1939, p. 78).

Rev. John Haynes Holmes, New York, N. Y., was shown to be a sponsor of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace on the call to that conference. The conference was cited by this committee at a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been "aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into

a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" (report 378, April 25, 1951, p. 58).

A letterhead dated March 16, 1937, listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the National People's Committee Against Hearst, cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a subsidiary organization of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was described on page 2 of this report (report, June 25, 1942, p. 16).

A letterhead dated March 20, 1926, listed Rev. John Haynes Holmes as a member of the advisory board of Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., cited by the special committee as a Communist enterprise which was directed by Harold Ware, son of the well-known Communist Ella Reeve Bloor (report, March 29, 1944, p. 76).

New Masses for March 31, 1936 (p. 2) named John Haynes Holmes as a member of the League for Mutual Aid, cited as a Communist enterprise by the special committee (report, March 29, 1944, p. 76).

According to the Daily Worker of February 16, 1948 (p. 16) Rev. John Haynes Holmes signed a statement to the mayor and city council in behalf of Simon Gerson, a Communist. An advertisement in the New York Times (February 19, 1948, p. 13), listed him as a supporter of the Citizens Committee To Defend Representative Government, supporting the seating of Gerson.

The following was reported in the Daily Worker on September 22, 1948 (p. 5): "Professor Ralph Sarton Perry of Harvard University released yesterday the names of 93 prominent educators, churchmen, and inidviduals in other cultural fields, who have formed a committee of welcome for the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, D. D., dean of Canterbury Cathedral. Dean Johnson had been invited to visit the United States by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship for a countrywide tour under its auspices. A visa was refused him on the ground that the sponsoring organization was on the Attorney General's list. The Committee of Welcome had extended to Dean Johnson an invitation to come to the United States under its independent auspice in November and December of this year and to speak at public gatherings." The article named Dr. John Haynes Holmes, minister, the Community Church, New York, among the members of the committee.

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the National Council * * * as "the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian" (report, March 29, 1944, p. 156).

The Daily Worker of February 19, 1951 (p. 2) reported that Rev. John Haynes Holmes was a signer of a statement addressed to the Attorney General, urging withdrawal of contempt of Congress proceedings against a number of persons who had been indicted for refusing to answer questions before congressional committees.

The Daily People's World of August 1, 1951 (p. 2) reported that Rev. John Haynes Holmes endorsed a statement attacking the Smith Act, which was anti-Communist legislation. It was reported in the Daily Worker of January 15, 1953 (p. 8) that Rev. John Haynes Holmes, minister-emeritus, the Community Church of New York, signed a letter to President Truman asking for amnesty for 11 leaders of the Communist Party arrested under the Smith Act.

In testimony before this committee on July 7, 1953, Benjamin Gitlow, former member of the Communist Party, said: "Before the creation of the front organizations, the ministers who carried out the instructions of the Communist Party or collaborated with it were limited in numbers. The outstanding ones among them were * * * Rev. John Haynes Holmes * * *" (Communist Activities in the New York Area, p. 2077).

The Daily Worker of January 1, 1953 (p. 1), reported that Rev. John Haynes Holmes signed a petition for clemency for the Rosenbergs. The same newspaper on January 13, 1953 (p. 2) published a list of "the clergymen of various faiths and other religious leaders who have urged President Truman to use his power of clemency to save the lives of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg." The name of Dr. John Haynes Holmes, New York, appeared on the list. The Rosenbergs had been convicted of conspiracy to commit espionage and sentenced to death.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Mary McLeod Bethune, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, May 19, 1955 (p. 20), reported that Mary McLeod Bethune, founder of the National Council of Negro Women and president emeritus, Bethune-Cookman College, died on May 18, 1955, at her home in Daytona Beach, Fla., at the age of 79.

The name of Mary McLeod Bethune appeared on the honor roll of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, as published in the Sunday Worker of March 9, 1947 (p. 7); Elizabeth Gurley Flynn is one of the few outstanding women leaders of the Communist Party in this country.

A photostat of a letterhead of the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief dated August 6, 1945, listed Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune as a member of the Sponsors Committee of the organization.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, Inc., as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the American Slav Congress, June 26, 1949 (p. 78), cited the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, Inc., as a Communist front which "was actively supported by the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, United States of America."

A pamphlet entitled "7½ Million * * *" (p. 34), released by the American League for Peace and Democracy, lists the name of Mrs. Bethune as a member of the national committee of that organization; a letterhead of the organization, dated July 12, 1939, and a photostat of a letterhead of the Baltimore division of the group dated May 18, 1939 furnished the same information. "Fight" magazine for March 1939 (p. 3), and letterheads of the league dated March 24, 1939, and April 6, 1939 (photostat), name Mrs. Bethune as vice chairman of the league.

The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union * * *." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States. * * * The league contends publicly that it is not a Communist-front movement, yet at the very beginning Communists dominated it. Earl Browder was its vice president."

Mrs. Bethune was a sponsor of the Win-the-Peace Conference, as shown on a letterhead of that group dated February 28, 1946, the Daily Worker of March 5, 1946, and "A Call to a Win-the-Peace Conference" in the National Press Building, Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946; she was vice chairman of the national committee, New York Committee to Win the Peace, according to a letterhead of that group dated June 1, 1946, and the New York Committee Call to Win-the-Peace Conference, June 28–29, 1946.

The National Committee to Win the Peace was organized at the Win-the-Peace Conference in Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946, and was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

Letterheads of the Civil Rights Congress, dated March 4, 1948, and May 7, 1948, list the name of Mrs. Bethune as vice chairman of the congress; she signed the call to the national conference which was held in Chicago, as shown in the Daily Worker of October 21, 1947 (p. 5); and was one of the sponsors of a meeting of the group, according to the Daily Worker of Janauary 19, 1949 (p. 10), in which source she was identified as president, National Council of Negro Women.

The Attorney General cited Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party," and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

In a report on the American Slav Congress, released by this committee April 26, 1950, the organization was cited as "a Moscow inspired and directed federation of Communist-dominated organizations seeking by methods of propaganda and pressure to subvert the 10 million people in this country of Slavic birth or descent." The Attorney General cited the American Slav Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. Mrs. Bethune was one of the sponsors of a testimonial dinner which was held in New York City, October 12, 1947, under the auspices of the American Slav Congress (invitation issued by the congress; and the printed program, p. 2).

The Daily People's World of April 20, 1944 (p. 3), reported that Mrs. Bethune was one of the sponsors of the American Youth for Democracy club; on a program of the dinner celebrating the first anniversary of the American Youth for Democracy, October 16, 1944, Mrs. Bethune was named also as a sponsor of the group (see program, Salute to Young America Committee).

The Attorney General cited the American Youth for Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee

on Un-American Activities cited the American Youth for Democracy as the new name under which the Young Communist League operates and which also largely absorbed the American Youth Congress (Report, March 29, 1944, p. 102). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947, cited the American Youth for Democracy as a front formed in October 1943 to succeed the Young Communist League and for the purpose of exploiting to the advantage of a foreign power the idealism, inexperience, and craving to join which is characteristic of American college youth. Its "high-sounding slogans" cover "a determined effort to disaffect our youth and to turn them against religion, the American home, against the college authorities, and against the American Government itself."

Mrs. Bethune signed the call to the Congress of Youth which was the fifth national gathering of the American Youth Congress, held in New York City, July 1-5, 1939 (from the proceedings of the congress, p. 2).

The Attorney General cited the American Youth Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 7, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7444; also cited in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the American Youth Congress as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party."

Mrs. Bethune was a member of the advisory board of the Southern Negro Youth Congress (letterheads of the organization dated June 12, 1947, and August 11, 1947; and a page from a leaflet published by the organization).

The Southern Negro Youth Congress has been cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9); and as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League (Committee on Un-American Activities, report 271, released April 17, 1947, p. 14). The Attorney General cited the group as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, United States of America, which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letterhead of December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list).

A pamphlet of the Council on African Affairs entitled "Seeing Is Believing," which was published in 1947, named Mrs. Bethune as a member of the council; she participated in a conference of the council, according to the pamphlet, "For a New Africa" (p. 36), also published by the organization. She sent greetings to the National Negro Congress, October 1937, as shown in the proceedings of the congress; she also participated in the Conference on Africa, held in New York City, April 14, 1944 (pamphlet of the proceedings of the conference which was held under the joint auspices of the Council on African Affairs and the National Negro Congress).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters released on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The National Negro Congress was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2), published an appeal of the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy to lift the embargo on arms to Loyalist Spain; Mrs. Bethune was shown as one of those who signed the appeal. The special committee cited the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization in report 1311 of March 29, 1944. Mrs. Bethune issued an individual statement which was printed in the booklet, "These Americans say: 'Lift the Embargo Against Republican Spain,'" which was compiled and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo, urging that "in the name of true neutrality, in the cause of world peace and democracy, lift the embargo (on the sale of arms to Spain)"; she sponsored the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as was shown in the pamphlet, "Children in Concentration Camps." The Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the Party carried on a great deal of agitation (special committee in report 1311 of March 29, 1944). The Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special committee in a report of January 3, 1940.

Mrs. Bethune was a sponsor of the National Emergency Conference (letterhead of the organization dated May 19, 1939); and a member of the board of sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (press release of the group dated February 23, 1940). She signed the 1943 message of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, addressed to the United States House of Representatives, as shown on a leaflet attached to an undated letterhead of that organization. Mrs. Bethune was a sponsor of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, as shown on the "Call to a Conference on Civil Rights, April 20–21, 1940" (p. 4), and on a letterhead of the group dated April 26, 1940.

"It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties" (report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, released September 2, 1947); the three organizations were also cited by the special committee in report 1311 of March 29, 1944. The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program. (It) was established as a result of a conference on constitutional liberties held in Washington, D. C., June 7–9, 1940" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Attorney General also cited the organization as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The Washington Committee for Democratic Action was cited as an affiliate or local chapter of the National Federation "The program of the Washington Committee followed that of the National Federation. National Communist leaders have addressed its meetings, and conferences sponsored by it have been attended by representatives of prominent Communist-front organizations" (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447); the Attorney General also cited the group as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special committee found that "when the American League for Peace and Democracy was dissolved in February 1940, its successor in Washington was the Washington Committee for Democratic Action. The latter was affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties" (reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944).

Mrs. Bethune was one of the sponsors of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown in Soviet Russia Today for December 1942 (p. 42); she spoke as a member of the women's panel of the congress, held in New York City, November 6, 7, 8, 1943, as shown by a photostat of the program. She participated in a meeting paying tribute to women of the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. held in Carnegie Hall, New York City, March 6, 1944, under the auspices of the committee of women, National Committee of American-Soviet Friendship ("Soviet Russia Today," March 1944, p. 35; and "New Masses" for February 29, 1944, p. 29); she was named as a sponsor and a member of the committee of women of the national council * * *, on the call to a conference of women of the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. in the postwar world on November 18, 1944, in the Commodore Hotel, New York City; a letterhead of the committee of women, national council * * * dated March 1, 1948, contains the name of Mrs. Bethune in the list of members; she was a member of the board of directors of the national council, as shown on letterheads of that organization dated February 8, 1946, and March 13, 1946, and a photostat of a letterhead dated January 10, 1945. An invitation to a luncheon, "Women of the United Nations," held under auspices of the committee of women of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, December 12, 1946, New York City, listed Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune as a member. She was shown as a member of the national council on a report to the membership of the board and officers of the national council at the annual membership meeting, April 23, 1952.

In its report of March 29, 1944, the special committee cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as having been "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian." The Attorney General cited the national council as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, list.

A letter of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, opposing alien registration, carried the signature of Mary McLeod Bethune, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 23, 1939 (p. 3, columns 7–8); she was one of the sponsors of the fourth annual conference of the organization which was held in Washington, D. C., March 2–3, 1940 (as shown on a letterhead of the conference); a booklet entitled "The Registration of Aliens" which was prepared and published by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, lists Mrs. Bethune as one of the sponsors of that organization.

The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

Mrs. Bethune was one of the sponsors of the League of Young Southerners which is the youth division of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown on a letterhead dated August 13, 1940; she was named in The Southern Patriot, for December 1946, as a member of the board of representatives (1947–48) of the Southern Conference; she was a member of the executive board, as shown on a leaflet of the conference entitled "The South Is Closer Than You Think" (received about February 1947).

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare was cited as a Communist-front organization which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South although its professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States (Committee on Un-American Activities in report 592 of June 12, 1947). The special committee also cited the group as a Communist-front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of the funds by which many Communist fronts operate (report of March 29, 1944).

Mrs. Bethune received the New Masses award for greater interracial understanding at a dinner in her honor at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, January 14, 1946 (Daily Worker, January 7, 1946, p. 11, columns 1–2); she received a similar award for contributions made to promote democracy and interracial unity at the New Masses Second Annual Awards Dinner, as shown in New Masses for November 18, 1947 (p. 7).

New Masses was cited as a nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * * whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service (special committee report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in committee reports of January 3, 1939, and June 25, 1942). It was cited also by the Attorney General as a Communist periodical (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447).

Mary McLeod Bethune was an initiating sponsor of the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as shown by the Daily Worker of December 24, 1944 (p. 14), and a letterhead of the group dated November 26, 1946.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Oscar Hammerstein II, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Oscar Hammerstein II signed a Call Upon the Film Industry To Revoke the Blacklist, released by the Theater Division of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as shown in an advertisement that appeared in Variety for December 1, 1948 (p. 21).

The National Council of the Arts was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in House Report 1954 dated April 26, 1950.

Mr. Hammerstein was one of the initiating sponsors of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as shown in the Daily Worker of December 24, 1944 (p. 14); the name of one Oscar Hammerstein appeared on a list of the initiating sponsors of the same organization, as shown on their letterhead of November 26, 1946. The Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in a Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, released April 19, 1949.

As shown in the Daily People's World of October 13, 1943 (p. 5), Oscar Hammerstein, II, was one of those who endorsed the Writers' Congress which was held October 1, 2, and 3, 1943, under the joint auspices of the University of California and the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. As shown in the program of the Writers' Congress, he was a member of the Seminar on Song Writing in War. The Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, Attorney General Consolidated List, April 1, 1954).

A letterhead dated February 28, 1946, of the Win-the-Peace Conference which was held in Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946, named Oscar Hammerstein II, as one of the sponsors of that conference; the same information also appeared in the Call to a Win-the-Peace Conference. The National Committee To Win the Peace was formed at the Win-the-Peace Conference. The National Committee To Win the Peace was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, Attorney General consolidated list, April 1, 1954).

One Oscar Hammerstein (II not shown) was a sponsor of the United Nations in America dinner held under the auspices of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City, April 17, 1943, as shown on the invitation to the dinner. The United States Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, Attorney General consolidated list, April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in a report dated March 29, 1944, cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

In the Daily People's World of October 2, 1944 (p. 5), Oscar Hammerstein (II not shown) was named as an honorary member of the Association of Young Writers and Artists, an organization affiliated with the Southern Negro Youth Congress.

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated January 3, 1940; the organization was cited as being subversive and "among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, United States of America, which seek to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means" (U. S. Attorney General in press release of December 4, 1947; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, Attorney General consolidated list, April 1, 1954). The group was cited as being "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League (Committee on Un-American Activities in report 271 of April 17, 1947).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: William Lloyd Imes, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

William Lloyd Imes was one of those who signed a statement on December 14, 1939 (the day before the 148th anniversary of the Bill of Rights), "warning against denying to the Communists, or to any other minority group, the full freedom guaranteed by the Bill of Rights" (letter signed by Dashiell Hammett dated January 1940, attached to the statement).

A pamphlet entitled "The People vs. H. C. L." which was dated December 11–12, 1937, named William Lloyd Imes as one of the sponsors of the Consumers National Federation, publishers of the pamphlet.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the Consumers' National Federation as a Communist-front organization.

He supported the National Negro Congress (Daily Worker, February 3, 1936, p. 2); spoke at the Second National Negro Congress in October 1937 (program of the congress); and supported a conference of the congress to push passage of the antilynch bill (Daily Worker, March 17, 1938, p. 4).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

William Lloyd Imes sponsored a dinner-formum called by the Protestant Digest Associates on the subject, Protestantism Answers Hate, which was held in New York City, February 25, 1941.

Protestant Digest was cited as "a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 48).

He signed a petition of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, as shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead dated January 17, 1940; and sponsored a citizens rally of the same organization, on April 13, 1940, in New York City (according to a leaflet announcing the rally).

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 13), cited the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers.

William Lloyd Imes sponsored the Fourth Annual Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, as shown on a letterhead of the conference which was held in Washington, D. C., March 2 to 3, 1940.

The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committe for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

Dr. Imes contributed to Fight magazine, official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism (Fight for August 1935, p. 4); he was chairman of a rally of the American League which was held in Harlem (Fight for September 1935, p. 14); he spoke at the National People's Committee Against Hearst of the American League (Daily Worker October 21, 1936, p. 4); he supported a statement of the League, addressed to the United States Congress (Daily Worker, February 27, 1937, p. 2); he was a member of the National People's Committee Against Hearst (letterhead of March 16, 1937); he spoke in New York City at a joint meeting of the American League and American Friends of the Chinese People (Daily Worker, September 23, 1937, p. 2); and was one of the sponsors of the China Aid Council of the American League, as shown on a letterhead of the council dated May 18, 1938. As shown by the Daily Worker of April 6, 1937 (p. 5), Rev. William Lloyd Imes, pastor, St. James Presbyterian Church, was guest of honor at a dinner of the American League Against War and Fascism, April 6, 1937, New York City.

The Attorney General cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a "Communist-front organization" (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as "completely under the control of Communists."

A letterhead dated November 3, 1937, lists William Lloyd Imes as a member of the national executive committee, People's Congress for Democracy and Peace; he sponsored the Boycott Japanese Goods Conference of the American League for Peace and Democracy, February 5, 1938 (Daily Worker, Jan. 11, 1938, p. 2); he signed a letter of the American League, as was shown in the Daily Worker of February 23, 1938 (p. 2); he signed a statement of the league concerning the international situation (New Masses, Mar. 15, 1938, p. 19); a letterhead of the New York City Division of the American League named him as a member of the advisory board as of that date (September 22, 1938); a letterhead of the City Executive Committee, New York City Division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated September 26, 1938, contained the name of the Reverend William Lloyd Imes in the list of members of the advisory board; he endorsed the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, January 6–8, 1939, in New York City, as shown on a letterhead dated December 7, 1938. A letterhead of the New York City Division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated March 21, 1939, listed him as a member of the advisory board of the league. A letterhead of the Baltimore Division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated May 18, 1939, contained the name of Dr. Imes in the list of members of the national committee; a letterhead of the league, dated July 12, 1939, furnished the same information, and also a pamphlet entitled "7½ Million * * *," which was published by the league.

The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States."

The Daily Worker of August 13, 1940 (p. 5), named Dr. Imes as one who endorsed the Emergency Peace Mobilization; he was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Committee of the Emergency Peace Mobilization, as shown on an undated letterhead.

The Attorney General cited the Emergency Peace Mobilization as follows: "The American Peace Mobilization was formally founded at a meeting in Chicago at the end of August 1940, known as the Emergency Peace Mobilization" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7443). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944, cited the Emergency Peace Mobilization as a Communist front which came forth, after Stalin signed his pact with Hitler, to oppose the national defense program, lend-lease, conscription, and other American warmongering efforts. It immediately preceded the American Peace Mobilization in 1940.

Dr. Imes sponsored the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, as shown on the call to the conference, June 7, 1940; he signed a letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, addressed to Attorney General Jackson, in defense of ballot rights of minority parties (Daily Worker, Sept. 24, 1940, p. 1); he signed a statement of the federation, opposing use of injunctions in labor disputes, according to an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times of April 1, 1946, in which source he was identified as president of Knoxville College.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America as "an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organizations" (Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 102). The Attorney General cited the conference as one as a result of which was established the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446).

The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesigned April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program * * *" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties at "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party."

Dr. Imes signed on open letter of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, pp. 1 and 5); he was one of the sponsors of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy, as shown on a letterhead of that group dated November 16, 1938.

The National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights was cited as a Communist front organization by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 102). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 12), cited the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights as follows: "It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties."

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

Dr. Imes was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, as shown on the program of the conference, February 12, 1940. He spoke before the American Youth Congress (Daily Worker, Jan. 29, 1938, p. 3); and endorsed the American Youth Act, as shown on a press release of the American Youth Congress.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its March 29, 1944, report (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The organization was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Sept. 2, 1947, p. 3), as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as "originated in 1934 and * * * has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7444). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the American Youth Congress as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" and "prominently identified with the White House picket line * * *."

According to the proceedings and report, and to "Equal Justice" for July 1939, he sent greetings to the National Conference of the International Labor Defense. He signed a letter to President Roosevelt, defending the publication, New Masses (issue of April 2, 1940, p. 21) .

The Attorney General cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 75–78), cited the International Labor Defense as "the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States."

New Masses was cited as a "Communist periodical" by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 75), cited New Masses as a "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * *."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Ira W. Jayne, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Ira Waite Jayne was a member of the National Lawyers Guild in 1939, as shown by a list of the membership for that year which was made available to the special Committee on Un-American Activities; Ira W. Jayne was national vice president of the guild, as shown by a letterhead of that organization, dated May 10, 1946; Judge Ira W. Jayne was a member of the arrangements committee for the 5th annual convention of the guild, which was held at the Book-Cadillac Hotel in Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941 (Convention News for May 1941 (p. 3) published by the National Lawyers Guild for the 5th annual convention); Judge Ira W. Jayne was toastmaster at a banquet at the same convention (convention program printed in Convention News, May 1941 (p. 2) published by the National Lawyers Guild for the 5th annual convention).

Ira Waite Jayne was vice president of the National Lawyers Guid, as shown by a letterhead dated June 11, 1947; by the program of the National Lawyers Guild on Legislative Investigation or Thought Control Agency, dated October 20, 1947 (p. 4); the Daily Worker, February 24, 1948 (p. 3); and a letterhead of the guild dated March 8, 1948.

Ira W. Jayne is listed as a member of the executive board of the Detroit chapter of the National Lawyers Guild and its national vice president, on a letterhead dated March 19, 1948; Ira Waite Jayne was listed as vice president of the guild on the letterhead of the organization dated May 7, 1948—a letter sent to Members of Congress by Robert J. Silberstein, executive secretary of the guild, attacking the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the guild as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents" (report on the National Lawyers Guild, H. Rept. No. 3123, September 17, 1950).

The Daily Worker, March 14, 1936 (p. 4) named Ira Jayne as treasurer of the Scottsboro Defense Committee in Detroit, Mich.

The Scottsboro Defense Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports dated January 3, 1939 (p. 82) and March 29, 1944 (p. 177).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. W. Montague Cobb, member of national board of directors, chairman of the national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to the Bookshopper for July 1948 (p. 2), Montague Cobb, professor, Howard University, lectured at a membership meeting in January 1948 of the Washington Cooperative Bookshop, 916 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The Attorney General of the United States found that "evidence of Communist penetration or control [of the Washington Cooperative Bookshop] is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations * * * certain of the officers and employees of the bookshop, including its manager and executive secretary, have been in close contact with local officials of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447); subsequently, it was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as a Communist front (report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Dr. W. Montague Cobb, identified as professor of anatomy, Howard University, spoke at the 1947 convention of the Association of Internes and Medical Students, according to their official organ, the Interne (January 1948, p. 61); the same publication (February 1950, p. 27) reported that he had spoken at a convention of the organization; the printed program of the 16th Convention of the Association of Internes and Medical Students which was held in December 1950, revealed that he had spoken at the convention.

The Association of Internes and Medical Students was cited as an organization which "has long been a faithful follower of the Communist Party line," and which supported the International Union of Students' Second World Student Congress in Prague in August 1950 (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Communist Peace Offensive, dated April 1, 1951).

An advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post of May 18, 1948 (p. 15), disclosed the name of Dr. W. Montague Cobb as having signed a statement against the Mundt (anti-Communist) bill.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Westley W. Law, Savannah, Ga., national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

An undated press release, General Youth Statement (p. 3), listed W. W. Law, Savannah, Ga., as an endorser of the Youth Statement of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace (May 29–30, 1950).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 58), cited the Mid-Century Conference for Peace at a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been "aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda."

The Daily Worker of June 23, 1949 (p. 2), reported that W. W. Law, past national chairman, National Association for Advancement of Colored People, youth division, Savannah, Ga., signed a statement against the North Atlantic Pact.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. J. M. Tinsley, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

As shown by the official proceedings of the National Negro Congress, 1936 (pp. 5, 41), Dr. J. M. Tinsley, Virginia, was a member of the presiding committee and a member of the national executive council of the organization. J. M. Tinsley, Richmond, was treasurer of the National Negro Congress (Daily Worker, Apr. 7, 1936, p. 3).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations designated previously pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

J. M. Tinsley endorsed the Southern Negro Youth Congress (Daily Worker, Feb. 25, 1938, p. 3).

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letter released Dec. 4, 1947; redesignated Apr. 27, 1953, and included on Apr. 1, 1954, consolidated list). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: William H. Hastie, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

In 1940, William H. Hastie represented the Abolish Peonage Committee of the International Labor Defense at a conference with the Department of Justice in Washington, D. C., as shown in Equal Justice for April 1940 (p. 3), and in the winter (1941) issue of the same publication (p. 28).

The International Labor Defense was cited by the Attorney General as "subversive" and "Communist" and as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948 and included on a consolidated list on April 1, 1954, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7687, respectively. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 1 and 2), cited the International Labor Defense as "part of an

international network of organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers."

William H. Hastie was one of the sponsors of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, at which the national federation for Constitutional Liberties was launched (program leaflet, Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940, p. 4). He signed a statement sponsored by the national federation, hailing the War Department's order on commissions for Communists; he was identified in this connection as dean, Howard University Law School (the Worker for Mar. 18, 1945, p. 2); his photograph appeared in this issue of the Worker (Sunday edition of the Communist Daily Worker), along with the text of the statement and a list of those who signed it.

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited by the Attorney General as "subversive" and "Communist" and as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7446, and included on the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party."

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild contains the name of William H. Hastie, identified as a judge whose address was St. Thomas, Virgin Islands; in 1930, he was a candidate for delegate to the national convention of the guild, administrative slate, Washington, D. C., chapter (election campaign letter, May 18, 1940); he was a member of the convention resolutions committee (Convention News, May 1941, p. 2), and identified in this source as being from Washington, D. C. A letterhead of the guild, dated June 11, 1947, listed the name of the Honorable William H. Hastie, Virgin Islands, as vice president of the guild. A printed program of the guild, entitled "Legislative Investigation? or Thought Control Agency," dated October 20, 1947, also listed the name of the Honorable William H. Hastie, Governor, Virgin Islands, as vice president of the guild; he was also vice president in 1948 (Daily Worker for February 24, 1948, p. 3; letterhead of the guild dated March 8, 1948; and a letterhead dated May 7, 1948). The Daily Worker of November 30, 1942 (p. 1), printed the text of a report adopted by the national executive board of the National Lawyers Guild; the report was submitted by Thurgood Marshall, special counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and William H. Hastie, dean of Howard University Law School.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents" (Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 21, 1950).

One William Hastie, Washington, D. C., endorsed the call for National Negro Congress, February 14, 1936, in Chicago, Ill. According to the Official Proceedings of the National Negro Congress, 1936 (p. 5), he was a member of the presiding committee of this congress. Also in this same publication on page 40, he is listed as a member of the national executive council for the congress. In a report on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, released by the Committee on Un-American Activities June 16, 1947, William H. Hastie was listed as one of the sponsors of the conference (report No. 592, p. 15). He presided at a dinner meeting of the southern conference, May 22, 1946, as reported in the Washington Evening Star of May 23, 1946 (p. A-4); a leaflet entitled "Look Southward Angel!" revealed the name of William H. Hastie as vice president, Washington committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare. In the official report of a conference of the group, held in Nashville, Tenn., April 19–21, 1942, the name of William H. Hastie appeared as consultant, "Panel III Youth and Training: Civilian and Military"; he was identified as civilian aide to the Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as "subversive" and "Communist" and as "sponsored and supported by the Communist Party" in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447), and included on the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The special committee, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

William H. Hastie was one of the sponsors of a conference on civil rights, April 20–21, 1940, held under the auspices of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action (call to the conference, p. 4). Attorney General Francis Biddle cited the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as an affiliate or local chapter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448). On April 1, 1954, he included it on his consolidated list.

The Communist Daily Worker of May 10, 1948 (p. 6), reported that William H. Hastie, governor of the Virgin Islands, "charged that the United States Government practically robs the island government of its own sorely needed internal revenue taxes, which are dumped into the United States Treasury."

In the Daily Worker of July 15, 1949 (p. 3), it was reported that "Gov. William H. Hastie of the Virgin Islands defends 'radicals of every persuasion' before the 40th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People currently meeting in Los Angeles; Hastie, first Negro governor of an island possession, lambasted local, State, and Federal authorities who pretend to be neutral in matters between aggrieved minorities and those who seek to maintain the inequalities of our society."

The Daily People's World of August 5, 1949 (p. 3), reported that Gov. William Hastie, of the Virgin Islands, had been recommended for appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States by Carey McWilliams, a well-known lawyer on the west coast who has defended Communists.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Earl G. Harrison, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Communist Daily Worker of October 29, 1943 (p. 4) reported that Earl G. Harrison had spoken before the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. An invitation issued by Donald Ogden Stewart to attend a "United Nations in America" dinner in New York City, April 17, 1943, arranged under the auspices of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, showed that the "Honorabe Earl G. Harrison, United States Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization will be presented with the Annual Award by the Honorable Vito Marcantonio on behalf of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born."

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report 1311, of March 29, 1944). It was also cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948). The organization was included on the Attorney General's consolidated list released April 1, 1954.

Reference to Earl G. Harrison was made on the floor of the Senate, June 19, 1948 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 7, p. 9023).

Earl G. Harrison signed a statement reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, pages A2450–A2460), at the request of the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana. The statement was "made by 87 leading American liberals, setting forth what they consider to be a standard of political conduct for those who believe in liberalism or progressivism as a middle way between the extremes of reaction and communism—the true highway toward the fullest achievement of American democracy. This statement of liberalism accuses the American Communist Party and its sympathizers of an un-American lack of forthrightness, and announces the refusal to associate with American Communists as a proper and responsible requirement for anyone who is to be of practical help to the cause of liberalism in the United States. The statement of these 87 liberal leaders draws a proper distinction between association with American Communists and their sympathizers, on the one hand, and, on the other, an objective attitude toward the problems of Russia and a hope for peaceful relations with that country * * *."

The article was accompanied by a list of individuals who had signed the statement, in which source Mr. Harrison was identified as Dean of the Law School, University of Pennsylvania.

The Daily Worker of June 26, 1952 (p. 8) printed an article datelined Cape May, N. J., June 25, which stated that "Witchhunts threaten liberty in America, Earl G. Harrison, former dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, warned here, in an address to some 2,500 Quakers at the Friends General Confernece. Harrison said: 'Investigations, witchhunts, and guilt by association without the fairness of trial are all part of our feverish zeal to wipe out any suspected subversive threat to democracy—a zeal that is itself the greatest blow to liberty.'"

FEBRUARY 14, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Harry J. Greene, Philadelphia, Pa., national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily

a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

On the call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America at Washington, D. C., June 7–9, 1940, the name of Dr. Harry J. Greene of Philadelphia, Pa., appears in a list of the sponsors; he was one of the sponsors of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown on their letterheads dated September 10 and November 6, 1940, in which sources he is shown as being from Philadelphia.

The printed program of a National Action Conference for Civil Rights which was scheduled to be held in Washington, D. C., April 19–20, 1941, named Dr. Harry J. Greene, Philadelphia, as one of the sponsors of that conference, called by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (formed as a result of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7–9, 1940), as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations * * * by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their programs"; and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446; and press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948, respectively; also included on consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (report of Mar. 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and Jan. 2, 1943). The Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties in a report released September 2, 1947.

Dr. Harry J. Greene was chairman of a discussion group on "Denial of Citizenship Rights" at the Second National Negro Congress, October 15–17, 1937, in Philadelphia, as shown on the printed program of that congress (p. 19), in which source he is identified as being from Philadelphia, Pa., and president of the Philadelphia branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. A booklet of the National Negro Congress entitled "We Are Rising" (April 1939, p. 2) named one Harry Green as vice president, Philadelphia council of the congress.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes" (report of Jan. 3, 1939; also cited in reports of Jan. 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and Mar. 29, 1944). The Attorney General cited the Congress as "an important sector of the democratic front, sponsored and supported by the Communist Party" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447); later, the Attorney General cited the congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Roscoe Dunjee, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker for April 16, 1947 (p. 2), reported that Roscoe Dunjee, attorney, Oklahoma City, Okla., was one of the signers of a statement defending the Communist Party. He was one of the signers of a statement condemning "punitive measures directed against the Communist Party" as shown by the April 20, 1947 issue of the Worker (p. 8). The Daily Worker for April 27, 1947 (p. 24), shows Roscoe Dunjee as one of the signers of a statement against the ban on the Communist Party. Roscoe C. Dunjee, publisher of the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, was a sponsor of a statement attacking the arrest of the Communist Party leaders, according to the Daily Worker, August 23, 1948 (p. 3). He sponsored the "Statement by Negro Americans" in behalf of the arrested Communist leaders as shown by the August 29, 1948, issue of the Worker (p. 11). The Daily Worker for March 7, 1950 (p. 4), reported that Roscoe Dunjee attacked Judge Medina in the case of the Communist leaders.

Roscoe Dunjee was a member of the initiating committee, of the Congress on Civil Rights held in Detroit, Mich., April 27 and 28, 1946, as shown by the summons to the congress. The Daily Worker of April 16, 1947 (p. 2), deported that Roscoe Dunjee, of Oklahoma City, Okla., was one of the signers of a statement released by the Civil Rights Congress defending the Communist Party. The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, 1947 and 1948; included in consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954.) The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as being "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (report No. 1115, Sept. 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19).

The pamphlet Seeing Is Believing, 1947, and the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 135), show Roscoe Dunjee as a member of the Council on African Affairs, Inc. The Council on African Affairs was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. He redesignated the organization on April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954.)

Roscoe Dunjee was a sponsor of the Win the Peace Conference of the National Committee to Win the Peace, as shown by the Daily Worker March 5, 1946, a letterhead of the organization dated February 28, 1946, and the call to a win-the-peace conference, National Press Building, Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946. The National Committee To Win the Peace was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released in 1947 and 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

The Daily Worker for October 19, 1948 (p. 7), reported that Roscoe Dunjee was one of those who signed a statement released by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The council was cited as a Communist front by this committee in its review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace (April 26, 1950—original release date April 19, 1949, p. 2).

Roscoe Dunjee was a signer of the call to the Second Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Chattanooga, Tenn., April 14–16, 1940. A letterhead of the conference, dated June 4, 1947, shows Roscoe Dunjee as vice president and a member of the national committee of that organization. He was also shown as vice president of the organization in an undated leaflet, The South Is Closer Than You Think, and the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947, page 139. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare was cited as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. (Specal Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 147.) In its report of June 12, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities described the conference as a Communst-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South," although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The New York Times of October 9, 1944 (p. 12), reported that Roscoe Dunjee was one of the signers of an open letter to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey for the pardon of Morris U. Schappes, which was sponsored by the Schappes Defense Committee. The Schappes Defense Committee was cited as a Communist organization by the United States Attorney General (letter to the Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953). The special Committee on Un-American Activities described the Schappes Defense Committee as "a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York." Morris U. Schappes "was on the teaching staff of the College of the City of New York for a period of 13 years. In 1956 his superior on the college faculty refused to recommend him for reappointment. This action led to prolonged agitation by the Communist Party" (report, March 29, 1944, p. 71).

Roscoe Dunjee was a member of the advisory board of the Southern Negro Youth Congress according to a letterhead of that organization dated June 12, 1947, the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committeee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 97), a letterhead dated August 11, 1947, and a page from a leaflet published by the organization. The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., "which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means" (U. S. Attorney General, letter to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The Committee on Un-American Activities said it was "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League (report No. 271, April 17, 1947, p. 14). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the organization as a Communist front (report, January 3, 1940, p. 9).

According to the Daily Worker for April 1, 1945 (p. 6m), Roscoe Dunjee was asked what he thought of New York's new anti-discrimination law, and was quoted as replying: "It shows a trend in the direction which the United States as a nation must take if we rise to the level of Russian morality * * *"

Photographs of Roscoe Dunjee are found in the Daily Worker, issues of December 9, 1941 (p. 7), and April 1, 1945 (p. 6m).

Roscoe Dunjee, editor of the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, Okla., was quoted in the March 28, 1944, issue of New Masses (p. 15), as follows:

"I attended a Lincoln and Douglas meeting held under the auspices of the Communist Party, February 12 * * * Most assuredly Americans should stop and listen to what Communists have to say. The Russian experiment as expressed today in Soviet life is too effective for anyone to attempt to overlook this. As president of the state conference of branches of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I have every year for the past 10 invited the Communist to address our meeting. Alan Shaw, secretary of the Communist Party in Oklahoma, addressed our State conference at Tulsa last November * * * personally I endorse the idea of an international State * * * as espoused by the Communist Party."

The following is quoted from the Daily Worker of April 8, 1952 (p. 2):

"Roscoe Dunjee, editor of the Oklahoma Black-Dispatch, leading Negro newspaper in the Southwest, has hailed in a long editorial the victory won by William L. Patterson, head of the Civil Rights Congress, in securing acquittal on a contempt of Congress charge."

(Note citation of Civil Rights Congress on p. 1 of this report.)

Roscoe C. Dunjee, Oklahoma City, was listed as 1 of 4 sponsors of a statement which appeared in the Sunday Worker, August 29, 1948 (p. 11), from which the following is quoted:

"THE FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

"(Statement by Negro Americans to the President and Attorney General of the United States)

"We, the undersigned Negro Americans, strongly condemn your hysteria-breeding arrests of national leaders of the Communist Party, and call upon you to take positive action to protect civil rights instead of persecuting political minorities.

"We raise here no defense of the principles of the Communist Party. Our concern is to defend the right of political and other minorities, especially the Negro people, to fight for the kind of society which they consider necessary to give full expression to the principles of American democracy * * *

"The obvious purpose of these Gestapo-like arrests of Communist leaders is to frighten people away from the Wallace movement and progressive people's organizations generally, practically all of which have been slandered as Communist or subversive * * *

"We call upon our Government to halt its Fascist-like attacks upon opposition minorities, and to act for the protection of minority rights * * *"

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The program of the fifth national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Atlantic City, N. J., March 29–30, 1941, listed S. Ralph Harlow as a sponsor.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

S. Ralph Harlow was an endorser of the Committee for Citizenship Rights as shown by a letterhead dated January 10, 1942. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 95), cited the Committee for Citizenship Rights as an organization which defended the "interests of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Committee for Citizenship Rights as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

Prof. S. Ralph Harlow signed a statement calling for international agreement to ban use of atomic weapons attached to a press release of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, December 14, 1949 (p .9). He was identified in this instance as associated with Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 54), cited the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact as an organization which was formed as a result of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, and which was located, according to a letterhead of September 16, 1950, at 30 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and to further the cause of Communists in the United States doing their part in the Moscow campaign.

As shown by Soviet Russia Today of November 1937 (p. 79), S. Ralph Harlow was a signer of the Golden Book of American Firendship with the Soviet Union, cited as a "Communist enterprise" signed hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers.

"January 23–25, 1948, New York City," conference call of the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East, listed Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, Smith College, as a sponsor of the conference. The Attorney General cited the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East as Communist, and a conference called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy in a letter released July 25, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

A news release of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties dated December 26, 1941, listed S. Ralph Harlow as a signer. He signed the organization's 1943 message to the House of Representatives (leaflet, attached to undated letterhead); and the group's statement supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party (undated leaflet, "the only sound policy for a democracy * * *" and Daily Worker, March 19, 1945, p. 4).

The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as among a maze of organizations which were spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.

As shown by the Daily Worker of September 17, 1940 (pp. 1, 5), S. Ralph Harlow signed a telegram of the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson in behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union defendants. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights as a Communist-front group.

S. Ralph Harlow sponsored the call for the Protestantism Answers Hate dinner-forum held under auspices of the Protestant Digest, New York, February 25, 1941, as shown by a leaflet. He was identified in this instance as professor of sociology, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 48), cited the Protestant Digest as "a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal."

According to the New York Times, October 9, 1944 (p. 12), S. Ralph Harlow, chairman, department of religion, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., signed an open letter of the Schappes defense committee to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey asking a pardon for Morris Schappes.

The Schappes defense committee was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as "a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York." (Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 71).

Prof. S. Ralph Harlow endorsed the World Peace Appeal as shown by an undated leaflet, Prominent Americans Call for * * * (received Sept. 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker, August 14, 1950 (p. 2).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 34), cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy"; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has duty to rise to this appeal' "; and as having "received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist parties throughout the world."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Robert C. Weaver, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Robert C. Weaver, identified from Washington, D. C., and as economic adviser to the Secretary of Interior, was discussion leader of a panel on "The Federal Housing Program and the Negro" at the Second National Negro Congress as shown by the program of that congress which was held in Philadelphia, October 15–17, 1937.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The special committee in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes." The Attorney General had cited the group previously as follows: "From the record of its activities and the composition of its governing bodies, there can be little

doubt that it has served what James M. Ford, Communist vice presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted: 'An important sector of the democratic front,' sponsored and supported by the Communist Party" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447).

The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2), listed Robert C. Weaver, identified as Assistant Housing Administrator of the Department of Interior, as one of the signers of the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy letter to lift the Spanish embargo. The special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

Robert C. Weaver, Washington, D. C., contributed financially to Social Work Today as shown by the January 1941 issue of that publication (pp. 16–18). Social Work Today was cited as a Communist magazine by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 129).

R. C. Weaver, 1206 Kenyon Street, Washington, D. C., was listed as a member of the Washington Book Shop on a 1941 membership list of the organization subpenaed by this committee. The Washington Book Shop Association was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as showing "evidence of Communist penetration or control" according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7447. The Special Committee report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the organization as a Communist-front organization.

Robert C. Weaver was the author of The Negro Ghetto which was reviewed by Herbert Aptheker in the August 1948 issue of Masses and Mainstream (p. 85). The Congressional committee, in its report on the Congress of American Women, April 26, 1950 (p. 75), cited Masses and Mainstream as successor to New Masses, a Communist magazine.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Lewis Gannett, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

On December 18, 1934, the Daily Worker (p. 5) reported the following: "A reception to mark the 10 anniversary of International Publishers took place * * * December 14, in * * * the new school for social research * * * Scores of prominent writers, artists, and editors were present to pay tribute to International Publishers' decade of achievement * * * Among those present were * * * Lewis Gannett, book-review columnist of the New York Herald Tribune * * *"

The Attorney General of the United States cited International Publishers as "The (Communist) Party's publishing house," headed by Alexander Trachtenberg (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445); and as the "publishing agency of the Communist Party" (brief for the United States in the case of William Schneiderman, p. 145). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited International Publishers as an "official publishing house of the Communist Party in the United States" (Reports of January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as the "Official American Communist Party publishing house" (Report No. 1920 dated May 11, 1948).

Lewis Gannett, Harvard, was a member of the sponsoring committee of dinner sponsored by the American Student Union for "alumni of the student movement and present members" as shown in Student Advocate for February 1937 (p. 2). The American Student Union was cited as a Communist front which was "the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists" in 1935. The Young Communist League took credit for creation of the organization (Report of the special Committee on Un-American Activities dated Jan. 3, 1939; also cited in reports of Jan. 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1949).

A letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939 contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the Writers' and Artists' Committee of that organization; the same information is shown in public hearings before this committee July 21, 1953 (p. 3639). The American League was cited by the Attorney General as "designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7443); and subsequently, as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "a bold advocate of treason" (reports of January 3, 1939; Jan. 3, 1940; Jan. 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and Jan. 2, 1943).

The special committee cited the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers (report of June 25, 1942; also cited in report of March 29, 1944); a letterhead of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, dated May 26, 1940, contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the organization's national executive committee.

A letterhead of the American Russian Institute for Cultural Relations With the Soviet Union, Inc., contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of its board of directors; the letterhead was dated July 14, 1938. The Attorney General cited the American Russian Institute as Communist (press release of April 27, 1949; also included on consolidated list dated April 1, 1954).

Lewis S. Gannett was a member of the board of directors of the American Fund for Public Service, as shown on a photostat of their letterhead dated September 8, 1930. The "American Fund for Public Service was established by Charles Garland, son of the wealthy James A. Garland. Young Garland, conditioned against wealth through radical acquaintances at Harvard, declined to accept his inheritance for his own personal use. Instead, he established, in 1922, the American Fund for Public Service with the sum of $900,000 which consisted largely of conservative securities. During the lush twenties, the fund grew to some $2 million.

"A self-perpetuating board of directors was set up for the purpose of handing out this easy money. Sidney Hillman was among them. Associated with Hillman as directors were Roger N. Baldwin, William Z. Foster, Lewis Gannett, * * *." (From report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944.)

An undated booklet of Friends of the Soviet Union contains the name of Lewis S. Gannett in a list of members of the Reception Committee for the Soviet Flyers, under auspices of that organization; he contributed a review of Maxim Gorki's "A Book of Short Stories to Soviet Russia Today (September 1939, p. 26). The Attorney General cited Friends of the Soviet Union as Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special committee cited the organization as "one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States" (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). Soviet Russia Today was published by Friends of the Soviet Union.

Soviet Russia Today for November 1937 (p. 79) published a list of individuals who signed the Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union under this statement: "I hereby inscribe my name in greeting to the people of the Soviet Union on the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Republic." The Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union was cited as a "Communist enterprise" signed by hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers (Report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944).

The Daily Worker of January 18, 1939 (p. 7) reported that Lewis Gannett was a committee sponsor of the League of American Writers, cited as a Communist-front organization by the special committee (reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). The Attorney General cited it as being under "Communist control" and as subversive and Communist (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445; and press releases of June 1, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

New Masses for March 16, 1937 (p. 26) named Lewis Gannett as one of the sponsors of a send-off dinner for the ambulance corps under the auspices of the American Artists and Writers Committee, Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy; an undated letterhead of the Writers' and Artists' Committee for Medical Aid to Spain also contains his name in a list of sponsors; the letterhead also carries the notation "Affiliated with the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy"; he signed a petition of American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo, as shown in the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4).

During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, "recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy" (report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944).

Another such organization which was cited by the special committee (see last paragraph above) was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy; their letterhead of July 6, 1938, contained the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the Writers' and Artists' committee.

The Liberator for September 1921 (p. 11) contained Lewis Gannett's interview with "Bill Haywood in Moscow"; he also contributed an article to the July 1922 issue of the same publication (p. 30). The special committee cited the Liberator as a "Communist magazine" (report of June 25, 1942).

Lewis Gannett contributed articles to New Masses for February 16, 1937 (p. 21) and August 10, 1943 (p. 20); he signed New Masses' Letter to the President of the United States, as shown in New Masses of April 2, 1940 (p. 21), which source identified him as literary editor, New York Herald Tribune. New Masses has been cited by the Attorney General as a "Communist periodical" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448); the special committee cited it as the "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * * whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942).

A letterhead of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League, dated April 11, 1928, contains the name of Lewis S. Gannett in a list of members of that organization's national committee. The Attorney General cited the All-American Anti-Imperialist League as a "Communist-front organization" (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); the special committee cited the group as a Communist front (report of March 29, 1944).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to the Communist publication, the Daily Worker of April 13, 1936 (p. 3), Buell G. Gallagher, identified as President of Talladega College, endorsed a peace strike of 500,000 students who planned a demonstration for April 22, 1936. The strike was sponsored by the American Student Union which was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports dated January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

The Daily People's World, the Communist journal on the West Coast, listed Dr. Buel Gallagher as a member of the Draft Cross Committee, in connection with a move to draft Mayor Laurence L. Cross, of Berkeley, Calif., as candidate for Congress from the seventh district of California. (See Daily People's World of January 28, 1948, p. 3.) In the February 17, 1948, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3), we find that "the committee originally formed to draft Mayor Laurence Cross for Congress has resolved to stay together in support of the candidacy of Dr. Buell G. Gallagher in the 7th District." According to Judge Louis J. Hardie, committee chairman, "In Dr. Gallagher, we feel that we have found a congressional candidate who possesses those qualities of intelligence, integrity, and idealism which we admire in Dr. Cross. His deep acquaintance with social and economic problems and his broad experience in community activities insure the voters of the 7th District a candidate who will honestly and ably serve them in the 81st Congress" (ibid).

In the March 10, 1948, issue of the Daily People's World, we note that the "Alameda County CIO Council voted endorsement last night for Dr. Buell Gallagher, pro-Wallace candidate for Congress in the 7th District. Dr. Gallagher, endorsed previously by the AFL Central Labor Council and Building Trades Council, will run in the Democratic primary in June against Dyke Brown, the Truman candidate. Congressman from the 7th district now is Republic John J. Allen, who voted for the Taft-Hartley Law" (p. 3).

Under date of February 10, 1951, Dr. Gallagher addressed a letter to the chairman of this committee detailing an analysis of the information reflected in the public files of the committee, and stating, "at no time have I ever been a member of, or sympathizer with, the Communist Party; nor a member of, or sympathizer with, any organization which I knew or believed to be a front for communism." The chairman, in a letter to Dr. Gallagher dated March 3, 1951, advised him that his analysis would be made a part of the committee records and quoted in any future releases.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Judge Hubert T. Delany (also spelled Delaney), national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Hubert T. Delaney was a member of the Council on African Affairs, as shown in the following sources: Pamphlets entitled "Africa in the War," "Seeing Is Believing" (1947), "For a New Africa" (p. 36), "8 Million Demand Freedom" (inside back cover); leaflets headed "The Job To Be Done" and "What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World" (June 26, 1944). New Africa for December 1943 (p. 4) and a letterhead of the council dated May 17, 1945, contained the same information. Mr. Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities July 21, 1947 (p. 135), that Judge Delany was a member of the Council on African Affairs. According to the Daily Worker of March 29, 1948 (p. 7), Judge Hubert T. Delaney was a member of the executive board of the council. The Daily Worker of April 26, 1947 (p. 12), named him as having signed a statement issued by the council.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, which was made available to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, contains the name of one Hubert T. Delany, 30 Broad Street, New York City. The name of Hubert T. Delany appeared on a letterhead of the Guild dated May 28, 1940, as director ex officio. The New York Guild Lawyer for September 1950 listed him as vice president of the New York chapter of the guild. A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild (as of December 1949) contains the name of the Honorable Hubert T. Delaney in a list of members or the organization's executive board; he is so named in a list dated May 1950. Both of these lists were printed in a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published by the Committee on Un-American Activities September 17, 1950.

Convention News of May 1941 (pp. 2 and 4), issued by the fifth annual convention of the National Lawyers Guild which was held May 29-June 1, 1941, in Detroit, Mich., named Hubert T. Delany as a member of the convention resolutions committee; he was also named in the same source as a member of the national executive board, National Lawyers Guild. Judge Delaney presided at an annual convention of the guild in Chicago, Ill., in 1951 (Daily People's World, October 18, 1951, p. 2); he also spoke before the guild in 1951, as reported in the Daily Worker of April 10, 1951, page 5. In the latter three sources, he was identified with the domestic relations court of New York City.

The Daily Worker of October 7, 1952 (p. 3), reported that Judge Delany was to lead a workshop at the national conference on civil rights legislation and discrimination to be held in New York City, October 10–12, under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild; a letterhead of the New York City chapter of the guild dated October 17, 1952, listed Hubert T. Delany as vice president. The Daily Worker of February 20, 1953 (p. 6), announced that he would speak at a panel session on civil rights and liberties, February 22, at the annual convention of the guild, February 20–23, in New York City. According to the Daily Worker of May 27, 1953 (p. 8), Hubert T. Delany was reelected vice president of the New York City chapter of the National Lawyers Guild at the annual membership meeting May 26. He was elected one of the vice presidents of the National Lawyers Guild, New York City chapter, for the years 1954–55, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 26, 1954 (p. 8).

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report No. 1311 dated March 29, 1944. In a report on the guild, prepared and released September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, it was shown that the National Lawyers Guild "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

Hubert T. Delany was a member of the Lawyers' Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy, as shown on their letterhead dated April 6, 1939. The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of April 1, 1954); he had previously cited the organization as "established in the United States * * * in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7443). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States" (report of January 3, 1940).

The catalog of the George Washington Carver School (winter term, 1947) contains the name of Judge Hubert T. Delany as a member of the board of directors of that school, cited by the Attorney General as "an adjunct in New York City of the Communist Party" (press release of December 4, 1947; included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Hubert T. Delany was named as a representative individual who advocated lifting the arms embargo against Spain in a booklet entitled "These Americans Say," which was prepared and published by the coordinating committee to lift the embargo, cited as one of the number of groups set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation. (From a report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.)

A letterhead of the Lawyers Committee on American Relations with Spain dated March 5, 1938, and a prospectus and review of the organization both name him as a member of that group.

In a report dated March 29, 1944, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities had the following to say concerning the Lawyers' Committee on American Relations with Spain: "When it was the policy of the Communist Party to organize much of its main propaganda around the civil war in Spain, the lawyers' committee * * * supported this movement."

A letterhead of the medical bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy dated July 6, 1938, contains the name of Judge Delany in a list of members of that group.

During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party wholeheartedly campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and setting up so-called relief organizations such as the medical bureau and North

American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (From report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.)

Hubert T. Delaney was one of the sponsors of a testimonial dinner in honor of Ferdinand C. Smith, Communist Party member and national secretary of the National Maritime Union; identified as tax commissioner, New York City, Judge Delany was listed by Labor Defender (issue of October 1935) as one of the individuals who signed a petition for the freedom of Angelo Herndon, a Communist.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Norman Cousins, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

In an article which appeared in the Daily Worker of January 13, 1948, it was reported that "Thirty-five well known authors, editors, clergymen, and other public figures today called on the new Federal Employees Loyalty Review Board to prevent injustices to individuals in the Government loyalty check." Norman Cousins was one of those who signed the letter, addressed to Seth W. Richardson, board chairman. This article also appeared in the New York Times on the preceding day, January 12, 1948 (p. 10).

In a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace," dated April 19, 1949, we find the following statement concerning a speech of Norman Cousins before that conference:

"In answer to this totalitarian philosophy of dragooning culture, Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, declared amid a great deal of hissing and boing, that 'Democracy must mean intellectual freedom, that it must protect the individual against the right of the state to draw political and cultural blueprints for its painters and writers and composers or to castigate them, or to enter into those matters of mind in which the individual is sovereign.'" (See p. 13 of the Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Algernon D. Black, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Dr. Algernon D. Black was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientic Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, March 25–27, 1949 (conference program, p. 12, and conference call). The Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (p. 2), announced that he was a member of the program committee of that conference. Speaking of Peace, edited report of the conference, March 25, 26, 27, 1949, listed Algernon Black as a speaker on A Warning Against Sectarian Prejudice, and gave biographical data concerning him (pp. 121, 139).

In 1948 and 1949, Dr. Black signed statements of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (Daily Worker, Dec. 29, 1948, p. 2; letterhead received in January 1949; New York Star of January 4, 1949, p. 9, an advertisement). He spoke before the group in February 1949 (Daily Worker, Feb. 28, 1949, p. 2).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and held in New York City on March 25, 26, and 27, 1949, April 26, 1950, cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this same report the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the scientific and cultural conference as actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.

The call to a national conference on American policy in China and the Far East, held in January 1948, included the name of Dr. Algernon Black in the list of sponsors (Call, January 23–25, 1948, New York City); the conference was called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. In the December 1949–January 1950 issue of Far East Spotlight, which is the official organ of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, Dr. Black answered a questionnaire issued by that committee, favoring recognition of the Chinese Communist government.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy as a Communist organization in a letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board and release to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

The Daily Worker of June 21, 1948, reported that Algernon D. Black had signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, calling for a conference with the Soviet Union; he signed an appeal of the same organization to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled "End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace" which was dated December 1948); he signed a statement in praise of Henry Wallace's open letter to Stalin (May 1948), as shown in the pamphlet How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace (p. 9), prepared and released by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian."

Dr. Black contributed an article to the pamphlet We Hold These Truths (p. 22), which was issued by the League of American Writers. He was named as a member of the executive committee of Film Audiences for Democracy in the June 1939 issue of Film Survey, official organ of Film Audiences, cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944, p. 150).

The Attorney General cited the League of American Writers as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "founded under Communist auspices in 1935 * * * in 1939 * * * began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its reports of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), June 25, 1942 (p. 19), and March 29, 1944 (p. 48), cited the League of American Writers as a Communist front organization.

A letterhead of the nonpartisan committee for the relection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio, dated October 3, 1936, listed the name of Algernon D. Black as a member of that committee. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 122), cited the nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Vito Marcantonio as a Communist-front organization.

Algernon Black was a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union, as shown in a pamphlet entitled "Presenting the American Student Union." The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated January 3, 1939 (p. 80), cited the American Student Union as a Communist-front organization.

A letterhead of the Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York, dated May 11, 1946, listed the name of Algernon Black as one of the public sponsors of that organization. The Attorney General cited the Veterans Against Disciminaton of Civil Rights Congress of New York as subversive in a letter released December 4, 1947; included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

Mr. Black signed an open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown in the booklet 600 Prominent Americans (p. 16). The Attorney General cited the National Federation as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

The printed program of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, February 12, 1940, reveals the name of Algernon D. Black as vice chairman of the group. A letterhead of the American Russian Institute, received July 26, 1949, contains the name of Dr. Black as a member of the interchurch committee of that instiurte. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its reported dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front organization. The Attorney General cited the American Russian Institute as a Communist organization in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

Dr. Black was a member of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy (letterheads dated March 13, 1931, and February 21, 1938); and described as a representative individual in a booklet entitled "These Americans Say" which was published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as a Communist front organization. The Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

In a pamphlet entitled "News You Don't Get" (dated November 15, 1938), Algernon Black was named as one of those who signed the call to a conference on pan-American democracy; a letterhead of the organization dated November 16, 1938, named him as one of the sponsors of the conference. The Attorney General cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the Conference on Pan-American Democratcy as a Communist front organization.

Algernon Black signed a declaration of the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee honoring Dimitrov, as shown in the New York Times of December 22, 1943 (p. 40). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 112 and 156), cited the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee as a Communist front organiztion.

Dr. Black signed an open letter in defense of Harry Bridges. (See Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, p. 4.) Letterheads of the Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges dated June 8, 1943, and January 10, 1944, listed Algernon Black as a committee member or sponsor of that group. The open letter in defense of Harry Bridges was cited as a Communist front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 87, 112, 129, 166). The citizens' committee for Harry Bridges was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 90 and 94), cited the citizens' committee for Harry Bridges as a Communist front organization.

The Daily Worker of March 29, 1951, (p. 9), reported that Dr. Algernon D. Black signed a letter of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born attacking the McCarran Act. Algernon D. Black was shown as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in the Daily Worker, April 4, 1951 (p. 8), a leaflet: "Call—Mass Meeting and Conference," October 27, 1951, Dearborn, Mich., and a photostatic copy of an undated letterhead of the 20th anniversary national conference * * *, U. E. Hall, Chicago, Ill. (Dec. 8–9, 1951). The Daily Worker of August 10, 1950 (p. 5), reported that Dr. Algernon Black signed a statement of the American Committee against denaturalization.

The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

On June 13, 1949, the Daily Worker reported that Dr. Black was one of the sponsors of an organization formed to oppose the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill; a press release of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, dated June 15, 1949, revealed the same information. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt bill dated January 2, 1951, cited that organization as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation."

A letterhead of the Voice of Freedom Committee dated June 16, 1947, listed Algernon D. Black as a sponsor of that organization. An invitation to a dinner held under auspices of the group, January 21, 1948, listed him as a member of the dinner committee. He signed a petition of the organization as shown by a leaflet published by the Voice of Freedom Committee. The Attorney General included the Voice of Freedom Committee on his April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

Algernon D. Black, New York Ethical Culture Society, signed an open letter of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact to Senators and Congressmen urging defeat of President Truman's arms program, as shown by a letterhead dated August 21, 1949.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 56), cited the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949, to be held in Washington, D. C., and as having been instigated by Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign.

The Daily Worker of December 10, 1952 (p. 4), listed Dr. Algernon D. Black as a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Ralph Bunche, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Dr. Ralph Bunche was a member of the executive board of the Washington committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown on their letterhead of June 4, 1947. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization in its report of March 29, 1944. In 1947 the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the conference, in which it was cited as a Communist-front organization which sought to "attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South," although its "professed interest in southern welfare" was "simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States" (Report No. 592 of June 12, 1947).

Ralph Bunche was a sponsor of the Conference on Civil Rights of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, April 20–21, 1940, as shown by the conference call, page 4. A letterhead of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action dated April 26, 1940, named Dr. Bunche as one of the sponsors of that group.

The Washington Committee for Democratic Action was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included in the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General had previously cited the group as an affiliate or local chapter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as successor in Washington to the American League for Peace and Democracy and an affiliate of the national federation (reports of June 25, 1942, and Mar. 29, 1944).

Official proceedings of the National Negro Congress for 1936, pages 5 and 40, named Dr. Ralph Bunche, Washington, D. C., as a member of the presiding committee and a member of the national executive council of that organization.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes, and reported that "the officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists" (report of January 3, 1939). The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447; press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of cited organizations, dated April 1, 1954).

The Washington Post and Times Herald, May 29, 1954, p. 6, reported that "A Federal loyalty board announced today that it has unanimously cleared Dr. Ralph J. Bunche of any and all charges." the article quoted the official announcement as follows:

"The full board had its second meeting with Dr. Bunche yesterday following which it unanimously reached the conclusion that there is no doubt as to the loyalty of Dr. Bunche to the Government of the United States.

"This conclusion has been forwarded to the Secretary of State for transmittal to the Secretary General of the U. N. At the same time it has been informally transmitted to Dr. Bunche."

Reference to the loyalty board's clearance of Dr. Bunche is found also in the Washington Evening Star, May 28, 1954, p. A–1.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. H. Claude Hudson, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily People's World of May 2, 1947 (p. 8), listed Dr. H. Claude Hudson as a sponsor of the Los Angeles chapter of the Civil Rights Congress.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor

Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Carl R. Johnson, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

An undated leaflet, The Only Sound Policy for a Democracy, and the Daily Worker of March 19, 1945 (p. 4), listed Carl R. Johnson, lawyer, Kansas City, Mo., as a signer of a statement sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties among a maze of organizations which were spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Alfred Baker Lewis, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or finding of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

On July 11, 1942, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties addressed an open letter to the President of the United States urging him to reconsider Attorney General Francis Biddle's order to deport Harry Bridges; the letter also stated that: "It is equally essential that the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party be rescinded." Alfred Baker Lewis, executive board, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and executive board member, Union for Democratic Action, New York, N. Y., signed the open letter, as shown in the pamphlet entitled "600 Prominent Americans Ask President To Rescind Biddle Decision," published September 11, 1942, by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties and incorporating the open letter in full. The open letter, together with a list of individuals who signed it, appeared in the Daily Worker on July 19, 1942 (p. 4).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "Part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program;" and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446); and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948, respectively; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the federation as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943). It was also cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law (Report No. 1115 of September 2, 1947).

An undated letterhead of the League for Mutual Aid, 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City, contained the name of Alfred Baker Lewis in a list of members of the organization's advisory committee. The league was cited as a Communist enterprise by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944.

"Greetings and best wishes for success to the second national Negro congress" were contained in the printed annual program of that congress, sent by A. Philip Randolph, chairman, and Alfred Baker Lewis, secretary, Negro Work Committee of the Socialist Party. (Printed annual program, second national Negro congress, Philadelphia, Pa., October 15, 16, and 17, 1937, p. 61.) The National Negro Congress was cited as an important sector of the democratic front, sponsored and supported by the Communist Party; and later, as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447; and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the congress as the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. James J. McClendon, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of March 18, 1945 (p. 2), and an undated leaflet, The Only Sound Policy for a Democracy, named Dr. James J. McClendon as one of the signers of a statement, sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which supported the War Department's order on granting commissions to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party. Dr. McClendon was identified as President of the Detroit National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. D. J. J. McClendon was one of the sponsors of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown by the program, Action Conference for Civil Rights, held in Washington, D. C., April 19–20, 1941; and on letterheads dated September 11, 1940, and November 6, 1940.

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in press releases dated December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in his consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The Attorney General described the organization as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities stated that "There can be no reasonable doubt about the fact that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties regardless of its high-sounding name—is one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (special committee report, March 29, 1944, p. 50); also cited in reports, June 25, 1942 (p. 20), and January 2, 1943 (pp. 9 and 12).

Dr. James J. McClendon was named in the Daily Worker of March 16, 1942, (pp. 1 and 4), and on a letterhead dated April 2, 1942, as one of the sponsors of the National Free Browder Congress.

The National Free Browder Congress was cited as a Communist front which arranged to meet March 28-29, 1942. Earl Browder was general secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America, who had been convicted and sentenced to Atlanta Federal Penitentiary for passport fraud. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944 (pp. 69, 87, and 132.)

Dr. James McClendon was one of the sponsors of the sesquicentennial bill of rights celebration, held under the auspices of the Michigan Civil Rights Federation, Detroit, Mich., December 1–2, 1939, as shown by the call of conference. Dr. James J. McClendon was one of the sponsors of a statewide conference, held under the auspices of the Michigan federation in Detroit, Mich., September 12, 1943, as shown by call of the conference. He was identified as president of the Detroit chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The Michigan Civil Rights Federation was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as "an affiliate of the Communist front, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; and as subversive and Communist organization which has been succeeded by and now operates as the Michigan chapter of the Civil Rights Congress." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446; and press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also including in his consolidated list of organizations, dated April 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as a Communist-front organization. (From Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944; and Report No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated September 2, 1947, p. 3.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: A. Maceo Smith, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily

a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A. Maceo Smith was a signer of a statement released by the Civil Rights Congress of Texas against a ban on the Communist Party as shown by the Worker, April 27, 1947 (p. 25).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: James Hinton, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

James M. Hinton, identified as president of the State conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for South Carolina, was one of the sponsors of a Congress on Civil Rights, as shown on the call to the congress which was held in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946. (See pp. 21 and 22 of Rept. No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Civil Rights Congress, September 2, 1947.)

The Civil Rights Congress was founded at a conference in Detroit April 27, and 28, 1946, effectuating the merger of the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The Civil Rights Congress was "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (pp. 2 and 19 of Rept. No. 1115).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Theodore M. Berry, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild which was made available to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 1939, contains the name of Theodore M. Berry, 308 West Fifth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, as a member.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Earl B. Dickerson, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (p. 9), Earl Dickerson, attorney, Illinois, was one of the signers of a statement defending the 12 Communist leaders. He signed a statement in behalf of the attorneys in the Communist cases as shown by the July 31, 1950, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 9). This same information was shown in the February 1, 1950, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 3). As shown by the Daily People's World of May 12, 1950 (p. 12), Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of a statement to the United Nations in behalf of the Communist cases.

Earl B. Dickerson protested approval of the Smith Act by the Supreme Court as "having a disastrous impact upon * * * struggle of Negro people" (Daily Worker, October 1, 1951, p. 1). He filed a petition with the clerk of the United States Supreme Court supporting the pending application for a hearing on the constitutionality of the Smith Act as shown by the Daily Worker, October 4, 1951 (p. 15). Mr. Dickerson was identified in this source as a Negro attorney in Illinois. He spoke against the Smith Act according to the February 12, 1952 issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3), and was co-author of a memorandum to the Supreme Court "on the menace of the Smith Act to the Negro people" (Daily People's World, July 15, 1952, p. 1). Earl B. Dickerson, president, National Lawyers Guild, Chicago, was a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, p. 4). As shown by the Daily Worker, December 29, 1953 (p. 8) and the Worker, January 3, 1954 (p. 6), Earl B. Dickerson was one of 39 prominent Midwest citizens signing a plea for Christmas amnesty for Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act, which was wired to President Eisenhower. He was one of the initiators of an appeal for reduced bail for Claude Lightfoot, Illinois Communist leader, indicted under a section of the Smith Act as shown by the September 12, 1954, issue of the Worker (p. 16.

According to the December 25, 1952 issue of the Daily Worker (p. 8), Earl D. Dickerson was a signer of an open letter to President Truman asking clemency for the Rosenbergs. The Daily People's World of March 13, 1953 (p. 3), reported that Earl B. Dickerson contributed a statement to the pamphlet, The Negro People Speak Out on the Rosenbergs, distributed by volunteers for the East Bay Committee To Save the Rosenbergs, Oakland, California.

Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of an appeal to the Greek Government protesting the court marital of Greek maritime unionists as shown by the Daily Worker, August 19, 1952 (p. 1).

Earl B. Dickerson was listed in the spring 1943 (p. 22) and fall session 1943 (p. 27) catalogs of the Abraham Lincoln School as a member of the board of directors. He was named in the same source as a guest lecturer at the school (p. 19).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Abraham Lincoln School as an adjunct of the Communist Party in a letter to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947. The Attorney General redesignated the school April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the Abraham Lincoln School as successor of the Workers School as a Communist educational medium in Chicago.

A pamphlet entitled "For a New Africa" (containing the proceedings of the conference on Africa, New York, April 14, 1944) names Earl B. Dickerson as a member of the National Negro Congress.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

He was a member of the Council on African Affairs, as shown in a pamphlet entitled "8 Million Demand Freedom," and the pamphlet For a New Africa (p. 36). Earl B. Dickerson is listed as a member of the Council on African Affairs in a leaflet, issued by the organization, The Job To Be Done, a leaflet entitled "What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World?" a pamphlet entitled "Seeing Is Believing" (1947), and a letterhead of the group, dated May 17, 1945, and a pamphlet, Africa In the War.

The Attorney General cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The name of Earl Dickerson, of 35 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., appears on a 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers' Guild on file with this committee. In 1949 he was president of the Chicago chapter of the guild and chairman at a meeting on anti-Communist legislation, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 15, 1949 (p. 6); in the same year he attacked the Marshall plan as shown in the Daily Worker of July 19, 1949 (p. 5), in which source he was identified as president of the Chicago chapter of the guild; he participated in a discussion entitled "Status of Civil Liberties," fifth annual convention, National Lawyers' Guild, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941, as shown by the convention program printed in Convention News, May 1941 (p. 2), published by the guid. This same Convention News (pp. 3 and 4) listed him as a member of the convention nominations committee of the fifth national convention of the National Lawyers' Guild. He submitted a report of the giuld, denouncing lynching and discrimination, as shown in the Daily Worker, November 30, 1942 (p. 1). As shown by the October 15, 1951, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 1), Earl B. Dickerson was president of the Chicago chapter of the National

Lawyers' Guild; he spoke at the national convention of the organization in Chicago. The October 18, 1951, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 2), reported that Earl B. Dickerson was elected president of the National Lawyers' Guild. He was shown as president of the National Lawyers' Guild in the Daily Worker, January 25, 1952 (p. 1), and February 20, 1953 (p. 6), and the Daily People's World, January 25, 1952 (p. 8). The January 18, 1952, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3) reported that Earl B. Dickerson was to speak on the Smith Act, the Constitution, and You, at a gathering of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild on February 1, 1952. The Daily Worker of February 24, 1953 (p. 6), reported that Earl Dickerson, president of the National Lawyers' Guild, addressed the annual convention of the group held February 20–23, at the Park-Sheraton Hotel, New York City, and stated that "a new foreign policy is needed if the drive against liberties is to be halted." The Daily People's World of July 6, 1953 (p. 3), announced that he was to be honored by the Los Angeles-Hollywood chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild at a luncheon. The Daily Worker of August 28, 1953 (p. 2), reported that Earl B. Dickerson, president of the National Lawyers' Guild, issued a statement opposing the American Bar Association's call for disbarment of Communist lawyers. As shown by the September 6, 1953, issue of the Worker (p. 6), Earl Dickerson protested the placing of the National Lawyers' Guild on the list of subversive organizations by the Attorney General.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Nations Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

One Earl Dickerson (with no middle initial shown) spoke at the morning session of the Congress on Civil Rights which was held in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946, as shown in the program, Congress on Civil Rights (p. 1); Earl B. Dickerson signed a statement of the Civil Rights Congress which was in defense of Gerhart Eisler, according to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1947 (p. 2); he was one of the sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Civil Rights which was held in New York City on July 19, 1948, according to the Daily Worker of July 12, 1948 (p. 4); a photostat of a letterhead of the Civil Rights Congress, Illinois, dated December 18, 1948, listed Earl Dickerson as a sponsor. As shown by the Daily Worker of November 1, 1950 (p. 4), Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress. A handbill, Dodge Local 3 Supports FEPC Rally, listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of those who would speak at a rally to be held under partial auspices of the Civil Rights Congress of Michigan on April 16, 1950.

The Attorney General cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

According to the printed program of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (p. 14), Earl B. Dickerson was one of the sponsors of this conference which was held in New York City, March 27–27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; he signed a statement of the council which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 7, page 9435. Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of a Resolution Against Atomic Weapons as shown by a mimeographed list of signers attached to a letterhead of the National Council of the Arts, Science, and Professions dated July 28, 1950. Mr. Dickerson signed a statement to the American people, "We uphold the right of all citizens to speak for peace," released by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as shown by the handbill, "Halt the Defamers Who Call Peace Un-American." He spoke at a conference on equal rights for Negroes in the arts held by the New York Council of the National Council of the Arts, New York City, November 10, 1951, according to the November 7, 1951 (p. 3), and November 14, 1951 (p. 7), issues of the Daily Worker. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1952 (p. 3), listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of the endorsers of the national council resolution calling for a hearing of Tunisia's demands in the United Nations. He spoke at a conference for equal rights for Negroes in the Arts, Sciences, and Professions held by the Southern California Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, on June 14, 1952, in Los Angeles (Daily Worker, June 20, 1952, p. 7).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this same report the committee cited the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

Earl B. Dickerson was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, as shown by letterheads of the group dated February 26, 1946, February 3, 1948, May 18, 1951, and January 5, 1953. He signed an open letter of the organization to President Truman on Franco Spain as shown by a letterhead and mimeographed letter of April 28, 1949. He signed a petition of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee to President Truman "to bar military aid to or alliance with fascist Spain" as shown by a mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1951.

The Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization.

Mr. Dickerson was chairman of the Illinois Legislative and Defense Committee of the International Labor Defense, as shown in Equal Justice, September, 1939, (p. 3). He spoke before the International Labor Defense, together with Earl Browder, according to the Daily Worker of October 1, 1942, (p. 5); October 6, 1942, (p. 5); and October 11, 1942, (p. 3). The pamphlet Victory in Oklahoma, October 1943, back cover, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a member of the National Committee of the International Labor Defense.

The Attorney General cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as the "legal arm of the Communist Party." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 1 and 2), cited the International Labor Defense as "part of an international network of organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers."

Earl B. Dickerson was a speaker at the Conference on Constitutional Liberties, the founding conference of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown in the printed program, Call to a Conference, page 2, June 7, 1940.

The Attorney General cited the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America as a conference as a result of which was established the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 102), cited the conference as "an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organizations."

The program and call to a national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, held in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25 and 26, 1947, listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of the sponsors of the conference; he was one of the sponsors of the sixth national conference, which was held in Cleveland, May 9 and 10, 1942, as shown in a leaflet of the conference, page 4. In the latter source, Mr. Dickerson was identified as a member of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices. Earl Dickerson was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as shown by a 1950 letterhead, an undated letterhead (received for files, July 11, 1950), an undated letterhead (distributing a speech of Abner Green at the conference of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born of December 2–3, 1950), and a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (April 30, 1951). Mr. Dickerson, identified as president of the Chicago Urban League, was a sponsor of a dinner given by the Midwest Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born for Pearl Hart (Daily Worker, Apr. 6, 1950, p. 4). A letterhead of the sixth annual conference of the Midwest Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born dated May 16, 1954, Chicago, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a sponsor.

The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

In 1942 Earl B. Dickerson was a patron of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown on a letterhead of the congress, dated October 27, 1942; he was named in Soviet Russia Today (December 1942 issue,

p. 42) as one of the sponsors of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship; the call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6–8, 1943, listed Earl B. Dickerson among the sponsors. He signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, praising Wallace's open letter to Stalin, May 1948, as shown in a pamphlet, How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace, page 9. He was identified in the last-named source as an attorney at law, Chicago. A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship dated September 17, 1951, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a sponsor of that group. A photostat of a letter of the national council dated March 19, 1952, listed Mr. Dickerson as a sponsor.

The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, (p. 156), cited the National Council as "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Rusian."

The Daily Worker of October 21, 1942 (p. 1), named Earl B. Dickerson among the list of members of the National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching. He signed an appeal to lift the Spanish embargo, which appeal was made by the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, according to the Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2). He contributed to the Jue 22, 1943, issue of New Masses (p. 9). He signed a petition of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder, as shown in an official leaflet of the organization.

The National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Negro Communist-front organization, whose secretary was Ferdinand C. Smith, high in the circles of the Communist Party (report, March 29, 1944, p. 180).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

New Masses was cited as a Communist periodical by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447), and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1955, pp. 48 and 75).

The Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter dated April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 6 and 55), cited the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder as follows: When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder.

An open letter demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston Counties contained the name of Earl B. Dickerson in the list of persons who signed according to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1940, page 5. He was attorney for Eugene Dennis, general secretary, Communist Party, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 19, 1947, page 7, being identified in this source as a former member of the city council, Chicago. Reference to Earl Dickerson as attorney for Eugene Dennis appears in the Worker, November 30, 1947, page 4; the Daily Worker of January 15, 1948, page 5; and the Daily Worker of October 27, 1948, page 10, in which source he is identified as a Negro leader, of Chicago.

Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade, Illinois assembly, as shown by a letterhead dated April 12, 1951, the Illinois Peace Crusade, May 1951 (p. 4), and a photostat of a letterhead dated June 21, 1952. He was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, held by the American Peace Crusade in Chicago, Ill., June 29, 30, and July 1, 1951, as shown by a leaflet, An Invitation to American Labor To Participate in a Peace Congress, the Call to the American People's Congress, and the leaflet, American People's Congress * * * Invites You To Participate in a National Peace Competition, June 29, 1951, Chicago, Ill. He was a sponsor of a contest held by the American Peace Crusade for songs, essays, and paintings advancing the theme of world peace as reported in the Daily Worker, May 1, 1951 (p. 11).

The Attorney General included the American Peace Crusade on his January 22, 1954, list of organizations designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and report on the Communist Peace Offensive April 1, 1951 (p. 51), cited the American Peace Crusade as an organization which the Communists established as a new instrument for their peace offensive in the United States and which was heralded by the Daily Worker with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives.

Masses and Mainstream for February 1952 (pp. 52–56) listed Earl B. Dickerson as co-author of an amici curiae brief to the Supreme Court supporting an appeal for a rehearing of its decision upholding the Smith Act, dated September 27, 1951.

According to the April 30, 1950, issue of the Worker (p. 15), Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the Midcentury Conference for Peace, cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been "aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" (report on Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951, p. 58).

Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt bill as hown by the pamphlet, Hey, Brother, There's a Law Against You (p. 2); a release of June 15, 1949 (p. 2), and a photostat of a letterhead dated May 5, 1950. He signed a statement of the organization according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, December 7, 1950, cited the organization as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation."

Earl B. Dickerson signed a letter defending the 12 Communist leaders, as shown on a letterhead, dated January 7, 1949; he later signed a statement asking for the release of the Communist leaders, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 8, 1949 (p. 6). He signed a brief on behalf of the attorneys who represented the Communist leaders, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 2, 1949 (p. 2); he signed a statement on behalf of the attorneys, as shown in the Daily Worker of December 7, 1949 (p. 5); he represented the attorneys who represented the 11 Communist leaders, according to the Daily Worker of January 24, 1950 (p. 3).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Benjamin E. Mays, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker, March 4, 1948 (p. 2), named Benjamin E. Mays as one of the signers of a letter in behalf of Communist deportation cases, which was sponsored by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. A letterhead of the group contained his name as one of the sponsors (letterhead December 11 and 12, 1948).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission June 1 and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated by the Attorney General April 29, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the committee as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College, was a member of the initiating committee for a Congress on Civil Rights which was held in Detroit, April 27 and 28, 1946. (See, Urgent Summons to a Congress on Civil Rights.) He was an honorary national chairman of the Civil Rights Congress, New York, as shown by an undated letterhead concerning a conference held October 11, 1947. He signed a call for a national conference of the Civil Rights Congress to be held in Chicago (Daily Worker, Oct. 21, 1947, p. 5).

The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberities); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., signed a statement by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship in praise of Wallace's open letter to Stalin, May 1948 (pamphlet, How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace, p. 9). A leaflet, "End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace." (December 1948) named Benjamin E. Mays as one of the signers of the National Council's appeal to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union. He was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Committee on Education, as shown by a bulletin of the group, dated June 1945 (p. 22).

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its

report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian. * * *"

Dr. Mays signed an open letter sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties denouncing United States Attorney General Biddle's charges against Harry Bridges (Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, p. 4); booklet, "600 Prominent Americans," p. 25). He also signed a statement sponsored by this organization hailing the War Department's order on commissions for the Communists, as shown by the Daily Worker, March 18, 1945 (p. 2).

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The special committee, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the federation as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the federation as among a maze of organizations which were spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subverison from any penalties under the law.

Letterheads, dated June 12, 1947, and August 11, 1947, of the Southern Negro Youth Congres, list Dr. Mays as a member of the advisory board. A leaflet of the organization (exhibit 46, public hearings, July 22, 1947, Steele) also contained the name of Dr. Benjamin Mays.

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means by the Attorney General in a letter released December 4, 1947. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special committee, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the organization as a Communist front. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as surreptitiously controlled by the Young Communist League.

The Daily Worker, April 27, 1947 (p. 24), reported that Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, Georgia, signed a statement against the ban on the Communist Party. He signed a statement against the North Atlantic Pact, according to the Daily Worker of June 28, 1949 (p. 2). He spoke at a conference on "Jim Crow in the Nation's Capital" (Daily Worker, December 21, 1950, p. 8).

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: A. T. Walden, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of October 7, 1952 (p. 3), reported that A. T. Walden, Georgia, was to lead the National Lawyers Guild workshop discussions at a national conference on civil rights, legislation, and discrimination, New York City, October 10, 11, and 12.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations and controlled unions and which since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.

A mimeographed letter addressed to the House of Representatives, May 12, 1948, included a list of signers opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill. Austin T. Walden, Georgia, was one of those signers.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Arthur D. Shores, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications, of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to letterheads of the Southern Negro Youth Congress, dated June 12 and August 11, 1947, Arthur D. Shores was a member of the advisory board of this organization. A page from an undated leaflet of the organization also listed Mr. Shores as a member of the advisory board. Arthur Shores, Negro attorney, was associated with Nesbitt Elmore in the defense of Senator Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho, who was fined $50 and ordered a 180-day suspended jail sentence for defying Birmingham's segregation laws at a meeting of the Southern Negro Youth Congress in Alabama (Daily Worker, May 6, 1948, p. 4).

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League (report 271, Apr. 17, 1947, p. 14). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated January 3, 1940, page 9, cited the Congress as a Communist front. The Attorney General of the United States cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, United States of America, which seeks to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, Dec. 4, 1947); the Attorney General redesignated the Congress pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450 of April 27, 1953, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

Arthur D. Shores, prominent Negro attorney, told the Daily Worker that "outlawing the Communist Party would 'pave the way for a one-party dictatorship in this country'" (Daily Worker, March 19, 1947, p. 5).

The Worker for December 14, 1947 (p. 8, southern edition), reported that Arthur Shores, identified as a leading Negro civil-rights lawyer, was assisting in the case of Mrs. Ruby Jackson Gainor, "outstanding Negro teacher fired by the Jefferson County Board of Education. * * * Mrs. Jackson is the leading petitioner in contempt-of-court proceedings against the board for its refusal to equalize salaries of Negro teachers in accord with a Federal court decree * * *." The article, which identified Mrs. Gainor as president of the Birmingham teachers' local of the United Public Workers, also reported: "The outcome of Mrs. Gainor's case has become the keystone of the fight of all the Negro teachers in Jefferson County for equal pay. The United Public Workers nationally is supporting the fight * * *."

It is noted that the United Public Workers of America was formed in 1946 by a merger of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America and the United Federal Workers of America. Both of these unions were cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 18 and 19), as among the CIO unions in which the committee found Communist leadership strongly entrenched. The Congress of Industrial Organizations, by vote of the executive board, February 15, 1950, expelled the United Public Workers of America, effective March 1, 1950, on charges of Communist domination (press release, 12th CIO convention, November 20–24, 1950).

OCTOBER 13, 1955.

Subject: Lloyd Garrison, chairman, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Lloyd K. Garrison was a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association according to a letterhead of the organization dated May 18, 1942, and the leaflet, "What is the I. J. A.?" Lloyd K. Garrison, dean, University of Wisconsin Law School, commended the International Juridical Association bulletin in that pamphlet.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the International Juridical Association as a "Communist front and offshoot of the International Labor Defense." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 12), cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

The Daily Worker for March 18, 1945 (p. 2), and an undated leaflet, "The only sound policy for a Democracy," listed Lloyd K. Garrison, National War Labor Board, as one of the signers of a statement sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties hailing the War Department order on commissions for the Communists. A photograph of Mr. Garrison is found in the Daily Worker reference.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program * * *" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose

of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

Lloyd K. Garrison, Madison, Wis., former Chairman of NLRB, was listed as a member of the Committee on Legal Research and Legal Education of the National Lawyers Guild and his book was reviewed in the newsletter of the National Lawyers Guide, July 1937 (pp. 2–3). Convention News, May 1941 (pp. 3 and 4), published by the National Lawyers Guild for the fifth annual convention, listed Lloyd K. Garrison as a member of the convention nominations committee of the fifth annual convention, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29 to June 1, 1941.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The pamphlet of the Second National Negro Congress, October 1937, listed Lloyd Garrison as one of those who sent greetings to the congress.

"The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress. * * * The officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, January 3, 1939, p. 81; also cited in reports, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 20; and March 29, 1944, p. 180). The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as a Communist-front organization as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7447.

The Daily Worker for February 23, 1939 (p. 3) reported that Lloyd Garrison spoke at a conference of the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation, Madison, Wis., February 18, 1939. The Attorney General cited the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Sidney A. Jones, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Sidney A. Jones, attorney, was an endorser of the National Negro Congress as shown on the call for National Negro Congress, in Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7746–7747). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes. * * *"

It was reported in the Daily People's World of December 2, 1947 (p. 4), that Sidney A. Jones, Jr., was vice president of the Chicago chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, and was further identified as being associated with the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, Urban League, Chicago. Mr. Jones was shown as an executive board member of the National Lawyers Guild from Chicago as of December 1949 and May 1950 in the Committee on Un-American Activities' report on the National Lawyers Guild September 17, 1950 (pp. 18–19).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4), listed Sidney A. Jones, attorney, Chicago, Ill., as one who signed a statement of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill. A photostat of a letterhead of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill (Chicago chapter), dated May 5, 1950, listed Sidney A. Jones as a Chicago sponsor of the organization.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, December 7, 1950, cited the organization as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation."

Sidney Jones, vice president of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, sent greetings to Paul Robeson according to the Daily Worker of April 29, 1947 (p. 12). He signed Labor Day greetings to the Daily People's World, which appeared in the August 29, 1947 (p. 4), issue of that paper; signed Statement by Negro Americans, in behalf of arrested Communist leaders (the Worker of August 29, 1948, p. 11); and he signed a statement on release of Communist leaders, and was identified as a Negro attorney in Chicago as noted in the Daily Worker of November 8, 1949 (p. 6).

The Daily Worker of December 25, 1952 (p. 8), listed Sidney Jones, attorney, Chicago, as a signer of an open letter to President Truman asking clemency for the Rosenbergs.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: W. Robert Ming, Jr., national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

An election campaign letter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated May 18, 1940, listed Robert W. Ming, Jr., as the candidate for delegate to the national convention, Washington, D. C., chapter. Robert Ming., Jr., Washington, D. C., was a member of the convention nominations committee, fifth annual convention of the National Lawyers Guild, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29 to June 1, 1941.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

A 1941 membership list of the Washington Book Shop listed Robert W. Ming, Jr., Howard University, Washington, D. C., as a member.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Washington Book Shop Association as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously cited. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the Washington Book Shop Association as a Communist-front organization.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Arthur J. Mandell, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The News Letter of the National Lawyers Guild, July 1937 (p. 2), named Arthur Mandell, Houston, Tex., as a member of the Guild's committee on American citizenship, immigration, and naturalization; and a copy of the 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, made available to the special Committee on Un-American Activities by the organization, contained the name of Arthur Mandell, Shell Building, Houston, Tex.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149); and it was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities (H. Rept. No. 3123, Sept. 21, 1950), wherein it was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

Arthur J. Mandell, attorney, Houston, Tex., was shown in the Call to the First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish American Peoples of the United States, March 24–26, 1939, Albuquerque, N. Mex., as one of the signers of that Call. The Congress of the Mexican and Spanish American Peoples * * * was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 120).

A leaflet, attached to an undated letterhead of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, named Arthur J. Mandell, attorney, Houston, Tex., as a signer of the organization's January 1943 message to the House of Representatives. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited

as being subversive and Communist (Attorney General letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450, see consolidated list, April 1, 1954); as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446); as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 50; also cited in reports, June 25, 1942, and Jan. 2, 1943); and as being among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Sept. 2, 1947, p. 3).

Arthur Mandell was a member of the resolutions committee at the Congress on Civil Rights in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946, as shown by a mimeographed release issued by the congress; and Arthur J. Mandell, Houston, was listed as a sponsor of the National Conference of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago, November 21–23, 1947, in the printed program, Let Freedom Ring. The Civil Rights Congress has been cited as a subversive and Communist organization by the Attorney General (letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated, see consolidated list, April 1, 1954); and, as an organization formed in April 1946 by merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties), "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party," and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Committee on Un-American Activities, House Report No. 1115, Sept. 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19).

OCTOBER 26, 1955.

Subject: Robert W. Kenny, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Reference to Robert W. Kenny is found in the appendix to this committee's public hearings regarding communism in the United States Government, part 2, September 1950 (pp. 2991–2992), as follows:

"Robert W. Kenny: Kenny, attorney general of State of California during the years 1943–47 and president of the National Lawyers Guild during the years 1940–48, has been associated with the defense of a number of Communist cases. He was also one of the attorneys for the Hollywood 10. He sent greetings to the Biennial National Conference of the International Labor Defense held April 4–6, 1941; this organization was cited by the former Attorney General Francis Biddle as the 'legal arm of the Communist Party.'

"The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born has specialized in the legal defense of foreign-born Communists such as Gerhard Eisler. Kenny was a sponsor of its national conference held in Ohio on October 25–26, 1947, and again in 1950. He spoke in behalf of Communists held for deportation, according to the Daily People's World, Communist publication, dated March 8, 1948.

"On repeated occasions, Mr. Kenny has attacked the trial of the 11 Communist leaders convicted for teaching and advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, particularly as reported by the Daily People's World of July 22, 1948, and the Worker of October 30, 1949.

"He signed a statement in behalf of arrested leaders of the Communist Party of Los Angeles, according to the Daily Worker of October 19, 1949, and the Daily People's World of November 7, 1949. Statements opposing the outlawing or restricting of the Communist Party have been signed by Robert W. Kenny and have appeared frequently in the Communist press. Mr. Kenny has opposed Government loyalty procedures on various occasions.

"On the eve of the 1947 May Day celebration, Pravda, the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, hailed Robert W. Kenny as a 'friend of the Soviet Union in the United States.' Another Communist government, namely that of China, selected Mr. Kenny to defend its legal interests, according to the Daily People's World of April 26, 1950 (p. 4).

"Robert W. Kenny has a number of affiliations and associations with Communist-front organizations. These include the American Youth for Democracy (formerly known as the Young Communist League), the National Committee to Win the Peace, of which he was vice chairman, Civil Rights Congress, Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, Hollywood League for Democratic Action, California Labor School, Lawyers Committee on American Relations with Spain, Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, and the American Slav Congress."

Subsequent to this committee's release which contained the above reference to Robert W. Kenny, he had served as counsel for 66 witnesses before this committee.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Milton R. Konvitz, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A membership list of the National Lawyers Guild contains the name of Milton Konvitz, 744 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (List in committee files.) The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149). The organization was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents" (Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, Sept. 21, 1950).

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Loren Miller, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

One Loren Miller, 837 East 24th Street, Los Angeles, Calif., was a signer of Communist Party election petition No. 120 in California in 1932.

An article entitled "Why I Will Vote 'Red'" written by Loren Miller appeared in the Daily Worker of July 11, 1932 (p. 4). In a note which accompanies this article, the following information is given concerning the author: "Loren Miller, until recently city editor of the California Eagle, Los Angeles, Calif., largest and oldest of western Negro newspapers, is now en route to the Soviet Union." Excerpts from this article follow:

"I regret very much that I will not be present to take an active part in the struggle that Negroes must wage to pile up a huge vote for William Z. Foster and James W. Ford, Communist candidates for President and Vice President.

* * * * *

"It must be evident to anybody who thinks through the things about which I have been talking that the Communist Party is our party. It is fighting our fights, warring against our enemies, struggling for our welfare. Commonsense dictates that we should support our party with every means at hand."

Loren Miller wrote an article for the Daily Worker while he was traveling in the Soviet Union with a group of Negro writers, workers, etc., observing conditions. This article concerned the equality of races in the Soviet Union and appeared in the Daily Worker of September 24, 1932 (p. 4). Mr. Miller compared racial equality in the Soviet Union and the United States, stated that the Communist Party in the United States was the only political party which promised equality, and concluded as follows:

"Only the Communists with their straightforward platform on relief for the por (sic) farmers and workers, their demand for self-determination for Negroes in the Black Belt, and with a Negro, James W. Ford, as nominee for the Vice Presidency deserve the vote of the Negroes of the United States. It is for these reasons that I wish to renew my plea to Negroes everywhere in the United States to vote Communist."

The Daily Worker of January 26, 1948 (p. 10), reported that Loren Miller, attorney, Los Angeles, defended Claudia Jones, Communist. He signed a statement opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill as shown by the Daily People's World of May 12, 1948 (p. 3). According to the Daily People's World of July 22, 1948 (p. 3), Loren Miller, attorney, Los Angeles, attacked the arrest of the Communist Party leaders.

In the Daily Worker of December 24, 1931 (p. 3), Loren Miller was named as a reporter for the Worker. Reference to Loren Miller as a reporter for the Worker appeared in the Daily Worker of December 21, 1935 (p. 3). Loren Miller has been a contributor to the Daily Worker as shown in the issue of May 4, 1938 (p. 7), as well as the two issues already cited.

The Worker is the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker, which was cited as "official Communist Party, U. S. A., organ" by the Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1920, dated May 11, 1948. The publication was cited as "chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party" by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944; it had previously been cited as a Communist publication in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, January 3, 1941, and June 25, 1942.

Loren Miller was named as editor of New Masses in the issue of August 20, 1935 (p. 5), and as associate editor in the issue of January 14, 1936 (p. 5). He was shown as contributing editor in the following issues of New Masses: June 2, 1936 (p. 5), January

5, 1937 (p. 22), May 11, 1937 (p. 9), September 7, 1937 (p. 9), January 11, 1938 (p. 9), and September 20, 1938 (p. 14). He was a contributor to New Masses, as shown in the issue of August 20, 1935 (p. 26), and was named as a contributor to New Masses in the Daily Worker of April 3, 1936 (p. 3).

New Masses was cited as a "Communist periodical" by the Attorney General of the United States (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). It was cited as a "national circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944. New Masses had been cited previously as a Communist publication in reports of the special Committee on Un-Amerian Activities, dated January 3, 1939, and June 25, 1942.

As shown by an undated letterhead of Book Union, Inc., Loren Miller was a member of its advisory council. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in report 1311 of March 29, 1944, cited Book Union as "distributors of Communist literature."

According to a letterhead of August 24, 1939, Loren Miller was a member of the Harry Bridges defense committee, southern division.

In report 1311 of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, the Harry Bridges defense committee was cited as one of the Communist fronts formed to oppose deportation of Harry Bridges, Communist Party member and leader of the San Francisco general strike of 1934 which was planned by the Communist Party.

As shown in the Call for the National Negro Congress held in Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936, Loren Miller, Los Angeles, Calif., was one of the endorsers of the National Negro Congress.

"From the record of its activities and the composition of its (National Negro Congress) governing bodies, there can be little doubt that it has served as what James W. Ford, Communist Vice Presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted: 'An important sector of the democratic front,' sponsored and supported by the Communist Party" (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The National Negro Congress was cited as a Communist front in reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The Attorney General cited the group as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

Loren Miller, author, was a signer of the open letter to American liberals, as shown in Soviet Russia Today, issue of March 1937 (pp. 14–15).

"In March 1937 a group of well-known Communists and Communist collaborators published an open letter bearing the title given above. The letter was a defense of the Moscow purge trials" (report of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942).

As shown in the Proceedings of the Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism, held in Chicago, Ill., September 28, 29, 30, 1934, under auspices of the American League Against War and Fascism, the report of the publications committee was presented by Loren Miller. (See public hearings, appendix, vol. 10, p. 22.)

"The American League Against War and Fascism was formally organized at the First United States Congress Against War and Fascism held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. * * * The program of the first congress called for the end of the Roosevelt policies of imperialism and for the support of the peace policies of the Soviet Union, for opposition to all attempts to weaken the Soviet Union. * * * Subsequent congresses in 1934 and 1936 reflected the same program" (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6 p. 7442).

The American League Against War and Fascism was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442). The Attorney General cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

In connection with the testimony of Harper L. Knowles and Ray E. Nimmo before the special Committee on Un-American Activities on October 25, 1938, a brief relating to activities of the Communist Party among professional groups was presented and incorporated in the record. In this brief Loren Miller is described as "contributing editor to New Masses and a member of the Communst Party" (public hearings, p. 1997). According to this same source, he was a participant in the Western Writers Congress, cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

A pamphlet, "Equality, Land and Freedom," published by the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, Decemeber 1934 (p. 44), listed Loren Miller as a member of the national council of that organization.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the League of Struggle for Negro Rights as follows: "The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress. Practically the same group of leaders directing this directed the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, which was, until 2 years ago, the name of the Communist front for Negroes. The name was later changed * * * in 1936 to the National Negro Congress."

It was reported in the Daily People's World of September 28, 1950 (p. 5) that Loren Miller was one of a group of Los Angeles lawyers who signed a brief against a Communist registration ordinance. The brief was presented in connection with the case of Henry Steinberg, county legislative director of the Communist Party, who was charged with failing to register with the sheriff's office in accordance with provisions of the ordinance. Reference to Loren Miller as one of the attorneys who signed a brief charging Los Angeles County's Communist registration ordinance with being "basically unconstitutional" also appeared in the Daily People's World of October 9, 1950 (p. 3). The brief was filed in connection with a hearing on a demurrer against the ordinance filed by attorneys for Gus Brown, Furniture Workers Local 576 business agent.

The Daily People's World of May 17, 1950 (p. 3), listed Loren Miller as one who signed a statement against the loyalty oath.

OCTOBER 26, 1955.

Subject: Bartley Crum, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of March 15, 1947 (p. 5) printed statements made by several individuals, registering opposition to the proposal of Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach to outlaw the Communist Party. Bartley Crum's statement, which immediately follows that of Robert W. Kenny, reads:

"It is unconstitutional and utterly stupid for Government to attempt to prevent people from thinking or believing as they wish. Action of this sort is contrary to the Bill of Rights. This Government was founded on the theory that we are not afraid of what any person or group of persons might think. Freedom of belief and freedom of speech are guaranteed.

"The Supreme Court has ruled that these freedoms may be limited only when a clear and present danger to the country exists. In that event the burden of proof rests upon Government which must show that the clear and present danger arises from the beliefs that are put forward.

"As a non-Communist, I think the most effective answer to the Marxists is to make our democracy work by providing equality and job opportunities for all, strengthening the trade unions and raising the standard of living."

The official organ of the Communist Party on the west coast, the Daily People's World of November 8, 1947 (p. 6), published an editorial regarding Mr. Crum, in which the Honorable Jack B. Tenney, chairman, California State Committee on Un-American Activities, was quoted as having called Mr. Crum a "Communist for every practical purpose."

Mr. Crum was attorney for Harry Bridges on behalf of the Civil Liberties Union (U. S. Supreme Court reports, 89 Law. Ed. October 1944 Term, U. S. 323–325, U. S. 326, p. 2106); he was identified as being from San Francisco. He was attorney for John Howard Lawson (brief for John Howard Lawson, U. S. Court of Appeals, February 16, 1949, District of Columbia, No. 9872); he was attorney for Dalton Trumbo (brief of *Dalton Trumbo* v. *United States of America*, U. S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, No. 9873); he served as attorney for John Howard Lawson, Dalton Trumbo, Samuel Ornitz, Edward Dmytryk, Adrian Scott, Ring Lardner, Jr., Lester Cole, and Bert Brecht (hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities, October 27, 28, 29, and 30, 1947).

In a report on the National Lawyers Guild which was released by this committee September 17, 1950, a list of National Lawyers Guild members who have represented witnesses before the Committee on Un-American Activities was shown. "In each case, the witnesses have refused to answer questions regarding Communist affiliations propounded by the committee. In a number of cases espionage activities were involved. It should be noted in this connection that it is standard Communist practice to accept as attorneys only those who agree to abide by the party's propaganda and conspirative directives. Cases are known where attorneys who have volunteered their services have been summarily rejected because they would not become partners to the party's ulterior purposes." (Report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 3.) The same report also named Mr. Crum as one of the vice presidents of the guild as of December 1949 and May 1950 (pp. 18 and 19).

Mr. Crum was vice president of the guild in 1945, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 25, 1945 (pp. 1 and 2); in 1947, as shown on a letterhead of the guild dated June 11, 1947, and a printed program of their conference on "Legislative Investigation? or Thought Control Agency?" dated October 20, 1947 (p. 3); and in 1948 as shown on letterheads of March 8 and May 7, 1948, and the Daily Worker of February 24, 1948 (p. 3).

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944); it was the subject of a report released by the Committee on Un-American Activities September 17, 1950, in which the guild was cited as "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions."

The statement of policy of the National Committee to Win the Peace (dated February 6, 1947), contains the name of Bartley Crum in a list of persons who organized that committee; a letterhead of the Win-the-Peace Conference, dated February 28, 1946, named him as one of the sponsors of that conference, as does the Daily Worker of March 5, 1946 (the conference was held in Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946); the call to that conference contained Mr. Crum's name in a list of sponsors. A letterhead of the New York Committee to Win the Peace, dated June 1, 1946, lists his name as vice chairman of the national committee; the New York committee call to Win-the-Peace Conference, June 28 and 29, 1946, also listed him as vice chairman of the national committee.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Committee to Win the Peace as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

A letterhead of the Conference on China and the Far East, dated September 19, 1946, carries the name of Bartley C. Crum in a list of sponsors of that conference which was called by the national committee to Win the Peace and the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy; the call to that conference, which was held October 18–20, 1946, shows him as one of the sponsors; the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy was cited by the Attorney General as Communist (press release of April 27, 1949, and consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Mr. Crum was one of the National Sponsors of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (letterheads of that group dated February 26, 1946; February 3, 1948; April 28, 1949; May 18, 1951; and January 5, 1953; he spoke before a rally of that organization in Madison Square Garden, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 25, 1945 (pp. 1 and 2); an invitation to dinner which was issued by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee for March 31, 1948, named Mr. Crum as a member of the National Reception Committee for Madame Irene Joliot-Curie who was in this country for a speaking tour, sponsored by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as subversive and Communist (press releases of the Attorney General dated September 21, 1948, and December 4, 1947; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited it as a Communist-front organization in report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

New Masses for October 30, 1945 (back page), and a letterhead of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, dated January 21, 1946, both name Mr. Crum as vice chairman of that committee, cited as Communist by the Attorney General (press release of April 27, 1949; consolidated list of April 27, 1949).

Mr. Crum was one of the initiating sponsors of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (Daily Worker of December 24, 1944, p. 14); and a member of the board of directors of the organization (letterhead of November 26, 1946). The independent Citizens Committee * * * was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities (report of April 1, 1951).

The spring catalog (1947) of the California Labor School lists Mr. Crum as one of the sponsors of that school; he is identified as president, San Francisco Chapter, National Lawyers Guild. The Yearbook of the school (1949, pp. 6 and 35) name him as a member of the board of directors and a sponsor of the school. Biographical notes are also given in the same source. The California Labor School was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press release of June 1, 1948; included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

An invitation to attend a testimonial dinner in New York City, October 12, 1947, issued by the American Slav Congress, as well as the program of that dinner, contain the name of Bartley C. Crum in a list of sponsors of the dinner. The American Slav Congress has been cited as subversive and Communist (press releases of the Attorney General dated June 1 and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Congress as "a Moscow-inspired and directed federation of Communist-dominated organizations seeking by methods of propaganda and pressure to subvert the 10 million people in this country of Slavic birth or descent" (report dated June 26, 1949).

Mr. Crum signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, hailing the War Department's order concerning commissions for Communists (Daily Worker, March 18, 1945, p. 2); Mr. Crum was identified as a lawyer from San Francisco, Calif. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited by the Attorney General as an organization "by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program"; and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 744C; and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954.) The special committee cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943); the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the organization as having been "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (report 1115 of September 2, 1947).

The Daily People's World of May 10, 1946 (p. 5), announced that Mr. Crum (identified as a San Francisco attorney) would speak at the American Russian Institute's presentation of Russian author, Konstantin Simonov, in San Francisco, May 13; he also spoke at a meeting of the American Russian Institute as shown in the Daily Worker of June 3, 1948 (p. 2), in which source he was identified as publisher of PM, a New York daily newspaper. The American Russian Institute was cited as Communist by the Attorney General (press release of April 27, 1949; included on consolidated list of organizations released April 1, 1954).

The program of a dinner held on the first anniversary of the American Youth for Democracy, October 16, 1944, Bartley C. Crum is shown as a sponsor of the dinner committee. The American Youth for Democracy was cited as the new name under which the Young Communist League operates and which also largely absorbed the American Youth Congress (special committee in report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Attorney General cited it as Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Behind the Silken Curtain, written by Mr. Crum, was recommended for reading by Youth magazine (July-August 1947 issue), a bimonthly publication of the American Youth for Democracy; the same book was favorably reviewed in the June 24, 1947, issue of New Masses (p. 12); it was a selection of the Book Find Club, according to the New York Times of September 14, 1947 (book review section, p. 19); it was also favorably reviewed by Albert Kahn in the Worker (Sunday edition of the Daily Worker), for June 15, 1947 (p. 11M).

New Masses has been cited by the Attorney General as a Communist periodical (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447); and by the special committee as "a nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party" (report of March 29, 1944). The Daily Worker is the chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party (report of March 29, 1944).

Joseph Starobin, in his column, Around the Globe, which appeared in the Daily Worker of May 4, 1948 (p. 8), had the following to say concerning Bartley Crum, at the time the new PM appeared on newsstands: "Take Bartley Crum, for example, whose unquestionably progressive career has a dialectic all its own: A Willkie Republican leader who championed the reelection of FDR 4 years ago; a successful lawyer, of Catholic faith, I believe, with a record of sincere work in organizations which the Attorney General insists are subversive; a leader of the Progressive Citizens of America, who declined to come out for Henry Wallace, and yet, is said to feel very warmly toward Wallace and the program for which he stands; a political figure * * * he rejected a job in the Civil Aeronautics Board, but accepted membership in the investigation commission for Palestine; and came back with some conclusions which still plague the State Department and Truman, too. * * *"

OCTOBER 26, 1955.

Subject: Morris L. Ernst, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

In testimony of Walter S. Steele before the special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 15, 1938, Morris Ernst was named as a member of the board of the American Fund for Public Service (public hearings, p. 388). The following issues of New Masses named Morris L. Ernst as treasurer of the American Fund for Public Service, November 1930 (p. 19), November 1931 (p. 31), and January 2, 1934 (p. 2). He was named as treasurer and a member of the board of directors of the American Fund for Public Service on a letterhead (photostat dated September 8, 1930).

The American Fund for Public Service (Garland Fund) was "established in 1922 * * * it was a major source for the financing of Communist Party enterprises" such as the Daily Worker and New Masses, official Communist publications, Federated Press, Russian Reconstruction Farms, and International Labor Defense. William Z. Foster, present chairman, Communist Party, and Scott Nearing, a leading writer for the party, served on the board of directors of the fund (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report of March 29, 1944, pp. 75 and 76).

A letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy (a photostat dated April 6, 1939) carried the name of Morris L. Ernst as a member of the lawyer's committee of the league. The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in letters furnished the Loyalty

Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. It was established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (Attorney General of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the league as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States" (report of January 3, 1939).

The Daily Worker of February 19, 1937 (p. 4), reported that Morris Ernst spoke at a meeting of the American Youth Congress in Washington, D. C. The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list). The Attorney General cited the organization as "originated in 1934 and has been controlled by Communist and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7444). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American Youth Congress as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" (report of June 25, 1942, p. 16).

Mr. Ernst spoke at a meeting of the League of American Writers in New York City, as was revealed by the Daily Worker of December 5, 1936 (p. 5). He spoke for the League for Mutual Aid on "Dethroning the Supreme Court," February 1, 1937, as shown in New Masses of January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

The League of American Writers was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948) and was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, April 27, 1953; and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The League of American Writers previously had been cited as a Communist front by the Attorney General and by the special committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445; and reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, respectively). The special committee cited the League for Mutual Aid as a Communist enterprise (report of March 29, 1944, p. 76).

Morris L. Ernst was named on a letterhead of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, dated July 6, 1938, as a member of the Lawyers' Committee of that organization. "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheatedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations" such as the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (report of the special committee dated March 29, 1944, p. 82).

Morris L. Ernst, identified as treasurer, American Fund for Public Service, was shown as a stockholder of New Masses on a photostatic copy of the statement of ownership of that publication, dated October 1, 1930. New Masses was cited as a "Communist periodical" by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448) and as the "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party" by the special committee (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 48 and 75).

The Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in the report of March 29, 1944 (p. 122). Mr. Ernst was chairman of the Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio, as was shown on a letterhead of the organization dated October 3, 1936.

A newsletter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated July 1937 (p. 2), listed Mr. Ernst, of New York City, as chairman of the guild's committee on the relation of government to business. The Daily Worker of February 10, 1939 (p. 2), reported that he spoke at a meeting of the National Lawyers Guild; a letterhead of the guild, dated May 28, 1940, named Mr. Ernst as director ex-officio of that group; a membership list (1939) of the guild, on file with this committee, contains the name of Morris L. Ernst, 285 Madison Avenue, New York City.

On September 17, 1950, the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the National Lawyers Guild in which it was cited as a Communist front and the "foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions." An earlier report of the special committee (report of March 29, 1944, p. 149) cited the guild as a Communist front.

An editorial in the Daily Worker of December 10, 1947 (p. 9), criticized Morris Ernst for his proposed legislation to register front organizations. Morris L. Ernst, of New York City, testified voluntarily before the Committee on Un-American Activities, February 11, 1948, regarding legislation before the committee which would seek to curb or outlaw the Communist Party. He stated, in part, as follows:

"Mr. KERSTEN. Would you say we would have to have the freedom of expression on the parts of teachers in our schools, professors in our universities, the freedom of expression to the extent that the president of this particular institution could, if he wants to, permit his teachers to teach to the students, for example, the tenets of communism?

"Mr. ERNST. Well, may I state my position on that? I have got to cut down underneath it a bit.

* * * * *

"I think the Communists or the Klan have a right to elect the Government of the United States. Not having elected the Government of the United States, I take it to be the mandate of the people to the officials elected to make sure that neither Klan nor Communist policy is infiltrated or injected into the Government.

"Under those circumstances, it seems to me I would say that no klansman should be in the Bureau of Education of the United States Government even though on an open debate and an election with nightshirts off, they may elect the Government, that's what we are gambling on.

"Now, I have got faith that they are not going to elect the Government, if they take their shirts off.

"Mr. KERSTEN. The question is, however, do you think a university president has the right or teachers have the right in that university, if they wish to exercise it, to teach the student the tenets of communism?

* * * * *

"Mr. ERNST. I should say that if it is an avowed Communist or a teacher said this is what communism is, I would like to see that taught in the schools without nightshirts, yes. I would like to see it taught.

"Now that doesn't mean that I am at all in favor of a school being sneaked upon, as our schools were in New York by Communists sneaking their perfidious stuff underground. I am not afraid of the thesis of communism aboveboard, not at all. Americans will beat it down at every point. We are not afraid of them at all, haven't got the least fear of that crowd, and they are not all crackpots. They are fanatics, maybe, but not crackpots, but I have great fear of any secret group for this reason.

"Up to now the problem of America has been the protection of minorities against majorities, oppression by majority or minority. From now on in, I suggest our problem is reversed, because a tightly regimented controlled minority in a labor union, in any place in life with the complexities of modern life can oppress a majority, and that is what the Communists are doing to the decent part of the American labor movement today." (Public hearings, pp. 291, 292.)

Reference to Mr. Ernst was made by Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, a witness during public hearings before this committee, August 22, 1951, as follows:

"Without going into details which are in this file, the International Red Aid, Soviet-Comintern sponsored, becomes the the International Labor Defense, and the American Labor Defense becomes the Civil Rights Congress. And, incidentally, again Weiss, as an organizer, develops other agencies, such as the American Committee for the Defense of the Foreign Born, and several other organizations, all of which have been analyzed and commented on adversely by Mr. Morris Ernst, a reputable New York lawyer, who resented, apparently, ever having been mixed up with this group." (American Aspects of Richard Sorge Spy Case, p. 1188.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Z. Alexander Looby, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, on file with this committee, contains the name of Alexander Looby, 419 Fourth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions," and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The Daily People's World of April 25, 1948 (p. 11), reported that Alexander Looby, attorney, Nashville, Tenn., had spoken before the Southern Negro Youth Congress. The Worker of May 16, 1948 (p. 2), disclosed that Z. Alexander Looby, attorney, Nashville, Tenn., had spoken before the same organization.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means" (letter to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947). The Attorney General redesignated the group April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the organization as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Paul J. Kern, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Paul J. Kern was attorney for Communist Party leaders such as Benjamin J. Davis, as reported in the Daily Worker of August 5, 1949 (p. 1), and October 26, 1949 (p. 3); he was a sponsor of the national nonpartisan committee to defend the rights of the 12 Communist leaders, as shown on a letterhead dated September 9, 1949, and the Daily Worker of July 18, 1949 (p. 2). He signed a statement of the Commtitee for Political Advocacy, defending the 12 Communist Party leaders (Narodna Volya for March 25, 1949, p. 4; and the Daily Worker of February 28, 1949, p. 9), in which sources he was identified as former president of the municipal civil service commission, and a letterhead of January 7, 1949. The Daily Worker of May 6, 1949 (p. 2), reported that Paul J. Kern, chairman of the Committee for Free Political Advocacy, condemned the trial of the Communist leaders.

Identified as being from New York City, Paul J. Kern was one of those who signed a statement addressed to the President of the United States defending the Communist Party (Daily Worker of March 5, 1941, p. 2); he was retained as special counsel in the Communist Party's fight to remain on the ballot in New York State (Daily Worker of September 23, 1946, p. 5); he also signed a statement in 1947 protesting the proposal to outlaw the Communist Party (Daily Worker of March 12, 1947, p. 3, in which source he was identified as a former New York City civil service commissioner); he was a member of the nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio, as shown on their letterhead of October 3, 1936; he condemned the purge of Communists from the film industry (The Worker of November 30, 1947, p. 10—southern edition—in which source he was identified as former New York City civil service commissioner).

Mr. Kern was named as one of more than 200 outstanding professors, clergymen, lawyers, writers, professional people, and others (who) have addressed a petition to United States Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, urging him to withdraw contempt proceedings. The contempt proceedings involved 17 men and women who invoked their constitutional right not to testify (before a congressional committee) on grounds of self-incrimination. From the Daily Worker, of February 19, 1951, p. 2.) The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 5, page 5841, named Paul J. Kern, New York City, as one of those who signed a statement opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill. He signed a statement to the mayor of New York City and the city council, on behalf of Simon Gerson, a Communist (Daily Worker, of February 16, 1948, p. 16), and supported the Citizens Committee To Defend Representative Government which organization urged the seating of Simon Gerson (from an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times on February 19, 1948, p. 13, in which he was identified as former president of the municipal civil service commission).

In 1941 an investigation was made of the city council into the affairs and conduct of the municipal civil service commission of the city of New York and Hon. Paul J. Kern, its president, pursuant to section 43 of the charter of the city of New York.

Paul J. Kern was one of the sponsors of the Consumers National Federation, as shown in the pamphlet, The People Versus H. C. L., dated December 11–12, 1937 (p. 2). The Consumers National Federation has been cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated March 29, 1944.

The Daily Worker, of March 18, 1937 (p. 5), named Paul J. Kern as vice president of the National Lawyers Guild; the article concerned Dr. Kern's attack on the United States Supreme Court; he was vice president of the guild in 1937, as shown by the organization's news letter of July 1937 (p. 2), in which source he was identified as being from New York; he was named in the same source as chairman of the guild's committee on publications and public relations; he spoke before the guild, as reported in the Daily Worker, of February 25, 1939 (p. 1), as having been president of the New York chapter of the guild for 2 years and as having denied that he had resigned from the guild. A membership list of the guild, dated 1939, contains the name of one Paul Kern whose address was shown as 1451 Municipal Building, New York City; a letterhead of the same organization, dated May 28, 1940, named him as director ex officio. Paul J. Kern participated in a discussion entitled "Status of Civil Liberties" at the fifth annual convention of the National Lawyers Guild, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941, as shown by the convention program printed in Convention News, May 1941 (p. 2). This same source showed him as a member of the convention resolutions committee.

In 1944 the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization (report dated March 29, 1944); in 1950 the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the guild, in which it was called "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" (report rated September 17, 1950).

Paul Kern spoke before the International Labor Defense during its New York State conference (Labor Defender, November 1937, p. 3); he was a sponsor of the organization's summer milk drive in 1939 (Equal Justice for June 1939, p. 7). Mr. Kern was a member of the national committee of the International Juridicial Association, as shown in the leaflet, "What is the I. J. A.?" The Attorney General of the United States cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as the legal arm of the Communist Party (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 75–78), cited the International Labor Defense as the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 1 and 2), cited the International Labor Defense as part of an international network or organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers. The International Juridicial Association was cited as a Communist front and an affshoot of the International Labor Defense (special committee's report of March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activitiess cited the International Juridicial Association as having actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line (report of September 17, 1950).

In March 1937 a group of well-known Communists and Communist collaborators published an open letter bearing the title given as "Open Letter to American Liberals in defense of the Moscow Purge Trials" (special Committee on Un-American Activities in report of June 25, 1942); Paul J. Kern signed the open letter as shown in the Daily Worker of February 9, 1937 (p. 2), and Soviet Russia Today for March 1937 (pp. 14–15).

An undated letterhead of the New York Tom Mooney committee listed Paul J. Kern as one of the sponsors of that organization; he was one of those who lectured at the School for Democracy, as shown in New Maasses for May 26, 1942 (p. 31); the catalog and program of the school, dated January 1942, listed him as a guest lecturer on legislation, lobbying, and the people's program, He was identified as president of the civil service commission, New York City.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the New York Tom Mooney committee as a Communist-front organization. "For many years, the Communist Party organized widespread agitation around the Mooney case, and drew its members and followers into the agitation (report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944, p. 154).

"In 1941, the Communists established a school in New York City which was known as the School for Democracy (now merged with the Workers School into the Jefferson School of Social Science)." The school was "established by Communist teachers ousted from the public school system of New York City." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report No. 1311.)

A handbill entitled "Protest Brutal Nazi Persecutions" announced a mass rally of the American Labor Party and named Paul J. Kern as one of the sponsors of the rally. The special committee found that "for years, the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party but outside of New York City, they have been unable to win control" (report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Mr. Kern signed the call of the American Youth Congress to their New York model legislature of youth, New York City, January 28–30, 1938, as shown on the leaflet, Calling Young People of New York, in which source he was identified as chairman of the New York Lawyers Guild. He spoke in New York City before the Workers Alliance, according to the Daily Worker of June 18, 1937 (p. 5).

The Attorney General cited the American Youth Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the American Youth Congress previously as controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7444). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the organization as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" and "prominently identified with the White House picket line."

The Attorney General cited the Workers Alliance as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a "Communist penetrated organization," (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 72–74), cited the organization as follows: "Among the successes in its 'front movements, the Communists point to the "Workers" Alliance of America.'" It was created in 1936 and organized "in practically every relief project in the country."

It was "apparently patterned after the 'Unemployed Councils of St. Petersburg,' Russia, set up in 1906 as a part of the Communist front there. As the councils in Russia staged sit-down strikes, so also did the Alliance stage sit-down strikes in various State legislatures and relief bureaus in our country."

Mr. Kern was attorney for the International Workers Order as reported in the Daily Worker of September 27, 1950 (p. 5), which source identified him as from New York.

The Attorney General cited the International Workers Order as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and April 1, 1954. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "one of the strongest Communist organizations" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 79), cited the International Workers Order as "one of the most effective and closely knitted organizations among the Communist-'front' movements." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the American Slav Congress, April 26, 1950 (pp. 82–84), cited the International Workers Order as "one of the strongest Communist organizations."

The Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940 (p. 4), named Paul J. Kern as one of the sponsors of that conference, cited by the special committee as "an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organization," (Report, March 29, 1944, p. 102). The Attorney General cited the conference as the one which resulted in the formation of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program."

Mr. Kern was chairman of a meeting in New York City of the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy (Daily Worker, June 5, 1937, p. 2); he spoke before the group in February 1938, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 28 of that year (p. 8); a letterhead of the medical bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, dated July 6, 1938, named him as a member of the lawyers committee of the organization; a letterhead of the group, dated January 30, 1939, also named him as chairman of the lawyers committee of the organization. Mr. Kern was one of the sponsors of the Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 5, 1937 (p. 2); he signed a petition of the organization to lift the arms embargo against Loyalist Spain (Daily Worker of Apr. 8, 1938, p. 4).

In a booklet prepared and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift The (Spanish) Embargo, and entitled "These Americans Say" (p. 8), Mr. Kern was named as a representative individual who advocated lifting the arms embargo; he spoke in New York City before the Morningside branch, Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (Daily Worker of June 16, 1937, p. 3); he spoke before the brigade in September 1937, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 29, 1937 (p. 2); he endorsed the drive of the same organization to bring veterans back to America, as reported in the Daily Worker of June 7, 1938 (p. 2), and a circular entitled "And Tell the Folks That I'll Be Home If."

Mr. Kern sponsored the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, according to a letterhead of that organization dated September 16, 1940; and was chairman of the Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain, a participating organization, as shown in the pamphlet, Children in Concentration Camps. A prospectus and review of the lawyers committee also named him as chairman of that group.

The North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and the Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain were all set up during 1937 and 1938, when it was the policy of the Communist Party to support the Spanish War. (Rept. No. 1311 of the special Committee on Un-American Activities dated Mar. 29, 1944). The North American Committee and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade were also cited as Communist organizations by the Attorney General (press release of April 27, 1949, redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list). The Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign was cited by the Special Committee as a Communist front organization (report dated January 3, 1940).

The call to a Bill of Rights Conference, New York City, July 16 and 17, 1949, named Paul J. Kern as an initiating sponsor and acting chairman of the conference; he was identified in this source as former president of the Civil Service Commission, New York City. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, member of the national committee of the Communist Party, in writing about the conference for her column in the Daily Worker (July 25, 1949, p. 8), stated that one of the highlights of the conference was the fight for the 12 defendants in the current Communist cases. She reported that seven of the defendants were present and participated actively. The New York Times (July 18, 1949, p. 13) reported that "the 20 resolutions adopted unanimously by the 2-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, the presidential loyalty order, deportation for political belief, among others. The conference also called for an end to the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal, activities."

A short personal statement by Paul J. Kern against anti-Communist legislation appeared in New Masses for March 25, 1947 (p. 11); he was one of the sponsors of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, as revealed by a press release of the group dated June 15, 1949 (p. 2), in which source he was identified as being from New York City; the organization's pamphlet, "Hey, Brother, there's a law against you" (p. 2) and a photostatic copy of a letterhead dated May 5, 1950 also named Mr. Kern as one of the sponsors of that group which this committee cited as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation" (Rept. No. 3248 of Jan. 2, 1951, originally released Dec. 7, 1950).

The Daily Worker of February 2, 1938 (p. 5), reported that Paul J. Kern had spoken before the League of American Writers. He signed a statement of the American League Against War and Fascism against Franco spies, as shown in the Daily Worker of May 11, 1937 (p. 1); he was one of the sponsors of a joint meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism and American Friends of the Chinese People (Daily Worker, Sept. 24, 1937, p. 6); he was chairman of the Lawyers' Committee, American League for Peace and Democracy, as shown on their letterhead dated April 6, 1939.

The League of American Writers was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special committee in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944; it was cited as a Communist front by the Attorney General, and subsequently as subversive and Communist (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445; and press releases of June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948, redesignated Apr. 27, 1953, and included on Apr. 1, 1954, consolidated lists).

The American League Against War and Fascism, predecessor of the American League for Peace and Democracy, was cited as a Communist-front organization (special committee in reports of Jan. 3, 1939; Jan. 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and Mar. 29, 1944; and by the Attorney General; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442; and press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948, redesignated Apr. 27, 1953, and included on Apr. 1, 1954, list).

Identified as president municipal civil service commission, New York City, Paul J. Kern was one of those who signed a petition of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, as shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead of the group dated January 17, 1940. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited as a Communist-front organization which defended Communist teachers (special committee in reports of June 24, 1942; and Mar. 29, 1944).

Mr. Kern was a member of the advisory board of Film Audiences for Democracy, according to Film Survey of June 1939 (p. 4). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Film Audiences for Democracy as a Communist-front organization (report of Mar. 29, 1944). He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference for Inalienable Rights, as shown on the program of the conference which was held February 12, 1940. The special committee cited the New York organization as a Communist front (report of Mar. 29, 1944).

A program of the American Continental Congress for World Peace, held in Mexico City, September 5–10, 1949, named Paul J. Kern as one of the sponsors of that congress, cited by this committee as "another phase in the Communist peace campaign aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere (report 378 of Apr. 25, 1951).

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Karl N. Llewellyn, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Prof. K. N. Llewellyn, Columbia Law School, spoke at a conference of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as shown by the program, February 12, 1940.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist-front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

A letterhead of the Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Vito Marcantonio dated October 3, 1936 listed Karl N. Llewellyn as vice chairman of the organization.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 122), cited the Non-Partisan Committee for the re-election of Vita Marcantonio as a Communist-front organization.

An undated letterhead of the International Juridical Association listed Prof. Karl Lewellyn, New York, as a member of the National Committee.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 12), cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Shad Polier (Isador Polier), national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Who's Who in America (vol. 25, 1948–49, p. 1971) shows that Justine Wise Polier married Shad Polier in 1937. Who's Who in American Jewry (vol. 3, 1938–39, p. 818) shows that Justine Wise Polier is the daughter of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise and that she married Isadore Polier, March 26, 1937, New York City. It is noted further that Max Lowenthal, a witness during public hearings before this committee, September 15, 1950, when asked if he were acquainted with Shad Polier, stated: "Yes, he was Rabbi Wise's son-in-law." (Communism in the United States Government, pt. 2, p. 2984.) Therefore, this report includes references from the public records, files and publications of this committee which appear under the name, Shad Polier, and references which appear under the name, Isadore Polier.

Shad Polier was named in the election campaign letter of the Washington, D. C., chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated May 18, 1940, as a candidate for delegate to the national convention of the Guild. Convention News for May 1941 (p. 3) listed Shad Polier, New York City, as a member of the nominations committee of the National Lawyers Guild Fifth Annual Convention at the Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941. Shad Polier is shown as the writer of an article in the Lawyers Guild Review, vol. VI, pp. 490–491.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Report 1311, March 29, 1944, p. 149), and was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, September 17, 1950, in which it was cited as a Communist front that "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

A letterhead of the International Juridical Association, dated May 18, 1942, carries the name of Shad Polier, New York, as a member of the organization's national committee. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" (report of March 29, 1944, p. 149); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line" (report 3123, September 21, 1950, p. 12).

A 1941 membership list of the Washington Book Shop, on file with this committee, contains the name of Shad Polier, 3610 Idaho Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. "The Washington Cooperative Book Shop, under the name 'The Book Shop Association,' was incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1938. * * * It maintains a bookshop and art gallery at 916 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., where literature is sold and meetings and lectures held. Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations." (United States Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Attorney General also included the Book Shop on lists of subversive and Communist organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948) and redesignated it pursuant to Executive Order 10450 (memorandum of April 29, 1953, released by the Department of Justice); and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the Washington Bookshop as a Communist front (report of March 29, 1944, p. 150).

The news letter of the National Lawyers Guild for July 1937 (p. 2) named Isadore Polier, New York City, as chairman of the guild's committee on constitutional and judicial review. A leaflet, What is the IJA?, contains the name of Isadore Polier as a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association. An undated letterhead of the group listed him as executive director, and this committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 13), reported that Isadore Polier was executive director of the International Juridical Association at "the time of its inception." See citation on page 1.

The Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4), reported that Isadore Polier signed a petition, sponsored by the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, to lift the arms embargo. "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy" (report of the special committee dated March 29, 1944, p. 82).

The booklet, These Americans Say (p. 8), compiled and published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named Isadore Polier among the representative individuals who advocated lifting the Spanish embargo. The Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited by the Special Committee as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 137 and 138).

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Jawn Sandifer, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of April 10, 1951 (p. 5), reported that Jawn A. Sandifer was a speaker for the National Lawyers Guild. The October 7, 1952, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 3), reported that Jawn L. Sandifer, New York, was to lead workshop discussions at the national conference of the National Lawyers Guild on civil rights, legislation, and discrimination to be held at the Park Sheraton Hotel, New York City on October 10, 11, and 12, 1952.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organiaztion as a Communist front, which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Sidney R. Redmond, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

S. R. Redmond signed the open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties denouncing the Attorney General's attack on the Communist Party and decision in the Harry Bridges case as shown by the Daily Worker of July 19, 1942 (p. 4), and the booklet, 600 Prominent Americans (p. 27). Sidney R. Redmond, editor, National Bar Journal, St. Louis, Mo., signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting the War Department's order on granting commisions "to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party" according to an undated leaflet, "the only sound policy for a democracy" and the Daily Worker, March 19, 1945 (p. 4).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation * * * among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

Subject: George M. Johnson, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by

or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

George M. Johnson, Washington, D. C., was a member of the executive board of the National Lawyers Guild as of 1949. (See the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 18.)

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist-front which "Is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Edward P. Lovett, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this Committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild listed Edward P. Lovett, 615 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., as a member of that organization.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Louis L. Redding, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers' Guild listed Louis Redding, 1002 Franch St., Wilmington, Del., as a member of the organization. Louis L. Redding, a member of the Delaware bar, was among the speakers at a panel session on Civil Rights and Liberties as part of the National Lawyers' Guild annual convention, February 20–23, 1953, New York City, according to the Daily Worker, February 20, 1953 (p. 6).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The official proceedings of the National Negro Congress, 1936 (pp. 5, 6, 41), listed Louis L. Redding, Delaware, as a member of the National Executive Council and a member of the presiding committee and general resolutions committee.

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Joseph B. Robinson, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

One Joseph B. Robinson signed the call for the National Emergency Conference, Washington, D. C., May 13 and 14, 1939.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 49), cited the National Emergency Conference as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 12), cited the National Emergency Conference as follows: "It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Dr. Edward L. Young, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Dr. Edward L. Young was an initial sponsor of the American Peace Crusade as shown by letterheads dated February 1951 and February 1953. He signed a petition of the American Peace Crusade calling on President Truman and Congress to seek a big-power act as reported by the Daily Worker of February 1, 1952 (p. 1), in which source he was identified with the Harvard University Medical School. The Daily Worker of February 1, 1951 (p. 2), listed Dr. Edward L. Young, Committee on Physicians for Improvement of Medical Care, Brookline, Mass., as a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 51), cited the American Peace Crusade as an organization which "the Communists established" as "a new instrument for their peace offensive in the United States" and which was heralded by the Daily Worker "with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives." The Attorney General of the United States designated the American Peace Crusade January 22, 1954 pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

Dr. Young was a United States sponsor of the American Continental Congress for Peace as shown by an official leaflet published by the Congress.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 21), cited the American Continental Congress for Peace as "another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere."

According to a statement attached to a press release of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, dated December 14, 1949 (p. 10), Dr. Edward L. Young, Committee of Physicians for Improvement of Medical Care, Brookline, Mass., signed a statement calling for international agreement to ban use of atomic weapons.

The Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as an organization which was formed as a result of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and which was located, according to a letterhead of September 16, 1950, at 30 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and to further the cause of "Communists in the United States" doing "their part in the Moscow campaign."

A mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee dated May 18, 1951, listed Dr. Edward L. Young, Brookline, Mass., as one who signed a petition to President Truman "to bar military aid to or alliance with Fascist Spain."

The Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization.

Dr. Edward L. Young was shown as a member of the board of directors of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions on a leaflet, Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950, a letterhead dated July 28, 1950, and a letterhead dated December 7, 1952 (photostat). He was a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, March 25–27, 1949, as shown by the conference program (p. 13), the conference call, and the Daily Worker, February 21, 1949 (p. 9). As shown by the conference program (p. 10), he spoke at the conference, and according to Speaking of Peace, edited report of the conference (p. 49), Dr. Young introduced the discussion on psychiatric aspects of today's international crisis. He signed a statement supporting a rehearing of the case of the Communist leaders before the Supreme Court and protesting the Smith Act as shown by We Join Black's Dissent, a reprint of an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 20, 1951, by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (p. 2) reported that Dr. Young was a speaker for the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. He signed a statement of the organization as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 7, page 9435. He signed a resolution against atomic weapons released by the National Council as shown by a mimeographed list of signers attached to a letterhead of July 28, 1950. He signed a peace appeal in a drive of the National and New

York Councils of the Arts, * * *, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 16, 1952 (p. 2).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this report, Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, the committee cited the conference as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

As shown by an undated leaflet, "Prominent Americans Call For * * *" (received by this committee September 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker of Aug. 10, 1950 (p. 1), Dr. Edward L. Young signed the World Peace Appeal.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1954 (p. 34), cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy"; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal' "; and as having received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist Parties throughout the world."

The following is quoted from a "Statement of Principles for the Defense of Democracy Against McCarthyism," as reported by the Daily Worker of March 31, 1954 (p. 8):

"Minority opinion is being suppressed by such devices as blacklisting, dismissal from employment, and even jailing.

"Teachers, lawyers, doctors, writers, artists, actors, and other professionals should be free to practice their professions without discrimination because of their political beliefs or associations, whether they be Republican, Democrat, Socialist, or Communist."

The Daily Worker article reported that "the signers of the statement urge support for an eight-point program, including abolition of the Attorney General's list of 'subversive organizations,' reinstatement of teachers dismissed in recent inquiries, and amnesty for those in jail on charges of 'conspiracy to teach and advocate' their political views." Dr. Edward L. Young, Brookline, Mass., was named as a signer.

The call to a bill of rights conference New York City, July 16 and 17, 1949, named Dr. Edward L. Young, Massachusetts General Hospital, as a sponsor. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, in writing about the conference for her column in the Daily Worker (July 25, 1949, p. 8), stated that one of the highlights of the conference was the fight for the 12 defendants in the current Communist cases. She reported that seven of the defendants were present and participated actively. The New York Times (July 18, 1949, p. 13) reported that "the 20 resolutions adopted unanimously by the 2-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, the Presidential loyalty order * * * deportation for political belief * * * among others. The conference also called for an end to the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal, activities."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Viola Bernard, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4), listed Viola Bernard as one who signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy."

OCTOBER 25, 1954.

Subject: Dr. John P. Peters, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Communist Daily Worker, on March 5, 1941 (p. 2), printed the text of a statement signed by "450 leading figures in America urging the President and Congress to uphold the constitutional rights of the Communist Party of the United States." Prof. John P. Peters, New Haven, Conn., was listed among the signers. The statement said, in part:

"The Communist Party has been submitting itself to the franchise of the American people for 20 years. For all that time its program and its activities are an open record. In the few cases in which one of its members has been tried for advocating force and violence, the evidence has not been about anything they have done, nor about the party program, but about the writings of earlier Communists, and in particular the implications drawn from these by the prosecution. * * * Consequently we, who are not Communists, whose concern goes beyond the preservation of their constitutional rights to the maintenance of the democratic way of life as the road into the future, urge you, the President, to exercise your authority and influence to prevent those under you from stimulating un-American actions against Communists by undemocratic utterances * * *."

The following is quoted from a Statement of Principles for the Defense of Democracy Against McCarthyism, as reported by the Daily Worker of March 31, 1954 (p. 2):

"Minority opinion is being suppressed by such devices as blacklisting, dismissal from employment, and even jailing * * *.

"Teachers, lawyers, doctors, writers, artists, actors and other professionals should be free to practice their professions without discrimination because of their political beliefs or associations, whether they be Republican, Democrat, Socialist, or Communist."

The Daily Worker article reported that "the signers of the statement urge support for an eight-point program including abolition of the Attorney General's list of 'subversive organizations,' reinstatement of teachers dismissed in recent inquiries, and amnesty for those in jail on charges of '"conspiracy to teach and advocate" their political views.'" Dr. John P. Peters, New Haven, was named as a signer.

The files of this committee contain an undated "Open Letter to the Members of the 83d Congress of the United States" mimeographed on the letterhead of the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act (Internal Security Act of 1950). The letter (received by the committee in January 1953) urged support of "legislation seeking repeal of the McCarran Act (the Internal Security Act of 1950)." The letter said, in part:

"We ask this because we believe that it is the essence of our American democratic tradition that the right of dissent is basic to our democratic institutions; that the people and not the government shall judge the merit of ideas; that the people shall be free to organize into political, religious or economic associations without governmental restraint; that men may be punished for crimes they commit but never for opinions they hold * * *"

Dr. John P. Peters was named as a signer.

The Daily Worker of July 27, 1953 (p. 8), reported that "Initiators and sponsors of the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act made public yesterday an open letter to President Eisenhower asking him to urge Congress 'to repeal or thoroughly revise' the McCarren-Walter Immigration Act." Dr. John P. Peters, New Haven, was listed among the signers.

According to the Daily Worker of February 25, 1942 (pp. 1 and 4), John P. Peters was a signer of a call issued by the National Free Browder Congress. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited that congress as a Communist front which arranged to meet March 28–29, 1942. Earl Browder was general secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America, who had been convicted and sentenced to Atlanta Federal Penitentiary for passport fraud (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 69, 87, and 132).

An undated leaflet published by the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder named as one of those who appealed to President Roosevelt for justice in the Browder case John P. Peters, professor of internal medicine, Yale Medical School, and secretary of the Committee of Physicians for Improvement of Medical Care. The Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the United States Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447; letter to Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949). It was included in a consolidated list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, compiled from memoranda of the Attorney General dated April 29, July 15, September 28, 1953, and January 22, 1954 (indicated in citations hereinafter by *).

The Daily Worker of July 19, 1942 (p. 4), reported that John P. Peters was a signer of an open letter in defense of Harry Bridges, cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 87, 112, 129, and 166).

On the back of letterheads dated June 8, 1943, and January 10, 1944, Prof. John P. Peters, Yale University, was a committee member or sponsor of the Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges (ibid., p. 97).

It was reported in the Daily Worker of December 10, 1952 (p. 4), that Professor Peters was a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act.

Dr. John P. Peters, of the Yale University School of Medicine, was a sponsor of the Bill of Rights Conference, New York City, July 16–17, 1949, according to the Daily Worker, July 1, 1949 (p. 5), and the call to the conference. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, in writing about the conference for her column in the Daily Worker (July 25, 1949, p. 8), stated that one of the highlights of the conference was the fight for the 12 defendants in the current Communist cases. She reported that seven of the defendants

were present and participated actively. The New York Times (July 18, 1949, p. 13) reported that "the 20 resolutions adopted unanimously by the 2-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, the Presidential loyalty order * * * deportation for political belief * * * among others. The conference also called for an end to investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal activities."

Soviet Russia Today, in its issue of September 1939, printed the text of an open letter calling for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union. The letter was quoted as saying: "The Soviet Union continues as always to be a consistent bulwark against war and aggression, and works unceasingly for the goal of a peaceful international order." Dr. John P. Peters, department of internal medicine, Yale University Medical School, was listed as a signer. Soviet Russia Today was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944, p. 167; June 25, 1942, p. 21) and by the Committee on Un-American Activities (report No. 1953, April 26, 1950, p. 108).

Dr. Peters was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown by the call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6–8, 1943 (p. 4), and a memorandum isued by the council, March 18, 1946. Soviet Russia Today reported (June 1943, p. 21) that he was a signer of an open letter to the American people, sponsored by the council. The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; September 11, 1950). In its report of March 29, 1944, p. 156, the special Committee on Un-American Activities said: "In recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian has been known as the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship."

According to a letterhead dated September 22, 1939, John P. Peters was a member of the National Committee of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. A mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead dated January 17, 1940, named him as a signer of a petition sponsored by the organization. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, reports of June 25, 1942, p. 13, and March 29, 1944, p. 87).

John P. Peters was listed as a signer of an appeal sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, urging the Governor of California to dismiss charges against Sam Adams Darcy, Communist leader, in a report which appeared in the Daily Worker, December 19, 1940. The article said (p. 5):

"Darcy was recently extradited by California authorities from Pennsylvania, where he was State chairman of the Communist Party. He faces up to 14 years imprisonment for a minor inaccuracy in his registration as a voter in California in 1934."

This committee's report on Civil Rights Congress as a Communist-front organization, September 2, 1947, contains a reprint of a statement (from PM, March 3, 1947, p. 20) by "outstanding Americans" who urged the President to "effect immediate release of Gerhart Eisler," a German Communist. Prof. John P. Peters, Yale Medical School, was named as one of those joining in the statement.

A letterhead dated April 6, 1939, showed Dr. John P. Peters as a national sponsor of the American League for Peace and Democracy. That organization was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7442 and 7443). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities called it "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States * * * Earl Browder was its vice president * * *. An examination of the program of the American League will show that the organization was nothing more nor less than a bold advocate of treason" (reports of January 3, 1939, pp. 69–71, and March 29, 1944, p. 37.)

A pamphlet, Relighting the Lamps of China, named John P. Peters as a medical sponsor of the China Aid Council, cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a subsidiary of the American League for Peace and Democracy (report of June 25, 1942, p. 16).

Professor Peters was a signer of an open letter sponsored by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, according to a report in the Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, pp. 1 and 5. In its report of September 2, 1947, p. 12, the Committee on Un-American Activities said: "It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communist built protecting organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties." The organization was also cited by the special committee, in its report of March 29, 1944, pp. 48 and 102.

As reported in the foregoing, Professor Peters was named as a signer of an appeal sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties in Behalf of Sam Darcy. A booklet, "600 Prominent Americans" (p. 27), names him as a signer of an open letter sponsored by the federation, urging the President to rescind "the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party" and Harry Bridges. An advertisement in the New York Times, April 1, 1946 (p. 16), listed him as a signer of a statement sponsored by the federation, opposing use of injunctions in labor disputes. The Attorney General stated that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446; also cited in letters to the Loyalty Review Board released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948). The Committee on Un-American Activities reported that it was among a maze of organizations which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general, but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 3). The special Committee on Un-American Activities called it one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party (report of March 29, 1944, p. 50).

A letterhead dated November 18, 1936, named John P. Peters as a member of the doctors committee on the medical bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy. New Masses reported (January 5, 1937, p. 31) that he was a member of the professional committee of that organization. Letterheads dated July 6, 1938, and January 30, 1939, named him as a sponsor of the medical bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy (see also New Masses, May 18, 1937, p. 25). "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report of March 29, 1944, p. 82). The organizations named in this paragraph were among those referred to in the citation.

A booklet, "These Americans Say: 'Lift the Embaro Against Republican Spain,'" the material for which was compiled and published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named John P. Peters as a representative individual who "in the name of true neutrality, in the cause of world peace and democracy," advocated lifting the embargo on the sale of arms to Spain. The Coordinating Committee was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 137 and 138).

According to a letterhead dated November 16, 1939, John P. Peters was a sponsor of the Medical Aid Division of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, cited as a Communist front (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report of Jan. 3, 1940, p. 9).

The Daily Worker of December 24, 1944 (p. 14), named Dr. John P. Peters as an initiating sponsor of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. A letterhead of the Connecticut ICCSAP listed him as a council member. Letterheads of May 28, 1946, and November 26, 1946, named him as a member of the board of directors of the ICCSAP. The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist front (Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, H. Rept. No. 1954, Apr. 26, 1950, p. 2; H. Rept. 378, Apr. 25, 1951, pp. 11 and 12).

Dr. Peters was named as a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, March 25–27, 1949, which was arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (conference call; conference program, p. 13). The Daily Worker of May 16, 1952 (p. 2), reported that he was a signer of the Peace Appeal in the spring peace drive of the National and New York Councils of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist front by the Committee on Un-American Activities (H. Rept. 1954, Apr. 26, 1950, p. 2).

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Dr. Russell L. Cecil, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A pamphlet, "Relighting the Lamps of China," listed Russell L. Cecil as a medical sponsor of the China Aid Council.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the China Aid Council as a "subsidiary" of the American League for Peace and Democracy, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union * * *" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7442

and 7443). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States * * *."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Dr. C. Herbert Marshall, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A membership list of the American League for Peace and Democracy which was compiled by the special Committee on Un-American Activities from original records of the organization, subpoenaed in 1939 by the committee, contains the name of one C. Herbert Marshall, of 2712 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7442 and 7443). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States. * * *"

C. Herbert Marshall was shown as a sponsor of the Washington Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder in an advertisement of the organization which appeared in the Washington Post of May 1942 (p. 9). "When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder * * * Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, one of the few outstanding women leaders of the Communist Party in this country, headed it" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, pp. 6 and 55). The Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The call to a conference on civil rights, April 20–21, 1940 (p. 4), lists C. Herbert Marshall, M. D., as a sponsor of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, under whose auspices the conference was held. A letterhead of the organization, dated April 26, 1940, also shows C. Herbert Marshall as a sponsor. In 1941, Dr. C. Herbert Marshall was a member of the executive committee of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, according to a letterhead dated May 23, 1941.

The Attorney General cited the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as an "affiliate" or "local chapter" of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. "The program of the Washington committee followed that of the national federation. National Communist leaders have addressed its meetings, and conferences sponsored by it have been attended by representatives of prominent Communist-front organizations" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 22), cited the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as follows: "When the American League for Peace and Democracy was dissolved in February 1940 its successor in Washington was called the Washington Committee for Democratic Action."

As shown by an advertisement in the Washington Post, May 18, 1948 (p. 15), Dr. C. Herbert Marshall signed a statement against the Mundt anti-Communist bill.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Gloster Current, director of branch department, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Gloster Current and his orchestra were scheduled to play at the Independence Day picnic to be held July 3–4, 1938, under the auspices of the Communist Party of Michigan, according to a leaflet entitled "Where's Everybody Going?" which announced the picnic.

The Civil Rights Federation (affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties) issued a call to a statewide conference, September 12, 1943, in Detroit, Mich.; the name of Gloster Current appeared on the call in a list of sponsors and he was identified as secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Detroit chapter.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as an affiliate of the Communist front, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; and as a subversive and Communist organization which has been succeeded by and now operates as the Michigan chapter of the Civil Rights Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446; and press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list of organizations.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as a Communist-front organization. (From Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944; and Report No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated September 2, 1947.)

In July 1947 Mr. Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings before this committee, at which time he named Gloster Current of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as a council member from the United States to the World Federation of Democratic Youth (from Steele testimony, p. 81).

The World Federation of Democratic Youth was founded in London in November 1945 by delegates from over 50 nations. From the outset, the World Federation of Democratic Youth demonstrated that it was far more interested in serving as a pressure group in behalf of Soviet foreign policy than it was in the specific problems of international youth. (From Report No. 271 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated April 17, 1947.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Ruby Hurley, southeast regional secretary, Birmingham, Ala., NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Ruby Hurley was a sponsor of the World Youth Festival, Prague, July–August 1947, as shown by the World Youth Festival, page 7, and the booklet, the Bright Face of Peace, published by the United States Committee for the World Youth Festival. As shown by the call to World Youth Festival (p. 3), the festival, held in Prague from July 20 to August 17, 1947, was sponsored by the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (pp. 12 and 13), cited the World Federation of Democratic Youth as follows: "The AYD (American Youth for Democracy) is affiliated with the World Federation of Democratic Youth, which was founded in London in November 1945 by delegates from over 50 nations. * * * From the outset the World Federation of Democratic Youth demonstrated that it was far more interested in serving as a pressure group in behalf of Soviet foreign policy than it was in the specific problems of international youth."

The International Union of Students was cited as follows by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 13): "The World Federation of Democratic Youth brought into being the International Union of Students, which held a meeting in Prague on August 17–31, 1946. The administration and direction of this project was entrusted to a 17-man executive committee, of whom 12 were known Communists."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Franklin H. Williams, west-coast regional secretary, counsel, San Francisco Calif., NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Franklin H. Williams was a member of the executive board, New York committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown on an undated leaflet entitled "The South Is Closer Than You Think," published by the New York office and received for committee files about February 1947.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The Daily Worker, in its issues of December 16, 1947 (p. 10) and December 21, 1947 (p. 4), reported that Franklin Williams, New York

State chairman, American Veterans' Committee, was a speaker at a rally protesting the barring of Howard Fast from speaking at student campus rallies at Columbia University, Brooklyn, and City Colleges. Fast was barred from speaking because he was under a 3-month jail sentence for contempt of Congress.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: U. S. Tate, regional special counsel for southwest, Dallas, Tex., NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to the program, Second National Negro Congress, October 1937, U. Simpson Tate was chairman of a discussion group at the congress. In the material prepared by Walter S. Steele and submitted in connection with his testimony before the special Committee on Un-American Activities on August 17, 1938, U. Simpson Tate was named as having been elected national treasurer of the National Negro Congress at the second congress (public hearings, p. 626).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Thurgood Marshall, special counsel, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Thurgood Marshall was a member of the national committee of the International Juridical Association, as shown in the pamphlet, What Is the I. J. A.? The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" (Rept. No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944). In a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, the International Juridical Association was cited as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild, as of December 1949 (printed in the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 18) contains the name of Thurgood Marshall, New York City, among the members of the executive board. He was shown to be an associate editor of the Lawyers Guild Review in the issue of May-June 1948 (p. 422). It was reported in the Daily Worker of November 30, 1942 (p. 1), that Mr. Marshall, special counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was one of those who submitted a report denouncing lynching and discrimination which was adopted by the national executive board of the National Lawyers Guild. It was also reported in the Washington Evening Star (February 8, 1948, p. A–22 and February 12, 1948, p. A–8), that Mr. Marshall, identified as special counsel, NAACP, criticized the loyalty program in a public forum held under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild in Washington, D. C.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944 (p. 149). In the committee's report on the organization, released in 1950, the guild was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The Daily Worker of November 24, 1947 (p. 4) reported that Thurgood Marshall was among a group of attorneys who sent a telegram to New York Congressmen asking them to oppose the contempt citations in the case of the so-called Hollywood 10.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Clarence M. Mitchell, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Clarence Mitchell, a representative of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities, May 3, 1950, in opposition to H. R. 7595, at which time he stated that he was not then and had never been a member of the Communist Party. He stated that the question as to whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party "is an unfair question, because it immediately precludes from appearing before this committee many of the people who would be on trial under a bill of this kind (H. R. 7595). Presumably there are people who may, for sincere and personal reasons, wish to be members of the Communist Party, but they may want to come here and object to this bill, but I suppose if they had to answer that question they very likely would not come." (Public hearings, pp. 2296–2302.)

It is noted by the Daily People's World of February 12, 1952 (p. 2) that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, "blasts civil rights record of presidential hopeful." The Daily Worker of February 15, 1952 (p. 1) reported that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau, NAACP, appeared before the Senate Armed Forces Committee in protest of universal military training.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Henry Lee Moon, director, public relations department, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A membership list of the Washington Book Shop which was subpenaed by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1941 contains the name of Henry Lee Moon with address shown as 1206 Kenyon Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Washington Book Shop Association as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the Washington Book Shop Association as a Communist-front organization.

Henry Lee Moon, New York, was a member of the national executive council of the National Negro Congress, as shown on the official proceedings of the congress for 1936 (p. 40).

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. A. Phillip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940 "on the ground that it was 'deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organization members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists.' Commencing with its formation in 1936, Communist Party functionaries and fellow travelers have figured prominently in the leadership and affairs of the Congress, * * * according to A. Phillip Randolph. John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, has admitted that the Communist Party contributed $100 a month to its support." (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

A review by Abner W. Berry of Henry Lee Moon's book, Balance of Power: The Negro Vote, was published in the Daily Worker of May 28, 1948 (p. 12). The review reads, in part:

"As a newspaperman who spent the war years in Washington and later was associated with the CIO Political Action Committee, Henry Lee Moon has written, in balance of power a helpful survey of Negro suffrage in America. He defends the Negro voter against the charge of venality and corruptibility with the materials of history, and traces the long fight for the franchise.

* * * * * *

"* * * It is the only volume brought to our attention which gives a detailed national picture of the Negro vote. It is too bad the author felt impelled to defend the two-party system and the Negro. And it is worse that he chose this otherwise useful contribution as the bearer of his offering of fuel for the cold war."

A photograph of Henry Lee Moon was published in the June 16, 1932, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 2).

The Daily Worker of June 17, 1946 (p. 2), reported that one Henry Moon (no other identification shown) was one of the signers of a statement of the Action Committee To Free Spain Now which protested the delay in breaking diplomatic relations with Franco Spain.

The Attorney General cited the Action Committee To Free Spain Now as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The Daily Worker of February 16, 1949 (p. 13), reported that Henry Moon was nominated as commentator of the Voice of Freedom Committee.

The Attorney General included the Voice of Freedom Committee on the April 1, 1954,

consolidated list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Clarence A. Laws, regional director, New Orleans, La., NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

An undated letterhead (1947) of the Committee for Louisiana, affiliated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, listed Clarence A. Laws as a member of the executive committee of the organization.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference * * * as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Robert L. Carter, assistant special counsel, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Robert L. Carter wrote an article which was published in the Lawyers Guild Review (vol. VI, pp. 553–54, and 599–601). The Lawyers Guild Review was cited as "an official organ of the National Lawyers Guild" by the Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 21, 1950 (p. 13).

The National Lawyers Guild was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front organization in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149). It was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents." (Committee's review on the National Lawyers Guild, September 21, 1950.)

It was reported in the Times Herald of April 28, 1948 (pp. 1 and 4) that Robert L. Carter, of the American Veterans' Committee, was a sponsor of a conference against anti-Communist legislation.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Torea Hall Pittman, assistant field secretary, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The official proceedings of the National Negro Congress for 1936 (p. 6) listed Mrs. Torea Pittman, of California, as a member of the general resolutions committee of the National Negro Congress.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. A. Phillip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940 "on the ground that it was 'deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists.' Commencing with its formation in 1936, Communist Party functionaries and fellow travelers have figured prominently in the leadership and affairs of the congress * * * according to A. Phillip Randolph, John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, has admitted that the Communist Party contributed $100 a month to its support." (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Madison S. Jones, Jr., assistant field secretary, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

No reference to Madison S. Jones, Jr., is found in the records of the committee; however, one Madison Jones, 557 West 144th Street, signed the Communist Party nominating petition for councilman of the city of New York, Borough of Manhattan, in 1945 (Davis). (See p. 21 of the petitions.)

One Madison Jones, of New York, youth director for the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People, spoke at a peace mass meeting at Mecca Temple (Daily Worker, February 2, 1941, p. 3 ,col. 4).

In 1954, the total list of officers, board members, executive staff members, and others listed are 193. Out of that number, 89 of them have been cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee, or 46.1 percent of the total. It should be noted, however, that 16 persons serve in more than one capacity and are listed in both capacities. When you consider that these 16 persons have double offices or designations, the total list would be 177 of which 78 are cited by the House Committee on Un-American activities, or 44.1 percent.

The facts speak for themselves; the record has been made. There can be no successful contradiction of these affiliations by these individual members of the association.

On yesterday, it was my privilege to have a lengthy talk with my good friend, Mr. W. B. Nicholson, superintendent of the public school system at Blytheville, Ark. Mr. Nicholson is a learned educator and a student of race relations. In the conversation I had with him, his remarks were adduced to writing, and I would like that the full text of his statement be incorporated as a part of my remarks:

I have striven to approach this issue in my thinking in a way that I cannot be accused honestly of being guilty of prejudice against any man because of the color of his skin or the texture of his hair. But, to me, the acts of the NAACP are in violation of the divine principles of creation—and I don't think that is prejudice.

In my thinking, any act on the part of man to annihilate those things which are so fundamental in their nature that they have survived time, and still exist, is just counter to the original intention of the Creator.

Now, when the NAACP embarks on a program to break down the laws against interracial marriages in our respective States—and I understand there are 28 States that have laws against it—then the NAACP is not after all working honestly and sincerely for the recognition of the rights of the Negro; they are really working for the abolition and ultimate annihilation of both races.

I am thoroughly convinced that the NAACP does not reflect the honest, sincere sentiments and wishes of the southern Negro. Now, the southern Negro is the only one I am acquainted with. I have lived in Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama; and now I live in Arkansas. I have visited in New Orleans, traveled through Louisiana, and the Carolinas. I spent a year in North Carolina and a great deal of time in South Carolina. The Negro, as I know him, is not honestly being represented and his views are not being reflected accurately or correctly by the NAACP's programs, goals, or campaigns.

I am convinced in my own mind—I might not be able to put my finger on the facts—but I am convinced that the NAACP has embarked on a program which will result in great harm to both races in this country if they can succeed with it.

The Negroes in our area openly say that they want to maintain their own social identity in their schools and their organizations as it now is.

I acquiesce and concur fully with the views which Mr. Nicholson expresses.

I call upon this Congress to probe fully and completely the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Now, what should that investigation include? How large a scope and sphere should the committee encompass and inquire into? Would it not be proper to ascertain the amount of the collections of the organization; the salary of its officers; the source of its contributions and what expenditures are anticipated by this organization in the various States of the Union in the furtherance of their objectives? According to the Commercial Appeal article by Paul Malloy which had been referred to earlier, NAACP Counsel Thurgood Marshall was quoted as saying:

What is so particular about Mississippi? It is just a State in the Union; and as long as it stays in the Union, it will have to play by the rules. We have set up a fund there of close to $300,000.

Now, I think it would be in order that the Congress and the people should know what funds have been earmarked for other States. I feel that such a thorough investigation is necessary to protect the southern Negro and others who have been duped, victimized, and exploited by and through the promotion schemes of the NAACP. It would be most desirable

that our southern Negroes should know the facts with respect to any organization with which they would become alined or affiliated. Having lived among these people all my life, I am convinced that they would not knowingly contribute to or take part in the activities of any organization upon which there is a question mark.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the exposition which the gentleman is making of the citation of officers and directors and others acting in an official capacity in this NAACP organization. I call to the gentleman's attention the fact that in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, there is a news item stating as follows:

RESOLUTION HITS AT NAACP

COLUMBIA, S. C., February 22.—The South Carolina General Assembly today adopted a resolution asking the United States Attorney General to place the National Association for Advancement of Colored People on his list of subversive organizations.

Fifty-three of the NAACP's top officers have been cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee for "affiliation with or participation in Communist, Communist front, fellow-traveling or subversive organizations or activities," the resolution declared.

Adoption was without comment in both house and senate.

The resolution said the NAACP "should be classified as a subversive organization so that it may be kept under surveillance and that all citizens of the United States may have ample warning of the danger which lurks in such an organization."

Employment of NAACP members by the State or its political subdivisions would be banned under a bill passed by the house to the senate today.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his contribution, and to have in the RECORD at this point the information in the resolution that has been passed by the South Carolina General Assembly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Has the gentleman completed his statement?

Mr. GATHINGS. I have.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I would like to congratulate the gentleman for rendering a distinct service to his country, by exposing this organization which is stirring up racial hatreds throughout not only the South but also throughout the entire country.

I think it is the duty of this Congress, as the gentleman has stated, to investigate the background of the leaders of the NAACP and to investigate their activities fully.

I might state further that it might be well for this Congress also to take a look at this so-called Leadership Conference which is scheduled for Washington in the next few weeks.

Mr. GATHINGS. In the near future, I believe.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Permit me, if you will, to read from the remarks of Representative DIGGS of Michigan, under date of February 9, 1956, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, in which he inserted a news release issued by the leaders of this group calling this conference to be held in Washington on March 4 through March 6.

The person who issued the call is one Roy Wilkins, chairman of the group, who is also, as I understand, the secretary of this NAACP outfit.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I quote from the news release as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"It is essential," the call declared, "that Congress enact legislation in this session to safeguard the civil rights of American citizens and the processes of orderly government."

The news release goes further to state this:

The conference seeks enactment of an eight-point legislative program including job equality through the establishment of an effective Federal FEPC, withholding of Federal funds from any institution which defies the constitutional prohibition against segregation in public facilities, making lynching and other race-inspired acts of violence Federal offenses, abolition of the poll tax and protection of the right to vote, establishment of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice with authority to protect civil rights in all sections of the country, creation of a permanent Federal Commission on Civil Rights, elimination of remaining segregation and other forms of discrimination in interstate travel, and provision for majority rule in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

In this article they quote this Roy Wilkins as stating this:

The influence of this assembly on the Congress will depend less upon the number of individual delegates in attendance than upon the number of States and congressional districts represented.

When I heard that meeting was to be held in the Interior Department Auditorium, a Government building under the administration of the General Services Administration, I inquired to find out if political meetings could properly be held in that auditorium. I find that these are the regulations governing the use of the departmental auditorium and adjacent conference rooms.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD a copy of these regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
REGION 3,
Washington, D. C.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE USE OF THE DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM AND ADJACENT CONFERENCE ROOMS, CONSTITUTION AVENUE BETWEEN 12TH AND 14TH STREETS NW.

1. The departmental auditorium and conference rooms A, B, and C adjacent thereto shall be available for assignment to:

a. Agencies of the Federal Government and the government of the District of Columbia, for official use.

b. Officially recognized agencies, clubs, or educational units of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia.

The foregoing shall not be construed to include sponsored meetings, meetings of a political, sectarian, fraternal, or similar nature, or meetings held for the purpose of promotion of commercial enterprises or commodities.

2. Application for the use of the auditorium or conference rooms should be submitted at least 1 week in advance. It should be addressed as follows and include the information outlined below:

General Services Administration. Attention: Triangle area manager, region 3, room 1408, New Post Office Building, 12th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 25, D. C.

a. Name of agency in whose behalf the application is submitted.

b. Date of requested assignment, and hours proposed for its commencement and termination.

c. Nature of the contemplated program.

d. Approximate number of persons expected to attend.

e. Whether motion pictures or lantern slides are to be exhibited, stating (1) size of film, 35 or 16 millimeter; (2) size of lantern slide.

3. No program shall continue beyond midnight.

4. If the projection of motion pictures or lantern slides is a part of the program, competent operators will be furnished under the supervision of the General Services Administration.

5. Music racks, ushers, and attendants for checking wraps, if needed, must be furnished by and at the expense of the permittee.

6. No admission fee shall be charged, no indirect assessment shall be made for admission, and no collection shall be taken. Commercial advertising or the sale of articles of any character will not be permitted.

7. The serving of refreshments is prohibited.

8. A sample of any literature or folders to be distributed or posted shall be forwarded for review when formal request is made for either the auditorium or conference rooms.

9. All persons attending meetings will be required to go directly to the auditorium or conference rooms and to leave by the most direct exit. They shall be provided with tickets or other identification, except when the general public is invited. No one will be admitted to other parts of the building unless in the possession of a properly signed pass.

10. All persons attending meetings will be subject to the "Rules and Regulations Governing Public Buildings and Grounds," promulgated by the Administrator of General Services.

11. Smoking is prohibited within the auditorium.

Approved December 1, 1953.

WILLIAM A. MILLER,
Regional Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You will note that these regulations provide that the departmental auditorium and conference rooms A, B, and C adjacent thereto shall be available for assignment in 2 instances, and 2 instances only.

First. To agencies of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia for official use.

Second. Shall be available to officials of recognized agencies, clubs, and educational units of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia.

On February 20 I sent the following telegram to the Secretary of Labor, who I am informed, had requested the General Services Administration to permit

the use of this auditorium by this group under the sponsorship of the Labor Department:

I am informed that at the request of the Department of Labor General Services Administration is granting the use of the Departmental Auditorium, Constitution Avenue between 12th and 14th Streets NW., to a conference scheduled for March 4, 5, and 6. Inasmuch as this gathering is purely political in nature and has been called for purpose of lobbying and pressuring the United States Congress, I urge you to withdraw the Department's request for use of the auditorum, Roy Wilkins, chairman of the conference, is quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in issuing the call for the conference, as follows:

"The influence of the assembly on the Congress will depend less upon the number of individual delegates in attendance than upon the number of States and congressional districts represented."

General Services Administration regulations prohibit the use of this auditorium for political meetings but they seem to think your request for its use should be honored. I do not believe it was ever the purpose of Congress when creating the Department of Labor and enacting subsequent laws that the Department should engage in such a bold and blatant political move as you are doing in helping to sponsor this so-called leadership conference.

Mr. Speaker, 3 days have expired and I have not heard a word from the Secretary of Labor. I think the appropriate congressional committee might well go into this situation and find out if it is true that the NAACP and its allied leftwing organizations are actually being regarded as official agencies of the United States Government by virtue of this recognition accorded them by the Department of Labor. I may say that I am not sure any of the groups listed are Red, but I do know that the Communists have allied themselves with the aims of the NAACP. I think we should look into this proposition.

Mr. GATHINGS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I hope other Members of the Congress will join me in protesting the use of this Interdepartmental Auditorium by these radical organizations that have been attempting to high pressure, bulldoze, and intimidate the Congress into going along with their political aims and desires.

Mr. GATHINGS. Since the gentleman has not heard from the Department in answer to his request, it seems to me it would be most desirable and urgent that something be done soon because the meeting will be held in a very short time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wonder what the Secretary of Labor might say if the citizens' councils of the States of Mississippi, Alabama, or Georgia, organizations designed to promote the interests of the white people, as well as to defend the Constitution, were to request permission to use this Interdepartmental Auditorium?

Mr. GATHINGS. That would be mighty interesting to me. I am appreciative of the gentleman's remarks and am in full accord with you that a Federal departmental auditorium should not be used for a mass political gathering. I trust that the Secretary of Labor will deny the use of that Department's facilities for this conference.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. First, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing some most enlightening information to the Members of this House. I have been amazed to hear these facts concerning various Members of the NAACP, most of them officers of the organization, being on the subversive list. Most of those the gentleman mentioned were officers or directors of that organization, is that correct?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. I would like to say to the gentleman that I have here an actual list of those that will be inserted in the RECORD. Some of the citations are of a most severe nature, others are not——

Mr. ASHMORE. And the total number was 80 something, did I understand the gentleman to say?

Mr. GATHINGS. No, I do not think there were that many—41 percent, I believe it was. I will have to get that figure.

Mr. ASHMORE. Officers and directors?

Mr. GATHINGS. But it was about 41 percent of the total that were listed as heads of the organization in various capacities; that is, the board of directors, its officers, its executive staff, its legal division, and its health division.

Mr. ASHMORE. I have heard many reports and many rumors and, you might say, talk or gossip, whatever it might be, about various members of the NAACP being subversive or communistic, but none of those statements or reports have pinpointed the thing to the degree that the gentleman has. The gentleman has brought out these statements and these records which show undoubtedly that many of their leaders are on the subversive list.

Mr. GATHINGS. Well, you can see the large list here. They are the ones that will be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. ASHMORE. I want to commend the gentleman again for bringing those facts to us, and I also want to commend the legislature of my home State of South Carolina for requesting the Attorney General to place the NAACP, because of these facts and other facts which have been brought to us, on the subversive list. And, I want to say further that if the Attorney General does not do it, I want to know why he does not do it in the light of the facts we have heard here today. I do not see how he could do otherwise than say that the entire organization, infested with leadership of this type, should be placed on the subversive list. I believe, that in fairness to those who have been placed on the list, and the American poeple in general, that this organization should be declared subversive, and if the Attorney General fails to do so he should make a clear-cut statement as to why he does not.

Mr. GATHINGS. And I think that the Congress should probe this organization in all of its phases.

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes, and I hope the Members of the Press will give as much publicity to these facts as has been given to the other side of the case. I think it is only fair to the Southland, to the white people and to the colored people of this country, that both sides be brought out and let us know what is going on in this country.

Mr. GATHINGS. I feel that our southern Negroes ought to know these facts.

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes. And, if many of our southern Negroes did know the facts, they would not follow this NAACP leadership, because I know of some in my hometown of Greenville, S. C., who have been putting greenbacks into the bushel baskets, when they collected funds to fight these things that the NAACP wanted to fight, but when they found out what the true purpose of the NAACP was, they quit going to the meetings, stopped giving their money to the leaders of the NAACP in my city and are now on the other side of the fence, on the side where they used to be, with the white people of the South who have done so much for the Negro.

The South Carolina resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the Attorney General of the United States to place the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the subversive list for reasons set forth herein

Whereas the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee reveal records of affiliation with or parties in communism, Communist-front, fellow traveling, or subversive oganizations or activities on the part of the following officials of the NAACP: the president, the chairman of the board, the honorary chairman, 11 of 28 vice presidents, the treasurer, 28 of 47 directors, the chairman of the national legal committee, the executive secretary, the special counsel, the assistant special counsel, the southeast national secretary, the west coast secretary, the director of the Washington bureau, and director of public relations and two field secretaries;

Whereas of the NAACP's 28 vice presidents, the following 11 have records of un-American activities: John Haynes Holmes, 23 citations; A. Phillip Randolph, 20 citations; the late Mary McLeod Bethune (who still is listed as a vice president) and William Lloyd Imes, 16 citations each; Oscar Hammerstein, II, the composer, and Bishop W. J. Walls, 7 citations each; Ira W. Jayne and L. Pearl Mitchell, 2 citations each; Williard S. Townsend, T. G. Nulter, Grace B. Fenderson, 1 citation each;

Whereas of the 47 members comprising the association's board of directors, the following 28 have records of Un-American activities: Earl B. Dickerson, 25 citations; Algernon D. Black, 18 citations; Lewis Gannett, 15 citations; Roscoe Dunjee, 13 citations; S. Ralph Harlow, Channing H. Tobias, 10 citations each; William H. Hastie, 9 citations; Hubert T. Delaney, 8 citations; Benjamin E. Mays, president of Atlanta's Morehouse College, 6 citations; Robert G. Weaver, 5 citations; Buell G. Gallagher, 4 citations; President Arthur B. Spingarn, Earl G. Harrison, James J. McClendon, Ralph Bunche, Allen Knight Chalmers, and W. Montague Cobb, 3 citations each; J. M. Tinsley, Wesley W. Law, of Savannah, Ga., Norman Cousins, Alexander Looby, Henry J. Greene, Alfred Baker Lewis, 2 citations each; H. Claude Hudson, Carl R. Johnson, A. Marceo Smith, James Hinton, Theodore M. Berry, 1 citation each;

Whereas other officers of the NAACP with un-American activities records are: Lloyd Garrison, chairman, national legal committee, 5 citations; Treasurer Allan Knight Chalmers and Branch Department Director

Glaster B. Current, 3 citations each; Southeastern Regional Secretary Ruby Hurley, West Coast National Secretary Franklin H. Williams, Field Secretary Madison S. Jones, and Assistant Special Council Robert L. Carter, 2 citations each; and Field Secretary Tarea Hall Pittman, 1 citation: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina believes that for the reasons herein set forth that the NAACP should be classified as a subversive organization so that it may be kept under the proper surveillance so that all citizens of the United States may have ample warning of the danger to our way of life which works in such an organization; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Attorney General, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT. I want to congratulate my colleague from Arkansas for bringing this to the attention of the House. It seems to me that this forum here, in the Halls of the Congress, is about the only place you can get any publicity or the only place you can discuss it in this section of the country. The gentleman will probably recall that several years ago there was pictured in Life magazine some scenes of school buildings over in his or near his congressional district in West Memphis, Ark.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes, I recall that.

Mr. GRANT. They showed several colored children drinking from a hydrant with one dipper. Well, I imagine the gentleman, like myself, has carried water from the spring and drunk it out of a gourd. The superintendent of schools in one of the counties of my congressional district in Alabama, which has one of the finest systems of both white and colored schools that can be found in the entire United States, had some 12 or 15 pictures taken of colored schools in that county and sent them to the publishers of Life, showing them what fine colored school buildings we had in the State of Alabama.

Mr. GATHINGS. If the gentleman will suffer an interruption right there, I would like for a representative of the magazine to come to West Memphis now and see the facilities we have for our colored children.

Mr. GRANT. I want to say this to my colleague from Arkansas, they were returned, they were not published because such magazines take the attitude that nothing good can come out of the South. Therefore, they do not want to show the good part of anything.

Mr. GATHINGS. I could very easily show the gentleman some very fine buildings; as a matter of fact, some of the Negro schools in my congressional district are finer than the white schools.

Mr. GRANT. That is true.

GATT AND THE FARM PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has just signed an international agreement, the revised General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which threatens this country's domestic farm policy. Now it wants Congress to approve our joining an international agency, the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which was created to enforce this agreement.

The agreement, known as GATT, calls on the United States to drop import restrictions on foreign farm and dairy products at the earliest practical moment. It urges the United States to abandon all subsidies and other forms of Government aid which result in the sale of American farm products abroad at prices less than those prevailing here. In a report released July 12, 1955, the contracting parties to GATT advise the United States and other industrialized nations to concentrate on manufactures, leaving the production of food and raw materials to underdeveloped nations.

IMPORTS

Thanks to farm price supports, the American farmer gets a better price for his products than any other farmer in the world. Foreign farmers can sell in the American market for less, and still get more than they do at home. Inevitably, unless imports are controlled, farm products from abroad would flood in and wreck the support program.

The Government presently limits imports by setting specific quotas for price-supported products—wheat, cotton, butter. Imports of other products beyond a stated quantity pay an extra tariff charge. This applies, for example, to potatoes, wool, and tobacco.

Quotas can at any time be established for any product covered "by any loan, purchase or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture or any agency operating under its direction." The same law provides that—

> No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with this section.

In spite of this law the State Department, in the spring of 1955, signed the revised GATT, which now has 35 members. Article XI of the revised GATT flatly provides that—

> No * * * quotas * * * shall be instituted or maintained by any contracting party on the importation of any product of * * * any other contracting party.

Another clause, it is true, permits quotas on agricultural products provided domestic production is also controlled and provided that such quotas will not reduce the share of the market normally held by imports—article XI, section 2. Domestic production of many of the products on which the United States maintains quotas is controlled—for example, wheat, tobacco. In these cases the only question is whether or not the quotas fairly represent the share of the market normally held by imports. The revised GATT provides that, in the event of dispute, the question will be referred to the proposed new Organization for Trade Cooperation, called OTC—GATT, article XXIII. Note: In OTC the United States has only 1 vote out of 35 or possibly, if party to a dispute, none—see article 8, OTC charter.

This exception, however, does not apply to quotas presently maintained by the United States on butter, cheese, dried milk, rye, oats, barley, and linseed oil. Domestic production of these is not controlled. After 5 years of wrangling, in the course of which the State Department apologized for the action of Congress in authorizing quotas on these products, a temporary waiver was obtained permitting us to continue such quotas for the time being.

As a condition of this waiver, however, the State Department agreed that the United States will consult with other nations before setting any new quotas and will remove existing quotas on all farm products, whether covered by the waiver or not, as soon as circumstances permit. It also agreed to report progress once a year and, if any such quotas remain in effect at the time of report, explain why and what steps are being taken to remove them.

No wonder that in its statement of legislative policies for 1954 the National Grange said:

> We recommend that congressional action be taken to examine the State Department's structure and to clearly define the authority of that Department to make commitments in the name of the United States Government without congressional aproval.

EXPORTS

It is often pointed out that the United States exports a large part of its production of certain important farm products. In the marketing year 1953–54 we shipped abroad 19 percent of our wheat crop, 24 percent of our cotton, 26 percent of our tobacco and 45 percent of our rice. Despite these figures for particular crops, however, about 90 percent of our total farm output is marketed at home. Exports are nevertheless important.

It is not as frequently pointed out that these exports are largely financed by the American taxpayer. Of $3.2 billion worth of farm products exported in the fiscal year 1954–55, $1.7 billion worth—more than half—were covered by some kind of Government aid, either grant, loan or other aid to foreign countries or direct subsidies to our own exporters.

GATT is antagonistic to any form of aid, direct or indirect, which results in a surplus for export. It calls on member countries to avoid the use of such aids for primary products, which includes most farm products. If a member country does resort to aids of this kind, it must first consult with other members and apply the program in such a manner that its farmers do not thereby acquire more than an equitable share of the export market. Apparently, in event of dispute, OTC will decide what is an "equitable share"—GATT, articles XVI, XXIII and OTC charter:

> So, as with import quotas, our farm policy is again in conflict with GATT. As a result, formal complaints have been filed by Greece against United States export subsidies for sultana raisins, and by Italy against our export subsidies for oranges

and almonds. The first case was settled by reducing the subsidy from $2.95 to $2 per 100 pounds, a reduction of 30 percent. In the second, the United Kingdom (in the interest of Cyprus) the Union of South Africa, and Canada are supporting Italy. This case is still pending.

Furthermore, thanks in part to GATT's general opposition to aids which even indirectly stimulate exports, we are stuck with $7 billion worth of agricultural surpluses. Secretary of Agriculture Benson spent weeks during the summer of 1955 traveling around among the GATT countries, and others, to find out where and at what prices they will agree to let us sell these surpluses in the world market. Even when we try to give them away other countries claim we are depriving them of historical markets for their own farm exports.

TARIFF RATES

Adequate tariff rates on farm products could have reduced the need for quotas. But the State Department chose to go in the opposite direction. Under the Trade Agreements Act and GATT it has cut rates on farm products in half.

The rate on wheat, for example, was cut from 42 to 21 cents per bushel, on cotton from 7 to 3½ cents per pound—1¾ cents for long staple—on butter from 14 to 7 cents per pound, on cheese from 35 percent ad valorem to around 15 percent ad valorem. Meanwhile prices have doubled, cutting in half the protective effect of rates fixed in cents against the former price. The few rates not cut include such items as mules, chickpeas, dandelion roots, and acorns.

The effect of these cuts, and the resulting need for quotas, can be illustrated by the present problem in butter. According to Otis M. Reed, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee on behalf of the American Butter Institute:

New Zealand can ship butter here, pay all the costs, pay the present tariff and still have an advantage of 7 cents on our market.

That 7 cents is exactly the amount by which the State Department cut the rate. Except for that cut no quota would have been required.

Moreover, in GATT, the State Department agreed to freeze these cuts and even negotiate further cuts when asked. If for any reason we raise a rate previously cut, we are obliged to work out some form of compensation—such as reducing some other rate—with any member nation whose producers are affected. One of the responsibilities of OTC will be to decide what is appropriate compensation—GATT, articles III, XXIII, XXVIII, and XXIX:

The United States has already felt the bite of these provisions. In 1952, because dried figs were coming into this country in such increased quantities as to threaten serious injury to domestic producers, the President raised the rate on dried figs from 2½ cents to 4½ cents per pound. Thereupon Turkey, with the approval of the other GATT countries, increased her duties on iron furniture, desks, cabinets, office machinery, and milling machinery. Greece, with no rates she wanted to raise, formally requested the United States either to restore the 2½ cents rate or, failing that, to reduce rates on other products Greece wanted to sell in the American market. Italy simply wanted the 2½ cents rate restored.

A general settlement has now been worked out. But it took 3 years and several new concessions by the United States.

OPINION ABROAD

There is no doubt about the reality of the conflict between our farm policy and GATT. It broke out into the open at a meeting of GATT countries in Geneva early in 1955. Here, from a story by Henry Gemmill and Mitchell Gordon in the Wall Street Journal for March 4, is an eye-witness account:

FOREIGN FUROR—UNITED STATES FARM PROPS ANGER ALLIED NATIONS AND IMPEDE UNITED STATES PLANS FOR FREER TRADE

It is becoming increasingly clear that a domestic policy of the United States Government—its propping of farm prices—is losing America friends abroad.

For example, the United States has been insisting that nations should end quantitative restrictions in imports—specifically the widespread discrimination against goods bought with dollars. Time and again the Americans have been hooted down because the United States itself has slapped import quotas on many a farm product to protect its high-priced domestic market. And it has demanded a waiver in the revised GATT pact to permit this to continue.

For another instance, the United States representatives have been pressing here for tighter rules concerning the disruptive effect of what is called State trading—government buying and selling of the raw materials and products of industry. But they have been laughed at by other delegates, who cite sales of butter and grain from the vast surplus stocks of the United States Commodity Credit Corporation.

The influential Manchester Guardian pictures America as asking GATT for legal permission to live in a state of sin. The London Economist, internationally read and usually pro-American, depicts the United States insistence on quotas for farm imports as sadly retrogressive. Other publications have played up the official protests registered by Denmark, the Netherlands, Australia, and New Zealand against United States efforts to sell surplus butter abroad and have featured the contention of Burma and Siam that the United States is cutting into those nations' export market for rice.

GAAT'S OWN POSITION

The conflict is further highlighted by a formal report issued in the name of the contracting parties to GATT this summer.

This report openly takes the position that industrial nations like the United States should concentrate on the production of manufactured goods, leaving the production of raw materials and foodstuffs to underdeveloped nations. By specializing in this way, the report says, each nation would become more efficient. Such a policy, according to the report, would help bring down the price of farm products, contribute to a more effective allocation of world resources and thereby to the promotion of economic wealth among all nations.

It will come as a surprise to the average American farmer to learn that he is making ineffective use of world resources. Although his costs are higher, because he pays his help more and enjoys a higher standard of living, he can still produce more per acre than any other farmer in the world. It is hard to believe that he will willingly help the State Department put him out of business by concurring in this kind of global planning.

It may also stun underdeveloped nations to learn that, in order to keep the price of raw materials and foodstuffs down, it is their duty to remain underdeveloped forever. It was just this sort of thinking—trying to keep the colonies as a perpetual source of cheap raw materials for England—which helped provoke the American Revolution.

THE NEXT MOVE

Congress has never approved GATT. In fact no present contracting party has yet accepted GATT otherwise than provisionally.

The State Department is now asking Congress in effect to approve GATT without looking at it. By a bill styled H. R. 5550 it seeks confirmation of United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, GATT's policing arm. But none of the substantive provisions of GATT—the rules against quotas and subsidies, for instance—are submitted. Thus Congress is confronted by the problem of delegating vital authority to OTC without any previous or present opportunity of passing on the regulations OTC will enforce.

Once OTC is established, and GATT thereby indirectly approved, the conflict between our farm policy and GATT will intensify. With the State Department and 34 nations behind GATT and OTC, and Congress having signed away its authority, there is little doubt which would eventually win.

PROTEST

GATT and OTC have been advertised as the logical culmination of the State Department's trade agreements program.

But they are not what Congress had in mind when it passed the Trade Agreements Act. The first words of that act were and are "For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States," not for "the more effective allocation of world resources." On the contrary when an organization frankly created for this other purpose was proposed—the International Trade Organization in 1947—Congress sat on it.

Many farmers have been induced to go along with the State Department's tariff-cutting policy by the slogan "We have to buy in order to sell." Now, however, farmers are coming to realize that, for farm products, this slogan is deceiving. Because of low labor costs many countries can grow farm products more cheaply than we. They will certainly not buy such products from the American farmer unless, by some form of subsidy, or foreign aid, they can get them still cheaper. Even then countries with a surplus to sell accuse us of dumping and disrupting the market.

One of the main purposes of the State Department's tariff reduction program is to foster trade in place of aid. Dr. Claudius Murchison, economic adviser, the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., analyzes the implications of this for farmers as follows:

Of our total imports only about 2½ billion represent imports in the so-called protected categories. Yet this limited segment includes the commodity range which

would have to provide the offset for reduced foreign aid if it is to be accomplished by an increase of imports from tariff reductions. Even a doubling of such imports would fall short by one-half of offsetting the discontinuance of foreign aid as a balance of payments factor. Obviously this area of trade is too narrow a basis for the intended objective.

Consequently, one is forced to the conclusion that the free-trade advocates also have in mind the withdrawal of quota and tariff protection from American agriculture. This could mean nothing less than the abandonment of the entire agricultural support program.

Worse still, the cold fact is that, no matter how much this country buys from other countries, the dollars they earn will seldom come back to the farmer. They will go instead for things like trucks and automobiles—and even farm machinery to increase the foreign farm output.

It is not to foreign markets that the farmer must turn but to an expanding home market, which is already taking 90 percent of his output. And like himself, his customers in the home market need the protection of fair tariffs against low labor cost competition from abroad.

As these facts come home to roost, more and more farmers are joining the protest against the State Department's present policies. As noted earlier, the National Grange has already called for a congressional investigation. Much to the surprise of the State Department, votes from the traditionally low-tariff farming regions of the South and West nearly defeated H. R. 1, the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act for 3 more years. Only when amendments were added improving the protection of domestic producers did the bill pass.

H. R. 5550

Defeating H. R. 5550—the OTC bill—may be difficult. Superficially, GATT and OTC seem innocent enough—simply a method of working out complicated trade problems by friendly discussion with other countries. Many farmers may be lulled into a false sense of security by their success with H. R. 1. Others may still be confused by State Department slogans.

It is imperative to dispel this apathy. If H. R. 5550 passes, OTC will become an accomplished fact, wedding the United States to GATT for good. Immediate, active protest is needed to prevent this.

Even if H. R. 5550 is defeated, GATT itself will linger, further entangling the farm program in international politics. Congress needs to go beyond H. R. 5550 and investigate GATT directly. Only by facing up to the problem squarely, and letting their Congressmen and Senators know where they stand, can farmers and farm groups arrest the present drift to a diplomatic instead of a domestic farm program.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief statement?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, our country is spending billions of dollars and untold energy and resources in order to defeat the threat of communism. We all recognize the Communist danger. But I am convinced there is a danger here at home which we scarcely recognize.

I am speaking of the threat of monopoly—the increasing danger that a few corporations will grow so large and so powerful they will bring an end to the effective functioning of our competitive free-enterprise system. Many a small-business man knows from intimate experience what I am talking about. For in the past 3 years there has been a tremendous wave of mergers—great corporations combining to become even larger. Over 3,000 corporations have disappeared in these 5 years, having been swallowed up by bigger firms.

The amazing thing is that as these great corporations carry out their merger acquisitions they do not stay in their own lines of business. The Wall Street Journal reports:

Rail-equipment builders enter the road-machinery and electronics field. A chemical concern proposes marriage to a washing-machine maker. A coal-mining organization acquires oil, shipping construction machinery and machine-tool firms. A construction contractor acquires a steel mill and a paint-maker.

And so the story goes. Huge corporations are gobbling up smaller, independent businesses, making it more and more difficult for the small-business man who is the backbone of this Nation to stay in business. It is harder for the small-business man, because a large corporation entering a new line of business can afford to lose money in order to drive out its small-business competitors. The big corporation simply makes up losses in its new field out of profits—often monopolistically fat profits—it makes in its long-established lines. Now, there are those who say there is something natural and inevitable about the continued growth of huge corporations. These apologists for monopoly seem to agree with Karl Marx that economic processes are somehow beyond man's control. Mr. Speaker, I am glad there are so many Members of this Congress who emphatically disagree with that point of view. We can stop the growth of monopoly in America; we can preserve our free competitive system, if we make up our minds to do the job, if we strengthen our antitrust laws and appropriate adequate funds for their enforcement.

We cannot expect the Federal Trade Commission, for instance, successfully to defend the public interest against the country's top corporation lawyers if we give it only pennies with which to work.

In this connection I want to commend the House Anti-Monopoly Subcommittee and its able chairman, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. EMANUEL CELLER. Our country owes a great deal to Mr. CELLER for his years of yeoman service in the battle against monopoly and for freedom of enterprise.

The Antimonopoly Subcommittee has unanimously recommended that Congress "make a substantial increase in its appropriations to the Federal Trade Commission, with the increase earmarked specifically for merger work." The subcommittee has recommended $951,000 for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge that we support the recommendation of the Antimonopoly Subcommittee. We are spending billions to protect ourselves from the Communist brand of aggressive centralized power. Surely we cannot afford to lose by default to the aggressive, centralized power of monopoly here at home because of our failure to appropriate less than a million dollars.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 7763.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at that point in the RECORD where the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] yielded to me for some comment, I may insert the full resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of South Carolina that was referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. [Mr. METCALF]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is good for all Americans to be reminded from time to time how fortunate we are to live in a land where the press is free. I was reminded of that truth vividly the other day. A friend of mine was expressing resentment over a news column, which he thought contained unfair criticism of a public official. He said, "Isn't it terrible that a man in public life has to take such criticism?" My answer was: Think how much more terrible it would be if you lived in a country where public officials could not be criticized.

We must never forget that freedom of expression is our strongest guaranty of other freedoms upon which our democracy is based because a tyrant's most dreaded enemy is a free press.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert two newspaper clippings at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the Boston Post of February 21, 1956]

NO MAN'S COLLAR

Until now the Boston Post has remained silent concerning a conflict with the Shubert theatrical interests. This conflict involves the fundamental right of freedom of the press and the privilege of honest reporting.

This matter has already received mention in other publications. For the issues at stake concern the very foundation on which the free press in this country is based. Post readers, who are directly involved, now have a right to know the facts.

The facts are very simple.

The Shubert interests have blacklisted Elliot Norton, the Post's drama critic, from their theaters because he wrote a review and a subsequent Sunday column on "The Ponder Heart." The review and the column displeased J. J. Shubert, who owns or operates Boston's seven legitimate theaters.

NO SURRENDER OF FREEDOMS

When the Post refused to order Mr. Norton to revise his future writing so that it would be more satisfying to Mr. Shubert, the advertising placed in the Post by the Shubert theaters was slashed.

The Post does not question the right of the Shuberts to drop Mr. Norton from its press list; we are quite willing to pay for his tickets.

Nor does the Post challenge the privilege of the Shubert interests to reduce their advertising. They have a perfect right to do so.

If the price of the Shubert advertising is a surrender of the right of freedom of expression and honest reporting and a tacit understanding that every show presented in a Shubert theater will be praised, whether deservedly or not, then that is a price the Post will not pay.

OBLIGATION TO READERS

The Post does not wear the collar of Mr. Shubert, or anyone else. Our obligation is to our readers. Our responsibility is to tell them the truth, as we see the truth.

Elliot Norton, whose writing the Shuberts seek to control, is an experienced and well equipped drama critic. A graduate of the Boston Latin School and Harvard College, he is a well rounded newspaper man who has been with the Post for 30 years. He has been its drama editor for 22 years.

He is one of the country's foremost experts in his field. His opinions are respected by leading producers, directors, and actors in the theatrical profession. A mild-mannered person who is extremely popular with his fellow-newspaper workers, he is a constructive rather than a destructive writer. His suggestions frequently have been adopted by producers and directors to improve their shows.

Richard Rodgers, celebrated composer and partner of Oscar Hammerstein, declared recently in a national television interview that Rodgers and Hammerstein open their plays in Boston largely because of Mr. Norton's analysis and constructive criticism.

Raymond Massey has referred to Mr. Norton as one of the theater's finest jurors. Helen Hayes has called Mr. Norton one of the outstanding dramatic critics of the country, adding that what is more important, he loves the theater.

The late George M. Cohan described Mr. Norton as not only a very important, well-informed and widely read critic, but what is far more important, he doesn't permit his personal likes and dislikes to creep into his writing. He shoots straight.

Cornelia Otis Skinner declared that Mr. Norton commands the respect and friendship of everyone in the theater who appreciates sincerity and uncommon critical perception.

Tallulah Bankhead characterized him as a first rate and sincere observer of the drama with real integrity and affection for the theater.

Those are but a few of the testimonials to Norton's ability, integrity and sincerity as a drama critic that could be cited.

The Post, of course, does not challenge the right of anyone to disagree with Elliot Norton. But it does insist most forcefully on his right to express his honest opinions to Post readers.

COLUMNS NOT FOR SALE

The news columns of the Post are not for sale to Mr. Shubert or to anyone else. It would be nothing more than a complete abandonment of newspaper integrity and a shoddy sellout of Post readers, if Mr. Norton were to be instructed that in the future his reviews and columns are to be written to please J. J. Shubert and that he no longer can call plays as he sees them. That has not happened. It will not happen.

The implications in the banning of the Post drama critic are far-reaching. If the Shubert interests can control the play reviews and tell a critic what to write, someone else obviously can do the same thing in another section of the newspaper.

If the Shuberts can do what they are endeavoring to do, it would be the beginning of the end for the free press and the honest reporting and expression of opinion that are its bulwarks.

The charge made by the Boston representative of J. J. Shubert is that Mr. Norton "belabored" the theater.

Here is what precipitated that charge:

Mr. Norton wrote a critical review of The Ponder Heart, in which he referred to it as a "disappointing play." Subsequently, in his Sunday column, he elaborated on his first criticism.

TICKETS DENIED CRITIC

A representative of the Shubert interests visited the Post advertising director the day after this column was published to complain about it. He was referred to J. J. McManus, editor in chief of the Post. The Shubert spokesman insisted to Mr. McManus that Mr. Norton had no right to criticize the play a second time. He maintained that Norton's job should be "to help the theater."

Editor in Chief McManus replied that Mr. Norton's function was to act as drama critic, not to praise plays which do not deserve praise. He declared that Mr. Norton would not be ordered to change his attitude or alter his writing in any way.

The Shubert representative, thereupon, declared that Mr. Norton would be suspended from the theater's press list and that no ticket would be available for him for a play opening that night. He was told that the Post will be glad to pay for the critic's tickets.

Mr. Norton purchased a ticket that night for Someone Waiting, liked the show and said so in his review the next day.

On that occasion, the Post did not report this brazen attempt to muzzle the press. However, so many other publications, upon learning of the matter, have commented on it that we believe the time has come to discuss it fully.

The Shubert interests, unable to dictate the policy concerning Mr. Norton's columns and reviews, next notified the Post that they were cutting down all advertising in this newspaper, presumably in the assumption that such a step would whip the Post into line.

[From the Boston Post of February 22, 1956]

NO MAN'S COLLAR

(Continued from yesterday)

When the Shubert theatrical interests sought to stifle the expression of honest opinions in the reviews and columns written by Elliot Norton, The Post's drama critic, it was not the first time they boldly tried to stangle the freedom of the press.

Other newspapers and publications have been the targets for similar brazen and dictatorial tactics, when they told the truth, as they saw it, about presentations in theatres owned or controlled by the Shuberts.

Here in Boston, The Pilot, official publication of this Catholic Archdiocese, was suspended from the Shubert press ticket list because its editors dared to publish three reviews which displeased J. J. Shubert.

The Pilot was one of the newspapers which protested editorially, when it first became known that Mr. Norton's name had been stricken from the press list of the Shubert theatres because The Post had refused to order him to change his writing so that it would conform with the ideas of Mr. Shubert.

"LIKE A SPOILED CHILD"

The archdiocesan newspaper, whose comment is reprinted in full on page 20, observed that the principle involved in the Norton incident was either write the reviews to suit J. J. Shubert or, like any other spoiled child, J. J. doesn't want to play any more."

"This attempt at censorship by pressure should get some strong reaction from those who really care for the American stage—we hope they wil stand up and be counted," The Pilot declared.

When the national magazine, Newsweek, telephoned John Shubert, son of J. J. Shubert, in New York for a comment on the black listing of the Post's critic, the magazine's reporter quoted him as replying: "You write a bad review and we'll fix you, too."

Newsweek pointed out that as far back as 1915, Alexander Woollcott, then writing for the New York Times, was barred from the Shubert theatres in New York because he wrote that a Shubert production was "not very amusing."

OTHER CRITICS BLACKLISTED

Over the years, the Shuberts have similarly blacklisted or refused press tickets to other critics and columnists in New York, Chicago and elsewhere, Newsweek reported. The magazine referred to Mr. Norton as "perhaps the most respected critic in New England."

Variety, the "bible of the entertainment world," long has been blackballed by the Shuberts because of its refusal to surrender its rights of honest reporting and expression of opinion.

In an article on the removal of Norton from the Shubert press list, Variety reported that "there have been numerous Shubert bans against critics and columnists in New York."

"The fact that Norton's outspoken opinions have made him the outstanding Boston critic, virtually the only one taken seriously by the trade, has not spared him the resentment of those whose shows he has rapped," Variety asserted.

CAN SHUBERTS DICTATE?

The issue involved in the conflict between the Shubert interests and the Post, which has seen the Shuberts not only blacklist drama editor Norton but also reduce their advertising in the Post in reprisal for Mr. Norton's criticism, is very simple.

That question is: Should the Post stand firm and insist upon the right of honest writing for its readers; or should it allow the Shuberts to dictate what will be said about the plays staged in the theaters under their control?

Fundamentally, what the Shuberts are seeking to do in their efforts to strangle freedom of newspaper expression is no different from the tactics of dictators which resulted in the destruction of the free press in some countries.

It is incredible that this should happen in Boston, the Cradle of Liberty, where freedom itself was born. Yet the first step would

be taken, if J. J. Shubert were to prevail in this instance.

By itself this dispute is not of vital consequence. It is not of great importance whether the Shubert interests bar Mr. Norton from their press list or if they reduce their advertising in the Post.

GREAT PRINCIPLE INVOLVED

But the implications involved are of tremendous significance, and the principle at stake concerns one of the rights that is guaranteed in the United States Constitution—that of freedom of the press, that of a newspaper to tell its readers the truth.

It would be a bitter day for the people of this city and Nation, if the time ever comes when one man, whatever material power he may wield, can deny that right. In essence, that is what J. J. Shubert is trying to do.

If the owner of a chain of legitimate theaters can dictate what is said in the drama section of a newspaper about the plays that are presented, it logically follows that a man who controlled enough advertising could elect Governors and Presidents by telling the newspapers whom they must support for high public office.

That is a shocking, sobering thought. But the shocking, sobering fact is that the breakdown of the free press in the dictator countries began with orders as to what could and could not be printed in one section of a newspaper.

The Post reiterates. It wears no man's collar. It never will. The Post's responsibility is to its readers. That duty demands the presentation of the truth and honest opinions without fear or obligation. To allow J. J. Shubert or anyone else to dictate what should be printed in any section of this newspaper would be to break faith with those readers.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time to speak about a shocking and disgraceful incident that has occurred in the district I represent and in the capital city of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

It concerns a flagrant attempt to violate one of the basic and fundamental freedoms that is guaranteed in our Federal Constitution—the right of freedom of the press.

Involved in this conflict are the Boston Post, the leading Democratic newspaper in New England, and the Shubert theatrical interests.

The Shubert group attempted to dictate what could and could not be published in the Post's dramatic reviews concerning the plays and shows presented in the legitimate theaters under its control.

When the Boston Post refused to be intimidated and insisted on exercising its right to tell the readers the truth in its drama section, the Shubert interests blacklisted Mr. Elliot Norton, the Post's drama editor, in its theaters and reduced its advertising in the Post.

This is not the first time that Mr. J. J. Shubert has tried to enforce his views upon an entire community Mr. Speaker, and unless we take some action I suspect it will not be the last.

This has happened in the past, Mr. Speaker, in Boston, in New York, and Chicago. Now a great Democratic newspaper has seen fit to take a stand and make a fiight on this issue, and I am going to ask the House Judiciary Committee to investigate this matter and to call Mr. J. J. Shubert before it and ask him some very pertinent questions.

In my city, Mr. Speaker, we also have a publication called the Pilot. Most of you undoubtedly have heard about it. It is the official publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston.

When it dared to publish three reviews which displeased Mr. J. J. Shubert, it was immediately blacklisted in the Shubert theaters.

When a reporter on the national magazine Newsweek called a representative of the Shubert interests, he was told that if he published anything on the matter, he also would be "fixed."

Variety, the so-called bible of the entertainment world, is blacklisted by the Shuberts.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that in my district a great newspaper has chosen to make a public fight against bold and flagrant attempts to muzzle and stifle the free press which is so important in our democratic form of government.

There is a great deal about this matter which I believe the Judiciary Committee of the House should investigate. I believe Mr. Shubert should be called before the committee and made to explain what gives him the right to boldly and brazenly attempt to trespass upon the freedom of the press, and why he has the effrontery to attempt to muzzle honest reporting and truthful expression of opinion.

I also feel that the committee should make a thorough investigation to determine whether our antitrust laws are not also being violated. In the great city of Boston, Mr. Speaker, all seven legitimate theaters are under the control of the Shuberts. That situation will be partly corrected in 2 years as a result of a recent court order, but at the present time a producer must obey the dictates of the Shuberts or he cannot bring his show to Boston. He can be blackballed just the same as the newspapers which refused to write their drama reviews in a manner which will be pleasing to Mr. Shubert.

The Shuberts exercise a very tight and very complete monopoly over the legitimate theater in the city of Boston. And there are other questions to which the Judiciary Committee should get the answer. Is there an advertising racket employed by the Shuberts so that a producer who takes a show into Boston cannot even advertise his own production in the newspapers, except in the manner prescribed by the Shuberts. I would like to know whether these arrogant and insufferable people exercise such control over civil liberties that in this day and age they can tell a producer where he must place his advertising and where he cannot place it.

I ask that the committee ascertain whether the contracts which the Shuberts execute are framed in such a way that the producer is coerced and intimidated under the threat of not getting another theater unless he does what the Shuberts tell him he must do. I want the committee to determine just what harsh conditions are imposed on producers who want to present their shows in theaters under the Shubert control. Is it true that they must come in on the Shubert terms or that otherwise they cannot come in at all? This is a matter which I believe warrants the attention of our Committee on the Judiciary.

While the committee is making the investigation it would also be interesting if we investigated some of the filthy productions in their theaters. Furthermore, it would be interesting if we investigated the Communist line that many of their plays have been following through the past and all of these various actors that they had before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

There is no question but that a monopoly of the worst sort is involved here, and I believe there are very serious violations of the antitrust law. It may not be an important episode in our history, Mr. Speaker, when a drama critic is blacklisted in all the legitimate theaters in a great metropolitan city because he insists on his right to publish his honest opinions. But it is of great consequence when a man who has a monopoly in his field tries to muzzle and throttle the press and to violate the freedom of the press. To me it is a shocking thing that such an attempt could be made in the historic city of Boston, the cradle of American liberty, the place in which the fight for American freedom was started. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it was in vain that the early patriots dumped the tea in Boston Harbor. I can tell you there are many people in the city of Boston who believe there should be another tea party and that Mr. Shubert should be dumped into the harbor. If this man is to be allowed to whittle away at the freedom of the press in one area and if he can get away with his outrageous effort to gag the Boston Post, then other men with evil intentions are certain to try the same thing in other fields. That is exactly what the Communists do. That is how the breakdown of the free press started in those countries which now are under the oppression of Soviet tyranny. Any attempts to infringe upon the rights guaranteed under our Constitution concern this Congress. I certainly hope that the House Committee on the Judiciary will thoroughly probe this insult to the people of the great city of Boston, and that Mr. Shubert will be called before the committee and asked to answer a great many questions concerning his monopoly in the capital city of Boston.

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL'S ELOQUENT TRIBUTE TO LINCOLN

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day speech by Mr. VURSELL.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an address seldom, if ever, equaled, paying tribute to Lincoln and showing that adherence to the principles enunciated by Lincoln will insure our national prosperity and security, was made by our colleague, the Honorable

CHARLES W. VURSELL, at Belleville, Ill., on February 9, 1956.

That address reads as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY CONGRESSMAN VURSELL AT LINCOLN DAY DINNER, FEBRUARY 9, BELLEVILLE, ILL.

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, we meet tonight to pay homage to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, which will, I know, renew our faith in the greatness of America. Lincoln's life and his impregnable faith are enduring monuments that must continue to serve as beacons of hope for us all.

Lincoln, the great leader and father of the Republican Party, met the challenge of his life in a way that has made us forever proud to say, "he walked among us."

Abraham Lincoln met the need of his time just as President Eisenhower today responds to the challenge to our safety and security. Lincoln and his party held a great Nation together by wisdom, faith and courage.

Tonight, for a moment, let us bring to mind some of our great statesmen, whose acts and lives have been an inspiration to millions of American citizens and early guideposts to the building of this great America:

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the immortal Declaration of Independence.

Gen. George Washington, and his troops fighting for the independence of this country at Valley Forge, and throughout the Revoluntary War. Then, to his inauguration as the first President of the United States, in which office he served the people for two terms, and went down in history as the Father of His Country.

Then, let us move on to the next greatest American of his time, Abraham Lincoln. The first President to serve under the new Republican Party, and whose memory we commemorate this evening. Of the many great deeds that immortalized Lincoln's name, was his saving the Union, as "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Since the era of Lincoln, our country in the past 40 years has gone through three tragic wars, and has been faced with the threat of world communism.

During this era there arose from humble birth, the greatest military leader in world history, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in whom later the people showed their confidence by electing him President of the United States, in 1952.

All public polls show that Eisenhower has united the thinking of the American people—and gained their affection—as no one has done since the days of Washington and Lincoln. He has attracted the people because of his ability, his sincerity, his integrity, his courage, and his spiritual leadership. He is now regarded as the world's leading statesman, in his continued effort for world peace.

There are some who believe that divine providence always has ready the right man to meet major crises which threaten the future of our country—founded on Christian principles.

He came to power as President at a time when there had been years of dissension—at a time when the people had lost much of their confidence in Government policies which were threatening the financial stability of our Nation.

History will doubtless associate his name, and contributions to America, along with those of Washington and Lincoln. Washington, the Father of His Country; Lincoln, who saved the Union; Eisenhower, who saved the United States from a dangerous economic crisis on the homefront, and stopped the advancement of world communism.

Now, my friends, on this occasion, it is always appropriate to discuss the policies of the Republican Party and make comparisons of its record with that of the opposing party. On these occasions being held throughout the Nation, commemorating the memory of Abraham Lincoln, who might be regarded as the "Father of the Republican Party," the people are given an opportunity to compare the two parties on their records. I shall attempt such a comparison tonight.

First, I want to point out some of the accomplishments of the past 3 years of the Eisenhower Republican administration—and compare them with 20 years of the constant control of this country by the Democratic Party.

What did we find when Eisenhower and the Republican Party came to power in January 1953?

We found a public debt of about $270 billion. A budget request prepared by President Truman for $76,800 million to defray the expenses of the first year of the Eisenhower administration. He said it was a tight budget, and could not be cut.

We also found $80 billion in debts had been contracted, which were coming due weekly, and monthly, and had to be paid. In addition, President Truman had spent $9,700 million more in his last year in office than he had collected in revenue—leaving a deficit which we had to pay.

We found $140 billion in Government bonds which had been sold to people over the past years were coming due in the first year of the Eisenhower administration, which had to be refinanced.

We found the people had lost confidence in their Government, to the extent that they cashed in $550 million more of their Government bonds in 1952 than the Government could sell back to the people—a dangerous situation.

Of greater importance, the Korean war, which had taken a terrible toll of American lives, and billions of dollars, was dragging along in a stalemate.

HOW WE MET THE CRISIS

Let me show you how the Eisenhower Republican administration met and solved every crisis.

EISENHOWER TO KOREA

Shortly after the election in November, Eisenhower went to Korea, as he said he would if elected, and made a careful study of the Korean situation, and conditions in the Far East. When he was later inaugurated as President, he served notice on Russia, China, and the world that his Government would not permit the Korean stalemate to continue—that something had to be done.

They recognized the great military ability of President Eisenhower. They knew he meant business, and that their day of bluff and appeasement was over.

Within a few weeks, Mr. Malik, then representing Communist Russia in the U. N., spoke up, urging an immediate move toward peace.

STOPPED THE WAR IN KOREA

We stopped the war in Korea, as the first great accomplishment of the Eisenhower Republican administration. Not one American soldier in the past 2½ years has lost his life on the battlefield.

We stopped the war that cost us over 157,000 American casualties. We stopped the war that the Truman-Atcheson administration got us into, and whose policies prevented our soldiers from winning.

Every American father and mother, and millions of our people throughout our land tonight are grateful for this great humanitarian service to the people of our Nation. Tonight we have peace and prosperity throughout the land. We no longer are dependent upon war. Our people now have a feeling of serenity, hope, and confidence in the future.

HOW WE MET THE CRISES ON THE HOMEFRONT

President Eisenhower persuaded some of the ablest businessmen in the Nation to come into Government service—to head some of the most important departments of Government. He knew that it would take the best brains in the Nation, some of the most successful businessmen in the country to reorganize and unscramble the overstaffed, inefficient departments of Government the New Deal political bureaucrats had been 20 years building up.

He knew it would take men of wide business experience, such as: Charlie Wilson, who now heads the Department of Defense, and George Humphrey, of Ohio, as Secretary of the Treasury, who has done the biggest and best job in that governmental department that has ever been rendered to the Nation. All of the other departments of Government have been staffed with the highest caliber of businessmen, who have dedicated their efforts to the service of our country.

EISENHOWER URGES ECONOMY

The first act of the President was to write the heads of each department, urging they economize to the limit. This they have done as no other group of administrators has done during my 14 years in the Congress.

Heretofore, the heads of the departments have often come to the Appropriations Committee with their requests padded—asking millions more than were needed. These new department heads now come before our Appropriations Committee, and state they want to cooperate fully with the committee. They ask for the least they feel is necessary in their departments, and make it known that it will be their purpose to spend the funds as economically as possible, in the hope they may have some balance left at the end of the year. I can say here and now, very truthfully, wasteful spending has come to an end in all departments of Government. This one act of the President, in securing men who will cooperate, is saving hundreds of millions of dollars each year for the taxpayers.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESS COOPERATES

We in the Congress realized drastic action must be taken to preserve the financial solvency of the Nation. In the first session of Congress we cut the proposed budget for the first year of the Eisenhower administration (which Truman said could not be cut), by about $14 billion.

Then, to keep our pledge to reduce taxes as early as possible, we continued the excess-profits tax for 6 months. We also continued the corporation tax at 52 percent for another year. We built up the Treasury to the point where for 1954 we were able to reduce taxes by $7,400,000,000—the greatest tax reduction ever voted by the Congress.

In addition to this, we revised the entire tax code, which had not been done in over half a century. We cut out inequalities. We provided tax relief in this revision for millions of smaller taxpayers, and for business.

In fact, we gave small business the green light of confidence throughout the Nation, and held out hope that big business would also find, in the revision, some benefits.

The business people of the Nation, little and big, recognized that the Republican Party opposes socialistic policies of Government, and that business, as well as all the people, had a friendly Government that intended to keep the avenues of opportunity open for all our citizens—from the most humble to the highest.

Two-thirds of this tax reduction of $7.4 billion went to the taxpayers in the lower brackets, and the larger part of the other one-third reduction went to the taxpayers in the medium brackets, and only a small part went to big business.

I point this out because the Democrat leaders, who had increased taxes for 20 years, and who had never reduced taxes, immediately falsely claimed that the Republicans' tax bill favored big business. They knew

then, and they know now, when they make such statements they are only attempting to deceive the people.

WE PREVENTED A DEPRESSION

We gave this tax reduction the 1st day of the 2d year of the Eisenhower administration, because we realized that in the transition of our Government from war to peace there was great danger of a recession, or depression, following.

We knew that the leaders of the Russian Government felt when the war was over that the United States would go into a depression that would enhance their opportunity to spread communism in America. Many leaders of European governments were also fearful this would happen.

And in the beginning of 1954, men began to lose their jobs, business began to slacken, and there were those in the Democrat Party, Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, particularly, who began to preach to the press, and to the Nation, that a depression was inevitable—that a recession was here. Others, for political purposes, took up the gloom and doom theme song at that time.

The Republican administration took the position that if we would allow the people to keep $7.4 billion, and not take it away from them in taxes, they would spend this $7.4 billion—much of it for things that people had to buy—but which first had to be made in the factories and foundries of the Nation. In other words, we increased the purchasing power of the American people by $7.4 billion in the belief that it would help us beat off the threat of depression until the transition from war to peace had been accomplished.

We were so right that while the first year, 1953, of the Eisenhower administration had proven to be the most prosperous administration in the history of our Nation, that recovery set in in 1954, which brought that year out as the second best peacetime year of prosperity the Nation had ever enjoyed.

BUSINESS EXPANSION

Our reduction of wasteful spending, of establishing sound business policies, building up the financial strength of the Treasury, following with a tax reduction, brought about an expansion of business in the beginning of 1955 which has given this Nation the greatest era of prosperity it has ever enjoyed.

We stopped inflation that had risen 13 percent under the last 3 years of the Truman administration, penalizing all wage earners, consumers, annuitants, and bondholders, by driving down the purchase power of the dollar to 50 cents.

During the past 3 years of the Eisenhower Republican administration, the general cost of living has not increased by even 1 percent. Food prices of all kinds, which make up a large part of the consumers' budget are lowest since 1950. The average cost of food is now 13 percent lower than it was in May 1955.

ITS EFFECT ON LABOR

Over 65 million laboring men have jobs at the highest wages ever known, and their take-home pay, by reason of our reduction of taxes, alone has been increased by over 10 percent. In addition, their take-home pay now buys 13 percent more food than they were able to get under the Truman administration, and their wages are the highest ever in the history of this Nation.

BUSINESS IS BOOMING

Throughout 1955 steel production, oil production, industrial production in every category have broken all past records. More houses have been built by veterans, and others, under the Eisenhower administration than ever before. Department stores sales have reached one peak after another. More people own automobiles than ever before. More radios, more television sets, and more electrical appliances have been made, and purchased, than in any years of our history. The people have bought, and are holding, more Government bonds than ever before. More food of every kind has been purchased by the people, and the leading economists predict that there will be a general level of prosperity prevailing throughout the entire year of 1956.

Our gross national product has risen from $345 billions in 1952 (under the Truman administration) to an annual rate running close to $400 billions; in other words, an increase in our annual output of almost $55 billions in the last 3 years under the Eisenhower administration.

If further proof is needed, our citizens have bought, and are now holding $1,929,000,000 more E and H savings bonds than they held in the last year of the Truman administration. They have bought many billions more of all other series of Government bonds—a tribute to the confidence of the Eisenhower Republican administration. All of this has been accomplished in an era of peace.

Fewer young men have been drafted into the service. Everything is booming but the guns; in fact, the people have never had it so good.

Regardless of the sharp criticism and false claims of the Democrat leaders, who were thrown out of power in 1952 because they failed the people, the average American knows that the Republican Party has given them what the great majority want—peace and prosperity.

Knowing this, they will vote to continue 4 more years of the sound policies of the Eisenhower Republican administration.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Adlai Stevenson and his party leaders, in 1952, told the people our promises to reduce taxes could not be kept. Of course, if his party had been successful, taxes would not have been reduced. We stopped wasteful spending, adopted business principles, and gave the people a tax reduction of $7.4 billion—the largest in history.

Adlai Stevenson, their candidate, told the people our promises to balance the budget were false, and this could not be done. Of course, if he had been elected, inflation would have continued, and the budget would not have been balanced.

He was wrong again. We will balance the budget this coming June, and have a surplus left over, of several hundred million dollars, that can be applied to reducing the national debt—or to give the people another tax reduction.

The Democrats told you that another Hoover depression would follow—if Eisenhower and a Republican Congress were elected—and there would be a return to the soup and bread lines. They were wrong again.

The boundless prosperity, with over 65 million people employed, refutes that statement. The Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, and President Eisenhower, in a recent statement said that we would not only balance the budget in June 1956, but we would balance the budget again in June 1957.

THE FARM PROBLEM

Most well-informed farmers know that the present low farm prices in some categories are the direct result of the laws passed under the past Democrat administrations which had been effective up to the 1955 crop season. They know that the mountain of surplus farm products sold to the Government, of over $8 billion, overhanging and depressing the farmers' market has driven his prices down.

For example, the Government-owned or controlled 2 billion bushels of wheat before we began to harvest last year's wheat crop of 860 million bushels. The same applies to cotton and to a lesser extent to corn, which overhangs the market and has naturally depressed farm prices.

Most farmers know that in 1952, under the last year of the Truman administration, all hog prices for the year averaged $17.80 a hundredweight, and that throughout 1953, under the Republican administration, they averaged $21.59 a hundredweight, and that in 1954 they averaged $21.60 a hundredweight—both years much higher than in the last two years of the Truman administration.

Farmers know that the big drop in hog prices last October, to a low of $12 per hundredweight, was due to the great increase of the last three pig crops by 12 percent over normal; that the market was broken when 34 percent more hogs came on the market in the third week of October 1955 than had come to the market on the same week in October 1954. The facts are that hogs had been so profitable during all of 1953 and 1954 that the farmers increased the hog crop to where the surplus was so great that it glutted the market, and wrecked prices.

I am happy to note that due to the pork purchase program of Secretary Benson, and due to the reduction of the last pig crop, that the price of hogs has recovered rapidly to over $15 a hundredweight.

REMOVING SURPLUSES

The Eisenhower administration knows that farm surpluses must be disposed of before the farmers can fully share in our prosperity. During the 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, we have disposed of over $4 billion of farm surpluses owned by the Government. We have made such an effort to regain our export markets that in the same time our exports have totaled over $4½ billion. Exports during each of the 3 years of the Eisenhower administration have been increased, and we will continue to increase our exports this year.

With the nine-point farm program the President has recommended, including the soil bank program, added to what we have already done to remove the cause of low farm prices, we feel certain that the farmers will soon share fully in the boundless prosperity of our country. We will continue to exert every effort to that end.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Recently, some Democrat Party leaders sought to gain political advantage by criticizing the statement of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles over a news article in a popular magazine quoting him as saying in substance: three times we have been at the brink of war under the Eisenhower administration, and maintained peace by our strong policy which served notice on China and Russia not to miscalculate our position. He wanted the Communists to know if they started to grab more territory they would have war with Uncle Sam. He afterward answered such criticism that one had to take such a calculated risk to prevent war.

The great majority of our citizens applaud President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles for taking this strong position. Basically, it is the same policy that Teddy Roosevelt took, and prevented war. His policy was "speak softly but carry a big stick," and the bigger the bully, the firmer we should be—and the bigger the stick we should carry. This is a proud American policy, too long neglected, that will help prevent war, and maintain peace.

NO MORE APPEASEMENT

Contrast this statement, and its results, with the past blunder of the Truman-Atcheson administration, when a few months before the Korean war, Secretary of State Dean Atcheson declared to the world that Korea was outside of our perimeter of defense in the Far East—meaning we did not intend to defend South Korea if she were attacked.

In addition, they pulled our troops out of South Korea, and most of them from Japan. In fact, this the Communists regarded as an invitation to China and North Korea to gobble up South Korea. They promptly moved in, and when the North Korean Communists crossed the line, with strong military forces, Truman and Atcheson switched their policy, and put this country into war overnight.

A few American soldiers, including General Dean, left in South Korea without sufficient arms, joined the South Korean forces in an attempt to hold back the invaders. It was then that American soldiers tried to stop the Communists' tanks from the north with only machineguns and a few bazookas. Many of them were slaughtered before General MacArthur could move in reinforcements from Japan. Through the terrible months following, thousands of our soldiers lost their lives and were about to be driven into the sea when, through their valor, with the help of the South Koreans, this terrible tragedy was prevented.

THE BRINK OF WAR

Talk about Dulles' statement of being at the brink of war, and preventing it. The Democrat administrations, during the last 40 years, not only led us to the brink of war three times, but over the precipice into World War I, which took the lives of 50,000 American men, and more wounded; then, into World War II, which cost the lives of 300,000 soldiers, and a million Americans wounded; then, after the blunder of Truman and Atcheson, in which Secretary of State Atcheson said, "we will let the dust settle. Korea is outside our perimeter of defense," they plunged us into the Korean war overnight that took the lives of over 54,000 soldiers, with 103,000 wounded.

President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and the American people know that Russia respects nothing but force. They know that in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war that we were drawn into all of them because of our weak appeasement policies, which led other nations to believe they could start these wars, and the United States would remain out of them.

This appeasement policy led the Kaiser to believe, in 1914, that we would not enter the war. This appeasement also led Hitler and Mussolini to believe, in 1939, they could take over Western Europe, and we would not enter the conflict.

Had Truman and Atcheson issued such a policy as Eisenhower and Dulles have issued, clearly warning the Communists in advance that we would fight to repel aggression in Korea, the chances are great that the Korean war, that took the lives of 54,000 Americans, would have been avoided.

Russia, China, and the Communist world now know not to make that mistake again, and they will doubtless not make it, because they know they could not win.

OUR MILITARY STRENGTH

Since President Eisenhower was elected, we have built up the strongest military force in the world—not for war, but to prevent war—and continue our efforts for world peace. Our military machine has been modernized to make the greatest use of newly developed atomic weapons, and of long and short range missiles.

RUSSIA SURROUNDED

We have Russia surrounded today by a hundred airbases on the west, reaching from Norway down through England, France, Spain, across North Africa into Turkey, Greece, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan. In addition, we have our great Mediterranean fleet all ready, poised on her south, which contains many great flattop aircraft carriers from which our planes can take off—100 from each deck every hour—and rain atomic bombs on the war industries of Russia within from 1 to 3½ hours flying time.

We have our Pacific fleet ready for action north of Japan with flattop carriers, and planes ready to strike eastern Russia and China with bombs. We have airbases in Japan, Formosa, Okinawa, and the Philippines that can rain bombs on the Communist enemy in eastern Asia within 1 to 4 hours flying time.

Our military buildup under President Eisenhower, and our foreign policy have worked so well that we have stopped Russia and China. We have so far deterred them from starting another war, to the point where the best military authorities predict continued peace. Continued peace because Russia knows that if she and China start another war, we have the power to destroy their industries, and their power to successfully wage war.

In conclusion may I say that time has permitted me to only touch upon a few of the many great accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration, which has brought to all of our people 3 years of expanding business, full employment, a bountiful prosperity, and peace.

Corruption and Communists have been eradicated from government. Honesty and efficiency has again been installed. Confidence in the future has been firmly established under the leadership of our great President, who has again brought dignity to the White House, and has gained the respect and the confidence of our people and the leaders of the free nations of the world.

This is what the American people voted for in 1952. They will not allow these greatly improved conditions to be taken away from them by the Trumans, the Harrimans, the Kefauvers, the Stevensons—who offer the people nothing but a return to the wasteful spending, scandals, mismanagement, inflation, and governmental chaos they stopped in 1952 by the election of Eisenhower and a Republican Congress.

While we hope and pray that the President's health will continue to improve to the point where the people can have his great leadership another term, if perchance he decides he must retire, the people know that for their own good they must have 4 more years of the Eisenhower Republican policies, and will elect a Republican nominee for President who has his support, and a Republican Congress. They will vote to help continue his program—he so nobly began.

INVESTIGATION OF THE FEDERAL AIRPORT AID PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, today I have requested an investigation of the Federal airport aid program. This request is contained in a letter addressed to the Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives, which I will insert in full in my remarks.

I might point out that the Government Operations Committee of the House has the duty under the rules of the House of Representatives of studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and its efficiency.

In its rules the Government Operations Committee of the House created various standing subcommittees, one of which is the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs. That subcommittee has investigative jurisdiction over several departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government, among them the Department of Commerce. In the Department of Commerce is the Civil Aeronautics Administration which is the agency through which the program for Federal aid to airports is carried out.

My interest in this subject has developed largely because of a rather violent controversy between two airports in the Detroit metropolitan area. One of those airports, Willow Run, is the terminal for scheduled commercial airlines serving the Detroit area. The airfield itself does not happen to be in my congressional district, but the terminal for the airport is in my district, the county line running between the terminal and the airfield.

Willow Run Airport was built in conjunction with the Willow Run bomber plant constructed during the early years of the war by the Ford Motor Co. for the purpose of building B–24 bombers. That plant—and that field from which thousands of large bombers were flown—served admirably during World War II and provided weapons which enabled the United States and it allies to be victorious.

I was told by the Ford Motor Co. representative in charge of the airport that when Willow Run was built it was the finest airport in the United States.

The commercial airlines before and during World War II used the Detroit City Airport at Gratiot and Six Mile Road in the city of Detroit as their terminal. But when the airlines began their tremendous postwar expansion immediately after World War II and commenced to use four-engine craft, the Detroit City Airport became inadequate, partly because of a huge gas tank located on the airport, and partly because of the limited length of the runways. The airlines had nowhere to go.

But here was this beautiful Willow Run airport, a war casualty, which became surplus after World War II, having served its military purpose. An arrangement was worked out whereby that surplus airport was deeded to a public body, the regents of the University of Michigan, a body corporate of the State of Michigan, with the provision that it be maintained as a public airport.

The university was interested in the airport because it had important research contracts, mostly for the Defense Department, and used some of the buildings on the airport and some of the space of the airport for its research activities. The university, however, was not in a position to go into the airport business as such, and, in turn, made an arrangement with a corporation formed by the airlines to maintain and operate the airport.

For 10 years now Willow Run Airport has served satisfactorily as the terminal

for the Detroit area. It has done so at practically no public expense and although it is the sixth busiest airport in the country in terms of volume of traffic handled, it has never had an accident.

Now, about six air miles away from the Willow Run Airport there is another airport called the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. After the war the Wayne County Road Commission, which owns that airport, and its engineer, Leroy C. Smith, began a gigantic expansion program at Wayne Major. They have poured into that airport some $13 million of Wayne County-State of Michigan funds and they have poured into it in excess of $4 million of Federal Airport aid funds which is 52 percent of all the Federal airport aid money that went to the State of Michigan in the 10-year period from 1946 to 1956. I have no doubt but what Leroy Smith is a competent highway engineer, but I am equally as convinced that he knows little about airport engineering.

Willow Run was a large existing airport in 1946 and it was the Detroit terminal. Does it make sense, then, to commence a new major airport only 5 or 6 air miles away from another airport and in the same traffic pattern? I say it does not take an expert to realize that the erection of two major airports in the same air traffic pattern is just a waste of money and does not make sense for future airport planning.

Mr. Smith, who is quite an able politician and has been active in Detroit and Wayne County for many years, was able to persuade the Detroit City Council, the Wayne County Board of Supervisors, and the Wayne County Road Commission to designate Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as the official terminal for the city of Detroit.

The lobbyist for the Wayne County Road Commission, John P. McElroy, is a member of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission. Smith and McElroy were able to persuade the Michigan Aeronautics Commission to designate Wayne Major airport as the so-called official terminal for the city of Detroit.

Armed with those resolutions and those commitments from Michigan bodies, they came to Washington and persuaded the Civil Aeronautics Administration also to recognize this airport which was being built up right next to an existing airport, as the official terminal for the city of Detroit. That is the reason why this $4 million of airport money has been poured into that airport within the last 10 years.

Now, just about 2 weeks ago, in the allocation under the 1956 appropriation for airport aid money, Wayne Major was granted an additional $975,000 from funds for this fiscal year. And, I might say that I was told by the Civil Aeronautics Administration officials that they arbitrarily set a ceiling of $1 million for any one airport, so Wayne Major got almost the ceiling.

This means what? It means that the Civil Aeronautics Administration has committed itself to a further huge expansion program which is estimated to run in the neighborhood of $30 million to $32 million, and when they get through they still will have just one airport.

That seems to me a foolish and unconscionable waste of public funds, and I believe it ought to be investigated. And, if the decision made by the Civil Aeronautics Administration with respect to this airport program is typical of its decisions nationwide, I say it is high time that the Congress knew about it.

It is particularly important, in my judgment, that the airport aid program be investigated by a congressional committee, because only last year we practically took Congress out of the airport picture.

I might say parenthetically that I am getting awfully tired of having Congress abdicate its policymaking authority and turning everything over to the executive branch of the Government.

We passed Public Law 211 last summer which for a period of 4 years commits the sum of about a quarter of a billion dollars for airport aid throughout the country. But the law went beyond that. It departed from our usual practice of authorizing year by year and authorized the program for a 4-year period. But, even beyond that, it practically committed the Congress to appropriate the funds to that extent and leaves very little discretion in the Committee on Appropriations or in the Congress itself. So, we are faced with this proposition—no matter how we may like whatever pattern of airports the Civil Aeronautics Administration decides it wants in the United States, we here in the Congress are powerless to object to it or to have any influence or control over what happens.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in my remarks a letter I have written to the chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am a member, and I also should like to insert following that a brief summary of the press release I issued in requesting an investigation of the airport aid program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1956.

The Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN,
Chairman, Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Government Operations Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you know, Public Law 211 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, vested vast authority in the Secretary of Commerce, to be exercised through the Civil Aeronautics Administrator, over the future pattern of airport construction in the United States.

That measure was an unusual departure from traditional procedure because it provided authorization for a period of 4 years rather than 1, and committed a total of a quarter of a billion dollars of Federal funds for airport aid, to be matched, of course, by an equal amount of State and local funds.

Another unusual feature of that act is that for all practical purposes the Congress, for that 4-year period, divested itself of any power over the airport-aid program. The law, in effect, bound the Appropriations Committees, and the Congress itself, to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to discharge the obligations of the Federal Government arising from grant agreements made by the Civil Aeronautics Administrator.

The rules of the House of Representatives impose on the Government Operations Committee "the duty of—studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency." The House Government Operations Committee in its rules delegated that authority with respect to the Commerce Department to the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of which you are the chairman.

I urge the subcommittee to undertake immediately a broad and comprehensive investigation of the Federal airport-aid program.

In support of this request I cite what appears to be an unconscionable waste of public funds in the grants heretofore made and those projected for the future to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport located near Romulus, Mich.

Until the end of World War II the scheduled commercial airlines used the Detroit City Airport at Gratiot and Six Mile Roads in the city of Detroit as their terminal. When commercial aviation in its big postwar growth began to use four-engine aircraft, Detroit City Airport became inadequate and an alternate terminal for the scheduled airlines was needed immediately.

They turned to Willow Run Airport, located near Ypsilanti, Mich., built during World War II in connection with the Ford Motor Co. bomber plant and used to fly off thousands of B–24 bombers. After the war the airport was declared surplus and an arrangement was worked out whereby Willow Run Airport was deeded to the University of Michigan with the proviso that it be maintained as a public airport. The university utilized a portion of the property for important research work, mostly for the Department of Defense, and leased to a corporation formed by the airlines the space needed for scheduled commercial flight operations.

For 10 years Willow Run has satisfactorily served as the air terminal for the Detroit metropolitan area at almost no public expense. It is the sixth busiest airport in the country and has never had an accident.

Meanwhile, the Wayne County Road Commission and its engineer, Leroy C. Smith, undertook a gigantic expansion program at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. Additional land was purchased or condemned. Roads were closed. Runways and other necessary aviation facilities were constructed. A total of $13 million of Wayne County and State of Michigan funds was poured into the project, and $4,035,858 of Federal airport aid money, 52 percent of the total received by the State of Michigan, was spent on this expansion program between 1946 and 1956.

The Wayne County Road Commission, its engineer, Leroy C. Smith, and its lobbyist, John P. McElroy, have conducted a relentless campaign to coerce the scheduled commercial airlines to transfer their operations from Willow Run Airport to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. They obtained resolutions from the Detroit City Council, Wayne County Board of Supervisors, Wayne County Road Commission, and the Michigan Aeronautics Commission, of which lobbyist McElroy is a member, approving Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as the commercial air terminal for the Detroit area. Thus armed, they secured the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Administration as represented by the allocation of Federal airport aid funds. In 1955, they urged the Department of Defense to locate military jet-training operations of the Navy, the Air Force, and the Michigan Air National Guard at Willow Run Airport after refusing a request by the Navy Department to locate Navy Reserve jet-training operations at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

They did this with the purpose and intent of making the airlines so uncomfortable at Willow Run that they would be forced to move to Detroit-Wayne Major. As a result of those efforts the Air Coordinating Committee ordered its airport use panel to hold public hearings and make recommendations concerning the best interests of the public, the most feasible civil-military utilization of the airports, existing and proposed, in the Detroit area.

June 22–23, 1955, the airport-use panel held public hearings in the city of Detroit and November 4, 1955, issued a report recommending in substance that Willow Run be used for military purposes and that Detroit-Wayne Major be used as the commercial air terminal for the Detroit area. Curiously, the report of the airport-use panel completely disregarded questions of cost and expressly ignored the problem of air space congestion, the two most important factors in determining the proper use of airports in the area.

Subsequently, the airlines in discussion with officials of Wayne Major Airport learned that it would cost from $28 million to $32 million more to complete the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport so as to accommodate present air traffic.

Detroit-Wayne Major and Willow Run Airports are only 6 air miles apart from border to border and 8 air miles apart from center to center. They have a common air traffic pattern. In instrument flying weather, takeoffs and landings at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport are controlled from the Willow Run tower. Jean Pearson, the Detroit Free Press aviation writer, who has written a very illuminating series of articles on Detroit's airport problems, very aptly stated: "On the ground you have two large airports—Willow Run and Detroit-Wayne Major. In the air you have only one."

It does not require technical or expert knowledge to conclude that someone blundered badly in attempting to develop a major airport right next to an already existing major airport, both of which would necessarily use the same traffic pattern.

December 28, 1955, six of the seven major airlines now using the Willow Run Airport as their terminal for the Detroit metropolitan area announced "once and for all" that they had no intention of removing operations from Willow Run and transferring them to Detroit-Wayne Major. They indicated that they believed another airport would be needed for the Detroit metropolitan area but that it should be located in a different traffic pattern from Willow Run, and they condemned the Detroit-Wayne Major expansion program as a waste of money, a substantial part of which the airlines themselves would be expected to provide.

February 9, 1956, the Civil Aeronautics Administration announced the allocation of Federal airport-aid funds for fiscal year 1956, and $975,000 was allocated to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. The request of Willow Run Airport for $86,500 was denied in its entirety.

It is my suggestion that the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee explore the administration of the airport-aid program by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in its entirety, taking as an example the present and prospective expenditure of Federal funds at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, with a view to determining whether or not those moneys are being expended efficiently and economically in the interest of civil aviation and its future development in the United States.

Because of my intense interest in this subject over the past year, I have accumulated an immense amount of material, all of which is placed at the disposal of the subcommittee to facilitate its inquiry.

Because of the importance of civil aviation to our national economy, I hope the subcommittee will give top priority to this inquiry.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

PRESS RELEASE OF FEBRUARY 23, 1956

Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, Michigan, today called for a full-scale inquiry into the Federal Airport Aid program and termed "an unconscionable waste of public funds" Federal grants to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport at Romulus, Mich.

The Detroit-Wayne County port is located 6 air miles from Willow Run Airport, Detroit's commercial air terminal, and has been developed since the end of World War II. It currently serves one scheduled air carrier, elements of the Michigan Air National Guard, air cargo carriers, and scores of light and executive-type aircraft.

MEADER requested the inquiry into Federal airport aid in a letter to Representative ROBERT MOLLOHAN, Democrat, West Virginia, chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee.

MEADER, himself, is a member of that subpanel which is charged with keeping tabs on expenditures in the Department of Commerce, which through its Civil Aeronautics Administration, administers the Federal Airport Aid Act.

The Michigan lawmaker noted that the current airport aid act "was an unusual departure from traditional procedure because it provided authorization for a period of 4 years rather than 1 and committed a total of a quarter of a billion dollars of Federal funds for airport aid over the next 4 fiscal years. It also commits Congress to appropriate funds for that period."

In a speech to the House of Representatives MEADER declared: "That unusual authority granted the Civil Aeronautics Administrator makes it even more imperative that Congress maintain its check on how that money is spent."

MEADER called attention to the post-war growth of civil and military aviation and its future role in the American economy.

He also called attention to the early post-war need of commercial airlines for a larger airport in the Detroit area and how Willow Run Airport, owned by the University of Michigan, has served safely for 10 years as the motor city's air terminal at almost no expense to taxpayers.

MEADER declared: "Despite repeated assurances by the airlines that they would not move to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, Detroit and Wayne County officials went ahead in frenzied fashion to build another huge airport at public expense on top of one which already exists.

"The Civil Aeronautics Administration gave tacit approval to that waste of public money by continually allocating taxpayer money to a white elephant which rather than ease the congested air traffic situation in the Detroit area actually has complicated it."

MEADER quoted a recent Detroit newspaper story which noted: "On the ground you have two large airports—Willow Run and Detroit-Wayne Major. In the air you have only one."

Some aviation authorities, including airlines, have called for still another Detroit airport to be located somewhere north of the city.

MEADER said he agreed adding: "Both Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and Willow Run for all practical purposes are but one airport now. Another airport for Detroit must be located somewhere outside the overly congested traffic pattern which already exists."

He asserted: "It does not require technical or expert knowledge to conclude that someone blundered badly in attempting to develop a major airport right next to an already existing major airport, both of which would necessarily use the same traffic pattern."

Some sources estimate that from $28 million to $32 million still is required of Federal, State, local, and airline money to make Detroit-Wayne Major Airport suitable for full-scale commercial operation.

MEADER also described as "military dominated" a Federal airport use panel which last June held "public hearings" in Detroit, ostensibly to settle the issue.

The panel last November recommended an airlines' switch to Detroit-Wayne Major with concentration of Reserve military flight activity at Willow Run Airport.

MEADER condemned as a "sham" the hearings charging the panel "knew what it was going to recommend before it ever went to Detroit."

He called its report a "fraud and declared: "Curiously, the report of the panel completely disregarded questions of cost and expressly ignored the problem of air space congestion, the two most important factors in determining the proper use of airports in the area."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned with this problem over a period of time. It is about a year since this matter first was brought to my attention, and I have made a number of speeches in connection with it on the floor of the House.

I have appeared before committees of the House and testified. I have introduced bills. I prepared a list of the references in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the airport matter and the bills to which I have referred. I ask unanimous consent to insert that list at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LIST OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD REFERENCES AND BILLS RELATING TO WILLOW RUN AIRPORT PROBLEM

March 31, 1955, volume 101, part 3, pages 4132–4137: Military jets at Willow Run Airport, the Nation's sixth busiest.

April 13, 1955, volume 101, part 4, pages 4388–4392: Military jets at Willow Run Airport, the Nation's sixth busiest.

April 21, 1955, daily Appendix, page A2635: Extension of remarks; Willow Run no proper place for jets. (Ann Arbor News editorial.)

April 27, 1955, volume 101, part 4, pages 5158–5167: Amending the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

May 4, 1955, H. R. 6026: Minimizing interferences—amending National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

June 1, 1955, daily Appendix, page A3793: Attempt to move airline appears blocked for present. (Ann Arbor News editorial.)

June 6, 1955, H. R. 6650: Minimizing interferences—Secretary of Defense.

July 18, 1955, volume 101, part 8, page 10804: Airport aid formula (Public Law 211), interference—MEADER and BENNETT.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, just this month, commencing on February 3, 1956, a Detroit Free Press aviation writer, Jean Pearson, commenced a series of 13 articles in that paper discussing all aspects of the Detroit aviation problem. I have read those articles and I am impressed with the thorough and dispassionate approach of the author of those articles. I think they are very readable and set forth clearly the problem which faces the Detroit metropolitan area with respect to airports.

At this point in my remarks Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate that series of articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 3, 1956]

WILL AIR AGE LEAVE CITY BEHIND?—TRAFFIC ALREADY CONGESTED IN WAYNE-WILLOW HUB

(By Jean Pearson)

Metropolitan Detroit will have a population close to 4 million by July 1960.

Today it's estimated at 3,515,000.

Among the 22 large hubs of air traffic, Detroit now rates sixth in the continental United States.

At present there are 386 scheduled airline flight operations daily at Willow Run Airport.

An estimated 3,100,000 air passengers will arrive or depart on planes in the Detroit area in 1960.

This is well over 1 million more passengers than arrived or departed on planes here in 1955.

By 1965, the number will be close to 4 million passengers.

This is only the air passenger picture.

As one of the largest industrial centers in the world, Detroit has a heavy air cargo business.

Many industries have found it's cheaper to hire a cargoliner to fly parts to an assembly plant in another part of the country than to close down the plant until parts arrive by surface transportation.

It is routine to airship parts manufactured at night in Detroit for use in the morning shift of assembly plants in the South and East.

What does this all add up to?

Trouble—trouble if Detroiters do not take a personal interest in what is being done to meet aviation's future needs and how their money is being spent.

For all intents and purposes—and the millions of public funds spent—Detroit is still just a one-airport town for airline service.

Whether the airlines operate at Willow Run or Detroit-Wayne Major is beside the point.

The reason is obvious. Wayne Major and Willow Run are only 8 air-miles apart and the air traffic above them must be considered as one major air traffic hub.

Yet the traffic generated by them already exceeds the amount the Civil Aeronautics Administration (CAA) considers congested for navigation aids now in operation.

By standards set up by the CAA (published in "The Federal-Aid Airport Program, Policies and Procedures" in October 1955), Detroit should be headed straight for the construction of a second airport far removed from the Wayne Major-Willow Run air traffic hub.

"With present technical know-how," the report says, "an airport with 100,000 or more air carrier operations annually has reached or is approaching the limit of efficient IFR (instrument flight rules) operational capacity.

"A community, therefore, has a potential need for two airports for air commerce when it has 100,000 or more air carrier operations."

Willow Run had over 141,000 operations annually. An "operation" is either a landing or take-off.

Add the more than 70,000 operations now recorded annually at Wayne Major and you have the answer.

You also have the answer to two questions that frequently puzzle Detroiters:

1. Why do the airlines insist the 28 million-plus it would cost to make Wayne Major a commercial airport would be better spent developing an airport north of the city?

2. Why is it claimed development of a Northeast airport should be given No. 1 priority over spending 28 millions to save the 12 to 15 minutes driving time between Wayne Major and Willow Run?

Airport development time is a prime factor.

Optimistically, if construction could begin immediately on the Northeast site, it would be 3 to 5 years before the airport would be ready to receive the airlines.

Pessimistically, if the legal suits blocking expansion of the 74-acre site already owned by the city are dragged out, it would take a good deal longer.

Recently, a spokesman for the airlines said they would begin dual operation at Willow Run and a Northeast port as soon as it was ready.

He urged development of a new airport as soon as possible to handle the rapidly developing air traffic.

But even if the land condemnation suits for the Northeast airport were settled today, construction with Federal, State, or county aid couldn't begin until 1960.

It couldn't simply because backers of Wayne Major development are planning to use all available aid exclusively at Wayne Major until 1960.

For 25 years LeRoy Smith, county highway engineer, has been determined to develop Wayne Major as Detroit's air terminal.

When he began, the development was needed.

But though millions were poured into it, development, for reasons beyond Smith's control, did not keep up with the need.

In 1946, when the airlines were looking for an airport capable of handling their new four-engine planes, they seriously considered Wayne Major.

But it would have been 2 years before it could take on full airline operation.

Nearby Willow Run, however, not only had four runways over a mile long, but the airlines could begin operations there almost immediately.

When the airlines moved to Willow Run, they made it clear that they would not move again until some airport nearer to the population center of Detroit than either Willow Run or Wayne Major became available.

Robert Averill, spokesman for the airlines at that time, said Willow Run was considered only on an interim basis.

At that time the city was considering a northwest site.

Despite the airline's move and clear stand on the matter, nearly $10 million has been poured into Wayne Major since 1946.

The airlines attempted to discourage what they considered unwise use of Federal funds at Wayne Major in 1949.

At that time the city was trying for an international airport at Windsor.

Milton W. Arnold, vice president of the Air Transport Association, told the CAA the airlines believed the international airport merited consideration.

Was the public ever consulted?

Yes, once.

In 1946 the public was asked to approve a $5 million bond issue for Wayne Major. It was turned down.

Still, half a million dollars in county taxes are funneled annually to Wayne Major. The funds don't have to be voted.

Some people believe there has been mutual back scratching by the city and county.

Twenty-five percent of the cost of expressways within the city is paid by the county. The city wants expressways.

The city has backed development of Wayne Major, operated by the county road commission, and common council has designated it Detroit's principal air terminal.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 4, 1956]

WHAT HAPPENED TO WINDSOR SITE FOR AIRPORT?

(By Jean Pearson)

"Whatever happened," someone always asks when you are talking about Detroit's aviation situation, "to that big airport they were going to build in Windsor?"

Equally good questions would be:

Whatever happened to the northwest sites? To the one at Eight Mile and Dequindre? To the one off St. Clair shores?

Detroit, apparently, has done more dickering than doing in getting a centrally located airport.

Experts have been hired. And experts have given their services free. Study groups, committees, commissions, and authorities have been formed.

Outsiders have been invited in to study the situation and make recommendations. Insiders, with more knowledge of the local situation, have made studies and recommendations.

Unfortunately, too few of the plans and suggestions offered are, or have been, free of political interests of pressures.

More unfortunately, the ultimate users of the airport, the public and the airlines, too seldom have been consulted.

For a while, it looked as though the ideal answer had been found—the international site in Windsor.

Obstacles which would have taken some time to overcome (but which might have been cleared away long before now) and some opposition, both overt and subtle, defeated it.

Approximately 10 years ago, an international site was suggested, but received little consideration. Common council, eyeing several possibilities, turned it down.

When the airlines moved to Willow Run as an interim airport until one more centrally located and nearer to the population center than either Willow Run or Wayne Major was available, they went on record as still preferring a northwest site.

Several northwest sites had been considered. They were blocked by self-interested citizens in the area.

So, about 1948, interest shifted back to the possibility of an international site.

A Detroit metropolitan aviation authority was formed and charged with developing a master airport plan for the metropolitan area.

After a thorough study, the authority's master plan finally came out in 1949.

Twice the Wayne County Road Commission attempted to block publication of the report which recommended immediate action on obtaining the international site and relegated Wayne Major primarily to an air cargo terminal.

LeRoy Smith, county highway engineer, who has never deviated from his desire to make Wayne Major the principal air passenger terminal in Detroit, contended the report would only lead to public confusion.

The authority's staff, however, said:

1. Development of Wayne Major would cost more than twice the estimated $7 million to make it into a major port. (Latest estimate is more than $28 million.)

2. Wayne Major was too far from Detroit and there was no indication that the airlines would move to Wayne Major if it was developed.

Except for Smith and Glenn C. Richards, chairman of the authority and DPW commissioner, who has spearheaded the drive for development of Wayne Major, the authority's report received wide acceptance.

(Richards and Smith are now spearheading a drive for the establishment of a new metropolitan aviation authority.)

Detroit's Mayor Eugene I. Van Antwerp had backed the border port. Windsor pledged full cooperation. Common council supported it. Governor Williams endorsed it. The airlines were unanimous in their approval.

Even the public seemed to like the idea.

It was less than 5 miles from downtown. It was centrally located, so it could serve both sides of metropolitan Detroit equally well.

Finally, it was expected to be less than 15 minutes' driving time from Detroit.

Attorney General Stephen J. Roth ruled that establishment of an international airport would not require a Michigan constitutional amendment.

Roth added, however, that the project would require approval of the United States and Canadian Governments.

Then it was discovered that a Federal ruling would prevent financial aid.

But after investigation it was determined that legislation could be put through Congress that would make financial aid possible. It would be, however, a matter of 2 or 3 years.

In Washington, Paul Stafford, Assistant Administrator of the Office of Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration, said the CAA favored the site and would support necessary legislation.

Stafford warned, however:

"If there is no major opposition to the project, the legislation for Federal aid and the agreement with Canada might be completed in 2 or 3 years. It would then require another 2 or 3 years for construction.

"If some opposition develops locally it could cause delays before Congress and the project might take much longer."

Two politically powerful men were known to be opposed to the Windsor site. They wanted development of Wayne Major.

Some efforts were made to sound out the Canadian Government. There seemed to be a lot of technical difficulties.

Who, for example, would have the ultimate authority in policing the international airport area?

Would Americans who were flying from one place in the United States to another place in the United States be involuntarily placed under Canadian law if their plane landed in Windsor?

Another complicating factor was that Trans-Canada Airlines, a Government-controlled airline, was happy to welcome the United States airlines—providing they would use and expand the Walkerville Airport.

That was not what the Americans had in mind. Slowly the bright dream faded.

On January 26, 1951, it disappeared.

Common Council, expressing "complete disappointment" at lack of progress, ordered that plans for a major airport in Warren Township be prepared immediately.

The plans were prepared.

A 74-acre center for expansion was acquired.

A $3 million bond issue for purchase of land has been authorized.

The airlines have said they will not move to Wayne Major but will have flights out of both Willow Run and the Northeast site as soon as the latter is ready.

Thursday, a jury turned down Warren Township's move to reclaim the Northeast site as a recreation area. But more legal steps remain.

Presumably, its full steam ahead now for the Northeast site.

But there are many past experiences to remember—and there's also the fact that if Wayne Major remains a No. 1 priority airport there may not be the funds needed to develop the Northeast site.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 5, 1956]

YOUR STAKE IN THE AIRPORT FIGHT—CHANCES 4 TO 1 NORTH SITE WILL BE TO YOUR ADVANTAGE

(By Jean Pearson)

Mayor Cobo never fails to stress the need for an airport to the north of the city when discussing future aviation needs of metropolitan Detroit.

Anyone with a population density chart of the area and simple compass can tell why.

Flint, which is the third largest city in the State, and one of the fastest growing, could be serviced by the northeast airport.

So could Bay City and Saginaw.

More important, so could the burgeoning industrial and residential areas of Macomb and Oakland Counties, which are expected to double in population by 1961.

But for the most obvious reason, take your population density chart, and compass, and start drawing circles.

With Detroit Wayne-Major Airport as a center, draw circles with a 5 mile, 7½, 10, and 12½ radii.

Do the same with the proposed Northeast Airport boundaries (Ryan, DeQuindre, 12- and 14-Mile Roads), as a center.

What do you have? Graphically, the answer is printed in the chart next to this column. The source is the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission.

First of all, you find that no matter what radius you compare—the 5, 7½, 10, or 12½—Northeast Airport would serve more than twice the population that Wayne-Major could.

It is because of this population pull that the airlines would consider scheduling flights at both airports, as they do now in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Though they dislike split operations, because of the added cost and inconvenience to them, they know there is a big untapped customer potential on Detroit's northside.

By operating at both airports, they say, they would be giving more people service.

Secondly, that by the time you get to the 12½-mile radius, the ratio is almost 4 to 1. At the 12½-mile radius, Northeast would serve a population of 2,204,920, compared to only 615,350 by Wayne Major.

Thirdly, downtown Detroit is within 12½ miles of the Northeast site. Wayne Major is well beyond that limit.

Well, you can say, all true. But there isn't any expressway running to the Northeast site. Couldn't one be built?

Not only has Mayor Cobo reiterated the importance of the Northeast development, but the city already has cleared one legal barricade to expansion of the 74-acre airport Detroit already owns there.

If the city gets a legal green light, can it go ahead?

Not for a number of years, if more than $28 million is spent first at Wayne Major.

Not if all Federal and State aid funds available to the metropolitan Detroit area until 1960 go into Wayne Major, as its backers plan.

Delays already have proved costly.

When the city decided to go ahead with the Northeast site, authorization for the issuance of $3 million in bonds for land purchase was made. The bonds were to be issued when the condemnation proceedings were completed.

With the proceedings dragged out, cost of the land needed has risen an estimated one to two millions more.

Last fall, city officials admitted they deliberately had delayed legal proceedings for acquisition of more land at the Northeast site during the spring and summer.

They explained that attention drawn to the Northeast site during the period the Willow Run-Wayne Major airline shift was being considered might confuse the issue.

So now, unless within 6 months all condemnation suits being heard are completed (and Supreme Court appeals heard) the period in which the bonds can be issued will run out. Cutoff date is June 30.

Planned delays, political bickering and behind-the-scene struggles for power have been extremely costly to Detroit's aviation development.

One thing is certain. The rapid growth of air traffic will not stop.

With only 8 air miles between Willow Run and Wayne Major, the air space above those airports in foul weather is one traffic-control center.

By Civil Aeronautics standards, that air traffic hub already is congested.

Another airport, well removed from that hub, should be under construction now.

By even conservative estimates, it will be needed before it is ready.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 6, 1956]

AIRLINES FINALLY PAY OFF AT WILLOW RUN

(By Jean Pearson)

Are the airlines getting a free ride at Willow Run?

Mayor Cobo says they are and that that's the reason they won't move to Detroit-Wayne Major.

All seven of the major airlines operating at Willow Run have denied the charge.

The truth? It's probably that after losing money for 5 years at Willow Run in giving airline service to the public, the airlines are on a good, sound financial basis.

Seven airlines—American, Capital, Delta, Eastern, Northwest, Trans World, and United—formed into the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc. (ANTSCO), operate Willow Run under a lease from the University of Michigan, owners of the airport.

The lease calls for an annual payment of $15,000 to the university plus 10 percent of all gross income above $250,000 on nonairline revenue.

Last year the university received $44,000, of which $29,000 represented the 10 percent on nonairline revenue.

"There are some who would have you believe that the airlines have been riding some kind of a gravy train, at the expense of the taxpayer, in their operation of Willow Run," Robert J. Wilson, vice president of Capital Airlines, said at the Airport Use Panel hearings last June in Detroit.

"Such a belief," said Wilson, who is official spokesman for 6 of the 7 major airlines, "is completely false."

ANTSCO, he said, has set up a rate of rentals and other fees comparable to other airports and charges each airline fees based upon such rates.

"In addition to such fees," Wilson said, "each airline agreed to share proportionately any deficiencies resulting from the cost of meeting the university lease requirements of maintaining the airport in as good condition as it was received.

"For several years, with rentals comparable to others in the United States, each airline has made deficiency payments until, through good management and promotion of airport activity, the airport is now on a paying basis. Some, but not all, deficiency payments have been returned to the carriers.

"The cost of maintenance and operation of the airport—at no cost to the taxpayers—amounts to about $977,661 a year.

"In addition, the airlines have spent substantially over a million dollars on facilities and intend to spend considerable more to redo the terminal building."

This year, the airlines expect maintenance costs at Willow Run to exceed a million.

There is little doubt, however, that operation at Willow Run is financially attractive to the airlines.

"We don't intend for one minute, though, to apologize for being good businessmen," Wilson said.

"If we couldn't operate economically we'd soon be forced out of the business of providing public air transportation."

"Actually, when it comes to airport-operation costs, it is the taxpayers who are the ones fortunate enough to be getting a 'free ride.'"

Willow Run is one of the biggest airport bargains a community ever had.

As an airline terminal, it hasn't cost Detroit or Wayne County citizens 1 cent in local taxes.

Built as a B–24 bomber plant in World War II, with adjoining field for testing and fly-away operations, Willow served its purpose.

It owed nothing to the public. But it was too good to let it go to weeds and cracked-up concrete—as many wartime airfields have.

Offered as surplus property by the War Assets Administration, however, the $21 million property found few takers.

Any person or group taking over the property not only had to agree to maintain both the landing field and airport in as good condition as it was received, but also to keep it open as a public airport.

None of the local or county governments, who could have had it on the same terms as U–M took possession, showed any interest.

Though it would have cost them only $1, Wayne County officials turned down the offer of Willow Run, an excellent field ready for operation, to pour millions into developing Wayne Manor—only 8 air miles away.

Since 1946, close to $10 million has been sunk into Wayne Major.

It was spent despite the fact the airlines repeatedly have claimed they have no intention of moving except to an airport considerably nearer to the air traffic center of Detroit than either Willow Run or Wayne Major.

What Detroit needs much more than duplication of facilities 8 air miles apart, they claim, is a new airport north of the city to serve the eastern half of metropolitan Detroit.

The airlines assert that they would move into the Northeast site just as soon as it is ready and have flights out of both Willow Run and Northeast.

[From the Free Press of February 7, 1956]

AIRLINES HAD NO ALTERNATIVE TO MOVING OPERATIONS TO WILLOW RUN—WHY THE AIRLINES SHIFTED OPERATIONS TO WILLOW RUN—WAS ONLY SPOT THAT COULD HANDLE FOUR-ENGINE PLANES

(By Jean Pearson)

Why did the airlines settle permanently at Willow Run?

They had little alternative.

Detroit City Airport, with short runways and a gas tank in the middle, was too small for the four-engine planes put in operation after World War II.

Detroit was being bypassed. Air service to the city was not expanding as rapidly as it was in other metropolitan areas.

Wayne County Airport (since renamed Detroit-Wayne Major) was seriously considered.

Even with all the breaks on time and agreement among principals, it would have taken 2 to 5 years to make Wayne Airport suitable for use by commercial airlines serving Detroit.

Willow Run, on the other hand, had 2 runways over 7,000 feet long, 4 over 6,000 feet, huge hanger space, and an excellent business proposition.

Willow Run obviously was the best choice.

There were three factors which resulted in Willow Run becoming Detroit's major airline terminal in 1947.

1. The airlines needed an airport which could accommodate four-engine airliners. Only Willow Run was immediately available.

2. The United States Government had no further use for its wartime, $21 million bomber plant and airport.

It was important that someone keep the airport intact so it could be reactivated at a moment's notice in the event of another national emergency.

3. The University of Michigan, faced with an increasing demand from the Government and industry for an expansion of aeronautical and other types research at a time when it was utilizing every building on its Ann Arbor campus to meet the rising student enrollment, saw Willow Run as a possible answer.

All three problems were solved when the University of Michigan agreed to terms set by the War Assets Administration.

Although the University of Michigan was low on the purchaser priority list, below city and county bodies and war veterans, it was ahead of the airlines.

If the university had not taken over Willow Run, however, the airlines said they would have bid for the airport, paying much more than the nominal fee arranged for a governmental agency such as the university.

The university took over Willow Run on a quitclaim deed for $1, January 15, 1947.

The university had to promise to maintain Willow Run as an airport open to the public in the same good condition in which it was received.

Terms set by the board of regents, governing body of the University of Michigan, also had to be met.

The regents agreed to the acquisition only on condition that it would not be supported by State funds appropriated for the university itself.

The university leased the airport to the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc., reserving certain buildings for use by the university for research purposes. In turn, the airlines were to maintain and operate the field.

The lease calls for an annual payment of $15,000 to the university plus 10 percent of all nonairline revenue in excess of $250,000. Nonairline revenue includes all airport concessions.

The cost of converting Willow Run from a bomber plant to an air terminal has been paid by the airlines since they moved there in 1947.

Seven airlines maintain and operate Willow Run as the company, the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc.

Members of ANSTCO are American, Capital, Delta, Eastern, Northwest, Trans World, and United.

None of these airlines receives any Federal subsidies for service within the United States.

North Central Airlines also operates out of Willow Run. It receives a Federal mail-carrying subsidy.

Two air-cargo lines, Riddle and Slick, also operate at Willow Run.

ANTSCO already has spent approximately $1¼ million on improvements at Willow Run.

Under the Federal Aid Airport program, the university received $154,740 for improvement of the ramps, runways, and instrument landing system, compared with $4 million spent by the Government at Wayne Major since 1946.

What ANTSCO leased from the university was the 1,986-acre airport proper, with 6 runways more than a mile long and 160 feet wide, plus the 18-bay hangar.

In the main hangar is the terminal building with all its facilities, control tower and bays used by the airlines, the university and Great Lakes Airmotive.

A distributor of Cessna Aircraft, aviation products and aircraft services, Great Lakes Airmotive subleases one bay.

Landing fees are charged fare-paying aircraft only. Military, private and executive aircraft land free.

Originally, the fuel storage and pumping facilities cost approximately $200,000. In 1954, the airlines invested another $50,000 in the system, which now has a 290,000-gallon capacity.

In 1954, the airlines turned in from Willow Run to the State of Michigan $225,596 net in aviation gas taxes. In 1955, there was a 29 percent increase, due to bigger planes in service and an increase in the number of flights scheduled.

There now are 386 scheduled airline operations daily at Willow Run.

Within 5 or 10 years, the airlines believe an airport well removed from the present site (to avoid air traffic congestion) will be needed.

If it weren't for the combination of military, private and commercial air traffic in the Willow Run-Wayne Major area, they contend that extension of runways and construction of additional hangars at Willow Run could see them through the next 20 or 25 years.

All traffic in that area already is very heavy, however, so they favor a move to another airport removed from either Willow Run or Wayne Major.

They favor the immediate development of an airport north of the city to serve Detroiters east of Woodward, citizens of Macomb and Oakland counties, and the many people requiring air travel in the tri-city area of Flint, Saginaw and Bay City.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 8, 1956]

WILLOW RUN IS DUE TO GET FACELIFTING—AIRLINES TO FOOT COST OF $1½ MILLION JOB

(By Jean Pearson)

When columnist Inez Robb was in Detroit recently, she blasted Willow Run Airport by comparing the terminal to a "county carnival."

Robert E. Miller, president of Airline National Terminal Service Co. (ANTSCO), admitted the terminal "left much to be desired."

But he also defended the colorful display and concessions.

They are contributing to the maintenance and operation of one of the Nation's largest commercial airports, he said, thus saving tax money.

Since not a cent of local tax money has gone into the operation of Willow Run, Miller said, perhaps taxpayers can appreciate the concessions' financial value as well as finding them entertaining and useful while waiting for plane connections.

But Miller and the airlines realize much can be done to make the terminal more attractive and functional. And they intend to do something about it.

When 6 of the 7 major airlines decided once and for all to remain at Willow Run, as they recently expressed it, the way was clear to go ahead with an improvement and expansion program.

Approximately $1½ million will be spent in the face-lifting program. The airlines expect to pay for all of it.

On February 16 the board of ANTSCO will meet at Willow Run.

The airlines plan to take up two matters of major concern—extension of their airport lease with the University of Michigan, owner of Willow Run, and authorization of the improvement program.

The current lease expires in 1962.

Both the airlines and the University have said they are interested in extending it.

As for the expansion and improvement program, Robert J. Wilson, vice president of Capital Airlines and spokesman for six of the airlines, says they are all behind it.

Therefore, those voting in favor of improving Willow Run terminal probably will be Capital, Delta, Eastern, Northwest, Trans-World, and United. Doubtful vote will be American, which may move to Wayne Major alone.

Where will the million and a half be spent?

Miller says it will be spent in three stages of development. Completion of the project will take about 2 years. But 2 of the 3 major phases can be finished in the next year, Miller said.

Priority goes to passenger comfort.

Renovation and improvement of the men's and women's public restrooms have already started. An estimated $40,000 will be spent.

Improvement of the terminal will include more comfortable seats, new flooring, an attractive new ceiling, renovation of the baggage area and installation of a self-service baggage system.

Outside of the terminal at the entrance, a canopy will be installed so passengers can step out of cars and airline buses under the canopy.

On the airline loading side of the terminal, the concourses will be improved and probably heated.

All of these improvements are in the first stage of the 2-year program.

Scheduled for the second stage of development is improvement of the coffee shop. This, however, may be speeded up to the first phase.

The catering and food facilities also may be moved. This decision rests upon American Airlines' final decision. If they make a lone switch to Wayne Major, they will relieve a bottleneck in this department. If they do not, the facility will be expanded.

The third stage of the project is on the airfield proper. It will include ramp, runway and taxiway development.

When the bulk of the improvement project is completed, Landrum and Brown, nationally famous airport consultants, of Cincinnati, Ohio, estimate Willow Run Airport should prove adequate to meet the anticipated air needs for the next 10 years or at least until the proposed Northeast Airport is in operation.

Would the airlines be planning such extensive improvements if they had any intentions of moving to Wayne Major?

Since they are businessmen, the airlines representives say, the answer is obvious.

They intend, they claim, to remain at Willow Run. Then, when the Northeast Airport is ready, they plan to schedule flights there also.

As Wilson has pointed out, the airlines expect to have a financial commitment at Northeast. But they believe the business generated by serving a new area in metropolitan Detroit will be worth the additional capital investment there.

To pour millions into Wayne Major, only 8 air miles away, solves neither the problem of growing air traffic congestion in the Willow Run-Wayne Major area nor adds any passenger potential.

Therefore, to the airlines, it doesn't make good aviation or business sense, Wilson says. And he can't see how it could to the taxpayer either.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 9, 1956]

WAYNE MAJOR STILL NEEDS 19 MILLION—PILOT SAYS "IT STINKS" DESPITE FUNDS NOW SPENT

(By Jean Pearson)

It takes more than flat land and concrete to make a good airport.

Detroit-Wayne Major Airport is proof.

It has 4 square miles of fenced flat land—some of it submerged in spring or during heavy rains—and miles of concrete.

Yet it would take 2 to 5 years and a final investment of more than $28 million to make it ready for full commercial airline use.

Why?

To quote one Air National Guard pilot who flies there:

"The concrete is a roadmaker's masterpiece. But as an airport, it stinks.

"When I'm in No. 1 position at takeoff and a plane is coming in, I not only have to wait for him to land but I have to wait until he stops, turns around, and taxis back up the runway.

"Just burning up gallons of that JP-4 jet fuel because the lousy airport doesn't even have taxi strips off its best runway."

Since 1946 more than $4 million of Wayne County taxpayers' money has been poured into the airport. The majority of all county taxes are paid by Detroiters.

More than $4 million more has come from Federal funds and more than 1 million from State funds.

This still leaves 19 million as a minimum estimate to complete the $28 million post-war expansion.

What is there to show for it?

A jumble of buildings, the longest and widest runway of all civil airports in the Detroit area (but without proper taxiway and an approach to the terminal and executive hangars that rates as high adventure.

To use a favorable phrase of Airport Manager Henry Baker, the airport looks as though it were planned on a we'll-cross-that-bridge-when-we-come-to-it basis.

Actually, there is not 1 airport but 2.

One is the old Wayne County Airport in the northeast section.

On it is the big hangar for small aircraft, flight schools, aircraft dealerships, repair shops and small aviation businesses plus some sheds and miscellaneous buildings.

In that corner, with an entrance from Middle Belt, are the old control tower and terminal building, a well-constructed brick and concrete building that's virtually abandoned.

Next to it are the seemingly permanent "temporaries" of the days when Wayne Major was Romulus Army Air Force Base. These are used by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Farther down the line, on Middle Belt, is the old, abandoned officers' club. Large, but not a permanent type building.

Next comes the new Air National Guard administration building, paid for completely by Government funds.

Around the bend, on Goddard going west off Middle Belt, there are on the north side the Air National Guard hangars, including the $700,000 one just completed. It was designed for military operations. There are also miscellaneous sheds, loading docks and supply depots built of temporary material.

This, basically, comprises the northern, eastern and southern sides of the old, mile-square airport. In its center is a complete runway and taxiway system of little, if any, use to the bigger one now being constructed in the middle of the field.

In the new section, the terminal tower juts up in the middle, with an assortment of hangars and buildings scattered around it.

Also on the airport are a salt mine, gas-oil drilling and an Army Nike antiaircraft missile installation.

To reach the terminal, you have to drive out on a runway. But cars only get half the runway. Down the middle is a snow fence. On the other side of the fence airplanes are taxiing.

To get to the executive hangars, you have to cross the runway. Companies such as Ford Motor, Holley Carburetor, Wyandotte Chemical and Great Lakes Steel keep their planes in these hangars.

At this crucial point, there is a stop-and-go light.

This of course, as Leroy Smith, in charge of the airport development and operation, and Baker point out, will be changed if the airport is developed for full airline use.

What they plan as a solution is an access road from the Willow Run Expressway.

To reach the terminal, the access road will have to be tunneled under the expressway, the Wabash Railroad track and, in time, under a runway and taxi strip.

At other airports, these runway underpasses have cost $1 million each. They are not included in the estimated 28 million plus development program for Wayne Major.

In February 1947, Smith said that close to 5 million would be spent on improving Wayne Major and that it would be available for use by the airlines in October if they wished.

Further improvements would continue, he said, for the next 3 years. By 1950, he said, the expansion program would be complete and Wayne Major would be one of the finest airports in the country.

In August 1947, Smith said, "It is anticipated that by next July the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport will be equipped to handle all of the major airlines serving Detroit."

Nine years later, it would still take at least 2 years to develop Wayne Major for full commercial airline use.

Yet more than 9 millions of County, State and Federal funds have been sunk into the airport since 1946.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 10, 1956]

BLANK-CHECK DEAL SHUNNED BY AIRLINES—WOULD HAVE TO MAKE UP WAYNE MAJOR DEFICIT

(By Jean Pearson)

"Would you sign your name to a blank check?"

That's the answer you get when you ask the airlines why they object to the contract offered them for operation at Detroit-Wayne Major.

Before discussing the contract, however, the airlines insist on making it clear that it was not the type of contract offered that caused six of the seven to decide "once and for all" to remain at Willow Run.

Their prime reason for refusing to move, they reiterate, is their sincere belief that the millions it would cost the airlines and taxpayers to develop Wayne Major would be spent best at the Northeast Airport.

Nevertheless, they add, the type of contract offered them was unacceptable.

Reason is a simple one.

To issue revenue bonds to finance Wayne Major's development, the Wayne County Road Commission must have signed contracts from the airlines.

Retirement of the bonds, plus the interest rate, must come from operating revenue at the airport.

If the road commission goes into the hole financially operating at the airport (and past record makes this probable), they have told the airlines they would expect them to make up the deficit.

As a result, the road commission so far has refused to offer the airlines any contracts with fixed fees not subject to change.

If they do give them such a contract, then the taxpayers would have to make up the difference.

So the airlines not only couldn't be certain about what it would cost them to operate at Wayne Major, but they would be expected to make up all of the deficits.

Further, they point out, the deficits could easily come from poor management over which they would have no control.

There is nothing in the history of the operation of Wayne Major Airport during

the last 5 years that would give them any encouragement.

During the last 5 years Wayne Major has operated at a loss of $222,194.

In 1951, the loss was $91,614. In 1952, it made $689. In 1953, the loss was $68,536. In 1954, the loss was $62,733. In 1955, there was a profit—$6,240. Total loss: $222,194.

Two years bear special mention.

In 1952, the Government paid $46,979 for damages done during World War II.

Airport officials say this gives them a profit of $689 for 1952. However, it hardly can be considered operating revenue from good management in 1952.

If it were not classed as operating revenue for that year, the total loss for 5 years would be over a quarter million dollars.

The other year bearing special mention is 1955. It was a good year. The only truly profitable one.

But how much of an annual return on an investment of over $9 million, the amount poured into Wayne Major since it was opened in 1930, is $6,240?

It is pointed out by the road commission that "during the year 1955, an amount of $250,000 was received for salt and mineral rights, which would offset net deficits for the past 5 years."

That's good, everyone agrees. But it is good luck, like finding a diamond.

It's true the road commission hopes to strike oil.

But what assurance do the airlines have that they will continue to be lucky? Or that nonaviation activities will continue to make up possible operating deficits?

In contrast to the Wayne Major picture, at Detroit City Airport there has been an operating profit for every year during the same period.

Total net operating profit at Detroit City Airport for the last 5 years has been close to one-half million dollars.

The net operating profits by year were: 1951, $78,347; 1952, $74,544; 1953, $89,180; 1954, $122,057, and 1955, $113,487—for a net total operating profit of $477,615.

Further less than $5 million has been put into city airport as a capital investment since it opened in 1928, compared to $9 million at Wayne Major.

All profits from the city airport must go back to the city, although anyone who has been out there recently can see easily where they could be spent for airport improvement.

Requests for capital improvement, however, must be made to the city in the annual operating budget for the year.

And when the tax situation is tight, as it is now, airport improvement requests are most likely to be lopped off.

Only one airline, North Central, services city airport, compared to Pan American World Airways and several nonscheduled airlines servicing Wayne Major.

It was not until 1954, when Pan American started operation at Wayne Major, that the airport's annual operating revenue exceeded Detroit City Airport's. It exceeded it again in 1955.

How well was the operating revenue handled? A comparison of figures for both airports is revealing.

In 1954, Wayne Major had an operating revenue of $603,039 with a net operating loss of $62,733. Detroit City Airport had an operating revenue of $588,135 with a net operating profit of $122,057.

In 1955, Wayne Major had an operating revenue of $852,757 with a net operating profit of $6,240.

Detroit City Airport had an operating revenue of $570,912 with an operating profit of $113,487.

Which may explain why the airlines claim signing an "open-end" contract, subject to the operating efficiency or inefficiency of Wayne Major would be "like signing a blank check."

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 11, 1956]

MANY NOW USE WAYNE MAJOR—NAVY WANTS TO MOVE THERE SO ITS PILOTS CAN FLY JETS

(By Jean Pearson)

Detroit-Wayne Major Airport isn't quite so unpopular as the airlines make it seem.

Even though 6 of the 7 major airlines have decided to remain at Willow Run and put future investments in a northeast airport, the county field has its admirers.

It's serving well as an air cargo terminal.

Businesses and industries on the west side, such as Ford Motor Co. and Wyandotte Chemical, base their executive planes there.

Pan-American has one international flight daily and several nonscheduled airlines make it a stop.

The Air National Guard, which has called Wayne Major home for more than 25 years and has leases there until 1980, wants to stay.

Approximately $2 million in Federal funds has been spent on buildings and other permanent improvements to serve the Guard's needs.

Finally, the Navy, urgently in need of a field from which it can fly jets, much prefers Wayne Major to Willow Run.

Rear Adm. Benjamin A. Moore, director of aviation plans for the Chief of Naval Operations, said last June that Willow Run Airport was "unsuitable" as a place to move the inadequate Grosse Ile Naval Air Station facilities.

"The only existing site acceptable is Detroit-Wayne Major Airport," he told the Detroit Navy League board of directors.

In a letter to Representative LESINSKI (Democrat, of Michigan) regarding the Navy's needs, Rear Adm. James S. Russell, chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, said last spring:

"The Detroit-Wayne Major Airport with its fine runways and approaches and its accessible location is the preferred site."

Then why doesn't the Navy move in? It asked to move there over a year ago.

But Leroy Smith, Wayne County highway engineer, in charge of Wayne Major, refused to let it.

It has been established that it would cost $3 million to set the Navy up at Wayne Major, compared to an investment of 6 to 10 times that amount to develop Wayne Major for commercial use.

Further, as Robert J. Wilson, vice president of Capital Airlines and spokesman for the six airlines, says, if the Navy's need is urgent, Wayne Major would be its best bet.

The Navy could start operations at Wayne Major within a few months.

But at Willow Run it would be at least 2 years and perhaps more before the airlines could move out and the Navy move in. And the six airlines say they have no intention of moving out.

The reason they couldn't share Willow Run is that all hangar and building space already is taken and air traffic would be further congested.

The airlines had more than 141,000 air operations (either a landing or takeoff) last year and the Air Force, which has established a new Reserve squadron on the opposite side of Willow Run, expects to have 22,000 operations annually.

Total annual operations would then top 160,000. According to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, air traffic is considered "congested" when there are 100,000 or more operations annually.

Why does the Navy prefer Wayne Major?

Capt. M. T. Martin, commander of the Grosse Ile Naval Air Station, has mentioned several reasons.

Included among them are:

1. Wayne Major is closer to Lake Erie, over which the Navy conducts most of its combat training.

2. It has cleared approaches for landings and takeoffs and one longer runway.

3. Jet training could begin at Wayne Major within a few months as the airport would be used as a satellite field for Grosse Ile while buildings are being erected.

4. Wayne Major is closer to Detroit and the downriver communities, where the majority of the Navy reservists live.

Further, the Navy believes that additional training benefits could come from working with the Air National Guard on joint tactical problems.

The Navy and Marines have some excellent radar and other electronic equipment not owned by the guard. It could be utilized for training by all three branches of air service.

In addition, the Navy points out, operational savings might be made through combined use of crash, salvage, and fire equipment.

If the Air National Guard stayed, if the Navy moved in, and air cargo and business flying increased, every cent spent at Wayne Major so far would be justified.

With the addition of some taxiways, perhaps the lengthening of one runway, and a new access road, it would be a good airport for such an operation, experts say.

William A. Mara, chairman of the aviation committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce, said last June at the airport-use panel hearings:

"It's a credit to Leroy Smith that he dreamed up Wayne Airport many years ago, because it makes a nice base for the military."

But Wayne Major authorities, who want no part of the military, say all services should be at Willow Run since the Government could recapture it for exclusive use in a national emergency.

Others counter:

"Would county and city official deny the Federal Government use of Wayne Major in a national emergency?"

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 12, 1956]

WILL WAYNE MAJOR BE WORTH THE COST?

(By Jean Pearson)

There isn't any question about the attractiveness and functional quality of the proposed air terminal of Detroit-Wayne Airport.

From all descriptions by Wayne Major planners, it certainly will be handsome.

There isn't any doubt that the runway system planned would be more than adequate to meet the demands of any commercial planes in production or on the drawing boards today.

They would be long enough, heavily constructed, well-lighted and drained and coordinated with modern navigational aids.

But the real question businessmen and many aviation experts ask are:

1. Is this trip to the public money trough necessary?—or wise?

2. Is the financing plan realistic?

3. Does Wayne Major solve Detroit's present and future air traffic problem?

A look at the first question brings up the matter of how much taxpayer money—from county, State, and Federal funds—is involved.

Overall answer is that of the minimum $28 million estimate for the master plan development of Wayne Major, all but $23 million is from public funds. The $5 million difference will be in revenue bonds for a terminal building.

Will this include everything to make the airport complete?

Not by any means.

Not included in the $28 million estimate are:

Hangars (probably about 9 at $1 million each).

Fuel tank farms and storage pits.

An access road (probably about a mile long).

Underpasses under Willow Run Expressway, under the Wabash Railroad, and possibly under a future runway and taxiway.

At other airports, these have run up to $1 million each.

This is the financial background.

Now let's look at question No. 1—Is the trip to the public money trough necessary?

Yes, plus many millions more, probably, if the taxpayers want to develop an airport the majority of the airlines say they have no intention of using.

Is it necessary to solve the military flying needs? Realistically, no.

The Air Force is settled at Willow Run, its prime choice.

The Air National Guard is happy at Wayne Major, where it has been for 25 years.

The Navy wants to move into Wayne Major and could be accommodated there at the expense of only $3 million, compared to the cost of 6 to 10 times that amount to develop Wayne Major for full commercial airline use.

Is it wise?

Yes, if a handsome terminal building and saving 12 minutes driving time is worth $23 million to the taxpayer.

The only catch here is what would you be saving 12 minutes for?

Only one airline, American, has expressed any intention of moving.

Capital, Delta, Eastern, Northwest, United, Trans World, and North Central plan to remain at an expanded Willow Run. Then, just as soon as the Northeast Airport is developed, they say they plan to schedule flights out of there to serve the larger population of metropolitan Detroit.

Question 2: Is the financing plan realistic?

Even LeRoy Smith, Wayne County highway engineer, admitted at a meeting of airline, county and city officials last November, "there are some optimistic figures."

It looks good on paper.

But a great deal of it is based on hopes, expectations and appropriations that are only made year by year in advance.

For example. In the last 10 years, Michigan's Legislature has appropriated only $2,811,727.21 for the entire State as matching funds to Federal and county money.

The largest single State grant during this period was to Wayne Major for $304,647.50.

Yet within the 1955–59 period, Wayne County expects to receive $3,456,178.70 in State appropriations for Wayne Major Airport alone.

Since the metropolitan Detroit area can only receive 50 percent of all State appropriations, it will be necessary for legislature to double that amount for the State—or appropriate approximately $7 million.

It is true that Wayne Major, operated by the Wayne County Road Commission, has perhaps basis for its great expectations.

John P. McElroy, personnel and public relations officer of the Wayne County Road Commission, not only is a registered lobbyist for the road commission in Lansing but is vice chairman of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission.

The areonautics commission appoints the director of the Michigan Department of Aeronautics, who makes recommendations for appropriations to the legislature.

Backers of Wayne Major are planning on getting every bit of the Federal and State airport funds available to Detroit through June 30, 1959.

This means not 1 cent of these funds would go to the development of the Northeast Airport until 1960.

Mayor Cobo has said that the $3 million in bonds authorized for Northeast and the $5 million expected from the sale of Detroit City Airport "will give $8 million that could be matched with Federal funds."

What funds? When?

Of the estimated minimum $23 million in tax funds for the Wayne Major master development plan, $10,940,157.20 would be Federal funds, $4,550,077.54 State funds, and $7,766,848.48 from county taxpayers. Over 70 percent of all Wayne County taxpayers live in Detroit.

Question 3: Does Wayne Major solve Detroit's present and future air traffic problem?

With less than 8 air miles between Willow Run and Wayne Major, the two ports simply make one big air-traffic hub in the sky. It is an air-traffic hub that is already congested by Civil Aeronautics Administration standards.

As one pilot pointed out, moving airline operations from one airport to another makes no difference in the total amount of air traffic in that hub. It's no different than moving from one room to another room in a house. You're still inside the same house.

Perhaps the most revealing answer to this question, however, is in the last paragraph of the letter of transmittal for the November 4, 1955, airport use panel report which recommended the airline move to Wayne Major.

It says: "Nothing in this report should be construed to mean that any airspace problems involved in this matter have necessarily been resolved or that the recommendations contained herein have been endorsed by the members of the Airport Use Panel Advisory Committee."

[From the Detroit Press Press of February 13, 1956]

AIR CROWDED NEAR WILLOW, WAYNE MAJOR—2 AIRPORTS ON GROUND, BUT ONLY 1 ABOVE

(By Jean Pearson)

On the ground you have two large airports—Willow Run and Detroit-Wayne Major.

In the air you have only one.

The reason is that the airports are less than 8 air-miles apart. Together they make one air-traffic hub.

The more you expand air traffic at either airport, the greater the congestion grows.

Even now, when the weather socks in and pilots are flying on instruments, Willow Run, with its superior navigational aids, takes over and controls traffic for both airports.

Wayne Major becomes a slave to Willow Run.

Both have instrument landing systems (ILS).

But at Willow Run there is, in addition, the finest radar and communication equipment.

In fact, Willow Run was recently designated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration as 1 of 38 busy terminals in the United States to be given a second radarscope to speed aircraft safely in and out of the area.

The electronic eyes of the radar at Willow Run show aircraft from 6 to 50 miles around the airport.

Though extremely valuable, the equipment and its installation is expensive.

But so far, no mention has been made of the extra cost of moving or installing this equipment at Wayne Major if that airport is developed for full-scale commercial airline use.

Seeing traffic 50 miles out might seem like a comfortable margin.

It is for a DC–3. But a jet could cover that distance in 5 minutes, and the 8 miles between Wayne Major and Willow Run in 48 seconds.

During instrument weather, holding patterns for aircraft waiting their turn to land are oval shapes in the sky.

It takes an oval 19 miles long and 8 miles wide to provide a buffer of airspace around each plane.

The planes are then "stacked" above each other as 1,000-foot intervals.

Above 19,000 feet the oval must be 38 miles long and 16 miles wide. Above 29,000 feet, the oval is 57 miles long and 24 miles wide.

By present-day airline standards, a holding pattern above 19,000 feet seems high. But jet airliners are coming and they are different.

Charles J. Lowen, new Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, noted this February 4 when he talked on jet age requirements at the Jet Age Conference of the Air Force Association in Washington.

Lowen said:

"The one feature, other than speed, that most sharply distinguishes the jet transport from current civil aircraft is that this new beast is an inhabitant of the higher altitudes.

"It operates most efficiently at about 30,000 to 40,000 feet.

"When a B–47 makes a missed approach, for example, I understand it consumes some 2,700 pounds of fuel just in descending from and returning to the 1,000-foot level."

Considering these holding patterns, it can easily be seen why, even with the smallest oval, 2 airports less than 8 air-miles apart constitute 1 traffic hub in the sky.

What aviation experts can't understand is how two large airports were allowed to develop so near each other. They ask:

"Will regional CAA officials ever be asked to explain why they approved expansion of Wayne Major (at the cost of many millions to the Federal Government) when it was practically on top of Willow Run?"

Millions were spent on Wayne Major development after Willow Run already was in operation as a major air terminal for all the airlines. The airlines' group never encouraged development of Wayne Major.

Another question asked by those who keep tabs on the local aviation picture is:

"Why hasn't the metropolitan Detroit area air traffic study, requested by the Airport Use Panel last June, been made public?"

They are not as interested in the report sent from Kansas City (CAA regional headquarters) to Washington as the one sent from Detroit to Kansas City and the opinion or conclusion of the local people.

Granted that Wayne Major and Willow Run are but one airport from the sky, what's the answer?"

As mentioned in earlier stories, the CAA has said that when air traffic reaches 100,000 operations (landings or takeoffs) annually at an airport, a potential need for a second airport exists.

There are already more than 100,000 operations annually at Willow Run alone.

Good sense dictates that the second airport be far enough removed to avoid further air traffic congestion.

The proposed northeast site is not only far enough removed but it is also north of the east-west air traffic flow that passes directly over Willow Run and Wayne Major.

Planes headed for Northeast Airport could be "peeled off" the airway some distance away to relieve, rather than add, to the traffic coming into Wayne Major and Willow Run.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 14, 1956]

MACOMB COULD BRAG ABOUT NORTHEAST AIRPORT

(By Jean Pearson)

Someday, Macomb County may boast about having one of the finest airports in Michigan.

It could also boast that it was the most modern, designed and built from scratch.

Not a "make do" airport. Not a rehash of an airport begun in 1928, but an airport keyed to a new era in aviation transportation.

It would be a modern airport in every respect—two 10,000-foot runways, a helicopter landing area, a handsome, functional terminal building, newest and speediest of baggage handling systems and ample parking space.

It would be an airport serving more than 2 million people of 3 counties in a 12½-mile radius (almost 4 times as many people as served by Detroit-Wayne Major Airport in a 12½-mile radius).

It would be within 13 miles of Cadillac Square in the heart of Detroit. Expressways, such as the proposed eight-lane Hastings superhighway, would speed ground transportation.

All of this would not cost Macomb County 1 cent.

Yet some emotionally aroused people in Warren Township, where the airport is planned, are fighting it with every legal maneuver in the books.

From the time a northeast airport was suggested in the early 1950's, legal skirmishes have been carried on.

Finally, in 1954, the 74-acre Warren Airport was purchased by the city of Detroit for $93,000 as a nucleus for the proposed northeast airport.

Immediately, some Warren Township officials, who opposed what they considered "a big city pushing them around," protested.

The township entered a suit to condemn Warren Airport for a park, despite its drainage disadvantages for a recreational area.

They lost the suit, heard before a Macomb County jury in Circuit Judge James E. Spier's courtroom this month.

Now, the one hurdle remaining before the tricounty airport can become a reality is a condemnation suit filed by Detroit to acquire the land for expansion of Warren Airport.

When completed, the airport boundaries would be Ryan, Dequindre, Twelve, and Fourteen Mile Roads.

The court case is expected to come up this spring. It will be one with sparks flying. And no matter which side wins, it is likely to be appealed to the Michigan Supreme Court.

One of the first steps to blockade the condemnation was taken last Friday when Warren Township paid $234,300 to Poultry Farmer Frank B. Krause for his 71-acre farm.

The $234,300 was taken from a $300,000 fund voted for recreation purposes in the township. A school district, which joined the purchase, wants a portion for a school site.

Township Superviser Arthur J. Miller said bluntly, after the deal had been made secretly, "We're not kidding anyone. We bought the land for two reasons—the park and to stop Detroit."

Detroit Corporation Counsel Paul T. Dwyer said, however, that he did not believe the township's move will make any difference to the airport case.

More emotions than facts seem to have been stirred up in Warren Township over the proposed airport.

Some of the problems concern land values in condemnation, taxes obtainable from the area, school bonds, water, real estate values, schools, and safety.

Taking them 1 by 1, these are the facts:

Condemnation: It has been pointed out that more than a fair price is assured every property owner because the condemnation jury, composed entirely of Macomb residents, will decide the values.

Taxes: At the present time, approximately $12,000 in taxes is levied in this area. A park and school will not increase them.

By comparison, business establishments at Detroit City Airport are now paying twice that amount. All of these establishments and many more would move to the northeast airport.

School bonds: School bonds are now assessed against the 2 square miles that will be condemned.

It has been pointed out that in previous condemnation cases, the city of Detroit has paid off such bonds so there would be no extra burden on taxpayers outside the area.

Water: Warren Township is dependent upon Detroit for its water and some sewers. The township is short of water and cannot develop without it.

It is costing Detroit more than $50 million for the improved facilities that will assure Warren Township and other suburbs enough water for fire protection and normal growth.

Real estate: Impartial surveys show that municipal airports do not adversely affect the value of nearby real estate.

Actually, an airport brings businesses, increases employment, and creates new demands for homes.

Schools: Concern for the safety and scholastic retardation of approximately 15,000 pupils enrolled in schools in a 30-square-mile area surrounding the proposed Northeast Airport has been expressed by opponents.

By comparison, approximately 40,000 public and parochial school students are studying within a 2-mile radius of Detroit City Airport.

And, as has been pointed out, "not once in the 25 years since that extremely busy airport has been operating has a schoolchild so much as lost his hat to a descending airplane."

Safety: A lot could be said to point up the fallacy of hysteria on this point.

Suffice to say that records show a person is safer near an airport than on a railroad or highway.

Safer, even than on a sidewalk. Bicycles kill more innocent bystandars annually than airplanes.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 15, 1956]

WILL MILLIONS BE WASTED ON WAYNE MAJOR?—NORTHEAST AIRPORT SEEN MORE SENSIBLE MOVE

(By Jean Pearson)

For nearly 2 weeks the Free Press has been printing a series of articles on Detroit's airport situation.

What, in summary, are some of the important points that affect the taxpayer and the way his money is spent?

In this concluding article, some of the highlights are reviewed.

First, by way of background, Metropolitan Detroit is expected to have a population close to 4 million by July 1960.

An estimated 3,100,000 air passengers will arrive or depart in the Detroit area that year.

This is well over a million more than arrived or departed on planes here in 1955.

By 1965, the number will be close to 4 million passengers.

Detroit should be building another airport now.

This does not mean Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

Whether the airlines operate at Willow Run Airport or Wayne Major is beside the point.

They may be two airports on the ground but they are only one in the sky. Being only 8 air-miles apart, they form one air traffic hub.

The two airports are so close together that in instrument flying weather the Willow Run tower, with superior navigational aids, takes over air traffic control for both fields.

Already this air traffic hub is congested.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has stated:

"With present technical know-how, an airport with 100,000 or more air carrier operations has reached or is approaching the limit of efficient IFR (instrument flight rules) operational capacity.

"A community, therefore, has a potential need for two airports for air commerce when it has 100,000 or more air carrier operations."

Willow Run now has more than 144,600 operations (either a landing or takeoff) annually. Of these, more than 120,000 are air carrier operations.

Add the more than 135,000 operations annually at Wayne Major to the single air traffic hub and you have the reason why another airport, far removed from either, is needed.

You also have the reason why the airlines insist the minimum of $19 million more needed to develop Wayne Major for full airline use would be better spent developing the Northeast site.

Further, this 19 million estimate (added to the 9 million poured into Wayne Major since 1946) would not complete the airport.

It does not include hangars (about 9 at $1 million each will be needed), fuel storage, an access road about a mile long and underpasses (which have cost about 1 million each at other airports), under Willow Run Expressway, Wabash railroad and possibly under a future runway and taxiway.

To finance this tremendous expenditure for an airport 6 of 7 major airlines say they have no intention of using, an exceedingly optimistic program has been set up.

It was set up by the Wayne County Road Commission, sponsor of the airport under the direction of Leroy Smith, county highway engineer, for more than 27 years.

Total estimated cost for development of Wayne Major (without hangars, fuel storage, access road and underpasses) is a minimum of $28 million, of which $23 million is tax money.

More than 9 million of the total has already been spent since 1946 and still the airport is such a jumble it would take 2 years before it could be ready for full airline use.

Many have wondered how the regional CAA happened to approve development of one large airport practically on top of another large airport.

Millions in Federal funds were poured into Wayne Major after all the airlines were already at Willow Run. Further, all but one had indicated they had no intention or moving to Wayne Major.

Now, with the Federal millions already spent, aviation observers wonder if millions more will be poured in "to chase it up."

They also wonder if eventually the CAA in a face-saving gesture might try, through direct or indirect pressure, to force the airlines to move.

Of the $23 million in tax money for the Wayne Major master development plan, $10,940,157.20 would be Federal funds, $4,555,077.54 State funds and $7,766,843.48 from county taxpayers.

More than 70 percent of the county taxpayers live in Detroit.

Though the legislature has appropriated only $2,811,727.31 for the entire State to match Federal funds for airport development in the last 10 years, Wayne County officials expect legislators to appropriate $3,456,177.70 for it alone during a 4-year period.

Since Metropolitan Detroit may receive only 50 percent of all State funds appropriated, this means the State legislators would have to appropriate nearly seven million for airports during that period.

The road commission expects to get what it asks for. It usually does.

Its personnel and public relations officer, John P. McElroy, is a registered lobbyist in Lansing and vice chairman of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission.

The Aeronautics Commission appoints the director (Brig. Gen. Lester J. Maitland) and he makes the recommendations to the Legislature.

Further, though Willow Run, Wayne Major, Detroit City Airport and the proposed Northeast Airport are expected to share the State funds available to metropolitan Detroit, the road commission expects to get every penny for Wayne Major through June 30, 1959.

Not one cent would be available for the Northeast Airport until 1960.

From Wayne County taxpayers, the county expects to get $3,456,177.70 during the four-year period.

It already receives half a million dollars yearly to sink into Wayne Major.

Ultimate responsibility for making up any airport operating deficiencies might eventually also fall upon the taxpayer.

This would be the case if the county signed contracts with the airlines providing fixed charges not subject to revision or review or tied to some sliding scale.

Since the war, the public has been consulted only once about Wayne Major.

In 1946, a $5 million airport development bond issue was presented to the people.

The county hasn't risked a vote on its airport activities since.

Because this great expenditure is being used to duplicate a large, fully operative commercial airport only 8 air-miles away, the airlines say it doesn't make good sense—for them or the public.

The military Air Reserve program is an important part of Detroit's airport situation.

The Air National Guard, with a $2-million investment in facilities, has been at Wayne Major more than 25 years and holds leases until 1980. It wants to stay there.

The Navy, desperately in need of a field from which it can fly jets (Grosse Ile Naval Air Station is too small for jet operations), always has expressed a preference for Wayne Major.

Not only could it start preliminary jet operations there within a few months, but its installations would cost only an estimated $3 million. This would be from the Federal and residential area of south Macomb County.

For this reason, the airlines have said that investing in the northeast site makes good business sense for them and, they believe, the public.

* * * * *

Finally, the Air Force Reserve is already set up at Willow Run—where it prefers to be.

The airlines say the number of jet operations planned by the Air Force will not interfere with their operations.

The airlines moved to Willow Run when they began using four-engine airplanes in 1946.

City airport was too small.

They considered Wayne Major, but were told it would be 2 years before it would be ready for full airline use.

Ten years and about $10 million later, it still isn't.

At the time the airlines moved, they said they had no intention of moving again until an airport more centrally located than either Willow Run or Wayne Major became available.

Willow Run, built as a testing and fly-away field for the B–24 bomber plant, had served its wartime purpose and owed nothing to anyone.

The fact that it has been put to use and maintained in good condition is a credit to both the University of Michigan, its owner, and the airlines, which lease it.

Willow Run hasn't cost the citizens of metropolitan Detroit 1 cent in city or county taxes.

The airlines pay rent to the university plus percentage of income from nonairlines revenue.

They operate the airport and maintain the field and buildings.

For 5 years they operated at a loss.

The airlines paid for the conversion of the bomber plant to an air terminal.

They also expect to foot the bill for the $1½-million facelifting and expansion already begun at Willow Run.

Nevertheless, they see the future need for an airport north of the city.

More than four times as many persons would be served within a 12½-mile radius of Northeast Airport than would be served in a 12½-mile radius of Wayne Major.

The figures are 2,204,920 within a 12½-mile circle around Northeast compared to 615,350 with 12½ miles of Wayne Major.

Northeast Airport's area of service would extend in every direction:

North, to the area of Flint, Saginaw, and Bay City.

West, to Pontiac, Birmingham and Royal Oak.

East, to Mount Clemens, Roseville, and St. Clair Shores.

South from Detroit and the rapidly expanding industrial area they will schedule flights there.

Then, as they do in Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles, they would operate at two or more fields to provide better air transportation to a greater number of people.

One question remains.

Will millions be spent needlessly (utterly wasteful," as the chairman of the Aviation Committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce has said) at Wayne Major or will the Northeast site be given No. 1 priority?

Politicians may decide the answer—unless the public and legislators have a more powerful voice.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, last year, Leroy Smith, the Wayne County road commission engineer, wrote a letter to Secretary Wilson of the Department of Defense and urged as follows: That Willow Run Airport, now used by the commercial airlines, be converted into a military airport; that the Air Force Reserve jet operations, and the Navy jet Reserve training operations and the Air National Guard, which is now located on Wayne Major Airport, and probably cannot be moved from it, all be transferred to Willow Run; and that the airlines be made to go to Detroit-Wayne Major.

Mr. Speaker, I learned something about the executive branch of the Government as a result of that experience. They have an outfit called the Air Coordinating Committee, which was not set up by the Congress, has no statutory standing or authority of any kind. That Air Coordinating Committee has a variety of panels. It has an airport use panel. It has an air space panel. I think it has a panel dealing with navigational aids and other aspects of aviation.

What is the Air Coordinating Committee? I hold in my hand the Code of Federal Regulations, and on page 162 is Executive Order 9781 establishing the Air Coordinating Committee, signed by Harry S. Truman, September 19, 1946. The members of this Air Coordinating Committee at that time were: the Department of State, War, Post Office, Navy, Commerce, and the Civil Aeronautics Board. That has been added to. There are some more. But for all practical purposes—and it was the case in the airport use panel which held hearings in the city of Detroit—the Air Coordinating Committee is dominated by the military.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire text of Executive Order 9781.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 9781, ESTABLISHING THE AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, and in order to provide for the fullest development and coordination of the aviation policies and activities of the Federal agencies, and in the interest of the internal management of the Government, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. (a) There is hereby established the Air Coordinating Committee (hereinafter referred to as the committee) which shall have as members one representative from each of the following-named agencies (hereinafter referred to as the participating agencies): the State, War, Post Office, Navy, and Commerce Departments and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The members shall be designated by the respective heads of the participating agencies. The President shall name one of the members as the chairman of the committee. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall designate a representative of the Bureau as a nonvoting member of the committee.

(b) Each officer or body authorized under subparagraph 9 (a) hereof to designate a member of the committee shall also designate one or more alternate members, as may be necessary.

(c) The committee shall establish procedures to provide for participation, including participation in voting, by a representative of any agency not named in subparagraph 9 (a) hereof in connection with such aviation matters as are of substantial interest to that agency.

2. The committee shall examine aviation problems and developments affecting more than one participating agency; develop and recommend integrated policies to be carried out and actions to be taken by the participating agencies or by any other Government agency charged with responsibility in the aviation field; and, to the extent permitted by law, coordinate the aviation activities of such agencies except activities relating to the exercise of quasi-judicial functions.

3. The committee shall consult with Federal interagency boards and committees concerned in any manner with aviation activities; and consult with the representatives of the United States to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or to the permanent successor thereof and recommend to the Department of State general policy directives and instructions for the guidance of the said representatives.

4. The committee, after obtaining the views of the head of each agency concerned, shall submit to the President, together with the said views, (a) such of the committee's recommendations on aviation policies as require the attention of the President by reason of their character or importance, (b) those important aviation questions the disposition of which is prevented by the inability of the agencies concerned to agree, (c) an annual report of the committee's activities during each calendar year, to be submitted not later than January 31 of the next succeeding year, and (d) such interim reports as may be necessary or desirable.

5. The heads of the participating agencies shall cause their respective agencies to use the facilities of the committee in all appropriate circumstances and, consonant with law, to provide the committee with such personnel assistance as may be necessary.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 19, 1946.*

Mr. MEADER. The Air Coordinating Committee, when this controversy between these two airports developed, ordered its airport use panel to hold public hearings in Detroit, which they did on the 22d and 23d of June of 1955.

I say that the airport use panel is a stacked deck. It had 2 civilians out of the 6 members of that panel, a representative of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and a representative of the

Civil Aeronautics Board. But it had 4 military representatives, a representative of the Department of Defense and 1 each from the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy. In other words, there were 4 military representatives and 2 civilians. That was a 2 to 1 vote in favor of the military on any problem in the Detroit area concerning the use of airports.

I told you this Air Coordinating Committee has no statutory standing, being created by executive order, but it is presumed to bind the executive branch of the Government. Let me tell you that I have come to learn that the executive branch of the Government has come to have a lot more to say about the future of aviation in this country than the Congress does. The Air Coordinating Committee itself signed the report which resulted from the hearings of this airport use panel and that, like the panel, was represented 4 to 2 military over civilian.

What did that panel report? It reported exactly what it knew it was going to report before it went out there. It was going to give the military anything they wanted, and it was going to back up the CAA and its mistaken program of underwriting this huge expansion program to build one airport right on top of another one.

Who was going to fight it? They knew what they were going to do, but they went through the sham of a public hearing and let people come in and talk themselves out, knowing all the time that it would not make a bit of difference. They could have stayed right here in Washington.

There are some curious things about that report. I am not going to ask that the entire report go into the RECORD, because it is too long. But what would you think would be some of the factors you ought to consider in deciding how airports should be used in a particular community? Would you not think that the item of cost would be one that you would consider? Would you not think that the location of airports and the use and development of airports would have some bearing upon the congestion of air space? But this amazing report of the airport use panel, which was decided before they ever heard a word of testimony, says this in their letter of transmittal of November 4, 1955:

> Nothing in this report should be construed to mean that any air space problems in this matter have necessarily been resolved or that the recommendations contained herein have been endorsed by the members of the airport use panel advisory committee.

Just a moment on the significance of that last phrase. The airport use panel advisory committee is not a Government agency. It is composed of representatives of trade associations interested in flying, the Air Line Pilots Association, the Air Transport Association, and so on. There are a number of such associations. They formed an advisory committee. This question was referred to that advisory committee, but they did not go along with the airport use panel. That is why they had to say that the recommendations contained in their report have not been endorsed by the airport use panel advisory committee. But the important thing is their saying themselves that they did not consider the air-space problem.

Here you have two airports that right now, with their present traffic, without the Air Force and the Navy jet training operations, are both operating at near capacity. Would you not think it would be intelligent to consider the air-space problem before you decide about the present and future airport use in the city of Detroit? But this panel did not dare look at that question because it would have directed them not to put more congestion where there is already too much.

Furthermore, there is the item of cost. Let me just read you what they said about the item of cost. They belittle it. The airlines say, "We know what it costs to build airports, we know what it costs to build terminals and hangars and runways and storage facilities, and all those things. We think it is going to cost between $20 million and $30 million."

But what does the airport use panel say? It says:

> While the panel questions the $20 million to $30 million suggested during the hearings as the estimated cost of transferring carriers to the Detroit Wayne Major Airport, it knows, of course, that such a move might very well be costly.

But when the airlines who have been negotiating with the representatives of the Detroit Wayne Major Airport over the years finally got the figures from them; what were they? From $28 million to $32 million.

The panel brushed that off. Congress, or some other public body, has to put up a good share of that money. But the airport use panel does not care about the cost. That again might be because the panel is dominated by the military where cost is not generally considered too important.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to put in the RECORD the recommendations of the airport use panel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SIEMINSKI]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., November 4, 1955.

ACC AIRPORT USE PANEL MAKES RECOMMENDATIONS ON AIRPORTS IN THE DETROIT, MICH., AREA

The Airport Use Panel of the Air Coordinating Committee today released the following recommendations as a result of a hearing held in Detroit, Mich., June 22 and 23, 1955, to "determine, in the best interests of the public, the most feasible civil/military utilization of the airports, existing and proposed, in the Detroit, Mich., area."

1. That the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport be developed and utilized as the major civil air terminal serving the Detroit area.

2. That the scheduled air carriers now using the Willow Run Airport transfer their operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as soon as adequate facilities can be made available to serve their needs.

3. That the Willow Run Airport continue to be operated under civil ownership as a joint civil/military airport.

4. That one Air Force Reserve fighter squadron be immediately relocated from Selfridge Air Force base and established on the Willow Run Airport, utilizing present Government-owned facilities and pursuant to existing rights of the Government to use the airport.

5. That the Naval Air Station be relocated from Grosse Ile and established on the Willow Run Airport.

6. That the Air National Guard squadrons now stationed at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport be transferred to the Willow Run Airport as soon as agreement can be reached between the State of Michigan and the officials of Wayne County for the replacement of Air National Guard facilities now existing or under construction at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport with equally adequate facilities at the Willow Run Airport.

7. That the proper authorities proceed with plans to develop additional public airports adequate to serve present and future civil aviation requirements in the Detroit area.

8. That, in the event Naval Air Station Grosse Ile is declared surplus to the needs of the military, consideration be given to civil use of this airport for general aviation.

9. That the appropriate local, State, and Federal officials develop, coordinate, and integrate the master plans of all airports in the Detroit metropolitan area to the extent necessary that each airport may be utilized effectively and fully consistent with the recommendations contained herein.

10. That consideration be given to the establishment of a single metropolitan airport authority to administer the civil airports in the Detroit area.

The Airport Use Panel is a component of the Air Coordinating Committee and its membership is composed of representatives of the Departments of the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Commerce, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is responsible for recommending to the Air Coordinating Committee major policies involving airport matters affecting both military and civil agencies and is authorized to take final action for the ACC when in unanimous agreement.

The panel's recommendations pertaining to the Detroit hearing were unanimously endorsed by:

> Fred B. Lee (Chairman), Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce; Roger W. Fulling, Director of Construction (P. & I), Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense; Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, Director of Operations, Department of the Air Force; Maj. Gen. Hamilton H. Howze, Chief, Army Aviation Division, Department of the Army; Rear Adm. W. L. Rees, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Air), Department of the Navy; Joseph P. Adams, Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on the 29th of December, the airlines met again and said once and for all they were not going to move to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and they were perfectly happy at Willow Run. They condemned the expenditure of about $30 million at Wayne Major Airport as a waste of public funds.

In addition the airlines said that probably there should be another airport in the Detroit area but that it ought to be away from the Willow Run traffic pattern and that it would be foolish to build one airport right on top of another. As a matter of fact, today, in instrument flying weather, those airports are so close together that landings and take-offs at Wayne Major Airport are controlled by the Willow Run tower.

As Jean Pearson, the Free Press Aviation writer, very aptly said, "You have two big airports on the ground—Willow

Run and Detroit Wayne Major—but in the air you only have one."

But with the increased speed of flying and the increased volume of traffic, it just does not make sense to congest these airports further. That $30 million would be more intelligently spent on the other side of Detroit away from the present traffic pattern of those two existing airports. Certainly, they have thrown in $17 million already, but is that any reason because we have been foolish in the past that we should throw away another $30 million? I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to incorporate in my remarks at this point the letter of December 29 of the airlines addressed to the Honorable Albert E. Cobo and Leroy C. Smith, and the news release accompanying it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DECEMBER 29, 1955.

Hon. ALBERT E. COBO.
Mr. LEROY C. SMITH.

GENTLEMEN: We the undersigned airlines have given most careful consideration to the proposal that we move our Detroit terminal from Willow Run Airport to Wayne Major Airport. During the past several weeks we have made a thorough analysis and study of the detailed Wayne Major operation as presented by you to us at our meeting of November 17 last, including your proposed rates and fees, required improvement program, time scheduling of such improvements, necessary expenditure of public funds, etc.

It was agreed at that meeting between city, county, and airline officials that it would cost at least $28,265,000 additional to equip Wayne Major for full airline use. Even this sum did not include such other necessary costs as fuel facilities, access roadways, and the movement of navigational aids. As outlined by you this cost would be borne in part by the county, State, and Federal Governments and in part by the airlines, payable in rents and charges.

We fully recognize that Wayne Major is more conveniently located to the center of Detroit and would represent a 10- to 12-minute saving in traveling time downtown. We also recognize that the comfort and convenience of our passenger customers is of primary concern.

Thus the basic question was a balancing of increased passenger convenience against the expenditure of private and taxpayer funds to duplicate at Wayne Major those facilities already existing and being used at Willow Run. In our considered judgment, the benefits to the traveling public are not sufficient to warrant this expenditure.

We have not been unmindful of the requirement that the various military aviation units find a permanent home. Of the three service units concerned the Air National Guard is satisfactorily located at Wayne Major and the Air Force has moved into Government-owned facilities at Willow Run. This leaves only the Navy to be located and it expressed a preference to operate at Wayne Major Airport.

At the airport use panel hearing it was estimated that it would cost only $3 million to establish the Navy at Wayne Major to make it suitable for a military operation. Thus the difference between the cost of $3 million to install a military operation and the $28,265,000 to set up a commercial operation at Wayne Major would be $25,265,000. It was expressed at the panel hearing that an urgency exists for a relocation of the Navy and this urgency could more readily be met by a move to Wayne Major.

We also have before us the need for another airport in the northeast section. We feel that any money spent on further airport facilities in the Detroit area should be invested in the development of the Northeast Airport, as a solution to Detroit's airport needs.

In conclusion we wish to express our thanks to both the city and county officials for their interest in the matter.

ROBERT J. WILSON,
Capital Airlines, Inc.
TODD G. COLE,
Delta Air Lines, Inc.
MAURICE LETHBRIDGE,
Eastern Airlines, Inc.
DALE MERRICK,
Northwest Airlines, Inc.
GEORGE H. CLAY,
Trans World Airlines, Inc.
RALPH S. TWIST,
United Air Lines, Inc.

AIRLINES NATIONAL TERMINAL SERVICE CO., INC.,
Ypsilanti, Mich., January 1956.

Seven of eight major airlines operating at Willow Run Airport today informed Detroit and Wayne County officials that they have finally decided, "once and for all," against moving operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

The decision was reached in a special meeting December 28, of member airlines comprising the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc. (ANTSCO). An announcement of the action has been withheld until each airline signed a letter which was received today by Leroy C. Smith, Wayne County highway engineer and manager of Wayne Major.

"In our considered judgment," the carriers told Smith, "the benefits to the traveling public are not sufficient to warrant" the expenditure of some $32 million, the amount in public and private funds estimated necessary to convert Wayne Major.

In their letter, the airlines said their final decision followed a thorough analysis and study of the detailed Wayne Major operation as proposed by the airport's backers.

"We fully recognize that Wayne Major is more conveniently located to the center of Detroit and would represent a 10- to 12-minute saving in traveling time," the airlines said. "We also recognize that the comfort and convenience of our passenger customers is of primary concern.

"Thus the basic question was a balancing of increased passenger convenience against the expenditure of private and taxpayer funds to duplicate at Wayne Major those facilities already existing and being used at Willow Run."

The airline's decision was also governed by the requirements of the Michigan Air National Guard, currently based at Wayne Major, and the Naval Air Station at Grosse Ile. A new Air Force reserve squadron is expected to begin its weekend flying operations at Willow Run later this month.

National Guard spokesmen have said they are "happily located," while Navy officials have expressed a clear preference for relocating all naval flying activities at Wayne Major rather than Willow Run. It has been estimated that it will cost only $3 million to transfer the Grosse Ile base to Wayne Major, a clear-cut savings of nearly $30 million over the cost to convert the Wayne County port for commercial operations.

The letter to Smith was sent by all ANTSCO member airlines except American, which has indicated it is considering a lone switch to Wayne Major. American was represented at the special ANTSCO meeting, but declined to make any comment on the outcome.

The airlines' unified stand apparently spells an end to Wayne County hopes for a multimillion dollar revamping of Wayne Major, but the aircarriers pledged their complete support and cooperation in working toward another Detroit airport in the northeast section to supplement Willow Run.

"We feel," the airlines said today, "that any money spent on further airport facilities in the Detroit area should be invested in the development of the Northeast Airport, as a solution to Detroit's airport needs." Pointing to current air traffic increases of from 10 to 15 percent yearly, they say two airports in the metropolitan Detroit area will be "justified and warranted" by the time a new facility can be constructed.

The "once and for all" decision to remain at Willow Run thus paves the way for the start of a $1,500,000 remodeling and expansion program there, financed by the airlines.

Based on an extensive study by Landrum & Brown, nationally famous airport consultants of Cincinnati, Ohio, the project in its entirety will take about 2 years to complete. Two of three major phases of the improvement program, however, can be finished by next year, ANTSCO president, Robert E. Miller, said today. He added that a detailed explanation of the project will be announced publicly when a date for the start of actual work has been set.

When the bulk of the improvement project is completed, the Landrum & Brown report estimates, Willow Run Airport should prove adequate to serve all anticipated air-travel needs of the metropolitan Detroit area for the next 10 years, and at least until the proposed northeast airport is in operation.

Cost of the revamping would be reduced considerably should American Airlines decide to move, Miller explained, as the remaining seven carriers would absorb space currently utilized by American, which accounts for some 28 percent of operations at Willow Run. This would then cut down planned and needed expansion of the terminal building and hangar facilities.

To back up with action their intention of remaining at Willow Run, ANTSCO officials have been authorized to negotiate with the University of Michigan, owner of the vast airport, for an extension and/or renewal of the current lease, which expires in 1962.

Airlines who concurred in the final decision to remain at Willow Run include Capital, Delta, Eastern, Northwest, Trans World, and United. The seventh, North Central Airlines, is not a member of ANTSCO, but intends to stay. An eighth operator, Slick Air Freight, moved early last year from Wayne Major.

Mr. MEADER. After the airlines said that they were not going to move—this has happened. There have been three attacks in an attempt to force the airlines to move. I have here a letter dated February 14, 1956, from the Department of the Navy addressed to Mr. Floyd Wakefield, the University of Michigan Airport supervisor at Willow Run, in which the Navy says: "We need so much space—please give it to us."

The university has not yet replied to that letter, but I do not know how they could make any other reply than to say, "Well, we are sorry, but there just is nowhere to go. The space is occupied," which it is.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point in my remarks to incorporate the letter from the Navy Department to the University of Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington 25, D. C., February 9, 1956.

Mr. FLOYD G. WAKEFIELD,
University of Michigan Airport
Supervisor, Willow Run Airport,
Ypsilanti, Mich.

DEAR MR. WAKEFIELD: I am writing in regards to the recent Airport Use Panel public hearing held in the city of Detroit and that panel's recommendation of November 4, 1955, that the Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Mich., be relocated and established on the Willow Run Airport.

It is the desire of the Navy Department to comply with the above recommendation as soon as possible in that the Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, is no longer adequate to support the newer type aircraft planned for that station. Feasibility studies have proven that the cost of expanding the Grosse Ile runway system would be prohibitive as well as requiring excessive fill in the Detroit River. For these and other reasons, no further consideration is being given to the expansion of this facility.

The purpose of this letter is to set forth the anticipated Navy requirements for the relocation of the Naval Air Station on the Willow Run Airport and to request an estimated date and extent of available facilities upon which this Department can plan, and program for, this recommended move. The anticipated Navy requirements for the Willow Run Airport are as follows:

1. Land area—approximately 80 acres.
2. Aircraft parking apron—90,000 square yards.
3. Aircraft hangar: Hangar area, 50,000 square feet; Leanto area, 60,000 square feet.
4. Ground training building, 30,000 square feet.
5. Aviation fuel storage, 10,000 barrels.
6. Supply offices and warehouse storage facilities, 50,000 square feet.
7. Public Works and automotive maintenance facilities, 20,000 square feet.
8. Ordnance storage facilities, three magazines.
9. Personnel and welfare facilities to be constructed.

It is anticipated that Navy aircraft, approximately 60 in number, of which 37 will be jet type, will average 32,000 operations per year.

Your early attention and cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
E. A. HANNEGAN,
Captain, United States Navy
(By direction).

Mr. MEADER. Meanwhile, almost on the same day, February 13, 1956, the secretary of the Airport Use Panel, this kangaroo court that I have been talking about, wrote a letter to the University of Michigan which is really a masterpiece of Federal bureaucratic arrogance and impertinence.

They wanted to know why the University of Michigan had not answered a letter which, I understand, the university never received. They wanted to know when the University of Michigan was going to start obeying the orders of the Airport Use Panel. If it binds anybody, it binds the executive branch of the Government, but it does not have any authority over the State of Michigan or any agency of the State of Michigan.

They had the impertinence and audacity to tell the University of Michigan, and the regents of that university, that they should not renew any lease with the airlines. I would say they are way out of bounds. It is an ultra vires act and should be ignored.

I think the university is drafting a reply to that letter.

I would like to incorporate the Airport Use Panel letter of February 13, 1956, at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The letter is as follows:)

AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1956.

Dr. HARLAN HATCHER,
President, University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

MY DEAR DR. HATCHER: Early in November 1955, you were furnished a copy of the airport use panel's report dated November 4, 1955, concerning the most feasible civil military utilization of the airports, existing and proposed in the Detroit, Mich., area. That report recommends, among other things, (1) that the scheduled air carriers now using the Willow Run Airport transfer their operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as soon as adequate facilities can be made available to serve their needs, and (2) that one Air Force Reserve fighter squadron, the Air National Guard squadrons now stationed at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, and the Naval and Marine activities presently located at Naval Air Station Grosse Ile be transferred to the Willow Run Airport. While these recommendations obviously are of vital concern to the University of Michigan as owner of the Willow Run Airport, the panel, thus far, has received no official indication of the university's position with respect to the proposed changes in the use to be made of that airport.

In approving this report, the Departments of the Federal Government comprising the airport use plan, individually and collectively, committed themselves to implement the recommendations contained therein. Since the issuance of this report, each of the member agencies primarily concerned has further indicated its full intention to proceed with implementation of these recommendations as expeditiously as possible. In this connection, it is understood that both the Air Force and Navy Departments have already been in touch with the university with a view to negotiating agreements for transfer to the Willow Run Airport of the military operations noted above.

It is also pointed out that since the issuance of the panel's report, the panel has been officially advised by the mayor of the city of Detroit, the chairman of the Board of Wayne County Supervisors, and the director of aeronautics for the State of Michigan, acting on behalf of the Governor, that the agencies of government they represent also intend to cooperate with the Federal Government to the fullest extent consistent with their statutory authority, in the implementation of the panel's recommendations.

As the owner of the Willow Run Airport it is recognized that the regents of the University of Michigan are in a position to considerably facilitate the changes in civil and military use of the airport contemplated by the airport use panel. Accordingly the panel has directed me to request, on behalf of all its member agencies, the cooperation of the regents of the university toward that end.

In this connection it has come to our attention that some of the airlines now operating at the Willow Run Airport are reluctant to transfer their operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, as recommended by the panel, and that the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc., acting on their behalf, has proposed to the university a long-term extension of the agreement under which it operates and maintains the Willow Run Airport. Inasmuch as any extension of the ANTSCO agreement might make it more difficult to implement the recommendations of the panel than would otherwise be the case, it is the panel's hope that the university will not concur in any such amendment.

In view of the fact that the action to be taken by the Federal Government and the several other interested agencies will depend, in large measure, on the position to be taken by the regents of the university, the panel has directed me to request an official statement of the intent of the university in this regard.

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated by all of the agencies of the Federal Government concerned.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH W. JOHNSON,
Secretary, Airport Use Panel.

(Copies to mayor of Detroit, Mich.; Governor of the State of Michigan; chairman, Wayne County Board of Supervisors.)

Mr. MEADER. In addition to that, one of the recommendations of the Airport Use Panel was that there be a Detroit Aviation Authority, so Mr. Smith set up a Detroit Aviation Authority which they wanted to make a 9-member board. They are willing to have the University of Michigan be represented by 1 member. That member could be outvoted 8 to 1. They would like to have the University of Michigan turn over the airport to this Detroit Aviation Authority. That is very much like, "Will you please come into my parlor, said the spider to the fly."

The University of Michigan indicated that they had obligations under their lease with the Airlines Terminal Service Co., and although they sent a representative to one of the organization meetings, that did not mean that they were committing themselves to the Detroit Aviation Authority.

Mr. Speaker, what does all this mean in terms of the future of aviation in the United States? We all know how important aviation has become, but I would like to read two paragraphs from the report on aviation facilities of a study group appointed by the Bureau of the Budget. It is popularly known as the Harding report and is entitled "Aviation Facilities." It is dated December 31, 1955.

On page 22 I read as follows:

Since 1948, total United States flying hours have more than doubled, and the air carriers have boosted their passenger-miles from about six to almost twenty billion. Military operations have increased and so have those in the category of general aviation. Controlled traffic is now about equally divided between civil and military.

At the beginning of this period, both industry and Government were predicting airline traffic of only between nine and eleven and one-half billion passenger-miles by 1955. In 1951, the CAA revised its figures and predicted that airline passenger-miles would reach 20 billion in 1960. That traffic volume will be attained this year—5 years ahead of schedule. This, then, is the first major factor having an impact on the problem: Aviation's rate of growth and the load it will put on our facilities are constantly being underestimated in future planning.

But to handle this fantastic growth of air traffic; to build a sound policy for its

continued healthy development the report has this to say on page 30:

In summary, then, the present responsibility for aviation facilities development, within the Government, is distributed somewhat as follows:

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the responsibility for operating the airways.

The military services fly under Civil Aeronautics Administration's control but must, of necessity, provide certain traffic-control and air-navigation services to meet their own requirements, if the Civil Aeronautics Administration is unable to meet them.

The Air Coordinating Committee has the responsibility for coordinating broad aviation policies.

The Air Navigation Development Board is responsible for coordinating aviation facilities development programs.

The Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics is a Government industry advisory organization with no continuing official Government status which serves upon request.

There are now over 75 committees, subcommittees, and special working groups addressing themselves to aviation-facilities matters. The existence of so many groups is not, in itself, an evil, but it is increasingly apparent that the process of coordination is becoming more and more time consuming, and that preoccupation with current issues tends to obscure forward vision.

Mr. Speaker, however well prepared that report is, I want to call the attention of the House to one surprising statement contained on page 2. The statement answers the following question:

Should a study of long-range needs for aviation facilities and aids be undertaken? * * * it is our considered opinion that there is still no top-level systems study and master plan which would provide the executive branch and affected agencies of the Government with a firm basis upon which to build a comprehensive legislative and fiscal program for aviation-facilities development.

Mr. Speaker, I ask a question in return: What about the Congress? I have long sought better and more adequately paid professional staffs for committees, to enable them intelligently to discharge congressional responsibility as the policymaking branch of Government, the proper branch to formulate aviation policy for this country.

It is not the role of the executive to make policy; it is not the role of some high-powered so-called experts to advise the executive how to make aviation policy; it is not for the executive to write legislation, as the Harding report implies.

It is for us in Congress to do that job. It is my hope that the inquiry of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee will provide a fund of factual information which will enable the appropriate legislative committees and the Congress to discharge its constitutional function in determining policy in the field of aviation. It is my hope that the committee's inquiry will also disclose the extent to which military thinking is influencing national aviation development.

As a result of the Harding report the President has appointed Edward P. Curtis as special assistant for aviation facilities. An interesting sketch on Mr. Curtis and his responsibilities appeared in a recent issue of a newsletter published by the magazine American Aviation, which I incorporate at this point in my remarks:

CURTIS TAPPED TO RUN AVIATION FACILITIES STUDY

Edward P. Curtis, newly appointed special Presidential assistant for aviation facilities, told American Aviation this week he will take over the job with "no preconceived ideas." The 59-year old vice president of Eastman Kodak Co., and a longtime personal friend of the President, views the appointment as a full-time assignment. He said he expects to work with an informally-run advisory board and a "very small staff."

Curtis, executive assistant to Gen. "Tooey" Spaatz, the Chief of Staff of the Strategic Air Force in World War II, will start to work on a long-range plan for easing the congestion in the Nation's airways on March 1.

His appointment is a followup to the Harding report to the Budget Bureau which recommended the study of a 20-year master plan for airways and traffic control.

THREEFOLD RESPONSIBILITY

In a letter to Curtis, President Eisenhower said responsibilities of the new post included:

1. Direction and coordination of a long-range study of aviation facilities requirements.

2. Development of a comprehensive plan for meeting in the most effective and economical manner the needs revealed by the study.

3. Formation of legislative, organization, administrative and budgetary recommendations to implement the plan.

Eisenhower's concern with increasing civilian and military air traffic and the complications likely to be created when commercial jets take to the air lanes was revealed in his letter to the new aviation aide.

"I am taking this action," he wrote, "because the rapid technical advances in aviation and the remarkable growth in the use of air transportation have confronted the Nation with serious aviation facilities problems.

"Modern aircraft can be operated in the numbers required by the National defense and the civilian economy only if airports, navigation aids, air traffic control devices and communications systems are suitable for their needs."

"To delay the formulation of the plan is to invite further congestion of air space," the letter continued, "needless hazard, economic loss, inconvenience to users, and possible impairment of the National security."

The Departments of Defense and Commerce have been instructed to cooperate fully with Curtis. They will probably turn over facts and information they have collected in connection with air traffic facilities and name a top official to work with him.

Curtis joined Eastman Kodak in 1921 and became vice president in 1945. He was an Army pilot in World War I. In the Second World War, he attained the rank of major general, serving as executive assistant to General "Tooey" Spaatz. He owned a private pilot's license some yeargs ago, but CAA records show it expired in 1933.

He is a director of the Air Force Association and a member of the Wings Club.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the committee will meet promptly and act favorably on my request for a penetrating investigation of the Federal airport aid program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

FEDERAL CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago I introduced a bill, sponsored jointly by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] in this House and by Senators KEFAUVER and WATKINS in the other body, which proposes an important modification in Federal criminal appeal procedures. It would permit any person who has been sentenced in a Federal district court to appeal to the proper court of appeals solely on the question of the propriety of the sentence. This review is not now available in the Federal courts, although comparable provisions have long been observed in the laws of my State of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Ohio, and several others.

It is a highly desirable curb on the arbitrary discretion of the sentencing judge, not likely to be used except in most unusual cases, but insuring against any miscarriage of justice by its mere existence. The proposal has been sponsored in the past by several attorneys general. Current interest in it extends from addresses on the subject by our present distinguished Solicitor General, Judge Simon Sobeloff.

I am pleased to report that in the course of its midwinter meeting in Chicago this week the American Bar Association, acting through its board of governors and house of delegates, has endorsed this proposal, pending in this House as H. R. 4930, and has recommended its enactment by the Congress. I hope this endorsement will be instrumental in hastening favorable action on the bill. It would represent an important improvement in the administration of justice at the Federal level.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. TUMULTY, for 15 minutes on February 27.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 1 hour on Tuesday, February 28.

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes on Thursday next.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. CANFIELD, for 10 minutes on Monday, February 27.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes on Monday, February 27.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina, for 1 hour on Thursday, March 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'NEILL and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SELDEN and include an address by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. TUMULTY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HINSHAW and to include a humorous glossary of terms used to keep the wheels turning in Government and industry and to have them printed in separate form as it appears in the dictionary.

Mr. TOLLEFSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LIPSCOMB and to include an article.

Mr. UTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (at the request of Mr. MEADER) and include a speech by Hon. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. MEADER.)

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include two letters.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include a speech delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] before the national meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Associations.

Mr. KEATING.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor);

H. R. 2430. An act to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America; and

H. R. 8101. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 27, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 84th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress, entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948.

JOHN D. DINGELL,
15th District, Michigan.
JAMES C. HEALEY,
22d District, New York.
ELMER J. HOLLAND,
30th District, Pennsylvania.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1568. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 20, 1955, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on Beaver Slough at Clinton, Iowa. This interim report is submitted under the authority for a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 22, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1569. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 11, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Saginaw River, Mich., with a view to determining the feasibility of improving Saginaw River or its tributaries for flood control and other purposes at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted April 19, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 25 illustrations.

1570. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 23, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on preliminary examinations and surveys of Bayou Chevreuil, La., made pursuant to several congressional authorizations listed in the report (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 2 illustrations.

1571. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 22, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a beach erosion control study of the Lake Michigan shore of Manitowoc County from Two Rivers to Manitowoc, Wis., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 348); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

1572. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 5, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Boston Harbor, Mass., with a view to deepening the reserved channel to 35 feet and also with a view to increasing the width of channel for which the Federal Government is responsible. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 21, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 349); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2884. An act to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 501. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; with amendment (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7763. A bill to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8750. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 1810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 9498. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 9499. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 9500. A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 9501. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 9502. A bill to amend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 9503. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities

received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 9504. A bill to authorize the transfer to the fund for the payment of Government losses in shipment of certain amounts representing unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 9505. A bill to recognize and confirm the authority of arid and semiarid States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their geographic boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 9506. A bill to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 9507. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 9508. A bill to reduce the percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9509. A bill to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949 and the act of June 28, 1937, in order to authorize disposal of surplus farm commodities, and products thereof, to Federal, State, and local penal and correctional institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (by request):

H. R. 9510. A bill to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST (by request):

H. R. 9511. A bill to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 9512. A bill to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 9513. A bill to amend Public Law 484, 73d Congress, to provide that in determining eligibility for pension thereunder of widows and children of veterans of World War I, World War II, or of the Korean conflict, commercial insurance on the life of the deceased veteran shall be excluded from income to the extent that such insurance is used to pay the expenses of burial of the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9514. A bill to establish corporate income-tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 31 percent surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9515. A bill to amend the laws providing for life insurance for veterans, to permit insured veterans to divest themselves of all incidents of ownership over their policies so that such insurance will not be included in their gross estate for Federal estate-tax purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9516. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on National Housing Policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 9517. A bill to amend certain laws relating to the provision of housing and the elimination of slums, to establish a National Mortgage Corporation to assist in the provision of housing for families of moderate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 9518. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide increases in annuity for persons who have attained age 75 or above; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9519. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for certain reservoir projects located in the State of Texas, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 9520. A bill to provide that public lands of the United States shall not be withdrawn or reserved for defense purposes except by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 9521. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public or private educational institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 9522. A bill to raise revenue, assist the American farmer by providing for the use of motor fuels of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown upon the farm in the United States, to utilize grains in surplus, to balance consumption with production of certain agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9523. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 9524. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 9525. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel post) mail matter at the post office at Muscatine, Iowa; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 556. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a sound national minerals policy, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to take certain action in furtherance of such policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore tobacco acreage allotments to their 1955 level; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9526. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Maria Ciccone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9527. A bill for the relief of Miss Pnina Shlapak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 9528. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Tzouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 9529. A bill for the relief of Arcadio Navarro-Savala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 9530. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Ayala de Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 9531. A bill for the relief of Nashat Saadi Zabalaoui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 9532. A bill for the relief of Pak Un Ha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 9533. A bill for the relief of Monica Zatica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Res. 406. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 7176, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

564. By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Hertel, of Blue Earth, Minn., and 121 other signers, protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio, television, newspapers, and magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

565. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of the Townsend plan for National Insurance State Office, signed by many citizens of Jasper County, Mo., urging me to lend my best efforts to having the Townsend plan as defined in H. R. 4471 adopted as an amendment to the Social Security Act in place of the present programs of old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

566. By Mr. TAYLOR: Petition, as follows: We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increase the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television, signed by Mrs. Isabelle F. Wilson and other citizens of Mooers, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

567. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the grand knight, Knights of Columbus, Corpus Christi Council, No. 2502, Mineola, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

568. Also, petition of the grand knight, Knights of Columbus, Joan of Arc Council, No. 1992, Port Jefferson, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

569. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Mr. Albert J. Troyer, of Millersburg, and sundry other signers, requesting repeal of a portion of Public Law 761 and any other social-security laws which contain compulsion for farmers, and so forth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I am today extending in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list of the 34 participating projects which are a part of the Colorado River storage project. I am including the construction cost of the projects, the total area in acres each of the projects would serve, the irrigation allocation per acre, and the percentage of the irrigation allocation which would be repaid by the irrigators.

Mr. Speaker, not one single irrigation project in all of the 34 participating projects is financially sound.

If we consider the original 11 approved by the President and Secretary McKay, the cost for area served on the individual projects ranges from $200 to $800 per acre for construction alone. The water users can repay a weighted average of 17.5 percent. This average is that low because the largest of all the projects, central Utah, is the least feasible.

However, Mr. Speaker, these figures of cost per acre fail to represent a true measure of cost, because nearly two-thirds of the acres to be served are already in production and would receive only a supplemental water supply. In most cases this additional supply would be only a few inches in depth per annum, and thus only a small fraction of the amount of water necessary to put arid land into full production.

The real cost of putting enough water on an acre of land in this arid to semi-arid region would on the central Utah project be over $2,600 an acre.

It must be remembered that in these figures I am considering only construction costs. I am not considering interest charges on the Government's investment.

Nor do the figures I am presenting include another legitimate charge for irrigation. This is the proportion of the cost of building the storage reservoirs which should be borne by the irrigation projects.

As many an unlucky farmer has learned by bitter experience, the real value of his land is not what he has put into it in money and labor, but what he can get out for what he produces. The lands proposed to be irrigated in the Colorado River storage project lie at altitudes from 5,000 to 7,000 feet above sea level. They are not in tropical or semitropical latitudes. They have a short growing season and are generally capable of producing only forage crops and grains.

Land in the region, fully irrigated and improved, brings in the market an average of only about $150 an acre.

The list of projects follows:

Colorado River storage project participating projects

Project	Project construction cost	Total area served	Irrigation allocation per acre	Percentage of irrigation allocation to be repaid by irrigators
	Thousands	*Acres*		
1. La Barge	$1,673	7,970	210	29.6
2. Seedskadee	23,272	60,720	383	20.6
3. Lyman	10,564	40,600	260	21.3
4. Silt	3,356	7,300	450	31.1
5. Smith Fork	3,367	10,430	321	31.3
6. Paonia	6,944	17,040	399	35.5
7. Florida	6,942	18,950	343	26.3
8. Pine River extension	5,027	15,150	332	40.7
9. Emery County	9,865	24,080	400	38.6
10. Central Utah (initial phase)	231,044	160,380	794	11.9
11. Hammond	2,302	3,670	627	16.1
Total (11 projects)	304,356	366,290	[1] 545	[1] 17.5
12. Eden	7,287	20,200	361	20.6
Total (12 projects)	311,643	386,490	[1] 536	[1] 17.7
13. Navaho	211,237	137,250	1,530	14.6
14. San Juan-Chama	135,169	225,000	480	25.8
15. Gooseberry	5,761	16,400	350	41.5
Total (15 projects)	663,810	765,140	[1] 694	[1] 18.4
16. Savery-Pot Hook	10,814	31,610	340	12.9
17. Dolores	24,633	66,000	370	6.2
18. Sublette	37,099	84,000	430	3.7
19. Fruitgrowers Dam extension	1,690	3,850	440	27.8
20. Bostwick Park	2,634	6,870	380	26.4
21. Dallas Creek	10,330	21,940	470	9.2
22. East River	212	2,750	80	44.8
23. Fruitland Mesa	11,551	19,400	590	9.2
24. Grand Mesa	20,164	25,300	800	.1
25. Ohio Creek	3,402	16,910	200	1.0
26. Tomichi Creek	11,523	27,580	420	0
27. Battlement Mesa	5,854	6,830	860	11.0
28. Bluestone	3,330	10,875	310	11.1
29. Eagle Divide	3,412	10,875	310	8.9
30. Parshall	11,882	27,510	430	12.0
31. Rabbit Ear	4,733	19,190	250	16.1
32. Troublesome	5,243	13,640	380	13.8
33. West Divide	79,676	65,610	1,220	7.5
34. Woody Creek	178	2,965	60	100.0
Grand total (34 projects)	912,170	1,228,845	[1] 633	[1] 14.8

[1] Weighted average.

The Conservatism of George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last evening the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] delivered a very intelligent and informed address on the conservatism of George Washington. The Senator spoke in his usually fine, impressive manner. I think a reading of the address would be of value to Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSERVATISM OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

(Address by Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, before the American Good Government Society, Washington, D. C., February 22, 1956)

I am deeply honored to join with you in celebrating the birthday of our first President. The annual George Washington Day Dinner has become a splendid tradition in the Nation's Capital. These annual observances of the American Good Government Society will, I hope, become a tradition in communities all over the country.

Of all the great men in American history Washington is unique in that he is, and always has been, beyond responsible criticism. Jefferson, Lincoln, Jackson, Calhoun, Hamilton, and Marshall, to name only a few, continue to be somewhat controversial. Washington stands alone, universally acclaimed and unanimously accepted as the Father of his Country.

For Americans of all ages it was ever so. Take, for example, Henry Adams, grandson of the sixth President and great-grandson of the second. Even at the tender age of 12, Henry Adams was urbane, somewhat cynical, an ardent abolitionist, and completely unawed by the power and prestige of Presidents. Adams, in his famous autobiography, The Education of Henry Adams, gives these impressions of his first trip to Washington, made in 1850 at the age of 12:

"No sort of glory hedged Presidents as such, and in the whole country, one could hardly have met with an admission of respect for any office or name, unless it were George Washington. That was—to all appearance sincerely—respected. People made pilgrimages to Mount Vernon and made even an effort to build Washington a monument. The effort had failed, but one still went to Mount Vernon, although it was no easy trip."

* * * * *

"George Washington was a primary, or * * * an ultimate relation, like the Pole Star, and amid the endless restless motion of every other visible point in space, he alone remained steady, in the mind * * * to the end."

Then Henry Adams tells of his trip to Mount Vernon in a carriage and pair with his father, Charles Francis. On the way Henry was tempted to ask his abolitionist father how a slave state could produce such a man as Washington. He never put the question. He wrote in his Education the following words:

"Luckily Charles Francis Adams never preached and was singularly free from cant.

He may have had views of his own, but he let his son Henry satisfy himself with the simple elementary fact that George Washington stood alone."

Daniel Webster expressed this feeling in a single sentence: "Washington is in the clear upper sky." To speak about a man of such great and unquestioned stature is a most difficult assignment. The task is further complicated by the fact that millions of words have been spoken and written about George Washington, the most important of which are familiar to an audience such as this.

Tonight, I shall talk about Washington's conservative political philosophy. Whether or not Jefferson and Lincoln were liberal or conservative, is still a topic of lively debate. To the best of my knowledge, however, nobody has tried to pin the neoliberal label on Washington. Again it is indicative of Washington's unique place in history that even the most militant of modern liberals do not seem disturbed by Washington's conservatism. They appear to assume that the conservative policies pursued by Washington were sound under the circumstances of time and place.

Only when we begin to apply Washington's conservative principles to current problems do we involve Washington in political debate. I have often thought what would happen if God should see fit to return Washington to us for a period of 30 days. Let us imagine that Washington is scheduled to arrive at the National Airport tomorrow in a celestial DC–7.

There would, of course, be a motorcade from the airport to the White House along the route reserved for visting celebrities. Government offices would be closed early. I suspect, however, that few Government employees would use this extra time off for shopping on F Street.

In touring this vicinity, three places would give Washington particular pleasure. First, he could not fail to be deeply moved by the monument erected to his memory and dominating the skyline of the Nation's Capital. No man could ask for more in the way of an official token of gratitude.

Washington would be more pleased, I think, to find that Mount Vernon had become a national shrine. Watching the steady stream of visitors to his beloved acres on the Potomac, Washington would know that he never really died; that he continues to live in the minds and hearts of the common people.

Washington would derive great satisfaction from a visit to the Fairfax County Courthouse. There he would find recorded in the office of the clerk his last will and testament. Dusty records in the clerk's office would convince him that we had taken seriously the advice in his Farewell Address: "To maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property."

Shortly after his return there would be a nationwide TV appearance. Then the American people could judge with their own eyes whether history has been right in painting Washington as frigid and austere. I suspect they would see a simple dignity—a dignity regrettably lacking in many public officials. Our crackerbarrel philosopher, Charles F. Browne, better known as Artemus Ward, showed a keener insight than many historians when he said:

"The prevailin' weakness of most public men is to slop over. G. Washington never slopt over."

The revivified Washington could not wholly despair of America's future after meeting the leading figures in our Government. He would find in President Eisenhower a worthy successor. They have much in common—a military background, an unimpeachable personal integrity, and a deep disgust for those who would gamble with the Nation's security for the sake of political advantage.

Washington would be very proud to find his beloved Virginia so ably represented in the Senate of the United States. No man in public life has done more than HARRY BYRD to implement the conservative fiscal policies which Washington deemed so important. In his Farwell Address, Washington advised us to "cherish public credit" and to avoid "the accumulation of debt," while at the same time making those "timely disbursements, to prepare for danger which frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it." We are indeed fortunate in having as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and as the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee a man so well qualified to strike this delicate balance.

Washington would also be gratified to find as Secretary of the Treasury a man who compares so favorably with his own great Secretary Alexander Hamilton. A greater compliment is not within my power to bestow. We shall, I hope, hear all about Secretary Hamilton's remarkable career in 1957 when we officially observe the bicentennial of his birth.

During his brief visit with us, Washington would certainly discover a close political kinship with Senator GEORGE. The theme of Washington's Farewell Address is the danger of factionalism and "the fury of party spirit," particularly in the conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs. No one has done more than Senator GEORGE to prevent partisan attacks on settled principles of American foreign policy.

Of course, Washington would make a triumphal tour of the United States, culminating, I suppose, in a mammoth ticker tape parade in New York. For Washington this adulation would be no new experience. He would be reminded, I think, of April 16, 1789, and the days immediately following.

George Washington was up before dawn on that eventful day. Martha did not go along with his ungodly hours, so he sneaked softly downstairs and headed for the kitchen. A subdued clatter of skillets assured him that the cook was already on the job, and his nose detected the promising aroma of corn meal hoe cakes.

The vast sweep of the Mount Vernon plantation was still wrapped in slumber, but we can well imagine that a fledgling cockerel was practicing an adolescent crow; that a hungry calf was complaining about the lack of service—and that a reckless foxhound puppy was teasing an irascible and noisy goose.

These were matinal sounds that were dear to the heart of the farmer-general—and he had thought that they would be his own forever. He felt that he had had enough of public life.

Eight years before—at Yorktown—he had said, "The work is done and well done."

Six years before, he had said goodbye to his officers, put away his uniform, hustled home to Mount Vernon and enthusiastically written to Lafayette that, "At length, my dear Marquis, I am become a private citizen on the banks of the Potomac; and under the shadow of my own vine and my own figtree, free from the bustle of a camp and the busy scenes of public life, I am solacing myself with those tranquil enjoyments of which the soldier * * * the statesman * * * and the courtier * * * can have very little conception."

The work was done for his muscular and triumphant little army. But the work was not done for Washington, and today, April 16, 1789, he was saying goodby once again—this time to Mount Vernon—as President-elect of the new United States.

He had his hoe cakes—with honey—and a pot of tea, and as he went outdoors, he found his horse, already saddled, full of oats and groomed to a glistening sheen. It nickered a welcome, and his dogs swarmed around his legs—a small and turbulent sea of waving tails and jealous clamorings for his personal attention. There were men in those days who said they could not understand this always dignified, austere and sometimes frosty man—but animals—and children—understood him very well indeed.

The President-elect of the new United States was in no hurry to get going on the long and muddy-roaded journey to the temporary capital in New York City. There was time enough to note that one of his mares had foaled the night before, and the oldest ewe sheep on the place was calling his attention to the charms of her new-born twin lambs. The Presidency could wait a little longer.

There would even be time for a second breakfast of fresh fish, ham and eggs, more corn cakes and more tea, and the President-elect was well aware that neither Col. David Humphreys, his aide, nor Charles Thomson, the Secretary of the Congress, who had brought him official word of his election, would be astir for at least another hour.

Those two men were to accompany him to New York, and it was 10 o'clock before the carriage wheels began to turn. We are given to understand that Washington rode in silence. Possibly he was oppressed by the fact that he had to borrow money to make the trip. As always, he was rich in land, and poor in cash. It is more likely that he was oppressed by the frightful responsibilities that had been thrust upon him by the unanimous vote of the presidential electors. As a commander in the field, he recognized his own abilities. As a military strategist, he had no lack of faith in himself, but his confidence in the future of George Washington as a statesman was almost nonexistent.

It was fortunate, perhaps, that he had little time to brood about it. His first stop was at Alexandria, Va.; there was a public dinner, and a large bouquet of flowery speeches. At Georgetown, there were parading troops in full dress; cannon belched salutes, and bells were tolled.

Baltimore was a mob scene of enthusiastic citizens, delirious with hero worship.

It was a triumphant march. The Governor of Pennsylvania met the carriage at the border with a uniformed escort, and at Trenton, N. J., 13 young girls who were dressed to represent the 13 States, recited a long and fulsome poem in unison.

New York wrapped both arms around him. It was before the days of ticker tape, but our modern parades through the heart of New York have nothing on Washington's reception at the temporary capital. New York had entered into the spirit of the occasion with a fervorous abandon. The city shook with the thunder of gunfire and the peals of bells. Flags and streamers fluttered in the breeze, and the rooftops were black with people—some of whom naively believed that Washington was about to be crowned as a king.

The inauguration took place on April 30, 1789. The Congress was in session. The Government of our infant federation was about to be launched. Three times in the course of his inaugural address Washington invoked the favor of God. Midway in his address he declared that, "no people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than the people of the United States." If Washington were to speak to us today, he would ascribe to Providence the major credit for America's progress over the past 167 years. In all of his writings, Washington invariably recognized the creative acts of providence.

If Washington were to spend a month with us, the gulf separating him from contemporary liberals would soon be obvious to all. Washington constantly stressed the

need for self-restraint and self-reform. He believed not only that men must act in conformity with ethical absolutes, but that their morality could not prevail in the absence of religious conviction. Washington regarded the Constitution primarily as a restraint on men in their collective capacity. He recognized as the two great constitutional pivots:

"[First] That the general government is not invested with more powers, than are indispensably necessary to perform the functions of a good government."

And secondly, "that these powers * * * are so distributed among the legislature, executive, and judicial branches, into which the General Government is arranged, that it can never be in danger of degenerating into a monarchy, an oligarchy, an aristocracy, or any other despotic or oppressive form, so long as there shall remain any virtue in the body of the people."

In other words, Washington felt that the struggle between good and evil is waged primarily in the individual rather than in society; that the individual's base instincts must be restrained by morality and religion; and that the popular will of the State must likewise be restrained by the immutable political truths of the Constitution.

Contrast Washington's political philosophy with the philosophy recently expounded by a leading Senate exponent of modern liberalism. This Senator recently wrote for publication:

"The one distinctive aim [of liberalism] was the liberation of man from traditional restraints."

This Senator also said:

"The liberal approach must be experimental, the solution tentative, the test pragmatic. Believing that no particular manifestation of our basic social institutions is sacrosanct or immutable, there should be a willingness to reexamine and reconstruct institutions in the light of new needs."

And the Senator concluded:

"We must release ourselves from the shackles of yesterday's traditions and let our minds be bold."

Here we have a difference of first principles—a difference which cannot be composed by mediation and compromise. As a result, we find Washington insisting, "We are not to expect perfection on this world." On the other hand, all traditional restraints are regarded by modern liberals as impediments to achieving paradise on earth.

As Washington went about the United States, he would probably not express himself on specific political issues. After his retirement from the Presidency, he was reluctant to intrude upon what he described as "the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people." He did not even seek to buttress his place in history by writing his memoirs. He wrote to his personal physician, Dr. James Craik, who broached the subject that "any memoirs of my life, distinct and unconnected with the general history of the war, would rather hurt my feelings than tickle my pride whilst I lived. I had rather glide gently down the stream of life, leaving it to posterity to think and say what they please of me."

How refreshing.

However, Washington might not be wholly successful, if he were among us, in maintaining a posture of political neutrality. Suppose, for example, he were asked about current proposals to amend the Social Security Act. Could he resist repeating what he said in his Farewell Address about "not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear?"

It would be improper for me to suggest what position Washington might take on my proposed treaty-control amendment. He would be keenly interested in this debate, for the Jay Treaty was the most controversial act of this administration. Alexander Hamilton, writing under the pen name Camillus, was his staunch defender in that fight. Hamilton pointed out that all treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land. He emphasized the power of the Senate to approve or to reject a treaty. And he emphasized the fact that the only constitutional exception to the power of making treaties is that it shall not change the Constitution. Hamilton wrote that "a treaty cannot transfer the legislative power to the executive department, nor the power of this last department to the judiciary; in other words, it cannot stipulate that the President, and not the Congress, shall make laws for the United States; that the judges and not the President shall command the national forces."

In sum and substance, the treaty power as defined by Hamilton was limited to those objects over which neither contracting nation had sovereign jurisdiction. My amendment would merely impose on the treaty-making power the restraints originally intended to govern its exercise.

Could Washington remain silent upon seeing with his own eyes the extent to which political power has been centralized in Washington? There would be those who would explain the altered Federal-State relationship on the ground that "times have changed," or that the "Constitution must evolve to meet new conditions." Washington might remind them of what he said in his Farewell Address:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation."

During his brief visit with us, Washington would certainly be given a reception at the United Nations headquarters. Perhaps he would repeat his warning about "the policy and will of one country (being) subjected to the policy and will of another." He might refer again to the danger of "passionate attachments for others" in foreign affairs.

In many ways Washington was like the great British conservative, Edmund Burke. Both men sacrificed themselves for the masses, but not to them. As representatives of the people, both men insisted on the right to exercise their own best judgment. Like Burke, Washington distrusted the spirit of innovation, and respected custom and tradition. Washington's conservatism explains in considerable measure why the American Revolution bears such little resemblance to the French.

At the end of Washington's imaginary return, I like to think that he would make a second farewell address. However, I do not believe that its content would differ greatly from the one delivered on September 17, 1796. He might point out that his earlier statement in opposition to entangling alliances has been distorted by some. He would certainly say that nuclear weapons and intercontinental bombers have overcome America's "detached and distant situation" which existed in 1796. But now, as then, I believe that Washington would pin his hopes for America's survival on the indispensable supports of religion and morality.

Before Washington ended the visit which I have imagined, I am afraid that he would be a highly controversial figure. We might expect to read snide editorials attacking hero-worship; warning about "the dead hand of the past"; and scoring Washington for doubting both the inevitability of progress and the perfectibility of man. So, it is probably just as well, that Washington will not return to us in person. It is good to have one great American as a fixed and noncontroversial point of reference. So long as Washington remains "in the clear upper sky," the conservative principles for which he stood will never be wholly erased from our political conscience.

Integration of Common Supply and Service Areas Among the Military Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert two letters concerning plans for the Department of Defense to integrate the handling of certain common supplies and services. These two letters relate to those which I placed in the RECORD on January 16, 1956.

The step which Secretary Wilson has now taken, though belated, is important. It is hoped that he will insure that his directive to integrate these common use items will receive diligent followup lest it suffers the fate of other directives of similar purport. I also hope that this is but one of several steps that will be taken to carry out the full intent of the National Security Act and the O'Mahoney amendment of 1952.

As I have previously stated, the large savings through integration of the common supply and service areas among the military departments will go a long way toward financing some of the things which we so desperately need at this time.

The letters follow:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1956.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Secretary of Defense Wilson advised you by letter dated January 27, 1956, that I would furnish you complete information regarding our efforts toward improvements in the logistics field. The purpose of this letter is to reply to your letter of December 13, 1955, and to outline our program for supply of common-use items and common services.

The position of the Department of Defense with respect to supply, as discussed in the references cited in the second paragraph of your letter, was based on the supply techniques known to be available and developed as of that time. While it is true that our present plans may seem to change the previous concept, at the same time they reflect our never-ending effort to improve supply management as practical methods for doing so are developed. It is a seemingly simple task to designate that "supply support will be accomplished by single-service assignment." On the other hand, the tools and organizational arrangements to do so and insure adequate support in time of both peace and war must be carefully developed and considered, else we create a situation more objectionable than the one we endeavor to correct. We have vigorously worked on the problem and, among other actions, have developed what we feel is a sound solution—the single manager plan.

A significant factor affecting the previous efforts to solve the supply system problem was unquestionably the lack of the Federal Catalog, and hence, a common identification of items. Despite the sincerity of efforts to develop and further the concept of cross-servicing or making single-service assignments for supply, they cannot be effective

without the common language of the Federal Catalog program. In this regard I wish to point out that all catalog identification is scheduled for completion by September 1956, but it will not be until 1957 that a few more classes will be converted and the balance in 1958. In addition to the necessity of being able to use the common language of the Federal Catalog, we had to await the extension of the principle of stock fund financing in the departments to effect a sound financial basis for furthering our concepts. The military departments have vigorously pursued programs for refinements and improvements in their own military supply systems in a commendable manner, which has further assisted us. At this point I would like to explain briefly what we mean by conversion so that you will appreciate the time required after catalog identification has been completed. Conversion involves the renumbering of all items that are physically in inventories in all warehouses, the reprinting of all stock lists and reference material for procurement, and the revision of operating and maintenance manuals so that new numbers will be used when parts are requisitioned.

At the present time only subsistence, medical, clothing, and petroleum items are completely converted. Following the completion of conversion, the potentialities for cross-servicing become a reality and a major step completed in our efforts to develop single-service supply responsibility.

During the winter and spring of 1954–55, my staff completed the detail analysis of the single manager plan for supply of common-use items. As you know this culminated in the assignment of subsistence to the Army on November 4, 1955. Concurrently, we pursued a very active effort to analyze and develop assignments in other commodity categories. Our actions culminated on January 31, 1956, by Secretary Wilson's decision that the single manager plan be extended in the supply field to petroleum, medical-dental, clothing-textile, photographic equipment, and in the service field to traffic management. A copy of his memorandum to the military service secretaries, together with Department of Defense Directive 5160.12, also dated January 31, 1956, is inclosed. This directive sets forth the policies and implementations of single manager assignments.

I would like to point out the reasons why we selected subsistence before medical supply for the application of the single manager plan. Subsistence represented the commodity that had the greatest degree of single service (Army) integration and the fewest complications with respect to technical aspects of the inventory and the magnitude of mobilization reserves to be repositioned under the distribution policies of the plan. The Army already bought for all services and stored and distributed for the Air Force. Since only approximately 10 percent of the inventory is for mobilization reserve and complicated by many very technical items. A complication regarding distribution of medical supplies, emphasized by Operation Alert in June 1955, is that the need for medical supplies by the civilian population might take precedence over military requirements in the event of attack on continental United States. The need to provide dispersion even at some sacrifice in basic supply economy became apparent. These factors were all considered. As I have indicated, we now are assigning medical and dental supplies under the single manager concept to the Navy.

In our study of the single manager plan for common-use items, it also became quite evident that the same concept could be applied for common services such as Traffic Management, Military Sea Transportation Service, and Military Air Transportation Service. As indicated in the inclosure, this procedure has been approved by Secretary Wilson.

I trust that this answers your question as to our policies and programs. If further information is desired, I shall be pleased to provide it.

Sincerely,

T. P. PIKE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY WILSON: I am in receipt of Assistant Secretary T. P. Pike's letter of February 8 in response to my letter to you dated December 13, 1955.

I am pleased to learn that you have embarked upon a relatively broad program for the supply of common-use items and services as contemplated by the O'Mahoney Act of 1952. Respecting Mr. Pike's explanations as to the reasons for a change in policy involving the handling of medical and subsistence supplies respectively during the past year and a half, I want to state that my concern is not upon what is past, but what may be done to insure the success of the program that has now been charted. I am not unmindful of the difficulties which confront you in accomplishing this program, which I am sure can bring about tremendous savings.

In order that I may keep abreast of development, will you please send me copies of implementing documents which are issued from time to time? When available, I should like to learn by categories of supply (subsistence, medical, etc.) where the depots will be located and their respective missions, the locations of supply-demand-control points for each category of supply, the prescribed stock levels, what the interval of stock status reporting will be (i. e., monthly or quarterly, etc.), and whether standard forms, procedures, accounting, etc., are planned.

You are to be highly complimented for the action you have taken in this matter, and as stated in my letter of December 13, 1955, I am sending copies of pertinent correspondence to other interested Members in both Houses, and will also insert same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Surplus Food for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to see that President Eisenhower is making our surplus food available to western Europe, which has suffered from blizzards and floods in one of the worst winters in 20 or 30 years. I am particularly pleased with his statement, and I quote:

> The United States stands ready to make surpluses of agricultural commodities, which we have in abundance, available for relieving the distress of the people in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, to me this is a great humanitarian deed, and I am one who has always felt that it was ridiculous for us to have surplus food when people in other parts of the world are hungry. I congratulate the President on his immediate action to relieve the distressed.

Upper Colorado Storage Project Scheme Defies Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed upper Colorado River storage project bill, H. R. 3383, is wholly incompatible with the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy of December 22, 1955.

If ever a piece of water resources legislation cried for processing under the procedures the Presidential advisory committee recommends, this is it. This would involve an application of benefit-cost principles which would give a more realistic appraisal of the benefits and detriments of this project; and ultimate review by an independent Board of Review which should give the Congress a correct picture of the highly controverted engineering and financial details of the proposal.

Compare just two of the statements of the Presidential advisory committee with the facts of this project:

1. Use of excess revenues:

* * * * *

> The committee believes that such a use of excess revenue from Federal power sales to repay a portion of the costs of other types of projects is a justifiable procedure provided the project to which such revenues are applied is a part of the area from which such excess revenues are derived. However, it should be pointed out that the utilization of excess revenue to aid projects which are in no way related to the facility producing the excess revenues amounts in reality to the operation of a Government facility to obtain a profit to be used for other purposes, and there are obvious limits beyond which such a policy cannot be justified (report, pp. 33–34).

The participating projects to be benefited by the anticipated power revenues are connected in no other way with the power dams. Each one of these irrigation ventures could be constructed without the storage dams. No water impounded by these dams is to be placed on the land. Yet 88 percent of the cost of these irrigation projects is expected to be repaid from power revenues. If such a percentage does not exceed obvious limits, what would? The precedent in this bill would be so enormous for this type of subsidy that we may as well forget a national water policy on this score.

2. Payment of interest:

* * * * *

> The committee recommends that as a general policy interest be paid on all Federal in-

vestment subject to repayment. In making this recommendation the committee recognizes that the provision of interest-free Federal funds for irrigation does not conform to this policy. The committee believes, however, that this provision should not be eliminated but rather that interest should be shown clearly as a Federal cost, as should all nonreimbursable items in all projects (report, p. 34).

The Bureau of Reclamation has admitted that the project recommended by the Secretary—Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams and 11 participating projects—"would result in a total interest cost of $1,153,000,000 in the year 2032."

This staggering figure has been variously estimated by other sources to run as high as $4 billion, depending on which of the many over-all project plans may be under consideration. In any event, consider the Bureau figure as a minimum. This is not included as a project cost as the Presidential Advisory Committee now recommends. It was brought out only by determined questioning. It gives some idea of the true cost of the project to the taxpayers.

Salute to Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that there is one among us who is not conscious of the fact that we are in the midst of the annual observance of Brotherhood Week. In the newspapers, theaters, and pulpits of this great land, this wonderful thought—launched by the National Conference of Christians and Jews—has been spread.

It has been reassuring to observe the response of the people of this Nation to the appeals of religious and lay leaders of all faiths. I am sure many have realized that this week is a time for stocktaking and soul searching; a time for rededication to democratic principles and to the principles of our religious faiths.

To me Brotherhood Week is America's positive answer to the greatest challenge of our times—that is, if the human race is to survive there must be established a firm foundation of understanding and brotherhood around the globe. It seems to me that we can make the most significant contribution in the history of man if we can create an atmosphere of brotherhood and love in our world to replace the present aura of distrust and fear.

It is my hope that this week will form another link in what may eventually become part of a powerful chain, not only in the United States, but throughout the world, that will embrace men and women of every race, creed, and color, who will live side by side in a spirit of mutual respect.

Let us all join together and march in that procession which must someday lead us to ultimate victory over the forces of disruption, bigotry, and intolerance. Let us show the world that we Americans do not seek to destroy the beliefs and practices of those not in our own particular faith, but we believe there can be created a genuine spirit of brotherhood among all faiths if we but have the will and patience to bring it about. And let us never forget that in the principles of our religious teachings lie the hope and salvation of this world in which we live.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, if the next 25 years are as dry in the western part of our country as the last 25, it will take the whole quarter century to fill the proposed Glen Canyon Dam. Since the financial feasibility of the upper Colorado River project depends upon the power production of this dam there should be no authorization of such a proposal until the question of interpretation of the Colorado River compact is settled in the United States Supreme Court where the issue is now pending.

Article 3 (e) of the Colorado River compact provides:

> The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

The power production at Glen Canyon Dam therefore depends on whether or not the upper basin States, under the Colorado River compact, have a right as against the lower basin States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, to accumulate and withhold water at Glen Canyon for power generation if the lower basin needs it for domestic and agricultural uses.

Article 4 (b) of the Colorado River compact provides:

> Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electric power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

Governor Johnson, of Colorado, in his statement to the Senate hearings on this project said:

> Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water (over and above the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin) for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs (Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs) must be released.

Governor Johnson further stated that:

> Under the seven-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico before they can use one drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the seven-State compact was ratified.
>
> In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

Is it not foolhardy to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in Glen Canyon Dam on a question of interpretation of the Colorado River compact which may be set aside by the Supreme Court in an action which is now pending in that Court? Plain commonsense demands that all consideration of this bill await the Supreme Court decision.

Surpluses for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, unprecedented storm conditions in Europe this winter have created an opportunity for us to further evidence the humanity of the American people. Suffering among human beings and livestock can be alleviated out of our huge surpluses of foodstuffs.

Actually no physical transfer of foodstuff is believed necessary to relieve outright starvation conditions since the Government already has on hand in Europe millions of pounds of foodstuffs that can be made available immediately. These, in turn, could be replaced by shipments from the United States at a later date.

I suggest that we move immediately to authorize the various American volunteer organizations—some 20 of them with units in Europe—to make distribution of food packages and other essentials to take care of the immediate problem of starvation. This I understand is more real than would seem possible in these times.

However, in addition, it seems to me the problem is much larger than just seeing to it that people don't starve. Our great surpluses of food creates on obligation for us under these conditions—an obligation to help these people in every way we can.

It is already apparent that farmers in many European nations will have to start from what we call scratch in order to bring back their acres to fertility. We can aid them in many ways.

I suggest that we proceed with the utmost dispatch to make our surpluses available to these winter-stricken nations which are still in the grip of an unrelenting winter, the worst in a century.

In addition, I suggest that we consider making available to those nations supplies from such other surpluses as we may have available.

From our tremendous surpluses, generous, unstinting, and immediate gifts would demonstrate once again most clearly to the entire world that we are not the selfish, grasping people we have been pictured in the Communist propaganda mills.

No one under these circumstances could be persuaded that we were dumping surpluses on the world market, for if stories from Europe are true, and I am sure they are, the average European farmer will be lucky if he can just restore his land to normal conditions by the end of the coming growing season.

I believe this is a splendid opportunity to aid a stricken people, create good will for our country, and in a way relieve some of the distress that has occurred economically here and abroad from the storing of such tremendous quantities of surpluses, particularly in foodstuffs.

Of course, President Eisenhower already has ordered some shipments for relief in Europe, but it is my hope that every effort be made to see that these European nations are abundantly supplied in the quickest possible manner with as many of our surplus supplies, as may be necessary to carry them through the 1956 growing season.

International Security and Disarmament in the Light of Present Day Circumstances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in August last it was my privilege to represent the United States Government at the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Helsinki, Finland. It was also my privilege to address the group there assembled on the subject International Security and Disarmament in the Light of Present-Day Circumstances.

I have received from Finland requests for copies of the address I then delivered, and inasmuch as the address was rather informative in view of events which have developed since, I ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, as I listened to the brilliant report of the Rapporteur, the words of an American poet came to mind:

"Oft to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood
For the good or evil side.
Some great cause, God's new Messiah,
Shows each the bloom or blight,
So can choice be made by all men
Twist the darkness and the light."

And as I thought on these words I remembered what Dante said: "Give light and the people will find the way." I paused and asked myself, what is the meaning of the word "light" to this age, and the answer came—freedom and opportunity of nations and people.

Then a second thought flashed across my mind. It was from an American philosopher, "What you are, speaks so loud I cannot hear what you say." I again paused and applied that maxim to the state of the world today. You all have done the same. We've heard time and again that the world needs deeds that reflect wisdom and understanding, not honey words. Right deeds by the rulers of certain nations would cast out fear and misunderstanding that is so prevalent and dangerous to the peace of the world.

Then the words came to me "Have that mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus." What did the Apostle mean? What is the meaning of that statement to this age? Was it not to build peace and faith in the minds of the peoples and rulers of earth? Was it not a mandate that men and nations should find the way to the light (spoken of by Dante) so that deeds instead of words would reflect the meaning of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Otherwise nations will not "break their swords into ploughshares" and cease to war any more.

I have just come from Geneva and have seen the exchange in a friendly and peaceful manner of ideas about mankind's new servant for peace and war—nuclear power. Today as representatives of the free parliaments of the world, we discuss a related subject, international security and disarmament.

More than 10 years ago when the Allied and Associated Powers met at Dumbarton to consider the first draft of the United Nations Charter, one of the great powers put forth a bold suggestion. It proposed that the postwar international organization be given an international air force to help in the maintenance of international peace. The proposal was never spelled out in detail. But in the light of President Eisenhower's suggestion at Geneva a few weeks ago that mutual air inspection might be a basis for assurance against surprise attack, it would be most interesting if the authors of the international air force proposal—the Russians—were to look back through their files to examine the details of that 1945 proposal.

The years since 1945 have been most disappointing with respect to the control of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations has had commissions working on these problems constantly. While the United Nations has not had authority to impose any disarmament system on member states, there is nothing in the charter that has prevented that organization from considering any kind of disarmament proposal. And as a matter of fact, the U. N. has done a thorough job of studying, although the results have been nil.

As one looks back at those early years after the war, he cannot help but be amazed at the boldness of some of the proposals that were submitted to the United Nations.

It will be recalled, for example, that at the first meeting of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission in New York in 1946, the United States proposed the creation of an International Atomic Development Authority. It suggested that this international agency be given managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities which might be dangerous to world security and that the United Nations be given powers of inspection, of licensing, as well as authority to foster peaceful development of atomic energy. The United States proposal went so far as to call for the relinquishment of the veto with respect to matters relating to the control of atomic weapons and called for the destruction of existing atomic weapons once an adequate system of international control had been established.

Although this proposal became the basis of a plan that was approved by the vast majority of the members of the United Nations, it was rejected by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union for its part called for the immediate destruction of all atomic weapons as a condition precedent to the creation of any system of international control and inspection.

I need not labor the points of difference between the Soviet approach to the control of atomic and other weapons and the approach of most of the other members of the United Nations. Suffice it to say that the free world was not willing to destroy its stock of atomic weapons while the Soviet Union maintained its massed armies. The Soviet Union was not willing to reduce its armed forces in the race of the atomic stockpiles of the West. Hence it was that the production of and experimentation with atomic and hydrogen weapons went forward on both sides, uncontrolled.

And while this process of competitive arming went forward, it gradually became apparent to more and more of the people of this earth, that a nuclear war might spell the death knell for mankind. It gradually became apparent that a small war anywhere might degenerate into a worldwide nuclear war. The atomic clock ticked faster and faster.

Thus it was that the armaments race went on unabated. Meanwhile, the demands of peoples throughout the world for a permanent and stable peace grew in strength. While tensions increased and armaments mounted, the nations of the world vied with each other in proposing peace plans. The Stockholm peace appeal was signed by millions—but international communism plotted the military conquest of Korea. The Soviet Union called for the abolition and destruction of atomic weapons—but it moved as rapidly as possible to develop those weapons.

The nations of the West united in NATO and perforce by their weakness in manpower, considered the use of atomic weapons should they be required to defend their lands from military attack. Atomic weapons have been included in that arsenal of the West as a substitute for manpower. No less than 175 divisions of soldiers have been mobilized in the Soviet Union. At the maximum, the nations of the West have had in the vicinity of 40 divisions at their service. There have been some who have objected to consideration of the use of atomic weapons in defense against attack. But in the absence of manpower, reliance has necessarily been placed on these weapons.

We know that the free world is spiritually and morally incapable of using such weapons against any people except in a defensive war. The United States never has been and never will be a party to aggression. But atomic weapons have necessarily been held in readiness to deter possible military aggression—a course of action which we know by experience the Communists are capable of following. It was Sir Winston Churchill who some years ago noted that it was the existence of atomic weapons that has prevented the Communists from attempting to capture Western Europe by force.

Fortunately for the state of the world, in recent weeks we have seen some relaxation of tensions. The about-face of the Soviet Union on the matter of the Austrian State Treaty, the relaxed affability of Soviet officials, an apparent willingness to take a fresh look at the disarmament problem, and the announced intention of Soviet reductions in her armed forces, have all been good signs.

But we must never, at our peril, forget the underlying questions. Why this about-face? Is the Kremlin sincere or trying a new tactic to achieve its old goal of domination? Is it sincerely motivated by a desire to coexist? Will the Soviet Union continue on its new course, or is this part of a military

redeployment to put the free world into a position where a dagger may be plunged into the back of freemen?

I speak frankly because for 10 years the Soviet Union has given us reason to be suspicious. Our own interests require that we be skeptical of the motivation of a totalitarian regime famous for the agility of its diplomacy, and unrestrained by responsibility to a free and informed electorate.

There is no check in the Soviet system on the power of the officialdom of the Communist Party. Soviet officials have for years doomed the Soviet people to a distorted view of life. They have denied their people the truth that makes men free. Those in political bondage to the Soviet rulers have been told that Mr. Dulles started the Korean war and that the NATO alliance is designed to serve the purpose of warmongers. These lies have been repeated so often that even should the Soviet officials desire to change the course of their foreign policy, it will be years before they can undo the damage they have wreaked on their own people by denying them the truth.

I fervently hope in the months ahead that the leaders in the Kremlin will see the need for giving the facts to the common man—the man who must bear the burdens of war and whose needs for food and clothing and shelter cannot be satisfied during an armed peace. The common people deserve the truth. A stepped-up program of exchanges of persons and a greater willingness to print the facts in the daily press will help build understanding between the peoples of all nations.

It is essential I believe that in the months ahead we view Soviet proposals for disarmament with a healthy skepticism. The announcement a few days ago that the Soviet Union planned to reduce its armed forces by 640,000 men is indeed welcome. It may be the "earnest of good intentions" which is needed in the interests of the further reduction of international tension. But we must remember that during the last year the United States reduced its own armed forces by some 600,000 men without the flurry of propaganda that his accompanied the Soviet announcement. It must be remembered that the total strength of Soviet forces is not known but that it is estimated that there are still close to 5 million men in those forces and that they are augmented by some 1,250,000 men in the satellite nations. The number still largely exceeds those under arms in NATO.

It would be a fatal mistake at this time for the NATO nations to slacken their efforts to maintain and develop their defensive posture. We must remain strong while we seek in good faith a feasible, reliable, foolproof method of reducing the burden and the dangers of armament.

The heritage we guard is not our own. It is the heritage of individual freedom built on the sacrifices of our forebears and to be cherished and passed on to our children. We have a continuity of freedom to maintain if we are to be true to our trust.

Despite our deepest desires, it would be a most grievous mistake for us to accept without the most searching inquiry the sweetness and light that has exuded in the last few weeks from the Soviet Union. We must not without further proof accept it as an indication of a profound change of heart. As was remarked recently, it is toughness in deeds, not words, that counts. We must not hastily recast the very policies that have finally brought home to the Soviet leaders the dangerous ground they tread.

While Soviet foreign policy can be changed overnight, the policies of free nations based on the fundamental desire of their people to establish a world of peace and security in which individual freedom may thrive, cannot be a will-o'-the-wisp policy. A free nation cannot chart its course by the light of each passing ship. It must not confuse the light of the passing ship with a star. Its foreign policy must be based on the veritable truths that freedom is hard to achieve, and easy to lose—that actions speak louder than words—and that man must be master of the state, not its servant.

There can be no doubt that the United States in reversing the policy held by nations, "to the victor belongs the spoils," to the policy "to the victor belongs the obligation to reconstruct," was searching for a way to peace. The United States will continue to search for a method to reduce international tension, to reduce armament, to control atomic weapons, hoping that a way to peace will open up.

Last spring President Eisenhower created a post in the Cabinet of the United States charged with the one duty of developing practical disarmament proposals. He put in charge of that operation the man who for the past 3 years has been charged with full responsibility for our mutual assistance program.

Even earlier, the President proposed that steps be taken to break the stalemate in the control of atomic energy by his plan to proceed with the exchange of information on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. As evidence of our good faith we have offered to give fissionable material to an international atomic authority.

And most recently at Geneva, President Eisenhower in the utmost candor proposed a system of air inspection of air bases, ports, and rail centers, which might be used as bases for the launching of surprise attack. I have noted in the press of the last few days that General Twining, the highest ranking Air Force officer in the United States—a member of our joint chiefs of staff—has endorsed the proposal, thus indicating the seriousness with which we have entered upon implementing the President's proposal. I am sure that at the forthcoming meeting of the Disarmament Commission in New York we will see further elaboration of this plan.

Finally, the resolution before us recommends to the various parliaments that they keep themselves properly informed on the progress of disarmament negotiations and keep the public of their countries informed of progress in the field. The United States Senate this past session created a special Committee to study proposals for disarmament. That Committee, of which I am a member, will not only keep itself informed of developments in the field of disarmament, but it will actively and vigorously seek, in cooperation with the President, to develop fresh approaches to the control of these weapons which threaten mankind.

We are deadly in earnest in our search for a peaceful world. While, as I have indicated, the American people view recent Soviet turnabouts with a certain skepticism, we will spare no effort in trying to find ways to reduce armaments.

Fellow delegates, I would not want my candor in these remarks to be construed as indicating undue pessimism with the state of the world and the prospects for disarmament. Alexis de Tocqueville, the French philosopher of the last century who wrote so understandingly of democracy in America, said that without common beliefs no society can exist. Common beliefs are basic to a cohesive society.

I believe we may now be in the process of developing common understandings that can be the basis of the peaceful development of an international community. We now understand that modern war does not merely threaten mankind, it can destroy mankind. This is a situation comprehensible not only to good men, but to bad men. It is comprehensible to democracies and to dictatorships, to free men and to men in political bondage. Will the fear of destruction beget the wisdom to outlaw war? Will mankind broaden his horizon to see the grander view of peace?

President Eisenhower has stated that "there is no alternative to peace." It is the basis of Sir Winston Churcill's remarks that the terror of atomic weapons will force peace upon us.

Despite my admonitions and skepticism, we may be in the process of achieving what the scientists describe as a "breakthrough." As a result of the fear of war and mankind's search for a broader view, the way may open up. We must now seek to exploit every opportunity to reach a modus vivendi—an understanding—which will make it possible for mankind to resume his often interrupted climb toward the good life.

I believe I speak for the American people when I say that my country will never cease in its search for peace with freedom.

The words of a great common man of the people, Abraham Lincoln, come to mind: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present."

God grant that the nations will breed leaders who will recognize the truth of this statement as applicable to the changed and changing world of today.

The same American poet that I quoted in the beginning wrote:

"New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient creeds uncouth;
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of Truth,
And serenely down the future
See the thought of men incline
To the side of perfect justice
And to God's supreme design."

—*James Russell Lowell.*

Glossary of Terms Used To Keep the Wheels Turning in Government and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following glossary of terms used to keep the wheels turning in Government and industry:

Program: Any assignment that cannot be completed with one phone call.

Channels: The trail left by interoffice memos.

Coordinator: The guy who has a desk between two expediters.

Consultant or expert: Any ordinary guy more than 50 miles away.

Under consideration: Never heard of it.

Under active consideration: We are looking in the files for it.

Conference: Where conversation is substituted for the dreariness of labor and the loneliness of thought.

Committee: A means for evading responsibility.

Board: First, made of wood; second, long and narrow; and, third, sometimes warped.

Reliable source: The guy you just met.

Informed source: The guy who just told the guy you just met.

Unimpeachable source: The guy who started the rumor originally.

Make a survey: Need more time to think of an answer.

Note and initial: Spread the responsibility.

Clarification: Fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground.

Check the files: Ask the janitor to look through yesterday's sweepings.

Finalize: Scratch gravel to cover errors.

Bill of Rights Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1955, I introduced a joint resolution to establish December 15 of each year as Bill of Rights Day, since ratification of that historic document took place on December 15, 1791. This year we shall celebrate the 165th anniversary of this historic event.

The resolution—House Joint Resolution 367—has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, but thus far no action has been taken. I trust the committee will take the necessary action so that the Nation can celebrate the event beginning with this year. The resolution authorizes the President to issue a proclamation each year setting aside December 15 as an occasion for public celebration, urging the display of the American flag on all public buildings, and inviting the American people to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies.

The idea was first suggested to me by Mr. Vincent Rossini, a New York newspaperman, who founded the American Bill of Rights Day Association on December 15, 1941. The association is still very active and Mr. Rossini is its director. In a pamphlet published by the association, the origin of the idea is traced as follows:

It was at the NUIA convention, on September 24, 1938, when there was offered an honor scroll to Gov. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, that Mr. V. Rossini, inspired by Mr. LEHMAN'S speech, spoke on the Bill of Rights, and informed the audience of his sponsorship for a national holiday to be called Bill of Rights Day.

In fact, the NUIA, a well-known organization, dedicated and pledged to the perpetuation of the American principles, on December 14, 1940, passed a resolution—which was introduced at the 1939 annual convention, with Lieutenant Governor Poletti as presiding officer—to promote a movement to have the 15th day of December each year declared a national legal holiday, to be known as Bill of Rights Day.

The American Bill of Rights Day Association adopted a fundamental resolution in 1941 calling on Congress and the legislatures of the 48 States to pass a law declaring December 15 as Bill of Rights Day.

The signers of the above resolution were: Gov. Charles Poletti, Judge Matthew J. Diserio, Judge Anthony J. Di Giovanni, Ada Bess, Rosina Martella, Hon. Victor L. Anfuso, Ada Kellogg Krammer, Albert Clausi, Hon. Nicholas Rossi, John Martignetti, Nicola Perillli, Saverio Monachino, Lillian Mulé, Michael Farinola, Antonio Squillante, Mamie Casablanca, Vincent Rossini, Joseph Susca, Arturo Egitto, and Mildred D. Wilcox.

One December 15, 1941, the first observance of the Bill of Rights Day was held at the Memorial Hall of the YWCA, in Brooklyn under the auspices of the NUIA. Principal speakers were: Hon. Matthew J. Diserio, judge advocate of the American Legion, New York County, and deputy commissioner of the city department of sanitation; Mr. Vincent Rossini, founder of the Bill of Rights Day. Presiding officer was Mrs. Henry F. Kramer, chairman committee of management International Institute of YWCA, assisted by the officers of the Sgt. James Bealin Post of King's County, American Legion.

Statement of Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., of Massachusetts, on Proposal To Amend Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a copy of my statement before the House Committee on Education and Labor on legislation to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

As a Representative from Boston, Mass., one of the major established seaports of our country, I have had more opportunity than most of you to observe the working conditions, and to really know and appreciate the problems of our longshore and harbor workers. For many years, both as a representative in the State Legislature of Massachusetts, and as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I have worked for recognition and sympathetic understanding of the difficult, dangerous, and yet vitally essential work which they perform. They are a most deserving group, and their interests have long been close to my heart.

I feel that the amendments provided for in my bill, H. R. 9147, are long overdue. It is my hope that you, my colleagues, will assist me to secure prompt and favorable action.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has before it several bills proposing to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. I have before the committee my own bill, H. R. 9147, which is similar to S. 2280, the Magnuson-Morse bill, which passed the Senate during the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

H. R. 9147 would amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act for the first time since 1948. These hard-working men who earn their livelihood on the docks, piers, and ships, perform the second most hazardous occupation in our economy. The statistics show only logging to be more dangerous.

I am one who believes in the principle that the worker is entitled to a family saving wage; i. e., in time of sickness, injury, or unemployment, the employee's average wage should be such that his savings would permit him to carry his household in the accustomed manner until his compensation funds came due. Unfortunately, this is not the case in this industry, and is the consequent urgent need for section 1 of the legislation of which I am the sponsor.

Section 1 of H. R. 9147 recommends that the waiting period be shortened from 7 to 3 days, which is in line with the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. It also proposes to raise the weekly maximum benefit to $50, and provides for a minimum of $20 per week. This amends the current inadequate $35 per week maximum ceiling which was established in 1948. The value of the $35 per week maximum has decreased substantially as the cost of living has increased.

In addition, H. R. 9147 proposes an increase in the schedules of indemnities in cases of partial disability, permanent in quality, and would repeal the present ceiling on death benefits.

I realize that the members of this committee have listened to many witnesses, have gone into this matter fully, and are aware of the many defects and inadequacies in the present law. Having acquired the knowledge of the longshoremen you now possess, it is my earnest desire that the committee will also hear H. R. 833 on safety in longshore and harbor work. As the sponsor of this bill, which provides for safety in longshore and harbor work through a system of safety rules and regulations, I wish to advise the committee that it is my conviction the legislation is just, sound, equitable, and urgent, and it is my hope that you will see fit to work for its enactment.

The REA—Yesterday and Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Hon. W. R. POAGE, of Texas, addressed the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in its national meeting at St. Louis on January 25. What he had to say is worthy of the attention of all of us who have watched the great contribution REA has made to America's free enterprise system in the last two decades.

Mr. POAGE, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, has had a large part in promoting this very important program that turned on the lights in millions of rural homes in America, and that has brought to these homes the freedom from drudgery, the conveniences and the comforts that hitherto were shared and enjoyed only by the people of our towns and cities.

I want to commend Mr. POAGE for the great contribution he has made to REA, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentleman, it has been a number of years since I have had the opportunity to meet with the men and women from all over America who have done so much to improve rural life—the men and women who have built the great rural electric service systems of the United States. Probably nowhere in the history of the world can we find a parallel to the electrification of the American farm. And to you, the leaders of the local rural electric cooperatives from Puget Sound to the Straits of Florida, I unhesitatingly give the credit. Others have indeed come into the picture since you showed that it was a practicable and profitable undertaking, but they stood aside when the whole field was theirs for the taking. You led the way; others followed.

It is with real pleasure that I return to one of your great conventions. It is a real inspiration to work with this group. In it are some of my finest and closest friends. I am proud of every one of you. Had I not been, I am sure I would never have agreed to leave the great agricultural price fight in Congress and to come here and speak on the subject assigned to me this afternoon.

On the other hand, had you been any other than the sincerely dedicated group of public-spirited citizens which you are, you would have never asked anyone to speak on the rural-telephone program. You could have smugly passed it by. You could have talked only of your great and praiseworthy achievements in the field of electrification. That is your especial responsibility. You need not bother with the problems of getting telephone service for farmers; that is, you would not need to do so were it not for the same spirit which makes you co-op managers sit up nights trying to figure out ways whereby you can take lights 2 long miles up the creek to a lonely cabin which will never pay more than a minimum bill, the same spirit which has made hundreds of you board members give the co-op more of your time than you are able to give to your own business, this same spirit forces you, and I believe it forces me, to do what we can to lend a hand to the rural-telephone program.

That program needs a hand. The act of Congress authorizing the REA to make telephone loans has helped. It has helped the situation even more than most of you know, but to be a success, the telephone program needs enthusiasm and cooperation even more than the electric program ever needed it. We started the rural-electric program just as farm income began to move upward from the depth of the depression. The telephone program had hardly gotten off the ground, as it were, when the terrible and relentless price squeeze began to paralyze the farmer. We started the electric work with a program for which we can expect at least 95 percent acceptance when economic conditions are favorable. The telephone program can never expect connections to reach more than possibly three-fourths of our rural homes, even in the most prosperous times. Most people look upon electricity as a necessity to be retained and paid for even after they have lost the family automobile. Many people look upon a telephone as a luxury to be taken out when the going gets hard.

We would, therefore, be unrealistic as well as unfair if we were to expect too much of the rural-telephone program. But let us see just what has been done and what needs most to be done that we may the better appraise the needs of the future:

In order to see what the rural telephone program has done, we must in all fairness, go back to the time when we began talking about REA financing of telephone lines. We must do this because we recognized then, as we recognize now, that one of the greatest contributions of the REA telephone program would be the momentum which it would give to nonborrowers to improve and extend their own rural systems. I recall that during the fight to pass the rural telephone bill, I repeatedly made the statement that I expected such legislation to be of far more help from the standpoint of inducing the private telephone systems that theretofore had refused to give any appreciable rural service, to extend and improve that service. Of course, it worked out exactly that way. For 20 years prior to the discussion of an REA financed rural telephone system, the number of rural phones in America had dropped steadily from 2,498,493 in 1920 to 1,526,954 in 1940. Very few of the independent telephone companies were putting in any new rural lines and, of course, the farflung Bell System was concentrating on the higher returns to be found in the great cities and in the long line service, but once the REA telephone system was proposed and a bill introduced in Congress, even the Bell System undertook to forestall the passage of legislation by constructing lines which it had just a few months earlier declared unfeasible.

During the fall and winter of 1948–49, this legislation was pending in the House of Representatives. The Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., which operates the exchange in my hometown of Waco, was refusing to accept new city subscribers on the theory that the switchboard facilities at Waco were inadequate to care for any more connections. Of course, this was but the predicate for one of their periodic drives for higher rates. Strangely enough, each time the big telephone companies increase the efficiency of their plant, they increase the charges to the public. Be that as it may, the Southwestern Bell picked this peculiar time to vastly expand its rural service in the country surrounding Waco. Hundreds of telephones were connected in the rural areas of the county. They all went on the overloaded switchboard of Waco. I think it is but fair to attribute this and similar activity throughout the country to the pendency of the REA legislation.

Since this legislation was passed, this same Bell affiliate has been extremely anxious to extend its rural lines in another one of my counties where there are two privately owned REA-financed independent companies trying to provide rural coverage, but in still a third county of my district where there has been very little possibility of any well-financed new telephone development, the Bell people have been completely unwilling to give any appreciable new rural service. I have asked them why. Their answer has simply been that they weren't ready to develop the territory. Somehow or another they never seem to get ready to develop any territory until somebody else offers to develop it.

Let us, therefore, start with 1945 when there were about the same number of rural phones as in 1940—roughly a million and a half. By the time REA actually was making telephone loans in 1950, there were probably 2 million rural telephones in the United States. Today, there are about 2½ million rural telephones which means that almost exactly 50 percent of the farms of America today have telephone service, and, of course, the service is available to a good many more who simply feel they can't afford to pay the necessary rates. Probably more than half of these rural homes that have telephone service have modern service, so we can say that while the picture is not all bad, neither have we begun to approach a solution of the problem.

At the same time, we are reminded that in February 1949, speaking on behalf of the Independent Telephone Association, Col. William C. Henry stated:

"There is now available, without construction charges to the subscriber, rural telephone service to between 80 and 85 percent of the occupied farms of the United States. Adequate rural telephone service is not a national problem."

At the same congressional hearing, Mr. E. M. Widen, of the Southwestern Bell Co., of this city, said:

"If let alone, there is no question in my mind but that this problem will be met by my company and other telephone companies."

Most of the older delegates here today will recognize a striking similarity between these statements and those of Mr. Neff who, in speaking for the private power companies in 1935 said that the job of rural electrification was then practically complete.

As a matter of interest, I think we should observe that the loan part of the telephone program has moved rather more rapidly than some of us had supposed. At the end of the first 5 years of electric loans, REA had committed $369 million. At the end of 5 years of telephone loans, it had approved $275 million. Of course, these figures are somewhat like comparing bales of cotton with bushels of corn, but it does indicate that the privately owned telephone companies cannot sit complacently by and assume that their stranglehold on territory which they do not serve will never be challenged. And that, to my mind, is one of the most important features of the whole program.

It is very true that I would feel that the situation were much better if more of these loan funds had actually been advanced to the borrower. Only about one-half of this money has, as of this date, been actually turned over to the borrowers for construction. Likewise, I would feel better if a somewhat larger percentage of these loans were going to farmer-owned cooperatives. As of December 31, 1955, loan allocations had been made to 226 commercial companies and to 189 cooperatives. Just over half of the money was advanced for new construction, most of the remainder for improvements. Again, of the 606,000 subscribers to be served by these outstanding loans, just over one-half, 310,000, will be new subscribers while 296,000 will be customers who had some kind of telephone service but who are now to get improved, modern service.

While the record of repayments of telephone loans is not as good as that of the electric systems, it is certainly not a record of which we need be ashamed. As of November 30, 1955, there were 24 delinquent borrowers. They owed $527,398, but against this, we must note that other borrowers had paid $112,300 in advance of the due date. Most of these delinquencies seem to be due to the fact that the original telephone loans were, in most cases, made before it was possible to secure equipment and before it was possible to establish an earning base on the funds borrowed. I believe that REA has largely corrected this situation and that we can reasonably hope that the record of the next 5 years will be much more favorable.

And what of the needs of the future? Can we by legislation? Can we by administration? Can we, in any other way, increase the efficiency and the progress of the rural telephone program? I have no magic formula. In 1944, the Agriculture Committee of the House was able to so revise the basic REA legislation that the electric co-ops were given a longer amortization period, a guaranteed

low-interest rate, and the assurance of effective help in solving their engineering and operating problems. There is no such opportunity to come to the aid of the telephone borrowers at this time. I have inquired both of borrowers and of the REA as to what, if any, legislation Congress should pass in order to be helpful. I stand ready—and I know the majority of the Agriculture Committee of the House stands ready—to sponsor any sound and reasonable legislation that may be needed. Frankly, there have been very few suggestions made for legislative changes. Possibly this convention may want to offer suggestions. If it does, I can assure you that they will be well received.

What, then, of the administration of the act? Certainly some of our ablest telephone people have contributed to the administration of the program. Certainly both Claude Wickard who launched this program, and Ancher Nelsen who now directs it, have been anxious and determined to bring telephones to our farm folks just as far as they could. I am not here to criticize or condemn anyone, but since it is much easier to sit on the outside and tell someone else how his business should be run, then it is to actually accept the responsibility for running it, and since I am prone to take the easy course, I think that we should at least consider the possibility that we might be able to improve this program by applying some of the techniques that were successful in the case of rural electrification.

Fundamentally, it seems to me that our present telephone program does not have the crusading spirit that was associated with the early days of the electric program. I have tried to determine why this is lacking. I believe that basically it is lacking because the farmers simply have not felt that this telephone program was their program as they did in the case of the electric program.

Now, I am not here to say that I think that REA should make all its loans to cooperatives or even that it should undertake to see that cooperatives handle the bulk of the business. I look upon farmer cooperatives simply as a means of getting something done that someone else won't do at a reasonable price and with reasonable efficiency. There can never be much public demand for an REA financed rural telephone cooperative in an area where a commercial company is providing adequate coverage and satisfactory service at reasonable prices. There would never have been a single rural electric cooperative had the power companies of America met the reasonable needs of the rural areas for electricity. It would not be necessary to organize another rural telephone cooperative in the United States if the existing telephone companies would overnight provide the needed service at reasonable prices, but they haven't done it, and I have no reason to believe they will do it without the nudge that these farmer-owned cooperatives give them. On the other hand, I realize the farmer-owned cooperatives need the competition of the privately owned commercial companies. When you and I were working to get the electric cooperatives established, REA was giving us every kind of help that it could in connection with organization and management of the cooperatives. I think we need that kind of aggressive assistance right now. I fear that REA is not giving it.

The telephone problem is more difficult than the electric problem and the telephone companies are even more obstinate and, in many cases, more reactionary and less inclined to give service than were the electric companies 20 years ago. This is understandable because of the even greater monopoly that exists in the telephone field than is found in the highly monopolized electric field. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. is the largest corporation in the world. It controls about 80 percent of all of our telephones in the United States and it controls an even larger percentage of the long-distance lines.

The so-called independents who carried on a long, bitter—and almost successful—fight against the establishment of an REA financing system for rural lines have in many cases been even less cooperative with the needs of the people than the Bell System. I am delighted that some of their members have recently seen fit to avail themselves of REA financing. I welcome them into the fold of REA borrowers, but I would say to them as I would say to the farmer-owned cooperatives: I don't want to see any one segment of the industry obtain a monopoly. I believe the whole great work of the REA rests on the fact that it has been able over the years to prevent the development of monopoly in the electric field. I want to see the same thing prevented in the telephone field. One of the ways to do this is to keep a substantial balance between commercial companies and farmer-owned cooperatives. To keep this balance, it seems to me that the REA should give the same kind of cooperation and help to the telephone cooperatives which was accorded to the electric cooperatives in years past.

Along much the same lines, it seems to me that there may be room for substantially more research and development of telephone equipment and facilities than there has been by REA. Again referring to the early days of the electric system, REA carried on the research needed to materially lower the cost of rural systems. That research was just as helpful to the private power companies as it was to the cooperatives, although in the beginning most of the private power companies opposed it. I have a feeling that today the private telephone equipment companies don't want REA to conduct this kind of research. I think it is one of the great obligations of that lending agency.

Two highly controversial fields for a possible speeding up of the telephone work present themselves: Both involve a compromise of the ideal with the practical question of costs to the farmers. One lies in the reduction of the so-called equity requirements. Frankly, I don't know how far we should go. I realize that telephone connections are not as stable as electric connections. I realize we must have some local investment before we can expect the Government to advance the money for entire new plants. This problem of equity investment is possibly more serious with the farmer-owned cooperatives than with the commercial companies. Commercial companies ordinarily have some substantial equity either in money or in kind, but in the case of the cooperatives, the present regulation usually simply means that they must collect $50 per prospective subscriber in cash. This is a far greater sum than I as a householder have to put up as a deposit with any utility company—either in Waco or in Washington. I have at least wondered if it might not be feasible to require each subscriber to furnish his own instrument—of course, buying the instrument from the local cooperative—and to provide that should the subscriber discontinue the service, that the instrument would be reconveyed to the cooperative with appropriate and rather substantial depreciation deducted.

The second closely related field of possible acceleration of the program seems to me to involve the question of the quality of service. We all want good service. We want the best we can pay for, but may it not be that a great many of our people who cannot pay for the kind of telephone service that is given here in St. Louis might be able and glad to pay for something, possibly a little better than the fenceline service that we used to have when I was a boy, but still something less than the best? I know that I would like to have a Cadillac automobile. I am sure it is a good car and doubtless worth the money—if you have the money, but I have never owned a Cadillac. I do own a Chevrolet and I do get a great deal of pleasure out of it. Maybe we are trying to force all of the rural people of America to buy Cadillac phone service when their income won't afford it. If we are really interested in wide coverage, we better give some thought to the statistics on the limited number of Cadillacs as contrasted with the number of Chevrolets and Fords in the United States.

Again, I confess that I am not expressing any matured or well-thought-out conclusions. I am simply offering a suggestion for consideration.

I think, however, that I can, without fear of contradiction, put my finger on the one single factor which more than any other has retarded—and still retards—the development of rural telephone. That is the tragic inadequacy of farm income. If every American farmer were making $10,000 a year or up, we would need no Government lending program; rural telephone service would be so profitable that even the most conservative commercial companies would seek to furnish it. The latest figures indicate that the average farm income is only about $913 per year. This means that vast numbers of farmers who should be consumers of their own local telephone systems simply can't afford the convenience of a telephone, regardless of the fact that they may even now have telephone wires across their front yard.

Farm income, or the lack of it, is unquestionably the most pressing economic problem at this time confronting America. It limits your business—electric as well as telephone. It adversely affects the REA's collection records. It is beginning to throw men out of work in the implement and equipment factories of St. Louis, and sooner or later, it is certain, if not corrected, to lead our high-flying economy over the same kind of brink which so nearly ruined us in 1929. No one knows how long we can "free wheel" down the road. We did it for 7 or 8 years in the twenties. We have done it for 3 years during the fifties. Maybe we can do it for several years to come, maybe we are already on the brink as we were in the spring and summer of 1929—I do not know, but this I do know—that unless we improve farmer income the rest of our great economic edifice is sure to fall.

Nor has the Department of Agriculture or the administration offered us any clear or effective program for an immediate increase in the price of the things farmers grow.

But I resolved that I would not talk any politics at this convention.

The only way I know of to keep that resolution is to stop—so thank you one and all.

Don't Let the House Be Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the impression seems to have been growing that there is a vast difference between the upper Colorado storage project bill passed by the Senate (S. 500) and the measure soon to be considered by the

House, H. R. 3383. The following table is taken from the committee report which clearly indicates the falsity of this impression:

	S. 500 (Senate)	S. 500 (House) and H. R. 3383
Power and storage dams	Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Juniper, Navaho.	Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Navaho.
Participating irrigation projects (authorized).	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.
Participating irrigation projects (conditionally authorized).	San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette.	Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette, Animas-La Plata.

This table clearly shows that as to projects, there is only this difference between the bills: The Senate has authorized the Echo Park and Juniper Dams and also the Gooseberry project, while the House version eliminates Echo Park and Juniper Dams and conditionally authorizes the Gooseberry project.

There are certain other minor details in which the bills differ but their objectives remain essentially the same and in particular the projects contemplated for the development of water and power in the upper Colorado Basin are exactly similar.

However, of the greatest importance, and I doubly emphasize, should the House pass the measure which will come before it, it is obvious that the principal matter for the conferees to settle will be the three projects—Echo Park and Juniper Dams and the Gooseberry project. Most important of these, of course, is Echo Park. The question I would pose is: Should the House act favorably on the pending bill? What assurance have we that Echo Park and the other projects authorized in the Senate bill will not be restored to the House bill in conference? This becomes especially important in view of the fact that the Senate refused to eliminate Echo Park by a vote of 52 to 30 and would therefore undoubtedly insist on its inclusion. It would therefore seem to be a complete delusion for any Member to feel that merely because Echo Park has been eliminated from the House version that this means that it will not be included ultimately in the legislation.

What's Wrong With Our Propaganda?—Is USIA Adequately Answering the Voice of the Kremlin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of February 22, 1956, carried an article by one of its foreign correspondents, C. L. Sulzberger, which asks "What's Wrong With Western Propaganda?"

Writing from Berlin, Germany, Mr. Sulzberger states that F. Bowen Evans, in a study of Russian propaganda, concludes that the U. S. S. R. employs 375,000 full-time and 2,100,000 part-time propagandists. He says the Bolshevik Party maintains 6,000 special schools for training professional agents in that field. Former Senator William Benton, who recently visited the Soviet Union, prepared some observations on "the voice of the Kremlin" for the Encyclopaedia Britannica's 1956 Book of the Year. Benton writes:

> At its most ambitious, the aim of Soviet propaganda is so daring that we in the West can hardly comprehend it; so to condition its citizens that they think of their personal freedom and their personal ambitions as identical with the purposes of Soviet society * * * in Russia the rulers seek to convert the total culture into a giant propaganda apparatus. * * *
>
> This is a struggle of a new type, to be waged with new weapons. It is a struggle for which the Western World is little prepared. It boils down to an effort by two great opposing forces to win the faith and confidence of the world's peoples. * * * Russia cannot match us in the export of automobiles, tractors, or business machines. She proposes to beat us with her ideas and her trained manpower.

A FAITH IN ULTIMATE VALUES

Having set forth this information for our consideration Mr. Sulzberger continues as follows:

> But it is questionable whether our propaganda has successfully faced this challenge. The West German Government has published a commentary complaining that we emphasize material things too much. We have allowed the initiative in the realm of spiritual ideas to remain largely in the very materialistic hands of communism. "Are we," asks Bonn, "ready for this spiritual competition? Do we understand the system of thought, belief, and ideology of the East? Do we have any certitude about the basis of our lives and our faith? Ideological faith in the collectivist idea makes the Soviet man capable of achievements and sacrifices that surpass human strength. Only a faith that in no way is dependent on material events, that does not live in expectation of future well-being, can resist this ideology. This faith, this conviction must inspire western man to risk his life for the ultimate values that cannot be abandoned—freedom, personal dignity, the lives of other men, the truth of religion.
>
> There is no sign that the powers of the West have sought seriously to analyze the problem of their propaganda and to coordinate efforts in presenting their case abroad.

THE RUSSIAN CHALLENGE CAN BE MET

In his budget message on January 16 this year the President recommended a modest increase in appropriations for the educational-exchange programs of the Department of State which, he said, "constitute a basic element of our long-term effort to attain a better mutual understanding with other peoples of the world. These programs bring to this country leaders of public opinion and facilitate the mutual exchange of students, teachers, and research scholars. In addition to appropriated funds, part of the foreign currencies received from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities abroad will be used to meet certain overseas costs of educational exchange."

The President's budget request for these strategic and highly important educational-exchange programs of the Department of State which, in the President's own words, "constitute a basic element of our long-term effort to attain a better mutual understanding with other peoples of the world" is being considered by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

In my statement to the House Appropriations Committee on Tuesday, February 21, 1956, I said that I could not personally attest to the exact amount of money needed for this important program. The President's budget request is for $20 million. I am sure that this is not enough, but I hope that the subcommittee will at least give the President every penny he requested.

The New York Times pointed out on December 12, 1955, that the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange recommended $31 million for this program. The distinguished educators and businessmen, appointed by the President of the United States as an advisory body on this program, certainly know what they are talking about. They know the program from a professional as well as an operating standpoint so they are in a position to make an accurate recommendation.

I shudder to think what the Russians and Red Chinese are spending on this type of thing. From all reports I see on their activities it must be a tremendous amount.

We should not attempt to get into direct and blatant competition with the Communists in this field but we should be willing to invest whatever amount is necessary to demonstrate our willingness to carry on our international relations on the highest plane possible.

I do not know what prompted the Secretary of State to disregard the Advisory Commission's recommendation that $31 million be allocated to this important program. I would personally concur in that amount, or even a much larger amount, for these activities.

I hope that the House Appropriations Subcommittee will agree with my estimate of the value of this program to our international relations effort and that it will recommend a substantial increase over the $18 million which it approved last year.

While the President recommended only a modest increase of $2 million for

activities which constitute a basic element of our long-term effort to attain a better mutual understanding with other peoples of the world he recommended that the $89,218,895 available to the United States Information Agency in fiscal year 1956 in appropriations and obligations be increased by $48 million.

The vast difference between these two recommendations which follow each other in the budget message typifies the Madison Avenue approach to the problems of the world, an approach to world problems which is the hallmark and the most distinguishing characteristic of the present Republican administration.

AN ANSWER TO THE VOICE OF THE KREMLIN

Concerned as I am with these exchange programs which include the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts, the interchange of persons under the technical assistance programs carried on by the International Cooperation Administration, and the cultural presentations programs of the President's Emergency Fund for Participation in International Affairs, I have developed a measure which I am convinced will contribute importantly to the development of adequate answers to the voice of the Kremlin. This is a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 474, "to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs."

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, author of one of the great acts of Congress on exchange of persons, has introduced a companion measure in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 120, and that Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has joined Senator FULBRIGHT as cosponsor of the measure.

In the House Members who have joined with me in sponsoring the joint resolution include Representatives HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, VICTOR L. ANFUSO, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, DON HAYWORTH, THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, GEORGE M. RHODES, PETER W. RODINO, JR., B. F. SISK, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and HERBERT ZELENKO.

I include as part of my remarks two articles from the New York Times referred to earlier in my remarks:

[From the New York Times of December 9, 1955]

INCREASE SOUGHT IN EXCHANGE FUND—ADVISERS ASK $31 MILLION TO STEP UP PROGRAM AND OFFSET GENEVA FAILURE

WASHINGTON, December 8.—The Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange recommended today a $13 million increase next year in the State Department's exchange program.

This would bring the total appropriation asked of Congress to $31 million. The recommendation was prompted by the breakdown in cultural interchange negotiations with the Soviet Government at the Geneva conference of foreign ministers.

The Commission, appointed by the President, acts as an advisory body within the State Department.

Rufus H. Fitzgerald, commission chairman, said: "It is evident that the Soviets have not changed their major strategy but are practicing deliberate fraud as shown through their refusal to negotiate on major issues at Geneva.

"This continued attitude increases the challenge to the United States to cooperate with all free peoples in the free interchange of persons and ideas."

He said that by increasing the program the Government would stimulate private organizations and educational institutions to step up interchange programs.

Mrs. Anna L. Rose Hawkes, commission member who is also president of the American Association of University Women, said that the association would increase its efforts along this line. It spent $100,000 this year in bringing 39 women from 22 foreign countries to study in the United States. It also provided 10 graduate fellowships for specialized work by foreign women students.

Mrs. Hawkes said the proposed increase in funds should go largely to projects aimed at bringing to this country leaders of thought and opinion.

"That is the best way to convince them of our motives," she said. "They go back and say: 'The United States is not warmongering. I have been there and I know.'"

The other members of the commission, which has just finished a 2-day meeting, are Arthur H. Edens, president of Duke University; Arthur A. Hauck, president of the University of Maine, and Laird Bell, Chicago attorney.

[From the New York Times of February 22, 1956]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—WHAT'S WRONG WITH WESTERN PROPAGANDA?

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

BERLIN, February 21—The greatest proof of the fallacy of Marxism is, curiously enough, the existence of the Soviet Union. For Karl Marx foresaw the triumph of his theory first in highly industrial countries like Germany or England. Yet what we call communism came initially to power in underdeveloped Russia, where it assumed the form, not of socialism but of the most massive state capitalism known to history. And the next outstanding triumph of the Marxist legend was in backward China.

Despite such glaring inconsistencies, Marx's latter-day prophets extol the "scientific" immutability of their dialectical materialism and insist it must logically inherit the earth. But the Communists themselves continually modify this "proven" doctrine. Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky, Tito, and Mao Tse-tung have each reinterpreted the credo. Now Khrushchev is the latest to amend accepted dogma.

Nevertheless, by blandly ignoring these constant fluctuations, Soviet propaganda seeks to convey the impression of a basic logic that progresses unalterably toward an inescapable end. Lenin, who brilliantly grasped what was helpful to him in Marx, taught that "propaganda is of crucial importance." Modern means of applying this dictum have been carefully coordinated by the Moscow monolith.

PROPAGANDA BUREAUCRACY

F. Bowen Evans, in a study of the subject, concludes that the U. S. S. R. employs 375,000 full-time and 2,100,000 part-time propagandists. He says the Bolshevik Party maintains 6,000 special schools for training professional agents in that field. Former Senator William Benton, who recently visited the Soviet Union, prepared some observations on "the voice of the Kremlin" for the Encyclopaedia Britannica's 1956 Book of the Year. He writes:

At its most, ambition, the aim of Soviet propaganda is so daring that we in the West can hardly comprehend it; so to condition its citizens that they think of their personal freedom and their personal ambitions as identical with the purposes of Soviet society * * * in Russia the rulers seek to convert the total culture into a giant propaganda apparatus * * *.

"This is a struggle of a new type, to be waged with new weapons. It is a struggle for which the Western World is little prepared. It boils down to an effort by two great opposing forces to win the faith and confidence of the world's peoples * * * Russia cannot match us in the export of automobiles, tractors, or business machines. She proposes to beat us with her ideas and her trained manpower."

A FAITH IN ULTIMATE VALUES

But it is questionable whether our propaganda has successfully faced this challenge. The West German Government has published a commentary complaining that we emphasize material things too much. We have allowed the initiative in the realm of spiritual ideas to remain largely in the very materialistic hands of communism. "Are we," asks Bonn, "ready for this spiritual competition? Do we understand the system of thought, belief, and ideology of the East? Do we have any certitude about the basis of our lives and our faith? Ideological faith in the collectivist idea makes the Soviet man capable of achievements and sacrfices that surpass human strength. Only a faith that in no way is dependent on material events, that does not live in expectation of future well-being, can resist this ideology. This faith, this conviction must inspire western man to risk his life for the ultimate values that cannot be abandoned—freedom, personal dignity, the lives of other men, the truth of religion."

There is no sign that the powers of the West have sought seriously to analyze the problem of their propaganda and to coordinate efforts in presenting their case abroad. We remain constantly on the defensive, permitting the Kremlin's experts to exploit the very evident chinks in our imperfect armor. Thus, the tragic convolutions of the United States attempt to obliterate segregation feature the front pages of the world where Autherine Lucy is now a well-known name. What has already been accomplished in the name of Jeffersonian democracy remains forgotten. Britain's embarrassing attitude on Cyprus erases from popular memory her deeds in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Only when Moscow acts openly with brutal menace do the free powers respond in concert and remember that the essential contradictions of our time are those between themselves and communism. In periods of relaxation we tend to forget the need to constantly reassert the inner meaning of our ideology. This is a dangerous lack. Surely there are enough beneficial aspects in the democratic system, whatever imperfections it may have, to merit retelling to a redundant point.

Simple facts bear frequent repetition. As Pericles told Athens: "We are superior to our enemies * * * our city is open to the world * * * we live freely, and yet we face the same dangers as readily as they * * * those men surely should be deemed bravest who know most clearly what danger is and what pleasure is and are not made thereby to flinch."

Compulsory Social Security for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD petitions signed by many of my constituents of the 17th Congressional District of Ohio. You will note, Mr.

Speaker, that these citizens are asking for the repeal of that portion of Public Law 761, or any other social-security law which contains compulsion for farmers, farmer employer, or the farm owner.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of this subject, I am one who firmly believes that all should be given an opportunity to be heard and their views brought to the attention of this Congress. I respectfully ask that the proper authorities, or committee, of this Congress give every consideration to the request contained in these petitions.

Lincoln Day Speech by Hon. Clifford G. McIntire, of Maine, at Keene, N. H., Before the Cheshire County Republican Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take great pleasure in inserting in the RECORD a copy of a speech given by my good friend and colleague, Congressman CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of Maine, before the Cheshire County Lincoln Day dinner held in Keene, N. H., on February 16, 1956:

As Republicans we meet here tonight to celebrate the birthday of a martyred President, and, in so doing, may well consider, for a time, those virtues which he represented. To know those virtues, and to appreciate them, is well. It is not enough.

Abraham Lincoln had an understanding of human nature and a standard of values uncommon to any walk of life, and certainly not often to be found in a President. He was temperate in all things except, possibly, his love of man and his hatred of unnecessary suffering. In an Executive, these things are desirable. They are not enough. Sensitive as a child, he had the rugged strength of your mountains. He was intellectually honest. Morally he was brave. That is enough.

His early failures, his lack of formal education, and his comparative poverty marked him as what one of our major political parties would refer to as "a common man." But for himself, and for all other Republicans—all Americans—he would assert, with Dean Alfange: "I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon. I seek opportunity, not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenge of life to guaranteed existence, the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of utopia. I will not trade freedom for a beneficence nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world boldly and say, 'This I have done.' All this is what it means to be an American."

Lincoln was born in 1809—21 years after New Hampshire came into the Union—when my State of Maine was still a part of Massachusetts, and this Nation had been in existence only 33 years.

Americans then had all the enthusiasm, vigor, and fearlessness to attempt the seemingly impossible that we recognize in our United States Marines today, and the same amazing ability to accomplish it. The world looked at us with dubious eyes, critical of our unorthodox ways, and with no conviction we would come to other than a bad end—and that speedily.

Lincoln believed that to know what is right is not enough. To dare to do what is right is. Throughout his Presidency, he looked upon our Republican Party as the organization best capable of conducting the affairs of the Nation fearlessly and effectively, and on February 27, in a public address, warned against "groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong; vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man."

Believing that "He who does something at the head of a regiment will eclipse him who does nothing at the head of a hundred regiments," his idea of political potency was not to nominate a man because that man would be easy to elect. His philosophy dictated that you find the man who stood for the things in which the party honestly believed, and an army of eager campaigners would arise and exert the necessary energy to elect.

Lincoln was unique, in looks, in personality, and in thought. He has become the symbol of this Nation. He did not write the words, but he of all of our countrymen believed so implicitly that "all men are created equal" that he was willing to trust in God to uphold his stand, and so staked his future and that of his country on that proposition.

Those fishermen and traders who were the early settlers of New Hampshire had those qualities which made possible the breaking away from the known perils and persecutions of the Old World and the setting up of a new organization of States—the knowledge of the past and the vision of the future that inspired those who wrote our Constitution—and such qualities were reliable governors to assure that progress would be steadily upward. Our real danger, from the outset, was that we would travel so far so fast that we would lose sight of the reasons for the grand attempt. It is so easy to forget.

One whose ancestors claimed New Hampshire as their home claimed acquaintanceship with a man who often proclaimed "I know a lot. I just can't remember it." Abe Lincoln would have appreciated such a story.

He is the all-American of all the years. He knew hunger for food, but it was learning for which he thirsted. He toiled and suffered, and he knew defeat intimately. For long years every hope seemed vain, but he persevered in efforts to improve himself and to make the world a better place in which others could live. He might easily have found bitterness in his hard wrestlings with fate, and found excuse, as others have, for settling for the cheap rewards paid to those who practice political expedience. But providence was trying the right man. One who, although beaten to his knees, always staggered back to his feet, and, with eyes raised, pushed forward, would be a worthy trustee for the liberties of a people.

It was almost exactly 100 years ago, at Peoria, that Lincoln said, "If there is anything which it is the duty of the people to never intrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

Here tonight, we should ponder well whether we have been alert in this regard; whether, as individuals, we have been willing to assign our rights and obligations to our own Government; whether, as a Nation, the preservation and perpetuity of our liberties and institutions has been or is being delegated to others.

While Lincoln concerned himself with preservation of our Union, Marx and Engels preached the doctrine of Communist statism and control over the individual, advocating a new and evil system of government and society in the guise of assisting and elevating man.

Communism exerts force, and utilizes a fifth column. Socialism practices a stealthy political maneuvering. Such procedures are as foreign to the Republican Party, as they were to Abraham Lincoln. Such leadership of the world's freedom-loving peoples would never have permitted the deathly cold hand of communism to clutch and hold Eastern Europe and most of Asia as it does today nor have permitted the filching fingers of socialism to perform a sleight of hand on most of the rest of the world, so that the powers of the people became the powers of government itself.

Lincoln neither feared nor disdained wealth. Like each of us, he probably had a wholesome respect for something he had little of. He did not try to discourage its accumulation. At Cincinnati in 1859, and the following year in New Haven, he publicly proclaimed his conviction "That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interest should, after a while accumulate property, and, after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace is right. I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to, and wish it might prevail everywhere. One of the reasons why I am opposed to slavery is just here. What is the true condition of the laborer? I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free, to acquire property as far as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in law to prevent a man from getting rich. It would do more harm than good. So, while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else."

Certain self-styled "idealists" would label profit as immoral. But they mistakenly assume that financial is the only kind of profit, or that that is the kind that is immoral. Few persons and corporations can be persuaded to risk capital and few individuals will exert great personal effort without some promise, however remote, of reward of one kind or another. It is through profitable management that plants are expanded, more work provided for our citizens, and an ever higher standard of living enjoyed by all.

In every country where initiative and incentive have been restricted, and success penalized, the standard of living has been lowered, and frequently only grants-in-aid by this country have kept their citizens alive. Communists and Socialists, alike, decry profits, taxes, and individual freedom. But a government that carries on the business of a nation (as Communist and Socialist Governments do) receives the profits, makes the decisions as to what part it shall keep in lieu of taxes, and takes from the individuals their freedom. We know that profits make living possible. Taxes make governments function. But individual freedom is what makes both living and government desirable.

Those who advocate centralization of power have made few converts from among Republicans, for, as a party, now as in Lincoln's time, we are firm for a strong Union of strong States. Similarly, those who would subvert our Constitution, or make of it merely an exhibit for the archives, substituting some world charter as our rule for operation, are certainly a small minority in our party.

Lincoln was truly "of the people" as he was "for the people." While we can readily believe that his impulses were all good, he was not impulsive. He was a thoughtful man, and acted only upon mature reflection. His conduct and record would seem to refute the idea that statecraft is something to be schooled in, and diplomacy the "dexterity

and artfulness of securing advantages without arousing hostility." He was not artful. He overcame the weakness and meanness of his associates by his infinite patience, complete honesty and magnanimity. He was never unduly concerned with the future and fortunes of Lincoln, but he cared passionately that America should be a place where a humble man might find opportunity for happiness—where the courts should be truly temples of justice for all—where people like himself might find possibilities for service, happiness and, even as he did, immortality.

He took his position and his duties seriously. Himself he did not. He was never what we call a "stuffed shirt." His critics decried his lack of what they termed dignity. But Lincoln would be the first to say that for sheer dignity nothing can surpass a body ready for burial.

In all his utterances, witty or serious, Lincoln spoke as the great majority of all good Americans would had it the gift of words. He put into words what many of us strive desperately and despairingly to state as our philosophy of living. Now, 90 years after his death, undimmed by time or the momentary bursts of brilliance from the meaner achievements of the politically expedient, at home and abroad, his name and memory live on.

Republicans created our national banking system; built up the Nation's credit; and made our currency, based on gold, the world's soundest. We demanded respect for our flag and our nationals the world over—the safety of our citizens was guaranteed while they were on the high seas or abroad.

Republicans passed the first Civil Service Act in 1883, and revised it to provide equal pay for equal work.

The Department of Labor in 1884, Commerce in 1903, the Patent Office, Weather Bureau and Postal Savings System all were established by the Republicans, and it was our party that created the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Lincoln recommended establishment of a Department of Agriculture in 1862 and the same year passage of the Homestead Act provided farms for our people and opened the West to settlement. Later, the Morrill Act provided land for agricultural and mechanical arts colleges, such as our University of New Hampshire.

When Lincoln became President, the Democratic Party had been in power for many years, and every patronage job was filled with a Democrat. Republicans then, as now, besieged the White House, demanding appointments. One day a Senator, calling on the President, noticed his dejection and expression of anxiety and said, "Mr. President, has anything gone wrong? Have you heard bad news from Fort Sumter?" The President, still solemnly, replied: "No! It's just the postmastership at Jonesville, Mo."

Our Republican Party is situated today much as it was then. Grave problems face our Nation. Any delegation of our duty and responsibility to try to solve them to another political party is an act of cowardice of which we'll never be guilty. Am I right?

A few short years ago a famous American pondered the question as to whether or not he would be a candidate for the office of President of the United States. Over many years he had worked closely with his Government. One major party had urged him to be their candidate. He gave the matter most serious, and, I am sure, prayerful thought. I believe he looked back over American history and thought in terms of the great men and the things they believed, and the standards that they established. I believe he looked over our great system of political parties. He had never joined one, so he looked objectively. He thought of Jefferson, but concluded that the principles laid down by that great statesman were not those of the leadership of the Democratic Party today. Few men had had the privilege to observe more closely the workings of the Truman administration—its policies—and those in authority. He wanted no part of it. He chose the party of Lincoln, and with the encouragement of you folk in New Hampshire and others across the country became a candidate and was elected President of the United States. That man was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The leader of the greatest armed might in the history of the world has proven himself the greatest President and world leader we have known in generations.

Nearly 4 years of his leadership are now a matter of public record.

It is a record that renews our faith in America; that proves we can enjoy peace, prosperity, and fiscal integrity, and look upon government as a servant and not the master of the people. We find in public office those who look upon administrative and elective office as a public trust and not just a part of the Pendergast or Hague machines or a part of Tammany Hall. We expect loyalty, justice, and equity, and want no more Hisses or Caudles. This type of government has brought encouragement to our people, renewed our faith in ourselves, and furnished a basis for trust and confidence in representative government.

A great American tonight turns over in his mind the problems and issues associated with another great decision. Again he considers the matter seriously and prayerfully. A matter of party is not involved. He knows which party has helped him build for a greater America. He will make the decision and map the course, and to each of us passes the responsibility of getting out and working in the coming campaign—electing a Republican President and a Republican Congress. To do less will put us back on the road to Trumanism. To those who would do that the road signs should read, "Dangerous; proceed at your own risk."

Daniel Webster has said that "duly performed or duty violated is still with us, for our happiness or our misery." Well, freedom and the future are not for fumblers.

Why Irrigate Poor Land First?—Another Ridiculous Feature of the Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, one of the most ridiculous arguments being advanced in favor of the upper Colorado River storage project is the project's alleged benefits to our Nation's agricultural program. The project would supply irrigation water for high-altitude land in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

Let us see just how ridiculous this argument is.

THE PROJECT WOULD GROW CROPS ALREADY IN AGRICULTURAL SURPLUS

Because of a surplus of agricultural products and depressed prices for such products, the Congress is now considering a soil-bank proposal which would take 40 million acres of agricultural land out of production at a large cost per acre to the taxpayers.

Inconsistently, the upper Colorado River storage project would put new acres into production—also at a large cost to the taxpayers per acre.

Surplus agricultural products already being supported by the Nation's taxpayers—without considering the new costs of the soil-bank proposals—include corn, cotton, wheat, butter, oats, butter oil, cheese, dried milk, wool, rye, barley, dry beans, cottonseed oil, grain sorghum, hay and pasture seeds, and soy beans. Sugar beets are under the restriction program of the Sugar Act of 1951, and the price is held up to a desired level. What are called proportionate shares are established by the Secretary of Agriculture. Thus, if more sugar-beet land is brought into production, shares of all others must be decreased accordingly.

Reports of the Reclamation Bureau reveal that all of the types of crops which would be grown on each of the proposed projects in the upper Colorado River project are already surplus agricultural crops being supported by the Nation's taxpayers. The crops to be grown on these projects will be largely grain and forage crops for dairy cows and sheep which will produce butter, milk products, and wool which are already in surplus and under Government subsidy and in storage at a fantastic cost.

THE PROJECT WILL SERVICE, FOR THE MOST PART, ONLY MARGINAL AGRICULTURAL LAND

The Nation's taxpayers would be forced by the upper Colorado bill to spend hundreds of millions on irrigation projects which will supply water for farmlands of relatively poor quality. The projects will service for the most part only marginal agricultural land much of it at high altitudes suffering frosts each month of the year and having a short growing season at best.

Only 20 percent of the lands serviced by the project are classified by the Bureau as class 1. The lands are at high elevations—as high as 7,000 feet. The growing season on this high mountain plateau is very short. On some of the lands there is frost every month of the year. Low-value feed crops will be the principal products.

It has been demonstrated that these lands, even when fully developed under the upper Colorado bill, will be worth on the average only about $150 per acre. Yet the cost to the Nation's taxpayers to develop them will average $3,000 to $5,000 per acre according to figures of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Such a result cannot be justified in the face of the fact that at a cost of less than $100 per acre fertile lands in the East, Middle West, and South could be irrigated, thus bringing heavier yields than ever from the best agricultural land in the Nation.

There exists at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project.

Contrast the upper Colorado's plan for irrigating marginal high-altitude land at a cost of $3,000 to $5,000 per acre—to produce land which will be worth on the average only about $150 per acre even when fully developed—with the fact that there are at least 20 million acres of first-class land on existing farms in

19 States of the Middle West, South Atlantic, and Southern States that can be placed in production at any time they may be needed at a fraction of the cost. And remember that even much of this first-class land is not "needed" under cultivation in this era of agricultural surpluses.

The Department of Agriculture reports that there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage. Such land is available in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Development costs in these States would be from $60 to $100 per acre for such land—compared with $3,000 to $5,000 per acre for land to be developed by the upper Colorado irrigation projects. The cost involved to taxpayers of the Nation in developing new and supplemental water for the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado project, which amounts in all to only about 600 square miles of new land, would range up to 50 times as much for each acre developed.

MOLEY ARTICLE

The ludicrous picture presented by these bald inconsistencies has been well described by Mr. Raymond Moley in his regular column Perspective, in Newsweek magazine, in an article entitled "New Acres for Old" in the issue of February 6, 1956.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and the taxpayers of our Nation:

In the President's state of the Union message, separated by only a few sentences are two recommendations: "I shall urge authorization of a soil-bank program to alleviate the problem of diverted acres and an overextended agricultural plant * * *" and "I strongly recommend that action be taken at this session on such wholly Federal projects as the Colorado River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

This means that the President is asking Congress to take out of cultivation an immense number of acres at a large cost per acre to the taxpayers, and on the other hand to bring into cultivation or to increase the productivity of over a million acres at a cost in the upper Colorado project of as high as $5,000 an acre and in the Fryingpan-Arkansas project of about $1,400 an acre.

This continues the mad cycle which has been going on for years: The Agriculture Department laboring to curb production, and the Interior Department just as zealously trying to increase production. Of course, this makes no sense. But lots of things in politics make no sense and are paid out of the sweat of the taxpayer's brow.

Nearly 2 years ago, when the gigantic upper Colorado project was presented to Congress by the administration and the Hoover Commission was setting to work to look into all and sundry water conservation projects, the President appointed a committee on the general subject, composed of Secretary McKay, chairman, and the Secretaries Benson and Wilson. This committee has just submitted its report.

In the first place, the report recommends that State and local governments should share the cost of water projects. But the President in his message recommends that the two projects named above be wholly Federal.

Next, the committee recommends that there be set up "an independent Board of Review * * * to analyze the engineering and economic feasibility of projects and report to the President." If any such board were to report independently and factually on these two projects, it can be taken for granted that no President would dream of recommending them. As it happened, the pressure for these projects came from interested Members of Congress and bureaucrats anxious to spend more and more tax dollars. The congressional committees that considered them are stacked with Members from the beneficiary States. In the case of the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 500), only one Member came from east of the Mississippi, and he represents a State paying a relatively small percentage of the taxes involved. One might as well have a plaintiff pick the jury which would pass upon his claim.

The other notable recommendation is that while the old practice of charging water users on irrigation projects no interest on the money advanced by the Federal Government should be continued, nevertheless interest should "be shown clearly as a Federal cost." This means that when a project is presented to Congress, all the cards would be laid on the table. Hitherto the interest charge has been one of those things that the interested parties never chose to mention. Only occasionally a stalwart champion of economy has pried that cost out of the Bureau of Reclamation.

That interest charge is very important. Since no project except 1 or 2 has been paid for by the water users within the 53 years since Federal irrigation began, the interest charge runs to twice to three times the original cost.

Immediately after the President made the report public, a Congressman from Colorado, WAYNE N. ASPINALL, shouted his disapproval and in so doing let a cat as big as a mountain puma out of the bag. He said that "if they did not favor the elimination of the interest charge immediately after adding it to the cost of construction, there wouldn't be a reclamation project in the United States that would be economically possible."

In short, if the real cost plus interest were considered, none of the presently proposed irrigation projects would stand scrutiny.

That is exactly what I have been saying in this space for 2 years.

Aid for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the backbone of the American economic system is without question, I think, the small-business man. Through the initiative and inventiveness of the small-business man America has grown into the great industrial giant that it is. Because we have had leaders in this field throughout our history, we are in a better position to inspire the free world in the struggle against communism. Without our industrial might, such things as the Marshall plan, point 4, and our other economic assistance programs would not be possible.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the small-business man has his back to the wall today in the struggle to maintain his place against the large corporations. If there be any doubt of the truth of this statement, the statistics of business failures bear mute evidence of its accuracy. In 1945 there were only 809 failures. In 1953 there were approximately 8,862. In 1954 there were 11,086. The latest reports for 1955 indicate that there were almost as many in that year—10,969—as there were in 1954. And this was a year of great boom in the American economy—or at least this is what the economists tell us. Truly, the Nation's small-business men face at least as serious a problem as the American farmer.

Nor are the statistics of failure the only evidence of the threat to our traditional free-enterprise system. Many of us have become increasingly aware of the growth in the size of our already gigantic corporations. Much of this increase has come about through the merger of smaller corporations with larger ones. This merger activity has taken place even between companies in entirely unrelated fields as the larger corporations expand their operations into ever more diversified activities.

Statistics of the Federal Trade Commission show the following trend in the number of manufacturing and mining concerns acquired or merged during the last 30 years. Beginning in 1922, the number of mergers rose steadily from 297 to a peak of 1,216 in 1929. Thereafter the number of mergers leveled off at less than 200 in 1932, and varied within a range from 87 to 419 throughout the forties. However, mergers rose rapidly in 1951, reached 822 in 1952, and stayed at a high level in 1953 and 1954.

The question then arises as to why small business is having such a hard time in keeping its collective head above water in times of supposed prosperity. Put in its simplest terms, the answer lies quite obviously in the fact that small business is small and therefore a much more risky and uncertain affair than the large corporations. This has its most far-reaching effect in the ability of the small concern to secure capital for its operations. The large or giant business only needs to indicate its desires and the money flows in for investors know, or are at least quite certain, that there is little risk. Perhaps the best example of this activity in recent days was the stock issue by the Ford Motor Co. How many small-business men could expect the investing public to respond to a desire for funds in the way that stockbrokers scrambled for Ford stock?

Yet it is almost always the smaller businesses which need capital from outside sources in order to expand operations. Large outfits are able to plow back a certain percentage of the vast profits they make and therefore do not have to go outside their own company for expansion funds. If they want to undertake a really vast program banks are more than glad to loan money at low rates for the security is very good.

In addition, the large corporations are able to siphon off the best of management personnel because they are able to afford much higher salaries for their executive departments based on their ability to earn much greater profits.

Under these circumstances, the management of small business becomes essentially unprofitable and these concerns either give up the struggle and go quietly into bankruptcy or, if they are lucky, they are able to persuade a larger concern to buy them out.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it behooves the Government to take whatever action seems necessary to preserve the ability of the small corporations to compete with their larger neighbors. For this reason, I am introducing a bill designed to give some measure of tax relief to the small-business men of the United States. Under this bill, which has been introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and a distinguished list of cosponsors, the tax on net earnings would be reduced from 30 percent, as it presently is, to 22 percent, and the surtax on corporate income in excess of $25,000 would be increased from the present 22 percent to 31 percent.

This bill would have the following effect on corporate taxes: Corporations with incomes of $25,000 or less would have their tax burden reduced by 26.7 percent. A corporation with income of $100,000 would be given a tax relief of 2.7 percent. Corporations with incomes of $500,000 and over would have increased tax liabilities of from 1.1 percent, in the case of a corporation with that income, to 1.9 percent for a corporation with income of $100 million a year. This bill would result in a net gain in Government income of some $20 million. Its benefits to the small-business man would be much, much greater. With the funds which he formerly had to set aside for Government taxes, he would be able to finance many of the increased activities, enabling him to compete on a much more equitable basis with his large competitor. It would enable him to pay higher salaries to his executive personnel. It would enable him to undertake some of the research activities which are the lifeblood of the modern corporation.

The benefits to the Nation are, I think, quite as great. As I stated at the outset, we are a Nation built on the basis of a free competitive economy. Anything which strengthens this economy is to the benefit of all. In addition, we are today leaders of the free world and we advertise the success of our free-enterprise system. If we are to maintain the position and the strength of the free world in the struggle against the alien system of communism, we must maintain our own concepts. This bill is certainly no cure-all, but it is, at least, a step in the right direction.

The Price of Freedom Is High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include a recent speech made by my distinguished colleague, Hon. KENNETH ROBERTS, who represents the fourth Alabama district.

This address was delivered by Congressman ROBERTS at the midwinter conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on February 11, 1956, in Anniston, Ala. I am sure that all who read Representative ROBERTS' timely statement will find it of real interest:

The price of freedom is high. All of us in this room are aware that the price of freedom is high because we have already made a substantial payment. Some of the payment has been made in the currency of time from our own lives; some has been made in the currency of dollars and cents; and some of us have had members in our families make their final payment with their life.

When the United States entered World War I, it was with the hope that this was the "war to end all wars." Unfortunately time has cruelly shown us that this was a pious hope. Following the Treaty of Versailles, the United States, searching for the road to peace, participated in a disarmament race. An immature United States danced and drank its way through the roaring twenties, oblivious to world problems; seeking only the gratification of momentary pleasures.

The "crash" which obliterated our dream world of the twenties was a harsh, terrifying experience for America. The long, hard depression had a sobering and maturing effect on our country. During these years of the thirties there was a hard core which felt that the United States Government should devote its foreign policy to staying free from any entangling alliances. Our efforts should be directed toward strengthening our own domestic policy. We had remained out of the League of Nations and we should not now indulge in politics abroad. It was during these years, while we refused to look beyond the gentle rolling surf of our coastlines, that Hitler and Mussolini rose to power. The results of our hope to remain free from world strife by not participating and assuming our role of responsibility took its toll when World War II broke out and invaded the lives of all of us.

I am proud of the mature, responsible role the United States has played since this time. Through the combined efforts of all our citizens the United States did reach total mobilization. The United States contributed her men, her industrial strength, and her philosophy rooted deep in constitutional liberty and respect for the individual. The United States contributed these elements so that the world could live in peace again and be a haven for all freemen everywhere.

Unfortunately once again time did not bring our wish true, at least not immediately. In contrast to previous behavior, however, we have not drawn about us the cloak of isolationism in the false hope that this would provide protection. We have taken a strong stand to see that what we fought for and what many men died for will not be lost. We still must make payments upon the altar of military preparedness if we want to keep peace. And this we are willing to do.

This time the United States took a strong stand to keep faith with those who died so that they may sleep in peace in Flanders Field. You might ask, what has our program for peace been? First, let me say it has been a strong, positive program based on a realistic appraisal of the world—the world's many governments, its peoples, and the intricate struggle being made by some for world control. When I think of what might be called our militant program for peace, which to some may seem a contradiction in terms, I am reminded of a statement made by that wonderful warm, human philosopher, Will Rogers. Will Rogers commenting on the reality with which the Pilgrims faced life said: "When the Pilgrims prayed, they usually had a musket in their hands so they'd be sure to get what they asked for."

Of our immediate postwar action, I think that history will prove that the Marshall plan was one of the greatest and most humanitarian concepts ever conceived and implemented by any conqueror. It would have been quite possible for a nation geared to win an all-out war, while still in the white heat of battle, to have accepted the infamous Morgenthau plan—a plan to completely carve up the carcass of Germany and serve it upon a platter for all the victors to relish. Our philosphy transcended this petty bitterness and embraced a program to benefit free men wherever we could. We had not lost our vision. We had come to the sad realization that though the last shot had been fired in the hot war, the struggle still continued.

It took both courage and vision for our Government to act to aid Greece and Turkey. Time has proved that this decision was right.

Our Government was not flustered by the Russians prohibiting land travel into Berlin. We countered this maneuver with the Berlin airlift.

As the true character and designs of the Russian Bear continued to unfold bit by bit, the United States and our allies adopted a counterdefensive policy. The Western Allies formed the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance. This has been followed more recently by the Southeast Asian Alliance.

The United Nations, with our full support, took the difficult strong stand to meet force with force to halt overt aggression in Korea.

In this tense international chess game being waged between the East and West it is difficult to anticipate where the next move will be made. It is not difficult, however, to know what the aims of our opponent are, and our best defensive is to be prepared and to remain alert.

Congress has been very much concerned about both remaining prepared and alert. Although the present administration in 1953 recommended a New Look for the Air Force, which, translated into simple language, meant a cutback in the number of air wings, Congress opposed this action and appropriated funds to provide us with 137 air wings.

In the 1st session of this 84th Congress the administration moved to cut down the manpower of the United States Marine Corps. Congress opposed this reduction. Congress voted additional funds to increase manpower personnel and to maintain it at combat readiness.

This year I think that either the present administration decided that the people wanted and knew a strong military defense program was essential or the administration feared congressional criticism and opposition, for in the President's budget for fiscal year 1957 the defense budget requests are up over last year's and are higher than what everyone was predicting would be requested. I am not advocating that military appropriations be allowed to break the financial back of the Nation. However, when our national income is higher than it has ever been, and when it appears probably that the budget may be balanced this year for the first time since the Truman administration accomplished this in 1948, it seems only sensible that we make an intelligent investment in those programs which are essential to maintaining world peace. If we do not, it may very well be that there is no peace, no prosperity, no freedom, and very little hope.

It was of very grave concern to me when I read the first of Gen. Matthew Ridgway's story, and I quote: "I felt I was being called upon to destroy, rather than to build, a fighting force on which rested the world's best hope for peace. * * * As Chief of Staff, I quickly learned that though my own recommendations were made on a purely military basis, the decisions of the Defense De-

partment were based on considerations other than clear-cut military needs. They were based on budgetary considerations, on political consideration, on the advantage to be gained in the field of domestic politics by a drastic reduction in military expenditures."

If any of General Ridgway's statement is true, it is a shocking situation. The defense of our country should not become political football considerations. The people of our country who are called up to arms whenever there has been an error in judgment, do not want partisan politics to determine our policy. We cannot afford to be partisan in terms of either money, men, or time. As a Member of Congress, regardless of whatever party-line propaganda may be distributed, I can assure you I intend to support those programs which I sincerely feel will carry us toward peace. This is a matter of world security.

One of the deadly races now being run between Russia and the United States is to develop the ballistic missile. Since the end of World War II, the Kremlin has been striving to narrow the technological gap between the Russian economy and our own. Each year they have challenged us more formidably in our one area of superior strength—our ability to design and put into production superior weapons. The Soviets achieved their first atomic bomb in 1949. In 1953, less than 9 months after the United States first full-scale hydrogen tests, the Russians detonated a hydrogen bomb. The Soviets have developed the Bison x long-range jet comparable to our B–52's. Today our monopoly for delivering atomic bombs no longer exists. There are facts we cannot ignore.

In the hands of a treacherous aggressor, the intercontinental ballistic missile can bring hydrogen warfare's threat of extinction to Main Street, United States of America. And it can arrive in less than 30 minutes, direct from Moscow. To date, there is no known defense against this monster.

During the past few years, Congress has been appropriating increasing amounts of money for the guided-missile program. I feel that this program will have to be seriously stepped-up if we want to win this race. If we do not win, it is possible that Russia will blackmail our allies into inactivity by threat of extinction. It is possible that this program could be quickened, if Senator JACKSON'S proposal to remove this program from interservice rivalry were followed and it was established in an independent setup, such as the Manhattan District was created to develop the atomic bomb. I hope that the Senate and House Armed Services Committees will give this deadly matter their immediate attention.

In this race for technical superiority, we cannot overlook the need for brains. Are we winning the race developing and training one of our greatest natural resources, the minds of our young people? In the 26 years between 1928 and 1954 Russia graduated 682,000 engineers as against 480,000 in the United States. Last year Russia graduated twice as many engineers as we did.

At this time I would like to say that I am very much in favor of the stand which the VFW had taken in supporting legislation which would continue GI educational training benefits so long as young men are being drafted. Such legislation seems only equitable to me. I should also like to point out that this program pays for itself in dollars and cents as well as in intangibles. When the trainees of World War II completed their training, their income was below that of nonveterans in the same age group. In 1954, 10 years after the act had been in effect, the veteran's average earning power had gone past the nonveterans, and these men were contributing in income taxes alone approximately $1 billion a year more than the nonveterans. The total cost of the World War II educational program was $14½ billion. This means that the program paid for itself within 14½ years and that the taxes after that are all profit. And it cannot be overlooked that this program trained 180,000 needed doctors, 113,000 research scientists, 450,000 civil engineers and many, many others. I can assure you that I expect to support legislation to continue this very fine program when it comes before the House of Representatives for a vote.

I have spoken of military preparedness this afternoon. But it is in the hearts and minds of men that we shall win our final victory. The success of our great humanitarian concepts—the Marshall plan, the point 4 program, to share the world's abundance—is obvious, if one is to judge by the fact that Russia is now trying to emulate us. World War II cost us $350 billion. Our foreign aid programs have cost less than $65 billion. This is a small investment to make for peace, and the return is incalculable in terms of life, liberty and happiness.

I am sorry if I seemed to have painted you a picture of gloom here this afternoon. I do not feel that way about it. I do feel that it is a realistic appraisal and that a strong portion of our defense depends upon facing reality. I would like to say that I have faith. I have faith in this great Nation of ours. In the heritage bestowed upon us by our ancestors who came to this wilderness to found a nation dedicated to "liberty, justice, and freedom for all."

The West believes in the dignity of man; in human worth; in freedom for the development and expression of man's soul. For these reasons I do not doubt that we shall win ultimate victory in the hearts and minds of men. In Zechariah it reads: "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

California Witnesses Prove That Colorado River Project Will Not Threaten California's Water Rights

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, It is the duty of those of us who represent California in the Congress to satisfy ourselves that not one drop of water to which California is legally entitled is taken from it by the Colorado River project legislation. That this is at the heart of California's particular concern in this matter is clearly set forth in the following excerpt from the comments of the California State engineer, Mr. A. D. Edmonston, on the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Colorado River storage project:

> The primary interest of the State of California in the specific projects set forth in the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation as approved by the Secretary of the Interior on January 26, 1951, is that in the construction and operation of any of these projects, California will receive its due apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River system as provided for in the Colorado River compact and related laws, instruments, and documents.[10]

Should authorization of the project prejudice California's legal rights to the waters of the Colorado River, my duty as well as the duty of every other person charged with the responsibility of representing California in or before Congress would be to oppose the legislation with all possible vigor. Conversely, such opposition is out of order if it can be established that authorization would pose no threat whatsoever to California's legal share of waters of the Colorado River, providing the project is otherwise in accord with the general policy of the Federal Government governing water resources development.

I have come to the conclusion that it is possible for the upper basin to develop and use some of the water to which it is entitled under the terms of the Colorado River Compact without impairing its ability to deliver to California and the other lower basin States the water to which they are entiled. That conclusion is based on statements by Northcutt Ely and Raymond Matthew, attorney and engineer, respectively, for the California-Colorado River Board, and on official comments and statements by California State Engineer Edmonston, and by the Colorado River Board of California to the effect that all of the consumptive uses in the upper basin contemplated in current legislation can be made without interfering with the quantity of water which must be delivered to the lower basin. Later[11] in this article evidence will be presented from the official record which establishes that California officials have, first, admitted that water available for use in the upper basin is more than adequate to supply all the requirements of the projects included in the Colorado River storage project without injury to California; second, maintained that large holdover storage in the upper basin is an essential prerequisite to development there in order to assure that California and the other lower basin States will continue to receive the water to which they are entitled under the compact; third, urged prompt construction of the largest feature of the Colorado River storage project, namely, the Glen Canyon reservoir; and fourth, endorsed the generation of electric energy as a necessary and desirable adjunct of upper basin development.

BACKGROUND OF PROPOSALS FOR UPPER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

Basic to any understanding of the rights of the seven States of the Colorado River Basin to the use of the waters of the Colorado River is the Colorado River Compact of 1922.[12] That compact divides the Colorado River Basin into two parts, the upper basin comprising parts of the upper basin comprising parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming, and the lower basin comprising parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah, with Lee Ferry, a point in Arizona, as the dividing point between the two basins. Each basin is defined to include, in addition to the specified States, such other States located outside

[10] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess., 297 (1954).

[11] Infra, at p. 17 et seq.

[12] H. Doc. No. 717, 80th Cong., 2d sess., at A17 (1948).

the drainage area of the Colorado River system as are or will be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colorado River system above or below Lee Ferry, as the case may be.

Article III (a) of the compact apportions to each basin in perpetuity:

> The exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum.

Article III (d) provides that—

> States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years.

The Colorado River Compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act,[13]—which authorized the Hoover Dam and the All-American Canal as its major features—became effective in 1929 after ratification of the compact by 6 of the 7 States of the Colorado River Basin, the enactment of the California Limitation Act[14] and the proclamation by the President. Development in the lower basin proceeded at a fast pace with the construction of Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, the Colorado River Acqueduct, and other works. Development in the upper basin, on the other hand, proceeded more slowly, due to various factors including the lack of a comprehensive plan for the use of their waters and of an apportionment of the waters among the States themselves, and to various economic, technical, and other problems that confronted it.

The first effective step toward eventual upper basin development came with the enactment of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940.[15] Section 2 (d) of that act provided for a payment of $500,000 annually from the Colorado River dam fund, which was established by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, to a special fund in the Treasury designated the "Colorado River development fund." The first receipts of the fund up to $1,500,000 were directed to be used "for the continuation and extension, under the direction of the Secretary of studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River system for irrigation, electric power, and other purposes" in the upper and lower divisions of the Colorado River Basin. Receipts of the fund through the year 1955 were directed to be used for investigation and construction of projects in the four States of the upper division.

Pursuant to that authorization, the Department of the Interior undertook an exhaustive investigation of potential water resources developments in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the results of which were contained in an interim report of the Secretary of the Interior published in 1947 and entitled "The Colorado River—A Natural Menace Becomes a National Resource."[16] Before publication the report was submitted to the seven affected States and to the Secretary of war, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Agriculture, and their replies were included in it. The report contained a comprehensive inventory of potential water resources developments in the Colorado River Basin. In his letter transmitting it to the President, the Secretary of the Interior stated:

> Although I cannot recommend authorization of any projects at this time, I am sending the accompanying inventory report forward in order that you and the Congress may be apprized of this comprehensive inventory of potential water resource developments in the Colorado River Basin, and of the present situation regarding water rights in the Colorado River Basin.[17]

The report took cognizance of the fact that while the Colorado River compact divides the water between the upper and lower basins, it made no division among the States within each basin. It further noted that an Upper Basin Compact Commission had been created to apportion upper basin water. The commission reached agreement and the compact became effective upon the concurrence of Congress in 1948.[18]

Following the apportionment of the waters among the upper basin States, various bills were introduced to authorize developments there. Meanwhile the Department continued its studies, and under date of December 1950, the Bureau of Reclamation presented Project Planning Report No. 4–8a–81–1 which recommended approval of an overall plan of development of the upper Colorado River Basin and initial authorization and construction of 5 storage projects and 10 participating or consumptive-use projects. Under date of June 14, 1951, California submitted its views and recommendations on the report, saying, among other things, the following:

> The State of California favors congressional authorization of the specific projects set forth in the proposed report of the Secretary of the Interior or as may be modified, and their construction with Federal funds consistent with national welfare if (a) such projects qualify under criteria, policies, and procedures of the Congress, and (b) the diversion and utilization of the waters of the Colorado River system by and through these projects will not impair the rights of the State of California or any of its agencies to the waters of that system as defined and set forth in the Colorado River compact and related laws and documents.[19]

The project was the subject of continuing study by the Bureau of Reclamation on the basis of which a supplemental report dated December 10, 1953, was prepared. It recommended the construction of the Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage and power units and of some 11 reclamation projects. The total cost of the units recommended for authorization was $923,056,000. The report was transmitted to the Speaker of the House.[20] President Eisenhower referred to the report in a press release dated March 20, 1954, which read, in part, as follows:

> I have today approved recommendations for the development of the upper Colorado River Basin.
>
> The general plan upon which these recommendations are based has been prepared by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary's recommendations have been reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget. Legislation embodying the administration's recommendations is being prepared for introduction in the Congress.
>
> This is a comprehensive, well-planned development of a river basin. The close Federal-State cooperation upon which the Secretary's plan is based also carries out this administration's approach to water-resource development.
>
> The development will conserve water, enabling the region to increase supplies for municipal uses, industrial development, and irrigation. It will develop much-needed electric power.
>
> The development calls for sound financing. The legislation now being drafted will set up a fund for the entire project so that it will be constructed and paid for as a basin program.
>
> I hope the Congress will give early consideration to enactment of the administration's legislative proposal. I firmly believe development of the upper Colorado River Basin, in accordance with its provisions, is in the national interest.[21]

The President has repeatedly urged the Congress to approve his proposed upper Colorado River development. In his State of the Union message to the Congress in January 1955, President Eisenhower stated with reference to the project:

> The Federal Government must shoulder its * * * partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West.[22]

In his budget message for the same year the President said:

> I also recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the upper Colorado River Basin development in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas development in Colorado. The Colorado River development will enable the upper basin States to conserve floodwaters and to assure the availability of water and power necessary for the economic growth of the region * * * Sale of power generated at these developments will repay the power investment within 50 years and will make a contribution toward repayment of other investments.[23]

In his State of the Union message for 1956, delivered only last month, President Eisenhower again urgently recommended action authorizing the Colorado

---

[13] 45 Stat. 1057 (1928).
[14] Calif. Stats. 1929, ch. 16, p. 38.
[15] 54 Stat. 774.
[16] H. Doc. No. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947).
[17] Id. at 2.
[18] 63 Stat. 31 (1949).
[19] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess. at 297 (1954).
[20] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess. (1954).
[21] Id at 1.
[22] H. Doc. No. 1, 84th Cong., 1st sess. at 8.
[23] H. Doc. No. 16, 84th Cong., 1st sess. at M. 65.

River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project during the current session of Congress.[24]

THE PROJECT BEFORE CONGRESS

The Senate's bill to authorize the project, S. 500, passed that body during the 1st session of the 84th Congress. It would authorize 6 storage reservoirs with hydroelectric features and incidental works and 12 participating or consumptive-use irrigation projects plus some 21 additional projects conditioned on later congressional approval of feasibility reports on each. The total construction cost of all features in the Senate bill is $1,658,460,100.

H. R. 3383, to authorize the project, was favorably reported.[25] by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on July 8, 1955, and shortly thereafter cleared for floor consideration by the House Committee on Rules.[26] Congress adjourned before the matter was taken up in the House. It is assumed that the backers will press for House action early in the current session of the 84th Congress. As reported by the committee, H. R. 3383 would authorize as an initial phase of the comprehensive plan of upper basin development 4 holdover storage reservoirs and 11 participating projects. The 4 holdover storage units and their locations are as follows:

Glen Canyon, Ariz. and Utah. Flaming Gorge, Utah and Wyo.; Navajo, N. Mex.; Curecantil, Colo.[27]

The 11 consumptive-use projects would bring irrigation to some 132,000 acres of new land and provide a supplemental water supply for an additional 234,000 acres.

The controversial Echo Park Dam, which has been opposed by individuals and organizations on grounds that it would invade the Dinosaur National Monument, was eliminated from H. R. 3383 in our committee, as was the Juniper Dam. The bill would authorize the appropriation of $760 million which is $190 million less than the $950 million recommended for the project by the Eisenhower administration.

Recently an agreement was reached between the governors, Senators, and Representatives of the upper basin to eliminate Echo Park Dam from the project in deference to those who opposed that particular feature because of its location. Based on the elimination of Echo Park, the executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, which is typical of the national conservation societies which opposed the project solely because of Echo Park, advised Congressman Dawson of Utah by letter dated February 1, 1956, that its opposition has been withdrawn.[28] That withdrawal leaves the California opposition as the only objector to legislation to authorize the Colorado storage project.

Although, as has already been pointed out, California's primary concern with legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project relates to any adverse effect the project may have on its legal shares to the waters of the Colorado River, much criticism has been forthcoming from the California opposition based on the financial aspects of the project. Following is the allocation of costs of the project which would be authorized in the pending H. R. 3383:

Item and allocation	
Nonreimbursable: Flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation	$8,205,000
Reimbursable:	
Power	422,743,500
Municipal water	40,950,000
Irrigation	[29] 282,800,000

Of the total cost of the project less than 1 percent is nonreimbursable and that is for features which have specifically been recognized as Federal expenses such as flood control,[30] fish and wildlife,[31] and recreation.[32] The remaining 99 percent plus of the cost is reimbursable. The entire allocation for municipal and industrial water and power of approximately $463.7 million is returnable to the United States with interest on the investment plus interest accruing during construction. The irrigation allocation of $282.8 million would be repaid in equal installments over a 50-year period plus any development period authorized, but does not bear interest in accordance with a principle that has been a part of reclamation law for over 50 years.

Referring to the application of revenues contemplated from the project included in H. R. 3383, the following is set forth in the committee report:

In a 50-year period following the last power installation, net power revenues from the power facilities herein authorized are estimated at $1,075 million. Irrigation revenues in 50 years from the irrigation projects herein authorized are estimated at $36.6 million. The $1,075 million from power revenues would be sufficient to pay the power investment of $422.7 million, interest on the power investment of about $320 million to the Federal Treasury, the necessary financial assistance to irrigation of $246.2 million ($282.8 million minus $36.6 million) and leave a surplus at the end of the period of about $86 million. Municipal water revenues would be sufficient to repay the municipal water allocation with interest including interest during construction.

After the project has been completely repaid, the net power revenues amounting to from $15 million to $20 million annually for the units herein authorized will continue to flow into the Treasury. Over the long run, these additional revenues will more than offset the cost to the Federal Government resulting from interest-free financing for the irrigation investment. Thus, it is evident that the repayment plan is sound and that repayment is in accordance with the normal procedure for reclamation projects.[33]

In his testimony on S. 500.[34] Mr. Northcutt Ely decried the fact that the power revenues, in addition to repaying the cost of the power facilities with interest, will be used to pay out the cost of the reclamation facilities included in the project. Yet the use of power revenues for such purposes has been a common feature of Federal reclamation projects financing.[35] It received the endorsement of President Eisenhower's Presidential Committee on Water Resources Policy in a report [36] sent to the Congress on January 17, 1956. The Committee was comprised of the three following Cabinet officers: Secretary of Interior McKay, Chairman; Secretary of Agriculture Benson; and Secretary of Defense Wilson. In their report the members said in part as follows:

Use of excess revenues: Reclamation law has for many years permitted the application of excess revenue from the sale of power and municipal and industrial water (i. e., revenues received in excess of the amount necessary to amortize the capital cost with interest and cost of maintenance and operation of such purposes) to help repay part of irrigation costs. Such application has been made on numerous projects over many years. It should be recognized, however, that any charge for power above that necessary to repay power costs constitutes in effect an assessment upon the power users, who include practically all of the residents in the region. Thus, it is one method of collecting a share of costs from secondary local beneficiaries.

The Committee believes that such a use of excess revenue from Federal power sales to repay a portion of the costs of other types of projects is a justifiable procedure provided the project to which such revenues are applied is a part of the area from which such excess revenues are derived.[37]

The Californians who object to the project on grounds of subsidy do so in the fact of the fact that the major subsidy to the reclamation projects comes not from the Federal Treasury, but from the power users in accordance with regular principles. The Federal subsidy amounts to only $8.2 million and that for features which are recognized as Federal expenses.[38] Contrast that subsidy with the estimated nonreimbursable Federal cost of $348 million [39] for only one flood control project in Southern California, namely the Los Angeles County drainage area—excluding the Whittier Narrows Reservoir—and you can get some idea of the reaction of Upper Basin spokesmen to challenges to the Colorado River storage project based on economics by the California opposition. Thus a single flood-control project which benefits 1 area in California carries a nonreimbursable Federal grant which is

[24] H. Doc. No. 241, 84th Cong., 2d sess., at 10.
[25] H. Rept. No. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess., (1955).
[26] H. Rept. No. 1332, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (1955).
[27] Authorization of this feature was made subject to a finding of feasibility and report to the Congress.
[28] 102 Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD A1079 (Feb. 2, 1956).
[29] H. Rept. No. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess. at 11 and 12.
[30] 49 Stat. 1570 (1936), 33 U. S. C. 701a (1952).
[31] 60 Stat. 1080 (1934), 16 U. S. C. 662 (1952).
[32] The report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. Vol. 3, Water Resources Law (1950) at 331.
[33] H. Rept. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess., at 12 and 13.
[34] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 572.
[35] The report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., supra, at 296.
[36] H. Doc. 315, 84th Cong., 2d sess. (1955).
[37] Id. at 33.
[38] Supra, notes 30, 31, and 32.
[39] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, U. S. Senate on H. R. 6766, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (1955), at 1886.

over 43 times the subsidy to the Colorado storage project in which 4 States benefit. If it is considered appropriate to take into account the cost to the Federal Government based on the non-interest-bearing irrigation investment, those features of the Colorado River storage projects would cost the United States some $285 million in interest over the 60-year amortization term. At the end of that period, all Federal costs will have been repaid. The nonreimbursable Federal grant for the Los Angeles County drainage area, on the other hand, will over the same length of time cost the United States $570 million in interest alone and this interest cost will continue to mount indefinitely. After 100 years, it will amount to $870 million.

Furthermore, it is difficult for Californians to oppose the upper basin development on economic grounds when the State of California is going to build the Feather River project out of its own funds with no reference to historical standards of feasibility.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S POSITION

At the outset I stated that my refusal to join the alinement against the upper basin development which Northcutt Ely and Raymond Matthew—attorney and engineer, respectively, for the California-Colorado River Board—have spearheaded is based on a conviction that it is possible for the upper basin to develop some of its legal share of the waters of the Colorado River Basin without impairing California's rights to its share of the same waters. It is my purpose to now set forth the evidence on which that conclusion is based—evidence assembled from the public record which I believe does not support the stand of those who have fought upper basin development as a "threat to California's vital water and power supplies." [40]

WATER AVAILABLE FOR USE IN UPPER BASIN

It has already been shown that article III (a) of the Colorado River compact apportions to the upper basin the beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum from the waters of the Colorado River Basin. The State engineer of California has stated that the long-term average quantity available for use in the upper basin may be somewhat less than 7,500,000 acre-feet a year due to article III (d) of the compact which provides that the upper basin States will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre-feet for any 10 consecutive years. He stated that studies have indicated that the upper basin during a critical period such as 1931–40 would not have more than 6,077,000 acre-feet available to it, which, together with estimated reservoir losses of 831,000 acre-feet, would result in a total consumptive use of 6,908,000 acre-feet. He then concluded that the long-term average quantity available for consumptive use in the upper basin is between 6,900,000 and 7,500,000 acre-feet per year.[41]

[40] 30 Los Angeles B. A. Bull. 227.

[41] H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947), at 33 and 34.

There has been unanimous agreement among Californians that the consumptive uses of projects included in S. 500 or H. R. 3383 would not require near the amount of water allotted to the upper basin by the compact. Mr. Ely testified, in part, as follows:

> The aggregate consumptive use of these projects is said to range from about a half million to about 1½ million acre-feet. These quantities when added to about 2,500,000 acre-feet, said to be required by projects already constructed or authorized would represent a total use of say 3 million or 4 million acre-feet in the upper basin. The larger of these figures is still within the quantity of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, the use of which is apportioned to the upper basin by article 3 (a) of the Colorado River Compact. Moreover, the engineering studies indicate that this total could be permanently put to use without the construction of any new hold-over storage whatever.[42]

Not only did Mr. Ely and Mr. Matthew concede that the consumptive uses of all projects included in the Colorado River storage project legislation is well within the upper basin's entitlement, but they testified such uses were so small that they could be made without the construction of any hold-over storage facilities whatsoever.

Mr. Matthew testified before the House committee, in part, as follows:

> Under present conditions of development of the upper basin, the measured flow at Lee Ferry during all periods of 10 consecutive years has always materially exceeded 75 million acre-feet throughout the period of record to date. Studies by the Bureau in the project planning report indicate that in the dryest 10-year period of record, 1930–40, the upper basin could have theoretically used, without holdover storage, about 4,300,000 acre-feet of water, or about 2,300,000 acre-feet more than the present use as estimated by the Bureau.[43]

Mr. Ely referred to the fact that all authorized and contemplated uses in the upper basin would represent a total of from 3,500,000 to 4,500,000 acre-feet in the upper basin and added:

> Moreover, the engineering studies indicate that this total could be permanently put to use without the construction of any new holdover storage whatever, and that no holdover storage would be required for nearly half a century even if other projects were added.[44]

Even the pendency of the case of Arizona against California does not affect the amount of water required for consumptive use by the Colorado River storage project, plus that required for all presently authorized and existing projects. The future determination by the Supreme Court in that case on such important questions as whether beneficial consumptive use as used in article III (a) of the Colorado River compact and the Mexican Water Treaty means the quantity in fact used, measured at the place of use, or the effect of that use measured in terms of stream depletion at Lee Ferry, as well as its decision on other disputed interpretations of provisions of pertinent compacts, laws, and treaties does not warrant a delay in authorization of the Colorado River storage project, since, as Mr. Ely has testified, the amount involved in that litigation vis-a-vis the upper and lower basins amounts to 2 million acre-feet.[45] Thus if all disputed issues in that case are resolved in favor of the stand California has taken in Arizona against California now before the Supreme Court, there will remain 5,500,000 acre-feet per year available for use in the upper basin. This amount is still well over 1 million acre-feet in excess of the 3,500,000 to 4,500,000 acre-feet which Mr. Ely testified could be put to use in the upper basin without any danger to the lower basin.

THE STORAGE DAMS

By far the biggest assault from southern California on the Colorado River storage project has been directed at the storage dams. This is understandable since those dams, which include hydroelectric features, are the "cash registers" of the entire development. This is so because the revenues derived from the sale of power will, in accordance with standard practice, be used to pay off part of the cost of the participating, or irrigation, projects. Without them the irrigation projects canot be built except at prohibitive cost and the waters of the Colorado River apportioned to the upper basin by the compact must remain undeveloped.

The desire of southern Californians to forever preclude or at least delay development in the upper basin is understandable when the effect of such development on lower basin power revenues is taken into account. Manifestly, water which is used in the upper basin will not pass through Hoover and other lower basin dams to generate low-cost power. The power generated from water to which the upper basin is entitled is sold as secondary—undependable—energy at a low rate as contrasted with firm—dependable—energy which is sold at a higher rate. That upper basin Senators are not insensitive to this basis of the southern California opposition is shown in the following colloquy between Senators Anderson, of New Mexico, Watkins, of Utah, and Mr. Raymond Matthew, of the Colorado River Board of California, in the course of the Senate hearings:

> Senator ANDERSON. May I stop you there to ask: Since this has been dealing with Hoover Dam, is it or is it not a fact that the Hoover Dam contracts are all set up on a basis of gradual reduction of power quantities dependent upon the development of the upper basin?
>
> Mr. MATTHEW. That is correct.
>
> Senator ANDERSON. Then why should you suddenly complain about it now, if what you anticipated takes places?
>
> Mr. MATTHEW. Well, this is far more than was anticipated. The firm power is defined in the contracts starting with 4,330 million kilowatt-hours a year, reduced by 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours a year, due to depletions in the upper basin.

[42] Hearings on H. R. 3383, supra, at 825 and 826.

[43] January 26, 1954, Raymond Matthew's statement before the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation on H. R. 4449 and others, 83d Cong., 2d sess., at 692.

[44] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 571.

[45] Hearings on H. R. 3383 et al., at 991, 992, and 993.

Senator ANDERSON. Would the projects involved in this bill reduce it more than that?

Mr. MATTHEW. Yes, these storage projects would——

Senator ANDERSON. But, surely, you would not contend that it was anticipated that the flow at Lee Ferry should be above 7½ million acre-feet, and keep Hoover Dam going to capacity?

Mr. MATTHEW. Not just necessarily for that. I am merely pointing out that under the contracts as set up, in order to deliver that firm power at Hoover, it would require the larger quantity. And if there was only 7,500,000 acre-feet at Lee Ferry, then the firm power output would be reduced 26 percent, and they would not get any secondary.

Senator ANDERSON. I am trying to get down to bedrock, but you insist on these interpretations of the contracts requiring the delivery of 7½ million acre-feet at Lee Ferry. Now, if we live up to that part of the compact, and that results in any cutting down at Hoover Dam, do you think that is wrong?

Mr. MATTHEW. Yes, we do.

Senator ANDERSON. You do. Therefore the Hoover Dam situation is more important than that section of the compact? [46]

* * * * *

Senator WATKINS. I am just wondering how they can lose when, as a matter of fact, they have been getting the benefit of a gift, in effect, from the upper basin States all these years in the way of secondary power, and, of course, firm power, much more of it than you could ordinarily guarantee unless you counted on having the water from the upper basin States run there personally (sic).

Senator ANDERSON. That is the loss, Senator. The loss he is talking about is a loss that they would obtain if somebody stopped all the water in the Colorado River Basin from flowing down there.

Senator WATKINS. If we stop giving our water to them.

Senator ANDERSON. Yes. That is the loss.

Senator WATKINS. I have had people make gifts to me once in a while, and if they stop giving me those gifts I have lost (sic).

Mr. MATTHEW. As was testified to yesterday by Mr. Tillamn, of course, that secondary power and firm power was not guaranteed.

Senator WATKINS. It was not. That is true.[47]

It is clear, as brought out in the foregoing colloquy, that the reduction of energy available to allottees of Hoover Dam power which will result from the use by the upper basin of its share of the Colorado Basin waters has been anticipated since consummation of the compact. The Hoover Dam energy contracts with California public agencies and companies such as the cities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale, and Burbank, the Metropolitan Water District, and the Southern California Edison Co., and the California Electric Power Co. each contain the following express condition and covenant:

Delivery of water for generation of electric energy:

10. (a) Subject to—

* * * * *

(ii) the further statutory requirement that this contract is made upon the express condition and with the express covenant that the rights of the * * *, as a contractor for electrical energy, to the use of the waters of the Colorado River, or its tributaries, shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River Compact.

The United States will deliver the State energy in the manner required in this contract.[48]

Although Mr. Ely's position is that all the participating projects in the upper basin can be built "without the necessity for any storage whatever," [49] and Mr. Matthew has stated that "storage units should not be built in the upper basin in advance of their need in connection with consumptive-use projects," [50] the California State engineer and the Colorado River Board of California included the following recommendations in their comments on the Secretary of the Interior's report on potential upper basin developments:

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The following comments and conclusions are submitted with respect to the proposed report of the Secretary of the Interior entitled "The Colorado River," approved June 7, 1946.

* * * * *

6. Large holdover storage as indicated in the report is required in meeting the requirements of the Colorado River compact and in conserving and utilizing as far as it is ultimately possible the waters of the Colorado River system.

* * * * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

C. That prior to determination of the allocation of the waters of the Colorado River system among the States of the upper basin, new consumptive-use projects in that basin be authorized under the following conditions:

(a) That the consumptive use of each project be assuredly within each water allocation as is considered the minimum for the State for which the project is to be constructed, after due allowance for all existing and authorized projects.

(b) That, concurrently with the construction of any new projects in the upper basin which involve large additional use of water, holdover storage capacity be provided in that basin, to such an extent as may be necessary to assure that the flow of the river at Lee Ferry will not be depleted below that required by article III (d) of the compact.[51]

The largest in physical dimensions and cost of the storage dams, which is included in both the House and Senate bills, is Glen Canyon with a total cost allocation of $421,270,000. It represents 55 percent of all the recommended appropriation for units authorized in H. R. 3383. The reservoir storage capacity of Glen Canyon would be 26 million acre-feet and the total installed power capacity, 800,000 kilowatts. This dam would be located on the Colorado River in northern Arizona about 13 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona State line and 15 miles upstream from Lee Ferry, which divides the upper and lower basins.

This dominant financial and physical feature of the entire Colorado River storage project was endorsed as late as February 15, 1954, by the State engineer of California in his official comments on the administration's report on the project, which comments were approved by Fred W. Simpson, chairman, the Colorado River Board of California. They were, in part, as follows:

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

* * * * *

10. The early construction of Glen Canyon Reservoir would be justified from the standpoint of other immediate advantages. Based upon the cost analyses in the report, the Glen Canyon Reservoir and power development could be constructed and operated on a sound financial basis and therefore merits authorization at this time.[52]

Testifying on H. R. 3383, Raymond Matthew endorsed Glen Canyon thusly:

Of all the proposed units of the storage project, the Bureau's cost estimates indicate that the Glen Canyon Reservoir and power development is the only one that can clearly stand on its own feet as a financially sound project unit.[53]

It might be expected that after a clear endorsement of Glen Canyon by the State engineer, the chairman of the Colorado River Board of California, and by Mr. Raymond Matthew, the chief engineer of the board, as an economically feasible and even desirable development, that Mr. Northcutt Ely would follow the official State position. Instead of doing so, he opposed the Glen Canyon development as unsound.[54]

Much criticism on the project is based on an allegation that the storage dams may be operated in such a manner as to be detrimental to the rights of California, particularly during the period when the reservoirs are being filled. The Department of the Interior has repeatedly emphasized that the filling of the reservoirs will be accomplished in a manner to minimize any adverse effect on Hoover Dam power. Commissioner of Reclamation Dexheimer testified that during many years they have had to release flood waters from Hoover Dam to make space. He continued:

That water is wasted. Every year we are wasting water into the gulf because we do not have adequate storage now to take care of it.

If we could have stored water a few years back from excess, it would have been available now and would certainly be beneficial not only in the upper basin but in the lower basin.[55]

Dead storage can be built up during the long construction period by impounding what would otherwise be run-off or waste waters from Hoover Dam. In that manner the heads for initial power generation would be accumulated over a long period of time without affecting the production of power at Hoover. The time required to fill the reservoirs would, of course, depend on the amount of run-off in the river. Under unfavorable conditions, filling could be achieved in 5 years, but it could be much longer in the event of drought. In short, the Department of the Interior has given every assurance that it will adapt initial

[46] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 517 and 518.

[47] Id., at 519.

[48] See, e. g., power contract, city of Los Angeles, dated May 29, 1941, H. Doc. 717, 80th Cong., 2d sess., at A361. See also the agreements with other contractors in the same volume.

[49] Hearings on H. R. 3383 et al., supra, at 982.

[50] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 526.

[51] H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess., at 51, 52 and 53.

[52] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess., at 19.

[53] Hearings on H. R. 3383 et al. at 912 et seq.

[54] Id. at 987.

[55] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 28.

filling to the amount of run-off and the downstream demands for water and firm electrical energy. By the way of further protection for the lower basin, section 15 of H. R. 3383 directs the Secretary of the Interior to operate the facilities authorized in the bill in compliance with the compacts and acts which comprise the so-called law of the river and permits any State of the Colorado River Basin, in the event the Secretary fails to so comply, to maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States and gives the consent to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit.

One further consideration relative to the upper-basin storage is that the benefits will not accrue only to that basin. California and the other lower-basin States will likewise share in the benefit, since it will be assured of a regular supply in accordance with the terms of the compact. Thus, in years of low flow in the river caused by drought, water will be released from the reservoirs to satisfy California's rights.

GENERATION OF ELECTRIC POWER IN THE UPPER BASIN

The importance of the installed electrical energy generating capacity at the storage dams as a means of financing part of the cost of the irrigation works has already been discussed. There will be no problem whatsoever in marketing the energy to be generated by the Colorado River storage project in the power-hungry area it will serve. Ten private power companies have offered to purchase any available power above that required by project or other Government contracts.[56] Referring to the private power companies' proposals, our committee stated in its report:

The committee finds that this project is unique in that there is no public versus private power controversy involved. Representatives of the 10 private power companies operating in the area presented testimony before the committee indicating their desire to cooperate with the Federal Government in the transmission and marketing of electric power and energy from the Colorado River storage project. Their proposal provides essentially that the Secretary construct the backbone transmission lines connecting major powerplants of the project and that use be made of the existing systems of the companies and additions thereto to market the power.

* * * * *

The proposal by the power companies seemed entirely reasonable to the committee.

The Department of the Interior advised the committee that it was sympathetic to the private power companies' proposal and indicated that the suggestions would be given studied consideration if the project were authorized. Therefore, the committee expects the proposal by the private power companies for cooperation in the development to be carefully considered by the Department of the Interior and the electric power and energy of the project to be marketed, so far as possible, through the facilities of the electric utilities operating in the area, provided, of course, that the power-preference laws are complied with and project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected.[57]

[56] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 30.

[57] H. Rept. No. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess., stet at 16 and 17.

Not only the private power companies, but the REA cooperatives,[58] and the State of California are anxious to secure the power. The State engineer of California, Mr. Edmonston, and Mr. Matthew and Mr. Edmonston, the chief engineer and chairman, respectively, of the Colorado River Board of California stated as late as February 15, 1954, in their official report on the project as follows:

11. Glen Canyon power could be readily disposed of in the lower basin where there is a great need for additional power. The question of policy regarding its disposal merits the special consideration of the Executive and the Congress.[59]

California's official position has always been favorable to the development of the power potential of the upper basin. In its official comments on the Secretary's interim report on the Colorado River appears the following with respect to the development of electric power in the Colorado River Basin:

ELECTRIC POWER

Full development of the water resources of the Colorado River necessarily include the production and transmission of hydroelectric power made possible by the construction of storage works for the regulation and utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

An initial construction program could and should include hydroelectric power developments when found needed and justified. Such projects are nonconsumptive in effect.

* * * * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. That an immediate and intensive investigation and study be made and reported upon by the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with interested agencies, concerning possible hydro-electric projects upstream from Lake Mead on the Colorado River with a view to authorization and construction at the earliest practicable date; provided, it be found that such projects are of nonconsumptive-use character, are feasible from engineering and economic standpoints, are consistent with the primary purpose of furnishing water supplies for domestic and irrigation uses in accordance with the Colorado River Compact, and will not be inconsistent with a comprehensive plan for progressive development of the Colorado River system.[60]

Disregarding this fair and reasonable recommendation of the State of California, California opposition has stood steadfast against the storage dams and appurtenant power facilities proposed for initial authorization in pending legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project. As already indicated, if they succeed, they will foreclose upper basin development since the power dams are the cash register that make that development possible.

CONCLUSION

It would appear to be an inescapable conclusion from the evidence assembled from such official California sources as the California State engineer and the chairman and chief engineer of the Colorado River Board of California that authorization of the Colorado River storage project will not deprive California and the other lower basin States of the waters of the Colorado River Basin to which they are entitled. Not only have those officials approved the development generally, but they have specifically endorsed the construction of storage reservoirs in the upper basin as a necessary protection for lower basin water supply. The major storage facility of the project, the Glen Canyon Reservoir, has been twice officially endosed by two successive California State engineers, Mr. Edward Hyatt and Mr. A. D. Edmonston, by the last two chairmen of the Colorado River Board, Mr. Evan T. Hewes and Mr. Fred W. Simpson, as well as by Mr. Raymond Matthew, chief engineer of the Colorado River Board of California. In view of the stand taken by these responsible State officials, I fail to see the basis for opposition on the part of California to the Colorado River storage project.

[58] Charles J. Fain, hearings on S. 500, supra, at 329 et seq.

[59] H. Doc. No. 684, 83d Cong., 2d. sess., at 19.

[60] H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess., at 47, 48 and 53.

Conservation of Marine Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, at the recently concluded meetings of the Inter-American Council of Jurists in Mexico there occurred an action which has been interpreted as a severe setback for United States diplomacy. There was passed a resolution dealing with the breadth of the territorial sea and the principle of freedom of the seas. If carried to its logical conclusion the resolution would split the oceans surrounding the Americas into segments of sovereign territory stretching to sea as far as the coastal country thought was necessary to protect its interests. The implications of such a radical change in practice upon the defense, merchant marine, and air commerce of the hemisphere are so far reaching that they defy immediate assessment.

Hardly less shocking to United States diplomacy than the substance of the resolution was the way in which its passage was accomplished. The Department of State has worked with some degree of urgency and energy in recent months to explain and rationalize the position of the United States on the doctrine of the freedom of the seas to our southern neighbors 1 by 1 and in groups. But in the last analysis nations who have already laid claims to 200 miles and more or high seas prepared a resolution without asking the United States to participate in its drafting, and ramrodded it through the meeting without analysis, discussion, or study. The vote was 15 to 1 against the United States. Four other countries tempered the defeat lightly by abstaining from voting.

This is not the first time that this subject has been brought to the attention

of the Congress nor do I suppose it will be the last. The topic has been fermenting in Latin America for 10 years. The last time it bubbled over was at the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas in the spring of 1954. In reaction to that the Congress enacted Public Law 680, 84th Congress, 2d session, which among other things provided for the United States Treasury standing good for any fine when a vessel of the United States was seized pursuant to rights and claims not recognized by the United States.

This is a complicated subject and there are undoubtedly some aspects of it of which I have no clear understanding. I say this advisedly, because I am certain that no rational person knowing what little I do about the subject would have voted for such a resolution, and I am sure that the delegates there assembled were rational persons and represented rational governments. A large component of the problem, however, is concerned with the conservation of fishery resources lying in the high seas and this is a subject about which I do have some knowledge and understanding.

The development of fishery conservation theory and the application of it to the practical problems of conserving marine resources has been advanced substantially in my State during the past 30 years. Such eminent scientists in the field as M. F. Thompson, F. Harvard Bell, H. A. Dunlop, Richard VanCleve, W. C. Herrington, Lloyd A. Royal, J. L. Kask, and M. B. Schaefer have come from the school of fisheries of our University of Washington to contribute mightily to theory and practice in the field. Such eminent public-spirited laymen as Edward W. Allen, the late Miller Freeman, Harold Lokkon, and others are known nationally and internationally, with their Canadian counterparts across the border, for the skill with which they have translated these scientific activities into practical diplomatic, economic, social, and political accomplishments.

I hope that it is with pardonable pride that I relate the achievements which the United States has made in the conservation of fishery conservation in the past 30 years, which are unequaled by any other country, and the part that citizens of my State have played in that achievement. I do this not for the glorification of our State or Nation but to illustrate to our neighbors to the south that the objectives they seek in this complex matter can be accomplished quite adequately, practically, economically, and quickly by peaceful international collaboration and cooperation, which strongly promotes international good will among the participants instead of generating chaos in international relations as would the resolution adopted at Mexico City if it were put into practice.

During the First World War there was much the same shortage of protein food in the world as we remember from so short a time ago in the Second World War. Fishermen and farmers were exhorted to produce more and more food. Under this impetus the halibut fishermen of the State of Washington, British Columbia, and Alaska expanded their fishing effort as rapidly as possible until it spread all over the Northeast Pacific and out along the Alaskan Peninsula. During the entirety of the 1920's, the intensity of the fishery continually increased, but just as steadily the total catch of halibut by Canada and the United States declined.

By 1924, the direction of decline was so apparent to the industry leaders on both sides of the border that they knew something had to be done about it, but they knew not what. Now, of course, we know that the resource had been overfished during the intensive harvesting of World War I, but a short 30 years ago this thought was not widely harbored. Most people still considered that the fish of the sea, like the sands of the beach, and the stars in the skies, were unlimited in number and inexhaustible in supply. There was no science of applied fishery biology as such, and oceanography was a fancy name some Navy people used to refer to the study of wind, wave, and weather at sea.

However, something was required to be done or the whole industry would go broke. The leaders of the industry finally prevailed upon their governments to negotiate a treaty under which a joint commission could be appointed to study the matter. The treaty was signed and put into effect in 1924.

The newly appointed Commissioners had no better knowledge about what had happened to the halibut than did the fishermen. To get started they hired a bright young man who did seem to have some ideas on the subject. He is now the world-renowned Dr. W. F. Thompson, director of applied fishery research, University of Washington. He hired a group of young graduate students, none of whom had had fishery training, and put them to sea with the fishermen to study, observe, and report upon the ocean, the fish, the fishery, the fishermen, and the observable relations between them. This was the International Fishery Commission, and it was the first venture of the sort that nations had embarked upon.

Results did not come quickly or easily, but after 6 years of the most rigid examinations of the facts available to them, Dr. Thompson and his young men had put together a theory to account for the diminished catches of halibut despite the intensified fishery effort. It ran, in essence, like this:

Fish are continually entering the fishery from the newly born crop that comes along each year, and the weight of the fish in the stock was increasing as the individual fish in it grew. On the other hand fish were leaving the stock steadily by death. In a state of nature these forces were in equilibrium and the ocean was supporting the maximum population of halibut it was capable of doing.

When a fishery was started on such a virgin stock of fish three things happened: First, the total abundance of fish in the stock began to decrease; second, the average size of fish in the stock began to decrease; and, third, the productivity of the stock in terms of pounds of fish it would yield to the fishery began to increase. All three of these things continued to happen until a maximum point of productivity was reached. This corresponded precisely with a certain, determinable level of fishing effort. If the fishery was increased in intensity beyond that level the catches would actually decrease, and the more you fished beyond that point the less you caught.

Essentially there was a point of fishing effort at which the stock of fish would produce the maximum sustainable yield. If you held the fishery at that level the production could be had year after year indefinitely. If you let the fishery go beyond that point you were wasteful of the resource, because less fishing would catch more fish. On the other hand it was just as true that if you did not fish that hard you were just as wasteful of the resource, because part of it was being lost by natural deaths to no man's use.

If all of this theory was correct then all that had to be done to restore productivity and prosperity in the halibut fishery was to cut back the fishing effort to below that point which in any season it would produce a little less halibut from the stock—when taken together with natural deaths—than natural growth had added to it.

While all of this sounds logical, coherent, and sensible in 1956 it was nothing but radical theory, unsubstantiated by experience, in 1930. The International Fisheries Commission had no authority to establish the regulations anyway. The Canadian Government could not regulate American boats. The State of Washington could not regulate Canadian boats. Catches were steadily falling off. Fishermen had to fish steadily the year around throughout the bitter winter to scratch together a meager living. The whole industry was going broke and the outlook was bleak.

So after a year or so of wrestling with the problem the industry on both sides of the border decided to take the gamble. Things could not be much worse anyway. So, accordingly, their leaders went once more to Washington, D. C., and to Ottawa and asked their Governments to renegotiate the treaty establishing the International Fisheries Commission so as to give the Commission regulatory authority over the halibut fishermen of both countries. This was done, and in 1933 the regulation of the fishery was begun on the basis of the scientific information gathered by Dr. Thompson and his young men.

The thing was a success almost from the start. Within 2 years fish were enough more plentiful on the banks that even the fishermen could tell the difference. Fishing was easier, catches were had more quickly; it was soon possible even to increase the permissible quota of catch for the season and still keep the stock increasing. In 1937 the treaty was renegotiated again to give the Commission more regulatory authority over the fishery. This still worked good and catches were increased steadily. This has kept right on year after year until last year the catch was more than twice as great as it had been in 1933, it was greater than it had been at the height of the unrestricted fishery of World War I, and the catch was taken in 2 months of fishing instead of 12 months. The stock was producing pretty close to the maximum quantity of

halibut each year that the North Pacific was capable of doing. Friction between the governments and the fishermen of the country was almost nonexistent. The industry in both countries was stable and profitable.

While this great experiment was going on the salmon fishermen of Puget Sound and nearby British Columbia, who depend on the production of salmon from the Fraser River, began to suffer the same troubles that the halibut fishermen had gone through during the twenties. The harder they fished the less they caught. The example of what was going on in halibut was under their eyes. They asked the two governments to do the same for them that they were doing for the halibut fishermen. As a result a treaty establishing the International Salmon Fisheries Commission was signed by Canada and the United States in 1937. After a period of several years of scientific research, as provided for in that treaty, that Commission began the regulation of the fishermen of both countries. The results over the past 10 years have been, if anything, more spectacularly successful than was the case with halibut.

World War II brought the same aftermath of hunger as did World War I and similar increases in fishing intensity. But now theory was available, experience and practice had been gained with such problems, and trained scientists—mostly from Dr. Thompson's brood—were available. The tuna fishermen of California had watched the halibut and salmon fisheries go through periods of great growth, overfishing, short resulting catch, scientific research, economic distress while the resource was rebuilding, and then again stable catches and prosperity. They determined to avoid this cycle by getting their research done before overfishing came, to get the facts in hand with which to build adequate regulations against the date they were needed. So they came to Washington and asked their Government to do for them what it had done for the salmon and halibut men. From this grew the highly successful Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission established under treaty among the United States, Costa Rica, and Panama.

Next the New England fishermen came asking the same thing. Haddock and cod were getting hard to catch and small in size. This was a much more complicated problem than had been tackled yet. Several different kinds of fisheries were being fished in the area by several types of gear. The citizens of 10 countries—Canada, Iceland, Norway, England, Denmark, Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, and the United States—fished together in the area. This was just about as complicated a set of economic, social, legal, political, and diplomatic problems as can be conceived in a fishery problem. Yet the 10 nations—working on the example of the now old halibut commission—did sign a conservation treaty, establish the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, conduct their researches jointly under it, and finally began to jointly regulate their fishermen. My friends from New England tell me that progress under this multilateral commission has been most satisfactory. International friction over the fisheries has quite died away, and the haddock and cod are getting larger and easier to catch again.

Now a similar treaty has been signed between the United States and Canada to cover the fisheries of the Great Lakes. Another signed a few years ago between Canada and the United States and Japan to cover all their joint fisheries in the North Pacific has materially reduced friction over fisheries in the area and Russia has even asked for permission to attend the next Commission meeting. For some years 19 nations have been engaged under similar treaty to study and regulate the whale fishery of the whole world under the International Whaling Commission. Although the United States has not had a whale fishery for a generation it took the initiative and leadership in establishing the International Whaling Commission and has actively participated in its work and deliberations. Negotiations are now under way among Japan, Russia, Canada, and the United States to draft a conservation treaty covering the fur seals of the North Pacific. A similar treaty has been proposed by the United States to Mexico to cover the shrimp fisheries of the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, this mixture of industry, scientists, and Government officials in international fisheries conservation commissions works. In all cases where it has been tried, and these are now too many to be regarded as accidental, the resource has been conserved, the industry has been made economically sound, and international friction has diminished or quite disappeared.

What was novel 30 years ago when the citizens of my State first got into such problems has now been recognized as sound practice by the majority of nations. In April of 1955 the fishery experts of 50 countries gathered together in Rome under the auspices of the United Nations in the "International Technical Conference on the Conservation of the Living Resources of the Sea." After 3 weeks of meeting, during which some of the sessions were quite stormy, the conference adopted a report which contained these general conclusions:

> The conference notes with satisfaction conservation measures already carried out in certain regions and for certain species at the national and international level. International cooperation in research (including statistical investigation) and regulation in the conservation of living resources of the high seas is essential. The conference considers that wherever necessary further conventions for these purposes should be negotiated.
>
> The present system of international fishery regulation (conservation measures) is generally based on the geographical and biological distribution of the marine populations with which individual agreements are concerned. From the scientific and technical point of view, this seems, in general, to be the best way to handle those problems. This system is based upon conventions signed by the nations concerned.
>
> From the desire expressed during this conference by all participating nations to cooperate in research and from the guidance given by existing conventions, it appears that there are good prospects of establishing further conservation measures where and when necessary.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, there is a system of international cooperation adequate to provide for the full conservation of fish resources lying in the high seas. It has been tried successfully time after time on a great variety of such problems to the satisfaction of the nations involved and their fishermen. It has the stamp of approval of most of the maritime nations. It is to be hoped that our Latin American neighbors, who are not fishing people, and who have no more trained fisheries scientists than we had 30 years ago, will give this method thorough study and evaluation. It is certain that the United States would give the utmost cooperation in following such a method in their area. It is equally certain that the destruction of the doctrines of the freedom of the seas which they propose to accomplish this end will not prevail.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, who dost bring forth Thy righteousness as the light and Thy judgments as the noonday: In the presence of the ageless realities which the blasphemies of deluded men cannot touch, we pause in reverence, with a deep sense of responsibility as servants of the public welfare, praying for courage to attempt, power to achieve, and patience to endure. In these days of dire perplexity we would commit our way unto Thee, fretting not ourselves because of the men who imagine a vain thing and who attempt to bring wicked devices to pass. Steady us with the assurance that evildoers shall be cut off and that those who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength and shall inherit the earth.

Our eyes having seen the glory of a government of law bringing peace and prosperity to many States and to men of all colors, creeds, and races, within our own Nation, give us an unshakable faith that a lawful order can be established for the whole world. In this faith steel our hearts to march forward toward the clean world our hands can make. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 23, 1956, was dispensed with.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate dispense with the call of the calendar on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be subject to a 2-minute limitation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in order to expedite the work of the Committee on Appropriations in the remaining months of the present session of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to meet when necessary during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although of course I shall not object—let me say that the Appropriations Committee is one committee which must meet regularly in order to permit the Congress to adjourn, because this committee handles the regular appropriation bills for the Government departments. Because of that fact, we feel justified in agreeing to the request for such unanimous consent, even though in the case of other committees such an authorization would not be desirable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee may be authorized to meet this afternoon, during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 29

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide aid for school construction

"Whereas public education is the lifeblood of liberty and democracy and is essential to national security and the American way of life; and

"Whereas the spirit and quality of education and the physical safety of children in public education are dependent upon the facilities in which education programs are conducted; and

"Whereas the facilities for schooling in this country are generally overtaxed and outmoded, and in many parts of the country are so unsatisfactory as to endanger the children as well as jeopardize their education; and

"Whereas, through no fault of local tax programs, financial support of school construction in some areas is not adequate to correct this situation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to act in the exercise of its broad legislative powers to provide Federal appropriations for use in aiding in the construction of new and additional school facilities;

"SEC. 2. That the Congress make such funds available to the States in grants qualified on a Federal approval basis similar to the qualification arrangement governing Federal assistance to hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act; and

"SEC. 3. That the clerk of the senate is directed to forward copies of this resolution, duly authenticated, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each of the Senators and Representatives from Kentucky now serving in the Congress, and to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 37

"Concurrent resolution petitioning Congress and the Veterans' Administration for improvement in hospital facilities for veterans

"Whereas the facilities thus provided have on several occasions clearly expressed their intention to provide special facilities for those who served in the defense of their country; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has acted in the fulfillment of the people's attention by providing a veterans' hospital program among other benefits; and

"Whereas the facilities thus proivded have become overcrowded to the extent that some veterans are unable to get the hospital care they need, and either along with this overcrowding or as a consequence of it, there has developed a considerable amount of preliminary procedural requirements for entering such facilities which discourage their use by many who are entitled to make use of them: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to act to provide more hospital beds for the use of veterans to enable all veterans to obtain necessary hospital treatment;

"SEC. 2. That the Veterans' Administration is urged to seek the installation of more hospital beds and reduce the procedural prerequisites for admission to veterans' hospitals; and

"SEC. 3. That copies of this resolution, duly authenticated, be forwarded by the clerk of the senate to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each of the Senators and Representatives now serving in the Congress and to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, Veterans' Administration, United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 30

"Concurrent resolution urging Congress and the United States Army Corps of Engineers to complete water-control construction in the upper Cumberland River area

"Whereas the value of complete systems for controlling the water resources of the land for purposes of water conservation for agriculture and industry, navigation to provide cheaper movement of cargo, water power for industry and national defense, and flood control to protect against the ravages of flood waters, has been proven beyond doubt in the many fine control systems now existing in this country; and

"Whereas the control plan for the upper Cumberland River has been determined for some time and worked out in detail by the United States Corps of Engineers, calling for dam construction at Celina, Rockcastle Narrows, Laurel, Helenwood, and Devils Jumps, to supplement the system around Wolf Creek Dam; and

"Whereas these supplemental dams have not yet been built: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to appropriate funds for the completion of the upper Cumberland River Dam system, particularly for the construction of dams at the sites of Celina, Rockcastle Narrows, Laurel, Helenwood, and Devils Jumps to provide complete safety and resources control in this area;

"SEC. 2. That the Corps of Engineers is urged to seek funds for completion of the Corps of Engineers plan for the upper Cumberland River; and

"SEC. 3. That copies of this resolution, duly authenticated, be forwarded to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to the United States Department of the Interior, and to the United States Corps of Engineers."

Two joint resolutions of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the age of qualification for the benefits of the old-age assistance program from 65 years to 60 years of age

"Whereas by the old-age assistance program as defined under the Social Security Act passed August 14, 1935 (ch. 531, 49 Stat. 622; U. S. C. A., title I, sec. 6), and its amendments, August 10, 1939 (ch. 666, 53 Stat. 1362, U. S. C. A., title I, sec. 103), and August 28, 1950 (ch. 809, 64 Stat. 549, U. S. C. A., title III, pt. 1, sec. 303 (a)), benefits under this program are limited to individuals who have attained the age of 65 years; and

"Whereas there are many individuals deserving of the benefits of this program who are not eligible therefor because of their inability to meet the age requirement; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the benefits of this program be made available to as many deserving individuals as possible: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in regular session assembled, the senate and house concurring, memorializes the 84th Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act as it pertains to old-age assistance to include those individuals who have attained the age of 60 years.

"SEC. 2. That the Senators and Representatives of Kentucky in the 84th Congress are urged to introduce and support legislation to accomplish the foregoing.

"SEC. 3. That copies of this memorial, duly authenticated, be sent by the clerk of the senate to the President and Chief Clerk of the Senate of the United States, the United States Senators from Kentucky, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Representatives in Congress from Kentucky."

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the retirement age, as defined for eligibility for the benefits of the Social Security Act, from 65 years to 60 years of age

"Whereas by the terms of the Social Security Act as passed August 14. 1935 (ch. 531, U. S. C. A., title II, sec. 216 (a)), the retirement age is specifically set out as being 65 years of age; and

"Whereas there are many individuals deserving of the benefits of this program who are not eligible therefor because they have not attained the retirement age of 65 years; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the benefits of this program be made available to as many deserving individuals as possible: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in regular session assembled, the senate and house concurring, memorializes the 84th Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act and the retirement age thereunder, making eligible for the retirement benefits those individuals who have attained the age of 60 years.

"SEC. 2. That the Senators and Representatives of Kentucky in the 84th Congress are urged to introduced and support legislation to accomplish the foregoing.

"SEC. 3. That copies of this memorial, duly authenticated, be sent by the clerk of the senate to the President and Chief Clerk of the Senate of the United States, the United States Senators from Kentucky, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Representatives in Congress from Kentucky."

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of Hawaii County, Hilo, Hawaii, relating to the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NINETY PERCENT PARITY FOR FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Farmers Union Oil Co., of Portland, N. Dak., favoring the continuation of 90 percent of parity for farm products.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we, the Farmers Union board of directors of the oil company of Portland, N. Dak., representing 600 actual farmers and producers patrons, urge your continued support of 90 percent of parity basis on quality, determining a premium loan on hard spring wheat over soft-wheat varieties.

We definitely feel that the above is essential to the future solvency of the farmers of the northwest area.

FARMERS UNION OIL CO.,
NORVAL C. OLSON, *Secretary.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3277. A bill to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certain studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 3278. A bill for the relief of Brian Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3279. A bill to extend the term of patent No. 2,262,132 for 5 years; and

S. 3280. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of athletes selected by the United States Olympic Association to represent the United States in the games of the XVI Olympiad for certain expenses incurred by them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3281. A bill declaring the inundation of property because of, or aggravated by, wind, waves, or tidal effects on the Great Lakes to be property within the flood-control activities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3282. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act to prevent sudden and unreasonable decreases in the price of hogs and cattle which are sold at stockyards subject to that act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 3283. A bill for the relief of Lamar Jamerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 3284. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Jefferson Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of George W. Edwards, Jr., against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3285. A bill for the relief of Oey Giok Po; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3286. A bill to recognize by honorary promotion, service in either Spanish-American and World War I or service in World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. KEFAUVER), submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by Mr. KEFAUVER, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. MURRAY), submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. HENNINGS), submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NATIONAL FLOOD INDEMNITY AND REINSURANCE PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2862) to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program, and for other purposes, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 22, 1956,

The name of Mr. MONRONEY was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3271) to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 in order to promote scientific education, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MCNAMARA) on February 22, 1956.

URGENTLY NEEDED SMALL FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 23, 1956,

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3272) to increase and make certain

revisions in the general authorization for small flood control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. BUSH on February 23, 1956.

SAM H. RAY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of Sam H. Ray and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

WILL FARMERS PERMIT THE FAMILY FARM TO DISAPPEAR?—NEWSLETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newsletter prepared by Representative USHER L. BURDICK, one of the outstanding Members of the Congress of the United States, who hails from the State of North Dakota. The subject matter of the newsletter is Will the Farmers Permit the Family Farm to Disappear?

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL THE FARMERS PERMIT THE FAMILY FARM TO DISAPPEAR?

(By USHER L. BURDICK)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The farmers in the Wheat Belt (and some of the uprising touches the Corn Belt) are on the march against Republicans. They are so bitter now that I doubt if Congress can do anything at this late date to turn their condemnation from the Republican Party. The Senate has tried to remedy the situation and has placed in the farm bill a provision for 90 percent of parity, but the forces against this, led by Secretary Benson, Senator AIKEN, and the President will, in my opinion, secure a veto to the bill. If it returns to the Congress I am sure the House will pass the bill over the President's veto, but the path is not so smooth in the Senate. Leading Republicans seem to take no heed of this farmer uprising and they argue, of course, that since the East is prosperous the West ought to be, and would be, if the farmers knew how to manage their farms.

This is precisely the situation we had just before the last depression. The West was broke in 1920, but the results did not reach the East until 1932–33. Then the cause of the depression in the East was not taken seriously until soup lines began forming in all the industrial centers. The regular orthodox Republicans refused to be budged by these warnings until it was too late, and Hoover was swept out of the White House by an avalanche of votes. As I recall it now, the Republicans carried only six States and there was a contest in one of those.

It is even worse now, because many leaders feel the farmers should fold up and join the ranks of labor and let the farming be done by corporations like Tom Campbell's, whose fields extend over a good share of the Indian reservation, rented to him by the Secretary of the Interior. The Government cuts down the acreage of legitimate farm owners—those who live on the farms with their families—and at the same time lets a huge corporation get all the land it wants from the Government leasing department. The whole tendency seems to be to eliminate the family-type farm. I predicted this exact situation 2 years ago, but not being a regular Republican, but an independent one, no attention was ever paid to my warning.

Right now, with the farm belt seething with resentment, the powers that be insist upon a veto of the parity formula. The President himself knows very little about the situation, as I presume his advisers don't want him to know. All the farm experts that surround him are hell-bent on driving the farmer off his land. The National Farm Bureau Federation has been bucking parity for years, and now it seems to be betting its inning. The Farm Bureau advises Benson, and Benson in turn advises the President, and that is as far as we get. The farmers in the West know that Secretary Benson is merely a mouthpiece of the President, so it is inescapable that the President is responsible. After the President's promises in his speeches in the farm belt that he would sustain the parity formula and try to go it one better (100 percent of parity) and this action of Benson's, unquestionably approved by Eisenhower, who now can rise up and say the farmers do not have just cause for revolt?

If this farm bill is vetoed and the veto sustained, more Republican Congressmen will be washed out of Congress than in any election since 1932. And the pity of it is that those who have fought for the farmers against this assinine action of the administration will be washed out, regardless of what they have stood for, if their names appear on a Republican ballot. I expect to get washed out, but I am slightly different from some. I know what will happen, while many others do not.

ADDRESS BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD a very able address delivered by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, at Seton Hall University. The university conferred the honorary degree of doctor of law upon Mr. Meany and AFL-CIO secretary-treasurer William F. Schnitzler. I call the address to the attention of my colleagues, and particularly that part of it in which Mr. Meany discusses the problem of foreign aid.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In behalf of my colleague, William Schnitzler, and for myself, I express to you deep appreciation. The honor you have conferred upon us is, above all, a timely tribute to the growing vision, influence, and responsibility of more than 15 million American workers in their new unity.

We, as officers of the AFL–CIO, welcome this great honor. It will encourage us to greater devotion to the highest ideals and worthiest aims of the free labor movement. These are closely inter-related with the ideals and principles of the church.

Very few of us are blessed to live 100 years. But from generation to generation many of us are blessed because institutions like yours live and grow century after century. Over the years the lives of the many are likewise enriched by the endeavors of the truly illustrious few. Bishop James Roosevelt Bayley demonstrated courageous initiative, reflected the spirit of growth of his times, and responded to the needs of the day when on September 1, 1856, he threw open the doors of Seton Hall, the first Catholic institution of higher learning in New Jersey.

Yours have been years of notable progress. You have already established the first medical and dental college in your State. Your progress spells progress for all America. No nation can long continue in honor, freedom, and well-being without benefit of the moral principles instilled by your center of learning.

Whether we are workers or employers, farmers or merchants, scientists, priests, or laymen—no matter what our religion may be—we can all subscribe to these principles. They are based on the fundamental concepts of morality. It is in this vein that distinguished ministers, rabbis, priests, and laymen agreed 10 years ago on a pattern for social justice in our country. They agreed that the profit motive must be subordinated to the moral law. They affirmed that workers have an inviolable right to join a union. Some leading Catholic authorities on the social encyclicals maintain that working men and women have a duty to join a union.

Enlightened American industrialists and businessmen can only welcome, not seek to weaken or destroy, the American trade-union movement. It is a built-in guaranty to security for America and the American way of life. The AFL–CIO is dedicated to making American democracy more vital and more effective. We want an alert and intelligent and not an inert and uninformed electorate. We want our country to have more and better schools. We want homes for the American people. We want healthier and happier communities. We shall use every democratic means to invigorate and improve the free institutions of our country and to promote its common welfare.

The AFL–CIO constitution provides that the united federation serve the interests of all the American people. It pledges our membership to "the strengthening and extension of our way of life and the fundamental freedoms which are the basis of our democratic society." Our stirring preamble claims:

"We shall combat resolutely the forces which seek to undermine the democratic institutions of our Nation and to enslave the human soul. We shall strive always to win full respect for the dignity of the human individual whom our unions serve. With divine guidance, grateful for the fine traditions of the past, confident of meeting the challenge of the future, we proclaim this constitution."

We, of America labor, firmly oppose all forms of dictatorship. We vigorously support our free system of government. We realize that, without a free system of government, there can be neither free labor nor free enterprise. Communism and every other totalitarian despotism is the deadly enemy of free labor unions. Free labor unionism and totalitarianism simply cannot coexist. They negate each other. Where a Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Peron, or Khrushchev rules, there free labor unions are ruined. When such dictatorships begin, free labor unions are finished. We are their first target because we are their sworn enemies. Our new unity means greater strength in protecting our American labor movement against any and all corrupt influences. It means strengthening determination to defeat "the undermining efforts of Communist agencies and all others who are opposed to the basic principles of our democracy and free and democratic trade unionism."

Nor can I emphasize sufficiently that communism is likewise the mortal foe of private

capital, private ownership, and the private management of industry.

To me it is inspiring and interesting that Seton Hall celebrates its first centenary in 1956. It is also the year when our country is significantly marking the hundredth anniversary of the birth of a renowned educator and outstanding President of our Republic. It was Woodrow Wilson, with his concept of the new freedom, who declared more than 40 years ago: "The commands of democracy are as imperative as its privileges, and its opportunities are wide and generous." In his spirit he sought to lead our Nation in the front lines of world responsibility. It is from this viewpoint that I want to consider your vital role in the profound crisis now gripping mankind.

You are not merely students. You are not merely teachers. Yours is not merely an institution within whose walls the learning and experience of yesterday are studied for the benefit of today and tomorrow. In the present grave world situation you are in the front line of the fight for human freedom and enduring peace. Today our schools of higher learning can and must be fortresses of freedom.

Our country is a democracy. Our country is democratic, despite all its imperfections, some of which are painful. It is a command of democracy for every citizen to contribute to the building of America into an ever better and ever stronger democracy—free from all racialism, discrimination, economic, and social injustice. This command is all the more urgent today because our Nation's foreign policy now plays so great a role in the life of each and every one of us.

In the last resort the foreign policy of every nation must reflect its domestic ideals and principles. The faith which other nations will place in our country's devotion to peace and human freedom is, in great measure, dependent on how we manage our affairs at home, on whether we treat our citizenry without regard to race, color, national origin or economic status.

Any government which distrusts its own people, which, like Moscow and Peiping, wages war on the rights and standards of its own people, cannot, for long, be trusted to treat other peoples justly and peacefully. Violence, injustice, and social immorality at home inevitably lead to aggression, injustice, and indecency in the treatment of peoples abroad. A government which denies its own people freedom of conscience, cannot long be good neighbors with other peoples. Such a government cannot, in good conscience, respect their liberties, their freedom to worship God, their freedom to think, and their right to preserve their national ideals, beliefs, and culture. This applies to every type of dictatorship, to the Nazi no less than to the Communist, and to the Communist no less than to the Falangist.

It is to the highest credit of the students of the University of Madrid that, in their great majority, they recently expressed their opposition of Falangism. The academic community in our own country and in the entire free world has every reason to be proud of this reaction by the Spanish students to an officially sponsored poll.

Here is an inspiring tribute to the vitality of freedom as an ideal and to the love of liberty as a human force which cannot be extinguished by despotism. It behooves us of the ranks of labor and you of the ranks of learning to see to it that such healthy reactions are not exploited and perverted by Communist demogogs. We can do that best by making our democracy a living faith, by giving reality to our democratic ideals in the context of the present world situation.

We can go a long way in meeting the Communist menace and challenge by combining highly deterrent military strength with social, economic, and educational measures for improving the conditions of the peoples in the economically underdeveloped countries. Our country has more than industrial skills and material strength. Above all else, we have the ideals and the ideas. We can and must find better ways of sharing with other peoples these great assets of civilization. These are assets which must be universal, if they are to survive the terrible impact of the tidal waves of Communist reaction and slavery now threatening to engulf all mankind.

When I think of this menace, I also think of the opportunity before us. It is high time for our Government, for our schools and colleges, for the great voluntary organizations of our land—like those of labor, learning, management, science, and agriculture to get together and plan for training teachers, scientists, managers, organizers, technicians, and others—especially for utilizing their skills and talents through rendering service in foreign lands. We Americans have much experience in pioneering. The spirit of the pioneer continues very strong in our life today. We are rightly proud of this creative spirit. Let us infuse our efforts to aid other peoples, now menaced by Communist subversion and Soviet aggression, with this spirit of the American pioneer.

I am confident that this spirit would go a much longer way in strengthening the cause of peace, freedom, and human betterment than would the mere handing out of dollars. In the current crisis, a combination of the American pioneer spirit and generosity is vital. It might well be decisive. I am not afraid of communism winning the world through helping other people. So far, communism has never gained a position anywhere except by fraud, force, and terror. In spite of all its loud propaganda to the contrary, communism has never given any people anything free. So far, Moscow has done infinitely more taking from, than giving to, other peoples. The Kremlin has not really helped others. Actually, it has only helped itself at the expense of other countries. Look at the captive peoples of Europe. Who of us can forget how Soviet Russia plundered Manchuria? Yes, Bolsheviks do barter—many big promises with little performance in exchange for much in return.

Our country can well afford to challenge Moscow to match us dollar for dollar and service for service in Egypt, India, or anywhere else, in saving people from hunger and disease, in helping people build anew and build better. Of course, we should never say, we will merely match Moscow's efforts to help and merely match its aid to others. At best, that would mean that we would do next to nothing. That would really mean turning our back on needy nations.

I see no reason for our diplomats getting panicky because Moscow talks big about helping others. There is not the slightest evidence that Moscow has veered even an inch from its policy of building an ever bigger war machine, an ever more deadly terror machine against its people at home and an ever more expanded and expensive fifth column apparatus. These are costly and crushing burdens forced on the Russian people by their Communist rulers.

We must never forget we have no quarrels with the Russian people. We have only friendship and heartfelt sympathy for the Russian people, for they are the first and heaviest sufferers of Communist dictatorship. Nor dare we forget that the captive peoples of the European satellite lands and on the Chinese mainland have been suffering cruel hardships. When I speak of such crushing burdens, I speak not only of suffering in a physical sense. I have in mind especially the spiritual and moral losses. I am thinking of the missionaries, of the great scholars, hounded, tortured, and forced to flee from Communist China because they would not sell their souls or debase their intellect.

I can never forget the shocking revelations recently made by the Reverend Dr. Bradshaw after his release from the Chinese Communist paradise. That is why I find it hard to believe—at least of all to fear—that Moscow and its puppets have suddenly become great humanitarians and will match the genuine and generous help we have been giving and should be prepared to give in the future. Where is the slightest evidence of even the faintest beginning of such a miraculous transformation of the ruthless Kremlin dictatorship?

The time has arrived for our Government to reexamine and study our country's last decade of experience in foreign aid. No doubt we have made mistakes. No doubt we must do some things better than we have done to date. No doubt we should even stop doing some of the things we have been doing. No doubt we must meet new tasks in the foreign-aid field. But let us not get panicky and rush to drown rubles with dollars. We should be ready to help where there is need and when we can, help the needy rather than their oppressors. We must always be ready to help where the cause of peace and freedom can be served and strengthened.

We must likewise reject every effort or scheme to appease and assist the Communist aggressors through business deals with them. Neither peace, nor freedom, can be bought that cheap. Doing business as usual with Khrushchev is basically just as bad and unsound as was doing business with Hitler. Shortsightedness in commercial relations never really pays. Such deals with Communist Russia and Communist China only help the plunderers and oppressors of the Russian, Chinese, and the other peoples to tighten their dictatorial grip, to build their war machines and to secure new channels of subversion. No profit garnered in any such deal can ever make up for the damage and the tragedy it causes.

Of course, what I say about business as usual also applies to cultural relations as usual. There can never be real freedom of genuine cultural relations between the American and Russian peoples until the Russians can have free relations, cultural and other, among themseves.

We are living in an age of profound crisis. For that very reason, we are also living in an age of consecration. We of the free labor movement, and I am sure you of the free academic world, can find no more worthy ideal than to consecrate ourselves to the promotion and protection of our freedom. This great task is inseparable from and indispensable to consecrating ourselves to aiding others, to helping others whose fundamental human rights have been taken from them by the most total and brutal concentration of power in all human history.

How timely then was the wisdom of Woodrow Wilson about the privileges, opportunities, and commands of democracy being wide and generous. I know that men of your calling and learning realize fully that freedom to think, freedom of conscience, freedom to worship God, to associate, assemble, and organize are a priceless heritage. This great heritage cannot be preserved and promoted merely by praising it and enjoying it, while the enjoying lasts. We have to work at freedom. We have to practice it. We have to nurse and nourish it. We have to live it so that it may live and thrive.

We Americans are a privileged people. We were born free. Twice we fought fratricidal conflicts to assure and advance our freedom. Twice we fought on global scale in foreign lands in order to safeguard the security of our own free land and the freedom menaced by foreign forms of tyranny and pernicious aggression. I do not despair. I am confident

we and the free world with us have the faith and the courage, the idealism and the ideas, the capacity and the will to organize our lives and our international associations so that we can cooperate for the good of mankind; so that we can unite our forces for deterring and, if need be, defeating aggression. Then mankind can and will be saved from an atomic world war.

In this light, all of us can only welcome heartily the plea made recently by Pope Pius XII, for the world to agree on renouncing nuclear weapons and assure compliance with this agreement through a system of effective control. We have repeatedly demanded the same. He hail the holy father's plea for its emphasis on the necessity of effective control and on the need to include all steps, and not merely an agreement, to end military nuclear experimentation.

The furtherance of this noble goal, fanatically challenged and menaced by the godless hordes of communism, is the highest command of American democracy. It is also your, and my, most imperative privilege. As Americans, from factory bench and school bench, from office and classroom, let us dedicate and consecrate ourselves to this task. Like you here at Seton Hall, we of American labor are entering a new era. Be with us, as we face the future with confidence that with God's help, we shall not fail in our responsibilities or accomplishments.

THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, it is once again my great privilege to join my fellow citizens of Estonian descent in commemoration of the founding of the Republic of Estonia. On this 38th anniversary of the proclamation of Estonian independence, I fervently hope that the gallant people of Estonia may soon be emancipated from the merciless oppression of the Soviet invaders.

The tragic and forcible annexation of Estonia and her Baltic neighbors weighs heavily on the conscience of the free world. The Government of the United States remains firm in its determination not to recognize the conquest of these countries by the Soviet Union.

The faith of free men sustains the brave people of Estonia in their resistance to the Communist aggressors. On this independence day, the American people voice their prayers that the birthright of freedom may soon again be Estonia's possession.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may address the Senate for approximately 4 minutes on the subject of Estonian independence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today is the 38th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia.

Since the middle of the 13th century the Estonian people have been fighting for the right of independence. Although under the political domination of various foreign nations for many centuries, their desire for freedom has never faltered, and their identity as a people was never lost.

Czarist Russia first conquered Estonia in 1710, and it was not until 1917 that the dream of full independence for this Baltic state was finally realized. On February 24, 1918, Estonia proclaimed herself a democratic republic. By May of the same year, de facto recognition of Estonia was extended by Great Britain, France, and Italy. Soviet Russia itself, by the Treaty of Tartu on February 2, 1918, recognized Estonia as an independent state, and renounced voluntarily and forever all rights of sovereignty formerly held by Russia over the Estonian people. However, in typical Soviet fashion, Communist leaders had no intention of abiding by the treaty, and eventually were to violate its terms.

During the period between World War I and World War II, Estonia cooperated with the League of Nations, maintained good relations with the other Baltic States, and even endeavored to establish friendly relations with her totalitarian neighbor, Soviet Russia. Unfortunately, however, the Soviet leaders in the Kremlin had no desire to see Estonia remain independent. Encroachment upon Estonian freedom began on September 28, 1939, when an allegedly friendly mutual assistance pact was imposed upon Estonia. The Soviets professed that the pact implied no interference in the internal affairs of this independent nation. In effect, however, the treaty permitted Soviet military occupation of Estonia. Ultimately, through a series of false accusations, the Soviets insisted that this powerless Baltic State had violated the terms of the mutual assistance pact, and on June 17, 1940, the Red armies marched in and occupied the country. A fraudulent puppet government was established, and by August 6, 1940, Estonia was incorporated into the Soviet Union. The hard-earned independence for which Estonians had struggled so valiantly was thus lost, and a ruthless policy of complete sovietization was initiated by Russia. The United States quickly denounced the aggressive tactics of the Kremlin, and on July 27, 1940, our Government rebuked the devious processes by which the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were to be deliberately annihilated by their more powerful neighbors.

The Russian aim was the extinction of Estonia as a national entity. To accomplish this task the Communists found it expedient to eliminate centers of resistance. To achieve these ends the Soviets began to employ their well-known tactics of mass deportations, terror, arrests, and murder. Approximately 150,000 Estonians were deported to the Soviet Union to work in slave-labor camps. Russia attempted to obliterate all vestiges of Estonian culture, character, and national consciousness. Mass murder, physical torture, and brain-washing techniques were used to remove active and patriotic Estonians who insisted on resisting the oppressor. No better example of the reprehensible crime of genocide can be found in modern history.

Despite the almost insurmountable handicaps, the desire for freedom still exists in this enslaved nation. The spirit of Estonia has not been broken, and resistance still continues against the Soviet tyrant. The U. S. S. R. itself admits the existence of Estonian resistance against the Communist regime.

Today, the 38th anniversary of Estonian independence, will not be an occasion for celebration in that enslaved nation. However, it is fitting, on this day, that we remind the captive Estonian people that they have not been forgotten, and assure them that any regime that exists by terrorizing its people cannot long endure.

The American people, defenders of the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they desire to live, look to the day when Estonia regains her freedom and once more takes her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

In the meantime, the American people must insist upon prompt action by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in reporting the genocide pact, which has been too long buried in the archives of that committee. The early approval of this pact by the Senate of the United States will, I know, send a thrill of hope throughout that vast area beyond the iron curtain. It would surely be an appropriate recognition of the incredible suffering to which the Estonian people have been exposed.

Finally we can move to do something about our immigration laws so that we can provide asylum in this country for some, at least, of those brave Estonians who have escaped the Soviet terror and today seek refuge and opportunity in the free world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today marks the 38th anniversary of the independence of Estonia. On this date, 38 years ago, the Estonian people rose in revolt against Russian rule of more than two centuries. The remarkable and tenacious Estonian people who had managed to keep alive their faith, their customs, and their love of freedom for 208 years immediately established a democratic government.

For a generation the people of Estonia prospered under their new democracy. For 22 years they devoted their strength to establishing the institutions of freedom.

However, in 1940 the Red army of the Soviet Union moved with crushing force across the borders of this tiny independent nation. There was no provocation and no justification. The massive power of the Soviet Union overran the defenses of Estonia and its neighboring democracies.

Today the people of Estonia once again suffer under a ruthless totalitarianism which seeks to exterminate every vestige of Estonian culture and to absorb the Estonian people within the massive confines of Soviet communism. In violation of every human decency, the Soviet Union has literally transported thousands and tens of thousands of Estonians from their native land to execution or Siberia. This systematic effort has been carried out coldly, cynically, and brutally.

Even under this new tyranny, more deadly than the one they had known under the Russian czars, Estonians have kept alive their hope of independence and freedom. We Americans refuse to

condone this tyranny which once again has been fastened on Estonia. We want the people of Estonia to know that the people of America and of the free world will not forget the glorious history of the struggle for Estonian independence. We will never complacently accept the Soviet occupation of Estonia, and we are confident that Estonian independence will one day be reestablished.

SENATOR GORE, OF TENNESSEE, "OLD-FASHIONED LIBERAL"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate has approved the creation of a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures, lobbying, and certain other activities affecting the Senate or any Member thereof.

I wish at this time to express my deep appreciation to our distinguished majority leader and our equally distinguished minority leader for the initiative and leadership they have shown in selecting the committee, and also to compliment them on the high type of men who will represent the entire Senate in the proceedings.

It is my hope that the chairman of the committee will be our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. He has always had our full confidence in his many years of service in the Congress of the United States. He has the integrity of the bigness to do a thorough and outstanding job, and I know that, as always, he will be a credit to his State, to the Nation, and to the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Tuesday, February 21, 1956, and a news story in the New York Times of Friday, February 24, 1956, entitled "Old-Fashioned Liberal."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 21, 1956]

THE LOBBY INQUIRY

Even with the best of intentions the Senate faces some understandable difficulties in deciding exactly how to proceed with the broadened investigation of lobbying. The jurisdictional questions are intricate. The Elections Subcommittee, which was treated in highly cavalier fashion during the first phases of the inquiry into the gas lobby, has a legitimate claim to jurisdiction. So does the Government Operations Committee, since many of the questions will intrude upon its responsibilities. Considering the enormous importance of a fair and thorough investigation, there is much to commend the establishment of a larger bipartisan committee to handle the matter separately.

If Senate leaders decide to embark upon the plan they are now considering for a larger six-man committee, they will have to use the utmost care in selecting the members. Whenever an inquiry is taken away from a standing committee or subcommittee, there is likely to be suspicion that the motives are not entirely disinterested. Fortunately, the sincerity and determination of the leadership can be tested quite readily in this case. There will be reason to accept at face value the professed good intentions of the Senate leaders if Senator ALBERT GORE is at the helm of the investigation, either as chairman of his Elections Subcommittee or as chairman of a special committee. If he is satisfied with the mandate and makeup of whatever body is given the investigative responsibility, the country will have cause for reassurance.

Senator GORE has evidenced a deep awareness in his statements of the moral crisis before the Senate. He has made plain his interest in rescuing Congress from the risks and dangers of the present unsatisfactory methods in which men in public life are forced to obtain their financial support. The size of the appropriation he has requested for the Elections Subcommittee—$300,000—shows his awareness of how big the job is. His readiness to defer to the wishes of the Senate, in the event that it prefers another committee for the inquiry, shows how big he is. The job ought to be in his hands.

[From the New York Times of February 24, 1956]

OLD-FASHIONED LIBERAL—SENATOR ALBERT GORE

WASHINGTON, February 23.—Who can say precisely when a man's star began to rise?

For Senator ALBERT GORE, you might argue that it started back before birth when his father, a farmer from Carthage, Tenn., traveled the river boats with another young Carthage man named Cordell Hull.

Certainly the career of the junior Senator from Tennessee, who seems certain to head the Senate investigation of campaign contributions and illegal pressures on lawmakers and officials, has been cast in the image of "the good gray judge."

If Mr. GORE is the Senate's closest thing to an old-fashioned southern liberal his frank emulation of the late Mr. Hull is partly responsible.

To his own cause Mr. GORE has contributed tenacity, earnestness tempered with a quiet sense of humor, the foresight to select a wise wife and the resolution to speak ill of no man.

Today, at 48 years of age, he is one of the Senate's coming men, a workhorse whose voice carries increasing weight among Democrats. On the Senate floor he is perhaps his party's ablest young debater. His mind is quick; he thinks on his feet; and he does his homework.

For more than 15 years in the House and Senate, he has been a Democratic administration regular, except for dramatic instances where conscience or principles were outraged.

Though he is not completely at home either with the northern liberals or the southern conservatives, he can work effectively with both. His ability for taking effective political action without compromise to his basic principles is, perhaps, the quality most essential for durable success in the Senate.

Because he possesses this ability, his star seems on the ascendant, although he is the least celebrated of Tennessee's crop of bright young politicians. Many believe that time will prove him the most capable and durable of the lot.

In person, as in his old-time southern liberal political principles, there is the faint suggestion of the old-fashioned about him. His hair is graying and wavy and he parts it straight down the middle and this strengthens the impression.

He is handsome in the way of the man in the collar ads who has been outmoded by the crewcut executive and the crooner with the duckbill hairsweep.

"CHOPS A LITTLE"

His forebears "came across the mountain" after the Revolution "and started choppin' timber," he tells you in his mountain drawl. "I still chop a little now and then myself when my fences need mendin'."

To raise money for college, he taught in a one-room mountain schoolhouse. In 5 months he had enough to enter the University of Tennessee. There he went from job to job to pay his way toward a degree.

He was 23 when he first ran for office. At stake was the job of school superintendent for Smith County, Conn.

He lost. Not only the big job but the chance to get a teaching post. Back on his father's farm, he "made crop," forgotten by all but his recent campaign opponent.

The next year the man who had beaten him learned that he was dying. Summoning his lieutenants, he named Mr. GORE to succeed him as school superintendent.

Nowadays the Senator believes he was put on the road to Washington because he had not made "any uncomplimentary references" to his opponent in that first campaign. The man, he believes, esteemed him for that and bequeathed him the top school job in return.

"Uncomplimentary references" to campaign opponents have been out ever since.

But he was ambitious. He needed a law degree. Short of funds, he enrolled at the Nashville YMCA night law school. For 3 years he made the 103-mile roundtrip drive to classes 3 nights a week after work and got his degree.

By 1939 he was running against five others for Mr. Hull's old seat in Congress.

His platform, of course, was pure Hull, who is still his "ideal in public service."

His skill on the fiddle, however, may have been the more compelling force on the voters.

His wife, whom he regards as his best political adviser, had warned him not to play it in the campaign. If he did, all five opponents would accuse him of "fiddling while Rome burns," she reasoned.

The campaign seesawed unmusically through the Cumberland foothills with Mr. GORE preaching Mr. Hull's reciprocal-trade-agreements program. The mountaineers were not inflamed.

One night in the middle of his reciprocal-trade exhortation a man with a fiddle appeared out of the crowd.

"When I ran out of breath," Mr. GORE said, "he held the fiddle up to me and said, "Here, Albert, play us a tune."

"I'll play a tune if you vote for me," Mr. GORE replied. The crowd came to life and started cheering. Reciprocal trade was forgotten as the candidate swung into a barn-dance tempo.

"Sure enough, next day my opponents said that Albert had fiddled while Rome burned," he said. "But the more they talked the bigger crowds I got." The electorate applauded the fiddle and voted for GORE. On election day his vote nearly equaled that of the five other candidates combined.

Though country fiddling was the springboard to Washington, Washington has since been more interested in the man.

The degree of its approval can be measured best by its likely acceptance of his leadership in the highly sensitive and potentially explosive investigation board.

SENATOR HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, to my colleagues I wish to express my regret that in the days of this week prior to today I was unable to be present. I have been afflicted with my old trouble, phlebitis. I could not get about, but was confined to my couch.

I noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that while I was absent tributes were paid to our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAY-

DEN], for the 45 years he has served so nobly in the Congress of the United States, in both the House and Senate. I wish to identify myself with other Senators who paid tribute to him, because I consider the Senator from Arizona one of my closest friends, a man who, ever since I have been in the Senate, has been one of our best advisors, and he is one whom I shall always honor.

Mr. President, I should like now to refer to another matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, AMBASSADOR TO INDIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently our Ambassador to India, John Sherman Cooper, formerly a Member of this body, has returned from his post to discuss conditions in that vitally important nation with officials here in Washington, including our own Foreign Relations Committee.

It is my belief that Ambassador Cooper is doing an excellent job, and that what he has to say should receive the serious attention of all of us.

On Wednesday, January 18, the Morristown (N. J.) Daily Record carried a lead editorial entitled "Weary Is the Task." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, which is very complimentary to Ambassador Cooper, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEARY IS THE TASK

Returning to America to report, John Sherman Cooper, our Ambassador to India, deserves the commendation of his fellow citizens for service well rendered.

Though this former Kentucky Senator had done a stint as a United States delegate to the United Nations, he was new to the Foreign Service when he undertook this assignment under appointment from President Eisenhower. He has shown vast aptitude for the job.

We are in a period of extremely touchy relations with India. Premier Nehru has seemed more than ordinarily susceptible to Russian Communist blandishments in recent months. And his avowed neutralism has struck many an increasingly tinged with hostility toward America.

Yet we cannot by this fact write India off and perhaps hand it to the Reds. It is too big and too vital a part of south Asia. Cooper has made it his task to see that relations are not allowed to deteriorate too far. And he surely comes home with ideas for bringing real improvement to United States-Indian ties.

He should be listened to with great care by his supporters in Washington.

HATTIE CARNEGIE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, earlier in this century the feminine eyes of the world looked to Paris for their clothing inspirations, and had it not been for a handful of pioneers who dared to suggest that the United States could just as well serve the couturier needs of women, that situation might well still exist.

Hattie Carnegie was one of those who dared. She came to this country from her native Vienna near the turn of the century with her father, and on his passing she went to work in a New York department store. Her first venture into the designing and manufacturing business came in 1909, when she, with another lady, opened a small dress shop on East 10th Street, in New York City. She applied herself to her chosen profession. She worked hard, and she strove constantly to be original, to the end that her contributions to fashion would be an expression of America instead of the historic source, France. That she succeeded is indicated by the universal association of her name with that which is new and fine in the fashion world. On Wednesday of this week this lady, who in her life so epitomized the American dream, passed on to her reward.

I rise today, Mr. President, as a member of the retail profession, to express what I know to be the general sorrow in that craft for the loss of this great lady. I rise also, as one who knew her, to call the attention of the young people of this country to the story of her life, and to remind them that her success proves that where there is an idea and a will to work at that idea, success is ever possible for one following the American approach. She was indeed a wonderful person, whose passing will leave a void in this world. To her family and to her coworkers I express my heartfelt sympathy.

WISCONSIN DAIRY WEEK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, commencing on February 27, the Nation's Capital will be the scene of a dairy promotion designed to emphasize why Wisconsin is known throughout the world as America's dairyland.

Mr. President, we have done fairly well in getting rid of the surpluses of dried milk and butter, but the accumulation of cheese is still a problem. If we are to engage in self-help in connection with solving the problem, we must advertise widely the fact that in our own country we have this good commodity. Furthermore, if Americans ate as much cheese per person as the Canadians do, we would not have any cheese problem whatever.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement on this subject, coming from Wisconsin, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Nation's Capital will be the scene the week of February 27 of a dairy promotion designed to emphasize why Wisconsin is known throughout the world as America's dairyland.

Sponsored by the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture, and financed by funds appropriated by the State's legislature, Wisconsin Dairy Week in Washington will be a combination of glamor—featuring two lovely personalities—merchandising and advertising, consumer education, and a tie-in with the Wisconsin congressional delegation which will act as host to its State's touring constituents.

The promotion is carried on in behalf of Wisconsin's 150,000 dairy farmers who currently produce more than 600 million pounds, almost 50 percent of the Nation's cheese and some 7 times as much as the next closest State. Wisconsin Dairy Week features Alice in Dairyland, a lovely 21-year-old Independence, Wis., girl who currently is engaged in promoting Wisconsin dairy products throughout the Nation. The symbol of the Badger State's prowess, Alice is selected yearly to spearhead a public relations and educational program on Wisconsin cheese and all other dairy products made in Wisconsin.

The State also ranks first in the production of milk, with more than 16½ billion pounds according to 1955 figures. Wisconsin also tops the list in the production of malted milk powder, powdered whey, powdered whole milk, and evaporated milk, while ranking second in the country in butter production.

With Miss Brown will be Mrs. Joan Hood, Waukesha, Wis., wife of a Wisconsin dairy farmer, whose job as the State's official nutritionist keeps her in close contact with homemaking groups who help her spread the story of Wisconsin dairy products from a home economics standpoint.

Heading the official Wisconsin delegation which will be in Washington are Donald N. McDowell, director of Wisconsin's department of agriculture, and Donald E. Wilkinson, chief of the State's markets division. W. T. Reese, marketing specialist, and other Wisconsin experts have lined up a program that includes a close liaison with Washington area supermarkets which will feature Wisconsin dairy products during the promotion. Local girls will be used as store demonstrators.

The schedule of "Alice" and her cohorts will be a busy one. The Wisconsin dairy group is to be feted on its arrival Sunday evening at a buffet supper and reception sponsored by the Wisconsin congressional delegation under the direction of MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican Representative, of Wisconsin's Seventh District.

On Monday at 11:45 a. m. "Alice" will present a gift box of her State's famed cheese to Vice President NIXON. The group will be luncheon guests of Representative LAIRD at 12:15 p. m. Monday in the Speaker's dining room. All members of the Wisconsin congressional group have been invited to attend that luncheon.

On Tuesday, at 2:30 p. m., "Alice" is scheduled to make a cheese presentation to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. The remainder of the week will be occupied by radio and television appearances, as well as other presentations to various Washington dignitaries.

The unique taxpayer-supported promotion which Wisconsin started some 5 years ago this year will reach an estimated 2,500,000 families who will be given a complete consumer education program on Wisconsin dairy products in 9 States in the spring season. Solidly backed by the State's 150,000 dairy farmers, the program also has the enthusiastic support of Gov. Walter J. Kohler, who says:

"To maintain Wisconsin's reputation as America's Dairyland, we must continually promote our fine dairy products. Wisconsin produces almost 50 percent of all the cheese in the Nation, and we are vitally interested in making even more people aware of the fine quality of our leading agricultural product."

The Wisconsin group noted the need for such a promotion program when dairy surpluses began to rise after World War II. The department obtained funds from the legislature which have been increased as the program grew in scope. This year's itinerary in 12 cities and 9 States is the most ambitious ever undertaken by the group, according to McDowell. He said that "only through continuance of such promotions can we be sure Wisconsin will retain its dairy leadership."

UNJUSTIFIED ATTACKS AGAINST RECLAMATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in view of the long-range importance of the President's recommendations for a uniform water-resources policy, I am pleased to report today that progress is being made in our efforts to resist the unjustified and unsubstantiated attacks being directed against reclamation—the primary water-resource development program in 17 semiarid Western States.

These attacks have included widespread dissemination of misrepresentation about sound reclamation projects, including press agent gimmicks which have been mailed to newspaper editors throughout the land. This attack has even included, I have just found out, personal visits by representatives of southern California interests to newspaper offices throughout the country.

As a former editor and publisher of a small weekly newspaper, I am gratified that responsible segments of our press are not being taken in by such propaganda tricks. I have previously reported that the Washington Post and Times Herald had assessed these misinformational maneuvers, has discarded them as unsubstantiated, and has added its unqualified support to the project.

Today, I wish to present an account of how such attacks upon reclamation by selfish southern California interests were received in the editorial offices of a great Midwest newspaper, the Des Moines Register. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the Des Moines Register of February 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCKS FOR THE EDITOR

Some southern California interests appear to be resorting to extremely unfair tactics in opposing the proposed upper Colorado River storage project.

The power and irrigation project, which calls for constructing huge dams and reservoirs at a cost of up to $4 billion in the upper Colorado River area, would benefit primarily Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The Senate approved a billion dollar start on the project last year. The modified proposal now before the House calls for $738 million expenditures. Echo Park Dam, which conservationists the country over had opposed because it would have destroyed much of the value of the Dinosaur National Monument, has been abandoned. As a result, the National Council of Conservationists has withdrawn its opposition to the project.

Two southern California attacks on the project came to our attention last week. One was cute. Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, sent us a sample of Chinle shale along with some pictures of an experiment he had conducted.

One picture shows him pouring water on this shale from Glen Canyon, where one of the major dams would be erected. A second picture shows how the shale had completely disintegrated in 5 minutes. Hosmer concludes building the Glen Canyon Dam might leave the Nation's taxpayers "with a billion dollar mud puddle." He invited editors to test the shale for themselves. We did and the shale did turn to mud.

The second southern California pitch on this project came from an executive vice president of the California Taxpayers' Association, who visited the office to pass along some printed material and his views.

He produced a map purporting to show the "tax costs" to each State of the project—with an Iowa figure of $62 million. This tax cost, the map said, was based on computations by the Tax Foundation. This fellow also laid great stress on the fact that Government statistics show that 21 million acres of fine farmlands are now lying idle in the Midwest, East, and South.

We hadn't read the speech which Senator ARTHUR WATKINS, Republican of Utah, made in the Senate on January 13 at the time the California representative called on us. Now we have and it seems obvious that Southern California people are guilty of misrepresentation.

The tax map, it appears, is largely phony. The Tax Foundation, a highly reputable organization, did not prepare the cost figures used on the map and they were published without its knowledge. The director of the Tax Foundation says the Colorado River Association apparently just used a Foundation formula for apportioning tax burdens among States. It applied this to its own estimate of the cost of the project. It didn't point out that any of the money would be repaid—and Senator WATKINS says the four benefiting States would reimburse 99 percent of the cost, two-thirds of it at full interest. There would be some subsidy in the project—but it wouldn't cost $4 billion in added taxes to the Nation or 62 million in added taxes to Iowans.

The United Soil Conservation Service, in response to inquiries from Senator WATKINS, has made it clear that it just isn't true to say that 21 million acres of the best American cropland now are unused for any purpose. The California facts and figures about "idle land" and the interpretations are mighty questionable.

That brings us up to the experiment with rocks from Glen Canyon. Senator WATKINS anticipated that attack, although not that rocks would be mailed out to editors.

He presented information to the Senate from the Department of the Interior showing that competent engineers have studied the Glen Canyon site. They believe it's practical and safe from an engineering standpoint. So we question if editors should decide that it's not feasible on the basis of such an unscientific experiment as pouring water on some bits of rocks.

We have some grave doubts about the upper Colorado project; doubts as to whether it's economically sound and whether it's desirable to bring additional farmland into cultivation through expensive irrigation. But we have only contempt for the California lobbyists who are using such unfair tactics in an attempt to influence public opinion. They are hurting their case by this misrepresentation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am aware that the Des Moines editorial indicates some remaining doubts about the Colorado River storage project; but if those good people in the Midwest are not blinded and confused by southern California's untruths and propaganda, then I am sure they are in a position to honestly assess our project and reclamation in general. The facts are that the Colorado River storage project is economically sound, and it is urgently needed to prevent further wasting of fresh water—needed for all purposes in the semiarid basin States—into the Pacific Ocean. We are not afraid of honest scrutiny of our project; in fact, we welcome it.

The Des Moines Register editorial clearly indicates that an attack is being made throughout the country on the engineering integrity of the world's foremost builder of large reclamation works—the United States Bureau of Reclamation. Under the circumstances, I think it appropriate to introduce in rebuttal a letter I have just received from a highly competent geological engineer now living in California. The engineer is Mr. Robert L. Wilson, of Fontana, Calif., an individual who feels personally abused by the southern California attack upon Glen Canyon Dam engineering, because he is one of the competent Government engineers who was engaged in the field work of extensive engineering and geological investigations of that project. He is now engaged in private industry, and, therefore, is at liberty to speak out in defense of the engineers with whom he worked in the Government service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Wilson's letter printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FONTANA, CALIF., *February 16, 1956.*

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Senator WATKINS: I greatly appreciate your attention to my letter of February 14.

Possible water loss in the Glen Canyon Reservoir was the subject of much thought during the planning stage. Pressure tests (water pumped into drill holes under high pressure) were conducted during the foundation investigation at Glen Canyon in 1948–49. The results of the tests, which show little water loss are included in a Bureau of Reclamation, region III, report entitled "Preliminary Geology Report, Glen Canyon Dam sites" by Glen Lasson. Copies of this report should be available in Boulder City and in the geology section of the Bureau in Denver.

In 1950 a special team was sent from the research branch in Denver to the Glen Canyon Dam site to investigate the permeability of the rock. The laboratory investigations showed that an appreciable amount of water would travel through a small sample of the sandstone. Chemical grout (sodium silicate and calcium chloride) in various concentrations was pumped into freshly drilled holes in the abutments. The grout would not penetrate and finally the research men tried to inject water in a duplication of the original pressure tests. Still no penetration of the liquid was obtained. (By "no" I mean 4 to 6 inches.) The outline of the tests and conclusions drawn from them were written up by the Denver research branch, but I do not have the specific title of the report. Can Representative HOSMER produce any tests or other factual data to discount these tests?

As you may know, the field of geology has as many specialties as the medical profession. If Representative HOSMER's consultants are academic or oil geologists, their advice may be as appropriate as an ear doctor's recommendation for foot treatment. Perhaps it would be well to look into their background.

Regarding the statement that the Bureau of Reclamation (intimating the Bureau of Reclamation geologists) did not know what they were doing, I present the following summary of qualifications of the five geologists who participated in some phase of the geologic planning:

Roger Rhoades, chief geologist who reviewed the work; University of California; mining geology work in several countries;

engineering geologist with TVA about 5 years; chief geologist, Bureau of Reclamation about 10 years; now important consultant on worldwide basis for largest construction firms in the United States.

Gene Waggoner, liaison geologist who also reviewed work; U. C. L. A.; geologist with major oil company; engineering geologist 10 years; now consultant on engineering geology for United Nations and other large organizations.

Glen Lasson, regional geologist who planned and supervised field work and wrote report; engineer and engineering geologist, Bureau of Reclamation 20 years.

William Gardner, field geologist who did mapping and part of drilling supervision, University of Colorado, mining geologist; engineering geologist for Bureau of Reclamation for 5 years; now with major oil company.

Robert Wilson, assistant regional geologist who assisted in both field and office studies; Colorado School of Mines, Arizona University, 5 years construction engineering; Major in Army Engineers; 5 years engineering geology with Bureau of Reclamation; district geologist for Corps of Engineers; now employed by major industrial firm.

Can Representative HOSMER and his consultants match this array of specialized experience?

Incidentally Rhoades and Waggoner worked on the geology of several California reclamation projects and apparently their work was satisfactory.

The statements regarding the detrimental effect of the chinle formation would be laughable if it were not for the seriousness of the overall situation. Unfortunately few have the technical knowledge or familiarity with the Glen Canyon region to pick out the fallacy of Representative HOSMER'S stand. As you know the people in the East and South have no conception of the geological conditions in the West or in the Glen Canyon area. Performances such as the distribution of the chinle clay samples have no doubt been indelibly stamped in the minds of many lawmakers and will be remembered long after a statement of facts by competent people.

If there is anything further that I can do to clarify the situation, please let me know. You have my permission to make this public if you desire.

Thank you again for your interest.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. WILSON,
Geological Engineer.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, at the suggestion of Mr. Wilson, I had the Library of Congress make a search for biographical information on the two geologists referred to in the southern California charges made relative to the Chinle shales in the Glen Canyon area. The individuals named were a Harold W. Hoots and a Peter H. Cardett.

Dr. Hoots was readily identified as a prominent petroleum geologist. His biographical sketch, as carried in American Men of Science, was extracted as follows:

Hoots, Dr. Harold William, 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. Geology. Winfield, Kans., February 8, 1899; m. 1921; B. S. Oklahoma, 1921; Kansas, 1922–23; fellow, Stanford, 1923–35, Ph. D. (geology), 1925. Junior geologist, United States Geological Survey, 1921–24, assistant geologist, 1924–28; geologist and assistant chief geologist, Union Oil Company of California, 1928–37; chief geologist, Richfield Oil Corp, 1937–46; consulting geologist, 1946—; assistant, Kansas, 1922–23, U. S. A. 1918. Fellow Geological Society; Association Petroleum Geologists (vice president, 1938). Geology of oil and gas, especially in California.

Source: American Men of Science, volume I, 1955, page 895.

At the present time, I have not been able to locate any information on the scientific background of Mr. Peter H. Cardett. A researcher at the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, checked these sources, without finding any reference to Mr. Cardett: Who's Who in America; American Men of Science; Who's Who in the West; Who's Who in the Southwest; Leaders in American Science; International Who's Who; Biography Index, 1946 to date; Directory of American Scholars; Who's Who in American Education; Who's Who in World Jewry; Current Biography, 1940 to date; World Biography.

Hence, I shall leave it up to my colleagues in the Senate and the House to utilize the information in assessing this latest attack upon Bureau of Reclamation engineering. Do they wish to accept the patient and painstaking technical research of five competent geological specialists who spent months in research on this project; or do they choose to accept the very limited evaluation of an oil geologist who spent a few hours in the area, after being transported there in a helicopter provided by southern California water interests who stand to benefit by millions of dollars from any further delay in the Colorado River storage project?

I shall leave the answer to this question to the good sense of the Congress and the American people.

NEED FOR TILLAMOOK ROCK LIGHTHOUSE, OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, next Thursday in Astoria, Oreg., the Coast Guard will hold a hearing on a proposal to close down the Tillamook Lighthouse and substitute for it a newfangled whistle buoy to be anchored nearby.

Mr. President, only native Oregonians, well past their 75th birthday, can remember a Tillamook Rock without the world famous tower and the beacon flashing its warning light to ships at sea.

Proposals have been made before to close down the lighthouse, but the vehemence of the protest made at the previous hearings deferred such action. There is little reason to think next week's hearing will find the protesting voices less vehement.

Although the lighthouse became a landmark approximately a hundred years after the ships of Capt. James Cook and Capt. Robert Gray first sailed Oregon waters, in the past 75 years the lighthouse has come to be an integral part of the coast scene; its closing and subsequent removal is a thought as rude and shocking to be the people of Oregon as would be a suggestion to remove the torch on the Statue of Liberty to a New Yorker, or a proposal to silence Big Ben to a Londoner.

Oregon has not the long history behind it that gives maturity to the Atlantic Coast States, but nonetheless, though a younger State, the citizens of Oregon have traditions to which we cling as fiercely as any New England Yankees or any Virginia planters cling to theirs. This will be demonstrated again when the hearings open at Astoria, March 1.

I alerted my constituents in the general vicinity of Tillamook Rock, when I first was notified of the proposed closing. I followed that, Mr. President, with a telegram to Admiral Perkins of the 13th Coast Guard District.

I ask unanimous consent that my telegram, as well as an editorial appearing in the Oregonian of February 9, 1956, and a newspaper article from the Oregonian of February 17, 1956, pertaining to this subject, appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram, editorial, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, *February 15, 1956.*

Adm. L. W. PERKINS,
13th Coast Guard District,
United States Coast Guard,
Seattle, Wash.:

Urgently request that both tradition and history be fully considered by Coast Guard before active operation of Tillamook Rock Lighthouse is abandoned. Furthermore, urge that Coast Guard be thoroughly convinced of safety and practicality of any substitute devices. The sum of $15,000 annually, which is said to be cost of maintenance of lighthouse, would be trivial in contrast to that of any maritime disaster resulting from inadequate replacement buoys.

Kind regards.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

[From the Oregonian, Portland Oreg., of February 9, 1956]

NEED FOR TILLAMOOK LIGHT?

Tillamook Rock lighthouse, which the Coast Guard again proposes to abandon, is famous the world over. The World Book Encyclopedia lists it as a noted light along with Eddystone in the English Channel and with Minot's Ledge in Massachusetts, Spectacle Reef in northern Lake Huron and a series of iron skeleton towers on the Florida Reefs. Rachel L. Carson in The Sea Around Us tells of a storm which threw rocks through its lantern 132 feet above the sea.

For 75 years Tillamook Rock light has guided mariners around Tillamook head into the safety of the Columbia River 20 miles to the north. When it was built, there was no thought of such modern aids to navigation as radar, loran and radio direction stations. Ships then hugged the shore and the light from storm-besieged Tillamook Rock was a welcome beacon. Today radar-guided vessels go far out to sea and aim for the Columbia River lightship.

The Coast Guard, which would like to get out from the cost of maintaining Tillamook Rock light, points out that supplying the rock and transporting personnel to and from it are hazardous. So it has been from the beginning. The rock claimed its first life before construction had fairly started, when John R. Trewavis, a Portland mason who had worked on lighthouses in England, was swept away by waves as he tried to land to make the final survey.

A lighted whistle buoy anchored to westward would serve the purpose as well, says the Coast Guard. Perhaps it would, along with the electronic aids which now are available to navigators. But one is of the opinion that hard facts will not suffice to do away with the famous, tradition-encrusted lighthouse.

In 1948, when the Coast Guard first proposed abandoning Tillamook light, the press was told that historic or sentimental phrases could not be involved in the final decision.

The Coast Guard, it was announced, would ask coastal mariners if they had objections. And objections they did have, strong ones. So overwhelming were the remonstrances received at hearings and in answer to questionnaires that the proposal was dropped.

Has a new generation of mariners taken over since then, one less inclined to put their trust in a traditional but possibly outmoded aid to their craft? The Coast Guard will find out soon. One believes—or at least one hopes—that radar and loran and radio beams have not so soon done what the storms of 75 years have failed to accomplish—the washing out of one of the world's most famous lighthouses.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of February 17, 1956]

KEEPER OF TILLAMOOK ROCK DESCRIBES LIFE IN WAVE-BATTERED HOME OFF OREGON COAST

(By Lawrence Barber)

Life is not too tough on the bleak Tillamook Rock, 1½ miles off the Oregon coast southwest of Seaside, where the Coast Guard is considering a proposal to close down the 75-year-old lighthouse and substitute for it a lighted sea buoy anchored nearby, according to its keeper, Oswald Allik, 3408 Northeast Liberty Street, Portland.

Allik returned home Thursday for his regular 3-week leave after a regular 6-week work period at the rock. He and one of his men were taken off the rock Wednesday by means of a breeches buoy lowered by a derrick which has been mounted on a platform on the rock ever since the lighthouse was erected.

TRIP USUALLY DRY

The men were dropped into a 28-foot motor launch to be taken to the 180-foot lighthouse tender *Ivy* which stood by a few hundred yards away. They slipped out of the breeches buoy as the lifeboat surged up and down in 12-foot swells, neither of them getting wet.

Then came a couple of newspapermen who made a brief call at the lighthouse and one of them got wet—not through any fault of the Coast Guard but because the ocean sent by a larger swell than others and washed over Robert Chessman, publisher of the Astorian-Budget.

In Portland, Allik explained that getting to and from the rock usually is a dry passage although it includes the excitement of riding a breeches buoy up or down. For 18 years he has been going to and fro and only once has he gotten wet.

However, the tender and its crew frequently come out in winter weather and refuse to attempt a landing owing to the big swells. They make the trip every 3 weeks to bring personnel replacements, supplies, and mail.

The regular trip this week was scheduled for Tuesday, but the ocean was too rough and Lt. Comdr. R. J. Evans, commanding the *Ivy*, elected to turn back in the mouth of the Columbia River, returning to Tongue Point Depot to await another attempt Wednesday.

ROCK KEEPS THEM BUSY

"One winter the tender was unable to get out until 2 weeks later," said Allik. "That time I had only 1 week ashore because we lose our leave time when the ship is delayed."

The crew at Tillamook Rock Lighthouse consists of a keeper and 4 men. While the keeper is ashore, the assistant keeper, now Alban K. Chinn, a 22-year-old Chinese boy from Los Angeles who has been in the Coast Guard for 3 years and stationed at the rock for 7 months, is in charge. With Chinn now are Lonnie G. Haynes, of Portland, and James H. Jack, Portland. The fifth man in the crew, Alan D. Richards, Shelton, Wash., came ashore with Allik Wednesday for his regular 3-week leave.

"We keep busy on the rock," said Allik. "We have to keep the 4 diesel engines, 2 compressors, 2 generators and other equipment operating. That is enough work to keep the men busy during regular working hours. When they have spare time, the younger men usually study for advances in rating to enginemen or boatswain's mate."

Allik is a native of Estonia who came to Oregon in 1926 to seek work. He had been a machinist apprentice and mail carrier in his home country. During the first 4 years here he was a logger. Then he became an oiler in the engine room of the Columbia River lightship, under Capt. Jacob Nielsen, now dead.

FISHERMEN LIKE COMPANY

Six years later he passed a civil-service examination for lighthousekeeper and he asked for assignment to Tillamook Rock, because it was closer to his Portland home than was Destruction Island, the other station open. He has been at the rock ever since and he hasn't minded it a bit.

"If the Coast Guard should decide to close up the lighthouse on the rock," he said, "I imagine the fishermen who anchor near it during the summer will miss us. They seem to like the company we afford when there are some men on the rock looking down on them.

"Occasionally big ships steam in fairly close to the rock, apparently to give their crews or passengers a better look at us. None of them go between us and the mainland at Tillamook Head. There is a large 'wash rock' between us and the shore. We call it Half-Mile Rock.

"We see seals, porpoises, whales, or blackfish in the water around us. We seldom do any fishing. It is too difficult to get down to the water, and too dangerous, too. When one man goes down, usually another goes down with him, with a rope tied between them."

The crew has a TV set in the station and it gets its best signals from Tacoma and Seattle stations. Portland stations are blanked out by the towering Tillamook Head.

WEATHER SOMETIMES ROUGH

"We have some pretty rough weather out there. One of the worst storms was January 15 and 16 when heavy swells crashed against the rock for 36 hours, loosening up rocks and throwing them with the spray up against the lighthouse building, more than 100 feet above the ocean. It left some dents in the tower lantern roof and some leaks in the engine room. Some old cracks were opened up in the 2-story, 7-room building, even where the walls are 3 feet thick and built of native stone brought from Clackamas, Oreg. No windows were broken because they are portholes and are covered with steel shutters during storms."

REFERENCES TO HEALTH OF PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, exactly 1 week ago the following paragraph appeared in a news story by Mr. Jack Bell, political reporter for the Associated Press, as printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 17, 1956. Quoting the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] on the question of whether President Eisenhower's health might become an issue in this year's election, the article stated:

CURTIS said Republicans could meet the issue by citing the medical record. He said there would be none of the deception he contended the Democrats practiced in 1944 "when they propped up a corpse and ran Mr. Roosevelt for reelection."

Those are quotes in the Associated Press story, Mr. President—"when they propped up a corpse and ran Mr. Roosevelt for reelection." The quotation is attributed to the senior Senator from Nebraska.

When I read it, I was incredulous. I have delayed a full week in making reference to it, because I hoped the junior Senator from Nebraska had been misquoted, although Mr. Bell is an experienced and capable reporter.

Yet there apparently has been no correction, Mr. President, and so far as I have seen, there has been no public criticism of this remark.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago one sentence was wrenched from the context of the newsletter I sent home to Oregon and made the basis of considerable criticism of me. The newsletter, which merely expressed apprehension that in the heat of political campaign the President's health might be disregarded, was entirely friendly and respectful toward President Eisenhower; yet I was severely criticized, and much shock was professed on the opposite side of the aisle.

I have heard no shock expressed over the statement that the Democrats "propped up a corpse and ran Mr. Roosevelt for reelection."

I have waited a week in vain for comment from those who pretend to such solicitude for the respect due to our Presidents—past as well as present.

Mr. President, I am expressing shock right now, and amazement, too, at the deafening silence that has greeted the quotation that "the Democrats propped up a corpse and ran Mr. Roosevelt for reelection."

Of course, Mr. President, Franklin D. Roosevelt's place in history is secure. A whole generation of Americans remember that President Roosevelt came into office at the height of the most terrible depression in American history. They remember that President Roosevelt instituted, with boldness and imagination, measures to save his countrymen from want and destitution; that he restored our confidence in a better future for all Americans and our faith in the attainment of that better future by democratic, American processes of popular government.

Millions of Americans who fought for the victory of our Nation and the free world against the forces of tyranny and oppression in World War II have not forgotten the leadership of President Roosevelt in that historic contest. Those who cast their votes for his reelection in 1944, while in the armed services, remember the stirring addresses and messages of that year in which President Roosevelt eloquently expressed the meaning and the goals of the fight for freedom in which we were engaged and are still engaged.

The people of America voted on this unsurpassed record in peace and in war when they reelected President Roosevelt in November 1944. Yet it is said by a Member of the United States Senate that the American people elected a "corpse"

when they voted for Franklin Roosevelt in 1944.

It may have been, from the standpoint of his own health, that Mr. Roosevelt should not have run for a fourth term. As I said on the floor of the Senate last January 27, for the sake of his health I believe that my party may have made a mistake when President Roosevelt was encouraged to run in 1944—even though he had not, to my knowledge, then had any clear warning as to his health. But President Roosevelt was brave and valiant, as other Presidents have been brave and valiant, and he felt that the Nation had a great victory to complete and a peace to win.

The American people honored President Roosevelt's sacrifice of his life to this great cause. Now, when he cannot reply from the grave a Member of the Senate declares that President Roosevelt's party—my party—"propped up a corpse and ran Mr. Roosevelt for reelection."

The quotation is an insult to the memory of a great President, to the American people, and to the Democratic Party.

I deplore the quotation. I have waited a full week for somebody else to deplore it.

LAG IN BOMBER PRODUCTION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the lead editorial entitled "Behind in Bombers" in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald says in part:

BEHIND IN BOMBERS

Whatever else has come out of all the discussion about ballistic and guided missiles, one sobering fact has emerged. The production of American B–52 jet bombers is running at a rate of only 17 a month. At this rate it will be years before the now antiquated B–36's in the Strategic Air Command can be replaced. Estimates indicate that production of the comparable but more recently developed Soviet Bison bomber is substantialy greater than that of the B–52. The question is whether considerations of budget balancing have induced the administration to take a dangerous chance. If more money for the Air Force would produce more B–52's faster, we think it ought to be granted. It is encouraging to see Members of Congress in both parties taking this view.

Mr. President, I have not always agreed with the editorial policy of this great American newspaper; but I have always respected its integrity and patriotism.

It is because of this fact I was shocked and saddened to read that statement about B–52 bomber production, because I know they would not have published it unless they had first checked and thought they were publishing the truth.

Mr. President, this country is making nothing like 17 B–52 jet bombers a month, and under present schedules will not make anything like that quantity for a great many months to come.

At lunch today, in a public address, one of the ranking Members of the House of Representatives expressed his distress at reading the figure in this editorial, adding that his best information was that no more than four per month were being produced.

Mr. President, why does this administration continue to mislead the people with respect to our bomber production and our relative military strength as against that of the Communists?

If that production is something they should be proud of, if it takes into consideration the Communist threat, why all the reluctance to tell the people the truth, and above all, why put out all this misleading information?

We Americans are now being forced to bow down to a policy of secrecy, never explained, never justified.

Those who demand that this policy be reversed are often criticized and sometimes ridiculed.

Mr. President, no secret government has ever remained free.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business, morning business is concluded, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Barkley	Hill	McNamara
Beall	Ives	Mundt
Bender	Jenner	Murray
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Ellender	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Langer	Sparkman
George	Lehman	Stennis
Goldwater	Magnuson	Watkins
Green	Mansfield	Wiley
Hayden	Martin, Pa.	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent in order to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. THYE, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senate is at present engaged in discussing very important proposed legislation which is intended to improve the position of agriculture in our country. It may seem unusual to some persons that it is necessary to pass agricultural legislation every year or two; but the fact is that none of us can look into the future and be certain what agricultural conditions will be in the years ahead, and what improved farming methods may bring about.

Right now American agriculture is undergoing a revolution which makes the industrial revolution of almost a century ago look like a slow-motion picture. There have been so many technological improvements in agricultural methods, so many changes, and so much mechanization that it is very difficult for many farmers to keep up with the progress which is being made, and some farmers are getting trampled upon in spite of their efforts to keep pace.

I would not say, as some persons do, that we are in a farm crisis at this time. We are in a farm squeeze. We are still nowhere near a crisis. I hope we will never approach a crisis such as we have known in past years. The average number of farm foreclosures, which ran about 110,000 a year between 1932 and 1942, has been only about 7,000 a year for the past 10 years; and even this year will be the 11th year in succession when there will be a very low level of farm foreclosures. The farm population, in spite of the fact that they are not sharing equitably in the unprecedented national prosperity, are holding up well their end in the purchase of savings bonds and life insurance and in making savings banks deposits.

I point these things out simply to show that while we are in a farm squeeze, we are not in a farm crisis, and we are now undertaking to legislate so that we will not approach a crisis stage.

I think it might be well to consider for a moment the general agricultural situation. The number of farmers has been decreasing over the years. A century ago almost 80 percent of our people were engaged in agriculture. That number has now dropped. Fourteen percent of our population now are living on farms;

and of that number, about 10 percent are producing approximately 90 percent of the food and fiber marketed in this country.

The number of farm families has been reduced over the decades until at present roughly 5 million families live on farms. Of that number, about 1½ million are mainly residential families; that is, they depend on off-farm income for their living. About 1½ million families are still living on farms which are yielding an average income of about $1,000 a year; and those 1½ million families are finding it very difficult, indeed, to get along in the world and live on anywhere near a decent standard.

There are about 2 million farms which are called commercial farms. They produce about 90 percent of all the food and fiber this country needs, besides growing substantial production for export. Those farmers are the ones who are revolutionizing the farm processes. It is said today that whether a man succeeds in farming or not depends fully as much upon his facilities, his buildings, and his equipment as upon the land itself. Farmers generally throughout the country know how to treat and improve the land. They can restore wornout land over a period of 2 or 3 years. But the farmer cannot expect to succeed if his buildings and equipment are not adapted to the purpose; and in an effort to modernize his farm plant, he has had to borrow money heavily.

When a farmer wants to increase his production or improve his efficiency these days, instead of going to an employment agency, he goes to a credit agency. Farm production has been increased more than 40 percent over a period of only a few years, with the same number of persons working on the farms. The consequence has been that farm indebtedness has increased during the past few years. Fortunately, however, it has not been increasing as fast as the farm assets have been.

One reason why farm indebtedness has increased during the last 2 years is that insurance companies and farm-credit agencies have increased the appraisal values of the land, and also because they are lending 40 percent of the value of the farm, instead of 30 percent as was the case only 2 or 3 years ago. This in itself furnishes considerably more capital for the farmer than he had available in previous years. Also, the farmer has available for purchase today equipment which was not available only a few short years ago.

So the commercial farmers are becoming more efficient every year. Our farmers are becoming more expert in their line of business each year. The long-range future for the commercial farmer looks very good, especially as the numbers of farmers become smaller. The numbers could be reduced too rapidly; but I think we should face the fact that in the future there will probably be fewer commercial farmers than there are today.

Still, despite his efforts to conduct his operations more efficiently and to convert to modern methods of farming, the farmer today is not getting his fair share of the unprecedented national prosperity; similarly, the spread of the price between the farmer and the consumer is not being narrowed; if anything, it is being widened. It is in an effort to correct this situation and to make certain that the farmer gets a greater share of the national income, or more nearly his proper share of it, that farm programs are presented to Congress session after session.

In 1954 much legislation was enacted which was aimed at improving farm conditions. While we have been trying to improve the conditions of the farmer, we have also been trying to preserve and improve the natural resources of the Nation for the benefit of those who will come after us. In 1954 Congress enacted the Watershed Act and extended the Water Facilities Act to the entire country. We provided for a more rapid writeoff, for tax purposes, of buildings and equipment. Provision was made so that permanent soil conservation practices could be charged as an annual crop expense, rather than to be placed on the capital increase side of the ledger. Rapid writeoffs for tax purposes were provided for farm grain storage.

When we did all those things, we reduced, on paper at least, the net income of the American farmer.

The most expensive item in running a farm today is the depreciation and the operation of farm equipment. When we halve the time in which a farmer may write off the value of new farm equipment or new buildings, the deduction comes out of gross farm income, and makes net income look considerably smaller than it would have been had Congress not provided such tax benefits for the farmers.

In 1954 Congress enacted the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. In 1954 the agricultural attachés were transferred from the State Department back to the Department of Agriculture, where they belonged. Agricultural attachés are being selected because of their knowledge of farm operations and of farm marketing, and nearly all of them have been appointed for duty in foreign countries with which we do business at this time.

We have been improving foreign trade somewhat, under Public Law 480, and the prospects are that we can make still further progress in developing markets for American farm commodities in areas where markets did not exist before.

In an attempt to improve the situation of the woolgrower, Congress passed the Wool Act of 1954. That was a short-term measure, and so far it has not increased the production of wool materially. I think it still has possibilities.

There are those who say, "Well, you are simply applying the old Brannan plan to wool. Why not apply it to other commodities, too? What is the differenc?"

The difference is that American production of wool is about one-third of the amount we consume, while other commodities are in surplus production. There is quite a difference between creating incentive prices for a deficit commodity and creating incentive prices for a surplus commodity.

One other important matter which was acted upon by the Congress in 1954, and which has contributed to the squeeze on farm families today, was the inclusion of the farm population under the Social Security Act. We may say, "That is putting money in the bank." Nevertheless, when there is imposed an additional tax, such as the social security tax, it comes out of the money which farmers would be free to spend for other purposes.

There are many other expenses which farm families have today which were unnecessary some time ago. Farmers have to pay hospital insurance and automobile insurance. Nowadays the children of farmers have their teeth cared for and their eyesight corrected, just as the children of other people do. That has increased the cost of living on the farm. I am glad the farm families are now enjoying a living which is comparable to that enjoyed by other segments of our society.

We have been legislating for farmers over the years, and today I think we have the best foundation we have ever had upon which to build a farm program. Yet there is a need for doing still more. The disparity between the incomes of farm people and those of nonfarm people is altogether too wide. I know that benefits flow to those living on a farm which do not accrue to those living in towns and cities. At least, I think there are such benefits. Nevertheless, when nonfarm families have a per capita income at least twice that of farm families, that is not at all equitable.

It was recognition of that situation which prompted President Eisenhower a few weeks ago to send to the Congress a special message on agriculture. He made nine points in his message. I shall enumerate them for the RECORD.

First, President Eisenhower recommended a soil bank, which is incorporated in the proposal now before the Senate.

The President recommended improved methods of surplus disposal.

He would strengthen our commodity programs.

He suggested that Congress consider putting a limit on the amount which could be granted to any one farm in the way of price supports.

He asked again, as he did a year ago, that Congress give him the tools with which to promote a rural development program, so that the million and a half families living on less than $1,000 a year might have a better chance in life.

He referred to the Great Plains program, which will be a cooperative one with the States, but which will also benefit from the measure now pending before the Senate.

He indicated he would ask for a one-third increase in the amount of funds available for agricultural research, with special emphasis to be put upon the marketing problem, in an effort to narrow the spread between the farmer and the consumer.

He recommended strengthening our farm credit programs.

He also recommended deleting the tax on gasoline used on the farm for purely agricultural purposes.

The legislative proposal now before the Senate contains a great many beneficial provisions. Probably the one attracting the most attention is the one providing for the soil bank. There have been many varieties of soil banks suggested to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and to the Congress itself.

I think in working out the soil-bank plan which is written into the bill now before the Senate, the committee has done very well. Perhaps it is not a perfect job. No doubt there are those who expect too much from a soil-bank program. There are no doubt others who will not realize the great benefits to be derived from it.

The purposes of a soil bank are three.

First, it will reduce the surpluses of crops under mandatory price supports, which are now bothering us in this country.

The next purpose of the soil-bank program is to prevent the millions of acres taken out of the production of mandatorily supported crops from being devoted to the production of nonsupported crops, thus breaking the price on the market of those crops which are, in a sense, innocent bystanders, and which have not benefited from the mandatory supports which apply to the basic commodities.

The third purpose, one which we are likely to lose sight of in our short-range desire to increase farm prices and income as quickly as possible, is that the soil-bank proposes to retire land into a conservation reserve, to get some of the less productive land out of production of cultivated crops and turn it to the production of forest trees or turn it into wildlife preserves which will benefit all the people of the Nation. I think we should put greater emphasis on the conservation and recreational byproducts of the soil-bank program. They appeal to all the people whether they live on farms or not.

The soil-bank proposal as written would permit some small marginal farms to be taken out of production altogether, and the owners of such farms would be enabled to take other jobs which would pay them enough so that they could make a better living, and at the same time be sure of some income from the marginal lands from which they have been trying to make a livelihood.

The bill now before the Senate contains very strong forestry provisions. It provides that land taken out of production and put into a conservation reserve may be reforested, with the help of the Government, and reasonable payments will be made on that land for a period of not exceeding 15 years, so there will be no temptation to plow the land up and return it prematurely to the production of crops.

The bill also contains provisions whereby the Federal Government may cooperate with the States on general reforestation programs on about the same basis as that on which the Federal Government now is authorized to cooperate with the States on soil-conservation and water-conservation payments.

All in all, the forestry provisions of the bill are very strong, indeed.

We had a little difficulty determining the type of cropland which would be made eligible for the conservation reserve. Of course, the acreage reserve is available to the producers of crops which have allotments. Finally, I think we arrived at the proper wording for this provision of the bill, which was discussed yesterday on the floor of the Senate. The provision we finally worked out was that the land which is eligible to participate in the conservation-reserve program must be land on the farm, generally used in rotation, regardless of whether it was planted this year in corn or in oats, or in hay or in clover.

One provision of the bill which I believe will be of considerable help, particularly to the North Central States, is that which relates to the commercial wheat area, taking 11 States out of the commercial wheat area and putting them in the noncommercial area. I have not received any protests so far from the States affected, and I think most of the growers in those States will be delighted to have their States taken out of the compulsory control programs, and allowed to proceed on their own.

As I have said, the bill will bring about no utopia.

I have not yet commented on all the provisions of the bill. However, some of the provisions are not good, and will tend to nullify the good provisions of the bill. For instance, let me refer to the provision that the parity for specified crops will be the higher of that produced by the old parity formula or the new parity formula. That is called the dual-parity plan. It is not good. Certainly, if we use the formula for each commodity which is most favorable to it, it will be only a question of time before the parity concept will be entirely worthless as a concept for measuring agricultural prosperity or for determining the price relationship between the various agricultural commodities.

The parity formula is intended to be used to determine the proper price relationship between farm commodities. All of them together, of course, add up to 100. But the provision of the bill which I think would completely nullify all the good provisions of the bill——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when the so-called modernized parity formula was placed on the statute books, was he not?

Mr. AIKEN. I was.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont recalls, does he not, that those who advocated that formula contended that within 3 or 4 years parity prices for the basic commodities under the modernized parity formula would catch up with those under the old parity formula?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the Senator from Vermont also remembers, does he not, that I was instrumental in submitting an amendment which kept the old formula in effect until such time as the modernized formula could catch up with the old formula? I refer to so-called dual parity.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the amendment provided that dual parity would prevail for 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; for 4 years.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; 4 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. And does not the Senator from Vermont remember before the end of that 4-year period the committee again took up the matter; and because the modernized parity formula had not caught up with the old formula, Congress renewed the dual parity formula for 2 more years, and that period expired on December 31 of last year. Does not the Senator from Vermont remember that?

Mr. AIKEN. It was renewed——

Mr. ELLENDER. It was extended.

Mr. AIKEN. That was done because those who were benefiting from the much higher prices brought about by use of the old formula, had the votes to renew or extend that arrangement. That renewal or extension was made for that reason, and not because it should have been made.

Mr. ELLENDER. But those who advocated the modernized parity formula said it would soon catch up with the old formula, and we extended the dual parity formula for 4 years, and subsequently for 2 years more in order to permit it to do so.

The reason why we are now asking for another extension of dual parity is that the proponents of the modernized parity formula are still in error; it has still not caught up with old parity.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to continue with my statement, perhaps I may provide an answer to his question.

I say that the dual parity formula was extended because those who benefited from it had the votes required to extend it, and not because the extension should have been made at that time.

I may say that many of the predictions of the advocates of the new parity formula have come true. For instance, today there is only a fraction of a cent difference between the parity price of cotton under the old parity formula and the parity price of cotton under the new parity formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is about four-tenths of 1 cent.

Mr. AIKEN. The new parity formula resulted in better prices for the protein foods and dairy products.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. And also in the case of milk, hogs, beef, and the commodities for the production of which a great deal of hand labor is required. The modernized parity formula did somewhat reduce prices in the case of commodities, the production of which had become almost completely mechanized.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator from Vermont will concede that those who felt that the modernized parity formula would not do justice to the basics were agreeable to letting the old formula continue for 4 years; is not that true? I

do not recall that the Senator from Vermont himself opposed it.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not recall the circumstances. As I recall, there was a period when the market price was so much higher than the support price that it did not matter what the parity formula was. As a matter of fact, there were 2 years when flexible supports were in effect in the United States, although the public never knew it.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was during the war.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; that was because of the war.

Mr. ELLENDER. Ninety percent or even 100 percent would not have done any good then, because those commodities were then selling much above the parity price.

But since my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont, has been discussing the dual parity formula provisions of the bill, I wish he would state whether or not it is true that the modernized formula has not made it possible for the producers of wheat, for example, to obtain a fair support level in contrast to what they would have obtained under the old formula.

Mr. AIKEN. There is a question in the minds of many persons as to whether $2.50 a bushel is not a higher price than the price wheat would normally be entitled to have; and that price is about the price the old parity formula would have resulted in.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Vermont mean to say that the farmers object to receiving that price?

Mr. AIKEN. No; but when one farm commodity receives more than its share, that causes a reduction in the share of the others, because altogether they add up to 100.

I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that the parity formula today is not an accurate yardstick; it favors some commodities, and I do not think it does any more than justice to others.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Vermont tell us, for the record, what difference it would make in the price of wheat for 1956, let us say, if the old formula were used, in contrast to the modernized parity formula?

Mr. AIKEN. I hear there would be a difference of 44 cents.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, if the modernized parity formula is used this year the wheat farmer would get 44 cents a bushel less?

Mr. AIKEN. I did not think that was the question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was only trying to trace the difference between the provisions of this bill and what might happen without the bill. If we had 75 or 76 percent of parity on the present basis, the price would run, I believe, to $1.81 a bushel, or something of that nature. If we have a provision which strikes out the modernized parity formula and supports wheat up to 90 percent, it comes to something like $2.25. That is where the 44 cents difference comes in. The difference, because of modernization of parity, is only 13 or 14 cents a bushel this year, since use of a transitional parity price limits the amount of change per year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator state that if this bill were enacted as written, the wheat farmer, for 1956, would receive 44 cents a bushel more than otherwise?

Mr. AIKEN. No. I do not think the wheat farmers would get it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield very briefly.

Mr. THYE. On page 7 of the report, under "Wheat," it will be found that the new parity price is $2.19. The old parity price was $2.51. If we subtract $2.19 from $2.51, the difference, as between the old and the new parity prices, is 32 cents. That is shown on page 7 of the report. The report is meaningless if we do not accept that figure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. First, I should like to say that, regardless of what the support level is, it does not mean that the wheat grower gets that price. The highest price the wheat grower received for his wheat was in 1947, when he got $2.29 a bushel, on the average; in 1948, $1.99; in 1949, $1.88; in 1950, $2; in 1951, $2.11; in 1952, $2.09; in 1953, $2.04; in 1954, $2.12; and in 1955, $1.99. In every one of those years the support price was far above what the farmer actually received for his wheat. The support level does not mean that the farmer receives that price.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I suggest to my good friend——

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator that under the old parity formula the parity price of wheat, and consequently the minimum support price for wheat, would be about 13 cents a bushel more than it would under the transitional parity formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, the announced support price for wheat, for this year's crop, is $1.81 per bushel, which is 76 percent of transitional parity.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. If this bill becomes law, the support price for wheat will be $2.26 a bushel, or 45 cents more than the announced price. That is shown on page 3 of the report.

Mr. AIKEN. That means that the parity price for wheat would be $2.50-odd a bushel?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, and it would mean that 90 percent of parity on wheat would assure the farmer of a support price of $2.26 per bushel instead of $1.81.

Mr. AIKEN. We are driving the wheat off the market rapidly at the present price. I would not want to encourage much more of that sort of thing.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. To clear the RECORD, it will be noted, on page 7 of the report, that the modernized parity formula would set the wheat parity price at $2.19, whereas the dual formula would set it at $2.51.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. President, as I started to say, the most harmful provision in the pending bill is the provision which provides for a return to the rigid, 90 percent of parity price supports.

Altogether too much emphasis is placed upon price supports as a means for maintaining a prosperous agriculture.

It has yet to be demonstrated that price supports alone will go very far toward taking the farmer out of the doldrums.

We have not as yet found any way of communicating minimum price supports to the farmer as a group.

The figures which I read a few moments ago show conclusively that, regardless of the support price for wheat, it does not mean that the farmer gets anywhere near that price. In 1953 wheat was supported at 90 percent of parity, and the farmer received 81 or 82 percent, instead of 90 percent.

We are not likely to do so unless we nationalize the processing, transportation, and distribution systems of this country—and even then it is doubtful that the farmer would receive his full share except as he may organize, stand on his own feet, and carry enough influence with Government possibly to control it.

The time has not come yet when we want to nationalize the industry of America.

The proponents of section 101 of the bill before us contend that a restoration of high rigid supports would make the farmers of America prosperous and happy. This line of reasoning is completely fallacious. High rigid supports never have brought prosperity to the American farmer and never will.

High rigid supports are primarily responsible for the difficulties that the American farmer finds himself in today. Look at the chart at the rear of this Chamber. It shows the farm operator's realized net income from 1928 to date. It starts in 1929 from a fairly high level, at least for those days.

The farmer never has received his full share or anywhere near his full share of the national income, and he will not do so until he takes matters into his own hands and stops relying upon Government and Government officials to work out his salvation. This chart shows that income dipped from 1929 to a low point in 1933.

The combination of drought and depression brought the American farmer to bankruptcy in large numbers. One year 223,000 farmers went into bankruptcy. That situation continued until the war year of 1942, when 24,000 farmers went into bankruptcy in America.

Back in 1932 and 1933 the farmer began to get patent medicine from the Government but in spite of 8 years of nostrums, he was still selling 5-cent hogs and 10-cent cotton and 50-cent corn and getting 15 cents an hour for his labor when the year 1940 rolled around.

Eight years of Government panaceas found him almost exactly where he was in 1932 as far as income was concerned. After 8 years of experimenting, farm prices were almost exactly the same as they were in 1932.

Then, in 1941, farm prices shot up almost perpendicularly. Was it support prices that shot the farmer's income up in 1941–42? No. It was war—cold, merciless, bloody war. Price supports and farm programs had nothing to do with it.

It will be seen from the chart that the farmer's income rose suddenly in 1942 and then dipped. That dip was caused by price ceilings. Government action did affect farm income in that way. The farmer never was permitted to get the income which he naturally would have received had Government not interfered.

When price ceilings were removed after the war farm income shot up again reaching its highest point in 1947. This rise in farm income was brought about because America was pouring millions of tons from her larder into the devastated countries of the old world. The law of supply and demand was responsible for the record income of American farmers in 1947 and early 1948.

And then, in June 1948, the Congress enacted legislation with an amendment which continued 90 percent rigid supports. What happened? Farm prices hit the skids and kept skidding. A major depression was in the making. Ninety percent rigid supports were not stopping it, and not even slowing it up.

Farm income maintained its downward course until June 1950 when it started up again. Did high rigid supports start from income on the way up? Certainly not. Again it was war—cold, merciless foreign war.

To be sure we got high prices for farm commodities as a result of war—$5 milk, $6 flaxseed, $3 wheat, $30 hogs, $40 cattle.

For a while the farmer received mighty fine looking checks for his produce, mighty sad looking telegrams starting out with: "The Secretary of the Army has asked me to express his deep regret that your son * * *".

We paid pretty dearly for the high farm prices of those days—broken homes, broken hearts, broken bodies, and broken minds.

Then, in the spring of 1953, the man in the White House put an end to the futile, fruitless furor of war.

Farm income had already started to drop in 1952.

Between August 1952, and January 1953, farm income dropped 9 parity points, the sharpest drop in history.

Even war was not keeping it up this time.

Farm income has continued to drop ever since.

The number of telegrams from the armed services to the farm families of America has dropped also.

Whereas the requirements of war itself had rendered inoperative the high rigid support prices, this high support level did result in an incentive for overproduction after the firing stopped.

When President Eisenhower took office in January 1953, he found the country committed to a continuation of high rigid supports for 2 years more.

He had promised to carry out the law in this respect, and he did so. But in the meantime warehouses had been filled to overflowing with wartime commodities not needed in peacetime.

Transition to a peacetime agriculture has been delayed, and government today finds itself with almost a $12 billion investment, mainly in 3 or 4 farm commodities.

Only 2 weeks ago we were advised by the Commodity Credit Corporation that of its $12 billion borrowing authority only $600 million was left uncommitted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not wish to lose my trend of thought at this point. It is inevitable that the Commodity Credit Corporation, whether the pending bill is passed or not, will have to come before Congress before July 1 and ask for between $1 billion and $3 billion more in additional lending authority.

The producers of the commodities in which the Government has such a huge investment find themselves in real trouble, and the producers of other commodities are the indirect victims of an unwise Government policy.

Let us see what high rigid supports have done for the commodity producers of America over a period of only a few years. Let us consider wheat first.

The wheat grower of the Great Plains has seen millions of acres of his normal production transferred to other States.

He has seen a compulsory reduction of 20 million acres in the planting of wheat.

He has seen nation after nation apply subsidies to the production of wheat in their own countries in order to be self-sufficient and independent of American sources of supply.

The cotton grower has seen the production of synthetic fibers increase year after year until the world today is using the equivalent of 13 million bales of cotton for the production of synthetic textiles.

We have forced the development of synthetic textiles until today they have taken over enough of the cotton markets to equal all the cotton we produce in the United States in a year.

The small cotton grower has seen his allotment cut and cut and cut, until his acreage has been reduced to an uneconomic size, on which he can never expect to support his family in decency.

The cotton grower has seen the American umbrella of rigid support prices induce production in foreign countries in almost direct proportion to the reduction in planting required in the United States.

During the last 4 years, we have forced a reduction of 5 million acres in the land planted to cotton and at the same time other countries have increased their planting by 5 million acres.

Our foreign markets for cotton are almost gone and, if we continue to price American cotton out of the world market, the rest of the world will be completely self-sufficient in another 2 years.

American textile manufacturers have been put at a disadvantage and are now clamoring for high trade barriers to protect them.

Mr. President, can anyone imagine what high trade barriers imposed at this time would, because of retaliatory action by foreign countries, do to our fruit growers, to our tobacco growers, and to other producers in this country? Nevertheless, the cotton situation is bringing that about.

Cotton production in America has been frozen in uneconomic producing areas simply because the producer is trying to protect his production allotment. Year after year he goes on producing cotton at a cost which is more than the support price because he does not dare give up that allotment so that cotton could be produced in some area where the cost per pound is not so high as it is in his area.

The total production of cotton in the United States has been arbitrarily cut 10 million acres, and in spite of that reduction, surpluses continue to increase.

What have high rigid supports done to the tobacco grower? Because of the nature of this commodity, his prices have been maintained. His allotments, however, have been cut to uneconomic size.

Manufacturers have developed homogenized products which may reduce the demand for certain types of tobacco by as much as 50 percent.

Production of tobacco in foreign countries is rapidly increasing. We cannot control and reduce acreage in other countries. We can produce only uneconomic farms in the United States.

The tobacco capital of the world has been shifted from Wilson, N. C., to Lexington, in Southern Rhodesia, Africa, where tobacco production is increasing, and where the producers are rapidly taking over control of the world market.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that both Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower have favored continuing 90 percent of parity price supports for tobacco.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe everybody agreed to that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know that to be the fact.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that we are all equally to blame. The tobacco grower has fared well under the program. This year he will get a little more than 100 percent of parity. However, he will lose half his market.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that tobacco has been used in larger quantities year by year. The real trouble, if there be any, is that the farmers have followed the advice of the Secretary of Agriculture as to how to grow tobacco better; their yields have increased. The Senator knows that to be a fact.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary of Agriculture has carried out the instructions of Congress. I will not attempt to state the percentage of tobacco growers who are restricted to a production of six-tenths of 1 acre. No family can live decently by producing tobacco on six-tenths of 1 acre.

Mr. ELLENDER. The family that grows six-tenths of 1 acre of tobacco today is growing more tobacco than it grew on an acre and a quarter only 10 years ago.

Mr. AIKEN. But they are not able to live decently from the tobacco they can raise on six-tenths of an acre.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point, inasmuch as his train of thought has been interrupted?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The question I desired to ask the Senator a few moments ago was this: How soon does the Senator believe the soil bank will have the effect of reducing the surpluses?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it will have an effect on the surpluses beginning this year.

Mr. THYE. How extensive will the effect of the soil bank be on the reduction of the surpluses?

Mr. AIKEN. If the soil bank can be put into effect quickly enough, the Secretary of Agriculture, as I understand, intends to fix an incentive price which will take out of production 12 million acres of wheat, 3 million acres of cotton, and 5 million acres of corn. That should have a material effect on market prices.

Mr. THYE. How could that reduction be brought about unless there was a plowing down of already existing wheat acreage?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is provided for. The spring wheat is not yet planted.

Mr. THYE. The spring wheat, however, is produced mostly in the area of the Dakotas, Montana, and in the great Northwest region of the United States, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Secretary contemplates that some of the acreage planted to winter wheat can be put into the soil bank next spring if the bill is enacted promptly.

Mr. THYE. But that would require plowing down or clipping before the wheat goes into a headed state, would it not?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. It would mean that it could not be harvested.

Mr. THYE. In this one calendar year we cannot expect any great accomplishment in the removal of the surpluses from the soil-bank provision of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we can.

Mr. THYE. What leads me to ask these questions is primarily this: I think the Senator from Vermont will agree with me that the farmer's income is far out of balance with the Nation's very excellent economy in every other field. Business is at an alltime high. It is only the agricultural economy that is low. Therefore, if the surplus does not vanish through the soil-bank provision, is it not to be expected that the reduced corn support and the reduced wheat support, which were earlier discussed by the Senator from Vermont and other Senators, will leave the farm economy very low? Are we not justified in endeavoring to help the farmer by returning to his former supports?

Mr. AIKEN. I know the Senator from Minnesota is very sincere in his thinking.

Mr. THYE. I am never anything but sincere when I speak about agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. The price supports I noted go back to 1953, 1954, and 1955, but the farmer never did get the support price or anywhere near it.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from Vermont will yield further, let me ask this question: If a farmer has a thousand bushels of wheat to seal, if he is allowed to seal it at last year's figure, which was $2.08 a bushel, and in 1956 it will be $1.81, which of the two price supports will yield him the greatest amount of money?

That is a simple arithmetical question which the average school child could figure out. The difference between $2.08 in 1955 and $1.81 in 1956 is 27 cents on a bushel of grain. Any child who can add 4 and 4 or subtract 2 and 2 can arrive at the proper result.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not quite so simple as that.

Mr. THYE. The supports on wheat are mandatorially set this year at $1.81 a bushel, and last year they were $2.08 a bushel.

Mr. AIKEN. The farmer did not get it.

Mr. THYE. On corn the support price is down 19 cents a bushel from 1955.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not so easy as that. The Senator is thinking in terms of price support and not in terms of income.

Mr. THYE. We cannot separate the support prices from the income of the farmer.

Mr. AIKEN. I always thought that price times production represented income, and not price alone. The wheat farmer has had to take 20 million acres out of production and, as a result, his net income from wheat is much less. That was true last year when he was receiving 90-percent support, because, as he reduces the acreage planted, the cost of producing each bushel rises, because of fixed costs.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will tolerate another question in connection with his remarks, let me say that it is unfortunate that we did not have soil-bank provisions in the 1954 act. Some of us advocated it. If we had had the soil bank we would be ahead on the course of reducing surpluses. The shrinkage in the farmer's income has increased every single year because of the higher prices he incurs in the purchase of replacement machinery and everything else in connection with farm operation.

I agree with the Senator from Vermont that the objective cannot be accomplished simply with price supports.

I wish to thank the Senator for permitting me to make this statement in connection with his remarks, because I think it is a very pertinent part of the discussion.

Mr. AIKEN. Many of us who were active in passing the act fo 1954 contemplated that approximately 30 million acres would be taken out of production. That did not prove to be the case, because the 30 million acres, as I shall point out very shortly, were promptly put into the production of other competitive products.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not like to break in on the Senator's statement. First, I wish to say that I have the very highest regard for the distinguished Senator from Vermont and for his familiarity with agricultural problems, and he has been discussing one which is very close not only to Kansas but to the entire wheat-raising section of the Nation. The wheat farmer reduced his production from 78 million acres in 1953 to 55 million acres. It is now anticipated that through the soil bank 12 million more acres will be set aside. I can readily see that in the future the soil bank has some good possibilities, but with reference to the winter-wheat area, I cannot agree with the statement which the Senator from Vermont made, that we may anticipate more plowing up of wheat already planted.

Let me invite the attention of the Senator from Vermont to his statement of a day or two ago, in which he said that it was his understanding, after talking with the Department, that they expect the annual rental will be approximately 10 percent of the value of the land; that if the land is worth $50 an acre as cropland, the rental will be $5, and that if it is worth $100 an acre, the rental will be $10 an acre.

I am somewhat familiar with the production of winter wheat. We in Kansas grow about one-fourth of the winter wheat which is produced. We have some land which we will assume would sell for $100 an acre. The production of wheat on such land might well be from 15 to 25 or more bushels an acre. I can assure the Senator that no farmer is going to think of plowing it up——

Mr. AIKEN. The figures which the Senator is quoting from my remarks apply to the conservation reserve and not to the acreage reserve.

Any farmer who would plow up wheat planted last fall would get a much higher price. Under the law, he would get as much as he could normally expect to receive from the production of the crop plus a substantial incentive. He would not be expected to plow up his wheat unless he would get greater cash income by doing so than he would from carrying it through to maturity.

Mr. CARLSON. May I follow this through a little? What the Senator has said clarifies the situation. But let us assume these are conservation acres which a man will set aside, at 10 percent of the value of the land. If the land is worth $100 an acre, the payment would be $10. There are many sections in Kansas where farmers summer fallow. Summer fallowed land would not, in my opinion, be set aside on the same basis. I think there are some problems in Kansas which do not confront farmers in the ordinary, small, wheat-producing areas. In Kansas wheat growing is a business in its own right, and some real problems go along with it. I sincerely hope the Senate will give thoughtful consideration to the real problems which exist in the Wheat Belt.

Mr. AIKEN. I think a farmer in the Wheat Belt would not be permitted to set aside so many acres in fallow this year and then plant those acres again next year, use them for some sort of rotation, and get paid for doing so. Undoubtedly he would be required to set aside so many acres and to keep them set aside until it was agreed that he could

put them into production again. At that time we shall be finished with the whole soil-bank program and the farm program, and a way may be devised to get wheat production back into the wheat States.

Ninety percent rigid supports were too much of a temptation for the farmers in Illinois, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and other Eastern States. When they could produce 30 or 35 bushels of wheat to the acre, with a guaranteed $2 a bushel, growing wheat resulted in a better income than almost anything else.

As I understand, Cornell University, in New York, made a study of the types of farmers who received the greatest hourly earnings as income. It found that it was the wheatgrower in New York. He stepped in and took Kansas acreage. He produced heavily. As I understand, the farmers actually hired unused farms on which to produce wheat in the Eastern States. I am sure that is so. When the time came to reduce production, those farmers insisted on holding the extra acres which they had been planting, and that acreage cannot go back into Kansas acreage.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to pursue that further. We in Kansas are not happy about having other States take our wheat acreage. Kansas has cut back its production from 18 million acres in 1953 to 10,800,000 acres. Kansas wheat growers are trying to comply with the program and to keep the price up. If we have a price somewhere near 90 percent of parity, or at parity, it will help us with our acreage reduction.

If it is proposed to take 12 million more acres out of production, and Kansas is to take three or four million acres more, I do not know what will happen to the wheat growers of Kansas. I think they are entiled to some serious consideration.

Mr. AIKEN. Except for special legislation, the wheat growers would not be allowed 55 million acres; they would be getting an allotment of 18,500,000.

Mr. CARLSON. I am certain the Senator did not advocate that we cut wheat production back to 18 million acres. Nevertheless, I agree in general that the Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. On the the basic commodities, Congress by law has set aside the intent of the Triple A Act and has established higher minimum national acreage allotments for those commodities. Higher total acreage minimums have been set for wheat, rice, cotton, and peanuts. Also, it has been necessary to establish a higher minimum for tobacco—six-tenths of an acre for each farm. Everyone knows that a farmer cannot make a living from tobacco produced on such a limited acreage.

Mr. CARLSON. Many of the wheat farmers of Kansas have quit farming. They had quarter sections of land on which they used to grow wheat on 80 or 90 acres. Now their allotment is 30 acres. They cannot operate successfully any longer.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that if the soil bank program takes effect, the Senator will find that a great deal of wheat acreage will be retired in those States, which have purloined acreage from States, such as Kansas, which are located in the great western Wheat Belt.

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy about the soil bank program, but I think it is a long range, slow program, something which will not take effect quickly, this year.

Mr. AIKEN. If it takes effect this year, the farmer will net as much as if he had raised wheat, plus an incentive.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Vermont said a while ago that the Eastern States had increased their wheat acreage in recent years. I have before me a table prepared by the staff of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, which shows that the increase in wheat acreage during the past 15 years took place west of the Mississippi River, and that most of the Eastern States decreased their production. I wonder if the Senator would care to have the table inserted in the RECORD as a part of his remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. I should be glad to have it in the RECORD. However, the Eastern States have decreased their acreage through cultural methods.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All wheat: AMS seeded acres, 1941 through 1955

[Thousand acres]

State	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
North Atlantic:															
New York	305	287	269	349	352	222	385	449	405	417	428	456	479	364	339
New Jersey	74	65	62	75	93	96	107	115	107	109	106	107	107	85	76
Pennsylvania	892	818	799	931	959	911	947	985	926	889	862	871	884	743	669
North Central:															
Ohio	1,953	1,704	1,602	1,937	2,150	1,849	2,212	2,377	2,377	2,172	2,085	2,273	2,409	1,783	1,542
Indiana	1,489	1,207	1,003	1,292	1,587	1,383	1,603	1,811	1,739	1,621	1,621	1,556	1,665	1,315	1,184
Illinois	1,797	1,170	1,214	1,334	1,400	1,289	1,431	1,745	1,952	1,562	1,859	1,883	2,165	1,624	1,698
Michigan	753	692	691	949	992	877	1,210	1,416	1,303	1,173	1,243	1,438	1,524	1,036	953
Wisconsin	82	80	71	69	61	95	118	127	117	90	82	76	72	61	52
Minnesota	1,523	1,156	1,162	1,325	1,109	1,412	1,200	1,088	1,304	977	1,098	1,190	1,056	735	636
Iowa	320	182	152	149	168	192	220	340	411	264	254	178	152	130	109
Missouri	1,856	845	1,217	1,472	1,423	1,314	1,472	1,722	1,825	1,661	1,727	1,520	1,702	1,583	1,805
North Dakota	8,353	7,478	8,620	10,107	10,005	10,444	10,407	9,933	11,055	9,145	10,718	10,672	10,333	8,239	7,390
South Dakota	3,066	2,730	3,154	3,254	3,355	3,755	3,858	4,022	4,359	3,562	4,001	4,051	3,818	2,806	2,514
Nebraska	3,511	3,024	3,113	3,585	3,777	4,037	4,608	4,674	5,018	4,346	4,673	4,613	4,471	3,745	3,479
Kansas	13,091	10,861	10,741	13,210	14,148	14,006	15,404	14,634	16,244	13,807	14,773	15,068	14,315	11,738	10,799
South Atlantic:															
Delaware	68	63	59	68	73	68	70	71	66	64	61	61	54	37	35
Maryland	367	323	304	395	391	376	368	361	343	292	283	283	269	210	193
Virginia	560	476	466	539	534	459	496	481	438	407	383	379	393	310	279
West Virginia	130	117	99	102	100	90	96	96	82	79	74	70	67	57	48
North Carolina	506	544	511	567	448	394	492	408	465	395	427	440	449	377	366
South Carolina	252	311	245	262	202	160	238	217	174	146	166	189	215	168	173
Georgia	204	257	200	228	198	141	198	178	140	118	105	140	173	121	106
Florida															
South Central:															
Kentucky	441	432	367	496	516	392	404	420	403	359	323	326	421	316	291
Tennessee	372	353	328	423	381	276	332	355	301	266	213	245	353	261	243
Alabama	9	18	18	25	24	15	14	15	13	13	8	14	26	30	88
Mississippi	14	12	12	25	25	16	20	16	15	9	7	18	66	45	32
Arkansas	41	31	25	65	44	38	40	34	31	27	43	115	84	96	
Louisiana															
Oklahoma	4,983	4,086	4,086	5,557	6,335	6,715	7,051	7,263	7,481	5,910	6,265	6,450	6,966	5,294	4,923
Texas	4,372	3,935	4,092	4,951	5,842	6,835	7,587	6,752	7,090	5,601	6,049	5,384	5,438	4,840	4,356
Western:															
Montana	3,820	3,373	4,147	4,507	4,147	4,426	5,183	5,201	5,975	5,283	6,274	6,230	6,185	4,962	4,761
Idaho	1,050	876	936	1,137	1,156	1,324	1,388	1,523	1,597	1,382	1,601	1,702	1,836	1,288	1,261
Wyoming	254	244	270	282	286	301	347	384	392	368	422	453	471	355	333
Colorado	1,551	1,374	1,493	1,658	1,850	2,244	2,903	3,186	3,552	3,226	3,676	3,836	4,003	3,204	3,282
New Mexico	375	388	415	463	452	542	740	682	618	584	725	649	631	528	460
Arizona	32	25	25	26	27	29	30	29	30	30	26	25	25	18	44
Utah	276	236	232	298	286	335	375	431	441	428	462	464	464	370	369
Nevada	16	14	16	16	18	19	21	21	20	19	19	20	19	14	9
Washington	2,203	1,857	2,455	2,485	2,667	2,769	2,922	2,959	3,139	2,789	3,103	3,046	3,102	2,285	2,074
Oregon	876	709	814	980	970	1,050	1,063	1,100	1,214	997	1,144	1,215	1,270	928	876
California	868	585	497	596	614	675	756	718	740	696	675	703	626	480	431
United States, total	62,705	52,998	55,982	66,189	69,191	71,577	78,314	78,345	83,905	71,287	78,048	78,337	78,789	62,569	58,284

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, New York, in 1941, had 305,000 acres planted in wheat. In 1955 the acreage planted in wheat was 339,000. That is a small increase.

New Jersey, in 1941, had 74,000 acres planted in wheat; in 1955, 76,000 acres, or about the same acreage.

Ohio, in 1941, had 1,953,000 acres planted in wheat; in 1955, 1,542,000 acres.

The wheat acreage in Indiana and Illinois decreased between 1941 and 1955. They are major wheat-producing States.

Mr. AIKEN. What were the years?

Mr. YOUNG. From 1941 to 1955—last year.

Mr. AIKEN. In 1941 wheat was selling for 5 cents a bushel for rubber production.

I think Michigan has shown a great increase, and over the years Illinois and Missouri have shown an increase. It is true that Missouri is west of the Mississippi River. I think Virginia and the Carolinas have shown increases. While the increases in the case of any particular State may not be large in the aggregate, they are large.

Mr. YOUNG. The wheat acreage in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia decreased. The increase in wheat production has occurred west of the Mississippi River.

Mr. AIKEN. In what years?

Mr. YOUNG. In any year the Senator may choose. The period covered by the table is from 1941 to 1955. The table was prepared by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. Whether they have increased or decreased, the question is whether the decrease has been sufficient to put the production back into the wheat States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Vermont remember what the parity percentage was in, say, the 1930's and the 1940's?

Mr. AIKEN. It was very low. The Senator from Indiana may recall that during the war and in the years immediately following, even as late as 1948, special incentive prices for the production of commodities were urgently needed. We were faced with the expiration of a law which had provided, up to that time, for supports ranging from 52 to 75 percent of parity for the basic commodities. However, I think 57 percent of parity was the highest level of support which was ever put into effect.

Mr. CAPEHART. In what year was that?

Mr. AIKEN. In 1948. I think the law expired on December 31, 1948, and it was necessary to enact legislation to take its place; otherwise the support would have reverted to the 52-percent level.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator recall what the parity price was from 1940 to 1948?

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, ceiling prices were in effect, because we had unloaded a heavy harvest.

Mr. CAPEHART. The OPA controlled prices during the war.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. CAPEHART. What was the price during the war?

Mr. AIKEN. It was very low; I think around 70 cents a bushel in 1940.

Mr. CAPEHART. What was the parity percentage?

Mr. AIKEN. I can soon tell the Senator, I am certain. From 1937 to 1941, the average national price of wheat was 77 cents a bushel.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator remember what the parity price was?

Mr. AIKEN. That was about 56 percent of parity; but I cannot state the price in dollars and cents.

Mr. CAPEHART. What was the parity price support on corn?

Mr. AIKEN. On corn it was about 55 or 56 percent. The first support price came, I believe, in 1933.

Mr. CAPEHART. What was the percentage of the support price on corn then?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know, offhand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the able Senator from Louisiana have those figures? I am trying to ascertain what the parity price was on corn from 1934 to 1940.

Mr. YOUNG. If the Senator will yield, I should like to read into the RECORD a statement I received from the Department of Agriculture pertaining to the first price-support program which went into operation with the act of 1938.

The price support of corn for 1938 was 70 percent. For 1939 the price support was 69 percent of parity. In 1940 it was 75 percent of parity.

Mr. CAPEHART. What was it in 1940?

Mr. YOUNG. Seventy-five percent of parity.

Mr. CAPEHART. What was it in 1941?

Mr. YOUNG. I do not have that information. The Steagall amendment went into effect.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Steagall legislation became effective at about that time and raised to 90 percent the price-support level on all commodities for which the Secretary of Agriculture had asked increased production.

Mr. CAPEHART. That was for the purpose of war production, was it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That was on nonbasics only. I put that information into the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. CAPEHART. On nonbasics?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. What was it on basics?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was placed at 85 percent in early 1941.

Mr. CAPEHART. On basics?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish the Senator from Louisiana would check that. I do not think that is the situation at all. The Steagall legislation rovided 90 percent of parity price supports as a minimum.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Senator from New Mexico would check it himself. I put that information in the RECORD yesterday. As a matter of fact, the first amendment raising support levels was just before the war; a minimum support level of 85 percent of parity on the then basics was put into effect so as to bring the prices to the farmers up. It was only after the war began that President Roosevelt acted——

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean after the war started?

Mr. ELLENDER. After the war started, in 1942, President Roosevelt requested in a special message that a ceiling should be placed on the prices of farm commodities, and that ceiling was put at 100 percent.

Mr. CAPEHART. That was the OPA ceiling.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. He also stated that, in order to protect the farmer after the war, the support price should be set at 90 percent for a reasonable period after hostilities ended.

Mr. CAPEHART. That was for 2 years after the war.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That was not put in a farm bill, but in the Stabilization Act.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, Congress provided for 90-percent supports for the basic commodities during the war and for 2 years thereafter. As I recall, the Steagall amendment did not restrict the administration and did not limit it, because I know the price received for milk was running at about 130 percent of parity.

Mr. CAPEHART. Was the purpose of putting 90 percent of parity support prices into effect during the war to increase production?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; to guarantee that the producer, if he increased his production drastically and the war should end suddenly, would not be left holding the bag.

Mr. CAPEHART. The farmer had 2 years' grace.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. What figure was it understood the prices would return to?

Mr. AIKEN. Had there been no legislation, they would have returned to the figures of the 1938 Agricultural Act, which provided supports from 52 to 75 percent of parity for basic commodities. I do not recall offhand whether any price was fixed for the nonbasic commodities.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why was not the issue of 90 percent of parity versus 52 to 75 percent of parity a controversial subject in those days?

Mr. AIKEN. Congress enacted the act of 1948, which provided supports should be raised so that, for practical purposes, they were 72 to 90 percent of parity. The bill was finally approved in this chamber on the morning of the 20th of June 1948, at 6 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. CAPEHART. I remember that very well.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to complete the statement I have prepared.

Let us consider what high rigid supports have done for the corn grower.

As wheat and cotton producers have had their acreage cut, they have planted such acreage to crops competitive with corn.

Over 16 million acres of land diverted from wheat and cotton have been planted to feed grains competitive with corn in

the last 2 years. These millions of acres have produced approximately 800 million bushels of feed grain. This production on diverted acres has resulted in controls over corn, even though corn did not increase its own planting. Corn is the direct victim of an unsound Government policy. Except for the production of feed grains on diverted acres, the corn supply would be in perfect balance today.

Have high rigid supports maintained the price for corn? Certainly not. The support price for corn this year was 87 percent of parity. The actual farm price for corn was 67 percent of parity.

Again I emphasize the fact that the level of support does not necessarily have too much to do with the price the farmer receives, particularly with respect to those commodities as to which only a percentage of the producers can qualify for supports, anyway.

The disparity between what the farmer did receive and should have received is due to the production of feed grains on diverted acres.

The low price for corn can be charged directly against rigid supports for wheat and cotton.

The rice grower, a supposed beneficiary from rigid supports, has seen his acreage cut from 2,600,000 acres to 1,600,000 in 2 years' time.

His outlook for foreign markets at this time looks dubious.

The hog raiser has seen his price knocked down from $20 a hundred to $12 a hundred in 1 year's time, simply because the high rigid supports for wheat resulted in excess production of feed grains on diverted acres.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall yield as soon as I complete one more sentence.

The whole Midwest farm economy, which should be stable today, has been disrupted by the effect of high rigid supports for the producers of other crops.

Now I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator had touched on the rice question. That was why I was rude enough to interrupt him.

So far as rice was concerned, let me say that the committee recognized the problem. We also recognized that rice was not one of the major crops. Therefore, we wrote into the bill a provision for a trial run of a two-price system. It is an experiment to see whether it is possible to have an arrangement whereby a crop such as rice can be sold on the domestic market at 90 percent support prices and can be sold at a different price on foreign markets. It is a trial run.

The Senator has not made any mention of what we are trying to do in the bill with regard to rice.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not make any mention of the two-price provision included in the committee bill because I have the feeling that before the debate is over, we are going to run into vigorous and violent opposition to that experiment. Already foreign countries are raising the roof and threatening retaliation with respect to other exported commodities if we undertake to flood the world market with rice at cut rates. I am in favor of selling our surplus rice. I think we ought to sell it, and not hold a red flag in front of other rice-producing countries of the world and say that we are going to dump it on their markets. We do not need to advertise it. Let us simply sell it and take our licking.

Mr. THYE. It is true that if we are going to sell on any international market we shall have to, as we have done under the International Wheat Agreement, subsidize some of our exports, or we shall have to resort to a two-price system. We are trying to have a trial run of a two-price system on rice. I do not think we should run for cover merely because we are going to meet with opposition or because somebody raises an objection. That would be legislating under pressure, and I, for one, have never been of the frame of mind that I would legislate under pressure.

In the case of rice, I think our two-price system will give us an opportunity to make a trial run to see whether the United States can maintain somewhere near the parity price in the case of the rice consumed in the United States, whereas our surplus production of rice will be sold competitively in the world market at a price the world market will be willing to offer for it.

Mr. AIKEN. If we are to undertake to sell our commodities in the world market on a two-price system, I think rice is a good commodity with which to try that out. I am glad the program is for only 2 years.

However, I think it would be much better to sell our rice in the world market in the same way we have sold almost a million bales of cotton in the last 5 or 6 weeks, instead of advertising the fact that we are going to unload the rice for whatever we can obtain in the world market. In that event, we shall be inviting two-price systems and dumping on the part of other countries, and we shall be inviting retaliation against our fruitgrowers and our growers of other export commodities.

Mr. THYE. However, we do not necessarily need to apologize for the results of the subsidized International Wheat Agreement, do we?

Mr. AIKEN. No. Of course, when we raise more than we need for our own families, I know it is human nature to sell the surplus for what we can get; and that is what is proposed in this case.

Mr. THYE. But the Senator from Vermont has not grasped my question. Is it not true that there has not been too much unpleasantness in connection with the International Wheat Agreement, by which we have subsidized and put into international channels wheat produced in the United States, and have done so at a price less than the price the domestic processor is willing to pay for the wheat?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether the International Wheat Agreement will be continued or not. I had hoped it would be continued. I had thought it was a good experiment. We have tried it for 6 years, I believe. But Great Britain has not been willing to participate any further in the agreement. Apparently she thinks she can obtain the wheat she needs at a lower price if she does not participate in the agreement.

During the last year we have subsidized wheat at the rate of approximately 75 cents a bushel, during the time the International Wheat Agreement has been in effect. We have spent $800 million in subsidizing the wheat sold through the International Wheat Agreement.

Probably, as the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, if, beginning with the time when we began to participate in the International Wheat Agreement, we had devoted the amount of money it has cost us to the operation of a soil bank, we would be better off today.

Mr. THYE. Like the old Chinese proverb: "Look back, that you may have the wisdom to look ahead intelligently."

So it is well for all of us to examine past events, as we consider the new plans.

The soil bank is the first realistic approach to resolving our surpluses of agricultural commodities. I believe that once the soil bank is given sufficient time to reduce effectively the total acres harvested, we shall be on the way to giving the farmer parity in the market place. But in the meantime, we have a problem confronting us.

Since the Secretary of Agriculture is announcing reduced supports for corn and the other basic commodities in 1956, we propose that the program of 90 percent of parity be renewed until the soil-bank program has had an opportunity to work.

Mr. AIKEN. If we can succeed in having 15 million or 20 million acres of land removed from the production of the basic crops this year, that will be a major step toward accomplishing the purpose with which the Senator from Minnesota and I are in full agreement.

Mr. THYE. I think the soil-bank approach is sounder than the one we have tried thus far.

Mr. AIKEN. But it is human nature, of course, to try many wrong ways before we finally hit on the right way to proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Vermont think that, in the case of our basic crops, we shall ever be able to compete with foreign producers, unless we employ some kind of subsidy?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know that anyone can answer that question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would not the Senator from Vermont answer the question in the negative—in short, that we could not compete without having some sort of subsidy?

Mr. AIKEN. Today, we are subsidizing peanuts by reason of putting 50,000 to 100,000 tons into oil each year.

We are subsidizing wheat through the International Wheat Agreement.

As yet, we are not subsidizing tobacco.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, will not the Senator from Vermont concede that since our living standards are so very

much higher than the standards of living one finds in, let us say, Mexico, Peru, or Pakistan, it would be almost impossible for the farmers in the United States who produce, let us say, cotton to sell it in competition with the cotton produced in those countries, unless we have a subsidy arrangement?

Mr. AIKEN. We have been producing cotton in competition with the cotton produced in other countries. About 6 weeks ago we began cutting the price of some of our lower grades of cotton which are being sold in the world market. I do not believe we are as yet subsidizing the higher grades of cotton. However, we are losing the world market by reason of having American promoters, if I may use that term, go into other countries, where everything is cheaper, and produce cotton in competition with the cotton produced in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the case of that cotton, is it not true that the Commodity Credit Corporation is taking a loss of from $45 to $50 a bale?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Commodity Credit Corporation is taking a substantial loss. However, I believe we could produce any quantity of cotton in the United States in competition with the cotton produced in any other part of the world, if the growers in our cotton-producing areas were permitted to produce without restriction. But we have been basing our cotton-support program on the requirements of the more uneconomic producers; and I do not believe we can support them properly, even if we put the support level for cotton at 200 percent of parity; I still do not think they could make a good living.

In some of the old cotton-producing areas, it probably costs the small producers 30 cents a pound to produce cotton today. But in the United States there are great areas which are restricted as regards the production of cotton, but which could produce the same cotton at a cost of from 15 to 25 cents a pound; and the cotton produced in those areas of the United States—for instance, in New Mexico, Arizona, west Texas, California, the delta area of Missouri, Arkansas, and Mississippi, and, I believe, to some extent in Louisiana—can compete any day in the world market with cotton produced in other countries.

But the small producer who lives in the old cotton-producing area, where cotton has been grown continuously for 150 years, probably cannot compete in the world market without having a generous subsidy.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know of an area in the United States that can compete costwise with Mexico, Peru, or Brazil, insofar as the production of cotton is concerned, particularly if these countries continue to show a willingness to employ various artificial devices in order to keep their export markets.

Mr. AIKEN. But the cotton produced in the parts of the United States to which I have referred is competing not only with the cotton produced in those foreign countries, but also with synthetics which are produced here at home.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the case of wheat, does the Senator from Vermont think it is possible without the payment of a subsidy for wheat produced in the United States to compete with wheat produced in Canada and with wheat produced in other countries which normally produce wheat, such as Australia?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; and I think that as regards the sale of wheat to the purchasing countries of the world, Canada has adhered almost exactly to our own prices.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont knows that wheat is virtually running out of the ears of the Canadian farmers, and is being sold by them much cheaper than we can sell it.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, to some extent, but it must require a great deal of restraint on the part of the Canadians to keep from unloading that wheat on the market for whatever amount they can obtain for it, and thus cutting the ground from under us. However, the Canadians have not done that so far. I think we owe them a debt of gratitude because they have refrained from mercilessly dumping their surplus wheat on the world market.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would become of the wheat producers of America, assuming that we had a normal supply on hand, without support prices? Does the Senator think the wheat producers of America could increase exports without the International Wheat Agreement?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think we are likely to do so so long as we have 1 billion bushels of surplus wheat hanging over the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. My question was predicated upon normal production, and normal supply on hand—not the huge surplus we now have. The question I am asking is this: Could the wheat farmers of America compete with other countries without our Government helping them in some way, by way of the Wheat Agreement, or some kind of subsidy?

Mr. AIKEN. The answer is the same as in the case of cottongrowers. Some of them could and some could not.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that most could not.

Mr. AIKEN. For many years we have been basing our farm-support programs on the requirements of the more uneconomic producers. That has been a laudable effort to try to maintain a living income for those people. However, times have changed. The Senator from Louisiana probably knows of women who were doing an excellent business as beauticians. Then the home permanent came along and put them out of a job. They had to do something else. Many farmers have had to do the same thing.

I do not believe we help ourselves as a nation when we try to base our programs on our most uneconomic production, when we have areas that can produce in competition with any other part of the world. I do not think our cottongrowers of the South and the West, or our wheat producers of the Great Plains need to take a back seat to any producers in the world when it comes to efficiency and economical production.

Mr. ELLENDER. My good friend would be surprised to learn how much more cheaply cotton can be grown just across the Rio Grande in Mexico than on similar lands in Texas.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Also, in Pakistan and Brazil it can be grown much more cheaply than it can be produced in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. With labor in other countries receiving about the equivalent of 15 cents an hour, how does the Senator figure that American farmers can compete with them and maintain our living standards.

Mr. AIKEN. I can remember when the same situation prevailed on our northern border, when labor received only a fraction as much north of the border, in Canada, as it was paid in the United States; when milk sold for less than half what it sold for in the United States. Potatoes sold for 25 percent of what they were bringing in the United States. That seems like only yesterday. However, today when we go into Canada, we find that prices for labor, milk, beef, and almost everything else, are identical with our prices. I hope before many years the Mexicans will reach that stage in their standard of living, and that their earnings will become comparable with ours. In the meantime, I agree with the Senator that cotton can be produced a great deal more cheaply in Lower California than it can be produced anywhere in the United States. It not only can be produced more cheaply, but is produced more cheaply. However, there is a limit to how far they can go.

Mr. President, I wish to continue where I left off.

The dairyman too had rigid 90-percent supports until the spring of 1954. What happened to him? During a period of 10 years, the per capita consumption of milk dropped from 816 pounds to 639 pounds. The butter market dropped off 500 million pounds and the use of substitutes increased.

If we had today the per capita consumption for dairy products that we had in 1942, we would need more than 15 billion pounds more of milk production today to meet the demand.

In the spring of 1954, Government owned 1,600,000,000 pounds of dairy products. This surplus was steadily accumulating in the face of steadily diminishing consumption.

Flexible supports for dairy products were put into effect in 1954. The Government surplus, except for cheese, has virtually disappeared.

Our supply of butter owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation has gone down from 500 million pounds to 30 million pounds, only a week ago.

The consumption of milk has increased more than 20 pounds per capita in the past 2 years. It is still increasing.

Total consumption of milk has increased more than 10 billion pounds in 2 years' time. We are nearly in balance. In 1955, for the first time in years, America consumed more butter than it produced.

The dairy farmers of America have done a splendid job for themselves, and can do still better as time goes on.

In the face of this conclusive evidence as to what rigid supports have done to

the American farmer, we still have a clamor for the continuance of this type of program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield. I thought the Senator from Minnesota would soon be on his feet.

Mr. THYE. I thought I saw the Senator from Vermont look over his shoulder to see whether or not I would arise.

Mr. AIKEN. I am amazed at the delay, to tell the truth. [Laughter.]

Mr. THYE. Inasmuch as the Senator was looking for me, I did not wish to disappoint him.

In all seriousness, I join the Senator from Vermont in paying tribute to the farmer for having in conjunction with other producers of the Nation, assessed himself so much a pound of milk, or dairy products delivered to the creamery or cheese factory, in order to raise an advertising campaign fund. The dairy farmers have employed all proper methods of selling their products. Of course they should have done so. That sort of campaigning was not needed during the war. There was an embargo to prevent the export of fats and oils, because we were in short supply in the United States.

But when we passed from the war period into the period when we commenced to add to the surplus, it was then that the producer groups reorganized themselves, and began to raise a fund for advertising. The dairy farmers are doing an excellent job.

There is no one more intelligent in his approach to the farm problem than is the Senator from Vermont. He is quite capable of taking care of himself in any debate on the farm question. The Senator from Vermont knows that the heat of last summer in the New England area caused a drought which resulted in shortage of pasture and feed. The increased consumption of fluid milk and ice cream did more to reduce the supply of fluid milk and increase consumption, and lessen the amount of milk going into butter, than did any price support factor.

I should like to run through the years and show the record of payments per hundredweight by the Twin Cities Milk Producers Organization for milk of 3½ percent butterfat. This is one of the largest cooperative organizations in the Nation. No private corporation profits are taken out of these prices. Incidentally, this year more than 8,000 farmers are grouped in the Twin Cities Milk Producers Organization.

Going over the figures for the various years, it is interesting to note that in 1946 the producers received $3.62 a hundred for 3½ percent butterfat milk; in 1947, $3.615; in 1948, $3.959; in 1949, $2.916; in 1950, $2.928.

Then, when we got into the Korean war, in 1951 the price jumped to $3.441; in 1952, $3.777; in 1953, $3.264. In 1954 the full flex came into operation. That is when the support prices went from 90 percent down to 75 percent. In the calendar year between 1953 and 1954 the price dropped from $3.264 to $2.916. That represents a drop of more than 30 cents a hundred. In fact, it is 35 cents a hundredweight.

The producers never regained that loss. The price has remained down. The consumer has not received any benefit. Most of the disappearance of powdered milk represents powdered milk which went into feed mixes. It did not go into human consumptive channels.

In 1955 the Twin Cities Milk Producers Organization paid $2.888, or slightly less than $2.89.

Mr. AIKEN. That is not for fluid milk, is it?

Mr. THYE. That is the Twin Cities Milk Producers price paid to members for manfacturing No. 1 grade milk, 3.5 butterfat, delivered at the plant.

Mr. AIKEN. That is what I wanted to make sure, that it was not for fluid milk, but for manufacturing milk.

Mr. THYE. That is for manufacturing milk. That is what we must consider, because it is the manufacturing milk to which the 90-percent parity formula was applied. It was not applied to the Federal milk orders in existence in the large cities of Vermont, Massachusetts, New York, Maryland, Tennessee, and in other cities.

Mr. AIKEN. How does the Senator explain the fact that a great cooperative like Twin Cities would pay only $2.87 for manufacturing milk when the support price was $3.15?

Mr. THYE. That is exactly what I am getting at, that even after they got into the new parity formula, the 75 percent formula did not give them the 75 percent we had expected it would, because if it had given it to them, they would have received $3.15 a hundred. That is what they were supposed to get under the 75-percent parity formula, but it did not figure out that way.

In order to give the Senator further information along that line, if we take some of the creameries or cheese factories of the cooperatives affiliated with Land-O-Lakes, which is one of the largest marketing organizations in the world, and convert that price, we will find that in 1953 the price was $3.27, and in 1954—which was after the flex went in—it dropped to $2.97. If we subtract, we find that there was a 30-cent drop in those years.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct, but——

Mr. THYE. Under the so-called revised or new parity formula the Secretary can say, "We are going to give the producers 83 percent of parity." But even when he fixes it at 83 percent of parity under the new parity formula, it is not the equivalent of the 75-percent parity paid under the formula which was in effect 2 years ago.

The Senator and I must consider these figures before we can understand what we are talking about. Some people have painted a very rosy picture. But it is not good. In spite of the reduced price, the producer, in order to meet his obligations and pay his bills, has increased his production per cow, and has increased his number of cows, the national production is up.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator from Minnesota, in submitting the figures with respect to the amount paid by cooperatives in his State for manufacturing milk, pointed out one of the dairy farmers' major problems. Although the Commodity Credit Corporation pays to creameries—cooperative as well as proprietary—a price for manufactured products which should reflect $3.15 per hundredweight to the producer, the producer nevertheless is not getting that price. In some cases I can understand the reason for that. I know that some cooperatives have gotten into rather bad financial shape. In the last 2 or 3 years they have been improving their situation. It is probably wise that they should follow such a course. Nevertheless, the time has come when we should examine the situation, to make sure that the cooperatives are not building up excessive reserves, and returning too small an amount of cash to the producer. It is essential that we have adequate reserves, of course, and I agree with that.

Mr. THYE. Also——

Mr. AIKEN. I want to assure the Senator from Minnesota that Minnesota is not the only State having trouble in that direction.

Mr. THYE. I wish to assure my distinguished friend from Vermont that the Twin Cities milk producers, in the first instance, do not do that, because it would put them in jeopardy with their income tax exemption.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Secondly, they have an excellent financial record, and always have had.

Mr. AIKEN. It may be that they are paying a little better price for fluid milk. I have had the feeling for some time, although not with regard to this particular cooperative——

Mr. THYE. I can tell the Senator exactly what the situation is, so that he can determine for himself. The price of grade AA fluid milk, which is delivered at the Twin Cities plant, before any freight is charged, is $3.80. Then it varies depending on what station it comes from.

If the milk comes from Lake Elmo, which is some distance away, the price is $3.70. From Farmington, it is $3.70, and from River Falls, Wis., it is $3.69. That, of course, is fluid milk which is sold to the consumers of St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn., embracing an area where there are two large cities. When we come to manufacturing milk No. 1—and we must recognize that that is really the kind of milk of which there is a surplus—the price of manufacturing milk No. 1 was $2.98 as of December 1955. Manufacturing milk No. 2—and a great deal of milk goes into No. 2—was only $2.89. Therefore there is no question about the figures with respect to either Twin Cities or Land O' Lakes, and those are probably the best dairying organizations from the standpoint of management.

Mr. AIKEN. They may have had some expansions, and some reductions were made for those expansions.

Mr. THYE. No; that is not correct. I can go back month by month for the past 5 years, if the Senator desires, to show that that is not the case. What I have stated shows how serious the situation is to the dairy farmer in Wisconsin, northern Michigan, Minnesota, and in the eastern part of the Dakotas and in the northern part of Iowa, where milk

must go into manufacturing if it is to find a market.

In that area there are not the large cities that take the fluid milk, which is the situation in areas like Washington, Boston, Baltimore, New York City, and Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. AIKEN. I can assure the Senator from Minnesota that I have been very much concerned over the price of manufacturing milk in the area to which he has referred, because the average price for the whole country for 1955 was $3.22 a hundredweight; yet there seems to be an area, one of our greatest producing areas, where milk is not receiving the full support price.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure that we should not revise our methods of figuring the value of manufacturing milk and tie it to the value of fluid milk to a greater extent than has been done up to now. I do not know how to work that out, but I have been thinking about it.

Mr. THYE. If there is an area in agriculture which needs thorough study, it is the entire milk industry, particularly in view of the fact that Federal orders have come into the picture. Of course, without Federal orders we would have chaos in the market, because competition would be introduced, and when that occurred the market would eventually be destroyed, and there would be price wars, and adequate sanitary standards would not be maintained. Therefore, the Federal orders are a necessity in the major markets. However, they in themselves have become a barrier, and in certain milksheds no milk can come in except as it is permitted to come in. Therefore, we must have a study made.

But outside of the big fluid milk market, there are many dairy producers who are in serious trouble because of the costs of handling a dairy herd in these days when labor is scarce and the producers have to pay exceedingly high wages to get herdsmen to whom they can entrust valuable dairy herds. So they are today in jeopardy, and many of them are young farmers with limited capital.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct in saying that dairying is a major field of agriculture which requires study. It should be studied without much delay. We are now getting such a large percentage of milk under marketing orders that the composite price received could well be used for fixing a more rational price for manufactured milk. I assure the Senator that I have been studying this subject. I have been gathering statistics on it, as I know the Senator has also.

Mr. THYE. Yes; I have.

Mr. AIKEN. Although the figures may not be exactly correct, the intent is good, and it is something we should follow. It would do away with the feeling that one area is being prejudiced to the benefit of other areas. There are grounds for believing that today. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that we must do something about it. I know he is thinking along the same lines as I am at this time.

Mr. President, to restore rigid support prices today would be the same as trying to cure a man suffering from snakebite by letting the same snake bite him again.

Who is it that wants rigid support prices restored?

First, there are those who sincerely believe that such a course will raise farm income;

Second, those who are making fortunes out of the storage of Government surpluses; and

Third, those who want a completely regimented agriculture in America and know that their best chance of achieving this rests in maintaining enormous price-breaking surpluses in the hands of Government.

Yes, Mr. President, virtually every dollar of drop in farm income since 1947 can be laid at the door of high rigid support prices.

Do we want to continue on this course?

Do we want to price the rest of our export commodities out of the world market?

Do we want to force the greater use of substitutes and synthetics?

Do we want to deprive the American farmer of the freedom of choice in managing his own farm?

Shall we insist that he come to the seat of government on bended knee and with bowed head for the support of his family?

If this is what we want, then we will vote to continue the rigid support program.

But the best way is to face the facts and to do all we have to do, even though it may be painful at times, to provide for the future of the Nation, and to provide for a prosperous, productive, and free America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which I wrote to President Eisenhower on February 7, asking as to his position in regard to the reestablishment of high rigid price supports, and also a copy of his reply, which was sent to me under date of February 8.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1956.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In our consideration of pending nine-point farm program, we have some uncertainty as to your position with reference to including with the soil-bank proposals other provisions which would reestablish high rigid price supports.

It would be of great value at this time to have your views on this basic matter.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1956.

The Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Your letter of February 7 poses a question of great importance, and I am glad to comment on it.

You know, of course, the genesis of our soil-bank proposals. As long as we go on accumulating surpluses, thereby depressing agricultural markets more and more, it will be impossible for our farming people to share fairly in the Nation's growing prosperity. In order to have a free, prosperous agriculture, we must deal effectively with the problem of these surpluses. It is principally for this purpose that we have proposed the soil bank.

Of course, these price-depressing surpluses themselves are largely the result of high rigid price supports of wartime, too long continued in time of peace. It would be inconsistent to enact a soil-bank program and, at the same time, reestablish production incentives that would again fill Government warehouses, again depress prices, and thus defeat the main object of the soil bank.

I realize that there is always room for varying opinions on how best to resolve public problems. Nevertheless, in this instance, I must say that I should be gravely concerned if the soil bank should be coupled with the restitution of production incentives certain to nullify the great benefits that the bank can bring.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the minority views of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

The Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee (1) by the narrow margin of 8 to 7 voted for returning to rigid 90 percent mandatory price support without regard to the size of surpluses for cotton, corn, and peanuts for 1956 and 1957. (Also the committee voted for rigid 90 percent mandatory price support on mill-quality wheat which as now defined will qualify nearly all wheat seeded) and (2) voted for continuing old parity for any so-called basic commodity if it is higher than modernized parity. In 1954 90 percent mandatory rigid price supports, without regard to the size of surpluses, were defeated in the Senate by a vote of 49 to 44.

Thus through S. 3183 the majority of the committee is again asking the Senate to approve farm legislation which the Senate has considered previously and which it has determined is against the interests of farmers and ranchers in particular and the public in general.

Title I of the bill directs that the commodities wheat, cotton, and corn, which are in serious oversupply situation, be supported at levels which will continue to stimulate wasteful overproduction. Likewise, it directs the support of peanuts at a level which will encourage overproduction.

Title II (the soil-bank provision) contradicts title I and directs that farmers go in the opposite direction by lowering production to help bring supplies into balance with demand. Thus the bill, on the one hand, proposes to raise the level of price support and thereby stimulate production and, on the other hand, it proposes a soil bank which is intended to reduce production and dispose of surpluses. How production can be stimulated and reduced at the same time, we don't know. Even Joshua only commanded the sun to stand still. As bold as Joshua was, he wasn't so foolish as to command that the sun stand still and simultaneously both rise and set. The continuation of wartime incentive levels of price support nullifies the good points of the proposed legislation aimed at bringing supply and demand into a healthy balance.

Going back to 90 percent rigid price supports, regardless of how high surpluses pile up, is like eating more green apples to cure a stomach ache caused by eating green apples.

The evidence is overwhelming: At the outset of World War II, Congress raised price

supports from a range of 52 to 75 percent of parity to 90 percent of parity in order to encourage allout production for insatiable war demand—production shot up.

Continuation of those wartime incentive levels for more than 10 years after the war has smothered farmers in an avalanche of surpluses. No wonder prices have sagged. No wonder the net income of farmers has gone down. There isn't any business that can be operated successfully on the basis of pouring more and more resources into production at a time when markets are contracting due to an adjustment from wartime to peacetime levels. Increased production in agriculture has been encouraged by Government intervention at a time when incentives to produce should have been gradually lowered to encourage adjustment to peacetime demands. Farmers and ranchers see clearly that rigid 90 percent supports on the basic commodities in the fact of mounting surpluses are doing them more harm than good. We have gotten into trouble by extending 90 percent supports year after year. Flexible supports haven't been given a chance to help guide production and consumption. Farmers and ranchers are being hurt by the Government continuing to provide an incentive to increase production of unneeded commodities, by curtailing the movement of production into domestic and foreign markets, and by piling up income-depressing surpluses in Government hands.

Net farm income has continued to decline despite 90 percent rigid price supports. Flexible supports are only being put into effect on some commodities for the first time in 1956. The law didn't allow flexible supports to be put into effect until the harvesting of the 1955 crops last fall and only then on a very limited basis. The following table shows the levels of price supports on basic commodities that were in effect in 1954 and 1955.

Level of price support

Commodity	Unit	Beginning of marketing season	1954		1955	
			Average support price	Support level, percent of parity	Average support price	Support level, percent of parity
Wheat	Bushel	July	$2.24	90	$2.08	82
Corn	do	October	1.62	90	1.58	87
Cotton (upland)	Pound	August	.3158	90	.3170	90
Peanuts	do	do	.122	90	.122	90
Rice	Hundredweight	do	4.92	91	4.66	86
Tobacco:						
Flue-cured	Pound	July	.479	90	.483	91
Burley	do	October	.464	91	.462	91
Other				[1] 90		[1] 90

[1] Generally 90 percent

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture release, October 1955.

The foregoing table clearly shows that for practical purposes rigid high price supports have been in effect up to the present time.

The following table shows what has happened to net farm income for the past 15 years:

Realized net farm income from farming

	Billions of dollars	
1940	4.3	
1941	6.2	
1942	8.8	World War II.
1943	11.9	
1944	12.2	
1945	12.9	
1946	15.0	Postwar reconstruction in Europe and domestic shortages of nonagricultural consumer goods.
1947	17.2	
1948	15.9	
1949	13.7	
1950:		
1st quarter	12.8	
2d quarter	12.1	Korean war against communism begins.
3d quarter	12.7	
4th quarter	13.8	
1951:		
1st quarter	14.0	
2d quarter	14.7	
3d quarter	14.9	
4th quarter	15.6	Korea.
1952:		
1st quarter	13.4	
2d quarter	14.1	
3d quarter	15.9	
4th quarter	12.8	
1953:		
1st quarter	13.6	
2d quarter	13.6	Korean war stalemated.
3d quarter	13.2	
4th quarter	13.2	
1954:		
1st quarter	13.2	
2d quarter	11.3	
3d quarter	11.4	
4th quarter	11.3	
1955:		
1st quarter	11.2	
2d quarter	10.7	
3d quarter	10.2	
4th quarter	10.2	

Source: USDA Farm Income Situation, Dec. 16, 1955.

High rigid supports have been in effect practically all of this time. Farmers know that war demand caused prices and net farm income to shoot up. They do not want to resume the sacrifices of war. The following chart gives a clear picture of how war has affected net farm income.

SURPLUSES PILE UP

Surpluses were beginning to get out of hand just before Korea. Even while the war against the Communists was going on in Korea, the stimulus to overproduction was causing surpluses to mount higher and higher. Also, the incentive to produce has been so great that production has increased while large parts of the country suffered from drought. A combination of drought, production controls, and Government-induced surpluses has brought real hardship to farmers in many areas.

Carryover of selected basic commodities

	Wheat	Cotton	Corn
	Millions of bushels	*Millions of bales*	*Millions of bushels*
1948	196	2.991	124
1949	307	5.218	813
1950	425	6.749	845
1951	396	2.166	739
1952	256	2.720	487
1953	562	5.512	769
1954	902	9.653	920
1955	1,020	11.140	1,024
1956	1,050	14.000	1,200

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

As surpluses grow higher and expenditures mount, the borrowing authority of CCC is being sharply increased.

CCC borrowing authority increases

	Billions
Aug. 12, 1945	$4.750
June 28, 1950	6.750
Mar. 20, 1954	8.500
Aug. 31, 1954	10.000
Aug. 11, 1955	12.000

Source: Commodity Credit Corporation.

As of December 1955, $10.992 million of these funds was in use.

By disposing of surpluses through (1) the International Wheat Agreement, (2) the use of a part of duties on imports, (3) the International Cooperation Administration and predecessor agencies, and (4) similar devices, the Commodity Credit Corporation does not reflect on its books much of the loss which finally shows up in taxes and the public debt.

Costs of storage alone are now more than $1 million per day.

NOTE.—For further facts in regard to agricultural development see appendix A.

RESPONSIBLE OPINION FAVORS FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS

The great majority of informed opinion favors flexible price supports. Every Secretary of Agriculture for the past 25 years has recommended flexible supports. The major general farm organizations, representing most of the farmers, have rejected rigid supports as unsound.

The only general farm organization in the United States which has a member-State organization in each 1 of the 48 States overwhelmingly favors flexible price supports. In its convention last December, only 39 voting delegates out of 163 favored rigid supports. This organization, representing over 1,600,000 farm families and a steadily increasing membership, favors price supports as a method of avoiding the dumping of a full year's harvest on the market at one time. It looks upon price supports as a method of helping farmers to market their commodities in an orderly manner over a 12-month period. However, it does not consider it the responsibility of the Government to guarantee profitable prices to any group. These farmers recognize that real farm income cannot be protected by policies which draw excessive resources into agriculture, create unmanageable surpluses, or cause artificial prices to be capitalized into land values. Farmers themselves insist that it should be recognized that (a) a Government storehouse is not a market and (b) that farmers cannot get fair prices for farm products in the market place as long as we are faced with surpluses of such products.

Farmers want national policies affecting farm production and marketing to promote a realistic balance between markets and productive capacity. They recognize we have a greatly expanded productive plant and reduced foreign markets. Any program which has the result of expanding agricultural output in the absence of a comparable increase in effective market demand is contrary to the interests of farmers. Likewise, programs which induce producers to continue inefficient production render a disservice to agriculture by contributing to the accumulation of surpluses, raising the average cost of production and limiting production per man—all of which tend to limit the opportunity of farm people to earn a good income.

Livestock producers, through their associations, have consistently rejected not only rigid price supports but price supports of any kind. Poultrymen, vegetable growers, fruit growers, and many others, speaking through their associations, likewise oppose rigid high price supports.

Economists are practically unanimous that the long-run interests of farmers are harmed by rigid supports. The thorough studies by Department of Agriculture experts in 1946 1947, and 1948, and again in 1953, 1954, and 1955, came to the firm conclusion that rigid wartime supports designed to stimulate production for war needs, were incompatible with a peacetime economy.

FARMERS GAIN INCOME WITH LOWER SUPPORTS

Corn

Some people insist that lower supports will lower farmers' net income. Henry Wallace,

former Secretary of Agriculture (1933–40), in November 1955, had this to say:

"Eighteen months or so ago when hogs were around $26 a hundred I said the Corn Belt farmer ought to be happy with $16 hogs and $1.20 corn as a 10-year average provided other things did not go up in price. This is not 90 percent of parity. It is not even 80 percent of parity.

"The truth of the matter is, and every well-informed person in the Middle West and Northwest knows it, we now have far too many acres of land in grain of all kinds and especially so in wheat. Radical steps will have to be taken soon if the ever-normal granary and commodity-loan system is not to be destroyed.

"I believe the Corn Belt farmer stands to gain in income if the loan is usually made at somewhat less than 90 percent of parity. The reason why I believe in a loan for corn which is usually less than 90 percent of parity is twofold—first, corn is being produced with less cost per bushel as a result of new techniques. Second, the consumption of livestock products can be greatly increased if the price is not too high."

AGRICULTURAL ACTS OF 1948 AND 1949

Widespread misunderstanding exists with regard to the economic and political facts surrounding the passage of the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949 which were designed to carry out in the postwar period the idea of assisting farmers to market their commodities in an orderly manner throughout the marketing year.

The Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949, which constitute the basic price support and adjustment program authority, were designed to provide farmers governmental assistance in adjusting production to effective demand.

It should be borne in mind that this legislation was evolved during a period after World War II that resembled in many ways the current period. Then, as now, we had moved out of a shooting-war situation into a postwar type of economic setting. Then, as now, we had our agricultural plant overexpanded and were confronted with reduced foreign demand. The year 1947 was one of extensive farm program studies just as 1955 was.

On April 21, 1947, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Secretary of Agriculture, said:

"We need to develop a long-range system of commodity price floors to protect producers against excessive or abnormal declines during the market season and to generally cushion declines in farm prices and incomes in the event of business recessions. We should make sure, however, that we do not establish a rigid system of price relationships * * *. Prices are and should be an effective means of encouraging changes in production as the conditions of production and demand change."

In 1947, in response to questioning by members of the Senate Committee of Agriculture and Forestry, Carl C. Farrington, speaking as chairman of the Department's Committee on Price Policy and Production Adjustment, said:

"We have given much thought to the percentage of modernized parity which might be used as a minimum price floor. Our studies indicate that 50 percent of parity, for example, might not be high enough to act as an effective stop-loss mechanism, and 90 percent might force us into a completely managed agricultural economy."

President Truman sent a message to the Congress on May 14, 1948. In it he asked for flexible price supports in these words:

"Many shifts in production will have to be made and flexible price supports will help us make them in an orderly manner. This will require authority to make prompt adjustments in support levels in line with current and prospective supply-and-demand conditions. It will also require flexibility in the choice of methods or programs that are designed to be most effective for individual commodities, that avoid waste, and that help bring about needed adjustments in production, distribution, and consumption."

Both the Republic and Democratic Party platforms in 1948 were straightforward in their endorsement of the basic principles of the Agricultural Act of 1948, including flexible price supports.

Both candidates for President campaigned in support of flexible price supports. In a speech which President Truman delivered at Springfield, Ill., on October 12, just prior to the November 2, 1948, election, he said:

"Here are the main outlines of the agricultural program we must have:

"1. We must have on a permanent basis a system of flexible price supports for agricultural commodities. Price supports and related measures help us keep our farm production adjusted to shifting market requirements."

The President's Council of Economic Advisers on January 7, 1949, submitted an economic review under the heading, "Farm Price Supports," in which they used these words:

"Intercommodity price relationships must be kept consistent with basic trends in demand and supply conditions. To the maximum extent possible parity-price relationships and support-price programs should encourage shifts to those commodities that are most wanted. Rigid systems of support, in violation of this principle, can only lead to rigid systems for restricting output that violate our tenets of economic freedom, that work aganst our objectives of maximum production, and that in the end take away from farmers' incomes through decreased volume as much as, or more than, they add through increased prices.

"The Agricultural Act of 1948 represents an important step forward in recognizing the difficulties associated with overrigid supports."

In his budget message to the 81st Congress in January 1949 President Truman restated the fundamental principles upon which the Agricultural Act of 1948 was based.

"As I said a year ago, price supports should be regarded 'chiefly as devices to safeguard farmers against forced selling under unfavorable conditions and economic depression.' Their purpose is to bring an element of stability into agriculture. At the same time they should not place excessive burdens on the Treasury and taxpayers or inhibit shifts in production needed to meet peacetime demands and to promote adequate conservation of our soil resources."

The majority report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming) and Congressman HART (Democrat, New Jersey) had this to say on May 1, 1949:

"In order to fit a prosperous and equitably treated agriculture consistently into an economy seeking to operate continuously at maximum levels, agricultural price supports must be kept as floor prices; not as a means of price fixing, nor to guarantee a profit, but to provide a barrier against the sort of devastating price declines which in the past have made agricultural depression the forerunner of business and industrial depression * * *."

"The need to put into operation a flexible, well-integrated and varied farm program is urgent. In addition to flexible price supports intelligently adapted to postwar conditions, consideration should be given as parts of a coordinated program to such measures as the provision of adequate storage facilities, more adequate credit accommodations, crop insurance, and so forth."

The minority report contained the following pertinent paragraph:

"We still consider that a support-price program for farm prices is highly desirable to prevent the development of a depression through a complete collapse in agricultural products. We do not feel that it is our function at this time to discuss the various plans for such price support, but we recommend that a full trial be given to the Aiken-Hope Act and its plan of sliding-scale support recommended by the leading agricultural associations. The administration of this plan should be directed not as if it were a relief measure or a guaranteed equality of income for individuals, but as a major weapon against distortion between urban and rural incomes which could bring collapse to the entire Nation."

RIGID SUPPORTS ARE GENERALLY HARMFUL

Rigid mandatory supports at 90 percent of parity without regard to supply seriously injure (1) the vast majority of farmers and (2) consumers.

RIGID SUPPORTS INJURE FARMERS

Rigid supports injure farmers by increasing their costs, decreasing their markets, obstructing needed adjustments, assisting their competitors, lowering their net income, discrediting sound farm programs and decreasing their freedom of choice.

1. Increase costs

(a) Unit costs: As acreage controls are applied farmers are being forced to cut down on the number of acres devoted to the production of a particular commodity, and in many instances this raises the unit cost of production. Farmers thereby make less net income.

(b) Diverted acres: One of the fundamental premises of the price-support program is that price support will encourage production. Since the time of the Federal Farm Board, advocates of price support have insisted that production control is a necessary part of the price-support program. This first price-pegging operation failed because there was not any authority for keeping supplies in line with demand, and it has not yet been demonstrated that any governmental authority will keep supplies in line with demand when producers have prices supported at incentive levels.

The Farm Board asked farmers to cut down on production voluntarily, but there was not any mechanism whereby if one farmer cut back he could be sure his neighbor would do likewise. As a consequence, the price supports were an incentive to produce more than the market would take at such artificial prices. Alexander Legge, Chairman of the old Federal Farm Board, in his final report, had this to say about the failure to keep supplies in line with demand:

"No cooperative system can successfully accomplish its purpose unless production is coordinated with marketing * * *. Attempts to effect production through general advice * * * but without definite organization for the purpose had little effect * * *. Experience with stabilization thus demonstrated that no measure for improving the price of farm products other than increasing the demand of consumers can be effective over a period of years unless it provides a more definite control of production than has been achieved so far."

In other words, the program was unsound and as a result it failed.

The second effort to support prices of agricultural commodities was in the form of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, the old triple A. One of the basic requirements of that act was that in return for price supports farmers had to earn them by adjusting total production to market demand at such increased prices. It was clearly recognized in the law that prices could not be supported above a free market demand price without controlling production because the cost to the United States Treasury would be so great that the public would not stand for its continuation.

Later, as a result of failure to control production incentive price supports on potatoes, it cost the Federal Government in excess of $500 million on a total of only 2 million acres of potatoes in the entire United

States. The unsoundness of this program caused the public to revolt with the ultimate effect being the repudiation of price support on potatoes by the Congress. The story of eggs is quite similar. There was no means of controlling production and as a result the program broke down. The continuation of rigid 90-percent price supports violates the fundamental principle of keeping supplies in line with demand.

Millions of acres have been shifted out of wheat and cotton into the production of barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and other crops. Thus supply problems, instead of being solved, are being shifted form one group of crops to another, which is grossly unfair. Oftentimes producers of a basic crop maintain that they are willing to restrict production in order to obtain price support at 90 percent of parity. What they mean, in most cases, is that they are willing to divert acres out of the basic crop and into other uses in order to obtain price support on the basic crop. This does not face up to the problem.

With an acreage-control program, there probably is no way fully to control the shifting of supply problems from one crop to another. That being the case, price support should be kept at moderate levels so as to minimize the problem.

It is no accident that we have the largest amount of feed grain in the history of the country. Such plentiful supplies are bound to increase the production of livestock products and weaken the market for beef, hogs, and dairy products. Accordingly, it is quite unfair to permit the producers of basic commodities to be eligible for price supports and at the same time shift the acreage out of price-supported crops into other crops.

2. Decrease markets

Rigid support decreases farmers' markets by lowering consumption. This is just exactly the opposite of what farmers need at this time. The most satisfactory solution to the current farm problem is to expand domestic and foreign markets until they balance agricultural production. It is sometimes argued that price has little to do with the consumption of agricultural products. Though we might decrease the price of wheat or cotton, it is said, no more bread or shirts would be purchased than before. There is enough truth to this statement to make it convincing, and enough untruth to make it dangerous. In the case of many agricultural products, such as livestock and dairy products, fruits, and vegetables—by far the most important source of farm income—the statement that price has little to do with guiding production and consumption is completely untrue. It is true, however, that a lower price for wheat would not increase the domestic consumption of bread. But it would permit us to meet export competition and to move more wheat in the form of livestock feed. A lower price for cotton would permit us better to meet the competition of synthetic fibers. It would permit us to regain a part of the world cotton trade which has been lost to foreign countries with respect to whom we have held a price umbrella. The housewife chooses food on the basis of price. The foreign buyer of American export products is price-conscious. The textile trade selects its fibers partly on the basis of price. No more effective weapon can be used to drive customers away from our products than to price these products at levels which are out of line with other products or alternative sources of supply.

The price-support programs of this country have had the effect of making America a residual supplier of most price-supported commodities. Under these conditions subsidies are needed to bridge the price gap between the domestic and export market. To maintain any semblance of the export market for wheat we have had to pay export subsidies as high as 80 cents a bushel. As a matter of fact the average subsidy under the International Wheat Agreement for 1955 was 75 cents a bushel. During the 6 fiscal years from 1950 to 1955, inclusive, subsidies under the International Wheat Agreement and similar subsidies outside the International Wheat Agreement have amounted to over $800 million.

Pricing domestic products at 90 percent of parity draws imports to our shores as a magnet draws metal. These products are attracted out of their normal trade patterns, away from the legitimate recipients and to our already overburdened markets.

In order to keep costs down, embargoes, quotas, and import fees are needed. These unavoidable obstructions offend those nations whom we urgently need as friends.

If 90 percent of parity price support is voted, the Congress by that act establishes a restrictive foreign-trade policy for agricultural products. The producers of export crops as well as other farmers will inevitably pay for this error.

3. Retards needed adjustments

It is sometimes argued that since the legislation recommended by the President would permit price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic commodities, the supports might as well be fixed at 90 percent by law.

There is, however, a great difference.

The flexible program serves to keep in the foreground the fact that supplies must be held in line with demand in order for price supports to be at or near 90 percent of parity.

There are numerous unforeseen events which might occur.

The minimum acreage provisions for certain crops might be raised by law.

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas might not be invoked.

Yields might be extremely high.

Export markets might suddenly be diminished.

Domestic outlets might be curtailed.

If supplies pile up as a consequence of such circumstances, it is important that there be an opportunity for lowering the support price to encourage consumption, to reduce the incentive for high production, and to encourage desired shifts in the pattern of production.

Mandatory price support at 90 percent of parity does not permit these needed adjustments.

4. Assists competitors

The efficient wheat-producing farmers that were in business in 1940 have watched with growing concern the shifting of the right to produce wheat from themselves to other farmers here in the United States as well as in foreign countries. The western Kansas wheat farmer along with the wheat farmers in Texas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and the other great wheatgrowing States have seen thousands of acres of additional land in the old Dust Bowl area of southwest Kansas, northwest Texas, northwest Oklahoma, and southeast Colorado returned to wheat in violation of the principles of effective soil conservation. They have also seen the less efficient wheat-farming areas of the country that are better adapted to other types of farming shift to the production of wheat. For example, they have seen Michigan expand wheat and go out of the production of dry edible beans because the production of wheat for the Government was a more profitable venture. Now that we have such a tremendous surplus supply of wheat, which is destroying market prices and threatening to overwhelm the farm program in a manner similar to the way it destroyed the old Federal Farm Board, serious cuts in production are being called for. The new areas are claiming their right to produce wheat and the efficient producers in the old areas are being cut drastically. For the most part, the efficient wheat-producing areas can produce wheat better than anything else, yet the support program has built up such surpluses that they are being deprived of their right to produce while other areas which could more efficiently produce alternative crops are staying in the production of wheat due to the high Government incentive prices. The efficient western Kansas wheat farmer along with the efficient wheat-producing farmers in other States also see that the price-support program has encouraged the Canadian, Argentinian, Australian, Turkish, and other wheat farmers of the world to plunge into the production of wheat in competition with him, knowing that the wheat of the United States farmers will be the last to find its way into the world markets. The cotton producer who is looking at the facts is also aware of both domestic and foreign competition which is being aided by the rigid 90-percent price supports. Since 1930 synthetic consumption in the world has increased from the equivalent of 1 million bales of cotton to 13 million bales. Before 1933 America produced more cotton than all the rest of the world. This situation is no longer true today.

In fact, while we have reduced acreage through Government control programs from around 26 million acres to around 17 million acres, the rest of the world has increased the planting of cotton by more than 22 million acres.

Blind adherence to rigid price supports, without regard to the effect upon markets has destroyed the major portion of America's foreign market for cotton.

This market can now only be laboriously recovered by realistically adjusting price supports in order to meet competition in price, quality, and promotion.

5. Lowers net income

With price supports at 90 percent of parity and controls strictly applied, the volume of agricultural production must be sharply curtailed. Net income, not price alone, is the concern of agriculture. Net income is affected by volume and by costs as well as price. Restricting output often raises the cost per unit of production, and of course reduces the number of units sold. Thus, while price may be enhanced by the strict controls necessary to obtain 90 percent of parity, it does not necessarily follow that net farm income increases. As a matter of fact the evidence is quite clear that it decreases.

6. Decreases our freedom of choice

Through marketing quotas, farmers are in effect restricted in the use of their agricultural facilities as their best judgment dictates. Drastic restrictions in production also sharply restrict activity in related agricultural industry. Each step we take toward making farmers dependent upon government lessens their independence and takes the entire country one step closer to a type of government that our forefathers tried to avoid when they set up a limited government.

RIGID PRICE SUPPORTS INJURE CONSUMERS

By holding commodities off the market permanently and making them artificially scarce, as contrasted to helping farmers market their products, rigid supports increase the cost of food to consumers. The most striking example is butter. When price supports were lowered by the Secretary of Agriculture from 90 to 75 percent of parity, a corresponding price decrease occurred in the market place. As a result consumption of dairy products increased about 7 percent.

While the detailed facts may be hidden from view, many of the farmers' customers know that something is wrong and they do not like it. The general public became resentful about the potato and egg programs which resulted in the Government removing price supports on these commodities. The general situation with respect to wheat and other commodities is causing similar resentment. Unconsciously the general public understands that if land, labor, and equipment is being used to produce commodities which are not being sold, that

someone is paying for this waste. They suspect that somehow they are being unfairly treated. There isn't any question but what consumers ultimately have to pay for using resources to produce what consumers do not want.

The public generally, as well as the farmers, are aware of the fact that the public debt is straining at the $275 billion limitation and that rigid price supports have helped contribute to this burden. The reality of taxation and the burden of the public debt cannot be explained away to the taxpayer by failing to look at all of the costs. While it is true that the Commodity Credit Corporation has only recorded losses of about $2¾ billion on the program that it calls price support, it is only fair to point out that billions of dollars have been spent for surplus removal programs, acreage allotment, and marketing quota programs, none of which would have been carried out except for the problems created by price supports. The Department of Agriculture has submitted facts which make it abundantly clear that rather than the true cost of price support being a billion dollars, that it is many, many times this figure. However, this is not the most important issue. The real question is, Have rigid supports worked? Obviously they have not worked and we are not getting full value for the money spent.

SURPLUS DISPOSAL

The Federal Government has billions of dollars worth of surpluses on hand.

The Government is trying to dispose of its stocks without destroying the market or incur the wrath of friendly foreign nations. This is not easy.

It is trying to dispose of them by—

First, sales for dollars in cash.

Second, sales on credit for dollars.

Third, sales for foreign currencies. (Under this program the foreign currencies are being reloaned to the foreign country at very reasonable rates. In many instances, these currencies are being given to the foreign country for economic development.)

Fourth, exchanges for other commodities (barter).

Fifth, gifts to schools for school lunches.

Sixth, gifts for domestic charitable institutions.

Seventh, gifts to friendly foreign countries.

Eighth, gifts to domestic charitable organizations for gifts to foreign peoples (CARE, etc.).

Despite all of these activities, surpluses are continuing to build up in the hands of the Federal Government at a much greater rate than the rate of disposal. It is correct to say that the Government is finding it extremely difficult to even give away stocks at a faster rate than they are accumulating. Yet some people in the face of such facts say we do not have surpluses.

DUAL PARITY

Section 106 extends into the indefinite future the provision that for basic commodities the effective parity is the old or new parity price whichever is higher. Such a provision was in effect from 1950 through 1955.

Prior to the adoption of the new parity definition which became effective in 1950, parity prices were sharply criticized because they retained the same pattern of price relationships that existed in 1910–14. One of the major reasons for adopting the new parity formula was to bring and to keep the pattern of price relationships more nearly up to date.

When the new formula increased parity prices, it went into full effect immediately.

To avoid any sharp decline in the parity prices of individual commodities the law provided that the decline in the parity price of any commodity could not exceed 5 percent of the old parity price in any 1 year. This provision was effective for nonbasic commodities beginning in 1950. The Agricultural Act of 1954 provided for a similar transitional provision to become effective on basic commodities in 1956.

The effect of continuing the use of old or new parity, whichever is higher, for basic commodities is acceptance of the new parity formula when it results in a higher parity price and rejection when it results in a lower parity price. This is more generous treatment for basic commodities than for the nonbasic. Furthermore, it is another effort to maintain a rigid support price for the commodities which are already in the most serious trouble as a result of rigid support prices.

Making the parity price the result of whichever of two alternative calculations gives the higher answer raises serious questions about the whole parity concept. If the new parity formula is an improvement over the old formula, and we think it is, it should be accepted for all commodities. If it is not an improvement it should be rejected for all commodities.

RIGID 90-PERCENT SUPPORTS ARE A FAILURE

The facts are well known to farmers, consumers, taxpayers and the Congress.

Rigid price support amounts to a price ceiling at the support level, misdirects the use of agricultural resources by maintaining an excess output, prohibits the proper flow of commodities into consumption, attracts additional imports of commodities in surplus, prices American products out of the world market, injures the income of farmers, injures consumers, and is therefore against the best interests of the country generally.

The Senate should reject the proposal for rigid 90-percent price supports for wheat, cotton, corn, and peanuts for 1956 and 1957 as well as reject the proposal for continuing the dual parity standard of requiring old parity for any so-called basic commodity if it is higher than modernized parity.

Those subscribing to the above minority views are as follows:

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.
CLINTON P. ANDERSON.
GEORGE D. AIKEN.
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER.
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

APPENDIX A

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS

(Pt. IV of appendix B of the Economic Report of the President, January 24, 1956)

OUTPUT AND STOCKS

Total farm output set a new record in 1955—about 3 percent more than in 1954 and 12 percent more than in 1950. For most major categories of farm commodities, previous records were approached or exceeded.

Output of all livestock and livestock products rose by nearly 3 percent during the year, largely as a result of the 4-percent increase over previous high figures for meat animals while production of poultry and dairy products continued at record levels. Sharply increased pork production and unprecedented beef production furnished meat supplies of 161 pounds per capita, the highest since 1908.

Output of all crops in 1955 closely approached the all-time high of 1948, despite instances of severe weather damage in several areas and acreage restrictions on the six basic crops. Feed grain output was nearly 6 percent higher than in 1954, and second only to 1948. Hay and forage production rose more than 5 percent and was close to the record set in 1942. Output of oil-bearing crops was 10 percent above the previous record level of 1954. Though planted acreage in cotton was 12 percent less than in the previous year, total output increased by 7 percent because of record-breaking yields. Production of food grains was reduced from that in the previous year by smaller acreage allotments on wheat and rice, but the acreage reduction was partially offset by higher yields.

The 1955 crops were produced on about the same total acreage of cropland used in 1954. The index of crop production per acre reached a new high, 5 percent above 1954 and 1 percent above 1948. The man-hours of labor used for farmwork continued the more or less steady decline that had begun in 1919. The 1955 figure was about the same as in 1954 and 39 percent below the 1918 peak. Output per man-hour continued the rise that has been so pronounced since the beginning of World War II; the index reached 130 percent of the 1947–49 average in 1955, an increase of 16 percent since 1950 and 88 percent since 1940.

These summary figures reflect the rapid changes in our commercial agriculture during the last two decades. Increased use of machinery to replace human labor and horses, increased use of fertilizer, widespread adoption of many new production techniques, and increasing farm size which facilitates adoption of these more efficient methods have all contributed to the rapid rise in output.

At the beginning of the crop year stocks of most major farm commodities were unusually high, and the bulk of the carryover of most price-supported commodities was held by the CCC. Production in 1955 again exceeded market demand at current prices, and CCC inventories and commitments for loans outstanding reached the record level of $8.2 billion on November 30, 1955. World supplies of many agricultural products are at all-time highs, and surpluses of cotton and wheat are particularly large.

FARM PRICE MOVEMENTS

Average prices received by farmers for all products remained fairly stable in the first half of the year, slightly above the level of the last months of 1954. In mid-1955 the impact of the near-record harvest began to be felt, and the index of prices received by farmers declined in almost every month from June through December. On December 15, 1955, the index of prices received was 7 percent below that of a year earlier.

The decline in the average conceals many divergent price movements. The December 1955 index of prices received for poultry and eggs was 32 percent higher than in December 1954, and prices received for dairy products, tobacco, and commercial vegetables were all slightly higher than a year earlier. The largest price declines were in products marked by high current output; and for some of these products, carryover stocks were already abnormally heavy. The December 1955 index of feed grain prices was 16 percent lower than the index in December 1954. Because of the record output, prices of oil-bearing crops decreased by 17 percent between December 15, 1954, and December 15, 1955; and the larger crop of potatoes resulted in sharply lower prices to potato producers. The index of prices received for meat animals was 21 percent lower on December 15 than a year earlier, largely because the average price of hogs had dropped by 38 percent.

The prices paid by farmers for commodities used in family living remained relatively stable during the year. Prices paid for items used in production declined slightly, primarily as a result of lower feed prices. In the last few months these declines were partially offset by increases in the prices paid for motor vehicles and farm machinery. The expansion of nonfarm employment opportunities contributed to a rise in farm wage rates, which at the end of the year were 3 percent higher than a year earlier and more than 5 times the average in the 1910–14 base period. The index of farm real-estate taxes rose by nearly 5 percent during 1955, and that for interest charges by 8 percent. The index of prices paid by farmers, interest rates, taxes, and wage rates are combined to form the parity index, which was

at the same level at the end of 1955 as a year earlier.

Since the parity index remained unchanged while the index of prices received decreased during 1955, the parity ratio declined. The average for the year was 84, which was 6 percent below the 1954 average. On December 15, 1955, the parity ratio was 80, or 7 percent less than the figure for a year earlier.

FARM INCOME

The increased sales of farm products during the year were not enough to offset the fall in farm prices, and net farm income declined. Realized net farm income of farm operators in 1955 is now estimated at $10.6 billion, a decrease of 10 percent from 1954.

The number of farms continued to decline as existing farms were enlarged to improve efficiency, but net income per farm dropped by about 9 percent. As the economy expanded and nonfarm demands for labor increased, farm people earned more from nonfarm sources, but preliminary indications point to a 6 percent decline in per capita income of farm people from all sources.

Nevertheless, many farmers received higher incomes in 1955 than in 1954. Estimates of the Department of Agriculture made for four types of commercial farms indicate that for some farms 1955 was a much better year than 1954. Cotton farmers in the southern Piedmont region, with unusually high yields for this price-supported crop, found their net incomes increased substantially. For dairy farms in the Central Northeast, the higher milk output when prices were stable and feed costs somewhat lower resulted in slightly higher incomes. After very low yields in 1954, wheat, small grain, and livestock farms in the Northern Plains generally experienced improved yields in 1955, which raised their income. On the other hand, hog-dairy producers in the Corn Belt found their incomes sharply reduced by lower hog prices which were only partially offset by larger marketings. In the western Corn Belt many producers suffered from a combination of severe drought and low hog prices.

There were also important regional differences in the changes in farm income in 1955 (table 1). Realized net income in New England, the Middle Atlantic States, and the Pacific States averaged approximately the same as in 1954; in the South Atlantic and East South Central regions, it was higher in 1955 than in 1954; and in the West South Central, the East North Central, the West North Central, and the Mountain regions it declined—the decline in the last 3 regions amounting to 20 percent or more. Variations in weather, yields, and individual commodity prices account for most of these variations between regions. Such variations are not unusual in agriculture, and statistics showing total United States farm income often obscure important regional divergences.

TABLE 1.—*Realized net income of farm operators, by regions, 1954–55*

Region	1954	1955 [1]	Percentage change, 1954 to 1955 [1]
	Millions of dollars		
United States total	11,814	10,576	−10
New England	200	197	−2
Middle Atlantic	497	497	0
East North Central	2,266	1,770	−22
West North Central	2,795	2,223	−20
South Atlantic	1,604	1,687	+5
East South Central	1,159	1,229	+6
West South Central	1,408	1,264	−10
Mountain	723	565	−22
Pacific	1,162	1,144	−2

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Department of Agriculture.

AGRICULTURAL FINANCES

Farm prices and incomes generally declined during the year, and both farm mortgage debt and nonmortgage debt rose. Yet total farm asset values and owners' equities in these assets increased, chiefly because the value of farm real estate continued to rise.

Average values of farm real estate on November 1, 1955, were 6 percent higher than a year earlier, and above the peak that had been reached in 1952. There were new record values in nearly half of the States. This strength of farm real estate prices is unusual in the light of the trend in farm prices and incomes and of past relationships. The demand for farm real estate arises in part from the desire of farm operators to enlarge existing farms in order to utilize labor and machines more efficiently. Sales to farm operators accounted for an increasing proportion of farm sales in 1955.

Farm real-estate debt increased by an estimated 10 percent during 1955. It was to be expected that, as land prices moved upward and increasing numbers of younger operators entered farming, farm mortgage debt would rise from its very low level at the end of World War II. However, in historical perspective the present ratio of mortgage debt to real-estate value is low (table 2). The rate of farm foreclosures increased slightly during the year ended March 1, 1955; but it was still below that in any year prior to 1944, only one-ninth of the average for 1925–29, and one-fourteenth of the 1930–34 average. Preliminary indications suggest little change in this rate in 1955.

TABLE 2.—*Value of farm real estate and real estate debt, 1920–55*

End of year [1]	Value of farm real estate [2]	Real estate debt	Real estate debt as percent of value	Foreclosure rate per 1,000 farms
	Billions of dollars			
1920	61.5	10.2	16.6	3.2
1921	54.0	10.7	19.8	4.0
1922	52.7	10.8	20.5	6.6
1923	50.5	10.7	21.2	11.7
1924	49.5	9.9	20.0	14.6
1925	48.7	9.7	19.9	16.7
1926	47.7	9.7	20.2	17.4
1927	47.6	9.8	20.5	18.2
1928	48.0	9.8	20.3	17.6
1929	47.9	9.6	20.1	14.8
1930	43.6	9.4	21.6	15.7
1931	37.1	9.1	24.5	18.7
1932	30.6	8.5	27.7	28.4
1933	31.9	7.7	24.1	38.8
1934	33.1	7.6	22.9	28.0
1935	34.0	7.4	21.8	21.0
1936	35.1	7.2	20.4	20.3
1937	35.0	7.0	19.9	18.1
1938	34.0	6.8	19.9	14.3
1939	33.6	6.6	19.6	13.5
1940	34.6	6.5	18.8	12.6
1941	37.9	6.4	16.8	10.5
1942	42.1	6.0	14.1	6.2
1943	48.8	5.4	11.1	4.4
1944	54.8	4.9	9.0	3.1
1945	61.8	4.8	7.7	1.9
1946	69.6	4.9	7.0	1.5
1947	73.9	5.1	6.9	1.1
1948	76.8	5.3	6.9	1.0
1949	75.3	5.6	7.4	1.2
1950	85.8	6.1	7.1	1.4
1951	93.7	6.6	7.0	1.5
1952	92.7	7.2	7.7	1.5
1953	89.1	7.7	8.6	1.2
1954	91.4	8.2	8.9	1.7
1955 [3]	97.0	9.0	9.3	1.9

[1] Foreclosures are for year ended Mar. 1.

[2] Figures for 1950–55 will be revised upward in line with the 1954 Census of Agriculture.

[3] Preliminary.

Source: Department of Agriculture.

Farmers' financial assets changed very little during the year. Non-real-estate debt rose about 8 percent, but the rise in real-estate values was more than enough to offset total debt increases. Owners' equities rose about 3 percent.

Source: Economic Report of the President, January 1956.

AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I submitted an amendment to the social security bill which would have the effect of increasing Federal matching for the assistance to aged persons. This amendment was introduced on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

As I stated at that time, I felt particularly honored that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] had decided to join me in offering the amendment, inasmuch as the Senator from Georgia has played a major role in the establishment of our social security and public welfare program. He has served as a member of the Senate Finance Committee for many years. During a considerable number of years he has served as chairman of that committee. The Senator from Georgia has presided over many of the sessions that led to the development of the Nation's social security and public welfare programs.

Briefly stated, our amendment would provide that Federal matching for old-age assistance would be increased by providing $25 of Federal funds to match the first $5 of State contributions. Thereafter, the Federal Government would match State governments on a 50-50 basis to a maximum payment of $65 per recipient. In other words, a State contribution of $22.50 would be matched by $42.50 of Federal funds.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, suggested to me that the amendment should include a so-called passalong provision to assure that the increase in Federal funds would result in increased payments to those needy aged persons who are presently receiving monthly payments under State welfare programs.

Accordingly, I have redrafted the amendment to include such a provision. Senators will note that the amendment provides that any State desiring to avail itself of the liberalized matching formula must demonstrate that the average State contribution has not been reduced from the 1955 level. If a State does not desire to comply with this requirement, the States should be permitted to continue Federal matching as under existing law.

The formula established by the McFarland amendment in 1951 would be continued for that purpose. Assuming that each State complies with the requirements of the amendment, this would result in an automatic increase of at least $5 for all aged persons who are presently receiving as much as $25 per month in old-age assistance. For those who are receiving as much as $57.50 per month old-age assistance, the payments would be increased by $7.50.

Based on figures available for September 1955 the estimated cost of the amendment would be $184,459,372. A total of 2,552,596 aged persons would be benefited and the average welfare payment to aged persons would be increased from $52.50 to about $58.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing the amount of money that each State would receive as well as the

number of persons affected by the amendment.

There being on objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Number of individuals receiving old-age assistance, September 1955	Average monthly payments, September 1955	Amount State would benefit under proposed amendment
Alabama	87,783	$32.67	$5,306,524
Arizona	13,982	55.82	1,181,914
Arkansas	55,072	33.33	3,332,189
California	268,065	65.35	23,443,405
Colorado	52,592	84.84	4,335,355
Connecticut	16,846	86.57	1,477,922
Delaware	1,586	42.57	106,751
District of Columbia	3,076	53.29	245,983
Florida	69,200	46.50	5,333,196
Georgia	98,515	37.94	5,910,900
Idaho	8,677	55.14	706,496
Illinois	93,907	59.96	7,827,809
Indiana	36,188	48.77	2,468,337
Iowa	40,728	57.72	3,330,871
Kansas	33,865	65.25	2,766,006
Kentucky	55,444	35.50	3,326,460
Louisiana	120,452	51.06	7,571,225
Maine	12,530	49.40	993,792
Maryland	10,445	45.61	779,425
Massachusetts	88,300	77.47	7,660,071
Michigan	73,756	56.00	6,075,485
Minnesota	51,578	67.51	4,173,656
Mississippi	70,611	27.85	4,236,660
Missouri	132,444	49.66	7,946,640
Montana	8,950	57.94	748,964
Nebraska	17,666	50.30	1,433,124
Nevada	2,627	57.63	231,995
New Hampshire	6,233	58.99	522,675
New Jersey	20,132	68.53	1,689,152
New Mexico	10,586	32.33	662,695
New York	100,226	78.70	8,359,794
North Carolina	51,765	31.69	3,105,900
North Dakota	8,159	68.60	655,631
Ohio	100,431	58.42	8,689,873
Oklahoma	95,100	61.68	7,848,302
Oregon	19,211	64.64	1,603,993
Pennsylvania	55,677	45.92	4,134,156
Rhode Island	8,075	59.86	657,133
South Carolina	43,231	32.43	2,596,860
South Dakota	10,633	44.91	640,260
Tennessee	64,735	34.80	3,893,820
Texas	223,043	41.71	13,436,460
Utah	9,432	59.82	788,803
Vermont	6,814	48.52	534,604
Virginia	17,263	30.25	1,092,749
Washington	58,289	76.34	5,128,057
West Virginia	23,836	27.70	1,430,160
Wisconsin	42,788	64.14	3,419,253
Wyoming	3,981	58.89	340,656
Alaska	1,661	64.70	144,578
Hawaii	1,792	49.31	132,653
United States	2,552,596	52.50	184,459,372

Mr. LONG. From this table Senators will note that there is a higher percentage of individuals receiving old-age assistance in some of the Southern States than in many of the industrial States. This results from two factors: First, industrial States have benefited more from social security protection, inasmuch as social security coverage for farmers and agricultural workers is only now coming into existence. In a great number of States, the Social Security System has provided for the needs of the great majority of the aged citizens, thereby greatly reducing the need of public welfare assistance for the aged in those States.

In the second place, many of the Southern States, as a consequence of low per capita income, have greater numbers of aged persons who have been unable to accumulate sufficient savings to provide for their needs during their declining years. These people have contributed in large measure to the development and growth of this Nation. Their labors and efforts have made it possible for others to reap large profits and accumulate great riches. Yet in many respects they have been the victims of exploitation of human resources in an earlier period just as the resources of their States suffered from such exploitation before adequate conservation methods came into being.

I regard it as more than a desirable public policy that we should provide liberally for the needs of these aged citizens.

A nation that can afford to spend more than $5 billions each year in assisting the development of foreign nations and raising living standards throughout the world can certainly afford to care for its own.

During this current administration, tax reductions totaling more than $7 billions have gone into effect benefiting almost every major corporation and every individual in middle and upper income brackets. General Motors Corp. alone has had its tax burden reduced by more than $500 millions each year. Further tax reductions are in prospect.

Those who enjoy the protection of social security have seen their payments increased, not as a result of their increased contributions, but as a result of amendments and liberalizations of the social security laws. The minimum payment under social security has been increased from $25 to $30. The maximum payments have been increased by $13.50.

It can well be argued that 20 years from now the public welfare burden will have been tremendously reduced as a result of universal social security protection. However, that does not meet the present problem. We have with us today millions of persons who are not protected and not benefited by social security. It would be an act of neglect were we to do nothing to relieve the penury and wretchedness of those persons during this period of unprecedented prosperity.

It seems to me that the intent of this amendment is good government, good economics, and simple justice to those who have benefited least in a financial way from the tremendous growth and accumulations of wealth that have occurred in this Nation.

Since the amendment was offered by the Senator from Georgia and myself, we have offered other Senators the opportunity to join as cosponsors. I am happy to report to the Senate that 44 other Senators have decided to lend their names to this effort, and I have received assurances of support from other Senators who for one reason or another did not care to join formally as sponsors.

Permit me to state further, Mr. President, that while the proposed amendment would cost this Nation approximately $185 millions each year, based on present State contributions, it would be my hope that the cost would be substantially greater. I say this because I am familiar with some of the problems in other States.

For example, the State of Louisiana has almost as many aged recipients of assistance as the States of Mississippi and Arkansas combined. Likewise, the average payment in Louisiana is very much greater than the average payment of either of those 2 neighboring States. This is true notwithstanding the fact that the per capita income of Louisiana is substantially greater than the per capita income of those 2 neighboring States.

In my judgment, the reason that Mississippi and Arkansas do not have a larger percentage of their aged persons receiving old-age assistance is the difficulty of providing adequate revenues for matching purposes. While Louisiana is able to obtain large amounts of revenue from the taxation of the severance of natural resources, which can be devoted to public education, the two neighboring States to which I have referred, being unable to do so, are compelled to give first order of priority of the limited State revenues to the education of their youth.

I would hope that States where the need is great may be able to find additional revenues in order to provide in more substantial fashion for those aged needy persons who are today without assistance. Certainly this amendment will help along that line.

Furthermore, I would anticipate that the passage of time will find a gradual reduction in the expense of public welfare. Protection afforded by social security is daily causing a shift in case load from public welfare assistance to social security insurance. Already the trend is very noticeable.

In the year 1950 there were 2.8 million persons receiving old-age assistance and 2.3 million individuals receiving payments from old age and survivors' insurance. On the other hand, in the year 1955 the shift had been so noticeable that those persons receiving old-age assistance numbered 2.5 million and those receiving old age and survivors' insurance payments had increased to 6.4 million.

As desirable as this trend may be, we should not ignore the present problem. Adequate funds for those persons who are not protected by social security is a matter of necessity and justice during the next few years.

Furthermore, I would like to point out that our aged persons who are not protected by social security in a sense contributed to the payment of the social-security benefits of those who are in a more fortunate position.

Generally speaking, the social-security tax can be compared to a hidden sales tax. Every manufacturer in pricing his product includes the cost of social-security taxation and passes it along to the consumer. Every laboring man bargains for a take-home paycheck in the assurance that the cost of his social-security coverage will be passed along as a part of the cost of the product being manufactured in the same sense that the manufacturer passes along the cost of his own contribution. Thus the social-security tax, while it appears on the surface to be a tax on payroll, is in the last analysis a tax on those who consume the products produced by the workers involved.

Therefore it can fairly be said that the needy aged persons of our Nation who are not in position to benefit from social-security payments have paid and will continue to pay the social-security tax just as much as every other consumer in the Nation can be expected to make

his contribution to the Social Security System.

Inasmuch as these needy aged persons do not benefit from social-security payments, they are all the more entitled to expect assistance from public welfare.

The last time that the Congress of the United States provided additional funds to assist the needy, it was done by means of an amendment proposed by the then Senator from Arizona, Senator McFarland, on behalf of himself and a rather large number of other Senators. I was proud to be one of the cosponsors at that time.

In view of this background, it warmed my heart to receive a message from my good friend Ernest McFarland, the present Governor of Arizona, who, I note, still feels as kindly toward the aged as he did when he led the fight for their cause in 1951.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a copy of the letter I have just received from the Governor of Arizona.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *February 20, 1956.*

Hon. RUSSELL LONG,
Senator of Louisiana, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR RUSSELL: I noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1956, that you made mention of some of my activities regarding aid to the old people. I want to thank you and congratulate you for continuing this program. I well remember the help you used to give me and I am glad to see you making efforts in the same direction.

Sincerely,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Governor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 45 other Senators, namely, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. YOUNG, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes. I ask that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Louisiana upon submitting his amendment. I, too, believe that Governor McFarland will be pleased to hear about it.

If the Senator will examine the record, he will see that I, also, was a coauthor of the bill which was introduced by former Senator McFarland. I am glad the Senator from Louisiana is submitting his amendment today, because I think it is necessary to take action in this field.

We hear much said today about persons who are 60 years of age and older. I believe the committee this year will report a bill which will make provision for persons who are unemployed, disabled, or who cannot otherwise work when they became 60 years of age—not 65, but 60. Something must be done for them. A great many persons will soon find themselves in this category. They will not be eligible for social-security payments. This bill will take care of them.

It is for that reason that I believe Congress should enact legislation in this field, so that persons in this category who need to be taken care of will receive consideration.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I sincerely appreciate the remarks which have been made by the Senator from South Carolina. I remember very well that he was one of the cosponsors of the last increase in the amount of Federal matching funds for State welfare programs. I hope very much we shall be successful in this effort. I know the assistance of the senior Senator from South Carolina will be most beneficial in securing the passage of this measure.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, I also am a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. I sincerely hope the bill will be passed. I commend the Senator from Louisiana for bringing the matter up again. However, I still think the amount of the increase proposed is too small—far too small. I received this morning a letter from a woman who is confined to a wheelchair and is trying to live on $47.50 a month. It is a disgrace to the Nation to have that kind of situation exist. The amount of increase proposed in the bill is $5, is it not?

Mr. LONG. Actually, the bill would make it possible to increase the matching up to $65; so the amount could be $10 more a recipient.

Mr. LANGER. I would vote for the bill if the increase were double that amount. But the bill is a step in the right direction. As I said before, I think the Senator is to be highly commended for taking up the battle in the way he has taken it up year after year upon the Senate floor.

Mr. LONG. I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the Senator from North Dakota. We on the Democratic side of the aisle frequently argue and undertake to persuade the American public that the Democratic Party is more interested in the welfare of the common man, the little man, the poor man, and the unfortunate of the Nation, than is the Republican Party. However, no Senator on either side of the aisle can equal or exceed the senior Senator from North Dakota in his sympathetic feelings and his favorable sentiments toward the aged, the needy, the poor, and the unfortunate whenever a measure comes before the Senate which affects their interests.

I, too, feel that the amendment should go further than it does. I notice the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] on the floor. He too suggested to me that the amendment should go somewhat further, or that perhaps the amount of matching funds should be increased to a $75 total payment for aged persons. However, it is believed that $65 is about as far as it will be possible to persuade a majority of the Senate to go at the present time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I appreciate the Senator's yielding, because he just made reference to the bill I introduced last year, which provided not only for an increase, by way of matching funds with the States, to those receiving old-age assistance, but also provided for aid to the blind, as well as aid to dependent children.

I wish to join in commending the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] for the work he is doing in this particular matter. I have joined with him, and have done it very gladly, indeed. If the measure in which I have been interested, which is directed to the same end toward which the measure of the Senator from Louisiana is aimed, cannot secure approval, I certainly hope the one which goes at least a portion of the way, which has been introduced, will receive favorable consideration not only of the committee, but of the entire Senate.

As the Senator may know, I have introduced a measure, which is now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, relative to housing for the aged. There again we encounter the problem of people who have reached the declining years of their lives. Of necessity, they must have housing facilities which are entirely different from those required by younger people, so to speak, and we can place ourselves in that category. Any aged people are unable, because of their advanced years, to go up and down steps readily. In too many instances they face great hardship. The State of Massachusetts has done a great job of engineering in making one of the most constructive reports on the subject ever made in this country.

Certainly, if we are going to work from the angle of medical research in an attempt to extend the life span of the human race, then we in turn should be just as anxious to see to it that people who have had their earnings wiped out or who have expended everything they have in looking after their requirements in the orderly processes can have some place to turn to, and have at least the bare necessities of life to keep flesh and blood together during their remaining years on earth.

I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for what I believe is an excellent approach and a much needed approach to a very realistic problem which affects so many people who are not

blanketed under the provisions of the social-security law, and who have to turn to this method of aid from the State and Federal Governments in order to keep body and soul together.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Maine. I should also like to state that I am extremely happy to have as cosponsors a substantial number of Senators on the Republican side of the aisle, as well as on this side.

I should like to say to my good friend from Maine, who was formerly Governor of his State, and who has a knowledge of the need of looking after the welfare of people in a State, I would like to have the Federal matching amount made $75. If the Senator from Maine cares to offer such an amendment when the proposal comes to the floor, I would be willing to vote for it as a substitute for the provision of $45 which I am offering.

The only reason for proposing the lesser figure is that I think it is the best we could hope to get at the present time. Perhaps I am in error, however, and if we could obtain a more liberal matching provision, such as that the Senator from Maine proposes, I would be delighted to vote for his proposal and support it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I daresay the Senator from Louisiana took into consideration how much various States would be willing to provide in matching funds. Some States might provide substantial matching funds, but other States might not be in a position to match even the amount proposed. Is that not correct?

Mr. LONG. Yes. What has been provided is that a State must continue to make the same average contribution to the recipient that the State had made before. In some instances, in 1951, when we liberalized the Federal matching funds, certain States were more interested in economizing than in assisting the aged. Some of the States reduced their State contributions at a time when Federal aid was increased. I know that in the State which I have the honor in part to represent, after the additional $5 of Federal matching funds was voted for, for some time only $2.50 of that increase was passed along to the aged. After about 2 or 3 years, the $4 or $5 increase in Federal matching was passed along.

Of course, the Senator realizes the amendment provides that a State cannot reduce its matching. Therefore, along in July or August there should be an increase to those who would benefit.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not true that it would not be necessary for a State to match the $5 increase being asked for, and the only provision is that it will have to pay at least as much as it is now paying?

Mr. LONG. It would work this way: When the State puts up the first $5, instead of putting up $20 of Federal money, the Federal Government would put up $25. The only stipulation would be that the State must not reduce its contribution. If the State cared to take $1 of State money and match it against $20 of Federal money, it would find it would not receive the benefit of the new matching formula. It would have to rely on the previous law. That is to prevent a State from retrenching in its expenditures because the Federal Government has seen fit to go further.

When the $55 level was reached, at which point the Federal Government ceases to match under the present law, the Federal Government would continue to match on a 50–50 basis up to a figure of $75.

I wish to thank my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, for his assistance in working out the amendment, and also for supporting the amendment. I believe with his help and that of other cosponsors, we will be able to have the amendment agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What the Senator has stated points up what I said, that some States would refrain from matching any more than $5 above the $55, which would bring the amount to $60. Some States have a hard time meeting their financial obligations, and might hold back on the payments. They should not do it, but they may of necessity do it.

Mr. LONG. I completely agree with the Senator. I hope the State of South Carolina not only will not reduce the average State contribution, but will pass along the increase, which would be $5 for the average person receiving old age assistance in South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I hope so.

Mr. LONG. I hope the State of South Carolina will find it possible to provide additional revenues for the welfare program of that State. My good friend from South Carolina knows that the State of Louisiana has about twice as many people who are receiving assistance as has the State of South Carolina. As a former Governor of South Carolina and also as a Senator from that State, I know the Senator has worked diligently to provide aid for the needy and the aged. If sufficient revenues can be found, I know this liberalized formula will result in providing aid to needy persons who today are receiving no welfare assistance.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. While I was Governor, I fought for having the funds matched at all times, and to make sure that people would receive every dollar to which they were entitled through matching Federal funds. I for one would have been glad to see the payments go to $75. I certainly hope my State will do what is necessary if more funds are required to match Federal funds.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota cannot resist the temptation to advise the Senator that the State of North Dakota was the first State in the Union to pass an old-age pension law. That law was enacted in 1933, before Dr. Townsend was ever heard of. To show the Senator that there were some reactionaries in the Senate, after the House passed a decent old-age pension bill, believe it or not, the Senate reduced the aid to $2.50 a month.

So the distinguished Senator from Louisiana can see what great progress we have made. Franklin D. Roosevelt became President at about that time; and the Senator from Louisiana knows that shortly thereafter we began to provide some funds for the aged people of the United States.

So I cannot resist letting the Senate and the rest of the world know that North Dakota had the first old-age pension law in the United States.

Mr. LONG. And unless I miss my guess, Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] played an important part in the enactment of that first old-age pension law.

Mr. LANGER. Yes. I was Governor of North Dakota at the time, and I am very proud that that was one of the accomplishments of my administration.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me ask this question of the Senator from Louisiana: Is it not also true that many States have penalized the aged persons within their borders by making such rigid requirements in connection with participation in the old-age pension plans that their elderly citizens can scarcely receive any benefits? For instance, if an aged person has even purchased a cow, sometimes that person will be removed from the old-age pension rolls.

Mr. LONG. Such situations are what have troubled many of us. I know that Louisiana probably has the most liberal requirements, insofar as old-age assistance is concerned. On the other hand, in some States the old-age pension plans require that a recipient of old-age assistance must, if he owns a home, place a mortgage on his home; and then, after he dies, the home goes under the auctioneer's hammer, in an effort to get back some of the old-age assistance funds which went to that person. In some instances, I understand some State welfare plans even require the selling of an elderly woman's gold wedding ring prior to her burial, if she is to be declared eligible to receive any old-age assistance during her lifetime.

Prior to the time the Louisiana plan was liberalized a story was told about an elderly man who was receiving a little assistance through the old-age pension rolls. One day an investigator found that that elderly man had some canned goods on his shelf. So he was taken off of the rolls and was denied the meager welfare check he had been receiving. After a few months had passed he was again permitted to receive a $5 check monthly; but then someone found that he had gone fishing and had caught a little string of

perch, so again he was removed from the old-age pension rolls.

We have disagreed vigorously with the concept that old-age pension payments should be denied to a person who has any income whatever.

So, Mr. President, I hope that all the States will make their old-age assistance plans more liberal, so that more elderly persons will be entitled to enjoy the benefits of the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). If the Senator from Louisiana will permit, the present occupant of the chair desires to commend the Senator from Louisiana for offering the amendment; and the present occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Texas, would like to join in sponsoring it.

The Chair hopes that all the States of the Union will take steps to enable their elderly citizens to receive increased assistance, so as to be able to catch up with the cost of living.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the present occupant of the chair for making that statement, and I am very glad to have the distinguished junior Senator from Texas join in sponsoring this measure.

In connection with this proposal, let me point out that under the proposed amendment to the law, we anticipate that 223,043 persons in Texas would benefit.

Similarly, let me point out to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that in the case of his State, we expect that under the proposed amendment to the law, 43,281 persons would benefit. However, I hope that the great State of South Carolina may be able to find additional revenues with which to match more of the Federal funds which we hope to make available, so that number can be increased.

I know that Lousiana has about three times that number of persons who are receiving old-age asistance; and I hope that South Carolina can take even greater advantage of the proposed amendment to the law than might be anticipated as a result of the chart I have placed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am satisfied that South Carolina will obtain the necessary revenue, all right. We have sufficient revenue for that purpose, and I believe we shall provide it in this connection. If I had not thought so, I certainly would not have joined in sponsoring the proposal.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment I intend to offer to Senate bill 3183, and I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kansas will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the amendment is submitted by me, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

The amendment comprises the bill known as the bill for domestic parity for wheat—sometimes incorrectly known as the two-price system. I expect to debate the amendment next week, when the amendment comes up for consideration.

Mr. President, some of us believe the time has come when we must deal with some of our farm crops by commodities, instead of dealing with them on an across-the-board parity basis. Personally, I do not think either rigid price supports or flexible supports will solve the farm problem. I believe we shall have to approach the problem on a commodity basis, and I think that is especially true in the case of wheat. I believe it would be just as ridiculous for us to assume, as we study this entire program, that we could conduct our tariffs on an across-the-board basis. That simply could not be done and would not be done.

We hope to have the amendment adopted next week, whenever I am able to obtain the floor.

I wish to say that the amendment provides for the holding of a referendum, under which the wheatgrowers themselves will determine whether they wish to enter into this program, if it is approved by the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for some questions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I gladly yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. For the sake of the legislature record, I should like to ask the Senator several questions.

First of all, with respect to the so-called basic commodities enumerated in section 203, what is the Senator's opinion as to the effect of the bill upon the farmers who are not engaged in the growing of any of such basic commodities?

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean in regard to the soil bank?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. They could participate only in the conservation-reserve program.

Mr. ALLOTT. That would leave them under the reserve program. For example, in Colorado there are a great number of irrigated farms which produce perhaps 15 or 20 acres of wheat, some sugar beets, hay, and feed crops. The point I wish to make is that under the acreage-reserve program which is subtitle A, except as applied to such small wheat acreage as they grow, there would be no application to them at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. None at all. They would come under what we call the second prong of the plan.

Mr. ALLOTT. They would come under it so far as wheat is concerned; but since Colorado, under the allotment plan, is not a commercial corn State, corn grown in Colorado would not be covered by the first section.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move now to the second prong. I forget which Senator it was who had a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yesterday afternoon on this subject; but referring to subparagraph (1) of section 207 (a), on page 12, it provides as follows:

> (1) To establish and maintain for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water-storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses on a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops (including crops, such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage).

As I understand, the process of merely leaving the land alone, to grow its own protective coverage, would not qualify under that section.

Mr. ELLENDER. Land can qualify for the conservation reserve only if it were cropland. The Secretary could no doubt agree in the contract between the Department and the farmer, that if a native grass would conserve the soil, that practice could be followed as a method of participation. But let us not forget that the second prong of this program applies, and can be made to work, only with respect to acres which produce some kind of crop, be it a row crop, or, as I explained yesterday, tame hay, or alfalfa—in either case, it must be land which had previously been planted, no matter whether that particular crop is cultivated yearly or not. In some States, certain hays are planted, and they produce hay for 4 or 5 or 6 years. Under the terms of the bill, the Secretary would be permitted to enter into a contract with respect to such acreage.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall try to make my particular problem specific. I see the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the Chamber. I am sure he anticipates what I am getting at.

In the high Plains States there are areas in which it is impossible to grow such things as grasses, except over a long period of years. For example, only yesterday I was talking with the President of the American National Cattlemen's Association. He pointed out that fact. He and others have land with which I am familiar, which required as much as 15 or 20 years to re-cover with grass. So the planting of grasses would be of no use. It would be a waste of money. Alfalfa or hay requires too much water. The only thing which would perhaps come under subparagraph (1) would be row crops of one kind or another.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me state to my good friend from Colorado that there is a third program, known as the Great Plains program, which is not incorporated in this bill. It is a separate and distinct program, which I hope will be enacted, so as to take care of the land to which the Senator is now referring. We did not think it advisable to include the Great Plains program in this bill, in which we had, as our first objective under phase 1 of the soil bank, the discouragement of production of crops on allotted acres—production which would tend further to aggravate our surpluses of basic commodities.

The second phase of the program—the conservation reserve, which we are now discussing—applies to any lands devoted to the production of any crops. It is felt that if we can put into that program as much as 20 million or 25 million acres, it will no doubt reduce the production of many small grains which are now on the market, and which are really affecting the price of corn and wheat grown for feed, as well as other prices.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure the distinguished Senator realizes that in that particular area the only alternative to grass, which takes a long time to develop, or wheat, is to be found in the small grains, the sorghums, milos, maize, and crops of that sort. I am sure the distinguished Senator agrees with me that the attempt to grow more and more of such grains would only in turn accentuate the wheat problem and the small grains problem which we now have.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is it the intention of the committee to proceed with the Great Plains program?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I expect the committee will do so as soon as recommended legislation is drafted by the Department of Agriculture. It is really the third phase of the soil bank. A special study was made of a program to meet a problem which is peculiar to the Midwestern States.

The legislation has not yet been drafted; that is why we did not put it in with that program.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am familiar with that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very hopeful that we will be able to take care of that phase of the soil-conservation program soon.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to hear the Senator say that it is the intention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to go forward with it. If the Senator from New Mexico wishes to take the floor now, I shall be glad to pursue the matter further with the Senator from Louisiana at a later time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from Colorado to be kind enough to yield to me now because I wish to put some basic material into the RECORD, and I thank him for his courtesy.

I am very sorry that I was not on the floor of the Senate the other afternoon when some very fine tributes were paid to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for his work on the bill. Regardless of how we may differ on the final votes, I would certainly be unfaithful to every impulse I have if I did not commend the Senator from Louisiana for his long trip around the country, for his hard work in committee, and for his steady insistence that an agricultural bill get to the floor of the Senate.

We may differ in connection with a great many votes as the bill comes along, but as I put into the RECORD my expressions of some of my opinions as to the proposed legislation, I certainly also wish to put into the RECORD my expression of opinion of the very able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. President, there is some basic material which may be profitable to have in the RECORD, so that we may have an opportunity to look at it and perhaps use it in the discussions that lie ahead.

We shall have a discussion of the wheat problem. The able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is concerned with that right now, as are all the people who are involved in the production of wheat.

We have a great deal of difficulty with our wheat picture, although our stocks on hand are more than enough to take care of our needs for a long time in the future.

I desire to submit for the RECORD at this time a tabulation of the production, stocks, and markets of wheat. It shows the figures for the periods 1935 to 1939, from 1945 to 1949, from 1950 to 1954, and then for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955.

I ask unanimous consent that that chart may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wheat: Production, stocks, markets

[Million bushels, except as otherwise indicated]

Crop year beginning July 1	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Carry-in	154.5	193.2	508.3	562.5	902.4	1,020.6
Production	758.6	1,202.4	1,090.7	1,169.5	984.8	938.2
Imports	14.2	1.2	15.0	5.5	4.4	4.0
Total supply	927.3	1,396.9	1,614.0	1,737.5	1,891.6	1,962.8
Domestic consumption [1]	692.7	759.1	656.6	618.6	597.3	623
Exports	53.3	415.4	329.9	216.5	273.7	275
Total disappearance	746.0	1,174.5	986.5	835.1	871.0	898
Carry-out	181.3	222.4	627.5	902.4	1,020.6	1,064.8
United States exports as a percentage of world trade (percent)	8.8	47.6	34.3	24.7	29.1	[2] 29
	Calendar year					
Per capita civilian consumption of wheat flour (pounds)	157	144	129	126	124	121
Per capita civilian consumption of wheat breakfast cereals (pounds)	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1

[1] This is a residual figure.

[2] Based on the following statement: "World wheat trade in 1955–56 may approximate that of 1954–55."—The Wheat Situation, WS 146, Oct. 31, 1955, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

"Practically all our wheat and flour exports now move only under direct subsidy or under special export programs."—Economic Report of the President, January 1956.

United States quota under International Wheat Agreement, 1955–56 (million bushels) 196.5

Total export quota under International Wheat Agreement, 1955–56 (million bushels) 395.0

United States quota as a percentage of total quota (percent) 49.8

Cost of Wheat Agreement subsidies to United States:

	Total cost	Cents per bushel
1950–51	$178,179,517	67.0
1951–52	166,928,526	65.5
1952–53	138,990,015	54.3
1953–54	55,893,000	47.0
1954–55	98,482,076	74.8
1955–56 estimate	[a]	[a]

[a] Subsidy rates on Jan. 30, 1956, were 66 to 87 cents per bushel, depending on port, type of wheat, and destination.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to say that a look at the chart will indicate one of the problems which face the wheat producers. The per capita consumption of wheat flour has dropped from 157 pounds in the period from 1935 to 1939, down to 121 pounds today. Therefore, even though there has been an increase, indeed a very substantial

increase, in the population, the consumption of wheat remains at about 500 million bushels. We do not change the consumption by any stimulation which we would like to give to it, and the only hope for any real increase in the consumption is to be realized by the use of the commodity in all types of feeds, such as for livestock and products which result from the conversion of wheat into meat, eggs, and so forth.

If we were to start tommorow to ascertain how best to conserve wheat in the United States, the answer would be to ask people to eat more bread. I say that because if the people eat wheat only in the form of bread, they are actually not able to consume very much of it; but if they eat wheat in the shape of various other nutritious foods, they can consume a great deal of it.

That is why, in the discussion of these agricultural problems, it becomes difficult to realize that the commodity we are discussing may not itself be consumed by human beings to the same degree it would be if it could be transformed into other foods.

In the case of wheat the great problem is to find something to induce people to eat more nutritious foods which depend on the consumption of wheat.

I believe it is also worth while to bear in mind that under the International Wheat Agreement we have increased the cost of our wheat subsidies. The last figures we had show that in 1954 and 1955 we were paying about 74.8 cents a bushel for subsidies. At the present time we cannot move wheat even with an 87-cents-a-bushel subsidy. I do not believe we could move it even if we had a subsidy of a dollar a bushel. That presents one of the real problems with respect to wheat.

The second chart I wish to present for the RECORD is a chart which deals with cotton. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cotton: Production, stocks, markets

[Million running bales, except as otherwise indicated]

Crop year beginning Aug. 1	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Carry-in	8.3	5.9	5.5	5.6	9.7	11.1
Production	12.8	12.0	14.0	16.4	13.6	14.5
Imports	.2	.2	.1	.1	.1	.1
Total supply [1]	21.3	18.1	19.6	22.1	23.5	25.7
Domestic consumption	7.0	9.1	9.3	8.6	8.8	9.2
Exports	5.3	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.4	2.4
Total disappearance [1]	12.3	13.0	13.3	12.4	12.3	11.7
Carry-out [1]	9.0	5.0	6.3	9.7	11.1	14.0
United States exports as a percentage of world trade (percent)	42.2	39.8	33.7	29.6	29.3	20.0
	Calendar years					
Per capita civilian consumption of cotton (pounds)	25.5	31.0	28.8	[2] 27.9	[2] 25.4	
Per capita civilian consumption of rayon and acetate (pounds)	2.6	6.6	7.9	[2] 7.7	[2] 7.1	

[1] Due to rounding, items do not always add to total.

[2] Preliminary.

Mr. ANDERSON. The chart indicates that we have been building up a very substantial carryover of cotton year by year. We have increased it from year to year, but the interesting fact is that the United States export of cotton as a percentage of world trade has been dropping very rapidly. In the period 1935 to 1939 United States exports of cotton as a percentage of world trade represented 42.2 percent. In the period 1945 to 1949, it was 39.8 percent. In the period 1950 to 1954, it was 33.7 percent. In 1953, it was 29.6 percent. In 1954, it was 29.3 percent. In 1955 it was about 20 percent.

Gradually we are losing our world markets for cotton. Gradually, also, the areas of the world which depend upon synthetics are finding an increasing demand for those products. The consumption of rayon and acetate has risen from an equivalent of 2.6 pounds in the 1935–39 period to something over 7 pounds at the present time.

The per capita civilian consumption of cotton goods has stayed at about 25 pounds. Therefore, the problem is not like the problem with respect to wheat. We have not lost the market so far as the domestic consumption is concerned. We have lost the world market, and we cannot get it back very easily.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that in 1950, soon after the war in Korea started, we had to put an embargo on cotton exports, because at that time we had less than 2 million bales on hand?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not agree that we had to do it. I agree we did it.

Mr. ELLENDER. We did it. The administration thought we had to do it in order to keep sufficient cotton on hand for our use.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was done. At the same time, if we are to go back into cotton history, we must go back to the time when we did not put quotas on cotton, or acreage allotments. I think we should have put on a limitation in 1953.

Mr. ELLENDER. I doubt that we could have put on a limitation in 1950.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not say 1950. I said 1953. In 1952 the farmers of this country should have been asked to adopt cotton quotas for the 1953 crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will remember that the Korean war was in progress, and that is why crop controls were not applied.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Korean war was in progress, but it was not a very aggressive conflict at that time, and the need for cotton had pretty largely disappeared so far as the armed services were concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator will agree that the existence of hostilities in Korea is the reason why quotas were not put on in 1953.

Mr. ANDERSON. The argument was made—and I do not wish to go into it—that 1952 was an election year, and that may have had something to do with it. However, regardless of that, we did not impose quotas at the time when we should have done so, and we proceeded to get ourselves into all kinds of trouble as a result.

Here again it is said that the Secretary of Agriculture can bring the matter under control, because the agricultural act provides that the acreage can be brought down to 10 million acres. However, it must also be borne in mind that the Secretary in his calculations must use a 5-year period in estimating what the average production is, and doing that he finds that production went up tremendously last year. For example, in the State of Arizona, if I remember correctly, the average production in 1955 was more than 1,000 pounds per acre. Knowing something about the poor areas of Arizona, so far as cotton is concerned, it is necessary to have acre after acre producing 3 bales.

We have that situation. Farmers have used enormous quantities of fertilizer. I myself gave an illustration of a farmer who approached me with regard to his problem of acreage. He had had something like 135 acres of cotton on which he had produced about a bale and a half

to the acre. His acreage was cut to 70 acres, and he fertilized the 70 acres to the point where he raised more cotton from that smaller acreage than he had raised on 135 acres. Under such circumstances it is extremely difficult to bring a commodity under control.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I point out to my good friend that last year was unprecedented, from the point of weather conditions. I do not suppose our farmers ever had a year at any time in our history that was so suitable for the growing of all crops. I wish to point out that in 1955, with 2,200,000 acres less than were planted in 1954, we produced a little over 1 million bales more cotton.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is what I am trying to show. The farmer was cut down in acreage in 1955 to a greater degree, but he spent extra money for fertilizer, he worked harder, and produced a bigger yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same situation occurred in 1954, but only 13 million bales of cotton were produced. The weather that year was not as good as in 1955. So, rains at the proper time, and other conditions, are really the things that enabled the farmers to produce such a huge quantity of cotton and other crops last year.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the rains came pretty well in 1954. There was a greater incentive on the part of farmers to produce, and they did produce. Although the acreage of cotton will be down somewhat in 1956, it will not come down enough to make any appreciable dent in the great oversupply of cotton we have on hand.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I have a very high regard for the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico, and I should like to ask him this question: With regard to the high cost of operation of farms with present-day methods, to what extent does it put pressure on the farmer to produce everything he can produce under any system Congress can enact?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator will agree with me that whenever the farmer is confronted with increasing production costs he faces the obligation to produce as much as he can or give up his farm. That situation has been steadily going on. I have disposed of some farm equipment within the past year or so. For one piece of equipment 5 or 6 years old I received more than I paid for it originally.

Mr. CURTIS. It seems to me that as acreage restrictions and other factors have further and further reduced the size of a farming unit, the farmer has been faced with two alternatives. One is to surrender his farm as being no longer an economical unit, and sell it to a larger producer, or make what he has left produce more.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think he has no other alternative.

I turn, Mr. President, to the tobacco picture, because there we have a product which has been very carefully controlled. Even though production has gone up very sharply, it has merely followed an increase in consumption.

The domestic consumption of burley tobacco has increased from 305 million pounds to approximately 500 million pounds, at the same time production was increasing from 15 million pounds to 500 million pounds. That is why the tobacco program has had a very satisfactory history and an acceptance by the growers of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing production, stocks, and markets of burley tobacco and flue-cured tobacco.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Burley tobacco: Production, stocks, markets (farm-sales-weight basis)

[Million pounds, except as otherwise indicated]

Crop year beginning Oct. 1	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Carry-in	673.6	885.9	1,080.9	1,163.4	1,198.2	1,347.8
Production	315.8	567.9	599.8	564.4	667.2	509.8
Total supply	989.4	1,453.8	1,680.7	1,727.8	1,865.4	1,857.6
Domestic consumption	305.3	480.5	498.7	495.0	484.8	500
Exports	12.0	39.1	31.6	34.6	32.8	33
Total disappearance	317.3	519.6	530.3	529.6	517.6	533
Carryover	672.1	934.2	1,150.4	1,198.2	1,347.8	1,324.6

Flue-cured tobacco: Production, stocks, markets (farm-sales-weight basis)

[Million pounds, except as otherwise indicated]

Crop year beginning July 1	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Carry-in	881.6	1,329.8	1,708.0	1,851.9	1,915.1	2,056.6
Production	863.6	1,209.4	1,332.3	1,272.2	1,314.4	1,504.1
Total supply	1,745.2	2,539.2	3,040.3	3,124.1	3,229.5	3,560.7
Domestic consumption	364.4	694.0	776.6	777.7	744.1	780
Exports	367.8	443.8	441.3	431.3	428.8	500
Total disappearance	732.2	1,137.8	1,217.9	1,209.0	1,172.9	1,280
Carryover	1,013.0	1,401.4	1,822.4	1,915.1	2,056.6	2,280.7
	Calendar years					
United States exports as a percentage of world trade (all types)	36.5	46.3	37.7	39.9	35.1	40
Per capita (15 years and over) civilian consumption of cigarettes (pounds)	4.65	8.75	9.66	10.03	9.48	9.68
Per capita (15 years and over) consumption by civilians and overseas Armed Forces (pounds)	4.65	9.25	10.01	10.46	9.84	9.96

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. When we consider the increase in production, I believe the full picture becomes plain. With respect to cotton, in 1954, on 19,791,000 acres the production was 13,696,000 bales, and in 1955, on 17,489,000 acres, the production was 14,663,000 bales, indicating that 1955 was a banner year. The same is true for almost every crop planted.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is a question of whether we give full credit to the weatherman for those things or give a little credit to the farmer. As the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has pointed out, the farmer tries to get from his land the greatest possible returns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table having to do with soybeans, indicating, again, a pretty satisfactory relationship of this crop to the production.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Soybeans: Production, stocks, markets

[Million bushels, except as otherwise indicated]

Crop year beginning Oct. 1	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Carry-in	.5	4.7	4.4	10.1	1.3	10.0
Production	56.2	208.9	298.0	268.5	341.6	371.3
Total supply [1]	56.6	213.5	302.4	278.7	342.9	381.3
Crushings for oil and meal	35.5	174.0	238.6	213.2	249.0	275.0
Exported as beans	4.1	9.1	35.3	39.5	60.1	70.0
Seed and feed [2]	16.6	26.7	22.7	24.5	23.7	28.0
Total disposition [1]	56.2	209.8	296.5	277.2	332.8	373.0
Carryover [1]	.5	3.7	5.8	1.3	10.0	8.0
Exports of soybeans and soybean oil, bean equivalent basis	5.0	27.5	55.4	46.5	65.0	
United States exports as a percentage of world trade (soybeans and soybean oil, bean equivalent basis)	5.6	[3] 80.0	65.6	[3] 69.7	61.9	

[1] Due to rounding, items do not always add to total.
[2] Includes residual.
[3] Unofficial estimates. Based on data from various sources.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, merely because I shall be referring to it at a later date in connection with some other discussions we shall have, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table having to do with the production of rough rice.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rice (rough): Production, stocks, markets

[1,000 hundredweight, except as otherwise indicated]

Crop year beginning Aug. 1	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Carry-in	2,637	1,332	3,820	1,515	7,557	26,700
Production	22,434	35,522	49,969	52,761	[1] 64,216	[1] 53,420
Imports	1,374	74	432	417	64	100
Total supply [2]	28,860	36,665	53,849	56,018	67,869	77,260
Domestic consumption	20,088	21,467	25,548	25,753	27,050	26,360
Exports	3,245	13,483	19,835	22,708	14,119	23,000
Total disappearance	23,333	34,950	45,383	48,461	41,169	49,360
Carryout	3,527	1,715	8,466	7,557	26,700	27,900
	Calendar years					
United States exports as a percentage of world trade	[3] 1.2	[4] 13.6	13	17	12	11
Per capita civilian consumption of milled rice (pounds)	5.7	4.6	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3

[1] Does not include production of minor States—Missouri, South Carolina, Arizona, and Florida.
[2] Items do not add to total. Total supply adjusted to equal total distribution.
[3] 1936–40 average.
[4] 1946–50 average.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, one of the things which persuaded the able senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I believe, to take the position he has taken on agricultural questions has been the experience which the citrus-fruit growers have had in his State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table having to do with fresh citrus fruits and with the production and marketing of those commodities.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fresh citrus fruits: Production, markets

[Million pounds, except as otherwise indicated]

Calendar year	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Production	6,876	9,115	7,507	7,838	7,576	7,798
Imports	32	13	25	37	13	
Total supply [1]	6,907	9,129	7,532	7,875	7,589	
Domestic disappearance:						
Civilian consumption	6,345	8,121	6,629	6,776	6,552	
Armed Forces		245	106	121	108	
Exports and shipments	562	763	797	978	929	
Total distribution	6,907	9,129	7,532	7,875	7,589	
United States exports as a percentage of world trade:						
Oranges	9.9	19.2	[2] 12.6	14.5		
Grapefruit	28.2	54.6	[2] 48.0	47.0		
Lemons	7.9	9.5	[2] 7.6	9.4		
Per capita civilian consumption:						
Fresh citrus fruits (pounds)	48.5	57.2	42.5	42.8	40.6	40.7
Processed citrus fruits, farm weight equivalent (pounds)	5.7	32.2	38.8	41.5	44.1	
Total (pounds)	54.2	89.4	81.3	84.3	84.7	

[1] Due to rounding, items do not always add to total.
[2] 1950–53 average.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the table shows that the consumption of fresh citrus fruits has been fairly stable, but that the use of processed citrus fruits has expanded tremendously. Here was a group of persons who decided to do something about their agricultural problem, and who succeeded in doing it by increasing the per capita consumption of processed citrus fruits from 5 pounds per capita to 54 pounds per capita. Had it not been for that, the situation of the citrus-fruit industry would have been disastrous.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table dealing with commercial apples.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commercial apples: Production, stocks, markets

[Million pounds, except as otherwise indicated]

	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Production, farm disposition, utilization of sales						
Total production	6,111	5,009	5,092	4,479	5,273	5,054
Farm household use	373	210	208	186	215	
Sold	5,356	4,629	4,752	4,293	5,027	
Production having value	5,729	4,839	4,960	4,479	5,242	
Fresh sales	4,011	3,324	3,259	3,022	3,192	
For processing	1,345	1,305	1,493	1,271	1,835	
Apples for fresh use:						
Beginning stocks	1,312	1,189	1,156	963	955	1,194
Production [1]	4,385	3,534	3,467	3,208	3,407	3,400
Imports	1	58	83	82	72	
Total supply [2]	5,698	4,781	4,706	4,253	4,434	
Domestic disappearance:						
Civilian	3,945	3,457	3,392	3,191	3,106	
Armed forces		83	51	51	50	
Exports and shipments	445	119	115	56	84	
Total distribution [2]	4,390	3,659	3,558	3,298	3,240	
Ending stocks [2]	1,307	1,121	1,148	955	1,194	
United States exports as a percentage of world trade (percent)	29.7	14.7	[3] 8.6	3.5		
Per capita civilian consumption:						
Fresh use (pounds)	30.2	24.2	21.8	20.2	19.3	19.7
Processed, farm weight equivalent (pounds)	2.8	4.6	5.8	5.5	6.1	
Total	33.0	28.8	27.6	25.7	25.4	

[1] Includes apples for sale for fresh use and quantities used in farm households.
[2] Due to rounding, items do not always add to total.
[3] 1950–53 average.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, dealing with the dairy situation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table with reference to total milk, its production, utilization, and distribution, showing the effect upon it of various programs.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total milk: [1] Production, utilization, and distribution

[Billion pounds, except as otherwise indicated]

Calendar year	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Total milk production	105.9	117.6	118.7	121.4	123.7	124.5
Utilization (milk equivalent):						
Fluid milk and cream and other [2]	44.2	55.0	57.0	57.7	59.4	61.1
Butter (creamery and farm)	44.0	32.1	31.0	32.3	32.9	31.0
Cheese	6.7	11.3	12.4	13.3	13.4	13.4
Evaporated and condensed milk	4.8	7.8	6.6	6.2	6.2	6.5
Dry whole milk	.1	1.3	.8	.8	.7	.8
Ice cream	3.2	6.9	7.4	7.8	7.7	8.3
Fed to calves	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4
Beginning commercial stocks	2.9	2.5	3.5	4.8	3.3	
Total milk production	105.9	117.6	118.7	121.4	123.7	124.5
Imports	.8	.2	.6	.6	.5	
Total supply [3]	109.6	120.4	122.8	126.9	127.5	
Civilian consumption	103.5	106.7	109.8	108.9	112.8	
Armed Forces		3.2	2.5	2.6	2.8	
Commercial exports and shipments	.4	2.2	1.1	.9	.9	
Net purchases, USDA		2.3	2.4	7.9	4.3	
Fed to calves	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.4	
Total distribution [3]	106.6	117.6	119.2	123.6	124.2	
Ending commercial stocks [3]	2.9	2.8	3.6	3.3	3.2	
Per capita civilian consumption:						
Total milk, whole milk equivalent-fat solids basis (pounds)	791	750	704	688	699	710
Total milk fat solids (pounds)	31.2	29.9	27.6	26.7	27.1	27.5
Total nonfat milk solids (pounds)	39.6	47.8	47.3	47.2	48.3	49.0
Cheese (pounds)	5.5	6.8	7.5	7.4	7.8	7.7
Condensed and evaporated milk (pounds)	16.5	19.1	17.8	17.2	16.5	16.5
Fluid milk and cream (pounds)	300	373	350	349	349	353
Ice cream—product weight (pounds)	9.8	18.7	17.3	17.7	17.2	18.0
Butter, farm and factory—actual weight (pounds)	16.8	10.5	9.2	8.5	9.0	9.2

[1] Milk equivalent of milk and cream and manufactured dairy products, including butter computed on basis of fat content.
[2] Other includes dry cream malted milk, dry part skim milk, dry ice cream mix, cottage cheese, miscellaneous minor uses and any inaccuracies of independently determined production and use items.
[3] Due to rounding, items do not always add to total.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the question of controls upon cattle is an interesting one. The livestock industry has been very vigorous in saying it wanted no controls of any kind or description. I have never known whether they were completely right or completely wrong. I have here a table showing that the per capita consumption of beef has gone from 54.8 pounds in 1935 to 1939, to 79.2 pounds in 1954, and to 81 pounds in 1955.

Mr. President, we have the greatest cattle numbers we have ever known. Personally, I think there is a reason for that which does not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but has to do with income-tax provisions. We may have to get to that at a later date. But beef which has come on the market has found some consumers, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing beef, its production, stocks, and markets.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beef: Production, stocks, markets

[Million pounds, carcass weight equivalent]

Calendar year	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Beginning stocks	112	163	199	262	249	188
Production	6,937	9,719	10,694	12,433	12,991	13,600
Imports	215	162	347	271	225	
Total supply [1]	7,263	10,044	11,241	12,966	13,465	
Civilian consumption	7,167	8,943	10,496	12,139	12,765	
Armed Forces		699	494	520	450	
Net purchases for export, USDA	−56	169				
Exports and shipments	53	63	38	58	62	
Total distribution [1]	7,164	9,874	11,028	12,717	13,277	
Ending stocks [1]	99	170	213	249	188	
Per capita civilian consumption (pounds)	54.8	62.7	67.1	76.7	79.2	81.0

[1] Due to rounding, items do not always add to total.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for purposes of comparison I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table dealing with pork, its production, stocks, and markets.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pork: Production, stocks, markets

[Million pounds, carcass weight equivalent]

Calendar year	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Beginning stocks	502	388	468	489	327	449
Production	7,337	10,538	10,752	10,063	9,952	10,000
Imports	48	1	101	164	184	
Total supply [1]	7,887	10,927	11,320	10,716	10,463	
Civilian consumption	7,286	9,771	10,394	9,957	9,631	
Armed Forces		435	336	298	278	
Net purchases for export, USDA		221				
Exports and shipments	142	81	128	134	105	
Total distribution [1]	7,428	10,508	10,857	10,389	10,014	
Ending stocks [1]	458	420	463	327	449	
Per capita civilian consumption (pounds)	55.7	68.6	66.7	62.9	59.7	66.0

[1] Due to rounding, items do not always add to total.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr President, finally, because of its relationship to both beef and pork, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table dealing with the production of corn, the stocks on hand, and the markets.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Corn: Production, stocks, markets

[Million bushels, except as otherwise indicated]

Crop year beginning Oct. 1	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Carry-in	250.3	341.4	751.9	768.8	919.7	1,028.8
Production	2,315.6	3,056.8	3,087.8	3,192.5	3,010.2	3,184.8
Imports	25.6	.7	.9	1.1	1.1	1.0
Total supply	2,591.5	3,398.9	3,840.6	3,962.4	3,931.0	4,214.6
Domestic consumption:						
Industrial and food uses	184.7	249.8	252.0	238.7	[1] 248.9	250.0
Seed	15.9	11.8	11.0	10.9	10.9	11.0
Livestock feeds	1,972.0	2,614.1	2,678.0	2,690.1	[1] 2,539.4	2,747.0
Total	2,172.6	2,875.7	2,941.0	2,939.7	2,799.2	3,008.0
Exports	44.0	75.9	111.0	103.0	103.0	[2] 100.0
Total disappearance	2,216.6	2,951.6	3,052.0	3,042.7	2,902.2	3,108.0
Carryout	374.9	447.3	788.6	919.7	1,028.8	1,106.6
	Year beginning July					
United States exports as a percentage of world trade (grain only) (percent)	9.4	41.5	56.1	70.8	53.9	42.7

[1] Unofficial estimates.

[2] Exports of grain only.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope that sometime I will have the opportunity and occasion to deal with these figures. I wanted them to appear in the RECORD so that they may be available to all Senators for examination, instead of having to hand them back and forth.

I desire to yield the floor, merely saying that I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] in giving me an opportunity to place the tables in the RECORD so that in the subsequent debate we may have an opportunity to refer to them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PAYNE ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] may be recognized for about 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who wish to speak, I move that, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 27, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in spite of the clouds and darkness which sadly limit our finite vision, keep us steadfast in the assurance that righteousness and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne.

Thou hast taught us that Thou dwellest not just out on the rim of the universe far from our individual pulse beat, but also in humble and contrite hearts, and that, as we are made in Thy image, no despot can enslave our consciences.

Against the defilement by impious hands of that sacred inner shrine, we pledge a sacrifice from which no cost can hold us back.

Strengthen our will, we beseech Thee, to halt the designs of tyrants, drunk with the sight of power, who would bring us and all people under their slavish domination.

And, as we say and pray "God bless America," make our land the kind of a land Thou canst bless and make a fit channel for Thy healing grace to all the peoples of the earth.

We ask it in the name of that one whose truth will make all men free. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 24, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

UNOFFICIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that on Wednesday, February 29, at 12:30 p. m., there will be an unofficial joint meeting of the House and the Senate in the House Chamber, for the purpose of hearing an address by His Excellency, the President of Italy, Giovanni Gronchi.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF LOBBYING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD three editorials, one from the New York Herald Tribune, one from the Baltimore Sun, and one from the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 26, 1956]

LOBBY INVESTIGATION

When a California oilman offered to contribute $2,500 to the campaign fund of a South Dakota Senator, he stirred up a hornet's nest. First result of his action was the Presidential veto of the bill to free natural gas producers from Federal price regulation. The President was outraged by the offer, even though the Senator in question, Republican FRANCIS CASE, turned it down and voted against the bill.

But that was just the beginning. Last week the entire Senate went into action. Following the lead of Senators LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas, and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, California, majority and minority leaders, respectively, it voted overwhelmingly to set up a special committee to investigate any and all attempts to influence legislation "through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying or * * * other activities." The resolution called for an 8-man committee, 4 Democrats and 4 Republicans.

The two leaders went to work at once to find their men. This was not easy. First, no Senator running for reelection was eligible. Second, it was necessary to find two in each party who had voted for the gas bill and two who had voted against it. Finally, it was necessary to convince these men that they ought to undertake what would be a distasteful task at best. Nevertheless, the committee was formed wihin 24 hours of the passage of the resolution.

In marked contrast to regular Senate committees, this one was authorized to select its own chairman. It was expected that Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, Tennessee, would be the members' choice. Senator GORE is chairman of the Senate Elections Subcommittee, which had already decided to investigate a part of the general area to be covered by the special committee.

The investigation into "attempts to influence improperly or illegally" Members of the Senate or senatorial candidates will be extended to similar attempts in connection with "any officer or employee of the executive branch." The judiciary was specifically excluded. The House of Representatives so far has taken no action in the matter.

The new committee was directed to make specific recommendations in these three areas:

1. Improvement and modernization of the Federal election laws.

2. Improvement and strengthening of the Corrupt Practices Act, governing campaign contributions; the Hatch Act, governing political activities by Federal employees, and the Regulation of Lobbying Act.

3. Assurance of "appropriate administrative action in connection with all persons, organizations, associations, or corporations believed to be guilty of wrongdoing punishable by law."

It is required to report by January 31, 1957, and is authorized to spend up to $350,000. Concerning its work, Senator JOHNSON said there is nothing to prevent interim reports upon which legal changes might be made before the November elections.

Senator KNOWLAND said that the committee had "one of the most important tasks ever assigned" by the Senate.

The Senate leaders did not just sit back and wait for the committee's report, however. On Friday they announced a decision to work together on legislation to modernize laws on campaign activities in time for the November elections. Immediate goal is to place a "realistic" limit on campaign spending, permit income-tax deductions up to $100 for campaign contributions and allow radio and television companies to divide free time between "major" parties without having to give equivalent time to splinter parties. Purpose of the tax deduction is to broaden participation in campaign financing.

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 25, 1956]

INFLUENCE, PROPER AND IMPROPER

The Senate has appointed its special influence committee, which is charged with the task of looking into the whole large question of improper efforts to influence legislators and Government employees by means of campaign contributions. It is a good bipartisan committee, consisting of Senators experienced in investigation. Senator GORE, who has been spoken of as the probable chairman, hopes that the investigation will bring about basic remedial legislation.

The committee has its work cut out for it. Politics is not carried on in a vacuum. There never was such a thing as a campaign contribution that was not given in the hope of influencing political decisions. The question, often asked but never satisfactorily answered, is at what point an effort to influence the course of politics by campaign contributions ceases to be proper and becomes improper. The President found that the lobbying in the case of the gas bill was arrogant, and there are few who will defend the contribution of $2,500 which was proffered to Senator CASE. Here was impropriety that everyone recognizes. But no one would seriously contend that interests directly or indirectly affected by the fate of that bill were not entitled to support their interests by every device of legitimate persuasion. Just where is the borderline beyond which the lobbying in this case became improper? No one can pin it down for sure.

Nor have efforts to legislate on the amounts and sources of legitimate campaign contributions ever been really effective. Mr. Thomas O'Neill touched on the history of these efforts in his column in the Evening Sun of Friday. Restrictions of that type always seem to have convenient loopholes.

Probably the best we can hope for is not specific restrictions of this type, but a better and more systematic illumination of where the money comes from, and why. If there is full disclosure of the amounts and kinds of political contributions, and if their true sources are really identified, at least the public will know what is going on. At present, most of the time, it doesn't. There exists no study that treats this question of electoral financing in realistic detail—and, of course, such studies as there are become obsolete quickly. Nor has there ever been full and systematic disclosure in the realm of local, State, or national politics.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 27, 1956]

HONEST ELECTIONS BILL

The drive for enactment of the so-called honest elections bill is a necessary concomitant to the investigation into lobbying and use of money to influence legislators. One effect of the furor over Senator CASE's disclosures and the forthcoming inquiry is likely to be a drying up of contributions for the 1956 campaigns from donors interested in getting bills through Congress. Even regular contributors are likely to think twice before offering any substantial sum to a Senator or Representative while the investigation is under way. It becomes especially important, therefore, to encourage campaign contributions from other sources.

The evil that has come sharply into focus as a result of the natural-gas lobby's activities is not the spending of money in political campaigns. The people must be informed about issues and candidates if they are to vote intelligently. Our democratic system is admittedly expensive to operate. The real danger arises when special interests contribute heavily to political campaigns in the expectation that the legislators elected with such help will pass bills the special interests want. The Senate concluded, largely on the basis of the CASE incident, that this danger demands thorough investigation.

At the same time the Senate leaders are keenly aware of the fact that campaign contributions do not grow on bushes. While striking a blow at gifts from special interests, they see the need for encouraging more numerous donations from the rank and file of citizens interested in good government. Consequently, the plan that seems to be emerging from conferences by Majority Leader JOHNSON, Minority Leader KNOWLAND, and other Members of the Senate and House emphasizes three important steps:

First, it would permit taxpayers to deduct from their taxable income political contributions up to $100. This would be a substantial incentive to taxpayers to aid the party or candidates of their choice. Contributions on this level would not be large enough to create any sense of obligation on the part of the candidate to the donor. For some legislators, this proposal may well become a declaration of independence.

Second, it would permit radio and television networks to give free time to major candidates without extending similar favors to every fringe or splinter office seeker. This would notably ease the high cost of campaigns.

Third, expenditure limits would be lifted to make the law meaningful, and reporting requirements would be drastically tightened. Means should also be found, in our opinion, of extending the safeguards of the bill to campaigns for nomination, which in about one-third of the States, are equivalent to elections. Senator MUNDT'S proposal that congressional candidates be required to file in Washington duplicates of their reports to the States on campaign contributions and expenditures appears to have a good deal of merit in this connection.

The important objectives are to stimulate a flow of contributions from the right sources, to discourage gifts that tend to sway legislative judgment and to expose all transactions bearing upon nomination and election to public office to the fullest public scrutiny.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF ARMY AND AIR FORCE VITALIZATION AND RETIREMENT EQUALIZATION ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 302 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO MAILING OF OBSCENE MATTER

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing grants in aid to State agencies for the promotion and enforcement of safety in industry

"Whereas legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States which would provide grants in aid to State agencies for the promotion and enforcement of safety in industry, to wit: Senate bill No. 1091 and House of Representatives bill No. 5740, which are identical bills; and

"Whereas it has long been desired that the State of Colorado extend and amplify its presently existing safety and accident prevention program to the end that the number and severity of industrial accidents with their attendant loss of wages and distress to the wage earner and his family may be reduced, but this program has been hampered by lack of funds: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That it respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law the bills presently pending before it providing for grants in aid to State agencies for the promotion and enforcement of safety in industry, namely, Senate bill No. 1091 and House of Representatives' bill No. 5740; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Congress from this State and to the Secretary of Labor of the United States.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

"STEPHEN L. R. MCNICHOLS,
"President of the Senate.

"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to restore to the citizens their constitutional rights to own, hold and possess gold and to buy and sell gold in a free market

"Whereas the absolute and arbitrary control exercised by the United States Treasury over the production, disposition and holding of domestic gold is in direct violation of the rights of personal liberty, personal security and private property which are fundamental rights of free men and women guaranteed to citizens of the United States by their Constitution; and

"Whereas the $35 (per fine ounce) price of gold was proclaimed arbitrarily by the President in 1934, and has since been rigidly maintained for all purchases and sales of gold by the Treasury, regardless of the fact that the value and purchasing power of dollars has decreased to considerably less than half of what it was in 1934; and

"Whereas Treasury regulations require that gold producers in the United States and Alaska, obtain licenses from them before processing and refining the gold mined from their properties and that thereafter such gold must be sold to the Treasury or their licensed agents at their arbitrary $35 price, and that these conditions are enforced by the Treasury through threats of confiscation of the gold owned by producers and threats of their criminal prosecution with fines and imprisonment, if they do not conform to such regulations; and

"Whereas it is well known and officially admitted that the costs of labor and all other commodities, especially such costs as enter into the production of gold, have doubled or trebled since 1934; and

"Whereas the Treasury having thus, in effect, confiscated newly mined gold in the United States has usurped the right of its owners to sell this gold to industry and to the arts, and through its regulations it has denied private citizens the right to own, buy or sell gold as a commodity or as a store of value, in a free market so that it might reflect its actual value; and

"Whereas these practices by the Treasury have imposed such uneconomic and arbitrary restrictions upon gold producers that 95 percent of the primary gold mines of the United States have been forced to close down, thus leaving the United States without available future sources for new gold; and

"Whereas the sale of gold from our Treasury gold stocks, to private industry, annually exceeds the total domestic gold production and is dangerously dissipating the available United States gold supply which should be held intact and increased for future monetary protection of our citizens and for national defense; and

"Whereas the industry and well being of many communities in the State of Colorado and the Western United States have been seriously impaired through the enforcement of its arbitrary and inadequate price of gold by the Treasury which thereby deprives said State of Colorado from development, production and enjoyment of a substantial part of its mineral wealth: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the President and the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to enact legislation which will end the wasteful sale of gold from United States gold stocks, to private industry, and to restore to the people of the United States their constitutional rights to have a free market for all newly mined gold, and such other gold as they may desire to acquire, which provisions in substance are contained in legislation now pending in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado be authorized and directed to transmit properly certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States; the President of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Representatives of the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"STEPHEN L. R. MCNICHOLS,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 59

"Resolution memorializing Congress to reduce the tax burden on the major industries of the Commonwealth of Kentucky

"Whereas the isolated imposition of inequitable and onerous tax burdens on the major industries of any State is patently contrary to sound public policy and principles of economics; and

"Whereas the imposition of burdensome taxes has not only an undesirable effect upon industry and the community, but also deprives the States of sources of desperately needed revenue; and

"Whereas two of the Commonwealth of Kentucky's major industries, distilling and tobacco, are presently burdened with unjust, unfair and economically unwise taxes by the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas it appears that in the best interests of the citizens of this Commonwealth, as well as those of the other 47 States, relief from such special tax burdens should be granted; and

"Whereas such relief can only be afforded by appropriate action by the Congress of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States act in the exercise of its broad legislative powers to reduce, alleviate and distribute amongst the States, on an equitable basis, the pressing burden of taxes presently being borne by the distilling and tobacco industries in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

"SEC. 2. That copies of this resolution be sent by the clerk of the house to the President and Chief Clerk of the Senate of the United States, the United States Senators from Kentucky, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Representatives in Congress from Kentucky."

Two concurrent resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to restore tobacco acreage allotments to their 1955 level

"Whereas agriculture is of highest importance to the economy of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; and

"Whereas the production of tobacco is of first importance in the Agriculture of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas there has been drastic reduction of tobacco acreage over the past 2 years totaling about 40 percent, resulting in considerable reduction in total farm production and causing hardship to the farmers in this Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the total 1955 tobacco production has fallen far below the earlier crop estimates on which the 1956 allotments were based; and

"Whereas there has been a favorable increase in consumption of burley tobacco over the past several months; and

"Whereas it now appears that reductions in tobacco acreage allotments for 1956, made in November of 1955, are unwise and unnecessary; and

"Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture is without authority to now correct its 1956 allotments to adjust to the several differences between the estimates and the facts; and

"Whereas failure to do everything possible to bring about the production of tobacco in amounts most suitable to the economy of tobacco marketing within the principles of the production control program of the Federal Government, would undermine confidence in the program and cause undue hardship on the farmers of the Commonwealth: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to act in the exercise of its broad legislative powers and in the performance of its specific duty under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to correct the tobacco acreage allotments for 1956 determined on the basis of an erroneous estimate of the 1955 crop;

"SEC. 2. That the Congress act in this regard by canceling the reductions in the tobacco acreage allotments for burley tobacco and restoring the burley allotments to their 1955 level as is made advisable by production statistics now available to the Department of Agriculture and to the Congress; and

"SEC. 3. That the clerk of the house of representatives is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each of the Senators and Representatives from Kentucky now serving in the Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture, United States, and to the president of the Kentucky Farm Bureau."

"House Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to restore tobacco acreage allotments to their 1955 level

"Whereas agriculture is of highest importance to the economy of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; and

"Whereas the production of tobacco is of first importance in the agriculture of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas there has been drastic reduction of tobacco acreage over the past 2 years totaling about 40 percent, resulting in considerable reduction in total farm production and causing hardship to the farmers in this Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the total 1955 tobacco production has fallen far below the earlier crop estimates on which the 1956 allotments were based; and

"Whereas there has been a favorable increase in consumption of cigarette tobacco over the past several months; and

"Whereas it now appears that reductions in tobacco acreage allotments for 1956, made in November of 1955, are unwise and unnecessary; and

"Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture is without authority to now correct its 1956 allotments to adjust to the several differences between the estimates and the facts; and

"Whereas failure to do everything possible to bring about the production of tobacco in amounts most suitable to the economy of tobacco marketing within the principles of

the production control program of the Federal Government, would undermine confidence in the program and cause undue hardship on the farmers of the Commonwealth: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to act in the exercise of its broad legislative powers and in the performance of its specific duty under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to correct the tobacco acreage allotments for 1956 determined on the basis of an erroneous estimate of the 1955 crop;

"SEC. 2. That the Congress act in this regard by canceling the reductions in the tobacco acreage allotments for burley tobacco and restoring the burley allotments to their 1955 level as is made advisable by production statistics now available to the Department of Agriculture and to the Congress; and

"SEC. 3. That the clerk of the house of representatives is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each of the Senators and Representatives from Kentucky now serving in the Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture, United States, and to the president of the Kentucky Farm Bureau."

Resolutions of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

"Resolutions urging the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Defense to provide Watertown Arsenal with work in the guided missile and new weapons fields

"Whereas it is proposed to reduce the production and personnel of the $100 million ordnance plant, Watertown Arsenal; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense has given important guided missile and new weapons work to many private industrial firms which do not have the same available facilities; and

"Whereas the loss of $15 million annual payroll of the Watertown Arsenal in this area would drastically contribute to the economic plight of New England; and

"Whereas the Watertown Arsenal is capable and ready to produce guided missiles and the new defense weapons; and

"Whereas the skill of the scientists and technicians at Watertown Arsenal, who have pioneered in major metallurgical and scientific developments for decades, have won national and international acclaim: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Defense to provide this vitally important ordnance installation, Watertown Arsenal, with work in the guided missile and new weapons fields from funds already appropriated in the defense budget, thus working for the best interest of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the Secretary of Defense, to the members of the Armed Service Committee, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the New England Conservatory of Music Alumni Association, at Boston, Mass., relating to the designation of the Cathedral of the Pines, in the State of New Hampshire, as a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of citizens of Lithuanian descent, at Los Angeles., Calif., relating to the 38th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A joint resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the age of qualification for the benefits of the old-age assistance program from 65 years to 60 years of age

"Whereas by the old-age assistance program as defined under the Social Security Act passed August 14, 1935 (ch. 531, 49 Stat. 622; U. S. C. A., title I, sec. 6) and its amendments, August 10, 1939 (ch. 666, 53 Stat. 1362, U. S. C. A., title I, sec. 103) and August 28, 1950 (ch. 809, 64 Stat. 549, U. S. C. A., title III, pt. 1, sec. 303 (a), benefits under this program are limited to individuals who have attained the age of 65 years; and

"Whereas there are many individuals deserving of the benefits of this program who are not eligible therefor because of their inability to meet the age requirement; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the benefits of this program be made available to as many deserving individuals as possible; Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in regular session assembled, the Senate and House concurring, memorializes the 84th Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act as it pertains to 'old-age assistance' to include those individuals who have attained the age of 60 years.

"SEC. 2. That the Senators and Representatives of Kentucky in the 84th Congress are urged to introduce and support legislation to accomplish the foregoing.

"SEC. 3. That copies of this memorial, duly authenticated, be sent by the clerk of the senate to the President and Chief Clerk of the Senate of the United States, the United States Senators from Kentucky, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Representatives in Congress from Kentucky."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 74

"A resolution urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation reducing the Federal tax on whisky

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Kentucky is in dire need of additional revenue with which to afford its citizens the necessary governmental services; and

"Whereas a reduction in the Federal tax on whisky from $10.50 per gallon to $9 per gallon would present an opportunity for the Commonwealth to levy additional taxes on the whisky industry for the benefit of its citizens; and

"Whereas such reduction in Federal taxes can only be accomplished by legislative action by the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States act, in the exercise of its broad legislative powers, to reduce the Federal tax on whisky from $10.50 per gallon to $9 per gallon.

"SEC. 2. The clerk of the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky shall transmit copies of this resolution to all United States Senators and Congressmen from Kentucky.

"HARRY LEE WATERFIELD,
"President of the Senate.
"THOMAS FITZPATRICK,
"Speaker, House of Representatives."

PUBLIC-SCHOOL INTEGRATION—JOINT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. On behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and myself, I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which was enacted without a single dissenting vote by the South Carolina General Assembly on February 14, 1956. This is a joint resolution condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the States and Congress to prevent this and other encroachment by the Central Government. The resolution declares the intention of South Carolina to exercise all powers reserved to it, to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people.

I ask that this historic document be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with an article from the February 27, 1956, edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald. The article was written by Mr. John M. Fenton and is entitled "The Gallup Poll: 8 Out of 10 Southern Whites Veto Integration."

Mr. President, I have offered these two insertions to be printed in the RECORD together to point out to the Congress that the people of South Carolina are handing down an almost unanimous verdict that they do not want integration and that they do not approve of legislation by judicial decree. This resolution demonstrates the unanimity of the South Carolina General Assembly on this point, and the Gallup Poll shows that 9 out of every 10 white South Carolinians are against integration. The people of South Carolina believe that local matters can best be handled by local people who are familiar with existing conditions and public sentiment.

I submit, Mr. President, that public sentiment is a vital factor in determining either the success or failure of any undertaking. Abraham Lincoln believed this to be true, also, when he uttered these words of warning in 1832:

With public sentiment nothing can fail. Without it nothing can succeed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Joint resolution condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the States and Congress to prevent this and other encroachment by the Central Government and declaring the intention of South Carolina to exercise all powers reserved to it to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people.

Mindful of its responsibilities to its own citizens and of its obligations to the other States, the General Assembly of South Carolina adopts this resolution in condemnation of and protest against the illegal encroachment by the Central Government into the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people, and against the grave threat to constitutional government, implicit in the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, for these reasons:

1. The genius of the American Constitution lies in two provisions. It establishes a clear division between the powers delegated by the States to the Central Government and the powers reserved to the States, or to the people. As a prerequisite to any lawful redistribution of these powers, it establishes as a part of the process for its amendment the requirement of approval by the States.

The division of these powers is reaffirmed in the 10th amendment to the Constitution in these words: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Long judicial precedent also clearly reaffirms that central government is one of delegated powers specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and that all other powers of government, not prohibited by the Constitution to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people.

The power to propose changes and the power to approve changes in the basic law is specifically stated by article V of the Constitution in these words: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

Lincoln, in his first inaugural, recognized these constitutional principles in the following language: "The maintenance inviolate to the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions, according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend."

2. Neither the judicial power delegated to the Supreme Court in article III of the Constitution nor such appellate jurisdiction as the article authorizes the Congress to confer upon the Court, makes the Court the supreme arbiter of the rights of the States under the compact.

3. The right of each of the States to maintain at its own expense racially separate public schools for the children of its citizens and other racially separate public facilities is not forbidden or limited by the language or the intent of the 14th amendment. This meaning of the 14th amendment was established beyond reasonable question by the action of the Congress in providing for racially segregated schools in the District of Columbia by legislation contemporaneous with the submission of the 14th amendment to the States in 1866, and by the fact that a majority of the States in the Union at that time recognized that segregation in public facilities had not been abolished by this amendment. There is no evidence in the Constitution, in the amendments, or in any contemporary document that the States intended to give to the Central Government the right to invade the sanctity of the homes of America and deny to responsible parents a meaningful voice in the training of their children or in the selection of associates for them.

4. For almost 60 years, begining in 1896, an unbroken line of decisions of the Court interpreted the 14th amendment as recognizing the right of the States to maintain racially separate public facilities for their people. If the Court in the interpretation of the Constitution is to depart from the sanctity of past decisions and to rely on the current political and social philosophy of its members to unsettle the great constitutional principles so clearly established, the rights of individuals are not secure and government under a written Constitution has no stability.

5. Disregarding the plain language of the 14th amendment, ignoring the conclusive character of the contemporary actions of the Congress and of the State legislatures, overruling its own decisions to the contrary, the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, relying on its own views of sociology and psychology, for the first time held that the 14th amendment prohibited the States from maintaining racially separate public schools and since then the Court has enlarged this to include other public facilities. In so doing the Court, under the guise of interpretation, amended the Constitution of the United States, thus usurping the power of Congress to submit, and that of the several States to approve, constitutional changes. This action of the Court ignored the principle that the meaning of the Constitution and of its amendments does not change. It is a written instrument. That which the 14th amendment meant when adopted it means now (*South Carolina* v. *United States*, 199 U. S. 437, 449).

6. The educational opportunities of white and colored children in the public schools of South Carolina have been substantially improved during recent years and highly satisfactory results are being obtained in our segregated schools. If enforced, the decision of the Court will seriously impair and retard the education of the children of both races, will nullify these recent advances and will cause untold friction between the races.

7. Tragic as are the consequences of this decision to the education of the children of both races in the Southern States, the usurpation of constitutional power by the Court transcends the problems of segregation in education. The Court holds that regardless of the meaning of a constitutional provision when adopted, and in the language of the 1955 Report of the Gray Commission to the Governor of Virginia, "irrespective of precedent, long acquiesced in, the Court can and will change its interpretation of the Constitution at its pleasure, disregarding the orderly processes for its amendment set forth in article V thereof. It means that the most fundamental of the rights of the States or of their citizens exist by the Court's sufferance and that the law of the land is whatever the Court may determine it to be * * *." Thus the Supreme Court, created to preserve the Constitution, has planted the seed for the destruction of constitutional government.

8. Because the preservation of the rights of the States is as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the National Government, since "the Constitution, in all of its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States" (*Texas* v. *White* ((1869), 7 Wallace 700, 725)), and since the usurpation of the rights reserved to the States is by the judicial branch of the Central Government, the issues raised by this decision are of such grave import as to require this sovereign State to judge for itself of the infraction of the Constitution.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina:

SECTION 1. That the States have never delegated to the Central Government the power to change the Constitution nor have they surrendered to the Central Government the power to prohibit to the States the right to maintain racially separate but equal public facilities or the right to determine when such facilities are in the best interest of their citizens.

SEC. 2. That the action of the Supreme Court of the United States constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt to change the true intent and meaning of the Constitution. It is in derogation of the power of Congress to propose, and that of the States to approve, constitutional changes. It thereby establishes a judicial precedent, if allowed to stand, for the ultimate destruction of constitutional government.

SEC. 3. That the State of South Carolina condemns and protests against the illegal encroachment by the Central Government into the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people and against the grave threat to the constitutional government implicit in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the States and the Congress do take appropriate legal steps to prevent, now and in the future, usurpation of power by the Supreme Court and other encroachment by the Central Government into the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people to the end that our American system of constitutional government may be preserved.

SEC. 5. In the meantime, the State of South Carolina as a loyal and sovereign State of the Union will exercise the powers reserved to it under the Constitution to judge for itself of the infractions and to take such other legal measures as it may deem appropriate to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people.

SEC. 6. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the governor and legislature of each of the other States, to the President of the United States, to each of the Houses of Congress, to South Carolina's Representatives and Senators in the Congress, and to the Supreme Court of the United States for its information.

SEC. 7. This act shall take effect upon its approval by the Governor.

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
President of the Senate.
SOLOMON BLATT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Approved the 14th day of February 1956.
GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, Jr.,
Governor.

The article, presented by Mr. THURMOND, is as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 27, 1956]

THE GALLUP POLL—8 OUT OF 10 SOUTHERN WHITES VETO INTEGRATION

(By John M. Fenton)

PRINCETON, N. J., February 26.—Just how strongly does the average southerner feel about desegregation?

One needs to penetrate only a few miles into the South to become aware of the impact of the Supreme Court's decision in the 13 Southern States today, everybody is talking about the possible end of segregation.

This reporter has just returned from a 4,000-mile tour of the South, during which he spoke with many southerners—both white and Negro. Aided by the public opinion reporters of the institute's southern staff, we interviewed a representative cross-section of adults in all parts of the South—from Virginia to Texas.

All in all, we found 8 out of 10 southern whites opposed to the Supreme Court's outlawing of segregation in the public schools.

Opinion is slightly less opposed to the recent Interstate Commerce Commission ruling which outlawed segregated travel between States on buses, trains, and in public waiting rooms.

There are still about 3 out of 4 southern whites, however, who oppose such a move.

The questions and results:

"The United States Supreme Court has ruled that racial segregation in the public schools is illegal. This means that all children, no matter what their race, must be allowed to go to the same schools. Do you approve or disapprove of this decision?"

Southern whites only

	Percent
Approve	16
Disapprove	80
Undecided	4

"The Interstate Commerce Commission has ruled that racial segregation on trains, buses, and in public waiting rooms must end. Do you approve or disapprove of this ruling?"

Southern whites only

	Percent
Approve	19
Disapprove	76
Undecided	5

The wide split in opinion that the segregation issue has brought to the American domestic scene is illustrated by the vote of people in the 35 States outside the South on the two issues—as recorded in the latest institute survey:

Supreme Court's decision—Outside the South

	Percent
Approve	71
Disapprove	24
Undecided	5

ICC's ruling—Outside the South

	Percent
Approve	67
Disapprove	24
Undecided	9

The degree of opposition to both rulings in the South is directly related to the size of the Negro population in each of the 13 States.

In the border States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Oklahoma, and Texas, for example, where the white-Negro ratio averages 8 whites to 1 Negro, we found nearly 1 white in 4 approving of the Supreme Court's decision.

Moving into what might be termed the "Midsouth States" of Florida, Virginia, Arkansas, and North Carolina—where Negroes constitute, on the average, about 24 percent of the total population—we discovered slightly greater opposition with about 1 white person in 5 favoring mixed schools and a little more than this approving on the ICC question.

It is in the five States of the Deep South—Georgia, Albama, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Mississippi—where the greatest opposition and bitterest resentment is found. In these areas—where more than one-third of the population is Negro—nearly 9 out of 10 whites are opposed on both questions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHWAYS, LITTLE FALLS DAM, POTOMAC RIVER—JOINT RESOLUTION OF MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Members of the Senate, Joint Resolution No. 22, approved by the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland, on February 20, concerning the construction of fishways at the Little Falls Dam on the Potomac River, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 22

Joint resolution expressing the sentiments of Maryland citizens concerning the construction of fishways at the Little Falls Dam on the Potomac River

Whereas it is the opinion of representatives of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Maryland Game and Inland Fish Commission, the Board of Natural Resources of Maryland, the League of Maryland Sportsmen, Inc., and other sportsmen's conservation groups that the construction of adequate fish ladders on Little Falls Dam on the Potomac River is essential for the conservation of abundant fish life in the Potomac and the Chesapeake Bay; and

Whereas the Corps of Army Engineers and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have adamantly held that they have no authorization from Congress to spend funds for such purposes; and

Whereas on February 7, 1956, the Comptroller General of the United States stated in part as follows: "It is our opinion that the Congress has both approved and appropriated money for a fishway at the Little Falls Dam. However, it is apparent that this authorization and appropriation is permissive only and not mandatory and does not constitute a positive direction from Congress that a fishway be constructed; and

Whereas there is immediate need to advise Maryland's United States Senators and Congressmen that the people of the State of Maryland are vitally interested in having these fishways included in the construction of the Little Falls Dam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Governor, the president of the senate and the speaker of the house of delegates, be and they are hereby requested to take immediate steps to inform the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army; the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the United States Senators and Members of Congress from Maryland that the people of Maryland want the fishway to be constructed on Little Falls Dam; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Maryland Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the Corps of Engineers, and Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to the Governor of Maryland, and to the president of the senate and the speaker of the house of delegates of Maryland.

A SOUND CONSERVATION PROGRAM—LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a letter I have received from the Faribault (Minn.) chapter of the Izaak Walton League, expressing their concern over bills and legislation contrary to a sound conservation program.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARIBAULT CHAPTER,
IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Faribault, Minn., February 7, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Faribault Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America hereby seeks your support in Congress for the correction of bills and legislation contrary to a sound conservation program.

We are vitally concerned in keeping Federal refuge areas set aside by farsighted conservationists from falling into the hands of individuals and groups who are only interested in the immediate situation or can realize financial gain. We must do everything within our power to preserve this wildlife heritage which now appears to be on the brink of extinction.

We believe there should be more congressional control of the Department of Interior so as to avoid and correct situations such as the leasing or disposing of wildlife preserves for oil and mining speculation and the turning over of tracts of land to the military.

Therefore, we ask you as our Senator to do everything in your power to incorporate these ideas in a sound conservation program.

Respectfully yours,

K. W. HOLLISTER,
Secretary.

FEDERAL ACQUISITION OF LAND IN MAHNOMEN COUNTY, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Mahnomen County commissioners at their meeting held on February 6, 1956, regarding the acquisition in their county of land by the Federal Government.

This resolution, Mr. President, is symptomatic of the kind of problem that can arise in a given community when acquisition of land by the Federal Government withdraws that land from local taxability. It is situations such as these which have prompted several bills now pending in the Senate which would provide for payments to localities by the Federal Government in lieu of taxes. One of these bills is my own, S. 1566. I have already had an opportunity to conduct certain hearings for the Senate Committee on Government Operations investigating this whole matter. I am hopeful that additional hearings will be scheduled on this question in the near future.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Mahnomen County Board of Commissioners has indirectly received information that the United States Government is considering the acquisition of land in Mahnomen County, Minn., for use by the Armed Forces; and

Whereas said Mahnomen County is extremely low in taxable valuation and needs every dollar of taxable value; and

Whereas there are now thousands of acres of land not on the tax rolls in said County of Mahnomen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, if the United States Government does acquire land in the said County of Mahnomen, the authorized agency thereof be, and hereby is respectfully requested not to purchase lands from which a tax revenue is being derived.

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS—STATEMENT AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the eyes of the Nation are following very closely

the developments on the House of Representatives side, dealing with the new Federal-aid-to-highway legislation.

I present a statement which I forwarded to a conference called on Washington's Birthday, broadly representative of the vast number of Wisconsin groups interested in improving the Nation's highway program.

I append to it three resolutions on this subject: the first, adopted by the Wisconsin section of the American Society of Civil Engineers; the second, adopted by the Washburn County Good Roads Association, and Federal Labor Union, No. 19985.

I ask unanimous consent that these four items be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY STRESSES URGENT NEED FOR HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(Excerpts from statement by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, to the Wisconsin Conference on the Federal Highway Program, February 22, 1956, Madison, Wis.)

We all agree that one of our Nation's most urgent needs is indeed for improving and expanding our highway system. Our 1965 traffic, based on 81 million vehicles, is estimated to exceed 800 billion vehicle miles per year. As you all know, our existing highways system is not anywhere near sufficient adequately to handle this gigantic flow.

The expansion of our highways—interstate, primary, secondary, and urban—is essential to our continued growth and development. We are aware of the benefits that will accrue. There will be better thoroughfares for regular motoring and tourism, as well as better feeder roads for access to farms, factories, small towns, and other points. Improved highways will help to diminish our tragic tolls of death and injuries, and severe economic losses resulting from traffic tieups.

In addition, the program for expansion and development will, in itself, be an economic shot in the arm for the building trades and for the Nation, and will provide needed economic insurance for the future.

An additional point that we might all remember is that a complete, well-integrated system of highways is essential for civil and national defense.

In the event of war the 48 States may be under attack, with a resulting disruption of traffic and communications. We must not lessen our chances of survival by being shortsighted, penny wise, and pound foolish in failing to provide adequate routes and alternate routes for defense traffic.

We come to the heart of the problem before us—exactly how to finance highway expansion.

As you are all aware, the alternative Fallon bill, the Boggs bill, the AAA program, and other proposals are before the Public Works and Ways and Means Committees of the House of Representative. These proposals offer different and controversial methods of resolving the important financial question. A compromise must be achieved to avoid delay of the much-needed program.

The objective, of course, is to provide an equitable distribution of the financial burden. What proportion should be borne by the trucking industry, and what fraction by the auto-traveling public—represents a difficult problem which must be worked out carefully and objectively. No one group may prove 100 percent satisfied in the long run, but a compromise should prove feasible which would be fairly acceptable to almost all groups.

You may be assured that—unless unfair provisions are written into the final bill on the House side or in conference committee—I will give my full support to legislation to effect this program.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED FEBRUARY 22, 1956, BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE WISCONSIN SECTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS RELATIVE TO PROPOSED FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Whereas there is general agreement of an existing need for improved highway facilities, both rural and urban, to keep abreast with the everincreasing traffic problem; and

Whereas recent studies indicated the value of developing an extensive Interstate Highway System, and, at the same time, maintaining the existing established Federal-aid highway systems; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin, its counties and local units of government, would materially benefit from an augmented Federal highway program; and

Whereas the additional cost of developing the proposed highway facilities is beyond the ability and capacity of State and local governmental units to finance such projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Wisconsin section of the American Society of Civil Engineers does hereby request the Senators and Representatives from the great State of Wisconsin to give due consideration to the need for an adequate and improved Federal highway program and vote favorably for the adoption of a sufficient and adequate highway bill including incr ed funds for the development of an extensive Interstate Highway System, and the continuance of substantial aids for the existing established Federal highway systems in both urban and rural areas; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Wisconsin section be directed to submit a copy of this resolution to each of Wisconsin's Senators and Representatives as promptly as possible.

WASHBURN COUNTY GOOD ROADS ASSOCIATION,
Spooner, Wis., December 19, 1955.

The Washburn County Good Roads Association, an affiliate of the Wisconsin Good Roads Association, meeting at Spooner, Wis., Monday, December 19, passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has under consideration the question of a national highway program to be designed to meet the requirements of our rapidly increasing interstate highway traffic and to provide adequate extensions and replacements to handle present-day transportation needs: Be it

"*Resolved*, That in the forthcoming session of Congress our Senators and Representatives give their attention and efforts toward building such a program, which, it is generally conceded, is a present necessity."

A copy of the resolution to be presented to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY and to Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.

JOHN S. CHICHESTER,
Chairman.
CHARLES L. LEWIS.
FRANCIS LINK.
WM. W. STEWART.
LAVERNE WEST.

Whereas America faces a grave crisis because more and more vehicles daily crowd highways, a burden which will double by 1970; and

Whereas lagging highway construction and hit-and-miss planning has contributed to this situation in the past; and

Whereas it is estimated that poor highways cost taxpayers some $4 billion yearly in deaths, accidents, and high insurance rates; and

Whereas better roads will not only benefit all citizens in this Nation on wheels, but are necessary to national defense, economic expansion, and full employment; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to the recommendation as contained in the Weeks' committee report for the financing of such a program; and be it further

Resolved, that Federal Labor Union, No. 19985, on behalf of its members, urge its United States Senators and Representatives in Washington to support and promote a bold, long range program for highway construction whose costs will be equitably distributed among all segments of the population of this country.

Adopted this 24th day of February 1956, at Kenosha, Wis.

DEXTER LEWIS,
Recording Secretary, Frost Federal Labor Union, No. 19985.

CERTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION— RESOLUTION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the San Luis Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., at its annual meeting at Monte Vista, Colo., on February 1, 1956, concerning certain recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, commonly known as the Hoover Commission, has recommended that the Rural Electrification Administration be abolished, that the so-called preference clause be abolished, that the Government no longer finance the construction of transmission lines or make loans for generating plants; and

Whereas the adoption of any of these recommendations would, in the opinion of the members of this cooperative, mean the swift strangulation of rural electric cooperatives and their speedy acquisition by the private power monopolies: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the San Luis Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., is unalterably opposed to these recommendations and strongly urge their rejection; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the members of the Colorado congressional delegation and to the chairmen of the Agricultural Committee of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROJECTS; RESOLUTION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Public Service Commission of the State of North Dakota with reference to Federal-aid highway projects.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Whereas the construction of Federal-aid highway projects frequently require relocation of electric supply and communication lines; and

Whereas the expense involved in relocating electric supply and communication lines tends to increase the cost of furnishing electric and telephone service, particularly

for rural electric and telephone cooperatives; and

Whereas it is our belief that the cost of relocating electric supply and communication lines to accommodate construction of Federal-aid highway projects should be considered a part of the cost of highway construction and borne by those who benefit from the highway program; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Public Service Commission urge the Congress to enact legislation providing that electric supply and communication companies be reimbursed for the net cost of relocating their facilities to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each United States Senator and Representative from the State of North Dakota.

Dated at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 2d day of February 1956.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
MARTIN VAALER, *President.*
ERNEST D. NELSON, *Commissioner.*

Attest:

ELMER OLSON, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 767. A bill for the relief of Andrew Rosner (Rept. No. 1573);

S. 1881. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Ventimiglia (Rept. No. 1574);

S. 1975. A bill for the relief of Jenny Antoinette V. Ingrum (Rept. No. 1575);

S. 2012. A bill for the relief of Chong You How (also known as Edward Charles Yee), his wife, Eng Lai Fong, and his child, Chong Yim Keung (Rept. No. 1576);

S. 2042. A bill to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States (Rept. No. 1577);

S. 2345. A bill for the relief of Lilu Yuen Chuang (Rept. No. 1578);

S. 2666. A bill for the relief of Catherine Toews (Rept. No. 1579);

S. 2686. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Boni (Rept. No. 1580);

H. R. 944. A bill for the relief of Nicola Teodosio (Rept. No. 1581);

H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Krsevan Spanjol (Rept. No. 1582);

H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Howard Rieck (Rept. No. 1583);

H. R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chiu-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze) (Rept. No. 1584);

H. R. 3557. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed (Rept. No. 1585);

H. R. 4181. A bill for the relief of P. F. Claveau, as successor to the firm of Rodger G. Ritchie Painting & Decorating Co. (Rept. No. 1586);

H. R. 6532. A bill for the relief of John William Scholtes (Rept. No. 1587); and

H. R. 6617. A bill for the relief of Boris Kowerda (Rept. No. 1588).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1411. A bill for the relief of Marion Drucker (Rept. No. 1589);

S. 1533. A bill for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulias (Rept. No. 1590);

S. 1687. A bill for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson (Rept. No. 1591);

S. 1734. A bill for the relief of Johann Antonius Tudhope and Walda Fedor Tudhope (Rept. No. 1592);

S. 2016. A bill for the relief of Lawrence F. Kramer (Rept. No. 1593);

S. 2697. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Yamada Clark (Rept. No. 1594);

H. R. 1082. A bill for the relief of Golda I. Stegner (Rept. No. 1595);

H. R. 1495. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Porter (Rept. No. 1596);

H. R. 2946. A bill for the relief of Eugene Dus (Rept. No. 1597); and

H. R. 3996. A bill to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (Rept. No. 1598).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1929. A bill for the relief of Regina M. Knight (Rept. No. 1599).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright (Rept. No. 1600);

H. R. 1806. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc. (Rept. No. 1601); and

H. R. 5876. A bill to amend the copyright law to permit, in certain classes of works, the deposit of photographs or other identifying reproductions in lieu of copies of published works (Rept. No. 1602);

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1146. A bill to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives (Rept. No. 1603).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles K. Rice, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice H. Brian Holland, resigned;

Joseph P. Lieb, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Florida;

John M. Cashin, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York;

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, vice Edgar S. Vaught, retiring;

Oliver Gasch, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years, vice Leo A. Rover, elevated;

John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi for a term of 4 years (reappointment);

Oliver H. Metcalf, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania;

Albert Di Meolo, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the western district of Pennsylvania;

Santos Buxo, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be United States marshal for the district of Puerto Rico; and

Louis F. Kreek, of the District of Columbia, to be an Examiner-in-Chief in the Patent Office, Department of Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

R. Dorsey Watkins, of Maryland, to be United States district judge for the district of Maryland; and

Gerald Francis Bracken, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Lyle F. Milligan, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin for a term of 4 years, vice Clemens F. Michalski, resigned.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ewing T. Kerr, of Wyoming, to be United States district judge for the district of Wyoming.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 3287. A bill to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3288. A bill to relieve certain veterans from liability for repayment of amounts erroneously paid to them while members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3289. A bill to authorize the coinage of standard silver dollars in commemoration of the Nevada Silver Centenary and the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3290. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Chief of Chaplains of the United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3291. A bill to provide for the demolition of certain temporary buildings in the District of Columbia, the construction of permanent-type replacements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 3292. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria (Schandl) Cote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3293. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of April 6, 1949, relating to special livestock loans, to producers of hogs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3294. A bill for the relief of Manuel Saborido-Bures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 3295. A bill to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 3296. A bill to amend the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act to

encourage private transactions in FHA insured and VA guaranteed mortgages at stabilized prices which approach or equal par value of such mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (by request):

S. 3297. A bill to amend and improve the child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, to authorize special project grants to institutions of higher education or research in connection with maternal and child health and crippled children's services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 3298. A bill to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors; considered and passed.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

REPAYMENT OF AMOUNTS ERRONEOUSLY PAID TO CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a great many veterans have received pay erroneously, and there are hundreds of such cases pending. I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to take care of that situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3288) to relieve certain veterans from liability for repayment of amounts erroneously paid to them while members of the Armed Forces, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COINAGE OF STANDARD SILVER DOLLARS IN COMMEMORATION OF NEVADA SILVER CENTENARY AND 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF DISCOVERY OF COMSTOCK LODE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the coinage of standard silver dollars in commemoration of the Nevada Silver Centenary and the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev.

This bill would authorize the issuance of not less than 500,000 silver dollars for general circulation.

Today, Virginia City, sometimes called America's liveliest ghost town, is making plans to become the hub of a Statewide celebration in 1959 commemorating this opening chapter in Nevada's statehood. My State wants the entire country to join in this tribute to those hardy workmen who took $1 billion worth of gold and silver from beneath Virginia City.

It was this greatest of all silver and gold deposits in the world which made its mark on American history, at one time making Virginia City the most powerful city west of Chicago. This bullion, wanted by the North in the Civil War to help save the Union, played probably the greatest role in bringing about Nevada's Statehood in 1864.

The influence of this great new wealth built San Francisco into a world financial center. At one time when a new rich vein of silver was discovered on the Comstock, the German Empire made haste to get off the silver standard.

Of the 40,000 fortune seekers who crowded Virginia City in its hey-day, few achieved riches, but those who did, read like an early American Who's Who.

It was the silver found by one whiskered laborer, George Hearst, which would bring prominence to its finder. The same silver helped his son build a great newspaper empire.

It was the millions found by John Mackay which laid the first transatlantic cable, and consolidated the cable and telegraph operations of this country into a world system known as Postal Telegraph.

Later Marcus Daly became America's "copper king" and Adolph Sutro one of San Francisco's great mayors. Darius Mills founded a great banking firm, when he started the Bank of California.

It was up to Sandy Bowers, who had silver doorknobs at his mansion, to startle the European continent by offering to buy the Arch of Triumph from the French Government while visiting in Paris.

Fame came to others who did not dig gold and silver. A young reporter on one of Virginia City's four daily newspapers signed his articles "Mark Twain."

Today, Virginia City is steeped in history of the passing scene, but the memories live on.

The State of Nevada hopes that Americans everywhere will join in honoring this 100th anniversary of the Comstock Lode's discovery, a never-to-be-forgotten chapter in this country's history.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3289) to authorize the coinage of standard silver dollars in commemoration of the Nevada Silver Centenary and the 110th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev., introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956, RELATING TO SPECIAL LIVESTOCK LOANS TO PRODUCERS OF HOGS—AMENDMENT AND BILL

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 3183, the unfinished business. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. CAPEHART. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the provisions of the act of April 6, 1949, relating to special livestock loans, to producers of hogs. The bill and amendment would amend the Agricultural Act to include hogs. I do not know why they were left out in the first place, because hogs certainly are as much livestock as goats or cows.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a pamphlet issued by the United States Department of Agriculture entitled "Special Livestock Loans."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the pamphlet will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3293) to extend the provisions of the act of April 6, 1949, relating to special livestock loans, to producers of hogs, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The pamphlet presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

SPECIAL LIVESTOCK LOANS

PURPOSE

The special livestock loan program is designed to help livestock producers continue their normal operations.

WHO MAY BORROW

Established producers and feeders of cattle, sheep, and goats, except commercial feed-lot operators, who:

1. Are temporarily unable to get from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources, the credit needed to continue their normal livestock operations.

2. Have a good past record of livestock operations.

3. Have reasonable prospects for success with the help of a loan.

USES OF LOAN FUNDS

These loans are made to meet usual expenses necessary to successful livestock operations, such as the purchase or production of feed, and replacing, hiring, or repairing of farm machinery and equipment. Loans also may be made for the limited restocking of herds, if the applicant can carry his present herd, plus the additional livestock to be purchased, without buying a substantial portion of his feed. Loans are not made to expand operations substantially or to pay existing debts, except current incidental bills.

LOAN TERMS

Loans bear 5 percent interest and are to be repaid as rapidly as possible, according to a schedule based on the applicant's ability to repay, but may not extend beyond 3 years. Loans will be secured in their full amount by the personal obligation and available security of the applicant. Other creditors are not asked to subordinate their liens, but are expected to stand by and to agree that a reasonable part of the applicant's normal income from livestock can be used in repaying the loan. The standby agreement is required to give the farmer a fair chance to work out of his difficulties resulting from the emergency.

LOAN APPROVAL

A State or local livestock loan committee, appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, decides whether the applicant is eligible

and approves the loan. An application for a loan of more than $50,000 must have final approval by the Secretary.

WHERE TO APPLY

Applications for special livestock loans may be made at county offices of the Farmers' Home Administration.

AUTHORITY

Public Law 38, 81st Congress, as amended, provides authority for making special livestock loans through July 13, 1957. After that date, and through July 14, 1959, special livestock loans may be made only to bororwers indebted for such loans.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION CHARTER ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to make several changes in the Charter Act of the Federal National Mortgage Association. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3296) to amend the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act to encourage private transactions in FHA insured and VA guaranteed mortgages at stabilized prices which approach or equal par value of such mortgages, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

I wonder how many Senators are aware of what it costs to borrow money to buy a house in this country? I'm not talking about the price of the house, the interest rate, the taxes and insurance, or the so-called closing charges—I refer merely to the fee charged by lenders when purchasing loans insured or guaranteed under the FHA and VA programs.

In order to get a 30-year $10,000 Government-guaranteed loan, at 4½ percent interest, this is what the home buyer or the home builder, or both, must pay to the lender:

1. Three hundred dollars in the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island.

2. Three hundred and fifty dollars in the States of Colorado, Georgia, Indiana, Maryland, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia.

3. Four hundred dollars in the States of Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah, and Washington.

4. Four hundred and fifty dollars in the States of Idaho, Louisiana, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

In citing these figures I am relying on the quotations of the Federal National Mortgage Association. Existing law, as interpreted by the FNMA, requires it to establish purchase prices for Government-guaranteed loans at the market price for such loans. The charges I have cited, from $300 to $450, are taken from the current FNMA purchase-price schedule, and, therefore, are apparently representative of what long-term private lenders are charging.

For what purposes are these charges made? Is it for some service rendered? Is it because the mortgages are inferior paper? Is it because the houses are poor securities or because the borrowers are poor risks? No; the charges are purely and simply a method of increasing yields, because the market will bear them. The maximum permissible interest rate for these virtually risk-free loans is 4½ percent. However, by charging from $300 to $450 discount, which is the term used to describe the fees I refer to, the lenders automatically raise the interest rate, or the yield, to an amount above the 4½-percent maximum.

Discounts are the result of supply-demand conditions in a fixed-interest, long-term, money market, and I am not condemning them, as such. I do maintain that their wide fluctuations, and their persistent high rates are unnecessary and are injurious to the stability of the national economy. The regional differentials are unfair and discriminatory, when it is considered that these mortgages are guaranteed or insured by the Federal Government.

Now it can be argued, and with considerable persuasion, that the only solution is to support the mortgage market with unlimited amounts of Federal money during periods of long-term money shortages. While I admit that such action would undoubtedly support a par market for FHA and GI loans, I do not admit that this is the only way to relieve the situation.

I believe that the modest amounts now available to the Federal National Mortgage Association can be used to reduce discounts. The FNMA interpretation of existing law causes it to follow the market, whereas I believe the proper role of that Association should be to lead the market, or at least to influence it in the direction of stability and nondiscrimination merely on the basis of the State in which a mortgage originates. Furtherfore, I believe that existing requirements, regarding the purchase of FNMA stock by mortgage sellers, enables further increases in discounts to be charged by other purchasers in the secondary-mortgage market. If FNMA quotes a price of 95 percent, less one-half percent for service fee, less 3 percent for FNMA stock, the seller actually receives only 91½ percent of the mortgage amount. Thus, the effective price offered by FNMA in the market place is not 95 percent, which is represented as the market price, but is 91½ percent, which is the actual liquid return offered by FNMA. The practical effect of this is to lower the market price to somewhere between 91½ and 95 percent.

Nobody knows with any degree of certainty what actual quotations are made in the secondary-mortgage market. One may make informed judgments based on specific transactions, but this market is not published like the prices for stocks, bonds, agricultural commodities, and other items traded daily in the American economy. I believe that the agencies of the Government and the public in general deserves more specific information about discounts in the secondary market for Government-guaranteed mortgage loans.

For these reasons I am introducing a bill with three major purposes. First, my bill revises section 303 (b) of the FNMA Charter Act in the following ways:

(a) Whereas existing law requires the seller of a mortgage to the FNMA to buy at least 3 percent of the mortgage amount in FNMA stock, this bill would establish a formula under which the stock purchase requirement would vary from zero to 3 percent; and

(b) The variable stock purchase requirement would operate so that if the FNMA purchase price is 95½ percent or below, then no stock purchase is required; if the FNMA purchase price is 96 percent, then only one-half percent stock purchase could be required; if the FNMA purchase price is 96½ percent, then only 1 percent stock purchase could be required, and so on. If the FNMA purchase price is 98½ percent or above, then up to 3 percent in stock purchase could be required.

If discounts cause purchase prices to drop to 95½ percent, then the present stock purchase requirement only serves to further depress the market. I believe that this formula for varying the stock purchase requirement will tend to lower discounts without causing an unreasonable increase in FNMA purchasing activity.

Secondly, my bill revises section 304 (a) of the FNMA Charter Act to change the bases upon which the association determines its purchase price schedules. Under existing law the association establishes its purchase prices at the market price for the particular class of mortgage loans involved. This language has been interpreted to cause the association to follow the market and thereby tends to influence the market downward. My bill would require the association to fix its prices under three criteria, as follows:

(a) Its prices should promote stability in the secondary market, and reduce price discriminations between different geographical areas;

(b) Its prices should reasonably prevent excessive use of the association's facilities; and

(c) Its prices should permit the association to operate within its income.

I believe that price schedules fixed under these criteria will enable the association to influence the market upward and toward a more uniform national price without an unreasonable increase in its purchasing activities.

Thirdly, my bill requires the FHA and the VA to gather and analyze data with respect to sales of insured and guaranteed mortgage loans, and thereby build up a precise body of knowledge on the subject of discounts. I understand that this work will not add appreciably to the administrative expenses of the FHA, since that agency already requires reports of trading in insured mortgage loans. The gathering of this data may involve a small additional expenses to the VA. However, it would be well worth while.

I cannot state too strongly my opinion that something must be done to equalize the cost of home financing in the various sections of the country. The savings of the people of the South, Southwest, and Far West flow into the eastern money markets, and are being sent back to these people at added costs for which there is no reasonable justification.

CHILD-HEALTH AND WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower stated that needs in the area of social welfare include increased child-welfare services. In his budget message, the President stated that he was recommending increased appropriations to expand grants to States for child welfare services.

At the request of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide those improvements, as recommended by the President.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a detailed statement of the purposes of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3297) to amend and improve the child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, to authorize special project grants to institutions of higher education or research in connection with maternal and child health and crippled children's services, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement, presented by Mr. MARTIN, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

The bill which I have just introduced, at the request of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, incorporates the President's recommendations with regard to increased child welfare services. This will also improve certain provisions of the present law pertaining to grants for maternal and child health, and crippled children's services, which are also authorized under the same title, namely, title V, of the Social Security Act.

Increased child welfare services are urgently needed so that these social services may be made available to more children who need them. Children who are homeless, children who are neglected or abused, and children who are in danger of becoming delinquent are among the children who receive protection through these services.

During the past 20 years, with the help of Federal child welfare funds under the Social Security Act, States have broadened and multiplied their activities in behalf of these children, particularly in rural areas. Despite this progress, over 14 million children are living in communities, both urban and rural, where the services of a public child welfare worker are not available.

In many urban communities, the combined programs of both public and voluntary agencies are inadequate to meet the need for child welfare services. The shortage of these services is a major gap in many community programs for the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

The present law requires that Federal child welfare funds be used for local child welfare services only in predominantly rural areas. The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommended to the President of the United States that "Federal financial support for child welfare services be made generally available not only in rural areas, as at present, but also in urban areas, where serious need exists for this program."

Improvement is needed in the kind of foster care many children are receiving and in the quality of this service. In some States children are kept in institutions because of inadequate foster-family service. In other States, children are kept in foster-family care too long because workloads are too high. In many communities the inadequacy of foster-care services is a major factor contributing to the black market in babies.

The bill I have introduced is designed to enable the States to expand their child-welfare services and to make them available in urban areas as well as in rural areas. It provides for increasing the authorization for appropriation of funds for child-welfare services from $10 million annually to $12 million for the fiscal year 1958 and $15 million annually thereafter. It removes the restrictions limiting to predominantly rural areas the use of Federal funds for local child-welfare services. It gives greater emphasis to foster care by making explicit that Federal child-welfare funds may be used for extension and improvement of foster care.

This bill also would stimulate and encourage special projects of regional or national significance, in all three programs under title V of the Social Security Act, namely, maternal and child health, crippled children's, and child-welfare services. It provides for earmarking (in the annual appropriation) a portion of the grants for each of these programs to be used for grants for special projects of regional or national significance. These special project grants would be available not only to the respective official State agencies, but with their concurrence, to any public or nonprofit institution of higher education or research.

A number of other important changes would be made in the present provisions of title V of the Social Security Act, as summarized below. These child health and welfare amendments of 1956 reemphasize the concern of our Nation for protecting the well-being of our children. If enacted, these amendments would enable the States to extend their child-welfare services and to make more livable the lives of many children now deprived of the benefits of these services.

SUMMARY OF CHILD-HEALTH AND WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1956

The bill would amend part 3 of Title V of the Social Security Act, relating to child welfare services, in a number of respects. It would also amend parts 1 and 2 of that title, relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services, with respect to special project grants. These amendments would be effective July 1, 1956.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

Rural areas: The present limitations requiring that Federal child welfare funds may be used for local child welfare services only in predominantly rural areas would be removed. This would give greater flexibility to the States. Federal funds could be used in any part of the State where they are effective in establishing, extending, and strengthening child welfare services. Emphasis would, however, continue to be placed on services in rural areas, as in the maternal and child health and crippled children's provisions of the present law.

Foster care: The bill would make explicit the authority to use Federal funds for the extension and improvement of foster care.

Amount authorized for annual appropriation: The amount authorized for annual appropriations for grants to the States for child welfare services would be increased from the present $10 million to $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and to $15 million for each year thereafter.

Allotment formula: In order to make the allotment of funds consistent with the above changes concerning rural areas and foster care, the bill would change the present statutory formula under which allotment is made entirely on the basis of rural child population under the age of 18. Allotments to the States of funds appropriated in any year for this purpose would, instead, be made (after a flat allotment) on the basis of the need of each State for financial assistance in carrying out its plan, as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare after considering the relative population under 21 and the relative rural population under that age.

The flat allotment referred to above, which would be made first would be $40,000 if the appropriation were $10 million. It would be reduced proportionately if the appropriation were less than $10 million and would be raised proportionately if the appropriation were increased to the higher amounts authorized by the bill.

Matching: Each State's allotment would be available for paying the Federal share of the cost of the expenditures under the State plan, with the balance being made up from State and local funds. The Federal share would vary inversely with the State's relative per capita income between a minimum of 33⅓ percent and a maximum of 66⅔ percent, with the share for the State with a per capita income equal to that for the United States being 50 percent. The Federal share for Alaska and Hawaii would be set at 50 percent and for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico at 66⅔ percent.

Reallotment: A new provision would be added to permit redistribution of Federal funds, after a State certifies that any portion of its allotment will not be required for its program. The portions so certified would be reallotted from time to time to other States which the Secretary determines have need for and will be able to use amounts in excess of their original allotments. The reallotment among these States would be based on their State plans after taking into consideration the relative size of the population under age 21, the relative size of the rural population under such age, and the relative per capita income of the States eligible for the reallotment.

Special project grants: A new provision would authorize up to 15 percent of the funds appropriated for grants for child welfare services to be earmarked (in the appropriation) for grants for special projects of regional or national significance. These special project grants would be available to State public welfare agencies, and, with the concurrence of such agencies, to any public or nonprofit institution of higher education or research.

Return of runaway children: The bill changes the present law by raising the age limit of children who may be returned to their community in another State through the use of Federal child welfare funds from 16 to 18 years, and adding authorization for the use of these funds for maintaining the children pending their return (for a period not exceeding 15 days). These costs, and the costs of the return of the child, could be met when they cannot be met by those legally responsible for the child's support.

SPECIAL PROJECTS RELATING TO MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

The bill authorizes up to 12½ percent of the annual appropriation for grants for maternal and child health services to be earmarked (in the appropriation) for special projects of regional or national significance. This percentage represents the same proportion of the total annual appropriation as is reserved at present for special project grants. These special project grants would be available not only to the State agencies administering the State plans, as at present, but also, with their concurrence, to other public and nonprofit institutions of higher learning or research.

SPECIAL PROJECTS RELATING TO CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Amendments, similar to those described above for maternal and child health services, would be made by the bill in the crippled children's provisions of the Social Security Act.

PRINTING AND BINDING OF AN EDITION OF SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at the desk is a joint resolution which has been introduced on behalf of myself and the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150), the first time by its title, and the second time, at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed and bound for the use of the Senate 1,500 copies of Senate Procedure, to be prepared by Charles L. Watkins, Parliamentarian, and Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian, to be printed under the supervision of the authors and to be distributed to the Members of the Senate.

SEC. 2. That, notwithstanding any provision of the copyright laws and regulations with respect to publications in the public domain, such edition of Senate Procedure shall be subject to copyright by the authors thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BUTLER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GEORGE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KERR submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be printed, printed in the RECORD, and ordered to lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 3, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"PRICE SUPPORTS—FEED GRAINS

"SEC. 104. Title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary shall make available through loans, purchases, or other operations price support at a level of not less than 90 percent of their respective parity prices to cooperators for any crop of barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums with respect to which two-thirds of the producers of such commodities voting in a referendum held by the Secretary for such purpose vote to approve the program provided by this section. Such referendum for the 1956 crop shall be held not later than May 1, 1956, and for any subsequent crop not later than January 1 of the year in which such crop is planted.

"'(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply in any year to commodities produced on any farm on which the cultivated acreage exceeds 20 acres unless—

"'(1) there is withheld from cultivation, grazing, and all other revenue producing uses an amount of acreage on such farm (in addition to any acreage placed in the acreage reserve under subtitle A of the Soil Bank Act)—

"'(a) in the case of 1956 crops, not less than 20 percent of the cultivated acreage on the farm,

"'(b) in the case of 1957 and subsequent crops, not less than such percentage of the cultivated acreage on the farm as the Secretary determines may be so withheld without impairing supplies of agricultural commodities needed to meet domestic and export requirements;

"'(2) the acreage withdrawn from use in accordance with paragraph (1) has not been withdrawn for the purpose of such paragraph in any prior year, until all other acreage on such farm has been so withdrawn for prior years.

"'In determining, for the purposes of this section, the total cultivated acreage on any farm, or any percentage thereof, there shall be included all acreage regularly used in the production of crops (including crops such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage), and there shall be excluded any acreage covered by a contract entered into under subtitle B of the Soil Bank Act. The percentage proclaimed by the Secretary under paragraph (1) (b) shall not be more than 15 percent, and shall be uniform for all farms. Such proclamation shall be made prior to the holding of the referendum under subsection (a).'"

On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"LIMIT ON PRICE SUPPORT

"SEC. 107. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 421. The total amount of price support made available under this Act to any person for any year through loans to such person, or through purchases made by Commodity Credit Corporation from such person, shall not exceed $25,000. The term "person" shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. In the event of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing association, such limitation shall apply to the amount of price support made available through such cooperative association to each person. The limitation herein on the amount of price support made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchases of a product of an agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to apply such limitations.'"

On page 4, line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

On page 35, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"MINIMUM NATIONAL ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR 1956 AND 1957 CORN CROPS

"SEC. 405. Section 328 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'The acreage allotment of corn for the 1956 and 1957 crops shall not be less than 49 million acres in the commercial corn-producing area.'"

On page 35, line 16, strike out "405" and insert "406."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be printed, printed in the RECORD, and ordered to lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENTS

"SEC. 107. (a) Section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'rice,' the following: 'hogs, cattle, manufacturing milk.'

"(b) Such section is further amended by inserting '(a)' after the section number and adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(b) The Secretary is authorized, at any time, to make payments for the purposes of subsection (a), with respect to any of the commodities specified therein, and to use for such purposes the funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c).'"

On page 4, line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

On page 25, strike out lines 16 to 20, inclusive, and insert the following:

"NATIONAL SECURITY RESERVE

"SEC. 301. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 102 of the Agricultural Act of 1954, the quantity of cotton and wheat in the commodity set-aside created pursuant to section 101 of that act shall be increased to the maximum quantity provided therein, and there shall be added to such set-aside 250 million bushels of corn.

"(b) So much of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 as follows the table therein is amended to read as follows:

"'Such quantities shall be known as the "national security reserve."

"'Not later than December 15 of each year the President, with the advice of the National Security Council and the Administrator of Civil Defense, shall ascertain and proclaim the volume of each storable farm commodity and of each storable product of perishable and semiperishable farm commodities that should be added to the national security reserve in order to provide for the next calendar year adequate supplies of such commodities and products for the purpose of providing for emergency domestic needs for the national defense and the national welfare in the event of war or other national emergency, for the purpose of sales and donations to other nations under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, or for use in financing and implementing economic development projects in other countries related to our security or foreign policy.

"'To the maximum extent practicable, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall convert, through the usual channels of trade, agricultural commodities acquired by it through price-support operations or operations under section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c), and not required for domestic consumption, export, or other food and fiber distribution programs of the Department of Agriculture, into such products as may be designated by the President under the preceding paragraph.'

"(c) Sections 102 to 106, inclusive, of such act are amended by striking out the words 'commodity set-aside' wherever they appear in such sections and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'national security reserve.'

"(d) Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 103. (a) The national security reserve shall not be reduced except (1) on order of the President at any time when in his judgment such reduction is required for purposes of the common defense, (2) in time of war or during a national emergency with respect to common defense proclaimed by the President, on order of such agency as may be designated by the President, (3) on order of the President, by transfer to the national stockpile established pursuant to the act of June 7, 1939, as amended (50 U. S. C. 98–98h), or (4) for any purpose specified in section 101 of this act.

"'(b) If the quantity of any commodity or product in the national security reserve is reduced by natural or other cause beyond the control of the Corporation, there shall be restored to the national security reserve at the earliest practicable date an amount of such commodity or product equal to the amount of such reduction.'

"(e) The last sentence of section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by striking out '1955' and inserting '1956'.

"(f) The last sentence in section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is repealed."

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 17, 1956,

The names of Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MALONE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. HUMPHREY were added as additional cosponsors to the following bills, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT on February 17, 1956:

S. 3233. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to establish a permanent program of financial assistance for local educational agencies under the provisions of such law, and for other purposes; and

S. 3234. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, in order to provide a permanent program of assistance for school construction under the provisions of titles III and IV of such law, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Lincoln Day address delivered by him before Upshur County Republican leaders, at Buchannon, W. Va., on February 11, 1956.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement by him relative to observance of anniversary of independence of Lithuania.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Views by him concerning proposed Colorado River storage project legislation.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF FLETCHER WARREN, OF TEXAS, TO BE AMBASSADOR TO TURKEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Fletcher Warren, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States to Turkey, vice Avra M. Warren, resigned. Notice is given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, at the close of business on Friday, the Senate gave its consent to the recognition of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] for 20 minutes at the close of morning business today. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I call that to the attention of my friend, the Senator from Maine.

TRIBUTE TO NORTH CENTRAL AIRLINES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to a splendid organization which means a great deal to my own State and to the surrounding area. I refer to the Nation's leading local service airline, North Central Airlines.

Last Friday, it observed its 10th anniversary. Starting with a mere 3 small planes a decade ago, its fleet has grown to 20 DC–3's. It has carried 1.3 million passengers more than 215 million miles. It now operates a 2,661-mile system, serving 43 cities in Wisconsin and 5 other States.

I salute North Central Airlines, and wish it many, many more happy landings in the years to come, and increased service to the great central area.

Every community which North Central serves has found that airline service is a vital adjunct to increased prosperity.

AMERICAN FOREIGN AID PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY DULLES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on yesterday, in Philadelphia, at the forum conducted by the Philadelphia Bulletin, Secretary of State Dulles delivered an outstanding address on what he called our foreign-aid strategy. In his address he restated his own feeling, which was expressed by the President in his state of the Union message, that we should have available a flexible fund, which might run from year to year, to meet sudden emergencies which might be presented by the New Soviet strategy. In the Secretary's address in Philadelphia, he asked for a supplementary foreign-aid fund of $100 million a year, to be used over a period of years.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dulles' full statement be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM'S NEW TASK

As we meet here at Independence Square, our thoughts inevitably turn to the world scene where freedom is at stake.

It is a moment of unusual significance. The Soviet rulers are reforming their lines. The Soviet 20th Congress, which adjourned last night, was busy revising the Soviet Communist creed. We cannot yet fully appraise what has happened. And, in any event, it takes time for doctrinal changes to get fully reflected in the mind and conduct of the party members.

But two things at least we know. One is that there is already a notable shift in Soviet foreign policy. And the other is that those Soviet policies which they change are being changed not because they succeeded, but because they have been thwarted by the free world.

Until recently, the foreign policy of Soviet communism was based on fanatical intolerance of all other systems and upon the organization of violence to overthrow all other systems. Marx, Lenin, and Stalin all taught that it was necessary to hate all who differed from the Soviet Communist creed; and they also taught that only by violence could international communism achieve its destined goals.

But the free nations, when confronted by this policy, grew more strong, more resolute and more united. Consequently the Soviet pattern of hatred and violence produced ever diminishing returns.

In Europe, the defensive strength of NATO, was rounded out by the addition of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In the western Pacific, freedom was consolidated by adding to our ANZUS, Philippine and Japanese treaties, the new mutual defense treaties with Korea and with the Republic of China. And the Congress, you will recall, authorized the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States in the Formosa area, if necessary, for its defense.

In southeast Asia, the western powers joined with Asian powers in a treaty for collective security, and they transformed the Indochina struggle from a struggle against colonialism to a struggle by truly independent nations—Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia—to maintain their freedom.

In the Middle East, the northern tier concept, without challenging the concept of Arab unity, has drawn together for collective defense 4 nations which, for 2,500 miles, lie just south of Russia's frontiers.

Back of these formulations of free world resolve lay the vast mobile power of the United States which constituted a formidable deterrent to open armed aggression.

So the Soviets had either to give up their expansionist aims or turn to other means to advance them.

Lenin and Stalin had taught that, under these circumstances, there should be no giving up, but rather a shift to new methods.

So, last year, the Soviet rulers concluded that the time had come to change basically their approach to the non-Communist world.

II

In May of 1955, the Soviet rulers signed the Austrian State Treaty; they made their pilgrimage of repentance to Tito; they offered to establish diplomatic relations with Germany and to make a belated peace with

Japan. In Asia, the Chinese Communists, at the Bandung Conference, gave at least lip service to methods other than outright violence.

The Soviet rulers trumpeted all this throughout the world as proof that Soviet Communist policy was no longer predatory.

We hoped that this was so. But we were highly skeptical. We well knew that under Leninism any tactic is admissible and that the change had come about, not through change of heart, but because old methods had failed.

On the other hand, we knew that the new Soviet tactics of increased tolerance and less dependence upon violence required a basic change in Soviet Communist doctrine. This can, in the long run, have major internal consequences and set up within Russia powerful liberalizing trends.

But the fanatical teaching of a generation cannot be erased all at once. Also the change had not gone so far that there could not almost overnight be a sudden reversal to the old practice of intolerance and violence. Also we could only safely assume that the new tactics were designed as a new means of conquest. So we did not relax our vigilance or allow our military posture to slump.

But, on the other hand, we do not assume fatalistically that there can be no evolution within Russia or that Russia's rulers will always be predatory. Some day—I would not attempt to guess when—Russia will be governed by men who put the welfare of the Russian people above world conquest. It is our basic policy to seek to advance the coming of that day.

So last spring, when Soviet conduct began to change, we determined to do all that we safely could to make that change a first installment toward an eventual Russian state that would be a normal, not abnormal, member of the society of nations.

One major step we took was to join with Britain and France to invite the Russian rulers to a conference of heads of government. At that summit Conference at Geneva President Eisenhower did more than any other man could have done to open up to the Soviet rulers the vista of a new era of friendly relations between our countries.

We cannot yet measure what has been the full effect of that Conference. The gains will be measurable only in the future. For the time being the Soviet rulers, finding that the road of intolerance and violence was blocked, have subordinated those elements of their old creed in the hope that, in a new garb, they could still pursue conquest. Now they pursue their foreign-policy goals with less manifestation of intolerance and less emphasis on violence. Their foreign policy now puts large emphasis upon seeking political cooperation with leftwing Socialists, whom formerly they detested. Finally there is heavy emphasis on trade and economic assistance. It is this economic aspect of the Soviet "new look" that I would consider today.

III

This Soviet economic campaign is a varied one. It includes the barter of surplus arms into areas where tensions were already high. There are highly publicized purchases of agricultural commodities from a few countries where mounting surpluses have exposed the vulnerabilities of economies lacking in diversity. Incidentally the Soviet bloc, with typical cynicism, has reexported some of these commodities to markets that the original sellers normally would supply. And the Soviet bloc has made loans to a selected number of countries.

This policy has been directed especially toward certain peoples in the Near East and south Asia. There the Soviet rulers believe that they can also exploit historic grievances for their own ends.

But the new Soviet policy roams far and wide. Even African and South American countries are receiving Soviet economic propositions.

What is the import of this new economic campaign of the Soviet bloc countries?

The first thing to note is that Soviet capital exports divert resources from the Soviet people who still lack many of the ordinary decencies of life. On this we have the testimony of Mr. Khrushchev in his recent speech to the 20th Communist Party Congress. There he stated:

"It must be said that we do not yet have an adequate quantity of consumer goods, that there is a shortage of housing, and that many of the important problems connected with raising the people's living standards have not yet been solved." Still quoting Mr. Khrushchev:

"Production of many important foodstuffs and manufactured goods still lags behind growing demands. Some towns and communities are still insufficiently supplied with such items as milk, butter, and fruit. There are even cases where supplies of potatoes and other vegetables are irregular. There are also difficulties in supplying the population wtih certain high-grade manufactured goods."

The Soviet Union, of course, has the capacity to do much to lift up the living standards of the Russian people, which Mr. Khrushchev described, and to give them opportunities for greater happiness. There was indeed a moment when it seemed that this might become the Soviet policy. Mr. Malenkov, as the Prime Minister who first succeeded Stalin, advocated more consumer goods and better quality goods for the Soviet people. But Mr. Malenkov was quickly removed from leadership, and his successors resumed the policy of forcing the Russian people to work primarily to build up the power machine of the state. The output of consumer goods—food, clothing, and housing—was firmly relegated to a secondary place.

Under these conditions, can we accept at face value the Soviet professions that its foreign economic activities are primarily designed to help others?

Actually in this campaign the Soviet Union is seeking to advance its interests.

It is important, therefore, to examine how the Soviet Union sees its interests.

IV

Throughout its 38 years of existence, the Soviet pattern has been unvarying. Whenever the opportunity has arisen the Soviet Union has swallowed up its neighbors, or made satellites of them, or subordinated them in other ways.

The future may well produce a different Russia. But today changes in creed and conduct are looked upon as ways to make it easier to achieve old goals of conquest. If there is less apparent intolerance and less reliance on violence, there is perhaps more reliance than ever on division, enticement, and duplicity.

On December 29, 1955, speaking to the Supreme Soviet, Mr. Khrushchev stated the fundamental precept: "If certain people think that our confidence in the victory of socialism, the teaching of Marxist-Leninism, is a violation of the Geneva spirit, they obviously have an incorrect notion of the Geneva spirit. They ought to remember once and for all that we never renounced and we will never renounce our ideas, our struggle for the victory of communism."

In his lengthy speech to the Twentieth Party Congress, Mr. Khrushchev promised "fundamental social transformations"—this means a Communist Party dictatorship—to any nation unwary enough to allow its political life to be undermined by the Communist apparatus.

We must assume that the intent behind the Soviet economic campaign is to subvert and communize the nations that are its targets.

The United States is engaged in programs of economic assistance to the less developed countries. Our programs have been in progress for a number of years and have totaled billions of dollars.

By these programs, we too hope to advance our legitimate national interests. We have never pretended otherwise.

But again the crucial question is: What are those interests and how are they intended to be served?

Our interests will be fully served if other nations maintain their independence and strengthen their free institutions. We have no further aims than these. We want a world environment of freedom. We have shown this time after time by electing to give freedom where we could have had conquest. Our historic policy, reflecting the will and the views of our own free people, is wholly compatible with the interests of the less-developed countries as their leaders themselves have defined them.

VI

The political leaders in the economically less-developed countries are entirely capable of judging the purposes and principles of other nations. They are, for the most part, men of political experience. In many cases they have had an active part in winning for their countries political independence. They have no desire to preside over the loss of that independence.

The wisdom and patriotism of the political leaders of the newly independent nations are among freedom's greatest assets. These men are not blind to Soviet purposes and past actions.

But we must also recognize that the Soviet Communist experiment has won for itself a considerable popular prestige in the less-developed countries. In these countries "industrialization" is a word of magic. It is a slogan that the people have come to believe will solve all domestic economic and political problems. The peoples of these countries do not like to be dependent upon the industrialized West for manufactured goods. For the most part, they now have political independence, but they do not yet have what they consider to be adequate economic independence.

The neighboring Asian peoples have seen the Soviet Union within a generation develop itself into a major industrial power. These observers are but dimly aware of the fact that the Soviet rate of progress was possible only because natural conditions favored, and that even so its cost in human servitude has been tragically high. They are like those of us who admire the pyramids, the palaces, the temples, and the coliseums which despotic rulers once produced out of slave labor. We are only dimly conscious of the cost in terms of human misery.

So it is with the peoples of less-developed lands who are informed in extravagant terms of the industrial monuments which have been built by the Soviet masters of 220 million subject peoples.

And when Soviet propaganda says to less-developed peoples, "See what we have done for ourselves; with our help, you can do the same," there is a strong temptation to accept that so-called help.

The political leaders of these countries, however wise they may be and however patriotic they may be, will find it difficult to resist the public pressures which Soviet propaganda arouses, unless there is some alternative.

The industrial nations of the West, with matured and vigorous economies and much well-being, can and must provide such an alternative.

VII

Western efforts to advance the economic well-being of the less developed countries are nothing new. We need not be panicked by the new Soviet economic policy.

With or without the so-called competition of the Soviet Union, we propose to go forward with sound policies to aid the economic progress of less developed countries.

Normally, under our system, private capital could and should do the job. And, indeed, much private capital today flows into many less developed countries. But it flows only where the political and economic risks are deemed tolerable. In much of the world, these risks are such that private capital is not ready to take them. If capital is to be found, a substantial part must be provided on a public basis which spreads the risk so that it is not appreciable in terms of any single individual.

This is one of the purposes of our mutual security program which now, in one form or another, is in its eighth year. The economic part of that program amounts this year (ending June 30) to about $1,700,000,000. Much of this is used to help our allies, particularly in the Far East and in Asia, to support adequate military establishments of their own. Of the total, approximately $600 million will assist, by loan or grant in capital developments in other lands.

This year we are asking Congress to appropriate for next year's economic program $100 million more than is available for this year. The capacity to spend wisely depends on many factors, and we should not appropriate, in a panic, merely because of Soviet economic activities. There is, however, need for somewhat greater flexibility, and for greater continuity, as regards support for long-range projects.

Some of the development projects which are most significant will take several years to complete. It is difficult for the countries concerned to arrange for financing these projects unless United States support can be relied upon not just for 1 year at a time, but for several years. Also, with United States support, it is easier for them to procure funds from other sources, such as the World Bank.

We believe, therefore, that the United States Government should have authority to commit some such amount as $100 million a year for several years for long-range projects which will develop to an important degree the economic strength of less developed countries. Without that limited, long-range authority we take a risk which is quite unjustified having regard to the relatively small cost of avoiding it.

VIII

If our Nation and the other free nations play their proper part, we can face the future not with complacency—that would be disastrous—but with confidence.

I do not wish to minimize the threat of the Soviet "new look," of which the economic campaign is a part. Economic assistance knows no territorial limits. And we must count on the Soviets and their local Communist parties to press their policies with vigor.

But we should reflect that Communist successes in the world so far have come when Red armies were at hand. No people has willingly accepted the Soviet type of Communist dictatorship.

Communist open aggression has now been checked by the cohesion, resolution, vigilance, and strength of the free nations. Let us never forget that this is what deflected the Soviet rulers from primary reliance upon violence to which they were dedicated by creed and which they are skilled to practice.

They came up against the granite of a declared and strong resolve. If that granite should turn to putty, then violence and threat of war could again become the order of the day.

Meanwhile, we have new problems. These will require new efforts; without relaxation of the old cohesion, resolution, vigilance, and strength. But the new efforts will be of a kind that is in accord with our tradition. This Nation was conceived with a sense of mission and dedicated to the extension of freedom throughout the world. President Lincoln, speaking at this very Independence Hall, said of our Declaration of Independence, that there was "something in that Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all men should have an equal chance."

That has been the spirit which has animated our people since they came together as a nation. We have, it is true, acquired much for ourselves. But also we have had in large measure the greatest of all satisfactions—that is the satisfaction which comes from creating and from sharing.

We have created at home and we have also created abroad. We have shared here at home and we have shared abroad. Today the greatest opportunity for creation and for sharing lies in those areas which, possessed of great economic and human potentials, have not yet realized the opportunities which are theirs.

We have unprecedented resources with which to create and with which to share. Our 160 million people, working in freedom and with ample leisure, produce over three times as much as do the 220 million of the Soviet Union working in servitude. Our industrial techniques are beyond compare. Our desire to create and to share with others is not a political plot; it is an expression of the spirit which has long animated our Nation. It is not a product of Government; it is a product of the faith of our people.

Let me conclude with words which Benjamin Franklin wrote from Paris on May 1, 1777:

"It is a common observation here that our cause is the cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own. It is a glorious task assigned us by Providence; which has, I trust, given us spirit and virtue equal to it, and will at last crown it with success."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the New York Times of Monday, February 27, there is an editorial entitled "Mr. Dulles on Foreign Aid." I feel the Times has done a real service to the American people in this interpretation of Mr. Dulles' position; and inasmuch as I find myself in accord with the editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my strong feeling that we must not become confused over the discussion of a so-called continuing program of foreign aid. From my experience on trips to various parts of the world and my discussions with leaders in numerous countries, I am convinced that if we are to do anything effective, we should indicate that our policy is one of continuing aid on a partnership basis to help the underdeveloped countries to learn the practical problems involved in democratic processes and to effect the economic steps necessary to insure their freedom, independence, and self-determination.

As the Times editorial concludes, let us not tie the future of freedom to the fiscal year.

EXHIBIT A

MR. DULLES ON FOREIGN AID

Secretary Dulles was on solid ground when he discussed a continuing program of foreign aid in his speech in Philadelphia yesterday. What he had in mind wasn't new, for President Eisenhower had suggested it in his state of the Union message of January 5 and had returned to it in his press conference of January 25. He said on the latter occasion, in an unrehearsed response to questions, that part of the money we spend on national security has got to go in helping friends, and he intimated that asking how long this should go on is like asking how long is a piece of string?

Mr. Eisenhower is now getting up a new message on spending, to be delivered on March 5. It is believed that this message will contain a recommendation for a supplementary foreign aid fund of $100 million a year, which we would be at least morally obligated to keep up for perhaps 10 years. This sum isn't money at all, the way things are today.

It is, however, a principle. It was this principle that Secretary Dulles seemed to be thinking about yesterday—or perhaps the night before, as he sat up revising his speech. Mr. Dulles had had a reasonably hard time with the Foreign Relations Committee on Friday, as the transcript published in part in this newspaper yesterday indicated. He was trying to explain, against a considerable partisan outcry, why he believed we had made diplomatic gains against Russia.

This was not too easy a task. Indeed, victories that have to be established by argument are never thoroughly satisfactory. But Mr. Dulles did come to rest on the principle of an aid program that would supplement the present system of aid—which works by fits and starts, by guesses and uncertainties, by close votes and behind-the-scene bargains. Everybody who has had even a little to do with foreign aid, whether military or economic, whether in the guise of loans, grants or technical assistance, whether big or little, knows how hard it is to compress a worthwhile undertaking within 12 months of a fiscal year.

In private business this truth would be taken for granted. It should be accepted when we deal with public business. To give a dramatic example, we are in process of making agreements wtih other nations to lease fissionable material: both sides must obligate themselves for a period of time in order to make this experiment valuable. The same may be said of the effort to set up an international agency, in cooperation with the United Nations, for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Representatives of 11 other countries, Russia among them, will meet today in Washington to negotiate a statute for such an agency.

We and our friends need to arm against the danger of being attacked and crushed by military force. Nobody denies the need for planning such precautions far in advance. Airplane carriers, bombers, and infantry divisions are not created over night or between two New Year's Days. Economic defense and economic progress demand even more time.

Our friends are not beggars at the gate, waiting patiently until the lord of the manor goes forth followed by his pursebearer. They are our friends, indeed—our fellow workers, our neighbors. They are now in many cases being temped—as Secretary Dulles pointed out—by deceptive offers from Moscow. These offers are not tied to the calendar: they may be worthless, or worse than worthless, but they run with the years.

The kind of foreign-aid program Secretary Dulles was talking about errs, if it is weak, on the side of modesty. It implies too little

imagination, not too much. Let us hope that Congress, when the time comes, will not pinch these pennies or tie the future of freedom to the fiscal year.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF WOODROW WILSON

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this year all Americans will celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

The 2d session of the 83d Congress passed a joint resolution creating the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, of which I have the honor of being Vice Chairman.

The Commission has recently prepared a handbook describing the centennial; and I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation from the pamphlet entitled "The Woodrow Wilson Centennial: What It Is and Why We Celebrate It," be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The year 1956 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, the 28th President of the United States.

Woodrow Wilson was a man of remarkably varied interests and achievements.

As scholar and educator he helped to vitalize American education and to make it a democratic instrument in the service of the Nation.

As political reformer, Governor of New Jersey, and President, he fought to purify the processes of popular government and to shape its policies to the human and social needs of the 20th century.

As Chief Executive he led the Nation through the First World War, tortured because "It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war" but convinced that "the right is more precious than peace."

As world statesman he dedicated himself to the search for lasting peace based on justice and freedom and made effective through the League of Nations operating as "the organized moral force of men throughout the world."

To all of these tasks Woodrow Wilson brought an abiding religious faith and sense of spiritual values, an intense conviction of the citizen's duty to serve both his country and humanity, and a passionate love of America that made his patriotism a matter of principle as well as of sentiment.

The past is a vital source of a people's strength that lies in the seamless web of its life. To draw upon that source we pause on occasion to examine the careers of our most illustrious leaders. We reflect upon their words and deeds and are made stronger. We recapture some measure of their greatness and appropriate it to the service of our own generation. Such an occasion is the centennial year of Woodrow Wilson's birth.

And so the Congress by joint resolution, has asked that the people of the United States join in celebrating that event in 1956.

THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last Friday, February 24, marked the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the people of Estonia.

Many Estonian refugees and Americans of Estonian descent joined on Friday in New York City to commemorate this date and to pay honor to that hard-won independence. Since 1940, the people of Estonia have had no freedom. Every day they hope and pray that their treasured independence will soon be regained. I earnestly share that hope and join in that prayer.

Mr. Khrushchev has now apparently rewritten Communist doctrine with respect to the necessity for violent revolution. With continued pressure from all free people, we must hope that the Kremlin masters will return to Estonia that which was so cruelly taken from her 16 years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted in New York on Friday, February 24, 1956, by those who were assembled in solemn commemoration of the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Estonia.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the occasion of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Estonia on February 24, 1918, we the Americans of Estonian descent and the Estonians residing in this country have gathered here in New York in order to pay tribute to this supreme achievement of the Estonian people, for which it had tenaciously struggled and fought for centuries.

The 38th day of Estonian independence is being commemorated at a time when the country itself, and its people are suffocating in the stranglehold of unprecedented Communist terrorism following the forcible occupation of the country by the Soviet Union in 1940, in violation of all existing international treaties.

At this anniversary of the Estonian independence, we are gravely concerned by the international developments of the past year and the strongly reemerged Soviet quest for world domination. The speech by Nikita Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the resolutions the Congress itself cannot be bypassed as mere bragging, they do mean strongest determination to work doggedly toward the achievement of this ultimate goal.

The Estonians know, out of their own experience what the Soviet world domination would be like, if achieved. It certainly would not mean just some slight hegemony in the world, or just domination, but total extinction of the western civilization and physical destruction of hundreds of millions of people, the living pillars of the free world.

We feel, therefore, duty bound to sound the warning to the peoples yet free, that the expansion of the ever-aggressive communism cannot be stemmed by just erecting defensive dams, or by patchwork. If once the balance of power in the world has become favorable to the Soviets, the free world and this country of freedom and human rights will be doomed.

It is, likewise, our deepest conviction, grown out of our experiences with the Soviet communism, that the self-defense of the free world against the Soviets cannot remain just passive, intended on their contention, but can be effective only, if it is actively and determinedly directed toward rolling back the Soviet power.

It's in the free world's awareness of the necessity to meet the Soviet quest for world domination actively, that we see hope for the liberation of the Estonians and the other east European captive peoples from the deadly grasp of Communist terrorism.

Our greatest trust lies in the generosity and enlightened self-interest of this free and powerful country, the United States of America.

FEDERAL FLOOD RELIEF AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President. I rise to express my deep regret that Adlai Stevenson, in a Jefferson-Jackson Day speech at Hartford, Conn., last Saturday night, found it politically necessary to misstate the facts regarding flood relief and flood prevention actions taken by the administration.

Statements made by Mr. Stevenson in his Hartford speech are subject to two interpretations:

First. Either he is woefully ignorant about what the administration has done and proposes to do to meet this problem; or

Second. He deliberately stooped to flood politics, a tactic of which responsible public officials of both parties in my State have not been guilty, I am happy to say.

I am confident that many Democrats in Mr. Stevenson's Hartford audience shrank in distaste on hearing such misstatements and distortions from the Democratic candidate for the presidential nomination in a State where so much has been accomplished by nonpartisan cooperation in a tragic period.

State and local officials of the Democratic Party in my State have frequently paid high tribute to the effectiveness of Federal agencies, under the President's leadership, in helping to rehabilitate the flood-stricken communities in Connecticut. We have worked together, in a spirit of full cooperation and complete nonpartisanship, in seeking to meet the many problems arising from the terrible flood disasters of August and October 1955. I am confident, despite Mr. Stevenson's attempts to inject a sordid political note into this subject, that we in Connecticut will continue to work together in that spirit.

In order to set the record straight, I shall cite some of the facts about what the administration has done to relieve the distress caused by floods in my State and to rehabilitate the communities which were so sorely afflicted.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration has stated that as of February 13, 1956, Federal agencies had spent, or obligated for expenditure, a total of $66,452,613 in Federal funds for flood relief in Connecticut.

While I do not have at this time a complete breakdown of the total, I shall cite, in a few moments, some of the more important current figures in connection with Federal flood aid, and shall submit for the record other figures as soon as they can be assembled.

To measure the extent of the Federal contribution to relief and rehabilitation in Connecticut, it may be compared with the appropriations of State funds for this purpose. The Connecticut General Assembly, in special session, appropriated

approximately $35 million for flood rehabilitation purposes, little more than half the amount of the Federal contribution.

While many Federal agencies have participated in rehabilitation work in Connecticut, the work of the Corps of Engineers has been especially noteworthy. The work the Army engineers can do is limited by the restrictions of Public Law 875. Nevertheless, as of February 13, 1956, the Corps of Engineers had spent, or obligated for expenditure, a total of $20,546,255 for the following purposes: First, amount spent on contractual work, $5,420,255; second, amount still to be spent, $10,180,000; third, amount of reimbursement to State and local subdivisions, $4 million; and fourth, amount estimated for temporary repair costs applied to permanent restoration, $946,000; total, $20,546,255.

Mr. President, one of the most important jobs that had to be done in the post-flood period was to put people back to work. Hundreds of small businesses, stores and factories, were affected by the floods. Unemployment created by the floods reached a peak of 30,000 men and women.

To get these people back to work, assistance had to be given to the proprietors of the flood-affected businesses. The Red Cross did valuable work in this field, but the only source of available government assistance, whether on the local, State, or Federal level, was the lending authority of the Small Business Administration.

The Small Business Administration rose to the occasion. As of this date, the Small Business Administration has approved 1,082 flood loans in Connecticut, totaling $19,487,678.

In the days ahead, the work of rehabilitating the flood-affected Connecticut communities must go forward. An important source of Federal assistance lies in the field of slum clearance and urban renewal. As of this date, planning grants to flood-affected communities in Connecticut have been made by the Urban Renewal Administration totaling more than $500,000.

Mr. President, Adlai Stevenson was less than fully candid in discussing the flood-prevention program for New England. He failed to mention that one of the reasons for lack of progress in the past was, it is sad to relate, disinterest and even opposition in the affected States. The Corps of Engineers cannot go forward with a flood-control project unless the State in which it is located gives its consent. One of the projects in the New England program is the proposed dam at Thomaston, Conn. Although this work was authorized in 1944, the State of Connecticut did not give its necessary concurrence until September 1955, a month after the first of the two flood disasters. Similarly, needed flood-control projects in Massachusetts and elsewhere were stalled by lack of State concurrence. I am glad that these errors of judgment on the part of the States in the past are being corrected, but Governor Stevenson is not sticking to the facts when he implies it was inaction by the administration which has held back the program.

And, in discussing flood prevention, Governor Stevenson was guilty of an omission when he failed to note that the President had taken action to get an accelerated flood program for Northeastern States underway.

The first appropriations bill upon which the Senate acted in this session was the urgent deficiency bill for 1956. Upon the President's recommendation, it contained planning and construction funds for flood-control dams and reservoirs and other large projects which involve a total Federal cost of $135,500,000.

Nor was Mr. Stevenson speaking with complete candor when he failed to note that action taken by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, controlled by members of his party, would have sabotaged the President's proposals for an early start on this program. It took a bipartisan revolt on the House floor to correct the committee's shortsighted blunder.

I have found in the Senate a complete willingness on the part of a great majority of Senators on the other side of the aisle to approach flood problems in a spirit of cooperation and bipartisanship. The other day I introduced a bill S. 3272, which would permit the Corps of Engineers to break through the bottleneck of time in the construction of small but urgently needed flood protection projects in many communities throughout the Nation. I am proud to have a number of Democratic Senators, among them the distinguished President pro tempore, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], joining me in sponsorship of this measure.

The distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and I have been working together in an effort to draft a sound, workable program of flood indemnity and reinsurance. We expect to conclude our hearings on this subject this afternoon, and it is our hope that we will soon be able to report an acceptable bill to the full committee and to the Senate.

A spirit of cooperation and bipartisanship is the only way in which flood problems should be approached. I am confident that spirit will survive the ill-considered attempt on the part of Governor Stevenson to undermine it.

Stevenson will find resentment in both parties and among public officials and people in all walks of life, particularly in the flood-affected areas of Connecticut. It seems a shame that he has injected himself into a situation concerning which he is so badly informed.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut if it is not correct to say that everything possible has been done in a bipartisan way to correct the terrible situation in which the northeastern part of the United States finds itself by reason of the floods of last year.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct. What Mr. Stevenson said was an intrusion on his part, and his intrusion is the first sour note we have had in connection with the subject. The people of Connecticut will resent it very much.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, apropos the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut, I believe Mr. Stevenson seems to be able to get up to the brink of the truth very often, but never seems to get quite over it.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his statement.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN SPENDING AND LOBBYING

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a most comprehensive and thorough article about the origins and background of the forthcoming special Senate committee investigation of campaign spending and lobbying was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 26, 1956, under the byline of that experienced and able Capital reporter, Mr. Robert C. Albright.

It seems to me that Mr. Albright's impartial and effective article should appear in the body of the RECORD as part of the events leading up to this stage of developments in the inquiry. I ask unanimous consent that it do so.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL SENATE STICK WITH ANGELS ON LOBBY PROBE?

(By Robert C. Albright)

Every so often in the history of the American political system an aroused public opinion asserts itself, forcing surprising changes in the way Congress does business and screens its own membership.

Sometimes the reforms of the moment take permanent root in the legislative process. Sometimes they flower into lasting changes in the Nation's election laws. More often they have died on the vine, as public interest itself has waned.

When that has happened, Congress has generally declined in esteem, along with the politicians who mostly comprise it, until—as inevitably occurs in a democratic system—somebody comes up with some new answers.

A HISTORIC MOMENT

Perhaps Congress was at the turn of just such a cycle at that moment in the gas bill debate when Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, South Dakota, arose in his place and made a speech which almost stopped the show. A lawyer interested in passage of the natural-gas bill had attempted to contribute 25 $100 bills to CASE's campaign. CASE told his colleagues he could not keep the money. What was more, he said, he could not now vote for the bill.

Four days later (on February 6) the Senate passed the gas bill anyway by a roll call vote of 53 to 38.

The log of the next fortnight is worthy of note:

February 7: The Senate voted 90 to 0 to create a four-member bipartisan committee to investigate the CASE incident. (The FBI had already been investigating it for 3 days.)

February 8: A Senate Elections Subcommittee lost a tug of war with the newly created Senate unit for jurisdiction, but vowed that it would make a broader inquiry later.

February 11: The Senate's so-called select committee turned up testimony that the $2,500 campaign contribution to CASE came from the personal funds of an oil and gas company president.

February 14: A Federal grand jury began questioning key witnesses on the Case incident.

February 17: President Eisenhower vetoed the gas bill. In so doing he denounced the activities used in lobbying for the bill as highly questionable and arrogant.

February 22: The Senate voted 79 to 1 for an all-embracing investigation of improper influences on Government, to be conducted by a new 8-member bipartisan committee. The authorization was so broad that it superseded other previously projected investigations.

RIPE FOR REFORM

The United States Senate thus came a long way in 2 weeks. From openly expressed skepticism on CASE's charges, it had swung over, as one cynic put it, "to the side of the angels." Would its new select committee travel as far in the weeks and months ahead, not only in exposure of wrongdoing, but in formulation of constructive remedies?

That is the big question being raised this weekend on Capitol Hill.

Long before the Case incident, sentiment had been crystallizing for some rather far-reaching reforms in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and the Capitol's equally outmoded lobbying statutes.

As far back as June 22, 1955, the Senate Rules Committee had favorably reported the so-called Hennings bill. This was designed to modernize existing ceilings on campaign contributions and to turn the spotlight of publicity on future contributions.

The Hennings bill is now on the Senate Calendar and can be called up at any time. Some of its key provisions are bitterly contentious, but even a compromise bill, which is likely to come out of the crucible, could result in substantial reforms.

THE 20-CENT FORMULA

Here are some of its central provisions:

Spending by national political committees, now limited to $3 million, would be fixed by a new formula which would lift it to about $12 million. The ceiling would be computed by multiplying 20 cents by the total vote for all presidential candidates in any of the last 3 presidential elections.

Candidates for the Senate could spend up to $50,000, or a larger amount determined by a similar formula. This would be figured by multiplying 10 cents by the total vote of all candidates for the seat in the previous election. Senate candidates are now limited to $25,000.

Candidates for the House could spend up to $12,500 or a larger sum determined by an identical formula. House candidates are now limited to $5,000.

The proposed law provides that the ceilings include not only the amount spent by the candidate himself, but all the money spent by all committees, both interstate and intrastate, set up to support him.

Practically all of these sections have come in for some criticism, chiefly from legislators who think the ceilings are too low. But the principal opposition of a type which could hold up the bill, comes from Republicans and Southern Democrats opposing an even more controversial proviso. This is a section extending the law to cover primaries and party nominating caucuses.

The present law does not cover primaries or conventions. Southern Democrats and some northern Republicans call the primary proposal an unconstitutional invasion of States rights. Proponents deny this, citing a 1941 Supreme Court decision (*United States* v. *Classic*) which held that Congress does have the authority to regulate primaries.

Regardless of the controversies which rage around the fringes of the Hennings measure, the real heart of the bill, providing for toughening up present lax campaign contribution reporting requirements, is comparatively free from attack.

These provisions require every political committee and every candidate to file statements of contributions and expenditures not only with the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, but with the clerk of the United States district court in the appropriate area.

For the first time the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House would be directed to provide for the preparation and periodic publication of campaign statements filed with them.

Under present law, these officials make campaign reports available for inspection on request. But no attempt is made to utilize or summarize the information filed with them. As a result, very little information regarding campaign finances is currently made public.

The heart sections provide further, for the first time, for legislative supervision over the administration of the act. This is done by requiring the Senate Rules Committee and the House Administration Committee to exercise continuing watchfulness in their respective fields.

If these reporting provisions are kept intact, some supporters of the bill may be willing to make concessions on the rest.

Party realists suggest, for example, that the spending ceiling might be eliminated altogether providing Congress approves a reporting system showing exactly where the money comes from, who spends it, and how much. The attendant publicity, they argue, would do more than anything else to "purify" the process. As a concession to realism, the extension of the law to party primaries may also come out. The barebones result would be a far cry from the original Hennings bill, but it would be considerably more effective than the existing statute.

The so-called Hennings bill isn't the only attempt to find an answer to a question which has long plagued American politics: How to find an honest yet practicable basis for underwriting the high cost of American political campaigns.

Nine months ago Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, summed up the dilemma in a speech to the annual dinner of the University of Chicago's School of Business.

At a time when we need the highest sort of people in politics, because of the awesome decisions they must make, Graham said, little is being done to solve the financial problem which produces something less than the best.

Graham said the problem is: "How can we raise enough honest, untainted money to permit our politicians to run for office without becoming obligated to corrupt or selfish forces? And in doing this, how can we help to create a higher regard for the importance of politics in American life?"

He suggested that the answer might lie in the modest campaign contributions by millions of individual citizens to the party of their choice, so that politicians needs never rely on (1) the underworld, (2) special-interest groups, or (3) the so-called political hopefuls.

Graham suggested a public service advertising campaign to that end, under the sponsoring to the nonprofit, nonpartisan Advertising Council.

The Advertising Council later sponsored such a plan for 1956, but it was suspended for want of the required number of Republican project sponsors. Democratic leaders have said that they produced their four nominees to the joint committee which would have sponsored the bipartisan project.

Several interesting variations of the same idea of broadly based political contributions, in modest individual amounts, have meanwhile been gaining in favor.

As one means of encouraging numerous small contributions, Representative STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona, and Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, JR., Democrat, of Missouri, last summer introduced House and Senate bills to provide Federal income tax exemptions for up to $100 contributed to political campaigns by individuals.

As far back as last April the State of Minnesota rewrote its income tax laws to permit (1) deduction of modest amounts contributed to a political candidate, party or cause and (2) deduction of unreimbursed campaign expenditures personally paid" by the candidate.

Byron G. Allen, Minnesota's State commissioner of agriculture, sponsored the Minnesota reform. Allen recently has suggested another way in which Congress might encourage moderate political contributions by the many instead of big contributions by the few.

A national foundation would be set up under a Federal charter, which as the American Red Cross, is now chartered. The new foundation, administered by a representative board of directors, would see that the money collected in this way was fairly distributed. All Congress would have to do would be to provide the charter.

It isn't at all outside the realm of possibility that the Senate's new eight-member select committee, under the broad powers granted it to investigate the campaign-lobby-influence problem and recommend legislative solutions, may come up with one or more of these formulae.

Still another variation was presented last week by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon. He introduced legislation authorizing the Federal Government to finance Federal election campaigns of both major parties, on a matching basis, to avoid what he said was the evil of large private contributions.

Other suggested solutions range all the way from a proposal to ban political contributions made across State lines in excess of a $100 total, a prohibition some critics say might easily be avoided by clever lawyers, to suggestions that the donor of a contribution as well as the recipient be required to report it.

Two of the major radio and television networks have indorsed a proposal which its sponsors say could result in the two major parties getting an estimated $3 million more in free network time, reducing their fundrasing problem by that amount.

The proposal is to amend section 315 of the Communications Act to permit the unrestricted appearance of political candidates on radio and TV news and discussion programs, without imposing on broadcasters the obligation to afford equal opportunity to all rival candidates.

The purpose of this amendment, which was originally put forward by Frank Stanton, CBS, Inc., president, is to give networks and stations an opportunity to cover political developments of both major parties without having to give equal time to "splinter" interests or so-called frivolous candidates.

Urging the change, the February 20 issue of Broadcasting Telecasting magazine said that it was impossible for broadcasters to provide adequate news and discussion coverage of the two major candidates for President in 1952 because "each time General Eisenhower or Mr. Stevenson appeared, broadcasters were required by law to make similar arrangements available to 16 other candidates who were running—or crawling, it might better be said—in the same race."

Perhaps the biggest assignment of all given the new eight-man select committee set up by the Senate was to investigate the steadily mounting lobbying pressure on Congress and come up with remedial legislation.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, chairman of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, was all set to launch his own independent investigation of lobbying when the problem was pooled with the whole subject of campaign expenditures and election law revision and turned over to the new Senate committee.

As one of the eight members of the new group, KENNEDY will have the opportunity to pursue a goal he has long set his heart

on, strengthening of the ineffectual regulation of lobbying incorporated in the 1946 Congressional Reorganization Act.

Ever since a 1954 Supreme Court decision, in the case of *United States* v. *Harriss*, the number of lobbyists registering at the Capitol has been falling off, along with their reported expenditures, despite an indicated increase in lobby pressure. The decision upheld the constitutionality of the law's registration provisions but narrowed the definition of lobbying. As a result, several organizations changed their methods of reporting expenditures.

KENNEDY isn't out to crack down on lobbying as such, for a precious constitutional safeguard is involved—the right of petition. For years jurists have been struggling to define the term "lobbyist." Some wiseacres have called him "the fellow who's against a bill that you favor," and vice versa. But the problem of professional lobbying is a very special one, and has been marked by Congress for special treatment.

KENNEDY states the objective this way:

"Our goal should be to preserve intact the right of the public to petition Congress while at the same time requiring professional lobbyists to supply sufficient information so that their identity and that of those they represent will be known to Congress and the people.

"When the activities of those who would influence legislation can withstand the bright glare of publicity, the lobbying problem will have been solved."

But Congress and State legislatures have grappled with the problem of lobby pressures before, with a surprisingly lean record of doing anything about them. Is there any reason to believe that the bipartisan investigation the Senate launched last week will be any more successful?

In his book, The Legislative Process in Congress, Dr. George B. Galloway, senior specialist of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, notes that half a dozen major investigations of lobbying have been conducted in the past 50 years.

The first was the famous 1905 investigation of the life insurance lobby in New York State, conducted by a joint committee of the New York Legislature. It was conducted by Charles Evans Hughes. Its resulting 10-volume report laid the basis for the New York State law regulating lobbying.

During the first Wilson administration, the Garrett committee of the House of Representatives investigated the lobbying activities of the National Association of Manufacturers. This investigation produced 60 volumes of testimony, but no legislation.

In 1927 the Senate's Caraway committee investigated the American Legion and other lobbies. This investigation led to a bill to regulate lobbyists which passed the Senate but died in a House committee pigeonhole.

In July 1935, the Senate created a special committee headed by former Senator Hugo Black (now a Supreme Court Justice) to inquire into power lobbying activities. This investigation was touched off by disclosures that various utility companies had spent vast sums of money to defeat the so-called public utility death-sentence clause of the Wheeler-Rayburn bill.

This investigation was more fruitful than most, as it made inevitable the passage of the Holding Company Act of 1935. But legislation to require lobbyists to register and reveal the source of their income finally died in conference, even though it initially passed both Houses of Congress. (More than a decade later, a joint House-Senate committee embodied some of these recommendations in the Monroney-La Follette legislative streamlining bill, however.)

The most recent investigation of lobbying was conducted by a select House committee headed by the late Representative Frank Buchanan, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, during the 81st Congress (1949–50).

Dr. Galloway records that the Buchanan committee "made an intensive investigation of lobbying by various organized interest groups, foundations and Government agencies, including the extent of their activities, their fund-raising and lobbying techniques, grassroots pressure, and the causes and costs of modern lobbying."

Incidentally, the Buchanan committee recommended several improvements in the 1946 statute. Strangely, nothing has been heard of them since.

EMPLOYMENT OF INDIANS IN INDUSTRY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Indian Bureau of the Department of the Interior has been engaged for several years in a relocation program. It involves taking Indians from reservations and relocating them in centers of population, where they may find proper employment. The program has meant the opening of factories at Gallup, N. Mex., and Winslow, Ariz. The success of the program has been due largely to a man from Arizona, Mr. Carl Beck.

We in Arizona are very proud of Mr. Beck and of what he has accomplished. He is a man of great knowledge of the problem of the Indians and of wide association with them. His efforts have resulted in the betterment of the life of the Indians.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Lewistown Daily News be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OTHER EDITORS SAY INDIANS WILL WORK—THEY PROVE AT ROLLA

Who says Indians won't work?

It is about 3 years now since Bulova started its jewel-bearing plant at Rolla, N. Dak., which employs about 80 Indians from the Turtle Mountain Reservation.

As for absenteeism, the Rolla plant has the lowest rate of any manufacturing plant in the watch industry, which is certainly overwhelming evidence that Indians will work and work regularly, when they get good jobs.

This greatly strengthens the hand of Carl Beck, special assistant to Indian Affairs Commissioner Emmons, who is working hard and effectively on a program to bring industries to reservations where they can create jobs for Indians, and better their living standards.

Incidentally, despite the comparative short period of time in which Beck has been on the program, the Indian Bureau has already been successful in the securing of manufacturers to open plants at Gallup, N. Mex., and Winslow, Ariz.

The program made quite an impression on people in Winner, S. Dak., when Beck was there recently with the hope of securing some industry which would employ Indians from the nearby Rosebud Reservation. "It is the first sensible approach the Government has made to whip the problem," the Winner Advocate reported people there as saying.

Beck has also spent much time in Montana talking with Indians, and with people in communities adjacent to reservations.

The Indian Bureau official is no "pie in the sky guy." He knows something of the hard-headed factors involved in making a business pay out, knows that such industries must succeed if they are to perform permanent service to the Indians as well as to themselves.

AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently in Phoenix, Ariz., the Cotton Growers' Association of Arizona held a meeting at which the members expressed great concern over the pending agricultural bill.

I should like to read one paragraph from a letter which I received from the association and then ask that the whole letter be printed in the RECORD.

It appears to me that S. 3183 and other bills introduced in the present session of Congress are based on political expediency and are no more than attempts to buy the votes of various farm groups. I have not seen a single statement credited to any Member of Congress in which he expressed or indicated that he was interested in what was best for either the farmer and/or the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARIZONA COTTON GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Phoenix, Ariz., February 23, 1956.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: It gives me great pleasure to report that our members, at their annual meeting on February 21, adopted a resolution which, in effect, repudiates the present program of high-support prices for cotton.

A copy of the resolution is enclosed.

You will note that it covers a lot of territory but does approach the surplus problem in a positive way and offers for consideration a suggested solution of the cotton problem.

This resolution was offered before those in attendance at the membership meeting and was fully discussed. However, most of those taking the floor were interested in getting a clear understanding of the various provisions of the resolution and in trying to see how it would work under various hypothetical situations.

Only 1 member opposed the proposal and, when put to a vote, it received the full and enthusiastic support of the whole group, with only 1 "no" vote being recorded.

I feel that adoption of this resolution marks quite a change in the thinking of many of our members within the past year or so and gives me freedom to express to you some of my personal thoughts in regard to farm legislation now before the Congress.

It appears to me that S. 3183 and other bills introduced into the present session of Congress are based on political expediency and are no more than attempts to buy the votes of various farm groups. I have not seen a single statement credited to any Member of Congress in which he expressed or indicated he was interested in what was best for either the farmer and/or the United States.

Secretary Benson has taken a lot of abuse and has been accused of doing almost everything, up to and including stealing money from the pockets of the farmers. But it is my opinion that Secretary Benson is the one man who is honest enough and who has guts enough to see what is best for the farmers and to try to get them to take their medicine, even though it is unpalatable.

A year ago it was my pleasure to hear Secretary Benson address the annual meeting of the National Cotton Council. That group presumably included many people who favored rigid, high price supports for cotton. Yet when the Secretary finished telling them the facts of life they gave him

the greatest ovation that meeting has ever given one of its guest speakers.

At the recent annual meeting of the National Cotton Council the voting delegation approved a resolution putting the strength of the Council behind a move to change the basis of the cotton support program from seven-eighths of an inch cotton to the average grade and staple of the crop. They did this with full realization that it meant a drop in price of around 2 cents a pound if no other changes were made in the support program.

Naturally, there were individuals who did not approve the above action but no one spoke against the proposal.

I would say that the general feeling among the cotton producers and others attending the Cotton Council meeting last month was one of acceptance of the fact the price of cotton must be reduced if we are to make cotton attractive to the mills as compared to synthetics, and also in order to discourage further expansion of foreign plantings which are taking our world markets.

Even H. L. Wingate, of Georgia, who has been a leader of the rigid 90-percent group supported the proposal to change the loan basis.

Yet, in the face of general acceptance by the producers of the need for a lower price, we find their representatives in Congress fighting to restore, or continue, the high support program. They are not acting in the best interests of their people, nor are they truly representing the views of their constituents.

We are aware that you are not a supporter of the rigid high support program but we hope that now that our association has adopted the resolution enclosed that you will actively use your very considerable influence among the Republican Members of the Senate in an effort to influence them to adopt a program that will make American cotton more attractive to the mills and to foreign buyers.

Our resolution, of course, goes beyond the mere repudiation of high support prices. It offers a positive program for getting cotton into a free market and for disposing of the present surplus. We hardly expect our suggestions to become law, at least now, but our members adopted the proposal wholeheartedly in the belief that if it should be accepted as a cotton program that it would accomplish the objective we all want—namely allow us to eventually grow more cotton and recapture both our domestic and foreign markets.

Farm groups have always tried to steer away from direct cash payments from the Treasury knowing that such payments quickly become unpopular and can be cut off much more easily by Congress than can the indirect method of price supports.

Yet we see the President recommending and the Congress seriously considering a soil-bank program which, in my view, is nothing but a nice-sounding way of paying farmers around a billion dollars this year—hopefully most of it before elections.

No one seems to have any idea how the soil bank will work. Even Secretary Benson in his appearance before the Senate Agricultural Committee was might vague. It would appear it was forced on him by politicians who hoped to gain a vote here and there.

It seems to me that we can prophesize that any time you start paying anyone not to do something you are going to run into trouble, whether it's called a soil bank or anything else. Our resolution includes such an undesirable proposal, too. But better to pay a man to just let his land stand idle than to get into endless argument as to whether or not he planted the correct soil building crop or did, or did not, use it for pasture. I can see a lot of trouble ahead if the soil-bank idea is made into law.

At the moment it looks like the Republicans have better than an even chance of winning the presidency in any event. Should Mr. Eisenhower be the candidate it will not even be a contest. Why, then, let your associates get mixed up in an impracticable plan that will not be good, in the long run, for the farmers, the Treasury or anyone else?

This letter is too long and perhaps contains some statements not properly a part of an official association communication but they have been bubbling in me for sometime and as I mentioned, adoption by our members of the enclosed resolution gave me at least some license to express them.

Your very truly,

E. S. McSWEENY,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a resolution adopted by the Arizona Cotton Growers' Association at its annual meeting on February 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the members of the Arizona Cotton Growers Association at their annual meeting on February 21, 1956, assembled in open session, after thorough discussion of the cotton problems of this State and of the United States, view with great concern the diminishing portion of our production going into channels of consumption, and the increase of CCC stocks; realizing that for the third time in approximately 15 years the cotton stocks in the possession of the United States have become well nigh unmanageable, and that this difficulty in 1939 and again in 1950 was overcome and obscured by World War II and the Korean war and the aftermath of each, respectively, deplore the thought of ever looking for the future to provide such relief again, and realizing in full their responsibility as part of a great industry to assist in devising ways and means looking toward the solution of this otherwise seemingly unmanageable problem, and greatly concerned with their responsibility to the taxpayers of the United States as a whole, do hereby

Resolve, That it is their judgment that while the acreage-allotment program should be continued, the support program for upland cotton should be forthwith discontinued so that current production of all upland cotton may sell at competitive levels for use at home and abroad; with the understanding that, as a transitionary measure, a compensatory payment be mde to the producers by the Treasury of the United States equal to two-thirds of the difference between the market price and parity price on like qualities;

Provided further, That in order to contribute as far as possible to a reduction in the supply of cotton and to the maintenance and hoped-for improvement in the market price of cotton, there be authorized a payment to the farmer for each acre of cotton allotment not planted to cotton, a payment of 6 cents per pound of the 3-year average cotton production per acre on a given farm, or the average production of the county in which such farm is located, whichever is the higher;

Provided further, In order to encourage a different and more beneficial use of such nonplanted allotted acres, the producer shall be reimbursed by the United States for such costs as he may be occasioned, for following for 3 years on such acres practices accepted as soil building by the local Agricultural Extension Service or Agricultural Stabilization Committee;

Provided further, That in order to maintain an equitable balance between supply and demand, whenever production for the current year is estimated to be less than the sum of domestic consumption plus exports during the preceding year, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to sell in an orderly manner from United States and Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, for use at home and abroad, a quantity of cotton equal to 120 percent of such difference.

THE STAMPMASTER POSTAL VENDING MACHINE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, undoubtedly many Members of the Senate have received letters from their constituents concerning a machine called the stampmaster which the Post Office Department has put into use. I have not had an opportunity to see the machine, but I understand that a purchaser of stamps from the machine receives with his stamps a brief printed statement telling the purchaser something about the stamps or extolling the postal service.

Because I have received numerous complaints about the machine, I wrote to the Postmaster General regarding it. As usual, when anyone writes to the Post Office Department asking for a simple statement of facts, I received numerous pieces of correspondence from the Department. I ask unanimous consent that the letters and statement be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1956.

Hon. ARTHUR SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ART: Following my letter to you of February 7, with which I enclosed a letter from Mr. Burton P. Freireich, of Phoenix, Ariz., relative to the "Stampmaster" postal vending machine, I received several more communications from my constituents complaining vigorously about this proposed expenditure by the Post Office Department.

The initial reports concerning this device were considerably distressing to me, and I could not envision any practical purpose to be served by the appropriation of even the smallest amount of money in such a manner. It was my hope, however, that your reply would either be sufficiently clarifying to establish a logical justification for this expenditure, or that you would express some inclination to abandon the proposal. The letter which I received from your Special Assistant, Mr. L. Rohe Walter, enclosing a copy of the Post Office Department's press release, which I am attaching for your ready reference, concerning the "Stampmaster," failed to adhere to either of these alternatives, and leaves me further confused and disappointed.

Now, of course, this is a relatively small matter by comparison with the vast sums and projects currently being undertaken by the Federal Government at the taxpayer's expense, but I think that you will agree with me that it was just this kind of "little thing" which, when multiplied many times, created the kind of waste and extravagance that we Republicans complained so bitterly about for so many years. If I am wrong about this, I am perfectly willing to stand corrected and enlightened. However, the information which I have so far is wholly unsatisfactory.

With your reply, I wish you would answer these questions for me:

1. Why is it necessary for the Post Office Department to apply "improved modern merchandising practices" as would be employed by commercial businesses, when there is no competition for the sale of postage

stamps and when such sales are in the nature of a necessity of life?

2. Assuming that it is a convenience to have such a "Stampmaster" capable of making change for postal patrons, why is it necessary that the machine also talk, and what does it say of really necessary and worthwhile importance in the "dozen recorded messages that can be changed easily"?

In closing, and by way of emphasis, I would also like to take exception to the implication of that sentence in the press release which says that "the talking feature of the machine adds only about $30 to the cost." This kind of statement is reminiscent of the old days under the Democrats, when the only kind of economy practices was not that which eliminated expenditures, but rather that which justified unnecessary expenditures by citing their "bargain features."

I am going to await your response to this letter with much interest, and I hope you will regard my statements herein as only an effort to obtain some constructive perspective on this proposal, for I am the last individual who would ever embark upon an arbitrary criticism of the practices and policies of the Post Office Department, especially when that Department is under the direction of such an able and fine friend as you.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1956.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: This acknowledges your recent letter and accompanying memorandum attaching a letter from Mr. Burton P. Freireich about the new Stampmaster machine.

We believe your constituent will better understand the advantages of this improvement after he has read the complete story on the attached sheet.

We appreciate your interest and are returning Mr. Freireich's correspondence for your files.

Cordially yours,

L. ROHE WALTER,
Special Assistant to the Postmaster General.

The Post Office Department is following improved modern merchandising practices by using a new, experimental Stampmaster changemaking and patron-operated stamp-vending machine that works 24 hours a day and gives information on how mail users can help themselves to better mail service, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield has announced.

The new machine was first installed at a modern post office at McLean, Va. "It does more than merely talk," Mr. Summerfield emphasized. "Unfortunately," he added, "some of the early news stories on the device were incomplete and misleading.

"The early stories indicated that about the only thing it does is say 'Thank you.' Actually, the talking feature, consisting of about a dozen recorded messages that can be changed easily, gives important messages about the postal service to the postal patrons. And the talking feature of the machine adds only about $30 to the cost.

"Prototype handmade models of the Stampmaster will cost about $4,000. However, if the Post Office Department should desire to purchase them in quantity, after experimental use has proved their value, the cost would be considerably less."

"The Stampmaster," Mr. Summerfield added, "will accept one of a variety of coins—for example, a nickel, dime, or quarter. It is operated easily. The patron merely dials, on a telephone-type dial, what quantity of several different denominations of stamps he wishes, such as 2-cent, 3-cent or 6-cent denominations. The machine dispenses these to him immediately and gives him whatever change he may have coming."

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1956.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senate.

DEAR BARRY: In reply to your letter of February 14, I can readily understand your concern over the misconception of some well-meaning citizens about the "Stampmaster" vending machine.

Actually, what we are trying to do with this machine is to further cut our operating costs, and at the same time improve the service to the mail patrons.

The new experimental changemaking, patron-operated stamp vending machine works 24 hours a day. It makes possible around-the-clock service to patrons without the necessity of human attention, which is vastly more expensive.

The first "Stampmaster" was installed in a modern post office at McLean, Va., on February 11, 1956. In the first 80 minutes use, you will be interested to know that the machine handled 133 transactions; in the first 48 hours (including Sunday), it handled 699 transactions.

Another "Stampmaster" was installed yesterday in the Benjamin Franklin Station.

This machine does far more than merely say "thank you" as reported in some of the early news stories on the device, which were unfortunately incomplete and misleading. Actually, the talking feature consisting of about a dozen recorded messages that can be changed easily gives important facts about the postal service to stamp buyers. This talking device was not in the original specifications but was added without cost to the Department by the manufacturer. If experiments prove that the patrons like this idea, we can have it installed in any new vending machine, assuming we go ahead with their purchase, for a very few dollars each.

The "Stampmaster" vending machine will accept a nickel, dime, or quarter, and it operates easily. The patron merely dials, on a telephone-type dial, the quantity of stamps he wishes, in the 2-cent, 3-cent, or 6-cent denomination. The machine dispenses these to him immediately, plus whatever change he may have coming.

Its use enables the patrons to buy stamps during business hours without waiting in line and at other hours of the day or night when stamp windows are closed. It will also save man-hours for clerks and could easily pay for itself in a short time.

The Post Office Department believes the proposed use of this "never sleeps" salesman is in accord with modern merchandising practices. If we find that our patrons like the idea—if it proves helpful to them as a convenient service—and if it proves to be a moneysaver, we shall then consider its adoption and use in post office lobbies where around-the-clock stamp dispensing service is justified.

Perhaps you will be interested in Congressman JOEL T. BROYHILL's comments, and I quote: "The stamp vending machine is not just a cashier that says 'thank you.' It has many advantages, including the making of change for a variety of monetary denominations. It is a fine and laborsaving device. I have examined it very closely and I am impressed with its attributes and may I say that the good citizens of McLean are likewise impressed. The Post Office Department is to be commended rather than condemned for expediting the sale of stamps to the public."

Certainly we earnestly desire to immediately erase the bad impression that has been made on some of our citizens. I would be delighted to have you personally inspect, with me, the machine in operation, at your convenience.

With kindest personal regards,

Cordially and faithfully,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
The Postmaster General.

RECENT STATEMENTS ABOUT OUR PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, yesterday I spent about 2 hours listening to television and radio broadcasts by 3 statesmen from the other side of the aisle. Their discourses concerned our being far behind Russia in our preparations for defense.

Of course, unless someone speaks out and attempts to give the correct information, some people will believe the things they hear from such persons.

I believe we have the best defense machine that we have ever had in our whole history. I believe we have a leadership that is competent and capable. We elected a great President, largely because of his military experience. Certainly he knows what is happening in the Defense Department, as well as in all of its branches.

We do have testimony from our experts on what the facts are concerning our defense.

Some people have the quality of saying nothing with immense seriousness. Yesterday, the air waves were thick with accusations about the deficiencies of our defense. I need not use superlatives or indulge in spurious conversation to make my point. There has not been a war in this century under a Republican administration.

President Eisenhower stopped the war in Korea. In his administration he has been intent in keeping us out of war by having the best defense of any country in the world. I do not know of a better deterrent to war than a strong defense. Without fanfare, without blowing of trumpets, and without ostentation, this administration is keeping the peace. As a matter of fact, everything is booming but the guns.

Air Force Secretary Quarles reassured the Nation February 18 on this Nation's defense strength after scare remarks by certain statesmen relating to Soviet propaganda boasts of superior achievements in the missiles field.

In testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee February 9 and 10, an edited version of which was released February 18, Mr. Quarles made these points:

First. The United States is probably well ahead of Russia in the guided missile race.

Second. A missile armed with a nuclear warhead is horrifying, but "it does not kill you any deader than a bomber does with an atomic bomb."

Third. Long-range bombers are the best way of reaching targets and will continue to be in any war occurring in the next 5 years.

Fourth. America will have B–52 bombers which can do a better job than anybody with missiles for some time to come.

Fifth. Even if Russian boasts of the development of a 1,500-mile missile are

true, it would not materially affect the balance of arms power.

Sixth. Retaliatory bombing power is the Nation's best defense.

Without mentioning critics by name, Mr. Quarles told the House subcommittee:

I regard as highly misleading, and highly damaging to our whole position here, the whole line of publicity that says "this is an ultimate weapon, that we have no defense against it, that the first fellow that gets it is going to be on top and the rest might as well throw up their hands."

Earlier, Mr. Quarles had told the Air Force Association:

We have good reason to expect that the air power [we have] will continue to be an effective deterrent to keep an enemy from starting a war.

At the same time he said:

I am confident that in striking power this Air Force in being is superior to that of any other nation.

That the attacks were based on something less than solid fact was strongly pointed out in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., editorial on Senator Symington entitled "How Does He Know?"

The Star, expressing the hope that the Senator from Missouri was not "trying to make a partisan issue out of the vital question of American air power," admitted a sense of bafflement as to the Senator's source of information. Referring to the Senator's televised remark that the Russians "are ahead of us in ballistic missiles" the Star said:

How does he know this? Does he have exclusive sources of information, or is the same information on which he relies available to the Defense Department?

And, concludes the Star's curiosity about the Senator from Missouri:

We do not see how any worthwhile national decision can be reached on the basis of undocumented accusations by Senator Symington.

President Eisenhower had much the same reaction to sources available to the two Democrats when he answered a reporter:

Well, I am always astonished at the amount of information that others get that I don't.

He concluded the discussion of guided missiles and misguided Senators by saying:

I think overall, we have no reason to believe that we are not doing everything that human science and brains and resources can do to keep our position in a proper posture.

Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, followed up Secretary Quarles' House testimony with a statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee February 21 that the United States Air Force is still ahead of Russia in top-quality combat airpower, defenses, and guided missiles.

The missiles stir recalled a statement by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in Atlantic City, N. J., September 15, 1955. The admiral pointed out:

In my judgment, we have an industry-science-military team which is unbeatable. * * * I certainly would be unwilling to trade this combination, or any part of it, for that of any other power.

This is not a quantity arms race. We have long since leveled off our military strengths for the long pull. We are not attempting to match any nation plane for plane, gun for gun, bomb for bomb, or man for man.

But we are attempting to maintain a qualitative superiority in men, weapons, and equipment so as to discourage, and, if need be, destroy an aggression with convincing force.

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson, told by a reporter that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] had implied there might be need of a crash program for guided missiles, replied:

Well, I am trying to set up a program that won't crash.

Question. Mr. Secretary, would you say that we are doing everything we possibly could toward speeding the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile and the intermediate range ballistic missile?

Answer. I think the answer to that would be "Yes." Actually, it's a little broader than that.

Army Secretary Wilber M. Brucker told the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 20:

The Army is enthusiastic about its ability to cope with any military problem of the atomic age. The Army is modernizing every part of its equipment and weaponry as well as its concepts of tactics, strategy, and logistics.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, answered a question on Communist numerical superiority, that "quality offsets a simple headcount."

On February 21 the House Armed Services Committee approved five projects aimed at accelerating development of the intercontinental ballistic missile. Four, involving land required for missile testing, were blanketed in secrecy. The fifth was a $15.4 million project which included the construction of an atmosphere simulator at Ames Aeronautical Laboratory in California.

BARBARA D. COLTHURST

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 97) for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, which were, after line 8, insert:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of section 316 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pedro P. Dagamac shall be held and considered to have been physically present in, and a continuous permanent resident of, the United States during the period from February 1946 until November 7, 1952, while temporarily absent from the United States in the employment of the United States Government.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the periods of time Edith Kahler has resided or was physically present in the United States or any State since December 11, 1947, shall be held and considered as compliance with the residence or physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, Pedro P. Dagamac, and Edith Kahler."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on July 18, 1955, the Senate passed S. 97, S. 1368, and S. 1540, all of which would consider as constructive residence for naturalization purposes, certain temporary absences from the United States of the beneficiaries. On February 7, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 97, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of S. 1368 and S. 1540. This is in line with the new policy of the House of Representatives to include the names of several beneficiaries of private bills into one bill and to shorten the time required for the consideration of private bills.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

JANE EDITH THOMAS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7588) for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7588) for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered to have been and to be applicable to a child born outside of the United States and its outlying possessions after January 12, 1941, and before December 24, 1952, of parents one of whom is a citizen of the United States who has served in the Armed Forces of the United States after December 31, 1946, and before December 24, 1952, and whose case does not come within the provisions of section 201 (g) or (i) of the Nationality Act of 1940."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act granting the benefits of section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to certain children of United States citizens."

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
FRANK CHELF,
RUTH THOMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. EASTLAND. As passed by the House, the bill would have made the nationality laws presently in effect applicable in the case of Jane Edith Thomas, a 4-year-old child who was born in Italy in 1951 of a United States citizen father who was stationed abroad with our Armed Forces. Her mother was a national of Italy. The child did not acquire citizenship at birth because she was born in 1951 when a wartime statute had expired. Under the 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act, the child would have acquired United States citizenship at birth. The Senate amended the bill by substituting language which would grant the same benefits, not only to Jane Edith Thomas but to all children born abroad of a citizen parent, who served in our Armed Forces between December 31, 1946, and December 24, 1952, and an alien parent.

This conference report adopts the Senate version, whereby the provisions of existing law would extend to all cases involving children born to an alien parent and to a parent who is a citizen of this country, who served in the Armed Forces after December 31, 1946, and before December 24, 1952. Such children would be citizens of the United States.

I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator speaking with reference to a conference report?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it a conference report which was held over from last year? My reason for asking is that I am the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Immigration, and I had not heard of any conference on a matter of this kind. I know of the bill to which the Senator is referring, I understand what it purports to do, and I am favorable to it; but I wanted to have the record clear as to what is taking place with reference to it.

Mr. EASTLAND. The House passed the bill during the closing days of the last session. The Senate amended the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Utah signed the conference report.

Mr. WATKINS. I am trying to find out if that was done in the last session. It must have been some time back. I am in favor of the bill, but I wanted the record to be clear as to its status. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

MULTILATERAL AND RECIPROCAL TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS—THE AMERICAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the Department of State on August 1, 1955, announced that the United States would participate in the 1956 multilateral and reciprocal tariff negotiations in Geneva under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. Those negotiations are now in progress.

The list of products up for possible negotiation at this conference numbers about 900 types of foreign goods, including a few in cotton manufactures and others in flax and hemp, wool, wool manufactures, silk manufactures, and manufactures of rayon or other synthetic textiles.

While the number of textile products, particularly in cotton manufactures, up for possible negotiation this year is not so large as last year, I think this is an opportune time to once again call attention to the plight of our domestic textile industry and to sound a note of caution in regard to further textile tariff reductions.

At the 1955 GATT meeting in Geneva, severe cuts were made in a very wide range of textile import duties. Since the 1955 reductions took effect on September 10, there has been a sharp increase in textile imports, with the result that our domestic industry, already suffering from depressed conditions, is faced with the possibility of even more serious injury.

It would not be accurate to contend that imports alone account for the difficult conditions faced by our domestic industry. The fact is that the industry underwent a sharp expansion during World War II, and was able to maintain its capacity in the following years because of high civilian demand and the Korean war. In recent years the inevitable adjustment has taken place, resulting in hundreds of mill closings and many thousands of our citizens losing jobs. The problem has been accentuated because of declining per capita consumption of textiles and because of the stiff competition which synthetics are giving natural fibers. In addition mergers, industrial migration and disastrous floods have particularly affected the New England States, which are also suffering the general economic adjustments common to older economic regions. From 1947 to the first quarter of 1955 employment in New England textile mills dropped from 301,000 to 172,000, or 43 percent.

The position of the textile industry generally can be appreciated more fully by a comparison of certain figures. Since 1947–49 prices of all nonfarm commodities have increased by 15 percent, but cotton goods prices are down 10 percent. Prices of all commodities are up by 10 percent, while those of all textile-mill products and apparel are down by 5 percent. In the years 1952–55 returns on sales of textile-mill products averaged less than one-half the returns on all manufacturing. In addition, exports are declining, as is total investment in plant and equipment in the textile industry.

Under these conditions of domestic adjustment, it is neither reasonable nor just to ask that the textile industry carry too great an import burden.

Japan, of course, is our most serious textile competitor. No one would quarrel with increasing Japanese imports in an expanding domestic market. But it must be remembered that our domestic textile market is contracting in many cases, with the result that imports may annihilate some manufacturing firms, generally the smaller ones which are trying to make the adjustments being forced upon them by basic economic changes in the industry itself.

There is general agreement that Japan has made a remarkable comeback in textiles and has now regained her prewar title of the leading textile exporter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I noticed that the Senator said Japan has made a wonderful comeback. Has not America helped her a little bit in her comeback?

Mr. PAYNE. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As a result of the money we sent to Japan, this country is facing increased competition from Japan at the present time.

Mr. PAYNE. There can be no question that without the aid which America has given Japan, she would not have come back as she has as a textile exporter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. She would not have made such a comeback at such a rapid rate. Is that correct?

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. President, in 1955 total exports of cotton cloth to the United States ran between 120 million and 130 million yards. This is double the 1953 rate, and the entire increase came from Japan. The inflow of wearing apparel from Japan is also becoming a major problem. Such imports were at a very low level in 1953, but doubled in 1954, totaling $3 million. In 1955 they reached about $15 million. The thing to remember about these figures is that most of the 1955 gains occurred under the old and much higher tariff which existed before the GATT reductions became effective in September.

Fortunately, the Japanese Goverment has in recent months taken steps to curb the flow of textile exports to the United States. It remains to be seen what the long-range effect of this voluntary action will be, but I think it is significant that the Japanese Government recognizes the possible dangers to its own trade posed by attempts to flood the American market.

One of the major reasons why Japan is able to make serious inroads in our domestic market is her low-wage situation.

Labor is the most important single element in textile production, accounting for about 40 percent of unit cost. The Japanese textile worker gets only approximately 14 cents an hour, while his American counterpart receives approximately $1.36. American productivity is greater than that of the Japanese, but we must remember that Japan's industry is efficient and modernized. Her productivity is increasing week by week, and it is no exaggeration to say that our somewhat greater productivity seldom makes up for the gaping wage differential.

Furthermore, there is a strong element of unfair competition in this wage situation. According to the staff papers of the Randall Commission, on page 433, the test of unfair wage competition is whether the labor force involved is receiving wages, per unit of output, which are substantially lower than wages received in the country as a whole. Department of Labor figures show that the average hourly wage in all manufacturing and mining industries in Japan is 24 cents, while in textiles it is only 14 cents. This is a substantial difference, indeed, and may very well meet the test of unfair competition set up by the Randall Commission staff.

There is no question that Japan must trade to live. In recent years, as Japan finds some of her traditional Far Eastern markets closed to her, or more competitive than in prewar years, the United States assumes a more important place as a market for her products. And the United States, seeking a free and stable Japan, wants to help. That was one reason why we made such generous tariff cuts, ranging up to 48 percent, in favor of Japan at the 1955 GATT meeting, cuts which were extended to the other contracting parties of GATT on a most-favored-nation basis. The responsibility for strengthening Japan through greater trade rests not only with the United States, however. Some 14 nations, mostly in Europe, have become alarmed by the prospect of a flood of Japanese imports into their home markets, and have, as a result, refused to grant trade concessions to Japan.

To the New England or Southern textile worker out of a job it looks very much as if he alone is being asked to make sacrifices, while many other nations of the free world protect their workers by maintaining barriers against Japanese trade.

Last summer the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 121 directing the Tariff Commission to keep informed regarding the import of textiles and texile product imports and to be prepared to act promptly on any request for an escape-clause investigation under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended. While the resolution will have little practical effect in offering greater protection to the domestic textile industry, it did represent an awareness on the part of the Senate of the special problems of the industry.

Also introduced by 63 Senators last year, and now before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is a bill (S. 2702) which would encourage the sale of cotton for export, and would limit imports of manufactured cotton products. In other words, among other things this bill would put an import quota on manufactured cotton products. I am a cosponsor of this bill, and realize full well the serious effects such legislation could have on our foreign-trade policy. I am sure that many of the cosponsoring Senators would agree with me that we should avoid, if possible, the imposition of an import quota. The United States today does not have one import quota on manufactured products. On the other hand, if, when the full effects of the 1955 tariff reductions are felt, it becomes evident that serious injury is being done to our domestic industry, then it may become necessary, Mr. President, to explore completely the need and the feasibility of an import quota.

The textile industry is one of the oldest and most important in this country. Its contributions in peace and in war are great, indeed. It would be the height of folly for us to take action which would contribute to the further decline of this industry. Our friends abroad fear nothing more than economic instability in this country. But that is exactly the situation we encourage by weakening one of our major industries which, in turn, is vital to the good economic health of many other industries.

The textile industry does not seek special favors. But it does ask, Mr. President, that the additional burden of ever-increasing imports not be added to its other troubles. The industry seeks a chance to adjust, to work out its problems, so that once again it can stand strong against all competition, from whatever source.

Our Government should explore alternative ways of dealing with the Japanese problem. In addition, we must strongly impress upon other countries their responsibilities for helping to solve that problem. In trying to live up to our own heavy world responsibilities, we must be careful, Mr. President, not to take action which spells serious injury to an important industry or to an entire area of our country, for such action might in the long run only defeat the cause we seek to promote.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. PAYNE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Maine has made a very good suggestion, namely, that our Government make attempts in other ways to assist the Japanese.

I am sure the Senator from Maine is familiar with the fact that great difficulty is being encountered in developing trade between Japan and Korea, which is one of the natural markets for the Japanese.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Serious trouble is also being encountered in getting the Japanese to trade with the Philippines.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And likewise with Formosa.

Mr. PAYNE. We are also having difficulty in getting some of the other countries, which should be standing with us in encouraging trade which will help Japan remain firm and be able to recover, likewise to give a little aid, instead of asking the United States to give all of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. In my mind there is no question but that the best way to help Japan is to permit her to expand her markets.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me that our Government should work with the Philippines and also with South Korea in attempting to help Japan expand her trade in Southeast Asia, where the Japanese traded during the pre-war years. If such a course were pursued, then, in my humble judgment, the Japanese would not be so anxious to dump their goods on our market, as they have done in the past.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Louisiana has made a very clear point; and I believe it will be recognized that, naturally, the Japanese would prefer to do business close to home, in their own natural trade area or field, rather than to have to look to markets many thousands and thousands of miles away from the shores of Japan. But until that objective can be explored, and until we can find ways and means of achieving that result, of course everyone who wishes to see Japan remain strong must be willing to give help. However, all the burden should not be placed on our shoulders.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true; but it strikes me that we are now in a position to help Japan develop markets in her historic area, since the Philippines and South Korea and Formosa are so dependent upon us for aid.

I made that suggestion when I returned from abroad, last year, after I had visited Formosa, Korea, the Philippines, and elsewhere in Southeast Asia. It seems to me that a large market there can be developed in behalf of the Japanese, so that, as we have just indicated, they will have adequate markets in their own area.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that we stand in a good position to do that.

Recently did the Japanese not enter into an agreement or understanding to the effect that they would limit to some extent their cotton textile exports to the United States?

Mr. PAYNE. That is true. Of course, the heads of the Japanese Government recognize that the United States has been one of Japan's fields of trade, one of the areas to which the Japanese could send goods, and where they could trade. The Japanese are quite realistic. They realize that if a strong storm of protest arises in this country because of the danger of damage to our domestic industries as a result of Japanese imports, such a development would not place Japan in a very strong position. So I think they have been realistic in facing the situation and in trying to work out an arrangement which can be of mutual help.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Maine concedes that that would be a good thing to do, does he not?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to commend the Senator from Maine for the presentation he has made. What he has stated is very important.

If the Japanese were allowed to flood the United States with goods of their manufacture, I believe that would create many headaches and considerable unemployment in our country—something which we do not want to occur. Nevertheless, it is likely to occur if there are considerable imports of Japanese goods, because our labor cannot compete with Japanese labor. That is one of the chief troubles we are facing at the present time.

Inasmuch as salaries and wages in Japan are probably one-sixth of those in the United States, we cannot expect our manufacturers to be able to compete with Japanese manufacturers.

Mr. PAYNE. In fact, Mr. President, I think wages and salaries in Japan are approximately one-tenth of those in the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Furthermore, the Japanese buy their cotton for less than our manufacturers have to pay for the cotton they buy in the United States. The Japanese buy cotton on the world market; and the world market is usually from 5 to 6 cents a pound lower than the United States market, in which our manufacturers purchase the cotton they use. That situation makes it almost impossible for American manufacturers to meet the competition of Japanese manufacturers.

Therefore, in my opinion, all we can do is have a quota which will protect American manufacturers, and make it possible for the Japanese to trade with the countries near Japan, and thereby not seriously affect our market. Of course, such trade will affect our market to some extent—but perhaps to only a small extent.

However, as I understand, at the present time the Japanese are in a mood to agree with us along those lines, or at least they have thrown out a hint that they would be willing to do so.

Mr. PAYNE. I think they are realistic about the situation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If we are to go ahead and enter into agreements with them and establish a quota on Japanese goods to be brought into the United States, I think we had better do it now, rather than to wait, because they might change their minds later. We could impose a quota, but it would be much better to do it by agreement with them, rather than to force it on them.

Mr. PAYNE. I agree very definitely with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and also with the observations of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I think we must first make sure that our own domestic industry is given an opportunity to continue. The impact is felt, not only in the so-called yard-goods industry, as relates to textiles, but it can very well find its way into the apparel manufacturing end of the business, as well as the textile machinery field. The effect can be multiplied over and over again. The bobbin manufacturing industry, and all other fields related to textiles are affected. The impact could be very serious, resulting in a tremendous upset of the economic structure of the textile industry.

There are definitely fields in which our Government, through its proper agencies, should endeavor to help the Japanese to develop their natural trade areas, so as to enable them to take some of the Japanese production. It is only commonsense to realize that Japan must find an outlet if it is to live and be a strong and sound nation.

So we have a dual purpose. First, we must put on realistic glasses and look at our own situation. Then we must look at the situation of the Japanese, and see if we cannot mutually agree upon something which will be of benefit to both countries.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have finally arrived at a uniform wage to be paid throughout the United States.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There was a time when wages paid in the South were much less than those paid in the New England States. The effect was felt by the New England States at that time. During recent years wages have been approximately the same in both areas. I know whereof I speak, because at one time I worked at a cotton mill in the South for 25 cents a day—not for 1 day, but for months. Later I received 50 cents a day. I know how the various areas of the country were affected. Now the entire United States is being affected by what is taking place in Japan.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, if there are no further questions, I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Maine for his statement and compliment him for the information he has brought out today. I also wish to congratulate him for the fine cooperation he gave last year on this important subject, when we were discussing it with Senators, appearing before the Finance Committee, and when we were introducing legislation to bring about the desired result. This subject is of great importance to the New England States and to the Southern States.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. While bouquets are being passed around, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for the great amount of work he has done on this very important subject. He recognizes the great value of the textile industry to the Nation as a whole, as well as to particular regions.

I have been most happy to join with him in several efforts, along with others of our colleagues, to see if we could not arrive at some realistic approach which would tend to stabilize and save an industry which is continually feeling a depressing effect upon its operations.

Mr. THURMOND. I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Maine. The distinguished Senator from Maine has a keen appreciation of the importance to the economy of this Nation of the great textile industry.

Mr. President, I, too, am deeply concerned with the textile situation with regard to imports and exports.

In 1947, which was a peak year for cotton textile exports from the United States, this country imported only 3.2 percent as much cotton textiles as it exported, based on dollar value.

In 1955 we exported $244,700,000 worth of cotton textile products, but last year textile imports amounted to $120,900,000. This means that imports in 1955 were 49.4 percent as great as our exports of cotton textile goods.

The significant point in these figures is that we are rapidly losing our export markets for cotton textile goods.

This means trouble for the cotton farmer as well as for the textile manufacturer.

In 1947 the United States was exporting the equivalent of one and a half million bales of cotton in the form of textile products. But in 1955 our exports of textile products amounted only to about a half million bales of cotton.

Practically all of our cotton textile exports are in the form of yard goods. Our overseas purchasers buy from this country to get American skill in designing and styling and because of the speed with which we can deliver their orders, compared with other textile manufacturing countries.

Much of the imported goods from Japan to the United States is in the form of made-up goods, such as shirts and blouses. A comparison of yard goods imported with yard goods exported does not accurately reflect the trend.

About 50 percent of the cotton textile fabrics imported from Japan is made-up goods. I am informed that in December alone 21 million yards of yard goods were shipped from Japan to the United States. In addition to this, it is reported that Japan shipped 15 million cotton blouses and shirts to this country in December. This would mean another 18,750,000 yards of cotton goods in the blouses and shirts. Other products totaling two or three million yards of made-up goods also were shipped to the United States in December.

This would mean a total of 41 million yards of cotton textile goods—made-up and not made-up—were exported from Japan to the United States in December 1955.

On the other hand, our exports of cotton textiles are estimated by the Export Association as amounting to only 39 million yards of goods in December.

Thus, based on these figures, for the first time in history the month of December saw the United States import more cotton textile products than were exported from this country in the same month.

The United States is a natural textile-exporting country, because we have the

largest industry in the world and offer more diversified goods. Also we are the largest producer of raw cotton.

I am deeply concerned with this situation which has developed. If the administration does not take administrative action to halt this dangerous trend, I hope that the Congress will act.

Mr. President, I wish now to read a letter addressed by me to the Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, under date of February 27, 1956. The letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1956.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Because of my deep concern on behalf of the more than 1 million persons of this Nation's textile industry, 133,000 of whom are in my own State of South Carolina, I am writing to ask you to consider approval of negotiating quota agreements with Japan which has poured an increasing stream of cotton-textile products into the United States. Or you could exercise authority already vested in you by law.

Government reports and trade reports out of Japan show that textile imports greatly increased during the last months of 1955. Based on the surge of imports since the negotiation of the GATT agreements started in Geneva last year, I believe it is no longer wise to judge the effect by comparing the total of 1955 textile imports with the 1954 total. Even that comparison shows a tremendous increase, but the data of the recent months should be recognized as a danger signal.

Our domestic cotton producers and our textile manufacturers and the people they employ will all suffer unless adequate safeguards are established to protect against imported goods manufactured from cheap cotton and by low-wage labor in foreign countries.

From the base periods of 1947-49, the cotton-textile industry price index has declined 8 percent, while the index of other industries has risen 18 percent on an average. Consumption of cotton products has been nearly static since the base period while consumption of all other industrial commodities has increased about 17 percent.

If penalties such as the agreements negotiated for the reduction of textile tariffs last year are to be imposed on the industry, the result is that cotton textiles have no prospect of progressing like other industries.

Unless action is taken by this country, we cannot hope for Japan to continue voluntary control of their exports. Only by self-protection, or at least by negotiated agreements for protection of our interests, can the United States prevent an eventually disastrous volume of textile goods from being poured into this country.

I urge your immediate attention to this matter.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

STATEMENTS BY SECRETARY DULLES ON SOVIET POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In view of the fact that my remarks may be considered to be critical of the Secretary of State, I believe I will yield to the Senator from Louisiana so that he may suggest the absence of a quorum, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object. I think a Senator who is about to address the Senate is entitled to a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I renew my request that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for withdrawing his objection.

Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to a matter which dwarfs all other subjects before it. To put it plainly, it is this: Will the Secretary of State Dulles tell America the truth about our present peril, or will he say one thing publicly and the opposite privately? Will he give us a fair chance to decide for ourselves, with full knowledge of the facts, what efforts we should make for our own salvation, or will he lull us to sleep in an hour when the Soviet Union has launched a powerful diplomatic offensive against us? Will he by his candor rally the free world to a trust in American leadership; or, from an apparent craving for popular approval, will he endanger the mutual trust which supports the association of free peoples?

In putting these questions before the Senate, let me make one thing quite plain. I know that no American Secretary of State walks an easy path. His motives may be pure, his patriotism may be firm, his acts may be wise, yet the problems that crowd upon him do not lend themselves to easy answers. Some of the problems lie wholly beyond his control. Some have been gathering force long before most of us here were born, and no one among us can dispose of them with a flick of the wrist. We may, in fact, have to reconcile ourselves to the fact that our grandchildren may be wrestling with some of the same problems that plague us here today.

For this reason, any Secretary of State merits and should receive every sympathy and every ounce of support within our power to give. I, for one, as a Democrat, recall an all too recent chapter in American history, and I have no desire to repeat it. I have no desire to vilify a Republican Secretary of State, as a recent Democratic Secretary of State was vilified because he did not reverse every world current that was adverse to America. Apart from the wrong to the person involved, we have seen all too clearly how this kind of partisanship makes the whole of America its victim.

What we want and what we will support is the truth, however unpleasant. What we want and what we will support is a Secretary of State who will not treat us as children ready to clap in delight at every fairy story, however fanciful. What we want and what we will support is a Secretary of State who will come to us, not with packaged solutions to every ill that plagues the world; but who will come to us, instead, with a statement of facts about the nature of those ills. Such a Secretary of State would win our respect for his courage, and for the respect he himself showed the truth.

It is my unpleasant duty to say that on Friday of last week in the Foreign Relations Committee, we did not have such a Secretary of State.

The Secretary's statement about Soviet policy was so fantastic that a leading and respected journalist, Mr. Reston, stated in an article in the New York Times on Sunday that Mr. Dulles does not himself believe his own statement.

What could possibly induce the Secretary of State to attempt to deceive the American people about the deadly menace which confronts them?

Why did he offer us on Friday an estimate of the world situation which was more like a midsummer dream than any transaction now going on in the world of real things? To raise the question is to state the exact point at which the Secretary of State subverted what it is that makes for responsible power. For if America were a dictatorship like the Soviet Union, Mr. Dulles would be at liberty to practice the little arts where words need not be consistent in their meaning, nor represent any realities whatsoever. Like Mr. Khrushchev or Mr. Bulganin or Mr. Molotov, he could say one thing on Friday, do an opposite thing on Saturday, and say yet a different thing on Sunday. He could proceed this way because under a dictatorship public opinion does not have to be consulted. Whatever the people think, the means for executing policy can be extracted from them—if necessary, at the point of a bayonet.

This is not the case in the United States. The fact is that America is not the Soviet Union. Nor are our allies satellites. We and our allies have drawn together for the express purpose of preserving systems of government where an informed public opinion can be the source of public policy, the guide and the controlling force over public policy. But I ask the Senate: Are these systems of government well served when a Secretary of State misleads public opinion, confuses it, feeds it pap, tells it that if it will suppress the proof of its own senses, it will see that Soviet triumphs are really defeats, and Western defeats are really triumphs? Will such a public opinion be prepared to make new sacrifices when the Secretary of State implies that the battle against the Soviet bid for world dominion has been won?

And what of the Members of the Senate when we return to our people? Will our people believe us when we ask them to approve of the votes we may have to

cast for new outlays related to our foreign affairs? Have not the people been provided by the Secretary of State with a reason for resisting such outlays—for resisting them on the ground that the Secretary of State, by his testimony, said that Soviet designs had been frustrated already?

Consider in closer detail what Mr. Dulles told us on Friday. Briefly, he told us that the Soviet Union was losing the cold war. And what proof did he offer? He said:

> At this very moment, in Moscow, they are having to revise their whole program. If we had to go through such a revision and change of our whole program as they are undergoing, it would be advertised all over the world that we had failed. The fact is, they have failed, and they have got to devise new policies.

Mr. Dulles said further that the Soviets were not making progress in the Middle East; that the speeches of Khrushchev and other party leaders in Moscow during the recent Congress indicated a failure in their foreign policy; and that as a result of this failure "they have got to revamp their whole creed, from A to Z."

In addition, he said:

> But one thing that is absolutely certain is the unity and firmness and resolution of the free nations during the past few years have caused the Soviet policy to fail, and today they are trying to figure out how they are going to get a better one.

It is in the nature of a delusion which, if it pierces the human mind, does so because of a small truth it twists. In this light, this much is true enough: The unity of the free world, as it was first forged after the Second World War, checkmated the Soviet policy of expansion as it was pressed along rigid Stalinist lines. Moreover, by our program of economic aid, technical assistance and cultural exchanges we managed to brace countless nations against the shock of subversion from within their own borders. Yet the success we achieved during this period was due in large measure to two circumstances: First, the monopoly of nuclear weapons; second, a monopoly over the capacity to export capital for the use of underdeveloped countries.

In recent years, however, both monopolies have been broken by the Soviet Union. They have an ever-increasing arsenal of nuclear weapons, and an ever-increasing capacity to deliver them on to their targets. At the same time, whether by squeezing the living standards of their own people, or by other authoritarian means, apparently they have arrived at a position where they can offer underdeveloped countries capital and technical assistance for their development. In short, they now appear to be able to imitate the best features of American policy and are pressing ahead with vigor and determination.

By no stretch of the imagination can these developments mean defeat for Soviet policy. Quite the contrary. The changes in the Soviet Union have led directly to a position of strength which enables the new leaders to press on with renewed vigor toward the old aim of world dominion—and to do this by more effective means than by following the bluster, threats, and blackmail crudely employed by the Stalinist regime. In Stalinist days, America and its friends abroad recognized the danger of overt aggression, and drew together to meet force with force. But can they meet the new form of Soviet challenge, a challenge which was underway long before the 20th congress in Moscow? Can we meet this more subtle, more astute challenge if we are told it is not a challenge, but a confession of failure?

Mr. President, I ask in all candor, does the skillful way the Soviet Union has posed as the champion of Asiatic peoples represent a triumph for Western diplomacy as Mr. Dulles suggests? It does not. Does the sight of tens of millions of people cheering Soviet leaders in India and Burma represent a dismal failure of Soviet policy? I think not. Does the dramatic and vigorous entry of Russia into the once forbidden zone of the Middle East represent a setback for the Kremlin? It does not. Is the shaky edifice of the Baghdad Pact a proof that all is well with the Western cause in that part of the world? I think not. Are the cracks in Western Europe, the citadel of the Western Alliance, a reason for applauding the course American diplomacy has recently taken? I think not.

Indeed, wherever one looks, even in our own Latin American neighborhood, there is the Soviet Union on the march, confident, even cocky, wearing a false mask of new respectability, talking treacherously in soft words that are suited to parliamentary governments, and losing no chance to preempt the cause of peace for its exploitation. Wherever one looks, there is the Soviet Union, parading itself as the friend of the underdeveloped peoples, ready to help them raise their miserable standards of life, without requiring first that they enter into military alliances.

And wherever one looks there is an impression of America that is a bitter caricature of what America really is and what it really wants—but caricature, nevertheless, which a good part of the world takes for reality. It accepts it, among other reasons, for causes that can be laid directly at the door of the present Secretary of State. It believes that America can think of the fight for peace in no terms except that of military alliances and the shipment of arms.

We in America know that this is false. We know that since V–J Day we have taxed ourselves to the tune of $55 billion to aid the world's economic and political recovery. We know that we have asked nothing of the people on the receiving end of this aid except that they shall remain the authors of their own history, and shall not permit themselves to be one more sheet of paper on which the Communists shall stamp another grim chapter in their bid for world dominion.

The new strength and boldness of the Soviet policy should not be the occasion for despair, nor should it be misrepresented as a sign of failure. It should cause us carefully to reassess our resources, reevaluate our policies, and rededicate ourselves to a program of action designed to demonstrate by deeds, and not words, the superiority of our system of society. We are deprived of any chance to make the right decisions to this end if the facts which confront us are misrepresented by those who, because of their official position, are presumed to know the truth. If our commonsense can be fortified by the truth, I believe that human liberty can still prevail over the police state of the Soviets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a series of articles written by some of the best qualified writers in this or any other country in the field of foreign relations, as follows:

An article entitled "Mr. Dulles and Mr. Kennan On Soviet Policy," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times of February 26, 1956.

An article entitled "Coue and Dulles," written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 27, 1956.

An article entitled "A Revealing Blunder," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 21, 1956.

An article entitled "Our Time Is Running Out In Southeast Asia," written by John Cowles, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 26, 1956. Mr. Cowles is president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, and has just returned from Asia. The title of his article is a coincidence.

An article entitled "Soviet Poses a New and Greater Challenge—Stalin's Static Communism Is Ended as New Era of Dynamism Begins," written by Harrison E. Salisbury, and published in the New York Times of Sunday, February 26, 1956.

An article entitled "Russians Are Scoring in Asian Propaganda," written by Thomas J. Hamilton, and published in the New York Times of Sunday, February 26, 1956.

I consider Mr. Salisbury and Mr. Hamilton to be authorities in this field.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1956]

MR. DULLES AND MR. KEENAN ON SOVIET POLICY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 25.—Secretary of State Dulles celebrated his 68th birthday today by playing host to President Eisenhower at a dinner party and getting himself involved in another rousing controversy.

He told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday that the new Soviet policy of tolerating Titoist tendencies in other Communist parties and trying to destroy Western influence in Asia and Africa by economic and political offensives was not a sign of Soviet strength but of Soviet weakness.

He asserted that the United States was stronger in relation to the Soviet Union today than it was a year ago, that the Soviets were not making progress even in the Middle East, and that their recent moves merely proved the wisdom and dramatized the success of our own policies.

The committee was astonished. Ambassadors in the committee room from friendly countries with long experience in the Soviet Union were dumbfounded.

MR. KENNAN'S VIEW

Mr. George F. Kennan, former United States Ambassador to the U. S. S. R. and

probably the shrewdest student of Soviet policy in the Western world today, could hardly believe the news this morning.

"The Soviet threat," he said, "is more serious today than at any time since 1947. I do not recognize the world Mr. Dulles is talking about."

Mr. Kennan does not deny that the organization of the Western nations in an anti-Communist coalition has greatly influenced Soviet policy and encouraged Russia to change from a policy of rigid violence to a more subtle policy of economic penetration and political subversion.

What he denies most emphatically, however—and he is supported in this by almost every Soviet expert in the Capital—is that Soviet policy is being changed, as Mr. Dulles said, "from A to Z," and that it is not making progress.

On the contrary, he thinks Moscow's switch to a more lenient policy toward the Communist parties in France, Italy, and other countries, and its economic barter policy in Asia and Africa is designed to detach the Western powers from those areas and is much more likely to do so than the policies followed in the Stalinist era.

The Communist leaders, in their party congress in Moscow this week, did not, as Mr. Dulles said, "revamp their whole creed." They did not rule out violence as an instrument of policy. That merely said that there were places and occasions where their objectives could be achieved without violence.

Stalin did not feel strong enough to permit deviations among the other Communist parties from the rigid Soviet line. Khrushchev and Bulganin, in Mr. Kennan's view, are more flexible and confident. They are now saying to the Communist leaders in other countries: "Take power if you can, by parliamentary means if you like, in accordance with the political structure of your particular countries. The main objective is to weaken or destroy American and other Western influence where you are."

Mr. Dulles took the position that the new Soviet emphasis on economic aid and technical assistance to neutral and underdeveloped countries was merely proof that they were adopting policies favored by the Western Powers for many years. The Soviet experts here do not deny this. What they deny is Mr. Dulles' interpretation that this proves their failure and their weakness.

On the basis of what the Secretary of State said yesterday, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Nation would be justified in assuming that everything, therefore, is all right, that the policies of the present will take care of the Soviet offensive if they are merely modified a little and made more resilient.

THE OTHER DULLES

Nobody here really believes this, and the astonishing but comforting fact is that neither does Mr. Dulles. He is not a new boy in town. He is not only aware of the menace of the new Soviet tactics, but he has been saying privately for months that the more resilient and imaginative Soviet policy of Khrushchev was in many ways a greater menace to the West than the rigid policy followed by Stalin.

Mr. Dulles has merely got caught once more in the increasingly disturbing official habit in this city of giving one impression in public and another in private.

The Dulles of yesterday was the old defense lawyer scoring debating points in a political atmosphere. The Democrats were after him, so he went over to the offensive. He told the truth but he didn't tell the whole truth. He noted the Soviet change of tactics, and claimed that it was a justification for boasting, but he did not grapple with the consequences of the change.

Now, of course, he will have to grapple with them. His statements made propaganda abroad and they weren't bad politics at home—particularly with an electorate that wants to be told comfortable things—but he will now have to get appropriations for foreign aid out of a Congress that has been told we are ahead and the Soviets are making "very little progress," even in the Middle East.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 27, 1956]

COUE AND DULLES

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

In his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has now elevated the practice of Coueism to the status of a major technique of American foreign policy.

For those whose memories do not go back so far, Dr. Emile Coue was an amiable, bearded pseudo-physician who brought a new panacea out of France in the 1920's. By taking thought, said Coue, you could cure yourself of anything from a hernia to the blind staggers. All you had to do was to repeat often enough, with enough loud conviction, "Every day, in every way, everything is getting better and better."

The fad caught on for a while; but after a bit it was observed that the blind staggers went on staggering and the hernia sufferers could not do without their trusses. Now, however, the Coue cure-all has been resurrected from obscurity, with the august endorsement of the Secretary of State of the United States.

What Dulles told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in brief, was that the Soviet Union was now losing the cold war. "One thing is certain," he declared with exalted conviction, "the unity of the free world has caused the Soviet policy to fail, and right today they are trying to figure out a better one * * * at this moment in Moscow, they are having to revise their whole program. If we in this country had to admit that, we would be advertised all over the world as having failed. They have failed."

These statements are truly remarkable, for several rather simple reasons; they are wholly unsupported by a shred of intelligence data. They are not believed by any of Dulles' own ambassadors. They are not believed, either, by any member of the higher staff of the State Department, with the possible exception of 1 or 2 courtiers who have a knack of believing what is currently expedient, and they are not believed, finally, by any leader among our major allies.

Except for Dulles, expert opinion unanimously attributes the important changes in the Kremlin's policy line to a new self-confidence, derived from the great improvements in Soviet military posture and gains in heavy industry which Dulles himself mentioned to the Senators.

Before he became a minority of one, even Dulles used to hold this same view. In earlier briefings of the press, he himself has frankly stated that the Kremlin's abandonment of the rigid and brutal Stalinist line in favor of a more flexible and less doctrinaire policy has greatly increased the dangers and risks of the free world. It would be interesting, then, to know what has changed the Secretary's mind.

Certainly the hard facts of the world situation do not offer any support to the new Dulles view that "every day, in every way, everything is getting better and better." Throughout almost all of Asia, the Communists are making such rapid and disturbing progress that two warm Eisenhower supporters and extremely accurate observers, John Cowles and Paul Hoffman, have just returned from Asian journeys to raise the alarm in this country.

In the Middle East, the outlook is so dark that leading members of Dulles' own staff have been quoting the odds on an Arab-Israeli war as about 50–50 either way. Even if the war danger is surmounted this year, moreover, it is universally admitted that the new Communist political offensive in the Middle East has already scored brilliant successes. It is also becoming clear that Communist infiltration in certain of the Arab States is now very far advanced.

Even in the citadel of the Western alliance, in Western Europe, the situation shows signs of grave deterioration. France is in chaos, and will hardly emerge from chaos without the loss of the position in North Africa that makes France a major power. Britain, too, is in the midst of an acute economic crisis. Moreover, far eastern and middle eastern revenues and all that balance Britain's books, and thus the Communist pressure in these areas now threatens Britain with irretrievable bankruptcy of a sort that would destroy Britain's great-power standing.

Even in West Germany, American policy rests solely on the frail foundation of a wonderfully brave but very old and very ill man, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. The future German Army is not shaping well. And almost every American observer on the spot agrees that if anything happens to Adenauer, Germany will move rather rapidly toward a neutralist position, probably leaving NATO to buy German reunification.

Altogether, it is not a pretty picture. But perhaps the Coue method really will work in foreign policy, although it was a dud in medicine.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 21, 1956]

A REVEALING BLUNDER

(By Walter Lippmann)

The affair of the Saudi Arabian tanks is a ludicrous but damaging example of what can happen in a big and complicated government when it is not clearly led and firmly administered from the top. For months this Government has been faced with the dangerous problem of arms shipments to the Middle East. On this subject there has recently been a conference at the highest level between the President and the British Prime Minister. There have been many pronouncements about arms for the Middle East. How then could it happen that the State Department had forgotten about its own approval of the sale of the Saudi Arabian tanks, that the Defense Department was operating without realizing what a mess the shipment of these arms would now cause, once the facts became known?

The reason for this incident must be that there is no high policy for the Middle East which comes from the top and is administered all the way down the line from the policymaking officials to the operating officials. The President has not, of course, been truly in command, certainly not since his illness, in fact not really since he went to Denver last August. Yet it is only the President who can effectively coordinate two great departments like State and Defense. He can coordinate them only if at Cabinet meetings and elsewhere he makes the heads of these departments understand clearly what the policy is. It is only too obvious that nothing of the sort has happened during the past 6 months, or could have happened.

The lack of a high command has been aggravated by the way Mr. Dulles conceives the office of Secretary of State. He thinks of himself as a roving negotiator, who represents the President's constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs. He works out high problems by personal negotiation, and then leaves the policies to be administered and operated in his absence by officials who do not know at first-hand what they are. Mr. Dulles is not in Washington long enough or continuously enough to command the operations of his Department. The effect, as the Saudi Arabian tanks illustrate,

is to leave the immediate business of the Government to be operated by bureau chieftains on their own notions without overhead directions from the top.

The administrative confusion is not the only, or indeed the most serious, consequence of the way our affairs have been conducted during the past 6 months. There has been nobody at the top whose business it has been, or who was able, to face up to the new Soviet challenge which has confronted us since the first Geneva meeting. The President has been too ill to deal with it, and Mr. Dulles has been too preoccupied with his travels, his negotiations, and his speeches. In these past 6 months we have suffered the biggest and most serious setback since the Communist victory in China.

The fundamental cause of the setback is that the Soviet Union has been developing a new foreign policy since Geneva whereas we have remained frozen and inflexible in the policy of the pre-Geneva period. That is why there is scarcely a country from France and Italy and Germany and Greece to India and beyond where the pro-Western and pro-American parties and politicians are not in trouble. With nobody at the top in Washington who can and will take new decisions, our diplomacy is almost everywhere fighting unattractive rear-guard actions.

It would be interesting to know who, in the high places where decisions can be taken, has been putting his mind on the speeches delivered last week at the Communist Party Congress in Moscow. They are very long speeches. But they are exceedingly important. Their common theme is that within the Communist world, they have an industrial system which is, in the terms of national power, not only in arms but also in the means of capital development, already reaching equality with the West. The Soviet leaders have been declaring that the rate of economic growth in the Soivet Union surpasses that of all countries, and that, therefore, they will become a more and more formidable competitor in the economic and political markets of the world.

I do not know whether all the statistics that were put out last week are correct. But the world will not doubt the great fact that the Soviet Union is now the strongest power in Eurasia. It is this economic fact which accounts for the extraordinary tone of confidence that pervaded all the speeches made in Moscow last week. It also explains the ideological and political declarations about how Khrushchev and his people expect to win the cold war without revolutionary violence. They believe that in the competition with us for influence in the uncommitted countries, they can make more attractive offers than we are likely to make.

Even if they cannot offer as much economic aid as we could, they will be able to offer more than Congress will allow us to offer. Moreover, whatever they offer, they can offer on terms which are politically more attractive than the terms which Congress insists that we should impose.

They are in a stronger bargaining position in the uncommitted nations. For they do not ask, they do not need to ask, for military pacts or their equivalent. They are able to identify themselves with the popular longing to remain unentangled. What is more, in the underdeveloped countries, which are by definition without capital resources, the governments must necessarily play the principal role in capital formation. This suits the socialist ideology of the Russians. It runs at cross purposes with our own antisocialist ideology.

The new challenge of the Soviet Union is very formidable indeed. If we are to meet it, we shall have to reverse ourselves on a number of things which are strongly believed in here. We shall have to be willing to export capital on a considerable scale. We shall have to be willing to do that without insisting on military terms, without penalizing political neutrality, and without expecting the underdeveloped but old and crowded countries to adopt all the principles of the American free enterprise system. We shall, in other words, have to be willing to contribute capital to countries which, as neutrals and as socialists, will be unlike the United States.

The alternative, I believe, is to go on losing our influence in the uncommitted world.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 26, 1956]

OUR TIME IS RUNNING OUT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By John Cowles)

"Why," I asked one of the most distinguished editors in India, "are the Indian people, who are so violently opposed to colonialism in Asia, apparently indifferent to Soviet Russia's colonialism in Eastern Europe?"

"Because Asians think of colonialism as being the rule by white people of colored people," the editor answered, "and the people who live in Russia's European satellites aren't colored."

"But, then, why don't Indians regard Communist Russia's occupation of Czechoslovakia and Poland as being, if not colonialism, at least imperialism?" I asked.

"Because Russia does not have an emperor," was the reply. "To Asians, imperialism means exploitation by a foreign country which has an emperor. You will recall that the British formerly called their King the Emperor of India. Russia today has no emperor, no czar. The Communists liquidated him. Therefore, what Russia may be doing in Eastern Europe is not by our definition imperialism."

Americans may think this is a silly, hairsplitting exercise in semantics, but a few days later, after another distinguished Indian editor in another city had answered my same questions in almost the same way, I began to realize why many of our propaganda broadcasts and appeals to Asia apparently have so little effect.

Some of the Asian leaders are, like Prime Minister Nehru, pure Aryan in their racial ancestry, but the bulk of the people of Asia, constituting more than half of the total population of the globe, have brown or yellow or black skins, and they are extremely sensitive to what they suspect are white people's assumptions of racial superiority.

They, the peoples of Asia, irrespective of nationality, have many things in common, which we must understand if we are to comprehend why they act and react as they do. Most of them have just recently won their national freedom from European colonial powers, and have what one might call a psychosis on the subject of colonialism and foreign interference.

They all want their dignity as free and sovereign nations respected. They all want to raise their standards of living. They all want peace.

Although President Eisenhower has enormous personal prestige in Asia, largely because of his emphasis on peace at the Geneva summit meeting, Communist propaganda is nevertheless highly effective in presenting the United States as a Nation which wants war in Asia so that Americans can subsequently exploit the Asians.

Whenever we press an Asian country to sign any kind of a military-assistance agreement, or even indirectly try to encourage Asian nations to join such things as the Baghdad Pact, of which Britain rather than the United States is the nominal sponsor, we provide the Communists with rich propaganda material. One important effect is that some of the other Asian neutral countries become suspicious, fantastic as we may know it to be, of our motives.

A few days ago some 7,000 American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines descended on Thailand from sea and air to demonstrate to the Thais in a much ballyhooed operation that the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization has real teeth in it, and is not just "a paper tiger." Undoubtedly we convinced the Thais that American armed might is real, but the fact of highest significance is that no other Asian mainland nation participated in the military maneuvers.

Philippine military forces took part, but all the rest were white non-Asians—Americans, British, Australians, and New Zealanders. Even the Pakistanis, with whom we have a military pact and to whom we have given much military equipment, were conspicuously absent. This was despite the fact that Pakistan is the sole Asian mainland nation other than Thailand which is a member of SEATO.

While we are conducting a military demonstration near Bangkok the Russians continue such things as operating a free medical clinic and hospital at Tehran, Iran. Undoubtedly this clinic is also a center for Communist espionage, but it is an example of how clever the Russians are in dressing up their activities so as to appeal to the Asians, while we, in the minds of the neutralists, appear to be concentrating on preparations for war.

Even Pakistan is beginning to weigh the relative value of its military pact with the United States in comparison with the benefits it might get from Russia and China if it terminated its agreement with us, "went neutral" and signed peace and good will treaties with the Communists.

The Prime Minister of Pakistan volunteered to me a few weeks ago, for example, that he was planning a "good will mission" to China shortly after the conclusion of Secretary of State Dulles' much publicized visit to Karachi next month.

The American position is progressively deteriorating throughout most of Asia. If we want to be realistic, we must recognize that before long we will probably face one of two alternatives:

1. Either the free world must be prepared to accept the loss to the Communist orbit of most of what remains of free Asia, and with it the tin, and tungsten, and, manganese, and other natural resources on which a substantial part of our own national security depends; or

2. We must rapidly adopt a bold, imaginative and appealing policy in Asia.

It seems perfectly clear to me what our policy toward southeast Asia should be. It is to adopt a partnership approach toward the 600 million people in the 10 new countries there which have won their independence since the end of World War II, a partnership in the cause of world peace and freedom. They have much to give. We have much to give.

Those nations, in alphabetical order, are Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Laos, Pakistan, the Philippines, South Korea, and South Vietnam. Perhaps Iran should also be included in this group. Perhaps Iran should be part of another program for the Middle East area.

Most of these countries are economically and politically extremely weak, but most genuinely want to establish themselves as independent, free, self-sufficient democracies.

The United States, incomparably the strongest and richest democracy in the world, ought to regard it both as a necessity in connection with our own long-term national security and as a tangible affirmation of our own basic philosophical faith to help these struggling nations raise their living standards and maintain their liberties from totalitarianism.

These nations are all children of revolution. So is America. They all want to escape war, stay neutral, and avoid entangling military alliances just as George Washington in his farewell address urged a then weak United States to do.

Should we criticize these politically immature and unstable countries for desiring to remain neutral as between the two colossal power blocs, the Communist world, which abuts many of them on the north, and the free world, consisting primarily of the United States and Britain, plus a part of northwestern Europe, which is thousands of miles away?

Our own country stayed neutral for nearly a century and a half after its creation. We have learned to respect and esteem other nations which also have wished to remain neutral. Sweden and Switzerland are examples.

Instead of criticizing these new southeast Asian countries for their wish for peace through neutrality, we should give them understanding encouragement and financial aid, not solely for reasons of our own national security, but also because of our honest desire to see them succeed as independent democracies, and because of our deep, almost religious, American conviction that all men should be free.

Fortunately, the chance is good that if we act promptly and imaginatively and sympathetically, we can save this vital quarter of the world's population and probably at only a small fraction of the financial cost of our Marshall plan aid to Western Europe.

But Asia is overwhelmingly worth saving even if the cost should prove commensurate with that of the Marshall plan. Our own eventual freedom may be at stake. Nor, in increasing our expenditures for foreign economic aid, should we reduce our expenditures to intensify our own military strength, particularly in the field of sientific research and development.

But those Americans who regard foreign economic aid simply as giveaway programs and glibly profess ambitions to liquidate them, should be wary that in the process they do not liquidate the whole free world.

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1956]

SOVIET POSES A NEW AND GREATER CHALLENGE—STALIN'S STATIC COMMUNISM IS ENDED AS NEW ERA OF DYNAMISM BEGINS

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

It is too much to say that Moscow has been going through a second revolution in the past 10 days.

But not since 1917 have changes been recorded in Russia that appear to be fraught with greater potential significance—and danger—for the democratic Western World, than those associated with the Communist Party's 20th Congress, just closed.

What happened is this:

The hollow plaster image of the 30-year Stalin epoch has been smashed from its iron pedestal. And from the tremendous dust cloud and drab debris has emerged the glistening outline of a new—and far more threatening—Communist dynamic.

The threat and the danger lie in two major factors: The style of the new Communist dynamic is fresh, self-confident, and original. And the content of the dynamic is pragmatic, supple, and designed deliberately to appeal to many men of varied political convictions, social status, and economic situation.

CHALLENGE TO SPIRIT

Let no one mistake this—the new doctrine and the new course the Moscow leaders have unveiled in the past few days confront the democratic Western World with an awesome challenge.

It is not a challenge that democracy cannot meet, but it is a challenge that will put the West on its mettle and draw upon its material and spiritual resources. And it is going to require thinking and planning and imagination on the part of western leaders.

For here is no mere military challenge—although behind it, Marshal Georgi K. Zhukov affirmed, lies the fast mounting stockpile of Soviet nuclear weapons, the Soviet development of 1,500-mile ballistic missiles, the glimmering silhouette of Soviet intercontinental jet aircraft.

Of course the Soviet regime has not suddenly reversed the world balance of forces, or cut the Gordian knots of all its basic economic, social, and political problems at one fell swoop. Vast problems lie ahead of the Soviet leadership and the Communist world.

Nothing that was done in Moscow the past 10 days proves that the Communist Party Secretary, Nikita S. Khrushchev, and his comrades have found a solution to Russia's chronic problem of agricultural underproduction.

Nothing that has been done demonstrates that the Soviet Union is going to be able to eliminate the coercions of police power and state-wielded terror.

Nothing that was accomplished by the Communist Congress proved that the Soviet leaders would be able to abolish the kind of intrigue and ambition which led to the rise of Stalin.

ASIAN ARGUMENT

Nor did Moscow's new definition of alternate roads that lead to communism suggest that Russia and Communist China may not, ultimately, fall apart in an argument over who shall be master of Asia.

The Russian leaders did not suddenly acquire the technological know-how to enable them to surpass America's industrial and economic lead.

In all these respects—and a good many others—the United States and its Western allies maintain enormous advantages over Moscow and its allies.

But the decisions and the speeches of Moscow put the Western world on fair warning; Russia is not going to stand still and the free world cannot expect to retain its advantages by a policy of drift and inaction.

The storm signals are up and flying plain for all to see.

The essential thing that has emerged from the addresses of Mr. Khrushchev, Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin, Anastas I. Mikoyan, and the others is that Soviet Russia has broken with the ideological and political clichés of the Stalin regime.

Taking a realistic look at the world around them the Soviet leaders have set full sail on a new course that they confidently anticipate will gain world leadership and, ultimately, a Communist world.

MORE THAN TACTICS

It is easy to shrug off the Communist speeches as just a tactic or a revision of the party line. They are both. But they are considerably more than mere tactics and they reflect a startling Soviet self-confidence.

The theoretical basis for the new course proclaimed in Moscow was in the repudiation of three doctrinal theses, originally proclaimed by Lenin but reduced to a catechism by Stalin.

The repudiated theses were:

1. The inevitability of wars so long as capitalism exists in some countries.

2. The impossibility of establishing communism except by armed revolution and civil war.

3. The existence of "capitalist encirclement" of Russia constituting an ever-present threat to Soviet security.

The new Communist platform declares:

That war is no longer inevitable because of the factual balance of forces between East and West; that there are many routes to communism including parliamentary pathways (a doctrine that sails so close to the Fabian gradualist socialism that the Moscow orators were hard put to show how it differed), and that in place of capitalist encirclement there are now 2 world systems, 1 capitalist, and 1 Communist.

It is the new, free-and-easy interpretation of the Marxist dialectic that enabled Moscow to restore relations with the heretic regime of Marshal Tito in Belgrade; to find comradeship in the quasi-socialistic nationalist movements of India and Burma; to reopen the long-barricaded avenues toward rapprochement with Socialist and left wing movements everywhere.

But these doctrinal changes—revolutionary as they are—are only surface indications of the deep break with the Stalin regime.

SHATTERING OF STALIN

The true drama of the past 10 days has come in the new leaderships' treatment of images. Not only has the statue of Stalin been hurled from its fundament, the leaders have danced upon the fragments.

Director of this Bolshevik ceremonial was Mr. Mikoyan, one of Stalin's earliest proteges but now emerging as a man to whom the name and memory of Stalin are as much anathema as that of Leon Trotsky was to the late Generalissimo.

Not only did Mr. Mikoyan speak with open contempt for the economic theses of Stalin; not only did he toss aside the falsified Stalinist history of the Communist movement; not only did he call for rehabilitation of many accused victims of Stalin's purges; not only did he strongly indicate that the absolute anathema on Trotsky himself was to be lifted, Mr. Mikoyan went further.

He went so far that a question could legitimately be asked as to what, if anything, the new leaders propose to preserve of Stalin's reputation.

What Mr. Mikoyan did was to sneer, publicly, at the holiest ikon in the Stalin reliquary—the quasi-religious, semimystic oath to Lenin that Stalin took at Lenin's funeral bier.

Mr. Mikoyan coupled his sneer about those who swear by Lenin with an equally acid reference to one of Lenin's most famous documents—the "will and testament" left as a guidance to the party.

The testament was suppressed by Stalin.

(Lenin spoke of Stalin's hastiness, administrative impulsiveness, spite, rudeness, lack of patience, loyalty and impoliteness and called for his removal as party secretary.)

LENIN'S VOICE

Now, it is apparent, the testament will be published, as well as a wealth of anti-Stalin material written by old Bolsheviks and long concealed in the party archives.

But it is not only to the past—their own past—that the new leaders are looking with hard, fresh eyes. They are looking around themselves at the world with a good deal of the bright and naive wonder of men who have suddenly cast off bandages that shuttered their view for many years.

They do not appear to be frightened by what they see. Thus, an address by Dimitri T. Shepilov, the editor of Pravda and Communist Party secretary, who may be being groomed to replace V. M. Molotov in the Foreign Office, takes a good, hard look at propaganda toward the United States—not in the clichés of Fascist beasts and warmongers, but in terms that would make sense on Madison Avenue.

MALENKOV'S CONTRIBUTION

Thus, when former Premier Georgi M. Malenkov, now Minister of Electric Power Stations, discussed Russia's power situation he cast the body of his address in the form of a discussion of the American power industry that gives some credit to the vision of American electricity magnates.

This new free-wheeling kind of communism once again compels the foreign Communist parties to make a hairpin turn at a high rate of speed. Some of their leaders certainly will be dumped over the precipice.

But by junking most of Stalin's heritage—except the concentration on basic heavy industry and No. 1 priority for defense—the men in the Kremlin have relieved themselves

of a heavy burden and thus made the Soviet challenge to the West more serious. They have gone far in what from a moral standpoint has been their prime task—to restore to communism some of the viability and dynamism it lost in the long years of Stalinism.

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1956]

RUSSIANS ARE SCORING IN ASIAN PROPAGANDA—THEIR TALK OF AID WITHOUT STRINGS HAS APPEAL IN FORMER COLONIAL AREAS THERE AND IN AFRICA—ERRORS OF UNITED STATES DIPLOMACY

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

Although the democratic cause has lost ground almost everywhere in the last few months, the Soviet Union's new psychological economic offensive has inflicted particularly heavy losses in Asia. John Sherman Cooper, United States Ambassador in New Delhi, India, has fought valiantly, but he has had to concede that relations between the United States and India are deteriorating.

Paul Hoffman and John Cowles are even more pessimistic about the position of the United States throughout South Asia. Both are urging large increases in our program of economic assistance, and Mr. Cowles in fact wants the United States to lend India $1 billion in the next 5 years without taking into account whatever is needed in the rest of Asia.

A billion dollars is, of course, a lot of money. But it is small in comparison with the billions that the United States spent on the Marshall plan. Official figures show, in fact, that since the war, and including contributions to international relief organizations as well as loans and grants to individual countries, the United States has provided $55 billion in foreign economic assistance.

RECOVERIES MADE

Thanks in large part to the help that both friend and foe received from the United States, the war-devastated countries have made excellent recoveries. There is no longer much danger that they will go Communist; if France or Italy should do so now, it would be because they had lost the art of governing themselves, not because they are poor.

The United States is now confronted with a different problem, the demand of the underdeveloped countries for help in raising their standards of living.

If this were still the age of Victoria, the countries making such demands would be promptly sent about their business. They would be told that they had a choice between saving their money, so that they could pay for their own development, or of allowing American or European investors to do it for them—of course at a suitable rate of return.

The underdeveloped countries, whether they are in Asia or Africa or Latin America, are in no mood to accept such an answer. Their very low per capita income makes it difficult, if not impossible, for them to pay for hydroelectric projects, or factories, or malaria control out of savings. And the few countries that are still willing to allow private investors from the outside to step in are very reluctant to permit the dividends necessary to attract risk capital.

This situation, together with the fact that the meeting between President Eisenhower and Marshal Nikolai A. Bulganin allayed many fears of Soviet aggression, was made to order for the resourceful men who succeeded Stalin.

They had already reversed his refusal to give anybody anything and had contributed to the United Nations technical assistance program; now they have offered economic assistance to India, Burma, Indonesia, Iran, and Afghanistan, to Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Lebanon, to Liberia, to all of Latin America.

BARTER ACCEPTED

In most instances it has turned out that this help was to be in the form of a loan or trade. But since the Soviet Union was willing to accept payment in Egyptian cotton or Burmese rice, which the owners had not been able to sell elsewhere, this created no difficulties; the countries concerned said that they would rather pay in this way than accept the strings they feel are tied around the gifts proffered by the United States.

The Soviet economic program has been backed up by a propaganda campaign emphasizing the solidarity of the Soviet Union with the Asian and African countries and demanding the end of colonialism. Asian friends of the United States, in particular Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Dr. Syngman Rhee, are assailed as imperialist lackeys, and America's responsibility for keeping Communist China out of the United Nations is adduced as the final proof that the United States is on the side of colonialism.

Most damaging of all are the claims that the Soviet Union wants to do away with the atomic bomb, the United States wants to keep it; the Soviet Union is not trying to compel anybody to join anything, the United States will not rest until it has forced the whole world to join an anti-Soviet alliance; the Soviet Union wants peace, the United States wants war.

THE INDIAN VIEW

Public opinion polls in India show an amazing number of persons who believe that it is the United States that threatens peace; the number who hold the Soviet Union guilty is extremely small—so small that Nikita S. Khrushchev, in his speech at the 20th Communist Party Congress, made a special appeal to the leading neutralist countries—India, Burma, Afghanistan, Egypt and Syria. The emergence of the Soviet Union as a champion of the Arab countries against Israel, including the sale of Czechoslovak planes to Egypt, is part of this pattern.

As anybody will testify who has spent an afternoon in the delegates' lounge of the United Nations, this propaganda has made headway not only in these countries, but in other Asian and African nations. It has been assisted by a series of errors in United States policy statements: outstanding are Secretary of State Dulles' reference to Goa as a Portuguese province and his brink of war claim, the confusion over the Saudi Arabian tanks, and the confusion about the Air Force balloons.

AID IMITATED

Since imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, the United States now knows how well its program of economic aid has served the cause of freedom. However, its usefulness has been greatly diminished by the conditions attached to the assistance.

The Soviet Government has much more leeway. Furthermore, although the Soviet Union makes quite sure that its good works take the tangible form of a steel mill, many United States donations have been hard to identify, or have been commingled with projects locally financed. Needless to say, United States farm surpluses are so mountainous that, while we can give away help, we cannot allow anybody to pay for it with rice or cotton.

For all these reasons, a reappraisal is in order of the methods that the United States has used to combat Soviet subversion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the Senator from Arkansas for laying the facts of life as they are on the table for the Senate and the American people to see. I am glad the Senator has seen fit to make his speech this afternoon, because I have been disturbed by the testimony given on last Friday, which seemed to indicate, so far as our relationship vis-a-vis the Soviet Union is concerned, that we are on top and the Soviet Union is in retreat.

The Senator from Arkansas has quite graphically pointed out that in south central Asia, Bulganin and Khrushchev have made great gains; that in the Near East they have leap-frogged the wall of containment; that in Africa, Western Europe, South America, and elsewhere they are on the march.

I think the record will bear out the Senator that since just before the Geneva Conference, the summit meeting of last July, the Soviet Union has been on the diplomatic and economic offensive; and I am afraid, on the basis of recent evidence in the field of air and guided missiles, they not only are on the march, but are ahead of us, as well.

The Senator from Arkansas is to be commended for laying the facts on the table. I sincerely hope the Senate, Congress, and the American people will take cognizance of what the Senator from Arkansas has said this afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the remarks by the Senator from Montana, especially because there is no Member of the Senate or, for that matter, no one in the country who has given more serious and persistent attention to conditions in southeast Asia, and who knows more about the real conditions which exist in our foreign relations, than the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Arkansas for the speech he has made on American foreign policy. It is a speech which I hope will be treated as the opening of a historic debate on that subject. In that debate every single facet of our foreign policy will be laid before the American people, because they are entitled to know what is taking place in that field. They are entitled to have the administration disclose to them the facts about American foreign policy.

This afternoon the Senator from Arkansas has made a great contribution to the debate. As he knows, I feel that the greatest issue which faces the United States in the field of foreign policy is as to public disclosure. The administration has been keeping secret from the American people a great many things which they are entitled to know. It is the American people who will die, and will die by the millions, if Dulles stumbles off the brink. I have no confidence in his equilibrium or footing. I am satisfied that if the American people do not put a check on Mr. Dulles, if we do not combat the kind of philosophy which he expressed at the hearing last Friday, he will lead us off the brink.

I commend the Senator from Arkansas. So far as the Senator from Oregon is concerned, I intend to discuss foreign policy in the months ahead. So far as I am concerned, there is not going to be

any facet of the subject which will not be subject to debate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I listened to the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas, I listened to the Secretary of State on last Friday during the hearings, and I read his speech yesterday. I did not understand in any of his statements on Friday or yesterday that he said he would not reassess or constantly renew and invigorate American foreign policy. I would say further that I would take his statement made on Friday and again on yesterday as being perhaps optimistic—perhaps too optimistic—but certainly we cannot proceed on a basis of great pessimism. I see nothing that could be interpreted as intentional misrepresentation of any facts. The statement was one, rather, of optimism and faith, of constantly looking toward how the policy could be reassessed and improved, but not remain static. That is the impression I received from the hearing of last Friday. That is the way I read his statement of yesterday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Surely the Senator from Massachusetts will not deny—for the record is very clear—that I remarked during the course of my questioning of the Secretary on Friday that, unfortunately, the Russians appeared to be making progress in the Middle East. The Secretary of State categorically denied that. He said absolutely they were not making progress at all. I believe he used the precise words "absolutely not." He said further that these changes in Russia's policy, which most of us have interpreted as a refinement, not a change, in policy, are an indication of weakness.

It is true that in this field there is bound to be some difference of opinion, but I submit to the Senator, the Secretary of State, who is supposed to be most familiar with matters in this field, is the only one, so far as I have noted, among commentators or public men, who has interpreted Russia's moves in that way.

I think one has to reach his own conclusion as to why the Secretary of State takes this attitude. I shall not enlarge upon that. I have already stated how I feel about it. But I must add it is not a question of being pessimistic or optimistic; it is a question of trying to assess the situation as it really is. For example, I cannot help but feel that the Senator from Massachusetts is disturbed about the situation in the Middle East, and that he believes the Russians have made great progress in that area in the last year. Specifically, Russia's dealings with Egypt and her offer of arms to other countries in the area of the Middle East, and the acceptance of such arms by those people, certainly have been unprecedented in modern times.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his realistic discussion of this situation. I think that is exactly what it is. If I understand correctly the message of the Senator from Arkansas, it is that we ought to review these matters realistically, neither optimistically nor pessimistically, but as they actually exist.

Does the Senator know of any service which can be rendered the American people by overplaying optimism, as the Senator from Massachusetts has described it, in the way in which the Secretary of State did on last Friday and on other occasions?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that I know that on other occasions, including executive sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Secretary of State has minimized the seriousness of some of the acute international problems. The Senator from Alabama has asked whether a service is rendered by such optimism. To the contrary, if the Secretary of State is overly optimistic, I think it is definitely a disservice, for we are then not able to exercise properly our functions in the Senate. The Senator from Alabama and I give the best attention we can to these matters, but we are limited in our sources of information. We are very reluctant under the circumstances to take issue with the Secretary of State, on a matter of fact. But when everything we know and everything we read about our international relations is contrary to what the Secretary of State told us in the meeting last Friday, it is time to speak out and demand that he justify such optimism. I do not think he can support it. But the harm is done when people hear or read his assertion that conditions are better and that we are on the march, and the Russians have failed. People wish to believe that all is well in the world. If they are encouraged to believe it by the Secretary of State, our function as a Senate is made difficult, because we have to be supported by enlightened public opinion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Even though people like to believe optimistic statements, does not the Senator think they also would want to accept the proof and that they ought to be correctly advised as to what the true situation is at all times?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly do. Because people like to hear such optimistic reports, it makes it very dangerous. We have to be careful not to be overly optimistic. From the standpoint of national security, it is safer to be pessimistic than to be overly optimistic. It is natural for people to believe we excel not only in this field, but in other fields as well. So there is an obligation on the part of the Secretary not to paint an unjustifiably rosy picture. To do so endangers the very foundations of our national security.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, designated as "2-22-56-0."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 2 on page 2, as follows:

PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS—BASIC COMMODITIES

SEC. 101. Section 101 (d) (6) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(6) except as provided in section 402, the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent of the parity price for the 1956 and 1957 crops of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas therefor."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment for the purpose of making the question of 90-percent support prices the pending business.

I desire also to ask unanimous consent that there be added to the list of cosponsors the name of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there is an amendment which also pertains to minimum acreages on cotton. Because we have had a discussion of that subject previously, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point the estimated 1957 State allocations of national 1 percent reserve for additional acreage for minimum farm allotments pursuant to Senate bill 3183.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated 1957 State allocations of national 1-percent reserve for additional acreage for minimum farm allotments pursuant to S. 3183

State	State allocation from national reserve [1]	State contribution to national reserve [2]
Alabama	27,900	10,252
Arizona	200	3,436
Arkansas	9,900	14,245
California	1,000	7,824
Florida	3,400	370
Georgia	18,100	9,032
Illinois	100	31
Kansas	0	0
Kentucky	300	78
Louisiana	8,500	6,109
Mississippi	21,400	16,466
Missouri	2,300	3,781
Nevada	0	23
New Mexico	500	1,794
North Carolina	20,400	4,839
Oklahoma	6,600	8,456
South Carolina	13,900	7,262
Tennessee	17,200	5,635
Texas	20,400	74,109
Virginia	1,900	171
United States	174,000	173,913

[1] Estimates based on additional acreage needs developed for similar purposes in connection with 1956 acreage allotments on the assumption of (1) apportioning 100 percent of county allotments to farms and increasing farm allotments to the larger of 4 acres or 80 percent of the highest planted acreage for the 3 years 1953, 1954, and 1955, and (2) a 1957 national acreage allotment of 17.4 million acres, or the same on the 1956 national acreage allotment.

[2] 1 percent of the 1956 State acreage allotment. The 1956 allotments used here for purposes of comparison, since 1957 State allotments have not been determined.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Chair if the amendment just offered by the Senator from New Mexico is the pending question now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. That is the pending question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield so that I may make a statement?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STATEMENT ON 50–50 LAW—CARGO PREFERENCE ACT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, I should like to bring briefly to the attention of the Senate an action recently taken by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which I believe may well have grave consequences for our Nation, particularly as respects our merchant marine, but equally as it affects both our program of agricultural surplus disposal and, ultimately, our national defense.

I refer specifically to the action of the committee in approving in section 307 of S. 3183, the Agricultural Act of 1956, the exemption of the 50–50 cargo preference provisions of the act of March 26, 1934—Forty-eighth Statute at Large, page 500—as amended by the act of June 29, 1936—Forty-ninth Statute, page 1937, and the act of August 26, 1954—Sixty-eighth Statute, page 832.

By action of the committee, these acts are declared not to apply to transactions under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended. In other words, the fair and equal treatment represented by the 50–50 shipping law—Public Law 664, August 26, 1954—is being destroyed, and we are left to conclude that the committee has overlooked the advantages—no, the necessities—of that measure which equally divides the transport of farm surplus cargoes between American and foreign ships.

It has been clear to the Congress for many years, as demonstrated by consistent congressional action in the past, that, if we were ever to be without a strong American merchant marine, foreign maritime powers would be in a position to carry out goods at times and from ports of their own choosing and at whatever prices the American traffic could be forced to bear. The very existence of a United States flag fleet is our protection against a situation which would permit such arbitrary and costly action.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not have the floor; the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has yielded to me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Maryland, provided he does not yield for too long.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not wish to break my agreement with the Senator from Mississippi. I told him the number of minutes I would speak. However, I am glad to yield briefly to the Senator from Maryland, for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Massachusetts know that this matter came up before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that section 307 was inserted in the bill without holding any hearings, after the chairman of the committee had promised the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other groups interested in the American merchant marine that hearings would be held before any action was taken?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I knew there had not been any hearings; and later in my remarks I shall point out that I believe this matter should be heard before the proper committee as a separate matter, and not included in the agricultural bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts also know that the difference between the world price per ton and the American price per ton is only approximately 25 cents?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to have the Senator from Maryland tell me that; I did not know it.

Mr. BUTLER. And that we now carry in American bottoms only approximately 22 percent of our total commerce. So the 50–50 cargoes could make very little difference, in dollars and cents.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Maryland for that information.

A healthy American merchant marine insures stability both of rate and of service, and the merest glance over our history reveals painfully clearly that when we have been without an adequate merchant fleet—invariably at times when we needed it most—the consequences for America have been immediate and painful, both economically and as regards our national defense. Economically, we have always paid for such neglect in skyrocketing freight rates, or in goods piling up in our warehouses and on the docks because they could not be shipped at the prices demanded.

Public Law 664, the Cargo Preference Act, more familiarly known as the 50–50 Law, is one of the pieces of legislation which contribute to the strength, the health, and the effectiveness of our merchant marine, with consequent widespread benefits for our Nation as a whole. This is one of the simplest pieces of legislation on our books. It provides merely that at least half of all overseas cargo owned by our Government and paid for by American taxpayers shall be carried in United States merchant ships, provided they are available at reasonable rates. On nine separate occasions since 1948, Congress has written this 50–50 provision into various aid programs. The Cargo Preference Act of itself made it unnecessary to repeat that procedure each time a similar program was authorized.

The Cargo Preference Act, as fair and equitable a piece of legislation as can be recalled, has done several worthwhile things:

First. It has expressed the will of the Congress that narrowly conceived, unrealistic demands that all farm surplus cargoes be moved in United States ships manned by American seamen be rejected as impractical and definitely not in our country's best interest.

Second. It recognizes the two-way character of foreign trade, by assuring that foreign nations shall be permitted to earn dollars by carrying part of our exports and imports.

Third. By a judicious and sensible recognition of the purposes and provisions of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, in effect made full and equal partners of American agriculture and the American merchant marine in the most extensive and soundly progressive program of world rehabilitation and international good will that history has ever seen.

The impression is being created by foreign maritime interests that our burdensome farm surpluses will not be purchased abroad unless and until the 50–50 law is abandoned. They have established as their first beachhead in this attack title I of Public Law 480, which we know more familiarly as the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. Under this title food surpluses in excess of normal exports may be sold overseas for foreign currencies. The 50–50 principle embodied in the Cargo Preference Act applies to cargoes that move under this program, just as it does to all cargoes financed by our Federal Government.

It is easy to understand, of course, why any thoughtful farmer or farm organization head is concerned whenever there is the slightest suggestion that anything whatever may be permitted to impede our farm surplus disposal efforts.

It is reasonable, therefore, that charges from overseas to the effect that the 50–50 law has slowed down such shipments of surpluses under title I should be thoroughly explored.

Such an exploration of the facts, however, proves clearly that these charges are debatable, and that our surplus disposal program, in all of its aspects, is making encouraging and continuing progress. Two-thirds of the $700 million authorized for surplus disposal under the 3-year, Public Law 480 program was exhausted in its first year, and the authorization had to be doubled to $1.5 billion. The latest report from the Department of Agriculture shows that 33 agreements have been completed with 22 countries for the disposal of $769 million worth of surpluses, or more than 50 percent of the 3-year authorization under title I of the act.

All in all, since disposal operations began 18 months ago, the United States has programed the disposal of $1,692,000,000 worth of food surpluses under this act and other authorizations.

It would be an extremely dangerous precedent for the United States to abandon its 50–50 cargo preference policy merely on the basis of the application of pressure relative to the disposal of our surplus agricultural commodities. If for this particular purpose we permit a foot to be placed in the door, we shall be opening the door wide to subsequent elimination of this fair and equal provision for all purposes. The danger to our merchant marine and to our economy present in any such move is clear and great.

Moreover, this is not even good business. No reputable company, for instance, would permit an isolated group of potential customers to dictate its regular sales policies and to interfere with its internal management.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me at this point?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has the floor. Let me ask whether he is willing to have me yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well; I yield for a question.

Mr. BUTLER. Is not the correctness of the statement the Senator from Massachusetts has just made indicated by the fact that the cargo preference law applies only to Government-owned and Government-financed cargoes, and that American ships need not be used unless they can be obtained at a reasonable price?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is true, although I am not sure about the correctness of the Senator's statement in regard to "reasonable price."

Mr. BUTLER. I mean if they are available at the going price.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

The foreign maritime interests to which I refer, and about whom there is no secret whatever, have swelled opposition to the 50–50 law far out of fair and reasonable proportion. Understandably, foreign shipowners want more business, and it is apparent that, by placing a heavy hand in this way upon our sensitive surplus-disposal program, they hope to destroy the 50–50 principle, not merely for their immediate purpose, but permanently. If they succeed in this, the effect upon the American merchant marine may well prove disastrous.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield at this point?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Mississippi is willing to have the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well; then I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not true that foreign-flag ships now carry almost 80 percent of our cargoes, and that in this case we are dealing with only the remaining 20 percent?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe that is true.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; those are the facts.

Mr. BUTLER. I believe the figures are approximately 22 percent and 78 percent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Approximately that; yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, elimination of the 50–50 principle now and in the future would place us at the mercy of foreign maritime interests economically and as regards our ultimate national security. I am reluctant to suggest that any such dominance of world trade routes by foreign shipping could mean the withering away of the American merchant marine. This would not only be fatal to America economically, but it would put us in the thoroughly untenable position of dependence upon the ships and shipping facilities of friendly nations in time of war, a dependence which might well—despite their desire to join in the common defense—leave America high and dry, without having any ships or shipping facilities available anywhere.

The solution, therefore, seems to me to be a specific one. I know that in opposing the committee's action in writing section 307 into S. 3183, I am expressing not only the unanimous opinion of our people in Massachusetts and the people in many another maritime State, as well, but also that of such respected and farflung organizations as the National Grange, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Foreign Trade Council, the National Industrial Traffic League, and the Pacific Supply Cooperative—the latter an organization which represents 70,000 farmers in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and northern California. I have checked on that matter, Mr. President; and I believe that statement to be accurate. To all of us it is clear that the 50–50 provision and surplus disposal are not incompatible in any way.

Let me emphasize that Public Law 480 and this 50–50 principle represent a sound American program, one of basic and continuing interest and value to our farmers, to maritime labor and management, and as regards our Nation's total defense. Moreover, it represents, as its popular title "50–50" suggests, a solution of a real and continuing problem that is fair and equitable to us and to our friends abroad.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; if the Senator from Mississippi is willing to have me do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that in the actual practice of the 50–50 formula, when American shipping interests cannot actually provide the ships with which to meet the immediate shipping need, then it is possible for the goods to be transported in foreign bottoms? In other words, I recall that last year the Senator from Washington joined me in taking action to make it possible for the apple growers in the Northwest to sell some apples to England and, I believe, to one of the countries on the Continent of Europe. However, there simply were not available enough American refrigerator ships to transport the apples, but some foreign refrigerator ships which could transport them were available. We took the matter up with the State Department, and, as I recall, they followed the policy of making an exception to the 50–50 formula. It is only when American bottoms cannot be supplied that the formula applies.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Oregon is entirely correct. First, the cargo must be Government property or Government-financed property. Second, the ships and space must be available.

This, then, is the problem, Mr. President. By way of solution I should like to offer certain specific suggestions which I hope may prove of help.

First, may I say that I am reliably informed that no hearings were held by the committee on section 307. This in itself gives me some concern, inasmuch as the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has for some time now been giving detailed and comprehensive attention to the Cargo Preference Act.

I am told that several witnesses have been heard on the subject and that these have included representatives of the Federal Government, Farm Bureau, and National Grange spokesmen, representatives of American maritime management and labor, and representatives of foreign maritime interests as well.

I am informed finally that most of these witnesses have expressed an overwhelming support of the 50–50 principle and that few voices indeed have been raised in opposition to it. I think we can all agree that with a measure of such moment, we should certainly be concerned that full and adequate hearings be held by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or—we might well decide—by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, inasmuch as this section 307 would appear to be more appropriately a transportation measure than one of agricultural surplus disposal alone.

Secondly, we are all aware I am sure of the scope and significance of S. 3183 for every American. We are aware too of the honest but strong differences of opinion that have already arisen regarding major provisions in this bill. I refer of course to the question of price supports and that of the soil-bank plan.

Given such differences of opinion on major provisions of this bill and the importance of resolving such differences without complicating them further by other controversial matters, may I suggest that section 307 be deleted from S. 3183 and that it be considered separately and on its merits. There is a bill now pending to do just this—S. 2584.

Finally, Mr. President, though it may appear to be repetitious, I want very much to emphasize the fact that this Cargo Preference Act, embodying the 50–50 principle as it does, is a measure of interest not only to agriculture, not alone to the American merchant marine,

not merely to management and to labor in those businesses and industries dependent upon foreign trade and markets abroad, not only to those thousands upon thousands of persons employed in these and related activities, but to all of them together, since all benefit from or suffer from any action we take on a major economic measure of this kind. Equally, our national security is affected by our maintenance or our rejection of this 50–50 principle, representing as it does a major factor in the health and well-being of our merchant marine, which has been often but very truly called our "fourth arm of defense."

In the interest of our national economic health, therefore, and in the interest of our national security in time of emergency, I recommend strongly, Mr. President, that section 307 be deleted from S. 3183, but, in order that the principle to which it refers may be given due and full consideration, that S. 2584 be carefully considered by the proper committee.

Any further obstruction to our Nation's maritime progress and development may have costly repercussions for us economically and, perhaps, militarily. Anything that weakens our merchant marine weakens America now and in time to come.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield, with the permission of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator may yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Maryland know, I expect to suggest an amendment designed to take section 307 from the bill, and to bring it before our maritime subcommittee for hearings, so that everyone will have an opportunity to be heard. I am hopeful that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will agree to that course. I assure the members of that committee here and now that we will hold such hearings and will consider modifications, so that the difficulty can be entirely cleared up. I am sure the hearings will develop that this section is not really important to the agricultural bill. It is of vital importance to the merchant marine. I think we can arrive at an adjustment under which neither of these two great segments of our economy will be injured.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to hear the Senator from Washington say that. I purposely did not mention the name of the committee specifically, because I did not wish to become involved in any possible dispute between two committees. Members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, whose distinguished chairman is present in the Chamber, have been very fair about this question. We have informally discussed it, as the Senator from Maryland knows. I am hopeful that we shall be able to reach an agreement along the lines suggested.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. In 1954, when this act was first passed by the Congress, very extensive hearings were held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Of course, I have no objection whatsoever to further consideration of this legislation. I am confident that the result of such further consideration will be a reaffirmation of the 50–50 principle. However, I think it is absolutely essential that section 307 be stricken from the agricultural bill at this time. If that is not done, I think I can predict that it will require the transfer to foreign flags of the majority of our tramp fleet, if not the entire tramp fleet. We cannot operate American ships without cargo, and we cannot get cargo in the absence of the 50–50 principle. I think it would be a dreadful thing to force the transfer to foreign flags of American vessels, and put American labor on the beaches, thus forcing us to depend almost entirely on foreign bottoms for the carriage of our foreign commerce, merely to ameliorate to some small extent an irritation, at the most, which now exists.

In view of the provisions of the act, that American ships do not have to be used unless they are readily available at the going prices, and the fact that the act applies only to Government-owned cargo or Government-financed cargo, I think it is reasonable in every respect. I believe it would be a great mistake to lessen the effectiveness of that law without a hearing of the fullest character.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We cannot keep the American merchant marine in mothballs. In the first place, the ships deteriorate; and, second, we lose the crews. So we must have cargoes.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me make one further observation. I think it is the wish of our foreign friends that we keep our ships in mothballs. They will readily acknowledge the necessity of an American merchant marine. They will admit privately that without a strong American merchant marine they could not have survived in World War II, but they say that we should build our ships and subsidize them, and then tie them up and not use them. I say that is not the way for America to transact its business, especially when the cargoes which we are seeking to have carried in American bottoms are cargoes which the people of America have bought and paid for, to a greater or lesser extent. If we are to be kind and generous and make these gifts abroad, I think it is only reasonable to insist that we are entitled to carry at least half of the cargoes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his contribution; and I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his courtesy.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to announce that with respect to the pending agricultural bill the leadership is presently considering a unanimous-consent agreement which would become effective on Monday, March 5. The agreement, if entered into by the Senate, would provide 2 hours of debate on any amendment or motion, the time to be divided equally and controlled by the mover of such amendment or motion and the majority leader, and would provide 4 hours of debate on the bill.

It is evident that it will be impossible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement on the unfinished business so as to vote on the bill this week; but it is hoped that by tomorrow or the following day it will be possible to obtain the unanimous consent of the Senate to proceed to a vote on Monday next, in which event it will be the plan of the leadership to ask the Senate to convene at 11 o'clock in the morning.

I make the announcement so that all Senators may be informed of the prospects of securing a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator's statement mean there will not be any voting of any kind on the unfinished business this week?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; it does not mean that. A vote can be had at any time the Senate is prepared to vote.

A unanimous-consent agreement has not been entered into. Such proposal has not been agreed to, for instance, by the distinguished minority leader. But we are pursuing our conversations toward securing such an agreement, in the hope that it will be possible to have the Senate agree to it. In the event the agreement should be entered into, it is unlikely that any voting will take place this week. However, I cannot give any assurance and the Senate cannot give any assurance on that score.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would there be any voting before Monday? I have been asked that question several times by various Senators, who would like to receive assurance that if the Senate is to begin to vote on Monday, there will not be any voting on amendments in the meantime.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would be delighted to join with the Senator from Louisiana, and the Senator from Vermont, and other Senators in an effort to protect Senators who may not be here; but unless we can constitute a majority, we can never give such assurance.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have taken up with some of my colleagues the question of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I have yet to find any objection to the proposal of setting the date to begin voting as Monday next. The 2-hour limitation on each amendment appears to be acceptable. The proposal of 4 hours of debate on the bill itself also seems to be acceptable, and the method of controlling the time seems to be agreeable to everyone.

However, there is some question about the proposal that when the action on the bill has finally been completed by the Senate, the Senate should then proceed

to consider House bill 12, and that the language of the Senate bill should be substituted for the language of the House bill. I think perhaps that is simply a matter of some Senators not having made up their minds as to what they might wish to do in that respect; and therefore, they will not agree at this time to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no deep feeling one way or the other. I shall be glad to be guided by the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Vermont. I hope they will carry on their negotiations, and will reach a satisfactory solution.

Mr. AIKEN. Apparently some Members of the House feel that if the language of the Senate bill were substituted for the language of the House bill, H. R. 12, then only the House members of the committee of conference would have an opportunity to consider the soil bank and certain other provisions which have been placed in the Senate bill. However, the reluctance at this time to enter into an agreement does not mean that there will not be eventually full agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no intention even to propose the agreement today. I merely want each Senator to be on notice of the intention of the leadership to propose the agreement tomorrow. At that time Senators can raise such questions as the Senator from Vermont has just raised.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is highly advisable in the interest of time that voting on the amendments and on the bill itself, under the limitation of time in an agreement, should take place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be offered to the Senate tomorrow. The majority leader has no preference concerning the second page of the agreement. Whatever is agreed upon by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Louisiana will be satisfactory to the majority leader.

Mr. AIKEN. That will give us more time in which to consult.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to the Senator from Vermont that I discussed with the Parliamentarian this morning the matter of substituting the Senate language for the language in the House bill. The Parliamentarian thought that one of the simplest ways to handle the matter would be to pass the Senate bill, and as soon as that was done, to have the Senate proceed to consider the House bill, and to substitute the language of the Senate bill for the language of the House bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, farm prosperity is basic to American prosperity. In seeking to make agriculture prosperous we promote the prosperity of every segment of the American people. Our country cannot be strong unless its basic industry is strong and prosperous. The question before the Senate is, Shall we pursue the course which will return the greatest net income to the farmer?

Mr. President, we cannot pull the rug from under the cotton farmer. We must take the steps which will be necessary to make him prosperous and which will result in a strong cotton-growing economy. I shall discuss these principles as they apply to the American cotton farmer. In this light I shall discuss the pending amendment, which would strike from the bill the provisions for mandatory 90 percent support prices for the years 1956 and 1957.

Consideration of price alone does not constitute a farm program. Because our policies have been based solely on price the cotton farmer is now in depression. The pending bill, without the 2 year mandatory 90 percent support price provision and with the administrative steps which will be taken, will, in my judgment, greatly benefit the cotton grower. In fact, it will save the cotton grower from destruction. The cotton growing industry of the United States has all but collapsed because cotton has been made noncompetitive, and markets which heretofore have been enjoyed by the American cotton farmer have been taken over by those who produce its competitors, rayon, other synthetic fibers, and by foreign cotton producers.

In the beginning I shall describe in general terms the deplorable conditions in which the American cotton growing industry finds itself. A prosperous cotton growing economy must be based upon two factors. First, the consumption of more than 9 million bales of cotton domestically, and exports of around 6 million bales. To sustain a prosperous economy it will take an acreage large enough to produce 15 million bales of cotton which can be sold at prosperous prices. Our country has historically exported 6 million bales of cotton, and has in the past dominated the world export cotton business. Because we dominated it we could fix the world price of cotton. Our exports in the past years normally averaged 60 percent of the foreign cotton export market. This shrank last year to 29 percent of this foreign cotton market, and is now running, in 1956, at less than 20 percent. In fact, we have only exported around 800,000 bales of cotton since last August 1. It now appears that our exports this year will be the lowest in 100 years except during the Civil War, World War II, and their aftermaths. Our exports now should easily be in excess of 3 million bales for the current marketing year.

On the domestic scene, rayon has made tremendous inroads in the domestic cotton market. It has made these inroads because cotton has been priced, by law, a few cents a pound above this competitor. In 1955 the increased consumption of synthetic fibers in the United States displaced 978,000 bales of cotton. In 1957 we face a further acreage reduction of 1,549,720 acres. It is very significant, Mr. President, that the acreage reduction which we face approximates the acreage required to produce the increased rayon consumption. Beginning in 1955, the synthetic industry planned an expansion program for a 3-year period in which $155 million is being spent in the United States on new synthetic fiber plants. These new plants will displace in the domestic market a large part of the 9 million bales of cotton which are now consumed in this country. This synthetic fiber expansion must be stopped. In addition, if our cotton pricing policies are not changed, the acreage in cotton will get lower and lower each year. There is no end in sight for acreage reduction under our present policies.

Today, with 90 percent support prices and the acreage reduction which follows, the farmer's income is not at 90 percent of parity. His acreage for production has been cut to less than 60 percent of normal. At 90 percent supports this will provide him with only 53 percent of a parity income. In fact, his cotton parity income today stands at 53 percent. It will sink still lower in the future if cotton acreage allotments are permitted to decrease. Later, Mr. President, I shall describe in detail what has happened in the world cotton-growing industry, and show its terrible effect upon the American cotton farmer. I think it safe to say that with present acreage allotments and normal per acre production, most of the cotton farms in the South will lose money on this year's operations. Many farmers will lose their farms. In 1955 it took an abnormally favorable growing season and the highest per acre production in history, something that is extremely rare, to enable most of the cotton farmers to make their income equal their cost. As cotton acreage has gone down, the cost of production has not declined. The total cost has remained static, but has increased on an acreage basis.

Mr. President, my judgment is that the administration has a program for cotton. It is my honest judgment that this program will materially benefit the cotton grower. If 90 percent support prices for 2 years are deleted from the bill, if the soil bank in enacted, and if the parity base is increased from 7/8-inch staple middling cotton to the average grade and staple of the crop, I feel sure that steps will be taken which, in the long run, will greatly benefit the millions of cotton growers who live in the South, Southwest and Western States. I believe, Mr. President, that the support price for 1956 will be fixed at a reduction in price of less than 3 cents a pound. This reduction is necessary to place cotton in a better competitive position with rayon.

There will be this year a carryover of more than 14 million bales of cotton, the largest in history. I am confident that an export sales program for all qualities of cotton will be announced, whereby our exports in the long run will be built up to 5 million bales of cotton or greater yearly. This will arrest the continual expansion of cotton acreage in foreign lands.

I am further convinced, Mr. President, that cotton acreage will not be permitted to go below the 1956 figure of 17,391,304 acres. It is my judgment that for 1957 and 1958 the administration will seriously consider and probably support legislation or an amendment to this bill which will fix the minimum cotton allotment for these years at 17,391,304 acres, which is the 1956 allotment. We will thus for these years have a floor under

cotton acreage such as now prevails for wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. When was that promise with respect to a minimum cotton acreage allotment made? It is news to me.

Mr. EASTLAND. I said that that was my personal opinion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator have any assurance that the Department of Agriculture will agree to maintain a floor with respect to cotton acreage allotments?

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say to my friend that I stand on the statement I made. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Assuming that the bill as now drafted is passed, that is, with a 90 percent of parity provision included, is it not correct to say that even under a flexible price-support program the same acreage allotments will exist, and the same machinery will be used to designate acreage allotments, as under a 90-percent support program?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is not what I said. I said I thought legislation would be supported by the administration which would do that. It would take legislation to do it. That is my opinion. I may be wrong, but that is my opinion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us assume that the 90 percent of parity support provision is removed from the bill, as the Senator suggests. Is it not correct to say that the law, with respect to crop controls, will remain unchanged, that is, precisely as it is now? Is it not true that the method used for computing acreage allotments would not be changed one iota if the 90 percent of parity support level is adopted? The law as to determining acreage remains unchanged in either event.

Mr. EASTLAND. Unless it is amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, but in determining the number of acres to be planted, in the event the flexible price-support provision should remain in the law, the situation would be unchanged. With either 90 percent of parity, or a flexible support program, the acreage allotments for cotton would be computed in the same manner. To place a floor under cotton acreage would require new legislation; is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. I said it would require legislation and that I thought there would be administration support for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us what that legislation will be?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. I am not trying to commit anyone to anything. I simply gave my distinguished friend from Louisiana my personal judgment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been hearing such legislation rumored for the past 2 or 3 weeks, and I am wondering what is its purpose, and where it is. I have not seen it. It is a very attractive proposal, but it has not yet materialized. I am wondering if it will be submitted any time soon or if it will remain only a rumor, although an attractive one.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall stand on my statement.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should say that the purpose of any tentative program would be to put cotton on the market and get back as soon as may be possible to a situation under which the cotton producer can again plant a decent acreage and be assured of a fair income for what he produces. I am not so familiar with cotton as is the Senator from Mississippi. I know he has been growing it all his life. I think he has had a very happy experience this winter in seeing a million bales of the lowest grade cotton put on the world market and disposed of much more advantageously and much more quickly than anyone had supposed it could be disposed of. It has demonstrated, I think, conclusively, that it is possible to recover our world cotton market.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. It was thought it would take until August 1 to sell a million bales of extra-short-staple cotton. From January 1 through last Tuesday 891,000 bales have been sold and the program will be finished within 2 weeks.

Mr. AIKEN. There will be sold in less than 10 weeks' time what it was expected would take 7 months to sell.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It has been so encouraging that it has demonstrated that if we sell cotton competitively on the world market, in competition with substitute textiles, it will be safe to approve legislation which will assure no reduction in cotton acreage next year.

Mr. EASTLAND. In 1957 and 1958.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the reasoning of the Senator from Mississippi in this respect is sound.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator not know that, with the huge surplus we now have on hand, if the Secretary of Agriculture is to administer the law as it is now written, whether price support is set at 90 percent of parity or whether it is flexible, there is no possible way for a floor to be placed beneath cotton acreage, short of enacting new legislation?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to know if during the debate on this bill the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Mississippi will offer an amendment which will carry out the proposal to place a floor under cotton acreage.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am going to stand on the statement I am now making.

Under the formula in the law and under the present market and supply conditions, the American cotton farmer, unless legislation is approved, faces a reduction in acreage for 1957 of approximately 1,550,000 acres. This, if correct, and I believe it is correct, will make a national acreage allotment next year of only 15,841,000 acres, which is the smallest acreage planted in cotton in the United States since the Civil War.

Mr. President, we face an acreage reduction next year of 8.9 percent.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the probable acreage reduction by States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

States	1956 allotment	1957 allotment	Acreage reduction for 1957	Percentage reduction from 1956 to 1957
Alabama	1,025,141	905,503	119,638	11.7
Arizona	343,640	328,995	14,645	4.3
Arkansas	1,424,511	1,271,412	153,099	10.7
California	782,405	737,294	44,111	5.8
Florida	36,974	34,111	2,863	7.7
Georgia	903,221	805,369	97,852	10.8
Illinois	3,110	3,110	0	
Kansas	29	29	0	
Kentucky	7,799	6,841	958	12.3
Louisiana	610,891	543,435	67,456	11.0
Maryland	25	25	0	
Mississippi	1,646,562	1,458,671	187,891	11.4
Missouri	378,055	341,192	36,863	9.8
Nevada	2,324	2,324	0	
New Mexico	179,378	167,373	12,005	6.7
North Carolina	483,932	428,152	55,780	11.5
Oklahoma	845,616	755,397	90,219	10.7
South Carolina	726,193	649,484	76,709	10.6
Tennessee	563,491	510,886	52,605	9.3
Texas	7,410,893	6,877,025	533,868	7.2
Virginia	17,114	14,956	2,158	12.6
Total	17,391,304	15,841,584	1,549,720	8.9

Mr. EASTLAND. The State of Mississippi faces an 11.4 percent acreage reduction.

The State of Arkansas faces a reduction of 10.7 percent.

The State of North Carolina faces a reduction of 11.5 percent.

The State of South Carolina faces a reduction of 10.6 percent.

Mr. President, I do not believe the economies of any of those States can stand such reductions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator concede that whether we have flexible price supports or rigid price supports the same acreage allotments will prevail? Will the Senator not concede that unless new legislation is enacted, placing a floor under cotton acreage, the acreage allotments will be the same, whether the support level is determined by a flexible formula or fixed at 90 percent of parity for the next 2 years, as the pending bill proposes?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator propose such minimum cotton acreage legislation to us?

Mr. EASTLAND. I said I was going to stand on the statement I am making here. I am not trying to convince my friend from Louisiana of anything. I think an amendment will be offered, and I hope the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will support it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why was not such an amendment proposed before the committee when we were considering the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. It was not proposed then, because we did not know how this export program would work. It has worked out so well that the export program, plus the acreage reserve in the

soil bank, will work off the surplus in 2½ years.

Mr. ELLENDER. And it will do so if we provide a 90 percent support level, will it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the system, which I have supported, the fact remains that we have the lowest cotton acreage since the Civil War.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The successive reductions in acreage and what that does to the problem of the individual farmer is not confined to the cotton farmer. When we have successive reductions of 10 or 12 or 13 percent in acreage, it applies to the small farmer, and we are reaching a point where the total net return to the farmer is not sufficient to justify the purchase of machinery and equipment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Wheat is in a preferred position over cotton. There is a vast acreage for wheat.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In general, yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. But not as to cotton. We have an acreage which will produce 10 million bales. If this amendment is agreed to, it will simply give cotton the same base as to acreage that it now has.

Remember, as acreage is decreased, the cost of production does not decrease, but it increases on a unit or acreage basis. To arrest further acreage declines for 1957 and 1958 will tremendously benefit the cotton-growing areas of the country.

I desire to add that while I have given the figures for acreage reduction in 1957, they will be much more drastic in 1958, unless legislation is enacted to place a floor on cotton acreage.

Mr. President, our present cotton policies cannot continue. Their continuance will destroy the economies of those States and those people which are dependent upon the cotton crop. We have lost the major part of our great export market to new cotton-producing areas in foreign lands and to foreign rayon production. We are losing our domestic market. Must we sit here and wait and do nothing until the remaining great markets which we have are lost before we take steps to correct it?

Two steps must be taken simultaneously to save the American cotton industry. One step must be to place cotton in a better competitive position with rayon in the domestic market, and the other is to begin to liquidate by Government action the tremendous stocks of cotton which have accumulated. We must do this and at the same time increase the income of the cottongrower. These steps, I am confident, the administration is prepared to take and, Mr. President, as one Senator from a cotton State, I am certainly prepared to support these steps. I think they are constructive, and I know they will be of tremendous benefit to the cotton farmers.

It is proposed to liquidate the 10-million-bale surplus by a two-pronged attack. First, as I have said, is for the Commodity Credit Corporation to liquidate its stocks at competitive world prices. Second, under the soil bank, it is proposed to reduce the present allotments by 3 million acres and to pay the farmer who voluntarily reduces his allotments 15 cents a pound based on his average production for the past 5 years. The farmer whose production averages a bale to the acre will receive $75 an acre not to plant part of his allotment in cotton. If the bill shall be enacted in time to become effective this year, this, plus the export program, should liquidate the surplus in 3 years of operation, and with no further reduction in acreage allotments.

In addition, this provision of the soil bank will add to farm income because the payments to reduce the acreage below the allotments will be greater than the net income if the acreage is actually planted in cotton. Let me say at this point that the figures for my State are $22 million. I say from experience that a farmer cannot make money on the reduced acreage at a bale to the acre production. This is the break-off point.

The American cotton farmer is in a deplorable condition. Support prices for cotton have been set at an arbitrary figure of 90 percent of parity by law without regard to market conditions or world price levels. The farm program, without the aid of an export sales program, has caused the accumulation of excessive stocks of American cotton in the hands of, and under the support program of, the Commodity Credit Corporation. The problem has been made more complicated and acute because this agency has been prevented by the State Department from disposing of these stocks at competitive world prices, and this has greatly contributed to the shrinkage of American exports. However, the entire system, because it held American cotton prices above foreign prices and above American-produced rayon, resulted in a drastic shrinkage of the American cotton producers' market, both domestic and foreign. The present program was designed and made operative before synthetics became a real competitive factor, and unless changed will continue to have disastrous effects upon the entire American cotton economy.

The fixed support-price program of the United States has largely fixed the price level of world cotton. It has guaranteed that there would be no drastic declines in world cotton prices. Bankers have been secure behind this price umbrella to finance greatly expanded cotton production in the old cotton-producing countries, and it has caused the creation and development of new cotton production in great volume in many new producing areas of the world. This expanded foreign production, and the increased production of synthetics, coupled with our large cotton surplus finally broke through this floor and broke world prices 6 to 8 cents a pound for a time. This market break of their own making should reduce their profits and scare the risk capital that has financed this production to some extent for the future. Now is the time for us to move in and continue to discourage their further expansion. In fact, we can stop it by making it unprofitable. However, this foreign acreage continued to expand and in the last few years the increase in acreage grew to nearly 1½ times the total United States acreage allotted for 1956. Meanwhile, the United States producers were cut from 1953 plantings by 21 percent for 1954, an additional 15 percent for 1955, 4 percent more in 1956, and face another 9 percent cut in 1957. In fact, the United States producer has virtually borne the entire acreage reduction for the world. As he has reduced his acreage there has been a corresponding increase in the acreage planted to cotton abroad. His sacrifice has maintained the world price at a high level, and encouraged foreign producers to expand acreage, capture historical American markets, and enjoy a period of unrivaled prosperity which the American farmer has created, but in which he has been denied full participation because of his curtailed acreage.

The result is that markets we have been generations in creating have been surrendered to foreign producers without firing a shot; foreigners have placed their cotton prices just under ours in order to get this export business and to take over in grave proportions the markets for American-grown cotton.

A further incentive to expanded foreign production was our technical and financial assistance programs to provide know-how, equipment, and irrigation projects to remove the production risks and create new production areas. Mr. President, cotton is different from other farm commodities. Cotton must compete with synthetic fibers. Cotton must compete with foreign-grown cotton. The domestic market will not sustain the cotton economy of our country.

The 90 percent support-price program, and the lack of an export sales program, have not only protected the domestic and foreign cotton prices, but the system has also protected the American and foreign synthetic industries, particularly the rayon industry, which have placed their prices just under the price of cotton, and as a result have made great inroads into cotton consumption both in the United States and abroad. The result has been to further decrease the consumption of American cotton, which has made additional contributions to the present low cotton-acreage allotments. I am of the opinion that unless changed, the present program will in the future cause further decreases in the consumption of American cotton and still lower acreage allotments in the United States. Additional losses in the domestic market to synthetics and the loss of our exports to foreign cotton production and synthetics could easily cut our national marketing quota, under existing law, well below 10 million bales; and this, with continued increases in production per acre in the United States, would necessitate additional cuts in acreage allotments that would be still more disastrous to individual producers and areas of the Cotton Belt.

Mr. President, I desire at this time to discuss the domestic upland-cotton situation.

The carryover of 11.1 million bales of cotton on August 1, 1955, and a production of 14.5 million bales for that crop year necessitated the imposition of stringent and uneconomic acreage controls for the 1956 crop year under the existing law. The carryover and the crop provided a supply in excess of 25.6 million bales—an all-time record high. Under the marketing quota law, the following situation exists:

Exports estimated	2,500,000
Let me say that this is a half million bales too high.	
Estimated domestic consumption	9,200,000
Estimated disappearance	11,700,000
Thirty-percent allowance for carryover	3,510,000
Estimated normal supply	15,210,000

These estimates will apparently leave a surplus of over 10 million bales above a normal supply, and a carryover on August 1, 1956, of 14 million bales. The Secretary of Agriculture was required under the law to impose controls for 1956 in the amount of 17,391,000 acres. This drastic reduction in acreage is creating extreme hardships on producers. The 9 percent additional reduction in allotments for 1957 under the law will be disastrous to cotton producers.

Now, Mr. President, let us consider foreign cotton production expansion.

The fixed price-support program and our past CCC policy with respect to export sales have furnished an umbrella under which foreign production has expanded both in acreage and in production per acre with the assurance that it could capture our export markets at profitable prices. Our Government policy has been to force the United States cotton farmer to reduce his cotton acreage in this country to bring world supply into balance with effective world demand.

Foreign countries, with suitable climatic and soils conditions for the production of cotton, and in need of an exportable commodity to provide them with needed exchange or barter in world markets, turned to cotton as a safe commodity to produce, because our fixed cotton-pricing policy guaranteed them a market for their full production at profitable prices. In several instances part of the expansion has been carried out with private American capital, and with United States Government financed technical assistance. In addition to the technical assistance, the United States Government, through gifts, grants, and loans, for economic developments, including irrigation facilities, equipment, and so forth, has actively and materially assisted the expansion of existing cotton-growing areas, and the creation of new such areas in foreign lands. In fact, our Government is largely responsible for the increased foreign production.

I am of the opinion that, if it were not for the mandatory 90 percent support-price program of the United States Government and the lack of an export sales program, which has maintained world cotton prices, bankers and lending agencies would not have extended the credit to expand foreign cotton production, and a large part of these new cotton-growing areas might not now be in existence.

I desire to give a few selected instances of foreign expansion in acreage, and the increase in production encouraged by the price-support program, CCC sales policy, and other policies of the United States Government.

In the period 1950–55 Egypt planted 134 percent of her 1945–49 acreage; Argentina, 139 percent; India, 146 per cent; Mexico, 191 percent; Turkey, 225 percent; Syria, 673 percent; Nicaragua, 936 percent. This acreage resulted in an increased production of 3,777,000 bales in these countries during this period. This increase in production was sold principally at the expense of the American cottongrower's market.

Central America is one of the high-producing areas which is expanding cotton production most rapidly. Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala have steadily increased from 50,000 bales only 4 years ago to 300,000 bales last year. A further increase of about 100,000 bales is expected for 1955–56, and potential production estimates by the United States Department of Agriculture specialists range from 700,000 to 900,000 bales in the next few years. Mexico has doubled her acreage in the last 5 years. India increased her cotton acreage 1.3 million acres in 1955 and she plans additional increases out of the 1.5 million acres of new irrigation from the Bhakra-Nangal multipurpose-dam project. India's long-range plan, under our umbrella, is to increase cotton production from 2.6 million bales in 1949–50 to 5.8 million bales in 1961. Pakistan plans a rapid expansion of production from the 1954–55 level of 1.4 million bales to 2.5 million in the near future.

Foreign acreage increased from an average of 39,152,000 acres for the period 1945–49, to 56,315,000 as an average for the period 1950–54, or an increase of 17,163,000 acres. In other words, Mr. President, the increased acreage abroad under our price umbrella, from 1950 to 1954 was 17 million acres, which approximates the total acreage planted in cotton in the United States.

The unsoundness of our policy is further demonstrated by the fact that our cotton producers were forced, through controlled acreage for 1954, to reduce allotments to 21,379,000 acres, while foreign plantings were increased in the same year—1955—to 60,483,000 acres, or an increase of 21 million acres.

For 1956 the United States farmers' allotment is cut to 17,391,304 acres, which is a slash of 5,457,000 acres from the 1950–54 average planted acreage. Unless we can apply the helpful provisions of this bill, cotton farmers—as I have stated—face another 9 percent national reduction in acres down to 15,800,000, or a cut of over 1.5 million acres more, for 1957. If we continue with our present program, our acreage allotments will continually decrease. Meanwhile, foreign producers will continue to expand substantially above last year's plantings, and will continue to capture markets which are historically those of the American cotton farmers.

As a consequence of the policies demonstrated above, it is clear that United States producers have become for the first time in history the residual suppliers for world cotton markets. These policies have already driven thousands of farmers off the land, and, if continued, will bring bankruptcy to hundreds of thousands of our cotton farmers or will force them completely off the farm. A continuation of these policies will destroy our cotton economy and will undermine our entire economic strength. These policies have deprived thousands of United States tenant farm families of their historical means of livelihood for the crop year 1955, and additional thousands for 1956. These families have had to move, and are moving, to town, and many of them are now living primarily on welfare allotments. They are further adding to our rolls of unemployed, while they are seeking other work. Most of these people are not adapted to, or capable of, efficient industrial production; and they are creating acute social and economic problems in the areas to which they have moved. Past experience indicates that many of them will never return to the land.

Mr. President, let us look for a minute at the world export picture for cotton. The world export picture indicates a continuous loss of these markets by the United States cotton producer since 1929. In the 5-year period 1925–29, the world export market consumed an average of 14,433,000 bales, of which foreign producers supplied 5,858,000 bales, or 40.6 percent, and the United States supplied 8,575,000 bales, 59.4 percent. By 1953, our share of this market had dropped to less than 30 percent. At our present rate of exports for this year, it appears that for the first time we may supply less than 20 percent of this market, the smallest United States exports in 100 years, except for war years.

The world cotton export market has not expanded since 1925, in spite of the increase in per capita consumption, the increase in world population, and the improved economic conditions of its people. This is due to the inroads of the man-made synthetics on the fiber market. Our share of this relatively stable market, however, has steadily declined, except for the fluctuations brought about by World War II, the Korean war, and their aftermaths.

The limitation by our Government on exports in 1950–51 helped to raise the world price to unrealistic heights, and stimulated the aforementioned foreign acreage expansion. This gave impetus to the trend in increased production abroad which constitutes a major feature of our present cotton problem and to expanded synthetic production capacity.

Much of the cotton that we have moved during the last few years into export channels which has sustained the industry has been moved through assistance programs. In other words, approximately 41 percent of the pitifully small amount of cotton we have exported in the past few years has been virtually given away under the export programs,

because our cotton has been priced out of the market. From April 1948 to February 1955 we exported over 28 million bales of cotton. We sold for dollars 58.8 percent of this, or 16.5 million bales, and we financed or gave away through ECA, MSA, and FOA the other 41.2 percent, or approximately 12 million bales. These assistance programs are helpful in disposing of our production. They, along with the short crop in 1950 and the Korean war, helped to prevent a situation similar to the one we now have from developing earlier. These programs, as helpful as they are, are not the answer to our long-time problem. The most important part of the answer is markets. There is no substitute for markets in any formula. We must sell what we produce. A farm program which surrenders markets is doomed to failure. A farmer who loses his markets, Mr. President, loses his farm. We can by law influence the price of cotton for a limited time, but we cannot indefinitely repeal the laws of supply and demand in regard to price. Price alone is no solution. Price alone is not a farm program. Our efforts in this direction have finally caught up with us, as is clearly indicated by the fact that our carryover will be the largest on record—14.2 million bales, next August 1, and our exports will be the smallest in 100 years, except for war years when we had no bottoms in which to ship the cotton.

We have sacrificed markets and production in an effort to maintain price. In this endeavor, we have sacrificed the domestic market, as well as the export market. We have reduced our acreage beyond the stage of individual hardship, to the point of cumulative hardship on every producer, small or large. This is due primarily to the fact that we have become noncompetitive in price by our fixed support-price program and by the export sales policies of the CCC, as set up by the State Department.

The cottongrowers of the United States, as individuals, without the aid of their Government, are at an impossible disadvantage to meet competitive export prices which are subsidized by foreign governments of competing countries. They cannot challenge practices by these countries which bear resemblances to actual dumping of cotton on the world market. These practices have been successfully used to capture the markets of the American cotton farmer. It will take action by the United States Government to meet these conditions which now prevail in the world cotton trade. This is why the sale by the CCC of its stocks at competitive prices is of such tremendous importance to the American cotton farmer. As I have stated, I believe that an announcement in this connection is imminent.

The American cotton farmer should not be expected or required to compete individually with the treasuries of foreign countries. This is especially true when the foreign policy of his own country has materially contributed to his predicament.

Mr. President, another situation that throws much light on this problem and proves that our program has made the American cotton producer the residual supplier of the world market is the change in location of world cotton inventories. Ten years ago the United States carried over 45 percent of the free world's inventories on August 1, while at the end of the marketing year of 1954 we were carrying two-thirds of these inventories. Not only have we forced the American cotton producer to provide them a price umbrella and endeavor to maintain the world supply at normal, but he, through the CCC, carries most of the raw cotton inventories for both foreign and domestic mills. Foreign cotton and synthetic producers are supplying the export fiber market.

I say that that fact speaks eloquently on the point that something is gravely wrong when we have a system which has built up in the United States the greatest cotton surplus in history. It has resulted in the lowest figure for exports in a hundred years. It has resulted in the lowest cotton acreage since 1860. There has been terrific expansion abroad, and there is no surplus of cotton abroad. The surplus is held only in this country. What further must we do to show that there is something gravely wrong with a system which permits such conditions?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's opinion that the cotton growers of the United States would be able to compete on equal term with the peon labor of Mexico, Peru, Brazil, Pakistan, and other countries now producing cotton?

Mr. EASTLAND. I will give the Senator what I think is a complete answer to that question. For 50 years the American cotton producer has successfully competed with peon labor in India, where the wage scale was from 5 to 8 cents a day.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows very well that India produces only a pittance of cotton above her own needs.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. ELLENDER. I mean beyond her own consumption. India exported very little cotton.

Mr. EASTLAND. India exported cotton.

Mr. ELLENDER. To Asia.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know to where it was exported. I think we could compete.

Mr. ELLENDER. At what price would the American farmer have to produce cotton in the United States to be able to compete on the world market?

Mr. EASTLAND. That would depend, of course, on what the world market was. Cotton grown in Louisiana and cotton grown in my State are highly competitive with cotton grown in Mexico. It is about a 1 1/16 inch staple cotton. Yes; I think we could easily compete with Mexico.

Mr. ELLENDER. At what price? What would be the price range?

Mr. EASTLAND. Last fall Mexico began to dump her cotton because she was afraid of the announcement of an export sales quota. The market fell to 26 or 27 cents for a few weeks. It is now back to 29 or 30 cents. I think it would move at from 30 to 31 cents. We have some advantage over the Mexicans in respect to quality.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator arguing that the cost of producing cotton in Mexico is around 25 or 30 cents a pound?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think the Mexican cotton producers lost a great deal of money last year. My information is that they lose a great deal of money at 27 or 28 cents a pound. They have an export tax of 5 cents a pound to pay.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could the government not manipulate that tax? As a matter of fact, does she not manipulate it now? Could Mexico not make it half a cent, or even do away with it altogether?

Mr. EASTLAND. The government could manipulate it. However, I will state, as a cotton farmer, that I am confident that we could very successfully compete with Mexico and Central America.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does it cost American cotton farmers to produce a pound of cotton?

Mr. EASTLAND. That depends entirely on the production per acre. If a cotton farmer makes three-quarters of a bale to an acre, it costs a great deal. If he makes a bale and a half to the acre, it costs much less.

Mr. ELLENDER. In order to indicate that we now have a huge surplus, the Senator is taking acreage and production figures of last year and the year before, is he not? It is my recollection that last year we planted over 2 million acres less than we did in 1954, and produced almost a million bales more.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. That year was unprecedented.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. So why argue?

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand; but is the Senator not using production figures of that character to depict the huge surplus he is talking about?

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no.

Mr. ELLENDER. What figures is the Senator using?

Mr. EASTLAND. We did not build up the surplus in one year.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator remembers that in 1950 we had an embargo on the shipment of cotton.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. That was in 1950.

Mr. ELLENDER. All that surplus accumulated when controls were lifted, and farmers were told to plant all the cotton they could, because of the Korean war. As the Senator knows, 90 percent price support had nothing to do with it.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have said that there are two reasons why we have this surplus. There are two reasons why we have become residual cotton suppliers. One is that the support price has held the price of our product above that of the foreign cotton producer. He has been able to market his product just under our support price. The State Department has refused to permit an export program which would enable us to compete.

Mr. ELLENDER. What assurance has the Senator that the same policy will not be continued in the future?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think there is another reason. I have said that I thought

an announcement was imminent with respect to an export sales program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Before the vote on the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know whether it will be before the vote on the bill. I have said that an announcement is imminent. I hope it is imminent.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to know if the Senator has any inkling as to what is happening. Has the administration had a change of heart, or is it throwing out any baits which might attract some opposition to the 90-percent price support incorporated in the pending bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know of no baits. However, as my friend from Louisiana is aware, for a year the Department of Agriculture has been doing everything within its power to get an export sales program. I believe it has been cleared.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator says it has been cleared, does he mean it has been cleared by the State Department?

Mr. EASTLAND. All I can say is—and this is what I stand on—that in my judgment an announcement is imminent.

Mr. ELLENDER. I repeat, I presume the announcement will be made before a vote on the bill is taken.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not want to presume that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will presume it. Let me take the responsibility.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to have the Senator take that responsibility.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. Currently there are no surpluses in foreign countries above seasonal supplies. The only surplus is in the United States and there is room for part of it now in that market. Yet, in the first half of this year we exported roughly only 800,000 bales of cotton—less than half of last year's small exports because the foreign mills have been waiting on us to adjust our price. But the experts tell us now that foreign cotton production is less than 2 million bales away from export market needs. We must do something now. We have no more time to waste because at present trends foreign cotton production will equal foreign cotton consumption in 2 years according to the Department of Agriculture. Their point there is quite significant. Foreign production has risen, until today it is within 2 million bales of foreign consumption. When the two figures meet, that is, when foreign production meets foreign consumption, United States cotton will be out of business as a major factor in the world cotton industry. The American farmer will be bankrupt.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that not because we cannot produce on an equal cost basis with the foreign producers, and because we do not subsidize cotton exports?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course that is not the reason. The cause is what I have been saying all afternoon. It is because of two things. First, we have priced ourselves out of the market, and, second, we have not had an export sales program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that we have priced ourselves out of the market through gearing our cotton support program to the requirements of the most uneconomic producers?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct. If we had supplied our markets at competitive prices and retained them we would not now face the uphill fight to regain them from foreign cotton and synthetic producers who have geared their production capacity to supply them. Also, Mr. President, we must dispose of our surpluses while together we and they are producing in excess of this current market. This is not going to be an easy task. The producer must be permitted by the Congress to assist in this struggle for markets.

Mr. President, let us now take a closer look at our synthetic competition.

To further complicate the problem, inroads have been made on the domestic and world cotton markets by the synthetic fibers. Profitable investments in the expansion of synthetic production on a worldwide basis have been assured by the United States cotton price support umbrella. These fibers are very competitive in use, but offer little inducement on a consumer preference basis. They have been able to capture huge markets formerly enjoyed by United States raw cotton mainly on the basis of price because a mill will buy and spin what it makes the most money by spinning.

Rayon production alone has increased in the United States from 700,000 cotton bales equivalent in 1938 to 3,400,000 bales in 1954. World rayon production has increased from 4,500,000 cotton bales equivalent to 16,600,000 in the same period. On the domestic scene, rayon in 1954 displaced over 5½ million cotton acres based on the United States average production per acre of the immediate past 5 years. Our 1955 production of synthetics in the United States increased 763,700 cotton bales equivalent. Our synthetic imports doubled for the year to a total of 415,000 bales equivalent. Our United States total increase for 1955 in the consumption of man-made fibers was 978,700 bales, bringing our consumption to 4,578,700 cotton bales equivalent. This increase in synthetic consumption in 1 year displaces another 1.5 million cotton acres production. This is the amount of the acreage reduction facing cotton growers for the 1957 crop below current allotments. The cotton farmers of this Nation cannot continue to cut cotton acreage 1 to 2 million acres each year. This 1955 United States consumption of synthetics now displaces nearly 7 million United States cotton acres annually. The cotton producer must be permitted to become more competitive in the market. On the same basis in the world picture, rayon now displaces over 22 million cotton acres on the world average production per acre. Reliable textile milling interests state that less than 20 percent of rayon consumption is on a consumer preference basis, and that over 80 percent has been lost purely on the price factor.

It is thoroughly alarming that the United States cotton support price became the stabilizing base for world cotton and synthetic production, and thus provided an incentive for expansion. To carry out this policy, we store our cotton and hold it off the world market until such times as the world supply is exhausted. When world production is excessive, our domestic production remains off the world market, accumulates in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, and forces curtailment of United States production through acreage controls. No other cotton-producing nation exercises any control over cotton production as such, so that presently world production is increasing faster than United States curtailment. The American farmer should not be expected to bear the entire burden and pay the entire cost of maintaining a normal world supply of cotton, at the same time providing both price and market assurance for world rayon expansion.

Mr. President, as I have pointed out, the road we are now traveling will legislate the cotton farmer out of business in a few more years. Unless we adjust the price support laws and permit him to compete, there is no end in sight to acreage reduction. Allotted acres will get less and less, and acreage reductions have already reached the point of diminishing returns. We have lost our cotton export markets and the Government must spend millions of dollars to help regain them beginning now. Will we also sit here and continue to legislate away what is left of the domestic market before we attempt to save it? Can we justify our refusal to permit the cotton farmer the opportunity to meet his competition and save his industry with our assistance?

Mr. President, I desire a program under which farmers will get the highest possible price for what they produce, the highest possible net income, and which will afford them a high degree of prosperity. It takes two things for a prosperous agriculture. One is price support; the other is volume, or an acreage large enough to give them volume production. We have sacrificed volume production to protect price, and the result is that the American cotton industry is on the brink of collapse. The proposals in this bill, coupled with administrative action which I believe will be taken immediately, and which I have heretofore outlined, will go far toward saving the American cotton producer. I think this entire plan will increase the net income of southern cotton farmers and that it is far superior to what we now have. The provisions of the soil bank will help to bridge the income gap in moving the cotton surplus into consumption and provide a better production plant to enable the cotton farmer to meet his competition when supplies are again normal. We, of course, must have support prices which will help stabilize our rural economy, enable a farmer to secure his fair share of the national prosperity, and preserve a sound banking structure. It is necessary that production move into consumption. The warehouse is no substitute for a market, and I believe that the cotton program as out-

lined will place the American cotton industry back on the road to prosperity. Therefore, I shall support it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Mississippi on his very comprehensive and intelligent analysis of the position of the cotton grower in the United States today. I only wish that every cotton grower in the country could have heard what the Senator has had to say on the floor this afternoon, because, then, I am sure we would not continue a minute longer the discussion as to whether we should return to a program which has already lost the cotton grower of America most of his export markets and a good share of the remaining domestic market. There should be no question about going ahead with a program which would restore the cotton industry to somewhere near its former proportions and restore income to the cotton producers of the United States. By "income," I mean price times volume produced.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from Vermont. Does the distinguished Senator not think that this program would place the cotton producers of the United States on a better economic level?

Mr. AIKEN. If Congress does its part, there is no question that the Department will do its part to restore the great domestic cotton-producing industry to its former status. I know the Senator from Mississippi is on very sound ground when he predicts better days ahead for the cotton growers of America, provided the Congress does what it should in the form of legislation.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank my friend from Vermont.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think my good friend from Vermont is overoptimistic.

Mr. AIKEN. I have reason to be.

Mr. ELLENDER. My good friend from Mississippi must know a great deal that others of us do not know as to what is in contemplation and what will be announced before next Monday.

It is apparent that the Senator from Mississippi has made quite a study of the displacement of cotton by synthetic fibers. Does the Senator know at what price cotton should sell in order to regain some of the market it has lost through the substitution of rayon and other synthetic fibers?

Mr. EASTLAND. That would depend on the commodity.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about cotton now.

Mr. EASTLAND. At what price cotton should sell to displace rayon?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. That depends on the commodity.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has thoroughly studied this problem——

Mr. EASTLAND. If we put the cotton price down to 22 cents, it would move in on the entire cord market. No one favors any such thing as that. It is something we cannot control. The point I was making was that beginning on January 1, 1955, there was $155 million earmarked for synthetic fiber expansion in the United States over a 3-year period. We have got to cut cotton prices from 2½ to 3 cents a pound to stop that expansion.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator expects to accomplish that through the amendment which he will propose?

Mr. EASTLAND. I stated that I thought if it is not done——

Mr. ELLENDER. To eliminate the seven-eighths yardstick?

Mr. EASTLAND. That would be only part of it. I said I thought I would fix it at a total price reduction of under 3 cents a pound.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that would include changing from the seven-eighths basis, and what else?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think it would be approximately 87 percent. That is merely my judgment. I have no information that my friend from Louisiana does not have.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to feel that way.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish to state that I am perfectly satisfied to do everything I can to protect the cotton industry in which my State's economy is primarily involved.

Mr. ELLENDER. I expect to do the same thing for the cotton industry of Louisiana, but I shall travel a different road.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. I am doing what I think is right and my friend from Louisiana is doing what he thinks is right.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me point out to the Senator that, as he undoubtedly remembers, in 1950 there were 18,629,000 acres of cotton planted, with a production of 10,014,000 bales of cotton.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. He remembers, also, that last year, with 17 million acres planted to cotton, 14,600,000 bales were produced.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And in 1951, although there were 28 million acres planted to cotton in contrast to 17 million acres last year, the difference in production was less than a million bales.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I merely wish to point that out to indicate to my good friend from Mississippi that the huge amount of cotton which we now have on hand can be attributed to the high yields per acre which were realized in the past 2 or 3 years because of the wonderful weather our farmers were blessed with.

Mr. EASTLAND. That certainly cannot be correct, when normal exports of from 5 to 6 million bales a year fell to 3¼ million bales and are now running at a point where we will do well if we export 2 million bales.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator said himself that we gave away the cotton that went into export.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I did not say that.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator said we gave away 40 percent of the cotton exported.

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a moment. Let us keep the record straight.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. I said that in the 6-year period I named after 1948 we exported 26 million bales of cotton, of which 12 million bales were given away under some foreign-aid program.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Our exports have been running 3 million bales, 3¼ million bales, 2½ million bales, in the past 2 or 3 years. Approximately half of that was given away. But when I mentioned these pitiful exports I also mentioned that half of it was given away because we priced it out of the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator can see also, I presume, that if the plan which he envisions or which he thinks will be announced to the Senate is followed, it will entail a loss to the Treasury.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think that at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us consider the million bales of cotton which will be sold within the next 2 or 3 weeks. Does the Senator know how much loss will be sustained by the Government?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is very short cotton which has been unrealistically priced. The seven-eighths provision is for the purpose of correcting that situation.

The Senator has said there would be a loss to the Treasury. The Senator knows that when we have a stock of any commodity in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the price of that commodity falls, the Treasury takes a loss in its inventory. That has happened to wheat and to every other commodity.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the loss which will be suffered by the sale of the million bales is in addition to all that. My information is—if I am incorrect I should like to be corrected—that the loss will be in the neighborhood of from $35 to $45 a bale.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is cotton which is not consumed in this country.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. Practically all the mills in the world, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, want to spin cotton having a staple length of from 1 inch to one and one thirty-second inches. This will run to about 80 percent of the world's consumption. When we begin to offer cotton like that under an export program, we will not have to take such terrific losses.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means longer staples, does he not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

FARM PROGRAM MUST BE FAIR TO ALL FARMERS ALIKE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the questions of farm policy which the Senate is now debating are among the most important facing our Nation this year. They involve directly the livelihood of millions of American families, and indirectly the prosperity of thousands of communities throughout the country. At a time when claims of unprecedented prosperity are made for much of our economy, surely the agricultural recession of the last 3 or 4 years is one of our most important domestic problems.

Certainly no other area of domestic policy has had so much attention or has been so thoroughly and continuously debated in recent times as our programs for agriculture. The economic difficulties which have beset, and continue to beset, our farm families have been graphically documented in the hearings and reports of the responsible committees of Congress. No time or effort has been spared in giving a hearing to every point of view while considering the hotly debated alternative proposals for helping American agriculture through its present difficult period.

The other evening, Mr. President, I was leaving the Senate Office Building at 8:30 o'clock, and I thought that I was probably the last Senator to depart. But at the entrance I met members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who were coming back from dinner for another night of hard work. That was characteristic of the unselfish effort and energy which have gone into the preparation of the bill now before us.

Unfortunately, I do not have the privilege of serving on the Agriculture Committee. Because the farm bill is now receiving such able exposition and debate from the distinguished members of that committee, who have far more experience than I with the development and the record of our agricultural policies, I do not presume to add much new wisdom to their discussion, and I shall speak only briefly on the bill.

There is much in the bill to which I subscribe, and some things which I deem inadequate.

I believe the committee was wise to grant a trial to the soil-bank program—a plan with origins deep in Democratic farm policies and now fortunately and wisely endorsed by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson.

I believe it was the part of wisdom to institute a program to encourage farmers to plant grasses, trees, and other resource-strengthening species, in the parts of their acreage taken out of crop production.

I believe the committee was wise in restoring the 90 percent of parity level for price supports on the products which qualify for it, because this is the most immediate way, in my judgment, of shoring up falling farm income in this particular realm of agriculture.

BILL WORTH WHILE, BUT DOES NOT GO FAR ENOUGH

For these reasons, I support the committee's bill. My disagreement is concerned with areas in which, in my opinion, the committee did not act boldly enough.

For one thing, Mr. President, I believe the domestic parity certificate plan for wheat certainly merits the same trial which we are now prepared to give to the soil bank. This plan offers a well-thought-out method of protecting the income of wheat farmers without Government purchase and accumulation of wheat surpluses, and it encompasses provisions to protect growers of price-supported feed grain against undue competition from lower-priced wheat. The time has come for us to submit this plan to the test of experience, and it deserves inclusion in the farm bill. I trust the Senate will add it by amendment on the floor.

Secondly, Mr. President, I believe that this bill perpetuates, more fundamentally, the injustice of protecting the incomes of growers of some crops but leaving the majority of our farmers without any protection whatever.

Why should the Government of the United States support the prices of corn, and cotton, and tobacco, and wheat, and peanuts, and thereby the incomes of those who raise these crops—and do nothing to protect the incomes of farmers who raise cabbages, or apples, or turkeys?

I think that if I live to be 200 years old—although I have no expectation of doing so—I shall never quite see the justification of such a limited farm policy.

Perhaps development of a really far-reaching agricultural policy—designed to protect the diversified family farm against the economic as well as the natural conditions which make the farmer's economic position a peculiarly precarious one—has not yet been stressed by the major farm organizations. Perhaps these organizations have been principally concerned with maintaining and improving the Government support programs for the great basic, mass-produced commodities. But important as they are, these support programs reach only a minority of farm families. In my State of Oregon, only about 16 percent of cash farm receipts in 1953 came from basic commodities. About 66 percent—two-thirds—of cash farm receipts came from commodities with no supports whatever. Mrs. Neuberger's family, who are small farmers, constantly call this to my attention.

During the 4 months I spent in Oregon last autumn, I met with hundreds of individual farm operators to whom the great controversy of this year, over the soil bank and 90 percent or sliding parity, are quite comparatively irrelevant. Yet these farmers are suffering the same squeeze as the producer of basic commodities between rising costs and falling receipts. And the letters I have received from Oregon farmers since my return continue to bear out this obvious fact about our present farm programs.

For instance, Mr. President, on January 23, 1956, Mr. Walker Ellis, of Milton-Freewater, wrote me, in part, as follows:

> Since at no time in 1955 did the prune growers receive anywhere near the cost of production, we feel no one should blame us if we are indignant that all proposals for "farm problem solutions" are concentrated on subsidized crops. In view of the fact that four-fifths of the Nation's food crops are nonsubsidized we feel it is time some action was taken in behalf of these farmers. This portion of agriculture is in huge majority, in number of farmers, volume of production, and acres in production, yet because of the small units and diversity of interests is unable to organize or raise huge sums of money for lobbies to promote their interests.

Similarly, I received this letter from Mr. H. G. Faust, of Boring, Oreg., dated January 16, 1956:

> We heard you over radio last evening on the President's farm program and I want to congratulate you on your stand and defense of the small farmer. You are right in saying that they should participate in all help. I retired from a college professorship 5 years ago and came to a small ranch I have owned a long time and have 14 acres of berries and the price was so low last year that we had to take a terrible beating and a severe freeze got most of them in November. If there is not a change for the better this year the berry farming is well on its way out and another year or two will wind it up in the Gresham area.
>
> The small farms too will have to go because of low income and increased expenses. I assure you that anything you may do for this situation will be appreciated by thousands of small farmers around the Gresham area. Thanks for your monthly letter and report.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
>
> H. G. FAUST.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter from Mr. R. E. Schedeen, of Gresham, Oreg., and a letter sent on January 5, 1956, to Secretary Benson by Mr. Edwin E. Phetteplace, a copy of which was sent to me, which make the same point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHEDEEN BROS. FARMS,
Gresham, Oreg., February 6, 1956.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DICK: Thanks for the letter of last December. I heartily agree with you that our party's present subsidy program is inadequate. Not only is it inadequate but it is unfair. For example, farmers in the lower Willamette Valley who are growers of mostly specialty crops not only do not receive any benefits from the program but actually contribute to it in the way of taxes.

In considering the farm problem, great emphasis is placed on present surpluses—too much emphasis. True, on some commodities, such as wheat they are a real burden. However, most commodities are not saddled with overabundance yet their prices are at cost of production and below.

As far back as last spring, before planting time, the market on broccoli was active and the demand keen. The principal buyer in Oregon, Birdseye-Snider, went out at planting time and attempted to increase their acreage contracts. The contract price was low, about $100 per ton field-run. This price I have found from experience is below cost of production. I have been producing three to five hundred tons per year. The broccoli market has remained firm throughout and is still good at the present time.

All industry is experiencing and fighting the cost rise. The food processors alleviate this particular problem by the simple process of whacking the price they pay the producers for the raw product. This illustration holds true in a great many other commodities. My point is that present farm surpluses are not to blame for our troubles.

From what I can see, I would say the farmer is greatly to blame for his troubles. He is in much the same position as labor years back. The farmer must organize and tell the processor what the price will be.

The soil bank proposal I believe is sound and basic. It could remove much marginal land from production, thousands of acres of which should never have been devoted to

cultivated crops. However, I doubt that even after 10 years will such a program affect total production. But, from the standpoint of conservation the program could have real value to the future economy of our Nation.

Benson is now stoutly defending the small farmer, yet from the time he took office, it has been obvious from his attitude that certain operators, and he implied the small and marginal operators, were going to be forced through the economic wringer. From strictly an economic standpoint this may be sound. But it appears to me that if they must go and adjust into a new life that some provision be made which will allow them to make the change without suffering the humiliation of being forced from their small farms. These farmers and their families are fine people and should be allowed to maintain their dignity and self-respect.

More and more small farmers in this area are taking full-time jobs until at the present time most of the farmers in Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties are what we call part-time farmers. Living close to a metropolitan area they can readily make this change, but throughout our country most small operators do not enjoy this advantage. Spending their time and energies away from their farms is not complementary to their farm operations. This is apparent to one who will drive along country roads and view these places. No doubt production is declining on these places and will continue to do so. These folks are simply trying to work out their own economic problems.

If Congress is going to legislate some action in behalf of agriculture it should be in the form of a basic and permanent program. Subsidy programs are temporary and uncertain and do little more than harm the farmers' public relations with the general public. I am sure you agree with me that their status is none too good now.

Could you possibly send me some of the material on proposed legislation from time to time—no hurry.

Say "hello" to Mrs. Neuberger. Best of luck.

Sincerely,

R. E. SCHEDEEN.

THE DALLES, OREG., *January 5, 1956.*

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some time ago you invited, through the newspaper, criticism or help from the farmers. We being small farmers owning and operating 30 acres of fruit (peaches, apricots, and cherries) and leasing 65 acres of wheat and scab land, have found that it has come to a point where we can no longer make a living on the place. It is necessary for my wife to work in town.

What we are interested in is the fact that wheat, cotton, and peanuts come under a heading of protected yields and guaranteed payments. We believe that it would only be fair that all subsidies be removed and let growers of these crops be obliged to make a living as we have had to do all our lives.

There has never been a time that a small rancher depending on all his own efforts has been helped by the Government, to our knowledge. As we are born Americans, also our grandparents, we think that we are as much a part of these United States as the large wheat grower or the foreigner whom we attempt to appease in the foreign countries, or should we be looked upon as the third-class passengers were on the Titanic. We are still of an open mind, ready to be shown by any Government agent who is welcome to come to our ranch and show us how we can make a living without a subsidy.

Yours truly,

EDWIN E. PHETTEPLACE.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe the point is valid. We will not have a really adequate agricultural policy for this Nation until all farmers are treated fairly and with the same recognition for the unique problems they face. We cannot continue forever to place some farmers under the umbrella of price supports and leave all other farm families exposed to economic blizzards.

Recognition of this condition received at least lip-service from the President when he was a candidate for office in 1952. In his well-known speech at Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952—a speech the farmers of the Nation have since had cause to recall—General Eisenhower said:

> We must find methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms, our producers of perishable foods. They yield the rich variety of meat, milk, eggs, fruit, and vegetables that support our nutritious national diet. As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops. The Democrat planners have made the diversified farmer the forgotten man of agriculture. They keep saying, "There is no way of protecting perishables except through the Brannan plan." We can and will find a sound way to do the job without indulging in the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan.

Perhaps that was only campaign oratory—just as probably was the other famous promise of that campaign for not merely 90 but 100 percent of parity for farm products. But while the performance on these promises has been nil to date, the principle of a farm program for the small, diversified, or specialty producer is right, and it is never too late to redeem the promises.

NINETY-PERCENT SUPPORTS NEEDED NOW TO HALT SLIDE IN FARM INCOME

Actually, of course, Mr. President, the administration has failed not only to extend our farm program, as General Eisenhower promised, to new categories of farm families, but it has not even succeeded in maintaining successful programs for those farmers who are reached by existing policies.

Let me read another letter from Mrs. Henrietta Bowers, of Harrisburg, Oreg., dated December 3, 1955, which is typical of many:

> Is there anything to be done about the present farm price situation? Today, Ezra T. Benson in a radio broadcast stated that the farmers were accustomed to the high prices brought on by the war and had to come down to reality. The facts on this untruth speak for themselves; the farm income is down 7 percent from a year ago, as compared to a rise in the cost of machinery, and also increased operation cost. In short, the rest of the country is operating on inflation prices while the farmer is operating on depression prices.
>
> My husband and I have been registered Republicans all our lives but as far as we are concerned the farm situation is an outrage to the administration.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD a letter of February 1, 1956, from Mr. Willard M. Pell, of Pendleton, Oreg., on the consequences of President Eisenhower's insistence on flexible supports.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PELL'S ACRES,
Pendleton, Oreg., February 1, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My only means of raising a family is in growing and selling wheat.

Our farm program of flexible price supports coupled with acreage allotments is a sure way of driving competent small farmers into eventual bankruptcy, or giving up to a large operator. The pinch is felt now and under this program it is certain strangulation.

I strongly advocate 90 percent of parity with a limit of $30,000 CCC loan to any one operator. While the rest of the Nation's business basks in prosperity, we farmers are getting in a precarious position under the present farm program.

Time is of the essence to prevent a repetition of the thirties.

Very truly yours,

WILLARD M. PELL.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, to my mind the flexible-support policy is an error, because its major premise is an error. Criticism of 90 percent supports say that such supports encourage overproduction and create vast and unmanageable surpluses. Perhaps so, and perhaps we must face up to the problem of surplus production. But it seems illogical, and in defiance of the simplest economics and human nature, to say that supports lower than 90 percent encourage lower production. Obviously, they rather encourage even more forced production on the permitted acreage, so as to make up in quantity what has been taken away in price supports per bushel.

The real effect of sliding supports, and probably their real purpose, is to reduce the receipts from growing the supported commodities to such a point that many farms will simply be forced out of production. If, as I say, that is the purpose, it is certainly being brought rapidly toward fruition.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have appear at this point an article from the Sheridan (Oreg.) Sun of February 16, 1956, under the headline "State's Farm Income for 1956 Predicted To Be Little More Than Half of 1951," which discusses recent trends in Oregon's farm economy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE'S FARM INCOME FOR 1956 PREDICTED TO BE LITTLE MORE THAN HALF OF 1951

Another rough year is looming on the Oregon farm front. Average net income for Oregon farmers this year may be little more than half of what it was in 1951, believes M. D. Thomas, Oregon State College agricultural economist.

Large stocks of farm products piled up in past years will hold prices down even if Congress approved the so-called "soil bank" early this year, says Thomas. Major benefits from the soil bank are "long range," states the economist, with immediate benefits likely to be felt only by Oregon seed growers who would find rapidly expanded markets for grass and legume seeds to plant the Nation's soil banks.

The soil bank would take out of production 10 to 20 percent of the Nation's cropland and save it until needed in emergency such as drought, all-out war, or by our future population.

If the acreage taken out of crops brought sufficient production cuts, farmers' incomes would improve after a while, Thomas explains. Farm prices would probably be enough better in 2 or 3 years to more than offset the decreased production, he believes. Meanwhile, substantial Government payments would be necessary to keep many farmers going while the "bank" is being established.

Already, the average Oregon farmer's net income from farming has dropped below $2,000, compared to $3,000 in 1951. A further drop in 1955 and prospects for some further decline may slash farm family income by nearly one-half in the past 5 years.

The average net would be down even more if the number of farm operators in the State had not decreased, says Thomas. The census shows only 54,442 farms in the State in 1954 compared to 59,827 in 1950 and 63,125 in 1945.

Many farmers on smaller Oregan farms are supplementing their income with off-farm work. The economist believes such families will seek even more off-farm work in 1956 with job prospects and salaries now favorable. Mill and factory wage rates have risen steadily for several years and now average one-third higher than in 1949.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, perhaps a return to 90 percent supports will be only a stopgap. I have already said that in the case of wheat, the chief supported commodity grown in my State, I favor a trial of the domestic parity certificate plan. But I am supporting 90 percent supports now, so that our farmers will still be there, on the farms, by the time a long-range program for basics and for all the different areas of our agricultural economy has been worked out.

DROP IN FARM INCOME STABILIZES PRICE LEVELS?

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to refer briefly to the administration's claim, which we hear so aften nowadays, that the cost of living has been stabilized by the wisdom of its economic policies. Much is made of the fact that there has been no rise in the overall cost of living. However, while the farm bill is under consideration is an appropriate time to bring the reason for this to the attention of the Senate.

The celebrated "stabilized cost of living" is being taken out of the hide of the American farmer.

An article by Mr. Richard Rutter in the Sunday business section of the New York Times of January 29, 1956, demonstrates that "the drop in farm prices has kept the overall index in line."

Wholesale farm prices have dipped some 13 percent during this period of 1954–55—

the New York Times states.

Meanwhile, metals, rubber, lumber, and other products far removed from the agricultural field have gone up steadily and in some cases spectacularly in the last year and a half.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this revealing article printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO INFLATION, BUT PRICES ARE HIGHER—INDEXES REGISTER STABILITY ONLY BY VIRTUE OF SLUMP IN FARM PRODUCTS—INDUSTRIAL GOODS RISE—OVERALL BALANCE THUS HIDES AN INTERNAL IMBALANCE THAT MAY CAUSE TROUBLE

(By Richard Rutter)

"This may not be inflation we're having, but it's a pretty good facsimile."

That view was expressed the other day by a leading economist. His remark was in direct challenge to a key passage in the President's Economic Report, submitted to Congress on Tuesday. That message stressed that the record boom had been accomplished without the accompanying specter of inflation.

But had it?

Almost daily, for the past few months, news columns have carried reports of significant price increases. These have occurred mainly in basic industrial commodities, but some consumer items have been affected. Consider this sampling of price increases so far this month:

United States Steel raised charges for extras, or special handling charges, applying to carbon plates, sheets, and strip. The adjustment amounted to a 3 to 5 percent price increase.

The American Viscose Corp., the Nation's largest rayon producer, increased prices of high-tenacity yarns by 3 to 5 cents a pound. The material is used for tire cords. Three days earlier, American Enka Corp. had posted similar rises.

Zinc was raised half a cent a pound to 13½ cents, quoted at East St. Louis. The increase followed two recent half-cent increases for lead, the companion metal.

Standard Oil Co. (Ohio) raised heating and diesel fuels 0.3 cent a gallon. Esso Standard Oil Co. marked up marine diesel fuel by 13 cents a barrel, with upward adjustments in other grades.

Prices of Douglas-fir lumber jumped $5 to $6 a thousand board-feet.

Price rises of 2 cents a pound were put into effect by major producers of titanium dioxide.

Dow Chemical Co. added 1.5 cents a pound to the price of magnesium alloy.

BUYERS VERSUS INDEXES

Few executives are more on top of the price picture than the members of the National Association of Purchasing Agents. Buying of materials is their daily concern. Each month the trade group quizzes its members on the latest economic trend. And each month since September 1954 the purchasing agents have reported higher prices.

How does this jibe with the Government's price indexes, which indicate the cost line has remained stable?

To put it bluntly, these statistics are—not intentionally—misleading. They depict only the surface picture.

Most familiar to the average person is the consumer price index, compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is usually regarded as the cost-of-living barometer. In the past 18 months this key figure has actually declined from 115.2 in July 1954 to 114.7 in December 1955 (1947–49 equals 100). Food, of course, is a major part of the family budget; it constitutes almost 30 percent of the budget used in the consumer price index.

It will come as no new tidings to learn that the average retail prices of farm products have declined some 10 percent in the last 18 months. Every other major item in the cost-of-living yardstick—apparel, housing, gas and electricity, medical care, transportation, services, and the like—has risen substantially. So the apparent stability in the cost of living has been due entirely to a decline in food costs.

The businessman, however, is far more concerned with the wholesale price index. This also is compiled by the Labor Department and it keeps tabs on the host of materials on which industry depends.

What has happened to this important barometer over the last 18 months? The answer, again: Apparent stability. Between July 1954 and December 1955 the wholesale price index has moved up just barely, from 110.4 to 111.3 (with 1947–49 equaling 100).

But here, too, the drop in farm prices has kept the overall index in line. Wholesale farm prices have dipped some 13 percent during this period. Meanwhile, metals, rubber, lumber and other products far removed from the agricultural have gone up steadily and in some cases spectacularly in the past year and a half.

A breakdown of the wholesale price index tells the behind-the-scenes story.

Since July 1954, basic industrial materials have gone up in price as follows:

	Percent rise
Nonferrous metals	25.9
Rubber and products	19.7
Metals and products	13.2
Iron and steel	11.6
Lumber	9.4
Construction equipment	8.7
Petroleum and products	6.8
Gas	5.1
Paper	5.1
Coal	4.3

Another way to measure the price rise of basic materials is to compare the quotations in the "spot" or cash markets. Comparaing mid-July 1954, with mid-January 1956, this is the gap:

Iron, No. 2 grade, at Philadelphia (a ton):	
July 1954	$60.16
January 1956	62.66
Steel billets, Pittsburgh (a ton):	
July 1954	64.00
January 1956	68.50
Steel scrap, No. 1 heavy, at Pittsburgh (a gross ton):	
July 1954	32.00
January 1956	57.00
Copper, electrolytic domestic (a pound):	
July 1954	.30
January 1956	.43
Aluminum, ingots (a pound):	
July 1954	.21½
January 1956	.24^{11}/$_{10}$
Lead (a pound):	
July 1954	.14
January 1956	.16
Zinc, East Louis (a pound):	
July 1954	.11
January 1956	.13½
Tin (a pound):	
July 1954	.96¾
January 1956	1.02⅞
Rubber, No. 1 smoked sheets (a pound):	
July 1954	.23⅞
January 1956	.40
Gasoline (a gallon):	
July 1954	.15
January 1956	.16

What does it all add up to? A major price movement—upward. If not actual inflation (how high is up?), this shapes up as an alarming forerunner. It is a symptom—if not a tipoff—that as of now 1956 is an economic question mark. Strong forces are in effect that may well spell serious trouble.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, while food costs—30 percent of the average family's budget—have gone down,

the Times reports that every other major item in the cost of living yardstick—apparel, housing, utilities, medical care, transportation, and other services—has risen substantially.

Perhaps this stabilizes the overall national cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But what happens to the cost-of-living index of a farm farmer's family when the steel with which his machines are made, the rubber in the tires of his tractor, the lumber with which he repairs his barn, the fuel he burns, all keep going up and up while the price of wheat or meat or butterfat drops?

In other words, Mr. President, because the American farmer is being put through an economic wringer, this administration boasts of a stabilized cost of living. I think that on this basis, the administration's pride is hardly justified. When we have inflation in our industrial prices and deflation on our farms, we have little cause for gloating or for pointing with pride.

Mr. President, I trust that we shall enact legislation in this Congress to reverse the unhealthy and dangerous trend toward a farm depression of the last few years. We may not be able to undo overnight, with one farm bill, the dislocations and hardships which have been created by the neglect of this administration in the area of agricultural policy; but the bill which the able members of the Agriculture Committee have brought to the floor takes some essential immediate steps, and I am glad to support its major provisions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks letters from Mr. R. W. Schaad, of La Grande, Oreg., dated January 2, 1955, and from Lester H. Abraham, of Halsey, Oreg., of December 16, 1955, which also illustrate the feeling of the farmers of Oregon that action must be taken soon, and their willingness to give independent thought and imagination to the kind of steps which, they believe, deserve study as possible roads to progress in our farm policies.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

LA GRANDE, OREG., *January 2, 1956.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: I appreciated the letter from Mr. John G. Jones, dated December 8, requesting my thoughts and opinions on the proposed soil-bank program.

I have given this subject much thought and have also visited with many farmers on the subject. Personally, I do feel that some type of an emergency program needs to be put into effect to bring the income from agriculture and nonagricultural groups nearer parity. I am not too sure, however, that the soil-bank program will be the answer. This is also the opinion of many farmers in this area, including many Farm Bureau members. It appears that unless the incentive payments for placing farmland into a soil bank are sufficiently high to compensate the landowner or operator for this set-aside acreage, it will be one of the quickest methods of bringing disaster (financially) to many farmers. This is especially true of the smaller operators. Most of the smaller operators can hardly make a go of it with the present acreage he farms. Machinery must be utilized to the greatest efficiency (labor and capital as well) in order to provide the overhead of operation and necessities of life for the farm family.

The general opinion concerning the use of contracted acreage, should this program be placed into effect, is that absolutely no use except pasturing be made of this land. The reason for the pasturing privilege is that it is a known fact by general farmer and livestock men alike, that pastures as a whole are sadly depleted and overgrazed. If the general idea is to reduce cereal production and restore the productive capacity of the land, it could be done on more acreage at the same time by lightening the burden on all pasture lands, including the soil-bank lands.

We further suggest that the soil-bank land be rotated every 3 or 4 years in order to increase the fertility of a larger area of the farm than just a designated 5 or 7 percent.

In order to be a democratic program, we feel that it should not be compulsory. Instead of buying surplus commodities, put this amount of money into incentive payments. This system will keep the Nation's wealth in circulation instead of storage bins. It is our opinion, too, that a compulsory program will require too much administrative cost in enforcement. The most farmers are independent enough that he would rather do something voluntarily rather than by force.

Sincerely,

R. W. SCHAAD.

HALSEY, OREG., *December 16, 1955.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am sorry that I couldn't attend the Pendleton hearing on the farm situation. A little bit about myself. I am a member of the Oregon State Farmers Union, president of the Oakville local, and a member of the Oregon State Grange. I am speaking for myself only. I own a 140-acre farm, run about 2,000 head of poultry, and 4 head of milk cows. I am 39 years old.

In 1949, I did a gross volume of $21,000, and about 5 percent of that was net profit. Today, my gross volume will be around $12,000 or $13,000. Last year, for the first time in 17 years, I ended up in the red.

Up to now, I have been putting my profit back into my place in building up the soil and buildings. Two years ago I reached that point, but I had to mortgage my property to do that. The way it looks today I am beginning to wonder if I am going to meet the financial obliagtions that are rising higher and higher, day by day. I think that it is very important that you know the plight of the family farmer of today—the backbone of the Nation. It must be reckoned with that the farmer who is 40 years old today, and younger, is the one who is in the most serious trouble. That is, the majority of them. They have made the money, but they have plowed it all back in to raise a family and buy needed equipment.

The majority of farmers who were 40 years old 12 years ago, and who lived under the prosperous era, have paid up their mortgages and obligations, and have money in the bank.

I live in the center of the grass seed area in Oregon. Common rye grass is 4 cents a pound today; in 1953, it was 10 cents; in 1954, it was 8 cents. My 1955 crop is still in my own warehouse for lack of finding a buyer. I have about $40 per acre in it, figuring taxes, operating expenses, depreciation on the place and machinery. It all has to come from the soil over a period of years.

I was a member of the farm bureau for 2 years when I discovered that the organization was not talking for all the farmers but for the special interest boys who are farming the farmers. Businessmen are very highly organization, and labor is organized.

We farmers are nothing but sitting ducks waiting to be picked off because we are unorganized. That is where I feel the Government has its responsibility to the farmers, because for the farmers it is financially impossible for them to organize because they do not have the capital to operate. Some farmers always have some obligations to meet and he has to sell something at rock-bottom price to meet that obligation. I believe that it is part of the duty of the Government to act as mediator or administrator to attain fairness to all.

I am utterly opposed to the flexible program because it tends to eliminate small or family farmers, and it also fosters an autocratic type of farming. We have enough of that in the executive branch of our Government today. I am opposed to the two-price plan on wheat for the reason that the program is too burdensome. The machinery set up to operate it is too costly. Besides, why just support wheat? Why not write a farm program for all farmers?

I question the acreage-reserve plan for fear that will work hardships on family farmers. But I trust that you, Mr. Chairman, use your good judgment to what is right. I am not opposed to the food-stamp plan, but I am opposed to taking our surpluses and dumping them to get rid of them when there are hungry people in this world. That would be a very poor Christianity.

I am very much in favor of a program for all farmers based on the law of supply and demand, with 90 to 100 percent of parity, that support and subsidy to be used only in cases of difficult times, much preferring production payments over supports or subsidy; and, last, that each farmer be put on 1,800 units of production, which will cover 95 percent of the farmers. These limits are very essential in controlling surplus on the farm level. I would like to say that farmers are just as greedy a bunch as any other group of business. If they could make a million on an acre, they would holler for more. Therefore, these limitations are very important.

The present program we have today is like a rope around our neck, and we are being led around by our noses.

What I am in favor of is nothing but the old Brannan program.

My reason for the 1,800 units is simply let us farmers be our own boss; let us produce abundantly. We will govern our production when it is based on the unit system, for the law of supply and demand will control the overproduction. This program, I realize, will cost a lot of money to start, as the present administration has allowed parity to drop so far. During the war we had a unit system for deferment. One cow a unit, so many hogs, so many chickens were units. Payments for milk were put on a production basis.

Mr. Chairman, I frankly believe that if this program had been in effect today our farm economy would not be sagging as it is today. I also feel that our surplus food today is an asset, not a liability.

I also am sending copies to Senators MORSE and ELLENDER and to Representative GREEN.

Yours truly,

LESTER H. ABRAHAM.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, S. 3183, which I ask to have printed and to lie on the table until called up at a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this proposal, known as the Plainview plan, is very simple. It would establish price supports of 90 percent of parity on barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums, provided a certain percentage of the total cultivated acreage on each farm is taken out of production, over and above that set aside under the acreage reserve program in the Soil Bank Act. This percentage would vary each year according to the supply of feed grains on hand, up to a maximum of 15 percent, except that 20 percent would be laid out the first year.

Farmers would maintain their own soil-building practices on the layout land without direct payment for that purpose. Their compensation would come as a result of the 90 percent of parity on crops actually planted. Compulsory rotation of layout acreage would be required so the least productive land could not be devoted to this purpose every year. Cross-compliance as to the basic allotments would be required, but no marketing quotas or acreage allotments would be necessary on feed grains.

Farms with 20 acres or less of cropland would receive 90 percent of parity without complying with the layout requirements. The amendment would become effective upon approval by two-thirds of the producers of feed grains in a national referendum.

It is generally agreed that the two principal objectives of the present farm legislative proposals are, (1) to relieve the farmer from the price squeeze caused by the increase in the cost of production and the gradual lowering of the price of farm commodities, and (2) to reduce the surplus with its depressing effect on the market for all agricultural products. This amendment would contribute a great deal toward both goals.

As to the first, with the support levels recommended in the pending bill, farmers will be able to derive a fair return from the portion of their farms devoted to the basic crops. However, nationwide and on the average farm, the basic crops amount to only approximately 40 percent of the cultivated land. On the remaining 60 percent, the farmer is either losing money or is making such a small margin of profit that it is not feasible for him to continue. What the farmer urgently needs is another cash crop on which to realize a fair return.

This amendment would not only put more money into the farmer's pocket; it would also give him something to show his banker or his local representative of the Farmers' Home Administration, in applying for a loan. In many areas, it is not possible to obtain such a loan now because of the severe cutback in acreage allotments of the basic crops; and the lending agency cannot afford to take a chance that nonbasic commodities may be worth little or nothing when harvest time rolls around.

With reference to the second objective of this proposed legislation—to reduce the surplus of farm commodities—the simple answer, of course, would be for the farmer to stop producing those commodities in excess supply. However, many of our farmers have been reduced in their basic crops to the point where they have no cash and no credit. A farmer in financial difficulty cannot afford the large expenditures for new machinery required in changing from one crop to another, even where growing conditions permit, especially when the new crop may itself be in surplus within a year or two. He must have sufficient income to sustain himself and his family, so he continues to grasp for a straw. He goes on planting his land, hoping against hope that by harvest time the market for the crops he has planted will have strengthened.

Some of this land has been put into vegetables, hay, and permanent pasture; but by far the major part of it has gone into the production of feed grains—barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. As a result of the large production of these crops, cattle which formerly went to feed lots in the Midwestern States are now going to areas which produce feed grains. The corn farmer is being hurt, and the feed-grain farmer is going broke.

Farmers from the Panhandle and south plains area of Texas, New Mexico, and Oklahoma met recently in Plainview, Tex., and resolved to do something about this situation, or at least to ask Congress to do something about it. The plan which I am presenting is the outgrowth of that meeting. While they were producers of grain sourghums and particularly were concerned about that commodity, this problem is shared by all feed grain farmers. The program they have recommended now includes barley, oats, and rye in addition to grain sorghums.

These farmers stand ready to give up a percentage of their land without revenue for a fair and equitable price on the crops raised on the remaining land. They suggest a 20 percent reduction in 1956—that is, over and above all soil-bank or reserve acreage—because the least productive land will naturally be taken out first, and a maximum of 15 percent thereafter. However, it is well to bear in mind that this percentage is of the total cultivated acreage on each farm. Since few farmers have over 50 or 60 percent of their land in feed grains, the reduction in feed grain-acreage would run much higher, probably 30 to 35 percent the first year, and about 25 percent thereafter.

Agriculture Department figures show that nearly 70 million acres were planted to feed grains in the United States last year. Assuming a 30 to 35 percent reduction in 1956, somewhere between 21 million and 25 million acres would be laid out. After that, the layout land would run approximately 15 million acres per year.

On their 70 million acres of feed grains, American farmers in 1955 harvested approximately 2,229 million bushels of these commodities. It would not be completely accurate to say that 30 to 35 percent of this total production would be eliminated, because the farmer would naturally lay out his poorest land the first year. However, a safe prediction should be that 15 percent, or 334,350,000 bushels, would be removed from the market. After the first year, the percentage reduction should be about the same for both acreage and production.

The amendment which we propose will fit perfectly into the soil-bank provision of the committee bill. While the primary purpose of the soil bank plan—at least, the acreage reserve portion of that proposal—is to reduce acreage planted to basic crops, this amendment will attack another serious problem—the tremendous surplus of feed grains. Actually, it would also complete the job of the soil bank plan by taking the pressure of excessive competition away from the basic crops, especially corn.

For the information of other Senators, I ask permission to have included as part of my remarks a clipping from the Wall Street Journal, showing the serious nature of this problem; a summary of Agriculture Department reports setting out feed grain acreage and production by States; and a sketch of how this plan would operate on the average farm, in relation to the Soil Bank Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article, summary, and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

SORGHUM GLUT SPECTER RISES WHERE WHEAT, COTTON WERE CUT BACK—EXPANDED PLANTINGS WILL GET BOOST FROM NEW SEED THAT PROMISES 20 PERCENT HIKE IN YIELD

(By Jerry Bishop)

LUBBOCK, TEX.—Here on the table-flat plains of Texas, where the cotton country meets the wheat country, the specter of a new farm surplus is rising to plague the agricultural planners.

The up-and-coming promiser of unwanted plenty is sorghum. It's a plant with a stalk that resembles that of corn. But at its top, instead of a tassel, it has a head of grain.

Of all the burdens borne by Uncle Sam's price-propping Agriculture Department, there are none to compare with wheat and cotton. Some $4 billion of Federal funds is now tied up in idle heaps of the grain-and-fiber pair. And, to escape the wheat and cotton scourge, the Government has, in the past few years, ordered mighty cuts in the acreage planted to them. Northward from here toward Canada, more than 20 million acres have been whacked off wheatfields. Southward another 10 million acres have been cut from cotton.

A NEAT PILE GROWING

But farm folks in these parts have made an interesting discovery. A crop of sorghum just does fine in those idled acres. And the Government price props sorghum grain. So the farmers are now growing it like crazy. And, since they are producing it faster than livestock can eat it, a neat pile of the grain is already beginning to form in the lap of Government surplus holders.

A final note of irony: Plant wizards have just come up with a new hybrid sorghum seed that will produce 20 percent or more sorghum per acre than seed heretofore used. The De Kalb Hybrid Seed Co., one of the Nation's largest producers of hybrid-corn seed, is now busy shoveling out some 10,000 bushels of the new sorghum seed to farmers in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Nebraska. Farmers will pop it into the ground this spring.

Agriculture Department production figures bespeak the frenzied activity in sorghum growing. Prewar 1939 saw farmers produce only 53 million bushels of sorghum grain. Last year they harvested a thumping 232 million bushels. Now, with the potent new seed to help out, many talk freely of 300-million-bushel crops in the near future.

Officials figures also delineate the pileup of this grain in Government hands that's now being noted nervously by Federal officials. Two years ago, at the end of 1953, Government men had an undisturbing 5.8 million pounds of sorghum grain in their bins. But at the end of 1954 they had over 756 million pounds. And as 1955 wound up they had nearly 1.8 billion pounds.

COTTON LAND, WHEAT LAND

Here in this 1 Texas county (Lubbock County) some 170,000 acres have been taken out of cotton over the past 4 years—and just about all of it planted in sorghum.

"We don't keep records of sorghum acreage on the county level," say Walter Wells of the county's agricultural stabilization committee, "but it's almost a sure bet that every acre that was taken out of cotton in this country went into sorghum." A single Lubbock County farmer, T. A. Stevenson, switched 400 acres to sorghum just this past year.

Travel north from here into the wheat country and you hear the same story. Some 200 miles north of Dalhart, Tex., where farms are really man-sized, farmer Harold Hogue, who cultivates about 12,000 acres, put 4,600 acres of exwheat land in sorghum this past year.

To some it is disturbing spectacle. Howard S. Whitney, agricultural economist at Texas A. & M. College, figures that, counting on population and livestock growth, this big sorghum grain productivity will be fine, say 20 years from now. But for the near future he can't see how it's to be consumed. "There's just so much and no more that can be used," he says.

ANOTHER BASIC CROP

Agriculture Department men with an ear to the ground may well reflect uneasily over murmurings in these parts to the effect that sorghum is getting to be such a big boy that it ought to be considered a basic crop in the price-support machinery.

The basic staples—now corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—get better support treatment. The minimum at which they can be price-propped now is 75 percent of parity—and there's a bill in Congress aimed at making 90 percent mandatory again. Sorghum at present only has a 70 percent of parity support. The Agriculture Secretary could abstain from giving it any price support at all if he wanted to.

There's no big clamor yet to give sorghum a basic status. But the idea has its advocates. Such a one is E. B. Lindsay, farmer and manager of a grain elevator a few miles north of here at Abernathy. Says Mr. Lindsay: "They should include sorghum with corn in the support program."

He, like other sorghum farmers, points out that these two crops are almost identical in chemistry and in use. Both are used primarily as livestock feed. (Basic corn will be price-propped at 81 percent of parity this year, compared to sorghum's 70 percent.)

There is no precise definition of just what it takes to make a crop basic in the price supporting world. But the nearly 13 million acres of sorghum grain harvested last year was pretty close to cotton's 16-million-plus acres. It was 7 times the 1.8 million acres harvested in basic rice, 8 times the 1.7 million acres harvested in basic peanuts, and 9 times the 1.5 million acres harvested in basic tobacco.

Acreage and production of feed grains in the United States, 1955

State	Oats		Barley		Rye		Sorghum grain		Total feed grains	
	Acreage (thousand acres)	Production (thousand bushels)	Acreage (thousand acres)	Production (thousand bushels)	Acreage (thousand acres)	Production (thousand bushels)	Acreage (thousand acres)	Production (thousand bushels)	Acreage (thousand acres)	Production (thousand bushels)
Maine	83	2,490	2	52					85	2,542
New Hampshire	2	70							2	70
Vermont	21	735							21	735
Massachusetts	2	78							2	78
Connecticut	3	99							3	99
New York	710	29,820	88	3,168	12	252			810	33,240
New Jersey	41	1,681	23	851	12	252			76	2,784
Pennsylvania	793	34,099	222	8,436	22	462			1,037	42,997
Ohio	1,365	70,980	65	2,502	32	656			1,462	74,138
Indiana	1,315	68,380	82	2,542	96	1,584	1	35	1,494	72,541
Illinois	3,168	177,408	140	4,760	105	1,785			3,413	183,953
Michigan	1,466	67,436	129	4,580	40	600			1,635	72,616
Wisconsin	2,807	138,946	63	2,205	44	550			2,914	141,701
Minnesota	4,828	197,948	1,155	28,298	112	1,680			6,095	227,926
Iowa	5,738	258,210	20	660	22	374			5,780	259,244
Missouri	1,511	60,440	436	11,554	70	980	93	2,325	2,110	75,299
North Dakota	1,968	55,104	3,568	82,064	585	9,360			6,121	146,528
South Dakota	3,872	100,672	503	9,306	321	4,012	65	1,008	4,761	114,998
Nebraska	2,095	54,470	200	4,000	164	1,886	713	7,843	3,172	68,199
Kansas	1,171	32,202	688	12,384	69	690	2,772	31,878	4,700	77,154
Delaware	10	375	12	396	15	270			37	1,041
Maryland	73	2,993	86	3,354	15	292			174	6,639
Virginia	183	6,954	110	3,850	22	385			315	11,189
West Virginia	57	2,080	14	462	2	28			73	2,570
North Carolina	528	18,480	56	1,652	18	252	108	3,024	710	23,408
South Carolina	780	21,450	18	369	15	165	16	304	829	22,288
Georgia	644	16,744	9	162	10	95			663	17,001
Florida	40	960							40	960
Kentucky	164	4,592	125	2,875	20	270			309	7,737
Tennessee	327	9,483	80	1,440	21	220			428	11,143
Alabama	300	7,800					46	874	346	8,674
Mississippi	512	15,360							512	15,360
Arkansas	456	15,960	30	600			61	1,372	547	17,932
Louisiana	107	3,852					5	100	112	3,952
Oklahoma	706	12,002	224	2,912	70	490	1,070	13,375	2,070	28,779
Texas	1,492	26,110	148	2,072	17	110	6,297	144,711	7,954	173,003
Montana	375	13,875	1,397	41,910	19	304			1,791	56,089
Idaho	209	10,032	576	18,432	5	75			790	28,539
Wyoming	145	4,205	129	3,612	8	88			282	7,905
Colorado	146	4,526	355	8,875	34	238	660	4,950	1,195	18,589
New Mexico	21	567	28	700	7	70	363	4,356	419	5,693
Arizona	11	550	188	11,280			133	6,783	332	18,613
Utah	39	1,677	190	7,790	8	80			237	9,547
Nevada	6	246	16	560					22	806
Washington	166	7,636	732	18,300	31	326			929	26,262
Oregon	301	10,327	559	17,888	15	218			875	28,433
California	176	5,632	1,781	64,116	8	88	194	9,700	2,159	79,536
Total	40,933	1,575,736	14,247	390,969	2,066	29,187	12,597	232,638	69,843	2,228,530

Source: Crop Production, 1955 Annual Summary, published by Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

AVERAGE FARM OF 125 ACRES

(a) Twenty-five acres of submarginal land leased to the Government under the conservation reserve program.

(b) Forty acres basic crop allotment; 10 acres of this taken out of production under acreage reserve program.

(c) Twenty acres of layout land under Plainview plan (20 percent of cultivated land excluding conservation reserve).

(d) Forty acres of nonbasic crops, part of all of which would be feed grains.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. YOUNG, and

Mr. CHAVEZ) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 3, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"PRICE SUPPORTS—FEED GRAINS

"SEC. 104. Title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary shall make available through loans, purchases, or other operations price support at a level of not less than 90 percent of their respective parity prices to cooperators for any crop of barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums with respect to which two-thirds of the producers of such commodities voting in a referendum held by the Secretary for such purpose vote to approve the program provided by this section. Such referendum for the 1956 crop shall be held not later than May 1, 1956, and for any subsequent crop not later than January 1 of the year in which such crop is planted.

"'(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply in any year to commodities produced on any farm on which the cultivated acreage exceeds 20 acres unless—

"'(1) there is withheld from cultivation, grazing, and all other revenue-producing uses an amount of acreage on such farm (in addition to any acreage placed in the acreage reserve under subtitle A of the Soil Bank Act)—

"'(a) in the case of 1956 crops, not less than 20 percent of the cultivated acreage on the farm;

"'(b) in the case of 1957 and subsequent crops, not less than such percentage of the cultivated acreage on the farm as the Secretary determines may be so withheld without impairing supplies of agricultural commodities needed to meet domestic and export requiremnets;

"'(2) the acreage withdrawn from use in accordance with paragraph (1) has not been withdrawn for the purpose of such paragraph in any prior year, until all other acreage on such farm has been so withdrawn for prior years.

In determining, for the purposes of this section, the total cultivated acreage on any farm or any percentage thereof, there shall be included all acreage regularly used in the production of crops (including crops such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage), and there shall be excluded any acreage covered by a contract entered into under subtitle B of the Soil Bank Act. The percentage proclaimed by the Secretary under paragraph (1) (b) shall not be more than 15 percent, and shall be uniform for all farms. Such proclamation shall be made prior to the holding of the referendum under subsection (a).'"

INACCURATE STATEMENTS ATTRIBUTED TO CERTAIN REA COOPERATIVE OFFICIALS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to refer to an article written under the byline of Nat Caldwell and published in the Nashville Tennessean. The article was printed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD on February 8, at the request of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. The article includes some statements alleged to have been made by Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, at the recent meeting of the national association, at St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. President, at the outset I wish to state that if I had been in the position of the distinguished Senator from Montana, and if I had read an article of that sort, and if I had been chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is concerned with power and similar matters, probably I would have called attention to the article, too.

However, I wish to say that the statements quoted in the article and attributed to certain officials of REA cooperatives in the State of South Dakota are untrue, as has been stated to me by several of those who attended the session.

I wish to call attention to the statements on that score, and I desire to say something about Mr. Ancher Nelsen.

The article, which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on January 29, 1956, included, among other things, these paragraphs:

TO SILENCE MANAGER

A South Dakota cooperative president said that Nelsen appeared before his organization's board and warned them to silence its manager, long a critic of Nelsen's REA policies.

"Make Virgil Hanlon keep his slingshot in his pocket, if you want any help from me," the president, Alfred J. Pew, Madison, S. Dak., quoted Nelsen.

Hanlon, manager of the East River Elective Cooperative Association, has been active on key committees of the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association. He was a strong supporter of the Colorado-Ute resolution.

The articles contain this further paragraph.

The co-op now is applying to the Bureau of Reclamation for an additional power supply from Fort Randall Dam. "Nelsen said that we had no chance with the Bureau if he refused to help us and he would so refuse, if Hanlon was active," Pew said.

It happened that I was going through the city of Madison, S. Dak., on the 16th of February just past. That is the residence of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I stopped at the office of the East River Electric Cooperative for the purpose of conferring with Mr. Hanlon and leaving with him some information which I had assembled with respect to the charges for power from the Missouri River Basin projects. I found that the directors of the East River Electric Cooperative Association were in session. They invited me to sit with them for a time, both before and after lunch.

During the time I was present the matter of this article came up for discussion, and Mr. Alfred J. Pew, president of the association, flatly stated, in my presence, and to the group there, that Mr. Nelsen did not make any such statement as he, Pew, is quoted in the article as having said Mr. Nelsen made. I refer to this sentence:

"Make Virgil Hanlon keep his slingshot in his pocket, if you want any help from me," the president, Alfred J. Pew, Madison, S. Dak., quoted Nelsen.

I refer also to the following sentence:

"Nelsen said that we had no chance with the Bureau if he refused to help us and he would so refuse, if Hanlon was active," Pew said.

Both those quotations attributed to Mr. Pew were referred to during the discussion, while I was present at the meeting. Mr. Pew very definitely said that he made no such statement. That is, he did not quote Mr. Nelsen as having made any such statement.

I think the discussion indicated that, in a somewhat jocular vein, Mr. Nelsen did refer to Mr. Hanlon, and said, "Virgil, keep your slingshot in your pocket, and let us get down to business," or something to that effect. But it was in a jocular vein, and the import of the statement, as it was understood at the time, was that they should address themselves to the matter at hand; that there was no threat; and that there was no statement to the directors present that they should "make Virgil Hanlon keep his slingshot in his pocket."

In addition to Mr. Pew, the president, there were present at the meeting which I attended Mr. Dwight Dickason, vice president of the East River Cooperative, from Castlewood, S. Dak.; Mr. William Raabe, of Tyndall, S. Dak., chairman of the Operations Committee; Ralph Dennis, one of the directors, from Canova, S. Dak.; and Mr. Arthur Jones, secretary of the East River Cooperative, whose home is at Britton, S. Dak.

Mr. Jones was the only one of the group who thought to read into anything Mr. Nelsen said any suggestion of disfavor. The others were unequivocal in saying that they did not know how this article came to be written in that way. Mr. Pew used the phrase "I do not know how they got it screwed up that way." I talked with Mr. Pew on the telephone the other day, and he confirmed what I have said, that Mr. Nelsen did not make the statements attributed to him.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, first of all, I am very happy that my colleague happened to be present at the meeting of the East River Electric Cooperative board of directors. My hometown is the headquarters of the East River Cooperative. I am glad that my colleague has brought to the Senate this direct information, correcting the false impression which was conveyed by the article in the Tennessee newspaper.

I should like to supplement what my colleague has said by saying that when I read the article in the Appendix of the daily RECORD I wrote to a number of friends of mine in the REA in South Dakota, inquiring what it was that had given rise to the article, and what all the furor was about. I have received a few letters upon which I should like to comment briefly. The first is from Mr. Harry C. Anderson, of Lily, S. Dak. He is vice president of the board of directors. He attended the meeting at Madison, to which my colleague has referred, where this subject was discussed a week or two ago. In reply to my letter he says:

LILY, S. DAK., *February 15, 1956.*

Senator KARL E. MUNDT.

DEAR FRIEND: Several letters have come out of your office in regard to a newspaper article which appeared in a Tennessee paper and brought to the attention of the Senate by a Senator from Montana. Apparently you picked the East River Electric Cooperative directors at random in mailing out your letter, as several of us did not receive the letter. However, one of the directors who received the letter showed it to me today. I feel, as vice president of the board of directors and chairman of the joint commit-

tee, that I should write you concerning the matter referred to in your letter.

First, let me say Ancher Nelsen was asked to meet with us in St. Louis. This request came from the East River board. The meeting took place in the hotel and I was present through all of the discussion. After Mr. Nelsen was briefed on the difficulty we are having in coming up with a master contract with the Bureau, Mr. Nelsen offered the services of his assistant, Ralph Forman, who was present at this meeting, in helping us get the contract in a final and an acceptable form.

In leaving the room Mr. Nelsen looked to Mr. Hanlon and made some remark about Mr. Hanlon keeping his slingshot in his pocket. I don't think anything was said in the discussion to prompt this remark, as we had a very friendly discussion. And the remark was made in a joking manner. I did not take it very serious although some of those present take a different attitude, but that is a matter of personal opinion.

Ralph Forman was in Madison today attending a special board meeting carrying out the service that Ancher Nelsen said he would and I believe that considerable progress has been made on the master contract.

As far as I am concerned the news article carried several misstatements as well as being slanted.

Now. I don't have your letter or the part of the RECORD that you mailed to refer to at this time. But I want to make this point clear, that as far as I can determine the relationship between the East River board and Ancher Nelsen is no different now than it has been in the past. We may not be in full agreement on everything, but I am sure we respect each other just as much for that.

You probably will receive letters from some of the other directors too, so this matter gets cleared up to your satisfaction.

Thank you very much for your interest and I hope this has helped straighten out some questions you asked.

I remain, as ever,

HARRY C. ANDERSON.

Mr. Anderson describes the position Mr. Jones took in much the same manner as my colleague has described it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Jones agreed that the statement was not made in the way in which it was quoted.

Mr. MUNDT. That is additional confirmation as to the reaction of those who actually heard the statement.

I think it should be emphasized that here is a man who heard the discussion, who attended the meeting in St. Louis, and who is vice president of the East River Electric Cooperative of South Dakota. He says:

As far as I am concerned the news article carries several misstatements as well as being slanted.

I also received a letter from another member of the board, Mr. William Raabe, of Tydal, S. Dak., dated February 16, 1956. He says:

TYNDALL, S. DAK., *February 16, 1956.*

Senator KARL MUNDT,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I received your letter and copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I was glad to receive but was somewhat shocked when I read some of the statements made. I was present at the meeting when Mr. Nelsen met with the board of directors and Manager V. T. Hanlon, of East River Power Cooperative, Inc.

At this meeting we talked over matters concerning the master contract that East River Power Co-op is entering into with the USBR and at which time we asked Mr. Nelsen for some help, and it was at this time when Mr. Nelsen said he would do all he could to help us and also offered the help of Mr. Ralph Forman to get matter cleared with USBR and it was at this time when Mr. Nelsen said to Manager Hanlon to keep his slingshot in his pocket till we see what we could get done, but my thinking was that Mr. Nelsen said this in a pleasant, joking way. I also would like to mention that Mr. Hanlon has been disappointed with the USBR in getting things done and I am sure he has the backing of the entire board, which feel the same way.

In regard to Mr. Nelsen's meeting with the resolution committee, I have no comments to offer as I did not meet with this committee.

* * * * *

With personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WM. RAABE,

Director, East River Electric Power Co-op.

I have a third letter, from Mr. Dwight Dickason, of Castlewood, S. Dak., another member of the board. He writes along the same line. He says:

CASTLEWOOD, S. DAK., *February 16, 1956.*

Senator KARL MUNDT,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: It just so happened that your letter came just ahead of a special board meeting of East River, and this incident described in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was given a thorough airing. It so happened that Senator CASE was in town and was invited to sit in.

As to the slingshot incident just as Mr. Nelsen was leaving the room, as I remember his words and with a smile on his face the words he used were "See that Virgil keeps his slingshot in his pocket." However, we had not been discussing bureau power allotments, we had been discussing our master contract.

In the discussions that ensued yesterday both Mr. Pew and Mr. Jones denied making such statements. As to what happened in regard to the other activities mentioned I would not know. You may check further with Senator CASE as to the reactions of the board when this incident was mentioned.

Respectfully yours,

DWIGHT DICKASON.

I think it is important to clear up this matter, because I do not know where the editor of the Tennessee newspaper got his information. I know our good friend from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] put the editorial into the RECORD in good faith, because he saw it in the newspaper and had no reason to dispute its accuracy. However, it is important to correct this statement, because it may be designed to drive a wedge between the REA co-ops in South Dakota and the REA Administration in Washington. Quite the contrary from the implication in the article is true. We have had a most successful experience with REA in South Dakota from its inception. I should like to point out, for example, that REA electric loans in South Dakota during calendar year 1955 reached the highest level since 1950. They totaled $5,300,000. This was $2 million more than had been made in either of the last 2 years of the previous administration.

In the telephone program, the REA record in South Dakota is even more impressive. It is a matter of record that since the present administration took office, telephone loans in the State have increased 360 percent.

Quite obviously, with a record like that, no right-thinking official of REA in South Dakota, and no REA official in Washington would be critical of Ancher Nelsen or the administration of the REA program.

I should like to point out further that in South Dakota there are 34 borrowers of electric loan funds. It is also true that at this time there is only one South Dakota borrower who has an application on file with REA to borrow additional money. More than anything else, this indicates the good service and prompt attention REA is giving the needs of its borrowers. It also indicates the success with which REA is being operated and administered at the South Dakota end of the line.

Adequate funds are available for the rural electric systems of South Dakota to carry on the work of extending their lines and improving their service. As a matter of fact, they have a total of $10 million in unadvanced loan funds, which they may draw down at any time to meet their needs.

Not one of the South Dakota borrowers is delinquent in paying back the money borrowed from REA. The borrowers maintain this record in the face of mounting debt payments. This can be attributed to the administration's policy of selective help to borrowers, that is, providing help where it is needed. It can also be attributed to the splendid, efficient administration of Ancher Nelsen.

The REA record of this administration is one of acceleration. Nowhere is there evidence of a slow down, but on nearly every front there is evidence of speed up and of close attention to the needs of borrowers.

I believe that fact needs to be spread on the record, so that those who might have formed a false impression from an inaccurate statement reported in a Tennessee newspaper can have the facts not only from the record of performance in South Dakota, and from direct first-hand information given men and my colleague, when my colleague attended the meeting of the East River Cooperative, but also from the letters sent to me by the directors of cooperative in South Dakota who attended the meeting and who heard make the statement which was referred to in the newspaper.

Mr. President, in the West we have the faculty sometimes of saying things in jest or with a smile on our face which, when reduced to cold print, do not mean what they were intended to mean when they were said. I have heard Mr. Hanlon and Mr. Nelsen kidding each other a great deal, and that is quite understandable, Mr. Nelsen being a Republican, and Mr. Hanlon being a Democrat. Neither one of them was engaged in playing politics. When they kid one another it is all done in good fun and with a smile on their faces, and it is so understood by all who have been associated with them. It is certainly not cricket to put down in cold print a statement taken out of context, devoid of the smile, and devoid of the tone of voice, and imply that REA is assuming a dictatorial policy in South Dakota, because such is definitely not the case.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the contribution which my colleague has made to the debate and his

comments, as well as the letters which he has read into the RECORD.

I wish to say, in addition, that I know that Ancher Nelsen has been exerting every effort he appropriately can exert to arrive at a solution of the problem of the contract which has existed between the East River Cooperative and the Bureau of Reclamation, which is the agency selling power from the Missouri River Basin dams.

I know that Mr. Nelsen has spoken at various times with me about the matter. He had his representatives at Madison on the day to which allusion has been made. To the extent that the Rural Electrification Administration has been able to help the East River Cooperative in getting the contracts approved in the way the East River Cooperative desired to have them approved, the REA has done so.

I should like to conclude my remarks by saying that I appreciate the presence on the floor of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I had told him I would say something about the matter. I wish the RECORD to be perfectly clear that I know he inserted the editorials in the RECORD in good faith, and had no knowledge that the incident was not as it was reported.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, it is obvious that I have no personal knowledge of the accuracy or inaccuracy of the statement contained in the newspaper. It is a nationally known journal, and I assumed that it printed what it thought was the truth. I shall be glad to call to the attention of the editors of the newspaper the statements the Senators from South Dakota have made and to have the editors determine whether they will accept the correction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate very much the statement by the distinguished Senator from Montana.

I conclude my remarks by asking permission to insert at this point in my remarks extracts from an address by Mr. Nelsen, Administrator of the REA, as printed in the February 1956 issue of Rural Electrification.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today in the year 1956, I am sure every one of us is hopeful that the next 20 years will parallel the success of the past. Therefore, I think it is most appropriate that we now look to 1976.

The great strength of our country was developed by our people. They weren't looking for a welfare state. They were looking for the opportunity to think for themselves and to do things for themselves. There is much to help guide us as we adjust our course toward 1976.

Today we sometimes see signs that the old-time guiding principles are being forgotten. Yet these principles were so effective for those early champions of democracy.

But consider, for example, what the REA program would have been like if it had just been a big government project, if it had not been built upon the foundation of local independence. Suppose, for a minute, that the REA program had been a power program laid down by bureaucrats from Washington—as some have advocated. Your ideas, your judgment, and your independence in that case would have been excess baggage. Unwanted and unused. Do you think you would be where you are today with a program like that? We didn't let it happen and we mustn't.

During 1955 average monthly usage per farm served by REA borrowers was 245 kilowatt-hours. This means that farm usage has doubled in the last 7 years. We have barely made a start at what can be accomplished in adapting electricity to farm production.

In face of the increasing consumption, what should be our attitude toward promoting greater usage? It is, of course, vitally important that you encourage increased usage not only as a service to your consumers but also as a means of balancing your load and thus improving your load factor. This is a sound way to increase your net revenues.

Today the rural electrification plant representing the REA program is relatively new despite the 20-year age of the program. The average age for electric distribution plant today is about 9 years. Consequently, wear and tear has not been of much significance so far. You have had to spend very little for replacements and give very little attention to maintenance. Experience with outside plant in operation for 9 years has been that the wearing out rate is less than one-fifth of 1 percent.

This brings us to the point that is of concern to you as you look toward 1976. Your plants are just now reaching the age at which the wearing out increases sharply. By 1976 it will be 15 times the present rate.

On the basis of the loads we can see developing in the next 20 years, new generation plants and related transmission will have to be built by your power wholesalers in the amount of an estimated $3 billion.

We can expect that only a part of this new capacity will have to be built with REA financing. On the assumption that the generation and transmission construction within the program continues at approximately the present rate, you are likely to be looking for loans approaching a billion dollars.

Now then, add these generation and transmission needs to the distribution needs and you have about $6 billion.

In other words, our rough calculation indicates that your systems will need approximately twice as much capital in the next 20 years as you have had in the first 20.

Let us think of this point in terms of the challenge it presents to you for the next 20 years. In many respects it is a greater challenge than that which faced us two decades ago. If it took good farmer commonsense to get our program started, it will take even more of that same good commonsense to carry on successfully.

In the country today there are about 300,000 unelectrified farms. Nearly all of these can be electrified in the next 5 years. But it is up to you. At the present time, your co-ops are connecting 8 out of every 9 farms being connected.

Undoubtedly, there will be a few farms which, because of isolation or other reasons, will not be electrified, but these ought to be mighty few.

Cost of power is a highly important factor in our financial operations. And as we look at the power-cost picture today, we must recognize that the cost of the essentials to electric power production—materials, supplies, labor, taxes, and financing—has risen sharply during the last 10 years.

What effect will this have upon your operations?

System improvements are going to require more and more of your attention as the consumption we spoke of a few minutes ago continues to rise. And at the same time, you are seeing your return per kilowatt-hour decreasing as consumers through their increased usage move into lower rate blocks.

Next, let us take the matter of power supply and procurement.

Because of the importance and complexity of power-supply situations, REA concentrates more attention on this and related aspects than any other one thing. Right at the top of our electric organization, we have men assigned to do nothing but follow nuclear power developments, for example. And we have made it a specific assignment to help borrowers with power contracts.

By working with one group of cooperatives, new contracts were negotiated that will save the co-ops $100,000 in 5 years. Power costs have been reduced from a wholesale cost of 1 cent a kilowatt-hour in 1941 and 8.2 mills in 1951 to the figure of 7.6 mills for 1954 and down to 7.4 for 1955. Part of this reduction is due to improved load factor, but part of it is also due to improved wholesale contracts.

We all need to remember that the availability of low-cost hydro power in many sections of the country is limited.

Atomic energy is a new and exciting possibility for rural electrification. But many of those who are authorities in the nuclear power field believe that it may be at least 5 and possibly 10 years before competitive cost power is produced from reactors.

Nowhere is commonsense more urgently needed than in the consideration of power supply. There are great benefits springing from the ownership of a generation plant—adequate supply, independence of operations, the satisfaction of being your own boss which is a traditional aim of all good Americans. But in the consideration of powerplants, we need to look at the act itself. Nowhere in the act is the administrator permitted to use as justification, pride of ownership or prejudice. We shall, however, proceed to finance powerplants when the interest of the farmer can better be served by so doing.

Let us now take the matter of public relations. I am sure all agree on the importance of this. The picture others have of your cooperative and its activities will play a big part in how you fare on the road to 1976.

You have often heard me say that I believe one of the greatest threats to this program is the politics that is sometimes played with it.

I am sure we have all had occasion to see co-ops, now and then, fall victim of political intrigue. Partisan advocates can—and have—split co-ops wide open. I know of one instance where the co-op—or I should rather say in this case, the farmers—stands to lose a valuable source of power simply because somebody tried to use this program for political advantage. I know of another instance where the contribution of a co-op mailing list to one political faction, but not to another, cost the co-op and the program public support that was badly needed. * * *

Perhaps our best guide in public relations is the law itself and the legislative history that accompanied its enactment. The act calls for the extension of rural electrification and telephone service to our rural people. And that has to be our objective. What's more, it is commonsense that the farmer and the general public can understand and fully endorse. It is your soundest course to 1976.

Applications for telephone loans are coming in this year at a slightly higher level than for any year in the program to date. Our telephone loans are up and our backlog is the lowest it has ever been. We have made more than $40 million in loans during the last 6 months, the largest amount in any similar period of the program.

During the 1956 fiscal year, we expect to reach the $80 million telephone loan program we had set as our goal.

Overall processing time for loans is about half of what it was a couple of years ago and we are advancing funds at nearly double last year's rate. That means telephone building is proceeding at new record levels.

We have been able to cut the number of delinquent telephone borrowers from 33 at the end of December 1954 to 23, even though a larger number of borrowers are now in a debt-service status.

When they come to us and ask for REA loans to provide modern dial service to the farmers in their areas, we make the loans, provided feasibility and the requirements of the act are met.

Similarly, when a cooperative or mutual can do the job, we give them all the help we can. We hope that no one will attempt to pit cooperatives against independents. This will tend only to slow down expansion of rural telephony.

I am pleased to report to you that the President in his recent budget message indicated strong and vigorous support for the program. The new budget provides for approval of loans for electrification in the amount of $185 million in 1957, which is the same as that for 1956 and $20 million higher than in 1955. It also provides for approval of loans for rural telephones in the amount of $80 million, the same as for 1956 which is $27 million higher than for 1955.

The President said that we are going to go right ahead with our policy of meeting the farmers' needs for electrification and telephones. And I likewise pledge you that our efforts of the past 3 years will continue and that we will work without fear or favor in the interest of the American farmer.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, if that is the Senator's wish.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the farm bill, S. 3183. In doing so I wish especially to commend and to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] for his steadfastness to the duties of his committee, for his diligence, and for his perservance. I know of no man who has given more time, more thought, and more hard work to the preparation of legislation in one of the most complex and difficult fields than has the senior Senator from Louisiana. I think it is fair to say that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has performed its task of seeking information relating to the problems affecting our farm economy with the utmost care and steadfastness of purpose.

As the Senate knows, the committee has conducted hearings in many States. For weeks and weeks hearings were held in Washington. There were many hours of executive sessions. There have been prolonged discussions with representatives of the major farm organizations as well as with official representatives of the Department of Agriculture.

I am particularly pleased to note that the farm question is one which has received more public attention than has almost any issue which has been before the Congress.

This debate may well be one of the most crucial of the debates of this session of the Senate. It is another milestone in the historic struggle of American agriculture for equality of treatment in our economy.

Mr. President, I intend speaking at considerable length during this debate, because I am convinced that there is an urgent necessity to clarify the atmosphere and to correct the historic record of much of the barrage of misinformation, calculated or through sheer lack of knowledge, which has distorted in the public eye the position of the American farmer and the justice of his fight for economic equality.

To my colleagues who are present I may say it is my intention not only to speak this afternoon, but, if permitted, to speak tomorrow, and possibly I shall have to ask to speak even later than that. I have prepared a very substantial record with much detailed documentation. This record runs to more than 350 pages, and it is my intention to present every word of it.

As one Senator, I have witnessed a barrage of advertising, propaganda, and so-called public relations on the farm question which is without precedent in American history. This propaganda, emanating not only from political circles, but from the Department of Agriculture, has done much to confuse public thinking on the vital economic and social issue of agricultural legislation.

It is my sole purpose in the opening stages of the debate, insofar as my own participation is concerned, to set the record straight, to get the facts before our colleagues, and, hopefully, to get the facts before the American people.

I regret the necessity of using this forum to expose false assumptions which have been accepted by the American press as fact, primarily because of the authorship of some of this misinformation coming from official circles in the Government. Yet, I feel there is such a necessity, if we are properly to understand just what is really at stake in our forthcoming vote.

I champion American agriculture upon the floor today, as I have repeatedly in the past and shall continue repeatedly to do in the future, because it is a minority—an economic minority and a population minority—a mistreated and neglected minority. It is a minority less organized than most, with, by its very nature, less opportunity to use other means of protecting the inherent rights of those engaged in farming to share fully in the privileges of our democratic society, economically as well as socially.

It lacks the power of concentrated big money to wield influence in its behalf.

It lacks the power of organized economic bargaining to protect it from exploitation in the marketplace.

Yet it has on its side the greatest power of all, namely, the power of justice—of common American justice. If the American people can but know the facts, then understanding the facts, they can translate and relate their views to their representatives in Congress, and justice will prevail.

Our democracy's blessings are intended for all the people. For a democracy to survive, its economic opportunities must be shared by all the people.

My concern for agriculture is basically justice for our farm families, and the strengthening of our democracy by keeping the balance of economic opportunity from being tilted too far in any one direction.

I digress to say that the first moral requirement of Government is justice to its citizens—political justice, social justice, economic justice. The facts of today can lead but to one conclusion: That the American farm family is not being given economic justice, or is not even being afforded the opportunity to obtain economic and social justice.

My concern for farmers is the same concern I have always held for any underprivileged group needing someone to speak out in their behalf. It is with considerable regret, therefore, that I sometimes note a lack of concern for the plight of farm families among some of my good friends who are eagerly crusading for justice to all minorities.

It is with even deeper regret that I see great organs of the American press taunt some of us who dare champion the farmer as mere self-seeking politicians, capitalizing upon the bad odor they themselves have created in the public's mind around the honorable word politician.

If they must persist in refusing to give some of us credit for deeply held convictions, let them at least examine the facts to see if our motivation is politics alone.

Farmers are becoming increasingly smaller in number and in percentage of our population, and therefore decreasingly important politically if that is man's only concern for his fellowman.

Frankly, it is merely simple arithmetic. There are not as many people on the farms today as there were a few years ago; and from a point of view directly related to the votes, the votes are not there. Therefore, I think it is quite evident or obvious that what we are really talking about is fair play, equality of treatment, and economic justice for each and every American; and in this particular debate, for the American farmer.

The influence of the American farm population, politically and economically, is but a shadow of that of the great industrial giants of our day, or even, of the vast numbers of our working men and women banded together in organized labor. The political reward for championing the cause of the farm population is even less—unless a man is dedicated to justice and feels compelled to reckon with his own conscience.

Mr. President, in past years I have traveled the length and breadth of the land, visiting hundreds and hundreds of farm homes. I have traveled the highways and byways of the State of

Minnesota as much as, and in some instances, I am sure, more than, most of our citizens. I have attended the family picnics, community picnics, the meetings of farm bureaus, Farmers' Union locals, the Grange, and cooperatives. I think I know those farm people. I have listened to their expressions of their problems. I have attended their community gatherings. I have spoken at their REA meetings. I have been in their homes. I am happy to say that my wife and children many times have been with me.

During the past year I have concentrated more of my time and attention upon the problems of agriculture than upon any other single aspect or area of the legislative responsibility which is mine in Congress. I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I want the record to be quite clear that long before I came to the Senate I was deeply concerned about the economic and social challenges and problems which faced our farm families. I am very proud to say that my father before me, as a State legislator, a city official, and a merchant, was equally concerned.

As mayor of the city of Minneapolis, it was my privilege on several occasions—yes, on many occasions—to visit with, talk to, and participate with many farm groups that came to the city of Minneapolis. Furthermore, I would travel from time to time in the outlying areas of our State, representing my city of Minneapolis at the great agricultural gatherings.

Therefore, let any of the critics and cynics go out with me among the farm people and spend as much time as I have spent with them. Let the critics and the cynics see at first hand the basic worth of the farm people as individuals; as human beings instead of statistics. Let them come to know the sturdy character of these fine Americans, and to know of their devotion to farming as a way of life, rather than simply as a way to make a living.

Any Member of the Senate who would have attended the hearings held before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would have been proud to witness the high caliber of citizenship and the intelligent participation of our farmers as they came to give their testimony. It gave me new faith in American democracy. It made me understand more clearly and more precisely the great secret power of this country, namely, the maturity of judgment, the good commonsense, the sense of justice and fair play, which exist in the great body of American citizenry.

If those who are critical or cynical will review and study history, in our own country and abroad, they will gain an understanding of what a stabilizing factor the people of the soil and a sound agriculture have proven to be to countries and governments. Let them review the writings and reflect on the vision and foresight of Thomas Jefferson and others of our early founders, who recognized so well the vital importance of farm families to the preservation of the kind of democracy they were creating.

I remind the Senate that no society ever was destroyed when its agriculture and its farm families were given an equal opportunity to share in the fruits of their toil and in the benefits of organized society; or, conversely, that every nation which has gone down the pathway of totalitarianism or tryranny, or every country or civilization which has been destroyed, has first witnessed or experienced the exploitation of its human resources, and then of its great natural or physical resources.

When the people are taken care of, and when the people and their governments will manage and preserve and safeguard their God-given natural resources, we have the underpinnings of a strong, sturdy, and wholesome society.

The great responsibility of this Government is ever to be concerned about our people; to be concerned about justice and fair play for our people. Then the Government and the people, working together, will preserve, conserve, and develop the great God-given resources of land, water, timber, and minerals with which this country is so abundantly blessed.

And then let those who are critics of our farmers or those who attempt to speak up for our farms tell me that farm people are not supposed to share equally in our economy, that they are supposed to be just "second-class citizens." Or let them review the blunt record of facts and figures I intend to present, and then tell me farm people are sharing equally in our economy.

I offer these introductory remarks merely to emphasize how deeply significant the issue before us really is.

It is more than an economic issue. It is an issue which tests the whole moral fiber of the Senate of the United States, the sense of fair play and equal treatment which is supposed to be characteristic of the American system.

What is involved is far more than a matter of who is going to get farmers' votes next November, and who is not. No man can predict that. Farmers, thank God, are independent-minded people. They have been a balance wheel in this country and in every other country for generations.

It is far more than asking a beneficent government to hand out a relief "dole" to needy farm people. It is really a matter of preserving the very keystone of our democracy by proving to ourselves and to the world that American democracy offers equal opportunity for rural resident and city resident alike and that justice does not stop at our metropolitan boundaries.

In a democracy, economic justice is as vital as legal justice.

We who are fighting for justice for agriculture must fight an uphill battle against growing cynicism, misrepresentation, and regrettably, at times, outright exploitation.

There are those who would prefer, for their own selfish ends, seeing a large segment of our population at their economic mercy.

There are others who just do not care, as long as they are doing all right themselves. At least, it would so appear. I hope that I am most wrong.

There are others so smugly blind that they refuse to look beyond their preconceived notions, and repeatedly parrot unfounded assumptions and generalities that have been dangerously harmful, not only to agriculture but to our entire country's economy.

It is regrettable, indeed, that in a country so dependent upon agriculture as a basic source of sustenance and raw material, the greatest body of the opinion-influencing press and periodicals of this country have let themselves fall into one or the other of those three categories.

Now I should like to outline the aims of this debate insofar as my participation is concerned.

Perhaps this debate should be regarded as an opportunity to educate our nonfarming people, not only about the problems of farm people, but of their own stake in those problems. There really is not a separate farm problem in America, Mr. President. It is a national problem, a national question. Every part of our economy is interdependent. We all rely on one another. This great productive American economy cannot long endure if it finds itself out of balance, with certain segments on the ascendancy and other segments moving toward recession and depression.

Perhaps this is an opportunity to correct much of the misinformation which is still being given out across the countryside. I read it every day, Mr. President, and I have heard a great deal of it over television, even within recent days, under official auspices.

In any event, it shall be my intention during my participation in the debate to correct the misconceptions.

My remarks will be divided into sections covering where we really stand in American agriculture today, how we got there, how agriculture's plight threatens the rest of our economy, and what we can and should do about it.

In discussing these topics, I hope to explode a lot of myths—and, may I say, very cleverly designed myths which have been foisted upon the American people month after month and year after year.

I intend to challenge many of the assumptions so blindly accepted as fact today—usually by people who are more willing to echo wisely the mouthings of others which just happen to readily fit their own comfortable little niche of preconceived impressions, than they are willing to put such assumptions to the careful scrutiny of test against facts and experience.

The first myth which has gained too much acceptance in this country is the idea that all this talk of farmers suffering economic hardship is just hogwash; that, really, farmers are mostly riding around in Cadillacs and puffing 50-cent cigars—the kind of impression Harper's magazine recently tried to create, and others have contributed to. It is just about as true as having farmers think everyone in New York lives in a penthouse and gads around nightclubs all night, just because that is the way they see it in some movies.

Next, the idea that 90 percent of parity is either "rigid" or "high."

Our good friends in the working press have been told it time and again, and I can well understand why on occasion

they have had to accept, as fact, the argument that 90 percent of parity is "high" and "rigid."

If newspapers think that, they can say so as views of the editors in the editorial columns. I want to set the record straight, so far as news columns are concerned, to the effect that 90 percent is neither "high" nor "rigid," and I shall spend some time in that discussion. It is just as accurate as the different media of communication—radio, television, the press, and periodicals—labeling off-shore oil as tidelands when we were talking about something miles behind the ebb and flow of the tide. Yet when we discussed the off-shore lands, the word "tidelands" was continually used, even though it was not a subject of debate.

Yet it is these devastating distortions which have helped rob the American farmer of justice at the hands of his own society. I have yet to read the newspaper that defines FHA housing loans as "high" and "rigid," simply because the Government guarantees the banker 90 percent of such loans. Now, if a 90-percent-crop loan by the Government to the farmer is "high" and "rigid," then why is not a 90 percent guaranteed mortgage loan to the bankers for the building of a home labeled "high" and "rigid"?

Then there is the oft-repeated assumption—another myth, by the way; and this one is really a lulu—that all of Secretary Benson's woes came from an "inherited mess"—and I use the phrase "inherited mess" with quotation marks at each end, for it is Mr. Benson's own special phrase—of surplus commodities, and that these surpluses are the cause of the present farm depression. It is about time some skeptical reporter asked the Secretary for facts, instead of talk. I intend providing such facts. I intend to disprove, by facts from our own Government's records, the repeated misleading assertions of both our Secretary of Agriculture, and regrettably, our President. Those facts are available to the White House and to the Department of Agriculture. In fact, those statistical tables and facts have been prepared by the Department of Agriculture, through its research and statistical divisions.

I suggest that the Secretary of Agriculture read those facts. I know that apparently he did not read the article published in Harper's magazine; and I can understand that the Secretary of Agriculture has been busy. He has been busy traveling all over the country, making political speeches. I merely suggest in a most friendly and charitable manner that he stop long enough to read the statistical tables and factual sheets of his own Agricultural Marketing Service, of his own research division. Then, after reading them, he can brief them for the President; he can put them on one sheet, and can go to the White House and present them to the President.

Apparently the President knew these facts when he ran for office in 1952, because in 1952 he was in favor of a farm program that I support. But since 1952, apparently the facts have not been reaching the White House. That may be due to the leadership of the Department of Agriculture.

Of course, there is also the myth that lower price supports curb production. This is a myth which has been widely developed. It has had the full emphasis and weight of the propaganda and public relations machine of the Republican administration—the myth that lower price-supports will curb production, and—and this is the opposite side of that coin—that 90 percent supports will simply stimulate more surpluses. We read that every day. Scarcely a day passes that that myth is not dinned into the ears and minds of the American people. I respectfully suggest that those who bring these matters to the attention of the American people, through the various media of communication, have not even seemed to bother quoting anyone as saying it; they simply assume it to be so.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AND FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HUMPHREY AFTER MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets tomorrow the Senator from Minnesota be recognized at the conclusion of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Minnesota plans to speak for an additional 10 or 15 minutes at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will, at the end of that time, do me the favor of moving that, pursuant to the order which has been entered, the Senate stand in adjournment, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to do so.

Let me ask whether I correctly understand that at the conclusion of the session today, the Senate will stand in adjournment, rather than in recess.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, I was speaking of the myth that lower price supports curb production, and that 90 percent supports stimulate more surpluses. As I have said, that myth has been repeated again and again, and it has been assumed that that is so. I challenge anyone to prove it. I make this flat statement to the Members of this body: I will take on all comers who may disagree with what I have just said, and who may disagree with the argument I am making. I challenge anyone to prove the validity of the statement that lower price supports have curbed production, or that 90 percent of parity supports are responsible for creating our surpluses. Those who disagree with me can take either side of that coin. I shall be here on the floor of the Senate, prepared to argue and debate, and to document my case by facts, that that myth is exactly what it is termed—namely, a myth. I challenge anyone to disprove in the course of this debate the facts I shall present to burst the balloon of this huckstering fallacy.

Mr. President, I have waited a long time for this opportunity. I have been preparing for four years for it; and, as is said out my way, I am "loaded for bear"—wanting to go to the mat with any and all comers. These great issues relate to our agricultural policy; these myths affect our decisions on sound agricultural policy.

I want to end, once and for all time, the oft-repeated falsehood that the only program the Democratic Party offers for agriculture is 90 percent of parity, that all we want to do is to turn back to the past. You know, Mr. President, the fact that the press or our critics just say these things, does not make them so.

The record speaks for itself. Perhaps our critics do not bother looking at the record. For that reason, I intend to remind them, again and again, of what the vast majority of the Democratic Party have sought for agriculture, what we have done for agriculture, and what we propose doing for agriculture.

If they want to invite a test comparison as to which party has held an open and receptive mind to new ideas and new approaches, and which has had the imagination and foresight to come forward with such ideas, I shall welcome it. I assure you I shall not let the record of this debate close without providing, for the RECORD and those willing to read it, documentation of the Democratic Party's insistence upon a broad, over-all approach to improving conditions in agriculture, rather than full reliance upon price-supports alone.

Mr. President, there may be some who may say, "Apparently the Senator from Minnesota is going to treat this subject in a partisan manner." However, Mr. President, that is not my intention. The chairman of our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry admonished every member of the committee that we were to approach this problem on an economic basis, on the basis of what we deemed best for American agriculture, and not in a partisan manner.

But, Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not call to the attention of this body the fact that a considerable sum of money, running into the hundreds of thousands of dollars, is being expended for spot announcements on practically every radio station in the midwest, and on full-page advertisements in leading newspapers, and on half-page advertisements in country newspapers—a barrage of propaganda the like of which the American people have never witnessed or experienced on any other issue before

the Congress. There is talk about lobbying in connection with the natural gas bill. Mr. President, I hope the oil and gas industry will not feel offended when I say they are pikers, they are really second-rate lobbyists, compared to the kind of lobbying that has been going on in recent days to get through what some persons call the Eisenhower farm program.

Of course, Mr. President, no Eisenhower farm program is before the Senate. I do not know what those who refer to such a program expect the Senate to vote on, because the program before the Senate is the proposal of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a nice little half-page advertisement from the Thorp Courier, of Thorp, Wis. This advertisement is typical of much that is being published.

It says:

Help Eisenhower pass the new farm program.

Eisenhower does not even have a vote in the Senate. How can he pass a farm program? We have a separation of powers in this Government. We do not have kings and monarchs—at least, I hope not. The Senate and the House of Representatives will pass a farm program.

Next I read about the Eisenhower-Republican nine-point farm program. As we go down the list, we find that most of that program, including the soil bank, has already been offered by the Democrats, long before. I shall discuss that subject later.

Proposals to permit faster surplus disposal have heretofore been offered by Members of Congress, both Democratic and Republican.

Another point is to protect the family-type farms by limiting the size of price support loans. The junior Senator from Minnesota has been a sponsor of such a program for more than a year, long before the President got it in his message.

I think the record should be clear, that there is no Eisenhower farm program before the Senate. There is a program which was designed, after many weeks of hearings, by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and brought forward by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If the Republicans wished to publish advertisements calling for the support of the Ellender farm program, or the program supported by the Democratically controlled Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, there would be some legitimacy to such advertisements.

It is others who have held closed and sterile minds on some of these agricultural questions. It is others who have refused to look at anything new. It is others who still refuse to even objectively consider or give a fair analysis to any new approach advanced by Democrats in our constant efforts to improve and extend the coverage of our already broad scope of farm legislation.

The facts are on our side. Yet the adjectives in the press still go to the opposition. This administration can suggest virtually nothing, and overnight it becomes a bold, new, sweeping, many-sided approach to aiding agriculture. Well, it will be interesting to hold the record up to the light of public exposure, as I intend to do in the course of this debate.

There are many more myths that need exploding, and many more that I will explode.

The smug generalities in the minority report on this bill is in itself an indictment of what I consider to be the hucksterings tactics this administration has brought into our legislative processes—whereby facts are unnecessary, so long as something is said long enough and repeated often enough so that people believe it must be true. This propaganda line is as old as man himself. I have recounted some of these myths I intend to disprove during these opening remarks of this farm debate to serve advance notice upon the press and the administration alike. Nothing could be more fair than to give them time to muster their meager forces for a counterattack. Because the facts are on my side, I expect that counterattack will have to rely on new misrepresentation, new distortion, new hucksterism. When all the shouting is over, I shall invite the press to carefully compare the record—and sift for themselves the fact from the fantasy.

Mr. President, I am about to yield the floor. I had issued a press release with respect to some of the myths it was my intention to consider and discuss in this debate. I have outlined some of them.

Tomorrow I shall start on the topic "Where We Are Today in American Agriculture," with an economic analysis, so far as official records permit, of prevailing economic conditions in the American agricultural economy, including not only prices, but income, as well as production figures, and the relative position of the American farm family in the American economy.

I wanted my colleagues to know what is to be the subject of my discussion tomorrow. If anyone can show that the American farm family is getting along wonderfully, I should like to receive the good news. If, between now and tomorrow, anyone can present documentary information to indicate that the administration is well on the way to bolstering the economy of our farm families through effective programs, I should like to receive that good news. I want to be happy. I am, in general, an optimist. I should like to feel that life is good. It is my feeling that after we finish with this farm debate and pass a good farm bill, life will be better.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27, 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICES

Fletcher Warren, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Paul C. Weick, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Emerich B. Freed, deceased.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Earl Walter Barnes, 67A, Regular Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general, United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr., 461A, Regular Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general, United States Air Force.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of section 407, Public Law 351, 81st Congress (Career Compensation Act of 1949):

To be lieutenant colonel

William G. Miller, 2180A.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be captains, USAF (Judge Advocate)

James M. Bumgarner, AO666237.
Richard S. Casale, AO414295.
Everett G. Hopson, AO1858565.
Milton E. Kosa, AO957882.
John H. Leonard, AO2071344.
James C. Moseley, Jr., AO673254.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Carl R. Abrams, AO2247279.
Michael J. Barrett, Jr., AO2253302.
William H. Carnahan, AO1861363.
Prichard E. Gray, AO830450.
James S. Hocker, AO1865346.
Robert T. Holt, AO704122.
J. T. King, AO1856712.
Henry R. Lockington, AO2082621.
James M. Nabers, AO1865070.
Benjamin H. Rosker, AO2205179.
William F. Rutherford, AO2245959.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Chaplain)

George R. Connelly, AO2255047.
Paul S. Haney, AO2251346.
Donald J. Hass, AO2230540.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 101 (c), Public Law 36, 80th Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by section 5, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, and Public Law 37, 83d Congress; with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated under the provisions of section 307, Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Nurse)

Juanita Howle, AN2241846.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the

United States Air Force for service as members of the Air National Guard of the United States under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 and the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954:

To be major general

Col. Francis William Billado, AO311562, Vermont Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Lawrence Haas Bell, Jr., AO423819, Arizona Air National Guard.

Col. Edsel Olin Clark, AO1699452, Ohio Air National Guard.

Col. Homer Reid Flynn, AO1797983, Georgia Air National Guard.

Lt. Col. Jack LaGrange, Jr., AO1551661, Nevada Air National Guard.

Col. John Patrick McFarland, AO256643, New Mexico Air National Guard.

Col. John Lawrence Strauss, AO326325, Missouri Air National Guard.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Gerald C. Thomas, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps effective from the date of his retirement.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Eugene I. Van Antwerp, S. S., St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Lord God of nations, we adore Thee. And since "it is the duty of all nations to implore God's protection and favor" (George Washington) we ask Thee to bless these our Representatives, the "sentinels of our freedom" (Daniel Webster). Give them the knowledge to see and the courage to do what is right and just, that they may use their talents, intelligence and integrity and strength for the glory of God and the good of all men, made in the image of their God.

And, O God of peace and strength, who so many times in the past has favored our undertakings in this home of freedom, send forth Thy grace, and crown Thy great gifts with peace. Bring peace between nations, between races, between factions, between all elements of division, among all men, among all the children of God.

And may these favored men, our Representatives, be Thy instruments for good, forever.

Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 23, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1637) entitled "An act for the relief of Sam H. Ray" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. WATKINS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7588) entitled "An act for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 97. An act for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer, pursuant to Thirty-fourth United States Code, page 1084, appointed the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN, the Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK, and the Senator from Maryland, Mr. BUTLER, members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy; also the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ, the Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLOTT, and the Senator from Maine, Mrs. SMITH, members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56-7.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may be privileged to sit during general debate in the sessions of the House this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may be privileged to sit during general debate in the sessions of the House this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file a report on cargo preference and its relations to the farm surplus disposal program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the acting majority leader as to the legislative program for the balance of this week.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished minority leader for giving me this opportunity to advise the Members of the House of additions to the legislative program for this week.

After consideration on the general Government appropriation bill has been completed, the bills H. R. 9428 and H. R. 9429, if rules are granted, and it is expected that rules will be granted, will be called up for consideration in that order on Thursday or Friday, H. R. 9428 being a bill to provide for procurement of medical and dental officers for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and H. R. 9429 being a bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman understands the appropriation bill has not yet been reported by the committee?

Mr. ALBERT. That is true and it may be that we will have to defer consideration of the appropriation bill, but the plan now is, if possible, to consider the general Government appropriation bill on Thursday and to follow consideration of that bill with the two bills I mentioned.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation bill to which reference has been made has not been reported. The committee voted to report it this morning but it has not yet been reported and I do not know when it is going to be. We, on the minority side, have not been told when it was going to be. I would assume that it would have to lay over some, although I do not know that there is anything controversial in it.

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding that the bill will be reported in a short time this morning.

Mr. MARTIN. Not this morning.

Mr. ALBERT. Well, today, within a few minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD TO JAMES D. CORRIELL

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1956, Mr. James D. Corriell, an editorial writer of the Boulder Daily

Camera, Boulder, Colo., was given the top national award by Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge. I wish to include that article as part of my remarks:

THE RIGHT TO TOIL, SWEAT, AND BE FREE

On the anniversary today of the birth of George Washington, Father of our Country, it might not be out of order to review one of the basic principles Washington fought for, lived for, and helped found a government for.

That principle is liberty.

Not that we Americans have any less desire for liberty today than the revolutionary patriots had, but our desire is necessarily based on tradition, while theirs was based on bitter experience.

We know the definition of liberty. They knew its meaning.

Washington and the men of his time who founded our Government believed in the unalienable right of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They knew what this idea meant because they knew what it was to be without it.

We moderns have always had this right. We take it for granted. And we fail to grasp the deepest meaning of it because we've never been without it.

This is evident in the fact that we have all but lost the word "pursuit" from that basic outline of the rights of man. We have tended to accept the good things we enjoy under the wings of liberty as a gift, rather than a reward for effort. Happiness is not guaranteed; the right to work for happiness is.

The very basis of the liberty which Washington and his compatriots fought for was responsibility—it was the freedom to assume the responsibilities and duties of free men in pursuit of the rewards of liberty.

The newspapers, the radio, the TV channels, the lecturers—yes, even the teachers—of our land have been loud in their proclamation of the rights of man, but they have been all too silent on the duties of man in acquiring and maintaining those rights. The implication is that rights are gifts. "The best things in life are free."

How Washington would have cringed at that.

The unalienable right he fought for were the right of men to enjoy the rewards of their own labor, the right to seek and work for better things, the right to be responsible for their own acts, the right to toil and sweat and know the inner satisfaction of having earned something good.

It is for us in the 20th century to remember that privilege without responsibility was what the colonists had before the Revolution for independence. So long as the crown got its material share of colonial wealth, colonists needed to endure no other responsibility for the privileges they had.

With the Declaration of Independence, American colonists assumed direct responsibility for every act they did. It was this assumption of responsibility that justified their independence and their right to pursue freedom and happiness.

Every individual liberty we have has its counterpart in duty. To shun this duty is to forfeit liberty.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND SUNDRY GENERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1812), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FENTON reserved all points of order on the bill.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there are specific provisions of the bill introduced today by my fellow member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. WIDNALL, which should, in my opinion, be strongly impressed upon the minds of our colleagues and the general public.

Three of the bill's provisions have particular application to my State, and should be of assistance to its citizens.

As is well known, the Golden State is the mecca for those from other areas of the Nation who seek in their later years climate and environment suitable for greater longevity and serenity of being. It is appropriate therefore that I call attention to the proposed changes in legislation which will permit private enterprise, through the insuring services of the Federal Housing Administration, to provide assistance in rental or sales housing for the elderly.

The proposed amendment to section 203 which permits borrowing of the downpayment amount by persons age 60 or over will permit purchase of their own homes by many senior citizens heretofore not able to meet this requirement. The additional permission by FHA to insure mortgages secured by the credit of a cosigner will provide even greater impetus to home ownership by the elderly. I fully expect the enactment of these proposals to spur the already active building program in California and to attract even greater numbers of persons in the retirement phase of life to our great State.

FHA will also, under the terms of this bill, liberalize its insurance provisions in multifamily housing for rent where the projects are partially or totally designed for use by the elderly.

Mortgage insurance to the limit of 90 percent of appraised value instead of the present 80 percent would be permitted where occupancy at or above 25 percent was designed and reserved for the elderly. Additionally, a change from 90 percent of value to 90 percent of replacement cost is authorized under section 207 where sponsorship of multifamily rental housing is by nonprofit organizations and occupancy is intended solely by the elderly.

Some portions of our State as well as those to the north were severely stricken late last year and through the early days of the current year by flood disaster. While those residing in my own district were fortunate to escape the consequences of disaster, I recognize, as I am sure all of us do, that disaster knows no boundaries, geographical or political. Our sympathy and our desire to help is restricted by no material dividing line or border.

I am pleased to note therefor that liberalization of two sections of the Housing Act is recommended in the administration bill. There should be no serious objection to the inclusion of either in the measure which finally comes to this House for its consideration.

The present title I, FHA home repair and modernization program is intended to provide more adequate insured financing for this purpose. The permanence of the program; its increase in amount from $2,500 to $3,500, and in term from 3 to 5 years, will assist in obtaining financing for necessary repairs on a more equitable repayment basis. This, coupled with deletion of the 6-month occupancy requirement in disaster areas already enacted by this Congress, will permit renovation and rehabilitation of those homes damaged by recent floods.

In the urban renewal section of the proposed housing amendments of 1956 further recognition is given to the needs of those overcome by disaster.

It is recommended that certain standard requirements for participation in this program be waived for presidentially designated "disaster areas." The workable program requirement would not be a prerequisite to urban renewal assistance, the urban renewal plan need not conform to a general plan of the community, public hearings would be waived in such cases, and there need not be conformity with the requirement that the area be predominantly residential in character.

All of these changes will make possible the speedy rehabilitation of areas hit by disaster, and contribute much to the upgrading of community areas despite the devastation wrought by flood or other disaster.

I commend the Housing Administrator and those working with him in this administration who propose such measures as will be beneficial to our citizens and call upon this Congress to act expeditiously in the consideration of these provisions.

WILLIAM MOORE, CHICAGO TRIBUNE'S CORRESPONDENT IN MOSCOW

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that mention should be made of the fact that the Chicago Sunday Tribune of February 26, 1956, printed on the first page and under an eight-column headline the first dispatch from Moscow of William Moore, the Tribune's new correspondent in Moscow. It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, because in his 20 years of service as a reporter for the Chicago Tribune, Bill Moore was 13 years

a member of the Washington bureau staff of that newspaper. He has covered the deliberations of this body and of the other body and he is universally respected and beloved by the Members of the Congress of the United States. We wish him well in his new niche, in which we are sure he will measure up to the highest traditions of American journalism.

My colleagues will be interested to know that Bill Moore is accompanied on this most important mission by his wife, Eloise, and it will come as no surprise to us who know brilliant and studious Eloise to learn that in preparation for this mission of Bill's she worked and studied with such determination that in a very limited period of time she became a master of the Russian language.

Bill tells us in his first dispatch that when he arrived at Moscow the thermometer registered 19 below zero, which the people in Moscow told him was a bit of a heat wave, since the thermometer shortly before his arrival had been 30° below zero. The final paragraph of the first dispatch from Moscow states:

> But no matter how cold it is, Moscow citizens buy ice-cream cones at sidewalk stands and munch them as they scurry.

It is this reflection of the American sense of humor that I am sure will go very far in bringing the people of Russia into closer understanding with the people of the United States. We are serious when the occasion demands, but we ease off the tensions that sometimes develop on less serious occasions with our sense of humor.

Chicago has contributed many outstanding journalists who have represented American newspapers in foreign lands. I predict that the record of Bill Moore, working as he always does in close teamwork with Eloise, will rate with the highest achievements in American journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot close without putting in a commercial for the great Second District of Illinois. Bill Moore is a product and a graduate of the University of Chicago. So, too, is Eloise.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8675) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8675, with Mr. METCALF in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement entered into on February 23, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will give NACA authority to construct items totaling $15,444,000. The committee examined into each of the items and was fully satisfied that every one of them was needed; that every one of them tied directly into the maintenance of superiority in air power; and that not one of them was unnecessary by reason of similar facilities existing elsewhere.

I think that a rundown of the specific items which were included in this program would be helpful to a fuller understanding of the bill.

First, at the Langley Laboratory, at Hampton, Va., there would be the following items:

High-speed leg for the unitary plan tunnel	$6,500,000
Data-processing system for the high temperature structural research laboratory	414,000
Modernization of the 7- by 10-foot high speed tunnel	947,000
Power supply for the structures research laboratory	715,000

The first item mentioned above proposes the construction of a continuous-flow hypersonic tunnel with a range of 7 to 12 times the speed of sound. Rocket propulsion technology has now reached the stage where large ballistic guided missiles of several thousand miles range are technically feasible. Because of its ability to glide to a normal landing, the winged vehicle offers promise in future commercial as well as military operations.

At high supersonic speeds, extremely high temperatures and heat-transfer rates offer serious problems.

At present, the NACA has no facility that is suitable for the required research and development. Enough exploratory work has been carried out in existing facilities to outline the many problems which will require research on a larger scale. Existing facilities can handle many of the transient problems but few of the steady-state problems. A large continuous-drive tunnel is required for work in this high-speed range.

The proposed facility will serve a dual purpose in that it will extend the range of the unitary plan tunnel system and will provide an adequate continuous-drive type of facility for basic research.

The second item will provide NACA with a data-recording system capable of recording up to 28,000 units of data for a single test run of less than 3 minutes, and promptly compute and tabulate the data to guide the conditions for the next run. This item will save weeks of computing time.

The third item will modernize the 7-by-10-foot tunnel to provide low transonic testing so that it will be possible to determine the complete static and dynamic stability behavior of a new airplane shape throughout its speed range utilizing only one model.

The fourth item increases the electric power-supply system to provide 10,000 kilowatts at 2,300 volts in order to broaden the scope of test conditions in the structures laboratory.

At the Lewis Laboratory, the bill would authorize two items:

Modifications to the propulsion systems laboratory	$5,317,000
Disposal system for combustion waste products	645,000

New concepts developed in recent months reveal the possibility and methods of accomplishing flight at very high altitudes over long ranges. Increases in flight altitudes of a very substantial nature above present limits are indicated for both fighter and bomber aircraft. The realization of these goals require experimental verification of several important assumptions and the investigation of new propulsion-system problems. It is the purpose of these modifications to provide the research facilities necessary to carry out these investigations.

The second Lewis item consists of the construction of a special system for handling hazardous waste products generated during combustion experiments.

At the Ames laboratory, authorization would be for:

Air-removal system for the 2-by-2-foot transonic tunnel	$437,000
Atmosphere-entry simulator	469,000

The air-removal project will remove the boundary layer from the test walls of the tunnel, thereby virtually eliminating interference from reflected shock waves.

As the committee pointed out in its report, the atmosphere-entry simulator, though relatively minor in cost, represents an area of activity which is of particular interest at this time in view of the urgency of this Nation's missile program.

The proposed equipment is a free-flight test apparatus which will be used to study the effects of aerodynamic heating on ballistic models under conditions simulating those encountered by high-speed, long-range missiles entering the earth's atmosphere and will broaden the scope of research that can be conducted on aerodynamic heating problems.

That is one of our worst problems today—the heating problem, going from top speed into different types of atmospheric conditions.

The instrumentation proposed for the simulator will provide basic research data on surface temperature, heat transfer, loss of surface material, and surface burning. The flight of the model through the simulator will be photographically recorded and will show whether or not the surface has been destroyed, thereby enabling an evaluation of the success or failure of a given design at a small fraction of the cost of a full-scale flight test.

That about covers the items. Your committee went over these items very carefully. We have felt for many years that this agency is one of the most important, although not the largest agency of the Government; but it does the finest research work of any agency in the world. Its primary function is research in connection with all of our missiles and airplanes in connection with our national defense security and commercial aviation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. There are three items in this bill: one for $8,576,000; another for $906,000; and another for $5,962,000. That totals $15,444,000.

Mr. DURHAM. I think those figures are correct.

Mr. GROSS. I notice this language: "Any of the approximate costs enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, be varied upward 5 percent to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work so enumerated shall not exceed $15,444,000."

Where would the money be obtained if the cost should be 5 percent more than the above figures?

Mr. DURHAM. That question was raised in committee. We have always had that provision in each authorization of bills. Of course, few of these items are completed on yearly basis. They take a year or more, and they can come back and get that 5 percent, if needed, because of overrun cost.

Mr. GROSS. If the cost exceeded the estimate by 5 percent, you would have to come back to Congress to get some more money?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Is this 5-percent provision usual in all contracts?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not know whether it is usual in all authorizations, but we have always carried it in the aeronautics authorization bill, because the wind tunnels and all research tools are very difficult to be exact in making a dollar cost on them in the contract.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish first to express my deep and sincere appreciation to the chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], who is well versed in the subject. The gentleman from North Carolina is not only a valuable member of the Committee on the Armed Services, but most of us know that he is also vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I consider that he is one of the best-versed men on the subject of atomic energy and power in the Congress, and I know that he is well informed, perhaps better than any other Member of this House in the matter of the stockpiling of strategic materials. We all appreciate the valuable contribution he has made to the deliberations of our committee, particularly on a difficult subject like that under consideration.

I think the Members of the House should bear in mind that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is an independent agency set up separately from the armed services 40 years ago. Most of its work has been in pure science and to some extent applied science. When war came finally all the money that we had invested in this agency to explore aerodynamics and problems connected with it paid off in rich dividends. Without its research we could never have built up a mighty Air Force. It is just like having a great growing industry for the manufacture of automobiles and trucks; if war should come where in the world would we be unless we had this industry to contribute to our national defense? It produced the tanks, artillery, and other powerful weapons of war.

Members also should bear in mind that today while the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was more or less a civilian agency working only in the realm of science to meet peacetime demands, today practically all of its effort and output is for the military in this most vital field. While we have appropriated astronomical sums, hundreds of millions, and even billions of dollars in the promotion and improvement of weapons of warfare, yet we ought to realize the absolute necessity for it. Certainly no one should expect the United States to match man for man the teeming manpower of Soviet Russia and the Asiatic continent. Our only hope of victory or chance of survival in another global conflict would be in our superiority of weapons and in the superior skill of the man to handle those weapons.

So while we gambled billions of dollars on the atomic bomb—and we did gamble about $2 billion—it is a fascinating story. I listened spellbound 2 or 3 days ago as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee told other members of secret nighttime trips to the Pentagon to discuss with the then Secretary of War, Henry Stimson, the progress that was being made on this mystery weapon. After sinking one and three quarter billions of dollars on the development of the atomic bomb they had not yet solved the problem or produced the weapon. But with the expenditure of a quarter billion more we did after those long months of hard research and laborious experiment, after the expenditure of $2 billion, we did produce the atomic bomb.

Now we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on this particular agency; we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on the development of the guided missile, the intermediary ballistic missile, the intercontinental missile. All of us hope we will soon be able to develop a missile that can be shot a distance of perhaps 5,000 miles at a height of 800 miles that will come automatically to rest and then drop perpendicularly at the rate of 15,000 miles an hour, not possible of being intercepted by any kind of defense weapon. Of course we shudder and are horrified when we read about this. Nothing is impossible. It simply goes to show how important it is that we keep abreast of the times and that we keep ahead in this particular field.

Mr. Chairman, after expressing again my appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], I would like to yield to a member of the minority on that subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks in regard to me. I can also return the compliment to the gentleman from Missouri who over the years since I have been here has made many valuable contributions to the defense of this country. May I make reference to one thing that is probably not known by many Members of the House when we set up this agency under its new authority which heretofore was acting under approximately 10 words in an appropriations act, beginning in 1950. We broadened the plan and set up what we call a unitary plan trying to bring together all of the services into an agency where we would not scatter basic research of such nature all over the world. That is one thing that has been accomplished.

Now, speaking of atomic weapons, we do have atomic weapons, of course, we have produced them and we have done an excellent job. As I stated, we do have atomic weapons, but you have to have something to get those weapons to the point of delivery if you expect them to be worth anything. Therefore this agency has a most important part in the air, both by plane and by missile or any other means we deliver them by.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman and may I say that never do I feel my profound and abysmal ignorance as much as when I visit Langley Field down in Virginia and listen to some of these scientists explain or try to explain to us all of the complexities as we are ushered through those wind tunnels. I am simply lost in a phantasmagoria of metaphysical complexities that defies decription. I feel less and worse than an acanthocephalan.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to concur in everything the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has said about the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. It has been an education to me as well as a joy and a pleasure to sit as a member of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of which he is chairman.

In his letter to the Congress, January 23, transmitting the 41st annual report of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Dr. J. C. Hunsaker looked back upon 40 years of aeronautical research accomplishment since establishment of the NACA which he heads. I was very much struck by the reason he gave for attainment by the United States of aeronautical leadership.

This continuing achievement—

Dr. Hunsaker said—

has been the result of a partnership in which the Congress, the military air services, the aircraft industries, and the NACA have joined.

Too often, I am afraid, the fact is forgotten in the excitement of achievement, that it takes real courage and foresight on the part of the Congress to appropriate the large sums required for the

new and novel research facilities which are requested by an agency such as NACA to be used in exploring the unknown.

And so it was gratifying to note the public recognition by the NACA that, to quote Dr. Hunsaker again:

> The importance of aeronautics and what had to be done to advance it was recognized by the Congress.

It was just 10 years ago that we were asked to appropriate millions of dollars for the design and construction of a whole new complex of very large transonic and supersonic wind tunnels. The NACA people were very careful, in their reqeust, to say there could be no guaranty that the returns in improved aircraft performance would quickly justify the great expense involved. But they were able to convince the Members of Congress that there was real need for the new wind tunnels, if we were to continue to hold our position of world leadership in aeronautics.

It was almost exactly a year ago, that the Congress was told of the dramatic improvement in performance of the Convair F–102 as a result of work accomplished in the new wind tunnels. Late last year, further details about this major breakthrough in aeronautics were made public. An area rule, developed by a young aeronautical research scientist at the NACA's Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, was what made it possible. The area rule gave us airplanes that would fly faster, or farther, without increase in power.

In the disclosure, it was said that Whitcomb's work was performed in one of the new transonic wind tunnels—and that for technical reasons, except for this new piece of research equipment, the area rule might not have been possible.

One dramatic consequence of early application of the area rule was that it assured to the military services tactical airplanes with much superior supersonic capabilities. Not only that, but it made sure that the airplanes, for which the military services had already committed hundreds of millions of dollars in contracts, were what was wanted.

The area rule, I am reliably told, is being extended in usefulness well into the supersonic speed range. It is hard for me, or any other nontechnical person, to realize that today speeds of 1,200 miles an hour or more, are considered in matter-of-fact fashion when tactical airplane requirements are discussed. But such is the fact, and it is the area rule, in large part, which makes this possible. The cost of the new wind tunnels has already been justified, and much more.

In perhaps no field is the axiom so true, that progress must be perpetual. At a time when we are being challenged inexorably by another nation, we cannot for a moment relax our efforts. I am sure that now, and in the years ahead, the NACA will come to the Congress again and again, requesting funds for still more research facilities, so new and so novel as to be almost beyond comprehension.

On the basis of past performance, I say that we must listen carefully to what the NACA scientists say they need. On the basis of past performance, I say we can expect they will use their new research tools to provide an immensely valuable service to aeronautics and the welfare of the Nation.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take you back some 15 years when a committee of this Congress was holding hearings on the first proposal to lend-lease money to countries abroad. I went over to what is now the Ways and Means Committee room and listened to some of those hearings. I recall the afternoon I was there when Charles A. Lindbergh was on the witness stand tesifying, and he made a statement that has assisted me at every hearing since then as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. He said that if we had an airplane that would go 185 miles an hour and our enemy produced one that would go 195 miles an hour, all of our airplanes of 185 miles an hour became obsolete; we would immediately have to catch up that difference of 10 miles an hour. I think the NACA in its wonderful work is doing just exactly what Charles A. Lindbergh advised 15 years or more ago.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to very cordially concur in the commendatory remarks made about the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DURHAM. I have had the pleasure and benefit of being a member of his subcommittee now for several years. It is not only a great pleasure to those of us who have the capacity to understand the technical phases of this subject but we are always greatly benefited by his able, devoted, and thoroughgoing leadership on that committee and his understanding of the problems involved.

I have been asked this morning how the NACA is constituted. The report on pages 1 and 2 shows that. A committee of 17 members is named by the President of the United States. They serve without pay. They establish policy and plan the research program to be conducted. There are some 7,500 scientists, engineers, and supporting personnel. I think one of the most valuable and pleasing policies of this important group of expert scientists and technicians is the extent to which they use the educational institutions of our great Nation. For instance, in the year 1955, on pages 2 and 3 of our report, it shows that more than 25 high educational institutions in our great Nation were actively participating in this program. Some of these are the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Oklahoma, Purdue, Syracuse University, University of Washington, Stanford University, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Institute of Technology, and others of like rating listed there.

I support the bill and its worthy objectives.

I wish to call attention to some facts concerning the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory located at the Municipal Airport in Cleveland.

One of the major research centers of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is located at the edge of the municipal airport at Cleveland. As its name, the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, implies, its scientists and engineers concentrate upon powerplant problems.

The engineman will admit that it is vitally important for aerodynamic advances—like the NACA's area rule—to be made. At the same time, he will say that the heart of the airplane is the engine, and that if we are going to continue to fly faster and farther and higher, then we are going to have to have more powerful, more efficient engines.

Here again the situation is one of partnership, with the Congress, the military air services, the manufacturers, and the NACA working as a team. Somehow, ways must be found to accelerate the process of obtaining new ideas, new knowledge, and then transforming them into the useful engine developments upon which our country's aeronautical progress depends.

In the past decade or so much good work has been done at the Lewis Laboratory, especially in the field of turbojet engines. The results of this work is reflected in the powerplants which are in the new supersonic fighters and new near-supersonic bombers which the aircraft industry is building today.

I am told much more remains to be done if we are to have the sufficiently powerful ram-jet and rocket engines which will be required to propel the long-range missiles we need to maintain our leadership in the air. The task ahead of developing these new engines is very difficult. It can be accomplished only by strenuous effort on the part of talented workers in many fields. But, though they may be difficult to reach, the goals are in clear sight.

Beyond all this lies the possibilty that we, or some other nation, can successfully harness nuclear energy for the propulsion of our supersonic aircraft. The performance capabilities of such an airplane would be supersonic flight to any point on the face of the earth, and return. From the practical standpoint, range will be extended to the point where it is limited only by human desire and human endurance.

Even with so large a gain, it is essential that vigorous, sustained attacks be made on the formidable technical problems that must be solved. In this effort, the Atomic Energy Commission is also a member of the team, along with the Congress, the military air services, the aircraft industry, and the NACA.

For obvious security reasons, it is impossible to say in any specific way what the scientists and engineers of the NACA's engine laboratory at Cleveland are doing on this problem. I will note, however, that last year, the Congress appropriated nearly $5 million for the design and construction of a reactor to be used in studying problems connected with nuclear powerplants for aviation. It will be located near Sandusky, Ohio. Meantime, of course, NACA personnel are doing much work on nuclear problems at the Lewis Laboratory.

Our national welfare, perhaps even our national existence, may depend on the intensity of our effort in this direction, and the competence with which the basic research and subsequent development are carried forward. We cannot settle for half-hearted, or business-as-usual efforts, in this vital area.

I wish to say to the Members of the House that it has been my pleasure to visit most of the wind tunnels in our great Nation and most of these great laboratories.

At least once a year, it has been my pleasure and benefit to sit on the Durham subcommittee and listen to the testimony of the heads of the NACA and some of their distinguished technicians in the field of aeronautics and under the expert chairmanship of Mr. DURHAM, of North Carolina. I believe this bill presently before us comes in full merit and worthy of your unanimous support.

It is particularly fascinating and inspiring to me to see the extent to which not only the NACA but the scientific and technological departments of our great universities and other great institutions are really making up a team, a great team, a team which is making great progress. We as a Congress should feel it an honor and good judgment to cooperate with them.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman to whom I am about to yield time has worked in close cooperation with the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. He is a former flier in World War I. I am happy now to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I endorse most heartily all the nice things said about CARL DURHAM. It was my pleasure to serve on a subcommittee with him known as the Stockpiling Committee. This was authorized by Public Law 520, 79th Congress. It provided that every quarter we must review the stockpiles. The report given us was then locked in the safe of the Armed Services Committee of the House. In that way we came to be very intimate friends. I do not know of anybody I like better in the House of Representatives than CARL DURHAM and there are many colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I admire very much.

To me it is very interesting to note that this development started in 1915. As all of you will remember, the Germans started the war in 1914 and in 1915 the NACA started its drive to develop proper airplanes. Flying was then in its infancy. These are some of the men who were involved in that commendable struggle: Carl Spaatz, who was Chief of Staff of the Air Force; General Arnold; Billy Mitchell; Tom Milling; and a host of others who had learned to fly way back in 1912 were getting ready for the battle that was looming ahead, so if our country became involved and we could cope with aerial warfare and come out the victor.

The eager-beaver man in this project was, and is, John Victory. I think he has been with the organization almost since its inception. He is the one that master-minded some of the things the Agency was doing and proposing.

Also I want to point out that one of our California Congressmen did a lot for aviation. He was Clarence Lea. He retired several years ago after serving in Congress for 32 years. He was the one that was induced by Mr. Victory to pass the necessary laws to help develop the air age. He was the author of almost all of them, because for pretty nearly all that time he was chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I have visited Ames Aeronautical Laboratory. It is a very fascinating place to visit. I have been there several times. I want to visit some of the other laboratories, also.

As I see it today, the world is divided into two parts, the Democratic world and the Soviet world. We are waging a worldwide battle of scientists and research and development men to determine who can develop the best kind of weapons.

A curious situation was revealed in 1945 that surprised and shocked us.

I remember particularly that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] was on that trip with me. We went into a tunnel that appeared to be nothing but a railroad tunnel under a large mountainlike hill. This was near Nordhausn, a horror camp of Hitler's. We went into the tunnel and found a very large development plant where the Germans were building V–1 and V–2 bombs which were to be launched on London from Amsterdam. A few of them were landed on London and struck their targets.

So as I say, this is a battle between the scientists to see who can develop the most powerful weapons. As the former chairman of our committee mentioned, it is hideous and shocking to think of the civilized world as engaged in a battle where one or the other may exterminate the other half of the world. We hope and pray that through our strength and operating under the visible strength that we have not only in our Air Force but our other armed forces, particularly the Navy, and also with our allies, we can convince those that would destroy us that we have the scientific research and know-how to protect ourselves. Under the visible sign of that strength, especially in the international armed force that is now over in France, the NATO group, we will find some way to resolve our differences and live like a civilized world. Also that we may have the longed-for peace that we have been looking forward to for almost 2,000 years, and for which so many of our men have fought and died.

So as I say, it is very interesting to look back and see the tremendous development that has been going on all through the years since 1915 to put us in the position in which we are today. We hope and pray that our scientific battle will be victorious and bring the peace which the world deserves.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the subcommittee under its distinguished chairman [Mr. DURHAM] on its farsightedness with respect to the further development of aeronautical research facilities of the National Advisory Committee of Aeronautics. This subcommittee under its chairman has made a tremendous contribution to the national defense and to the development of aeronautical research in America.

As a Representative to Congress from the Cleveland area, I am in hearty support of this legislation which will provide modifications to the Propulsion Systems Laboratory at the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory in Cleveland.

The Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory is an institution of which Cleveland is justifiably proud. Our citizens have great satisfaction in the achievements of the laboratory and its great contribution to the national defense and to aeronautical progress. The developments of the Laboratory have been useful not only to the Nation and to industry but to the entire economy as well.

The Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory is also a good neighbor in Cleveland. Its operations are conducted at the highest standards and are completely compatible with the nature of the community in which the laboratory is located. The laboratory is operated in a manner employing the most effective methods of nuisance control which are known. Noise is completely abated. There is no noticeable emission of fume or smoke. The construction of a disposal system for combustion waste products authorized by this legislation is completely in keeping with the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory as a good neighbor in our community. The experience of this laboratory in the control and abatement of nuisance should be made available to all industry, particularly the heavy industries of the Cuyahoga River Valley.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in paying my compliments to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable CARL DURHAM and to its ranking member the Honorable DEWEY SHORT for their knowledge and understanding of this problem. I would like also to join my colleague from California in recognizing the great work that Dr. John Victory, secretary of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics has done in this field.

I want to say a few words about an activity which is carried on at Moffett Field on a day-and-night basis which is of extreme importance to the future welfare of this Nation. I doubt whether many of the residents of the Peninsula area where Moffett Field is located, let alone the Nation at large, know much about the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory.

It is a comparatively small organization, fewer than 1,500 scientists, engineers and supporting personnel. Established just before World War II, this research center of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has made very valuable contributions to the performance of our newest aircraft. At the Ames Laboratory, the mission is to solve high-speed aerodynamic problems—and

solve them as they are doing. In many ways the scientists and engineers at the Ames Laboratory are contributing importantly to the improvement of our airplanes.

But today I wish to concern myself directly with some very vital work that is being conducted at the Ames Laboratory on the basic problems which must be solved if the United States is going to develop the intercontinental ballistic missile. So important is this work that Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, the Director of the NACA, who is an extremely modest man, and not at all given to horn blowing, admitted in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee that basic work by NACA was directly involved in the great effort being made to design and develop the intercontinental ballistic missile. I am sure, had he been so disposed, he could have made his statement very much stronger.

Now, as I understand it, the problems having to do with the intercontinental ballistic missile—which often is called the ultimate weapon—are threefold. First, we must learn how to develop sufficiently powerful rocket engines to shoot the missle hundreds of hiles high and across a total distance of 5,000 miles or more. That, unquestionably, is a very difficult problem, but I am told that essentially it is one of development effort rather than one where first basic new knowledge has to be attained.

Second, is the problem of guidance. Here, again, the problem is very difficult because all the guidance that can be given such a missile—which travels at speeds up to 15,000 miles an hour—comes in the first 20 to 50 miles of flight. From then on the missile follows the same sort of course as a cannon shell after it had left the barrel or, for that matter, as a rock after it had been thrown.

Inertial guidance is one way of accomplishing this direction. The principles of inertial guidance, according to the information given me, are generally well known. I recognize the difficulty of the work ahead, but wish to make the distinction that with respect to guidance, the effort must be largely developmental, working forward from established bases of knowledge.

It is when we get to the third problem that we come to the great unknown. Air friction at the speeds the intercontinental missile will be required to travel becomes so fantastically high that no material known to man can withstand the tremendous heat—heat which is measured in thousands and thousands of degrees Fahrenheit.

We all know what happens to a meteor when it enters the earth's atmosphere after a celestial flight at speeds hardly faster than the intercontinental missile will be traveling. It becomes incandescent, and most of the meteors are completely consumed before they reach the earth's surface.

When the intercontinental missile is shot off it quickly gathers speed, and of course this air friction begins to appear at once. The missile, however, is climbing almost straight up as it gathers speed and before the effects of what the scientists call aerodynamic heating can become too critical, the missile is so high, flying above the thin envelope of the earth's atmosphere, that it is in the position of the meteor before it began to burn up.

It is at this very high altitude that the missile flies during most of its intercontinental journey. It is only when it begins to come down and reenters the earth's atmosphere, that air friction becomes so terribly important.

I have been informed that even if it were traveling at only 7,000 miles an hour—or roughly half the actual speed which is envisioned for such a missile—temperatures up to 8,000 degrees Fahrenheit would be reached.

How to keep the missile from burning up—the engineers would probably prefer that I use the technical term of "sublimate," which means disappear completely without even vaporizing in the process—is the big problem, the one where new knowledge must be secured on the frontiers of science.

At the Ames Laboratory the research people have had to devise all manner of new equipment in order to duplicate, under the precisely controlled conditions so necessary, the tremendous heats, the conditions of rarefied and then denser air, and finally the very, very high speeds. NACA's Langley Laboratory is also working on this problem, using other approaches.

At the Ames Laboratory they have one wind tunnel which simulates the atmosphere so high that, as one scientist put it, stray molecules go wandering around inside, occasionally bumping into each other.

Our great aviation industry is making tremendous progress in the development of the intercontinental missile. The future welfare of the United States demands that they succeed in this giant effort. If they are to succeed they must be provided, on an accelerated basis, with the fundamental new knowledge which the NACA scientists at the Ames and Langley laboratories are providing. I am heartened that already much of the necessary new information has been gained. I am determined that what remains to be done shall be done, and quickly.

I want to take this opportunity to encourage the Members of the House to accept invitations that are extended to you by the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics to visit their laboratories. What the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] have told you about the work which you will see at those laboratories, is correct. If you go I know that you will come away struck by the fine work that is being done by dedicated men. The scientists, engineers, and technicians at those laboratories are for the most part young men who have devoted their lives to their jobs. You will come away filled with reassurance that these men are doing their all to keep this country in the forefront of the race for air supremacy.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to a distinguished Member of the House who represents the birthplace, the cradle of aviation, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK], to close this debate on our side.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of the fact that I have the great privilege and honor to represent the Third Congressional District of Ohio, which as you know is the birthplace, the cradle of aviation. It was my privilege to know the Wright brothers personally. When I was a lad I used to take my bicycle to their shop to have it repaired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I am sure the gentleman wants to keep the record correct, and I do not want to detract in any way from the great work of the Wright brothers whom I happen to have known and admired greatly. But of course, the first plane ever sustained in the air by power was flown at Kitty Hawk, N. C., by the Wright brothers.

Mr. SCHENCK. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I agree with him that the first plane was flown at Kitty Hawk, but only after it was designed and developed and made in Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. BONNER. All the experimental work was done at Kitty Hawk.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, it would be impossible to overemphasize the importance of research, not only in the field of aviation but in all other lines of endeavor. America owes much of its great development to the ability and work of our scientific research people and to their everlasting search for new products and new methods. I would like to add my personal commendation to the great chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] for bringing in this legislation. It should be approved unanimously, and we should encourage research in all lines of endeavor.

We should also encourage the education and development of scientists in our institutions of higher learning, so that we may continue to keep the place of eminence that we have in all of these scientific fields.

So, Mr. Chairman, I again urge unanimous approval of this very important and worthwhile legislation.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I join in commending the Committee on Armed Services for bringing this report to the floor today. I congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and their committee for the deep interest they have in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. It is particularly significant that this report comes to the floor within a few days short of the 41st anniversary of this agency. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was established by an act of Congress, approved March

3, 1915. During its 41 years, it has been one of the most effective agencies of our Government in aeronautics research. Many great problems and mysteries of flying have been solved by dedicated men in the NACA.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations. This committee, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], deals with the budget requests of the NACA. It is always a pleasure to have the officials of this agency appear before our committee in justification of its expenditures. No one who listens to the testimony could but be impressed with the great and significant part the NACA plays in the field of aerodynamics. I would like to quote from a letter which accompanied the NACA's 41st annual report:

In the years that followed World War I, definite leadership in aeronautics was regained by the United States. This continuing achievement has been the result of a partnership in which the Congress, the military air services, the aircraft industries, and the NACA have joined. As its part, the NACA undertook research to provide basic information which talented designers in industry used in developing superior airplanes, both civil and military.

How successful this team effort has been was emphasized by the recent public disclosure of the discovery and experimental verification of a new aerodynamic concept known as the "area rule," and of its prompt use by the aircraft industry. It is a simple method of reducing the sharp increase in drag heretofore associated with transonic flight, and has already led to gains in speed of more than 1000 miles per hour by supersonic airplanes. Richard T. Whitcomb, aeronautical research scientist at the NACA Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, has just been awarded the Collier trophy for discovery and experimental verification of the area rule, a contribution to basic knowledge yielding significantly higher airplane speed and greater range with same power.

This accomplishment was the result of research begun in 1951 as the first major project made possible by the new transonic wind tunnels. It is important to recall that when the NACA requested and received from the Congress in 1946 funds for these transonic wind tunnels, there could be no guaranty that there would come so early and so large a gain from their use.

Mr. Chairman, the accomplishments reported above in and of themselves justify the expenditures which the Congress has approved for NACA. I take particular pride in the fact that Mr. Whitcomb, the recipient of the Collier trophy, is a native of Massachusetts. If this Nation is to maintain its position in the field of aerodynamics, it is absolutely essential that we give the NACA the implements and the tools with which to continue its vast research and experimentation. The bill before us today authorizes additional construction for facilities and installation of additional equipment in three of the great laboratories in which the NACA does much of its research. The money which will be expended for these improvements is small indeed compared to the benefits that will accrue.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 1 of Public Law 672, approved August 8, 1950 (50 U. S. C. 151b), the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to undertake additional construction and to purchase and install additional equipment at the following locations:

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Hampton, Va.: Hypersonic tunnel, data-processing system, modernization of an existing tunnel, and an addition to the electric power supply system, $8,576,000.

Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif.: Improvements to an existing transonic tunnel and an atmosphere-entry simulator, $906,000.

Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio: Improvements to the propulsion systems laboratory and installation of a disposal system for combustion waste products, $5,962,000.

SEC. 2. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, be varied upward 5 percent to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work so enumerated shall not exceed $15,444,000.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $15,444,000 to accomplish the purposes of this act.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. METCALF, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8675) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD WAR I VETERANS ARE THE FORGOTTEN VETERANS OF THE NATION

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation today thousands of veterans of World War I are focusing their attention on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs as it considers pension legislation for World War I veterans based on service, age, and disability.

On behalf of my fellow veterans of World War I, for the past several years I have been advocating a service pension for the World War I veteran and have sponsored various bills on the subject. This morning I was the first witness to appear before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs at which time I made the following statement:

THE VETERAN OF WORLD WAR I, THE FORGOTTEN VETERAN OF THE NATION, IS ENTITLED TO A SERVICE PENSION BASED ON DISABILITY OR AGE

Mr. Chairman, once again I am privileged to appear before your committee in support of legislation that will be of special benefit to the veteran of World War I who, in my opinion, is the forgotten veteran of this Nation.

Time and time again from the late 1920's when I served as commander of the Pennsylvania department of the VFW and later in the 1930's as commander in chief of the VFW for 3 consecutive years, and since 1939 as a Member of Congress, the records of this committee will show that I have been a staunch advocate of a pension for the veteran of World War I.

While serving the Veterans of Foreign Wars as a department and national officer, I joined with other veteran leaders in this country in aiding the veteran of the Spanish-American War to get an increase in his pension, which was granted to him 20 years after the close of the war and which, today, amounts to $101.59.

My support of the Spanish-American War pension was based on my belief in the traditional American concept of giving special grants of one kind or another to those who have performed honorable military service—not as pay, but in token of their fellow citizens' appreciation.

This traditional policy of our Government was established in the days of George Washington and recognized by Congress who granted service pensions to the veterans of all wars from the days of Valley Forge to and including the Spanish-American War.

It was not until after World War I that Congress deviated from this traditional policy of a service pension by substituting a schedule of non-service-connected disability benefits with income limitations.

With the substitution of the program of non-service-connected disability benefits, there was launched a general attack on all veterans' benefits and, especially, against payment of a service pension to the veteran of World War I.

I am sure that many of you have heard the oft-repeated accusation that the veteran of World War I was a Treasury raider, bent on wrecking the Treasury and that he was not entitled to be recognized as being any different than a civilian.

During the days of the fight for the World War I bonus—which I played a part in as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars—we were told bluntly that as veterans we should not expect preferential treatment from our Government just because we had served our country in time of war.

This attack on World War I veterans has not only increased in viciousness and intensity, but it has been extended to veterans of all wars from the time of the infamous Franklin D. Roosevelt Economy Act of 1933 to the reports of the Hoover Commission and the added threat of tomorrow from the forthcoming report of the Bradley Commission.

It is interesting to observe that those who sponsored the Roosevelt Economy Act, the Hoover Commission, and the Bradley Commission, at one time or another publicly supported the traditional policy of this country that our veteran population is entitled to preferential treatment.

For example, let me quote President Herbert Hoover in 1931 when he said "veterans in need are, and should be, a preferred class that a grateful country should be proud to honor with its support * * * the principle

that the Nation should give generous care to those veterans who are ill, disabled, in need, or in distress, even though these disabilities do not arise from the war has been fully accepted by the Nation." This opinion voiced by President Hoover has, without doubt, the overwhelming endorsement of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I appear here this morning in support of any bill that you have before you designed to provide for the veteran of World War I, a service pension based on age or disability.

The records of the Veterans' Administration show that 4,744,000 Americans served in World War I and today the average age of the World War I veteran is about 62 years, with an average death rate of 236 every 24 hours.

These figures reveal that World War I veterans are not only getting old but of the 3,112,000 living on November 31, 1955, over 80 percent of them are married or have dependents.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned a moment ago that the average age of the World War I veteran is 62 years. However, whether they are 62 years of age or over, it is a well known fact that many veterans of World War I, as they advance in years, are faced with disability, unemployability, or economic circumstances which make it impossible for them to provide an adequate living for themselves or for their dependents.

While I do not have available the exact figures of the number of World War I veterans over age 65, let me read to you an interesting newspaper item carried by the Associated Press under the date line, January 9, 1956, which concerns the plight of Americans over the age of 65:

"Nearly three-fourths of Americans over 65 either have no income or less than $1,000 a year, according to a study released today. The report was issued by the Twentieth Century Fund, a nonprofit foundation for economic and social research and education. The study reveals that of the population over 65 years old, 36 percent have no income of their own; 38 percent have annual income under $1,000; 11 percent have between $1,000 and $2,000; and 15 percent have $2,000 or more."

Mr. Chairman, with the average age of the veteran of World War I at 62 today, in the matter of a few years all World War I veterans will be age 65 or over. Therefore, I think the result of the study of the Twentieth Century Fund, which I have quoted, clearly reveals the future economic status of elderly Americans which includes the veteran of World War I.

In revealing the economic plight of World War I veterans as they advance in years, it should be recalled that upon discharge from military service, the World War I veteran received $60 as a separation allowance which, at that time, barely covered the cost of a civilian suit of clothes or an overcoat when he reached home.

It was 18 years after the armistice of November 11, 1918, before the so-called bonus was paid to the veteran of World War I, and which was designed as an adjustment of the $30 monthly paid to the American doughboy for military service in 1917–18.

In mentioning the $60 separation allowance and the so-called bonus, I want to emphasize the fact that there were no fringe benefits, such as terminal-leave pay, unemployment insurance benefits, or GI benefits in general, as received by the veteran of World War II.

Mr. Chairman, I have several bills pending before this committee; namely, H. R. 347, H. R. 8406, and H. R. 9361.

H. R. 347, which I introduced January 5, 1955, was introduced by me in previous Congresses. This bill will increase the amount of disability pension payable to veterans of World War I to $75 monthly or to $90 if the veteran has reached the age of 65 or has been in receipt of a pension for 10 years.

H. R. 8406, which was introduced at the request of the American Legion, amends part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards.

H. R. 9361 was introduced at the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and establishes a pension program for the veterans of World War I.

Mr. Chairman, any of these bills are a step in the right direction and I sincerely hope that this committee will perfect and send to the floor of the House of Representatives, at the earliest possible date, a bill that will include an adequate monthly pension for the veteran of World War I, for truly, he is the forgotten veteran.

My suggestions regarding the amount of a World War I service pension are as follows:

1. Seventy-five dollars monthly if the veteran has a disability or disabilities rated at 70 percent or more, regardless of age.

2. One hundred dollars monthly if the veteran has attained the age of 65 or is permanently and totally disabled.

3. One hundred and fifty dollars monthly, regardless of age, if he is helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless and blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person.

In addition, I think the bill—which I hope you will perfect—should provide outpatient care for every veteran of World War I, who is in need of medical treatment on the same basis as provided the veteran of the Spanish-American War.

In regard to income limitations, I think we have to face the fact that public sentiment supports the view that World War I veterans gainfully employed and in receipt of a reasonable income should not object to an income limitation of $2,400 a year if single, or $3,600 if married or having dependents.

I realize that the income limitation is a departure from the accepted principle of paying a service pension without any strings attached. Nevertheless, I am aware of the fact that the precedent has been established of requiring an income limitation on non-service-connected benefits and that Congress is reluctant to approve any pension measure unless it contains an income-limitation clause.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I am certain that it is understood I have been discussing a service pension for the veteran of World War I based on age and disability and I want it understood that the proposed legislation has no relationship to compensation or other benefits now being paid to veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean war for service-connected disabilities. I wish to make it clear that I am advocating a service pension for World War I veterans based on age and disability.

As a veteran of World War I and World War II, I hope that my fellow veterans of World War II and the Korean war will support a service pension for the veteran of World War I because, as I have told you in all sincerity, he is truly the forgotten veteran.

AN AMERICAN AID PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting today a revision of the President's budget to permit a modest tax reduction for those in the lower income brackets, a sizable reduction in the public debt, and more adequate financing of several essential Government activities. I hope that it may meet with the approval of the Congress and the American people. I feel certain that these are objectives the majority of the people will endorse.

Several days ago I congratulated the President upon his submission of a balanced Federal budget. All of us know how difficult it has been to reverse the trend toward more and more Government spending. The President has accomplished this objective and deserves commendation.

However, I am not entirely satisfied.

I find that the estimated surplus for the next fiscal year is $400 million. I think it should be larger.

I find there is no possibility of tax relief unless we have larger reductions in spending or an unanticipated increase in revenue. I find that many pressing Government obligations cannct be fulfilled as they should be. Finally, I find that it is proposed to devote another $5 billion to foreign-aid programs of various kinds.

Foreign aid is an issue that arouses a great deal of interest all over the Nation. In the heartland of America, between the Blue Ridge and the Rockies, there is no better way to stir up an argument than to mention the billions of dollars that have been poured out since the end of the war. There was considerable support 10 years ago for the relief activities with which our Government endeavored to assist both former ally and vanquished foe. The foreign-aid program at that time was, in fact, a true reflection of the generosity and Christian concern of Americans everywhere.

There is still support for humanitarian assistance. The success of the CROP and CARE programs is proof enough of that. Almost everyone urges that some of our surplus food and fiber be given to others all around the globe who are in distress.

But, you will walk many a mile, and talk to many a citizen, before you find one who is willing to give American dollars to any foreign nation for building its armies or for hydroelectric dams, waterways, hotels, factories, or any other kind of economic aid. Americans know too well the amazing story of Europe's economic recovery. They know too well that their tax dollars are going to governments that are unable or afraid to tax their own people at anything like the exorbitant rates we pay. They know too well, and the recent French elections proved it again, that all of our dollars have not bought friendship nor put any backbone into wavering continental allies.

As one who has consistently voted to reduce and to stop foreign-aid authorizations and appropriations, I say that the time has come when the people of America are determined to call a halt.

Statesmen may know some reason for foreign aid. They may have some justification for continuing the free-handed spending that has cost us some $60 billion in 10 years. But, they have not convinced the people, and they do not represent the people.

The people have had enough.

I propose to refuse any further authorization or appropriation for foreign aid. I propose to require the International Cooperation Administration to liquidate its operations. I propose that

the unexpended balances, which now total more than $9 billion, be used as planned over the next 2 or 3 years. I want to give notice to our friends and Allies that the golden goose has regained its senses and will lay no more.

I can hear already the cries of outrage from the ivory towers where such words as these are the rankest kind of heresay. I can visualize the statements that will be issued by those who have a vested interest in this international giveaway program. They will say that we must not affront our allies—we must not shake world confidence in the leadership of the United States—we must not give Russia a propaganda advantage—and so on.

We have heard it all before. I am less impressed each time I hear it. Who is it we fear to affront? The Government of France, with its 150 Communist deputies? Marshal Tito? The mobs in Marseilles who stone our sailors? The Egyptians for whom we are preparing to build a multimillion-dollar water project?

I doubt that we will affront anyone. Rather, I think they will rapidly overcome their disappointment at the loss of our dollars and will respect us more.

Let me repeat that my proposal does not end the program abruptly. While that might be wise, it appears to be impossible. I propose that we permit the program to continue with the $9 billion in unexpended funds that are already available. My latest report, as of November 30, 1955, indicates that this unexpended balance included $6,625,000,000 in military assistance money—$343 million for direct forces support—and $2,843,000,000 for other assistance.

Of this amount—again as of November 30, 1955—I am informed that $2,400,000,000 was unobligated.

At the rate of expenditure indicated by the early months of this fiscal year, these funds will continue to operate a program of foreign assistance for 2—and perhaps 3—more years.

This should allow ample time for the recipients of American assistance to adjust their budgetary operations. It will allow time for the American firms, holding foreign-aid contracts, to build up other business. In this regard, the large sums of money that will become available in our own country should assure that there will be ample business of all kinds to maintain a high level of production and take up any slack that may be created because foreign assistance has ended.

We should refuse to authorize or appropriate any additional funds for foreign aid.

This simple and sensible decision will immediately increase our anticipated budget surplus to $5,200,000,000.

Let me show you what the people of America could do with this.

DEBT REDUCTION

My position has been that debt reduction should be the first reward of a budget surplus. We are paying about $7 billion per year on interest on the public debt. Most of this, of course, is money we borrowed to give away to foreign nations. Interest we have paid so far on money borrowed for foreign aid amounts to more than $18 billion. Since no foreign government contemplates repayment of our assistance—and in most cases we have not even suggested it—it seems to me that we should begin to reduce this interest burden.

If we eliminate new appropriations and authorizations for foreign aid, we should devote at least one-half of our budget surplus to debt reduction. Although the $2,600,000,000 would amount to only about 1 percent of the public debt, I think it would be a very important and auspicious beginning.

As the President has said, it will establish our financial integrity.

TAX REDUCTION

Having applied one-half of our balance to the retirement of debt, I believe we must also give consideration to tax reduction.

Two years ago we reduced taxes by over $7 billion. That was the largest tax reduction in the history of any nation.

Even so, Americans now carry a heavier tax burden than the people of any other nation on earth, including all of those who have benefited from our largesse.

Our Canadian neighbors have enjoyed several tax reductions since the end of the war. If we were to adopt Canadian tax rates, our Federal revenue would be reduced by $8 billion. Similarly, our dollars have been used to lighten the burden of taxpayers in many other countries. It is time that we had additional tax relief ourselves.

I suggest that Congress consider a $20 tax credit to each individual income-tax payer, as outlined in plan No. 5 of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. This plan would reduce Government revenues by $1,113,000,000, primarily by reducing the tax payments in the lowest income brackets. Some 3 million taxpayers would be relieved of any Federal income-tax payment. Eighty-three percent of the benefit would accrue to those with incomes under $5,000.

This is a plan that could be put into effect almost immediately. It would put additional cash into the hands of those who need it most. It would take care of the need for tax relief in the lower income brackets pending a general overhaul of the income-tax structure, which I hope the Congress will undertake in the near future.

Like the wage earner in the lower tax brackets, the small businesses of this country also need tax relief. I suggest that we consider a proposal to reverse the present normal and surtax rates on corporate income. At present, as we know, the normal tax on the first $25,000 of corporate income is at the rate of 30 percent and the surtax is at the rate of 22 percent. If we were to reverse this structure and make the normal rate 22 percent and the surtax rate 30 percent, we would give a reduction of up to 26 percent to the business firm in the lowest bracket. We would not increase any corporation's tax. We would suffer a reduction of revenue estimated at three to four hundred million dollars. And we would stimulate small business at a time when it badly needs help if it is to survive.

These two tax programs need not be permanent. As I have indicated with regard to personal income tax, I believe we should strive for a general overhaul of rates that would be more equitable to all.

The total loss of revenue for 1 year would be an estimated $1½ billion. With the elimination of new foreign-aid appropriations, we can afford this tax relief, as well as the $2,600,000,000 debt reduction already mentioned.

DOMESTIC GOVERNMENT

Members will note that I have not accounted for $1,100,000,000 of the surplus that would follow upon the end of the foreign-aid program.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been acutely aware of the fact that we have been slighting our own welfare in order to have funds available for foreign purposes.

Many necessary and desirable domestic programs have been postponed or inadequately financed because of our large foreign and military commitments.

All of us remember how the Truman administration refused to recommend new starts in reclamation and flood control work because it was said we could not afford them. At present our good friends and colleagues from the Intermountain West are waging a difficult campaign for the upper Colorado River Basin project—yet we find that the foreign-aid program envisions many millions for a similar program on the Nile River—and there is little objection to that. I have not yet committed myself on the Colorado project, but I will say that if the Government of the United States proposes to spend a billion dollars—or any part of it—on water projects, I am for spending it on the Colorado rather than the Nile.

This is only an example of what I have in mind. I have gone through the President's budget carefully, seeking to find those programs where we have favored foreign nations while neglecting our own institutions, our own resource development, and our own people. My proposal to stop foreign aid will make it possible to give adequate financial support to these worthy domestic endeavors. I am submitting a chart listing some of the proposals that could use—and should have—better support. I would like to discuss each of them briefly.

NEW HIGHWAY LEGISLATION

Perhaps the first thing that comes to mind is the proposed new highway legislation. This legislation failed to pass the House last year because controversy over financing arose. Now, the Ways and Means Committee is considering a bill that would increase taxes on all highway users in order to finance the program. Our mail is heavy with complaints from those who would pay the increased taxes—and we are urged to exempt one group—lay the burden on another—charge the truckers more—and so on. Indicating there is considerable alarm throughout the country at the prospect of additional taxes on highway users.

A large part—and perhaps all—of this anxiety could be avoided if we would resolve to stop foreign aid and devote

our present revenue to our own purposes.

Under my proposal, up to $1 billion per year—out of the present revenue—could be made available to the new highway program. We could finance the badly needed improvements in American highways with the money we are now giving away for foreign aid. We would not have to add to the already heavy burden of those who use the highways. In this connection, let me say that additional taxes on truckers eventually will mean higher rates for farmers, businessmen and consumers on everything that is transported by trucks. Like the proposed increase in rail freight rates, such an increase would mean a general increase in the costs of doing business.

I strongly urge this as the solution to the highway finance problem.

DOMESTIC GOVERNMENT

I find the Federal Communications Commission is a regulatory agency with a considerable backlog of work. It is entirely proper for the Federal Government to regulate this field. Assuming the power to regulate carries with it an obligation to act promptly on the petitions and applications citizens submit.

Failure to act promptly impedes progress and is costly to individuals whose funds are thus tied up for long periods of time. I propose an increase of $100,000 to permit the FCC to enlarge its staff sufficiently to get its work current. This need not be a continuing appropriation. I do not think it should be—after the present heavy expansion of the industry is cared for.

Second. The Smithsonian Institution, storehouse of the Nation's historic, scientific, and natural treasures, is not able to provide the kind of service a national museum should provide. It is years behind in its modernization program. I propose that we use a part of our surplus to improve this service to the people, and have set down the tentative figure of $1 million to expedite the modernization program.

PUBLIC BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS

The condition of our public buildings has been allowed to deteriorate alarmingly during the years since World War II began.

We have devoted so much of our money to war and foreign aid that we have not been able to make any but the most critically needed repairs to our public buildings. The General Services Administration is now embarking on a 10-year program to eliminate the backlog of repairs and improvements that our buildings need. This means that some Americans will have 10 years to wait before an adequate and proper post-office building is able to serve their needs. It means that some Government workers must labor for 10 years in inadequate, poorly arranged, and poorly lighted structures where it is well known that their efficiency and the service they render is not their best. I propose to make available out of the surplus this year an additional $56,700,000 to remain available until the General Services Administration has completely wiped out its backlog of needed repairs. Perhaps it cannot be completed in the next fiscal year, but it should be done as swiftly as possible. It is an expense that will not recur if we will keep this work current.

CONSERVATION

Agriculture is of prime interest to almost every one of us. While there are some necessary and worthwhile increases in the program recommended by the President, I feel that they do not go far enough.

It seems to me that a 25-percent increase in agriculture research, to be devoted especially to improved marketing and distribution of farm products and new uses for food and fiber, would be a wise expenditure. It will add, as the table shows, just $8 million to our budget.

Plant and animal disease and pest control is another item that has an important economic bearing on the welfare of our own people. We suffer each year a terrific economic loss through disease and pests. It seems entirely just to me to propose an increase of $10 million which will enable us to accelerate all of the various disease and pest-eradication programs, with resulting benefits to the entire Nation.

A good example of a program that requires greater support is the eradication of the gypsy moth. This insect threatens the hardwood forests of 25 States, including Ohio. Yet, only $500,000 has been requested for its support. I think we should undertake a vigorous program to control the gypsy moth where it is found and prevent its spread into other areas of the Nation.

The Forest Service has been neglected for too many years.

For example—the program for reforestation in national forests is based upon the planting of 20,000 acres per year. Four million acres need reforestation. If we give this program the attention it deserves, I believe we should increase it tenfold.

Also, the reseeding of national forest lands is lagging far behind what wise conservation practices indicate. It is based upon the reseeding of only 60,000 acres per year. Again, I think this program could well be increased tenfold.

The President's budget includes $1,850,000 for these 2 programs. I propose that it be increased to $18,500,000, which would take only $16,650,000 from our $5,200,000,000 surplus.

The soil-bank programs contemplate the shift of many millions of acres into forage and timber. I am hopeful that a great many farmers will recognize the wisdom and long-term value of growing timber on these acres. Such an increase in farm woodlots and small-timber areas will require additional forest research, however, and will place a much heavier burden on the various programs under which the Forest Service and the State forestry departments cooperate. I think that a necessary corollary of the soil-bank program is a modest increase in these Forest Service activities.

I have proposed an additional $1,100,000 for forest research and an additional $4 million for cooperative programs—the latter to be made available only as next year's State legislative sessions provide their proper share of a larger program.

With so much emphasis now being placed on conservation, I do not believe that we should permit any area of the Federal Government's land resources to fall behind.

Still in connection with the soil-bank program—and the effort to reduce crop acreage—I suggest that we consider an increased rate of acquisition of private lands to be added to the national forests under the Weeks law. I am distressed to note that there is no provision for this program in the budget. I believe it should be supported to the extent of $2 million, and the National Forest Reservation Commission should be urged to expedite its program—especially in areas where desirable acquisitions are, or have been, under cultivation.

I am certain all of us will recognize how the activities of the Soil Conservation Service fit into the general picture. I believe that sizable increases are warranted for conservation operations, watershed protection, and flood prevention.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Turning now to the Commerce Department, I am suggesting a sizable increase in funds for the Patent Office. Heretofore, we have been anxious to expedite the work of this office—but we have been faced with a budget deficit that prevented additional appropriations.

With the end of the foreign-aid program, this consideration no longer would apply. We could give the Patent Office sufficient funds to eliminate its backlog of work and keep future work current. This is a service our Government has agreed to perform for the people. Performance has been slow and the service inadequate. Let us make it the kind of service the taxpayers have a right to expect.

Also in commerce, the Civil Aeronautics Administration should receive funds for a greatly increased program of air safety.

The CAA made headlines recently when an official was quoted as saying that there were at least four narrow escapes every day when airliners barely avoided mid-air collision. The safety and welfare of the American people demand an accelerated air-safety program.

My good friends from California have asked for a modest sum of money to increase research on earthquakes. The sum of $700,000 appropriated to the Coast and Geodetic Survey might provide extremely valuable knowledge, and I believe that we can afford such an expenditure if we eliminate foreign aid.

Under the Defense Department, I have suggested only one item—a proposal to reimburse the Muskingum Conservancy District for the amount owed it by the Government. The Corps of Engineers and the district have agreed that the debt is $535,000. It should be paid. All legitimate obligations of the Federal Government should be paid—and paid promptly.

The Public Health Service can profitably use, for the long-term advantage of the Nation, small additional amounts for its water-pollution studies. I think these are of vital importance.

Also, it has been widely suggested that the National Heart Institute requires a larger program, and I have proposed sufficient additional appropriations to give this agency $30 million in the next fiscal year.

Dental research may also merit increased support.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The Interior Department is another conservation and housekeeping agency which has been unable to do a proper job because there was never enough money left after our foreign friends received their handouts.

I suggest that an additional $3 million be appropriated to the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Land Management, to complete mapping and cadastral surveys here in the United States. Large areas of our own Nation have not yet been surveyed. The work must be done before we can have full knowledge or development of our resources. I think that this increase should be made an annual appropriation until the basic work is completed.

The Bureau of Land Management is also in need of an increased staff to reduce a terrific backlog of oil and gas, and other applications. There should be no backlog. We should be able to expect prompt attention to our applications. I suggest an added $1 million to enable the Bureau to bring its work into current conditions.

The Bureau of Mines can and should contribute far more to our knowledge of mineral resources—and how they may be developed—than its former budget permitted. I think an additional five million, primarily for research, should be made available, and could be used to our everlasting advantage as a nation.

The National Park Service has been sadly neglected. We now have before us a 10-year program that will overcome the accumulated deficiencies in the system, and provide the necessary accommodations, protection, and facilities for the millions of Americans who visit the parks each year. The first year's program for this purpose will cost $66 million. I propose that we provide the full amount.

Although not conversant with the details, I believe that we have a serious school situation in the District of Columbia, and that the Federal Government, with the surplus indicated by the cessation of foreign aid, should increase the Federal payment to the district in whatever amount is required to provide a proper school system in the Nation's Capital. I should think that $2 million would be adequate.

There may be many other programs of the kind I have listed—programs that are necessary, proper functions of Federal Government—programs that have been neglected during the years of our preoccupation with the needs of other nations. If so, I think there is room in the budget for them.

All of the increases I have proposed would cost only $204,879,000. Just 3 percent of the amount saved by eliminating the new request for foreign aid.

SUMMARY

In summary, I propose to eliminate all new appropriations and authorizations for foreign aid. This will save us $4,800,000,000 proposed by the President. Added to his estimated surplus for the next fiscal year, we will have $5,200,000,000 to devote to our own rather than foreign programs.

I propose it be used as follows:

For debt reduction	$2,600,000,000
For tax relief for individuals	1,113,000,000
For tax relief for small business	400,000,000
For proper support of domestic agencies	204,679,000
For highways	900,000,000
Total	5,217,679,000

I welcome suggestions and comments on this program. I hope that many will see the wisdom of the proposal. If we can lift the burden of foreign aid, we can do all of these things.

It seems to me it is high time we began to take care of Americans.

Budget increases suggested by Mr. Bow

Independent agencies:	
Federal Communications Commission	$100,000
Smithsonian Institution	1,000,000
General Services Administration — Public Buildings Service	56,700,000
Agricultural Research Service:	
1. Research	8,000,000
2. Plant and animal disease and pest control	10,000,000
Forest service:	
1. Resource development	16,650,000
2. Forest research	1,100,000
3. State and private forestry cooperation	4,000,000
4. Acquisition of lands for national forests (Weeks Act)	2,000,000
Soil Conservation Service:	
1. Conservation operations, SCS	5,000,000
2. Watershed protection	2,000,000
3. Flood prevention	3,000,000
Commerce Department:	
Coast and Geodetic Survey	700,000
Patent Office	3,000,000
CAA, air safety	5,000,000
Defense Department: Civil functions (Muskingum district)	535,000
Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Water pollution	1,000,000
National Heart Institute	7,894,000
Interior Department:	
Geological Survey	1,500,000
Bureau of Land Management	2,500,000
Bureau of Mines	5,000,000
National Park Service "mission 66"	66,000,000
District of Columbia: An additional Federal payment sufficient to complete modernization of school facilities, add new facilities, and reduce teacher load to acceptable level	2,000,000
	204,679,000
For new legislation: Interstate highway system, first year	900,000,000

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is there available a list of the obligated and the unobligated funds, showing their purpose?

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman mean in the foreign-aid program?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. BOW. That list could be secured from the ICA.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The unobligated funds are about how much?

Mr. BOW. The unobligated funds are something over $2 billion.

Mr. NICHOLSON. And the unexpended funds are about $7 billion?

Mr. BOW. That is about right. In other words, they could do this. They could continue the present program for a period of 2 or 3 years even though we appropriated nothing this year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the excellent presentation he is making on this very important subject. I trust that he remembers that not so very many months ago, Dictator Tito in Yugoslavia gave our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, a nice ride in a speedboat, and it was immediately announced we would fork over millions of dollars to build a superhighway in Yugoslavia. I understand we are now building a superhighway in Jordan that for all practical purposes begins nowhere and ends nowhere. I understand we have built roads in the Belgian Congo. I certainly subscribe to the gentleman's statement that we should stop any appropriation for foreign aid this year and use the money thus withheld in behalf of the people of America.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is making an interesting statement, of course, but I assume the gentleman noticed in this morning's papers that the Secretary of State has indicated that we need a long-term foreign-aid program.

Mr. BOW. I listened with great interest to the statement the Secretary of State made in Philadelphia when it was being televised, as I say, with interest, knowing that I was going to be on the floor today, and knowing that with the amount of money that has been appropriated and that now is in the foreign-aid cash register, so that they can continue for a period of almost 3 years, we should begin to think about the people at home. I hope the gentleman from Oklahoma will think, too, about some of his people out there and some of the needs that they have in Oklahoma, and join with us in an attempt to reestablish these things in this country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Again I want to commend the gentleman and concur with him heartily in his proposal. His talk is most timely in view of the fact that the President of Italy is to be before the

House this week, apparently seeking further handouts for his government.

I hope that when the President of Italy appears before the House of Representatives he will at least make it plain whether he is or is not advocating United Nation's recognition of Red China.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a summary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

JUAN PERON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, last week I had occasion to make certain remarks with respect to an unwelcome guest which this Government had in the person of one Juan Peron, ex-Dictator of Argentina, who was overthrown by the people of Argentina and who was residing in luxury in the Hotel Washington, of all places, which is owned by the Canal Zone Company, which, in turn, is owned by the United States Government.

For some months Mr. Peron, after having throttled the liberties of the Argentine people, has been enjoying a holiday that would be out of the realm of financial possibility for any ordinary citizen here in America.

After he was thrown out by his people he made his way through various Latin American countries and wound up in Panama. He wound up in the Hotel El Panama. He complaining of the prices decided to leave there and he transferred to the Washington Hotel.

I complained to various people about the propriety of his staying in this Government-operated hotel where he luxuriated. But nobody wanted to embarrass anyone, so nothing was said for quite some time. However, once a dictator, always a dictator. It has been well said that Bourbons learn nothing and forget nothing; so Mr. Peron, this unwelcome guest, started to plan from the Hotel Washington his return over a sea of blood to the people of Argentina. All this time he was, as I say, residing in property owned by this free country.

Last week I suggested that the United States throw him out of the hotel. I said we should very bluntly tell him: "Hit the road, bum." And after that I got a call from the State Department, which never calls me—I have never heard from them except the first days when I was elected to Congress when I got a high-school sophomoric lecture from them on elemental civics. The representatives of the State Department chided me for my attitude. I told them we had got to get rid of Mr. Peron. The representative of the State Department said they had wanted to get rid of Peron for some time and that they had tried to in a very diplomatic sort of way, but they were making slow progress. I told them we should be vigorous and get him out of there, that to let him stay was not fair to decent people everywhere. At about this time statements were appearing in the Herald Tribune, for instance of February 20 of this year, in an article written by Joseph Newman, a correspondent of that paper. He quoted Peron as saying: "When I return to Argentina many heads will roll, it will be terrible, perhaps as many as a million will be killed." All this taking place in a hotel which we own.

Now, some of the poor taxpayers of the United States could not get into that hotel, yet here was this 20th century Nero conducting himself in a fashion that if you and I had conducted ourselves in a Washington hotel we would have been thrown out.

He brought with him, I understand, various people who share his use of this hotel and who make his life more leisurely for him in his spare moments, by helping him in his plotting.

At any rate I was pleased to read that the State Department and the Defense Department over the weekend have at long last said that they have instructed the Governor of the Canal Zone to put him out.

Reading from the New York Times I understand that the State Department announced on February 25 that it had taken steps to force Juan D. Peron, former Argentine dictator, to leave the Government-owned Hotel Washington in the Panama Canal Zone.

The action came after several Congressmen had protested. I am the "several Congressman" who protested. Although some consider me a singular person—the plural is a better description. I do not say that he is inaccurate when he says several Congressman, but I am that "group"; and as I say while I am not "Congressmen" in the plural, nonetheless, I am probably the size of two average Congressmen, at least, and them with their briefcases loaded with books thrown in.

But the papers said the action came after several Congressmen had protested—and again I say I am the "several"—against permitting the ousted Argentine president to live in the hostelry.

A State Department spokesman said that the decision was made "some weeks ago." He said that if Senor Peron continued to stay at the hotel "it could be incorrectly construed." The State Department went on to say that some weeks ago the Departments of State and Defense had concluded that Mr. Peron should establish a domicile—how very tender. How solicitous—a domicile outside the Washington Hotel in Panama. He said that it was a transient hotel. I do not know whether that hotel moved around or not, but he said it was a transient hotel and that any stay giving the appearance of permanent residence could be incorrectly construed. How else could it be construed?

How did this dictator, this despoiler of all that democracy stands for, get to occupy a hotel run by our Government in the first place. Surely this shocking laxity should be investigated by some appropriate congressional committee. What type of example are we giving to the free world when we set ourselves up as the harbor for stranded dictators? It has been said that old soldiers never die, they just fade away. Apparently old dictators never die but go on a luxurious vacation in hotels run by the United States Government—if this is to be considered a typical example of our diplomacy. I am glad to say that the State Department and the Defense Department have acted, even though belatedly.

One newspaper says that Peron wants this notice to get out in writing. It is remarkable how legalistic dictators get when their own skins are involved. The best way to get rid of him is to take him by the scruff of the neck and heave him out. Get 2 good marines down there to do it, or 2 good hotel "bouncers."

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. The gentleman from New Jersey has rendered a real service to the people of this country so far as demonstrating to our friends in South America that we do not agree with the proposition of our Government furnishing a spa to deposed dictators. I was wondering about this: Most hotels in this country in accordance with municipal regulations are required to keep registers of their guests and are required to make some inquiry prior to the time they receive a guest. The thing I am wondering about is, consistent with those rules and regulations, how did this deposed dictator gain admission into the hotel in the first place?

Mr. TUMULTY. In answer to the gentleman from Illinois, I may say that is the $64,000 question.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I am trying to answer the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois. I may appear to be large enough to answer two questions at once, but I have not mastered that as yet.

Mr. MUMMA. I can explain something to the gentleman.

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman to explain how Peron got in there in the first place.

Mr. MUMMA. I am not defending Mr. Peron in the least, but may I say that the Washington Hotel is owned by the United States Government but it is run by a concessionaire. We own it but it is leased to a concessionaire. I do not know any more about it except the gentleman says it is run by the Government.

Mr. TUMULTY. That is right.

Mr. MUMMA. Technically it is run by a concessionaire.

Mr. TUMULTY. Then it is misrun by the concessionaire.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Even though it might be run by a concessionaire, I think most communities have regulations that would enable the hotel to deny access to it of nuisances. I think we ought to have some sort of regulation to deny access to our hotels by those who are nuisances.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. It was my understanding that the hotel was leased. They repaired it, painted it, and so forth, to brighten it up. They did not make a go of it and they turned it back to the Panama Canal Company and it is run, according to my understanding, by the Panama Canal Company.

Mr. TUMULTY. There is no doubt in my mind but what the Panama Canal Company runs it. The Government owns it and is running it now, as evidenced by the belated action of the State Department and the Defense Department that they can get Peron out. They could have done so 2 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from an Argentinian, which I shall read, however I am not going to reveal the name of the gentleman who sent it, for obvious reasons.

The letter says:

> You complain, and quite justly, about Peron's recent statement that he would purge a million of his enemies if he ever returns. The statement is stupid, since Mr. Peron proved to be a yellow—

And then he calls Peron a name that I cannot repeat here on the floor. Continuing—

> from his refuge in Panama, protected by your Government, does not stop there. I am enclosing four pages of today's paper in order to illustrate you about the acts of sabotage which are going on here, ordered by Mr. Peron from the Washington Hotel. There is proof, which you will surely get if you do some research, that the former dictator has engraved records giving sabotage instructions to his paid murderers here, and has written pamphlets, dated in Panama, to the same effect.

Mr. Speaker, that brings me to the second portion of my address.

Recently the State Department entered into a treaty with the Republic of Panama and in it it is proposed that certain land and property be transferred to Panama. Among the properties to be transferred is this very same hotel, the George Washington. Now, so far no legislation has been introduced to effect the transfer of this hotel, so I feel that if Mr. Peron is still in Panama, even though he may be out of the hotel while this legislation is pending—and I speak only for myself—I would not be disposed to vote for the transfer of that property to the Republic of Panama. It seems to me that the presence of this dictator, this man who is the antithesis of everything the United States of America believes in, ought not to be condoned by our sister Republic. I realize, of course, that Panama has to run her internal affairs in her own way, and I am not attempting to interfere in any way except when it comes to voting here in this House I am going to be voting for the best interests of our own country. I do not know how Mr. Peron got into the hotel. He was there, as I say, from November through December, January, and February. He may be there now, for all I know. I do not know whether they have actually physically put him out or not, but whether they have put him out or not I would be very much interested to find out how he got in there in the first place, how it was this came about, how it was that no one, apparently, in our Government, took steps to put him out. All I know is that it is a bad place for him to be; it is bad for our Nation; it makes us look as a Nation which condoned what this man did. It may be true in Latin America that they have the principle of providing asylum, but this fellow is different. As I said last week, when it comes to a showdown, he makes Frankenstein and Dracula look like good citizens. When he goes swimming the fish near him die of shame. He is a man who has throttled to death liberty, he is a man who has made democracy his enemy, and he is a man who openly proclaims he is going to murder a million people. He is certainly not the kind of a man to have on our property. It is a dubious tribute to George Washington to have a hotel named after him suffer the indignity of the Peron carcass in its halls, for Peron is a man who stands opposed to all of Washington's ideals. So, let us tack up on that hotel not that Washington slept here, but that Peron was kicked out of here.

I would like to refer to another letter from Argentina which says "Very important." The author of this letter suggests that I limelight the statement of Argentina's provisional President who, when asked where he thought Peron should go, said "to Russia, which is a dictatorship adequate for him."

So, I would like to bring my remarks to a close by at least saying that the State Department and the Defense Department have done the right thing at long last about getting him out of the hotel. I wish they would have acted sooner. I call upon them to explain as to how Peron got in there in the first place. At any rate, let us get him out of the hotel, and I hope the Republic of Panama will get him out of Panama. I know where he should go, but he is not ready for it yet. The Western Hemisphere would be well rid of him.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOYLE. I think for the edification of the State Department that they ought to think in terms of quit sleeping with any dictator. In everything that the gentleman has said it applies with strong force and effect to Peron. But, I do not think the State Department would have to look very far or look very arduously to see a lot of other dictators that have holes in their stockings and who probably are not worthy of our tender society and association as well.

Mr. TUMULTY. I may say perhaps we could suggest to the State Department that instead of massive retaliation their motto should be "massive exasperation."

FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, recent correspondence I have received from the Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, and a New York importing firm indicates to me that the movement is being revived to weaken the Flammable Fabrics Act by exempting lightweight silk scarves from its provisions.

As my colleagues know, I have long taken the position that nothing should be done to weaken this act, which was developed to safeguard the public and protect persons from suffering and death by fire. To satisfy the demands of manufacturers, the act was amended by the 83d Congress to lower somewhat its standards, but even with this, certain lightweight silk scarves could not comply and efforts were put forward last year to grant them outright exemption.

At that time I voiced strong objections to any further emasculation of the act, and was supported by textile labor groups and certain manufacturers. We were successful in defeating this move by way of an amendment that would have exempted such scarves from its provisions. A rule to bring up the bill for House action was overwhelmingly rejected.

Textiles importers and distributors, moved by economic considerations are apparently about to renew their fight, and thus free for sale and distribution in this country, millions of dollars of inventory in stocks, here and abroad, that do not meet the act's requirements.

I cannot agree with the reasoning that because there is no record of anyone having been burned seriously by having one of these scarves ignite, or that a scarf knotted about the neck could be easily removed should such an incident occur, this is sufficient cause to dilute this law, enacted only after years of study and effort.

The time to act is before tragedy strikes and lives needlessly lost. Locking the barn after the horse has been stolen may prevent similar recurrences, but we have in the Flammable Fabrics Act the protection to prevent tragedy. Are we then going to throw this away and wait until flame searing death strikes some child or woman, and moves us again to clamor for the protection we once had and willfully relinquished?

I want to reiterate here and now, I will never withdraw from the position that the Flammable Fabrics Act must not be further weakened, that no item of wearing apparel, and a scarf knotted about the throat assuredly rests in that category, shall be exempted from its provisions.

It is unfortunate that the Japanese people with all their technical skill, their ingenuity and inventiveness, cannot develop processes that would make it possible for them to produce a lightweight scarf that would meet the standards of the act. But until they are willing and able to take this step, I will continue to fight for the scarves' exclusion and the exclusion of the products of any manufacturers, domestic or foreign, which do not meet its standards; to safeguard the lives of the men, women and children who may become the innocent victims of human negligence and greed.

THE CHARLESTOWN (MASS.) BOYS' CLUB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is 25 years ago since I joined the Boys' Club of Charlestown, Mass. I remember the dues—1 cent a year, the greatest bargain a boy could get—swimming, basketball, gym—everything to attract and brighten the heart of a growing boy—Nate Hurwitz, a great athlete, stern disciplinarian, admired and respected by all the boys. Many fine men were molded in the Charlestown Boys' Club.

In the February issue of Reader's Digest there is an article in praise of boys' clubs. I am in agreement with the amount of good boys' clubs do, but the article indicts the citizens of Charlestown, many of whom are the parents of today's members of that boys' club.

Charlestown is a small community, historically famous and a part of Boston proper. A great number of its citizens earn their living either at the Boston Naval Shipyard, or on the waterfront. Hardworking, honest, and sincere, the people of Charlestown are devout in their religion, which is mostly Catholic. Their family life is clean and strong, built on a love of God and country, and ever respectful of the laws of man.

So incensed are the people of Charlestown at the unjust criticism, the deliberate falsehoods, and the inaccurate misstatements, that a citizens' meeting was held to discuss the article, and to urge the editors of the Reader's Digest to print a retraction. It is a privilege for me to join with them, and I hope that the Reader's Digest will speedily retract the erroneous statements and correct the wrong which they have done. The Reader's Digest has not told the truth to its readers. It has printed an article using manufactured figures to color a story which have maligned the good name and respect of all of the decent citizens of Charlestown. The American people have always guarded the freedom of the press, but they demand that we have an honest press.

I am enclosing two articles from the Boston Pilot, the official newspaper of the archdiocese of Boston, which I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

The articles follow:

[From the Boston Pilot of February 18, 1956]

READER'S DIGEST HAS "CLUBBED" CHARLESTOWN

(By Rt. Rev. Daniel T. McColgan, Ph. D.)

(The author, a native of Charlestown and presently director of Nazareth, is a recognized scholar who has done extensive research on questions of social science.)

"Club" is variously defined by Webster as "a weapon for delivering rough blows"; an association of persons to promote a common object." In the title "Boys' Clubs of Boston" the term obviously is used in the latter sense. However, without any publicly noted dissent on the part of this association's administrators, the Boys' Club has been recently used as a weapon for delivering some very rough blows at at least two sections of Boston, namely, South Boston and Charlestown.

The attack was launched in the February 1956 issue of Reader's Digest, in an article by roving editor William L. White. Mr. White begins the assault by mentioning South Boston, "where cops once went in pairs." As a secret admirer of the people of South Boston, I am certain that their stature is not less noble, their virtues not less numerous and rich than are those of the people of Charlestown. I would be presumptuous, perhaps, to speak for them, but I am a native and lifelong resident of Charlestown.

Having dealt with South Boston, Mr. White turns to my "home town" and writes:

The nearby Charlestown district is a square mile, bounded by two rivers and a harbor, noted for its tough characters. Many broken families live here, and it has the fourth highest adult crime rate in the State. Yet, because it also (sic) has a Boys' Club it is third from the bottom in juvenile crime, which last year dropped another 7 percent while its adult crime rate rose.

The impressions thus conveyed to the reading public throughout the country are cruelly false. The evil is aggravated by the fact that Reader's Digest policy provides no hope of retraction nor fair opportunity for retort. In the hope that in some slight way the reputation of a maligned community may be repaired, I offer this document.

Let me say at the outset that while I disavow Mr. White's characterization of Charlestown and lament Mr. Burger's collaboration therein, I join both of them with alacrity in acclaiming the easily verified achievements of the Boys' Clubs which on the local level were launched in New England nearly 100 years ago, and whose national organization, The Boys' Club of America, formed in 1906, is celebrating its golden jubilee this year.

It is indeed regrettable that an article dedicated to the laudable task of publicizing the work of the Boys' Clubs should be marred by gross distortions of truth, outrageously illogical conclusions, unwarranted slurs and gratuitous assumptions.

SAINTS AND SINNERS

It is not my purpose to deny that Charlestown has had its sinners. However, I do believe that if these poor souls were to crush their besetting sin by becoming totally abstinent (and I don't mean from chocolate), especially if their good resolutions were seconded by local tavern keepers who cooperatively might close their emporia and depart to other pursuits in their distant, "dry," suburban habitats, then Charlestown would be truly the land of saints. Indeed, it has had and still has more than its share of them in spite of prevailing temptations.

Charlestown family life has traditionally been strong, pure, fruitful and integral. Crimes of a sexual nature have been almost nonexistent. Deliberate crimes of violence have been remarkably rare among her citizens.

Surely the Reader's Digest would not wish to ascribe to Charlestown the evils, and evildoers, at the State's prison. Surely the denizens of the "clubs" on Chelsea Street, Main Street and Sullivan Square are not representative Charlestownians. These institutions unfortunately and much to the dismay of its citizens are in Charlestown, they are definitely not of it. Charlestown serves as a crossroads leading directly from the heart of Boston to the north. Daily an estimated quarter million travelers use its streets. Surely, the moral missteps of these strangers should not be cited against the reputation of our native sons.

When one thinks of Charlestown, it is not images of the delinquent or dissolute that flood one's mind. One recalls hardworking men who earn their daily bread on the docks, in the Navy Yard, in the freight yards, and elsewhere in public or private employment. These men are faithful to their families, their God and fellow men. A simple priest walking through the streets of Charlestown finds a nonsaluting passerby as rare as does an admiral aboard his flagship. And no admiral could be half so proud to be saluted by a fellow serviceman as I am to be greeted with a "Good morning, Your Reverence," by the longshoreman whose mammoth left hand has just passed over his mouth to remove a favorite corncob while his right hand doffs that now rare bit of masculine attire, a hat or cap.

The wives of these men are at home "keeping house" and rearing the priests, nuns, teachers, doctors, lawyers, the soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen, businessmen, and women of tomorrow.

Yes, there is an occasional adult and juvenile black sheep. That there are not more is certainly not the achievement solely of the boys' club as the Reader's Digest writers would seem to allege.

PARENTS AND PARISHES

That Charlestown is a law-abiding community of earnest citizens of modest means is due mainly to the good fathers and mothers whose name is legion. They are aided and abetted in their task by three well-knit, finely organized parishes served by a dozen or more zealous diocesan priests who care for the spiritual needs of the town. You see, Charlestown is predominantly Catholic. For its Protestant brethren there are available the ministrations of several churches and devoted clergymen. There are no Jewish religious facilities.

Nearly 60 nuns staff 3 parochial schools wherein over 1,800 children are taught. Additional hundreds of children are instructed and edified by scores of dedicated and talented public-school instructors.

Nine Little Sisters of the Assumption literally fly on their errands of mercy to the sick. The poor in worldly as well as spiritual goods are sponsored and succored by fellow laymen in conferences of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and men and women in parish units of the Legion of Mary.

The parochial units of the Catholic Youth Organization annually boast of champions in swimming, basketball, baseball, scouting, etc., but they are prouder still of their contribution to the saintly lives and good citizenship of all their members.

In this good work the local boys' club plays an important and praiseworthy role, but it is not a preponderant one. Most certainly it is not the sole community agency promoting good and preventing delinquent conduct. Yes, there are many character building agencies laboring hard in Charlestown. These include the boys' club.

CHARACTER

But what is this entity character that they are helping to produce? Mr. Arthur Burger, executive director of the Boys' Clubs of Boston is quoted by Mr. White in the Reader's Digest as being of the opinion that—

"Character is something that is caught, not taught. If a boy doesn't catch it from his parents, it rubs off on him from other boys and club leaders."

Most respectfully, and I hope not presumptuously, in speaking for the citizens of Charlestown, I would say that they do not think of character as an acquired veneer—certainly it is not caught like chalk from a billiard stick. Rather do they think of character as life dominated by principles as distinguished from life dominated by impulse from within and our circumstances from without. These principles are conceptions of right and duty, deeply rooted in the mind, branded in consciousness, brooded over—elevated into standards of judgment, taste, feeling and action, and consistently applied to life.

A collection of principles covering all departments of life constitutes an ideal. A man of principle is, therefore, a man with an ideal. The people of Charlestown believe

that there cannot be lofty character without high ideals, for ideals are the blueprints according to which we build our character. To be effective and worthwhile, the ideals must be not merely pictured, admired and longed for, they must be embodied in a set of definite principles dominating life and resulting in character. Accordingly as their ideals and principles are good or bad, people have good or bad character.

The people of Charlestown consider that in the task of character formation, the two rich resources are the family and religion. The home is the primeval school. It is the best, the most hallowed, and the most potential of all the academies; and the parent—especially the mother—is the first, the most influential, and the most cherished of all teachers.

Charlestownians feel that the most wholesome and the most lasting influence is exercised on children by parents of good character, for where precept is supplemented by personal practice, the parental example begets the respect and love of the child and remains a guide, an inspiration, a protection and an enobling influence amid the dangers and pitfalls of life. Parents must be strong, alert and steady. They must appreciate the need of constant personal supervision and care of their children. They must be ready to administer discipline and correction where necessary. For says the wise man of the scripture:

"Folly is bound up in the heart of a child, and the rod of correction shall drive it away." (Proverbs xxii: 15.)

My fellow townsmen feel that within the home religion should be a guiding force in the life of youth, and a chief asset in that constructive guidance which is the best preventive of delinquency. There is no substitute for the true function of religion in supplying ethical and religious guidance to youth. There can be no guaranteed security against crime, there can be no moral security unless there is a definite, vitalized, moral system resting on the solid rock of religion. Religion furnished the highest ideals of conduct and the best motives for following those ideals.

I believe that traditionally the home and the church have been hard at work in Charlestown — forming consistently good character.

I most humbly, sincerely, and assuredly feel that their efforts, aided to a degree by the local boys' club have been uniformly successful.

A great man once said:

"A man should be proud of the place in which he lives, and live so that the place will be proud of him."

There are many, many youths in Charlestown who feel this way. And as their neighbor, I would like to stand and be counted with them.

FOR CHARLESTOWN

The EDITOR OF THE PILOT:

Your editorial in the February 11 issue of the Pilot captioned "Causes and Conclusions," was the first ray of hope to a much maligned citizenry who have been arraigned before the readers of the national publication, the Reader's Digest, as citizens of a town which ranks fourth in this State in adult crime.

It is easy for any group to point out to the world the work which they do and it is far easier to claim all the good effects of this work in a community while completely hiding the bad features behind a shroud of silence.

The decent people of Charlestown and to me that means all the people in Charlestown, have no criticism of the local boys club, they have done and are doing a good job, but for the people in charge of this club to claim that it is only because of this club that the juvenile delinquency rate in Charlestown is among the lowest, is a deliberate falsehood, and their statement cannot be proven by facts or figures.

We have in Charlestown, 3 Catholic and 3 Protestant churches, serving the religious needs of our people, all of these parishes have programs to help their young people. It is true that none of these parishes can afford to have a swimming pool or a gymnasium, neither do they have the great cushion of the Red Feather Community Fund aid, and must by necessity limit these activities on the ability of their parishioners to finance such programs, but these limited activities pay off, and when our people send their children to the boys' club, the club officials will find a fairly decent boy to deal with, one usually well versed in how to conduct himself properly and honorably.

We have in Charlestown 3 parochial and 7 public schools, the nuns and the teachers in these schools have done an exemplary job in assisting us in the molding of the character of our children, these schools are filled with good, decent and honest children, who come from good and respectable homes, which are presided over by God-fearing, God-loving and law-abiding parents, parents, who, although they respect the good work accomplished by the local boys club, yet do not look upon it as a correctional institution, nor do we feel that they have the right to take over our duties as good parents.

It was, it is and it ever shall be our God given right to bring up our children to love and respect God and His church, to love and respect their parents, their brothers and sisters and their homes, and to protect and cherish the rights of their friends and neighbors. This is our Charlestown heritage, passed down from generation to generation and jealously guarded by our people.

To heap coals of derision on such a people, because of a few isolated instances, by such a national publication as the Reader's Digest, and whipped up to a song of hate and intemperance by its roving reporter, is a rank injustice. It should be retracted.

This past week a group of Charlestown citizens met to discuss this article, among this group were priests, ministers, the clerk and the probation officer of the local court, the captain of the police, our local representative, and a group of public spirited citizens. It was found that the Reader's Digest figures on adult crime in our town were completely false, and that a letter shall be sent to the Digest requesting them to send their roving reporter to us, and to write a story about the good people in Charlestown. We feel that one monthly edition of the Digest would prove insufficient to record our good deeds.

The Pilot editorial suggests caution; it is sound advice; any group claiming credit for the lack of juvenile delinquency in one section of the city, because of the activity in which they are interested, should be ready to assume the failure of their activity in some other section of a city where juvenile delinquency and also adult delinquency are much higher than in poor abused Charlestown.

Thanking you for your kind patience and attention, I remain.

JOSEPH W. MCCARTHY.

CHARLESTOWN.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a letter addressed to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, from a constituent of mine. The letter is well written and, I believe, self-explanatory.

FEBRUARY 22, 1956.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: A few weeks ago our friend, Congressman BURNSIDE, sent us a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, calling to my attention your address to the House of Representatives with reference to matters pertaining to small business.

Being a small manufacturer, in business for the past 10 years, and being a principal supplier to various Government agencies, including Army, Navy, and Air Force, we have had more than our share of experiences in the manner by which small business is treated by these various organizations. We have had some very pleasant relations with several branches of the Navy, along with Army ordnance. On the other hand, we have had some very disappointing and disgusting experiences with other agencies, along with the Small Business Administration.

I am sure small manufacturers throughout the country appreciate the efforts of you and your associates in behalf of maintaining free enterprise and a democratic form of business. I also believe the majority of small manufacturers agree there is a definite need in this country for big industries and I do not believe that anyone will deny this fact; however, as Mr. Fairless once told me, the backbone of United States Steel's business is based on support they have gotten from the thousands of small firms. We in small business sincerely hope you will continue the fine work you have undertaken and we only hope this pressure will not be let up until your objective is accomplished.

In reference to the Small Business Administration, I have had several occasions to request help from this organization, as well as knowing other responsible firms who likewise seeked help. In every instance we were, for some reason or another, turned down. It certainly is disgusting to see an organization which has been set up by Congress for the purpose of contributing certain benefits to small business not fulfill its obligation.

I am more than convinced that Small Business Administration is the most useless of all agencies sponsored by the Government. This organization is manned by broken down bankers who are not capable of earning a livelihood outside of a Government agency, along with political appointees consisting of lawyers and so-called professional experts who are likewise incompetent and unable to earn a respectable living in competition with other men in their profession. It is too bad that more of your associates in the House, as well as Senate, do not take the time to really investigate that hornet's nest.

We certainly wish you every success in your efforts on behalf of small business and if we can be of help at any time, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

LE JOHN MANUFACTURING CO.,
SAM POLITANO, *President.*

APPLAUSE FOR THE HONORABLE A. FERNÓS-ISERN, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes, to revise and extend my

remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take these few minutes to applaud the Honorable A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

His exposition of the delicate situation confronting the citizens of Puerto Rico in their use of the English language impressed me.

I trust that my colleagues in the House join with me in applauding our friend and colleague, the doctor. The correspondence which follows discloses, I believe, the reason for my enthusiasm:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1956.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Thank you for your warm and friendly postal card in reply to my letter of February 16. It was because I regard you as a friend that I felt I could write you with such frankness. I knew, of course, that there must be a misunderstanding and your message in reply shows that most certainly there was.

You have been to Puerto Rico and you have observed firsthand our attitudes and how close we feel to our continental brothers. You have always exhibited friendliness to us and understanding of our problems, and it is in this spirit I feel that we in the Congress can work together toward worthwhile objectives and in harmony of effort.

Sincerely always,
A. FERNÓS-ISERN,
Resident Commissioner.

P. S.—Yes; I see now the other pages of the RECORD. No disagreement.

Thanks again.

FERNÓS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES CONGRESS,
February 16, 1956.

Hon. A. FERNÓS-ISERN,
Resident Commissioner,
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

MY DEAR DOCTOR, FRIEND, AND COLLEAGUE: Patriot that you are, man of courage, you who know your job as you know your people and your beautiful country (over much of which I flew), to you, who looks after the interests of your people and your country as you did so magnificently in your brave and splendid letter of February 16, 1956, what more could one say but "Thanks," "Thanks for drawing our hearts and our minds closer, closer to those goals each of us must travel in the future we vision for ourselves." May its brilliance and fullness bring us joy and glad tidings.

Your friend, always,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
Member of Congress, 13th, New Jersey.

P. S.—Did you note my remarks on page 460–461 of the hearings?

A. D. S.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1956.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIEMINSKI: My attention has been directed to your statement concerning Puerto Rico, which appears on page 362, on the hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, on Monday, January 23, 1956, in considering appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies.

I regret that I must disagree with the concepts of your statement. I am sure you would welcome further information to substantiate the reasons for my disagreement.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a self-governing sovereign community within the United States federative political system, in accordance with the terms of a compact, and Samoa, a possession of the United States, have such different political status; different social conditions, different historical and cultural backgrounds; their peoples respectively are so widely different, that there is no basis for establishing a parallel.

As you may have noted, during the entire hearings on the Territories and possessions of the United States before the subcommittee, not a single item was presented for which appropriations by the Federal Government were sought specifically for Puerto Rico. While Federal money is appropriated for the operation of the local governments of the Territories and possessions, the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico pay the full cost of their Commonwealth government with their own taxes.

Federal monies are spent in Puerto Rico, not as specific appropriations for Puerto Rico, but rather because Puerto Rico is a participant in the United States Federal system, and the Federal Government has certain functions in Puerto Rico as it does in continental United States. Such Federal expenses may be classified in three main groups, as follows:

1. Expenses for national defense. There are strategic United States military bases in Puerto Rico.

2. Expenses for Federal civilian agencies operating in Puerto Rico. (As to these expenses, I know there is a strong feeling amongst leaders in Puerto Rico, that whenever a reexamination of the present economic and political relationships between the United States and Puerto Rico may be undertaken, Puerto Rico should insist upon assuming as many of these obligations as in their nature can properly be assumed and administered by the Commonwealth Government; of course, without in any way altering the fundamental relationships of Puerto Rico with the United States, but with the purpose of relieving the Federal Government of any expense in Puerto Rico, which Puerto Rico may itself be able to carry.)

3. Federal contributions to programs carried out under grant-in-aid laws, which of course, are as much of national as of local interest. In each case, Puerto Rico must pay its share at least by the same proportion as in the States. (In the case of public welfare assistance and the school lunch-program, the formula applied to Puerto Rico is not as liberal as that applied to the member States of the Union or to the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.)

There is no question that Puerto Rico derives great benefits from its status as a Commonwealth within the United States political system, and from the relationships so created. However, I would be less than honest if I did not call attention to the fact that the benefits of our noble association are reciprocal.

We are citizens of our Commonwealth and citizens of the United States, as residents of New Jersey are citizens of the State and of the United States. As United States citizens, we are under the same obligation to defend the Nation as are the citizens of a State. And we have always answered the call without equivocation. The record of the Puerto Ricans in the recent conflict in Korea is second to none. Puerto Rico is a bulwark of the United States in the Caribbean; for the Panama Canal, a vital spot in our defense.

Puerto Rico is one of the best overseas markets of the United States, in fact, the sixth-best in the New World. Our annual purchases from the United States have reached over half-a-billion dollars, while sales of Puerto Rico's products to the mainland are well below that figure. More than 90 percent of the imports of Puerto Rico originate in the United States. United States goods enjoy the full protection of the United States tariff laws.

Puerto Rico is a shining example to the entire world of how peoples of Spanish culture, traditions, and origin can maintain in this new world of ours their individualities, in freedom and security, intimately associated with the free peoples of the United States mainland.

With our self-imposed taxes, we maintain our own school system, in the same way that the State of New Jersey maintains its school system. This is a tremendous task for us. Our proportionate school-age population is much larger than that of any other United States community of comparable numbers. The average income in Puerto Rico is lower than the lowest per capita income in any State. It is only about 50 percent of that of Mississippi.

No Federal money is appropriated to maintain our school system. However, not only have we endeavored and succeeded to a very impressive extent in creating a school system that will give educational opportunity to all our children, but we have the double task of teaching them the normal curriculum of any school in a modern country, plus a language other than their vernacular, from the very first grade on.

Puerto Rico is a Spanish-speaking community for the same reason New Jersey, your own State, is an English-speaking community. The reasons are ethnological and anthropological. You can well imagine what this effort would mean if New Jersey tried to include in its present curriculum the teaching of Spanish in addition to vernacular English and endeavored to make every one of its citizens bilingual in both languages of the new world. We do this of our own volition and in great earnest because we have chosen to live within the United States political system, as a commonwealth. Much as we cherish our cultural traditions as a people, we understand the great value of our people becoming bilingual. Thus, they will be able to communicate freely with their fellow citizens of the mainland, a consummation devoutly to be desired. That is why English is taught in Puerto Rican schools from the very first grade. In 50 years we have reduced illiteracy from 80 percent to 20 percent; while at the same time trying to be literate in two languages. We have been reasonably successful to say the least.

To reconcile the foregoing with your statement that you found evidence of little interest in the English language in Puerto Rico, is difficult for me. The information given you in the sense that there were 115 crackerjack instructors in Puerto Rico and since 1952 the figure has fallen to around 15, is a colossal misinformation. With 115 instructors—whether they be crackerjack or not—it would be absurd to try to teach English to our present school enrollment of over half a million. We teach English in Puerto Rico with the teachers we have, with the teachers we can afford to pay, and we think that Puerto Rico should be commended for its efforts. About 30 percent of our budget is dedicated to education. (I am attaching a very interesting clipping from the Christian Science Monitor of October 19, 1955, on this matter.)

Puerto Rico's Constitution is one of the most modern in the modern world. Upon its adoption by the people of Puerto Rico, and the approval of Congress it became effective on July 25, 1952. It guarantees universal suffrage and the secret ballot. We have peaceful elections every 4 years.

Your query as to whether there is an attempt to keep the people from knowing English in order that the intelligentsia may better control them, puzzles me. Suppose the people in Puerto Rico did not know any English whatsoever. Why could a purely Spanish-speaking people be better controlled by their Spanish-speaking leaders than an English-speaking people would be by their English-speaking leaders?

The teaching of English has nothing to do with the communication between the leaders of the people and the people themselves. This, of necessity, must be conducted in the language the people best understand. If communication between the leaders of this Nation and its people were to be carried in a language different from its own, certainly the people could not understand what it was all about.

There are no cries of gringo in Puerto Rico; the word is foreign to us. We do not use it. It is not really a Spanish word. It is a Mexicanism. I never heard it until I came to the United States. We never call our fellow citizens of the mainland gringos. We consider it charged with uncomplimentary overtones. You must have heard of it somewhere else than in Puerto Rico.

The shootings in Congress were the result of the machinations of a handful of extremists led by an unbalanced, fanatic leader who is in prison in Puerto Rico, convicted under Puerto Rican law and by Puerto Rican courts. Their infernal doings were unanimously condemned by the people of Puerto Rico. To try to establish any relationship between their vituperable action and the present leadership of Puerto Rico is an offense which I, in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, must determinedly reject.

It is to be deplored that during your short stay in Puerto Rico you may have been exposed to so much misinformation as it seems you were given. However, I realize that in any community there may always be those who because of political enmities do not seem to stop at anything in their efforts to create misunderstanding which they think may accrue to their benefit. We have them in Puerto Rico, of course. But it is deplorable that they may go so far, as they seem to have done in the present case, as to try to create misunderstanding and distrust between the citizens of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and their fellow citizens of the mainland.

Sincerely,

A. FERNÓS-ISERN,
Member of Congress, Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

On page 361 of the hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives relative appropriations for 1957 for the Interior Department and related agencies, on January 23, 1956, as previously disclosed in the letter of the Honorable Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, my interest in the use of the English language by citizens and nationals whose governments have adopted our currency, developed as follows:

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Lausi, you are asking for $24,028,000, is that correct?

Mr. LAUSI. Yes.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Can you tell me, or put in the record, what the revenues to the Treasury of the United States are, or have been, in the last 2 or 3 years from the territories?

Mr. LAUSI. Yes, sir; we will submit that.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I think it is rather helpful to couple income with outgo. If we can get that it might enable Congress to appropriate for very worthwhile propositions with fullest confidence.

Mr. LAUSI. We will supply the information to the committee.

PRESTIGE OF SAMOA

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Now, coming back to you, Governor, you make mention of prestige in your statement. In what way would that be manifest?

Governor LOWE. We are the only American Territory south of the Equator. We are the only one in the South Pacific.

We feel, and the Department of the Interior feels, that we should maintain an administration in American Samoa that the United States Government can be proud of, and that will hold up its head as to its ability to operate such a territory as well as the people who are operating those territories around us.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Is that prestige based on sizzle, razzmajazz, and display, or is it based on benefits accruing to the people in terms of health, education, welfare, and other standards of living?

Governor LOWE. It is principally based on the last part of your statement, health, education, and welfare and the standards of living and economic conditions.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. At the moment, the Dutch, the French, the New Zealanders, the English and the Australians do better than we on that, do they?

Governor LOWE. No, sir; I do not say that. I say that there is prestige at stake in this, and it gets into the budget question on the basis of adequate financial support to do a good job.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. You would not say that the Dutch, the French, the British, the New Zealanders and the Australians are doing better than we are?

Governor LOWE. No, sir; I do not say that. I think that our administration of that Territory out there, once we got away from that rapid exchange of governors, which got to be kind of a laughingstock in that area, once we got over that, and we got where one man stayed in the place long enough to do an adequate job, that our administration has been very good.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. What is the language of Samoa?

Governor LOWE. Samona.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Is any effort made to learn English or to teach it in the schools?

Governor LOWE. Yes, sir. We teach English as a subject in all of the schools, from the third grade on up.

However, the elementary teachers are all Samoans who do not speak English very well themselves. In the five junior high schools they are all Samoan teachers, but they attempt to teach in English in the junior high schools. We teach all in English in the high schools.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. What is the currency in Samoa?

Governor LOWE. American currency.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. We face a very sensitive point there. We are dealing with something that has an American value, and, of course, we feel that we have to maintain the local customs and traditions in Samoa. I imagine as education increases more and more they might want to know a little more about the country whose currency is used?

Governor LOWE. The impact of western civilization is something that continues to increase. We have owned this Territory for 55 years, and that has been increasing.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I visited Puerto Rico last fall, and I was told that, while once we had some 115 crackerjack instructors there in the English language, since 1952 the figure has fallen to around 15. One seems to find little interest in the English language in Puerto Rico though they are United States citizens. Many come up our way. Time and money is spent on them to help fit them into the cultural and industrial pattern of the community. They use our money, they need it, and they want it, and yet, with the higher-ups, the extension of the courtesy of learning our language seems not to be there. I wonder where we are missing the boat in that connection. Is it because we lack something, or is it because we are too far away? Or is it that with the intelligentsia alone knowing English, they better control the people and keep them suspect to convenient cries of gringo that find expression with shootings in the Congress.

Governor LOWE. I cannot speak of those people, but it is recognized by the Samoan people that they must have a bilingual society.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Do the Dutch, the French, the British, the New Zealanders and the Australians make an effort in the schools of the islands that they administer, or help to administer, to ask that their language be taught?

Governor LOWE. I know about the New Zealanders, the Australians, and the British. They do a great deal of teaching of their language. I do not know how far the Dutch go in that respect, nor do I know how far the French go, but I understand in Tahiti and New Caledonia they do teach French in the schools, because it is one of the international languages. None of the little island languages are very satisfactory languages with which to deal with outside nations. I am sure they all make rather strenuous efforts, at least, to bring some of them up to the place where they can understand English. Our people understand it pretty well.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. It might be interesting to note the move that is taking place in the Caribbean.

In 3 or 4 years I understand that the British are going to attempt to take all of their possessions down there, with the exception of Bermuda, and incorporate them in a commonwealth setup and send an ambassador to Washington to represent them. That means that they will have unlimited right of entrance to the United States, that they will be coming up here and find ready work on our farms, in our factories and in our homes. They know the King's English, and speak with accents like Oxford graduates. They will be taking our money out, sending it to British possessions in the Caribbean. It will not be going in like volume to Puerto Rico, Cuba, and other of our friends. If a depression hits Cuba or Puerto Rico their people have, as they do now, automatic right to migrate here. The question is, who will get the first call for positions on the farms of America, in the homes, and in the factories? Naturally, it would appear those who speak our language and who know our traditions. So, while we, on the one hand, gladly assist those people with funds, those whom we do not assist will be free to come in and take our dollars out, take them back to British possessions; that appears to give something to think about on two fronts at the same time.

Governor LOWE. The people of Samoa, as American nationals, actually do migrate to the United States. Any attempt to keep them from it would meet with considerable opposition. They are very proud of the fact that they are American nationals, and they are very loyal.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I am sure that they are, and I wish them the very best.

In the same hearings, on January 30, 1956, on pages 460 and 461, referred to in the postscript of my card to the doctor, cited above, further interest in the use and benefit of the English language to those who live with our money, developed as follows—from our Indian schoolchildren to citizens of Puerto Rico migrating to the United States:

Mr. SIEMINSKI. One observation: One of the rangers in one of the national parks last summer, on this question of Indian edu-

cation, made an observation and I wonder if there is anything to it and, if there is, what can be done about it. He said that in the lower grades the Indians probably are better in the graphic arts on the things he could see and touch than the white boy; but, in high school where an understanding of the American language and imagination and a sense of creativeness is called into play, the white boy passes the Indian. Whether that is true or not, or it is because of his background in having to survive under conditions of nature, I do not know; but if we should have to integrate them someday along the line of delaying one's advancement as against the other, what would happen? I wonder if you would care to comment on that.

ACHIEVEMENT OF INDIAN CHILDREN

Mrs. THOMPSON. Of course there are many opinions about the achievement of Indian children as compared to other children. I do not believe there is any factual data that would indicate there is any difference in achievement of Indian children and other children, given the same opportunities. It is true that many Indian children come from non-English-speaking homes; therefore they start school with a language handicap and that language handicap must be overcome. In those lower grades, when expressing their thoughts, if they cannot express them in the same language, they are likely to express them in pictures.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Yes; and there is where they seem to shine over the white boys.

Mrs. THOMPSON. That is true. And that language handicap, unless overcome, and he makes an effort to overcome it, will be reflected in his achievement in the upper grades. But, starting with the same language start and progressing through, as between Indian children and white children, I do not think we can find the one is above the other. I do not think there would be any difference between them in achievement in that case.

USE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I am happy to have that. I am very interested in the English language being taken up voluntarily by people who are not born speaking it, such as in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Samoa, and elsewhere; yet, in asking those people to accept our language, we do not want to give them the impression, I am sure, of a colonial decree, so to speak; but, rather, to paint the picture, as we are trying to do here this morning, showing them, as you have said in your statement, the benefits to accrue to them by getting into the stream of opportunities that the English language opens up to them—the benefits of having become Americans. If we can get the picture across to the people of Puerto Rico that they are citizens, and when they come up into my district they can better set themselves up and get located and adjusted to the community, we are not trying, as I see it, to get the people of Puerto Rico to talk our language as a matter of necessity, but as a matter of benefit; so that if there is a depression in Puerto Rico and they need help and want to avoid bloodshed in Puerto Rico, it is a help to the people of Puerto Rico as well as to ourselves to have them speak the language.

I am glad you gave me the answer you did, because you most astutely avoid the issue that you must meet later on.

Reference the Caribbean Federation which the British are setting up among some 3 million of their subjects, mentioned above, it is interesting to note the treatment it received in an editorial in the New York Times on February 26, 1956, cited now. The editorial, of course, does not dovetail the competition for jobs in the United States this new setup will give our citizen Puerto Ricans. Ability to use our language might be a deciding factor in a race for less menial jobs. This might be an element overlooked in another article in the same issue—February 26—of the New York Times wherein it is stated, in part:

Puerto Ricans deserve to be treated as part of the American labor pool and accorded its protections.

The editorial and the news article on page 74 of the February 26, 1956, issue of the New York Times follow:

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1956]

CARIBBEAN FEDERATION

A new nation is taking form right on our doorstep, one of the strangest nations, geographically speaking, in the world. It is the West Indies Federation, which is to be created out of the British islands of Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados, and the Windward and Leeward Islands. The Bahamas are excluded and the mainland colonies of British Guiana and British Honduras and the British Virgin Islands are still holding back. They may well change their minds some day if the high hopes held for the new federation materialize.

The West Indies colonies already enjoy full adult suffrage and freely elected local governments. London's Colonial Office left it to the colonies to decide whether they wanted federation or not. The long, often arduous, arguments have now ended with an affirmative answer. It will be a federation on the Australian model, with each island government retaining residual powers over local affairs, but with the administration, lawmaking, and the general economy of the group being run from a central government in a capital yet to be chosen.

It will be a remarkable nation, stretching over 1,000 miles of water, which is the distance that divides the two main units of Jamaica and Trinidad. Of course, the East Indies cover a greater space and a far larger population, but there is no true comparison between the ancient civilization and long history of the East Indies and the new, mainly Negro, civilization of the West Indies.

The advantages of a central government are essentially fiscal and economic. The islands compete against each other with the same products—sugar, rum, bananas, citrus fruits, tobacco, and spices. Together the 3 million people of these lush and beautiful lands will make a formidable trading unit. Politically they will undoubtedly become a part of the worldwide British Commonwealth, which will give them a status and dignity far beyond what they now have as individual colonies. And they will be sovereign and independent. Thus, the British can chalk up one more triumph for their enlightened colonial policy.

[From the New York Times of February 25, 1956]

STATE TO GIVE AID TO PUERTO RICANS—HARRIMAN SAYS AGENCIES ARE TO COOPERATE IN PROBLEM OF ASSIMILATION HERE

The Governor sent a message to the eighth annual convention of the Spanish-American Youth Bureau. He said that State agencies "hope to assist in the quick acceptance and fair treatment in our communities of Americans of Puerto Rican and Hispanic origin."

Mr. Harriman regretted that the legislature had failed to close loopholes in the rent control law. He contended that they had resulted in exploitation, particularly of newly arrived citizens.

One important way in which such citizens could help themselves in bettering their economic conditions, the Governor declared, was through political participation.

The meeting was attended by more than 150 representatives of private and public agencies working with Spanish-speaking residents. They met in the McBurney branch of the Young Men's Christian Association, 215 West 23d Street.

Charles Abrams, chairman of the State commission against discrimination, called for a nationwide program to help settle Puerto Rican immigrants throughout the country.

"Discrimination against Puerto Ricans, particularly by homeowners and local officials, is making it difficult to effect a distribution to other industrial centers," he said.

"Puerto Ricans deserve to be treated as part of the American labor pool and accorded its protections. They should enjoy equal participation in industrial employment and at least equality with, if not preference over, alien labor in agriculture."

"Puerto Rican, immigration to the continental United States may be expected to continue at the rate of 35,000 to 50,000 annually," Mr. Abrams said. He added that the solution of the problem lies not in a curtailment of the migration, nor entirely in the improvement of the economic situation in Puerto Rico, but in a nationwide program of settlement.

The very fine article of Tuesday, October 18, 1955, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, referred to in the letter by the doctor, now follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of October 18, 1955]

PUERTO RICO: LEARNING WITH ENTHUSIASM

(By Leonard S. Kenworthy)

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.—Puerto Ricans are justifiably proud of the progress they have made in the last few years in many phases of their educational program. Probably no place in the world has made so many gains in so short a time as has this Commonwealth of the United States.

Progress has been so rapid in so many different fields that Puerto Rico has become a mecca for trainees in the point 4 program of the United States Government and in the technical assistance program of the United Nations. In the past few years more than 1,000 such trainees have visited the island to see what is being done in economic, social, governmental, and educational planning, in the establishment of factories, the building of roads, the improvement of agriculture and the improvement of public health.

In education they have followed with keen interest the meteoric rise of vocational education, the slow but steady work in community education, innovations in the teaching of English as a second language, the extensive program of school lunches and child-breakfast centers, the attacks on illiteracy, the preparation of new teaching materials, and other aspects of Puerto Rican education.

Puerto Ricans usually employ the year 1940 as the base for their statistics. That date is considered by them the beginning of their modern era. In that year there were 303,000 children in school. Today there are 533,000. In 1940 only 50 percent of the children from 6 to 18 years of age ever got to school. Today 72 percent of the Puerto Rican boys and girls of that age group are in school.

1960 GOAL ALREADY ACHIEVED

Under their 6-year plan a goal was set for 1960 of 91 percent of the pupils of elementary school age in school. That goal has already been achieved.

Even more important is the increased holding power of the schools. In 1948 about 50 percent of the children had dropped out by the end of the third grade. Today most pupils stay in school through the sixth grade.

In the past 14 years there has been a phenomenal increase in the number of high-school pupils. In that year there were only 10,000 students in high schools. Today there are more than 40,000.

This also has meant an enormous job of finding and training new teachers. In 1940 there were 6,000 of them on the island. Today there are double that number. And today's teachers are far better educated, too, than they were a few years ago.

Buildings had to be enlarged and new ones built. Since 1940, 3,300 new classrooms have been added. More important, many of them have been built by parents and other citizens. Partial responsibility has rested with the local municipalities through the years. Now an experiment has been started for 1955–56 of having the Department of Public Works construct the foundations and put up the girders and roof, with the parents finishing the structures, including the walls, floors, and windows. Forty classrooms are to be built this year in this way.

Most buildings are being built today of concrete rather than of wood, making them more durable and hurricaneproof. Lunchrooms are an essential part of all schools, too.

Literacy has increased from 69 percent to 78 percent in the intervening years since 1940. But the problem of increasing it still further is getting larger owing to lack of resources, the rapid increase of population, and the fact that those who wanted to learn most have already been taken care of. Under the direction of a world-renowned expert, Dr. Rodriguez Boa, a strenuous effort is being made now to reduce illiteracy 10 percent more by 1960. And by illiteracy Dr. Boa means the equivalent of a third-grade education rather than merely being able to read and write one's name.

Spectacular progress has been made in vocational education, an essential part of the industrialization of the island. In 1947–48 there were around 8,000 persons getting some kind of vocational training; today that figure has soared to 25,000. There are now 11 high schools with vocational programs. In them the pupils receive 3 hours of general education and 3 hours of vocational training.

The school lunch program has been greatly expanded, too, since 1948. In that year there were 181,000 children provided for. Today there are 240,000 boys and girls who receive a complete meal at school. The result has been improved health for the children, better eating habits for them and their families, and an outlet for more of the island's products, together with food from the mainland of the United States.

In addition to these children, 21,000 nonschool children from 2 to 10 years also receive breakfast outside the schools.

Instruction in the elementary grades always has been in Spanish and after the Columbia University survey of 1948, Spanish became the language of instruction in the high schools. An intensive effort is being made, however, to develop English as the second language of all school pupils. Oral English is started in the first grade and written English is commenced in the third and fourth grades. Some articles in the elementary school paper "Escuela" are printed in English. Many children listen to the radio programs in English or hear it over the TV. Newspapers and magazines in English are now much more widely available, and persons from the mainland who speak English are much more in evidence. Supplementing these motivations is the carefully constructed program of the schools, with a special series of books developed by Dr. Charles Fries, expert on the teaching of English from the University of Michigan.

An extensive program of publications has been developed for the schools; 350,000 copies of Escuela are published weekly in 3 editions for elementary, junior high, and senior high schools and is distributed free. A monthly journal for teachers, Educación, is prepared and printed. Starting this fall, a newspaper with a general cultural orientation, including many pictures, is being printed in an edition of 250,000. This will go to adults on the island.

Progress can also be noted in the spread of school cooperatives, in the increase in exchanges with teachers and school officials in New York City and Chicago, in the expansion of the University of Puerto Rico and other colleges, in the establishment of music schools for the gifted, and in the continuation of the activity-month scheme whereby teachers go to school, work in the local community, or do some equivalent work 1 month in the year.

Despite the tremendous progress in the past few years, many problems still persist. Some of them are the inevitable problems of a system which is bursting at the seams. Others are more fundamental problems of goals and methods of attaining them.

AMERICANIZATION WEIGHED

One of the most basic problems is the extent to which young Puerto Ricans should be Americanized. This is a question of long-term goals which will have to be decided by the general populace of the island, but a question on which the educators should have much to say, as it vitally affects every phase of education.

With close economic and political ties with the United States, with rapid industrialization and urbanization, and a growing feeling of kinship to the States, the question of how much of their Spanish background can be retained in the next generation continues to cause controversy. Certainly older and even middle-aged people are proud of their Spanish cultural heritage, but whether this pride can be developed in the oncoming generation is still open to question. Already most of the African and Indian heritage has disappeared; whether the same will eventually happen to the Spanish heritage remains to be seen.

Some educators are concerned on this point, but the role of the schools in helping to determine goals does not seem too clear at the present time. Many people hope that Puerto Rico can develop a rich crossroads culture, molded from the best of their European, North American, and Latin American traditions.

Another problem seems to be the education and supervision of teachers. A problem everywhere, this is especially noticeable in Puerto Rico, with scores of new teachers to be trained each year and about 500 new teachers needed as replacements for those who drop out annually.

All this could not have happened without aid from four sources. One is the strong support for education from the people of Puerto Rico. A second has been the generous support financially from the legislature, with about 30 percent of governmental funds devoted to public education. A third has been the leadership of such men as Dr. Mariano Villaronga, Secretary of Public Instruction, and his assistant, Dr. Cracisco Collazo, both Puerto Ricans rather than continentals. Lastly, but certainly not least, has been the devoted efforts of the teachers of the island who have much of the enthusiasm of people all over the world who have begun to plan for themselves rather than carry out the projects of colonial powers.

Perhaps that is the most important characteristic of Puerto Rican educators today: their pride in making Puerto Rico a better place for all people to live through education.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in presenting to the House today, a bill which is intended to be the housing amendments of 1956. The legislative proposals contained therein are those of the Eisenhower administration for the betterment of living conditions for the American people. I am pleased to take the initiative in this regard because this legislation is forward-looking in nature and conforms to the oft-stated desire of the President to be "liberal in the matters which concern the welfare of our people."

The proposals which are advanced by the Housing and Home Finance Agency under the capable leadership of Albert M. Cole, a former Member of this body, and endorsed by the President, seek to meet the needs of all citizens who are desirous of obtaining better homes while retaining to the greatest degree possible, private enterprise initiative in the housing field. I will cite here only a few of the major provisions of this bill—those which I believe will have the greatest impact upon our national economy.

At the request of the President, Administrator Cole has proclaimed 1956 as Home Improvement Year. Large segments of our business economy have set forth upon a program known as Operation Home Improvement to augment this proclamation. It is fitting, therefore, that the administration should propose that title I, the Federal Housing Administration home repair and improvement program, should be amended to enable those who are individual homeowners to more readily obtain the financing necessary to undertake improvement and rehabilitation of their dwellings. My bill provides for a permanent program rather than one which requires extension by Congress from time to time, an increase in the maximum amount of loans from $2,500 to $3,500 on single-family structures, and from $10,000 to $15,000 for the improvement of structures housing two or more families. Also, authorization for the Federal Housing Commissioner to increase the maximum term of such loans from 3 to 5 years.

One of the greatest difficulties encountered has been in the provision of suitable homes for those displaced by governmental action. This is particularly true in the carrying out of the urban renewal program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Congress has heretofore provided for low-cost private housing, the so-called section 221 program, for this purpose. It has not met with success to date and the administration now recommends to the Congress that there be a liberalization in allowable construction cost and in mortgage ratio as well as mortgage term.

My bill provides for an increase in the maximum amount from $7,600 to $8,000 per dwelling unit and from $8,600 to $10,000 per dwelling unit in high-cost areas. Also, in contrast to the 95 percent mortgage insurance now available, the insured mortgage could equal the appraised value of the property, except that the pur-

chaser would have to pay $200 in cash or its equivalent. That payment could include settlement cost and initial payments for other prepaid expenses. The bill also provides for increasing the term of the mortgage from 30 to 40 years.

Recognizing the increasing housing needs of our elderly citizens, the administration has proposed in this bill, several provisions which should help the senior members of our society to attain for their own use, homes and dwelling facilities tailored to their needs. Under the public housing provisions of this proposal, single persons 65 years of age or over, who are otherwise eligible, shall henceforth be permitted to occupy low-rent public housing and in fact, will be given preference therefor. Recognizing that the needs of the elderly extend beyond the limited field of low-rent public housing, it is proposed that the regular Federal Housing Administration section 203, sales housing program, be amended to permit a third party to provide the downpayment for the purchase of a home where the mortgagor would be a person 60 years of age or over. Also provided is permission for such third party to be a cosigner of the mortgage note for an elderly person lacking adequate credit.

Two amendments are suggested for the section 207 rental housing program of the Federal Housing Administration as well. One would liberalize mortgage insurance where such housing would be occupied to a proportion of 25 percent or greater by elderly persons and where such housing would be expressly designed for that use. An increase in the mortgage to a value ratio would be effected to 90 percent where the mortgage does not exceed $7,200 per family unit.

The second recommendation would change the application of mortgage amount to 90 percent of replacement cost instead of 90 percent of value, up to $8,100 per dwelling unit where nonprofit organizations sponsor multifamily projects exclusively for the use of the elderly.

Being convinced that private enterprise cannot yet care for the total housing need in the several communities of our Nation, and recognizing the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide decent, safe, and sanitary homes for those displaced by governmental action, it is recommended that authorization for 70,000 units of low-rent public housing be given by Congress in the next 2 fiscal years. Administrative preference is now granted to families displaced by such governmental action. The authorization is intended for use in communities participating in an integrated attack on slums and blight. We cannot close our eyes to the plight of those who, by necessity rather than choice, dwell in the least desirable homes of the Nation. With the stimulus to slum clearance being given by the urban-renewal program, it is essential that we not create further deterioration by forcing families to move from one undesirable dwelling in a project area to another immediately outside that area. For those who have not incomes sufficient to support proper private housing facilities, it is intended that the Government contribute its share to see that these people do have adequate homes. It is primarily for this purpose that the President has proposed and this bill provides for a sufficient number of low-rent public-housing units to meet this need.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, the bill which I introduce today envisions that this administration shall continue its sympathetic approach to the needs of our Nation insofar as the provision of good homes is concerned. It is a liberal bill in many respects because we believe that this is the proper approach to our needs. It is nonetheless a bill also which provides proper stimulus to private enterprise so that it may contribute a major share to meeting this great need. It is well for us to remember that in the last calendar year there were private nonfarm housing starts greater in number than 1,300,000, second only to the record year in our history, 1950, the time when we were first able to meet the pent-up demands for housing which were occasioned by the cutbacks in construction and credit during and immediately after World War II.

I make so bold as to state today, that 1956 will see this Nation continuing at an unprecedented level of prosperity with our people obtaining more and better homes in which to raise their families. The bill before us, which I hope will be granted early hearings by our Committee on Banking and Currency, is designed to do the job which I am sure all of us desire to do and that is to continue the prosperity in peace which has been the keynote of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am including as a portion of my remarks, a brief summary of the housing amendments of 1956 so that all of our colleagues may have ready access to the information concerning this proposal:

BRIEF SUMMARY, HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1956

The housing amendments of 1956 would provide new assistance to housing for the elderly both through the FHA mortgage insurance programs and the low-rent public housing program. Sufficient mortgage insurance authorization would be provided for another year of FHA operations and the FHA military housing program would be extended on a permanent basis. An additional 70,000 units of low-rent public housing, to be contracted for over a 2-year period, would be authorized for communities which will participate in an integrated attack on slums and blight. Urban renewal would be given new assistance through the liberalization of FHA insurance terms for the repair and rehabilitation of housing and the provision of low-cost housing for families displaced by urban renewal. In addition, the authorization for Federal grants to State and regional planning agencies to assist urban planning would be doubled. The Federal National Mortgage Association's secondary mortgage market operations would be broadened. The authorization for college housing loans would be increased and changes made in the program to encourage more participation by private lenders. New provisions would be enacted to expedite the disposal of the remaining defense and World War II housing and other properties still held by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. A number of other perfecting changes would be made in the laws governing the programs of that Agency.

Following is a brief summary of the provisions of the housing amendments of 1956 in the order in which they appear in the bill:

FHA TITLE I HOME REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

That FHA title I home repair and improvement program would be amended to—

(1) eliminate the expiration date of the program (September 30, 1956) and make the program permanent;

(2) increase the maximum amounts of the loans which can be insured under the program from $2,500 to $3,500 for home improvement and nonresidential loans, and from $10,000 to $15,000 for loans for the improvement of structures housing two or more families; and

(3) authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to increase the maximum term of home improvement and nonresidential loans from 3 years (the present limit) up to 5 years, if he determines that such increase is in the public interest.

HAZARD INSURANCE ON FHA ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

The Federal Housing Commissioner would be authorized to establish a fire and hazard loss fund to provide self-insurance coverage with respect to real property acquired by FHA under any of its programs.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY—FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE

The regular FHA section 203 sales housing program would be amended to permit a third party to provide the downpayment required for the purchase of a home where the mortgagor would be a person 60 years of age or older. Combined with existing authority, the third party could make the downpayment and also become a cosigner of the mortgage note for an elderly person lacking adequate credit.

The FHA section 207 rental housing program would be amended to provide liberal mortgage insurance for multifamily housing where at least 25 percent of the units in the project are expressly designed for the use of the elderly and a priority of occupancy for these units is given to the elderly throughout the life of the mortgage insurance contract. The maximum amount of the mortgage in these cases would be 90 percent of value where the mortgage does not exceed $7,200 per family unit without regard to the present requirements as to the average number of bedrooms.

A second amendment of the FHA section 207 rental housing program would provide more liberal mortgage insurance for multifamily housing designed and held entirely for elderly persons and sponsored by nonprofit organizations approved by the FHA as to financial responsibility. The maximum amount of the mortgage in these cases would be $8,100 per dwelling unit and the mortgage could be 90 percent of replacement cost instead of 90 percent of value.

GENERAL FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

The FHA mortgage insurance authorization would be increased to make available $3 billion of this authorization for the next fiscal year. The balance of the present authorization would be included in this amount.

LIBERALIZATION OF SECTION 221 LOW-COST HOUSING FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES

The FHA section 221 program for the housing of displaced families (for both single family homes and for multifamily housing of nonprofit corporations) would be liberalized—

(1) by increasing the maximum amount of mortgages which can be insured from $7,600 to $8,000 per dwelling unit and from $8,600 to $10,000 per dwelling unit in high-cost areas;

(2) to permit the mortgage to equal the value of the property except that the mortgagor, in the case of a single family home, would be required to make an initial payment of $200 in cash or its equivalent, which amount could include settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, and other prepaid expenses (present maximum is 95 percent of value and downpayment of 5 percent of estimated cost on single family homes); and

(3) by increasing the maximum maturity of the mortgage from 30 years to 40 years.

APPROVAL OF COST CERTIFICATIONS MADE FINAL

The cost certification of a mortgagor with respect to a multifamily housing project would be made final and incontestable after the Federal Housing Commissioner has approved the certification, except where there is fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor. It would also be made clear that allocations of general overhead items can be included as part of the actual cost of the project. These amendments would remove doubts and fears on the part of prospective sponsors of multifamily housing that their cost certifications may be reexamined and questioned from time to time over an indefinite period of years and as to what can be included in the cost of a project for cost-certification purposes.

EXTENSION OF THE CAPEHART MILITARY HOUSING PROGRAM

The FHA mortgage insurance authority for the Capehart military housing program would be extended on a permanent basis.

FNMA SECONDARY MORTGAGE MARKET

The present $15,000 limit on the amount of an FHA or VA mortgage which can be purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association would be removed with respect to mortgages purchased by FNMA in its secondary market operations. The $15,000 limit would continue to be applicable to mortgages offered for FNMA purchase under the special assistance functions of FNMA, except where the mortgages cover property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii. The principal amount of any mortgage purchased by FNMA in its secondary market operations, including Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii mortgages, would, of course, be limited by the amount permitted under FHA insurance or VA guaranty legislation.

REDUCTION IN CAPITAL CONTRIBUTION TO FNMA BY MORTGAGE SELLERS MADE POSSIBLE

The present requirement that mortgage sellers must subscribe to FNMA common stock in an amount equal to 3 percent of the unpaid amount of the mortgages, or such greater percentages as may from time to time be determined by FNMA, would be changed. The amendment would provide that sellers of mortgages to FNMA under its secondary market operations would be required to make capital contributions to FNMA equal to 2 percent of the unpaid principal amount of mortgages purchased or to be purchased by the association, or such other greater or lesser percentage, but not less than 1 percent, as may from time to time be determined by the association, taking into consideration conditions in the mortgage market and the general economy.

MORTGAGE PURCHASE PRICES TO BE ESTABLISHED WITHIN THE RANGE OF MARKET PRICES

FNMA would be authorized to establish the prices to be paid for mortgages purchased in its secondary market operations within the range of market prices for the particular class of mortgages involved instead of at the market price as presently required.

URBAN RENEWAL PLANS

An unnecessary requirement would be removed from the present law under which an identifiable urban redevelopment plan must be part of an urban renewal plan if redevelopment of part of the urban renewal area is planned along with rehabilitation and conservation of the balance of the area.

CHANGES IN DEFINITION OF "URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT"

The definition of "urban renewal project" in the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, would be amended to make the whole urban renewal area (instead of merely the area to be cleared, as under present law) subject to the predominantly residential requirement. Under the present predominantly residential requirement an urban redevelopment area (i. e. the area to be cleared) must, with certain exceptions, either be predominantly residential to begin with or else be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses. This change would thus make the requirement consistent with other requirements in title I which apply to the whole urban renewal area. The definition would also be amended to consolidate the provisions relating to slum clearance and redevelopment with those relating to rehabilitation and conservation.

LOSS OF CERTAIN TAX REVENUES AS URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT COST

A new provision would permit an amount equal to the ad valorem taxes on real property acquired by a local public agency in an urban renewal project to be included in the gross project cost if the local public agency has not paid such taxes or made payments in lieu of taxes during the time the real property was in its possession. This would provide for equitable treatment as between communities which receive tax payments on real property held by a local public agency and those which do not.

URBAN RENEWAL IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

The Housing Administrator would be authorized to extend urban renewal assistance to major disaster areas, under certain conditions, without regard to requirements that the community must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums, that the urban renewal plan must conform to a general plan of the locality, requirements of public hearings, and certain requirements with respect to the predominantly residential character or blighted character of urban renewal areas.

The FHA sections 220 and 221 urban renewal housing programs would also be amended to permit temporary waiver of the present workable program requirement, and urban planning grants would be permitted for a community affected by a major disaster without regard to the fact that the community's population is 25,000 or greater.

URBAN PLANNING AUTHORIZATION INCREASED

The urban planning grant authorization would be increased from $5 million to $10 million.

SEVENTY THOUSAND ADDITIONAL LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS AUTHORIZED

New loan and annual contributions contracts would be authorized for not more than 35,000 additional low-rent public housing units after July 31, 1956, and an additional 35,000 on and after July 1, 1957. Each 35,000 increment would be available for contracting until 2 years after it first becomes available.

WORKABLE PROGRAM REQUIREMENT RESTORED FOR LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

The previous requirement that the locality must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums before a contract could be entered into for Federal assistance to low-rent public housing (which was dropped by the Housing Amendments of 1955) would be restored to the law.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Single persons 65 years of age or over with low incomes would be made eligible for low-rent public housing units, and local housing authorities would also be permitted to extend a prior preference, as among low-income families which are eligible applicants for occupancy of dwellings of given sizes and at specified rents, to elderly families (including single persons 65 years of age or over) for any low-rent housing designed specially for, or suitable to the needs of, such elderly families. As among applicants eligible for this preference, those displaced by slum clearance or other governmental action would be given a first preference. The limit of $1,750 per room on the cost of low-rent public housing would be increased to $2,250 per room where units are designed specifically for elderly families.

TRANSFER OF FARM LABOR CAMPS

The Public Housing Administration would be directed to transfer farm labor camps without monetary consideration to local public housing agencies in the areas of the camps if requested within 12 months after enactment of the bill and the local public housing agency certifies as to the low-rent need for the project and that preferences will be given, first, to low-income agricultural workers and, second, to other low-income persons and families.

DISPOSAL OF DEFENSE HOUSING

Provision would be made for the disposal of the temporary or relocatable Korean defense housing projects still held by the Housing Agency—about 10,000 units. Forty-two of these projects, plus 3 World War II projects (on or near military reservations), needed for continuing use by military personnel would be transferred to the Department of Defense, effective July 1, 1956. The remainder of this defense housing held by the Housing Agency would be sold to the highest bidder not later than June 30, 1957 (unless previously disposed of under other provisions of law). The Tonomy Hill World War II project at Newport, R. I., would be transferred to the local housing authority. However, a first preference would have to be given to military personnel in a certain number of units in that project for 3 years.

MODIFICATION OF WAR HOUSING SALES PREFERENCE PROVISIONS

A new provision would be added to the Lanham Act designed to accelerate the disposition of two classes of permanent war housing. One class consists of housing which is to be sold for removal from the site. The other consists of projects to be sold onsite which cannot be subdivided in such a manner as to offer for separate sale dwelling structures designed for occupancy by not more than four families. In the first class of housing the existing sales preference requirements would be eliminated effective upon enactment of the bill, and in the second class, all preference requirements would be terminated with respect to the onsite sale of the nondivisible projects which the Housing Agency holds on January 1, 1957, as of that date. All housing disposed of under the new provision must be disposed of as expeditiously as possible on a competitive basis to the highest responsible bidder, except that the Housing Administrator may reject any bid which he determines to be less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation.

INCREASE IN COLLEGE HOUSING LOAN FUND AUTHORIZATION

The college housing revolving loan fund authorization would be increased from $500 million to $600 million.

INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES—COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

The formula in the present law with respect to the interest rate paid by the Housing Administrator on funds borrowed from the United States Treasury for college housing loans would be changed to provide that such funds shall bear interest at a rate, calculated each calendar quarter, based on the current

average market yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a remaining maturity of 15 or more years. This formula would be in place of the formula now in the law which bases the interest rate on the average rate borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States, irrespective of maturity, as computed at the end of the preceding fiscal year, or 2½ percent, whichever is higher. The rate proposed by the bill would currently result in the Housing Administrator paying 2⅞ percent on funds borrowed from the Treasury. Under the present law, the rate for fiscal year 1956 is 2½ percent.

The bill would also require the Housing Administrator, in making college housing loans, to charge a rate equal to that payable by him to the Treasury plus one-fourth of 1 percent. The present law provides for a similar spread, except that if the resulting rate is less than 2¾ percent, the higher rate must be charged. Because of the different base to which the one-fourth percent differential would be applied under the bill as compared with the present law, the net result of the bill, under current market conditions, would be to change the college housing loan interest rate from 2¾ percent to 3⅛ percent.

These changes are designed to increase participation by private lenders in bond issues sold by colleges to finance college housing construction.

HOUSING DATA

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be authorized to undertake such surveys, studies, and compilations and analyses of statistical data and other information as he determines to be necessary in the exercise of his responsibilities, including the formulation and carrying out of national housing policies and programs. He would utilize the available facilities of other Government agencies, and such agencies would be required to confer with and advise the Administrator, at his request, on improvements in any existing or proposed systems and techniques for gathering and reporting housing and related data.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR FOR PEACE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include an address by Mr. J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone in the country will read the speech by Commander J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion, given at a dinner by the department of Massachusetts in his honor at Boston, Mass., on Saturday, February 25, 1956. The theme of the speech was on winning the fight for men's minds and he made very fine suggestions and outlined a splendid program, which I hope may be carried out. He indicated in his speech that he feels that we are losing to the Russians the control of men's minds to communism. You could have heard a pin drop as he spoke and when he finished he was given a standing ovation. I have endeavored for a number of years to secure the establishment of a permanent committee of the House to watch over our informational and intelligence service abroad. It seems to me that we are losing, as Commander Wagner cites, the battle for men's minds. I would call it a psychological struggle for peace rather than psychological warfare.

Mr. Speaker, the very fine speech made by Commander Wagner, previously referred to, follows:

I am very happy to be here tonight and grateful for this opportunity to meet with you good Massachusetts Legionnaires and Auxiliary members.

The department of Massachusetts has long occupied a strategic role in American Legion affairs. Your record of dedicated, effective support of our programs of service for God and country is unsurpassed throughout our organization. Whether it is fighting for the security of our country, working for the welfare of our children, contributing to the strength and preservation of our freedoms, or helping buddies in need, you devote yourselves to our programs so completely and so successfully that it's possible for us to say tonight: It's great to be an American Legionnaire.

Here in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and in your historic capital city, the American Legion's programs to strengthen and preserve the freedoms with which we have been blessed take on a special meaning. The names of Boston and Concord and Bunker Hill will be enshrined in the hearts of all Americans as the birthplace of liberty.

It would be impossible for any American to visit Boston and to see such historic monuments to freedom as the old North Church without having a renewed, deepened love of America and all that it means to us. It seems to me that you Bay State Legionnaires and your fellow-citizens could never fail to be inspired and strengthened by the landmarks of liberty that surround you.

I know that my heart beats faster and my pulse more strongly as I stand on the very ground where patriots died so that I might live in freedom.

Yet, in remembering their sacrifices, in reliving for the moment the drama of liberty enacted on this historic land nearly 2 centuries ago, I have tired not to forget that freedom is a very present and personal thing.

Freedom is not something that can be purchased once and forever secured. It must be defended by every generation. It is true today as it was yesterday and as it will be tomorrow, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Are we vigilant enough today to protect our freedoms? Are we prepared to defend our liberties and our way of life against the Godless tyranny of communism * * * the greatest threat to freedom the world has ever known?

In seeking the answer to this question, we naturally and necessarily think in terms of military preparedness. We question earnestly and honestly whether our program of national security will enable us to meet the great and growing military power of Russia and her Communist satellites. We wonder whether the structure of collective security built by the free nations of the world on the foundation of America's military and economic strength can withstand the tidal wave of Red aggression that might be unleashed against it.

The American Legion has not been satisfied completely with the answers to these questions. We have recommended certain essential steps which should be undertaken immediately to accelerate the buildup in our Air Force, to increase the fighting power of our Navy and Army, to bring into being and complete readiness a strong, trained Reserve force, and to expand and improve military research and development.

These steps and measures to maintain our own economic strength while selectively helping to increase the financial and military power of other free nations are essential. They are imperative if we are to remain strong enough to deter the Communist aggressor or defeat him if he should attack.

But tonight I must tell you in all sincerity that all we have done and will continue to do militarily and economically in the defense of freedom cannot stop the spread of communism.

Indeed, our tremendous investment in the defense of America and the other free nations of the world is threatened tonight because we have been losing the battle for the minds of men.

The Kremlin has outflanked our military-economic defense line to hit and hurt us seriously in recent weeks with weapons of words.

We may scornfully condemn these Soviet words as lying propaganda. We may resent bitterly the distortions of truth coming from Moscow. But unless we're prepared to stand alone as freedom's last defender in a Kremlin-dominated world won over in a bloodless war of words, it is time we woke up to reality.

Tonight, enslaved millions in Communist-controlled countries behind the Iron Curtain, and hundreds of millions of uncommitted people throughout the non-Communist world whose constant source of news bears the Kremlin dateline, are reading headlines like this: "United States says it wants Middle East peace—Ships 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia while considering further arms aid to Israel."

In previous weeks they saw pictures of United States balloons carrying elaborate, high-altitude camera equipment, which had been forced down above Moscow or Leningrad or some other Russian city. The stories accompanying these pictures told of how the United States tried to pretend that these balloons were solely for weather observation purposes. But the cameras proved otherwise, didn't they?

Moreover, the United States had agreed to stop sending these balloons over Russia and her Communist satellite nations. This to them was an admission per se that the United States was guilty as charged by the Kremlin.

These stories also emphasized the human-interest side of the news.

Not only were these balloons a threat to the military security of the Russian and satellite people, they endangered aircraft flying in Soviet-dominated skies, and even caused the crash of a civilian airplane with a tragic loss of life.

Absurd? From our standpoint perhaps. But hardly from the viewpoint of readers who know no other facts—who have had these documented illustrated stories fed to them day after day after day.

How do you suppose the United States looks to these same people who have been reading repeatedly in recent weeks that our country, after having rejected Moscow's first proposal for peace, has yet to reply to the Kremlin's second offer?

I'll tell you what they think—what they can't help but think because we have not given them the truth.

Millions of people throughout the world today stand ready to join forces with that ideology and that way of life which they believe to be in their best interests. Russia is trying to propagandize these people and the millions now behind the Iron Curtain who once knew freedom and the power of truth into believing that the United States has no intention of cooperating in any honest, sincere efforts to find a just and lasting peace. The so-called evidence furnished by the Kremlin is designed to compel the conclusion that the United States is actively preparing for war.

To us, of course, such a conclusion is an absolute lie. We find it hard to believe that anyone could fall victim to pure propaganda

and forget all that America has done to prove its dedication to freedom and to the cause of peace.

But this kind of thinking has led us to the brink of defeat in the battle for the minds of men. It will continue to be a roadblock to victory in this vital struggle as long as we permit ourselves the luxury of believing that all men recognize communism for what is really is—that all men see through the lies and deceit and treachery of Communist propaganda.

Unless and until the United States admits that to date we have been beaten and beaten badly by the Communists in the fight for men's minds, we will not take the bold, drastic action necessary to reorganize and reinforce our defenses on this vital front.

The examples of recent Russian propaganda which I cited a moment ago, and they are only three of many, dramatically demonstrate the shocking weakness of our efforts to inform the world about America, and about our policies, our programs, and our people.

Let's be honest about it. The Russians threw us the propaganda ball and we booted it in a manner not befitting our claims as the most advertising-conscious, promotion-minded Nation in the world.

We boast about being able to sell an ice box to an Eskimo, about fashioning a self-generating higher standard of living through advertising—advertising which creates an ever-widening circle of more customers caused by more workers to build more products for customers first sold through advertising.

Yet we have not been able to sell competitively the most inspiring, richly rewarding, sought-after product ever conceived by the God-given mind of many—freedom. Men have died to create this product. Men have died in its defense. Yet, we have not been able to sell freedom in competition with communism—the most godless, degrading, enslaving tyranny that ever existed.

Why?

Because we haven't tried to, not on the all-out crash basis that is required if we are to win the battle for the minds of men.

We've got the product and we've got the talent in America to put it across. What we lack is the planning, the coordination, and the support on a national level which must be brought into force.

I say to you tonight that the time has come for the President of the United States and the Congress, working together in this urgent cause, to reevaluate our entire information program. A single, Federal program must be evolved, and immediately, to reverse the serious defeats we have suffered in recent months alone at the hands of Russian propagandists.

A proper evaluation of existing Government information programs overseas can best be assured, I believe, by the appointment of a Presidential Committee composed of recognized national leaders in all of the information and advertising media to study present information programs, policies, personnel, facilities, and budgets.

This committee would have as its objective not only an evaluation of existing programs, but the establishment of goals and requirements reflecting the vital importance of winning the battle for the minds of men.

As a nation, we cannot afford to devote less effort, less resources, and less time to this urgent task than do the Russians, any more than we can afford to do less than the enemy in the field of national defense. For men who have surrendered to Communist propaganda are no more free than those who succumbed to Communist aggresison.

Whatever the method to be used in establishing an effective United States information program, it must certainly provide the authority and the coordinating machinery which will prevent repetition of the confused, conflicting handling of the Russian balloon-propaganda charges.

We can no longer afford the luxury of having one agency of the Federal Government replying to such charges and another later telling it to shut up. The lack of national policy and lack of coordination which permitted such conflicting statements cannot continue uncorrected.

Whether by law or by Presidential directive or both, action must be taken to provide effective, speedy machinery by which a single uncontradicted national policy on such matters can be determined and announced and effectively repeated to the world.

Finally, the Congress must provide the budgetary support needed to make a revitalized and dynamic United States information program effective.

Of course, the question will be asked, Can we afford it?

The real question, however, is, Can we afford not to afford it?

Obviously, we cannot.

I am certain that you Bay State Legionnaires and Auxiliary members have been as disturbed as I have been about the fact that the United States is losing the battle for the minds of men. You recognize, as I do, that our security and our freedoms will be jeopardized as seriously by this loss as they would be by Communist military victories on the field of battle. And I'm sure you share my belief that America can win this battle, late though it may be, if we but put our minds to it.

Second only to the story of Christ, we have the greatest story to tell that mankind has ever known—the story of freedom—freedom that began here. We have the know-how and the resources to make this story a best seller. Let's begin telling our story today with traditional American vigor and dramatically show waiting millions throughout the world that freedom under God is man's greatest hope for happiness and lasting peace.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 15 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes on Wednesday, February 29, and that the special order granted him for today may be vacated.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 10 minutes today, and to include therein two newspaper articles.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) and include related material.

Mr. DENTON and include a statement he made today before the Veterans' Committee.

Mr. OSTERTAG.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include charts.

Mr. UTT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JENKINS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 3 days on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 23, 1956, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li ((Tsi Gziou Lo);

H. R. 2430. An act to release restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America; and

H. R. 8101. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1573. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 302 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1574. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1575. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 20, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Dickinson Bayou, Tex., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1576. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 23, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Las Chollas Creek, San Diego County, Calif., authorized by the Flood Con-

trol Act approved August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1577. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 20, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Lake Minnetonka, Minn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1578. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committee were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 9536. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5975. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired under the Federal reclamation laws for their moving expenses, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8226. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353); without amendment (Rept. No. 1814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1736. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1188. An act to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks; with amendment (Rept. No. 1816). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6623. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency; without amendment (Rept. No. 1817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. A report on cargo preference and its relation to farm surplus disposal program pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5488. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Gilbert Henkens, Jr., star route, mile 17½, Anchorage, Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 1811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred to as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 9534. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II, and making appropriation therefor; the the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 9535. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II, and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 9536. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 9537. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 9538. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9539. A bill to amend, with respect to basic commodities, the parity provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 9540. A bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 9541. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 9542. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 9543. A bill to provide for an annual audit of the accounts of the White County Bridge Commission; to provide a new method of appointment for the commissioners and for staggered terms of office; to exempt the income of the commission from Federal taxation; and to clarify the authority of the commission to transfer all its assets to certain public agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9544. A bill to terminate the White County Bridge Commission, to transfer its assets, liabilities, functions, and authority to the Commissioner of Public Roads, and to authorize the transfer of the bridge operated by the commission to certain State agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 9545. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that amounts paid for the medical and dental care of children who have not attained the age of 6 shall be deductible without regard to the limitations contained in such section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 9546. A bill to provide authorization for emergency flood-protection projects in areas of the United States where such projects are needed for the protection of life and property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 9547. A bill to amend section 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the prescribing of regulations under certain provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 9548. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to authorize contracts between freight forwarders and railroads for the movement of trailers on flatcars; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 9549. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, in order to provide a permanent program of assistance for school construction under the provisions of titles III and IV of such law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9550. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to establish a permanent program of financial assistance for local educational agencies under the provisions of such law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9551. A bill to transfer to the Government of the District of Columbia the Public Employment Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 9552. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management, and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9553. A bill to provide a program of grants and scholarships to encourage education and training in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 9554. A bill to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9555. A bill to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 9556. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to moving-picture admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 9557. A bill to provide for equality of treatment in the restoration to tribal ownership of surplus lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 9558. A bill to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income-tax purposes not to exceed $100 each year of political contributions made to candidates for elective Federal offices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax treatment with respect to oil, gas, or production payments and to provide a special rule for determining an oil or gas property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 9560. A bill to promote the interest of national defense through the advancement of the scientific and professional research and development program of the Department of Defense, to improve the management and administration of the activities of such department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9561. A bill to increase the minimum postal-savings deposit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9562. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter," approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 9563. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 9564. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 9565. A bill establishing Camp Stewart, Ga., as a permanent military installation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 9566. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9567. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. J. Res. 558. Joint resolution to provide for observing certain legal public holidays on Monday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 407. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a study and investigation of the influence of professional gamblers on amateur and professional sports; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly, memorializing Congress on the low-income public-housing development for senior citizens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the Massachusetts State Senate, urging the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Defense to provide Watertown Arsenal with work in the guided-missile and new weapons fields; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore to the citizens their constitutional rights to own, hold, and possess gold and to buy and sell gold in a free market; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to purchase a tract of land adjacent to the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery to be included as part of Zachary Taylor National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reduce the "retirement age," as defined for eligibility for the benefits of the Social Security Act, from 65 years to 60 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reduce the age of qualification for the benefits of the old-age-assistance program from 65 years to 60 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide Watertown Arsenal with work in the guided-missile and new weapons field; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the States and Congress to prevent this and other encroachment by the Central Government and declaring the intention of South Carolina to exercise all powers reserved to it, to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 9568. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Joseph Bertolone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 9569. A bill for the relief of Kurt Johan Paro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 9570. A bill for the relief of Albert A. Heinze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 9571. A bill for the relief of Peter Henry Reich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 9572. A bill for the relief of John S. Ewing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 9573. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willie Soher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 9574. A bill for the relief of William R. Overton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 9575. A bill for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Everywhere, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 9576. A bill for the relief of Harold John Begley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 9577. A bill for the relief of Louis Hoekveld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 9578. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Colorado; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 9579. A bill for the relief of Nicola Marcello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9580. A bill for the relief of Angus Learie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 9581. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Good News Camp, Port Hope, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

570. By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts: Petition of the City Council of the City of Boston, Mass., relative to Israel's application for arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

571. By Mr. ELLSWORTH: Petition of Mrs. Clarence Curries and 22 other citizens of the city of Roseburg, Oreg., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

572. Also, petition of Zina M. Canada and 34 other citizens of Roseburg, Oreg., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

573. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Rev. H. J. Meritt and other citizens of Crane, urging legislation which would prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

574. Also, petition of Mrs. Nora J. McNeill and other citizens of El Dorado Springs, protesting the advertising on radio and television of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

575. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Orange, N. Y., requesting the Congress to study and take appropriate action in respect to flood damage in Orange County; to the Committee on Public Works.

576. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the Frost Federal Labor Union 19985 at Kenosha, Wis., on February 24, 1956, opposing the Weeks committee report for financing a national highway program and supporting a bold, long-range program for construction, the cost of which to be equitably distributed among the population of the country; to the Committee on Public Works.

577. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, New England Conservatory Alumni Association, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Cathedral of the Pines, at Rindge in the State of New Hampshire be designated and recognized as a national shrine—an altar of the Nation—a perpetual monument in our beloved country, the United States of America; to the Committee on Internal and Insular Affairs.

578. Also, petition of the chairman, Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

579. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the extent and methods of financing a compre-

hensive national highway program and enact legislation during the 84th Congress providing for the authorization and financing of such a program; to the Committee on Public Works.

580. Also, petition of the county clerk, county of Hawaii, Hilo, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of legislation for an equitable reapportionment of membership in the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

581. Also, petition of the president, the Estonian National Committee in the United States, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to sounding the alarm to the peoples yet free regarding the expansion of communism, and that our greatest trust lies in the generosity and enlightened self-interest of this free and powerful country, the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, February 16 was the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I made in observance of this important day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Throughout the world freedom-loving men pause on February 16 to observe the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. In America and other free nations there will be large gatherings to mark this occasion. But, the people of Lithuania can at best only gather in small groups in their homes to observe their Independence Day. The Communist overloards do not permit them to openly celebrate this day in their native land. Yet, while the right of open assembly can be denied to them, no power on earth can wipe the glorious past of this brave nation from the pages of history nor tear from the hearts of the people of Lithuania the ardor and devotion for freedom and independence.

For centuries the Lithuanian people have been in the forefront of man's continuing struggle against oppression. Over 600 years ago the first independent Lithuanian state was organized and through the centuries this small but noble country developed into a leader among the peace-loving peoples of Europe.

However, a strong and vicious neighbor, even then hungry for conquest, forcibly annexed Lithuania in the 18th century and she disappeared from the maps of Europe as an independent state. At the end of World War I Lithuania regained her independence and became a model republic, only to be engulfed in the Red tide of expansionism at the start of the global conflict in 1939.

Yet, the people of Lithuania are neither broken nor discouraged by these stark realities. The fever of liberty and freedom is heightened, not dispelled, by this adversity. Their courage and indomitable will to resist grows stronger with every outrage committed against them by those who seek to become masters of their spirits as well as their bodies. We in America and her countless friends throughout the free world will remain true in our struggle to free Lithuania from the Communist yoke. We shall take courage from the valor of the Lithuanian people. We shall be sustained by their devotion to our common cause. We shall continue the struggle with every resource at our command to overcome the scourge—that godless conspiracy—which would enslave the entire world, and which now has gallant Lithuania within its grasp. We will be steadfast in the position that all peoples can live in peace and harmony and that man's right to be free is not only inalienable, but unconquerable. With the strength of these convictions we have on our side the truly ultimate weapon of the atomic era, free man's faith in God and his own destiny.

People of Lithuania, we salute you on your Independence Day. You have our undying faith and respect, and we reverently pray that God will continue to give you the strength to carry on.

Atomic Power Will Obsolete Upper Colorado Powerplants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of the upper Colorado project seek to a large extent to justify the huge expenditure on the assumption that the sale of power will reimburse the Nation for the funds advanced with interest.

When the Boulder Canyon Project Act authorized Hoover Dam on the Colorado River, the legislation required that contracts for the sale of power be negotiated before the construction began. No such protection or guarantee is included in the upper Colorado project bill, and it is extremely doubtful that there will be a market for anywhere near a hundred years for power produced by the project.

The power units are proposed to be located in a region which has almost boundless energy potential in the greatest coal, oil shale, and uranium deposits in the country. When it is considered that atomic electric power will be available in the comparatively near future and this, combined with the other natural resources of the area, will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete in a few years, there would be little or no reimbursement to the Federal treasury.

We know that whereas 15 years ago nuclear power was practically unheard of, today commercial nuclear electric energy generating plants are actually being constructed. We are assured that nuclear electric energy will be produced much cheaper than hydroelectric energy and the time when this will be a fact is not far distant. Yet the planning figures for this project show that it may take up to a hundred years to pay for them out of the revenues produced by hydroelectric power. In fact, it is expected that these powerplants will pay not only for the cost of the power dams and installations but also 88 percent of the cost of the irrigation projects.

Proponents of the bill in having such expectations completely ignore the cost figures prepared by James A. Lane of Oak Ridge National Laboratory which show that while the cost of producing electricity in conventional steamplants is 7 mills per kilowatt hour, the cost in a nuclear plant would be 6.7 mills. The actual production of power, therefore, is less costly than by steam and then in addition, plutonium is produced as a by-product of the nuclear electric plant and can now be sold for approximately $100 a gram. Even if the plutonium price were to drop back to its fuel value of about $20 a gram, the cost of producing power by atomic energy would still be far less than any other method.

Can anyone doubt, in view of these facts, that the Colorado River project is financially unsound? The taxpayers of our Nation should not be forced to bear such a tremendous burden. I hope my colleagues will join with me in defeating this measure.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward Martin of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Upshur County Republican Executive Committee, at Buckhannon, W. Va., on February 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE LINCOLN DAY DINNER OF THE UPSHUR COUNTY REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT BUCKHANNON, W. VA., FEBRUARY 11, 1956

I am highly honored by your invitation to address this meeting of patriotic Americans.

I sincerely appreciate the privilege of joining with you in tribute to the memory of one of the greatest of all Americans, Abraham Lincoln.

And let me assure you, with equal sincerity, that it is always a pleasure to come to the great mountain State of West Virginia.

Through the years I have enjoyed the most agreeable association with many of your fine citizens in business, politics, military affairs, and in the activities of government. There are so many whose friendships I treasure, but I cannot come into West Virginia without making special mention of my long-time friend, your Republican national committeeman, Walter S. Hallanan.

He is a real American, an unselfish leader of the Republican Party, and a tower of strength in support of good government. Without expecting anything for himself he gives generously of his time, his means, and his energy to advance the welfare of his State and the Nation.

In honoring the immortal fame of Abraham Lincoln we recall with gratitude his greatest achievement, the preservation of the Union. We recall with pride that West Virginia, in those days of national crisis, gave the world an example of loyalty and faith in the American Republic.

In Lincoln's time the Nation was torn asunder by a great internal upheaval. Out of the turmoil and struggle of that day patriotic Americans rallied to defend the Union and the cause of human freedom.

They formed a new party—the Republican Party—dedicated to the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

As one of the founders of the Republican Party and first Republican President of the United States Lincoln grows in stature year after year. He lived by high ideals and had the courage to stand by them in the face of discouragment and disappoinment.

We must have the same courage today to do our full duty as Americans. The future of our Nation depends upon the course of action we take and the outcome of our fight for the principles in which we believe.

As Republicans we believe in freedom of the individual, freedom of enterprise and freedom of opportunity. These are American principles which have come down to us as a priceless heritage. They were the principles of Abraham Lincoln. They are the principles of the Eisenhower administration.

Three years of clean, decent Government have proven that the Republican Party is the party of peace, progress, and sound prosperity. There has never been an administration with such a brilliant record of achievement in so short a time.

We can be proud that we have a Republican administration at Washintgon without favoritism, without corruption, without extravagance and without socialistic regimentation.

We have a Republican administration that is sound, trustworthy, and economical, serving no special interests, but working to advance the welfare of all the people.

We have an administration that believes in the Constitution of the United States and respects its limitations on the power of the Central Government.

We have an administration that supports the American system of free enterprise which means unlimited opportunity, progress, and prosperity.

But we must remember that this year of 1956 is one of tremendous importance. It is a year in which we face a challenge that calls for all our courage, determination, and loyalty.

This year the American people will decide whether we will go forward to greater achievement under sound, constructive Republican leadership or whether we will return to the disastrous, crazy-quilt pattern of corruption, confusion, and Korea of the previous Democratic administrations.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the Republican Party has gained the confidence of the American people by its magnificent record under the inspired leadership of our great President, Dwight Eisenhower.

I cannot tell you whether he will be a candidate for reelection or not, but I am firmly convinced of one thing. His decision will be made without thought of himself but will be based solely on whether he can fully and completely serve the best interests of the United States and the world.

Whatever President Eisenhower's decision may be, we can go into this year's national campaign with a record of achievement that reflects the basic philosophy of the Republican Party and the principles to which the Republican Party is dedicated.

Every real American, regardless of his politics, rejoices that we have gone through 3 years of the greatest prosperity we have ever known—prosperity based on a sound, expanding economy—without the blood, sweat, and tears of war.

In the heart of every American there is gratitude for the crowning achievement of the Eisenhower administration in bringing to an end the death and destruction of Mr. Truman's so-called police action in Korea.

It took great courage for Eisenhower to go over to Korea in fulfillment of his campaign pledge to do everything within his power to end the fighting. But no one has ever questioned his courage. Less than 6 months after he took office the guns were silenced—the casualty lists were ended and no more brave American boys gave their lives without hope of victory.

If the Republican Party had no other claim for credit, that alone would shine forth as a bright beacon of honor and glory.

It took great courage for the President to stand firm for a balanced budget and the reduction of the national debt before a further cut in taxes. That may not be popular with some people, but it is the right course for the safety and security of our Nation.

Let me review briefly some of the accomplishments in 3 years of Republican leadership:

Taxes have been cut within the margin of safety. The Republican 83d Congress in 1954 reduced taxes by nearly $7½ billion, the largest tax cut ever made in a single year.

Government spending has been brought under control. The cost of government has been reduced by $10 billion below the latest budget proposed by President Truman. We will have a balanced budget this year and next.

In 3 years there has been no significant loss in the purchasing power of the dollar. Inflation has been checked.

The personal income of the American people is at an all-time high.

More than 65 million working men and women are employed at higher wages and salaries than ever before.

Unfair restrictions on business and labor have been eliminated.

The 20-year trend toward centralization of Government in the socialistic pattern has been reversed.

Communists, fellow-travelers, and other disloyal subversives have been weeded out of the Government service.

Social security has been expanded and its benefits increased.

We have built a balanced military defense, the strongest in the history of our Nation.

We now have a firm, strong, dynamic foreign policy that has lessened world tension and has brightened our hope for peace.

These are just a few highlights. There are many more I could enumerate. Not the least of these are the high moral and spiritual values which guide President Eisenhower and which have restored honesty and decency to our National Government.

We believe with President Eisenhower that to serve the cause of world progress we must first protect the liberties of our own citizens. To go forward in leadership for freedom, justice, and peace we must preserve the American system of government.

Therefore, the Republican Party seeks no alliance with those who would socialize our country. The Republican Party rejects the support of those who think the American form of government has outlived its usefulness. We ask no help from those who would distort the meaning of the Constitution to serve their selfish purposes.

In the great crusade which resulted in Republican victory and the election of President Eisenhower, we did not promise an easy way of life. We did not promise security from the cradle to the grave, without effort and without cost.

We did not seek to create disunity. We did not array one class against another or stir up sectional hatreds.

But we did make a solemn pledge to the American people that their liberties would be protected by a finanically sound Government structure, based on sound fiscal policies and rigid economy.

We promised to protect American freedom from the dangers of socialistic experimentation which would concentrate all authority in the Central Government.

We promised that unwarranted peacetime controls that shackled the expansion of productive enterprise would be removed. We pledged the Republican Party to create an atmosphere that would once more provide incentives for free enterprise to function for the maximum benefit of every man and woman who works for a living.

Those pledges have been fulfilled. The Republican Party has been faithful to its campaign promises.

The memorable words of Abraham Lincoln have come down to us for inspiration and guidance.

When the Republican Party was being organized 100 years ago he said, and I quote:

"Let us, in building our new party, plant ourselves on the rock of the Declaration of Independence and the gates of hell shall not be able to prevail against us."

The political wisdom of Abraham Lincoln grows more impressive with the passing years. It calls upon us in our day to reaffirm our allegiance to the heritage passed on to us by the Founding Fathers, preserved for us by the first Republican President and strengthened by the high spiritual concept of government to which our great President, Dwight Eisenhower, is dedicated.

Let us go out from this dinner with renewed determination to face the challenge of 1956.

America must not turn back.

With the honored memory of Abraham Lincoln to inspire us we can go forward to victory—victory for the Republican Party—victory for the United States and the free world.

No Floors in Their Churches on Trinidad, British West Indies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a Baptist sect on the island of Trinidad, British West Indies, has no floors in its churches. A chauffeur on Trinidad developed the story in this way:

"There are many religions here. A Baptist group does not have any floors in its churches.

"Why not?

"They love Mother Earth, believe it the supplier of strength and inspiration. It grows our food, nourishes our animals and gives us water to drink. These

Baptists go on retreats lying in the ground, buried up to their chins. For over 20 days, they drink only fluids. They believe in this state, mother earth will give them visions and inspiration enough to carry them over until their next retreat. So they are most at home when they worship in their churches standing on the ground."

Mr. Speaker, when I related this story to Congressman BURDICK, of North Dakota, a Baptist, he said:

Well, don't you know, in politics, we say that a man with his feet on the ground can't be beat.

Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing tendency on the part of southern California spokesmen to attempt to convince other Members of Congress that without the use of the Colorado River the State will die of thirst. This is simply not true. Southern California does not need to take Colorado River water belonging to the upper basin States in order to meet her own water needs.

Informed California officials are on record to the effect that California has enough water within its borders to meet its own requirements for many years to come.

Excerpt from Preliminary Report on the Major Features of the California Water Plan in the North Coastal Area, dated January 3, 1956:

The data developed in State Water Resources Board Bulletins Nos. 1 and 2 demonstrate the basic geographical water problem of California, and also indicate the solution to that problem. From the abundant water supplies of the north coastal area and the Sacramento River Basin, an average of approximately 23 million acre-feet of water per season will ultimately have to be developed and exported to the remaining inherently water-deficient areas of the State. These exports will be surplus waters, over and above the waters needed in the north coastal area and the Sacramento River Basin for ultimate local use. With the full practicable development of local water resources in all areas of the State for local use, and with the water available under California's rights in and to the waters of the Colorado River, these exports from the north will satisfy the probably ultimate requirements for water in all parts of the State.

Excerpts from an article by J. J. Deuel, director, California Farm Bureau Public Utilities Department and Water Problems Department, entitled "California's Water Program," which appeared in the California Farm Bureau Monthly of January 1956:

It is estimated that the present annual use of water in California is approximately 21 million acre-feet; that 51 million acre-feet will support a population in California of 40 million people, and that the total amount of water available each year is approximately 70 million acre-feet. Based on the above figures, which are supported by extensive studies made by the State engineer, it is apparent that there is sufficient water available to supply the needs of California into the far distant future. The problem is one of stopping the surplus water from wasting into the ocean and making it available where needed for domestic, agricultural, and industrial uses. The Feather River project has an important place in the plan to bring that about.

Quotation, Engineering News-Record, February 9, 1956:

Spokesman for the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, C. C. Elder, held that while sewerage reclamation is the district's most important reserve, with its Colorado River aqueduct operating at only 33 percent of capacity the district couldn't see asking taxpayers to pay for waste water reclamation when the aqueduct won't reach full capacity for another 20 years.

February Is Catholic Press Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, February is being commemorated all over this Nation as Catholic Press Month. It is with great pleasure that I pay tribute today to those publications which faithfully report on events of significant and special interest to Catholic readers.

The Catholic press of the United States is filling a definite need. It is primarily concerned with giving a more detailed report on Catholic events than do secular papers and evaluating the changing times in which we live. The high quality and uniform excellence of our Catholic press is confirmed by the high esteem in which it is held by all its readers. They look to it for the guidance and interpretation so badly needed by all of us today.

The paper with which I happen to be most familiar, and which I salute also today, is the Catholic Courier Journal, which is the official newspaper of the diocese of Rochester. Its circulation is over 53,000. Its coverage of the news is complete, timely, and well written. By means of wire services from all over the world, the Courier Journal is able to supply its readers with the latest, up-to-the-minute happenings soon after they take place. This fine paper also carries accurate accounts of important Catholic events and is noted for its complete coverage of significant Catholic news.

Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Courier Journal of my city is just one of many fine Catholic newspapers of this country. It is an integral part of the network of diocesan papers which, though restricted in its readership and area of coverage, is a most effective and good influence on our public life.

The Catholic press is serving its ends well. It is a strong and enlightening influence in the homes of all who read it. As Catholic Press Month draws to a close, I salute these publications for their past accomplishments and wish them continued success in the years ahead.

Taking From Peter To Pay Paul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with subsidies for taking land out of production and with subsidies for putting land into production at the same time.

This is the anomaly that is presented to the House in its consideration of the upper Colorado River project.

I wish to insert in the RECORD the letter I have directed to each Member of the House, together with a copy of the "expert testimony" of the distinguished former Governor of Nebraska, Robert LeRoy Cochran, who is eminently qualified to speak on the subject:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1956.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Enclosed is a reprint of a recent interview in Newsweek magazine with Robert L. Cochran, relating to the upper Colorado River project.

Mr. Cochran recently retired from the United States Bureau of the Budget, where he served more than 10 years as an expert on the financial and engineering aspects of Federal water-conservation projects. His distinguished career dates back to 1915 when he entered the office of the State engineer of Nebraska. He also served an unprecedented three consecutive terms as the Governor of that State.

Now free to speak publicly, Mr. Cochran points out the economic folly of authorizing the upper Colorado River project and also points out that the power features of the project, which are supposed to help pay the costs, may well be obsolete before the repayment period begins.

He further states that 90 percent of the irrigation costs would be Federal subsidy and that with the pending soil-bank proposal, Congress is faced with subsidies for taking land out of production and with subsidies for putting land into production at the same time.

I hope you will find it possible to take the time to read Mr. Cochran's statements prior to action by the House on the matter.

Sincerely,

CECIL R. KING,
Member of Congress.

EXPERT TESTIMONY

(By Raymond Moley)

On January 31 Robert LeRoy Cochran retired from the United States Bureau of the Budget, where he served more than 10 years as an expert on the financial and engineering aspects of Federal water-conservation projects. His distinguished career suggests that there is no man in the United States better qualified to advise in that field of Federal activity. Beginning in 1915, he spent 20 years in the office of the State engineer of Nebraska, during 12 of which he was head of that department. In 1934 he was elected on the Democratic ticket Governor of his

State, and was reelected in 1936 and 1938. This was the first time in the history of the State that a governor was elected for three consecutive terms. In addition to this unparalleled official experience in a reclamation State, he himself has owned a reclamation farm for 40 years.

He is now free to speak publicly, and I have asked him a number of questions concerning the multibillion-dollar upper Colorado storage project which is now before Congress.

Question. Governor Cochran, since the great majority of the readers of this article are interested in the Colorado River storage project as taxpayers rather than as beneficiaries, I believe they would like to have your opinion concerning the possibility of repayment to the Treasury of the money spent for power and irrigation. What is the formula proposed by the Interior Department for repayment?

Answer. It is called the Collbran fomula. It proposes that the power features be paid off first, with interest, from the revenues from the sale of electricity. After those expenditures are liquidated, which it is estimated will take about 50 years, the power profits would be used to pay off the costs of the irrigation aspects of the plan. Such repayment, if ever made, would take considerably more than another half century.

Question. What is your opinion about the practical prospects of repayment?

Answer. According to the claims of the Bureau of Reclamation and the congressional sponsors of the project, the cash boxes from which most of the repayment must come are power installations, the largest of which is Glen Canyon near the Utah-Arizona border. On the basis of the figures submitted, only Glen Canyon could be justified as financially feasible. Even if the revenues from that one dam were as good as anticipated, they would be entirely consumed in paying the deficits on the other power dams. That would leave nothing at all for the repayment of the irrigation costs during the first 50-year period.

The analysis presented by the department was based upon a 50-year period, generally considered to be the useful life of a project. Such a period may be too long in the light of the future potentials of power production from atomic energy and other sources.

Question. How then could the costs of the irrigation aspects of the upper Colorado project be paid back to the Federal Government?

Answer. A small proportion (about 15 percent) of the construction costs alone would be repaid by the farmers during the first interest-free 50 years. While it is proposed that the balance (85 percent) be paid back out of the revenues of the power aspects of the plan, we have already seen that there is no validity in that claim. Payment from that source would not begin anyhow until after about 50 years. By that time, the power features might well be obsolete. It should be emphasized that there appears to be a very serious doubt as to whether any power revenues would ever be applied to the payment of irrigation costs in the upper Colorado basin. I submit that a proposal to start payment after 50 years on a debt for any purpose is not worth the paper it is written on.

Meanwhile, because of the high construction costs per acre of the irrigation works and the accumulating unpaid interest, the Federal subsidy would be enormous. Under the ultraliberal construction of the reclamation law by the department, freedom from interest extends not only through the 40 or 50 years beyond a development period, but indefinitely into the future.

Something like 90 percent of the irrigation costs (including interest) would be Federal subsidy. Besides, experience with reclamation projects indicates that after 30 years or so it is necessary in a considerable number of cases to spend further money on rehabilitation. This is another large item of expense for the Federal Government. There is also the fact that there is pending in Congress a proposal to subsidize a soil bank of land now under production. We are faced with subsidies for taking land out of production and with subsidies for putting land into production at the same time.

Question. But proponents of the upper Colorado storage project, ignoring the fact that in humid or semihumid sections of the country there are millions of acres which might with relatively small cost be prepared for cultivation, say that new irrigated land will be neecssary by 1975 because of the rapidly increasing population in the United States. What about that argument for bringing new irrigated land into cultivation?

Answer. Such a claim must be balanced against the fact that through technology increased production can be and is being obtained from fewer acres. It will be very many years, if ever, before such land as is proposed in this project could be needed.

I would conclude that if Congress proposes to pay this immense subsidy to bring this arid land into production, it should be done in the open. As it is, the subsidy is pretty well concealed by means of a repayment formula which is absolutely without validity.

Tribute to Cantor Aaron Horowitz, of Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the outstanding record that has been achieved by one of my constituents, Cantor Aaron Horowitz, of Congregation B'nai Jacob, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

This fine spiritual leader has served for the past 60 years, without interruption, as a cantor in orthodox Judaism, a record of longevity that perhaps exceeds that of any other cantor in the United States.

He has served well the spiritual needs of his congregation, B'nai Jacob, for 33 years, and still serves the congregation fully and actively.

During his 60 years of cantorial service, Cantor Horowitz has participated in approximately 44,000 daily synagogue services. That figure perhaps also establishes a record in this country.

Cantor Horowitz, in addition to his accomplishments in orthodox Judaism, is a splendid musician and composer as well as a Biblical and Talmudic scholar.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you can readily see that I am speaking of a fine, well-balanced and outstanding individual—a man of great spiritual strength and dignity.

As befitting a man of such stature, his congregation tendered to him and his wife a testimonial dinner on Sunday, February 26, 1956.

I would like to join his many friends and admirers in wishing Cantor Horowith many more years of service to his congregation.

Inauguration Day Should Be a Legal Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the following statement which I submitted on February 24, 1956, to the House Committee on the Judiciary during its hearing on bills providing for a legal holiday on Inauguration Day:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to present a statement in support of the resolution, House Joint Resolution 19, which I introduced on January 5, 1955, for the purpose of declaring a legal holiday on January 20, 1957, and on the day in every fourth year thereafter which is celebrated and known as inauguration day.

Permit me to say that I had the privilege to appear before your committee in behalf of a similar resolution on June 17, 1953. In that statement I stressed the importance of the event and the fact that, in practice, all over the country the national economic life, public and private, comes to a standstill.

We all recognize inauguration day as a significant event in the public and private life of our great country. On that day the attention of all persons is unremittingly fixed on the auspiciousness of the occasion. Through the media of radio and television our country and, indeed, the entire world, participate in the solemnity of the occasion and in the festivities of the day.

In this statement I wish to emphasize the unique moral and ideological importance connected with this vital quadrennial occurrence in our national life. Generally, holidays are directed to the memory of a past event, and in their commemoration the event becomes a symbolic example and a guiding pattern for our future life. We are grateful for the past and, implicitly, we promise to make our future life more and more worthy of those sacred ideals.

Inauguration day is the day which celebrates the most outstanding expression of the will of our people and elevates it as a symbol of the will of our Nation. On this day the Nation more than ever is one and united; on this day we look with new confidence, assurance, and faith toward the future. In the ensuing 4 years the political, economic, cultural, and moral life of our people will establish new landmarks.

Why do we allow free time for our people to vote if we do not permit them the opportunity to celebrate nationally the direct result of their voting. We look upon the right to vote as the blessing bestowed upon us by a true democratic way of life. If we esteem it as a transcendent privilege for the old and young, for all classes, races, and creeds, should we not afford our countrymen the opportunity to celebrate in their political choice—the final outcome and expression of their will.

On inauguration day we do not rejoice in a single man, in a certain name, in a particular political leader. On that day we reaffirm our faith in and our allegiance to a

most sacred institution—we honor and extol the office of President as the cornerstone upon which our Constitution is preserved, protected, and defended.

The proposed legislation is not without precedent in the annals of our history. Permit me to call to the attention of the committee the act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 980, 50th Cong., 2d sess.), which declared a national holiday on April 30, 1889, the centennial anniversary of the inauguration of our first President. It provided:

"That in order that the centennial anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States, George Washington, may be duly commemorated, Tuesday, the 30th day of April, anno Domini 1889, is hereby declared to be a national holiday throughout the United States. And in further commemoration of this historic event, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on the second Wednesday of December, anno Domini 1889, when suitable ceremonies shall be had under the direction of a joint committee composed of 5 Senators and 5 Representatives, Members of the 51st Congress, who shall be appointed by the presiding officers of the respective Houses. And said joint committee shall have power to sit during the recess of Congress; and it shall be its duty to make arrangements for the celebration in the Hall of the House of Representatives on the second Wednesday of December next, and may invite to be present thereat such officers of the United States and of the respective States of the Union, and (through the Secretary of State) representatives of foreign governments. The committee shall invite the Chief Justice of the United States to deliver a suitable address on the occasion."

Various public groups have given their support to the purpose of this proposed legislation. It is common knowledge that most businesses come to a standstill that day.

In view of all the above factors, I do hope the proposed legislation will receive the favorable consideration of this committee in order that all our countrymen may participate to the fullest extent in the importance of Inauguration Day.

State by State Cost of Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on the total construction appropriation to date, by States, for active Corps of Engineers civil-works programs, including completed works.

Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, flood control is a direct appropriation to the States and communities. Neither principal nor interest is repaid to the Treasury.

This study of total expenditures for flood control, which amounts to $6,859,553,000, is about 3 times the amount spent on reclamation projects. Reclamation projects pay back the principal, and they bring a new source of wealth and security to the communities of the arid West.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the States that have profited so much from flood-control projects will look with some favor upon reclamation projects. They are both an investment in America.

Total construction appropriations to date, by States, for active Corps of Engineers civil-works program, including completed works

Alabama	$55,404,000
Arkansas	369,412,000
Arizona	1,381,000
California	473,031,000
Colorado	31,713,000
Connecticut	31,966,000
Delaware	22,738,000
Florida	116,783,000
Georgia	148,235,000
Idaho	51,319,000
Illinois	263,260,000
Indiana	60,634,000
Iowa	97,564,000
Kansas	106,514,000
Kentucky	245,489,000
Louisiana	450,936,000
Maine	10,496,000
Maryland	26,423,000
Massachusetts	85,125,000
Michigan	118,076,000
Minnesota	58,774,000
Mississippi	255,858,000
Missouri	324,703,000
Montana	135,817,000
Nebraska	125,822,000
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	15,581,000
New Jersey	56,378,000
New Mexico	18,058,000
New York	238,109,000
North Carolina	62,821,000
North Dakota	263,255,000
Ohio	158,657,000
Oklahoma	154,393,000
Oregon	478,627,000
Pennsylvania	227,073,000
Rhode Island	6,895,000
South Carolina	59,789,000
South Dakota	267,688,000
Tennessee	195,594,000
Texas	292,530,000
Utah	708,000
Vermont	5,259,000
Virginia	100,328,000
Washington	451,282,000
West Virginia	120,851,000
Wisconsin	13,386,000
Wyoming	300,000
District of Columbia	4,518,000
Total	[1] 6,859,553,000

[1] Includes maintenance of the Mississippi River alluvial valley project prior to fiscal year 1942, since both construction and maintenance funds were combined in annual appropriations in the early years of the project and are inseparable.

Gaining Momentum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I recently called the attention of the House to the fact that Eastman Kodak Co. has formally recognized Good Friday as a day of deep spiritual meaning to the Christian world, and has designated it as a paid holiday.

My attention has since been drawn to the fact that another large company in my district, the Massey-Harris Ferguson Co., of Batavia, N. Y., has also signed a contract with its employees in which Good Friday is designated as a paid holiday, thanks in large measure to the interest and efforts of the works manager of the plant, Mr. Robert L. Benson. I am indebted to Mr. M. O. Clement, civil defense director of Genesee County, for this information.

Regardless of one's faith, the increasing recognition by industry of the spiritual significance of Good Friday underscores the fact that this is indeed one nation, under God, indivisible.

Washington, Too, Had His Second-Term Health Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether President Eisenhower intends to be a candidate for reelection continues to be the all-absorbing subject whenever any two persons meet in conversation. It will continue to be so until the President makes an announcement.

In writing upon the subject in my weekly Washington in Review, on January 12, last, I said:

I am of the opinion that the President's health, under certain conditions, might have a bearing in determining his final answer. I do not think, however, that it would necessarily be a controlling reason. I have a strong feeling that fear that it might be detrimental to his health or even mean his possible death for him to continue the heavy responsibilities of the Presidency would not, standing alone, determine him to answer "No; I will not be a candidate." We all well know that at no time during his service in the Army of his country would any possibility of death deter him from the full performance of his patriotic duty, whatever it might be.

Thus, it is my thought that if the President should feel that the world situation is such that continued peace would be imperiled by his relinquishment of the office of President, that then in such case he would feel an obligation to continue regardless of the possible physical consequences to himself. I am strongly of the opinion that fear of death or physical harm would no more determine him to avoid responsibility in time of peace than it would in time of war. President Eisenhower is too patriotic, and his love of country is too strong to permit him to make any decision other than what he thought necessary for the best interests of his country, regardless of any personal physical considerations.

Thus, it seems to me that in the final analysis, I would expect the President's decision to be based primarily on world conditions, and, if they be such as to cause him to feel that his continuation in the office of President is either necessary or advisable, that then he would respond and assume the duties in the same patriotic spirit that we all know would actuate him to accept responsibility in a time of national emergency growing out of a war that required his services.

On Wednesday, February 22, 1956, the Courier-Post of Camden, N. J., carried an editorial entitled "Washington, Too, Had His Second-Term Health Problem." It was an exceedingly interesting article, particularly because of the fact that President George Washington had a similar question of health facing him, before deciding to be a candidate for a second term, as now confronts President Eisenhower.

The editorial to which I have referred reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, TOO, HAD HIS SECOND-TERM HEALTH PROBLEM

As President Eisenhower ponders his great decision, it is interesting to recall that George Washington would have preferred not to run for a second term because of his health.

Though the first President was a strong, powerful man, the rigors of the Revolution and his earlier campaigns and travels had left their mark on him when, at the age of 61, he came to the end of his first term.

To Thomas Jefferson, Washington wrote that he felt himself "growing old," that his memory was "becoming worse" and his health "less firm." He prepared a farewell address, but it was only delivered, in amended form, at the end of his second term instead of the first. In it he said:

"I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power * * * to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. * * * But mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence impelled me to abandon the idea."

The troubled foreign affairs to which Washington referred arose primarily from the outbreak of the French Revolution and the ensuing war between France and England, with the strong sympathy felt for France by many of Britain's recent colonists, especially the Jeffersonians, which was fanned by the machinations of the French envoy to this country, Citizen Genet.

Washington was determined that the infant Nation would not imperil its precarious existence by taking sides in the European conflict. So to make sure of that, he subordinated his personal inclinations to the country's welfare and accepted a second term.

During this term the excesses of the French revolution made his neutrality policy popular instead of unpopular, and there were notable achievements in several fields.

Threats from hostile Indians were lessened. Open resistance to excise tax collections was put down. Access to the Mississippi was assured. The national credit was made firm. The Nation's international standing was strengthened.

It was fortunate for the United States that health which was less robust at the end of his first term than it was at the beginning did not deter Washington from a second one. The second term added greatly to his luster. Without it he might not have been called first in peace as well as first in war and first in the hearts of his countrymen.

There are certain striking parallels between Washington and Eisenhower, though it would be foolish to stretch them too far.

But one of them is the perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations that existed in 1792 and exists again in 1956.

It would be a strange working of fate, but entirely conceivable, if the 34th President should decide for the same reasons as the first to forego his own personal desires and serve a second term.

Mr. Speaker, thus, it will be seen there are certain striking parallels between Presidents Washington and Eisenhower in this matter of health. As President Washington accepted the responsibility of a second term because of the perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations that existed in 1792, so it can be hoped that President Eisenhower in 1956 will also accept the responsibility of a second term because, as stated in my news release, "the world situation is such that continued peace would be imperiled by his relinquishment of the office of President."

We need President Eisenhower today for the same reasons that the world conditions in 1792 created a need for President Washington at that time.

Eighteenth District Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed 16 questions to the homes of the 18th Congressional District of California which I have the honor to represent. The response was widespread. I believe my colleagues will be interested in the views expressed by this large group of Americans as shown in the following tabulation:

18th District opinion poll	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. "What 'we' did"? [1]	87.6	5.5	6.9
2. "Where 'we' are"? [1]	85.8	6.4	7.8
3. Finance new highways from more highway taxes instead of general revenues?	67.0	24.5	8.5
4. Reduce national debt before cutting personal income taxes?	77.8	16.5	5.7
5. Foreign aid is a needed weapon for winning the cold war?	63.8	26.6	9.6
6. Repeal McCarran-Walter immigration law?	24.8	44.8	30.4
7. Raise 1st class postal rates to help cut post-office deficits?	65.6	28.5	5.9
8. Federal aid for school construction?	59.3	32.4	8.3
9. Federal "reinsurance" of private health insurance plans?	41.8	40.6	17.6
10. "Soil bank" and flexible supports instead of rigid farm supports?	79.6	9.4	11.0
11. Repeal Taft-Hartley law?	11.4	75.1	13.5
12. Federal water-power projects only where private financing unavailable?	81.2	13.4	5.4
OPTIONAL QUESTIONS			
A. Do you think President Eisenhower will run for a second term?	53.3	31.1	15.6
B. Do you think the Government is giving away our natural resources?	26.7	56.9	16.4
C. Do you think the net effect of "big business" is good rather than bad for the country?	75.5	16.0	8.5
D. Do you think the net effect of the CIO-AFL merger will be good rather than bad for the country?	23.9	58.6	17.5

[1] As set forth in the President's state of the Union message in which he stressed "we" means not just his administration, but also Congress—including both parties—and all American people, Democrats and Republicans alike.

Pensions for World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 5 of last year I introduced H. R. 656, which provides that World War I veterans shall receive substantially the same pension benefits as those received by the veterans of the Spanish-American War. The rates are set forth in the bill, but in brief, a World War I veteran at the age of 62 would receive $101.59 a month, without a means test.

World War I ended more than 37 years ago. Thirty-five years after the close of the Revolutionary War, the veterans of that war were given a pension on the basis of service alone. Similar pensions were bestowed by a grateful Nation 39 years from the end of the Mexican War, and just 24 years after the Civil War was over the veterans of that conflict were granted pensions as a matter of right.

Only 18 years elapsed before a system of general pensions was set up for the Spanish-American War veterans. But in the period more than twice that long, since the Armistice of 1918, no such benefits have yet been provided for the veterans of World War I.

I am a veteran of both World War I and World War II. During World War I, I was in a branch of service which we in that first Air Corps considered hazardous. During World War II, I was a "retread," performing office work, and was as safe as if I had been at home in bed. Nevertheless, I am very proud of my World War II service.

I entered the Army in that war when I was 46 years of age. To have taken preliminary training at an Army school at that age, together with the financial sacrifices I made, gives me much pride in my World War II service, and, for that reason, I generally wear the "ruptured duck" service emblem in my lapel. However, I cannot help but contrast the difference in the way the veterans of the two world wars were treated at the close of each conflict.

When their service was ended, the World War II veterans were each given mustering-out pay of $200 to $300, which cost the Government approximately $4 billion, without a question. Veterans of World War I were given mustering-out pay of only $60 apiece in 1918 and 1919. At that time, $60 would not purchase a suit of clothes.

A man who enters the military service in wartime must give up his job or position, and when that service ends there

generally follows a period of hardship during which he must find employment and readjust himself to civilian life. The Government did very little to help the veterans of World War I tide themselves over this period. Even men released from prison are given a suit of clothes and travel fare home. They are treated with more consideration than was accorded the veterans of World War I.

And then came the long struggle to right that wrong. First, the Government gave World War I veterans the so-called "adjusted-service certificates." The Government ascertained the amount of mustering-out pay that it should have paid to these veterans at the time of their discharge. An increment was added to make up for delay in payment. There was determined how much paid-up insurance due in 20 years could be bought with each veteran's "adjusted-service credits," and each veteran was given a certificate for that amount of paid-up insurance, due in 20 years.

At first, the veterans were permitted to borrow on 10 percent of the face amount of these certificates; then legislation was passed permitting them to borrow on 50 percent; and, finally, in 1936, a law was passed over a Presidential veto to pay the veterans of World War I the full amount of their "adjusted-service certificates"—or mustering-out pay. Three similar bills had been vetoed by other Presidents.

So, 18 years after they were discharged, World War I veterans got their due mustering-out pay. The amount they received, under the forced-investment or insurance idea of the adjusted-service certificates, was $3.8 billion. The expenditure involved would have been much less—only about $1.5 billion—if the veterans of World War I had been paid this money due them when they were mustered out of service, as were the veterans of World War II.

In addition to mustering-out pay, since World War II, veterans have been given terminal-leave pay which cost the Government $3.1 billion, and unemployment compensation which cost the Government $3.8 billion. They have been given social-security credits for the time they spent in military service. Complete figures as to the cost of these are not available, but it will amount to something over $600 million. None of these benefits were given the veterans of World War I.

The veterans of World War II were also given the "GI Bill of Rights." Under this program, they received on-the-job training and academic education. To date, these benefits have cost the Government approximately $15 billion. These veterans also were given the benefit of guaranteed loans to purchase homes, to go into business, or to start farming. Loans for veterans' homes, alone, have totaled $30 billion, and $16 billion of this sum has been guaranteed by the Government.

Similar benefits were granted to the veterans of the Korean conflict, although in some instances they were not so great as those granted World War II veterans.

Excluding disability pensions—which are available to veterans of both World Wars—and aside from the housing-loan program, which has cost relatively little but provided an enormous benefit, World War II and Korea veterans have received benefits at a direct cost of about $26.5 billion. This figure will almost certainly exceed $30 billion within 10 years from now.

That sum is 20 times the amount given World War I veterans as "adjusted-service credits," before the increment made because of delay in payment. Twenty million World War II and Korea veterans will have received 20 times the benefits which were begrudgingly granted the 4.6 million veterans who survived World War I. That is a benefits ratio of more than 4 to 1 against World War I veterans.

Now World War II and Korea veterans have received these benefits because of the activity and work that World War I veterans unselfishly gave in support of the "GI Bill" proposal. The veterans' organizations were very active in initiating this program, and, in 1943, a group of Members of Congress who had served in the First World War met and decided on a course of action to obtain for the veterans of World War II the benefits which those Members thought should have been provided after World War I. And that movement was, of course, successful.

These benefits which World War II veterans have received have been money well spent. Any benefits of any kind that we might now provide World War I veterans would come to them late in life when their days of opportunity are, for the most part, long past. It was a priceless advantage to veterans of World War II to have their education and readjustment benefits when most of them were young and their days of opportunity were just dawning.

It has been estimated by a Census Bureau expert that the sum of $9,000 invested in college education for a young man will increase his lifetime earning capacity by $103,000. That is a return, or a benefit, of more than 11 times the investment. Multiply the World War II veterans' education-benefits payment of $15 billion by 11; the product is $165 billion in final economic benefits to those veterans. And the benefits of the housing-loan program are countless and beyond all calculation.

The educational provisions, alone, of the "GI Bill of Rights" have added materially to the wealth of America by providing us with trained scientists, engineers, doctors, lawyers, businessmen, farmers, skilled laborers, and followers of many other useful occupations. This is a wise program and America is much richer for it.

But don't forget, it was the veterans of World War I whose support assured the veterans of World War II of these benefits. And don't forget, either, that World War I veterans got no such benefits—either in terms of first cost or final result.

Many veterans of World War II have said to me that they appreciate greatly what has been done in their behalf by the World War I veterans who supported the "GI Bill." They said that, without this support, they would never have received these benefits. And they say, too, that they would like to see World War I veterans treated with the same fairness as were veterans of other wars.

Whenever it has been proposed to do anything for the veterans of World War I, someone has always stated that the cost will be prohibitive—that general pensions for them would drive the Government bankrupt. These opponents of such a program launch into a flight of astronomical figures which might overawe and frighten off people who have not taken a look at our budget history.

Let us look at the situation in the year 1910. That was the 45th year after the end of the Civil War, by which time all who fought in that war could have qualified for a service pension. That year, we paid Civil War veterans pensions totaling $105,399,354. The total of all Federal expenditures for that year was $693.6 million.

Thus we see that, in 1910, the Government spent 15.2 percent of the total budget on Civil War veterans' pensions. I think everyone will agree that the country did not go bankrupt then (and I might mention, incidentally, that the Treasury ran a deficit of $18 million that year).

Now let us suppose that my bill, H. R. 656, had already been enacted and were in effect during this year, 1956. Approximately 1,272,000 World War I veterans now at least 62 years old could qualify. And assume that everyone of those veterans did apply for a pension, and did qualify. And suppose those in good health got $101 a month, and those who are invalids got $135 a month—resulting, for the whole number, in an average monthly payment of perhaps $120 apiece. On that basis, the total cost for this year, 1956, would be $1.8 billion. That cost would be 2.8 percent of the total Federal expenditures estimated for the current year.

These figures I have mentioned are without reference to the sum which will be paid out this year under the currently existing, but inadequate, World War I pension program. That sum is approximately $480 million for veterans' pensions. (Both as to Civil War pensions and as to World War I pensions, I have excluded any reference to sums paid as dependents' pensions, for convenience of discussion and comparison.) If you consider the $480-million sum already due to be paid, my bill would add $1.3 billion to the current annual cost—an increase of 2.1 percent over present total expenditures.

So, if paying Civil War veterans' pensions amounting to 15 percent of the total budget did not break up the Treasury and drive the country to disaster in 1910, it is reasonable to believe that World War I veterans' pensions of 2 to 3 percent of the national budget would bankrupt us in 1956? I don't believe that it is.

Now, someone may say that the Federal budget is a far different thing today from what it was in 1910, and that the Government has taken on new and costlier responsibilities. Granted, it may have. So, let us just make a comparison

of pension costs with the national income, then and now.

The national income in 1910 was $25.6 billion. The sum of $105 million paid as pensions to Civil War veterans that year amounted to approximately one-half of 1 percent of the national income. And to pay World War I veterans the pension I propose—$1.8 billion for the year 1956—would take from the estimated national income of $340 billion a portion no greater than one-half of 1 percent. By 1963, when the budget cost of H. R. 656 probably would reach its peak, it is highly unlikely that this cost would ever have reached 1 percent of the national income, even if the national income does not increase at all—and we have assurances on every hand that our national income will increase, substantially.

Someone may say: "But look at the burden the Government now has to bear in paying pensions to other veterans—those of the Indian wars and the Spanish-American War." And I say: So was there a burden in 1910 of paying pensions not only to Civil War veterans, but also to the veterans of the War of 1812 and the war with Mexico, as well as the Indian wars. A total of 23 percent of the Federal expenditures that year went for veterans' pensions of various types. Today, we set aside only 7.4 percent of the Federal budget for veterans' benefits of every description.

Maybe someone else will say: "But in this modern age we fight 'total' wars, when every fit person of military age must serve without expectation of compensation in money." My answer to this is, that, happily, we have not yet had to fight such a "total" war. But some of the wars we have fought have been more nearly "total" than others. And World War I was, fortunately for the United States, one of the least "total" of all.

This country has fought in 6 really major conflicts, and more of the population stayed safely at home in their ordinary pursuits during World War I than in any of the other 5. During the Revolutionary War, 14.2 percent of the population saw military service; 7.4 percent served in the War of 1812; 9.7 percent of the available population performed Federal service during the Civil War; 11 percent served in World War II; 4.4 percent served in the Korean conflict; while only 4 percent of the population was called up for service in World War I. Relatively speaking, those who served in World War I were but a few selected from among the many.

I believe that the figures I have presented here should convince any reasonable person that this country can afford to pay the veterans of World War I the pension I have proposed in H. R. 656, with certainly no more—and probably less—strain than was imposed by Civil War veterans' pensions in 1910. The Government affords a great many more things today in the cause of ordinary human justice than was thought it could afford 45 years ago, and, to my mind, we have already delayed long enough, now, in affording ordinary human justice to the veterans of World War I. It is time some action was taken.

For the veterans of World War I, the sands in the hourglass of time are running low. Today, their average life expectancy is only 15 years. Of the 4.6 million who came home when the fighting in France was done, barely 3 million remain. "Taps" has already sounded for more than one-third of the "Doughboys" of 1918. Every passing day, 235 of them die. Tomorrow, 235 of them whom we could have pensioned today will be dead. A year from now 90,000 more of the boys who faced shot, shell, and gas in the trenches will have gone to Eternity—unpensioned and very nearly forgotten.

I think there is a just cause in the argument for World War I service pensions. And I know that when the case for them is put squarely to those who oppose these pensions, some of these opponents become sheepish, and their arguments weaken and falter. Their last resort of opposition is that these pensions would cost too much at present. To me, that is an admission that we have not done right by our World War I veterans, and that a service pension for them would be only just and proper, "but for the cost."

Surely no one would want to say that, while these veterans in all fairness are deserving of these benefits, we had better wait until death has thinned their number still more, and start paying them pensions when it can be done more cheaply. Surely no one would want to play such a cold-blooded waiting game as that.

I prefer to believe that all of us will recognize now the justice in the proposal to pension those veterans, and that we will take steps now to do now what ought to be done. And there are bills now pending on which action can be taken to produce the appropriate result.

I have no extreme pride of authorship in H. R. 656. There are other good bills which are similar to mine. Among them I would mention H. R. 170, by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], H. R. 551, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], and H. R. 4264, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Let me urge that favorable action be taken on some one of these bills. Let the veterans of World War I be treated with the same consideration as those of the other wars in which our Nation has fought. Let there be no generation of forgotten men among America's veterans!

Application of Federal Tax Laws in the Possessions of the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to cite a study prepared for me by the Library of Congress on the application of our Federal tax laws in the possessions of the United States. I think it will be of interest to the House.

The study follows:

APPLICATION OF FEDERAL TAX LAWS IN THE POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

There is some variation in the application of Federal internal revenue laws in the Territories and possessions of the United States. The tax relationships between this country and some of its more important possessions are briefly described below:

PUERTO RICO

In general, the internal revenue laws of the United States do not apply in Puerto Rico. This principle was originally set forth in the Foraker Act (the Organic Act of 1900) [1] and the Organic Act of 1917.[2] The law today provides that Puerto Ricans are exempt from Federal income taxes. The only exception to this rule is that income received from the United States, such as that received as an employee of the Federal Government, is subject to Federal taxation.[3] Puerto Rican products shipped to the mainland of the United States are taxed in the same way as products of domestic manufacture, but the revenue derived from this source is turned over to the treasury of Puerto Rico.[4]

VIRGIN ISLANDS

The income tax laws in force in the United States apply also to citizens of the Virgin Islands. The proceeds from such taxes, however, are paid into the treasury of the Virgin Islands.[5] As in Puerto Rico, articles shipped to the United States are subject to taxation, but these receipts are also turned over to the government of the Virgin Islands.[6] Other taxes levied in the islands by the United States Government, such as quarantine, naturalization, immigration, and passport fees, are also reserved for the local treasury.[7]

GUAM

Under the provisions of the Organic Act of Guam enacted in 1950, residents of Guam are subject to Federal income taxes.[8] Again, the revenues from income taxes, customs duties levied on articles shipped to the United States and from quarantine, passport, immigration, and naturalization fees are returned to the treasury of Guam.[9]

HAWAII AND ALASKA

The Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are treated somewhat differently with respect to Federal taxation. They are subject to the same internal revenue laws as are any of the 48 States.[10] Unlike Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, the amount collected under these laws is not returned to the Territorial treasuries, but is paid directly into the Federal Treasury. In the fiscal year 1945, the Federal Government received $44,537,000 from Alaska and $126,340,000 from Hawaii in internal-revenue collections.

The principle of "no taxation without representation" has been advanced by some as the reason for the practice of returning taxes collected to the local treasuries of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. This

---

[1] Act of Apr. 12, 1900 (31 Stat. 78, ch. 191, sec. 4).
[2] Act of Mar. 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 954, ch. 145, sec. 9).
[3] Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (sec. 933 (1)).
[4] Ibid. (sec. 7652 (1) and (3)).
[5] 48 U. S. C. 1397.
[6] Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (sec. 7652 (b) (1) and (3)).
[7] 48 U. S. C. 1398.
[8] 48 U. S. C. 1421 i.
[9] 48 U. S. S. 1421 h.
[10] Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (sec. 7701 (9)).

principle, however, does not fully explain the tax advantage enjoyed by these three possessions over Alaska and Hawaii. It is true that Alaska and Hawaii do enjoy greater representation than the Virgin Islands and Guam in that they are represented in the United States Congress by a Delegate. Puerto Rico, however, which pays no Federal taxes, is also represented in Congress by a Resident Commissioner. While these three representatives may introduce bills and participate in committee and House debates, they do not exercise any vote, either in the committees or on the House floor.

It should be pointed out that the Federal Government does return a portion of Federal taxes received to Alaska and Hawaii in the form of various grants-in-aid. However, while Guam receives no grants-in-aid and the Virgin Islands receive a very small amount, Puerto Rico receives more than all of the Territories and possessions combined. This is borne out by the following statistics for the fiscal year 1954:[11]

Grants-in-aid received

Puerto Rico	$55,018,868
Hawaii	29,038,862
Alaska	11,232,846
Virgin Islands	793,061

A more significant reason for the more favorable tax treatment accorded Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam is that returning these revenues represents an effort to improve the general economic well-being of these possessions. While recent economic data are relatively scarce, some idea of their comparative economic condition may be given from the following statistics on median income of persons receiving income reported by the Bureau of the Census for 1950:

Median income

Alaska	$2,072
Hawaii	2,728
Puerto Rico	378
Virgin Islands (St. John Island only)	579
Guam	(1)

[1] Not reported.

[11] U. S. Treasury Department Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances, 1954. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1955, p. 702.

It Is Time We Woke Up and Recognized the Necessity of Having Trained Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the time is at hand when it is necessary for a change of policy in administering our Selective Service System. Today it would seem that at least local draft boards and some State boards are oblivious of the need of trained scientists to maintain our national security, by providing advanced types of weapons that will exceed in effectiveness those that are the result of advanced scientific development in nations that are unfriendly to our way of life.

Today there is pending before Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey a case that I have brought to his attention where local and appeal boards, in New Jersey, have turned a deaf ear to a request that would permit a student in advanced science to complete his course at a State university. The young man is a graduate of college and has now almost completed his advanced scientific course in pursuit of a doctor's degree. His studies up to this time have followed a course that is most necessary if we are to meet the challenge of other nations in such matters. I have purposely withheld details of his name, the name of the college at which he received his original degree, and the university he is now attending to attain his higher degree of doctor in his chosen scientific course. This boy is no slacker. He stands ready and willing to serve his time in the Army. He and his father, a distinguished Legionnaire of New Jersey, only ask that he be permitted to finish his final course that will take only a comparatively few more months of time, June 1957.

It is more important to our future security that this young man be permitted to finish his course of advanced scientific study, or, be sent into the Army at this time for the usual training process, that can include some duties not too important. That is the question that must be decided in this particular case.

During a visit to Soviet Russia and several of its satellite countries last fall I was astounded to learn of the extent to which Russia is preparing its students for scientific usefulness. Today, it is far ahead of us in this respect. Tomorrow, it will be so far ahead that it will create a situation that can be serious. This is a fast-moving world in the study of pure science as well as applied science. We cannot afford to lag behind.

In confirmation of this thought which I have expressed, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and all who are part and parcel of our Selective Service System, to an article that appears in the February 27, 1956, issue of the Des Moines Register by Marquis Childs in the form of an interview with former United States Senator William Benton, entitled "Soviets Train Scientists To Win Cold War." I commend it to the serious consideration of all who think in terms of the welfare of our Nation and its people. It reads as follows:

FORMER SENATOR WARNS—SOVIETS TRAIN SCIENTISTS TO WIN COLD WAR

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—A report based on firsthand observation adds another note of warning that education in the Soviet Union is far outstripping education in the United States.

The massive educational program still expanding in Russia, under which today nearly twice as many students are enrolled above the high-school level as in this country, is one reason for the extraordinary confidence expressed by Soviet leaders at the recent 20th congress of the Communist Party.

For as the latest warning, from former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, makes clear, the Soviet educational system is geared to win the cold war.

SURPLUS OF ENGINEERS

Benton, who made an intensive study of Soviet education and propaganda last year, says that system is producing a surplus of engineers and technicians who will be assigned to carry out technical assistance in every uncommitted country of the world. While getting their scientific training, they are thoroughly indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist line.

There are schools—and this seems to have escaped the attention of even specialists whose business is to know what is going on in Russia—in which all the training from the first grade on is in English, French, or German. Graduates of these schools have a fluent working knowledge of the language they will need when they are sent abroad to do a technical—and propaganda—job.

RAPID EXPANSION

In a lengthy article for the Britannica Yearbook, of which he is publisher, Benton writes:

"The Soviets are now challenging us frontally at what have historically been two of our strongest points, technology and mass education.

"In less than 30 years the Soviets have created a primary school system rivaling our own in universality, with nearly 100 percent enrollment. Their secondary school system is mushrooming amazingly. By 1960 every Russian youngster is to be given an education at least comparable to a better high school diploma."

WARNING BY STRAUSS

Late last year, Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said it was evident the United States was rapidly falling behind Soviet Russia in the training of scientists and technicians with the "certainty that we are turning out less than one-half the number of scientists and engineers we require."

The deficiency begins, according to Strauss, in the high schools where science training has long been inadequate and standards of science teaching dropping rapidly.

He cited the fact more than half of all American high schools fail to teach physics or chemistry.

In contrast, Benton points out that in the last years of secondary school, Soviet students must take 4 years of mathematics, including algebra, geometry, and trigonometry.

FEW ELECTIVES

Since the Soviet Union is a totalitarian state, the student has little choice once he has selected a specialty. Electives are few and far between. So-called cultural courses are held to a minimum.

The objective, it is hardly necessary to add, is a Communist education—that is, first-rate technical training buttressed by complete indoctrination in Communist dogma.

It is the combination of indoctrinated zeal with technical proficiency that is so ominous for the West.

Others say that while the threat of massive technical training is a real one, the very fact of advanced education in the scientific spirit will raise troubling doubts that will in turn, lead to a weakening of the support for the state. If this could happen, then an evolution away from totalitarianism and toward a genuine acceptance of peaceful coexistence might be possible.

SPECIAL ACADEMIES

In a recent speech, Benton proposed the creation of technical assistance academies similar to West Point and Annapolis where young men of superior intelligence would be trained as engineers and technicians in every field. In return for their free education, young men would agree to sign up for a certain number of years of service in America's technical assistance program overseas.

Short of some positive, constructive step such as this, the drift will continue. And if estimates of Soviet progress are even approximately right, the gap will widen and America will fall increasingly behind.

To permit this to happen is hardly less than an admission of defeat. For if we have learned nothing else in the atomic-electronic age, it is that the engineers and scientists of today win the battles of tomorrow.

Multiple Purposes of Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Colorado River storage project, now before Congress, makes a very positive, persuasive case, if people will take a few minutes to consider the multiple purposes of the project and the many reasons justifying it as a sound and economically feasible undertaking for the Federal Government.

It recently was my honor to be chosen to represent the proponents of this project by presenting the positive side in a pro-and-con analysis of the proposed legislation, published by the American Enterprise Association. The two opposing views of this legislative proposal, Raymond Moley having stated the negative side, were published by the American Enterprise Association as a public information service. Copies of this publication can be obtained from the Washington, D. C., office of the association at 1012 14th Street NW.

I ask unanimous consent that my views on this matter, as reflected in the American Enterprise Association publication be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

(By Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Colorado River storage project is necessary to regulate, control, and convey the waters of the upper Colorado River for and to those areas entitled to its use under the terms of the Colorado River compact and upper Colorado River compact.

It is a well-planned, economically sound, completely self-liquidating, long-range project designed to provide for the conservation and development of a vitally needed water supply for a four-State semidesert area larger than New England.

No other comparable river development program has ever been presented to Congress for authorization backed by the detailed engineering and economic studies and interstate cooperation in its planning reflected in this bill. This project has been under detailed study and investigation for more than 20 years, during which time there have been expended, from State funds and power revenues allocated to these investigations from the Hoover Dam, approximately $10 million.

The Colorado River storage project is the culmination of an overall basinwide program for the total consumptive use of the waters of the Colorado River provided for in the Colorado River Compact signed by the seven States in the Colorado River Basin and the Federal Government. The first units of this basinwide plan, beginning with the Hoover Dam, all in the lower basin, have now been completed largely with Federal financial aid.

The Colorado River Compact was agreed to by the 7 States of the Colorado River Basin and the Federal Government in order to insure an equitable division of the water resources of the Colorado among the several States, regardless of the time of development. It was recognized that the lower basin would develop first because of the greater ease of control and diversion of the water, the need for flood control in the lower basin, the need for an All-American Canal to serve the Imperial Valley, and the proximity of large centers of population in California. During the last 33 years, the lower basin, with the help of Federal funds and the support of the upper basin States, has enjoyed practically full development.

It was also recognized at the time of the signing of the compact that the upper basin, because of its difficult topography, relative inaccessibility, and the necessity for major storage for regulation, would develop much more slowly. The signers of the compact in the lower basin, however, pledged their support to upper basin development when such development was ready for construction. That time is now.

Why, then, has so much misinformation been spread about this program and why has opposition to the upper basin development been generated, largely by southern California, in the lower basin?

The explanation is simple, but first one must get a true picture of the situation.

(a) The Colorado River Basin is an arid region. The total flow of the river is not sufficient to meet the water needs of the area. This fact was recognized early and prompted the Colorado River Compact which divided the waters of the river among the States before it was put to use.

(b) The Colorado River is the last major source of water available to the upper basin States (Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming).

(c) More than 90 percent of the water in the Colorado River system originates in the upper basin States. No water originates in California.

The flow of the river varies widely from year to year and season to season. For example, the flow at Lee Ferry may be as low as 4 million acre-feet in 1 year, and as much as 25 million acre-feet in another year. The flow at Yuma, Ariz., may be as low as 3,000 cubic feet per second during the dry season, and as much as 300,000 acre-feet during the season of flood flows.

To utilize the entire flow of the river, the flow at the points of diversion must be made to coincide with the demand, both with respect to amount and time. To meet this requirement the river has to be regulated, that is, storage must be provided which will make it possible to hold the water during wet seasons and release it during the dry seasons. Long-time hold-over storage for river regulation is necessary on the Colorado River because of the wide fluctuations in its flow. Wherever the term regulation is used in this discussion it means artificial storage to make the flow of the river coincide with the demand for water use.

(d) The Hoover Dam fully regulates the flow of the lower river. A fully regulated, safe supply is available to all water users below the dam.

(e) In the lower basin there are many thousands of acres of land for which there is no water within the allocation made to the lower basin by the compact.

(f) Water runs downhill. The value of this water resource to the upper basin is beyond measurement because it is renewable. Water is liquid gold.

(h) So long as the upper basin States can be prevented from using their water, the lower basin users, who are principally in California and Mexico, will enjoy the benefits from the upper basin's share of the Colorado River.

Therefore, the issue is clear. The Colorado River storage project will make it possible for the upper basin States to use their allocated share of the Colorado River. So long as this project is not built, the lower basin users, principally in California and Mexico, will be the beneficiaries of this great resource in terms of water and hydropower.

Each year that the present unused portion of the Colorado River water allocated the upper-basin States is allowed to flow into the lower basin, it means a windfall of roughly $4 million a year to southern California power users, and it gives southern California and Mexico an opportunity to utilize consumptively the waters belonging to the upper-basin States.

The following is a brief description of the principal features of the project and sound positive reasons why people interested in economy and sound fiscal governmental policies—a group in which I claim membership—can support the Colorado River storage project.

II. PRINCIPAL FEATURES

1. The Colorado River storage project and participating projects is a basinwide proposal which, when carried out, will provide the facilities necessary for the upper-basin States to use their share of the Colorado River water. The proposed basin development is unique and difficult because of topography, distances to be covered, storage to be provided, water exchanges to be made, and power to be developed. It must be planned and built as a basinwide project. This accounts for the large authorization requested, but it must be remembered that it will take 30 to 40 years to complete the works included in this project.

2. The Colorado River storage project and participating projects provides for regulation of the river—storage of seasonal floodwaters to make the river's water available for use year round in the upper-basin States where 90 percent of the river's water originates.

3. The Colorado River storage project provides water for consumptive use by direct diversion or by exchange, both within and outside the Colorado River Basin.

4. The Colorado River storage project provides power as a byproduct, the net revenues from which will be used to help pay the costs of the project.

5. The Colorado River storage project provides regulating and control works and conveyance channels to convey the water to the land, to municipalities, and other points of use.

6. The Colorado River Storage Project Bill, H. R. 3383, provides for the authorization of 4 storage dams, 3 allied hydro-power plants and 11 participating projects to deliver water for use in each of the 4 States. The estimated cost of these units is about $760 million and the construction period approximately 30 years.

7. The Colorado River storage project is self-liquidating. The cost of the power and municipal water features will be repaid with interest. The cost of the irrigation features allocated to the water users will be paid back in 50 years, plus a 10-year development period, without interest. The balance of the cost allocated to irrigation will be paid back from power revenues, all within 50 years. The cost of the interest on the irrigation features during the payout period will be exceeded many times by the new income

taxes which will pour into the Treasury from the new wealth created as a result of the construction of the project. After the project costs are repaid, the project power plants will continue to pour into the United States Treasury many millions of dollars per year.

8. Historical summary of the development of the Colorado River, 1870–1954:

1870–1922: Isolated, limited small projects on tributaries, along banks of main stream and in Imperial Valley of California and Mexico—limited by uncontrolled late season flow and subject to frequent floods which would wash away the diversion works. Water rights acquired under doctrine of appropriation—i. e., "First in time is first in right."

1922: The Colorado River compact was drawn to divide the water resource of the river, prior to its being put to use. The compact provided for total ultimate consumptive use of the water resource, and equitable division of such use among upper and lower basin States and Mexico.

Total consumptive use of the water resource depends upon:

(1) Complete regulation of flow, with long-time holdover storage. Necessary to carry water available during wet years over to dry years and provides for:

(2) Storage of water for consumptive use.

(3) Power, the net revenues from which would help pay for the project.

1922–54 (lower basin):

(1) Construction of Hoover, Parker, Imperial Dams, and All-American Canal under reclamation law. Davis Dam under Mexican Treaty.

(2) These provide (a) storage for regulation and power and water for consumptive use; (b) power revenues pay entire cost of storage for regulation and power, and help pay cost of irrigation features.

(1) Investigations to establish plan for development.

(2) Investigation completed in 1950. A feasible project was reported by United States Bureau of Reclamation, and favorably recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President in 1954.

(3) Construction in the upper basin during the 32 years has been limited to the Colorado-Big Thompson project and a few very small, miscellaneous projects.

(4) Authorizing legislation has passed the Senate (S.500) and is now before the House (H. R. 3383). This legislation provides for 4 dams and reservoirs to provide for river regulation, holdover storage and water for consumptive use, and 3 allied hydropower plants for the generation of hydroelectric energy. It also provides for 11 participating projects, to convey water from points of origin to points of use.

And now may I point out some of the reasons why this project should be authorized and built.

III. JUSTIFICATION

1. The project will provide water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural needs.

2. The project will end a deplorable waste of fresh water into the sea.

3. The project will provide for holdover storage.

4. The project is well planned, based on sound engineering design, and the cost estimates and estimates of net power revenues are conservative.

5. The project is a true partnership enterprise.

6. The project is a multiple-purpose development.

7. The project produces power as a byproduct.

8. The project will provide water and power for the industrial development of the area.

9. The project is vital to national defense.

10. The project is an investment of recognized Federal interest.

11. The project users pay all operation and maintenance costs.

12. The project will benefit every section of the Nation.

13. The project will stabilize the river and protect downstream facilities.

14. The project will start the Navaho Tribe on the road to independence and self-sufficiency.

15. The project does not involve the public versus private power controversy.

16. The reimbursable project costs—99 percent of the total—will be repaid by the users of the water and power.

17. The reclamation fund provides ready cash in the Treasury to finance reclamation projects.

18. The project creates a new source of income to the Federal Treasury, not a tax burden on each State.

19. Water rights are established by compact.

20. The project construction period will be at least 25 years.

21. The project costs are reasonable.

22. The project does not add to the agricultural surplus.

23. A discussion of southern California's proposals for alternate reclamation in nonarid areas.

24. The contemplated future firm power production at Hoover Dam would not be adversely affected.

25. The real issue—who gets the water and power?

26. Partnership in reclamation.

IV. THE WATER PROJECT IS JUSTIFIED

1. The project will provide water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural needs.

The climate of the Colorado River basin is semiarid to arid. The river is snow fed. It runs high during the snow-melting period, and low in the late summer and winter. This project will store the water during wet years and wet seasons, and make it available during the dry years and seasons for all consumptive uses. The project will extend and stabilize the water supply and provide water for the maximum agricultural, industrial, and municipal development.

2. The project will end a deplorable waste of precious fresh water into the sea.

The upper-basin States are now using less than 2½ million out of 7½ million acre-feet apportioned to them by the Colorado River compact. From 4 to 5 million acre-feet annually are being wasted into the sea, or are being diverted illegally by lower basin or Mexican water users. This water flows through the turbines at Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams, after which it wastes into the Gulf of Lower California. The Colorado River compact provides for total consumptive use, and after full development there should be no water reach the sea.

3. The Colorado River storage project will provide holdover storage for regulation of a wild and unruly river. Such storage, above Hoover Dam, also will improve the operation characteristics of Lake Mead, and provide increased firm power generation at any dam which may be built between Hoover and Glen Canyon. More important, the Glen Canyon Dam will extend the life of Lake Mead indefinitely, because much of the silt now building up in Lake Mead will be trapped in the Glen Canyon Reservoir. The holdover storage in the upper basin also will guarantee annual delivery to the lower basin and Mexico of the waters to which they are entitled under the compact and the Mexican Water Treaty.

4. The Colorado River storage project is well planned, based on sound engineering design, and the cost estimates and estimates of net power revenues are conservative. More than 20 years time and $10 million have been expended in engineering and economic studies. These studies were made by the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with the respective States, and took into consideration the total potential basinwide development.

5. The Colorado River storage project is a true partnership enterprise.

The proposed development will be carried out under the terms of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, an interstate agreement entered into by the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The irrigation water users will repay the irrigation costs up to the limit of the land and water capability, without interest. The municipal water users will repay the full cost of the municipal water features, with interest. The power facilities will be repaid, with interest, from power revenues. The costs allocated to irrigation, above the ability of the irrigators to pay, will be paid back out of power revenues. Thus all water and power users in the area concerned will participate in the repayment of the project costs.

Public benefits of great magnitude will result from this project. Recognition of these public benefits by the Federal Government is reflected in the provision of interest-free money on the unpaid balance of the construction costs allocated to irrigation. Save for contributing less than 1 percent of the total cost for such nonreimbursable benefits as flood control, the Federal Government makes no other direct contribution, even though the States involved are more than 50 percent federally owned.

The States contributed liberally to the costs of planning. The Upper Colorado River Basin Compact Commission has cooperated in the planning of the project and furnished information relating to it. The project has the unanimous support of the four upper basin States, on a bipartisan basis.

6. The Colorado River storage project is a multiple-purpose development.

It provides water for municipal, agricultural, and industrial purposes, and power as a byproduct. It will greatly improve the recreational and wildlife facilities of the area. It will provide for flood control by regulation and use of the water. All water uses developed in this project will be subject to the respective State water laws governing appropriation and use.

Although the initial use of the water may be agricultural, in this area of limited water supplies uses may change, with agriculture yielding to municipal or industrial demands under long-established legal priorities. The economy of the area is so closely tied together that the water and power users are essentially the same people. Therefore, there is no objection from the power users to paying an extra price for their power, when they know it is going to help pay for the cost of water, which in turn, benefits agriculture, municipalities, and industry, and contributes to general economic progress in the area.

7. The Colorado River storage project produces power as a byproduct.

Falling water represents energy. This energy, when converted into useful forms, becomes very valuable to man. Water is one of the few renewable resources. Therefore, power created from the energy of falling water is in great demand, because there is no recurring cost for fuel.

Hydropower is premium power, because of the ease of making the power output coincide with the demand for power. When the load goes off, the turbine gates close, and the water is put in storage. When the load comes on, the urbine gates open, and the water is drawn from storage. Such an operation is impossible with either thermal or nuclear power. Hydropower will never be put out of business by other forms of power, because of its value for peaking purposes.

The project storage dams are ideal sites for hydropower plants. These dams are necessary to the storage of water and the regulation of river flow. It is good business to utilize them also to convert the energy of falling water to power. This power, when sold at competitive rates in the intermountain area, will produce net revenues which will be used to help pay the cost of the

irrigation features and thus make the entire project self-liquidating. After all costs have been repaid, these plants will still be producing power. the revenues from which will flow into the public treasury.

8. The Colorado River storage project will provide water and power for industrial development of the area.

The upper Colorado Basin States are storehouses of raw materials. Great quantities of coal, oil, gas, oil shale, strategic minerals, nonferrous and ferrous metals, hydrocarbons, and other minerals and chemicals are found in the area. All the raw materials for chemical and fertilizer industries abound in the area. To develop these materials, water and power are required. Both will be available from this project.

It is estimated that 500,000 acre-feet of water will be required to meet the industrial needs of the area in the next 25 years. It will take at least 25 years to develop this water resource.

9. The Colorado River storage project is vital to national defense.

In this age of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, most of our centralized vital industries are "sitting ducks." Many could be wiped out in a single aerial bombing or missile strike. Such industries should be dispersed.

New defense plants should not be constructed alongside old ones. When new plants to make steel, scientific instruments, machine tools, processing plants for vital materials, heavy equipment and armaments, are built, they should be widely dispersed, and some of them located in the mountains where they would be hard to find and hit. The Rocky Mountains provide such protected sites, but water and power are needed to make the sites useful. Early construction of the Colorado River storage project, to provide water and power for such industries, is amply justified on the grounds of national defense.

10. The project is an investment of recognized Federal interest.

Approximately two-thirds of the total cost of the Colorado River storage project is to be repaid with revenues from power and municipal water features. These costs are fully reimbursable, with interest; hence, for this portion of the project there is no cost to the taxpayers.

The irrigation features of this project will cost approximately one-third of the total. The costs of these features are fully reimbursable, but without interest. The estimated average annual cost of these features of the project is $10 million.

The reclamation fund, a revolving fund used to finance reclamation projects, is made up of income from the sale or lease of natural resources on the Federal lands in the public land States, including power revenues and other miscellaneous receipts. By June 30, 1954, this fund totaled $848,149,945, plus an unappropriated balance of $88,033,070. This fund is so large that currently more than half the total appropriations to reclamation, and more than all the appropriations to the irrigation features, come from this fund. In 1955 more than $20 million from the natural resources in the upper basin States (Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming) were added to this fund.

So long as the average annual appropriation to build the irrigation features of the Colorado River storage project does not exceed the annual contribution to the reclamation fund from the upper basin States, the construction cost of this project represents an investment of all or a portion of the upper basin's share of the revolving fund which is already in the revolving fund bank. Such construction, therefore, would take no tax money out of the Federal Treasury. As far as the irrigation features are concerned, this project pays its way with direct income from water users and the upper basin States and the contribution to the reclamation fund, which is made up in major part from the sale or lease of natural resources held in trust by the Federal Government in the said States. The other features of the project are built all or in part with borrowed money for which interest is paid.

11. The project water users pay operation and maintenance costs.

Almost all of the river and harbor and flood control projects are not only largely nonreimbursable, but the Federal Government also assumes most operation and maintenance costs. During the next 10 years, the Federal Government will spend more on operating and maintaining these water resource projects than will be required to finance the capital construction costs of the Colorado River storage project, a completely reimbursable project that will require an estimated 30 years to complete. In the case of this Colorado River project, as with all other reclamation projects, the direct beneficiaries (water and power users) pay the capital costs and also the operation and maintenance costs.

This point is not made in criticism of the flood-control and river-and-harbor programs, as such. I believe that sound projects under these two great programs are just as much an investment in national economic and social progress as the comparable reclamation projects. But in supporting these other programs and appreciating their value, I have been impressed that most water-resource studies have recommended that all other water-resource development programs be placed on the same basis as the 54-year-old reclamation program, insofar as cost sharing by beneficiaries and payment of operation and maintenance are concerned.

In this connection, I also have been impressed that the major economic arguments against the Colorado River project have come from California, which not only has received the lion's share of the reclamation appropriations, but has also received more appropriations under the general flood-control program than any other State.

12. The project will benefit every section of the Nation.

Every State in the Nation will benefit from the Colorado River storage project. These benefits are tangible and can be measured. They come in different ways, but the end result is the same—benefit for every area.

Expansion of trade area: Products produced in a reclamation area create new trade through transportation, processing, manufacturing, wholesaling, financing, retailing, and all other processes between production and the ultimate consumer, whether the products be uranium or apricots.

New markets: New income resulting from reclamation projects is the source of new buying power for goods produced in other areas of the United States. A case study of the Central Valley project in California provides an excellent example of the influence of resource development on retail sales. This project alone resulted in a new market for a million pair of shoes each year, parts of which will be made in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Missouri; for $10 million worth of tobacco products, which will come largely from North Carolina, Virginia, Kentucky, Florida, and Pennsylvania; for 8,000 vacuum cleaners, 8,000 refrigerators, 8,000 washing machines, 8,000 radios and TV sets which will come from many States but largely from Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

The increased purchasing power of this one project translates into an annual market for 15,000 new cars, some from Detroit, and South Bend and other cities, but many assembled in California from parts manufactured in Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin; for hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of textiles from New England and South Atlantic States; and for thousands of tires, accessories, home appliances, office machines, and all the assorted products of the day produced in all corners of the country.

Eighty-one percent of the construction costs of the Colorado River storage project will be spent in markets outside the Upper Colorado Basin, for the labor and materials with which to build the project. This means that practically every State in the Union will benefit from expenditures resulting from such construction.

13. The project will stabillize the river and protect downstream facilities.

The Colorado River carries a heavy silt load which is now being deposited behind Hoover Dam. These silt deposits will ultimately fill up Lake Mead. It is estimated that the life of Hoover Dam, without upstream storage, will be less than 300 years. The construction of Glen Canyon Dam, which provides for 23 million acre-feet of silt storage, above Lee Ferry, will make the life of Hoover Dam indefinitely greater, and will also protect subsequent developments planned between Hoover Dam and Glen Canyon. The storage in Glen Canyon will make feasible, power developments in the canyon between Glen Canyon and Hoover Dam. Glen Canyon, therefore, will provide the regulation for future firm power generation, at no expense to the lower basin power users. It will, in fact, be a free contribution worth many millions of dollars.

Extensive headwater holdover storage provided by the Colorado River storage project will add stability to the water supply for the lower basin during extreme drought, because such holdover storage will make it possible for the upper basin States to meet the required delivery at Lee Ferry of 75 million acre-feet each consecutive 10 years in spite of recurring dry years, when the flow at Lee Ferry drops below 7.5 million acre-feet per year.

14. The project will start the Navaho Tribe on the road to independence and self-sufficiency.

The Colorado River storage project is the Navaho's major hope for the future—their opportunity to become self-supporting.

The Navahos make good farmers—when they have water. There never has been a food surplus in the Navaho Nation, but always a shortage of food. Hunger and poverty are constant specters among the Navahos. The proposed development will provide food to eat, economic stability and opportunity for progress.

The Navahos do not ask for charity, but by authorizing the project, the people of the United States will be able to keep some of the promises made to the Navahos in the Treaty of 1868.

The average cash income of the Navahos today is about $150 per person per year. The project will raise the Navaho standard of living and provide opportunities for the Navahos to earn their own way.

The project will accelerate the educational program by providing a basis for a more concentrated population.

The project is the least expensive way to provide for long-range rehabilitation of a proud and deserving people.

15. The project does not involve a public versus private power controversy.

Ten private power companies serving the upper basin area appeared before the congressional committees in support of this project. The National Association of REA Cooperatives has endorsed the project. The power from the project powerplants will be sold under the provisions of the Reclamation law, which includes the preference clause. There is no Federal subsidy to power in this project. The entire cost of the power features will be repaid with interest. The power will be sold at competitive rates, expected to be about 6 mills per kilowatt-hour at the load centers. This means that the users of power in the area, who are also

the water users, will help pay for the cost of the project.

16. All reimbursable costs will be repaid by the users of water and power.

The Federal Government, throughout its history, has provided financial aid to public works, where such public works would result in public benefits. The earliest aid was given in the improvement of rivers and harbors, ship canals, and roads. Later, such aid was extended to flood control, railroads, highways, shipping, airlines, and critical industries. In most of these uses, the first costs were never repaid and frequently the operation and maintenance costs were also assumed by the Federal Government. Currently the Federal Government is spending billions on water resource projects (rivers and harbors and flood control), little of which will be repaid and upon which no interest is charged.

In spite of the erroneous and misleading propaganda which has been widely disseminated, the construction costs of the Colorado River project will be 99 percent reimbursed by the water- and power-users of the area served. The nonreimbursable 1 percent represents a very modest appraisal of other values, such as flood control and fish and wildlife protection.

Approximately two-thirds of the total cost of the project represent the investment in power and municipal water features. These costs will be repaid with interest. The one-third allocated to irrigation will be repaid, without interest. This is in harmony with national policy which has been in effect for more than 50 years, because the value of the interest is the Federal Government's contribution toward the cost of the public benefits which are many, and recognition of the large percentage of public land in the reclamation States.

With the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902, a revolving fund, called the reclamation fund, was established to finance reclamation projects. The major source of this revolving fund has been and still is the income from the sale of timber, public lands, and oil, gas and mineral leases and power revenues in the public land States. This fund has been built up to nearly $1 billion, and its annual accruals are now sufficient to finance reclamation investigations and overhead, and to provide more than one-half the construction appropriations for reclamation.

Considering the multipurpose character of reclamation projects, and the fact that the power and municipal features of these projects draw interest on the unpaid balance of the construction costs, it is obvious that the interest-free money outside that in the revolving fund required to finance the irrigation features of the reclamation program is very small. The charges that the Colorado storage project will place a heavy tax burden on other States are therefore completely erroneous.

17. The project creates a new source of income to the Federal Treasury, not a tax burden upon each State.

The widely disseminated charge that the Colorado River storage project will be paid for by States outside the upper Colorado River Basin is pure fiction.

The provision of interest-free money from the Federal Treasury for irrigation features of reclamation projects has been national policy for more than 50 years. This is not a subsidy. It is a form of payment for indirect benefits received by the public from the results of reclamation. These benefits are tangible and can be evaluated. During the payout period of a reclamation project, the value of these benefits greatly exceeds the cost of interest on the cost of the irrigation features.

Put in a more recognizable form, let's look at the income-tax situation alone, because this revenue goes directly into the Federal Treasury.

First of all, the expenditures for construction become income, which is immediately taxable. H. R. 3383 provides for an expenditure of $760 million. Assume for the purposes of illustration, that the construction is completed in 10 years at $76 million per year. This expenditure, in one form or another, becames taxable income. The Treasury Department estimates 20 percent is about an average income-tax rate. Twenty percent of $76,000,000 equals $15,200,000. Out of the $760 million expended for construction, therefore, $152 million goes back directly into the Treasury as a new source of income to the Treasury, which would not exist if the project were not built.

A part of this new income would offset the interest on the unpaid balance during the construction period. The offset would be current, so only simple interest would be involved. The net new income into the Treasury during the assumed construction period, therefore, would equal $106,752,000.

At the beginning of the development period, the farm income would start to increase. This new farm income, which did not exist before the project was built, is taxable.

The new income taxes resulting from increased farm income, increase from 0 at the beginning of the development period to an estimated $4,947,000 annually at the end of the development period, and are assumed to remain constant during the 50-year repayment period. For a period of 24 years this new income to the Treasury annually will total less than the simple interest on the unpaid balance, but beginning with the 25th year after full development is reached, the total new income to the Treasury would exceed total simple interest, if applied to the unpaid balance of the construction costs. At the end of the payout period for the last unit of the irrigation features, the cumulative new income to the Treasury from increased income on the farm exceeds the total value of interest on the unpaid balance of the construction costs by $131,811,000.

In this analysis, no credit is given for increased State income or ad valorem taxes resulting from project construction, even though they would be considerable.

This claim for new Federal revenue from reclamation projects is not a theoretical assumption. The facts have been borne out in 50 years of reclamation activities. Typical of economic returns, exclusive of direct crop values, from reclamation projects are these from a sampling of long-established reclamation projects:

Salt River Valley, Ariz.: Total cost of project, $24,631,302; cumulative Federal tax revenues attributable to project—$310,700,000 on individual incomes, and $253,100,000 corporation income-tax receipts.

Yakima project, Washington: Total cost of project, $49,593,890; cumulative Federal tax revenues attributed to project on individual incomes, $239,600,000, and corporation income, $101,800,000.

Strawberry project, Utah: Cost, $3,348,684; current annual tax revenues attributed to project, $1,797,960 to State and local governments, and $4,432,800 to the Federal Government.

New income to the United States Treasury, regardless of the source, reduces proportionately the income taxes required or it provides additional revenue for new expenditures.

Providing interest-free Federal money for reclamation is not a subsidy (nor a taxpayer's burden) for the following reasons:

(1) No interest should be charged because the money for the irrigation costs would come out of the reclamation fund, which comes from the States involved.

(2) The project creates new wealth from which new income taxes, in excess of the value of interest, are paid.

(3) The value of interest may be considered as payment for public benefits.

18. Water rights as between the upper and lower basins are established by compact. Nothing in the pending legislation will impair these rights.

The upper basin States are required not to deplete the river at Lee Ferry below 75 million acre-feet each consecutive 10-year period, and, in addition, the upper basin States must carry one-half the Mexican requirements in case of short water supply. The bill affirms these compacts as the law of the river.

19. The project construction period will be at least 25 years.

If the project were authorized tomorrow, it would take 2 years to produce planned reports and contract documents. It is estimated that to construct Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Currecanti and Navaho Dams, will take more than 10 years, and that at least 15 years will be required to fill the reservoirs.

The participating projects will start to deliver water at about the eighth year after authorization, and their construction will string along for about 17 years, even without the customary delays in appropriations. The flow of appropriations will govern, but it is doubtful that more than $30 million per pear, on an average, will be available for construction, which suggests 25 years as the minimum construction period.

20. The project costs are reasonable.

The Colorado River storage project is expensive, but so is virtually all water development these days. The Colorado project's costs are increased by the rough topography, large holdover storage requirements, long distances to the points of consumptive use, and the scattered arable land areas involved. The costs, however, are not excessive, because this project provides water for present and future municipal and industrial uses, as well as for agricultural uses. In addition, the reservoirs and dams which are necessary for river regulation and holdover storage are also valuable as efficient power sites.

The generation of electric power from the energy of the falling water as a byproduct of the irrigation project provides revenues which can be used to help pay the cost of the irrigation features of the project. This unique situation places the burden of repayment upon both the water and power users of the area, and no portion of the cost is passed on to those outside the area, in spite of the fact that they do receive benefits.

The per-acre costs on the 11 participating projects vary from $210 on the LaBarge project in Wyoming to $794 on the central Utah project in Utah. These costs are spread over a 50-year period, after a 10-year development period, making the annual costs per acre vary from $4.20 to $16, a rather modest annual cost for a long-term water supply.

The costs are reasonable and well within the limits of net increased returns per acre, after water is made available. Fifty years experience on reclamation projects show that the cost of supplying water to the land has averaged from 2 to 3 times the market value of the land and water at the beginning of the payout period. At the end of the payout period, however, the market value of the land is 3 to 4 times the cost of supplying the water. Every acre of land proposed to be irrigated under this project will show an increased net production, after water is made available, greater than the annual repayment plus the cost of operation, maintenance, and replacement. The propaganda arguments against the per-acre cost on this project are pure fiction.

Nonagricultural benefits from reclamation projects were cited in the recent Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Water and Power (vol. 1, p. 44) as follows:

"The justification for Federal interest in irrigation is not solely to provide land for farmers or to increase food supply. These new farm areas inevitably create villages and towns whose populations thrive from furnishing supplies to the farmer, marketing

his crops, and from the industries which grow around these areas. The economy of seven important cities of the West had its base in irrigation—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Spokane, Boise, El Paso, Fresno, and Yakima. Indeed these new centers of productivity send waves of economic improvement to the far borders, like a pebble thrown into a pond. Through irrigation, man has been able to build a stable civilization in an area that might otherwise have been open only to intermittent exploitation."

21. The authorization of the Colorado River storage project will have no effect on the current agricultural surpluses for the following reasons:

The basic crops which are under mandatory price support or which constitute the bulk of our surpluses are: wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts. None of these crops, except wheat and corn is grown in the upper basin States. Very little wheat is grown on land to be supplied with water and most of this on nonirrigated land, which, when water becomes available, will be diverted into specialty crops or alfalfa and forage, and thus reduce the wheat acreage and production. In Utah—and this is typical of the other upper basin States—less than 7 percent of farm income is derived from the basic crops which are now under mandatory price supports. The principal crops to be grown on this new irrigated land will be fruits, vegetables, alfalfa, and forage. None of these crops is in surplus, or under mandatory price supports.

The total acreage of new land that will come into production as a result of the project will be small (132,360 acres), and the timetable of construction so long, that the surpluses will have vanished before the area comes into production. For example, elapsed time between beginning and end of construction will be at least 30 years.

It is estimated that 10 years will be required to construct the major storage and control works and the conveyance channels to the participating projects. An additional 10 to 15 years or more will be required to fill the storage dams and to build the participating projects. Experience has shown that it takes about 10 years to fully develop the irrigation practices after water is made available to the area. Therefore, although a few acres will be irrigated annually after about the 10th year after authorization, the project cannot possibly be in full production before about 30 years after authorization.

The principal crops grown in the upper basin States are fruits and vegetables and other specialty crops so important to the American diet (75 percent of the present production comes from irrigated lands in the 17 Western States), and alfalfa and forage.

The upper basin States are deficit areas in the production of livestock feeds. Most of the Nation's feeder cattle are produced in the Mountain States. To maintain the supply of feeder cattle needed to fill the feed lots of the Midwest, sufficient alfalfa and forage must be produced to carry the intermountain area livestock through the winter. As of December 7, 1955, 17 counties in Utah and Wyoming were on drought relief. The upper basin States will remain deficit feed areas until water is made available so that more alfalfa and forage can be produced. The United States Department of Agriculture reports that drought assistance and relief through the loan and feed programs amounted to over $20 million in 1953–54 and over $14 million in 1954–55.

Population is growing at a staggering rate. Estimates for 1975 population vary from 200 to 250 million people in the United States. The President's Materials Policy Commission report in June 1952 says that the United States will need 40 percent more agricultural production in 1975 than in 1950. The commodity estimated to be in greatest demand by 1975 is livestock—a 49.4-percent increase in total consumption of meat is forecast, and a 41.6-percent increase in beef. Livestock feed and feeder cattle will control the supply, and the new demand will be built up before the Colorado River project can be put into production. A 6-percent increase in vegetables for processing is forecast, and a 37.2-percent increase in fruits other than citrus. The total demand for cereal crops also will be up—wheat only 23 percent—but not to the same degree.

The demands for food and fiber projected by the USDA and the President's Materials Policy Commission cannot be met in the next 20 years. For example, the USDA says we will need 35 million new acres by 1962 to produce the feed necessary to maintain the current per capita meat consumption of 156 pounds. About 17 million of this can be obtained by shifting acreage from wheat and cotton to livestock feed. A part of the balance can be obtained from increased per-acre production, but such increases are definitely leveling off. Projecting the period to 1975, when the population will be in excess of 200 million, we will need in excess of 100 million acres of new land in production. Actually, the acreage requirement by 1975 will be greater than 100 million, because each year approximately 1 million acres of farmland is taken out of production for highways, airports, urban development, military or public buildings. This will amount to 20 million acres by 1975. Erosion and alkali will take out additional acres.

It is not unreasonable to assume that by 1970, when the bulk of the land in the Colorado River storage project starts to come into production, that this country will need the equivalent of 100 million acres of new land. The USDA estimates probably 20 million could be obtained by draining and clearing land in the humid and subhumid areas; hence 10 million additional acres will have to be found elsewhere. This is about the equivalent of 6 million acres of irrigated land, and that is about all the irrigable land left in the 17 Western States.

The Colorado River storage project, as proposed in H. R. 3383, will bring into production 132,360 acres by 1980. The need by then will be 6 million irrigated acres. Therefore, the land brought into production by the Colorado River storage project can have absolutely no effect on the current agricultural surplus. The total new area to be irrigated would be only 0.027 of 1 percent of the total cropped land in the United States and would be used primarily to grow fruit, vegetables, alfalfa and forage crops, all of which will be in great demand by 1975.

The Colorado River compact apportioned, for beneficial consumptive use, 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per year to the Upper Colorado River Basin. Of this more than 5 million acre-feet per year are now unused in the upper basin and without holdover storage in the upper basin these waters flow downhill to become available to the lower basin and Mexico. In both these lower basin areas the physical facilities are available for the control, diversion and use of the entire flow of the river. Failure to use the 5 million acre-feet in the upper basin makes it available to the lower basin for the production of cotton, which is now in surplus. Cotton acreage in the lower basin and Mexico has increased greatly, because of the availability to these areas of unused upper basin water. Here is what has happened during the past year, 1955. Cotton quotas were reduced in California. Cotton growers moved over into Mexico, and, using upper basin water, produced in 1955 nearly 500,000 bales of cotton.

The acreage in California taken out of cotton was used to grow alfalfa seed, which soon flooded the market and threatens the demestic alfalfa seed industry. Water belonging to the upper basin States and not used now in the upper basin is being utilized to produce crops which increase the crop surpluses.

The Colorado River storage project will make water and power available for industrial and municipal development as well as for agriculture. The Colorado River basin is a storehouse of raw materials. Development of these resources will provide jobs, homes, create new wealth and add new income-tax pipelines to the Treasury. It is not unreasonable to believe that the increased population resulting from this project will consume more agricultural crops than it produces and this will create new markets for such crops from other areas.

The farm surplus is a current and temporary situation. This country will soon outgrow it. It is inevitable with the rapidly growing population. This country must project its food and fiber needs in to the future. It cannot afford to live only in the present with no concern for the future, when it takes so long to develop a dependable food and fiber supply. A few years ago, during the war, there was a shortage of food. Everyone remembers it. The people in the West remember the drought of 1934. Another year like 1934 would wipe out the present food surplus.

The United States has become the greatest Nation on earth because it invested in the future—in the promotion of transportation, communication, agriculture, industry, even to the extent of providing cash grants. It planned for the future. We must continue to look ahead, and 25 years is not too long a forward look. In 25 years we will need all the food the Colorado River storage project can produce, and it will take about that long to bring the land into production. The project must be built beginning now. It cannot possibly add to the current surplus. It is even doubtful that it can meet the increased food demand by the time it is in full production.

22. The reclamation fund: With the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902, a revolving fund was established to finance the reclamation projects. This fund is known as the reclamation fund. This fund is supported by proceeds from the sale of public lands and timber, and was later augmented by a percentage of the oil, gas, and mineral leases and revenues from the repayment of construction costs of projects to develop the natural resources of the public-lands States.

The Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment to the reclamation law in 1938 provided that all revenues from reclamation projects should be deposited in the reclamation fund, an earmarked fund in the Treasury. In fiscal year 1955, more than one-half the total money appropriated for reclamation projects (irrigation and power) came from the reclamation fund.

Up to June 30, 1954, $936,183,015 had been paid into the reclamation fund. Of this total, $848,149,945 had been expended on reclamation projects, leaving a balance in the fund of $88,033,070 on June 30, 1954.

Up to June 30, 1954, the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico had put into the reclamation fund $178,456,067.

During 1954, these same States, out of public land resources, put into the reclamation fund approximately $20 million. This is more than enough to have paid interest on the unpaid balance of the cost of the irrigation features of all reclamation projects in those States, including the Colorado River storage project, if its construction had been initiated during that year.

When all States, except the public land States of the West, were admitted to the Union, they retained all their land and mineral resources. These resources were developed as taxable private enterprises, or as sources of State revenue. In the Western reclamation States, more than half the land and most of the oil and mineral resources on it were kept by the Federal Government.

Under these conditions it is no more than right that the proceeds from these Federal resources in the upper basin States should be used to offset the interest on the money advanced by the Federal Government to build the irrigation features of reclamation projects.

23. A discussion of the southern California proposals for alternate land reclamation in nonarid areas:

Wet lands of South, East, and Midwest can be drained and cleared. It is estimated that perhaps as much as 21 million acres might be reclaimed by such action.

The soils for the most part are shallow and infertile from centuries of leaching by heavy rains. Heavy applications of fertilizers will be required annually. These annual costs plus the first cost of reclamation greatly exceed the cost of reclamation by irrigation.

Except for limited areas, the cropping pattern will be limited to a few crops, most of which are in surplus.

If these lands had been attractive for reclamation at the very low costs as claimed by the southern California groups opposing upper Colorado River development, why haven't they been reclaimed before, during the period of agricultural shortages and high prices for agricultural products?

Within 15 years this country will need to have every available acre of productive agricultural land in production including the total irrigable area in the 17 Western States.

Every year the highway, airfield and urban expansion is taking out of production more available land than is being brought into production. It is reported by the Soil Conservation Service that these withdrawals amount to more than 1 million acres per year. In the four upper Colorado River Basin States, 160,000 acres of cropland are diverted to other uses every year.

24. Current power production at Hoover Dam:

The contracts for power were based on a rate sufficient to repay the entire cost of the dam and power facilities in 50 years. Power which was considered to be firm and available at all times, regardless of development in the upper basin, is under contract at the rate of 1.34 mills per kilowatt-hour. Power, which is to be available only so long as upper basin is not using its water, is secondary or dump power, and the rate for this power is .33 mills per kilowatt-hour.

So long as the upper basin is kept from using its water, the secondary power at Hoover is just as good as firm power, and the southern California users get it for the secondary rate and sell it as though it were firm power. The value of this power, being made with water apportioned to the upper basin States, amounts to approximately $4 million per year. This is an outright gift to the southern California power users at the expense of the upper basin States.

From 5 to 10 million acre-feet of water per year is now going into the sea from the Colorado River. This water is being used to generate power for the primary benefit of California.

With the completion of construction of Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams, this water which is now wasting into the sea will be used to fill those reservoirs, and later for consumptive uses in the upper basin.

The loss of this power source is one of the main reasons for California's opposition to the Colorado River storage project, in spite of the fact that California signed the Colorado River compact and agreed to a division of the waters of the Colorado River. Planned reductions of firm power to the lower basin as a result of expected upper basin water diversions are plainly provided for in Hoover Dam power contracts.

25. The real issue—who gets the water and the power.

There is not sufficient water in the Colorado River to supply all the agricultural, industrial and domestic needs of the area.

After all the water of the Colorado River is consumptively used, there will still be thousands of acres of thirsty lands, raw materials undeveloped and living space unoccupied by people because of lack of water.

To provide for an equitable division of this water resource among the States of the basin, a compact, dividing the use of the water among them, was drawn, signed by each State and the United States.

This compact divided the use of the water between the upper and lower basin, the first 15 million acre-feet equally.

The lower basin (California, Arizona, and Nevada) developed first with the support of the other States and the use of money from the Federal Treasury.

Storage reservoirs, powerplants, control structures and conveyance channels have now been built, largely under the reclamation law, sufficient to control, divert and convey all the water of the river.

There are more than 2 million dry acres in the Colorado River Basin of Mexico and 500,000 acres in the Imperial Valley of California waiting for water to make them productive. It would take more water to irrigate these lands than the entire allotment to the upper basin.

An insatiable power market exists in the southern California area sufficient to use all the power that can be generated with all the water in the Colorado River system.

The lower river is completely regulated by the Hoover Dam.

Water runs downhill. If by any means the upper basin States can be kept from using their water, this water will run downhill and southern California and Mexico will get it.

This water resource is literally worth billions of dollars. It is not surprising, therefore, that the southern California opposition is willing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep the people in the upper basin from utilizing their allocated water.

There is only one issue to this controversy—who gets the water and the power allocated by compact to the upper basin States?

Failure to authorize this project by this Congress will lend the support of this body to the consummation of the "steal of the century," whereby one Commonwealth, which has become prosperous and powerful as a result of water and power made available through Federal aid from a common river source which was divided by compact, now uses that strength and economic wealth to take, by indirection, that portion of the river resource apportioned to the upper basin by a valid contract which that Commonwealth signed.

26. Partnership in reclamation:

The reclamation partnership program joins good land and good water with good people. This combination creates new fertile acres, new wealth which will produce food and fiber in perpetuity. In one sense, a nation is only as strong and enduring as its food supply. In another and more important sense, no nation can be strong unless there exists a deep spirituality among its citizens.

Fulfilling the commandment God gave in the beginning, "to multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it," is one of the best ways to develop those spiritual forces every nation must have to endure. The good earth is man's best friend. In Proverbs it is declared, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." The subduing of the earth requires imagination—vision. Let us have that same vision that inspired the Dutch, who reclaim land from the ocean itself, to live their creed that "A nation that lives builds for the future."

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1956

Rev. Andrew K. Rule, professor of church history and apologetics, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, Louisville, Ky., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who in Thy mysterious providence, hast laid upon us responsibilities of unimaginable proportions, far surpassing in their demands the limits of human knowledge and wisdom, grant us the guidance of Thy spirit, who knows the end from the beginning; and make us sensitively responsive to His gentle leading; that what we shall do together this day may be acceptable in Thy sight and beneficial to all mankind.

With sorrow, but in faith, we bow before Thy inscrutable will, thanking Thee for the rich blessings that came to us and to our country through the life and service of our friend, Senator KILGORE; praying that the consolations of Thy gospel may be richly ministered to his bereaved family; and that Thou wilt raise up others to fill this great gap in the ranks of those who serve. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PASTORE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 27, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 25, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 180) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8675) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 97) for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, Pedro P. Dagamac, and Edith Kahler, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8675) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEATH OF SENATOR KILGORE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, it is my melancholy duty to inform the Senate that earlier today our distinguished, beloved colleague, HARLEY M. KILGORE, passed into the silent land from which no traveler ever returns.

Later the Senate will be asked to designate a day on which to commemorate this great patriot, statesman, and friend.

I present a resolution and request its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 221), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Honorable Harley M. Kilgore, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be a member of said committee, to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after consulting with the minority leader, I should like to announce that an appropriate day will be set aside when tributes may be paid to our late beloved colleague, HARLEY KILGORE.

At the present time, Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. It was with a deep sense of shock that I heard this morning of the passing of Senator KILGORE. The attending physician at the Capitol told me yesterday that HARLEY KILGORE was in serious condition. But it was a little difficult for me to realize just how serious the situation was.

HARLEY KILGORE was a kindly man. HARLEY KILGORE was a gentle man. He was beloved by his friends, and his friends were many.

He dedicated his abilities to the service of the people of his State, and they reciprocated by honoring him and by electing him to serve in this body.

We all mourn his passing. Our hearts are with his loved ones, and our prayers are dedicated to bringing them solace and comfort in this trying hour.

The working people of this country, Mr. President, have lost one of the best friends they ever had, and we have lost one of our most loyal colleagues.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority, I wish to join in the expressions of the majority leader, and to concur in stating that, after a conference with the members of the family of our late colleague, at a later time a day will be set aside when eulogies may be delivered by his colleagues on the life and public services of the late Senator KILGORE.

All of us on this side of the aisle heard with profound regret of the passing of our late colleague, and we on this side of the aisle, along with his colleagues on the other side, join in extending our deepest sympathy to the family of our late colleague, and to the people of his State, whom he served for so many years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee provided for in the resolution will be appointed later.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a limitation on statements of not to exceed 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, on December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the following publications: A-48, Rules of Practice and Procedure, June 1, 1955; A-49, Regulations Under the Federal Power Act, September 1, 1955; R-51, Typical Residential Electric Bills, January 1, 1955; P-29, Estimated Future Power Requirements of the United States by Regions, 1954-80; S-116, Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1954; S-117, Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1954; S-118, Production of Electric Energy and Capacity of Generating Plants, 1954; S-119, Consumption of Fuel for Production of Electric Energy, 1954; M-45, Major Natural Gas Pipe Lines, December 31, 1955 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Ouintah Starr, of Lansing, Mich., relating to the bill (S. 1636) to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Pioneer Water Co., Tulare County, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the construction of the Success Dam on Tule River, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Tarrant County, Tex., Medical Society, commending Senator DANIEL for his stand against further economic aid to foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Edward Reinhart, of San Diego, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Rockaway Council, No. 2672, Knights of Columbus, Rockaway Beach, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amend-

ment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the administrative committee of the Democratic Party of Wisconsin, at Madison, Wis., favoring an investigation of all activities of the gas and oil lobby; ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 3299. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lewis de Huszovszky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3300. A bill for the relief of Ivan Curko, also known as Ivan Sam Curko or John Curko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3301. A bill for the relief of Josefa Kusiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) (by request):

S. 3302. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 3303. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Colorado; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3304. A bill for the relief of Satenik Damlama;

S. 3305. A bill for the relief of Livio Cianci; and

S. 3306. A bill for the relief of Sergius Kusmin and his wife, Irene Kusmin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3307. A bill to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in the Federal courts in certain reemployment cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. KERR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 3308. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deduction for Federal income-tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted, considered, and agreed to:

By Mr. NEELY:

S. Res. 221. Resolution pertaining to the death of the late Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. NEELY, which appears in his remarks under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the majority whip, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Montana, [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], my colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to safeguard the interests of our citizens in honest elections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be kept on the desk until Monday next, in order that any Senator who may care to associate himself as a sponsor may have that opportunity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this measure has been carefully drawn, in consultation with some very able lawyers from the drafting service, lawyers with the policy committee, and with Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. It is bipartisan in the fullest sense of the word, and I believe no election bill can be successful unless it has the sympathetic understanding of Members of both parties.

The basic assumption of the bill is that the people are entitled to all the relevant facts before they select their public officials. The sponsors of the measure have tried to insure that those facts will be presented.

Our bill would require a complete accounting by Federal candidates of their campaign contributions and their spending.

Our bill would set realistic spending limits—limits that will not invite evasion of the law.

Our bill would require the big campaign contributors to make an accurate—and a complete—report of their contributions.

Our bill would permit the granting of free and equal time to Presidential candidates of the major parties.

Our bill would encourage the small campaign contributor by granting him a tax deduction up to $100 for his political contributions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a concise explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTION BILL

A. TITLE I—CORRUPT PRACTICES

1. Redefines candidate to include candidates for President and Vice President.

2. Redefines political committee to include all committees receiving contributions or making expenditures in excess of $100 in connection with Federal general elections. Existing law covers only interstate committees.

3. Prohibits committees from receiving contributions or making expenditures on behalf of a candidate unless specifically authorized in writing to do so. Permits withdrawal of such authorization by candidates. Makes candidates liable for violations by authorized political committees.

4. Reduces the number of reports to be filed by political committees and changes the method of reporting to insure a fuller disclosure of all material information.

5. Requires all expenditures by persons other than political committees in excess of $100 to be publicly reported in the same manner as political committees report. Also will require consolidated reports from individual contributors of more than $5,000.

6. Requires candidates to report twice on each election, all to the Clerk of the House and district courts of their residence, and Senators and presidential candidates to the Secretary of the Senate in the same manner as political committees are required to report.

7. Requires candidates for nomination or election to the House and Senate to file with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate certified true copies of campaign statements required to be filed by State law in their States.

8. Specifies obligations of the appropriate committees of the Senate and House and of the Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate to improve reporting systems under the law, compile and disseminate the information in the reports, insure and improve enforcement of the law, and make recommendations for improvements.

9. Changes of the existing limitations on campaign expenditures in the following manner:

Senators (and representatives-at-large):

Existing law (applies only to candidates)—$10,000, or 3 cents per vote cast in the last general election, but not to exceed $25,000.

Proposed (applies in aggregate to candidates and all committees)—$75,000, or 20 cents per vote cast in any State election held in preceding 4 years, whichever is higher.

Representatives, Delegates, or Resident Commissioner:

Existing law—$2,500, or 3 cents per vote cast in the last general election, but not to exceed $5,000.

Proposed—$15,000, or 20 cents per vote cast in any election for such office in preceding 4 years, whichever is higher.

Specifically provides that candidates may not spend more than their State law permits, regardless of these provisions.

10. Amends the existing provisions of law with respect to the limitations on individual contributions only to the extent necessary to make them consistent with the other changes in the bill.

11. Repeals the existing $3 million limitation on expenditures by national political committees and establishes for all political committees a new ceiling of 20 cents per vote cast in any of the last three Presidential elections. This would amount to over $12 million for the present. While this seems high

for State and local committees, it must be remembered that existing law established no limits for them.

B. TITLE II—INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

1. Permits individuals to deduct in any taxable year not to exceed $100 for political contributions. This would allow $200 deductions on joint returns.

C. TITLE III—POLITICAL BROADCASTS

1. Amends section 315 of the Communications Act to allow radio and TV licensees to grant free equal time to any Presidential or Vice Presidential candidate whose party's candidate in the preceding Presidential election received not less than 4 percent of the total popular votes cast or who is supported through his political party by petitions signed by no less than the number of valid signatures which aggregate not less than 1 percent of the total popular vote cast in the last Presidential election.

2. Provides that the Federal Communications Commission shall establish appropriate rules and regulations for implementing this statute and shall, upon the request of a licensee, declare the eligibility of any candidate for the Presidency or Vice Presidency for equal free radio and TV time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe, Mr. President, that every Member of the Senate will agree with me that the present election laws are obsolete. They were passed at a time when the population of the country was considerably smaller, and the expenses of campaigning were relatively modest.

The result of such laws in a jet age can only be confusion. Our people are entitled to procedures which give them accurate and complete accounting—accounting that is understandable to all.

The sponsors of this measure do not pretend that it is the answer to all the intricate problems of modern-day campaigning. We do not have enough information to present all the answers or even to try to present all the answers.

We are hopeful that we can have an honest election bill to cover the election in 1956, and we indeed look forward to the complete recommendations in the report which will be submitted by the blue ribbon special committee named by the Vice President. Perhaps it will be possible to enact a much more comprehensive and extensive bill when their final report is available.

All of us must admit that, as we go along, it is probable that further legislation will be necessary. For example, I doubt whether any of us really know how much a campaign costs, and I do not believe we can even find out in the absence of such legislation as I am proposing today.

We believe that, by and large, this legislation will be a good beginning. We believe it will be a long step forward in the establishment of procedures which will protect the most basic right of the people in a great democracy—the right to know all the facts about their public servants.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have just introduced be printed in the body of the RECORD, to accompany my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3308) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deductions for Federal income tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Elections Act of 1956."

TITLE I—CORRUPT PRACTICES

SECTION 101. (a) Section 302 (b) of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'candidate' means an individual whose name is presented at an election for President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is elected;".

(b) Section 302 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $100 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of candidates or Presidential or Vice Presidential electors;".

(c) Section 302 (d) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, subvention, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution;".

(d) Section 302 (e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, subvention, advance, deposit, or gift, of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure;".

SEC. 102. Section 303 (c) of such Act (relating to keeping of receipted bills for expenditures by political committees) is amended by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100".

SEC. 103. Section 303 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) (1) No contribution shall be accepted and no expenditure made, by or on behalf of a political committee (other than a political committee which is a branch, subsidiary, or affiliate of a political party legally existent under the laws of the State within which it is located) until the candidate (or a representative designated by him in writing) has authorized in writing the political committee to support his candidacy and has filed a copy of such authorization with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. In the case of political committees supporting a candidate for President, Vice President, or Senator, such authorization shall also be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

"(2) Upon the filing by a candidate of a withdrawal of authorization with the Clerk of the House of Representatives (and, in the case of candidates for President, Vice President, or Senator, with the Secretary of the Senate), and upon the receipt of notice of withdrawal of authorization by the treasurer of a political committee, the political committee shall be prohibited from receiving further contributions or making further expenditures on behalf of the candidate unless a new authorization is filed."

SEC. 104. Section 305 of such Act (relating to statements to be filed by political committees is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 305. (a) The treasurer of a political committee shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, between the first and fifth days of July in each year, and also on the fifth day next preceding the date on which an election is to be held, with respect to which contributions were received or expenditures made by such committee, and also on the fifth day of January, a statement containing, complete as of the fifth day next preceding the date of filing—

"(1) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution, and the names of the contributors shall be arranged alphabetically within each category, according to the amount of contribution as follows: $100 to $499; $500 to $999; and $1,000 and over;

"(2) the total sum of the contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (1);

"(3) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

"(4) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more has been made by such committee, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

"(5) the total sum of all expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (4); and

"(6) the total sum of expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year.

"(b) (1) Each item of expenditure shall be described in sufficient detail to accurately identify it, including, in the case of printed cards, pamphlets, circulars, posters, dodgers, booklets, or other such advertisements, writings, or other statements (such as reprints from periodicals, books, newspapers, or other publications), the title and number of each; in the case of newspaper advertisements, the names of the newspapers; and in the case of radio and television time, the names of the stations. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (including State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate shall be in the same ratio as specific expenditures on behalf of each candidate (including State and local candidates) for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures.

"(2) Each expenditure shall also be described by general category, including (i) personal services and reimbursed expenses (salaries, commissions, fees, traveling, and subsistence), (ii) printing and advertising other than radio and television, (iii) radio, (iv) television, (v) office overhead, (vi) subvention or transfer to other political committee or candidate, (vii) miscellaneous, and the total expenditure for each such category shall be listed.

"(c) The statements required to be filed by subdivision (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

"(d) The statement filed on the 5th day of January shall cover the preceding calendar year.

"(e) In the case of political committees supporting candidates for President, Vice

President, or Senator, a copy of the statement filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under subsection (a) shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate."

SEC. 105. Section 306 of such act (relating to statements to be filed by persons other than political committees) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 306. (a) Every person (other than a political committee) who makes an expenditure in one or more items, aggregating $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contribution to a candidate or political committee, for the purpose of influencing the election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives an itemized detailed statement of each expenditure in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 305, and in the case of any expenditure in support of a candidate for President, Vice President, or Senator shall file a copy of the statement with the Secretary of the Senate.

"(b) Every individual who makes contributions and/or expenditures in one or more items aggregating more than $5,000 within a calendar year for the purpose of influencing the election of candidates in any and all Federal elections, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives a consolidated statement showing all such contributions and/or expenditures, described in sufficient detail to accurately identify them, including the amount of each item, the date when made, and the name and address of the person to whom made."

SEC. 106. Section 307 of such Act (relating to statements to be filed by candidates) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 307. (a) Every candidate shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives on the fifth day before, and also within thirty days after, the date on which an election is to be held—

"(1) a correct and itemized detailed statement of contribution received by him and expenditures made by him in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 305, including, in the case of contributions, amounts expended from his own funds; and

"(2) a statement of every promise or pledge made by him or by any person for him with his consent, prior to the closing of the polls on the day of the election, relative to the appointment or recommendation for appointment of any person to any public or private position or employment for the purpose of procuring support in his candidacy, and the name, address, and occupation of every person to whom any such promise or pledge has been made, together with the description of any such position. If no such promise or pledge has been made, that fact shall be specifically stated.

"(b) The statements required to be filed by subdivision (a) (1) shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward. The statement to be filed on the fifth day preceding an election shall be complete as of the fifth day next preceding the date of filing, and the statement to be filed within thirty days after an election shall be a final and complete statement.

"(c) Every candidate shall enclose with his first statement a report, based upon the records of the proper State official, stating the total number of votes cast at the election required to be used as a basis for the computation under section 309 (b) (2) or (3).

"(d) For the purpose of further informing the Congress and public, every candidate for nomination or election to the Senate or the House of Representatives shall file with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House, respectively, within thirty days following an election a certified true copy of any statement or statements of campaign contributions and expenditures required to be filed by him in his State by the laws thereof, and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall determine only that such statements are in fact true copies of the reports filed in the particular States.

"(e) In the case of a candidate for Senator, a copy of the statement filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under subsection (a) shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate."

SEC. 107. Section 308 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"A copy of every statement required to be filed under the provisions of this title (except statements filed under section 307 (d)) shall also be filed with the clerk of the United States district court in the district in which the principal office of the political committee is located, in the case of statements by political committees; in the district in which the candidate resides, in the case of statements by candidates; and in the district in which contributions are received and expenditures made, in the case of statements by others."

SEC. 108. (a) Subsection (b) of section 309 of such Act (relating to limitations on amount of expenditures by candidates), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Unless the laws of his State prescribe a less amount as the maximum limit of campaign expenditures, a candidate, in his campaign for reelection, may make expenditures up to—

"(1) the sum of $75,000 if a candidate for Senator or Representative at Large, or the sum of $15,000 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner; or

"(2) in the case of candidates for Senator or Representative at Large, an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the total number of votes cast in any election held in the State in the preceding 4 years; or

"(3) in the case of candidates for Representative, Delegate or Resident Commissioner, an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the total number of votes cast in any election held in the State in the preceding four years for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks."

(b) Section 309 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) For the purposes of the limitation prescribed in subsection (b) there shall be included in the total of expenditures made by a candidate the expenditures made on behalf of the candidate by all committees except those not authorized to support his candidacy. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (including State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate shall be in the same ratio as specific expenditures on behalf of each candidate (including State and local candidates) for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures."

SEC. 109. Section 314 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Any candidate who knowingly consents to any violation of this title by an authorized political committee shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than 2 years.

"(d) To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of this act and in developing such amendments or legislation related thereto as it may deem necessary, the appropriate committees of the Senate, in the case of candidates for President, Vice President, or Senator, as well as in the case of political committees supporting candidates for election to such offices, and the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives, in the case of candidates for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, as well as in the case of political committees supporting candidates for election to such offices, shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the administration of this act by the agencies concerned. It shall be the duty of these committees—

"(1) to study all pertinent reports filed under the provisions of this act and such other materials as may be necessary;

"(2) to ascertain whether candidates, political committees, or others have failed to file statements as required by this act or have filed defective statements;

"(3) to report violations of this act to the appropriate law-enforcing agencies of the Government and to review such reports at regular intervals to ascertain the action taken by those agencies. Any department, official, or agency administering the provisions of this act shall, at the request of any such committee, consult with the committee, from time to time, with respect to their activities under this act;

"(4) to take such other action as shall be necessary and proper to supervise the administration of this act; and

"(5) to report to the Senate or the House of Representatives respectively, from time to time, on their activities under this Act.

"(e) (1) It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate (A) to develop uniform methods and forms for the making of reports required under this title; (B) to provide for making the statements filed under this title available for public inspection; (C) to ascertain, when practicable, whether candidates, political committees, or others have failed to file statements or have filed defective statements and to give notice to delinquents directing them to file such statements or to correct defective statements; (D) to provide for the preparation and periodic publication of compilations containing summaries indicating the total contributions and expenditures and the total for each category of expenditure in each statement filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate, and the name and address of, and the amount contributed by, each contributor shown by any such statement to have contributed the sum of $500 or more.

"(2) The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit the summaries prepared by him under this section, and the notices of delinquency dispatched by him to delinquent candidates, committees or others, to the appropriate committees of the Senate.

"(3) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit the summaries prepared by him under this section, and the notices of delinquency dispatched by him to delinquent candidates, committees or others, to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives."

SEC. 110. So much of section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code as defines the terms "candidate", "political committee", "contribution", and "expenditure" is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'candidate' means an individual whose name is presented at an election for President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is elected;

"The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $100 in any calendar year for the purpose of

influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of candidates or Presidential or Vice Presidential electors;

"The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, subvention, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution;

"The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, subvention, advance, deposit, or gift, of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure;".

SEC. 111. The second paragraph of section 608 (a) of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "This subsection shall not apply to contributions made by a political committee."

SEC. 112. The first paragraph of section 609 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "No political committee shall receive contributions or make expenditures during any calendar year in amounts greater than the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the total number of voters casting votes for candidates for the office of Presidential elector in any one of the last three elections for that office."

TITLE II—INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"(a) Allowance of deduction: In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction any political contribution (as defined in subsection (c)) payment of which is made within the taxable year. A political contribution shall be allowable as a deduction only if verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(b) Limitation: The deduction under subsection (a) shall not exceed $100 for any taxable year.

"(c) Definition of Political Contribution: For purposes of this section, the term 'political contribution' means a contribution or gift to—

"(1) an individual whose name is presented for election as President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, an elector for President or Vice President of the United States, a Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate to the House of Representatives) in a general or special election, in a primary election, or in a convention of a political party, for use by such individual to further his candidacy for any such office; or

"(2) a committee acting in behalf of an individual described in paragraph (1), for use by such committee to further the candidacy of such individual."

(b) The table of sections to part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"SEC. 217. Cross References."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 217. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"SEC. 218. Cross References."

SEC. 202. The amendments made by this act shall apply only to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, but only with respect to contributions or gifts made on or after such date.

TITLE III—POLITICAL BROADCASTS

SEC. 301. Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 315) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 315. (a) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified and nominated candidate for the office of President or Vice President of the United States to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunity in the use of such broadcasting station to every other such candidate for such office—

"(1) who is the nominee of a political party whose candidate for that office in the preceding presidential election was supported by not fewer than 4 per centum of the total popular votes cast; or

"(2) whose candidacy is supported by petitions filed under the laws of the several States which in the aggregate bear a number of signatures equal to at least 1 per centum of the total popular votes cast in the preceding presidential election and which signatures are valid under the laws of the States in which they are filed.

"(b) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any other public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station.

"(c) No licensee shall have any power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of subsection (a) or subsection (b). No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate.

"(d) The charges made for the use of any broadcasting station for any of the purposes set forth in this section shall not exceed the charges made for comparable use of such station for other purposes.

"(e) The Commission shall—

"(1) prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this section, and

"(2) determine, and upon request of any licensee notify such licensee concerning, the eligibility of each candidate for the office of President or Vice President of the United States to receive equal opportunity under subsection (a) in the use of any broadcasting station."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, an editorial from the Washington News, and an article written by the very able reporter of the United Press, John A. Goldsmith, which I regard as an accurate summary of my views on this general subject.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 28, 1956]

REPORTING COMES FIRST

The amount of support Majority Leader JOHNSON and Minority Leader KNOWLAND are mustering in their bipartisan efforts to obtain a practical electoral reform law is very encouraging. One indication of the breadth of the support is the bill introduced yesterday by Representative WILBUR MILLS to grant a $100 income tax deduction on political contributions. This is essentially the same proposal already made by Senator HENNINGS and Representative UDALL, and its enactment should help stimulate small contributions at a time when expenditures are being brought under better control. Since tax measures must originate in the House, additional sponsorship by one of the ranking members of the Ways and Means Committee materially increases the chance of action.

In light of the progress of the reform bill it is unfortunate that a statement issued by Senator HENNINGS' office has attacked the Johnson-Knowland draft for its failure to include primaries. We agree that it would be desirable to have a new law on campaign expenditures include primaries, which are the meaningful elections in perhaps one-third of the States. There was such a provision in the original Hennings bill, and it is useful to have the principle restated. Soundings on Capitol Hill have indicated, however, that because of controversy over Federal powers a bill covering primaries would face many difficulties.

Senator JOHNSON has indicated that he does not rule out the reporting of expenditures in primaries, and we hope that he and Mr. KNOWLAND will find an acceptable formula. Perhaps the answer lies in the proposal of Senator MUNDT to require candidates to file in Washington duplicate copies of their reports to the States on campaign contributions and expenditures. In any event, our own feeling is that it would be better to concentrate on a general bill covering the reporting of contributions and expenditures, even though it might fall short of the ideal, than to permit a fight over primary coverage to snag the whole effort.

The compelling need is to obtain full reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures in general elections, with realistic overall limits and with identification of the original source of funds. That is the approach which the Johnson-Knowland effort appears to take, and it is aimed at correcting the major evil which concerns Mr. HENNINGS—namely, the dependence on and influence of undisclosed funds. The proposed plan also would include the $100 income-tax deduction and a provision enabling television and radio stations to grant free time to major presidential contestants. The important thing, it seems to us, is to get behind this plan which would correct the big defects and has a reasonable chance of passage, and to leave the more controversial qualifications for later action if necessary after the reform becomes law.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 28, 1956]

FULLEST OF FULLEST

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON says Congress will be pressed at this session to pass a law which will encourage the "fullest public participation and the fullest public review" of all elections.

That is an apt description of the principle on which the proposed law should be written.

How to write an enforceable law which will be realistically effective is another matter.

This is where the new lobby-campaign fund investigation comes in.

There isn't any reason, as Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND suggest, Congress can't pass a new election-money law at this session, even if the investigation is incomplete. There are ample defects in the present law which are obvious to any practical observer.

But before it is ended the Senate probe ought to give the lawmakers an abundance of useful guides on tightening up the law. Certainly, that will be the result if the committee runs a hard-hitting inquiry, as promised.

A foremost purpose of this investigation is to give the public a full review of how campaign funds are raised, how they are accounted for, or not accounted for, and what influences they exert on the candidates who benefit from them.

Public opinion often needs to be backed up by a stiff law, to make itself truly effective. But the public itself can be a decisive influence on public policies, once it has an opportunity to make its views known.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 26, 1956]

STRAITJACKET PREDICTED FOR INFLUENCE PEDDLERS

(By John A. Goldsmith)

Senate Democratic leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, predicted yesterday the impending Senate investigation of lobbying will result in a law that will put the influence peddler in a straitjacket.

At the same time, he said, the law will fully protect each citizen's constitutional right of petition.

JOHNSON made his prophecy in a discussion of the lobbying inquiry to be started soon by a select eight-man bipartisan Senate committee created earlier this week. The committee was set up as an outgrowth of an oil lobbyist's $2,500 election campaign contribution which Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, rejected.

JOHNSON said the investigation will not be confined to attempts to influence legislative action. He pointed out that the authorizing resolution also applies to the executive departments of the Government.

"I would think that everybody in the executive departments would want to be ready to fully disclose or explain any improper influences they may have any information on," JOHNSON told newsmen.

Speaking for the Senate's Democratic leadership, he urged anyone anywhere who has such information to come forward with it.

"I predict that we'll come out of this whole thing with an up-to-date lobbying act, a comprehensive law which will protect a citizen's right of petition and, at the same time, put the influence peddler in a straitjacket," he said.

But he cautioned that a modernized lobbying act will become a reality only after hearings by the new committee, and a subsequent study by the Government Operations Committee which is the regular Senate committee with jurisdiction. There is a real problem, he said, in determining where free speech ends and lobbying begins.

JOHNSON said the committee will hold an organization meeting Tuesday. He declined to speculate on who will be the chairman, but it is expected to be Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee.

JOHNSON'S statement came just 24 hours after he disclosed that the Senate leaders in both parties are trying to draft a new elections law in time for this year's elections.

[Representative WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, was expected to introduce in the House this week a bill to permit income-tax deductions for political contributions of up to $100, a plan advocated by Senator JOHNSON. MILLS is a high-ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

[The exemption for political contributions has been urged to encourage wider participation in politics and reduce the importance of large gifts from a few sources.

[Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, meanwhile put forward a plan under which he said an "honest elections" bill might indirectly cover primaries. His proposal would require candidates to file in Washington duplicates of their accounting of contributions and expenses as required by State laws.]

TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLAR BOOMERANG

Demands for action on lobbying and campaign spending followed CASE'S disclosure that an oil company attorney, John M. Neff, Nebraska lobbyist for Superior Oil Co., Los Angeles, had left a $2,500 contribution for his campaign after seeking out CASE'S views on the natural gas bill.

The special four-man committee, formed to look into the CASE incident, yesterday called Neff's Lexington (Neb.) law partner for testimony. The group sent a subpena to Paul J. Gerdes to testify Tuesday when Chairman WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, Georgia, hopes to wind up the committee's hearings.

[The Associated Press reported that Robert J. Brisson, a Sioux Falls, S. Dak., telephone company official, was subpenaed yesterday to appear before GEORGE'S committee. Brisson, local manager for the Northwestern Bell Co., was ordered to produce all toll tickets, records or other documents pertaining to calls made to Washington from the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader or the home of E. J. Kahler, the newspaper's business manager, between January 13 and 28. Kahler recently appeared before the committee and a grand jury investigating the CASE incident. Kahler received the contribution which Senator CASE later rejected.

[It was also reported from Pierre, the State capital, that Geraldine Ostroot, South Dakota's secretary of state, had been instructed to submit to the George committee a certified copy of all campaign contributions made to the Republican State Central Committee since 1940.]

Informed sources said that Gerdes, as Neff's partner, has some records and information which bear on Neff's gift of $2,500 to the Nebraska State GOP Committee. Neff made that gift, and tried unsuccessfully to make another, after learning that Nebraska's two Republican Senators were not interested in $5,000 which he had been authorized by the interests controlling Superior to give them.

GEORGE had previously announced that the Tuesday hearing will feature more testimony by Neff, Elmer Patman, the Superior Oil Co. attorney who hired Neff, and perhaps Howard B. Keck, Superior president whose "personal" funds were the source of the money rejected by CASE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish again to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the honest-election bill which I introduced on behalf of the majority leader, the minority leader, and the majority whip will be at the desk, under the unanimous-consent agreement until next Monday. I am hopeful that every Member on the minority side as well as on the majority side, who desires to be a cosponsor of the proposed legislation, will so inform the clerk.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which is proposed to be the "Housing Amendments of 1956," and which is the legislation recommended to the Congress by the administration.

Having served as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and being presently ranking member of that committee and its Housing Subcommittee, I take pride in sponsoring the administration bill at this time.

I desire that the bill, and a brief summary of its provisions, follow my statement in the RECORD, so that they will be available to those Senators who wish to have ready access to them.

There have been several bills introduced in this session purporting to represent the needs of our people for housing legislation. Many of them are so broad in scope that they would ultimately lead to a complete socialization of housing and housing credit.

In contrast, the bill I introduce today takes into account the need for liberalization of some programs heretofore enacted by the Congress, continues others in present form, and generally stabilizes the housing economy, second only to agriculture in its economic impact upon the Nation.

I am confident that enactment of the administration proposals as carried out in the Capehart bill will enable private enterprise to meet substantially the needs of the Nation.

There is provided in this bill the authorization for the low-rent public housing to the amount of 35,000 units per year during fiscal 1957 and 1958. This is the number I supported in the last session of this Congress, and is consistent with the need for adequate housing to place those removed by governmental action from less desirable housing.

As a co-sponsor of proposed legislation already introduced to assist the elderly in their quest for better housing, I am happy to endorse also the provisions of this bill which assist in this endeavor. The facilities of both private and public housing assistance are made available under its terms.

The general authorization of the Federal Housing Administration is continued, and terms and amounts of title I are extended in scope, the college housing and urban renewal programs are provided for, FNMA secondary market operations would be broadened, and disposition of defense and World War II housing would be effected.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency recommends continuation of the so-called Capehart amendment under title VIII, which subject will be covered more fully by the Defense Department in appearances before the committee. I expect to devote considerably more time to the subject of military housing on some other occasion.

We are, Mr. President, in an economy where the well-being of our people is being preserved and strengthened; where the best brains of our Nation are being utilized to bring to Americans a more abundant life in a peaceful existence. The aims of this administration and the Republican Party, of which it is representative, are well-defined in the minds of Americans throughout the land. There shall be peace. There shall be prosperity. They shall exist together, one with the other.

The bill I introduce today conforms with those aims; it is legislation looking to a peaceful future and based upon the needs of our people in a large and important segment of our economy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3302) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1956."

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

PROPERTY IMPROVEMENT LOANS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "and prior to September 30, 1956,".

(b) Section 2 (b) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, or improvement of existing structures exceeds $2,500, or for the purpose of financing the construction of new structures exceeds $3,000" and inserting "exceeds $3,500";

(2) striking out "except that" in clause (2) and inserting "except that the Commissioner may increase such maximum limitation to 5 years and 32 days if he determines such increase to be in the public interest after giving consideration to the general effect of such increase upon borrowers, the building industry, and the general economy, and"; and

(3) striking out "$10,000" in the first proviso and inserting "$15,000 nor an average amount of $2,500 per family unit."

HAZARD INSURANCE ON FHA ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

SEC. 102. Title I of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to establish a Fire and Hazard Loss Fund which shall be available to provide such fire and hazard risk coverage as the Commissioner, in his discretion, may determine to be appropriate with respect to real property acquired and held by him under the provisions of this act. For the purpose of operating such fund, the Commissioner is authorized in the name of the fund to transfer moneys and require payment of premiums or charges from any one or more of the several insurance funds established by this act and from the account established pursuant to section 2 (f) of this act, in such amounts and in such manner, including repayments of such moneys, as the Commissioner, in his discretion, shall determine. In carrying out the authority created by this section, the Commissioner and the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund shall be exempt from all taxation, assessments, levies or license fees now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. Moneys in the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund not needed for current operations of the fund shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States or in bonds or other obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, and public funds of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to purchase such other insurance protection as he may, in his discretion, determine, and he may further provide for reinsurance of any risk assumed by the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund."

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

SEC. 103. Section 203 (b) (2) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting a comma and the following: "except that with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor who is 60 years of age or older, as of the date the mortgage is endorsed for insurance, the mortgagor's payment required by this proviso may be paid by a corporation or person other than the mortgagor under such terms and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe."

SEC. 104. (a) Section 207 (b) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "to take" in the fifth sentence and inserting "(except provisions relating to housing for elderly persons) to take"; and

(2) striking out "hereunder" in the sixth sentence and inserting "hereunder (except with respect to housing designed for elderly persons, with occupancy preference therefor, as herein provided)."

(b) The second sentence of section 207 (c) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "two per family unit," and inserting "two per family unit, or if 25 percent or more of the family units are designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons in accordance with standards established by the Commissioner and if the number of bedrooms is equal to or exceeds two per family unit for such units as are not specially designed for the use of elderly persons,"; and

(2) by inserting a colon and the following provisos before the period at the end thereof: "*Provided*, That if the entire property or project is specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons in accordance with standards established by the Commissioner and the mortgagor is a financially qualified nonprofit organization acceptable to the Commissioner, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation not in excess of $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property as may be attributable to dwelling use and not in excess of 90 percent of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of such property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *And provided further*, That the Commissioner shall prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to elderly persons priorities in occupancy of the units designed for their use."

GENERAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 105. (a) Section 217 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "July 1, 1955" in the first sentence and inserting "July 1, 1956";

(2) striking out "$4,000,000,000" in the first sentence and inserting "$3,000,000,000"; and

(3) striking out "section 2" in the first and second sentences and inserting "section 2 and section 803."

(b) Section 803 (a) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after "title" in the first proviso the following: "(except mortgages insured pursuant to the provisions of this title in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing amendments of 1955)."

LOW-COST HOUSING FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES

SEC. 106. Section 221 (d) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "$7,600" in clauses (2) and (3) and inserting "$8,000";

(2) striking out "$8,600" in clauses (2) and (3) and inserting "$10,000";

(3) striking out "95 percent of the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence: *Provided*, That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 5 percent of the Commissioner's estimate of the cost of acquisition in cash or its equivalent" in clause (2) and inserting "the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence, less such amount as may be necessary to comply with the succeeding proviso: *Provided*, That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least $200 in cash or its equivalent (which amount may include amounts to cover settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, and other prepaid expenses)";

(4) striking out "95 percent of" in clause (3); and

(5) striking out "thirty" in clause (4) and inserting "forty."

APPROVAL OF COST CERTIFICATIONS

SEC. 107. Section 227 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) inserting the following new sentence between the first and second sentences: "Upon the Commissioner's approval of the mortgagor's certification as required hereunder such certification shall be final and incontestable, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor."; and

(2) striking out "legal expenses," in clauses (i) and (ii) in paragraph (c) and inserting "legal expenses, such allocations of general overhead items as are acceptable to the Commissioner,".

MILITARY HOUSING

SEC. 108. Section 803 (a) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking the last proviso and the colon which precedes it.

TITLE II—SECONDARY MORTGAGE MARKET

SEC. 201. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "; and (2)" and inserting ", (2)";

(2) striking out "if (i)" and inserting "if"; and

(3) striking out "or (ii) the original principal obligation thereof exceeds or exceeded $15,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage" and inserting ", and (3) except with respect to mortgages covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii, the Association may not purchase any mortgage offered for purchase under section 305 if the original principal obligation thereof exceeds or exceeded $15,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit."

SEC. 202. Subsection (b) of section 303 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting: "The Association shall accumulate funds for its capital surplus account from private sources by requiring each mortgage seller to make payments of nonrefundable capital contributions equal to 2 percent of the unpaid principal amounts of mortgages purchased or to be purchased by the Association from such seller or equal to such other greater or lesser percentage, but not less than 1 percent thereof, as the Association may determine from time to time, taking into consideration conditions in the mortgage market and the general economy."

SEC. 203. Subsection (a) of section 304 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "at the market price" in the second sentence and inserting "within the range of market prices."

SEC. 204. Subsection (c) of section 305 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended

by substituting "purchases" for "purchasers" in the clause preceding the proviso.

SEC. 205. Section 306 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "and subsection (e) of this section" in the last sentence of subsection (c); and

(2) repealing subsection (e).

TITLE III—URBAN RENEWAL

GENERAL

SEC. 301. (a) Section 105 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "(including any redevelopment plan constituting a part thereof)."

(b) Section 110 (b) of said act is hereby amended by striking out clause (3) and the semicolon and the word "and" which immediately precede said clause and by inserting the word "and" after the semicolon at the end of clause (1).

SEC. 302. (a) Section 110 (c) of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) 'Urban renewal project' or 'project' may include undertakings and activities of a local public agency in an urban renewal area for the elimination and for the prevention of the development or spread of slums and blight, and may involve slum clearance and redevelopment in an urban renewal area, or rehabilitation or conservation in an urban renewal area, or any combination or part thereof, in accordance with such urban renewal plan. Such undertakings and activities may include:

"(1) Acquisition of (i) a slum area or a deteriorated or deteriorating area, or (ii) land which is predominantly open and which because of obsolete platting, diversity of ownership, deterioration of structures or of site improvements, or otherwise, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the community, or (iii) open land necessary for sound community growth which is to be developed for predominantly residential uses: *Provided*, That the requirement in paragraph (a) of this section that the area to be a slum area or a blighted, deteriorated or deteriorating area shall not be applicable in the case of an open land project;

"(2) Demolition and removal of buildings and improvements;

"(3) Installation, construction, or reconstruction of streets, utilities, parks, playgrounds and other improvements necessary for carrying out in the urban renewal area the urban renewal objectives of this title in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

"(4) Disposition of any property acquired in the urban renewal area (including sale, initial leasing or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

"(5) Carrying out plans for a program of voluntary repair and rehabilitation of buildings or other improvements in accordance with the urban renewal plan; and

"(6) Acquisition of any other real property in the urban renewal area where necessary to eliminate unhealthful, insanitary or unsafe conditions, lessen density (including measures designed to reduce the vulnerability of metropolitan target zones from enemy attack), eliminate obsolete or other uses detrimental to the public welfare, or otherwise to remove or prevent the spread of blight or deterioration, or to provide land for needed public facilities.

"For the purposes of this title, the term 'project' shall not include the construction or improvement of any building, and the term 'redevelopment' and derivatives thereof shall mean development as well as redevelopment. For any of the purposes of section 109 hereof, the term 'project' shall not include any donations or provisions made as local grants-in-aid and eligible as such pursuant to clauses (2) and (3) of section 110 (d) hereof.

"Financial assistance shall not be extended under this title with respect to any urban renewal area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character unless such area will be a predominantly residential area under the urban renewal plan therefor: *Provided*, That, where such an area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character contains a substantial number of slum, blighted, deteriorated or deteriorating dwellings or other living accommodations, the elimination of which would tend to promote the public health, safety and welfare in the locality involved and such area is not appropriate for predominantly residential uses, the Administrator may extend financial assistance for such a project, but the aggregate of the capital grants made pursuant to this title with respect to such projects shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount of capital grants authorized by this title.

"In addition to all other powers hereunder vested, where land within the purview of clause (1) (ii) or (1) (iii) of the first paragraph of this subsection (whether it be predominantly residential or nonresidential in character) is to be redeveloped for predominantly nonresidential uses, loans and advances under this title may be extended therefor if the governing body of the local public agency determines that such redevelopment for predominantly nonresidential uses is necessary and appropriate to facilitate the proper growth and development of the community in accordance with sound planning standards and local community objectives and to afford maximum opportunity for the redevelopment of the project area by private enterprise: *Provided*, That loans and outstanding advances to any local public agency pursuant to the authorization of this sentence shall not exceed 2½ percent of the estimated gross project costs of the projects undertaken under other contracts with such local public agency pursuant to this title."

(b) The first sentence of section 110 (d) of said act is hereby amended by striking out the words "either the second or third sentence" in clause (2) and inserting "the second sentence."

SEC. 303. The first sentence of section 110 (d) of said act is hereby amended by striking out the phrase ", public facilities financed by special assessments against land in the project area," in clause (3) and adding the following proviso before the period at the end of the sentence: ": *And provided further*, That in any case where a public facility furnished as a local grant-in-aid is financed in whole or in part by special assessments against real property in the project area acquired by the local public agency as part of the project, an amount equal to the total special assessments against such real property (or, in the case of a computation pursuant to the proviso immediately preceding, the estimated amount of such total special assessments) shall be deducted from the cost of such facility for the purpose of computing the amount of the local grants-in-aid for the project."

SEC. 304. Section 110 (e) of said act is hereby amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "Where real property in the project area is acquired and is owned as part of the project by the local public agency and such property is not subject to ad valorem taxes by reason of its ownership by the local public agency and payments in lieu of taxes are not made on account of such property, there may (with respect to any project for which a contract of Federal assistance under this title is in force or is hereafter executed) be included, at the discretion of the Administrator, in gross project cost an amount equal to the ad valorem taxes which would have been levied upon such property if it had been subject to ad valorem taxes, but in all cases prorated for the period during which such property is owned by the local public agency as part of the project, and such amount shall also be considered a cash local grant-in-aid within the purview of section 110 (d) hereof. Such amount, and the amount of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes included in gross project cost, shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator and such rules, regulations, limitations, and conditions as he may prescribe."

DISASTER AREA

SEC. 305. (a) Add the following new heading and section at the end of title I of said act:

"DISASTER AREAS

"SEC. 111. Where the local governing body certifies, and the Administrator finds, that an urban area is in need of redevelopment or rehabilitation as a result of a flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which the President, pursuant to section 2 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters and for other purposes' (Public Law 875, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950), as amended, has determined to be a major disaster, the Administrator is authorized to extend financial assistance under this title for an urban renewal project with respect to such area without regard to the following:

"(1) The 'workable program' requirement in section 101 (c), except that any contract for temporary loan or capital grant pursuant to this section shall obligate the local public agency to comply with the 'workable program' requirement in section 101 (c) by a future date determined to be reasonable by the Administrator and specified in such contract;

"(2) The requirements in section 105 (a) (iii) and section 110 (b) (1) that the urban renewal plan conform to a general plan of the locality as a whole and to the workable program referred to in section 101 (c);

"(3) The 'relocation' requirements in section 105 (c): *Provided*, That the Administrator finds that the local public agency has presented a plan for the encouragement, to the maximum extent feasible, of the provision of dwellings suitable for the needs of families displaced by the catastrophe or by redevelopment or rehabilitation activities;

"(4) The 'public hearing' requirement in section 105 (d);

"(5) The requirements in sections 102 and 110 that the urban renewal area be a slum area or a blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating area; and

"(6) The requirements in section 110 with respect to the predominantly residential character or reuse of urban renewal areas.

"In the preparation of the urban renewal plan with respect to a project aided under this section, the local public agency shall give due regard to the removal or relocation of dwellings from the site of recurring floods or other recurring catastrophes in the project area."

(b) Clause (d) (1) (A) of section 220 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(A) be located in (i) the area of a slum clearance and urban redevelopment project covered by a Federal-aid contract executed, or a prior approval granted, pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, before the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954, or (ii) an urban renewal area (as defined in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended) in a community respecting which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the certification to the Commissioner provided for by subsection 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, or (iii) the area of an urban renewal project assisted under section 111 of the Housing Act of 1949, as

amended: *Provided*, That, in the case of an area within the purview of clause (i) or (ii) of this sentence, a redevelopment plan or an urban renewal plan (as defined in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended), as the case may be, has been approved for such area by the governing body of the locality involved and by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and said Administrator has certified to the Commisisoner that such plan conforms to a general plan for the locality as a whole and that there exist the necessary authority and financial capacity to assure the completion of such redevelopment or urban renewal plan: *And provided further*, That, in the case of an area within the purview of clause (iii) of this sentence, an urban renewal plan (as required for projects assisted under said section 111) has been approved for such area by the said governing body and by the said Administrator, and the said Administrator has certified to the Commissioner that such plan conforms to definite local objectives respecting appropriate land uses, improved traffic, public transportation, public utilities, recreational and community facilities, and other public improvements, and that there exist the necessary authority and financial capacity to asure the completion of such urban renewal plan, and".

(c) Section 221 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) adding immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence the words ", or (3) there is being carried out an urban renewal project assisted under section 111 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended"; and

(2) striking out "clause (2)" in the places it appears in the last proviso and substituting "clause (2) or (3)."

(d) The second sentence of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The Administrator is further authorized to make planning grants for similar planning work: (1) in metropolitan and regional areas to official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agencies empowered under State or local laws to perform such planning; (2) to cities, other municipalities, and counties having a population of 25,000 or more according to the latest decennial census which have suffered substantial damage as a result of a flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which the President, pursuant to section 2 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters and for other purposes' (Public Law 875, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950), as amended, has determined to be a major disaster; and (3) to State planning agencies for the provision of planning assistance to such cities, other municipalities, and counties referred to in clause (2) hereof."

PLANNING AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 306. The last sentence of said section 701 is hereby amended by striking out "$5 million" and inserting "$10 million."

TITLE IV—PUBLIC HOUSING

LOW-RENT HOUSING

SEC. 401. (a) Subsection (i) of section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as of August 1, 1956, to read as follows:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law the authority may enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 31, 1956, for not more than 35,000 additional dwelling units, which amount shall be increased by 35,000 additional dwelling units on July 1, 1957, and may enter into only such new contracts for preliminary loans in respect thereto as are consistent with the number of dwelling units for which contracts for annual contributions may be entered into hereunder: *Provided*, That the authority to enter into new contracts for annual contributions with respect to each such 35,000 additional dwelling units shall terminate 2 years after the first date on which such authority may be exercised under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional unit shall be entered into except with respect to low-rent housing for a locality respecting which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the determination and certification relating to a workable program as prescribed in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended: *And provided further*, That no new contracts for loans and annual contributions for additional dwelling units in excess of the number authorized in this sentence shall be entered into unless authorized by the Congress."

(b) Clause (2) of the third proviso appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration" is hereby repealed.

SEC. 402. Section 101 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following after the first comma therein: "or for annual contributions or capital grants pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for any project or projects not constructed or covered by a contract for annual contributions prior to August 1, 1956,"

SEC. 403. Subsection (d) of section 21 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the figure "10" in both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "15."

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

SEC. 404. (a) Section 2 of said act is hereby amended by adding the following at the end of subsection (2) thereof: "The term 'families' means families consisting of two or more persons, a single person 65 years of age or over, or the remaining member of a tenant family. The term 'elderly families' means families the head of which or his spouse is 65 years of age or over."

(b) Section 10 of said act is hereby amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(m) For the purpose of increasing the supply of low-rent housing for elderly families, the Authority may assist the construction of new housing or the remodeling of existing housing in order to provide accommodations designed specifically for such families. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 10 (g), any public-housing agency, in respect to dwelling units suitable to the needs of elderly families may extend a prior preference to such families: *Provided*, That as among such families, the 'First' preference in subsection 10 (g) shall apply.

(c) Section 15 of said act is hereby amended by inserting after the word "Alaska" in subparagraph (5) thereof, the following: "or $2,250 in the case of accommodations designed specifically for elderly families."

FARM-LABOR CAMPS

SEC. 405. Section 12 of said act is hereby amended by adding the following at the end of subsection (f) thereof: "Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, upon the filing of a request therefor within 12 months after the effective date of this sentence, the Authority shall relinquish, transfer, and convey, without monetary consideration, all of its rights, title, and interest in and with respect to any such project or any part thereof (including such land as is determined by the Authority to be reasonably necessary to the operation of such project and contractual rights to revenues, reserves, and other proceeds therefrom) to any public-housing agency whose area of operation includes the project, upon a finding and certification by the public-housing agency (which shall be conclusive upon the Authority) that the project is needed to house persons and families of low income and that preference for occupancy in the project will be given first to low-income agricultural workers and their families and second to other low-income persons and their families. Upon the relinquishment and transfer of any such project it shall cease to be a low-rent project within the meaning of this act, and the Authority shall have no further jurisdiction over the same, except that in any conveyance hereunder the Authority may reserve to the United States of America any mineral rights of whatsoever nature upon, in, or under the property, including the right of access to and the use of such parts of the surface of the property as may be necessary for mining and saving the minerals. Any project or part thereof not relinquished or conveyed or under a contract for disposal pursuant to this subsection shall be disposed of by the Authority pursuant to subsection (e) of section 13 of this act, notwithstanding the parenthetical clause in said subsection."

DISPOSITION OF DEFENSE HOUSING

SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, there are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, effective July 1, 1956, all right, title, and interest, including contractual rights and obligations and any reversionary interest, held by the Federal Government in and with respect to all real and personal property comprising the following housing projects:

Project No.:	Location
Ala-1D1	Ozark, Ala.
Ala-1D2	Ozark, Ala.
Ala-2D1	Foley, Ala.
Ala-2D2	Foley, Ala.
Ariz-1D1	Yuma, Ariz.
Ariz-1D2	Yuma, Ariz.
Ariz-3D1	Flagstaff, Ariz.
Cal-3D1	Oceanside, Calif.
Cal-3D2	Oceanside, Calif.
Cal-4D1	Miramar, Calif.
Cal-6D1	San Ysidro, Calif.
Cal-7D2	Barstow, Calif.
Cal-9D1	Barstow, Calif.
Cal-9D2	Barstow, Calif.
Cal-10D1	Twenty-nine Palms, Calif.
Colo-1D1	Colorado Springs, Colo.
Fla-2D1	Green Cove Springs, Fla
Fla-4D1	Milton, Fla.
Fla-8032	Pensacola, Fla.
Fla-8084	Pensacola, Fla.
Ga-1D1	Hinesville, Ga.
Kan-3D1	Hutchinson, Kans.
Me-4D1	Brunswick, Maine
Md-1D1	Bainbridge, Md.
Mo-1D1	Waynesville, Mo.
Mo-2D1	Waynesville, Mo.
Mo-4D1	Waynesville, Mo.
Mo-5D1	Waynesville, Mo.
Nev-2D1	Fallon, Nev.
NC-1D1	Camp LeJeune, N. C.
NC-3D1	Camp LeJeune, N. C.
NC-4D1	Elizabeth City, N. C.
Pa-36011	Philadelphia, Pa.
Pa-36012	Philadelphia, Pa.
RI-1D1	Portsmouth, R. I.
RI-2D1	Portsmouth, R. I.
Tex-2D1	Kingsville, Tex.
Tex-3D1	Hondo, Tex.
Tex-5D1	Beesville, Tex.
Tex-5D2	Beesville, Tex.
Tex-6D1	Mission, Tex.
Va-6D1	Quantico, Va.
Va-10D1	Yorktown, Va.
Va-12D1	Yorktown, Va.
Va-13D1	Williamsburg, Va.

The provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, and of the act entitled "An act to expedite the pro-

vision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, shall not apply to any property transferred hereunder and, except as otherwise provided herein, the laws relating to similar property of the Department of Defense shall be applicable to the property transferred.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, any housing constructed or acquired under the provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, which is not transferred under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall, as expeditiously as possible, but not later than June 30, 1957, be disposed of on a competitive-bid basis to the highest responsible bidder upon such terms and after such public advertisement as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may deem in the public interest; except that the Administrator may reject any bid which he deems less than the fair-market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation: *Provided*, That project No. IDA–2D1 at Colbalt, Idaho, shall be sold only for use on the site.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby directed to convey housing project No. RK–37013 to the Housing Authority of the City of Newport, R. I., pursuant to the provisions of section 606 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of that section or of any other law, the agreement required by that section shall permit the use of the project in whole or in part for the housing of military personnel without regard to their income, and shall require the authority, in selecting tenants, to give a first preference in respect to 360 dwelling units to such military personnel as the Secretary of Defense or his designee prescribes for 3 years after the date of conveyance and to give 30 days' advance notice of available vacancies to such designee.

SEC. 407. The act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section 614:

"SEC. 614 (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, (1) any housing to be sold onsite determined by the Administrator to be permanent, located on lands owned by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the Administrator, which is not relinquished, transferred, under contract of sale, sold or otherwise disposed of by the Administrator under other provisions of this act or under the provisions of other law by January 1, 1957, except housing which is determined by the Administrator by that date to be suitable for sale in accordance with section 607 (b) of this act; and (2) any permanent housing to be sold offsite which is not relinquished, transferred, under contract of sale, sold, or otherwise disposed of prior to the effective date of this section shall be disposed of, as expeditiously as possible, on a competitive basis to the highest responsible bidder upon such terms and after such public advertisement as the Administrator may deem in the public interest; except that the Administrator may reject any bid which he deems less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, all contracts entered into after the enactment of this section for the sale, transfer, or other disposal of housing (other than housing subject to the provisions of section 607 (b) of this act) determined by the Administrator to be permanent, except contracts entered into pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, shall require that if title does not pass to the purchaser by April 1, 1957 (or within 60 days thereafter if such time is necessary to cure defects in title in accordance with the provisions of the contract), the rights of the purchaser shall terminate and thereafter the housing shall be sold under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof. For the purposes of this subsection, title shall be considered to have passed upon the execution of a conditional sales contract.

"(c) The dates set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not be subject to change by virtue of the proivsions of section 611 of this act.".

TITLE V—COLLEGE HOUSING

SEC. 501. Subsection (d) of section 401 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$500,000,000" and inserting "$600,000,000."

SEC. 502. Subsection (c) of said section 401 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) A loan to an educational institution may be in an amount not exceeding the total development cost of the facility, as determined by the Administrator; shall be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding 50 years, as may be determined by him; and with respect to loan contracts entered into after the date of enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1956 shall bear interest at a rate equal to the total of one-quarter of 1 percent per annum added to the rate of interest then chargeable by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (e) of this section."

SEC. 503. Subsection (e) of said section 401 is hereby amended by striking the second sentence and substituting the following: "Such notes or other obligations issued to obtain funds for loan contracts entered into after the effective date of the Housing Amendments of 1956 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the annual rate for each calendar quarter as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of February or May or August or November, as the case may be, next preceding each such calendar quarter, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month of February or May or August or November, and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent."

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

HOUSING DATA

SEC. 601. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby specifically authorized to undertake such surveys, studies, and compilations and analyses of statistical data and other information as he determines to be necessary in the exercise of his responsibilities, including the formulation and carrying out of national housing policies and programs. In discharging this responsibility, the Administrator may utilize the available facilities of other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government, and such departments, establishments, and agencies shall confer with and advise the Administrator, at his request, on improvements in any existing or proposed systems and techniques for gathering and reporting housing and related data. The Administrator may disseminate (without regard to the provisions of 39 United States Code 321n) any data or information, acquired or held under this section, in such form as he shall determine to be most useful to departments, establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government or State or local governments, to industry, and to the general public. Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Administrator under title III of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, or any other provision of law.

The summary presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

SUMMARY—HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1956

The housing amendments of 1956 would provide new assistance to housing for the elderly both through the FHA mortgage insurance programs and the low-rent public-housing program. Sufficient mortgage insurance authorization would be provided for another year of FHA operations and the FHA military housing program would be extended on a permanent basis. An additional 70,000 units of low-rent public housing, to be contracted for over a 2-year period, would be authorized for communities which will participate in an integrated attack on slums and blight. Urban renewal would be given new assistance through the liberalization of FHA insurance terms for the repair and rehabilitation of housing and the provision of low-cost housing for families displaced by urban renewal. In addition, the authorization for Federal grants to State and regional planning agencies to assist urban planning would be doubled. The Federal National Mortgage Association's secondary mortgage market operations would be broadened. The authorization for college housing loans would be increased and changes made in the program to encourage more participation by private lenders. New provisions would be enacted to expedite the disposal of the remaining defense and World War II housing and other properties still held by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. A number of other perfecting changes would be made in the laws governing the programs of that agency.

Following is a brief summary of the provisions of the housing amendments of 1956 in the order in which they appear in the bill:

FHA TITLE I HOME REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The FHA title I home repair and improvement program would be amended to—

1. Eliminate the expiration date of the program (September 30, 1956) and make the program permanent;

2. Increase the maximum amounts of the loans which can be insured under the program from $2,500 to $3,500 for home improvement and nonresidential loans, and from $10,000 to $15,000 for loans for the improvement of structures housing two or more families; and

3. Authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to increase the maximum term of home improvement and nonresidential loans from 3 years (the present limit) up to 5 years, if he determines that such increase is in the public interest.

HAZARD INSURANCE ON FHA ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

The Federal Housing Commissioner would be authorized to establish a fire and hazard loss fund to provide self-insurance coverage with respect to real property acquired by FHA under any of its programs.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY—FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE

The regular FHA section 203 sales housing program would be amended to permit a third party to provide the downpayment required for the purchase of a home where the mortgagor would be a person 60 years of age or older. Combined with existing authority, the third party could make the downpayment and also become a cosigner of the mortgage note for an elderly person lacking adequate credit.

The FHA section 207 rental housing program would be amended to provide liberal

mortgage insurance for multifamily housing where at least 25 percent of the units in the project are expressly designed for the use of the elderly and a priority of occupancy for these units is given to the elderly throughout the life of the mortgage insurance contract. The maximum amount of the mortgage in these cases would be 90 percent of value where the mortgage does not exceed $7,200 per family unit without regard to the present requirements as to the average number of bedrooms.

A second amendment of the FHA section 207 rental housing program would provide more liberal mortgage insurance for multifamily housing designed and held entirely for elderly persons and sponsored by nonprofit organizations approved by the FHA as to financial responsibility. The maximum amount of the mortgage in these cases would be $8,100 per dwelling unit and the mortgage could be 90 percent of replacement cost instead of 90 percent of value.

GENERAL FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

The FHA mortgage insurance authorization would be increased to make available $3 billion of this authorization for the next fiscal year. The balance of the present authorization would be included in this amount.

LIBERALIZATION OF SECTION 221 LOW-COST HOUSING FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES

The FHA section 221 program for the housing of displaced families (for both single family homes, and for multifamily housing of nonprofit corporations) would be liberalized—

1. By increasing the maximum amount of mortgages which can be insured from $7,600 to $8,000 per dwelling unit and from $8,600 to $10,000 per dwelling unit in high-cost areas;

2. To permit the mortgage to equal the value of the property except that the mortgagor, in the case of a single-family home, would be required to make an initial payment of $200 in cash or its equivalent, which amount could include settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, and other prepaid expenses (present maximum is 95 percent of value and downpayment of 5 percent of estimated cost on single-family homes); and

3. By increasing the maximum maturity of the mortgage from 30 years to 40 years.

APPROVAL OF COST CERTIFICATIONS MADE FINAL

The cost certification of a mortgagor with respect to a multifamily housing project would be made final and incontestable after the Federal Housing Commissioner had approved the certification, except where there is fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor. It would also be made clear that allocations of general overhead items can be included as part of the actual cost of the project. These amendments would remove doubts and fears on the part of prospective sponsors of multifamily housing that their cost certifications may be reexamined and questioned from time to time over an indefinite period of years and as to what can be included in the cost of a project for cost-certification purposes.

EXTENSION OF THE CAPEHART MILITARY HOUSING PROGRAM

The FHA mortgage insurance authority for the Capehart military housing program would be extended on a permanent basis.

FNMA SECONDARY MORTGAGE MARKET

The present $15,000 limit on the amount of an FHA or VA mortgage which can be purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association would be removed with respect to mortgages purchased by FNMA in its secondary market operations. The $15,000 limit would continue to be applicable to mortgages offered by FNMA purchase under the special assistance functions of FNMA, except where the mortgages cover property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii. The principal amount of any mortgage purchased by FNMA in its secondary market operations, including Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii mortgages, would of course be limited by the amount permitted under FHA insurance or VA guaranty legislation.

REDUCTION IN CAPITAL CONTRIBUTION TO FNMA BY MORTGAGE SELLERS MADE POSSIBLE

The present requirement that mortgage sellers must subscribe to FNMA common stock in an amount equal to 3 percent of the unpaid amount of the mortgages, or such greater percentages as may from time to time be determined by FNMA, would be changed. The amendment would provide that sellers of mortgages to FNMA under its secondary market operations would be required to make capital contributions to FNMA equal to 2 percent of the unpaid principal amount of mortgages purchased or to be purchased by the Association, or such other greater or lesser percentage, but not less than 1 percent, as may from time to time be determined by the Association, taking into consideration conditions in the mortgage market and the general economy.

MORTGAGE PURCHASE PRICES TO BE ESTABLISHED WITHIN THE RANGE OF MARKET PRICES

FNMA would be authorized to establish the prices to be paid for mortgages purchased in its secondary market operations within the range of market prices for the particular class of mortgages involved instead of at the market price as presently required.

URBAN RENEWAL PLANS

An unnecessary requirement would be removed from the present law under which an identifiable urban redevelopment plan must be part of an urban renewal plan if redevelopment of part of the urban renewal area is planned along with rehabilitation and conservation of the balance of the area.

CHANGES IN DEFINITION OF URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT

The definition of urban renewal project in the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, would be amended to make the whole urban renewal areas (instead of merely the area to be cleared, as under present law) subject to the predominantly residential requirement. Under the present predominantly residential requirement, an urban redevelopment area (i. e., the area to be cleared) must, with certain exceptions, either be predominantly residential to begin with or else be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses. This change would thus make the requirement consistent with other requirements in title I which apply to the whole urban renewal area. The definition would also be amended to consolidate the provisions relating to slum clearance and redevelopment with those relating to rehabilitation and conservation.

LOSS OF CERTAIN TAX REVENUES AS URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT COST

A new provision would permit an amount equal to the ad valorem taxes on real property acquired by a local public agency in an urban renewal project to be included in the gross project cost if the local public agency has not paid such taxes or made payments in lieu of taxes during the time the real property was in its possession. This would provide for equitable treatment as between communities which receive tax payments on real property held by a local public agency and those which do not.

URBAN RENEWAL IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

The Housing Administrator would be authorized to extend urban renewal assistance to major disaster areas, under certain conditions, without regard to requirements that the community must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums, that the urban renewal plan must conform to a general plan of the locality, requirements of public hearings, and certain requirements with respect to the predominantly residential character or blighted character of urban renewal areas.

The FHA sections 220 and 221 urban renewal housing programs would also be amended to permit temporary waiver of the present workable program requirement, and urban planning grants would be permitted for a community affected by a major disaster without regard to the fact that the community's population is 25,000 or greater.

URBAN PLANNING AUTHORIZATION INCREASED

The urban planning grant authorization would be increased from $5 million to $10 million.

SEVENTY THOUSAND ADDITIONAL LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS AUTHORIZED

New loan and annual contributions contracts would be authorized for not more than 35,000 additional low-rent public housing units after July 31, 1956, and an additional 35,000 on and after July 1, 1957. Each 35,000 increment would be available for contracting until 2 years after it first becomes available.

WORKABLE PROGRAM REQUIREMENT RESTORED FOR LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

The previous requirement that the locality must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums before a contract could be entered into for Federal assistance to low-rent public housing (which was dropped by the Housing Amendments of 1955) would be restored to the law.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Single persons 65 years of age or over with low incomes would be made eligible for low-rent public housing units, and local housing authorities would also be permitted to extend a prior preference, as among low-income families which are eligible applicants for occupancy of dwellings of given sizes and at specified rents, to elderly families (including single persons 65 years of age or over) for any low-rent housing designed specially for, or suitable to the needs of, such elderly families. As among applicants eligible for this preference, those displaced by slum clearance or other governmental action would be given a first preference. The limit of $1,750 per room on the cost of low-rent public housing would be increased to $2,250 per room where units are designed specifically for elderly families.

TRANSFER OF FARM LABOR CAMPS

The Public Housing Administration would be directed to transfer farm labor camps without monetary consideration to local public housing agencies in the areas of the camps if requested within 12 months after enactment of the bill and the local public housing agency certifies as to the low-rent need for the project and that preferences will be given, first, to low-income agricultural workers and, second, to other low-income persons and families.

DISPOSAL OF DEFENSE HOUSING

Provision would be made for the disposal of the temporary or relocatable Korean defense housing projects still held by the housing agency—about 10,000 units. Forty-two of these projects, plus three World War II projects (on or near military reservations), needed for continuing use by military personnel would be transferred to the Department of Defense, effective July 1, 1956. The remainder of this defense housing held by the housing agency would be sold to the highest bidder not later than June 30, 1957 (unless previously disposed of under other

provisions of law). The Tonomy Hill World War II project at Newport, R. I., would be transferred to the local housing authority. However, a first preference would have to be given to military personnel in a certain number of units in that project for 3 years.

MODIFICATION OF WAR HOUSING SALES PREFERENCE PROVISIONS

A new provision would be added to the Lanham Act designed to accelerate the disposition of two classes of permanent war housing. One class consists of housing which is to be sold for removal from the site. The other consists of projects to be sold onsite which cannot be subdivided in such a manner as to offer for separate sale dwelling structures designed for occupancy by not more than four families. In the first class of housing the existing sales preference requirements would be eliminated effective upon enactment of the bill, and in the second class, all preference requirements would be terminated with respect to the onsite sale of the nondivisible projects which the Housing Agency holds on January 1, 1957, as of that date. All housing disposed of under the new provision must be disposed of as expeditiously as possible on a competitive basis to the highest responsible bidder, except that the Housing Administrator may reject any bid which he determines to be less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation.

INCREASE IN COLLEGE HOUSING LOAN FUND AUTHORIZATION

The college housing revolving loan fund authorization would be increased from $500 million to $600 million.

INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES—COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

The formula in the present law with respect to the interest rate paid by the Housing Administrator on funds borrowed from the United States Treasury for college housing loans would be changed to provide that such funds shall bear interest at a rate, calculated each calendar quarter, based on the current average market yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a remaining maturity of 15 or more years. This formula would be in place of the formula now in the law which bases the interest rate on the average rate borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States, irrespective of maturity, as computed at the end of the preceding fiscal year, or 2½ percent, whichever is higher. The rate proposed by the bill would currently result in the Housing Administrator paying 2⅞ percent on funds borrowed from the Treasury. Under the present law, the rate for fiscal year 1956 is 2½ percent.

The bill would also require the Housing Administrator, in making college housing loans, to charge a rate equal to that payable by him to the Treasury plus one-fourth of 1 percent. The present law provides for a similar spread, except that if the resulting rate is less than 2¾ percent, the higher rate must be charged. Because of the different base to which the one-fourth percent differential would be applied under the bill as compared with the present law, the net result of the bill, under current market conditions, would be to change the college housing loan interest rate from 2¾ percent to 3⅛ percent.

These changes are designed to increase participation by private lenders in bond issues sold by colleges to finance college housing construction.

HOUSING DATA

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be authorized to undertake such surveys, studies, and compilations and analyses of statistical data and other information as he determines to be necessary in the exercise of his responsibilities, including the formulation and carrying out of national housing policies and programs. He would utilize the available facilities of other Government agencies, and such agencies would be required to confer with and advise the Administrator, at his request, on improvements in any existing or proposed systems and techniques for gathering and reporting housing and related data.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, RELATING TO JURISDICTION IN CERTAIN REEMPLOYMENT CASES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in the Federal courts in certain reemployment cases.

This bill is designed to clarify and confirm the jurisdiction with which the Federal courts are vested to enforce the reemployment rights granted by section 9 (g) (3) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act—title 50, United States Code, Appendix, section 451 and the following—to certain reservists and persons who have been rejected for military service.

The Federal district court for the District of Colorado, in the case of *Christner v. Poudre Valley Cooperative* (134 F. Supp. 115), decided on July 13, 1955, that the court is without jurisdiction to enforce section 9 (g) (3) which, unlike sections 9 (g) (1) and 9 (g) (2) does not specifically refer to the rights and benefits provided by section 9 generally.

The statute provides that employees covered by the section—in the main, reservists called up for training duty only—shall be granted a leave of absence by their employers for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining physical fitness to enter or performing training duty in the Armed Forces. Upon their release from training duty or rejection, and after making proper application, these employees are entitled to be reinstated in their positions.

While comparatively few cases under section 9 (g) (3) have been presented for litigation, the existence of a clearly recognized remedy in the Federal courts under reemployment legislation is believed to be of vital importance in minimizing litigation and facilitating the administration and enforcement of this phase of the act.

Section 9 (d) of the act, as originally enacted in 1948, conferred jurisdiction upon Federal courts to enforce compliance with the provisions of sections 9 (b) and 9 (c) (1) of the act. The act, as it now stands, also includes three other sections—9 (g) (1), 9 (g) (2), and 9 (g) (3)—granting and defining rights. None of these sections specifically authorizes the Federal courts to enforce the rights it describes. However, sections 9 (g) (1) and 9 (g) (2)—which embrace inductees, enlistees, and reservists on active duty—provide that the persons affected shall be entitled to all reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by section 9 of the act for persons inducted under the section. This reference would, of course, include enforcement rights under section 9 (d).

An appeal from the Christener decision has been taken by the Department of Justice and is now pending in the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. However, the matter may not be finally resolved by this appellate court for many months. In the interim, as long as the decision of the district court stands, reservists and rejectees covered by section 9 (g) (3) of the act may, in many instances, find reemployment delayed or denied upon their return from the Armed Forces. In other jurisdictions, employers and the courts might tend to be influenced by the precedent of the Christener case. The reversal of the district court would still leave a situation in which the question of jurisdiction can be raised in each of the other nine circuits. Thus, the thousands of reservists who are called up periodically to serve short periods of training duty, or merely for the determination of their physical fitness, may be confronted with obstacles which Congress sought to eliminate in facilitating their orderly return to civilian employment. This result would be disruptive of the reemployment pattern which is so important a feature of the act.

To prevent hardship to trainees and rejectees who may be denied rights because of the Christener decision and to guide employers who might incur liability through following that decision, I am introducing this bill in the hope that this correction will be approved by Congress as soon as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, which is very brief, may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3307) to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in the Federal courts in certain reemployment cases, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "subsection (b) or subsection (c) (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "this section."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect as of June 19, 1951.

AMENDMENT OF RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL ACT OF 1953—AMENDMENT

Mr. BEALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1207 at Louisville, Ky., which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today a list of 86 persons for appointment, promotion, and designation in the Foreign Service of the United States. I desire to give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION ON TOMORROW OF SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was my intention today to request unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for not to exceed 15 minutes, in reply to the speech made yesterday of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], attacking Secretary of State Dulles. However, Mr. President, in light of the tragic death of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from West Virginia, HARLEY KILGORE, and after consulting with the majority leader and the minority leader, I have decided to postpone my remarks until tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow I be given the floor for 15 minutes, after the close of the morning business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have consulted with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, and I wholeheartedly concur in his request. I want the distinguished Senator from New Jersey to realize that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] holds the floor, after the morning hour; and it is possible that he will still be speaking on tomorrow. But I think I am at liberty to say that I believe he will have no objection to the allowance of 15 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey. Therefore, I hope the request of the Senator from New Jersey will be granted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Texas.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MAJ. GEN. DENNIS A. NOLAN

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, today in Arlington Cemetery there was laid to rest a great American soldier and patriot—Maj. Gen. Dennis A. Nolan.

During his long and brilliant military career, General Nolan saw service in many parts of the world. In World War I, he was chief of military intelligence under General Pershing.

In October 1918, General Nolan was in command of the 55th Infantry Brigade of the 28th Division, the renowned Iron Division of the Pennsylvania National Guard, in which I had the honor of commanding a regiment. At that time the Germans were making desperate efforts to repulse the fresh advances of our troops in their march to victory in the Meuse-Argonne campaign. In that terrific struggle General Nolan demonstrated his genius as a military tactician. In addition, he exhibited bravery of an exemplary character. He was literally on the front line at all times, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism in personally directing the movements of his tanks under machinegun and artillery fire.

General Nolan was an inspiring leader and an outstanding American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a biographical sketch outlining General Nolan's distinguished military and civic career.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gen. Dennis A. Nolan was born in Akron, N. Y., on April 22, 1872. At West Point he distinguished himself as an All-American end on the football team and as left-fielder on the baseball team.

Two years after his graduation from the military academy in 1896, he was fighting against the Spaniards in Cuba and won the Silver Star for bravery. The next year, he commanded a cavalry squadron in the Philippine Insurrection.

He was promoted to first lieutenant December 4, 1898; to captain July 6, 1901; to major July 1, 1916; to lieutenant colonel January 1, 1920, and to brigadier general July 3, 1920, but this was a recess appointment and expired March 4, 1921. While serving in France he had the temporary rank of brigadier general. He was reappointed brigadier general April 27, 1921, and was made a major general January 18, 1925.

He was on duty with the War Department in April 1917, when the United States entered World War I. The next month he sailed for France with General Pershing, and organized the military intelligence unit for the American Expeditionary Forces.

General Nolan's work as intelligence chief won him the Distinguished Service Medal. France gave him the Croix de Guerre and Britain made him a Commander of the Bath. Other decorations were conferred upon him by Italy, Belgium and the Republic of Panama.

After the war, General Nolan served on a subcommittee of the Peace Conference drafting details of German disarmament. In 1926 and 1927, he was deputy chief of staff and served on the American delegation to the Commission on Reduction of Armaments at Geneva.

From 1927 to 1931, General Nolan commanded the Fifth Corps Area with headquarters at Columbus, Ohio. From 1931 until his retirement in 1936, at the age of 65, he commanded the Second Corps Area with headquarters on Governors Island, N. Y.

After retirement, General Nolan turned to civic activities and directed his efforts toward building the defensive strength of America on every front. For 7 years he served as chairman of the Citizens Budget Commission of New York, working for budget reductions and economy in city, State, and Federal Government.

THE TERRIBLE TOLL OF ACCIDENTS IN INDUSTRY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each year our Nation suffers a severe and largely avoidable toll because of accidents. One such sphere of accidents is regrettably in American industry.

The latest estimates are that in 1955, almost 2 million American workers were disabled, and in 14,200 instances were killed, by on-the-job injuries. 1.8 million employees suffered injuries which disabled them at least a full day. 76,800 suffered permanent physical impairments.

This, Mr. President, is a shocking toll. Of course, American industry is on the lookout toward reducing this toll to the greatest possible extent. United States management has installed all sorts of safety devices, and procedures have been adopted for the widest range of precautions. However, it is obvious that there is still abundant room for further efforts to cut down the accident toll.

I send to the desk the text of an article published in the Thursday, February 23 issue of the newspaper Labor's Daily. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEATH, ACCIDENT RATE ON JOB HIGH IN 1955

WASHINGTON.—Nearly 2 million workers were killed or disabled by on-the-job injuries during 1955, according to survey estimates by the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The approximate estimate was 1,930,000 of whom 14,200 or more were killed and 76,800 suffered permanent physical impairments ranking from an amputation of a finger to complete and permanent disability.

The other 1,839,000 received injuries which disabled them at least a full day; the average disability was about 17 days.

The total loss to the Nation and to the injured workers in production time during the year was some 39 million man-days. (This was about a third more than the time loss through strikes and lockouts.)

And an estimate of the total loss over future potential productive years, when the deaths and permanent disabilities are figured in, is some 193 million man-days.

The figures were higher than those of the previous year, mainly because of a higher rate of employment and slightly longer hours of work, the bureau said.

Only a few thousand more Americans were killed during the entire Korean war.

The most dangerous occupations are farming, mining, and logging.

The latter traditionally has the highest rate of disability per man-hours worked while mining has the highest rate of deaths per man-hour worked.

There were 413 coal miners killed during the year, and some 19,710 badly injured. By far the largest segment of the deaths was caused by roof falls.

Estimates of deaths by industry:

Agriculture, 3,700; contract construction, 2,400; Government service and miscellaneous, 2,300; manufacturing, 2,100; trade, 1,400; transportation, 1,300; mining, 800; public utilities, 200.

The agriculture figures are an absolute minimum, since injuries and deaths received doing daily chores were not counted.

Here are the occupations which are most dangerous, according to the rate of disabling work injuries per man-hours worked, in order of frequency; logging, iron mining, coal mining, lumber working, garbage collecting, trucking and warehousing, fire fighting, police jobs, special trade construction, heavy construction (not highway), water supply jobs, lumber trades, dairy trades.

The safest jobs are in telephone communications, banks and insurance work, radio, and telecasting, apparel trades, general merchandising and manufacturing of electrical machinery and instruments, in that order.

DEMOCRATIC CRITICISM OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I listened in this Chamber yesterday to an unfortunate speech by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and to supporting statements by four of his Democratic colleagues. The speech and statements were, in my opinion, an unwarranted partisan attack upon our Secretary of State and the foreign policies so ably carried on by him.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I heard the testimony of the Secretary of State before that committee on last Friday. Under the sharpest kind of partisan questioning, the whole of the Secretary's testimony was distorted for purposes of a partisan attack. On Sunday the Secretary of State in a prepared speech amplified and stated with admirable clarity the very policies which were under attack on the Senate floor yesterday. Yet none of his attackers saw fit even to refer to that speech, but they contented themselves with attacks on a few words taken out of context, rather than the whole of what he has said on the subject.

It is not my purpose today to inject a partisan note into these proceedings. It is my purpose only to serve notice that I shall at the next session of this body undertake to demonstrate that yesterday's attacks upon the Secretary of State have been motivated by partisanship and are based on a deliberate distortion of the Secretary's own policies.

I can understand why the Senator from Arkansas and his Democratic colleagues feel that the success of Secretary Dulles' policies are bad campaign politics for their party. But I regret their making that success a partisan issue. I am certain that the Amercan people will regard his successes as good news for the country.

HIGH COST POWER MEANS END OF NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the water which courses down the Columbia River and its tributaries is the most valuable natural asset of the Pacific Northwest States. The extent to which it is developed and utilized by man is the yardstick by which the region's material progress can be measured. Throughout our region's history the Columbia has been our major transportation artery. Along its banks, our cities have risen and farms have spread. But the Columbia also has great impact on the lives of people in an industrial economy. The Columbia and its tributary streams are the region's only source of energy to drive factory wheels, smelt aluminum, or do the thousand-and-one other chores of a mechanized age.

Last fall I had an opportunity to discuss the value of our vast supply of falling water in a series of "partnership" debates in the eastern section of Oregon. I pointed out repeatedly that our region could never become an industrial empire if it sacrificed the prevailing Bonneville rate for industries of 2.2 mills a kilowatt-hour in favor the the average Pacific Power & Light Co. industrial rate of 8.2 mills. Low-cost power is the key to achieving full economic maturity in the Pacific Northwest. When such a huge potential exists for low-cost power, the imposing of high electric rates would have the same effect on our region as if the growth of a child were stopped at the age of 12.

My warning, of course, has been disregarded at Hells Canyon, where Idaho Power Co., with the highest rates of any major utility in the Northwest, is taking over the magnificent Hells Canyon high dam site. Hells Canyon should have become part of the 2.2-mill Bonneville power system.

Now comes ominous news for the Pacific Northwest.

The Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. and the Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp. have announced that they can buy power from improved new steam plants in the Ohio Valley for 4 mills a kilowatt-hour. I do not intend to convey the thought that regions with great coal-bearing bodies should not be permitted to reach their full economic potential. But, this development has great significance for the Pacific Northwest States.

It is an announcement of grim foreboding for Oregon and the State of Washington, particularly since the policies of Interior Secretary McKay has doomed new Federal starts like Hells Canyon Dam for the Bonneville power network.

D. A. Rhoades, Kaiser general manager, made this disturbing statement:

> The real significance lies in the fact that the aluminum industry is no longer dependent upon locations close to large hydroelectric installations which are remote from industrial markets. We are convinced that it is a turning point for the rapidly expanding aluminum industry.

And I am convinced that this is a turning point for the Pacific Northwest—downward. Steam power at 4 mills in the Ohio Valley, plus favoritism in the Northwest to the private utilities with their 8.2-mill industrial rates, can only result in the drying up of our region's one brightest hope for a source of new payrolls to absorb the employment slack taking place in lumber.

I have quoted many times from the Stanford Research Institute report, which announced that aluminum had brought 85,000 new jobs to our Northwest—needed jobs and permanent payrolls. But this expansion slackened as we ran out of new generators to come onto the line. With the dams started by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman being finished and their capacity gobbled up, what would our region do for low-cost power?

Secretary McKay choked off new Federal starts so the private utilities could preempt such choice sites as Hells Canyon and John Day, either through "partnership" or outright surrender.

Now the chickens have come home to roost, so soon. We are running out of additional supplies of 2.2-mill Bonneville kilowatt-hours for industry. The administration holds that the only possible replacements are kilowatt-hours of the Pacific Power & Light variety, at an average industrial price of 8.2 mills. But Kaiser and Olin Mathieson can buy steam energy in the Ohio Valley, right at the back door of the consuming centers of America, for 4 mills.

Mr. President, I can only conclude and mourn that the harm that Douglas McKay has done to the once-glowing future of his own native region will live on and cause economic hardship long after he has left the Interior Department.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of Sunday, February 26, 1956, by Mr. Gene Smith, with regard to the competition between Ohio Valley power and that of the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL CATCHES UP TO WATERPOWER—ADVANCES MEAN OHIO VALLEY ELECTRICITY CAN COMPETE WITH NORTHWEST'S

(By Gene Smith)

King Coal won't take a back seat to atomic energy or Northwest water resources for electric-power generation.

That is the significance to the electric utilities of recent announcements of major aluminum-production projects in the Ohio River Valley.

Basically, power-producing technology has reached the point where utilities can offer potential heavy electric users power at about 4 mills a kilowatt-hour in the industrial Ohio River Valley. Hydroelectric power at 2.2 mills from Federal dams in the Northwest no longer enjoys its competitive advantage when the cost of transporting finished items to the East is included.

Technical efficiencies realized last year, for example, resulted in a 3-percent drop from the 1954 level in the rate for electricity produced with coal. This meant that it took only 0.96 pound of coal to generate 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. The 1954 figure was 0.99 pound and compared with 1.29 pounds in 1946 and 1.38 pounds in 1939.

KAISER LED MOVE

The Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. led the trek to the Ohio Valley in early December when it announced plans for a $120-million aluminum reduction plant to be built at Ravenswood, W. Va., on the Ohio River.

Less than a month later the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. confirmed its plans for an aluminum plant on the Ohio near Clarington, Ohio. It, too, will cost $120 milion.

Behind the two projects—and the expected announcement of a third major aluminum plant in the area—was a 6-year study of the power supply problem by the Ohio Power Co., a subsidiary of the American Gas & Electric Co.

The findings of this study indicated that gas as a fuel for driving turbines was due to go up in price and that most of the economically feasible hydroelectric sites already had been developed.

"This brings coal and coal-based generation sharply into the picture," according to Philip Sporn, president of American Gas, a utility holding company. "Where this coal lies on navigable water, and this is true in a large section of the Ohio Valley, it offers today an ideal combination of favorable economic factors for the development of large-scale economical coal supplies required in large aluminum reduction operations."

Both aluminum plants will be situated at sites where coal reserves of 50 to 100 years have been made available, thus assuring uninterrupted power, a major complaint of

aluminum operators dependent on the whims or hydroelectric power.

Kaiser's contract with Ohio Power calls for the availability of 450,000 kilowatts for 40 years. Olin's contract emphasizes even more the coal tie because it involves operation of a major deep-rim coal mine at the power site, plus construction of a coal carbonization plant that will provide a more economical boiler fuel known as char. This cokelike residue from the distillation of coal will be fed directly to the boilers by conveyor belt, a further example of new technologies in power production.

The Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., which will own and operate the mill and mine, plans an initial capacity of 2 million tons of coal a year, rising to three times that figure later.

WATERWAYS ARE NEAR

D. A. Rhoades, vice president and general manager of Kaiser, explained that the nearness of navigable waterways also meant that the mill would be connected with its alumina plants and Jamaica, British West Indies, bauxite mines by economical shipping.

Explaining his company's shift from the Northwest, Mr. Rhoades said: "The real significance of this combination lies in the fact that the aluminum industry is no longer dependent upon locations close to large hydroelectric installations which are remote from industrial markets. We are convinced that this development will greatly influence and benefit the domestic aluminum production pattern of the future. We believe that it is a turning point for the rapidly expanding aluminum industry."

American Gas & Electric further emphasized its belief in the future of coal by announcing 2 days after the Olin plans had been disclosed that the Appalachian Electric Power Co., another operating subsidiary, would build a $55 million steam-electric plant at Carbo, Va. This also will be situated on property owned by a coal company, Clinchfield Coal Corp. Clinchfield has set aside 40 million tons of coal from its adjacent reserves to supply the powerplant.

"There is every reason to believe that the two aluminum projects will be followed by still further developments in the Ohio Valley in aluminum and other chemical, electrochemical, and electrometallurgical operations which require large quantities of power," Mr. Sporn predicted.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, justice and freedom of political sovereignty demand that both Alaska and Hawaii be admitted to the Union. A most cogent and effective editorial urging such a step appeared in the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., for February 24, 1956. In my opinion, the editorial is particularly significant because, in the past, the Oregonian has not been especially friendly to statehood for Alaska. Yet it is the case for Alaska which is emphasized in the Oregonian's presentation of the problem.

The editorial concludes:

With the major objections removed, it seems clear to us that statehood would confer a boon on Alaskans and consequently on those States, like Oregon, which are in close communication with Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Alaska, Hawaii Both Ready for Elevation to Statehood," be included in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA, HAWAII BOTH READY FOR ELEVATION TO STATEHOOD

It has been the view of the Oregonian that, because of its relatively greater development, Hawaii should precede Alaska into statehood. This page has also advocated independent consideration of the two statehood proposals because of the patently different considerations involved. Those convictions remain unchanged. But the time has come for this important qualification: Alaska is ready for statehood, and should at the earliest possible moment follow Hawaii into that higher estate.

In the past we have urged deliberation in acting on Alaskan statehood, primarily for two good reasons: (1) The Territory, 99 percent of whose area is owned by the Federal Government, lacks in its own right the resources to support itself as an independent State; (2) there has been a question of the possibly adverse effect of statehood on the Nation's defense outposts in Alaska.

It is our firm belief that these objections are no longer overriding, that the pending statehood legislation, as it pertains to Alaska, provides substantially for all essentials to qualify the Territory for a place in the Union.

Consider first the ability of the State of Alaska, as projected, to pay its way:

The current annual cost to the United States of administering the Territory through the Department of the Interior is approximately $28,500,000, just slightly more than Alaska's own Territorial budget. But only about a third of this amount would be transferred to the responsibility of the new State. The remainder is composed of appropriations for activities such as are carried on a Federal expense in other Western States.

The bulk of the burden to be transferred to the State stems from the highway program. Interior is spending $9,800,000 on Alaskan highways this year. The statehood bill, however, makes allowance for gradual assumption of the highway chore by the State; and, in the first fiscal year after admission, the Federal contribution would be $20 million, more than twice the current level. This figure would decline to $1 million in the 15th year, the last of the special Federal subsidy.

It should also be understood that, as a state, Alaska would qualify for Federal highway aid, which it does not receive as a Territory although its citizens pay all Federal taxes including gasoline tax. Since the total acreage of Federal holdings in Alaska is so tremendous, the State would have a comparatively favorable matching formula. Construction costs would be borne 86.34 percent by the Federal Government and 13.66 percent by the State.

The State government would also assume costs of the governor's office ($95,000 annually) and legislative expenses ($48,000 every other year). The only other major new expenditure for the State would be for the hospitalization of the insane. Transfer of this responsibility is already projected in a bill that passed the House of Representatives January 18. The legislation provides for Federal grants totaling $12 million for a transition period of 10 years. This would be ample to cover all anticipated costs in that time.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has calculated that, with the interim Federal assistance provided by statehood legislation, Alaska, as a State, would intially have a budget of only about $2 million a year higher than its 1955 total of $28,484,917. This would not be intolerable, especially in light of the fact that the Territory had a surplus of $6 million at the beginning of the current fiscal year.

Moreover, pending legislation makes generous provision for land grants for the enrichment of the new State. The Federal Government would make available to Alaska a total of 103,350,000 acres, or approximately 30 percent of all land area. The State government would have wide discretion to select land in the following categories: 800,000 acres from national forest and other public lands adjacent to established communities (for urban expansion); 2,550,000 acres for specific purposes, such as schools, hospitals, and other public institutions; 100 million acres to be used as the State may elect for lease or sale to private owners for development of resources and other economic potentialities. In the last-named category would be mineral-bearing lands, including those under lease for oil exploration.

Now to the military objection.

The Pentagon's misgivings were expressed before a Senate committee by James H. Douglas, Under Secretary of the Air Force. "I think it is only natural that the Secretary (Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson) has expressed reluctance to lose some degree of flexibility and freedom of action," Mr. Douglas said. "The Secretary is not saying that the defense program will be seriously damaged in the event of Alaskan statehood. He is saying that there are very unusual problems, that we would for the present like to continue to operate in the existing environment to which we have become accustomed."

Having read all the testimony, we cannot take the military objections seriously. They appear to be based on convenience, not necessity. The Pentagon prefers not to be bothered by an Alaskan congressional delegation or a State government in its operation of 3 major air bases, several interceptor stations, 2 naval bases, and a number of radar warning installations. Logic cannot be bent to the support of the Pentagon's position that Alaska is stronger as a Territory than it would be as a State. If it could, then the suggested course would be to return to territorial status such vulnerable frontier States as Oregon, Washington, and California.

Space does not permit the detailing of the many advantages of statehood—the application of self-government, the elimination of the remote control over fisheries, and the monopoly-encouraging restrictions under the Maritime Act of 1920.

With the major objections removed, it seems clear to us that statehood would confer a boon on Alaskans and consequently on those States, like Oregon, which are in close communication with Alaska. Statehood can be achieved, we believe, if Congress will disjoint the Hawaii-Alaska issues and thus prevent the combination of the opponents of each.

Alaska's best bet is to put all of its influence behind Hawaiian statehood. Once that is gained, the 50th star will be within Alaska's reach.

THE INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF JURISTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement relative to a recent meeting held by the Inter-American Council of Jurists, dealing with the question of the territorial limits of the inter-American states.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Inter-American Council of Jurists is a specialized body of the Organization of American States. It is composed of specialists in international law and has the func-

tion of advising the OAS on technical phases of the interpretation of international law as it bears on the relations between the Republics of the Americas.

The council met in Mexico City late in January of this year. On its agenda was the item: "System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions: Preparatory Study for the Specialized Inter-American Conference Provided for in resolution LXXIV of the Caracas Conference."

The council did not make such a study, A group of delegates had gotten together prior to the meeting and devised a resolution which served their narrowly conceived nationalistic aims. Reports reaching me indicate that they rammed the resolution through the council to adoption by deliberately choking off discussion and debate. The distinguished and able delegate of the United States, Counselor of Embassy William Sanders, could do no more than file the following declaration and reservation of the United States of America:

"DECLARATION AND RESERVATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE RESOLUTION ON TERRITORIAL WATERS AND RELATED QUESTIONS

"For the reasons stated by the United States representative during the sessions of committee I, the United States voted against and records its opposition to the resolution on territorial waters and related questions. Among the reasons indicated were the following:

"That the Inter-American Council of Jurists has not had the benefit of the necessary preparatory studies on the part of its permanent committee which it has consistently recognized as indispensable to the formulation of sound conclusions on the subject;

"That at this meeting of the council of jurists, apart from a series of general statements by representatives of various countries, there has been virtually no study, analysis, or discussion of the substantive aspects of the resolution;

"That the resolution contains pronouncements based on economic and scientific assumptions for which no support has been offered and which are debatable and which, in any event, cover matters within the competence of the Specialized Conference called for under resolution LXXIV of the 10th Inter-American Conference;

"That much of the resolution is contrary to international law;

"That the resolution is completely oblivious of the interests and rights of states other than the adjacent coastal states in the conservation and utilization of marine resources and of the recognized need for international cooperation for the effective accomplishment of that common objective; and

"That the resolution is clearly designed to serve political purposes and therefore exceeds the competence of council of jurists as a technical juridical body.

"In addition, the United States delegation wishes to record the fact that when the resolution, in the drafting of which the United States had no part, was submitted to committee I, despite fundamental considerations raised by the United States and other delegations against the resolution, there was no discussion of those considerations at the one and only session of the committee held to debate the document."

Among other things the resolution "declares that the acceptance of these principles does not imply and shall not have the effect of renouncing or weakening the position maintained by the various countries of America on the question of how far territorial waters should extend.

"TERRITORIAL WATERS

"1. The distance of 3 miles as the limit of territorial waters is insufficient, and does not constitute a rule of general international law. Therefore, the enlargement of the zone of the sea traditionally called 'territorial waters' is justifiable.

"2. Each State is competent to establish its territorial waters within reasonable limits, taking into account geographical, geological, and biological factors, as well as the economic needs of its population, and its security and defense."

It aids in the understanding of what is meant by the world "reasonable" in the above paragraph to know that 3 of the countries whose delegates sponsored this resolution have proclaimed sovereignty to a band of ocean extending to a minimum distance of 200 marine miles off their coasts, and a fourth has proclaimed sovereignty over an area of high seas adjacent to its shores which is in some places nearly 500 miles wide.

I need hardly review for the Members the vital nature of the doctrine of the freedom of the sea and its companion doctrine of a narrow territorial sea to the life of these United States and of western civilization. The free flow of commerce by air and by sea between nations is a necessity of modern life. The unimpeded use of the highways of the air and sea for quick and certain military communication is an absolute necessity in these troubled times if the free world is to be successfully defended.

To keep the seas open for the unimpeded use of our citizens and our Armed Forces was one of the reasons that the colonies engaged in the French and Indian Wars; it formed one of the basic causes for the Revolutionary War; it was for this reason that we engaged in the war with the Barbary pirates; the War of 1812 was fought chiefly on this point; it was to protect this right that we entered the First World War; it was by establishing command over the air and sea that we and our allies were able to bring to a successful conclusion the Second World War and particularly the war in the Pacific. Today we are appropriationg tens of billions of dollars to our defense establishments to enable us and our allies to keep the sea and air free for our use.

Why have we adopted such a policy and pursued it so unswervingly through our history?

Why have the other maritime countries done the same? The reasons are quite simple.

The growing human population of the world has required the efficient use of the world's resources to keep it alive. Centers of population grow in industrialized areas which are too dense to even be fed on local resources. The product of their manufactures must be able to flow to markets all over the world. Centers of food production arise where more food can be grown than can be eaten by the local population. The excess of the harvest must be able to flow to market in centers of industry all over the world. The complicated economic web of exchange of goods between areas of specialized ability to produce is the very basis upon which our civilization has been able to grow. In this postwar period the United States alone has expended billions upon billions of dollars to bolster the economies of its friends and allies. To the extent that impediments are placed in the way of the free flow of goods by air and sea between centers of varied production in the free world, the ability of the free world to prosper, to thrive, to keep strong and vital, and to be able to defend itself by economic means shrinks.

In the proclamations adverted to above by which several nations have sought to establish their sovereignty over broad stretches of the high seas and the air spaces above this vital point has been noted and an attempt has been made to meet it by an accompanying declaration that would grant permission to vessels and aircraft of foreign nationality to pass through such purported areas of sovereignty. This does not, and cannot, meet the point.

The nationals of the world now use these sealanes and airlanes of the world under rights that pertain to them under international law as free and independent sovereigns. They need no permissive grant from another sovereign for that use. Any permission that one sovereign is able to grant to another to pass through its territory it is also able to withdraw or to modify at a later date. In time of peace it could control traffic through its territory or charge fees for it; in time of war it could proclaim neutrality and exclude such traffic.

Accordingly, the United States and the other maritime nations of the world have maintained the doctrine of the freedom of the seas and the air spaces above and have adhered to the doctrine of a narrow territorial sea. This has been done no more for their benefit than for the benefit of smaller, less developed nations. To the extent that a small, underdeveloped country is impeded in getting its produce to market the economic and social development of that country is slowed down. To the extent that a small and militarily weak country is separated by unnecessary and new barriers from its defenders the freedom and independence of that country is placed in jeopardy.

We realize that the use of common places and common resources by different entities brings problems whether it is individuals using the same driveway to their homes or whether it is sovereign nations using common sealanes and airlanes. It is to be expected that that greatest common of all, the high seas which cover nearly three quarters of the globe and are used by nearly every nation, will generate great problems.

The United Nations is at the present time intensively studying this whole subject. Last year the United Nations called together a special International Technical Conference on the Conservation of the Living Resources of the Sea in which 50 nations of the world participated. Acting upon the report adopted by that meeting and the results of other multilateral conferences on other branches of this complex subject, the International Law Commission devoted nearly the whole of its 1955 sessions to working out recommendations on the twin subjects of Regime of the High Seas, and Regime of the Territorial Sea. Its recommendations have been submitted for study and comment to all of the members of the United Nations. The International Law Commission will once more devote nearly its whole session this year to revising its recommendations on these subjects in the light of comments it has received during the year from the member nations. Its finalized report will be submitted to the General Assembly this fall, and the subject is already on the General Assembly's calendar for consideration this year. There it will go to committee for study, discussion, and possible alteration before it finally comes to the floor of General Assembly for debate.

Mr. President, these are the normal ways by which independent and free peoples work out problems of relations among themselves and mutually reach conclusions that are mutually agreeable and practical in operation.

This is not, however, the way the Inter-American Council of Jurists has acted on this subject which is of the greatest importance to the United States and to the world. The Council, under the charter of the Organization of American States, is supposed to work as a serious, technical body. Yet it adopted a resolution advancing far-reaching legal pronouncements on vital social, economic, scientific and defense interests of nations, upon which as legally trained persons the delegates were not even qualified to

speak, with virtually no analysis, no study and no discussion.

The United States and other delegations raised basic questions regarding the contents of the resolution, but its proponents chose not to reply to those points or otherwise justify their proposals.

The resolution was drafted to support the thesis of a few Latin American countries which have evidenced a desire to claim large areas of the high seas as part of their sovereign territory. Such claims are without precedent in international law since the 17th century.

The United States has repeatedly protested these claims and actions under them as clearly outside the bounds of international law. These countries have rejected our offer to take the issues to the International Court of Justice and are now trying to impose upon the United States new rules of law which will back up their extravagant claims of 200 miles or more.

There was not even any suggestion in the resolution that the rights of other nations under long-established principles of the freedom of the seas must be respected. The application of this idea would result in chaos in such areas as the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, the Gulf of Panama, the Mediterranean, the North Sea, the seas off southeast Asia, and other areas of the world where projections of territorial boundaries might overlap.

Mr. President, we are profoundly disturbed not only by the substance of this resolution but by the log-rolling tactics which were used to put it across. It disturbs our very faith in the long-established precedents of relations among the Republics of this hemisphere. We must only hope that the parent organization of the Organization of American States will take such actions as are required to correct the behavior of its technical agency in order that faith in the OAS itself will not be further shaken.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 28, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 97) for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, Pedro P. Dagamac, and Edith Kahler.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no further statements Senators may wish to make at this time, I desire to propose a unanimous-consent agreement. But before I do so, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that all Senators may be on notice.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are now working toward a solution of what we have come to call the farm problem. The administration, understandably, does not exactly put it that way. The President instead says that our farmers are not now sharing in the general prosperity.

Some of my Texas farm friends put it more directly: They say they have been "Bensonized."

Whatever it is called, Mr. President, it is there and it is unmistakable. Since January 1953, farm prices have fallen from 94 percent of parity to 82 percent of parity. Prices received for crops and livestock have dropped 14 percent. Net income of farmers has fallen from $14 billion in 1952 to $10.3 billion in 1955.

The Secretary of Agriculture has reacted characteristically to these facts. At first it was denied that there was such a thing as a farm problem. It was said those who talk of a farm depression are misinformed. Then, after acknowledgment that such a situation exists, the trouble was said to have been inherited from the previous administration. Then it was blamed on surplus, on incentives, on labor unions, and then, incredibly, on the farmers themselves.

It was suggested that perhaps there are just too many small farmers, that many of them are simply not operating efficiently. This, then, was the theory of natural selection—a sort of survival of the fittest code.

Mr. President, there are plenty of "fit" farmers and ranchers in Texas, and many of them are just barely surviving. A friend of mine writes from south Texas that 80 percent of the ranch people are not making operating expenses—that all hog raisers lost money in 1955.

My friend in south Texas sends along these lines which are currently going the rounds of the country stores and gatepost sessions. They say of the Benson farm program:

A fake and a phoney,
A failure and a fuss,
A fraud on the farmer,
And flexes only one way.

And that one way, Mr. President, is down.

Mr. President, we have before us a farm bill, which has been discussed for several days. Many Members of the Senate are anxious to vote on the bill. Some are ready to vote today, while others are not ready to vote this week.

I had hoped that we would be able to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on next Monday. I have been informed that consent will not be given to vote on Monday or on Tuesday. However, I believe the record should show that on behalf of myself and the minority leader I am submitting a proposed unanimous-consent agreement that effective on Monday, March 5, the limitations on debate shall start to run. Therefore, on behalf of myself and the minority leader I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and I ask that the clerk be instructed to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, March 5, 1956, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That when no further amendment is to be proposed, the amendments adopted shall be deemed to be engrossed and the bill read the third time; that a motion shall then be in order that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12, an act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, to which motion the same limitation of debate shall apply as in the case of any other motion or amendment; that in the event the motion to take up the House bill is agreed to, it shall then be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof inserting the provisions of Senate bill 3183 as amended; that the amendment shall be deemed to be engrossed and the House bill as amended read the third time.

Ordered further, That in the event the motion to proceed to the consideration of the House bill is not agreed to, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the question of the final passage of the Senate bill; otherwise it shall proceed to the consideration of the question of the final passage of the House bill, debate on either of which shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the Senate or the House bill, as the case may be, allot additional time to any Senator or Senators during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal with respect to the Senate bill.

Ordered further, That in the event of the passage of the House bill as amended, Senate bill 3183 shall be deemed to be postponed indefinitely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not think anything in the way of legislation is more important than is the farm bill. I have consulted with a group of Senators in regard to the debate to take place on this issue, and I know it is physically impossible to complete the debate by next Monday and agree to any such unanimous-consent request as the one proposed.

For example, I am satisfied that the discussion of one topic in connection with the bill, namely, the problems of the wheat farmer, will take probably all of 2 days, because there happens to be a group of us who intend to make a very detailed record in regard to the plight of the wheat farmers. We feel very strongly that if a two-price plan is sound for some commodities it is particularly sound for wheat. We believe it offers the wheat farmers the best hope, if not the only hope, of remaining economically solvent in the period immediately ahead. I think, important as it is, we should have as early a vote as a complete record

will permit, but agreeing on next Monday as the day for voting is out of the question.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think the great tragedy which has struck the membership of the Senate today, and because of which we all grieve, makes it necessary for us to rearrange our schedule somewhat. Therefore, I reluctantly feel it necessary to object to the suggested early date for a vote. I would accept a unanimous-concent agreement to vote on next Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am willing to strike out Monday and insert Wednesday, March 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request as modified?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry to propound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. Yesterday I submitted an amendment which is designed to prevent any increase in the price of power by any governmental agency over the prices now in effect, for a period of 18 months subsequent to the enactment of the bill. What I should like to ask is whether there is any provision in the unanimous-consent agreement that would prevent my amendment being in order with reference to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would ask the opinion of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's amendment deals with REA projects; does it not?

Mr. KERR. It deals with the price of electric power to the REA cooperatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sufficiently informed on all the details to know whether the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma would be germane. Would the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry care to express an opinion as to whether it would be germane to the pending bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I doubt that it would be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So far as the majority leader is concerned, and, I hope, the minority leader, I should be willing to modify the agreement to except specifically this one amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I would greatly appreciate that, and on that basis I would have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would raise a question on that point. I do not believe the Senator's amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma would be germane. I respectfully suggest to him that during the consideration of the important legislative proposal now before the Senate there is no desire to prevent any amendment dealing with the subject matter, but the provision in the unanimous-consent request relative to germaneness is inserted for the purpose of preventing a wide-open field day after the agreement has been entered into.

I wonder, in view of those circumstances, if the Senator would not feel that it would be better not to have obviously nongermane amendments excepted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The best way to ascertain whether it is a germane amendment is, first, to get the advice of the Parliamentarian, because I should like to discuss the other side of the question. We are dealing with economic problems of American farmers, and vital to their problems is not only the cost of electricity, but the assurance that REA's are going to be able to expand and grow because of having reasonably cheap power. I take the position that when we are dealing with a farm bill which has to do with economic problems of the farmers, the Kerr amendment is germane, because what happens to the REA's will influence greatly the economic standards of our farmers.

Before we proceed on the assumption that the amendment is nongermane, Mr. President, I should like to know what the Parliamentarian thinks about it, because I respectfully submit that an amendment which deals with electric rates which the REA's will have to pay for power is germane to a farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the exception would be proper as suggested. However, the Chair holds that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is not germane.

Mr. KERR. I respectfully ask the sponsors of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement to exempt my amendment from exclusion. I do not seek to ask them to accept the amendment. I simply do not wish to offer an amendment on one day, and then, under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement entered on the next day, to have consideration of the amendment excluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oklahoma the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. KERR. The sole purpose of the amendment is to prevent for a period of 18 months any increase by any governmental agency in existing rates or charges which are made for power sold or delivered to rural-electric cooperatives.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not this matter be handled in the regular way? This is a subject which normally would be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee has not heard any evidence on the question. If the Senator from Oklahoma will introduce a bill designed to correct whatever evil he thinks exists, I will, as chairman of the committee give him assurance that I shall proceed to hold hearings as soon as possible.

Mr. KERR. I know the Senator from Louisiana would do that. The situation developed in this manner. The Department of the Interior advised rural electric cooperatives that the Department was about to file a request with the Federal Power Commission for the confirmation of an increase of about 40 percent in the rates charged to rural electric cooperatives in the Southwest area. Joint hearings on the subject are now in progress before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and of the two similar committees of the House.

It is entirely possible that after the hearings the Department of the Interior eventually will agree to permit Congress to have enough time in which to study the matter adequately and to have the opportunity to take action which would forestall the increase. But as to the amendment, the Department has agreed only to a postponement of about 6 weeks from this date.

All the amendment would do would be to set a date and provide that while the hearings were being held and the proposed legislation was being considered by the committee headed by the Senator from Louisiana, the increase in rates would not be put into effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it not be possible for a bill embodying the proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma to be considered and passed within 6 weeks' time?

Mr. KERR. I have grave doubt that such action could be obtained in 6 weeks' time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can give assurance that it should be possible for the Agriculture Committee to report a bill within the next 2 weeks, and I feel confident the House committee could do likewise.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator from Louisiana object to the consideration of my amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not a question of objecting; the amendment is not germane to the issues covered by the pending bill. I fear the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma might complicate matters on the final passage of the bill; the farm problem is urgent and our farmers need immediate relief.

The Agriculture Committee does not have much information about what the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to do. The committee does not know all the issues involved. The committee has not had any hearings on the Senator's proposal. I feel it would be best to let the Senate consider the matter in the form of separate legislation on which hearings had been held.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, do I understand the Chair has ruled that the amendment is not germane?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Then, upon the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that if the matter shall be introduced as a bill, its consideration will be expedited in his committee, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there are several Senators who are vitally interested, not only in the passage of the bill as such, but especially in a section of the bill, namely, section 307, which deals with maritime matters and would effect the virtual repeal of a maritime law which requires, on government-financed cargoes, that at least 50 percent

of the cargoes shall be shipped in American bottoms.

This section, as I understand, was placed in the bill without hearings having been held on it. It is a maritime matter. The section would exempt from the application of Public Law 664, 83d Congress, 2d session, shipments of agricultural products financed by the taxpayers and thus would vitally affect the American merchant marine. It may have some importance in the bill, but is of minor importance to agriculture compared to the importance it bears to the entire American merchant marine.

Much has been said about germaneness. This is a subject which affects the entire American merchant marine. Hearings should be held upon it. It is true that a similar provision was included on the floor in foreign aid bills on several occasions, but hearings had been held on the 50–50 provision when it was made permanent. I have appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations on many occasions in connection with this matter.

I do not think the provision belongs in the farm bill. It is a matter which is very important to the American merchant marine and to those of us who have a deep interest in the maintenance of the American flag on the seas. We are having enough trouble keeping our flag on the seas now.

Many Senators will want to talk at some length on this subject. I know I would. I would not want to be limited by such a restriction as the proposed unanimous-consent agreement sets forth. I had hoped we might come to some agreement on the matter, because I too am interested in the agricultural bill; but an amendment which I would propose would permit the question involved in section 307 to be considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which rightfully should consider it. That committee would hold hearings and let all who are interested appear before the committee, so that opportunity would be afforded again to determine and reevaluate the importance of the matter to the American merchant marine and also to ascertain whether it affects the agricultural problem at all.

I assure the Senate—and I have discussed the matter with other members of the committee—that hearings would be held very promptly. A bill dealing especially with maritime problems could then be reported to the Senate. Some modifications of the present law might be needed.

I am very familiar with the subject. Approximately 80 percent of American exports today are carried in ships flying foreign flags. We are dealing here with less than 20 percent of our cargoes, only that portion of them, which are Government-financed.

This is the least we can do for our merchant marine. Two nations in Europe in particular are maritime countries. That is fine. I do not blame them for seeking our commerce, but they have been using the 50–50 law as a lever to promote their own interests.

This cargo preference provision is not mandatory; it is flexible. No one has said it should be enforced on a ship-by-ship or month-by-month basis. We have merely said that every opportunity should be afforded to achieve the 50–50 balance; otherwise the American flag will disappear from the seas. Today we are doing relatively little to keep our merchant marine alive. It is necessary for the Government to subsidize it. The more cargo that is taken away, the more it will be necessary for the Government to subsidize to keep our merchant marine from disaster.

During World War II, the American merchant marine hauled overseas 95.6 percent of all military cargoes. The merchant marine is actually our fourth arm of defense. It is just as important as any other service. But to include section 307 in the bill would be to cripple our merchant marine while we were engaged in an honest effort to solve our agricultural problem. I think the hearings will show that this provision will not help the agricultural problem. But all we seek is an opportunity to consider the question again. Perhaps it would be desirable to modify the provision to some extent.

In my State, the British saw fit to apply the law to reefer ships and to perishable commodities. Some fruit is exported from our State. The American merchant marine does not have reefer ships which call at Pacific coast ports. The law should not have applied at all. Perhaps it should be amended to take care of perishables, or to provide that in the case of strategic materials from all over the world inbound cargoes shall be hauled, in some fixed proportion, in American bottoms. But those are questions which should be explored by those who have experience in merchant-marine matters. Of course, we are interested in agricultural problems, but no hearings were held on this phase of the bill. The provision was inserted in the bill toward the end of its consideration, when the bill was being marked up. I think it is a subject which should be examined.

I am sure many Senators—I personally know of 15 or 20 Senators—would want to know something about what would happen if section 307 should be kept in the bill.

So, unless we can agree on this matter in some respect, I am sure I shall have to object to the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not conferred with other Senators as to how much time they may want, but after I do, perhaps the proposed unanimous-consent agreement can be modified. We think section 307 is a very, very important provision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I remind my distinguished and beloved friend from Washington that it is proposed to provide 4 hours' debate on the bill. All of those 4 hours could be yielded. Usually, as the Senator knows, time is yielded back. All of the time could be yielded on any amendment at any time.

So far as the majority leader is concerned, I would be glad to bear in mind the Senator's need for extra time, and to agree here and now to yield him a portion of the 2 hours the majority leader would control under the unanimous-consent agreement, for use on an amendment. In addition to that, I know the Senator is very reasonable and fair, and I know he has not had time to confer with respect to the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We did not know this provision was in the bill until the last minute, or we would have appeared before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not blaming the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Texas is perfectly willing, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Washington, to provide 3 hours on this particular amendment—if our colleague, the Senator from California, would go along with the suggestion—in addition to yielding a portion of the 4 hours on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If this provision is kept in the bill, I shall speak at some length on the subject. I shall review the history of the merchant marine, because the provision would be a great blow to the American merchant marine. I should like to help in dealing with the agricultural problem, but I think we can do it in a different way. All that is necessary is to agree to let the matter be considered. We would bring back a bill on the subject after hearings. Perhaps there is a need to modify the law.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I desired to ask the Senator from Washington if he remembered that some time last July, the 1st or 2d day following the illness of the able majority leader, a bill affecting the merchant marine was before the Senate. I wanted to offer an amendment to strike out the cargo preference provision. Everyone was advising me not to offer such an amendment from the floor. Although considerable embarrassment was caused to those who felt the amendment should be presented, it was not offered because it was felt agriculture ought to have a chance. Nothing happened. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] joined in a bill which would do what was contemplated by the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If section 307 is deleted from the bill, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can take up the subject and hold hearings on that bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Nothing was said until the provision went into the agricultural bill, and it went into the bill by unanimous agreement of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There is a limit as to how far we can go to help the American merchant marine. I think it is right to help it. I have voted to help it time after time, but when it gets to the point where assisting it cripples the agricultural program, that is going too far.

As I recall, restriction contained in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act went into the act by a floor amendment. The Senator from Washington proposed a floor amend-

ment without any hearings being held. We propose the same thing, in return. What is wrong with that? The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. Blessed be the name of the Lord.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it is wrong. We did not get a chance to protest an amendment that was proposed from the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is true that in the first aid measure amendments were proposed from the floor, because of the plight of the American merchant marine. I had appeared before the committee. Senator Tom Connally said, "We will let you offer the amendment on the floor and we will accept it." Amendments were usually accepted by him when he was chairman of the committee, when the early bills on the subject were considered. Amendments were added to the foreign aid bill in that manner. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] later introduced a bill to make the law permanent. We had long hearings. The proposal was approved unanimously by our committee, and the law was made permanent.

Section 307 of the pending bill would virtually repeal the permanent law. It does not repeal the riders put into the law by amendments from the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish the Senator would look at the provision. I do not think it repeals the permanent law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. It repeals it as to certain agricultural commodities, and they are very limited.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. However, it is directed to the permanent law, which was enacted after hearings. We think that if a permanent law is to be modified or changed, after long hearings had preceded its enactment, we ought to have a chance to have hearings to look into the question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was going to suggest to the Senator from Washington that if he could see his way clear to accept the proposal presented by the Senator from Texas, it could be that there would not be as much opposition as the Senator might think to striking out the section and holding hearings. But I do not believe a unanimous-consent agreement should be held up on that basis alone. I think we should go along and trust our majority and minority leaders.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I desire to make my position clear. I am just as much interested in agriculture as is any other Senator, but many Senators are also interested in the American merchant marine. I do not want to hold up anything. I ask the simple justice of having hearings on so important a matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator's point of view that this particular section should not be in the bill without hearings having been held, but I hope the Senator will not object to the unanimous-consent agreement as proposed. As the Senator knows, if he felt himself pressed for time and found he could not complete his remarks, he would have an opportunity, under the unanimous-consent agreement, to offer an additional amendment to take care of any time he needed. I do not think the matter will require as much discussion as perhaps the Senator is fearful it will take.

If the Senator would be happier to have 3 hours instead of 2 hours provided on this particular amendment, perhaps that could be done, although I should dislike to see us begin to modify the proposed agreement by excepting various amendments. We are in a position where obviously the Senator is entirely within his rights in making his objection.

I believe the Senator, who has excellent knowledge of the subject, could present his facts and be more successful in making friends for his proposal within a 2-hour period, with such time adjustments as could be made, than he could as a result of a prolonged discussion. I say that as one who happens to believe this particular section should not go in the bill without adequate hearings being held before the proper committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not alone in the view I take. I speak for myself and other Senators who are not now present on the floor, but who happen to think this is a vital matter. I refer to the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Florida, the Senator from California, and other Senators.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The fact of the matter is that on numerous occasions the 50 percent proposal has gone into the law by a very substantial majority.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know how long other Senators interested in the matter would wish to speak. So far as I am concerned, I think I could present my statement in a couple of hours, because when the Senate is informed, I believe it will see what a serious effect section 307 would have on the American merchant marine. It may be the hearings will show that this section will help agriculture. But when we weigh the two in the balance, I do not think any fair-minded person would favor such treatment of our merchant marine.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield to me, I may also point out that the proposed limitation of debate will not begin to run until next Wednesday.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Therefore, the able Senator from Washington and other Senators to whom he has referred will have ample time between tomorrow and next Wednesday to make adequately plain the great dangers, as he and other Senators may see them, in connection with having a provision of this kind in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to add a statement of fact which I think possibly may change the situation. For myself, I feel that we should not now enter into an agreement to limit debate. This morning—and at the first opportunity, I may say—the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. He was accompanied by members of his staff. He testified in a very interesting and informative manner in respect to the problems of agriculture.

During the discussion there, I addressed several questions to the Secretary of Agriculture; and I asked him to prepare some amendments to this bill. One of the questions I addressed to him was based upon the fact that President Eisenhower, in his message on agriculture to the United States Congress, had specifically asked for repeal of the provision of Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress which confines the sale of surplus commodities to friendly countries.

Senators who may have had the opportunity of listening to Secretary Dulles when he participated in the Philadelphia Bulletin program of last Sunday afternoon, and who may since have had an opportunity to read his speech, may recall that he said that in Russia, behind the Iron Curtain, Mr. Khrushchev had told the Soviet gathering of the other day that in Russia there is a shortage of foodstuffs and, I think, of fiber. The Secretary quoted at great length the language used by Mr. Khrushchev in referring to the shortage of food supplies in Russia. If the Secretary of State finds that to be a fact, and if the President of the United States found it wise to insert in his message to Congress a request for repeal of this section, which confines such trade to friendly countries, I think that is a matter which should be laid before the Senate of the United States.

Therefore, I requested Secretary Benson to have prepared an amendment which would prevent abuse of the sale of our surplus food commodities in Russia, although at the moment it is difficult for me to think of a method by which such sales could be made a matter of abuse. The President sent to the Senate a message regarding ways of building peace with atomic energy. I think there is no reason why the Senate should not now undertake to study any amendment which the Secretary of Agriculture might send here at my request.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me add that the amendment was included in Senate bill 2949 when it was introduced approximately 6 weeks ago.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct; the Secretary of Agriculture so stated.

Mr. AIKEN. It was a very short amendment, and was included in that bill. However, it was stricken out in the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that in its consideration of this matter, the Senate must remember that 18 years ago, when Adolf Hitler was preparing Germany for its aggressive operations, he laid down the doctrine that the German people had to choose between guns and butter; and he stressed the importance, for their purpose, of obtaining guns.

If the same doctrine is followed by the Soviet Union I think we must be careful to make sure that we are not furnishing the Russians with the butter while they are making the guns—that is to say, various types of armaments—for such a course would enable them to concentrate their efforts on preparations to destroy the free world, while we were busy supplying them and other countries with foodstuffs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I completely agree. Nevertheless, I think we should look into the matter, particularly since the amendment—which in my judgment should be offered—should contain a provision to make certain that there would not be a substitution of guns for butter, but, instead, that there would be a substitution of butter for guns.

But I must point out that it was revealed by the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. McCLELLAN], in a speech which he made last week, that some of our allies are now shipping copper wire and other strategic materials to the Soviet Union, and are refusing to tell the United States what they are doing, basing their refusal on the ground that such disclosure would be against public interest, although the facts in regard to such shipments of strategic metals by Britain and perhaps other nations have been freely published in the trade papers of England, and thus we obtain our information circuitously, while the State Department, in a letter written by the Deputy Secretary of State, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., has refused to supply the Senate committee with the information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may be mistaken, but my understanding is, not that the State Department refused to furnish certain information to the committee, but that the matter at issue related to the working papers. I think there has been testimony as to the amount of copper wire so shipped. I can say to the Senator from Wyoming that it has not made sense to me to have copper wire, which could readily be changed into shell casings, going into the Soviet Union in the quantities in which it apparently has been going there, when our Government itself does not permit such shipments of copper to be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My point now is simply that the question is of such momentous importance that we should look into it. The President recommended such a provision, and it was included in the bill the Department of Agriculture suggested. It has been stricken from the bill by the committee. So far as I know, there have been no minority views on the part of any member of the committee in regard to the provision; in other words, I know of no objection to it.

But now that the Secretary of State has said publicly, by referring to the quotation from Mr. Khrushchev, that behind the Iron Curtain there is a shortage of food, let us find out about it, and see whether there is a practicable method of using for peaceful purposes the bread and the beef and the butter which we can produce in such abundant quantities.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If such commerce can be kept on a peaceful basis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And that the Russians are not going to use in heavy industries, for the making of guided missiles, guns, planes, tanks, and other armaments to be used to destroy the free world, the workers who, except for such shipments of food to Russia, would have to be used in the production of such food.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I completely agree.

The other question I asked the Secretary of Agriculture was this: Inasmuch as the President has expressed sympathy toward the family-sized farm, would the Secretary consider an amendment to the bill which would provide that the full 90-percent supports would be extended to the production from family-sized farms, farms operated by families, and that the flexible supports should be confined solely to corporate farms and farms of a thousand acres or more?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I offered such an amendment to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, graduating the supports from the small family type farm to the larger farms, providing that in the case of a commodity loan application involving not to exceed $1,000, 100 percent supports would be granted; and that in the case of the large operators, making applications for commodity loans of several thousand dollars, supports possibly not in excess of 70 percent of parity would be applied. In that manner we would make certain that the Treasury would not underwrite the operations of someone who found it desirable to employ his invested dollar in the production of agricultural commodities in competition with what are normally regarded as the small, family type farm.

If such an amendment were studied and considered, we might well preserve and protect the family type farm, and not make the Treasury the underwriter for the man who wishes to use his dollars in the development and production of an agricultural commodity of which we have a surplus, in direct competition with the small family type farm, operated by a family who are making farming an existence, a way of life. I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was aware that the Senator had such an amendment.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be unwise to limit debate at this moment, while the Secretary of Agriculture, who said he would do certain things, is working upon the proposed amendments. I expect to receive some suggestions from the Department of Agriculture. I do not like to see debate shut off.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator realizes the reason why agricultural legislation should be enacted at the earliest possible moment; does he not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. AIKEN. In order that farm people may begin to receive the increased benefits which would be derived from it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that is very important.

Mr. AIKEN. If we delay, such benefits may be lost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I understand the request, it is that the limitation on debate begin next Wednesday.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All I am saying is that I do not wish to enter into such an agreement today. I wish to see the amendments from the Department of Agriculture before I agree to limit debate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the Senator expect to receive those amendments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I expect to receive them as soon as they can be prepared. I assure the Senator from Louisiana, who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that I will telephone the Secretary's office again this afternoon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to state to my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, that the committee gave a great deal of study to the proposal which he is now discussing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the committee voted it down. In fact, several such proposals were made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee may have been right.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think we were. I can cite one reason why I think we were right——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may vote with the Senator. However, I have not seen the new proposals which the Secretary has promised to prepare for us. If he does not prepare them, that will be another matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the bill was reported to the Senate for consideration, I had a time-table in mind which contemplated completion of consideration of the bill this week. Now, because there is objection to limiting debate, we are being asked to postpone action until Wednesday of next week. That means it will be a week from tomorrow before we begin voting.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senate be in session tomorrow?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then the Senator can raise the question tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. We made the request yesterday, in the hope that it could be agreed upon today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am only saying that I hope we will not limit debate until we find out the significance of what Khrushchev said, what Dulles said, and what the Secretary of Agriculture said, all of which are new developments since the committee held its meeting.

Mr. ELLENDER. They were not new developments. We passed on those issues in committee. They are not new.

They have already been presented to us and they were rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Khrushchev spoke only a few days ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about making food available to Russia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Secretary of State spoke only last Sunday. The Secretary of Agriculture spoke this morning before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am speaking of making food available to Russia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the problem the Senator presents.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know, but there may be some new aspects to the question since the Secretary of State made his suggestion.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator must realize that if Russia wishes to buy food, she can buy food today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us look into the question. Then we shall know whether we are to continue to hold back development of arms in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Wyoming has been digging up some red herrings. Russia can buy food today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am so far from the red-herring grounds that I would not know a red herring if I were to meet one. I will take the advice of the Senator from Vermont on red herring.

I am merely saying that I shall object to any unanimous-consent agreement today.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement made this morning, February 28, by the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Most people in the Nation are enjoying unprecedented prosperity. Unfortunately, this is not so for all farmers and farm people. The President's Economic Report states: "The first and most pressing problem requiring the attention of the Congress is the continued decline of agricultural incomes." Since 1951, farm income has receded while new highs have been established in the nonfarm economy. For sound economic growth, the fruits of our amazing productivity must be widely shared. The President's program for agriculture, if adopted shortly, will substantially strengthen the opportunities for our farm people to share in the ever-rising standard of living which our national capabilities provide. It will help add new vigor to sound economic growth.

THE CURRENT AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

Heavy supplies depress farm prices

The huge surplus and our high level of output levy a heavy and growing burden on our farm and ranch people. Our economists estimate that the huge surpluses reduced farm income in 1955 by the staggering sum of more than $2 billion. This is nearly 20 percent of net farm income.

Most of agriculture is staggering under the accumulation of the greatest surplus of farm commodities in the Nation's history. Further, the current level of production of some commodities is outrunning our markets at this time even at prices distinctly unsatisfactory to farmers. The factors which have contributed to this vast supply burden are well known: Wartime price support production patterns maintained too long for a peacetime economy; the explosive impact of rapid technological changes on farm production; and the rising agricultural output in other countries which has limited our outlets for commodities in greatest supply.

At the beginning of the current marketing year last July, CCC investment in farm commodities exceeded $7 billion—the equivalent of more than a fifth of total farm marketings in a year. On top of record stocks, carried over from previous years, farm output in 1955 reached a new high, some 3 percent larger than in 1954. Crop yields rose 9 percent from the previous record—a gain in 1 year equal to the total gain of the preceding 5 years. In addition, the hog and cattle cycles were concurrently reaching their peaks with record or near-record rates of slaughter. During the first half of 1955, prices received by farmers had been fairly stable. The average of all farm prices in June 1955 was at the same level as at the beginning of the year. But under the impact of record output, the price decline, which had been under way since 1951, was renewed. Between June and December, prices received by farmers moved down 8 percent on the average. The sharpest drop came in hogs.

In recent weeks, the downtrend in prices has been arrested. According to the Department's latest report on agricultural prices, prices received by farmers in mid-January averaged slightly higher than in December. The hog market, although still low, has made a considerable recovery, especially since mid-January.

High cost structure also contributes to lower farm income

The farmer, with declining prices for the products he sells, faces a high and unyielding cost structure. Prices paid by farmers in mid-January averaged almost as high as a year earlier while prices received were down 7 percent. Further, this apparent stability in farm costs is misleading. It balances out substantial declines in prices paid for feed and feeder livestock—in many instances purchases by one farmer from another—with widespread price increases for products purchased from industry, notably motor vehicles, farm machinery and building materials. Even for food, the persistent increases in marketing costs have kept farmers, as well as other consumers, from realizing much relief in their food bills despite declines in prices of farm products.

The net result of the tightened cost-price squeeze in agriculture was a drop of about 10 percent in farm operators' total net income in 1955. This is the aggregate for the Nation. In some regions, particularly the Northeast and the Pacific States, farm operators' net income was much the same in 1955 as in 1954. In large parts of the South, incomes were improved in 1955. The major impact of declining farm incomes came in the North Central and Mountain regions.

On a per capita basis, including the income of farm people from nonfarm sources as well as farm income, the decline from 1954 to 1955 was 6 percent. These reductions in incomes of farmers and farm people in the past year come on top of other reductions suffered in every year but one since 1947. That one year was 1951, at the height of the Korean war.

Agriculture is not prostrate and we should not forget that we have had large declines in the past. For example, in one year, 1949, per capita income of farm people dropped 20 percent. The total decline per capita since 1951 has been 12 percent. Further, despite this reduction, the average farm person in 1955 was about as well off in terms of purchasing power as in 1949. We can point to other indicators—the low rate of farm foreclosures in 1955, the strong farm financial position, the rising trend in land values to record highs—to show that there is a high degree of stability remaining in agriculture. But farm prices and farm incomes are too low, and we must see to it that significant improvement in the farmers' economic position is brought about promptly.

Wartime incentives were continued in peacetime with the apparent hope that they would protect farm incomes. Whatever the purpose, they have obviously failed. The decline in farm income from 1951 until the harvest of the 1955 crops occurred under the old law. In fact, realized net farm income has declined every year but one from 1947 to 1954, all under the old law. That one year was 1951, during the Korean war. Only during recent months has the Agricultural Act of 1954 begun to be operative.

Consumption increasing steadily, but stocks continue to rise

The present agricultural situation, while one of deep concern, has some favorable aspects. The broad base of consumption of farm products has expanded. Not only is our population increasing rapidly, but food consumption per person has also shown a significant increase since 1951. As a nation, we are consuming over 10 percent more food than at the time of the Korean war. This is real progress in developing peacetime uses for wartime production levels. Further, export volume of United States farm products, while still unsatisfactory in relation to our potential in world markets, has been improved materially in the last 3 years. The volume of agricultural exports dropped almost 30 percent from the fiscal year 1952 to the fiscal year 1953. Since then about half of the decline in export volume has been regained. In the current fiscal year, even with reduced demand from abroad for United States cotton, we expect an export volume in total about the same as last year.

To a substantial extent, these gains in expanding markets, particularly foreign markets, reflect vigorous programs of surplus disposal. In fiscal 1955 the CCC disposed of over $2 billion of price-support commodities compared with a half billion in fiscal 1953. In the current fiscal year, we expect to dispose of $2.5 billion of surplus commodities.

Despite aggressive surplus disposal and growing consumption of farm products, production of some crops has continued out of balance with peacetime needs. For each bushel equivalent sold out of CCC stocks, approximately one and a half have replaced it. The CCC investment in inventory and in price-support operations by the end of December has risen to $8.7 billion and it may well be that the statutory authority of $12 billion will need to be raised during the current session of Congress.

By the end of the current marketing year, carryover stocks of wheat are expected to exceed 1 billion bushels. While this is slightly less than at the beginning of the season, it is still more than enough to meet prospective requirements for our product in domestic and foreign markets for a full year. We expect that the cotton carryover at the end of this season will approximate 14 million bales, a new high and also more than enough for a full year's domestic and export requirements. The corn carryover will likely also exceed 1 billion bushels, and the carryover of other feed grains is expected to be a record high. Rice stocks are also at record high levels and increasing. Most of these stocks will be held by or under loan to the CCC. The exception to the rule

of mounting surpluses is that stocks of food fats and oils by next fall will be less than half those of 2 years previous, reflecting a better balance in butter production and increased disposition of other fats and oils in foreign markets.

The President's farm program

It is clear that the onrush of technology and the productive potential of our agricultural community have outrun the capacity of existing farm programs to decisively and realistically adjust production to present market potentials. Moreover, the surplus problem has been aggravated to the extent that it will remain a barrier to price and income improvement and the effective working of present programs until significant reductions are in view. The President's program amounts to a massive attack to attain the objectives of adjusting production so as to reduce as rapidly as possible the vast surpluses and to insure that such unwieldy stocks are not built up again in the future.

The soil bank

The heart of the President's program to adjust production and reduce stocks is the soil-bank proposal. The establishment of a soil bank would be in two parts. One part—the acreage reserve—is specifically directed at the surplus crops of wheat, cotton, corn, and rice. The target for this proposal is to bring about the reduction of excessive carryovers for these crops to normal levels in 3 or 4 years. Farmers would voluntarily reduce their averages of these crops below their allotments. They would place specific acres into the reserve, receiving in return as compensation certificates which would be redeemable by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The total acreage involved in this proposal might be from 20 million to 25 million acres below 1956 allotments. For the next several years production would be reduced below consumption rates. Commodities now in Government hands could move to market. This is a temporary program to end as soon as surpluses are brought down to the size of normal carryover stocks.

This is a voluntary program. We have studies underway to determine the rate of compensation to farmers necessary to insure their participation in the acreage reserve. The payment will be generous enough to assure broad participation and effectiveness of the program.

The other phase of the soil bank is the conservation reserve. This is a long-range program. Also voluntary, it would be open to all farmers regardless of the crops they grow. The objective is to shift about 25 million acres from cropland to forage, trees, or water storage. It is designed to take some of our less productive lands out of current use and to improve them for long-range needs. In addition, some of the acres which have been diverted out of wheat and cotton into feed grains would be affected. Thus we will be moving in on the surplus problem of feed grains caused by the acreages diverted from other surplus crops. For this part of the program the Goverment would bear a fair share of the cost involved in establishing suitable cover, up to a maximum amount, that would vary by regions. Further, as the farmer reorganizes his farm along these soil conserving lines, the Government would provide certain annual payments for a period of years related to the length of time needed to establish a new use of the land.

Let me point out that both the acreage reserve and conservation reserve have a strong feature of income insurance, since these payments would be made regardless of crop yields. Also historic acreage allotments would be protected.

Thus the soil-bank program could take out a total of 45 to 50 million acres of presently used cropland. There would be no grazing on the acreage reserve. Grazing would be prohibited on the conservation reserve for a specified period. We would be taking out as much as one-eighth of our total cropland from current use. We would expect a substantial reduction in crop output in 1956, especially output of surplus commodities, if the tools this program provides are available soon.

Let me discuss for a moment the 1957 budget expenditure estimates included in the President's budget message. You will note that the total budget expenditures for agriculture in fiscal 1957 are estimated at about the same level as in fiscal 1956 despite the inclusion of $400 million to be expended for the conservation reserve of the soil bank. You will also note that the principal offsetting factor is the reduced estimate of expenditures under price-support programs. While the CCC budget estimates were formulated before the soil bank proposals were made by the President, it may be said that they include sufficient to cover the cash outlays under the acreage reserve program. This is based on the assumption that acreage reserve payments will amount to somewhat less than the amount of price-support loans that otherwise would have to be made on production from these same acres. I should mention that the estimate of the cost of price-support programs can be only a rough approximation at this time depending on the yields and market conditions that are realized during fiscal 1957. Under conditions of further acreage restrictions and the possibility that yields this year will not be as high as the very high yields of 1955, a substantial reduction in price-support expenditures would have been anticipated in any event.

This program is designed to increase farmers' net income in 1956 both directly in terms of payments to farmers from the Government and indirectly through the easing of supply pressures on prices.

Other parts of the program

The President's program consists of 9 points. I have discussed the soil bank which is perhaps the most vital of all. I will mention the others briefly.

The President has proposed measures which will widen and improve surplus disposal, particularly barter opportunities and removal of restrictions on surplus movements to the Communist bloc. This will help move CCC stocks out of the front door while the soil bank reduces what comes in the back door.

Commodity programs will be strengthened to improve price-support operations for individual products, including, among other actions, higher price supports for 1956 crop soybeans, cottonseed, and flaxseed, and an expanded school-milk program.

The President proposed that, if the Congress sees fit to enact it, a dollar limit on price supports should be established which will enable our family farms better to compete with huge corporation-type units.

The rural-development program already underway should be enlarged. It will open wider the doors of opportunity for both farm and nonfarm activities, especially for a million and one-half farm families with incomes of less than $1,000 a year. In brief, this program, which is cooperative with other Federal agencies and many of the States, involves research, education, credit, technical assistance, employment information, and vocational training.

The Great Plains program will help promote a more stable agriculture in an area where the risks of farming are great.

The President proposed increases in research which will help us find new crops, new market, and new uses for our agricultural abundance. A strengthened program of research and education will insure continued healthy progress in our agriculture and result in new horizons for our future.

Credit facilities will be expanded and strengthened to aid in the period of adjustment.

The gasoline tax, now paid by farmers to the Federal Government, would be refunded for purchases of gasoline used on farms.

This program, therefore, is many sided. It attacks not only the supply side of the farm problem but also expands market outlets and eases the cost-price burden in agriculture.

It is obvious that this cost-price squeeze will continue until and unless we can dispose of the surpluses which smother farm prices. But how dispose of them?

Number one way is to sell them at home—move the produce somehow into the domestic market in competition with current production. We know what this would do to farm prices.

The number two way of getting rid of surpluses is to sell them abroad. That can be done to a certain extent, and we have been doing it. But to force our surpluses on markets abroad in excessive quantities brings justifiable objections from our allies overseas. To upset world markets and depress world prices stimulates restrictive laws and retaliatory measures against us that hurt American farmers.

Number three way to get rid of our surpluses is deliberately to destroy them. This cannot be tolerated; the public will not approve such waste.

There is one other way, the only sound way yet devised, to get out from under the surplus burden and that is to cut down the flow of wheat, corn, and cotton into Government hands. This must be done—soon.

What the President proposed is a direct and effective attack on the surpluses themselves, an all-out operation which we should not ask the Nation to undertake more than once. In this respect it is not a new farm program; it is a means of clearing away the debris of our past programs so that our present program can go forward. This is not a program to empty warehouses so they might be filled again.

The Senate is now debating S. 3183. This bill would in general implement the administration's soil bank proposals. It would, however, also provide for a return to high rigid price supports for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity, which the administration opposes for many important reasons. Mandatory 90 percent of parity—

Piles up surpluses, which then depress farm prices and farm incomes.

Fails to protect 75 percent of our farm production.

Stimulates unneeded output.

Retards wise farm management.

Discourages sound soil conserving practices.

Results in strict production controls.

Shifts problems to other commodities through the diverted acres route.

Distorts price relationships among farm products.

Throttles consumption.

Disturbs foreign trade.

Causes government to replace the private trade in the marketing of farm products.

Increases the cost of farm programs.

Gives least help to the small operators, who need help most.

Ignores the fact that volume is important, along with price.

If 90 percent of parity were the answer to our farm problems we would have no farm problems. Rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity have been in effect on every basic commodity from the year 1947—which was the high benchmark of farm income—until this fall's harvest. Except for the last few months, the declines in farm prices and farm income have taken place while 90 percent of parity was in effect.

With the soil bank, S. 3183 would strive to reduce our surplus. With rigid price

supports at 90 percent of parity, the bill would provide the incentive for increased production and growing surplus. Both programs are costly and, so far as the effect on surplus is concerned, directly opposed to one another. It is time to decide whether we wish to move toward still greater surplus or toward a better balance of supplies and markets. This is the real issue as the Senate debates this bill.

S. 3183 would return us to the use for four commodities, of old or new parity, whichever is higher. This feature cannot be supported on a basis of equity or economics. Of the 159 farm products on which parity prices are computed, 4 would get this special treatment. These 4 are wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts. In terms of up-to-date supply and demand conditions (that is, modernized parity) the support levels provided by S. 3183 would be: peanuts, 107 percent; wheat, 103 percent; corn, 100 percent; cotton, 91 percent.

Other features of S. 3183 are objectionable, and should be deleted. One is a provision which would increase the level of price supports for dairy products. The dairy business is making a commendable recovery from the dark days of 1954, when huge stocks of butter filled Government warehouses. Consumption is up, Government stocks are down, and the dairy industry has launched an effective sales and promotion program. To require an increase in the level of price support would return the dairy industry to the very difficulties from which it is now escaping.

There is an opportunity to get constructive legislation for agriculture, this year, if a number of the more objectionable features of S. 3183 can be deleted. Luckily this bill is so drawn that the needful amputations can be achieved without impairing the constructive parts of the bill. The big task, of course, is to persuade the patient to undergo surgery.

How much the administration's proposals will affect farm income in 1956 is hard to judge. We have reaped the consequences of years of unfortunate policies in agriculture. We cannot correct the situation overnight. We should keep firmly in mind that this program is not a temporary alleviation of the distress in agriculture. It corrects the basic ills, and its benefits are cumulative. The program provides a long-range solution to one of the most pressing problems our economy faces.

Let us realize also that in developing a solution for the economic forces that beset the farmer in the market place, our efforts on behalf of the low-income farmer who produces little for these markets should not lag behind. If we are to solve the whole agricultural problem, we must also proceed vigorously in the President's program to help the low-income farmer who has been so long disadvantaged in participating in the Nation's progress.

It is no less important, in this period of adjustment in agriculture, that we do what we can to ease the burden of high costs in agriculture. Rigidities in the price structure of the nonfarm economy have increased the cost of items which the farmer must purchase and reduced the share he receives of the consumer's food dollar. In a period of declining farm prices, I cannot be sympathetic with increases in prices of items such as steel and of farm machinery which have occurred in recent months. Nor can I view with detachment the current request of the railroads for a further increase in freight rates which will aggravate the cost-price squeeze. The economic forces and policies that are contributing to a higher cost structure in agriculture, and in the economy at large, are not only a distinct threat to the well-being of agriculture, but perhaps also to the stability of the economy as a whole.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have just been attending hearings before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I listened to the statement of Secretary Benson on the currently proposed agricultural legislation. I find this testimony of the Secretary to be so factual, so clear, and so rational, that I believe it should be made available to the entire membership of the Senate as a part of the discussion now in progress with regard to the agricultural bill. So I am glad the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has had it printed in the body of the RECORD. Had he not done so, I would have made the request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad there is to be printed in the RECORD at this point the statement made earlier today by Secretary of Agriculture Benson before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I would have offered it for printing in the RECORD at this point if it had not been previously submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and again referred to by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, earlier I reserved the right to object to the unanimous-consent request, and then yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who made the objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] objects.

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I was very sorry, indeed, that it was not possible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to begin voting on the farm bill. With respect to the item which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and other Senators discussed a few moments ago, I should like to say that section 307 in the bill merely provides that the cargo preference acts shall not apply to transactions under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

I merely wish to point out that title I refers to sales for foreign currency. We are providing in the bill that sales can be made to foreign governments, which they will pay for with their own currency, but we then tell them that they must ship the goods in American bottoms.

Mr. President, that has been the cause of annoyance. It does not necessarily cause any great financial loss to the foreign countries to make them comply with such a provision, but people just do not like to be told that when they buy something with their own money they must comply with our directions as to how they shall transport the goods to their countries.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, by unanimous vote, thought that such a provision was not proper. It thought the provision was impeding the agricultural development of this country, and particularly that it was doing a great deal of damage to the agricultural commodities produced in the area from which the Senator from Washington comes and which he well knows.

If there is objection to section 307 of the pending bill today I merely say that the bill has been on the floor for a long time, and that it was reported to the Senate after a marathon session which lasted 14 hours of almost continuous meeting by members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. To say now that such a provision should be taken back to committee and reconsidered seems pretty hard to some of us.

I merely wish to point out that if we do not begin voting on the bill soon we will succeed in making its provisions inapplicable to 1956. That can readily happen, because in a very short time the farmers will start planting crops in many parts of the country.

While I do not like the provisions which the able majority leader and the able minority leader have agreed upon, I say very frankly that I am willing to forget that and am willing to go on and debate the bill under the limitations proposed.

There was a reference in the first proposal to substituting House bill 12 for the Senate bill. I do not like House bill 12 at all. It merely provides for 90 percent price supports, and my position on that provision is well known. However, the leaders on both sides have agreed on something which they believe is sensible, and I am certainly not going to object to that sort of program.

I express the hope that an agreement to vote will finally be reached, so that we can start to vote on the bill at an early date. After the farm bill is passed by the Senate, if it is finally passed, it must go to conference. A great many Senators, I am sure, remember how tough some of the conferences between the Senate and the House have been on agricultural bills.

I sat in the conference on the farm bill of 1949 almost by special courtesy, because my name had been attached to the Senate bill. I did not have sufficient seniority on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to be there, yet the members of the committee were gracious enough to permit me to be present. We remained deadlocked for days. Finally, it became quite apparent that we were not going to reach any agreement, and I made a motion that the conferees break up in disagreement and report disagreement to the Senate and to the House. That motion carried. The action subsequently was reversed—I never knew exactly how—and we took another vote the next day, when we were not so tired, and did submit a conference report. But we were literally days and days in steady session. On this occasion, we are going to have pretty much the same problems between the Senate and the House.

The House, in 1949, passed a 90 percent price-support bill, and the Senate passed a flexible price-support bill with the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on it.

In 1949 we had the same story. The so-called Brannan plan was reported by the Committee on Agriculture to the

House of Representatives. A then Representative, now a Member of the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), strongly opposed it as it was reported from the Committee and moved as a substitute for the Committee bill that 90 percent price supports on basics be continued for the year 1950. His motion prevailed and the Gore substitute passed the House, but the Senate passed the flexible price support bill to which my name was attached. Again we spent many days in conference.

We may again find ourselves in the same sort of a wrangle. The House may pass the 90 percent bill. I trust the House will pass something different than that, but a conference agreement will not be quickly reached.

The House has now passed a 90 percent support bill. I trust the Senate will pass something different from that.

Some day I hope the farmers of the United States can have legislation passed before half of the planting season is over.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, whenever the majority leader and the minority leader can find some basis of agreement, I think we should start to vote, because I shall take whatever they present.

SHIPMENT OF COPPER AND OTHER STRATEGIC MATERIALS TO RUSSIA

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, shipments of copper were mentioned on the floor this morning. In view of the fact that also this morning there was reported in the press an interview with Sir Roger Makins, British Ambassador to the United States, who appeared as a guest on Reporter's Roundup yesterday, February 27, regarding United Kingdom shipments of copper to the Soviet Union, I wish to submit a few observations.

Sir Roger Makins was asked some questions regarding the study the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of which I am a member, is now making of East-West trade. I believe there are going to be some misunderstandings coming out of Sir Roger Makins' interview which I thought it would be well to try to clarify as soon as possible.

There was some controversy in this broadcast with respect to copper.

Mr. President, there was testimony before our subcommittee that more than 250 million pounds of copper products have been sent to the Soviet Union since copper was removed from the embargo list in August 1954. Over 75 million pounds of this was sent from the United Kingdom and it is my understanding that licenses have been received for the sale of many more millions of pounds of copper wire during 1956. Perhaps Sir Roger Makins would inform us as to the number of licenses that have been granted by the United Kingdom for the shipment of copper wire during this year.

I might say here, Mr. President, that as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], chairman of the Investigations Subcommittee, reported in a speech to the Senate last Thursday, Congress was officially informed on December 23, that copper remained under embargo. The Senator from Arkansas stated, "this was a gross misstatement of a material fact. It served to mislead Congress and the people."

Sir Roger Makins was questioned about the horizontal boring machine and its strategic value, and whether any of these types of machines have been sent to the Soviet bloc by Great Britain. The Ambassador stated he did not know about such a machine.

In view of this I thought it would be helpful to place some facts in the RECORD.

First, the horizontal boring machine in question costs between $200,000 and $500,000. Second, it was testified before our subcommittee by Defense Department experts, that this machine is indispensable in the manufacture of tanks, heavy artillery weapons, aircraft, ship transmission parts, and catapult parts on aircraft carriers.

These huge machines take approximately 18 months to manufacture. Sir Roger Makins said he did not know of any of these machines being sent to the Soviet bloc. But the record shows one and possibly 2 of these machines have been sent, and that 4 more are to be sent by a British manufacturer.

It might be well, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD some figures on the United Kingdom's exports to the Soviet bloc since the relaxation of controls in August 1954. In 1953 the United Kingdom exported $92.7 millions worth of goods to the Soviet bloc, of which $34.3 millions was to the Soviet Union itself. In 1955, 6 months after trade restrictions had been relaxed with the concurrence of this Government, the United Kingdom exported $164.4 millions worth to the Soviet bloc of which $89.4 million was to Russia.

During that period of time, Mr. President, there was an increase of about 80 percent in the United Kingdom exports to the Soviet bloc and almost 150 percent increase in Great Britain's exports to the Soviet Union itself.

Mr. President, although the complete statistics are not available for 1955 as to the type of goods sent by the Soviet Union to Great Britain, there are some statistics available for the first 6 months of that year. The Soviet bloc furnished to Great Britain in return for these machine tools, machinery, metals, and transportation equipment, $20 million of wood and wood pulp, $13 million of cotton, $13 million of meat, $10 million of coal, $7½ million of fur skins, $4½ million of eggs, $4 million of pig iron, $3 million of corn, $3 million of fruits and vegetables, $2½ million of manganese, and $2 million of feeding stuffs, and so forth.

Mr. President, there was also another exchange with Sir Roger Makins on Reporter's Roundup regarding the United Kingdom's shipments of rubber to the Soviet bloc which I think should be clarified. So that there can be no dispute about it, I should like to read the questions and answers.

WILSON. Well, Bob, I, as a good Middle Western American, can't let the opportunity pass wholly to Miss Montgomery to twist the lion's tail as we call it. So, may I ask you, Mr. Ambassador, is there being shipped behind the Red Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain any rubber which is within the control of Her Majesty's Government?

MAKINS. Not from the—not from United Kingdom sources. Or colonial—or British colonial territories—that is prohibited. It is being shipped from other countries.

WILSON. But not within the orbit of Government of the United Kingdom?

MAKINS. No.

WILSON. But from somewhere in the south of—southeast Pacific probably. Is that right? Southwest?

MAKINS. Well, there are countries that are shipping, that are sending rubber to China because they have very strong, in fact, invincible, almost economic arguments for doing so.

In order to clarify the record, Mr. President, let me say that in 1955 the United Kingdom shipped 25,371 tons of rubber and rubber products to the Soviet Union. Compare this to 1954 when there were 429 tons exported by the United Kingdom to the Soviet Union. We all are well aware of the strategic value of natural rubber.

What worries us on the committee is that all this information is kept from the American people.

The executive branch classifies this information in this country; but it is a matter of public record abroad.

I submit all this information in order to clarify the record.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). In accordance with the last resolving clause of Senate Resolution 221, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late senior Senator from West Virginia, the Senate will now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m., as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia, the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 221, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 29, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28, 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from the class of career minister to the class of career Ambassador:

James Clement Dunn, of New York.
Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado.
H. Freeman Matthews, of the District of Columbia.
Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister:

Don C. Bliss, of New Jersey.
James C. H. Bonbright, of New York.
Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia.
Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., of Virginia.
Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia.
Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire.
James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas.
William J. Sebald, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Robert G. Miner, of New York.
Barr V. Washburn, of Utah.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William H. Bray, Jr., of Missouri.
Harry H. Schwartz, of Ohio.

Paul C. Hutton, of Colorado, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Benjamin Bock, of Texas.
Frank M. Bryan, of Washington.
John Pryor Furman, of Virginia.
George O. Gray, of New Mexico.
George R. Jacobs, of Illinois.
Edward R. Kelley, of New York.
Robert Klaber, of Maryland.
Guy A. Lee, of Indiana.
Donald H. Nichols, of New Mexico.
R. Douglas Smith, of Virginia.
Miss Rebecca G. Wellington, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joseph A. Angotti, of West Virginia.
Miss Elizabeth R. Balmer, of Massachusetts.
Clifford O. Barker, of Virginia.
Raymond E. Chapman, of Michigan.
Frank A. Ecker, of Maryland.
John L. Hagan, of Virginia.
Earl T. Hart, of North Carolina.
Mrs. Mary S. Johnston, of Massachusetts.
Dallas L. Jones, Jr., of Louisiana.
Charles J. Kolinski, of Wisconsin.
Miss Lillie Levine, of Iowa.
Floyd W. McCoy, of Ohio.
Vernon L. Merrill, of West Virginia
Walter L. Nelson, of Wisconsin.
Douglas B. O'Connell, of New York.
W. Angie Smith III, of Texas.
Eldridge A. Snight, of Virginia.
Richard Straus, of Maryland.
Casimir L. Sutula, of Connecticut.
Mrs. Kathleen Clifton Taylor, of Washington.
Karl F. Weygand, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Raymond Bastianello, of Texas.
Miss Virginia Whitfield Collins, of Florida.
William J. Drew, of Massachusetts.
Robert D. Hodgson, of Michigan.
William C. Kinsey, of Virginia.
Waldemar A. Olson, of Wisconsin.
Joel Orlen, of Massachusetts.
Muneo Sakaue, of California.
Peter Simon, of New York.
Thomas E. Tait, of New Jersey.
Miss Marion M. Whinery, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Paul J. Aylward, Jr., of Kansas.
Curtis B. Brooks, of Vermont.
Don T. Christensen, of California.
Robert S. Dillon, of Virginia.
Guido C. Fenzi, of California.
Myles L. Greene, of Florida.
Harry W. Jacobs, of Kentucky.
James A. Klemstine, of Pennsylvania.
Albert A. Lakeland, Jr., of New York.
Jay R. Nussbaum, of New York.
Gerald A. Pinsky, of New York.
Miss Mary A. Roughan, of New Jersey.
Edward H. Springer, of Oregon.
Richard L. Springer, of Ohio.
Charles R. Stout, of California.
Frank G. Trinka, of New Jersey.
Frank M. Tucker, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Frontis B. Wiggins, Jr., of Georgia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Alice C. Mahoney, of Arizona.
Eugene D. Sawyer, of New York.
Edmund R. Murphy, of Maryland, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.
Harold G. Williams, of Washington, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Dean J. Almy, Jr., of Maryland.
Thomas R. Craig, Jr., of West Virginia.
Wesley L. Laybourne, of Virginia.
Frederick U. Wells, of Maryland.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Laurence Walrath, of Florida, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1956, vice Martin Kelso Elliott, resigned.

Donald P. McPherson, of Pennsylvania, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1962, vice John Monroe Johnson, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. R. Donald Williamson, First Baptist Church, Tully, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, we pause humbly before Thee.

In a world seeking brotherhood Thou art the father of all mankind.

In a world weak through its own sins Thou art a God of power.

In a world where despair rules in the hearts of men Thou art a God of hope.

In a world where the hearts of men are gripped by the fear of war Thou art a God of peace.

Look down upon us this morning and bring to us the spirit of brotherhood. Where there is weakness, bring us strength. Where there is despair, bring us hope and bring to the peoples of the world the peace of God that passeth all understanding through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

IMPORT TAX ON NATURAL GAS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which has as its purpose the imposition of an import excise tax of 10 cents per thousand cubic feet on all natural gas imported into the United States. The object of my bill is to afford much needed protection to American interests as they may be affected by the many proposals to import natural gas from Canada and Mexico. I am advised that the Federal Power Commission is currently considering a number of applications seeking authority to import gas from Canada to serve communities adjacent to the northern borders of the United States and that an application is pending which proposes to serve the midwestern and eastern parts of the United States with Mexican natural gas.

There may be some who will contend that an import excise tax upon natural gas is in violation of the spirit of free trade between the United States and Canada and Mexico. However, I wish to point out that there is at present in effect in Canada an import excise tax upon American natural gas crossing the borders into our good neighbor country. Since I represent a State which is noted for its production of bituminous coal, it seems appropriate also to point out that the Canadians tax all American coal coming into Canada at the rate of 50 cents per ton. The Canadians cannot, therefore, seriously object to the imposition of an import tax on such natural gas as may be authorized to be brought into the United States.

It is necessary to preserve and protect our own fuel resource industries from damage and destruction which can result from the introduction of foreign natural gas into the United States. Such gas can be brought in on a basis that will cause economic dislocation, impair capital investments, and create needless unemployment unless some form of a balancing excise tax is applied to this foreign competition. It has not yet been determined the extent which the Canadian Government or the Canadian Provinces, or both, will finance and otherwise subsidize the proposed trans-Canada natural-gas pipeline. Present indications are that it cannot be built without substantial subsidy from the Canadian Government. Yet Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. and Midwestern Gas Transmission Co. are asking the United States Federal Power Commission to approve applications to bring natural gas into the United States and to service areas in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. The point is that the FPC is being asked to approve the importation of natural gas without first knowing the extent to which American competing fuel industries will be asked to compete against a Canadian subsidized gas industry. Such subsidized competition would represent a disruptive and destructive force loosed upon

the competing American fuel industries—natural gas, oil, and bituminous coal.

It is only the exercise of commonsense to act now to protect our own best interests in this manner by writing into the law an import excise tax as I have proposed. I repeat, that we are only doing here that which has already been done by the Canadian Government since they have imposed a tax upon American natural gas and coal that crosses the Canadian border into Canada. I am introducing my bill today in the hope that the Congress will act favorably on it and recognize the need for such legislation in order to protect the best interests of the Nation in maintaining our self-sufficiency in the all-important field of energy production in the United States. I will give the Congress additional facts and figures at a later date to show that legislation of this character is necessary.

DISASTER INSURANCE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as many in the House know, the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], has been conducting hearings on proposals to establish a Government system of disaster insurance. On the Senate side as well, the Banking and Currency Committee has been taking expert testimony on the deficiencies in commercial insurance policies involving loss and damage by natural disasters such as hurricanes, tidal waves, floods, and tornadoes.

Last week in the district which I have the honor to represent, the 24th District of Illinois, the twisting winds of a tornado struck with devastating force. There was literally millions of dollars of damage.

Now it is possible to buy commercial insurance against some of the losses that may result from a tornado. But it is not possible for a citizen to cover himself with commercial insurance from all the losses that may result.

For example, if a person carries tornado insurance with a reliable commercial company, he will be reimbursed if a shingle is blown off the roof of his home or his barn or if the barn blows down. But he will not be reimbursed for damage to his crops. He will not be reimbursed for water damage arising from the flooded creeks and streams that frequently accompany tornadoes. The windstorm may pass him by and yet he may suffer great loss from the flood damage that occurs a little later—and for the loss occasioned by this flood damage he is completely unprotected. It is possible, I am told, for a farmer to buy crop insurance—at a very high rate—from Lloyds of London. But the rate is so high as to be prohibitive for ordinary people. American commercial companies simply do not offer, as a general thing, insurance against loss of crops due to tornadoes and their side effects, any more than they offer policies covering a farmer against such natural disasters as drought. The small businessman can buy a policy protecting him against windstorm damage to plate-glass windows and the merchandise he has stocked. But he cannot buy a commercial policy protecting him from flood damage attributable to the tornado or other windstorm.

It seems to me that the deficiency is exactly the kind of weakness in our commercial insurance system that can be met only by Government action.

The resources of the commercial companies are not adequate to meet the need. No one can accurately predict where a tornado or hurricane or flood will strike. It is popularly supposed, for example, that tornadoes usually occur in the Midwest and the South. Yet in June of 1953 a tornado of devastating force hit the city of Worcester, Mass. The hurricanes, tidal waves and floods resulting from hurricanes used to punish the State of Florida; in recent years they have been striking the Carolinas, Virginia, New England, and the reaches of Canada.

The Banking and Currency Committees acknowledges, I believe, that in setting up a system of Government-inspired insurance against the loss arising from natural disasters it is necessary to move with caution. No one knows exactly how to calculate the cost of the system. No one knows precisely what types of natural disaster should be included in the system when it is inaugurated. The Congress needs the advice and counsel of experts, even though the statistics available to these experts are not all inclusive.

Certain facts, however, are inescapable. First, as our population grows and as investment expands, the potential damage from natural disaster obviously increases. Second, there are great gaps in the system of commercial insurance now available. Third, certain types of loss—such as loss from damage to crops and loss resulting from floods and rising water are not now covered by American commercial companies and are not likely to be covered by private companies in the future. Fourth, the generosity of the American people and the emergency relief offered by such fine organizations as the Red Cross are no longer adequate to meet the serious economic needs.

It seems to me that the appropriate committees of this body and the Senate are exploring a field of great importance in holding hearings on measures to establish a Government system of natural-disaster insurance. I would urge them to consider earnestly the importance of action and the importance of including, if possible, insurance against loss from damage to growing crops as well as damage of other kinds from floods and tornado-caused ground water.

I am today introducing a bill to establish a Government system of insurance. Some 40 such measures already have been offered, and I am aware that the distinguished committee has already conducted some 3 weeks of hearings on the proposals. It is my earnest hope that the distinguished chairman [Mr. SPENCE] may feel that the time is ripe for resuming consideration of the proposals, if in his judgment that is wise, and that the committee may decide that it is possible to report a bill for consideration by the House itself. I have done all that I could to help set in motion the appropriate processes now available for help to the hard-hit citizens of the 2d District, but I am aware—as all of us are, I think—that what is now available is not sufficient to meet the need when an area and its people are struck by unforeseeable natural disaster. A carefully planned system of Government-encouraged or Government-guided insurance would come much closer to meeting the need.

RAILROAD ACCIDENTS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House that again today we have had more railroad accidents. I am advised that in Swampscott, Mass., this morning there was a serious railroad accident causing the death of 16 persons and injuring hundreds of passengers. I am informed that a seven-car stainless steel train en route from Portsmouth, N. H., to Boston, Mass., plowed into the rear of a four-car Budd train that was stopped at the time during a heavy snowstorm. It is very apparent to me, Mr. Speaker, that these railroad accidents are becoming more and more frequent. We had our troubles sometime ago with the New Haven Railroad. And now these accidents are on the Boston and Maine Railroad. Last Friday night in the Cambridge-Boston district, a number were injured when an accident happened in that area. The reason given by them was that somebody had pulled the emergency stop signal. As a result of that accident, a number of people had to be sent to the Massachusetts General Hospital for immediate attention. Mr. Speaker, as one who rides frequently on the railroad, it is hard for me to believe that anybody would pull a stop emergency signal and cause such an accident. It is very apparent to me that many of these unfortunate accidents to these railroad riders come about as a result of the railroad curtailing on the help from time to time and also as a result of the fact that the equipment is not in proper condition. For that reason today, Mr. Speaker, I am filing a resolution which I am including as part of my remarks, and I hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will investigate these accidents not alone in my own State of Massachusetts but in New England generally.

House Resolution 412

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the factors contributing to railroad accidents in the United

States, giving particular attention to the railroad accidents which have recently occurred in the New England area, for the purpose of determining the best available methods for preventing the occurrence of similar accidents in the future.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

RAILROAD ACCIDENTS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am today, like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], introducing a resolution providing that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Congress investigate the accidents which appear to be occurring almost weekly. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in the last 4 days there have been 4 accidents on the Boston & Maine Railroad which goes through my district as well as the district of my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]. I do not believe that we can, at this particular stage, fix the blame, Mr. Speaker. There was a very bad snowstorm going on in Massachusetts when the accident occurred this morning, but I, like my colleague [Mr. LANE], have been deeply concerned over the lack of maintenance and equipment on some of these roads. Something must be done.

I called the White House a few moments ago and asked them down there to exercise all the authority at their disposal to take action in this regard so that we can prevent as far as humanly possible these recurring accidents.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I am a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I, too, hope that there will be a prompt investigation to establish the facts in regard to these very unfortunate accidents.

I hope also that the Interstate Commerce Commission on its own initiative will start an investigation to determine these facts as quickly as possible. Those who have served with the Boston & Maine Railroad and all the other great railroads are entitled to the full facts now.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman.

EMPLOYMENT IN SHIPYARDS AND NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the time is not far off when all ships, both naval and private, will be propelled by atomic power. The first surface ship, a light cruiser, is included in the fiscal 1957 construction program.

Obviously, it will be necessary to have trained personnel in all shipyards to install and service this new type of power. A knowledge of nuclear reactors is something that can be acquired only by advance study and training. In my own district in the State of Washington, I have been gratified to find that recently 4 workers were nominated for a 1-year course at the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge School of Reactor Technology. Also, I am informed that certain other engineers will attend classes in the navy yard for the purpose of creating a nucleus of trained personnel to teach this important subject to other skilled workers and, finally, I was pleased to learn that the University of Washington will establish classes for those who desire study in this new field.

Because our first use of atomic propulsion will be in combat vessels, it does not follow that only the workers in public yards should have training available to them. I hope that Members of Congress who are on the appropriate committees will see to it that equal opportunity is afforded to the personnel of private shipyards for schooling in the adaptation of nuclear reactors for marine propulsion.

Along this line, I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that recently private industry hired away from the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard two men who are skilled in the atomic field. These men may still be available for Government work, but it would appear to me that Members of Congress should see to it that incentive in the way of pay and retirement in Government service is comparable to private industry so that we can retain engineers and skilled workers who are necessary to install and maintain the reactors for our Navy.

President Eisenhower has said the United States is making available for sale or lease 88,000 pounds of uranium 235—$1 billion worth—for power production, one-half in this country and one-half for foreign use, not including, of course, the Soviet bloc. We are truly waging peace by emphasizing and promoting the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It would seem to me, however, that more know-how among American technicians and workers is needed. Are we going to have the skilled workers to install, maintain, and operate atomic powerplants and utilize this uranium 235?

Often one hears it said we have a cloak of unnecessary secrecy over much atomic information. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the workers of America are not being overlooked. Opportunities to progress are their right, just as it is the right of America to have a skilled work force trained to make the most of this atomic age. Know-how can be our greatest resource.

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 408, Rept. No. 1823), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 311 and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

Barden	Gamble	Mumma
Bell	Garmatz	Osmers
Bentley	Gavin	Poage
Boland	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Bonner	Horan	Priest
Bowler	James	Prouty
Boykin	Jenkins	Rabaut
Carrigg	King, Pa.	Rains
Celler	McCulloch	Simpson, Pa.
Chatham	McDowell	Tollefson
Denton	McIntire	Van Zandt
Eberharter	Macdonald	Watts
Edmondson	Merrow	Wharton
Fascell	Metcalf	Williams, Miss.
Fogarty	Mollohan	Zelenko
Fountain	Morgan	
Fulton	Morrison	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF PATENT RIGHTS TO CERTAIN WARTIME INVENTIONS

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 409, Rept. No. 1824), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2128) to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS

Mr. O'NEILL (on behalf of Mr. MADDEN), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 410, Rept. No. 1825), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9428) to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and pending that, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in order to not only enable the needs of America of today, and of 10 years or more, to be met, we must plan and build now.

As we view the world of today and look into the future, as far as we can with reasonable certainty, we see a nation in the next 12 years with a population of 200 millions of persons, and in a few generations, with a population in excess of 300 million. At the present time, the increase in our population is at the rate of about 3 million persons a year.

With this increased population will come increased demands for services and essentials of life and of industry and of national character. This will be particularly so in the field of water resources.

America is blessed with great natural resources, and among them are our great rivers, the resources of which are now, in the main, going to waste. If these resources are marshaled and utilized, and capable of the great use not only now but in the future, it will be for the best interests of our people and our country. In order to meet the demands that exist now, and which will rapidly increase, as we can foresee, we should act now to stop the wasting of our great resources. In doing this, we are building for the future.

In the pending bill, we are making an investment which in terms of money will be returned manifold, but greater, in terms of happiness, to countless of American families will be of inestimable value; and in terms of benefit to our country, will be unlimited.

We must bear in mind that our organic reclamation legislation goes back to 1902. For it was during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt that the National Reclamation Act of 1902 was enacted into law. It was nurtured under Theodore Roosevelt, and under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman it blossomed into nationwide action and benefits. And the projects built and completed during the past 50 years have been an investment beneficial not only to the area served, but to the country as a whole. For an important element in the growth of our country is reclamation and water-resources development.

In terms alone of conserving our water for personal use, our country now has a challenge in various sections; and in the near future, it will be a national challenge.

The mere fact that we live in a section of the country removed from the wide section that this great project will immediately serve, and because of geographical residence alone, as a result of which we have no immediate or special interest, is no reason why we should vote against this or any other worthwhile project. We should not view projects of this kind from a sectional angle. We should view them from a national angle and the national interests.

The Colorado River storage project, now before us, while somewhat different from the Senate bill, calls for an integrated system of dams and storage reservoirs to regulate and control the waters of the upper Colorado Basin covering major parts of four of our great States—Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah. In this great area, water alone is of vital importance.

In the immediate intermountain region, the Colorado River with its tributaries constitutes the greatest source of water. From its source, the Colorado River and its tributaries flow into the Gulf of California. It is a great project for a great country, the authorization and completion of which will make a great contribution to the future growth and welfare of our country. Involved is not only the question of water for personal use, but also reclamation and power and other favorable results that will be of great benefit, not only in the area served, but nationwide. The completion of this project will, through its controlled features, preserve millions of acre-feet of water now permitted to escape in eroding fury during wet years. It will assure the lower basin States of a constant and dependable source of water for the indefinite future.

It is interesting to note that in connection with this project, that although large quantities of electric power will be generated if the dams are built, the power aspect is considered a byproduct of the dam's purpose.

In past years we have witnessed great fights in this body to have enacted into law and to make the necessary appropriations for the construction of great projects in different sections of the country. We know as we look back that each and everyone of them have contributed to the progress of America. This great project is another step, another contribution to the progress of our country.

After many years of legislative effort and struggle, this project is before the Congress in its final legislative stages. Without regard to what section of the country we live in, let us view this project with vision and with courage, recognizing its needs not only for the immediate future, but the great benefits that will come to our country in the decades that lie ahead.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and to vote for the substitute bill that will be offered by the committee and upon final passage to vote for

the bill, for authorizing projects of this kind today means a stronger America tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that before he left Washington I spoke with Speaker RAYBURN about this matter. He is away on a very unfortunate journey. We hope and pray, all of the Members, for the quick recovery of his loved one. Speaker RAYBURN told me that he strongly supports the passage of the substitute bill, as I do, which will be offered by the committee to the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have sought this time in order to say that I shall support this rule and shall support the bill, and I sincerely hope that the rule will be adopted and that the bill will be passed. As I am quite sure at least most of you know a measure dealing with this problem has already passed the other body, and that by a substantial vote. I think it is fair to say that the measure as it passed the other body in many respects goes much farther than the bill that is presently before us.

Mr. Speaker, this whole matter has been long under consideration. It has been the subject of great controversy. It has been debated in Congresses in the past. I am quite convinced that the time has come to resolve the matter and to go ahead with the enactment of this measure, which, I am sure, is in the national interest.

Now, as everyone knows, I come from the State of Indiana. My district is not in the area directly affected by this project, so I have no direct sectional interest in it. But, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts who just preceded me, I think this is one of those measures where we are called upon to look at the broad national interest and what is best for our country rather than in any sectional interest. And that is not to say that in the passage of this measure can I find anything of adverse effect to my particular section.

I have given the whole matter such study as I could. I have tried to become informed about it. I do not claim to be too well advised about all of the intricate details that are involved in the legislation. But, having weighed the matter as best I can and knowing also that there are many conflicting views—and certainly those in opposition have my utmost respect—I am convinced that this bill should be passed.

Let me say here that it is not my intention to inject at this point or at any point any politics in this measure, because there should be no politics in the consideration of such a measure as this, but there have been some charges at times that those of us who sit on our side of the aisle are unmindful of the necessities for programs of reclamation in various sections of the country. Now, I think the record clearly discloses that any such charge as that is far from the truth. I well recall that as the majority leader in the 80th Congress I did my part in the appropriation of funds for reclamation that I think exceeded in their total any such sums theretofore appropriated by any Congress. I well recall that in the 83d Congress, as the majority leader, I scheduled for action a project somewhat similar to this known as the Arkansas-Fryingpan project. I did what I could to bring that measure to successful passage, and in that effort I was supported by an overwhelming majority of the Members on our side. But, as you know, history has it that that measure was defeated. Also, in that 83d Congress, I was happy to do my part in scheduling for action and bringing to passage the Trinity River project. Of course, in this Congress we have already passed measures for the Washita and Ventura projects.

In order that the matter may be perfectly clear—and possibly I should address these remarks primarily to my colleagues on my side of the aisle—I well recall that back in 1950 we Republicans in the Congress undertook to draft a statement of principles and policies. It was my responsibility to take a primary part in that because I was chairman of the House committee of three on the drafting of that statement. The committee of three Republicans from the other body was headed by the late great Senator, Bob Taft. In that statement we said that we supported "continued development and restoration of our soil and water resources through soil conservation and reclamation."

Then in the 1952 platform of our party, having to do with Public Works and Water Policy we said this:

> The Federal Government and State and local governments should continuously plan programs of economically justifiable public works. We favor continuous and comprehensive investigations of our water resources and orderly execution of programs approved by the Congress.

Then we come on down to the 1955 state of the Union message, and amplify it further, when President Eisenhower said this:

> The Federal Government must shoulder its own partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West.

I am also permitted to say that in recent weeks and months the President has again stressed the sincere conviction on his part that this measure is in the national interest; that it is for the good of the country, and should be passed. As a mater of fact, it was no longer ago than this morning at the White House, at our leadership meeting, that the President again urged us to do everything we could to bring about the passage of this measure.

As a matter of fact, the whole problem of water conservation is one of the most important things before the country. In many places, on occasion, we have too much water. On occasion, water can be like fire. Fire is good at the right place, but if it gets out of hand, it can be very bad, very destructive. The same can be said of water.

At the moment, today, there is going on out in my district a hearing having to do with flood control. I would be there as would my adjoining colleague, Mr. MADDEN of Indiana, but for our legislative responsibilities here. There are other times when we do not have enough water and the problem then is how shall we undertake to control this matter of our water resources.

Let me say to my friends out in my section of the country, this problem of the conservation of our water resources for the uses that are necessary is not confined alone to the intermountain country, or the West, or the arid areas. It was not so long ago that I had occasion to be in a discussion with the president of one of the biggest industries in the Middle West, the headquarters of that company being in Cincinnati. We got to talking about the availability of water for industrial and other uses and he said that while on occasion the Ohio gets up to flood stage, there come times in the season when water is at the lowest point. He predicted that in 20 years Cincinnati would experience difficulty because of a shortage of water for industrial purposes.

So, while at the moment I suppose the matter of water is of much greater interest to the people in the western arid and semiarid areas, let us not forget that the time may well come when these same problems will be besetting us.

The upper Colorado project provides for storage and for the conservation of water for use. I am quite sure that much of the water that would be saved for beneficial use, if this measure is passed and these projects are carried out, would be of tremendous value not only to that section of the country but other sections as well, and to the country as a whole, instead of going to waste as it does now at certain seasons of the year, flowing into the ocean.

The upper Colorado project was proposed after decades of negotiations, agreements, and research. Perhaps the most significant event leading up to the present project was the formulation in 1922, 34 years ago, of a unique and comprehensive document known as the Colorado River compact. This compact was approved by the seven States of the Colorado River Basin and is recognized by the Congress of the United States and by the President as the law of the river.

This document is unique in that it divided the waters of the river on a basis of equity before any major development was undertaken. It was recognized early that there was not enough water there for all of the use that might be developed, so the compact prepared the way for the development of the area known as the lower basin of the Colorado River, including principally California, Nevada, and Arizona. Such magnificant structures as Hoover Dam, Davis Dam, Parker Dam, and the All American Canal followed this compact, with benefit to the lower basin. The upper basin States, where 90 percent of the water of the Colorado River originates, are now ready to proceed with a siimlar development. This program has taken years to plan, years to prepare for your consideration today. It has been

devised by the Bureau of Reclamation, by the Senate, by House committees, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and it has received, as I have said before, the wholehearted endorsement and support of the President of the United States.

The total depletion of water from the river in the upper basin, including all present projects, will be approximately 4 million acre-feet annually. This, I am informed, is well within the 7½ million acre-feet allocated to the upper basin by the compact.

This, then, as I see it, is a project planned in accord with a compact and meeting the terms of that compact. On moral and legal grounds I say it is right. It gives to the four States in the upper basin what so far as I am concerned was clearly contemplated when the compact was drawn.

From the standpoint of benefits to the Nation it also is right. It will create new markets for goods manufactured in other parts of the Nation. It will provide for development of the raw materials and other natural resources in an area that has become known as the mineral treasure chest of the Nation. It is advantageous to national defense. It will strengthen a large area, and when any region is strengthened our Nation grows greater. This has been the history of the past and it will be the history of the future as long as we seek and plan for progress.

I think it should be clearly understood that one obstacle to the enactment of this legislation last year has been removed, and that is the Echo Park Dam, that met with the strong opposition of conservationists all over the country. That has been removed.

So I urge your support of the Colorado River storage project because it meets the provisions of an honorable compact, because it has firm justification in benefits that will accrue to the Nation as a whole, because it will aid national defense, and because it will be another step forward for our Nation in the development of our own resources.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, should this matter be disposed of on the rule, it would be a matter of disposing of money at the rate of $93 million a minute when you consider the cost of this project. I think this Congress would hardly want to handle such a difficult, complex, and expensive problem in that cursory fashion. Therefore, although I shall probably vote against the rule for the purpose of indicating my opposition to the legislation I do feel it deserves a great deal of consideration, more than can be given in the short hour provided on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] and I may extend our remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills, H. R. 9583 and H. R. 9589, to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act for the purpose of building what is known as the Interstate System. The purpose of introducing these bills is to provide the funds to reimburse the various States for highways already built or under construction that will be designated as part of the Interstate System. Taking my own State of New York, in which I am very much interested, we realized a number of years ago the great necessity and the importance of building highways. Just as rapidly as possible, we have moved ahead to the end that now we are completing what is known as the New York State Thruway, part of the Interstate System, which runs from New York State to Buffalo and beyond that point, a total of almost 600 miles at a cost of approximately $900 million.

Under the present Fallon bill, H. R. 8336, on which hearings are being held before the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee, credits are provided, but no funds or formula for paying the credits. The bills I have introduced provide two methods. One bill provides that the reimbursement money necessary be deducted over a period of years from the total sum of $24,800,000,000 authorized in the bill. The second bill increases the money authorized to $27,800,000,000 to provide the reimbursement money necessary under the credits provided.

New York State, and several other States, that have moved ahead to meet their obligations of both their economy and national defense and have built their highways in accordance with Federal specifications, would be penalized unless the provisions of these bills are enacted.

I might point out that New York State is not only penalized in this instance because it is and has been progressive in building necessary facilities. The same thing applies to school legislation and other types of Federal aid because, while funds are voted by the Congress to assist various States in the Union that have not kept up with the times, New York will provide a great deal of the tax money necessary to assist in meeting the current and future demands. But there is never provision in legislation to reimburse New York and the several other States for facilities built and for which the taxpayers of the State will be paying off the bonds for many years to come. This to me is unfair and unjust. I am joined in this feeling by my Republican colleagues from the State of New York. I might further add that the Governor of the State of New York has sent letters to all of the members of the New York congressional delegation requesting the reimbursement features embodied in these bills. The chairman of the New York State Republican Committee has also taken this position and has gone on record supporting these reimbursement features. I offer these bills as amendments to present bills being discussed to provide the money that is necessary.

I have also embodied in these bills a section providing that, under all the contracts for the construction of these highway projects in the national system, the contractors and subcontractors pay to all laborers and mechanics wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act—40 United States Code, section 276–a. Last year I supported this provision in the bill that was defeated, and again I support it as a matter that is just and fair to the laborers and mechanics throughout our country.

I shall bend every effort and seek the support of the Members of the House that the provision for reimbursement as well as the prevailing wage sections be injected into any highway legislation that comes before this House and is acted upon by the membership. Highways are sorely needed throughout our country. I support this to the fullest extent, but I am also cognizant of the fact and have been for many years that, while a great portion of the taxes paid into the Federal Government and expended for relief and aid to many parts of our country comes from New York State, very little filters back to the taxpayers of the State of New York, and, when I refer to the State of New York, I also have in mind other States, such as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, California, and several others.

JUSTICE UNDER FEDERAL HIGHWAY AID

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and neighbor in Nassau County [Mr. BECKER] has today introduced jointly with my colleague [Mr. PILLION] two bills which seek to alleviate, by amendment, some of the inequities of H. R. 8836. As a member of the New York State delegation, I am continuously aware of the great burden thrown upon the taxpayers of my State, in support of Federal projects, and I commend my two colleagues for their timely action.

These two bills provide for appropriate repayment and credits for interstate roads already constructed, not merely by intent, but specifically, and provide for recognition of the Davis-Bacon Act in the employment of laborers and mechanics on initial construction work. In order to design a highway bill which will in reality aid our 48 States in the constructon of their roads, it is essential that they be included in any measure upon which we are asked to vote.

The present highway bill will be much the better if the aforementioned amendments are adopted.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that my friend from southern California has indicated there will be no attempt to defeat the rule on this measure. I agree with him that it would be impossible in the short time that we have to attempt to dispel the fog or, I should say, smog, with all deference to my friend from southern California, that has been cast over this measure.

I think our minority leader properly advised you when he said that this measure has been under consideration for a good many, many years, not the exact measure before you today, but the general investigation of this project.

During the last 7 years more than $10 million has been spent in engineering investigations alone on the feasibility of this project. Some of the greatest engineers in this land have been at work on it, the same engineers who designed and helped construct the Hoover Dam, Shasta, Parker, Davis Dam, Hungry Horse, and other great dams in this country.

This matter has also been considered about as thoroughly, or more thoroughly, by the committees of this Congress than any measure—at least any measure that has been before our House Interior Committee.

The other body considered the matter for a good many, many weeks; it came up for consideration in the Senate and was passed by a vote of 58 to 22.

When the matter was considered before your House committee in 1954 it was impossible to bring it to the floor for action before adjournment. It was also considered for a good many weeks last year; and, of course, this year also. I believe there have been more weeks of hearings on this measure than any measure before the committee.

The bill was reported out of committee by a vote of 20 to 6. Of course, it has passed the Rules Committee, and it is now before you.

I simply call these matters to your attention to indicate that we are not coming before you with a hastily drawn or ill-conceived measure.

Since as far back as 1922 when these waters were divided between the lower basin States and the upper basin States, there have been continuous investigations. I might also state that in the Boulder Canyon Act a provision was included that part of the revenue from the Hoover Dam was to go into investigations of projects in the upper basin States so they could go ahead and develop their projects. This money, together with money put up by the States themselves, has gone into these investigations. To us in the arid States where we have less than 12 inches of rainfall a year, I want to assure you that this is a matter of life and death.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman from Indiana suggested a thought which to me is rather persuasive in reaching a decision on this issue, and that is that it is presently proposed to extend to the upper Colorado Basin the same extent of Federal aid or Federal participation that has previously been given in the development of the lower Colorado.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is absolutely correct; and I may also state the total amount of expenditures made in the lower basin States taking into consideraton reclamation, flood control, power, and so forth is tremendous. The amount of reclamation money that has been spent in southern California is absolutely fabulous.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I must refuse to yield. I have only a short time and wish to complete my statement.

I would simply like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that when the Hoover Dam was constructed, as the gentleman from Indiana said, it was provided, and the State of California was required to and did enter into a limitation agreement providing that they would not take any more water than was provided in the limitation act; and the Colorado compact divided the waters half to the lower basin and half to the upper basin.

We have been all these years trying to get our water divided among ourselves, and our projects developed. Now we come before the Congress with a comprehensive plan to permit us to go ahead with the development.

I would also like to remind you that 99 percent of this money will be paid back, the major portion of it with interest. We are taxing our lands and purchasing the water and power to help pay for it. The power that is to be generated will be sold in our own area. All we are asking is for an advance of these funds, the major portion of which is going to come out of the reclamation fund made up of moneys collected from our own States. In my State of Utah 73 percent of all the land is owned by the Federal Government. The Government receives oil and gas revenues from my State which go into the reclamation fund. We feel it is our own money. We are asking for the right to use it and the Reclamation Act provides it cannot be used for any other purpose than to construct reclamation projects.

All we are asking is for our own money and the opportunity to work out our own destiny.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will pass the rule which will give the House an opportunity to listen to 4 hours of honest, sincere debate on the upper Colorado River project. If you do not care to hear the debate, perchance, you might read the arguments, pro and con, in the quiet of your office or of your study. But, because of the importance of this legislation it is absolutely necessary that both sides have an opportunity to be heard. It was reported by the Interior Committee by a 20-to-6 vote with 3 not voting.

We are not dealing, in this legislation, with a matter that can be resolved in terms of hours, days, or years. It is not a matter of States, areas, or localities, but of all the United States. We are dealing more specifically with a matter that will find its place in the future of every man, of every woman, and every child in the United States of America, for future generations to come.

I want to say, in all frankness, that with the adoption of this rule we will be able to show that it has the support of this administration and complete bipartisan support of the Congress. We will show that it is economically feasible; we will show that its engineering is correct, that it will pay back to the Treasury the money that is invested in the development of this resource. We will show that southern California will not lose one drop of water guaranteed them under the compact of 1922. We will demonstrate and show, to your satisfaction, that the bill does not cost $4 billion or untold millions, to every State in the Union. We will show that the land to be irrigated eventually under this development is only about 132,000 new acres, not 586,000 acres as the opponents would have you believe. We will show that it will help the Navaho Indians and the good people of this tribe.

When the Colorado River compact was entered into nearly a quarter of a century ago, California, and lower basin States, under this compact were allocated 7½ million acre-feet of water each year. The same amount was allocated to the four upper States. Water was also promised to Mexico.

Southern California, under the Colorado compact made in 1922, approved and signed in 1928 the building of Hoover, Davis, Parker, and Imperial Dams, and also the Palo Verde weir. Much of this construction was under the guise of flood control and did not cost southern California one thin dime. Southern California has prospered fabulously under the wise use of this stored water. They have had a tremendous economic growth because of the electricity produced at the several dams. The city of Los Angeles could not exist without the long canal giving water from the dams to the city. I am glad they have had that growth. It is part of a growing, dynamic America.

In my judgment, the key to the economy of the West rests in the ability of its people to control two of their great natural resources—land and water. Without the electric power generated from the Hoover Dam, the industrial cities of southern California would not exist. The great Northwest has had its remarkable development because of the projects on the Columbia River. There would be no Los Angeles, no Spokane, Seattle, or Long Beach, as we know them today, if it were not for the men in Congress, in the Government, and in all walks of life who had the vision and the courage to build these projects.

The upper States in the Colorado River project now are asking for their 7½ million acre-feet of water. They are asking that it be stored in reservoirs and that eventually about 132 million acres of land will receive water. They are asking that electric energy be developed, and, indeed, about two-thirds of the money for this project is for the development of electric energy and will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with interest.

The great growth of southern California can be attributed to the wise use of water and electric energy. The same stability and growth of communities in the upper basin States will become a reality when this project is in full force and effect.

The upper Colorado project has been the subject of one of the more strenuous public campaigns in many years. Your

desk has been flooded with propaganda from the Colorado River Association, with offices at 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. Before the debate is ended, I am sure that many of you will realize that much of this propaganda has no basis in fact. Propaganda that this would cost other States millions of dollars has no basis of fact. The engineering feasibility has been established. All these facts will be established.

The project has been conceived and designed by some of the most sincere and capable experts who have had the benefit and experience dating back to the designing and construction of the Hoover Dam. I am sure that Members of Congress must be confused because of the statements and counterstatements relative to this project. The only way these misunderstandings and confusions can be resolved is to listen to or read the debate which will follow on the passage of this rule.

What we are considering in this bill is a matter of extreme national interest. It will permit the people in the upper States to utilize the water guaranteed them by the solemn compact with the States in the lower basin, and it will permit another forward step in the development of the national resources in the United States of America.

A rule has been granted that will permit discussion on this legislation which is so important to our welfare. The rule recognizes that amendments might be necessary to make this a better piece of legislation.

I would like to make it clear that I have no personal interest in this legislation. My State will receive no water and not one kilowatt of electricity will be delivered in Nebraska from any of this project. I am interested because I believe the project to be a vital part in the future of a growing, dynamic America. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule.

You may not agree with the proponents or opponents, but I trust you will permit the Congress to work its will by free and open discussion on this vital legislation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that the 7½ million acre-feet under the Sante Fe compact goes to all the lower basin States. I do not want the gentleman to give away all of Arizona's water in such a cavalier manner. Arizona is a State in the lower basin and certainly expects to share in that 7½ million acre-feet. California has, by her own act, limited herself to 4.4 million acre-feet of water from the Colorado River.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct; thank you.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would just like to say at this point that there are arguments on the other side as to whether or not the 4.4 million acre-feet to California and the other water to the lower basin is imperiled by this project, and I shall discuss it further.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the gentleman will. In the judgment of many, California's water will not be affected.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is faced today with probably one of the most complicated measures which we have had to consider in this 84th Congress. The time of 4 hours, I am sure, will be used to the full by those who are for and against this measure. It is my hope that during the time of that 4-hour debate many of us who believe this bill should be defeated can appeal to the reason and good judgment of the Members of this House to the point where this bill can be defeated. The Members from southern California, on both sides of the aisle, may be placed by the proponents of this bill in a false position. They say that we are water hogs, that we want all the water in the river, and all that sort of thing. As a matter of fact, this compact has been in controversy for more than 25 years. Over 20 interstate commissions have tried to get together to determine what is the meaning of the Colorado River compact. At this very time, as a result of a suit by the State of Arizona against the State of California, the matter is before the Supreme Court for the determination of the meaning of the compact.

There are at least 12 different points that the people in southern California honestly and sincerely feel should be clarified. The only place we can get that clarification, interstate conferences having failed, is before the Supreme Court of the United States.

We have rested our case before the Supreme Court and we are ready and willing to abide by the opinion of the Supreme Court when it comes, whatever that opinion may be. It may be contrary to the belief of southern California. On the other hand, it may support some of our beliefs as to what the compact means. But we honestly and sincerely believe that this tremendous and complicated piece of legislation should not be passed while there is pending in the Supreme Court a suit between States of the compact, which will affect all of the States within the compact; the clarification of which will affect the rights of the separate States, including that of southern California. We feel our contractual rights are in jeopardy. We know of no other way to find out than to seek the judgment of the Supreme Court. We do not want any ill feeling between neighboring States. The Members from California have stood aside on 10 different occasions when legislation conferring benefits upon the upper basin States has been offered. We supported the compact for the upper basin and the approval of the contract by the Congress. We have been willing that money that comes from Hoover Dam go to the upper basin States for engineering projects over the years. We are not a dog in the manger on this project. We merely seek to protect our rights.

We have 6 million people in southern California that are depending upon the water from the Colorado. And I should like to say that the municipalities and the irrigation districts and water districts of California have expended over $700 million in aqueducts, irrigation ditches, and transmission lines from Hoover Dam.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. If the decision of the Supreme Court is in favor of southern California, what effect would that have upon the project as it is presented to the House?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In my opinion, if the Supreme Court should recommend in favor of southern California's interpretation of the compact, it would protect our rights under the compact. But if it should rule against our interpretation of the compact, we fear we would lose some of that protection.

Mr. DIES. That is not quite the question. What I want to know is, if southern California won the case would that change the nature and effect of the project; would it destroy the project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Oh, no.

Mr. DIES. Or have any effect upon it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, as far as I know; it would not.

Mr. DIES. Then what has the case got to do with the project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It might modify the contract to give protection to southern California for water rights which if it were decided against us would make some of our present contracts null and void.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Also in the case before the Supreme Court is the definition of beneficial consumptive use as it applies to the compact.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. That makes a tremendous difference in this particular instance, because that definition makes a difference between the upper basin and the lower basin as to what net water is available for use; and also there is the matter of something in excess of 2 million acre-feet of water claimed by the Indians that might have to be subtracted from the water available between the lower and the upper basins.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to clarify a point that seemed to be in doubt following the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the question as to whether this project came into the same category as far as equal benefits are concerned as the lower Colorado development and the Hoover Dam.

It does not by any means, because before a steam shovel was turned for the building of the Hoover Dam, and that was after years and years of engineering

and investigation as to the best location, before a steam shovel was turned there was a firm contract agreed to by California and the Federal Government that California would pay for the cost of Hoover Dam by consuming the power developed at the dam. It was written down and signed and agreed, and that has been lived up to.

This project does not equal that in any sense whatsoever. This project is seeking to obtain all of the money from the Federal Treasury without any assurance of any return except from the result of the sale of the power and the reclamation of the land eventually. That is paying beforehand, while we in California gave every assurance and guaranty of the payment of it before the project was started.

Another thing, so far as the jeopardy of the lower Colorado River water is concerned, is that there is in the minority report a reliable and a very dependable statement made by Raymond Hill and several other engineers. I quote Mr. Hill because I know him personally. I have had personal contact with him. I know his reputation. He was retained as a consulting engineer by the State of Colorado. He gave to the State of Colorado this statement as a result of his survey:

When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation, there will not be a sufficient flow in the river below Lee Ferry—

That is the dividing point—

to supply the full right of the Metropolitan Water District, namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right.

Here is an engineer's report that that river compact is going to be violated if these projects are put into effect.

The report goes on further to say that the building of the upper Colorado River projects will be disastrous to the lower river States' water supply.

I recommend that the rule be defeated, because I do not think this project is in a form in which it should be debated at this time. It should be recommitted to the committee. More study should be made of it. It is not in a shape in which we should consider it at this time. I am going to vote against the rule just as I voted against the rule the first time it was on the floor, when this House defeated the rule the first time this project was offered to the House for consideration.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Has this project ever been before this body before?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This project has never been before this body before.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The rule was defeated.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I beg the gentleman's pardon, the rule was not.

The only reason I take a little time here is to discuss the question of the so-called lawsuit pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. That is just another method that those in southern California are using in an attempt to defeat this bill.

May I outline to you that the people of southern California and all of the people of the Colorado River Basin States agreed on a compact, providing for a division of the water between the upper basin States and the lower basin States. The southern Californians insist that we should deliver to them an average of 75 million acre-feet over a 10-year period. In order to get the Boulder Canyon project approved the State of California by its legislature, adopted a bill which the Congress of the United States directed them to do under no circumstances and under no condition were they to use or attempt to assert any right in excess of 4,400 million acre-feet plus one-half of the surplus thereof. That was in the original Boulder Dam Project Act approved December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057). Not until this bill began to see the light of day did you ever have southern California or anywhere else, anybody question that compact at all. The southern Californians went to the Supreme Court of the United States and did their best to get the sovereign States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico into it for the purpose of then coming before the Congress saying, "You cannot pass it because it is now in the Supreme Court of the United States." The Supreme Court of the United States turned down the request of southern California and said that this compact as it deals with the upper basin States and this compact and this bill, as we expect to pass it, did not in any manner, and would not in any manner affect this bill nor would we be engaged in any litigation whatsoever.

It is my thought, and I think the record will bear it out, that southern California at the time the Hoover Dam was built, agreed, as the gentleman from California said a moment ago, to repay by paying for the energy and for the water. But what did they do? They came to this Congress in 1940, after that contract was entered into wherein they agreed to pay approximately 5.6 mills per kilowatt-hour for the electric energy they wanted at Hoover Dam, and asked this Congress for permission to rewrite that contract. That contract is rewritten and today they are getting that energy for 2¼ mills per kilowatt-hour. That is one of the things they are fighting it for because they know their obligation to pay it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. So that I will not interrupt the gentleman at the high point of his speech, I wonder if the gentleman would tell the House how many acres of new land will be put into cultivation if this legislation passes the House?

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to the gentleman that that will all be brought out in debate, however, I will answer it now and say approximately 135,000 acres of new land.

Mr. Speaker, first may I express my deep appreciation to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for permitting me to have this much of his all too limited time, and also I wish to thank my very fine and helpful friends, the Speaker pro tempore of this body, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the former floor leader of the House on the Republican side, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] for the fine statements that they made in support of the rule. Much of what has been said here during the last half hour, of course, has its place in the debate. My purpose here is to use the time which I have been given to suggest to my colleagues that this legislation is of sufficient significance and importance to have the rule adopted and to proceed to debate.

Naturally, as sponsor of the bill, H. R. 3383, I support House Resolution 311 now under consideration, and sincerely trust that the Members of this honorable body will approve such resolution and make possible full debate of the upper Colorado River project legislation—legislation about which much has been said and publicized, and of which a great part has been misleading.

My residence in the area to be directly served by the project, which will be authorized by the bill under approval of House Resolution 311, began as a boy in 1904. It has been continuous since then. Although I retain a great warmth of affection for the place of my nativity, the district so ably represented by our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], nevertheless, I shall be eternally grateful that my parents found the needed haven in western Colorado when my mother's health made it imperative for us to find a new home.

My forebears helped pioneer and settle many areas of the East. I am happy that the same fate fell to me as far as a part of the Rocky Mountain West is concerned. The place where my home has been for a half century was out from under Indian rule only 20 years when I moved there. I am the only Member of this great body who is an actual resident of the upper Colorado River basin, an area larger than the whole of New England. I believe that I am qualified to tell you of the hopes and ambitions of the people of that undeveloped storehouse of a large quantity of our country's natural-resource values. Here is an area with its people just waiting for the opportunity to make its contribution to the general advancement and welfare of our great Nation. The upper basin area of the Colorado is a land of great promise. Its agricultural resources now limited by the topography of the area can be developed further. Its mineral resources are virtually untapped. I do not need to advise this body that the upper basin contains the greatest uranium-producing area in this country and perhaps in the Western Hemisphere.

Just a few miles from my home lie mountains of oil shale, vast beds of coal and mountains of phosphates—to mention a few of the items comprising the mineral wealth of my area. The same, of course, is true of New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. These tremendous mineral deposits with their vast potential benefits for the people of our land, wait only for the availability of power at reasonable rates and the availability of sure supplies of domestic and industrial water. The downrush of the waters of the Colorado will provide the bootstrap by which this area can pull itself up, paying its own way as it goes, and giving incalculable values to the Nation generally.

I stand here in the well of the House with a feeling of great hope that this day will see a generation-old dream come true—a dream of the people of the upper Colorado River Basin area for a rather limited number of new farms, a somewhat greater number of old farms with a sure supply of vital water at some period in the future beginning not earlier than 1964, a limited amount of municipal water development, and electric power as an incidental feature to bring new mines, mills, and factories to develop our abundant resources. If indeed industrialism proceeds as visualized much of the agricultural water will be taken for cities. In it also is the first necessary step in a long-range program to aid a large segment of our Navaho Indians.

We of the upper Colorado River Basin have been working toward this sound development for the better part of this century. Bills to achieve it, following upon negotiation, planning and interstate agreement, have been before the Congress for several years. Now the great effort is at a time of decision—the bill is ready for House action. We of the upper Colorado Basin area and States directly interested therein stand ready to justify the Nation's faith in our plan with our assurances for repayment of the financial credit we here seek. There is no better demonstration of our faith in this project.

I cannot here add dramatic new testimonials to the soundness of this legislation. I would not, if I were able to do so, guild it as the lily, but I know it to be fundamentally sound and worthwhile—worthwhile to the underdeveloped area through which the Colorado River now flows as an erratic and wasting asset, and equally worthwhile to the Nation as well.

This Nation was built by, and has always profited from, the development of its resources. Bonneville, Coulee, Central California, Boulder—all these stand as monuments to the gain for the Nation to be achieved by initial advances from the Government.

I have not time now to refute each dramatic thrust that has been made against this legislation—thrusts made by skillful and well-financed opposition. Such opportunity will be afforded to us with the adoption of the rule under consideration. It is my hope that the facts will be the basis of decision in your case, as it has been in mine. These speak for themselves and speak in solid support for this Federal resource investment.

These facts have grown out of extensive hearings. As chairman of the committee which held these hearings, I made sure that each point of view was fully, even redundantly, heard and considered, whether fact or folly. We did not proceed as partisans or as wastrels, but rather as men seeking to bring to fruition the type of development which has proven to be so valuable in other areas, and to the Nation generally. Evidence of this careful consideration can be found in the newly adopted provisions of the bill excluding and protecting national park and monument areas—which legislative protection was sought by conservation-minded groups. Further evidence is found in our limit on the total appropriation to an amount considerably below the figure approved by the other body, but a figure which we believe to be adequate to do the job.

This is now being submitted to you from the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for your judgment. In the reports we have offered facts to undergird the conclusions which resulted from our extensive consideration.

Beyond this, to each of you who have had a question to ask of me, I have given a plain and forthright answer—as your questions deserved. I have not, nor will I now, paint this logical program as a glittering package of indescribable and limitless value, but my colleagues and I shall do our best to present to you its worth and possibilities to the area and Nation. It will provide the economic stimulus for a now underdeveloped area which will enable it to build new farms, new cities, new factories, and create other income and tax-gathering facilities out of which repayment can be made. It is not something new, and for a testimonial of its economic worth and value, just turn your ear to the concerted opposition rising up from southern California which would like to profit from the use of the same water even though they signed solemn agreements that it was not theirs.

I know only too well that all of you have been treated to carefully calculated points of opposition ranging from purported statistical data to side-show routines about rock that dissolves in water. To those of you on my right convinced that you do not favor this legislation, I offer this last chance to join in a new and challenging adventure. To those of you on my left in this same situation I offer the reminder that this is favored by past and present leaders and spokesmen of your great party and has an honorable history back to the administration of the able and dynamic Theodore Roosevelt. It is not a partisan matter at all.

What is it that we propose? We propose at last to control the upper half of the turbulent Colorado River, much as it has been controlled by Federal help in its southern reaches. To do so, we need a giant dam, not as high as Hoover, but more expensive, to tame the erratic flow. This dam, Glen Canyon, and the falling water from it converted to electrical energy, will enable us to put water to use in development elsewhere for farms, cities and people; for mine and mill and factory. These economic creations will generate the new income necessary to repay the advances made during construction. That is all there is to it. True, the $760 million figure is a considerable sum, but recall only that the repayment to the Government, in that it involves interest on two-thirds of the features, will be even larger. It is not, unfortunately, enough of a return to attract private industry, but it is enough to bring wealth, net new wealth, new income, new taxes, new markets, to the Nation. That is the criteria upon which I support this legislation. It will provide the necessary development of now underdeveloped resources in a manner that will return the advance. Is it not good enough for you as well?

Just to save a lot of time, I should like to cover in pointed terms what this bill does not contain. I realize that this is perhaps not the best way to approach the virtues of any legislation, but until we clear the tangled underbrush of calculated confusion, we cannot see the trees. There are many interests and groups who fear to have the trees seen lest they be appreciated and approved. Accordingly, they take the devious path of confusion. The upper Colorado storage and development project is not something new, something recently concocted by a bunch of harebrained planners bent on development at any cost. The history of this proposal, rather, goes back before the turn of the century when farseeing men began the development of the arid West by means of irrigation. This development was a key point in the necessity which moved the States along the Colorado to come to binding agreement on the division of its waters which culminated in the Santa Fe compact in 1922. This development was foreseen, supported, and advanced by such farseeing political leaders of our country as Herbert Hoover, Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Calvin Coolidge, and a list of highly respected conservationists too long to include here. Indeed, some of the very dams proposed as a part of this upper basin development were surveyed and contemplated for construction by the lower basin before they settled on a high dam in Black Canyon, since known as the Hoover Dam. This development merely provides for the use of the waters of the Colorado River and this has been contemplated, planned, supported, and advanced by each negotiation, legislative enactment, compact, and proposal since the early settlers were able to see that water was life in the West. This is not to say that all has ever been harmonious or unanimous. Water is the lifeblood of the West, and if I seem repetitious, let it merely indicate a measure of the conflict that has occurred over its control and use. I wish each of you had time to go over the history of the development of this great region stretching from the Rockies to the Gulf of California. I wish you could go back with me over the long negotiations, battles, and final agreements affecting this river. It is a fascinating story with able and energetic

characters, a worthwhile plot, and more than adequate drama. It has many authors—men now forgotten, men once famous but now passed into memory, and men who were there and are still available to recount the story in personal terms even though time is taking its toll. It has many side plots and plots within plots, yet it is all a consistent part of the whole drama of development in the Colorado River Basin—and how general development is tied irrevocably to the waters of this great stream.

The bill, consideration of which would be in order upon the approval of the resolution now before us, does not authorize, or even contemplate, the construction of any facility having any adverse effect on any area reserved as a national park or national monument. On the other hand, the legislation as approved by the committee specifically provides for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument should it be endangered by the construction of the Glen Canyon unit. It goes even further and provides that it is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be in any national park or monument.

The suggested legislation does not authorize or of necessity contemplate any billion dollar boondoggle to siphon away funds from the National Treasury or economy. In fact, the nonreimbursable cost allocations in this legislation are very small with 99 percent of all the funds advanced by the Federal Government to be repaid in full to the Federal Treasury with those costs allocated to power, and municipal water repayable with interest.

The bill does not involve, either as now presented or originally proposed, any multibillion dollar subsidy to this area of the West. In fact, the legislation contains no authorization for subsidy as the word is so often misused these days. Evidence will be presented by the proponents of the legislation to show that the benefit-cost ratio of this particular project is most favorable to the Nation generally. The plan to be considered by this body does not involve or even contemplate any use of water which will have adverse effect upon present legitimate and legal uses based upon the law of the river at any place along the river, in its basin or in areas now served by waters from the river. In fact, the proponents will show that provisions have been incorporated in the legislation to cause the law of the river to apply in every possible instance. The bill does not involve or even contemplate any sudden or eventual use of the Colorado River water not known to any informed person of the whole area for the last three decades, nor does it involve any theory, proposal, or Federal aid not equally well known and previously supported by several States and legal entities of the area now supporting or opposing the present program to be authorized by the legislation to be considered. In fact, it conforms, and in some respects more conservatively, to the established procedures, rules, and regulations for reclamation developments heretofore authorized by this body.

The bill does not require vast sums of money from other States of the Union to their damage and hurt. In fact, it requires only a limited amount of aid over the necessary construction period from funds other than those available in the revolving reclamation fund. Well-grounded estimates show that in no year during the construction period would the Federal Government be called upon to furnish from the General Treasury more than $18 million a year, practically all of which would be repayable.

The bill does not involve or even contemplate power costs in excess of that presently charged or available in the foreseeable future for the area to be served; nor does it contemplate hydro power development adversely affecting our diminishing resources of hydrocarbons; nor does it contemplate any program that would adversely affect our nuclear power reactor projects. In fact, the development of the upper Colorado River project would aid the development of the other programs and the power produced would be furnished at a rate benefiting the users.

The bill does not involve or even contemplate the culture of any esoteric food or any crop now in great surplus or in competition with those produced in any other area. In fact, the amount of land to be developed under the project is considerably less in acreage than the amount now being withdrawn from agricultural production for military, municipal, highway, and other uses made necessary by an increasing population, and the progress of our economy.

The bill does not involve any flimsy program hastily thrown together without a thought as to its integration to the needs of the whole area or the Nation. In fact, on the contrary it is a well thought out and well planned project carried as far along in concrete plans and specifications as funds available have permitted. Of course, there is considerable engineering work to be done yet to insure that the various facilities of the project can be constructed effectively, safely, and economically.

The bill does not, of necessity, involve the appropriation of money at a time when the budget may not be exactly balanced. However, with the approachment of the time when the budget is balanced, the much-publicized phony interest and nimble numbers charges would assume their proper perspective and relationship. In fact, the national benefits which would be possible under the authorization after it comes into operation would aid and further our national welfare to a material degree.

The sponsors of H. R. 3383 and companion bills, if given the opportunity, will present in an orderly, and we trust, effective manner the facts and procedures pertinent to the legislation. We respectfully ask for your favorable support of the rule and close attention to the matters which are factually involved.

I wish to suggest to my good colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] that it is a rather pleasing experience for me to come this far along in the consideration of this legislation and find ourselves in mutual agreement at least on one thing and that is that this legislation is sufficiently important to be considered by the House.

May I advise of the amount of consideration that has been given to this bill? More than 125 hours were devoted to the taking of testimony by committees in the 83d and 84th Congresses, and to careful and close consideration of the matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman tell the committee how that time was divided?

Mr. ASPINALL. With the exception of about 6 hours which were given to departmental witnesses to present their case, the time was divided 50–50, 50 percent of the time to the proponents and 50 percent of the time to the opponents.

More than 2,800 pages of printed testimony are available for the Members of this body to study if they see fit.

Of those witnesses who appeared before our committee during the 84th Congress, 38 were basin proponents, 1 was an REA spokesman supporting the bill; 3 were Indian representatives supporting the legislation; 2 were private-utility spokesmen supporting the legislation; 11 were conservationists who were opposed to the legislation at that time; 2 were in general support; 15 southern California witnesses appeared in opposition, and only 1 witness other than this group from southern California appeared in opposition to this legislation.

When my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], suggests that we are bringing to this body an entirely different piece of legislation than that originally put before the House, the gentleman is absolutely mistaken. The germaneness of what is proposed in the amendment has been passed upon by those who are familiar with parliamentary practice before this body.

We have stated we would not attempt to bypass the important Rules Committee in any particular whatsoever.

One of the most important amendments that has been placed in the substitute is to the effect that no national park or monument area shall be trespassed upon in the construction of this project.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not all of the so-called conservation controversies have been resolved? Is the conservation group satisfied with this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. All of the conservation opposition that was formerly placed before our committee to my knowledge has been withdrawn. Some of them not only have withdrawn their opposition, but they now support this legislation wholeheartedly, as is shown in the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That includes the Sierra Club of California?

Mr. ASPINALL. That includes the Sierra Club of California, under the able leadership of Mr. Brower.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. May I make a correction? Mr. Brower has contacted me within the past few days, continuing to voice his opposition to the proposition.

Mr. ASPINALL. We are not going to get into any argument on that. I have stated what is my opinion.

We have made one change in the substitute which goes to the formula for repayment. We have done this, as you will be advised, in order to see to it that the waters allocated to the upper basin through the Colorado River compact of 1922 and the upper Colorado River compact of 1948 are properly allocated to bring about the use of such allocations heretofore made to the various States. By direction we have attempted to do what the former bill did by indirection. It is the feeling of the committee that this amendment is germane.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman has just referred to a list of interests that have approved the bill. Would the gentleman care to inform the House whether or not the private power companies of Utah, Colorado, and Arizona approve this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. I shall advise the gentleman from New York that there appeared before our committee two representatives of the private power utilities in that area, stating that they represented some 10 private utilities. They advised the committee that they were willing to accept the responsibility of distributing the power that was surplus to the needs of the REA.

Mr. DONOVAN. The answer of the gentleman then is that this bill is all right with the private power utilities of that area; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. In that part of the area we have had friendly operations. They have come into the picture and suggested to us their willingness to accept this responsibility.

Mr. DONOVAN. So that this is one piece of public power legislation in the West that the private power companies do not oppose; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will let the gentleman answer his own question.

Mr. DONOVAN. Would the gentleman care to inform the House as to what knowledge he has as to why the private power utilities concur in this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, some question has been raised here during debate upon the rule as to the propriety of certain actions that will be taken. It is my understanding that the commitee proposes to offer an amendment to its bill in the form of a substitute. I take it if the substitute is germane it may be offered. If it is not germane an objection would stop it. Therefore, I see nothing irregular about this procedure. It is perfectly in order.

Mr. Speaker, while I personally am constrained to oppose this bill and vote against it, it is of sufficient importance that the rule should be adopted and full discussion had as is provided under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 354, nays 26, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—354

Abbitt	Christopher	Green, Oreg.
Abernethy	Chudoff	Green, Pa.
Adair	Church	Gregory
Addonizio	Clark	Griffiths
Albert	Clevenger	Gross
Alexander	Cole	Gubser
Alger	Colmer	Gwinn
Allen, Calif.	Cooley	Hagen
Allen, Ill.	Coon	Hale
Andersen, H. Carl	Cooper	Halleck
	Corbett	Hand
Andresen, August H.	Coudert	Harden
	Cramer	Hardy
Anfuso	Cretella	Harris
Ashley	Crumpacker	Harrison, Nebr.
Ashmore	Cunningham	Harrison, Va.
Aspinall	Curtis, Mass.	Harvey
Auchincloss	Curtis, Mo.	Hays, Ark.
Avery	Dague	Hayworth
Ayres	Davidson	Healey
Bailey	Davis, Tenn.	Hébert
Baker	Davis, Wis.	Henderson
Baldwin	Dawson, Ill.	Herlong
Barrett	Dawson, Utah	Heselton
Bass, N. H.	Deane	Hess
Bass, Tenn.	Delaney	Hiestand
Bates	Dempsey	Hill
Baumhart	Derounian	Hinshaw
Beamer	Devereux	Hoeven
Becker	Dies	Hoffman, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Diggs	Hoffman, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Dingell	Holland
Berry	Dixon	Holmes
Betts	Dodd	Holtzman
Blatnik	Dollinger	Hope
Boggs	Dolliver	Horan
Boland	Donovan	Huddleston
Bolling	Dorn, N. Y.	Hull
Bolton, Frances P.	Dorn, S. C.	Hyde
	Dowdy	Ikard
Bolton, Oliver P.	Doyle	Jarman
	Durham	Jennings
Bonner	Edmondson	Jensen
Bosch	Elliott	Johansen
Bow	Ellsworth	Johnson, Calif.
Bowler	Engle	Johnson, Wis.
Boyle	Evins	Jonas
Bray	Fallon	Jones, Ala.
Brooks, La.	Fascell	Judd
Brooks, Tex.	Feighan	Karsten
Brown, Ga.	Fenton	Kean
Brown, Ohio	Fernandez	Kearney
Brownson	Fino	Kearns
Broyhill	Fisher	Keating
Buckley	Fjare	Kee
Budge	Flood	Kelley, Pa.
Burdick	Fogarty	Kelly, N. Y.
Burleson	Forand	Keogh
Bush	Ford	Kilburn
Byrd	Forrester	Kilday
Byrne, Pa.	Frazier	Kilgore
Byrnes, Wis.	Frelinghuysen	Kirwan
Canfield	Friedel	Kluczynski
Cannon	Gary	Knox
Carnahan	Gathings	Knutson
Cederberg	Gentry	Krueger
Celler	George	Laird
Chase	Gordon	Landrum
Chelf	Grant	Lane
Chenoweth	Gray	Lanham
Lankford	Patterson	Smith, Wis.
Latham	Pelly	Spence
LeCompte	Perkins	Springer
Lesinski	Pfost	Staggers
Long	Philbin	Steed
Lovre	Poff	Sullivan
McCarthy	Polk	Taber
McConnell	Preston	Talle
McCormack	Price	Taylor
McDowell	Prouty	Teague, Calif.
McGregor	Radwan	Teague, Tex.
McMillan	Ray	Thomas
McVey	Reece, Tenn.	Thompson, La.
Machrowicz	Rees, Kans.	Thompson, Mich.
Mack, Ill.	Reuss	
Mack, Wash.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, N. J.
Madden	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Magnuson	Riehlman	Thomson, Wyo.
Mahon	Rivers	Thornberry
Mailliard	Roberts	Trimble
Marshall	Robeson, Va.	Tuck
Matthews	Robsion, Ky.	Tumulty
Meader	Rodino	Udall
Metcalf	Rogers, Colo.	Vanik
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.	Van Pelt
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Velde
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Tex.	Vinson
Miller, N. Y.	Rooney	Vorys
Mills	Rutherford	Vursell
Minshall	Sadlak	Wainwright
Morano	St. George	Walter
Moss	Saylor	Weaver
Moulder	Schenck	Westland
Multer	Scherer	Whitten
Mumma	Schwengel	Wickersham
Murray, Ill.	Scott	Widnall
Murray, Tenn.	Scrivner	Wigglesworth
Natcher	Scudder	Williams, N. J.
Nelson	Seely-Brown	Williams, N. Y.
Nicholson	Selden	Willis
Norblad	Sheehan	Winstead
Norrell	Shelley	Withrow
O'Brien, Ill.	Short	Wolcott
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sieminski	Wolverton
O'Hara, Ill.	Sikes	Wright
O'Hara, Minn.	Siler	Yates
O'Neill	Sisk	Young
Ostertag	Smith, Va.	Younger
Passman	Smith, Kans.	Zablocki
Patman	Smith, Miss.	

NAYS—26

Blitch	Jackson	Poage
Carlyle	Jones, N. C.	Roosevelt
Davis, Ga.	King, Calif.	Sheppard
Flynt	Lipscomb	Shuford
Haley	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Hillings	Mason	Utt
Holifield	O'Konski	Wilson, Calif.
Holt	Phillips	Wilson, Ind.
Hosmer	Pillion	

NOT VOTING—53

Andrews	Garmatz	Pilcher
Arends	Gavin	Powell
Barden	Granahan	Priest
Belcher	Hays, Ohio	Quigley
Bell	James	Rabaut
Bentley	Jenkins	Rains
Boykin	Jones, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.
Burnside	King, Pa.	Richards
Carrigg	Klein	Riley
Chatham	McCulloch	Simpson, Pa.
Chiperfield	McIntire	Tollefson
Denton	Macdonald	Van Zandt
Dondero	Martin	Watts
Donohue	Merrow	Wharton
Eberharter	Mollohan	Wier
Fountain	Morgan	Williams, Miss.
Fulton	Morrison	Zelenko
Gamble	Osmers	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Riley against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Carrigg.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. James.
Mr. Quigley with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Gamble.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of personal privilege.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial from the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, a recent issue which is entitled "Colorado Moves On."

In speaking of the fate of the bill the editorial says:

It appears the project can be brought to the House for floor debate late this month, leaving no excuse for failing to give it careful consideration and a calm vote.

One may suggest that aside from the Nation's welfare, no time should be lost for the sake of Congressman HOSMER of California. If he is given many more weeks in which to dream up a bigger falsehood than those he has already presented, the consequences can't be foreseen.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial reflects upon my integrity as a Member of this body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman send the editorial to the Chair?

Mr. HOSMER. I will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks the gentleman raises a question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter, including tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial being couched in the terms it is leaves a question on everything that I have ever said about this project over several long years of effort. I am going to itemize these to you and ask you: True or false? And leave it to your opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that I opposed this project because it tramples the water rights of California both as to quantity and to quality. True or false?

Mr. Speaker, I stated, under date of March 16, the reason for my opposition to the upper Colorado basin project because as proposed it would qualify California's right to waters of the river established by compact, contract, and appropriation. This is my full statement:

Southern California Congressmen have been receiving numerous letters from home urging us to oppose the upper Colorado Basin storage project.

For myself, as a member of the committee holding hearings on it, I wish to say that I have devoted the majority of my time to this great battle on behalf of the 6 million southern Californians vitally dependent on the quantity and quality of their lawful share of the water of the Colorado River. We vitally need it for our homes, our farms, and our job-giving industries.

If the day should ever come that Colorado River water failed to flow into our area, on that day Southern California would be changed from an oasis to a desert. On that day, every southern Californian would lose the value of his home and everything else he owns that could not be transported to another part of the country.

In addition, we must protect the almost three-fourths billion dollars we have invested in dams, canals, transmission lines, and other facilities constructed to make use of our share of the water.

All southern California Congressmen have participated wholeheartedly in this nonpartisan battle for southern California's vital interests.

The reason we oppose the upper Colorado Basin storage project is that, as proposed, it would violate California's rights to waters of the river established by compact, contract, and appropriation.

It is a strange, but true, fact that developments on the upper Colorado can proceed without interfering with California's rights.

Thus, our fight is not blindly directed against upper Colorado Basin developments in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico. Rather it is against carrying them on in such a way as to trample our water rights.

Whenever these States are willing, in building and operating their projects, to recognize and respect our rights, I believe California's opposition will vanish like a snowball in the hot sun.

We, in the arid West, are all interested in seeing that every possible use is made of what water we have. But we will forever "stand on our ditch" and protect what is rightfully ours.

Southern Californians can become "water vigilantes" and help in this battle. They should write their friends and relatives in other parts of the country to contact their own Congressmen and Senators urging opposition to the upper Colorado project until the legislation contains provisions guaranteeing California's existing water rights.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOSMER. I decline to yield. I wish to make my statement. If any time is left I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman from California is not speaking to the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This question of personal privilege is one of rather broad latitude.

The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield at this point.

I state further that whenever these States are able to build and operate their own projects, I believe California's opposition will vanish.

Again, on April 28, 1955, I made a similar statement and concluded it must be revamped and redesigned, referring to the upper Colorado River project, so that ultimately it will produce results, not just consequences. True or false? This is the text of the statement:

Strong opposition to the proposed upper Colorado Basin storage project has been voiced to the House Interior Committee considering it by southern California's congressional delegation.

Acting as spokesman for the group, Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, Long Beach, presented the committee with a 121-page statement summarizing objections and supporting them with detailed economic, engineering, and other data.

The Hosmer statement included the following points:

The project would seriously cut down the amount of water the Golden State could expect from the Colorado River.

The quality of that water would be seriously impaired by a higher concentration of salts and alkalis.

Power generated at Hoover Dam would be reduced by water shortages and to replace it, southland home and industrial consumers would have to pay over $2 million a year more for power.

Going on to general objections to the project shared by citizens of all the 48 States, HOSMER said:

Lost power revenues during the life of the present Hoover Dam contracts would cost United States taxpayers at least $187 million.

The ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project would cost United States taxpayers an additional $4 billion, and $372,800,000 of that amount would be borne by California taxpayers.

The project $4 billion cost means that the price tag to irrigate each acre in the 600 square miles of farmland involved will be $5,000. Its products would involve taxpayers in further expenses when purchased as surplus under price-support programs. There is that much land in other areas of the country that can be brought into cultivation later, if needed, at a significantly smaller cost.

The project's vast hydroelectric production facilities must sell power at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour for the next 100 years to pay for themselves. This will be impossible because of lower cost power developing from nuclear fuels and the facilities will be left on the taxpayers' backs as the most monumental white elephant in history.

The project's Echo Park Dam will invade scenic Dinosaur National Monument with unsightly power facilities.

Utah's famed Rainbow Bridge, the world's largest and most magnificent natural structure of its kind, will be endangered by construction and operation of the project's Glen Canyon power reservoir.

The project will saddle a limited agriculture economy on the upper basin States of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico whereas they have unlimited possibilities for the future if left free to develop an industrial economy.

In urging defeat of the project HOSMER concluded, "it must be revamped and redesigned so it ultimately will produce results, not just consequences."

Southern California Congressmen joining HOSMER's general opposition to the project, without specifically committing themselves to any of the particular arguments against it, were: Representative DONALD L. JACKSON,

Republican; Representative GORDON MCDONOUGH, Republican; Representative CECIL KING, Democrat; Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat; Representative CARL HINSHAW, Republican; Representative EDGAR W. HIESTAND, Republican; Representative JOE HOLT, Republican; Representative CLYDE DOYLE, Democrat; Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat; Representative PAT HILLINGS, Republican; Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican; Representative HARRY SHEPPARD, Democrat; Representative JAMES UTT, Republican; Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, Republican, and Representative ROBERT WILSON, Republican.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that California is not opposed to this project on the basis of any loss of low-cost power. I have merely taken the opportunity to point out that the United States Treasury will lose some $187 million in revenues from the Hoover Dam if this project is built. I have not opposed it because it will cost some $2 million more a year in power costs to southern California power users. That amounts to about $2 a family, and we can afford it. That argument is specious.

I have argued that the quality and quantity of the water that California gets will be interrupted, interfered with, and deteriorated because the overall project will store 48 million acre-feet of water, 48 million acre-feet of water that will never pass through Lee Ferry to go to southern California to serve that area, and another 10 million acre-feet that will disappear by means of evaporation. Water is one of our most precious commodities; we cannot afford such waste.

The Bureau has stated to the committee in this connection that the upper-basin States can store water for the purpose of using it 50 years hence and keep it from those who want to use it now in the lower basin, that such is a proper interpretation of the compact. That is an interpretation of the compact which is entirely strained and erroneous.

Whether you believe my statement is true or false as to the deterioration of California's water in quality and quantity, I want you to evaluate this on the statement made by Gov. Ed C. Johnson, who prabably knows more about the Colorado project than any other individual. He served in the other body for a number of years and is presently the Governor of the State of Colorado. I refer to his statement issued in December 1954 in which Governor Johnson, among other things, quoted ex-President Hoover, who was the man at the head of the Colorado River Compact Commission back in 1922. He quoted Mr. Hoover to the following effect: "The lower basin will receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper basin for agricultural purposes."

Governor Johnson further stated:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin and must be delivered to the lower basin.

There are serious misconceptions abroad concerning the terms of the Colorado River compact, according to Governor Johnson.

He says it imposes restriction on the upper basin which must be understood, as they are basic to any plan of development in the upper basin.

These basic questions are, according to Johnson:

First. Does the compact deny the upper basin the right to withhold water it cannot use for domestic and agricultural purposes?

Second. Does it deny the upper basin the right to withhold water to develop power?

The answers he gives are these:

Article II (h) of the compact defines "domestic use" as for household, stock, municipal, mining and milling, industrial, and like purposes, excluding power generation.

Article III (e) says the upper-basin States shall not withhold water and the lower-basin States shall not require delivery of water which cannot reasonably be applied for domestic and agricultural uses.

Herbert Hoover was chairman of the Commission that drafted and signed the compact. He interpreted these provisions at the request of Representative Hayden, of Arizona, on January 27, 1923, before any State ratified the compact.

Asked if article III (d) meant that upper basin could withhold all except 75 million acre-feet within consecutive 10-year periods and thus secure not only III (a) water but the entire unapportioned surplus, Hoover replied:

No. Article III (a) gives the upper basin 7.5 million acre-feet per annum. III (e) says the upper-basin States cannot withhold water that cannot be beneficially used. III (f) and III (g) specifically leave to further apportionment water now unapportioned. So there is no possibility of construing III (d) as suggested.

According to Governor Johnson, when asked why article IV (b) made impounding of water for power purposes subservient to its use and consumption for agricultural and domestic purposes, Hoover said:

(a) Because that conforms to established law in most semi-arid States.

(b) Because cultivation of land outranks in importance generation of power.

(c) Because there was a general agreement by all parties appearing before the commission that such preference was proper.

Asked if such subordination of hydroelectric power to domestic and agricultural uses would destroy Arizona's claimed ability to develop 3 million horsepower if the river continued to flow undiminished into Arizona, Hoover answered, according to Governor Johnson's statement:

Since the compact states that no water is to be withheld above that cannot be used for agriculture, the lower basin will thus receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper basin for agricultural purposes.

Governor Johnson then quoted Delph E. Carpenter, Colorado's compact commissioner who reported to the Governor of Colorado on December 15, 1922:

Power claims will always be limited by the quantity of water necessary for domestic and agricultural purposes * * * power is * * * subservient to the preferred and dominant uses and shall not interfere with junior preferred uses in either basin.

On March 20, 1923, Carpenter, in a letter to a Colorado Senator and Congressman, reiterated:

All power uses in both basins are made subservient to * * * agriculture and domestic * * * and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

Further explaining the point, Governor Johnson said that an interpretation of the compact published January 15, 1923, W. S. Norviel, Arizona's commission said:

The fifth principle (established by the compact, is that the upper States shall not withhold water that cannot be reasonably applied for agricultural uses.

In response to written questions, Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, on January 20, 1923, elicited the following statement from A. P. Davis, then Director of the United States Reclamation Service, according to Colorado's governor:

The Colorado River compact provides that the lower basin shall be guaranteed an average of 7.5 million acre-feet of water annually from the upper basin and all the yield of the lower basin, and that water not beneficially used for agricultural and domestic uses shall likewise be allowed to run down for use below.

I quote Governor Johnson directly as follows:

The foregoing official interpretations were made before the compact was ratified and were not disputed. Most certainly we are bound hand and foot by them.

Johnson added that the compact foresaw a subsequent treaty with Mexico as to that country's right to Colorado River water and spelled out just how that burden should fall on the upper and lower basins. Article III (c) provided that it was to come out of surplus to the extent possible, and the balance of the burden would be shared equally by each basin.

Then Governor Johnson made this admission:

If the upper basin States build storage reservoirs at the Glen Canyon and Echo Park sites as is now contemplated, the water withheld thereby will, of necessity, be surplus water since the upper States cannot use it for agricultural or domestic purposes, and the upper States, therefore, must deliver such water to Mexico as is allocated to her under the provision of the Seven State Compact.

Senator HAYDEN's question No. 15 to Hoover on this point brought the reply:

The upper States shall add their share of the Mexican burden to delivery to be made at Lee Ferry. Article III (c) requires that amount to be delivered in addition to the 75 million acre-feet otherwise provided for * * * the upper basin must furnish its half of any deficiency.

Carpenter's report to the then Governor of Colorado contained a similar statement.

Governor Johnson then adds, that if Carpenter had thought about it, he also would have said:

Water held in the upper basin to generate power and which for physical reasons could not be used by the upper basin for agricultural or domestic purposes is surplus water to the upper bain.

Governor Johnson clinches it with this statement:

Such an interpretation must be crystal clear to any student to the seven-State compact and the official interpretations of its provisions.

Then he goes on to summarize what the compact does as follows:

The upper and lower basins were each apportioned * * * the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7.5 million acre-feet of water per annum, and in addition the lower basin was given permission to increase its beneficial consumptive use of an additional 1 million acre-feet per annum of surplus water (art. III (b)). However, the 7.5 million acre-feet awarded the lower States had a very clear priority over the 7.5 million acre-feet awarded the upper States. In reality, the compact gave the lower States 7.5 million acre-feet of water per annum and the upper States that much water if there should be any water left in the river, provided the upper States used that water only for domestic or agricultural purposes.

As to the article III (b) entitlement of lower-basin States to make beneficial use of an additional million acre-feet of water, Governor Johnson said this is to be met out of surplus water over and above article III (a) water, provided the upper States are using their 7.5 million acre-feet for agricultural and domestic purposes. Even if the upper basin stores for power, at least 1 million acre-feet per annum must go to satisfy this article III (b) demand.

HAYDEN questioned Hoover on this point, according to Governor Johnson, and he answered that the article III (b) water was not just to come out of tributary sources in Arizona, but was to come from the main river or from any of its tributaries.

So, Governor Johnson stated:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in Glen Canyon and Echo Park reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1.5 million acre-feet to Mexico and the 1 million acre-feet (of article III (b) water) to the lower basin; further, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Governor Johnson adds, the upper States must deliver 75 million acre-feet during each 10-year period plus 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico, total 82½ million acre-feet, before they can use any water beyond that used before the compact was ratified.

In the current 10-year period that would leave 3¼ million acre-feet. In the previous 10-year period it would have been 4,150,000 acre-feet. In 1902 upper basin would not have had anything under this formula.

Eight hundred eighty thousand acre-feet would be lost per year in evaporation. Colorado would be charged with 400,000 acre-feet of that loss, yet would not get one drop of water out of the storage dams. Colorado is too close to the bottom of the water barrel and cannot afford that loss, so must insist on storage projects in Colorado, according to Johnson.

The Hill report, bought and paid for by the State of Colorado, indicated about 1 million acre-feet of unappropriated water in Colorado. But it did not charge Colorado with the Mexican burden of at least 375,000 acre-feet which will jump to 750,000 acre-feet if the dams are built for storage. This plus evaporation would leave the State without any unappropriated water at all.

In connection with the statement true or false as to the reduction in California's rightful share of water, I quote the Attorney General of the State of California, Mr. Pat Brown, who states I am correct.

The following article appeared in the Los Angeles Times under date of February 24, 1956:

UPPER COLORADO BILL'S DEFEAT URGED BY BROWN—ATTORNEY GENERAL CALLS PROJECT UNNEEDED AND THREAT TO CALIFORNIA'S WATER RIGHTS

California's Democratic attorney general spoke out decisively yesterday against the billion-dollar upper Colorado River project bill now nearing a vote in the House in Washington.

The long struggle over the controversial measure has been moving toward a climax.

Attorney General Brown's statement summed up the California position and explained the opposition of this State to the measure.

"In the interest of sound reclamation and sound national economy, the upper Colorado River project bill ought to be decisively defeated," Brown said. "I understand that it is scheduled to come up for a vote in the House of Representatives during the week of February 26."

ADVERSE TO STATE

"I am convinced that the upper Colorado River project bill as it is being presented to Congress will adversely affect California's vitally important water rights on the Colorado River.

"The office of the attorney general now is engaged in defending California's water rights on the Colorado River in a suit pending before the Supreme Court. With this suit in progress, certainly every other precaution also must be taken to protect California's rights on the Colorado River from harmful legislative measures. I believe the upper Colorada River project bill constitutes such a threat."

OTHER BASIC REASONS

"There are other basic reasons why the bill should not be adopted. Certainly it is inconsistent for our good neighbors in the upper Colorado River Basin to press for a bill that would bring hundreds of thousands of acres of new land into crop production at a time when Congress is faced with the plan to pay farmers billions of dollars to withdraw some 40 million acres of farmland from crop production.

"I am convinced that there is no justification for the passage of the upper Colorado project bill, at this session of Congress."

Now, if that is not enough, I want to tell you this statement that Governor Johnson made in connection with the Colorado River controversy I just quoted is based on the report of Raymond C. Hill and Associates, an engineering firm who was sufficiently able to be hired and paid for by the State of Colorado to report on their water resources. This very serious statement made by Governor Johnson I have mentioned is based on that report.

Mr. Hill was also employed by the San Diego County Water Authority to make a survey of its water resources. The San Diego County Water Authority is one of some 67 southern California agencies, cities, towns, and groups that are in the metropolitan water district that vitally depend upon the Colorado River for its water supply. This is what Mr. Hill told the San Diego County Water Authority:

When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation there will not be a sufficient flow in the river below Lee Ferry to supply the full right of the MWD (metropolitan water district), namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right. * * *

Any reduction in the Colorado River aqueduct diversions will mean a proportionate decrease in the amount of water available to the San Diego County Water Authority through the existing aqueduct. Its effect on the authority would be disastrous.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, what affects one member of the Metropolitan Water District disastrously affects all members disastrously. All 67 cities and authorities in southern California would be so affected—6 million people, a tremendous part of the economy of our country.

If I did less than to use every best effort that I have to oppose this project on the basis that I have just read to you, I would do that much less than my oath of office and my duty to the people of southern California would require.

I set forth California's reasons for opposing the upper Colorado project in a speech found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 9, page 11412. During 1956, I made remarks entitled, "State of California Officially Opposes Upper Colorado—A Resolution of the State Legislature"—and "California's Opposition Based on Protection of Her Water Rights."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is not speaking on his question of personal privilege, but is speaking as to the nature of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has previously stated that in laying the foundation for answering the charge of falsehood in the editorial, the gentleman from California would have rather a broad field to discuss his reasons for defending himself. The Chair calls attention to the gentleman from California, that there are limits to the liberality extended in this connection and suggests that the gentleman from California proceed in order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand this editorial is several weeks or months old. Does the age of the editorial make any difference with the Chair in that it should have been answered more promptly and that the gentleman should have been more resourceful than to use this particular time in dealing with the editorial?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair feels that that question has no

purpose at all in the present problem. The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have said that the $1.5 billion upper Colorado River storage project as approved by the Senate and an ostensibly similar House bill are one and the same thing. True or false?

In actuality, the project is the nondivisible $1½ billion entity described in House Document 364 of the 83d Congress. Only segments of that entity are contained in the House bill. Although such expensive and controversial integral parts of the whole project as Echo Park have been deleted from the House bill to make it appear palatable, they cannot be deleted from the project. Authorization of the initial segments will make mandatory later authorization of the remainder so that power revenues can be obtained to help repay the investment.

Like an iceberg, the House bill displays only part of its mass to view, but the remaining bulk nevertheless exists and must be reckoned with.

The bill as reported out by the committee is S. 500 with all after the enacting clause stricken and the body of H. R. 3383, as amended by the committee, substituted. We thus have two versions of S. 500. The projects they provide for are as follows as can be seen from the chart I have here:

	S. 500 (Senate)	S. 500 (House) and H. R. 3383 (substitute)
Power and storage dams	Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Juniper, Navajo.	Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Navajo.
Participating irrigation projects (authorized).	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.
Participating irrigation projects (conditionally authorized). By Senate, 21. By House, 24.	San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette.	Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette, Animas-La Plata, Yellow Jacket.

From the foregoing tabulation it may be seen that as to projects the only difference between the bills is this: the Senate authorizes the Echo Park and Juniper Dams now, as well as Gooseberry project, while the House version neglects to mention Echo Park and Juniper although it conditionally authorizes Gooseberry, substitutes San Miguel for Woody Creek, and adds Animas La Plata and Yellow Jacket.

Although the bills differ in detail, they are essentially the same in objective, and in projects contemplated for development of water and power in the upper Colorado River Basin. Both bills must be considered together and treated as one bill. Should the House pass the measure before it, it is obvious that the principal matter for the conferees to discuss would be the treatment of these small differences about which projects to authorize now and which to come back for later.

Should the House act favorably on the pending bill, it is likely that the project authorizations and other provisions of the Senate bill will be added to the House bill in conference.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. For the last 5 minutes the gentleman has made no reference to the truth or falsity of the charge that he raised under his question of personal privilege. On the contrary, he has placed before the Members of the House a chart, and from that he now proceeds to discuss the bill. It has no relation to the truth or falsity of the charge. The gentleman has refused to permit anyone to ask him any questions and proceeds to discuss this bill, so that it does not come within the definition of personal privilege, on which grounds he sought the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair might state that he feels that the gentleman from California is very close to the line where the Chair may sustain a point of order. As the Chair understands it, the gentleman has the right to discuss the facts involved in the pending bill insofar as that is necessary in order for the gentleman to express his views with reference to the charge of falsehood contained in the editorial, and to answer that charge, and make his record in that respect. The Chair again suggests to the gentleman from California, having in mind the observations of the Chair, particularly those just made, that he proceed in order and confine his discussion of the bill at this time only to that which is necessary to challenge the charge of falsehood contained in the editorial.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am in a difficult position, because the editorial states merely that, "He would dream up a bigger falsehood than those he has already presented," and I can only say what I have said about the bill for the purpose of challenging that statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not stopped the gentleman to date but has suggested to the gentleman that he is getting very close to the borderline where the Chair reluctantly may be constrained to sustain a point of order. I might say the Chair has been very liberal and hopes that the gentleman from California will not present arguments on the merits of the bill which are not related to meeting the charge of falsehood contained in the editorial, to a point where the Chair will feel constrained to sustain a point of order.

The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I proceed now to the point whether it is true or false, the statement that I have made that these various versions of the bill are one and the same thing, that it is actually a $1½ billion entity. I have shown you the various participating projects, and have explained to you the very minute difference in the authorizations sought in similar projects.

I now want to explain my allegation is supported by statements contained in the majority report. If the Members will turn to the report, they will find on page 6 the statement:

> The legislation recognizes that the units and projects authorized and the additional projects named for planning constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive plan for development of the water resources apportioned to the upper basin and that the legislation is not intended to limit or preclude, in the future, as additional needs are indicated, authorization by the Congress of other projects for the use of waters apportioned to the upper basin States under the Colorado River compact.

That is why I say that this is just the initial foot in the door, camel's nose under the tent, that we are dealing with a $1½ billion entity here labeled as the upper Colorado River storage project; and that once we mire ourselves down in the beginning of it, there will be no end to expenditures that will have to be made.

I have said that the ultimate cost of this piece of legislation before the House will be $5 billion. Why have I said that? Is it true or is it false?

In order to answer that question and in order for you to evaluate the accuracy of it, I must say this: In connection with reclamation projects in general, the portion of the funds that goes to construct the irrigation phase, as distinguished from the power phases of the project, are reimbursable to the United States Government, but reimbursable without interest.

Therefore, there is a burden upon the taxpayers of the United States of the interest that accumulates on the money that the Federal Treasury borrows and has to continue borrowing during the whole period that a project pays out. That bears directly on whether or not this is a $5 billion entity or not.

Just take the projects alone that are in our bill, or take the Senate bill, which is practically the same, insofar as those projects on which this type of nonreimbursable interest would accumulate are concerned, not for 10 years, not for 20 years, not for 30, not for 40, but for 70, 80, or up to 100 years, we do not know, at 2½ percent for 10 years you accumulate an interest charge of a quarter of the principal amount borrowed. In 40 years you have accumulated an amount equal to 100 percent. In 80 years you have accumulated an amount equal to 200 percent of the original investment, and that is the reason why this type of legislation involves the taxpayers of the United States in such tremendous costs.

Just on those projects that we have in the bill, and although they are listed at $760 million in the authorization, the Bureau of Reclamation has told us they will cost $933 million, on the projects alone substantially, according to the calculations on the paybacks and the time they will take, and, parenthetically, you notice that portions of the bill talk about up to 100 years and other portions talk about up to 50 years, to pay back the accumulated interest would be $1,428 million, on a probable direct project cost, of more like $1,093 million: that would make its total cost $2,521 million. Give or take half a billion on that to accommodate it to the $933 million price tag on this bill and you still have a $2 billion project.

That is why I say that this initial phase is so extensive. If you do the same type of calculation for those projects which are listed for study and later authorization, you will find that the bill adds up to $5 billion. You get back your original investment in power, you get back your original investment in irrigation, if the thing pays out, but you are still out those tremendous sums in the payment of interest. Proponents will be coming back in later years to get the additional projects listed for study by the bill. That is why I say this will end up as a $5 billion project. I refer you to the following chart prepared at a time when the projects in the bill totaled $1,093 million, as illustrative of the hidden interest burden, together with how it is distributed among the States:

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Alabama	0.93	$10,164,900	$13,280,400	$15,354,300	$31,889,700
Arizona	.41	4,481,300	5,854,800	6,769,100	14,058,900
Arkansas	.48	5,246,400	6,854,400	7,924,800	16,459,200
California	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,600	152,222,200	316,153,800
Colorado	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Connecticut	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200
Delaware	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000
Florida	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300
Georgia	1.30	14,209,000	18,564,000	21,463,000	44,577,000
Idaho	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400
Illinois	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,975,600
Indiana	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500
Iowa	1.21	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900
Kansas	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300
Kentucky	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Louisiana	1.09	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100
Maine	.38	4,153,400	5,426,400	6,273,800	13,030,200
Maryland	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500
Massachusetts	3.23	35,303,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700
Michigan	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,196,200
Minnesota	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200
Mississippi	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400
Missouri	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200
Montana	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
Nebraska	.73	7,978,900	10,424,400	12,052,300	25,031,700
Nevada	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,611,600	5,486,400
New Hampshire	.27	2,951,100	3,855,600	4,457,700	9,258,300
New Jersey	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
New Mexico	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
New York	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
North Carolina	1.38	15,083,400	19,706,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
North Dakota	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Ohio	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,900	219,113,100
Oklahoma	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Oregon	.95	10,383,500	13,566,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Pennsylvania	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	258,203,700
Rhode Island	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
South Carolina	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
South Dakota	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Tennessee	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Texas	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Utah	.34	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Vermont	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
Virginia	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,800	50,749,200
Washington	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
West Virginia	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Wisconsin	2.05	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Wyoming	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc.	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Total	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000
		2,521,000,000		5,080,000,000	

More than that, the secondary phases of the central Utah project, and only the initial phases are provided for here, are such that in the Rules Committee one of the project's opponents admitted that the direct cost of that without interest would probably be in excess of $3 billion.

If you think that this is a falsehood with respect to the interest and its accumulated cost, the compound interest on the money that is borrowed, just let me quote to you from a letter dated March 17, 1955, to the chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the other body from the Department of the Interior, signed by a man named Crosthwait, of the Bureau of Reclamation, in which he said that the project recommended by the Secretary would involve a total interest cost of $1,153,000,000. That is a lot of money, and that is why I make these charges. Here is the pertinent paragraph of the letter:

The project recommended by the Secretary would involve an interest cost to the Federal Government discounted to year 1957 of about $175 million based on the allocation to power being repaid in year 2002 and $190 million based on the final payment from the irrigation water users in year 2032. Studies show (1) that compound interest at 2.5 percent on the construction costs would be in the magnitude of $550 million which amount less credits of $15 million for interest on payments by the irrigation users would result in an interest cost in the order of $535 million, and (2) that the interest cost incurred through year 2032 and interest from year 2003 to year 2032 on the remaining balance would amount to about $1,200,000,000 which, less credits of $47 million for interest on payments of the water users, would result in a total interest cost of $1,153,000,000 in year 2032.

So that there may be no question as to how I arrived at the $933 million direct cost of the project referred to a few moments ago, let me put it this way.

Section 12 of the bill reported by the committee contains an appropriation authorization of "such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act but not to exceed $760 million." This implies that such sum is sufficient to construct the projects authorized by the act. In fact, according to the Reclamation Bureau figures contained in the hearings, an additional $173,468,300 would be required to construct the authorized features, bringing the total sum to $933,468,000.

In view of the notoriously inadequate estimates made in the past by the Bureau, it is a very good possibility that ultimate costs for these features alone will be well over $1 billion.

In any event it should be thoroughly understood that the figure used in the bill will not, according to Bureau estimates, construct this project. Instead of $760 million the actual figure is $933 million, or, if a lower Curecanti should be constructed (either is authorized by the bill) the cost would be $894 million. Here are the figures taken from those supplied by the Bureau at pages 64–67 of the hearings. The projects here accounted for are only those named as authorized in section 1 of the bill:

11 participating projects	$304,356,300	
Glen Canyon Dam	421,270,000	
Flaming Gorge	82,942,000	
Navaho (dam and reservoir only)	49,305,000	
Curecanti (940,000 acre-feet)	49,305,000	
		$894,273,300
Curecanti (modified plan)		88,500,000
		933,468,300

Actually, the project development sought to be authorized by the bill is just the starter for some 34 or more storage and reclamation projects specifically named, contemplated, and designated in House Document 364 as the upper Colorado River storage project, involving a construction cost of $1.6 billion at least, or over twice the amount of the appropriation set forth in the House bill. The figure of $760 million in the House bill is an attempt to hide from Congress the true cost of the development.

I have mentioned before that the $760 million appropriation figure in the

bill should not mislead you when it comes to determining whether or not what I say about the cost of this bill is true.

Now that cost even at that is probably a very low one because I have taken the precaution, as I have in all my statements, to have the documentation necessary to back them up. I obtained from the second Hoover Commission a full list of the projects that have been carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation—what the Congress brought the hammer down on them for—what the Bureau of Reclamation told the Congress they would cost—and what the Congress actually ended up appropriating for them. It is a long list but you may be interested in just a few excerpts. One Colorado project was sold to the Congress for $1,300,000 and ended up costing $8.9 million.

A New Mexico project was supposed to cost $2.3 million and Congress ended up appropriating $27 million. These are direct construction costs.

A Wyoming project was supposed to cost $9.4 million and the Congress ended up appropriating $26.6 million.

A Utah project started out at $9.9 million and ended up costing the taxpayers $33.4 million.

Here is the complete chart:

Project	Date of authorization	Estimated total cost at time of authorization	Estimated total cost, June 30, 1952
Hondo, N. Mex.	1903	[1] $359,000	$371,788
Milk River, Mont.	1903	1,000,000	9,881,774
Newlands, Nev.	1903	1,250,000	7,899,479
North Platte, Nebr.	1903	2,516,000	27,939,501
Salt River, Ariz.	1903	2,800,000	26,244,688
Uncompahgre, Colo.	1903	1,300,000	8,965,959
Bell Fourche, S. Dak.	1904	2,100,000	5,288,236
Buford-Trenton, N. Dak. (old)	1904	[2]	223,423
Lower Yellowstone, Mont.-N. Dak.	1904	1,200,000	3,633,219
Minidoka, Idaho-Wyo.	1904	2,600,000	43,706,054
Shoshone, Wyo.-Mont.	1904	[1] 7,828,000	23,673,962
Yuma, Ariz.-Calif.	1904	3,000,000	5,806,743
Boise, Idaho	1905	[1] 10,852,000	66,371,938
Carlsbad, N. Mex.	1905	[1] 605,000	5,800,683
Garden City, Kans.	1905	[1] 419,000	334,475
Huntley, Mont.	1905	900,000	1,552,159
Klamath, Oreg.-Calif.	1905	[1] 4,470,000	18,871,222
Okanogan, Wash.	1905	444,000	1,633,973
Rio Grande, N. Mex.-Tex.	1905	2,317,113	27,337,078
Strawberry Valley, Utah	1905	1,250,000	3,498,994
Umatilla, Oreg.	1905	1,000,000	5,324,457
Yakima, Wash.	1905	10,000,000	60,359,928
Sun River, Mont.	1906	7,372,000	10,059,013
Williston, N. Dak.	1906	[2]	409,095
Orland, Calif.	1907	[1] 607,000	2,564,519
Grand Valley, Colo.	1911	[1] 3,621,663	6,765,733
King Hill, Idaho	1917	527,230	1,987,854
Yuma auxiliary, Arizona	1917	[3]	2,266,487
Riverton, Wyo.	1920	9,465,000	26,626,000
Owyhee, Oreg.-Idaho	1926	17,715,000	18,998,744
Vale, Oreg.	1926	3,590,000	4,962,697
Weber River, Utah	1927	3,000,000	2,725,885
All American Canal, Ariz.-Calif.	1928	38,500,000	67,614,755
Boulder Canyon, Ariz.-Nev. (Hoover Dam and powerplant)	1928	126,500,000	172,070,000
Bitter Root, Mont.	1930	750,000	1,037,087
Baker, Oreg.	1931	200,000	281,589
Burnt River, Oreg.	1935	550,000	601,026
Central Valley, Calif.	1935	170,000,000	737,774,000
Colorado Basin, Wash.	1935	487,030,228	754,476,000
Frenchtown, Mont.	1935	220,000	290,797
Humboldt, Nev.	1935	2,000,000	1,214,321
Hyrum, Utah	1935	930,000	953,854
Kendrick, Wyo.	1935	20,004,000	37,738,385
Moon Lake, Utah	1935	1,500,000	1,599,359
Ogden River, Utah	1935	3,500,000	4,735,284
Parker Dam, Ariz.-Calif. (power)	1935	21,767,000	24,201,808
Provo River, Utah	1935 [4]	9,974,000	33,452,199
Sanpete, Utah	1935	375,000	374,540
Truckee storage, Nevada-California	1935	$1,000,000	$1,092,423
Buffalo Rapids, Mont.	1937	3,055,000	5,669,336
Colorado-Big Thompson-Colo.	1937	31,702,772	164,131,000
Colorado River, Tex.	1937	20,000,000	23,961,794
Deschutes, Oreg.	1937	8,000,000	12,943,000
Gila, Ariz.	1937	19,474,000	[4] 50,083,860
Pine River, Colo.	1937	3,240,000	3,471,437
Tucumcari, N. Mex.	1937	8,278,000	[5] 15,540,011
Austin, W. C., Okla.	1938	5,600,000	12,295,102
Fort Peck, Mont.-N. Dak., (exclusive of powerplant and dam)	1938		25,400,000
Fruitgrowers Dam, Colo.	1938	200,000	200,309
Buford-Trenton, N. Dak., (WCU)	1939	1,500,000	1,238,546
Paoni, Colo.	1939	3,030,000	6,723,308
Rapid Valley, S. Dak.	1939	1,118,000	927,412
Colorado River, Ariz.-Calif.-Nev. (front work-levees)	1940	[6]	[6] 12,190,000
Eden, Wyo.	1940	2,445,000	6,152,000
Mancos, Colo.	1940	1,475,000	3,926,000
Mirage Flats, Nebr.	1940	2,560,000	3,282,588
Newton, Utah	1940	595,000	712,591
San Luis Valley, Colo. (1st unit)	1940	17,465,000	56,230,577
Davis Dam, Nev.-Ariz.-Calif.	1941	41,200,000	118,902,056
Palisades, Idaho-Wyo.	1941	24,092,000	76,601,000
Scofield, Utah	1943	640,000	943,889
Balmorhea, Tex.	1944	347,000	429,554
Hungry Horse, Mont. (power)	1944	48,319,000	102,900,000
Intake, Mont.	1944	62,000	90,530
Missoula Valley, Mont.	1944	250,000	278,762
Rathdrum Prairie, Idaho	1944	300,000	482,360
Lewiston Orchards, Idaho	1946	1,466,000	2,488,000
Arnold, Oreg.	1947	220,000	205,535
Cachuma, Calif.	1948	32,310,000	36,967,000
Ochoco, Oreg.	1948	1,500,000	849,830
Preston Bench, Idaho	1948	453,000	449,554
Solano, Calif.	1948	45,577,000	47,111,000
Fort Sumner, N. Mex.	1949	1,798,000	2,434,257
Grants Pass, Oreg.	1949	100,000	100,000
Weber Basin, Utah	1949	69,534,000	70,385,000
Canadian River, Tex.	1950		96,079,100
Eklutna, Alaska	1950	20,365,400	33,800,000
Middle Rio Grande, N. Mex.	1950	30,179,000	29,606,000
Vermejo, N. Mex.	1950	2,679,000	2,919,000
Collbran, Colo.	1952		17,236,000

[1] Estimated in H. Doc. 1262, 61st Cong., 3d sess., Fund for Reclamation of Arid Lands 1911.
[2] Combined cost of Williston and Buford-Trenton estimated in 1911 at $1,195,000.
[3] Included in estimate of Yuma project.
[4] Exclusive of contemplated allocation of $1,553,565 of cost of Imperial Dam herein included in All American Canal project.
[5] Exclusive of cost of storage works (Conchas Dam) constructed by Corps of Engineers.
[6] $100,000 per year.

As I have indicated on the hidden interest chart I referred to previously, if you total these direct costs and extremely extravagant hidden interest costs and apply the percentages that each of the various States of the Union contribute in taxes to support the Federal Government, you can find out how much your own State would pay.

It is true, I have said, that while this river is running through four States, it will drain 44 States, and from these charts I think you can see well why; and well see why I have consistently termed this piece of legislation the solid gold reclamation project; and have asked would it not be just as sensible for the Congress to appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as it would be to appropriate money for the upper Colorado project?

It is because I believe that this project is not sound that I am opposing it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have two points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the first point of order is that the gentleman is not permitted under the rules to refer to something said by a Member of the other body in that body, and secondly, that the gentleman from California is not referring to the truth or untruth of the allegations in the editorial when he is quoting some person such as a Member of the other body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the point of order made by the gentleman from New York sounds correct. Reference cannot be made to what has taken place in the other body. The gentleman from California made such reference previously, but no point of order was made. The Chair has been very liberal in permitting the gentleman from California to retain the floor because if the Chair sustains the point of order, the gentleman would lose the floor and the Chair hesitates to go that far with reference to any Member of the House who has the floor on a point of personal privilege. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from California cooperate with the Chair in trying to enable the gentleman from California to retain the floor for the remainder of his time. The gentleman from California may proceed in order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have another point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chair having sustained the point of order, which has just been made, must now declare the gentleman from California has lost the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that what the gentleman said in raising the point of order was sound, but that the Chair has not yet passed on that point of order, and has recognized the gentleman from California to proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly attempt to proceed in order and will expunge the remarks with reference to a Member of the other body from the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that the project is not self-liquidating—true or false? Start with the $933 million which the Bureau states it will cost.

The Bureau presents this as being a self-liquidating project. Plain arithmetic shows that it would not be. Simple interest alone, even at 2½ percent on $993 million of original investment for the smaller project proposed is $23,325,000 per year; for the larger $1.6 billion development proposed is $40 million per year. Total net revenues, as estimated by the Bureau for the smaller or larger developments, would average less than these amounts. At page 12 of its report the Interior committee estimates for the first 50 years of the project, power revenues of $1,075,000,000 and water revenues of $36,600,000. Total $1,111,600,000, or revenues of $22,230,000 a year on the average. Obviously this is a smaller sum than the $23,325,000 annual interest. Equally obvious is that the project is bankrupt before it even starts.

As the project could not pay simple interest on the investments, its revenues could never retire the capital cost. The Nation's taxpayers would have to do that. Or if revenues were earmarked to retire the capital, the taxpayers would have to

pay about all of the interest. In any event, the net burden on the taxpayers would be more than $1 billion for the smaller development and $4 billion for the larger development, by the end of the proposed repayment period. The accumulated debt would keep on increasing until paid off by general taxation since it could never be repaid from project revenues.

These figures I think show us that the project is obviously not self-liquidating as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Now, I next have said that the financial scheme is unsound and will burden the taxpayers for generations and generations to come. Is this true or false?

I have made certain charges underlying and supporting this. I want you to determine whether they are true or false. I have said the irrigation projects are financially infeasible, requiring an average subsidy of 85 percent of the cost. True or false? Here are the facts:

None of the reclamation components of the project would be financially sound themselves. The original direct irrigation investments on the 11 projects recommended by the Secretary range from $200 to nearly $800 per acre for the central Utah project—initial phase. For the Navaho project authorized by the Senate-approved bill, the original investment would be over $1,500 per acre. Including the cost of the storage units allocated to irrigation, the average direct investment—construction cost—disregarding hidden interest, would be $750 to $900 per acre, varying with the number of projects included.

As compared to these costs, the average value of already irrigated farmlands in the project area is about $150 per acre. Thus, the average investment proposed by the project would be 5 to 6 times the average value of the land after irrigation.

Of the total irrigation investment, the irrigation water users on the average would be able to repay about 15 percent. Consequently, these irrigation projects must be subsidized to the extent of about 85 percent either by power revenues or directly from the Federal Treasury by such devices as allocations for assumed flood-control benefits, fish and wildlife benefits, and so forth.

I have said project repayment provisions are unrealistic and economically indefensible. True or false? Here are the facts: The proposed repayment plan for the project would be to pay off the entire irrigation investment in 50 years by applying all power and irrigation revenues toward that end. Thereafter, the huge power investment would be paid off in not to exceed 100 years.

The record reveals that such a plan might work in the case of a development comprising the Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and the 11 participating reclamation projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, but would fail with additional projects added.

At the House hearings, a Bureau witness, E. O. Larson, stated, page 215, House hearings on H. R. 3383:

> With 11 participating projects paid out concurrently, you could do that and pay off power in less than 100 years. But 1 disadvantage of that plan is that you cannot take on more than the 11 projects without raising the power rate, if additional projects are developed while the power is taking 100 years to pay out, the higher you have to raise the power rates.

Studies indicate that the minimum number of projects specified for authorization in the House bill might pay out under the repayment provisions of the bill, and that it would take 90 to 95 years to repay the power investment with power sold at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. But with additional projects added, either storage units or irrigation projects, either the power rate would have to be materially increased to get within the 100-year payment period for power, or the period of repayment would be far greater than 100 years.

The $1.6 billion overall project would have no possibility of payout with 6-mill power under the repayment provisions of the House bill. In fact, it could never pay out under such a financial program.

Moreover, to predicate a repayment plan on continuing revenues from hydroelectric power development for 100 years in the future is unrealistic and unsound, in view of possible changes in economic conditions, obsolescence and competing sources of power, including atomic energy.

I have said the project's financial scheme is based on the impossible assumption that 6-mill power will be marketable for the next 100 years.

If my statement is to be determined true or false, we will have to see what the prospects for the power revenues are. Every single estimate and calculation that has been made as to paying off this project from power have been based on selling 6-mill power for the next 100 years. Here are the facts:

Six mills or more, the price to be charged for power generated by the hydroelectric plants in this project, is an extremely high rate for public power. There is no guaranty that the power can be sold at that rate. The bill does not require that contracts for the sale of the power be negotiated before construction begins, such as was required under the Boulder Canyon Project Act which authorized Hoover Dam.

It is especially doubtful that a market for 6-mill power will continue for 100 years—a full century—as contemplated by the bill. These power units will be located in a region having boundless energy potential in the greatest coal, oil shale, and uranium deposits in the country. These resources, combined with the approaching availability of atomic electric power, will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete in the near future, and the project will not be able to repay the Federal Treasury as scheduled, or, perhaps, at all.

We are being asked to look 100 years into the future by this newspaper that accuses me of falsehood. To consider the future, let us look back 100 years. The Civil War had not even been fought; Thomas Alva Edison was 9 years old; and electricity had not even come into use for any purpose other than an occasional bolt of lightning.

One hundred years in the future is a tremendous interval, especially in the light of present atomic development. Can you imagine how it will develop? Can you compare hydroelectric power with atomic generated power? Is it feasible to expect these revenues to come in to make the project feasible and pay out having to sell hydropower against atomic-developed power during the next 100 years? That is why I ask you to evaluate my statement as to the project's scheme of financing being wholly unsound.

Let us get into these nuclear developments. Today Congress has seriously before it a bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], and others, to provide actual atomic heating and lighting of the Capitol of the United States. The Shoreham Hotel downtown is determining whether or not it will install an atomic plant. So you see these developments are not speculative, they are not 100 years ahead of us, they are here today. When these installations have been made what is to become of them? Hydroelectric power can in no way be modernized and be made competitive as these developments unfold.

This project is not financially sound. If you took out the hydro part and put in nuclear power, yes, it could be modernized and made competitive, but you cannot make hydropower competitive with atomic power. That is why I say the project's financial scheme is not feasible or workable. That is why I made the following statement on the subject on March 6, 1955:

> The age of nuclear power has arrived and electric power companies are now building at their own expense new plants which will supply electricity produced by atomic fission.
>
> What does this mean to conscientious legislators who must evaluate proposals to invest large sums of money in new Federal hydroelectric projects?
>
> Simply that they must look at them, not only in the light of all factors heretofore considered, but with this additional question in mind: Will nuclear power be transformed into electric energy at cheaper rates than electric energy can be obtained from water power in the foreseeable future?
>
> If the answer is "Yes," then our vast hydroelectric plants may become obsolete white elephants, giving way to more efficient nuclear-electric plants just as the horse and buggy gave way to the more efficient automobile. If this should happen, the Federal Treasury would never recover the millions it might pour into hydroelectric and related developments.
>
> With millions, and possibly billions at stake, consideration of this possibility is absolutely essential if Congress is to act with responsibility in this day of swiftly moving scientific progress.
>
> The proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado storage project is a specific instance.
>
> Bills now before the Congress call for a spending authorization ranging from $1 billion to $1.8 billion on the Upper Colorado River. They would construct numerous irrigation projects, the revenues from which could repay only 7 percent of their cost. Tied in with the bills are expensive hydroelectric projects, the power revenues from which would be expected to repay not only the cost of the power dams and installations,

but also 93 percent of the cost of the irrigation projects.

Planning figures show that it may take up to 100 years to pay for these projects out of the hydroelectric power "cash register."

Thus, for financial success, nuclear-electric energy must not be produced more cheaply than hydroelectric energy for at least 100 years.

What are the prospects in this regard?

Simply, that not in 100 years, not in 50 years, but in a much shorter time nuclear-electric energy will be produced much cheaper than hydroelectric energy.

Remember, just 15 years ago, in 1940 nuclear power was practically unheard of. By 1945, 5 short years later, the first A-bomb had exploded over Hiroshima. Research for peacetime use was so concentrated during the subsequent 10 years that today commerical nuclear-electric energy generating plants are being constructed.

The British Government announced a 10-year program for building 12 atomic power stations at an estimated cost of $840,000,000. The British say these plants will produce electricity at a cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour in comparison with their present conventional generating cost of 7.2 mills.

United States cost figures prepared by James A. Lane, of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, show the average figure in this country for producing electricity in conventional steam plants is 7 mills per kilowatt-hour, while the cost in a nuclear plant would be 6.7 mills.

That is without considering that nuclear-electric plants can actually produce plutonium as a byproduct which can be sold for a high price, in the neighborhood of $100 a gram.

If this be done, there is little cost left for power generation to bear, and a reactor plant could put on the transmission line 1 or 2 mill current instead of 6.7 mill current. Even if the military demands become satisfied and the price of plutonium eases back to its full value of about $20 a gram, the sale of byproduct plutonium can be a substantial source of operating revenue.

That is why Representative CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, vice chairman of the Joint House-Senate Atomic Energy Committee, just a few days ago predicted that atomic experts will develop a reactor in the next 2 years that will produce power as cheaply as oil, coal, or water.

Within 5 years, he said, atomic powerplants should be commercially competitive with present lower cost sources of power, which, of course are the hydroelectric plants.

During a speech in Los Angeles on February 15, Floyd B. Odlum, financier and president of Atlas Corp., predicted that by 1975 all electricity in the United States will be generated by uranium-based powerplants. He, too, said that even at present atomic energy is practically competitive with other fuels for the generation of electric power.

Using a cubic-inch block of wood as a symbol representing a similar block of uranium-235, Odlum said that 20 such little blocks of U–235 would supply enough energy to provide New York City with all its electrical needs for a 24-hour period.

Of course, there are numerous technical difficulties yet to be overcome in the production of nuclear electricity. But the fact is they are being overcome and sometimes in the very process of building nuclear-electric facilities.

Consolidated Edison of New York, one of the Nation's leading power producers, boldly announced only a month ago that it will soon build a nuclear-electric generating plant to add to its system.

Thus the problem is facing us squarely, and we cannot dodge it in connection with the upper Colorado proposal. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Congress must have their eyes open to these facts of modern-day life. There must be a clear-cut determination as to whether or not nuclear-electric energy developments will turn this proposed multibillion dollar expenditure into a dead loss. We cannot inflict such an enormous new burden on the Nation's taxpayers for several generations to come.

Therefore, Congress must hold thorough hearings on this point. It must even delay consideration of the legislation for a year or two, if need be, so that the legislation may be evaluated in the light of results of nuclear-electric energy research and development now under way.

So that the Congress may be further informed I am backing up this plea with additional information I have collected over the past few weeks.

That is why I made another statement on this subject on February 21, 1956, as follows:

Production of electric power by atomic energy is not a dream of the future. The age of nuclear power is here.

Today the United States is engaged in a vital contest with the Soviets to maintain its nuclear leadership not only in weapons, but equally in economic uses of the atom's secrets. If we fail in this, then we will fail to stem the tide of ruthless, aggressive, dictatorial communism. Such a failure would not be America's alone, but would be shared by people everywhere who look to us to preserve the peace and maintain the freedom and dignity of mankind.

Yet in the midst of this deadly struggle, Congress is being asked to waste hundreds of millions of dollars worth of our resources to build hydroelectric plants as "cash registers" for irrigating arid land at high altitudes in Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah. This is a project so infeasible that its water revenues could repay less than 15 percent of its cost. It is a project that could only add to the Nation's bulging agricultural surpluses.

I refer, of course, to the "solid gold Cadillac," a multibillion dollar upper Colorado River storage boondoggle.

If political pressures are so great in an election year that Congress cannot resist this greatest hoax since P. T. Barnum invented the "egress," at least it should be carried off in a manner minimizing its drag on the Nation's vital strength in the great battle against the Communist evil.

If Congress should insist on spending billions of dollars to put arid new land under cultivation and at the same time enact a $1 billion a year program to deposit 40 million acres of farmland in soil banks, then at least in the process it should provide something of national benefit to salve the welts on United States taxpayer's backs.

This can be done if Congress firmly and courageously yanks out of the bill every cent of the $504,212,000 provided for "horse and buggy" hydroelectric plants and directs this amount of money be used to build nuclear-electric facilities.

Such a substitution has a greater value merely than giving the United States nuclear-electric program a half-billion-dollar shot in the arm to spur it toward supremacy over the Reds. The idea may well save from ruin the already shaky financial structure of the upper Colorado scheme. It is presently based on selling 6-mill power for the next hundred years. Obviously, 6-mill power will be rendered competitively obsolete in a fraction of that time by nuclear-electric developments. Starting out with nuclear power plants, they could from time to time be modernized and bring power production costs down. Starting out with hydro plants, nothing could be done to stop them from being turned into history's most monumental white elephants by swiftly unfolding technological developments.

In short, not only do common sense tactics vis-a-vis Soviet developments demand this nuclear for hydroelectric substitution, but dollars and horsesense as well demands it.

This is particularly true because there is no need for water storage behind power dams to enable the upper basin to make the new uses of 600,000 acre-feet of water annually contemplated in the bill. Over a million acre-feet of new uses can be made without such storage. The unnecessary storage provided for hydroelectric uses would permit evaporation from extensive lake surfaces of over 800,000 acre-feet of precious water annually—125 percent of the amount put to beneficial use.

In the water-short West this is an additional and compelling reason to pull out the hydro plants and put in nuclear ones.

There is no justification for building great hydroelectric dams when atomic power can be more effectively utilized.

I have also pointed to the infeasibility of the financial scheme of the project by bringing to the attention of the Members of this body another swift-moving development that has occurred within the past few months. That is exemplified by the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Weather. It is a report that shows rain making is here today and that at a cost of a million dollars a year these four States—Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico—can get more water than they need. Yet the financing of this scheme calls for no recognition of that, no competition with that kind of a financial threat to the finances of the United States Treasury. The following is the text of my recent statement on this subject:

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT—WEATHER CONTROL MAKES IT A WHITE ELEPHANT

There has been an important scientific development since the upper Colorado River project was conceived which makes such project, if possible, even less economic and more infeasible than ever before.

The development is weather modification or control, commonly known as rainmaking.

The President's Advisory Committee on Weather Control has just made its report to the President. Additional precipitation of water through cloud seeding and similar weather modification methods has been proven, and acceptable methods of measurement of the degree of success of obtaining precipitation over normal have been found.

The President's Advisory Committee has studied the possibilities of additional water for the Colorado River through weather-control operations in the upper Colorado watershed and has stated that if the precipitation can be brought to 20 percent above the normal—that is, what it would be for a given year without such weather control—the upper river basin runoff for dry years would be increased by approximately 3 million acre-feet; for normal years by approximately 4,500,000 acre-feet; and for wet years by approximately 5,700,000 acre-feet.

Dr. Irving Krick, meteorologist, of Denver, Colo., who has carried out many such weather modification projects including studies and test work in the upper Colorado watershed, states that a 20-percent increase in precipitation is an exceedingly conservative estimate and that the average increase

of precipitation over normal in other projects has approximately 50 percent. If the 50-percent figure were used for the upper Colorado basin, the additional runoff in dry seasons would be about 7 million acre-feet and for normal seasons would be more than 11 million acre-feet.

The upper Colorado River project now before Congress creates no additional water. It merely impounds water that is in the river anyway. It actually causes the available water to be decreased because it is admitted even by the proponents of the project that close to 1 million acre-feet would be evaporated into the air annually from the proposed reservoirs.

The water that would be brought to the Colorado River by weather control—rainmaking—in the upper Colorado River watershed is more than the needs of the upper basin area. It can be used on its way down to the main river from the snowpacks, rainfalls, and so forth, to give moisture to pasture lands. It can be impounded here and there near its sources in small reservoirs to take care of the needs of present or proposed irrigation projects in the upper basin and then it can go down to the river for use below Lees Ferry.

The cost of such small impounding dams above various points of use would be small compared with the nearly $1 billion for the project as proposed in the bill.

The cost of obtaining this added runoff would approximate—according to the President's Advisory Committee—less than 50 cents per acre-foot or about $1 million per year. On Dr. Krick's estimate of a greater precipitation the annual cost per acre-foot would be much less than 50 cents.

This added water, as it passes into Lake Mead and through the Hoover power plant, would be worth at least 50 cents per acre-foot for electric generation alone. But it then goes down the river where it can be used by various irrigation districts and water districts such as the Imperial and Coachella irrigation districts and the Metropolitan and San Diego water districts. The water for these purposes is worth more than $2 per acre-foot.

Thus, on a more than self-sustaining basis from the start and with an expenditure of approximately $1 million per year, all the nonpower objectives of the upper Colorado River project are met without the expenditure of nearly a billion dollars.

Furthermore, this increased precipitation will cause the water as it reaches points of use in the lower Colorado areas to have less salt content, whereas the evaporation of 1 million cubic feet a year resulting from the carrying through of the upper Colorado River project would admittedly cause the salt content of the water to increase materially. The water already carries about a ton of salt per acre-foot of water. Any increase of this salt content would require more water by the irrigator for leeching purposes and if the salt content increases greatly it would render such irrigator's soil worthless for purposes for which now used.

Weather modification in the upper Colorado Basin, in view of the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, should be tested for a few years before commitment is made for a billion-dollar project. The billion-dollar project will merely impound water already in the river and destroy part of its usefulness through evaporation. Weather modification at almost insignificant expense—which will be self-sustaining from the start—will create additional available water through increased precipitation and increased runoff.

The potential deficit of water in the Colorado River Basin is indicated by the President's Advisory Committee to be 9 or 10 million acre-feet per year. This cannot be produced by the project covered by the bill because no water is created. It can be produced without such project by simple and inexpensive weather control by cloud seeding, and so forth.

Dr. Krick has indicated his willingness to undertake such weather modification at actual out-of-pocket cost estimated at not to exceed $1 million per year and to take his fee for services on a contingent basis at the rate of a certain number of cents per acre-foot of water produced over normal for the year in question.

From the above it is clear, based on the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, that the Colorado River project cannot be justified from the standpoint of irrigation and domestic needs in either the upper or lower river basins.

Few who have considered in Congress the bill for the upper Colorado River project have known much about weather modification—rainmaking—and its possibilities in the upper Colorado basin. What has been accomplished in this new field has been known only by a few. But the recent findings of the President's Advisory Committee change all this.

The upper Colorado River project bill should be sent back to the Interior Committee and carefully restudied in the light of this new development. It points the way to greater benefits for the areas and populations involved at far less cost.

I have pointed out that the financial scheme of the project is unsound, and I ask you whether it is true or false when I also said that the very water rights upon which the project depends to produce its power revenues are in litigation now and may never be available for use by the power dams in this project. Why do I say that? Because the whole financial structure of the Colorado River storage project depends upon power production at Glen Canyon Dam, and this in turn depends on whether or not the upper basin States, under the Colorado River compact, have a right, as against the lower basin States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, to accumulate and withhold water at Glen Canyon for power generation if it is needed for domestic and agricultural uses in the lower basin. The upper-basin spokesmen are in disagreement among themselves on this point. Governor Johnson, of Colorado, submitted a prepared statement in the Senate hearings in which he said:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin.

Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Under the 7-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico before they can use 1 drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the 7-State compact was ratified.

In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

Governor Johnson bases his contention on articles III (e) and IV (b) of the Colorado River compact, which provide:

ART. III (e). The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

ART. IV (b). Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

If Governor Johnson is right, all the estimates of power revenues at Glen Canyon are wrong, because they are based upon the assumption that if the upper-basin States release to the lower basin 75 million acre-feet in each 10 years—the minimum required by article III (d) of the compact—they may keep everything else. Even at that, it would take 25 years to fill Glen Canyon Dam if the next quarter century is as dry as the last 25 years.

These questions of interpretation of the Colorado River compact are now at issue in the United States Supreme Court in the case of Arizona against California, et al. Whether or not the upper States, who have been impleaded by California, become parties to that case, the Court cannot divide the water in the Colorado River among Arizona, California, and Nevada, without ascertaining how much water these States have a right to receive from the four upper States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. It is foolhardy to invest hundreds of millions in Glen Canyon Dam on an interpretation of the Colorado River compact which is challenged by the Governor of Colorado, and may be set aside by the Supreme Court in an action which is already pending in that Court. The consideration of this bill should await the Supreme Court decision.

Also in that court dispute is the question whether or not some millions of acre-feet of water annually of Indian claims to water are available.

Of course, when I mentioned Governor Johnson's statement a while ago saying that the water had to be let down, then I mentioned that the Bureau of Reclamation said "No," it could be stored. Who can say that an additional court case going to the Supreme Court will not have to be fought over this water, which could be lost, and which, therefore, has a bearing on whether or not the financial scheme of this project is unsound? True or false?

Mr. Speaker, I have made several statements with respect to the project being dangerous to agriculture in this country. I have said that the project would grow crops already in surplus. True or false?

I have the word of the Bureau of Reclamation on that and they have listed the crops that will be grown on the various projects and whether or not they are surplus. From Reclamation Bureau reports a table has been compiled showing every type of crop which would be

grown on each of the 33 proposed projects, and whether or not they are supported crops. Here is the table:

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
La Barge	7,970	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Seedskadee	60,720	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
		Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
Lyman	40,600	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Silt	7,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Potatoes	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Smith Fork	10,430	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Paonia	17,040	Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Florida	18,950	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Alfalfa	
Pine River	15,150	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
Emery County	24,080	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sheep	Yes.
Central Utah	60,380	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Hammond	3,670	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beans	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Gooseberry	16,400	Alfalfa	
		Pasture	
		Grain	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Navaho	137,240	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Vegetables	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
San Juan-Chama	225,000	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Rabbit Ear	19,190	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Troublesome	13,640	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
West Divide	65,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Savery-Pot Hook	31,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Dolores	66,000	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beans	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Sublette	84,000	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitgrowers	3,850	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Bostwick Park	6,870	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Dallas Creek	21,940	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
East River	2,750	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitland Mesa	19,400	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Grand Mesa	25,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Ohio Creek	16,910	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Tomichi Creek	27,580	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Battlement Mesa	6,830	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Bluestone	10,875	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Vegetables	
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Eagle Divide	10,875	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Parshall	27,510	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Woody Creek	2,965	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.

I invite your attention to what the table says and to the large number of products now in surplus that would be produced if this project is allowed to pass this House.

Further, in evaluating whether or not the statement I made that this is dangerous to agriculture is true or false, I have pointed out that for the most part only marginal agricultural lands would be serviced by the project. That comes directly from the Bureau of Reclamation itself. Remember I said only marginal agricultural lands would be serviced by this project. True or false?

Only 20 percent of the lands serviced by the project are classified by the Bureau as class 1. The lands are at high elevations—as high as 7,000 feet. The growing season on this high mountain plateau is very short. On some of the lands there is frost every month of the year. Low-value feed crops will be the principal products.

It has been demonstrated that these lands, even when fully developed under this bill, will be worth on the average only about $150 per acre. Yet the cost to the Nation's taxpayers to develop them will average $3,000 to $5,000 per acre on the Bureau's figures. Such a result cannot be justified in the face of the fact that at a cost of less than $100 per acre fertile lands in the East, Middle West, and South could be irrigated, thus bringing heavier yields than ever from the best agricultural land in the Nation.

I have also said that there already exists 20 million acres of land in this country that could be put into production at considerably less than the cost of this project will require. I have said that. What are the facts? Is what I said true or false?

The Department of Agriculture settled that one when they submitted a tabulation showing there were 20 million acres of land in the humid areas of this country that could be put into production at a cost of from $60 to $100 an acre compared with the cost this project involves for its land.

As an example, the Department of Agriculture lists acreage available for low-cost development in these 21 States, as follows:

	Acres
Alabama	683,000
Arkansas	1,865,000
Florida	1,970,000
Georgia	1,721,000
Illinois	69,000
Indiana	135,000
Kentucky	170,000
Louisiana	2,769,000
Michigan	690,000
Minnesota	874,000
Mississippi	1,272,000
Missouri	323,000
New York	100,000
North Carolina	1,157,000
Ohio	95,000
Pennsylvania	90,000
South Carolina	996,000
Tennessee	242,000
Texas	3,928,000
Virginia	514,000
Wisconsin	316,000

I said also that in addition to these 20 million acres there exist 21 million additional acres of land that have been in agricultural production heretofore that is not today and could be put back into production. Is that true or is it false?

Well, I got these figures by having a man go to the Soil Conservation Service itself. True, the raw figures upon the books of the Soil Conservation Service were those taken through a survey in 1944, but consistently the keepers of the books said this, that there has been some in and some out. But, land in and land out just about balance each other out. So my figures are substantially correct, and as correct as anybody can get. They total up to almost 21 million acres of idle land. So, let me say this: We have heard that new agricultural land is needed, and I have said that this project is not the way to do it. True or false?

For your information, the statement I made on this subject was as follows:

WE ALREADY HAVE AN IMMENSE SOIL BANK

The President has made a very commendable proposal to relieve the farm problem by use of soil banks. Few people know that the deposits he envisions will be additional to nearly 21 million acres of fine farmland in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States already in the bank.

These 21 million acres are good cropland now lying idle in the farms of these 19 States—States and acreage amounts tabulated below. They are not woodland or pastureland. They are good, unused farmland in soil classes I, II, and III.

The interest the Nation will be paid by the existence of these two soil banks should not be diminished by inconsistent reclamation programs, such as the upper Colorado River project, which would bring large amounts of new land into production.

If 40 million acres are to be taken out of production, as proposed by the President, and placed in a soil bank and reserve for future use, then these idle 21 million acres must be added to the total. Thus, the proposed soil bank would have deposited in it a total of more than 60 million acres.

Early last fall I began a study to determine the amount of idle cropland in certain areas of the Nation.

Specifically, the question I wanted answered was this: How much good agricultural land is unused in farms in the humid sections of the United States?

PURPOSE OF SURVEY

Evidence has indicated to me that there was a large amount of good land in eastern, southern, and midwestern farms that was not producing crops.

How much?

In line with my opposition to the proposed multi-billion dollar upper Colorado River project, I considered this a matter of great significance.

The upper Colorado River project would bring into production more than half a million acres of cropland, the major part of which would produce crops of the kind already in great surplus and heavily supported by the taxpayers.

In the present session of the Congress, the problem of our mounting surpluses has priority on the legislative calendar. Congress will consider a plan for decreasing the number of acres producing crops in surplus.

Yet, while Congress is struggling to decrease the number of acres now producing agricultural products, it is being asked to approve a gigantic irrigation project that would bring more acreage into production at extremely high cost.

Data before me at the time Congress adjourned last year showed that large amounts of the acreage contained in farms was literally soil in the bank. That is, we already had a large soil reserve that might be brought into production when and if this country needed it to produce food and fiber.

My observations were begun before any specific soil-bank program was officially tendered the Congress for consideration. Now that has been done. However, I shall not dwell on the present legislation designed to curtail our agricultural production and decrease the enormous load of surpluses.

I shall report on the findings of my study of idle land in farms. These findings show us that all during the time we have been burdened with the dilemma of a mounting agricultural surplus, we already had an enormous amount of our best farmland lying completely unused.

Here, on the one hand, are millions of acres of first-class agricultural land lying idle in areas of adequate rainfall. On the other hand, legislation before Congress proposes to spend enormous amounts of public money to bring more acreage into production in such developments as the upper Colorado River project. In addition, the Reclamation Bureau is proposing an extensive program for developing hundreds of other projects, all designed to increase our agricultural production with money from the same taxpayers who are paying heavily to support crops and store them.

IDLE LAND SURVEY FINDINGS

My survey of idle land in farms showed there are nearly 21 million acres of fine farmlands now lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States.

In determining this total—precisely 20,937,153 acres—only agricultural lands in classes I, II, and III, the best farmland, was included in the survey.

The acreage tabulated was contained in privately owned farms.

Woodlands, pasture or lands owned by the Federal Government, municipalities, or school districts was not considered.

Some of the land tabulated had a history of agricultural usage, but was idle in all respects, according to the latest data available.

Official records of the United States Soil Conservation Service were the basic source of the information obtained. Permission to examine records and to confer with field officials was obtained from Soil Conservation Service headquarters.

A trained researcher visited each of the 19 States in which the survey was conducted, and at State headquarters of the Soil Conservation Service conferred with soil scientists and engineers.

Every effort was made to obtain the most factual data, and no information was included that was not approved by the Service officials.

THE STATES SURVEYED

The States in which my survey was conducted all lie in the humid section of the country, where crops depend upon rainfall, and where irrigation, if used, is supplemental. It is interesting to note that even in these sections of more or less dependable rainfall, supplemental irrigation is being used increasingly to assure annual production. Thus, in the Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern areas of the Nation, supplemental irrigation is helping to increase production and contributing to the prevention of crop failures.

The States selected for my study may be divided into three general geographic sections.

Midwestern States: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri.

Southern States: Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky.

Southeastern States: Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia.

Tabulation of idle farmland, in classes I, II, and III only, in the South, Southeast, and Midwest as obtained from the U. S. Soil Conservation Service

SOUTH

State:	*Acres*
Alabama	823,564
Arkansas	2,723,547
Kentucky	671,673
Louisiana	2,487,300
Mississippi	1,270,691
Tennessee	279,563
Total	8,256,338

SOUTHEAST

State:	
Florida	2,037,392
Georgia	972,748
North Carolina	4,264,763
South Carolina	492,309
Virginia	919,307
Total	8,686,519

Tabulation of idle farmland, in classes I, II, and III only, in the South, Southeast, and Midwest as obtained from the U. S. Soil Conservation Service—Continued

MIDWEST

State:	*Acres*
Illinois	627,135
Indiana	231,780
Michigan	1,761,390
Minnesota	564,702
Ohio	491,098
Wisconsin	124,133
Iowa	50,759
Missouri	143,249
Total	3,994,296
Grand total	20,937,153

CONCLUSIONS

Here is evidence to show that while Congress is being asked to approve enormous costly new irrigation projects, at least 20,937,153 acres of the best American cropland are unused for any purpose.

Right now we have before us in Congress the gigantic upper Colorado River project. Unquestionably the most expensive and unsound scheme yet devised, it alone would bring into production more than half a million acres in high barren, remote areas of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico.

With millions of acres of the best farmland awaiting the plow in areas where the rainfall is heavy and the growing season long, it is proposed to force this great new burden of the upper Colorado River project on the American taxpayers.

I consider the findings of this survey nothing short of amazing. In addition to the 21 million acres of the best farmland that is now idle in 19 States there are millions of other acres in lower soil classes and in other States that are idle in the humid area of the Nation. Much of this idle lower class land could be improved with little cost and developed into pasture.

These millions of idle acres of the best lands are close to markets, to population centers, with roads and transportation running through them, and with schools and municipal governments established.

Where the multi-billion dollar upper Colorado River project would be built, there is little population, few roads, no metropolitan markets, few towns. The enormous cost of establishing municipal governments, police forces, schools, building of highways and new towns must be added to the cost of developing the arid lands.

It is an unbelievable proposal for the purpose of growing more farm products of the kinds already in great surplus while there are these millions of acres of good idle land in the Midwest, South, and East.

The Bureau of Reclamation would have us believe that we must spend billions to develop projects like the upper Colorado in order to provide food and fiber for our growing population.

That simply is not true. On the presently producing farmlands we are growing so much food and fiber that we cannot find adequate space to store it. The President has asked that 40 million acres of our presently producing lands be placed in a soil bank.

Each year new methods are reported for increasing per acre yields.

Yet the Bureau of Reclamation would have Congress appropriate billions of dollars for such unnecessary and wasteful projects as that proposed in the upper Colorado Basin. This project alone would saddle a new $4 billion tax loss on the Nation's taxpayers. The four States benefiting would pay less than 2 percent of the cost. Taxpayers of the other 44 States would have to pay the balance.

The cost of bringing the millions of acres of good farmland now idle into full production would run from only $15 to $150 an acre—when and if they are needed.

Compare that with the $5,000 an acre cost of building the upper Colorado project and you see how inconceivable the scheme is. Bringing into production the good lands now idle in the East, Midwest, and South would cost the taxpayers nothing. In the upper Colorado project the taxpayers would have to pay not only the excessive cost of building the irrigation projects, the roads, schools, and other necessary community projects, but then the taxpayers would have to subsidize the crops that would be grown, such as dairy products, grains and wool. The whole thing is nothing short of economic idiocy.

Well, of course, this is the fact. The fact is that with the 20 million acres that the Department of Agriculture says are available and with the 21 million acres of idle land, that is 41 million. The estimates are that by 1975 the additional needs of the country's increased population will be 100 million more acres and that 70 million of those acres will come from land capable of production, which leaves 30 million to go. Well, we have 41 million right here, so certainly my statement with respect to the agricultural effect of this project should be true.

I most urgently commend to your attention Adm. Ben Moreell's recent remarks on water policy in regard to what I have just said on the agricultural problem. Here are extracts:

EXTRACT FROM SPEECH BY ADM. BEN MOREELL, NATIONAL WATER POLICY CONFERENCE, ST. LOUIS, 1956

Federal water resource policy should be related to national policy in the determination of priorities for the uses of water. In particular, Federal policy should not encourage or condone the commitment of scarce water to meet needs of marginal utility or for uneconomic purposes.

A notable example of confusion in policy is our handling of croplands. We have a total of 350 million acres now being harvested. Another 134 million acres are available on existing farms but are not being harvested, although about half are used for pasture.

Irrigated lands in cultivation total 26 million acres. But of these, less than 7 million acres are on Federal projects, the remainder, 19 million acres, having been developed by private enterprise. While the current Federal program provides for bringing more land under irrigation at costs ranging up to $1,500 per acre, the Department of Agriculture reports that 21 million acres of good cropland can be obtained by clearing and drainage works which would cost only $175 an acre. During the 3 years 1953, 1954, and 1955, the Federal Government, under marketing quotas, removed 31 million acres from cultivation. And recently, we have learned that 40 million additional acres would be taken out of cultivation under the President's soil-bank plan.

Why should the Federal Government commit large quantities of precious water to provide increases of cropland acreage while, at the same time, it is forcing large-scale withdrawals of good lands from cultivation? Illogical allocations of water to agriculture, which is already burdened by oppressive surplus problems, will stifle industrial and urban development and will result in profligate waste. The spending of huge sums to bring more land under cultivation while the Government is paying even more money to take land out of cultivation is inexplicable—unless, of course, the primary purpose is to get rid of the money.

Now, I have also made several points with respect to the geology of this project, and you have all heard that. I said that this project should be delayed until these geological questions are settled. True or false?

Well, that, of course, is a matter of opinion and speculation, and you cannot say whether that statement of opinion is true or false. I do not think that is what the Salt Lake paper is talking about, but I do think they are talking about a statement that I made that there could well be landslides of gigantic or earthquake proportions occur in the reservoir area of the Glen Canyon Dam and thereby imperil the financial ability of this project to pay back.

A number of you have seen this chinle shale that I sent to you and have watched it disintegrate, and I have pointed out that that would be a danger. True or false?

Well, there is approximately 50 miles of it, 47 miles to be exact, in the Glen Canyon reservoir area. The Bureau of Reclamation admits to knowing only about 14 miles in this entire area. It is usually found in areas where it is formed in cliffs 400 feet high, overlain by massive sandstone rock formation, which, when undermined by disintegration of the chinle, would crash down and fill up the reservoir. This picture I have here shows some of that type of disintegration, and I just want to read you an extract in determining whether what I have said is true or not, an extract from forgotten pamphlets down in the Bureau of Reclamation by a man who investigated the area for the Geological Survey back in 1931, Prof. Herbert E. Gregory. He wrote:

[Extracts from U. S. Geological Survey publications describing Chinle]

THE KAIPAROWITS REGION

(U. S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey Professional Paper 164 (1931), by Herbert E. Gregory and Raymond C. Moore)

The Chinle formation includes the group of shales, "marls," thin, soft sandstones, and limestone conglomerates lying between the Shinarump conglomerate and the Wingate sandstone. * * *

Records show that the Chinle is thickest in northeastern Arizona and southwestern Utah * * * 320 to 393 feet in upper Glen Canyon, and 830 feet in the San Juan Canyon (p. 53).

A fragment of fresh rock immersed in water swells to nearly twice its bulk, and after drying is nothing more than a pile of disconnected, irregular grains; alternate drying and wetting produces a substance part of which passes through filter paper. Under the microscope, most of the material appears to be colloidal (p. 57).

When the Chinle marls and shales on steep slopes are saturated they seem to move by their own weight, carrying their broken strata and talus blocks to lower levels. At the south base of the Paria Plateau slides in the Chinle have spilled over the Shinarump conglomerate and down the Moenkopi cliffs to the Kaibab below, and at a place about 14 miles south of the Burr trail the Chinle beds have lost their hold and have slid, accompanied by huge fragments, over the upturned beds of Navaho sandstone, down the west side of the Halls Creek Valley in a jumbled mass that is roughly three-fourths of a mile wide, 1½ miles long, and 80 feet deep (p. 145).

As viewed from the rim of the Kaiparowits Plateau at Fiftymile Point the landslides are impressive. The slopes below the capping Cretaceous sandstone constitute a field about 2 miles wide and 10 miles long, everywhere strewn with boulders, the largest of which are square blocks of sandstone 40 feet thick. Successive slides have banked the materials in huge ridges like a series of terminal and lateral moraines.

Except in areas of Chinle and Tropic shales landslides were not observed. The steep slopes of other formations are bare or coated with only ribbons and scattered patches of debris (p. 146).

THE SAN JUAN REGION

(U. S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey Professional Paper 188 (1938), by Herbert E. Gregory)

The position of the relatively soft Chinle between two cliff makers accounts for its preservation in a region where erosion is vigorous (p. 49).

In the Chinle formation the conditions for producing slides are exceptionally favorable. The thin sandstone beds readily break into talus fragments, and the marl beds when saturated seem to move by their own weight. * * * Instability is further shown by mud flows that after heavy rainfall issue from the base of slides. In places recurrent movement is indicated by the arrangement of material in parallel ridges on Chinle slopes and by unconformities in the piles of debris successively pushed over cliffs (p. 102).

Note particularly Professor Gregory's description of a Chinle landside 2 miles wide and 10 miles long. Well, 10 miles of land sliding down into a narrow reservoir is to my mind a landslide of earthquake proportions. The following is the statement I made respecting the Chinle question:

GLEN CANYON RESERVOIR PERILED BY CHINLE FORMATIONS

Gigantic landslides were pictured as possibly devastating the $421 million Glen Canyon dam and reservoir, key unit of the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project, by Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, today.

Fifty miles of the immense walls of the long, narrow reservoir site are comprised of rock so soft that it swells to nearly twice its size and disintegrates when touched by water, HOSMER declared. The reservoir would extend 186 miles along the Colorado River and 70 miles along the San Juan River.

The soft rock—known as Chinle shale—forms immense cliffs in numerous areas that would be covered by water impounded by the proposed 700-foot high Glen Canyon dam. The dam, known as the "cash register" of the upper Colorado project now before Congress, was designed to produce power revenues to pay off some 30 other units of the project that cannot pay for themselves.

HOSMER stated that he had been advised by independent geologists that the reservoir's water would swiftly disintegrate the Chinle shale, and it would flow downslope into the reservoir. More importantly, it would undermine and cause collapse of all overlying cliff-forming rocks, HOSMER said. All of the broken debris, the Congressman explained, including blocks of sandstone as big as houses, would move downslope and partially or completely fill the proposed reservoir in the extensive areas of Chinle shale.

"If this is permitted to happen," said HOSMER, "the finances of the entire upper Colorado River project would collapse with it.

"The Nation's taxpayers would be left with a billion-dollar mud puddle.

"Congress should withhold any consideration of the legislation pending a full and complete geological survey and report of the site."

HOSMER's sensational charges were based on a personal investigation he made of the

reservoir area last December in the company of two independent consulting geologists. The expedition was made by helicopter to remote sections of the reservoir site in northern Arizona and southern Utah. Several hundred pounds of the Chinle shale were gathered and flown out for laboratory tests.

Using samples of the Chinle rock he obtained in Glen Canyon, HOSMER demonstrated the rapidity with which it turns to mud when placed in an ashtray containing a small amount of water.

"I am presenting to Congress reports of the distinguished geologists who accompanied me to Glen Canyon," HOSMER said. "These reports show that if this Chinle shale is brought in continuous contact with water from the proposed reservoir it would immediately disintegrate and flow down slope into the reservoir.

"Obviously, with evidence such as this, obtained from unimpeachable sources, the least that can be said is that there are sound reasons why Congress should not approve this immense investment of public money."

HOSMER said that the geological investigation and the collection of rock samples was done by Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., and Peter H. Gardett, consulting geologists.

He stated that landslides which could occur would be of unbelievable size to anyone except a geologist. Much of the Chinle shale, now dry, supports several hundred feet of overlying Wingate and Navaho sandstone which would collapse into the reservoir when the Chinle disintegrated in water.

"The size of the landslides which could occur may be pictured by considering the fact that the Chinle itself has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River, for instance. On top of the Chinle are the great cliff-forming sandstones.

"The whole upper Colorado River project would cost the taxpayers more than $4 billion, and it would be entirely unworkable without Glen Canyon to produce power revenues," HOSMER said.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this. I want to know if the provisions of this bill are broad enough to provide that every citizen of southern California might have a handful of rainmaking pellets. In southern California you have a situation where there are more clouds for rainmaking and they are confined closer than any place in the country. It is the only place I know of where with a handful of pellets you can sow clouds at arm's length and cause it to rain on your feet while your head remains perfectly dry.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, that is not much of a parliamentary inquiry, but I hope the gentleman is happy that he has made some kind of a point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who answered that parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOSMER. I have also said that there is a great possibility that this Glen Canyon Reservoir would never hold water even if the dam were built. True or false? Again, that is a statement of opinion, but let us see whether the facts I have stated with regard to it are true or false.

I have said that there exist in the area of the reservoir gigantic geological downwarps. These are simply the ground formations swinging down into little valleys and going underground.

I have said that this area is Navaho sandstone. I do not think there is any question about that. I point to the existence of these downwarps. I have had the Geological Survey draw a map showing them so there would not be any question about their existence, if you are going to believe the Geological Survey.

I have also said that this Navaho sandstone has a porosity of 22 percent. That was admitted at the hearing.

I have also said that it is quite possible that these tremendous downwarps which have such a vast capacity might be dry and therefore drain off any water that started to be impounded behind the reservoir. The following is the complete text of my statement on this subject:

GREATEST ENGINEERING BLUNDER IN OUR HISTORY

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, said today that gigantic Glen Canyon Dam, $421 million main unit of the proposed upper Colorado River project, could become the "greatest engineering blunder in our history," because water for the project would pour into two enormous subterranean sieve-like basins, instead of flowing through the dam to make hydroelectric power.

"Alongside of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir are two underground basins of almost unbelievable size. Once the 700-foot high dam was built across the Colorado River, the flow of water could back up and pour into these immense sieves," HOSMER stated.

"One of these great subbasements of the earth is known as the Kaiparowits Basin. It would hold at least 250 million acre-feet of water. The other is the Henry Mountains Basin, and it would hold 100 million acre-feet of river water. (Note: An acre-foot of water is enough water to cover 1 acre of ground a foot deep.)

"That is 350 million acre-feet of water, or at least 26 years' flow of the whole Colorado River at this point.

"If adequate power cannot be produced by the dam to pay its cost, it hardly seems reasonable to build it and force this great new loss on the taxpayers of the Nation."

HOSMER said that scientific data in his hands make it doubtful that Glen Canyon Reservoir could be filled "in our lifetime," and doubtful as well that adequate power could be produced by the dam.

"This matter demands an exhaustive investigation by independent geologists and engineers who have no personal interest in the project," HOSMER declared.

The Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains basins would hold enough water to cover the District of Columbia to a depth of 8,000 feet.

That is enough water to serve the people of New York City for 98,000 days, or 268 years.

"Here, based on sound geological reports, we have the frightening spectacle of the whole Colorado River flowing for years into gigantic underground sponges," said HOSMER.

"The great dam that is proposed here would stand as a towering monument to engineering folly and a memorial to the wanton waste of all these millions.

"These endless cellars are immediately adjacent to the reservoir site and are 2,000 feet in depth below the river. There are miles and miles of rock of great porosity through which the river water would flow away, to be forever lost to use in the cavernous depths of the earth.

"This rock is marked by enormous cracks and fissures which I have observed myself as late as last December. Water backed up behind Glen Canyon Dam could have free flowing passage into them and into the great basin through them. Undoubtedly many of these cracks and fissures occurred during the gigantic geologic earth movements that created these tremendous downwarps.

"Such a loss would be a major tragedy. In addition to the great money loss to all taxpayers, the entire economy of most of the West would be irreparably damaged. This in turn would effect the welfare of the entire Nation."

HOSMER said that last December, in the company of geologists Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., and Peter H. Gardett, he made an examination of the Glen Canyon Dam and reservoir area in northern Arizona and southern Utah. The country contains no roads, and the trip was made by helicopter. Sample of Navaho sandstone and Chinle shale rock were brought out from the reservoir site.

HOSMER quoted from a report submitted to him by Dr. Hoots as follows:

"The Navaho sandstone clearly is sufficiently porous and permeable to contain large quantities of water, and to permit movement of this water from the proposed reservoir into and through the sandstone walls to areas of lower hydrostatic pressure."

HOSMER emphasized that the Bureau of Reclamation has reported favorably on the proposed upper Colorado River project and its chief unit, Glen Canyon Dam, without adequate information as to the practicability of the project, without proper engineering studies, and without determining the immensity of water losses that would occur.

In House Document No. 364 of the 83d Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation's explanation of the project, a startling admission is made as to water losses of an unexplained nature in the San Juan Basin, into which the reservoir's waters would extend and which is crossed by the Henry Mountains downwarp.

HOSMER quoted the following from the document (p. 180):

"Unexplained losses of water have been reported also in the San Juan River Basin. The proposed study in the vicinity of the Navaho Reservoir is for the purpose of evaluating this loss, and determining the quantities that are lost by evaporation and transpiration."

In connection with these structural basins, House Document No. 364 adds (pp. 180–181):

"There is also the question whether the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

"Several wells drilled in the region for oil indicate that the regional water table is at great depth below the plateaus. In the Mexican Hat field along the San Juan River, small quantities of oil were encountered in a synclinal structure, an exceptional occurrence which has been explained as due to the lack of ground water in the area. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir."

HOSMER stated: "I most emphatically agree with Dr. Hoots and other eminent geologists and engineers that the Glen Canyon reservoir project has been proposed and recommended without benefit of a vast amount of information essential to a determination of the practicability and future success of this project. This is evident from statements made by the United States Geological Survey that much of this essential information is not available.

"Orderly consideration of this project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the

topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies."

I have not just dreamed up those figures, taken them out of the thin air and as to whether they are true or false, I want you to look at the record that I am going to include with my remarks. This is in a report of a Ph. D. geologist who probably knows more about rocks and downwarps and leakage than any of us here do. He says that it will go in there, if those things are not now full of water. This is Hoots' statement:

MEMORANDUM ON GEOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED GLEN CANYON DAM SITE AND RESERVOIR AREA IN NORTHERN ARIZONA AND SOUTHEASTERN UTAH

(By Harold W. Hoots, consulting geologist, Los Angeles, Calif., December 29, 1955)

The writer was requested by Hon. CRAIG HOSMER to undertake a geological investigation of the proposed Glen Canyon dam site at Mile 15 on the Colorado River in northern Arizona, and the proposed reservoir area located principally in southeastern Utah and extending 186 river miles up the Colorado River from Mile 15, and 71 miles up the San Juan River.

PURPOSE OF THIS INVESTIGATION

The purpose of this investigation was threefold, namely:

(1) To inspect in the field critical geological aspects of the proposed Glen Canyon dam site and reservoir area, and to collect rock samples considered essential to this investigation;

(2) To review: (a) existing conclusions and recommendations pertaining to the proposed dam site; and (b) published geological data pertinent to the proposed dam site and reservoir area, for the purpose of appraising the adequacy of geological investigations that preceded the recommendation of this construction project; and

(3) To ascertain from tests by qualified engineering laboratories certain critical physical properties of rocks exposed at the proposed Glen Canyon dam site and in the reservoir area.

PROCEDURE

Field work

The geological investigation and collection of rock samples in the field was done by Harold W. Hoots and Peter H. Gardett, consulting geologists, December 12–14, 1955. Transportation by helicopter made it possible not only to inspect the geology of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and reservoir area from the air, but also to land at strategic localities for the examination of rock outcrops and the collection of rock samples along both the Colorado River and the San Juan River.

Several hundred pounds of rock samples were collected, flown out by helicopter, and shipped for laboratory determination of certain physical properties of the Navaho sandstone and the Chinle shale. Samples of water from the Colorado River and the San Juan River also were collected for use in conducting laboratory tests on rock samples under conditions that would approach actual field conditions within the proposed reservoir area.

Photographs were taken to illustrate the erosional characteristics of rock formations critical to the proposed reservoir area, and to emphasize the difficulty and tremendous expense involved in constructing a dam that would adequately protect Rainbow Bridge from destruction by the proposed reservoir.

Laboratory tests of rock samples

The more important of the laboratory tests were directed toward:

(1) Determination of the permeability and porosity of the Navaho sandstone which forms the walls of the Canyon of the Colorado River at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and along most of the 186 river miles of the proposed reservoir area.

These tests were made with water from the Colorado and San Juan Rivers, and were designed to duplicate, insofar as possible, conditions that would exist within the proposed reservoir. Their purpose was to determine: (a) the ability of this Navaho sandstone to absorb water from the reservoir; (b) the capacity of the pore-spaces within a unit volume of this sandstone; (c) the total quantity of reservoir that could be lost by leakage through the sandstone walls of the proposed reservoir, and thence by natural gravity drainage into the large structural basins known to extend from the Colorado River for many miles to the north; (d) the magnitude of the leakage that might occur around the abutments of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam at mile 14; and (e) whether Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be protected from flooding by a dam built in this sandstone.

(2) Determination of the physical characteristics of the Chinle shale which outcrops, and would be covered by water, along 50 river miles of the proposed reservoir area.

The purpose of these tests was to determine the ability of the Chinle shale to maintain its position and physical strength when saturated with water, and, under these conditions, to support the load of several hundred feet of overlying cliff-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstone, and to thus prevent the ultimate loss of much of the calculated capacity of the proposed reservoir.

Office studies and preparation of this memorandum

Critical review of available information bearing directly on investigations of, and recommendations made for, the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir was essential to this investigation and the preparation of this memorandum. Particular attention has been devoted to (1) published and mimeographed reports by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey on the geology and ground water of the area containing the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir area; (2) to the adequacy of the investigations made by the Bureau of Reclamation of the physical character of the Navaho sandstone at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site, and to the extent that the Chinle shale in the reservoir area will increase sedimentation and reduce the storage capacity and usefulness of the reservoir; and (3) the problems and expense involved in the construction of a dam designed to protect the Rainbow Bridge, and the uncertainty that such a dam would actually provide this protection.

FINDINGS

The Navaho Sandstone

The canyon of the Colorado River at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and along most of the 186 river miles of the proposed reservoir is composed entirely of Navaho sandstone. This sandstone, as it occurs in this region, is described by Dr. Herbert E. Gregory and Dr. Raymond C. Moore[1] as follows:

"The Navaho sandstone is essentially an aggregate of white, crystal-clear quartz grains, loosely held together with cement. * * * In general the cement is weak. Even where iron oxide forms the bond, it is not easy to obtain a well-trimmed hand specimen, and much of the rock exposed at the surface is so friable that it crushes under the foot, and a single blow of the hammer may reduce a block of sandstone to a mass of dust. Blasting this rock with powder presents special difficulties."

J. W. Harshbarger, C. A. Repenning, and J. T. Callahan[2] of the United States Geological Survey, make the following statement regarding the Navaho sandstone:

"One striking feature of this sandstone is its great permeability and capacity to absorb, immediately, a substantial portion of the light precipitation. Evidence of this rapid absorption is the extremely small amount of runoff from the area of outcrop. * * * Undoubtedly the Navaho sandstone transmits water more freely than any other water bearer in the region."

Laboratory tests of porosity and permeability

Samples of Navaho sandstone collected from the lower part of the canyon wall at the site of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam were determined to have a porosity varying from 24.3 percent to 25.5 percent, and an average porosity of 25 percent. One acre-foot of this sandstone thus has sufficient porosity to contain one-fourth of one acre foot of water.

The permeabilities of these samples of Navaho sandstone to air were found to be uniformly high, to vary from 4,920 to 5,180 millidarcys, and to average 5,060 millidarcys. Their permeabilities to Colorado River water under normal vertical hydrostatic gradient for 100 hours averaged, at the end of this 100-hour period, 1,330 millidarcys. Permeabilities of this magnitude permit comparatively rapid movement of water into and through the Navaho sandstone.

Significance of established porosity and permeability: The Navaho sandstone clearly is sufficiently porous and permeable to contain large quantities of water, and to permit movement of this water from the proposed reservoir into and through the sandstone walls to areas of lower hydrostatic pressure. Several such areas of lower pressure adjoin the proposed reservoir and are tabulated below:

1. The sandstone walls of the canyon adjacent to the proposed dam and the lower end of the proposed reservoir: Average permeability of this sandstone indicates that in excess of 15 million gallons of water may leak around the abutments of the proposed dam every day.

2. The Kaiparowits downwarp or structural basin: This geologic feature, one of the major structural basins of this region, extends from the lower part of the proposed reservoir northwestward for 70 miles. (See accompanying map of A. A. Baker of United States Geological Survey). It is a magnificent natural basin for containing water in volume many times that calculated for the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir.

Access of water to this basin from the proposed reservoir is provided by porous and permeable Navaho sandstone walls along 50 river miles of the proposed reservoir immediately above the proposed dam. This basin covers over 1,700 square miles and has the capacity, within the Navaho sandstone alone, to hold an estimated 250 million acre-feet of water when the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir is full. Since this capacity is about 10 times that calculated for storage in the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir, it is essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and is thus free to drain water from the proposed reservoir.

3. The Henry Mountains basin: This geologic feature crosses the Colorado River about 45 river miles above the mouth of the

[1] The Kaiparowits Region, U. S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 164, pp. 65 and 66, 1931.

[2] The Navaho Country, Arizona-Utah-New Mexico, included in the Physical and Economic Foundation of Natural Resources, p. 121, by Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, U. S. Congress, 1952.

San Juan River. It is similar to the Kaiparowits basin in its geologic character and ability to drain water from the proposed reservoir. It has ready access to the reservoir through permeable Navaho sandstone walls along many river miles of the proposed reservoir, and it has the capacity, within the Navaho sandstone alone, to hold an estimated 100 million acre-feet of water when the proposed Glen Canyon reservoir is full. It is essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and is thus free to drain water from the proposed reservoir.

4. The Rainbow Bridge National Monument: This area, it is proposed, is to be protected from flooding by a dam built in the porous and permeable Navaho sandstone, but regardless of the cost expended this low area will be subjected to flooding by seepage of water from the proposed reservoir through the Navaho sandstone.

The Chinle shale

The Chinle shale is exposed along the canyon walls of the Colorado and San Juan Rivers for an aggregate distance of about 50 river miles within the proposed reservoir area. Its importance to the proposed reservoir area lies in the fact that it immediately underlies the canyon-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstones and, in areas of exposure of this shale, provides the only foundation support for these overlying cliff-forming rocks.

The Chinle shale is a fine-textured, bentonitic-type rock that varies in color from gray to blue, red, and purple. When exposed to the elements it has little resistance to erosion, and when brought in contact with water it expands and rapidly disintegrates to a shapeless mass of mud.

If brought in continuous contact with water from the proposed reservoir this Chinle shale, which now is partially protected in canyon walls above the river level, would immediately disintegrate and flow downslope into the reservoir. More importantly, it would undermine and cause collapse of all overlying cliff-forming rocks in extensive areas bordering the proposed reservoir. All of the broken debris resulting from this collapse would move downslope and would partially or completely fill the proposed reservoir in these extensive areas of Chinle outcrop.

Field and laboratory investigations of the character, distribution, thickness, and geological relations of the Chinle shale strongly indicate that this formation, if brought in contact with water in the proposed reservoir, would contribute materially to rapid diminution of the capacity and usefulness of the reservoir for water storage.

The Chinle shale is not thin. According to H. D. Miser [3] this formation has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River. Its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the nearby Colorado River appears to be similar.

LACK OF ADEQUATE INFORMATION

It is essential that the expenditure of money required for the proposed Glen Canyon Dam project be supported and justified by adequate data, and expert appraisal and interpretation of these data. Published statements by the United States Geological Survey emphasize the fact that a vast quantity of data essential to a technical evaluation of the soundness of this project has not been obtained.

The following quotations of statements by the United States Geological Survey are taken from pages 178-182 of House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, 2d session, entitled "Colorado Storage Project."

[3] The San Juan Canyon, U. S. Geological Survey water supply paper 533, fig. 2, p. 34, 1924.

Page 178, second paragraph: "Although much information on water resources of the upper Colorado River basin already has been collected, available records fall far short of presenting the complete understanding of water resources which will be needed for purposes of the storage plan outlined in this report, and for full utilization of the waters allocated to the respective States under the terms of the upper Colorado River basin compact. Detailed geologic maps and data for the upper Colorado River basin are inadequate, and in large areas they are entirely lacking. The topographic mapping essential for inventory of both water resources and mineral resources is likewise far from adequate. Only 11 percent of the basin is adequately mapped, and mapping is in progress in an additional 2 percent of the area."

Special erosion and sedimentation studies, page 179, first and second paragraphs):

"The Colorado River has always been outstanding in sediment transportation, and has been cited as a horrible example of land erosion and soil wastage by many writers. The sediment has been a vexing problem in the preparation of the storage project." * * *

"* * * Far more research is needed before reliable predictions can be made as to sedimentation in the future, and before evaluation can be made of proposed preventive measures. * * * A complete analysis of the problem will involve study also of meteorological aspects, as well as soils and vegetative cover—that is, coordination of effort among the Geological Survey, the Weather Bureau, and agencies of the Department of Agriculture."

Special water-loss studies—page 179, last paragraph: "In the case of Glen Canyon, it has been estimated that evaporation losses would average about 63 inches annually, of which 54 inches would be chargeable to the basin. These estimates are based on very meager data as to evaporation from free water surfaces, and transfers of data from remote areas in the case of natural losses from the stream. Detailed investigations have not been made of evaporation from streams in the basin under varying conditions of turbulence, or of evapotranspiration from riparian vegetation or from flood plains bordering the streams."

Glen Canyon Reservoir and vicinity, Arizona and Utah, page 180, last paragraph, and page 181, first and second paragraphs:

"Topographic mapping of more than 2,600 square miles has a high priority for the Glen Canyon project. Geologic mapping of a slightly smaller area along the Colorado and San Juan Rivers is proposed. The rocks cropping out in the reservoir area are predominantly sandstone, as shown by geologic reconnaissance. It is known that structural basins lie northwest of the reservoir site under the Kaiparowitz Plateau and also under the Henry Mountains. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowitz and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

"Several wells drilled in the region for oil indicate that the regional water table is at great depth below the plateaus. In the Mexican Hat field along the San Juan River, small quantities of oil were encountered in a synclinal structure, an exceptional occurrence which has been explained as due to the lack of ground water in the area. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowitz and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amount of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir. * * *

"The Glen Canyon Reservoir will extend upstream into Cataract Canyon, where gypsum and salt of the Paradox formation crop out near the river level in several places. The possible effect of these rocks upon the quality of water in the reservoir should be investigated."

Classification of Federal Lands for Water Development, page 182, first paragraph: "The Geological Survey is responsible for classification of Federal lands as to their water-storage and water-power values. These values are dependent in part upon the upper basin's ability to furnish water to the lower basin as required by compact, and dependent therefore upon the Colorado River storage project. Many of the streams in the basin are not adequately mapped, and geological investigations of possible dam sites must precede any classification as to their water-power or water-storage value."

CONCLUSIONS

The Glen Canyon Reservoir project has been proposed and recommended without benefit of a vast amount of information essential to a determination of the practicability and future success of this project. It is evident from the above quoted statements by the United States Geological Survey that much of this essential information is not available.

Orderly consideration of this project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies.

Of particular importance is the determination of (1) the magnitude and rapidity of water-loss that can be expected from the proposed reservoir into the large Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains' Basins; (2) the extent to which the disintegration of water-soaked Chinle shale and other similar formations will reduce the capacity and usefulness of the proposed reservoir; and (3) how the dam suggested for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be built in the impassable terrain surrounding this area, and how any dam, regardless of its construction, can protect this National Monument from flooding.

HAROLD W. HOOTS,
Consulting Geologist.

And if you go to House Document No. 364, which is the basic document on this matter, you will find that the Bureau itself admitted that they did not know whether these downwarps are dry, wet, or in what state they were. My statement above contains excerpts from this document.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, for whom I have a very high regard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Texas for an inquiry on the question of personal privilege? The Chair will state that the inquiry has to be confined to the question of personal privilege. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Texas for that purpose?

Mr. HOSMER. I thought I was yielding for a question. I do not wish to yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question the gentleman asks must relate to the question of personal privilege.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to frame a question under

that definition. I shall be glad to ask my question and if the Chair thinks it is not pertinent, I shall withdraw it.

The gentleman has made a very careful study of this project and he has given us some valuable information. I wanted simply to ask whether in the course of his investigation he has found anything good in the project. I ask that seriously. I have not made up my mind. I want to hear both sides. I have no interest in this measure but almost everything has something good in it and I want to find out frankly from the gentleman if there was any phase of this project that had any merit, in his opinion.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, if I may propound a parliamentary inquiry, may I answer that question and still be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may use his own judgment and the Chair will pass on the question, if the gentleman answers it, as to whether it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HOSMER. I shall merely say yes, that I have. Because I have also said about the project that there is a great amount of uranium it will cover up and that will be in it, and we will be losing a valuable resource, a great amount of uranium deposits. True or false?

I have here a letter from a geological consultant, not from Los Angeles, not from Riverside, Pasadena, or Cucamonga, but from the heart of Utah, a town named Moab. In evaluating whether or not my statement is true or false, I want you to hear what he says:

GEOLOGICAL CONSULTANT SERVICE,
Moab, Utah, February 1, 1956.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
United States Representative, California, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After reading your protest of the construction of the dam under the proposed Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project, in the Salt Lake Tribune dated January 31, I would like to commend you on your stand.

However, as a geological consultant with over 3 years' experience in uranium, and associated minerals, of the Colorado Plateau in general and with the Glen Canyon area in particular; perhaps you have overlooked a most vital reason for objecting to the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project.

No mention was made of the uranium deposits, now so vital to our national defense and national economy, which would be buried under millions of tons of water and which could never be recovered if the Glen Canyon area was flooded by the Colorado River storage project.

I have recently completed a comprehensive geological examination and report on the Glen Canyon area for several large uranium companies. This examination required approximately 4 months of detailed field study of the area in question, and consisted of both aerial reconnaissance and exhaustive field investigations. During this time I flew Glen Canyon and the canyons of the San Juan in a chartered super cub for the purpose of mapping detailed structural and sedimentary geology. I flew in and along the canyons for a distance of approximately 100 miles. Outcrops of considerable importance were noted on the map and were subsequently re-visited by use of a jeep and by foot. During this period I flew for 3 days giving adequate time for this examination.

Several trips into the area required camping and long stays as it is quite far from the nearest settlements. During these trips I examined numerous Chinle-Shinarump sandstone lenses and paleo-stream channels which are one of the most important guides to the discovery of uranium deposits on the Colorado Plateau. Enclosed you will find several pictures taken during the examination, containing notes on the reverse side, regarding their importance and location. If the Colorado River storage project is completed and a dam constructed, it is probable that all of the pictured area, in addition to a great proportion of the area examined, will be inundated and rendered useless to the Nation.

For example, the Whilwind Mine located in section 2, T 41 S, R 13 E, has produced over 1,000 tons of uranium ores. It is probable the waters backed up by the dam will flood the Whilwind property and parts of Copper Canyon, Nokai Canyon, and most important Oljetoh Wash, wherein is located some of the best uranium mines on the Colorado Plauteau. Also, Industriol Uranium Corp. has just recently blocked out an estimated 125,000 tons of uranium ore. Other major deposits situated in Oljetoh Wash are the Mitten-Skyline, Koley-Black, and several other interests too numerous to mention.

The Chinle formation in the area which probably would be covered by water possesses a great potential of uranium reserves, and that any destruction will be of considerable detriment to our national defense and economy; therefore, in the best interest of the Nation I would like to voice my support in your stand.

Sincerely,
GEORGE R. GRANDBOUCHE,
Geological Consultant.

Mr. DIES. That answers my question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOSMER. As a matter of fact, there has been a persistent difficulty in getting geological information out of the Bureau of Reclamation concerning this project.

Secretary McKay himself exuded doubts about the geologic capability of Glen Canyon to support a 700-foot dam; doubts which I have expressed and to which the Salt Lake paper may have been referring. Here is the statement I made on the subject:

PLANS FOR HUGE UPPER COLORADO DAM UNCERTAIN, SAYS SECRETARY MCKAY

Proponents of the upper Colorado storage project are asking Congress to authorize an appropriation of $421 million for a gigantic power dam at Glen Canyon, Ariz., without knowing whether the rock foundations at the site would support the immense structure as it would have to be built to integrate with other overall features of the project.

This amazing fact was disclosed in a letter written November 30, 1954, by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay to David R. Brower, executive secretary of the Sierra Club.

Glen Canyon is on the Colorado River, and the proposed dam would be a key structure designed to raise power revenues to help pay for the multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project (H. R. 270) now before Congress.

In his letter, Secretary McKay stated that the materials on which the dam would stand are "poorly cemented and relatively weak * * * in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams." The Secretary also revealed that "experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful."

Further, although the Bureau has presented preliminary plans for a 700-foot dam, it does not intend to present final specifications for it until after Congress has approved the present vague project.

On this subject, Secretary McKay wrote Brower:

"Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction."

Despite this situation, great pressure is on Congress to approve the project. After that is done the Reclamation Bureau would conduct studies to determine what size and type of dam can be built. In other words, Congress is being asked to approve spending this great sum of Federal money when Reclamation Bureau engineers themselves don't know what the final plans and designs may be, how big the dam would be, how much it would cost, how much power revenues it would bring, and when there are grave doubts that such a structure would be secure.

Thus, Congress is being asked to buy a "pig in a poke."

The Secretary's disclosures refute a 1950 report of the Reclamation Bureau which stated that the rock at the dam site "is remarkably free of structural defects."

This 1950 report also said: "The Glen Canyon site is geologically favorable for a high concrete dam."

Secretary McKay told Brower:

"Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or more feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam."

It has been the custom of the Reclamation Bureau to secure authorization of a project based on a cost estimate which they assure Congress will be ample. However, it is rarely found that these cost estimates prove sufficient. Actual costs of projects usually have been 50 to 100 percent greater than the estimates made at the time of authorization.

The obvious result has been that the Bureau's assurances of economic and financial feasibility have collapsed.

The financial plan for the whole upper Colorado River project sets up Glen Canyon Dam as the "cash register" for the development.

Yet, the Reclamation Bureau apparently does not yet know how much Glen Canyon Dam would cost or how much revenue it can be expected to produce.

In the face of these uncertainties Congress should not approve this project.

The full text of Secretary McKay's letter follows:

"Mr. DAVID R. BROWER,
"Executive Director, Sierra Club,
"San Francisco, Calif.

"MY DEAR MR. BROWER: On October 21, 1954, you were informed that further reply would be made to your inquiries of September 28, 1954, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation, concerning the effect of the proposed

Glen Canyon Reservoir upon the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. We now have the necessary information from the field to complete that reply.

"It is our intention to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the Rainbow Bridge National Monument from waters of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir and to ask Congress to provide for such protection in the authorizing legislation. Cooperative studies are underway by the field offices of the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service to determine the best means of providing this protection, and to date these studies have revealed no unsurmountable problems. The topography of the area surrounding the monument indicates that a barrier dam 1 mile below the natural arch and outside the monument would provide adequate protection. Details of such a plan will require extensive study and are not available at this time.

"On the basis of data available at the time of writing the 1950 report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, a 700-foot dam (580 feet above stream level) at Glen Canyon was the maximum height which met the criteria of economy, safety of the structure, and adequate protection of the Rainbow Natural Bridge. Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or more feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

"Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction.

"Sincerely yours,

"DOUGLAS MCKAY,
"Secretary of the Interior."

After hearing the following testimony during subcommittee hearings:

EXTRACTS OF PAGE 243, PART I, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, HEARINGS BEFORE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE INTERIOR COMMITTEE, MARCH 10, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Have you done any work upstream from this site? (Glen Canyon Dam site.)

Mr. DEXHEIMER (Commissioner of Reclamation). Nothing but geological exploration, of course, sir.

Mr. HOSMER. What is that—surface exploration?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Largely.

Mr. HOSMER. And how far back up the stream from the proposed dam site would the reservoir extend?

Mr. LARSON. 186 miles up the Colorado and 71 miles up the San Juan. I mentioned it in my statement.

Mr. HOSMER. Then you have taken visual surface geology in those extensive areas only?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes. I am sure that our geologists have covered that reservoir area.

Mr. HOSMER. Well, surface geology?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes.

Mr. HOSMER. You were in the office 6 years. Do you know of any of the results of that work?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. It has been some time since I went over the geologist's reports, and I am not familiar enough now to say that I remember just what they were. But those reports, of course, were fundamental to the selection of this site and the reservoir area.

Mr. HOSMER. You cannot tell us what is in them at the present time?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. No, I cannot.

I wrote the subcommittee chairman as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1955.

Re Upper Colorado Basin storage project hearings

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommitee, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ASPINALL: During the questioning of Interior Department witnesses on March 10 it became apparent that those present had no geological information of pertinence to the subcommittee in evaluating the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and its accompanying reservoir. In response to my questions it was admitted that such information was in the possession of the Denver office of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Commissioner Dexheimer nevertheless testified in his opening statement (on p. 2) that the geology at Glen Canyon Dam site would be a matter of discussion.

It is therefore respectfully requested that when the Bureau witnesses return for further questioning that they be accompanied by someone fully conversant with the geology at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and reservoir site so that questioning with respect to same may be carried on.

If this be impractical from any standpoint, including the fact that such questioning may involve a considerable amount of the subcommittee's time, then alternatively it is requested that specially designated members, including myself, be authorized to hold special hearings in Denver on the question at a mutually convenient time.

The reason for this request is that doubts have been expressed as to the suitability of geological formations at the proposed location for the intended purposes. The magnitude of the proposed investment of public funds thereat would seem to make it mandatory that these doubts be resolved.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress,
18th District, California.

(Copies to Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation.)

A geologist was produced subsequently who testified, in part, as follows:

EXTRACTS OF PAGE 362, PART I, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT HEARINGS BEFORE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE INTERIOR COMMITTEE, APRIL 22, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Now, I believe the proposed lake would extend about 190 miles up the Colorado River.

Mr. MURDOCK (J. Neil Murdock, regional geologist, Bureau of Reclamation). Approximately that. River miles.

Mr. HOSMER. And how far up the other river?

Mr. MURDOCK. Sixty-one miles, approximately.

Mr. HOSMER. Is that the San Juan River?

Mr. MURDOCK. The San Juan River.

Mr. HOSMER. During all this time, are you in the Navaho sandstone formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. No, sir.

Mr. HOSMER. What else do you get into?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, you go up the Colorado River and you get into the older shales, Triassic shales, and into the limestones.

Mr. HOSMER. Is that the Kayenta formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; you get into the Kayenta formation and the Triassic formations, too.

Mr. HOSMER. What is the Kayenta formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is a shale and sandstone.

Mr. HOSMER. It is more permeable than the Navaho sandstone; is it?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; all the formations are more permeable in that area than the Navaho.

Mr. HOSMER. It is a less homogeneous formation than the Navaho; is it not?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. It contains some sand and some gravel?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, shale and sandstone.

Mr. HOSMER. What is the permeability of this formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Very low. We did not make any tests on it. But it is very tight.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you have any figures whatsoever?

Mr. MURDOCK. No.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you have any figures for the Triassic (which includes Chinle)?

Mr. MURDOCK. No laboratory figures, but shale formations are recognized as impermeable.

Mr. HOSMER. That is not altogether true, is it, Mr. Murdock?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, you might find exceptions, but in the oil business they utilize this, because the shales are impermeable and they trap the oil in the sands.

Mr. HOSMER. That is true with a subsurface formation, but I am talking about a formation that is fairly close to the surface.

Mr. MURDOCK. Surface formation has nothing to do with the permeability of the shale. It breaks down into a clay, which again is impermeable.

Mr. HOSMER. Depending upon its extent of saturation at the time you measured it; is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I don't think saturation has anything to do with permeability.

That Triassic about which he testified, including as it does the Chinle shale, which most of you saw disintegrate in water before your eyes, I believe lends credence to what I may say about the geology of the project which may be in conflict with the Bureau of Reclamation's statements upon which the Salt Lake paper appears to rely.

I have also said Rainbow Bridge could be endangered by the project. True or false? Here are the facts taken from a statement, in part, by Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., consulting geologist made December 29, 1955:

Orderly consideration of this project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies.

Of particular importance is the determination of: * * * how the dam suggested for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be built in the impassible terrain surrounding this area, and how any dam, regardless of its construction, can protect this national monument from flooding.

I want you to determine whether this is true or false. I have said that you can no more take this Echo Park Dam out of the upper Colorado projects than

you can abolish history by tearing out the page in the book that it is written upon.

I have carefully documented that allegation in a statement I released on February 15 of this year citing 17 instances in the record of the hearings before the committee on this bill, the first of which was by Mr. Ralph Tudor, then an official; I think he was Reclamation Commissioner. When asked about taking out Echo Park he said:

I might say it would be like taking the pistons out of an engine. We feel definitely that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted.

Here is my full statement:

TO SAVE DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MUST KILL ENTIRE UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Representative CRAIG HOSMER said today he was informed that supporters of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument were planning to take the dam "temporarily out of the upper Colorado River project bill as a subterfuge to secure approval of the controversial project by the House."

"Probably never before in our history has such a storm of public protest been created against a power project as that which is now raging against the plan to build a large dam and reservoir at Echo Park in Dinosaur National Monument," HOSMER said.

"So intensive has been the opposition to it from every part of the Nation that I understand the project's proponents are contemplating arrangements under which they would appear to be removing Echo Park Dam from the bill," he added.

The dam is a key unit of the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project in Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming.

"On January 18, 1954, Ralph A. Tudor, then Under Secretary of the Interior, testified before the House Interior Committee that Echo Park is a necessary part of the upper Colorado project," HOSMER stated. Mr. Tudor was questioned by Representative CLAIR ENGLE as follows:

"Mr. ENGLE. In order to get something constructive done for the upper basin, it might be more intelligent to take Echo Park out and proceed with less controversial features, and perhaps explore Echo Park and its alternates a little further. That is why I ask if taking Echo Park out would be like taking the engine out of an automobile.

"Mr. TUDOR. We think Echo Park is a necessary part of the project, sir.

"Mr. ENGLE. You think it would be like taking the engine out of an automobile, then?

"Mr. TUDOR. I might say, like taking the pistons out * * *

"Mr. TUDOR (later). We definitely feel that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted."

HOSMER declared:

"Removal of Echo Park Dam from the bill under such circumstances would be at the most a subterfuge. The action would do no more than accomplish the temporary deletion of the national monument dam from the project measure.

"The only result would be that if the bill went to conference, even next year or later, the project's proponents would come back and say: Give us the pistons for our engine * * * give us Echo Park * * * the thing will not work without it.

"Reasons for the Echo Park removal strategy are plain.

"The upper Colorado River project has already passed the Senate in S. 500. Echo Park Dam is in that bill. An amendment to remove it was defeated on the Senate floor.

"The vigorous efforts of opponents of the project, who fear that the invasion of Dinosaur National Monument would open the door to further intrusion upon the sanctity of our national parks, fell before the strength of Senators from the States of the upper Colorado River Basin * * * Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona."

HOSMER pointed out that the supporters of the upper Colorado project "realize that strong opposition to Echo Park Dam would come from many Members of the House, should the bill reach the floor."

HOSMER added:

"Thus, the project's advocates have formulated strategy under which they would remove Echo Park Dam temporarily from the bill while it is in the House Interior Committee. This would be done for the purpose of getting the bill * * * minus Echo Park * * * before the whole House. With the controversial dam temporarily out of the bill, the proponents feel they have a better chance of securing passage by the House."

HOSMER asked:

"What would happen if that occurred?

"The Senate and House bills would be sent to a conference committee assigned to reconcile differences and submit to both bodies a conference report.

"It would be naive to presume that the Senate, in the face of the previous powerful support for the project containing Echo Park Dam, would reverse itself and accept a bill with Echo Park removed.

"It would be as naive to presume that a bill without Echo Park Dam in it would be reported by the conference committee.

"Should Echo Park Dam be removed by the House Interior Committee, and should such a bill pass the House, it is a foregone conclusion that the conference committee would restore Echo Park."

Striking the printed words "Echo Park Dam" from the bill cannot strike Echo Park Dam out of the project any more than "tearing a page out of a history book can abolish the history that was recorded there," HOSMER said.

"But this is the strategy of illusion which proponents of the project are now formulating in the hope of circumventing the vigorous opposition which has been engendered by Americans who wish to prevent spoliation of our national playgrounds," HOSMER continued.

He declared there were good reasons to fear that the building of Echo Park Dam would create a precedent, and there were many other good reasons for opposing the dam.

"In addition to the objectionable site, Echo Park Dam is an unsound project," HOSMER stated. "The financial structure on which it is proposed is so weak that it could not stand alone. In order to repay its cost, the dam must be supported by revenues from another power dam at Glen Canyon. Neither Glen Canyon nor Echo Park Dams store water which would be used for irrigation in the upper basin. They are designed solely for the purpose of supplying power which would be sold, perhaps, to pay for the reclamation units of the project. The latter could not pay for themselves. Without heavy subsidization they could not be constructed. The power rates at both Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams have been set at artificial levels, and there are grave doubts that this power could be purchased by consumers because of this high price.

"Echo Park Dam would ruin Dinosaur National Monument. It would flood some of the deepest, most spectacular and colorful canyons in the country. Well may the question be asked: If the boundaries of one national monument can be opened to the Bureau of Reclamation for power dams and immense reservoirs, why couldn't all national monuments be opened? There are statutes to prevent such a thing, but it is apparent that the Reclamation Bureau does not choose to abide by the statutes in the case of Dinosaur National Monument."

He charged that there have been previous efforts to invade our national parks and monuments, and said there are excellent power sites in Yellowstone, Glacier, and many other sanctuaries set aside for the enjoyment and edification of this and future generations.

"The effort to build Echo Park Dam might well be looked upon as a dinosaur-foot-in-the-door move," he declared, adding:

"You may be certain that as of the very moment the upper Colorado River project might be authorized without Echo Park Dam, the project's proponents would start their program of nibbling to get it back.

"If they did not succeed in restoring it in conference, time would build continuously stronger arguments for their cause.

"You can almost hear them saying: Billions of the taxpayers' money have been spent to build the upper Colorado project. The only way to get the money back is to build Echo Park Dam. Give us the pistons for our engine. That is the only way we can make it work financially.

"I suggest to my colleagues and to all others who are opposed to Echo Park Dam, either for reasons of economics or conservation, that its removal from the bill under present conditions would be nothing more than a subterfuge to secure its ultimate approval by Congress.

"To stop the building of Echo Park Dam it is necessary to kill the entire upper Colorado River project."

I also made a statement on the same subject June 6, 1955, as follows:

AN ENGINE WITHOUT PISTONS

(News release from Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

The supporters of the gigantic upper Colorado River project admit that in its present form it is "an engine without pistons."

Yet they are asking Congress to pass this incredible bill, and force the Nation's taxpayers to suffer a loss of more than $4 billion.

The "pistons" of the upper Colorado project was Echo Park Dam. Conservationists throughout the country fought Echo Park Dam because it would flood a part of Dinosaur National Monument.

Facing certain defeat, the bill's supporters finally informed the conservationists that Echo Park Dam would be taken out. The conservationists accepted this promise and withdrew their opposition.

It is apparent from the record that the conservationists have walked into a trap.

The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, and numerous individuals have testified repeatedly that Echo Park Dam is absolutely vital to the feasibility of the upper Colorado River project.

For instance, on January 18, 1954, Under Secretary of Interior Ralph A. Tudor, testified before the House Interior Committee as follows:

"Mr. TUDOR. We think Echo Park is a necessary part of the project, yes, sir.

"Mr. ENGLE. You think it would be like taking the engine out of the automobile, then?

"Mr. TUDOR. I might say it might be like taking the pistons out. We feel definitely that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted."

There is nothing in the world to prevent Congress from returning Echo Park Dam to the bill. If the bill can be passed without its pistons, obviously it will not work, and the pistons will have to be put into the engine.

By withdrawing their opposition to the bill, the conservationists are permitting themselves to be deceived. They are being

lulled to sleep, and they will wake up some morning to find that Echo Park Dam is to be built in Dinosaur National Monument.

The record before Congress is replete with unqualified statements by Reclamation Bureau officials and others that Echo Park must be in the project or the project will not work, cannot pay out, and would fail to provide the development desired.

Here are excerpts from that record:

Mr. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior: "1. With respect to the need for the Echo Park Reservoir, our recommendations remain unchanged. We still recommend the construction of the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir."

Mrs. PFOST: "2. In your opinion, are there other sites that would be as beneficial to the project as Echo Park?

Mr. Aandahl: "No; I think Echo Park is way out ahead"——

Mrs. PFOST: "There is no other substitute?"

Mr. Aandahl: "It is way out ahead of alternates that might be proposed."

Mr. W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation: "3. The proposed use of the canyon sections of the Dinosaur National Monument for water and power developments was contemplated long before the original 80-acre area was enlarged to its present size of over 200,000 acres in 1938. A number of powersite withdrawals prior to that year are evidence of this fact. Recognition of the importance of these potential power developments was given in the President's proclamation enlarging the 80-acre monument. The supervision of the area by the National Park Service under this proclamation was not to affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended, and administration of the monument was subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904.

"The plan before you for coordinating the development of the water and power resources of Green and Yampa River Canyons along with their scenic and recreation values is therefore consistent with the language and spirit of the proclamation. The Department has no doubts as to the appropriateness of creating an artificial lake and adjoining facilities within the bounds of this particular national monument. It would not create a precedent for invasion of other parks. The precedent, if any, was created in 1938 when the boundaries were extended to the canyon areas with a clear understanding that water conservation and power development had prior right to the use of those areas."

Mrs. PFOST: "4. Mr. Commissioner, is Echo Park essential to the economic feasibility of the upper Colorado project?"

Mr. Dexheimer: "Yes. Although, by elimination of parts of the project, the economic feasibility might be established for something less. But it would not be, we think, the proper way to meet the ultimate or even the present needs of the upper basin."

Mr. Dexheimer: "5. It (Echo Park) is essential in the upper reaches of the area, and without it we would be unable to make the full development anticipated and would probably have to leave out even some of the participating projects which are recommended at the present time, or some of the units in participating projects, and it would greatly decrease the financial feasibility of the overall plan."

Mr. E. O. Larson, regional director, region 4, Bureau of Reclamation: "6. Here are the principal advantages of including Echo Park Dam and Reservoir in the Colorado storage project plan:

"1. With respect to storage capacity and power generation, Echo Park would be second in size to Glen Canyon in the reservoir system planned for the upper basin.

"2. Evaporation losses per acre-foot of water stored in Echo Park would be less than any other major storage site in the upper basin.

"3. Construction of Echo Park Reservoir in place of Dewey Reservoir, the best alternative outside of a national monument, would save an estimated 200,000 acre-feet of evaporation losses annually, a significant quantity of water in the arid West.

"4. Echo Park Reservoir, located just below the junction of the Green and Yampa Rivers, would be integrated with the upstream Flaming Gorge and Cross Mountain Reservoirs in regulating the flows of the rivers, that is, when they are constructed. In addition, it would contribute materially to the feasibility of reservoirs at Split Mountain and Gray Canyon sites downstream on the Green River. This is why Under Secretary Tudor mentioned that Echo Park was the wheelhorse in the upper basin.

"5. The use of the Echo Park site is the key to the economical development of the upper end of the upper Colorado River Basin. The site is strategically located with respect to upstream power markets of the proposed system of dams and powerplants and the basin's many resources awaiting development, such as phosphate rock for fertilizer, chemicals, oil shale, coal, natural sodium carbonate, and many other important minerals."

Mr. Sisk: "7. Could I ask you this question, Mr. Merriell: Do you feel that Echo Park represents a more important feature of this project, let us say, than Glen Canyon, assuming that only a portion of the project could be built?"

Mr. Frank C. Merriell, chief engineer of the Colorado River Water Conservation District: "In some ways it does. In the first place, where this project will sell power, the first places are in the vicinity of Salt Lake and of Denver, and the most direct transmission that can be devised in the project is from Echo Park to each of those places. Now, that is the principal reason, and there are other collateral reasons. There is a possibility of a very great industrial use right close to Echo Park in the phosphate beds of the Uinta Mountains, and other possibilities in the Uinta Mountains, in the Grand Valley, in industrial use, whereas Glen Canyon is a long ways from there."

Briant H. Stringham, Vernal, Utah: "8. Opponents of the project, most of whom are well intentioned citizens, base their chief argument on the false premise that the building of Echo Park Dam within the Dinosaur National Monument will set a precedent for the commercial invasion of all parks and monuments. This argument is not based on facts as the following official documents will show. These instruments also prove that it was definitely understood by officials and the people at the time the monument was enlarged that power and reclamation projects were to be constructed inside the monument at some future time, and that the area would be subject to several other existing rights.

"On June 10, 1920, the Federal Water Power Act was passed creating the Federal Power Commission. This Commission was given authority to grant licenses to construct dams in national monuments according to the opinion given by Councilor Abbott representing the House Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation. However, on March 3, 1921, the Congress amended the Federal Water Power Act taking from the Power Commission and giving to the Congress authority to grant licenses to construct dams within parks and monuments, but in doing so, the Congress added these significant amendments: 'As now constituted or existing,' thus leaving the authority in the Federal Power Commission to grant licenses for construction of power dams in newly created monuments such as Dinosaur. President Roosevelt recognized this fact in his proclamation enlarging the monument."

Mr. George D. Clyde, commissioner of interstate streams for Utah: 9. "Mr. Chairman, I think the Echo Park Dam is absolutely necessary to this project. The Echo Park Dam, in my opinion, occupies the same position that I would, for example. I am pretty good with both arms and both legs. You can cut one arm off and I can still live, and you can cut two arms off and I can still live, and you can cut both legs off and I can still live, but I am not much good. And Echo Park Dam is an essential unit in this thing because it is a basinwide project, and it must be considered in terms of the series of storage dams, their operation to provide for water for consumptive use, provide the water to meet the obligation to the lower basin, and to provide for power generation. All of those three are inextricably tied together."

Mr. Dixon: "10. You concur in his testimony that there is no substitute equal to Echo Park as a dam site."

Mr. Clyde: "Yes, sir; I am convinced in my independent analysis as well as review of many, many reports, that there is no substitute for Echo Park."

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, a United States Senator from the State of Wyoming:

"11. So I say without any hesitation or equivocation that the creation of the expanded Dinosaur National Monument in 1938 on the 14th of July had nothing to do with the preservation of any historical site or the preservation of any scientific area. On the contrary, it was an attempt to use for scientific purposes, for development purposes, water that had previously been recognized as one of the best sources of waterpower in the United States."

Milward L. Simpson, Governor of Wyoming: "12. Echo and Glen Canyon Dams are vital elements in the development of the upper basin States."

H. T. Person, dean of engineering, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.: "13. In regard to Echo Park Reservoir—this unit is one of the very important units in the team of storage units necessary for the fullest development of the water resources of the upper basin. Its strategic location below the confluence of the Green and Yampa Rivers, its low evaporation losses and its contribution to maximum power production makes it an essential unit in the upper basin development. The grandeur, the spiritual and esthetic values of the canyons of the Echo Dam site are acknowledged. The Echo Park Reservoir will not destroy these values. Echo Park will eliminate some sections of river rapids—but there are hundreds of miles of river rapids in the vast areas of the upper Colorado River basin. Echo Park Reservoir will make the recreational values of this vast area available to hundreds of thousands of people every year—rather than to just those few hundred daredevil river runners who now have that opportunity. Echo Park Reservoir is in the Dinosaur National Monument. However, the evidence is documentary and clear, that the people of the area were given assurance in 1938 when Dinosaur Monument was extended to include the Echo Park area, that establishment of the extensive monument would not interfere with the use of the area for grazing, or with the development of the water resources of the area."

G. E. Untermann, director, Utah Field House of Natural History, Vernal, Utah: "14. Much of the opposition of rabid conservation groups to a proposed dam in Dinosaur National Monument is baseless and unrealistic."

Herbert F. Smart, Salt Lake City, Utah: "15. Conservationists opposed to the construction of this dam say there is a principle involved. Yet actually the only principle involved is one of the integrity of the Government and the people, including conservationists, in keeping promises and assurances, and abiding by conditions incident to the enlargement of the Dinosaur National Monument. The question of the inviolability of a national monument is not at issue here. The question of the inviolability of promises

incident to the enlargement of the boundaries is involved. The integrity of our national park system is predicated upon good faith, and conservationists interested in preserving the inviolability of our national park system should be the first to recognize and, in good faith, insist upon compliance with the conditions under which the Dinosaur Monument boundaries were extended, namely, subject to power and reclamation withdrawals.

"To many of us who have been a part of the conservation movement in the West, we are at a loss to understand the motives of conservationists opposing a project which will result in such a material gain to conservation objectives and principles. In the best tradition of Gifford Pinchot, the passage of the Colorado River storage project will mean the greatest good to the greatest number for the longest period of time."

Angus McDonald, legislative assistant, National Farmers Union: 16. Sites other than those recommended by the Department of Interior have been suggested because it was contended that the building of a dam at the Echo Park site would be an invasion of the national park system and would forever mar the natural beauty of the area. The record will show that the original monument created by President Wilson consisted of 80 acres which would not include Echo Park and when President Roosevelt expanded the monument by Executive Order in 1938, that he provided that expansion of the monument should not bar the building of power projects. In other words, the Echo Park site has never been part of the national park system. The mere fact that it was called a park did not make it a national park. It is also contended that development of the water resources of the upper Colorado and the Echo Park site would impair it as a recreational center and that in some way it would disrupt the Dinosaur Monument. Geography indicates that the bones of the dinosaurs, if any, would not be disturbed because the dinosaur graveyard is down the river from the Echo Park site. Impounding water behind the Echo Park would not submerge a single dinosaur bone. On the contrary the proponents of the project tell us that the creation of a huge lake behind the Echo Park would enhance the recreational opportunities and that roads would be built into the area so that many more thousands of people could enjoy recreational activities, whereas at the present time, the area is relatively inaccessible."

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS, a United States Senator from the State of Utah: "17. This puts the shoe on the other foot. It is not a national monument that is being invaded—it is a matter of some misled or misinformed conservationists who are trying to urge that Uncle Sam violate his integrity and treat as mere scraps of paper solemn reservations in the public interest in the Dinosaur Monument area that precede the limited monument proclamation by 17 to 34 years. It ill-behooves honest conservationists to take such an untenable position, because we who love our parks and monuments should strive to preserve as honorable and legal commitments the reservations of public lands for such a noble and worthy use as parks and monuments. Therefore, how can we, in the same breath, ask that equally binding and legal reservations for water development, be invaded, especially when the monument proclamation itself recognizes and exempts from the Dinosaur Monument land reservation these previous withdrawals for water resource development?"

REFERENCE INDEX TO QUOTED STATEMENTS

Colorado River storage project: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session on H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, H. R. 3383, H. R. 3384, and H. R. 4488 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

PART I

Name	Date	Page
1. Aandahl, Hon. Fred G	Mar. 9, 1955	32
2. Aandahl, Hon. Fred G	do	38
3. Dexheimer, W. A	do	51
4. Dexheimer, W. A	do	174
5. Dexheimer, W. A	Mar. 10, 1955	193
6. Larson, E. O	do	193-194

PART II

Name	Date	Page
7. Merriell, Frank C	Mar. 11, 1955	471
8. Stringham, Briant H	Mar. 14, 1955	551-552
9. Clyde, George D	do	559
10. Clyde, George D	do	571
11. O'Mahoney, Hon. Joseph C	Mar. 16, 1955	615
12. Simpson, Milward L	do	619
13. Person, H. T	do	623
14. Untermann, G. E	do	650
15. Smart, Herbert F	do	683-684
16. McDonald, Angus	do	703
17. Watkins, Hon. Arthur V	do	706

Now, true or false, what I say about Echo Park still being in the bill. If you do not put it in they are going to have to come back and ask for it later. The project is not going to be financially feasible without it, so if the project is not financially feasible without Echo it certainly must still be in it, sooner or later, so the issue is actually before the Congress of the United States now, whether we like it or not.

I reiterate what I said in that regard by quoting the same newspaper that wrote the editorial about me. Last year when the Echo Park Dam was taken out of the project by the House they said:

It has long been a part of the upper basin States' strategy to delete the Echo Park Dam in the House bill on the hope it will be restored.

I do not think it will be restored by the other body, during conference this year, if we pass the bill, but I do believe it will be restored as time goes on and it becomes obvious that the project cannot work without it.

I want you now to determine whether or not this is true or false: I have said that the assistance to the Navahos in the bill is negligible. I think that even the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will agree with me on that, because he said that was true when the bill was being discussed by the Republican policy committee. The bill would only build a Navaho dam and reservoir. It would be nothing more than a piece of concrete in the middle of a river, and when built it would be an item to point out and say, "Now, give us the money to do the rest of the job."

What is the rest of the job? The rest of the job is to build the project down to the Navaho Indians, which the Commissioner of Indian Affairs admitted would cost $200,000 each for 1,100 Indian farms.

The assistance to Navaho Indians in the bill is negligible; cost of project's benefits is $200,000 for each and every Navaho farm: the assistance to the Navaho Indians in the bill would be negligible without the addition of the costly Navaho reclamation project.

The bill would authorize the Navaho Dam and Reservoir only and this does not irrigate any Navaho lands. The water stored in the reservoir could not be used for irrigation of Indian lands unless and until canals and other facilities of an additional reclamation project are authorized and built, involving a construction cost of $175 million or more.

According to testimony presented at the hearings, the Indian Bureau contemplates that the additional reclamation project would provide for 1,100 Navaho Indian family farms. The cost per family farm would be about $200,000. Indian Bureau witnesses estimate the gross income per family farm would be $5,000 a year. In comparison, it should be noted that the $200,000 of capital proposed to be expended per family farm would, if invested at 5 percent interest, yield an income of twice the estimated gross farm income.

In view of these facts, consideration might well be given to some different program for use of Federal funds to rehabilitate the Navaho Indians that would be more beneficial to them and more practicable and effective from the standpoint of the Federal Government than the costly irrigation project as proposed. In this connection, the record indicates that it is not certain that the Navaho Indians either want to farm irrigated lands, or would succeed as irrigation farmers.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I will not yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman is taking this time as a subterfuge to discuss the bill. When he asked us to determine whether something was true or false I asked him to yield so I could show him it was false, and he declined to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair feels that the gentleman has for the last few minutes been proceeding in order. The gentleman is recognized to proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the Speaker.

I want to return now to a matter that I asked you to determine in your own minds whether my statement is true or false, and that was the statement that I made that this piece of legislation would take away water to which California has existing rights by contract, by compact, and by appropriation. True or false?

A football field is slightly more than an acre of ground. Cover it a foot deep with water and you would have about an acre-foot of water. Cover it with a tower of water 11,000 miles high, and you have an idea of the amount of water parched southern California will lose if the upper Colorado Basin storage project is built as now planned.

Imagine a canal wide enough and deep enough to float the world's biggest ship, the Navy's new aircraft carrier *Forrestal*. Imagine that canal stretching from New York City to Los Angeles. During just one year, enough of the Colorado River's water to fill it could be stopped from

flowing downstream at the project's gigantic Glen Canyon Dam.

That is water that could not be used by southern California, Arizona, and Nevada because it would be withheld upstream in violation of the Colorado River compact and never reach them.

All this is true because the overall multi-billion-dollar project is designed to put approximately 48 million acre-feet of water in storage behind dams in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Another 10 million acre-feet of water would be dissipated into thin air by evaporation during storage.

In all, 58 million acre-feet of water would not flow down the Colorado River from the upper-basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado to the lower-basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California.

Yet so vital is this water in the lower basin that even today arid Arizona and California are before the United States Supreme Court litigating their rights to it.

California agrees that the upper basin is entitled to use some of that 58 million acre-feet, but contends that her share of it must be left flowing down to the lower basin under provisions of a solemn contract entered into by these 7 States in 1922 known as the Colorado River compact.

California's basic position is that she conforms to the compact and must insist that the States of the upper basin and the Federal Government do likewise in the planning and administration of the storage project. California thus is fighting only to preserve rights to water she already has and not for any new and additional water rights.

Relying on these existing rights, California carefully invested between one-half and three-quarter billion dollars of local money, not Federal money, for water projects calculated to make maximum use of her share of the Colorado River. Thereby, southern California was transformed from a semidesert into an oasis constituting one of the Nation's key economic and agricultural regions, supporting millions who migrated to her borders from less hospitable climates.

As southern California continues to grow, her need for water becomes greater, not less. Should the bleak day ever come when her Colorado River water supply is cut off, on that day the jobs of the millions she supports will vanish and the value of everything they own that cannot be transported to another part of the country will be lost completely and forever.

That is why Californians in Congress are fighting so hard to prevent spending billions from the United States Treasury to build the upper Colorado project in such a manner as merely to transport the oasis of southern California to Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. In the process, financial ruin would be imposed on almost 6 million southern Californians. These States can plan their projects without this disastrous result and California demands that they do so.

The reason they have failed so far to do it is clear. To find a common ground for agreement amongst themselves, each of the upper-basin States had to accept every project, good, bad, or indifferent, any of the others asked for. They ended up with a monstrosity that did not fit the interpretations and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Rather than recede, they adopted a technique of twisting, straining, and distorting the compact in an attempt to stretch it over the monstrous package to which they have affixed the euphonious label, upper Colorado River storage project.

The reason they have adopted this technique is not so clear. To understand it requires some knowledge of the Colorado River compact and the situation that produced it.

Early in this century southern California already had begun its miraculous expansion in population, agriculture, and industry. A water shortage was faced, and Los Angeles began reaching up into the Owens Valley for water to be transported through an aqueduct over 100 miles long. Even then, men of vision foresaw water needs beyond those satiable from the Owens Valley and began talk of more ambitious plans. Plans which one day would result in such great works as Hoover Dam, Davis and Parker Dams, the All-American Canal, and the metropolitan water district's vast Colorado River aqueduct, with its extensions reaching even as far as San Diego.

Meanwhile, the upper-basin States were experiencing little growth or progress. A Supreme Court decision had laid down a rule of law respecting use of river waters which said that whoever first begins using them obtains a right to continued use that cannot be taken away by someone who later wants to use the same water. The upper States foresaw burgeoning southern California acquiring first rights to almost all the river's water before they were able to appropriate uses themselves.

In this circumstance, according to the language of Delph Carpenter, Colorado's negotiator of the compact:

> The upper States had but one alternative, that of using every means to retard development in the lower States until the uses within the upper States have reached their maximum.

And that exactly is what they did. The Boulder Canyon Project Act authorizing Hoover Dam was stalled in Congress for almost 10 years by the obstructive tactics of upper basin Senators and Congressmen. It was passed only after tribute had been extracted from California and the lower basin in the following manner:

First, imposing the Colorado River compact which removed at least 7½ million acre-feet of water from appropriation by them; and

Second, requiring the California Legislature to pass a law further limiting the amount of water to which the State could acquire first rights.

The net effect was to place on California a limit of slightly less than 5½ million acre-feet of water per year that she could use. Thus limited, the State had to jettison many desirable projects. Nevertheless, California went to work and tailored her developments on the river strictly to the limitations and to the intent and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Even with only a portion of the great dreamed of projects built, no place in time or history has experienced developments of water resources comparable in scope and magnificence to those of southern California.

It is the water rights which underlie those developments that Californians seek to protect when they oppose the upper Colorado River storage project and charge that it tramples these rights.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. For what purpose does the gentleman ask me to yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. For the purpose of restating the position which the gentleman says the Governor of Colorado took.

Mr. HOSMER. I decline to yield at this time. If I have a little time later on, I will yield.

The upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress seeks the construction of 11 irrigation projects in the so-called upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. These would irrigate about 200 square miles of new land and supply supplemental water to about 400 square miles of land irrigated inadequately at present. They are known as participating projects.

Placed in the best light, according to Government experts, they would cost about $300 million, and that amount would be repaid to the United States without interest over a 50-year period.

The participating projects would use an estimated 400,000 acre feet of Colorado River water a year for irrigation, domestic and industrial purposes. This amount is well within what the upper basin is entitled to use and California cannot object on that score.

There is, however, a "but" to the proposal and it is a big one. It is that revenues from the sale of water from the 11 participating projects during the 50 years would bring in only about 15 percent of the money needed to repay the Government for its investment.

As a consequence the proponents of the projects had to look elsewhere for an additional source of revenue to pay the remaining 85 percent of the price tag within the time limit. They seized on the idea of building vast power dams and utilizing the revenues from the sale of power for this purpose. In the proposals before Congress, these are called storage projects to obscure their true cash register nature.

As a starter two power projects are proposed—one at Glen Canyon and one at Fleming; another, conditionally at Curecanti. Other power projects would follow later.

The Glen Canyon and other power projects are unrelated in any way to the 11 participating projects, except as cash registers. The latter could function to supply water entirely without them. Yet Congress is being asked to spend about $500 million additional for the power features for the sole purpose of paying the $300 million participating projects' cost.

It is little wonder that alert citizens throughout the Nation, concerned over the Federal debt and high taxes, have voiced opposition to the scheme. Federal taxpayers would be better off if Congress makes an outright gift of the 11

participating projects to the upper basin States and forgets the power features completely.

It is with these power features that Californians have also a special concern. They would hold back, for power use, most of the 48 million acre-feet of water to be stored by the project. In the storage process, another 10 million acre-feet of water would disappear by evaporation. Thereafter, they would evaporate another 600,000 acre-feet of water per year, enough to supply the needs of a city of 3 million people. The magnitude of the evaporation is apparent when compared with the 400,000 acre-feet figure that is to be put to beneficial use by all 11 participating projects.

That is mostly water that thirsty southern Californians claim they are entitled to have flow downstream to their State and which cannot legally be withheld from them because of their prior right to it established by contract, appropriation, and the Colorado River compact.

The Colorado River compact was negotiated at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1922 by the seven States bordering on the river. It is a contract between these States and authority for such interstate agreements is found in the United States Constitution. Herbert Hoover, then winding up his affairs as World War I Food Administrator for starving Europe, acted as chairman during the negotiations.

The compact did not attempt to divide up water in the river as such, nor did it make any specific allocations of water as such to the States involved. Rather, it proceeded by regarding the river as consisting of three parts:

First, the upper basin: Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah;

Second, the lower basin: California, Arizona, and Nevada; and

Third, that part of the River which crosses the international boundary and flows in the Republic of Mexico.

The dividing line between the upper and lower basins was fixed at a point called Lee Ferry in northernmost Arizona, near the Utah border.

Thereupon the negotiators proceeded to apportion beneficial consumptive use of the river's waters between the basins. The compact nowhere defines "beneficial consumptive use," and its meaning is one of the issues in the pending Supreme Court suit by Arizona against California. In general, it amounts to use of water for irrigation, industrial, or domestic purposes.

That kind of use of water in the amount of 7½ million acre-feet yearly was apportioned to each basin by the compact's article III (a). This totals 15 million acre-feet, and since that was not all the water the negotiators believed available, by article III (b) they permitted the lower basin to make use of an additional 1 million acre-feet of surplus water.

Having no authority to cut Mexico out of water to which she might legally be entitled, they wrote article III (c) saying Mexico was to have whatever might be determined by a later treaty. This, again, was to come out of surplus, but if need be, equally out of each basin's III (a) apportionment. A subsequent treaty fixed Mexico's entitlement at 1½ million acre-feet a year.

At this point the negotiators had disposed of 17½ million acre-feet of water a year, but they thought there was even more in the river so in article III (f) they set up machinery for "a further equitable apportionment" of remaining water at a later date. Subsequent experience with the river has shown not only that this additional water is nonexistent, but also that part of the apportioned water likewise is nonexistent. The river, in fact, averages a critical deficiency of almost 2½ million acre-feet a year.

Unless she desires to enter into a one-party suicide pact California must resist to the utmost the upper basin's bold attempt, by means of the upper Colorado Basin storage project as now planned, to charge almost all this deficiency against California's preexisting water rights.

Unfortunately, this is only one of many ingenious ways in which the attempted invasion of California's water rights is being conducted. There are about a dozen other provisions in the compact on which upper basin proponents are placing weird interpretations trying to deny California and the lower basin even more water. Illustrative is the dispute involving article III (d).

Since the flow of the river varies widely from year to year, lower basin negotiator insisted on guaranties preventing the upper basin from manipulating its uses between wet and dry years to the disadvantage of the lower basin. This turned up as article III (d) prohibiting the upper basin from depleting the amount of water flowing past Lee Ferry below a total of 75 million acre-feet in any period of 10 consecutive years.

In their desperate water grab, project proponents now contend this proviso, rather than amounting to a minimum guaranty to the lower basin, amounts to the maximum amount of water they are required to turn down the river. They say they can keep everything in excess, storing it for power purposes or making any other use or nonuse they desire.

They persist in this contention even in the face of an interpretation of the compact made by Herbert Hoover at the time it was negotiated in his words as follows:

> The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above what cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes.

In the past, California has not opposed upper basin developments. Many projects in Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado have passed Congress without an objection from the Golden State. But when schemes are proposed such as this that cut deeply into the vital water supply, like a man attacked in his own home, Californians must command their every means and skill for self-preservation.

That the proposed upper Colorado Basin storage project would euchre California out of vast quantities of Colorado River water to which she is legally entitled should be well known and understood.

An additional specific objection to the project must not be ignored by Congress:

It threatens seriously to impair the quality of water, if any, southern California might receive from the river after project construction.

No one contends the quality of the water even now received from the Colorado River approaches excellence. Millions of dollars have been spent for purifying devices to remove hardening alkalies and salts before use in homes and factories. Yet witnesses for the Bureau of Reclamation have told Congress they neither concern themselves with water quality nor recognize any responsibility whatever to operate the proposed project with regard to this vital subject.

Only after searching cross-examination would they admit that their files contained no more than the most sketchy information on the subject. Based on it they reluctantly confessed even the initial features of the overall project would raise these impurities by a thumping 12 percent when the water reaches California.

That figure would jump to 54 percent if additional projects now in the planning stage are added to those presently under consideration.

The reasons why southern California's water quality would suffer are simple: First, water returning to the river after new upstream irrigation uses would contain added impurities dissolved from the soil. Second, pure upstream water diverted in large amounts through mountains and out of the river system forever would not be available to dilute concentrated impurities further downstream. Third, water withheld in upstream storage reservoirs would likewise be for dilution purposes.

Competent engineers estimate 1.2 tons of alkali and salt would be added to every acre-foot of water available for use in southern California.

Irrigators use at least 3 acre-feet of water per acre in a year to grow their crops. That would deposit 3.6 tons a year of such impurities on every acre. Just how long soil could continue growing crops in face of this is speculative.

The effect would be similar in home and industrial water systems, to say nothing of the already irritated digestive tracts of almost 6 million southern Californians.

At the same time, and for the remaining life of the power contracts at Hoover Dam—until 1987—the Federal Government, and thus the United States taxpayers, would lose a total of $187 million in revenue from power not sold because there was no water to generate it.

This $187 million loss to taxpayers illustrates that there are substantial reasons not to build the upper Colorado River storage project in addition to those local to California. These reasons, shared by the citizens of all the 48 States, are varied and compelling.

Many people throughout the country find the project objectionable because Echo Park, one of the major power features of the overall development, lies in the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. They point out that a precedent would be set for the invasion of

any and all national parks and monuments by unsightly power facilities in disregard of the trust imposed on each generation of Americans to preserve these public shrines unviolated for future generations.

Naturalists also point to the possible destruction of, or at least damage to, Utah's famed Rainbow Natural Bridge during construction and operations at the Glen Canyon power site.

In their turn, taxpayers groups and economists attack the project's effect on Federal finances from several fronts.

Raymond Moley, one of ex-President Roosevelt's brain trust, has stated that by the time compound interest for 50 to 100 years is paid on the $1 billion the United States must borrow to construct the project, costs will run to not less than $4 billion. Even simple interest at 2½ percent amounts in 10 years to 25 percent of the money borrowed; in 40 years to 100 percent; and in 80 years to 200 percent.

Moley's figures indicate the total cost would amount to more than $5,000 per irrigated acre. So poor is most of the land, located as it is at high elevations where growing seasons are short, that even after irrigation its value will average only about $150 an acre.

In all, about 600 square miles would be irrigated to produce surplus crops involving further losses to taxpayers when purchased under price-support programs. Even if needed, certainly there lies somewhere within the borders of the entire United States another 600 square miles of land that could be brought under cultivation at a cost significantly less than $4 billion.

Project proponents point out that the Government can expect to recoup part of its outlay by selling electricity from power features. However, their calculations are based on selling power for 6 mills per kilowatt hour for the next 75 or more years. This anticipation is utterly unrealistic because production cost of electricity from both conventional and nuclear fuels is plummiting. With these costs at far below 6 mills in the foreseeable future, the net effect will be to leave the project's vast hydroelectric facility on the backs of Federal taxpayers as the most monumental white elephant in history.

There is a further fundamental concern pointed to by economists which must be faced both by the Nation and the people living in the upper basin who are even more directly involved. It is that the region is unbelievably rich in natural resources: coal, oil, natural gas, oil shale, uranium, gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, molybdenum, vanadium, phosphate, and many other minerals.

The resources utilized toward development of an unlimited industrial economy, not a limited farm economy, are the real keys to the area's future and to its full contribution to the American way of life.

Water resources in the area are of measurable quantity and their potential benefits in an agricultural economy not great. On the other hand, the benefits which they can bring in a program of industrial expansion are immeasurable.

Should not this region, and must not the Nation, insist that the course of development be pursued which is to the greatest good of all?

It is clear that Californians must oppose the upper basin storage project to protect the quantity and quality of their Colorado River water supply and to protect an important source of their electric power.

It is equally clear that all other Americans should join in this opposition for protection of the Nation's finances and in pursuance of a sound national policy to develop each part of our homeland to its own, and to the country's highest good.

The whole upper Colorado project must be revamped to the end that it ultimately will produce results instead of merely consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I will extend in my remarks additional material and try, as I was not able to do today, to place these remarks in a more orderly fashion, but in stating them and in reading them I will say what I have said, and I will say why I have said what I have said, and I will leave it up to you as to whether my statements are true or false.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman has not had permission to extend his remarks, and I am rather prone to object to his extending his remarks unless he has already obtained it.

Mr. HOSMER. I have already obtained that permission.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is material he desires to place in the RECORD that has not been spoken in his presentation of the question of personal privilege explaining the position he has taken. It would seem that the Members of the House ought to have the right to know something about the extent of it.

Mr. HOSMER. I will be glad to tell the gentleman what I am going to put in by way of extension. The only reason I am not talking about it now, of course, is that my time has almost expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does it represent the pile of papers the gentleman has before him on the desk?

Mr. HOSMER. I will include many of the things in these papers before me.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Has it already been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HOSMER. No; if the gentleman will permit I will tell him what some of this material I have here is, or so much as time allows.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. HOSMER. I am going to put in further material as to the costliness of this project, material further substantiating the statement I have made in that regard.

I am going to put in substantiating material showing that the cost estimated by the Bureau backstopped by the statement in the appropriation authorization in the bill of only $760 million is misleading.

I am going to put in a table showing the distribution of costs amongst the 48 States, and also as to the true cost of the tremendous interest that will have to be paid.

I am going to extend and show why I have said that the huge hidden subsidy to these four States is unwarranted and unconscionable.

I am going to put in additional material to prove my allegation that the project is not self-liquidating as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

I am going to put in additional material to backstop my allegation that the financial scheme of the project is wholly unsound, that the project payment provisions are unrealistic, uneconomical, and unfeasible.

I am going to extend additional material with respect to the impossibility of selling power at 6 mills for the next 100 years.

I am going to put in additional material to show why I make the statement that the dams are nothing but subsidized irrigation projects and are not for power.

I am going to put in a rather full discussion of the statement that low-cost nuclear electric power development potentialities have been disregarded and neglected in connection with this piece of legislation; and in that connection I am going to quote W. Kenneth Davis, the Director of the Division of Reactor Development of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, who in the presentation to the United Nations 10th anniversary celebration in San Francisco last June stated that the most important point in considering this question is that we have a changed situation in the matter of power development; that any answer which may be given today will almost surely be changed because of the rapid progress that is being made in this new field. This is Mr. Davis' statement:

EXTRACT FROM REMARKS PREPARED BY W. KENNETH DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF REACTOR DEVELOPMENTS, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, FOR PRESENTATION AT THE UNITED NATIONS 10TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE WEEK ACTIVITIES SYMPOSIUM ON ATOMIC PEACE—HORIZON OF HOPE, JUNE 24, 1955, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Where do we stand today in the technical development of nuclear power for the generation of electricity or for other power uses?

A most important point in considering this question is the rapid change of the situation with time. An answer which can be given today will almost surely be out of date a year or two from now because of the rapid progress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Mexico rise?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the point of order that the gentleman now clearly shows that he is proposing to put in the RECORD not matter on the question of personal privilege, but merely debate on this bill, and that he is taking advantage of the committee by subterfuge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is answering a question propounded by the gentleman from Nebraska. Whether or not he puts it in is a matter for the House to determine. His having already obtained con-

sent to his request it is a matter for the gentleman as a Member to consider.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, a further point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico will state it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman's request was to extend his remarks dealing with the substance of his discussion of the question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from California is now offering to put in the RECORD things that are entirely not in order but which constitute debate on the bill. There is no doubt about that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman has already obtained permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter, the Chair assumes the gentleman is not going to trespass upon the judgment or the conscience of any other Member.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have said the project would forever tie the future of the intermountain West to a horse-and-buggy farm economy and forestall development of its rich industrial potential. True or false. Here are the facts:

The region in which the project would be constructed is unbelievably rich in natural resources. These are the measures of its future potential.

The water resources of the area are of measurable quantity, and their potential benefits to agriculture would be small. On the other hand, the benefits which these limited water supplies could bring to a program of industrial expansion are immeasurable and of unlimited value.

Irrigation is a very uneconomic user of water. The value of crops grown under western irrigation is equal to about 10 cents for each 1,000 gallons of water withdrawn. The value of manufactured products amount to about $5 for each 1,000 gallons withdrawn.

The potential thermal power resources of the project area are beyond comprehension. In the heart of this land, the Bureau of Reclamation is proposing a horse-and-buggy economy that would cripple forever opportunities to create a profitable and unlimited industrial economy.

Steam or nuclear plants to provide electrical energy in these States could be built by private capital, with no Federal subsidy involved. They would create new employment in the coalfields and in the industries that would build to take advantage of the avaliable power. Thus a sound stone would be placed in the area's economy by each plant and each job created, and the plants, the new industries, and those employed by them, would pay taxes to the local, State, and Federal Governments.

Agricultural development will seriously injure, if not kill, all opportunities to build such a sound economy. There is only so much water, and the most wasteful way to use it would be by subsidizing unneeded, extravagant, and wasteful irrigation projects. The hope of the area lies in a modern-age industrial program, not a surplus-ridden farm economy.

I have said the benefit-cost ratio has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics. True or false? Here are the facts:

The bill would, in effect, approve the use of the so-called benefit-cost ratio for testing the economic justification of irrigation projects. This has never been authorized by law. The testimony shows that, as now practiced, the benefit-cost ratio is simply a device used in attempting to justify projects, which are both economically and financially infeasible; first, by use of fictitious and unrealistic values to inflate the benefits; while, second, at the same time overlooking factors of cost to the Nation which would result from the project.

Example No. 1: on one participating project—the Hammond—the Reclamation Bureau would collect from the farmers only $2.02 per acre per year, but says the direct benefits are $41.50 per acre per year, or 2,000 percent of the amount it would require the farmer to pay. This contrast in benefits and repayment ability is simply not believable. Any formula achieving such a result obviously needs a drastic overhauling.

Example No. 2: The Government's revenues from firm power production at Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams would be decreased as much as 25 percent during the time—which may be as long as 25 years—the storage dams of the proposed project are filling. This loss has been ignored by the Bureau.

In view of these major discrepancies, coupled with the fact that most of the projects named in the bill have a marginal benefit-cost ratio under the Bureau's own figures, there should be an independent review of the Bureau's computations by a group of impartial expert economists. On the Seedskadee project, for instance, the Bureau had to find $638,500 of indirect benefits and $313,100 of public benefits to add to the finding of $614,500 in direct benefits—all items over a 100-year period—to arrive at a final ratio of only 1.46 to 1. The indirect benefits category includes such nebulous factors as the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers, while the public benefits category is even more speculative, including dollar figures for Bureau guesses as to the increase or improvement in settlement and investment opportunities, community facilities, and services and stabilization of the local and regional economy.

The only true criterion of economic justification of reclamation is reimbursability which has been the required basis of findings of feasibility since the inception of Federal reclamation in 1902. It should be maintained in the law without change. This the project utterly fails to do.

I call particular attention to what has been said about this cost-benefit ratio by Adm. Ben Moreell as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH BY ADM. BEN MOREELL, NATIONAL WATER POLICY CONFERENCE, ST. LOUIS, 1956

A third area of divergence covers the requirements and criteria for determining economic justification and financial feasibility of projects, including the kinds of benefits and costs to be considered. Under present law, economic criteria are few and indefinitely described. There are no definitions of "benefits" and the interpretation of what constitutes "costs" varies fr.m agency to agency. The Bureau of Reclamation, for example, has even prescribed a factor to apply to attendance at the movies as a measure of project benefits. Such painful efforts to justify projects of dubious worth give rise to the suspicion that there has developed in this country a conviction that the expenditure of Federal funds to promote the interests of a particular area, or of a particular group, is warranted provided it can be shown that the probable resulting benefits to that area or groups may exceed the out-of-pocket costs which are paid for by the general taxpayers. It is almost traditional that benefits are overestimated and costs underestimated. The question whether this is the best expenditure of Federal funds in the interest of all of the people of the Nation, who pay the bill, has been given little consideration.

I have said that 50 years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are jettisoned by the project. True or false? Here are the facts:

Example 1: Present law requires repayment within 40 years, with respect to power and municipal water, and 40 years plus a development period of not to exceed 10 years with respect to irrigation.

Under this bill: (a) The power allocation is permitted to be repaid in 100 years; (b) the municipal water allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years from the date of completion of each unit; (c) the irrigation allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law. Thus, the repayment period for power is extended 60 years, municipal water 10 years, and irrigation 10 years plus an undetermined period, over existing law.

Example 2: Present law requires that no contract relating to power or municipal water be made unless it will not impair the project for irrigation purposes. Under the bill, contracts relating to municipal water may be made without regard to this section. Although this may not be a bad result, it is another symptom of eroding the reclamation law by individual pieces of legislation instead of considering such matters in the context of a national water policy bill.

Example 3: Present law requires interest at "not less than" 3 percent per annum on the power investment. Under this bill, interest would be the cost of money to the United States, or about 2½ percent per annum.

Example 4: Present law requires a finding of engineering and financial feasibility, the latter to be in terms of the 40-year repayment ability. Under this bill, the so-called benefit-cost ratio has been substituted for financial feasibility in order to come up with an economic feasibility based on fantastic national benefits supposedly to be realized. This constitutes one of the greatest breaches of present law and leaves Congress with no well-defined standards of feasibility whatsoever.

I have said the project wholly ignores the Hoover Commission report. True or false? Here are the facts:

The Hoover Commission report has just been released. The bill ignores any of the counsel to be gained from the

labors of the Commission, which has completed a detailed study of this entire complex field. In fact, the proponents of this gigantic scheme tried to get it through Congress before the Hoover Commission made its report, so blind have they been to the true national welfare in connection with water resources.

However, one may disagree with some of the recommendations of the Commission and the task force, your minority submits that the members of this group should be heard before Congress commits itself to the billion-dollar precedents of this bill. It should not be forgotten that this Commission was established by Congress to report to Congress so that Congress might consider the advisability of legislation to implement some if not all of the Commission recommendations. Regardless of the jeers heard from spokesmen for special interests, your minority considers that the people of this country respect the industry and the sincerity of the Hoover Commission inquiries.

Your minority believes that the people are entitled to and will demand a thorough consideration of the Commission reports in every field. For example, in the water-resources field, the Commission report relates five conditions which the task force found to be necessary for the success of reclamation projects:

First. They must have technical feasibility.

Second. They must be sound financially.

Third. They must have fertile soil capable of agricultural production over long periods of years.

Fourth. They must have adequate and suitable water supply.

Fifth. There must be farmers available who are interested in and enthusiastic for irrigation agriculture.

Relating these to the project before Congress, the record shows there is question as to the technical feasibility of the proposed 700-foot Glen Canyon Dam; the financing is wholly unsound; the soil by and large is of dubious quality; and the water supply is actively in ligitation in the Supreme Court.

The Commission further found experience shows that the farmers alone cannot bear the whole cost of irrigation projects. Conceding this, would it not be a proper inquiry for Congress to determine what the farmers should pay? Should they pay only 12 percent, as this bill allows? If so, who should bear the balance of the cost, local area residents or the taxpayer in every corner of this Nation?

The Hoover Commission makes a pertinent suggestion on this score—that the beneficiaries—including States—contribute at least 50 percent—which may well be forgotten if the hydroheaded monster now before Congress becomes law.

I have said the project should not be authorized at this time because the economic, engineering, and financial survey prerequisite to its proper evaluation are still inadequate and incomplete. True or false? Here are the facts:

The official reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the testimony of Bureau witnesses clearly show that the investigations, surveys, and studies in regard to engineering and the economic and financial aspects of the proposed Colorado River storage project and participating projects are incomplete and inadequate.

The provisions of the Senate bill itself, which require further studies and report by the Secretary of the Interior on economic feasibility and financial reimbursability of the 11 participating projects previously recommended by the Secretary, demonstrate that reliable information is not now available even on those projects that the Bureau has already reported on. The House bill seeks to cover up this deficiency even in the face of the clear recommendation of the administration that these projects be reevaluated before authorization.

The Senate bill with which the House bill might go to conference includes authorization of scores of projects on which no reports have as yet been submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, on many of which only the barest reconnaissance data are now available.

The record reveals the need for much more thorough investigations and studies of the proposed storage units. Even as to the Glen Canyon storage unit, the Interior Department officials have expressed concern over the adequacy of the foundations and have stated that decisions as to final plans would not be made until further studies are completed after authorization. Plans for the other storage dams are even less decisive. Thus there is grave question as to the adequacy of cost estimates and the financial feasibility of the storage features of the project.

In addition, it is clear from the record of the hearings that the proposed storage units of the project will not supply any water to the reclamation components now proposed and are not needed to enable these projects to obtain and use the amount of water estimated by the Bureau to be required. Yet under the House bill, it is proposed to spend about $600 million, and under the Senate bill about $750 million, for storage units that are not to be needed to meet basic water-supply requirements for at least 25 years and probably more.

In view of the foregoing, action on the project at this time would be premature and without justification.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Andrews	Burdick	Dondero
Barrett	Bush	Eberharter
Bell	Carrigg	Fountain
Bolling	Celler	Fulton
Boykin	Chatham	Gamble
Garmatz	Macdonald	Reed
Gavin	Machrowicz	St. George
Harris	Merrow	Shelley
Hays, Ark.	Mollohan	Simpson, Pa.
Hays, Ohio	Morgan	Tollefson
Hyde	Mumma	Van Zandt
James	Osmers	Vursell
Jenkins	Powell	Wharton
Kee	Priest	Williams, Miss.
Kilburn	Prouty	Young
King, Pa.	Rabaut	Zelenko
McCulloch	Rains	
McDowell	Reece, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and seventy-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to take a moment to thank the Members of the House who have by and large received my remarks with very great courtesy and attention. I know they realize it is an extremely difficult thing when every statement one has made upon a particular issue over the past several years has been challenged, how difficult it is to cover it as it should be covered; nevertheless, I much appreciate their courtesy in listening to me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3383, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the pending bill and this project, I regret to find myself in disagreement with some of my friends from southern California. If I thought that this project would cost California one bucketful of water to which California is entitled from the Colorado River system, I would not be for this bill. Last Thursday I inserted in the RECORD to the extent of some 8,000 words my analysis of the legal situation with reference to the water rights of California on the Colorado, and because I regard that matter as a sectional matter and one which we Californians ought to settle among ourselves—but which unfortunately we have

not been able to settle among ourselves—I do not intend to take the time of the committee or of the House in dealing with that particular aspect of the case.

I may say before I start my discussion that we have tried to divide the time in this debate fairly. The gentleman from Nebraska, the ranking Republican member of our committee and former chairman of the committee, is supporting this bill, as is the gentleman from Colorado, who is handling the time on the Democratic side. The gentleman from Nebraska has, as I understand, agreed to yield approximately one-half of his time to those who want to speak in opposition and the gentleman from Colorado has taken the same position As a consequence, we are somewhat limited with reference to time because this is a long, difficult, and complicated matter.

I want to devote my time to giving to you the legislative history of this project, comment upon the economics of the project which have been challenged and make some reference to the relationship of this project to the farm surplus problem. If I can get over those 3 items briefly in the next 15 minutes and have some time left, I will be delighted to yield to Members on the floor. If not, perhaps at some later time if inquiry is made I will be glad to answer them.

I want to go into the legislative history to some extent because I know it is not possible for every Member of this House to be an expert on every piece of legislation that comes before it. You simply have not the time, any more than I do, to study the whole record on each bill. You have to take someone's judgment for what is right with reference to some of these bills. So it is important to me, I know, when I sit out here as a Member of the House and listen as a juror to those who are acting as advocates of particular legislation to be informed as to who has passed on the legislation and who have found it to be sound and who have found it to be unsound. Therefore, I want to run through this very briefly for the purpose of demonstrating to you that every executive agency that has examined this project has approved it and every time this project has appeared before a legislative body of this Congress it has passed.

A report on the Colorado River storage project was completed and the project was approved by the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation on December 15, 1950. That was during a Democratic administration. The project was approved by the former Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Michael W. Straus, on December 22, 1950, and by the Secretary of the Interior on January 26, 1951. That Secretary of the Interior was a Democratic Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Oscar Chapman. It was approved by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Dexheimer, on November 13, 1953, in a Republican administration and by Secretary McKay on December 10, 1953. Therefore it is correct to say that this legislation has had the bipartisan approval of the Interior Department and the Bureau of Reclamation under the command of the Democrats when they were in power, and since then under the command of the Republicans. This is not a Republican project in any sense of the word. This project was initiated back in 1936 under a study which continued until the first report was submitted in 1950.

Now, in response to an official request by the Secretary of the Interior for the views and recommendations of the States affected, Wyoming approved the project in March 1951 and again in December 1953. The reason each State approved it twice is because when the Democratic Secretary of the Interior got the report he sent it to all the States. When the Republican Secretary of the Interior got into office, he sent it to all the States. As a consequence Wyoming approved it twice. Utah approved it twice. New Mexico approved it twice. Arizona approved the project in June 1951 and again in January 1954, and Nevada approved the project in November 1951. The State of California approved the project on June 14, 1951, but on February 15, 1954, restricted its approval to the Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir and the principal features of the project.

The Federal Power Commission approved the project on February 26, 1954. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare approved the project on April 5, 1954. The Department of Agriculture approved the project on March 23, 1954. The Corps of Engineers approved the project on February 4, 1954. The Bureau of the Budget, which is supposed to be the sharpest outfit around here with a pencil, especially under a Republican administration, approved the project on March 18, 1954, and the President approved the project and issued a statement thereon on March 20, 1954.

Now, I emphasize these executive approvals because they indicate that probably as many as 1,000 top men who are experts in the water and power field have given examination to this project and not one single one of those agencies has ever disapproved it. If this project is as far out of line and as fantastic as some people would try to make you believe, then I say there are a lot of men in the executive branch of the Government, both in this administration and in the past, who ought to have their heads examined.

In addition to that, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee favorably reported this bill by a vote in the last session of 11 to 1, and the Senate itself in April of 1955 passed the project 58 to 23. You have already heard that our committee approved this project by a vote of 20 to 6. In other words, this project has on three occasions gone before legislative bodies of this Congress, and in one instance carried by 11 to 1, in another instance carried by more than 2 to 1, and before our own committee carried by better than 3 to 1. So this project has been approved every time it has been put to the test. Now, I grant that it is not possible for all of you to make the careful analysis of this legislation that these people have in the executive branch of the Government and those who serve upon these committees, but I think I should say this, that whenever you get that kind of favorable reaction to legislation by those who have studied it, then you have a right to say that you can place some confidence in the correctness of that judgment. I know you are not going to dig through the deluge and the barrage of contradictory statements in regard to the facts with reference to this legislation, but here are the men, the agencies, and the legislative bodies that have approved what we are saying are the facts with reference to this legislation. The President of the United States, on so many occasions that I will not mention them all, has urged this legislation.

We have a little different bill before you than the one which was voted out by the Senate. The Senate bill was a great deal larger. Our House committee cut it in half for all practical purposes. Their bill was $1,658,000,000. As I said, it passed the Senate by a vote of better than 2 to 1 even in that shape. We cut it in half. We took out the controversial Echo Park feature and thereby secured the support of many of the conservation people throughout the country.

We have adopted some amendments since this bill was voted out of our committee in the last session and approved by the Committee on Rules for consideration on the floor. The amendments all fall within and are consistent with the repayment plan proposed in H. R. 3383 as initially reported.

Essentially, these amendments do two things. First, the amendments which have been added make the legislation acceptable, as I have said, to the conservation groups and as indicated in the supplemental report, all of those groups now favor the legislation. Secondly, the amendments carry out the unanimous agreement recently reached among the upper basin States relative to spelling out in greater detail the accounting and funding requirements to be made applicable to the basin fund. That is a bookkeeping matter.

That is the bill that is before you at the present time. It is the bill initially voted out as amended and brought before you as set out in the supplemental report. So, when you want to see what the bill is, read the supplemental report which contains the bill as we voted it out with the amendments in italics. That covers the legislative history of this bill.

I have referred to the approvals which this legislation has had because I want to speak briefly of the economics of this project and its repayment. The fact is, as stated on page 12 of our committee report that in 50 years following the last power installation, the project revenues will amount to $1,075,000,000. This will be sufficient to repay (1) the power investment with interest, and (2) the required irrigation assistance of $246 million, and (3) leave a surplus at the end of that time of $86 million. That is the cash money that will be in the Treasury of the United States.

These two charts which I have here give a breakdown of the figures and give the allocations to each of the elements in the project and the total revenues that will be secured. These are the charts which have been prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation with the approval of the Department of the Interior. They have the approval of all of these executive

agencies to which I have referred, including the Bureau of the Budget.

We will see some other figures around here, but these are the figures that have come up from downtown, in two administrations. The chart which is shown in color is one which gives a quantitative display of the cost of the project and the repayment. You will see that the repayment quantitatively is just a little more than twice the total cash cost of the project.

There is one thing, I think, I should point out to you, because I should like to say that this project is every bit as good as the Central Valley project in California so far as repayment to the Federal Government is concerned—and the Central Valley project in California is the most famous irrigation and reclamation project in the world. This project pays out just as that project does—the Federal Government gets its money back. The difference is this, that the irrigators do not pay so much. You have heard of the high cost per acre. The people in the area are going to pay that. The irrigators do not pay very much. If you look at this small red slip, that represents about 15 percent of the total cost of the irrigation works. So the irrigators do not pay very much. They pay all that they can pay, but the power users step in and pick up the rest of it. All of the money comes out of those four great States, out of their consumers, out of their resources, and out of their people.

How does it make any difference to the Federal taxpayer whether a power consumer who turns on a light helps pay back this bill or an irrigator pays it back? Let us assume that the irrigators are going to pay half of it. Under reclamation law, all we do is reduce the power rate. The power rate in this instance to carry this load has to be 6 mills. The power rate in this Nation has never gone down in all history. It does not make any difference whether the power consumer pays it, living out on his ranch, running a pump and lighting his house, and the little communities that this project feeds and sustains, or the irrigator. In the Central Valley project the irrigators will pay back about 66 percent of the cost, and power one-third. The power rate in the Central Valley project of California is 4 mills. If these irrigators could pay more we would just reduce the power rate. In any case, the Federal Government gets its money back. It would get the money back on the power investment. It will be the investment in the power plus the interest, the investment in municipal water plus the interest, and the Federal Government will get the irrigation investment back without interest, which is traditional under 50 years of reclamation law.

I assert that this project is just as good on its economics as any of them. The people I have mentioned who have recommended this project will say to you that it is engineeringly sound, that it is economically justified, and that it is financially feasible.

In addition—and this should be pointed out—because a great deal has been said with respect to the allocation among the States, there is sufficient money now in the national reclamation fund to put up over half—55 percent— of the amount of money which will go into this project. As a matter of fact, the only money that will come out of the general revenues of the Treasury to finance this project will be less than $18 million a year.

I have seen the tax chart sent around purporting to show the amount to be paid by each State. I wrote Mr. Dexheimer, the Reclamation Commissioner, and I asked him about that. This is what he said. He said that recent articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the public press contain erroneous and misleading data on proposals for authorizing additional reclamation projects.

Allegations are made that the cost of these projects would be proportionately assessed against the States of the Union according to the States tax burden. For the upper Colorado project, for instance, it is mentioned at $4 billion.

He says these statements are not in accord with the facts. The facts are that the reclamation fund, which will be discussed later in some detail by my colleagues, is made up out of money that comes from reclamation projects, out of oil and gas lease revenues, and out of public land sales in the West, which will constitute over 55 percent of the money going into this project.

The actual assessment, Mr. Dexheimer states, against the average taxpayer throughout the United States will be less than $18 million a year throughout the period of the construction of this project. That is not equal to the amount of money that will go into the power-producing features of this project. The interest-free features which, as you will see here, cost some $287 million, will come out of the reclamation fund and will not come out of the general tax fund, will not cost the taxpayers of this Nation anything whatsoever out of the general tax revenue. On the other hand, the investment in the power features of this project will pay the Federal Government back all of the principal and the interest.

I want to say something with reference to the farm surpluses, because it is contended that there is a basic inconsistency between authorizing this project and on the other hand setting up a soil bank. I assert that delivering water to these lands will move in the direction away from those surpluses which have troubled our Treasury and our Nation. There are only two of them that will be raised of any consequence in this area. They are wheat and corn. Experience has shown that when dry land producing wheat is irrigated, the land for the most part is diverted to other crops.

Here is an example. On the Columbia basin project where 500,000 acres have been brought under irrigation to date the wheat acreage has been cut by 90 percent and the production of wheat cut by 2½ million bushels a year. As the tremendous growth in the Columbia basin increases, there will be a further reduction in the production of wheat and it is estimated that by the time the project is completed, there will be a reduction of 5 million bushels of wheat per year. In short, the irrigation of these areas leads precisely away and in the opposite direction from these supported crops, and as a consequence it is not an addition to the surpluses of this Nation. What we are creating here is a water bank and not a soil bank—a water bank for future progress, development and living in that great area.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that the legislative history of this bill shows it has been approved by every executive agency and by every legislative group which has given it a hearing up to this time. It will not add to the surpluses of this Nation. The figures show that this project is engineeringly sound, economically justified, and financially feasible. It has been approved by the finest engineers in both this administration and in the past administration. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that when this bill goes to a vote in the final test that it has here before this legislative body, the record will be made 100 percent in the approval of the upper Colorado River basin project by every executive agency and legislative body before which it has been put to a test.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] has made a very fine statement of the economics of the project and its effect upon reclamation in the West and in the Nation generally. In the few minutes I have at my disposal, I wish to bring to you a picture of the physical area concerned and also a very short statement of the legislation itself. The area of the Colorado River reaches from the southern parts of Wyoming, the northern parts of Colorado and Utah to the Gulf of California. Because of differences had during the early part of this century over the use of the water and the possible future uses of the water, a compact was entered into by representatives of the seven States concerned. The compact provided that the water of the Colorado River or rather the use of the water of the Colorado River would be divided at Lee's Ferry as far as the quotas between the two areas were concerned. Lee's Ferry is just south of the boundary between Arizona and Utah. Too, the lower basin was guaranteed the first 7½ million acre-feet of water. The upper basin was guaranteed the second half—whatever that might be, and if the water was not there, the upper basin would be the one that would be short. Also, the lower basin was allotted an extra million acre-feet of water which either rises within the bed of the river itself or rises from tributaries below Lee's Ferry. That was the Colorado compact—solemnly entered into by the States and approved by the Congress of the United States in 1923.

I can advise my colleagues without any fear of contradiction that the legislation proposed in H. R. 3383 is in compliance with the Colorado River compact and the other compacts and agreements which go to make up the "law of the river."

Already since 1930 some $400 million of Federal moneys have been spent to develop the area south of Lee's Ferry, mostly in southern California or along the river itself. Since 1939 and 1940,

moneys have been given to the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditure in the upper basin to investigate, and survey, and make reports on projects which would do for the upper basin what has been done for the lower basin.

The reason the work has not proceeded faster is because the contribution from the Boulder Canyon fund is only $500,000 a year, and the amount appropriated by Congress has not been sufficient to firm up a faster job. But as the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], has said, in 1946 the Department of the Interior filed with the Congress its first report. It filed with the Congress its second report on the Colorado River in 1947, with the statement of the various States, all of them favorable. Since that time we have been busy trying to draft legislation to bring before the Congress to start the development of resources, mostly water resources, but other developments too that necessarily go along with it in the upper basin.

The bill now before this Committee provides for 4 major units, 3 of which are power producing units and 1 of which is regulatory in streamflow only. I will name them.

The Glen Canyon Dam with which I think you are familiar. I think you are also familiar with the Flaming Gorge Dam; and may I suggest that there are those of us who still think the Echo Park site was more to be desired than Flaming Gorge, but we have been defeated in our purpose and we are willing to abide by the decision of the Committee and have taken Flaming Gorge in the northern part of Utah in place of Echo Park. While doing this we have entered into an agreement with the conservationists to the effect that we would not trespass upon any national park or national monument area in the construction of projects authorized under the provisions of this bill. I mention this because of a colloquy had during the discussion had on the rule between the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] and myself relative to the position of the Sierra Club. Since that time I have talked to Mr. Brower, the director of the club, and he has assured me within the last 20 minutes that their opposition is withdrawn provided we place and keep within this bill the provisions that we will not trespass upon the national park or national monument areas.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Because some of the Members were not here at the time the colloquy took place, would the gentleman mind explaining what was represented by the gentleman from California?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado made the statement that the Sierra Club had withdrawn its opposition, that they were now not opposing it as they had in the first place. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] took issue with me and stated that within the last few days he had conversed with Mr. Brower and that that was not their position. So I immediately went to Mr. Brower, who I knew was in the gallery, and asked him. He said that I might advise you that they have withdrawn their opposition to this legislation provided we have within the bill the provisions to which I have just referred.

In addition to the two authorizations just referred to there is a conditional authorization for Curecanti, if and when the Secretary has found it feasible.

Also, there is an authorization at this time for Navaho as a regulatory dam. In connection with the welfare of the Navaho Indians, there is no possible use by them of the water to which they are entitled under treaty rights unless we start with the construction of the Navaho Dam or a similar facility.

Then, in addition to these 4 major projects, there are 11 participating projects which are authorized by this legislation.

The participating projects, with the exception of the central Utah project, are small irrigation projects which are necessary to put the water to use in the upper basin primarily for agricultural purposes. The central Utah project is a large project, it produces power, and it also provides water for municipal use in the Utah area. As I say, it is a large one. The participating projects are the only way by which benefits can be secured to any part of the area as far as irrigation is concerned.

In addition to this authorization, the bill names some 24 projects of some nebulous value in the upper basin to be studied further by the Bureau of Reclamation to see whether or not they do present any economic value which can be given to the area and to the Nation in the future providing Congress is willing to authorize them. The reason for this, of course, is quite apparent to those of you who have studied the legislation. Under this bill, the State of Colorado, which furnishes 70-plus percent of the total flow of the river and is entitled to 51.75 percent of the upper-basin allocation, gets only 5 small projects, the costs of which are in approximately $22 million. These projects do not provide for the consumptive use by the State of Colorado of the water to which it is entitled under its allocation. Therefore, in order to firm up possible development in the upper basin, especially in Colorado, these projects are named for further study. If they are economically and physically feasible, why, of course, they will be brought to the attention of Congress for future action.

The authorization for this project is $760 million. The members of the House committee can advise you that they intend to stay as near that figure as they possibly can provided we go to conference. The value of Federal aid to the lower-basin contributions already made is considerably over $400 million. Of course, this bill has a statement of intent to the effect that this is not to be the final development in the upper basin.

In the West we have, as many of you know, different water law than the rest of the Nation. Simply stated, it holds that he who first puts water to a beneficial use acquires a perpetual right to that use, a right which no man and no legal entity can impair. So long as the volume of water available for irrigation, power, and domestic and industrial use exceeded the demand, there was no problem. Then with increasing settlement came increasing demand, and the waters of western streams for irrigation and other uses became very valuable and an item of controversy not only among individuals but more importantly among States. The question of control or ownership was uncertain. Some held that the State of origin had complete control even to the point of stopping the entire flow of the river at the State line. Others held that the Federal Government had control of rivers in interstate concourse. Out of this controversy between individuals, States, and the Federal Government there slowly evolved a body of legal opinion that seemed to confirm the supreme right of the first user irrespective of point of origin of the water, place of use, or State line.

This apparent legal determination brought to a head a growing controversy over the waters of the Colorado River. As you know, settlement in the Southwest, coming up from Mexico, preceded that in the Rocky Mountain West. Additionally, most of the land along the lower reaches of the Colorado was flat, had a long growing season, and easily developed for agricultural use. This tended to mean that unless some division was made of the Colorado, first use in the lower basin would forever preclude any development in the upstream States where over 90 percent of the water supply originated. The major drawback to development in the lower-basin area was the erratic flow of the turbulent river. In the spring it was a raging monster, yet by late summer a dangerously low trickle. So far as southern California was concerned, the ever-present problem was just this. The Imperial Valley where the water was used lies below sea level and below the bed of the Colorado. This created a great danger that the Colorado would turn to this great sink—and, indeed, it did in 1905—and ruin all that had been built. Fighting the annual flood battle was a costly and uncertain proposition. Then late in the summer the low trickle was inadequate for vital water needed in the late-growing season. Beyond this, the then supply canal lay in part in Mexico and this made upkeep and flood prevention more difficult. These circumstances led very early to a determination in this area that flood control was mandatory and so was an all-American canal for water delivery. Storage was also important. Just a little later, the metropolitan area foresaw an end to local or native supply of domestic water and their eyes turned to the far-away Colorado. Economics was the big stumbling block to the achievement of this complicated diversion since it required great pumping operations and cheap electric power to operate them. Out of this, in time, evolved a program which would achieve all these ends and other important projects in southern California. What was required was flood control, river regulation, an all-American canal, and storage and power on the river to make feasible this ambitious undertaking.

In early form, the flood control could have been most easily and cheaply taken

care of by a relatively small dam as far down the river as possible, but this would have done nothing for either power, adequate holdover storage, or water regulation or for municipal water. Storage in the early stages appeared most favorable in dams as far up the river as possible, but it was questionable whether this was legal for the dams of necessity would have been in another State. These upstream dams would have taken care of the Imperial Valley irrigation and perhaps the all-American canal, but again have left out municipal water for want of cheap and accessible power in adequate amounts.

Thus it was that the lower basin area sought a program to achieve all these ends in an economic form since none but flood control and some irrigation could stand alone. In time—and with progress in dam engineering—came the concept of a huge dam and reservoir at the point closest to the metropolitan area so that its power would be marketable in the demand area. In this plan all needs could be met—the huge dam would provide both flood control annually any cyclical water regulation and control for both irrigation and municipal use. The huge power output could be utilized to pay for the dam structure and power features, provide cheap pumping power for the municipal water canal and also control the lower river so that lower power dams and diversion points for the municipal and irrigation water would be practical.

Now you will note, and the record is clear, that each separate desire had initially a separate solution of which only flood control was certain both as to economics and legality. You will also note that the key to unlock this dilemma was power, power in such amounts, at such cost, and in such location, that it would be salable in the power-market area, would be close enough for the municipal pumping and still provide a means of repayment for the only feature not directly related to either reclamation, municipal water supply, or flood control which were the only sure legal methods then existing under law. I say to you then that Hoover Dam and its blessing-bestowing power plant was not an incidental part of the legal flood control, reclamation, or municipal water supply, but rather the only thing that made the whole program even remotely feasible. And now southern California has the gall to come in and complain about the "cash register" dams of the Colorado storage project, and they at least are charged in part to irrigation while not one cent of Hoover Dam was ever charged to irrigation, which it made possible; municipal water, which it made possible; and the flood-control allocation was a minor part of the whole program. I am not speaking idly when I say that my face would be crimson should I so switch my position in just one generation.

But on to the water-use problem. Unless and until the lower-basin area, especially southern California, could insure its complete right to a minimum of water, this ambitious project, even if broken down into parts, was impossible. Up until this time, that is 1920, no final legal determination had been made or was even sure of achievement. Water right depended upon use and here use was impossible without a sure right.

Do not let me seem to imply that the upper-basin area stood by idly through this period. I have pride rather in saying that forward-looking men there were men who were also trying to find means to develop their resources through water use. With the uncertain status of water right, they feared that the lower-basin program would estop upper-area development and they accordingly gave logical opposition to such program seeking instead a uniform development along the river.

Into this ever hotter issue stepped the calm figure of an eminent Colorado water specialist to suggest a division of the water of the Colorado by treaty or compact as between the States desiring its use. This man, Delph Carpenter, thus became virtually the father of a treaty division which was finally achieved in Santa Fe, N. Mex., late in 1922. The lower-basin area, including southern California, welcomed this proposition to establish sure rights so that their development and their construction could proceed. Out of earlier meetings among the States involved, thus came a Colorado River Commission with two members appointed in official action by the Governor of each State—Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. In that concurrence of the Congress and the Federal Government was necessary—and indeed required by the Constitution—for such multi-State agreement, a Federal representative was appointed, Herbert Hoover, then Under Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Hoover, incidentally, was elected by the commissioners as chairman of the interstate group.

Many meetings were held as this group attempted to divide the Colorado River water so much to each of the seven States. It soon became obvious that this was impossible. But in that there was a natural division into an upper basin area and a lower basin area, it was determined to divide the use between the two natural basins. In addition, a decision was rendered by the Supreme Court that the first user of water had the superior right, irrespective of State line—Wyoming against Colorado—in the summer of 1922, and this provided the final push to find an agreement. When worked out, that unanimous agreement was to divide the water in perpetuity between the two natural areas, the upper basin, or highland area, from which the water came, and the lower, or sea-level area. The only reason that the wording did not read as a straight division was that Mr. Hoover, in proper support of the Federal interest, could not then accede to a final ownership or control of interstate water by the States. Nonetheless, the sole purpose of the commission and the compact it drafted was to divide the water and its attendant use.

[H. Doc. 717, 80th Cong., 2d sess., Report by Hon. Herbert Hoover, Representative of the United States (H. Doc. 605, 67th Cong., 4th sess.) p. A24]

Frequently in the past just such very serious conflicts have arisen on interstate streams resulting in prolonged and expensive litigation and causing long delays in development. This compact, when approved, will be a settlement of impending interstate controversies and an adjudication of rights to the use of the water in advance of construction, thus eliminating litigation and laying the groundwork for the orderly development of a vast area of desert land, estimated at some 4 million acres; the utilization of river flow now unused in the generation of hydroelectric energy, the possibilities of which are estimated at 6 million horsepower; the construction of dams for the control of floods which annually threaten communities in which over 75,000 American citizens now reside, with property worth more than $100 million; the establishment of new homes and new communities and the creation of a vast amount of new wealth.

The primary purpose of the compact is to make an equal division and apportionment of the waters of the river. For this purpose the river system is divided into an upper and lower basin.

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies; and to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two basins, and an apportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River system is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made. (Article 1 of the Colorado River compact negotiated and signed by the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Ratified by all States except Arizona, including a self limitation requirement for California, as a condition precedent to the Boulder Canyon project and proclaimed by President Hoover, June 25, 1929.)

This they achieved by "apportioning in perpetuity"—in article III (a)—"the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum" to each basin with each State to obtain its share—by later in basin agreement they thought—from its own basin. This apportionment was designed to and did exclude the doctrine of appropriation as to use between the two areas. Thus, the early right of the Imperial Valley attached only to lower basin water and not to any upper basin water up to its legal apportionment—section VIII, Colorado River compact.

Unfortunately, even after the adoption of the compact in 1922, controversy still continued. This was not, however, between the States of the upper basin and southern California. Rather, the upper basin States were happy to then add their weight to the passage of the act to build the Hoover Dam and its appurtenant structures and thereby set in motion the full development of southern California, for had they not just come to agreement that each area would have a firm and fixed share of water and firm and fixed right to its use? They also lent their support to other lower basin development under the same thinking. Arizona, the other major lower basin user, has been unable to achieve its hope of a major and long-planned development, but we have supported them. The opposition to

that project also centered in southern California.

However, over the next few years, it was with not only cooperation but active support from the upper basin area, that the nonreclamation area objection to the Hoover Dam program was finally overcome. May I say to you that the self-same arguments presently being used against the Colorado storage project were used against Hoover Dam and its related works—size, complexity, lack of power market for that cost of power, growing of already surplus crops, public-power opposition, cost, and just plain inertia. Each of these arguments has been doubly discounted by the passage of time and the success of these projects. The mighty Hoover Dam broke the back of the turbulent Colorado and made the lower basin flow useful and profitable. The cessation of the flood menace, the storage and the all-American canal fixed things up fine for the Imperial Valley. The river control made possible the installation of lower power dams and diversion points for other uses, including the metropolitan water diversion. The great storage made possible a firm and fixed supply of water for all periods of the growing season and municipal supply. Best of all, the cheap power made the metropolitan water pumping feasible and provided the cash register to repay, with interest, the cost of the dam and the generating works. By so paying for these, the other canals, diversions and uses could pay for their part of the overall facilities.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In other words, if power were not assuming a large proportion of the original cost of Boulder Dam, it would be quite difficult for flood control or reclamation and other uses, river regulation, to repay the Government for the original investment

Mr. SCATTERGOOD (chief electrical engineer and general manager of the Bureau of Power and Light of the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles). It would be utterly impossible, because reclamation could not stand any such cost or even a reasonable share of that cost. (Hearings before Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, House of Representatives, 76th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 6629, 1939.)

As a matter of further fact, the Superior Court of California held that the Boulder Canyon project was not even an irrigation project and that requirements of section 4 of the Reclamation Act had no application—Evan T. Hewes, substituted for John L. DuBois, et al., against All Persons et al., see page 52, Federal Reclamation laws, annotated.

Further reference could be made to the committee hearings on H. R. 9093 in the 3d session of the 76th Congress, pages 118 through 123, or to pages 535, 536 of the first edition of the Hoover Dam documents by Wilbur and Ely, and it must be the first edition for this material does not appear in the later edition except as a reference to see appendix such and such in the first edition.

Here recorded is a letter from John B. Miller, then chairman of the board of Southern Edison Co., written to Secretary of Interior Wilbur which reads:

As has been repeatedly pointed out, the Boulder project is chiefly a water project and our interest in that project is simply securing for the community which we serve the assurance as to an additional supply of water which the community believes it will require.

So far as power is concerned, it is more costly under the contract price proposed than power which we are securing from the alternate source of steam plants.

Even though the Black Canyon site so appropriated—and I use the word "appropriated" since private groups had filed on the site before the whole canyon area was withdrawn by the Federal Government—was the best on the river and even though the lowlands are the best of the area for irrigation, the example of this huge program not only paying its way but creating vast new wealth, is ample demonstration that the Colorado storage project—to utilize water apportioned way back in 1922—will do the same in the upper basin area. As the lower basin development could follow only the achievement of agreement among the States as to water use and the cooperation of at least 6 States in passage of the legislation for construction, it follows that the same situation should obtain for the upper basin. As the Hoover Dam and related works was the program to allow the lower basin the use of its apportioned share of this vital water, so is the Colorado storage project the long delayed but long planned and expected program for use by the upper basin of its share of the water. We fail to understand why what was sauce for southern California is not now sauce for the upper basin. Yet, on the contrary, they are trying to cook our goose. We must have a program similar in magnitude and concept to this if we are to use our legal allotment of water, and the upper basin States got together not long ago and peacefully divided their upper basin area share. In the lower basin, California has Arizona in the courts and tried to drag us in. Just as the late flow was inadequate for safe use for irrigation in the Imperial Valley—before any metropolital diversion above it—before storage was provided, so is any safe use in the upper basin impossible in low-water years without compensatory storage in and for the upper basin. Such holdover storage will insure that the upper basin can use its legal share of the erratic flow and still deliver the apportioned sum to the lower basin and Mexico annually.

This need stems all the more forcefully from a dramatic decrease in the average flow of the Colorado. In 1922 when the compact was hammered out, the river was thought to flow in excess of 16 million acre-feet. The average now is down to about 12 million acre-feet, or less by far than the legal division of 7½ million acre-feet to each basin plus 1½ million acre-feet for Mexico. Divide it how you will, you cannot get 16½ million acre-feet from 14 million, especially when the bulk of the total flow runs down the river at flood crest when the snow melts in the spring. Holdover storage in the upper basin is required to regulate seasonal flow and also to save wet year water for dry year delivery downstream. Only a bit over half of our legal allotment can be used as a safe supply without such compensatory storage. Efforts to use more would have an adverse effect on all users all along the river in low flow years. At the time of the compact negotiations, Arizona wanted the upper basin to build storage reservoirs similar to those now proposed to insure firm downstream delivery. So far as I can ascertain, California had no such interest for she knew that storage in her own area was necessary for the projects she so much wanted. Now the wheel has turned. Arizona supports this storage, but California, in the form of southern California objection, seeks to prevent the construction of storage other than her own. I say again, she so well knows the value of the power that she wants no other to obtain it. As it now stands, as a matter of fact, she is able to utilize all of the unused flow of the Colorado when it does come by—and she can catch it in storage—and utilize it for the generation of dump power at Hoover Dam. Why, they say to themselves, should we lose this virtually firm but actually cheap dump power? The only reason is that the whole legal structure of power production at Hoover rests upon the firm supply of only the 7½ million acre-feet of lower basin flow rights—plus Mexico—and all contracts for power have always recognized this fact and the corollary that development contemplated and planned for in the upper basin would reduce the power head to this legally defined minimum flow. So much for that.

CALIFORNIA FIGHTS TO KEEP CHEAP POWER, HEARING REVEALS

(By George S. Holmes)

WASHINGTON.—"The cat is out of the bag." California's testimony before the Senate Interior subcommittee, opposing authorization of the Colorado River storage project, shows that what she fears most is loss of the cheap dump, or secondary electric power which the city of Los Angeles is now buying from Hoover Dam.

The hidden feline was let loose by Gilmore Tillman, assistant city attorney of Los Angeles and attorney for the department of water and power, who confined all his testimony to the effect Los Angeles believes the storage project will have upon its contracts for power from downstream projects.

His views were later corroborated by Northcutt Ely, special counsel for the Colorado River Board of California and an assistant to the attorney general in California, when he made his presentation before the committee.

Mr. Tillman's testimony disclosed that for years the city of Los Angeles has been reaping a bonanza in cheap electric secondary power from Hoover Dam, but now that the filling of the proposed new dams in the storage project might cut off this so-called dump power, it can no longer rely upon it for their customers and their rates would have to be increased.

This excess of dump power, was acquired by Los Angeles as a happy circumstance of the inability of the upper basin States to develop their share of the resources of the Colorado River.

Now that the latter have banded together to obtain storage dams and participating projects for their own advantage, using only their own legal share of the water, Los Angeles has become excited, as revealed by Mr. Tillman's arguments, over the loss of power on which they had no claim in the first place and on which they have no claim now.

It was just the good luck of Los Angeles that it could buy and use this excess power at bargain rates. Now, the big town comes out into the open at last and is fighting

against losing something that never actually belonged to her.

The latter point is admitted by Mr. Tillman in his brief, in which he said, in discussing the amounts of energy involved:

"I wish to emphasize that I do not contend or even suggest that any of these estimates or assumptions by the Government constitute guaranties. They are necessarily based on two factors which cannot be anticipated with certainty—the actual runoff of the Colorado River and the time of the development of upstream diversions authorized by the Colorado River compact.

"If, in experience, either of these two factors deviates from the original estimate or assumption, and this deviation results in a dimunition of secondary or even firm power, as estimated, we have no ground for complaint.

"On the other hand, it is equally clear that the United States has no right willfully and voluntarily to divert to some other purpose of its own, water which would otherwise be available for the generation of firm and secondary energy at Hoover Dam.

"Upon this ground, as a representative of a public agency threatened with serious injury, I object to the construction of the storage units proposed in the bill now pending before this committee (S. 500) and their operation in the manner contemplated by the Department of the Interior as evidenced by House Document 364 and by testimony introduced before this committee."

Thus, as this reporter views his testimony, Los Angeles is now making claim to something which the city's own attorney says it has no right to claim.

Dump-power has always been sold wherever available, at cheaper rates than firm power, because the supply is neither stable nor predictable.

It is purchased at a risk and therefore commands a cheaper price.

The only power guaranteed Los Angeles at Hoover Dam is the firm power acquired under the contract. All else is gravy. It is this gravy Los Angeles is now seeking to hang on to, even if meant that Colorado and the upper basin States could never develop their own resources, in accordance with the river compacts.

Depriving Los Angeles of this nonguaranteed and fluctuating excess electric power, because the upper basin States will have some life-saving, river-regulating reservoirs to fill, now becomes an invasion and violation of the rights of the city of Los Angeles, according to Mr. Tillman.

The Los Angeles legal representative cities the amount of money the city has expended in transmission lines from Hoover Dam and how much it is now going to cost the city to buy fuel oil in case it cannot enjoy the use of the dump power it has been getting all these years at a low rate.

"In an average year," complained Mr. Tillman to the committee, "the water thus diverted (for filling the proposed reservoirs) necessarily will be replaced by 760,000 barrels of fuel oil. At a price of $1.80 per barrel, the oil thus substituted for falling water would cost $1,365,000."

Discussing it in further detail, Tillman says the total extra net cost for replacement fuel for all secondary energy, would be approximately $2,152,000 in a normal year.

Thus Los Angeles is now promoting a vested interest in a benefit from the river to which she admits having no guaranty. In fact, Mr. Tillman spelled out the demands of Los Angeles as follows:

"In order to fulfill its obligations and maintain the integrity of its existing contracts, the United States must:

"1. Deliver at Hoover Dam, for the generation of firm and secondary energy, the full run of the river, less all upstream diversions for domestic or agricultural purposes; or

"2. During the filling period of the proposed storage units, deliver to the Hoover Dam power contractors, at the applicable contract firm or secondary rate, energy which in quantity and in time and place of delivery is equivalent to that which would have been generated at Hoover Dam had no water been diverted to this upstream storage; or

"3. During the filling period of the proposed storage units, make full financial reparation to the Hoover Dam power contractors for the costs to them (including capital costs, where appropriate) of the replacement of all "firm" or "secondary" energy which would have been generated at Hoover Dam had no water been diverted to this up-stream storage."

The legalities of the situation, it may be noted, revolve around the questions raised by Governor Johnson, as to whether or not waters impounded by the upper basin for power generation, in order to regulate the river and provide power revenues for building the participating units can be witheld for those purposes or must be interpreted as surplus waters which must be released to the lower basin for beneficial consumptive use.

Quoting Governor Johnson on this matter by calling it a very fair assumption, Northcutt Ely, of Ely and McCarty, legal representatives here of the Colorado River Board of California, supports the position of Mr. Tillman and told the committee that water appropriated in the lower basin, even though excess or surplus waters, may not be withheld from use, for the generation of power. Mr. Ely asserted that if the upper basin States could curtail water during the filling period, legally, they could also do it lawfully at any other time.

"Is it your contention," asked Elmer Bennett, congressional liaison representative of the Interior Department, at the Senate hearings, "that the generation of power in the lower basin has a priority or preference somehow, under the compact, over power generation in the upper basin, assuming the right to use were on a par otherwise?"

"We say," replied Ely, "That the rights established under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the power contracts made thereunder, cannot lawfully be interfered with by the withholding of water at Glen Canyon or other upstream dams solely for power generation."

Whatever the outcome of this legal problem, accentuated by Governor Johnson's testimony and statements, it demonstrates the dog-in-the-manger policy of California charged by members from the upper basin States and that its real fear is the loss of its cheap "dump power" from Hoover Dam.

Do not think either that the passage of the Hoover Dam legislation was the last example of upper basin support for lower basin development. After Hoover was built and in operation, it was found by southern California that the program they had calculated would not work as they had planned or as they had said it would when obtaining agreement for support from the other States. Accordingly, they wished to have the Boulder Canyon Project Act revised. This led to a series of events culminating in the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act. This too is a great story if time permitted its telling, but I shall have to cover it rapidly and insert material to cover the parts which might be useful for reference.

I mentioned before that the record shows that all hands were fully aware of the fact that power at Hoover Dam was not an incidental to the development but rather the very key. Of the $173 million cost of Hoover, 100 percent was to be recovered from power. It may be that the now deferered $25 million flood control allocation will not be repaid, but all repayment comes from power alone. It was also known by many that contracts to take Hoover power were signed even though the allottee knew that the hydropower cost was in excess of then existing alternate generating facilities. Southern California had assured all questioners that the power would be taken at its cost, and so demonstrated in a show of remarkable faith by signing such contracts. Then, by the time power came on the line in 1937, events external to the Colorado had also altered the situation. Interest was down from 4 to less than 3 percent. Steam or other generation had increased in efficiency and decreased in cost—also due to depression prices—and the Federal Government had built such power projects as TVA, Bonneville, and initiated such projects as Fort Peck on the Missouri, where power rates were not on a competitive basis as for Hoover but rather on an amortizing basis at less cost. Such concept was written into the reclamation law in 1939 and represented a material advancement in resource development.

Naturally power users on the Hoover line wanted an adjustment in charges more in conformity with life. Under the Boulder Canyon Act, such readjustments could have been made in 1945, but millions in extra cost would be charged prior to that time. The other Colorado River States interposed objection—not to the readjustment but to potential changes in the original act applicable to them. Arizona and Nevada had each been guaranteed a payment of 18¾ percent of surplus revenues beyond the amount needed for repayment—the balance, or 62½ percent, of surplus revenue being allocated to repayment of flood-control features. And I may interpose the thought that this charge for flood control should never have been necessary, but this extra burden was accepted in order to get water and meet ill-conceived opposition. If the proposed rate adjustment were to provide solely for an amortizing basis, then these in lieu of tax payments to Arizona and Nevada would have been abrogated, and, in addition, the proposal to defer repayment of the flood-control allocation until after the repayment of all other costs would have postponed almost indefinitely the agreed payment into a special fund to provide for further study and development along the Colorado. This fund was to survey development all along the river, but its greatest value would have been to the upper basin area.

So it was that the interested States again undertook to negotiate their desires into an agreement. Accordingly each of the Governors appointed 2 members to a committee which, when 2 power allottees were added, become known as the committee of 16. This committee, when agreement was unanimously achieved, appointed a committee of three to draft the actual adjustment bill and present it to the Congress with proper notation of the unanimous agreement. One of the committee of three, and the one who carried the ball in the Senate

hearings, was the late Judge Clifford Stone, of Colorado. His contribution all the way through this matter was of considerable and then appreciated value. The appreciation did not last very long, but Judge Stone did live long enough to see the program report for the development of the upper basin and of Colorado, which report he understood to be an integral part of the Boulder Adjustment Act.

The unanimous agreement reached by the 7 States and power allotees was briefly: That interest charges be reduced from 4 to 3 percent; that rates be established not on a competitive but on an amortizing basis; that to replace the 18¾ percent promise to each of Arizona and Nevada, an annual payment of $300,000 would be made; that the repayment of the flood control cost be postponed at least until all other features were repaid; and, finally, to insure the future development along the Colorado that $500,000 annually be paid into the Colorado River development fund for investigation and construction subject to appropriation by Congress. These concepts were adopted, with the unanimous support of the upper basin Representatives as the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act. Should it seem that much was given for little, let the record also show that competent estimates at that time were that these adjustments would save southern California some $100 million, while the other changes were merely to insure certain payment of amounts stated in the original act since these payments would have been wiped out by California's suggestions for adjustment.

This adjustment act was passed in the summer of 1940—not long ago. Up until that time, cooperation and mutual support was a great thing according to southern California. However, when the plan of development for the upper basin was worked out from the money provided, as I mentioned, in the adjustment act, and from earlier studies, southern California decided that cooperation had lost all its purpose—all this in just a few years between 1940 and 1950. What was useful in 1940 to obtain a desired end, suddenly died in 1950 when others came forward with long-awaited plans of development. Since 1950, expensive opposition from southern California has become increasingly frantic and the last 14 months have brought an ever-increasing flood on antiupper Colorado storage project propaganda pouring from this well-organized and well-financed group—and you have seen this in the RECORD and elsewhere.

The program spelled out in this proposal is the outgrowth of negotiations and conferences of water leaders in the West going all the way back to 1900—or over 50 years. After these long negotiations and conferences of the interested States and Federal agencies, it was Colorado's thought that the water had been divided and its full use in each basin spelled out and provided for and use by States in the upper basin. Accordingly, Colorado has given its full and often crucial support to the great programs and projects which allowed southern California to develop for use over three-fourths of the whole lower basin share of water. It was understood that such mutual cooperation and support would continue, even though all agreed that the lower basin projects were least expensive and easiest to build.

In hours of need, as in the necessary adjustment of the original Boulder Canyon Act, and indeed in its very passage, Colorado has been pleased to help her neighbor. She has also acquiesced to use by other States of great volumes of water from the Colorado even though she alone supplies three-fourths of its total flow.

Now the hour has finally come for the development of her share. The very success of development, primarily in southern California, on the lower Colorado proves that this program is valuable and economically worthwhile to the Nation. We cannot understand southern California's opposition in any terms other than that she, in view of such values, wishes to have them all for herself.

Acting in conformity with section 15 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, passed in 1928, and section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, passed in 1940, the Bureau of Reclamation carried on extensive studies and investigations on the Colorado River. These investigations and the formation of a report were intensified in the years 1940 to 1945 and the forepart of 1946. On June 7, 1946, a departmental report of the Department of the Interior was issued. This followed and was based upon a report and recommendations, dated March 22, 1946, by the directors of regions 3 and 4, Bureau of Reclamation. The 1946 report stated that there was not enough water available in the Colorado River system for full expansion of existing and authorized projects and for all potential projects referred to in the report. The report stated further that there was a pressing need for a determination of the rights of the respective States to deplete the flow of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact and its associated documents and recommended that the States determine their respective rights in such matter. The report was submitted, as required by law, to the affected States for their respective views. Colorado submitted its comments and criticisms, and concurred in the conclusion that there should be an apportionment of water among the States of the upper basin. In his report to Congress on July 24, 1947, the Secretary of Interior recommended among other things "that the States of the upper Colorado River Basin and States of the lower Colorado River Basin should be encouraged to proceed expeditiously to determine their respective rights to the waters of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact."

Acting in conformity with the suggestions contained in the 1947 report the upper basin States negotiated and signed the upper Colorado River Basin compact which compact was approved by Congress April 6, 1949. The upper Colorado River compact is subject to the provisions and limitations of the Colorado River compact of 1922. It apportions the consumptive use of upper basin waters to the upper basin States as follows:

Arizona, 50,000 acre-feet.
Colorado, 51.75 percent of balance.
New Mexico, 11.25 percent of balance.
Utah, 23 percent of balance.
Wyoming, 14 percent of balance.

It provides further for the creation of an interstate administrative agency to be known as the Upper Colorado River Commission. Other important provisions are: First, that States of the upper basin must assume the responsibility for losses of water occurring as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed in the upper basin; and second, that consumptive uses of water by Indians shall be charged to the State in which the use is made.

These acts then are the law of the river:

(a) The Colorado River compact.
(b) The Boulder Canyon Project Act.
(c) The California Limitation Act.
(d) The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act.
(e) The Treaty with Mexico.
(f) The upper Colorado River Basin compact.

The legislation now before this committee provides that whatever authorization is approved by Congress in this respect, the administration of such must comply with the "law of the river."

With the signing and approval of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the States of the area were in position to request of the Department of the Interior that it file its final reports with Congress on those projects ready for consideration by Congress. The States of the upper basin then proceeded to draft the necessary legislation. The first bill to be presented to prospective sponsors was forwarded from the upper Colorado River Commission, with offices in Grand Junction, Colo., on October 10, 1951. The substitute bill now before the committee is a greatly modified and reduced bill from the one originally recommended by the commission. The bill presently before us is also greatly reduced from the proposal as originally suggested by the Department. It is, however, the opinion of the majority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the legislation now recommended is sufficient in authority, and size for the purposes intended.

When the upper Colorado River development report was approved by formed Secretary of the Interior Chapman, he said:

> The comprehensive plan for the upper Colorado River Basin provides a blueprint for one of the few remaining great basin areas of the West which are not already well on the way to full use of their water resources. The 48.5 million acre-feet of storage space provided for in the plan compares with present available reservoir storage of less than 2 million acre-feet. The hydroelectric capacity of 1,622,000 kilowatts compares with less than 125,000 kilowatts of existing capacity in the upper basin, including internal combustion and steam plants as well as hydroelectric plants.
>
> Now that the upper basin compact, which apportions the available water among the States, is in force, urgently needed irrigation projects may be undertaken to turn dry land into productive farms and to supplement the meager water supply on several hundred

thousand acres of presently irrigated land. An urgent need also exists for the hydroelectric power made possible by the storage reservoirs to permit utilization of the upper basin's natural resources, including timber and vast deposits of coal, petroleum, oil shale, phosphate, and other minerals.

This statement was accompanied by one from the then Acting Commissioner of Reclamation, Goodrich Lineweaver, when he said:

The States of the upper basin can realize the use of their apportioned water only when extensive river regulation is provided to assist them in meeting the downstream delivery of 75 million acre-feet in a 10-year period as provided by the Colorado River Compact. This regulation can only be obtained by means of large reservoirs holding over great quantities of water from years of high runoff to years of low runoff. Judging from past records, these cycles might be as long as 20 to 25 years. Therefore these reservoirs must be ready to store water many years ahead of the actual time of need for irrigation purposes.

In view of the existing national emergency, consideration should also be given to the suitability of the power features of the storage project as they relate to the national defense.

Bills authorizing the upper Colorado River project have been thoroughly and minutely considered by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior of the House. Over 100 hours have been spent in taking testimony during the last two Congresses. Approximately 25 hours of marking up procedures have been spent in considering the legislation; 2,886 pages of testimony have been taken. In fact, the legislation has been most thoroughly considered. Although there is a minority report it is only fair to advise this committee that the legislation now recommended has been reported to the House by a vote of better than 3 to 1 in the Committee on Interior.

H. R. 3383, as amended by the substitute here recommended, provides for irrigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, municipal water, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits.

Two kinds of project installations are provided: First, the first category known as project units consisting of four major dams; and second, the second category known as participating projects consisting of 11 auxiliary or subsidiary smaller projects made up of smaller dams, division works and canals and laterals. Three of the larger units and one of the participating projects have hydroelectric facilities included in their construction and operation.

The pertinent facts of the major units which are to be used for the regulation of the river, storage of water to guarantee mutually agreed upon deliveries to the lower basin, and the production of needed electric power are:

Glen Canyon Dam to be located on the Colorado River in northern Arizona about 13 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona State line and 13 miles upstream from Lee Ferry, the dividing point between the upper and lower basins. The dam would be a concrete, curved, gravity-type structure rising 700 feet from bedrock. The reservoir, which would be the final regulating storage point for deliveries to fulfill lower basin commitments under the compact, would have capacity of 26 million acre-feet including 20 million acre-feet of active capacity. The reservoir, when filled, would have a maximum water surface of 153,000 acres and would extend about 186 river miles up the Colorado, nearly to the mouth of the Green River, and 71 river miles up the San Juan. The reservoir would be the principal sediment repository in the upper basin. In 200 years, at present rate of sediment flow in the river, silt deposits would fill all inactive storage space and reduce the active storage space by half. The power plant would be located near the toe of the dam and would consist of seven generating units with a total installed capacity of 800,000 kilowatts. The plant would have a mean power head of 480 feet. Total cost is estimated at $379,143,000.

Flaming Gorge unit includes the Ashley Dam which would be located on the Green River 32 air miles north of Vernal, Utah, and the same distance downstream from the Utah-Wyoming border. Ashley Dam would be a concrete, gravity-type structure rising 491 feet from bedrock. Flaming Gorge Reservoir, created by the dam, would have total storage capacity of 3,940,000 acre-feet including active capacity of 2,950,000 acre-feet. When filled, the reservoir would have a water surface area of 40,800 acres and would extend 91 miles upstream, to within 3 or 4 miles of the town of Green River, Wyo. The powerplant would consist of 3 units with a total installed capacity of 72,000 kilowatts operating under a mean head of 395 feet. Estimated cost of construction is $74,648,000.

Navaho Dam site is on the San Juan River in northwestern New Mexico, about 19.5 river miles upstream from Blanco and 34 miles east of Farmington, N. Mex. It is 3.5 miles downstream from the confluence of the Pine and San Juan Rivers. The dam would be an earth-fill structure 360 feet high and the reservoir would have a total capacity of 1,200,000 including an active capacity of 1,050,000 acre-feet. When filled to capacity, the reservoir would have a water surface of 10,800 acres and would extend 33 miles up the San Juan River to 3.5 miles beyond the town of Arboles, Colo. The powerplant would have 3 units with installed capacity of 30,000 kilowatts and operate under a mean head of 275 feet. Total cost is estimated at $32,933,000.

Curecanti unit includes a concrete, gravity structure rising 510 feet from bedrock and located a few miles downstream from Sapinero, Colo., on the Gunnison River. The capacity of the Curecanti Reservoir would be 940,000 acre-feet of water with as yet an undetermined amount of hydroelectric power. In addition to the major dam it is contemplated that there shall be three smaller power-producing dam installations a short distance down the river from the major dam itself.

The participating projects with pertinent facts for each one are:

Central Utah project, Utah: The comprehensive Central Utah project, a large multiple-purpose development, is of such magnitude that it has been planned in two parts—the initial phase, a unified portion that could operate independently, and the ultimate phase. Only the initial phase is included in the group recommended for initial participation in the upper Colorado River account.

The initial phase would intercept the flow of streams on the south slope of the Uinta Mountains as far east as Rock Creek and would convey the water westward by gravity flow for use in the Bonneville Basin. Water for replacement and expanded irrigation in the Uinta Basin would be provided by storage on local streams. Several regulatory reservoirs would be required in both the Bonneville and Uinta Basins, the principal one being the enlarged Strawberry Reservoir on the Strawberry River. By construction of Soldier Creek Dam the capacity of the reservoir would be increased from 283,000 acre-feet to 1,370,000 acre-feet. The initial phase would provide for the irrigation of 29,600 acres of new land and 165,800 acres now irrigated but in need of more water or improved water regulation. It would also provide 48,800 acre-feet of water annually for municipal, industrial and related uses. It would generate each year approximately 359,100,000 kilowatt-hours of firm energy and 3,400,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary energy.

Emery County project, Utah: Irrigation water would be furnished 24,080 acres of land under existing canals diverting water from Cottonwood Creek to Huntington Creek in east-central Utah near Castle Dale. Supplemental water would be provided for 20,450 acres of the land and a full new supply would be provided for 3,630 acres. The irrigation water would be made available through storage of surplus spring runoff at a 57,000 acre-foot reservoir at the Joes Valley site on Cottonwood Creek. Water for lands in the Huntington Creek area would be conveyed by canal from Cottonwood Creek.

Florida project, Colorado: Lemon Reservoir, with a capacity of 23,300 acre-feet, would be formed by the Lemon Dam on the Florida River in southwestern Colorado, southeast of Durango. This reservoir would regulate the Florida River runoff to provide an irrigation water supply for 18,950 acres, including 12,650 acres now irrigated with only a partial supply and 6,300 acres not now irrigated. Approximately 1,000 acres of the land in the project area are Indian owned. The regulatory storage provided for irrigation would reduce floods which nearly every year cause extensive damage along the river course.

Hammond project, New Mexico: The Hammond project would divert natural flow of the San Juan River to provide an irrigation supply for 3,670 acres of presently unirrigated land along the south side of the river near Bloomfield, N. Mex. The water would be diverted from the river by a low diversion dam and conveyed to the project land by a gravity canal. A pumping unit would be installed to lift water 49 feet from the gravity canal to two highline laterals that would serve about 1,100 acres of the project land.

La Barge project, Wyoming: Unregulated natural flow of the Green River would be diverted for the irrigation of

7,970 acres of land located west of the river between Big Piney and La Barge in southwestern Wyoming. Only 300 acres of the land are cultivated and partially irrigated at present. The principal construction feature would be a canal 38 miles long, mostly of earth section.

Lyman project, Wyoming: Water would be stored in an offstream reservoir of 43,000 acre-foot capacity at the Bridger site on Willow Creek to furnish supplemental irrigation water for 40,600 acres of land along Black Fork near the town of Lyman in southwestern Wyoming. The reservoir would be fed by canals from Black Fork and West Fork of Smiths Fork.

Pine River project extension, Colorado and New Mexico: The extension is planned to enlarge and lengthen distribution works in order that storage water already available in Vallecito Reservoir of the Pine River project might be furnished to some of the arable project land still unirrigated in southwestern Colorado and northwestern New Mexico. The extension would serve 15,150 acres of land, including 1,940 acres administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Seedskadee project, Wyoming: This project would irrigate 60,720 acres of presently unsettled land located along both sides of the Green River in southwestern Wyoming, about 35 miles east of Kemmerer. The land would be irrigated by gravity diversions from the Green River. Two drops in distribution canals would drive turbines to lift water to higher land. No reservoir storage would be required.

Silt project, Colorado: A reservoir of 10,000 acre-feet capacity would be constructed on Rifle Creek in west-central Colorado near Rifle. Most of the reservoir water would be released to water users downstream, replacing part of the natural flow heretofore used. In exchange for the storage water an equivalent amount of natural-flow water would be diverted from East Rifle Creek above the reservoir and conveyed to project land in Dry Elk Valley and on Harvey Mesa. Water would also be conveyed from the reservoir to land under the Davie ditch in Rifle Creek Valley. During the low stages of the reservoir pumping would be required. In all, 5,000 acres of land would be provided a supplemental water supply and 1,790 acres would be provided a full new supply.

Smith Fork project, Colorado: Surplus runoff of Smith Fork and Iron Creek would be regulated in a reservoir of 14,000 acre-foot capacity at the Crawford site on Iron Creek in west-central Colorado near Crawford. Water from Smith Fork would be diverted to the reservoir by feeder canal. The stored water would be conveyed by canal to land on Grand View Mesa and land adjacent to Cottonwood Creek. Part of the released storage water would replace natural flow on this land, permitting additional diversions of natural flow to land above the reservoir in the upper Smith Fork Basin. A total of 9,800 acres would be benefited, including 7,670 acres now inadequately irrigated and 2,130 acres of dry land.

Paonia project, Colorado: The Paonia project provides for construction of a dam at Spring Creek "B" site on Muddy Creek, a tributary of the north fork of the Gunnison River. The dam will form a reservoir of 18,000 acre-foot capacity in the west-central Colorado near Paonia. The reservoir will provide supplemental water for 14,830 acres now irrigated with only a partial water supply and a full supply for 2,210 acres not heretofore irrigated. Work is nearing completion on the enlargement and extension of the Fire Mountain Canal which will distribute project water. Land served from the extension will include land now irrigated from Minnesota Creek and land on Rogers Mesa now irrigated from Leroux Creek. Leroux Creek water will then be diverted higher upstream and used for irrigation on Redlands Mesa.

Some 24 probable participating projects are listed in section 2 of the legislation for further study and determination by the Bureau of Reclamation. There is no attempt at authorization of these projects in this bill—only a direction for their further survey. Each one if found to have merit and feasibility must be brought back to Congress for study and final legislation.

The legislation now before this committee does not contain the controversial Echo Park unit. The substitute legislation proposed by the committee goes much further in that it provides "that as part of the Glen Canyon unit, the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument"; and, further, "it is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument." And may I here and now advise this committee that the sponsors of the legislation promise and agree with the Members of the House that they shall keep their agreement with the conservationists of the Nation in this particular.

The bill as now recommended to the House complies with all important and pertinent provisions of the national reclamation law of 1902 and acts amendatory thereto. The repayment features, although somewhat technical, are in virtual conformity with all reclamation-law requirements. In some particulars there is a closer conformity to such requirements than in like-size projects heretofore authorized, many of which are already constructed, and others now in the process of construction. The recommended legislation provides for the construction and Federal control of necessary transmission lines and the sale of electric power to preferential customers as provided in general reclamation law.

The 160-acreage limitation provision of reclamation law is applicable. The small amount of facilities required for public recreation and propagation of fish and wildlife values must be constructed and operated in accordance with reclamation law.

By the expressed terms of the bill any and all construction is entirely dependent upon budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the Nation—Congress and its pertinent committees having absolute control in this respect.

Planning for development shall have regard for the achievement in each State of the fullest consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River system, consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the law of the river in the storage and release of waters impounded by the facilities to be constructed under the provisions of this legislation. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to comply any State of the Colorado River basin is authorized to maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce compliance.

The amount of the authorization is $760 million and the committee is of the opinion that the cost of the work authorized by the bill can be kept well within this figure. This total amount is indeed a large sum. However, it is to be expended over a period of approximately—if times continue to be fairly good—25 years. The amount of moneys needed in any 1 year will never amount to more than $40 million. This means that in no year during its entire construction will the general treasury of the United States be asked for more than $18 million. In fact, at the end of the construction period the drain on the general treasury will be far less—this because of the fact that the reclamation fund itself will be able to furnish 75 percent of all moneys needed. The amount of the total authorization compares favorably with Central Valley of California up to now; far less than the authorization for the Missouri River Basin, which is proving so beneficial to the basin specifically and to the Nation generally; and about one-half of the total amount needed for the financing of the Aswan Dam in Egypt, in which project our country has agreed to furnish a rather major part.

The need is immediate for getting started on the actual construction of this project. We have reached the point in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming where we cannot consider any substantial further development of the waters of the Colorado River until we have achieved a measure of regulation of the erratic flow of the river. By regulations, of course, I mean that approach to equalization of flow of the river system, which can be achieved only by storage. This storage must be of such capacity that flows in wet years can be caught and held for release in dry years to meet our commitment to the lower basin. Without such equalizing storage any full development in the upper basin would have disastrous effects on both basins in low water years. Without the benefits of cyclical storage we can only sit and watch the waters run downhill.

Immediately following the decision of the sponsors of H. R. 3383 to not bring it up for House consideration during the closing days of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, a further study of some of the provisions of the bill was made by various representatives of the upper basin States. After many conferences it was decided that the legislation would be more equitable to all of the States directly concerned in the upper basin if further provisions were incorporated in the bill to guarantee to each of the upper basin States possible water resource development so each of said States would be able to put to consumptive use the

waters allocated to it by the upper Colorado River basin compact. Accordingly, there have been incorporated in section 5 of the bill, that section having to do with the establishment of the basin fund and the bookkeeping procedures relative thereto, provisions which after certain general repayment obligations would divide the excess net revenues accruing from the storage facility projects equitably among the States.

Before final recommendation to the House of these new suggestions, the Office of the Department of Interior was requested to review the repayment analysis of various projects of the bill, especially the central Utah project, to ascertain whether or not the Department of the Interior could comply with the new suggestions and successfully administer the legislation.

Their reply was forwarded to the committee under date of February 6, this year, and is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASPINALL: During an informal conference in your office on February 1, 1956, representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation were asked to review the repayment analysis of the central Utah project (initial-phase development) in view of certain amendments now under consideration concerning procedures set out in H. R. 3383, a bill for authorization of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

We are pleased to comply with your request and submit the results of our review based on the following assumed general criteria:

1. Each participating project must repay its own annual operation, maintenance, and replacement costs.

2. Net revenues (revenues in excess of operation, maintenance, and replacement costs) from each participating project are to be used in repaying its remaining reimbursable costs as follows:

(a) Total power costs are to be repaid within a period of 100 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(b) Total municipal water costs are to be repaid within a period not exceeding 50 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(c) Irrigation costs are to be repaid up to the ability of the irrigator to repay over a contract period not to exceed 50 years exclusive of a development period except for Paonia and Eden projects whose contract periods are fixed by law.

3. Net power revenues from the Colorado River storage project are to be used to repay irrigation costs of each participating project or separable features thereof in excess of the ability of the irrigator to repay during his contract period.

These power revenues, when augmented by the irrigator's payments, are to retire the irrigation cost of each participating project in equal annual installments during the irrigator's contract period.

4. The storage-project revenues are to assist the participating projects through establishment of credits in a basin fund. Credits are to be allotted 46 percent to Colorado, 21.5 percent to Utah, 15.5 percent to Wyoming, and 17 percent to New Mexico.

5. Credits are to be established in the basin fund from revenues from units of the storage project remaining after payment of—

(a) Operation, maintenance, and replacement costs;

(b) Interest on power investments;

(c) Equal payments (50 in total number) toward the storage project cost allocated to irrigation;

(d) Amounts sufficient to retire the power investment in a period not to exceed 100 years.

Under the terms of the proposed amendments of H. R. 3383 a basin fund could be established providing the Utah projects the necessary credits within its percentage allotment of 21.5 percent. In doing so, total credits in the basin fund would be governed by the requirements of Utah's participating projects because of their magnitude. Credits in the basin fund would more than satisfy the requirements of the other participating projects proposed in H. R. 3383. In fact only one-third of these credits will be required to complete the repayment of all the projects proposed in H. R. 3383, namely, central Utah and Emery County projects in Utah; Silt, Smith Fork, Paonia, and Florida projects in Colorado; the Pine River extension project in Colorado and New Mexico, the Hammond project in New Mexico, the Seedskadee, La Barge, and Lyman projects in Wyoming, and the presently authorized Eden project in Wyoming.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

Immediately thereafter a representative of the Bureau of Reclamation delivered to me a statement of the Bureau's repayment summary, together with a statement of its analysis. I include both at this time for the consideration of this committee. It is my understanding that the Bureau's letter, summary, and analysis amount in fact to a statement by them that they are able and willing to conform in this respect to the wishes as expressed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPAYMENT SUMMARY—COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH H. R. 3383 DATED FEBRUARY 8, 1956

This repayment summary of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects has been prepared to demonstrate how repayment of the project could be accomplished as required by H. R. 3383 dated February 8, 1956.

Storage units consisting of Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and Navaho Dam and Reservoir and participating projects consisting of La Barge, Seedskadee, Lyman, Eden, Silt, Smith Fork, Paonia, Florida, Pine River extension, Emery County, central Utah (initial phase) and Hammond have been included in this analysis with construction costs limited to approximately $760 million as prescribed by H. R. 3383.

This analysis has been accomplished based on the following assumed general criteria:

1. Each participating project must repay its own annual operation, maintenance and replacement costs.

2. Net revenues (revenues in excess of operation, maintenance, and replacement costs) from each participating project are to be used in repaying its remaining reimbursable costs as follows:

(a) Total power costs are to be repaid within a period of 100 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(b) Total municipal water costs are to be repaid within a period not exceeding 50 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(c) Irrigation costs are to be repaid up to the ability of the irrigator to repay over a contract period not to exceed 50 years exclusive of a development period except for Paonia and Eden projects whose contract periods are fixed by law.

3. Net power revenues from the Colorado River storage project are to be used to repay irrigation costs of each participating project or separable features thereof in excess of the ability of the irrigator to repay during his contract period. These power revenues, when augmented by the irrigator's payments, are to retire the irrigation cost of each participating project in equal annual installments during the irrigator's contract period.

4. The storage project revenues are to assist the participating projects through establishment of credits in a basin fund. Credits are to be allotted 46 percent to Colorado, 21.5 percent to Utah, 15.5 percent to Wyoming, and 17 percent to New Mexico.

5. Credits are to be established in the basin fund from revenues from units of the storage project remaining after payment of:

(a) Operation, maintenance, and replacement costs.

(b) Interest on power investments.

(c) Equal payments (50 in total number) toward the storage project cost allocated to irrigation.

(d) Amounts sufficient to retire the power investment in a period not to exceed 100 years.

Net revenues from the units of the storage project and from the participating projects approximating $1,800 million would be adequate to repay all the costs of the project under the terms or conditions established in H. R. 3383 and in addition would provide a surplus in the basin fund of some $480 million even with power costs being repaid with interest in 82 years following installation of the last power unit, a considerably shorter time than permitted by H. R. 3383.

A brief tabular summary and a detailed payout schedule are attached. Under H. R. 3383 some flexibility is inherent in the repayment of the project power costs. Should the Curecanti unit be included in the immediate future there would be a somewhat greater surplus in the basin fund. Also, the basin fund could be increased somewhat by extending the construction schedule of major participating projects.

Repayment summary

[Thousands of dollars]

Item	Construction cost	Interest during construction	Reimbursable cost
Estimated project cost	758,813		
Allocation of costs:			
Irrigation	[1] 282,784		[2] 292,106
Power	422,744	31,231	453,974
Municipal and industrial water	40,950	1,446	42,396
Subtotal reimbursable	746,478		788,476
Ultimate phase features central Utah	4,950		
Nonreimbursable costs	7,385		
Repayment of reimbursable costs:			
Irrigation [2]			292,106
From water users			36,546
From power revenues			255,560
Power [3]			453,974
Municipal and industrial water [3]			42,396
Subtotal			788,476
Interest paid on project investment:			
Power [4]			492,768
Municipal and industrial water [4]			32,332
Subtotal			525,100
Surplus revenues			481,631
Total net revenue			1,795,207

[1] Excludes $9,322,000 expended on Eden and Paonia projects under previous authorization.
[2] Includes $9,322,000 expended on Eden and Paonia projects under previous authorization.
[3] Includes interest during construction.
[4] Excludes interest during construction.

1 (f) Colorado River storage project and participating projects—Financial repayment schedule in accordance with repayment conditions, storage units, participating projects, costs and allocations as recommended by House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in H. R. 3383, Feb. 8, 1956

[Units $1,000]

Year of power operation	Fiscal year	Net revenues from sale of power at Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and initial phase of the central Utah project at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour				Repayment of irrigation costs			Net revenue from sale of municipal and industrial water	Application of net municipal and industrial revenues		Project investment						Excess power revenues	
			Application of net revenues [1]									Power investment		Irrigation investment		Municipal and industrial water investment			
		Total	Interest	Power investment	Irrigation investment	By power users	By irrigation	Total		Interest	Municipal and industrial investment	Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance	Annually	Accumulative
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
	1957													3,643	3,643				
	1958													3,158	6,801				
	1959													3,644	10,445				
	1960														10,445				
	1961													4,460	14,905				
	1962						13	13				275,976	275,976	87,785	102,677				
1	1963	7,659	6,899	−702	1,462	1,462	30	1,492				27,330	304,008	2,072	103,257	1,353	1,353		
		10,475	7,600	1,413	1,462	1,462	30	1,492	48	34	14	27,330	329,925	43,415	145,180		1,339		
	1965	13,297	8,248	3,587	1,462	1,462	30	1,492	48	33	15	27,330	353,668	20,945	164,633		1,324		
		16,065	8,842	5,035	2,017	2,017	96	2,113	48	33	15	27,330	375,963		162,520		1,309	171	171
5		18,797	9,399	7,210	1,783	1,783	109	1,892	48	33	15	28,237	396,990	46,800	207,428		1,294	405	576
		21,502	9,924	9,270	1,849	1,849	137	1,986	48	32	16	22,711	410,431	19,800	225,242		1,278	459	1,035
		22,380	10,261	9,811	1,875	1,875	154	2,029	48	32	16	17,730	418,350		223,213	41,043	42,305	433	1,468
	1970	22,933	10,459	9,203	2,082	2,082	285	2,367	1,495	1,058	437		409,147		220,846		41,868	1,189	2,657
		22,831	10,229	8,433	2,275	2,275	377	2,652	1,495	1,047	448		400,714		218,194		41,420	1,894	4,551
10		22,723	10,018	8,536	2,296	2,296	387	2,683	1,495	1,036	459		392,178	12,600	228,111		40,961	1,873	6,424
		22,621	9,804	8,649	2,295	2,295	387	2,682	1,495	1,024	471		383,529		225,429		40,490	1,873	8,297
		22,510	9,588	8,354	2,416	2,416	419	2,835	1,495	1,012	483		375,175	12,019	234,613		40,007	2,152	10,449
	1975	22,405	9,379	9,046	3,134	3,134	573	3,707	1,495	1,000	495		366,129		230,906		39,512	846	11,295
		22,297	9,153	9,164	3,456	3,456	669	4,125	1,495	988	507		356,965		226,781		39,005	524	11,819
15		22,195	8,924	9,291	3,456	3,456	669	4,125	1,495	975	520		347,674		222,656		38,485	524	12,343
		22,087	8,692	6,982	3,979	3,979	682	4,661	1,495	962	533		340,692		217,995		37,952	2,434	14,777
		21,985	8,517	7,055	3,979	3,979	682	4,661	1,495	949	546		333,637		213,334		37,406	2,434	17,211
	1980	21,877	8,341	6,488	4,614	4,614	682	5,296	1,495	935	560		327,149	31,765	239,803		36,846	2,434	19,645
		21,775	8,178	6,549	4,614	4,614	682	5,296	1,495	921	574		320,600		234,507		36,272	2,434	22,079
20		21,667	8,015	6,604	4,614	4,614	682	5,296	1,495	907	588		313,996		229,211		35,684	2,434	24,513
		21,481	7,850	5,481	4,851	4,851	691	5,542	1,495	892	603		308,515		223,669		35,081	3,299	27,812
		21,295	7,713	5,432	4,851	4,851	691	5,542	1,495	877	618		303,083		218,127		34,463	3,299	31,111
	1985	21,115	7,577	4,374	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	862	633		298,709		212,345		33,830	4,095	35,206
		20,929	7,467	4,298	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	846	649		294,411		206,563		33,181	4,095	39,301
25		20,743	7,360	4,219	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	830	665		290,192		200,781		32,516	4,095	43,396
		20,563	7,255	4,144	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	813	682		286,048		194,999		31,834	4,095	47,491
		20,377	7,151	4,062	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	796	699		281,986		189,217		31,135	4,095	51,586
	1990	20,191	7,049	3,978	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	778	717		278,008		183,435		30,418	4,095	55,681
30		20,011	6,950	3,897	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	760	735		274,111		177,653		29,683	4,095	59,776
		19,825	6,853	3,808	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	742	753		270,303		171,871		28,930	4,095	63,871
		19,639	6,757	3,718	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	725	772		266,585		166,089		28,158	4,095	67,966
	1995	19,459	6,664	3,631	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	704	791		262,954		160,307		27,367	4,095	72,061
		19,273	6,574	3,535	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	684	811		259,419		154,525		26,556	4,095	76,156
35		19,087	6,485	3,438	5,070	5,070	713	5,783	1,495	664	831		255,981		148,742		25,725	4,094	80,250
		18,907	6,399	3,343	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	643	852		252,638		142,958		24,873	4,094	84,344
		18,721	6,316	3,240	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	622	873		249,398		137,174		24,000	4,094	88,438
		18,535	6,235	3,135	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	600	895		246,263		131,390		23,105	4,094	92,532
	2000	18,355	6,156	3,034	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	578	917		243,229		125,606		22,188	4,094	96,626
		18,169	6,080	2,924	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	555	940		240,305		119,822		21,248	4,094	100,720
40		17,983	6,007	2,811	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	531	964		237,494		114,038		20,284	4,094	104,814
		17,803	5,937	2,701	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	507	988		234,793		108,254		19,296	4,094	108,908
		17,617	5,870	2,582	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	482	1,013		232,211		102,470		18,283	4,094	113,002
	2005	17,431	5,805	2,461	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	457	1,038		229,750		96,686		17,245	4,094	117,096
		17,251	5,744	2,342	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	431	1,064		227,408		90,902		16,181	4,094	121,190
45		17,065	5,685	2,215	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	405	1,090		225,193		85,118		15,091	4,094	125,284
		16,879	5,630	2,084	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	377	1,118		223,109		79,334		13,973	4,094	129,378
		16,699	5,577	1,957	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	349	1,146		221,152		73,550		12,827	4,094	133,472
	2010	16,513	5,529	1,819	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	321	1,174		219,333		67,766		11,653	4,094	137,566
		16,327	5,483	1,679	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	291	1,204		217,654		61,982		10,449	4,094	141,660
50		16,141	5,441	1,535	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	261	1,234		216,119		56,198		9,215	4,094	145,754
		16,045	5,403	2,939	3,609	3,609	713	4,322	1,495	230	1,265		213,180		51,876		7,950	4,094	149,848
		15,955	5,329	2,923	3,609	3,609	713	4,322	1,447	199	1,248		210,251		47,554		6,702	4,094	153,942
	2015	15,865	5,256	2,905	3,610	3,610	713	4,323	1,447	168	1,279		207,352		43,231		5,423	4,094	158,036
55		15,769	5,184	973	3,413	3,413	648	4,061	1,447	136	1,311		206,379		39,170		4,112	6,199	164,235
		15,679	5,159	908	3,413	3,413	648	4,061	1,447	103	1,344		205,471		35,109		2,768	6,199	170,434
		15,589	5,137	979	3,345	3,345	619	3,964	1,447	69	1,378		204,492		31,145		1,390	6,128	176,562
		15,493	5,113	907	3,345	3,345	619	3,964	1,425	35	1,390		203,585		27,181		0	6,128	182,690
	2020	15,403	5,090	1,789	3,141	3,141	489	3,630					201,796		23,551			5,383	188,073
60		15,313	5,045	2,604	2,956	2,956	397	3,353					199,192		20,198			4,708	192,781
		15,217	4,980	2,573	2,895	2,895	374	3,269					196,619		16,929			4,769	197,550
		15,127	4,916	2,547	2,895	2,895	374	3,269					194,072		13,660			4,769	202,319
		15,031	4,852	2,948	2,767	2,767	342	3,109					191,124		10,551			4,464	206,783
	2025	14,941	4,778	4,992	2,045	2,045	188	2,233					186,132		8,318			3,126	209,909
		14,851	4,654	5,026	1,721	1,721	93	1,814					181,106		6,504			3,450	213,359
65		14,755	4,527	5,057	1,668	1,668	80	1,748					176,049		4,756			3,503	216,862
		14,665	4,402	7,506	1,149	1,149	67	1,216					168,543		3,540			1,608	218,470
		14,575	4,213	7,605	1,149	1,149	67	1,216					160,938		2,324			1,608	220,078
	2030	14,479	4,023	8,335	513	513	67	580					152,603		1,744			1,608	221,686
		14,389	3,815	8,453	487	487	49	536					144,150		1,208			1,634	223,320
70		14,299	3,606	8,572	487	487	49	536					135,578		672			1,634	224,954
		14,203	3,390	9,808	278	278	40	318					125,770		354			727	225,681
		14,113	3,144	9,964	278	278	40	318					115,806		36			727	226,408
	2035	14,023	2,895	11,128			18	18					104,678		18			0	226,408
		13,927	2,617	11,310			18	18					93,368		0			0	226,408
75		13,837	2,334	11,503									81,865					0	226,408
		13,837	2,047	11,790									70,075					0	226,408
		13,837	1,752	12,085									57,990					0	226,408
	2040	13,837	1,450	12,387									45,603					0	226,408
		13,837	1,140	12,697									32,906					0	226,408

[1] Generation based on full use of upper basin water apportionment by year 75.

1 (f) Colorado River storage project and participating projects—Financial repayment schedule in accordance with repayment conditions, storage units, participating projects, costs and allocations as recommended by House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in H. R. 3383, Feb. 8, 1956—Continued

[Units $1,000]

Year of power operation	Fiscal year	Net revenues from sale of power at Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and initial phase of the central Utah project at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour				Repayment of irrigation costs			Net revenue from sale of municipal and industrial water	Application of net municipal and industrial revenues		Project investment						Excess power revenues	
			Application of net revenues [1]									Power investment		Irrigation investment		Municipal and industrial water investment			
		Total	Interest	Power investment	Irrigation investment	By power users	By irrigation	Total		Interest	Municipal and industrial investment	Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance	Annually	Accumulative
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
80		13,837	823	13,014									19,892					0	226,408
		13,837	497	8,928									10,964					4,412	230,820
		13,837	274	1,445									9,519					12,118	242,938
	2045	13,837	238	1,481									8,038					12,118	255,056
		13,837	201	1,518									6,520					12,118	267,174
85		13,837	163	1,556									4,964					12,118	279,292
		13,837	124	1,595									3,369					12,118	291,410
		13,837	84	1,635									1,734					12,118	303,528
	2050	13,837	43	1,676									58					12,118	315,646
		13,837	1	58									0					[2] 13,778	329,424
90		13,837																13,837	343,261
		13,837																13,837	357,098
		13,837																13,837	370,935
	2055	13,837																13,837	384,772
		13,837																13,837	398,609
95		13,837																13,837	412,446
		13,837																13,837	426,283
		13,837																13,837	440,120
	2060	13,837																13,837	453,957
		13,837																13,837	467,794
100	2062	13,837																13,837	481,631
Total		1,683,933	492,768	453,974	255,560	255,560	36,546	292,106	74,728	32,332	42,396	453,974	0	292,106	0	42,396	0	481,631	481,631

[2] Includes $1,660,000 in year 89 and $1,719,000 each year thereafter of excess power revenue from central Utah project.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Colorado for his fine speech, and for the outstanding job he has done as chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation. I do not believe I have ever witnessed a finer demonstration of patience, fairness, and legislative generalship, than has been displayed by Colorado's distinguished representative, WAYNE ASPINALL, during the long and tiring course of committee hearings and consideration of this bill. It has been a pleasure to serve on a subcommittee with such a chairman, and the House may rest assured that the legislation before it today has received committee consideration in the highest and most careful sense of the term.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

I have no personal ax to grind on this bill. No water or power would come into Nebraska; however, benefits would extend to the entire Nation—all 48 States would be more prosperous because new wealth is created—new industries spring up. New wealth will need many things from the industrial East. It will mean new markets, new jobs, a stronger national economy. I believe in this project as an investment in America. A growing, dynamic America needs to move ahead and prepare for the future.

I cannot, in my 13 years in Congress, recall a campaign more vigorous or more vocal than the one that has been waged by the Members of Congress, the associations, and the "lobbies," if you please, who have seen fit, in their wisdom, to express the fears that the upper Colorado project was a "give away," a water steal, that it would bankrupt citizens of every State in the Union, that the dams would not hold water, that the reservoirs would soon fill with silt, and that the crops grown under these project lands would add to the agricultural crops now in surplus and that the project is not feasible and would cost other States untold millions of dollars. These statements are false, and they will be exposed.

Most of this misinformation comes from the Colorado River Association and you ask, "Who is this association?" The description of this organization as written in the quarterly Lobbying Report to Congress is as follows:

Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. Citizens' organization for presenting information concerning Colorado River water matters. Opposes any legislation jeopardizing California water rights on the Colorado River.

This organization has had unlimited funds for propaganda purposes.

I include at this point the lobbying report of the Colorado River Association:

TOTAL ANNUAL RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES REPORTED UNDER THE FEDERAL LOBBYING ACT BY NORTHCUTT ELY (OR ELY, MCCARTY & DUNCAN), THE COLORADO RIVER ASSOCIATION, AND THE SIX AGENCY COMMITTEE, 1951–55

Northcutt Ely (including law offices of Northcutt Ely and—during the two reported periods for 1955—Ely, McCarty & Duncan). (Totals listed cover only the following organizations as employers: Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, East Bay Municipal Utility District, Imperial Irrigation District, Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, Water Project Authority of the State of California, and the Water Resources Board of California.)

1. Receipts including contributions and loans. The term "contribution" includes anything of value such as a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, amount received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.), and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution:

A. 1951	$59,176.04
B. 1952	60,520.26
C. 1953	56,727.42
D. 1954	59,118.29
E. 1955	63,218.75

2. Expenditures (the term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure):

A. 1951	$2,349.37
B. 1952	2,456.31
C. 1953	1,357.42
D. 1954	774.75
E. 1955	524.21

Colorado River Association (where listed as organization filing; does not include where listed as employer of any individual filing).

1. Receipts (totals listed cover contributions of $500 or more), including contributions and loans (the term "contribution" includes anything of value such as a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, amount received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.), and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution):

A. 1951	$109,400.48
B. 1952	140,608.00
C. 1953	59,680.00
D. 1954	136,102.84
E. 1955	195,760.00

2. Expenditures (the term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure):

A. 1951	$92,622.70
B. 1952	111,538.15
C. 1953	50,595.81
D. 1954	25,288.17
E. 1955	64,403.31

Six Agency Committee (where listed as organization filing; does not include where listed as employer of any individual filing).

1. Receipts (totals listed cover contributions of $500 or more), including contributions and loans (the term "contribution" includes anything of value such as a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, amount received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.), and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution):

A. 1951	$17,400
B. 1952	20,000
C. 1953	20,000
D. 1954	20,000
E. 1955	30,000

2. Expenditures (the term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure):

A. 1951	$26,280.72
B. 1952	22,269.96
C. 1953	17,821.35
D. 1954	17,938.55
E. 1955	32,231.36

Mr. Chairman, I am not an engineer and I will have to leave the feasibility or infeasibility of the great project structures to the gentlemen who are qualified by years of training and experience to evaluate these technical factors. They have demonstrated beyond doubt that the project is, from an engineering standpoint, sound. Neither am I a geologist, so I cannot testify as to the rock and soil formations that will be encountered. I do not know where the opponents of this project came by their beakers of so-called Chinle, and until these opponents started casting their straws in the wind, I am sure many people thought "Chinle" was the name of a well-known distributor of a product medically known as "spiritus frumenti." But this is all a part of our educational process, and it is sometimes necessary to lay these things out in the open where we can look at them in the interest of good legislation. The economic report shows the project sound—over 60 percent of the entire cost will be paid back with interest from the production of electrical energy.

WILL THE PROJECT ADD TO THE FARM SURPLUSES?

I am prepared, however, to testify on the two fundamental problems involved in the upper Colorado project. First, the problem of farm surpluses, and, second, the problem of money.

In the past months we have become increasingly aware of the detrimental effect of surplus crops on the national farm income. The Government owns or is the first mortgagee on crops worth more than $8 billion, and every individual in Government is looking around for someone or something at which to point an accusing finger of blame. More often than not, reclamation projects have been singled out as the villain. But, gentlemen, nothing could be further from the truth. Reclamation adds no more to the surplus than a cap gun does to a shooting war.

The opponents of reclamation would have you believe that the great Federal irrigation projects are causing a terrible economic crisis among the farmers that will lead to their bankruptcy. But they do not cite you to any facts and figures to show just how much of this surplus is produced on irrigated lands. There is a very good reason for that, because except in terms of generalities, the argument falls very flat.

In 1954, only 0.35 percent of the 3 billion bushels of corn, and only 1.7 percent of the 970 million bushels of wheat in the United States, came from lands served by federally irrigated projects. A great part of these surplus grains were grown on dryland farms in areas blessed with adequate rainfall. They did not come from irrigated lands. Three States—Iowa, Illinois, and Minnesota—produced most of the corn and they are not irrigated; very little wheat is irrigated. Corn raised on irrigation projects is generally fed to livestock.

The irrigated West produces almost all of the Nation's apricots, almonds, walnuts, dates, lemons, figs, prunes, and olives. It grows 95 percent of the grapes, 90 percent of the lettuce, 75 percent of the avocados, pears, and cantaloupe. Indeed, it would be unusual to have ample supplies of fruits and vegetables without the great production from the irrigated West.

SURPLUSES OF TODAY MAY BE SHORTAGES OF TOMORROW

When we think of surplus crops, we should also remember that it takes about 10 years to develop a good reclamation district. We should also remember that our population will increase about 3 million yearly. These people will require food. Indeed, the diet of the American people in the world has changed a great deal in the last 25 years. The average person in the United States is eating more of a variety of fresh fruits and vegetables than ever before. It is estimated that more than 200 different farm commodities are in active use on the American table. Many are ample because of irrigation. We are eating 3 times as much citrus fruit as we did 20 years ago and 4 times as many carrots.

The children of today are bigger and taller than they were 25 years ago, all because of an ample diet containing all of the vitamins for good health.

Agricultural experts predict that in 10 years we will need an additional 35 million acres of land upon which to grow the meat that we presently consume. The American people should face reality or we will not escape the horrible nightmare of a shortage of food in the very near future.

It was only 11 years ago that the House of Representatives had a committee investigating the shortage of food. There was a shortage of meat, poultry, wheat, and the things American people enjoy having on their tables. That could happen again. Indeed, if surplus empty stomachs had all the food they need there would be no surplus of crops today.

VALUE OF IRRIGATION

As the House of Representatives begins its debate on the upper Colorado River development, I am sure that many of my colleagues will want information about the value of irrigation. It is right and proper that questions be asked, such as, Why bring more land under production when we have a surplus of crops today; or, How much is this country investing in irrigation power projects? Where does the money come from? How much money has been paid back? In fact, does irrigation pay—is it necessary?

I know some of you will say, "Congressman MILLER, we will meet that crisis when we come to it." I say, "We cannot sit back and wait." We better start crossing the bridge now and the bridge of more production in this case is reclamation and irrigation. In order to cross that productive bridge later, we must proceed to develop millions of additional acres through irrigation. The problem of producing food and fiber are growing side by side with the expanding population. The arid West needs to stabilize their economy and minimize the shock that comes with crop failure. The people in the arid West realize that they must make good use of their water supplies. They realize that water on good lands brings new wealth and a security so necessary to a growing, dynamic America. To me it is utterly foolish that this Nation, facing agricultural shortages, would sit back idly on a river or creek bank and watch the water run to the sea, when it should be used for irrigation and power. Remember it takes years to develop raw land with good irrigation projects. Some lands under the Colorado River project will take 30 years to bring into production.

It should also be realized that during the last 15 years, croplands have disappeared, some through erosion, and being taken out of production by the Federal Government for building military plants. About 15 million acres of tillable land was taken out of production because it was swallowed up by expanding cities, building of new plants, new highways, parks, and airports.

WHERE DOES THE MONEY COME FROM FOR RECLAMATION?

Reclamation came into existence when Theodore Roosevelt signed the law in 1902, which provided establishment of a Bureau of Reclamation and included a provision for financing Federal undertakings through a revolving fund to be established within the Treasury of the United States, to be known as the reclamation fund.

In the beginning, the fund was supported by the proceeds from the sale of public lands. It was later augmented by a percentage of the royalties from oil holdings and of certain minerals in the United States. It was intended that revenues from these sources, plus revenues derived from repayment of project construction costs, would provide sufficient funds to continue construction of new projects. However, it became evident that the fund was not adequate to

undertake major construction projects, and since 1930 appreciable appropriations have been made from general funds of the Treasury, in addition to appropriations from the reclamation fund. Income to the fund is derived from accretions and collections. Accretions to the reclamation fund include 96 percent of the revenues from the sale of public lands, 52½ percent of the revenues from oil leases, 52½ percent of the revenues from royalties and rentals from potassium leases, and 50 percent of the revenues from FPC waterpower licenses. The income to the reclamation fund from collections results from construction and operation and maintenance repayments on reclamation projects. To date, over $1,006,580,000 has been appropriated from the reclamation fund. For fiscal year 1956, the amount of $89,510,000 out of a total of $170,791,000 appropriated for the reclamation program will come from the reclamation fund.

It is estimated that in another 10 years all the funds for reclamation will come from the revolving fund which is made up of revenue from the sale of public lands, oil leases, and so forth.

MONEY RETURNED TO THE TREASURY

Up to last year, Reclamation had repaid over $600 million to the reclamation fund and during the present fiscal year approximately $60 million more will be returned to the Government from the contracts entered into by water users.

Since 1902, about $2.8 billion has been allocated to reclamation and power projects. Irrigation has used $1.3 billion; industrial and municipal power $1,130 million; flood control $207 million. You will note that of the total amount, about one-half is charged to irrigation. All of the money is returned to the Treasury except that attributed to flood control's $207 million.

It is interesting to note that flood-control projects have received about 3 times the amount of money that has come to reclamation. Every State in the Union and nearly every community has had some benefit from flood-control moneys. These moneys pay back not one cent to the Federal Treasury in either interest or principal. The reclamation moneys pay back the principal. Money allocated to power projects pay back both interest and principal.

WATER IN STORAGE

The reservoir capacities in our reclamation dams would store 9.2 million acre-feet of water. This amount is sufficient to cover the State of Maryland with about 13 feet of water or Pennsylvania with 3 feet of water. This water is used on about 70 projects to produce crops, generate power, and take care of municipal and industrial water needs. The reclamation dams produce hydroelectric capacities sufficient to serve a nonindustrial city of almost 9 million people.

RETURN FROM POWER

The net power revenue in the fiscal year of 1955 from 34 Bureau of Reclamation powerplants, after deductions for annual operation, maintenance, and replacement, totaled $31.3 million. Total net power revenue returns to the Treasury through June 30, 1955, amounted to $257.2 million. Crops produced in 1954 from 69 projects was valued at $865 million and the total value from the beginning of irrigation now totals $10.6 billion.

The Federal tax revenue since 1916 from reclamation areas which can be attributed to Federal reclamation developments is estimated to total about $4.5 billion. This land, my friends, would be almost worthless without good water and without the people working the land.

The retail sales in the 17 Western States totals more than $43 billion in 1954. Much of this can be attributed to the income from the soil.

IRRIGATION—NORTH PLATTE, NEBR., PROJECT

I want to point out, particularly, one irrigation project with which I am well acquainted. The North Platte project in Wyoming and Nebraska. Here is a report on an area that would be practically worthless without water being placed upon the land:

1. Irrigated land outproduces comparable dry-farmed land 13 times. Approximately 68 percent of total cropland in the dry-land area is used to produce wheat as compared to less than one-half of 1 percent in the irrigated area.

2. The irrigated area comprising 10 percent of a 4-county area produces 91 percent of the income.

3. Land values in the irrigated area are 7 times greater than adjacent dry land.

4. The irrigated area supports 27 times more people and provides 40 times more income as adjacent dry areas of equivalent size.

5. With irrigation the property tax revenues have grown twentyfold.

6. Federal tax revenues per acre in the irrigated area, in 1953 were 33 times greater than for the adjacent dry-land area. Federal taxes which arise out of the irrigated area and its towns total about $16 million annually or more than two-thirds the cost of building the project.

7. Adjacent prairie areas lost 12 percent and the irrigated area gained 18 percent in population during the drought and depression years 1930–40.

8. The irrigation farmers spend about $50 million annually for materials, fuel, and machinery which come from other parts of the Nation.

9. Approximately 72 percent of all reimbursable project costs have been returned to the Federal Treasury. Repayments are being made on schedule.

10. Project farms have produced crops worth 20 times the cost of building the project.

NEW WEALTH PRODUCED

It should be remembered that all of this production from federally operated reclamation projects calls for the shipment of crops and livestock which creates an income for transportation; processing; milling; manufacturing; wholesaling and all of the processes between the farm and the consumer. The steer that is produced and fed on an irrigated farm in the North Platte Valley might be finished in the feed-lots of Iowa, butchered and processed in Chicago and fed to the people of New York City. It is all a way of creating wealth, of creating jobs. It means purchase power for farmers and others whose livelihood depends on production. New wealth means those who produce and process the food from the farm to the table can buy shoes; vacuum cleaners; refrigerators; washing machines, radios and a million items manufactured and produced in the industrial East. I say this, my colleagues, because you in the eastern part of the country should derive a great benefit from the new wealth created from irrigation projects. Water is the life blood of the arid West. Water placed on good soil at the proper time brings a feeling of security, confidence, and new wealth to a community.

ENDORSED BY PAST PRESIDENTS

President Hoover had this to say about the justification of irrigation:

The justification for Federal interest in irrigation is not solely to provide land for farmers or to increase food supply. These new farm areas inevitably create villages and towns whose populations thrive from furnishing supplies to the farmer, marketing his crops, and from the industries which grow around these areas. The economy of seven important cities of the West had its base in irrigation—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Spokane, Boise, El Paso, Fresno, and Yakima. Indeed these new centers of productivity send waves of economic improvement to the far borders, like a pebble thrown into a pond. Through irrigation, man has been able to build a stable civilization in an area that might otherwise have been open only to intermittent exploitation.

The development of reclamation and power projects has been in the platform of the major political parties for many years. President Truman and President Eisenhower have endorsed the upper Colorado River storage project. It is a bipartisan matter.

YEARS TO DEVELOP

In the development of the upper Colorado River Basin, two-thirds of the money is allocated to power. Every cent of this will be repaid to the Federal Government with interest. The part earmarked for irrigation is important. It will take 10, 20, or maybe 30 years to develop some of these projects. We should plan today, not for your benefit or mine, but for the benefit of future generations. Water is becoming a more and more valuable resource. It should not be permitted to run to the ocean without first being used.

WATER IS NEEDED IN THE WEST

Water is the lifeblood of the arid West. Water placed on good soil at the proper time, can bring a feeling of security, confidence and new wealth to a community. If we are to eat in the future, we will need to produce more crops.

Before the upper Colorado River project can be completed, we will have more than 250 million people living in the United States. These people will need jobs, they will need food, they will be a part of a growing, dynamic America. Unless you and I have some vision today, these people may not be doing so well 50 years from now.

I call your attention to the inscription cut in stone over the Speaker's table. Have a look at this quotation carved in stone:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered. (Daniel Webster.)

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. I fail to find in either of the two reports issued by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that is, the one issued last year when this bill was reported first and the supplemental report issued on the bill that is now before the House in the nature of a substitute, I fail to find the opinion and the criticism of the Director of the Budget.

I do find the Budget Director's opinion of the bill in the Senate report. The report of the Director of the Budget is dated March 17, 1955. Is it true, and I presume it is true, that the House Interior Committee had before it the same Budget Director's report as the Senate committee had?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is true. These are words that should be burned into the hearts of the individual who sometimes feels that irrigation and reclamation projects do not pay. We should not be shortsighted and think just of today. We have to think of tomorrow and the future. What are you going to do to take care of future generations?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Having established the fact that the Budget Director's report does not appear in either of the House committee reports on this bill, may I ask the gentleman whether it is true as set forth in the report of the Budget Director of March 17, 1955, that in the absence of detailed planning reports for certain projects now contained in this bill——

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is that the report of the other body?

Mr. DONOVAN. I am reading the Budget Director's report to the Senate side. Is it true that the Budget Director says or reported that for certain reasons the Budget Director believes that the authorizations for Flaming Gorge, in this bill, Curecanti, in this bill, Navaho, in this bill—Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama and Navaho participating projects, all in this bill, should be deferred until the necessary information as to their feasibility justifying their presence in this bill has been submitted to the Congress?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, to answer that.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my colleague. The language just read is in the letter to which the gentleman from New York makes reference. Also, in that letter is the statement, the one, perhaps, which found in favor of Echo Park instead of the Flaming Gorge units. May I say to the gentleman from New York that this bill gives a conditional authorization to Curecanti and, therefore, Curecanti is still in accordance with the budget message. This bill does not add anything for Navaho participating projects except to state that it is one of the projects to be planned and to be surveyed and reported back. This bill does provide that Navaho Dam, as such, which is not the facility referred to by the gentleman from New York will be authorized and built and paid for out of surplus new power revenues in the upper basin. In other words, the only project in this bill which seems to go counter in any way at all to what the gentleman has referred to is that of Flaming Gorge, and since that report has been written, we have been advised, and I understand the advice will come to us later, that the administration, which speaks higher than the budget, is in favor of the bill proposed by the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The proponents of the proposed legislation are insisting that the approval of this measure will not create competition with, or increase, the surpluses on hand. What in the world are they going to grow out there if they do not grow products similar to those which we have today in surplus, or may help to create surpluses in the future?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman will find that alfalfa and a good many of the feed crops are not in surplus. We are willing to accept an amendment to be offered by your colleague from Kansas in which that is rather clearly spelled out.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will yield further, it so happens that there will be no participating projects other than, perhaps, the Paonia project, which can be brought anywhere near production within the 10-year period. If you take into consideration the development that means there will not be any of these projects which will be in violation of what the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Are we assured then that as far as wheat and other basic crops are concerned that this project will not compete with those crops? I understand the projects proposed in this bill are not specifically for the production of power. As I understand the measure it provides a little more than two-thirds, power and a little less than one-third for irrigation. I want to make sure none of this expenditure is charged to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the gentleman agree with me—and I am reading the actual language of the Budget Director and the only evidence of a position by the Budget Director on this bill, language from the report of March 17, 1955:

> For these reasons we believe that the authorizations for the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho units, and the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama and the Navaho participating programs should be deferred until the necessary information justifying such action has been submitted to the Congress and the budget.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is an answer to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FLOOD THREAT SEEN NEXT SPRING

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a recent press report of Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., the New England division engineer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I have been greatly concerned about conditions in my district, State, and area arising from the devastating floods of last summer and fall. There is a great deal of work to be done regarding rehabilitation and protection, which will require the assistance of the Federal Government, and I am happy to see that the Congress has already acted in order that a sound beginning may be made on programs designed to this end.

General Fleming is an authority on floods and flood-control work and his warning expressed in the article clearly indicates that New England is in a precarious situation and, if any further floods should occur before protective measures have been completed, additional, enormous damage will be done. It is for this reason that I have been urging the utmost speed in carrying out flood-control projects necessary to control raging waters of seasonal storms and spring freshets.

I am in complete agreement with the views expressed by General Fleming and believe that they will be informative to Members of the Congress, as well as useful in enabling all of us to have a better understanding of the danger, which only prompt action by the Congress, looking toward the completion of necessary flood protection, can avert.

[From the Hartford Courant of November 19, 1955]

NEW FLOOD THREAT SEEN NEXT SPRING

BOSTON, MASS., November 18.—Flood-scarred New England will be in for more trouble in the spring if any early hard winter freezes waters at their present level, the Chief of Army engineers in the region said today.

Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., spoke at a meeting on flood control problems during the closing day of the 31st annual conference of the New England Council at the Hotel Statler here. He said: "I don't want to be an alarmist, but, if we get an early freeze before a substantial amount of water has a chance to run off, and if we get just a normal snow cover this winter, I think we're in for trouble in the spring."

STREAMS CLOGGED

General Fleming told the flood control meeting that New England streams and ponds are clogged and the region's water

table is extremely high due to the heavy rains of this fall.

General Fleming said that upstream reservoirs and channel improvements are the only two feasible weapons against floods in New England. Two other devices—protective dikes such as those at Hartford and selective flooding permitting unvaluable areas to flood to save other sections—have little usefulness in such a highly developed region, he said.

The General maintained that flood control dams in New England should be for that purpose only, and he criticized proposals which have been made in recent months that the power possibilities of such dams be exploited.

"Power and flood control in New England," he said, "are like oil and water—they just don't mix."

General Fleming explained that a flood control dam to be effective must be kept empty, and that a power dam, if it is to produce power, must be kept full. So-called multi-purpose dams in other parts of the country, he said, are actually a series of reservoirs in one dam. He said New England offers "only two possibilities" for multi-purpose dams from an engineering point of view, and "none from an economic point of view." He did not specify the two possibilities.

GOP HARMING IKE'S ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 23, 1956, issue of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph entitled "GOP Harming Ike's Road Program":

GOP HARMING IKE'S ROAD PROGRAM

President Eisenhower's highway program in Washington is suffering today from foot-dragging and sabotage from members of his own Cabinet.

Whether accidentally or by design, the performances of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks as witnesses before the House Ways and Means Commitee definitely lessened the chances of passage of a highway bill that will carry out the President's program.

The position taken by Humphrey perhaps can be rationalized to be that simply of a treasurer desiring to balance his books whether any roads are built or not.

The position of Secretary Weeks was just plain baffling.

The committee heard Weeks because he has supervision of the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

Weeks read a long prepared statement praising those sections of the highway bill with which the committee has no responsibility and very little concern.

He was then questioned on the tax features of the bill, which are totally the concern of the committee and were presumably the reason for Weeks' appearance.

The Secretary had no advice and no counsel.

He was unable to answer questions that almost everybody in the room, including the spectators, could have answered readily.

Not only did he not know the answers, he refused to let two officials of the Bureau of Public Roads give the answers themselves.

It was more than sheer ignorance.

It was obvious to everyone present that Weeks was not going to help the Democrats write a tax bill to finance the Eisenhower highway program.

If the Eisenhower program is voted down in the House because of lack of Republican support, the blame can be traced directly to the attitude shown by Humphrey and Weeks.

They were negative witnesses.

Apparently the President will have to state his position again.

He will have to state it bluntly and specifically so that no one will confuse his position with that taken by his two Cabinet members.

He has said already that he will support a highway bill financed by higher taxes, and in saying so he attempted to make the bill bipartisan.

At least that is the way everybody but Humphrey and Weeks saw it.

Their actions have served only to confuse those Republicans who will have to vote on the bill.

They are wondering which administration position is the official one.

The Weeks' performance looked particularly bad because he was preceded as a witness by a Republican who intelligently and enthusiastically supported the highway bill and its tax schedule.

He was Charles P. Taft, mayor of Cincinnati, and a brother of the late United States Senator Robert Taft.

Taft disagreed with previous testimony given by Humphrey and certainly will disagree wtih the position taken by Weeks.

The facts are that a Republican Ohio mayor did more to advance the Eisenhower highway program, for which he has no responsibility, than the two responsible Cabinet officers put together.

The Sun-Telegraph and the other Hearst Newspapers regard it as of vital importance that the President again make his position clear and undo the damage done to a project in which he has a deep personal interest.

THE SHRIMP FISHERY OF THE GULF OF MEXICO

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, fishing for shrimp has become one of the major industries of Florida in recent years. Several thousands of our citizens who live in nearly every seaboard city in the State are engaged the year around in manning the vessels that catch the shrimp, in processing them for market, in distributing them to markets all over the country, and in supplying needed materials to the vessels and plants.

The fishery is an old one on both the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico sides of the State but it received a great impetus directly after the war when it was found that the so-called brown or pink shrimp which occasionally were found in the catches were abundant in deeper waters of the Gulf of Mexico than had theretofore been fished commercially. Not only were they abundant in these deeper waters but they were delicious and they found a quick and ready market in all parts of the United States. Under the impetus of this discovery the shrimp fishery has grown to be the most valuable sea fishery that the United States has, surpassing salmon some years ago and even becoming greater than tuna in the value of its landings last year.

To fish in these deeper waters whole new fleets of larger modern trawling vessels had to be built and financed from the catch. Their activities quickly spread out all over the high seas of the Gulf of Mexico wherever the bottom and water conditions were suitable for fishing and for supporting the shrimp they sought. Rather quickly it was found that some of the best shrimping grounds were in the southern part of the gulf off the coast of Mexico in the Campeche, Tampico, and adjacent areas of the high seas. These were seas well known to Florida fishermen who had fished for red snapper in that area for several generations, and still do.

While it was American fishermen from Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas who discovered and proved up these shrimp fisheries of the southern gulf it was not long before Mexican fishermen began to participate in these offshore fisheries too, as often as not with vessels, capital, and business experience provided by American partners. Since there was little or no market at the time for shrimp in that part of Mexico most of the Mexican-caught shrimp was exported to markets in the United States as it still is.

The Mexican fishery in the area developed rapidly as did the American fishery and as they developed side by side friction grew, as it often does in such circumstances. Part of this was due to normal competition on the fishing grounds and in the market. It was a new, dynamic, pioneer fishery and excesses of exuberant spirits were present on both sides. Smouldering in the background was the century-old dispute between the United States and Mexico as to where the territorial sea left off and the free high seas began. Mexico and the Gulf States claimed that the territorial sea in the gulf was 9 marine miles in breadth; the Department of State replied as vigorously that the territorial seas of all parties in the gulf were 3 marine miles in breadth. Aiding and confusing such friction as arose over this issue were claims made by Argentina, Chile, and Peru to total sovereignty over 200 miles or more of ocean off their coasts. If they could make such extravagant claims why could not Mexico do so too and drive the Americans completely out of the Gulf of Mexico south of the Rio Grande?

There was continued friction on the fishing grounds, heated articles in the Mexican newspapers and, finally, seizure of American vessels which drew the immediate attention of the Congress and the Department of State. It also called for quick reaction from the American shrimpers themselves. If American fishermen were going to be forced out of the fishery they had developed they would seek to close this American market to the Mexican product. It would be tit for tat. In early 1950, when the serious problems began to flare, bills were introduced into the Congress for that purpose.

But as quickly as the serious trouble flared it began to die down. There were wise heads in the industry on both sides of the border and in the spring of 1950 they decided to get their heads together and devise ways and means to all stay in business profitably. There were shrimp enough for both groups of fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico if some patience could be found. There was market enough in the United States to absorb the catches of both if they worked at it. As a matter of fact discussions did not get very far before it was found that they had more serious interests in common than they had disputes. There was need for a better merchandizing program to build up the market in the United States. There was need for both sides to improve the quality of their products and this was a joint problem because they were in the same market. There was need for biological and oceanographic research to learn more about the resources itself, so that overfishing could be avoided.

From this original meeting grew an organization which I think is without parallel in American relations and which deserves the plaudits of the public on both sides of the border. On the spot was formed the Shrimp Association of the Americas. The governing board of the organization was divided half and half between American and Mexican citizens in the shrimp business. Dues and assessments were apportioned on the basis of the volume of business transacted, whether by a Mexican or an American firm. Projects of mutual interest were to be undertaken.

To begin with the bills to bar shrimp imports from the American market were dropped and the hue and cry to drive the Americans out of the high seas off Mexico began to die down. Quality control projects were begun and have been carried on continuously since. Jointly sponsored advertising projects were devised and carried out. As time went on the United States Fish and Wildlife Service was persuaded to extend their biological and oceanographic research on shrimp in the entire gulf, and the Mexican Department of Fisheries helped as it could. Both sides pressed their governments to negotiate a conservation treaty of the sort that has been so usefully employed in the halibut, salmon, tuna, fur-seal, whale, and New England fisheries, and progress along this line is being made. Agents were hired by the association in Mexican ports so that vessels in distress or with injured crewmen could enter these ports without governmental friction. Work is under way to provide better storm and weather predictions.

In short the Shrimp Association of the Americas as composed exclusively of Mexican and American businessmen in the shrimp industry has in 6 short years shown more of the traditional spirit of inter-American cooperation and friendship and what can be accomplished on practical levels of human relationships than could have been reasonably expected by anyone in that short period of time, or than anybody on either side of the border would have guessed in the tense spring of 1950. True, problems keep coming up and friction still rises at times, but little of this has come from within the ranks of the industry on either side of the border, and in each case the Shrimp Association of the Americas has been able to meet the problem and relieve the friction.

But businessmen are businessmen whichever side of the border you are on, and diplomats are diplomats the world over. One is interested primarily in practice and the job of making income pay the bills, and the other is often more involved in policy and principle. Sometimes these paths lead in different directions and that appears to be the situation just now.

The Inter-American Council of Jurists concluded a meeting in Mexico City on the 5th of February just past. The council is made up of specialists in international law from each of the American Republics. Under the charter of the organization of American States it is supposed to work as a serious, technical body. I do not suppose that any of the delegates know much about the shrimp business, the Shrimp Association of the Americas, or how their deliberations over international law, or the lack thereof, could knock into a cocked hat the hard-won diplomatic victories of a group of hard-headed shrimp fishermen on both sides of the Rio Grande.

In the concluding session of the council's meeting a resolution was railroaded through with virtually no analysis, no study and no discussing. The United States and other delegations raised basic questions regarding the contents of the resolution but debate was choked off and no replies were made by the proponents. It was just voted, and the votes were counted before they were cast. The United States representative, the able William E. Sanders, had nothing he could do except file a strong reservation on behalf of the United States both as to the contents of the resolution and the high-handed methods used to put it across. I attach hereto copies both of the resolution and of the reservation filed by the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am alive to the great issues of defense, security, and commerce which this action in Mexico City raises, and the difficulties that it throws in the way of a program of genuine inter-American cooperation in economic, social, diplomatic, and legal fields of our relations with our good neighbors to the south. But I must confess that at the moment I am more immediately concerned with the effect of this action on what I consider to be the splendid diplomatic accomplishments of these shrimp-fishing private citizens of both Mexico and the United States.

I do not suppose that this makes much difference to people outside the Gulf States, nor do I suspect that it weighs heavily in great affairs of state. But I do hope that these diplomats will find some way to work out their grave problems without further upsetting my shrimp fishermen, or causing them any more trouble than they deserve.

DECLARATION AND RESERVATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE RESOLUTION ON TERRITORIAL WATERS AND RELATED QUESTIONS, ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF JURISTS, THIRD MEETING, MEXICO CITY, JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1956

For the reasons stated by the United States representatives during the sessions of committee I, the United States voted against and records its opposition to the Resolution on Territorial Waters and Related Questions. Among the reasons indicated were the following:

That the Inter-American Council of Jurists has not had the benefit of the necessary preparatory studies on the part of its permanent committee which it has consistently recognized as indispensable to the formulation of sound conclusions on the subject;

That at this meeting of the Council of Jurists, apart from a series of general statements by representatives of various countries, there has been virtually no study, analysis, or discussion of the substantive aspects of the resolution;

That the resolution contains pronouncements based on economic and scientific assumptions for which no support has been offered and which are debatable and which, in any event, cover matters within the competence of the specialized conference called for under resolution LXXXIV of the Tenth Inter-American Conference;

That much of the resolution is contrary to international law;

That the resolution is completely oblivious of the interests and rights of States other than the adjacent coastal States in the conservation and utilization of marine resources and of the recognized need for international cooperation for the effective accomplishment of that common objective; and

That the resolution is clearly designed to serve political purposes and therefore exceeds the competence of the Council of Jurists as a technical-juridical body.

In addition, the United States delegation wishes to record the fact that when the resolution, in the drafting of which the United States had no part, was submitted to committee I, despite fundamental considerations raised by the United States and other delegations against the resolution, there was no discussion of those considerations at the one and only session of the committee held to debate the document.

RESOLUTION XIV, SYSTEMS OF TERRITORIAL WATERS AND RELATED QUESTIONS, ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF JURISTS, THIRD MEETING, MEXICO CITY, JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1956

The Inter-American Council of Jurists suggests to the Council of the Organization of American States that it transmit to the specialized conference provided for in Resolution LXXXIV of the Caracas Conference the resolution entitled "Principles of Mexico on the Juridical Regime of the Seas" approved by this Council, together with the minutes of the meetings in which this subject has been considered during the third meeting, with the character of the preparatory study called for in topic I–a of its agenda, "System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions."

(Approved at the fourth plenary session, February 3, 1956.)

RESOLUTION XIII, PRINCIPLES OF MEXICO ON THE JURIDICAL REGIME OF THE SEAS, ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF JURISTS, THIRD MEETING, MEXICO CITY, JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1956

Whereas the topic System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions: Preparatory Study for the Specialized Inter-American

Conference Provided for in Resolution LXXXIV of the Caracas Conference was included by the Council of the Organization of American States in the agenda of this third meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists; and

Its conclusions on the subject are to be transmitted to the specialized conference soon to be held, the Inter-American Council of Jurisis recognizes as the expression of the juridical conscience of the contineut, and as applicable between the American States, the following rules, among others; and declares that the acceptance of these principles does not imply and shall not have the effect of renouncing or weakening the position maintained by the various countries of America on the question of how far territorial waters should extend.

A. TERRITORIAL WATERS

1. The distance of 3 miles as the limit of territorial waters is insufficient, and does not constitute a rule of general international law. Therefore, the enlargement of the zone of the sea traditionally called "territorial waters" is justifiable.

2. Each State is competent to establish its territorial waters within reasonable limits, taking into account geographical, geological, and biological factors, as well as the economic needs of its population, and its security and defense.

B. CONTINENTAL SHELF

The rights of the coastal State with respect to the seabed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf extend also to the natural resources found there, such as petroleum, hydrocarbons, mineral substances, and all marine, animals, and vegetable species that live in a constant physical and biological relationship with the shelf, not excluding the benthonic species.

C. CONSERVATION OF LIVING RESOURCES OF THE HIGH SEAS

1. Coastal States, following scientific and technical principles, have the right to adopt measures of conservation and supervision necessary for the protection of the living resources of the sea contiguous to their coasts, beyond the territorial waters. Measures that may be taken by a coastal State in such case shall not prejudice rights derived from international agreements to which it is a party, nor shall they discriminate against foreign fishermen.

2. Coastal States have, in addition, the right of exclusive exploitation of species closely related to the coast, the life of the country, or the needs of the coastal population, as in the case of species that develop in territorial waters and subsequently migrate to the high seas, or when the existence of certain species has an important relation with an industry or activity essential to the coastal country, or when the latter is carrying out important works that will result in the conservation or increase of the species.

D. BASE LINES

1. The breadth of territorial waters shall be measured, in principle, from the low-water line along the coast, as marked on large-scale marine charts, officially recognized by the coastal State.

2. Coastal States may draw straight base lines that do not follow the low-water line when circumstances require this method because the coast is deeply indented or cut into, or because there are islands in its immediate vicinity, or when such a method is justified by the existence of economic interests peculiar to a region of the coastal State. In any of these cases the method may be employed of drawing a straight line connecting the outermost points of the coast, islands, islets, keys, or reefs. The drawing of such base lines must not depart to any appreciable extent from the general direction of the coast, and the sea areas lying within these lines must be sufficiently linked to the land domain.

3. Waters located within the base line shall be subject to the regime of internal waters.

4. The coastal State shall give due publicity to the straight base lines.

E. BAYS

1. A bay is a well-marked indentation whose penetration inland in proportion to the width of its mouth is such that its waters are inter fauces terrae and constitute something more than a mere curvature of the coast.

2. The line that encloses a bay shall be drawn between its natural geographical entrance points where the indentation begins to have the configuration of a bay.

3. Waters comprised within a bay shall be subject to the juridical regime of internal waters if the surface thereof is equal to or greater than that of a semicircle drawn by using the mouth of the bay as a diameter.

4. If a bay has more than one entrance, this semicircle shall be drawn on a line as long as the sum total of the length of the different entrances. The area of the islands located within a bay shall be included in the total area of the bay.

5. So-called historical bays shall be subject to the regime of internal waters of the coastal State or States.

(Approved at the fourth plenary session, February 3, 1956.)

RESERVED POWERS OF THE STATES

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to a joint resolution passed unanimously by the South Carolina General Assembly and signed by the Governor. This joint resolution condemns and protests the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the States and Congress to prevent this and other encroachment by the Central Government and declaring the intention of South Carolina to exercise all powers reserved to it to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the States and Congress to prevent this and other encroachment by the Central Government and declaring the intention of South Carolina to exercise all powers reserved to it, to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people

Mindful of its responsibilities to its own citizens and of its obligations to the other States, the General Assembly of South Carolina adopts this resolution in condemnation of and protest against the illegal encroachment by the Central Government into the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people, and against the grave threat to constitutional government implicit in the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, for these reasons:

1. The genius of the American Constitution lies in two provisions. It establishes a clear division between the powers delegated by the States to the Central Government and the powers reserved to the States, or to the people. As a prerequisite to any lawful redistribution of these powers, it establishes as a part of the process for its amendment the requirement of approval by the States.

The division of these powers is reaffirmed in the 10th amendment to the Constitution in these words: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Long judicial precedent also clearly reaffirms that Central Government is one of delegated powers, specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and that all other powers of Government, not prohibited by the Constitution to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people.

The power to propose changes and the power to approve changes in the basic law is specifically stated by article V of the Constitution in these words: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

Lincoln, in his first inaugural, recognized these constitutional principles in the following language: "The maintenance inviolate to the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions, according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend."

2. Neither the judicial power delegated to the Supreme Court in article III of the Constitution nor such appellate jurisdiction as the article authorizes the Congress to confer upon the Court, makes the Court the supreme arbiter of the rights of the States under the compact.

3. The right of each of the States to maintain at its own expense racially separate public schools for the children of its citizens and other racially separate public facilities is not forbidden or limited by the language or the intent of the 14th amendment. This meaning of the 14th amendment was established beyond reasonable question by the action of the Congress in providing for racially segregated schools in the District of Columbia by legislation contemporaneous with the submission of the 14th amendment to the States in 1866, and by the fact that a majority of the States in the Union at that time recognized that segregation in public facilities had not been abolished by this amendment. There is no evidence in the Constitution, in the amendments, or in any contemporary document that the States intended to give to the Central Government the right to invade the sanctity of the homes of America and deny to responsible parents a meaningful voice in the training of their children or in the selection of associates for them.

4. For almost 60 years, beginning in 1896, an unbroken line of decisions of the Court interpreted the 14th amendment as recognizing the right of the States to maintain racially separate public facilities for their people. If the Court in the interpretation of the Constitution is to depart from the sanctity of past decisions and to rely on the current political and social philosophy of its members to unsettle the great constitutional principles so clearly established, the rights

of individuals are not secure and Government under a written Constitution has no stability.

5. Disregarding the plain language of the 14th amendment, ignoring the conclusive character of the contemporary actions of the Congress and of the State legislatures, overruling its own decisions to the contrary, the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, relying on its own views of sociology and psychology, for the first time held that the 14th amendment prohibited the States from maintaining racially separate public schools and since then the Court has enlarged this to include other public facilities. In so doing the Court, under the guise of interpretation, amended the Constitution of the United States, thus usurping the power of Congress to submit, and that of the several States to approve, constitutional changes. This action of the Court ignored the principle that the meaning of the Constitution and of its amendments does not change. It is a written instrument. That which the 14th amendment meant when adopted it means now (*South Carolina* v. *United States*, 199 U. S. 437, 449).

6. The educational opportunities of white and colored children in the public schools of South Carolina have been substantially improved during recent years and highly satisfactory results are being obtained in our segregated schools. If enforced, the decision of the Court will seriously impair and retard the education of the children of both races, will nullify these recent advances and will cause untold friction between the races.

7. Tragic as are the consequences of this decision to the education of the children of both races in the Southern States, the usurpation of constitutional power by the Court transcends the problems of segregation in education. The Court holds that regardless of the meaning of a constitutional provision when adopted, and in the language of the 1955 Report of the Gray Commission to the Governor of Virginia, "irrespective of precedent, long acquiesced in, the Court can and will change its interpretation of the Constitution at its pleasure, disregarding the orderly processes for its amendment set forth in article V thereof. It means that the most fundamental of the rights of the States or of their citizens exist by the Court's sufferance and that the law of the land is whatever the Court may determine it to be." Thus the Supreme Court, created to preserve the Constitution, has planted the seed for the destruction of constitutional government.

8. Because the preservation of the rights of the States is as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the National Government, since "the Constitution, in all of its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States" (*Texas* v. *White* ((1869), 7 Wallace 700, 725)), and since the usurpation of the rights reserved to the States is by the judicial branch of the Central Government, the issues raised by this decision are of such grave import as to require this sovereign State to judge for itself of the infraction of the Constitution.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina:

SECTION 1. That the States have never delegated to the Central Government the power to change the Constitution nor have they surrendered to the Central Government the power to prohibit to the Sates the right to maintain racially separate but equal public facilities or the right to determine when such facilities are in the best interest of their citizens.

SEC. 2. That the action of the Supreme Court of the United States constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt to change the true intent and meaning of the Constitution. It is in derogation of the power of Congress to propose, and that of the States to approve, constitutional changes. It thereby establishes a judicial precedent, if allowed to stand, for the ultimate destruction of constitutional government.

SEC. 3. That the State of South Carolina condemns and protests against the illegal encroachment by the Central Government into the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people and against the grave threat to the constitutional government implicit in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the States and the Congress do take appropriate legal steps to prevent, now and in the future, usurpation of power by the Supreme Court and other encroachment by the Central Government into the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people to the end that our American system of constitutional government may be preserved.

SEC. 5. In the meantime, the State of South Carolina as a loyal and sovereign State of the Union will exercise the powers reserved to it under the Constitution to judge for itself of the infractions and to take such other legal measures as it may deem appropriate to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people.

SEC. 6. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the governor and legislature of each of the other States, to the President of the United States, to each of the Houses of Congress, to South Carolina's Representatives and Senators in the Congress, and to the Supreme Court of the United States for its information.

SEC. 7. This act shall take effect upon its approval by the Governor.

In the senate house the 14th day of February.

In the year of our Lord 1956.

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
President of the Senate.
SOLOMON BLATT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Approved the 14th day of February 1956.
GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, JR.,
Governor.

CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago a DC–3 took off at Long Beach, Calif., with 22 passengers for New York. This flight, unheralded at the time, was probably one of the most significant trailblazing episodes in postwar commercial aviation. That was the inauguration of air coach. The young war veterans who operated that flight developed North American Airlines, the independent enterprise which has had such great impact on the air-transportation industry in the past decade.

I salute the imagination and perseverance of these young men. Thanks to their willingness to face innumerable obstacles they have not only built a successful and important company, but they have made a vital contribution to all commercial aviation—and a real contribution to the American public. For them to have survived for 10 years in a field as difficult and as full of handicaps testifies both as to the ability of the North American organization, and to the demand of the traveling public which insisted upon low-cost service and supported it, despite elaborate efforts to dissuade anyone from using the independents.

But I am not here to sing the praises of any one airline or criticize or condemn any carrier.

What concerns me is our public policy. How wise, how practical, has our public policy been in regard to civil aviation? Has the Government shown foresight and prudence and real courage?

Everyone is aware of the difficult task Congress has always faced regarding the aviation subsidy. It is a problem which my colleagues and I have been faced with in our Appropriations Committee. I will not burden you with technical details, only these few simple figures: that in the 6 years following the war the Federal Treasury gave, to the airlines in the form of direct and indirect subsidy, an average of almost one hundred million dollars each year. This substantial figure did not solve the industry's problems. During a period when other businesses were booming, the certificated airlines suffered from a recession all their own. In 1946, the industry lost $5,367,000; in 1947, $14,256,000; and in 1948 lost $12,204,000. The major airlines, at that time, offered no low-cost, popular type of service. On the contrary, they had various super-deluxe flights at special premium fares which put added burdens on the Treasury. Their only answer to the problem was to come before Congress and request additional subsidy. In 1949 one airline president called for $90 million in the form of increased mail pay. A spokesman for the Air Transport Association stated before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1949:

> The fact remains, however, that the long-range growth in domestic airline passenger traffic halted (at least for the time being) abruptly and unexpectedly.

The industry took the position that aviation markets were drying up and only Government subsidy could keep them flying.

At this very time, the independent industry, led by the North American management, was growing at a rapid rate and growing without a cent of Government subsidy. They were earning substantial profits and plowing these profits back into equipment and expansion. They were accused of skimming the cream, but survey after survey showed that they had discovered a vast new market by ignoring the cream and developing the skim milk—the middle-income group. Thus they created a real mass market.

But we must not lose sight of the fact that the CAB, the regulatory agency, did not direct or lead or shape the new development. The Board remained laggard and was only impelled to move when air coach was an accomplished fact. Then the CAB was confronted with the application to grant certification to the only operators of air coach—the independent. The Board did not grant such certification, denying it in the Transcontinental Coach case. This refusal was roundly castigated in an historic dissent by member Adams who wrote that the Board's action was "merely further evidence of the refusal of the majority to recognize and satisfy a public need, now,

which has been demonstrated by the facts and record in this case." But the Board could not deny or ignore the proven success of air coach. The public demand was clear. So, after a private conference with the CAB, the major airlines offered a few coach flights on the transcontinental run late in 1951.

Success was instantaneous. The increase in coach traffic has advanced more rapidly than all other phases of traffic. Profits have been substantial. Today we must pay special tribute to North American and the other pioneers of the low-cost field, because they showed how to wean the industry off of subsidy. This achievement has saved the Government millions of dollars and has brought additional service to millions of passengers. Aviation has become the fastest growing industry—and this year almost half the traffic will be air coach.

North American has virtually been the yardstick, establishing the rate criteria for all air coach. In 1953 North American reduced its transcontinental fares from $99 to $80. Last fall the certificated carriers adopted identical rates, for a 6-month period. It is interesting to note their experience. I quote from Aviation Daily:

TWA SAYS COACH EXCURSION FARE CATCHES ON

Trans World Airlines' transcontinental tourist traffic has increased "nearly 60 percent since inauguration of the $80 midweek excursion coach fare," according to TWA Sales Vice President E. O. Cocke. Actual gain for the fourth quarter of 1955, Cocke said, was 58.9 percent over the same 1954 period. "Preliminary figures for December," he added, "indicate the gain in volume * * * is directly attributable to the new excursion fare inaugurated by TWA on September 12." Special fare applies Monday through Thursday each week for round trips completed within 30 days.

I repeat, my interest is directed toward examining our public policy. Did the CAB follow sound doctrines or did it not in administering the mandate of Congress?

We cannot find that the Board was perceptive or alert to the aircoach possibilities. Moreover, when we look behind this we find an even more serious thing, that the CAB was engaged in formulating a deliberate policy to eliminate the very people who were developing aircoach—the very people whose ingenuity was responsible for getting the industry off of subsidy.

I am referring to a memorandum dated September 16, 1948, prepared by the Chief of the CAB's Bureau of Economic Regulations. This document sets forth in the most cynical language how the independent carriers could be eliminated without laying the Board "open to criticism of stamping out, without due process, these carriers which they have permitted to come into being." The memorandum sets up a choice whereby the independent is trapped, and ultimately put out of business, either by economic strangulation or by regulatory execution.

This document, the so-called Goodkind memorandum, first came to light before Senator THYE's Select Small Business Committee in 1953. To date there has been no thorough inquest into exactly what has been going on inside the CAB during this period and how such a memorandum became the blueprint for CAB policy.

Properly, these are questions which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Small Business Committee, and the Antimonopoly Subcommittee might be concerned with.

Each year the CAB appears before us seeking subsidy. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am keenly interested. I would like to know what goes on in the mind of a Government agency when it attempts to kill those enterprises in an industry which are responsible for eliminating the subsidy, while at the same time the agency appears before Congress defending and urging subsidy.

I repeat, in closing, that I salute North American Airlines on the historic anniversary of the inauguration of air coach, and I devoutly trust that we, in Congress, will take such action in our respective committees to insure that the innovators, the pioneers, the men who risk and succeed will at least be given an opportunity to participate in the fruits of their labors.

FATHER JAMES G. JOYCE: MARTYR AND PATRIOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1955, at the townhall in my hometown of Clinton, Mass., a huge civic welcome home reception was tendered under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus to our distinguished fellow townsman, priest, martyr, and patriot, Rev. James G. Joyce, O. P., who but a short time before had been released from an extended period of imprisonment by the Chinese Reds. At this very impressive reception which was largely attended by friends and admirers of Father Joyce, there were moving scenes of rejoicing and of thanksgiving to the Almighty for his liberation and safe return home.

Father Joyce is a member of the famed and ancient Dominican Order, and prior to his imprisonment by the unspeakable Chinese Reds had been a missionary in China for over 20 years. After the fashion of the Communist police state which represses every semblance of human liberty and exerts particular enmity toward religion and the religious, Father Joyce was arbitrarily seized while devoutly ministering his priestly duties, was placed under arrest and confinement for over 2 years.

During that time, he was held incommunicado and was not privileged to talk with anyone, not even to his guards, and then only when he was spoken to. He was not permitted to write letters, was furnished only enough food for bare subsistence and was visited with many indignities to his high calling and person.

Pursuant to the usual base, degenerate practices of the Communists, he was shamefully mistreated and brainwashed day after day—unjustly accused of espionage and plotting against the so-called People's Government in China with a persistency, force, and violence calculated to break down his resistance and designed finally to induce him to sign incriminating statements against himself and his religious colleagues.

Of course, anyone knowing Father Joyce would immediately understand that these efforts to break his iron will and indomitable spirit were doomed to failure before they began. With characteristic zeal and gallantry, with a God-given fortitude and courage that possibly could not be excelled, Father Joyce stanchly and successfully resisted all the threats, violence, intimidation, and punishment which the dastardly Red forces inflicted upon him. In the same dauntless way his colleagues, Father Hyde and Father Gordon, who were confined with him refused to yield to Red domination, and together with Father Joyce they thus followed the finest traditions of the dedicated religious of their faith and adhered to the highest and most exacting standards of American patriotism.

Father Joyce and his colleagues proved something to the Chinese Reds which force of arms has as yet failed to do, and that is, that there is a greater force in this world than the physical—a force capable of standing up against greatest odds, capable of enduring torture and punishment beyond description in order to prove true, loyal, and devoted to the cause of God and country. That is the invincible force of the spirit that comes only from profound belief and faith in God.

His and theirs was a great victory over insidious godless elements who renounce all religious belief and who are the sworn enemies of freedom. It was a triumph of moral and spiritual courage over physical force and violence. It conclusively demonstrated to the Reds and to the world that while they may vilify and denounce, wrongfully accuse, imprison, and cruelly torture their innocent, helpless victims, that there are individuals associated with the free world who are so strong in their beliefs, so inflexible in their purpose, and so indomitable in their faith that their spirit can never be broken. That is the immortal saga of Father Joyce and his dauntless colleagues.

The town of Clinton where Father Joyce was born and reared is to a man, woman, and child inexpressibly proud of the inspiring example of Father Joyce. His family, friends, order, and country are very proud of him. But there is indeed a far greater significance to his experiences and his contributions. He stands before the Nation and the world as a peerless symbol of personal bravery, unfaltering loyalty and superlative faith. He is, in truth, an inspiration to all those who cherish freedom and mean to preserve it, if necessary with their own

lives. And the same is true, of course, of his colleagues.

The community that can claim Father Joyce, and the other men with him, as its own is fortunate and proud indeed. The Nation which claims him and them has a priceless possession of loyalty and stalwart patriotism which will fire and strengthen the national purpose of standing up courageously against the threats and blandishments of evil conspirators who would reduce the free world to serfdom and destroy the precious institutions of freedom and justice upon which our Nation is founded.

This episode of Father Joyce and his colleagues should prove to Communist leadership that there are forces in this Nation and in the free world which will never surrender their heritage of freedom, and will never, for any reason, give up its hard-won liberties.

It will indeed be the spirit, the courage and fortitude of Father Joyce, and men like him, which will, in the end, put tyranny and oppression to rout, and preserve our free way of life against brutal and ruthless enemies.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein several excerpts and newspaper articles throwing further light upon the great sacrifices, strength of character, nobility of purpose, gentility of spirit, profound reliance in the living God, and unsurpassed gallantry and patriotism of Father James Joyce and his colleagues.

It is not inappropriate to note here that while some of our own military personnel, well trained and especially doctrinated in Americanism cracked under terrible Communist mistreatment and torture that Father Joyce and his group stood firm, steadfast and unyielding in the face of harsh cruelty and brutality, and thus exemplified a most glorious page in American history as well as in the great religious order to which they have the honor to belong, and which they themselves so distinctly honor.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 12, 1955]

PRIEST WELCOMED HOME FROM RED CHINA PRISON

CLINTON.—More than 500 townspeople expressed feelings of rejoicing and thanksgiving to welcome home one of their priests from Communist imprisonment at a reception at Fallon Auditorium Sunday night.

Rev. James G. Joyce, O. P., told the well-wishers their prayers helped to sustain him during his solitary confinement in China. He described his imprisonment and thanked the townspeople for their faith.

GIFTS PRESENTED

Representatives of the clergy, town, and national governments and the Knights of Columbus, which sponsored the reception, filled the stage with the white-robed priest. Speakers expressed the thanks of the townspeople at his safe return and praised his fortitude under the torture devised by his captors.

A chalice inscribed with a Celtic cross and a check to aid him on his expressed desire to visit Ireland were presented to Father Joyce by Austin F. Sheridan, chairman of the reception. The gifts resulted from donations of townspeople collected by the K. of C. since his release in Hong Kong in September.

Father Joyce described the arrest in August 1953, which began his solitary confinement in a 10-foot-square room where he was to spend 25 months. Locked in separate rooms in the same house were two other priests of his order who were later freed with him.

TORTURE DESCRIBED

Efforts of the Communists to break the will of the priests and force them to confess to spying for the United States Government were also described with feeling by the missionary.

"Those 25 months sound bad and they were bad," he said. "But for men of God, it was a wonderful experience.

"It was wonderful to be so close to Him. We could almost see the Holy Family in there with us, and after all they had little better than we had, at Nazareth. The religious and spiritual experience was wonderful."

SPIRITUAL LIFE ENRICHED

Their spiritual life was enriched, he said, by reciting parts of the mass they could remember, their rosaries, and their breviaries.

Rev. Leon D. McGraw, pastor of St. John's Church, expressed the greetings of the missionary's home parish. "He did it for the love of God and he was ready to suffer more to bring Christ to the people of China. We are grateful to Almighty God that he has been spared and returned to us."

Paul P. Lavelle, chairman of selectmen, told the audience that Father Joyce's experience shows the nearness of world events to the people of Clinton.

United States Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN called Father Joyce's experience an inspiration for the Nation. He decried what he said was a move among some governments to admit the Red Chinese to the United Nations despite treatment given to such as Father Joyce.

Praise for his Christian fortitude was given the missionary by Rev. Frances J. Carroll, pastor of Our Lady of the Rosary parish. "We are proud of the Christian steadfastness you have shown," he said.

Other speakers introduced by Austin J. Kittredge, master of ceremonies, were Rev. James McLarney, of the Dominican province of St. Joseph; Judge William P. Constantino, and Rev. Aloysius O'Malley, C. P., vice rector of Holy Family Monastery of West Hartford, Conn., and a native of Clinton.

Music was played by an orchestra assembled by John H. Flannagan and vocal selections were given by St. John's Church choir under direction of Mrs. T. Francis McDonald. Francis C. McDonald, grand knight of Clinton Council, K. of C., opened the ceremonies.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette of December 12, 1955]

CLINTON'S FATHER JOYCE RECOUNTS HIS FAITH AGAINST RED SLAPS

CLINTON, December 12.—This town paid tribute to a courageous native son with a joyous testimonial to Rev. James G. Joyce in Fallon Auditorium Sunday night.

More than 500 townspeople joined with clergy, Government officials and the Knights of Columbus to express their thanksgiving for the return of the Dominican missionary.

Father Joyce was released from nearly 5 years' imprisonment in Communist China in September. He returned here last month.

A check to aid the priest fulfill a desire to visit Ireland and a chalice inscribed with a Celtic cross were presented to the Clinton missionary by the Clinton Council, Knights of Columbus, which sponsored the reception. The gifts were raised from donations of townspeople.

Father Joyce, wearing the white robes of his order, thanked the audience for their prayers which he said helped to sustain him during 25 months' solitary confinement. He also told the assembly the treatment at the hands of his Communist captors was a wonderful experience for a man of God.

WIT SNAPS GRAVITY

Despite the seriousness of his testimony, the priest often broke the audience into laughter with his good-natured witticisms.

His solitary confinement began, he told the audience, in August 1953 when he and two other Dominican missionaries were locked in separate 10-foot-square rooms in a small house. He described efforts of their captors to break the will of the priests and force them to confess to spying for the United States Government.

The Communists would list a lot of charges against him, Father Joyce said, and when he said they were false they would slap his face.

"They said they offered us a road to peace and freedom or a road to our little rooms," he said, "We would tell them they were giving us the road to Hell."

When his captors threatened to take him out and shoot him the priest told them to go ahead, he said.

"Those 25 months sound bad and they were bad," the missionary said with sincerity. "But for men of God it was a wonderful experience.

"CLOSE TO HIM"

"It was wonderful to be so close to Him. We could almost see the holy family in there with us, and after all they had little better at Nazareth than we had. The religious and spiritual experience was wonderful," he said.

During their confinement the missionaries, each in his separate cell, enriched their spiritual life by reciting portions of the mass, the rosary, and their breviaries, he explained.

"All of these were helpful, along with your prayers, in keeping us sane," he said, adding with characteristic good humor, "That is if I am sane."

The missionaries thought they were on their way to execution, he said, when they were brought before the judge who ordered them expelled from China.

With a voice that began to grow husky toward the end of his off-the-cuff talk, the missionary expressed confidence in the vigor of Chinese catholicism.

"Their faith grows stronger and stronger all the time," he said. "China is a sanctified country."

First of the speakers to express his thanks at the homecoming was Rev. Leon D. McGraw, pastor of St. John's Church, the missionary's home parish.

"He did it for the love of God and he was ready to suffer more to bring Christ to the people of China. We are grateful to Almighty God that he has been spared and returned to us," he said.

Paul B. Lavelle, chairman of selectmen, said the priest's experiences "show how the events of the world have a personal effect on our lives."

United States Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN called Father Joyce "one of the most distinguished native sons to come from this town as well as an international and national hero."

Other speakers introduced by Austin J. Kittredge, master of ceremonies, were Rev. Francis J. Carroll, pastor of Our Lady of the Holy Rosary Parish; Rev. James McLarney, of the Dominican Province of St. Joseph; Judge William P. Constantino; and Rev. Aloysius O'Malley, C. P., vice rector of Holy Family Monastery, of West Hartford, Conn., and a native of Clinton.

[From the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item of December 12, 1955]

FATHER JOYCE HONORED AT RECEPTION ON SUNDAY

"Our faith became stronger as our persecution continued," Rev. James G. Joyce, O. P., told a large gathering of townspeople, distinguished clergymen, town officials, and national figures, at the joyful welcome home

celebration held in his honor at Fallon Memorial Auditorium on Sunday night.

The beloved Dominican missionary and native Clintonian, who had been held captive by the Chinese Communists for 25 months, expressed his deep regard for the people of Clinton, and for all his other friends, whose constant prayers during his incarceration, were responsible he claimed for his freedom today.

DESCRIBES IMPRISONMENT

Father Joyce described his imprisonment and solitary confinement and the constant attempts of his captors to make him confess to trumped up charges of spying. "We have a bullet reserved for you," they told him, "but if you confess we will give you your freedom."

He described his confinement with two other missionaries, of the same order, in separate small rooms, never allowed to speak, only to answer to endless interrogations which were accompanied by slaps across the face.

"It sounds bad," he said, and "it was bad, but for a man of God it was a wonderful experience to be so close to Him. The spiritual part was wonderful" he continued, "to have the love, grace, and peace of God in our hearts."

KNIGHTS PLAN PROGRAM

The celebration was planned by the members of the Father Joyce Class of Clinton Council, K. of C., assisted by the K. of C. members and local affiliates of Bishop O'Reilly Assembly Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus.

Among those seated on the stage with Father Joyce, who was dressed in his white Dominican robes, were Rev. Leon D. McGraw, pastor of St. John's Church, Rev. Geoffrey B. Hughes, Rev. Urbain J. Gionet, curates of St. John's parish, Rev. Francis J. Carroll, pastor of the Church of Our Lady of the Rosary, Rev. Thomas J. Tunney, pastor of St. Richard's Church, Sterling, Rev. Edmund B. Haddad, administrator of St. Francis Xavier Church, Bolton, Rev. Leo A. Battista, assistant director of Catholic Charties, Worcester, Msgr. Francis L. Keenan of St. Michael's Church, Lowell, Rev. Aloysius O'Malley, C. P., vice rector of Holy Family Monastery, West Hartford, Conn., Rev. James McLarney of St. Mary's Priory, Dover, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Paul P. Lavelle, chairman the the board of selectmen, Francis C. McDonald, Grand Knight of Clinton Council K. of C., Judge William P. Constantino, Austin F. Sheridan, chairman of the committee, and Attorney Austin J. Kittredge, mast of ceremonies.

"PROUD OF HIM"

Attorney Kittredge told the audience that no previous occasion when he was called upon as master of ceremonies, gave him such a feeling of elation or pleasure as to welcome home Father Joyce, "We are proud of him, glad that he has returned safely and we welcome him back to Clinton," he said.

EXTENDS PARISH GREETINGS

Father McGraw, in extending greetings from St. John's said, "the privation and suffering he endured, he did for the love of God and was ready to suffer even more to bring the name of Christ to the poor people of China. He is back from a living death and it is time for rejoicing. We are grateful to God he has been spared and may the length of his days be strengthened to carry on the work to which he has dedicated his life."

WELCOME FOR TOWN

Paul P. Lavelle, chairman of the board of selectmen, representing the townspeople, told the audience that Father Joyce's experience made us realize the joy and happiness of living in a small town.

He said, "We have emerged from a season of thanksgiving and are entering the holy season of rejoicing and good will. In this atmosphere I bring the warm greetings of the community to you, your family and your friends. Your experience has made us more keenly aware that matters of international treachery are not remote."

"This occasion," he concluded, "brings to mind the words of the happy song, 'So It's Home Again, Home Again, America for Me.' Welcome home Father Joyce."

GREETING OF PARISH

Father Carroll speaking for his parishioners said, "There is no distribution of parish lines in Clinton, I've noted when it comes to honoring someone for whom the town can be proud or who has achieved fame."

"We were just as interested in Father Joyce's welfare, we prayed as hard and it was with happiness and joy we received the news of his freedom from martyrdom," he added.

"Father Joyce has made the name of the community and church noteworthy throughout the Christian World," he concluded.

INTERNATIONAL HERO

Congressman PHILBIN told the audience, "We are here to welcome home an international hero. No one could have served with more zeal or faith despite the indignities and privations inflicted by the despicable enemies who incacerated our priests."

"They are liars, sadists, and murderers who defy God and man," he continued, "but in spite of their treachery they could not shake his shining faith and his love for his God and his country."

JOY AND GLADNESS

Father McLarnen expresed great joy and gladness for the return of Father Joyce to the safety and security of America and pointed out that his return is a great lesson to us who did not realize the tryanny and cruelity of people who do not know God.

WARNS OF ENEMY

Judge Constantino stressed the importance of vigilance at all times and an awareness of recognizing communism for what it is. "We are happy that we still have Father Joyce and may he enjoy years of good health in the service of God," he said.

PRESENTED CHALICE

Austin F. Sheridan, chairman of the committee, presented Father Joyce a beautiful chalice enscribed with a Celtic Cross and a check in behalf of the townspeople.

"Because of your pride in your Irish ancestry we have enscribed the chalice with a Celtic Cross," Mr. Sheridan explained in presenting the gift. He told Father Joyce the check could be used to aid in his expressed desire to visit Ireland.

Messages of regret at being unable to attend were sent by Rt. Rev. Msgr. James S. Barry, D. D., pastor of St. Peter's Church, Worcester; Rev. Alexander J. Struczko, pastor of St. Mary's Church; and Congressman James G. Donovan, of New York, all of whom extended their best wishes to the guest of honor and the hope that he would be spared for many years to carry on his missionary duties.

MUSICAL PROGRAM

During the evening, an inspiring musical program was presented by John H. Flanagan, violinist, and an assembled orchestra with vocal selections by St. John's senior choir under the direction of Mrs. T. Frank McDonald. The choir was heard in two beautiful renditions, Thanks Be to God, and Juravit.

The impressive program was concluded with a prayer by Rev. Aloysius O'Malley, of the Passionist Order and native Clintonian.

MORE FEDERAL FUNDS FOR RESEARCH TO SAVE OUR TEETH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, what is the most prevalent disease in the United States?

Tooth decay.

Almost all persons suffer from oral disease at some time during their lives.

Seventy-five percent of the people who lose teeth, lose them because of pyorrhea.

Half of the adult population is wearing 1 or 2 full dentures, or plates, as a result of previous dental diseases.

Apart from all the pain and suffering that people endure because less than one-half the population receives adequate dental care, the financial cost to the Nation is huge. The civilian dental bill is $1½ billion. In addition, the Armed Forces require the services of 6,000 dentists, and the Department of Defense spends $100 million a year for dental health care for the military. Between 1948 and 1953, the Veterans' Administration spent a quarter of a billion dollars for the dental care of men and women who had once served in the uniform of their country. Not to mention the large sums being spent for dental care by State and local governmental agencies and institutions. The manufacture of toothpaste and toothpowder is big business in the United States.

Yet, in spite of all this money and effort, we are losing our natural teeth, are suffering from various oral infections, and, in general, are fighting a defensive battle against tooth decay.

The reason?

We are not spending enough money in research to get to the root of the problem.

The discovery that the fluoridation of domestic water supplies would reduce the incidence of dental decay by about two-thirds, is one of the most significant contributions of dental research.

Can some similar preventive procedure be found to slow the rising toll of periodontal disease?

Will there ever be a truly therapeutic dentifrice instead of those now being prematurely advertised?

Can the incidence of dental disease be reduced so that dental health care can be realistically included in health-insurance programs similar to Blue Shield and Blue Cross?

The answers depend upon basic scientific research and the money to support such research.

The American Dental Association, with 85,000 members of the 100,000-strong dental profession, is currently spending almost one-quarter million dollars in direct research efforts.

The 43 dental schools and 7 dental research centers have all they can do to make both ends meet. The facilities and staff needed to train dentists and dental hygienists tax their resources to the limit. The financing of adequate research is beyond their powers.

It was not until 1948 that the problem was recognized, and the National

Institute of Dental Research was created by the Congress of the United States.

During the current year, fiscal 1956, the total appropriation for the Institute is only $2,214,000, or the smallest budget of the seven National Institutes of Health.

Of this sum, only $421,000 is available for dental research projects, principally in schools. It is being spread thin to support 45 different projects. Since most of these require from 2 to 3 years to complete, the Institute can accept only about 15 to 20 new projects a year under the present budget. Actually, the schools and research centers have become so discouraged as a result of having their applications rejected time after time because of insufficient funds that they hesitate to spend the time necessary to prepare the detailed type of application required.

Where else can the public look for adequate support of dental research but to the Federal Government?

For the year beginning July 1, the American Dental Association is recommending an increase to $6,026,000 in the amount set aside for dental research.

This for the sake of national health and not to promote any individual's wealth.

To finance 265 additional projects, through grants to dental schools and other nongovernmental research centers.

However, under appropriations recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, for the fiscal year 1957, only $16,000 will be available for each of the Nation's 43 dental schools and 7 private research centers, for this purpose.

This neglect of dental research is sharply defined by the following comparison. In 1954, the Federal Government made research grants to each of the Nation's medical schools, averaging $692,000 for each school.

Not realizing the damaging effects of dental disease upon each person's general health.

One hundred thousand American dentists ask for a concerted attack upon this problem through the medium of Federal grants to promote dental research.

They are backed by every American who is subject to oral disease.

That includes practically everyone.

Six million dollars a year is so little to ask for research that will lead to the control and prevention of a common misery.

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to speak briefly in behalf of the schoolchildren of the United States, and, more especially, those who are forced to attend school in crowded, inadequate, unsafe classrooms. There are nearly 900,000 children going to school in shifts because of teacher and classroom shortages. I am speaking of the elementary classroom shortage. There are 2,385,000 elementary and high-school pupils above the normal capacity of the buildings occupied. Schoolchildren in this country deserve more consideration. There are 30½ million pupils enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools this school year, and within the next 5 years this total figure will be more than 45 million. The $400 million proposed to be spent in direct aid a year for 4 years to help the States and local school districts in the construction of more adequate classrooms is actually only equal to the cost of operating the Defense Department for 2 weeks. Clearly, the school classroom shortage is becoming so great that it is now a Federal responsibility to aid the States and localities.

The facts about school building inadequacies and other serious problems of education were reported and discussed at the White House Conference on Education last November. Delegates attending this meeting from all over the country agreed—2 to 1—that the Federal Government should aid our public schools. A large majority of the delegates also favored more Federal funds for school construction. The whole meeting proved to me that the truth about the Nation's school problems is wanted. When the facts and figures are clearly presented and bear evidence that emergency action is needed, the people usually respond because they know what they want. There is no longer a question whether Federal aid is necessary—this has been answered. We know, and the Nation knows, that the rate of school construction must be increased. I feel that the House Rules Committee will give the House of Representatives an opportunity to discuss school construction at an early date. Many people ask me, "When will the Rules Committee give Congress an opportunity to discuss school legislation?" In view of the great need for this legislation throughout the country today, I wish to make an urgent plea to each member of that committee to bring this legislation before the House as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Powell amendment has not become the tail that wags the dog. Additional Federal legislation is not appropriate to this issue. It would be completely unnecessary because the Supreme Court's decision has declared the law of the land on this subject. The Court has also recognized the complications surrounding integration. So with deep insight into how long it would take this social problem to be worked out, the Supreme Court decision provided that the Federal court system should oversee the process. Federal aid for school construction is of paramount importance if we are to give children an equal opportunity in the years ahead. The approval of this program would be a major step in providing the scientists and technicians that we must have in the future for our defenses. As it has often been said, segregation cannot be abolished in schools that do not exist. Personally, I have confidence in the Supreme Court decision. Schoolchildren all over the Nation are in need of adequate places in which to go to school. We should not further complicate this problem and hinder their futures.

The Committee on Education and Labor authorized the expenditure of money to make a thorough survey of the school-building needs in the United States in 1950. Pursuant to that survey the United States Office of Education published a report in December 1953 which revealed the following:

In 1952 we had a million classrooms in use, but we needed 312,000 additional classrooms to house 8,881,000 children. Half of these children were going to school in obsolete buildings. A third of them were in overcrowded classrooms (taking 30 pupils to a room as a reasonable standard). The remainder represented the enrollment increase between 1951 and 1952.

Nearly a third of the children enrolled in 1952–53 were affected by the classroom deficit.

The national school facilities survey also disclosed some of the following unfavorable conditions under which American children were attending school. Thus, in 1952:

More than half of our classrooms were overcrowded (providing less than 30 square feet per elementary pupil and 25 square feet per high-school pupil).

Fourteen percent of our classrooms provided less than 15 square feet per pupil—a space 5 by 3 feet per child.

Two classrooms out of five had more than 30 pupils in them. Nearly 1 in 10 had more than 40 pupils.

Nearly half of all the school buildings surveyed (47 percent) were built before 1922.

More than 1 building in 5 was over 50 years old. In the mid-20th century, 1 child in 10 was going to school in a 19th century building. Two children out of five were in buildings that did not meet minimum fire safety requirements.

According to ratings by State and local survey teams, 1 out of 5 pupils in 1952–53 was housed in school plants ready to be abandoned and replaced; 2 out of 5 were housed in buildings which needed to be modernized and rehabilitated; only 2 out of 5 were in satisfactory school buildings.

Seven hundred thousand children were on double sessions: 1½ million were going to class in rented buildings or in buildings not designed for school use. (The figures above are derived from the December 1953 Report of the Status Phase of the School Facilities Survey published by the United States Office of Education.)

We must fulfill the Federal Government's responsibility to the children of this Nation. Our schools can no longer be neglected. There are enough glaring examples of inadequate schools throughout the length and breadth of this land to emphasize the need for more adequate financing to alleviate an impending disaster. Accepting this emergency as first in national importance, Congress is called upon to enact legislation marking the beginning of a new period of better understanding that our Federal system is one of partnership based upon a willingness to cooperate in measuring up to national problems affecting all the people. Together we accept the truths that the American schools are in serious trouble throughout the Nation. The Committee on Education and Labor worked for months on this legislation last year. Again I urge that Congress be given a chance to act immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I placed in the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this date a story appearing in the Washington Post entitled "Reds Gear Schools To Win Cold War" by Marquis Childs. I feel that the membership of the House will be interested in Mr. Childs' column on the subject of schools. This Congress must act on this vital issue.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. PERKINS, for 15 minutes today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, that the special order granted him for today may be vacated and that he may have a special order for tomorrow for 60 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. LANE, for 15 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL and to include in his remarks of today and tomorrow in Committee of the Whole in the debate on H. R. 3383 certain pertinent material, including sections of statutes, statements of witnesses, newspaper articles, summaries, graphs, tables, and various papers, each germane to the legislation to be considered.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS and to include extraneous material.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. DAGUE and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska to revise and extend the remarks he makes in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein certain charts.

Mr. COLE.

Mr. YOUNG (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. MCGREGOR.

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WHARTON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. PELLY), for 3 weeks, on account of health.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at request of Mr. ALEXANDER), for today, on account of official business.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 97. An act for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, Pedro P. Dagamac, and Edith Kahler.

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of regret that I announce to my colleagues of the House the death of our senior United States Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable HARLEY MARTIN KILGORE, who died early today at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md. The 63-year-old West Virginia Democrat, serving his third term in the United States Senate, succumbed at 2: 23 a. m. of a cerebral hemorrhage incident to high blood pressure.

Senator KILGORE, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, made an intensive inspection tour of Europe and the Middle East last fall. He became ill in Madrid and was hospitalized for high blood pressure. Upon his return to Washington he went to Key West, Fla., for a rest.

The Senator returned to his duties 2 weeks ago. Following a slight stroke he was again hospitalized at the naval hospital where early reports were he was improving. But on last Saturday he suffered a relapse and passed away this morning from a cerebral hemorrhage.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE was born in Brown, Harrison County, W. Va., January 11, 1893, the son of Quimby Hugh Kilgore and Laura Jo Martin Kilgore. His father was an oil-well driller and contractor. He was a descendant of the pioneer John Kilgore, who settled in Chester County, Pa., in 1730.

He attended West Virginia public schools and received his LL. B. from West Virginia University in 1914. He taught public school in Hancock, W. Va., in 1914–15, and in 1915 organized the first high school in Raleigh County, W. Va., serving for a year as its principal. He began the practice of law in Beckley, W. Va., in 1916.

When the United States entered the First World War, he enlisted in the Army, serving from 1917 to 1920, successively as second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain. In 1921 he became a member of the West Virginia National Guard, was commander of its 2d Battalion from 1922 to 1932 and was long active in its judge advocate general's department. He retired in 1953 as a colonel.

He continued the practice of law until 1933, when he became judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County, W. Va. He was reelected to the judgeship in 1938, and served until his election to the United States Senate. As a judge he won a statewide reputation for his concern with the problems of young offenders, and he was one of the organizers of Mountaineer Boy's State.

He was an ardent advocate of doing something about the matter of our juvenile delinquency. He was one of the founders of the Second Boys State organized in the United States at Jackson Mill in West Virginia.

He was first elected to the United States Senate in 1940, defeating Senator Rush Holt in the Democratic primary and the Republican candidate, Thomas Sweeney, in the general election. He was reelected in 1946, in a year when there were widespread Republican gains in other States, again defeating Thomas Sweeney. He was reelected in 1952, defeating former Senator Chapman Revercomb, the Republican candidate, becoming the first person ever elected by the people of West Virginia to three successive terms in the United States Senate.

Senator KILGORE was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopoly and chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration. He was also a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the State and Justice Departments.

During his years in the Senate he also served on the Armed Services Committee, and the former Senate Committees on Privileges and Elections, Mines and Mining, Military Affairs, Claims, and the special Truman Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

Senator KILGORE early won a national reputation as a liberal Democrat. He sponsored and vigorously supported legislation in a number of fields, for better mine safety laws, more adequate social security and unemployment compensation, fair labor legislation, a Federal program to combat adult illiteracy, veterans legislation, small business and antimonopoly legislation and rural electrification; and in foreign affairs he was an initial supporter of the Democratic programs to combat communism, including the Marshall plan, the Greek-Turkey aid program, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and point 4.

Senator KILGORE assumed the chairmanship of the Senate Judiciary Committee when the Democrats took control of the 84th Congress. He was a liberal and had been a strong supporter of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

Senator KILGORE is survived by his widow, Mrs. Lois Kilgore, two children, Mrs. Albert T. Young, Jr., of Falls Church, Va., and Robert Martin Kilgore, of Washington; a sister, Mrs. C. Russell Turner, of Cleveland, Ohio; and five grandchildren, Albert, Helen, and Bonnie Young, and Scott and Candace Kilgore; an aunt, Mrs. Alva Echols, of Greenville, Pa., an uncle, Foster Martin, of Clarksburg; and a cousin, Wayne Martin, of Clarksburg, W. Va.

Mr. Speaker, may I in this hour of their bereavement take this opportunity to express to Mrs. Kilgore and to her excellent son and daughter the heartfelt sympathies of myself and, I am sure, the heartfelt sympathies of practically every West Virginian.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, today I mourn the loss of a friend, and the Stars and Stripes bows its colors in silent gratitude to Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,

whose love of his fellow man and duty to country has made him a leader among leaders.

This is one of the saddest days of my life for death has taken from me a close and loyal friend. I think back to days gone by when the Senator's family and my own were neighbors in the hills of Monongalia County, W. Va.—when our families were mountain-folk neighbors, working and planning together, grieving and merrymaking together. The friendship between my father and the elder Kilgore was so sincere that when I was born my father declared, "Your name shall be Harley."

So life progressed through the years and each of us followed various paths, but always there were contacts which in a large measure influenced my life, spiritually as well as politically. To me, HARLEY KILGORE has been an ideal, a teacher, a protector.

But the Nation has lost so much more than I. It has lost a servant, tried and tested and proven worthy. He has been the staff of Presidents, and the counselor of the workingman, the teacher, the farmer. He has put the welfare of the Nation and the State of West Virginia above self. Even until almost the hour of his death he was studying and planning and solving problems that face this Nation and the world.

What makes a man great? Surely, it is not the kind remarks, expressions of sympathy, or wordy eulogies in his behalf made after his death. No, I feel a man is great who has so built his record during his lifetime—in his boyhood, youth, and manhood—by his good deeds done for his fellow men.

Senator KILGORE was a good man, a kind man, a Christian, a family man, and a statesman. There is no doubt but that he will go down in the annals of history as a great man.

Yes, I have lost a benefactor; the Nation has lost a leader; but our loss is God's will and we must accept His wisdom.

My heart goes out to Mrs. Kilgore, their son, Bob, and daughter, Eleanor. They have lost a good husband and kind father.

The untimely death of Senator KILGORE is a loss almost too much for the human heart to endure, yet there is much solace and comfort in the knowledge that his years on this earth were spent in service for his fellow men, and to the members of his family I say, may the Good Lord console you with his nearness.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep and personal feeling of bereavement that I rise to join my colleagues in mourning the passing of Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia. Senator KILGORE, who died last night, was more than a distinguished Senator and an outstanding West Virginian. He was a great American who, through his memorable career in the Senate of the United States, has contributed to the Nation a vast number of public accomplishments which will serve well our generation and those who will follow us.

Senator KILGORE's presence among those who guide the destiny of our country will be sorely missed. The loss will not be felt in West Virginia alone. Common people over all the United States have lost a great friend, for Senator KILGORE, throughout his career in the Senate, dating back to 1941, distinguished himself by never losing his faith in the ordinary citizen. His sole guide in reaching a decision on any public matter was inevitably the interest of that great body of men who have so few powerful voices to speak for them in Washington—the average American citizen.

Senator KILGORE had a keen analytical mind. He was an avid reader with a broad knowledge of history and Government. He could understand and contribute to the solution of complex national problems. Yet he never lost his regard and respect for the private individual. Despite his knowledge and his high office he possessed true humility. Whether on a trip through West Virginia or at his office in Washington he was ever ready to discuss a personal problem, however small, with any of his constituents. His door was always open to anyone; the Senator's advice was available to all who sought counsel with him. He, therefore, leaves behind him a host of people in every walk of life who were privileged to meet him and receive his personal help.

The achievements of Senator KILGORE have been so numerous and so imposing that but to review them is to wonder at the magnitude of the spirit which evoked them. I shall not presume to set them out here today completely. Nor can I presume to relate here the highlights of his career. From a series of great accomplishments, who can profess to designate the greatest. Senator KILGORE retained a lifelong interest in advancing legislation in the field of human rights. He was prominent in the fight for better social security, rural electrification, and unemployment compensation. He maintained a vigorous interest in our foreign affairs. He supported the Marshall plan, the Greek-Turkey aid program, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the point 4 program.

In the Senate he served with distinction on the Judiciary Committee, of which he was chairman at the time of his death. He contributed much to the soundness of our law through his work on this committee.

During World War II he cooperated with former President Truman on the special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. We all know the accomplishments of this committee headed by then Senator Truman. To these accomplishments Senator KILGORE contributed immeasurably.

Although the man is no longer with us, the very programs with which he was associated will be judged by the historians of the future as beacons of progress in our Nation's development, and the name of Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE will live in the continued expansion of the work he leaves behind him.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Sixth West Virginia District [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the tributes which have been paid to a distinguished public servant. Senator KILGORE was my friend, a friend of the kind we find only once in a while on earth. I might say that he was my neighbor, too, because he came from my own Raleigh County. The people of my county and State loved and respected Senator KILGORE. They respected him because he was brilliant; they loved him because he was humble. They mourn his passing, not alone for what they have lost but also for the great man which our Nation has lost.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the privilege of every man to build for himself a great shaft of granite or to engrave his name upon a plate of bronze. It is, however, within the power of every human being to so live as to plant an ever-growing flower of love within the bosoms of all whom he meets. Senator KILGORE planted this flower, and it will never cease to shed its fragrance in the lives of those who knew him.

I know that words can do little to relieve the sorrow which has come to Senator KILGORE's family. Words cannot remove the vacant chair or heal the wounded heart. My sympathy goes out to his companion and to those whom he left behind when he embarked upon the voyage to that bourn from which there is no return. They will miss him. We will miss him. But there is comfort in the knowledge that the painful question asked centuries ago by Job, "If a man die, shall he live again?" was answered by the Man of Galilee:

> I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.

This is the hope that leads us on in the day of trials, the hope that enables us to believe that some day, somewhere, we shall see our friend again.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from West Virginia may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, this is, indeed, a sad day for me. This is a sad day for West Virginia and for the people of the United States. News came over the radio this morning of the passing of my very dear friend, the Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE, a beloved Member of the United States Senate from West Virginia.

Senator KILGORE was truly an outstanding West Virginia son. He was a wise man, an able lawyer, a soldier of respect, a judge of note, a legislator in the truest sense of the word. All West Virginians were gratified to see him serve

as chairman of the respected Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate.

He was a fine husband, a considerate father, an excellent citizen. In fact, earlier this month, Senator KILGORE had been unanimously selected as West Virginia's Son of the Year for 1956. This is an award given to West Virginia's outstanding son.

Today, my memory goes back to my own late husband. During our years together here in Washington we both treasured our friendship and association with Senator and Mrs. Kilgore. Especially after the passing of my own husband did I appreciate the wise counsel and true friendship so generously and graciously extended by HARLEY KILGORE.

A wise and steady voice in the guidance of the affairs of state has been silenced—a great loss to our Nation. However, I cannot help but feel that we are—as a Nation and as individuals—better off because of the life and work of HARLEY KILGORE. He was truly a dedicated public servant who gave freely of his energy and ability. He respected human rights. As a true friend of the workingman, he served all of the people faithfully and well. We are grateful to this great statesman.

To his loyal and wonderful wife, Lois, and to his two children and his grandchildren, I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy, and reaffirm our close and binding friendship.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this moment to pay my respects to the memory of, and to express my regret at the passing of, Senator KILGORE.

It was when I was in North Korea in December, 1950, that I received from my wife a newspaper clipping from the Newark News showing Senator KILGORE in Newark, N. J., addressing a State democratic group at a banquet. Part of the mission of the banquet was to elect, I later discovered, myself, to the Congress of the United States. So, in absentia, Senator KILGORE did much for me in helping to bring me to the Congress. How then can one forget such a man? It was natural when I arrived in Washington to look the Senator up; I expressed my thanks to him and with those thanks there was a reciprocity of feeling that prevails even to this very moment; a great warmth existed between Senator KILGORE and myself.

I suppose if in certain religious faiths it is permissible to say, "The Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost" when we pay our respects to the One, so too, I wonder if we can, in speaking of our fellow man, say that each of us is three people—the person we know ourselves to be, the person that others believe we are, and that person that each of us strives to be in that little window of the mind.

I believe I knew Senator KILGORE as he knew himself. I knew him as I saw him in action, and I think I knew him in that little window of the mind that brings us all here to the Nation's Capitol to legislate what is best for the future of America while shepherding its present. He was a student who liked to evaluate the present and point for the future by revelations of the past. For instance, it was news to me that as early as the Russo-Japanese War in 1904 and 1905, there was a plan by certain Americans to girdle the globe with a railroad from Alaska to London across the Bering Sea through northern Russia to Scandinavia thence south to Calais and under the English Channel to Dover thence to London.

That plan was stymied by certain interests headed by Prince Ito in Japan who sought as a condition a priori from Russia for the peace that ensued at Portsmouth that America not be allowed to go ahead with its railroad around the world. Senator KILGORE said that had we had that railroad and had Pearl Harbor been more destructive than it was to our fleet and had we met more substantial opposition from the submarines of the enemy, and had we been paralyzed on the water, this American dream of the early 1900's of the railroad around the world running as it would have through the lands of our allies, could have and would have saved us. It would be interesting to know what force that tacit Russo-Japanese agreement has today. Senator KILGORE, to me, was always thinking of alternatives, always thinking of what America could do, should do in the face of any sudden danger that could come upon it. Your measure as an individual in the service of your fellow man, it seemed to him, was your ability to come up with an alternative which would spell safety and happiness in the face of disaster or peril.

I think the aforementioned discloses, perhaps, that the Senator was a deep student of history. He liked to weigh his opinions with an evaluation of the past so that you could understand why conditions were as they were today without your taking the meat axe out and hitting over the head the man who might be in opposition to you because his appreciation of a predicament is based on his understanding of facts as seen through his window, not yours.

Situations that one often confronts here in the Congress, according to Senator KILGORE in my discussions with him, come about because of crosscurrents of thought, of movements, opinions, and facts that are available to people when they act as they do. He once said: "Do not ever make a conclusion unless you understand why any man does as he does. Even though you think you are right, allow that man his say, his opinion, with you, not just in court but in conversation and debate."

We traveled together in November of 1951. It was there, on that trip to Europe which carried us as far as Athens where I met his charming wife, Mrs. Kilgore. In Geneva at breakfast one morning we discussed many things confronting the world. Always Senator KILGORE came up with the human equation. The interest of man was the practical interest. Always you could see man against the silhouette of the sun. The shadows that were cast by man he said oftentimes were shadows of sorrow brought about by the ills of other people.

He was never afraid of a combination of men or organized groups against him; rather did he say: "So long as I know that what I am doing can promote the best interests of the individual, and multiply that man by the many millions which go to make up the United States, then do I know that I am serving the best interests of the United States. But for me to simply disregard people and say that I stand for the best interests of the United States without a regard for the one man we should preserve, and that is the citizen and his integrity, would make me false." After all, our great reservoir is in Christendom; in the spirit of the life of Christ to support mortal man; and yet, what is the lesson of Christianity? Lay hands on Christ and you crucify Him as they did in those days of old—one man who was just another person—and they did not give him the time of day. And his defense? Study the trial of Christ and see how unjust it was. That was Senator KILGORE'S philosophy, the philosophy of tolerance and understanding. How different from worldly judgment; if you say you are a Christian, you give a person every consideration; you dare not move one false step in his direction without being guilty in your time of the crucifixion of Christ. We are all God's children. Such a profound man was Senator KILGORE. Many people look at the crucifixion of Christ as an isolated, historical thing that took place 2,000 years ago. It is repeated every day when we move falsely against man. In this Senator's judgment we should be guided by the simple spirit of the Christ toward the millions of our fellow men.

In closing, I wish for Mrs. Kilgore and the family of the Senator every happiness that it is possible for them to muster in this moment of their bereavement, happiness that will live with them from here on out in knowing that there are others in the land who will carry on the inspiration of the Senator they cherish. I shall try as long as I can.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and public service of Senator KILGORE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked this morning when I heard the sad news of the passing of Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia. While I was aware of his illness and confinement to the Bethesda Naval Hospital, I gathered from the public press during the past few days that he was much improved and was about to return to his home.

I knew the distinguished Senator quite well and considered him a close and loyal friend. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Judiciary, and Related Agencies. As I

hold similar status in the House, I naturally had occasion to see and talk with him from time to time and of course we served together on the conference committee in connection with the annual appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Judiciary, and Related Agencies. He was also chairman of the powerful Judiciary Comimttee.

I have always found HARLEY KILGORE intensely loyal and sincere. He had the esteem and respect of all his fellowmen. During his service in the United States Senate he made a great contribution to good government and his passing is a tragic loss to his State and country.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his lovely wife and son and daughter in their bereavement.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 411).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profund sorrow of the death of Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE, a Senator of the United States from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appoints the following as members of the funeral committee on the part of the House: Messrs. BAILEY, STAGGERS, Mrs. KEE, Messrs. BYRD, MOLLOHAN, BURNSIDE, and SILER.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, February 29, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1579. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1954, and the Fire and Casualty A-*, approved October 9, 1940"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1580. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1581. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff as of December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 201 (c) of Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1582. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 10th annual report describing the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year 1955; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1583. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 24, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Springsteel Island, Minn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1584. A letter from the Secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting a report of its activities during the year 1955, pursuant to the charter of the National Institute of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8535. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1955, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems; with amendment (Rept. No. 1822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 408. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9429, a bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1823). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 409. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2128, a bill to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1824). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 410. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9428, a bill to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1825). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; with amendment (Rept. No. 1826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9257. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody; without amendment (Rept. No. 1828). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 402. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 5918 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 406. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 7176, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Morton J. Krakow; with amendment (Rept. No. 1831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2900. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5580. A bill for the relief of Juanita Gibson Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7074. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; with amendment (Rept. No. 1834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7075. A bill for the relief of Bunge Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7377. A bill for the relief of Donald W. Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7703. A bill for the relief of Dora Thelma Andree; with amendment (Rept. No. 1837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 66. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 67. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 68. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 9582. A bill to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9583. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9584. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for certain hearings before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission at locations convenient to claimants; to provide that claimants shall be afforded the right to examine evidence in the possession of the Commission, and to examine and cross-examine witnesses; to provide judicial review of certain actions of the Commission; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 9585. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 9586. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9587. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 9588. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9589. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 9590. A bill to amend section 317 (a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 9591. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLYLE:

H. R. 9592. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers, subject to certain conditions, to grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 9593. A bill to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 9594. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 9595. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works for flood control and other purposes on the Sacramento River in California; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 9596. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 9597. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 9598. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9599. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 9600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for amortization deductions with respect to housing facilities for farmworkers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9601. A bill to provide that certain voluntary employees' beneficiary associations shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9602. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 9603. A bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 9604. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Sergeant Floyd Monument as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 9605. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel post) mail matter at the post offices at St. Joseph and South St. Joseph, Mo.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 9606. A bill to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 9607. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 9608. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works for flood control and other purposes on the Sacramento River in California; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H. R. 9609. A bill relating to the compensation and term of office of the judge of the District Court of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 9610. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River for flood control and allied purposes in the vicinity of Mankato and North Mankato, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 9611. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 9612. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9613. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 9614. A bill to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 9615. A bill to reduce the percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 9616. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9617. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 9618. A bill to amend and clarify section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to confirm jurisdiction in the Federal courts to enforce section 9 (g) (3); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9619. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 9620. A bill creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 9621. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 9622. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain sales of antique weapons from tax under section 4181 thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 9623. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 9624. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 9625. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 9626. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 9627. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 9628. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 559. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent interference with the police powers of the States and to prevent interference with the power to regulate health, morals, education, marriage, and general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. J. Res. 560. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H. J. Res. 561. Joint resolution designating December 1, 1956, as Civil Air Patrol Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. J. Res. 562. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. J. Res. 563. Joint resolution authorizing the construction of certain water conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution expressing the friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Italy and expressing the hope that Italy will remain one of the free and democratic nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 412. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study railroad accidents in the United States, giving particular attention to the accidents recently occurring in New England; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Res. 413. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study railroad accidents in the United States, giving particular attention to the accidents recently occurring in New England; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 414. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 11, a bill to reaffirm the national public policy and purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing grants-in-aid to State agencies for the promotion and enforcement of safety in industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9629. A bill for the relief of Eva Magalhaes y Aguirre alias Eva Pugliese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9630. A bill for the relief of Anna Rossetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 9631. A bill to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 9632. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clarabelle Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 9633. A bill for the relief of Paul Clifford Wilkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9634. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 9635. A bill for the relief of the Sergeant Bluff Consolidated School District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 9636. A bill for the relief of Chi-Tsu Tsang; his wife, Yung-tsing Hwang Tsang; and their children, Arlene Bai-Hwa Tsang, Betty Lai-Hwa Tsang, Carl Yang-Hwa Tsang, Doris Tiau-Hwa Tsang and Diane Si-Hwa Tsang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9637. A bill for the relief of Kwen Fang Sun, his wife, and his minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 9638. A bill for the relief of Costas George Vernadakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 9639. A bill for the relief of Refugio Guerrero-Monje; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 9640. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property hertofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 9641. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 9642. A bill for the relief of Mariano Santana Llamas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 9643. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Kujawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. J. Res. 564. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

582. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 107 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

583. Also, petition of 47 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

584. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of citizens of Sayre and Bradford County, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

585. By Mrs. CHURCH: Resolution adopted February 21, 1956, by the unanimous vote of the board of directors of the Union League Club of Chicago, approving the recommendations of the Hoover Commission insofar as they pertain to the achievement of greater efficiency and economy in the Federal Government, and pledging its support in behalf of the study and adoption of said recommendations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

586. By Mrs. GRIFFITHS: Petition of Mrs. Percy C. Whiting, and 477 others from the Detroit, Mich., area urging the enactment of legislation to establish a commission to study the transportation of obscence and immoral literature in interstate commerce and the necessary legislation to prohibit any such transportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

587. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Associated Farmers of Richland County citing their opposition to social security and also petition of the same group setting forth their opposition to controls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

588. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Pearl Jones Gates and other citizens of Aurora, Mo., protesting alcoholic-beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

589. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Pioneer Water Co., Porterville, Calif., urging the immediate appropriation of the initial funds necessary for the immediate commencement of construction of Success Dam, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

590. Also, petition of the chairman, Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., expressing their support of House Joint Resolution 309 (S. J. Res. 94); the objective of which is to restore the protection of our Federal Constitution to the fundamental rights of United States citizens serving abroad as members of our Armed Forces, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

591. Also, petition of the secretary-treasurer, Weather Control Research Association, Bishop, Calif., requesting that the life of the National Advisory Committee on Weather Control be extended as proposed in Senate bill 2913; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Lake Mead National Recreation Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, there are few people who would not agree that the Arizona Highways magazine, published monthly by the Arizona Highway Department is one of the finest publications of its type to be found anywhere.

Particularly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the State of Arizona on the excellent work contained in the March 1956 issue of Arizona Highways, which is devoted to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, part of which is situated in the State of Nevada. This area comprises 2,655 square miles of federally owned land and joins Grand Canyon National Monument on the east and follows the course of the Colorado River for approximately 185 miles, extending as far south as Bullhead City, Ariz. Within this vast acreage are to be found two sizable and scenic manmade lakes. One of these is Lake Mead, which is formed by the water impounded by Hoover Dam, which is the largest manmade lake in the world, and which with 550 miles of shoreline offers countless panoramas of rugged, beautiful country.

Below Lake Mead and formed by the water impounded by Davis Dam is found Lake Mojave, some 67 miles of rugged canyons and attractive mountain scenery.

To this recreation area last year came nearly 2½ million visitors who were thrilled by the scenic and geologic sights and scientific developments to be seen there. One of the best known visitors last fall came from as far as England. He was Sir David Campbell, and on the placid waters of Lake Mead he set a new world's speed record for hydroplanes.

Mr. Speaker, like all of the 181 areas in the National Park Service, there is much additional work to be done here. Potentially the Lake Mead National Recreation Area is one of the largest playgrounds in the Nation, although up to the present but a small portion of its potential has been tapped.

Even without further development, I am sure that those who have been fortunate enough to visit this area will agree that their efforts were very worthwhile, and the Arizona Highways magazine has done a commendable job in portraying it. It is my hope that the March issue will further kindle interest in the development of our National Park Service, and I am sure that my colleagues from Arizona join me in extending a cordial invitation to all who might be interested in seeing some of the outstanding scenery of the West to visit the Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

Secretary Dulles and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans who have become uneasy of late about the unsteadiness of our leadership in the realm of foreign policy, I read with considerable curiosity the speech delivered February 26 in Philadelphia by the Secretary of State. It is stimulating to have Mr. Dulles with us from time to time to speak for the administration, because the dramatic changes in Communist strategy which have been building up in Moscow for the past year require a thoughtful response from our Government. Mr. Dulles' speech seems to qualify as thoughtful, although it is not always his prepared utterances which make the happiest impact on his public. One looks in vain, however, for new ideas to match the new departures of the Communist high command. We can only hope that this does not signify that Mr. Dulles really believes what he suggested to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 2 days earlier—that the Russians were only at that very moment revising their whole program because of cumulative failures. Any newspaper reader realizes that the revision of the Communists' approach to the world has been in effect most drastically for many months.

Yet even though the Secretary of State made no really new proposals in his address, I fear that the response of his party followers in Congress will be something new. Ordinarily an administration spokesman can expect the Members of his own party in Congress to applaud and support his recommendations.

This should be particularly true in matters which truly embrace the national interest, as do our relations with the underdeveloped nations of the world. If a Secretary of State, himself, cannot command such allegiance, surely his President should be able to find friendly voices among his own party in Congress to speak up in favor of his recommendations. Yet the one idea in Mr. Dulles' address which evidences any degree of freshness is one that has been met by silence within his own party—a silence made all the more humiliating by the fact that a band of Democratic Members of the House have publicly announced themselves in favor of the proposal.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the request made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union address that he be given authority to commit this country to support a limited number of economic and technical assistance projects for a period of time sufficient to insure their completion. This authority is deemed necessary by the administration to strengthen our policy of positive contributions toward creating a better life among the newly enfranchised peoples of the world whose struggle for democracy is so vitally important to the free nations. Secretary Dulles reiterated this proposal, Sunday. The acceptance of this idea by myself and 16 of my Democratic colleagues was publicly announced on January 22. The President and Mr. Dulles must long for a similar profession of agreement from their own side of the aisle. The idea of advance commitment of aid funds is somewhat new, to be sure, although Congress has certainly indulged in implied commitments in undertaking previous large-scale aid programs even on a yearly appropriations basis. Yet, at a time that cries out for original responses to the changing situation which confronts us, it must be disheartening to the Secretary to find Members outside his own party taking the lead in seconding this modest new suggestion, while his own party colleagues remain eloquently silent.

As a signer of the letter of the 17 House Democrats on January 22, I am happy to renew my support of the Eisenhower-Dulles proposal for limited authority to commit this country to aid important foreign development projects until their completion. It is regrettable, we feel, that Members of the President's own party have not given him and his sometimes harassed Secretary of State a similar expression of approval.

Rabaut Receives Highest DAR Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to the honor bestowed by the Daughters of the American Revolution upon my colleague and fellow Michigander, Congressman LOUIS C. RABAUT. The Daughters presented Mr. RABAUT with their highest tribute—the award of merit—for his efforts in having the words "under God" inserted in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. This ceremony was most fitting, as Mr. RABAUT has worked long and hard to remind the American people that all we are or ever will be is a direct result of divine protection.

I am happy to append the presentation speech of Mrs. T. O. Timberlake, regent of the Continental Dames, District of Columbia DAR, and the acceptance statement of Congressman RABAUT:

ADDRESS BY MRS. T. O. TIMBERLAKE, REGENT, CONTINENTAL DAMES CHAPTER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAR

This great Nation was born of an intense and burning desire for freedom—to live, to

work, and to worship God. The ancestors of the Daughters of the American Revolution sacrificed their all for these ideals. They fought with every tangible odds against them, except their burning zeal and their supreme faith in God. Everything they did was done in faith and the knowledge that God was with them. In every deliberation and every meeting or battle—in their homes—they asked God's blessing and His guidance. They suffered hardship and privation, they fought and died in the bitter cold and snow with prayers on their lips and they sat down to write the greatest documents ever written, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, only after invoking God's blessing and guidance. And America grew and prospered.

Somehow, we seem to have forgotten God—we have forgotten that He is still and will always be our only hope and refuge and that it is we who have separated ourselves from Him, and not He from us.

You, Congressman RABAUT, have done a beautiful and a far-reaching service to your country and to the American people by introducing and engineering the passage of a bill in Congress to insert the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag—thereby bringing constantly to our thoughts the fact that this Nation is under God.

The Daughters of the American Revolution strive constantly to preserve the American way of life—to keep ever sacred the ideals of our Founding Fathers, and because what you have done is so definitely consistent with our purposes, Continental Dames Chapter of the District of Columbia, DAR, has empowered me, their regent, to present to you the Daughters of the American Revolution Award of Merit for 1956—the highest honor within our power to bestow.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN LOUIS C. RABAUT

It is a great pleasure to have an endeavor of mine honored by such a distinguished group as the Daughters of the American Revolution. Your organization long ago became synonymous with patriotism, devotion to duty, and moral strength.

I want to thank especially Mrs. Timberlake and the Continental Dames Chapter for the kind invitation to come here today and receive your coveted award of merit.

Perhaps you have wondered what set of circumstances combined to bring about this historic change in the wording of the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

I certainly would never infer that I was the first to strive for a recognition of the Almighty in our national affairs. On the contrary, many organizations and individuals have sought to accomplish this worthy end. The Knights of Columbus and the American Legion had unofficially incorporated the meaningful words in their pledge recitation prior to my bill. The first suggestion for appropriate legislation came to me from a private citizen, a Mr. Mahoney of Brooklyn. Also, the Reverend Doctor George M. Docherty, pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, in a sermon with the President in attendance, spoke on the subject of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and urged that the phrase "under God" be added to the pledge of allegiance. I am happy and proud that I was able to be the instrument of change.

In addition to my Under God bill, I introduced a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide a mail cancellation die bearing the words, "In God We Trust."

When the 3-cent and 8-cent stamps were issued bearing this motto, I did not press for further action on my bill, but later introduced a bill of similar importance, using instead the words "Pray for peace." This bill, H. R. 692, was passed in the House last year and it is now in the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I would appreciate you contacting member friends throughout this country and urge them to write their Senators in support of my action. I feel that mail going throughout this country and the world bearing the words, "Pray for peace," cannot help but turn men's minds toward the only One who can really give us the peace so urgently sought in these troubled times.

How proper it is that we, as the first of the sister nations of the earth, proclaim to the whole world, as did our Founding Fathers, our praise and dependence upon Almighty God.

In closing, I would like to thank you again for inviting me here today. You are a most gracious group of ladies. I will always remember this day and cherish this high honor you have bestowed upon me.

Politics and Parity; Sanity and Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, there is now under debate in the other body one of the most unsound, unrealistic, and wholly demagogic bills that has ever been presented to any Congress. I refer specifically to the pending farm bill which undertakes to combine the administration's soil bank plan with a restoration of 90 percent supports.

The proponents of this outlandish combination ignore completely the established fact that farm prices hit the toboggan while high rigid supports were in full force and effect, and it is without all logic and contrary to commonsense to now turn to a device under which the farmer has taken his worst licking as a means of restoring him to economic parity with the rest of industry.

The soil bank plan is designed primarily to eliminate the agricultural surpluses which have acted as a price-depressant, and we certainly meet ourselves coming back when we reinstitute high supports which can only serve to accelerate production and start the extra crops, for which there is no market, again rolling into Government storage bins.

The proponents of this legislative throwback, motivated solely by the concern for the farm vote, are charging the administration—and Secretary Benson—with dragging their heels in attempting to dispose of the enormous pile of food and fiber now in Government hands, whereas the record is quite clear that with 90 percent supports we have priced ourselves completely out of the foreign market. The Secretary is striving with might and main to dispose of this albatrosslike burden from around the Department's neck, but the best he has been able to do is to sell his goods at cutrate prices or for counterpart funds, either of which means a staggering loss to the American taxpayer.

Those who are now bleeding so profusely for the farmer—while all the while they are concerned only with his vote—should come forth honestly and advocate a straight cash subsidy to take care of the differential between farm income and farm costs. I would, of course, vote against such handouts just as I have always opposed high rigid supports, although I must concede that such a plan would be marked by an honesty which is wholly absent from the current legislative monstrosity now pending in the other body.

The following is an editorial taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 25, wherein the finger is put directly on the inconsistencies embodied in this current hybrid—which in common with its kind can only prove to be sterile:

GET POLITICS OUT OF FARM SUPPORT BILL

Just about the most freakish—and most unsound—legislation ever attempted on America's farm problems is the hybrid bill now before Congress.

It is an election-year monstrosity in which Democrats, for perfectly obvious political reasons, are linked with some farm State Republicans to force a return to the high rigid farm price-support system. In this move the high, unalterable, and artificial support plan is jammed on top of the administration's "soil bank" proposal.

That would make the measure, by which the administration aimed to reduce excess acreage and thereby to hold down huge, unmanageable farm crop surpluses, worthless.

Is this politically motivated scheme headed toward greater prosperity for farmers? Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, declared in a speech yesterday, "High rigid price supports never have brought prosperity to the American farmer and never will."

But they have brought the dead weight of vast, unusable, unsalable accumulations of wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts. We think Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson called the turn in his television appearance Thursday night when he declared, "Surpluses are smothering farm prices and income."

They can't be sold to any worthwhile extent; can't even be given away. But they hang like a vast pall over the farmers of the United States: always a threat to existing prices; always a brake on better prices.

Senator AIKEN showed yesterday how the real upsurge of farm prosperity came from the Second World War; then from the Korean conflict. Farm prices, he said, skidded between those two outbreaks; then took another downward turn starting in 1952.

Congress gave President Eisenhower a mandatory directive to continue the high price supports—the 90 percent of parity system—for 2 years, the Senator said. And what happened? It filled the Government and other warehouses to overflowing again. It made farmers—to be paid with tax money—plough and sow acreage far above requirements to produce immense crops that had no place to go except those warehouses.

Mr. Benson has fought valiantly, and continues to fight, for a formula that will cut down unneeded crop acreage, and unusable crops, and in time reduce the need for all this storage of crops nobody wants. Senator AIKEN took a significant jab on the latter point in his speech when he referred to some champions of high-level supports as people "making fortunes out of storage of Government surpluses." Few, if any, of those engaged in crop storage are farmers.

The important thing Senator AIKEN did yesterday, as Mr. Benson has been doing all along, is to shed a clear light on the hard facts about high farm price supports: That

they didn't solve farm problems and won't solve them if tried again.

The administration bill seeks, by reducing acreage—for which farmers would receive a subsidy, and a realistic application of flexible farm price supports—to create barriers against greater and greater surpluses.

But the farm-bloc amendments, for the 90-percent-of-parity supports, would wipe out the soil-bank plan. It's plain enough the soil bank would work to reduce farm crop surpluses; the high-level supports would make certain that more surpluses would occur. That shows how charged with politics the farm bloc's 90-percent-of-parity revival is.

For the farmers, and the Nation, it would be a backward step to continue the same faulty attempt to meet farm problems that have failed in the past. No sound, permanent solutions of those problems can be worked out by politicians for political reasons. The Eisenhower-Benson program seeks real and lasting solutions. Without the crippling partisan amendments that have been loaded on to it, that program should have the full support of farmers and all other citizens of the Nation.

The Upper Colorado River Storage Project Threatens California's Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Congressman ENGLE has alleged that the testimony of California witnesses proves that the Colorado River project will not threaten California's water rights. To reach this position, which is diametrically opposed to the conclusions reached by these witnesses, Congressman ENGLE on the one hand has relied upon quotations taken out of context, while on the other he has ignored those parts of the testimony which point out the serious danger in the upper basin project to the State's water rights.

Not only are Mr. ENGLE'S conclusions at odds with those of the legal and engineering experts upon whom he seeks to rely, but they are directly contrary to the official position of the Legislature of California, the State's attorney general, and the Colorado River Board.

Assembly Joint Resolution 37, enacted by the California State Legislature last May, is as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 37

Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to pending legislation affecting the waters of the Colorado River

Whereas more than 6 million people of this State depend upon the Colorado River as an important source of water for irrigation, domestic and industrial needs; and

Whereas the metropolitan area of southern California, including Los Angeles, San Diego, and some 60 other cities depend on the Colorado River for water and hydroelectric power; and

Whereas the Colorado River is the sole source of water to irrigate over 1 million acres of land in this State; and

Whereas legislation is now pending in the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of two major power and irrigation projects in the upper basin of the Colorado River at an estimated total cost approximating $1,750,000,000; and

Whereas one of these projects as contemplated by S. 500, H. R. 270, and companion bills, known as the Colorado River storage project, includes (1) the construction of 6 large dams creating reservoirs with an aggregate storage capacity of 44 million acre-feet, and (2) the construction of 14 or more irrigation projects known as participating projects; and

Whereas these storage dams are not required to serve the proposed irrigation projects but would store water for power purposes under interpretations of the Colorado River compact now being defended against by California in the United States Supreme Court in *Arizona* v. *California et al.;* and

Whereas the major irrigation participating projects are very costly transmountain diversion projects to take large amounts of the highest quality water out of the Colorado River Basin to other river basins; and

Whereas the other project, as contemplated by S. 300 and H. R. 412, and known as the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, is also a very costly transmountain diversion project to take the best quality water out of the Colorado River basin to the Arkansas River basin, and is the initial phase of a project to divert 900,000 acre-feet of water per annum out of the Colorado River Basin; and

Whereas both of these projects are based upon interpretations of the Colorado River compact which are now at issue before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Arizona* v. *California et al.;* and

Whereas these projects, if constructed under those interpretations, would be detrimental to both the quality and quantity of water to which California has rights long established by prior appropriation as well as by contracts with the Federal Government for projects now constructed; and

Whereas both proposed projects are based upon questionable standards of financial feasibility and if constructed would cost the taxpayers of our Nation several billion dollars in the form of a subsidy to the lands which would be irrigated; and

Whereas California is the second largest taxpaying State in the Nation, and would therefore be doubly injured if these projects were authorized both by the impairment of the quality and quantity of water to which existing California projects have established rights, and by the burden of a tremendous taxload: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to suspend further consideration of legislation authorizing the Colorado storage project and participating projects, and legislation authorizing the Fryingpan-Arkansas project until the Supreme Court decides the case now before it; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

The State's attorney general, Hon. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, stated as follows on February 24, 1956:

In the interest of sound reclamation and sound national economy, the upper Colorado River project bill ought to be decisively defeated. I understand that it is scheduled to come up for a vote in the House of Representatives during the week of February 26.

I am convinced that the upper Colorado River project bill as it is being presented to Congress will adversely affect California's vitally important water rights on the Colorado River.

The office of the attorney general now is engaged in defending California's water rights on the Colorado River in a suit pending before the Supreme Court. With this suit in progress, certainly every other precaution also must be taken to protect California's rights on the Colorado River from harmful legislative measures. I believe the upper Colorado River project bill constitutes such a threat.

There are other basic reasons why the bill should not be adopted. Certainly it is inconsistent for our good neighbors in the upper Colorado River Basin to press for a bill that would bring hundreds of thousands of acres of land into crop production at a time when Congress is faced with the plan to pay farmers billions of dollars to withdraw some 40 million acres of farmland from crop production.

I am convinced that there is no justification for the passage of the upper Colorado River project bill at this session of Congress.

The argument advanced by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] in rationalization of his own position is not a new one. He first advanced it in March 1955, during the House Interior Committee hearings upon the Colorado River storage project on cross-examination of the California witnesses. It was fully and effectively answered at that time—see House hearings on H. R. 3383, pages 977–992.

The following colloquies are illustrative. At page 982:

Mr. ENGLE. If I correctly interpret that statement, it means that this Congress could authorize, and the Bureau of Reclamation could build, all of these participating projects without the impairing by as much as one bucketful the water to which California is entitled under the Colorado River project.

Mr. ELY. Subject to two qualifications: First, if they were built without the construction of storage works which would intercept our water supply; second, to the degree that they do not involve transmountain diversions which would impair the quality of water.

* * * * *

Mr. ELY. Bear in mind two things, Mr. ENGLE: First, quality of water, which we reserve at all times under article 8 of the Colorado River compact; and, second, in all of my answers to you, you and I are both dealing in complete ignorance of the claims of the United States for the use of Indians and as to whether they would be adjudicated to be ahead of the compact and outside of the compact. If they are, then no answer I give you can have any validity whatever because none of us know how much water the upper basin or lower basin would have coming to them after the satisfaction of those rights.

At page 989:

Mr. ENGLE. All I am asking is, Do I interpret that statement correctly, that the State of California and the Colorado River Board regard Glen Canyon, standing by itself, as a sound project?

Mr. ELY. Not as proposed; no, sir. May I explain?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes, if you can explain that; go ahead.

Mr. ELY. In Glen Canyon, as proposed, the financial setup is based upon the assumption there may be withheld from the lower basin and accumulated in storage for power generation at Glen Canyon, water which may not lawfully be held there under the Colorado

River compact. Such water must be released to the lower basin and is not available for power generation at Glen Canyon. That is point 1. Point 2: The 6-mill rate proposed here is not realistic. This project is not sound economically.

At page 991:

Mr. ELY. The storage project would be constructed, operated, and filled on the assumption that the upper basin may retain in storage during the filling period, which is about 20 years, some two to three million acre-feet per year that we say the lower basin is entitled to receive. It withholds that from us. That is the consequence during the filling period. There would be a consequent reduction in the quantity of water available for consumptive use in the lower basin in violation of the power contracts. I am still speaking of the filling period. After the reservoirs are filled, then the consequences depend upon the rate of development of the consumptive use in the upper basin.

The plans of the Bureau of Reclamation contained in House Document 364 are based upon the assumption that the ultimate consumptive use planned by section 2 of the bill will be at the rate of 9,500,000 acre-feet in extreme years and will average 7½ million and be calculated upon depletion instead of consumption at the site of use. That means a permanent deprivation of water from the lower basin of about 2 million acre-feet, taking into account the further consequences of the Mexican Treaty.

So my answer to you is, sir, that the effect of this project is immediate in withholding from the lower basin 2 million acre-feet or more per year to which we are entitled as soon as the gates are closed at Glen Canyon. That situation will prevail during the entire filling period. It will recur thereafter to the extent that the upper basin is developed in accordance with the plans presented in the project before you.

The burden of the reports of the State engineer and of the statements of California witnesses was that the reports on which the upper basin project were planned gave no proper or adequate consideration to the interest of the lower basin States, and that the project was planned on erroneous interpretations of the Colorado River compact, all of which cut California's rights seriously, and that the project should proceed only, first, if there were assurances that these rights were not impaired, and second, if the project could qualify under proper criteria of feasibility and repayment. The project fails in both respects.

In these circumstances it was the absolute responsibility of the representatives of the State and the agencies affected to point out these grave failures to the committee. This was done by Fred Simpson, chairman of the Colorado River Board of California; by board members Evan T. Hewes and Samuel B. Morris; by General Counsel James H. Howard for the Metropolitan Water District who also represented Joseph Jensen, member of the Colorado River Board; by Ben Griffith, president of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles and Gilmore Tillman as counsel for the city; as well as by Raymond Matthew and Northcutt Ely, engineer and counsel for the board respectively, the two persons whom Mr. Engle singles out in his attack.

To bear out the concern and objections voiced by these representatives, there is now at hand an independent engineering report on lower basin water supply entitled "Report on Water Supply for Probable Future Developments in the San Diego County Water Authority, September 1955." One of the engineers who made this report is Raymond A. Hill, who completed a report on Colorado River waters for the State of Colorado in 1953—see Senate Document No. 23, 84th Congress, first session. The San Diego report concludes that the upper Colorado River storage project will have a disastrous effect on the water supply of the densely populated coastal cities of southern California. It states that:

16. When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation, there will not be a sufficient flow in the river below Lee Ferry to supply the full right of the metropolitan water district, namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right.

17. In order to obtain its full right in the Colorado of 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum, it will be necessary to make other arrangements to replace the deficiency resulting from the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project.

18. Any reduction in the Colorado River aqueduct diversions will mean a proportionate decrease in the amount of water available to the San Diego County Water Authority through the existing aqueduct. Its effect on the authority would be disastrous.

See report, page 20.

How, in the face of this report, to say nothing of the testimony made in good faith by California representatives, can the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] support this project, and still say, as he does, "should authorization of the project prejudice California's legal rights to water of the Colorado River, my duty as well as the duty of every other person charged with the responsibility of representing California in or before Congress would be to oppose the legislation with all possible vigor"?

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I beg to advise the House that today I presented to the Congress a resolution on pending farm legislation that was sent me by the Associated Farmers of Richland County, Inc., of Mansfield, Ohio. It sets forth their opposition to any form of Federal control or subsidies.

I also have presented to the Congress a resolution on social security by the Associated Farmers of Richland County over the signature of its chairman, John G. Woods.

I respectfully ask the membership of this body to analyze carefully these resolutions.

Compulsory Licensing—The Path to Creative Atrophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article regarding compulsory licensing of patents provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, published in the February 27, 1956, issue of Washington Atomic Energy Report:

COMPULSORY LICENSING—THE PATH TO CREATIVE ATROPHY

(By W. Sterling Cole)

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides advanced legislative principles and standards to guide a rapidly expanding industrial, scientific, international, and military program. It contains progressive principles and is a sound law, except for the so-called compulsory licensing provisions.

A compulsory license to a patent is a governmental order which authorizes persons other than the patent holder to use and benefit from his discovery. I consider such a provision in any law unconstitutional, unreasonable, and an invasion of personal and property rights for no good purpose.

Proponents of compulsory licensing of atomic energy patents argued that the Federal Government had spent some $13 billion developing the atomic energy art; and that the corporations who were contractors of the Atomic Energy Commission would capture important patents, conceived while a contractor, to the exclusion of companies with no prior AEC relationship. I sympathized with this concern. However, compulsory licensing is not necessary to prevent this happening. I believe in a different approach, one which looks to the problem itself. I would deny a patent in any case where the invention or idea rightfully belonged to the Government.

The framers of the Constitution provided in article 1, section 8, clause 8 that Congress would have the power "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." The Constitution does not refer to patents as such but rather to the exclusive right of authors and inventors. I examined the available historical records of the Constitutional Convention and found that the word "patent" was considered by the framers but the words "exclusive right" were chosen instead. I believe this was purposeful—to protect the integrity of the grant—to prevent such things as the compulsory license.

The First Congress created a patent system, using the words "sole and exclusive right" in the first patent statute to describe a patent. With this the concept of exclusiveness was fortified. The patent statutes provided the base upon which industrial America grew. The patent gave a temporary monopoly to one individual or company; yet the system was such that the concepts embodied in the discovery were published for the world to see. The competitor or patentee then set to work to improve upon the invention to insure that once again he could compete in the national market place. This guaranteed a pyramid of development and gave birth to an industrial giant.

Congress, in acting later to curb combinations in restraint of trade, passed the antitrust laws—but these laws left intact the patent monopoly. In recent years there have

been proposals calling for a compulsory licensing system because of alleged monopolistic practices involving patents. Such proposals have failed when faced with the contention that the patent monopoly was a fleeting one—one that passed with the next significant improvement.

The compulsory licensing features of the Atomic Energy Act are the first of their kind. They defy the Constitution because the power of Congress is limited to granting the "exclusive right." This patent with a cloudy title is not exclusive—it is public and open to invasion. Thus, section 153 of the Atomic Energy Act does violence to the patent system and established a dangerous precedent.

The greater reason for having a normal patent system in the atomic energy field exists in the express desire of our Government to quickly bring the benefits of atomic energy development to our people. Compulsory licensing will only lead to the creative atrophy of the Socialist state. Why should one improve upon the patent of his competitor if the Government will give him ready access to the existing invention?

During the debate on the 1954 act, the House at first rejected compulsory licensing and substituted an amendment which I proposed. This is now section 152 of the act. This section provides that any invention or discovery in the nonmilitary atomic field conceived during a relationship with the AEC would be deemed to have been made by the Commission but the Commission can waive this right. The House rejected compulsory licensing, but it was adopted by the Senate, as section 153 of the act. As enacted, the law retained both sections.

In this Congress, I have introduced H. R. 5167 which would abolish compulsory licensing and also modify section 152. The amendment would continue to preclude special patent advantages to contractors—but where section 152 now refers to most any relationship with the AEC, my proposed amendment refers only to those relationships with the Commission which were for the benefit of the Commission. (The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will hold hearings on the Cole bill in March.) It has been the practice of the AEC of late to enter into various contractual relations which are not specifically for the benefit of the Government or of the Commission. An example of such a contract is the so-called access agreement. In such an agreement the Commission contracts to make available to an industrial corporation certain classified information to assist that company in the development of the peacetime applications of atomic energy. The company agrees in return to protect this information. A later idea or discovery produced by this company would not rightfully belong to the Government. H. R. 5167 would therefore amend section 152 so that it would only relate to those contracts which were expressly for the benefit of the Government or the Commission.

Progress in the United States is based upon incentive. This incentive is not only material but has its roots in the satisfactions of accomplishment. I am striving to preserve this.

A Bill for the Protection of Ex-Korean Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution which I hope will correct flagrant abuses by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in the administration of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, which provides for the payment of compensation to ex-prisoners of war for treatment they received in violation of the Geneva Convention of 1929.

The law voting these benefits contained a provision defining a prisoner of war as one who did not "voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress" give aid to or collaborate with the enemy. It is also necessary to keep in mind that the law requires each claimant to satisfy the Commission as to the exact number of days he received insufficient food—for which he is entitled to compensation at the rate of $1 per day—or was subject to inhumane treatment—for which he is entitled to an additional $1.50 per day.

It has been the practice of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, in the case of all Korean prisoners of war against whom no allegations of collaboration have been brought, to presume that the claimants were insufficiently fed and inhumanely treated during the entire period of their captivity. Generally speaking, these claims have been paid promptly and in full.

Unfortunately, a very different situation exists with respect to the processing of claims of prisoners of war against whom derogatory information has been received by the Commission. In these cases, the Department of the Army has furnished the Commission with secret and unsubstantiated allegations relating to the activity, treatment, and attitude of certain POW's during their captivity. Upon receipt of this secret and often hearsay information against a claimant, the presumption that he received substandard food and inhumane treatment has immediately been "suspended" and the claimant has thereupon been requested to establish his eligibility by affirmative proof. In other words, the claim has been disallowed by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and the claimant has then had the burden of proof of establishing either that he was not a collaborator or that he, in fact, actually received substandard food and inhumane treatment during each day of his imprisonment.

Claimants who have requested a hearing after having their claim disallowed on primary examination have been furnished a summary of information which, to my knowledge, has been identical for each claimant. In each case, it reads as follows:

A. Assisted the Communist propaganda by:

1. Writing and circulating peace petitions promoting Communist causes.

2. Writing and publishing articles containing information adverse and inimical to the interest of the United States.

3. Drawing cartoons which promoted communism and reflected adversely on the United States.

4. Participating in the preparation and dissemination of front line surrender leaflets.

5. Attempting to influence prisoners of war to accept communism.

6. Participating in the publication called New Life.

7. Actively participating in a group called Yen-So-Yen (workers) whose apparent mission was to interrogate and indoctrinate newly captured prisoners of war.

8. Serving as chairman of the camp peace committee.

B. Received the following preferential treatment from the hostile forces:

1. Better medical care than the other prisoners of war.

2. Better food and better clothing.

3. Easier jobs.

C. Cultivated the friendship of and were overly friendly with the hostile forces.

D. Frequently visited the Chinese officials of the prisoner of war camp by invitation and voluntarily both by day and night.

E. Were selected and approved by the hostile forces for special jobs such as squad leader and chairman of the peace appeal committees.

These are the general charges, Mr. Speaker, which each ex-Korean prisoner of war must rebut if secret and unsubstantiated allegations against him have been received by the Commission.

Actually, however, a claimant has no way of knowing whether he must affirmatively prove that he was badly treated or whether he must prove that he was not a collaborator with the enemy—or whether he must prove both. In dealing with the issue of collaboration, the policy of the Commission is to be found in a memorandum from the general counsel to the members of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission:

It is suggested that in the disallowance of claims under section 6 (e) of the act in which collaboration is an issue, the decision be based upon the finding that the evidence is insufficient to warrant the conclusion that the claimant, while imprisoned, was not fed or treated as provided in the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929. No reference, expressed or implied, need be made therein to any official document or report which the Commission may have considered.

What the counsel's memorandum says is that the Commission may come to its conclusion on the basis of the issue of collaboration, and then write up its decision, in the same case, on the basis of another entirely different issue. This amazing document also contains the tacit admission that unevaluated, derogatory information, used by the Commission in reaching its decision, is then hidden from the claimant under the pretext that the information never entered the decision. In short, these hapless veterans find themselves deprived of their benefits and given a false reason, to boot.

I think you can see, Mr. Speaker, how closely this appalling procedure resembles the well known shell game. And I am sure you also see how far afield this procedure is from the accepted traditions of American justice.

The legislation which I have introduced today seeks to correct this deliberate and systematic injustice by requiring the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to specifically inform a claimant of the reasons for disapproving his claim either in part or in full. It gives the claimant or his attorney the right to examine the evidence which is the basis of the Commission's determinations, and it prohibits the Commission from considering evidence which cannot be examined by the claimant.

Because many veterans have not been in a financial position to come to Washington to appear before the Commission,

the resolution introduced today provides that hearings shall be held at a location not further from the claimant's residence than the capital city of the State in which he resides. The measure also gives each claimant the specific right to be represented by counsel, to have compulsory process to require witnesses to appear, and to cross-examine all witnesses on whose evidence the Commission has relied in denying his claim or in disapproving it in part. Evidence given by any witness on whose evidence the Commission has so relied, and who is not available for cross-examination by the claimant, must be disregarded by the Commission in reaching its decision.

In order that past abuses may be corrected, Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I have been discussing allows claimants to reapply to the Commisison for redetermination of their claims if, in the past, the claims were denied or approved for less than the full allowable amount, on the direct or indirect ground that the claimant collaborated with any hostile force or enemy of the United States.

Finally, the measure establishes the right of claimants, against whom adverse decisions have been handed down by the Commission, to institute proceedings for the review of such decision by filing a written petition in our Federal district courts.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge the careful and immediate attention of each Member of this House to the legislation which I have introduced today. The time has come to cut through the maze of fraud and hypocrisy which surrounds the proceedings of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. In a letter to me dated January 10, 1956, Mr. Whitney Gillilland, Chairman of the Commission, piously declared that "in the administration of this type of legislation there is no adversary aspect. No one prefers charges or makes accusations. The legislation is of a beneficial nature and the determinations of the Commission are based solely on whether or not a claimant factually meets the eligibility requirements." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a claimant upon whom has been placed the burden of proof to establish that he did not collaborate with an enemy of the United States finds the proceedings to be adversary in every aspect. And I find it more than difficult to understand how Mr. Gillilland can say that "no one prefers charges or makes accusations" when he himself has signed hundreds upon hundreds of letters containing the summary of information against claimants relating directly to the issue of collaboration.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, beyond the circle of whose all-embracing love we cannot drift, turning from traditions which separate us and write our names in different camps of thought and conviction, we pause now for the upward look which makes us one in solemn yet glad communion with Thee, Thou God and Father of all mankind. The heartless cruelty that sweeps the earth often appalls us; but in this hallowed moment we are strengthened by the assurance that when willful man has done his worst he must still reckon with Thee.

Another empty chair in this body reminds each of us that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day. We thank Thee for the service that one whose face we will see here no more rendered with ability and devotion, and for the legion of friends his genial nature bound to him in a loyalty strong as steel. Grant the consolations of Thy grace to the dear ones who mourn his passing.

And now, as today we salute the President of a Nation whose long struggles for freedom boast the names of great emancipators and whose history goes back to the grandeur that was Rome, we pray that Italy, escaping the wiles of those who play on her human problems tempting her to barter her liberty and her very soul for specious promises, may recognize her true friends and tie her future to liberty, rather than tyranny, and to truth, and not falsehood, thus espousing the things that belong to her peace. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 28, 1956, was dispensed with.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 29, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GREEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, since the Senate meets today following an adjournment, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, I ask unanimous consent that any statement made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 221, agreed to yesterday, the Chair announces as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, the following:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

EXPENSES OF FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR KILGORE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and request its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 222) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Hon. Harley M. Kilgore,

late a Senator from the State of West Virginia, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 222) was considered and agreed to.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as of December 31, 1955, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Pearl Shucker, Chicago, Ill., relating to the lowering from 65 to 62, the age at which women could begin collecting social security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to provide for a revision of the Status of Forces Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to implement the Hoover Commission report on the use and disposal of Federal surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from James Real Bird, Vice Chairman, Crow Tribal Council, Crow Agency, Montana, transmitting a copy of the minutes of an emergency council called by the Crow Indian tribe and held February 24, 1956, relating to the sale of certain Indian lands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSING FOR AMERICA'S AGED—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation welcomes the increasing signs that at this session of the Congress, legislation to provide specialized low-rent housing for aged Americans will be enacted.

Already, proposed legislation for this purpose has been introduced on a bipartisan basis.

Moreover, the Eisenhower administration indicates that it, too, has this objective very definitely in mind.

I was pleased, therefore, to receive from Harry G. Slater, first assistant city attorney of Milwaukee, and from Richard W. Perrin, executive director of the housing authority, a resolution, which had been approved by the Common Council of Milwaukee, fully supporting this objective.

I, for one, pledge my own efforts to make sure that ample provision for America's old folks is written into new housing amendments.

Of course, to fulfill adequately the needs of our 14 million elderly people over 65, will require basically the action of the great private housing industry, rather than action on the part of the Government; but to the extent that the Government can encourage such action, it should do so.

I present the resolution from Milwaukee, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION RELATING TO URGING CONGRESS TO INCLUDE IN PUBLIC HOUSING LEGISLATION FOR ADEQUATE LOW RENT HOUSING FOR AGED PERSONS

Whereas there is a definite and growing need for low rent housing for aged people, so that such persons may find comfortable and adequate housing at rentals which they can afford to pay; and

Whereas present housing programs do not adequately reflect the needs of such aged people to secure convenient and comfortable housing; and

Whereas Congress should be urged to specifically provide adequate housing for aged people by including in Federal housing programs now being planned or which may be planned, plans directed toward providing adequate housing for aged people at adequate rentals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, and it hereby declares its policy to be, That adequate housing for aged persons be provided at reasonable rental rates; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be requested to include as a part of its Federal housing program a plan of providing adequate and comfortable housing for aged persons at reasonable rentals, either as to single persons who are aged or as to aged persons forming a family unit; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution urging such a program be forwarded to each representative from this State in the House of Representatives and to the two Wisconsin United States Senators; and be it further

Resolved, That the housing authority of the city of Milwaukee, city attorney's office, and such alderman or aldermen as may be selected by the president of the common council be authorized and requested to confer with Members of Congress and housing officials of the Federal Government for the purpose of urging a housing program for aged persons, as is more fully set forth in this resolution, and that they be further authorized and requested to appear at congressional hearings of either the House or Senate committees dealing with legislation pertaining to housing, for the purpose of explaining the position of the city of Milwaukee and for recommending a program consistent with the objectives of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the persons herein authorized so to do take whatever steps may be required in order to urge the Federal Government to enact appropriate legislation which would permit the local housing authority to make available its present housing to aged persons, either single or in family units, on a preferential basis.

DISASTER INSURANCE—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received from the American Municipal Association, an organization which reflects the views of the mayors of 12,000 American cities, a letter enclosing a resolution adopted by that association at its 32d annual congress recently held in Miami, Fla.

This resolution deals with disaster insurance and urges the passage of appropriate legislation on this subject. The letter from Patrick Healy, Jr., executive director of the association, indicates special interest in the bill which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and I have introduced and which is pending before the Banking and Currency Committee (S. 3137) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Healy, and the resolution, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1956.

The Honorable HERBERT LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The American Municipal Association at the 32d annual American Municipal Congress at Miami, Fla., unanimously adopted the enclosed national policy statement on disaster insurance. The statement which calls upon Congress and the administration to develop a plan for natural disaster insurance reflects the thinking of the mayors of the 12,000 cities who are members of our association.

As you probably already know, a mayor and another city official testified on behalf of this legislation before the House Banking and Currency Committee. Written support of this policy statement was also presented to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee for incorporation in the hearing record.

In view of your keen interest in this matter, you may wish to have our national policy statement incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You may be assured of the support of this association for the bill which you have introduced or for any other Senate bill which will accomplish the purpose of protecting municipally owned property from loss through natural disaster.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK HEALY, JR.,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION 5

Floods of unprecedented magnitude have struck our cities the past year. These disasters have come without warning and have left in their wake a wide path of death, destruction, and suffering. Cities are unable financially to bear the tremendous costs of replacing municipal property that is destroyed.

The principle of distribution of risk through the medium of insurance is soundly established in this country. However, there is no insurance available which will cover losses to our cities from natural disaster: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association calls upon the administration and the Congress to develop a plan for

natural disaster insurance which will adequately protect our cities and which will allow for the maximum participation of private business.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3309. A bill to extend and enlarge the authority to provide housing for servicemen through the use of mortgage financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 3310. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide greater coverage for employees of food industries whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3311. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a permanent museum building to house the relics and other items of historical value of the Fort Berthold Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3312. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in the State of Mississippi to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hershey; and

S. 3313. A bill for the relief of Ruth Carter Fairley; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 3315. A bill to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3316. A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. KERR, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. FREAR when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted, considered, and agreed to:

By Mr. NEELY:

S. Res. 222. Resolution to pay certain funeral expenses of the late Senator Kilgore, of West Virginia.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. NEELY, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, RELATING TO HOUSING FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend and enlarge the authority to provide housing for servicemen through the use of mortgage financing, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a sectional analysis, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and sectional analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3309) to extend and enlarge the authority to provide housing for servicemen through the use of mortgage financing, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 801 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The term 'State' includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and Midway Island."

SEC. 2. Section 803 (a) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the first proviso and inserting in place thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title (except mortgages insured pursuant to the provisions of this title in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955) shall not exceed $3 billion."

SEC. 3. Section 803 (a) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the last proviso thereof.

SEC. 4. Clause (B) of section 803 (b) (3) of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(B) not to exceed with respect to any project an average of $16,500 per family unit, and with respect to all projects for anyone of the armed services an average of $15,000 per family unit, for such part of the property (including ranges, refrigerators, shades, screens, and fixtures) as may be attributable to dwelling use: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be reduced by the average amount per family unit of the replacement cost, as determined by the Commissioner, of all usable utilities which are owned by the United States, and which are not provided for out of the proceeds of the mortgage, and are within the boundaries of the property or project; and."

SEC. 5. Section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 404. Whenever the Secretary of Defense or his designee deems it necessary for the purposes of this title, he may acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer, any land or (with the approval of the Federal Housing Commissioner) any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The purchase price of any such housing shall not exceed the actual cost (as that term is defined in sec. 227 (c) of the National Housing Act with respect to new construction) of the housing as determined by the Commissioner less depreciation thereon at a rate of 2 percent per annum, less the amount of accumulated unexpended reserves for replacement, and less the principal amount and accrued interest under any mortgage or other indebtedness outstanding thereon and assumed by the Government. Property acquired under this section may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this section prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. The authority so to require housing may be exercised by acquiring the capital stock of a corporation owning and operating housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955, but without deduction for such reserves for replacement as are held by the corporation at the time of the transfer of the capital stock to the Government."

SEC. 6. Section 405 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "$9,000,000" and inserting in place thereof "$18,000,000."

SEC. 7. (a) Section 803 (b) (3) of the National Housing Act, as amended, and sections 403 (a) and 403 (b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 are amended by striking out the term "eligible builder" wherever appearing and inserting in place thereof the term "eligible bidder."

(b) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out the term "the builder" wherever appearing and inserting in place thereof the term "the mortgagor."

(c) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out the term "with any builder" appearing therein.

SEC. 8. Section 407 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Any funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be expended by a military department for military construction or by the Coast Guard for acquisition, construction, and improvements may, within the purposes specified in subsection (a) above, be used for capital expenditures other than the amortization of outstanding mortgages."

SEC. 9. Title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 410. (a) In the construction of housing under the authority of this title and title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, the following are the maximum limitations on net floor area for each unit:

"(1) For flag officers and general officers, 2,100 square feet.

"(2) For captains in the Navy and colonels, 1,675 square feet.

"(3) For commanders and lieutenant commanders and for lieutenant colonels and majors, 1,400 square feet.

"(4) For Officers below the grade of lieutenant commander or major, 1,250 square feet.

"(5) For enlisted members, 1,080 square feet.

"In this section 'net floor area' means the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement, service space instead of basement, attic, garage, and porches.

"(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased—

"(1) 10 percent for quarters outside the United States and outside the District of Columbia;

"(2) 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station, base or other installation, based on the grade authorized for that position."

SEC. 10. Section 106 (a) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, is amended by deleting paragraph (9) thereof.

The sectional analysis, presented by Mr. CAPEHART, is as follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1 would redefine the term "State" so as to remove an impediment to the possible use of the title VIII authority in Midway Island and the Canal Zone.

Section 2 would increase the authority of the Federal Housing Commissioner to insure mortgages under the new title VIII of the National Housing Act (Capehart Act) from $1,363,500,000 to $3,000,000,000 so as to increase the number of housing units to be covered thereby from 100,000 (plus 1,000 for the Coast Guard) to 200,000 (including 1,000 for the Coast Guard). At the same time, it would clearly exclude from this limitation the mortgages insured under the old title VIII (Wherry Act). This increase parallels the increase in cost limitations that would be effected by section 4.

Section 3 would remove the time limitation (now fixed at September 30, 1956) on the authority of the Federal Housing Commissioner to insure mortgages under the new title VIII of the National Housing Act. The removal of the customary short-time limitation on the insuring authority of the Federal Housing Commissioner is a recognition of the fact that such insuring authority is merely incidental to the principal objective of title VIII of providing a long-range authority in the Department of Defense for housing for servicemen to be used in the place of authority to construct such housing under a military public works bill. A limited life for the title VIII authority is inconsistent with that objective and is a deterrent to orderly planning, which covers a period of a least 4 years.

Section 4 would increase the statutory limitation on housing constructed under title VIII from $13,500 to $15,000 and, at the same time, include in the $15,000 limitation the cost of ranges, refrigerators, shades, screens, fixtures, and on-site utilities. This cost limitation is not directly comparable to the cost limitation on appropriated fund housing, which does not include work or equipment outside of the house. This amendment would apply $15,000 limitation on an overall service basis but would permit within that overall limitation a 10-percent increase to $16,500 for particular installations. This would insure sufficient flexibility to meet the requirements of the various installations, which vary with the applicable cost factor and personnel complement. This amendment would also clarify the meaning of clause (B) of section 803 (b) (3) of the National Housing Act by rewording the proviso so as to make it a direct limitation on the dollar amount specified in the clause rather than a limitation on the Commissioner's estimate of replacement cost, which is a matter that is dealt with separately in the preceding clause (A).

Section 5 would provide a realistic cost basis for the purchase by the Department of Defense of old title VIII (Wherry Act) housing. That basis would be the actual cost as defined in connection with a builder's cost certification under section 227 of the National Housing Act (which includes a reasonable allowance for builder's profit) and would include an allowance for depreciation on a life basis equal to the usual leasehold term. The fair market value basis for compensation is inappropriate in the case of such a purchase inasmuch as the determination thereof involves the valuation of an intangible leasehold interest directly dependent upon the success or failure of the operation of the project. The use of such method in these cases would involve the capitalization of prospective profits. The danger of windfalls under such a speculative valuation is very great. The amendment would provide a more equitable basis for evaluation.

Section 6 would raise the limitation on the total expenditures for principal, interest, and other obligations, except those of maintenance and operation, of the mortgagor corporation. This increase would be commensurate with the increase in the authority of Federal Housing Commissioner to insure the new title VIII mortgages.

Section 7 is a clarifying amendment and would provide for a greater uniformity of terminology in title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955. It would insure, for example, that section 403 (a) of that title is not intended to require the transfer to the Secretary of Defense of the capital stock of the corporation described in section 403 (b) as being qualified, among other things, to construct housing of the type covered by that act, but rather that it is intended to cover a new corporation formed for the purpose of executing the mortgage.

Section 8 would make construction funds available in connection with capital expenditures that do not immediately result in equivalent savings in appropriations for quarters allowances and hence are not properly chargeable thereto. For example, the cost of acquiring land or housing under section 404 should be charged against appropriations for construction rather than appropriations for quarters allowances. On the other hand, the cost of amortizing the principal and interest of mortgages on housing projects would continue to be charged against appropriations for quarters allowances inasmuch as those appropriations would directly benefit by the withholding of quarters allowances from personnel occupying those housing projects. The maintenance and operation of those housing projects would, of course, be charged to appropriations for that purpose.

Section 9 would apply to title VIII housing the same square footage limitations that are applicable to appropriated fund housing for military personnel in the Department of Defense.

Section 10 would insure that construction contracts entered into under title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 are not subject to renegotiation. The Renegotiation Act of 1951, like the Renegotiation Act of 1944, exempts from renegotiation those construction contracts that are entered into on the basis of competitive bids. There does not appear to be any valid reason why construction contracts entered into under this act on the basis of competitive bids should not be similarly exempted from renegotiation.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide greater coverage for employees of food industries whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3310) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide greater coverage for employees of food industries whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Food Industries Amendments of 1956 to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended."

FINDING AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Congress hereby finds that the existence, in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or in activities affecting commerce, of labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for healthy, efficiency, and general well-being of workers (1) causes commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such labor conditions among the workers of the several States; (2) burdens and affects commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; (3) constitutes an unfair method of competition in commerce; (4) leads to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and (5) interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3 (j) of such act is amended by striking out "or in any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "or in any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof,".

(b) Section 3 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(p) 'Activity affecting commerce' includes any activity in commerce necessary to commerce or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages at rates below those prescribed by this act would burden or obstruct or tend to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce."

MINIMUM WAGES

SEC. 4. (a) That part of section 6 of such act, which immediately precedes subparagraph (1) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and every employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall pay to each of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged, wages at the following rates:".

MAXIMUM HOURS

SEC. 5. (a) Section 7 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, no employer shall employ any of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall employ any of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so

engaged, for a workweek longer than 40 hours, or a workday longer than 8 hours, unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed."

(b) Section 7 (b) of such act is amended by striking out paragraph 3 thereof.

(c) Section 7 of such act is further amended by striking out subsection (c) and renumbering the subsections accordingly.

CHILD LABOR

SEC. 6. Subsection (c) of section 12 of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall employ any oppressive child labor in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged."

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Section 13 (a) (1) and section 13 (a) (2) of such act are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. (a) the provisions of sections 6 and 7 shall not apply with respect to (1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity, (as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations of the Administrator); or (2) any employee employed in any retail establishment by an employer not having more than 5 such establishments and having a total annual volume of sales of not more than $500,000."

(b) Section 13 (a) is further amended by striking out subparagraph (4), including the proviso of such subparagraph and renumbering accordingly.

(c) Section 13 (a) of such act is further amended by striking out subparagraph 5 and renumbering accordingly.

(d) Section 13 (a) of such act is further amended by striking out subparagraph 10 and renumbering accordingly.

(e) Section 13 (b) of such act is amended by striking out subparagraph 4.

(f) Section 13 (b) is further amended by striking out subparagraph 5.

PROHIBITED ACTS; PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE

SEC. 8. (a) Section 15 (a) (1) of such act is amended by adding after the words "sell in commerce", the words "or in any activity affecting commerce", and after the words "sale thereof in commerce", the words "or in any activity affecting commerce."

(b) Section 15 (b) of such act is amended by adding after the words "sold in commerce", the words "or in any activity affecting commerce."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 9. The amendments made by this act shall take effect upon the expiration of 120 days from the date of its enactment.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3316) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to (1) that parcel of land, together with any improvements thereon, which comprises a part of the property commonly known as the Lillie Lela Moore estate, and which is described as lots 5, 6, and 7, block 29, Douglas County, Roseburg, Oreg., and (2) that part of such estate consisting of furniture, personal effects, and jewelry which has been designated by the said Administrator as lot A, personalty, such property having been devised to the United States by Lillie Lela Moore under the provisions of her will probated in 1940, and which has since been declared surplus to the needs of the United States.

The statement presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

The growing interest in our own history is a frequent theme of book reviewers writing with approving amazement of the historical volumes regularly found in the best seller lists. There are many other indications that we are becoming increasingly conscious of our history. One of the most encouraging indications is the tremendous attention given to local history. It is manifested in the infinite number of county historical societies that have been formed, in the number of bronze commemorative plates that adorn the homes where the famous lived and died, in the thousands of markers on streets and lanes that list both the modern identifications and the original name. Deserted courthouses, schools, and churches, from coast to coast and border to border, are saved from wrecking crews when the emblazoned sign "museum" goes up.

In Roseburg, Oreg., the Douglas County Historical Society, under the guidance of the president, Mrs. V. J. Micelli, has evidenced the interest, perception, and fidelity that makes the society's contribution of major importance in the cultural life of the county. The devotion and dedication so characteristic of the leaders of organizations like the Douglas County Historical Society may not bring rewards of ringing praise, public acclaim, or particularly wide recognition. They bring a rich reward, however, in the knowledge that generations to come will have a better understanding of the life and times of those who preceded them. I recall that a few years ago the cars of the last narrow gage railroad to operate in the State of Oregon were hauled quietly and unceremoniously from the State. The transaction brought no more notice than the sale of a used car. An alert historical organization can stop these raids on the very substance of regional and local history. The ever-watchful eye of such organizations can prevent the irremediable loss and dispersal of the indigenous monuments to progress found in every community. Mrs. Micelli and the city manager of Roseburg, George W. Farrell, have provided me with information and facts that show the Douglas County Historical Society is alert and is serving faithfully the trust reposed on them by yet unborn generations.

There is an old house in Roseburg, referred to locally as the Lillie Moore home, which was built a century ago by Lillie Moore's father for his young bride, Alice Gaylord. The home was representative of that stability and permanence befitting a community conscious of its sudden transition from the frontier days and its pioneer origins. It was proudly graced with many of the refinements of mid-Victorians living shipped around the Horn by order of the young groom, Mr. Moore. I have been told how the daughter, Lillie Moore, who passed on at an advanced age, recognized that her childhood home had historical significance and should be preserved as a historical museum. This home has no electric lights, no modern heating or other features common to our day, but it is completely representative of a prosperous, middle-class home of the 1850's.

I have been told how Miss Lillie Moore sat with her neighbors and enumerated pieces of furniture within her home that should be included in any local historical exhibit. Her will, made in 1927, they tell me, evidenced her intent of a bequest for educational and public purposes. Lillie Moore was the last of her line. The family had its beginnings in the New England States, coming to Oregon in early pioneer days.

On her death the property was left to the United States Government in the will probated in 1940, and following a period of litigation, it was given to the Government in 1952. I am informed that the United States has had cash returns to date of $104,630.44 from this bequest.

There remain in the possession of the United States three lots, the old home, and the contents of the home. Of minor value in comparison to that part of the bequest which has been sold, that which remains is admirably suited to the purposes of a museum in a city of over 12,000. I have been asked by the Douglas County Historical Society and by the officials of the city of Roseburg to introduce a bill which would convey to the city this remaining property to be used as a historical museum.

The United States has profited handsomely from the bequest of Lillie Moore. In keeping with her memory, in the interest of the community where she lived and died, and in keeping with the basic intent of her expressed desire in her later years, it would appear that the earliest possible conveyance of this property by the United States Government to the city of Roseburg would be an act of justice and the recognition of a moral responsibility to the local community, which shared in her love and interest.

NATIONAL CIVIL AIR PATROL DAY

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and 42 of my colleagues, namely, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. KERR, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. ALLOTT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be kept on the desk until Monday next, in order that any Senator who

may care to associate himself as a sponsor, may have that opportunity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Delaware.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day, introduced by Mr. FREAR (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. MURRAY) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS TO RELIEVE OFFICEHOLDERS OF PRIVATE OBLIGATIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 20, 1956,

The names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] were added as cosponsors to the bill (S. 3242) to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators) on February 20, 1956.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address entitled "Economic Justice," delivered by Senator BRICKER at the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association meeting at Philadelphia, February 28, 1956.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. HILL, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Thruston B. Morton, resigned. I give notice that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ANALYSIS OF GIVEAWAY CHARGES MADE AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, along with remarks I am about to make regarding the Department of the Interior, Secretary McKay, and certain charges which have been made, I should like to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of certain other charges and allegations made in a series of articles in the Washington Post and Times Herald which purported to go into the giveaway charges made against the present administration.

My staff and I have gone through this series of nine articles which appeared beginning on January 8 through January 16 of this year, and the analysis which I am placing in the RECORD points up the one-sided aspect of these articles, and, in general, the misinformation which has been characteristic of these so-called giveaway charges.

The analysis, which covers the major allegations made in this series of articles, shows once again how some facts have been twisted and other facts totally ignored. It also lends strength to my remarks of January 19, in which I pointed out that a newspaper which has loudly championed freedom of the press, had best begin to practice the responsibility of factuality that the public accepts as a duty of the press. The most rigid and the most demanding of these in the instance of the freedom of which we speak is that reporting be honestly and objectively accomplished.

Mr. President, I submit that a reading of the analysis shows that not only did the articles not follow the course demanded by a free press—fact and objectivity—but that the irresponsible, politically inspired charges which have been made under the general category of giveaway are without factual basis.

The truth is that Secretary McKay and this administration have upheld the highest principles of conservation of our great natural resources, and that if any giveaway did occur, it occurred due to laws which were on the books when this administration and Secretary McKay came into office. The responsibility for any giveaway must be placed at the doors of those who failed to provide remedial legislation, rather than those who administered the law of the land fairly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the analysis of which I have spoken be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I am a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and have been for more than 9 years, but I can join wholeheartedly in support of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona. The Department of the Interior, under the direction of Douglas McKay, has been operated in accordance with law, and, to my knowledge, there has not been one single instance in which anything has been given away.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Utah for his remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMATION OF INTERVIEWS AND DATA FURNISHED WARREN UNNA, WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD STAFF WRITER, IN CONNECTION WITH RECENT GIVEAWAY SERIES

NOVEMBER 25, 10 A. M.

Mr. Unna interviewed the Director. Earl Thomas, Assistant to the Director; Michael Giller, Minerals Officer; Mack Corbett, Information Officer; were also in attendance. Mr. Unna indicated he was seeking information for use in a series of articles and submitted queries based on information he had previously received elsewhere on practically all of the charges made by conservationists in his series of articles. It was in this interview he took the quote attributed to Mr. Giller on Wind River Indian Reservation oil leasing. The quote, "It's debatable whether it's a giveaway to have a competitive lease or a noncompetitive lease," was taken out of context and leaves an unfair impression of what Mr. Giller really said. The remainder of that particular quote was: "By that I mean it is debatable whether the Government always gains any advantage by competitive leasing."

Then Mr. Giller went on to explain that the regulations are designed to bring maximum rates to the Government by having competitive leasing where it is warranted and noncompetitive leasing where it is warranted, namely, in wildcatting or unknown geologic areas for oil and gas. Certain facts were given Mr. Unna on the Wind River oil leasing at this time. Mr. Unna's statement, as always, carefully attributed to "critics of the administration's program," rather than to himself, that the private oil companies now lease for 20 cents an acre with no need for bonus payments, is an oversimplification of the facts that were given him, namely: Department regulations call for payment of rental as follows: 50 cents per acre for the first lease year, no rental for the second and third lease years, 25 cents for the fourth and fifth years, and 50 cents for the sixth and succeeding years.

NOVEMBER 25, NOON

Mr. Corbett, subsequent to Mr. Unna's interview with the Director, gave Mr. Unna a large photostat prepared by the Departmental Information Office of Oregon newspaper clips giving both sides of the Al Sarena question, including Secretary McKay's statement, charges of Drew Pearson, the refutations made by both Oregon daily newspapers, and a favorable analysis by former Governor Sprague of Oregon.

ABOUT DECEMBER 7

Karl Landstrom of the Lands Staff, was contacted by Mr. Unna over the telephone, as result of which he prepared a table of data on withdrawals, restorations, and disposals, showing that approximately 700,000 acres had been disposed of since January 1, 1953, as compared with approximately 918,000 acres from 1945 through 1952. The trend figures on withdrawals and restorations showed that withdrawals exceeded restorations in 1955 and 1954 for the first time in several years.

The figures furnished by Mr. Landstrom are attached.

ABOUT DECEMBER 8

Mr. Unna contacted Mr. Corbett by telephone, requesting figures on acreages under mineral lease or permit by International Nickel, Inc., M. A. Hanna, and Kennecott Corp., in Minnesota. After a careful check of Geological Survey and BLM records, Mr. Corbett telephoned Mr. Unna the following day to give him these data: No leases to any of the three concerns; no knowledge of any 50-year leases pending or granted to International Nickel Co. which Mr. Unna seemed to have inside knowledge from other sources; 5 permits to International Nickel for 3,587.47 acres, and 5 permit applications pending for an additional 4,620 acres. One permit issued M. A. Hanna for 741.03 acres and 1 application pending for approximately 10,280 acres; no permits on record for Kennecott Corp. The original hand draft listing every mineral permit on record for Minnesota, and on which Mr. Corbett prepared the information given Mr. Unna, is attached.

ABOUT DECEMBER 12

Mr. Unna telephoned Mr. Corbett seeking to verify the width of right-of-way granted to Pacific Gas & Electric Co. by Congress near Barstow, Calif., for a natural-gas pipeline. Mr. Corbett advised Mr. Unna the next day that a check of the records, in the short time allowed, did not disclose any actual right-of-way agreement indicating the size of the right-of-way, but that all right-of-way grants are either 40 feet from the centerline or 50 feet from the centerline; therefore, it might reasonably be assumed that the right-of-way was an 80-foot right-of-way, since Mr. Unna's other informants had described it as being 40 rather than 50 feet.

ABOUT DECEMBER 14

Mr. Unna contacted Lewis E. Hoffman, minerals staff officer, regarding a 50-year recorded advance form of lease for International Nickel Co., M. A. Hanna Co., and Kennecott Copper Co. Mr. Hoffman told him his office had no record of such proposed leases and that if any of these companies had conferred with the Assistant Secretary he did not know about it.

In addition to this chronological summation, these Interior Department officials also talked with Mr. Unna in connection with the series of articles which he wrote:

Lee Muck, Staff Assistant, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management. Mr. Muck has since retired from the Department.

Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Parks Service.

John L. Farley, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Clark Salyer, Chief of the Refuge Division, Fish and Wildlife Service.

Alistair McBain, Chief of Information, Fish and Wildlife Service.

THE AL SARENA CASE

Charge: The one big giveaway case in the timber business * * * concerns Al Sarena Mines, Inc. It is extremely difficult to obtain timberland in the National Forest but one way is to obtain the lumber as a mere byproduct to claims for mineral deposits beneath the soil. In the past, Interior has been exceedingly tough on such claims because the timber byproduct being more valuable is usually the real incentive behind the claim for a mineral deposit.

Fact: Under Secretary of the Interior Clarence Davis has made it clear that the decision he made to grant patents in the Al Sarena case was dictated by the law, rather than by an unjustified usurpation by an executive agency of the powers rightly vested in Congress. Here is a quotation from his recent testimony on this point:

"Under the mining laws, which had not been changed since 1872, until last year, a miner who stakes out his claim on public lands and files on it, spends $500 in the development of it, and proves that he has a valid discovery of minerals, is entitled to a patent * * *. There is no reference to timber in the mining laws; whether there is much, little, or no timber make no difference whatever as a matter of law. * * *

"Nevertheless, a few years ago, the Department of the Interior attempted to inject into the mining laws a standard of discovery which required profitable operation and a showing that the mineral deposits had the greater comparative value than other uses. This is not the standard set up by law * * *.

"To allow mining claims to be located and then to judge them on standards other than those set up by the Congress and the Supreme Court is administrative legislation.

"If we are to adopt the philosophy that any Department of Government is vested with such vast powers, then it should be done by an act of Congress and not by administrative decision. * * *

"The wise use of our great national forests is a program supported by all of us. However meritorious that objective, I trust you will agree that we should never distort the law in order to attain it."

Charge: The standing timber on the Al Sarena claims, even before cutting is worth some $638,000—an 8,000 percent return on the company's investment.

Fact: The facts regarding the timber values have been set forth by Under Secretary Davis as follows:

"I must reemphasize at all times that the value of timber on mining claims is not material; that the Congress has never passed legislation which denies mining claims merely because there is timber on them; but there has been comment in the press and I believe from some of the members of your subcommittees to the effect that these claims constitute a timber grab. Let me point out:

"1. At the time these claims were filed on as mining claims, there can be no dispute that similar timber could have been purchased in Oregon for as low as $2 and $3 an acre. The fact that all the claims were staked between 1697 and 1939 would demonstrate conclusively that at least in the beginning there could have been no thought of any profits out of the timber.

"2. The only testimony in the record at the time I passed on the case was the testimony of Mr. G. Robert Leavengood of the United States Forest Service. His testimony is: 'The value of the timber which we would cut now runs about $77,000 on the contested claims.'

"Admittedly, timber has increased in value since this record was made up in 1950, but I have difficulty in believing that it has increased as fantastically as some of the figures which have been so freely used.

"3. If the mine had been developed, even without the issuance of any patent, the timber would have been available for the purposes of timbering the mine if underground workings were pursued and would have been largely lost to the Government."

Charge: Senator W. KERR SCOTT, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the joint investigating committee, finds the Al Sarena case smacks of "bottom of the deck" dealing by "high levels" within McKay's Department.

Fact: Here is the reply by Under Secretary Davis to this charge:

"Mr. Chairman, the language has been used that there was some kind of 'high level interference' in this case. I am a little puzzled as to what is meant by that term. * * *

"If you mean by 'interference' that the Secretary has overruled the decisions of one of the numerous bureaus, then I must protest the use of the language.

"The Secretary of the Interior, and by delegation in this case, the solicitor, is the final judge of the decisions of the Department. All of the actions of this vast army of 50,000 people employed by the Interior Department can be appealed ultimately to the Secretary for decision. * * *

"To say that the Secretary should not reverse field decisions or decisions of the bureaus is simply to argue that the decisions of field offices or bureaus should be final, and that we should have government by bureaucracy without interference from the elected executive branch. I hope it was not meant to imply that I am in error merely because I reverse the decision of some bureau. If so, then there is no need for a Solicitor, there is no need for Assistant Secretaries, and there is little need for a Secretary himself."

FACTS ON ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING WATER AND POWER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN SERIES OF ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD BEGINNING JANUARY 8, 1956

Charge: Not one new start has been made on a large Federal multipurpose dam (like Hungry Horse Dam in Montana) since the Eisenhower administration took office.

Fact: It is technically correct that no new dam "similar" to Hungry Horse in construction or in power capacity has been authorized or construction started. However, Glendo Dam on the North Platte River in Wyoming and the Trinity River development in California are new hydroelectric projects on which construction has been initiated in fiscal year 1956. The Glendo Dam will have 24,000 kilowatts capacity and the Trinity River project 233,000 kilowatts. The administration has supported Libby Dam in Montana, the upper Colorado River storage project, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado. All three would have major hydroelectric power production as part of their multiple-purpose functions. Several lesser hydroelectric plants have been started as part of existing reclamation projects.

Charge: Secretary of the Interior McKay failed in his responsibility to press for a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon.

Fact: The position of the Department of the Interior is that Congress has refused to authorize Federal construction and the Supreme Court has plainly placed responsibility for decision on the license application by the Idaho Power Co. in the Federal Power Commission.

Charge: This administration has abandoned dam sites such as Nez Perce on the Northwest's Snake River.

Fact: The Nez Perce site was abandoned in the previous Democratic administration on the insistence of fishery interests.

Charge: The Department of the Interior has abrogated the traditional "wheeling" regulation.

Fact: The Department continues to negotiate wheeling agreements with private power companies for delivery of Federal power to preference customers.

Charge: The Department has attempted to abolish preference customers altogether.

Fact: No example exists of any abolishment of preference rights of customers purchasing energy from the Bureau of Reclamation.

Charge: The Department's new marketing criteria is an attempt to force rural electric cooperatives out of existence.

Fact: The Missouri Basin marketing criteria was announced merely as a notice to advise the Missouri River Basin power suppliers, publicly and privately owned alike, that the Federal Government would not accept the responsibility of keeping the area supplied with power and that some long-range planning arrangements were necessary so that the suppliers could schedule construction of their own generating capacity.

In the Pacific Northwest, the Bonneville Power Administration policy of long-range commitments was considered for adoption on the same basis as in the Missouri River Basin; that is, that the Federal Government would not take the responsibility for supplying power for any particular area other than that developed as a byproduct of multiple-purpose river development facilities.

Charge: The Department of the Interior has allowed private utilities to enjoy "dump rates" for an indefinite period.

Fact: With respect to Canyon Ferry Dam, a Bureau of Reclamation structure in Montana, there is no question but that the Montana Power Co. is enjoying a benefit from Canyon Ferry power at dump rates. The final determination on construction of transmission lines, which would make possible delivery of power to other customers, rests with the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

Charge: The administration has proposed a downstream benefits bill, which would permit agencies with upstream private dams to charge the Government for storage of water.

Fact: In the Columbia River Basin, downstream benefits are computed and charged in operation of Federal dams. Simple fairness requires that private facilities receive the same treatment.

Charge: The administration is considering cutting the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. into California's publicly owned Central Valley project, by way of facilities of the Trinity River division.

Fact: This was a congressional action in the Trinity River authorizing legislation, which required the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the Pacific Gas & Electric and other possible partnership proposals for development of power facilities.

Charge: The administration, through the Bureau of the Budget, has generally discouraged Federal power projects.

Fact: While critics say there has been a general lack of enthusiasm from the Bureau of the Budget in authorizing new projects, evidenced by outright stop orders or behind the scenes "Dutch uncle" talks which keep Interior agencies from ever requesting funds, a little investigation would disclose that the same situation has existed for several years back during the Democrat administration in the Bureau of the Budget.

FACTS AND ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING MINERALS

Charge: The Department of the Interior is about to give away minerals on 12,000 acres of Superior National Forest, through a 50-year lease option to International Nickel Co.

Fact: While International Nickel has been a prospecting permit applicant since 1951 and does in fact hold 5 such permits covering an aggregate of 3,588.47 acres, no lease has as yet been granted.

International Nickel quite recently indicated it plans to request two leases covering a total of 4,938.77 acres. Involved in the two areas are one of International Nickel's own permits and one tract for which the company had applied for a permit not yet issued. The remaining acreage—about half the total—includes lands covered by other permits and permit applications upon which International Nickel holds options.

In view of the extremely low grade marginal copper and much lower content of nickel believed by experts to be present in the deposit, and the necessity for large investment to make production possible, it was found advisable to make preliminary arrangements for a long-term lease which might be issued if and when it was shown that an adequate mineral deposit was present and could be developed.

The schedule of rentals and royalties proposed under any lease, when and if issued, would be higher after the first 25 years than the terms of the average hard mineral lease issued by the Department on known commercial deposits, and the terms for the initial 25 years would be comparable, notwithstanding the marginal nature of the deposit in this instance.

The act of requesting that a lease be issued, as International Nickel has indicated it will in the near future, does not mean that the lease will be issued immediately, nor does such request assure that any lease ever will be issued. In making its request, the company will submit what it considers evidence of the presence of copper and nickel in sufficient quantities and of satisfactory quality to render mining operation feasible, and justifying the large investment which would be necessary to the operation.

Charge: The Department told the International Nickel Co. to draft the kind of lease it wanted and "we'll be glad to look it over."

Fact: In considering the preliminary arrangements for a long-term-lease form, conferences were held for a period of more than a year. Forest Service requirements for surface use of the lands, the marginal nature of the deposit, and the large operation handling a large daily tonnage which would be necessary in the area were among the factors contributing to the determination that a long-term lease would be needed if development of the mineral deposit were to be achieved.

The lease form finally agreed upon embodied terms proposed by the Bureau of Land Management and Geological Survey, and accepted by the International Nickel Co.

Charge: Under previous administrations, the company got nowhere in pressing for a 99-year lease, but once the administration changed it confronted the Forest Service with a letter from the Office of Defense Mobilization declaring the national welfare would be endangered if the Forest Service did not permit the mining.

Fact: The copper and nickel deposit in Superior National Forest was of sufficient interest to the ODM and other defense minerals agencies in 1952 that a representative of ODM called a meeting on July 17 of that year with the apparent intent of showing the need for immediate development of the deposit and to promote the issuance of prospecting permits.

Represented at this meeting on July 17, 1952, in addition to ODM, were the Office of Defense Materials Procurement, Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management.

During this meeting, maps of the deposit were examined and the nature of the deposit was discussed. It was considered to be highly marginal if commercial at all. The necessity for Government subsidy of any productive operation was foreseen as a strong possibility.

Defense minerals agencies indicated that development was important, in view of the existing scarcities particularly of nickel, and possibilities were explored for early issuance of prospecting permits. At that time two permits had been issued, and following the July 17 meeting work was begun on other applications so that by January 1, 1953, five permits had been issued. This number had been increased to 13 by February 1, 1953.

The act of June 30, 1950, 81st Congress, opens Superior and all other national forests in Minnesota to mineral leasing. This is a special act applying only to that one State.

FACTS ON ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING INDIAN AFFAIRS IN THE SERIES OF ARTICLES PUBLISHED BY THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD BEGINNING JANUARY 8, 1956

Charge: In a memorandum of May 16, 1955 the Commissioner of Indian Affairs made it possible for individual Indians to withdraw their share of the reservation or tribal land.

Fact: The May 16 memorandum had nothing whatever to do with tribal land which is the common property of all the members of a particular tribal group. It was concerned solely with allotted land which is the property of individual Indians. In essence, the memorandum provides that if the Indian owner of an allotment seeks a fee patent (or unrestricted title) and can demonstrate his competence, the patent shall not be withheld merely because the land happens to be located in a timber or grazing unit. In all cases where the sale of such patented allotments creates problems for the owners of Indian lands remaining in trust, the Indian Bureau will consult and cooperate actively with these owners in working out fair and equitable solutions. No problems have so far arisen under the May 16 memorandum which proved incapable of such solution and none is anticipated.

Charge: The Interior Department sponsored 1954 congressional bills removing from Federal protection a million acres of timberland on the Klamath Reservation in Oregon and 200,000 acres of timberland on the Menominee Reservation in Wisconsin.

Fact: Both the Klamath and Menominee Tribes were included in a list of tribes presented to the Senate Civil Service Committee in February 1947 by the then Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs with the statement that they "could be denied Federal services immediately or in the future, whichever the Congress should decide." Both tribes were also included in House Concurrent Resolution No. 108 which was adopted by both branches of Congress in the summer of 1953 without a dissenting vote. This resolution called upon the Secretary of the Interior to submit proposed legislation which would terminate Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the tribes named therein. In compliance with this mandate, such proposals were submitted covering the Klamath and Menominee Tribes, among others, in the forepart of 1954. After full hearings in which representatives of both tribes participated actively, laws providing for termination of Federal supervision over a period of approximately 4 years were enacted for both. Representatives of both tribes indicated approval of the legislation as finally enacted.

Charge: The Indian Bureau has given away property belonging to the Nez Perce Indians by authorizing the transfer of 19 acres of land and the several school buildings on it to Public School District No. 341, at Lapwai, Idaho.

Fact: For a period dating back 10 years up to 1949, some 150 Nez Perce Indian children have attended the public school at Lapwai. In 1949, that elementary school burned down; and the Government allowed the school district to use the buildings which had been the former Indian school. The State of Idaho needs long-term tenure to the property before it can make extensive repairs and heating equipment replacement.

There is a difference of opinion between the Government and the tribe as to the ownership of the land involved. That difference is now before the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia for settlement.

The Department's objective is to make the property available to the school district so that some 300 children (about half of them Indian) will have a place to go to school. Every effort is being made to accomplish this objective.

Charge: The Department released Wind River Reservation oil rights on 161,000 acres of the Riverton reclamation withdrawal area to the detriment of the Indians.

Fact: The pattern of administration of oil and gas development within the Riverton reclamation withdrawal was established not by the Department of the Interior but by congressional legislation—Public Law 284, of the 83d Congress. This legislation was

supported, prior to enactment, by the joint tribal council of the Wind River Reservation in a resolution of January 27, 1953, and by tribal attorneys and delegates at the Senate committee hearing.

Charge: The Department tried to shut down a garment factory in Flandreau, S. Dak., which, since 1935, has been adding $28,000 a year in earnings to the "submarginal existence of a group of 150 Indians." South Dakota's two Senators intervened and kept the factory open.

Fact: The Flandreau garment factory was established in 1934 to provide employment for Indian women of the local community during the depression period. After a few years of producing dresses only for the Flandreau Indian school, the operations were later expanded through the acquisition of high-speed power machines to include the manufacture of 30 different articles of clothing which have been widely used in schools and hospitals throughout the Indian Service.

In 1951 an intensive study of the factory's operations was made by a special survey committee of Bureau personnel. This study revealed (1) that the factory was not an economically sound enterprise (a loss of $7,656.70 was suffered in fiscal 1950; $6,853.62 in fiscal 1951), and (2) that closing the factory would not involve serious social or economic readjustment (19 of the 24 women then regularly employed were married and living with their husbands; current employment opportunities were available locally for 17 of the husbands while the other two were presumably eligible for old-age assistance; the 5 single women could obtain employment locally or in off-reservation garment centers). The committee recognized that the factory had served its original purpose but felt that there was no longer justification for continuing it as a Federal operation.

After discussions with the Indians about the possibility of their taking over the factory as a tribal enterprise failed to produce a favorable response, the committee recommended that the factory be closed on June 30, 1953.

The closing date, however, was later postponed to March 1, 1954, in order to allow ample time for the factory employees to make personal readjustments. Before this date was reached a further examination of the factory operation showed evidence of considerably improved prospects and an additional extension was granted to March 1955.

In August 1954, however, the picture was changed greatly when Congress enacted Public Law 568, providing for a complete transfer of all Federal Indian hospitals and other Indian health operations to the United States Public Health Service by July 1, 1955. Since the Public Health Service operates its own supply depot, it was obvious at once that a major market for the products of the Flandreau garment factory would be eliminated. In fact, during fiscal year 1955 sales of the Flandreau garments to Indian hospitals and health facilities totaled $49,935.93, as compared with $34,257.73 in sales to Indian schools.

In discussions leading up to the actual transfer of Indian health responsibilities, Public Health Service officials clearly stated that it would not be feasible for that agency to continue purchasing Flandreau garments indefinitely. In response to urging by the Indian Bureau and South Dakota Senators and Congressmen, however, they did agree to carry on the purchases for 1 fiscal year, so that every opportunity would be provided for making necessary adjustments and for exploring the possibility of having the factory taken over as a nongovernmental operation. Such explorations have been carried on but have thus far produced no tangible results. The factory is now scheduled to close by the end of the 1956 fiscal year.

Currently there are 15 workers employed by the factory. All of them have been offered full Bureau assistance in finding other employment opportunities.

Charge: The Bureau of Indian Affairs showed impropriety in awarding a food contract to an unpaid Bureau consultant.

Fact: The Bureau awarded a contract to supply food for five schools on the Cherokee Reservation in North Carolina for half a school year on a fact-finding basis to see if contract feeding would provide a better grade of food at less money than Government-operated kitchens. The short-term contract, which was limited to less than 1 percent of the Bureau's feeding operations, was awarded not to an "unpaid consultant" but to an experienced food service organization which had an excellent reputation for satisfactory performance on contracts of this general type. The final report of the operation, which ran from January to June of 1955, showed that the children got a greater variety of more nutritious and more palatable food from the private contractor than they did from Government-operation—and at less cost. Government prepared meals averaged 48.8 cents per meal; the contractor furnished better food at an average cost of 47.08 cents; and that average included some expensive cooking equipment which had to be installed, and which will last a number of years. After finding that a private contract was desirable, the Bureau invited bidding on a longer term contract to provide food service at the Cherokee schools. The competitive bidding resulted in the awarding of the contract to a company that had played no part in the carefully documented experiment; the contract was awarded to a Birmingham, Ala., concern which guaranteed the meals at 44 cents each—a saving of almost 5 cents per meal to the Indian Bureau.

Charge: The Bureau of Indian Affairs negotiated a "rigged" contract to rent automobiles instead of buying them and then abandoned the plan because of a threatened Congressional investigation.

Fact: The Bureau did rent 39 automobiles from a rental firm, after careful investigation of the company's rental plan and the plans of other national rental agencies. The contract was let as a "feeler" to find out if renting would be preferable and more economical than outright Government ownership. At the time of the contract, one of the Bureau's biggest problems in its operation of a fleet of 5,133 cars, trucks and busses was the cost of keeping them in running condition. The use of Bureau cars for a minimum of six years or 60,000 miles in remote areas and over bad roads made the maintenance problem one of serious proportions. The charge that the contract was "rigged" is entirely without foundation. It was an investigatory contract, let on what was the most feasible basis at the time. The chairman of the House of Representatives subcommittee investigating this matter publicly stated during the hearing that there was no evidence that would impugn the honesty or integrity of Bureau staff members in any way. The contract was not abandoned because of a threatened investigation, but was cancelled by action of the Comptroller General of the United States on the ground that it was entered into without competitive bidding.

FACTS AND ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING PLANTS FOR PRODUCING SYNTHETIC FUEL, OIL SHALE, ETC.

Charge: The Department has given away plants for producing synthetic fuel, oil shale, zirconium, titanium and helium.

Fact: The synthetic liquid fuels demonstration plants at Louisiana, Mo., converted from the Missouri ordnance works, were closed in the summer of 1953. The portion of the plants made up from the Ordnance works' original installation were turned over to the Army later in 1953 under terms of a congressional act dated September 13, 1951. The remaining structures were transferred to General Services Administration, as required by law. GSA, in turn, transferred custody to the Department of the Army. The Department of the Interior entered into no agreements or negotiations in the ultimate sale of the plants to private parties.

Fact: The oil shale retorting and refining installations at Rifle, Colo., have been placed in standby condition and still are the property of the Government. Some of the shops and other facilities are being used in connection with a Bureau of Mines research program in mining shale and some of the dwellings are occupied by Bureau employees assigned to the experimental mining program which involves an expenditure of $1 million in fiscal 1956.

No equipment, other than that damaged extensively by a roof fall at the experimental mine, has been sold.

Fact: Zirconium-production facilities of the Bureau of Mines at Albany, Oreg., remain intact as property of the Government. No equipment has been sold. In fact, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department have an agreement that the zirconium plant is to be maintained in such condition that it can be put into full-scale operation on 3 months' notice by AEC. Some of the equipment is being used by mines for special metallurgical research jobs. Most of the cost of building and equipping the zirconium plant was financed by AEC.

Fact: As a pioneer in titanium research, the Bureau of Mines was requested by the Army Ordnance Corps to enlarge its facilities at Boulder City, Nev., in order to test improved equipment and techniques for recovering superior-quality metal to be used in special Army ordnance military applications. This expansion was accomplished in 1952. All metal produced in research was used either by the Corps or for further experimental work at Boulder City. Although some commercial production was underway among several companies, the Defense Materials Procurement Administration decided output was not adequate and so requested the Bureau to step up its output at Boulder City. Between April 30, 1953, and September 7, 1954, the Boulder City pilot plant produced 246 tons of titanium, all of which went to the General Services Administration. This production supplemented but did not compete with private industry.

As industrial output gained, the Bureau ceased large-scale output and now uses the Boulder City facilities in research aimed at improving metallurgical methods. This work is being done under a cooperative agreement with an industrial firm which contributes funds to defray costs and agrees that any resulting patents shall be assigned the Government and made available to industry as a whole. No parts of the titanium production facilities at Boulder City have been sold or given to private industry.

In the Bureau of Mines laboratories, work continues on the improvement of present industrial processes and on development of new and improved methods for recovering superior quality titanium metal.

Fact: Helium production: No helium plants have been closed under this administration; in fact, the Department has authorized an additional plant for 1956. No helium-producing equipment has been sold or given away. The Department's Bureau of Mines remains the sole producer of helium on a commercial scale in the United States.

Charge: Coal-mine safety regulations have been given away to the States for supervision.

Fact: The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, as approved by the Congress in 1952, has been administered by the Bureau of Mines of the Department in strict accordance with that law. No provisions of the Federal law

have been turned over to any State for enforcement. No State inspection has replaced Federal inspection of any coal mine. The Bureau of Mines survey team recommended a stronger safety training program by the Bureau. That suggestion has been put into effect. The survey team recommended strengthening of health and safety activities and separating them from the Bureau's regional setup so Federal inspection and related work would be strengthened. That recommendation was adopted. The team suggested a 24-hour advance notice of the Federal inspection of a mine. That proposal was rejected by the Department.

Charge: The Government's $35-million Louisiana, Mo., synthetic fuels plant was sold for $5 million to private interests—a return of 25 cents on the dollar.

Fact: The Bureau of Mines of the Department, as authorized by the Congress, invested $14,852,130.76 in the two coal-to-oil demonstration plants at Louisiana, Mo. The coal hydrogenation plant ($10,438,880.76) began operating first and proved the feasibility of large-scale production of synthetic gasoline and other valuable products from representative American coals. The gas-synthesis plant ($4,413,250), incorporating many refinements over processes developed by the Germans, made several successful runs. At this point, the Department felt that the necessary information that could be gained from the installations had been obtained and that the benefits of further operations would not be commensurate with the $10,000-a-day operating costs at Louisiana, Mo. Less costly research on specific phases of the various steps in synthetic liquid fuels studies were assigned to laboratories at Morgantown, W. Va., and Bruceton, Pa.

In taking over the former Missouri Ordnance Works from the Army, the Department got a head start in that, without exchange of funds, it obtained many basic facilities, including roads, buildings, compressors, and a tremendous array of machinery. When it left Louisiana, Mo., those facilities were several years older and consequently less valuable. The demonstration plants also were in used condition and many of the devices were custom-made for making synthetic fuels and nothing else. These facts notwithstanding, the Department entered into no negotiations whatsoever in connection with the ultimate sale of the various facilities to private industry.

Charge: The Government's $16 million Rifle, Colo., oil-shale plant has been shut down as not feasible on a commercial scale, although it had worked its cost of producing gasoline down to 13 cents a gallon (against an 11-cent price at a petroleum refinery), and only a token amount of work on mining techniques continues. Meanwhile Union Oil Co., of California, is spending large sums on its own oil-shale process.

Fact: The oil-shale plant at Rifle was shut down after a roof fall in the experimental oil-shale mine February 28, 1955, cut off the supply of oil shale and showed that the mining method then used needs revision. The investment in equipment, installation costs, and real estate to June 30, 1955, was about $6 million. The plant was put in standby condition when the Congress trimmed the Department's request for funds for Rifle from $1.25 million to $1 million and restricted work to be done there during fiscal year 1956 to mining studies. The estimate of a 2-cent cost spread between gasoline from shale oil and that from petroleum was based on extremely low mining costs, which could be attained in commercial operations by the method used before the roof fall. As mining the shale makes up about one-third the cost of crude shale oil, development of a revised mining system that will be safe and about as inexpensive as that formerly used is the key to early commercial production of shale-oil products. The Department is pressing vigorously its studies designed to develop such a revised system.

Union Oil Company of California, which owns large oil-shale deposits near Grand Valley, Colo., reportedly is confining its studies to retorting oil shale and refining shale oil. It intends to mine enough shale for its experimental work by open-cut methods, but only a minute fraction of the Nation's—or that company's—oil-shale reserves can be mined by such methods. When an oil-shale industry is established, virtually all of the shale used must come from underground mines.

None of the Bureau of Mines retorting equipment at Rifle has been sold. Some mining equipment, badly damaged by the roof fall in the experimental mine, is being sold and new mining machinery is being purchased.

Charge: The Government's multi-million-dollar zirconium-producing plant at Albany, Oreg., was shut down last June, dismantled, and put in standby condition.

Fact: At the request of the AEC, the zirconium plant of the Bureau of Mines was put in standby condition last summer. Part of the equipment was disassembled for cleaning and was put in mothballs to prevent deterioration. However, the Bureau has agreed with AEC to maintain the plant in such condition that it can be reactivated on short notice. The United States has only one large commercial producer of reactor-grade zirconium (a special type of zirconium), but there are several producers of lesser-grade zirconium. There is some doubt whether existing commercial facilities for making reactor-grade zirconium will be able to meet coming demands. In that case, the Bureau of Ships or the AEC probably will ask the Bureau of Mines to go back into production.

The Bureau of Mines has not given or sold to private industry any of its zirconium equipment. It has made available to industry valuable technical facts regarding the making of zirconium. When the zirconium plant at Albany went into standby condition, about 70 Bureau of Mines employees were laid off. It can be assumed that some of them did obtain positions with commercial zirconium producers.

Charge: The Department of the Interior has created a new office of education to help States get back to doing their coal-mine inspecting.

Fact: Educational activities of the Bureau of Mines have been strengthened in recent months, but not for the purpose of transferring Federal inspections of coal mines to the States. A revitalized safety program includes accident-prevention classes conducted among workers and supervisors. It is intensification of work that began in 1947. Thus far, about 150,000 employees have completed the accident-prevention course. Some 140 mines have completed 100-percent training. This means that every employee and every supervisor at nearly 150 mines has completed the Government's accident-prevention courses.

Charge: The Bureau of Mines survey team recommended that the Government get out of the helium-production business.

Fact: This is true, but the suggestion was not adopted by the Department. In a letter dated May 10, 1955, Secretary McKay wrote the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman, House Committee on Government Operations:

"The Department was hesitant to divest itself of the helium activity without giving intensive consideration to this subject; to assist it in reaching sound conclusions on so important an issue, the Department arranged for an independent study of the whole helium program and operations thereunder. The study was made under contract with Stone and Webster Engineering Corp. * * *

"As a result of our own deliberation and the findings of the Stone and Webster report, we have reached the conclusion that the Bureau of Mines should continue its helium-production program. Therefore, and since it was well established that current helium production was insufficient to meet prospective defense demands, the Department sought and obtained an appropriation of $6 million for additional helium-production capacity. Construction of additional facilities is now well under way."

FACTS AND ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING HELIUM

Charge: That Republican Congressmen HOFFMAN and MCCARTHY introduced—presumably at the administration's behest—identical bills to give the Secretary of the Interior the right to dispose of the Government's helium properties.

Fact: These bills were introduced, at the Interior Department's request, to restore powers the Secretary of the Interior had possessed for more than 25 years under the original Helium Act of 1925. A clause in this act gave the Secretary of the Interior the right to dispose of wells, lands, or interests therein "not valuable for helium production" and to dispose of oil, gas, and byproducts of helium operations "not needed for Government use."

This clause was removed from the Helium Act in 1951, when Congress passed legislation (Public Law 247, 82d Cong.), aimed at repealing Government property laws that seemed to conflict with the Federal Property Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.), which placed authority to dispose of all Government surplus property within the General Services Administration.

The Interior Department found that this action crippled it in performing its duties under the Helium Act, because:

1. Helium production facilities and other property utilized in the helium operation are not surplus within the meaning of Public Law 152. They are essential to the Bureau of Mines in its integrated program for conserving, producing, and selling helium gas.

2. The Bureau of Mines receives no funds directly from Congress for maintaining and operating helium plants. The entire activity of producing or purchasing helium-bearing natural gas, delivering it to the plants, extracting the helium, and disposing of residue gases must be financed from money received as payments for helium, related services, and other products of the operation.

Recognizing this, the original Helium Act provided that such money should be credited to a helium-production fund. This fund is used to finance the cost of producing helium.

For example, the Bureau is disposing of the condensate, similar to a light oil, which is produced during the processing of helium-bearing natural gas at the Navajo, Ariz., helium plant. Removal of this condensate is necessary to prevent fouling of plant equipment.

However, removing the condensate and preparing it for sale entail considerable expense and trouble. The condensate itself is not needed by the Bureau, but the money received from its sale is needed to offset the cost of producing it as an incidental part of the helium operation. Under the Helium Act, the Secretary of the Interior can sell the condensate and turn the money received into the helium-production fund.

Amendment of the Helium Act by Public Law 247 removed the Secretary's authority to sell such byproducts. Therefore, the Bureau would have to charge its loss in producing these products to the cost of producing helium.

When the Interior Department explained its reasons for wishing the disposal clause restored, GSA officials agreed, but requested that the phrases "not valuable for helium production" and "not needed for Government use" be omitted since they might be construed to mean that property so described was surplus and as such should be disposed of by GSA.

Although the Department of the Interior had no objection to this request, Congress insisted that the clause be restored in its original language.

OIL AND GAS LEASING IN WILDLIFE REFUGES

On December 2, 1955, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay announced new regulations governing oil and gas leasing on wildlife refuges. These regulations give a great deal more protection to the propagation of wildlife than those formerly in force.

The new regulations have been misinterpreted. The facts regarding the most serious of these misinterpretations are set forth below:

1. Do the new regulations permit oil and gas leasing on national wildlife refuges for the first time?

Lands within national wildlife refuges have been subject to oil and gas leasing since the passage of the original Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437). The authority for such leasing was reaffirmed by the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 950), which amended the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. In 1947 Department of the Interior regulations were issued which defined conditions under which the leasing would be permitted. Oil and gas leases embracing lands located in several national wildlife refuges were issued under the authority of these clearly defined laws and regulations prior to 1953.

However, within a few months after Mr. McKay became Secretary of the Interior, he decided that existing regulations did not provide adequate safeguards for the refuges. On August 31, 1953, he suspended the old regulations until such time as his Department could formulate new rules which would guarantee maximum protection for wildlife values. While the old regulations were suspended no leasing was permitted except in cases where it was necessary for the Government to protect itself from oil drainage or where possible damage to wildlife values was not involved. An example of the latter category is the Railroad Valley National Wildlife Refuge in Nevada where only a small percentage of the 140,000-acre refuge is used exclusively in the protection and propagation of wild waterfowl.

During the more than 2 years between August 31, 1953, and December 2, 1955, the old regulations were given a thorough review by the Department of the Interior, specialists from its Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Land Management, its Solicitor, and the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Conservation. The new regulations embody the corrective measures that were recommended and agreed upon as a result of this study.

The most noteworthy provision in the new regulations is one which gives the Fish and Wildlife Service and its career technicians absolute authority over where, when, how, and by whom drilling will be permitted on the refuges.

Another significant revision makes refuges which provide habitat for rare and endangered species absolutely inviolate for the first time in history.

It is obvious, therefore, that the new regulations provide much more stringent limitations than the regulations in existence when this administration took office.

2. What is the legal authority for the leasing?

The legal authority for the issuance of oil and gas leases on national wildlife refuges is set forth in detail in the laws cited above. The confusion surrounding this aspect of the new regulations has been generated by those who have mistakenly contended that the same laws which apply to prospecting permits for fissionable materials also apply to oil and gas. This is not the case.

3. Do the regulations provide adequate safeguards for wildlife values?

As stated above, the purpose of Secretary McKay's 1953 stop order was to arrest a situation that obviously was inimical to the primary purpose of refuges—the protection and propagation of wildlife. The new regulations correct these deficiencies inherent in the old regulations by carefully spelling out the conditions, and on what refuges, oil and gas leasing is permitted.

It is significant that these regulations have the wholehearted endorsement of career specialists in the Fish and Wildlife Service and the approval of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Conservation. Those who have the responsibility for protection of our wildlife feel that the new regulations are the means by which that protection can be insured.

4. Are the regulations in accord with the intent of Congress?

The assertion that oil and gas leasing on the national wildlife refuges is a violation of the intent of Congress is an error in fact. The laws mentioned above, which were enacted by Congress, are irrefutable proof that it has been the sense of Congress that these refuge lands should be subject to multiple use, including oil and gas leasing. The Department of the Interior is bound by the law. Any argument about the philosophy of permitting oil and gas drilling on the refuges is irrelevant. The Secretary of the Interior has no alternative but to abide by the provisions of the laws that apply to the functions of Government under his jurisdiction. The most that can be done is to make the regulations implementing these laws as stringent as possible. This has been done by Secretary McKay.

5. Have leases issued under the regulations returned the full amount due the Government in royalties and rental fees?

Only those persons who are unfamiliar with the law will argue that the Government is not getting its just rental and royalty fees from the leases issued under the revised code. Because these leases were issued on lands defined by the Geological Survey as not being on a known structure of a gas and oil field, they had to be granted on a noncompetitve basis. The act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913) is explicit on this matter. This act also prescribes the royalty to be charged in noncompetitive leases; to wit, 12½ percent, the amount stipulated in the so-called Frankfort leases. The rental fees of 50 cents per acre are also set by the law.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER OF HIS AVAILABILITY FOR SECOND TERM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning, in between subcommittee meetings, I was pleased to tune in for a few moments and hear on the radio the announcement which the entire Nation has been eagerly awaiting. It was the announcement that the Chief Executive of our country is willing to run again for the highest office of the land, if his party and his Nation desire that he do so.

The response of America and of his party is, I know, instantaneous. The Republican Party wants Dwight D. Eisenhower for a second term, and the Nation wants him for a second term.

Every public-opinion poll shows that President Eisenhower has achieved the almost impossible feat of remaining at peak levels of popularity—this despite ofttimes bitter partisan attacks against him, and despite his unfortunate setback last September.

The President's announcement was presented in a way that we have come to expect of him. He offered his services once more to the Nation, if the Nation desires him, knowing, as it does, the full facts concerning his health. His announcement, therefore, is one of honest humility and yet complete frankness. It is another page in the chapter of glowing sincerity which he has written, and which accounts for the great hold which he has on the affection of the American people.

Beyond any question, he will now run for a second term and be elected for a second term. To do so will be to fulfill the obligations of a good soldier carrying out the mandate of the people of the United States. To do so, moreover, will be an inspiring example to the people of the world of the power of a man's spirit to come back, the power of a man's mind to conquer any thought of inadequacy, of limitation. It will be a demonstration of the power of spirit triumphant, spirit which molds one's body, spirit which restores powers which might otherwise have been lost, spirit which conquers any fear of handicap or limitation.

More and more modern science confirms the supreme power of men's thinking, men's courage, and men's faith. Because of such thinking, courage, and faith, and because of our understanding of their power, we realize today that the heart or any other organ can be healed and healed completely.

There are millions of Americans who have some impairment or other, but they will see in the President's offering of his services a thrilling confirmation that their own future can be just as full, just as bright and abundant as it might have been before their impairment—indeed, far more so, because of the sensible attitude of care and moderation which they will exercise.

I rejoice in the President's decision, and I particularly commend him for the way in which he announced it, and the way in which he will present it to the Nation by his nationwide address tonight. The American people will take his announcement to their hearts because of the substance of the decision and because of the way in which it was submitted to them—not as a commander, but as an humble servant; not on the basis of carefully selected facts, but on the basis of the people's understanding of all the facts regarding the President's health and the problems of his office.

On the world scene, the President's announcement will be a great shot-in-the-arm for the cause of freemen everywhere. It will be welcomed behind the Iron Curtain, as well, because, despite occasional Soviet attempts at vilifica-

tion, I am convinced in my own mind that the average man and the average woman in the satellite countries and in Soviet Russia itself see in Dwight D. Eisenhower an honest, effective, humble champion of peace, a man who has tried at the summit, and in every other way, to avoid war, and who will continue to try to avoid, as it must be avoided, another world conflict. The President's continuation in office will assure America's success in the competitive coexistence race. It is the best possible answer to the recent policy decisions made at the 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow, at which the Soviet leaders indicated their continued cunning efforts to subvert the world through peaceful means in some places, and through violence in other places.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this morning, upon receiving the wonderful news about President Eisenhower, I released the following statement to the press:

The announcement from President Eisenhower is the greatest good news. The President is a symbol to all mankind of peace and good will. His recovery is God's gift to America and to the world. We can all be reverently thankful.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which I issued this morning concerning the announcement by President Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE ON PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S ANNOUNCEMENT

President Eisenhower's decision to again be the Republican candidate for the Presidency is of momentous importance to the people of the United States and the world. I am delighted with the President's announcement. In 1952, I was one of the original supporters of Dwight Eisenhower's nomination for the Presidency. It was my privilege, as Governor of Maine, to head the Eisenhower campaign for delegates in our State and to actively work for his nomination and election. The outstanding leadership he has demonstrated as President in the past 3 years has more than justified my faith in him. I know that the people of the United States share my appreciation of President Eisenhower's long and earnest reflection on the decision he has announced today. We may all be certain that President Eisenhower is a candidate only because he considers it to be in the best interest of the American people that the principles of sound government at home and strong leadership abroad, for which he stands, be continued. The President's announcement is in line with my repeated predictions that he would be a candidate for reelection.

WELCOMING NEW INDUSTRIES TO WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on two occasions I have been pleased to invite attention on the Senate floor to the fine facilities offered to new industries by my State, the Badger State. They include facilities in the form of wholesome, established, forward-looking communities; skilled labor; honest, efficient government at State, county and local levels; as well as fine, leisure time, vacation-land attractions nearby; together with many other worthwhile inducements.

I am glad to call attention to still another attractive feature of the Badger State. It is the Wisconsin Development Credit Corp., an almost unique institution in the Nation, designed by forward-looking Wisconsin public officials and private citizens, to help on a voluntary, permissive basis to fill a credit vacuum, and thereby to help launch new industries or help expand old ones.

The Development Credit Corp. provides simply a "credit pool" for sound lines of credit to be made available by the free enterprise system for an expanding free-enterprise system. It is typical of the self-reliant philosophy of Wisconsin, relying on private initiative and on substantial action, not on special lures or one-time gimmicks. This is the type of State self-reliance which, it seems to me, should be encouraged to the fullest extent.

I send to the desk the text of an editorial from last Sunday's issue of the Milwaukee Journal, describing this relatively novel approach to expanding private business horizons. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILLING A CREDIT VACUUM TO HELP INDUSTRIES GET STARTED

Wisconsin's new awareness that it must have a conscious policy of stimulating industrial development is finding expression, among other ways, in the field of credit—helping industries meet the cost of getting started or expanding.

But there is no subsidy involved, no welfare statism. The only State action was to put some "do it yourself" legislation on the books last year. Conservatism of the approach is attested by the fact that it was pioneered by the State of Maine. Maine, indeed, threw in a little tax money to get a private development credit corporation started. The Wisconsin law is purely permissive and regulatory.

The purpose of such a corporation is to fill the credit vacuum, particularly for smaller industries in smaller communities, where the local bank may be unwilling or unable to carry by itself a single loan in the amount required by a firm that wants to locate or expand.

For such cases the corporation will offer a credit pool. It will have major lending institutions throughout the State as its members, and they will assign lines of credit to the corporation. It will then prorate approved loans among these members. This is purely private enterprise and entitled to profit.

The Marshfield banker, John L. Stauber, was a prime mover in obtaining the legislation, and he and others, through the Wisconsin Bankers' Association, are going ahead promptly with organizing and capitalizing the Wisconsin Development Credit Corp., one of the few of its kind in the Nation.

Obviously, in view of the sponsorship, this is not to compete with present lending institutions. The law specifies that pooled loans shall be made "only when credit is not otherwise readily available." But equally obvious is the implied recognition, by bankers themselves, that a credit vacuum does exist and needs filling.

Some few States let municipalities buy industrial sites and build factories for lease, as a special lure to new industry. A score of States make direct tax concessions of one kind or another, such as waiving or reducing property taxes on new plants for a period of years.

But industry is learning to look this kind of gift horse in the mouth. Firms that have taken such lures blindly have sometimes had the tax boom lowered on them later, or found themselves otherwise disadvantaged. The subsidy to them often means cheapening of other public services, and unfair burden on other taxpayers. Thoughtful industrial leadership is willing to pay the fair cost of doing business.

The kind of effort to win and hold industry that is reflected in the Wisconsin credit corporation law—enabling the business community itself to furnish stimulus and aid in a businesslike way—is in a sounder tradition, and should be better received in the long run.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER ON FARMERS' COSTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a speech made in Iowa on February 28, by one of our colleagues, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who is a candidate for nomination for President on the Democratic ticket. The speech made on that occasion by the Senator from Tennessee is described in part as follows in an article appearing in the Washington Star of yesterday:

The administration "bemoans" increased prices the farmers must pay for the things they buy, Senator KEFAUVER said, but higher interests rates are "the biggest increase in the expense of your farms."

The increase in interest rates was a matter of deliberate policy on the part of the administration, he said.

Mr. President, as a farmer who really farms, and who pays the bills each day and deposits the checks and knows exactly what is going on on his farm, and has done so for many, many years, I am amazed that any Member of the Senate or any other public official would make any such statement as the one made by the Senator from Tennessee, namely, that higher interest rates are "the biggest increase in the expense on your farms."

Mr. President, I simply cannot understand such irresponsible statements; and I cannot let pass such a statement as the one to which I have just referred, without calling it to the attention of the Senate, because it simply cannot be true.

I do not know what set of facts the able Senator from Tennessee may have used in arriving at that conclusion, but I simply cannot conceive that anyone would make the statement that increased interest rates are the principal cause of the increased costs of production on farms. I simply cannot understand such a statement.

TRIBUTE TO MISS TENLEY ALBRIGHT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Saturday the city in which I lived for so many years—the city of Newton—celebrated the Olympic championship in

skating, which was won by Miss Tenley Albright.

Mr. President, we in Massachusetts set great store by character and hard work. It is heartening, therefore, to observe the outstanding accomplishments of Miss Tenley Albright, the remarkable young lady from Newton Center, whose achievements as a champion figure skater so cleary reflect her conscientiousness and determination.

Tenley Albright, who is now 20, started her skating career as a little girl of 9. Her father, a Boston surgeon, recognized her talent, and encouraged her ambitions in every way possible.

Tenley's climb to the heights of world fame has not been easy. There have been discouragements and disappointments severe enough to defeat less hardy spirits. At age 11 Tenley suffered an attack of polio. She fought back courageously, and 4 months after her struggle with polio she won the American juvenile figure-skating championship. At 14 she became the United States junior champion. At 16 she won a place on the United States Olympic team and finished second. In the following year, 1953, she became the first American to win the women's world figure-skating championship. She repeated the performance in 1955. This year, in Olympic competition, Tenley achieved her greatest ambition by winning a first-prize gold medal for the United States.

Hard work is certainly one of the foundations of this young lady's spectacular success. But courage, too, has played an important part. In the recent Olympics Tenley performed the most exacting, intricate, and dangerous figures while suffering from a painful gash in her ankle. In spite of this Tenley's performance was acclaimed as almost flawless.

Undoubtedly Miss Albright could go on to fame and fortune as a professional skater. Instead, she plans to become a doctor. She has chosen a highly demanding profession, but Tenley Albright has demonstrated in her skating career qualities which will carry her far in the medical profession.

Tenley Albright has earned the respect and admiration of the world.

Massachusetts is very proud of her and, I may say, expects to hear a great deal more from her in years to come.

Mr. KENNEDY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] with regard to the pride which all of us in Massachusetts share in the accomplishments of Miss Tenley Albright, who carried the torch for the United States so ably in the Olympic games last month.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF ITALY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, following a quorum call, the Senate will stand in recess, so that it may go to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear, along with the Members of the House, an address to be delivered by the President of Italy.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, to assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address to be delivered by the President of Italy, the Senate to reconvene upon the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate, preceded by the Secretary, Felton M. Johnston; the Sergeant at Arms, Joseph C. Duke; and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to greet and to listen to the address to be delivered by His Excellency Giovanni Gronchi, President of the Republic of Italy.

(For the address delivered by the President of Italy, see House proceedings in today's RECORD.)

At 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m., the Senate returned to its Chamber, and reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

QUESTIONNAIRES FROM OFFICE OF SENATOR YOUNG TO RESIDENTS OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the results of a questionnaire which I sent to approximately 20,000 citizens of North Dakota. The returns are from the second most Republican State in the elections of 1952.

There being no objection, the questionnaire and results thereof were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following are the results of the questionnaires sent to about 20,000 North Dakota people. This tabulation is on the basis of incomplete returns totaling 4,385—2,817 being from farmers and 1,568 from nonfarmers. All but a few of these returns were signed. A few were critical of the idea of sending out questionnaires. The vast majority, however, looked upon them as a good opportunity to express their views on various important issues. Reading the many, many comments on these questionnaires was about like visiting with nearly 4,500 people in North Dakota.

1. If you plan to vote Republican this year, which of the following would you prefer to see as candidate for President? Eisenhower, 1,802; Nixon 83; Knowland, 171; Warren, 639.

2. If you plan to vote Democrat this year, which of the following would you prefer to see as candidate for President? Lausche, 137; Stevenson, 893; Kefauver, 1,343; Harriman, 210.

3. If the following were the Republican and Democrat nominees for President, which one in each group would you vote for? Eisenhower: Farmers, 922; nonfarmers, 971; total, 1893. Stevenson: Farmers, 1005; nonfarmers, 338; total, 1343. Nixon: Farmers, 436; nonfarmers, 517; total, 953. Kefauver: Farmers, 1457; nonfarmers, 579; total, 2036. Stevenson: Farmers, 1135; nonfarmers, 475; total, 1610. Nixon: Farmers, 564; nonfarmers, 603; total, 1167. Stevenson: Farmers, 958; nonfarmers, 344; total, 1302. Warren: Farmers, 902; nonfarmers, 710; total, 1612.

4. Do you think Ezra Taft Benson has done a good job as Secretary of Agriculture? Yes: Farmers, 338; nonfarmers, 627; total, 965. No: Farmers, 2,331; nonfarmers, 781; total, 3,112. No opinion: Farmers, 99; nonfarmers, 114; total, 213.

5. What do you think of the following new major Eisenhower-Benson farm proposals?

A. Conservation Reserve (soil bank)? Good, 1,051; fair, 1,431; poor, 1,406; no opinion, 335. (Nonfarmers were slightly stronger in favor of soil bank than farmers.)

B. Acreage Reserve? Good, 1,039; fair, 1,440; poor, 1,238; no opinion, 267.

C. Stepped-up program to dispose of agricultural surpluses? Good, 2,492; fair, 748; poor, 495; no opinion, 249.

D. Proposal to limit amount of price supports any 1 farmer can receive to $25,000 in any 1 year? Approved, 3,421; disapproved, 518; no opinion, 192.

E. Proposal to increase support levels of soy beans and flaxseed? Approved, 2,763; disapproved, 669; no opinion, 421.

6. Do you believe that these Eisenhower-Benson proposals, coupled with the present flexible price-support program will have much effect in improving farm prices in 1956? Yes: Farmers, 249; nonfarmers, 465; total, 714. No: Farmers, 2,297; nonfarmers, 870; total 3,167. No opinion: Farmers, 121; nonfarmers, 174; total, 295.

7. Do you believe 90-percent supports for basic farm commodities should be reinstated? Yes: Farmers, 2,441; nonfarmers, 948; total, 3,389. No: Farmers, 281; nonfarmers, 501; total, 782. No opinion: Farmers, 51; nonfarmers, 85; total, 136.

8. Do you believe price supports for other small grains such as oats, barley, and rye should be increased? Yes, 3,050; no, 960; no opinion, 301.

9. In general, do you think President Eisenhower has done a good job of handling international relations? Yes, 2,703; no, 976; no opinion, 545.

10. Do you approve of Secretary of State Dulles' proposal to increase appropriations for foreign assistance by about $2 billion? Yes, 673; no, 2,699; no opinion, 840.

11. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's super-interstate-highway program? Yes, 2,423; no, 1,091; no opinion, 704.

12. What, in your opinion, will be the major issues in the next presidential election? (1) Farm program, 3,146; (2) foreign policy and peace, 1,122; (3) taxes, 162.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the leading conservationists of America have become aroused over one of the gravest emergencies ever to confront their cause. They are aware that the decision of Secretary McKay to abandon the magnificent power site at Hells Canyon poses a terrible threat to the fisheries, wildlife, and outdoor grandeur of the Pacific Northwest.

These are men and women who have tried to stay out of the fight between public power and private power. They are interested primarily not in any ideological or political struggle, but in protecting the scenic and recreational resources of the United States. That is their mission.

And they have decided that the surrender of Hells Canyon is a peril to what they stand for, fight for, and work for.

This is an epochal development in the long struggle by a few of us to save the Hells Canyon hydroelectric-power site for the public, and to prevent its preemption by private greed and exploitation. I believe, Mr. President, that this is a turning point in that struggle. It is a determining event in alerting the American people to the disastrous implications of Secretary McKay's abject giveaway of a priceless resource.

On June 1, 1955, in the Senate, I warned that the surrender of Hells Canyon inevitably would lead to pressures for the building of dams on the great Salmon and Clearwater Rivers, which should be saved for migratory fish spawning, for wildlife, and for outdoor recreation.

In January of 1956, the administration submitted its budget recommending Bruces Eddy Dam on the north fork of the Clearwater River. My warning had come true, with a vengeance.

And on February 28, 1956, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources issued a major statement of policy, asking for a complete reappraisal of the Hells Canyon decision because of the danger to sites in the Northwest where wildlife values are at stake.

FAMOUS BIOLOGIST SEES HELLS CANYON SURRENDER AS PERIL TO CLEARWATER

Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, distinguished biologist and chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, announced:

> We are not concerned with the battle between public versus private-power interests. But it is apparent that reduction in reservoir capacity at the Hells Canyon site is forcing power and water interests to advocate high dams on the Clearwater River, where a disastrous effect on fish and wildlife resources of national importance will needlessly result.

Dr. Gabrielson, who served for many years as Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, added that "big dams on either the Clearwater or the Salmon Rivers would wipe out important fish-spawning grounds, inundate many thousands of acres of forest land, and, in addition, destroy critical winter range for some of the country's finest elk and deer herds. It makes little sense to reduce drastically the amount of water storage at Hells Canyon, where no important wildlife or scenic values are at stake, if this means destruction of scenic and wildlife resources that the Nation could otherwise save for the enjoyment of present and future generations."

After all, Mr. President, we are losing 3 million acre-feet of water storage at Hells Canyon by letting the Idaho Power Co. proceed with its piecemeal and pigmy plans.

Mr. President, I said this to the Senate on June 1, 1955:

> Conservationists also pointed out that one river had to be kept forever free of man-made obstructions if the Chinook salmon runs were to survive. This, of course, was the Salmon River of Idaho, where not less than 30 percent—and perhaps as much as 50 percent—of the extremely valuable spring Chinook salmon runs migrate and then spawn the next generation and cycle of fish.
>
> On top of all this, it was agreed that the river which, next to the Salmon, had to be kept clear of new dams as long as possible was the Clearwater River, at the source of which foam and champ the two most majestic wilderness streams of the Northwest, the Selway and the Lochsa.
>
> So this was the schedule of the conservationists:
>
> First. The best dam for not destroying scenic and wildlife values was Hells Canyon on the Snake.
>
> Second. The river never, never to be dammed was the Salmon.
>
> Third. The river never to be dammed further, if possible, was the Clearwater.

I do not pose as a prophet, Mr. President, because it is said that only the seventh son of a seventh son can prophesy. Furthermore, I have been as wrong as the next person on many questions. But, in this particular instance, I was right. The warning was fulfilled that the abandonment of Hells Canyon would definitely result in an attempt to construct dams which would blockade fish runs, drown out wildlife habitat and generally ruin and destroy irreplaceable realms of scenic majesty and outdoor enjoyment.

The Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, under Dr. Gabrielson, which has reached a verdict to try to save Hells Canyon, is not any fly-by-night group. It includes men and women whose names are legendary and impressive in the modern history of American conservation—people like Howard Zahniser of the Wilderness Society; Dewey Anderson of the Public Affairs Institute; C. R. Gutermuth of the Wildlife Management Institute; Joseph Penfold and William Voigt of the Izaak Walton League; Ex-Chief Forester of the United States Lyle F. Watts; Alfred A. Knopf of the National Park Service Advisory Board; David R. Brower of the Sierra Club; Gen. U. S. Grant III, and many others.

CONSERVATIONISTS FAVOR HIGH DAM AT HELLS CANYON ON SNAKE RIVER

Mr. President, the position of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources makes it more evident than ever that Secretary McKay has failed as head of the Government Department charged with custodianship over our natural resources. He should resign. Instead of safeguarding resources from exploitation, he has hastened their looting. Instead of being a protectionist, he has defaulted his great responsibilities. Indeed, he has brought about the very thing he presumably sought to avoid. He has forced into a stand favoring a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon the conservationists of the Nation, who always had avoided taking sides in the power issue.

But, as the gifted poet Lowell wrote long ago, "new occasions teach new duties, time makes ancient good uncouth." When they realized what the abandonment of Hells Canyon meant in terms of pressure on the Clearwater and Salmon River sanctuaries, the conservationists acted unhesitatingly. They got into action on the side of Hells Canyon high dam—public power or no public power. With them, it was wildlife and recreation first. And to put first things first, they had to save Hells Canyon before the north fork of the Clearwater, and, later, the Clearwater's main middle fork, were in danger of being destroyed as vast wilderness reserves.

Mr. President, so that the citizens of the United States will know the stand of our conservation leaders with respect to the high dam at Hells Canyon, a stand made necessary by compelling exigencies, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, signed by the secretary, Mr. Spencer M. Smith, and also the statement announcing the organization's position, as prepared by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson.

I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD an analysis of the efforts under way to block off the Clearwater River and its picturesque forks, as prepared by Morton R. Brigham, secretary of the Idaho Wildlife Federation Committee to save the Clearwater elk.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD include an article by Mr. A. Robert Smith from the Pendleton East-Oregonian of January 26, 1956, entitled "Bruce's Eddy Dam Too Hot for Politicians."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D. C. February 28, 1956.

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

Just as soon as we have the Echo Park controversy settled, the administration appears bent upon starting another one like it. But if they insist on building dams on the Clearwater River they will certainly have the conservationists up in arms again.

Conservationists have been often accused of unreasonable opposition to power and reclamation projects, when in fact, conservationists have urged alternative sites or projects to protect the nonrestorable benefits of nature. The instant case is a classic demonstration of what conservationists have been urging again and again.

The high Hells Canyon Dam would fully develop a place ideal for power, water storage, etc.—a place that does not invade or destroy wilderness areas, parks, nor wildlife habitat. The administration has rejected this project. In its place is recommended a project, admittedly inadequate because of this underutilization, that would make other projects necessary, which in turn would damage severely wildlife and scenic beauty.

Just prior to leaving for the North American Wildlife Conference in New Orleans, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson gave an explanation of the conservationists' position, a copy of which is attached.

Sincerely,

SPENCER M. SMITH,
Secretary.

CLEARWATER DAM THREAT FORCES CONSERVATIONISTS TO HIGH HELLS CANYON DAM

A major threat to important fish and wildlife resources of Idaho's Clearwater River, big tributary to the Snake River, has forced conservation leaders to ask for a reappraisal of the role of the controversial Hells Canyon dam site. This development was announced today by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Chairman

of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a national conservation organization with headquarters in Washington, D. C.

"We are not concerned with the battle between public versus private power interests," Dr. Gabrielson stated. "But it is apparent that reduction in reservoir capacity at the Hells Canyon site is forcing power and water interests to advocate high dams on the Clearwater River, where a disastrous effect on fish and wildlife resources of national importance will needlessly result."

The President's budget provides for a huge dam at Bruces Eddy, on the Clearwater, which joins the Snake River downstream from the Hells Canyon site, Dr. Gabrielson pointed out. An additional Clearwater dam is planned at Penny Cliffs, with subsequent construction planned for the Salmon River, which joins the Snake between the Hells Canyon site and the Clearwater.

"Big dams on either the Clearwater or the Salmon," Dr. Gabrielson added, "would wipe out important fish spawning grounds, inundate many thousands of acres of forest land, and in addition destroy critical winter range for some of the country's finest elk and deer herds. It makes little sense to reduce drastically the amount of water storage at Hells Canyon, where no important wildlife or scenic values are at stake, if this means the destruction of scenic and wildlife resources that the Nation could otherwise save for the enjoyment of present and future generations."

Dr. Gabrielson's statement continues: "The Army Corps of Engineers, the Interior Department, and the Federal Power Commission have all made statements urging water development on the Clearwater, and plans are well advanced. With the Echo Park controversy out of the way, conservationists are now turning to protect natural resources from this new threat. They will need to act swiftly to block the Bruces Eddy Dam in the present session of Congress.

"Let me stress that this is not part of the public versus private power controversy, nor is it an attempt to prevent necessary flood control or power development. These needs can be met without jeopardy to important public values by intelligent use of other dam sites in the Columbia Basin. The kind of short-sighted planning that would allow the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers dams to be built can also lead to the building of Glacier View Dam, which would inundate an important part of Glacier National Park.

"No matter who builds on the acceptable sites, whether public or private agencies or a combination of both, these sites should be fully utilized. It is up to the Nation's citizens to see that they are, and to require proof that there are no alternatives before considering irrevocable damage to our best scenic and wildlife resources."

A REVIEW OF THE PROPOSALS FOR BRUCE'S EDDY AND PENNY CLIFFS DAMS

(By Morton R. Brigham, secretary, Idaho Wildlife Federation Committee To Save the Clearwater Elk)

The Clearwater Dam battle began in 1953 when Senator DWORSHAK, of Idaho, obtained an appropriation of $140,000 for the Corps of Engineers to spend in finding substitutes for a high Federal Hells Canyon Dam. Following a hurried survey, the Corps in November 1953 revealed for the first time at a public hearing in Orofino, Idaho, its plans to construct 2 nearly 600 foot dams on the North and Middle Forks of the Clearwater River. Federal and State officials, charged with the administration of wildlife resources, and sportsmen's groups found themselves opposing a thoroughly organized promotion as they struggled at the hearing to marshall objections.

The Corps of Engineers had not provided the agencies or the conservation groups with either specifications or locations of the dams that were proposed for construction.

Most of the opinions expressed at the hearing favored Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs Dams, but a review of the hearing record shows that many of the proponents of the projects suffered as much from the lack of information as the opponents. Four nearby communities presented statements favoring 3 dams instead of 2, and another omitted reference to any particular dam. Seven organizations presented statements favoring 4 dams instead of 2. Regional Forester, Pete Hanson of the United States Forest Service, Missoula, Mont., asked the corps to "sit down and discuss" its plans with the Forest Service. Of 53 statements presented at the hearing, only 11 were related directly to the 2 projects—Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs—which the corps proposed for construction.

The Idaho Fish and Game Department, Oregon Game Commission, Oregon Fish Commission, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service presented statements outlining the serious effect that the proposed structures would have on fish, big game, and other resources. These showed that the Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs Dams would flood winter game and seasonal migration routes of tremendous elk and deer herds at the project sites, and would eliminate most of the steelhead and salmon spawning waters of the Clearwater River to cause a serious loss to the fisheries of the Snake and Columbia Rivers.

On January 24, 1954, the Pacific Northwest Power Co. applied to the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit to investigate the two Clearwater sites. Although this was protested by conservationists from Idaho and over the country, the permit was granted by the Commission at the end of the 1954 congressional session. This action was taken by the Commission following the unsuccessful attempt of the Corps of Engineers to obtain authorization for H. R. 8981, a bill authorizing construction of Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs Dams, which was introduced by Representative Angell, of Oregon. The bill never got out of committee.

In November 1954, the Pacific Northwest Power Co. announced that it had no further interest in the Penny Cliffs site and applied for deletion of this project from its preliminary permit (No. 2147). In its application the company stated that other sites showed greater potentialities for power production than Penny Cliffs. K. M. Robinson, Spokane, company president, stated publicly that his company had no interest in developing this site at any time in the foreseeable future.

After completing test drilling of the Bruce's Eddy site in December 1954, the Pacific Northwest Power Co., moved its drilling machine to the Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep sites on the Middle Snake River. Legislation to provide Federal payment for downstream benefits from storage at upstream sites was introduced in Congress in 1955 but failed to gain support and died in committee. Such legislation is thought to be necessary to make Bruce's Eddy Dam economically feasible for a private company. The company's interest in Bruce's Eddy appears to have been replaced by that in the two Snake River sites, which are economically feasible under existing laws. Recently the company applied for construction permits on the two Snake River sites. Conservation problems related to these sites are of a minor nature and losses to game and fish are believed to be negligible.

In 1955 Senator DWORSHAK obtained an appropriation of $78,000 for biological studies in the Middle Snake River Basin to be conducted by two United States Fish and Wildlife Service biologists. Studies of the Clearwater River's big game resource were begun in September. Continuation of this work, which is being integrated with a crew of three biologists of the Idaho Fish and Game Department will be dependent or additional appropriations. The Idaho Game Department plans to add a fourth biologist to the work, making a force of six biologists who will be assigned to the investigations of the Clearwater's rich resources.

Studies to evaluate fisheries resources of the Clearwater also got under way in 1956. When fisheries biologists of the Idaho Fish and Game Department began work on creel censuses, migration studies and the collection of other basic data on the Clearwater's salmon and steelhead resources. During the year ending in July 1955 the Clearwater steelhead count at the Lewiston Dam showed a sizable increase over any previous year on record. Approximately 14,000 adults were counted at the fish ladders. This represents an increase from about 3,500 in 1950, which was the first year a count was taken following the installation of fish passage facilities at the dam.

After obtaining funds for Federal survey on Clearwater resources, Senator DWORSHAK added an amendment to H. R. 6766, the Public Works Appropriation bill, which provided $100,000 for "detailed plans" of the Bruce's Eddy project by the Corps of Engineers. A telegram was sent to Idaho's Senator WELKER asking for an amendment on the Senate floor to remove the appropriation. Senator WELKER replied that the funds were believed necessary to "develop additional facts." A glance at the Dworshak amendment reveals that the "additional facts" brought out by the appropriation probably would have produced final plans for construction of the dam which has yet been unauthorized by Congress. The amendment was deleted in conference. As a result, the Corps of Engineers still lacks both the authorization and appropriations for the project and a stay of execution has been granted to the fish, wildlife, and other resources of the North Fork.

A review of the official position of Government officials relative to damming the Clearwater is interesting. Senator DWORSHAK is probably the most effective proponent of the Clearwater projects. Senator WELKER has tried mightily to stay neutral, but deserted conservationists in their hour of need when the appropriation for Bruce's Eddy Dam passed the Senate in 1955. Representatives PFOST and BUDGE give no clue as to their intentions. Idaho's Governor Smylie followed strict neutrality prior to becoming elected and carefully evaded any inquiry as to his position, but he has consistently favored a dam on the Clearwater instead of a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon during hearings held in 1955. Oregon's Governor Patterson and Washington's Governor Langlie joined Governor Smylie, of Idaho, in supporting dams on the Clearwater instead of a high Federal storage dam at Hells Canyon. Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay long ago expressed preference for dams on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers by withdrawing opposition to the Idaho Power Co. proposals which conflict with the proposed Federal Hells Canyon Dam. Len Jordan, former Governor of Idaho and now chairman of the International Joint Commission, favored the Clearwater proposals by filing a statement 10 days after the so-called hearing held by the Corps of Engineers in November 1953. And in July 1954, while Governor of Idaho, he transmitted his official blessing for both Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs projects, dams, to the Corps of Engineers by requesting their construction.

Lined up in opposition to dams on the Clearwater are many conservation groups, including the National Wildlife Federation, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho Wildlife

Federations, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, the Izaak Walton League of America, Sport Fishing Institute, Outdoor Writers Association, Sierra Club, the National Parks Association, and the Natural Resources Division of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Senators NEUBERGER and MORSE, of Oregon have spearheaded opposition to the Clearwater projects.

The Penny Cliffs dam would cause the flooding of 46 miles of the completed Lewis Clark Highway up the Middle Fork and Lochsa Rivers. Its penetration of the Selway-Bitterroot wilderness area has caused it to lose public support and leaves the Bruces Eddy project as the more imminent threat to the resources of the Clearwater. This project would cause permanent ruin to some of the most popular and most accessible fishing streams in the State.

During the last decade the lower North Fork adjacent to the proposed Bruces Eddy reservoir has had a great increase in numbers of elk. Large numbers of whitetail and mule deer also occupy this range. Several years ago it became apparent that a game population problem was becoming acute on winter ranges of this area and a larger harvest was thought desirable. The October 1 opening date was advanced to September 15 in a large area adjacent to the Canyon Ranger Station but poor roads and trails still kept out most of the hunters and commercial packers. The opening date was advanced to September 1 and the area enlarged to further encourage harvest of the surplus animals. Reports from hunters forest service personnel and outfitters indicate excellent hunting for elk, deer, and bear in the area.

Studies in similar areas in Idaho indicate that whitetail deer would be seriously affected by Bruces Eddy dam because of the traditional dependence of the species on bottomland for winter range. The damage that the dam would cause to the estimated 10,800 elk in the drainage can only be determined after exhaustive surveys and field observations have been completed by competent ecologists who are familiar with game-survival problems.

No reliable count of game animals has ever been taken in the Bruce's Eddy area. Only very limited information is available on snow depths, seasonal migration routes, and winter browse utilization, big game throughout the proposed pool area. Observations to date indicate that a huge elk and deer population may be dependent on winter range that would be flooded. Preliminary studies by biologists show that the area surrounding the proposed Bruce's Eddy impoundment contains a large population of elk and deer which are underharvested. Winter range in this area is superior to many of the similar ranges on the Selway and Lochsa and farther up the North Fork because it has not been subjected to as heavy use for as long a period by big game herds. In short, the Bruce's Eddy impoundment would probably flood some of the best and most critical winter range in the Clearwater drainage.

Mule deer, which are scarce today in comparison to their former numbers on the Selway areas, are still abundant in the North Fork.

Surveys to determine the effect of dams on the resources of the Clearwater will require a minimum of 3 years. If a heavy winter with deep snows does not occur during this period, additional time may be required.

As stated previously, authorizing legislation for Federal dams on the Clearwater may be introduced in the next session of Congress.

The Pacific Northwest Power Co. plans for the Bruce's Eddy dam are not known. It is possible that the company may apply for a license to build Bruce's Eddy before its preliminary permit expires in January 1956. Protests against this dam mailed to the Federal Power Commission would give additional insurance against such an occurrence.

Much of the critical winter range land within and adjacent to the Bruce's Eddy site is privately owned. At present it is available to game herds during the winter and spring months. Slackwater transportation, if made possible by the Bruce's Eddy impoundment, would render the land accessible. In this event, critical winter range would be subject to heavy use by livestock and could be used for other agricultural purposes which conflict with the requirements of big game.

In summary, the abundant wildlife resources of the North Fork are in a precarious position, and most careful management will be required to maintain the present level of abundance. Bruce's Eddy dam would cause heavy inroads on the big game resource and certain disaster to sea run fish.

[From the Pendleton East-Oregonian of January 26, 1956]

BRUCES EDDY DAM TOO HOT FOR POLITICIANS

(By Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration has run into unexpected difficulties in a proposed partnership arrangement between private utilities and the Federal Government for construction of Bruces Eddy Dam on Idaho's Clearwater River.

So far, the administration has been unable to find a member of Congress who will sponsor such a bill.

Moreover, conservation groups have banded together to take a strong stand against building dams on the Clearwater or Salmon rivers, where they claim damage would be inflicted on migratory fish and wildlife in the area.

STORY BEGAN IN 1954

President Eisenhower said in his budget message last week that he would be glad to recommend a big chunk of construction funds to start the Bruces Eddy project, if Congress would authorize it as a partnership dam. This would mean, generally speaking, that local utilities would put up some of the costs, the Government would put up the balance, and the utilities would get the 240,000 kilowatts of power which this dam would generate.

The story began back in August 1954, when the Federal Power Commission issued a preliminary permit for Bruces Eddy explorations to the Pacific Northwest Power Co., a combine of utilities—Pacific Power & Light, Washington Water Power, Portland General Electric & Montana Power.

By last spring, the utilities had asked the administration for a partnership agreement by which the Government would put up some of the dam's estimated $122,935,000 cost. The administration agreed and went to work on it.

The draftsmen of the bill thought it should be patterned after other partnership bills previously introduced in Congress for Cougar and Green Peter Dams in the Willamette Valley. This would mean the utilities would put up the costs allocated to power, while the Government paid what was allocated to flood control and other nonreimbursables.

The administration asked Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, Republican, of Idaho, to sponsor the Bruces Eddy partnership bill—but DWORSHAK wouldn't touch it. Usually one to play the power issue with great caution, DWORSHAK thought it would not be a particularly popular move to sponsor the utilities' proposal.

The Representative of the congressional district in which the dam would be built is Congresswoman GRACIE PFOST, a Democrat who has sponsored the high Hells Canyon Dam project and been highly critical of the administration for its power policy. She was no help to the administration in getting a sponsor for the bill. More than likely, she would oppose it.

Many persons involved in the preparation of the bill thought it to be virtually a dead issue until the President's budget message last week revived interest and discussion of it.

Among those to bring it up were representatives of most of the major national conservation groups, who met here last week and adopted a vow to fight Bruces Eddy and other proposed dams in the Clearwater and Salmon River area. They took the position that while these projects have been represented as good sites at which to make up the water storage and power that would be lost by not building the high Hells Canyon Dam, they would be injurious to fish and wildlife in that region—but Hells Canyon would not be harmful from a conservationist standpoint.

Under these conditions, it is considered doubtful that any action can be expected on a Bruces Eddy "partnership" proposal in the near future.

THE NEED FOR WILDERNESS AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to receive unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 1, 1955, a significant address on the Need for Wilderness Areas, by Mr. Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, and editor of the Living Wilderness. Mr. Zahniser had delivered his address at the National Citizen's Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People, in Washington, D. C., on May 24, 1955.

In asking for this consent, I said:

Mr. Zahniser not only pointed out the practical needs for areas of wilderness for recreational and other purposes; he also discussed the underlying philosophy, and proposed the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system.

Such a system, it was suggested, would be made up of areas already within our Federal estate that are appropriate for the purpose. No changes in jurisdiction would be involved. No new land-administering agency would be created. Areas within the system—areas already under some kind of Federal administration and still wilderness in character—would be designated, with congressional approval, by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, or by Executive order, with the provision that removal of an area from the system would be effected by Congress. The agency administering an area designated as a unit in the national wilderness preservation system would simply be charged with the responsibility of preserving its wilderness character.

The wildernesses in the national forests, for example, would continue under the protection of the Forest Service but with the guaranty of perpetuity that Congress can give. National park and monument areas would continue under the National Park Service. National wildlife refuges to be included would continue to be administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service as wildlife refuges, but without the developments and installations that destroy wildernesses. So it would be with any other kinds of land

in our proposed wilderness system. Each area would continue to serve its peculiar purpose in the program of its particular administering agency, but every agency would be charged with the responsibility of preserving the wilderness character of any such area in its custody.

A Wilderness Preservation Commission modeled in part after our Migratory Bird Conservation Commission would assist in the establishment and administration of the system and in the gathering and dissemination of information for the public, coordinating the common interests and activities of the various agencies. With a minimum of administrative time and expense and with only slight modification of our present land-management policies we would thus see affirmed our national policy to preserve for all time some areas of our pristine American wilderness.

The interest and response to this proposal from every part of the country have been remarkable. Few seem to doubt the underlying philosophy, or to dispute the practical need. Letters have been received from people in all walks of life—lay people and professional people, educators, physicians, scientists, conservationists—people with a deep concern to preserve their heritage of the magnificent, almost untouched, natural areas in our national parks and monuments, our national forests and wildlife refuges.

Mr. President, excerpts from letters responding to this wilderness proposal have been collected by the Council of Conservationists. Conscious of the special interest which I know this subject has for many Members of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that these collected excerpts be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following are excerpts from letters which have been addressed in the past 8 months to Members of Congress, to well-known conservationists, and to conservation and civic organizations, copies of which were furnished to the Wilderness Society by the writers of the letters or their recipients. It is significant that people of widely diverse backgrounds, from urban as well as rural areas, should have responded with such a unanimity of appreciation of the wilderness and its benefits to mental and bodily health, as well as for its recreational, esthetic, historic, and educational appeal.

Elizabeth B. White, M. D., of Spokane, Wash., writes:

"As a physician I see the need for people to get out * * * commune with nature. A great many of my patients are improved in mind and spirit after spending * * * a vacation in one of our vacation spots here in (the State of) Washington. They seem to gain a perspective that is not obtainable in the rush and humdrum of a business world. * * * We need wilderness areas. Let's establish a system whereby they will always be preserved and properly controlled."

Conservation of the human being is one of the prime objectives to be obtained in the conservation of wilderness—a conviction expressed by a research worker, Burgess W. Heacox, of Essex, Calif. Mr. Heacox writes:

"I have come to realize the significance of conservation practices and their importance for our continued welfare. Through my present work I am beginning to realize the importance of another aspect of conservation—conservation of the human being. This may sound a bit nebulous, but of what importance is the conservation of natural resources without a comprehensive program aimed at providing man with outdoor recreational opportunities. The opportunity to lose himself in a relaxing and peaceful environment, to reestablish his relationship with all the world of nature, perhaps even to instill a little humility as he realizes his comparative insignificance. Nowhere have I seen this expressed more adequately than in the paper by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of The Wilderness Society, titled 'The Need for Wilderness Areas' as inserted by Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 84th Congress, 1st session, on June 1, 1955.

"Speaking for myself and friends," Mr. Heacox continues, "we wholeheartedly endorse Mr. Zahniser's positive program (p. 7, The Need for Wilderness Areas) to secure the preservation of wilderness as a national policy—within the framework and jurisdiction of existing agencies."

These wilderness areas are essential to the American way of life, in the opinion of another research leader, John J. Craighead, of the cooperative wildlife research unit at the University of Montana. Mr. Craighead writes as follows:

"More and more we are beginning to recognize the need for preserving large areas of wild lands for recreational and esthetic purposes. As you well know, we have in the Northwest some of the finest and largest of these so-called wild areas (wilderness and primitive areas). As the population density in the Northwest continues to grow, decisions eventually will have to be made as to the best use of these lands in the general economy of the region. Many of us believe that these wild lands are essential to the American way of life, and in fact are becoming increasingly necessary as population density and its accompanying tensions build up.

"I am very much in favor of a bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system that would affirm a national policy to preserve such lands," Mr. Craighead continues. "Should such a system be established in cooperation with the Federal land administering agencies and conservation organizations, a provision that the removal of an area from the system can be effected only by Congress would be a tremendous step forward."

The desire for the consummation of national wilderness protection, with a recognition for the healing qualities of large wild areas, transcends political subdivisions. K. W. Hodgdon, assistant chief of the State game division, Augusta, Maine, writes:

"While we in Maine have several large tracts of relative wilderness areas and are fortunate in having been given the Baxter State Park area, I can well understand the concern of other States for the preservation of certain areas as wilderness areas to be set aside for the enjoyment of the future generation. I believe that we should not be blinded by our good fortune, and therefore should help in any way possible to establish a policy which would provide for such areas throughout the Nation which could be preserved against future exploitation. In the rush of today's business matters, such areas provide a mental relief as well as much enjoyment to those who have access to them. They could very well play an important role in the physical well-being of our people."

Another citizen, Paul J. Linsley, of Whittier, Calif., speaks for the serene influences of wild nature "as a most vital essential in this era of restlessness approaching hysteria."

"Such a bill if passed," writes John C. Asbury, Doniphan, Mo., "would be of great benefit to the general public as a whole, providing relaxation and recreational values for the present and future generations of our people."

The ministry of wild nature in its far reaches, to the soul, is touched upon by the eminent Suffragan Bishop of Connecticut, Robert McConnell Hatch, who writes:

"We have made an excellent start toward preserving a portion of our natural heritage for the recreational and spiritual benefit of our future citizenry. More needs to be done, in order to safeguard permanently certain of our remaining wild and primitive areas in a world that is becoming increasingly mechanized."

Again Bishop Hatch writes: "I hope that this program can be enacted before it is too late. * * * It is both practical and positive, and it contains the best hope that I know of for preserving our remaining wilderness."

"I pray," Bishop Hatch writes, "that Congress will act on your proposals."

The spiritual need is recognized also by Mrs. Helen M. Hiller, Mattapoisett, Mass.:

"These unspoiled places are of historical, scientific, and educational value but most of all spiritual. There is peace and relaxation. As Lois Crisler says in the Christian Century, no one can walk in the forest without a feeling of awe and pleasure. This is what saved Leo Tolstoy in his generation and ours.

"We have lost much of our virgin forests," Mrs. Hiller continues. "In 1907 there were 469 million acres. The annual burn has been 20 to 30 million acres, much of it the result of logging operations. Now there are 44,600,000 acres. The logging interests are determined to get more. They are working especially hard just now on the Olympic National Park. They want 225,000 acres. They have lengthy articles with many pictures in big magazines trying to win the public. We want the wilderness areas preserved for future generations by the maximum possible degree of security but is there any guaranteed security? The Indians thought they were safe when the Indian Reorganization Act was passed in 1934. Now it has been violated by an emancipation law and they may lose everything. Any law can be repealed or bypassed."

The intangible need is expressed also in a letter from Dave Gaskill, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.:

"I felt a deep kinship with your presentation; a difficult subject at best, dealing in large part with intangibles—intrinsic qualities that are generally out of the realm of majority experience—and often, I think, not well understood or even perceived in the sense desired. Wilderness values are something we must experience for ourselves. It is indeed sad that such universal values are so frequently unrecognized or overshadowed by practical, transitory demands.

"In particular, I am reminded of Europeans (mountaineers and such) whom I have met in our western high country and canyon lands, who, above all else, are deeply stirred by this quality of wildness, something fresh and delightfully new to their senses."

On this aspect I shall quote from another letter. It was written to Mr. Zahniser by Laurie Whitlock, of Arlington Heights, Mass., who said:

"Your address entitled 'The Need for Wilderness Areas' which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, touched me deeply as I know it must have touched thousands of others.

"You spoke so directly and challengingly to the very finest of innate human understanding. * * *

"Would that it had been reprinted in every newspaper in the country."

Next a scientist comments:

"As a professional mycologist and plant pathologist, I recognize especially the scientific values that will accrue if Congress

brings into existence such a system," writes Francis W. Holmes, of Amherst, Mass. Of the recreational values, he writes:

"These values far transcend the commercialized view of nature that is often all that remains in developed natural areas. Far from threatening our national park system with invasions and bloodlettings, we should be bolstering and enlarging it for our larger population and also creating a parallel national wilderness system."

John F. Wanamaker, assistant professor of biology, at the College of Liberal Arts, in Elsah, Ill., writes:

"I took steps as soon as I read the report to write my Congressman."

The need for permanent wilderness preservation as a national policy, persists throughout all of these letters that were received from correspondents who were moved to write by Mr. Zahniser's address.

A scientist, philosopher, artist, writer, and biologist of note, the distinguished president and director of The Wilderness Society, Dr. Olaus J. Murie, writes as a private citizen from Moose, Wyo.:

"Mr. Zahniser does not advocate a new department, but suggests that administration of these various areas remain in the care of the agencies in which they now reside. * * * We here in Wyoming are proud of the beauty of these recreational areas, and they mean a lot to us as people, but also, I would add, economically. Anything that you can do in Congress to further these ends I am sure will be acclaimed by the people of this State as well as by conservationists throughout the United States."

The president of Philadelphia Conservationists, Inc., Allston Jenkins, of Philadelphia, writes on behalf of his organization:

"I heartily endorse the idea of a national policy of wilderness preservation. Coordination and cooperation are vitally essential in saving our wild natural areas from misuse. At present there are often conflicting policies between various Federal agencies and departments. Federal legislation to correct this deplorable situation is badly needed.

"We have a priceless asset in our wilderness lands. They have cost us nothing. The value of what they give us cannot be reckoned. We should immediately take steps to recognize their worth by a strong national policy of preservation."

"With the rapidly increasing population in the United States and the greatly increasing appreciation and need of natural areas," writes Mrs. A. R. Laskey, from Nashville, Tenn., "we need protection for our national parks, national monuments, and wildlife refuges from infringement on their boundaries and natural grandeur."

Miss Ada Fuller Crowley, Englewood, N. J., writes:

"Some definite national policy must be set up."

"As lifelong users of the wilderness areas," writes Miss Evelyn B. Bull, Pasadena, Calif., "we strongly recommend the preservation of wilderness as a national policy, using existing agencies."

T. N. Anderson, of Eustis, Fla., editor of Fun, Facts, 'n' Fishing,' writes:

"Every year we who are interested in conservation fight a losing battle against commercial interests who wish to capitalize on all or parts of our now existing State and national forest lands. A Wilderness Preservation Commission would possibly help us to assure the future of land being left in a wild state."

Wilderness areas must be carefully protected from the changes that would damage the characteristics which make wilderness the prized resource it is—a prized possession of all the people. This is a thought that many of these correspondents stress. Don Bleitz, of Los Angeles, Calif., writes, for example, that he has "for many years been an advocate of and an ardent supporter for the inclusion of additional wilderness areas in various sections of the United States," and he emphasizes the need for "wilderness areas, to be left exactly as they are now, without additional roads nor any improvements whatever except maintenance of trails, etc." Mr. Bleitz adds: "If, during the next session of Congress, legislation is introduced to form additional areas I should like to urge your support of such legislation."

When the destruction of a wilderness begins, irrevocable change also begins. Its value historically as a living museum, as a source of continuity from our past, through the present, to the future, is extinguished by man-made alterations.

H. M. B. Weicksel, Renovo, Pa., writes:

"Because I live in a small town in the middle of one of the largest areas of wild land east of the Mississippi, I can see some of the desirable features of providing for the future some unspoiled tracts.

"Man has put his stamp on the vast majority of our outdoors, and all too often it has resulted in anything but beauty.

"It is quite likely that many of our citizens will be unable to appreciate unspoiled nature. Many will see only lumber in a tree or potential electric power in a stream and will picture to themselves the wealth in mineral resources lying beneath the surface.

"We apparently were not satisfied until we had destroyed the heath hen, the grayling, the eastern buffalo, and elk. We have just about done the same for the plains buffalo, the whooping crane, and the trumpeter swan. Must we add to the sordid record the last of the unspoiled wilderness?

"Not far from my home considerable areas have been ripped up by strip miners in pursuit of comparatively cheap coal and clay while thousands of deep miners are out of work. What were once productive farms or timberlands are now desolate wastes. Farms that might have produced for centuries are ruined for a few thousand quick dollars.

"The same thing can conceivably happen to our last remaining wilderness areas. If for no other reason than sentiment let's use every effort to preserve them as nature made them."

Douglas E. Wade, editor and educational director with the South Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, Columbia, S. C., comments:

"It was a genuine pleasure to receive from you a copy of Howard Zahniser's wonderful essay, The Need for Wildnerness Areas, which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"Believe me when I say that it gives one a good feeling to realize that some of you folks in Congress see clearly in this matter of wilderness preservation. Personally I consider an understanding of the wilderness problem basic to an understanding of the entire conservation picture. In your own State the Quetico-Superior country is much to the point. I have been in that part of our State. My home State is Wisconsin."

The "proposal to secure congressional recognition for such areas is very significant and should have the backing of various conservation organizations throughout the country," writes Paul W. Thompson, chairman of the Michigan Natural Areas Council, Birmingham, Mich.

A private citizen, Miss Irene Koslan, Bronx, N. Y., writes:

"It was with great pleasure that I read this paper. * * * It * * * presents the problem from every vital point of view * * * its philosophy (is) of such basic importance to the people of our land."

How universal is this sense, this need for wilderness preservation. Mrs. Robert R. Usher, of Tully, N. Y., relates this to experience nearer home.

"At present there has been much discussion in various parts of the country—including our own New York State—over preservation of national wilderness areas, parks, etc. I have just read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, The Need for Wilderness Areas, remarks of Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY quoting an address by Howard Zahniser, the executive secretary of The Wilderness Society.

"We hope that a bill may soon be drawn up to establish a national wilderness preservation system, with the joint cooperation of the Federal land-administering agencies and conservation organizations.

"We would like to see the bill include certain important provisions, such as: It should affirm the national policy to preserve such a wilderness system.

"It should define the proper uses of areas within the system and provide protection from misuse.

"The bill should list areas included and provide for additions by executive order or as recommended by Secretary of Agriculture or Secretary of the Interior and also provide that no area could be removed without approval by Congress."

On the editorial page of the Christian Science Monitor, issue of November 3, 1955, in a letter to the editor, Rose K. Gidley, of Palo Alto, Calif., discusses the importance of preserving the wilderness, and stresses what the wilderness does for mankind individually and, so, collectively. She writes as follows:

"To quote Robert Marshall, one of the world's foremost conservationists, 'it is difficult to overestimate the importance adventure assumes in the longings of innumerable vigorous people. Lack of opportunity to satisfy such longings undoubtedly is responsible for much unhappiness, for a considerable portion of the crime which is so often committed as a means of self-expression, and * * * even for war.' He (Robert Marshall) also continues to point out that the demand of the wilderness brings out a person's resourcefulness, is ideal relaxation, and stimulates esthetically all the senses which a man has. Further he points out that the wilderness brings 'to many human beings the most perfect experience of all the earth.'

"Are these not more important than all the political maneuverings and axe-grindings that seem to accompany the so-called development of the wilderness?"

William Mussig, of Lapeer, Mich., writes:

"I enjoyed reading Mr. Howard Zahniser's paper, particularly the chapter The Wilderness and Human Realities. The whole text illustrated explicitly the finest resort one can turn to in his most despondent and hopeless hour, for solitude and comfort, and to regain composure.

"It was my fate to experience the agitated harshness of a big city when inflicted early in youth with an eye injury and later on severe eyestrain because of occupation, with frightful consequences of becoming a total nervous wreck and making life an enduring misery. It was when I bought some wilderness land (it was wilderness to me—a mere scrub farm where I was prepared to grub for a living as a last resort) that I discovered the healing powers of nature—ever so slow but sure. That was 16 years ago and now at 49 I possess perfect health except for limited occular capacity.

"During those years it grew upon me to devote all my energy and time to preserve and develop this beautiful wooded lake farm for those who seek sanctuary. It is not wilderness by exact description, but enough for those with a sense of appreciation and imagination.

"It is gratifying to know this cause is toward a national policy. With an already over-industrialized Nation and all forms of business merging into colossal pyramids, cold and calculating, characteristically dwarfing more and more insignificant man, is it not possible for man to counteract these smothering forces to ground himself by the many natural resource organizations and start

climbing these colossal granite structures like a clinging vine to give it life and beauty? Imaginative as it is, there is room for individualism to make the most of this opportunity in promoting natural resource conservation by constructive objectives."

Mrs. Eddie W. Wilson, of Los Angeles, Calif., writes:

"As a citizen deeply concerned regarding the preservation of our wilderness areas—national parks and forests, State parks and forests, and our other heritages of the out-of-doors—and realizing the recreational, educational, historical, scientific, and inspirational values of these areas, I wish to tell you how greatly pleased I am with the paper presented by Howard Zahniser, May 24, 1955. I rejoice that this paper is now a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"I feel that Mr. Zahniser's statements on the need for wilderness areas and his assertion that wilderness needs are interrelated are true, indeed. And, finally, I feel that his detailed proposal for a national preservation system housed in a bill which thus provides for the joint cooperation of the Federal land-administering agencies and conservation organizations is very necessary and worthy of passage at the earliest possible time.

"Here I am reminded of the late President Theodore Roosevelt's plea at the Grand Canyon, Ariz., on May 6, 1903: 'Leave it (the canyon),' he urged, 'as it is. You cannot improve on it. What you can do is to keep it for your children, your children's children, and for all who come after you.'

"May necessary and immediate action be taken to keep our wonderful wilderness areas exactly as they are."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say, in concluding my remarks on the subject today, that in the very near future I hope to introduce a bill which will establish a wilderness-preservation system, thus embodying in legislative form this imaginative proposal which has already attracted such widespread support.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, last Thursday, February 23, I discussed briefly on the floor of the Senate the results of the investigation by the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee into East-West trade, or trade between our allies and the Soviet bloc countries.

At that time I pointed out that since the meeting of the COCOM—Coordinating Committee—in Paris in July 1954, considerable trade had occurred between our Western Allies and Communist bloc countries in some very strategic materials, machine tools, and other items which are vital to a war effort.

Mr. President, on the following day Great Britain admitted that it had doubled its trade with the Communist countries since the COCOM conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a news article published in the New York World Telegram and Sun of Friday, February 24, 1956. The article, which was written by R. H. Shackford, is entitled "Britain Admits Doubling Red Trade."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN ADMITS DOUBLING RED TRADE

WASHINGTON, February 24—Great Britain disclosed today that the 1954 relaxation of export controls on trade with Communist countries allowed her sales to Soviet Russia to more than double—from $41.2 to $89.3 million in 1955.

The sale of copper wire to Russia by Britain jumped from 7,500 tons in 1954 to 33,200 tons in 1955—more than four times.

Copper wire is one of the 100 items which Harold Stassen, former administrator of the Battle Act, agreed in 1954 to let 14 allies take off the embargo list.

SENATOR'S POINTS

The 1955 British figures were made availabe here by the British Information Service. Chairman JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas, of the Senate permanent subcommittee on investigations accused the administration of:

Making "astounding secret concessions to our allies whose merchants want business as usual with the Soviet Union."

Concealing the facts about this action and doing "everything to hamper and hinder the subcommittee's efforts to ascertain the facts."

Misleading Congress and misrepresenting the facts about Mr. Stassen's 1954 negotiations.

The Senator urged that Congress withhold action on the administration's request for $4 billion in new foreign aid money until his subcommittee gets the evidence.

Senator MCCLELLAN'S outburst in the Senate yesterday was the culmination of weeks of unsuccessful effort by the committee to get the executive departments involved in trade controls to agree to publish the facts.

In its survey of East-West trade, the British Information Service disclosed that, despite extraordinary efforts in the last couple of years, Britain had succeeded only in increasing its exports to Communist China from $19.3 million in 1954 to $22.1 million in 1955.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a syndicated article by David Lawrence, published in many newspapers throughout the country, including the Washington Evening Star. It is entitled "Strategic Materials List," and was published in the Washington Star of February 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGIC MATERIALS LIST: TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS OFFER TO SENATOR OVERSHADOWED REVELATIONS ON BANNED GOODS ALLIES SHIPPED TO SOVIETS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Sometimes the most sensational news is overlooked in the hurry of modern news gathering and maybe it's because the subjects themselves are not easily grasped. Thus a $2,500 contribution to a campaign fund makes headlines because it is easily understood or is announced under dramatic circumstances. But one would think that the revelation of a scandal in which the Allies of the United States obtain American money and then proceed to help to arm and industrialize Soviet Russia might also get full coverage in the press. But is received scant mention.

SENSATIONAL SPEECH

On Thursday of last week, Senator MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Permament Investigations, made a sensational speech on the floor of the Senate which was recorded verbatim in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He spoke of the most astounding secret concessions made by our Government in a conference with its Allies. He gave instance after instance of strategic materials released which will help the Soviet Union to build an armament machine that some day can be used to kill American soldiers and to devastate American cities.

Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, Democrat, chairman of the allimportant Armed Services Committee of the Senate, rose afterward to characterize it a most startling state of affairs. Three other members of the Armed Services Committee joined to deplore a scandal that shocked them. It was disclosed that Defense Department experts had protested in vain.

Senator MCCLELLAN reported to the Senate that his investigating committee had conducted hearings to try to find out how and to what extent the United States Government had agreed to allow its Allies to arm Soviet Russia. After reading the Arkansas Senator's speech one wonders whether the American Government in refusing to let Israel have arms or in letting tanks go to Saudi Arabia isn't straining at a gnat in the Middle East while swallowing a camel in Central Europe.

For Senator MCCLELLAN said that in August 1954 at a secret meeting of the United States and its allies 200 of the 450 items previously under embargo to the Soviet Union were released. The Soviets know what the items are because they are buying them, but to this day the executive branch of the Government here refuses to disclose to Congress just what the items are that have been released, though they have been published in technical periodicals abroad and in an official journal of the British Government's trade bureau.

Here are 4 conspicuous examples of the 200 articles released to the Russians:

1. Boring mills essential to the manufacture of tanks, artillery, aircraft, and atomic reactors used in submarines.

2. Vertical boring mills essential to the manufacture of jet engines.

3. Dynamic balance machines used for balancing shafts on engines for jet airplanes and guided missiles.

4. External cylindrical grinding machines which a Defense Department expert testified are essential in making engine parts, guided missiles, and radar.

"It was emphatically stated," says the Arkansas Senator in describing the testimony of a Defense Department expert on machine tools, "that it would be better to permit shells, guns, or guided missiles to be disembargoed and sent to the Soviet Union for they could be used against us only once while these machine tools will be used to make armaments of war which could be used against us many times."

Senator MCCLELLAN and other Senators served notice in the same debate that they wouldn't vote for the $4,900,000,000 asked by the administration for aid to our allies unless the whole matter was satisfactorily cleared up. Mr. MCCLELLAN said to the Senate:

TERMS POLICIES INCONSISTENT

"If we are providing these funds to our allies for the purpose of helping them to develop their military power and strength as a defense against communism, then how inconsistent is it for the same allies, for the sake of trade and profit, to place in the hands of the Communist bloc, the machines, materials, and other essentials of the war potential in a war effort? Is not the advantage we are trying to gain, and for which we are trying to provide, being offset by the making of such machines, tools, and materials available to a potential enemy?"

Plainly the administration is in for trouble in the Senate on the whole foreign aid program because of what has been done secretly and injudiciously to satisfy allied pressure for more trade with the enemy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., on February 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

In August 1954, a 15-nation group, including United States representatives, agreed to ease trade embargos which prevented Western nations from shipping strategic materials behind the Iron Curtain. Counsel Robert F. Kennedy, of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, says the number of embargoed items was reduced from 460 to approximately 250.

Included among the items decontrolled or downgraded were machines essential in making heavy artillery, guided missiles, jet engines parts, and tanks, as well as materials required for the production of ammunition and weapons parts. Rail equipment vital to the movement of tanks and oil also was included, as was beryllium, a metal used in atomic reactors.

Defense Department representatives, testifying before the subcommittee, have said they opposed downgrading and would be against further decontrol, because such moves aid the Soviet war potential.

Unfortunately, however, their testimony has been limited by the same official stumbling-block that has hamstrung the subcommittee for 2 years. It still is unable to get a list of the items that were downgraded in 1954; officials appearing before the investigating committee have cited President Eisenhower's letter to Defense Secretary Wilson on May 17, 1954, as authority for not replying to certain questions.

Mr. Kennedy believes protection behind the May 17 executive order has been sought to a point where it could be used by a future tyrant in the White House to cover up malfeasance, corruption, and even treason. Chairman MCCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas, of the Senate subcommittee says the United States has made astounding secret concessions to allies whose merchants want to trade with Russia. He has charged that the facts behind relaxation of free-world trade embargoes on strategic items have been concealed and hidden from Congress and the public, and that documents have been censored and classified to hide the errors, inefficiency, and poor judgment of certain officials.

These are serious charges; they are doubly serious because, in the wake of Prime Minister Eden's recent visit to the United States, American officials now are discussing liberalizing free-world trade by relaxed policies involving Red China and the European Soviet bloc.

Moreover, if satisfactory explanation is not given to Congress as to why East-West trade data is being withheld, this policy may, in the words of Senator JACKSON, Democrat, Washington, "invite complete jeopardy of the foreign-aid program." Congress deserves to know what agreements have been made in this field, and what moves are contemplated; a matter so closely akin to national and free-world security should be subject to the most careful analysis.

The administration ought to effect immediately the revocation or modification of the President's 1954 letter, which prolongs the unwarranted and undesirable curbs on information imposed by former President Truman, and which already has been the subject of considerable criticism.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published in the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of February 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE WITH SOVIET BLOC

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN is fully justified in his demand for public hearings on East-West trade by his Senate investigating subcommittee. Senator MCCLELLAN says that America's allies are selling war goods to the Communist nations, and if that is so, the fact shoud be made known to the American people.

He maintains also that one of the reasons for Prime Minister Anthony Eden's visit to Washington is to obtain further relaxation on Western restrictions on trade with the Soviet bloc, particularly Red China. Britain's trade with Red China is an established fact.

It is well known that the Western Powers relaxed export controls against Communist countries at the conference in Paris in August 1954. Harold Stassen represented the United States at that conference, and he has declared that the changes made at Paris were approved by the Eisenhower administration. It is understood that many items of a strategic nature were included in the list on which export controls were removed.

If this is so, it is difficult to understand why President Eisenhower gave his approval. Stassen has maintained that such a relaxation of trade with the Communists was for the best interests of the United States. But to furnish strategic materials to a government unquestionably devoted to a program of aggression against the free world, with major emphasis on the United States, certainly cannot be in the best interests of the American people.

This situation presents a subject for thorough examination, and Senator MCCLELLAN is fully justified in planning a careful study by his Senate Investigating Committee. Many items of a strategic nature are undoubtedly being sent to the Soviet bloc, and it is hard to understand why our Secretaries of Defense and State, and even the President, should approve this procedure. The best interests of the United States, as well as the security of the free world, demands that the situation should be looked into thoroughly.

MR. DULLES AND SOVIET POLICY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial written by Marguerite Higgins entitled "Mr. Dulles and Soviet Policy." The editorial appeared in the Monday, February 27, 1956, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is unquestionably a brilliant, highly motivated man with an immense scholarly background in foreign affairs. But, strange as it seems, there are an important number of his associates who wish the Secretary were not quite so scholarly, not quite so sure of himself, because, if this were so, he might consult more often with his own experts in such fields as Soviet affairs and, in the opinion of some, save himself from some errors. For while these experts may not have as impressive a scholarly background as Mr. Dulles, they do have more time to keep abreast of changing developments.

And the astonishing thing is that the vast majority of Government officials versed in Soviet affairs do not by any means agree with Secretary Dulles' statement Friday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the Russians have failed and that this accounts for their revisions of Communist doctrine. So deep is the disagreement that one official after reading the Dulles testimony sighed ruefully and said, "Sometimes I wonder whether the Secretary ever read telegrams from our Embassy in Moscow."

It may even be that in the heat of senatorial cross-examination, Secretary Dulles went farther than he had intended. For it can be authoritatively revealed that shifting Soviet tactics and impact they have already had not only in neutralist nations but among our allies, have already caused in the State Department and in the executive branch of the Government a major reexamination of our policies. And it can also be stated with equal authority that as a result important policy changes are in the offing. These include, specifically, those areas in which the United States has seemed to condone colonialism and oppose nationalism, by keeping silent out of deference to one or another of our European allies.

Instead of being the result of failure, the present Soviet tactics are viewed by the overwhelming majority of specialists in Russian affairs as being a sign of new economic and military strength and a new Soviet self-confidence. Tactics have been changed because Russia's new economic and technical strength (more engineers graduated yearly, for instance, than in the United States), as well as big backlogs of military hardware give Soviet leaders in the nuclear age an opportunity to use less risky methods of trade and technical assistance to attract nations if not into the Communist orbit at least out of the Western orbit.

Being a dictatorship, the Russians can afford to sacrifice their own people's standard of living to wage a politically motivated trade offensive. Moscow's recent and highly qualified renunciation of violence is a technique to soften fears of the target nations and make them more amenable to political and economic penetration. And the Russians also possess today what they did not have only a year ago—the threat of fear implicit in their new capacity for mass delivery of nuclear weapons by bomber, rocket, and guided missiles.

What is the Communist record? Here are some of the high points.

Between 1945 and 1950 the Communist empire expanded at the rate of 50 to 60 square miles an hour: all of East Europe, East Germany, China, North Korea, Tibet, Outer Mongolia, parts of northern Indochina.

During the war in Korea the United States had to face the fact that the Russians were mass-producing far more modern fighter planes (such as the jet MIG 15 and jet MIG 17) than we were and were able to give far more to its Far Eastern allies than we could to ours. The Chinese built up, thanks to the Russians, a 2,000-plane force in slightly more than 2 years, but we were saved in Korea by quality performance of our pilots.

Between 1945 and 1955 Soviet steel production more than trebled.

The Russians exploded an atomic bomb 2 years earlier than we said they could; they recently exploded a hydrogen bomb. They put formations of Soviet intercontinental jet bombers into the air before our own long-distance bomber counterparts were operational.

With the truces in Korea and Indochina (which the Communists claimed as smashing victories for their side and proof that the United States was a paper tiger) the only major Communist threat of force has been in Formosa.

By 1954, the Communists, who had exploded their own nuclear weapons and grasped their destructive power, looked around for methods of expanding Soviet power without risking Communist real estate. A rather vacillating New Look policy was born.

But it has reaped rewards (Austrian neutrality, for instance) and the realists in the State Department believe that the American people should be braced to expect further Communist progress resulting from the hard fact of visibly growing Soviet nuclear and industrial power.

And certainly one of the vital international results of the New Look is the discovery by many nations of the profit to be had in flirting with the Communists, now that they do not (outwardly) seem so menacing.

Egypt led the way. She traded some cotton for Communist-made jet planes and thereby galvanized the United States into extending credit and assistance for building the giant Aswan Dam—a project previously under discussion for 2 years.

This example has not been lost on such countries as Saudi Arabia which have been dropping hints that there are certain things they have long been wanting to get from the west and might, reluctantly of course, have to get from the Communist world. It's an example that hasn't even been lost on our stanchest friends and allies such as Turkey and Pakistan where voices are being raised to say that the way to lower your priority with the United States is to allow yourself to be taken for granted.

And who would have thought only 2 years ago—when the New Look was just beginning to emerge—that atheistic engineers of Communist Poland would be surveying the historic and holy pilgrim's railroad in the Arabic world with a view toward its reconstruction?

Or that Lebanon would be strongly tempted by Soviet offers to give technical assistance and credit in return for accepting Lebanese products, such as fruit, which the country is having a hard time selling?

Or that Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Premier of Cambodia, who 2 years ago told this correspondent that the friendship and assistance of the United States was the crux of that country's future, would be making a trip to Communist Peking and negotiating there a treaty of friendship?

Certainly the United States ought not to be panicked by the prospect of competition with the Soviet Union. This Nation is starting in a position of vast surpluses. Russia is a nation of enforced scarcities. It's true that such a Communist-type dictatorship can offer amazing financial terms without fear of public criticism at home. But if the United States handles matters coolly and flexibly—with maximum attention to promoting the independence and freedom of the nation involved—our rich and prosperous country has every advantage. But it's no use pretending that the Soviet offensive is a sign of weakness. To do so is to encourage people to think it will fail and cause popular disillusionment when—as is inevitable in the nature of things—the Soviets do have occasional successes. The new Soviet tactics, including the trade offensive, have been adopted because in the nuclear age they best seem to serve the age-old Communist purposes. And they will be carried out with the same determined—and deadly—earnestness as the tactics of old.

PRISON CAMP VETERANS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from Vincent A. Harrold, commander, American Prisoners of War, Inc.. 155 Richard Road, Braintree, Mass., together with the editorial referred to in the telegram which appeared in the Boston Post on February 28, 1956.

There being no objection, the telegram and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAINTREE, MASS., *February 28, 1956.*

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request you insert in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Boston Post editorial of this date entitled "Heroes or Chickenhearts?" This editorial completely expresses the feeling of this organization for prison-camp veterans. Maj. William E. Mayer's statement, "And, all too often, the prisoner lost even his will to live. He would crawl off in a corner, refuse to eat, and—without having any disease whatever—simply die" is vicious beyond all understanding. What a tribute to American servicemen who died for their country. What a consolation to their families. What a reflection on America's gratitude. Since repatriation from Communist dungeons American GI's have been the target of false accusation without parallel in the history of the Nation. This organization has and will continue to lead their defense. Hardened from experience of dealing with charges made against survivors of captivity, we are shocked beyond belief that even the dead are now to be included in this torrent of slander and abuse.

VINCENT A. HARROLD,
Commander, American Prisoners of War, Inc.

[From the Boston Post of February 28, 1956]

HEROES OR CHICKENHEARTS?

One of the dreadful legacies of the Korean war—the first of the Nation's wars in which we were not victorious—is the insistent attacks upon the behavior of the American soldiers while captives of the Communist enemy.

Red Chinese have given wide currency to the contemptous view that American soldiers were men who, if deprived of material sources of support, proved insecure, easily manipulated and controlled, lacking real loyalty or conviction either to country or to comrades.

Several hundred Turkish POW's in Korea survived almost to a man because they held to military discipline and comradeship, it is claimed by Army psychiatrists.

Are these low estimates of soldierly character in Americans true, or unfair distortions? One-third of the American prisoners died in Communist prison camps. Did they die because of a basic defect of character, as psychiatrists would have us believe, or because they were special targets of a ruthless campaign to discredit all things American?

Brain-washing techniques used by the Communists in Korea on American prisoners were successful in one-third of the four-thousand-odd Americans who returned home, according to Maj. William E. Mayer, an Army psychiatrist.

He bases his astounding claim on 1,000 case histories of released Americans. In view of the latest Red claim that 450 missing Americans cannot be accounted for Major Mayer's conclusions concerning "chickenheartedness" of Americans should be investigated. How can he reach this conclusion on the basis of testimony of men who have been brain washed?

Asked if brain washing turned many American prisoners into Communists, he replied: "Brain washing did not turn a soldier into a Communist. But it often did weaken him as a loyal American. It extracted from him astounding amounts of military information, and a great deal of useful, believable propaganda material. It achieved widespread collaboration. It created a substantial loss of confidence, among prisoners, in the American system, raising doubts and confusion in the prisoners' minds about themselves and their country, and it turned the American prisoners into the most docile uniformed men we have ever seen.

"Brain-washed prisoners rarely tried to run away, never organized any effective resistance to their captors. They apparently learned nothing from the Communists that would be of tactical or strategic value to the United States.

"And, all too often, the prisoner lost even his will to live. He would crawl off in a corner, refuse to eat, and—without having any disease whatever—simply die."

What proportion of the 450 unaccounted for crawled off in a corner and died?

The code of behavior set up for American personnel in the event of capture is either too easy, or completely ineffectual in dealing with a fundamental insecurity. We had better find out which and stop pussyfooting around the problem.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION INVESTIGATION OF BOSTON & MAINE RAILROAD

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know that every Member of the Senate was shocked and grieved to read last night of the heavy fatalities and injuries suffered as the result of a collision between two Boston & Maine Railroad passenger trains near Swampscott, Mass. Many citizens of Massachusetts and New England have long been disturbed by the growing number of accidents, mishaps, and mechanical failures which have plagued New England railroads in recent years and endangered the lives of their passengers.

Particularly disturbing are the reports that many of these incidents are due to inadequate expenditures for maintenance and safety. In recent years, both the Boston & Maine Railroad and the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad have been taken over by interests with financial ambitions more highly developed than their concern for their passengers or the area they serve. Since that time, both events and the official figures on file with the ICC have been cause for alarm. In 1955, for example, total cash expenditures for maintenance by the Boston & Maine Railroad—during its first year under new management—showed a drop of 20 percent below the previous 2 years. Most of this decrease came in the second half of the year following the installation of the new management, despite the heavy expenditures required as the result of last fall's floods.

It seems to me it is high time for the ICC to investigate fully the condition of these railroads and to report to the Congress and the people of New England on what steps may be taken promptly to prevent further accidents and fatalities.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be very glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, by the courtesy of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has the floor, it was arranged yesterday through the majority and minority leaders that I might be recognized for a period of time today to reply to remarks made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on Monday concerning the Secretary of State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I request, then, Mr. President, that I not be interrupted during the presentation of my statement. After that, I shall be happy to answer any questions which may be asked of me.

Mr. President, last Monday on the floor of the Senate the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] made a sharp attack on the Secretary of State. I regret that because of conflicting engagements I was not on the floor at the time, but the matter was called to my attention Monday evening and I read the full text of the speech.

In his opening remarks the Senator from Arkansas said:

> Will Secretary of State Dulles tell America the truth about our present peril, or will he say one thing publicly and an opposite thing privately? Will he give us a fair chance to decide for ourselves with full knowledge of the facts, what efforts we should make for our own salvation, or will he lull us to sleep in an hour when the Soviet Union has launched a powerful diplomatic offensive against us? Will he by his candor rally the free world to a trust in American leadership; or, from an apparent craving for popular approval, will he endanger the mutual trust which supports the association of free peoples?

Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas based his attack on the testimony of Secretary Dulles before the Foreign Relations Committee on the afternoon of Friday, February 24. The appearance of the Secretary was primarily to answer questions with regard to the tense situation in the Middle East, and it was not intended at that open hearing to go into questions affecting our foreign affairs generally. In fact, during the hearing Mr. Dulles stated that he was making a speech in Philadelphia on the following Sunday before the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum, discussing more fully the general world situation.

On last Monday before the Senator from Arkansas spoke, I inserted the Philadelphia speech in the body of the RECORD.

In attempting to make a reply to the criticisms of the Senator from Arkansas, I feel myself personally in a difficult position because of my personal relationship with the distinguished Senator. He and I have been in the Senate together since the elections in 1944, a period of over 11 years, and although we belong to different parties, we have been close collaborators in all matters pertaining to foreign affairs. I have particularly valued the Senator's world vision and his interest, which is mine also, in such important subjects as the exchange of students, technical assistance, and, in general, our so-called partnership relations with the underdeveloped countries of the world. The Senator from Arkansas and I have served on the Foreign Relations Committee for 9 years, and we have, generally speaking, been in full accord with the overall objectives of developing a truly bipartisan foreign policy.

I was deeply shocked, therefore, when the Senator attacked our Secretary of State because of certain off-the-cuff statements which the Secretary made at the Friday hearing, and completely ignored the more complete statement that the Secretary made in the Philadelphia speech. I would not have been shocked if the Senator from Arkansas had differed in the appraisal of world facts from the position of the Secretary—that would be a perfectly proper position—but to charge that the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, had actually misrepresented the facts to the American people, and to charge that he would say one thing publicly, and an opposite thing privately, is to me completely indefensible.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should prefer not to yield until I have finished my speech; then I shall be glad to answer any questions the Senator from Arkansas may desire to ask me.

I feel strongly that such an unfair representation by the Senator from Arkansas must be answered by those of us who were present on these various occasions, who have known and worked with the Secretary of State, and who realize that the carefully prepared Philadelphia statement was the complete presentation of the Secretary's position.

He was not endeavoring at the Friday meeting to cover completely the whole field, as he did on Sunday.

I could not refrain from feeling at the hearing on Friday that the Senator from Arkansas did all he could in questioning the Secretary of State to put the administration's policies in a bad light, and to imply that the position taken by the Secretary was calculated to give to the American people a false impression of success in our policies.

Let me turn to the exact language of the Philadelphia address so that we may attempt to find where the Secretary is guilty of misrepresentation.

When, on Sunday, in Philadelphia, the Secretary, in referring to the Communist Congress, said, "We cannot fully appraise what has happened," did he misrepresent the facts? I think not.

When the Secretary on Sunday in Philadelphia stated that these policies of the Russians are being revised "because they have been thwarted by the free world," was he misrepresenting the facts? I think not, and, once more, the Senator from Arkansas apparently thinks not, too. In his Monday speech the Senator from Arkansas said:

> The unity of the free world, as it was first forged after the Second World War, checkmated the Soviet policy of expansion as it was pressed along rigid Stalinist lines.

That, as I understand, is precisely the point the Secretary was making. Having been checkmated, the Communists are now trying a new and equally dangerous and perhaps more insidious method of achieving their objectives—which have not changed one iota—namely, the domination of the entire world.

When the Secretary stated on Sunday in Philadelphia that these recent Soviet moves have come about "not through change of heart, but because old methods had failed," I do not see how he was saying anything more than what the Senator from Arkansas said when he discussed on Monday the new—and I quote the Senator—"more effective means than the bluster, threats, and blackmail crudely employed by the Stalinist regime."

Certainly there can be no disagreement between the Senator from Arkansas and the Secretary with regard to the failure of the old, rigid, blustery Stalin methods, which caused the free world to unite. Surely that Stalin policy did not work out as planned. That is why we are now faced with a new method of Communist subversion which we must meet head on and with imagination and courage.

When the Secretary stated on Sunday in Philadelphia with regard to Soviet moves last summer that "We could only safely assume that new tactics were designed as a means of conquest," where did he misrepresent the facts to the American people?

What misrepresentation was there in the Secretary's forthright comment with regard to the meeting at the Summit, when he stated Sunday in Philadelphia that "We cannot yet tell the full effect of that conference"?

Speaking of the new Soviet political economic and trade offensive, the Secretary said that "We must assume that the intent behind the Soviet economic campaign is to subvert and communize the nations that are its targets."

Where is the misrepresentation here? I find none.

I call special attention to the following statement in Philadelphia by Mr. Dulles:

> But we must always recognize that the Soviet Communist experiment has won for itself a considerable popular prestige in the less developed countries.

Is this not a statement of the facts? Where are the distortion of the truth and the misrepresentation?

This last problem of Communist prestige, which Mr. Dulles has frankly noted, is a serious one to which we all must give considerable thought. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas has done so. I certainly have. I hope he and I can work together to see if we cannot help the State Department and Congress find an answer to this and other serious

questions raised by recent Comunist moves.

The Secretary stated on Sunday in Philadelphia that important as these Soviet moves are, nevertheless "We need not be panicked by the new Soviet economic policy."

Of course, that is an optimistic touch.

The Senator from Arkansas said in part:

> The new strength and boldness of the Soviet policy should not be the occasion for despair.

That is a note of optimism on the part of the Senator from Arkansas, which I am delighted to observe.

I cannot see that the Senator from Arkansas is so far from the position of the Secretary of State. In any case, surely here is no misrepresentation or attempt to mislead our people.

The Secretary went on to say in his Philadelphia speech:

> I do not wish to minimize the threat of the Soviet "new look," of which the economic campaign is a part.

I would ask, Is this a misrepresentation of the facts? Does this sound like a man attempting to "deceive the American people about the deadly menace which confronts them," as the Senator from Arkansas has stated? Or does it sound like a man who is trying to "lull us to sleep," as the Senator from Arkansas charged in his speech on Monday?

The Secretary on Sunday in Philadelphia went on to say:

> Meanwhile we have new problems. These will require new efforts, without relaxation of the old cohesion, resolution, vigilance, and strength.

I am sure the Senator from Arkansas and his colleagues will join us in supporting these new efforts.

I know that my distinguished colleague is aware of my deep interest and concern with regard to assisting the underdeveloped nations. I have spoken on that subject frequently and at length. Just a year ago next month I made an extended speech on the subject on the floor of the Senate.

The Secretary of State has now in his Philadelphia speech again urged support for a new and more flexible policy of economic aid to these same areas, a policy which will have more continuity and I hope even more sucess.

I urgently hope that all Senators will join in supporting this sound and vital request, originally made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message.

The challenge of the new Soviet policy seems to me to be clear.

As Mr. Dulles said on Sunday in Philadelphia:

> If our Nation and the other free nations play their proper part, we can face the future not with complacency—that would be disastrous—but with confidence.

The President has also asked for increased funds for the USIA and for student exchange. These are vitally important parts of our answer to the Communist challenge.

I know perfectly well that the Senator from Arkansas will continue to work with us in supporting these urgently needed requests.

Let me conclude by saying that I deeply regret that the Senator from Arkansas, for whom I hold such high esteem and deep affection, saw fit to castigate publicly on the floor of the Senate, and for the American people to hear, the Secretary of State for the ad lib statements he made on the general subject of world policy in a meeting which was called to consider specifically the tense situation in the Middle East.

I hope the Senator from Arkansas will not continue to insist upon charging the Secretary of State with various misrepresentations of the facts to the American people. By all means let us have our debates on the high plane of discussion of principles, let us always continue to review here at home matters of our foreign policies, but let me suggest that, in the future, attacks on the Secretary and our leaders be based on the full facts and complete statements of policy, such as were presented on Sunday in Philadelphia by the Secretary in his speech there.

Let us in a bipartisan way review together, work together, discuss together, our foreign policies. In this way we will provide a real service to Congress, to the Secretary of State, and to the American people.

If we work together, criticize constructively, and do not in the future permit ourselves in this election year to slip into mere acrimony and personal political attacks over foreign policy, we will, God willing, meet the serious world problems of today and tomorrow with confidence and success.

Mr. President, finally I desire to close my remarks with a personal reference to my relationship with the Secretary of State. I have known the Secretary for many years, and have observed with pride his growth in his chosen profession, foreign affairs, and his real leadership in the cause of world peace, which he has so successfully advanced during the administration of President Eisenhower. It has been my privilege to be with him in Japan in connection with the Japanese Peace Treaty and in the Far East in connection with the Southeast Asian Defense Pact. We may not always agree in all details with Secretary Dulles' approach to some of these problems, but we can all agree that there never has been a Secretary of State of higher integrity, or a Secretary more anxious to discover the facts and disclose all the facts to the American people, whom he is serving so effectively. I cannot permit the record of Congress to show that the integrity of Mr. Dulles was questioned without a strong protest from one who knows him personally as an individual, as a valued friend, and as a great American statesman.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I promised to yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have additional time in order that Senators who wish to ask questions, such as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], whom I have criticized, may be permitted to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from New Jersey make a request for a definite period of time, say 5 or 10 minutes?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should think 5 minutes would be sufficient.

Mr. KERR. At the end of that time, if the Senator finds he does not have sufficient time, he may make a request for additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the desire of the acting majority leader?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from New Jersey ask unanimous consent that he be given a specific number of minutes of additional time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for additional time not to exceed 10 minutes, so that Senators who have heard me may ask me questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I certainly should like to make it clear that there is nothing personal either between the Senator from New Jersey and myself, or between the Secretary of State and myself, which influences the discussion of foreign policy. I do not believe I said anything in my speech on Monday, or in the examination on Friday, which would justify any inference that my remarks about the Secretary of State were based upon any personal feelings about him.

If the Senator alludes to my reference to the New York Times item which said that Mr. Dulles did not believe what he said, I was quoting the New York Times. Of course, I think that is a statement which would leave the impression that the Secretary did know what he said was not true, but I did not say that. I merely stated it as an example of the extremity to which the Secretary of State had gone in his statement before the committee.

If I may make 1 or 2 preliminary observations preparatory to the asking of questions, the Senator has said the remarks of the Secretary of State before the Committee on Foreign Relations were

off-the-cuff statements. I do not know what impression the Senator seeks to leave. It was a very formal meeting with all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Every member was present except one. There were also present a large number of other Senators. There were far more Senators before that committee than there were on the floor of the Senate, or than are on the floor of the Senate at this moment.

The Secretary's statement was a very formal part of our procedure of legislating and considering American foreign policy. The Senator well knows that the caucus room was full to overflowing. There were present a half dozen television cameras. Radio representatives were present, as were representatives of the press. To try to leave the impression that this was a private curbstone opinion is not accurate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator will remember that some discussion took place between the chairman of the committee and Mr. Dulles. Mr. Dulles asked, "Is this to be a discussion on the Middle East situation, or am I to be prepared to discuss the whole question of foreign policy? I am going to give a full-dress speech in Philadelphia on general matters of foreign policy."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will permit me to say regarding his reference to whether the Secretary's statement would cover the Middle East rather than foreign policy generally, of course we presume the Secretary of State knows something about the whole foreign policy situation and not merely about the Middle East, although meeting arose as a result of events in the Middle East. It is difficult to put a particular geographical area into a watertight compartment in a discussion of foreign policy, because all areas are interwoven into the policy. But this was not a meeting in which one casually bumped into the Secretary of State and he made a statement. It was an extremely important formal meeting; it was not casual in any respect. I am sure the Senator will agree with that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with that, but the Secretary had said at least once that he was to make a statement in Philadelphia on the overall foreign policy, and the particular statement of Friday was on the Middle East. I cannot understand why the Philadelphia statement was not considered by the Senator in making his remarks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The testimony of the Secretary took place on the afternoon of Friday and appeared in the newspapers on Friday evening, Saturday and Sunday. I had Saturday and Sunday to think about it, and I wrote my speech on Sunday. I could not both write it and look at television. My remarks were based on the Secretary's testimony before the committee, where the Secretary was exposed to questions.

Under our system, the process of questions and answers is considered to be an acceptable way to arrive at the truth, or at least to arrive at the truth of what a man says and does. That is the traditional way it is done in our courts of law. If a witness is not exposed to cross-examination, it is thought that a witness may sometimes misrepresent facts.

All my speech was based on the statement made by Secretary Dulles on Friday. I felt compelled to confine my speech to that statement. I did not look up his statements to see what the Secretary of State said last week, or the year before, or subsequently. I would like to say that one of the principal reasons for criticism of the Secretary of State is that he will make one statement on Friday, a different one on Saturday, and another different one on Sunday. That is one of the reasons so many of us are critical of him. I know I, as one Senator, and I think it is true of others on our committee and in the country, would like to see the Secretary develop a policy which he could consistently describe, or describe in a somewhat similar manner day after day.

The fact that the Senator is saying that the Secretary of State said something different on Sunday from that which he said on Friday seems to me not to be relevant to a discussion of what he said on Friday.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Secretary of State did not say anything different on Sunday, but he had announced on Friday that he was going to make a carefully prepared statement on Sunday dealing with these matters and elaborating on the general policy statements he made on Friday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me the Senator insists on putting together what the Secretary said on Friday and what he said on Sunday, when I was talking about what he said on Friday. I was writing the speech on Sunday. The Secretary was not put under cross-examination in Philadelphia on Sunday. He was not subjected to any questioning. He made a statement before television, and that was that. The Friday before, he made a statement before all the members of the committee. We could all ask him questions. The Secretary is an accomplished lawyer from New York City. He has made a great success in the field of law. I hope the Senator is not trying to leave the impression that Secretary Dulles cannot take care of himself in questions and answers.

Mr. Reston, head of the New York Times Bureau in Washington, is the one who made the statement I quoted in my speech. I will quote it again. He is the one who said the Secretary of State—at least, in his opinion—did not believe what he said on Friday. I consider that a rather serious indictment. I do not know what the Secretary believes. I have no idea what he believes. I am completely confused as to what the Secretary does believe. All I am saying is that it was a great disservice to say what he did say to the committee on last Friday.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to say that it is interesting that the President of Italy, who just spoke to us in the House Chamber a few minutes ago, said this, which is almost directly contrary to what Mr. Dulles said.

I do not wish to implicate the President of Italy. I am sure he did not know what Mr. Dulles said. But, for the record, I wish to quote what the President of Italy said when he addressed the two Houses of Congress today. As shown on the first page of the draft I hold in my hand—and a few minutes ago all of us heard the address delivered by the President of Italy—the President of Italy said:

> It should be recognized that, despite hopes and patient and generous endeavors, the world is not more secure today that it was 1 or 2 years ago.

That statement is almost directly contrary to, and the opposite of, what our Secretary of State said on last Friday.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Has the Senator from Arkansas read the speech Mr. Dulles made in Philadelphia on Sunday? It seems to me that is a fair question for me to ask, in view of the criticism the Senator from Arkansas is making.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My observation is made on the basis of what the Secretary of State said in his appearance before our committee, where he was answerable for what he said. The fact that he said something different when he spoke in Philadelphia on Sunday, seems to me to be, not an excuse, but, on the contrary, all the more inexcusable.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Secretary of State did not say anything different when he spoke on Sunday; he simply amplified on the point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me read further what President Gronchi, of Italy, said today in addressing the Congress:

> In fact, we are going through a disquieting phase of confusion of ideas and political orientation, and consequently of greater potential danger.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, Secretary Dulles has never denied that we are in danger.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to what Mr. Dulles actually said in his appearance before our committee—something he did not say in the speech he made in Philadelphia. Let me say that I hold in my hand the official transcript of the proceedings on February 24 before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The transcript was made by Ward & Paul, and I shall read from page 35.

The Senator from New Jersey has said that Mr. Dulles came prepared to speak about the Middle East and, apparently, nothing else—although I do not accept such a restriction. I think he should have been prepared to make at least general observations about our situation generally, when he addresses the Committee on Foreign Relations.

But the observation of the Secretary of State to which I took as much exception as I did to any other observation he made

was this—and I read from page 35 of the report on the proceedings:

Senator FULBRIGHT. Unfortunately, they—

I was referring to the Russians—

seem to be making progress, and especially in the Middle East; do they not?

I referred especially to the Middle East.

Secretary Dulles replied:

I do not think so. I think they made very little progress in the last few years, and the proof of it is that at this very moment, in Moscow, they are having to revise their whole program. If we had to go through such a revision and change of our whole program as they are undergoing, it would be advertised all over the world that we had failed.

The fact is, they have failed, and they have got to devise new policies.

I submit that that was a statement about the Middle East; and the origin of that answer by the Secretary of State was my question which included the words "and especially in the Middle East." That was the question I asked—although there were some following parts, with which I shall not delay the Senator from New Jersey or burden the RECORD, because I have dealt with that before.

But that was the core of my question to the Secretary of State, because in the mind of any reasonable person the statement he made leaves the impression that things are fine and that the Russians have made no progress. I believe such a statement completely ignores the significance of the developments in Egypt and the riots in Jordan and the difficulties between Israel and the Arabs, and so forth. I submit that the statement he made was about the Middle East; and I submit that the objection about bringing in some extraneous matters is not supported by the record.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator from Arkansas think that is misrepresentation, or does he think perhaps it is an optimistic statement?

Let me call attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for last Monday, when the Senator from Arkansas made the following statement to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Surely the Senator from Massachusetts will not deny—for the record is very clear—that I remarked during the course of my questioning of the Secretary on Friday that, unfortunately, the Russians appeared to be making progress in the Middle East. The Secretary of State categorically denied that.

But the Secretary of State did not categorically deny it. He did not say "absolutely not." Instead, he said, "I do not think so."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I cannot hear what the Senator from New Jersey is saying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Let the Senate be in order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have been quoting from the remarks made on Monday by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. From what page has the Senator from New Jersey been reading.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have been reading from page 3375 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 27, at the center of the first column on that page.

I shall read it again:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Surely the Senator from Massachusetts will not deny—for the record is very clear—that I remarked during the course of my questioning of the Secretary on Friday that, unfortunately, the Russians appeared to be making progress in the Middle East. The Secretary of State categorically denied that. He said absolutely they were not making progress at all. I believe he used the precise words "absolutely not."

And so on. On the contrary, the actual words used on Friday by Secretary Dulles, in reply to the Senator's question, were:

I do not think so. I think they are making very little progress.

I think the Senator from Arkansas himself went a little overboard in trying to interpret what the Secretary of State said on Friday; and I do not think the entire statement or speech made by the Secretary of State, on Sunday indicated that he was overly optimistic. In fact, the Secretary indicated that the Russians had made some progress. So it is a matter of interpretation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator from New Jersey is making any point about the Secretary's use of the word "absolutely," I point out that the word was used as a part of the exchange between the Secretary of State and myself. I have already read from page 36 of the report of the hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I shall read from the report again, for this part of the exchange takes only a few lines in the report.

Following the statement by the Secretary of State that "the fact is, they have failed, and they have got to devise new policies."

The next portion of the report of the hearing is this:

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is a very interesting demonstration.

I was referring to the applause which followed that statement by the Secretary of State; I was not referring to what the Secretary of State said.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And then I said:

You consider that an approval, of course, of the accuracy of your statements.

Do you think this last meeting which just ended, I believe, would indicate, or that the speeches of Khrushchev and the other leaders in the Russian Government would indicate, a failure in their foreign policy.

Secretary DULLES. Absolutely, sir.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a totally different question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not totally different; it is a part of the questioning as to whether the Russians are failing, and are not making progress, and so forth. I think that is a legitimate interpretation of that passage. In one case the Secretary of State said, "I think not"; but in the other instance he said, "absolutely it is a fallacy."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a matter of interpretation of the facts; but I say that the Senator from Arkansas is not correct in saying that the Secretary of State has made misrepresentations to the American people.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 10 minutes be allowed for this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President I did say personally that Secretary Dulles did not believe what he said was true. I quoted the article in the New York Times; and I call the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to the language used—which, as I have said, is not my language.

But the question of motives and of what the Secretary of State intended is a difficult one. Either he intended to misrepresent, or else he is so badly informed that he knows little about the facts. It seems to me that one may take his choice. Personally, I am willing to take the position that the Secretary of State does not understand the plain developments that everyone else seems to understand. I do not know of a single person who knows anything about foreign relations who agrees with him. I have just read what the President of Italy said today. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that on yesterday there was a report of what happened in the British Parliament. It was said that there was "stunned disbelief" when they heard what Secretary Dulles had said.

Many outstanding journalists, such as the head of the New York Times bureau, Mr. Reston; Mr. Salisbury, also of the Times, who is one of the acknowledged authorities; and others take the position I have stated. I shall not repeat my speech; but I repeat that we have been losing strength in the Middle East and we are still losing strength in the Middle East.

I am not blaming the Secretary of State for the difficulties. But I blame him for not telling the American people, and especially for not telling our committee what everyone else believes and what I believe is the truth.

If the Senator from New Jersey says Secretary Dulles did not know better, then either the Senator from New Jersey accuses Secretary Dulles of being uninformed—much more uninformed than a Secretary of State should be—or else it must be that the Secretary was trying to deceive the people of our country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Arkansas says Secretary Dulles did not tell the truth about our present peril. If that is not accusing the Secretary of misrepresentation, I do not know what it is.

But Mr. Dulles, himself, admits the peril. In his speech at Philadelphia, he said:

But we must always recognize that the Soviet Communist experiment has won for itself a considerable popular prestige in the less developed countries.

He has not missed realizing the danger for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would like to have him tell us the truth. I did not say what his motive was in not telling

the truth. He could do it from ignorance, in which case he did not deliberately misrepresent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I maintain——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator maintain that the Secretary is an honest man, but does not know what is going on in the world?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I maintain no such thing, as the Senator knows.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator does not believe that we have not lost ground in the Middle East in the past year, does he?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course not; and the Secretary so indicates. He says that we must realize that "the Soviet-Communist experiment has won for itself considerable popular prestige in the less-developed countries." That means, of course, that we have lost ground in certain areas. He did not mean to say that we have not lost ground anywhere. He understands what the dangers are, and he warns us constantly of those dangers. He keeps telling us to be alert, and not to let down our guard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly what the Secretary did not tell us on Friday. He did not tell us to be alert, and that we are in danger. On the contrary, he said that the Russian policy was a failure. I asked him if the recent congress would indicate that it was a failure. He replied:

Absolutely, sir. It is a failure.

The whole purport of his testimony was that the Russian policy has failed, and that we are much stronger than we were before. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] asked him:

Are we stronger today than we were a year ago?

The Secretary replied:

Yes, sir.

What does that mean? Perhaps I do not understand language.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is a matter of appraisal of all the facts, and of both statements by the Secretary, on Friday and on Sunday. The Senator from Arkansas may take one view and the Secretary may take another. What I am objecting to is the charge that the Secretary misrepresented the facts. I am objecting because the Senator from Arkansas did not read the entire Philadelphia statement, which was made in connection with the other one, before he made his attack. It is not fair to castigate the Secretary of State before the eyes of the world, as misrepresenting the facts to the American people, when there was no misrepresentation of facts. All the facts are clear.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think he misrepresented them. I will not assert for what reason, whether it was because he did not know any better, or whether he did know better, and did it for some ulterior political reason, which was not the enlightenment of the committee. In that connection I state no opinion. I do not say now that he did it for this or that reason. What I say is that what he told us was completely contrary to the facts.

I do not wish to engage in a long exchange with the Senator from New Jersey. However, I should like to make one final observation.

There is one program which has been very dear to my heart, and which I think has much merit. It is a program in which I know the Senator from New Jersey is as much interested as I am.

On page 6 of the Senator's prepared statement appears the following:

The President has also asked for increased funds for the USIA and for student exchange.

I am bound to say that during all the time I have followed the student exchange program, this year is the first time a budget request has come to the Congress which was less than the request the year before.

Last year the budget authorized a request by the State Department of $22 million for the student exchange program. This year the budget would authorize only $20 million. Last year, after a very difficult struggle with the House, we got $18 million. The Senate granted the full $22 million, while the House figure was $12 million. We compromised at $18 million. To maintain that either the Secretary of State or the President has given the support which I think they should to this program leaves a false impression. I was very disappointed, and still am. I think it shows extremely poor judgment to fail to increase the appropriation for the student exchange program. The Advisory Commission on Exchange advocated and formally recommended $31 million for this program. However, in the face of all that, the budget, which we all know is controlled directly by the White House and not by the Congress, would permit the Department to ask for only $20 million.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree entirely with the Senator on that point, as he knows. I was in favor of the larger request, and I still am very critical of the amount arrived at by the Congress for the student exchange program. I think a mistake was made in not making the amount larger.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is a serious mistake. It indicates a lack of discrimination as to what is important and effective in this field. When we build up the Military Establishment, and constantly emphasize it, and deemphasize a thing like the student exchange program, it does not increase my confidence in the capacity of the administration to administer our foreign policy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator and I are entirely in agreement on that point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is in agreement on that point.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am in agreement on that point.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I correct in assuming that morning business has been concluded, and that there has been an extension of time for other matters?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY EARL OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without losing my right to the floor, to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank my distinguished friend and colleague for allowing me to introduce a very distinguished visitor from one of our sister legislative bodies.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce to Members of the Senate the Earl of Buckinghamshire, one of the Deputy Speakers of the House of Lords of the British Parliament. [Applause, Senators rising.]

THE CONSERVATION OF TUNA RESOURCES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Minnesota resumes his speech will he yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to yield to my friend from California, provided I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Minnesota in yielding to me at this time.

Mr. President, it had been my intention to address the Senate on a subject quite foreign to the pending agricultural bill. I had prepared an address on the conservation of tuna resources, which is of very great interest to the people of the State of California and to the Senators who represent that State in the United States Senate. However, I do not wish to interrupt the comments of my friend from Minnesota on the pending business. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD the address which I had prepared to deliver at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL ON THE CONSERVATION OF TUNA RESOURCES

The tuna fisheries support one of the large industries of my State. Somewhat more than 90 percent of the tuna caught by United States citizens is caught by California fishermen. Several thousand Californians man the far-reaching vessels of the tuna fleets,

other thousands can and distribute the product when it is brought ashore, and many industries, large and small, both in California and in other States profit substantially by supplying the vessels and other components of the industry with needful items. A substantial portion of the economy of San Diego and San Pedro is dependent upon the tuna fisheries.

In the normal course of events about 5 percent or less of the tuna catch consists of bluefin tuna which occurs close by southern California and the adjacent high seas off northern Mexico. Another fifteen-odd percent of the catch consists of albacore, the tuna of temperate waters, which is mostly caught also off southern California and adjacent northern Mexico, but is also caught commercially on north to British Colombia, and at various places in the North Pacific straight across to the main islands of Japan.

The other eighty-odd percent of the catch is about equally divided between the 2 tropical tunas—yellowfin tuna and skipjack tuna. These 2 types of tuna do not, and never have, regularly occurred in commercial quantities in the waters of California or the high seas off our coast. In the fall months of some years both sorts of tropical tuna may be found in the channel islands area off southern California in varying quantities and for varying periods of time depending on temporary and shifting movements of the warmer ocean currents to the northward, but in the normal course of events the commercial fishery for yellowfin and skipjack tunas has its northern limit in the seas about 200 miles south of the southern boundary of the United States. From there it continues all along the coasts of the Americas down to central Peru and even, on occasions a little farther south yet.

Around the outlying islands that rise steeply from the ocean floor, such as the Reuilla-Gigedo's, Clipperton, Cocos, the Galapagos, and Marquesas the fishing may be within a stone's throw of the beach, but along the mainland coast the fishing is ordinarily done out of sight of land, and, in some places and times, several hundred miles from land. The tropical tunas are truly pelagic fish. They are borne, they develop, live, feed, and breed and die in the open waters of the high seas. Where they come in over the shallow waters over the Continental Shelf it is ordinarily at the edge, and they practically never come into the shoal waters near the mainland. They stay, for the most part, out over the ocean deeps and that is where the fishery for them is plied.

The fishery for tuna in southern California began toward the end of the First World War. It developed rapidly during the 1920's and grew primarily on the basis of the albacore which were closest at hand. After 1926 the albacore virtually disappeared, suddenly from the inshore waters off southern California, and did not return for some years. The shifting ocean currents had diverted them to the northward and to sea beyond the range of the small vessels that were then employed in the fishery.

The market demand for canned tuna continued to increase sharply as it has continued to do up to this date, and the fishery shifted from albacore to the tropical yellowfin and skipjack tuna which were abundant, and unused, in the offshore waters to the south off Baja California. To get at these more distant resources larger and better equipped vessels were required. The large vessels had to operate longer periods of the year as they increased in size in order to keep the cost per ton of production down to a level which would permit consumers to buy canned tuna. By the time of the outbreak of the Second World War the small, local summer fishery had grown into a year-round fishery which customarily covered an area of ocean larger than the continental United States.

At the outbreak of the Pacific war the United States Navy drafted into war all of the large vessels of the fleet, and this type of vessel proved to be so useful to it in the central Pacific that the Navy constructed a substantial fleet of them for its own wartime use. At the end of the war the Navy returned to their former owners such of the tuna clippers as had not been sunk, and sold its own fleet of YP's one by one to tuna fishermen. In the postwar hunger for protein food the landings of the augmented California fleet grew by leaps and bounds, and the market absorbed all that could be produced.

Prior to this time the Fish and Game Commission of the State of California had conducted scientific research on the tunas, practically from the inception of the fishery. There had been no need for conservation regulations because the fishery had been so small when compared to the size of the resource. Only maximum- and minimum-size regulations had been instituted by the State of California.

But the tuna fishermen had well in mind the experiences of the halibut fishermen in the northern Pacific and the salmon fishermen in that same area. In those fisheries the resource had been overfished, the fishery reduced in productivity, and many fishermen had gone broke. Then, in both instances, treaties with Canada had been formed establishing International Fisheries Commissions which were empowered to make proper scientific studies, formulate and apply adequate regulations, and enforce those regulations. In each case, after a period of research, the resource had been restored to full productivity and the industries dependent upon them had returned to economic prosperity.

In view of the fact that the tuna fishery was increasing so rapidly in the postwar period, and with the prior halibut and salmon experience before them, the tuna fishermen of California took the sound precaution of asking their Government to take up with Mexico the possibility of a fishery conservation treaty similar to those that existed to the north with Canada in order that adequate research could be done on the tuna stock, regulations prepared against the day that they would be needed. They sought to avoid the period of overfishing and economic distress through which the halibut and salmon fisheries had passed by being forearmed with adequate scientific information so that regulations suitable for preventing overfishing could be made ready and applied when the time came that they were needed.

The United States did engage in such conversations with Mexico and in 1948 an adequate treaty for this purpose was signed with Mexico and ratified by both countries. It established the International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna. The United States appointed its Commissioners, but Mexico has not yet done so, and thus the International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna has never been able to meet and begin its work.

Meantime, however, actions had begun in another section of the world which were profoundly to affect the tuna fishery of California but which none of us recognized as having any connection with it at the time. In 1946 the Argentine Republic proclaimed its sovereignty over the Continental Shelf, the islands rising from it and the sea above it off the Argentine coast. The Continental Shelf off Argentina is wide, extending hundreds of miles to sea in its southern parts. There was no foreign fishing off Argentina. Presumably the only practical reason for the claim was an effort to perfect a claim over the Falkland Islands which rise from the Continental Shelf, which for generations had been occupied by England, and over which Argentina had been in dispute with England for some years.

Some 8 months later, on June 23, 1947, Chile issued a similar proclamation. But Chile, practically speaking, had no Continental Shelf. The mountains shelve off abruptly into the ocean depths. So Chile proclaimed its sovereignty to a belt of sea extending 200 marine miles from its coast. Nobody fished off Chile's coast, except an occasional European whaler, and, as a matter of fact, Chileans themselves did very little fishing despite the large fishery resources of the area. So far as could be determined the reasons for Chile's proclamation were not much more complex than the thought that if Argentina was going to expand its territory out to sea, then Chile had better do likewise.

Later in 1947 Peru issued a proclamation almost identical with that of Chile, proclaiming its sovereignty over 200 marine miles of sea, and incorporating it into its territory. This also had no effect on the tuna fishery because in that time no foreign tuna vessels fished off Peru. As a matter of fact the United States Government at that very time was giving financial and technical assistance to Peru to aid the Peruvians in establishing a fish canning industry to take advantage of the rich resources off its shores.

But in 1948 Costa Rica published a 200-mile claim also. Costa Rica was in the center of the area fished by the California fleet. Cocos Island, which belonged to Costa Rica lay about 350 miles off its coast.

Thus Costa Rica aimed to establish a band of territory extending 500 and more miles out into the Pacific Ocean which lay athwart the navigation routes to the valuable fishing areas in the high sea off Panama, Colombia, and Ecuador. Also they gave as a reason for their action that the tuna resources off their coast, although they did not use them, were being destroyed by American fishermen.

This appeared to the California tuna fishermen to be just the opportunity to which they were looking forward. They immediately solicited the United States Government to negotiate a conservation treaty with Costa Rica, and this time make it open-ended so that any other country with similar worries could also join in the work later by simple adherence to the treaty. Costa Rica was pleased to do this. In 1948 such a treaty was concluded and in the following year the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission began its scientific investigations. The Supreme Court of Costa Rica subsequently declared its 200-mile proclamation to have been unconstitutional.

At this point the conservation and diplomatic histories of the tuna fisheries took separate paths for a time. The scientific research of the Commission went on apace aided by the California State Fish and Game Commission, the Scripps Institution of Oceanography of the University of California, the Office of Naval Research, and the tuna fleets themselves. Panama adhered to the treaty and began to participate fully in the Commission's work.

By the end of 1955 the Commission had enough research information to be able to make some conclusions. Put in simple form they were these:

1. The stocks of yellowfin and skipjack tuna were quite different as to volume and their reaction to the fishery, and they required to be treated separately.

2. The intensity of fishery on yellowfin had grown to the point that in 1951 it had been close to the maximum sustainable productive level that the stocks were capable of. Had the fishery continued to grow it would have been necessary to apply conservation regulations in it. Because of economic circumstances however, the fishery had shrunk after that time instead of growing and no regulations were required at this time. In view of the uncertainties of the economic situation, however, the fishery might again take an upturn. Therefore, a careful watch was be-

ing maintained upon it and a proper form of regulation was being worked out which could be applied when needed.

3. The skipjack tuna stocks were so large in comparison with the fishery upon them that not only were no regulations required at this time but there could not be detected any effect of the fishery upon the stocks.

4. The tuna bait stocks in inshore waters were all ample and were not in immediate danger of overfishing; and

5. The anchovette stock in the Gulf of Nicoya (Costa Rica) had been completely killed off by natural causes (red tide), had been restocked by the Commission by transplantations from Panama, and the new stock appeared to be thriving.

In the meantime, the diplomatic developments had continued to come along their separate way. To each such claim to extended territoriality the United States filed a reservation stating that it would not recognize the jurisdiction of any country over vessels wearing its flag at greater distance from shore than 3 marine miles.

In 1952 Chile, Peru, and Ecuador signed a treaty which, among other things, purported to establish "the exclusive sovereignty and jurisdiction corresponding to each of them over the ocean adjacent to the coasts of their respective countries up to a minimum distance of 200 marine miles from said coasts." Since that time these three countries have acted as a unit on this subject in the United Nations and in the Organization of American States. The United States filed reservations to this joint claim, too.

Their next move was to drive a "draft convention on territorial waters and related questions" through the Inter-American Juridical Committee meeting in Rio de Janeiro by a 4-to-3 vote over vigorous objection of the three outvoted members, among which was the United States member. This was in July 1952. This treaty would have given the sanction of the American republics to these extravagant claims.

Later in 1952 the Inter-American Council of Jurists, of which the Juridical Committee is a permanent standing body of technicians, met in Buenos Aires. The IACJ pointed out that the Juridical Committee had exceeded its authority and returned the whole subject back to the committee for the study it had been requested to make in the first place, and which it has not done to this day. This was the last of the subject in the diplomatic field until the 10th Inter-American Conference met in Caracas in March of 1954.

At the Caracas meeting Ecuador, with the support of Chile and Peru, introduced a resolution, one part of which read: "The 10th Inter-American Conference reaffirms that the sovereignty and jurisdiction of each of the American riparian States * * * shall include an area of 200 marine miles, reckoned from the outermost points of the coast."

By exceedingly skillful diplomatic work by the delegates of the United States, Cuba, and Uruguay, a vote on this issue was prevented, and instead a resolution was passed calling for a "specialized conference" by the Organization of American States to study the conservation of the natural resources of the Continental Shelf and the waters above it.

Subsequent to this Caracas meeting in 1954 the Congress took heed of this situation and that its shrimp and tuna fishermen were being subjected to hardship and economic loss through seizures upon what the United States claimed was the high seas, and told them they had a right to travel freely upon them and under the American flag. The Congress passed what the President signed as Public Law 680, 83d Congress, 2d session. The principal provision of this act was that if a United States vessel was seized by a foreign country under claims of rights not recognized by the United States and was forced to pay a fine in order to escape, the amount of the fine was to be repaid the fisherman by the United States Treasury.

The Department of State then moved on the question in the General Assembly of the United Nations. In the fall 1954 meeting of the General Assembly two resolutions were passed, one instructing the International Law Commission to undertake a review of the total subjects Regime of the High Seas, and Regime of the Territorial Sea, and report back to the General Assembly on it with recommendations on the subject in the fall of 1956. The second resolution instructed the Secretary-General to convene a specialized technical conference on the conservation of the living resources of the sea in Rome in April in time so that the results and recommendations of the technical conference could be of use to the International Law Commission in its meeting in June at Geneva.

The International Technical Conference did convene in Rome as scheduled. Forty-five countries sent accredited representatives, and another six sent observers. After more than 3 weeks of study and deliberations, the conference adopted a report which defined the objectives of fishery conservation, cited the types of scientific information required for a fishery conservation program, listed the types of conservation measures applicable in a conservation program, described the principal specific international fishery conservation problems of the world for the resolution of which international measures and procedures have been instituted (including the tuna fishery), analyzed the applicability of existing types of international conservation measures and procedures to problems, and arrived at a set of general conclusions:

In the course of its report the conference said "The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, already referred to, is an instance where an international conservation policy has already been formulated for the exploitation of a fishery of comparatively recent origin. Such early action, however, has been exceptional."

Of all the nations of the Americas, Africa, Europe, and Asia gathered at this conference only the delegations of Chile, Peru, and Ecuador filed reservations to the report.

On the basis of the report of this conference and other considerations, the International Law Commission prepared its recommendations on the Regime of the High Seas, and the Regime of the Territorial Sea. In the first section it set forth a commendable and generally accepted set of articles under which nations could practically, by joint and peaceful means, undertake and insure the conservation of living resources of the sea. In its second section it said this about the breadth of the territorial sea:

"1. The Commission recognizes that international practice is not uniform as regards the traditional limitation of the territorial sea to 3 miles.

"2. The Commission considers that international law does not justify an extension of the territorial sea beyond 12 miles.

"3. The Commission, without taking any decision as to the breadth of the territorial sea within that limit, considers that international law does not require States to recognize a breadth beyond 3 miles."

Both of these United Nations meetings during the first half of 1955 resulted in sharp defeats for the 200-mile countries, and improved the position of that great majority of nations who hold that the breadth of the territorial sea shall be narrow, and that the high seas shall be free for the use of all, subject to appropriate conservation, regulations, applicable equally to all, in fisheries that have reached the stage of development where regulations are required. With reference to the tuna fishery of the eastern Pacific, specifically, it had been demonstrated that a high-seas fishery could be prevented from overfishing a resource by peaceful international cooperation and without the extension of territorial sovereignty into the high seas.

In the spring of 1955 Ecuador seized, again, two vessels of the United States on the high seas off her coast and, in the course of this seizure, an American seaman was seriously wounded by gunfire. One of these vessels was a tuna purse seiner from Monterey, Calif. and the other was a large refrigeration ship from Seattle, Wash. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held executive sessions at which officials of our State Department were heard, and for which our Ambassador to Ecuador was recalled.

An outgrowth of this activity was a request by the United States Government to the Governments of Ecuador, Peru, and Chile, jointly and severally to take this dispute to the International Court of Justice for settlement, to sign a treaty providing for joint action to protect the ocean resources from over-fishing, and to stop seizing vessels on the high seas while the case was under adjudication.

The three countries quite firmly refused to submit the case to the International Court of Justice. Their reasons, of course were obvious. They would lose, becaues their actions were contrary to international law.

It was only after the most severe pressure was exerted by the United States that they agreed to a conference to negotiate a treaty under which the countries could jointly protect the fish resources off their coasts. Finally on September 14, 1955 such a negotiation was begun in Santiago, Chile. The negotiations finally broke down completely on October 5. The Department of State has published the full documentation of the conference. At the end of its report the Department says:

"In the course of the Santiago negotiations the United States made every effort to include in its proposals for a conservation agreement measures and procedures adequate for the cooperative activities necessary to assure the continued productivity of the stocks of fish in the eastern Pacific Ocean of interest to four countries. Such an agreement would make the participating countries full partners in a conservation program involving effective research, recommendations for conservation based on scientific data, and enforcement of necessary measures. However, it was not possible to conclude such an agreement owing to the inability of the delegations of Chile, Ecuador, and Peru, without further consultation with their respective Governments, to negotiate an agreement which did not include provisions in effect giving recognition to their claims to exclusive jurisdiction over large areas of the hgh seas off their coasts."

Thus it turns out that Ecuador, Chile, and Peru were not, in fact, interested primarily in the welfare of the tuna stocks off their coasts, which is the only one fished by the United States. Obviously, they were not interested in competition between the United States fishermen and their own fishermen either, because the native fishermen of all three countries combined catch nominal quantities of tuna.

As a matter of fact, what they are driving at now with respect to the tuna fishery, aside from saving of pride, is somewhat obscure. Surely they should understand by this time that the United States Government is not going to pay tribute to them for permission for its vessels to pass by their coasts or to fish in the high seas off their coasts. At least this has been told to them bluntly by President Eisenhower, Assistant Secretaries of State, and our Ambassadors both informally and in writing. The Congress, in passing Public Law 680, 83d Congress, 2d session, confirmed and strengthened the actions of the Executive. The International Law Commission has refused to consider favorably their petitions. Forty-two nations at Rome

refused to act in a way favorable to them. By refusing to join the United States in submitting the dispute to the International Court of Justice they have as much as admitted that their claims are beyond the pale of international law.

Yet they persist and that is my reason for speaking at this time. The head of the Ecuadoran Navy has informed our fishermen that no matter what the Ecuadoran Foreign Office says, he is going to enforce the 200-mile limits off Ecuador. Within the past month his vessels have overhauled four of our tuna vessels off his coast. All were on the high seas. One he seized and took into port. It was released without fine upon direct representation by the United States Ambassador to the President of the Republic and through him to the head of the navy. The other three had their papers seized only, and were released because it was found that although they had been fishing off Peru all three had had proper licenses to fish in Ecuadoran territorial waters.

Now we come to the meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists held at Mexico City between January 15 and February 6, 1956. There we find the meeting rigged against the United States in advance by the broad territorial sea countries—Ecuador, Chile, and Peru. They had in secret prepared a resolution designed to appeal to nationalistic feelings of the delegates. This was hurried through on the last day of the session without study, without discussion, and without time for consideration. The only thing that our distinguished delegate, Mr. William Sanders, could do was file the following declaration and reservation of the United States, which eloquently states the situation:

"DECLARATION AND RESERVATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE RESOLUTION ON TERRITORIAL WATERS AND RELATED QUESTIONS

"For the reasons stated by the United States representative during the sessions of committee I, the United States voted against and records its opposition to the resolution on territorial waters and related questions. Among the reasons indicated were the following:

"That the Inter-American Council of Jurists has not had the benefit of the necessary preparatory studies on the part of its permanent committee which it has consistently recognized as indispensable to the formulation of sound conclusions on the subject;

"That at this meeting of the Council of Jurists, apart from a series of general statements by representatives of various countries, there has been virtually no study, analysis, or discussion of the substantive aspects of the resolution;

"That the resolution contains pronouncements based on economic and scientific assumptions for which no support has been offered and which are debatable and which, in any event, cover matters within the competence of the specialized conference called for under resolution LXXXIV of the 10th Inter-American Conference;

"That much of the resolution is contrary to international law;

"That the resolution is completely oblivious of the interests and rights of states other than the adjacent coastal states in the conservation and utilization of marine resources and of the recognized need for international cooperation for the effective accomplishment of that common objective; and

"That the resolution is clearly designed to serve political purposes and therefore exceeds the competence of the Council of Jurists as a technical juridical body.

"In addition, the United States delegation wishes to record the fact that when the resolution, in the drafting of which the United States had no part, was submitted to Committee I, despite fundamental considerations raised by the United States and other delegations against the resolution, there was no discussion of those considerations at the one and only session of the Committee held to debate the document."

I submit that these are not tactics and procedures which free and friendly nations should use in dealing with each other. For a body which is supposed to be technically qualified only in international law, which under the Charter of the Organization of American States is supposed to work as a serious, technical body, to adopt such a resolution affecting vital legal, defense, social, economic, and security interests of all nations with virtually no study, no analysis, and no discussion is amazing. It shakes one's faith in the whole structure of the Organization of the American States.

Certainly we are glad to work out in the traditional spirit of inter-American cooperation and friendship the complex problems of the high seas. But actions such as that taken at the recent meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists will only create difficulties for a program of genuine inter-American cooperation. It is not too much for us to ardently hope, indeed, to ask that the Council of the Organization of American States will take such actions as it may require to correct this ill-advised action of the Council of Jurists and reestablish faith in the normal processes of inter-American cooperation.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a few observations on the pending bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield whatever time is necessary to the Senator from Michigan, who wishes to speak on the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me at this time. I would not make the request, except that I shall be absent tomorrow attending the funeral of our late distinguished colleague, Senator Kilgore.

Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the business pending before the Senate, the proposed Agricultural Act of 1956.

Our time is short. I am sure we would all like to have this bill voted on as soon as possible. We must have a new farm law quickly, so that our hard-pressed farmers may receive at least some benefit during the current crop year. I shall confine my remarks to something I hold essential to this legislation, namely, 90 percent parity, at least on basic commodities.

There is no need for me to dwell on the plight of our farmers. The statistics are on record showing how the farmers are caught in a price squeeze which is growing worse by the day. Even the Eisenhower administration admits that the great prosperity of which it boasts somehow does not include the farmers.

I have the honor, in part, to represent the State of Michigan. I am proud of the fact that wherever I go people refer to my State as the home of the automobile. It is a great industrial State. I am proud of the many thousands of men and women who have made this possible. But I am also proud of many Michigan men of whom we have heard much less, namely, Michigan farmers.

The farmers of Michigan are good, hard-working, solid citizens. They, along with all other farmers, have been hurt.

The parity ratio, that measure of justice which describes in unmistakable terms the relation between prices paid by the farmers for industrial products they use and the prices they receive for their own products, was at 80 percent of the national average last January 15. That was very low, indeed, but the same parity ratio for the farmers of Michigan was even less, only 79 percent.

When farm parity is down to 80 percent, 1 percent here or there does not make much difference. I merely wish to show that our Michigan farmers are no better off than their brothers across the Nation.

Whenever our Nation faces a great crisis—for example, World War II, or the Korean conflict—our farmers are urged to increase their production to meet the expanded need for food. They have always responded with zeal by increasing production, often going into debt. Did they not know, when the fighting stopped, they would be left with an expanded agricultural system producing far more than necessary to sustain a peacetime economy? Certainly they knew. But they assumed, in good faith—and they had every reason to do so—that when the last shots were fired, when the grim reality of overproduction was staring at them, the United States Government—the very Government that had asked them to work hard and produce more—would stand behind them. They felt that while a period of readjustment was taking place, the Government and the people would share the common burden. That is what did happen after World War II.

But what happened in 1952? The big business, hard-money hucksters persuaded the people to accept a Republican administration. As a sort of bonus, the farmers got Mr. Benson. Let loose on the sensitive field of agriculture, Mr. Benson did his best to prove again an old fact, that the Republican Party is more interested in the profits of big business than the needs of the farmers.

After working hard for 3 years to ignore the needs of the agricultural population, Mr. Benson and the Eisenhower administration are suddenly interested in doing something for the farmers—so interested, in fact, that they forced themselves to borrow ideas the Democrats have been urging day in and day out; but the Republicans were late, as usual. We could ask, What is the hurry? Why the urgency after 3 years of inaction? Could it possibly be the heat of the pending election?

Someday, we may see a magazine article telling in praiseful terms how Mr. Benson drove the farmers to the brink of disaster just as his Republican colleague in the President's Cabinet brags of dangling the Nation on the brink of war three times. But Mr. Benson may not be as adroit as Mr. Dulles claims to have been. Too many of our farmers not

only have been dragged to the brink—they have toppled over. And Mr. Benson's only solution is a soil-bank mattress at the bottom.

What we need, Mr. President, is a fence—a high, rigid fence of not less than 90 percent of parity—to help the farmers, at least until the full effects of the soil-bank program can be felt.

But Mr. Benson says that 90 percent parity on basic commodities will defeat the purposes of the soil bank. He says the soil bank is designed to cut down production and, ultimately, to raise prices. So far so good. But then he says that 90 percent parity will counteract this by inducing the farmer to produce more.

Mr. President, I believe there is a fundamental error in the Secretary's thinking. Indeed, recent developments have brought out that his argument has no basis in fact.

If the volumes of statistics prove anything, they prove that we have hardly ever lost any sizable sums of money on crops which were supported at a relatively high level. On the contrary, most of the losses came on commodities which were supported by a sliding scale.

I think, also, that Mr. Benson's statements show something else, namely, a basic distrust of the farmer. Would the farmer overproduce if his acreage should be cut by the soil bank and he had 90 percent parity? I am not a farmer, Mr. President, but I know the farmers of Michigan and the kind of people they are. And I am sure they think like a majority of American farmers. The farmer, I believe, will look at it this way: He knows that farming is in great trouble, and that this trouble is overproduction. Now he is promised 90 percent parity. He may not be entirely happy, because 90 percent is only 90 percent, and not 100 percent. But he is realistic and reasonable.

He is willing to shoulder his fair share of the burden of readjustment, if he is given a decent break. He knows he will not get rich, but he will get along until better times come. So he will not feel forced, or even inclined, to defeat the program by overproduction. And when we ask him to put some of his acreage into the soil bank, he will cooperate.

In addition to giving the farmers a pretty low score for intelligence—and honor—Mr. Benson also is attempting another time-dishonored Republican stratagem. I refer to his remarks designed to drive a wedge between the farmers and the industrial workers. By placing the blame for the farmers' predicament on industrial wage levels rather than on inept Republican policy, he hopes to turn these two mighty groups against each other.

But he cannot do it, Mr. President. The farmer and the industrial worker need each other, and America needs both. They will live and work and prosper together, if we help them and if we ignore the crippling attempts of Mr. Benson and others in the Eisenhower administration.

All we are asking, Mr. President, is justice—justice for the farmers—to enable them to gain their rightful share of the Nation's economy.

There is talk that passage of the pending bill, containing 90 percent parity provision, will meet with a veto. Mr. President, the Republican conscience—if there is such a thing—already has to put up with quite a burden, but a veto of such a bill would not be merely the rejection of a piece of legislation, it would be a rejection of the American farmer.

Again I thank my distinguished colleague from Minnesota for the opportunity to make my statement for the RECORD at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to congratulate and commend the Senator from Michigan for the statement, and for his expression of conviction on the subject of the agricultural program. The Senator represents in part a great agricultural State, and he is doing it exceedingly well. We welcome the support and guidance he is giving us in this matter.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, yesterday the Secretary of Agriculture announced an export-sales program on cotton. The New York Times today carries a statement from a spokesman of the Egyptian Embassy, which states that his Government was most unhappy about the American decision. He said, "We consider it a very unfortunate step at this time."

I call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact that what the United States is doing in supporting the prices of farm products, and then selling them at a cheaper price in the world market, is exactly what Egypt has been doing. The Egyptian Government, until 2 years ago, had in effect a form of export subsidy. Then it also indulged in currency manipulations. The Government was using trade practices of that kind in order to take the markets of the American cotton farmer.

What the United States is doing is meeting unfair competition.

Most of the Southern delegation in Congress have worked for several years to get an export-sales program adopted by the Government. I think it means the difference between life and death for the American cotton industry.

The Department of Agriculture for a year now has been pressing to secure that kind of program, because its officials have realized that it is right and just, but their efforts have been blocked by the State Department.

I congratulate the Secretary of Agriculture and the officials of his Department on the announcement and on the imminent institution of that program. I did not know the announcement would come so quickly, and I had no inside information about the terms of the announcement. However, I am very highly pleased with its terms, and I am sure that what will happen will be of great benefit to the cotton growers of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when I yielded the floor on Monday, I indicated that my next discussion of the farm bill would be in the nature of a review of the position the agricultural economy occupies today in relationship to the other segments of the American economy, and, also, that I would cite for the RECORD some of the developments which have taken place in the past 3 years in the agricultural areas which should long ago have commanded our attention.

Mr. President, before I go into that, on this particular subject, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a matter of rather grave concern to me, and, I hope, of rather grave concern to my colleagues.

It may be recalled that on Monday I cited the propaganda and advertising program which was going on throughout the country under the sponsorship of the Republican National Committee in an effort to persuade the farmers of America to vote for the Eisenhower farm program. I hope, Mr. President, that that program will be offered by someone, so that we can vote on it, because if it is offered, it will be defeated. Of all the misrepresentations any man ever heard of, or to which this country has ever been subjected, the advertising program that is going on at the present time is the supreme and extreme example.

I have been receiving a few letters. In fact, Mr. President, I sat in my office last night until after 2 o'clock signing mail in response to letters which I had received from farm families in Minnesota. I picked out a few of them. We have two or three thousand of them, yet unanswered, I must confess, even though I signed more than 700 last night. I added some personal note in an effort to keep our farm people apprised of what is going on in the Senate in the discussion of the agricultural bill. But some of those letters referred to the Eisenhower farm program, and I received a few of the coupons—a good old advertising technique: "Send in a box top and get a farm program."

The trouble is, Mr. President, that some farmers have sent in the box tops, but the instructions on the box tops related to nothing which is before the Senate. The farm program which is before the Senate was written by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is true that a few parts of the program were recommended in the President's message—a message in an election year. That was a very interesting message. Many of the other points in that message had been scorned and scoffed at by the same administration only a year before—the soil bank, for example. Apparently someone reached the President's ear and told him that the soil bank was popular. Anyone who traveled with the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when it was holding hearings would know that many farmers were interested in some kind of a soil bank.

Of course, Mr. President, I wish the record to be accurate and clear that the soil-bank proposal is not new. We have

had the soil-bank proposal in Congress since 1933. Several Members of the other House presented bills providing for a soil bank, but all such bills were rejected by this administration.

It was my privilege to introduce a bill on the soil bank almost identical with the conservation reserve section in the pending bill. As late as September 30, 1955, the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture said that the program which Hubert Humphrey suggested was unworkable, too costly, undesirable, in addition to several other adjectives by which it was described. That was on September 30, 1955.

But then came the President's message on agriculture. A few stories appeared in such outstanding farm journals as the Wall Street Journal which indicated that the administration was going to urge a soil-bank proposal; and all at once the soil bank became a great miracle formula for solving all our farm problems. It is around this concept of the soil bank that the newspaper advertising, the spot announcements, and the radio advertising are going on—the Eisenhower 9-point farm program.

Some of my Republican colleagues want to vote for it. I hope someone will offer the whole 9-point program, and we shall see how many votes it can receive in the Senate as a substitute for the pending bill.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I may say that some of us will offer 1 or 2 amendments covering portions of that 9-point program, such as limitation on crop loans for price-support purposes. I had such a bill pending for several months, but the administration was opposed to it when a Democrat introduced the bill. Yes, I had a proposal to cut off and to limit crop loans for price-support purposes along the lines suggested by the President in his message, but his own Department of Agriculture said, last July, that it was unworkable, administratively difficult, undesirable, and used a few other descriptive phrases.

Mr. President, I want the American farmers to know that if they can get someone to offer the Eisenhower farm program they might have more chance to collect on all the box tops which have been sent in.

But I am happy to know that the farmers of my State are alert, as they have always been. They are good, solid farm folk. At some time in the course of this debate I intend to read quite a few of the letters which I have received from them. There is one at hand which I think is rather interesting. I picked it off the top of the pile. It says:

DEAR SENATOR: I just finished reading the Republican ads regarding Eisenhower's nine-point plan and how we should write immediately to our Senator. This is not the kind of letter they have in mind. Nor was it the kind of letter Benson had in mind in his hysterical tirade in St. Paul the other night. I am the lady who recently gave you the housewifely example on the price squeeze.

She goes on to tell about the prices the farmers are paying, and then she says:

Another point that frightens me—and threatens what you are fighting for—is the veto of 90 percent of parity. We small farmers are competing with the big farmer now. Then we small ones will be squeezed between Uncle Sam and the big farmer.

She goes on further in her letter and says, speaking of Mr. Benson:

He mentioned your sad comment that the administration is trying to wipe out all parts of the farm plan that will bring an insured income to the farmer. In injured agony he shouted, "How dare HUMPHREY make a political issue of the farm situation?" (He neglected to mention the Republicans will spend $250,000 to advertise their plan, assuring us we can charge our necessities. If instead if they, like you, would try to assure us an income, we could buy our overshoes next year, too.)

You don't have to answer me, but just keep your slingshot handy and ping away at Benson. Ping him a good one for me.

She is a lovely lady and shows good judgment.

Mr. President, there are many letters which I could bring to the attention of the Senate.

As I said in a reply to one of my constituents, I would be happy to have an opportunity to vote on the Eisenhower farm program. Of course, I would vote against it. But the only place where I have seen the program mentioned is in the newspapers. While there are departments of the Government which hand out statements of their policies to periodicals—selected periodicals, of course—generally, Congress does not base its votes on newspaper stories; we generally vote—and I know of no exceptions—on bills which are before us.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator familiar in a fairly complete way with the nine-point Eisenhower farm program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am reasonably familiar with it.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator find in the entire nine points any provision which indicated an additional dollar would be put into the pocket of either a Minnesota or an Oklahoma farmer in the calendar year 1956?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must say that after careful examination I not only found that there would be no additional income; but if the program as it was presented to our committee, in the terms of the administration bill, had been approved by the committee, the prices of farm commodities would have gone down, down, and down.

I exposed the joker in the administration bill under which the administration was to have a sleight-of-hand performance to pay for the program. It is interesting to note that there was nothing included in the budget for the new soil bank program. It was to have been paid for by selling surplus commodities from the Commodity Credit Corporation into the domestic market at any price which could have been obtained for them.

When my colleagues learned that such a provision had been placed in the bill, they abandoned the bill as fast as it was humanly possible for them to leave it.

Mr. KERR. Is there any Republican now living of whom it can be said that he understands definitely every one of the nine points in the Eisenhower farm program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have not found one. I might say that if we continue to look, there is a possibility one will crop up.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Minnesota earlier mentioned something about election year programs. To what was he referring?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was referring to the most recent election year promise—the 1956 variety. The old promise of 1952 is still existent; it is untouched, unused. It apparently has been encased in some kind of political mothball preparation. But there is a brand new one out.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was the old promise honored?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The old promise was not honored. Apparently the old promise was a part of the storage program. It has been stored away.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What was the old promise?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The old promise was repeated often. Many of the letters I have before me refer to that old promise. It was the golden promise in Minnesota. The little town of Kasson has attained international fame because it is the place where the promise was made, but it was never redeemed by the Republican politicians.

At Kasson, in Dodge County, one of the finest areas of our State, the President, who was then the candidate of the Republican Party, promised 90 percent of parity; and he became so enthusiastic that he even put the amount up 10 more points, to 100 percent of parity. He went up to 100 percent. It paralleled the reaction of the stock market after Eisenhower speaks; it goes up 10 points.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was the promise made only in Kasson?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then Candidate Eisenhower went to Brookings, S. Dak., to Fargo, N. Dak., and to Omaha, Nebr. He was sort of making the rounds of the Midwest with his promise. It got better as time went on; it was a promise, without any ifs, ands, buts, or ors, that there would be not less than 90 percent of parity.

Mr. Benson has commented about the mess which the Republicans inherited, and about the terrible aspects, as he points out, or paints it, of 90 percent of parity. But all of that was known to the Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1952. He knew what 90 percent of parity meant. I trust he did.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is not the Senator indulging in a pretty violent assumption to state categorically that the Republican candidate in 1952 knew what he was saying?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am of a charitable nature today, and of a charitable mind.

Mr. KERR. Then, if the Senator speaks through charity, I can find no fault.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I am happy to yield to my charitable friends.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I take it that General Eisenhower, when he was a candidate for office in 1952, knew that the Republican farm program was for at least 90 percent of parity, and eventually for full parity, with no ifs, ands, or buts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is eminently correct. Candidate Eisenhower went even further by promising 90 percent of parity not only for storage commodities—the basic commodities—but for perishable commodities as well. Our hog farmers, who are getting about 60 percent of parity, are looking for the other 30 percent. One of the greatest hunts is now going on in our part of the country. The hog farmers are looking for the other 30 percent from the Republican parity.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I take it, then, now that we have laid the groundwork, that what the Senator really is referring to is what is supposed to be the present Eisenhower farm program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the one which is appearing in the newspapers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The one which is getting the half page advertisements for which the Republican senatorial and House campaign committees are putting up $250,000 to popularize the propaganda throughout the country. Is that the program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Where is that program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only place I have been able to find it is in my mail. It is not on the Senate calendar, I assure the Senator. It is not before any committee. I imagine there is a copy of it at the White House, and I assume there is a copy in the possession of the public relations firm in Chicago, about which I shall have something to say before the debate is finished.

Here is a copy of it. I always keep one handy. This is one of the half-page advertisements.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am getting them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The interesting thing is that there is not an upper Midwest Republican Senator or Representative who wants to endorse it; yet it is being published in their areas so as to help them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true; but it does carry the name of a Republican Senator and a Republican Representative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what could be called service beyond the call of duty. Those men should be honored for that, rather than to be chastised. I know the Senator meant his remark only in the sense that those Members of Congress are doing political work and political duty.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator indicates that this is a part of what seems to be a $250,000 advertising campaign.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the price which is stated. That is probably conservative.

Mr. KERR. Is there any statement in the advertisement as to where the funds came from with which to pay for the ad?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, it says: "Paid for by National Republican Senatorial and Congressional Committees."

Mr. KERR. Is that a farm organization?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I doubt it. The chairman of the senatorial campaign committee, our distinguished friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], has resigned, just as the sponsors of the administration's farm bill withdrew when they learned what the administration had placed in the bill.

I feel sorry for my colleagues if they were led to believe that something else would be in the bill. It is necessary to read through the fine print. There is a lot of fine print.

Mr. KERR. That is, in the advertisement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is very little heavy print. It is the fine print which really should be noted.

No; if this is a farm organization, it is a new one. But I doubt if we could really call the National Republican Senatorial and Congressional Committees an agricultural organization.

Mr. KERR. The advertisement does not contain a list of the board of directors, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, it does not.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed at this point in my remarks the release entitled "The Joker in Ike's Farm Bill." It explains what was in the administration's farm program.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOKER IN IKE'S FARM BILL

There is a joker in the deck of the administration's widely publicized new program for solving the farmer's plight, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, charged today.

"Instead of helping to bolster farm income and farm prices, all it is designed to do is to unload Government holdings of farm commodities at distressed prices on the domestic market in direct competition with the farmer already struggling for a better break on that market," Senator HUMPHREY said.

"Because they have run into too many obstacles against disrupting foreign markets by dumping these products abroad, they now propose dumping them at home—underselling other products farmers have to sell, and underselling their own support program.

"The entire farce is exposed in language of the administration's own farm bill introduced in the Senate yesterday—the fine print in the insurance policy that belies all the glowing promises made by the salesmen in the President's farm message and in the Secretary of Agriculture's testimony before the Agricultural Committee.

"It is a provision permitting the Government to sell surplus commodities into our domestic markets at the market price, regardless of support levels, to pay off the certificates given farmers in return for voluntarily cutting back their production beyond the allotments to which they would be entitled under law.

"Neither the President's message nor the Secretary's testimony revealed this fact. Both indicated that the program would be financed out of the existing stocks, but neither revealed that their intent was to dump these commodities at any prices they would bring regardless of how much they depressed the existing market.

"It becomes apparent that they are more concerned about getting rid of Government holdings than they are about what happens to the farmer.

"Anybody in the commodity trade will tell you that this single action will be the greatest price depressant for prices of basic farm commodities yet invented. If such a measure is pressed further and enacted, you can expect sharply lower prices for major grains.

"The sad part about it is that this administration brainchild would in the long run increase rather than decrease Government holdings.

"If the Government intends to sell its present holdings at lower than support prices, it only means that it will capture all the market from farmers and in turn have to take possession of all the farmers' commodities placed under loan at higher levels. It would just be a vicious circle, of everything having to go through Government hands to be sold back cheaper to the trade. I doubt very much if any buyer would be foolish enough to buy at higher prices from the farmer if he knows he only has to wait to get the same commodities at the administration's fire-sale bargain counter."

Senator HUMPHREY explained that the present law prevents the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling its stocks at less than 5 percent above the support level, plus interest, unless they are in danger of deteriorating. The administration bill provides for removing that 5-percent restriction, but then goes even further to exempt from any limitation the sale of any amount of commodities necessary to pay off the soil-bank certificates, he added. It is the latter proposal that Senator HUMPHREY vigorously protested as sabotage of the entire farm program price-support loan concept.

"Every action this administration has taken since it has been in office has tended to depress farm prices, and thereby drive more stocks into Government hands. It was too good to believe that the bold, new program would be any different—and now the truth is exposed. Once again, the administration is embarked on driving farm prices still further downward. The only difference is that the former objective was supposed to have been to force some farmers out of business. NOW, the objective is just getting rid of stocks in the Government's hands—regardless of the consequences upon farmers.

"Strangely enough, it is entirely contrary to everything this administration has preached about 100 percent of parity in the market place. Now, apparently, they want to determine themselves just what the farmer should get in administered prices and drive the market place down still further.

"When they talk so glibly about paying for removing the surplus with the surplus itself, what they are really saying is that they want to pay for it out of the pockets of farmers—out of their already depressed income, by driving it down still further.

"After having lowered farm prices, increased surpluses, and driven thousands of farmers off the land, the administration now proposes that the farmers still remaining pay the bill for the failure of its farm program and its administrative bungling.

"This new formula will result in crippling the free market, lowering farm prices, and lowering the boom on the Nation's farmers," Senator HUMPHREY said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to be clear. So far as

the junior Senator from Minnesota can recall—and I will keep the RECORD open for any corrections—all the Senators who introduced the administration farm bill repudiated that particular section when they found out what kind of a provision had been placed in the bill for financing the soil bank. That was an act of honor and intelligence on their part. I commend them for thinking in terms of the public interest, rather than being victimized, so to speak, by a measure which did not carry out what they thought was in it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Minnesota mentioned something about Secretary of Agriculture Benson going around the country talking about the mess which he inherited. Can the distinguished Senator tell the Senate and the country how much farm prices have declined in more than 3 years under this administration, and how much, in comparison, farm costs have risen?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have that on page 22. I have a long speech to make. I intend to document the farm case. It will take a little time to do so, because there has been so much misinformation that even when one has the truth it is necessary to take a little time to study it.

The total net farm income has declined 29 percent. The increase in the cost of farm operations I shall get to in more detail, but answering the question broadly now, most of the manufactured goods farmers use have risen 4 or 5 percent in price. That does not include the increases in taxes and interest, and the largest single increase is in interest.

Do my colleagues remember the day Ezra Taft Benson raised interest rates on emergency disaster loans? Interest—— this administration has had a price-support program for bond brokers and bankers ever since it has been in office. The first thing it did was to raise interest rates. Interest rates have not flexed one bit; the administration wanted them high, and rigid.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator not include power trusts as a group for whom the administration has had a program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I could expand the area of friendship and affinity of interest to many groups.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that when the President directed the preparation and execution of the Dixon-Yates contract, he proved he not only was in favor of fixed price supports, but was in favor of at least 125 percent of parity, provided it was for the benefit of a select few rather than for the farm families?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma is so right that there is not a man alive who would even think of disputing what he has said, because the record is replete with the very unfortunate and unhappy facts of the Dixon-Yates fiasco.

Mr. KERR. Therefore we can fully assume, at the beginning of the discussion, that the administration is not against fixed price supports and is not against 100 percent of parity or more, provided it is for the benefit of the designated few who are the especially favored of the administration. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is so right. I should say that, with few exceptions, there is an exclusive class in the group of the favored few wherein the farmer is not to be found.

I have another matter I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. The New York Times of this morning carried a very interesting news story, to which some reference was made earlier today. The news story is by one of the most able, noted, and distinguished reporters, Mr. William M. Blair. The date line is Washington, February 28. I shall read parts of the news item:

> WASHINGTON, February 28.—Ezra Taft Benson announced today that the Government would put all Federal-owned surplus cotton on the world auction block, effective August 1.
>
> The Secretary of Agriculture said also that he had offered southern Democratic Senators a higher support price for cotton in return for their support of the administration's flexible price-support system.

A little further down in the column, the following appears:

> Both actions by Mr. Benson were expected to have explosive effects. His recital of dealings with southern Democrats appeared certain to set off new political fireworks as the Senate moved toward a showdown vote on the bitterly contested farm issue.

I would not want to say that what I am engaging in now is fireworks, but I intend to light a match and throw a little light on the subject.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Might it not be an entirely worthy aspiration that it develop into fireworks insofar as the continuity of the present administration and the Secretary of Agriculture is concerned?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed.

Mr. KERR. The Senator would not be averse to building a little fire under the Secretary of Agriculture, would he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not now or in the future. Let me say I would not be averse to having a fireworks display now, although I usually wait until the Fourth of July.

Mr. KERR. Nor would the Senator be averse to adding a little fuel to the fire which he believes is burning, would he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to add the fuel of facts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the New York Times to which I have made reference be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENSON TO OFFER SURPLUS COTTON IN WORLD TRADE — FOREIGN PROTESTS EXPECTED — HIGHER PROPS PROPOSED FOR SOUTH FOR FARM BILL AID

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—Ezra Taft Benson announced today that the Government would put all Federal-owned surplus cotton on the world auction block, effective August 1.

The Secretary of Agriculture said also that he had offered southern Democratic Senators a higher support price for cotton in return for their support of the administration's flexible price-support system.

[Reports of the surplus-disposal plan sent cotton futures tumbling as much as $3 a bale in heavy selling on the New York Cotton Exchange. In Liverpool, some futures dropped the daily limit permitted by market rules.]

A protest was registered immediately by Egypt, one of the world's leading cotton producers. A spokesman at the Egyptian Embassy said his government was most unhappy about the administration decision. "We consider it a very unfortunate step at this time."

Mr. Benson said the new program would seek to recapture "our share" of the cotton market through sales of surplus cotton at world competitive prices. This is a step long sought by many southern Members of Congress and some cotton interests.

DUMPING IS DENIED

Both actions by Mr. Benson were expected to have explosive effects. His recital of dealings with southern Democrats appeared certain to set off new political fireworks as the Senate moved toward a showdown vote on the bitterly contested farm issue.

The competitive sale of all surplus cotton was regarded as likely to cause worldwide repercussions among countries that already have protested strongly the administration's surplus disposal methods.

Mr. Benson decried intentions of dumping cotton or other products to force down world prices. But, he said, the new cotton program is "notice to the world that we're not going to continue to hold an umbrella over world markets."

He referred to the Federal price support program that has held American cotton prices above world levels. He set an export goal of "somewhere in the neighborhood of 5 million bales a year as our share of the world market."

Exports totaled 3,500,000 bales for the fiscal year that ended last July 1. Exports for the current year have been estimated at less than 2,500,000 bales.

Nearly 12 million bales of cotton valued at more than $2,100 million are tied up under Federal price supports. Under a special program, cotton is being sold abroad at 6 to 10 cents a pound below domestic market levels. This program was started with an offer on January 1 to sell at competitive prices 1 million bales of low-grade cotton. More than 890,000 bales have been sold to date.

In instituting the special program, the United States promised other countries it would not sell more than the 1 million bales between January 1 and August 1.

These major farm front developments were accompanied by a reiteration from President Eisenhower today that he would not compromise on the flexible versus rigid price support issue in this election year.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, Senate Republican leader, said the President had "made clear" that he stood solidly behind the flexible system at a White House conference with Republican congressional leaders.

SOUTHERNERS NOT NAMED

Mr. Benson declined at his press conference, the first in several weeks with Washington newsmen, to name the southern Democrats or other Members of Congress with whom he had talked. But he named three Democrats about whom, he said, "it was rumored" that they might switch from rigid to flexible supports. All are from major cotton-producing States. Their names had been put forward previously as possible "switches" by farm organization lobbyists on Capitol Hill.

They were Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, and Senators JOHN J. MCCLELLAN and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.

Mr. Benson's statement was elicited by a reporter's question on whether he had made any commitments, oral or written, to any Members of Congress in return for their support of flexible price supports. He answered:

"I have had some very frank discussions with some of them but so far as making firm commitments, there hasn't been a word written. We have just talked and I have talked very plain and very frank as to what I thought was needed, particularly in the case of cotton."

Pressed for a definite answer as to whether he had made any commitments "oral or otherwise," he replied, "Well, I don't know."

He then said he had told the southerners of the need for "flexibility in the cotton support program" and "what we would be willing to do in this Department" if flexibility was obtained.

He said, "we would be willing to move the adjusting support level" by a smaller amount if he obtained adjustments in the price and in the staple length upon which price supports were based.

"And we have even talked in terms of what amounts," Mr. Benson added in referring to what the support level would be if the Southerners were willing to grant concessions.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND gave a clue to the situation only yesterday in a speech in the Senate floor. He said be believed that the support rate on cotton for this year "will be fixed at a reduction in price of less than 3 cents a pound." This reduction was necessary, he said, to place "cotton in a better competitive position" with synthetic fibers.

He coupled this statement with a conviction, that the administration probably would support legislation to fix a minimum cotton acreage allotment for 1957 to 1958 to prevent a 1,500,000-acre cut next year. He thought the floor under cotton would be 17,391,000 acres, the national allotment for this year.

Mr. Benson said the price support of parity mentioned by Senator EASTLAND was a little high. Mr. Benson said 86 percent of parity might be a better figure. Cotton was held at 90 percent last year, the first year of operation for flexible supports.

Prior to the adoption of flexible supports, 90 percent of parity was mandatory for cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and peanuts. The Senate bill would restore this fixed level to these so-called basic crops.

Parity is a Federal standard designed to assure farmers a fair return for their products in relation to purchasing power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to read parts of the article:

Mr. Benson declined at his press conference, the first in several weeks with Washington newsmen—

He has been away from Washington. He has been having conferences at Des Moines, St. Paul, San Francisco, and other places. He has been out of the city, explaining the farm program, so he has not been here to have these conferences.

Mr. Benson declined at his press conference, the first in several weeks with Washington newsmen, to name the Southern Democrats or other members of Congress with whom he had talked. But he named three Democrats about whom, he said, "it was rumored" that they might switch from rigid to flexible supports. All are from major cotton-producing States. Their names had been put forward previously as possible switches by farm organization lobbyists on Capitol Hill.

Then he goes on to name our colleagues.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Neither Senator from Texas is included?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, the Senator from Texas is not included.

Mr. DANIEL. Neither Senator from Texas is included.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Neither Senator. I protest Mr. Benson's indicating that he can make any kind of offer which will in any way change the vote of any of our colleagues. I think what he was trying to say was that he had such a wonderful policy and program to offer that he switched their votes.

I happen to know that one of those Senators had his mind made up a long time. In fact, I know of two of them, and I am sure the third is going to stand with us on 90 percent of parity price supports.

I should like to remind the Secretary of Agriculture and any other official of the Government of the fact that this is the administration which seems to think there are arrogant lobbyists running around. My colleagues may remember that in the President's veto message of the gas bill he mentioned the arrogance of certain interests, and the administration suggested that there are lobbying activities which should be investigated. There are 1 or 2 lobbies which they might investigate in their own shop, such as Executive lobbies.

Mr. President, in the United States Code, under title 18, section 1913, there is a section under the heading "Lobbying With Appropriated Moneys," which reads:

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service * * * telephone * * * or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer—of the United States, or of any department—thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment.

There have been many Members of Congress who have been quite disturbed by what they consider to be the lobbying activities of the present administration.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. On the basis of what he knows to be the facts, with reference to vigorous lobbying by certain representatives of the executive branch of the Government, would the Senator think that when the President uses the term "arrogant" with reference to lobbyists, his application of it is based solely on whether or not the lobbying coincides with his viewpoint or can be found in his official family?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There seems to be a good deal to show that is true. I should like to point out that, as I said earlier, Mr. Benson, in his press conference, makes quite clear what he is trying to do. He is trying to split up the votes in the Senate, and I want my friends from any section of the United States, particularly from the South, to know that one of the ties which has bound together the North and the South, particularly the Midwest and the South, is our great agricultural economy. We have had a great deal of identity of interests. The Secretary is moving in. He is offering a special corn program deal, a special cotton deal, and other suggestions here and there—anything to break down the provision before the Senate for 90 percent of parity.

I shall in a moment read from the report of his news conference. I think what I am saying is most moderate, and temperate. I wish to say again that I refuse to believe that the votes of any of my colleagues are for sale or barter to this administration or anyone else. I think it is about time we hammered that home. I do not think that minimizes the reflection Secretary Benson has cast upon some of our colleagues by naming them and stating that he expected them to switch their votes as a result of his attempts to influence them.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not perfectly and dramatically apparent that he is trying to divide and conquer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator took the words right out of my mouth. I was about to say it is part of Benson's tactics to divide and conquer. He has been trying to use Senator against Senator. For a long time the laboring man was used against the farmer and the farmer against the laboring man. Now we see the tactics of arraying farmer against farmer.

I read from the Secretary's press conference of February 28, which was reported stenographically by the Federal Reporting Service, in reply to questions as to whether he had made any kind of commitments on any commodity to any Members of Congress:

I have had some very frank discussions with some of them but so far as making firm commitments, there hasn't been a word written. We have just talked—

Mr. President, the written word seldom appears if we are trying to get at lobbying. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not entirely possible that the facts the Senator is now laying before the Senate would form a basis for indicating at least the possibility that the special committee which was recently selected by the Senate might look into the actions and statements of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was going to put a statement in the RECORD. I was about to say that reports of what Secretary

Benson has said he has done or attempted to do come mighty close to indicating infringement of at least the spirit of the statute to which I referred earlier, namely, title 18, section 1913, lobbying with appropriated moneys—close enough to make it appear necessary to let our new Special Committee on Lobbying look into it closely.

I wish to continue reading from the transcript. The Secretary said:

We have just talked—

Speaking of visiting with Members of Congress—

and I have talked very plain and very frank as to what I thought was needed, particularly in the case of cotton.

In answer to another question the Secretary said:

Well, I don't know. We have gone quite a ways, in which I pointed out what I thought was necessary, and expressed the hope they would go along with that kind of a program, including getting some flexibility in the cotton-support program.

Asked as to whether or not he had made any firm commitment, he said:

Well, I have made no firm commitment. You can put it that way. I have discussed possibilities, and what I thought would be a reasonable thing to do, and what we would be willing to do in this Department.

The Secretary of Agriculture should be the Attorney General. This is lawyer's language. He says "what we would be willing to do in this Department."

That is not a commitment. It is what he is willing to do, which means, "Perhaps you can push me up a little more."

We would be willing to move in this direction if we could get some adjustments in price supports and staple length.

What the Secretary is saying, in substance, is, "We would be willing to move up the price supports on cotton as close to 90 percent as you can get it, so long as you do not say '90 percent.' "

Then he says:

We are going to discuss the staple length.

I will say to my friend from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] that this has quite an effect on Texas. It has quite an effect on Oklahoma. It has quite an effect on Arkansas. We do not raise cotton in Minnesota, but I do not intend to allow the Secretary to divide me and the people I represent in the Senate from our friends in the great agricultural areas of the Southwest and the South. The moment we start to pit cotton against wheat, beef against soybeans or flaxseed, or dairy products against some other products, we become divided, and we have no farm program.

This administration has not believed in an effective price-support program. I have said publicly, and in the confines of our committee, that responsible officials in the Department of Agriculture have said openly that they did not believe in price supports. Those who are administering this program do not believe in price supports. I regret to have to say this, but even if we write the best law the human mind can conceive, if this administration remains in power and Secretary Benson remains on the job, it will be so poorly administered that it will be ineffective. No law is any better than its administration. We may have all the laws necessary on the books to prevent crime, but unless there is a good enforcement officer, a good chief of police, crime will be rampant. We may have a weak law on the books, but if we have a diligent, persevering administrator, good results will be obtained. There is much power in the present law which has not been used. There has not been the will to use it.

Listen further to what the Secretary said in his press conference:

We would be willing to move the adjusting support level at a smaller amount than though we didn't get those things—

That is not a very clear sentence, but I think we can get the idea—

We would be willing to move the adjusting support level at a smaller amount than though we didn't get those things; and we have even talked in terms of what amount.

What the Secretary is saying there is that if he gets what he wants, he is perfectly willing to move the price supports up just a little more, so that they will be palatable.

Let me say to my colleagues, who are here representing their areas and their States, that they should do the best they can, as they see it, for their respective States. They have problems. There are many problems in the cotton industry. But it is not the privilege of the Secretary of Agriculture to create an air of doubt over what we, as Senators, are going to do in connection with this bill.

Furthermore, if the Secretary had any proposals with respect to any particular commodity, he, or his representatives, should have appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If they had anything in particular they wanted to say, 15 members of the committee were sitting day after day and night after night to hear from them. Is it not interesting that this proposal is made only a few days before we vote on the farm bill? Mr. Benson is not much of a Secretary of Agriculture, but I take off my hat to him; he is some politician. He plays rough.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator mentioned something about Mr. Benson trying to divide Senators from the South and West—a very reprehensible act on his part. I wish to join the Senator from Minnesota, and say that I, for one, will not be taken in by that kind of strategy.

The Senator has also pointed out that Mr. Benson has tried to assign, as the cause for the farmers' plight at present, the fact that workers are getting increased wages. I point out that in New Orleans last September, Mr. Benson went so far as to say that the reason for the plight in which the farmer found himself was the fact that industry was making too much in the way of profits. How thin can he slice it? How much can he get away with? I think we should go into this question very thoroughly, as I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will do—and no one is better prepared to do so—and bring out the facts.

Let us bring out a few facts in connection with parity, high rigid price supports of 90 or 100 percent.

Is it not true that this administration—and the Senator from Minnesota and I voted for it because we believed in it—reintroduced the Brannan plan so that the woolgrowers of this country could get 106 percent of parity at the present time, and be entitled to as much as 120 percent of parity?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In substance that is correct. The principle of compensatory payments, which was the economic principle of the Brannan plan, is in the wool plan.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Parity for wool is 106 percent at the present time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It could go up to 120 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is nothing wrong with that. I am in favor of it. Why not put that principle into effect, so that it will be of some benefit to all other farmers?

We all know that parity means subsidy. If we are going to talk about a subsidy to the farmers, why not lay all the subsidy cards on the table and talk about subsidies to railroads, steamship companies, and airlines? Why not discuss the tariff, a form of subsidy which has been in operation for more than 150 years in the interest of businessmen? Why not talk about all these things? In effect, we are discussing the same subject. Why pick on the farmer, who, in the entire concept of our economic life, is the only segment whose income is going down and down? This administration, in the person of Secretary Benson, has said that the farmer can expect a further 6- to 10-percent decline this year. Why not do something to help the farmer, instead of using him as a scapegoat, instead of browbeating him and putting out propaganda publicity for the purpose of beating down the farmer and placing him in a bad light?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has placed his finger on something which should be discussed, and which we intend to discuss.

The American farmer has been far from the only recipient of beneficial programs on the part of the Government. I have before me a report from the Library of Congress on subsidy payments by the United States Government since 1940, pertaining to the Post Office Department, among others. More subsidy was paid on second-class mail last year than was paid out at any time, in any one year, in all the dairy program, to all our dairy farmers.

One would require a pretty good digestive apparatus to be able to eat a copy of the Reader's Digest and get much nutrition from it. However, one can eat butter and drink milk.

The Reader's Digest is a fine magazine. I am not complaining about the fact that three copies of this magazine can be sent through the mail at a lower rate than is charged on a letter which I write to my mother. I do not write to my mother as often as I should, perhaps, but she has never asked that the letters be longer.

In the February 1956, issue of the Reader's Digest is an article entitled "What To Do About the 'Farm Parity' Fiasco," written by Henry Hazlitt, and condensed from Newsweek. Mr. Hazlitt says:

> The myth of a farm crisis has been built up by the farm bloc in Congress.

Mr. Hazlitt, I hope you are here. If you want to find out about the farm crisis, take a little trip with me to Minnesota. First, you will see some beautiful scenery. Second, you will get some straight economic facts which you do not get out of an office, or out of your prejudice.

To put it frankly, this kind of article burns me up, Mr. Hazlitt goes on to say that—

> Certain farm groups, such as hog raisers, face special difficulties.

What delightful language that is. We can all understand, of course, that Mr. Hazlitt does not know the difference between a hog and a corncob, or he would not make the kind of statements made in this article. Perhaps I should say French poodle, because there seems to be some similarity there.

Then he writes:

> But gross farm income was running in the first half of 1955 at the annual rate of $33.7 billion, compared with an average annual income of $33.8 billion in the preceding 9 years.

Mr. Hazlitt should know that gross income is one thing, and net income quite another. In the preceding 9 years the prices that farmers had to pay for what they had to buy were very much less. Therefore, gross income gave a net profit. In the first half of 1955, the net profit was slim, indeed.

The tragedy of Mr. Hazlitt's article is that it was written by an economist. It is a good thing that Mr. Hazlitt did not go to the same school I attended, or he would have flunked the course. That is no way for an economist to write. If a Broadway actor wants to say something like that, that is all right, because he is used to exaggerating and to overdramatizing. However, an economist knows better than to talk about gross income in the first half of 1955 as compared with gross income for the preceding 9 years. One can lose his shirt on gross income. What should be considered is net income. That is what is used to pay bills and it is what profits represent.

After the first prejudiced paragraph, the article continues to expand and enlarge upon that general assumption. That is the kind of propaganda which has been broadcast over America. But, Mr. President, it is subsidized propaganda. It is subsidized distortion. It is subsidized misrepresentation.

I challenge any Senator on the floor today to defend that paragraph I have read from the article. The Government is paying the bill to send that kind of material through the mail. It is paying the bill for telling the American people a pack of lies, a pack of distortions. That kind of article puts farmer against city man, and city man against farming man.

When a person is riding in an airplane, and is being bumped around in rough weather, and is trying to hold on to his seat and read that article by Henry Hazlitt, and what Mr. Hazlitt has to say about the American farmers, he is angry in the first place for having taken the ride in the airplane, and then, as he reads the article, and tries to give the impression that he is not scared, he becomes even angrier when he reads about Senators trying to give a handout to farmers.

Mr. President, the only handout involved is the subsidy to a magazine which carries that kind of article.

I have asked the Post Office Department to give me the latest figures on subsidies. In 1952 the subsidy for such mail was more than $200 million. That is according to the Advisory Committee of the Post Office Department. I want the latest figures, Mr. President.

No segment of our farm economy receives an outright subsidy of $200 million. Not one segment of our farm economy receives that kind of subsidy. If we include all the commodities, that may be true, but it is not the case if we take one segment, and I am speaking of only one.

That is the kind of trouble we face, Mr. President. It is that kind of an argument we face, as we argue the case for agriculture.

By the way, Mr. President, to whom will the magazine publishers sell their magazines if people do not have enough money to pay for them? Farm people like magazines. There are a great many farm people in my area of the country, and they like to read magazines. We have a great many other people who read magazines and who do business with our farm population. When the people living on the farms are prosperous, the others are prosperous. When farm people have trouble, the others find themselves in difficulty. When farmers have good times, the other segments of the population have good times. All are in the same boat. Therefore we should not talk about a farm program or a farm problem, but, rather, about a national program and a national problem.

I should like to say to my friend the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the other day I said I was going to expose certain myths. For example, there is the myth of 90 percent high rigid price supports. Some people have taken 90 percent and have almost succeeded in making it a nasty phrase. We hear about a 90-percent mortgage guaranty on a house, and about a 90-percent guaranty on a loan. Oh, that is all right. That is wonderful. That is free enterprise. That is delightful. Then we hear about a 90-percent credit loan on a commodity to the American farmers. Oh, that is terrible. That is socialism. That is destroying the farmer's fiber, and it is bankrupting the country.

I should like to have someone tell me the difference between a 90-percent guaranteed loan on a house and a 90-percent loan on a commodity. Someone may say, "Oh, but farmers do not always pay back their loans." Well, that is not unique with farmers. A great many people have not paid their loans. They failed to pay their loans not because they did not want to pay them, but because they could not pay them. Farmers will pay off their loans if they make a profit. However, no living soul can pay off a debt if he does not make enough money with which to pay it off.

What happens when a man does not pay off a loan on his house? The person who loaned the money gets the property. That is exactly the way the Government gets the farmer's crops.

Someone will say, "Oh, yes, but in the case of a price-support loan, if the farmer can get more than 90 percent for his grain, he can sell the grain. On the other hand, if he gets less than 90 percent of parity for his grain in the open market, he can let the Government take it."

Well, Mr. President, when a man borrows money under a mortgage guaranty, in order to buy a $15,000 house, if he can sell the house for $20,000, the Government does not say, "Oh, no; you cannot sell it, because you have a mortgage for 90 percent." The Government, of course, says, "Go ahead, sell your house if you have a chance to make money on the sale." If the man cannot pay off the mortgage, what happens? The lender gets the house.

Mr. President, that practice is as old as the Statue of Liberty. It is thoroughly American. It has been going on for years. The only difference is that some people have taken the farm picture and have made it stand out as though it were a grotesque monster.

Since when do we consider 90 percent to be high when 100 percent is supposed to be level? Apparently the Department of Agriculture has been working from the bed of the Dead Sea. According to that kind of philosophy, 100 percent is fair and level.

Let us consider industry, labor, and farming. So far as industry and labor are concerned, 100 percent is all right for them. However, when we come to the farmer, we say to him, "You get 90 percent. If you can climb up the other 10 percent, that is well and good. However, we will not help you by giving you 100 percent. We will give you 90 percent. When prices drop, we do not want you to drop into the pit, and therefore we will give you 90 percent, and you can scramble up."

That is 90 percent. What is high about that? There is nothing high about it, unless we want to say that it is a little higher than 75 percent. What is fixed about 90 percent? What is the difference between a fixed price at 75 percent of parity and a fixed price at 90 percent of parity? They are both fixed. They are both set for a full crop year, and the parity is set every year.

What is more rigid?

I wish someone would use a measuring device which would show which is more rigid, 90 percent or 80 percent.

What is so rigid about 90 percent that is not rigid about 80 percent? What is so rigid about 90 percent that is not rigid about 60 percent? One is just as rigid as the other.

The truth is that parity itself is flexible. The parity is adjusted all the time. It is like a gyroscope. It is a balance wheel. It adjusts itself all the time. Parity is just another word for equity.

Parity is merely another descriptive term for the price the farmer gets for what he sells, as compared with the price he pays for what he buys. That is all it is.

The railroads are given parity rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Magazines get parity postal rates from the Post Office Department. Air lines get parity rates. Bankers get bank parity rates from the Federal Reserve System. Trade laws govern independent businesses. Wage laws are in effect for workers. We have unemployment compensation laws on the statute books. We have fair labor standards acts, Walsh-Healey Acts, Davis-Bacon Acts. We have every kind of act we can think of. What is the purpose of all those acts? The purpose is to accord equity, to provide balance, and to assure stability in our economy. However, for one reason or another, when a Republican administration comes into power, it cannot stand to have the same principle apply to farmers. That is the record. That is the sorry, full record.

I am happy to say that that is not the record of all my Republican senatorial colleagues. I want that to be made crystal clear in the RECORD. Some of them have stood the test. Some of them have fought hard for their people. They have put their country above their party.

However, that principle does not seem to work so far as the top command is concerned. I said the other day, and I will repeat it over and over again, that every time the Republican Party is in power, at least in the begining of its term, the New York stock market goes up, and the grain and hog and livestock markets go down.

A person could be asleep for 20 years. If he awakened after 20 years, even without reading the newspapers, but merely by looking at the grain market and the New York stock market, he could tell which party was in power. If the New York stock market was up and the grain market was down, he would know that the Republican Party was in power. He would not have to go to school to find that out, or make any extensive studies. He would just know that to be the fact.

I am not opposed to the New York stock market going up. That is fine. That is a part of our American enterprise system. However, I should like to see the other markets go up a little, too.

What seems to have been the philosophy of late, as Mr. Benson explained it, is that one of the problems of American farmers today is the labor cost. What he is apparently suggesting to the American farmer is, in effect, "Mr. Farmer, we have you down in the ditch. We realize that you are getting lonesome down there. Therefore we will get somebody down there with you. We will give you labor to keep you company. So we will put labor in the ditch with you." I suggest it is better to have everyone out of the ditch and up on the grand highway of American abundance, equity, fair play, and plenty. Instead of pushing one down and then looking for someone else to put down with him, because misery loves company, we should get the first one out of the ditch, and keep both out of the ditch.

It is not because the cost of operation has gone up too much that farmers are in trouble. It is not because some people are getting too much. The problem is that some people are getting too little, and those people are the farmers.

A few years ago I pointed out what was going to happen to agriculture. I said it on the floor of the Senate when I made my daily 5-minute remarks during the morning hour in 1953. I said then what would happen to agriculture. Look in the RECORD, Mr. President, and it will be seen that I predicted what would happen, and it has happened. Every time Mr. Benson made a speech he said things were now stabilized, but agricultural prices went down the next day. I have a full tabulation on that point. I shall not burden the RECORD with it, but it is here and available to any newspaper reporter or any Senator who wishes to see it. Every time the Secretary said the adjustment period was over and the decline had been stopped, prices went down the next day.

I recall, Mr. President, that there were those who scoffed when we talked about the possibilities of a farm decline and a farm depression. We were called prophets of doom and gloom. I remember that three of us were selected for treatment on that subject, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who took most of the abuse, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and myself. We were called prophets of doom and gloom, because we were pointing out what we thought might happen. Time after time I warned that when a farmer goes broke it makes little difference whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, he is just plain broke. He can have a paid-up membership in a local county Republican club, but when he goes into the bank the chairman of the Republican club is not going to say, "I love you so much that I am going to make you a loan." He will find out how much collateral the farmer has. A farmer can be a good Democrat, but if he is broke and goes to the local bank to ask for a loan, he will be asked, "What is your collateral? What do you have that is worth while?"

So, Mr. President, I only point out that when prices start to go down and income starts to fall, there is no party label upon the consequences.

So, Mr. President, it is not partisan politics we need to talk about in pointing to 1956 as a year of decision. It is legitimate farm politics I am talking about, the fight of American agriculture for survival, through the processes provided in our democracy for translating the will of the people into action, here in this legislative Chamber.

It is the insistence by farmers to be heard in this Chamber, and at the ballot box, if they cannot be heard anywhere else.

Mr. President, I predicted that Mr. Eisenhower would veto the natural gas bill. I thought he would run for reelection. I am predicting now to my friends on the other side of the aisle that if this Congress does not do something to restore our farm economy, there will be, come November, the greatest switch of votes at the ballot box this country has ever known. Farmers are not Republicans or Democrats; they are producers, and they will think of their own interest, as they should, and they will keep books on some of us. They will see how much we think of them, where we stand, and how much we are willing to fight for them.

I told my constituents what I was here to do for them, and I have been trying to keep my promise every day. My distinguished opponent used to say he wanted to go to Washington to help Ike.

I used to say, "Help Ike do what?"

He used to say, "I want to go to Washington to help Ike finish the job."

I said, "On whom?"

I said, "If you want to send somebody to Washington to lower your farm prices, he is the man."

These people kept their faith and trust in me, and I am keeping my faith and trust in them.

The welfare and economic well-being of our agricultural economy is so vital to the long range prosperity and progress of this Nation, and the ability and capacity of our country to give effective international leadership, that this issue can no longer be ignored or dealt with in indecisive or uncertain terms or policies.

We would be foolish indeed to forget the lessons of our history.

American agriculture still maintains a pivotal role in the total national economy. It is the keystone of our economic structure.

That keystone is crumbling, while men in high places in Washington utter pious phrases and slogans to hide their inadequacy or their stubborn unwillingness to meet the realistic needs of our time.

It is bad enough to be wrong, Mr. President, but it is worse to be righteously wrong. There are people who are just plain righteously wrong.

Let us squarely face the cold, harsh facts of our farm economy.

Farmers' total net income is down nearly one-third since 1952. Family farm purchasing power is down at least 25 percent since 1952. Farm population has been squeezed down 9 percent since 1952. The number of farms has been forced down 7 percent. Yet, the average-per-person income from farming, in our population, is down 19 percent.

What is worse, Mr. President, is that the young people are being forced off the land, the young GI veterans, the Korean veterans. They cannot stay on the land. I have an office full of mail from young men who have tried to farm, young men with college educations, trained at our best agricultural colleges. But they have had the price squeeze put upon them so hard that they cannot make it.

The farm population is growing older every single year. I think the average age is now approximately 57 years. Why? Because young men and young women in this day and age are not going to stay on the farm and be treated un-

fairly. They are going to go to the towns where they think there is a better chance, and where they may better their economic condition.

After years of struggle, farmers got REA so that some of the blessings of modern life could be brought to the farm homes. But, Mr. President, as I go along, I shall show the lack of modern facilities in some of our farm homes. When a young man finds that he has to buy high-priced machinery, high-priced land, and high-priced buildings at fairly high interest rates on long-term commitments, and then the price of his products drops out from under him, he is done. We are permitting them to be driven off the farms by sheer economic attrition.

That is the greatest single tragedy of the farm depression, namely, what has happened to the young men and their young wives and their young families.

The Secretary of Agriculture says, when he is on TV or at other places, that farm land values have not gone down. That is correct. Why? First of all, land values around the cities for the new suburban developments are considered to be in part land of the general farming area. Such land, which was about $100 an acre then becomes $2,000 an acre. It is all averaged in with sales of agricultural land.

Furthermore, many a farmer, when he saw what was happening to him, decided to expand his operations in the hope that if he could produce more he could save himself. I am going to show a little later that that is what farmers have been doing.

The administration said it was going to use the miracle formula, namely, flexible price supports, to solve the problem of supply and demand. It did not come anywhere near it. The supply is greater than it has ever been.

The flexible price-support program has not worked, and the price situation is becoming increasingly bad. Farm income and farm prices are still going down. This is the ray of hope to the young farmer: The prophecy for next year is that the situation will be about 6 percent worse than it is this year.

Then the administration wonders why farmers are up in arms. Imagine what would happen if the Secretary of Commerce said to the businessmen, "I am sorry for all you businessmen, but the situation is going to be 10 percent worse next year." He would not be liked any too well. I am quite sure we would hear at least some Senators saying, "We have got to have a change in policy to prevent this thing from happening."

That is what we in the Congress are now faced with—the responsibility of changing the direction of the course of agriculture so that we can move it up to its proper position.

Mr. President, hog prices at the year end were only 50 percent of parity, and the recovery flurry was short lived. They are headed downward again.

Mr. Hazlitt said they were having some difficulty. I do not know whether he wishes to call it difficulty or not, but if someone should cut my income in half, I would call it a major disaster.

There is not a Senator here from an agricultural State who has not received hundreds of letters from hog farmers telling them of the very dire circumstances they face.

Cattle prices continue at a level below 60 percent of parity, in many areas of the country.

Grain sorghums, oats, corn, rye, barley, cottonseed, and many other farm commodities hover at only 60 percent of a fair price.

Our parity index—the accepted standard of fairness in the relationship between prices farmers received and the prices farmers must pay—was down to 80 on January 15—the last report available.

Yet it was at 100, when the elections were held in November of 1952, and this country learned it was in changed hands.

In the face of this drastic and continued decline, Republican spokesmen have the effrontery even today of trying to point back before they assumed the helm of our Government and say much of the decline in farm prices came before they took office.

Perhaps such phrases sound good in Lincoln Day speeches to city folks, but they do not sound good to farmers. They would like to see Secretary Benson worrying more about conditions today than about conditions 3 years ago.

They know he got A in ancient history. They realize that. They would like to have him take a course in contemporary economics and see how he comes out.

Because it is their own pocketbooks which are hit, farmers know there is quite a difference between farm prices declining to 100 percent of parity, and declining far down under 100 percent of parity.

What a peculiar comparison the administration officials like to make. The Republicans say things were beginning to get bad even before they came in. It got so bad the farmer was getting 100 percent of parity. Would that we could be restored to such hard times again. Would that something would happen to get the American farmer back to 100 percent of parity.

The outlook is for more of the same for 1956—another 5, 6, or 7 percent decline. This is not merely my opinion; it is the official forecast from the annual outlook conference of the Department of Agriculture.

Farm prices are going to be still lower, it is said. Farm income is to drop even further.

In the midst of widespread national prosperity to which our colleagues on the other side of the aisle point with pride, farm families are having forced upon them the heavy hand of poverty.

While farmers total net income declined 29 percent, corporation profits after taxes went up 33 percent, dividends went up 19 percent, and interest increased 28 percent.

This is what some Republican economists and orators call the 50–50 treatment—1 horse to 1 rabbit—the farmers getting the rabbit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation of how farmers are doing, compared with other persons, as compiled from Economic Indicators, published by the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How farmers are doing (compared with others)

[Billion dollars]

	1952	1955	Percent change
Corporation profits:			
Before taxes	35.9	[1] 44.0	+23
After taxes	16.1	[1] 21.9	+36
Dividends	9.0	[1] 11.0	+22
Interest	12.3	[2] 15.8	+28
Rental income	9.9	[1] 10.6	+8
Business and professional proprietors	25.7	[1] 27.8	+8
Compensation employees	190	[2] 219	+15
Weekly earnings manufacturing workers (dollars)	68	[1] 78	+14
Farmers' total net income	14.9	[1] 10.6	−29
Farmers' total net income	[1] 16.7	[1] 10.6	−37
Per family (1954 dollars)	2,806	2,120	−24
Number of farms (millions)	5.4	5.0	−9

[1] 3d quarter annual rate, seasonally adjusted.
[2] September 1955.

Source: Economic Indicators, published by President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this table is from official figures available to the White House. It is on one page. It can be read by everyone. It tells the sad economic story of what has happened to agriculture.

Mr. President, we have heard so much said about preferential treatment of farm people as compared with city people that I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation comparing the earnings of farm people with those of nonfarm people.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Do farm families get parity income? Average per family income from all sources

	1950	1951	1953
Farm operator families	$3,382	$3,959	$3,459
Nonfarm families	5,232	5,721	6,393

Source: Survey of Current Business (March 1955), published by Department of Commerce.

Middle family income[1] of farm families compared with other families, 1952

[Figures from Bureau of Census; in 1954 Statistica Abstract of United States]

City families	$3,678
Rural town and village	3,408
Farm families	2,011

[1] Half of families in group got more; half less than figure shown.

Income from all sources	1952	1955 [1]
Income per person of people on farms	$949	$896
Income per person of nonfarm people	1,832	1,960

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Farm Income Situation (November 1955, published by Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Middle family income[1] of farm families compared with other families, 1952—Con.

	1952	1955[1]
Farm people were	15.5 percent of national population.	13.4 percent of national population.
And received	8.7 percent of national income.	6.1 percent of national income.

[1] Preliminary based on 3d quarter 1955 annual rate seasonally adjusted.

Source: Farm Income Situation, published by U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the income per capita of those on farms has been falling, while the income per capita of nonfarm people has been rising. These figures are from "Farm Income Situation," published by the Department of Agriculture. They show that the income per capita of people on farms has been going down since 1952, while the income per capita of nonfarm people has gone up about the same proportion as the amount of the drop for farm people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two tables based on data from Economic Indicators, published by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, showing that farm family purchasing power has gone down 25 percent since 1952, and down 12 percent last year alone.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Family-farm purchasing power down 25 percent since 1952

	1952	1955[1]	Percent change in 3 years
	Billion dollars		
Farm operators' gross income:			
Excluding inventory change	$36.9	$32.2	−13
Including inventory change	$37.7	$32.5	−14
Farm production expenses	$22.9	$21.9	−4
Farm operators' net income:			
Excluding inventory change	$14.1	$10.3	−27
Including inventory change	$14.9	$10.6	−29
Per farm:			
Current dollars	$2,778	$2,120	−24
1954 dollars	$2,806	$2,120	−25
Number of farms (thousands)	5.4	5.0	−7
Average per-person income from all sources:			
Farm population	$949	$896	−6
Percent of nonfarm average	51.8	48.9	
Nonfarm population	1,832	1,960	+7
Average per-person income from farming: Farm population	$698	$568	−19
Average per-person income from nonfarmers: Nonfarm population	$1,812	$1,939	+7
People on farms (millions)	24.3	22.1	−9
Nonfarm population (millions)	132.7	143.1	+11

[1] Third quarter, annual rate seasonally adjusted.

Source: Economic Indicators, published by President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Family farm net income and purchasing power down 12 percent from last year

	1954	1955[1]	Percent change
	Billion dollars		
Farm operators' gross income:			
Excluding inventory change	$34.0	$32.2	−5
Including inventory change	$34.4	$32.5	−6
Farm production expenses	$22.2	$21.9	−2
Farm operators' net income:			
Excluding inventory change	$11.8	$10.3	−13
Including inventory change	$12.3	$10.6	−14
Per farm:			
Current dollars	$2,413	$2,120	−12
1954 dollars	$2,413	$2,120	−12
Number of farms (millions)	5.1	5.0	−2
Per-person income, people on farms:			
From farming	$653	$568	−13
From all sources	$913	$896	−2
Nonfarm people: All sources	$1,837	$1,960	+7
Farm population (millions)	21.9	22.1	+1
Nonfarm population (millions)	140.5	143.1	+2

[1] Third quarter, annual rate, seasonally adjusted.

Source: Economic Indicators, published by President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, farm income cannot be separated from farm prices. Family farm income will not go up while prices are still going down. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks three tables showing the trends in farm prices on individual commodities, with the source of the figures used in each table designated thereon.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prices received by farmers mostly down from pre-Korea base period

[Figures from Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA]

Commodity	1947–49 average	Oct. 15, 1955	Percent change, up (+), down (−)	Commodity	1947–49 average	Oct. 15, 1955	Percent change, up (+), down (−)
Wheat, bushel	$2.14	$1.94	−9	Beef cattle, hundredweight	$20.20	$15.30	−24
Rye, do	1.82	.926	−49	Calves, do	22.60	16.80	−26
Corn, do	1.64	1.14	−30	Wool, pound	.460	.540	+17
Rice, hundredweight	5.38	4.60	−14	Lambs, hundredweight	21.90	17.40	−21
Oats, bushel	.852	.591	−30	Sweetpotatoes, bushel	2.35	1.44	−39
Barley, do	1.37	.909	−33	All milk, wholesale, hundredweight	4.42	4.34	−2
Grain sorghum, hundredweight	2.53	1.63	−36	All chickens, live, pound	.293	2.204	−30
Baled hay, ton	22.40	20.50	−8	Eggs, dozen	.466	.429	−8
Butterfat in cream, pound	.712	.569	−20	Tobacco, types 11–37, pound	.420	.550	+31
Cotton, do	.312	.328	+5	Average of all farm products (index)	271	230	−15
Cottonseed, ton	71.60	43.50	−39	Food grains (index)	246	220	−11
Soybeans, bushel	2.84	2.08	−27	Feed grains and hay (index)	230	167	−27
Flaxseed, do	5.54	2.76	−51	All crops (index)	247	224	−9
Peanuts, pound	.102	.118	+16	Meat animals (index)	334	240	−29
Beans, dry edible, hundredweight	9.92	7.04	−29	Dairy products (index)	275	264	−4
Potatoes, bushel	1.48	.723	−51	All livestock and products (index)	292	236	−19
Hogs, hundredweight	21.90	14.50	−34				

Prices received by farmers mostly down since 1952 harvest season

[Figures from U. S. Department of Agriculture]

Commodity	Oct. 15, 1952 price	Oct. 15, 1955 price	Percent change up (+) down (−)	Commodity	Oct. 15, 1952 price	Oct. 15, 1955 price	Percent change up (+), down (−)
Wheat, bushel	$2.07	$1.94	−6	Hogs, hundredweight	$18.60	$14.50	−23
Rye, do	1.74	.926	−47	Beef cattle, do	22.00	15.30	−31
Corn, do	1.53	1.14	−26	Calves, do	23.80	16.80	−30
Rice, hundredweight	5.76	4.60	−20	Wool, pound	.50	.62	+24
Oats, bushel	.83	.59	−29	Lambs, hundredweight	22.20	17.40	−22
Barley, do	1.42	.909	−36	Sweetpotatoes, bushel	2.94	1.44	−51
Grain sorghum, hundredweight	2.87	1.63	−43	All milk, wholesale, hundredweight	5.30	4.34	−18
Baled hay, ton	25.60	20.50	−20	All chickens, live, pound	.242	.204	−17
Butterfat, in cream, pound	.735	.569	−23	Eggs, dozen	.504	.429	−14
Cotton, do	.3703	.328	−12	Average of all farm products (index)	282	230	−19
Cottonseed, ton	70.70	43.50	−39	Food grains (index)	240	220	−9
Soybeans, bushel	2.71	2.08	−23	Feed grains and hay (index)	219	167	−24
Flaxseed, do	3.73	2.76	−26	All crops (index)	260	224	−14
Peanuts, pound	.111	.118	+6	Meat animals (index)	328	240	−27
Beans, dry edible, hundredweight	8.48	7.04	−17	Dairy products (index)	316	264	−17
Potatoes, bushel	2.11	.723	−66	All livestock and products (index)	301	236	−22

Average prices received by farmers for farm products, United States

Commodity and unit	Dec. 15, 1954	Nov. 15, 1955	Dec. 15, 1955	Commodity and unit	Dec. 15, 1954	Nov. 15, 1955	Dec. 15, 1955
Wheat, dollars	2.12	1.94	1.95	Hogs, dollars	17.00	12.20	10.60
Rye, do	1.14	.897	.944	Beef cattle, do	15.20	14.10	13.50
Rice (rough), do	4.63	4.63	4.62	Calves, do	15.70	15.70	15.90
Corn, do	1.39	1.09	1.15	Sheep, do	5.69	5.37	5.51
Oats, do	.767	.605	.62	Lambs, do	17.50	17.20	16.50
Barley, do	1.09	.919	.920	Butterfat, in cream, cents	58.1	57.2	57.7
Sorghum, do	2.22	1.67	1.72	All milk, wholesale, dollars	4.33	4.43	4.35
Hay, all baled, do	23.30	20.80	21.30	All chickens, live, do	17.4	20.0	18.8
Cotton, American upland, cents	32.67	32.42	31.19	Farm chickens, live, do	14.3	17.8	17.8
Cotton, American-Egyptian, do	63.3	53.9	53.3	Commercial broilers, live, do	19.2	21.5	19.4
Tobacco, types 11-37, do	50.0	52.5	57.2	Turkeys, live, do	29.6	30.3	31.1
Cottonseed, dollars	59.60	44.30	45.00	Eggs, do	32.7	43.4	47.1
Soybeans, do	2.57	2.06	2.11	Wool, do	50.5	39.0	39.2
Peanuts, do	12.5	11.7	11.9	Adjusted for seasonal variation:			
Flaxseed, do	3.04	2.80	2.84	Butterfat, in cream, cents	55.3	56.1	55.0
Potatoes, do	1.05	.829	.817	All milk, wholesale, dollars	3.97	4.06	3.99
Sweetpotatoes, do	2.54	1.68	2.03	Eggs, cents	29.2	38.1	42.4
Beans, dry edible, do	8.34	6.96	6.80				

Source: Agricultural Prices (Dec. 30, 1955) published by USDA.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think my colleagues would be interested if I noted for the RECORD a few of the commodities. For example, take the 1947–49 average as compared with the October 1955, prices.

Let us take, for example, corn. Corn has dropped 30 percent. Rye has dropped 49 percent. Wheat is down 9 percent. Flaxseed is down 51 percent. Soybeans are down 27 percent. Cottonseed, per ton, is down 39 percent. All chickens, live, are down 30 percent. All butterfat in cream, per pound, is down 20 percent. Grain sorghums are down 36 percent.

The great State of Texas produces a large amount of grain sorghums. I am proud to be associated in the offering of an amendment by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and other Senators, including the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], which will do much for the feed grain producers. That amendment will be called up at the proper time. It would restore some of the balance in the feed grain price situation.

Mr. President, it is not pleasant for any Senator to witness a drop of 46 percent in the price of any single commodity of his State. Of course, Senators representing their constituencies will want to do something about this condition. I hope there will be enough support to have the amendment placed in the bill. We came very close to adopting it in the committee; in fact, if the amendment in the committee had been prepared then as carefully as the amendment which the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] finally prepared it, I am certain it would have been adopted in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). The present occupant of the chair appreciates the kind words of the junior Senator from Minnesota, and sincerely hopes the Senate will adopt the amendment we have sponsored.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that if logic and reason shall prevail, the amendment will be agreed to.

While farm prices have been tumbling, prices paid by farmers have still been going up.

We have heard a great outcry from the Secretary of Agriculture lately, about the cost side of the farm cost-price squeeze. Yet it is interesting to note that costs have not risen anywhere near the percentage income and prices to farmers have fallen.

It would appear wiser for the Secretary of Agriculture to concentrate more on boosting farm prices and income to meet current costs, instead of trying to bring the rest of the economy down to the farmer's depressed level.

And of all the costs confronting the farmer, those rising the most have been interest rates and taxes. Between October 15 of 1952 and October 15 of 1955, for example, the index of interest paid by farmers went up 27 percent.

During the same period the index of prices paid by farmers for farm machinery went up only 4 percent.

If Mr. Benson is so worried about farm costs, perhaps he had better start at the point where costs are the greatest burden—and where Government policy can either ease or contribute to that burden. I am referring to interest rates. All I can recall Secretary Benson doing about interest rates is to raise them.

These interest rates are established in Washington by the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. I go back to some of the early days of this administration. One of the first things done by the Eisenhower administration was to raise the interest rates, which are price supports for money. The administration raised the interest rates in order to tighten credit. After the interest rates had been raised to the stratosphere, the administration said, "Now let us loosen up on the credit. Now that we have raised the interest rates, let the folks borrow all the money they want at the new high rates."

That is why the profits of the investment and commercial banks have been unprecedented under this administration. If any one of those fine institutions does not support this administration, it is an ingrate. Of course, such institutions ought to support the administration. Prior to the advent of the Eisenhower administration, they were doing well; they were getting rich. Now they are doing extra well and getting rich twice as fast. They, of course, ought to support this administration.

I myself would not accept their support. I am against their high interest rate policy. I would do anything I could to cut it down. This is no secret; I have said so privately and publicly many, many times.

All I can recall Secretary Benson's doing about interest rates is that he raised them. But he is the same man who said that the farmer was in a price-cost squeeze. One of the reasons why the cost of farm operations has gone up is that interest rates to the farmers have risen 27 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a tabulation of the index of prices paid by farmers, taken from Agricultural Prices distributed by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prices paid still rising—Index of prices paid by farmers

[1910–14=100]

Item	Oct. 15, 1952 [1]	Oct. 15, 1955 [1]	Percent change, up (+) or down (−), since Oct. 15, 1952
Taxes	353	409	+16
Interest	107	136	+27
Clothing	301	310	+3
Autos and auto supplies	282	292	+4
Farm machinery	310	321	+4
Farm supplies	284	265	−7
Building and fencing	350	365	+4
Fertilizer	157	152	−3
Household operation	190	198	+4
Motor supplies	157	163	+4
Motor vehicles	358	365	+2
Cash wage rates	506	518	+2
Household furnishings	276	271	−2
Building material, house	381	396	+4
Average production items:			
That farmers buy from nonfarmers	268	269	[2]
All items	269	246	−9
Average of family living items:			
That farmers buy from nonfarmers	274	282	+3
All items	269	274	+2
Average production items, interest, taxes: That farmers buy from nonfarmers	263	273	+4

[1] Or latest available data.

[2] Less than 1 percent change.

Source: Agricultural Prices, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the tabulation I have placed in the RECORD is official Government information. Mr. Benson knew what these tables showed when he started to make speeches in which he tried to place the blame for the farm problem on the wrong people. He could have stated, for example, what his own departmental figures revealed.

The price of farm machinery has risen 4 percent since 1952. The cost of automobiles has risen 4 percent; clothing, 3 percent. The price of fertilizer has fallen 3 percent. Supplies are up 4 percent; interest up 27 percent; taxes up 16 percent. Those are the taxes which farmers paid for putting in new roads and building new schools in the consolidated school areas.

I sometimes wonder whether the speech writers in the Department of Agriculture ever get together on statistics with the statisticians or the economic advisers.

Mr. President, to give us a better picture of farm price trends over the years, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation tracing the average market prices received by farmers for various commodities back to 1929.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average market price received by farmers

	1929	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1947	1949	1952	1955 [1]
Wheat, per bushel	$1.04	$0.38	$0.74	$0.85	$0.83	$1.03	$0.96	$0.56	$0.69	$2.29	$1.88	$2.09	$1.92
Barley, per bushel	.54	.22	.43	.69	.38	.78	.54	.37	.41	1.70	1.04	1.35	.90
Flaxseed, per bushel	2.81	.88	1.63	1.70	1.42	1.90	1.87	1.59	1.46	6.15	3.63	3.72	2.74
Oats, per bushel	.42	.16	.34	.48	.26	.45	.30	.24	.31	1.05	.66	.79	.56
Rye, per bushel	.86	.28	.63	.72	.40	.81	.69	.34	.44	2.26	1.21	1.73	.87
Sorghum grain, per hundredweight	1.32	.54	.91	1.70	.98	1.66	.88	.70	1.02	3.27	2.00	2.80	1.67
Beef cattle, per hundredweight	[2]	4.25	3.75	4.13	6.04	5.82	7.00	6.54	7.14	18.40	19.80	24.30	15.60
Beef calves, per hundredweight	[2]	4.95	4.64	4.92	7.16	7.20	8.10	7.90	8.40	20.40	22.60	25.80	16.80
Eggs (farm price), per dozen	[2]	.14	.14	.17	.23	.22	.21	.20	.17	.45	.45	.42	.44
Hogs, per hundredweight	[2]	3.34	3.53	4.14	8.65	9.37	9.50	7.74	6.23	24.10	18.10	17.80	15.70
Butterfat in cream, per pound	[2]	.18	.19	.23	.28	.32	.33	.26	.24	.72	.62	.75	.57
All milk, wholesale, per hundredweight	[2]	1.28	1.30	1.55	1.74	1.93	1.97	1.72	1.68	4.27	3.95	4.85	4.16
Wool, per pound	[2]	.09	.21	.22	.19	.27	.32	.19	.22	.42	.49	.54	.40
Potatoes, per bushel	1.32	.38	.82	.45	.59	1.14	.53	.56	.70	1.61	1.28	1.96	.71
Soybeans, per bushel	1.88	.54	.94	.99	.73	1.27	.85	.67	.81	3.33	2.16	2.72	2.00
Cottonseed, per ton	30.93	10.35	12.91	33.03	30.54	33.30	19.50	21.79	21.14	85.90	43.40	69.60	43.70
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel	1.12	.47	.68	.75	.67	.92	.78	.70	.73	2.16	2.14	3.38	1.42
Lamb, per hundredweight	[2]	4.47	5.04	5.90	7.28	8.05	8.88	7.05	7.78	20.50	22.40	24.30	17.70
Rice, rough, per hundredweight	2.22	.93	1.73	1.75	1.60	1.84	1.47	1.42	1.62	5.97	4.10	5.87	4.50
Corn, per bushel	.80	.32	.52	.82	.66	1.04	.52	.49	.57	2.16	1.25	1.53	1.24
Peanuts, per pound	.04	.02	.03	.03	.03	.04	.03	.03	.03	.10	.10	.11	.12
Tobacco, per pound	.18	.11	.13	.21	.18	.24	.20	.20	.15	.44	.46	.50	.52
Beans, dry edible, per hundredweight	6.82	1.97	2.77	3.52	2.95	5.37	3.10	2.56	3.25	11.60	6.59	8.67	7.07

[1] September 15, 1955.

[2] Not available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this table includes commodity prices up to September 15, 1955; and a most revealing document it is, too. Hog prices are lower this year than they were at any time since the period of the 1940's.

I could go on reviewing such depressing statistics for the next hour, and filling the record with supporting evidence. There are plenty more of them, and they are all bad.

I have made certain charges on the floor about the economic situation of those engaged in agriculture. I have supported my charges by statistics taken from official Government records. They are not merely my figures. They are the official statistics of the agricultural marketing service of the Department of Agriculture, and are taken from Economic Indicators, published by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. They have been made available for Ezra Taft Benson to read and study, just as much as they are available to me or to anyone else.

The simple truth is that every valid economic indicator confirms the fact that agriculture is in trouble—serious trouble. I know I need not prove this to our farmers in Minnesota, or the farmers in your home States. They know all too well, from personal experience. Their own bankbooks and farm records provide all the depressing statistics they need.

Yet, I am recounting them for the record for the sake of those skeptics who have stubbornly refused to demonstrate any concern as to what is happening to the foundation of our economy—the very bloodstream of our economic life out in the great Midwest, the Far West, and the South.

When some of us tried to warn the country 2 years ago where agriculture was headed, we were openly scoffed at. We were called "prophets of doom." We were assured everything was all right; it was just a "temporary adjustment," they kept saying.

That was done with regard to our foreign policy, too. This administration says, "Hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil. Just put on rosy glasses. Just smile. These things are not really happening," so the administration says. Everything is really going to be simply wonderful.

Well, the facts are to the contrary, and one does not have to be a pessimist to face the facts; he merely has to be a realist.

When propaganda machines are grinding out favorable comments about the administration and the President, setting forth how wonderful everything is, and how wonderful everything will be, I know it is pretty hard to say, "But look what is happening to agriculture."

The easiest answer is to say, "It isn't so," and then have publications like the Reader's Digest carry thousands of copies of distorted misinformation. There have been such articles in similar publications. The articles simply say it is not true.

After all, only about 13 or 14 percent of the people are now living on farms, so if one desires, if it is his will, he can ignore what farm people are saying and believe only what they want to believe.

That is what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was talking about earlier today with regard to our foreign policy. We are told that world conditions are much better, that they are all right, and we are told that continually, except that all the specific information leads us to believe conditions are not so good. Then when persons say they are not so good, they are told that they have no faith, that they have no confidence, that they are pessimists. Well, there is a difference between being a pessimist and being a fool. It is all right for people to face facts and then be a little pessimistic, but the man who refuses to face the facts is a plain fool.

The temporary adjustment to which I was referring is still adjusting, apparently—and always downward.

When we became even more concerned over trends a year ago, some people in high places still scoffed. We were already at the bottom of the decline, they said; everything was going to be rosy from here on out. It was all just politics, according to them—just an attempt to create a statistical depression. It was not supposed to be real.

Well, I ask my colleagues today: Have you asked the farmer in your State whether his loss of income during the past year has been real, or have you tried to convince him his shrinking buying power is just statistical?

That kind of fancy talk may be all right for appointive officers in the Department of Agriculture, but I doubt if many Senators can get by with it out among their farmer constituents.

Mr. President, I mentioned some time ago that I had some quotations from statements of the Secretary of Agriculture when he was painting a rosy pic-

ture. The first meeting at which he spoke was in St. Paul, on February 11, 1953. He said:

A drastic drop in cattle prices was in progress as we came into office. We hope you approved of the steps taken to stabilize the cattle markets.

Ten days later he said:

Markets have stabilized. People are again eating beef. The Department of Agriculture expects no major price changes for the next several months.

Of course, you know, Mr. President, that each week conditions became worse.

On April 7, 1953, at the Chamber of Commerce in Denver, Colo., the Secretary said:

Our analysts anticipate that prices of farm products during the spring and summer will be steady.

He ran out of paper. He should have said, "Will steadily decline." Then he would have been more accurate.

Then the Secretary said on October 21, 1953, at the National Retail Farm Equipment Association in Chicago:

There are soft spots in the agricultural economy. They are being firmed up.

Then at the annual convention of the National Grange in Burlington, Vt., the Secretary said:

This has been a difficult year. But I firmly believe that most of the price adjustments have now been made. The situation has become fairly stabilized. The outlook for next year is for continued stability.

Mr. President, since that statement was made, farm income has dropped about 18 or 20 percent. I think I mentioned the date of that last speech. It was in November 1953. In November 1953, parity was 90 percent, and the Secretary said that the outlook for the next year was for continued stability. A year later parity was 87. Stability sort of leaned to the port side, Mr. President.

A little later the Secretary said:

I believe 1953 has marked the turning point in the right direction.

That was December 16.

At the National Farm Bureau, in Chicago, Ill., he said:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three has marked the turning point in the right direction.

I do not want to indicate that Mr. Benson thinks lower farm income is the right direction, but he was really quite a prophet at that point, in terms of the direction in which the farm economy was moving.

Mr. President, when we have a Secretary who thinks everything is rosy and jim dandy, he is not going to do anything. I have three pages of clippings from the Secretary's speeches, from 1953 through the middle of 1955. Every time he spoke he said, "It is just wonderful. It has been getting better. It has been stabilized. We are over the worst. The adjustment has been made."

I was in Des Moines, Iowa, in the latter part of October. The front-page story in that city was "Secretary Benson Says Price Decline Stopped."

Poor fellow. The next 2 days the Department of Agriculture announced that there had been another 2 point drop in the parity ratio.

I want to make a friendly suggestion to the Department of Agriculture. Why do not the speech writers get together with the economists and the statisticians? I think there was a disservice done to the Secretary. Those who help write the addresses never check with the research division, and that puts the Secretary in a rather untenable position. He finds himself time after time predicting that everything will be well, and, of course, it turns out a few days later that the situation is a little worse than anybody anticipated.

For example, True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, on the 16th of November, 1954, at the conference of bank correspondents at the First National Bank, St. Louis, Mo., said:

Adjustment problems of farmers will be less severe in 1955 and for the years ahead.

Well, 1955 was about the roughest year farmers ever had. I hope Mr. Morse never goes into the prognostication business. Those bankers must have been pretty unhappy with him. That would have been a better speech to have been made to people who are a little more willing to have some inaccuracy govern their lives.

Then we note that on February 1, 1955, a little over a year ago, Mr. True D. Morse, speaking at Lexington, Ky., said:

The most drastic adjustments are over.

That is not the way the cattle and hog farmers of my State feel. Hog prices in February, 1955, were fairly good. The cattle and hog producers started to be hurt about the summer and fall of 1955.

The loss has been real enough for the thousands of farmers who have been forced to the wall.

It is real enough, too, for the small town businessman who has felt the decline of farm purchasing power.

And, at long last, it appears real enough to scare some previously unconcerned public figures who now see another election around the corner.

But all these charts I have submitted for evidence are just statistics, and national averages, one may say. Perhaps they present a distorted picture.

Out our way, we were not satisfied with just looking at USDA statistics, particularly when officials of even the USDA did not believe them enough to do anything about it.

Farmers are people, with the same desires, aspirations, and problems as anyone else. They work hard, earn as much as they can, do their best to keep ahead of the bills they have to pay, and hope to have something left over to send their children to college or provide some of the normal comforts of modern living accepted as commonplace elsewhere in our country.

One of the great Midwest cooperatives, itself making a constructive contribution to farm-family living by sound group marketing, set out to find out just how our farm families were getting along.

I am referring to the GTA family-farm survey, conducted by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, with which I am sure at least some of my colleagues are familiar.

It was a unique adventure on the part of a farmers' cooperative to get an actual audit of a cross section of family farms, as a basis for reexamining and reforming farm policy.

The main body of this report consists of the findings of a confidential and very careful survey of 4,321 farm operations. The survey avoided estimates in regard to receipts and expenditures in the farm business. Instead, it makes use of the very same data that farmers submitted to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

It has required a full year to make and present this farm survey to the Congress and the public.

In my opinion, the survey fills a big gap in the Nation's knowledge of agriculture, and should be of tremendous value in shaping the necessary legislation to protect America's historic family-type agriculture.

The sole purpose of this GTA survey was to find out how the typical family-operated farms have fared in five Midwestern States, namely, the States of Montana, Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota, during the 5 years from 1950 through 1954.

The findings primarily throw light on the trends in gross income, costs and net returns of the grain, livestock, and dairy farmers of the Dakotas, Montana, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

As M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the GTA, explains in his introductory remarks to the study before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

These findings help explain why, in the face of unprecedented national prosperity, we are witnessing the most rapid annual decline in farm population and in the number of family-operated farms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the body of the RECORD at this point some excerpts from Mr. Thatcher's introductory remarks for this survey, followed by a brief explanation of why the GTA survey was conducted, how it was conducted, and a summary of the facts revealed.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM INTRODUCTION BY M. W. THATCHER, GENERAL MANAGER, GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION

"This rapid decline is the inevitable consequence of two powerful forces: (1) declining gross farm receipts produced in large measure by the policy of lowering price supports, and (2) a persistent advance in costs of farm production.

"The administration's farm policy, deliberately sold to the consumer as being in his interest, has forced farm prices down. Parity prices for many important farm products have been 'modernized' downward, and the Secretary of Agriculture has in virtually every discretionary action entrusted to him by the Congress lowered price supports.

"In large measure, you can trace the trouble in dairying, livestock production and grain farming to this price support cutting. This administration's program of flexible prices (always flexible downward) has lowered income wherever applied. It has taken income away from dairy farmers. It has

taken income away from hog and cattle producers who were induced by downward-flexed feed prices to produce beyond market requirements, tumbling real prices of livestock to the lowest levels in 20 years.

"The persistent advance in farm costs is due to the ever-expanding power of business, manufacturing, finance, transportation, and labor over the prices of their products, aided by State and Federal legislation as well as by their own powerful organizations. There is no foreseeable hope whatever that this trend will be reversed. Every official forecast is for further increases in the price farmers must pay for nonfarm goods and services.

"The GTA survey findings for the years 1950–54, inclusive, verify our fears for the survival of family-type farming as we now understand it. And it appears, that, when we complete tabulations of 1955 farm cost and income records, the results will show a further setback for farmers. Furthermore, based on the Department of Agriculture's own estimates, the situation will be even worse in 1956.

"As you review the material and graphs relating to these findings, you will find that the stated objective of Congress—to provide parity income for farmers—has not been realized. On the farms in this five-State area there is clearly a farm recession, and a state of anxiety approaching that of the thirties.

"Based on the survey, the farm families of this area are in economic danger. Our findings lead us to believe that—

"Only the largest family farms can survive under today's prices and even these will not be able to maintain their farms and homes as they have been.

"Medium and small family farms will either be heavily mortgaged or lost to big operators.

"Only a few more years like the present will eliminate many of the younger farmers, many of whom are GI's trying to make a home for their growing families.

"Congress must act quickly or we shall see a further substantial decline in the number of farm families and a further rise in large-scale farming. We believe this would not be in the best national interest."

WHY THE GTA SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED

GTA is dedicated to serving farm families. That is its only reason for being. Consequently, it has always worked for national policies to enhance the take-home pay of the family-operated farm.

GTA, in carrying out its obligations to its patrons, speaks out aggressively on legislation affecting farmers. There has been and is a lack of information on the financial situation of family-type farming. To meet this need, GTA conducted an intensive survey to find out how the average farm family in the Northwest is doing. These findings are now available to the public and to Congress, an essential information in considering what should be written into the farm policy of this Nation.

The findings of this survey make up the body of this report. Here is information long needed. The survey answers such questions as these:

1. What has been happening to gross-farm receipts on farms in the Dakotas, Minnesota, Montana, and Wisconsin since 1950?

2. What has happened to farm costs of production and why?

3. What has the typical family-operated farm been earning on the capital it has invested in the farm plant and on the labor put in by the farmer and his family?

4. How do these earnings compare with rewards for capital, labor, and management in other occupations?

5. What are the reasons for the accelerated decline in number of family farms and the continuing rise of large-scale farming?

6. To what extent are farmers living on their depreciation allowances?

7. What is going to happen to farmers' ability to hold on to their farms if the level of farm prices is pushed down still more?

8. What has happened to the purchasing power of farmers' take-home pay?

9. What do farmers have in the way of home facilities and how does their standard of living compare with that of city people?

10. What do farmers need in the way of farm improvements, repairs, and equipment as a potential market for industrial production?

The answers to these and other questions are contained in the findings of this survey. They show the precarious condition of the typical family-operated farm in these States producing grain, livestock, and dairy products. The results of the study enable us to judge the economic and social impact of current national policy aimed at bringing down the level of farm prices still further.

HOW THE GTA SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED

From the outset, the board of directors and management of GTA were determined that the survey be expertly planned and conducted to get the real facts as to what was happening to the family-operated farm. It was a painstaking task in which guesses as to farm receipts, expenses, and net income had no place.

GTA dedicated a considerable sum of money to make possible a careful job. To draw up the questionnaire (a copy of which will be found at the end of this book), great care was taken. Economists from several State agricultural colleges and elsewhere, experienced accountants and survey specialists discussed and decided upon the questions to be asked.

To direct the assembling of the information, a well-known firm of certified public accountants, Strand & Roe, of Minneapolis, was retained.

It was decided that it would be necessary to go right out into the field and talk to farmers, face-to-face, about their farming business. It was decided, too, that the Federal income-tax reports filed by farmers would be the basic source of information as to how the farm family was getting along, the first time this has ever been done.

The tax returns provide data as to money receipts from the sale of farm products, even greater detail as to actual out-of-pocket expenses, and the reserve set aside for depreciation. This material, obtained from the tax return, is the hard, factual core of the survey.

The field auditors, on the average, spend about a half day with each farm family, usually going over records right at the kitchen table. The four-page questionnaire also secured additional facts on the farm family's investments, debts, inventories, facilities, hours worked, ages of members, and other social data.

These auditors were farmers carefully selected on the basis of ability. They were given intensive training to assure accuracy in obtaining the needed information. At the close of each day's work, the interviewer forwarded his completed questionnaires for the day to the GTA home offices in St. Paul. Name sheets were removed, and each questionnaire given a number so as to respect the confidential character of the information. Electronic tabulating equipment was used to speed the compiling of accurate tabulations of findings.

In order to obtain typical family farms that would be representative, it was decided to conduct the survey in 6 counties in each of the 4 States, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Montana. In Wisconsin, five counties were covered. Small-sized farms of 30 acres or less were not included.

Care was taken to choose counties that would best give information on typical family operated farms and an accurate portrayal of average conditions for the State as a whole.

In the counties in 4 of the States, cooperation of about 11 percent of the farms was secured. (Montana, 12.1 percent; North Dakota, 11.6 percent; South Dakota, 11.3 percent; Minnesota, 8.4 percent.) In Wisconsin, where farms are more numerous, a 4.5 percent representation in 5 counties was obtained. All counties had larger samples than are usually statistically required for adequate representation.

A SUMMARY OF THE FARM SURVEY

This survey was made during the first half of 1955. Very detailed reports for the 5 years 1950–54 were made for 4,321 farms in Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana. This is one of the Nation's best farming areas, with a large part of the national production of livestock, dairy products, and grains. Only family operated farms were selected, and they were larger than average in the 29 counties sampled. The sample represents 10 percent of the farms in the selected counties.

1. For 1954 these typical better-than-average family farms had well under half of parity returns as compared with returns to city labor and city businesses of similar skill or investments. Long hours of labor by wives and children are being donated without pay, and capital amounting to scores of thousands of dollars going unrewarded. The returns for 1955 will undoubtedly be lower, and for 1956 still lower yet.

2. Income from 1954 operations (including food raised for home and before paying any income tax due) was only $2,531, about $200 per month, or $50 per week.

3. This income came from some $8,400 from sales and home use of farm products, less $4,600 operating expenses and $1,300 depreciation charge to maintain farm equipment.

4. The average investment required to farm was $42,000 including a farm home with insurable value of $5,000 and some $14,000 of equipment and stock. In early 1955 debts of some $4,000 stood against this average farm. The investment varied from an average of $26,000 in the lowest counties to $115,000 in the county having the highest average.

5. The farmer, his wife, and children from the age 8 up, reported work on farm production totaling over 5,000 hours during 1954. Reducing the labor required to the barest minimum for efficient, able-bodied men, the farm family put in the equal of 3,300 man-hours, with much more on dairy farms. This is at least 75 percent more than the standard city work year of 2,000 minus sick time and holidays other than 2 weeks vacation.

6. Income for 1954 would return only 77 cents per man-hour with no return for a $42,000 investment. This is well under half the average factory wage in this area of $1.70 per hour. Or if only 5 percent is allowed as a fair return on investment, then only $449 remained as pay for labor performed, or 14 cents per man-hour. Returns from city businesses are yielding over two times as much on a similar investment. Neither estimate of farm returns includes anything for highly-skilled management of businesses with assets ranging from around $20,000 to over $150,000 apiece. Private farm management services for this purpose would cost from $500 to $1,500 depending on size of farm.

7. The returns for 1950–54 show depressed conditions throughout the entire period except for limited areas in years of exceptional yield. Prices received by farmers have gone down while everything they must buy has gone up. Farmers have increased production to attempt to make ends meet, thereby driving prices still lower. 1954 returns were about 25 percent lower than

1950, itself a badly depressed year for farmers. Further price declines in 1955 and indicated for 1956 will make these income figures still smaller, and raise the size of mortgages.

8. As of the time of survey, farmers reported they needed an average of about $5,000 per farm for repairs, new equipment and new buildings needed for farming.

9. Many farm homes were lacking some of the most essential facilities, such as running water or central heating, which have been enjoyed by city people for a generation or longer. Insurable valuation of farm homes indicates many new homes are needed and very few have been built since 1920. Average needs for housing and home equipment are 2 or 3 times what is needed for farm production.

10. If farmers were making fair income, they would provide a tremendous market for capital goods, estimated to be at least $5 billion just in these 5 States.

11. The low incomes brought about by low prices, as revealed by this survey, go far to explain the startling loss of farm homes now shown by the 1954 United States census. In these 5 States, between January 1950 and the fall of 1954, 38,000 farm homes have disappeared. That means one family in 13 gave up trying to live the life of their training and choice. In 1955 more farm homes have disappeared, and the prospect for 1956 is bleak. Our figures show that even the bigger-than-average family farms are in difficulties.

12. Nearly half of the farms had been taken over since the war by their present operators. Now, many older men are near retirement. With present depressed conditions, their farms will go to the biggest operators instead of to younger men. Many more farm homes will be wiped out unless drastic steps are taken to aid family farms.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just asked and received consent to have the descriptive material relating to the GTA survey placed in the RECORD. That includes a summary of the farm survey, a description of how the survey was conducted, and a section relating to the introductory remarks of Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Grain Terminal Association. I have the survey in my hand. It is an excellent document. It is authentic. The description of how the survey was conducted will reveal that a substantial sum of money was expended to hire certified public accountants to make an analysis of the income tax returns from 1950 through 1954, and some in 1955, so that the accurate economic picture could be developed.

Mr. President, I commend this entire survey to my colleagues for careful study. I understand copies have been made available to each Senator. Others can be provided to those interested in knowing just what is happening to our farm families in these five Midwestern States.

The summary already placed in the RECORD shows that the average investment of the 4,321 farms studied was $42,000, with an average of 3,300 manhours of labor put in annually on each by the farm family.

Yet the income from 1954 operations, including food raised for home and before paying any income tax due, was only $2,531—about $200 per month, or $50 per week.

That seems to me not to be a very adequate profit. How many Senators would be satisfied with such a return on a $42,000 investment, plus 3,300 manhours of work?

I wish Mr. Henry Hazlitt, or anyone else who has made snide, half-truth comments about American agriculture and its economic difficulties, would look over this document.

To doublecheck this study and determine if it is really typical of our midwestern farms, the representative character of the selected counties and the GTA's distribution of farms surveyed, by size of acreage, was compared with 1954 census figures.

Mr. President, I would like to place at this point in the RECORD a table showing that comparison.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison with census for countries, distribution of farms by size

[Percent]

	GTA survey	Census
Montana:		
30 to 259 acres	5	9
260 to 499 acres	11	13
500 to 999 acres	27	25
1,000 acres and over	57	53
North Dakota:		
30 to 259 acres	9	17
260 to 499 acres	37	36
500 to 999 acres	39	33
1,000 acres and over	15	15
South Dakota:		
30 to 259 acres	27	36
260 to 499 acres	35	33
500 to 999 acres	22	17
1,000 acres and over	16	14
Minnesota:		
30 to 139 acres	16	23
140 to 219 acres	37	34
220 to 499 acres	41	38
500 acres and over	6	5
Wisconsin:		
30 to 139 acres	38	50
140 to 219 acres	39	31
220 to 499 acres	22	18
500 acres and over	1	1

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be found that the figures which were developed in the GTA survey were all on the conservative side, as compared with the Census Bureau figures of the Department of Commerce.

That table reflects fairly close agreement as to distribution of farms, according to size, in each of the States surveyed. Another comparison usefully made was between the average value of land and buildings as given by the census, and the averages obtained in the GTA survey for the selected counties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed at this point in the RECORD a brief table showing that comparison, and a third comparison between the census and GTA survey distribution of farms according to the value of products sold in 1954.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average value, land and buildings, 1954

	GTA survey	Census
Montana	$47,000	$56,000
North Dakota	24,000	23,000
South Dakota	31,000	31,000
Minnesota	27,000	25,000
Wisconsin	17,000	13,000

Distribution of farms by value of products sold in 1954

	Value of products sold, 1954	Percent of farms	
		GTA survey	Census
Montana	$250 to $2,499	3	11
	$2,500 to $9,999	46	49
	$10,000 and over	52	40
North Dakota	$250 to $2,499	5	21
	$2,500 to $9,999	75	65
	$10,000 and over	20	14
South Dakota	$250 to $2,499	3	18
	$2,500 to $9,999	65	61
	$10,000 and over	32	21
Minnesota	$250 to $2,499	6	18
	$2,500 to $9,999	72	61
	$10,000 and over	22	21
Wisconsin	$250 to $2,499	11	11
	$2,500 to $9,999	82	70
	$10,000 and over	7	19

Mr. HUMPHREY. A final comparison was made between census data and the GTA average expenditures listed for gasoline and oil, for feed, for equipment, and for rental, for the surveyed counties. Because these comparisons emphasize the validity of the sampling for the rest of the GTA, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this other comparative table appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average expenditures, gasoline and oil, 1954

	GTA survey	Census
Montana	$1,051	$955
North Dakota	848	788
South Dakota	769	709
Minnesota	591	561
Wisconsin	367	325

Average expenditures for feed and equipment rental, 1954

	Feed expenditure		Equipment rental	
	GTA survey	Census	GTA survey	Census
Montana	$236	$503	$275	$687
North Dakota	204	376	133	310
South Dakota	502	690	315	408
Minnesota	1,029	1,347	204	238
Wisconsin	903	908	143	166

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only purpose of the tables is to ascertain the validity and accuracy of the statistical information which is now presented in the GTA family-farm survey for the years from 1950 through 1954.

While the income and expense figures revealed by this GTA survey are significant enough, I want to emphasize, Mr. President, that they are based on 1954 earnings.

Every indicator we have shows that these farm people were hit even harder during 1955.

Among the many fundamental facts about family-operated farms emphasized in this comprehensive survey was the large investment required in land, buildings, machinery, and inventory in crops and livestock.

The minimum investment required for farming today is large compared to what is required for substantial city businesses which support their owners on a level far above any to be found on the farm.

Just as families cannot farm without an investment, so they cannot stand this increased overhead when prices are by design forced to drift or drop to lower levels.

The heavy investment required in modern farming presents the typical family-operated farm with the kind of problem many faced in the early 1920's and early 1930's. In those decades, many farms were heavily mortgaged and then went bankrupt, pulling banks and other businesses down with them when prices were allowed to collapse.

The necessarily heavy investment in farming today holds an even greater threat in a period of declining prices than did the heavy mortgages in the 1920's and 1930's. Farmers can go broke much faster today than ever before.

Another significant fact was developed by this study, regarding the length of time the farm-family operator has been on the farm being surveyed.

They found that as of the first part of 1955, 65 percent of the farms surveyed were taken over since 1940. By now, this percentage is above two-thirds. About 20 percent of the farms had been occupied since 1940–44, and 45 percent during the 10-year period, 1945–54. As the survey itself comments:

Thus, many of the typical family farms are committed to investments made during the last 10 years of high land values and high capital costs. A sustained higher price level is as vital to these and all farmers as a sustained wage level is to industrial workers and a sustained consumer income level is to business in general.

I think this is a very important fact, and it should be well understood. It is not fair to compare the drop in farm income today with the drop in farm income in any other period, primarily because the investment involved in a farming operation today is an investment which was accumulated during high cost periods. Therefore, if prices are not a fairly high level, there is no chance in the world for the farmer to survive.

It used to be that a young man could enter upon farming in Minnesota, back in the 1930's, for $2,000 or $3,000 working capital. No young man or young woman would think of going into farming today without a minimum investment of from $10,000 to $15,000. We figure, on the average, that a reasonably good amount of capital with which to start a farm in our State today is $20,000. The farmer must buy high-priced equipment. He cannot pasture his tractor. He must have gasoline or fuel oil. So any drop in farm prices and farm income can have disastrous consequences.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing when farmers occupied present farms in the five States covered by the survey.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When farmers occupied present farms

	Before 1940	1940–44	1945–54
South Dakota	31.2	21.1	47.7
Minnesota	32.1	18.5	49.4
North Dakota	36.7	23.2	40.1
Wisconsin	37.0	16.8	46.2
Montana		18.8	40.2
5 States	35.0	19.9	45.1

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the GTA survey also shows the lack of opportunity for young people to start in farming, and the resultant increasing percentage of older farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point a portion of the survey entitled "Family Type Farming Declines."

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY TYPE FARMING DECLINES

The widening gap between farm and nonfarm income, the inadequate returns for capital and labor, as shown on the farms surveyed by the GTA, throw much light on certain revelations of the 1954 agricultural census, particularly those relative to the decline in the number of family-operated farms. Those Americans concerned with preserving the family farm as a necessary basis of American life, have had their fears greatly heightened by the more-than-usual decline in farm population since 1950, and the continued rise in large-scale farming. The failure of the family farm to hold its own in the face of sagging prices, rising costs, and limited acreage, clearly spells a decline in the number and position of owner-operated family farms. This is always the result when the cost-price squeeze in agriculture makes it more difficult or impossible for farmers to hold on.

Farm population is shrinking much faster than ever before. It has always done so relatively, but in recent years there has been an absolute decline of startling proportions. Between the depressions of 1921 and 1930, farm population declined from 32,123,000 to 30,529,000, or at the rate of 150,000 per year. Between the depressions of 1932, and 1942, farm population declined from 32,393,000 to 29,234,000, or at the rate of 316,000 per year. The first 2 years of our participation in World War II took nearly 4 million people out of agriculture, or at the rate of 2 million per year. Between 1949 and 1954, the farm population has declined from 25,954,000 to 21,890,000 or at the rate of 813,000 per year. This is a sharper decline than in any peacetime period.

In the five States surveyed by the GTA, as well as elsewhere, this decline in farm population shows up also in a decline in the number of farms. Wisconsin shows a drop of 9 percent in the 5 years, 1949–54; South Dakota a drop of 6 percent; Minnesota a drop of 8 percent; North Dakota, a drop of 5 percent; and Montana, a drop of 6 percent.

This shrinkage in the number of farms has resulted in an increase in the size of farms, particularly among the larger farms. In Montana, where 1,000 acres is not a large farm on dry land, the number of farms with 1,000 acres or more has now risen to about 40 percent, compared with 34 percent 10 years ago. In North Dakota, the proportion of farms of 500 acres or more has risen from 45 percent in 1945, to 51 percent, and in South Dakota the proportion has risen from 30 percent to 34 percent.

Undoubtedly, family-operated farms, as well as others, have increased their holdings in recent years, but we do not know to what extent. Judging, however, from the distribution of farms by size of income, we infer that most of the increase in large-sized farms is not typically family operated.

In Wisconsin, the 1954 census shows 3.7 percent of all farms with gross receipts over $25,000, compared with only 0.7 percent in 1949. Minnesota shows an increase from 1.3 percent to 2.5 percent. In North Dakota, the percentage rose from 2.3 percent to 2.9 percent, and in Montana, from 6.8 percent to 10.6 percent.

The GTA survey shows the lack of opportunity for the young people to start farming has a great deal to do with the increase in size of farms. With very low returns and high investment needed, only established farmers can take over available land. The GTA survey found only 1 or 2 farms per 100 operated by farmers under 25 years of age, and only 14 percent to 21 percent under 35 years of age. On the other hand, 18 percent to 21 percent were between 55 and 64 years old, and 6 percent to 12 percent over 65.

Age of farm operators in GTA survey

[Percent of all operators]

Age	Wisconsin	Minnesota	North Dakota	South Dakota	Montana
Under 25	1.9	1.0	0.9	0.9	2.1
25 to 34	11.8	16.1	16.5	20.2	17.9
35 to 44	32.8	31.9	28.2	27.2	30.4
45 to 54	24.7	26.7	30.0	25.3	21.1
55 to 64	20.6	18.1	18.4	18.7	16.2
65 and over	8.2	6.2	6.0	7.7	12.3

Soon, most of the farm operators over 65 years of age will be retiring on such savings as they may have and on social security. In 5 years perhaps as many as one-sixth of all farms will be taken over either by a new farmer, or one already farming. If present conditions are not greatly improved, young people are not going into farming, so this large acreage will go to others already farming to enlarge their holdings. If present trends continue, most of this land will go to the biggest operators to make them still bigger, thereby further weakening the position of family farms.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend the reading of the survey to my colleagues, because it shows what is happening to the family-type farms of America. I should like to quote one sentence from the survey, as follows:

Soon, most of the farm operators over 65 years of age will be retiring on such savings as they have and on social security. In 5 years perhaps as many as one-sixth of all farms will be taken over either by a new farmer, or one already farming. If present conditions are not greatly improved, young people are not going into farming, so this large acreage will go to others already farming to enlarge their holdings. If present trends continue, most of this land will go to the biggest operators to make them still bigger, thereby further weakening the position of family farms.

Mr. President, a great deal has been said about family farms. I do not suppose anyone can say how many acres comprise the average family-size farm. The best way we can identify a family farm is to say that that kind of farm is run by a family, that a family operates it and tills the soil. Perhaps it is done

with the help of one hired man. That is a family farm. That family farm has been the backbone of rural America. It has been the backbone of every State in the Union.

Do Senators know what is going to happen to the country if the number of family-size farms continues to diminish? It will mean that the small towns—where boys and girls have an opportunity to grow into manhood and womanhood—will be finished. It will mean a greater concentration of population in metropolitan centers, with all the problems which come with metropolitan living. It will mean that the little church one sees on the crossroads will be just a shell of a building, with no congregation. It will mean that the local government institutions—the small township governments that have been so important to the whole experience of democracy—will be obsolete and will no longer form an institution of government.

It will mean that the good, wholesome, challenging experience of living in the rural areas of America will be done away with.

I have been somewhat perplexed by our Government's policies relating to agriculture and to foreign relations. Many Senators heard President Gronchi, of Italy, speak at a joint meeting of the House and the Senate today. The President of Italy pointed out that the Italian people have made considerable progress in their land-reform program.

What did he mean by that, Mr. President? He meant that in Italy, in order for free government to survive, they have got to go back to the family type of farm; have got to get away from the big feudal estates, the big plantations. All over the world where democracy has been extinguished or real freedom never lived, it will be found that there is a land pattern which approximates the old feudal baronies of the middle ages. Wherever there is a country which is trying to become free and democratic, one of the first actions of the government is to break up the landed estates. General MacArthur did a magnificent job of that in Japan. That was the first task to which he set himself.

In South Vietnam we are having some of the best experts of this Government breaking up the land holdings, that the French colonial system had, as a pattern of agricultural activities.

Every country that is in trouble, or every country where freedom does not live, has a land pattern of large land accumulations, small baronies, so to speak, and huge estates. In some places they are privately owned.

In Russia they are owned by the State. It does not make any difference whether it is state collectivism or private collectivism, it is still collectivism.

The only difference is that when it is state collectivism, the government collectivizes it, and when it is private collectivism it means that some economic lord collectivizes it. This Government is spending many millions of the taxpayers' dollars to establish family farming all over the world, taking dollars away from our own farmers to send experts all over the world, to make loans and grants to get family farming. Right here in the United States the same Government, by its policies, is destroying family farming. The same Government, by its policies, is aggravating the collection of land into larger and larger units, driving the young people elsewhere, making it unprofitable for young men and young women to live on our farms.

Ask a member of the State Department or of the International Cooperation Administration why we are spending money and sending people to country after country to divide up the land to have land reform, and he will say it is because it is sound political and social practice for those countries.

Ask this question: "Now, Mr. State Department, maybe those folks over in Italy could operate more efficiently at lower costs per unit of production if they had bigger land holdings."

What will the answer be? The answer will be, "That may be true, but it is more important that people live on the land and own the land on which they live than it is to have cheap production or efficient production."

Yet the same Government, in another department, will go out into the countryside and say that farming is big business. That is what one of the Assistant Secretaries said. He said, "We have to face up to it. It is big business." Very frankly stating that the family farm is on its way out.

Representatives of the Department of State are going around the world and telling people, "What you need to do is to have family farms. We will help buy them. We will send people to show you how to get them."

Perhaps those are some of the people that the same Government has driven off the farms in the United States who are being sent overseas.

If anyone can make any sense out of this jumbled mess, I wish he would give us a logical statement as to our policies.

Of course, it can be pointed out that it may be more efficient to have a 2,000-acre farm with huge machines and hired help, frequently hired Mexicans, Jamaicans, imported labor; all too frequently. We can produce commodities at a lower unit cost, but what do we do to people? What kind of a country are we going to have if this is the way we are going to act, if this is the policy we are going to pursue?

Mr. President, I have never defended the family farm on the basis that it can produce a commodity at less cost than can a big operation. I am not interested in cheapness. I do not want cheap agriculture, cheap people, or a cheap country. There is something else in life than being efficient. We can look through the Old Testament and the New Testament, Mr. President, the Sermon on the Mount, and the Ten Commandments; we can look through every book of Holy Scripture, or the writings of Thomas Aquinas or John Locke; we can go back to the writings of Socrates and Cicero, and come down through the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the Constitution of the United States, but we will never find the word "efficiency." That word has been made "holier than thou" by the Republican National Committee.

I want all students of Holy Scripture to show me one word in the Bible about efficiency. There is a great deal about justice and love; there are words about compassion and charity. There are words about evil and good. But the word "efficiency"? No. That is not there, because efficiency is a byproduct. We do not seek that as our main goal. We seek the good life; we seek a sound social structure and a good social order.

Mr. President, if some of the policies now being pursued are continued, we will drive thousands and thousands of people off the land in the States of Mississippi, Minnesota, and others of our States.

Where will those persons go? There are already serious social problems and economic problems in many of those areas. The cities are already overcrowded. Where is the tenant farmer going to go, whether he be white or black? Where will he make a living? He does not want to go on relief. But if we continue the present kind of program and policy now being pursued, he will have to go on relief. He will be in the cities, living in hovels in the slums.

A man can live on a little farm. He may not make too much money, but he can breathe fresh air. He can bring up his family under good, wholesome conditions. He can go fishing and not have to fish in a polluted stream. He can have a place for his children to work rather than to loiter on the streets. Family farming has something to it besides dollars. It is a way of life. It is important to have enough dollars to sustain the farm and to provide some of the necessities and a modicum of the luxuries of life.

This Senator has always worked on the theory that if some people are entitled to 2 months in Florida or in the Caribbean, or somewhere on a yacht, then everyone is entitled to 2 weeks in a rowboat. Up my way we like to go canoeing. If men are willing to work—and if there is any group of people who work hard it is our farm people, who work hard and long—I happen to believe they are entitled to at least a fair shake, that the cards ought not to be stacked against them, and that one thing they should have a right to expect is a spokesman in this Government for their interest.

One of the reasons why I am speaking today, Mr. President, is because there are people in Minnesota who believe in me, and I will not let them down. I receive letters by the hundreds. Here is one which I picked up at random, which says, among other things:

> We have heard plenty of speaking over TV by Benson giving his side of the story, favoring flexible support. Now let's hear the other side.
>
> Would appreciate it if you would give a talk on 90-percent supports and a general discussion of agriculture. We heard you

talk at Albert Lea and again at Waseca. We feel that you are one of the best speakers to do this.

Sincerely,

HENRY WALSER,
Minnesota Lake, Minn.

I have thousands of letters, Mr. President, and I serve notice on editors, publishers, and commentators that when they start picking on those people they have got a bear by the tail, namely, HUBERT HUMPHREY, because I intend to fight for their interests. I know those people. They have never asked for a free ride in their lives, and they have never received one. But they are not asking to have the train derailed half way down the track, either, and have to get out of the debris of the wreck.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a report from Buckeye, Hardin County, Iowa, stating that they went on record last week as favoring 90 percent price supports and compensatory payments on perishable commodities. There are 132 farmers in Buckeye Township, and of that number 118 signed the petition.

These are folks who get together and talk over their problems. They are people who know their land. Most likely they have a mortgage on it, too, but they are working the land and are trying to pay off the mortgage. They are people who are doing their own talking. They did not have to read that two-bit ad. Of course, it cost a lot more; I was only giving its qualitative worth. Those people did not have to read that ad about Ike's nine-point farm program. They had 10 points before Ike ever thought about a farm program. These farmers have been farming the land in the Midwest for generation after generation.

If Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Benson could see the mail I am getting, believe me, Mr. President, they would know there was something afoot in that section of the country. I cannot read some of the mail into the RECORD, because the rules of the Senate prohibit my doing so. These are modest, temperate persons, but they have a full head of steam on right now.

One farmer sent me a three-point program, and started out by telling me he had always been a Republican, but he now had three points for a farm program: Vote Democratic, restore 90 percent of parity, and fire Benson. I agree with all three points. That is a very good program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire document prepared by the 118 farmers of Hardin County, Buckeye Township, Iowa, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUCKEYE, IOWA.—While the debate in Congress rages over "flexible versus rigid" when it comes to price supports, 9 out of 10 farm operators in Buckeye Township, Hardin County, Iowa, went on record last week as favoring:

1. Ninety percent price support on storable commodities.

2. Compensatory payments on perishable commodities.

3. Whatever production controls would be necessary to achieve the first two objectives.

There are 132 farmers operating farmland in Buckeye Township. Of that number, 118 signed a petition addressed to their congressional representatives endorsing those 3 major objectives. The percentage is 89.4 in favor of the petition.

Five farm operators out of the 132 refused to sign the petition because they felt that the 90-percent supports were too high. Eight did not sign because they were either undecided or had no opinion. Three signed but said 90-percent supports were too low. One did not sign for "other reasons." Only 2 farm operators in the township were not contacted; 1 of these was out of the State when the poll was taken on February 22 and 23. Some operators living outside the township but farming land within the township were included in the survey.

The survey was conducted by teams of 2 farmers in each of the 9 school districts in the township.

Leonard E. Hoffman, Ellis Township farmer and seed grower, flew into Washington, D. C., on Sunday night where he is presenting the results of the survey to various members of the House and Senate where proposed agricultural legislation is now being debated.

The idea to poll Buckeye township grew out of a "cracker barrel" discussion among farmers congregated in the combination Buckeye post-office and drug store. The poll was not sponsored by any particular farm organization and Farmers Union, Farm Bureau, and NFO members all participated. A Farm Bureau spokesman, however, said that the big majority of those taking the poll were not bureau members.

Buckeye township has never been a strong Farm Bureau township. Wayne Halstead, Farm Bureau fieldman, said that there are 43 Farm Bureau memberships in the township at the present time and there would be more before the drive was completed. Last year there were 57.

Hoffman, who is on the State Farmers Union committee, said that there were 65 Farmers Union memberships in the township at the present time. Otis Liittschwager, Buckeye township farmer and former member of State PMA committee, served as chairman of the informal meeting which was held to organize the poll. Myron Thomas served as secretary.

At a followup meeting, it was voted by the farmers attending to have Hoffman present the results of the poll to congressional Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and presidential assistant Sherman Adams.

The petition circulated read as follows:

"We the undersigned, all qualified farm operators in Buckeye township, Hardin County, Iowa, respectfully request that all Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress who are concerned with agricultural welfare thoughtfully consider the following petition for the good of both producer and consumer:

1. That 90 percent parity price supports be restored to all storable commodities.

2. That there be enacted into law a program of compensatory payments for all perishable commodities selling at less than 90 percent of parity, similar to that already in effect for wool and sugar.

3. That since the above proposals cannot be effectively administered without both production controls and a sound long-range soil-conservation program that will assure a continued abundance of food and fiber we pledge our support to such controls and conservation program. A good many farmers made some additional comment when signing the petition. One remarked that "in addition to controls some sort of cross compliance would be necessary."

One, not signed, said that "90 percent is too high; it will hamper our foreign trade."

One farmer said that "I am not in favor of 90 percent supports, but I do favor the soil bank 100 percent."

One farmer commented that he "wouldn't join the Farm Bureau because flexible price supports wouldn't work and 90 percent of parity would cost too much."

This is a breakdown of the poll by each of the nine school districts in Buckeye township:

	Number of farmers signing	Number of farmers believing 90 percent too high	Number believing 90 percent too low, but signing	Undecided or no opinion	Other reasons
1	15	0	0	0	0
2	10	0	0	1	0
3	15	1	0	0	0
4	7	3	0	3	0
5	13	0	3	0	1
6	18	0	0	0	0
7	14	1	0	1	0
8	16	0	0	0	0
9	10	0	0	3	0
Total	118	5	3	8	1

The farmers who conducted the poll were Dale Kellogg, Bennie K. Hall, V. R. Blome, M. E. Hyland, Gus Lettow, Henry Daum, Jr., Myron L. Thoms, Orville Knutson, Cecil O. Engelson, G. C. Kinney, Carl Brockett, Darrel Sielaff, Kenneth Berndt, Robert Hoffman, and Sig Halsve.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if any of my city friends think the farmers do not know what they are talking about, let them take time to read the resolution of these farm families. They know what is going on. They know what they are talking about. There may be a lot of support for flexible price supports, but it is not in that area.

I pride myself on being able to count. I have been in the rural areas. I can go for mile after mile in State after State and know that the overwhelming majority of the farm families are for 90 percent of parity. They are willing to accept control if only they can make an honest living.

I get a big bounce out of some of the surveys which are taken on flexible price supports. The interviewers will go to a beauty parlor and ask the operator, "Are you for flexible price supports or not?"

One would expect the beauty parlor operator, who constantly has to face the demand for long hair one year and short hair the next year, to be for a flexible price-support program.

The interviewers then ask an insurance salesman if he is for flexible price supports. The insurance man has read the Reader's Digest, Harper's Weekly, or Life magazine editorials. He bases his answer on such distorted information. I have in my folder such editorials from the leading newspapers in the State of Minnesota. I have a number of them. They are all for the Benson farm program. The editorial comment of the Minneapolis Star, the Minneapolis Tribune and the St. Paul Pioneer Press Dispatch are all for the Benson farm program.

Editorial writers know about as much how to operate farms as farmers know how to operate newspapers. Let anyone go into the country and get a farmer to write a good editorial on how to operate a newspaper. It will be just about as successful as the editorials are on how to operate farms.

The people of Minnesota have not been listening to the editorial comments of these newspapers—and they are fine newspapers. If the people had been paying attention to the editorial comments of those newspapers, I would not be here. As a matter of fact, if the people had believed the editorial comment of the newspapers, they would really have expected Eisenhower and Benson to give them 100 percent of parity, because that is what those newspapers said in 1952 would happen.

But I welcome the opposition of the press. When they start supporting the program which I favor, I shall begin to reexamine the program I am supporting. I would rather have one letter from a small farmer at home in Minnesota than 10 of these editorials. I have before me on the desk many nice letters. They really make me feel good. One letter says:

Please stick to the farm program you have now before the Senate. The President's and Benson's plan is not helping us small farmers. We have a 120-acre farm, started after the war as a GI.

Yours truly,

LEONARD SHERMAN.

Leonard, you can rest assured that I will stand by the 90-percent price-support program.

Here is a letter from Lakefield, Minn.:

DEAR SIR: The Senate Agriculture Committee turned out a good farm bill. It should be passed by a large majority. I would have liked to have corn kept as basic, and premium payments on hogs under 200 pounds up to $3 a hundred. I farm in Jackson County, Minn.

CLARENCE K. TALLMAN.

That county is on the Iowa border. It used to be hard to find there anybody who would vote on my side of the fence. It is not hard now, Mr. President. I have a fine group of friends there. I intend to be there, by the way, the coming weekend, in the vicinity of Albert Lea, in Jackson County.

Here is a letter from Walnut Grove, Minn., a lovely area of the State. It is an intriguing name. A lovely walnut grove is exactly what used to be there. The letter, addressed to me, says:

I am strongly against flexible price supports, which is endorsed by the Eisenhower administration. This program will create more surpluses and will lower our income.

I digress to say that that letter contains more sense than I have heard from five universities on the subject. I continue:

The Eisenhower 9-point program is all right (omitting flexible supports) for a long-range program, but will not help the farmer now when he needs it.

I am for the old parity formula, which will give us 90 percent of parity, as the old law states—not the new parity formula.

I would appreciate your voting for 90 percent parity and the soil bank program, providing that it will pay enough so we can take our acres out of production.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

DON E. ANDERSON.

WALNUT GROVE, MINN.

Listen to this letter from Paynesville, Minn. Paynesville is on the highway, off from St. Cloud, in west central Minnesota. It is a fine community and has one of the finest schools in the State. The letter, signed by Lionel G. Reeck, says:

The soil bank is of little value in keeping me on the farm unless I get parity for corn, dairy products, chickens, hogs, feed grains, and beef. This I do so hope you will inform other Senators from other States about.

Mr. Reeck, that is what I am doing. There are not many Senators in the Chamber to listen, but Mr. Reeck's statement will be in the RECORD. I continue:

Basic commodities must be supported at parity, including corn, according to the old parity formula, and production payments direct to the farmer, not the packer or chain store for perishables. I know you are fighting for us, and after Worthington, I've repeatedly told farmers that we can be ever so glad and thankful we have a Senator HUMPHREY with us. Keep it up.

Mr. President, that makes me feel good. I receive a great many letters like that. This man attended the farm hearings at Worthington.

This is a letter from Francis Senden, of Marshall, Minn.:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wish to thank you for the fine job you are doing, according to price supports, and the farmer as a whole. But as Secretary Benson has the farm situation all messed up, I am sure many of our farmers will have to quit and sell out, including myself. In fact, there has been a farm auction sale where the young man had to sell out. I hope that you will keep up the good work and fight for the 90 percent on basics.

Mr. Senden, you can rest assured that I will keep up the fight.

Here is a letter from Fred Wyells, of Marshall, Minn.:

I have been a farmer all my life, and in the years before we had price supports, about the time a farmer was getting along pretty well financially, the speculators and big business would cause a crash, and we would have to start over again. I know with high support prices we are protected against such wide fluctuations.

You know how a farmer's income is dropping; and if something isn't done soon, we will undoubtedly have one of the worst depressions we ever had.

Hoping you will vote for high support prices,

Sincerely,

FRED WYELLS.

Fred, you can be assured that that is what your Senator will do.

Marshall, Minn., is in Lyon County, one of the finest farming areas in the United States. If Senators ever have occasion to go to Marshall, Minn., they will see one of the finest, most up-to-date modern towns they have ever laid eyes on. There is a good baseball team there, too.

This letter is from Victor Schilling, also of Marshall, Minn. He says:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am writing to thank you for the fine way you have been representing the farmer all along, and to say I believe it imperative that we have rigid supports returned if we are going to avert a national financial catastrophe.

I am of the opinion it is a national disgrace to allow many of our GI's to be sold down the river as farmers, after the sacrifice they made during the war.

Respectfully yours,

VICTOR SCHILLING.

Here is a letter from Mahnomen, Minn.:

DEAR SIR: This is a letter to let you know how much many, many farmers around Mahnomen and also the business people appreciate all you are doing for them. We sincerely hope this farm bill will be passed with at least 90 percent of the old parity formula.

Thank you.

Mrs. J. L. LOCKWOOD.

MAHNOMEN, MINN.

Here is another letter from Mahnomen, Minn.:

DEAR SENATOR: Would like to add our voices to encourage you in your efforts on behalf of the hard-pressed farmers of this country.

We believe in, advocate, and desire 90 percent (at least) support prices on all commodities, the old system of figuring parity on the basics, a ban on imports of commodities now in surplus.

From a gathering of some 300 last night, perhaps not more than a dozen people will write to express themselves, but there was no doubt that sentiment for these provisions in a farm bill was almost unanimous.

Be of good cheer—we're behind you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. SAM PASKEWITZ.

I am of good cheer, Mr. and Mrs. Paskewitz.

Mr. President, I have in my hand another letter from Martin County, at Grenada. Martin County is in southern Minnesota. I have been in Martin County. I have visited the county fair. I have stood in the fairgrounds and have shaken hands with the farm people and visited with them. I think I know a little bit about the county.

Mr. President, I hope it will not sound too immodest if I say that I have traveled every highway and byway, and every country road in Minnesota. If the folks would not come to listen to me, I would go out to talk to them.

Many times I have stopped my car, crawled over a fence, gone into the field, and talked to farmers. I do not have to get my agricultural information from the Reader's Digest.

I have in my hand a letter from Grenada, Minn., in Martin County, which reads:

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: I want to compliment you on the fight you are putting up for the farm program.

I am inclosing figures on my corn allotment for 1955 and 1956 on my 80 acres. If you can use them to any advantage, you are welcome to do so.

Wishing you the best of everything.

Yours sincerely,

R. S. HOLLAND.

I am asked questions about the soil bank and what benefits the farmer will receive. I mention a few of these letters because every one of them receives a personal answer. If I have to stay up every night until 5 o'clock in the morning, I shall answer letters. I pride myself on answering my mail. I do not give my constituents a blanket reply; they get personal answers. When they write to me and ask me a question, I try to find the answer. Sometimes I have a little trouble getting service from the Department of Agriculture. But the service has picked up after I have had to use some harsh words on this floor about the lack of replies by the Department of

Agriculture to Senatorial mail. I am happy to say that of late I have been receiving replies.

(At this point Mr. HUMPHREY yielded to Mr. MONRONEY to introduce a bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act and to make brief remarks on the bill.

(Mr. MONRONEY's remarks appear elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while I had a free moment, I went through some of these letters. They are all very much alike. The count in my office on farm mail is about 7 percent for the Eisenhower farm program, as announced in newspaper ads, and about 93 percent for the principles embodied in the committee bill before the Senate at the present time.

I may point out that the mail comes from all sections of my State, and from people dealing with different farm organizations.

As I should have mentioned when I was discussing the Hardin County report, Iowa, the 118 farmers mentioned in that report belonged to the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, and other farm organizations, about evenly divided.

I picked out at random a letter from Mr. Philip E. Boxrud, of Madelia, Minn., which reads:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I trust you'll be able to read this letter personally as I am a common dirt farmer concerned over the welfare of agriculture. I admit to following the Republican policies of the past but am nearing the boiling point (as are many of my neighbors).

Have just finished listening to Mr. Benson's speech and could personally tear it all to pieces. Farmers are not lethargic, Mr. Senator, they'll not stand flowering phrases, ludicrous stories, and euphemism. "Let's have a little more light and a little less noise." Wasn't it ironical?

The true facts of the situation were not revealed. Let's face up to it, the Republicans want to stabilize the dollar and the farmer is the only group they can squeeze, by, as you say, "lip service," and doing nothing. They cannot control labor nor can they control big business but they can play coy with the farmer and subsequently achieve their purposes.

Mr. President, this man is a really smart man. This is the way the Republicans have stabilized the cost of living. Other costs have gone up. Farm prices have gone down. The Republicans say, "Look, we have stabilized the cost of living. We have stopped inflation." They have stopped inflation by letting some people be inflated and some deflated.

I continue to read from the letter:

I'm downright mad, Mr. Senator, as I'm young and want to stay in farming, but what chance does an honest man have?

I want to pay off my bills and obligations but unfortunately I'm too small as against the huge farming corporations and the likes of Pillsbury Mills. Thirty-four indictments for mixing Canadian wheat with American wheat for export. Under the present crisis farmers are experiencing, I call it sabotage.

There are people in this country that are not buying the protein foods because they cannot afford them.

And so forth. That is good, sound, basic thinking.

Mr. President, I shall not go through all the letters I have received. They come from Clarissa, Sleepy Eye, Olivia, Lake Lillian, Mountain Lake, and other places.

I should like to read this one letter I have picked up:

DEAR SENATOR: I heard over the noontime news we are supposed to write to our Senator right away about the 90-percent parity. Oh my yes, we all want the program at 90-percent parity. That is the only thing, so we don't have to slave the way we do for nothing. Can't have any enjoyment for ourselves, only put every cent for debts. If we can't get 90 percent we will quit, and I am not the only one. There are many like us. We have to work hard and still get nothing. We might as well stop working. We will have the same because with times like now we have to sell everything to make ends meet. We can't even eat. It takes everything to keep going and still we go in debt. What a living. We might as well give the land back to the Indians and let them feed and clothe us. So we need 90-percent parity and that is all that will help us now. But there will have to be a way to stop.

This lady goes on for two pages, stating that she wants 90 percent of parity support prices. I want to say to this lady, whose name is Mrs. Frank Warzecka, of Westport, Minn., that is the way I shall vote.

Mr. President, we have heard so much about the plush life our farmers are living, in such periodicals as Harper's, that I want the RECORD to show the true and typical picture of midwestern farming.

The survey I have mentioned shows it most dramatically, breaking it down county by county, State by State, with scientifically balanced sampling and a larger sampling than usually statistically required for fair and accurate representation.

I refer, of course, to the GTA farm family survey. The cross check with census figures provides ample evidence of the fairness of the sampling distribution.

So that my colleagues from the Midwest may know, I should like to call attention to some more of the survey's findings. After all, we in the Midwest are proud of our great agricultural area. We regard it as one of the finest in the United States. So if farmers in our region can do no better economically than these figures show, agriculture's picture is far from rosy.

Let us take a look at my own State of Minnesota. Minnesota is considered to be rather prosperous, in comparison with other States. Audits were made of 1,319 farms in 6 typical counties—8.4 percent of the farms in those counties.

The average Minnesota farm, as depicted by the survey, had 248 acres, with a total investment of $38,596. Gross receipts for 1954 were $7,577, with total farm expenses of $5,752. That left an income before taxes of $1,825. Adding $350 as the estimated value of food furnished by the farm for the farm family, boosts the total income from the farm, before income taxes, to $2,175.

If we deducted a 5-percent return to the farmer for his cash investment—a reasonable return by business standards—it would leave only $245 as a return for labor and management by the farm operator and his family.

Mr. President, General Motors Corp. made a return of approximately 20 percent on its investment. I am speaking about a return of only 5 percent on the farmer's investment.

As I have said, if we deducted a 5-percent return to the farmer for his cash investment it would leave only $245 as a return for the labor and management by the farm operator and his family. That does not look as if too many Minnesota farmers are buying Cadillacs.

In fact, the survey took a look at farmer-owned automobiles.

There has been so much talk on that subject that the press may be interested in the actual facts:

Out of those farmers owning automobiles in Minnesota, 39.5 percent had 1949 or older models, and another 49.3 percent owned 1950 to 1953 models. Only 11.2 percent had 1954 or 1955 models.

Out of those cars, 83.1 percent were in the low-price range, 13.1 percent were in the medium-price range, and only 3.8 percent owned cars in the high-price range.

Only 47 percent of the farms surveyed had bathroom facilities, and only 55 percent had hot running water. Believe it or not, in spite of the heavy investment in these farms, only 63 percent had even cold running water.

As evidence of what can happen when our Government provides the means and methods whereby farmers can advance their living standards, quite a corollary to the above facts is presented by a reference to the use of electrical appliances. Ninety-eight percent of the farms had high-line electricity and 97 percent had power washers.

Mr. President, when the REA was established, farmers began to live; and when the REA established lines to local cooperatives, farmers started buying electrical appliances. In the case of the farms in some of the best counties in Minnesota, where the land is good, only 47 percent of the farms surveyed had bathroom facilities, only 55 percent had hot running water, only 63 percent had even cold running water, 98 percent had high-line electricity, and 97 percent had power washers, or electric washing machines. Why? Because they had electricity. Mr. President, I cannot help wondering how the washing machine industry would have survived if the REA had not been established.

A tremendous potential market for other needed materials and facilities exists on these farms, if the farmers had adequate income with which to pay for them.

For example, for farm production alone, not including farm home needs, the average farm surveyed in Minnesota needed expenditures of $663 for repairs and painting, $1,749 for new farm buildings, and $1,713 for new farm equipment. These amounts are necessary for their immediate needs. That is a total of $4,125 in immediate needs, expenditures that would be flowing into our stream of economy if these farmers were getting anywhere near parity of income.

What is true of Minnesota is true of our surrounding States and all farm States. Mr. President, I think it is reasonably fair to say that the farm situation in my

State is not as bad as that in many other areas. The farms in Minnesota are a little larger than the farms in some other sections. In Minnesota we have good land, and there has been reasonably good production.

The GTA survey in five States alone showed a great potential market for American industry. Farmers were asked what they needed to spend for repairs and paint, for new buildings, and for new equipment. The needed expenditures totalled from $4,000 to $6,500 per farm. The very large outlet for capital goods in these five States alone could amount to $2 billion for just farm needs, aside from household needs, if farmers had the income with which to maintain and improve their farms.

The potential is equally great for farm home improvements.

The data compiled in this survey fails to bear out the notion prevalent among many city people that farmers are enjoying an abnormally high standard of living. Instead 21 percent to 44 percent of farms in the entire 5-State area are without cold running water; 28 to 56 percent are without hot running water; telephones are still lacking in 24 to 66 percent, and bathroom facilities are lacking in 36 to 58 percent.

I am sure my colleagues from South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, and Wisconsin will be interested in seeing the corresponding facts and figures for their States.

Mr. President, high policy makers have been telling those of us who serve in Congress that what the country needs is foreign trade. I am in favor of foreign trade. I have always voted for the reciprocal trade program, and I have voted against any crippling amendments. But we are having trouble getting foreign trade, because we are always in conflict with some friend of ours. We always have to be concerned with the needs of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, or other countries that need foreign trade, if they are to live. They cannot even exist without foreign trade; foreign trade is their market and their livelihood.

Then there are the problems of tariffs and the problems of exchange—for instance, the problems which arise because of different currencies. In addition, there are language barriers. There are all kinds of problems. However, our Government relentlessly pursues foreign trade, and we justify the making of many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of appropriations on the basis of foreign trade. That is well and good, and what I am saying is not to discount at all the importance of foreign trade. It is important.

But, Mr. President, if we would spend on getting increased domestic trade, 10 percent of the effort we spend on getting additional foreign trade, we would be better off. In the United States there are unlimited markets. One out of every six families in the United States is living on a very low subsistence level. The best market for American production is in America. The best market for bathroom fixtures is in the United States, including the five States I have just been talking about; and the people of the United States will be willing to buy bathroom fixtures long before persons living in Burma will be willing to buy them. The best market for additional electrical equipment and the best market for machinery and the best market for repair parts and for paint and wallpaper and for repairs to homes and buildings is in the great hinterland of America. On the basis of plain, sensible economics, a farm program that will increase farm income is good for business.

Many of our farm families were hoping they would get some major tax reduction. I went home to Minnesota and said, "Fellow Minnesotans, your taxes are going to be reduced. This Republican administration has a tax-reduction program. It has a system. It reduces your income, and that reduces your taxes."

That is exactly what happened. Farm income has gone down and Federal revenues from income taxes from farm families has gone down.

Any program that is directed toward lifting the income levels of the farm family will lift the levels of every single businessman, factory worker, producer, and manufacturer in the United States. The great untapped market in America is out in the countryside—to be sure, in our cities, too. I have noticed that some of our big industrialists are very much interested in foreign trade. They like foreign trade, because sometimes they can build their factories in foreign countries, hire labor cheaper, and make more money.

I call upon industry in this country to be interested in domestic trade, with our own American families, insofar as humanly possible, with the view of allowing those families to obtain the opportunity to earn a fair living.

The best thing that ever happened to business was when a workingman received a good wage. We could always notice the difference in our cash register when the men out at the packing plant received a raise in pay. Every time the employees of the Armour Packing Co. received an increase in pay, Humphrey's drugstore got a little increase in business. We did not have to negotiate a contract. But the salary of the manager of the plant could have been increased by 100 percent and it would not have helped our business. When the 1,200 or 1,400 workers in that plant got another $5 in their pay envelopes, they were downtown spending it for unfulfilled needs.

I have never been able to understand why a small-business man, or any other businessman, little or big, should resist so vigorously programs of economic justice and progress for the rank and file of our people. It seems to me to be a rather shortsighted policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a condensed portion of the report entitled "Survey Shows Great Potential Market."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farmers were asked what they needed to spend for repairs and paint, for new buildings and for new equipment. This is what we found:

Capital expenditures needed per farm

	Repairs and paint	New buildings	New equipment	Total
Montana	$802	$1,707	$1,626	$4,135
North Dakota	1,258	2,426	2,877	6,561
South Dakota	1,029	1,945	1,956	4,930
Minnesota	663	1,749	1,713	4,125
Wisconsin	1,021	1,810	1,952	4,783

The needed expenditures total $4,000 to $6,500 per farm. In the case of new equipment, these needed expenditures would add about 15 percent to present equipment inventory for Montana family operated farms, about a fourth for those in South Dakota and Minnesota, and about a third for those in North Dakota and Wisconsin. These largest percentages of needed additions and equipment show up among farmers in the two States having the smallest average gross income, namely, North Dakota and Wisconsin, whereas the smallest percentage was reported by farmers in Montana, the State with the largest average gross income.

The very substantial expenditures that the typical family operated farm needs to make could mean much to industries selling to the farm market. This very large outlet for capital goods in these five States alone could amount to $2 billion if farmers had the income with which to maintain and improve their farms. This is suggestive of the large potential market for industrial products, not only in these five Northwest States but also in the many other rural regions of the country.

The GTA survey did not secure estimates of needed expenditures for the farm home similar to the estimates of capital expenditures needed for production. But the gaps and deficiencies in the farmers' living standards and the potential market for industrial products for use in farm homes is clearly shown by the proportion of farms that still do not have certain home facilities that are generally taken for granted in city communities. Further, the insurable value of farm homes in the survey averaged only $5,000, indicating many very old and inadequate houses. Certainly many of these need replacing.

Measures of farm living standards

[In percent]

Percent of farms that do not have—	Montana	North Dakota	South Dakota	Minnesota	Wisconsin
Cold running water	23	38	44	37	21
Hot running water	28	44	56	45	34
High-line electricity	2	2	4	2	1
Telephone	66	31	31	21	24
Power washer	4	2	4	3	1
Refrigerator	2	4	4	4	4
Deep freeze	24	52	55	56	51
Television	73	68	82	64	53
Radio	1	1	1	2	2
Bathroom facilities	36	50	58	53	39
L. P. gas	79	37	25	51	54
Central heating	38	45	58	63	49

These facts do not bear out the notion prevalent among many city people that farmers are enjoying an abnormally high standard of living. The fact is, today very many farmers still do not have some of the elementaries of everyday living—21 to 44 percent without cold running water, and 28 to 56 percent without hot running water. Telephones are still lacking in 24 to 66 percent of the surveyed farms, and many of the phones in use date back to before World War I. Deep freezes were lacking in 24 to 56 percent of the farms in spite of the fact that deep freezes are of greatest benefit to farm families.

Most farms do not have television even though they are in areas receiving service. Bathroom facilities are still lacking on 36 to 58 percent of the farms, and 38 to 63 percent do not have central heating.

The total required to replace or modernize the farm homes in just these five States must be at least twice as much as most farmers reported they needed for farm capital expenditures. This would indicate a minimum of $4 billions for housings, with corresponding totals for the country as a whole, and a grand total of farm needs of five or six billion dollars for these five States alone.

We do not need to look only to foreign underdeveloped countries as potential additional markets for our industrial products. Millions of our own farm families, west, south, east, and north need billions of new capital expenditures to close the gap between rural and urban living standards.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The survey I have discussed brings out alarming facts on the situation of the average family-operated farm the five-State area covered.

No longer is this matter a subject of speculation and guesswork, for contained in the report I have reviewed is the factual material that tells the story of what is happening to typical farm families.

The farm family is in serious trouble, and heading into deeper trouble, unless action is taken to reverse the trend.

It should now be obvious to all that the farm family is not receiving parity with the rest of the country. It is, likewise, apparent that the farm family is losing still more ground from the goal of a fair standard of living, in return for its contributions not only of providing the Nation's food and fiber but also of being a major user of industrial products.

The farm family is being forced to use money for living expenses, that, in keeping with sound business practice, ought to be set aside for depreciation—to replace wornout machinery and other equipment, and to maintain the farm plant in good condition.

It should be apparent for all to see that farm families put in long hours to keep the farm going, and, in return, their take-home pay—what is left for their living—has been shockingly inadequate and is shrinking still more.

It is this lack of income, and lack of opportunity for income, that Congress must be concerned with now if we hope to restore balance to our economy.

Perhaps this review of where our farmers stand today will help set the stage for this Congress seeing that justice is done to the farmer when we vote on the new farm bill.

In any event, it sets the record straight about typical farm income, and typical farm living standards and needs.

It is just a start of what needs to be said, to complete setting the record straight.

Before going into details of the legislation before me, it is my intention, as I mentioned at the outset, to next review how agriculture got plunged into its present predicament.

For that purpose I shall continue this discussion this evening.

HOW AGRICULTURE GOT IN ITS PRESENT FIX

I wish to speak now on the subject of How Agriculture Got in Its Present Fix. Perhaps I should say "How the Present Fix Got on Agriculture."

If we concede that American agriculture is in economic trouble today, it is only fair to look at the cause of its troubles before proceeding with the remedies needed.

How did we get into this fix?

How did the Republican administration let agriculture drift aimlessly into depression while the rest of the economy was booming?

Oh, I know our Republican friends have conducted quite a propaganda campaign to divert attention from their own failures, by putting all the blame on so-called surpluses.

I challenge them to back up their propaganda with facts.

Contrary to the basic philosophy behind President Eisenhower's farm plan recommendations, surpluses are not the cause of present low farm prices.

Low farm prices have been caused by mismanagement of the price-support programs, in two principal respects. First, supports have been cut under the sliding scale policy, thus directly driving market prices down; second, the markets have been demoralized by threats that Government-owned commodities will be dumped, contrary to long-standing legal provisions for sale only at 105 percent of the support price plus carrying charge.

Those are two rather serious charges, and I intend to document them. I charge the Department of Agriculture with being grossly inefficient. One can charge the Republican administration with almost any crime except inefficiency. It flinches at the very thought of such a charge. I charge them with gross inefficiency, inefficiency of the worst kind, and mismanagement. I not only charge them with it; I intend to prove it. Not only is the Department inefficient, but the administration has so messed up the farmer-committee program that today it is practically a shambles. The letters which pour into my office dealing with the farmer-committee system are really very touching. They are very pathetic. Farmers who served for years were pushed out, for sheer political purposes. Today, as many a farmer says, they do not like to go into an office and ask a clerk, a young girl just out of high school, or a young boy just out of a short course in agriculture, how to do their farming, or what the farm program is about.

I say that low farm prices have been caused in part by mismanagement of the price-support program; and I have listed the two principal areas of mismanagement.

Partial responsibility must also be shared by the fact that existing and even previous farm programs are not fully adequate—but the administration has only acted and proposed to further weaken them, not strengthen them.

More than legislation alone is involved in the skids that have been put under American agriculture. Basic attitudes are involved.

The attitude of this administration with respect to agriculture is indefensible. Those who operate the program do not believe in it.

Too many people in Washington turned their backs on the fundamental importance of agriculture to our economy.

Too many people in Washington—and, yes, even too many people out on the farms—were deceived into rejecting sound, time-tested agricultural policies—policies and programs that helped bring American agriculture out of the depths of depression, strengthen its economy to where it withstood every challenge of World War II, the readjustment afterwards, and the Korean conflict.

That is the kind of farm program we have. It was strong enough to get us out of the depths of the depression and strengthen our economy to the point where it withstood the challenge and responsibilities of World War II, the following readjustment, and the Korean conflict. It required a pretty good program to do that.

Too little concern was shown when our highest public officials relegated agriculture to a minor role of importance in their considerations and counsels. Too many people let themselves be brainwashed by propaganda and slogans designed to conceal a deliberate intent to reverse agriculture's progress toward full and just equality in our economy.

If only half the energy and effort used by those in high places in our Government to distort historical facts—as part of a brazen, partisan, political attempt to divert responsibility for the fix we are in today—had been devoted to aggressive, constructive attempts to stem the tide of agricultural recession, American agriculture would be in a far better condition today regardless of any laws on the statute books.

Of course, we are more interested in the present, and the future, than the past.

I would rather talk about what can be done now, than argue over what was done in years gone by—and I intend doing so before I conclude. It would be far better if the Secretary of Agriculture would do the same.

But Secretary Benson has so distorted history in his stubborn partisanship that it is time to call him to account, before his unfounded dogma is preached further as fact by great segments of the misguided press in this country.

Let us set the record straight today, once and for all.

Where did our temporary surplus of food and fiber come from?

Were price-support loans at 90 percent of parity really responsible for the excess

abundance that has created much concern?

Were surplus the result of wartime policies "too long continued," as the President has charged in his message to this Congress, and his supporters are echoing across the land?

Those are the charges. Let us look at the answers.

Turn back, for a moment, to 1950. We, as a nation, became involved in a deadly serious attempt to halt Communist aggression in Korea, with grave fears that world war III might result.

Even though we have spent billions upon billions of dollars for defense, I charge today on the floor of the Senate that our Government has no policy whatever for food and fiber in case of war.

When representatives from the Office of Defense Mobilization came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry they had not even thought about a strategic reserve of food and fiber in case our country became involved in a war.

Our State Department does not even think about how to use food and fiber as a supplement to our foreign policy when it presents to us programs on foreign economic aid.

We talk about a lack of planning. Mr. President, better planning could be done in a madhouse. I charge that there is no planning in our Government on the use of food and fiber for our international responsibilities or for a program of national security.

The planning that is going on is to condemn surpluses, to cry to high heaven about surpluses and to cry about the mess some officials of the administration say they have inherited.

Mr. President, the outfit in the Department of Agriculture is sterile when it comes to imagination. It has no plan. It has no program. It is without any imagination whatever as to what should be done with the great stocks of food and fiber we have on hand.

What do Senators think Mr. Khrushchev or Mr. Bulganin would do if they had the supplies of food and fiber that we have on hand? They would make a Fuller brush man look like a man with rheumatism and arthritis as they went around the world. They would go around the world with that food and fiber and make one friend after another and one deal after another. What do we do? We stand around like a stunned ox, saying it is a problem.

I have said it many times, and I say it again, that if the biggest problem we have to face is the problem of what we are to do with our God-given abundance of food and fiber, then indeed we have been very well treated by Divine Providence. If the administration cannot determine what they can do constructively with the food and fiber of our country, they will never be able to figure out what to do about Russia.

(At this point Mr. HUMPHREY yielded to Mr. CLEMENTS for the purpose of proposing a unanimous-consent agreement. On request, and by unanimous consent, the proposal and the ensuing colloquy were ordered to be printed in today's RECORD following the conclusion of Mr. HUMPHREY's remarks for the day.)

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague for having yielded to me so that I might introduce a bill of importance to my State.

I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota on the leadership he is showing in the effort to work out a fair farm program. I happened to be occupying the chair of the Presiding Officer when the Senator from Minnesota referred to the promises made by a certain candidate for the Presidency in the 1952 campaign. As I recall, there was one set of promises made to which the Senator from Minnesota has not referred in his very able address.

Am I not correct in recalling that the distinguished Republican candidate for the Presidency said that a program would be evolved which would provide some form of Government help to producers of the various perishable commodities as well as to certain feed grains which were not included among the so-called basics?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is very definitely true. If the Senator from Oregon will refer to the speech of candidate Eisenhower at Kasson, Minn., he will find a very special and important section in the speech which was critical of the previous administration's farm program with respect to its failure to have an effective price support program for perishable commodities. The Republican candidate pledged that his administration would come forward with a program which would give to perishable commodities the same degree of protection and support as it would give to the so-called storable commodities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure to know that a colloquy is in progress between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon, but we on this side of the aisle are unable to hear it. If the Senators desire Senators on this side of the aisle to hear what they are saying, may I suggest that they speak a little louder?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I certainly wish to share my words with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is the acting minority leader.

The question was asked by the Senator from Oregon as to whether the Republican candidate for President in 1952, General Eisenhower, had announced or described a program for the support of perishable farm commodities.

I replied to the Senator from Oregon to the effect that in the speech at Kasson, Minn.—and possibly in other speeches; I am not certain of that—the Republican candidate for the Presidency said that one of the weaknesses of the previous administration's agricultural program was its failure to do anything effectively for perishable commodities. He pledged that his administration would develop a program for perishable commodities which would give them the same kind of treatment and help as had been given the storable commodities, such as grains. I have not his exact words before me, but I am sure that in substance I have given an accurate description of that portion of the speech. It made a very powerful impression at the time.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The reason I asked my question was that I happen to represent, in part, a State which has thousands of farm families, many of whom live on very small farms and raise perishable commodities, including vegetables and fruits. They have orchards, and they raise row crops.

In the 4 months that I was in Oregon recently, I visited many farm families. Mrs. Neuberger and I stayed overnight with some of them in their farm houses. They are receiving no Government support whatsoever.

May I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if there has been any attempt, to his knowledge—I know he is very familiar with the farm program—to carry out that campaign promise to do something for the people who raise or produce perishables.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In all honesty, I must say that the administration now has a program for the purchase of pork products, but it has been relatively ineffective, even according to the words of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The administration has a program for milk, which we in Congress have authorized. It has a special school-milk program, which was not recommended by this administration, but which came from Congress. There is a school-lunch program which has been in existence for the past 15 years or so. Those are the essential purchase programs which the Government has operated. Frankly, those purchase programs are not very effective unless they are timely. That is, if they are used at an early time after the market begins to slump, there is evidence that they will be helpful. But so far as a kind of overall program of assistance to perishable commodities is concerned, there is no such program. What is more, the administration has not shown any desire to develop such a program or to present one to Congress.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Undoubtedly the Senator has seen the reports in the press to the effect that the cost of living has been stabilized under the present administration. There has been much bragging and boasting about that. The administration has expressed much satisfaction over the so-called stabilization of the cost of living.

Is it not true that the stabilizing of overall price levels has been largely at the expense of the farm population, whether they have been raising livestock, grain, cotton, orchard fruits, or row crops?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about that. While the cost of living has leveled off, according to the price index, the main reason for its having leveled off is that there has been a drop in the farm price index, which has been taken off the increase in the other price indexes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Should it not be emphasized to the American people that, although the cost of living has begun to stabilize to some extent in the past 2 years, it has been at the expense of sacrifices on the part of the American farmers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. While such products as steel, lumber, aluminum, and rayon, which are produced in the Senator's State as well as my own, have gone up substantially in price, the cost of farm products has gone down, and the cost of food is about 30 or 40 percent of the budget of the average family. The administration can say that the cost of living is stabilized, inasmuch as the farmer is being sacrificed for the increased profits being reaped by industry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's analysis is directly to the point. The argument should be made again and again to correct the false impression which has gained such wide acceptance in this country.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Senator will permit me to ask one more question, I shall not interrupt him further.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is not interrupting me; he is contributing to the debate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator. Is it not particularly unfair and unjust to the farmer that the price of his products should be going down at a time when the cost of nearly everything else in our economy is going up? It would be bad enough to have the farmer's prices go down in a general decline, but at least then he would be perhaps benefiting to a limited extent from the fact that the things which he himself and his family would have to buy would be getting less costly. But is it not particularly unfair to the farmers to have the price of farm produce going down at a time when automobiles, farm equipment, clothing, medical care, transportation, and other items which they need are going up in direct contrast to what has happened to the farm economy?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The squeeze on the farmer under these conditions is getting to be unbearable. There can be no question about that. A farm price decline which goes to a point below the cost of operation, while higher costs continue could be disastrous. Such a condition is rapidly approaching in some areas of the Nation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, the farmer is isolated. He is in a sort of large island of adverse economic conditions, while all around him is the great sea of prosperity. He has to buck adverse conditions, while many others in the economy are prospering immediately. It seems to me this contrast is especially inequitable so far as the farm population is concerned.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his efforts, both on the floor and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to prepare a bill which will attempt to reverse the present very destructive drop in farm income.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator. He has been very helpful, and his observations are surely pertinent. They are explanatory of what some of this problem is about.

Mr. President, I am about to yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. Then I shall end my remarks for this evening, since I understand the Senate is about to recess or adjourn.

A friend of mine has just handed me a note saying the headlines in the papers now read "Ike Decides to Run." The body of the story under the headline, which I gather is not printed, but which should be printed, should read: "Found he cannot afford to retire on Gettysburg farm while Benson is still Secretary of Agriculture." [Laughter.]

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER OF HIS AVAILABILITY FOR SECOND TERM

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, in the hope of maintaining at least a semblance of political equipoise in the history of today's proceedings in this body, attention is invited to the following telegram which was sent by President Eisenhower on the 19th of January 1956 to the secretary of state of New Hampshire:

> It would be idle to pretend that my health can be wholly restored to the excellent state in which the doctors believed it to be in mid-September. * * * My future life must be carefully regulated to avoid excessive fatigue.

Today Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, issued a press release relative to this matter. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, said today "the American people will never elect a President who, at 65, has had a serious heart attack and who is unable to be a full-time Chief Executive."
>
> In response to requests for comment on Mr. Eisenhower's decision, Mr. Butler also said:
>
> "Republican leaders have high-pressured Mr. Eisenhower into this decision without regard for the possible consequences to him, his family, or the public. But the American people will never go along with it.
>
> "I personally had not thought Mr. Eisenhower would permit himself to be put in this position, not only because of the private and public hazards involved, but because his action establishes an unfortunate precedent.
>
> "The uncertainties of his future health are bound to affect the interest of our country and its citizens and, therefore, will be involved in the coming campaign even though the question of the President's health is not formally raised as a campaign issue by the Democrats. I fear that it will dominate the campaign and tend to obliterate discussion and consideration of the great issues of domestic and foreign policy.
>
> "Mr. Eisenhower's decision does not alter the campaign plans of the Democratic Party. Whether he or someone else is the Republican nominee, we will still be running against the record of failures and shortcoming of the Eisenhower administration.
>
> "Any realistic appraisal of the American political scene shows that the Democratic Party will win against any Republican candidate. The great Democratic trend of the last 3 years has swept everything before it, including 9 governorship victories for Democrats against no losses to Republicans.
>
> "The people of this country may like Mr. Eisenhower and appreciate his military contributions, but they have learned that as a President he has neither the will nor the energy to exert real leadership in the interest of all the people.
>
> "The times call for more than a part-time President. The Communist menace is not a part-time menace. The farm depression is not a part-time depression. The dangerous lag in our guided missile program is not a part-time lag.
>
> "Our country needs a full-time President with the energy and vigor to put a stop to the drift and confusion and bombast in our State Department and to assume the role of leader in the field of foreign policy.
>
> "Our country needs a full-time President with the time and inclination to familiarize himself with the plight of the farmer and to draft a program that will bring back prosperity to that vital segment of our economy.
>
> "Our country needs a full-time President who will personally see to it that our military strength is restored to the point where it will be a safe deterrent to aggression.
>
> "Our country needs a full-time President who is alert to corruption and who does not permit the Talbotts and Strobels to leave the Government with a warm letter and a pat on the back.
>
> "These are not times in which our country can afford four years of government by a shadowy regency acting in the President's name.
>
> "In the crucial 4 years which lie ahead, the people of this country will not settle for anything less than a vigorous, aggressive, full-time President."

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 5 OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, AS AMENDED

During the course of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech,

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for the courteous treatment which I always receive from him.

Mr. President, out of order, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD, following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. The statement explains the purposes of the bill, which is to protect civil service workers who have long periods of service in Government, and who then leave the Government for a period and come back. Under the law as it now exists, such employees would not be entitled to any survivorship benefits unless they had been back in Government service for a year or more.

A case in point is the recent death of our very able chief counsel of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. Frank Pellegrini, who had 16 years and 7 months service with the Government, was out of Government for a time, and then returned. He died 11 months and 6 days after his return

to Government service, and therefore his return was 24 days short of entitling him to survivorship benefits for his twin sons and his wife, which benefits they otherwise would have received.

The purpose of the bill is that others in Government service shall not have rights to survivorship benefits denied them when they return to service, such as happened in the case to which I have referred. Such employees should enjoy the same protection that other civil-service workers have.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3315) to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the next to the last paragraph in section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "separated" the following: "has been separated by death or."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of August 31, 1954, but no annuity shall be paid by reason of such amendment (a) for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act, or (b) unless the amount of any lump sum death benefit heretofore paid under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is redeposited in the civil service retirement and disability fund.

The statement presented by Mr. MONRONEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY

The interstate and foreign Commerce Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, was saddened and shocked by the sudden and unexpected death of its Chief Counsel, Mr. Frank Pellegrini, on January 14, 1956.

On January 16, I informed the Senate of his untimely passing and extended the heartfelt sympathy to every member of the committee to his surviving widow and twin sons. I paid tribute to his many years of faithful and efficient service to the Senate and to his country. It is not my present purpose to review the sentiments I attempted to express on that occasion. It is my duty, however, to inform the Senate of an unjust misfortune that will befall the surviving family of Mr. Pellegrini and perhaps others in similar circumstances under the present civil service retirement law.

Under the present law, if an employee with 5, 10 or 15 years of continuous service dies, his surviving widow and children receive an annuity. However, if the same employee should leave the Federal service for a period of time, he would have to be reemployed 1 full year after his return before his surviving widow and children receive an annuity.

At the time of his death Mr. Pellegrini had a total of 16 years and 7 months of Federal service. However, he was out of the Federal service for a time and his most recent period of employment commenced on February 9, 1955. Therefore, at the time of his death, his current period of employment was 11 months and 6 days, which falls some 24 days short of meeting the 1 year reemployment requirement. The result is that under present law, his widow and twin sons are not entitled to an annuity, but had he lived for another 24 days, they would be entitled to such an annuity.

I have no quarrel with the 1 year reemployment requirement generally. I think it is a necessary and proper restriction where employees themselves control their careers and decide whether they wish to leave or remain in the Federal service. However, I think it should not apply when an employee is prevented from fulfilling the requirement by reason of death or disability. These are matters over which the employee has no control.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is always a pleasure to accommodate the Senator from Oklahoma. He always does the same for me.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS BILL—ADDITION OF SENATOR HUMPHREY AS COSPONSOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] is about to leave. Before he does so, I should like to ask him whether the election financing bill which he introduced has been closed for the adding of additional cosponsors. It has not yet been closed; has it?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe the bill is still at the desk, if I am not mistaken. I cannot say definitely that it is, but I think there is still opportunity for cosponsors, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Presiding Officer if that is the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It still is possible to add additional cosponsors.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to have my name added as a cosponsor. The Senator from Oregon has been very helpful in explaining to me his proposed legislation, and I consider it a privilege to be associated with him in its sponsorship.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We are very honored to have the support and cosponsorship of the Senator from Minnesota.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my understanding that the Senate was about ready to recess or adjourn, but I have been told there is another matter which may be brought to the Senate, so I shall continue with my statement.

Just a few moments ago I was saying that I would much rather talk about what should be done in the future, which it is my intention to do, rather than discuss the past, but I cannot help but reiterate that the arguments which have been made by the Secretary of Agriculture and the spokesmen for agriculture in the administration have been so misleading and have tended so to misguide public opinion that it is important to set the record straight.

Where do the temporary surpluses of food and fiber come from? The argument is made that they are the result of wartime policies, as the President said, "too long continued," and, of course, due to 90-percent parity supports.

If we turn back to 1950, we will recall that as a Nation we became involved in a deadly serious attempt to halt Communist aggression in Korea, with grave fears that world war III might result.

We had learned a lesson from World War II, a lesson that could not be forgotten. Food and fiber are urgently needed to win a war, and a greatly expanded supply of food and fiber.

Our top policymakers of Government, charged with the Nation's security, determined the goals of agricultural production that had to be met for the Nation's safety.

I want to underscore that statement, because the decision as to production quotas was taken after much thought and consideration by the top policy makers—not merely by political leaders, but by men who had been brought in from industry and agriculture. Agricultural goals were set in order to strengthen our economy to give us the necessary food and fiber reserves or stocks which would be necessary in a period of war.

They were not goals determined for the sake of the farmer. They were goals determined for the protection of all our people. They were not the product of any Secretary of Agriculture's guess alone. They were the studied needs outlined by our defense officials, our munitions board, our State Department, and our Security Council.

During 1950, 1951, and 1952, we consumed, as feed, more feed grain than we produced.

We were running into a deficit, drawing on what limited small reserves we had.

Despite expanded production—this was only a few few years ago—4 years ago, 3 years ago—we were living off our reserves, and not from current production. Fortunately, we provided those reserves.

One would think we would remember that now, Mr. President, but it is like living out of one's savings instead of one's earnings. In time, one will run out of money and face trouble.

Looking ahead, the only safe answer was to increase production—or risk a shortage in time of national emergency.

The Department of Agriculture was asked, in the Nation's interest, to call upon America's farmers to increase production of feed grains, of cotton, and of other commodities for which potential demand was soaring.

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan was called before the Senate Agriculture Committee in the spring of 1952, to be questioned about whether these national security goals could be met.

No one then, Republican or Democrat, challenged the need for such increased production.

All one has to do is get those hearings.

Not a voice was raised against the goals. The only question was whether 90-percent price supports were high enough to get the production we needed.

Secretary Brannan promised the Senate an all-out campaign to achieve the production needed, regardless of price.

He had faith in America's farmers—faith they would respond to the Nation's needs. However, he expressed a hope

farmers could, in return, have faith in their Government not to let them down afterward if they produced more than was needed.

This is all a matter of official record. His faith in America's farmers was justified. His hope that farmers could have the same kind of faith in their Government apparently was not.

America's farmers responded to the Nation's need, when they were called upon to respond.

I digress to remind the Senate that the Production and Marketing Administration committees—they were called PMA committees—went over the countryside and encouraged farmers to expand their production to meet the national goals, just as the needs for the draft are met by selective service. So many bushels and pounds were to be produced.

Ninety percent of parity was not what got the farmers to produce. What got them to produce was the concentrated campaign by the Government, which called upon the press, radio, and television to ask the farmers to produce. In North Dakota the wheat farmers were appealed to. I am sure the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]—who is a true friend of the farmers, if there ever was one—recalls how the Government asked the wheat farmers of North Dakota to expand their production of wheat.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. First, I wish to express my appreciation of my colleague's statement about my efforts in behalf of the farmers.

Let me say that at that time, Congress provided greatly increased funds for the Department of Agriculture to use in informing the farmers of the plan for increased agricultural production. As a result of those appropriations, meetings were held throughout the Nation in an effort to urge every farmer in the country to increase production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota is absolutely correct.

At that time I was privileged to be a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. A few months later in 1953, I was not on the committee; and, as the Senator from North Dakota will recall, later in 1953 I returned to membership on the committee. I attended the hearings. I remember the great concern then as to whether the farmer would be scolded—scolded as he is being scolded now—for increasing his production. I recall that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was one of those who were much concerned on that point. At that time the farmer was being given a considerable working over; his patriotism was appealed to, and he was requested to expand greatly and to increase his production of agricultural commodities. I recall that the Senator from North Dakota was among those of us who wondered what would happen when the war came to an end. We wondered whether at that time the farmer would be blamed because he had done his job, because he had responded to the appeals to his patriotism. At that time the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, assured us that, of course, everyone would wish to keep faith with the farmer.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. As the Senator from Minnesota knows, at that time every member of the committee expressed concern about what would happen, and whether the Government would keep faith with the farmer if, for war purposes, he expanded his production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

So, Mr. President, as a result of those appeals to the patriotism of the farmer, he increased his production. That was done because of the appeals made to him; it was not done because of 90 percent of parity price-supports. In order to persuade the farmer to comply with that program, a great campaign was made. As the Senator from North Dakota has said, Congress made large appropriations for that purpose. An organized appeal was made to the patriotic devotion of farm people to their country.

Mass meetings were held all over the country, calling on farmers to produce more, with less manpower to help them, less machinery to work with. Our great farmer-elected committee system in every rural township of every rural county proved its worth, in carrying the appeal to the farmers.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the representatives of the press, who now are in the press gallery—and I say it with all the sincerity at my command—that in 1952, when our farmers were called upon to increase their production in 1952 and 1953, the decision to make that request of the farmers was a Government decision to which there was no dissent. As a result, the farmers increased their production. They did not do so because they were receiving 90 percent of parity. They received 90 percent of parity in 1948, 1949, and 1951. In 1951 and 1952 we did not have any great stocks of agricultural commodities. Instead, in 1952, we were running short; we were reaching a dangerously low level of reserves. I ask any representative of the press or any representative of the radio—those who carry this message to the American people—to check the facts, instead of accepting the gobbledygook which is run off the mimeograph machines in the Department of Agriculture. The simple truth is that the Government had to appeal to the farmers as patriotic citizens—as they are—to plant more crops, to increase the production of cotton, wheat, corn, fats, and oils. The farmers planted more. They got bumper crops. But ever since that day, some persons have been attempting to whip the farmers over the back because they did what their Government asked them to do.

Mr. President, the Government of the United States should be ashamed to treat its citizens in that way. What is more, those who continue to misrepresent that case should be ashamed of themselves.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Minnesota will recall that in July 1952, we were at war; and at that time our carryover of wheat was only 255 million bushels—an extremely small amount for a war period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and as the Senator from North Dakota will recall, at that time we were running short of fats and oils.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And we were using up our feed grains faster than we were getting them in the pipeline. In 1952, we had a ban on exports of cotton, Mr. President. We did not know but that world war III might almost be upon us. One section of the populace that was ready to do its work was the farmers. We had the ever-normal granary plan, so that sufficient stocks would be on hand. I cannot see why our Government regards it as fit and proper to store food and clothing for the Navy Department and to have on hand a 20-year or 30-year supply of hamburgers, hats, canteens, rifles, and other items of equipment for the Armed Forces—and, of course, it costs money to store those items—whereas if anyone suggests that we have a little reserve—half a year's reserve or a year's reserve—of essential food and fiber, it is said, "It is gross waste to have such staggeringly large, monstrous surpluses."

Mr. President, what kind of an American would we think a person was if he went around the country saying, "I hear that the Government has a year's supply of 155 millimeter shells. That is an awful waste." What do you think would happen then, Mr. President? Such a person would be called before a congressional committee, and would be asked, "What kind of a subversive are you?"

Mr. President, does anyone think it does not cost anything to store the necessary reserves of shells, bombs, planes, and tanks? Why does not someone write an article about the storage costs in the case of munitions? Why does not someone write an article regarding the cost of inventories—a cost which is passed on to the consumers? Today, most of the inventory in agricultural commodities is, of course, in the pipe line of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because of the support program, in order that the farmer will have orderly marketing. Does anyone who is in his right mind think a private industry does not charge as a part of the cost of the finished product, the cost of maintaining an inventory? A businessman would have to have holes in his head if he did not do that, Mr. President. I do not know a great deal about business, but we have a rather large inventory in the small business I am in. Does anyone think that the cost of that inventory is not figured into the cost of the items we sell to our customers? Of course it is.

Does anyone think that the United States Steel Corporation does not include the cost of maintaining its in-

ventory in the cost of the articles it sells? Of course it does.

The record of agriculture's response is a glorious one in our Nation's history. It is a disgrace, now, to tarnish that record by belatedly scolding farmers for producing what the Nation required of them.

Did we berate munitions makers for producing shells that were not needed? Or were we thankful they were not needed, and did we provide public funds to help the manufacturer convert to other items without any financial loss? Did we berate munition and plane manufacturers for producing shells and planes that were not needed, or were we thankful that they were not needed? Did we tell them it was their tough luck that Uncle Sam was going out of the munitions-buying business, or did we use public funds to settle their contracts and provide help for them to convert to other items without any financial loss?

We said to the big companies, "You are so patriotic. Of course, you have made a great deal of money, and you have tax write-offs. Now that the war is over, we are cutting down on defense orders, so we have made arrangements to help you shift your production or changeover."

However, Mr. President, what did we provide for the farmer? We gave him only criticism and complaint.

Mr. President, on tomorrow I shall resume this debate. If there is one thing that outrages my sense of fair play, it is that there has been no more unfairly criticized group in the history of our Nation than the farmers who, at the request of their Government, increased agricultural production. That is particularly true, if I may be pardoned for saying so, of the corn grower, the wheat farmer and the cotton farmer. The Government begged for those commodities. They were commodities which every official of the Government, Democrat or Republican, demanded that the farmer produce. The farmer was told, "Plow up your fields. Forget about conservation. Plant and harvest, plant and harvest. We will see that nothing happens."

Up in the Red River Valley in Minnesota our farmers went ahead and planted wheat. Down in southern Minnesota, our farmers went ahead and planted corn. They did their job. Ever since then they have been booted around as though they were foreign subversives. I am fed up with it. I do not think very much of an official in Government who has such a short memory and such a lack of understanding of this problem that he cannot take into consideration the facts which I have recited.

This is a free and open forum, for anyone who wishes a good fight or a good debate. I am prepared, as I have previously stated, to take on all comers on this issue. I want to hear some member of the administration, or some of its sympathizers attempt to prove to the contrary of what I have said tonight. I want Mr. Benson to have one of his supporters, with whom he can talk and make special side deals, come to the floor of the Senate and point out to me that the farmer was not literally enticed into expanding his production.

The Department of Agriculture ought to be thanking the American farmers for what they did to fulfill their production goals, with no strings, no rapid tax writeoffs, no tax concessions, no 27½ percent depletion allowances. They did not get any braid or stars. They did not get their pictures in the newspapers. They did not receive any awards. All they got was a bawling out. They have become the targets of those who seek to show how mismanaged the program was, when, in fact, it was managed so well that this country is the best fed country on the face of the earth. Food commodities are cheaper in this country than they are in any other country on the face of the earth. This is the only country in the world where one can go on a diet voluntarily. In most other countries one must diet of necessity.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY's speech,

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield so that I may propose a unanimous-consent agreement, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to yield, with the understanding that the request and colloquy which may ensue will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which I offer for myself and the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read the proposed agreement, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, March 8, 1956, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That when no further amendment is to be proposed, the amendments adopted shall be deemed to be engrossed and the bill read the third time; that a motion shall then be in order that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12, an act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, to which motion the same limitation of debate shall apply as in the case of any other motion or amendment; that in the event the motion to take up the House bill is agreed to, it shall then be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof inserting the provisions of Senate bill 3183, as amended; that the amendment shall be deemed to be engrossed and the House bill as amended read the third time.

Ordered further, That in the event the motion to proceed to the consideration of the House bill is not agreed to, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the question of the final passage of the Senate bill; otherwise it shall proceed to the consideration of the question of the final passage of the House bill, debate on either of which shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the Senate or the House bill, as the case may be, allot additional time to any Senator or Senators during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal with respect to the Senate bill.

Ordered further, That in the event of the passage of the House bill as amended, Senate bill 3183 shall be deemed to be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might begin voting on the pending bill this week. I realize, of course, that there are reasons why that cannot be done. I had been very hopeful that we could at least begin voting on the bill by Monday of next week, or by Tuesday, or certainly by Wednesday of next week. Objections were made to beginning the voting on the pending bill on those days.

I certainly hope that we can now reach an agreement to begin voting on the bill on Thursday of next week. The pending measure comprises very important legislation. Members on both sides of the aisle recognize that fact. After the pending bill is passed by the Senate, if it is passed, further action will still be necessary in conference with the House. Therefore, if we are to give assistance to the American farmer, and bring legislation into being, it is important that we begin voting soon.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the acting majority leader last week made it very clear that the acting majority leader was hopeful that on Monday we might agree to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote later in the week.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means last week, of course.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Last week. I was hopeful that we would get a unanimous-consent agreement last Monday to begin voting sometime later this week.

However, as is often the case when an important legislative measure is before the Senate, particularly when many Members of the Senate are vitally interested in expressing themselves on it, sometimes it takes a longer time to reach an agreement.

I believe this is a reasonable agreement. I believe it gives to all the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle an opportunity to express themselves and to be heard on this very important legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would be delighted indeed if no objection were raised to the proposed unanimous consent agreement. However, as has been stated by my friend from Kentucky, I had hoped that we would vote this week. That is entirely impossible now. I express the hope, however, that when we start to vote on next Thursday, the majority leader will ask the Senate to meet early on Thursday, perhaps at 10 o'clock, and request that the Senate stay in session a little later, so that we may dispose of the bill certainly not later than by Saturday of next week.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I will say to my friend from Louisiana that although I cannot look into a crystal ball and determine what the program will be on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, I can assure him that I am hopeful that we may complete action on the bill at the earliest possible date. Certainly, the bill offers something to the American farmer that he is not receiving under the present law and under the present administration of the present law. Bad as the legislation which is on the books at this time may be, it could do much more for the farmer if it had sympathetic administration. I can assure the Senator that there will be no delay on my part to bring the bill to an early vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been informed that 43 amendments have been submitted heretofore, and 2 more were submitted a few moments ago.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will say that there have been three more submitted.

Mr. ELLENDER. If all the time allotted to these amendments is utilized, we may be working on the bill until week after next. But if we can start voting on Thursday, beginning at 10 o'clock, and sit late in the evening, I think it would be well to do so. Let us have it understood that if we cannot complete action on the bill on Friday there will be a session on Saturday.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am not in position to commit the leadership to a schedule of that kind. I think my friend understands fully why I would not want to do so at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that amendments may be offered at any time up to the time voting starts.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is my understanding, but I should like to have a ruling from the Chair on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any amendment which is considered germane can be offered and discussed up to the time of the third reading of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Also, in accordance with custom, at least, no vote will be taken on any amendment until the time the Senate meets on Thursday next.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is my understanding that there will be ample speakers to consume the time between now and the time the unanimous-consent agreement will go into effect. It is certainly the understanding of the acting majority leader that there will be no amendment voted upon until after the morning hour on Thursday, provided the unanimous consent agreement is adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. That is my understanding, but I wished to have it spelled out in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield further?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the understanding I have, and I have stated it to quite a number of Senators. It is my hope that Senators who have amendments to propose may in the meantime offer and discuss them.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The agreement would not bar discussion of such amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Like the Senator from Louisiana, I had hoped we might conclude action on the bill this week, but if we cannot do it until next week it will be better than not to conclude action at all.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think the Senator from Vermont was on the floor last week when the colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana and the acting majority leader took place. I was hopeful that we would get an agreement as of Monday of this week, but I think the Senator understands the operations of the Senate, and he also recognizes the very great importance of this measure and the desire of many Members of this body to express themselves upon the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand, and I shall be reasonably satisfied if we can adopt the agreement which the acting majority leader has requested.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think it is a very reasonable request, and I think, if it is adopted, it will give all the Members of the Senate ample opportunity to express themselves on the bill. On Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, if it looks as if there would not be sufficient time, there is no reason why the Senate could not sit longer hours.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding, from listening to the acting majority leader, that there will be no voting prior to Thursday, March 8, and that it is the understanding of the acting majority leader that the time of the sessions and whether there will be a Saturday session is not being considered at this time. I understand that there will be a regular session on Thursday, which may start as early as 10 o'clock, and possibly the same on Friday, but there is no understanding that there will be a Saturday session. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT AND FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HUMPHREY TOMORROW

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its labors today it stand adjourned until noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the morning hour tomorrow, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who will not conclude his statement on the bill tonight, be entitled to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be the order.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, in order that the record may be clear, the Senator from Minnesota has agreed to yield time following the morning hour, after he is recognized, to the Senator from Maryland for a statement on the bill which he desires to make.

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech,

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a few minutes, to discuss another subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield, provided I do not lose the floor and that the remarks of the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, sometimes the day is brightened by a little water falling on the wheel that one has been turning almost by oneself for a decade.

The American system includes returning to the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights in the regulation of foreign trade and the national economy.

The American system includes defending the area it is necessary for us to defend for our ultimate security under the Monroe Doctrine principle and retaining the sole right to decide when and at what point our safety is threatened.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "The Flint the Senate Needs," written by Richard L. Jones and published in the Tulsa Tribune of October 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What we know about Russia is very little. Two American newspapermen were recently given visas which admitted them into the Soviet capital to see what they were allowed to see, which wasn't much.

The nearest report we have seen that reveals even a glimpse of the vast Soviet empire comes to us from GEORGE MALONE, the United States Senator from Nevada.

Nevada is a rugged State. It is the home of rugged men. MALONE is a mining engineer. By education and vocation he is trained to deal with flinty facts.

Among the Washington correspondents there is not one who has seen more and knows more about life abroad and at home than John O'Donnell, the Washington correspondent of the New York Daily News. O'Donnell is a reporter who is as factually

flinty as the mining engineer Senator from Nevada. They are friends.

Senator MALONE does not pretend to be a student of world diplomacy, but he puts his finger on what seems to be a significant fact. He reports, "The Russians are thinking and building in terms of centuries while we are thinking in terms of years. This is not a hundred-yard dash; we are in a marathon race."

Hundreds of Senators, Congressmen, newsmen, and other American tourist observers have visited Soviet Russia but, Mr. O'Donnell tells us, "The most dedicated anti-Communist who has visited Russia without any question is the tough Senator MALONE of Nevada."

"Furthermore," writes Mr. O'Donnell, "Senator MALONE stayed longer, saw more, traveled farther in Russia than any American we know of since the start of the big diplomatic freeze."

Continuing, Mr. O'Donnell says, "Reports started coming back from Moscow quoting MALONE'S opinion about the political security of the Communist regime and their economic toughness. This caused some high brow-raising in Washington among those who remembered that MALONE, his fellow Republican MCCARTHY, and the late Democratic Senator Pat McCarran were the toughest of the anti-Communist bloc."

The propaganda stories that pictured the flinty Senator from flinty Nevada as having been softened by the Communists caused most Washington writers, including MALONE'S good friend, to wonder if the Russians had a way with them that affected the clear thinking of those who had opposed their brutalities and dictatorial powers.

Lindbergh, it is recalled, was reprimanded, indeed repudiated because he told the truth about the military might of the Germans. MALONE is reported to have softened up because he assures that the Russians have no long-term peaceful intent. He, as Lindbergh once did, urges us to get our own house in order. In a personal letter to his friend, the distinguished Capital writer, John O'Donnell, MALONE wrote a month ago:

"DEAR JOHN: I am indebted to the September 19 Atlantic edition of Time magazine for the information that you had mentioned me in one of your columns. Time wrote its usual garbled story when they do not agree—

"My work here is as complete as I can make it. Have been here a month—August 29 to September 28—tomorrow. Have covered the nation from Kiev on the west to Novosibirsk in the east in Siberia and from the Georgian Republic in the south (Tiflis) to Leningrad in the north. Traveled about 14,000 miles in Russia, inspected steel plants, aluminum plants, mining machinery in the Urals; agricultural machinery at Rubtsovsk, tractor plants, 'gang' plow plants all the way to central Asia at Tashkent and Fiergandy Valley, where they are irrigating 900,000 hectares—about 2,250,000 acres—from their rivers. (All in the heartland of Asia.)

"Well, John, I have the feeling after covering the Balkan countries—Czechoslovakia, Austria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria and 14,000 miles in this country—that the area under Russian control can be made self-sufficient in everything they need for war or peace. And I also believe that there is no sign of revolt in the foreseeable future. They talk in centuries in Europe and Asia. We talk in years.

"I went to Bulgaria because I had reason to believe that they had uranium and other fissionable materials there, and my hunch was verified.

"John—if my feeling is correct that the Communist countries can become self-sufficient in the things they need for war and peace and that there is no sign of a revolt—then it behooves us to make our system work. And one way to do this is certainly not to raise our national debt limit every year to pay the $7 billion interest on our national debt. We better cut off the foreign 'star boarders,' lower our debt, cut our taxes, and begin to put the emphasis on the things that will be used in any third world war—such as guided missiles, atomic energy submarines, sonic speed long range bombers, etc. Foot soldiers, as you and I knew them, will be as obsolete in the next war as a Civil War musket.

"Let's quit making a lot of obsolete equipment and sending it to Europe and elsewhere. We are not fooling anybody. We can build up the modern equipment cheaper than the $32 billion per year we are now spending on our war economy.

"The time to have a business conference is just after you have paid a dividend—not when you owe the phone bill. The time to have a peace conference is when you can whip anybody.

"We all remember the Kellogg pact to outlaw World War II, the Dawes plan, and the 5–5–3 Navy disarmament program when Britain destroyed the blueprints. Japan built some battleships and we sank our battleships and then sold scrap iron and petroleum to Japan. The program of selling everything to a potential enemy except what some joker classifies as strategic material is cockeyed because shirt buttons are strategic material when you are getting ready to fight a war. So we must make up our minds whether to trade or not to trade. We are now trading through third nations and it does not make sense.

"We have to quit following those foreign nations whose policy is based upon ulterior motives—such as holding territory in colonial slavery four or five thousand miles from their mother country. That system is dead, John, and even we Americans, with all our power, can't hold it together.

"Sincerely,

"GEORGE."

MALONE spent 10 weeks touring Russia and her satellites. He comes back with facts and figures. And he asks his colleagues, "What are we elected for? To take the State Department's word for everything?"

The flinty Senator from Nevada assures us that we must make up our minds whether to conduct unrestrained trade across the Iron Curtain or stop all commerce with the Soviet zone and quit supporting allies who deal with the Reds. That is the kind of flint we need in our Senate now. Don't forget the scrap iron we sent to Japan which was forged into weapons that were hurled against our sons.

MALONE makes the Senators who punished MCCARTHY look like the saps they are. It is the Senate itself that has gone soft, not MALONE.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published in the Territorial Enterprise and Virginia City News, of Virginia City, Nev., of February 24, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MALONE MAKES SENSE

The proposal by Nevada's Senator GEORGE MALONE that the United States withdraw all and every military establishment from foreign soil and base its world military policy entirely in continental North America has, of course, been greeted with piercing bleats from the one worlders, the bleeding hearts, and the miscellany of emotional trash left over from the infamy of policy evolved to ruin the United States by Roosevelt, Hopkins, and all the other mushheads of a now discredited administration.

It is conceivable that the lawmakers in Washington will not see eye to jaundiced eye with Senator MALONE, but his proposal will serve notice on the administration that a resolute and ponderable portion of the American taxpayers want out, but completely, finally, and irrevocably, out of all the rathole delusions of saving the entire world by bankrupting America through ceaseless handouts and everlasting pulling out of the fire of other people's chestnuts. If we got so much as a thank you for bailing folks out it might be different, but France insists on coming apart at the seams at our expense, England, rolling in American dollars so that its economy has reached on all-time high and London is once more the luxury capital of the world, wants to do business with the Chinese Communist enemies of mankind and in Israel, a fanciful project floated on American currency, the happy populace is busy stoning the American consulate because we won't go to war for them against the Arabs.

Neither collectively nor singly does the United States need its alleged "allies" as much as they need America. We can get along, and elegantly, without all or any of them. They are a poor risk militarily and the rankest sort of dead beats financially. Except for such isolated eccentrics as the Finns who believe in paying their debts and the Greeks who said thank you in cordial terms for our helping to defend them from Communist aggression by the Russian orangutangs, none of them have so much as tipped their hats in the direction of the American taxpayer. Not only is the rest of the world busy looting the United States but it is kicking Uncle Sap in the pantaloons while doing it.

Senator MALONE voices the sentiments of a number of Americans who, if they were stood up and counted, would frighten the bejezus out of the professional wasters and spendthrifts in Washington. Our poor relations overseas would do well to consult Emily Post on acquiring at least a minimum of manners if they can expect the golden rain to fall incessantly or at least until such time as the United States is flat stonebroke, which may not be too far in the future.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published by the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of January 31, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROOF

It is traditional, and understandable, that the eastern seaboard of the United States has always had—as the saying goes here on the west coast—"one foot in Europe."

It has been equally traditional—although not understandable at all—that we on the west coast have, by and large, left the Far East to experts who also stem from the eastern seaboard or the Continent or Great Britain.

We who should have tried most of all to understand the Far East have done this. It is our shame and we must bear it.

And as far as Central and South America are concerned we have nearly forgotten them entirely over the years.

It has been a long time now since ex-President Herbert Hoover suggested that this hemisphere of ours, that North and South America together, could—in time of final stress—be a strong fortress unto itself.

He was scoffed at, no new role for this great man.

But now comes the proof.

There is, as you may know, a Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Until our Oregon neighbors let him down last November it was chairmanned by Senator GUY CORDON.

This committee has a Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels. And its chairman is Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada.

It has now issued its report—No. 1627—called Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials to the United States in Time of War and for Our Expanding Economy.

We have read this report and can assure you that it blasts into smithereens poppycock that somehow the nations of this Western Hemisphere have become "have not" nations in critical materials.

If the showdown comes—as of course at some future time the showdown must—this hemisphere, from Canada down through Central America to Cape Horn, has what it takes and what it needs.

Out of his experience, his engineering, and this great wisdom, Herbert Hoover knew this when he made his statement suggesting that, first of all, the Western Hemisphere get together—and very solidly.

Now, thanks to Senator MALONE and ex-Senator Cordon we have the proof.

And it is good to have this proof. For when the experimenters have run their course, and the dreamers have dreamed all their dreams, and the chips are down between a free world and a godless one, it will be good to know that we can make our stand.

If, God forbid, we must.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article by Jerry Greene, of the New York News—the Washington bureau, February 28.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOVE ON TO BRING HOME BULK OF GI'S

(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Several nationally known figures around town, some of them in the Pentagon, are nursing a proposal to quickly bring home most of the American soldiers now stationed abroad. They haven't yet figured how to spring it publicly. Anyhow, they are fearful of a fast throwdown from the White House for diplomatic—not military—purposes.

But the plan is receiving serious consideration, both in the Pentagon and in Congress. It would save billions in the budget and might well cause Russia to make an "agonizing reappraisal" of global strategy.

There is serious discussion going on in high places of a suggestion to withdraw the bulk of our occupation forces in Japan and Germany and to eliminate as soon as possible the use of American bases on foreign soil.

The men working on this project are by no means isolationists, far from it. They have a gimmick which they firmly believe is a near-ideal solution to the problem of running the cold war on a reasonable and economic basis.

THEY DON'T BUY TAYLOR'S STORY

They take vigorous exception to the recent testimony of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, that the free world could come up with enough manpower to match, and stop, the ground forces of the Kremlin. They point out that Russia has its 175 or more divisions ready for action—and it takes a year or 18 months or more to get a fresh division ready for combat.

Right now the United States has five-plus divisions in Europe, all good troops, but spread very thin and actually not much more of an obstacle to Russia's armor and infantry than a chicken-wire fence would afford a mosquito.

The feeling around the Capital is that our forces overseas, certainly our ground forces, are scarcely more than a token, an indication to our allies that if they get pushed around, the United States would certainly move at top speed to help them.

Well, the troops overseas are an expensive token. The Pentagon tells us that there are 400,000 Army troops, 400,000 sailors, and 260,000 Air Force personnel on foreign duty. In the case of the Navy the figure includes all those on sea duty.

WIVES AND CHILDREN RUN UP THE EXPENSE

These figures, however, tell only part of the story in expenses for maintenance and upkeep. The last available Pentagon count reveals that the Army alone has 175,000 wives and children overseas, and there were more than 116,000 civilians on the foreign Defense Department payroll.

To complicate matters further, the Army was running more than 140 elementary and high schools overseas, with an estimated 60,000 pupils all children of servicemen.

One source—not a general—told us that should war break out with Russia in Europe, some 20,000 service troops would be needed merely to attempt to evacuate families of GIs.

Now comes the proposed solution, in the words of a top military figure who doesn't want his name used because he understandably doesn't want his ears slapped off: "It's about time we took a realistic view of our commitments and did something about it. We might save 4 or 5 billions a year now and a lot more in the long run."

BALLISTIC WEAPONS OUTMODE OUR BASES

"Obviously, it won't be long before the Russians have ballistic missiles which could make our overseas air bases untenable. We have sunk and are sinking billions to build and maintain these bases. Because of the Pentagon's bookkeeping system and the rotation program only God knows what it is costing us to keep hundreds of thousands of men on our far-flung bases.

"What we have in mind, and what makes sense, is this. Bring the boys and their families and the kids and the school teachers and the supply and support forces back home. Now. This year and next.

"We do not violate any of our commitments, any of our treaties and we stick with our allies.

"We simply set up little outposts in each of the treaty countries. We leave a battalion in Germany, one in France, one in Italy, one in Belgium if they want it, and perhaps for a while a few troops in England to service the aircraft. Say a reinforced battalion of about 1,000 men."

SMALLER FORCES MIGHT FILL THE BILL

"These battalions would be combat units, ready for action. They would have no dependents with them, and they could be rotated with no trouble.

"They would set up their camps, or forts, or whatever you want to call them, raise the American flag at sunrise, lower it at sunset and remain ever on guard. The United States Government would simply announce to the world that the instant these American forces were fired upon, or overrun, or what not, the United States would throw its full might against the aggressor. That would mean hydrogen bombs, carried by B–52's or ballistic missiles or by donkey pack train if necessary.

"All we need is guts and the realization that one battalion ready to fight, with one American flag, is as good as a too-thin division which would be sacrificed anyhow, along with women and children."

Several Members of Congress, expressing interest in the idea, were a little concerned about the effect of the plan on allies we are urging to increase their own security precautions.

NO COMMITMENTS FOR LARGE FORCES

The project proponents note that we have no NATO treaty commitments for specific numbers of troops on the scene, and insist that the presence of any of them—backed by the full might of this country and a really strong, mobile striking force based in the United States—would be an ample deterrent.

This thinking has been developing for several years and there have been repeated public warnings that the United States ought not try to hold or defend territory unless the Nation intends to go all the way.

In testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee back in June 1954, Gen. Carl Spaatz, former Air Chief of Staff, said: "It is possible that the area you think you can defend may not be available to you as the war progresses. You may be forced to your own confines."

"Would that be the Western Hemisphere?" asked Senator GEORGE MALONE, Republican, Nevada.

"That might well be the Western Hemisphere," the general replied.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter and resolution sent to me by the Homer Laughlin China Co., of Newell, W. Va., dated December 30, 1955.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
Newell, W. Va., December 30, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: In compliance with your request of December 28, I am delighted to enclose herewith a copy of the resolution which was passed by our United States Potters Association.

I have been assured by the president of the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, which is the pottery workers' union, that at the next meeting of their executive board, they will approve the same resolution.

Very truly yours,
THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
J. M. WELLS.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained, that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingmen or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have the power to pay and collect duties, imposts and excises (tariffs or import fees) and to regulate foreign commerce; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy through the adjustment of duties, imposts and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which transferred such responsibility to the President.

THE UNITED STATES POTTERS ASSOCIATION,
W. A. BETZ, *Executive Secretary.*

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter and

resolution sent to me by the Reno Musicians Protective Union, dated December 8, 1955.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENO MUSICIANS PROTECTIVE UNION,
Reno, Nev., December 8, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. (MOLLY) MALONE,
Senator from Nevada,
Reno, Nev.

DEAR MOLLY: Thank you for your very fine letter of November 28, relative to the repeal of the 20 percent amusement tax. I appreciate it very much.

Am enclosing a copy of the resolution I had introduced at the Reno Central Trades and Labor Council on foreign trade, and it was accepted and approved.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

PAULA DAY,
Secretary, Local No. 368.

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained, that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "the Congress shall have power to lay and collect * * * duties, imposts and excises" (tariffs or import fees) and to regulate foreign commerce; and

Whereas, the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy through the adjustment of duties, imposts and excises, through its agent the Tariff Commission and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which transferred such responsibility to the President.

PAULA DAY,
TOMMY BLEEKE,
LOU LEVITT,
C. L. BYRD,
LOUIS CHASE,
Musicians Local No. 368.
FRANK WICKINSON,
Machinist Local No. 801.
HARRY HUCHEER,
Culinary Union, No. 45.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of organizations which have adopted resolutions similar to the ones adopted by the Homer Laughlin China Co. and the Reno Musicians' Protective Union.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American Mining Congress, Daughters of American Revolution, Nevada State Legislature, Nevada-Idaho Legislatures (joined), Idaho State Legislature, Nevada Republican Party (State convention), Silver State Republican Women's Club of Washoe County, Nevada Young Republicans, California State Legislature, Utah State Legislature, Advisory Mining Board of the State of Nevada, Nevada Mining Association, American Legion of Nevada, Utah Mining Congress, Pioche, Nevada Chamber of Commerce, National Society of Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Co.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, article 1, section 8, of the Constitution places the responsibility in Congress to regulate foreign trade and the national economy through the adjustment of duties and tariffs, not in the President and certainly not in the custody of an international organization known as the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, 3,000 miles away in Geneva, which authority was included in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

The security of the Western Hemisphere must be defended from North America. It must be done by long-range sonic-speed bombers, fighter planes, interceptors, guided-missile bases around North America, atomic-energy submarines, and a complete radar warning system. If this is done, as much as $10 billion can be saved annually to apply on the national debt and to lower taxes.

Let us quit signing pacts to feed and protect almost all of the nations of the world—which cannot be carried through.

The editorials and material which I have today submitted for the RECORD show that the investors and workingmen, to say nothing of the taxpayers, of the Nation, have begun to wake up after 24 years of international socialism, as opposed to the American system.

M. VAUCHER AND COL. WILLARD F. ROCKWELL—WATCHES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a communication from Mr. Maurice Vaucher, president, Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translation]

FEDERATION SUISSE DES ASSOCIATIONS DE FABRICANTS D'HORLOGERIE,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1956.

The Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: My attention has just been called to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, page 514 of the Appendix, wherein the association of which I am president, the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers, was subjected to charges which are unfair, unfounded, and utterly contrary to fact.

The material whose appearance I am protesting appeared in your insertion of a speech by Col. Willard F. Rockwell, of Pittsburgh, Pa. I fully appreciate that since it was done as an act of courtesy to Colonel Rockwell you would not be expected to substantiate or verify all the claims made in the speech. However, because of my acquaintance with your distinguished record in the Senate of the United States, I felt free to write you on the matter because I believe that you would not, even indirectly, want to be responsible for such harsh and unfair charges.

In the portion of the RECORD about which I am writing, the following appears:

"When our State Department complained recently to the Swiss Federation of Watchmakers that a million watch movements are being smuggled into the United States annually, we were told that smuggling cannot, or will not, be stopped until our tariffs are radically reduced."

In full and direct rebuttal to this I shall ask you to please accept the following as facts which can be readily verified:

First. At no time has the United States Department of State complained to the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers concerning the extent of watch smuggling into the United States.

Second. As long ago as January 1936, in the "Trade Agreement Between United States and Switzerland," specific measures against watch smuggling were incorporated. These measures were subsequently translated into legislation by the Swiss Government, have become the national law of Switzerland, and are therefore rigidly enforced both by the Federal Government and all organizations of the Swiss watch industry.

Third. The Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers has never said, or implied, that our rigid enforcement of the anti-smuggling measures is conditional upon the willingness of the United States to reduce tariffs.

I ask you to accept as a plain statement of principle the fact that the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers has always been opposed to smuggling activity. From a strictly commercial viewpoint, you may appreciate that smuggling of watches can only be extremely damaging to our trade relations since it could only adversely affect the affairs of the many highly respected, long-established companies in the United States which assemble and distribute Swiss watch products.

Our own investigations have shown that where actual smuggling exists, a large proportion of it originates in countries outside of the borders of Switzerland, and is therefore completely beyond our control. We know, also, that watch smuggling is conducted by individuals who are constantly effecting new methods to elude even the most careful and stringent policing. The prime deterrent to smuggling, of course, is vigilant action by the United States Customs and Treasury officials, and the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers has always given, prompt and sincere cooperation whenever it is requested by United States officials working on this problem.

From a realistic viewpoint, however, one must recognize, as do the United States Customs officials, the fact that smuggling has significantly increased within the past year and a half. This, we believe, occurred primarily as a result of the sharp increase in watch tariffs which stimulated smuggling activity because it increased the opportunities for illicit gain for people who are by nature inclined to take advantage of such opportunities.

Please believe that I have attempted to treat this problem with the utmost candor in this letter to you. I close this note by reaffirming our expression of continuing esteem for you, and with the sincere hope that you will see fit to take appropriate measures to correct the record in our behalf.

Yours respectfully,

MAURICE VAUCHER,
President.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the communication was the result of an insertion in the Appendix of the daily RECORD by me on January 19, of an address by Col. Willard F. Rockwell, of Pittsburgh, Pa., a manufacturer of steel and steel products. The exception by President Vaucher to a statement by Colonel Rockwell that "when our State Department complained recently to the Swiss Federation of Watchmakers that a million watch movements are being smuggled into the United States annually, we were told that smuggling cannot,

or will not, be stopped until our tariffs are radically reduced," is denied by Mr. Vaucher. Mr. Vaucher goes on to say, "from a realistic viewpoint, however, one must recognize, as do the United States Customs officials, the fact that smuggling has significantly increased within the past year and a half. This, we believe, occurred primarily as a result of the sharp increase in watch tariffs which stimulated smuggling activity because it increased the opportunities for illicit gain for people who are by nature inclined to take advantage of such opportunities," but denies that the "United States Department of State complained of the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers concerning the extent of watch smuggling into the United States," and also says, "the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers has never said, or implied, that our rigid enforcement of the antismuggling measures is conditional upon the willingness of the United States to reduce tariffs." Mr. Vaucher goes on to say that "a large proportion of it originates in countries outside of the borders of Switzerland, and is therefore completely beyond our control."

Mr. President. It is recognized that the watches do reach the United States via the smuggling route, and it makes little difference to the workingmen and investors of the United States who brings them.

The raise in the tariff on Swiss watches was not accomplished on any principle whatever. It was an arbitrary decision.

I quote recommendation No. 2, from page 3 of Senate Report No. 1627, filed with the Senate on July 9, 1954:

> 2. We recommend that Congress insure that the regulation of foreign trade conforms to the principles thus laid down in article I, section 8, of the Constitution thus assuring the American workers and investors equal access to American markets.

The committee was convinced that we should revert to the Constitution of the United States, article 1, section 8, in the regulation of foreign trade and the national economy which states that Congress and not the President of the United States, or the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva, shall set the duties or tariffs and shall regulate foreign trade and the national economy.

Mr. President, the Congress, for almost a century of time, has regulated the foreign trade and the national economy and created the United States Tariff Commission in 1916 to do the job on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, the flexible duty or tariff representing the difference between the effective wage standard of living here and abroad.

Mr. President, the answer to the 24-year period of juggling by the executive department of the duties or tariffs in the regulation of foreign trade and the national economy has destroyed the "investment climate" in the United States except in the public utilities, which enjoy a regulated monopoly in industry where taxpayers' money is advanced in the form of actual gifts or loans or short amortization periods, or a guaranteed unit price, or in industries virtually controlled by organizations or groups large enough and of such a nature that they can put their production plants behind the low-wage curtain and furnish the low-wage standard-of-living countries of the world, and import the product into the United States under free trade or a very low duty to sell in conjunction with their domestic product.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 1, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 29, 1956:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Thruston B. Morton, resigned.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commisisoned ensign

Albert Larsen, Jr., effective March 1, 1956.
Charles I. Harding.
Leroy W. Heilmann.
Oliver J. Weber.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose blessings are countless, may we daily enter with Thee into an intimate fellowship and have a vivid experience of Thy love and peace.

May we remember Thy mercies and be thankful; may we be mindful of our failures and weaknesses and be humble; may we be conscious of Thy grace and goodness and be hopeful.

Inspire us to meet our tasks and responsibilities, our trials and tribulations, calmly and confidently, assured of Thy presence to direct and strengthen us in the ways of righteousness.

Grant that in all our human relationships we may manifest a spirit that is gracious and gentle, kind and considerate, eager to minister to the needs of others and to help them bear their burdens.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the folowing resolution, Senate Resolution 221:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be a member of said committee, to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce at this time that unanimous-consent requests will not be entertained until after the joint meeting is concluded, at which time the Chair will receive unanimous-consent requests.

The House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess the following proceedings occurred:

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY GIOVANNI GRONCHI, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

The SPEAKER pro tempore presided.

At 12:25 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Members of the United States Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker pro tempore and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of Italy into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RICHARDS, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. CLEMENTS, the Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND, the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE, and the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and took the seats reserved for them:

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency Giovanni Gronchi, President of the Republic of Italy.

His Excellency the President of Italy, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor and pleasure to present to you His Excellency Giovanni Gronchi, President of the Republic of Italy. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY GIOVANNI GRONCHI, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

His Excellency, the PRESIDENT of the Republic of Italy. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, honorable Members of Congress, I am very grateful for your cordial welcome and I thank you for the opportunity you have given to me of extending here to the American people, to Congress, and to the United States Government the message of greetings and good wishes from the Italian people which I have already conveyed to President Eisenhower.

This message is an expression of the deep friendship which exists between our two peoples, and which has its roots, over and beyond all treaties and diplomatic agreements, in the bonds of a common civilization and of common democratic ideals, and in the kinship of a not inconsiderable segment of your great Nation for the large number of Italians who made their new home here.

My greeting is also a sincere expression of the gratitude of the Italian people for the striking proofs of solidarity which you gave us, at considerable sacrifice for all sections of your people, when, after the war, Italy had to rebuild from the ashes of a painful past her political, economic, and social life. This bond of gratitude cannot be forgotten, and my visit is meant as a reaffirmation of it. [Applause.]

But a friendship between two nations, as that between two persons, cannot be nurtured with sentiments and remembrances only. To keep it alive and vital, such friendship must draw nourishment from an intimate mutual knowledge and a steady cooperation of purpose and action.

Consequently, I shall attempt to focus your attention, albeit briefly, on the present position of Italy, her major problems, and on the evaluation that we in Italy make of current international developments. If I shall succeed in this task, the purpose of my visit will be, in my opinion, fully accomplished.

It should be recognized that, despite hopes and patient and generous endeavors, the world is not more secure today than it was 1 or 2 years ago. In fact, we are going through a disquieting phase of confusion in ideas and political orientations, and consequently of greater potential danger. It is sufficient in this context to look at North Africa and the Middle East, and to listen perceptively to the rumblings which come from the remainder of Asia.

It is true that, it would appear, we have moved from a war, a cold war but still a war, to a more peaceful competition, which impinges strongly upon the specific interests of each people, such as the development of national independence and the adjustment of the social structure. By becoming tinged with these features, such competition encompasses wider horizons and acquires every day a deeper meaning. Two basic conceptions face each other throughout the greatest part of the world. Will it be the principle of government for the people, or of the people subject to the government? Will it be the western brand of democracy—democracy through freedom—or the so-called people's democracy, that is Marxist-Leninist? The latter ideology, while organically repugnant to our own, also as a moral and social conception, has in itself a great power of expansion, since it has the appearance of a political and social system capable of bringing freedom from poverty and from their sense of inferiority to the underprivileged classes.

But this power of expansion must be viewed with alarm by people, such as us, of different traditions and background, and make coexistence difficult since that ideology is embodied in a watertight political and economic system, and consequently sustained by all the powers of a government, which include not only the weapons of propaganda and of the media of mass communication, but also more powerful and frightful weapons, conventional and nuclear.

History knows only one example of peaceful ideological expansion, the expansion of Christianity against the pagan world. It was a peaceful one since it taught to men not to kill but to die for their faith. [Applause.]

Against this ferment which is spreading among the people of all continents, we can safeguard our ancient civilization only through an effort that will unfold and display its fuller meaning. We have to make our democratic system more and more capable of accomplishing an effective reconciliation between the authority of the state and individual freedom. We have to reinforce the solidarity of the people who share those ideals and are striving to fulfill their ends. This solidarity exists, since the day of the signature of the Atlantic Pact among many Western nations, including the United States and Canada.

The Atlantic Pact, as conceived and operated thus far, was appropriate and sufficient so long as there was the fear of imminent armed aggression, intensified by an imbalance of strength between the two sides. It is a historical truth that the pact removed that danger and created the possibility of experimenting with attempts at solutions very different from those of the past. However, it should be brought into line with today's realities, when the military imbalance has been reduced and there have been so many changes of situation in many parts of the world.

Military cooperation continues to be very important today, but it should be supplemented with new and imaginative forms of cooperation. This is necessary not only to move away from a climate of emergency measures and to enter into a phase characterized by more complex and permanent arrangements, but chiefly because we all realize that no person, nation, or group of nations can consider without anxiety and anguish the prospects of a world where peace is based solely on military strength or on limited political alinements. Today especially when nuclear weapons have reached such fearful developments, which will be intensified in the future, it is essential that while an efficient military strength is maintained, every effort be made to reduce the danger of war, so that gradually the employment of force may be no longer required.

It has been said authoritatively, and truthfully, that even an adequate collective defense system does not constitute a final solution, but can only serve as a stage to go beyond the dangers of a balance-of-power approach, and to give a better foundation to peace. [Applause.]

In this brief survey which is made possible by my address to you, I do not wish to outline or discuss specific proposals. It would not be my task, anyhow.

One might consider a better coordination of the existing organizations, Organization for European Economic Cooperation, European Steel and Coal Community, Western Europe Union, the Council of Europe, because the new methods of a more organic cooperation should range from the political to the social and economic areas.

One might consider with more attention a better integrated functioning of NATO, involving a wider and more frequent use of the Atlantic Council.

In this way we would accomplish the purpose of making more fruitful and timely the exchanges of views between the various members, giving to them a fuller sense of responsibility and at the same time a recognition of the value of their contribution to the common cause.

Within the framework of the NATO pact one might consider, dispassionately, the possibility of bringing at last life into the spirit of article 2, which right from the beginning was meant to give to the military pact the wider and deeper connotation of a community of peoples.

I cannot fail to my duty of emphasizing that the reorganization of the Western World is the central problem of the day, which should be faced without delay. [Applause.]

It is clear that the solution of these problems is not only an American responsibility.

The European nations of Strasbourg must contribute their share, by setting into motion the process of integration.

Our old and restless Europe must find the way to her spiritual and political unity and must pool together her resources if she wants to take up again her mission of civilization, which is true to her traditions and her history.

The United Nations, with their great organization, ought to give a more effective, continuous, impartial, and harmonious content to their task, which is charged with so great political and human significance.

I am convinced that in the new competition of ideologies and economic assistance we cannot hope for the success of our democratic conception unless this gives concrete and factual evidence of its superiority by bringing to bear the willpower and the means which, through

appropriate action, can remove injustice and positions of inferiority within each national structure and internationally. [Applause.]

Italy wants to participate—within the limitations set by her resources and to the full extent of her commitments—to this work of redemption.

Italy has already contributed with full loyalty to the common cause. Italy asks that her contribution should not be appraised only with reference to her participation in the Atlantic Pact and to the financial effort accomplished, with the friendly help of the American administration and Congress, in order to discharge faithfully the commitments deriving from NATO.

I know that our financial effort has appeared to some observers as insufficient or lukewarm, or imperfectly planned at the technical level.

Permit me, however, to point out that in this subject one relies too frequently on hasty reactions. Actually there is little justification for some of the comments which are made occasionally and which would seem to throw an adverse light upon our determination to maintain our armed forces at the highest level of strength and efficiency consistent with our resources. For instance, there is little meaning in a mere comparison of the percentages of gross national income allocated to defense in the various countries: 11 percent in the United States, 10 percent in the United Kingdom, 8 percent in France, against 5 percent in Italy.

Such comparison does not take into account the differences in total and per capita national income in each country, and actually distorts the facts, as it can be seen when one considers that the income of an American family, in real, actual terms, represents the income of 5 or perhaps 6 Italian families. Because of their low level of income, our people have to cut deeply into their resources, foregoing essential needs, in order to bear the financial burden of defense. [Applause.]

But the most significant and substantive Italian contribution to the common cause is that of having strengthened its internal structure, having restored democratic institutions and, with them, the authority of the state, having overcome the disruptive economic and social effects that are typical of all postwar periods, having increased all-round production, and having improved the living conditions of the working classes, especially in southern Italy. Owing to the depressed conditions of many areas of the Italian economy, this effort has been, as it had to be, much more considerable than the one accomplished in order to strengthen our defensive military posture within NATO. Your administration and you, gentlemen of the Congress, have given us invaluable help in this reconstruction, with wisdom, imagination, and great generosity, despite the great sacrifices entailed for the American taxpayer. No one in Italy will ever forget this solidarity, which we appreciated also for its idealistic significance.

I know that from certain quarters there has been some criticism because of alleged waste or faulty utilization of the aid received. There may have been mistakes. But is there any responsible person in this country, so imbued with practical sense and experience, who can say that there is anywhere in the world a government or agency whose management is free from error?

In the overall picture of a national economy the important thing is not whether an individual item of accounting closes in the black or in the red, but whether the whole operation closes with a surplus or a deficit.

The 10-year period which has just ended for the Italian economy closed with a large plus balance. Consequently this Congress can tell the American people with satisfaction that the aid given to Italy was not an unproductive expenditure. [Applause.]

It is not my intention to bother you with figures; yet a few of them may be quoted to substantiate my statements.

(a) Industrial production increased five times since 1945, while agricultural production doubled.

(b) Pro-capital income and consumption increased by more than 50 percent with respect to 1947.

(c) The productive capacity of Italian industry doubled since 1947. Defense production is now every close to the levels required by NATO.

Therefore my country has made great strides, and if one looks back this is not to indulge in pride and self-satisfaction for what has been accomplished but to survey the long road which is still ahead of us, and what remains to be accomplished.

All of us in Italy, government, the major parties and all responsible persons know, as you know, that we have still a large pool of chronic unemployment, as it transpires from the statistics. We know that much has been done for southern Italy but that there is still an unfair and excessive gap in individual income between north and south. We know that we must complete the land reform undertaken with notable success, and which has also a function of moral, social, and consequently political rehabilitation.

We are aware of the fact that our housing problem, while of varying dimensions in different regions and cities, is still serious, also because of its human and political implications.

I am not telling you this to ask your help or to suggest that you continue a policy of aid which we consider rightly closed by you.

Italy can be compared to a working concern, well under way, which, however, has inadequate capital resources, falling short of what would be required to expand its physical plant and to improve its organization and its equipment.

Consequently, Italy does not hope and does not ask sacrifices from others and free advantages for her. On the contrary, she is anxious to be considered in the same light of a customer of good moral and financial standing who gets in touch with a bank, applying for loans at favorable terms, or approaching a financial institution in order to enlist its interest in profitable and secure joint ventures or other participations. [Applause.]. In many countries and probably also in yours, there are people who have a conventional picture of the Italian economy, based on stereotypes such as the hopeless lack of natural resources, the inability of the Government to collect taxes from its citizens and to manage its financial affairs competently, the alleged deficiencies of its vocational education. This picture is either inaccurate or obsolete. This may be due to the fact that many people, well meaning and well disposed, but with only a few days on their hands, are attempting to do in 2 or 3 days what, even for the study of a single firm or plant, would require weeks of work by an expert American auditor interested in scratching below the surface of things.

Our natural resources are growing. The discovery of large amounts of natural gas has permitted extensive practical applications to industry and science. Pretty soon oil will become one of our most important productive resources.

Taxes absorb a very high percentage of our national income, especially if one considers that the average income is very low.

Vocational schools, which are being expanded and better organized, are increasing and improving the productivity of our labor. You can draw yourselves a picture of this change by comparing the skills of earlier Italian immigrants with those of the more recent ones, who are better qualified and prepared.

In conclusion we have in Italy the essential prerequisites for a steady and balanced development of our economy. The program outlined by the late lamented Minister Ezio Vanoni aimed at that purpose, and it remains valid also today, with some corrections suggested by experience. Italy's great need is that, through mutual agreements at the international level, closer economic cooperation be removed from the stratosphere of science and high principles, and brought down to earth.

Economic cooperation, in an age like ours, is not a burden or a mere act of generosity from one country to another. It is a policy consonant with the interest of each and all concerned.

A poor country or a country beset with with difficulties and uncertainties is a danger to all others, on both counts, that is domestic weakness and inability to protect itself against external dangers. I can say that no people, even the richest in resources and creative power, can be durably prosperous if there are many nations which are unhappy and restless because of the hardships of poverty and starvation, of the burden of injustice, and because of the uncertainty of their immediate future.

The wonderful development of the United States, at which the world looks with admiration and astonishment, has become even greater since this country discarded its isolationist state of mind. From that point on, you have placed yourselves in the very heart of world events, and have become the determining factor of world history.

It is therefore in the name of a mutual interest that I appeal here to you for

closer and uninterrupted cooperation, carried on in a spirit of mutual trust and faith.

Spirit of faith is the basic element which I would like to mention in closing these words of mine. Without faith, there could be no meetings of the mind and no true cooperation.

Italy can be trusted, because of the capacity and willingness to work of their managers, technicians, and labor, and also because of her faithfulness to democratic ideals and firm determination to defend and expand their accomplishments.

Our destiny as individuals, in our family, social or political life, is safe and free only in a democracy which draws its principles from the Christian tradition.

After the historical experiences of Eastern Europe, what would be our anxiety if this type of democracy should disappear or even should yield to some degree. We all are firmly convinced of this fact, and I am the first to believe it.

In spite of uncertainties which are natural, given also certain dispositions of a Latin people, democratic stability in Italy is not in danger, and the democratic political parties together with the great majority of public opinion are fully conscious of their responsibility for maintaining and strengthening the institutions which the Italian people freely accepted through their constitution.

My people know that freedom becomes a sham and a privilege for those who are already strong, unless it means to every man and woman freedom from the hardships of poverty and starvation.

My people want to succeed, through an action based on progress and justice, in bringing about a friendly disposition toward the authority of the state on the part of certain large segments of our people who are still diffident or hostile to it. In this way the authority of the state will be strengthened through the self-discipline of the people.

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, gentlemen of the Congress, this is the Italy which today is before you, as a member in good standing of the great family of the western democracies. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m., His Excellency the President of Italy, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The purpose of the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress having been accomplished, the joint meeting is hereby dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the joint meeting was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT GRONCHI OF ITALY

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, the visit of the President of Italy, Giovanni Gronchi, to the United States is a gesture which solidifies the solid bond of friendship between the peoples of these two great republics.

Through our common heritage and ties of ancestry with Italy, that country has shown in the face of political dissention and world embroilment her fervent desires to stand as a nation dedicated to the cause of democracy and freedom of peoples. There should be no doubt in the minds of the Members of this august body, nor in those of the people of the United States, that Italy remains a stanch ally of the western coalition in spite of her men being involuntarily drawn into the infamous and unholy Axis alliance during World War II by the fanatic dictator Mussolini, and in spite of the fact that Italy today as the United States, has become a target for sinister Communist infiltration and agitation in vital sections of her government and economy.

It is fortunate indeed for Italy and her population that she has as her President such a capable and wise man in Giovanni Gronchi. Since his 8 months in office he has made notable progress in making the office of President more than the traditional ceremonial one and has, through action and keen oratory, taken active part and leadership in influencing the operation of the Government. President Gronchi has taken good advantage of the full powers of his position and can speak authoritatively on subjects ranging from civil rights to foreign policy. In short, he has made his office count for more in Italian national life.

President Gronchi's experience in government and state matters make him eminently qualified for the high and respected position he now holds. He has distinguished himself as a member of the Parliament, a partisan leader during German occupation, Minister of Industry under De Gasperi, and more lately as Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies.

I am pleased at the warm reception given by the people of America and Members of our Congress to Mr. Gronchi, the first Italian President to visit the United States. He has helped us to nurture the strong bonds of friendship between our two countries and is providing Italy with the forthright leadership she needs in these times which constantly are periled by the threat of totalitarian dictators.

DECISION OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the decision of President Eisenhower. I am sure I voice the sentiments of everyone on the Republican side of the House.

It had been my belief from the very first that if he fully regained his health, he would agree to accept a second term, if the people so desired. My belief was prompted by a full realization of the critical days ahead for the world. I knew it would be apparent to the President that he was the one man to whom the world could look with full confidence and that he was the strongest force for world peace. Therefore, with the fine certificate of health given him by his physicians, he could not refuse. No patriotic American, who loved his country, could do so. America and the world will breathe easier with his announcement.

THE LATE HOWARD ALDRIDGE COFFIN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, due to the unavoidable absence of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], the dean of the Michigan delegation, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of a former Member of this body, the Honorable Howard Aldridge Coffin, from Michigan, who died last night. Mr. Coffin was a very active citizen in the city of Detroit. He took part in most civic affairs in that metropolitan area, and in movements that were for the betterment of the community and the people.

Mr. Coffin was born on June 11, 1877, in Middleboro, Mass. He was a graduate of Brown University in 1901. He was a business executive. And, to show the amount of interest that he took in public and civic affairs, here is a short list of the things that he was engaged in and did active work in:

He was comptroller of the Warren Motor Car Co., of Detroit, from 1911 to 1913;

Manager of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. from 1913 to 1918;

Secretary of the Detroit Pressed Steel Corp., from 1918 to 1921;

Assistant to the president of the Cadillac Motor Car Co. from 1921 to 1925;

President of the White Star Refining Co. from 1925 to 1933;

General manager of the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Michigan-Ohio division, from 1933 to 1947;

Vice chairman of Appeal Board No. 1, Selective Service, for the entire State of Michigan;

Trustee of the First Liquidating Corp. of Detroit;

Trustee of Grace Hospital, Detroit, Brown University, and Detroit College of Law;

President of the Detroit Community Fund, and I understand that he held that position for approximately 10 years;

President of the Detroit YMCA; national council of the YMCA;

Member of the international board of the YMCA;

Then, of course, a member of various clubs in the city of Detroit.

He also served in the 80th Congress from 1947 to 1948.

In the passing of Mr. Coffin I have lost a personal friend and this Nation has lost a very useful, a very prominent, and a very illustrious man. We extend, and I am sure the Members of the House join me, in extending to his widow and the members of his family our sincere sympathy in the hour of their sorrow. May an unfaltering faith sustain them as it must sustain all of us some day when the shadows fall across the pathway of life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks on the passing of Mr. Coffin at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. DONDERO's announcement a few moments ago that Howard Coffin is dead caused me to experience a real and deep sense of personal loss.

Throughout the 80th Congress, Howard Coffin and I sat next to one another on the important House Committee on Public Works. I came to know him well and the better I knew him the better I liked him and the more I came to appreciate his sterling qualities of mind and character.

Howard Coffin's sense of humor was immense and charming, but also he had a keen, analytical, practical mind that bit through to the heart of every problem. He made you laugh and at the same time he made you think, too.

Howard Coffin's long business experience and fine mind made him a great asset to the House Public Works Committee and the Congress. He contributed much during his 2 years in Congress to almost every piece of legislation that came before him for study.

Howard Coffin will be missed by all who had the happy experience of knowing him. He was one of the most interesting men I have ever known.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, former Congressman Howard A. Coffin was Representative of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan during 1947 and 1948. As the present Representative of that district, I know that the constituency of the community and our State feel a deep and personal sense of loss in his passing. The Honorable Mr. Coffin was as unfaltering and devoted in his service to the people of his city, State, and Nation out of the halls of Congress as he was in them. His influence has been an integral part of the life of Detroit and Michigan. It has been felt in all its vigor and integrity in the automotive industry, the local branches and the international council of the YMCA, and through many of the social agencies of the city of Detroit. He was president of the Detroit Community Chest for 10 years, a trustee of Grace Hospital, which lies within the 13th Congressional District of Michigan, and vice chairman of Appeal Board No. 1 of the Michigan Selective Service. He was, as well, a respected and an astute Republican leader and I am sure that his dedication to his country, party, and its principles was a deep source of inspiration to his wife, who is now a Republican National Committeewoman from the District of Columbia. To Mrs. Coffin and to the family the Honorable Mr. Coffin leaves behind, we extend our heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our former colleague, Howard A. Coffin, leaves us shocked and saddened beyond expression. It was my privilege to become well acquainted with Howard Coffin. His courage was unquestioned, his integrity was unassailable, and his energy was amazing. Greed for power never goaded him and there was no scheming and no conniving in his makeup. He would not compromise with wrong nor waiver on a principle.

To his wife and family we extend our sincere condolences. They have lost a loving husband and father, the country has lost a great American and I have lost a true and loyal friend.

INCREASE THE AMOUNTS PAID TO THOSE RECEIVING OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amount payable thereunder by the Federal Government to States having approved plans for old-age assistance. My purpose in introducing this bill is to call attention to the Members of this House the fact that an amendment to H. R. 7225 has been coauthored by 45 United States Senators. If adopted, the conferees would have this proposal to decide. I hope, therefore, that many Members will approve this desirable amendment and at the proper time communicate their feelings to the House conferees.

In brief, my amendment would provide that Federal matching for old-age assistance would be increased by providing $25 of Federal funds to match the first $5 of State contribution. Thereafter, the Federal Government would match State governments on a 50–50 basis to a maximum payment of $65 per recipient. For example, a State contribution of $22.50 would be matched by $47.50 of Federal funds. On the basis of figures available for September 1955, the estimated cost of the amendment would be $184,459,372. A total of 2,552,596 aged persons would be benefited and the average welfare payment to aged persons would be increased from $52.50 to around $58.

It is hoped that States where the need is greatest may be able to uncover additional revenues which will provide more substantial aid for those aged needy persons who are today practically without any assistance. Certainly a nation that can afford to spend more than $5 billion each year in aiding the development of foreign nations, and raising the standard of living throughout the world, can afford to take care of its own. Furthermore, I feel that the purpose of this amendment is good government, good economics and humane justice to that segment of our population which has benefited least in a monetary way from the tremendous growth and increase of wealth that have occurred in our great Nation.

A BIPARTISAN PROGRAM TO MODERNIZE OUR OBSOLETE ELECTION CODE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in our fast-moving society what could symbolize the out-of-date more than, say, a 1925 model automobile?

Yet, astounding as it may seem, the law regulating the election of Members of Congress predates the radio-television era and has not been altered since it was enacted in 1925.

Indeed, our 1925 model Corrupt Practices Act features the absurd provision that a candidate for United States Representative may not spend more than $5,000 in a campaign. Is it any wonder that candidates resort to the special committee device to legally evade this ridiculous requirement? Or that public confidence in politicians and our American political system falters at times?

I am convinced that both of our political parties stand to gain from legislation guaranteeing open and fair elections.

This is a time in our history when holders of public office need a maximum of public respect, and nothing would better serve this cause and bring new integrity to our political life than laws designed to make our election campaigning responsible and thoroughly honest.

During the first session of this Congress realistic election code bills were

introduced—on the Senate side by Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, S. 636, and by myself in this body, H. R. 3139. Extensive hearings were held on these bills, and under the forceful leadership of the Senator from Missouri, Mr. HENNINGS, S. 636 was reported to the Senate for action.

Last week, in the wake of the Keck-Neff disclosures, the party leaders in the Senate, Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. KNOWLAND, somewhat belatedly recognized the great need for such reform legislation, and they have now prepared and introduced a bipartisan bill, S. 3308, which contains most of the worthwhile features of Senator HENNING's bill. This measure already has 20 cosponsors in the Senate—16 Democrats and 4 Republicans—and prompt action seems likely in that body.

The majority leader, Mr. JOHNSON, shrewdly observed yesterday that "no election bill can be successful unless it has the sympathetic understanding of members of both parties."

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill identical with S. 3308. I do not agree with all of the details of this legislation, but it embodies the pith and substance of H. R. 3139 which has already been considered by the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration, and I believe that this committee should give immediate scrutiny to this promising bipartisan measure.

I hope Members from both sides of the aisle will join with me in cosponsoring this urgently needed legislation so that the House will not lag behind in this important project.

And as food for thought, I present an excellent editorial discussing the bipartisan approach which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning:

LIMITED CAMPAIGN SPENDING

The emphasis on full reporting of political contributions in the Johnson-Knowland honest elections bill introduced yesterday is unquestionably a major step forward. Truthful accounting for campaign receipts and expenditures is the largest single need in exposing and eliminating unsavory influence. This salutary effort, and the provisions covering broadcast time for major candidates and permitting income-tax deduction of political contributions up to $100, far outweigh the minor defects in the bill.

Among the questions of detail likely to be raised is whether the proposed limitations on campaign spending are themselves realistic. By comparison with the obsolete limits in the present law the new figures are undoubtedly generous. To some they may seem excessive. But it must be remembered that the present law has never been effective. It has restricted the spending of each candidate and political committee without any control whatever over the number of such committees that may be set up in behalf of a single candidate. The new bill is an attempt to close this loophole, to require the reporting of all contributions for each candidate by a single agency. If it works out that way, some of the limits it would impose may prove to be too low rather than too high.

The present limit on spending by senatorial candidates ranges from $10,000 to $25,000, the basic measuring stick being 3 cents per vote. Under the Johnson-Knowland bill the minimum limit imposed on candidates in the smaller States is $75,000, with a 20-cents-per-vote escalator which, in the case of New York, would permit the spending of about $1,300,000. For candidates for the House the limit would be boosted from $2,500 or 3 cents a vote to $15,000 or 20 cents a vote. While these changes appear to allow drastic loosening of controls, the new figures must be compared to what candidates have actually spent in recent years and not to the fiction recorded in the statute books.

At first it appeared that the 20-cents-per-vote formula would impose a crippling limitation upon the Republican and Democratic National Committees. This formula would allow each to spend about $12 million in a presidential campaign. But State and local committees could also spend up to $12 million, which means that no effective limit would be imposed on the national parties so long as they operated in large part through State and local committees.

One especially significant provision would require all donors of more than a total of $5,000 to make consolidated returns showing who got their gifts. That should provide a ready index to any major effort to influence votes through the lavish distribution of campaign contributions. Yesterday's evidence before the George committee to the effect that Lobbyist Neff attempted to reach the Senators of 5 States in connection with the natural gas bill emphasizes the wisdom of this provision. By contrast, contributions of $100 or less would not need to be reported. Some provisions of the new bill are admittedly experimental, but with its stress on accurate and comprehensive reporting, it offers enormous advantages over the present law.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today may be vacated and that I be granted permission to address the House for 60 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

H. R. 2878: ADMISSION OF NEEDY SINGLE PERSONS TO FEDERALLY ASSISTED LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECTS

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will soon act favorably on H. R. 2878, introduced by me in the 1st session of the 84th Congress on January 24, 1955.

H. R. 2878 is solid legislation. The need for it is great. It authorizes the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of single persons, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects.

H. R. 2878 will do much to accommodate the aged. It will make their pensions and pittances go further while giving them bright, cheerful, modern living quarters. Loneliness is the bane of the aged: children grow up, marry and settle on their own. Mom and pop remain. Then one goes. The other ofttimes rattles around in a big house with mounting maintenance costs that eat into pension and pittance. The house is sold or the apartment once shared given up. A sunless, cold-water walk up beckons, a lonely end, brightened, perhaps, by memories of warmer, fuller, gayer laughing days. What a reward for rearing a family—burying your mate, faced with the choice of going back to your children or to go on living on your own. Many take the easier way. Still more take the road to loneliness, giving to their children the right to rear their families unfettered. To these noble souls, Mr. Speaker, the benefits of my bill, H. R. 2878 are directed.

H. R. 2878 makes available, as mentioned above, modern, cheerful, single unit quarters for the lonely and the needy. Heaven, we are told, is a bit slow in coming to some, especially to those who live into their seventies, eighties, and nineties. H. R. 2878, I believe, gives them sooner a little of that heaven on earth.

Then there are the young and the middle aged, single, who, for reasons beyond their control, will stay single and in need the balance of their lives. This bill seeks to accommodate them too. In each case, the need must be evident. This is not a bill to promote celibacy with a freer ride to those of able bodies and sound minds in less expensive living quarters. There must be a need, Mr. Speaker and it must be judged a need for one to qualify for accommodation under H. R. 2878.

A survey of the problem this bill H. R. 2878 confronts has been made in four States, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and Connecticut. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include now background data culled from the surveys of the four States and a copy of the bill, H. R. 2878, for the RECORD:

MAYOR'S REPORT ON SURVEY TO DETERMINE NEED FOR AMENDING FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING LEGISLATION TO BENEFIT SINGLE ELDERLY SENIOR CITIZENS

The present public housing law specifies that only "families composed of two or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption" may be admitted for occupancy in public housing projects. It will be noted that if a family is reduced to a single person by reason of death or marriage that persons cannot be evicted under the law. Accordingly, many housing projects are in the unique situation where many persons reside in Federal-aided public housing alone, while single persons are denied admission at initial occupancy. Needless to say, this condition causes confusion in the minds of many persons but the law itself, in my opinion, imposes a hardship on many otherwise qualified single citizens who, in most cases, are in the economic category for which public housing was primarily built.

Nationwide concern has been expressed for the future of our single citizens and there has been much discussion throughout our country over their plight with regard to employment and housing. In Jersey City approximately 35,000 persons or 12 percent

of the entire population is over 60 years of age (according to the 1950 United States census). Social security officials estimate that this figure will rise to approximately 17 percent by 1960 based on population trends and longevity tables. I feel it reasonable to assume that this same situation will be paralleled by most other communities in our country.

Concern over this problem, particularly in the field of housing, has led me to cause an investigation by the city welfare department and by the Hudson County Welfare Board.

Vincent McDermott, acting director of the Jersey City Welfare Department, reports 385 single elderly persons on its rolls who would be interested in and qualified for public housing. The Hudson County Welfare Board, through Mr. Joseph J. Michalski, director, reports approximately 900 cases of persons residing alone in the old-age bracket and another 400 persons in the disabled category who would be eligible for public housing if the law were amended.

Both welfare agencies indicate that a definite advantage would result in the housing of their clients in public housing. Jersey City Housing Authority statistics indicate that the average rent collected for a welfare client is $27 per month including utilities and refrigeration. The amounts that these welfare agencies pay to private landlords in sometimes substandard housing units far surpasses the $27 figure. In addition items such as ice, coal, and utilities must also be provided for.

In view of these factors, there was executed by Joseph S. Waters, executive director, and Conrad J. Vuocolo, tenant relations director, both of the Jersey City Housing Authority, a survey on this single elderly person occupancy problem in the housing authorities of four States—New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania.

Housing authorities in these States were asked the following questions:

1. Does the authority receive many requests from old persons, residing alone, for dwelling units?

2. Does the authority have information as to the number of persons who would be eligible and interested in low-income housing?

3. Does the authority believe that changing the law permitting single elderly persons at initial occupancy if otherwise qualified will mutually benefit the community and the applicants?

Since I feel the results of this survey in which housing officials almost unanimously indicated the need for amendment to the Federal law in favor of our single elderly citizens would be of great interest to all who are concerned with this problem, I am appending a tabulation of the survey as part of this report. I personally feel it is inhuman to ignore the plight of these elderly citizens any longer and urge enactment of legislation which would help them gain admission to suitable housing in their twilight years.

BERNARD J. BERRY,
Mayor of Jersey City.

FEBRUARY 23, 1956.

SURVEY OF HOUSING AUTHORITIES IN NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK, CONNECTICUT, PENNSYLVANIA, CONCERNING PROBLEM OF SINGLE ELDERLY PUBLIC HOUSING OCCUPANCY

Survey conducted by Joseph S. Waters, executive director; Conrad J. Vuocolo, tenant relations director, Jersey City Housing Authority.

Question 1: "Does authority receive request from single elderly persons for dwelling units?"

Question 2: "Does authority have information on number of such persons who would be eligible and interested?"

Question 3: "Is authority in favor of amending the law?"

Responding	Public housing dwelling units	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3
New Jersey:				
Jersey City	2,806	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Garfield	150	Yes	No	Yes.
New Brunswick	449	Yes	Yes	Yes.
North Bergen	172	No	No	Yes.
Phillipsburg	400	Yes	No	Yes.
Orange	280	Yes	No	No.
Camden	1,935	Yes	No	Yes.
Guttenberg	42	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Hackensack	144	Yes	No	Yes.
Hoboken	695	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Beverly	71	No	No	(1)
Long Branch	860	Yes	No	Yes.
Paterson	1,000	Yes	No	Yes.
Atlantic City	1,180	Yes	No	Yes.
Princeton	60	Yes	No	Yes.
Passaic	500	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Bayonne	496	Yes	No	Yes.
Perth Amboy	510	Yes	Yes	Yes.
West New York	120	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Harrison	268	Yes	No	Yes.
Newark	7,385	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Connecticut:				
Hartford	4,123	Yes	No	Yes.
Stratford	800	No	No	Yes.
Danbury	303	No	No	Yes.
East Hartford	1,296	No	No	(1)
Waterbury	1,379	No	No	Yes.
New York:				
New York City	92,297	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Yonkers	1,215	Yes	Yes	Yes.
North Hempstead	168	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Schenectady	957	Yes	No	Yes.
Plattsburgh	150	No	No	No.
Rochester	392	Yes	No	Yes.
Syracuse	1,422	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Utica	668	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Buffalo	5,113	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Middletown	100	No	No	Yes.
Paughkeepsie	186	No	Yes	Yes.
Pennsylvania:				
Philadelphia	12,150	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Harrisburg	1,080	No	No	Yes.
Pittsburgh	7,485	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Scranton	656	Yes	No	Yes.
Beaver County	2,030	Yes	No	Yes.
Bethlehem	1,472	Yes	No	Yes.
Erie	1,374	Yes	No	Yes.
Reading	926	Yes	No	Yes.
Chester	1,390	Yes	No	Yes.
Mercer County	516	Yes	Yes	Yes.

[1] Equivocal replies.

NOTE.—In many cases where the answer is "No" to the first question authority officials have pointed out that they have received few applications because of the general knowledge in the community that single elderly persons are ineligible under present laws.

PERTINENT COMMENTS CONTAINED IN HOUSING AUTHORITY RESPONSES

NEW JERSEY

"I believe very strongly that changing the law permitting single elderly persons into low-rent housing projects, if qualified, will be of mutual benefit to the community and to applicants. * * * Provisions should be made for the elderly person to be separate and apart from the other tenants."—Guy A. DeMuro, executive director, Passaic Housing Authority.

"We do have a number of separate elderly persons as tenants who are residual members of two-person families on admittance * * * definitely a need for providing housing elderly single persons of low income."—John E. Schulz, executive director, Long Branch Housing Authority.

"Single elderly persons would probably rate minimum rents and our percentage of such would preclude any further admittance."—L. G. Stratton, executive director, Beverly Housing Authority.

"We have found in most cases where the older persons have applied that they are receiving social-security benefits which are insufficient to meet expenses. In most cases due to the exorbitant rents they are paying it is necessary for them to receive additional subsistence either from county welfare or city welfare."—Joseph C. Barsalona, executive director, Hackensack Housing Authority.

"We must recognize this will become a growing problem. We feel that the provision of such housing would definitely benefit the community and the applicants."—Robert A. Watson, executive director, Atlantic City Housing Authority.

"Usually an old person, living alone, has an income consisting only of social security which makes it difficult * * * to pay for a 3- or 4-room apartment. The only other alternative is a furnished room. Certainly they need assistance, specially since most of them, to our knowledge, are women and unable to find work because of their age."—Harry Pelio, secretary-treasurer, Garfield Housing Authority.

"The primary purpose of the program is to provide low-rent housing for families. Aged, single persons can always manage to live comfortably somewhere and I sincerely cannot see where the community or the individual will be benefited by allowing them to occupy public housing."—Harry J. Callaghan, executive director, Orange Housing Authority.

"Changing the law * * * would be a very definite mutual benefit to the community and these applicants * * * our current files show approximately 650 such applications of persons who had to be refused public-housing accommodations."—Samuel Warrence, tenancy director, Newark Housing Authority.

NEW YORK

"We now have on hand approximately 4,000 applications for apartments from single elderly persons whom we have been unable to accommodate in projects. In addition, it appears that an additional 1,000 single persons will be displaced by clearance activities within the next 2 years and will require rehousing. (Since 1947 State-aided and city-aided projects have included 2 to 3 percent of apartments for single elderly persons.) We believe that the regulations, and if necessary, the law, should be changed * * * we have made a formal request that this change be made."—Warren Moscow, executive director, New York City Housing Authority.

"We know that almost 1,200 of these primary individuals, maintaining their own households, live in substandard housing. A change in the law * * * would be of substantial benefit in that it would provide persons with low incomes an opportunity for decent housing which they have been heretofore denied."—Mary K. Nemmo, Research Director, Buffalo Housing Authority.

"Yes. (Change of law desirable.) We are convinced of this providing certain obvious problems are prepared for in advance."—William L. McGarry, Executive Director, Syracuse Housing Authority.

"Yes, very much so (change in law) should single male be classified same as single female?"—Emmett Burke, Secretary-Director, Yonkers Housing Authority.

PENNSYLVANIA

"The Health and Welfare Council in Philadelphia has completed a study on the problems of the aged in this community and has suggested that housing for this group be increased."—Ephraim Glass, Chief, Rental and Occupancy Philadelphia Housing Authority.

"Public sentiment has been turned against us because of our turning down applications from such single persons and the pathetic circumstances under which so many of them live—whether it be in rooms of their own or unwanted guests of relatives, stirs the sympathy of those with a true knowledge of their situation."—Richard S. Coyle, Tenant Selection Supervisor, Reading Housing Authority.

"We receive enough applications from single aged persons to make it imperative that the low-rent program should provide for their placement at rents they can afford. * * * We also believe that if permission is ultimately given to authorities to accept these applicants they should provide conveniences within the structures and, through community facilities, also benefit these persons."—Ralph J. Bartholomew, executive director, Bethlehem Housing Authority.

"Have advocated at different conferences with PHA that the law be changed."—Joseph A. McNulty, executive director, Scranton Housing Authority.

CONNECTICUT

"We would feel that we can perform a public service by making one-bedroom units available to elderly lone persons. Since younger couples outgrow these units quickly, making them available to older persons would contribute to the growing problem of providing housing for the aging and also help reduce vacancy loss now experienced at times when we do not have eligible applicants on hand for vacant one-bedroom units."—D. G. Lyons, executive director, Hartford Housing Authority.

"We believe that some legislation should be enacted to provide housing for people of advanced years * * * any proposed housing should provide some supervision as to daily checks in rooms, dormitories, or otherwise."—John J. Kennedy, executive director, Stratford Housing Authority.

H. R. 2878

A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of single persons, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U. S. C., sec. 1415) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(10) The Commissioner shall include such provisions in contracts made pursuant to this act after the date of enactment of this subsection, and he shall negotiate with the public housing agencies involved such modifications of previously existing contracts, as may be necessary (A) to permit single persons whose incomes do not exceed applicable maximum income limits to be admitted to any low-rent housing project in any case where a duly authorized official of the public housing agency involved determines that exceptional circumstances exist which warrant such admission and that such admission will not prevent or delay the admission of any eligible family to the project, and (B) to provide, for persons so admitted, the same conditions for continued occupancy as apply with respect to family tenants."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, at the time of rollcall No. 10 on yesterday, February 28, 1956, on House Resolution 311, granting a rule on the so-called Colorado River project, I was at the Pentagon Building with some industrialists of Evansville, Ind., who were anxious to procure contracts for Government defense work. There is a serious unemployment situation in Evansville and I was trying to assist them in order to relieve the unemployment situation there. As soon as the rollcall started, I left the Pentagon and attempted to reach the House in time to vote on this resolution. However, the traffic was such that I was unable to reach the House in time to vote.

If I had been present at the time, I would have voted "aye."

CLEARWATER DAM THREAT FORCES CONSERVATIONISTS TO HIGH HELLS CANYON DAM

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a letter from the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources and a statement from that committee entitled "Clearwater Dam Threat Forces Conservationists to High Hells Canyon Dam."

Today when the House of Representatives is considering the upper Colorado River project it seems a fitting time to bring to the attention of the Members the importance of other multipurpose projects.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1956.

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

Just as soon as we have the Echo Park controversy settled, the administration appears bent upon starting another one like it. But if they insist on building dams on the Clearwater River they will certainly have the conservationists up in arms again.

Conservationists have been often accused of unreasonable opposition to power and reclamation projects, when in fact, conservationists have urged alternative sites or projects to protect the nonrestorable benefits of nature. The instant case is a classic demonstration of what conservationists have been urging again and again.

The High Hells Canyon Dam would fully develop a place ideal for power, water storage, etc.; a place that does not invade or destroy wilderness areas, parks, nor wildlife habitat. The administration has rejected this project. In its place is recommended a project, admittedly inadequate because of this underutilization, that would make other projects necessary, which in turn would damage severely wildlife and scenic beauty.

Just prior to leaving for the North American Wildlife Conference in New Orleans, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson gave an explanation of the conservationists' position, a copy of which is attached.

Sincerely,

SPENCER M. SMITH,
Secretary.

CLEARWATER DAM THREAT FORCES CONSERVATIONISTS TO HIGH HELLS CANYON DAM

A major threat to important fish and wildlife resources of Idaho's Clearwater River, big tributary to the Snake River, has forced conservation leaders to ask for a reappraisal of the role of the controversial Hells Canyon dam site. This development was announced today by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a national conservation organization with headquarters in Washington, D. C.

"We are not concerned with the battle between public versus private power interests," Dr. Gabrielson stated. "But it is apparent that reduction in reservoir capacity at the Hells Canyon site is forcing power and water interests to advocate high dams on the Clearwater River, where a disastrous effect on fish and wildlife resources of national importance will needlessly result."

The President's budget provides for a huge dam at Bruces Eddy, on the Clearwater, which joins the Snake River downstream from the Hells Canyon site, Dr. Gabrielson pointed out. An additional Clearwater dam is planned at Penny Cliffs with subsequent construction planned for the Salmon River, which joins the Snake between the Hells Canyon site and the Clearwater.

"Big dams on either the Clearwater or the Salmon," Dr. Gabrielson added, "would wipe out important fish spawning grounds, inundate many thousands of acres of forest land, and in addition destroy critical winter range for some of the country's finest elk and deer herds. It make little sense to reduce drastically the amount of water storage at Hells Canyon, where no important wildlife or scenic values are at stake, if this means the destruction of scenic and wildlife resources that the Nation could otherwise save for the enjoyment of present and future generations."

Dr. Gabrielson's statement continues: "The Army Corps of Engineers, the Interior Department, and the Federal Power Commission have all made statements urging water development on the Clearwater, and plans are well advanced. With the Echo Park controversy out of the way, conservationists are now turning to protect natural resources from this new threat. They will need to act swiftly to block the Bruces Eddy Dam in the present session of Congress.

"Let me stress that this is not part of the public versus private power controversy, nor is it an attempt to prevent necessary flood control or power development. These needs can be met without jeopardy to important public values by intelligent use of other dam sites in the Columbia Basin. The kind of short-sighted planning that would allow the Clearwater and Salmon River Dams to be built can also lead to the building of Glacier View Dam, which would inundate an important part of Glacier National Park.

"No matter who builds on the acceptable sites, whether public or private agencies or a combination of both, these sites should be fully utilized. It is up to the Nation's citizens to see that they are, and to require proof that there are no alternatives before considering irrevocable damage to our best scenic and wildlife resources."

KICK THE BUM OUT

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that last night one of our major television systems gave a program which was a farewell to ex-Dictator Peron, who left the United States-owned Washington Hotel in Panama, where he had had a three-room suite.

I invite your attention to the Chicago Daily News which carries a picture of his palatial residence, for him and his bodyguard.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that my honor was at stake. They referred to me anonymously, and said I was "one United States Congressman." I am here to reassert my honor. I feel I should more properly be referred to in the plural and I am going to serve notice on the TV network that I demand equal time, or in fact double time over their network; because if a dictator can get any of their time, a free citizen is entitled to twice as much time to give a freeman's version of why a dictator should have been thrown out and should have been kept out. I hope the Republic of Panama will see that he gets out of there. There

should be no place in the Western Hemisphere for deposed dictators, who are aspiring to get back to power.

I said, "Throw the bum out." I say now, "Keep the bum out."

WISCONSIN CHEESE WEEK

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, for over a century, the great State of Wisconsin has been known, among other things, for the unequaled excellence of its dairy products.

The fame of Wisconsin milk, cheese, and butter has spread throughout our Nation, and even reached foreign lands.

I am indeed proud and happy to note that the story of America's Dairyland will be presented vividly in our Nation's Capital during this week. It is this week that our State's dairy promotion campaign has reached Washington. It will move into Washington's retail and wholesale outlets, and endeavor to reach all of the local residents through the media of newspapers, radio, and television.

I understand that the campaign will be waged even on Capitol Hill, where our distinguished colleagues will be given a treat consisting of Wisconsin cheese.

Mr. Speaker, there are two chief reasons why I am particularly delighted about this promotional campaign: In the first place, because it will make many people happy by bringing delicious Wisconsin products to their notice; and, secondly, because it will, in the long run, help to provide a broader market for Wisconsin dairy products, thereby helping to sustain our Wisconsin dairy farmer's income.

I hope that the Wisconsin Cheese Week, which opened yesterday, will enjoy every success.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER ON COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this morning the following statement was made by President Eisenhower at his press conference, on the Colorado River project. This is unedited but essentially is what he said:

The other item of legislation which I am very deeply concerned about now is the upper Colorado Basin.

I have more than once expressed my conviction before, that I believe water is rapidly becoming our most valuable natural resource, and here is an opportunity, at last, to treat this whole great mighty Colorado River as a single entity, to treat it on a basin basis instead of merely local and individual. We should get busy and get on to it. There was one feature of it that was originally controversial because of the belief on the part of some conservationists we would destroy wildlife in one section of the area. That dam, Echo Park Dam, has been eliminated.

I think their fears were groundless but it has been eliminated and removed, that particular bone of contention. So again I hope that we can have positive action on that as rapidly as possible.

(The above is unedited and was dictated over phone by press section at the White House.)

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a very happy day for the American people. They have every good cause to rejoice not only because President Eisenhower is willing to be a candidate for reelection but because they know that his decision is based upon his own sincere conviction that he can do so without undue risk to his health. I am certain that millions of Americans, as well as millions more in the free world, feel confident that their prayers for his recovery have been answered. I am equally certain that they now look forward with renewed hope and confidence as to the future of this country and of free men and women everywhere under the inspired leadership of one of our greatest Presidents.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we who know Dwight D. Eisenhower as both President and friend have been concerned, above all, with his recovery. We rejoice in the fact that he is able to continue in the most demanding assignment in all the world.

As President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower has given new force and leadership to the principles of our way of life. His first concern always has been to advance the sacred rights of the individual and to make the Government of the United States ever more representative of all the people. We in America, and freemen throughout the world, can take heart that this man is willing to continue to lead us on to ever greater achievements.

It is his rare quality of complete frankness that endears him to us all which is evidencing itself in his determination to have the people of this great country know not only the facts about his recovery but also his thinking. Certainly no man in our history has so bared his soul. Let us who have prayed for his renewal thank God for his selfless readiness to carry the burdens of his great office for yet another term.

A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will make it short, Mr. Speaker. So many have referred to the President's announcement but they seem to have overlooked the fact that the President also said that he wants a Republican Congress. As a candidate, I am heartily in accord with that.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construction, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Andrews	Gary	Reece, Tenn.
Ayres	George	Richards
Bell	Hays, Ohio	Scrivner
Boykin	Hope	Shelley
Byrd	Jenkins	Spence
Celler	Knutson	Staggers
Chatham	Lankford	Teague, Tex.
Dodd	McDowell	Tollefson
Dorn, S. C.	Madden	Watts
Eberharter	Osmers	Wharton
Fascell	Powell	Williams, Miss.
Fountain	Priest	Young
Gamble	Rains	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 400 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Without objection further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask why we are asked to come in at 11 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. ENGLE. Because we are trying to finish this bill this week.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that it will take from 11 o'clock tomorrow morning through tomorrow and Friday?

Mr. ENGLE. It will take until 6 o'clock tonight just to finish general debate. I believe there are 3 hours and 3 minutes left of general debate. Then the bill must be read under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may state for the information of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that after the bill we are now considering, there will be an appropriation bill; and there are two other bills from the Committee on Armed Services. All those come under the program for this week.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether it is proposed to meet on Friday?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unless this legislation and the other referred to are disposed of; the appropriation bill and the two bills out of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the House should not meet on Friday. I object.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 3383.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 3383, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] had 1 hour and 28 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] had 1 hour and 38 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, it is not a pleasant task that I have to disagree with such eminent Members of Congress as the distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. ENGLE] for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration. I have had a great many friendly contacts with the ranking Member on the Democratic side, my good friend WAYNE ASPINALL, and I regret that I find myself in disagreement with him. I also have, I hope, on the Republican side a number of good friends, including the ranking Member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], and I regret that I find it necessary to disagree with him.

No later than an hour ago you heard read here on the floor of the House a statement that the President of the United States is also in favor of this project. Despite this fact, I must oppose this project and all that it represents, because I honestly and sincerely believe that it is not in the best interest of all of the people of our country. I hope that I have approached this project not from a partisan standpoint, nor a local viewpoint, but rather from a broad national scope.

The upper basin States should be allowed to put the water allotted to them under the Colorado River compact to beneficial consumptive use in a feasible project. Therefore in view of my beliefs the statement I am about to make I know should startle you, but I say to you in all sincerity that it is true. There is not a word of testimony in all the pages that have been taken before the committees of the House or the Senate that says that the bill before you, and upon which you are going to be asked to vote, is a feasible project. The fact of the matter is that all of the testimony that has been offered by the Bureau of Reclamation is in direct contradiction of this project's feasibility and therefore I ask you to vote against it.

You will recall that last year from all sections of every Congressional District you were besieged by letters from people who were worried because it was planned by the Bureau of Reclamation to invade a national monument in the upper Colorado River storage and participating projects. You have now been told by the proponents of this present measure and others who have spoken in favor of the bill presently before you that the invasion of Echo Park has been eliminated and, therefore, you should vote for the bill. But if you are to vote for a bill, you should vote for one that has the economically feasible factors that would make it pay out. With the elimination of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams from the project and the failure to substitute an alternate site or sites this project cannot earn sufficient funds. The uncontroverted testimony of Mr. Tudor, the Under Secretary of the Interior in 1954 before the House committee, is as follows:

> If Echo Park is eliminated it would certainly put the project in hazard. * * * The alternative would be to increase the rate for power, and we are getting up pretty high as it is, so that power it not competitive with any other means.

The Interior Department has not told any committee that they have refigured the project to substitute an alternate site or to increase the rates for power. The proponents have told you they have taken out Echo Park. However they have not informed you of any alternate site or increased power rates. They have taken out the only thing that will make this project self-sustaining—under the fantastic provisions which are included in the bill, and therefore I charge that when you vote for this bill under these circumstances you are voting to invade our national parks and monuments.

Mr. Tudor's statement has not been contradicted. There has never been a witness to appear before any Congressional committee who has challenged the correctness of his statement or said that Mr. Tudor was wrong. There has never been a man up here representing any branch of the Government, before any committee of the Congress who has come up and said to any committee that this project can work if the Echo Park Dam is taken out of the bill. Yet, the proponents of this piece of legislation have now come to you with the fantastic proposition that it can pay for itself.

When our committee reported this bill out last year it was an entirely different bill. It could have been defended. However, after this session started we had a meeting of the committee and there was offered the bill that is presently before you. It received no hearings, no official report from any department, nor was any reason for the changes given.

This is the bill that you will be asked to vote upon. The committee met for 2 hours and we heard the matter discussed by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] but he had absolutely no evidence to substantiate it other than the statements which he made. As I stated in the beginning—I have a great deal of respect for Mr. ASPINALL's integrity, but after all, he comes from the area. He has a very personal interest in this. It does not make any difference to me as far as my area is concerned, except that I do not want to burden my constituents with needless taxes to support a project that will not work. I am not personally interested in the Colorado River either upstream or downstream. But as one who is interested in the future of America, one who is interested in developing all sections of our country by sound means and methods, as a true friend of reclamation I warn you that to vote in favor of this present project and pass this bill, you will be voting in favor of a project which from the testimony of all departments, will not work.

The second point I want to bring out is the project, as presently planned, does not comply with the general reclamation law. The present law requires repayment within 40 years with respect to power and municipal water plus a development period not to exceed 10 years with respect to irrigation. Under this bill, the power allocation is permitted to be repaid within 100 years. No other project has ever been presented to this Congress or any other Congress has had that kind of provision in it. This provision exceeds by 50 years the pattern used in all other power repayment contracts and is not in accord with good engineering practices. The municipal water allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years from the date of completion of each unit. The irrigation allocation is permitted to be repaid within 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law. Thus, the repayment period for power produced by this project is extended 60 years; the repayment period for municipal water is extended 10 years; and the irrigation repayment will be extended at least 10 years, plus an undetermined period over existing law because of the changes being made. Present reclamation law requires interest at "not less than 3 percent per annum on the power investment. Under this bill interest

would be the cost of money to the United States, or about 2½ percent per annum.

If you believe that this statement is an exaggeration let me quote from an interview with Robert LeRoy Cochran, who recently retired from the United States Bureau of the Budget, after long and honorable service as an expert on financial and engineering aspects of Federal water conservation projects:

Question. Governor Cochran, since the great majority of the readers of this article are interested in the Colorado River storage project as taxpayers rather than as beneficiaries, I believe they would like to have your opinion concerning the possibility of repayment to the Treasury of the money spent for power and irrigation. What is the formula proposed by the Interior Department for repayment?

Answer: It is called the Collbran formula. It proposes that the power features be paid off first, with interest, from the revenues from the sale of electricity. After those expenditures are liquidated, which it is estimated will take about 50 years, the power profits would be used to pay off the costs of irrigation aspects of the plan. Such repayment, if ever made, would take considerably more than another half century.

Question. What is your opinion about the practical prospects of repayment?

Answer. According to the claims of the Bureau of Reclamation and the congressional sponsors of the project, the cashboxes from which most of the repayment must come are power installations, the largest of which is Glen Canyon, near the Utah-Arizona border. On the basis of the figures submitted, only Glen Canyon could be justified as financially feasible. Even if the revenues from that one dam were as good as anticipated, they would be entirely consumed in paying the deficits on the other power dams. That would leave nothing at all for the repayment of the irrigation costs during the first 50-year period.

The analysis presented by the Department was based upon a 50-year period, generally considered to be the useful life of a project. Such a period may be too long is the light of the future potentials of power production from atomic energy and other sources.

Question. How then could the costs of the irrigation aspects of the upper Colorado project be paid back to the Federal Government?

Answer. A small proportion (about 15 percent) of the construction costs alone would be repaid by the farmers during the first interest-free 50 years. While it is proposed that the balance (85 percent) be paid back out of the revenues of the power aspects of the plan, we have already seen that there is no validity in that claim. Payment from that source would not begin anyhow until after about 50 years. By that time, the power features might well be obsolete. It should be emphasized that there appears to be a very serious doubt as to whether any power revenues would ever be applied to the payment of irrigation costs in the upper Colorado Basin. I submit that a proposal to start payment after 50 years on a debt for any purpose is not worth the paper it is written on.

Meanwhile, because of the high construction costs per acre of the irrigation works and the accumulating unpaid interest, the Federal subsidy would be enormous. Under the ultraliberal construction of the reclamation law by the Department, freedom from interest extends not only through the 40 or 50 years beyond a development period, but indefinitely into the future.

Something like 90 percent of the irrigation costs (including interest) would be Federal subsidy. Besides, experience with reclamation projects indicates that after 30 years or so it is necessary in a considerable number of cases to spend further money on rehabilitation. This is another large item of expense for the Federal Government. There is also the fact that there is pending in Congress a proposal to subsidize a soil bank of land now under production. We are faced with subsidies for taking land out of production and with subsidies for putting land into production at the same time.

Question. But proponents of the upper Colorado storage project, ignoring the fact that in humid or semihumid sections of the country there are millions of acres which might with relatively small cost be prepared for cultivation, say that new irrigated land will be necessary by 1975 because of the rapidly increasing population in the United States. What about that argument for bringing new irrigated land into cultivation?

Answer. Such a claim must be balanced against the fact that through technology increased production can be and is being obtained from fewer acres. It will be very many years, if ever, before such land as is proposed in this project could be needed.

I would conclude that if Congress proposes to pay this immense subsidy to bring this arid land into production, it should be done in the open. As it is, the subsidy is pretty well concealed by means of a repayment formula which is absolutely without validity.

The Members who have spoken to you in favor of this bill would have you believe that the various agencies and bureaus of the Government who have examined it have approved it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN] yesterday endeavored to have his questions answered, and it was only with a great deal of difficulty and with some reluctance on behalf of the proponents that he was able to get any answers to his questions. But I can say to you that the bill which has passed the other body, and the bill that was reported out of our committee to the House, and upon which you are now being asked to vote, has never been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The administration recommended two storage units at Glen Canyon and Echo Park, and 11 participating projects at an actual estimated cost of $930 million. The House bill authorizes four storage units—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti and the Navajo 11 participating projects recommended by the Secretary. It also has a section which I say is tantamount to advance commitment by Congress, for 23 additional reclamation units to bring it up to the same bill which passed the Senate, S. 500.

The Bureau of Reclamation definitely recommended against the authorization at this time of the storage units Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho. In addition, the letter which was received from the Bureau of the Budget stating the administration's views, recommended that the legislation provide authorization of the 11 participating projects be conditional and only authorized on a new finding of favorable economic justification and of financial feasibility under specified financial requirements with reports submitted to the Congress on each project, and with the new studies of direct agricultural benefits made jointly with the Department of Agriculture.

In other words, even the study of direct benefits about which you have heard so much should be made jointly not by just the Department of the Interior but the Department of the Interior in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture.

This bill upon which you are going to be asked to vote favorably has three of the storage projects, namely Flaming Gorge, Curecanti and Navaho which have been definitely recommended against, and the 11 participating projects which are included are authorized completely. You will never have another chance to come back and take a look at them as the Bureau of the Budget asked; and I can say to you that despite what some of the advocates of this bill say, some of you Members will have it come back to haunt you because the 23 other participating projects which are conditionally authorized will be authorized in the final version and you will never have a chance to get another look at them.

Another phase of this bill that I would like to have you consider is that of bringing a half million acres of land under cultivation to produce crops already in surplus.

I have heard some Members who are in favor of this bill say that it will not come into production for a long time, that it will perhaps be as much as 27 years before these projects come into production. The advocates of this project had better get together with some of the Members of the Senate who have already voted upon this. I do not know whether they felt that the people who were over on this side were not interested in what was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or whether or not we do not care, or would swallow what somebody told to us. I have the greatest respect for the Senator from New Mexico, the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. ANDERSON, and I have not heard anybody say that the statement which he put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was inaccurate. You will find that he placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of the 33 projects which will be authorized under the Senate bill (S. 500), and here is what his own figures show: That 23 out of the 33 projects will come into production anywhere from 3 to 10 years; 2 will come into production in 11 years, 1 in 12; 1 in 13; 1 in 14; 1 in 15; 1 in 17; 1 in 26; and 1 in 27 years.

There is no duplication in the participating projects which are included in the bill you are presently considering except that they are divided into two sections of this bill. Of the 11 that are included in one section of this bill 3 will come into production in 8 years, 2 in 9; 2 in 10; 1 in 11; 1 in 13; 1 in 17; and the last in 26 years. Of the 22 projects, included in the other section 15 will come into production in 3 to 10 years; 1 in 11 years; 1 in 12 years; 2 in 14 years; 1 in 15 years; and 1 in 27 years.

And then this remarkable factor that you have been told about by those in favor of this bill, the great diversification of agriculture and how all these crops are going to be grown without creating any surplus, that it will be devoted to small crops, row crops, fruits, vegetables, and things of that character. The former Secretary of Agriculture put in a statement of just what is going to happen. He says there will be placed

into production in new acreage 270,000 acres of land under that bill. The remaining land is already being dry farmed, but will be put under irrigation and its crop production boosted skyward. He asked the Department of Agriculture to give him a report on what could be grown if this actually comes under cultivation and this is what the Department of Agriculture reported to him: 50,000 acres will be put in oats, 50,000 acres will be put in barley, 105,000 acres will be placed in alfalfa and 65,000 acres will be placed in irrigated pasture. Now, I have not heard anybody contradict the former Secretary of Agriculture, a great proponent of this piece of legislation. It appears from what the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] said and what some of the rest of us have maintained that the proponents of this bill talk out of both sides of their mouth. They try to tell you on the one hand it will not create surpluses, then in fine print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they put in what will be grown and they clearly show that what will be grown is now in surplus will continue to be in surplus.

In a recent article, Raymond Moley, a real student of this problem, is most clear and interesting on this subject. Mr. Moley's article is as follows:

In the President's state of the Union message, separated by only a few sentences are two recommendations: "I shall urge authorization of a soil-bank program to alleviate the problem of diverted acres and an overextended agricultural plant" and "I strongly recommend that action be taken at this session on such wholly Federal projects as the Colorado River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project."

This means that the President is asking Congress to take out of cultivation an immense number of acres at a large cost per acre to the taxpayers, and on the other hand to bring into cultivation or to increase the productivity of over a million acres at a cost in the upper Colorado project of as high as $5,000 an acre and in the Fryingpan-Arkansas project of about $1,400 an acre.

This continues the mad cycle which has been going on for years: The Agriculture Department laboring to curb production, and the Interior Department just as zealously trying to increase production. Of course, this makes no sense. But lots of things in politics make no sense and are paid out of the sweat of the taxpayer's brow.

Nearly 2 years ago, when the gigantic upper Colorado project was presented to Congress by the administration and the Hoover Commission was setting to work to look into all and sundry water-conservation projects, the President appointed a committee on the general subject, composed of Secretary McKay, Chairman, and the Secretaries Benson and Wilson. This committee has just submitted its report.

In the first place, the report recommends that State and local governments should share the cost of water projects. But the President in his message recommends that the two projects named above be wholly Federal.

Next, the committee recommends that there be set up an independent Board of Review * * * to analyze the engineering and economic feasibility of projects and report to the President. If any such board were to report independently and factually on these two projects, it can be taken for granted that no President would dream of recommending them. As it happened, the pressure for these projects came from interested Members of Congress and bureaucrats anxious to spend more and more tax dollars. The congressional committees that considered them are stacked with members from beneficiary States. In the case of the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 500), only one member came from east of the Mississippi, and he represents a State paying a relatively small percentage of the taxes involved. One might as well have a plaintiff pick the jury which would pass upon his claim.

The other notable recommendation is that while the old practice of charging water users on irrigation projects no interest on the money advanced by the Federal Government should be continued, nevertheless interest should be shown clearly as a Federal cost. This means that when a project is presented to Congress, all the cards would be laid on the table. Hitherto the interest charge has been one of those things that the interested parties never chose to mention. Only occasionally a stalwart champion of economy has pried that cost out of the Bureau of Reclamation.

That interest charge is very important. Since no project except 1 or 2 has been paid for by the water users within the 53 years since Federal irrigation began, the interest charge runs to twice to three times the original cost.

Immediately after the President made the report public, a Congressman from Colorado, WAYNE N. ASPINALL, shouted his disapproval and in so doing let a cat as big as a mountain puma out of the bag. He said that "if they did not favor the elimination of the interest charge immediately after adding it to the cost of construction, there wouldn't be a reclamation project in the United States that would be economically possible."

In short, if the real cost plus interest were considered, none of the presently proposed irrigation projects would stand scrutiny.

That is exactly what I have been saying in this space for 2 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. One of the proponents of this bill stated there would only be 120,000 acres brought in production. Another one said 140,000 acres would be brought into production. Evidently there is twice that much will be brought in.

Mr. SAYLOR. No one has challenged Senator ANDERSON'S statement showing there will be brought into production new land to the extent of 270,000 acres. They have not tried to challenge it because they know it is true.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman has talked about what is going to happen out here. Was the gentleman present at a committee hearing when Mr. J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General, testified that we have built projects out there in the West costing $150 million and did not have any water to put behind those dams?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman also inform the House whether or not he also testified that he and his department were then defending approximately 40 or 50 suits in other parts of the Western States?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct, defending suits for water and there is no water there.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call one other factor to the attention of the members of the committee. That is, the slightly inconsistent position which the various Departments of Government have taken. We are now being asked to vote upon a bill which will bring into production according to the figures given by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico at least 270,000 acres of new land. The cost will be approximately $5,000 an acre.

The Department of Agriculture within a week or so will come up here asking us to vote for a soil bank to take land out of production.

The President just a few years ago appointed a Water Policy Board consisting of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense. Those three men presented to the American public a new water policy. It is strange to relate this present project, which will be the biggest project this administration or any other administration can ever ask you to pass upon, was not included. This does not comply with the provisions of the President's Water Policy Board.

If ever a piece of water-resources legislation cried for processing under the procedures the Presidential Advisory Committee recommends, this is it. This would involve an application of benefit-cost principles which would give a more realistic appraisal of the benefits and detriments of this project; and ultimate review by an independent board of review which should give the Congress a correct picture of the highly controverted engineering and financial details of the proposal.

Compare just two of the statements of the Presidential Advisory Committee with the facts of this project:

(1) Use of excess revenues:

* * * * *

The Committee believes that such a use of excess revenue from Federal power sales to repay a portion of the costs of other types of projects is a justifiable procedure provided the project to which such revenues are applied is a part of the area from which such excess revenues are derived. However, it should be pointed out that the utilization of excess revenue to aid projects which are in no way related to the facility producing the excess revenues amounts in reality to the operation of a Government facility to obtain a profit to be used for other purposes, and there are obvious limits beyond which such a policy cannot be justified (Rept. pp. 33–34).

The participating projects to be benefited by the anticipated power revenues are connected in no other way with the power dams. Each one of these irrigation ventures could be constructed without the storage dams. No water impounded by these dams is to be placed on the land. Yet, 88 percent of the cost of these irrigation projects is expected to be repaid from power revenues. If such a percentage does not exceed obvious limits, what would? The precedent in this bill would be so enormous for this type of subsidy that we may as well forget a national water policy on this score.

(2) Payment of interest:

* * * * *

The Committee recommends that as a general policy interest be paid on all Federal investment subject to repayment. In making this recommendation, the Committee recognizes that the provision of interest-free Federal funds for irrigation does not conform to this policy. The Committee believes, however, that this provision should not be eliminated but rather that interest should be shown clearly as a Federal cost, as should all nonreimbursable items in all projects (report, p. 34).

The Bureau of Reclamation has admitted that the project recommended by the Secretary—Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams and 11 participating projects—would result in a total interest cost of $1,153 million in the year 2032.

This staggering figure has been variously estimated by other sources to run as high as $4 billion, depending on which of the many overall project plans may be under consideration. In any event, consider the Bureau figure as a minimum. This is not included as a project cost as the Presidential Advisory Committee now recommends. It was brought out only by determined questioning. It gives some idea of the true cost of the project to the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that in view of my statement and that of other sincere opponents of this bill you will, when the time comes, recommit it to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for further study.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The testimony which was just given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] was to Senate bill 500, was it not?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Yes; it was.

Mr. ASPINALL. It was not to the bill before this body.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am for the so-called natural resources features in this bill. I had a bill to make the Dinosaur National Monument made into a national park in the 83d Congress. I would like to present another such bill so that for all time this ground would be a national park, which could only be changed or extinguished by an act of Congress and the President's approval.

Further, I consider as an important contribution of the substitute bill the amendments providing protection for the national parks and monuments. I am confident that the Bureau of Reclamation can work out acceptable ways of developing water for the States of the upper basin without trespassing upon any national park or monument.

I am also now introducing the bill I formerly submitted to make the Dinosaur National Monument a national park.

Now I wish to submit some remarks on the bill as a whole and point out what I consider conspicuous weaknesses and fallacies in comments on the bill now before us.

We in northern California fully realize and appreciate the value of the reclamation program. Also we do not begrudge sharing its benefits with other States.

In our own area we have seen semi-desert areas blossom after the construction of the great Central Valley project. We expect to see still more of these areas become fruitful after the completion of Trinity and the Sacramento Canals.

From our own experience we know these costs have been worthwhile, and that, because of these Federal investments in large part, California can support its ever-increasing population in the national interest.

We have also seen how the power and water users together can repay the Federal Government for its capital investment. These same principles are contained in the bill we are considering.

I have been particularly interested in the variable cost figures used by the opponents of the project. I want to say a few words about these figures.

The Bureau of Reclamation has testified that the costs of the 11 participating projects would range from $210 per acre for the La Barge project in Wyoming to $794 per acre for the central Utah project.

These figures represent a cost of $4.20 to $16 per acre each year for an assured water supply. To me these costs are moderate. About 2 weeks ago we approved a bill authorizing the Ventura project at a cost of $1,800 per acre, according to the same Bureau's figures. I did not hear a word of protest at that time.

The figures used by the opponents of the Colorado River storage project bill leave me both puzzled and confused. I I do not pretend to be an Einstein, but I can do ordinary arithmetic.

On page 30 of the original minority report, the opponents say the project costs will be $3,000 to $5,000 per acre.

On page 31, the average construction cost is given as $750 to $900 per acre.

On page 35, the concealed subsidy is first given as $3,150 per acre. Later on the same page Federal subsidies are said to amount to $3,000 to $5,000 per acre.

On page 36, the direct irrigation investment is first given as $200 to nearly $800. Then later on the same page the average direct investment is said to be $750 to $900.

On page 50, the figure is given correctly at last—$210 to $794 per acre.

The opponents' supplemental minority report is no more reliable. On page 16 the hidden subsidy is said to be $5,000 per acre. Yet on the same page the irrigation investment is stated to be $750 to $900.

Frankly, I just cannot make sense out of the opponents' figures. I do not see any alternative to accepting the Reclamation Bureau's figures, which were good enough to authorize the Ventura project and the Trinity project during this Congress.

It is apparent to me that the opponents of this bill like to charge all the costs of the storage dams to the irrigation project when it suits their purpose, then add some Houdini compound interest figures to that.

The Colorado River compact apportions water to all the people of the four upper States. They cannot use their water without regulation to satisfy their obligations to the people of the lower basin.

These storage dams will make that regulation possible. It would be most unfair to charge these storage costs to the 11 irrigation projects in this bill. These dams will make it possible for all the upper basin towns, industries, and farmers to use the upper basin's share of the river without encroaching on the lower basin. These regulatory dams are for the general benefit of all the States of the basin, even if no additional irrigation project were ever authorized by the Congress.

I consider this project to be a worthwhile addition to the Federal reclamation program.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in 10 minutes' time obviously I will not be able to answer all of the statements made by my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], but very briefly I would like to call 1 or 2 matters to his attention. He has talked about people speaking out of both sides of their mouths before our committee and that there has been no one before our committee who would go for this project, any so-called expert, with Echo Park Dam out.

Now, for the gentleman's information, I have the statement here of an expert that he might be interested in. This is taken from the committee hearings in 1954, on page 780, quoting the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and here is what he says:

I certainly hope to live to see the time when the upper Colorado River storage project will be built up outside of Echo Park and Split Mountain.

In other words, the gentleman was for the project if we would take these two dams out; so I submit that for the RECORD.

Now, another matter before I get into my main talk, and I want to refer to some of the items that were inserted in the RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], in which a list of names was submitted of organizations who oppose this project. Among the various organizations as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were a number of railroad brotherhoods. In fact, there were some 150 organizations, most of whom were from southern California, with the exception of these few that were placed at the top of the list. Now, I took occasion yesterday to send wires to these union organizations who are listed, according to the gentleman, as opposing the upper Colorado project, and I have in my hand replies from these various organizations. Out of 9 brotherhoods that were reported as being opposed, according to the RECORD of yesterday, I have wires back from 7 of them, and you might be interested in them.

The first is from the Brotherhod of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and they state:

Your wire 28th: Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen has not taken a stand on upper Colorado storage project.

That was signed by H. E. Gilbert, national president, Cleveland, Ohio.

The gentleman also says that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is opposed to the upper Colorado project. I have in my hand a wire which arrived this morning from W. P. Kennedy, national president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and he states:

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen on record supporting upper Colorado River storage project.

I also have in my hand a report from the conductors and brakemen's organization who are listed by the gentleman from California as opposing this project, and Mr. W. D. Johnson, vice president, states in this wire:

Your telegram of February 28 to Mr. R. O. Hughes, president, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, referred to me for reply. This to advise our order has remained neutral in connection with upper Colorado River storage project.

The same applies to the representative of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks who are listed as opposing the project. They state in the wire which arrived today:

Our organization has never taken any position on the upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress.

The gentleman also says that the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen is opposed to this, and I have a wire from the president of the carmen's organization:

In reply to your inquiry regarding the upper Colorado River storage project the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America has taken no stand nationally and neither favors nor opposes this legislation.

The same applies to the railroad telegraphers who say they have taken no position on this project, and the same applies to the Brotherhood of Signalmen.

I refer you to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday in which all of these organizations are listed as having opposed this project, and we have these wires saying they support it or have taken no stand. At this point I desire to submit the wires for the RECORD:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *February 28, 1956.*
The Honorable WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your wire 28th: Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen has not taken a stand on upper Colorado River storage project.

H. E. GILBERT,
National President.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *February 29, 1956.*
The Honorable WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reurtel 28th: Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen on record supporting upper Colorado River storage project.

W. P. KENNEDY,
National President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 29, 1956.*
Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram of February 28 to Mr. R. O. Hughes, president, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, referred to me for reply. This to advise our order has remained neutral in connection with upper Colorado River storage project.

W. D. JOHNSON,
Vice President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 29, 1956.*
Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
New House Office Building:

Retel 28th: Our organization has never taken any position on the upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress.

HARTMAN BARBER,
General Representative,
Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 29, 1956.*
Congressman DAWSON of Utah,
House Office Building:

In reply to your inquiry regarding the upper Colorado River storage project, the Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America has taken no stand nationally and neither favors nor opposes this legislation.

IRVIN L. BARNEY,
The National Legislative Representative.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 29, 1956.*
Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wire 28th: The Order of Railroad Telegraphers has taken no position on upper Colorado River storage project.

G. E. LEIGHTY.

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 28, 1956.*
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Retel today: Our organization has not taken a stand nationally on the upper Colorado River storage project.

JEFFE CLARK,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Signal Men of America.

I leave it to you, my colleagues, to determine who is giving you the facts in regard to this matter. I wish I had more time to go in detail into the matters raised by my friend from Pennsylvania, but I simply remind you that when he says that the Bureau of the Budget has not given approval to this project, you should be reminded that the Bureau of the Budget is directly under the President and the President of the United States, no more than 4 hours ago, made the statement that he approved this project and urged the Congress to pass this measure. I think that is sufficient. We do not need to go much beyond that.

I would like, in the short time that remains, to discuss with you some of the reasons why this project is so important not only to the West but to the entire Nation.

The Almighty has blessed our land with rich, natural resources. But the happiness and well-being of our people and the stature, strength, and wealth of our Nation all depend upon the degree of use and development of those resources. That this Nation stands first in the world is not due to the chance development of an atomic or nuclear bomb, the superiority of our aircraft engineers, or the richness our deep, black soil. We are first because men of vision have planned and built for the needs of tomorrow. We are great because this type of man has anticipated our needs and has succeeded in devloping our natural resources to an extent—and with a speed—unequaled in any place else in the world.

A vast amount of this development came about through the initiative of men operating within the framework of private enterprise. An equally large amount of our Nation's development, however, was either done in partnerships with the Government or by the Federal Government alone. The transcontinental railroad which held a then-scattered Nation together with bands of steel was a joint venture made possible only through the grants to the railroads of large segments of the public domain. Highways which have cemented the States into a Union were Government developments. So was the Panama Canal and other major dredging operations that made our rivers highways of commerce. More recently our Government recognized in uncaptured falling water a resource—a renewable resource—of extreme value to the Nation as a whole. Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and hundreds of lesser structures stand as sound, self-liquidating monuments to the men in and out of Government who recognized this resource and conserved it for the betterment of the people.

But we should be reminded that this Nation has not made these great achievements through the accomplishments of our engineers and scientists alone, great as they may be. The planes that won World War II were built from aluminum refined with power from Grand Coulee and assembled in southern California by power from Hoover Dam and similar dams on the Colorado River. Yet when these dams came up for authorization before Congress, opponents claimed there would never be a market for the power they would produce. Grand Coulee Dam was labeled by its opponents "The white elephant of the Columbia River," and yet today after these great projects have been placed in operation, the Pacific Northwest is already suffering from power shortages.

The upper Colorado River storage project is now before you. This project has been the object of one of the heaviest financed—and I say, most distorted—attacks ever leveled at any single piece of legislation. I do not intend at this time to go into the reasons for southern California's opposition to this vital, national development. Nor do I intend—at this time—to answer all of their ridiculous charges. Let me say at this time, however, that the upper Colorado River storage project is not being sponsored by all Members of Congress from four rich but arid States for the purpose of putting landowners on Pike's Peak in the banana-raising business.

This project is more than the usual reclamation project. It is a long-range, multipurpose, self-liquidating development of an entire river basin—a river basin that drains one-twelfth of the land area of the United States and from the standpoint of mineral and metal wealth, the richest area in the Nation.

The project will store up the water now needed for municipal purposes and now going to waste in the Gulf of California. It will store up industrial water needed for development of the area's raw materials. The water now goes to waste in the Gulf of California. The project will generate power for use of the area's expanding industries—power now lost to the Nation in the present undeveloped stage. In all instances, the cost of municipal, industrial water and power production will be repaid to the Federal Government with interest.

What do these four States now contribute to the wealth of the Nation, and what additional resources can they contribute with the power and water furnished by this development?

Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado, along with Arizona and Nevada, produced in 1954 86.6 percent of the Nation's newly mined copper. This copper—having the value of half a billion dollars per year—is the raw material from which payrolls are made in our eastern and midwestern industrial areas. Continued development of our copper resources depends upon an expanding water supply.

The four upper basin States and Arizona produce nearly 100 percent of the Nation's uranium ore. Continued expansion of uranium mining and milling facilities depends upon more water.

Oil-shale deposits cover more than 4 million acres in 4 States of the upper Colorado River Basin. One formation alone has enough oil shale to produce 100 billion barrels of oil—more than twice as much as has been produced from wells to date in this Nation. Part of these valuable shales have been reserved for the future needs of the Navy. Water and power from the upper Colorado River project are necessary if these reserves are ever to be used.

The world's largest known deposits of phosphate are found in Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and Idaho. Water and power from the Colorado River are needed if these national resources are to be developed.

All but a few of the basic materials required for a chemical industry are found in the four States of the upper basin. With these basic raw materials and with water and power, this Nation can maintain chemical independence. The development of the upper Colorado River project will provide the necessary water and power and the States now have the raw materials.

The presence of these and other mineral resources in the four States has brought about a rapid development of new industries. These industries are not developed at the expense of established industries elsewhere. They are new because the products manufactured or refined are new. The construction of a cobalt refining plant in Utah, for example, does not hurt industries elsewhere. It aids them as it adds its output to the wealth of the Nation. The cobalt plant was built because a domestic supply of cobalt was found and developed in the area.

Each of the four States has a limit of development beyond which it cannot go. This limit is set by the amount of water it can store and use. The area has an annual average rainfall of less than 12 inches per year. Everything that grows—lawns, crops, flowers, vegetables—must be artificially watered by man. Our last remaining source of water is that now flowing to waste in the Gulf of California. This wasted water of the Colorado River was allocated by compact to us nearly 35 years ago.

Last and greatest, we have human resources. Population in these four States is growing at twice the rate of our national population growth. More young men and women are graduating from our high schools and colleges and the rate will continue to increase. The availability of employment in the area for these people depends upon new industry, which in turn depends upon more water.

We people of these four States are eager to unlock this treasure chest of mineral wealth and share its richness with the Nation. In order to do this we must capture and use our water which is now wasting into the sea. The upper Colorado River storage project is the key to the chest.

I mentioned before the opposition to the project from southern California—and that is the source of the opposition. I know there have been occasional newspaper editorials against the project in some smaller newspapers throughout the Nation. These editorials have been based on false information and in checking we always find that the information has been distributed by southern California spokesmen. Southern California wants to maintain the status quo. The campaign against this project shows how far they will go to prevent our four States from ever using our water and power resources.

What is the status quo? And why is southern California opposing any change? Members of this body today are asked to choose between developing a four-State area or letting things go along as they are now. Southern California has a selfish reason to oppose this legislation. Southern California now benefits from power produced by water allocated to the upper basin States. This power is sold at dump-power rates. After generating power, our water either flows to the sea or is—in increasing amounts—used by Mexico to increase her cotton production. Does Congress want to put the lid on the growth of four States in order to continue to subsidize power rates to a few dump-load customers in southern California, like the California-Edison Co. and permit our water to flow on to the sea or to Mexico? Will the ever-increasing cotton production in Mexico bring more long-range benefits to this Nation that the development of this vast and rich four-State area in our own land?

In the beginning, I said that a nation's strength depends upon the use it makes of its resources. The United States is first in the world because it has since its beginning developed its natural resources wisely and rapidly to meet its needs.

We hear a lot, these days, about intercontinental missiles. We compare our progress in nuclear weapons with that of the Soviet Union. We wonder if we are keeping abreast of the Communists in development of strategic bombers. We should, of course. Our safety depends upon it.

But the manufactured weapons of war and defense, in quality and amount, depends upon the development and wise use of the Nation's resources. We continually receive reports on the progress of the Soviet Union in harnessing nuclear power. How is our international rival progressing in development of its national resources—particularly its renewable resources such as falling water? From the best information available to us, it is apparent that the Soviet Union is making giant strides in harnessing its rivers and streams for the generation of hydroelectric power. Let me quote from an article by Paul Wohl on Soviet development, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of February 1, 1956.

Referring to U. S. S. R.'s current 5-year plan and its goals, Mr. Wohl writes:

> One of the big tasks of the current plan is to provide for the equipment and the power to utilize this mineral wealth. With this purpose in mind giant machines of all kinds are to be built, among them heavy presses which can turn out parts for cyclotrons as well as armament and are said to be capable of pressing a whole wing of a fighter plane in a single operation; excavator dredges large enough to load 2 large American-size freight cars with 1 shovel full, and machines for diffusion installations and for the turbines and boilers of propected thermo-power generating stations operating at a steam pressure up to 300 atmospheres and a temperature of 1,200°.
>
> These extremely efficient machines, which take about 3 years to build, represent an investment of billions of rubles. Some of them are unequalled even in the United States.
>
> POWER ARRAY
>
> They will be served by an extraordinary array of power stations, including 2 stations of 3,200,000 kilowatts capacity each, 1 on the Angara and the other on the Yenissei River (Grand Coulee, up to now the world's largest station has a capacity short of 2 million kilowatts).
>
> The power giant on the Angara River near Lake Baikal is to be partly completed and is to begin to operate before December 1960; the other one near Krasnoyarsk in west Siberia will be in construction at the end of the current plan.
>
> Altogether the Soviets intend to take into operation during the current 5-year period waterpower capacity equal to nearly one-quarter of United States waterpower capacity existing in 1953.

At my request, the Library of Congress searched Soviet publications in order to get some picture of the progress of the Communists in construction of hydroelectric generating facilities since the war. The survey was prepared by Mr. John K. Rose, senior specialist in natural resources, and Sergius Yakobson, senior specialist in international affairs. It, too, reveals that the Soviet Union has adopted a crash program of harnessing its rivers.

I herewith submit a tabulation of hydroelectric projects constructed or under construction in the Soviet Union since the conclusion of World War II. In all probability, this tabulation is incomplete. The installed generating capacity

for which we have definite figures in kilowatts totals 8,217,000 kilowatts. To this should be added the capacity of those undisclosed—but large. An analysis of the description of these projects would indicate that an additional 4 million killowatts is under construction in U. S. S. R., bringing its total new hydrogenerating capacity to more than 12 million since World War II.

Soviet Union hydroelectric projects completed or under construction since World War II

Project name	Status	Installed generating capacity
Tsimlyanskaya Dam	Completed April 1953	160,000 kilowatts.
Svir' upper dam	Began 1936; still under construction 1952	160,000 kilowatts.
Sukhumi Dam	Completed 1948	20,000 kilowatts.
Stalingrad	Began 1950; incomplete	1,700,000 kilowatts.
Shcherbakov Dam	5 units completed 1949	220,000 kilowatts.
Ust'-Kamenogorsk Dam	3 units completed 1952	240,000 kilowatts.
Narva	Pledged to be finished 1955	120,000 kilowatts.
Mingechaur Dam	4 units operating July 1954	200,000 kilowatts.
Kuz' Minskaya Dam	In operation 1948	1,000 kilowatts.
Kuybyshev	Work well advanced 1952; first hydrogenerator completed 1954; all scheduled completion 1955.	2,000,000 kilowatts (estimate).
Knyazhaya	Began 1952; first unit in operation 1955	Undisclosed.
Khrami Dam	Began 1935; first unit in operation 1947	90,000 kilowatts.
Kama Dam	First unit in operation 1954; 5 added since; not yet completed.	504,000 kilowatts.
Kakhovka	2 units in operation, 1955	250,000 kilowatts.
Gyumush Dam	Under construction	214,000 kilowatts proposed.
Farkhad Dam	1st unit operating, 1947	120,000 kilowatts.
Dnepr Dam	Reconstruction completed, 1949	648,000 kilowatts.
Bukhtarma	Under construction	420,000 kilowatts proposed.
Angara	do	1,200,000 kilowatts.
Votkinsk	do	Claimed to be one of largest in country.
Shirokovaskaya Dam	1st unit in operation, 1946 or 1947	Undisclosed.
Novosibirsk	Under construction	Undisclosed—"large."
Niva III	In operation, 1950	150,000 kilowatts.
Gor'Kiy	Under construction	Undisclosed but "large."
Known total		8,217,000.

In order to compare our progress in this field with that of the U. S. S. R., I have had the Federal Power Commission tabulate the hydroelectric projects constructed or expanded in the United States since 1945. The installed generating capacity totals 10,176,780 kilowatts. It should be remembered, however, that this figure includes hydroelectric capacity that was installed in Hoover and Grand Coulee Dams before the war and since expanded.

United States publicly owned hydroelectric plants, 1945–55

Project name (50,000 kilowatts and over)	Installed kilowatt capacity	State
Fontana	202,500	North Carolina.
Grand Coulee [1]	1,954,000	Washington.
Shasta	375,000	California.
Wheeler [1]	259,200	Alabama.
Keswick	75,000	California.
Allatoona	74,000	Georgia.
Davis	225,000	Arizona.
Hoover [1]	667,500	Do.
Hungry Horse	285,000	Montana.
Rock Island	135,000	Washington.
J. H. Kerr	204,000	Virginia.
Boone	75,000	Tennessee.
Dale Hollow	54,000	Do.
Detroit	100,000	Oregon.
Flat Iron	71,500	Colorado.
Lookout Point	120,000	Oregon.
Chief Joseph	256,000	Washington.
Denison	70,000	Texas.
Kentucky	160,000	Kentucky.
Fort Peck [1]	85,000	Montana.
Fort Louden	128,000	Tennessee.
Wautauga	50,000	Do.
Wilson [1]	436,000	Alabama.
Center Hill	135,000	Tennessee.
Wolf Creek	270,000	Kentucky.
Pickwick	216,000	Tennessee.
Bull Shoals	160,000	Arkansas.
Ross	270,000	Washington.
Clark Hill	280,000	South Carolina.
Cherokee	120,000	Tennessee.
McNary	700,000	Washington.
Fort Randall	280,000	South Dakota.
Douglas	112,000	Tennessee.
Folsom	162,000	California.
Blakely Mountain	75,000	Arkansas.
Grand total	8,841,700	

[1] Includes total installed capacity part of which was installed before World War II.

United States privately owned hydroelectric plants, 1945–55

Project name (50,000 kilowatts and over)	State	Installed kilowatt capacity
Kerr	Montana	168,000
Bliss	Idaho	75,000
Cresta	California	67,500
Rock Creek	do	113,400
Big Creek No. 4	do	84,000
C. J. Strike	Idaho	82,800
Cabinet Gorge	do	200,000
Osage	Missouri	172,000
Yale	Washington	108,000
Harris	Maine	75,000
Roanoke Rapids	North Carolina	100,080
Pit No. 4	California	90,000
Total		1,335,780

RECAPITULATION	*Installed kilowatt capacity*
Total publicly owned hydroelectric plants	8,841,700
Total privately owned hydroelectric plants	1,335,780
Total	10,177,480

These two surveys give clear indication that this is no time for us to rest on our oars. We must go forward in developing and conserving our resources if we are to remain strong and if we are to afford our increasing population the benefits of an expanding economy. The upper Colorado River storage project—in the last remaining undeveloped major river basin in the Nation—is crying for development. Its vast resources should not be overlooked in favor of the status quo.

I am herewith submitting a series of descriptive articles on the various new projects in Soviet Russia since the end of World War II. A glance at the tremendous amount of construction involved gives a good picture of the program of development now going forward behind the Iron Curtain. The articles were furnished by the Library of Congress.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. As a Member of the House from the State of Utah, can the gentleman tell the House how many souls live in that part of Utah that can be reached by irrigation and power from these projects at the present time?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I would say we have perhaps 3 million souls in the upper basin area, and we are choking to death for water. Water is our lifeblood, without it we cannot exist. I further advise the gentleman that if we do not develop our power resources and the falling water in this country, the day is going to come when we shall regret it. You talk about atomic power. That day is coming when we shall have atomic power, but that does not give us the excuse for wasting our hydroelectric potential. This is a resource that does not wear out. It can produce energy and still be used for other purposes, whereas someday our uranium resources may be exhausted. You should also remember that 90 percent of the uranium produced in this country comes from this very area. We would not have atomic power in this country if we did not have those uranium-producing areas, and we are not going to continue our development unless we are able to get the water to bring these resources into production.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Yes; I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I take the floor to discuss a rather sensitive matter in connection with the upper Colorado River storage project. The words I am about to speak, I hope will not be taken as a reflection upon any of my colleagues. I do want to deal with what seems to me to be false propaganda, masquerading as information on the bill we are presently considering.

There came to my desk this morning a so-called tax map, which as you will see in the red headlines states, "New $4 Billion Tax Burden Threatens You." It further states:

The tax map below shows you how much the upper Colorado River Basin project, now before Congress, would cost the taxpayers of each State in the Nation.

In smaller print you find these words:

Costs to States are based on the percentage of Federal taxes paid by each State, as computed by the Tax Foundation, New York City and Washington, D. C.

My own State, Nebraska, has a green circle around $34 million, as a tax to the State because of this project. The fountainhead of this propaganda and big lie technique comes from the Colorado River Association with an address of 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. It has fooled a lot of people. It fooled newspapers all over the country.

The Jerome North Side News, of Jerome, Idaho, on August 11, 1955,

carried the following editorial, showing they were misled by the information:

DUPED BY CALIFORNIA WATER-LOBBY MISREPRESENTATIONS

During May the News published a sketch illustrating the cost to Idaho of $13,600,000 in new taxes for the upper Colorado River Basin project. The sketch listed the tax which each State would be compelled to pay into the Federal Treasury to finance its share of this huge project. An explanation under the sketch explained that the total cost of the project was $4 billion, and this amount would be charged to each State on a per capita basis. New York was highest, with nearly a half billion in added taxes.

We find now that the publication of this sketch, with the supplemented information, was erroneous. We were duped. A so-called tax foundation with addresses in New York City and Washington, D. C., provided the information, according to the picture explanation. We were duped and have found out that the sketch with the erroneous information and statistics was compiled by the water lobby for the State of California. The upper Colorado bill authorizing the project in its entirety calls for an appropriation from Congress of only $760 million, which is a far cry from $4 billion.

Also, as in the case in most combination irrigation and power projects, the lands to be irrigated under the provisions of the bill will pay off the cost of the construction eventually, just as was the case in Idaho on several Federal and private projects, such as American Falls Dam, Owyhee Dam, etc.

The upper Colorado project is not an exclusive power undertaking such as Hells Canyon. It provides for expansion of irrigation in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, along with the many ramifications of the proposed project. It provides for a payment of 2½ percent interest on all moneys appropriated by Congress for its construction.

Such a program would not cost Idaho $13,600,000 in added taxes. But California is confusing the issues intentionally so that the upper river States will be deprived of their waters and these waters in turn will revert to California. A few years ago California had a plan to appropriate waters from the Snake in Idaho, as farfetched as that may seem, but it was a plan. Idaho should certainly stand by the other Mountain States to preserve these water rights for the beneficial development of the States in which they originate. We have never heard of California sharing with other States such rights as oil rights, fishing rights, or any other natural resources which that great State possesses in its natural boundaries. And it is not logical or consistent that the neighboring States of the West should give up such cherished rights in water which they might hold or should serve to develop for their own use.

Let us take the so-called tax map which was a direct application of the big lie technique of propaganda. A number of newspapers throughout the country used the tax map because it appeared on its face to come from a reputable tax research organization. It even fooled the minority members of our committee because they say in their minority report, and I quote:

The percent of the Federal tax burden by States as computed by the tax foundation shows that less than 2 percent of this required Federal subsidy would be borne by the taxpayers of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the chief beneficiaries of the project.

This tax map was deliberately prepared by the southern California lobby to clock their propaganda with the respectability of the nationally known tax research group.

On July 11, 1955, after these tax maps had been printed by a number of good newspapers throughout the country, the editorial director of the Tax Foundation found it necessary to mail out letters denying any connection with that propaganda effort. Here is the letter:

JULY 11, 1955.

Mr. H. ALLEN PAINTER,
Editor, Hackettstown Gazette,
Hackettstown, N. J.

DEAR MR. PAINTER: Our attention has been called to an editorial appearing in your newspaper on May 12 entitled, "One Hundred Forty-four Million Dollars for New Jersey To Pay." This editorial was reprinted in the daily Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 1955. The editorial says the Tax Foundation mailed to your paper a map showing what it would cost the various States if the upper Colorado River Basin project is approved.

I am writing this letter simply to set the record straight in regard to the map sent you. The map was not sent by the Tax Foundation, which is a private, nonprofit research organization. We have seen copies of this map in other newspapers. It was prepared by the Colorado River Association, with which the Tax Foundation has no connection. Apparently, the Colorado Association adapted a formula the Tax Foundation devised to apportion the tax burden among the various States, applied this to the cost of the upper Colorado River Basin project, and credited the Tax Foundation with the resulting figures. The Foundation did not prepare these figures, which were published without our knowledge or consent.

For your information, I am enclosing the May 1954 issue of 1 of our monthly publications, Tax Outlook, which carries on page 12 an article (A Better Yardstick) describing the formula we developed for allocating the tax burden.

Sincerely yours,

VINCENT D. MARTIRE,
Editorial Director.

The Colorado River Association referred to in the foundation's letter is a registered lobby which has reported receipts in 1955 of $195,700.00.

Mr. Chairman, the other body has a committee investigating lobby activities. A careful, microscopic examination might find some overripe fruit in the activities of the Colorado River Association. This same organization has turned its unrestrained propagandists loose in other areas of public misrepresentation. Not being satisfied with a false map of taxes, they now have other maps relative to rich farmlands in other States that should be placed under cultivation in lieu of a long-range project to develop badly needed water for a four-State semidesert area larger than New England.

This lobby tries to use the prestige of the Soil Conservation Service just as they tried to represent that the source of the tax map was the Tax Foundation. A southern California lobbyist distorts the facts relative to the cost of the self-liquidating Colorado River project, saying it will mean $4 billion in added taxes. They misrepresent the facts, saying the project will bring in 580 million new acres of arid mountain land. The truth is the units proposed for authorization will add about 132,000 acres of new land over an estimated 30-year construction period.

This southern California lobby has also attempted to discredit the engineering studies at the site of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam. The same engineers who had a big hand in building the Hoover, Grand Coulee, the David and the Parkers Dams had a big part in planning, after many years of technical research, the upper Colorado River Basin storage project.

The geology of the Glen Canyon site was thoroughly explored in congressional hearings. The selection of that site was approved by both the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. Mr. Dexheimer, of the Bureau of Reclamation, testified as follows:

I personally have been in on the original exploration and construction of the Hoover and the Shasta Dams and many others in days before they were conceived. I have investigated this site and gone through the geology. We have done a great deal more investigating on Glen Canyon than we have on Hoover or the others. We have no doubt at all but what a dam 700 feet high at the Glen Canyon site is entirely practical, feasible, and economical and would be safe from the engineering standpoint.

Later in the hearings he was asked if these conclusions were tentative. Mr. Dexheimer replied:

No, sir. They are firm conclusion for a structure up to 700 feet. There is no question in our minds.

It is clear that good, competent engineers have made positive evaluations approving the Glen Canyon site. Only the southern California lobby will contribute to the coming unwarranted and irresponsible attacks on the Glen Canyon Dam engineers. I am sure my colleagues will not be taken in or misled by some of their propaganda.

The only major opposition comes from the southern California water lobby which stands to profit by millions of dollars if they can succeed in delaying or defeating development, but the four upper-basin States have water allocated to them in a solemn, interstate compact signed in 1928. If they can defeat this project, they will have the unused water going downstream where their hydropower turbines utilize the water. The rest of the unused water will either be used in California or New Mexico or flow into the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman spoke a few moments ago about the development of uranium resources in the area. As I understand it, it is alleged that the flooding of this area to capture the water resources would destroy the possibility of developing the uranium resources.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I am glad the gentleman raised that question, and I would like to answer it. I do not know whether the Members heard it, but the gentleman says it has been alleged by the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam, if we flood some of this area, it could flood some valuable uranium resources. I think the best information we can get on that subject would be from the Atomic Energy Commission. That is the best source of information I know of.

I have before me a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission, dated February 14, 1956, directed to Senator ANDERSON, in which this statement, among others, is made:

Based upon present knowledge, no appreciable amount of commercial grade uranium or other radioactive ore would be inundated by the reservoir to be formed by the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

JESSE C. JOHNSON,
Director of the Division of Raw Materials, Atomic Energy Commission.

I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman claimed that there was a great potential development of uranium in the area. Where will this uranium be found, if the statement the gentleman just read is true?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. May I point out to the gentleman that the only area covered by this reservoir is in the bed of the stream. We have thousands and thousands of acres out there, all around the area, which is uranium country, and so this is a very small spot, and according to the Atomic Energy Commission they know of no considerable amount of uranium in the bed of that stream. Of course, it takes water to conduct these milling operations out there, and it takes water for the people to live there to develop them. I wish I had the time to develop this further, but in the interest of time I am going to insert in the RECORD, under permission previously granted to me, the details I have referred to. I hope the Members will take the time tomorrow to read it in the RECORD and examine it in some detail.

PROJECT: TSIMLYANSKAYA DAM

Location: The Tsimlyanskaya hydro power development, an essential part of the Volga-Don waterway system, is located near the new Tsimlyanskaya Stanitsa in Rostovskaya Oblast'. The powerplant is on the left bank of the Don River.

Brief history: The development was built between 1949 and 1952. The power station generated its first industrial current in June 1952. Navigation from the Sea of Azov to the reservoir began in April 1953. The Donskoy main irrigation canal was filled with water from the reservoir in April 1953.

Brief description: The dam has the functions of navigation, irrigation, and water supply as well as of power production. The major feature is a concrete gravity spillway dam 495.5 meters long and 60 meters wide at crest, with spillway crest 19 meters above the tail race level. Earth dams totaling 12.8 kilometers in length and with a base 300 meters wide include 9.9 kilometers of hydraulic fill with a maximum height of 35 meters, and 2.9 kilometers of rolled-fill with a maximum height of 11.8 meters. The run-of-the-river hydroelectric power station is equipped with four vertical 6-blade, 150-ton Kaplan turbines, coupled directly with four 40,000 kilowatts vertical umbrella type generators. There are two navigation locks, a river harbor, a railroad and highway across the dam, a fish-lock elevator and uncompleted installations to supply irrigation water to 750,000 hectares and water supply to an area of 2 million hectares. The water distributing system will include the 190 kilometers long Donskoy main irrigation canal extending from the reservoir, other distributing canals totaling 568 kilometers in length and about 140 pumping stations.

Capacity: The reservoir, with a maximum width of 38 kilometers and an average depth 8.4 meters raises the elevation of the river as far as 350 to 360 kilometers. The area at normal elevation is 2,700 square kilometers and total capacity is 24,000,000,000 cubic meters with an effective capacity of 12,600,000,000 cubic meters.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-ampere): Installed: 160,000 kilowatts (1953).

Electric output (kilowatt-hour/year): Proposed: 500 million kilowatt-hours to 650 million kilowatt-hours (1952).

Some facts relating to cost: Earth work amounted to some 76,400,000 cubic meters, of which 29,500,000 cubic meters were obtained by the hydraulic-fill method. Concrete and reinforced concrete amounted to 1,900,000 cubic meters, of which 1,213,700 cubic meters were used on the spillway, powerhouse, fish-lock elevator, etc.

Selected references: Razin, N. V., Peryshkin, G. A., Smirnov, K. I. Tsimlyanskiy Gidrouzel, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 12, December 1952, pages 6–11; V Sovete Ministrov S. S. S. R. Ostroitel'stve Volgo-Donskogo Sudokhodnogo Kanala I Oroshenii Zemel' V Rostovskoy I Stalingradskoy Oblastyakh, Gidrotekhnicheskoye. Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 1, January 1951, pages 1–3.

PROJECT: SVIR' UPPER DAM

Location: On the Svir' River, near Podporozh'ye village, some 96 kilometers downstream from Lake Onega. The dam with its lock, will be a part of the Mariinsky inland waterway system which connects the Baltic Sea, the Volga River Basin and the Northern White Sea waterway system.

Brief history: Construction began in 1936; opening was proposed for 1938, then postponed to 1942. There were interruptions and flooding during the war years. Work was underway again by 1946 but the dam was still under construction in 1952.

Brief description: The concrete dam is thought to be about 26 meters high and of the gravity type. Little information is available on the earth dam other than that it is of the embankment type.

A one chamber lock of reinforced concrete is indicated for the left bank of the river, with a capacity estimated at about 28 ships per 24 hours. The powerhouse is planned for location between the spillway section and the lock. Proposed installations would include 4 Kaplan-type vertical turbines of 37,500 horsepower rating and 4 generators of 25,000 kilovolt-ampere rating. There will be interconnection with the Lower Svir' plant for transmitting energy to Leningrad.

Capacity: There will be no reservoir, the plant will be of the run-of-the-river type with pondage formed by the dam.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): Projected 144,000 kilowatts (1937); projected 160,000 kilowatts (1939).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): 700 million kilowatt-hours estimated (1937).

Some facts relating to cost: By 1939 the following work had been completed: 653,000 cubic meters of concrete used; 2,651,500 cubic meters of earth used for embankment; 4,317,000 cubic meters of earth excavated; 200,000 cubic meters of wood piling used; 1,204 meters of steel cut-off piling used.

By April 1948, 615,000 cubic meters of earthwork and 18,000 cubic meters of concrete work were reported as completed. There are indications that nearly 265,000 cubic meters of excavation work may have been carried out during 1949 and 1950.

Selected references: Svir'stroy (Leningrad), issues 3, 5, and 6, 1935, pages 3–87; Kudyrskiy, A. R. Osrovniye Polozheniya Tekhnicheskogo Proyerta Elektromekhanicheskoy Chasti Gidrostantsii, Svir' II, Svir'stroy (Leningrad), No. 12, 1937, pages 158–181.

PROJECT: SUKHUMI DAM

Location: The main dam is located on the East Gumista River, between Andreyevskoye and Mikhaylovskoye villages, about 32 kilometers northeast of Sukhumi, in the Abkhazskaya A. S. S. R. An auxiliary dam on the Tsumur River, together with the above, supply water to the powerhouse, which is located on the West Gumista River.

Brief history: Work began in 1933 and was completed in 1948.

Brief description: The rivers being nonnavigable, this project serves for power production purposes only. The main dam on the East Gumista is indicated as a concrete spillway dam with crest gate more than 28 meters above its foundation in height and has a 10-meter spillway. The auxiliary dam of concrete on the Tsumur is of spillway type with sluice gate 5 meters high and 14 meters wide at the crest. A 327-meter tunnel connects this part of the project with the East Gumista. The generated power is indicated as supplied to the town of Sukhumi and perhaps to a section of the Black Sea Railroad.

Capacity: No reservoir is formed by either dam.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): Proposed, 20,000 kilowatts (1937).

Electric output (kilowatt-hour/year): Proposed 100 million kilowatt-hours (1937).

Some facts relating to cost (materials used):

The volume of work on the East Gumista River:
Earthwork, 1,120 cubic meters.
Rockwork, 26,418 cubic meters.
Concrete, 11,060 cubic meters.
Reinforced concrete, 3,427 cubic meters.
Rock fill, 5,840 cubic meters.
Granite facing, 490 cubic meters.
Volume of work on the Tsumur headworks:
Earthwork, 1,334 cubic meters.
Rockwork, 7,000 cubic meters.
Concrete, 4,500 cubic meters.
Reinforced concrete, 53 cubic meters.
Granite facing, 406 cubic meters.
Work on pressure tunnel:
Rockwork, 16,925 cubic meters.
Concrete, 13,263 cubic meters.
Reinforcement, 349 tons.
Work on powerhouse:
Earthwork, 17,100 cubic meters.
Rockwork, 51,789 cubic meters.
Concrete, 11,284 cubic meters.
Reinforced concrete, 4,529 cubic meters.
Stone laying, 3,897 cubic meters.

Selected references: Rutkovskiy, S. G. Gidrotekhnicheskaya Ustanovka NA R. Gumiste-Sukhumges, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 7, 1937, page 34.

PROJECT: STALINGRAD

Location: On the Volga at its confluence with the Aktuba, on the northern outskirts of Stalingrad, Stalingradskaya, Oblast RSFSR.

Brief history: Organizational and preparatory work began in 1950; actual construction work on the foundation pit for the dam and powerhouse was to begin in the second half of 1951. The first concrete was poured for the powerhouse on September 5, 1954. The spillway dam construction pit was drained, commencing on June 27, 1955, preparatory to further excavation and eventual construction. The project was initially scheduled for completion in 1955, or before But it appears to have been considerably delayed, with one statement being to the effect that five times as much rock and gravel would be required in 1956 as in 1955.

Brief description: It is claimed by the Soviets that it will be the largest construction project on the Volga. The dam, largely of earthen construction, will be over 5 kilometers in total length and high enough to raise the water level 26 meters. The dam itself will be up to 45 meters high. It will be of the nonoverflow type, with the earth portions connecting the spillway, pier, and lock portions to the banks. The right bank earth dam will be 1,300 to 1,400 meters long, whereas the left bank earth dam will be

2,300 meters in length. The foundation pit for power plant in some places exceeds 30 meters in depth and is 75 hectares in area.

Directly related is the construction of the gravity-flow Volga-Ural Canal, about 650 kilometers long, which has been indicated for completion in 1956. Work (excavation) was indicated as about to start in 1952. Also a bypass canal, 6 kilometers long, was being dug in 1954 for ships to pass around the dam and powerhouse, apparently a temporary diversion until the project, including locks, should be completed.

The 400 kilovolt transmission line from Stalingrad-Moscow will be about 1,100 kilometers long. It is indicated that the energy produced will be distributed approximately as follows: 4 billion kilowatt-hours to Moscow; 1,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours to central areas; 2,800,000,000 kilowatt-hours to Saratov, Stalingrad and Astrakhan areas; 2 billion kilowatt-hours for irrigation and water supply in the trans-Volga and Caspian lowland areas.

Some 1,500,000,000 hectares of land will be irrigated due to the electric energy produced by the Stalingrad Power Plant and 11,500,000,000 hectares will thereby be enabled to have a sufficient water supply.

Included will be turbines and generators of the same type as at Kuybyshev but perhaps only 17 instead of 20 of them.

Capacity: It is estimated that the reservoir, about 650 kilometers long and 30 kilometers wide, will cover 4,500 square kilometers, much of it good farm land.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-ampere): from a low of 1,300,000 kilowatts to 1,700,000 kilowatts (usual) to 2,310,000 kilowatt (recent high estimate).

Electric output (kilowatt-hour-year): about 10 billion kilowatt-hours (estimated for average year).

Some facts relating to cost: 75 million cubic meters of earth work are reported as having been completed, including 62 million by hydraulic fill. The total amount of earth to be moved is indicated as 150 million cubic meters, or, including the canal, in excess of 500 million cubic meters. At least 7 million cubic meters of concrete will be poured. About 400,000 cubic meters of concrete have been poured, with the amount to increase to 1,500,000 cubic meters in 1956 and 3 million cubic meters per year eventually, for a period not indicated.

Selected references: The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, volume vii, No. 35, October 12, 1955, pages 17–18, which carries a long item from Pravda; Loginov, F. At the Construction Site of the Stalingrad Hydroelectric Power Plant, Pravda, October 25, 1954, page 2; Davydov, Eng. M. The Giant Power Development in Stalingrad, Kul'turno-Prosvetitel'nava rabota, 1952.

PROJECT: SHCHERBAKOV DAM

Location: This most northeasterly project of the upper Volga power development (which includes Uglich and Ivan'kovo as well) is near the confluence of the Volga and Sheksna, a left tributary. Shcherbakov is the nearest large town.

Brief history: Work began in the winter of 1935–36. The first unit was installed in November 1941, development being continued during the war in order to supply electric power to Moscow. A second unit was installed in January 1942, a third in September 1945 and a fifth in 1949.

Brief description: The installations on the Volga consist of a concrete gravity spillway dam a little more than 30 meters in height above the river bed and foundations, and about 100 meters in length at crown, with 8 sluices, each 8.5 meters wide and 5 meters high. There are embankments on both banks, a twin lock at the left and a right-bank earth dam.

The development on the Sheksna River includes embankments on both banks, a powerhouse on the right bank and a nonoverflow earth dam which rises to a height of 33.4 meters above river bed and foundations, and is 0.5 kilometers wide at the base and 700 meters in length at crown. The right-bank embankment is 3.4 kilometers long, 16 meters high, has a 2,200,000 cubic meter volume and was built by the hydraulic-fill method. The smaller left-bank embankment, built by the same method, is only 230,000 cubic meters in volume, is 500 meters long and has a maximum height of 15 meters.

The lock on the Volga makes possible navigation control from Gor'kiy to Uglich. Five Kaplan 55,000-kilowatt turbines are included in the power installations, which belongs to the Moscow power system and supplies power to the capital.

Capacity: The reservoir has an area of 4,700 square kilometers, the largest man-made reservoir in the U. S. S. R. It is over 100 kilometers long and 50 to 60 kilometers wide; depth is as much as 26 meters in places. Maximum capacity is given as 11 billion cubic meters and effective capacity as 7.6 billion cubic meters.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes) proposed: 220,000 kilowatts (1936), 330,000 kilowatts (1938); installed: 220,000 kilowatts (1949).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours per year) proposed: 1 billion kilowatt-hours (1936), 1 billion kilowatt hours (1939); achieved: 92 million kilowatt-hours (1946).

Some facts relating to cost: The amount of work needed was indicated:

Earth work, 30 million cubic meters.
Concrete, 1,400,000 cubic meters.
Equipment, 7,800 tons.
Metal structures, 21,000 tons.
Brick laying, 7 million pieces.
Rock work, 270,000 square meters.
Hydraulic-fill, 10,800,000 cubic meters.

Selected references: Arngol'd. Verkhnevolzhskiye Gidroustanovki. Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 1, 1936, page 43; Vyazemskiy O. V. and Veselov, V. V., Gidrostantsiya S Nizkim Mashinnym Zalom I Vneshnim Raspolozheniyem Mashinnykh Kranov; Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Mascow), No. 1/2, 1944, page 16.

PROJECT: UST'-KAMENOGORSK DAM

Location: On the Irtysh River, a left tributary of the Ob' River, at the village of Ablaketka, above the confluence of the Ablaketka and Irtysh Rivers, about 12 km. from the town of Ust'-Kamenogorsk in Vostochno-Kazakhstanskaya oblast', Kazakh SSR.

Brief history: Preparatory work commenced in 1938 and actual work started in 1944. The first concrete was poured in 1948. The second unit was installed in August 1952. The third unit was installed in December 1952.

Brief description: This is the first completed project of 3 planned since 1938 on the Irtysh River. It will be the second upstream dam when the entire system is built. There are more than the usual uncertainties as to details, two full plans having been prepared, with, as yet no definite information as to which was carried out. The dam is indicated as 45 meters thick at the base, 67.2 meters in maximum height, and perhaps as much as 421.7 meters in length at the crown. The maximum head would be about 40–41 meters. The spillway would be 122 meters, the nonoverflow section at the left bank 120 meters and the nonoverflow section between lock and right bank 70 meters. A 1-chamber lock 180 meters long serves navigation. A 6 unit powerhouse was planned for Francis, 40,000 kilowatts, 125 revolutions per minute turbines and generators of the umbrella type. The plant is interconnected with the Altay Power System.

Capacity: The dam raises the water level in the river for 80 kilometers.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): 240,000 kilowatts (proposed in 1939).

Some facts related to cost: 600,000 cubic meters of concrete was used for the dam.

Selected references: Ust'-Kamenogorskaya Gidroelektrostantsiya, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow) No. 6, 1947, page 27; Korolev, A. A., Ust'-Kameno gorskaya Gidroelektricheskaya Stantsiya Na Reke Irtyshe, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 6, page 1.

PROJECT: NARVA

Location: Slightly below the famous falls, near Narva, Leningrad Oblast', RSFSR.

Brief history: Final tests on the first turbine under pressure were being made in late September 1955 and there was a pledge to finish the plant in 1955.

Brief description: The dam, of the reinforced concrete spillway type, will not be high and will form only a small head. There will be earth dams on both the right and left of the spillway dam. The powerhouse is below and on the right side of the river, served by a diversion canal 2 kilometers long.

Capacity: The reservoir will have an area of 20,000 hectares, otherwise mentioned as 200 square kilometers. There is mention of two turbines and 120,000 kilowatt capacity.

Some facts relating to cost: About 2 million cubic meters of earth and 500,000 cubic meters of rock were excavated.

Selected reference: A. A. Belyakov, At the Narva Waterfalls. Nauka i Zhizn' No. 8, 1954, pp. 3–5.

PROJECT: MINGECHAUR DAM

Location: This dam on the Kura River is located near the town of Mingechaur (and the railroad station of the same name) in the Khaldanskiy Rayon, Azerbaidzhan SSR.

Brief history: Earth works were first started in early 1945. In June 1947 work was started on the foundation pit. In 1951 work was started on the hydraulic fill dam. In 1953 the Mingechaur Sea appeared on the map. As of January 1954, basic work at Mingechaur was completed. At that time the water intake was built, as well as the first stage of the powerhouse for three generating units, the outdoor step-up substation and the step-down receiving substation, etc. On January 10, 1954, the two first generating units were put in operation. In July 1954, the fourth unit was put in operation.

Brief description: The basic purpose of this development is the regulation of the flow of the Kura River, not only for power production but for irrigation and improvement of navigation between the town of Yevlakh and the Caspian Sea. There is, however, no navigation lock.

The dam, an earth dam of hydraulic-fill type, built in the shape of a deep arch is 1,540 meters in total length, 520 meters thick at the base and has a maximum height above foundations of 87.5 meters. Various reinforced concrete structures, intakes, spillway and discharge sluices, are built into the earth dam. The powerhouse, located at the tail race slope of the dam, included installations of 4 vertical Francis turbines and 4 vertical 50,000 kilowatts generators as of July 1954, with installation of 2 more units anticipated. Four main irrigation canals are fed from the reservoir to irrigate about 1,500,000 hectares of Kura and Araks lowland.

Capacity: The reservoir is about 75 kilometers in length, 13 kilometers in width, has an area of 630 square kilometers and a capacity of about 17 cubic meters.

Electric capacity (kilowatt-amperes): proposed, 300,000 kilowatts (1946 and later); installed, 200,000 kilowatts (as of July 1954).

It was anticipated that all six generating units would be in operation at full capacity at the end of 1954, giving an installed capacity of 300,000 kilowatts.

Electric output (kilowatt hours/year): No information available except what may be derived by computation from above.

Some facts relating to cost: The total volume of the earth dam is about 30 million cubic meters. It was necessary to excavate about 9 million cubic meters of earth for the foundation of the dam and other structures. The total volume of reinforced concrete structures in the development is about 1 million cubic meters.

Selected references: Veytkov, F. L. Utverzhdeniye Tekhnicheskogo Proyekta Mingechaurskogo Gidrouzla, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1947, No. 8, page 28; Domanskiy, V. E. Opyt Vozeedeniya Krupnoy Namyvnoy Plotiny, Gidrotkhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1954, No. 1, pages 10–13.

PROJECT: KUZ'MINSKAYA DAM

Location: It is located on the Oka River, a right tributary of the Volga, near Kuz'minskaya Village, upstream from the town of Ryazan', Ryabanskaya Oblast.

Brief history: The dam was completed by the end of 1946 and put in operation in 1948.

Brief description: No details are available but this apparently is a low dam on a rather small river. The river varies from 140 to 430 meters in width and the depth near Ryazan' varies from 2 to 5 meters with an extreme of 10 meters. The lock in the dam contributes to control of navigation on the river. The power is apparently largely utilized by nearby collective farms.

Capacity: The river serves as a reservoir.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): Installed capacity 1,000 kilowatts.

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): 123,000 kilowatt-hours (1953).

Some facts relating to costs: 10,000 cubic meters of earth excavated; 4,500 cubic meters of concrete work done; 5,000 cubic meters of lumber used; 625 tons of iron used and 1,500 tons of cement used.

Selected references: Azmechatel'nyye Peremeny, Nauka i Zhizn' (Moscow), No. 1, 1953, pp. 30–32; Basseyn Verkhney Volgi U Oki, Spravochnik Po Vodnym Resursam SSSR (Moscow), 1936, vol. 3, pt. 2, pp. 130–131.

PROJECT: KUYBYSHEV

Location: Near Zhigulevsk on the Samara bend of the lower Volga, Kuybyshevskaya Oblast', RSFSR.

Brief history: Work was reported as well advanced in 1952 and scheduled for completion in 1955 or shortly thereafter. The first hydrogenerator was reported as completed early in 1954. The lower navigation lock, said to have been built in less than 4 years, was reported as opened on July 31, 1955. Eight turbines were reported as having been delivered in March 1955.

Brief description: The dam is largely of earth construction, about 3.9 kilometers in length, 36 meters wide, and rises to a height of 36 meters. Initial construction efforts involved a huge coffer dam 4.5 kilometers long and 18 meters high at some points. A third coffer dam, to go around the ferroconcrete spillway dam excavation, was 8 kilometers long. Four large concrete constructions are included—the spillway dam, the powerhouse, and upper and lower locks. The spillway dam is 1,200 meters long. Shiplocks will consist of 2 sets of locks on 2 levels and a 3-kilometer sector between where winter anchorage and shipyard will be. Railway lines were built to the project at both banks of the river, some 162 kilometers in total. An overhead cableway to transport materials to concrete plants was erected.

It was reported that 10 plants with a total output of 4,500,000 cubic meters of concrete per year were built for the construction of the development. About 500 million kilowatt-hours per year will be devoted to irrigation pumping for 1 million hectares of land in the trans-Volga area.

There will be 17 to 20 adjustable blade hydroturbines rated at 126,000 kilowatts each for normal head and sometimes estimated as low as 105,000 kilowatts for minimum head, each to weigh 1,600 tons. It is claimed by the Soviets that the generators are the largest ever assembled. They will be 40 meters tall, equivalent to an 8 or 9 story building in height. Each hour a mass of water equal to 1,800,000 cubic meters, a lake 1 kilometer square and 2 meters deep, will flow through the turbine. The foundation pit of the spillway section will be 1,200 meters long, 450 meters wide, and 20 meters deep—that for the powerplant will be 300 meters long and 45 to 50 meters deep. Many wells and pumping are required to control seepage.

The transmission will involve new design to transmit alternating 3-phase at 400 kilovolts. More than 900 kilometers of transmission line will be involved and 50,000 tons of steel will be used in the erection, along with 700,000 cubic meters of earthwork and 200,000 cubic meters of concrete work. The conductor will be aluminum over a steel core; some 20,000 kilometers of cable and 600,000 insulators will be involved. Towers, about half a kilometer apart, will weigh 7 to 18 tons and be as tall as a 7 story building. Split conductors will be used—3 conductors for each phase of alternating current, or 9 conductors for the 3-phase transmission. Uncommon use will be made of condensers. It is anticipated that about 6 billion kilowatt-hours per year will be transmitted to Moscow, but to utilize this power it will be necessary to reorganize the power system of Moscow, especially to reconstruct its underground cable network.

Capacity: The Kuybyshev Sea will stretch 580 kilometers along the Volga, 300 kilometers along the Kama, will have a maximum width of 40 kilometers, cover an area of more that 5,500 square kilometers, and have a capacity of 19,500,000,000 cubic meters.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): 1,700,000 kilowatts (lower estimate), 2 million kilowatts (usual estimate), and 2,100,000 kilowatts (higher estimate).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): 11 billion kilowatt-hours (estimated annual average).

Some facts relating to cost: It perhaps should be noted that this development, much more than most, was to a comparatively high degree mechanized and employed a considerable amount of what we may call for want of a better term, automation. A very early estimate (1936) was that 206,000,000 cubic meters of earth and rock would be excavated and over 3 million cubic meters of concrete would be poured. Some 12 billion cubic meters were removed from the foundation pit for the powerhouse. The two lower lock chambers were reported as requiring 630,000 cubic meters of concrete, more than 5 million cubic meters of earth were moved and placed, 35,000 tons of structures installed. More than 30,000 tons of piling were driven. For the main structures it is estimated that 160 million cubic meters of earthwork are required, 8 million cubic meters of concrete and reinforced concrete and almost 100,000 tons of metal constructions assembled.

Selected references: Electrification of the U. S. S. R., U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin, December 31, 1951, p. 763, Venikov, V. A., 400 kilovolt Transmission Line Nauka i Zhizn', No. 4, April 1953, pages 6–12; Razin, N. V. Mekhanizatsiya Zemlyanykh Rabot Na Kuybyshevgidrostroye (Mechanization of Earthwork at Kuybyshev Hydro Power Construction Project) Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo, No. 1, 1954, pages 5–10; Kronzin I., Kuybyshev GES Must be Put Into Operation in 1955, Pravda, November 26, 1954, page 2; Decisive Phase at the Great Construction, Pravda, March 7, 1955, page 2.

PROJECT: KNYAZHAYA GUBA

Location: Beyond the Arctic Circle, on the Kovda River, where it empties into Kandalaksha Bay of the White Sea, Murmansk Province.

Brief history: After exploratory work, actual work on the station began in early 1952. The first unit of the station was put in operation in October 1955.

Brief description: The river and lake (Kovdozero) exits were blocked, and water sent from the elevated lake across a narrow isthmus to the sea, utilizing the total drop of about 53 meters. The blocking dam of earth is 900 meters long. Longer dikes were built at low points in the ridge. The station is said to be completely automatic.

Capacity: Reservoir has a usable volume of almost 2 billion cubic meters.

Some facts relating to cost: In this previously unsettled area it was necessary to build a settlement as well as the project, 6,200,000 cubic meters of earth and rock were moved, 115,000 cubic meters of concrete poured and 1,300 tons of steel used, as well as roads, powerlines and telephone lines built.

Selected references: Especially Izvestia and Pravda for October 21, 1955, as reported by the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, vol. vii, No. 42, November 30, 1955, p. 15 et seq.

PROJECT: KHRAMI DAM

Location: On the Khrami River near its confluence with the Agri-Chay River, near the village of Barmaksiz in Tsalkinskiy Rayon, Georgian S. S. R.

Brief history: Construction started in 1935; one tunnel was completed in 1939. Construction was interrupted by the war but there is no information on damage. Work progressed and the reservoir was filled in 1946. The first generating unit was put into operation late in December 1947.

Brief description: The full development includes dam works, diversion and power station. The headworks consists of the dam, the overflow saddle spillway, and a 221 meters long bypass tunnel discharge conduit. The dam is of the rock-fill type with a stainless steel facing on the headrace side, a channel discharge spillway on the left side and a bypass discharge tunnel on the right side. The maximum height of the dam above foundations is 30 meters. The length at crown is 113.5 meters.

Capacity: The capacity of the reservoir is variously estimated as 230 million cubic meters to about 350 million cubic meters.

The power station is operated as an interconnected peakload plant to cover deficiencies in power supply during dry months when other Georgian power stations have a decline in production. Installations include 3 30,000-kilowatt generators.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): proposed 90,000 kilowatts (1937, 1939); installed, 90,000 kilowatts (1951).

Electric output (kilowatt-hour/year): proposed 27 million kilowatt-hours (1937).

Some facts relating to cost:

Total volume of earth and rock work on dam, 1 million cubic meters.

Total concrete work, 200,000 cubic meters.

Metal structures and reinforcements, 25,000 tons.

Selected references: Eristov, V. S. Plotina Iz Kamennoy Nabroski, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1945, No. 4/5, pp. 3–7; No. 6, pp. 1–7; Sooruzheniye Naporno Tunnelya Vysokonapornoy Reguliruyushchey Ges Bol'shoy Moshchnosti, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1948, No. 11, pp. 15–19 and No. 12, pp. 17–23.

PROJECT: KAMA DAM

Location: On the Kama River, a left tributary of the Volga, in the West Ural Mountain section of the U. S. S. R., 3 kilometers

downstream from the Chusovaya-Kama confluences and immediately north of the town of Molotov. It is the first large hydropower development in the Ural Mountains region.

Brief history: Preliminary surveys were made in 1935. Construction was interrupted by World War II but resumed in 1947. The first generating unit was put in operation in September 1954 and at least five more units were installed and interconnected with the system soon thereafter. Development, however, is not yet completed.

Brief description: The development includes a nonoverflow earth dam 1,250 meters in length of which 655 meters is in the river bed, and the remainder across the marshland of the left bank. There is a concrete spillway dam 386 meters in length with combined built-in generating units. This is noteworthy as the first structure of its kind in the U. S. S. R.—the generating units being installed under the spillway openings, inside the dam, between the piers. There are 24 spillway openings. Turbines are of a medium capacity (21,000 kilowatts). Six were installed in 1954 and the plan includes six more to be installed by the end of 1955, with 24 as the ultimate goal. The plant will provide power for the Molotov, Sverdlovsk, and Chelyabinsk regions. A six-chamber twin navigation lock is under construction, through which it is anticipated considerable amounts of ores and grains, and large amounts of timber will move.

Capacity: The dam is expected to create a reservoir covering 200,000 hectare with a volume of 10 cubic kilometers. It will raise the water level for a distance of 330 kilometers on the Kama River and 170 kilometers on the Chusovaya River. The reservoir will be 25 to 30 kilometers wide in places and the water level will be raised 21 meters.

Electric capacity (kilowatt-amperes): 350,000 kilowatts (proposed in 1935); 125,000 kilowatts (installed in 1954); 504,000 kilowatts (ultimate proposed).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): No information other than what may be derived by computation from the above.

Some facts relating to cost: The following amounts of materials were indicated as used:

Excavation work, 6,900,000 cubic meters.

Rock work, 520,000 cubic meters.

Hydraulic fill, 14,200,000 cubic meters.

Concrete and reinforced concrete, 970,000 cubic meters.

Steel structures and bridges, 25,800 tons.

Steel piling, 22,500 tons.

Selected references: Vasil'yev, A. F., Perekrytiye Reki Pri Stroitel'stve Krupnoy Ges Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1954, No. 2, page 1; Zagorodnikov, B. I., Kamskaya Gidroelektricheskaya Stantsiya Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1948, No. 12, page 30; Uspenskiy, B. S., O Vybore Tipa Gidroelektrostantsiy Gidrotekhnicheskove Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1948, No. 3, page 19.

PROJECT: KAKHOVKA

Location: Just below Kakhovka and near Kazatskoye Village on the lower Dnepr, Khersonskaya Oblast', Ukraine,

Brief history: Construction began about 1950. Navigation locks were used beginning in June 1955. The first turbine unit was put in production in October 1955 and the second on November 23, 1955.

Brief description: A hydraulic-fill dam cuts across the river to a reinforced concrete dam about 450 meters long with 28 spillways. Then comes the powerhouse, with 6 turbines weighing about 2,000 tons each, next to which is the lock, at the entrance of which stands the intake structure. The hydraulic-fill dam continues to the outskirts of Novaya Kakhovka; beyond which starts the Krasnoznamenskiy irrigation canal, to serve 2,400,000 acres of semiarid steppe. The earth dam will total 2.5 to 3.0 kilometers. Additionally, it is necessary to protect 2 important places with dikes; Marganets will be protected by dikes 7.5 kilometers long, 11 meters high, and containing 4,600,000 cubic meters of hydraulic fill. Nikopol' will be protected by a dike 19 meters high which already contains 150,000 tons of granite and 1,300,000 cubic meters of fill. Even so, it was reported necessary to move from the inundated area over 250 kilometers of railroad and automobile highways and thousands of homes.

Apparently peak power will be available in spring and summer, at which time this development will be the main source of power to Donbass and Rostov.

Capacity: The level of the Kakhovka Sea will rise 8 meters, it will extend for 200 kilometers, and will be 20 to 25 kilometers wide, will cover 2,000 square kilometers; the capacity will be as much as 19 billion cubic meters.

Electric capacity (kilowatt-amperes): 250,000 kilowatts (as initially planned).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): 1,400 million kilowatt-hours (estimated annual average). Another estimate puts the average as low as 1,200 million kilowatt-hours.

Some facts relating to cost: More than 27 million cubic meters of earth were moved, or to be moved. Some 1,250,000 cubic meters of concrete were poured; 120,000 tons of steel structure, reinforcements, and equipment were assembled, and 30,000 tons of piling were driven.

Selected references: Pravda, October 19, 1955, page 2, as carried by the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, volume vii, No. 42, November 30, 1955, page 14; the "Pet" Child of the Peoples of the Soviet Union, Slavyan, No. 6, June 1954, pages 42–46; Andrianov, S., Kakhovka Hydroelectric Power Plant Will Start Generating Power for the Country Ahead of Schedule, Pravda, July 29, 1955, page 2.

PROJECT: GYUMUSH DAM

Location: The powerhouse is on the left bank of the Razdan River, about 6.6 kilometers from the village of Gyumush, Armenian, S. S. R. The dam itself is near the village of Agpara, about 35 kilometers from Lake Sevan. This project belongs to the Lake Sevan-Razdan River hydropower development, for which eight powerplants were proposed for construction on the Razdan River.

Brief history: The start of construction was planned for 1936 with operation to begin at the end of 1939. However, in 1948 auxiliary structures were being constructed and a major part of the excavation work was apparently done in 1946–47. At the end of 1952, construction work was indicated as nearing completion, but the power station was still under construction.

Brief description: The river is not navigable—so the dam serves only for production of power. The headworks consists of a rock-fill dam having a maximum height above riverbed and above foundations of 15.5 meters, a length of 163 meters of which 105 meters is length at crown. An earth dam of maximum height of 5.5 meters and 164 meters length is involved as is a water intake, 30 meters wide, with an automatic spillway. The diversion canal is 18.4 kilometers long, of which about 7 kilometers is open canals and aqueducts and 11.3 kilometers of tunnels. The capacity is 60 cubic meters per second. The power installations do, or will, include 6 vertical, 45,000-kilowatt Francis turbines coupled with 43,000-kilowatt generators. An auxiliary circuit consists of a generator driven by a Pelton turbine. The power will be fed into the Armenian and Trans-Caucasian networks.

Capacity: Lake Sevan, into which 27 rivers and streams flow, but only the Razdan River flows out, serves as a natural reservoir.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): Proposed 260,000 kilowatts (1936); proposed 214,000 kilowatts (1947).

Electric output (kilowatt-hour/year) proposed: 861 million kilowatt-hours (1936) for average year; 1 billion kilowatt-hours (1936) in dry years to cover shortages elsewhere; 930 million kilowatt-hours (1947).

Some facts relating to cost: Materials used: The estimated volume of work is:

Rock and earth work, $3,600,000 cubic meters.

Tunnel excavation, 480,000 cubic meters.

Concrete work, 650,000 cubic meters.

Metal structures (headworks dam only), 290 cubic meters.

Selected references: Meyer, R. A., Gyumushskaya Gidrostantsiya Sevano-Zanginskogo Kaskada, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1936, No. 10, pages 30–35; Kechek, K., Kanakirskaya Ges, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1934, No. 9, pages 25–33.

PROJECT: FARKHAD DAM

Location: On the Syr-Dar'ya River, at the Begovat Rapids, in the Fergana Valley, near Khilkovo Railroad station and 14 kilometers upstream and east of the town of Begovat, 160 kilometers southeast of Tashkent on the border of Uzbek and the Tadzhik SSR.

Brief history: Work began in 1942 and the first stage of the power plant started operations in 1947. In 1948 the second generating unit was not yet in operation.

Brief description: A concrete spillway dam with 8 stony gates rises 26 to 28 meters in height above the river bed and foundations. It is 100 meters along the spillway. The spillway part of the dam is connected with a 410-meter long and 28 meter nonoverflow earth dam which becomes an embankment on the left bank of the river. There are no locks. The intake is 80 meters long and leads into a diversion canal 13.8 kilometers long, 40 meters wide at the bottom, 97 meters wide at the top and 12 meters deep which leads to the powerhouse on the left bank of the river, 13.8 kilometers from the dam and in or near the town of Begovat. Installations include 4 units rated for a 32-meter head. An irrigation canal carries the water further into the southern part of the Golodnaya Step'.

Capacity: The reservoir is 60 kilometers long, reaching the town of Leninabad. It has a capacity of 360 million cubic meters.

Electric capacity: 120,000 kilowatts (proposed in 1946).

Electric output: No information available except as may be derived by computation based on the above.

Some facts relating to cost: The first stage of the construction was to involve:

Earth excavation, 14,300,000 cubic meters.

Earth fill, 3,200,000 cubic meters.

Rock work, 260,000 cubic meters.

Concrete and reinforced concrete, including 3,500 tons of steel parts, 288,000 cubic meters.

The earth dam with a 600,000 cubic-meter volume was built by the hydraulic-fill method. The concrete part of the dam was 112,000 cubic-meter volume.

Selected references: Poslavskiy, V. V., Poyarkov, V. F., Simonov, V. M., Pregrazhdeniye Rusla Reki Syr-Dar'yi Na Golovnom Uzle Sooruzheniy Farkhadskoy Gidrostantsii, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Strolitel'stov (Moscow), No. 3, 1945, pages 4–7; Farkhadstroy, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'styrvo (Moscow, No. 12, 1946, page 23.

PROJECT: DNEPR DAM

Location: The dam is immediately upstream from Khortitsa Island in the Dnepr River, below its confluence with the Samara River and about 10 kilometers below the former rapids in this river. It is south of the Kichkas Settlement and near the city of Zap-

orozh'ye, Zaporozhskaya Oblast', Ukrainian SSR.

Brief history: The first construction started in 1927 and was completed in 1932. Portions of it were substantially demolished in 1943. Reconstruction was started in 1944 and was completed in 1949.

Brief description: This development is the largest hydroelectric power plant in the U. S. S. R. It is a part of the larger projected Dnepr River development which, when completed, will include also Kakhovka Dam and possibly Nikopol' Dam. The dam is a reinforced concrete gravity-arched type with 47 spillway gates. Thickness of the dam at the base is about 40 meters. The piers are 62 meters above the riverbed and the foundation, the spillway 44 meters high. The length of the spillway section is 611 meters, that of the nonoverflow section 250 meters. A three-chamber lock with an estimated freight capacity of 2 million tons per year is located at the left bank; it eliminates the rapids and makes navigation possible. The forebay is partly formed by the powerhouse intake dam, which is 230 meters long and 55.8 meters high. The powerhouse, immediately below the intake dam on the right bank, includes installations of 9 vertical Francis type turbines rated at 106,000 horsepower, 3 of them manufactured in Newport News, Va. There are nine 90,000 kilovolt-amperes, 72,000 kilowatts, 83.3 revolutions per minute generators, 3 of them manufactured by the General Electric Co. The plant is interconnected with the Dnepr and Donbass power networks.

Capacity: The estimated capacity of the reservoir is 3 billion cubic meters. It extends 150 kilometers up the Dnepr River and 100 kilometers up the Samara River. At Dnepropetrovsk, about 70 kilometers upstream, the water level is raised 4 meters.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): 558,000 kilowatts (1939); 630,000 kilowatts (peak load); 648,000 kilowatts (planned in 1947); 648,000 kilowatts (achieved in 1949).

Electric output (kilowatt hours per year): 2,058,000,000 kilowatt hours (1939); 2,221,000,000 kilowatt hours (1949); 2,271,000,000 kilowatt hours (estimated 1946).

The powerplant is expected to work 5,000 hours a year providing the forebay level is at 52 meters elevation and the flow is 200 cubic meters per second.

Some facts relating to cost: For the dam, 2,800,000 cubic meters of rock and earth were used or excavated and 1,200,000 cubic meters of concrete were laid. For the lock, 2,050,000 cubic meters of earth and rock were used or excavated and 150,000 cubic meters of concrete laid. For the powerhouse the figures were 1,500,000 cubic meters of earth and 1,900,000 cubic meters of rock.

Selected references: Rudenko, A. A., Meropriyatiya Po Vosstanovleniyu Plotiny, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1946, No. 3, page 20; Intsertov, D. D. Razrusheniye I Sostoyaniye Utselevshikh Konstruktsiy Gidrostantsii, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1946, No. 3, page 24; Kandalov, I. I., Dneprostroy V 1946 G., Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow) No. 3, 1947, page 6; Chernogubozskiy, Z. P. Vosstanovleniye Elektricheskoy Chasti Dneprovskoy Gidroelektrostantsii Imeni Lenina, Elektrichestvo (Moscow), 1947, No. 1, page 35.

PROJECT: BUKHTARMA

Location: On the Irtysh River, near Ust'-Bukhtarma slightly below the confluence with the Bukhtarma, in the eastern part of Kazakhstan.

Brief history: Reported as under construction in 1955. Basichydraulic work was reported as begun in 1954.

Brief description: The concrete dam is to be nearly 100 meters high. Another Soviet report says the dam will be the world's tallest.

Capacity: The prospective reservoir has been reported by Soviet sources as the world's largest, some 500 kilometers in length including Zaysan Lake, with one estimate of 30 billion cubic meters.

It is said that it will supply twice as much power as the Ust'-Kamenogorsk plant. Estimates range from a high of 520,000 kilowatts to a minimum of 283,000 kilowatts capacity and an estimated output of 2,450,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

Some facts relating to cost: It is reported that the cofferdam will be 600 meters long and 12 to 15 meters high. Some 3,000 tons of steel will be used for cutoffs and more than 150,000 cubic meters of earth and brick will be placed.

Selected references: Krutikov, I, On the Upper Irtysh, Pravda, June 29, 1954, page 2.

PROJECT: ANGARA

Location: In the region of the so-called dip, where the difference of about 30 meters exists between the upper and lower levels of the Angara River, some 10 kilometers from the city of Irkutsk, Irkutskaya, Oblast' RSFSR.

Brief history: The Angarstroy project of 1936 considered the construction, on the Angara River alone, of 6 large hydro projects with a total capacity of 9 million kilowatts and an annual output of 61,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours. With 7 additional projects on tributaries the planned capacity would be increased to 12 million kilowatts. It was planned to build the first hydroelectric plant at the outflow of Angara from Baykal.

The war years halted whatever work had been started. The postwar plans involved some modification and instead of 2 upper projects, 1 hydroelectric power station is being built, the first of several. Work, preliminary or otherwise, was resumed in 1949 and this first plant is now under construction.

Brief description: According to incomplete data the development will utilize an earth-gravel fill dam of over 10 million cubic meter volume. Another Soviet source indicates that it will be 65 to 80 feet above the river and will require more than 350 million cubic feet of fill. There will be no spillway dam—surplus water will be discharged through an aperture made inside the reinforced concrete powerhouse. A navigation lock will be included. Much mention is made of the low temperatures of winter, up to 40°.

Capacity: The reservoir behind the dam will reach Lake Baykal, which in itself has a surface area of 33,000 square kilometers. The level of Baykal will, it is reported, be raised by 1.5 meters. Dmitriyevskiy in an early report indicates that the initial capacity of the plant is determined at 435,000 kilowatts and the multiannual average of yearly output at 3,800,000,000 kilowatt-hours. A more recent official statement is that it will produce more than twice the amount of energy generated at the Dnepr which is variously indicated between 558,000 and 648,000 kilowatts.

Some facts relating to cost: What must have been a very preliminary 1937 estimate of the cost of construction of the Angara (Baykalskaya) hydro installation was given by Dmitriyevskiy as follows:

Dam, 215 million rubles.
Powerhouse, 62,200,000 rubles.
Navigation locks, 64,200,000 rubles.
Electrical equipment, 132 million rubles.
Construction cost total, 822 million rubles.

"Excluding the items, amortization of which will not be covered by power delivered, the replacement cost of installations is estimated at 632,300,000 rubles. On the basis of this amount, capital investment per 1 kilowatt of installed capacity is estimated at 1,054 rubles or 16.6 kopecks per 1 kilowatt-hour of generated power.

"In calculating the production cost of power, total amount of annual operational expenses is estimated at 16,700,000 rubles; assuming the annual production of the powerplant at 3.8 billion kilowatt-hours, the cost of 1 kilowatt-hour at the busbars of the step-up substation will be 0.44 kopecks."[1]

It perhaps should be noted that in 1955 it was complained (see Batenchuk in sources) that mainly because of trouble with regard to spare parts: "* * * the operations of earth excavators and cranes cost the construction last year 1,600,000 rubles more than was foreseen by the plan."

Selected references: Lebed', A. and Yakovlev, B., Angarstroy, chap. VIII, pages 140–144, in Transportnoye Znacheniye Gidrotekhnicheskikh Sooruzheniy, series 1, No. 4, Institut Po Izucheniyu Istorii I Kul'tury SSSR, Munich, 1944; Batenchuk, Ye., Obstacles to a Complete Utilization of Technical Equipment at the Angaragesstroy, Pravda, April 3, 1955, page 2; Dmitriyevskiy, P. M., Baykal'skaya Hydraulic Installation on Angara River, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo, October 1937, No. 10, pages 27–32.

PROJECT: VOTKINSK

Location: On the Kama River near Votkinsk, Udmurskaya ASSR, RSFSR.

Brief history: The building of embankments was reported as rapidly progressing in October 1954.

Brief description: The spillway dam will raise the water level 24 meters. There are also two large earth dams, a powerhouse and two reinforced concrete two-chamber ship locks.

Capacity: The reservoir is indicated as a large one, several times the size of the Moskva Sea.

The power plant is claimed by the Soviets to be one of the largest being built in the country.

Some facts related to cost: 20 million cubic meters of soil will be dug from the river and dams filled with 16 million cubic meters of dirt. Some 7,850,000 cubic meters of concrete will be needed for the spillway dam and ship lock.

Selected references: At the Construction of the Votkinsk Hydroelectric Power Plant, Pravda, August 16, 1954, page 1.

PROJECT: SHIROKOVSKAYA DAM

Location: This dam is located on the Kos'va River, a left-bank tributary of the Kama River, about 20 kilometers upstream and southeast of the town of Gubakha in the Molotovskaya Oblast.

Brief history: Work on this dam started in 1942, with the building of a cofferdam. The foundation pit was excavated in 1943. The underwater concrete parts of the dam were built in 1944. In 1945 or 1946 the rock-fill dam was built and the reinforced concrete structures were completed. The first generating unit was put into operation in 1946 or 1947.

Brief description: The dam consists of four interrelated parts. There is a right-bank, rock-fill dam, about 40 meters high, which is 81.5 meters thick at the base and 280 meters in length at the crown. The spillway dam, 37 meters thick at the base and 40 meters in length, is 29 meters above the river bed and 35 meters above the foundation. It is of buttress type made of reinforced concrete shell and filled with rubble and gravel. There is a powerhouse dam, partly of the gravity type, 26.4 meters in length and 47 meters in height above the foundation. A left-bank nonoverflow dam 81.5 meters in length varies between 17 and 27 meters in height above foundation. There are no navigation locks. Two vertical Francis turbines are coupled with generators. The station is connected with the Molotov power system which supplies the northwestern region of Uralenergo.

Capacity: Total capacity of the reservoir is 526 million cubic meters with an available draft of 350 million cubic meters, which is about 15 percent of the yearly flow.

[1] From Dmitriyevskiy, see sources listed.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-ampere) proposed: No information available.

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/years) proposed: 130 million kilowatt-hours for an average year was proposed in 1945.

Some facts relating to cost:

Total volume of excavation and construction work included:

Earth and rock excavations, 195,000 cubic meters.

Filling and filers, 102,000 cubic meters.

Loam layers, 18,000 cubic meters.

Rock-fill and rock-layers, 215,000 cubic meters.

Dry rubble and wet rubble masonry, 34,000 cubic meters.

Concrete, rubble stone concrete and reinforced concrete, 86,000 cubic meters.

Facings and aprons, 17,600 square meters.

Mechanisms and steel reinforcements, 1,630 tons.

Selected references: Lavrishchev, A. N., Ekonomika Urala I Stroitel'stvo Malykh I Srednikh Gidrostantsiy (Moscow), Gosplanizdat 1945, pages 36–38; Razin, N. V., Gidrostantsiya S Kamenno-Nabrosnoy Plotinoy, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1950, No. 7, pages 9–15.

PROJECT: NOVOSIBIRSK

Location: On the Ob' River 30 kilometers south of Novosibirsk in Western Siberia. Hamlets of Verkhniye and Nizhniye Chemy and Ogurtsovo are nearby.

Brief history: In August 1955 the cofferdam was already built and some of the reinforcing frames erected and concrete poured for the foundation.

Brief description: A 5-kilometer earth dam is involved, built in large part, apparently, by hydraulic fill. The short reinforced concrete spillway dam, about 160 meters long, will have 8 spillway spans.

A three-chamber lock and navigation canal will be included.

Capacity: The Ob' Sea will be about 240 kilometers long and 20 to 22 kilometers in width and will cover 1,300 square kilometers, displacing many people.

Electric capacity (kilovolt - amperes): Large.

Some facts related to cost: About 8 million cubic meters of earth will be involved in the dam; in all more than 11 million cubic meters of earth will be moved; 125,000 cubic meters of concrete will be involved in the powerhouse and locks. Some 7,500 tons of metal piling will be driven.

Selected references: Ugreninov, N., First Hydroelectric Power Plant on the Ob' River, Strotel'nava Gazeta, October 22, 1954, page 1.

PROJECT: NIVA III

Location: In the Arctic region of Murmanskaya Oblast, RSFSR, on the Niva River between Lake Plesozero and Kandalaksha Bay, about 13 kilometers from the mouth of the river.

Brief history: Construction of the dam was started in 1937; work was interrupted by the war; reconstruction work started in 1945; the plant was put in operation sometime between 1946 and 1950.

Brief description: The main and only function of the dam is to form a head and pondage for its powerplant. There is no artificial reservoir. The main storage reservoir for the Niva River regulation is formed by Lake Imandra.

The dam is a nonoverflow, crib-earth dam with a concrete spillway, and diversion installations. The maximum height of the dam is 19 meters and length of the earth dam at crown is 263 meters. The length of the spillway is 50 meters. It is rated for 150 cubic meters per second flow and has two control gates 12 by 8 meters. A headrace intake, a headrace upper flume 110 meters long, a headrace tunnel 2,690 meters long, and a headrace lower flume 1,173 meters long, are involved. Power installation includes 4 vertical Francis turbines and 4 generators. The plant will apparently supply a variety of local consumers and will be interconnected with the Niva II and Tuloma Hyroelectric power plants. There are no locks.

Capacity: There is no artificial reservoir.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): Planned, 120,000 kilowatts (1936); planned, 150,000 kilowatts (1939).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): Estimated, 750 million kilowatt-hour (1935).

Some factors relating to cost: Work and materials involved include the following:

Earth and rock used for embankment, 318,-000 cubic meters.

Morainic soil excavated, 553,000 cubic meters.

Rock excavated, 419,000 cubic meters.

Rock excavated from tunnels, 578,000 cubic meters.

Concrete and reinforced concrete work, 186,000 cubic meters.

Crib cofferdam work, 46,000 cubic meters.

Steel construction work, 2,400 tons.

Selected references: Gidroelektrostantsiya Niva III, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel' stvo (Moscow), 1947, No. 1, page 29; Vasil'vev, A. F., iz Opyta Stroitel'stva Tunneley Nivskoy Gidroelektrostantsii, Gidroteknicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1948, No. 8, pages 20–24.

PROJECT: GOR'KIY

Location: At Vasilevo Village, near the town of Gorodets, 44 kilometers from Balakhna and about 50 kilometers above Gor'kiy on the Volga River in Gor'kouskaya Oblast', RSFSR.

Brief history. This project began in 1933 and under original plans was to be completed in 1938–39. It was indicated as under construction, perhaps only started, in 1948. It was for some unascertained reason reported as near completion in mid-1952. As of early 1955 it was reported that the main earth excavation work had been completed and that more than half of steel structures and built-in parts had been installed. The project was about to enter the preoperational period. As late as April it was still estimated that five generating units would be put in operation in 1955, but one had been reported as manufactured as early as December 1952.

Brief description: It will comprise a concrete spillway dam about 336 meters long, an earth dam erected by the hydraulic-fill method of approximately 1,200 meters length, embankments with a total length of at least 11 kilometers, even a total of 18 kilometers of earth dams according to one source. There are to be two lines of navigation locks to make simultaneous movement upstream and downstream possible without interruption, also a 3-square kilometer basin for repair and winter anchorage. There will be a docking area.

Capacity: The reservoir will be 5 times larger than the Moscow Sea and cover at least 150,000 hectares, perhaps 179,000 hectares. It will raise the water all the way to Shcherbakov, a distance of 350 kilometers. Water level in the Volga will be raised by 8 to 10 meters, according to most sources, but according to one, by 18 meters. Over 10,000 rural and town buildings, many industrial enterprises, hundreds of kilometers of highways and communication lines have been or are being translocated.

Some facts relating to cost: Excavating or filling required more than 30 million cubic meters of earth (50 million cubic meters were mentioned by one source), twice the amount of earthwork undertaken at Dnepr. Concrete in the amount of 1,300,000 cubic meters will be required by the powerhouse dam and lock along with 100,000 tons of reinforcement. About 17,000 tons of metal structures were required. The construction has been indicated by the Soviet sources as highly mechanized; i. e., 90 percent of all production processes, 98 percent of the earthwork and 100 percent of the concrete work.

Selected references: Orlov, P. P., Near the City of Gor'kiy, Nauka i Zhizn, No. 6, June 1954, pages 4–6; Yurinov, D., Year of Decision for the Construction Project, Pravda, No. 99, April 9, 1954, page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] to extend his remarks.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, "pie in the sky" has been defined as a theoretical reward at some future time for an effort expended now. The ethereal benefits are ill-designed and incapable of definition. The sponsors and advocates of the Colorado River storage project, unable to contradict the plain arithmetic involved in the calculations for repayment, have tortured "pie in the sky" with such a complex arithmetic and such a devious rationalization of likely benefits, that it is impossible to extract from this political hocus-pocus the relevant facts related to what are called indirect benefits. Our forefathers, simple and direct as they were, early realized that an expenditure of community funds must be related to direct returns which would be readily observed. During the 1930's the theory of indirect benefits was superimposed upon what had previously been a clear and understandable economic theory. Out of this new concept of "pie in the sky," there emerged what came to be known as the so-called benefit-cost ratio. Although benefit-cost ratio has no standing in the law, it has been the lever used by the Bureau of Reclamation since the 1930's in claiming economic as distinguished from financial justification of projects.

"Benefit-cost ratio" means in simple terms a ratio between the various economic benefits alleged to stem from a project and the cost of that project in actual dollars and cents. Obviously, if the ratio is to mean anything, the two items must in some manner be comparable. There must be some common yardstick which can be placed on both the alleged financially usive benefits and also upon the known cost in taxpayers' dollars. The sponsors and advocates of the Colorado River storage project have not attempted to relate the two in any understandable manner, but have measured each factor of the ratio by entirely different criteria. It follows that the ratio obtained is completely meaningless and misleading.

The genesis of the "pie in the sky" social and economic philosophy on which this comparison of the incomparable is based, has never been more brazenly stated than in a report of President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950, and I quote:

Financial feasibility is not the same as economic feasibility. * * * For this reason the Commission is recommending that Con-

gress eliminate the requirement that irrigation projects show financial feasibility * * * the principle of full reimbursement has ceased to be useful or necessary. The Government has come to be recognized as an agency for social and economic action which need not follow the rules of the private capital market * * * social benefits and national interests should be clearly differentiated from those for which reimbursement should be required. * * * Where the public interest is clearly established, public expenditures to promote it cannot properly be regarded as subsidies. * * * The justification for public investment in irrigation is that there are public ends to be attained which the commercial price system cannot reflect."

Such terms as "social benefits," "public ends," and "national interests," have no more determination in financial terms than would the terms "private ends" and "family interests," when used by a private individual in attempting to obtain a personal loan. The projection of such terms in calculations of reimbursability raise the obvious question of who is to determine their value. Upon whom is to rest the responsibility of translating vague uncertainties into realistic terms? In the present instance it would not be elected public servants of the people who are directly responsible to those whom they represent for the careful husbandry of public funds. To the contrary, it would be the bureaucrats who love dearly to spend more and more public money under almost unlimited terms of discretion, and who have never demonstrated a dedication to careful fiscal scrutiny or rigid economy in the expenditure of public moneys. Together with the agencies and bureaus, representatives of the beneficiary States themselves would comprise the formal court of review and the agency for the interpretation and translation of benefit-cost. These would be in every sense of the words, ex parte judgments from which there would be no court of appeal and no review. The presumptions already adopted in this connection are so great that it has resulted in the sponsors of the act telling taxpayers in States far from the scene of the project what they themselves stand to gain in selling more automobiles, carpet sweepers, and baby carriages to families subsidized at the rate of $5,000 an acre.

The Engineers' Joint Council, a group including representatives of five of the great engineering societies of the Nation, had this to say of the benefit-cost ratio in a statement—Principles of a Sound National Water Policy—issued in 1951:

Increases in trade and commerce have usually been computed on the gross volume of new business without recognition of the fact that there is no benefit to be derived from the mere circulation of money. Actually, for such benefits to accrue, there must be tangible gains to those who transport, process, and distribute goods to the ultimate consumer, all without increased cost to him.

The conclusion of the Engineers' Joint Council, it would seem, must be the concensus of all people who believe in honest and understandable public accounting:

Direct benefits should be limited to those new and increased values which are definitely measurable. Such tangible offsets to cost, under ordinary business standards, would be limited to the capitalized value or present worth of future net revenues to be derived from operation of the works constructed.

The estimates of agricultural benefits have been challenged from many sources and one of the strong dissents was made by the Department of Agriculture in a review of the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on the Colorado River storage project. Also the Bureau of the Budget, in reporting on the initial project recommended by Secretary McKay, specified that the economic justification of all of the 11 reclamation projects should be reexamined in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

One example of the abuse of the benefit-cost ratio is in the Bureau of Reclamation's estimates for the Seedskadee project. It is claimed that there are indirect benefits of $638,500, public benefits of $313,100, and direct benefits of $614,500. When all these are added and compared with the cost in real dollars of expenditure, a benefit-cost ratio of 1.46 to 1 is reached. Thus it is easy to see that if only direct benefits were considered, the ratio would betray the unsoundness of the project. Now let us see what these so-called indirect and public benefits are. Indirect benefits are "the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project, and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers." Public benefits are "increase or improvement in settlement and investment opportunities, community facilities, and stabilization of the local and regional economy."

It is difficult to find a proper characterization for an agency employed by the Government to serve the interests of the Nation which could seriously place a monetary estimate upon such a jumble of indeterminates as this.

The Bureau's estimate on the Hammond project is a benefit of $41.50 per acre per year. The Bureau also estimates that the irrigation farmers on the project will be able to pay only $2.02 per acre per year for water. Thus the direct benefits would seem to be 20 times the farmers' ability to pay.

It should be noted that in the recent report of the President's Cabinet Committee on Water Resources Policy, which the President transmitted to the Congress on January 17, 1956, it is recommended that only direct or primary benefits be used in the calculation of benefit-cost ratios and that the evaluation period be limited to 50 years. In contrast, the Reclamation Bureau has included large indirect or secondary benefits evaluated over a 100-year period.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] in his remarks demonstrated, I think, something that would justify in my opinion the recommittal of this bill at the proper time to the committee for further study. I agree with the distinguished gentleman that there has been a lot of confusion and apparently in the last few months or the last 2 or 3 years we now have some experts on most everything that could happen in this great part of the country. It seems however, that even the experts become confused about the true situation.

It is not a pleasant duty for me to stand here and oppose the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], a very fine man, a very fair chairman. I might say the same thing for the distinguished gentleman on the other side when he was the chairman of this great committee.

We have had a lot of discussion from the experts here. I would like to just bring to the attention of the House some of the little fundamental things—maybe they do not mean a whole lot, but on the other hand they might have a considerable bearing on this project and its feasibility.

I say to the Members of this House that I do not think this is a feasible project.

We have had a great deal of discussion about a substance that is found in the canyon walls where you are going to store up this water; I believe it is called Chinle shale. I think everybody recognizes the presence of it. It is merely a question of how many miles of it are in the river banks of the area that is going to be the reservoir, if you please.

I hold in my hand here first a report from a man who allegedly is an expert on these matters. I also have some of the shale that came from the part of the river that was examined by this distinguished gentleman.

As I hold it up for you to look at it seems like pretty solid material, but let us see what happens to it when you put a little bit of it in water as I do now.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALEY. Not at this time.

Let us see what the expert says about this shale:

The Chinle shale is exposed along the canyon walls of the Colorado and San Juan Rivers for an aggregate distance of about 50 river miles within the proposed reservoir area. Its importance to the proposed reservoir area lies in the fact that it immediately underlies the canyon-forming Wingate and Navajo sandstones and, in areas of exposure of this shale, provides the only foundation support for these overlying cliff-forming rocks.

If brought in continuous contact with water from the proposed reservoir this Chinle shale, which now is partially protected in canyon walls above the river level, would immediately disintegrate and flow downslope into the reservoir. More importantly, it would undermine and cause collapse of all overlying cliff-forming rocks in extensive areas bordering the proposed reservoir. All of the broken debris resulting from this collapse would move downslope and would partially or completely fill the proposed reservoir in these extensive areas of Chinle outcrop.

Chinle shale is not thin. According to H. D. Miser—

He is quoting from the United States Geological Survey Water Supply Paper No. 538—

this formation has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River. Its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the nearby Colorado River appears to be similar.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. UDALL. The little nuggets of shale that the gentleman put in the water there, I am sure, are going to dissolve because I come from a Chinle shale district. Does the gentleman know that geologists state without contradiction that beds of Chinle shale are not permeable, that water cannot penetrate such beds?

Mr. HALEY. Probably the gentleman is an expert. I do not know. However, the document I have been reading from was written by a man who supposedly is an authority on the matter. I am a layman as you gentleman are and I, as you, must depend on the experts and authorities for scientific information.

Now, let us look at what is left in this experiment. Here is what will be left when the water permeates the shale—mud. I say you will get that in the reservoir or the river, and even a Missouri River catfish cannot live in that mud.

Mr. Chairman, Echo Park was originally in this bill and they will tell you that now it is out. I say it is not out and if it is out then you do not have a feasible project.

I would like to read from a report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, serial No. 11, page 24, wherein Mr. Tudor, who was Under Secretary of the Interior, was testifying. In response to the following question from Mr. ENGLE, Mr. Tudor said:

We think Echo Park is a necessary part of the project, yes, sir.

Mr. ENGLE. You think it would be like taking the engine out of the automobile then?

Mr. TUDOR. I might say it might be like taking the pistons out.

So, if Echo Park is no longer a part of this project, then it, the project, is not a feasible project. The statements I have read are statements made by your expert who came here to testify for the project. All that you have before you is the testimony of these men. In referring to the feasibility of this project, Mr. Tudor, who was then the Assistant Secretary of the Interior said that without Echo Park the project is not a feasible project.

In response to a question by Chairman MILLER, he said:

Mr. TUDOR. We feel definitely that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in a hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative submitted.

So have we got a feasible project? I say that we have not.

Now, let us see what they say they are going to grow on these lands and what it is going to cost the taxpayer. They say it is going to be paid back. When? Not during your or my lifetime. You heard the projects read off here, and some of them are going to be 26 years in the building. So, you do not have to worry about this project so far as you or I are concerned; they are not going to be paid back even during your children's lifetime, and they know it.

Let us see what they are going to raise on these acres, on these projects that they are building now. Oh, yes, they are looking way into the future, but we have in this country better than 20 million acres of land that could be brought into production at a fraction of the cost of this land. According to the testimony before our committee, we have approximately 20 million acres of land on the eastern side of the Mississippi River that could be brought into production. So why go out there? The gentleman said something about not raising bananas on Pike's Peak. Well, with the amount of money that you are spending out there, you ought to raise something other than what they are going to produce.

Let us see what these acres of land that are going to cost you from $1500 to $3000 per acre will produce. Mr. CHENOWETH—and he qualified his witness—in asking this question of Mr. Clyde, made the following statement:

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to compliment Mr. Clyde and Mr. Stringham on their very fine statements.

Mr. Clyde, you are recognized as an authority on reclamation. I am interested in the cost per acre that Mr. PILLION asked you about. It seems that opponents of reclamation are using the cost per acre as one of their principal weapons in their efforts to defeat the authorization of all reclamation projects. What is your theory in figuring the cost per acre? Should our thinking be revised? Is there some loophole here? Are the costs actual and factual, and can they be defended?

Mr. CLYDE. Congressman CHENOWETH, the costs are high. That is a part of the price we have to pay.

Let us see how much or how costly these acres are. Mr. CHENOWETH goes on and says:

What could we do to change that formula?

He is talking about the formula on which reclamation projects, I presume, are built.

Mr. CLYDE. I think we cannot change the formula. I think we have to admit that there are indirect benefits which are not measured in the dollar cost.

You take, for example, central Utah. If you take the cost of that project of $127 million, as I remember the figures, and divide it by some 240,000 acres which includes the Indian lands, you get a figure of $624 an acre.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You show $627?

Mr. CLYDE. $627, thank you.

Now, that $627 is the figure you get by dividing that $127 million by that number of acres.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That does not include interest?

Mr. CLYDE. That does not include interest. But look at the benefits coming to the community, the State, and the Nation as a result of that."

Now Mr. DAWSON of Utah, tried to determine the cost per acre from Mr. Matthew, chief engineer of the Colorado River Board:

Mr. DAWSON. Are you opposed to using power revenues to help defray the cost of irrigation projects?

Mr. MATTHEW. No, sir, not if it is set up in the proper way.

Mr. DAWSON. So it is just simply a matter of degree. You think in this particular case they are probably going a little too far; is that it?

Mr. MATTHEW. Well, it is quite a way, yes.

Mr. DAWSON. So you feel $2,500 an acre subsidy is a fair figure, too, do you?

Mr. MATTHEW. Yes. I think it would be more than that. Incidentally, I think that in answer to a question propounded by Senator KUCHEL at the Senate hearings, the Bureau of Reclamation has already reported that the accumulated debt for the projects recommended by the Secretary, that is, 2 storage units and 11 participating projects, would be over a billion dollars over the repayment period. If you divide that by 366,000 acres that would be benefited, it would be over $3,000 an acre. So the $2,500 figure an acre is conservative.

Now, on this high-price land, bear in mind that the President has asked the Congress to pass a soil-bank program. So let us see what has been the past history of the production of the lands brought into use by other projects that have been initiated and completed by the Bureau of Reclamation. I think that no one can question that we will have similar production of commodities in this proposed project and reading from the 1953 crop summary and related data from the table on page 26 of the Bureau of Reclamation report as to commodities produced, many of which are now in surplus. So we now have this kind of a situation where there has been requested that we retire approximately 40 million acres of land in order to diminish the surplus commodities. We find this situation in the report. There are approximately 66 million bushels of corn, barley, oats, rye, wheat, sorghum, and other crops produced. We find that for pasture hay, fodder, and similar crops the report shows that approximately 12 million tons were produced in 1953. We also find in the same report that cotton is produced to the extent of 980,000 tons. The same report indicates that approximately 42 million bags of 100 pounds of potatoes were produced. Citrus, which we have an abundance of in this country at the moment, were produced in the amount of 8¼ million hundredweight. So the statement that this land will not produce anything substantial that is not now in surplus is incorrect.

Does it make sense to continue to bring land into cultivation to produce crops which are now in surplus and for which at the moment at least cannot be used and merely means that the surpluses that we now have cannot be disposed of on the market of our country or the markets of the world.

One of the justifications of this project has been that the Navaho Indians will be benefitted by its construction. On page 562 of the hearings, identified as part II, it is plainly indicated by the following testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that in order to assist the Navaho Indians the taxpayers are called upon to sponsor a project which would cost $200,000 per Indian family. I call your attention to the remarks by Mr. Clyde and Mr. PILLION appearing on page 562:

Mr. CLYDE. Yes; I still think it would be a very marked fabrication.

Mr. PILLION. But you do not say that the figures submitted by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in which he estimated the cost of that project at $211 million to resettle or to irrigate farms to take care of the 1,100 families, you would not say that that was a fabrication; would you?

Mr. CLYDE. I am not familiar with the figures there, Mr. PILLION. I do know that it is an expensive project.

Mr. PILLION. At $200,000 per family it is a rather expensive project; is it not?

Mr. CLYDE. I would not wish to substantiate that in my testimony. I would like to figure it first.

I, too, am concerned about the status of our Indian population, but I do not think that this large expenditure of money would assist the Navaho Indians. As a matter of economy if this amount was necessary per family, why not deposit the money in the bank where it would draw 4½ or 5 percent interest, therefore giving to each Navaho family an income of approximately $10,000 a year and allow them to buy with such income many of the things that are in surplus crops?

There is no justification for this project insofar as the Navahos are concerned on this kind of basis. It would be much better to allow the Navaho Indian to draw his Government-issue blanket around him and sit on it than to try to assist him in this manner.

The entire Colorado River storage project should be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for further study until such time as a determination can be made as to its feasibility both from an engineering and economic standpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the demonstration you have just seen here involved some rock nuggets of Chinle shale which come from my congressional district. I was born and grew up in the Chinle shale country, and I will have a bit to say about that subject later.

However, at this point, since they want opinion of expert geologists, I am going to insert following these remarks a statement by a geologist from the University of Arizona who just completed a master's thesis on Chinle shale, and a statement by the regional geologist of the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. J. Neil Murdock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to get permission to insert someone else's remarks when the Committee rises.

Mr. UDALL. Very well; I shall do so. In any event, I will have a good deal to say, and if the gentleman will let me use his equipment, I have a piece of Chinle shale that was not picked up on the surface of the ground, but is a core from a diamond drill at the actual site of Glen Canyon Dam, and after my demonstration I will drink whatever remains of the water after I finish my speech. So, I think we can satisfy the Members on this Chinle shale proposition.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *February 5, 1956.*

Hon. Senator WATKINS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Upon returning to town, I read two articles in the Los Angeles Times which distressed me very much. They were in regard to the Glen Canyon Dam site. Copies of these articles are enclosed with my letter.

I was astounded to hear that the Chinle clays were detrimental to the Glen Canyon project. I have recently completed a 2-year study on the Chinle formation in northeastern Arizona as a thesis problem for my doctor of philosophy degree in geology at the University of Arizona. It is true that the beds containing bentonitic clay will disintegrate when placed in water—but the penetration of water into these beds is practically nil. Unless a current is present to remove the finely divided wet clay the penetration of the water will be on the order of 2 to 3 feet. Some slumping will take place along steep cliffs. In my study of the Chinle in the Navaho Reservation, it was shown that only about 10 percent of the beds contained sufficient bentonitic clay to cause prominent disintegration. There is no Chinle close enough to the dam site to interfere in any way with construction or operation. My conclusion to Representative HOSMER'S statements as reported in the Los Angeles Times is that he has absolutely no basis for any criticism in regard to the Chinle formation.

You should have Representative HOSMER tell about the uranium deposits which will be covered by the lake. I believe less than 1 percent of the entire Chinle outcrop will be submerged.

You may wonder why I have written this letter so hurriedly. Since I was one of the Bureau of Reclamation geologists who did the field work on the Glen Canyon project, I feel that Representative HOSMER'S statements are an attack on my professional reputation and on the reputations of two of the best engineering geologists in this country or the world for that matter—Roger Rhoades, who reviewed the work, and Glen Lasson, who supervised the work. Since I am no longer in the Government service, I feel free to speak out against those who put their personal desires above the truth. I admire the work you have done in trying to straighten out some of the inaccuracies which have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If there is anything I can do to help produce a factual picture of the geologic conditions on the Glen Canyon project, I would be glad to do so. I can be contacted at 17053 Upland Avenue, Fontana, Calif.; phone Valley 2-6102 for the next 2 months.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. WILSON,
Geological Engineer.

STATEMENT BY GEOLOGIST J. NEIL MURDOCK, REGIONAL GEOLOGIST OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, ON LANDSLIDES AND THE CHINLE SHALE

I feel it is entirely possible some landslides will develop in the Glen Canyon Reservoir but these should in no way impair the operation of the project. These would be very minor and could only occur in the upstream reach of the reservoir, as it is 40 airline miles (70 river miles) from the dam to the first shale formations.

Landslides into reservoirs are a common occurrence. They have occurred countless times in many operating projects. Grand Coulee Dam is a good example. Even during the construction of the dam a clay deposit on one abutment had to be stabilized by freezing to permit construction to proceed. A long stretch of highway had to be relocated because landslides into the reservoir took it out. Out of 75 miles of highway, landslides partly or wholly destroyed 13 miles.[1] Yet the reservoir has operated continuously and with no impairment to its efficiency.

Geologic conditions at Coulee are more unfavorable than the Chinle formation at Glen Canyon. The sediments at Grand Coulee are unconsolidated clay and silt of glacial origin. They are highly plastic and flow readily when saturated. This is in contrast to the Chinle shale which supports high sandstone cliffs even when subjected to the erosive action of fast running water.

---

[1] Report by Fred O. Jones, Geologist, U. S. Geological Survey, landslide conditions along the Ferry County Highway paralleling Lake Roosevelt from Kettle Falls to the mouth of the Spokane River, Wash. U. S. Bureau of Reclamation files.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD].

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Chairman, we are considering H. R. 3383, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. This bill was favorably reported with amendments on July 8, 1955, by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and a rule was thereafter granted by the Rules Committee. However, the bill did not come on for consideration by the House in the 1st session of the 84th Congress. The committee's explanation of that bill and the committee's conclusions and recommendations are embodied in House Report No. 1087. Three separate minority reports opposing the measure were filed to accompany the report on H. R. 3383.

On February 8 of this year, some 7 months after a rule had been obtained on H. R. 3383, a majority of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee considered and approved amendments to that bill. These amendments in effect constitute a new bill. We are asked that the same be substituted in lieu of the original bill.

The proponents of the Colorado River project must have realized the deficiency of H. R. 3383 and felt that it needed strengthening. One of the amendments and changes in the original bill is to make more positive the elimination of Echo Park Dam. There was language in the original bill to that effect, nevertheless, that language apparently was not deemed sufficient by those who objected to an invasion of one of our great national monuments and the establishment by such action of a dangerous precedent.

It is correctly stated in the minority views in the supplementary report that this Congress cannot bind a future Congress. The correcting sentence added to section 3 of the bill may be all that the committee can do legislatively, but it is not all that the committee can do under its power of inquiry. Based upon testimony at the committee hearings, Echo Park Dam and Reservoir will have to be included in the upper Colorado River project at some subsequent date in order, even on paper, to make the project feasible.

Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph A. Tudor testified before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 83d Congress in reference to Echo Park Dam. He said that taking the Echo Park Dam out of the upper Colorado River project would be like taking the pistons out of the engine of an automobile.

Fourteen months later Reclamation Bureau Commissioner Wilbur A. Dexheimer, when asked: "Mr. Commissioner, is Echo Park essential to the economic feasibility of the upper Colorado River project?" answered:

Yes. Although by elimination of parts of the project the economic feasibility might be established for something less. But it would not be, we think, the proper way to meet the ultimate or even the present needs of the upper basin.

And later Commissioner Dexheimer stated:

It—

Echo Park—

is essential in the upper reaches of the area, and without it we would be unable to make the full development anticipated and would probably have to leave out even some of the participating projects which are recommended at the present time, or some of the units in participating projects, and it would greatly decrease the financial feasibility of the overall plan.

From testimony such as this one cannot help but conclude that the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir will some day be included in the project unless further study is had upon the bill to ascertain whether or not an alternate site for Echo Park Dam is possible. The committee was advised that there are such alternate sites even better than the Echo Park site. The proponents of these alternate sites were enthusiastic in their recommendation of the same. We, likewise, had advice that there were no alternate sites for the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir and that ultimately it must be constructed and made a part and parcel of the project as essential to the upper reaches of the area.

The construction of the Echo Park Dam is highly controversial. Since some of the proponents of the Colorado River project feel that it should be included, I think this bill should be recommitted for further study, to the end that that question could be finally resolved. By so doing it can be fairly said that our foresight is better than our hindsight.

The bill contemplates the use of water for municipalities, and though that appears to be a reimbursable item, nevertheless, such a provision seems to me to be an inequitable advantage to the four States here involved. I do not feel that these States should receive such a benefit for purely municipal purposes over and above that allowed or permitted in the other States of the Union outside of the reclamation area. In nearly every State municipalities are required to finance their water supply on less favorable terms than granted in this bill. There is no provision of law of which I am aware that will aid the other States to secure municipal water at Government expense to be repaid on such favorable terms as granted in this bill.

Great stress is made by the proponents of this bill of the need of electric power for the future development of the States involved. Granting that to be true, for the sake of argument, nevertheless it appears from the testimony before the committee that the future needs of the area for electrical power have been and will be provided.

Several private utility companies who now furnish power for the four participating States filed a statement with the committee in which the following appears:

Furthermore, ever-growing needs for electric power in each of our States will provide a market for the power which the project will produce, provided the new generating facilities are put into production on a schedule in consonance with the growing demands for power. We have consistently kept abreast of these growing needs through the construction of additional generating capacity and the extension of our transmission systems. Our plans for the future necessarily entail continuous additions to our generating and transmission capacity so that we shall always be in a position to fill growing needs. To the extent to which project power becomes available to us at costs reasonably competitive with present or future generating costs, we would be relieved of the cost of constructing an equivalent amount of generating capacity and might be relieved from operating (except for peak and reserve generation) some of the older and higher cost generating plants on our own systems.

In other words the project will shift to the taxpayers throughout the United States the burden of cost now planned and contemplated by private utilities who frankly say they are presently generating a sufficient amount of power for the needs of the area and will meet the future needs as they arise.

The proponents of this bill thought it was ready for passage in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, but during the recess between the 1st and 2d sessions of that Congress they found reason to make additional changes which they say improves the bill. The changes are important and far reaching. If the bill was improved by the study made of it in 7 months, I am satisfied it can be further improved by additional study and consideration at a later date.

The present bill proposed to supply supplemental water for 243,000 acres of land presently in cultivation, and to irrigate 143,000 acres of new land at a total cost of $320 million. It was stressed in the committee that this land is vitally needed for the economy of the country. It seems strange, indeed, that on the one hand one department of our Government should recommend a soil bank for the withdrawal of acreage from production and the spending of large sums of money for that purpose, and on the other hand another department of our Government should recommend a project which would bring into cultivation additional lands which certainly are not needed and at such a terrific cost as herein specified.

The Bureau of Reclamation presented to the committee cost figures for the initial participating projects. As far as I can find out, the cost allocated to irrigation in this project varied from $210 to $794 per acre, or an average of over $400 per acre. We were informed that little of this land, even with sufficient water, would command a fair market value as high as this. Costs estimated for some 22 other possible participating projects, on the basis of only partial investigation, runs as high or higher, and up to $1,530 per acre in one instance.

The Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed for a low of $50 per acre and a high not in excess of $150 per acre. According to the Soil Conservation Service there are 2,686,518 acres of good idle land in farms of the five States of Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. Many other millions of acres are available in other sections. In my own State of North Carolina figures obtained from the same source shows there are 4,264,763 acres of good idle cropland in its farms. This is fine land in classes 1, 2, and 3 only. The total does not include woodlands, pastures, or Government lands.

We are told that the land to be brought into productivity by this project will not increase our surpluses for that none of the basic crops under support will be raised thereon. The bill makes no provision in this regard. I understand, however, it is proposed to make use of the land for the raising of alfalfa, and other hay crops, and a small amount of corn, all for the purpose of providing feed for livestock, which is about the most unprofitable use which could be made of irrigated land. In my opinion, such use of the land would have an adverse effect on the dairy- and beef-cattle industry which is suffering sorely at the present.

Mr. Chairman, I have not undertaken to discuss here all the objections I have to the bill. It is not necessary. I have only sought to bring to the attention of this body a few reasons for my objection.

It seems unreal to obligate the taxpayers of this great country of ours in the manner proposed in this legislation. I appreciate the enthusiasm of the proponents of the upper Colorado River project, but taking into consideration our obligations and commitments I do not think that this bill should pass.

The cost of this project has been estimated in various amounts. The bill carries an authorization of $760 million. Based on the Bureau of Reclamation estimates, the estimated cost of the project would amount to $933,468,300, and the construction costs of all the projects covered by the bill would amount to approximately $1,600,000,000. No provision is made in these figures of hidden interest subsidies which must be borne by the taxpayers.

As stated in one of the minority reports, I think the Colorado River storage project, as here proposed, is one which is uneconomical and unnecessary, and will not contribute to our national economic growth, but on the contrary will constitute a handicap and a drain on the Nation's purse. I sincerely hope the bill will be recommitted for further study.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, it shall be my purpose in the few minutes allotted to me to discuss briefly some of the legal problems which must be resolved before further consideration should be given to the construction of dams and reservoirs for the permanent diversion of additional waters from the Colorado River.

This is a phase that has not been discussed by the proponents of the bill. They have chosen to ignore it mainly because it is devastating and it would defeat the bill.

The State of Arizona filed a suit against the State of California for the purpose of quieting title to certain waters to which the State of Arizona lays claim. The State of Nevada intervened as an interested party and so did the United States Government, both asserting claims inconsistent with those of both Arizona and California. Some of

the issues which must be resolved in this controversy will include:

First, full interpretation of the Colorado River compact; second, the meaning and the effect of the compact between the State of California and the United States in which Arizona and Nevada are third party beneficiaries; third, and this is perhaps of tantamount importance—the quantity of the water which is legally and physically available for beneficial consumptive use in the lower basin. This will involve questions of fact and questions of law which will also involve the burden of the Mexican Water Treaty.

While it is true that most of the water available in the lower basin comes from the upper basin, the Gila River, lying wholly within the lower basin, must be considered as a tributary of the Colorado River and waters taken from the Gila River for use in Arizona must be chargeable to Arizona's entitlement from the whole system. It is true that much more is used by Arizona from the Gila River than normally reaches the main stream of the river in its native state. The court must determine whether the 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum made available under article 3A of the Colorado River Compact to the lower basin is exclusive of all waters generated in the tributaries flowing into the main stream below Lee's Ferry or whether they are inclusive. If the court holds that they are inclusive, then the water of the Gila River, now completely used by Arizona must be chargeable against the Arizona entitlement under the compact. Actually, Arizona is not a member of the compact.

The pending suit must determine whether consumptive use of water is to be measured in terms of the quantity consumed in the growing of crops and by domestic use or whether it is to be measured in terms of the resulting depletion of the virgin flow of the main stream. The United States Government in its intervenor is claiming a paramount right to water from the Colorado River for the Indians. It must be admitted by all parties that the Federal Government did not relinquish its Indian claims at the time the Colorado River compact was approved. The question to be resolved is the quantity of water the Court will allot to the Indians in the lower basin. The Federal Government is claiming that it must have more than 13 million acre-feet available in the lower basin for the following purposes: First, 1,700,000 acre-feet for the use of Indians in the lower basin; second, 1,500,000 acre-feet to take care of the Mexican Water Treaty; third, 700,000 acre-feet for evaporation on Lake Mead; fourth, 8,500,000 acre-feet to fulfill its contract obligations to California, Arizona, and Nevada; fifth, an undetermined amount for public domain, fish and wildlife, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, etc.

This amounts to 12,400,000 acre-feet exclusive of the undetermined claims of the Federal Government, which could well exceed another million acre-feet. This total figure exceeds the average flow below Lee's Ferry. The Federal Government has contracts to deliver 5,362,000 acre-feet annually to the State of California, 300,000 acre-feet annually to the State of Nevada, and 2,800,000 acre-feet annually to the State of Arizona.

The bill before us provides that in the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam the upper basin States are obligated to release 75 million acre-feet in each 10-year period or an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet a year. Under such an arrangement the Federal Government would find itself short 50 million acre-feet of water in each 10-year period or an average of 5 million acre-feet a year, short of fulfilling the Federal obligations.

The Federal Government claims that in spite of congressional approval of the Colorado River compact it has never relinquished the water rights. If the State of Arizona and the Federal Government are successful in their claims, California's entitlement would be reduced by over 1,500,000 acre-feet. The coastal area embraced by the metropolitan water district has an entitlement of 1,212,000 acre-feet a year which could be completely wiped out by the pending court action provided the upper basin States were not compelled to release at least 12,500,000 acre-feet to flow by Lee's Ferry. The upper basin States are not a party to the suit and would not be bound by the Supreme Court's decision, and if the Supreme Court holds in the present case that 12,500,000 acre-feet must flow past Lee's Ferry they would have to file a suit against the upper basin States to enforce its decree and if enforced, there would not be one drop of water available for the Glen Canyon Dam and reservoir, and you would have a 600-foot pile of concrete standing as a monument to the folly of Congress.

I do not agree with the Government's position in the matter or say that I would not agree with the Supreme Court decision; I say only that it is not impossible that the litigation should be resolved in favor of the Federal Government.

This then is the legal state in which we find ourselves. To reduce it to simplicity, let me say that no man among you would consider building a 13-story building with his own money upon a parcel of land, the title to which was under attack in the court, for you might very well find that after you had built the building the court would say that it was constructed on land that did not belong to you and your entire investment would be lost. Why then should you deal with the taxpayers' money in any other way than you would your own?

So I want again to call your attention to the fact that this whole thing is in dispute in the courts, and it would be mere folly if we were to go ahead and complete the project at the present time even though the administration favors this bill. Maybe one part of the administration favors it, but another, the Department of Justice, on the other hand, is saying here, "We want 12 million acre-feet of the water from the upper basin"; and if that should turn out to be the case there will be no water for Glen Canyon or for any other proposition. So the Federal Government is not a unit in support of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to go into all these questions raised or answer the propaganda literature that has come out; there is just too much of it.

Back in 1922 the seven States at a meeting at Santa Fe, N. Mex., signed a compact providing for the distribution of the waters of the Colorado River.

The State of Colorado produces 72 percent of all the water of that river. Notwithstanding that, the three lower basin States, California, Arizona, and Nevada, were allocated half of the water, which was estimated to be 15 million acre-feet annually. So the lower basin States got 7,500,000 acre-feet a year. As early as possible they got into construction and developed Boulder Dam and many other projects.

We of the upper basin States, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, had difficulty allocating our half of the water. Eventually we reached a decision. In the meantime California not only used the water allocated to it but, because none of the upper basin States had a way to impound the water, California used that for the generation of power and sold it at a very low figure to the power companies in Los Angeles. As I recall the last figures, the amount paid was around $50 million. That was money that the upper basin States were entitled to because the water was that of the upper basin States.

There has been all kinds of opposition to this bill, and I mean that part giving anything at all to the upper basin States. But it has been approved by everybody in authority. The President of the United States, I assume after consulting with officials who knew the conditions, recommended on 3 or 4 occasions, the last time this morning, the passage of this legislation.

The Colorado River development project bill, like most other forward looking legislation which has come before the Congress since the days of the Founding Fathers, is encountering bitter opposition based upon selfishness, greed, and lack of understanding. Its opponents have attacked it in much the same language as was used by the opposition to soil conservation, rural electrification, and other similar programs which have contributed so vitally to our country's enormous economic upsurge. It is high time that we penetrate this camouflage of propaganda with which the opponents of this bill have sought to becloud it, in the hope of blocking its enactment. Fortunately the propaganda has been so transparent, groundless, and at times so absurd as to defeat their purpose.

The height of absurdity was reached in desperation by the opposition when one of its southern California power interests spokesmen proposed that we should resort to the services of so-called rainmakers in the upper basin States and abandon any plan for utilization and conservation of the Colorado River waters. I shall not attempt to add further insult to the intelligence of the Members of this honorable body by making a detailed reply to such a weird proposal.

We in the Southwest have had experience—disillusioning and unsatisfactory experience—with rainmakers. Our drought-plagued farmers and ranchers have paid them thousands of dollars. Ask those ranchers and farmers about rainmaking. Their answers may not be polite, but they will be forceful.

Incidentally, the upper basin States are not seeking for more water through this legislation. They merely want to conserve and utilize the water which rightfully is theirs and which is now flowing down the Colorado River to generate electricity for southern California power interests, over and above the amount to which they are entitled.

The sole purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with construction of facilities on the upper Colorado River that will permit beneficial use of the water. This utilization would consist of generation of electrical energy, irrigation of lands, and even more important, making water supplies available for municipalities and industries in an area where economic progress has been seriously hampered by shortage of water and power.

The first requirement for legislation of this type must be that it is in the public interest. That should be the requirement for any sound legislation. When I speak of public interest I do not mean that it should benefit 1 group of people or 1 area to the exclusion of others, but that we must measure such proposals as this with a nationwide yardstick. The primary question, then, that we have before us is whether all of the American people will be benefited by the development of this upper Colorado River. Let us consider that.

The upper Colorado River and its tributaries traverse what is known as the Colorado Plateau. That is the only source of water supply for this area of 100,000 square miles of which 24,000 are in Colorado, 31,000 in Utah, 27,000 in Arizona and 19,000 in New Mexico, according to the records of the United States Geological Survey. The Bureau of Land Management estimates that approximately 75 percent of the nearly 65 million acres in the Colorado Plateau are owned or controlled by the Federal Government. In other words three-fourths of this land belongs directly to all the American people—not just to those of the individual States where the lands are located. The principal income from those 65 million acres and the resources on or under them, therefore, goes to the Federal Government for the benefit of the Nation's taxpayers. That is not an unusual condition in the public lands States of the West.

In regard to the Colorado Plateau, however, it becomes particularly significant when we consider the fact that from this area comes virtually all of the domestic supply of uranium for the successful operation of our atomic-energy program, in which the citizens of this country have invested nearly $15 billion since its inception. Domestic sources of uranium outside of the Colorado Plateau, so far as they have been discovered today, are negligible. Without Colorado Plateau uranium we would be entirely dependent upon imports in event of war or other emergency, at a time when our foreign supply of uranium would be radically reduced or entirely cut off. The $15 billion investment of the American people thus would be rendered virtually ineffective for our defense, or the continued economic development of our Nation. In this atomic age that would mean disaster, probably the most widespread and complete that has ever confronted us. It could spell total defeat for us.

According to the records of the AEC uranium production and processing, virtually all in the Colorado Plateau area, has passed the $100 million-a-year scale of operations. It probably is nearer double that today. For security reasons we cannot say what this means in terms of the overall atomic energy program. It can be said, however, that we have about reached the maximum uranium production and processing possible in this area until additional and more constant water and power resources are made available. There is only one way in which this can be done and that is by construction of the projects authorized by this legislation. Let me repeat that this is the only water resource in that vital area. In other words, our atomic energy eggs are all in this one basket.

Any man with a modicum of business sense would agree, I am sure, that reasonable investment by the American people to protect, expand and assure future success of a $15 billion atomic enegry program would be fully justified. Most certainly a plan for financing that development which provides for an original Government investment of $760 million, of which more than $752 million is self-liquidating, much of it with interest, must be recognized as good business. There is no giveaway of the people's money involved. All this talk about a cost of billions to the taxpayers is as false as it is foolish. No one knows that better than those who are doing the talking.

Simple arithmetic blows their false argument sky high. This bill authorizes a construction program investment of $760 million over a period estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation as approximating 25 years. That means an average investment of about $30 million a year. The Bureau of Reclamation conservatively estimates that an average of 60 percent of this amount will come from the reclamation fund, which is derived in considerable degree from production of minerals and oil on the public lands and from the sale of those public lands. A good percentage of that fund comes from the four upper basin States themselves, all of them key public lands States.

That means that $18 million of the annual requirements will come from the reclamation fund and only $12 million out of the general fund in the Treasury, virtually all of it reimbursable. Thus that claim is an unjustified burden on the Nation's taxpayers evaporates into smog-free air.

Those taxpayers are not as fortunate, however, when they are forced to pay $348 million for a flood control project that protects only Los Angeles. Please bear in mind that none of this money is reimbursable. It is an outright giveaway to southern California's metropolis. It all comes out of the people's pockets. I do not mean to imply I am opposed to flood control projects. I vote for every meritorious project as a member of the Public Works Flood Control Subcommittee. But I do object most strenuously to southern California's willingness to accept this gift from the Nation with one hand and knife the upper basin States development project with the other.

If the Colorado plateau promised nothing further than the development of its rich uranium resources, which geologists generally agree may easily be the world's greatest, enactment of this legislation would not only be justified but mandatory. The 100,000 square miles also have a vast potential in production of oil and gas, coal, oilshale, lead, zinc, copper, and many other minerals that have brought from many expert sources, both Government and private, a conservative appraisal of its economic value running high into the billions of dollars. It is often characterized as nature's most valuable storehouse of resources in the United States. Production of oil and gas, for instance, cannot be definitely estimated for the entire area, but the partially developed oil and gas resources in northwestern New Mexico may be reasonably accepted as a basis for calculation. That one small part of the Colorado Plateau has a reserve of 11 trillion cubic feet of gas. In that field alone 151 billion cubic feet of natural gas was produced in 1954, with a value at the well of 6.1 cents per thousand cubic feet. Oil production averages about 95,000 barrels of crude per month with a current value of about $2.50 per barrel. The annual value of the oil and gas production from this one field is considerably in excess of $12 million.

In this same area the United States Government has a helium-gas plant which makes an important contribution to this Nation's supply of that rare and most valuable strategic commodity, so essential to our defense program. Other oil and gas discoveries are constantly being made in Utah and Colorado which bear out the opinion of geologists that the Colorado Plateau eventually will be one of the Nation's greatest sources of those products. That development will be impossible without adequate water supply.

The return to the American people—to the Treasury of the United States to lighten the tax burden of the Nation—from the development of this vast potential is almost incalculable. I can assure you that the State of New Mexico would be delighted to finance its share of the proposed upper Colorado River development, if the Congress would approve legislation turning over to the upper basin States the rich Federal holdings in the Colorado Plateau and the full income from them. I am equally sure that every other upper basin State would be willing to do the same. We could build a dozen Colorado River development projects and still turn a surplus of millions every year into our State treasuries. Yet, we encounter bitter and unreasoning opposition to this legislation,

which will give our States but a fraction of the benefits that all of the American people will derive from the resulting development.

I can understand why southern California power interests, for instance, are resorting to every trick, fair or foul, in the legislative book to defeat this bill. For many years they have waxed fat from electrical energy derived from the waters belonging to the upper basin States that flow down the Colorado River through Hoover Dam outlets. Excess profits from energy developed by this upper basin water over the 7,500,000 acre-feet annually allotted to the lower basin States under the Colorado River compact, which the power interests have obtained at a so-called dump rate, has given them a windfall of at least $41 million—undoubtedly much more—in addition to the many other millions they make from primary contract energy. Naturally they do not want to lose this bonanza, regardless of the hardship it works on their neighbors along the Colorado River and on the rest of the Nation. Worst of all, fully half of this water, which rightfully belongs to the upper basin States is flowing eventually into the Pacific Ocean after it has turned the turbines at Hoover Dam. This waste of our water resources has been going on for three decades. To the water-starved and drought-stricken States in the upper Colorado Basin, now helpless to protect themselves, this can be regarded as nothing less than an outrage. Southern California vested power interests are reaching into the pocket of every taxpayer in the Nation when they seek to further deprive the Colorado Plateau of the water which it must have to continue its development. The American people are being defrauded. Only the proper conservation and utilization of the Colorado River waters in the upper basin can properly protect their interests. It is manifestly the obligation of the Congress to enact this legislation in furtherance of the public interest.

A few minutes ago I heard one of our delightful Members say that there were many millions of acres east of the Mississippi River, why not develop them? I will tell you one reason why some of the people in the northern basin should have some water.

About 1862 or 1863 when the Navaho Indians were having difficulty getting food because strange faces had come into that area and killed off that which they had for food prior thereto, they got rather upset about it and killed some of the whites. After years they were rounded up. They were not from New Mexico. They were the nomads of the West, from California, Nevada, and all the States west. What did they do with them? They put them in a stockade at Fort Sumner, N. Mex., and after some years moved them to the location they are occupying now, part in Arizona and the other part in New Mexico. We have at least 60,000 Indians in that area.

They say: "Well, you do not need water that comes by the hand of God. Get it from rainmakers."

Mr. Chairman, all we are asking here is what we are entitled to and nothing more.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. May I say that the Navaho Indians were confined in a concentration camp at Fort Sumner for 5 years.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thank the gentleman. The situation in my State of New Mexico and the other States concerned is about the same. The richest area of the world is what I am speaking about now, the upper northwest corner of New Mexico where it joins Utah, Arizona, and Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not a fact that the uranium industry in the United States is approaching very close to the $200 million figure and that the whole industry is based upon the production of raw uranium ore very near 90 percent of which is taken from this very area?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is true. In addition to that, we could supply the other 5 or 10 percent, because we have sufficient ore in McKinley, San Juan, and neighboring counties in New Mexico to supply the needs of the United States whether they be in war or in peace or both.

Now, I am not a chemist. I am not going to go through any chemistry demonstration with you or attempt to test out anything, but I do know what is required by way of water to process 1 ton of uranium ore. It needs up to 4 tons of water. We have one processing plant in McKinley County, New Mexico, and we would like to have another, but we do not have the water to treat the uranium.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not a fact that the gentleman is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in this Congress?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. And I want to say this to you, that the most important, the most valuable laboratory in the world is at Los Alamos, N. Mex. That is where the first atomic bomb was assembled. We have $15 billion of the people's money invested in atomic energy and hydrogen energy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me the greatest distance uranium ore is being hauled today for processing?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, I will say probably 150 miles.

Mr. GROSS. 150 miles is the greatest distance?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I mean by truck.

Mr. GROSS. By truck?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. By train how far is it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would not know, but very little in New Mexico is hauled by train.

Mr. GROSS. Where is the uranium now being mined in the Rocky Mountain area being processed?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is being processed near Grants, N. Mex.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the uranium ore is broken down into concentrates.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right.

Mr. ASPINALL. And they are shipped out, for instance, from Grand Junction, Colo., being the supply center, by railroad.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thought the gentleman was asking me about New Mexico.

Mr. GROSS. I wondered how far it is being hauled anywhere in the country.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We will get to that. I cannot yield any further. I am sorry.

Mr. GROSS. What I am thinking of, you might ship some into Iowa. We would like to have some industry in Iowa as well as New Mexico or the Rocky Mountain area.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We will soon give away a billion dollars worth to foreign countries of some of the uranium that we get from New Mexico. I assume that is important, or it would not be done. But, we have invested $15 billion, and what did it do? Well, before the atom was split, before the know-how existed to make a bomb out of uranium, I suppose we thought of an amount equal to the national debt of the United States, which is about $280 billion now. But it did not take that much. But it does take money.

Now, we have the Navaho Indians in New Mexico and Arizona. We need water in the development of home building. They build 400 houses at a time for a lot of people coming in to work in these uranium fields. And we have not a lot of land to put into cultivation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, the upper Colorado River Basin embraces an area of approximately 110,000 square miles, and consists of mountains, deserts and valleys, as well as many important cities and towns. This area is contained in five States, which are commonly known as the upper Colorado River Basin States. They are Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah, although Arizona is usually regarded as a lower-basin State.

The bill before the House today is the result of long, tedious study and prolonged negotiations between the water leaders of the upper-basin States. It was natural to expect a divergence of views and opinions, with each State anxious to protect and preserve its water rights.

There have been many differences of opinion, and even disunity at times, with respect to the methods to be pursued in developing the resources of this great river. It has taken a long period of years to resolve these differences and to agree upon upper river basin development program which would insure the maximum benefits for the largest number of people. Great credit is due all of those who participated in these negotiations. Except

for their patience and expert knowledge of water problems, and a willingness to make concessions, there would be no bill before us today.

I might state that there has always been complete unity on the necessity and importance of developing the upper Colorado River Basin. The divisions which have occurred have involved details, and not basic principles.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to state to the Committee today that this is a bill having the full support of the four upper-basin States, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. These States are completely and unequivocably behind this measure—H. R. 3383—introduced by my distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and which authorizes the Colorado River storage project, and participating projects.

As evidence of the unity which exists on this project, I wish to read letters which I have received from the governors of these four States. These letters contain the reasons why these States are supporting the present bill. It gives me great pleasure to present letters from Hon. Ed. C. Johnson, Governor of Colorado, Hon. J. Bracken Lee, Governor of Utah, Hon. John F. Sims, Governor of New Mexico, and Hon. Milward L. Simpson, Governor of Wyoming. These letters are the best proof of the intense interest in this project in these four States. Each governor gives this project his enthusiastic support and I am sure in doing so reflects the general sentiment to be found in all of the upper-basin States.

I wish to first read the letter from Governor Johnson, of Colorado:

STATE OF COLORADO,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Denver, February 21, 1956.

The Honorable Members of the United States Senate and the Honorable Members of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Thirty-five years ago California, searching for an additional irrigation and domestic supply of water and hydroelectric power, undertook the promotion of a Federal project on the Colorado River. California contributed practically no water to this stream, yet through transmountain diversion she planned to put many million acre-feet of its water to beneficial use.

The semiarid States of Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Colorado, who produced this water, were willing this be done provided first a compact among all the States of this river system be ratified by themselves and Congress, allocating to each State including California a specified and proportionate share of the water of the Colorado River system. Otherwise, the water laws of this whole area based as they are on the water doctrine of first in time, first in right would prevail and California having the first construction and use would have the first priority to all the water in this river. California, realizing that there could be no development of the river without the consent of all the States in its system, became the moving spirit and the foremost advocate of such a compact.

The Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover, acted as chairman and under his direction a seven-State compact was negotiated and afterward ratified by all the States and the Congress of the United States. Thereupon Hoover Dam was constructed with Federal funds and California began receiving her portion of the water of this river and also the power generated at Hoover Dam.

Among its many other provisions, the compact required the upper-basin States to deliver at Lee's Ferry 75 million acre-feet of water in each 10-year period, plus sufficient water to supply the Republic of Mexico.

These required deliveries by the compact gave California and the Republic of Mexico a priority to use of this specific water over all new uses of water in the river system.

Before Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Colorado can use additional water out of the Colorado River system, water which they themselves produce, they must first have storage facilities above Lee's Ferry so that they will be able to meet the burden of water delivery to the lower States which Congress placed on them when it ratified the seven-State compact. When Hoover Dam was built it was understood by everyone, including California and the Congress, that storage facilities would be necessary above Lee's Ferry if the upper States supplying the water were ever to put their water to use. Since the first concrete financed by Congress was poured in Hoover Dam, the upper States have acted in good faith and have taken it for granted that Congress and all concerned would act in good faith. We still believe that our confidence in Congress and the administration in Washington on this matter has never wavered.

The Colorado River, draining a vast semiarid region, is very erratic in water production. It has a water production varying from 4 million acre-feet annually to more than 20 million acre-feet. The streams feeding this system deliver 80 percent of their water in a 4-month spring flood period. The only way such a river system can be brought under orderly control and the only way the upper States can meet their obligation to the lower States is through the construction of huge storage reservoirs above Lee's Ferry and only the Federal Treasury can finance such gigantic undertakings.

The time has come for the construction of storage facilities above Lee's Ferry at Glen Canyon and elsewhere if there is to be any further development of this river. Unless and until this is done, the upper States are left high and dry and helpless by the very compact which was ratified by them and the Congress in good faith and which they had presumed would give them full and complete protection in the full development of the whole Colorado River Basin.

When Congress built Hoover Dam, it assumed as a matter of equity the obligation to build storage facilities above Lee's Ferry. To have built the one without the other would be the rankest kind of gross favoritism and injustice. Congress is known all over the world for its fairness and for meeting its responsibilities in full.

Water is mankind's most valuable natural resource and all of it everywhere must be conserved. If it is not used for crop production immediately the time will come when it must be so used. As a practical matter the legislation now pending in Congress authorizing storage facilities will not put new land into agricultural production for at least 20 years. H. R. 3383 should be enacted into law now. I hope most earnestly you vote for it.

Sincerely,

ED C. JOHNSON,
Governor of Colorado.

I now read a letter from the Governor of Utah, Hon. J. Bracken Lee:

STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salt Lake City, February 21, 1956.

The Honorable Members of the United States Senate and the Honorable Members of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: One of the important measures that you will soon be considering is H. R. 3383 which authorizes the development of the Colorado River storage project. Inasmuch as I am well aware of how difficult it is for you to keep thoroughly informed on every bill that comes up before Congress, I thought I would give you information about the aforementioned bill as it affects the great Rocky Mountain empire.

I am certain you are aware that President Eisenhower has endorsed the Colorado River storage project. This project also is endorsed and supported by the Governors and the people of the affected States; namely, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Our very future in the West depends upon this measure since any further growth and expansion of these four States is tied inevitably to the development of this last great water resource of the Rockies.

The Colorado River storage project as it has been planned will pay for itself and, thus, will not be an expense for the Nation's taxpayers but will be an investment. In addition, it will bring untold benefit to the Nation through the new economic resources it will help develop. Our primary interest in this project, however, is simply to secure for our future growth that one resource which is in short supply in the West—water.

The most vocal opposition to the H. R. 3383 originates in southern California. It seems to be the feeling in that area that the Colorado River storage project will deprive southern California of its share of river water. On the contrary, this bill will not deprive southern California of a drop of its rightful share of the Colorado River water, but will insure a regular and regulated flow of water to meet the lower basin requirements, as outlined in the Colorado River compact of 1922.

It seems there is every important reason to sanction this project and very few real reasons for opposing it. We sincerely hope, therefore, that you will study H. R. 3383 carefully and will keep in mind its vital importance to this area and the Nation when the measure is brought to a vote.

Sincerely yours,

J. BRACKEN LEE,
Governor of Utah.

I now read a letter from Hon. John F. Simms, Governor of New Mexico:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Santa Fe, February 11, 1956.

Hon. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHENOWETH: I am sure that you either have, or are about to, weigh the merits of H. R. 3383 which would authorize the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. The purpose of this letter is to let you know, before you decide finally what your vote will be, that approval of this bill is of the utmost importance, not only to every person in my State of New Mexico, but also to the Nation as a whole.

As you know, water is our lifeblood. A vast amount of the Colorado River water to which New Mexico and our sister States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming are entitled under existing treaties, is flowing now to southern California and the Pacific Ocean. We desperately need this water for our tremendous defense establishments—such as the Los Alamos Atomic Laboratory and Sandia Special Weapons Center—for irrigation projects which will not contribute to present food surpluses, for Navaho irrigation lands, for development of the San Juan Basin, for hydroelectric power, for domestic and industrial use.

Opposition to H. R. 3383 springs from the understandable desire of California to keep and use all of the Colorado River water which it can get.

It is my hope that when you vote on H. R. 3383 you will keep in mind these things:

1. Simple justice demands a favorable vote.

2. The projects will be self-liquidating.

3. Urgent defense requirements will be met.

4. The Navaho Tribe will be given an opportunity for agricultural rehabilitation.

All of us here in New Mexico will deeply and sincerely appreciate your help and your affirmative vote.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. SIMMS,
Governor.

The last letter I wish to read is from the Governor of Wyoming, Hon. Milward L. Simpson:

WYOMING EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Cheyenne, February 14, 1956.

The Honorable Members of the United States Senate and the Honorable Members of the United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The importance of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects to my State of Wyoming and to the Nation as a whole cannot be overemphasized.

The upper Colorado River development program is vital if we in Wyoming are to utilize the water to which we are entitled under the 1922 Colorado River compact and the 1948 upper Colorado River Basin compact. This water is essential to allow the agricultural, municipal, and industrial development for which we have such a great potential.

Irrigated land in Wyoming does not produce crops that add to the surplus problem. Irrigation is needed to stabilize our agricultural economy and prevent the necessity of Federal Government drought relief, upon which we have had to rely in the past.

Our vast storehouse of natural resources has barely been touched. The Colorado River storage project would provide the key to a great future for Wyoming. We could take our rightful place in the family of States industrialwise—not by taking anything away from other areas, but by becoming an area for supply.

I assure you that the entire State of Wyoming is enthusiastically supporting the Colorado River storage project and participating projects—a vitally important piece of legislation.

Sincerely yours,

MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
Governor.

Mr. Chairman, it has taken 30 years of intensive study and repeated conferences on the part of the water leaders of these 4 States to bring about this agreement and unanimity of purpose. Many water leaders from State and local governmental agencies have also participated in these negotiations over the years, as well as officials of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is indeed a tribute to this entire group that their efforts have succeeded and that we are now considering a bill which has the unqualified support of each State in the upper Colorado River Basin.

Immediately after the approval of the Colorado River compact in 1922, which divided the Colorado River Basin into two parts, the upper basin and the lower basin, the States of the upper basin began working on plans to develop the water which had been apportioned to them under the compact, amounting to 7,500,000 acre-feet per year. It was soon discovered however that it would be impossible to formulate a satisfactory basinwide development plan until the water apportioned to the upper-basin States was allocated among the four States involved. It had been previously determined that a basinwide plan was the only practicable type of development because of the physical nature of the country and the interrelationship of one project with another.

After many meetings and long periods of negotiation, the Commissioners representing Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, Utah, and the Federal Government, reached an agreement in 1948, which is known as the upper Colorado River Basin Compact. This compact resolved all of the basic differences between the States on the division of the water allocated to the upper-basin States, and divided this water among these States on the following percentage basis:

Arizona, 50,000 acre-feet.

Colorado, 51.75 percent of the balance.

Utah, 23 percent of the balance.

Wyoming, 14 percent of the balance.

New Mexico, 11.25 percent of the balance.

The bill which we are considering today, H. R. 3383, is based upon the upper Colorado River Basin compact, as well as all of the other agreements and documents which constitute the basic laws and regulations of the Colorado River.

There is no basis whatever to the charge that the lawsuit between Arizona and California, which is now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States, shows a lack of unity among the States of the Colorado River Basin, or in any way affects the bill we are now considering. This lawsuit relates only to the water in the lower basin of the Colorado River. It involves water that has been allocated and apportioned to the lower-basin States under the 1922 Colorado River compact. The upper basin States have no interest in this suit. They recognize they are bound by the compact and fully intend to comply with its terms.

On several occasions water interests of southern California have endeavored in vain to force the upper Colorado States into this lower basin controversy between Arizona and California. The upper basin States, by a united effort have successfully resisted such attempts which have been pursued for dilatory purposes in order to delay the passage of this legislation.

The Supreme Court has, twice in recent months, upheld and sustained the position of the upper basin States. On July 25, 1954, California filed a motion with the Supreme Court as parties to the suit, the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah. A hearing was held before the Court on this motion on December 6, 1955. On December 12, 1955, the motion was denied—Three Hundred and Fiftieth United States Reports, page 114. In denying the motion the Supreme Court said:

The motion of California to join the States of Colorado and Wyoming as parties to this cause is denied. The motion to join Utah and New Mexico as parties is granted only to the extent of their interest in lower basin waters.

On January 3, 1956, California made another attempt to delay action on this legislation by filing a petition for a rehearing on this motion. The Supreme Court on January 24, 1956, denied the motion for a rehearing. The Supreme Court, by these decisions, has determined the four upper basin States are not necessary parties to the pending litigation between Arizona and California.

The Navaho Indians are also very much interested in this legislation, and have given this project their enthusiastic support. The Navahos comprise a large segment of the population of the States of New Mexico and Arizona. The water which will be made available when this project is completed will bring new life and hope to them. By using this water on their parched land they will be able to grow many agricultural products, which would materially raise their standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious to any fair-minded person interested in the development of our natural resources that now is the time to initiate construction of the Colorado River storage project, and participating projects. Further delays are completely unjustified. I hope that the substitute bill will be passed, so that construction of this important project can be started at the earliest possible date.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] for a unanimous-consent request.

WHY THE OPPOSITION TO THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND THE STRANGE REASONING BEHIND THEIR OPPOSITION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation and trust we will pass it.

For months I have been receiving hundreds of pieces of literature poured out by the opponents of the Colorado River storage project. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been full of it, pamphlets, brochures, and what have you, have deluged our mailboxes, and it is about time this House understands the reasoning behind such unreal, distorted, and actual misinformation being put out through this excessive publicity.

In fact, the arguments have degenerated into a brawl between a well-heeled southern California lobby and the five States, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming, all of these States situated in or partially within the upper basin of the Colorado River.

We wonder sometimes where the southern California interests received all their money to so lavishly build up their opposition of publicity. Could it be because for many years they have had access to the use of water and the millions of dollars' worth of power revenues that have been originating through the upper basin States, thereby actually forming the basis for the wonderful economic progress southern California has made the past two decades?

It must appear to the most casual thinker that the very fact that the upper basin States have provided water for the use of southern California for so many years, with the unused part of it running into the Gulf of California, used by Mexico, or wasted into the Salton Sea, has so confused the leaders of the opposition to the upper Colorado River Basin as to our rights that they positively cannot see the forest for the underbrush. Their rights have been protected, and it certainly is surprising that they should be so distorted in their thinking that

they want to refuse the use of the surplus water to the States to which the water belongs. It is not their water and by no stretch of the imagination can they claim it.

Those who oppose H. R. 3383 have gotten themselves so far out on a limb in their opposition and their attacks have been so distorted that I cannot see how any fairminded Congressman can accept the truth even when accidentally expressed by these exaggerating heroes who propose to save water for southern California—water to which they have no right whatsoever—while they act like a dog in a manger and refuse to let the rightful owners put it to useful purposes.

The attacks by the opposition have gone through several distinct stages of variable and questionable approaches. Most of them disgusting, to say the least. To mention a few—the big breeze in opposition to the Echo Park storage unit—the wild, weird, and absolutely false statements, contrariwise to the thinking of every engineer of any status, that much of the soil bordering the edge of these reservoirs would be composed of such a type of soil that it would disintegrate and run into the lake by its own pressure. How silly can the publicity purveyors of false ideas get? So far out of line has the opposition to this legislation finally directed themselves that they are actually opposing or directly attacking the principles of reclamation itself, in spite of the fact that it has been reclamation that has been the basis of most of the economic development of all southern California.

I venture a statement that in a few years to come southern California and its fine people will wonder what type and kind of leadership they were following when they opposed the development of the upper Colorado River project.

The reclamation law that has for many years been the basis for the many great projects developed in the West seems to me to be above reproach, especially from sections of the country that have received its greatest benefits.

I think I should quote from an address made February 26 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a California Congressman, my colleague CLAIR ENGLE. He said and I quote:

> The Californians who object to the project on grounds of subsidy do so in the face of the fact that the major subsidy to the reclamation projects comes not from the Federal Treasury, but from the power users in accordance with regular principles. The Federal subsidy amounts to only $8.2 million and that for features which are recognized as Federal expenses. Constrast that subsidy with the estimated nonreimbursable Federal cost of $348 million for only 1 flood-control project in southern California, namely the Los Angeles County drainage area—excluding the Whittier Narrows Reservoir—and you can get some idea of the reaction of upper basin spokesmen to challenges to the Colorado River storage project based on economics by the California opposition. Thus a single flood-control project which benefits 1 area in California carries a nonreimbursable Federal grant which is over 43 times the subsidy to the Colorado storage project in which 4 States benefit. If it is considered appropriate to take into account the cost to the Federal Government based on the non-interest-bearing irrigation investment, those features of the Colorado River storage projects would cost the United States some $285 million in interest over the 60-year amortization term. At the end of that period, all Federal costs will have been repaid. The nonreimbursable Federal grant for the Los Angeles County drainage area, on the other hand, will over the same length of time cost the United States $570 million in interest alone and this interest cost will continue to mount indefinitely. After 100 years, it will amount to $870 million.

It is interesting to read from the testimony of a certain engineer by the name of Ely for the State of California. He said, and I quote:

> The aggregate consumptive use of these projects is said to range from about a half million to about 1½ million acre-feet. These quantities when added to about 2,500,000 acre-feet, said to be required by projects already constructed or authorized, would represent a total use of say 3 million or 4 million acre-feet in the upper basin. The larger of these figures is still within the quantity of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, the use of which is apportioned to the upper basin by article 3 (a) of the Colorado River compact.

In short, southern Californians have never stood up and honestly admitted what they are trying to do. Actually, they are trying to protect the greatest water and power steal of the century by preventing those really entitled to the water from using it. And they are doing this in the face of the fact that they themselves are signers of the Colorado River compact which was formulated to protect upstream interests of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah, and in spite of the fact that lower basin power contracts are predicated upon a consumptive use of water in the upper basin and a diminishing water supply at Hoover Dam.

Just how large is this windfall that southern California is not in any sense of the word either morally or legally entitled to and which she is frantically trying to prevent being utilized by those rightfully entitled to use it? In a letter dated June 10, 1955, to my colleague, Mr. DAWSON of Utah, Acting Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. E. G. Nielsen, has laid the answer on the line, as follows:

> The Bureau studies anticipated a decrease in the annual water supply available to Lake Mead of 3,949,000 acre-feet between 1938 and 1988, because of increased upstream uses, which is an average of 79,000 acre-feet decrease per year. However, the best information available at the present time indicates no significant decrease in water supply available to Lake Mead, because of increased upstream use. Thus, the amount of water available to Lake Mead during the 1938–54 period has been substantially higher than would have been the case if the increases in upstream use anticipated at the time of negotiation of the power contract had actually materialized.
>
> While depletion estimates cannot be made with an extremely high degree of accuracy, if it is assumed that upstream depletions have been maintained at a constant level from 1938 through 1954, as appears to be the best estimate that can be obtained, the additional water available at Hoover Dam because of inability to increase upstream use, has been about 11 million acre-feet for the 1938–54 period. This additional water is equivalent to about 4.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical energy generated at Hoover Dam powerplant, all of which has been secondary energy, on which the charge to the allottees has been about 1.30 mills per kilowatt-hour (falling water charge of about 0.45 mill and generating charge of about 0.85 mill). The value of this power as fuel replacement in the Los Angeles area is understood to be about 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. The indicated saving of 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour was realized without additional investment, and with only minor transmission losses. The saving to the California allottees of Hoover secondary energy over the period 1938 to date, then approaches $12 million.
>
> If upstream use is held at the present level throughout the remaining years of the power contracts, until 1988, the additional water available to Lake Mead for the entire 1938–88 period will have mounted to a total of about 100 million acre-feet. This is equivalent to about 43 billion kilowatt-hours of secondary energy from Hoover powerplant, and on the same basis as above will result in a saving to power allottees approaching $115 million during their contract period.

Lower basin devotees have on occasion expressed fears that the Colorado River storage project, when constructed, will adversely affect the revenues and payout of Hoover, Davis, and Parker powerplants. While we are at it, let us lay this ghost, too. General regulations for generation and sale of power in accordance with Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, to which are made subject the power contracts for power generated at Hoover Dam, contain the following provision:

> The amount of firm energy for the first year of operation (June 1, 1937, to May 31, 1938, inclusive) is defined as 4,330,000,000 kilowatt-hours delivered at transmission voltage. For every subsequent year the amount defined as firm energy will be decreased by 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours from that of the previous year.
>
> The term "secondary energy" wherever used herein means all electrical energy available in any year of operation in excess of the amount of firm energy as hereinabove defined.

Thus, it is glaringly obvious that what southern California has really been bellyaching about is the possibility that she may lose the use of a large amount of firm power at dump-power rates. It should be made clear, however, that anticipated revenues to the United States Treasury from the Hoover, Davis, and Parker powerplants will not be affected by the plan for the Colorado River storage project. Rate and repayment schedules for Hoover, effective since 1937, contemplate full repayment of reimbursable costs, with nothing added, under the condition of a diminishing water supply over the contract period which ends in 1987. In conformity with the decreasing available water supply is the firm energy production schedule, which decreases each year by 1,000 kilowatts or 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours.

Provisions for periodic adjustment of rates assure repayment of all amounts which will come due during the life of the contract. The Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, all contracts for Hoover electrical energy recognize the effect of the increasing use of water in the upper basin.

In a similar manner, rate and repayment schedules for the Parker and Davis powerplants anticipate a lessening water

supply. The assumed rate of decrease is more severe than contemplated by the plan for the Colorado River storage project. Contracts for energy from Parker and Davis Dams are relatively short-term as contrasted with those at Hoover. Current rates should fully amortize all reimbursable costs. If not, the rates will be periodically adjusted.

Because the plan for the Colorado River storage project and participating projects contemplates storage and consumptive uses of water less severe than the assumed rates of diminished flows upon which is based the schedule of firm energy production at Hoover, Davis, and Parker powerplants, the proposed uses of water in the upper basin will not curtail the firm energy production at the downstream powerplants. The lower basin power users, therefore, at the time they signed contracts for power contemplated a decreasing generation of secondary energy due to upstream uses in the upper basin.

Now, at further "be-smogging" the issue, southern California finds herself knocked out of the ring. Why? Because, gentlemen, as I have stated, the real issue is to be found in the question, Who should get the use of the water and power now used by the lower basin, but to which she is not entitled: Those to whom they both morally and legally belong in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah by the authorization of H. R. 3383 which is before you; or those in southern California who, after having the benefits of using them for 20 years desire to continue at the expense of the industrial, agricultural, and economic development of the upper basin States and the rest of the Nation, which will also receive benefits?

I might add, that if southern California is so anxious to have others wait for the medicine man to make it rain she has plenty of clouds mixed with fertilizing gases to which could be applied rainmaking techniques.

There is no basis for the arguments used by southern California in opposing the upper Colorado River project.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, when I heard my good colleague from California a while ago talking about the legalities of this situation, I wondered if I was in the wrong place and we were talking about an Arizona bill. Actually, of course, I wish I had time to give you the Arizona version of this lawsuit, but 5 minutes would not be sufficient to do so. But I should like to dispose of this legal situation, if I may, by stating one very important fact. That fact is that in the case of Arizona against California, the State of California moved to join all of the States of the upper basin as parties. The master who had been appointed by the court found against the motion and thereupon the State of California asked for oral arguments before the Supreme Court.

The question was thoroughly briefed and the Supreme Court, after oral argument, found that there was no issue in the case of Arizona against California which could have any effect whatsoever upon the rights of the States of the upper basin. So I do not believe that anybody here, on this point, wants to second-guess the Supreme Court as to whether or not the case of Arizona against California is important to the passage of this bill. It is not.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Yesterday the question was asked, I believe by the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. DIES] whether if the decision in the California-Arizona case went in favor of California it would make any difference in this project, the upper Colorado River project. Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will be very glad to answer it, but I do not have to answer it from my own mind. The Supreme Court has already answered it. If I interpret the action of the Supreme Court correctly, the answer is "No." No matter what the decision may be in that case, it will have no effect upon the rights of the States of the upper basin to divert water. Further to answer that question I should like to quote testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in connection with this particular bill. At this time I was conducting a colloquy with Mr. Northcutt Ely, chief counsel of the State of California, in the case of Arizona against California and also the chief witness in behalf of the State of California against this bill. We were talking about the question of transmountain diversion, whether or not it would harm the quality of the water coming down into the lower basin if there were transmountain diversions to the areas of Colorado and Utah across the mountains. I asked this question:

> So that has nothing to do with the amount which can be eventually put to beneficial consumptive use in the upper basin. It is still your understanding and your belief that 7½ million acre-feet can be beneficially used in the upper basin without violating the rights of the lower basin?

Here is what Mr. Ely said:

> Up to that in any one year, subject to the qualification that we want an adequate study of the effect of transmountain diversions.

With this in the RECORD, I do not know how it is possible at this point to say, as we have heard it said, that the passage of this bill will result in thirst in southern California, that it will dry up southern California and that all sorts of undesirable things will happen if this project is constructed.

How much water will this use? The best estimate we have is that it will actually use in beneficial consumptive use 900,000 acre-feet of water. There will still be all of the water coming down the river which now comes down the river with the exception of 900,000 acre-feet of water. That does not sound like very much to me when you talk about 7½ million acre-feet of water. Actually, as a lower basin State, the State of Arizona should be interested in having the water come down the river. We are interested. We are interested in having 7½ million acre-feet come down that river plus the surplus water to which the lower basin is entitled as set forth by the Santa Fe Compact of 1922. No more, no less.

If you take the arguments of the gentleman from California on this matter, then you would be, in effect, abroagting the Santa Fe Compact. If you defeat this bill for the reasons advanced by the gentlemen from California you would be depriving the States of the upper basin of the right to use water apportioned to them by that very solemn compact between all of the States of the Colorado Basin.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, many logical and sensible reasons have been advanced why the upper Colorado River project, H. R. 3383, should be defeated. I submit herewith 20 pertinent and sound reasons why this bill should not be passed:

First. The upper Colorado River project would bring 580,000 acres of new land into production while at the same time Congress is being asked to approve legislation which would remove more than 40 million acres from production. This does not make sense.

Second. The project would saddle an enormous new tax burden of more than $4 billion on the Nation's taxpayers. The four States benefiting would pay less than 2 percent of this added tax burden.

Third. The bill proposes that the cost of the power features of the project be repaid in 100 years. With cheap nuclear power just around the corner these gigantic hydroelectric dams would be obsolete by the time they were built.

Fourth. There is no power shortage in the upper Colorado River Basin. When increased industry creates a need for more power, steam plants can be built to supply it at a much cheaper cost than the proposed hyroelectric plants. The largest coal reserves in the world are located in the upper basin States.

Fifth. A 1955 survey shows that in 19 Midwestern and Southern States there are nearly 21 million acres of land now lying idle in farms. This is all first-class agricultural land and could be brought into production at a fraction of the cost of the upper Colorado River project.

Sixth. The project would cost the Nation's taxpayers $5,000 an acre to put water on land to grow more surplus crops, already the Nation's biggest headache.

Seventh. Secretary of Agriculture Benson said in Kansas City, Mo.:

> This is not the time to place a big new block of land in production.

Eighth. Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir, key unit of the proposed project, may not hold water or produce power because of physical and geological difficulties which cast doubt on its engineering and financial feasibility.

Ninth. The proposed dams, which are not needed, would cause enormous losses of irreplaceable water through evaporation from the gigantic reservoirs behind

them, estimated by the Reclamation Bureau at more than 800,000 acre-feet per annum.

Tenth. The true cost of the proposed project is concealed from Congress. The ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project total at least $4 billion. Reclamation Bureau cost estimates have always been notoriously low, as is revealed by the record.

Eleventh. The project's financinal scheme is wholly unsound.

Twelfth. Central Utah—initial phase—the project's largest irrigation segment, is the most infeasible of all.

Thirteenth. The benefit-cost ratio has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics.

Fourteenth. Fifty years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are jettisoned by the project.

Fifteenth. The project would forever tie the future of the intermountain West to a horse-and-buggy farm economy and forestall development of its rich industrial potential.

Sixteenth. Echo Park Dam is not removed from the project. Supporters of the project have repeatedly stated that the removal of Echo Park would be tantamount to "removing the pistons from an engine."

Seventeeth. The construction of Glen Canyon Dam will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge.

Eighteenth. The bill is wholly incompatible with the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy of December 22, 1955.

Nineteenth. The project would seriously impair water rights in the lower basin of the Colorado River.

Twentieth. This bill would not assist the Navaho Indians.

I urge the Members of the House to vote against this fantastic project.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in behalf of H. R. 3383, the Colorado River storage project bill.

I think I have certain special qualifications that enable me to speak objectively on this project. I am from an entirely different section of the country. That means I have no possible sectional interest.

On the other hand, I have visited the upper Colorado River Basin country, the area most directly concerned in this project. My visit just this past summer enabled me to observe and study conditions in that area. I can speak, therefore, with some direct and personal knowledge, and do not have to depend on what I am told by people who are either proponents or opponents of the project.

I am strongly in favor of the project for a number of reasons:

First of all, I know from a lifetime of observation and from a study of history that sound investment in developing the resources of this Nation, wherever they may be located, brings returns to the economy of the entire Nation. Just as the States of the Atlantic seaboard grew and prospered as a result of the opening up of fertile land behind the Appalachians, including my own great State of Illinois, just as we of the Midwest and older States of the East grew and prospered through the expansion farther westward to open up the treasures of the Far West, so will the economy of every corner of this Nation prosper when we develop the treasurehouses of resources in the upper Colorado River Basin.

I have seen the tremendous development in uranium and other strategic metals and minerals in the upper Colorado Basin. I know that the welfare of the entire Nation will be promoted if the necessary water and power are provided in the upper basin to insure rapid and complete development of these strategic resources. I know the entire Nation will suffer proportionately if this is not done.

I have seen the crops that are grown in the upper Colorado Basin and I know they are not the crops that are now in surplus. Grains grown there are primarily fed to livestock and poultry, and virtually none of them have been placed under price supports—only one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the corn grown there in 1954 went under price support, for example. What they grow are fruits and vegetables, specialty crops, and feed for livestock—nonsurplus crops even today.

A very important point to consider is this; this project if approved, will open vast areas of tremendously rich mineral and oil lands to development. With the present surplus of agricultural products, the opening up of additional land to cultivation does seem at this time to be inopportune. However, it is estimated that it will take from 25 to 30 years to complete this project, at which time it is estimated that the population of the United States will be in excess of 200 million people. There may be a dire need for this additional agricultural production at that future time. Building the Colorado River storage project will not in any way add to the farm surplus problem.

Opponents of the bill state that the project will cost taxpayers of the United States at least $5 billion before it is completed. The bill we are discussing today will cost approximately $760 million. Even if it were true that this project would cost $5 billion, as some opponents have claimed, and the actual cost will be only about one-sixth that amount—we could better spend the $5 billion on our own undeveloped lands for the good of the taxpayers of this country rather than spend it on undeveloped foreign countries who might some day be our enemies in case of war, and our competitors in world markets in peacetime.

As a Representative from Illinois, I have in the past expressed opposition to this project. This was due at that time to the inclusion of Echo Park Dam, as well as other possible projects which would invade and destroy some of the natural beauties to be found in our national parks and monuments. Any objection I might have had at that time has now been eliminated by the removal of Echo Park Dam from this project, and a personal assurance to me by the proponents of this bill that such a project will never again be included in the development of the upper Colorado River Basin project.

As a resident of Illinois, I have no direct interest in the building of this great reclamation project. But as a resident of Illinois I know that I will benefit from the development of this area of rich natural resources—just as will the residents of Alabama and Washington, of Maine and Indiana, of Texas and every other State. The entire Nation will, I am convinced, gain by the building of this project—and the entire Nation, I am equally convinced, will lose if we refuse to make this investment in America's future.

I therefore strongly urge this House to approve the legislation now before us.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, it is entirely understandable why the proponents of the Colorado River storage project seek to divert the attention of the Members of Congress away from the real issues involved and attempt to play up the whole argument as a controversy over the waters of the Colorado River, labeling California as an opponent of the project because she wants all the water for power generation or for uses beyond those permitted her by law and contracts.

The water controversy is at the core of California opposition. Most people probably feel it has little to do with the economic merits of this pending legislation. The States outside the Colorado River Basin feel they are not directly concerned and in general have little if any interest in this water controversy. On the other hand, the 44 States which are not in the upper Colorado River Basin are vitally concerned in the basic merits of this legislation which the proponents seek to gloss over by their charges against California. Is the project justified for authorization in the light of the excessive cost of the undertaking, the fact that it is financially unsound and of highly questionable economic justification and would require a huge hidden Federal subsidy in the amount of at least $5,000 an acre, which would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers—98 percent of the total subsidy by the 44 States not directly benefited by the project—and the further fact that it would bring into production at least 270,000 acres of new lands while at the same time a soil bank program is proposed to take out of production some 40 million acres of producing farmlands in order to alleviate the problem of surplus crops.

The charge made by the proponents of this bill is a deliberate misrepresentation of California's position. California's primary objection to the proposed upper basin storage project is that under the storage plans contemplated, as revealed in the official reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the testimony of witnesses at the hearings, California's rights to the use of Colorado River water for irrigation and domestic purposes in southern California would be tragically affected. A recent report made by a

board of consulting engineers to the San Diego Water County Authority concludes that if the upper Colorado River storage project is built as planned, it would result in the loss of at least half of the water supply from the Colorado River for the coastal plain. It is this real invasion of water rights necessary to support a growing civilization now numbering over 6 million people which we cannot countenance. California's legal rights under the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act to the consumptive use of Colorado River water for agricultural and domestic uses are at the heart of California's opposition to the upper Colorado River storage project as proposed in the pending bill.

You have heard, or will hear, that the generation of power at Hoover Dam, in which incidentally Arizona and Nevada are substantially interested as well as California, is the real basis for California objections. This is false.

The truth of the matter is that under the plans for the upper basin storage project, it is proposed to store and withhold water in the huge storage reservoirs solely for the generation of power, in direct violation of the Colorado River compact, and in total disregard of rights in the lower basin.

The Colorado River compact—article III (e)—provides as follows:

> The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

It further provides—article IV (b):

> Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

The record is clear that the upper basin storage project proposes to store and use water in these huge storage reservoirs with the capacity of 30 million acre-feet for the sole purpose of generating power and of securing power revenues to finance irrigation undertakings. The record is clear that the huge reservoirs proposed such as Glen Canyon are not needed in connection with any consumptive use on the irrigation and reclamation projects named in the pending bill. These reservoirs will not be used to put water on the land. This was admitted by Bureau witnesses. At the same time these huge reservoirs would result in a very substantial loss of water by evaporation to the extent of at least 600,000 acre-feet or more annually, which my good friend from Arizona just completely forgot about a few minutes ago when he was telling you how all this water would not be used. Since these huge storage reservoirs would not be needed in connection with actual consumptive use of water for any of the 33 participating projects named in the bill, the building of them now for power generation and the squandering of half of the entitlement of the coastal plain of California by evaporation into thin air, is indefensible.

For your complete information I would like to give you the true picture on the lower basin power contracts, about which our opponents make so much. If all of the water of the Colorado River over and above the amount required for consumptive use in the upper basin in accordance with its entitlement under the compact, is permitted to flow to the lower basin, which is clearly required by the provisions of the compact which I have cited, the incidental production of power at Hoover Dam will take place in complete satisfaction of the power contracts made by the Federal Government with Arizona, California, and Nevada.

The Hoover Dam power contracts are predicated on the expectation of Reclamation Bureau estimates of available water supply and power production over the 50-year contract period or until 1987. The esitmates made in 1941 by the Bureau were based upon the anticipation that the available water supply at Hoover Dam would be reduced progressively over the 50-year period by increased consumptive use in the upper basin. Firm power was estimated and defined to be 4,330,000,000 kilowatt-hours starting with the first year of operation in 1937, diminished thereafter by 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours each year by reason of upper basin uses. At the same time, the Bureau estimated that even with contemplated increased consumptive use in the upper basin there would be available some 40 billion kilowatt-hours of secondary energy in total over the 50-year period at Hoover Dam. This, of course, is over and above the firm energy which I have mentioned and which the lower basin contractors have a right to expect unless natural causes intervene.

The estimates of power output at Hoover were understood from the outset to be subject to the actual stream flow which depends upon the vagaries of the weather, and also on the actual amount of water diverted for consumptive use in the upper basin under the provisions of the compact. Therefore it was recognized at the outset, and still is recognized, that there is and cannot be any guaranty on the amount of power output at Hoover, which might be affected by these factors. At this moment and for many months past, firm power output at Hoover, to say nothing of secondary, has been cut over 25 percent because Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam is only one-third full—the lowest the reservoir has been since the project first filled. This is because stream flow has been dreadfully low in recent years so that the water must be conserved for domestic and agricultural uses. As it is, the present supply at Hoover Dam is enough only to support these life-giving uses in the lower basin for about 18 months.

No wonder we are concerned by this upper-basin monster. Forget about the power and consider that this project will take water guaranteed to us by Federal contracts a quarter of a century ago for use in the Los Angeles and San Diego area homes, farms, and factories. When we consider that it will take it not for consumptive use but to create gigantic lakes behind power dams for the generation of power in the effort to make these so-called participating projects look financially feasible, we are outraged. We ought to be. The provisions of the compact of 1922, which I have read, a compact signed by all of these upper-basin States, says that power generation "shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes."

It is no solace to tell us this bill gives us the right to sue if we are hurt. It should be even less solace to all of the 44 States whose taxpayers will feel the burden of the hidden subsidy in this bill. Whatever semblance of financial sanity there may be in this bill—the New York Times said in an editorial that "no partnership is involved here, presumably because no businessman in his right mind would invest in it"—is keyed into the power revenues the upper basin hopes to get. If a future Court action decides the upper basin must let this water down instead of impounding it for a maximum power head, then the whole shaky house of cards collapses and the entire project will be up for writeoff at the Federal Treasury.

This Congress should not be party to a bill of this magnitude which will violate the rights to use water needed now for consumptive use in the lower basin. California has not objected to and has supported some 10 projects in the last decade in the upper basin. We will continue that support where our rights are not cut in half. This is not one project—it is several dozen in one bill. We must oppose it and we urge you in justice to do likewise.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if there has been any showing here that this project will be different from the other reclamation projects of the West, and that they will not produce crops that are now in surplus? For instance, I have the 1953 summary from the Bureau of Reclamation which shows that during that year corn, barley, oats, wheat, and so forth, were produced on reclamation projects to the extent of 65 million bushels; hay, alfalfa, and other things, approximately 12 million tons and 42 million bags of potatoes. Is there any difference in this project and those?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; I cannot see any. As a matter of fact, the amendment that is supposed to be honey to the Midwest people who do not want additional land put into production is said to provide that they are going to take 10 years moratorium on those crops. They cannot produce anything on this land for 10 years that will be a crop in surplus. As a matter of fact, they cannot bring the land into being or into production in 10 years. So that is a phony.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska yesterday attempted to point

out that some terrible organization called the Colorado River Association had been spending some money to oppose this project. I have in my hand a little clipping from the Desert News and Telegram of Salt Lake City, dated January 18, 1956, in which it is stated:

The Utah Water Power Board reported Wednesday it had collected $21,044 so far as the State's share of the cost of promoting the proposed Colorado River storage project.

Further along it states:

The total collected included $20,744 for 13 counties.

It is further stated:

The Board said an assessment of $78,712 had yet to be collected from the other counties as their share of promoting the project.

Under unanimous-consent authority, the full editorial from the Salt Lake, Utah, paper called the Deseret News and Salt Lake Tribune, issue of January 13, 1956, is as follows:

UTAH COLLECTS $21,044 FOR RIVER PROJECT FIGHT

The Utah Water and Power Board reported Wednesday it had collected $21,044 so far as the State's share of the cost of promoting the proposed upper Colorado River storage project.

The money will be forwarded to the Aqualantes for use in gaining congressional approval of the billion-dollar project.

The total collected included $20,744 for 13 counties plus a voluntary contribution of $300 from the Utah Association of County Officials.

The board said an assessment of $78,712 had yet to be collected from the other counties as their share of promoting the project.

Assessments are based on the counties' property valuation for 1955. The 21 Utah counties most affected by the project were assessed one-tenth of one mill of their property valuation, while the remaining counties were assessed one-twentieth of one mill.

Salt Lake County drew the largest assessment, $56,936, followed by Utah County, $10,767; Iron County, $4,202; Weber County, $4,018; Carbon County, $3,147, and Tooele County, $2,120.

The smallest assessment to help promote the upper Colorado River project was $69 for tiny Daggett County.

Counties which had paid their assessments were Box Elder, Garfield, Grand, Juab, Piute, Rich, San Juan, Sanpete, Sevier, Uintah, Utah, Wasatch, and Washington.

Salt Lake City Corp. had paid an additional $1,500.

Water and power board officials said they expected little difficulty in collecting the remainder of the assessments.

If Utah had collected $21,044 at the time the article was written and had $78,712 more to collect, that totals $99,756 for Utah alone to pour into "the cost of promoting the upper Colorado River storage project."

Under the upper basin compact formula, Utah gets 21.5 percent of the upper basin's share of the Colorado River water. If funds are being collected on the basis of this water allocation, then the total being raised by all four upper basin States would be $463,900, a rather sizable sum indeed.

I would like you to consider that figure in relation to any remarks made about California's urgent effort to prevent loss of a substantial share of the water to which she is legally entitled.

Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Nebraska will agree with me that if all of this money is being put in by one side or the other on this program, the President might very well treat this bill as he treated the gas bill recently and veto it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If you will look at the Legislative Reference Service statement on lobbying, the receipts from the Colorado Water Users Association amount to over a half million dollars.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is in 5 years, the gentleman will note, and it appears on page 3513 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in case anybody wants to look at the statement made by my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Just on that I want to point out that the last report of the Upper Colorado Grassroots' Association, which is lobbying for the project, reportedly spent $44,853.82 in the first two quarters of 1955. I checked the files on them for any subsequent reports as required by law, and apparently they have not filed such subsequent reports, so that the collections reported by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] are perhaps as current as can be made.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished visitor from Italy today used a phrase which has been echoing in my mind ever since. He spoke of the "disquieting phase of confusion," and I think he chose a very appropriate day and a very appropriate place to use that expression. It should be apparent to everyone in the Chamber and in the Congress that we have a confusing subject, highly technical, and that there is confusion even among the proponents and the opponents upon some of the matters that have come before us. Basically, the situation seems to me to be unchanged.

I shall not attempt to repeat the arguments that have been made upon this floor by other Members who have raised the basic questions as to whether there is enough water and whether it is worth the amount of money involved. I think it is apparent when the vote comes that the majority of the Members of the California delegation will vote in opposition to the bill; that an equal number of Members of Congress from the other Western States will vote for it; and that, therefore, the deciding vote and the responsibility must rest with the Members of Congress who come from the East and from the Middle West. I see my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] sitting there. He and I entered public life, a little over 23 years ago, at the same moment, in the same room, in California, and we very shortly learned an axiom that may be applied here. That axiom is, When in doubt, a good vote is "No."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I come from that part of the country that produced for you in the four States involved in this debate on the north Colorado River project a great many of your citizens. We went out there in my fathers' time. Some of my children went. I could not get them back home again. Every one of them, though, when they went, knew that there was no water out there. Still, they liked the dry country, the mountain air and the desert.

Before they went, they never dreamed of going around the community and taking by force $25 from each family for every billion dollars worth of water they wanted to provide for themselves.

You have already taken by force of taxation $6 billion or $150 per family on the average for reclamation projects, from every family in my district. And we have not got back a plugged nickel of that. Our families do not believe you are ever going to pay back any of this money. In 53 years, not one of the projects has actually paid out. We can say that the Imperial Valley project is about to pay out. But it has not yet. Furthermore, when and if they ever pay the Reclamation Bureau has the law all rigged up to keep it in a revolving fund to build more unneeded Government projects.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The Salt River project of Arizona paid out its last cent on the original loan to build Roosevelt Dam in December of 1955.

Mr. GWINN. That does not seem to be of record yet. That is the only one, is it not?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not know as to others, but I am sure there must be others.

Mr. GWINN. At any rate, Mr. Raymond Moley in his study of the subject shocked us with these facts. He showed that these projects do not pay out. They simply postpone the day of payment. Here we have one that will take 100 years. What will happen in 100 years?

This whole business of coming into our area and taking our private property to turn it into Government-owned or communalized property is immoral under the American concept of freedom. It would have been immoral for the settlers going west to take people's property. It is no different to take a vote and do the same thing by group assault on us. That concept of immoral conduct is becoming unbearable. Why? Because we are so burdened down by these enforced taxes to set up special Government projects that the rest of us who never get any returns are forced into socialism by the very force of Government itself. In my State we are crying out now for the Government to come into our midst to heal our sick, care for the aged and educate our children. We plead for Washington to bring back some of what was ours in

the first place. We plead against our wills to continue this socializing process in all areas.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close this by saying that I do not believe, if we were all free to vote as our judgment dictates, that this bill would have no better chance than the proverbial snowball. But we Congressmen are not free. Some mysterious, persistent corrupting force puts fear into us. We have thought control from many directions. So I would like to suggest to the other body that is now investigating lobbies, that its investigating committees enlarge their sphere of action. It should include first of all the most powerful, the most numerous, the best financed, the oldest, and I believe the most corrupt lobbies of all. That is some of the bureaus of the Government itself, for example, the Bureau of Reclamation and the collateral forces it commands to influence the enactment of legislation such as this. It may be we will find that the private lobbies, even the rejected $2,500 oil money for campaign purposes is mere chicken feed compared to the big money, the people's money, the bureaus offer for votes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, on the subject of lobbying, about the amount of lobbying, I placed in the RECORD yesterday the amount of money the Colorado River Association has had, $1,086,000 in 5 years. Congress has been in session only about 180 days out of the year. That figures $1,200 for every day that Congress was in session. That is a pretty good sign of the amount of money there was to use for the purpose of lobbying. The Colorado River Association and the other two organizations have spent this average of $1,200 a day.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. I yielded to the gentleman when I had the floor. Now will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. My time is gone.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has control of the time. He can yield himself a minute.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield to me?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Briefly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Very briefly. May I point out to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska that California is fighting a case in the United States Supreme Court and has been for all these years, and has a right to bring into that money from the public treasury of California to spend on its case.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hope I am not asked to yield further in the 10 minutes I have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

WESTINGHOUSE STRIKE MUST BE SETTLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today is the 136th day of the strike by the International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO, against the Westinghouse Electric Corp. The company's largest plant is located in east Pittsburgh—which is part of the 30th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I am privileged to represent.

For this reason, I should like to review the facts of this nationwide work stoppage which has caused so much misery for so many months.

The International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers has had a contract with Westinghouse since 1950. IUE represents about 31 individual bargaining units in Westinghouse.

The units are scattered from Massachusetts to California and cover more than 50,000 employees.

Most of the employees working in these plants are production and maintenance workers and a number of salaried office workers.

IUE is one of the most militantly anti-Communist unions in the country.

It came into being in 1949 following the expulsion of the United Electrical Workers from the CIO on the grounds that it was Communist-dominated.

The 1954 contract was the first 2-year agreement signed by IUE and Westinghouse.

The union wanted only a 1-year renewal of its national agreement.

Westinghouse insisted on a two-year contract before it would agree to a modified wage adjustment asked by the union.

Early in August 1955, a stoppage of work occurred in the east Pittsburgh plant, provoked by management's attempt to impose a new time study program on day workers. The union felt that this act by the company initiated without consulting or advising the union, was a direct violation of the contract.

On September 12, 1955, the stoppage of work broadened into a national walkout.

Three days later the company and the union came to an agreement that time study would be considered with wages as a subject for negotiations during the reopening of the contract and the men agreed to go back to work.

Negotiations were renewed and although Westinghouse agreed to discuss these 2 issues they demanded an entirely new 5-year contract and that the present contract with 1 more year to go be junked.

In the Westinghouse industrial dispute the capitalistic system is on trial. We in the United States have accepted certain procedures that are followed to solve our collective-bargaining differences to assure our system will work.

Collective bargaining has been accepted by the employers of America.

When negotiations bog down there are always available State and Federal mediation and conciliation services or impartial arbitration.

In the Westinghouse dispute the company has refused to arbitrate.

This procedure has been successfully used to settle countless industrial disputes not only in the electrical manufacturing industry but in all the other manufacturing industries.

This is the enlightened way used in our highly industrialized society.

This avoids turning back to the dark days when the law of the jungle governed industrial disputes.

In my district—Homestead—the scene of the savage and brutal strike of 1892 occurred.

I rejoice today to see the great steel companies of Homestead settle their grievances around the bargaining table instead of with guns and clubs in the streets of Homestead.

Any strike which involves so many people, lasts so long, and covers so many communities brings misery to the country.

The average workingman has little or no cash reserve for use when disaster strikes.

In this case there has been widespread suffering among the striking workers and their families—in spite of the union's efforts to help the desperate cases.

The disastrous effects of the strike were not long in hitting the merchants in communities where Westinghouse plants are located.

The food stores, the drug stores, the stores where workers were buying necessary articles of furniture and equipment for their homes, have all felt the impact of the strike.

In many cases they are small storekeepers, operating on little capital, and they are seldom able to extend credit over long periods of time without bankrupting themselves.

Westinghouse stockholders will feel the pinch. While the last regular quarterly dividend was paid on time, there is little likelihood that stockholders will receive an equal amount for the first quarter of this year.

The company itself has lost business it can never hope to recover.

According to Business Week, and I quote:

> For Westinghouse customers, as well as for the company itself, time is running out.
>
> Dealers and manufacturers are getting only a trickle of appliances and small capital

goods from Westinghouse. Cancellations by industrial customers have reached serious proportions only in the last month but this is increasing every day the strike continues.

The loss of potential business is tremendous.

Already Westinghouse inability to deliver essential goods under Government contract has reached the stage where it might be called treason to award them further contracts.

The date for delivery of $22 million of radar equipment has already passed.

Westinghouse excuses their nonperformance by calling the strike an act of God. Is this an act of God, or is this an act of bad faith on the part of the company?

This strike can be over tomorrow.

Have Mr. Gwilym Price, president of the Westinghouse Electric Co., and Mr. James B. Carey, president of the IUE, AFL-CIO, sit down at a meeting in honest negotiation.

Use the representatives of the Mediation and Conciliation Services.

Use Dr. Taylor and Mr. Cole, chosen by the governors of the States in which plants of the Westinghouse are located.

Use every honorable means available to end this disastrous strike, but by all means end it.

If this is done the men will soon be back to work.

Immediately after this speech, I am sending a copy of it to Mr. Carey and Mr. Price, with the request as the elected representative of this district, this be done at once.

RAILROAD ACCIDENTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, are there other special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are no further special orders for today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there were two extremely serious railroad accidents in Massachusetts. In one accident 13 lives were lost and many were injured—over a hundred cars were demolished. There was another train accident involving a so-called Budd Liner train running to Boston and 20 or more were injured. An open hearing will be held at the courthouse in Boston on March 6 at 2 o'clock, to determine why this accident occurred, the Interstate Commerce Commission informs me.

Mr. Speaker, in considering haste, in an endeavor to have faster transportation, it is time that we consider the safety element. In considering economy, it is necessary that we not economize at the expense of human life and limb. It is brutal to do otherwise.

I understand some of these cars have been recently manufactured with a view toward economy and for the purpose of employing fewer people. If more people were employed to man these trains, I am sure these accidents might not have occurred. And if stronger steel had been used in construction of the cars the damage might have been much less.

I came very near being on the Ambassador that was wrecked not far from Fort Meade last Thursday. I was 8 hours late in getting to Boston about 2 weeks ago because a freight train had been derailed just ahead of us. I have repeatedly asked that the possibility of sabotage be investigated.

These accidents are occurring too frequently and should be stopped. These railroads are public carriers furnishing public transportation and we in the Congress should see that our people are transported safely. We must keep human life above material values.

THIRTEEN ARE DEAD, 100 HURT IN 2 RAIL WRECKS—BOSTON TRAIN RAMS ANOTHER IN STORM—SURVIVORS INJURED IN SECOND CRASH

SWAMPSCOTT, MASS., February 28.—A Boston & Maine Railroad passenger train sped through 2 snow-obscured warning signals today, and knifed into the rear of another train, killing 13 persons and injuring more than a hundred.

The Boston & Maine said a Budd train passed through a yellow caution signal 1.3 miles from the halted train and ran by a red stop signal 3,200 feet from the scene of the wreck in a blinding snowstorm.

The railroad said the signals were tested after the wreck and "found to be in perfect working order," although obscured by snow and ice. The Boston & Maine said the engineer, Ernest Tourtellotte, 55, of Winchester, who died in the crash, violated operating rules. Fireman Raymond F. Jones, of Lynn, also was killed.

SECOND WRECK IS SIMILAR

A short time later, another Boston & Maine train rammed a halted train in nearby Revere, injuring 20 persons. The railroad said that mishap happened under similar circumstances.

Some of the injured were in both wrecks.

Escaping from the fatal crash of the Danvers-Boston train, they boarded a Marblehead-Boston train at Swampscott station to continue on their way. It collided with an earlier train which had halted while its crew checked a signal.

The first wreck occurred in Swampscott, about 12 miles northeast of Boston. The four-car, self-propelled Danvers train struck a Portsmouth, N. H.-Boston train which had halted for a signal.

The Boston & Maine said that the train in addition to overrunning the signals, passed a flagman protecting the rear of the Portsmouth train. The statement added:

An engineer, according to the operating rules of the railroad, is required to make a full stop at any signal which is not giving him a proceed indication.

The lead car of the four-car train went under the end of a heavier stalled coach. Its steel roof and one side were ripped away.

ABOUT 1,000 ON TRAINS

The two trains carried about 1,000 passengers. Most were bound for business in Boston. Many were students attending schools in the metropolitan area.

Among the dead was Miss Ruth Bean, 33, of Salem, executive secretary of the Massachusetts League of Women Voters. Her mother, Mrs. Harold C. Bean, was the admittance nurse on duty today at the Salem Hospital and identified the body of her daughter. The young woman, a Simmons College graduate, had spent 9 years with the State Department, largely in the Orient.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered were granted to:

Mr. HOLLAND, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois, for 15 minutes on Thursday, March 1.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, for 1 hour on Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ALBERT and to include remarks of the distinguished acting Speaker, Mr. MCCORMACK, upon the announcement of the President.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, his remarks in general debate, and to include letters and charts.

Mr. BOSCH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in three instances.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of Colorado) and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER), for today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 1, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1585. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the quarterly report on the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the period to December 31, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6635. A bill for the relief of Joy Kulis and Janet Arline Kulis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 9644. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 9645. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 9646. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to restrict the categories of persons who may receive price supports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 9647. A bill to provide that abandoned deposits in certain banks shall escheat to the respective States in which such banks are located; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 9648. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 9649. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to excess acreage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 9650. A bill to provide that producers may relinquish their interest in agricultural commodities held as collateral for price support loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 9651. A bill to provide that certain payments shall be made to the Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station under the conditions which obtained before the enactment of Public Law 352, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 9652. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9653. A bill to amend part I of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide a presumption of service-connection in certain cases involving idiopathic convulsive seizures; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 9654. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Cimarron Crossing as a national monument and historic shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9655. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 9656. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 9657. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 9658. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 9659. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 9660. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey an 11¼-acre tract of land situated in the vicinity of Williamsburg, Va., to the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9661. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amounts payable thereunder by the Federal Government to States having approved plans for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 9662. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9663. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 9664. A bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 9665. A bill to provide for the transfer of a certain tract of land, being a portion of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, to the Secretary of the Army for use as a part of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Fort Sill, Okla.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 9666. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 9667. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 9668. A bill to amend the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. J. Res. 567. Joint resolution designating the period beginning April 22, 1956, and ending April 28, 1956, as National Industrial Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution expressing the friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Italy and expressing the hope that Italy will remain one of the free and democratic nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reduce the tax burden on the major industries of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 9669. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Perillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9670. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannine P. Downs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 9671. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio; to the Committee on the Government Operations.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 9672. A bill for the relief of Franz Krudewig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 9673. A bill for the relief of Hiroko Uesugi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 9674. A bill for the relief of Rosa Santa Bavaro, Domenica Bavaro, and Anna Bavaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 9675. A bill for the relief of Jan Kryla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 9676. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chisoon Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

592. By Mrs. CHURCH: The Lithuanian American Community of the USA, Inc., of North Chicago, Ill., gathered on February 12, 1956, to commemorate Lithuania's 38th anniversary of independence, expressed sincere thanks for the help given by the United States of America and urged the continuation of the fight for the freedom of the enslaved nations and for world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

593. By Mrs. HARDEN: Petition of Mrs. Ray Kinzer and 26 other residents of Hamilton County, Ind., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

594. By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Petition of Mrs. Amund Nelson, of Blue Earth, Minn., and 28 other signers, protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio, television, newspapers, and magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

595. By Mrs. SADLAK: Petition of Roman Romanyshyn, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Hartford branch, relative to the religious persecution in the Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

596. Also, resolution of John J. Fox, president, New Haven Jewish Community Council, New Haven, Conn. in re: Middle East situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

597. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Rev. Francis Henderson and other citizens of Taney County, Mo., urging legislation which would prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

598. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the board of directors, Wisconsin section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, on February 22, 1956, urging consideration be given to need for an adequate and improved Federal highway program and legislation enacted with sufficient funds to develop an extensive interstate highway system and the continuance of substantial aids for the existing established Federal highway systems in both urban and rural areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

599. By the SPEAKER: Petition of L. G. Dawson, Thornton, Calif., requesting that the name "San Joaquin Housing Authority" be deleted from H. R. 4211 and Senate bill 1536 now pending before the Congress, and that the name "The New Hope School District" be inserted in place thereof, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

600. Also, petition of the vice chairman, Crow Tribal Council, Crow Agency, Mont., relative to certain resolutions passed at a council meeting held February 18, 1956, calling for outright sale of tribal lands, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

601. Also, petition of Anna C. Murray, Fort Edward, N. Y., relative to a grievance against the United States Government for loss of job in the post office at Fort Edward, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by President Gronchi of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, all of us were privileged to hear the very fine address by the President of Italy, His Excellency Giovanni Gronchi, this afternoon. It was a message of sincere friendship from the people of Italy to the people of America. It was also an expression of deep gratitude from the Italian people for the aid given them in the rehabilitation of their country after World War II.

President Gronchi gave us an honest and forthright account of one of our stanchest allies in Europe, Italy. He acquainted us with its accomplishments in the past decade since the end of the war, its present conditions and major problems, and its current international position and outlook. It was an encouraging picture coming at a time when many nations of the free world are beset with all sorts of difficult problems. It is particularly encouraging because the leader of a great European country appeals to us "for closer and uninterrupted cooperation, carried on in a spirit of mutual trust and faith."

Of particular interest also is President Gronchi's view that a "better integrated functioning of NATO" is needed.

His views and comments will surely arouse much interest in Washington and abroad and will stimulate some fruitful thinking and planning for the future. His visit has already borne results for the good in the relationship between our two countries and for the benefit of world peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason I urge Congress to take immediate action in approving the resolution which I introduced on February 9, 1956, House Concurrent Resolution 213, expressing the friendship of the American people for the people of Italy and voicing our hope that Italy will remain one of the leading democratic nations of the free world. Similar resolutions have been introduced by my colleagues HUGH J. ADDONIZIO and PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey; PAUL A. FINO, of New York; DANTE B. FASCELL, of Florida; and ALBERT W. CRETELLA, of Connecticut. I urge the House Foreign Affairs Committee to report out the resolution in the very near future.

Power of Congress To Regulate Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent State Department pamphlet on OTC tends, I think, to minimize the power proposed to be lodged in this organization designed to control international commerce.

The question, however, this Congress must decide is whether it proposes to surrender its control over the regulation of foreign commerce and place it in the hands of an international body. Under present articles of the OTC agreement, it appears that this organization is set up to exercise definite control and regulation over the flow of international trade and would give the State Department rather than Congress the power to agree to any new obligations sought to be imposed upon us restricting the constitutional power of Congress to regulate our trade.

Under the proposed plan upon approval by Congress the OTC would thus be empowered to exercise regulatory powers over our tariffs and foreign commerce, and Congress in that event will have surrendered one of its fundamental constitutional prerogatives and obligations.

The State Department has already agreed in the GATT convention to eliminate certain import quotas and not to establish others.

It has also made agreements concerning tariff rates at specified levels and to maintain certain items on the free list.

By this action the State Department is in effect exercising specific constitutional powers and duties of the Congress. If congressional powers are exercised by Congress in the future in the face of agreements already entered into by this Government, it will lay the Congress open to charges of breaking international agreements. It is my conviction that the Congress should carefully scan our entire foreign-trade relations with a view to retaining its historic control of foreign trade and commerce. Congress, not the State Department or any other agency, should continue to exercise its constitutional power and duty to regulate foreign commerce of the United States.

Statement of Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, on the Announcement of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK:

My guess for the past few months has been that the President would be a candidate. If he is a candidate, there is a deep obligation to our country that the people must consider. Even under conditions of peace, the work of the President is most trying. In these days of emergency, his responsibilities are magnified many times. One of the obligations of the people is to recognize that ours is a constitutional form of government, not a parliamentary or managerial one; that there is no substitute for the leadership of the President, particularly in the field of foreign affairs; that it is a 24-hour job and not a part time or limited or semirecreational one. While my guess has been that he would be a candidate, my individual opinion is that any man in his position, without regard to party, would exercise wise judgment in not being a candidate. For over and above the benefits to some members of his party in their campaigns for reelection, or even the Republican Party remaining in control of our Government, is a question of the national interest of our country. I doubt very much that if the President runs and is elected, that the responsible authorities of other free government will enter into any agreements in the field of international affairs that would be other than of a temporary nature from day to day or week to week. I doubt if they would enter into any long-term agreement. I realize he had a hard decision to make with the political and business pressures upon him, and while I respect his decision, nevertheless, from the

angle of the country, I think his wise decision would have been not to be a candidate. Even as a candidate, and under the most favorable conditions to the Republican Party, I think he will not have more than a 50–50 chance of winning.

The Soil-Bank Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate is presently engaged in an extended debate on the farm bill, S. 3183. This bill was recently reported to the floor by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of whom Senator ELLENDER is chairman. Many amendments will be offered to this bill on the floor, and no one can say definitely at this time just what the bill will look like when the Senate has finished its deliberations.

The bill as reported out by the Senate committee is a great improvement over the bill which contained nothing but the soil-bank provisions, because S. 3183 provides for price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic commodities during 1956 and 1957. And in addition, it gives a little much-needed relief to the hard-pressed dairy farmer of this country by raising the support level of dairy products from the present 75 percent computed under the new formula to 80 percent computed under the old formula. Even these improvements leave much to be desired because the bill provides no relief whatsoever to the producers of beef, pork, poultry, fruit, and vegetables. Any sound legislation which will result in lifting agriculture out of the present depression and give farmers an income permitting them to pay their interest, taxes, operating costs, and still have anything approaching an American standard of living, must include an equalization payment direct to the producer, covering the difference between the price for which nonstorable commodities sell on the open market and 90 percent of parity. Anything less than the above is not approaching the problem in a realistic manner and will only result in failure to cure agriculture's greatest illness. There is no way to avoid the problem. Prices of farm products are too low. The farmer's share of the national income is too little. His share of the consumer's dollar is now less than 40 cents. Nothing but price supports will cure this situation.

The so-called soil bank has some merit as a conservation measure, but it will prove absolutely inadequate as a measure for restoring income and purchasing power to agriculture. The soil-bank measure, without adequate price supports, is much like a house without a foundation or a tractor without a motor.

The soil-bank plan is in two sections. The first section provides for the establishment of the soil bank which must be taken out of allotments; this is the acreage that will be retired for pay. The farmer will be required to enter into a contract with the Secretary covering, not less than a 3-year period and he will be required to establish the fact that he will be in control of this land for the duration of this contract. Most tenants operate under a year to year tenure, so this provision would make ineligible a tenant with only a 1-year lease, and might easily lead to the landlord pushing his tenants off the land and leasing to the Government whatever allotments he had. The ceiling on payments, as established in this bill, is $750 million per year, with 5 million farms in the United States, this would give an average payment of $150 per farm. It is true many farmers would get more than the $150 average—but that would also mean that many farmers would get much less than $150.

The soil bank would not release farmers from complying with their allotments because it is stated on page 7, beginning with line 15:

> To be eligible for such compensation, the producer shall reduce his acreage of the commodity below his farm acreage allotments within such limits as the Secretary may prescribe.

Again on page 21, beginning with line 14:

> No person shall be eligible for payments of compensation under this act with respect to any farm for any year, in which the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity exceeds the farm acreage allotment for that commodity under title 3, of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended.

So it is evident that the soil bank must be established out of allotments that are already so tight that it pinches. This provision is the same as the Holland amendment which Congress repealed last year; which simply means, if this bill is enacted as written, no farmer will be eligible for a payment under its provisions in any way—if he happens to overplant the acreage allotment on any crop.

The No. 2 soil bank provided for in this bill and referred to on page 16, as "Conservation reserve goal" is an acreage to be set aside and taken out of production by the farmer in addition to the soil bank which comes out of the farm allotments. The acreage taken out of his allotments, as well as the general acreage retired under the conservation goal, cannot be used during the life of the contract for any productive use whatsoever. The legislation provides that unless put under water—that means under dams, or set out in forest trees; it must have a cover of grass, and/or legumes established and maintained on this reserved acreage. Weeds must be kept mowed and brush controlled. No use can be made of the forage crop. It can neither be grazed, mowed for hay, nor can grass or legume seed be harvested from it. In most cases, it will need to be fenced to prevent grazing and the term of the contract proposed in the bill cannot be less—but may be more—than 3 years. The payment for this conservation acreage is limited to an average of $70 per farm per year, and must include the acreage assistance the Secretary would provide toward establishing and maintaining the cover on this land—the expense of fencing it, and so forth.

How long would a family-type farm survive on a little soil-bank payment if its operator must continue to sell the products of that farm at from 50 to 70 percent of parity, as he is doing in many cases today? It should not be forgotten that the first year in which this administration and Secretary Benson began to administer agricultural programs, namely 1953, was the first time in 11 years that the average price paid to the producer for all food and fiber produced on American farms was less than 100 percent of parity. Our old farm programs, properly administered, held the price of farm products at or above parity for 11 years—but the sliding scale farm program adopted by this administration and its Secretary of Agriculture, reduced the American farmer to his present plight in a 3-year period. The Secretary is still fighting every proposal which would raise the farmer's income and restore his purchasing power.

What diversified farmer has any considerable acreage he can financially afford to take out of his present allotment for rent to the Federal Government? I am appending to these remarks an article appearing in the current issue of the Ozarks Mountaineer. This article was written by Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association, stating his views on the agricultural situation. I commend the article to my colleagues for their reading and study. It follows:

FARM PROGRAM NO HELP TO REGION

(By Fred V. Heinkel, president of Missouri Farmers Association)

It is a far more simple matter to put ships in mothballs than it is farms.

The President has recommended a two-point soil-bank program. The first part is designed to take cropland out of production with the idea that our grain surpluses might disappear. The second part is aimed at taking marginal land out of production, and is a long-haul proposition. It would plant these marginal acres in trees or subject them to other conservation practices.

The President's message is encouraging in that he shows he realizes there is a farm depression and that the farmer's problems can be best solved by Government action. He stressed that Government should accept the responsibility.

The primary fault of the President's proposal is its failure to recognize the real farm problem. That problem is low income—not surpluses. By law the surpluses are insulated from the market and cannot be sold in this country for less than 105 percent of the support price plus storage charges.

The idea that if support prices are abandoned, the surplus will vanish, has found its way into the thinking of persons who have not checked the records.

During the twenties when general prosperity was at a high level, farm products brought less than a living wage to their producers. There were no support prices then, yet the ruinous prices were attributed to overproduction.

Sliding supports have aggravated the situation. In a desperate effort to meet increased expenses, farmers have worked harder and produced more. You never did hear of a farmer not planting his full quota of wheat

just because support prices had dropped and his wheat was worth less than before.

The Salina (Kans.) Journal in an editorial stated: "In proposing the soil-bank program, the administration in effect has scuttled the flexible-support scheme—although it may not want to admit it. If the flexible scheme is not to be relied upon to reduce production, then the reason for lowering the loan price has ceased to exist. The immediate question is a subsidy for ailing agriculture. Considering the need, the subsidy might as well be adequate."

THE PRESIDENT'S SOIL-BANK PLAN DOESN'T HELP THE OZARKS

Is the soil-bank proposal adequate to help Ozark farmers? A reduction in grain acres certainly will not help milk prices.

Our Ozark farms are not much of a factor in creating the grain surpluses. About all the grain that is grown in this area is fed to livestock—in fact, it is necessary to ship in additional grain each year for feed purposes.

Instead of selling cash grain, most Ozark farmers market their row crops when they sell their hogs, milk, butterfat, beef cattle, poultry, eggs, lambs, and wool. The livestock farmer is "left out" so far as the soil-bank proposal is concerned. In Missouri between 70 and 75 percent of income from farm marketing is from livestock.

Most Ozark farms are family-size operations. If these small farmers are compelled to reduce present crop acres, they will not be able fully to utilize their time or their equipment. Both the farmer and his equipment will become partially unemployed.

Many young men get started in farming by the renter route. They purchase machinery and rent additional land until they can save enough money to purchase more acres. It is likely that 100 percent of the Government soil-bank payment would be more attractive to the landlord than 50 percent of the crop he would receive as rent. What will happen to our young people? We don't want them all to move to the cities.

Most of our surplus grain in Missouri is grown in the river and creek bottoms. If this land is allowed to go unattended, the willows and cottonwoods will soon take over. In the Ozarks brush would be a problem. The land would have to be reclaimed before it could ever again be planted in crops. You cannot put farmland in mothballs, like you do tanks and battleships.

We agree with the President that the problems of our farmers are "of the utmost urgency." Drought conditions of the last few years have left few Ozark farmers in financial shape to face the decline in farm prices. This winter has been drier than 1930, 1934, and 1936—the years we associate with the Dust Bowl. It is time to get some cash in the hands of these people.

It has been proposed that the farmer be paid in certificates good for grain now in storage to compensate him for keeping acres out of production. This would not cut down on the amount of grain on the market. It would not help the price of wheat. The Government would dump some grain, but it would not help farm income.

I am convinced that the long-term conservation feature of the proposal has merit. But the marginal acres proposed to be taken out of production under this section are not much of a factor in creating our surpluses. Most farmers do have some land that would be suited for trees. Unfortunately, however, due to the advanced age of most of our farmers, they will never see trees they plant converted to timber. It might be better for the Government to purchase some of these marginal acres and place them under the management of the United States Forest Service. I believe, however, that in the not too distant future pulp mills will be built in the Ozarks, which will utilize the lower grades of timber in this area.

The main point is that the program does not meet the basic problem of Ozarks farmers—low income. If the farmer received parity prices for his milk, beef, hogs, wool, and grain crops, there would be little need for any of these nine proposals advocated by the President.

Prayer for Peace Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the prayer-for-peace movement inaugurated several years ago by Hon. Herve J. L'Heureux, outstanding member of the United States Foreign Service and veteran of World War II, continues to grow and to spread throughout the world.

It is based on the efficacy of prayer in solving current international problems and would establish an international custom whereby all men, women, and children who believe in God would pause for 1 minute in the midst of their daily tasks, at 12 o'clock noon each day and, raising their hearts and minds toward God, ask him to help us adjust our international differences to enable the nations of the world to secure an equitable and abiding peace.

Since it was established in 1948 this movement has made very impressive progress in many nations. Unique in the fact that it does not embrace any organizational form but merely promotes and urges universal prayer, it is fully understandable that it should compel the interest and acceptance of very large numbers of people of all denominations who have basic faith in the Prince of Peace. The movement is all-embracing as to believers in the Almighty and is not confined to any sect, denomination, nation, or race.

Having served loyally and faithfully in our armed services, and so ably and efficiently in our Foreign Service, Mr. L'Heureux possesses a wealth of ability, knowledge, and experience to conduct this movement. All lovers of peace, and all believers in God, applaud him for his unselfish devotion to the best ideals of religion and democracy. That he, above all others, should have had the inspiration, the zeal, the idealism, and selflessness to join with his service comrades to initiate Prayers for Peace, compels our admiration and our own prayerful associations.

The lines are drawn in the fearful struggle between East and West, between atheism and faith in God, between despotism and freedom, between Red imperialism and democracy. For reasons that are inherent in the philosophy and strategy of Marxist communism the world is racing madly toward another welter of blood and destruction that threatens civilization. Up to this time, the instruments of enlightened mankind, argument, persuasion, diplomacy have failed to check this ghastly race. It may well be, as has often been the case in history, that prayer, faith, brotherhood, and good works may accomplish what statesmanship has failed to achieve.

If people everywhere, individually and collectively, could be persuaded to turn away from materialistic concepts and practices which have taken hold of much of the world and return to their basic belief in the omnipotence, goodness, and mercy of the Lord, the great problems which now confuse and enthrall most of mankind might be solved.

There is more than a ray of hope in the current world situation. Despite the ruthless Communist conspiracy, many good, sincere, devout people throughout this Nation and the world, still are possessed of religious faith and belief, still worship the Almighty and repose confidence in Him. Even in the great Soviet Empire, notwithstanding the antireligion and persecution practiced by Marxism, millions and millions of people still hold firm to their religious beliefs and challenge the infamous doctrine that religion is merely an opiate.

If prayers for peace could be spread throughout the world to reach into the hearts and minds of believers, a great chorus of prayers for peace would echo through the world and, in time, would soften and chasten those now engaged in spreading international hatred, promoting the fires of revolution and war.

Mr. L'Heureux and his group are making a noteworthy contribution to the cause of peace. They are entitled to the respect, the gratitude, the encouragement, and support of all who earnestly seek peace, believe in the power of the living God, and hold fast to the ideal of human freedom. If this movement continues, it could well bring mankind together in a great unity of faith, and open the door to universal peace, prosperity, and happiness for the world.

How Would You Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include a questionnaire which is to be sent to the registered voters of the Fifth Congressional District of New York:

HOW WOULD YOU VOTE?

DEAR VOTER: This questionnaire is an endeavor to obtain the frank opinions of the constituents in my congressional district. I should like you to carefully consider the propounded questions and to then exercise your freedom of expression as though you were the Congressman. It appears to me to be the one way in which you, the people, can make known your feeling on these national and international problems.

I deeply appreciate the interest and consideration which you evidence in responding to these various questions of public interest.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1. Should economic aid to Europe be increased? ____ Decreased? ____ Discontinued? ____

2. Do you favor the repeal of the status-of-forces agreement which makes American servicemen subject to foreign laws? Yes ____ No ____

3. Do you favor the Bosch bill to establish a Foreign Service Academy to train personnel for future diplomatic service? Yes ____ No ____

COMMUNISM

4. Do you favor admission of Communist China to the United Nations? Yes ____ No ____

5. Do you believe Russia will make a military attack on the United States? Yes ____ No ____

6. Do you believe that active communism within the United States today is a real live threat to American freedom? Yes ____ No ____

MILITARY

7. (a) Do you favor continued military aid to Europe? Yes ____ No ____

(b) Do you favor military aid to Israel? Yes ____ No ____

(c) Do you favor military aid to the Arabs? Yes ____ No ____

8. Are you satisfied with the handling of our military defenses under the present administration? Yes ____ No ____

DOMESTIC

9. Do you favor the plan of Congressman LATHAM to eliminate overlapping and duplication of taxes by Federal Government, States, and cities (i. e., gasoline, tobacco, income)? Yes ____ No ____

10. Do you favor the objectives of the Bricker amendment providing in substance that the provisions of a treaty which conflict with any provision of the Constitution of the United States shall be of no force and effect? Yes ____ No ____

11. (a) Would you like to see the administration more liberal? Yes ____ No ____

(b) Would you like to see the administration more conservative? Yes ____ No ____

(c) Do you approve of Eisenhower's conduct of the Presidency? Yes ____ No ____

(d) Do you approve of NIXON'S conduct of the Vice Presidency? Yes ____ No ____

(e) If you don't like Eisenhower, what opposing candidate would you prefer? ____

____

12. Do you favor the Bosch bills to prescribe greater minimum visibility for landings and takeoffs for aircraft and the prohibition against jet planes at our New York airports? Yes ____ No ____

13. Do you favor the bill of Congressman LATHAM providing that the sale of narcotic drugs to a minor shall be a criminal offense punishable by death? Yes ____ No ____

14. Do you favor development of Niagara waterpower by private capital? Yes ____ No ____ New York State? Yes ____ No ____ Federal Government? Yes ____ No ____

15. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet the Post Office Department deficit? Yes ____ No ____ If not, should this be paid out of general United States Treasury funds? Yes ____ No ____

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

16. Do you favor any Federal aid for education? Yes ____ No ____

(a) If so, do you favor such aid for children attending nonpublic schools where the laws of the States of residence permit? Yes ____ No ____

(b) If so, should such aid be denied to States refusing to integrate their student bodies? Yes ____ No ____

17. Do you favor the Bosch bill providing for an increase in the minimum benefit payable under social security to $75 per month, reducing the age to 60 years, and eliminating the limitation on outside earnings after 60 years of age? Yes ____ No ____

18. Do you favor a national compulsory health insurance plan supported by additional payroll taxes? Yes ____ No ____

19. Do you favor more federally subsidized, tax-exempt public housing? Yes ____ No ____

AGRICULTURE

20. Do you favor elimination of the price-support program for farmers? Yes ____ No ____

VETERANS

21. Do you favor pension of $100 per month for veterans of World War I? Yes ____ No ____

22. Should present veterans' benefits be further expanded? Yes ____ No ____

CIVIL RIGHTS

23. Do you favor Federal laws to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color? Yes ____ No ____

24. Do you favor Federal laws to prevent discrimination in employment of those over 45 years of age? Yes ____ No ____

IMMIGRATION

25. (a) Should the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act be repealed? Yes ____ No ____.

(b) Do you approve the transfer of unused immigration quotas to countries whose quotas are oversubscribed? Yes ____ No ____.

(c) Do you favor the elimination of present restrictions on immigration which provide percentage quotas on the various national groups, in accordance with the census of 1920? Yes ____ No ____.

GENERAL

26. Should 18-year-olds be given the right to vote? Yes ____ No ____.

27. Which of the major political party policies most nearly meet with your own views? Republican ____ Democrat ____ Liberal ____ American Labor ____.

Sign this, or not, as you wish. Please return to Congressman ALBERT H. BOSCH, Room 1115 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C. Feel free to use reverse side for comments and remarks.

Name____

Street address____

Post office____ Zone ____

Economic Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an able address entitled "Economic Justice" delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] at a meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association held at Philadelphia on February 28, 1956.

There being no objection, address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC JUSTICE

(Address by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association at Philadelphia, February 28, 1956)

"Justice," said Disraeli, "is truth in action." Justice—rendering to a person that which is rightfully his—is mankind's noblest ideal. As the preamble to the Constitution and the pledge of allegiance to the flag make clear, justice is the core of our political creed.

Tonight I want to talk to you about a particular kind of justice—economic justice. What is it? How is it endangered? How can businessmen help to preserve it?

Of all the facets of justice, the economic side of it has suffered the greatest distortion. Concepts of legal and social justice seem to be more widely and better understood.

Four or five years ago a top economic planner in the Truman administration proudly announced that the Government was giving the people $19 billion more, after taxes, than the year before. That was a most revealing statement. It reflected a belief, perhaps subconscious, that the Government has some paramount right to 100 percent of the national income. The producers of that income were expected to thank the Government for its generosity in distributing the fruits of their labor. A greater inversion of economic justice is hard to imagine.

In a similar vein, President Truman said in campaign speeches in 1952 that farmers and wage earners would be ungrateful if they did not vote to keep the Democrat Party in power. A majority of voters refused to swallow this theory. They were swayed by nonmaterial considerations: A bloody, stalemated war in Korea; softness toward communism in the top echelons of Government; bungling in foreign affairs; and corruption spreading like cancer throughout the executive branch. The majority of voters were influenced, too, by the administration's perverted sense of economic justice, the most dramatic revelation of which was the seizure of the steel industry.

Today the political situation is reversed. We have a changed administration. We must stand on our record. I hope that no Republican, by exaggerating the economic achievements of this administration, will subvert the ideal of economic justice.

Even labor bosses concede, albeit grudgingly, that America is enjoying an era of unparalleled prosperity. These are the incontestable facts supporting that conclusion:

Gross national product approaching $400 billion.

Personal income of $306 billion.

New construction at the annual rate of $41.8 billion.

Sixty-five million Americans gainfully employed.

These are all-time economic records. For this economic progress the Republican administration may claim some credit. However, I hope that Republicans will not try to claim sole credit for these economic gains. I hope that no Republican candidate will claim that his party created 65 million jobs; or that it is giving the people personal income, after taxes, in the amount of $272 billion. What better way to promote Communist and socialist ends than by asserting that our jobs and our earnings spring from the wisdom and benevolence of Government?

Economic justice is merely the policy of recognizing that every man is entitled to the things that are his own—freedom to do the work for which he is best suited; compensation commensurate with his talents and contributions to society; and unmolested enjoyment of the fruits of his industry, provided, of course, that he does not trespass upon the economic rights of others. Since men are not equal in energy, intelligence, and frugality, it necessarily follows that identical economic rewards to all would be unjust. Shakespeare knew the tragic consequences of obliterating rational distinctions among men:

"O, when degree is shak'd,
Which is the ladder to all high designs,
Then enterprise is sick!

* * * * *

"Take but degree away, untune that string,
And hark what discord follows!
* * * * *
"Force should be right; or rather, right and wrong
(Between whose endless jar justice resides)
Should lose their names, and so should justice too.
Then everything includes itself in power,
Power into will, will into appetite;
And appetite, an universal wolf,
So doubly seconded with will and power,
Must make perforce an universal prey,
And last eat up himself."

—*Troilus and Cressida, act I, scene 3.*

Although this administration cannot honestly file a political patent on our current prosperity, it can point with pride to fostering economic justice. By promoting economic justice, this administration created the favorable climate in which the energies and ingenuity of millions of American farmers, businessmen, and workers in industry were released. They, not the public officials in Washington, rewrote the economic record books. However, a Republican administration, with the aid of conservative Democrats in Congress, helped materially by eliminating or alleviating economic injustice. These were the major examples of economic injustice existing just prior to the election of President Eisenhower:

Federal taxes at confiscatory levels.

Deficit spending at the rate of $10 billion a year.

Stifling wage and price controls on the economy.

Galloping inflation at the rate of 6 percent a year.

Growing Government competition with private business.

In just 3 short years this is what the administration and a cooperative Congress have achieved:

Taxes have been cut. A comprehensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code has encouraged risk-taking in job-creating ventures. I hope that it may soon be possible, and without impairing the national defense effort, to make a further reduction in taxes.

We have a balanced budget. The President has submitted a balanced budget for the next fiscal year as well. Only once during 20 years of Democratic rule was a balanced budget achieved.

Inflation has been halted. A dollar saved in January 1953 is worth a dollar today. A dollar saved in 1942 was worth only 61 cents 10 years later.

Nothing, however, is more unjust than Government interference with the free market economy. Such interference may take the form of direct economic controls or Government competition with private business enterprises. Even after direct controls were ended, 12 of the 15 Senators on the Banking and Currency Committee, myself not included, were anxious to give the President standby price and wage control authority. President Eisenhower threw cold water on this idea. For the first time in many years a President spurned a proposed grant of power. By way of eliminating unfair Government competition with private business, 24 synthetic rubber plants have been sold; the Inland Waterways Corporation has been sold; and the Defense Department has withdrawn from such commercial activities as coffee roasting, ice-cream making, tree growing, and rope manufacturing.

On the question of a free and competitive market economy, no compromise is possible. Of course, there must be some degree of Government regulation, as for example, to prevent fraud. In addition, the Federal Government's purchasing programs and its monetary, credit, and fiscal policies must necessarily exert considerable influence on the market. The crucial question, however, is who makes the major economic decisions: all the people in their capacity as consumers or a bureaucratic clique? In my judgment, Max Eastman did not exaggerate when he wrote in his book, Reflections on the Failure of Socialism:

"Mankind is confronted with a choice between 2 and only 2 business systems—a choice which involves the fate of democratic civilization. We can choose a system in which the amount and kind of goods produced is determined by the impersonal mechanism of the market, issuing its decrees in the form of fluctuating prices. Or we can choose a system in which this is determined by commands issuing from a personal authority backed by armed force."

"We have to choose," Eastman says, "and the choice is between freedom and tyranny."

Such a choice will be presented to the American people in the next election. In two of his most recent speeches, Vice President NIXON said:

"The choice is not between the Eisenhower program and something more conservative, but between the Eisenhower program and something far more radical."

The Vice President is right.

How radical is the alternative program referred to by Mr. NIXON? Let us call as a witness Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. The Senator's liberal credentials, at least in the modern sense of that much-abused word, are unimpeachable. He is a charter member of the ADA; an ardent supporter of Mr. Stevenson; and an able and articulate spokesman for the groups which dominate the Democrat Party. Here is what Senator HUMPHREY wrote in an article published in the autumn 1955 issue of the American Scholar:

"The one distinctive aim (of liberalism) was the liberation of man from traditional restraints."

Let me say at this point that the Constitution of the United States is a traditional restraint. The Constitution is, in fact, the most powerful temporal restraint on tyrannical action by government that the world has ever seen. If men in power are ever "liberated" from the restraining influence of the fifth amendment, economic justice will cease to exist.

Senator HUMPHREY also said in his revealing article on Liberalism:

"Liberalism may one day challenge and another day cherish the church; in one age it may seek less Government intervention in economic affairs, and in another age, more; it may at one time be hospitable to the specific interests of the business community and at another time be hostile.

Let me interject here that modern liberals are not usually so frank in stating their demands for absolute freedom of action. Personally, I have no desire to live under an administration which might be hostile to the church, economic freedom, and the business community.

Continuing the quotation from the Senator's article:

"The liberal approach must be experimental, the solution tentative, the test pragmatic. Believing that no particular manifestation of our basic social institutions is sacrosanct or immutable, there should be willingness to reexamine and reconstruct institutions in the light of new needs."

Just compare that philosophy of government with the "dynamic co servatism" of President Eisenhower. The difference is one of first principles. How absurd to say that the American people are limited to a choice next November between tweedledee and tweedledum.

Other forces are hacking away at the concept of economic justice. First, there are the spiritual descendants of Karl Marx, only a small fraction of whom are enrolled in the Communist Party. Marx, you will recall, wrote: "In order to create equality, we must first create inequality." Men of superior ability were deliberately penalized under the rule: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." If we have learned anything from history, it should be that communism and socialism create vast inequalities, but that the only equality produced is in misery and death. Still, there are many people who naively believe that the price of pork chops can be permanently controlled without the Government moving in the direction of hanging the butcher.

The ideal of economic justice comes under heavy attack from the economic agencies of the United Nations. A score of spending programs are based on the false assumption that a global redistribution of wealth would be just. The basic tenet of Marxism is given an international twist: "From each nation according to its ability, to each nation according to its needs."

On the international scene as on the domestic, men afflicted with planners' itch seek to control the production, distribution, and price of basic commodities. Their goal is total regimentation of international trade. Friends of the free market economy drew first blood when the U. N.'s International Trade Organizations collapsed for want of United States support. But when this master plan aborted, the global planners formulated international agreements for particular commodities—wheat, oil, tin, sugar, rubber, etc. The U. N. has even called a conference to draft plans for an international agency to support the price of olive oil. The proposed agency would be officially known as the Olive Oil Fund; unofficially as OOF. OOF would need to start with a fund of $20 million. You know who would foot the bill.

Then we have the U. N.'s International Labor Organization and Human Rights Commission which are attempting, by treaty law, to regulate the economic rights and duties of people all over the world. I do not have time to discuss these socialistic proposals in detail. In this connection, however, three facts deserve attention:

First, the extravagant economic promises set forth in U. N. and ILO treaties cannot be fulfilled without the imposition of unjust economic duties.

Second, a former Chairman of the U. N. Human Rights Commission, Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon, commented as follows on the U. N. draft Covenant on Economic and Social Rights:

"I think a study of our proceedings will reveal that the amendments we adopted to the old texts under examination responded for the most part more to Soviet than to Western promptings."

Third, the U. N. Human Rights Commission has voted overwhelmingly on several occasions against recognizing the right to own property as a fundamental human right.

What can businessmen do to defend the traditional concepts of economic justice? For one thing, they can stop supporting those U. N. agencies and commissions which devote their energies in the main to the promotion of socialistic causes. It is incomprehensible to me why some American businessmen fight even the mildest forms of economic intervention at home, while at the same time they finance organizations which spread the U. N.'s brand of socialism.

Next, businessmen can stop financing publications, organizations, and educational institutions which are hostile toward the ideal of economic justice. Many worthy conservative causes have folded for lack of adequate financial support. A whole book could be written on the subject of business contributions to those who would destroy private business enterprise.

And finally, businessmen can stop being smug—smug in the sense of regarding technological and economic achievements as the end-all and be-all of life. The time in which we live forbids hysterical optimism. The fact that responsible men, in the age of thermonuclear weapons and the Communist menace, can assert that this is the best of all possible worlds indicates a se-

vere loss of perspective. Even without the overhanging threat of communism, our unprecedented material prosperity would not necessarily prove that every day in every way life is getting better and better. Unless a veritable orgy of consumption is the object of life, a high level of prosperity offers merely a better chance for men to achieve the higher ends of life. The purpose of life is to live it with the greatest possible fidelity to such nonmaterial values as truth, justice, fraternity, and loyalty. These are the values which most Americans recognize as a reflection of God's will.

The future of America depends today, as as it always has, on the indispensable supports of morality and religion.

Hill Report Does Not Claim California Will Receive Less Water Than Due Under Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the upper Colorado River project yesterday and today, reference has been made to a report entitled "Report on Water Supply for Probable Future Developments in the San Diego County Water Authority" by a board of engineers comprising Raymond A. Hill, John S. Longwell, and Carl R. Rankin. This report is cited as the basis for the claim that southern California's water rights will be jeopardized by the upper Colorado basin project.

This report does not assert that southern California will lose water to which it is entitled under the compact. It says exactly the opposite because the report is based on compliance with the compact. It does say that there may be less water than was originally thought, and therefore not enough to go around.

It must be remembered that California, under its own limitation act, is entitled to 4.4 million acre-feet, plus half of any surplus; but if the water in the river is short there may be no surplus to divide. That is exactly what Mr. Hill and his associates are saying. In other words, under conditions of maximum use in the upper basin, plus short water-years, there may be no surplus, and therefore no surplus to divide. But, this is no fault of the upper basin in the exercise of its rights to take the water to which it is entitled. And California cannot complain that the amount of water available in the river does not meet its expectations, provided that the water which is in the river is divided according to the terms of the compact—which is presupposed in the report of Mr. Hill, as well as in the legislation before us.

Moreover, the conditions of maximum use in the upper basin which Mr. Hill and his associates use as the basis for their conclusions do not apply under the bill which is now before us. That is true because the maximum amount of water which the upper basin will use in the projects under this bill amount to less than 2 million acre-feet. The water already in use in the upper basin is less than 2½ million acre-feet. Therefore, the total uses when this project is in full operation 28 years hence will be less than 4½ million acre-feet—which is 3 million acre-feet less than the total amount to which the upper basin is entitled under the terms of the compact. Consequently, there is at least 3 million acre-feet of slack available before the conditions of maximum use on which Mr. Hill and his associates predicate their prophesies of short water.

For those who are interested in checking the matter through the Hill report, I would like to call their attention to the following quotations from that report.

The Hill report is based on the construction and operation of the Colorado River storage project in compliance with the Colorado River compact. I quote as follows from page 12:

> The Colorado River compact, among other things, provides that "the States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years, reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding ratification of this contract."
>
> It now appears, however, there is a possibility that the releases past Lee Ferry may be increased by an amount equal to the following items:

	Acre-feet per annum
One-half of required treaty delivery to Mexico (½×1,500,000)	750,000
One-half of estimated operating wastes past the international boundary (½×200,000)	100,000
Total	850,000

> If such an increase is agreed upon, the average annual flow passing Lee Ferry after construction of the upper Colorado River storage project and related works would become 7,500,000+850,000=8,350,000 acre-feet per annum. This may be taken as the probable maximum future flow past Lee Ferry.

I would like to point out, on the basis of the above language, that the study by this board of engineers is based on releases at Lee Ferry of not only an average of 7½ million acre-feet per year, or 75 million in each consecutive 10 years, but releases of an additional 850,000 acre-feet, making the total releases at Lee Ferry available to the lower basin amount to 8,350,000 acre-feet per year. The study goes on to show that with depletions of 6 million acre-feet between Lee Ferry and the international boundary—the 6 million acre-feet being the depletion for the year 1953–54 of the maximum of record—plus 1,500,000 acre-feet for Mexico, plus 200,000 acre-feet to meet half the operating waste past the international boundary, it will still be possible to increase diversions between Lee Ferry and the international boundary by 650,000 acre-feet. I want to emphasize that this increase is above the highest year of record, and I quote from the report:

> The data presented in table 4 and in the previous paragraphs clearly shows that when the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and the flows at Lee Ferry are regulated to comply with the Colorado River compact, with possible additions as referred to in table 4, compliance with the Mexican Treaty and with allowance for reasonable waste past the international boundary which, from a practical operating standpoint, cannot be avoided, it will be possible to divert only 650,000 acre-feet per annum from the river between Lee Ferry and the international boundary in addition to that actually used during 1953–54.

Now to go just briefly to the quotations which have been made from this report with respect to California's water rights being threatened. The metropolitan water district has no right to 1,212,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River. Even the report refers to this as a "claimed right," as indicated by the following from page 14 of the report:

> Plate B shows that very little surplus water from the Colorado River Aqueduct of the metropolitan water district will be available to the authority under the assumed condition providing the diversion from the Colorado of the metropolitan water district claimed right of 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum.

The claim of the San Diego County Water Authority to 112,000 acre-feet is based upon the metropolitan water district's claim to 1,212,000 acre-feet—so that if the metropolitan water district's right under the compact is only half the amount claimed then, of course, the amount for the San Diego County Water Authority would be also cut in half, and this is just the conclusion reached by this board of engineers.

Strength: The American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent statement of Syngman Rhee brings impressively before us the anomalous and ridiculous situation now obtaining in Korea.

As President Rhee points out, the Korean truce was no sooner made than it was broken. Americans will ponder a long time, I am sure, before they can agree about many aspects of the Korean truce but they certainly are alarmed by what has transpired since —in flagrant, cynical, ruthless disregard for the peace agreement. The evidence before us shows that the Chinese Reds and the Communists generally have conspired, and are still conspiring in violation of the terms of the truce to strengthen their air installations and armed forces in North Korea.

That they are also conducting a widespread campaign of espionage and infiltration in South Korea, sheltered and protected by the so-called truce team comprised of nations that are identified with the Communist bloc and hostile to the free world, appears to be established by available reports and statements from responsible sources.

President Rhee has spoken with force, propriety, and obvious justification, and the facts he set forth in his speech are

undeniable. Whoever thinks that it will be possible to placate and appease the vicious Communist conspiracy is suffering a palpable delusion since placation serves only to embolden the overt acts of the conspirators, and appeasement, like surrender to blackmail, only leads to further brazen and impossible demands.

Strength of attitude, backed up by strength of arms and spirit, and strength of purpose to face all necessary risks, must be a firm cornerstone of American policy toward the Communist world.

Proposed Soviet-American Treaty of Friendship—Some Reasons for Its Rejection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, recently the press throughout the Nation gave headlines to the report that President Eisenhower had received a friendly letter from Soviet Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin. It was eventually disclosed that this letter was in fact a Soviet proposal for a treaty of friendship and cooperation with the United States Government. In a letter to Premier Bulganin on January 28, President Eisenhower politely but firmly rejected the proposed pact.

Could the President have acted otherwise?

The answer is "No."

In the Bulganin proposal the Soviet Government asked the United States to conclude a pact "on the basis of equal rights, mutual respect for State sovereignty, and noninterference in internal affairs." It also declared that all disputes arising between the two countries were to be settled by peaceful means. Both contracting parties were also pledged to "contribute to the development and strengthening of economic, cultural, and scientific cooperation between the two States, on the basis of the principle of mutual benefit and equal rights."

On the face of it the Soviet proposal seems harmless. Indeed, to some it may be desirable; for the Bulganin letter and the proposed treaty read like a perfectly sensible appeal by the head of one government to the head of another to cooperate in easing international tension and to promote world peace.

After a careful and thoughtful analysis of the instruments, however, it is clear that the entire proceeding is nothing more than a propaganda trick, and if the United States Government were foolhardy enough to conclude such an agreement, it would mean a diplomatic victory of the first order for the U. S. S. R.; it would destroy the unity of the Western coalition; it would undermine the strength and spirit of the free world; it would in the long run lay open Western Europe and other areas of the world to Soviet aggression and expansion. In a word, the conclusion of such a pact would gravely endanger the life of our Nation.

The Soviet Government cannot be trusted.

Here is the first and foremost reason for rejecting the proposed pact.

Our relations with the Soviet Government have been a source of continuous disillusionment. In nearly four decades of our experience with the Russian Communist regime that regime has done little to inspire the type of confidence and trust that should exist among nations who want peace. No sooner was the Bolshevik regime established in Moscow than the Third International, the so-called Comintern, was founded; and at once the C. P. U. S. A., the American counterpart of the Russian Communist Party, began its work of subversion and intrigue to destroy the American Republic. When the United States finally recognized the Soviet Government in 1933, one of the key agreements in the negotiations was the Soviet pledge that it would not carry on subversive activities in this country. The agreements bearing on recognition were excellent agreements; they provided for every safeguard, except the one that rests with the intent of the contracting parties to fulfill their obligations in good faith. This, of course, the Soviets did not do; and even to this very day its agents, the members of the C. P. U. S. A., ever faithful to the Socialist homeland, the U. S. S. R., continue their destructive work in the name of "Americans."

The necessities of war brought the United States and the Soviet Union together as allies in 1941. Important agreements were concluded by the Allies at Yalta and Potsdam which, if carried out in a spirit of truth and justice, would have meant a real peace for the world today and genuine democracy in Eastern Europe. Our postwar experience with the Soviet Union has, however, demonstrated to us how little faith one can put in Soviet agreements. The ruthless sovietization of Eastern Europe was carried through in outright violation of engagements negotiated between the United States and the Soviet Union. Civil war in Greece was a graphic demonstration of Communist calumny and Soviet interference in the internal affairs of another state. The blockade of Berlin was another attempt to undermine the word and the spirit of allied agreements bearing on the occupation of Germany. And finally the Moscow-inspired Korean war—a hard and bitter experience for all of us—demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt how faithless the Communists really are.

Nor has Soviet conduct with other nations inspired any greater confidence and trust. In 1939, when Hitler was about to launch World War II, the Soviet Government concluded a pact with the Nazi government which divided Poland and other areas of Eastern Europe into spheres of conquest. At that time Soviet Russia had in force a pact of friendship and nonaggression with Poland, but it did not stop it from violating this pact by wantonly invading eastern Poland and annexing those territories to the U. S. S. R.

The Baltic States suffered the same fate. Pacts of friendship and nonaggression had been concluded between the Soviet Union and the Baltic States. A network of unilateral and multilateral treaties bound the Soviet Union to recognize the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of those states and to pledge its word not to intervene in their internal affairs. But all these treaties were no barrier to Soviet conquest in 1940 and reconquest in 1944.

Nor has the British or French experience with the Soviet Union been any more wholesome. Pacts of nonaggression were concluded during the war between the Moscow government and the British and French. Those pacts, however, did not prevent the launching of a Soviet-inspired Communist campaign to destroy French sovereignty over Indochina and to undermine British constitutional authority in Malaya. Only recently the Soviet Government tore up these pacts when West Germany joined the western coalition. This is itself a striking demonstration of the respect with which the Soviet Union holds formal international engagements.

Soviet Russia need not have a pact of friendship and nonaggression with the United States or any other member state of the United Nations. This is the second reason for rejecting the Bulganin proposal.

All major points proposed by the Soviet Premier are in fact substantive articles in the Charter of the United Nations. Soviet Russia and the United States agreed, when they signed the charter, "to develop friendly relations, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples." By this solemn treaty they agreed to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. And they agreed to work for "solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems" and strengthen "international cultural and educational cooperation."

Both the United States and the Soviet Union are pledged by the United Nations Charter to advance world peace and international cooperation. What end can be served, therefore, by heaping upon this fundamental agreement pledge after pledge, reiterating the very same principles? Is not this initial pledge of peaceful intent and nonaggression sufficient if Soviet Russia did not have other motives? There are, in fact, many areas of the world where international tension could be eased and peace assured if Soviet Russia indicated a willingness to do so. We need no pacts of friendship to do that. At the Geneva Foreign Ministers Conference in October of last year the Moscow government had every opportunity to indicate a desire to resolve the German question, which is the central problem of Europe today, and thus ease tension in that quarter. To solve the German question would be to set off a chain reaction that would lead to peace in Europe if not the whole world. But Soviet Russia would not risk a genuine German election, the key to reunification, knowing full well that it would mean the end of the East German Communist regime and thus the loss of a

springboard for the eventual Communist conquest of Western Germany and perhaps even Western Europe.

Disarmament, too, is a question that could be brought within workable limits of negotiation if the Soviets desired to do so. Rather than taking a positive attitude, they have shown marked intransigence in accepting a formula that would insure genuine arms control.

Recent Soviet activity in southern Asia and the Middle East is another instance where Soviet conduct in international affairs is not calculated to inspire trust among nations and peace in the world. On their tour of the subcontinent Premier Bulganin and Nikita Khrushchev, the First Secretary of the Soviet Russian Communist Party, resorted to every distasteful technique, even outright lies, to open up old wounds inflicted long ago by Western colonialism. Easing tensions was not their purpose in condemning the West; it was rather to stir up an already excited Asian nationalism and direct it against the West to their own peculiar advantage.

At the same time Moscow had acted in the most questionable way by pledging arms to Egypt. The Israeli-Arab question is an explosive question which could, if out of hand, spread war and destruction throughout the Middle East. Surely, if Bulganin were sincere in his desire to ease world tensions and insure peace, as he professed to President Eisenhower, he would not have intervened so recklessly in the troublesome Middle East.

Soviet policy in this area exposes the insincerity and duplicity of Bulganin's proposal to the President and points out clearly another reason why its rejection was imperative.

Finally, if the President had chosen even to negotiate with Bulganin within the terms stipulated in the proposed treaty of friendship, the United States would have done irreparable harm to the unity of the Western coalition. In the first place, the pact itself was intended to undermine the unity of the West when it singled out the United States among the Allied Powers as a contracting party. A pall of suspicion would unquestionably descend upon the capitals of Western Europe if the United States—the heart and core of the Western coalition—decided to step outside the framework of the Western defense system and negotiate unilaterally with Moscow. Such an unwise step would have almost required the nations of Western Europe to seek an accommodation with the Soviet Union in which case the Western coalition would have been smashed to shambles.

Clearly the Bulganin proposal could not be otherwise than obnoxious to the United States. So extraordinary is this proposal that no other conclusion can be drawn than that it was nothing more than a propaganda trick. Soviet Russia can, and probably will, throw its vast propaganda machinery into action and hammer this point relentlessly in the countries of the neutralist world. There is no doubt that this pact was drafted with Soviet eyes not upon American leaders in Washington but upon the men of the East.

In many respects the proposed Soviet pact points up the dilemma of America and the Western nations in the conduct of international relations today. In every conceivable manner Soviet Russia has tried to exploit the natural desires of humanity for peace. We want peace more than any other people on this earth. Democracy thrives upon peace; it abhors war, and engages in it only as a last measure of defense. But we are dealing with a nation whose ideology thrives not upon peace but upon contention and war; for communism is a creature of struggle, oppression, and misery. It seeks to conquer and destroy; and peace is nothing more than a tactical weapon in its array of armaments. Such a dilemma in which we are caught up presents no happy prospect for future generations, but it is one, nonetheless, that we must live with. However, as long as the leaders of our Government never lose sight of the wide and irreconcilable ideological breach that separates the democracy of the United States and the communism of the U. S. S. R., the interests of our Nation will forever be protected. For, it is only upon this knowledge that a wise and enduring policy can be based.

Foreign Aid Encourages Foreign Monopolies and Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States believe in free competition. Business firms throughout our history have been by law prohibited from organizing monopolies and cartels. We believe that the consumer is protected pricewise when business organizations compete freely with one another.

Many people, Mr. Speaker, will be surprised to learn that under our foreign-aid program we have actually been encouraging foreign monopolies and cartels. These same monopolies and cartels, with the use of our taxpayers' dollars, are competing with American industry.

The International Cooperation Administration or its predecessor agencies have never attempted to trace total foreign-aid expenditures on the basis of whether the suppliers of materials purchased under the program were monopolies or members of cartels or other restrictive market arrangements. We do know that a majority of the business organizations abroad are monopolies or operate under restrictive arrangements. I believe that the foreign-aid administrators have been consistently confronted with such practices. I presume, under present conditions abroad, that it has not been possible to avoid dealing altogether with these monopolies or restrictive business agencies because that is the nature of the European economy today.

Mr. Speaker, much of the mutual-security aid is furnished directly to the foreign governments involved. With regard to these funds the United States cannot intervene in the internal affairs of other countries to the extent of designating only certain foreign producers as approved suppliers of mutual defense material. However, the bilateral agreements for economic cooperation include provisions that each country will endeavor to prevent restrictive business practices affecting international trade which interfere with the joint program of European economic recovery.

There is no doubt that Government monopolies, cartels and, other restrictive business practices have added to the cost of the mutual defense program. Direct costs have been increased due to the higher prices which result from restrictive market arrangements and fixed price agreements. In addition, these very practices prevent realization of the mutual defense goals; that is, the increase in productivity and economic growth among the recipient countries of mutual defense funds.

These limitations to the mutual defense program have been pointed to many times, not only by critics of the foreign-aid program, but by the most ardent supporters of the program. It has been generally recognized, however, that the prevalence of economic controls and restrictive business arrangements are almost part and parcel of the European economic life. The following comment is typical of the many statements which have been made concerning this problem:

> Western European countries have no conception of the competitive free-enterprise system as we know it in America. In fact, they have historically shunned our competitive system. * * * Government controls, subsidies * * * prevent balanced and maximum economic growth. Then there are private restrictive cartel arrangements which cross international boundaries.[1]

Such is the framework of the European economy within which the mutual-defense program must work. The United States has sought to change it, but it has been impossible to avoid it. To have limited mutual-defense projects in Europe to those businesses only which were operating in accordance with a true competitive free-enterprise system would have resulted in no program at all.

Mr. Speaker, it must be said that the administrators of our foreign-aid program have sought to protect our economy from the effects of monopolies and cartels in other countries but without effect. Here, as I have heretofore mentioned, business organizations are restricted to unfair practices by antitrust laws of the United States. Such laws do not prevail in foreign countries.

Congress and the executive department have sought to encourage the development of competitive productive

[1] U. S. Congress. Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Joint economic report. Report of the * * * Committee on the President's Economic Report. Appendix H. Memorandum of Grover W. Ensley, staff director. Washington. U. S. Government Printing Office, 19541: 97 (83d Cong. 2d sess., H. Rept. 1256).

economies abroad and removal of artificial restraints on production and trade as they effect both international trade and the economic progress of free countries. This policy was given some statutory significance in the foreign economic policy of the United States by the so-called Benton amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1951. This same provision was later inserted in the Mutual Security Act of 1954. Congress said at that time:

The Congress recognizes the vital role of free enterprise in achieving rising levels of production and standards of living essential to the economic progress and defensive strength of the free world. Accordingly, it is declared to be the policy of the United States to encourage the efforts of other free nations to increase the flow of international trade, to foster private initiative and competition, to discourage monopolistic practices, to improve the technical efficiency of their industry, agriculture, and commerce, and to strenthen free labor unions; and to encourage the contribution of United States enterprise toward the economic strength of other free nations, through private trade and investment abroad, private participation in the programs carried out under this act (sec. 413, Mutual Security Act of 1954, 22 U. S. C. (1933)).

Mr. Speaker, the Executive Department recognized that in carrying out the above provision of the law this is not a policy which can become effective over a short period of time. The fact is that it can only be accomplished over a long period of time for the reason that it means a change of approach by business organizations abroad. It would seem that the most we can do is to encourage and assist other countries where there is a desire to establish a free economy. Unfortunately at this time there has been no evidence of a real desire to do so, yet we recognize that our own business firms under present conditions have to meet competition which is either government controlled or controlled by monopolies or cartels.

It will not be denied that under some off-shore procurement policies we have saved the taxpayers some money but this saving has not been very great when we consider the amount of money that we have given to support the economies of other countries.

The long history, Mr. Speaker, of monopolies, cartels and other restrictive business practices in the economies of the countries of Western Europe appear to preclude any quick and complete abolition of them in the near future. The extent to which the Mutual Defense funds have aided cartels or monopolies cannot be accurately assessed without check of actual expenditures both by the United States and by the countries to which we have extended aid.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem that if our foreign-aid program is to become effective and have an impact upon the economic life of the countries receiving our assistance, and if it is our policy to help to raise standards of living abroad, then there is an urgent need for closer examination as to the effect that our present programs are encouraging monopolies at the expense of the welfare of their own people.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1956

Rev. John Leo Sullivan, pastor, St. Francis Xavier Church, Waterbury, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty Creator and Lord of all, this august body gathered here to enact just and salutary laws ask of Thee, even as did Solomon of old, the gift of wisdom. And because we recognize that Thou, O God, art the divine and eternal lawgiver; that all manmade laws to be respected and enforced are ultimately founded on Thy eternal laws; and because we believe that fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; in wholesome fear and Christlike love we pray Thee send forth Thy Holy Spirit, that, like the words of the Apostles, our laws and preachments may resound around the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 29, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, since the Senate meets today following an adjournment, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that any statement made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, because of the fact that there is an interest in action on 2 or 3 nominations which are on the Executive Calendar, I trust that Senators who have matters to present in the morning hour will be considerate of me if I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar at this time.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take action on nominations on the calendar under "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Capt. Ira E. Eskridge, United States Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard, effective February 1, 1956.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Earl Freeman Hastings, of Arizona, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Franklin G. Floete, of Iowa, to be Administrator of General Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles K. Rice, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States district judges.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of United States district judges be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of United States district judges will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

The nominations of United States district judges confirmed are as follows:

Joseph P. Lieb, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Florida.

John M. Cashin, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

R. Dorsey Watkins, of Maryland, to be United States district judge for the district of Maryland.

Ewing T. Kerr, of Wyoming, to be United States district judge for the district of Wyoming.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Oliver Gasch, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States marshals.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of United States marshals be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of United States marshals will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Louis F. Kreek, of the District of Columbia, to be an Examiner-in-Chief in the Patent Office.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, while the Senate is still in executive session, I should like to inquire whether the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is the acting majority leader, has plans with respect to the nominations to the Tariff Commission. The Senator will recall that we had a colloquy on the floor of the Senate last week regarding the nominations, and I thought I had some indication they would be taken up this week. The nomination of William E. Dowling, of Michigan, has been on the Executive Calendar since February 12. The nomination of James Weldon Jones, of Texas, has been on the Executive Calendar since February 16.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The distinguished minority leader has been very patient and considerate about the nominations not being taken up by the Senate at an earlier date. I recall, and I am glad to have the RECORD show, that he and I had discussions about this matter during the absence of the majority leader from the Senate, and that while we did not have an agreement, there was an understanding that a decision would be reached at a date much earlier than the first day of March. At a later date, the minority leader and the majority leader had a discussion and a colloquy on the floor concerning the matter.

I wish to say to the minority leader that the Senator who has raised objections to the nominations is ill today, and I have not had an opportunity to discuss the nominations with him, but I assure the minority leader that at the very earliest possible date I shall do so.

I hope the minority leader will continue to exercise the same consideration and patience in the matter he has exhibited in the past, and I can assure him further that I shall do everything I can to expedite an early and reasonable decision regarding these nominations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to my good friend, the acting majority leader, that I not only hope the Senator concerned will have a full and prompt recovery, but that we shall have an equally full and prompt approval of the nominations of the two persons whose names have been on the Executive Calendar for some time. So I hope we may have cooperation, and that, as soon as the Senator who is ill is able to return to the Senate, he will at least present the facts, so the Senate may make its decision. The Tariff Commission is an important governmental body, and the vacancies should be filled.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I join my friend on the other side of the aisle in both observations, the one regarding the prompt recovery of the Senator who is ill, and, secondly, that we may have an early consideration of the nominations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, financial statements of that fund, as of December 31, 1955; which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a petition signed by Maude E. Pyles, and 34 other members of the Prince Georges County Temple Hills Baptist Church, Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the petition may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

MAUDE E. PYLES
(And 34 other persons).

RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOOVER COMMISSION—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Fargo, N. Dak., Association of Life Underwriters, favoring the enactment of legislation to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NEW HOOVER COMMISSION

Whereas the Fargo Association of Life Underwriters has always fostered the concept of better government at a better price for all Americans; and

Whereas the Fargo Association of Life Underwriters has consistently endorsed policies established to insure efficient administration of the Federal Government and to provide maximum savings to the taxpayer; and

Whereas the bipartisan first Hoover Commission, which, unanimously created by Congress in 1947, brought about a number of significant improvements in the administration of our Federal Government; and

Whereas this new Hoover Commission has prepared reports and submitted them to the Congress with recommendations to provide more orderly and responsible government at less waste and cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Fargo Association of Life Underwriters, That we reaffirm our support of such actions in the public interest which are designed to bring greater efficiency and dollar savings in Government operations; and be it

Resolved, That the Fargo Association of Life Underwriters urges the President and the Congress to take appropriate steps to carry out the recommendations of the new Hoover Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the Fargo Association of Life Underwriters alert the members of this organization to the need to join this great educational movement—on a patriotic, nonpolitical basis—for the public understanding, cooperation, and action in support of the recommendations of the new Hoover Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the members and officials of the Fargo Association of Life Underwriters individually and by cooperating with the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, endorse and work toward achieving the vital

goal of better, more efficient, and less expensive government for all the peoples of our Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress from the State of North Dakota.

WILLIAM A. BURD,
Secretary-Treasurer, Fargo Association of Life Underwriters.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—LETTER

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD all but one paragraph of a letter I have received from Rev. Joseph Hylden, of Edgeley, N. Dak.

Father Hylden has devoted a great deal of time to the study of farm matters. He has a keen interest in them. Largely because of his interest in farm matters he was appointed to the important position of first vice president of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

I am sure what Father Hylden has to say about the pending farm legislation will be of great interest to every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,
Des Moines, Iowa, February 23, 1956.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: The farm bill is up for debate in the Senate. May I give you my thinking on the matter? What I will say is, in the main, the thinking of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, of which I am first vice president.

I am opposed to the soil-bank proposals. This plan is not new, as the Secretary admitted to the House committee. It is a rehash of former plans that did not work. The Secretary has selected the best parts of these earlier plans.

Here are my reasons for opposition to the plan:

1. It is not effective. The purpose is to reduce or entirely end surpluses. This purpose has not been achieved by any related plan in the past. We have tried it with various commodities. It did not reduce total bushels or pounds of products. Many farmers, when reducing their acreage, maintain almost the same total production by better tillage practices, fertilization, and other means. H. M. Hanson, Grafton, N. Dak., a good member of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, admitted to me that when they reduced the acres for potato farmers he, like most others, planted their potatoes in rows 36 inches apart instead of 42 inches as before. Then, with increased fertilizer he got as many total bushels as the year before. This example can be multiplied all over the United States. Hence, the soil bank is not the effective way to reduce total production of any farm product.

2. It is not equitable. Reducing acres always put the pinch on the small farmer, the real family-sized farmer. The big operator can well afford to take acres out of production and still have plenty acres left to obtain income sufficient for himself and for total operation. Add to this, that under the soil-bank plan we, the taxpayers, pay this big operator money for not producing on acres he does not need. This only increases our problem, by helping the large operator and penalizing the small family farmer, the one we ought to be concerned about.

3. The moral implications of the soil bank are not good. We refer to the "acreage reserve" portion of the plan. It is quite well agreed that 2 out of every 3 people in the world go to bed hungry every night. Yet, in the face of this fact, we Americans plan to take fertile acres (perhaps 20 million acres) out of production—to reduce the available food supplies of the world. And why? For the selfish purpose of holding up the price of our farm products. How can we hold up our heads as moral leaders of the free world when we do such things? God has blessed us with millions of fertile acres. We Americans did not manufacture these fertile acres. God gave them to us as a sacred trust. We have farmed them fairly well.

We have made giant strides in advancing scientific agriculture. Our ambition and zeal have made us the leading agricultural Nation of the world. All this is again part of our gifts from God. Self-made men and self-made nations are nonexistent. We are what we are by the grace of God. At least that is what St. Paul once wrote. How, then, can we in good conscience refuse to produce for God's people what we are perfectly capable of producing? How can we send diplomats out to starving nations, extending to them the hand of friendship and leadership, while we take fertile acres out of production? National moral obligations are as strong and binding as individual moral obligations. And we have not even mentioned the widespread malnutrition of millions of our people within the United States, nor the snail's pace at which we have enlarged the school-lunch program, nor our failure to use surpluses in welfare institutions of our Nation. In short, ours is a problem of distribution, not of overproduction. If the Congress and the United States Department of Agriculture would turn their powerful efforts to properly distributing the produce given us from God's holy earth, I am sure that we would not even think about an acreage reserve.

MINNESOTA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the important proposed extensions of the 9-foot river navigation channel which serves the transportation needs of the great central valley of the Nation is the proposed channel-deepening of the Minnesota River above St. Paul and Mendota, Minn. This week I asked the Committee on Public Works to consider a resolution authorizing the Army Corps of Engineers to review the report of the district engineer forwarded by the Army engineers to the Congress on February 16, 1954. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my letter to the chairman of the committee, along with an attached resolution from a newly-formed group representing local interests in the proposed channel area, and indicating that the last remaining obstacles to a favorable report on the proposed Minnesota River navigation channel may now be removed.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1956.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Public Works, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to bring to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works the fact that a new situation now exists with respect to the proposal to construct a 9-foot navigation channel in the Minnesota River above St. Paul and Mendota, Minn.

The Minnesota River, rising in western Minnesota, flows toward the Mississippi through some of the richest grain-producing country in the world. The river is potentially a direct and economical means of shipping vast quantities of grain to processing centers, in addition to its great potential usefulness in shipping in coal and petroleum products from out of State. Particularly, as the rail transportation system each year becomes more inadequate to handle the movement of grain from the producing areas, every additional means of low-cost transportation becomes more valuable.

Since 1931 a 4-foot channel has been maintained as a Federal project from the mouth of the Minnesota upstream to the city of Shakopee, a distance of approximately 25 miles. Thus, an important grain-producing area has been given limited access to the great 9-foot channel of the Mississippi.

During 1943, at the height of the war effort, a local Minneapolis company, Cargill, Inc., cooperated with the Army engineers in having a 9-foot channel dredged from the mouth of the Minnesota to a point 13.1 miles upstream, in order to facilitate the downstream movement of towboats and oceangoing tankers constructed in the shipyard at Port Cargill. Since that time, Cargill and other companies which have established shipping facilities on the Minnesota at various points as far upriver as Chaska—29.6 miles from the mouth—have cooperated in partially maintaining the 13-mile channel dredged in 1943.

Since 1947, other large corporations have shown increasing interest in the possibility of using a permanently maintained 9-foot channel in the Minnesota. These include other grain shippers and importers of coal and petroleum, as well as manufacturing concerns.

Since 1951 the Cargill company, in particular, has demonstrated the potential value of a permanent 9-foot channel in the Minnesota by regularly increasing its annual shipments of grain from the 167,973 tons it shipped in 1951. In addition, the Northern States Power Co. has completed a steam-electric plant at mile 8.7 on the Minnesota which is expected to use 400,000 tons of coal via barge ultimately each year.

On March 2, 1945, the Congress authorized the Corps of Engineers to make a preliminary examination and survey of the Minnesota River up to a point 10 miles above New Ulm, Minn., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and related purposes, under the River and Harbor Act.

The report of the District Engineer on October 10, 1952, found that the most suitable plan of improvement would be "a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the mouth to mile 14.2." The estimated costs of the project were estimated at $2,303,000, with total annual carrying charges estimated at $115,300. The estimated annual benefits were estimated at $402,900—which resulted in a most favorable benefit-cost ratio of 3.49.

This report was passed on up to the Army Chief of Engineers on March 20, 1953, almost precisely 3 years ago, with the following comment:

"The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurs in general in the views of the reporting officers. It notes that the plan of improvement presented by the district engineer is economically justified. However, since local interests are unwilling to meet the requirements of local cooperation, the Board recommends that further improvement of Minnesota River, Minn., for navigation be not undertaken at this time."

Nearly 3 years have now passed. Since the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in 1953, a great deal

more activity has developed on behalf of the proposed channel improvement. Local interest is now great, and, in fact, an organization made up of mayors and other public officials and representatives of civic organizations from communities in Dakota, Hennepin, Carver, and Scott Counties has recently been formed to coordinate a plan to meet the requirements set by the Corps of Engineers, if the proposed channel is to be undertaken as a Federal project. This organization now plans to incorporate.

Recently I received a resolution from this organization which is headed by State Senator John A. Metcalf, of the 21st District of Minnesota. A copy of this resolution is attached.

Because of the vital change in the attitude of local interests in the area to be directly affected by the proposed channel improvement in the Minnesota River, and because the proposed project would so clearly benefit navigation, I respectfully request that the Committee on Public Works consider a resolution authorizing the Army Corps of Engineers to review the report of the district engineer on the Minnesota River, as transmitted by the Army engineers to the Congress on February 16, 1954.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Whereas interest in the navigation of the lower 30 miles of the Minnesota River has been rapidly increasing since the close of World II, especially since 1947; and

Whereas several large corporations have purchased land or obtained long-term leases on land bordering the Minnesota River with the intention of locating new plants there as soon as they know that the river will have a 9-foot channel maintained; and

Whereas from the junction of the two rivers at Mendota there is today more freight, almost double, moving up the Minnesota River than up the Mississippi River; and

Whereas Minnesota needs the additional industries, that desire to locate on the Minnesota River, to stabilize unemployment; and

Whereas local interest in this project is now great; and

Whereas local subdivisions and individuals are now planning on ways and means of meeting the requirements set by the Congress of the United States on the people of the territory for the completion of this project; and

Whereas the Minnesota River from its junction with the Mississippi River at Mendota to the Carver rapids is a level pool requiring no locks or dams but simply dredging and a small amount of rip-rap, the total cost of which would be small in comparison to the ultimate freight moved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we humbly request of the Congress of the United States that all necessary steps be taken to secure a review of the report on the Minnesota River in interest of navigation and related purposes as transmitted to Congress by the Army engineers on February 16, 1954, and to work for the early completion of the 9-foot channel to the bridge, mile 25.1 at Shakopee.

John A. Metcalf, State Senator, District 21; Frank X. Gallagher, State Representative, District 20; Myron Richards, Richards Oil Co., Savage; Cormac A. Suel, Publisher, Shakopee; Florian Ader, Mayor, Chaska; Frank Strunk, Editor, Shakopee; Mark Egan, Mayor, Savage; Emil Teske, Greater Chaska, Inc., Chaska; Jerome Akin, Chairman, County Commissioners, Dakota County; C. Stender, Chairman, County Commissioner, Carver County; Harold Huss, Mayor, Shakopee; Sylvester De Venny, Chairman, County Commissioners, Scott County.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5265. An act to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1607).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 2562. A bill to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1608).

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT (S. REPT. NO. 1606)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, who is ill, I wish to submit on behalf of that committee, and in compliance with section 5 (b) (3) of the Employment Act of 1946, the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the 1956 Economic Report of the President. The report includes supplementary views and minority views of one member of the committee, togther with an illustration. As in the past, materials on the economic outlook for 1956, prepared by the committee staff, are also included. Appendices summarize the recommendations of subcommittees, resulting from 1955 studies, and provide a check list of publications of the Joint Economic Committee.

Printed copies of the committee's hearings which served as the basis for the committee's report will be available within the next 10 days.

I ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 3317. A bill amending paragraph 1530 (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to rubber-soled footwear; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3318. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, entitled "Orphans"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3319. A bill relating to the direction and supervision of the comptroller organization of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3320. A bill to require certain agencies of the United States engaged in activities affecting the fiscal policy of the Government to advise and consult with the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, with respect to the credit policy of the Government of the United States; and

S. 3321. A bill to require agencies of the United States engaged in lending operations, or the insuring or guaranteeing of loans, to make certain annual reports to the Congress and the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3322. A bill to provide for reorganizing the insurance operations of the Veterans' Administration, to create a Veterans' Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3323. A bill to provide for comprehensive reports by the Bureau of the Budget with respect to all branches of the Government and the executive agencies thereof; and

S. 3324. A bill transferring to the Secretary of Defense the management of certain properties presently classified in the national industrial reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (by request):

S. 3325. A bill to provide for the mutualization of the Federal intermediate credit banks, and for other purposes;

S. 3326. A bill relating to the premiums to be charged for insurance issued by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; and

S. 3327. A bill to authorize the Rural Electrification Administration to borrow money, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3328. A bill to provide for improving management and technical personnel in the support activities of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3329. A bill relating to the lending activities of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; and

S. 3330. A bill authorizing the Federal Housing Administration to provide for its financing through the issuance of bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3331. A bill to require the filing with officials of the Congress of information copies of statements filed with State or Territorial officials with respect to contributions received, or expenditures made, in connection with primaries, conventions, and other processes for the selection of party candidates for election to the Senate or House of Representatives or for the selection of delegates to the national conventions of political parties; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 3332. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3333. A bill to permit the prospecting for and the development and utilization of mineral resources of national forest lands, or lands administered for national forest purposes, or in connection with national forest programs, which are not subject to the operation of the general mining laws or the mineral leasing laws, or for the development of which no other statutory authority exists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3334. A bill to extend for 1 year the time for filing of claims by former prisoners of war under section 6 (e) of the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3335. A bill to provide the rank of lieutenant general for the person assigned to duty as Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces, United States Air Force;

S. 3336. A bill to provide the rank of lieutenant general for the person assigned to duty as Special Assistant for Reserve Components to the Chief of Staff, United States Army; and

S. 3337. A bill to provide the rank of vice admiral for the person assigned to duty as Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Naval Reserve); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. GORE, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3338. A bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 3339. A bill to provide for the stabilization of the domestic fisheries industry in the United States through the creation of a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation, to bring about a better balanced flow of fish and shellfish and the products thereof in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. BENDER):

S. 3340. A bill to transfer the functions of the Passport Office to a new agency of the Department of State to be known as the United States passport service, to establish a passport service fund to finance the operations of the United States passport service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he reported the above bill, from the Committee on Government Operations, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3341. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit certain bank mergers and provide for more effective enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 3342. A bill for the relief of Pavel Blaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

BILLS IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, 12 bills designed to implement recommendations proposed by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. These bills cover recommendations set forth in the Commission's reports on lending agencies, budget and accounting, real property management, and the business organization of the Department of Defense.

From the time that the second Hoover Commission completed its work, it has been my hope that this session of Congress would expeditiously explore the recommendations which the Commission brought forth. Unfortunately the results to date have been disappointing. Certainly these bills should receive the prompt and careful consideration of the Congress. The Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government under the direction of former President Herbert Hoover, whom we all esteem highly, devoted tremendous time and effort in producing their reports. I again urge the committees of the Senate to give prompt attention to all of these bills which have been introduced to implement the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SMITH, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 3319. A bill relating to the direction and supervision of the comptroller organization of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3320. A bill to require certain agencies of the United States engaged in activities affecting the fiscal policy of the Government to advise and consult with the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, with respect to the credit policy of the Government of the United States; and

S. 3321. A bill to require agencies of the United States engaged in lending operations, or the insuring or guaranteeing of loans, to make certain annual reports to the Congress and the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3322. A bill to provide for reorganizing the insurance operations of the Veterans' Administration, to create a Veterans' Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3323. A bill to provide for comprehensive reports by the Bureau of the Budget with respect to all branches of the Government and the executive agencies thereof; and

S. 3324. A bill transferring to the Secretary of Defense the management of certain properties presently classified in the national industrial reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3325. A bill to provide for the mutualization of the Federal intermediate credit banks, and for other purposes;

S. 3326. A bill relating to the premiums to be charged for insurance issued by the Federal Crop Insurance Corp.; and

S. 3327. A bill to authorize the Rural Electrification Administration to borrow money, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3328. A bill to provide for improving management and technical personnel in the support activities of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3329. A bill relating to the lending activities of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; and

S. 3330. A bill authorizing the Federal Housing Administration to provide for its financing through the issuance of bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the subject of campaign contributions. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

The bill (S. 3331) to require the filing with officials of the Congress of information copies of statements filed with State or Territorial officials with respect to contributions received, or expenditures made, in connection with primaries, conventions, and other processes for the selection of party candidates for election to the Senate or House of Representatives or for the selection of delegates to the national conventions of political parties, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, along with a great many other Members of the Senate, I have been studying for some time proposed methods to include, in one way or another, the State primary elections of our political parties in the development of adequate legislation designed to prevent unwholesome influences in our elective processes.

As one who abhors the current tendencies of central government throughout the world to acquire added authority and to deprive local autonomies and individual citizens of their traditional freedoms. I have looked with jaundiced eye on legislative efforts to require, by Federal statute, State primary elections to be conducted on a standard pattern.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution, which, in my opinion, is the keystone of our Bill of Rights, protects the States in their rights to manage their own affairs wherever authority is not specifically delegated to the Federal Government. No such authority has been delegated in the area of determining how States should conduct their primary campaigns.

However, Mr. President, there is a way in which the Federal Government can help patrol the honesty and honor of State primary elections.

About 2 weeks ago I suggested it in a newspaper interview. I suggested that each candidate and each political committee or functionary in a State primary campaign be required to file in Washington with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate precisely the same records they are required to file within the State, under State law.

In this way, we can help achieve an open-book atmosphere for our primary campaigns, just as it is hoped the new

legislative proposals will provide such an atmosphere for Federal elections.

These requirements for filing in Washington of the State reports required by law should apply as well to convention activities and to the selection of presidential convention delegates wherever State legislation deals with that subject.

Each time we have held national conventions, both of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, we have heard a great many complaints made and have read a great many newspaper reports that this delegation or that delegation improperly represents the particular State it is alleged to represent, and that its vote should not be counted in the national convention.

Therefore, I believe it would be salutary to suggest that there be filed with both the House of Representatives and the Senate, in Washington, the reports required by the States.

Mr. President, I believe that the enactment of such a law as I propose would eventually stimulate States which may have weak or inadequate laws governing their States primaries and conventions to strengthen them, since I am sure within every State there is a great body of citizenship eager to make each State a shining light in the field of clean campaigning and honest elections.

Furthermore, such reports would be available to State legislatures for study, and to newspaper writers for their information, and would serve as a pattern to be followed by States that may wish to emulate the action of other States in the passage of improved election laws.

While the legislation proposed this week by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and other Senators has accepted a part of the suggestion I made in this connection, the paragraph in the Johnson bill on that subject is inadequate and vague, in my opinion, as well as lacking in detail and in enforcement provisions. Hence, I have introduced my proposal as a separate piece of legislation. It could be enacted as separate legislation or incorporated as an amendment in any general legislation which may be enacted.

In the main, the Johnson bill has considerable merit, but my study of it also discloses to my mind that it is inadequate in at least one other specific particular. It fails to meet completely the problem of huge contributions by organized labor to political campaigns.

There is divergence of opinion, Mr. President, as to whether union labor does or does not use money collected by other than voluntary means in its political campaigning. I believe new election legislation should positively prohibit the use of funds collected from any source by other than strictly voluntary methods in any phase of political activity or election campaigning. It is simply not in keeping with the American spirit to require by force and coercion, by the checkoff, or by compulsion, the collection of funds from the pay of laboring men to be used in a political campaign. If it be true that labor unions have been doing that, I think it should be stopped by law. If it be not true that labor unions have been doing that, this safeguard and this provision would modify none of their present practices.

In my opinion, Mr. President, any American should be permitted to work for the candidate and the party of his choice and to make reasonable monetary contributions for such support. It follows, in my book, as an American axiom, that no American should be compelled or required either to work for or to pay for the campaign efforts of any party or candidate at any time.

Since the Johnson bill is completely silent on that point, since it overlooks one of the most serious possibilities of improper campaign influence, I think an amendment should be made to it in committee to close the loophole which would otherwise remain in our campaign legislation even if the Johnson bill should be passed.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes to amend the law with respect to the Joint Economic Committee on the Economic Report. I include with it a statement explaining the bill, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3332) to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended, introduced by Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. GOLDWATER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended (relating to the time for filing the economic report of the President), is amended by striking out "at the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1947)" and inserting in lieu thereof "not later than January 15 of each year."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (a) of such act and the heading thereof are each amended by striking out "Joint Committee on the Economic Report" and inserting in lieu thereof "Joint Economic Committee"; and any other statute in which the name "Joint Committee on the Economic Report" appears is amended to conform to the foregoing change in the name of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Section 5 (b) (3) of such act (relating to the time for filing the report of the joint committee) is amended by striking out "March 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947)" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 20 of each year."

The statement presented by Mr. WATKINS is as follows:

The economy in 1955 not only achieved, but exceeded, the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power necessary to carry out the major purposes of the Employment Act of 1946. This is not made clear in the 1956 Report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which the chairman submitted to the Congress today.

The majority committee report is written in terms which not only tend to minimize the economy's progress in 1955, but also to cast doubt upon the likelihood of achieving, with reasonable success, in 1956, the objectives of the Employment Act. Primarily because of this, I dissented from the committee report. The Congress and the American people are entitled to an objective appraisal of the Economic Report and the economy's operation in 1955. This I have tried to provide in my minority views, which are hereto attached.

(See exhibit A.)

The experience of many committee members now on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, has convinced us that certain changes in the Employment Act of 1946 would be desirable. Therefore, I send to the desk for introduction a bill which would—

1. Change the name of the committee to the Joint Economic Committee.

2. Require the President to submit his Economic Report by January 15.

3. Require the Joint Economic Committee to submit its report to the Congress by March 20.

Senators Flanders and Goldwater, both of whom are members of the committee, join with me as sponsors of this bill.

Our reasons for introducing such legislation are these:

1. The name, Joint Committee on the Economic Report, is cumbersome and unwieldly. For example, one is almost required to refer to the committee's report in this manner: "Today the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report submitted to the Congress the Joint Economic Report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President on the January 1956 Economic Report of the President." This obviously requires too much verbiage. Also, since most people, who have occasion to work with the committee and its staff, generally use the name, Joint Economic Committee, it seems desirable to rename the committee, using that designation.

2. With the large number of Presidential messages which are transmitted to the Congress at the beginning of each session, it seems desirable, to the committee members, that the President be given until January 15 to submit the Economic Report.

But there is a more practical reason for giving the Executive an additional 2 weeks to submit the report: Even the preliminary statistical data for the fourth quarter of the preceeding year needed to write the Economic Report and the Economic Indicator is not available until early in January. So even though the law requires that the Economic Report be submitted to the Congress at "the beginning of each regular session," it simply is not possible for the President to comply and present a document containing all of the pertinent data.

3. There are a great many pressing demands upon all Members of the Congress at the beginning of each regular session. It is the judgment of the sponsors of this measure, therefore, that adequate time to study the Economic Report and hold the necessary hearings is not afforded if the committee report must be submitted to the Congress by March 1, as the law now requires.

In concluding my remarks, I merely want to say that in light of President Eisenhower's decision to run again, the people in 1956 and succeeding years can look forward to a continuation of the economic statesmanship which he and his subordinates have exercised with great effectiveness the past 3 years.

EXHIBIT A

MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATOR WATKINS

It is with some regret that I find myself unable to join in a majority report. This decision is made both upon the partisan nature of the 1956 hearings on the January 1956 Economic Report of the President, and

of the findings of the majority report, which are couched for the most part in verbiage obviously written to minimize the economy's progress in 1955 and to cast doubt upon the ability of the economy to achieve, with reasonable success, the objectives of the Employment Act in 1956. This and the further fact that the majority report is largely unsupported by economic evidence produced at the hearings or in the staff report on the 1956 outlook make it imperative that I register a strong dissent.

First, let me state that the committee's decision this year to depart from the procedure, relied upon in the past, of calling before it a selected group of economists for their comments and appraisals smacked of sheer partisan politics.

No better evidence of this fact is needed than to note the absence of any comment in the majority report with respect to "natural resources policy," although that topic was selected by the Democrat members of the committee as 1 of the 5 topics for the committee hearings, which pitted, on successive days, the present Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, against the former Secretary of the Interior, Oscar L. Chapman. If it was such an important topic that the committee had to devote a major portion of its hearings to its consideration, then certainly it should have been worthy of some comment in the majority report.

The new procedure which replaced the testimony of competent economists—some 80 witnesses were heard in 1955—with a group of political and administration antagonists, except in a case or two, was approved by a straight party vote—the Democrats for it; the Republicans opposed. Such a decision by the Democrats in an election year has served, in my opinion, to retard the professional approach to the objective study of the economy, which some members, at least, had believed was being gradually achieved by the committee. The only reason the testimony of the "politician witnesses" failed to produce the expected denunciation of the President's Economic Report was because the year 1955 was plainly a record year, which saw the achievement of the objectives of the Employment Act—maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

In my opinion, the usefulness of the committee's work and report, as a result, have been compromised both to the detriment of the committee's future work and to a better understanding on the part of the public as to the functioning of the economy.

Second, the statement in the majority report concerning the reluctance of the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to "discuss fully and freely for the record the implications and assumptions of the Economic Report," and which also suggests that "in the interest of consistency" the "Council members should in the future likewise avoid the role of policy spokesmen for the administration through the press, the air waves, and the speaker's platform" (p. 2) makes it very clear that, quite to the contrary, as suggested by the opening sentence of the majority report, the 10th anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946 does not find "the * * * machinery of the act firmly established" (p. 1).

For example, the question raised by some Democrat members of the committee in their supplemental views to the 1955 committee report with respect to this matter remains unresolved. Namely:

"Does the Council of Economic Advisers act solely as anonymous professional advisers, or does it represent the President's overall economic analyses and policies before the Congress and the public just as Cabinet members represent separate segments of his program?" (p. 15).

First, section 4 (c) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended, says:

"It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

"(1) To assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Economic Report.

"(2) To gather timely and authoritative information concerning economic developments and economic trends * * *, and submit to the President studies relating to such developments and trends.

"(3) To appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2 * * *, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto.

"(4) To develop and recommend to the President national economic policies to foster and promote free competitive enterprise * * *, and

"(5) To make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of Federal economic policy and legislation as the President may request."

This language clearly establishes the Council, as students of public administration would term it, a "staff agency" to the President. Reorganization Plan No. 9 of 1953 transferred "so much of the functions vested in the Council by section 4 (c) of that act as consists of reporting to the President with respect to any function of the Council under * * * section 4 (c) * * * to the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers."

The chairmanship, therefore, by the language of section 4 (c) and this reorganization plan is clearly established as a staff adviser to the President. A staff agency or official is an organ advisory to a line or operating official but without operating responsibilities of its, or his, own. The staff function involves the study of problems, the proposing of alternative courses of action, and an analysis of their probable effects to a line or operating official, such as the President in this case, who has responsibility for carrying out the activities of his particular organization, which in this case, is the executive branch of the Government.

If any of the recommendations of a staff officer are put into effect, they are done so upon the decision of the responsible operating official to whom the staff agency is responsible—not upon the order of the staff unit itself. In this respect, the Employment Act, although requiring congressional confirmation of the Council members and its Chairman, does not establish any formal relationship between these staff positions or the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Students of public administration are also in agreement, on the other hand, that if staff personnel are to be effective, they should serve exclusively in a staff capacity. As I noted in my supplemental views to the 1955 committee report—

"It is upon this basis that the Council must demonstrate the utility of its services. Members of the Council are of course political appointees, but this does not imply nor require in this respect that they be something more than economists" (p. 48).

With respect to this matter, therefore, I agree with the viewpoint of the majority report that—

"Council members * * * should likewise avoid the role of policy spokesmen for the administration through the press, the air waves, and the speakers' platform" (p. 2).

As I also stated in my supplemental views of last year:

"It is to be regretted that on occasion, since the passage of the Employment Act, Council members have been employed in the role of policy spokesmen for the administration in power. To the degree that this is done, the Council will not only lose that objectiveness which is so essential to a staff agency, but the President's Economic Report itself will also be discredited as a factual and reliable document" (p. 48).

Certainly, someone should speak for the President, and should defend his Economic Report in public, before this committee, and the Congress, but it should not be the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. The Constitution under the separation-of-power principle, invests the "executive power" in the President, and it has been established for many years as constitutional principle that the President cannot be required to appear before a congressional committee.

Who then should speak for the President with respect to the administration's economic policy? Advisedly the heads of the executive departments who not only are responsible to the President for administering his program, but who also are publicly responsible for defending those parts of the President's program they execute in public and before the other committees of the Congress. During the 1956 hearings, this committee heard three of these Cabinet officials—Secretaries of the Treasury, Interior, and Agriculture. Had it so desired, it could have received testimony on remaining parts of the President's Economic Report from the other members of the Cabinet. That it neglected to do so is clearly its own fault, resulting from the nature of the hearings the Democrat members of the committee decided upon.

In one other respect, I believe it should be noted that on the 10th anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946, the machinery of the act has not been firmly established and perfected. This relates to the continuing disagreement among committee members as to whether or not the Economic Report of the President should, as the committee report phrased it last year, "include a clear statement on the goals [maximum employment, production, and purchasing power] needed to meet the objectives of the Employment Act as prescribed by section 3 (a) of that act" (p. 4).

I do not agree with the majority report that an obligation rests upon the Council of Economic Advisers, from what I have just said nor by the President for that matter "to take the leadership in efforts to coordinate the assumptions underlying the Government's entire economic program and to supply these promptly to the Congress through the Economic Report" (p. 6).

As I stated in my supplemental views last year:

"Interpretation must be left to the President as a matter of practical necessity, and the President, and the Council of Economic Advisers, have reached the following conclusion concerning * * * section 3 (a) of the Employment Act:

" 'The phrase can be interpreted as calling for a numerical specification of economic goals, or it can be interpreted as calling for as good a specification of objectives, whether in terms of numbers or otherwise, as can be made. In the former case, one would assert that "to carry out the policy declared in section 2," employment must be X, production must be Y, and so forth. In the latter case, one might assert that "to carry out the policy declared in section 2" employment must be a little higher, or substantially higher, and so forth, the drop in employment and production, if any, during the recent past, after allowing for an increment of growth, would suggest the general order of the magnitudes that are involved' (hearings, p. 44).

"It should be recognized by all concerned that the President is a political officer and, as such, he must necessarily be permitted to interpret such legislation in a manner which will lend consistency to and facilitate his leadership role. Not to allow such leeway is to cast the purposes of the Employment Act into narrow partisan politics.

"To require by law, or by an interpretation of law, that the President should execute his responsibilities in this area in a definitive and narrowly construed manner is inconsistent with the basic nature of that office

and our political system. Dissatisfaction with his administration of the act should be reflected through our political processes utilizing the two-party system, and his position, be he a Republican or Democrat, should not be compromised by the narrow interpretation the committee report places upon the meaning of section 3 (a) of the Employment Act" (pp. 47–48).

In this respect, I should like to point out that the committee staff's projections of the level of gross national product required in 1955 to meet the objectives of the Employment Act were $1.2 billion on the low side, in terms of constant prices. I also feel, however, as the staff indicated in its report, that the Economic Outlook for 1956, which is contained in this document, that the difference for the year of only $1.2 billion cannot be an error of any material significance. But just let the President, regardless of political party, include such projected levels in his Economic Report which may be $1.2 billion below the actual realized gross national product in constant prices, and the politicians especially in an election year, would cry recession if not depression, when actually, as in 1955, the economy did, without any doubt, achieve the objectives of the Employment Act.

Therefore, I want to repeat the observations I made in my supplemental views a year ago that:

"I cannot agree that the President's report would have been more useful had it included estimates covering more detailed parts of the economy or that their inclusion necessarily would render easier the economy's task of reducing present levels of unemployment.

"The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, although recognizing that such projections form the basis of the Council's work as a staff agency of the President, told the committee at great length why it was undesirable for these projections to be included in the President's report.

" 'It is important to recognize the limitations of economic knowledge, and how difficult it is to make useful economic predictions or projections. Serious uncertainties surround even historical descriptions. * * *

" 'Economists who are familiar with statistical vagaries such as this, and who know how difficult it is to measure with tolerable accuracy even experiences of the past, will hesitate to specify numerical goals for the Nation's economy over the next 6 months or year or 2. They know that in setting goals some arbitrary assumptions * * * which often are no less reasonable than the particular ones selected, can lead to such a wide range of results, that the calculated goals cannot have great value for policy decisions' " (hearings, p. 44) (p. 49).

This same cautiousness was expressed by Dr. Ralph J. Watkins in his presidential address to the 115th annual meeting of the American Statistical Association in December 1955:

"We are not unmindful of the limitations of our statistical measurements. These measurements of the condition of the economy can be only approximations, for that economy is too massive and too complex to afford any basis for claims to perfection or certainty in our economic measures. The estimates and indexes that are carefully prepared to measure the state of the economy, in terms of such concepts as gross national product, national income, industrial production, employment and unemployment, represent at any given time the best approximations the technicians can arrive at, on the basis of the information available to them at the time and on the basis of the extent of the analysis that time and funds permitted. These measures are not perfect, they cannot represent certainty; and the best we can claim is that they are reasonable approximations at the time and under the given circumstances."

Also, as I stated in my supplemental views of a year ago:

"Certainly, it is necessary to know something about the potential of the economy, but it is just as essential that we recognize the limitations of projections which form, or would form, the basis of public policy. Long-range projections such as those made by the staff committee are very useful to the Congress, and the committee staff and its director are to be commended for their contribution, but it must be realized that their projections suffer the same limitations as those of other professional economists. Given our political system, it is one thing for the Congress to require the President to provide specific projections of production and employment and quite another for a committee of the Congress, through its professional staff, to make such forecasts.

"Dr. Paul J. Strayer, professor of economics, Princeton University, in an article published in the American Economic Review for December 1954, entitled "Full Employment—1954 Model," recognizes that the President had valid reasons not to include projections in the economic report: *

" 'There is reason to have some sympathy with the council and the Executive in what must have been a conscious decision to abandon the projections of the Nation's economic budget type * * *. Model projections also invite reaction when not realized and may have a tendency to lead to overcompensation that will result in an inflationary bias. The failure of the forecasts following the Second World War can also be cited in defense of the council (p. 885).'

"Dr. Strayer further concludes:

" 'To act effectively to stabilize the economy we must either have an accurate diagnosis of the problem, including a forecast of the outlook for a substantial period in advance, or a degree of flexibility in Government programs that will permit us to act boldly to offset known variations from the path of stability with confidence that policies can be reversed as required by further intelligence * * *.

" 'In most of the reports and testimony (1954 hearings) it is agreed that we cannot have much confidence in our ability to forecast the economic future (Martin Gainsbrugh dissenting) in the short run although there is greater agreement that long-range projections of the future potential may be more accurate. Even if our ability to predict the course of events in the short run should increase, the current state of the world leaves so many external forces free to upset any calculations as to discourage reliance upon a policy geared to projections of even so long as a year' " (pp. 51–52).

In summary, the President's 1956 Economic Report does contain an appraisal of the economic outlook for 1956 as it did in 1955. But it is in the nature of an appraisal, as it was in 1955, which recognizes the limitations of forecasting. As the President put it in his 1955 Economic Report—

"It is well * * *, to keep in mind the sobering fact that there is no way of lifting more than a corner of the veil that separates the present from the future" (p. 24).

THE ECONOMY IN 1955

Since the Democratic members of the committee have made such a point of criticizing the President's Economic Report for not containing numerical levels of employment, production, and purchasing power needed to achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946, it seems rather inconsistent for the majority report not to contain an analysis of the achievements of the economy in such terms. Rather the majority report merely states that—

"From the standpoint of the overall economy, 1955 was clearly a good year and in most respects a record one" (p. 2).

The vital determination for this committee to make is not whether 1955 was "a good year" since the "man in the street" knows that to be a fact, but whether the economy met the objectives of the Employment Act in promoting "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." Failure of the majority report to unequivocally point out that—based upon the committee staff's projections made a year ago—these objectives were attained, is inexcusable and a major reason for my dissent. Politics again appears a stronger attraction for the Democratic members of this committee than an objective appraisal and statement of its findings with respect to the functioning of the economy.

For example, we need only to compare the staff's conclusions of a year ago with that expressed in the supplemental views of the Democratic members of the committee—with respect to the projected needed year-end rate of a gross national product of $385 billion to meet the objective of the Employment Act—to substantiate this point. The committee staff, composed of competent, trained economists, concluded that—

"If realized, this expansion would be a substantial accomplishment. It would call for a continuance in succeeding quarters of a rate of advance in economic activity close to that prevailing since the third quarter of 1954. The concensus of views of the witnesses appearing before this committee a month ago was that this rate of acceleration might not be maintained" (1955 committe report, p. 83).

In contrast, the Democratic members of the committee concluded:

"If the Employment Act objectives of maximum employment and production are met, a cautious estimate requires a rate of production at the end of this year of about $385 billion" (1955 committee report, pp. 10–11).

The conclusion of the committee staff and the concensus of views of 80 witnesses who appeared before the committee last year were that such a rate would be a substantial accomplishment; the views of the Democrat members of the committee in contrast were that such a rate was in effect unspectacular. Under these circumstances, it appears rather odd for the majority report to express as a second finding this year that:

"It seems unlikely that this rate of expansion can be maintained in 1956. Recent low levels of unemployment and unused industrial resources tend to limit the pace of further immediate expansion in real output."

Since the majority report fails to analyze the success the economy had in achieving the objectives of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power in 1955, I feel obligated as a member of the committee to perform this function, although it belongs to the committee as a whole.

Production

In his 1955 Economic Report, President Eisenhower stated:

"With economic activity continuing to expand, it is reasonable to expect that the Nation's output within the coming year will approximate the goals of 'maximum employment, production, and purchasing power' envisaged by the Employment Act" (p. 24).

The committee staff a year ago concluded that the assumptions underlying this forecast would require a gross national product which seemed to "imply an estimate of demand by Government, business, and consumers for goods and services totaling about $375 billion for 1955," and "since the year started at an annual rate of about $365 billion, or less than the 'maximum' employment and production level, this demand for 1955 as a whole implies a rise to an annual rate of about $385 billion by the end of this year" (1955 committee report, p. 83).

That the economy in 1955 not only achieved but exceeded this rate of production is made clear by the 1956 staff report contained in this document:

"The staff analysis reached the conclusion that the Economic Report and the budget

[1955] probably implied a demand for a gross national product in 1955 of $375 billion, rising from about $365 billion at the beginning of the year to about $385 billion by the end of the year.

"The assumed average for 1955 must be adjusted by adding about $5.6 billion to allow for price rises in 1955, and by another $3.4 billion because of revisions in July 1955 of the 1954 benchmark data from which the projections were made. * * * Therefore, the revised annual estimate would be $384 billion. * * *

"The staff believes the * * * understatement for the year of only $3.2 billion * * *, is within limits of acceptability and can be easily explained" (pp. 101–102).

In ascertaining whether gross national production achieves the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 or not, it is important that not only the level attained be considered but also that the trend or direction of movement be considered. In 1955 the economy began at a yearly rate in the production of goods and services at a market value of $365 billion—some $10 billion less than the average for the year of $375 billion assumed necessary to meet the 3 major goals of the economy (employment, production, and purchasing power)—and ended at a rate of $397.3 billion, with an average for the year of $387.2. It also is obvious, therefore, that our economic expansion for the year not only was substantial but rather, in fact, was phenomenal. This rate of expansion resulted in a 6.1 percent increase in real output, some 3 percent in excess of the long-term rate for periods not marked by wars or recessions.

Simply phrased, as President Eisenhower expressed it in his 1956 Economic Report, the year 1955 brought us to "the threshold of a $400 billion economy, and the recent advance has been accomplished without the specious aid of price inflation. * * *, whether we observe economic activity at the stage of production, or employment, or income disbursement, or consumer spending we find evidence of progress and prosperity. Employment and wages are at record levels. Profits are satisfactory in most industries. Both investment and consumer spending are going forward at a good pace" (pp. 1 and 6).

This is not to say as we enter 1956 that some negative or adverse cumulative movements involving some industries and some of our people do not exist. They do exist, and the Congress as it develops legisl tive programs, needs to keep the President's thought in mind that—

"If economic growth is not to be seriously retarded in the future, we must * * * strive to make up for the neglects of the past" (1956 Economic Report, p. 12).

However, we should note that in a free enterprise economy, all of the millions of decisions made by businessmen, employees, and Government cannot be right. Some will overestimate their markets, some will not invest enough; others will produce too much of some products which the consuming public will not buy. To a large extent it is the cumulative effect of such decisions in a free enterprise economy which results in cumulative movements, up and down, within our industries. He who would not conclude that the wisdom of these free choices resulted in a greater good for a greater number of people during 1955 than the harm done by the bad decisions is indeed a bold soul. As long as people have freedom to make their basic economic decisions, we shall always have successes and failures, production of too much in some areas and too little in others. Yet, in the aggregate, it is true, that only such a free enterprise economy as ours could have produced such an abundance of goods and services as the American economy did in 1955.

Employment

Once again I am dismayed to find not one single word in the majority report devoted to an analysis of whether the economy in 1955 achieved the objective of the Employment Act of 1946 of promoting maximum employment. Yet, during 1955 total civilian employment during 2 months of the year—August and October—stood at 65,489,000 and 65,161,000, respectively. These were employment levels never before attained in the history of this country. For the year, employment rose by approximately 2 million and unemployment declined by 576,000, in spite of the fact that 1,379,000 people were added to the civilian labor force, although the staff economists anticipated an addition of only 1 million.

The remarkable gains made by the economy in 1955 were well expressed in President Eisenhower's 1956 Economic Report as follows:

"Total employment rose by over 3 million and unemployment declined by half a million between the last 3 months of 1954 and the corresponding months of 1955, as the civilian labor force increased by over 2½ million. The average workweek also increased, and there was considerable overtime work, particularly during the latter part of 1955. The longer hours, combined with a continued rise in average hourly earnings, brought weekly earnings to record levels in most industries" (p. 114).

In comparison, the Democrat members of the committee observed a year ago that—

"It is a cause of deep concern that unemployment in February 1955 was only about 300,000 below February 1954, a reduction of about 8 percent. The situation looks a little better if we use the seasonally adjusted unemployment index (1947–49 equals 100) of the Bureau of the Census. This index was 110 in February 1955 compared to 114 in January 1955, and a high of 142 in May of last year. This is a reduction of about 23 percent. Even on this basis, however, the reduction in unemployment is not commensurate with the recovery in production. These circumstances were reflected in the warnings at our hearings of possible chronic unemployment at high levels of production" (1955 committee report, p. 11).

Odd, is it not, to find these same Democrats a year later in a majority report, warning that "Recent low levels of unemployment and unused industrial resources tend to limit the pace of further immediate expansion in real output" (p. 2). I can only presume from this statement that they are acknowledging indirectly that the objective of promoting maximum employment was achieved in 1955.

Additional evidence of phenomenal progress in this area is provided by an analysis of unemployment during 1955. Concerning this matter, the 1956 Economic Report observed that:

"The decline in unemployment over the past 12 months took place while the labor force was increasing sharply. At the end of 1954, with about 63½ million people in the civilian labor force, unemployment had fallen to a little under 3 million. During the spring and summer of 1955, the expansion of job opportunities drew many people into the labor market and the civilian labor force rose by about 4 million. Meanwhile, after a seasonal rise early in the year, unemployment declined to a little over 2 million by the end of the summer. At the year-end, after declining somewhat less than seasonally since summer, the civilian labor force totaled about 66½ million people, and there were about 2.4 million people unemployed" (p. 117).

The committee staff economists assume for purposes of their projections that unemployment in years not marked by war or severe recession should average close to 4 percent of the civilian labor force, although other competent economists place the rate near 4.5 to 5 percent. Even though the percentage of the civilian labor force unemployed averaged 4 percent during 1955, as their staff projection reveals, the record level of total employment set in 1955 is all the more remarkable since instead of only an addition of 1 million to the civilian labor force, as the staff projected on the basis of average trends as calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the actual addition was 1,379,000, which represented an underestimate of one-fourth in the total number of people actually added to the labor force during the year.

This would tend to suggest, for years not marked by wars or recessions, that perhaps 4.5 to 5 percent of unemployment of the civilian labor force is more realistic a figure. Especially since, as noted in the President's 1956 Economic Report, the staff report and the majority report, the prevailing low levels of unemployment will tend to limit the rate of economic expansion in 1956.

Also, in ascertaining whether the economy fulfills the employment objective of the act in any year, it is important to consider the trend or direction of movement as well as the numerical levels attained. As the staff report points out:

"For example, some year, which began with 2 percent unemployed and ended with 6 percent, may not represent achievement of the maximum employment goals even though the average unemployment was only 4 percent" (p. 83).

Even by using 4 percent as the standard, as does the committee staff, the employment objective was achieved by the economy in 1955, since by quarters the percentage of the civilian labor force unemployed was 5.2, 4.1, 3.4, and 3.5. The magnitude of the upward employment trend during the latter part of 1955 is also revealed by the fact that even during December 1955, a month which experiences seasonal cutbacks in some industries such as farming and construction, a record new employment level of 64.2 million was established. This was 2.5 million more people than had ever been employed before during the month of December.

Thus, although 2.4 million were unemployed during December 1955, it should be remembered that these people were largely new entrants into the labor force, those in the process of changing jobs, and those shifting to new industries or occupations because of technological changes and developments. This is borne out by the President's 1956 Economic Report, which noted with respect to the composition of unemployment that:

"On the average, roughly half of those unemployed in any given month were no longer in that status in the following month * * * Unemployment declined the most among those unemployed the longest. * * * The rate of unemployment among married men living with their families declined sharply, from about 3 percent at the end of 1954 to about 2 percent at the end of 1955" (p. 117).

But, as the President also called attention to in his 1956 Economic Report, " 'structural' or 'spot' unemployment may remain even when the Nation's economy practically reaches full employment" (p. 61). In this respect, I am pleased to see the majority report give recognition to the President's recommendation for a comprehensive program to more satisfactorily deal with "excessive unemployment in economically depressed industrial areas" (p. 4). However, the economy made extensive gains even in this area, as indicated in the Area Classification Summary released in January 1956 by the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor:

"A year ago, at the beginning of 1955, the Bureau of Employment Security listed 44 major areas and 100 smaller centers as having relatively substantial unemployment * * *. By the beginning of 1956, however, only 19 major areas—the lowest number since autumn of 1953—remained on the surplus listing, while the number of smaller surplus areas had been reduced to 64 * * *.

"With only 3 exceptions (Biddeford, and Sanford, Maine; Long Branch, N. J.; and Ponce, P. R.), all of the major and smaller areas still classified as labor surplus reported some cutbacks in unemployment over the past year. Declines totaled an impressive 25 percent or more in 49 of the 83 large and small areas remaining on the surplus list; in 15 of these, jobless totals have dropped to less than half the year-ago level."

In summary, however, it must be concluded as the Executive Director, Dr. Grover W. Ensley, observed in his address to the 33d Annual Agricultural Outlook Conference—"unemployment and unused industrial capacity are today near an irreducible minimum." The economy in 1955 not only met but substantially exceeded the employment objective outlined in the Employment Act of 1946. The majority report should have made this fact plain; that it did not do so is regrettable.

Purchasing power

As the Employment Act of 1946 suggests, one of the best indicators of economic activity is the aggregate income paid to people by industry, agriculture, and Government. Of most significance from the standpoint of purchases of goods and services is "disposable personal income," which is that income people actually receive and can either spend or save. Concerning this indicator, the President's 1956 Economic Report observed that:

"Disposable personal income rose * * * by $14.4 billion to $269.2 billion * * *, despite higher Federal taxpayments associated with rising earnings and despite somewhat larger payments for State and local taxes. The income gains from 1954 to 1955 raised the per capita disposable income in constant prices by more than 4 percent" (pp. 107–108).

It should be noted that this $269.2 billion of disposable personal income which workers, farmers, professional and self-employed people and proprietors received, was some $1.5 billion in excess of that which the committee staff projected as possible of attainment in 1955, if the objective of promoting maximum employment and production was to be achieved.

This record receipt of disposable personal income gave rise to personal consumption expenditures which also reached record proportions in 1955. In 1955, personal consumption expenditures rose by $16 billion to $252.4 billion. In this connection, the President's 1956 Economic Report noted that:

"The rise in consumer spending was not, however, a passive accompaniment of rising incomes. On the contrary, it was a highly dynamic factor in the process of economic expansion. Consumers were of a mind to buy better things and increase their spending. This pervasive attitude, combined with the willingness of women and young people to take on jobs so that their families might better approximate the plane of living they wished to attain has been an outstanding feature of recent experience * * *. The confidence in the economic future so dramatically displayed by them was likewise felt and displayed by businessmen and investors" (pp. 23 and 25).

Although this rate of personal consumption expenditures, in relation to disposable income and personal savings, was in part made possible by a rapid expansion of consumer credit, it did not result in inflationary developments, since consumption of goods and services increased almost 6½ percent in real terms due to fairly stable consumer prices. This was the largest gain in real terms or constant prices since 1946. The 1956 Economic Report noted in this respect that:

"The vigorous expansion of economic activity during 1955 was accompanied by little change in the average level of wholesale or consumer prices. To be sure, the substantial stability of the price level reflected in some degree the opposite movements of industrial and farm prices in wholesale markets. However, the increase even in the average level of industrial prices was not large for a period of high prosperity. Because the overall change in prices was small, speculative accumulation of business inventories, such as has often led to economic recession in the past, was largely avoided last year" (p. 41).

It was just a year ago in their supplemental views that the Democrat members of this committee, concluded that—

"The President and the administrators of his economic programs seem unable to conquer their inflationary fears and to exhibit the kind of mature economic statesmanship on monetary policy which they advocate in the Economic Report" (pp. 24–25).

Quite to the contrary of this "political" observation, the American people in no small part owe the gains they enjoyed last year in real terms—a 6½ percent increase and the largest such basic gain in economic well-being since 1946—to the "economic statesmanship" the President and his subordinates have exhibited since assuming office. For their decisions to ease credit restrictions in 1954 and to place restraints on borrowing in 1955, we can be grateful. However, prudent restraint and concern for the facts suggest the obvious fact, as the President called our attention to in the 1956 Economic Report that—

"Final evidence of the effectiveness of recent governmental policies must therefore be sought in the economic annals that are yet to come as well as those for 1955" (pp. 40–41).

Installment credit, which was used principally in the buying of consumer durables, did increase $5.5 billion in 1955. Of this amount, the Survey of Current Business, for January 1956, indicates that nearly $4 billion of the total increase was due to "the rise in automobile paper" (p. 2). However, although the total credit outstanding is currently higher relative to income than in previous years, all of this gain, as the Survey reveals, is "attributable to the installment credit segment, and more particularly to automotive paper * * *, and even in the case of nonautomotive installment debt, the ratio to income is only moderately above prewar" (p. 3).

Such an extension of private debt to be paid out of future income has always been associated with the purchase of such durable goods which provide service over an extended period of time.

Although "monthly payments on the loans proceeded on schedule, and delinquencies were not only very low but even lower than in past years," as the 1956 Economic Report indicates (p. 26), prudence requires that further increase in the rate of consumer credit expansion be watched carefully. I find myself in agreement with the President's recommendation concurred in by the majority report, that—

"Although present conditions do not call for the use of * * * authority to regulate the terms of installment credit, this is a good time for the Congress and the executive branch to study the problem" (1956 Economic Report, p. 94).

I believe, therefore, that although the majority report fails to note it, that a reasonably objective person would conclude that the economy in 1955 most certainly did achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 in achieving maximum production, employment, and purchasing power. As the President phrased it: "Full employment, rising incomes, and a stable dollar have been cherished goals of our society. The practical attainment of these ideals during 1955 was the year's greatest economic achievement." (1956 Economic Report, p. 13.)

THE OUTLOOK FOR 1956

It is evident from what I have said that the gigantic rate of expansion which the economy made in 1955 cannot continue indefinitely. As the President indicated in the 1956 Economic Report:

"Under current conditions, the economic growth of our Nation is limited by industrial capacity and accretions to the labor force. When the economy has reached so high a level its near-term course is inevitably surrounded by a margin of uncertainty, and minor movements can occur without involving a change in general trend" (p. 49).

This implies a decrease in the rate of expansion not in continued economic growth. It means a period of relative stability in economic expansion, and, as was the case in 1954—a good year, a lessened rate of expansion does not imply stagnation; rather a mixture of cumulative movements up and down as required by the needs of individual industries.

In this respect, I believe the remarks of Dr. Ralph J. Watkins in his presidential address to the 115th annual meeting of the American Statistical Association last December are worth noting:

"The conviction that catastrophic depressions can be avoided does not at all imply a belief that economic recessions are a thing of the past. Indeed, we can see that modern economic fluctuations are part of the price of freedom. They are inherent in a free economy; inherent basically in that precious hallmark of a free society—freedom of choice; freedom to buy or not to buy; freedom as to what to buy; freedom of occupation and freedom of entry into business; and freedom in the management of our farflung business system, composed of more than 4 million separate business concerns.

"The business cycle is still with us and will continue with us so long as we remain a free economy and a free society, though we may properly continue our efforts at lessening the amplitude of economic fluctuations and may well hope to achieve more and more progress as we learn more about the behavior of the economy and as our management skills are sharpened by experience."

It has become the vogue these days for certain economists to speak of adjusting the rate of economic growth downward "to a more sustainable pattern of balanced growth" and "of adjusting to a rate consistent with rising productivity and growth in the labor force, avoiding the excesses of inflation and rising prices on the one hand, or renewed recession and rising unemployment on the other," as does the majority report (p. 2). But it must be realized, as the President so emphatically told the American people in the 1956 Economic Report:

"The economic life of a dynamic people is full of crosscurrents. No matter how rapidly the economy as a whole may be advancing, there are always some industries and areas that are standing still or even declining. Progress of technology is by its nature uneven; new products and new firms continually disrupt economic routine; shifts of demand keep occurring and recurring; foreign developments have widely divergent effects on domestic industry; and the weather itself is sometimes the arbiter over the lives and fortunes of people. These factors and many others like them diversify the economic life of a nation. If our economy is to continue growing, it will have to remain fluid and resilient, and broadly responsive to market forces" (p. 51).

The American people can expect in 1956 a continuation of the mature economic statesmanship on the part of President Eisenhower and his responsible associates by using the extensive powers of the Federal Government in such a manner as to accomplish the objectives of the Employment Act by promoting maximum employment, production and purchasing power. As the President's 1956 Economic Report indicates:

"The continuance of general prosperity cannot be taken for granted. In a high-level economy like ours, neither the threat of inflation nor the threat of recession can ever

be very distant. * * * If our economy is to advance firmly on the narrow road that separates recession from inflation, the Federal Government must pursue monetary, fiscal, and housekeeping policies with skill and circumspection. We must be alert to changes in economic conditions and be ready to adapt our policies promptly to them" (pp. 11–12).

I should like to point out that in an election year the expedient but generally unwise thing to do is to follow the course of least resistance. This the Eisenhower administration did not do in 1955. As the President in his 1956 Economic Report observed:

"Prompt and resolute governmental action to contain undue expansion requires courage and a willingness to focus on the less apparent and the longer-term interests of the economy" (p. 43).

A continuation of this statesmanshiplike use by the President of governmental powers can be expected by the American people in 1956.

What then seems to be the outlook in 1956 for achieving the Employment Act objectives of maximum employment, production and purchasing power? The 1956 Economic Report concludes:

"Taking recent developments all together, it is reasonable to expect that high levels of production, employment and income will be broadly sustained during the coming year, and that underlying conditions will remain favorable to further economic growth" (p. 49).

The committee staff's report indicates that the assumptions underlying the President's Economic Report and the budget imply a gross national product of about $400 billion for 1956. This reinforces the President's observation that economic expansion in 1955 brought us to "the threshold of a $400 billion economy" (1956 Economic Report, p. III).

Measured in terms of constant fourth quarter prices, this would represent a 2.8 percent increase in the production of goods and services over 1955. It also is significant to remember that whereas a year ago, the economy began at a level below the long-term average, it began in 1956 at a higher rate than the long-term average.

A $400 billion gross national product may involve a somewhat lower rate of production and utilization of available resources in 1956 than prevailed in the record fourth quarter of 1955. But this projected economic growth in 1956 is consistent with the long-term trend of a 3-percent increase in the production of goods and services and the maintenance of an unemployment level of 4.5 to 5 percent of the civilian labor force which many economists believe is normal for the economy in years not marked by wars or recessions.

In a few words, if a $400 billion economy is achieved in 1956, the objectives of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power would without much doubt be achieved. It also is regrettable that the majority report does not make this fact plain; but in an election year, especially in light of the nature of the committee hearings that the Democrat members decided to hold this year, such an omission is understandable even if it is not justifiable.

AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

The one major segment of the economy in 1956 which did not enjoy economic prosperity as a whole was agriculture. The net cumulative movement represented by the industry was negative, and as the President observed in his Economic Report this year, "the position of farmers in our dynamic economy has aroused deep concern" (p. 53).

Although the majority report findings and recommendations contain much merit, they ignore certain fundamental problems in agriculture which require extremely different solutions and types of public assistance than those recommended for agriculture as a whole. As long as the Congress continues to ignore these cleavages within agriculture, involving great extremes in the size and types of farms, it will continue to legislate inappropriate policies which merely treat the effects rather than the causes of these diverse income and production problems.

I do agree in general with the majority report's observation that—

"Because of the highly competitive nature of agriculture, because of the relatively inelastic demand for most agricultural products, and because of the national need for substantial standby productive capacity to meet the needs of increasing population and against the hazards of war and crop failure, agriculture as an industry will continue to present unique and difficult problems" (p. 3).

However, if the Congress will enact realistic legislation tailored to meet the separate needs of the owners and operators according to the 1954 agricultural census of our (1) larger commercial farms, mostly family-type farms who can benefit from price support programs, since they produce 85 percent of the annual marketable crop value and receive 80 percent of net farm income; and (2) smaller commercial farms, residential and part-time farms, as defined by the Census Bureau, who benefit but very little from price support programs, since they produce only 15 percent of the annual marketable crop value, and receive but 20 percent net farm income.

I have no doubt but what, in a comparatively short period of time, solutions can be found to "the unique and difficult problems" of these distinct groups of rural people.

Need for income data by economic class of farm

Our first step in formulaitng legislation which can treat the causes of these problems is to obtain meaningful annual farm income data by economic class of farm. It should be obvious that average and per capita farm income figures, derived by dividing the number of farms and farm people into a net income figure, are of questionable utility for policy determination. These figures represent the composite of: (1) the incomes of 2 million farms which comprise 80 percent of the net farm income, and (2) the incomes of 2.7 million farms, comprising only 20 percent of net farm income. This distorts all out of semblance to reality the farm income picture used for the purpose of shaping farm policies.

As the National Planning Association pointed out in its publication, Underemployment in Agriculture:

"Simple arithmetic will show what happens. Add the incomes of a group of 'medical science workers': $20,000 for a doctor; $8,000 for a laboratory technician; $4,000 for a nurse; $2,000 for a janitor. The average income for these 'medical service workers' is $8,500. Now, by using this average, the facts are distorted in two ways:

"(a) The doctor's salary appears to be much lower than it really is; and

"(b) The low income at the bottom of the group is glossed over.

"Thus, when national averages involving all farmers are used, the commercial farmers are made out to have much lower incomes than they actually have, and the real poverty of the low-income group is technically covered up. Yet this system of averages has been the common practice."

The Census Bureau defines a farm as 3 acres or more of land if the value of the products raised on that land amounts to $150 or more; or if it comprises less than 3 acres but the value of the products sold amount to $150. On the basis of this definition, the Agricultural Census of 1950 provided for the first time complete information on farm income by economic and other classes of farm, as follows:

CLASSES OF FARMS—1950 AGRICULTURAL CENSUS

Commercial farms (3,706,412)

Class I. Those farms which sold produce valued at $25,000 or more (103,231).

Class II. Those farms which sold produce valued at between $10,000 and $24,999 (381,151).

Class III. Those farms which sold produce valued at between $5,000 and $9,999 (721,211).

Class IV. Those farms which sold produce valued at between $2,500 and $4,999 (882,302).

Class V. Those farms which sold produce valued at between $1,200 and $2,499 (901,316).

Class VI. Those farms which sold produce value at between $250 and $1,199 (717,201).

Other farms (1,668,622)

Part-time, 639,230.

Residential, 1,029,392.

Total farms, 5,375,034.

Analysis of this data by economic class of commercial farm indicates that:

1. 1.2 million of the then existing 3.7 million commercial farms, mostly family type, comprising the first 3 economic classes of such farms, and containing 209.1 million acres of harvested cropland, produced farm products sold for $5,000 or more. Expressed another way, 22 percent of the total number of farms produced 74 percent of the total value of all farm products sold, utilizing 60.5 percent of the total harvested cropland.

The average family income, including both money and nonmoney income, of the 5 million persons living on these 1.2 million farms was $5,143. By comparison, the average family income of all farm families on farms that same year was only $2,650.

The average per capita income, including both money and nonmoney income, was $1,229, nearly twice that of all people on farms, which was only $651.

2. The other 2.5 million farms in the last 3 economic classes of commercial farms, containing 118.8 million acres of harvested cropland, produced crops sold for $4,999 or less. Expressed another way, 47 percent of the total number of farms produced only 24 percent of the total value of all farm products sold, utilizing 34.5 percent of the total harvested cropland.

The average family income including both money and nonmoney income, of the 10.3 million persons living on these 2.5 million commercial family-type farms was only $1,741—$3,352 less than the average of those families operating farms in the first 3 economic classes of farms and $859 less than the average family income of all farm families.

The average per capita income, including both money and nonmoney income, was only $430—$799 less than the average per capita income of persons living on farms in the first 3 economic classes of farms—and $221 less than that of all people living on farms, which was $651.

3. In addition, there were 1.6 million part-time and residential farms. These farms, representing 31 percent of the total number of farms, produced only 2 percent of the total value of all farm products sold.

It is evident from this analysis that income data in agriculture by economic class of farm are essential in evaluating the extent to which price-support programs aid farmers and raise prices and, therefore, incomes of the owners of farms in these different classifications. Obviously, two-thirds of our family-type farms produce so very little for sale that they cannot materially benefit from price support programs regardless of the level—75, 90, or 100 percent—of price support. No wonder average per capita farm income is but one-half that of nonfarm per capita income. Two-thirds of our farms contribute very little to total farm income, so

the result is that their inclusion for purposes of farm income analysis makes average farm family and per capita income figures compare unfavorably with nonfarm income figures.

On the other hand, it is obvious that the owners and operators of one-third of our farms, mostly family-type, who produce 85 percent of the annual marketable crop value are the people who benefit through the price support programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture. Yet we have had many honest and sincere people advocating a 90 percent of parity price support program in the mistaken belief that it will raise net farm income and narrow the gap between per capita farm and nonfarm incomes.

How can such a program do this when, in the first place, it relates to only the so-called basic commodities, which provide farmers only 26 percent of net farm income? Furthermore, in order to get price support, a farmer must have something to sell, but two-thirds of our family-type farms simply do not produce for commercial sale in any significant amount.

If such price support legislative "mistakes" are to be avoided in the future, the Congress must have more accurate and meaningful income data. Lacking such data, the majority report understandably expresses alarm at "the continued decline in farm prices and agricultural income" and concludes that "certainly the solutions thus far brought forward have not been adquate" (p. 3).

Yet the authors of the majority report concluded ostensibly on such inadequate data that they were "largely persuaded by the extent of the recent decline * * *, (to) feel compelled * * * to accept * * * strong price supports" (p. 4).

The lack of adequate farm income data prompted me to introduce, earlier this session, S. 3145, which would require the Bureau of the Census, in conducting its current population surveys, to include and publish annually money and nonmoney income data, relating to per capita and family farm income by economic class of farm. It is my hope that the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the committee will, during the coming year, give attention to improving the compilation of agricultural income data along this line, and that the authors of the majority report will in their own words "weigh sympathetically" this "difference approach to a solution" of our farm income problems.

The stakes are too high and the welfare of too many people is involved for the Congress to enact or reenact laws such as the rigid 90 percent price support program on basic commodities, which instead of removing the causes only treat the effects produced by our two major problems in agriculture: First, the need for effective price support legislation for our commercial farms; second, economic aid programs of quite a different nature to assist the great bulk of our farm people who, because of the lack of adequate-sized farms, financial means, or technical knowledge, do not produce enough farm products for commercial consumption to derive any substantial assistance from price-support programs.

Agriculture is basically sound

In light of the current election-year discussion, about declining parity ratios, prices and farm income, it is very important that the American people view these matters in proper perspective. Although the cumulative movement of agriculture has been down, agriculture, as Secretary Benson has said many times, "is not on the rocks." Commonsense and respect for the following basic facts concerning the soundness of agriculture, ought to guide the Congress in enacting farm legislation.

The prices received index did fall from 243 in January 1955, to 226 in January 1956—a drop of 16 points. But during the same period, prices paid by farmers for production and family living items, declined 7 and 1 points respectively, causing the parity index also to decline 2 points. Thus the parity ratio during the year fell 6 points from 86 to 80. Two significant facts emerge from these data. First, farmers as a whole did benefit from the price stability which prevailed during 1954, although the owners of one-third of our farms mostly family type which produce 85 percent of our annual marketable crop value benefited to a lesser extent, since, to a considerable degree, price stability was the result of the low prices they received. Second, commercial farms (in particular those in the first three economic classes of farms) as the 1956 economic report points out "have been producing and are geared to produce more than could be commercially disposed of at support prices" (p. 54).

We should take notice of the fact that whereas the total value of all farm assets is some $163 billion, total farm debt is only $18 billion—some 11 percent of farmers' assets. Only 3 out of 10 farmers have mortgage debts and over 80 percent of all farms mortgaged are mortgaged for less than 50 percent of their market value—over one-half are mortgaged for less than 30 percent of their market value. However, the demands for credit have been increasing, especially among young farmers and those who operate smaller farms.

Seemingly, the best indicator for determining the basic soundness of any segment of the economy is the trend in the number of bankruptcy cases filed by different types of businesses. Cases involving farmers have accounted for exactly six-tenths of 1 percent of the total number of such cases for the past 5 years. In 1955, only 386 out of 59,404 bankruptcy cases involved farmers. This is all the more important when it is remembered that according to the agricultural census of 1954 we had some 4.6 million farm operators.

Although the income positions of the owners of the one-third of our farms which produce 85 percent of our marketable crop value declined during 1955, those of the owners of the other two-thirds of our farms were virtually unaffected by the decline in farm prices because they produce so very little for sale—about 15 percent of our marketable crop value. However, evidence that the net-income picture of the owners of our largest commercial farms, mostly family type, which produce the bulk of our farm products, is good and that in general they have shared in the prosperity enjoyed during 1955 is found in the majority report recommendation that endorses "the President's proposal for a dollar limit on the size of payments or support loans to any one individual or farming unit" (p. 4).

For example, the 1950 census of agriculture revealed that:

1. Nine percent, or 484,000 of the farms in the first 2 economic classes of farms—those producing crops sold for $10,000 or more—produced 51 percent of the total value of all farm products sold and received 23 percent of the total net farm income.

The average family income provided by these farms was $6,585, nearly 2½ times that of all farm families. The average per capita income of people on these farms was $1,594; also about 2½ times that of all people living on farms.

2. At the other extreme, about 16 percent or 717,201 farms in the sixth and last class of family-type commercial farms—those producing crops sold for more than $250 but less than $1,200—produced only 2.3 percent of the total value of all farm products sold and received 5 percent of the total net farm income.

Average family and per capita incomes were only $975 and $254, respectively; these also were $5,610 and $1,340, repectively, below those enjoyed by people living on farms in the first 2 economic classes of farms.

The owners or operators of these 484,000 farms, mostly family-type referred to in point 1, are, and have been, receiving the largest subsidies under the price-support program. One private research organization recently reported that 1.9 percent of our farmers received 25 percent of the price-support subsidy in 1953.

The largest loans made under the price-support program, however, are those made to corporation, not family-type, farms. For example, in 1953 the largest wheat loans were made to:

1. The Harrigan Farms, of Prosser, Wash., which placed 152,840 bushels under loan, in the amount of $354,339.

2. The United States Wheat Corp. of Hardin, Mont., which placed 184,516 bushels under loan, in the amount of $348,646.

I should also like to point out that 1,468 loans over $25,000, with a total loan value of $63,437,759, were made on the 1953 wheat crop. The average loan value was $43,214.

At the other end of the price-support ladder, 554,058 loans under $5,000, but totaling $713,517,921, with an average loan value of $1,288, were made by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

With respect to corn, the largest loans on the 1953 crop went to:

1. Adams Bros. & Co., of Odebolt, Iowa, which placed 124,800 bushels of corn under loan at a face value of $190,944.

2. Emil Sovich, of Rensselaer, Ind., who placed 102,648 bushels under loan in the amount of $166,289.76.

On this corn crop, the Commodity Credit Corporation made 104 loans over $25,000, with a total loan value of $3,575,440. The average value of these 104 loans was $34,379.

At the other end of the subsidy ladder, 283,605 loans under $5,000 in value, but totaling $503,449,500, were made. These loans average $1,775.

The magnitude of the subsidy program to large operators is revealed by table 3 of the USDA's January 1956 publication, summary of sample survey of size of major 1953 crop-grain loans:

TABLE 3.—*Number of loans, total loan value and average loan value, 7 major 1953 grain crops*

Grain crop	Under $5,000	$5,000–$10,000	$10,000–$25,000	Over $25,000
Wheat:				
Number of loans	554,058	26,184	9,496	1,468
Total loan value	$713,517,921	$171,245,681	$130,731,400	$63,437,759
Average loan value	$1,288	$6,540	$13,767	$43,214
Corn:				
Number of loans	283,605	10,842	957	104
Total loan value	$503,449,500	$69,913,395	$12,357,165	$3,575,440
Average loan value	$1,775	$6,448	$12,912	$34,379
Oats:				
Number of loans	42,845	408	59	10
Total loan value	$32,307,931	$2,763,937	$814,485	$271,984
Average loan value	$754	$6,774	$13,805	$27,198
Barley:				
Number of loans	33,185	518	183	66
Total loan value	$29,817,683	$3,559,516	$2,772,665	$6,364,144
Average loan value	$899	$6,872	$15,153	$96,424

TABLE 3.—*Number of loans, total loan value and average loan value, 7 major 1953 grain crops*—Continued

Grain crop	Under $5,000	$5,000-$10,000	$10,000-$25,000	Over $25,000
Sorghum:				
Number of loans	30,753	1,643	401	25
Total loan value	$38,910,506	$11,863,572	$5,783,510	$1,002,869
Average loan value	$1,265	$7,221	$14,423	$40,115
Soybeans:				
Number of loans	59,717	746	56	5
Total loan value	$71,089,904	$5,108,484	$976,860	$189,982
Average loan value	$1,190	$6,848	$17,444	$37,996
Flaxseed:				
Number of loans	56,907	562	56	18
Total loan value	$52,781,564	$3,362,395	$762,966	$520,361
Average loan value	$928	$5,983	$13,624	$28,909

The lack of a limit upon the amount of price support assistance a farmer can receive gives, in my opinion, unnecessary financial assistance to a great many owners of the larger commercial farms, especially the 103,231 farms in the first economic class of farms, which in 1949 produced 26 percent of all farm products sold and each of which produced products valued at $25,000 or more. I introduced, therefore, S. 3126, which provides that price support is not to be made available during any calendar year with respect to the products of any one farm of a total value, determined on the basis of the support price, in excess of $50,000.

While it is clear that during certain periods even these farms may need some price-support assistance, it is equally clear that many of these farms simply do not need unlimited price support assistance. Many of these farms, year in and year out, will return to their owners, net incomes much higher than 90 percent of our people ever hope to receive. This they would do even if they never received a dime in price support subsidy.

This can be done by those who operate the more profitable farms and who know how to apply to their lands just the right amount of labor and machinery and to produce the largest possible volume at the lowest possible cost per unit of output. This type of farming, of course, results in the highest gross income possible of achievement with their particular size of farms.

Price support policy

The decline in the prices received index from 302 in 1951 to 223 in December 1955, primarily has resulted from several factors which have enabled our larger commercial farms (mostly family-type)—some 1.2 million—to produce more than consumers could remove from the market at fair prices. One of these factors has been the maintenance of a rigid 90 percent price support program on the basic commodities—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. Application of high rigid price supports in conjunction with the acreage allotment and marketing quota production control programs, in effect on these crops, has utterly failed to bring the supply of those commodities into line with effective demand, and, to raise, thereby, farms prices and incomes.

The 1956 Economic Report calls attention to the fact that:

"Government restrictions on acreage of several crops, notably wheat and cotton, have insufficiently curtailed production of these crops and have led to expansion of others. Huge carryovers have piled up, far beyond liberal estimates of desirable reserves. Government holdings acquired under price-support programs have kept rising, in spite of intensive and effective efforts to dispose of surpluses * * *.

"The production-control programs that have been operated for basic commodities, which account for [only] about one-fourth of the total income from farm marketings, have indirectly contributed to lower incomes for the producers of other important commodities. Farmers with acreage diverted from basic crops have deemed it more profitable to produce feed grains or other crops, even at lowered support prices * * *. Many have expanded their hog and beef cattle numbers to use the additional feed thus produced, adding further to the expansion induced by relatively favorable livestock prices in earlier years * * *. These factors have been largely responsible for lower prices of beef cattle and sharply lower prices of hogs in 1955, and a continued increase in production of dairy products.

"Unrealistic supports have * * * overstimulated production of several basic products in this country" (pp. 54, 56, and 57).

How large are these surpluses of basic commodities? As of December 31, 1955, the Commodity Credit Corporation had the following quantities of these commodities valued at $5,302,338,317 in its inventories:

Wheat, 888,542,189 bushels valued at	$2,399,042,201
Cotton, upland, 7,920,833 bales, valued at	1,437,071,012
Corn, 757,612,049 bushels, valued at	1,300,322,952
Rice, 15,387,444 hundredweight, valued at	175,902,152
Total	5,302,338,317

Other commodities whose outputs were increased by production on lands diverted from basic commodities, under the allotment and marketing quota programs, accounted for CCC inventories as follows:

Commodity	Inventory amount	Value
Cheese—pounds	333,001,929	$131,250,285
Butter—do	166,398,824	100,684,683
Grain sorghum—hundredweight	26,452,382	77,378,838
Barley—bushels	31,261,403	43,966,463
Oats—do	35,258,232	29,987,599
Dried milk—pounds	161,713,453	28,216,338
Rye—bushels	3,305,906	5,390,331
Other		182,455,434
Total		599,329,971

What have been the costs of programs conducted by the Department of Agriculture primarily for the stabilization of farm prices and incomes on basic commodities? For the fiscal years 1932–55, the total realized net cost was $5,632,700,000, although these commodities were supported at 90 percent of parity only during the years 1942–54. By commodity they were as follows:

Corn	$1,319,300,000
Cotton	1,602,900,000
Peanuts	166,500,000
Rice	29,300,000
Tobacco	101,800,000
Wheat	2,412,900,000
Total	5,632,700,000

In light of these facts, it would seem highly imprudent to reenact a 90-percent price program on basic commodities. High rigid supports have not facilitated adjustment of production to effective market demand; and being applicable to only the basic commodities which provide commercial farmers with only 26 percent of their income, they cannot materially raise farm prices or total net farm income.

But by the same token, a flexible price-support system cannot demonstrate the degree of ability it may have to help commercial farmers adjust production any better, as long as these large surpluses overhang the market. Whether the flexible price support program will be as successful as anticipated or not, depends upon removal of these surpluses and a fair trial. A partial year's test under present supply and inventory conditions in no way approximates such a trial, and this should be clearly understood by the American people.

In light of this fact, I concur in the finding expressed in the majority report, that "we must accept the expedient contained in the President's Economic Report for a soil bank as a desirable aid in helping avoid further additions to our already large surpluses" (p. 4).

However, if the soil-bank proposal is to be effective in reducing surpluses by facilitating production adjustment downward, it seems essential that certain changes be made in the conditions of eligibility for assistance under the price-support program and the agricultural conservation program.

It appears to me that the Secretary of Agriculture should be given permissive authority to require that farmers participate in the acreage-reserve program in order to be eligible for price support. The acreage-reserve program certainly will fail to produce the desired results unless participation by the commercial farmer in the cotton-, corn-, wheat-, rice-, and tobacco-producing areas is very substantial. At a time when we have almost unprecedented Commodity Credit Corporation inventories of these commodities, it appears essential that the Secretary should have a sanction at hand to induce substantial participation in the event the rates of payment are not high enough to accomplish this basic objective. Unless the commercial farmers, who benefit from the price-support programs, participate, the program will fail to materially reduce surpluses—the objective of the acreage-reserve program.

Likewise, if the owners of large commercial farms are going to continue to get payments for carrying out conservation practices under the agricultural conservation program, which result in increased yields and a greater total output of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco, they ought to be required to participate in the acreage-reserve program.

It is sheer nonsense and a waste of public funds, on the one hand, to pay out money to increase production and then not to require participation in an acreage-reserve program which has, as its objective, the reduction of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco production.

For the same reason, any farmer who knowingly harvests any acreage of a basic commodity—wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts (all of which, except peanuts, are eligible for the acreage-reserve program)—in excess of his acreage allotment should not be eligible to receive payments under the agricultural conservation program. The only exceptions to such a provision should be in those cases in which:

1. A farmer has an acreage allotment of less than 15 acres, since under the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, a farmer with a wheat-acreage allotment of less than 15 acres of wheat without penalty.

2. A farmer grows corn for ensilage, since it is consumed on the farm.

3. A farmer grows peanuts for seed to be planted to peanuts to be grazed by hogs on the farm.

4. Farmers have rejected marketing quotas in a referendum, since adequate penalty in the loss of maximum price-support assistance is provided in the law.

The basic reason for requiring that commercial farmers (mostly family-type) must comply with acreage allotments in order to receive assistance under the agricultural conservation program is to provide an added sanction to induce compliance with production controls so that production can more nearly be brought into line with demand. Although production controls at best are not too effective in bringing and keeping supply in line with demand, it is important in light of the big surpluses on hand of basic commodities that they be reinforced by such a sanction. This is especially true with respect to the commercial farms owned by one-third of our farmers who produce 85 percent of our marketable crop value and who receive 80 percent of our net farm income.

However, I do agree that such a sanction should not apply to our small family-type farms—especially those having wheat and corn acreage allotments of less than 15 acres. But I cannot agree that it should not be made applicable to the large commercial farms (also mostly family-type) though fewer in number but which produce the bulk of our food and forage crops. Specifically, my reasons for this are:

1. If public funds are to be used to increase the capacity of these commercial farms as is the case with respect to the agricultural conservation program, while at the same time the Government is obliged to support the prices of the crops in question, then the public interest certainly requires that adequate sanctions be imposed which will work toward the goal of keeping supply in line with demand.

That the bulk of payments now made under the agricultural conservation program are for practices which primarily increase output rather than build the soil, as do more permanent type practices, is revealed by table 5 to the summary of the agricultural conservation program for 1953 published by the USDA. In 1953, 42 percent of the $185 million farmers received was spent for fertilizer and inorganic materials—limestone, phosphate, and potash. Another 14 percent was used for protective manure crops.

2. If we want to really advance soil conservation on lands devoted to the growing of soil-depleting crops, then commercial farmers, family-type or not, if they are to be eligible for such financial assistance on such crops—and they are the crops in question here—should be required to observe acreage allotments. In this respect it should be noted that from 1936 to 1944 the USDA paid farmers $1,666,300,000 under the agricultural conservation program to withdraw soil-depleting crops, including those here in question, from production. Farmers were given an acreage allotment, and if they kept within that allotment, they received an agricultural conservation program payment.

That such a practice was more of a permanent soil conserving nature than most of those for which farmers are compensated today under the agricultural conservation program cannot be disputed. As Rainer Schickele, former chairman of the agricultural economics department of North Dakota Agricultural College, has so ably stated in his recent book, Agricultural Policy:

"The public interest is concerned primarily with erosion control, with keeping the topsoil in place, because it constitutes the nonrenewable fund resource of the soil. Fertility maintenance, better farm use of water, and maintaining forages are essential only insofar as they are needed to control erosion. The ACP objective fails to make this important distinction. Consequently a certain proportion of the available funds is used to pay for practices on land which would not have been permanently damaged if these practices had not been performed. * * *

"There can be no question that a considerable part of the ACP payments are being made for practices on land where those practices are not necessary for the public interest in soil conservation.

"If the funds now disbursed on lands not subject to erosion could be shifted over to unprotected erosible lands, the effectiveness of the program could be substantially increased. We as a nation would get more real soil conservation per tax dollar spent than we are getting now" (p. 104).

Contrary to the opinion of some people with respect to this matter, it is evident that not to require compliance with acreage allotments on soil-depleting crops as a condition for receiving ACP payments on farms having an allotment of over 15 acres would result in less conservation worthy of the name, than would otherwise be the case.

Experience also indicates that the Secretary of Agriculture should be required to obtain certifications from processors that the producers of agricultural commodities, for which any price support or surplus removal operation is carried out through purchases from, or loans or payments to processors, have been paid for their product:

1. Not the less than the support price therefor; or

2. In the case of commodities for which no support price has been established, such price, but not less than 75 percent of the parity price, as the Secretary finds necessary to provide a reasonable return to such producers.

In the latter case, it is necessary to require that 75 percent of the parity price to be paid producers in the case of commodities for which no support price has been established, because title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, provides that for commodities other than the basics (wheat, cotton, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco) and the designated nonbasics (wool, including mohair; tung nuts; honey; milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat) that the level of support, depending upon supply conditions, shall not be less than 75 percent of parity.

It does a farmer very little good to have the Department of Agriculture through expenditure of Commodity Credit Corporation funds, or section 32 funds, purchase commodities through surplus removal operations unless—

1. A support level as a percentage of the parity price of the commodity is set by the Secretary of Agriculture.

2. And processors are required to certify that producers have been paid that price.

It would seem much wiser not to institute such purchase programs unless it is evident that producers, for whose benefit they are initiated in the first place, will actually benefit pricewise. The Department of Agriculture has realized a net cost of $1,804,100,000 in carrying our surplus removal programs since 1932, and such programs are the major method the Department of Agriculture relies upon to support perishable commodities. To spend millions of dollars in surplus removal operations, without a support level being announced and which does not result in the improvement of market prices, can only lead to bitterness of feelings on the part of producers toward both the processors and their Government.

Expanded research programs

The President requested an increase of 25 percent in research funds so that for the 1957 fiscal year $103 million will be available not only to carry out the usual research activities of the Department but to expand research relating to the development of new uses, new markets, and new crops.

During the fiscal years 1948–55, the Department of Agriculture spent $47 million in marketing and related economic research, and State agencies spent some $9,800,000 under the Research Marketing Act during the same period. Now I am in complete agreement that we "must further improve our marketing mechanism * * * so that the benefits of our abundance may be still more widely distributed" as the President stated in his special agricultural message. But I am also convinced that mere improvement of the marketing mechanism—a real boon and subsidy to the processing, transportation, wholesale and retail food industries—does not necessarily mean that (1) resulting lower marketing costs are passed on to the farmer in the form of higher prices or lower handling costs (quite to the contrary, I suspect that most of this "saving" finds its way into the profits account) and (2) the total demand is increased for the commodity in question whose marketing costs are lowered.

As much is implied by the President's statement in his special agricultural message that—

"Marketing margins have continued to increase, even while farm prices have been declining. Thus the farmer's share of the retail food dollar has shrunk appreciably. Retail prices have changed little, thereby impeding desired increases in consumption. We must find ways to lower costs of food distribution."

Now it may be that lower marketing costs resulting from marketing research carried out by the Department of Agriculture at a cost of $56,800,000 during the past 8 fiscal years have been swallowed up by increased labor and transportation costs. But, as I have watched the press releases from the Department over the past few years, announcing the results of many of these "marketing research projects," it is difficult for me to see how some of these findings could result in (1) any material increased demand for the commodity in question, or (2) higher returns to farmers.

Research undoubtedly is an effective way to help attain the goal of lower costs of food distribution, but it should not be carried out by the Department of Agriculture if it will not help farmers sell more for a higher return. I, therefore, urge the committee during the coming weeks, as part of its proposed inquiry into the "cost-price squeeze in agriculture," to study the effect the results which specific marketing research projects have had upon the total demand for the commodity in question and prices paid farmers as a result.

During the 1930's, chemurgy seemed to hold out much hope for the diversion of substantial quantities of food and fiber products into industrial and other nonfood uses. A program of vigorous basic and applied research may turn up heretofore undiscovered nonfood industrial uses, but based upon our experience over the past 15 years, the prospects seem not too bright. The following seem to be the major obstacles to date:

1. Food and feed crops are relatively more expensive sources of raw materials than other available materials.

2. Not infrequently their use in manufactured products involves greater costs than use of competing materials.

For example, surplus wheat is our number one commodity problem as measured by the bushel quantity and dollar value of Commodity Credit Corporation inventories: 888,542,189 bushels valued at $2,399,042,201. Yet its use for the manufacture of industrial alcohol, its principal nonfood and feed use, has not been very extensive. Before 1940, little or no wheat was used for this purpose. But by 1943, even when it was difficult to get natural raw materials due to wartime shortages, only 107 million bushels out of a production of 1,060 million bushels that year were used in the manufacture of

industrial alcohol. Each year since then, the quantity of wheat diverted to this use has progressively declined in spite of cheaper wheat prices. In 1954, industrial alcohol production utilized an insignificant 62,000 bushels of wheat.

At the moment, new crops development research seems to be the front which offers the greatest promise for more efficient utilization of resources in agriculture now being used to produce quantities of some crops greatly in excess of demand. Dr. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, recently said in a talk entitled "New Crops Research":

"Americans have been on the lookout for new crops since the beginning of our history * * *, advances in every one of our major crops have come as a result of this continuous search for plants of the same or related species for use in improving varieties * * *. Some of our greatest opportunities, both for stabilizing farm production and opening up new markets in industry, will be found through research on crops we're now growing."

In this respect, as President Eisenhower said in his special agricultural message:

"We must find new crops offering such new opportunities and benefits as are exemplified by soybeans and sorghums."

New crops should mean the diversion in some areas of acreage out of the production of crops now in surplus, resulting in more economic and profitable use of capital and labor. However, much of the development of new and improved crop plants depends upon plant breeders having at their disposal adequate stocks of many different kinds of plants, both foreign and domestic, both wild and cultivated. Although these plants in themselves may not have much agricultural value, they often contain valuable genetic characteristics that plant scientists can use in developing commercial varieties.

Such improvements require the blending into new plants of superior genes. New genes or germ plasm cannot be created—the breeder must work with those that occur in those plants he has on hand. This expanded research leading, we hope, to new crops, which the Department of Agriculture is undertaking, in cooperation with State colleges and private institutions, will without doubt require a vastly expanded bank of germ plasm. To have such parent plants or seeds when they are needed, they must be preserved in quality and quantity in needed geographical areas which are suited to storage and readily accessible to plant breeders. Although present Federal and State experiment stations are doing the best they can to preserve these plant and seed stocks that can be used in the foreseeable future, they have neither the space nor facilities for holding seeds over a long period.

Because of this fact, I recently introduced S. 3095 which, if enacted into law, would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and operate a "national seed storage facility." The purpose being to to collect, store, and preserve seed and plant stocks for future needs. It would serve to facilitate cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and other public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and persons in new crop research. An authorization for needed appropriations is also included in the bill.

More recently in this connection, the Grain Research and Marketing Facility Committee of the Department of Agriculture at the conclusion of its annual meeting observed:

"Agriculture needs a national seed storage facility to extend the years of vitality of reserve seed stocks."

I hope the committee as it pursues its work this year will give consideration to new crop research and the need for such an expanded seed storage facility in connection therewith.

Small farms and low-income areas

Although the majority report calls for "comprehensive programs to assist small and low-income farmers by way of credit facilities, technical assistance, enhanced industrial opportunities, and otherwise" (p. 4), it by and large seems to assume that "low prices" explain farm poverty, since undue emphasis is placed upon the decline in farm income. This simply is not the case. Although farm prices have declined, and with them net farm income, this has had little effect upon the financial position of the "low income" farmer. By the same token, "strong price supports," rigid 90-percent price supports, or a 75-to-90 flexible price-support system, will not materially improve his income position. As the National Planning Association's publication, Underemployment in American Agriculture, so vividly points out:

"Raising prices won't eliminate poverty on a farm which doesn't produce enough of anything to sell. If a farmer raises a hog and has to eat it to live, it makes no difference whether he could have sold it for $10 or $40. Price supports do not produce hogs" (pp. 16–17).

Direct observation will also disprove the low price theory of farm poverty. In this connection it should be noted, according to the 1950 Agricultural Census that 1.6 million commerical family-type farms in the fifth and sixth economic classes of farms (selling between $250 and $2,500 worth of produce) produced in 1949 only 9.7 percent of all farm products sold. By comparison the 103,231 commerical farms in the first economic class of farms (mostly family-type and selling $25,000 worth or more) produced 26 percent of all farm products sold. These 103,231 most efficient and productive commercial farms provided average family incomes of $10,200; by comparison again, 1.6 million poorest and smallest commercial family-type of farms in the fifth and sixth economic classes provided average family incomes of only $1,900 and $975.

It should be evident, as I pointed out in my supplemental views to the 1955 committee report, that—

The problems associated with lifting the levels of living of about two-thirds of our farm people who live on farms which, for one reason or another, are uneconomic units, have not been and can never be solved through price-support programs (p. 65).

It is, in my opinion, plain demagoguery for politicians to tell the owners of small-sized farms working "tired" lands that high price supports will solve their income problems. It simply is not so.

Very plainly we have two major categories of farms in the United States; each with different problems which require for solution different types of public policies. Low farm prices and the need for price support are of major concern to only the owners of the larger commercial farms, as a commercial farm (mostly family-type) is defined by the Census Bureau. Public agricultural policy simply has not given adequate recognition to the fact that the problems confronting the owners of the smaller and less productive family-type commercial farms, as well as many part-time farms, are totally different, and require different solutions.

For most of these people living on small rural farms a noncommercial family-type farmers' program, as a new aspect of public agricultural policy, is urgently needed. The rural development program initiated by Secretary Benson last year, if given adequate congressional support, which has not been forthcoming to date, has all the earmarks of developing into just such a program. In any event, the solutions to the problems of the low-income farmer require different approaches or combinations of approaches.

Many owners and operators of fifth and sixth class commercial family-type farms in particular can benefit from more liberal long-term credit policies coupled with intensive assistance along technical farming lines from the Federal and State Extension Services and other Federal and State agencies.

More easily attainable credit would enable many such farmers to expand their farms to a size which could return to them and their families a decent level of living. For a great many other farms, lack of opportunity to acquire adjoining farmland, rather than lack of capital to purchase such lands, constitutes the size-of-farm problem. For others the need is for credit on liberal long-time terms to be used for the purchase of equipment, buildings, livestock, and so forth.

It was because of a firm conviction that the financial position of many farmers actually prevents their being able to become more productive farmers that I introduced recently two bills, S. 3184 and S. 3185 which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Farmers' Home Administration, to extend credit on more liberal terms to worthy farmers who cannot obtain it from private sources and who have the potential to repay such loans. Similar legislation was introduced by Senator CARLSON.

S. 3184 would permit the Farmers' Home Administration to:

1. Make or insure loans for the purpose of refinancing, consolidating, renewing, or extending all, or part, of the existing debts of the applicant for farm operating and subsistence expenses, whether secured or unsecured by real or personal property.

2. Such loans are to be made to farmers operating family-type farms who are unable to repay their existing indebtedness in accordance with present repayment schedules and who cannot secure refinancing through private or cooperative sources on terms that they could be expected to meet under present circumstances.

3. Such loans are to be repaid when it appears that the borrower can obtain a loan from cooperatives or private sources, including the local loan associations and production credit associations under the terms borrowers can meet.

4. Such loans are to carry such interest rates and conditions of repayment as the Secretary of Agriculture deems advisable under the circumstances, provided however, that the total principal indebtedness of a borrower shall not exceed the fair value based on earning capacity or the normal market value of the farm.

S. 3185 would extend the term for repayment of any such loan from the present maximum of 7 to 11 years.

Others will find the solution to their economic problems through a combination of part-time farming and nonfarm employment, as many have done in increasing numbers during the past few years, even if the latter provides most of their income. Evidence of this is found in the fact that the number of part-time farmers increased by 32,008 during the past 5 years, as disclosed by a comparison of the 1950 and 1951 Agricultural Censuses.

Whereas in 1940, only $2.7 billion of farm income from all sources was derived from nonfarm sources, $6.1 billion was derived in 1955. In 1946, our first postwar year, 20.5 percent of farm income from all sources was derived from nonagricultural sources; by 1955 this had increased to 32.2 percent.

We have witnessed, as far as this problem is concerned at least, growing industrialization in the Southern States, where 6 of our 9 major low-income farm areas are located. Other things being equal, the South undoubtedly will continue its industrial advancement, since one of the area's most attractive features is the existence of considerable manpower which is now underemployed on small-sized and unproductive farms.

Mr. Don G. Mitchell, chairman and president of Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., was

one witness at the automation hearing held last October by the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, who expressed the opinion that part-time farming combined with nonfarm employment offered real opportunities for underemployed farmers. In response to the questions as to whether the future held growing opportunities of this nature; and whether many farmers had gradually been absorbed in plants such as Sylvania's in the Midwest and South, Mr. Mitchell replied, "Yes, sir" to the first, and answered the second by saying:

"We employ a lot of them. Some of them are part-time truck gardeners when they go home at night, but they don't consider themselves farmers any more. They consider themselves industrial workers and would be so classified * * *.

"We give local plants their local choice as to what hours they would like to work. We open many of our plants in farm areas at 7 o'clock in the morning, so they can get through at 3 in the afternoon, and then they go home and farm after that * * *.

"It is not possible in very many instances to run your plant only during those months when he cannot farm. We have to run our plants through the year. We do these other things of starting at 7 o'clock and getting through at 3. He probably cannot be a full-time farmer from 3 until 8." (Automation and technological change, hearings, pp. 194–196.)

What effect has such off-the-farm employment had upon the incomes of part-time farmers? The 1950 agricultural census provides the answer:

1. The average family income and per capita income of the 2.5 million people living on 639,230 "part time" farms were $2,400 and $600, respectively. Their average family incomes were only $250 less than the average family incomes of all families living on farms, and their average per capita incomes only $51 less than the average of all persons living on farms;

2. Their average family incomes were $500 more than those of the 3.8 million persons living on 901,316 "full-time" family-type farms in the fifth economic class of commercial farms; and $1,425 more than those of the 2.7 million persons living on 717,201 "full time" family-type farms in the sixth economic class of commercial farms;

3. Their per capita incomes were $146 and $346 more, respectively, than persons on family-type commercial farms in the fifth and sixth economic classes;

4. Their family and per capita average incomes were only $100 less; and

5. In the case of average family incomes, theirs were only $100 less than those enjoyed by the 3.8 million persons living on the 882,302 "full time" family-type farms in the fourth economic class of commercial farms, but their average per capita incomes were actually $1 higher.

Still other people will derive better incomes only by leaving agriculture entirely. This voluntary exodus from agriculture will attract many younger people, who because of the lack of adequate capital required to begin a successful farming operation, must look elsewhere for their livelihood. For these, 4–H Club and other educational programs provided by State extension services and other agencies for rural youth need to stress vocational training which can lead to gainful nonfarm employment.

Older people living on marginal farms will not want to leave, in spite of the low level of living such farms provide them. Here an extension of rural social services may materially contribute to a better level of living for these people.

And we must not lose sight of the fact that others would rather go on living the kind of lives they are, than trade them for any other, not because they are disturbed by lack of material goods and services—larger incomes if you please—but because they like their lives as they now are. This, they too, should be free to do; "man is that he might have joy."

Summary

We are making progress in this agricultural area; it has been slow but the future for these people, if a real noncommercial family-type farmers' program is developed and maintained, will be much brighter.

However, from what I have said, it is evident, that for the purpose of price support policy and for realistic comparisons of farm and nonfarm income, the incomes of the so-called low-income farmer should not be included. Their inclusion not only has, but will continue to distort the facts and produce public agricultural policies which will continue to provide some farmers unnecessary financial assistance and which will provide little or none to those in greatest need.

And I want to conclude by emphatically stating that whether people leave agriculture or not, they should do so of their own free choice. At the same time, it should be understood that public price-support programs do not drive people from agriculture, although high rigid 90 percent price supports may cause some family-type farmers on the margin to linger on longer than their best interests would seem to dictate.

OTHER MAJORITY REPORT FINDINGS

At this time, I must also reserve, as Congressman Talle put it in a footnote to the 12th recommendation of the majority report, "final judgment on the merits of United States participation" in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. I must also express the view, that the safeguards against domestic injury which the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy recommended in its report (S. Rept. No. 1312, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) with respect to the escape clause, are entirely inadequate and if adopted would serve to further render that device ineffective.

The majority report's findings on tax policy mirror the President's recommendations and, therefore, I find myself in substantial agreement. [Again this year, I want to express publicly my appreciation to the executive director and the other members of the committee staff for their expert and kind assistance.]

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING OF CLAIMS BY FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for 1 year the time for filing of claims by former prisoners of war under section 6 (e) of the War Claims Act of 1948.

This bill is a general bill which I am informed will benefit some 12 American prisoners of war of the Korean conflict who, because of inadvertence, ignorance of the law, or excusable neglect, were late in filing their claims and are now precluded from doing so because of the technicality of the law.

This matter first came to my attention the first of this year when an appeal was made to me to learn why a veteran, who had been a prisoner of war in the Korean conflict for more than 3 years, had not received payment for his claim. I learned that his claim had been postmarked 12 days late. In my search, I found several other veterans similarly entitled who were prevented from recovering because of the time limitation.

After learning that there is nothing that can be done for these veterans short of legislation, I have decided to introduce a bill to extend the time for filing to 1 year.

It appears to me, Mr. President, that material things cannot repay these young men for the deprivations they suffered at the hands of their captors. Nor can we leave the time for filing open forever. There is need, however, for leniency in this instance, and I would request that favorable action be taken on it in the very near future. Surely this 1 year extension is not unreasonable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3334) to extend for 1 year the time for filing of claims by former prisoners of war under section 6 (e) of the War Claims Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RATES CHARGED IN CERTAIN CASES FOR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATED AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce a bill, and ask for its appropriate reference. The purpose of the bill is to freeze rates charged by the Department of the Interior and its various branches for electric power to the rural electric cooperatives receiving power from it or any of its agencies, and likewise power for the municipalities and Government installations which constitute the preference customers under the law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

FISHERIES STABILIZATION ACT OF 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the stabilization of the domestic fisheries industry in the United States through the creation of a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation, to bring about a better balanced flow of fish and shellfish

and the products thereof in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3339) to provide for the stabilization of the domestic fisheries industry in the United States through the creation of a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation, to bring about a better balanced flow of fish and shellfish and the products thereof in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill relates to the farmers of the sea, whom everyone is neglecting, even in Minnesota, where pike and pickerel and other fish are caught. The bill relates to a situation which is even a greater problem than the farming problem of America. I am hopeful that in our discussion of the economic plight of the American farmer—and I am very sympathetic to the American farmer, and have joined with the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Alabama on the question of parity—that at this session of Congress we will also pay some attention to a great domestic industry which is on the threshold of bankruptcy. I believe the bill would take care of some of its problems. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

A few days ago I reviewed the serious plight of our great domestic fisheries industry which has been brought about by inattention on the part of high ranking administration officials and their neglect in taking the necessary protective and remedial measures and introduced a bill to set up a United States Fisheries Commission.

As I pointed out then, the industry as a whole is declining fast. It is losing economic stature, with some segments already facing ruin because of the unrestricted importation of foreign caught fish. Foreign caught bottom fish imported into the United States during 1954 accounted for 52 percent of the consumption of those varieties. Our fishing fleets are being forced out of business by this kind of competition. Our tuna fisheries on the west coast have been virtually wiped out by the importation of cheaply produced fish caught mainly by Japanese boats.

Other fish production also is declining—not only because of official neglect of our great fishing industry—but also because there has been no satisfactory official effort to conserve our fishing grounds, to increase production, and to help our fishermen avoid the disasters that face them.

I have worked since I first came to Congress to promote the welfare of our fisheries industry. However, it has been an uphill fight since our Nation is actually aiding the foreign fishermen who are glutting our markets with fish. These fish are sometimes sold below their cost of production in order to obtain American dollars.

I have considered many suggestions for aiding our fishermen. I have come to the conclusion that in addition to the establishment of a fisheries commission it is only by initiating a program for reasonable restrictions and limitations on the importation of fish and fish products. Where such imports cause serious injury and hardship to the fisheries industry, that we can do a prompt and effective job. I believe that in this way we can assure our fishermen of having a market for their catches.

If we enforce such limitations on the importation of foreign fish it will mean that our fishermen can again operate the fishing fleets on all coasts, and off Alaska, and can produce the food fish that is so vitally needed and so welcomed by our people as an important part of their diet.

To help accomplish the revival of our great fishing industry I am introducing a bill today to create a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation which would be under the direction of the United States Fisheries Commission. I am delighted to be joined in sponsoring this legislation by Senator KUCHEL, who was with my committee during some of the summer hearings on the west coast.

The Corporation would be authorized to take steps to stabilize and revive the fishing industry through the making of loans to fishermen for boats and gear and to fish processors and others engaged in any phase of fisheries activities.

The Corporation would have a capital of $5 million fully subscribed by the Federal Government, and it would be authorized to issue bonds to obtain additional funds to carry on its work.

If we can revive our fisheries and return them to normal after these years of neglect, the cost will be small in comparison to the benefits we will derive. I hope that those representing all sections of the country will join with me in urging the enactment of this legislation.

I intend to hold public hearings on this bill, as well as the bill to establish a fisheries commission, in the very near future.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President. This proposed constitutional amendment is designed to replace the electoral college with a new system of tabulating presidential ballots. I do not intend to make a comprehensive statement now about this proposal. I shall have more to say about it when Senate Joint Resolution 31, which I have cosponsored and which deals with the same subject, reaches the Senate floor in the near future.

At the moment I would merely invite the attention of my colleagues to this new proposal. It represents the best thinking of a good many distinguished political scientists, especiall of Mr. Ralph Goldman, of the Brookings Institution, who first publicized it last summer. Under this proposed amendment, the electoral college will be replaced with a system that would split 435 votes according to the proportion of popular votes received by each presidential candidate on a nationwide basis—plus an assignment of two votes per State to the candidate who wins a plurality in each State.

Thus this proposal would recognize the Federal character of the American Republic by retaining 96 votes dependent upon State pluralities, while devoting the other 435 to the nationwide popularity of the candidates.

The total of 531 votes would thus represent the total votes of the State in the two Houses of Congress. This 531-vote base is one to which we are accustomed, to which we are adjusted politically.

No radical changes would be brought about by this legislation. Rather, it would cause the relatively slight adjustment which is needed to make the election results in a presidential election conform to the election realities.

One important result of this legislation would be to encourage greater voter participation. For under this plan, States with very high participation would have a distinct advantage over States with lower percentages of active voters. We could use this incentive toward greater democracy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDERSON (for Mr. HOLLAND) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by Mr. HOLLAND, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 7225, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

MEDICAL AND DENTAL RESEARCH AND TEACHING CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1956—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 3252) to provide a 5-year program of Federal construction grants for the purpose of assisting

medical and dental schools to expand and improve their research and teaching facilities, and of assisting other public and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical or dental research to expand and improve their research facilities, and for other purposes, the next time it is printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ERVIN:

Address entitled "Peace Through Truth," delivered by Senator SYMINGTON at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Raleigh, N. C., on February 26, 1956.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Sharing: the Key to Peace," written by Senator SMITH of New Jersey; and article entitled "Sacrificing for Freedom," written by Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

PROPOSED MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MEXICO, CANADA, AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that President Eisenhower has extended formal invitations to President Ruiz Cortines of Mexico and Prime Minister St. Laurent of Canada to meet with the President of the United States on March 26 and that the invitations have been accepted by these distinguished heads of state.

This meeting of the political leaders of the three great powers of the North American Continent can and should be of special significance. It should indicate the solidarity of the three democracies, as well as the equality, friendship, and understanding which exist among us. The meeting can emphasize the fact that we are neighbors, that we have, in many instances, many of the same problems, and that our interests are common to all three. The Republic of Mexico and the Dominion of Canada will come not as satellites or subordinate states. They will come to the meeting at White Sulphur Springs later this month as equals, and as sovereigns in their own right.

It would be my hope, Mr. President, that this meeting of the Big Three would be a forerunner to a later meeting to which all the sovereign states of the Americas—North, South, and Caribbean—would be invited. In neighborliness there is strength, and in neighborliness there is tolerance, understanding, and good will.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINENTAL MEETING

There is something attractive about holding an international conference simply because it is a good idea to get together. So far as anybody knows, even the officials concerned, there is no special reason why the United States, Canada, and Mexico should have a meeting, but there is likewise no reason why they shouldn't, or why it will not bring some good results.

The three heads of state of the North American Continent have never before met together in a conference of their own. Somebody, either President Eisenhower or Secretary Dulles, seems to have had the thought that it is about time they did meet, that neighbors living in the same geographic house ought to get together. So on March 26, in the lovely surroundings of White Sulphur Springs, President Eisenhower, Prime Minister St. Laurent, and President Ruiz Cortines will sit down at the same table and talk.

There is no formal agenda and no problems that specifically concern the three countries. There are even no subjects, problematic or otherwise, that especially involve the North American Continent. Yet in spite of these negatives, both Canada and Mexico agreed immediately to the suggestion. At a minimum the meeting can do no harm. At best it will foster neighborly relations between three countries with long, unguarded borders and with common interests.

The question of drawing Canada into the Latin-American community—of which we form a part through the Organization of American States and in many other ways—is a ticklish one. Canada, like Latin America, is a raw-material producer and exporter, with a growing but still relatively small trade with Latin countries. The main problem, however, is that Canada wants to keep her exclusive link to the British Commonwealth and she wants to keep as clear as possible of our overpowering influence. One therefore would hardly expect Prime Minister St. Laurent or Minister of External Affairs Pearson to rejoice at the White House's invitation to a friendly but not necessary get together with us and Mexico. All the same, the Canadians are being good sports about it and they will surely not regret it. They may even be pleasantly surprised to find that a meeting can bring positive and fruitful results.

INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO ATTEND THE PENNSYLVANIA RECREATION AND SPORTSMEN'S SHOW

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it has often been said of my State, that "Pennsylvania has everything."

Pennsylvania is a great sports center, particularly in regard to outdoor sports, which is equal to, or better than, any other in the world. Our State abounds in wildlife of all kinds. Its great mountains and hills are a mecca for hunters of both large and small game. While Pennsylvania is famed for its enormous industrial capacity, its virgin forests, timbered mountains, and great open spaces are less well known.

In order to make America better acquainted with our great opportunities for outdoor living and sports of all kinds, there will be held at our capitol city, Harrisburg, the Pennsylvania Recreation and Sportsmen's Show, during the week of March 20 through March 24. This great exposition will occupy the gigantic farm show building, perhaps the largest show building of its kind in the United States. There, within 14 acres of covered exposition space, Pennsylvania's leadership in outdoor living and leisure-time recreation will be on display.

At least one-quarter of a million people from all parts of Pennsylvania and the eastern seaboard are expected to visit and participate in this great enterprise. I may add that this exposition will be under the leadership of John W. Aitland, who for many years managed and directed Pennsylvania's justly famed farm show.

I take this opportunity to invite my distinguished colleagues in the Congress to visit this exposition, because I know that it will be of great value to them.

SAVING AS A RESULT OF WORK OF THE SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on February 16, when the Senate had under consideration Senate Resolution 188, providing funds for the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, there was debate as to whether the subcommittee could operate more economically, and whether the amount requested by the subcommittee, and provided by the resolution—namely, $215,000—should be reduced.

At that time I undertook briefly to inform the Senate of some of the work of the subcommittee and of some of the savings and economics which have resulted from the subcommittee's efforts; and I pointed out that in the course of the year 1955, those savings amounted to many times the cost of operating the subcommittee.

At this time I wish to report to the Senate another specific instance of savings resulting from the subcommittee's work. Since Resolution 183 was adopted on February 16 the staff of the subcommittee learned, during further inquiry into the procurement activities of the Government—and at that time I said there was much more work to be done in that field—that the Air Force had issued an invitation for bids for 46,000 NB–3 jackets lined with double-faced wool. The bids required, among other things, that the contractor supply the wool-pile material. The contractors were considering in their costs a quoted figure of about $4.20 a yard for the material, and bids were to be submitted on that basis.

However, the subcommittee learned through the work of its staff that the Army had on hand a considerable amount of wool pile and, furthermore, that during 1955 the Army had been selling this wool pile as surplus, at a price of 80 cents a yard. The attention of the Defense Department was called to this matter, and I am glad to tell the Senate that it responded promptly and moved expeditiously to have the Air Force examine the wool-pile supply in the Army's reserve, which it did. The stock of wool supply on hand by the Army was found to be completely acceptable. Therefore, I am happy to announce that new bids are now being called for by the Air Force in respect, on the basis that the wool material will be furnished to the contractors by the Government.

This action will result in a saving of about $250,000. That amount of savings produced in less than 2 weeks' time, is more than enough to pay the cost of operating the subcommittee for a period of 1 year.

I wish to give Mr. Carmine Bellino and Mr. Alphonse F. Calabrese, of the subcommittee staff, primary credit for this excellent piece of work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to compliment my good friend from Arkansas. As he knows, I have been opposing, not so much the committees themselves, but excessive expenditures which are made by some of them.

During the investigation of the matter to which he is now addressing himself, did the Senator find that the three services were cooperating to let one another know what they had on hand by way of inventory?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In this instance, obviously, they did not know. I am making this report not for the purpose of criticizing the services, but to emphasize the fact that the Government is so big, and handles such a great volume of materials, that a little looking into these things from time to time by the committee can produce good results.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, we have on the statute books a Unification Act.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the result would be a central purchasing agency of some kind, and that all this difficulty could be obviated if there were greater cooperation among the services.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is true. When we find instances such as this, and call them to the attention of the services, I am very glad to report that the services immediately respond. In this case the services responded immediately, and were willing to take immediate corrective action.

THE SAUDI ARABIAN POLICY OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICANS OF JEWISH FAITH

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, with much interest and great concern I have read the testimony given by Secretary of State Dulles before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week. That testimony has not alleviated my anxiety over our policy in the Middle East. Indeed, Secretary Dulles' replies to questions addressed to him by members of the committee have increased my disquiet and have heightened my sense of alarm.

But today I do not propose to dwell at any length on what I consider the basic errors of judgment and evaluation reflected in Secretary Dulles' testimony. It seems to me, however, that our present policy is one of paralysis and not of constructive action. In striving for a supposed impartiality between tiny Israel and her great Arab neighbors we are in danger of achieving not impartiality so much as impotency. We are in danger of becoming, in the Middle East, in a real sense, neutralists—a role that is basically foreign to us and wholly inconsistent both with our traditions and with the realities of the situation in the Middle East.

The most astounding thing about this administration's policy in the Middle East is the fact that it reflects, or seems to reflect, no sense of moral value. To Mr. Dulles there is nothing reprehensible about supplying arms to a feudal autocracy like Saudi Arabia, which is bent on the destruction of the free Republic of Israel. To me this shows, on Mr. Dulles' part, a kind of moral blindness. I am as much disturbed over this as over any other aspect of the situation.

But today, Mr. President, I wish to speak about a particular aspect of the situation we have gotten ourselves into—an aspect over which I have been concerned for some time.

I refer to those contractual terms we have entered into with Saudi Arabia, in reference to the air base we maintain in that country, under which the United States Government undertakes to see to it that no American soldier of the Jewish faith should serve in Saudi Arabia.

At this, I am shocked beyond words, Mr. President. It is an intolerable affront, not only to the 5 million Americans of Jewish faith in this country, but to the entire American Nation and to the principles for which we stand in world affairs.

It does not matter to me when these arrangements were originally entered into. Nobody seems to be able to find this out from the State Department, but I do not care whether it was under a Democratic administration or under a Republican administration. The fact is that these terms are being honored and enforced today. In commenting on these arrangements, Secretary Dulles said:

> We, perforce, accommodate ourselves to certain practices they have which we do not like. They, perhaps, accommodate themselves to certain of our idiosyncrasies.

In Mr. Dulles' mind this blatant discrimination against Americans of a particular religious faith or descent is nothing more, or not much more, than an idiosyncrasy on the part of the Saudi Arabian according to his own remarks. Mr. President, I consider it no idiosyncrasy on the part of the Saudi Arabian Government. I consider it intolerable. The Saudi Arabian Government can show its prejudices in its policies, if it wishes, but I cannot understand the Government of the United States officially subscribing to this prejudice and honoring it. I cannot understand the American Government enforcing that prejudice and discriminating as between American soldiers.

What would be our reaction, for instance, if the Government of Spain demanded that we refrain from assigning any American soldiers of the Protestant faith to work or serve on American bases in Spain? Would we not reject with fine indignation any such demand? I certainly hope we would. It is impossible, of course, to conceive of any sensible government making such a demand upon the United States.

Yet here we are, involved in a contractual arrangement with the Government of Saudi Arabia which bars certain Americans from assignment there on the basis of their religious faith, or even religious descent.

I consider it intolerable enough for Saudi Arabia to practice, as it does, overt discrimination against American businessmen. It is a fact that before any article produced in America can be imported into Saudi Arabia on a commercial basis, the supplier of such goods must certify that his firm is not a Jewish firm. I have received many complaints about this. I have brought these complaints to the attention of the State Department.

At this point I should like to have printed in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence I have had with the State Department about this situation, in reference to a particular complaint which was submitted to me by a very reputable American firm.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1956.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just received from the president of a very responsible New York firm called New Hermes Engraving Machine Corp., a letter advising me that he has been asked by a firm in Saudi Arabia to certify whether the New Hermes Corp. is a Jewish firm. Apparently the firm in Saudi Arabia desires to do business with the New Hermes firm and requires a certificate that the company is not Jewish—whatever that means.

Mr. N. Schimmel, the president of the New Hermes Engraving Machine Corp., writes to me that "as an American corporation, we are not interested in the religious affiliations of our stockholders." Mr. Schimmel is quite outraged by this matter, as I am.

I am aware that I have written to you before about analogous incidents. I am enclosing copies of the pertinent correspondence, and would appreciate very much the early attention of your Department to this situation. What is the status, the general rule, and the general experience in regard to this practice? Have we made any recent protests to the Saudi Arabian Government about it? Would you not agree that our Government has an obligation to its own citizens, and to its own ideals, to let the Government of Saudi Arabia know not only on one occasion, but on repeated occasions, that we view with utmost distaste the policy of which the letter to Mr. Schimmel is a manifestation?

I would appreciate your reactions to this inquiry, so that I might have a basis for a reply to Mr. Schimmel.

Yours very truly,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

JANUARY 23, 1956.

Mr. N. SCHIMMEL,
President, New Hermes Engraving Machine Corp., New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SCHIMMEL: I have your very interesting letter of January 19. While I am

shocked, I am not surprised. This is another manifestation of a policy by the Government of Saudi Arabia of which I have been very much aware. Indeed, I have protested to the State Department numerous times about analagous incidents, although I do not recall recently having seen such striking evidence of this policy of discrimination.

I shall write again to the State Department and bring to Secretary Dulles' attention the letter you sent me. I do not know whether it is at all possible to get anything done about the situation, but surely our State Department should take persistent notice of this practice and should protest on every practicable occasion.

When I write to the Secretary about this matter, I shall be glad to send you a copy of my communication.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

NEW HERMES ENGRAVING MACHINE CORP.,
New York, N. Y., January 19, 1956.

Senator HERBERT LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are sending you a photostatic copy of a very unusual letter which we received from Saudi Arabia.

As an American corporation we are not interested in the religious affiliations of our stockholders.

We have no right to ask them personal questions, and the Saudi Arabian Government should be made aware of this fact.

We are wondering about your reaction to the attached letter considering the billions of dollars spent by the United States under our foreign aid program, without questioning the philosophy or religious belief of the respective countries.

Very truly yours,

NEW HERMES ENGRAVING MACHINE CORP.,
N. SCHIMMEL, *President.*

ABDUL SALAM & BROS.,
Dhahran, Saudia Arabia, January 7, 1956.

Messrs. NEW HERMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIRS: With reference to your letter No. IW:ek of the November 21, 1955, we have to inform you that you will have to get the original certificate attested and certified by the Saudi Arabian consulate in your country to the effect that firm which exports the machine is not a Jewish firm, without which we cannot have dealings with your firm.

We shall be glad to open a letter of credit in your name as soon as we receive your reply that you can arrange the above mentioned certificate.

Remain in the meantime, we are,

Yours faithfully,

D (or A) KAURY,
Partner
(For Abdul Salam & Bros.,.

Mr. LEHMAN. The State Department advised me that it was unfortunate that the Saudi Arabian Government should indulge in such practices. But nothing effective has been done about it. This practice is still going on. And our Government tolerates it.

No, Mr. President, it is not bad enough that the Saudi Arabian Government should pursue a policy of studied and persistent discrimination against American businessmen of the Jewish faith. The Saudi Arabian Government also pursues the even more intolerable policy of discrimination against American soldiers of Jewish faith. Last year I brought to the attention of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of State, the fact that our Government takes official cognizance of the discrimination by the Government of Saudi Arabia and by the Government of Jordan, too, against American soldiers of Jewish faith or descent. I brought to the attention of these officials the fact that there is written into a United States Air Force Manual, U. S. A. F. E. Manual 30–1, dated June 20, 1953, entitled "Clearance and documentations for leave and duty travel," in section 27, 3d paragraph, the following:

Individuals of Jewish faith or descent are strictly barred entrance to or transit of Saudi Arabia. Further, any passport containing an Israeli visa will not be honored.

Section 13, paragraph 3C, reads:

Individuals of the Hebrew race will not be issued visas or admitted to Jordan.

When these passages were brought to my attention, I immediately wrote to the officials I have already named, and requested an explanation. At this point, Mr. President, I should like to insert into the RECORD the exchange of correspondence I had with those officials on this matter.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Congratulations upon your progressive efforts to secure a revision of the unduly restrictive immigration legislation which our Congress has enacted. Important attitudes of governments are reflected in their immigration laws; it is therefore desirable that our own Government be scrupulous in this outward manifestation of our feelings toward the other peoples of the world.

United States Air Forces Europe (USAFE) Manual 30–1, dated June 20, 1953, deals with "Clearance and Documentations for Leave and Duty Travel" for members of the United States Air Force. In section XXVII, paragraph 3, we read: "Individuals of Jewish faith or descent are strictly barred entrance to or transit of Saudi Arabia. Further, any passport containing an Israeli visa will not be honored."

In section XIII, paragraph 3c, we read: "Individuals of the Hebrew race will not be issued visas or admitted to Jordan."

By restricting the travels of a Jewish serviceman on military aircraft, the Military Air Transport Service (MATS), a lawful agency of the Government of the United States of American subjects itself to the bigoted religious doctrines of a foreign power.

Why aren't the rights of free passage through these countries demanded for all American citizens regardless of their religion or creed? Why does our Government recognize a religious distinction in the partial distribution of international privileges accorded to its traveling citizens?

If the matter cannot be adjusted between our own Government and the Government of Saudi Arabia, I strongly urge that it be brought before the United Nations.

The avowed religious bigotry of the Saudi Arabians and the Jordanians is incompatible with the great principles upon which the United Nations rests. If the peoples of these two countries cannot see fit to revise their perverted attitudes toward other religious groups they should be barred from membership in the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

JUNE 2, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received a letter from a commissioned Chaplain in the United States Air Force, whose name I will not use. He is of the Jewish faith.

He brought to my attention a regulation contained in an Air Force Manual, as you will see from the attached copy.

My objection is not directed, of course, against the quoted language in the Manual, but against our tolerance of the condition to which the regulation is directed.

I would appreciate very much your advising me of the attitude of your Department toward this matter. I would like to have your views as a basis for my reply to the young officer Chaplain who wrote me.

Yours very sincerely,

JUNE 2, 1955.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORTON: I recently received a letter from a commissioned Chaplain in the United States Air Force, dealing with the practice of discrimination against some United States citizens, on the basis of faith, by Saudi Arabia. I am enclosing a copy of the letter I received, with the name of the writer deleted.

I have brought other aspects of this discrimination by Saudi Arabia to your attention in the past. I would now like your comments on the phase of the matter described by the writer of this letter. I feel it is an intolerable situation when our men in uniform are discriminated against on the basis of religious faith.

I would appreciate your comments on this situation, and any suggestions that the Department may have for remedying it. I would like to have these views as a basis for a reply to the young officer Chaplain who wrote to me. I have written a similar letter to the Secretary of Defense.

Yours very truly,

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 9, 1955.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of June 2, 1955, enclosing a copy of a letter from an Air Force Chaplain concerning discrimination by the Saudi Arabian Government against citizens of the United States on the basis of faith. According to the Chaplain's letter, he had particular reference to the policy of the Saudi Arabian Government of not granting visas to individuals of the Jewish faith.

As an aftermath of the hostilities in 1948 and 1949 between certain Arab States and Israel, certain Arab countries have refused entry to persons of Jewish faith and background regardless of nationality. Saudi Arabia, however, has refused entry to Jews for a considerable period of time, going back to the edicts issued by the early leaders of Islam.

It has frequently been brought to the attention of the Arab Governments that, under the United States Constitution and laws, all American citizens are equal, regardless of race or creed. Due to the efforts of the Department there has been some improvement in the travel situation since the end of the 1948–49 Israel-Arab hostilities. It is the Department's belief that, with a gradual improvement in Israel-Arab relations, there will be further relaxation of the travel restrictions by the Arab States. According to international law and practice, it is, of

course, the fundamental right of any sovereign state to determine whether and under what conditions aliens may enter its territory.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

JUNE 20, 1955.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I refer to your expression of personal interest concerning the "Clearance and documentations for leave and duty travel" for members of the United States Air Forces in Europe.

The countries of Saudi Arabia and Jordan for purposes of internal security will not issue a visa for persons of the Hebrew race. This restriction is not only applicable to American citizens, but applies to Jewish people of all nations. Further, Arabic countries, specifically Saudi Arabia and Jordan, will not issue a visa to any person regardless of race, if the passport of the individual is stamped with any marking which would indicate that the traveler had visited Israel prior to the application for entrance into Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

These restrictions are promulgated and enforced by the Arabic countries and are not within the prerogative of the State Department or the military to change.

The only exception to the above procedures is when the traveler receives special permission from the Arabic Government concerned to enter that country.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

JULY 12, 1955.

Hon. H. E. TALBOTT,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of June 20. I am aware of the practice of the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Jordan in barring entrance to persons of Jewish faith. I had hoped, however, that the appropriate departments of the United States Government would work ceaselessly against any such regulation insofar as it affects American citizens. I was especially shocked to know that American GI's who happen to be of the Jewish faith are likewise discriminated against. I had hoped that far from simply taking cognizance of the matter, the Air Force would use its influence to the extent possible to see that this discrimination was not practiced against Americans who were serving their country in the Air Force.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

JULY 20, 1955.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I refer to your expression of personal interest concerning the practice of the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Jordan in barring entrance to personnel of the Jewish faith.

The Air Force is cognizant of the situation concerning restriction of travel to members of the Jewish faith to Saudi Arabia and Jordan. However, it must be recognized that we are dealing with a tradition of long standing, and in all probabilities, will take much effort and time on the part of all governmental agencies, including the Air Force, to try and work out a satisfactory solution with the countries concerned. The Air Force, together with other governmental agencies, has worked ceaselessly to abrogate regulations of this nature put into effect by foreign governments which affect American citizens. Unfortunately, as indicated in my previous letter, these restrictions or regulations are promulgated and enforced by foreign countries and are not within the prerogative of the Air Force to change.

The regulation placed in effect by Headquarters, United States Air Forces in Europe, concerning the clearance and documentations for leave and duty travel of its members, is an informative type regulation. The Air Force does not object to its members' traveling to any country while on leave as long as they are able to obtain an official visa from the respective country they wish to visit. Inasmuch as the Arabic countries will not issue visa to members of the Jewish faith, regardless of nationality, Jewish members of the Air Force are not permitted to travel in these countries.

I am taking the liberty of referring your letter to the Department of State for their consideration.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

Mr. LEHMAN. This is not a new matter, Mr. President. It is old business. The State Department and the Defense Department are well aware of it. They continue to tolerate it. If they have made any protests, they have been feeble ones.

Last week the Secretary of State called this policy on the part of Saudi Arabia an "idiosyncrasy."

Mr. President, I do not consider it an idiosyncracy. I consider it a shameful thing. I consider it something on the basis of which some forceful and positive action should and must be taken by the United States Government without further delay.

Our Government has not always been as apathetic about such matters as it appears to be today. Indeed, there is a startling and inspiring precedent which I commend to the attention of Secretary Dulles.

In the early years of this century, the czarist regime of Russia was pursuing with furious intent a policy of anti-semitism, a policy that aroused great resentment in the United States. Russia carried this policy finally to the extent of refusing to honor or to visa the passports of American citizens of Jewish faith or descent.

Did the American Government at that time call this an idiosyncrasy? No; that was not the policy of the administration of that day—and it was the administration of William Howard Taft, a Republican administration. Nor did the Congress sit idly by in the face of this repugnant circumstance. In 1911 the House of Representatives, by virtually a unanimous vote, passed a resolution calling upon the administration to denounce the treaty of friendship and commerce then in force between the United States and Russia, a treaty dating back to 1832. In 1913 President Taft did in fact abrogate that treaty on the ground that Russia had violated it by discriminating against a particular class of American citizens.

It seems to me that this action of 40 years ago should be carefully studied and reviewed by the officials of our Government and should be brought forcefully to the attention of the Government of Saudi Arabia.

I believe that the United States Government should now insist, with all diplomatic force, that the Saudi Arabian Government, and any other government which engages in such practices, cease forthwith to discriminate against American soldiers on the basis of their religious faith. We should not tolerate such discrimination. We should not accept it. Least of all should we enforce it upon our own soldiers.

By accepting this practice, and by barring American soldiers of Jewish faith from assignment to duty in Saudi Arabia, and by refusing to accept Americans of Jewish faith on military aircraft which land in Saudi Arabia, we are, in effect, condoning the practice. We become a party to it.

It is shameful. It is an affront to our dignity as a nation. It is an affront to the principles which underlie our country. It is an affront to our Constitution.

Mr. President, let me make one further analogy. During World War II we had bases, or at least operational establishments, for our Air Force, within the territory of Soviet Russia.

What would we have said if the officials of Soviet Russia had insisted, as a condition to our establishment of these vital air installations, that we assign to this duty only Americans who are Communists, or that we bar from those operations any American soldiers who were capitalists or descended from capitalists.

It is, of course, a ridiculous thought. So is the present situation a ridiculous situation. Our airbase in Saudi Arabia may be an important one, but I doubt whether it is as important as the maintenance of the integrity of the United States of America.

I call upon the State Department to disavow, in its entirety, this practice. I call upon the State Department to renegotiate the contractual arrangements with Saudi Arabia and secure the elimination of any undertaking that we discriminate against Americans of any particular faith or creed, insofar as assignments to duty are concerned or in any other way.

If the State Department does not proceed to do this, a further explanation to the people of the United States is in order. I shall ask that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee go further into this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 3183.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that on yesterday afternoon when the Senate adjourned the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] obtained consent to have the floor this morning. I now ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Maryland may proceed for approximately 30 minutes, without in any manner affecting the right of the Senator from Minnesota to the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question. Has the Senator from

Minnesota been consulted about this matter?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. And it is agreeable to him?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Maryland is recognized. Agreeable to the order entered yesterday, the right of the Senator from Minnesota to the floor will not be prejudiced.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] will at the appropriate time make a motion to strike from the pending bill section 307 which makes it the most dangerous antimerchant marine piece of legislation to come before us for serious consideration during my tenure in the Senate.

Senators will recall that during the 2d session of the 83d Congress I was privileged to serve as chairman of the Water Transportation Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. While in that capacity I introduced Senate bill 3233 which, after extensive public hearings, became Public Law 664.

That statute, often referred to as the cargo-preference bill, or the 50–50 law, is before the Senate today for repeal. There can be no doubt of this. Senators might think that S. 3183 is an omnibus farm bill. It might be that, but it is, on page 29, lines 4 to 9 inclusive, a great deal more.

Since lines 4 to 9 on page 29 of S. 3183 would, for all intents and purposes, destroy Public Law 664, the cargo-preference bill, those who seek its destruction or repeal should bear the burden of proving the necessity therefor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator go into detail in his speech with reference to what the present law provides?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I shall.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to anticipate the Senator.

It was my understanding that the effect of that section of the farm bill to which the Senator is now referring deals only with such surplus commodities as are sold for soft currency, and no giveaway or donation is involved. As I understand, it deals with bona fide purchases made and paid for by the country buying the commodities with its own currency.

Mr. BUTLER. I assume that the Senator is saying that section 307 is restricted to title I of Public Law 480, whereas the taxpayers of America, as the Senator from Louisiana well knows, even in the cases he has cited, stand a loss, in that the foreign purchaser does not pay the world market price for the product he buys and the Government of the United States guarantees the convertibility of the currency. In those cases there is much of the earmarks of the giveaway. If the Senator will let me proceed with my statement, I think I can answer his question more fully.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. I want the Senator to interrupt me if he wishes to do so; but I intend to cover this phase of the matter in my statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. In what category would the Senator place the sale of cotton, let us say, which has been sold in the last 3 or 4 weeks in order to meet world competition? In that instance, the cotton certainly was not sold at prices prevailing in the United States; on the contrary, it was sold for from $40 to $50 a bale cheaper than our own domestic users could purchase it.

Mr. BUTLER. That is more of a giveaway than a commercial transaction. What is the purpose of section 307?

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that not the section which the Senator seeks to strike out?

Mr. BUTLER. That is the section which I seek to have stricken from the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] are not here to answer for themselves. They are the Senators who proposed the section. My understanding of the section was simply that it would permit any country which bought any of our surplus commodities with its own soft currency to transport such commodities in their own ships, if they so desired, or to hire other ships for that purpose.

I wish the Senator from Maryland would bear in mind that, so far as I understand—and if I am wrong, I wish him to correct me—the exception is to apply solely and wholly to surplus agricultural commodities purchased from the United States with foreign currency. In other words, the exception would not apply to commodities donated to needy persons abroad.

Mr. BUTLER. It would be, in part, a donation. I documented on the floor of the Senate, I think it was last week, an instance such as that to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred. For example, Great Britain refused to take tobacco from us at less than the world price with the use of her soft currency, because she could not transport the tobacco in British bottoms. What happened? In the end, we gave the tobacco to Great Britain.

Great Britain used the money she would have paid us for the tobacco, had she not gotten out under the subterfuge of this law, to build barracks in Great Britain, for which the American Government pays rent today for the housing of our servicemen in Great Britain. When the United States withdraws its troops from England, the barracks will revert to Great Britain.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in complete accord with my good friend from Maryland where donations are involved. But suppose Sweden desired to buy wheat from the United States at the world market price?

Mr. BUTLER. The present law which, in effect, would be repealed, has nothing to do with ordinary commercial transactions. The law has to do only with cargo owned by the Government of the United States or with United States Government-financed cargo. In other words, it applies only in cases where the American taxpayer has a stake. When the taxpayers' money is at hazard, and there are some of the elements of a giveaway in the transaction, then half of that type of cargo must be carried in American ships.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator that as to transactions which are giveaways we should apply the Cargo Preference Act. But in cases of bona fide sales, in which the payment is to be made in soft currency, I do not see why the purchaser should not be permitted to use bottoms of his own country, or any other bottoms he prefers to use.

Mr. BUTLER. The reason is that there is an element of hazard, and the Government of the United States, and in the end the taxpayers of the United States, will take a loss on all such transactions. The Senator knows that to be true.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BUTLER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

The Senator knows there is always a hazard in handling soft currencies.

Mr. ELLENDER. In what respect?

Mr. BUTLER. They are subject to the most extreme fluctuations.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is also true of the American dollar, is it not? Our dollar today is worth 38 or 39 cents.

Mr. BUTLER. I would not say the American dollar is soft currency, by any means.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, but the fluctuation to which the Senator refers is as well applicable to the American dollar as it is to the currencies of England and other nations, although perhaps not to the same degree.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not agree with the Senator at all. I do not think that is so.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am merely asking a question without expressing a fixed opinion, so that my good friend from Maryland may, in the course of his statement, make a distinction, if he will, in the case of bona fide sales. Sweden, for instance, might buy wheat from the United States, and we, in return, might use their currency to buy pulpwood or steel from Sweden. It is cases like that which I wish to have my good friend discuss, to ascertain whether he does not think some exceptions should be made.

Mr. BUTLER. No; I do not think any exceptions should be made. The moment an exception is made, the American merchant marine will be destroyed. I think I can prove that conclusively. In all the transactions to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred, the American taxpayer, who has paid 90 percent of parity for the product involved, is losing money, and he also is being put to the hazard of losing money through the convertibility of the soft currency.

In all such cases where the Government has a stake, I think the American taxpayer has a right to demand that

half of the cargo be transported in American ships.

I had anticipated that the attack support for section 307, as the Senator from Louisiana will notice from the remarks which I shall make later, would be on the basis that the cargo preference law was slowing the disposal of farm products. That was the chief complaint I had heard. I had not heard seriously urged before, the complaint which the Senator from Louisiana is now urging.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Maryland will permit me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senaator from Louisiana?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my understanding—in fact, I so gathered from the discussion before the committee—that the United States could no doubt sell considerably more goods to some of the foreign countries which are well able to pay, provided we accepted their currencies, and they were permitted to hire bottoms of their own choosing in order to transport the goods, and provided, further, that the United States, in turn, would use the currencies obtained in such transactions in order to buy from the purchasing countries goods that we need.

Mr. BUTLER. We who aided in the enactment of the cargo preference bill willingly carried the burden of proving its merit before it became law. Therefore, those who now seek to repeal it should come forward and bear a similar burden. Indeed it seems to me that their burden should be an even heavier and more mandatory one, for when Public Law 664 was enacted we were doing little more than writing into permanent legislation a principle—namely, that 50 percent of Government aid and Government financed cargoes should travel aboard United States-flag vessels—which had been in effect for years.

In fact, before that time we had gone to the trouble of including that provision in at least eight foreign aid bills, as the Senator from Louisiana knows.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my good friend from Maryland that I have always voted as he has on the subject he is discussing. I am sure the Senator remembers that.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, I do. I thank the Senator.

Now, if we are agreed that, in logic and fairness, it is only fitting that those who have written lines 4 to 9 on page 29 into S. 3183 should bear the burden of proving their justification and usefulness, let us see whether they have carried their burden. Unquestionably they have not only failed to sustain the burden of proof, but, indeed, they have deliberately—or, what is equally inexcusable, carelessly—avoided justifying their anti-merchant-marine move.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator realize that the provision went into the bill by unanimous vote of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry? It was not done merely by one Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. I may say to my dear friend that the provision went into the bill by vote of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry before there were any hearings held on the provision, and after we had been assured that hearings would be held, and at a time when the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was holding extended hearings on this very same subject.

I think that a little later the Senator from Washington will move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the purpose of holding hearings on this provision.

Mr. ANDERSON. That would solve a great many things for a great many people.

Mr. BUTLER. But the Senator will admit that there were no hearings held on the provision, and the provision was put into the bill at the very last minute before the bill was reported to the Senate.

Senators will also recall that in the closing days of the last session, during debate on the floor of the Senate on the subject of whether the cargo preference principle should continue to apply to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities, we were assured by members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that the entire matter would be explored thoroughly in public hearings during the early days of this session. That was fair. It made sense. And the drive to kill the 50–50 principle subsided for the time being.

Those of us who know the principle's merit thought little more about the matter. Some took the precaution to write members of the Agriculture Committee, requesting that if and when the committee again considered removing the surplus agricultural commodities disposal program from the coverage of the cargo preference law, public hearings be held. They received assurances that before such a step was taken, public hearings would be held and all interested parties would be given ample opportunity to present their views.

Then, out of the blue, while the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was busily conducting extensive and well-publicized hearings on the question of whether the cargo preference law has impeded the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities, the Senate Agriculture Committee overnight, and without the benefit of any hearings on the subject whatsoever, reported a bill containing, as I have labeled it, the most anti-merchant-marine provision which has come before the Senate for serious consideration during my 6 years in office.

Therefore, today we are faced with the problem of whether or not we shall amend S. 3183 so as to strike from it lines 4 to 9 on page 29.

First, let us get a few facts clear in mind. In order to put this problem into its proper perspective, it is well to remember that there has been no conflict until now between the American merchant mariner and his brother, the American farmer. The American farmer has realized that the best if not the only reliable means he has of reaching foreign markets is via American-flag merchant vessels. The American farmer remembers instances during and after the First World War when American farm exports rotted on our docks for want of tonnage to carry them abroad. The American farmer remembers that all too often when American-flag vessels were not available, foreign ships carried our farm exports, but only at costs so high that there was nothing left for the farmer when the freight bill had been paid.

This has not been a one-way street. The American merchant mariner has recognized his debt to, or, better yet, his partnership with, the American farmer. Of at least incidental interest is the fact that the American merchant mariner purchases approximately $56 million worth of agricultural products annually from the American farmer for the American-flag ships.

Parenthetically, too, I should state that many farmers and farmer groups do not favor a repeal of the cargo preference law. For example, last fall the National Grange resolved:

> The National Grange considers the American merchant marine an indispensable link to foreign markets as well as an important auxiliary to our national defense. Agriculture and our maritime industry have a mutual interest in building and developing expanded foreign export markets for United States farm products. We therefore support the policies previously adopted by our Government to place American ships serving essential trade routes on a basis of competitive equality with foreign merchant fleets and assure United States merchant ships a fair and equitable share, which the law now establishes as at least one-half, of United States financed cargoes.

So, it can safely be said that until now there has been a true brotherhood or community of interests between the American farmer and the American merchant mariner.

A second fact we must not lose sight of is that unless we strike this antimerchant marine provision from S. 3183—and I am now quoting from some recent testimony given by the Maritime Administrator, Mr. Clarence Morse, to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee—the loss of 50–50 will "cause the elimination of the so-called tramp fleet."

No one knows more about this than does the Maritime Administrator. If, as he predicts, the repeal of the cargo-preference principle would force the lay-up of our tramp fleet, what would that mean to the American farmer and to our Nation?

Well, if our tramp fleet were laid up, the first thing which would occur would be the loss of employment for every American seaman now serving aboard American tramp vessels. Since at the present time there are more than 70 such vessels actively engaged, and since each employs approximately 40 American seamen, this would mean wiping out approximately 2,800 to 3,000 jobs at sea for American merchant mariners.

With the American-flag vessels thus laid up, having in such lay-up status lit-

tle national defense value, it would lead to a tidal wave of applications by their owners for permission to transfer or sell them foreign.

And so, knowing, as we should, from the Maritime Administrator's statement, that the abandonment of the 50–50 principle would destroy our tramp fleet, I say to my colleagues that unless the motion of the Senator from Washington is agreed to, we shall shortly see our tramp fleet laid up for a brief period before it sails over the horizon to foreign registry, destroying forever thousands upon thousands of job opportunities for American seamen.

Will the farmer benefit from this destruction of our American tramp fleet? Of course not. This is the irony, the pity—no, the ridiculousness—of the course we will be steering unless the Senate agrees to the motion of the Senator from Washington. Were it not for the American tramp fleet's bidding for the carriage of surplus agricultural commodities, the foreign tramp operators would have our farmers and, indeed, the entire disposal program, at their mercy. Stated in another way, the presence of the American tramp fleet acts as a competitive deterrent to the natural desire of foreign-flag vessel owners who will always, understandably, I concede, seek to charge what the traffic will bear.

Now, there is a third fact of which we must not lose sight. I, for one, consider it of prime importance that—and this is undisputed—our program under public law 480 to dispose of $1.5 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities is considerably ahead of schedule. Yes, I said ahead of schedule. As proof of this fact, I offer for your consideration, Mr. President, the recent testimony of the Department of Agriculture witness before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, to the effect that $1.2 billion worth of Public Law 480 sales, at CCC cost, will be consummated by spring. Since the goal under the law is only $1.5 billion, and since more than 12 months will remain, the demonstrated ability to reach the program's goal is far greater than many had imagined.

Does not this prove conclusively that all the anti-50–50 arguments presented by those who might seek to defeat my amendment mean nothing more than this: that without the 50–50 arrangement we might be able to get even further ahead of schedule in the disposal of our $1.5 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities than we already are. For the life of me, I cannot see any justification for scuttling our merchant marine because thereby we might be further ahead of schedule than we already are in disposing of our surplus agricultural commodities.

The fourth fact worth considering is that although the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provides that the Nation shall maintain a merchant marine capable of carrying a substantial portion of its foreign trade, last month American-flag vessels, even with the aid of the cargo-preference bill, transported only 16 percent of our export trade. No one will contend that 16 percent is a substantial portion. As I reported to the Senate on February 21, within the last 12 months we have suffered a 20-percent decline in the percentage of our exports and imports carried aboard American-flag vessels. And this decline has come about in spite of the help rendered by the Cargo Preference Act. I say to you, Mr. President, that those who now seek to violate the well-established cargo-preference principle remind me of those who delight in adding insult to injury.

Let me suggest that none of us make the mistake of assuming that the Cargo Preference Act applies to commercial cargoes. It applies only to cargoes financed by the American taxpayer, which never would move but for governmental aid and assistance. I mention this for the reason that certain spokesmen for foreign shipowners have contended that the Cargo Preference Act is unsound in that it applies to commercial transactions. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. President.

More particularly, under Public Law 480, the agreements are negotiated at Government level. Prices are not set by commercial standards. The losses are borne by the American taxpayers, and the acceptance of nonconvertible currencies reflects critical inducements made by the United States which no commercial exporter would ever make. Indeed, about 65 percent of the foreign-currency proceeds are either given back or are loaned back to the buyer nations, or are used in other ways for the direct benefit of the economy of the purchasing country or a third country.

Within the last few days—on February 27, to be specific—the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, after holding extensive public hearings, has filed a report—House Report No. 1818—strongly defending the Cargo Preference Act, and calling upon Members of the House of Representatives to oppose vigorously all efforts to change or modify it. In addition to urging all Members of the Senate to obtain a copy of this comprehensive and objective House report, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate certain matters contained therein which I consider most pertinent to our consideration of the problem at hand.

The report, after posing the question, "Has the cargo preference law imposed an excessive financial burden upon the appropriations made available for carrying out title I, of Public Law 480?" states:

> Definitely not. This objection clearly will not stand the test of factual analysis. Here again, the committee refers for evidence not to data supplied by the maritime industry or even by the Department of Commerce, but to testimony from the opponents of the 50–50 law.
>
> As a matter of fact, the committee found that the American merchant marine, through use of reserve fleet vessels for grain storage purposes, is lightening the financial burden upon agriculture appropriations. As a rough calculation, it was estimated that storage charges amounting to almost $22 million annually are saved through the use of merchant vessels in the several reserve fleets. This is, in effect, an indirect subsidy afforded to agriculture by the American merchant marine.

Skipping a few paragraphs, but still under the question of whether the cargo preference law has imposed an excessive financial burden upon the appropriations made available for carrying out title I, of Public Law 480, the House report, after establishing that the cost differential attributable to cargo preference is about $3 million, or approximately one-half of 1 percent of the program's cost to date, states:

> But what does agriculture get for the differential paid to United States tramps? The $3 million paid in this connection represents less than one-half of 1 percent of total program costs to date. This $3 million has kept 70 American-flag tramp vessels in operation and available for title I—Public Law 480 cargoes. It stands to reason that the existence of 70 vessels must have had a significant effect on any freight rates which are fixed by the law of supply and demand, as tramp rates are. If any estimate could be made, this factor alone has probably accounted for the entire $3 million.
>
> In fact, the testimony from all witnesses as to the state of the present market in which foreign-flag tramp rates have approached and in some cases even exceeded American-flag tramp rates, was to the effect that the control feature of Public Law 664 has acted as "an umbrella" over freight rates and kept them within reasonable limits.

Later in the House report this question is posed: "Is the cargo preference law essential to the American merchant marine?"

The following answer, in part, is given:

> Definitely yes. The fact is that no member of the committee, informed as they are with respect to maritime matters, realized prior to the hearings just concluded how vitally necessary the Cargo Preference Act is to the American merchant marine. The more serious problem presented by the evidence now of record before the committee concerns the fate of our merchant fleet when the aid programs of the Government terminate. But first let us analyze the existing situation with the aid of uncontested statistics.
>
> There are today a little over 1,000 ships in the active operating American merchant marine. Even the most conservative estimates from defense experts place this figure as representing a deficiency of several hundred vessels from what would be needed immediately upon the outbreak of a new war.
>
> Moreover, today the American merchant marine is carrying about 22 percent of the export-import commerce of the United States. In exports alone, where the aid cargoes are assured to United States-flag ships by force of the 50–50 law, some statistics showed we are carrying only 16 percent overall and the foreigners, the remaining 84 percent.

Mr. President, at this point let me interpolate that we carry but 16 percent of our export trade in American bottoms and that the berth liners carry the bulk of that trade which bears the same freight rate as that paid to the foreign ships for what they carry.

Skipping a few more paragraphs, we find that the House Committee concluded its answer to this question with the following statement:

> So the committee has concluded not only that the cargo preference law is vital to the American merchant marine but that the national defenses of the United States would be needlessly jeopardized by any weakening changes in the provisions of Public Law 664. The tragedy of the situation is the

lack of knowledge and understanding of the problem by those who publicly favor some amendment of the law. Those who testified along that line professed to having no facts on the effect such action would have on the merchant marine.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not sure that the Senator from Maryland understands the reason why the provision is in the bill. Does he think that any member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who voted for that amendment had previously voted against the Cargo Preference Act?

Mr. BUTLER. I say to my friend from New Mexico that I think the passage of the agricultural bill containing section 307 would, in effect, destroy the American merchant marine. The House committee, which had that very question before it, has just reached the same conclusion, after a very extensive hearing. The committee says in its report that it arrived at that conclusion through the testimony of the opponents of the 50–50 principle.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wished to make the point that I think nearly all of us—I believe all of us—who voted to put that provision in the bill had supported the Cargo Preference Act when it was originally passed. I cannot think of a single member of the committee who voted against it.

Mr. BUTLER. Then why was not the precaution taken of holding public hearings, so that a full understanding of the proposal could be had before section 307 was inserted in the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I can answer that question. There was a bill pending last July to which I intended to offer an amendment containing the identical language of title I of Public Law 480, which relates to sales for foreign currency only. It is contended that when a country lays down its own money to buy agricultural commodities, we should not specify that it must use American ships.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator was not present when I covered that point. I should like to be accurate about it, so I shall reread that portion of my remarks:

> Indeed, about 65 percent of the foreign currency proceeds are either given back or are loaned back to the buyer nations, or are used in other ways for the direct benefit of the economy of the purchasing country or a third country.

In other words, in 65 percent of all the so-called bona fide transactions to which the Senator is referring, the American taxpayer is in effect giving the product away. If we are going to give American commodities away, we can certainly transport half of them in American ships. We certainly ought to carry half.

Mr. ANDERSON. Who is the author of that statement?

Mr. BUTLER. I can verify the accuracy of it. I can assure the Senator that it is an accurate statement. It is in the President's report to the Congress on Public Law 480.

Mr. ANDERSON. All I wish to say to the Senator is that we had hoped that, as a result of the colloquy which took place in July, in which the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as well as the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and various other Senators from the farm area expressed their dissatisfaction with this situation, an amendment would be presented at that time. I understood from the acting majority leader that some assurances had been given to various Senators, including the Senator from Maryland, that such a provision would not be offered to the bill. Naturally, if such assurances had been given, then, of course, it would have seemed improper to propose it. It was a very difficult day for the acting majority leader, because the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] was for that day, for the first time, in the hospital at Bethesda. Neither the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] nor any other Senator was seeking to cause the majority leader any difficulty.

Therefore, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] came over to me and said, "If you think this provision should be stricken out, if we cannot bring it up today, why do we not jointly introduce a bill?" I was busy with some hearings then in progress before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I said, "Francis," if I may use such a familiar term on the floor; I think I have known the junior Senator from South Dakota longer than has any other Senator, "if you are prepared to introduce such a bill, put my name on it." The bill was introduced. That was prompt action.

August came and went; the fall vacation came and went. January and February came and went, and no action was taken until we placed this provision in the bill. Then there was some assurance that we might have a hearing at some indefinite time. If there had been a hearing in January, that provision might not have been in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I covered that point a little earlier in my remarks. We were given definite assurance that there would be a full and complete hearing on section 307. Also assurances were given to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the AFL, the CIO, and a number of other organizations, the names of which were placed on the desks of Senators yesterday, that such hearings would be held, but no notice was given that section 307 would be inserted in the bill.

The Senator from New Mexico will know better than I, because he was present, but I understand that section 307 was inserted in the bill at the very last minute, before the agricultural bill was ordered to be reported to the Senate, and that it was inserted at a time when the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was conducting its hearings on this very subject, and before it had made its report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Whose fault was it that there were no hearings? The bill was introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. It had to be referred to a committee, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. But was a hearing called?

Mr. BUTLER. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. ANDERSON. No hearing was called.

Mr. BUTLER. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had promised that there would be hearings on this particular section. He had made such a promise not only to Senators, but to several organizations. Such hearings were not held.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, I would instantly arise to defend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as would the Senator from Maryland, against any charge of irregularity.

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know that when the subject was brought up, the chairman of the committee suggested to the committee that he felt there ought to be hearings, because he had been approached on the subject. I assure the able Senator from Maryland that no one could have been more conscientious and upright on that point than was the able Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to the distinguished occupant of the Chair [Mr. ELLENDER] that I would never impute to him any bad motive. I think he is a man of the highest character and a man of great ability. I am very fond of him.

Mr. ANDERSON. I subscribe most heartily to those sentiments. What I tried to say was that the Senator from Maryland certainly had not pledged every member of the committee. So far as I know, no one had extracted any sort of pledge from me, and I do not know of anyone who had approached the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I do not know that anyone approached the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. They sat beside me as the vote was cast.

I do not know of any member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who wants to destroy the American merchant marine. We have tried to point out that, the way this particular section has been administered, it has been a terrific blow to American agriculture.

Mr. BUTLER. In what respect?

Mr. ANDERSON. By reason of various countries saying, "We will not buy under this program if you are going to tell us what ships to use, or if we must use American bottoms."

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator know that the only possibility of any conflict in that connection is in relation to a very small percentage of cargoes which move in tramp ships? Even then, there is a differential of only 25 cents a ton. It is nothing in the world but a blind on the part of other nations to cover up their efforts to retire the American merchant marine and tie it up so that they can charge any freight rates they may wish to charge.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know that, of course.

Mr. BUTLER. That would be the result.

Mr. ANDERSON. The American Farm Bureau Federation, an organization representing 1,600,000 farm families, took a position on this question.

Mr. BUTLER. I call attention to the fact that the National Grange has adopted a resolution endorsing the 50–50

principle. The National Farmers Union has also endorsed it.

Mr. ANDERSON. We are talking about what happens in connection with this particular section when foreigners come forward and try to buy our surplus commodities with their own currency. All I was about to suggest to the Senator was that if there had been a feeling on anyone's part that this matter might be adjusted, so that in situations where countries make bona fide offers to buy commodities with their own currencies the provision could be waived, I believe something could have been done along that line. No one came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to suggest that there was any possibility in that regard. The only answer was "Never mind the farmers. They will have to take it."

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator from New Mexico say that we should waive the provision of the 50–50 law if in fact 65 percent of the cargoes to which he refers go to a country by way of gift or for the purpose of assistance?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is not what I did say. That is why we have had so much trouble with this provision. If those who wish to keep the provision in the law would take the time to try to find out what farm organizations object to, we would not have such a provision in the bill. If we had an opportunity to sit down and discuss the subject, or had an opportunity to be heard by an appropriate committee—and I admit that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce probably is the appropriate committee—for even so much as a half hour, instead of not being given even so much as the courtesy of a passing glance, that provision would not be in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that if we had a full hearing on it, I am satisfied that the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Vermont and other Senators would be convinced that the 50–50 principle is essential to maintain the American merchant marine, and that a deviation in the present regard would destroy the American merchant marine.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me say only that I have the highest respect for the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Even though they differ with me on the way to handle agricultural matters. I go out of my way to express my high esteem for the members of that committee. I wish to say to the able Senator from Maryland that I believe if we had had a chance to discuss the subject we might have found a way of avoiding the route we have taken.

I for one do not wish to destroy the 50–50 provision of the law. But I believe that when agricultural surpluses are as high as they are today, and when agricultural trade stops, as it has stopped, even the maritime trade suffers greatly. If the Senator from Maryland will take the trouble to read the figures with respect to the export of cotton and note how our share of the world market has decreased in a relatively few years from more than 40 percent down to 20 percent, he might realize what the farmers are worried about.

I do not say that it is not still possible to find a solution to the problem. However, I believe that some assurance should be given that the farm program, which is a good program, will not be blocked in certain areas of the world by a requirement which seems to be unreasonable.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not believe it will be blocked. I say that for this reason: As I pointed out on the floor of the Senate last week—and I made reference to it again today—certain people who would come forward and make purchases—as the Senator from New Mexico sees fit to call these transactions—of our surplus commodities are, in fact, not interested in the momentary business of carriage, but are interested primarily in tying up the American merchant marine.

I pointed to a factual situation in my colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], when I referred to British purchases of tobacco. The British would not take the tobacco because we wanted half of it carried in American ships. We wound up by giving the British the tobacco. They with an equivalent amount built barracks in Great Britain. We pay rent for the barracks during the time we use them. When we leave, the barracks belong to the British. In other words, the British got the tobacco for nothing.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland tell us how that helped the American merchant marine?

Mr. BUTLER. It did not help anyone. However, we must take a firm stand on a principle. I have the highest respect for all members of the Agriculture Committee, and I do not impute to them any desire to destroy the American merchant marine. Certainly not. However, I say your understanding was not my understanding of the implications of section 307. The adoption of section 307, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has held long hearings on the subject, as well as in the opinion of many people who are well qualified to speak on the question, would destroy the American merchant marine.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have sent for a copy of the House hearings, but have not received it yet. Was the question of the transportation of title I goods raised in the House hearings?

Mr. BUTLER. The House committee went into the whole situation.

Mr. ANDERSON. It took testimony on it?

Mr. BUTLER. It took very extensive testimony on the whole subject, and the committee pointed out—and I am doubling back on the text of my speech—that had it not been for the American merchant marine, with some 70 tramp ships available, ocean-cargo rates would go so high that we would not be able to give the food away, because we would be at the mercy of foreign shipping.

Mr. ANDERSON. I heard that portion of the Senator's speech. All I am trying to say is that this sort of situation might not have developed if we had been extended so much as the courtesy of a hearing.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator feels aggrieved, as I do. I feel aggrieved by the fact that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry gave us no hearing on this matter. The Senator feels aggrieved because the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has not held a hearing on the subject.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I am quite well convinced that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had no intention of holding a hearing. I believe it was felt that the matter would stay bottled up.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from New Mexico tell me why the House committee, which had no legislation at all before it, went into every phase of the 50–50 principle and came up with the statement that any weakening of that provision of the law would have very detrimental results, not only to the American merchant marine, but also to the defense of the United States?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not intend to take the Senator's time this afternoon. I merely wish to suggest that if there is any possibility that he can work out language which will protect the American merchant marine and at the same time not crucify the American farmer, we might find a solution to the problem.

Mr. BUTLER. How can the Senator say the American farmer is being crucified when under Public Law 480 we have agreed to sell a billion and a half dollars worth of our surplus agricultural commodities before the end of the summer of 1957, and the Department of Agriculture representative told the House committee that by the spring of 1956, a billion two hundred million dollars worth of surplus commodities will have been committed? I do not believe there is any validity to the contention that we are holding anything up.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have heard that figure used, but I have not been able to lay my hands on it.

Mr. BUTLER. I assure the Senator it is an accurate figure, submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is not the testimony we received from the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not know where we are tied up, but I shall try to find out. It may be that the Senator's figure is accurate. However, I wish to point out that when the matter was under consideration before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a question was raised as to how much we should put into Public Law 480. The question was raised whether we should put in 1 billion, 5 billion, or 10 billion. The chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee suggested, very wisely, that we start with a modest figure, and we agreed on a billion and a half dollars worth.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to point out one thing to the Senator. The American merchant marine today carries approximately 22 percent of the export-import trade of the United States. Seventy percent of that commerce travels in what we call berth line steamers, which have the same

freight charge for both foreign and American cargoes. The remainder is carried in our tramp fleet. The only difference between the cost of carriage in a foreign tramp ship and in an American tramp ship is 25 cents a ton, which of course, is insignificant. If nations with whom we have been so generous are so grasping as to want to destroy the whole American merchant marine and our potential for defense for a piddling amount of money, then I say we are making no mistake by keeping that provision on the statute books. They should cooperate at least to that extent in order to save the American merchant marine.

A day or two ago I stated on the floor of the Senate that the foreign leaders will privately admit that had it not been for the American merchant marine they could not have survived in World War II. Those very countries are now trying to destroy that which gave them life and blood. I say it is outrageous. It is a movement on behalf of foreigners to take all the export and import trade of the American people. The 1936 act expressly lays it down as being the wish of the Congress and the policy of the American Government that a reasonable portion of American freight be carried in American bottoms so that we can have a merchant fleet and trained mariners when we need them. Where would we have been in World War II or in the Korean war if we had not had them? In World War I we were at the mercy of foreign shipping companies, who charged us anything they could get. In some cases the rate increased 2,000 percent.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure that no member of the committee wishes to destroy our merchant marine. If it develops that the provision is unreasonable, I think we would all be willing to find some solution. I hope that we may have some time to find out what the solution should be.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out to my good friend from Maryland, it was our understanding that the provision would apply to bona fide sales made in soft currency, without donations or loans or borrowings.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. But may I say to the Senator that statistics show that 65 percent of the transactions to which the Senator refers turned out to be another form of gift to the foreign buyer.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be cured by——

Mr. BUTLER. It could be cured by having them say, "We are perfectly willing to have you carry 50 percent of your generosity in American ships."

Mr. ELLENDER. It could also be cured by stating that in any transaction wherein any of the purchase price paid by the purchasing country is donated to it or loaned to it, it would not apply.

Mr. BUTLER. I respectfully say to the Senator that in many cases it could not be ascertained prior to the contract of carriage. I apprehend that in many cases the bargain is made and the carriage is performed and then the proceeds find their way back into some form of gift. As I pointed out to the Senator in my brief remarks, how can we call a sale bona fide when the Government of the United States makes it under the going market, guarantees convertibility of currency, and does many things which no commercial seller would think of doing?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. A number of us are concerned about this matter, and I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from Maryland will give some thought to it before it comes to a vote on the floor. It is something which requires attention. I am sure there is sufficient evidence to indicate that there are foreign commodities which could be and would be moved. No one wants to destroy the American merchant marine; certainly, I do not; but I think we have a very difficult problem here.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to tell the Senator that the disposal program is almost a full year ahead of schedule. So, there has been no holding back on the program on account of the preference law. The Senator will not find any opposition to the cargo preference provision outside Great Britain and the countries immediately around her, which are maritime nations and have made up their minds that they are going to get all, and not merely a part of the business. They get approximately 84 percent of the American shipping business now. They have made up their minds that they will get it all. I say we should not give it to them.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the fine work the Senator is doing on behalf of the American merchant marine, but the present law affects agriculture.

Mr. BUTLER. Wherein does it affect agriculture? We are a year ahead of schedule now. Had it not been for the tramp ships the freight rates today would no doubt be higher than they are and we could not afford to give the stuff away because it would cost too much to carry it. If we destroy the American merchant marine, as I am convinced passage of section 307 would do, we are putting agriculture into a position where it will not be able to pay the freight rates.

Mr. CARLSON. Based on testimony before the committee, there have been some problems solved——

Mr. BUTLER. There have been, but they have all been solved in favor of the foreigner who is now getting 84 percent of the American shipping business.

Mr. President, to resume reading the quotation which I had been reading:

> They had chosen to study the matter of cargo preference only from the standpoint of its impact upon American agricultural and international relations. The result was that the case they attempted to make out for changing the 50–50 law fell apart almost at the outset. The weakness of the opponents' case will be surprising to all who read the record.

Therefore, in view of the fact that the House report has just been published, and since it appears to me to be such an outstanding and objective study of the entire problem, I recommend it wholeheartedly to all who are interested in this vital matter.

Turning now, in closing, to the motion which will be made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for the purpose of removing from the omnibus farm bill the anti-merchant-marine provision contained on page 29, lines 4 through 9, I earnestly request Senators to give this amendment their prompt and favorable consideration.

If any Senator has any question concerning the effect of the cargo preference bill upon Public Law 480, and will state it to me, should I be unable at the moment to respond with statistically accurate facts, I will undertake to obtain the desired information and supply it within a few hours at most. I offer to do this because, while this matter is not without certain complexities, I am convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that the facts are there which will supply satisfactory and convincing answers to every question any Senator can raise.

REORGANIZATION OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1604)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit to the Senate a report on the reorganization of the Passport Office of the Department of State.

This report provides a detailed analysis of the tremendous increase in the workload of the Passport Office during the past few years, and the vigorous action taken by its present Director, Miss Frances G. Knight, to reorganize and modernize the Office so that it can meet the increased demands made upon its limited staff and facilities and to provide passport service to the American people in conformity with present-day needs.

At my request last July, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations directed the committee staff to cooperate with the Passport Office in a thorough study of passport operations, aimed at revamping operating procedures, equipment systems, and generally raising efficiency. The committee staff obtained the help of qualified Government experts in management, records, and paperwork control, and in other administrative and operating fields. Various Federal agencies assigned these experts to assist the Director of the Passport Office in developing an adequate reorganization program. I want to pay tribute to Miss Knight and her office for their complete cooperation in this successful experiment in improving efficiency in an overburdened branch of Government.

The committee report sets forth in detail the remarkable achievements that have resulted from this survey and the work of the reorganization team. Eight months ago the Passport Office was taking several weeks for final action on the issuance of a passport. Members of the Senate were getting numerous com-

plaints about the long and frustrating delays in the processing of passports and renewals. Today the average time has been cut to 5 days. This is all the more remarkable, because travel abroad has increased tremendously in the past few years. The number of passports issued or renewed in 1955 alone totaled over 528,000—about 18 percent over 1954. In 1956, another 17.4 percent increase is expected. In the past 10 years the work of the Passport Office has increased more than 240 percent.

But there is still room for legislative attention before the recommended reorganization procedures may be brought into full operation under impending peak loads.

For instance, it is pointed out in the report that a newly revised form of passport, which is designed to simplify and speed up action on passport applications, cannot be fully adopted until proper mechanized equipment and systems are obtained and installed. These include electric typewriters, specially designed pocket folders, cash registers, letter opening machines, sorters, cutters, and so forth, which are required to utilize fully the revised operating plan.

Mr. President, I am rather surprised that this has not been done long ago. I think it is partly due to the fact that we in Congress have not paid sufficient attention to this important office. Again, I wish to say that Miss Knight and her staff have certainly worked diligently and in a most cooperative spirit to reorganize the Passport Office on a much more efficient basis.

These new facilities cannot be procured until the necessary funds are made available. Due to the lack of this equipment, there is a possibility that the operating schedule cannot reach its full potential under the revised program. The staff estimates that an appropriation of approximately $10,000 would enable the office to avoid serious backlog accumulations during the heavy travel season that is presently impending.

Mr. President, I repeat the figure. I said "approximately $10,000." That figure is so seldom used by Congress, because it is a modest amount, that I thought there might be some misunderstanding. Only about $10,000 is needed to do the work of reorganization in the Passport Office.

In connection with the preparation of the report, the staff prepared a brief memorandum covering these equipment needs which the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations forwarded to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on February 9, 1956, with a suggestion that a deficiency appropriation be provided for this purpose. The latter was received too late to be considered before the committee took action on the deficiency appropriations, and it now appears that several weeks will elapse before any funds can be provided by a supplemental appropriation. By that time the heavy annual travel season will be upon the office and it is feared that the full utilization of the reorganization program cannot be put into operation, which may result in another backlog of applications within the next few weeks.

It is my understanding that the staff of the Committee on Appropriations has been giving some consideration to this matter, and it is my fervent hope that they will recommend to the Department of State that the necessary funds required for the implementation of the essentials of this program be provided from some other funds, without delay. The staff of the Committee on Government Operations will also continue its efforts to obtain this comparatively small amount, either from the Department of State or through the President's Management Improvement Fund.

The staff of the committee has drafted legislation to implement the recommendations made in the report which I am submitting to the Senate.

I conclude by saying that the work of the Committee on Government Operations in this particular instance, as well as in many others, and also the splendid work of a very good staff—a diligent and competent professional staff—has saved the taxpayers of the United States literally thousands upon thousands of dollars in the passport office and in improving service.

Furthermore, the committee and the staff have saved the taxpayers millions of dollars in the review of audits and reorganization procedures which have been instituted as a result of the work of the committee throughout the years.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the committee, a report known as the reorganization of the passport office, and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, at this time I take pleasure in adding a few words of commendation to the present Director of the Passport Division, Miss Frances Knight, and her splendid staff, who have worked long hours to give the very best possible service to the traveling public.

It has been the experience in my office that very, very few requests are being made to expedite action on passport applications, which in itself is evidence that prolonged delays are not the order of the day.

Even though applications have increased steadily over the past year, as much as 20 percent, I understand the time required to process such applications has been reduced from several weeks to approximately 1 week.

Again our thanks to Miss Knight and her coworkers.

REORGANIZATION OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3340) to transfer the functions of the Passport Office to a new agency of the Department of State to be known as the United States Passport Service, to establish a passport service fund to finance the operations of the United States Passport Service, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1605) thereon.

The bill would change the name of the Passport Office to the United States Passport Service, in line with the nomenclature recommendations of the Hoover Commission and to provide proper recognition to passport functions within the Department of State. Moreover, it would put the financial operations of the new Service on a more businesslike basis to enable the Service to meet expanding or contracting activities. Passport and renewal fees would be increased to bring them into line with increased Service costs. The new Passport Service would be provided with its own accounting and internal audit system, under periodic audits by the General Accounting Office.

The committee recommendation for the establishment of a fund to enable the Passport Office to meet fluctuating service demands, has been evolved as the best procedure at this time, in view of the present emergency conditions. The Director, with the cooperation of representatives of the General Accounting Office, will be requested to make extended studies of the operations under the fund—if approved by the Congress—with a view to recommending any supplemental action that may be found to be desirable, after the program has been fully tested.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3340) to transfer the functions of the Passport Office to a new agency of the Department of State to be known as the United States Passport Service, to establish a Passport Service Fund to finance the operations of the United States Passport Service, and for other purposes, was placed on the calendar and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all functions, powers, duties, and authority of the Passport Office of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, together with those funds, liabilities, commitments, authorizations, allocations, personnel, properties, and records of the Department of State which the Secretary of State shall determine to be primarily related to and necessary for, the exercise of such functions, powers, duties, and authority, are hereby transferred to the United States Passport Service, established pursuant to section 2 of this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the Department of State an agency to be known as the United States Passport Service (hereinafter referred to as the Service) which shall be headed by a director who shall be appointed by the Secretary of State in accordance with the civil service laws, and whose position shall be allocated to grade 18 of the general schedule as prescribed in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a fund for the Passport Service (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"). The fund shall be capitalized on the basis of—

(1) an initial appropriation by the Congress to the fund of a sum which, together

with the unexpended balances of any appropriations transferred to the service pursuant to the first section of this act, does not exceed $1 million, which sum is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated;

(2) any unexpended balances of appropriations, the inventories, receivables, and other physical assets of the Service transferred to the Service pursuant to the first section of this act (exclusive of buildings occupied and land), such inventories and other physical assets to be capitalized at fair and reasonable values to be determined by the Secretary of State; and

(3) assumption by the fund of all obligations, commitments, and liabilities of the Service as of the effective date of this act.

(b) The fund shall include all property and other physical assets acquired by the Service (except buildings and land), and there shall be deposited into the fund all amounts received for services performed by the Service, and all other amounts received by the Service from whatever source derived, including all proceeds arising from disposition of any property or other assets acquired by the fund.

(c) The fund shall be available without fiscal-year limitation for financing the direct costs and expenses of operating and maintaining the Service.

(d) All amounts received for passport fees in excess of $9 for each original passport and of $5 for each renewal of a passport shall be deposited at least annually into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Any surplus accruing to the fund in any fiscal year shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts during the ensuing fiscal year; except that any such surplus may be applied first to restore any impairment of the capital of the fund.

SEC. 4. In accordance with the provisions of existing law—

(a) The Secretary of State shall prepare and submit an annual business-type budget program for the Service.

(b) There shall be installed and maintained in the Service an integrated system of accounting, including proper features of internal control, which will (1) assure adequate control over all assets and liabilities of the fund, (2) afford full disclosure with respect to the financial conditions and operations of the fund according to the accrual method of accounting, and (3) supply on the basis of accounting results the data for the annual budget of the Service with respect to the last completed fiscal year. The system of accounting shall conform to principles and standards prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States so as to accomplish the purposes of this section, and shall be subject to such review by the Comptroller General as may be necessary to assure its conformance with the principles and standards prescribed and its effectiveness in operation.

(c) The financial transactions, accounts, and reports of the fund shall be audited on a periodical basis by the General Accounting Office and a copy of each report or audit shall be furnished promptly to the President, the Congress, and the Secretary of State.

SEC. 5. Section 2 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the issue and validity of passports, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1926, as amended (22 U. S. C. 217a), is amended by striking out "$5" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10", and by striking out "$9" and inserting in lieu thereof "$18".

FORCED LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Forced Labor," published in the New York Times of February 7, 1956, as well as a statement by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations on the International Labor Organization.

I commend the editorial and the statement to the attention of my colleagues, because they stress the importance of United States cooperation in ILO, and support the principles of my resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 117.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORCED LABOR

A questionnaire has been circulated by the International Labor Organization at Geneva asking member governments whether they would support a convention against the use of forced labor, for political or economic purposes. Every European country except France and Poland has returned a favorable reply, and both these are expected to approve, thus leaving the United States—in the words of a cable we published from Geneva a few days ago—"the only major industrial country not on record in favor of a convention outlawing forced labor."

How ironic for the United States to be on the outside looking in, while the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc solemnly register their opposition to the forced labor of which they are the world's prime exponents. Whatever the Communist motives for endorsing this convention, what reason could there possibly be for the United States to disapprove, or even to drag its feet as it is now obviously doing?

It was American Federation of Labor urging in 1947 that started the long process of the United Nations and the ILO looking into the outrage of forced labor. In the spring of 1953 a special U. N.-ILO committee issued a notable report on the subject. This report formed the basis for subsequent debate and condemnation of forced labor by the Economic and Social Council and, in a resolution of which the United States was one of the sponsors, by the General Assembly itself—only the Soviet bloc voting in opposition. The ILO was asked to continue its efforts to combat forced labor, and the proposed convention is the logical result.

How can the State Department put this country in the position of opposing, or blocking, or hesitating on a convention against forced labor? Is it because some employers' groups in the United States do not like the ILO and think the United States should get out of this organization altogether? Or is it because the Department fears the proponents of the Bricker amendment, who look with gravest suspicion on practically any convention or treaty? We are sorry to say that apparently the reasoning, if one can call it that, is that the United States must now join nothing of international flavor that could possibly affect internal affairs. Such a policy may satisfy Brickerism, but it happens to put the United States in an absurd and untenable position.

STATEMENT BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS—INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The executive council of the AFL-CIO is greatly concerned over the campaign of falsehoods being waged against the International Labor Organization. We regard the ILO as a vital forum through which to promote the cause of freedom and democracy in the world. We take this opportunity to officially reiterate our full and unqualified support of the ILO and of United States membership and active participation therein.

We urge the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Joint Resolution 97, which provides for an increase in the existing ceiling of the United States' contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 to $3 million. This will serve to bring the United States contribution to the ILO's budget, which is so essential to the success of the ILO's programs and activities, more nearly in line with contributions by the United States to the United Nations itself as well as to other specialized agencies of the United Nations.

In addition, the executive council urges the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Joint Resolution 117, which calls upon the United States Government, in cooperation with other nations, to assume leadership in the campaign to abolish the use of forced labor and to support the adoption of a convention on forced labor at the 1956 conference of the ILO.

The AFL-CIO believes that the failure of the United States Government to support the ILO both morally and financially would weaken the forces of freedom and democracy within that organization and throughout the world. Active and energetic leadership and encouragement would, on the other hand, demonstrate to the aspiring peoples of the world that America represents mankind's best hope on earth.

Contrary to the reported position of the United States Government, we do not believe that representatives of America at the ILO should refuse to endorse proposed conventions of the ILO which vigorously condemn such inhuman practices as forced labor. To do so will place the freedom-loving people of America in an embarrassing and untrue position of being the only member nation ILO which refuses to condemn such slavery out of hand through the strongest weapon available to the ILO—the convention against forced labor. In conclusion, we call upon not only the members of the unified trade-union movement of the AFL-CIO, but upon all other citizens of these United States to demand the continuance of America's membership in the ILO and the retention of its proud position in that organization as a fearless champion of human rights for the wage earners of the world.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today, March 1, 1956, marks the 100th anniversary of one of the loveliest and most progressive of all our American cities, Minneapolis, Minn. I am doubly proud of that fair city, for I had the honor to be the mayor of the city of Minneapolis for two terms. This is a great day for Minnesota and a great day for its largest city.

Beginning today and through the 1956 aquatennial festival Minneapolis will be celebrating its centennial observance. On behalf of Mayor Eric G. Hoyer, City Council President Eugene Stokowski, and every Minneapolitan, I invite everyone to visit Minneapolis this year and to help celebrate our centennial.

I invite especially every Member of Congress, particularly my colleagues in the Senate, with particular reference to the present Presiding Officer, the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], to visit the city of Minneapolis this year and to help us celebrate our centennial.

Last month, Mr. President, the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce published a handsome centennial issue. A very fine article in that issue is entitled "A

Century of Progress." It reviews the early history of Minneapolis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD certain excerpts from this article in Greater Minneapolis, published by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS CENTENNIAL—A CENTURY OF PROGRESS

Anyone contemplating the clean-cut skyline of Minneapolis, its gleaming buildings, its modern facades, finds it difficult to imagine the fledgling village of a hundred years ago. In that candle-lit era, only a few spare frame dwellings dotted the pasture that is now our loop.

A century is a long time in human reckoning; yet it is only a tick of the clock of eternity. But in this brief span of time—as eternities go—tremendous changes have been wrought. Rutted pathways have become broad avenues; the lean-to has given way to the skyscrapers; and creaking carts have been replaced by swift, whispering automobiles and airplanes.

Long before there was a Minneapolis, this site was the gathering place for the Sioux. They came to worship the Great Spirit by the plunging waters of St. Anthony as they had for centuries. Their tepees were staked on the present site of Bridge Square and around the lakes.

The first white man to break into this setting was Father Louis Hennepin, who discovered the Falls of St. Anthony in 1680. Hennepin, a Franciscan friar from Belgium, accompanied LaSalle on his first trip up the Mississippi and saw the falls which he named for his patron saint, St. Anthony of Padua.

Almost a century elapsed before another white man appeared on the scene. Captain Jonathan Carver, a young Connecticut Yankee, was the first English-speaking man to visit St. Anthony Falls. The date was November 1776. Carver was exploring the regions ceded to England by France after the French and Indian War.

Following the Louisiana Purchase, President Thomas Jefferson in 1805 sent a company commanded by Lt. Zebulon Pike to explore the headwaters of the Mississippi and find a suitable site for a military encampment. When Pike arrived at the confluence of the Mississippi and what is now the Minnesota Rivers, he sought to befriend the Indians and made a hasty treaty with them for lands, one tract extending up the Mississippi from the mouth of the Minnesota and including the Falls of St. Anthony.

Fourteen years later, a company of soldiers under Col. Henry Leavenworth set up a military camp on the present site of Mendota. The next spring, the camp called Fort St. Anthony was moved across the river. In 1824, its name was changed to Fort Snelling in honor of Col. Josiah Snelling who completed the project.

In 1822 the soldiers built a sawmill just below the Falls of St. Anthony on the west side of the river. Here they turned out lumber for their barracks. A year later they installed a flour mill at the site.

In the spring of 1934, two brothers, Samuel W. and Gideon H. Pond, young laymen from Connecticut, obtained permission at the fort to start mission work among the Indians at Lake Calhoun. Their log cabin on the east bank of the lake was the first dwelling on the present site of Minneapolis. About a year later, Rev. J. D. Stevens built a mission house on the northwest shore of Lake Harriet.

The Indian treaties of 1837 ceded to the United States the delta of land bounded by the St. Croix and the Mississippi Rivers. The first settler to stake a claim at St. Anthony was Franklin Steele, the sutler at Fort Snelling. The Godfrey house, built in 1848, was the first frame dwelling at the falls.

About this time, gold was discovered in California. Along with the great flood of immigrants moving westward came a purposeful group who sought homes for their families—not sudden wealth for themselves. They came into the fertile prairies of Illinois and Iowa from New York and New England. From 1848 to 1860 they streamed up the Mississippi and its tributaries, settling in Minnesota and adjoining States and Territories.

In 1850 the village of St. Anthony was credited with only 538 inhabitants. Only 4 years later the town boasted 3,000 citizens. So rapidly had the little community grown that its leaders asked the legislature to give them a city charter "in order to manage our local affairs better." This charter was given on March 1, 1856.

Henry T. Wells, who had come from Connecticut in 1853, was the first mayor of St. Anthony.

The west side settlement started later, since its land belonged to the Fort Snelling reservation which was not reduced in size until 1852, while pre-emption rights were not granted until 1855. Government permission had been granted John H. Stevens in 1849 to take up a claim on the reservation in return for free ferry service for the military across the river. Stevens built a home on the river bank across from the present Great Northern depot.

In 1852 Stevens drew up a bill for a new county to be called Snelling. But Martin McLeod, mindful of the Franciscan friar who had discovered the area, changed the name to Hennepin when he introduced the bill in the Territorial legislature.

County seat for the new county was the west side settlement, then called Albion, a name which seemed to please no one. A happy inspiration revealed the new name, Minnehapolis, to Charles Hoag, pioneer farmer and schoolteacher. In a letter to the St. Anthony Express, he wrote:

"The name I propose, Minnehapolis, is derived from Minnehaha, falling water, with the Greek affix 'polis,' a city, thus meaning Falling Water City or City of the Falls. * * * Until some other name is decided upon, we intend to call ourselves Minnehapolis."

The name met with instant approval, but the intermediate "h" was dropped in its final adoption when the city was incorporated in 1866. It was not until 1872 that St. Anthony and Minneapolis were consolidated and the real city of Minneapolis took shape.

Minneapolis today is a far cry from the little river community from which it grew. With a metropolitan population of more than a million, it is one of the truly great cities of the world.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in line with the discussion of yesterday, I wish to proceed with by remarks on the agricultural bill. I regret having had to make the digressions I have made, but I have responsibilities in connection with Senate committees, responsibilities which I thoroughly enjoy, and which it is my duty to fulfill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield, if I can do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. KERR. I had intended to suggest the absence of a quorum, if the Senator will yield for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in starting my discussion today on the farm bill, I should like to read a letter which came to my office as of yesterday. I answered the letter last evening, and I wish to share its contents, because I think the letter reveals some of the pathetic conditions which exist in some parts of American agriculture, and some of the heartbreaking episodes of agricultural living under depressed prices.

The letter is dated February 25, 1956, and is from Orleans, Minn., which is a small rural community. As you can see, Mr. President, this is not a letter which was prepared under the direction of somebody; it is written on good home stationery. The letter reads:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I know you are very busy man, but I am sure you will read my letter. I often wanted to write you, but will think to myself will you read my letter? Will it help? But of lately hearing Mr. Benson's, Secretary of Agriculture, speeches, they make me sick at heart. Because, Mr. HUMPHREY, we have been hit with more than just these falling farm prices. I want to tell you at least some of what's on my mind and very much in my heart. We have two sons. They both loved farming so much that while we didn't have much, we sacrificed, only Lord knows how much, so we could send them to better high school in Crookston, Minn., Northwest School and Experiment Station so they would make good farmers. Both boys graduated from the school.

I digress to say that the Northwest School and Experiment Station is one of our finest agricultural schools. I continue to read from the letter:

We sacrificed more, bought more land and raised more livestock so boys will have a better start. Now to make long letter as short as possible, both boys are away from farm. One is working in South Milwaukee, Wis., Ladish Manufacturing Co., welding. The younger one had good start on the farm here, borrowed money and worked 16 hours a day, plowed, seeded grain, and milked his cows, rented his older brother's cows, and when fall came he looked his farm record books over. His wife did an excellent job in keeping farm records.

He found out he got 11 cents an hour for his work, and his wife's work, too, both in the field and in milking the cows, but that then he would have to sell some of his cattle if he wanted to keep on making payments on his loan. So he sold everything—cattle and grain—and was $900 short to pay off the loan he borrowed, to buy machinery only. Now he is working in Los Angeles, Calif., for $2.10 an hour, also for the Ladish Manufacturing Co.

Here are my husband and I with 900 acres of land, paying taxes, and no one to work it. That is what Mr. Eisenhower and his administration are doing. We would be happy to see our sons and their family near and farming.

Now about Mr. Benson. I heard him say, "If anyone thinks farmers are heading for a

depression, he does not know what he is talking about." Well, there is little truth in that, because we are not heading, but we are in a depression right now. Mr. Benson is sure a scatterbrain if there ever was one. Anybody can tell that from listening to his speeches. One day it's understanding, and the next day it's condemning the farmers. We heard, I believe, two of his speeches in one week, and it was just like day and night. In Davenport, Iowa, he finished with, "Thank you," and in other speeches he says, on support prices, "I don't believe in them, and I will not do it." How such a man holds such an important position, only the Lord knows.

Now I want to tell you a bit about ourselves, how we are doing here on the farm the last 2 years.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I was quite interested in the statements by that good woman about her sons who had been raised on the farm and tried to farm, but could not make a living there. Did the Senator from Minnesota by any chance see the story, a little while ago, about a young man in Mississippi who had produced more corn on an acre of land than, so far as is know, anyone else had ever produced in all history?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I did see that.

Mr. KERR. I believe he produced more than 300 bushels an acre.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that was about the amount.

Mr. KERR. He was brought to Washington, and was honored, and received quite a nice little prize. Then he was interviewed as to his future farm hopes and prospects. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember the remark he made?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not. I should like to have my memory on that subject refreshed.

Mr. KERR. That young man said, "I am not going to stay on the farm. I cannot."

Those who interviewed him asked, "Why?"

He replied, "I cannot make a living at it."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the pathetic story all too often, in the case of our young farmers.

Mr. KERR. That young man had produced more bushels of corn on an acre of land than anyone else had ever been known to produce before. Yet, despite that efficiency in operation, he is going to have to leave the farm, in order to make a living.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Yesterday, we received the news that the President announced he would be available for drafting for another term.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I think I read that some place. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Minnesota is aware, is he not, of the fact that during the past month, and, in fact, during the past year and more, we had a good deal of information and indication that the President hoped he would not have to serve another term, because he wanted to retire to his farm at Gettysburg?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I have heard that many times.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Minnesota suppose that the President's decision not to retire to his farm at Gettysburg was made because of a realization by him that it would be impossible for him to make a living there? [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and yesterday I said, in addressing the Senate, that I felt that might have been one of the compelling reasons for the President's announcement. I made that statement on the floor of the Senate.

The President is a man of judgment. I said that if he considered the prices of agricultural commodities and the agricultural situation, I felt he would have some hesitancy in taking up farming as an avocation, and surely not as a vocation.

Mr. KERR. If a young man who has produced more bushels of corn on an acre of land than anyone else has ever before been able to produce, cannot make a living on the farm; and if a man who probably has a greater income from nonfarm sources than anyone else has had in recent times, believes that he cannot make a living on the farm, does that indicate that it would be impossible for anyone at all to make a living on a farm?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I think that is so.

The other day, I received a letter from a woman who, in writing to me, said she had been a lifelong Republican, but now she said her three-point program was as follows: First, vote Democratic; second, return farm prosperity; and, third, fire Benson. [Laughter.]

She stated those three points very concisely in a one-page letter.

Even with the best program the Congress could possibly write into law, the program must be administered; and it appears that so long as Mr. Eisenhower is on the job, Mr. Benson will administer the program.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Minnesota mean as long as Mr. Eisenhower is in the White House?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Of course, there is no connection between that and being on the job, is there? [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. Of course, we wish to proceed with a charitable spirit.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield in a moment.

First, I wish to say that it occurs to me that the one sure remedy for the farm situation is to change it by means of the forthcoming election. I do not know of a single Democratic candidate for the Presidency—and there are many of them—who would not, immediately upon taking that great office, discharge Mr. Benson. I think the farmers should know that. That is a positive assurance.

Mr. KERR. Then does the Senator from Minnesota think that if we hope to obtain a farm program, it will be absolutely necessary for the people to retire the present occupant of the White House, and put him in a posture where he can be on the job again on the farm?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In order to be on the safe side, I should say that would be the proper decision.

Mr. KERR. I would say the Senator from Minnesota is eminently correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to say that I am delighted to see that the Democrats are getting a little enjoyment, because on yesterday those of us on this side of the aisle had ours. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. We believe that our day will return in November, and then we shall see who does the smiling.

Mr. KERR. Let me ask the Senator from Minnesota whether it is possible that the Republicans will look more and more to yesterday as being their only day for smiling. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Hindsight is an outstanding Republican attribute.

Mr. MAGNUSON rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Washington wish me to yield to him?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wanted to talk a little about fish.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest that that will be an exceptionally good subject, following the remarks we have just heard. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was very much interested in the interchange in regard to how farmers are being pushed off the farms.

The case referred to by the Senator from Oklahoma was one in which apparently there had been efficient farming and good production. Yet that farmer testified he was not able to make a living on the farm.

The Senator from Minnesota knows that throughout the country, a great proportion of the farming people are located on small family-sized farms. What is happening to them all across the land?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are being lifted off the land, so to speak, pushed off the land, by the thousands. The drop in farm population in the past few years has been approximately 9 percent, since 1952.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The other day the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] stated that 400,000 farmers had been pushed off the farms.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a conservative figure; and the tendency is growing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not, as a matter of fact, being ruthlessly done as a part of the Benson policy in this administration?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not wish to impute any bad motives to them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We can use their own words.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was about to say that when the Under Secretary of Agri-

culture says that farming is big business, and a number of similar statements are made by others in the administration; when he says that those who are less efficient will have to get off the land, thinking in terms of dollars and not in terms of a way of life, thinking in terms of an IBM machine, a mechanical instrument, rather than human lives, land, and livestock—when we have that kind of thinking, we are bound to have trouble. That is what has happened.

No one in high places today is championing the cause of the farmer in America, unless those of us in this body who try to champion the cause of the farmer may be said to be a part of the Government of the United States at the legislative level.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has given a great deal of study and thought to the pending farm bill. I think there are some good features in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; there are.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But is there anything in the bill for the small family-sized farm?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is one of the weaknesses of the bill. However, I will say that the committee tried very hard to write into the bill language which would prevent the soil bank provision from being used to drive people off the land. It was very difficult to find the precise language which would guarantee that kind of protection.

The one provision in the farm bill which would do more for the small farmer than anything else is the 90 percent of parity provision, and the increase in levels of parity which we hope to establish. We shall have to do some amending to improve the situation.

In the area of livestock, there is nothing in the bill which will do anything for cattle and hogs. Perhaps something can be done in that respect indirectly, if we can tie into the bill a feed grain amendment and a livestock amendment to cover cattle and hogs. I have been trying to think in terms of premium payments for certain lightweight cattle and lightweight hogs. With that kind of program, and with a sensible program of purchases when there is an oversupply, we shall have something which will be of help to millions of small farmers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would not the Senator say that we need more than that? Do we not need some kind of credit structure which will permit the farmer to diversify, and to change from one crop to another as the law of supply and demand operates?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I shall send to my office for another letter which I have received from a farm family in Minnesota. The writer of that letter points out that this year one hog bought one pair of overshoes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. One hog bought one pair of overshoes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Please——

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was a small hog.

Mr. CAPEHART. It must have been a very little pig.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. Please——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let us wait until the Senator from Minnesota gets the letter for which he has sent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We shall have all the information for the Senator from Indiana.

The writer of the letter to which I refer pointed out that this time the farmers are running out of money. She says, in effect, "Benson says, 'Let us have more credit.' Is he suggesting that I charge the overshoes?"

We shall need more than a credit program, even though a credit program is sorely needed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the Senator include also an idea in behalf of which he has previously spoken, and which was included in a bill which I introduced last year, as the Senator may remember, namely, the idea of doing something toward expanding technical assistance to small farmers across the country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to reply to the Senator from Alabama.

I will say to the Senator from Alabama that the bill which he introduced a year ago includes many of the features which are needed to help develop what are known as marginal farms, and small farm units.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator believe that we ought to help the marginal farmer, rather than take the attitude that because he is operating a marginal farm he ought to be pushed off the land?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to pursue this thought a little further. I do not wish unduly to delay the Senator from Indiana, who wishes to ask a question.

The Senator from Minnesota said something about the soil bank. Let me say that in my opinion the idea of the soil bank is a very good one. I think we shall have pretty rough going getting it started, but I believe that, over a period of time, it will prove to be an excellent idea.

Again discussing the small farmer, the question that disturbs me is this: How is he going to spare any of his acreage to go into the soil bank? Let me give an example——

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a singular weakness, particularly in the acreage-reserve section of the soil bank. The acreage reserve section of the soil bank is the special new "gimmick."

Mr. SPARKMAN. It comes out of the allotment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the new part of the farm-soil bank program. I think that particular provision would have very little, if any, beneficial effect on the small farmer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me cite one county in my State. I refer to De Kalb County, Ala. I happen to remember certain figures with respect to that county. It is one of the best farming counties in my State. Practically every farm is owned and operated by those who live on it.

Cotton is the principal cash crop in that area. There were cotton allotments for 5,355 farms. The total acreage for that county was 31,000 and a few hundred, or just a little less than an average of 6 acres to the farm. Only 500 of those farms had an acreage in excess of 5 acres. Ninety-five percent of the farm had an acreage of less than 5 acres. They averaged about a bale of cotton to the acre. How is such a small farmer going to be able to give up any of his acreage? He has a most difficult time obtaining financing now, because his acreage is cut down to such a low figure. How is he going to get enough out of the bill to benefit him, except under the 90 percent price-support program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the only chance he has to be benefited by the pending bill. If certain provisions which the committee placed in this measure were not there, he would get no benefits whatsoever.

The so-called administration farm bill, which never got any further than the newspapers, did not have a thing in it for the small farmer. No one can point to anything in that proposal which would benefit the small farmer.

A bill was introduced, known as the administration farm bill, but after a few of us looked into it and pointed out to our colleagues what was in it, the proponents said, "Bury it. Forget that it happened. This is a sad chapter in our lives. Drop it." Everyone withdrew from it as though it were the plague. It was a type of plague.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suggest that we heard no wailing or gnashing of teeth by the brethren across the aisle when that bill was forgotten.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me make one suggestion in conclusion. I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from Minnesota in yielding. I hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, of which the Senator from Minnesota is an able and distinguished member, will not accept this bill as being the final program for helping the farmers, but that they will accept it as something that is being done to give quick help. I hope they will continue to work to get at the root of the farmers' troubles, many of which have been mentioned today in the discussion by the able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my conviction that we must proceed in the areas of farm credit and programs to help the small farmer. The Senator from Alabama has introduced a bill, which he has discussed from time to time on the floor of the Senate, to help the small farmer. Some work needs to be done in those areas.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] spoke about having introduced a bill to give

small farmers more technical aid. That fact shows the complexity of the whole farm situation. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] a moment ago told us about a young man who had to retire from farming because he raised 350 bushels of corn to the acre. Apparently he raised too much because he was too efficient. The able Senator from Alabama introduced a bill which would show the farmer how to raise more. How do the Senators reconcile those two statements?

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to answer that question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to do so.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma did not say the young man had to give up farming because he was too efficient and had produced too much corn. The Senator from Oklahoma was expressing his deep and sad regret that, in spite of the fact that the young man had become so efficient as to produce more on an acre than had ever before been known to be produced on an acre, he still was not able to make a living from farming.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator trying to tell the Senate that a man who can grow 350 bushels of corn to the acre, even at a dollar a bushel or 75 cents a bushel, is losing money? I am a corn farmer, and I happen to know that it takes only $50 or $60 to grow corn.

Mr. KERR. I was merely quoting the statement of the young man who had produced the corn.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator was quoting it to suggest that there was something bad about it.

Mr. KERR. No; something significant.

Mr. CAPEHART. The significance is that anyone who can raise 350 bushels of corn to the acre, and knows one iota about farming, can make money even if he has to sell it for 50 cents a bushel. That would be $175 an acre. I happen to know that it does not cost more than $50 or $60 an acre to grow corn.

Mr. KERR. I want to say to my good friend from Indiana that he is about as good a man as anyone I know who can afford to farm.

Mr. CAPEHART. That may be true. I am rather glad of the fact, and I am not apologizing for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I continue to read from the letter I received from Mrs. Wollenberg:

I want you to know we don't spend a cent on drinking of beer or anything of the sort. Neither one of us smoke. We have been to 3 movies in last 2 years. We work at least 16 to 17 hours a day. We milk 16 or more cows every summer. We truly are careful in spending, and we went in debt $1,900 in last 2 years just because we had to have a better pickup truck; have no car; and we put on a new roof on half of our house. I would like Mr. Benson to tell us why we didn't make enough to pay for every thing we just had to have, besides we need new drill or better one badly. Can't afford it. Where is that prosperity for farmers? I am telling you about ourselves, but it's speaking for thousands of people like us people with families are worse off people right around and every where need to repair homes and new machinery; they can't afford them. I would like Mr. Benson to tell us if they don't improve farm policy where would this lead to in another 2 years or so. We bought a hayfork the other day, $3.79; sold 24 dozen of eggs for $7.26. By the way, laying mash is $4.25 a 100 pounds. That's about enough for 2 weeks, and you have to feed them oats, too; this is for 60 hens.

We understand Mr. Benson with Mr. Eisenhower think small farmers are just a nuisance. Very interesting, and what plans have they got for small family farmers? To slave for co-op farmers or they are not telling, and will have concentration camps to have us work in. This is not nice remark, Mr. HUMPHREY; I apologize to you; but I am hurt and plenty and, believe me, if it wasn't for you and few like you in the Senate, we are sunk and how. Farmers don't want things given to them or handouts. All we ask is to sell our produce and livestock at fair prices. Last fall we sold our big cows at $80 and yearlings at $65 and less; how many do we have to raise of yearlings to meet our expenses? Does Mr. Benson know how much work it is to bring 16 head of yearlings in this cold Northern State? This year we will be feeding stock in the barn for 6 months. We are still keeping 9 head of cattle for our older son and 4 for the younger one, hoping things would get better and they would come back to the farm. My husband and I winter 49 head of cattle. Does Mr. Benson and Mr. Eisenhower know how much feed it takes and how much work there is to take care of that many cattle? We wouldn't need to keep that many could we sell them for better price. That's the answer why we overproduce. So Mr. Benson and Mr. Eisenhower can see what they did with their idea. Soil bank is help to grain farmer, but again to the bigger farmers.

Mr. Eisenhower is crowing about the $60 million a year farmers will get in refund tax on gasoline we use in tractors, how much it will be to a farmer that uses only about $400 worth of gas or fuel. This letter is getting long, but I could write hours. I will just have to say this much. Mr. Eisenhower has questions and answers. Here he has a question. How will soil bank help livestock producers? It's absurd, because it will not work like the rest of these ideas didn't work. He states that participants in soil-bank plan will sign an agreement not to graze their diverted acres. That is Mr. Eisenhower's wishful thinking, but that will never work, since this administration didn't come up with better plans, but got us farmers back in debt. Let them let you, Mr. HUMPHREY, and your supporters get our price support back, and God help you.

My scribbling is bad, but I don't have much time to write. You will notice on Ray's sale bill says due to my health. It's another story to that. He got his ulcer in service in Marines because he had bad knee, but again no one believes until he almost went crippled and developed ulcers, then they let him go with only $31 compensation. But what he would have liked to put on the sale notice, he told just about everyone, "Due to Benson's farm prices." Even the auctioneer referred to that statement.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOHN WOLLENBERG.

Mr. President, this lady may not be a graduate of Vassar College or of Smith College, but she knows something about farming, and she is heartbroken regarding the situation which exists in many of the great farming areas throughout the United States.

I have read this letter, Mr. President, because there is a kind of smugness in many areas with regard to the farm problem. I have heard how rich the farmers are and how they complain. If any other group in the American economy got as raw a deal as the American farmer is getting, they would be marching on Washington. If farmers were organized as business and labor are we would have to pay a much larger amount for our food. We ought to thank God that the farmers are as kindhearted as they are. The farmer of America is only asking from his Government that he be given an opportunity, through orderly marketing and through loans at a low rate of interest, to obtain a fair price for his products.

This administration points with pride to the huge net profits of the General Motors Corp. and all the other big corporations, it points with pride to the fact that there is prosperity in the land; but it is unwilling to offer a price-support program for the farmer that will result in his receiving real income.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When we look at the statistics of a few short years ago we find that the net income of the farmer was $17,200,000,000. When we look at the figures for the last quarter of the year 1955, we find that the net income of the farmer for that year was only $10,200,000,000. Could any other business stand that kind of a drop in income?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Absolutely not. It would be impossible for any other business to stand anywhere near that kind of a drop in income.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Can the farming industry stand it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It cannot stand it, and it is not standing it. Farm indebtedness in this country is going up by leaps and bounds. My colleagues may be interested in knowing that at the end of 1952 farm mortgage indebtedness stood at $5½ billion. Today, it is in excess of $9 billion. An article published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune points out that the Federal Reserve District Bank in Minneapolis reports a 17-percent increase this year over last year in short-term loans. Those are loans which are made to farmers to enable them to put in crops.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Not only do they have to pay back the loan, but they have to amortize it over the year, and they have to pay interest on the mortgages. Still, that is only a part of the picture. We also find that the farmers are paying higher prices for everything they buy, such as fertilizer, and all the other things they use on the farm including tractors and other farm machinery, which all cost more than ever before.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. With all those conditions facing the farmer, the administration at the present time is saying, "We will pull the supports out from under you from 90 per-

cent of parity to a sliding scale, probably down to 75 percent on the basics." Anything that is on a sliding scale always flows down.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The administration first talked about the "sliding price-support scale." Then it began to call it "flexible." Then it called 90 percent "high and rigid." That is the Madison Avenue technique of working over words. Someone told them, "Do not call it 'sliding'; that indicates something slippery, and the only way you can slide is down; you never can slide up." So they began to call it flexible.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am one Member of the Senate who does not feel that the support prices or parity are the underlying causes of our troubles. I think overproduction is the big cause. But the question I would like to ask the Senator is this:

What intelligence has come to the Democrats today that they did not have in 1938 when they controlled Congress and the Presidency, and set the supports at from 52 to 75 percent, then passed a bill during the war to increase them to 90 percent to get more production, and wrote into the bill that, automatically, 2 years after the war ended—and the Korean war came along—the supports would go back to from 52 to 75 percent? What has happened to change the position from 52 to 75 percent, a sliding scale, to a flat rate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy the Senator has brought that up. The Senator was on a radio program with me one Sunday and brought it up at that time, and I hoped he would do it again.

In 1938 we were trying to build a farm program. The whole price level was much different. The country had gone through a period of inflation and it had a period of deflation. We were beginning to build a farm program, and 50 to 75 percent of parity was much better than anyone had ever had before, but it was related somewhat to the overall prices in industry and labor, as well as to the prices of homes and buildings in other areas.

We have one faculty which some of our Republican friends do not have: We learn.

We found out that the program was not good enough. We found out that it did not do very much. We found out that prices were still too low, that farmers were still down at the lower level of the economic ladder. So we moved ahead in the war years to 90 percent of parity. Why? To increase production? No. It was so that if the farmer did increase his production, did overproduce as a patriotic duty during the war, he would not be taken to the cleaners after the war. We did it because of what happened after World War I when we had $2 wheat. After the war we had $1 wheat and 75-cent wheat.

The Senator from Indiana was not present when I discussed this matter. Neither the Senator from Indiana nor any other living man can prove that 90 percent of parity is a production stimulant or that it is too high or that it is responsible for our surpluses. In fact, to the contrary, I can show on the floor of the Senate by statistical facts that lower price supports bring higher production.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I yield. Does the Senator maintain to the contrary?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. I am not maintaining that at all. I am trying to find out what information the Democrats have today that they did not have when the original law was passed. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is filled with the fact that the supports were made 90 percent during the war for one purpose only, and that was to increase production. Then they wrote into the law a provision that 2 years after the war ended, the supports would automatically go back from 90 percent to from 52 to 75 percent. I am trying to find out the facts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to help the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I care not whether it is 52 percent or 90 percent. That is not the point. I think the farmer is entitled to 100 percent of parity in the market place.

In the meantime, I am willing to go ahead with a support plan, and I always have been. But what has happened in this election year to convince the Democrats that from 52 to 75 percent used to be good enough, but that today it must be 90 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the same intelligence and facts which convinced us, when we began a social security program providing $25 a week, that we should proceed to make the benefits $30 or $35; the same intelligence which taught us that although we had a 4-cylinder automobile in 1930, we might well have an 8-cylinder automobile in 1956; the same intelligence which makes us believe in progress; the same intelligence which teaches us that we ought to have the good sense to know what is going on; the intelligence which tells us that although there was once a 20-cent an hour minimum wage, it should be brought up to 50 cents, 75 cents, and now to $1.

I know this kind of thinking runs contrary to Republican theory; I know it runs against Republican views.

It is somewhat shocking to me to hear someone go back to a 1938 law and say, "That was all you could think of in 1938. How come you have changed your mind?"

We have even amended the Constitution. We have changed our minds about some parts of the Constitution. We have changed our minds about the rates of postage. We have changed our minds about the speed of automobile operation on the highways. We have changed our minds about the designs of radios, televisions, automobiles, and houses.

Are we supposed to say that 1938 was the year of decision, the time of divine inspiration? How does it happen that new ideas have been developed since 1938? It is an old Democratic habit. I know this will be shocking to some of my friends, but it is the old habit of learning as we go along.

The Senator from Indiana wants to know what new intelligence we have. It comes from experience, practical adaptation, learning what is going on.

Our goal ought not to be 90 percent of parity; it ought to be 100 percent of parity.

Housing loans were once made on a 90-percent mortgage guaranty basis. But we learned from experience. The Senator from Indiana learned by experience. We went from a 90- to a 95-percent guaranty on housing loans. That was price support for builders, price support for bankers. Guaranteed mortgage loans were all right as price supports for the housing industry. But price supports are not all right for agriculture, I hear. They are bad for agriculture, I have heard. Some persons have said they were bad for agriculture, but it was not the junior Senator from Minnesota who said it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Would it be in error to say that what one was thinking back in 1896 would not enable him to realize what would happen in 1938?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, indeed; 1938 would have seemed quite advanced to an 1896 thinker.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Indiana seemed to be quite shocked a while ago because someone had sold a hog and had received only enough with which to buy a pair of overshoes, thus evidencing the same lack of information about the grim realities of the whole matter before us which is so characteristic of Senators on the other side of the aisle.

I hold in my hand an NEA telephoto of a farmer who is displaying a sales slip concerning the sale of a calf. I am certain the Senator from Indiana will be interested in hearing about this, since he could not understand how it was that someone could sell a hog and not be able to buy more than a pair of overshoes. This is what the NEA news item says:

> Sells calf at loss: Farmer Albert Howland, of Neosho, Mo., has reduced the farmer's plight to simple arithmetic. Howland, who milks 14 cows on an 80-acre farm, recently sent a 2-week-old Jersey calf to market at Neosho. It sold for $1.25. The sales ticket Howland displays shows a total deduction of 90 cents—60 cents commission, 25 cents yardage fees, and 5 cents for insurance. That left him 35 cents balance. Then the trucker who took the calf to market billed Howland $1 and Howland ended up with a 65-cent loss.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma has given us more useful information.

I wish to go back for a moment. The Senator from Indiana was talking about the act of 1938. I should like to quote from page 3607 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6, 1941, when the act of 1938 was being amended, and when the so-called Steagall amendments were being brought into the legislative picture. Senator Bankhead was at that time, I believe, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. He said:

> Mr. President, the subject of parity income for farmers is one of paramount importance at this time. As a result of the expenditure

of billions of dollars by the Federal Government in its national preparedness program prices of industrial commodities are getting higher. The pay of industrial workers is increasing, and those increases are reflected in the cost of industrial commodities which the farmers must buy. The foreign markets for some of the basic agricultural commodities, particularly cotton and wheat, have completely disappeared. Six or seven million bales of cotton which have normally been exported each year are now eliminated from world trade. Millions of bushels of wheat which in normal times are sold to foreign markets annually are now held in elevators under Government loans. Excessive surpluses of corn are also in the ever-normal granaries.

That was under the old flexible system. Price supports had been flexed down to 52 percent of parity, as will be pointed out later; I have the figures.

From page 3610 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 6, 1941, listen to this:

> There is no prospect for an increase in the price of wheat and cotton. There is on hand at this time the largest surplus of each of these commodities in the known history of the world.

One would think that Ezra Benson and the other Republicans would have read that. The economy was under flexible price supports, and the supports were flexed down so far that the economy was practically on its back. There were surpluses and surpluses. But what did Congress do? Did Congress decide to correct the situation? Yes. It decided to put an effective system of price supports and production controls into effect, which is exactly what the 90 percent of parity program results in. That was what Senator Bankhead said.

The object of the bill before the Senate is to take another step toward benefiting basic agricultural commodities. What does it mean when we speak about the "parity price"? It means a fair price for farm products and a fair income for farmers.

Then Senator Bankhead goes on to tell about the use of the yardstick of a base parity. There is considerable discussion about the parity price picture, but I think the important factor to be noted is that at the very time when there were huge surpluses, and Congress was attempting to do something about the depressed conditions in agriculture, Congress came forth with a 90-percent-of-parity program. The results speak for themselves. They were effective results.

Mr. President, I am now going to turn to a matter almost apart from what I would call the regular presentation of my debate on the agricultural situation. I hope my colleagues will remain in the Chamber, if that be possible, because I propose to bring to their attention something which will be rather shocking. I want to amplify earlier charges about some of the attempts to lobby and to influence legislation. Propaganda barrages have been circulated, and misconceptions have been deliberately created.

Some of my colleagues have expressed interest in the organized public-relations campaign being conducted against the farm bill now before the Senate, particularly in view of the recent determination expressed by this body to examine carefully all lobbying attempts to influence legislation.

Because of some of the questions which have been raised, I shall depart briefly from the intended order of my remarks to expand a bit on the professional public relations techniques and operations being brought into this administration. Any of my colleagues who are interested in the lobbying question will receive some first-class information about how experts lobby.

Perhaps what I shall say will help explain how some of the myths I intend exposing, as I go along, became implanted in the public mind in the first place.

I found some of my colleagues amazed that the Republican senatorial and congressional campaign committees were conducting an organized campaign of newspaper advertising and radio advertising throughout the country, even to the extent of printing coupons for farmers to sign and send to their representatives, telling them how to vote. Apparently this advertising campaign has not been too effective with farmers, however; otherwise more Members of Congress would have heard about it, and more of them would have been impressed with it.

In any event, it was not news to me. I warned on the floor of the Senate some time ago that the Republicans were setting out to spend up to a quarter of a million dollars to defeat the only provisions in the bill which meant added income to farmers this year. I hope my colleagues will listen to what I am about to say.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] pleaded for bipartisan consideration of the farm bill. He met with the Secretary of Agriculture to assure the Secretary of bipartisan consideration of and support for the farm bill. The Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, asked all the members of the committee to join together on one bill. He asked Republicans and Democrats alike to agree on one bill, so as to keep the entire matter on the basis of an economic discussion and a policy discussion, rather than a partisan discussion.

In the midst of the committee hearings the Secretary of Agriculture went across the country and engaged in some of the most partisan speeches ever delivered by a Cabinet officer. We have witnessed since that time a campaign of organized propaganda—a campaign, I am happy to report, I exposed before it even came about, on February 14, 1956.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a press statement I issued to that effect on February 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP TO SPEND QUARTER MILLION FIGHTING FARM INCOME GAINS

Farmers of the Nation were warned by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, that the Republican National Committee was about to spend $250,000 "to defeat the only provisions in the new farm bill that would increase farm income."

"I am reliably informed that the Republican National Committee has authorized spending a quarter of a million dollars on an advertising and public relations campaign purportedly to support the administration's version of the farm bill," Senator HUMPHREY said.

"What they obviously mean is to defeat the improvements added by the Senate Committee on Agriculture designed to increase income of farmers this year.

"I am shocked by such a brazen repudiation of the bipartison work of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, after all the lip service the Secretary of Agriculture has given to keeping politics out of the farm bill," he declared.

The only provisions in the new bill meaning more income for farmers this year were new provisions added by the Senate Committee, Senator HUMPHREY declared.

"Not one thing in the administration's proposal adds to farm income this year, despite all the misleading impressions being given the American people.

"It is time they told the people the truth—that the administration's version of the soil bank was designed solely at solving its own problem of what to do about the surplus on its hands, without any intention of bolstering farm income this year.

"All that the soil bank payments amount to are replacement of income a farmer would have been entitled to if he planted up to his full allotment, instead of taking a voluntary cut. It is just partially replaced income, not in any way increased income.

"The entire emphasis of the administration's proposal has been upon what the farmer does not produce, without any regard or concern for prices on what he does produce.

"We have corrected this by seeking to assure more farmers of some semblance of decent prices for what they do produce, as a means of enabling more of them to cooperate in production adjustments without drastic loss of farm income.

"If the Republican National Committee insists on its Madison Avenue high-pressure advertising campaign against these changes made by our Senate Committee on Agriculture, it is just one more indication that the Republican Party does not really care very much about what happens to farmers and farm income.

"All they seem concerned about is getting rid of food stocks now in Government hands, regardless of what happens to the farmer.

"If they are as concerned as they profess about this so-called but greatly overrated surplus, why don't they start really giving some attention to wiser use of our abundance both at home and abroad, through such ideas as a domestic good stamp plan to supplement diets of low-income families, and a world food bank to combat famine abroad?" Senator HUMPHREY asked.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I repeat that this huge expenditure is boomeranging in farm areas.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to place in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Shakopee Valley News, of Shakopee, Minn., published February 23—one of our newspapers that published the paid ad I have referred to about "Help Eisenhower pass the new farm program—you will benefit this year if Congress acts before spring planting time," as the misleading advertisement so temptingly claims.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKE YOUR WISHES KNOWN

On another page of this newspaper appears a paid ad, sponsored by the National Republican Congressional and Senatorial Com-

mittee. It came to us from a New York advertising agency, and is accepted for publication in this newspaper at regular rates.

Its publication does not by any means indicate that the editor of this newspaper is in agreement with the content of the advertisement nor the method used to sell the present farm program to the farmers. While we are proud of the ability of advertising in this newspaper to obtain results, in this instance we are dubious if many of our farm readers will buy the story. Particularly since every Member of Congress from Minnesota, with the exception of Representative WALTER JUDD—who represents urban south Minneapolis—is not completely in favor of the farm program as presented to Congress.

Obviously, the purpose of the ad is to sell the nine-point program and to obtain as many expressions of support as possible. It might be well for those opposed, those who favor 90 percent of parity, for instance, to also write their congressional leaders and state their views. A 2-cent post card containing a message as brief as "I favor 90 percent of parity, now," would be enough. You can write your Senators, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and EDWARD J. THYE, the Senate Office Building, Washington, while the Congressman from this area is Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

A better editorial on the subject is the letter to the editor from a Scott County farm mother printed in this issue. It is well worth your reading.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the editorial contains some worthwhile information, and I hope it will be carefully read.

It is interesting to read that newspaper's reaction. It publishes the ad, but adds that "its publication does not by any means indicate that the editor of this newspaper is in agreement with the content of the advertisement nor the method used to sell the present farm program to farmers."

The editor of the Shakopee Valley News has more courage and honesty than have many editors. Weekly newspapers need advertising to survive, and most would welcome such a handout from the Republicans with open arms. And it is mighty difficult to resist the temptation of showing their appreciation by editorially supporting what they are getting paid to run.

But this editor goes on to say:

While we are proud of the ability of advertising in this newspaper to obtain results, in this instance we are dubious if many of our farm readers will buy the story.

The editor apparently knows his farm readers better than does the Republican high command here in Washington.

He winds up his editorial with the comment, "A better editorial on the subject is the letter to the editor from a Scott County farm mother, printed in this issue. It is well worth your reading."

Mr. President, I agree.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to read these nine points and ask the Senator whether he is opposed to them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have read those points several times in the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator object to any of the nine points?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is like asking someone if he objects to faith, hope, and charity, and mother love. Those nine points are about as pointed as a billiard ball.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. 9 in the ad reads:

Refund gasoline tax to farmers on motor fuel used in farming operations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that the Republican farm program?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am talking about what is in the ad. Is the Senator opposed to that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. CAPEHART. Still reading from the ad, No. 8 reads:

Assure adequate credit to farmers to meet capital needs of present farmers, help young farmers get started, tide farmers over emergencies.

Is the Senator opposed to that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is like asking someone, "Are you opposed to the calendar?" Why do we not talk about specific proposals?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. 7 reads:

Increase farm research appropriation to find new uses and new markets for farm crops, lower production costs, and increase farm profits.

Is the Senator opposed to that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Indiana opposed to Christmas?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. 6 reads:

Push forward the Great Plains program to stabilize income in drought-stricken areas, and to prevent another dust bowl.

Is the Senator opposed to that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. How does the Senator feel about Mother's Day? That is just as fair a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. 5 reads:

Expand rural-development program to help low-income farm families live better, earn more.

Is the Senator opposed to that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Proceed.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. 4 reads:

Protect family-type farms by limiting the size of price-support loans made to large corporate-type farms.

Is the Senator opposed to that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; but the Department of Agriculture is. Its representatives came before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and said it was unworkable. They said it was administratively impossible. I thought that President Eisenhower had something to say about this administration. Possibly not. Maybe he was away at that time and had nothing to say about it, but Under Secretary of Agriculture True Morse said this was an unworkable procedure. That is one of the nine points. We shall have to strike that one out.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. 3 reads:

Strengthen commodity programs on wheat, corn, dairy products, soybeans, cotton, and rice. Ease production controls wherever possible.

Is the Senator opposed to that one?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Indiana, since he is indulging in this questioning period—although I have the floor, I am happy to yield to him—this administration has imposed more restrictions on farmers than has any other administration. The present administration prattles about freedom from controls, and then imposes more controls, more acreage limitations, more quotas than has any other administration in the history of the Nation. This administration did not ask for a better program for commodities; it asked for permission to increase commodity restrictions.

Mr. CAPEHART. Still reading from the ad, No. 2 reads:

Laws to permit faster surplus disposal especially in foreign markets. Selling, not storage, is the answer.

Is the Senator opposed to that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I am not opposed to that anymore than I am opposed to having 29 days in February every leap year. I trust and suggest the Senator is too wise a man to read such glaring generalities and say they constitute a program. I hope the Senator is not going to go around in Indiana and campaign before his farmers on the basis of such generalities.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. 1 reads:

A voluntary, 2-point soil bank to take 40 to 45 million acres out of production of your problem crops, get rid of the surplus, raise prices.

An acreage reserve which uses the surplus to reduce the surplus.

A conservation reserve to prevent future surpluses and to build back soil for future needs.

Is the Senator opposed to that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; until I find out how much money it involves.

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, I see.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my friend from Indiana that a nice speech can be made on the floor about a soil bank, such as the Senator has read, but how much is to be paid in benefits to the farmers?

Mr. CAPEHART. I was merely reading the nine points to which the Senator was objecting. The minute I read them, I knew the Senator from Minnesota was in agreement with all of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Nobody is objecting to the philosophy and the righteousness and tonal qualities of this particular ad, except it is not before the Congress to be voted on. The only bill which was ever introduced in conformity with it was finally withdrawn by the sponsors of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point I was making was that the Senator agreed with the 9 points.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are just about as pointed as a tennis ball. I previously said billiard ball, but I shall soften it up. A billiard ball is too hard. It is like asking, "Do you believe in law and order?" The answer would be "Yes." The next question would be, "Do you believe in a speed law not to exceed 25 miles an hour?" The answer might be, "That goes beyond law and order."

The Republican administration has said it wants parity in the market place. We have never been told how the farmers were going to get it. The administration says it wants farm credit, but it curtails farm credit. The administration says it wants agricultural research, but when it sends its budget to

Congress it cuts down the request for research appropriations. The administration says it wants soil conservation, but when its budget is sent to Congress, it cuts its request for soil conservation. The administration says it wants school lunches, but when it sends its budget to Congress, it cuts its request for appropriations for that program. The administration says it wants everything that would do good, but it does not want to pay for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask the Senator a question of fact, because in the advertisement which has been the subject of the discussion, there is a point—I think it is point 3—in regard to protecting commodity prices.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Point 3 reads:

> Strengthen commodity programs on wheat, corn, dairy products, soybeans, cotton and rice. Ease production controls wherever possible.

What an escape hatch.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that ever since Mr. Benson has been Secretary of Agriculture, starting early in 1953, he has proceeded to exercise the discretion he has had under existing law to cut support prices on item after item, with the result that there is not a single agricultural commodity over which he has had jurisdiction as to which he has not followed a course of action which has resulted in cutting of prices, save and except as to wool, and in the case of wool, the Congress passed the wool bill, so he could not touch that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to read into the RECORD the type of loans available at the moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator mind placing it in the RECORD?

Mr. CAPEHART. I could do that. I thought the Senator might yield me enough time to read it, but I shall be guided by his wishes. Let me read the headlines: "Production and Subsistence Loans"; "Soil and Water Conservation Loans"; "Farm Ownership Loans"; Special Livestock Loans"; "Emergency Loans."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement, which contains an explanation of each of those items, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farmers' Home Administration loans in recent years have broken all records

United States:

1953	$228,500,000
1954	292,500,000
1955	293,189,000

TYPES OF LOANS AVAILABLE

Production and subsistence loans: For equipment, livestock, feed, fertilizer, seed, other farm and home operating expenses. Repayable over 7-year period. Up to $10,000 can be borrowed.

Soil and water conservation loans: For financing soil-conservation measures, for developing water supply systems for farm homes, livestock, and irrigation. Repayable over periods up to 20 years. Passed by 83d Congress.

Farm ownership loans: For purchase and development of family-type farms and for construction and repair of houses and other buildings on family-type farms. Repayable over 40 years.

Special livestock loans: For feed, repairs, labor, replacement of livestock, and other operating expenses necessary to continued operations. Payable over 3 years. Passed by the 83d Congress.

Emergency loans: For meeting operating expenses required for continuing normal operations. Available in designated areas where need for credit exists because of economic conditions or losses resulting from natural disasters. Secretary Benson on February 21, 1956, authorized loans under Public Law 727, 83d Congress, in Indiana and 12 other Midwestern and Southern States. Emergency loans previously authorized in many other areas. Emergency authorities broadened by 83d Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Indiana tell us how many the Republicans sponsored, and how many this administration is responsible for?

Mr. CAPEHART. Frankly, I do not know. But I wanted to make that statement during the debate, because a few minutes ago the Senator from Minnesota was complaining that this administration was not helping the farmers, through loans, and that the farmers should have more credit.

If the Senator from Minnesota and his colleagues wish to take credit for these proposals, the least they should do is not criticize this program. They may take the credit if they wish—I do not care. But if they do, they should not criticize their own program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Indiana through?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The point is, not that there are not enough loans in number, but that the loans do not total a sufficient amount in dollars. Under this administration, the amount available to the Farmers Home Administration has been reduced.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, Mr. President; I do not yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. You cut back——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I did not yield to my perpetual interrupter. [Laughter.]

Let me say that the funds which have been available under this administration, and for which the administration attempts to take credit, have generally been made available in increasing the amounts by action of the Congress of the United States. The administration takes credit for a big soil-conservation program, whereas its budget request cut the heart out of that program. But the Congress restored the program. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] took a very leading role in the restoration of that sum of money.

In the case of the emergency cattle loans, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and other Senators fought on this floor to have that program authorized. What the administration did do in a great hurry, and all by itself, was to increase the interest rate applying to the emergency loans; and Congress had to reduce the rate, later.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] brought that matter to our attention in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and the Congress had to pass a bill to prevent the administration from increasing the interest rate.

Now we have to enact a law to compel the Secretary of Agriculture to raise the parity rate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter, which was published in the readers' column of the Shakopee Valley News. The letter is from Mrs. George Knebel, of Prior Lake, Minn.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Shakopee Valley News of February 23, 1956]

To the EDITOR:

May I give you a housewifely example of the price squeeze that is pinching the farmers?

Recently, we bought our little son a pair of overshoes for $4.50. It turned out that they weren't as sturdy as they looked. And as they were no good, it set me to thinking. (An involved process for me.)

We had paid 45 pounds of pork for the overshoes.

In 1953—45 pounds of pork equaled $12;

In 1954—45 pounds of pork equaled $9;

In 1955—45 pounds of pork equaled $4.50 or a pair of small overshoes. So $9 to $12 equals $4.50 to us now. It doesn't sound like 1 plus 1 equals 2 and it doesn't appeal to my sense of economy.

To my further dismay, the Republicans paid out $250,000 to advertise their farm program. The eighth point in the program is extended easy credit to farmers. So then in 1956, do we charge our overshoes? That would be the next obvious step down.

I am no politician but think well before you send in that little slip so conveniently printed on the bottom of these Republican advertisements.

Mrs. GEORGE KNEBEL.

PRIOR LAKE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the letter, Mrs. Knebel writes as follows:

> May I give you a housewifely example of the price squeeze that is pinching the farmers?
>
> Recently, we bought our little son a pair of overshoes for $4.50. It turned out that they weren't as sturdy as they looked. And as they were no good, it set me to thinking. (An involved process for me.)
>
> We had paid 45 pounds of pork for the overshoes.
>
> In 1953—45 pounds of pork equaled $12;
>
> In 1954—45 pounds of pork equaled $9;
>
> In 1955—45 pounds of pork equaled $4.50 or a pair of overshoes. So $9 to $12 equals $4.50 to us now. It doesn't sound like 1 plus 1 equals 2, and it doesn't appeal to my sense of economy.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will read that letter. It is short and to the point; it contains a great amount of logic. In fact, it contains more logic than do any of the arguments presented at length on this floor about what is happening to agriculture. Mrs. Knebel simply points out that she bought her

little son a pair of overshoes costing $4.50—and it required 45 pounds of pork to pay for them. She writes:

To my further dismay, the Republicans paid out $250,000 to advertise their farm program. The eighth point in the program is extended easy credit to farmers. So then in 1956, do we charge our overshoes? That would be the next obvious step down.

Then listen to her conclusion:

I am no politician, but think well before you send in that little slip so conveniently printed on the bottom of these Republican advertisements.

Mrs. Knebel has said a mouthful, and has performed a public service for other farm wives and mothers.

Advertising, no matter how effective, will not explain away the lack of any money in the hands of farm people after a year's work. A slick advertising program of the sort we have been discussing will help no one except the person who is paid for publishing the advertisement. Generalized statements about specific problems, rounded-out statements which mean all things to all people, do not fool the farm people. The farm people are not fooled as easily as some Senators seem to be. The farm people do not "buy" that kind of language. They will not accept it, because they want to know what rate of interest will be charged for the loans. That is what they want to know, instead of being told Eisenhower generalities about "more farm credit"—but actually meaning none, Mr. President. The farm people want to know something specific about strengthening programs. They have heard the malarkey about "bold, courageous, forward-looking programs" and the other slogans of the Republicans. The farmers have heard those things long enough. Now they want to know whether they will receive 90 percent of parity or a smaller percentage of parity, and they want to know what the interest rate will be.

Mr. President, such advertisements are an insult to the farmers of America. Furthermore, such advertisements are but a further indication of the lack of understanding on the part of this administration and its public relations experts in regard to what farmers need and what farmers are thinking about.

Mr. President, this advertising approach is nothing new in this administration.

We have been witnessing a strange transition into government by public-relations experts, from the White House on down. Today, we have in our Government people who seem to think it is just a big show, where professional experts are hired to try to fool the people and make them like it.

When a Cabinet officer finds he is unpopular and that the people disagree with the administration's policies, the administration does not seem to think about changing the policies. Instead, they call in some new public-relations experts.

The big-business executives in this Government are so used to selling the public that they are always right, that they have brought the same idea right into our Government.

So I suppose it is perfectly understandable, in view of this general attitude, what our Republican leaders would do when they faced an election year, and realized they had a Secretary of Agriculture whose name was practically a bad word in most of rural America.

Mr. President, if you do not think Mr. Benson's name is a bad word in most of rural America, let me refer to a letter I have just received from the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer, of Racine, Wis. This outstanding publication has been serving Wisconsin farm families for more than 105 years. It is a conservative agricultural publication. The managing editor is Mr. Arthur G. Broughton; and enclosed with his letter he sent a page proof from the March 3 issue. That page proof contains information which he describes as follows:

The enclosed page proof from the March 3 issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturist contains information which we think may interest you. Please feel free to use it in any way you see fit.

Well, Mr. Broughton, I am just about to use it. I now point out, Mr. President, that page proof enclosed in the letter reads, in part, as follows:

Only 4 Wisconsin farmers out of 100 are willing to stand up and declare that Secretary Benson is doing a good job. You can see that the Secretary would hardly win a popularity contest in Wisconsin.

A big 55 percent of the State's farmers argue that he is definitely doing a poor job, while another 26 percent are kind of on the fence. They say that Benson is doing a fair job.

These are some of the figures dug up by a recent Wisconsin Agriculturist poll. They are the up-to-date thinking of how Benson is doing.

Mr. President, that poll has been going on for years. For example, in July 1953, 30 percent thought Mr. Benson was doing a good job, 42 percent thought he was doing a fair job, and 13 percent thought he was doing a poor job.

In September 1954, 14 percent—instead of the previous 30 percent—thought Mr. Benson was doing a good job; 38 percent—instead of the previous 42 percent—thought he was doing a fair job; and 37 percent—instead of the previous 13 percent—thought he was doing a poor job.

In September 1955 the opinion of Wisconsin farmers about Mr. Benson had changed even more; at that time they had an even worse opinion of him: 12 percent then said Mr. Benson was doing a good job; 34 percent said he was doing a fair job; and 45 percent said he was doing a poor job.

Then we find that in January 1956, only 4 percent thought Mr. Benson was doing a good job; 26 percent thought Mr. Benson was doing a fair job; 55 percent thought Mr. Benson was doing a poor job; and 15 percent made no answer.

In fact, the "no answer" percentages have ranged from 9 percent to 15 percent, between July 1953 and January 1956.

So it is perfectly understandable, Mr. President, why the Republicans want to have a public-relations firm do something about this matter.

Of course, the best way to do something about it is to change the policies. Similarly, the best way for the Russians to improve their international relations is, not to change what they say, but to change what they do. In other words, the best way for the Soviet Union to get along with the rest of the world is for the Soviet Union to change its policies, not to hire a public-relations firm.

Similarly, the best way for this administration to become popular with the farmers is to change its policies, instead of hiring a public-relations firm. But, Mr. President, the administration hired one—and what a pip.

They did not try to change the Secretary, or change his policies. The administration just hired some public relations experts to glamorize him into a more attractive package to "sell" to the supposedly naive and innocent American farmers. They are anything but that, judging from the letters which we have received.

This morning I read a column to the effect that apparently there was not very much interest in the farm debate, that it was not a very controversial issue. Let me say to my friends of the Fourth Estate that if they want to see how controversial it is, all they need to do is to come to my office and take a look at the mail which I receive, or go to any other Senator's office. If I were to ask Senators, one by one, "On what issue do you receive more mail than on any other?"—the answer would be, without a doubt, "The agricultural issue." The farmers are speaking up in no uncertain terms.

If they could run a State Department by hucksterism, members of the administration must have reasoned, there is no reason why they could not popularize a failure into a supposedly successful Secretary of Agriculture.

So that is what was done. I think it is good for us to know this, to know what we have to combat. Reason and logic and the facts, apparently, are no longer enough. You have to compete with the Madison Avenue approach. There are great agricultural experts on Madison Avenue. They have three petunia plants to every block. If it was good enough to keep the people thinking the President can do no wrong, or be responsible for anything wrong, no matter how much may go wrong with his administration, I suppose the experts got the feeling that they had good justification for thinking it might even work on Benson.

We were forewarned by a story in the December 13 issue of the New York Times, headlined "GOP Promoting Its Farm Policy." The subheading said: "Hires Public Relations Firm To Sell Program With Eye on Next Year's Election."

I should like to read a few opening portions of that story. This is how it starts:

WASHINGTON, December 12.—The administration and the Republican National Committee have embarked on a public-relations program calculated to turn a sow's ear into a silk purse.

The Republicans have retained a leading public-relations concern to turn the administration's farm policy, which seems to be unpopular among farmers, into an asset before the 1956 elections.

The Republicans believe they have failed to make a strong counteroffensive against Democratic attacks on the soundness of the policy. To remedy this, they have hired Braun & Co., of Los Angeles, as consultant to the national committee's farm division.

Let me digress from the article for a moment, to repeat that name: Braun & Co. I ask Senators to remember it.

What was Braun & Co. going to do?

Let me read the next paragraph:

The concern will help guide Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, on his public relations, including speeches and other public pronouncements on farm problems.

This explains why Benson's speeches have no relationship whatsoever to the facts which his own Department presents in the Agricultural Marketing Service bulletins. I apologize to Mr. Benson for criticizing him for the manner in which he used those facts. He hired a firm in Los Angeles, next to Hollywood, to prepare the farm speeches, but they never got around to finding out that there were such things as facts, or Mr. Benson would never have been making the speeches he was making.

Continuing with the article:

It will also cover relations with Congress, as that body tackles new agriculture legislation and suggestions by Mr. Benson.

If my colleagues do not know that they are being public relationed, I wish to inform them that they are. This firm is being paid a great deal of money to public relations use. I suppose that is why they have been able to offer a special deal on corn, a special deal on rice, a special deal here, there, and everywhere, as a part of the public relations program.

There is more to the article, and I think my colleagues will want to read it all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire story appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP PROMOTING ITS FARM POLICY—HIRES PUBLIC RELATIONS FIRM TO SELL PROGRAM WITH EYE ON NEXT YEAR'S ELECTION

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, December 12.—The administration and the Republican National Committee have embarked on a public relations program calculated to turn sow's ear into a silk purse.

The Republicans have retained a leading public-relations concern to turn the administration's farm policy, which seems to be unpopular among farmers, into an asset before the 1956 elections.

The Republicans believe they have failed to make a strong counteroffensive against Democratic attacks on the soundness of the policy. To remedy this, they have hired Braun & Co., of Los Angeles, as consultant to the National Committee's farm division.

TO HELP GUIDE BENSON

The concern will help guide Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, on his public relations, including speeches and other public pronouncements on farm problems. It will also cover relations with Congress as that body tackles new agriculture legislation and suggestions by Mr. Benson.

Republican political leaders, members of Congress and other party men have long complained that Mr. Benson, while sound in principles, has failed to build confidence among farmers during the difficult period of adjusting production to consumption.

Committee officials said the immediate problem was "to keep within the Secretary's principles but recognize that there is a practical political job ahead."

The committee's farm division will be expanded to include personnel in the field to work with GOP farm groups and farmers themselves. Rollis S. Nelson has transferred from Mr. Benson's staff to head the division which has been inactive in recent months as farm prices and income sagged.

Ted Braun, head of the public-relations concern, has put Jennings Phillips in charge of the Washington operation. Mr. Phillips has managed the concern's Salt Lake City division since 1942. He is a former western newspaperman and once was political editor of the Salt Lake City Telegram.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I certainly have nothing against Braun & Co. They have been doing a mighty impressive job. They have been doing the job they have been paid to do.

While I personally question the propriety of such an approach to good government, I recognize the right of the Republican National Committee and Secretary Benson to use any means at their command to try to convince farmers that he is not so bad after all.

We talk about the Benson farm program. Let us quit kidding ourselves. This is the Eisenhower farm program, which is bankrupting American agriculture. Benson would not be there for another minute if the President were to take time out to dismiss him.

I think we have been a little unfair to Mr. Benson. He is carrying out orders. He is loyal to the "Chief." The President of the United States is responsible for this farm program. Mr. Benson is there because the President wants him there. So I want whatever I say in this speech relating to Mr. Benson to go right back where it belongs, to the top roost, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the White House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To bring out the situation clearly, Mr. Benson is there because the President appointed him. Is not that true?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. He remains there at the pleasure of the President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The President can remove him any time he desires to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. Benson is supposed to carry out the orders of the President, is he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is exactly correct. Let me say that many times the President has supported Mr. Benson, as he should do if Mr. Benson is being kept on the job.

Furthermore, the reason the public relations firm was hired was that, so long as the President was going to have Mr. Benson on the job carrying out Mr. Eisenhower's policies, and so long as the policies were not to be changed, policies which have made it difficult for Mr. Benson to have any following in this country, something had to be done about glamorizing Mr. Benson. There is a simple way to popularize Mr. Benson, and that is to change the policy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I assume the Senator from Minnesota will not be surprised when I tell him that a farmer came before our Agricultural Committee at Columbia, S. C., and stated that President Eisenhower had made a speech on the Statehouse steps, across the street from where we were meeting, in which he stated that he was for 90-percent parity, and for 100 percent in the marketplace. The farmer said, "I was surprised at that, but I now find that he is not for that policy." He said, "You know, I sent that man my check for $750 to help him in the campaign." Today he is saying that President Eisenhower ought to fire Mr. Benson because he is not carrying out the program upon which Eisenhower was elected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have a better, surer system. The only thing to do is to see that there is a change in the administration next year. The public will have to register its votes, to fire the man who ought to be firing Benson.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that yesterday at his press conference the President reaffirmed his rigid and inflexible support of Mr. Benson's flexible supports?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

So the public relations firm was hired. It has a big job, requiring a big, experienced agency. It has been busy at the job. It has opened special offices, and brought an experienced political writer here from Secretary Benson's home State to direct the propaganda operations. Perhaps it is responsible for the fine Republican speech which Secretary Benson delivered at a recent GOP rally in St. Paul. It was a very interesting speech. I saw the Secretary at the joint meeting of the House and Senate the other day, and I congratulated him on the speech which he had delivered at St. Paul. It had a great deal of humor in it. I should have said it consisted mostly of humor, and not substance, but I congratulated him on its humor. It was better than Mr. Benson's usual speeches, especially the crack about, "You don't play on Hubert's private course if you shoot under 90."

Golf has a way of permeating the administration, even down through the Department of Agriculture. Secretary Benson says, "You don't play on Hubert's private course if you shoot under 90."

What he was saying, in effect, was, "You do not go into Minnesota and talk about farm problems unless you say '90 percent of parity or over'."

The Secretary surely knew the temperament of Minnesota farmers. I do not call Minnesota "Hubert's course." The State of Minnesota is not a golf course. The State of Minnesota consists of productive land, where people do

something besides chase a little ball. The State of Minnesota consists of productive farm land, industries, machinery, and energetic people.

But good or bad public relations experts as they may be, I seriously question the propriety of Secretary Benson and the Republican National Committee using them under circumstances I feel compelled to mention.

Whether Secretary Benson knows it or not, the public relations firm engaged to "popularize" him stands accused by the Justice Department of conspiring in criminal violations of the antitrust law. That is the Braun Co.

That is a rather blunt charge, and I regret I have to make it. I would not make it if I could not document everything I am saying. And I would not make it if I did not feel this Senate should know about it.

Let me emphasize I am in no way attempting to pass upon the guilt or innocence of this firm.

I have not brought the charges. Attorney General Brownell has.

It just seems to me that our Cabinet officers should get together now and then and compare notes. We have had plenty of strange conflicts within this administration, but this is one of the most glaring.

Here we have one Cabinet member accusing a public relations firm of being a coconspirator in antitrust violations, and the same firm is engaged not only to popularize another Cabinet officer, but to help with his relations with Congress.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to complete this paragraph; then I shall be glad to yield.

If Attorney General Brownell is wrong about this firm, I hope Secretary Benson will tell him so, to avoid any personal embarrassment of having his personal press agents prosecuted. If Secretary Benson is wrong in making use of the services of this firm, I hope the Attorney General will pick up the telephone and tell him so. I do not think even Secretary Benson would like to be popularized by a firm one of his fellow Cabinet officers is prosecuting.

The departments of the Government have representatives in the galleries. They are listening to what is being said here. If any of those representatives are in the gallery today, I suggest that they take back word to their departments that if Mr. Brownell is wrong, Mr. Benson should tell him. If Mr. Benson is wrong, Mr. Brownell should tell him. They should get together. Here we have a public relations firm facing prosecution by the Department of Justice for violating the antitrust laws. It was originally involved in a criminal indictment, which was later changed to a civil suit plus what in legal terminology is a "criminal information." I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, does the Senator believe that the President knows anything about it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am having trouble enough trying to keep up with what the President is supposed to know about.

Mr. KERR. A short time ago the President issued quite a denunciation of the arrogance of lobbyists in Congress. Can the Senator tell me anything that is more arrogant than the practice of the Secretary of Agriculture in employing a firm which is under prosecution on a charge like that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not remember anything that might be more arrogant, or, if the Senator will permit me to say so, more stupid.

Mr. KERR. Either the Justice Department is arrogant in prosecuting the firm, or Benson is arrogant in employing the firm while it is under prosecution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will accept that evaluation.

The charge against Braun & Co. brought by Attorney General Brownell involves a civil antitrust suit and criminal information filed against Safeway Stores, Inc.

The action brought by Brownell specifically names Braun & Co. as coconspirators designating it as "a corporation engaged in public relations counseling, and is so employed by Safeway."

I wish the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] were on the floor. A number of times on the floor of the Senate he has pointed to some of the practices which are indulged in in connection with the purchasing of meat products by some of the large grocery firms. It is interesting to note where Secretary Benson gets most of his advice on the subject of meat products, as well as other advice.

Mr. President, I would prefer to let the charges signed by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., speak for themselves.

I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a copy of Criminal Action No. 9584, filed November 1, 1955, in the United States District Court, Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division, entitled "United States of America against Safeway Stores, Inc., Lingan A. Warren, and Earl Cliff."

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* SAFEWAY STORES, INCORPORATED, LINGAN A. WARREN, AND EARL CLIFF, DEFENDANTS—CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 9584—FILED NOVEMBER 1, 1955

INFORMATION

The United States of America, acting through its attorneys, charges:

COUNT I

The defendants

1. Safeway Stores, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as Safeway) is made a defendant herein. Safeway is a corporation organized on March 24, 1926, under the laws of the State of Maryland. It has its headquarters and principal offices at Fourth and Jackson Streets, Oakland, Calif. Safeway operates retail stores in the United States in which it sells to consumers food and food products.

2. Each of the persons whose name and address is listed below is made a defendant herein. Each of said defendants has been, during part or all of the period of time covered by this count of this information, associated with Safeway in the capacity below indicated. Each of the defendants listed below within said period and within the last 5 years has been actively engaged in the management, direction, and control of the affairs, policies, and acts of Safeway, and has authorized, ordered, or done some or all of the acts constituting the offense hereinafter charged.

Lingan A. Warren, Oakland, Calif., president and director; Earl Cliff, Dallas, Tex., manager of Dallas division.

3. The acts alleged in this count of this information to have been done by Safeway were authorized, ordered, or done by the officers, directors, employees, or agents thereof, including but not limited to those individuals named as defendants herein.

The coconspirator

4. Braun & Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., incorporated in 1936, is named as a coconspirator in this count of this information. It is a corporation engaged in public relations counseling and is so employed by Safeway.

Definitions

5. The term "Dallas division" as used herein shall mean all those cities in the State of Texas east of longitude 102 in which Safeway operates retail food stores. (In general, this includes most of the cities in Texas within approximately 185 miles from Dallas.)

6. The term "El Paso division" as used herein shall mean all those cities in the State of Texas west of longitude 102 and all the cities in the State of New Mexico in which Safeway operates retail food stores. (In general, this includes that part of Texas west of longitude 102 and south of latitude 32 and that part of New Mexico east of the Rio Grande.)

7. The term "grocery section" as used herein shall mean that section or department in each of Safeway's retail stores in which Safeway classifies all its merchandise other than produce and fresh meats.

8. The term "food and food products" as used herein shall mean all merchandise of the types sold in the grocery, produce, and meat sections of Safeway's retail stores.

Trade and commerce involved

9. Crops and livestock, after production, move in a constant stream from farms to urban centers. Large quantities thereof are shipped from the State of production to other States for processing, canning, packing, or conversion into food products. In some cases, these products are then transported to wholesalers in still other States for distribution to retailers in the same and other States for resale by them to consumers. In other cases, such products are shipped to direct buyers, including voluntary buying groups, for resale in retail stores. Thus, food and food products move in a continuous flow in interstate commerce from points of production in one or more States to the consumers in other States, through the medium of producers, canners, packers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers.

10. Through its subsidiary, Salem Commodities, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as Salem), and its own divisions, Safeway purchases and processes numerous foods and food products. Products so processed include coffee, tea, margarine, shortening, salad dressing, soaps, gelatin desserts, cereals, canned fruits and vegetables, candy, jams and jellies, peanut butter, and a large number of dairy products and baked goods. These products generally are shipped from the place where the processing operations are performed to each of Safeway's warehouses in other States, where they are distributed to Safeway's retail stores and sold to consumers.

11. In addition, Safeway purchases directly, and through Salem, large quantities of food and food products from other manufacturers and processors in various States of the United States. These products are usually shipped directly from the manufacturer or processor to Safeway's warehouses in the several States, where they are distributed to its retail stores, and resold to consumers.

12. Food and food products procured directly by Safeway or through Salem are purchased in various States of the United States and shipped in interstate commerce to Safeway's warehouses, including its warehouses at Dallas and El Paso, Tex. These warehouses are the conduit through which food and food products purchased or processed by Safeway and Salem move in interstate commerce from producers to consumers in the States of Texas and New Mexico.

13. On December 31, 1954, Safeway operated 1,869 self-service retail food stores in the United States, having total sales in 1954 of $1,634,769,000. These stores are located in 19 States west of the Mississippi River, and in Maryland, Virginia, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. Safeway's retail operations in the United States are divided into 15 distribution divisions. The merchandising programs of the divisions are arranged and held in conformity with Safeway's unified national policy through compliance with frequent directives issued from headquarters in Oakland which are designed for the guidance of division officials and which are regarded as controlling. Among the merchandising policies thus established at headquarters for subsequent effectuation by the divisions are: determination of store expansion or store closings; determination of sales quotas to be attained in cities in which Safeway does business; and determination of pricing policies for stores.

14. Safeway has approximately 109 retail stores located in 64 cities within the Dallas division in Texas. It has approximately 41 stores located in 26 cities within the El Paso division. Of these 41 stores, 15 are in Texas and 26 are in New Mexico. Total sales by all Safeway stores in the Dallas division in 1954 were $118,772,087, and in the El Paso division were $37,145,536. Safeway sells substantially more food and food products in its retail stores in these divisions than any of its competitors.

Combination and conspiracy to monopolize

15. Beginning in or about 1954, the exact date being unknown to the attorneys for the United States, and continuing thereafter, the defendants, the coconspirators herein named, and others unknown to the attorneys for the United States, have engaged in a combination and conspiracy to monopolize the above-described interstate trade and commerce in the sale of food and food products at retail in the Dallas and El Paso divisions, in violation of section 2 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," as amended (26 Stat. 209, 15 U. S. C. § 2), commonly known as the Sherman Act.

16. The combination and conspiracy herein charged has consisted of a continuing agreement and concert of action among the defendants, the coconspirator named herein, and other persons unknown to the attorneys for the United States, the substantial terms of which have been that defendants agree:

(A) To secure for Safeway an arbitrarily determined proportion of the total retail business in food and food products in each of the cities in the Dallas and El Paso divisions, this proportion being approximately half of the total of such retail business in the smaller cities, and at least 25 percent in the larger cities, by (1) fixing arbitrary sales quotas for each Safeway retail store; and (2) requiring that the sales quotas so fixed be attained by safeway personnel.

(B) To engage in price wars in selected cities in the Dallas and El Paso divisions in order to injure and destroy competitors in the retail grocery business and to achieve for Safeway the arbitrary sales quotas fixed for these cities:

(1) by intentionally operating Safeway's retail stores in selected cities in Texas and New Mexico below the cost of doing business;

(2) by intentionally selling numerous items in the grocery sections of Safeway's retail stores in selected cities in the Dallas division below the invoice cost of such items delivered to Safeway's warehouse in Dallas;

(3) by intentionally selling numerous items in the grocery sections of Safeway's retail stores in selected cities in the Dallas division at prices lower than the prices charged for these items by Safeway in other cities in Texas and in other parts of the United States.

17. During the period of time covered by this count of this information, and for the purpose of forming and effectuating the aforesaid combination and conspiracy, the defendants, by agreement and concert of action, have done the things which, as hereinbefore alleged, they agreed to do.

Effects

18. The effects of the aforesaid offense, among other things, have been:

(A) To exclude competitors of Safeway and eliminate and restrain competition with Safeway in the sale of food and food products in Texas and New Mexico;

(B) To depress the general retail price structure for groceries in various cities in the Dallas and El Paso divisions;

(C) To drive some independent grocers in Texas out of business;

(D) To force other independent grocers, retail grocery chains and food wholesalers in Texas to sustain severe financial losses, or losses in sales volume, or both.

Juridiction and venue

19. The offense charged in this count of this information has been carried out in part within the Fort Worth division of the northern district of Texas and within the jurisdiction of this Court. During the period of time covered by this count of this information some of the defendants named herein, within the Fort Worth division of the northern district of Texas, pursuant to said combination and conspiracy, have performed many acts in furtherance of the combination and conspiracy hereinabove described.

COUNT II

20. Each and every allegation contained in the paragraphs in this information numbered 1 through 3 and 5 through 14 is here realleged with the same force and effect as though said paragraphs were here set forth in full.

Attempt to monopolize

21. Beginning in or about 1954, the exact date being unknown to the attorneys for the United States, and continuing thereafter, the defendants have engaged in an attempt to monopolize the above described trade and commerce in the sale at retail of food and food products in the Dallas and El Paso divisions, in violation of section 2 of the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209, 15 U. S. C. §2).

22. Pursuant to the aforesaid attempt to monopolize, the defendants have done, among others, the following:

(A) Attempted to secure for Safeway an arbitrarily determined proportion of the total retail business in food and food products in each of the cities in the Dallas and El Paso divisions, this proportion being approximately half of the total of such retail business in the smaller cities, and at least 25 percent in the larger cities, by (1) fixing arbitrary sales quotas for each Safeway retail store; and (2) requiring that the sales quotas so fixed be attained by Safeway personnel.

(B) Engaged in price wars for extended periods of time in selected cities in the Dallas and El Paso divisions in order to injury and destroy competitors in the retail grocery business and to achieve for Safeway the arbitrary sales quotas fixed for these cities:

(1) by intentionally operating Safeway's retail stores in selected cities in Texas and New Mexico below the cost of doing business;

(2) by intentionally selling at retail numerous items in the grocery sections of Safeway's retail stores in selected cities in the Dallas division below the invoice cost of such items delivered to Safeway's warehouse in Dallas;

(3) by intentionally selling numerous items in the grocery sections of Safeway's retail stores in selected cities in the Dallas division at prices lower than the prices charged for the items by Safeway in other cities in Texas and in other parts of the United States.

Effects

23. Each and every allegation contained in paragraph 18 of this information is here realleged with the same force and effect as if said paragraph were here set forth in full.

Jurisdiction and venue

24. The offense alleged in this count of this information has been carried out in part within the Fort Worth division of the northern district of Texas and within the jurisdiction of this court. During the period of time covered by this count of this information some of the defendants, within the Fort Worth division of the northern district of Texas, have performed many of the acts referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph 22 of this information.

COUNT III

25. Each and every allegation contained in paragraph 1 of this information is here realleged with the same force and effect as though said paragraph were here set forth in full.

26. Lingan A. Warren is hereby made a defendant in this count of this information. Said defendant, at all times from January 1954 until October 1955, has been president and a director of defendant Safeway. Defendant Lingan A. Warren authorized or ordered to be done some or all of the acts alleged in this count of this information to have been done by Safeway.

27. Each and every allegation contained in the paragraphs in this information numbered 5 through 14 is here realleged with the same force and effect as though said paragraphs were here set forth in full.

Offense charged under the Robinson-Patman Act

28. Beginning in January 1954, the exact date being unknown to the attorneys for the United States, and continuing thereafter, the defendant Safeway, acting through its officers, directors and agents, including Defendant Lingan A. Warren, while engaged in interstate commerce and in the course of such commerce, sold goods in the grocery sections of Safeway's retail stores in a part of the United States at prices lower than those exacted by said defendant elsewhere in the United States for the purpose of destroying competition, or eliminating competitors in such part of the United States, in violation of section 3 of the act of Congress of June 19, 1936, commonly known as the Robinson-Patman Act (49 Stat. 1528, 15 U. S. C. sec. 13a).

29. Pursuant to the offense charged in paragraph 28, the defendant Safeway, among other things, used the advantages of its multi-State organization in selected cities in Texas for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating competitors:

(A) By intentionally selling numerous items in the grocery sections of its retail stores in such cities at prices which were lower than the prices it charged for these items in other cities in Texas and in other parts of the United States;

(B) By intentionally selling numerous items in the grocery sections of its retail

stores in such cities at prices below its invoice cost of such items while charging higher prices for these items in other cities.

Effects

30. The effects of the aforesaid offense, among other things, have been:

(A) To drive some independent grocers in Texas out of business;

(B) To force other independent grocers, retail grocery chains and wholesalers in Texas to sustain severe financial losses, or losses in sales volume, or both.

Jurisdiction and venue

31. The offense alleged in this count of this information has been carried out in part within the Fort Worth Division of the northern district of Texas and within the jurisdiction of this Court. During the period of time covered by this count of this information the defendant Safeway, within the Fort Worth division of the northern district of Texas, performed many of the acts described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph 29 of this information.

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General.

EDWARD A. FOOTE,
First Assistant, Antitrust Division.

HEARD L. FLOORE,
United States Attorney.

MARGARET H. BRASS,
GEORGE H. DAVIS, Jr.,
ESTELLA L. BALDWIN,
WILLIAM F. COSTIGAN,
Attorneys, United States Department of Justice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call particular attention to section 4, following the naming of the Safeway defendants, headed "The Coconspirator":

4. Braun & Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., incorporated in 1936, is named as a coconspirator in this count of this information. It is a corporation engaged in public relations counseling and is so employed by Safeway.

Mr. President, this is the company which is also employed by the Republican National Committee to popularize and glamorize Secretary Benson and to help him in his relationships with Congress. It helps him in his publicity campaigns.

I call attention to the charge:

Combination and conspiracy to monopolize * * * interstate trade and commerce in the sale of food and food products at retail in the Dallas and El Paso divisions.

Intentionally selling numerous items * * * below the invoice cost.

That is a violation of the provision of the Robinson-Patman Act against price discrimination, and a violation of the antitrust laws.

The criminal information and suit is brought in the name of Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General, Edward A. Foote, first assistant, Antitrust Division, and it is signed by other officers of the Government.

Mr. President, for an explanation of these charges, I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, press releases issued by the Department of Justice on July 7, 1955, and November 1, 1955.

There being no objection, the press releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 7, 1955.

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., announced today the return of an antitrust indictment in Federal court at Fort Worth, Tex., charging Safeway Stores, Inc., and two of its officers, with violations of the Sherman and Robinson-Patman Acts.

In addition to Safeway, the indictment names as defendants Lingan A. Warren, of Oakland, Calif., president of Safeway, and Earl Cliff, of Dallas, manager of Safeway's Dallas division.

The indictment is in three counts. The first charges that the defendants engaged in a conspiracy to monopolize the retail grocery business in various cities in Texas and New Mexico. The second count charges that the defendants are attempting to monopolize this business. The third count brought under section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act names only Safeway and Warren as defendants. It charges that Safeway sold goods in its stores in Texas at prices lower than those it charged in other parts of the United States and below cost for the purpose of destroying competition.

According to the indictment, Safeway established sales quotas for each of its stores in Texas and New Mexico, amounting to from 25 to 50 percent of the total retail grocery business and insisted that the store managers meet these quotas. It is further charged that Safeway engaged in price wars in these areas for the purpose of destroying competition and that for that purpose during the course of these wars it sold groceries below its invoice cost for these commodities. According to the indictment, one of the effects of the defendants' activities has been to drive some independent grocers in Texas out of business.

According to the indictment, Safeway in 1954 sold more than $155,000,000 of food and food products in Texas and New Mexico and sold substantially more of these products in this area than any of its competitors.

In commenting on the filing of the case, Mr. Brownell stated:

"The type of predatory and illegal conduct charged in this indictment is particularly deplorable because its impact falls largely upon local merchants, who form the core of our American private enterprise system. To permit such large interstate organizations to wipe out local trade in this manner could only result ultimately in monopoly, with all of the evils which hurt the general public. The law does not permit interstate organizations to use the power of their far-flung operations to conduct local price wars in order to destroy competition. It is essential that the buying public in every market continue to have the services of a variety of grocery sellers, and that no one company be permitted to eliminate its competitors and achieve power to fix prices at whatever levels it may desire."

Assistant Attorney General Stanley N. Barnes, head of the Antitrust Division, said:

"This indictment attacks the use of localized predatory price slashing and below cost selling to destroy competition and achieve an arbitrary share of the available grocery business. If these alleged conditions continue they will make it impossible for both large and small grocers who are now serving the public to remain in business. These alleged practices must be eliminated if normal competitive forces are to provide the benefit of a free competitive economy to the buying public."

NOVEMBER 1, 1955.

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., announced the filing today of a civil antitrust suit charging Safeway Stores, Inc., with violating the Sherman Act by attempting to monopolize the retail grocery business in various cities in Texas and New Mexico.

At the same time, he said, the Government filed a criminal information against Safeway, Lingan A. Warren, San Francisco, former Safeway president, and Earl Cliff, manager of Safeway's Dallas, Tex., division. The criminal information charges violations of the Sherman and Robinson-Patman Acts and is substantially the same as the indictment returned against the defendants July 7, 1955, which the Department of Justice decided to dismiss.

The indictment was dismissed and the criminal information substituted with the consent of the court in order to avoid the delay and expense of testing the soundness of certain technical legal questions raised by Safeway in attacking the validity of the grand jury which returned the indictment. The Attorney General said that the action should not be construed to mean that the indictment was invalid or that the attacks on the grand jury have substance. He said:

"The Government elected to dismiss the indictment with the consent of the court and to substitute a criminal information in order to save the time which otherwise would be required to test the validity of the grand jury which returned the indictment, or to present the evidence to a new grand jury."

The civil complaint and the criminal information charge that Safeway has attempted to monopolize the retail grocery business in various cities of Texas and New Mexico. It is charged that Safeway established arbitrary sales quotas for each of its stores in Texas and New Mexico, amounting to 25 to 50 percent of the total retail grocery business of the areas and insisted that these quotas be attained.

The complaint and information further charge that Safeway engaged in price wars in these areas for the purpose of destroying competition, and, to accomplish this purpose, sold groceries below the invoice cost to Safeway; and sold in some areas at lower prices than in others to eliminate competition.

One of the effects of these activities, it is charged, has been to drive independent grocers in Texas out of business.

The civil complaint asked the Court that continuation of these alleged illegal practices be prevented by prohibiting Safeway from selling below invoice cost, or operating any of its districts below the cost of doing business for the purpose of destroying competition, or from selling identical items at different prices within the same area of its operations.

Assistant Attorney General Stanley N. Barnes, head of the Antitrust Division, said:

"The injunctive relief which we seek in the civil case is essential in order to prevent the continuation and repetition of the predatory business behavior alleged against Safeway in the complaint and in the information. The civil case is designed to enable grocers, both large and small, to continue to compete and to serve the public."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I repeat, Mr. President, that I am not passing judgment on these allegations. They are made by responsible officers of our Government. They are the charges of this administration, of which Secretary Benson is a part.

I intend no reflection whatever on either Safeway or the Braun agency, in suggesting it might have been more proper for a fellow Cabinet officer to reject services of the agency involved until the charges brought by another Cabinet officer had been cleared up one way or another.

The courts are the proper place to determine the merits of the charges that have been filed. All I know is that the criminal information alleges, among other things, "combination and conspiracy to monopolize interstate trade and commerce in the sale of food and food products at retail in the Dallas and El Paso divisions" of Safeway's trade area by engaging in "price wars in order

to injure and destroy competitors in the retail grocery business" by "intentionally selling numerous items below the invoice cost" and by other practices.

Assistant Attorney General Stanley N. Barnes—who, incidentally, is doing a good job in the Antitrust Division, from my point of view—is quoted in the July 7 release as stating that "the type of predatory and illegal conduct charged in this indictment is particularly deplorable because its impact falls largely upon local merchants, who form the core of our American private-enterprise system."

That is the firm which the Government is employing and the Republican committee is employing, in trying to popularize the Secretary of Agriculture. It is a shocking thing. The firm is handling his relations with Congress. I do not know how busy the new Special Lobbying Committee will be, but this is something that needs to be looked into.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to complete this paragraph first.

It seems to me to be an act of highly questionable propriety for the Republican National Committee to retain for purposes of publicizing and popularizing one Cabinet officer a firm which is facing such serious charges from another Cabinet officer.

It seems to be of highly questionable propriety for Secretary Benson to accept the services of such a firm for his personal exploitation, no matter how effective they may be, under these circumstances, if he knows about them.

If he did not, it is time he did know. It is time our Cabinet officers got acquainted, and knew what each other was doing. We have had too many examples of going off in opposite directions in this administration.

I regret to say it, but Secretary Benson does seem to have quite an affinity for Safeway and Braun personnel.

Two of his former executive assistants came from the Safeway organization, and one of his special consultants was a San Francisco manager for the Braun Agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point, a copy of a press release issued by the Department of Agriculture, dated January 1953, announcing the appointment of D. K. Broadhead as executive assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture and pointing out his years as a Safeway executive.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 1953.

Mr. Broadhead, whose home is in San Marino, Calif., has been identified for a quarter of a century with agriculture in California and the Nation, particularly in the marketing of dairy and poultry products. In recent years he has also been engaged in manufacturing. This experience has given him wide acquaintance among farm and industrial leaders throughout the Nation.

In his early years, Mr. Broadhead was active in farm youth projects, having been born April 17, 1905, on a diversified farm at Nephi, Utah. In 1923 he was awarded an agricultural scholarship to Utah State Agricultural College and he was graduated from that institution in 1928, after specializing in agricultural economics and marketing.

Following graduation Mr. Broadhead was field representative for the California Fruit Exchange, after which he was engaged for 2 years in both the credit and sales fields of business and agriculture. He later was company manager for the Morning Milk Co., of Stockton, Calif., and then for 9 years was employed by Safeway Stores in Oakland, Calif., in the dairy and egg division. He eventually became company manager for Safeway's egg operations in the United States and Canada. He has been particularly concerned with the procurement, processing, and distribution of dairy and egg products. He was a member of the Poultry and Egg War Food Advisory Board.

During the last few years Mr. Broadhead has been engaged in manufacturing radio transcriptions and electronics, with factories in New York and Los Angeles. However, he has continued to do consulting work in the dairy and egg business. Until taking his present post, he was president of the Allied Record Manufacturing Co. and related organizations, a director of several other concerns, and had other commercial and agricultural affiliations.

Mr. Broadhead has taken active leadership in business and service organizations in southern California, and has been active in civic and youth work, including that with Boy Scouts and the YMCA. He was married to Olene Smith in 1934 and they have four sons. Mr. Broadhead is a Republican.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of another press release issued by the Department of Agriculture on August 15, 1953, announcing the appointment of Lorenzo N. Hoopes to succeed Mr. Broadhead as executive assistant, and revealing he had been an executive of a Safeway store since 1949.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY BENSON NAMES LORENZO N. HOOPES AS EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, August 15, 1953.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced the appointment of Lorenzo N. Hoopes, Denver, Colo., as his executive assistant. Mr. Hoopes has been eastern district manager of the Lucerne Milk Co., and has been connected with agricultural marketing organizations for the last 20 years.

Mr. Hoopes succeeds Daken K. Broadhead, of San Marino, Calif., whose resignation was made necessary by the death of a business associate. Secretary Benson stated that he had accepted Mr. Broadhead's resignation reluctantly, and that he had asked him to continue his affiliation with the Department as a consultant in the general field of marketing and distribution.

Mr. Hoopes spent his early years on a small poultry and dairy farm. He has been with the Lucerne Milk Co., a division of Safeway Stores, since 1949. His experience in the last 10 years has been primarily in the procurement, processing, and distributing of eggs and dairy products, and all of his professional career has been concerned with agricultural commodities.

Mr. Hoopes' experience includes work with farmers' marketing cooperatives handling poultry and poultry products in the Western and Midwestern States; with the Calavo Growers of California, a farmers' marketing association; and with the Brentwood Egg Co. at Twin Falls, Idaho, and at Maywood, Calif.

The new executive assistant was born in Brigham City, Utah, November 5, 1913. He was educated in the Brigham City elementary and high schools and was graduated from Weber College at Ogden, Utah, in 1933. He did graduate work at the University of Utah in 1933–34, and in the advanced management program at the graduate school of business administration of Harvard University in 1952.

He is married and has two children. His home is Denver, Colo.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a third press release issued by the Department of Agriculture on November 1, 1954, revealing that Mr. Hoopes was leaving to return to an executive position with Safeway Stores, Inc.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY BENSON NAMES MILAN D. SMITH TO SUCCEED L. N. HOOPES

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, November 1, 1954.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced the appointment of Milan D. Smith, Pendleton, Oreg., as his executive assistant. Mr. Smith, whose appointment is effective December 1, 1954, has been associated with farming and food processing and marketing activities for nearly 15 years.

Mr. Smith succeeds Lorenzo N. Hoopes who has resigned to return to an executive position with Safeway Stores, Inc., Oakland, Calif.

Secretary Benson, commenting on the staff change, said, "While Mr. Hoopes came to the Department only on a loan basis from his business association, it is with great reluctance that I have accepted his resignation. He has performed a difficult top level staff job in the Department with effectiveness and efficiency that has been a distinct service to agriculture. I appreciate fully the compelling reasons that require his return to his former association.

"In Mr. Smith we will have a man whose agricultural and management experience qualify him highly for the complex administrative position to which he is coming."

Virtually all the new executive assistant's working experience has been in the field of agriculture, both in farming and in management positions in his family's food processing business. He and a brother own and operate a 640-acre irrigated farm near Burley in southern Idaho. Principal crops produced have been wheat, sugar beets, potatoes, alfalfa, and dried beans. He also has been active in the management of farm land leased in northern Idaho and Oregon for the raising of green and seed peas.

Since 1941, Mr. Smith has been general manager of the Smith Canning & Freezing Co. of Oregon, at Pendleton, and of Smith Frozen Foods (of Oregon and Idaho).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, they come and go. Safeway is a fine company, but it happens to be under a criminal information suit by the Department of Justice. Apparently, during this period of time its employees find jobs in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, to complete the record, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a fourth press release issued by the Department of Agriculture, Office of the Secretary, on October 15, 1953, announcing the appointment of Harold O. Belknap, of San Francisco, as a temporary consultant, and explaining he had been manager of the San Francisco office of Braun & Co., the same company

which is now involved in the proceedings before the Department of Justice as a coconspirator in the Safeway case, and the same company the Republican National Committee is using.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAROLD O. BELKNAP NAMED TEMPORARY CONSULTANT TO USDA

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, October 15, 1953.

The appointment of Harold O. Belknap, of San Francisco, Calif., as a temporary consultant to the United States Department of Agriculture was announced today by Secretary Ezra Taft Benson.

Mr. Belknap is on leave from Braun & Co.—management and public relations consultants—and has been manager of the San Francisco office of that firm.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I must admit I am curious as to how a firm accused of illegal actions on behalf of a grocery chain can be expected to have the best interests of farmers at heart.

I want the record to be clear that what the Braun Co. did was to try to help Mr. Benson with his public relations. Most recently, the Republican senatorial and congressional campaign committee has purchased the services of a firm in Chicago. I should like to pose that as a question for discussion here.

Perhaps Secretary Benson will take a tip: If he will just start properly taking care of our farmers and working with them instead of against them, he will not need any professional public relations experts try to glamorize him just before election time.

In my opinion, things have come to a mighty low state of affairs when a Secretary of Agriculture, supposedly representing and fighting for farm people and representing the administration, has to have private public relations experts engaged to sell him to farmers—whether those public relations experts face criminal charges or not.

I am sorry I felt it necessary to interrupt my planned outline of my farm policy presentation to this body to make these remarks today. I wish such incidents did not keep popping up. But they do keep popping up. Every time I am ready to settle down to the discussion of some big project here I find tanks going to Saudi Arabia; I find Mr. Dulles on the brink; I find an advertising agency trying to build up better public relations for the Secretary of Agriculture; I find Harper's magazine, in which appear notes written by the Secretary on articles which he has never read.

Mr. President, I do not think such tactics as I have been describing here are proper. I do not particularly like to belabor Mr. Benson or anyone else. However, I felt it important for this body to know some of the background I am referring to, when I talk about the high pressure public relations and propaganda drive being conducted to influence this body, and influence farm people, about legislative proposals before Congress.

I do not think following such tactics is the right way to make a democracy effective. Furthermore, I have too much confidence in the good judgment of our people to think they are going to work as well as the Republicans hope they will.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the January 14 issue of the Madison, Wis., Capital Times, entitled "Government by Huckster Will Not Solve the Problem of the Growing Farm Depression."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the history of the Eisenhower administration is written, Madison Avenue in New York City, the home of the high-pressure public-relations people, will be as prominent as Wall Street, the home of the big financiers. The huckster has been as prominent in the administration as the fat cats of finance.

No administration in recent history has depended more on slogans and stunts as a substitute for action. While our position in the international scene deteriorated, the administration struggled frantically to cover up with such slogans as massive retaliation, agonized reappraisal, unleash Chiang Kai-shek, the spirit of Geneva, and the others now so dismally familiar.

Now we see the administration trying to cure the economic illness of agriculture with more slogans. The President's farm program presented to Congress the other day is patently the work of the hucksters. It pretends to do something for the farmer, but it is obvious that there is nothing in it to alleviate the farmers' troubles.

Instead of taking action, the administration has turned again to the hucksters. Their job will be to sell Secretary Benson to the farmers. This time it is a public-relations firm in Los Angeles, Braun & Co. This high-priced publicity firm has been hired by the GOP National Committee to turn an unpopular farm policy into an asset before the 1956 elections, according to the New York Times.

Braun & Co. will have the job of selling the farmers on the notion that they have nothing to complain about. One of the main clients of the company is the Safeway Stores chain on which Secretary Benson has leaned so heavily in recruiting top officials in the Department of Agriculture.

Among the Safeway officials hired by Benson have been Harold Belknapp, B. K. Brodhead, and Lorenzo Hoopes, all of whom have had top advisory positions in formulating the policies which have brought recordmaking profits to the middlemen and depression to the farmers.

One wonders how long the administration thinks it will get away with government by huckster. Slogans will not raise farm prices and restore the fallen income, any more than they strengthened our position in the world.

The miracle men of Madison Avenue possess fantastic magic in many ways. But they cannot make prosperity out of depression, nor peace out of war.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a bit more belatedly than I had intended, I wish now to return to my originally planned discussion of farm policy and the farm bill which is before the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator recall the reports issued at the time this public relations firm was employed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I have a memory of them, and I have brought some of the information to the attention of the Senate. Possibly the Senator from Alabama has further information on the subject.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I merely want to ask the Senator if he does not think it seems a little strange that the Secretary of Agriculture has to have an advertising firm to build up better relations between him and the people he is supposed to represent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. Benson as an individual is a very fine and honest man. I have talked to him, I know him, and I have great respect for his faith, his convictions, and his personal demeanor. I think it is most unfortunate that the Secretary has to carry out the Eisenhower program. For a time I thought it was all Mr. Benson's idea, but I do not think it is. I think we have been unfair to the Secretary. He is carrying out orders from some place in the White House. I am not sure where they originate. I would assume he is carrying out President Eisenhower's orders. Possibly they are orders from Sherman Adams. But someone is giving orders.

I have stated on the floor at times that I thought the Secretary of Agriculture ought to be dismissed, but I think that was an unkind remark. I do not believe it would make a bit of difference if he were dismissed. He is carrying out the policy of the administration from right up at the top.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does it not seem passing strange that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Republican administration have to be sold to the Republican Members of Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, it does.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has noticed, I presume, that a part of the plan was to have meetings at which the Members of Congress could become acquainted with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I have not been invited to any of the meetings.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There was to be an open-door policy, so that Members could talk to the Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does it not seem a little strange that a public relations firm has to be employed to establish that kind of relationship?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not only strange, but it does not fit within the context of orderly government. In running for office a man may place a lot of advertisements in the newspapers in an effort to get votes. We all overdo it. But that is another thing. What we are now discussing is a matter of running the Government. There is a difference between running the Government, and running for office and hoping we will have a chance to run the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has said it probably would not matter if there should be a change in the office of Secretary of Agriculture, because the orders from above would be carried out anyway. The Senator has mentioned Judge Barnes, an antitrust officer in the Department of Justice, and he has said that in his opinion Judge Barnes has been doing a very good job. I believe his administration of the office has convinced those who have come into contact with

him and his work that he has been sincere in performing his duties, but I wonder if the Senator has noticed that in the Wall Street Journal it is stated that Mr. Barnes has been appointed to be a judge. Can it be that he is being kicked upstairs in order to make way for the friends of this administration?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Possibly he has been doing too good a job. I should like to leave in the RECORD what I have said about Judge Barnes, because I believe he has done a good job.

Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] would like to have me yield to him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from South Carolina and that his remarks may be printed in the RECORD at the end of my speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Senate on the Constitution and Integration. His remarks appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech.)

(Mr. HUMPHREY also yielded to Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. CAPEHART, each of whom addressed the Senate on questions foreign to the agricultural bill. Their remarks appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday I was discussing how agriculture got into its present fix. I started my discussion with an analysis of the farm situation.

A day or two ago a news article was called to my attention. It is an unusual article, and I should like to call it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, apparently troubles about agricultural policy are not new in the Benson family.

I have an interesting clipping from the New York Times of February 5, quoting an article that appeared in the August 9, 1864, issue of the Salt Lake Telegraph.

Yes; the date I mentioned was 1864—nearly 100 years ago.

Another Ezra Taft Benson, great-grandfather of the Secretary, was quoted in regard to a fight he was leading for the farmers.

But something has happened in the intervening 92 years.

The old-time Ezra was on the farmer's side.

The old-time Ezra had decided 92 years ago that farmers should not be left to the mercy of the free market. He wanted farmers to get together and insist on fair prices.

He was not as worried as the present Ezra is about "price fixing." He said that "the threatening times spoke loud enough to the farmers to regulate their own prices."

The present Ezra Benson says the free market should regulate prices, and we should not do anything to interfere with that market.

Apparently, he has not caught up with what his own great-grandfather learned nearly 100 years ago.

Let me quote from that August 9, 1864, article in the Salt Lake Telegraph:

> Mr. Benson alluded to the claim that the market would regulate prices. They had tried the experiment for 15 years unsuccessfully; and the threatening times spoke loud enough to the farmers to regulate their own prices. * * * He wishes the farmer and producer to say what he wanted for his grain, and if the farmers prospered the whole country would prosper.

Why, that sounds like the letters I am receiving from my Minnesota farmers today. But it certainly does not sound like the modern Ezra Taft Benson.

The New York Times dispatch from Salt Lake City quotes Dr. L. H. Kirkpatrick, librarian at the University of Utah, as saying Mr. Benson's great-grandfather was discussing difficulties arising from overproduction of grain by Mormon pioneers in the Utah territory.

That great-granddad was a smart man. When he saw farm troubles, he tried to do something about them. He wanted prices raised. He did not just complain about the surplus. He called on farmers to insist that they have something to say about prices, instead of leaving it all to the free market.

That is all farmers are trying to do today, asking the opportunity to work through their Government as a means of cooperating in lifting farm prices. Only the modern Ezra Benson objects.

Mr. President, I suggest the Secretary of Agriculture do some digging into his family records. Perhaps he will find some more writings of his great-grandfather that will be helpful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full article from the New York Times to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PROBLEMS RUN IN THE BENSON FAMILY

SALT LAKE CITY, February 4.—Dr. L. H. Kirkpatrick, librarian at the University of Utah, turned up evidence this week that farm problems currently plaguing Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, are not new to the Cabinet official's family.

An August 9, 1864, the Salt Lake Telegraph reported a speech by Ezra Taft Benson, great-grandfather of the Secretary, in this manner:

"Mr. Benson alluded to the claim that the market would regulate prices. They had tried the experiment for 15 years unsuccessfully; and the threatening times spoke loud enough to the farmers to regulate their own prices. * * * He wishes the farmer and producer to say what he wanted for his grain, and if the farmers prospered the whole country would prosper."

Dr. Kirkpatrick said that Mr. Benson's great-grandfather was discussing difficulties arising from overproduction of grain by Mormon pioneers in the Utah Territory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is reassuring to me that once in the Ezra Taft Benson family there was a man who said to the farm people: "Farmers, we must do something about prices. We must organize and set the prices, so that they will give us a profit and a chance to make a living."

I am pleased to note that the record of the Ezra Taft Benson family shows that it did not always complain about surpluses. Members of that family at one time were primarily concerned with what the market would offer in terms of labor well done and with production with which it had been blessed.

I said I wanted to discuss the subject of how agriculture got into its present fix, or, rather, how some people fixed agriculture so as to get it into its present difficulties. I indicated yesterday that the farmers of the United States had made wonderful responses to requests of our Government in World War II and in the Korean war period to meet production goals.

I pointed out that as a result of meeting those production goals surpluses had accumulated after the end of the war.

Did we berate munitions makers for producing shells that were not needed? Or were we thankful they were not needed, and did we provide public funds to help the manufacturer convert to other items without any financial loss? Did we berate munition and plane manufacturers for producing shells and planes that were not needed, or were we thankful that they were not needed? Did we tell them it was their tough luck that Uncle Sam was going out of the munitions-buying business, or did we use public funds to settle their contracts and provide help for them to convert to other items without any financial loss?

I should like to point out that if the farmers had been as tough in bargaining with Uncle Sam as some industries were before they planted one more row of corn or one more acre of wheat, the farmers would have said, "Uncle Sam, put your name on the dotted line, and we will plant it. We will plant it after you agree that you will buy it at a fair price and guarantee that you will continue to pay us a fair price."

That is what we had to do with the munitions makers. We said to them, "You produce the munitions, and we will pay you. If we have to cut the contract at the end of the war, we will pay you a special payment so that you will not go out of business."

We met our farm goals in 1952. Agriculture did its full part in preparing for whatever might come, and we could have been mighty thankful, as a nation, that we had such abundance available.

Yet, even with farmers gearing their production to the full security needs of America, we did not build up any so-called unmanageable surpluses.

I should like to remind my colleagues that every time the propagandists talk about surplus they always insert the word "unmanageable" before the word "surplus." There is nothing unmanageable about the surpluses if we know how to manage them. In fact, they are very manageable. I suggest, instead of constantly condemning the great abundance, that we look upon the surpluses as a part of the blessings of our time, and try to find a better use for them.

I have had called to my attention today a news article, which indicates to me what I believe to be a part of the challenge, and even of the opportunity, we have in dealing with the surpluses. A great tragedy has occurred in Europe because of the hard winter over there. The news article is headed: "United States Food To Be Boon in Southern

Europe—Floods Feared Now." The article goes on to name the countries that are suffering. They are Italy, Spain, Greece, France, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia, and Turkey. Those are our allies—every one of them. The article states:

In some countries in southern Europe, the need is great and the United States supplies will be a boon.

Sunshine brought Europe's first real promise of a break in the 26-day disastrous cold wave with hopes of a thaw, however came fears of floods.

During the last month many parts of Europe have been hit by the coldest and stormiest winter weather of the century. Crops have been damaged, roads and railways disrupted, and river valleys flooded.

As we know, the President is making available out of our storehouse food and fiber supplies to alleviate much of this suffering.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is interested in this matter. I heard a broadcast from Paris to the Columbia Broadcasting System in which a commentator was noting for the American audience the appreciation of the French Government for the Senator's concern over this situation.

A cold winter or a disastrous drought, or any other act of nature, could wreak the same havoc upon American agriculture and could cause us the same sort of trouble.

It is said that in France there is a $400 million loss in agriculture because of the terrible winter which brought the worst storms in a hundred years.

Mr. President, I am literally shocked when I find that our Government has never had a policy with reference to the necessary amount of food and fiber reserves we should have for international emergencies and domestic emergencies. Presently there are some set-asides for the purpose of selling them.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have a bill, which I shall offer as an amendment to the bill we are now discussing, providing for the establishment of a national organization to distribute certain foods both in the United States and in foreign countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator, and I hope he will be able to get the administration to support it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall offer it as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for emphasizing this point. I had something to say about it when I was the Director General of UNRRA, at which time there was a tremendous need for foodstuffs all over the world. We had been told that there were ample supplies, but no one knew just what they were. For 2 years we had to fight for every bushel of wheat or corn that was necessary for the relief of the people, and in the final analysis we were never able to ship abroad what was needed and what the American people wanted to have shipped abroad, because there was no survey made of the needs that existed or would exist, and our supplies fell to a point where they were completely inadequate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from New York that his record as Director General of UNRRA is one of the greatest and most glorious chapters in his career. The food and fiber surplus prior to World War II, during World War II, and after World War II, was one of the great resources of our strength. During the war years those reserves provided the American people and our Allies food at home and in the armed services. All this talk about the "unmanageable surpluses," Mr. President, is nothing more than talk. It is the obligation of Government to have at least on paper some suggestion as to what the needs of America would be in case of disaster.

Mr. President, we have charted what our needs are for critical minerals and critical materials. We have stockpiles of them sufficient for a year's industrial output, but we have not done the same with respect to our surpluses of food and fiber.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article which was published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 27, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES FOOD TO BE BOON IN SOUTHERN EUROPE—FLOODS FEARED NOW

NEW YORK.—Most European countries will not need winter relief food offered by President Eisenhower. In some countries in southern Europe, the need is great and United States supplies will be a boon.

Sunshine brought Europe's first real promise of a break in the 26-day disastrous cold wave. With hopes of a thaw, however, came fears of floods.

NATO headquarters in Paris readied planes, troops, and relief supplies for any new disaster area. The big danger was that melting snows might overload rivers already piled high with pack ice.

This is the situation found in on-the-spot surveys by correspondents of the New York Times.

During the last month many parts of Europe have been hit by the coldest and stormiest winter weather of the century. Crops have been damaged, roads and railways disrupted, and river valleys flooded.

These conditions moved President Eisenhower to make United States food surpluses available. Aid has been offered to 19 countries, including 4 behind the Iron Curtain.

Spain and Italy have suffered the widest damage and are most in need. Destruction in Greece, Turkey, and France also has been extensive, but the requirements of these three countries are less pressing.

In northern Europe the cold wave was abnormally severe, but outside assistance there is not needed. Central European states behind the Iron Curtain have not suffered severely, and so far there is no indication their governments will accept the United States offer. American ambassadors have been asked to make official reports to Washington from the 19 countries to which help was offered. Following is a summary of conditions, country by country:

ITALY

Storms and bitter cold extensively damaged the fruit and vegetable crops. Wheat probably will be hard hit also, and this year's deficit will be larger than usual. Conditions have caused widespread suffering, and Italian officials will be grateful for United States help in any form.

SPAIN

Officials estimate damage up to $100 million with half of this total representing losses in foreign exchange the country will suffer as a result of diminished exports.

Citrus crops were heavily hit before fruits could be picked. Fifty thousand persons usually employed in the citrus groves of the southeast Mediterranean seaboard at this time are out of work. Thousands are reported to be without daily necessities. Olive groves also have been badly damaged in the southeast. Crop damage in the north is also believed to be considerable.

GREECE

A Government survey reports damage by frost and floods to crops, trees, livestock, and installations such as bridges, dams, and culverts is estimated at millions of dollars.

Seed for planting cereals and potatoes is a special need. Emergency food is needed in some districts.

FRANCE

Of approximately 11 million acres sown in wheat, about 5 million have been damaged by the freeze. In Brittany, 90 percent of truck gardens have been frozen; in Provence the crop damage is estimated at $7 million and in Languedoc damage to vineyards is estimated in tens of millions of dollars.

A ministry of agriculture spokesman gave unofficial estimates of damage as being between $430 million and $425 million. One of the greatest needs is expected to be seed to sow new crops.

THE NETHERLANDS

There has been some crop damage, and more may come later when thaws bring floods. Officials, however, say there is no need for United States aid now. President Eisenhower's statement is gratefully described as another example of United States generosity and assistance.

YUGOSLAVIA

A quick thaw could result in extensive damage, but at present there is no emergency.

TURKEY

Foreign Minister Fuad Koprulu said Turkey needs aid and expressed gratitude for the Eisenhower offer.

Damage has been caused by floods in Thrace and along the Ceyhan River in southern Turkey.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in Italy there is widespread suffering, with many thousands of acres of wheat seed destroyed. In France, of approximately 11 million acres sown in wheat, about 5 million acres have been damaged by the freeze.

A similar condition prevails in Turkey. The article says that Turkey needs aid and has expressed gratitude for the Eisenhower offer. The Netherlands, Spain, and other nations have been greatly injured by the cold winter.

Mr. President, our food and fiber have done more good around the world than has any other single product of the American economy, and I cannot, for the life of me, understand why we have to have from high places such constant groaning about the abundance of our food and fiber. Of course there can be more than is needed, but, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Indiana and other Senators—and I have offered several proposals in connection with the surpluses—whenever there is an emergency

need we should dispose of the surpluses sensibly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is a fact, is it not, that the surpluses can be disposed of very quickly when need arises, and unless we have adequate surpluses, it is just too bad?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

I am going to show, Mr. President, that with all this talk about our so-called surpluses, actually, when we relate the amount of commodities we have to the human populations and animals which consume the commodities, figures in terms of poundage, bushels, and bales do not mean half of what they seem to mean on the surface.

We are always comparing what we had 20 years ago with what we have now. But at that time our population was much smaller and we consumed much less. Today our inventories must be larger because of the greater demand.

If surpluses are responsible for collapsed farm prices, and the administration blames the trouble on the surpluses inherited from the Democratic administration, how does it account for the fact that farm prices averaged 100 percent of parity in 1952?

Actually, Mr. President, the total corn reserve in October 1952 was only 486 million bushels—about a month and a half's supply—to protect us from a meat shortage in the event of a short crop to follow. A total reserve of that amount, a month and a half's supply of corn, is no surplus; that is a shortage of corn.

The carryover of wheat in July 1952 was only 255 million bushels, a fourth of what it is today, and a reserve enough for only about 3 months in an emergency.

A 3 months' supply of wheat is an absolute minimum inventory at any time. A month and a half's supply of corn is what we had at the end of 1952. Yet the administration talks about inheriting a mess. I say, "baloney." The administration did not inherit any mess; it inherited a farm price structure which was sound—well over 90 percent of parity.

Mr. President, I want the people of the United States to know what a reasonable supply of corn is. It would be poor planning not to have three months' supply of corn on hand. Why is not the Secretary of Agriculture telling the people in the cities the truth? Why does he not say what we would do if we did not have a surplus of corn for an emergency?

In the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I proposed that we set aside 350 million bushels of corn as a national security reserve. Mr. President, what do you think the officials of the Agricultural Department said? They said, "We do not have that much corn to set aside. It would tighten the corn market too much."

Yes, Mr. President, Mr. Benson and his associates go about the country and talk about the surplus of corn, but behind closed doors at executive sessions in the Senate of the United States they say, "We do not have enough. We cannot afford to set aside 350 million bushels."

The best we could get in this bill was a discretionary authority for the Secretary to set aside up to 250 million bushels, yet the same Department cut back the corn allotment to 43 million acres this year, just before we were ready to consider this bill.

There is a special little corn amendment which the administration plans to offer.

The scheme is to divide and conquer; pit the farmer against the worker; pit the farmer against the city man; pit the city man against the country man; then pit the corn man against the wheat man. It is the confounded business of trying to divide and divide, to slice and slice; in order to do what? To win an argument over parity price supports.

The Secretary of Agriculture is determined to prove, even if he wrecks the farm economy, that a program of flexible price supports, as he sees it, is the last word in sound agricultural economics. Before we get around to deciding that issue, there will be quite a scrap around here.

Cutting back to 43 million acres of corn cannot be justified. Either there is too much corn, or there is not enough. We cannot have it both ways. Yet publicly it is said we have too much corn; but in the committee, we are told we do not have enough to set aside 350 million bushels.

Let me go back for a moment. What is one of the myths which has been perpetrated upon the American people by this administration? Mr. Benson keeps talking about it. He spoke about it the other night on television. He referred to the mess which he had inherited from the Democrats. Well, when the Democrats control the administration of the Government again, I hope we inherit an equally good "mess"—a "mess" in which the farm price parity ratio was well over 90 percent; a "mess" in which the farmers were actually making money; in which the farm mortgage indebtedness was the lowest it had been in 35 years. That was the "mess." I will put that word in quotation marks, because it is hard to gather from the RECORD the voice inflections. We must be careful about the words we use.

There was no real mess.

What the present administration did inherit was a sound agricultural base, a sound agricultural economy. The farmer was getting more than 45 cents out of every dollar which was spent for food by the American consumer. Today the farmer is getting 39 cents out of the so-called consumer's food dollar.

In November 1952, when the election was over, the farmer was receiving 100 percent of parity. The farmer at that time was paying off his debts.

But what about surpluses? Surpluses have been accumulating since the administration's surplus disposal program came into being. This administration does not know how to get rid of surpluses; it cannot even give them away.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Inasmuch as some figures which I saw indicated that the farmer's income had dropped 23 percent in the past 3 years——

Mr. HUMPHREY. If I may help the Senator, the figure is 29 percent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am delighted to have the Senator's correction, because I know the Senator from Minnesota always has more advanced information and has more recent farm figures than I have, or than probably any other Senators have.

At the same time, corporate profits rose 14 percent before taxes, and 32 percent after taxes; and also the stock market has gone up some 62 percent in the same period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Under those circumstances, why is it, that the Secretary of Agriculture seems to be so annoyed about the efforts of the farmer to better himself this year, instead of waiting for a long-term plan to take effect, a plan which will mean nothing to him—certainly not this year, and possibly not for a long time to come?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If I could answer the Senator's question, I suppose I would be the hero of the day. All I can think of for the moment is that the Secretary believes he has a program for the farmers; and even if every farmer in the Nation disagrees with him, the Secretary will insist on his program, no matter how much money the Republican National Committee has to spend to propagandize people who know nothing about agriculture.

In the city of Duluth, in 1 day, over 1 radio station, 1 advertising agency spent more than $18,000 for 32 spot advertising announcements, telling the people of the Duluth area to write and tell their Senators to vote for the Eisenhower farm program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As usual, I am learning from listening to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. May I ask him who pays for such broadcasts?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suppose they are paid for with money which was collected at the $100-a-plate dinners.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Are the broadcasts in connection with the Eisenhower 9-point farm program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are in connection with the 9-point program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Has the 9-point program any relationship to the bill which is now before the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If it has, it is purely coincidental and accidental.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator is aware of a survey which was made by responsible sources, showing that in my State of New York, where dairying, of course, is the main agricultural industry, the dairy farmers received in payment for their labor 62½ cents an hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Sixty-two cents an hour?

Mr. LEHMAN. Sixty-two and a half cents an hour is all they received in payment for their labor. That is, of course,

below the minimum wage of $1 which only today went into effect. I was very glad indeed that Congress passed a $1 minimum wage law, because, like the Senator from Minnesota, I was one of the sponsors of the bill. The new law guarantees a minimum wage of $1 an hour to persons engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The Senator's figures with respect to dairy farming in New York are about the same as the figures are for Minnesota. They may be 1, 2, or 3 cents more. But the figure is about the same in most of the dairying States, especially Wisconsin, Ohio, Minnesota, and New York.

No farmer has a more expensive investment than a dairy farmer has. A modern dairy farm is one of the top investments in agriculture.

Mr. LEHMAN. I speak at this moment only for the dairy farmers, perhaps because I am so much more familiar with their problems than I am with those of other farmers. However, I imagine the same problems exist in other fields of agriculture.

The dairy farmers are caught in a disastrous squeeze. The revenue which they obtain as a result of their labor has been continuously decreasing; and it is honest labor, labor involving sweat and hard, continuous toil. I believe the Senator from Minnesota recorded yesterday the fact that the income of the dairy farmer has dropped an average of somewhere between 20 and 29 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Whereas, the supplies and equipment the dairy farmers must buy, together with the items which they need even for their household use, have not declined in cost.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. As a matter of fact, the prices of those items have gone up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They have gone up.

Mr. LEHMAN. The only price which has declined, and the only thing which, as a matter of fact, has kept average prices stable—and the Republicans make much of the stability of prices—has been the price of food, which has gone lower than it has in many years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is so right. The Republican administration proudly proclaims that it has stabilized the cost of living, but it has done so at the expense of American agriculture. What the Senator has said is exactly the truth.

But interest rates have not been stabilized; they have gone up. The largest single increase in farmers' costs has been in the interest rate charges which the farmers have to pay on their long-term and short-term notes.

As I said earlier today, a report just released by the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, which is in the 10th region, I believe, indicates that this year short-term farm credit, which is the kind of credit used to purchase livestock, seed, and equipment is 17 percent higher than it was last year. The costs of long-term credit on farm mortgages are going up at an average rate of more than a billion dollars a year beyond the ability of the farmers to pay.

So when we repeat what we have said, someone finally asks, "What are you going to do about it?" I will tell the Senate: We must enact legislation which will afford relief.

John Maynard Keynes was once asked, "What is the difference between the long-term and the short-term effects of economics?"

Lord Keynes replied, "In the long run, you are dead."

Long-term relief is not needed just now for agriculture. What is needed is short-term relief. Agriculture will not get such relief unless we adopt as a minimum S. 3183, which is now before the Senate. It needs some very strong amendments. It needs some very good amendments. But it needs amendments which will strengthen it, not amendments which will weaken it.

If we should go back to the newspaper program, the paid Republican advertisement "Boxtop" program, I do not know how we could do anything with it. I might ask the Parliamentarian how we could vote on the Eisenhower program, since it is before us only in a newspaper ad. I wonder if voting on a newspaper ad is within the precedents of the Senate. I shall not press it at this time, but I shall discuss it later. I should like to have the Parliamentarian look into the question of how the Senate could vote on an ad which appeared in the Shakopee Valley News. I have been receiving some of these ads from Shakopee and Chaska. Perhaps we can establish new precedents in the Senate so that we will not have to print bills, and we can cut down the costs of Government. We can have the Republican National Committee's ad agency write up the bills.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Assistant Secretary, Mr. Peterson, came into my State last year, and said that the farmer should realize that his dreamworld was over—the dreamworld being considered the war years. Does not the Senator agree with me that the farmer now realizes that the dreamworld of the war years is over?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The farmer surely does realize that fact. He realizes he is living in a nightmare—a Republican nightmare. There are no nice dreams any more. I may add that he has quit counting sheep, for the reason that he had to sell the sheep. It is a good thing we have a wool act; otherwise I do not know what farmers would have.

Mr. President, if my colleagues will bear with me, I should like to speak about the wheat situation, because the present administration likes to point out the "mess" they inherited from the previous administration.

The total carryover of wheat in July 1952 was 255,000,000 bushels, or one-fourth of what it is today. Such a reserve would have been enough for only about three months in event of an emergency. That would have been a scanty reserve for full-scale war.

The carryover was 225,000,000 bushels. I am going to say this next line rather loudly because I want Ezra Benson to hear me.

Ezra, do you think the 255,000,000 bushels of wheat which you inherited was a mess? Do you think that was too many bushels?

Ezra, do you advocate that this country should ever have less than 255 million bushels of wheat in reserve? On the other hand, Ezra, how come you have 1 billion bushels in reserve now, if you are so confoundedly good with your management and efficiency?

Two hundred and fifty-five million bushels of wheat, we had in reserve in 1952 and the farmers were getting a pretty good price for wheat. Yet the Secretary of Agriculture speaks for a half hour on television. I am going to be on tonight for only 15 minutes. I shall not need 30 minutes to answer what the Secretary of Agriculture said in 30 minutes.

The Secretary of Agriculture went on television and told the American people the reason things are bad is that he inherited "the mess." The only "mess" he inherited was his political affiliation. That is the only trouble. He has bumped into the wrong philosophy.

Facts are facts. Sometimes they are very disturbing. The fact is that in July 1952—and in Oklahoma and Kansas they have most of the crop already harvested by July—there were 255 million bushels of wheat in reserve.

I shall tell my colleagues something else. In July 1952, farmers could store their wheat for 6 cents a bushel, at 4 percent interest on their crop loans. One of the first things the administration did was to increase the price of storing wheat to 11 cents a bushel and increase interest rates from 4 to 4½ percent. The administration believes in price supports for some people.

Now representatives of the administration are going around the country and are saying that the American people are paying $1 million a day for storage charges. Whose fault is it? The administration's fault. It was not necessary that farmers pay 11 cents a bushel for storage. Farmers stored all the wheat they wanted for 6 cents a bushel 3½ years ago. Not only that, but the United States Government granted loans to build warehouses. The Government itself has built thousands upon thousands of storage bins.

The Department of Agriculture wants so thoroughly to discredit the price support program that the people will want to get rid of it. This has been said time after time in private conversations, which I have reported to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As I said to the committee, if anybody challenges the validity of my statement, I shall bring before them personnel from the Department of Agriculture who have made that statement. They are working on a program in which they have openly said they do not believe. The administration would like the program to fail. It would like to have the American people believe it does not work, so that there would be a free market.

I know what a free market means. One of the first jobs I had as a boy was driving a grain wagon. That was before farmers had many trucks. In South Dakota, where I worked as a boy we used to line up. I used to work in

a header box. There were days when the grain did not grow high enough to be shocked. We had to head it. If anyone wants to get a good workout, I suggest that he get in a header box and drive around all day in the hot sun. Then we would get in the grain wagon and drive our team to town. If the wagon could be seen coming a block or so away, the price of the grain would go down 5 or 10 or 12 cents before we got to the elevator. That happened in the days before the Exchange Act, which limits the fluctuation in any one day. I am not sure of the exact amount, but there are limits beyond which the price of grain cannot fluctuate. If the price exceeds the limits, the grain market has to close down.

My father told me that in the Dakotas he would have his grain shocked and ready for the community threshing rig to come through, but by the time he got his grain to market the price of it could have fallen 50 cents. After the grain speculators bought the grain, the price then went up.

Mr. President, that is one reason why we have price supports. One of the basic reasons is orderly marketing, to give the farmers a chance to store his grain long enough so he can take advantage of a market price which is reasonably steady. In Minnesota and other Northern States, most of the grain goes to the elevators in August or September, and, farther south, in such States as Kansas and Oklahoma, in June or July. If there were no controls, prices would be depressed at those times. After a while, the price would go up, but that would be after somebody else got the commodities.

The farm program provides a way for farmers to receive loans on their commodities. How many Americans know the price-support program is a loan program on goods? It is not a subsidy; it is a loan program on goods, the same as a loan for purchasing something at the store or obtaining a loan on a home. The farmer pays 4½ percent on the loan, and he has deductions made from the loan—on every bushel to pay for storage.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is a loan, but not a commercial loan. It is backed by a tangible collateral. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The collateral is in being, right there, on hand.

Interestingly enough, the price support program for 20 years under Democratic administrations cost less than 40 cents a person. Under the Republican administration it has cost $2.50 a person.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the 20 years under Democratic administration, the price-support program cost less than 40 cents a person, including all products under price supports, and including a loss of nearly half a billion dollars in the case of potatoes. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, the loss on all price-supported products in the 20 years of Democratic administration was an average of about 35 cents a person per annum. The cost to the taxpayer because of the loss on the basic commodities, as a result of price supports, averaged less than 1 cent a person per annum over the 20-year period. In other words, the loss, counting everything, was approximately $1 billion. The loss on the basic commodities was approximately $20 million. In the case of some products, such as cotton, substantial profits were made. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I think the same is true in the case of wheat. I am not sure, but I think that during the war period and the period immediately following the war, some profit was made on wheat.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In fact, in the case of cotton, there was a profit of $248 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Naturally I have been interested in the able Senator's description of heading wheat when he was a boy in South Dakota. I hope we are raising better wheat these days.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There was more drought then.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course there was some drought in the 1930's.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was not too old then.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The development of rustproof varieties of wheat has helped a great deal, of course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that my uncle, Dr. Harry B. Humphrey, formerly Chief Plant Pathologist for the Department of Agriculture for more than 20 years—he passed away only a few years ago—did as much to develop rustproof varieties of wheat, including control of the barberry bush, as was done by any other person. He was cited for his work in developing rustproof varieties of seed. He retired in the 1940's. I remember as a boy going into a wheatfield with my uncle, and I remember how we could see a dip in the field, and we would know that there was some rust there, and we could pick out the stems, and could find rust on them, and could see the trail of rust-infected wheat ahead of us. Those were interesting days to me.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think Dr. Humphrey did a great work in that respect.

There was a young man who went to the State college at Brookings, also——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from South Dakota refer to Dr. Hanson?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; not Dr. Hanson; I refer to a man who later went to Texas. His name escapes me for the moment. He was a student at the South Dakota State College of Agriculture; and he began experimenting with varieties of wheat, in the backyard of the house in which he roomed while he was in college. I have heard it said that his work resulted in multiplying the production of wheat in South Dakota from 2 times to 4 times what it would have been if conditions had remained as they were during the years when we were bothered with rust.

I apreciate the description the Senator from Minnesota has given, because I myself had a few boyhood experiences with farming, too.

I wish to suggest, however, that the able Senator from Minnesota could make a real contribution regarding the point he was discussing, namely, the comparative costs to the American people, in connection with the making of loans on wheat; if he would place in the RECORD, in connection with that point, a table giving the dollar-and-cent value of the support loans during the period of 2 years——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am going to do so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Because my memory is that the average of the loan prices for the last few years is far above the average of the loan values on corn and wheat during the preceding 20 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is correct, because during the last years we produced more.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; I mean that in the past few years the loan price per bushel on both corn and wheat has been far above the average for the prior 15 or 16 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course it has been if we refer to the average over the 15 or 16 years, because back in the 1930's a carload could be purchased for less than $1,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And the average for the past few years is also considerably above the average from 1945 to 1953.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator from South Dakota say it is higher than the average from 1948 through 1953?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, on both corn and wheat, in South Dakota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate that information. Let me ask the Senator from South Dakota what it proves.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It has been more expensive—I am not questioning that perhaps there has been expense—but if the loan price per bushel were lower, and if there were wartime markets, nothing was lost by having a low support rate. The wartime markets not merely took care of the surplus; they kept prices well above the lower support loan rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have always been interested in the administration's talk about peacetime markets. We are now spending for defense as much money as we spent at any time during World War II. In fact, the whole world is spending more money for defense. Our subcommittee has just made a study of armament expenditures throughout the world. They are at an all-time high, and have been since 1945. As you know, Mr. Pres-

ident, no more wheat is used as a result of shooting a gun. It all depends on the extent to which a nation is mobilized. We are now spending more money on armaments than we have spent during any year since the end of World War II, except during the Korean war.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to ask a question: Is it not true that today the Government of the United States is paying more than the market price to stockpile commodities in the interest of national security?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know whether the Government is paying more than the market price, but I know the Government is stockpiling—and that is a program which I approve.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that if there were to be an atomic attack, the first thing that would happen would be a dislocation of transportation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, is it not true that one of the most important commodities to stockpile—if not the most important commodity to stockpile—is food, so that cities such as New York would have sufficient food until transportation could be resumed to a reasonable extent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thinks that would be a sensible program, and I think the other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would take the view that that would be a good program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator from Minnesota see why the administration is so proud of its program of stockpiling various war materials, whereas, to the best of my knowledge, the administration has not stockpiled one pound of food to be used in case of an atomic attack? Does the Senater from Minnesota think that makes much sense?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; frankly, I do not. Also, I should like to have the administration tell the taxpayers how much money is being spent to stockpile all these defense materials, and also tell the taxpayers the total costs involved, and explain to the people the storage charges for those stockpiles, and how much more than the market price the Government has had to pay for them. I am asking this only for purposes of comparison.

Of course we know it costs money to store wheat and to store aluminum, and to store copper. I am saying that if we are going to have complaints on the radio and on the television, night after night, telling the American people that the Government is spending a million dollars a day in fees for the storage of agricultural commodities, it is only common decency and fairness also to say to the people, "Of course, the Government stockpiles many other things, too, on which substantial amounts of money are paid."

Mr. SYMINGTON. In fact, the storage charges in the case of some war materials are greater than the storage charges on agricultural commodities, because some of the defense commodities which are stored must be turned or moved periodically—for example, in the case of rubber. Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Missouri is correct about that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me long enough to enable me to comment on the price of beef in my State, and to request an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in one of the hundreds of letters which I have received in recent weeks, reporting personal experiences of Missouri farmers caught in the squeeze of falling prices and rising costs, was a news item from the front page of the Neosho (Mo.) Daily News of February 3, 1956.

Under the headline "Farmers Find It Costs Money to Raise a Calf and Send It to Market," this news story reported that a Newton County, Mo., farmer received only 35 cents, net, for a 2-week-old calf, after paying $1 for hauling the calf to market.

It is small wonder that the farmers of Missouri are demanding an opportunity for an equal share in the national prosperity, of which they read so much in the newspapers, but in which they have had a continually decreasing share under this present administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article from the Neosho Daily News of February 3 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS FIND IT COSTS MONEY TO RAISE A CALF AND SEND IT TO MARKET

Albert Howland, who milks 14 cows on his 80-acre farm near Neosha, figures it might not be a bad idea to revive Henry Wallace's farm plan and plow under every other pig. Only in his case it would be Jersey calves.

Producing a sales slip, Howland yesterday showed what he meant. He sent a 2-week-old Jersey calf to market.

It brought him $1.25 at the sales barn.

The ticket showed a deduction of 90 cents—60 cents for commission, 25 cents for yardage, and 5 cents for insurance.

That left a balance of 35 cents from the sale of the calf.

He paid a trucker $1 to bring the calf to market.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In response to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], on the question of the actual loan value of certain commodities, including wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, tobacco, barley, oats, rye, sorghums, and so forth, I have a table from the Agricultural Marketing Service. It shows, for 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955, the actual support price for each commodity, and the percentage of parity. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It takes us back only to 1952. I will obtain the other figures and place them in the RECORD the next time I obtain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I shall not object—would the able Senator have any objection to my inserting, following this table, the figures for wheat and corn for South Dakota from 1945 through 1953?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I think such figures would be very appropriate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have the figures at my office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be held open so that the Senator from South Dakota may insert a table at that point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be printed in the RECORD at this point; and, without objection, the RECORD will be held open so that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] may make an additional insertion, if he so desires.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Price support programs—Support price of farm commodities

[Established by Secretary of Agriculture under applicable laws]

Commodity	1952		1953		1954		1955	
	Actual	Percent of parity	Actual	Percent of parity	Actual	Percent of parity	Actual	Percent of parity
Wheat [1]	$2.20	90	$2.21	90	$2.24	90	$2.08	82½
Corn	1.60	90	1.60	90	1.62	90	1.58	87
Cotton	.31	90	.31	90	.32	90	.32	90
Peanuts	.120	90	.119	90	.122	90	.122	90
Rice	5.04	90	4.84	90	4.92	90	4.66	86
Tobacco		90		90		90		90
Butterfat	.692	90	.673	90	.562	75	.562	76
Milk, manufacturing	3.85	90	3.74	90	3.15	75	3.15	80
Wool [2]	.542	90	.531	90	.532	90	.62	106
Honey	.114	70	.105	70	.102	70	.099	70
Tung nuts	67.20	62	63.38	65	54.96	60	([3])	([3])
Barley	1.22	80	1.24	85	1.15	85	.94	70
Oats	.78	80	.80	85	.75	85	.61	70
Rye	1.42	80	1.43	85	1.43	85	1.18	70
Sorghum grain	2.38	80	2.43	85	2.28	85	1.78	70
Flaxseed	3.77	80	3.79	80	3.14	70	2.91	65
Soybeans	2.56	90	2.56	90	2.22	80	2.04	70
Beans, dry edible	7.87	85	7.79	87	7.24	80	6.36	70
Cottonseed	66.70	90	54.20	75	54.00	75	46.00	65

[1] 1956 support price: $1.81, 76 percent of parity.
[2] 1956 clip will be supported at 106 percent of parity.
[3] Means not yet announced.

Price supports in South Dakota

[Figures supplied by State A. S. C. office, Huron, S. Dak.]

Year	Wheat	Corn
1935	0	$0.45
1940	$0.60–.70	.61
1945	1.32–1.41	.90–.96
1950	2.02	1.36
1951	2.18	1.48
1952	2.18	1.50
1953	2.22	1.50
1954	2.25	1.50
1955	2.15	1.47

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I certainly agree as to the importance of the storage of food along with the storage of other essentials. I think such storage ought to be on the liberal side rather than to be on the gambling side. I have always been one of those who believed that the best place for such storage is as close as possible to the point of production. I believe in farm storage.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Storage on the farm.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Storage on the farm.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I concur in that general view. I think it makes good sense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The last year I was in the House of Representatives I joined with Representative PHILLIPS, of California, in offering an amendment to farm legislation pending at that time to authorize the advancement of funds for the building of grain storage facilities, including wooden bins, where they were approved, permitting the facilities to be paid for out of the storage fees which the farmer would earn during the first 5 years of the life of the building.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a good suggestion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am in hearty agreement with that general idea.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Dakota is familiar with the problems of the farmers in his home State. He has a practical knowledge of them. I have always been one of those who believed that more on-the-farm storage is very desirable. I think in the long run it would save the Government money.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it would, too. It has been true in my own case that once in a while we miscalculated the amount of feed we might need through the winter. It was pretty handy to have some of that grain near enough so that it could be unsealed and used for feed without paying freight charges to the Senator's great city of Minneapolis and back. We like to unseal it as near as possible to the point of use. Then, too, the feaure of storage on the farm has made it possible for farmers to acquire buildings which add to their property value. Through earnings from storage charges, they have been able to pay for facilities to store the grain, which otherwise would have gone to the terminals.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think there is another point in favor of storage on the farm. When storage is done on the farm the movement of that commodity is literally blocked at the farmer's gate, and it does not get into the terminal elevators or into the pipeline, so to speak, where it might have a depressing effect on the market price.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, I have seen trucks lined up, just as the Senator says he has seen wagon boxes lined up, waiting to unload. I have seen piles of grain dumped near the railroad station when cars were not available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Shortage of boxcars is a continuous problem.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is a problem. The Senator from Minnesota and I, in our personal experience, have seen the wisdom of providing a storage program and a loan-support program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. It is very valuable.

Continuing with the case of the so-called mess which Secretary of Agriculture Benson talks about inheriting, that mess consisted of a sound agricultural plant producing at levels demanded for that time, with farm prices averaging 100 percent of parity, and with only enough reserves for prudent safety in event the Korean conflict erupted further into a new world war.

Those minimum reserves—2 months' supply of feed grains, a month and a half's supply of corn, and slightly over 3 months' supply of wheat—and apparently the "burdensome surplus" the President appears so concerned about when he talks of wartime policies "too long continued."

Am I to understand that if he had been President in 1952, in the midst of wartime conditions, with feed demand exceeding annual production and in the face of those limited reserves, he or any other responsible official would have ordered at that time a cutback in our production? I do not think so. I do not believe President Eisenhower or any other President would have done that.

I ask that some spokesman for the White House answer that question, if the administration intends to persist in such misleading propaganda about past policies "too long continued."

The only way the Democratic administration could have "too long continued," those policies was up to January 1, 1953. We went out the first week of January 1953. If anyone continued the wrong policies after 1953, it must have been the Eisenhower administration that did so. I have been talking about the policies in effect up to 1952, what the level of production was up to that time, and the level of so-called surpluses.

I ask the present Secretary of Agriculture, in view of his continuing assertions about all of agriculture's troubles stemming from too long maintaining what they term "wartime incentives," whether he would have recklessly risked this country's security by cutting back production at such a time.

We were still at war in Korea, and we needed our maximum production.

In 1952 we had quite a war on our hands. We were worried about a larger conflict. The international situation was very desperate, very critical.

If the administration is to persist in saying that the troubles it inherited were caused by wartime policies, "too long continued," it must mean that in 1951 and 1952 we should not have expanded production, despite the fact that in 1952 we were using up our supplies of grain feeds faster than we were able to add to those supplies. If there were Republicans who did not think so, their voices were not raised then. How can they justify such a clamor now?

It is particularly ill-becoming the President of the United States to talk about wartime policies being too long continued, when during his own campaign in 1952 he himself pledged keeping 90 percent of parity for at least another year if he were elected, and promised to seek full parity after that.

If, as the President says, 90 percent of party was too long continued, he and his administration did the continuing by waiting until 1954 before daring to wiggle out of campaign promises to America's farmers.

Remember, in 1952 the carryover was only 255 million bushels of wheat, 486 million bushels of corn, and 20 million tons of feed grains.

Suppose they tell us they lacked time to effectively do anything about the 1953 crop.

All right, we will go along. We were still at war, and the Government still preferred taking its chances on the side of abundance rather than the side of shortage.

But even in October of 1953, the corn carryover was only 769 million bushels. Carryover of wheat was only 562 million bushels. Carryover of total feed grains was only 27 million tons.

Those figures are not at all alarming. Five hundred and sixty-two million bushels of wheat are just about enough for 6 or 7 months of normal consumption. Seven hundred and sixty-nine million bushels of corn are just about enough, under present consumption requirements, with the present census of animals—or, rather, were at that time, 1953—for about 2 months of consumption, or not even 2 months of consumption.

I repeat, Mr. President, at the end of 1953, the supplies on hand were not dangerously high. They were not at all dangerously high in the light of the commitments of this country, in light of the international situation, and, above all, in light of the increase in our population.

What would happen if in some of the great grain-producing areas of the United States we had a winter of the kind that has caused so much suffering in southern Europe this year? What would happen to the winter wheat crop? What would happen, for example, in some areas of the country where spring wheat is planted, if those areas were to get a killing frost of the kind Western Europe has suffered?

What do Senators think would happen to our supplies in situations like that?

I have lived through a drought, as I am sure other Senators have. We have had unusually good production weather during the past several years. I can remember when, as a boy, the last crop we had was in 1927 and the next one in 1938. We waited almost 12 years for a crop. I can remember duststorms day after day and month after month, which were so bad that we could not see a block

down the street. In one area of Beadle County, in South Dakota, I saw the topsoil blown off a large part of the land in that county. It was blown off, and all that was left was the hardpan. The earth was as hard as concrete.

The Government of the United States sent their great big bulldozers, and scoops, and shovels and the top-soil was taken out of the ditches and placed on the fields. I remember as a young man in South Dakota being able to walk from the ground up the side of the largest barn in the county. The dirt was piled up against the whole side of the barn. I believe I know something about a drought. I knew some people—no matter how efficient they were or how conscientious, or how filled with faith and purpose—who had no crops year after year.

I remind the Senate that only the other day there appeared in the newspapers pictures showing one of the most serious duststorms the southwestern part of our country has ever experienced. Whole areas were swept away by tornadoes.

I am not one of those Senators who are greatly concerned about the supplies in the pipeline and in our inventory.

I cannot imagine any businessman saying that he is greatly concerned about a reasonable inventory. No one with any business experience would say that. The first elementary lesson of business operation is that it is necessary to have a working inventory and a source of supply. I was taught that much when I was a boy 11 years of age. When I was that old I started in our business by taking an inventory. The first lesson I received was, "Son, be sure that you have most of your capital involved in inventory."

Of course, if there is little or no inventory in the farm program, the grain speculators have a field day, and the consumer must pay through the nose. That is what happens when there is not a sufficient inventory of food and fiber.

I say to the consumers of America and to all the housewives of America that one of the greatest blessings they have is in the form of abundant food and fiber supplies in the Commodity Credit Corporation warehouses. That inventory has done more to keep prices down than any other single factor. I would look with great concern on living in this country, or in any other country, at a time when there was a shortage of food and fiber.

A man who visited my office before I came on the floor told me that in Mexico turkey meat is selling for a dollar a pound. Minnesota is one of the largest turkey-producing States in the Nation. I believe it is either the second or third largest. We have some of the biggest turkey processing plants in the country, where the turkey meat is packed and frozen. That man was interested in turkey markets in the Latin-American countries. He said, "Senator, isn't it interesting that we have had all this talk about surpluses of turkeys? The Government hesitated to do anything about it. It hesitated even to help us open new markets."

The turkey processors and turkey growers are meeting in Washington today, trying to do something about the foreign markets. Our people in Minnesota will sell turkeys in Mexico.

Do Senators know why turkeys are selling for $1 a pound in Mexico? Mexico is short of turkeys. That is why the average Mexican does not get turkey meat. He does not have a chance to eat turkey.

If people will come to Minnesota, we will serve them the finest turkey they can get anywhere. They will get the finest turkey they ever tasted in their lives. They do not have to be bluebloods or rich, any one can get in Minnesota the finest food in the world at reasonable prices. We have an abundance of food and fiber. That is the reason, Mr. President, why prices are reasonable.

What has happened since 1953? I want the record to be crystal clear. Secretary Benson has talked about inheriting a mess. He may have inherited a mess, I do not know anything about that. However, it was not in the agricultural program. He may have inherited some other kind of mess, but he did not inherit a mess in agriculture.

In 1952, we had barely enough in the way of supplies to get by. In 1953, we had a modest carry-over. What has happened since? Well, let us see what the administration has done.

At the beginning of the 1955 marketing year, after 2 years of Bensonism, the carry-over of wheat was 1,021,000,000 bushels. The carry-over of corn was 1,050,000,00 bushels. The carryover of feed grain was 29½ million tons. Mr. President, people can blame a great many things on Harry Truman, apparently, and they can blame a great many things on Charles Brannan, the former Secretary of Agriculture. However, it is pretty hard to blame the 1955 and 1954 crops on them. It is pretty hard to blame on either Mr. Truman or Mr. Brannan something that happened in the Department of Agriculture 2 years after they left office. It is pretty hard to make anything like that stick. Some people believe that all our troubles are due to Truman and Brannan. There was one thing about Harry Truman. One always knew when Harry Truman did something. He took credit for what he did, and he took the blame for what he did not do, and for what other people did or did not do.

It was refreshing to see a man who was willing to take responsibility. Now it is a sort of shifting scene all the time, and we never know who is getting us into trouble. It is like Secretary Dulles' remark about the brink. When Secretary Benson appeared before our committee he said he did not know that we had been close to war; therefore he had not planned for the necessary food and fiber, because he had not been told that we were on the brink of war three times.

Then there is that frank and candid man from General Motors, Mr. Wilson, who holds a position called Secretary of Defense. He had not been told and he did not know that the country had been 3 times on the brink of war in 3 years, and that only by the miraculous hands of John Foster Dulles and President Eisenhower were we drawn back.

In case we get to another brink of war, I think the Secretary of Defense should be cut in on it, for if we get into war, he is one man who should know we are in it. And it would not be a bad idea to let the Secretary of Agriculture know sometime within the month.

The truth is that there is just a little too much independent operation, too much flying on one wing, and not enough coordination.

Mr. President, if surpluses have become unmanageable, and are to be blamed for depressed prices in agriculture, they are surpluses created by this administration, through price-depressing, income-reducing policies.

Our surpluses are not the result of 90 percent of parity. I have placed in the RECORD the fact sheets to show that the greatest production increase came in those commodities that have less than 90 percent of parity. I have pointed out, and I shall at a later time put into the RECORD, statistical evidence to show that as we cut price supports, we increase production.

Our surpluses would not be unmanageable if we had people with a will to manage them for the protection of farmers, and the creative imagination to use them constructively, instead of merely a blind drive to get rid of them at any cost—to the Government or the farmer.

Both Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower persist in deceiving the American people on this false concept of inherited surpluses.

I wish to pin this one down today. I know that some of my critics will be examining this record, and I ask any critic or anyone who disagrees with my position on agriculture to show me how the carryover at the end of 1953 was unmanageable. I ask them to examine the record of 1953 after the administration had been in power 6 months, and at the end of 1953, after it had been in power 1 year—1 full year in which to mess it up themselves. Even then the surpluses were great. At the end of 1952 the carryover was at a basic minimum for the protection of the health, welfare, and security of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not know how else to get this message out to the people. That is the only reason why I am making this talk tonight.

The people have been told so often that the surpluses at the end of the Democratic administration were too great that they begin to believe it. They have been told other untruths, too, Mr. President. I know of no better way to describe it than to say it was plain, outright misinformation. They have been told at times things about our national security which were not correct. If a phrase is repeated often enough by the radio, by television, in magazines and newspapers, some people will start to believe it. The Russians believe what the Kremlin leaders tell them, because that is all they hear.

Many of the German people believed what Hitler told them. Many of our own people in the cities and on the farms believe what is told them, because that is all they hear. They are told in magazine after magazine, editorial after editorial, that the reason why there is trouble in agriculture is because of "the

mess we inherited." The authors of that statement are Eisenhower and Benson.

If they think it is a mess, what will they think about what will be left to the next administration that comes in? I sometimes almost wish we Democrats were not going to win next November when I think of all the work cut out for us. The last time the Democrats took over from the Republicans in a national election, the Republicans had had the great engineer, Mr. Hoover, as President. He is a fine and distinguished citizen, but I regret to say that by the end of his administration there were so many tremendous problems left for the next administration, that it was anything but a joyride and a pleasure to serve as President. I hope our next President will not find himself in a similar situation.

Secretary Benson knows full well that the facts I have brought to the attention of the Senate today are true. They are from his own Department. I know the advertising agency he is using has not read those statements. I have a great respect for these public relations firms. They are fine; they are necessary, and they perform a great function in the commercial life of our Nation. They are absolutely essential. Advertising is an important occupation. But when an advertising firm takes hold of a commercial commodity, it tries to find out all about it. For instance, they set out to advertise motor oil. They examine the viscosity, they find out how many miles it can be driven, and whether it is Pennsylvania oil or Texas oil.

I wish the advertising agencies would do just as good a job when they write speeches and newspaper advertisements for Mr. Benson. I wish they would look at the facts first. If they would do that they would be doing us all a great service.

Mr. President, I said that the Secretary of Agriculture knows that what I have said is true. Yet he continues to blame the plight of agriculture on what he calls the mistakes of past administration leadership, blaming our stepped-up production entirely on previous programs of 90 percent of parity.

But he confessed the truth once, when few Americans were around to hear him. When he spoke before the Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome last year he told the rest of the world that America had increased production to protect the free world from the threat of shortage and scarcity, and that as a result, the free world had an obligation to help absorb that increased abundance.

Why does he not admit to the American people that it was the patriotism of the farmers in responding to appeals from our Government to produce enough for world emergency needs, and not Democratic mistakes, which resulted in overabundance.

I have one question to ask him. Is it morally right for the Secretary of Agriculture to tell the world family of nations that we produced an abundance to protect them from shortage and scarcity, and, therefore, they have an obligation to help absorb that abundance?

What can one think about our Secretary of Agriculture going over to Rome and telling the many members of the Food and Agriculture Organization that the reason America has an abundance and a surplus is because we entered upon a policy of increased production to protect the world from scarcity and shortage? Then he says to these delegates, "Gentlemen, you have an obligation, therefore, to help us by buying the products from us, because we Americans did our part. We expanded our production to help you. Now, you help us."

That is what he said in Rome. I wish I had been there. I was supposed to be a delegate, but I was engaged in farm hearings. But I had the record. Now, in the United States, when he goes on the radio or television, he says:

> The only reason why we have this terrible problem is that the Democrats messed it all up. They messed it up with overproduction.

Mr. Secretary, I ask this question: Is it morally right for you to talk this way? You should have told the folks in Rome what you tell the folks in Minnesota, or you should tell the folks in Minnesota what you told the folks in Rome. Or am I to understand that when you are in Rome, you do as the Romans do, and when in Minnesota, you do as the Republicans do. Is that what I am to understand?

I mean only some Republicans. I want to make the record clear. Many Republican Senators have had great courage. They have stood up against their own party leadership. They have represented their people.

The present Presiding Officer, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], has demonstrated his courage many times, especially in the field of agriculture.

I was in a discussion yesterday with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. The record of the junior Senator from North Dakota in behalf of the farmers of his State is an excellent one.

The farmers of North Dakota have never had a better friend than the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

My own colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], has demonstrated plenty of courage standing up for 90 percent of parity and the kind of farm program which we both favor. He a Republican, I a Democrat. We agree on a farm program. Do you know why, Mr. President? It is because we live where the farm people live. We talk to farmers. We see their conditions. I think we know the kind of people they are. We know farmers are people who have never asked for a free ride. We know they are people who have never asked for a handout. We know they are hard-working, self-sacrificing people, good, solid, substantial citizens.

Mr. President, I say that if anyone in America is deserving of a break, it is the people who work long hours, the people who respond to every request of their Government, the people who have a record of faithfulness and of honor second to none.

Mr. President the press-bestowed halo around Mr. Benson gets a bit tarnished at times when his actions are really placed under scrutiny.

Let me add one more comment about Mr. Benson's appeal to other countries to help bail him out of his surplus problems. If the free world has a moral obligation toward our farmers for their all-out emergency production, so indeed must our own Government have such a moral obligation.

How can the United States Secretary of Agriculture go to Rome and say to the Italian people, "You have an obligation to bail out the American farmers"? Yet the same Secretary of Agriculture returns to the United States and lectures the American farmers, as he did in St. Paul a couple of years ago, saying that they will not get any help from their Government unless there is a disaster. He said that price supports would be disaster insurance. He said that if the American farmers got too much help, it would hurt their moral fiber.

I have some advice for all those persons who worry about the moral fiber of others: Let them worry about their own. Generally, persons—especially persons engaged in politics—who go around lecturing other folks about their moral fiber would do better if they simply worried about their own moral fiber. There are clergymen who know how to preach better than such persons. I am of the opinion that clergymen have a better way of explaining, of touching our hearts, and of bringing us a little closer, perhaps, to Divine Providence than do some of us who are in positions of political responsibility.

Anyway, the farm families of Minnesota do not want to have anyone coming out from Washington to lecture them about their morals or their moral fiber. What they want is someone to help them get price supports on their food and fiber.

If no satisfactory program has been evolved to use our abundance wisely, the responsibility rests upon the shoulders of Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower.

If no satisfactory program has been devised to protect the farmers' income while adjusting production to world conditions that changed after 1952, the responsibility rests again upon the shoulders of those who asked the American people to trust them for leadership in 1952. And do not tell me that the widely huckstered "bold new Eisenhower" farm program of 1956 fills either of those needs.

This administration wants to claim credit for peace and prosperity. I gather they are going to do a lot of talking about it. If they want to receive credit for peace and prosperity, then I want them to take credit for what has happened to agriculture. If they want to take credit for reasonably full employment in American factories, I want them to take credit for all the farm surpluses which have accumulated, and which they say are so unmanageable. The surpluses were accumulated during the present administration.

They say, "Give us the credit for all the apples without spots and worms. You take the credit for those with spots and worms." I do not intend to let them get by with taking credit for all the gold and telling us to take the credit for all the tinsel.

But, I grant our task will be a tough one. I have never seen such political propaganda and controlled publicity in my life. It is actually impossible to get through the paper curtain in this country. The Iron Curtain is about the toughest to breach; but the paper curtain is pretty tough, too.

I repeat what I said earlier: I intend to make the record crystal clear, so far as Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY is concerned. This is not Benson's farm program; it is Eisenhower's farm program. Eisenhower is running for reelection. I want him to defend his farm program. If Eisenhower is to be a candidate for reelection, he will have to face up to these issues. He has made his own decision.

A clever job has been done in America by the Republican National Committee and its satellites. In foreign affairs, if anything goes wrong, it is Dulles' foreign policy. Anytime anything goes wrong in the Department of the Interior, in terms of natural resources, or the leasing of lands, it is McKay's policy. Whenever anything concerning atomic energy or the Dixon-Yates contract comes up, it is the policy of Admiral Strauss, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. If anything goes wrong in the field of agriculture, it is Benson's fault.

I do not agree with that. I say it is the fault of the man who is the boss, not of the man who is appointed. The President of the United States is an elected public official; his subordinates are appointive public officials. What clever political strategy it is if the Chief Executive can keep his appointees always expendable, thereby protecting the man at the top.

There was a theory in the early days of history that the king could do no wrong. That was when there were monarchies. We have never had in this country the theory that the President can do no wrong, because we check our Presidents. The President of the United States is responsible for the farm program; he is responsible for the surpluses; he is responsible for the mismanagement of the program. If he wants to correct those conditions, all he has to do is to change strawbosses.

This administration's imagination is so limited that it lacks the vision to convert to good purpose our ability to produce. Instead, all it can think of is to ask farmers not to produce—for which it will pay them some kind of "unemployment compensation" while disguising it behind a high pressure advertising campaign to make them think they are better off with less income.

I shall return to this subject later in my remarks, because it needs more than a passing lick. Suffice it to say that the Eisenhower farm program was designed to meet some problems of the Eisenhower administration, not to meet the problems of our farmers. While the public is made to believe this administration's great generosity is inspiring a handout of millions to farmers, not one thing it suggests means increased income or earnings for America's farmers this year.

But let us take these new proposals in due time.

We are still discussing how we got into this fix.

There has been more concern in the administration about the disposal of surpluses than there has been about disposing of the farm problem. What I have been worrying about is that in the process of removing the so-called surpluses, we shall be removing the farmers. Very frankly, that is what would have happened had we not learned about and exposed the administration's farm bill. I want to repeat: The sponsors of that bill surely left it in a hurry. The bill was introduced on a Monday. By Thursday, all its sponsors had run for the political weeds. One after one they made it quite clear. They said, "Record me on this. Get it in the RECORD." They have to get it in the RECORD, because not one Senator could have gone home to his constituency and stood the test of election if he had voted for that farm bill.

Farmers are wise. They would have found what was in the bill in short order, once they got a chance to look at it. My office was filled with mail from people who were wondering what was happening in Washington.

I repeat, I think it would be interesting for anyone to get the records of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and find out what it was the administration put in that administration farm bill. I want to tell you, Mr. President, they moved away from sponsorship of that bill faster than a bobsled team goes down the bobsled slopes in the Olympics. And that is pretty fast, too, Mr. President.

So if the people want us to vote for the Eisenhower farm program as set forth in the advertisement, someone is going to have to reintroduce the bill, and I am confident nobody in Congress will introduce it.

I can not get over these box-top politics: "Send a coupon to your Senator." It is a wonder they did not put the franking privilege on the coupon. Mr. President, that is an easy way to get one's political views across. One does not even have to write a form letter, but merely send a coupon.

"Clip the coupon and send to your Senator."

"Clip the coupon and send to your Representative."

I am very happy to report that in the State of Minnesota very few coupons have been clipped. Most of the "coupon clippers" in our State are against a good farm program, with few exceptions. There may be a few exceptions.

Oh, I know some people say Secretary Benson's lower support prices have not had a fair trial, and that this sliding—not flexible—scale program has not been in effect until last year.

The truth is, that Secretary Benson's attempt to control production by lowering farm prices has been in effect and force since the day he took office. His intentions to bring down support levels were made clear right from the outset. He wasted no time in lowering support levels over which he had discretion, and started a vigorous campaign to change the law so he could bring the rest down.

The time that future price prospects may have a bearing on a farmer's intention is at planting time, not at harvest time.

When farmers planted in 1953, they knew support levels would be lowered on some commodities and were likely to go down in the future on others.

When they planted in 1954, they knew the pressure was still downward, with a greater slide ahead.

When they planted last year, they knew the squeeze of lower prices was really on.

Yet production has gone up consistently, just as many of us warned it would. It has gone up the most on commodities where support levels were cut the most.

The earliest and most drastic price-support cuts Secretary Benson made were on feed grains, for which the law gave him full discretion. Yet today, the total supply of feed grains and other concentrates has increased to a new high of 197 million tons for the 1955–56 season, about 14 percent higher than the 1948–53 average.

The same thing has been true for other commodities.

When support levels were reduced, production increased, except where marketing controls were put into effect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in my remarks a statistical table substantiating my claim that the sliding scale has not reduced farm production. In fact, the sliding scale has greatly increased farm production on every commodity on which the price-support level has been reduced.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sliding scale has not reduced farm production

[When support levels were reduced, production increased, except where marketing quotas were put into effect.]

Commodity	Level of support			Production (million of units)		
	1952 (per unit)	1955 (per unit)	Percent change	1952	1955	Percent change
Wheat ..... bushels	$2.20	$2.06	−6	1,299	[1] 917	[1] −29
Rice ..... hundredweight	$5.04	$4.66	−8	48	[1] 49	[1] −2
Cotton ..... pounds and bales	$0.31	$0.31	0	15.1	[1] 12.9	[1] −15
Corn ..... bushels	$1.60	$1.58	−1	2,977	[1] 3,113	[2] +5
Oats ..... do	$0.78	$0.61	−22	1,260	1,636	+30
Sorghum grain ..... hundredweight	$2.38	$1.78	−25	83	227	+173
Soybeans ..... bushels	$2.56	$2.04	−20	298	388	+30
Milk ..... percent	90	75	−17	80,812	87,773	+9
Barley ..... bushels	$1.22	$0.94	−23	226	387	+71
Flaxseed ..... do	$3.77	$2.91	−23	30	43	+42
Rye ..... do	$1.42	$1.18	−17	16	28	+75

[1] Marketing quotas in operation in 1955 but not in 1952.
[2] Acreage allotments in operation in 1955 but not in 1952.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when we were asked in this Senate to approve the sliding scale of lower price supports, the main argument advanced was that lower prices would help curtail production.

Many of us argued the opposite, pointing out the farmer's fixed costs that compelled him to increase volume to attempt to maintain his income when unit prices were declining.

I submit, Mr. President, that the facts themselves now disclose the fallacy of the administration argument that lowered prices are an effective and proper means of curbing production.

The next argument advanced was that 90 percent supports meant too many controls, and that the sliding scale would make controls less necessary.

Pardon me, Mr. President, if I seem to chuckle at that suggestion. When I read it now it seems so ludicrous that anybody could have believed that flexible controls would have meant less control over farm production.

Perhaps some farmers bit on that one, but they have learned better.

With the sliding scale law of 1954 in full effect during the past year, marketing quotas were still in effect for cotton, wheat, peanuts, rice, and tobacco, with corn under acreage allotments. And the Secretary of Agriculture has already made known his intentions of tightening controls even more this year.

Show me where lower prices, and lower income, have freed farmers from controls.

Show me where lower prices, and lower income, have reduced production.

Show me where the sliding scale has done anything for agriculture other than squeeze downward on the farmers' income.

Some people still try to tell us what happens in Washington has little to do with farm prices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the change in support levels on different commodities between 1952 and 1955, and the resultant change in average prices received by farmers for those same products.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm prices are made in Washington

Commodity	Support level		Average Oct. 15 market price received by farmers		Percentage change 1952–55	
	1952	1955	1952	1955	Support level	Average national price received by farmers
Barley, bushel	$1.22	$0.94	$1.42	$0.909	−23	−36
Beans, dry edible, hundredweight	7.87	6.36	8.48	7.04	−19	−17
Butterfat, pound	.692	.562	.735	.569	−19	−23
Corn, bushel	1.60	1.58	1.53	1.14	−1	−25
Cotton, pound	.308	.32	.3677	.328	+4	−11
Cottonseed, ton	66.70	46.00	70.70	43.50	−31	−38
Flaxseed, bushel	3.77	2.91	3.73	2.76	−23	−26
Milk, wholesale, hundredweight	3.85	3.15	5.29	4.34	−18	−18
Oats, bushel	.78	.61	.828	.591	−22	−29
Peanuts, pound	.120	.122	.111	.118	+2	+6
Rice, hundredweight	5.04	4.66	5.76	4.60	−8	−20
Rye, bushel	1.42	1.18	1.74	.926	−17	−47
Sorghum grain, hundredweight	2.38	1.78	2.87	1.63	−25	−43
Soybeans, bushel	2.56	2.04	2.71	2.08	−20	−23
Tobacco, pound	.495	.466	.509	.55	−6	+8
Wheat, bushel	2.20	2.08	2.07	1.94	−5	−6
Wool, pound	.542	.62	.528	.395	+14	−25

Source: Agricultural prices, USDA.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say right now that it has been Secretary Benson's philosophy of cheap feed that has brought on cheap hogs and cheap beef, and thrown the greatest income-producing segments of our agriculture into a tailspin. That was testified to again and again in the Senate committee hearings. When cheap feed is available, there will be cheap hogs and cheap cattle. And let me hasten to add that it is cheap hogs and cheap beef to the producer, not to the consumer.

While farmers suffer hardship, meat packers' profits have soared tremendously.

Yet Secretary Benson shuts his eyes to such profits and tries to blame consumer meat prices on higher labor costs, when the truth is that labor cost per pound of meat coming out of our packing plants today is lower than a year ago. Labor costs on a pound of meat coming out of our packing plants are lower today than they were a year ago.

Ezra, answer that. I charge on this floor that you have misled the American people. The labor costs for a pound of meat today are less than they were a year ago.

Any increase in wage rates in meat packing plants in the last year have been more than absorbed in increased productivity, letting packers reap a windfall of profit at the expense of both livestock producers and consumers.

It is time for Republicans, and everyone else, to be more concerned about saving the farmer, than about saving face on a program that has not worked.

Secretary Benson's farm program stands today condemned as an utter failure, a proven failure.

It is a monument to mismanagement and bad judgment.

And no wonder.

It was born in a spirit of preconceived political prejudice and partisanship.

It has increased surpluses, rather than reduced them. It has reduced income, rather than increased income.

It has driven prices down, rather than pushed them up.

It has resulted in the liquidation of billions of dollars of farm assets.

I wonder how many people realize the tremendous liquidation of farm assets which has taken place in the past few years. It runs into the billions of dollars.

It has spread fear and uncertainty throughout farms and ranches of the Nation, and demoralized farm markets.

Even the much vaunted businesslike efficiency of Republicanism is absent from the Benson farm program.

It is a monument of mismanagement. It is a horrible example of confusion. And it is being administered by stubborn and willful men, unwilling to admit the error of their ways, more interested now in saving face than in saving the agricultural economy.

Farmers can no longer look to the Department of Agriculture as their friend in Government. The great farm committee system of freely elected farmer committee members, so essential to the successful operation of any farm program, has been demoralized and become the victim of political manipulation.

I wish the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] could explain again what has happened in the State of Missouri with regard to farmer committee election systems, as has happened in other States.

Farmers no longer run their own farm programs. Republican Agricats are in the saddle. The Department of Agriculture has become a privileged sanctuary for processors, speculators, and financiers.

Just as Republican policies are driving the farmers off the land, those policies have long ago driven farmers out of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, these days it is as hard to find a real dirt farmer in the top echelons of the Department of Agriculture as it is to find a glass of cold water in the Sahara Desert. There used to be lots of real honest-to-goodness farmers up top in the Department of Agriculture; there used to be in the Department of Agriculture farmers who were Secretaries of Agriculture or Under Secretaries of Agriculture. I can remember when Al Loveland, from Iowa, and Claude Wickard, from Indiana, served in the Department of Agriculture. They were real farmers. They tilled the soil. But today when we go to the Department of Agriculture, we meet persons from the Safeway Stores or persons from the food processors—not the growers, but the processors—or persons from the Meat Institute—not cattlemen, Mr. President, but persons from the Meat Institute. All of them are fine people; do not misunderstand me, Mr. President. But they should be serving in the Department of Commerce, not in the Department of Agriculture.

Nothing in the law provides that a real farmer cannot be appointed to a top position in the Department of Agriculture. Of course I do not say that all positions in that Department should be occupied by farmers. Of course I do not want every position in the Government to be

held by a farmer, any more than I want all Government positions to be held by labor, or all Government positions to be held by business. I do not want ours to be a farmer government or a labor government or a business government. I think the duty is to have a balanced government. But such a balanced government has long since been something of the past.

I know there will be those who will charge that I am just outright partisan in regard to this issue; but I wish to say that the hour for righteous indignation is at hand. If it is partisan to charge the Republican administration since 1952 with mismanagement, when it is proven by the facts, then I plead guilty. I have given the statistics and the facts.

Of course representatives of the administration will attempt to rationalize the present situation; they will say, "You do not realize the effect that Brannan and others who served in the past have had. Their spirit remains; it lingers on." I have even heard such persons say that one of the troubles is that there are too many carryovers and too many holdovers in the Department of Agriculture. Well, it is a good thing, Mr. President, that there are still some holdovers in the Department who have a working knowledge, and a basis of expert information.

It is amazing how many persons are still gullible enough to accept some of the brain-washing process that comes from the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, the office of Mr. Benson. He bemoans the surplus, which his policies have created and are aggravating. He bemoans farm-program costs, which under his bungling administration have soared to unbelievably new highs—but with less results.

He talks about freedom from regimentation, but then invokes stricter controls than agriculture has ever before had to endure, plus the worst regimentation of all—the regimentation of poverty.

He talks about bipartisanship, while injecting into the administration of our farm programs more partisan politics than ever before in history.

The sad and tragic thing about this administration is that it has now become a victim of its own propaganda. On this issue of farm surpluses, it has tried to scare the daylights out of the American people. In the process of so doing, it has frightened itself.

In order to meet this so-called monstrous problem, it has again embraced a fallacious economic philosophy—the same economic practices that were tried, and that failed, in the days of mass unemployment in the early thirties. The idea that by reducing prices, production will be reduced, and thereby agriculture's income problems will be solved, is a throwback to a repudiated political-economic formula that was tried on other surpluses a generation ago.

If mass unemployment—a labor surplus—developed, the supposed cure was to let wages fall until reemployment became "profitable," or until hunger-driven men would accept jobs at any wage. That is real regimentation.

If prices were falling, the cure was to let them fall until they hit bottom. If production exceeded consumption, the cure was to let enough surplus small-business men fail. Thus, these short-sighted people rationalized, every depression would ultimately end. Theoretically, that was correct, but of course in the meantime almost all the people were at the end, too. During the past quarter of a century, the great progress of our general economy from boom and bust to stability and progress, from inhumanity to social conscience, has repudiated that false economic doctrine, for most segments of our economy.

Mr. President, I must say that today the Republican leadership in far too many areas is trying to do to the American farmer just what the Republicans did to the American workingman 25 years ago. It is time these Republican Rip Van Winkles woke up, and learned some lessons from the past.

Our society has found that decent wage standards and living standards for workers require collective bargaining—another term for orderly marketing of labor—and unemployment compensation—another term for price supports for workers' income. Our society has accepted pegging of interest rates by the Federal Reserve System to assure solvency of our banks, and has accepted tariffs to protect our industry, and has accepted assurance of fair returns on investments for our transportation and utility systems. Our Government provides and protects these standards, by law.

It is about time, then, that we accept orderly marketing and price protection for farmers, as a legitimate function of government.

Please do not misunderstand me, Mr. President, I am not in any sense saying that legislation alone can solve everything for the farmer, or that the farmer should put his sole reliance on legislation.

What I am saying is that the Government has just as much responsibility to promote the welfare of farmers, as it does to promote the welfare of any other segment of our economy. But today the Government is failing to fulfill that responsibility.

Recently the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]—a Republican—and I both spoke before the National Association of Manufacturers, in New York. The Senator from Arizona and I shared the platform there. The subject of their panel, when we appeared, was "Political Requirements for Prosperity." Business and industry exert their influence to have the Congress enact legislation and adopt policies which they believe will be beneficial to business and industry. There is nothing wrong with that—and certainly there is nothing wrong with having the farmer ask to be remembered, too.

Why should he be told to go home and take care of his own problems, and to quit looking to his Government for help?

Today we need in Washington, men who understand that agriculture is a truly competitive industry, made up of independent enterprises that are the trademark of the American economic system. This competitive economy needs built-in economic safeguards and a climate of Government cooperation, for its preservation.

The central issue is more than an argument over the level of price supports, or, for that matter, over the details of any farm legislation. The central issue is the basic attitude of our Government toward American agriculture. No law is any better than the spirit and intent of those who administer it.

Do we really believe in the concept of equality for agriculture? Do we really desire to maintain and promote the traditional American social-economic pattern of family farming? If we really believe in equality of agriculture and continuation of the family farm tradition, then the Government must so design its programs and policies as to achieve and sustain these objectives.

Farmers are tired of being looked upon as statistics. They want to be looked upon as people, as human beings, as first-class citizens, as individuals of equal importance to anyone else in the national social and economic picture. Our farmers justly deserve all of this.

How can any farmer believe this administration really wants to see 100 percent of parity for farmers in the market place, as it professes, when its own spokesmen insist, out of the other side of their mouths, that crop loans at 90 percent of parity are too high because they price American agricultural products out of the market, and invite foreign competition? Mr. President, think that through for a minute, please. If 90 percent price supports are too high and force prices so high that foreign competition is invited to enter our markets and forces American-grown agricultural commodities out of the market place, what do you think, Mr. President, 100 percent of parity would do to the free market? One hundred percent of parity would make it even worse.

How can anyone say, on the one hand, when speaking out of one side of his mouth, that he is in favor of 100 percent of parity in the market place; but then say, out of the other side of his mouth that he is opposed to 90 percent of parity on crop loans because 90 percent is too high and forces American-grown agricultural commodities out of competition, and invites foreign agricultural commodities to come into our market?

Yet that is the kind of double talk the administration's spokesmen keep dishing out.

How can any farmer believe this administration really wants agriculture to achieve equality of income, when one of its spokesmen says farmers were living in a "dream world" back in 1951, and should not expect to get such prices again?

Yet, even in the "dream world" of 1951, the average net income of farmers was only half the per capita income of others.

How brazen can the spokesmen for the administration get? How ridiculous can they get?

Why should farmers, alone, be expected to take a downhill skid which the administration calls "adjustment," while the rest of the economy reaps profits far beyond their own "dream world" wartime highs?

Mr. President, I may say that in 1951 there was quite a "dream world" for a considerable number of other folks, too.

We have mentioned what has happened to agriculture since 1952. What has happened to the rest of our economy? Corporation profits, after taxes, are up 36 percent since 1952. Interest collections are up 22 percent since 1952.

Does this administration tell business and industry it should quit expecting such a dream world, and start adjusting downward? Of course not. That kind of talk is reserved for farmers.

How long do Senators think Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks would last if he persisted in publicly telling business and industry their profits were too high, and that they should expect less for their products next year?

What do Senators think would happen if Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, should go before the National Association of Manufacturers and say to them, "Gentlemen, you had it too good in 1951. You must quit even hoping that you will ever have it that good again, and you ought to be ashamed of yourselves for even having it that good at any time since." If any responsible official of the Department of Commerce should go to any business group in the country and say to that business group, "You had it too good in 1951; you were living in a dream world; you should never expect ever to have it that good again, and you ought to be ashamed of yourselves for even thinking of having it that good again," they would be down here demanding that he be fired, and justly so.

What do Senators think would happen if the Secretary of Labor went before a labor organization and said, "You had a dream world in 1951. You had it too good. It will never be that good again. You had better get used to it. You had better get used to coming down." There would be a mass movement to fire the Secretary of Labor so fast it would make one's head swim.

Yet Don Paarlberg, Chief Economist of the Department of Agriculture, can go up to Massachusetts and talk to a group of farm people, people interested in agriculture as a business, and say to them, "Gentlemen, 1951 was your best year. That was a dream world in which you were living. It will never be so good again. You had better get used to it. It is going to be worse next year. Do not ever even think about getting back to the standards of 1951."

That is in substance what Mr. Paarlberg said. He was even more blunt than that. That is a very peculiar kind of thinking to have as the economic philosophy of the Department of Agriculture.

Yet that is the way the Secretary of Agriculture has talked, ever since he has been in office. Is it any wonder farm prices have gone down, when the Government's official spokesman for agriculture keeps telling the public and the trade that prices are too high, and must be brought down?

Let me emphasize the untold harm done to America's farmers by this negative attitude on the part of the Department of Agriculture.

Regardless of the kind of laws we provide, they are not going to be effective if they are administered by people who either do not believe in them or lack the commonsense to make effective use of the legal tools placed at their disposal to help agriculture.

Administrative policies of the Department have been as detrimental to agriculture as the legislative monstrosities this administration has sponsored.

Because the Eisenhower farm experts had preconceived notions that everything achieved out of trial and error of the past must be wrong, because they had preconceived ideas that they always knew best, they set out to prove they were right—regardless of the consequences to farmers or the country.

They embarked upon a calculated effort to destroy public confidence in the price support programs, and they helped destroy confidence in the commodity markets in the process at the expense of every farmer and at the expense of the public.

They embarked on a campaign to scare the people with the buga-boo of surplus because they lacked the imagination to make good use of abundance, and wound up being scared of the surplus themselves.

It is not the surplus that depresses farm prices. It is how the surplus is handled—how it is managed.

As long as America's grain trade, cotton trade, and edible oil trade know the Department of Agriculture is determined to bring farm prices down, do you think any private operator is foolish enough to carry any larger inventory on hand than absolutely necessary?

That is why the Department of Agriculture is getting bigger surpluses the more it dumps products at cut-rate prices—because they are serving notice to the trade every day that they are going to get rid of everything they have on hand, come what may, at whatever sacrifice to farmers and taxpayers it may require.

I want the record to be clear. I have talked with some of the largest processors of fats and oils in our State, and in the Midwest. Those processors have told me that they would no more think of carrying a private inventory today than they would think of jumping into the Grand Canyon. They ask, "Why should we? The Government is constantly depressing prices. Let the Government carry the inventory. The Government is constantly dumping. We will get it at a cut-rate price."

Furthermore, the Secretary of Agriculture knows this, because some of the men in the grain business and the processing business have told the Department this very thing. Some of the Department's own advisers have told the Department these things. I have talked with some of the advisers of the Department. I know some of the Department of Agriculture advisers, and I know what they have had to say to the Department. But the Department refuses to heed the advice. So today the Government is carrying practically all the inventory.

One of the largest exporters in the Midwest told me less than a month ago that he completed an export transaction recently which ran into millions of dollars, and never touched the grain at all. He said, "In years gone by I always had the grain in my possession, but with the Department in control, you cannot tell what the price of anything is ever going to be." So he said, "We let the Government carry the inventory."

This is what I mean when I say that there is mismanagement. I do not ask my colleagues to accept my word for it. I ask my colleagues to go to the soybean processors and the processors of linseed oil. Go to the members of the grain trade itself. Most of them are Republicans. Ask them whether or not they think the Department of Agriculture is being well managed. I will put the best dinner that Washington affords on the line if 9 out of 10 of them do not say that the manner in which commodities are handled is a laughing matter; it is a matter about which they joke in the trade.

I receive telegrams from men in the grain business who say, "Do you know, Senator HUMPHREY, that they have been dumping corn in your market, the Minnesota market—1948 and 1949 corn, the best corn we ever had, good, dry corn, with good feed value, at distress prices, just to dump it?" Senators should see what happens to the cash corn market when that takes place.

I have asked the Department to open up the secret recommendations of its advisory committees. I am becoming tired of gumshoeing around Washington, finding advisers to the Department and asking them to come to my office or my home and tell me what they are advising the Department.

I was elected to the Senate. I was not appointed. I am an elected representative. I have a right, as a member of the Government, to know what the recommendations are to the Department of Agriculture. One cannot learn what they are. They are a more carefully guarded secret than the secret of the H-bomb.

Do Senators know why they cannot find out what is in those recommendations? Perhaps I can shake them out tonight. The reason is that the recommendations are contrary to the policy. The recommendations of the advisers to the Department are not the recommendations which the Department is making to the Congress. I regret that I must spend as much time as I do in finding members of the advisory committee so that I may talk with them. But I have talked with them. I am saying this in the Senate because I am sure there is someone present from the Department of Agriculture. I want him to rush back and tell the Department officials what I have said.

Let us get those recommendations to the Department of Agriculture here. Send them to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am a member of that committee. I am becoming tired of having to vote on legislative matters when all I have is the recommendation of an appointee who refuses to follow the recommendations of his own advisers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a press release which I issued on January 20, 1956. It is under the headline "Humphrey Seeks To Break Secrecy Lid on Farm Advisory Group's Reports."

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMPHREY SEEKS TO BREAK SECRECY "LID" ON FARM ADVISORY GROUP'S REPORTS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, sought today to "flush out into the open" secret recommendations of Secretary Benson's Agricultural Advisory Committee.

At a meeting of the Senate Agriculture Committee, of which he is a member, Senator HUMPHREY asked that "all the reports" of the advisory group be made available for the committee's review.

"Repeatedly, the administration has publicly stated that it has leaned heavily on the advice of this advisory group in formulating its farm policies," Senator HUMPHREY said. "Yet never has any of the group's reports or recommendations been made public. All we know about them is what Secretary Benson tells us.

"As long as our committee has the responsibility of drafting legislation to correct the deplorable condition to which American agriculture has deteriorated under this administration, I think we are entitled to take a look at the kind of advice Secretary Benson has been getting from his Advisory Committee about which they have talked so much—and whether he has been following it.

"I ask that Secretary Benson be called upon to submit to our committee for review all the reports of his advisory committee, so we can judge for ourselves whether he has been getting good or bad advice, and whether he has been using it.

"The President and the Secretary have both made much ado about getting together the 'best available brains' to guide them on agricultural policy, yet we in the Congress who must make critical decisions are not even given the chance to know what these advisors have to say. It is time to break this lid of secrecy, and bring these reports out into the open."

Senator HUMPHREY also asked the committee to determine whether or not the Department permitted dissenting members of its advisory committee to file "minority reports" on any recommendations, and if so to obtain such "minority reports" along with other recommendations and full reports of the advisory committee's meetings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to conclude quickly.

Much of the so-called surplus problem is merely getting the trade to carry its own inventory, instead of having it carried at Government expense.

Ever since this administration started lowering price supports and adopting other price-depressant policies—and asking for more authority to dump its holdings into the market at cut-rate prices—private commodity dealers have reduced their own normal inventories.

And why not? The private traders knew that under the panic of this administration's race to get rid of whatever it has on hand they could always buy back all they wanted, whenever they needed it later, at lower prices from the Government.

The situation is so pathetic, Mr. President. If I have talked once, I have talked fifty times with people in the processing business, in the grain trade itself. I visit with the grain trade people when I go home to Minneapolis. I go over to our grain trading pit, which is one of the greatest markets in the world. I wish Senators would talk to those people about how the Commodity Credit Corporation is operated. Do Senators know what some of the grain trade people have told me? They have said, "You Democrats did not do too well at it, but oh, man, this crowd." I had breakfast with some of them only about a month ago. They had asked me to have breakfast with them. Do Senators know what they wanted to talk to me about? They wanted to talk to me about how the administration is running the farm program. They were not talking about price supports. They were talking about business, and about the way the Government is handling the surplus commodities. Some of them frankly told me, "Senator, I know this is good for our business, the way it is being done, but we are citizens, too."

They were disturbed, and I was proud of them. I was proud of them for putting their country above their own economic interests.

They did not vote for me. I have scarcely a vote in all the 7 floors of the grain exchange building there. Perhaps there are 1 or 2. Perhaps I have 1 or 2 good friends there. They are brave souls. I have never asked them to advertise the fact that they have voted for me, because that might hurt their business. However, they do know how to run a business. They surely do not believe that the Department knows how to run one. Yet the Commodity Credit Corporation is the biggest business in all of agriculture.

When has this administration ever actually told the Congress what is surplus and what is not in the Government's holdings of farm commodities?

Oh, they tell you how much the CCC owns, and how much they have under loan.

But do they come before us, when they cry so loudly about the surplus, and tell us just what is the real surplus beyond total domestic requirements, export needs, and safe reserves?

Do they tell us to what extent their present holdings are normal inventory of the commodity trade?

Do they tell us, if they know, what level of supply of various major commodities the National Security Council feels should be maintained as available in the public interest, for immediate needs and potential emergency needs?

All these questions have been raised during Senate committee hearings. Where are the answers?

I wish the Secretary of Agriculture had the good judgment of the Red Cross. The Red Cross knows it needs a blood bank, and it tries to provide blood for its blood bank. The Red Cross knows it needs reserves of blood to meet an emergency. Of course if the people in the Red Cross followed the practice of the administration, they would say, "We ought to get rid of our reserves of blood. Whenever we need blood, we will simply go out in the street and snatch up someone and throw him on the ground and tap him."

I asked where the answers were.

They are not fooling the traders in the market place. They are outcounting the Department of Agriculture at every turn.

If the Department of Agriculture persists in thinking its main mission in life is in getting rid of everything in its hands, instead of getting farm income back where it belongs, the traders are going to take advantage of that knowledge by speculating downward on a market bound to go down.

Just let the Department suddenly reverse itself, and see how quickly the trade reverses itself in the commodity markets.

Suppose the Department of Agriculture were to announce today, for example, that it has changed its mind, that it is not going to get rid of any of its holdings; that it is going to lock them up tight, for emergency purposes. Over night we would see the difference in the market.

Why should grain buyers build up inventories now, with the Department of Agriculture frankly announcing that its prices will go down in July when new support levels go into effect? One must have holes in his head to want to do that.

Yet what do Senators suppose is going to happen when this Congress votes to change all that, and restore 90 percent of parity for this year's crop?

Just wait and see. Watch the private inventories build back up, while the buying is still cheap.

In fact, if this administration is so dedicated to surplus removal, the best thing it can do would be to agree with this Congress to lift prices for the coming year.

Private trade would step in and take 50 percent of everything we have in the Commodity Credit Corporation warehouses. If the Government really wants to relieve itself of storage charges, and if the Government really wants to get rid of some of its commodities, it should urge us to pass the 90 percent of parity program. Then we will see what will happen in as short a time as a month. Private traders will move in fast.

Let me cite just one of many, many examples.

That is the cruel hoax seriously depressing the corn market during the past year, when the Secretary of Agriculture seized upon a loophole in the law for purposes other than which it was intended to dump supposedly deteriorating corn onto the market at distressed prices, underselling the farmers they are supposed to protect.

The present farm law contains a necessary provision permitting the Secretary to sell, rather than hold any commodities in danger of spoiling in storage. Nobody objects to that. It all depends on how such authority is used.

The antispoilage provision was never intended as a market factor. If the Commodity Credit Corporation's holdings are acquired for the purpose of stabilizing prices, as the law requires, then these stocks should be rotated by being replaced with new commodities acquired in the open market whenever it becomes necessary to dispose of deteriorating commodities.

Such a course would keep from upsetting the market, and still preserve the good condition of our storage stocks.

But that is not the way this administration acted. In all the panicky search for ways to get rid of the surplus with which this administration has scared itself—a surplus amounting to only 3

months' reserve of corn—some bright boy sold the Secretary of Agriculture on the idea of using the "spoilage" loophole as a surplus disposal "tool," permitting him to sell below otherwise required levels.

Such action broke the corn market heavily last year, costing farmers thousands upon thousands of dollars. And it is quite common gossip in the commodity trade that some speculators made quite a killing out of gambling on prices going down when they learned in advance of the Department's decision to unload a sizable quantity of corn under this loophole.

I am afraid the Secretary was improperly "used" by advisers who had interests other than just getting rid of the surplus for the sake of the Government. I do not impugn his motives; I seriously question his judgment. And I think the situation that resulted could seriously bear being carefully investigated.

It is far from a secret in the grain trade that corn supplies labeled "in danger of spoilage" by the Department of Agriculture were bought at bargain-counter prices, and used to displace corn that would otherwise have been purchased from farmers. It is no secret in the trade that the corn was not spoiled. It was not spoiled corn.

Such tactics as these, indicating the Department's willingness to undercut the market, have kept private dealers apprehensive about carrying any substantial inventories of their own, aggravating the Department's surplus problem and adding to its storage costs that otherwise would be borne by the private trade.

In spite of all its lipservice to preserving free markets, this is just one more illustration of the way the Department of Agriculture under Secretary Benson has consistently disrupted normal functions of such markets, led to administered low prices for farm products, and channeled too great a proportion of our commodities through Government hands.

It is such administrative bungling, coming on top of lowered price supports and a propaganda campaign emphasizing that the farm prices would have to come down, that has piled up more surplus and greater costs of handling that surplus.

Losses to the Government are the greatest in history.

It is amazing, but true, that in just 3 years of Benson mismanagement, total losses on price-support operations have been greater than total losses in all 20 years of previous farm price supports.

Even this does not account for the full loss.

Losses on inventory values of Government-owned commodities which have not yet been chalked up—and will not until they are finally sold—total $2½ billion more—twice as much as the 20 previous years of total losses.

These inventory losses are the result of the administration's own action in cutting the support price—and therefore the market value—of farm commodities, including those in its own inventories.

Here are some figures that indicate the magnitude of the administration's mismanagement of the price-support programs:

[In millions of dollars]

	1933–52 (20 years)	1953–55 (3 years)
Surplus on hand (in CCC stocks or under loan)	2,452	8,666
Losses to Government on price support operations	1,048	1,280

Mr. President, cost figures on price support programs have always been made to look mighty big in the press. They are too big now, under this administration—bigger than they need to be for such an ineffective program.

But these costs are a mighty small investment per individual American, when they are broken down to the price each of us pays for insurance toward a stable economy and an abundant food supply.

For the entire period between 1934 and 1952, the average cost per person per year for price support programs under direction of Democratic administrations was 33 cents. Just 33 cents a year, for each of us, to keep agriculture on an even keel and keep us a land of plenty instead of a land of scarcity.

That is less than two packs of cigarettes a year. Is that too much for the public to pay for a sound economy?

Now, I must admit that we have to pay more than the of two packs of cigarettes under this businesslike administration.

The average cost per person per year for 1953 through 1955 was up to $2.67.

That is still not too much, if it produced results. But it has not.

That 33 cents loss per person was far more than offset by the total gain in farm income pouring into our economy.

Unfortunately, the $2.67 loss is just piled on top of more loss the farmer is suffering—and remember, he is paying for his share of this tax cost just like anybody else—that is, if he has any income left to pay it on.

I suppose the difference between that 33 cents per capita annual cost under we inefficient Democrats and the $2.67 per capita cost under the businesslike efficiency of Republicanism just reflects the higher standard of living to which some Republicans have become accustomed.

Instead of two packs of cigarettes as I mentioned, they want everybody to chip in a handful of four-bit cigars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of realized losses on price support programs from inception of the Commodity Credit Corporation, plus a table breaking those losses down to an average cost per year and an average per capita cost per year.

There being no objections, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Realized losses on price-support programs from inception, Commodity Credit Corporation[1]

Fiscal years	Basic commodities (corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco	Designated nonbasic (butter, cheese, dried milk, honey, potatoes and tung oil)	All other nonbasic (beans, eggs, flaxseed and linseed oil, grain sorghums, etc.)	Total
1934–41	$55,787,335	$176	$4,602,190	$60,389,701
1942–46	[2] 182,568,944	41,031,385	15,944,584	[2] 125,592,975
1947–50	80,991,915	486,147,833	134,103,927	701,243,675
1951	5,284,869	174,027,018	166,286,667	345,598,554
1952	15,417,947	1,283,599	50,650,030	67,351,576
Total 1934–52	[2] 25,086,878	[3] 702,490,011	371,587,398	1,048,990,531
1953	45,807,809	5,324,994	10,013,555	61,146,358
1954	177,385,988	131,177,789	110,913,297	419,477,074
1955	194,541,172	441,617,147	162,903,144	799,061,464
Total 1953–55	417,734,969	578,119,931	283,829,996	1,279,784,896
Total 1934–55	392,648,091	1,280,609,942	655,417,394	2,328,675,427
1956 (through Oct. 31, 1955)	61,066,532	109,183,413	70,264,077	240,514,022
Total 1934–56 (through Oct. 31, 1955)	453,714,623	1,389,793,355	725,681,471	2,569,189,449

[1] The above table relates only to the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and does not include or relate to expenditures made by the Department of Agriculture under sec. 32, parity payments, or any other activities financed with funds provided by the agricultural appropriation bill.
[2] Realized gain.
[3] Includes $478.1 million loss on potatoes.

Source: Figures from Commodity Credit Corporation Report, Oct. 31, 1955.

Losses on price-support programs from inception—Commodity Credit Corporation

Commodity group	Total cost		Average total cost per year		Average cost per person per year	
	1934–52	1953–55	1934–52	1953–55	1934–52[1]	1953–55[2]
Basic commodities (corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco)	*Millions* [3] +$25	*Millions* $417	*Millions* [3] +$1.3	*Millions* $139.0	(4)	$0.868
Designated nonbasic (butter, cheese, dried milk, honey, potatoes, and tung oil)	702	578	37.0	193.0	$0.256	1.206
All other nonbasic (beans, eggs, flaxseed, and linseed oil, grain sorghum, etc.)	372	284	19.5	95.0	.135	.593
Total	1,049	1,279	55.2	427.0	.330	2.667

[1] Computed on basis of 144,000,000 people (United States population average for 1933 and 1952).
[2] Computed on basis of 160,000,000 people (United States population for 1953–54).
[3] Operated at profit to Government.

Source: Figures from Commodity Credit Corporation financial report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, that is the fix we are in today—and how we got there.

And I am tired of hearing Benson's alibi boys say that things would have been just as bad with price supports at 90 percent, as farm prices were dropping anyhow.

Mr. President, anyone who does not believe that firm, effective price supports at 90 percent cushioned the decline far more than would otherwise have been the case is just not looking at the facts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a table showing the differences between percentage price declines on commodities having 90 percent supports, those under the sliding scale, and those without price supports between 1952 and 1954 and between 1952 and 1955.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sliding scale advocates say firm price supports are not effective. Facts are: Price supports cushion drop in net farm income

WITHOUT PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

	Farm operators net farm income	Percent change
	Billion dollars	
1920	6.9	
1921	3.7	−46
WITH PARTIAL PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM		
1952	14.9	−17
1954	12.3	−16
1955 (3d quarter)	10.6	−29

FARM PRICES ARE MADE IN WASHINGTON

PERCENT CHANGE FROM 1952 TO 1955 IN PRICES RECEIVED BY FARMERS FOR COMMODITIES (BASED ON PRICES AS OF OCT. 15, 1952, AND 1955)

I. With firm, adequate price supports

	Percent
Cotton	down 11
Peanuts	up 6
Tobacco, burley	up 8
Wool	up 17

II. With sliding-scale price supports

	Percent
Barley	down 36
Beans, dry edible	down 17
Butterfat	down 23
Corn	down 25
Cottonseed	down 38
Flaxseed	down 26
Grain sorghum	down 43
Milk (manufactured)	down 18
Oats	down 29
Rice	down 20
Rye	down 47
Soybeans	down 23
Wheat	down 6

III. Without price supports

	Percent
Calves	down 23
Chickens, all	down 17
Beef cattle	down 29
Eggs	down 15
Hay	down 20
Hogs	down 22
Lambs	down 21
Potatoes	down 66
Sweetpotatoes	down 51
Turkeys	down 4

PERCENT CHANGE FROM 1952 TO 1954 IN PRICES RECEIVED BY FARMERS FOR COMMODITIES (BASED ON PRICES AS OF OCT. 15, 1952 AND 1954)

I. With firm, adequate price supports

	Percent
Corn	down 5
Cotton	down 6
Peanuts	up 3
Rice	down 22
Tobacco, burley	up 5
Wheat	(1)
Wool	up 4

[1] No change.

II. With sliding scale price supports

	Percent
Barley	down 24
Beans, dry edible	down 8
Butterfat	down 23
Cottonseed	down 15
Flaxseed	down 18
Grain sorghum	down 26
Milk (manufactured)	down 22
Oats	down 12
Rye	down 31
Soybeans	down 6

III. Without price supports

	Percent
Beef cattle	down 28
Calves	down 34
Chickens, all	down 28
Eggs	down 36
Hay	down 14
Hogs	down 1
Lambs	down 21
Potatoes	down 56
Sweetpotatoes	down 28
Turkeys	down 17½

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have had enough of such negative leadership. It is time to call a halt. It is time to move ahead toward full prosperity for agriculture. It is time to demand equality for farmers. Yes; the issue before us involves more than price supports.

It is the entire question of fair income—fair not only to the farmer in meeting his living and operating costs, but fair in terms of relationship to the total national economy.

Any sound prosperity in our country must be built upon a firm foundation of balance in the economy, of maximum production, maximum employment, and maximum purchasing power. Our Government is committed to that concept in the Employment Act of 1946. That is why we have a Council of Economic Advisers for the President, to guide our economy toward that objective.

We appraise the health of our economy every year, to see what needs to be done to maintain that objective of balance between the triple goals of full employment, full production, and full purchasing power. We are constantly adopting and adapting policies and programs for the rest of the economy to implement that objective.

Why must agriculture be lost in the shuffle? How can we possibly achieve the goals for our total economy, if one major segment is left to drift aimlessly out of balance with the rest?

We cannot forget the tragic lessons of the early 1920's. Then, too, we heard the political hucksters sing the sweet words of "peace and prosperity." The stock market was at an all-time high. Corporate profits were going up and up. Then came the collapse that brought in its wake depression, unemployment, bankruptcy, and war.

A balanced economy is as vital to prosperity as a balance of power is to peace. We cannot and must not close our eyes to the dangers present in a farm recession. The solvency and security of the Nation is at stake. The farm problem is everybody's problem.

We can and must seek to bring agricultural income and purchasing power back into balance. We can and must seek to keep it in balance, so that farmers can share in rising living standards along with everyone else in our country. We must do it before agriculture's imbalance topples the rest of our economy. We can and must seek to realize fair income standards for agriculture through every means at our command.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a number of telegrams favoring 90-percent supports.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAHNOMEN, MINN., *February 23, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

Vote for 90 percent old parity included in soil bank.

R. H. SCHNELL and AGNES SCHNELL.

GRAFTON, N. DAK., *February 25, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building:

Thanks for your good work on farm bill. I am with you on 90-percent supports. Keep up the fight.

ART E. ERICKSON.

MANKATO, MINN., *February 25, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

We farmers need 90 percent on corn. Urge no compromise.

RICHARD COLDWELL.
BLUE EARTH COUNTY, AMBOY, MINN.

PITTSFIELD, ILL., *February 24, 1956.*
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

No compromise, 90 percent on all basics, Pike County, 94 percent. Representing 1,200 Pike County Farmers.

ARTHUR HARSHMAN,
Chairman.

MAHNOMEN, MINN., *February 24, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Mass meeting of farmers and business people of Mahnomen County last night urge passage of bill restoring 90-percent supports under old parity formula to basics and feed grains and dairy products. Immediate action also urged to help livestock farmers' incomes at farm level.

RICHARD COYLE,
President, Mahnomen County Farmers Union.

GREENBUSH, MINN., *February 27, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Greenbush Farmers Union favors passage of Senate farm bill favoring 90-percent support for basic crops, including oats, barley, rye, flax, using old parity formula.

JOSEPH G. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

LISMORE, MINN., *February 28, 1956.*
Senator H. H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to give full support to 90-percent of parity.
LISMORE-LEOTA LOCAL NO. 279.

SOLWAY, MINN., *February 28, 1956.*
Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
This will advise that 30 farmers in this area are solidly behind you in your fight for parity and 90-percent supports. We are aware of tremendous pressure by Eisenhower-Benson campaign to pass flexible farm bill. We regard the administration measure of no value to us.
ANDREW B. ANDERSON.

MOOSE LAKE, MINN., *February 25, 1956.*
Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The Kettle River local of the Farmers' Union urges the Senate to pass the farm bill for rigid supports and full parity.
Mrs. SWAN KALLIO,
Secretary, Kettle River Farmers' Union.

WABASHA, MINN., *February 24, 1956.*
Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington D. C.:
The undersigned wish you to know their position with respect to the highly publicized Batten, Barton, Durston & Osborne farm program. Possibly in 4 or 5 years it will begin to work for those farmers that are left. In the meantime something must be done to protect the family-sized farms, particularly the young farmers, from mortgage foreclosures and bankruptcy. Until something better is offered we are unanimously and strongly in favor of 90-percent price supports. In addition, to alleviate the problem of pork surplus we believe farmers should receive some type of incentive payment for marketing hogs under 200 pounds. These aids, added to the President's nine points, should make a workable farmers' farm program.

Leo B. Evers, Wabasha, Minn.; Math Schutn, Wabasha, Minn.; Nick Schmit, Wabasha, Minn.; Leo Kreye, Wabasha, Minn.; Anthony Gosse, Wabasha, Minn.; Francis Freese, Thielman, Minn.; Leo Schmit, Wabasha, Minn.; Lloyd Stamschror, Wabasha, Minn.; Fayne Zabel, Kellogg, Minn.; Joy Spooner, Kellogg, Minn.; Donald A. Tentis, Kellogg, Minn.; Allen J. Tentis, Kellogg, Minn.; Eugene Schurhammer, Kellogg, Minn.; George Eversman, Kellogg, Minn.; Frank Angelbeck, Thielman, Minn.; Harold R. Hall, Kellogg, Minn.; John R. Hall, Wabasha, Minn.

BEJOU, MINN., *February 23, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your stand for a decent farm program and am very thankful you are using the old parity formula which means the difference between the most of us family farmers going broke or making a living. If we have 2 years of good crops and good prices it will take 2 years to pay off our debts to the bank. Thank you for doing a swell job for us, and I assure you we all appreciate it very much.
FLLOYD V. WEIMER.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I made it clear at the opening of my remarks on this farm issue several days ago that I intended to make a rather comprehensive talk to expose some of the myths that Eisenhower-Benson propaganda is perpetuating. At that time, I indicated I had prepared 350 pages of supporting material in my text.

However, subsequent developments have led to the talk growing considerably in length. I have yielded to other Senators, and I am still far from finished, and far from running out of things that need to be said to protect the interests of American agriculture.

As I look at my prepared talk, it appears I probably would not be able to complete my remarks on Friday anyway, so it is my intention to yield the floor tomorrow for some of my colleagues to join the fight until I return from a quick trip among the farmers of Minnesota.

Several thousand Minnesota farmers plan to gather Saturday night at Benson, Minn.—note the name—to protest what Secretary of Agriculture Benson is doing to them—and they have appealed to me to come home and tell them what is going on.

I intend to tell them what is going on, and ask them just what they think about the Eisenhower-Benson high pressure advertising and lobbying campaign.

Then I am coming back to the Senate to renew my fight, and let the rest of my colleagues know just how these farmers really feel.

I do not know whether there is any significance to the selection of Benson, Minn., for this mass meeting or not. But I guess they have picked the fine community of Benson to protest the reflection on its good name that has resulted from the disregard in which Secretary Benson is now held in our farming areas.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that, like one of our great generals once said, I shall return.

Mr. President, I have just received some very interesting information about Braun & Co., which I mentioned earlier today.

When we were preparing these remarks earlier in the week, we checked very carefully. On Monday we found Braun & Co.'s special "Benson Office" downtown was open and in business.

Now, since my remarks today, I am informed that they have suddenly folded their tents and vanished.

By some coincidence, I understand the Republican National Committee now tells the press that this firm had only a 90-day contract, expiring this Tuesday—day before yesterday.

They never mentioned this 90-day contract before, in announcements about engaging the firm.

It seems they are ending the glamorizing job rather abruptly.

The man in charge has even suddenly left town, I am told by the press.

Well, I cannot help wondering if word had not reached the Republican headquarters that HUBERT HUMPHREY was making inquiries, at the Department of Justice and elsewhere—that we were doing a little investigating.

Or perhaps it was just concern about the new lobbying probe the Senate has authorized, for I have also just had it checked and find that Braun & Co., hired to represent Benson in his relations with Congress in connection with the new farm program, were not registered under the Lobbying Act.

Well, at least, perhaps we have done a service in letting people know about some of these goings-on. Perhaps they will be more careful about the next public-relations experts they engage.

I hope the Braun Co. enjoyed their 90-day stay in Washington. If it had not been for my statement, perhaps they could have remained on the payroll another week. I hope they do not think too unkindly of me. They knew last week that we were checking their headquarters to see what they were doing, to see whether they were still continuing their public-relations program. In fact, they were doing business on Monday when we checked. But on Tuesday—I gather that it must have been in the middle of the night—they folded their tents and undoubtedly left for a sunny clime away out in the West.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech,

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request, with the understanding that he shall not lose the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky will be recognized with that understanding.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand adjourned until noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CONSTITUTION AND INTEGRATION

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech,

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, moderation and restraint have been watchwords with me all my life. Respect for constituted authority and reverence for precedent are a fundamental part of my makeup. When there is a departure from any of these principles, I have always been quick to cry out against the dangers which lie in their wake.

One of the first things I learned as a young law student was a wholesome respect for legal precedent. What had the courts said in previous cases touching on the same subject? How had the courts arrived at such a decision? What was the courts' reasoning? What were the principles involved? In relying upon these principles and precedents we find in the law the Latin phrase "stare decisis," which means, in effect, to let the decision stand.

I do not intend today to reargue at length the everlasting errors committed by the Supreme Court in its school integration decision of May 17, 1954. I do wish, however, to recall some fundamentals. I do wish to ask whither we, as a Nation, are going. I do wish to ask what has become of "States Rights." What has become of the tenth amend-

ment to the Constitution of the United States? Are its provisions lost?

With all the criticism now appearing in the press directed against the Vice President in recent days, none has successfully charged him with lacking in candor. To be sure, he was right in his recent Lincoln Day address in New York. To be sure, he was right when he said a great Republican Chief Justice directed the Supreme Court in its decision of May 17, 1954. Few lawyers will dissent from the assertion that the decision on that day directing the integration in our public schools was a purely political one. The decision was not based on sound law. It was not based upon precedent or constitutional rights. The main precedent was psychological. The decision was a flagrant, direct appeal for the political favor of minority groups.

Let us for a moment take stock of the situation. Let us recall a little history. Let us realize—if we would but realize—what has made this country great, what has made it the envy of mankind everywhere. Why are there now millions of foreigners knocking at our immigration doors for admission to this country? The answer is, it is the way of life we have here.

Why are the minority groups in this country clamoring insistently to knock down all of our immigration barriers? The simple answer is that they want to afford their kith, kin, and friends the opportunities which the American way of life has to offer. We hear the hue and cry that the Reds are making propaganda out of our domestic laws and customs. Why should we as a nation be so concerned about what the Russians think of our way of life in the face of the demands of those fleeing from Russia and other despotic systems of government to enter our doors? Such arguments have never made very much impression on me.

A little historical background will be helpful. This Constitution of ours, which the Supreme Court in recent years has been stretching and expanding by leaps and bounds, would never have been adopted in 1787 had not the first 10 amendments been assured of adoption. There is not a lawyer hearing my words or reading them who is capable of denying this historical fact. The 10th amendment to our Constitution is as much a part of it as is the 14th amendment. The adoption of the 10th amendment was never under a cloud. It should be maintained as sacredly as any other provision. With the Supreme Court, as now constituted, and as its recent rulings demonstrate, the 10th amendment does not mean what it says.

We are a unique people. We have a unique government. We are unique in that our written Constitution has maintained us as a free government under a written constitution for the longest period of time in the history of man. The complete sovereignty of the United States is not alone in the Constitution of the United States. Our supreme sovereignty is in the people of the several States. When the people adopted the Constitution of the United States they surrendered part of their sovereignty. What they did not surrender, they specifically reserved to themselves. They reserved to themselves their sovereignty in a specific part of the Constitution. The 10th amendment so provides when it says:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The 10th amendment was ratified and became a part of the Constitution of the United States very shortly after the Constitution was established. Without it there would have been no Constitution. Unfortunately, its provisions now mean little to the courts.

The 14th amendment, which the Supreme Court recently construed, became a part of the Constitution in 1868. The pertinent provision of the 14th amendment under consideration by the Supreme Court in its decision of May 17, 1954, was "no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

In no provision of the original Constitution or of any amendment to the Constitution is there a sentence, clause, or word that gives the Supreme Court of the United States express authority to make any declaration, opinion, or decision respecting our public schools. The school systems of the United States have been maintained from its beginning as local, community, county, and State enterprises, each individual and separate from the others. The rights vary in degree as do the other local police powers vested solely in the States. Since our school systems originated within the States, the power to control must then, in my judgment, remain with the States. They must be kept as separate and distinct from Federal interference as every other local State function.

The Supreme Court long ago recognized the dividing line of authority, and always considered that public education was a State function until its recent usurpation of authority in the construction it placed upon the fourteenth amendment in the integration case.

The Supreme Court did not follow precedent; it did not follow sound reasoning; it did not follow the practice heretofore pursued by the courts. On May 18, 1896, in the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163, U. S. 573), the Supreme Court held that the 14th amendment did not apply when the State of Louisiana established separate but equal coaches for public transportation within the State of Louisiana. In a well reasoned opinion, concurred in by eight Justices, including Chief Justice Fuller and the later Chief Justice Edward Douglas White, the Court held that it was no violation of the 14th amendment to provide for equal and separate transportation facilities for the two races.

The Court referred to the fact that the Congress of the United States, under the authority of clause 17 of section 1 of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States, in exercising legislative jurisdiction in all cases whatsoever in the Distrct of Columbia, had provided through the years for separate schools for the races in the District of Columbia.

It might be news, but when the 14th amendment was adopted, Congress continued to appropriate money for segregated schools in the District of Columbia. The same Congress which approved the 14th amendment approved the appropriations for segregated schools.

Let me read the reasoning of the Court in the Plessy case, decided—lacking 1 day—58 years before the decision recently rendered:

> We consider the underlying fallacy of the plaintiff's argument to consist in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it. * * * If the two races are to meet upon terms of social equality, it must be the result of natural affinities, a mutual appreciation of each other's merits and a voluntary consent of individuals. As was said by the Court of Appeals of New York in *People* v. *Gallagher* (93 N. Y. 438, 448), "This end can neither be accomplished nor promoted by laws which conflict with the general sentiment of the community upon whom they are designed to operate. When the Government, therefore, has secured to each of its citizens equal rights before the law and equal opportunities for improvement and progress, it has accomplished the end for which it was organized and performed all of the functions respecting social advantages with which it is endowed." Legislation is powerless to eradicate racial instincts or to abolish distinctions based upon physical differences, and the attempt to do so can only result in accentuating the difficulties of the present situation. If the civil and political rights of both races be equal one cannot be inferior to the other civilly or politically. If one race be inferior to the other socially, the Constitution of the United States cannot put them upon the same plane.

The reasoning of the Court in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, when directly attacked in the case of *Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78), was good enough for Chief Justice Taft, speaking for himself and for Justices Holmes, Vandervanter, McReynolds, Brandeis, Sutherland, Butler, Sanford, and Stone.

The precedent in both the Rice and Plessy cases meant nothing to the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954.

I was happy to join the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in sponsoring a resolution of investigation, when, on May 26, 1955, he delivered his masterful address showing that the Supreme Court of the United States had based its most recent decision on psychological grounds rather than legal precedents. He clearly showed, and no one has been able to deny, that the authorities cited by the Supreme Court—sociological, psychological, or otherwise—were authored by individuals who had been cited many times by the Un-American Activities Committees of the House of Representatives and were on the several lists of subversive organizations prepared by the Attorneys General. I joined then with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in his resolution to investigate the extent and degree of participation by individuals and groups identified with the Communist conspiracy who prepared the modern scientific precedent upon which the Supreme Court relied in the school integration case. Truly, subversive

groups wrote most of the basis for the Court's radical departure from the well-reasoned law cases, which, short of 1 day, had remained unimpaired for 58 years.

In setting aside the law in the Plessy and Rice case as precedents and as being the supreme law of the land, the Supreme Court struck down very vital provisions of the 10th amendment. The Court said:

> We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment.

While it is true Judge Harlan rendered a lone dissent in the Plessy case, it is quite significant that 3 years later, in *Cumming* v. *Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528), he stated:

> We may add that while all admit that the benefits and burdens of public taxation must be shared by citizens without discrimination against any class on account of race, the education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States, and any interference on the part of the Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land.

It is my solemn conviction that the greatness of our country has been due primarily to the preservation of the rights of the States. States rights with me are paramount. I have never subscribed to the theory that centralization of power in the Federal Government is the best for the overall strength and development of our Nation. I long ago subscribed to the doctrine, first announced by Thomas Jefferson, that "a people least governed is a people best governed." When the seat of authority and power is removed from the sovereign people to a centralized government, then despotism is bound to follow, as the night follows the day. The whims of the majority, the passing fancy of those temporarily occupying high office, are bound to produce injustices which in turn destroy our States Rights.

Fortunately, our people are awakening to the fact that we should remain a government of laws, rather than a government of men: That a power too far removed from the people may gradually be lost and never be regained.

Our people are meeting in righteous indignation over the Supreme Court's failure to construe the law according to precedent. Our people have a right to resist judicial legislation. Judicial legislation is judicial transgression. Judicial transgresson may become tyranny. Judicial legislation may well destroy our free way of life.

The traditions, habits, and customs of our people, enjoyed by them for generations, cannot be upset overnight by a strained political construction of our Constitution. Have all the judges of all the courts and the Congress, too, in legislating for separate school systems in the District of Columbia been acting unconstitutionally for all these years? Can that be so, just because the Supreme Court for obvious political reasons now decrees it to be so? If today this rule happens to have an adverse effect upon those of us in the South, let it be remembered that tomorrow it can affect all the American people in all their habits, customs, and traditions.

I like to recall the sage advice of a great constitutional lawyer in this body. Not so long ago—it was on February 4, 1938—when there was before the Senate a measure highly offensive to the South, this Republican—Senator Borah, of Idaho, a great constitutional lawyer—in defense of States Rights said:

> Mr. President, my interest in this matter centers primarily in the preservation of the integrity of the State. I believe the State is the fountain source of the people's power in this Government; and when that is destroyed, democratic government is at an end. Even in these days of change and advanced thought, I am not ashamed to say that I am still a believer in the old-time Americanism, in the rights of the States, in local government, and in all the policies and precepts and principles which made us great as a nation and which alone will keep us great. What we most need in these troubled days—and may providence speed the coming—is a rebaptism of the national spirit and rededication to the national ideals. * * * under our system of government, when the States are sheared of their power, when the sovereignty of the States is broken down, then it is that the people are separated from the powers of government. It is in the States alone that the people really exercise the powers of government. For after all is said and done, the rights of the States are the people's rights; local government is the people's government. When these are destroyed, the people no longer speak to the government; the government speaks to the people.

Mr. President, I oppose, and will continue to oppose, concentration of power in Washington—whether it be in the executive or in the courts. I am old-fashioned enough to still assert that the Congress—not the executive or the judiciary—declares the policy of our Government. We in the Congress derive our power from the people. This was accepted as good law, good principle, good doctrine, until lately. How often have lawyers read, and the courts said, that the courts have nothing to do with the policy of a law. The legislatures establish policy. What becomes of the power of Congress to establish policy if the Supreme Court can construe the legislative language in such a way as to formulate any policy the Court may choose?

When I became a United States Senator, I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States to the best of my ability. That I have done; and, if need be, I would die in its defense.

But my oath did not require me to support, defend, or abide by the political and sociological pronouncements of a Supreme Court that has dashed constitutional government to the ground, and has placed in its stead judicial dictatorship. To the contrary, it is my bounden duty, as it is the duty of every other United States Senator, to uphold constitutional government and to keep it in its rightful place. We must keep the Supreme Court out of the legislative field.

Mr. President, my people of South Carolina in their rightful distress and indignation should be the concern of all of us here, and of all other Americans everywhere.

In defense of our Constitution and in defense of the rights of the sovereign States, whence all governmental powers in these United States come, the people of my State will resist the Supreme Court's ruling on integration in our schools. As a citizen of South Carolina, and as their senior United States Senator, I shall stand by them in defense of the dignity and perpetuation of our Constitution.

AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT RELATING TO PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN BANK MERGERS

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech,

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, so that I may make a brief statement in regard to the introduction of a bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I am very much aware of the serious competitive threat which the growing proportions of current merger activity pose for the small-business community. My recognition of this grave danger stems partly, of course, from knowledge of the crippling impact which previous periods of unrestricted merger activity have had upon small business. But, more important, the letters received by the committee from small-business men tell me of the dangerous trend toward economic concentration that is developing in the Nation's industries. During the past 2 years, as merger has followed upon merger, almost as a daily occurrence, small business protests have become progressively more forceful. Certainly, sufficient cause for their honest alarm is to be found in the statistical data now available, regarding the present rate of mergers and consolidations. Conservative estimates place the probable number of mergers in manufacturing and mining during 1955 somewhat in excess of 500, a figure which would exceed 1954's 387 mergers. In banking, some 240 to 250 mergers and acquisitions were consummated during 1955. This rate may be compared with 207 mergers in 1954, 116 in 1953, and 119 in 1952.

Mergers do seriously injure small business. Evidence of this may be found in the many complaints received by the committee from small-business men affected personally by particular mergers. These complaints are prompted by a variety of reasons. It may be that a merger has resulted in the loss to a group of small firms of their best or even their only source of supply for certain raw materials or products. For example, the output of the acquired company will no longer be sold to other companies but will be diverted to the acquiring company. Not infrequently, a merger will mean that important customers or outlets are foreclosed to a number of small concerns. This will

be the case when the acquiring company has decided to supply the acquired company with those materials or products which the acquired company formerly purchased from independent sources. These are the immediate competitive consequences of a merger that hurts the small-business men. Of course, there are also long-range competitive consequences of an acquisition, and small firms are not unaware of them. In many instances, complaints come from small companies apprehensive of their future in view of the tremendous gain in economic power and size which a competitor has derived through a large merger or a series of acquisitions. Although this is only a summary of the complaints concerning mergers received by the committee, it does reveal how widespread are the competitive consequences of merger activity.

Once the competitive injury inflicted upon small business by mergers is recognized, it becomes obligatory to take appropriate action and to do so with dispatch. Accordingly, on May 25 of last year, I moved to remedy certain deficiencies which I found to exist in the antitrust legislation which prohibits illegal mergers. I refer to my bill, S. 2075, which proposed amendment of section 7 of the Clayton Act so as to bring within its scope bank mergers by asset acquisition and also to require merging corporations to notify the antitrust agencies of their intention. On July 6 of last year, I introduced another bill, S. 2205, which would allow speedy enforcement of section 7 prohibitions against anticompetitive mergers. Also in July of last year, I accepted an invitation to appear before the House Antitrust Subcommittee to call attention to some of the trends in our economy that I felt were dangerous to the growth and vitality of small business. You may be assured that I scored the lamentable absence of aggressive enforcement actively in the area of mergers and consolidations.

At this juncture, I wish to say that the Antitrust Subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, has been doing very fine work in its study of major competitive problems in the national economy. In particular, the subcommittee has done yeoman's service in the antimerger field. It has favorably reported legislation sponsored by its distinguished chairman—legislation which I have endorsed as an appropriate means of curbing the merger movement.

Early in January of this year, I again appeared before the House Antitrust Subcommittee to discuss various ways and means of checking illegal mergers. I set forth 7 legislative recommendations which I deemed necessary to constitute a sound, constructive, and well-balanced program for revitalizing the administration and enforcement of section 7 of the Clayton Act. On that occasion, I also announced my intention to introduce shortly a bill embracing these proposals. While it may be that committees of Congress may wish to consider the proposals individually, I, nevertheless, believe that an omnibus bill will represent what action Congress should take to control the merger activity now menacing the economic life of our Nation.

I am today introducing my omnibus bill. As may be noted, certain features of my bill are similar to those contained in legislation pending before this body and the other House. For example, three provisions of this measure may be found in the bills, S. 2075 and S. 2205, which I introduced early in the first session of this Congress. The remaining provisions conform in principle and purpose to certain legislation which other members have already introduced. Thus, my bill may be seen to be an eclectic effort to produce the progressive antitrust program that Congress should adopt to prevent mergers which substantially lessen competition or tend toward monopoly.

The failure to stem the current merger trend seems to have resulted largely from the deficiencies of the enforcement procedures available under the Clayton Act. Accordingly, all but 1 of the 7 provisions of my bill are procedural in character. The only substantive provision is intended to plug the loophole found to exist in section 7 in the case of bank mergers by asset acquisition. With this exception, section 7 is otherwise fundamentally sound legislation, remarkably well-designed for striking down illegal mergers.

To review briefly the significant features of the provisions of my omnibus bill:

First. The bill proposes to bring within the purview of section 7 all bank mergers which substantially lessen competition or tend toward monopoly, even though effected by asset acquisition. This amendment would enable the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to attack a monopolistic banking merger in its very incipiency, that is, before the acquisition takes place. At present, the antitrust agencies can proceed against such a bank merger only under the Sherman Act which becomes operative only when it is shown that the merger has in fact produced anticompetitive effects.

Second. This bill requires that, in the event that either party to a proposed merger has assets of a million dollars or more, notice of merger plans be given 90 days in advance of consummation to the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission. The primary purpose for requiring such notice is to allow the antitrust authorities a reasonable period of time in which to study the competitive implications of a merger before deciding whether to prevent its consummation. Also of importance, the notice will enable the antitrust enforcement agencies to keep currently informed regarding all significant mergers. No longer will they have to rely upon the hit-or-miss method of scanning the newspapers and trade journals in order to find out where merger threats to competition are arising, nor will they be kept ignorant of those mergers not publicly announced before consummation.

Third. The bill couples with the prior notice provision a reporting requirement. Merging corporations must furnish to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission with all necessary data concerning the merger, in accordance with regulations to be issued by the Commission with the approval of the Attorney General. In this way, the antitrust agencies will be promptly informed of the salient characteristics of the merging companies and their respective markets, thus facilitating the judgment under section 7.

Fourth. The bill brings the enforcement procedures of the Clayton Act into line with those used by the Federal Trade Commission to enforce orders issued under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Furthermore, violation of the Clayton Act orders is made subject to the same civil penalties now applicable to violation of Federal Trade Commission Act orders.

Fifth. The bill authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to seek a preliminary court injunction restoring consummation of any corporate mergers pending final Commission action. The Department of Justice now possesses similar powers under section 11 of the Clayton Act. However, existing law prevents the Commission from moving against mergers prior to consummation in order to preserve the status quo pending completion of administrative proceedings before the Commission. This anomalous situation would be corrected by the provisions of my bill.

Sixth. The bill grants to the Federal Trade Commission authority to invoke equitable remedies short of divestiture in appropriate cases involving illegal mergers. Certainly, in judging how to eliminate the unwholesome effects of a merger, the choice of remedies available should not be limited to divestiture or nothing. It can be readily conceived that less drastic remedies than divestiture can serve the interests of competition more beneficially in particular cases.

Seventh. The bill provides that section 7 is applicable where either the acquiring or the acquired corporation is in interstate commerce. This provision is prompted by the experience of the Federal Trade Commission in its administration of section 7. Under existing section provision, the acquired corporation must be in interstate commerce in order to vest jurisdiction in the Federal Trade Commission. This loophole is most noticeable in the mergers taking place in the baking and dairy industries. As the Federal Trade Commission has publicly stated, "tremendous expansion of many interstate dairy and baking corporations has revealed a continuous pattern of acquisitions of purely intrastate corporations which, while individually not of great significance, are of the gravest competitive significance from a cumulative standpoint. Another important reason for adopting this proposal would be to assure speed in judgment of mergers. Probing for evidence of interstate transactions by each of a number of small corporations imposes an unnecessary burden, particularly in the normal case where acquisitions are by a national corporation clearly engaged in interstate commerce throughout the United States.

Mr. President, I feel that this bill is one which should be given prompt study

by the appropriate committee and by the Senate itself. The 4,200,000 small businesses in the United States are all affected in varying degrees by the increasing concentration in our economy and we cannot afford to ignore this threat to the American free enterprise system.

I now introduce my omnibus bill; and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I am delighted to have the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] join me in the sponsorship of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 3341) to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit certain bank mergers and provide for more effective enforcement thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the text of the first and second paragraphs of section 7 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731, as amended; 15 U. S. C. 18), is amended to read as follows:

"No corporation shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital, and no corporation subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission shall acquire the whole or any part of the assets, of another corporation if (1) either the acquiring corporation, or the corporation from which such stock, share capital or assets are required, is engaged in commerce, and (2) the effect of such acquisition of such stock, share capital or assets, or the use of such stock or share capital by voting, the granting of proxies or otherwise, may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly, in any line of commerce in any section of the country.

"No bank, banking association, or trust company shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock, other share capital, or assets of any other bank, banking association, or trust company if the effect of such acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly, in commerce, in banking or banking service in any section of the country.

"No corporation, bank, banking association, or trust company may acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock, share capital, or assets of any other corporation, bank, banking association, or trust company where any party to such acquisition is engaged in commerce and has capital, surplus, and undivided profits aggregating more than $1 million, until a period of 90 days has passed after delivery by the chief executive officer of the acquiring corporation, bank, banking association, or trust company to the Attorney General and to the Federal Trade Commission of notice of such proposed acquisition. After such notice is given the parties shall submit to the Attorney General and to the Federal Trade Commission such additional information as the Federal Trade Commission, after consultation with and upon the approval of the Attorney General may by regulation require. Whoever, having a duty to deliver any such notice or furnish any such information fails to give such notice or to furnish such information shall forfeit for each day of such failure the sum of $5,000 which shall be recovered in a civil action brought by the Attorney General. The failure of the Attorney General or the Commission to interpose objection to such acquisition within such 90-day period shall not bar the initiation at any time by any department, agency, or officer of the United States of any action or proceeding with respect to such acquisition under any provision of law. "The preceding paragraph shall not apply to corporation purchasing stock solely for investment when the stock acquired or held does not exceed 5 percent of the outstanding stock or other share capital of the corporation in which the investment is made; nor to the acquisition if such assets do not equal more than 5 percent of the capital, surplus, and undivided profits of either the acquired or acquiring corporation, or the sum of $5 million";

(b) The fifth sentence of the second paragraph of section 11 of such act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 21), is amended to read as follows: "If upon such hearing the Commission or Board, as the case may be, shall be of the opinion that any of the provisions of said sections have been or are being violated, it shall make a report in writing, in which it shall state its findings as to the facts, and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such violations, and divest itself of the stock, or other share capital, or assets held, or to take such other or additional steps as are necessary to restore competition or rid itself of the directors chosen contrary to the provisions of sections 7 and 8 of this act, if any there be, in the manner and within the time fixed by said order."

(c) Section 11 of such act is further amended by inserting therein, immediately after the sixth paragraph thereof, the following new paragraph:

"Whenever the Federal Trade Commission has reason to believe that—

"(1) any corporation is acquiring, has acquired or is about to acquire any stock, share capital, or assests of another corporation in violation of the provisions of section 7 of this act, and

"(2) the public interest requires that such violation be enjoined until a complaint based upon such violation is issued by the Commission under this section, and until such complaint is dismissed by the Commission or any order entered thereon by the Commission is set aside upon judicial review,

the Commission shall bring suit in a district court of the United States to prevent and restrain such violation. Any such suit may be brought to any attorney of the Commission designated by it for such purpose in the district court of the United States for any district in which such corporation resides or transacts business. Upon proper showing a temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond. Whenever it shall appear to the court before which any such proceeding is pending that the ends of justice require that other parties should be brought before the court, the court may cause them to be summoned whether they reside in the district in which the court is held or not, and subpenas to that end may be served in any district by the marshal thereof."

SEC. 2. Section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately after the word "association", a comma and the words: "or to any report made by any person, firm, partnership, corporation, or association in compliance with the third paragraph of section 7 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731, as amended; 15 U. S. C. 18)".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to be privileged to join as a cosponsor. I commend the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business, who is also one of the ranking members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for his consistent, persistent, and effective work in the field of antitrust law enforcement, and the work of prodding the Federal Trade Commission into even more aggressive activity.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. CAPEHART. Although I have not read the bill which the Senator from Alabama is introducing, I should like him to know that I am in sympathy with what he is trying to do. There is no question that we must protect small business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator cares to do so, I should like to have him join as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have not read the bill, and after I have read it I may do so. However, I did wish to tell the Senator that I am in sympathy with the objective he is trying to accomplish.

REPLY TO CRITICISM OF SECRETARY DULLES

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY's speech,

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me so that I may make a unanimous consent request?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, provided the insertion is printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I had prepared a speech in reply to the attack made on Secretary Dulles by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I had intended to deliver it this afternoon. However, because of the lateness of the hour and the fact that I am eager, as are other Senators, to get on with the debate on the farm bill, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

These past 3 years John Foster Dulles, under the leadership of President Eisenhower, has dedicated himself to the cause of peace. And Mr. Dulles has been so successful in waging the fight for peace that some people appear frustrated by the prospect that they will be utterly without a foreign policy political issue in 1956.

I regret deeply that partisan politics could seem to be more important to anyone than peace, which Mr. Dulles has sought so vigorously on a nonpartisan basis. In the interest of fair play, getting the facts straight, and because of the overriding importance that the world know what Secretary Dulles has done and is doing in the cause of peace, I am reciting for the Senate and the public record the circumstances under which the Secretary made, before the Foreign Relations Committee on Friday, the statements which

have been attacked so bitterly on the floor of the Senate.

The distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. GEORGE] said in his statement opening the hearing that Secretary Dulles had been asked to appear at a public session, and I quote, "to discuss the policy of the United States with respect to the situation in the Middle East."

At another point in his statement, the chairman said:

"I have indicated to the Secretary that the committee will limit its questions, as far as possible, at its open sessions to matters relating to the Middle East."

Consequently the prepared statement of Secretary Dulles limited itself to Middle East problems and the Secretary did not come with any prepared comprehensive statement on the significance of the recent changes in Soviet creed and foreign policy. But such a discussion was included by Secretary Dulles in his address before the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum on Sunday, February 26.

Secretary Dulles, in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, referred to the fact that such a speech would be made on Sunday. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] then said that he looked forward with much interest to that address by the Secretary of State.

Secretary Dulles' Philadelphia speech on this topic was fully reported by television, radio, and by the press. It was introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the opening of the Senate on February 27 and was thus fully available. Yet, later the same day, Monday, February 27, the Senator from Arkansas made a speech on the floor of the Senate in which he addressed himself almost wholly to isolated statements made by Secretary Dulles in the hearing on the preceding Friday—statements made by the Secretary in answer to prolonged questioning quite outside the bounds which had been prescribed for Secretary Dulles. In so doing, the Senator from Arkansas wholly ignored Secretary Dulles' comprehensive and thoughtful speech on this subject which was available to the Senator before the Senator spoke.

Could it be that the Senator from Arkansas ignored Secretary Dulles' Philadelphia speech because he sought to take political advantage of remarks made by the Secretary in answer to questions which he had no reason to anticipate at an open hearing under rules laid down by the committee chairman?

Obviously, Secretary Dulles, in his committee appearance, could only reply to questions which were asked, whereas in his Philadelphia speech, he presented the same facts in context and in a more organized manner.

The Secretary of State was just one day back from a much-needed vacation when he appeared before the committee. There, he was subjected to some 4 hours of questioning by 13 Senators.

It was under those circumstances, Mr. President, that the Senator from Arkansas made his speech on the floor of the Senate Monday afternoon. Even so, Secretary Dulles did a magnificent job before the committee and what he said there was not essentially different from the well-organized presentation in Philadelphia.

Of course, the American people want to hear of the peace we are now enjoying—but I think it was most unfortunate that the Senator from Arkansas on the floor of the Senate Monday, accused Mr. Dulles of speaking of peace out of "an apparent craving for popular approval."

The Senator from Arkansas talked about the Secretary of State attempting "to deceive the American people about the deadly menace which confronts them." And the Senator from Arkansas asked if Secretary Dulles would "tell America the truth about our present peril." The Senator from Arkansas also said, "What we want and what we will support is the truth, however unpleasant." But the Senator from Arkansas had already made up his mind that he would not now support a pleasant truth. The Senator appeared so disappointed at the success of Mr. Dulles' foreign policy that he referred to the Secretary's appraisal of our foreign policy in terms of a "fairy story."

Let's look at the record.

For almost the first time in 17 years no fighting is going on anywhere in the world. Just as important, the Soviets have not gained 1 inch of land by any new aggression in the last 3 years. I hope no one will attribute political significance to these statements, and I regret the apparent disappointment of the Senator from Arkansas in the fact that we are now at peace.

I was shocked yesterday to hear the Senator from Arkansas say:

"Wherever one looks, there is the Soviet Union parading itself as the friend of the underdeveloped peoples, ready to help them raise their miserable standards of life, without requiring first that they enter into military alliances."

I challenge that statement:

The record is conclusive that every nation that ever accepted the help of the Soviets found that the Soviets were the champions of making people underprivileged and that they did nothing but make living standards more miserable. Most of the intelligent people in the world choose to judge the Russians by their acts and deeds not by their phoney promises.

I was equally shocked when this United States Senator said on the floor of the Senate:

"Indeed, wherever one looks, even in our own Latin American neighborhood, there is the Soviet Union on the march, confident, even cocky, wearing a false mask of new respectability, talking treacherously in soft words that are suited to parliamentary government, and losing no chance to preempt the cause of peace for its exploitation."

I do not for an instance accept the statement that everywhere the Russians are on the march.

For my friends in Latin America, I deny the implication. May I remind the Senator from Arkansas that in the United States, Soviet Russia is certainly not on the march? Congressional committees have disclosed scores of Communists and fellow travelers formerly in high places in this Government—but none in recent years.

The Senator from Arkansas even compared his own attack on Secretary Dulles with attacks on former Secretary Acheson, saying: "I have no desire to vilify a Republican Secretary of State, as a recent Democratic Secretary of State was vilified because he did not reverse every world current that was adverse to America."

May I remind the Senator from Arkansas that Secretary Acheson in effect invited the Communists into Korea by publicly declaring that we had no interest in Korea and inferring we would not defend Korean land? When the Communists took us at his word, we expended thousands of American lives to stop an invasion that might never have occurred.

Mr. Dulles has made clear to the Communists our position. Thus far he has thereby avoided war. Yet the Senator from Arkansas would vilify him for his success, apparently because it is politically disappointing to the Senator from Arkansas.

Finally, while inferring that we are losing the cold war, the Senator from Arkansas accused Secretary Dulles of saying, in effect, that the cold war is over—and that the Russians have lost. Neither is the case.

The point Secretary Dulles made—and he made it very well—is that for many years the Russians were intolerant of anyone who did not follow their philosophy completely and they considered violence an appropriate means of accomplishing their ends.

Now the Russians have changed. They no longer are always intolerant. They no longer always rely on violence. Take Tito as an example. Previously they condemned him as a traitor, now they curry his favor.

Who can deny this change. And does the Senator from Arkansas think the change results from the success of their program of intolerance and violence?

The remarks of the Senator from Arkansas about the Secretary were based on the Secretary's testimony last Friday before the Foreign Relations Committee. But here is what the official transcript shows Secretary Dulles actually said.

The Senator from Arkansas had talked about the Russians being willing to preempt at any cost. Secretary Dulles replied:

"They are willing to preempt the whole world, Senator. They are not unique in relation to this (Middle East) area. They would take over the United States if given a chance."

Then the Senator from Arkansas commented:

"Unfortunately, they seem to be making progress, and especially in the Middle East; do they not?"

The Senator from Arkansas was apparently disappointed when Secretary Dulles replied:

"I do not think so. I think they made very little progress in the last few years, and the proof of it is that at this very moment, in Moscow, they are having to revise their whole program. If we had to go through such a revision and change of our whole program as they are undergoing, it would be advertised all over the world that we had failed. The fact is, they have failed, and they have got to devise new policies."

The Senator from Arkansas seems to have forgotten that 4 and 5 years ago there were Communist parades in Teheran, Iran.

When Senator FULBRIGHT said he would be interested to hear why Secretary Dulles thought that Soviet action indicated a failure of their policy, Mr. Dulles answered:

"All right, I will be glad to tell you. For 30 years, Soviet foreign policy and Soviet policy generally has been based upon two principles: namely, intolerance of any non-Communist system—or not even non-Communist system; any system which did not conform to Soviet communism, because there are other brands—and also upon the policy of using violence as a means of getting their results."

Secretary Dulles went on to say:

"There has been talk, time after time, that only by violence can Soviet communism succeed. Stalin said that if anybody did not believe in the policy of violence, he either did not understand Soviet communism or else had gone out of his mind.

"They also taught that if anybody did not conform to their particular standard, that he must be fought; he was an enemy.

"Those two policies, of intolerance and the use of violence, had been basic in Soviet policy for the last 30 years.

"Those policies have gradually ceased to produce any results from them. The free nations have banded together, shown their strength, shown their unity to an increasing degree, so that that policy was not producing any positive results.

"The result is, they have got to revamp their whole creed, from A to Z. It is a tremendous process for them, because they have got to undo the teaching of many years and get onto a new basis.

"What that new basis is going to be, I do not know, because their congress is still sitting, as we are sitting here today. But one

thing that is absolutely certain is, the unity and firmness and resolution of the free nations during the past few years have caused the Soviet policy to fail, and today they are trying to figure out how they are going to get a better one."

This change in Soviet policy is known to every schoolboy; and every mother knows the world is now at peace.

On Monday, Senator FULBRIGHT asked questions, on the floor of the Senate, which Secretary Dulles had already answered Sunday night. I wish the Senator had read Secretary Dulles' speech before he made his own.

For example, Senator Fulbright asked:

"Will he (Dulles) give us a fair chance to decide for ourselves with full knowledge of the facts, what efforts we should make for our own salvation, or will he lull us to sleep in an hour when the Soviet Union has launched a powerful diplomatic offensive against us".

The Secretary's answer given the day before was that if we and other free nations play our proper part, "we can face the future not with complacency—that would be disastrous—but with confidence".

On Monday, Senator FULBRIGHT asked: "Will such a public opinion be prepared to make new sacrifices when the Secretary of State implies that the battle against the Soviet bid for world domination has been won?"

But the day before the Secretary had answered that the Communist had come up against the granite of our declared strength, and, he went on to say:

"If that granite should turn to putty, then violence and threat of war could again become the order of the day". Mr. Dulles went on to say that we had new problems which "will require new efforts; without relaxation of the old cohesion, resolution, vigilance and strength".

I wish the Senator had taken the time to read Secretary Dulles' speech, which the Senator had previously said he looked forward to, before he made this attack on the Secretary.

Senator FULBRIGHT also asked if our people would support new outlays for foreign aid with Secretary Dulles saying that Soviet designs had been frustrated already.

But the day before Secretary Dulles had said: "If there is less apparent intolerance and less reliance on violence, there is perhaps more reliance than ever on division, enticement and duplicity."

Does that sound like saying that Soviet designs are already frustrated?

Senator FULBRIGHT said that the world "believes that America can think of the fight for peace in no terms except that of military alliances and shipment of arms."

I do not know the Senator's reason for that belief, but the thought could not have come from Mr. Dulles. The day before the Secretary had said:

Western efforts to advance the economic well-being of the less developed countries are nothing new. We need not be panicked by the new Soviet economic policy. With or without the so-called competition of the U. S. S. R., we propose to go forward with sound policies to aid the economic progress of less developed countries.

Senator FULBRIGHT could not have been more in error in the views he attributed to Secretary Dulles—views directly contrary to those given in the Secretary's speech of the day before.

Secretary Dulles has spent much of the last 3 years traveling about the world to promote the job of world peace. He has done so as a conscientious public servant, and as a fine American.

I am certain that the political aspects of achieving peace were the very least of his motives.

I regret very much that the Senator from Arkansas should have added to the Secretary's many burdens by attacking him only because his policy has been successful and the truth does not require him to give pessimistic reports.

Senator FULBRIGHT may regard this as bad campaign politics for his party; but it is good news for the American people.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order entered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, March 2, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1956:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Louis F. Kreek, of the District of Columbia, to be an Examiner-in-Chief in the Patent Office.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Charles K. Rice, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Earl Freeman Hastings, of Arizona, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1959.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Franklin G. Floete, of Iowa, to be Administrator of General Services.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Joseph P. Lieb, of Florida, to be United States district judge, southern district of Florida.

John M. Cashin, of New York, to be United States district judge, southern district of New York.

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge, western district of Oklahoma.

R. Dorsey Watkins, of Maryland, to be United States district judge, district of Maryland.

Ewing T. Kerr, of Wyoming, to be United States district judge, district of Wyoming.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Oliver Gasch, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney, District of Columbia, for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Gerald Francis Bracken, of Maryland, to be United States marshal, district of Maryland.

John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal, northern district of Mississippi, for a term of 4 years.

Oliver H. Metcalf, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal, middle district of Pennsylvania.

Albert Di Meolo, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal, western district of Pennsylvania.

Santos Buxo, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be United States marshal, district of Puerto Rico.

Lyle F. Milligan, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal, eastern district of Wisconsin, for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Yakov R. Hilsenrath, Beth Judah Temple, North Wildwood, N. J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose hands are the spirits of all flesh and in whose eyes all tomorrows stand revealed as today, we invoke Thy blessings upon the Members of this Congress who are gathered to take counsel with one another and deliberate concerning the welfare of man, the crown of Thy creations.

May harmony and sincerity of purpose ever guide their endeavors, unity, and a genuine spirit of brotherhood motivate their deliberations and resolves.

Guide and aid them to disperse the clouds of aggression and insecurity hovering over mankind. May all whom Thou hast created enjoy the right to live and work, to think and speak, in accordance with the dictates of their God-given conscience.

O God, speedily grant all mankind Thy most precious gift, peace. Enable Thy children to achieve and preserve it amidst every trial and circumstance. Inspire the members of our Government to contribute their energies toward making the United States of America an effective instrument to safeguard world security. Help them to usher in the long-awaited era when freedom's holy light will flood the world as the waters cover the sea. We ask this not for personal advantage but for the establishment of a Godly world and the recognition of Thy will in the hearts of all men. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JANE EDITH THOMAS

Mr. FEIGHAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7583) for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas and for other purposes.

A MORNING WISH

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, when there is so much confusion, distrust, and misunderstanding in the world, it is comforting to read a statement like this which I ran onto in the Sunshine magazine the other day, written by W. R. Hunt. I wish to make it a part of my remarks at this time:

A MORNING WISH

(By W. R. Hunt)

The sun is rising on the morning of another day. What can I wish that this day may bring to me? Nothing that shall make the world of others poorer, nothing at the expense of other men; but just those few

things which, in their coming, do not stop with me, but touch me, rather, as they pass and gather strength:

A few friends who understand me, and yet remain my friends.

A work to do which has real value, without which the world would feel poorer.

A return for that work small enough not to tax unduly anyone who pays.

A mind unafraid to travel, even though the trail be not blazed.

An understanding heart.

A sight of the eternal hills and unresting sea, and of something beautiful the hand of man has made.

A sense of humor and the power to laugh.

A little leisure with nothing to do.

A few moments of quiet, silent meditation, to sense the presence of God.

And patience to wait for these things, with the wisdom to know them when they come.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit while the House is in session next week, during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT OF ITALY

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state how thrilled I was to hear the speech of the President of Italy, the Honorable Giovanni Gronchi, who addressed us yesterday. I felt that the address was superlative in content and in delivery.

I was most fortunate because during his address I was privileged to sit next to my distinguished colleagues from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO and Mr. ADDONIZIO], who most fluently translated the address as the President spoke. I must say their translation was almost as eloquent as the address itself. I know that all the comments I heard here were most favorable to the President and I am sure the President again demonstrated how much civilization owes to Italy, this great and historic nation which has cradled us in our civilization and in our religion. Truly as President Gronchi said, The Italy before us today—as typified by himself—was an outstanding example of culture and democracy.

EISENHOWER'S DECISION

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the decision of President Eisenhower to offer himself as a candidate for a second term will be encouraging to his friends who will take it as proof that he has made complete recovery from his illness.

We must assume that in his own mind Mr. Eisenhower has determined that he is not only capable of resuming the full burden of the presidency but that the chances are that he will be able to do so for the full 4 years of a second term. A decision on any other basis would have been unthinkable.

In his first campaign for the presidency, Mr. Eisenhower received considerable support in the TVA area. His record, and that of his administration on TVA matters, has not been what the people of the TVA area had been promised and led to expect. They will take this into consideration next November.

ITALY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, a few moments ago concerning the address of the President of Italy. I did not have the benefit yesterday of interpreters, and I do not understand the Italian language, but I can read the English language. I was delighted to read in his address that there is a plus balance in the Italian treasury. I can say to my colleague from New Jersey that I will certainly be down here in the well of the House when the foreign WPA bill comes along to remind him of that balance in the Italian treasury, if there are any funds in that bill for Italy.

A NEW OBSERVANCE OF ARMISTICE DAY

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at a breakfast hosted by the New Jersey division of the American Legion, regret was expressed that we had allowed observance of Armistice Day to lapse and substituted for it Veterans' Day.

With all due respect to the veterans, armistice is the result of their actions; homage to veterans is a homage paid to people as against that which is inherent in the word "armistice," which means the homage we pay to the principles of peace; they are eternal.

We today are in an armistice not only in Asia but in Europe and other parts of the world.

I have assurances that the New Jersey unit of the American Legion is going to search the problem so that we here in the United States and possibly in Europe and Asia can have a universal day of armistice observance to keep the peace we are now in.

In the old days, armistice used to be called Trève de Dieu; that is, every Friday from sundown to sunup Monday, Christians on the Crusades ceased fighting and observed a 2½-day period of contemplation and prayer. In our time, Trève de Dieu got to be known after World War I as armistice. Many people thought of the armistice after World War I as in connection with the German war.

We do not want that connotation at all. We want armistice to mean observance of those principles for which we took up and laid down arms, and the breach of which arms will again be taken up, such as freedom of the seas, freedom to draw a breath whether you are small or large in the family of nations, and other free things involved in the moral sense of man, like those mentioned in the New York Times editorial of November 11, 1953, entitled "The Dead Did Not Fail."

I hope that the New Jersey division of the American Legion is successful in bringing about a new observance of Armistice Day the world around. It might conceivably help us broaden the span of peace from 21½ years between wars to a lifetime. Indeed, we have advanced the span of peace from 2½ days to an average of 21½ years—1918 to 1941 in Europe; 1941 to 1950 in Asia—Korea—notwithstanding. For the world, 1956—?

LEGISLATION WITH REFERENCE TO WHEAT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country the Republicans are taking a terrific lot of criticism because of the present farm policy. The Republicans are not to blame for that situation at all. But we have been sitting here and taking it without making reply. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] who is listening so attentively, knows that. The Senate has passed a bill which would help us out on the wheat surplus and correct a part of the error which was made when the legislation was written by our Democratic opponents. That is really where the blame belongs, over on the other side. I cannot understand why that Committee on Agriculture is pigeonholing legislation which will corect that situation with reference to wheat. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] will tell us about it. He would not be disclosing any secrets if he did tell us just Democratic members are holding up remedial relief.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Bailey	Gamble	Prouty
Bell	Hays, Ohio	Rains
Blitch	Hillings	Scrivner
Bowler	Hoffman, Ill.	Shelley
Boykin	Kee	Staggers
Burnside	Kelley, Pa.	Steed
Byrd	Knutson	Teague, Tex.
Chatham	McDowell	Thompson, Tex.
Denton	Mollohan	Tollefson
Derounian	Powell	Watts
Eberharter	Preston	Wharton
Fountain	Priest	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and ninety-two Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3383, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] had 32 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] had 32 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] had been recognized for 10 minutes, and had consumed one-half minute of his time. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California for 9½ minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I regret that one of the proponents for this bill has repeatedly referred to the Colorado River Association's so-called lobbying and expenditures in opposition to the upper Colorado project. No specific charge has been made of wrongdoing. The figures are drawn from official reports filed by the association in compliance with the law passed by Congress.

Any attempt by innuendo or otherwise to prejudice the Members' minds for this bill is, in my opinion, a desperate attempt to becloud the real issues.

The Colorado River Association and its attorneys, engineers, and research specialists are employees of the State of California, the cities of southern California, and the great irrigation districts of California. They are being paid by the taxpayers and property owners of California and honorable and legally established associations whose sole aim is to protect the water rights of over 6 million people and their property rights of more than $10 billion.

No hint of scandal has ever touched their proper and legal advocacy of the interests so vital to our State. So let's have no more of this sly type of debate.

Let's proceed to the issues.

I opposed the Dixon-Yates contract because it was a $100 million give away to private utilities of taxpayers' funds.

I am opposed to the give away of the Hell's Canyon Dam sites to private utilities because it will deprive the people of that area for all time to come of the benefits of cheap public power. They are giving away something that belongs to the Federal Government.

I am opposed to the upper Colorado River project for the same reason. It will also, for all practical purposes, cause the Federal Government to lose the advantage of its own dam sites.

It will lose for a hundred years the opportunity of the people of the upper basin to obtain cheap public power from federally-owned dam sites and facilities.

The proposed 6-mill-per-kilowatt contracts with the 10 private utilities in the upper basin will fasten on the consumers of that area high-priced private power rates for the foreseeable future.

The Federal Government will spend a half billion dollars for the dams, generating equipment, and transmission lines, and then turn the electricity over to the private profit-making utilities.

I know they will say that the preference right is in there, but there are very few, if any, organizations available to exercise the preference right, and there are over 6,600 miles of privately owned transmission lines. You have heard many Members of this House get up and object to transmission lines from public power dams to the load center points. The Government also pays for the transmission lines from these upper Colorado Basin dams to the private utility load center distributing points.

This bill represents the biggest giveaway of all time, a $453 million capital investment in dams and facilities. These are owned by the Federal Government, but the resulting electricity will be given to 10 private power companies so that they can be relieved of future generating investments in this area. Remember, no power is needed there at this time. The private power companies have said that they are keeping up with the demand so this bill will give for the foreseeable future Government-generated and Government-paid-for power to the utility companies at the cost that they can now produce kilowatts with coal-generating plants. The power when sold on the basis of a 6-mills contract to the private utilities will not be cheap public power, it will be high-priced private power. My friends from the Tennessee Valley and from the Grand Coulee and from the Shasta area who pride themselves on supporting cheap public power for the masses of the people, let me say to you, salve your conscience on this one. This is an occasion where you are turning over millions and millions of kilowatts to private power companies to sell at profit-making private-power prices to the people of that area, and you are denying the people the right to use those facilities and those damsites for all future time to generate the cheap power that means so much to the progress of civilization in that area.

Now, let us turn to a comparison between the Hoover Dam project and the upper Colorado River Dam project. We have heard that referred to by several of the speakers. In the case of the Hoover Dam it was put in on the basis of a 50-year amortization, paying 4 percent at first, and they reduced it after that to 3 percent interest.

The Colorado project is proposed on the basis of 100 years amortization. We had firm power contracts for 2 mills per kilowatt before we built the Hoover Dam. You have no firm contracts at all on this proposed project. You merely have tentative offers of 6 mills from the private power companies. The private power companies will not put their money on the line at 6 mills, and yet it is the 6 mills sale that you are depending upon for the feasibility—question mark—of your project.

Ninety-one percent of the power that comes from the Hoover Dam into California goes to publicly owned distributing centers and 9 percent to private. All of this—100 percent of the upper basin project's power, with the exception of 1 or 2 farm cooperatives, goes to private utilities.

The waters that are impounded in the Colorado by the dams at Hoover, Parker, and Davis are used for irrigation and domestic purposes, which is the primary use under the Colorado compact.

The waters impounded in those dams in the upper Colorado will not be diverted to irrigation except in one small instance on the Navaho project, but will be impounded for power purposes alone. The water they talk about needing can be diverted now from the river above the dam sites. These are some of the important points that I hope you will consider when you vote on this bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] has told you of the legal position of the State of California seeking for clarification of the compact. I cannot go into that because time does not allow me to do so.

Now, let us look at the soil-bank proposal. The administration is asking for 40 million acres to be withdrawn and put into the soil bank with a subsidy to be paid to the farmers. A recent survey of the United States Conservation Service shows that we have 21 million acres of idle land in the United States today that with proper drainage in some instances, and in some instances with no drainage at all, but in all instances in need of fertilization and a few things like that, which would cost much less than $100 an acre, can be brought into production. But here you are paying up to $5,000 an acre to bring 132,000 acres of new farmland and to give additional water to some 260,000 that now are in cultivation.

The statement is made that these will not be surplus crops, but here I have every project which is in the hearings and the testimony of the United States reclamation work which shows that the following crops—small grains, dairy cows, sheep, and sugar beets are all in the category of crop allocation or in the category of crop subsidies or commodity subsidies. Believe me, those lands will be used for those purposes. They tell you that they may only use it for alfalfa, but alfalfa feeds dairy cows and it feeds sheep, and in both instances you have a subsidy problem in those categories.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here a long time. I know pretty well the trend of the House. When the legislative juggernaut engineered by the majority leadership and the minority leadership gets into motion, it pretty well quashes the Members who are opposing the legislation. I have no illusions as to how this bill is going to go. But I opposed projects of this sort before that were giveaways. This is the biggest giveaway of all, $453,974,000 to build a plant to make power for private utilities. In other words, the Federal Government, the taxpayers of your State and mine, buy the cow, and the cream and milk go to the private utility companies and they water it down so that the public does not get the benefit of cheap power but pays through the nose for power generated in plants which their taxes built.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Colorado a question. He has been my personal friend for over a third of a century. Is it not true that you were attorney general for the State of Colorado during the proceedings leading up to the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I was attorney general from 1936 to 1941, and dealt with the representatives from southern California in working out the terms and conditions of the Boulder Canyon Act as passed by this Congress in 1940.

Mr. ASPINALL. And before coming to Congress you served as State counsel for the REA?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not also a fact that this 6-mill power is all going to be bought and paid for by the people of the upper basin States?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. So if there is any complaint about the rate we are paying, we are the people who are paying for it, and it is going back to pay for this project?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say that under no circumstances is this a giveaway in any manner whatsoever. It has a preference clause. There is $145 million in this bill for transmission lines. We have no fear but whatever the REA and every individual who has a right under the preference clause as provided in the reclamation law will get his part.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not also a fact that the water which belongs to the upper basin States, and which would go to the building of this project, is now going to waste in the Pacific Ocean, and as it passes over the turbines at Hoover Dam it is producing secondary power at approximately 1½ mills, which goes as a subsidy to southern California?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I may state that the record indicates that over 200 million acre-feet of water has passed into the Pacific Ocean in the last 30 years.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to recommend the adoption of H. R. 3383, known as the upper Colorado bill. This is another forward step in the development of the Colorado River. The watershed of this river is composed of seven States, which constitute approximately one-tenth of the area of the United States.

The Colorado River development began at the turn of the century. At that time engineers and forward-looking citizens envisioned the proper development of the United States. Studies were made of the potential flood control, electrical power, and the proper application of water throughout this entire area. The Congress of the United States authorized the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to enter into a compact respecting the disposition and the apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River, August 19, 1921—Forty-second United States Statutes at Large, page 171.

The Honorable Herbert Hoover was appointed by the President of the United States as a representative of the United States of America to confer with these States and arrive at a decision. None of you need to be reminded that under the leadership of the Honorable Herbert Hoover all of the States gathered around the table and adopted the Colorado River compact. This compact envisioned the proper development of the river in all of the States gathered at this table, and it was with the hope that all of the States could work together and develop the West. I need not point out to you that all of the States believed in the future development of the western half of the United States and all cooperated with the idea this could be accomplished by the efforts of the States with assistance from the United States Government.

This legislation is only one part of the plan for the development of the Colorado River. It is to be developed according to the reclamation law. This law was first enacted in 1902. Without the reclamation law the great West could never have developed and contributed to the Nation as it has in the past 50 years. The reclamation law is not designed to provide subsidies, but, on the contrary, it provides a definite method for repayment of advances made. In this instance there will be 99-percent repayment, and the small 1 percent is allocated to flood control and wildlife.

This legislation, when approved, will cause to be generated electricity for use in an expanding and growing area. The electrical energy will be sold under the provisions of the reclamation law which includes the preference clause. There is no power policy issue in this project. The power will be sold at competitive rates, and the users of the power will contribute to the project cost.

I believe that all proper-thinking individuals are interested in the development of our natural resources. This development cannot come all at once and must be taken in stages. This is not the first development on the Colorado River, and we who favor this legislation are somewhat preplexed at the opposition advanced against the development of this river. Why there should come such vehement opposition from those who have received the most out of this development is not understandable.

Permit me to direct your attention to the facts concerning the development of this river. When the Colorado River compact was ratified, the great State of California agreed irrevocably and unconditionally with the United States and the six ratifying States at that time that the aggregae annual consumption—diversion less return to river—of water of and from the Colorado River for use in the State of California shall not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of that water apportioned to the lower basin plus one-half of the surplus. With these limitations, southern California, and particularly the city of Los Angeles and the metropolitan water district together with all other contracting bodies, agreed to the terms and conditions of the compact and entered into contracts with the United States Government to repay the cost for the construction of the Hoover Dam and many other reclamation projects, less a $25 million subsidy for flood control.

These firm contracts were based upon the competitive steam-power rates in that area of approximately 5 or 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. Those desiring the water were given contracts at 25 cents per acre-foot. Then southern California, realizing that if she paid the rate under her firm contracts she would repay in less than 50 years, insisted that development be had in the upper basin States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. When the Boulder Canyon project was amended, then southern California began to pay not 5 or 6 mills per kilowatt-hour but is now paying an average of 2¼ mills per kilowatt-hour. She also reduced the interest rate. It is estimated she had a complete savings far in excess of $5 million a year. When the Boulder Canyon Project Act was approved at the insistence of all of southern California there was made available one-half million dollars a year for a 20-year period to the upper basin States for study and investigation by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a Colorado River system for irrigation, electrical power, and for other purposes.

With the moneys made available, the Bureau of Reclamation has for many years made a complete study in the upper basin States. This study revealed the amount of water that was available and selected sites for construction of power units. The study further reflected that sufficient income could be realized from these projects to pay their own way under the reclamation law. We, in the upper basin States, have waited for years for the Bureau to finish its study, and having finished its study and made its recommendations on a sound basis, we believe we are entitled to the development not only for our own area but for the benefit of the entire United States.

Since southern California has received an advantageous position by its contracts with the United States Government and developed its area far beyond its own expectations, we are at a loss to understand why they would oppose development which they, themselves, had advocated for years until this legislation was presented. As I have heretofore pointed out, they cannot lose any water because they, themselves, enacted the legislation which limits them to 4,400,000 acre-feet and one-half of the surplus. Studies reveal the upper basin States have by the compact agreed that over a 10-year period they are bound to deliver 75 million acre-feet of water, and certainly Southern California will at all times secure its just portion thereof.

Not once in all of the years of negotiation between the upper basin States and southern California was it ever indicated that they would in any manner oppose the proper development of the river. On the contrary, they held out many glowing promises and even suggested the funds for the studies and surveys as set forth in the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of June 19, 1940, Fifty-fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 774.

After southern California had secured their advantageous position and deserted their friends who had helped them secure this position, they set about a campaign of vilification, misrepresentations and untruths, the like of which Hollywood could never expect to equal. Many of you have reached pamphlets and literature indicating what it would cost your particular State or your particular county based upon some fantastic figure pulled out of the air without any regard to the true facts. Those who prepared this literature well know that the Reclamation Law provides for repayment, and I dare you to consult any of their literature where at any time they mentioned this fact.

Can it be that those in southern California are fearful that their advantageous position will be disturbed or if it is not disturbed that they will fail to get all of the water from this river and the electrical energy generated therefrom. When a fair division has been made, why should they object now to others developing? The only answer is that they are not satisfied with misrepresenting themselves to the other States but can only be satisfied when they have secured everything from the river of which they contribute no part of the flow.

A fair analysis of this bill will show that it is good legislation. The unfair and derogatory innuendos are not based upon fact. If you are interested in the development of the western part of the United States, and property of the entire Nation, then I hope that all of you will be fair and honest and properly consider the sources from which this opposition comes and vote for this bill.

Heretofore there has been a great deal of discussion advocated by those from southern California who say that they will be hurt by this legislation and that they are opposing it for that purpose. The first point I would like to make is that without the aid and assistance from those of southern California, this bill would not be here today. Second, I want to point out that it was their aid and assistance that made it possible, and we in Colorado, being on the mountain top of the Continental Divide, having rivers running in every direction, have been besieged with lawsuits from States all around us from the beginning of time. In 1921 when southern California came to us with a little olive branch of peace and a white dove of love and suggested to us that we settle these difficulties, we in Colorado joined with them and came to Congress and authorized the States to get together in a compact. The President of the United States appointed Hon. Herbert Hoover as the representative from the United States.

We sat down at Santa Fe, N. Mex. and wrote the Colorado River compact. It so happened at that particular time that my colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and I were in law school and our teacher on water rights was a representative to this meeting; he was the representative of the State of Colorado. He sat with these people, and with the Honorable Herbert Hoover to consider the terms and conditions of this compact. It was from him that we learned of the good intentions of those of southern California and all of the upper basin States to settle our differences amicably.

Following that all of the States, with the exception of the State of Arizona, ratified this compact. Arizona apparently began to see the will of the way of those who professed to be our friends at that time and who professed to be our friends until this bill came on the floor of the House. Apparently when they looked out and saw that dove of love they called it a buzzard, because it was their failure to ratify the compact that caused southern California to come back to this Congress and pass the so-called Boulder Canyon Project Act.

I want to direct your attention to the provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, section 13 (a), which provides that before this Hoover Dam can be constructed the State of California should pass a limitation act whereby they agree that under no circumstances will they consumptively use in excess of 4,400,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River.

Now, mind you, Mr. Chairman, the State of California has not contributed and does not contribute today one drop of water to the Colorado River. Seventy-two percent of this water rises in the State of Colorado and flows down that way. With that being the situation and with the California State Legislature passing its statutes of limitation, the President of the United States proclaimed as provided in the Boulder Canyon Act how we should proceed.

Contracts were entered into for the construction of the Hoover Dam and every one of those contracts stated that it was made subject to the provisions of the compact. If there is any doubt about it I have the complete list of all the contracts that were entered into and that contain that provision.

Let us examine this a little further. In the compact provision of the upper basin States they said Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico constituted the upper basin States; that the lower basin States constituted Nevada, Arizona, and California.

At the time they wrote the compact the engineering data showed that there were approximately 17 to 20 million acre-feet annually in this river. In order to be safe they said that those in the upper basin States would be entitled in perpetuity, mind you, in perpetuity, to 7,500,000 acre-feet; that those in the lower basin States would be entitled to an equal amount.

They then put into that compact a provision which I believe is unfair but nevertheless we of the upper basin States are obligated and have a burden to deliver over a 10-year period to the lower basin States 75 million acre-feet of water.

After these contracts had been entered into with the United States Government and, incidentally, they were to pay 6 mills for the production of power—is when California came to us again with an olive branch of peace and the white dove of love and said: "We want to get away from this contract. We want you to develop it."

For over 4 years all of the States sat together and finally agreed that the Boulder Canyon project Act should be amended. I want to point out to the Members of this House that there was the time that southern California agreed that pursuant to section 2 (d) of the amended Boulder Canyon project, after 1940 a half million dollars a year was made available to the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of conducting a study to see how we could develop in the upper basin States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, at the same time the southern California group came to Congress and we joined with them and a half million dollars was made available to the upper basin States for 20 years. That act also provided for an additional half million dollars a year for 30 years for the full development of all the basin. For the first 20 years $10 million was given to the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of making a study. It was at the suggestion of those from south-

ern California that it was put into legislation because they recognized, as I pointed out before, that they did not have any water. None of it originated in their State. They recognized that their only right was under this compact. They recognized that we were entitled to develop it. It was with that in mind that in 1946 and 1947 the State of California was asked to comment on our development. They did comment, and with a few reservations approved and went along with the right to develop as was contemplated all the time.

The Bureau of Reclamation, as has been stated on the floor of the House by the chairman of this committee, made a complete and fair study. From that study certain recommendations were made and in those recommendations it was found that the projects in this bill are feasible.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. And that was after a factual summary of the amount of water that is in the river and a finding of dependence upon that flow of water, is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct.

In addition to that I might point out to you of southern California who are so visiously fighting this bill: Did it ever occur to you that by the storage of the water in the upper basins and these reservoirs we would be in a better position to continue to deliver the 75 million acre-feet over a 10-year period? Is it not insurance to you to know that stored away up the river is plenty of water to run down to Hoover Dam and to supply the municipal water to the city of Los Angeles? Do you not know that if it is there stored it is then made available to you and why should you object to us developing it?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. May I say to the gentleman that water upstream above Lee Ferry will not affect the generation of power at Hoover Dam or will not put any water on the soil of southern California. We are concerned with the availability of this water.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I point out to the gentleman that we both know that water runs downhill. It comes down the Colorado River and the only way it is going to get to Hoover Dam, the only way it is going to get to Los Angeles, is as it comes on down. If it is being used there to generate electricity, the gentleman and I know there is very little water lost when used in the generation of electricity. You and I know that in this bill we cannot, under any circumstances, go ahead and use water to the extent that southern California has. Why would you not be satisfied and let us have a little bit of the supply we get from these high mountain ravines, up and down, and then when we are finished with it, make the beneficial uses we can, pass it on to you so that you may have it? Why would you not want to join with us and get more yourself?

Mr. HOSMER. Of course, the gentleman understands fully, does he not, that not one single drop of storage upstream is needed in order to make the beneficial consumptive uses of water which the upper basin desires to use under the project proposed and inserted in this bill and that therefore——

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Just a moment. I yielded to the gentleman for a question. The only thing I can say to the gentleman is that I do not understand his mathematics nor the water conservation that he advocates, because any person will recognize and he should know that far above, a mile high, where this water starts, it goes downstream, and if you have dams and reservoirs in which to impound it and run it through the electrical turbines, it is still in the river and will still go down to you, and it will help regulate the flow. I regret that after all these years, when we had what we thought was a fair group working with us for the proper protection of the entire West, we now run into opposition that is not understandable and that the dove of love is that of a vulture nature.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the word "expert" kicked around a bit here and perhaps it has lost its meaning. However, in that I have complete confidence in the ability of the Members to separate the wheat from the chaff, I would like to make reference to some commentary from a man, not only a water engineer but one who has dedicated his life to the study of the Colorado River. More than this, Mr. Merriell, of whom I am speaking, was one of the members of the commission which negotiated the Sante Fe compact which is often raised in these proceedings. I have thus in part only introduced my expert. He is no late comer to the Colorado controversy nor has he parlayed his knowledge of the subject into publicity. It grieves me somewhat that new Members of this body, only recently citizens of the area for which they speak with such fervor and knowledge, are constrained to sell their sudden knowledge as final in determining the merits of a matter at least as old as they in total years and far older than their personal relationship with it.

Still, recent acquaintance with a problem often leads an unsuspecting candor to emerge. My colleague from southern California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] thus, no doubt without knowing its impact, said:

> It is this real invasion of water rights necessary to support a growing civilization now numbering over 6 million people which we cannot countenance. California's legal rights under the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act—

And here he carefully omitted the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act and the California Self-Limitation Act—are at the heart of California's opposition to the upper Colorado River storage project as proposed in the pending bill.

I am glad he saw fit to bare this confession, yet he knew not what he said. In the first place, this legislation requires, and allows suit if it does not obtain strict adherence to all the law of the river. This legal stipulation alone illuminates the need for recourse to vast campaigns directed not to the facts but to the pursuasion of the jury. The Supreme Court has clearly held that there is no justiciable issue as between southern California and the rights of the upper basin States as regard this project. It does not improve his case to argue it with fine words and phrases. We have, of course, explained this before, just as we have met all other arguments, but I wish to make it clear that from the very first, that is way back about the turn of the century, we have entered negotiations to protect all rights under law, not only California but the other States as well. We do not propose here to abandon a half-century of policy and every bill we have considered, including the present one, so stipulates. Justice is served in the bill, but not by assertive statement directed to preconceived positions.

But to get back to one of the truly top men on matters affecting the Colorado River, Mr. Merriell, of Colorado. In his testimony last year before our committee, he spelled out how the rights of California are served, both by the law of the river and by actions of California herself. He shows, and I invite your attention to it for the real factual meat it contains, that her interests are better served by the river law and by our plans than they are by her own actions:

STATEMENT OF F. C. MERRIELL, CHIEF ENGINEER, COLORADO RIVER WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

It seems very necessary to explain to the subcommittee why upper-basin people, especially those from western Colorado, are sure they must have the storage project, in its main outlines, as quickly as it can be put to work.

During the negotiations which preceded the drafting of the 1922 compact by the Colorado River Commission, one member of that commission had a fixed determination to secure for the people of the lower basin a firm guaranty of Colorado River flow to the lower basin. Mr. Norviel, of Arizona, did not at any time desist from his determination to secure such a guaranty and he was, in the end, successful.

The primary reason upper-basin people feel they must have the storage project is to counteract the deleterious effect of that guaranty in the 1922 compact upon the upper basin. To explain that effect certain terms used in hydrology must be defined. The most commonly known tool of the practicing hydrologist is a record of flow taken at some point on any stream where it is believed it will later have value, by standard methods with as great accuracy as possible. This record, which should cover as many years as it can, is, in the West, known as historical flow and sets up for some time unit, such as days, months, or years, the actual delivery of water past the point chosen on the stream. Another quantity which also appears in this analysis, and is also highly important is not the actual flow, but the hypothetical flow that would have occurred at the time the historical flow was

measured, if there had been no use of any kind by men at any place above the point of measurement. This is called the virgin, or undepleted flow, and for the solution of many legal questions in water supply it often is more important than historical flow.

All members of the Colorado River Commission were agreed shortly after sessions were started that the probable average annual virgin flow of Colorado River, in the vicinity of Lee Ferry, at which point they decided to divide the Colorado River Basin into upper basin and lower basin, had for some years been and would continue to be, about 20 million acre-feet annually. They determined to divide at that time 15 million acre-feet evenly between the 2 basins, leaving what they conceived to be a considerable surplus for later division. In an effort to lessen the danger that was inherent in the guaranty of water to the lower basin, the commissioner for Colorado, Delph E. Carpenter, introduced in article III (d), of the compact the provision that the guaranteed amount of water should not be determined on an annual basis, but should be spread over periods of 10 years.

In the light of these facts it is essential to analyze, if that is possible, the reason for the opposition to the storage project of California water bodies, and of some of the State's Representatives in the Congress. Evidently, it is thought in California that its ability, without the storage project, to get the water allotted to the lower basin together with all the water allotted to the upper basin which that basin is not using, so far as it is present in the river, will enable California to secure and use for power much more water than as though the storage project were in existence. That this will be advantageous to California may not necessarily be true, and the history of storage and use of water in Lake Mead shows the point.

After storage was started in Lake Mead February 1, 1935, the lake was filled as quickly as possible and by summer of 1941 it was actually full. From that time until the end of 1952, Lake Mead has been operated as a full reservoir, which does not mean that there were not considerable annual variations of its content and power head, but that these were at all times the maximum possible in view of the flood-stage criteria laid down for that reservoir. This insured the maximum generation of power and a very large supply of water through 1952.

During 1953–54 the production of power was continued at about the same rate as had been possible with a full reservoir every year, in spite of the fact that the reservoir was rapidly being emptied because of the low inflow in both these years. As a result it was necessary in 1954 to cut power production by about 12 percent and on January 31, 1955, the content of Lake Mead was only 12,305,000 acre-feet, less than the reservoir had contained since it was first filled, when it passed this content in June 1937. At this level there is a decrease in power head of 34 percent of the maximum power head and perhaps 30 percent of the average power head as it has been operated for so many years. With the decrease in power head the quantity of water being released must be increased to the maximum usable at the power head available to generate constantly decreasing increments of power. The only remedy under these conditions would have been sooner to reduce the output in order to conserve power head and secure more efficient operation.

If, on the other hand, the storage project has been even partially built and were working during these years, the operation of Lake Mead would not have been greatly different during these 2 years than it had usually been and the reservoir would have been much more nearly full than it now is. If the present prospect of a fair water year in 1955 had been added to the regulation effected by the storage project, 1955 would have been in Lake Mead a year of essentially full-reservoir operation, whereas without the storage project even a very good year must be one of several such to restore the operating conditions that were so successfully maintained from 1941 through 1952. In other words, it would appear that the most efficient operation of Lake Mead will be assured only if there is regulation of this highly erratic river in the upper basin. It is a remarkable confirmation of this idea that during the months of negotiations of the Colorado River Commission, all the commissioners from both basins many times repeated their conviction that for the successful utilization of Colorado River, reservoir regulation must sooner or later be carried out in the upper basin.

Several advantages in addition to that just explained will accrue to the lower basin. The building of reservoirs in the upper basin will much lessen, although not entirely stop, the addition of silt to the loss of capacity Lake Mead has already experienced. Silt entering Lake Mead is not all deposited in the dead-storage space which is ostensibly where it should ultimately be found. Now much of it is in the live-storage space and that will always be true. This silt will neither generate power nor irrigate land, but insofar as it is part of the flow delivered to Lake Mead under natural conditions, it is measured as water, which it certainly is not.

When reservoirs have been built in the upper basin the necessity to carry empty several million acre-feet of storage capacity for possible floods can be largely eliminated. While floods are more apt to occur in the type of country composing the lower basin, it is hardly conceivable that they will require so much flood storage as is now provided, and the level of Lake Mead can be raised with profit in power production by reason of the flood protection of the upper basin reservoirs. That this protection for a most remote possibility does not lessen its necessity, means that somewhere on the river system these protective measures must be enforced.

The effect of all the factors discussed may now be assessed in western Colorado. It must first be said that all the water produced in that State, which is 70 percent of the total yield of the river, has as its first call the delivery of two-thirds of it to meet the obligation of the guaranty at Lee Ferry. In the table that accompanies this memorandum, which starts with listing of the historical flow at Lee Ferry, it is shown how the virgin flow is derived by the addition of all the various forms of consumptive use as nearly as these can be worked out. It is then necessary to deduct the amount guaranteed the lower basin and what remains is the water available for consumptive use in the upper basin. This amount, according to the 1922 compact, should be 7,500,000 acre-feet but as shown in column 11 of the table is reduced, by low-river flow to 5,866,760 acre-feet, as an average for the period, 1950–54. It varies from a yearly negative amount of 1,806,600 acre-feet in 1934, to amounts which in 9 years of the 25 are more than the upper-basin allotment, as already stated, total in the period some 20,350,300 acre-feet. But in all the other years of the period the flow is less, by considerable amounts, than the water the upper basin is supposed to have and varies very widely from year to year.

Analysis of flow, Colorado River at Lee Ferry, 1930 to 1954, inclusive

Year	Historical flow [1]	Diversions [1]		Municipal supply [1]	Irrigation			Virgin flow [1]	Lower basin [1]	Upper basin [1]	Colorado proportion [1]
		Colorado	Utah		Acres [2]	Acre-feet per acre	Total [1]				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1930	13,070.0	22.3	65.0	10.0	1,380	1.19	1,642.0	14,809.3	7,500	7,309.3	3,757.7
1931	6,388.0	16.0	35.0	10.0	1,380	.91	1,255.8	7,704.8	7,500	204.8	106.0
1932	15,290.0	26.6	45.0	10.5	1,380	1.27	1,752.6	17,124.7	7,500	9,624.7	4,954.9
1933	9,745.0	23.6	60.5	11.0	1,380	1.04	1,435.2	11,275.3	7,500	3,776.3	1,922.8
1934	4,397.0	16.8	83.0	11.0	1,380	.82	1,131.6	5,639.4	7,500	−1,860.6	−934.9
1935	9,911.0	41.6	54.5	11.5	1,385	1.05	1,454.3	11,472.9	7,500	3,972.9	2,030.1
1936	11,970.0	73.2	52.0	11.5	1,390	1.13	1,570.7	13,677.4	7,500	6,177.4	3,170.9
1937	11,900.0	78.5	59.2	12.0	1,395	1.13	1,576.3	13,626.0	7,500	6,136.0	3,144.3
1938	15,440.0	129.3	65.8	12.0	1,400	1.28	1,792.0	17,439.1	7,500	9,939.1	5,117.6
1939	9,394.0	99.9	63.8	12.5	1,410	1.04	1,466.4	11,036.6	7,500	3,536.6	1,804.3
1940	7,082.0	92.6	65.8	13.0	1,425	.94	1,339.5	8,592.9	7,500	1,092.9	539.7
1941	16,050.0	111.6	52.9	13.5	1,440	1.31	1,886.4	18,114.4	7,500	10,601.4	5,460.3
1942	17,030.0	51.0	64.2	14.0	1,455	1.34	1,949.7	19,108.9	7,500	11,608.9	5,981.7
1943	11,260.0	115.6	69.1	14.5	1,470	1.11	1,631.7	13,090.9	7,500	5,590.9	2,867.4
1944	13,220.0	80.2	68.0	15.0	1,485	1.20	1,782.0	15,099.2	7,500	7,599.2	3,906.7
1945	11,540.0	128.4	58.2	15.5	1,500	1.13	1,995.0	13,437.1	7,500	5,937.1	3,046.6
1946	8,744.0	114.4	61.0	16.0	1,520	1.02	1,550.4	10,505.8	7,500	3,005.8	1,529.6
1947	13,510.0	101.5	69.8	16.5	1,540	1.21	1,863.4	15,561.2	7,500	8,061.2	4,145.8
1948	13,690.0	84.7	86.4	17.0	1,570	1.21	1,899.7	15,788.0	7,500	8,278.0	4,258.0
1949	14,360.0	109.1	63.3	17.5	1,600	1.22	1,952.0	16,501.9	7,500	9,001.9	4,672.6
1950	11,060.0	125.1	81.3	18.0	1,630	1.11	1,809.3	13,093.7	7,500	5,593.7	2,868.9
1951	9,830.9	185.2	82.0	18.5	1,660	1.05	1,743.0	11,859.6	7,500	4,359.6	2,230.2
1952	17,978.9	185.6	70.0	19.0	1,690	1.36	2,298.4	20,523.9	7,500	13,032.9	6,718.7
1953	8,804.6	300.3	65.0	19.5	1,710	1.02	1,744.2	10,923.6	7,500	3,432.6	1,751.0
1954	6,101.1	378.7	55.6	20.0	1,730	.90	1,557.0	8,112.4	7,500	612.4	291.0

[1] 1,000 acre-feet.
[2] 1,000 acres.

(2)+(3)+(4)+(5)+(8)=(9). (9)−(10)=(11). (11)×51.75 percent=(12).

By comparing column 12 with the tabulation of "present consumptive use," on page 7, it will appear that in 8 years out of 25 the Colorado proportion of water available for use is less than the present demand, which is bound to grow rapidly in the next few years. This is the very situation the storage project is intended to ameliorate and perhaps cure. Nothing about this use of water by the storage project is contrary to the provisions of the 1922 compact, and as a matter of fact, the Colorado River Commission, although it did not express this in the 1922 compact, had in mind at all times that some project, similar to the storage project, would be a necessity in the upper basin.

Of the water which is the upper basin allotment, Colorado is supposed to have 51.75 percent of 7,500,000 acre-feet less 50,000 acre-feet allotted to Arizona, or 3,855,375 acre-feet. In column 12 of the table shown the actual water available for consumptive use within Colorado, which averages 3,015,240 acre-feet, but in 12 years of the period the

water actually available is less than the average, as shown in the following tabulation:

	Water (acre-feet)
1931	105,500
1933	1,927,800
1934	934,900
1935	2,030,100
1939	1,804,300
1940	539,700
1943	2,867,400
1946	1,529,600
1950	2,868,900
1951	2,230,200
1953	1,751,000
1954	291,000

while in only 4 years of the period is the amount of water more than the average for the period, although less than the compact allotment for Colorado.

Without the storage project the figure for the average water available has no meaning for the water that can actually be used in western Colorado is not the average but only the water actually available in each year, which as the tabulation above shows would be entirely inadequate in 5 years out of the 12 listed and would seriously hamper the raising of crops in all of these years.

It only remains to list the present uses in western Colorado with a fair evaluation of future uses, which are now rapidly developing, to show that in western Colorado necessity for the storage project is much greater than anywhere else in the upper basin, and that even present uses in western Colorado will be seriously hampered if the erratic flow of the river produces many more years of flow as low as it was in 1931, 1934, 1940, and 1954.

You may judge for yourself. The waterflow into Lake Mead has been adequate for required uses in the lower basin, yet it is now dangerously low. We propose, as this shows, to do better by them than they now do by themselves. We will thus help them achieve their own goals in spite of their own contrary efforts.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I shall address myself exclusively to this problem of surplus commodities. The gentleman from California about 15 minutes ago referred to this question.

The first question he asked was why have a soil bank and take acreages out of production and then bring in reclamation projects to put acreages into production. I would like to answer that question. The reason is simple. The soil-bank feature, especially the acreage reserve part of it, expires in 1959. It is a temporary affair, and it is fully planned by the department that production and consumption will be in balance in 3 to 5 years. That is why it is temporary.

The gentleman referred in the second place to the production of dairy products in the upper basin States saying that they would add to the surplus problem. Let me give you the most recent statistics from the Department of Agriculture concerning the amount of surplus dairy products in the hands of the CCC right now.

In 1953 we had 256,900,000 pounds of butter; in 1954, 264 million pounds. At the end of last year, 2 months ago, we had only 47 million pounds of butter; it is vanishing at a rapid rate. Now, you take your dried milk. In 1953 we had 432 million pounds; in 1954, 91 million pounds; now 3 million pounds. In other words, supply and demand are almost in balance through our new agricultural program as far as dairy products are concerned and it is reasonable to assume with the USDA that other commodities can be brought into balance in 3 to 5 years. I take as my thesis the fact that this project will not aggravate the surplus problem for the following reasons.

First, it brings in only 132,000 new acres of land.

Second, the 4 upper basin States take out of production many times more than 132,000 acres of new land every 10 years. This project will not be in full production for probably 20 to 27 years, so there will be more land coming out of production in the 4 upper basin States than would go into production. It comes out for urban development, roads, and other purposes with which you are familiar.

Third, the Bureau of the Census gives us an estimate of population by 1975, when this project comes into full production, of 228 million people. That is an increase of 40 percent. If we increase acreage by 40 percent, that would take 161 million more acres. But the Department said improved methods would make that unnecessary, that we would need possibly only 100 million acres. Improved methods of farming will offset millions of acres.

Mark you this second point. We get 20 million acres through reclaiming humid lands and bringing into production lands in nonirrigated areas. These are the lands which the opposition say we should use first. We will need all that, and more, too, and still we will be 10 million acres short. It will take 35 million acres by that time to produce the meat we need because meat consumption by that time will be 49 percent above the present. That is largely what we produce under the Colorado project.

In the fourth place, the Colorado project will reduce surpluses, not increase them. You may ask me, how do I come to that conclusion? Here is the whole story. It is assumed by the opposition that if dams on the Colorado project are not built, no land will come into production. That is a great fallacy. If these dams are not built thousands of acres of new land will come into production in the Imperial Valley and in Mexico. And that is where they really are producing the surplus commodities. That is where they are producing surplus commodities on our water right now. If you want more surpluses, just let the water run down the river. If you do not want surpluses, then let us use it in the upper basin and insure the use of it to the upper basin States. Congress has decreed that these States are the rightful owners.

My available time on the floor has come to an end. However, I am submitting the following statement as an extension of my remarks to provide elaboration and substantiation of the position that construction of the upper Colorado project will not affect our current surplus problem.

First, the new land to be brought under cultivation is only 132,360 acres and that will not be in full production until 1975. This 132,360 acres is a far cry from the "million acres of land which the gigantic upper Colorado River project and its satellite, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project would bring into production"—I quote from the release of Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Monday, January 23, 1956.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas brings in no new acres, and the Colorado only 132,000.

The Washita project in Oklahoma which we were pleased to vote out last week without an opposing vote will bring in nearly a third—41,000—as many new acres as the Colorado. The Ventura project sponsored by southern California will bring into production 12,600 acres at a cost of $1,216 per acre and an annual pumping cost of $50 per acre. It is in a highly developed urban area and it is worth it. Many of the reasons that make the Ventura project desirable also make the Colorado project desirable. Repayment features are the same in both projects.

Why then such a roar about the Colorado and surpluses? The reason is not surpluses. We must go deeper than surpluses. The real reason is that southern California is making a pass at the upper basin States' share of the water which the lower basin States and Congress decreed to the lower basin in the law of the river—1922.

Second, increased population will bring increased demands. Our population is growing at a staggering rate. Official reports by experts indicate that our agricultural demands by 1975 will far exceed our Nation's capacity to produce.

Population is increasing at a rate of approximately 2,800,000 each year. Assuming present rate of increase continues, the United States Census Bureau estimates the population by 1975, when the project approaches full production, at 228 million. Four other predictions place the population between 209 and 250 million. The Census Bureau estimate is an increase of 40 percent by 1975.

There are 409 million acres of cropland in the United States at the present time. If the needed increase in acreage were equal to the increase in population—41 percent—we would need 161 million more acres by 1975. Of course, this figure is high because of increasing productivity. In any case, conservative estimates indicate that we will need the equivalent of 100 million new acres. The USDA says the United States will need 40 percent more overall food production by 1975 and that one of the commodities in greatest demand will be livestock, with an increased requirement for consumption of 49.4 percent.

Byron T. Shaw of USDA testified before the House Committee on Interior Affairs that we will need 35 million new acres by 1962 to produce the forage and feed necessary to maintain the current per capita meat consumption at 156 pounds per person. Livestock is the major crop of the upper basin States. For example, livestock constitutes 70 percent of Utah's agricultural income. The

best estimates as to where the new acres will come from are as follows:

Total sources of new land

	Million acres
Acres offset by improved farming methods	70
Acres obtained by draining and clearing land	20
Total	90
New acres required	100
Acres short	10

The Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture is my authority for saying that the four upper basin States will have more cropland go out of production every 10 years than the entire Colorado project will bring new acres into production in 30 years. This is occasioned by withdrawals for urban development, highways, airports, military reservations, erosion, and other causes.

In addition to the loss of cropland we will be facing in the United States by 1975, it has been found necessary to reduce the numbers of livestock on the national forests and public lands at an alarming rate in order to protect the watersheds which are deteriorating under heavy grazing and drought conditions.

Take, for example, the watersheds in the Heber City, Utah, area, one of the best cattle and sheep ranges in the State. The livestock people are required to remove 20 percent of their cattle and sheep this year, 20 percent next year, and 20 percent the year after, because of the serious condition of the watersheds which sustain a population of 400,000 in the valleys below.

Third, these 132,360 acres will not come into full production until about 1975 and by that time demands for food will far exceed the supply. In fact, the Bureau of Reclamation's most recent report, Reclamation and the Crop Surplus Problem, says:

> Responsible officials of the USDA anticipate a balance between production and consumption of agricultural commodities in 3 to 5 years.

This is the reason why the acreage reserve program is to run only to 1959. The Department of Agriculture feels that there will be no need for it after that date.

This is the answer to the opposition's question: "How can the administration on the one hand call for a decrease in acreage allotments through the soil bank and, on the other hand, ask Congress to approve the building of reclamation projects?"

The answer is "the acreage allotment of the soil bank runs only until 1959."

The acreage reserve will expire 6 years before even the Colorado storage dams are completed.

Fourth, a vote for the Colorado project is a vote to reduce surpluses. On the other hand, a vote against the Colorado is a vote to increase surpluses in the basic commodities.

The assumption is fallacious that if the Colorado project is killed the water will not be put to immediate beneficial use in agriculture. On the contrary, this bill is being opposed by a well-heeled southern California lobby chiefly for the reason that they want the water. They know that water runs down hill. They know that unless the upper basin States have the storage dams to impound floodwaters these States can never use the 7½ million acre-feet per year which Congress and even the lower basin States themselves have awarded to them. Therefore, by blocking this measure the upper basin States' share of the water is, and inevitably will be, used by the lower California State and by Mexico.

If used in the upper basin States, the water will not produce, to any appreciable extent, basic commodities that go into Government warehouses under price supports. On the contrary, if the project is not approved by Congress, and hence the water not used by the upper basin States, it will be used by the lower basin States and Mexico to produce basic commodities that are seriously in surplus and do go into the Government warehouses in large amounts.

For example, in 1945—Cotton Branch of Commodity Stabilization Service, United States Department of Agriculture—Imperial County had 9 acres of cotton. In 1953 this county had 116,630 acres of cotton. In 1945, San Joaquin County had 317,900 acres of cotton; in 1953, 1,182,750. In 1945, all of California had only 319,000 acres of cotton; in 1953, 1,348,000.

What is more alarming to cotton producers of our country, Mexico, with no acreage restrictions, now produces one-half million bales of cotton, all with Colorado water, much of which belongs to the upper basin. California has at least 85,000 additional acres upon which she can grow cotton and other basic commodities. Mexico has many additional acres upon which she can grow cotton with the upper basin States' water on the Colorado River Delta, if upper basin water is allowed to run down to her. Upper basin States can guarantee not to raise 1 pound of cotton under the Colorado project.

This is only one reason why I say "A vote for the Colorado project is a vote to reduce surpluses."

It is important to realize that wheat production in the upper basin will be reduced by construction of the project, since dry farm wheat operations can be expected to be cut from 50 percent to 90 percent in favor of crops which are more economical when irrigation water must be purchased.

SOIL BANK HAS NO BEARING ON THE ISSUE AS NOW PLANNED

The opponents of the Colorado River have said that it is inconsistent to establish a soil bank plan and take land out of production and, on the other hand, to pass the Colorado project. How is this statement erroneous?

The acreage reserve program is to expire in 1959. It is a temporary measure. The United States Department of Agriculture plans to have supply and demand in balance in 3 to 5 years. The Colorado project will not begin to come into any production until years after that time.

The only crop produced in the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming which is eligible for the acreage reserve program is wheat, and irrigation water will reduce wheat production.

GRAIN PRODUCED IN UPPER COLORADO BASIN DOES NOT GO UNDER PRICE SUPPORT, BUT IS FOR LOCAL FEED

In 1954, 4,561,635 bushels of corn were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount a mere 440 bushels, or 0.01 percent of the corn produced in these 4 States on reclamation project lands were placed under price support at a support value of $723. Contrast this 440 bushels with the CCC corn inventory of 757,612,049 bushels with a support value of $1,300,322,952. Why such a small amount placed under price support? Because corn is not produced for commercial sale in these four States, but for livestock feed. In fact, none of these four States are even in the designated "commercial corn area" for price purposes.

In 1954, 2,751,961 bushels of wheat were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount only 402,420 bushels, or 14.6 percent of the wheat produced on reclamation lands were placed under price support at a support value of $864,609. Contrast this 402,420 bushels with the CCC wheat inventory of 888,542,189 bushels with a support value of $2,399,042,201.

In 1954, 5,121,245 bushels of barley were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount only 62,282 bushels, or 1.2 percent of the barley produced in these States on reclamation project lands were placed under price support at a support value of $63,708. Contrast this 62,282 bushels with the CCC barley inventory of 31,261,403 bushels with a support value of $43,966,463.

In 1954, 2,552,944 bushels of oats were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount, an insignificant 9,286 bushels or 0.36 percent of the oats produced on reclamation project lands were placed under price support at a support value of $7,093. Contrast this 9,286 bushels with the CCC oats inventory of 35,258,232 bushels with a support value of $29,987,599.

Why such a small amount placed under price support? Two reasons primarily: First, little acreage is planted to wheat because irrigated land used to produce fruits and vegetables and other specialty crops bring higher returns to farmers; second, most of the wheat produced, as are the other small grains, are fed to livestock.

In 1954, 2,299 bushels of rye were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this insignificant amount only 149 bushels, or 6.5 percent of the rye produced were placed under price support at a support value of $191. Contrast this 149 bushels with the 3,305,906 bushels in the CCC inventory, valued at $5,390,331.

SUMMARY

In summary, then, we have shown that the surplus issue has been distorted all out of proportion to its importance.

First, because the project brings under cultivation only 132,360 new acres. More acres will be taken out of production each decade than will be brought into production by the entire project. This is due to the many acres retired by urban growth, new highways, airports, and so forth.

Second, because these new acres will not be brought into full cultivation until 1975.

Third, that our agricultural demands by 1975 will far exceed our Nation's capacity to produce, and new acres at that time will be an unmitigated blessing.

Fouth, that far more basic commodities now in surplus will be produced if the water is permitted to run down into the lower basin than if it is consumed in the upper basin.

Fifth, that the crops produced in the upper basin States are not to any extent the basic crops that make up the Government surpluses.

Sixth, that the proposed soil bank has no bearing on the issue because the acreage reserve program of the soil bank expires in 1959, long before any acres under the Colorado can be brought into production.

Seventh, that the 20 million acres in non-irrigated sections of the United States which can be reclaimed will be needed before the Colorado project comes into production, in spite of the fact that except for special areas these acres would be limited to the few basic crops which make up the Government surplus.

The real issue is not surpluses, cost engineering, or repayment. The real issue is "Who gets the water?"

I doubt that my colleagues will deny the right of the upper basin States to use their own water and by such action make that water available to lower California and to Mexico.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this project has taken a rather curious turn. One of the speakers just a few minutes ago asked you to support the project because apparently he believes that Californians are a bunch of rascals in their position in this, and their opposition to the project on the basis it uses water of the river to which the lower basin is entitled.

Also, yesterday it was implied that I had quoted some resolutions in the RECORD that did not exist, from certain railway brotherhoods. The statements I put in the RECORD did not identify any particular national organizations. It was stated here apparently that I did state they were national organizations and telegrams were produced from them saying that they had taken no record on this.

As to the organizations to which I referred, I obtained their feelings on the matter by a letter dated March 7, 1955, from Railroad Brotherhoods, California Legislative Board, representing the Brotherhoods of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, Railroad Trainmen, Conductors and Brakemen, Locomotive Engineers, Railway Clerks, Railway Carmen, Maintenance of Way Employees; Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Railroad Signalmen, Sheet Metal Workers, National Railway Employees. These are all organizations in California and I neither stated nor intended to imply they were national organizations.

Also I have here a letter from the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, the grand lodge in Detroit; another letter from the locomotive engineers out in Sacramento. These will be available if anybody wishes to look at them.

There have been imputations of unworthy motives because of southern California's natural interest in maintaining the physical availability of water to which she has a legal right by urging defeat of the upper Colorado storage scheme.

There have been descriptions of some alleged water lobby, which, by the use of the word "lobby," apparently imply that something not quite proper is afoot. Such an attack is in fact an attack on 6 million southern Californians individually who, working through their own water-supply bodies, both officially and unofficially, are seeking to protect only what is theirs. These bodies are:

First. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, composed of 68 cities including Los Angeles, Long Beach, and San Diego.

Second. Imperial Irrigation District.

Third. Coachella Valley Irrigation District.

Fourth. Palo Verde Irrigation District.

Fifth. Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

Sixth. San Diego County Water Authority.

There is nothing either sinister or secret about these organizations or the men and women interested in them. Their only concern, and mine, is that southern California not become parched and her future strangled by upstream developments preventing our rightful share of Colorado River water from reaching us.

The attacks being made on us are purely diversionary tactics to take attention away from the merits of our cause and the very real and apparent defects, financial, geological, and engineering, of the upper Colorado River storage proposal.

Particularly offensive to me personally, is the obstinate refusal of project proponents to take into consideration the compound interest costs on money which would have to be borrowed to finance the project and which runs into billions of dollars.

Mention has been made of the Colorado River Association which opposes the upper Colorado scheme. Just what is it?

The Colorado River Association is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization of citizens from all sections of California and from 43 other States.

Acting in behalf of the Colorado River Board of California and the member agencies of that board, the association is carrying forward an educational program to inform the people of the United States of existing and proposed water and power developments on the lower Colorado River.

Members of the association are representative of business, industry, agriculture, labor, the professions, women's organizations, and numerous civic, patriotic, educational and service groups.

What is the Colorado River Board of California? This is an official California State agency. The board is composed of six members appointed by the Governor. Each member of the board represents a California water and/or power agency with established rights on the Colorado River. These are the public agencies I mentioned above, namely: Coachella Valley County Water District; Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles; Imperial Irrigation District; Palo Verde Irrigation District; San Diego County Water Authority; the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which represents 68 cities, including Long Beach, San Diego, and Los Angeles.

Under provisions of the State law which set forth the powers and duties of the Colorado River Board, it has the responsibility of safeguarding and protecting the rights and interests of the State, its agencies and citizens, in and to their contracted shares of water of the Colorado River system.

The board and the State's public agencies with rights on the river are not seeking to obtain more water from the Colorado River than California's share, but to safeguarding the share of the river's water for which California people, through their public agencies, have long-standing contracts.

There are 6 million people in southern California depending on Colorado River water. The people of this area desperately need the water they are now receiving from the Colorado River system. The 6 million people who must have this water are not asking for water to pour on arid acres in order to raise additional crop surpluses and increase the Nation's tax burden; they are not asking the Government to spend $5 billion to further their own selfish interests; they are not clamoring for the construction of a gigantic water and power system that is at best totally unsound, both from an engineering and economic standpoint; the people of California ask none of these things.

What then is southern California asking? The millions of people in this area are asking only to be allowed to continue their use of water that they must have to carry on normal daily living. This is water to be used in homes, schools, and business. This is water for drinking, washing, and water to meet the normal demands of any giant metropolitan area.

There are twice as many people living in southern California, all of them directly dependent upon water from the Colorado River, than in all of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming combined. In addition, only a small portion of the people in these four States could possibly benefit from the upper Colorado project, while on the other hand, everyone of the 6 million people in the Los Angeles metropolitan water district will suffer equal hardship by the project's completion.

This is a case where millions of people are asking the Government not to waste billions of dollars in order to take away water that they must have to live. This is a plea by the people of southern California for the most basic necessity of life, water.

It is difficult to imagine how Congress, mindful of the best interests of the Nation and with all of the facts so readily available, could presume to pass such a bill. There is only one answer to this type of legislation: decisive and permanent defeat.

I should just like to say that when it comes time to decide whether you are going to vote for the bill or against the bill, ask yourself this. You go back home and some constituent comes up to you and says, "Why did you vote for a bill that would cost over a billion dollars in hidden interest, according to a letter from the Department of the Interior? That is a lot of money when you add it on to the direct appropriation. When you do that, you have voted away almost $2 billions of the taxpayers' money, only $1 billion of which is calculated to come back. Why do you impose those additional taxes on your constituents?" What answer will you give them? What will you say when your constituents say, "Why, you voted for a project that is going to cost $794 an acre to irrigate 160,000 acres of land up in Utah, and the whole project overall will take $545 direct expenditure per acre." What kind of an answer are you going to give them when they ask you that question?

What kind of an answer are you going to give your constituent when he comes up to you and says, "I thought this bill had something in it for the Navahos but it has nothing substantial in it for the Navahos. Why did you vote for it?" What kind of an answer are you going to give your constituent?

He might say, "Mr. Congressman, you voted for that bill and it would require power to be sold at 6 mills for the next 100 years, but electric power was not even conceived of 100 years ago." How could you vote on getting the taxpayers' money back on a speculation as far into the future as that?

Another thing your constituent may ask you is, "Mr. Congressman, what about the developments in nuclear electricity? You voted to spend almost half a billion dollars for hydroelectric plants in a day when nuclear developments are taking place."

Those are some of the things you should think of.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, the passage of the upper Colorado River storage project now under consideration is in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. These projects are essential if a large section of our country is to grow and develop to make its full contribution to our expanding national economy. It is vital to the stabilization of the livestock industry of the area. It is essential if the natural resources of this area, which have been rightfully referred to as the "treasure box" of the Nation, are to be developed.

It seems that we recognize the importance of water only when we have too much or too little. Some areas of the Nation have recently suffered from too much water. We of the intermountain West have been sympathetic to their problem as we have been to other sections with the same problem. However, our problem continues to be that of too little water. It is a problem that has continuously confronted us. This has been expensive to the Nation as a whole and a source of catastrophe to the area. In the drought year of 1934, the Federal Government purchased in the State of Wyoming 284,548 head of cattle and 584,976 head of sheep as a relief measure. As least 10 percent of these were slaughtered in the fields because they were in no condition to ship. The Department of Agriculture reports that drought assistance amounted to over $20 million in fiscal year 1954 and over $14 million in fiscal year 1955. In 1 year, over $650,000 was spent in Wyoming for drought relief, primarily for hay. This was at the taxpayers' expense. Better we should be assisted in helping ourselves on a sound basis by getting at the cause of the problem.

The future of our area is directly dependent upon the availability of water through conservation. We have abundant natural resources which the Nation sorely needs. These include uranium, oil shale, oil, gas, coal, titanium, vanadium, phosphorus, iron, trona, forests, and others. Most require water for development. Even in our fondest dreams, we do not see our area as an industrial giant. We will not be taking industry away from any other section. With water, we will serve as a feeder area to supply other parts of the country with many critical raw materials and at the same time will develop as a better market for the finished products.

The number one argument of the opponents of the upper Colorado River project legislation now being considered by the House has been a contention that it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation an enormous sum. I can appreciate how this argument would cause the Representatives of the other States concern. It is an easy way to appeal to the emotional reactions of a tax-conscious electorate. The argument though is not sound and as I shall show you, is based upon fantasy and distortion.

To establish the facts, let us examine the provisions of the bill rather than to talk about something that is not before the House. The bill before the House for consideration, H. R. 3383, authorizes a maximum expenditure of $760 million. The cost estimate of the projects shown by the committee report is in round numbers, $758.8 million.

Of the total cost, only $7.4 million is not reimbursable. This is less than 1 percent of the total cost and represents that portion of the cost assigned to flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation. This is in keeping with the general policy that has been followed over the years and differs from other projects only in that there is such a small amount which is not to be reimbursed. On our other public-works projects such as river and harbors and flood control, not 1 percent but 100 percent is nonreimbursable. Certainly, neither the opponents nor the rest of the Nation can be objecting to this provision in the bill.

Of the remaining $751.4 million, $422.7 million are allocated to power. This entire amount will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with interest. Power revenues will continue to accrue to the Federal Treasury after the cost and interest are paid in full.

Another $41 million of the cost is allocated to municipal water uses. Similarly on this feature, not only will the principal be paid in full, but interest will also be paid.

The power and municipal water features encompass more than 61 percent of the total cost of the Colorado project. On this outlay, the taxpayers obviously are not expected to pay a penny.

The remaining $287.7 million authorized is allocated to irrigation. This amount is repayable in full, in 50 years, but does not bear interest. This is in accordance with the Reclamation law, and has been standard practice for the past 54 years. The principle is sound that the irrigation costs should not be expected to pay interest. Yet it is apparently on this fact that the opponents of the upper Colorado project, the most vocal of which have had the greatest benefit from this provision, apparently base their preposterous charges that some fabulous burden of hidden interest will be placed on the Nation's taxpayers. By means of arithmetical mysteries known only to themselves, the opponents have come up with some fantastic figures. One thing is quite obvious that they have assumed expenditures not authorized in this bill to accomplish their purpose. The Members of the House will certainly not fall for this type of argument to discredit this project or the reclamation program in general. This is actually an investment for the Nation as a whole and the Treasury will reap far greater returns on its investment than any theoretical interest charge would amount to.

President Theodore Roosevelt said back in 1901 when a proposal for a reclamation law was under discussion:

> The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country, just as settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States.

The following year, on June 17, 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt signed into law the first Reclamation Act, and over fifty-odd years since, the truth of his 1901 prediction was proved over and over again.

Through multipurpose reclamation projects, the entire Nation has been enriched by specialty crops not grown elsewhere in the Nation, by the stabilizing of the agricultural economy of a large part of our Nation, by the development of water for growing cities and

growing industries, by the production of hydroelectric power and in taxes paid directly into the Federal Treasury on the new wealth produced—wealth which would never have come into being without the aid of reclamation.

The sum total of these benefits—taking into consideration only the direct and obvious benefits, without regard to the multiple indirect benefits that flow into every corner of our Nation and bolster the economy—is more than 10 times the total of all money that has been invested in reclamation in this country since the beginning of the program in 1902.

As Theodore Roosevelt looked forward in 1901, the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power looked back on the 53-year record of reclamation in 1955 and summed it up this way:

> No Federal help or encouragement has been as attractive an investment as irrigation development, or has provided, per unit of expenditure, as great a unit of return in western regional development.

There is a clear difference between wasteful expenditure and sound investment. It is as uneconomic to pass up a sound investment as it is to spend money recklessly and wastefully.

The report of the Hoover Commission task force further stated:

> The justification for Federal interest in irrigation is not solely to provide land for farmers or to increase food supply. These new farm areas inevitably create villages and towns whose populations thrive from furnishing supplies to the farmer, marketing his crop, and from the industries which grow around these areas. The economy of seven important cities of the West had its base in irrigation—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Spokane, Boise, El Paso, Fresno, and Yakima. Indeed these new centers of productivity send waves of economic improvement to the far borders, like a pebble thrown into a pond. Through irrigation, man has been able to build a stable civilization in an area that might otherwise have been open only to intermittent exploitation.

A folder featuring a map and with banner headline entitled "A New $4 Billion Tax Burden Threatens You" was circulated yesterday among Members of Congress. As I have previously stated, there is no way that we can determine what mathematical mysteries were employed by the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles to develop these figures. This circular does shed some light on the situation. As shown on its face, it assumes 33 participating projects whereas this bill authorizes only 11 participating projects. Therefore, from its very inception, it is not applicable to the bill before us.

There is one other thing that appears on the face of the map which I think should be set straight. The Colorado River Association of Los Angeles in the circular states:

> Costs to States are based on the percentage of Federal taxes paid by each State, as computed by the Tax Foundation, New York City and Washington, D. C.

The careful wording of this leaves the inference that the Tax Foundation backs up the costs shown for the individual States. This is not the fact. Tax Foundation general estimates of how the Federal tax burden is distributed among States having nothing to do with the costs of this project were applied to the southern California fantasy figures. This was then used to create the inference. The fantastic costs assumed to accomplish the distortion are solely the responsibility of the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles and its associates. I am advised that the Tax Foundation has had to send out many explanatory letters.

It would appear that these people, to arrive at these costs, have entirely disregarded the fact that 61 percent of the expenditure is reimbursed in full with interest. This only leaves $287,700,000 in addition to the $7,400,000 that is nonreimbursable, on which interest is not directly paid back to the Treasury. This amount is repaid in full in 50 years plus the development period. These people certainly cannot expect Congress to accept this argument when one single flood-control project that they have recently asked for and which has been allowed and is presently under construction for the benefit of the city of Los Angeles involves $348 million of nonreimbursable Federal funds. I refer to the Los Angeles County drainage area project in southern California, which, excluding the Whittier Narrows Reservoir, is estimated to involve the $348 million of nonreimbursable Federal funds. These funds are not to be repaid in 50 years; they are never to be repaid. If we were to compound the interest on the Federal money for a period of 100 years on this expenditure for the city of Los Angeles and the surrounding area alone, we could contend that it was costing the taxpayers of the Nation $4,100,000,000. How the opposition could expect us to accept that interest on $295 million, a $53 million lesser amount, which is repaid in annual installments over a shorter period of time, and reach the same figure shows how preposterous their statement really is. But this money, for the benefit of southern California, is never repaid. If we were to continue compounding the interest for 200 years, a figure of $48 billion on this project alone could be developed. It is obvious that, by such ridiculous computations, it could then be contended that this one project, for the benefit of southern California only, would eventually be responsible for the entire national debt, and, for that matter, would bankrupt the Nation. The same line of false reasoning could be developed for any flood-control project in the United States. Obviously the conclusion is not true and southern California representatives would undoubtedly be the first ones to object. Our interest in rivers and harbors improvements and in flood control are not bankrupting us, as we all know. This is because it is an investment and not an expenditure on which we get no return. A sound investment, whether an improvement of navigation facilities, in flood control, or in reclamation, builds up the national economy.

Let us now take a close look at the interest-free money allocated to the irrigation features of the Colorado River storage project. We will see why this will not create a burden on the taxpayer, but will, rather, considerably ease the taxpayers' effort.

The surest way to judge what will happen on a project which is to be constructed is to check on what has happened on similar projects which have been constructed in the past. In nearly 54 years that the reclamation law has been in effect reclamation projects in the 17 Western States have returned to the Federal Treasury in taxes on the new wealth created over 25 percent more than the total cost of all reclamation construction.

A large number of these projects are not yet completed and therefore have not yet started producing. Many others have only begun to produce. That means that the full costs of the investment have been included, but that the full productive capacity has not been included in computing the return.

When we consider typical reclamation projects that have been in full production for some time, the comparison is even more impressive. The Bureau of Reclamation made a study of 15 reclamation projects that have been in full production over a number of years. It was found that the cumulative Federal income taxes paid from 1916 to 1953 directly attributable to the new wealth created by these projects—taxes that would not have accrued if the projects had not been constructed—totaled approximately 5 times the total cost of construction of the 15 projects. Without these tax revenues the tax burden on the balance of the Nation's taxpayers would have been materially increased. The net result of reclamation has been to substantially ease the taxpayers' burden, not add to it.

The figures I have just quoted relate to all reclamation projects or to samples of typical reclamation projects. There are numerous examples where the return on the investment in tax receipts has been even more startling. The Strawberry project in Utah is in the same area and on the same sort of land as the proposed Colorado River storage project. It was built some 40 years ago at a total construction cost of $3,348,684, of which 75 percent has now been repaid by the direct beneficiaries. The area which it serves was, prior to construction of the project, almost entirely wasteland. The tax return from that land was nil. At the present time 1 year's total of Federal, State, and local taxes on the wealth created by this reclamation project is more than $6 million, of which $4,400,000 goes directly into the Federal Treasury. Thus, each year the taxpayers of the Nation get back more than the entire original investment.

The projects which are proposed to be authorized in this bill have been subjected to close scrutiny by the executive agencies and by the members of the committee. In each instance it has been determined that the benefit to the taxpayers will exceed the cost, even allowing for interest on the full investment.

We thus see that there is no basis for the charge that the projects proposed by this bill will be a drain upon the Nation's taxpayers. Over 61 percent of the total amount authorized to be expended will be repaid in full with interest. Thereafter,

revenues from power and municipal water users will continue to accrue to the Federal Treasury. As to the amount allocated to irrigation, the principal would be repaid to the Treasury in equal annual installments in 50 years, plus any development period authorized by law. The interest on the irrigation investment would be offset many times over by direct benefits to the taxpayers—new taxes collected alone would offset many times this theoretic charge. We have not even considered revenues to the Treasury or the benefit to the balance of the Nation from business that would be directly and indirectly generated through this development.

Since the people in the area are paying for these projects again and again by irrigation payments, by power payments, by municipal water payments and by increased Federal taxes, it should neither be expected nor required that they should pay for them again. That they do is the fact under present law. Except for the 11 Western States, the other sister States were granted full and equal status with the Original Thirteen States. In our case, this is not so. We are the so-called public land States. The Federal Government still claims a major portion of our surface. Even on the remaining lands, the Federal Government has reserved the minerals since 1920. In the State of Wyoming the Federal Government holds over 50 percent of the surface and almost 74 percent of the minerals. Under the present law, all of the revenues from the sale of public lands and 52½ percent of the proceeds from mineral leasing, including the royalties, accrue to the reclamation fund. The reclamation fund is a revolving fund which by law can be used only for reclamation. At the present time approximately 50 percent of the total annual appropriation for reclamation, including power and municipal water features, comes from the reclamation fund rather than from the general Treasury. By 1965 it is estimated that 73.2 percent of the total appropriations for reclamation will be from the reclamation fund rather than from the general Treasury.

Right today repayments from Wyoming projects and contributions by Wyoming to the reclamation fund exceed the total cost of all reclamation projects constructed for the State of Wyoming. How can anyone argue that this is a burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation? Certainly no one expects to charge us interest on withdrawal of our own deposits from the bank.

Under the present law, and at the present rates of collection, neither principal or interest on the irrigation feature of this bill can ever cost the taxpayer of another State one red cent. This is true because during the actual period of construction, the upper basin States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico will actually contribute more money to the reclamation fund bank than the amount withdrawn for construction of the irrigation features. There can be no "hidden interest" charge on the other States when these four States are depositing more money than the interest-free money which is being withdrawn. To prove the truth of these statements, we shall refer only to contributions by the upper basin States to the reclamation fund from the sale of public land within these States and from proceeds of the Mineral Leasing Act ordinarily referred to as accretions to the fund. Total accretions to the fund for fiscal 1955 were $33,478,656.04. Of this amount, $23.3 million, more than two-thirds, was contributed by the upper basin States. Assuming that the annual accretions remain constant at the 1955 level, under present law, over a 19-year construction period the State of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico would contribute to the reclamation fund out of their irreplaceable natural resources the sum of $442.7 million. Not 1 cent of this money comes from the taxpayers of the Nation. The total cost of all projects authorized by this legislation allocated to irrigation is $287.7 million. The period of construction will be as determined by the Congress in making appropriations available. The most rapid period of construction that has been assumed has been over a 19-year period. We thus see that during this 19-year period of construction, the upper basin States would contribute to the reclamation fund from these sources only the full amount of the construction costs for irrigation, plus an additional $155 million. Even under this accelerated construction schedule, at any given year the amount that the four States had contributed to the reclamation fund from the beginning of construction would exceed the cumulative amounts necessary for the construction program. Never would it be necessary that funds for the construction of the irrigation features be taken from the general Treasury.

In this computation, we have assumed that the accretions to the reclamation fund will remain constant at the 1955 rate. This is an ultra-conservative assumption. The fact is that the contributions to the fund, and particularly from these States, have steadily increased during the past several years. If we were to assume annual contributions from these States at the rate which they contributed during the period from July 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955, the annual rate of contribution would be $26.5 million per year. The amount contributed over the 19-year construction period would be $503.5 million and the amount by which contributions would exceed expenditures for construction chargeable to irrigation would be $215.8 million. It is obvious that there can be no hidden interest chargeable to the taxpayers of the Nation. All features of the construction except irrigation are repaid in full with interest. Under present law, these four upper basin States will contribute during the construction phase far more to the reclamation fund than is required for that portion of the construction chargeable to irrigation. This money is to be repaid without interest but it is a case of the four upper basin States financing their project with their own money. No one could contend that interest should be charged. There is no hidden interest. There is no burden on the taxpayers of the rest of the Nation.

Certainly there must be some sense of equity in the heart of southern California. They cannot be so unreasonable as to expect us in the upper basin States to bank their projects from our natural resources without interest and then be heard to complain that we do not pay interest on our own money.

This project is sound. It is self-liquidating. It will not be a burden on the taxpayers. It is in the best interests of the Nation as a whole. It is essential to the growth and development of the area. With the project, the area can make its full contribution to the Nation through a stabilized economy and full development and delivery of its vital natural resources.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, the site of this upper Colorado River project is often referred to as a "treasure chest." Yes, it is a treasure chest. Nature has endowed this area most generously. It contains vast deposits of mineral ores. Hydro power, coal, and uranium are abundantly available to furnish necessary power.

Water, too, is available, but only in limited quantities. The water supply is sufficient to sustain a tremendous population and industrial expansion. But, this is so only if the water is applied to its highest use, human consumptive use and industrial use.

What we decide here, today, will shape the destiny of this segment of the Nation over the next 100 years.

We can go forward and benefit this area by wisely using nature's bounty. This area is destined to produce metals, chemicals, plastics, manufactured and fabricated products. We can transform these lands into an industrial empire comparable to Pittsburgh, Detroit, or the Ruhr Valley.

Or, we can go backward. The allocating of power revenues to irrigation, artificially increases electricity prices. This precludes industrial expansion and produces uneconomic farm surpluses. Water for irrigation is its most wasteful use. This program would relegate the area to a horse and buggy economy for the next 100 years.

The Senate bill, S. 500, passed last summer, contains the minimum goal of the proponents of this bill. This discussion will be confined, in large measure, to the project as is contained in Senate bill 500.

GENERAL SCHEME

Now, let us examine the overall outline of this operation.

This bill creates a holding company known as the upper Colorado Basin

fund. The basin fund would construct and finance the projects and has four general purposes:

The first and primary objective is to construct 33 irrigation projects to cost $628 million.

The second purpose of this bill is to construct $72 million worth of municipal waterworks.

The third objective of this bill is to rehabilitate 1,100 Navaho Indian families by the construction of a dam and irrigation works at a cost of $212 million.

The last and final objective is to furnish a cash register to partially pay for these three dubious speculations. The financial scheme to bail out these first three objectives is to construct 5 dams, with reservoir and powerplants to generate electricity. This would cost an additional $746 million.

The total cost of these 4 ventures is $1,658,000,000.

COST (INITIAL AND ULTIMATE PLANS)

The present bills represent, merely, the initial phase of this proposal. There are more than 100 separate irrigation projects under study for the ultimate and comprehensive upper Colorado project. This ultimate plan would cost an additional minimum of $1,600,000,000 for a grand total of $3,200,000,000.

Based on a national population of 160 million people, this initial phase would cost an average of $10 per person. The additional projects in the ultimate plan would increase the average cost to $20 per person or $7 million for each congressional district.

REPAYMENT PROVISIONS

How does this bill propose to repay the $1,658,000,000 invested by the taxpayers? Repayments are allocated not on costs but on the Reclamation Bureau's estimates of ability to repay.

Six hundred and eight million dollars of allocated power costs would be repayable from power consumption with 2⅞ percent interest.

Seventy-two million dollars of municipal water works would be repayable by water districts with 2⅞ percent interest.

The remaining $1 billion is repayable without interest, on an if and when basis out of possible power revenues, and upon the Reclamation Bureau's guesses as to repayment ability.

The payout period ranges from 50 years in the Senate bill to 120 years on one project under survey.

ANALYSIS

Now, if we analyze this project, here is what we find.

At 2⅞ percent the interest charges on this $1,658,000,000 investment would be $47 million annually, for the Federal taxpayers.

The net revenues of all the power projects is only $22 million per year. The total repayments for both principal and interest from farmers, municipalities and the Navahos is $7,100,000 per year.

The total repayments of $29,100,000 for principal and interest, leaves us with an annual deficit to the taxpayers of $17,900,000, upon interest alone. The principal obligation of $1,658,000,000 can never be repaid.

TAX SUBSIDY

I have a letter, here, from a privately owned utility comparable in size to the Glen Canyon hydro plant, costing about $400 million. This private utility estimates its taxes to be:

	Per year
Federal taxes	$9,000,000
Local taxes	9,500,000
State taxes	4,500,000

The tax subsidy would amount to $23 million a year on only one-quarter part of this project.

INFLATION LOSS

If and when repayments are made, what do we receive for today's loans to this project? In the past 50 years, from the year 1905 to 1955, the purchasing power of the dollar has dropped from $1 to 32 cents. If this inflationary rate continues, the repayment over a 50-year average, will be worth less than one-third of the $1,658,000,000 invested.

NO INVESTMENT BY BENEFICIARIES

It is interesting to observe that—

First. The 6,700 farmers, who claim these benefits, invest nothing in this project.

Second. The municipalities, who want water facilities, invest nothing.

Third. The power companies who purchase power without investment in plants, invest nothing.

Fourth. The States of Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado invest nothing.

If these beneficiaries have no faith in their self-conceived project, how can they ask the people of the other 44 States to take all the risk without any of the benefits. This is truly a heads, I win and tails, you lose proposal.

WATER SUPPLY

The Federal financing of $72 million for municipal water systems is wholly unrelated to reclamation. It constitutes an unjustifiable preference in Federal financing for one segment of the country when hundreds of thousands of municipalities lack finances for their own expansion of water distribution needs. This would constitute a private, not a public PWA project, without any of the merits of the PWA.

ELECTRIC RATES

The fiscal irresponsibility of this project is illustrated by the proposed Curacanti and Juniper power projects.

The cost of electricity sold by private taxpaying steam plants in the area is 7.3 mills per kilowatt-hour. The same power generated at Curacanti will cost 9.6 mills and the cost at Juniper will be 10 mills per kilowatt-hour. No one has yet tried to explain how you can profitably sell electricity at 7.3 mills when it costs 9.6 mills and 10 mills to produce.

NAVAHO PROJECT

The Navaho project is submitted by the Indian Bureau as a private relief project. The Reclamation Bureau is so dubious about it that it took great pains to disclaim responsibility for it.

Although it takes only $240 to relocate an Indian to an industrial job, this bill would bestow $192,000 upon each of the 1,100 Navaho families.

If this bill is passed, why should not we grant $192,000 to each of 120,000 other Indian families, so that there will be no discrimination?

This is the revival of the WPA as a private instead of a public WPA project, without any of the merits of the WPA.

NO APPROVAL BY ENGINEERS

It is generally conceded that the United States Army engineers are the top authority on engineering and fiscal feasibility for projects of this type.

On July 3, 1951, Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army engineers, severely criticized this project, and said:

> In conclusion, therefore, I am unable to concur in the recommendations in your report at this time with respect to approval of the overall plan and the immediate authorization of the initial phase proposed.

In its latest report in 1954 the United States engineers again criticized and refused to approve this project using the exact same language.

At no time, and I repeat, at no time, has the United States Army engineers, the Budget Bureau, the Reclamation Bureau, the Federal Power Commission, or the Agriculture Department, approved this complete project as contained in Senate 500.

If this House approves this project by passing this initiating bill, it must do so upon its sole responsibility as to economic, financial, and enginering feasibility.

FARM PRODUCTS WILL COMPETE WITH 48 STATES

The proponents sincerely and seriously claim that the farm expansion on 1,016,675 adidtional acres will not compete with other farmers. Nothing could be more fallacious.

I say 1,016,000 acres because those are the figures contained in the Senate Report 500 that is available at this desk. It is not 120,000 acres. It is 1,016,000 acres.

This country is one agricultural market. Our agricultural economy is so flexible that our farmers can shift their production, almost overnight, from cotton, to soybeans, to corn, to hogs, to poultry, to milk, or to 50 other farm products.

The sugar beets to be grown on these additional acres in Utah will compete with the cane sugar of Louisiana and with the sugar beets now grown in Utah and in a dozen other Midwest and Western States.

The excess corn, wheat, barley, and oats grown in Utah will compete with the same products produced in 40 other States.

The cattle, hogs, sheep, and milk produced in Utah, on these lands, will compete with and lower prices for the same products in 40 other States. Mr. Chairman, this bill would have the Federal Government invest $1,658,000,000 in a scheme which, primarily, proposes to irrigate lands owned by 6,700 farmers and 1,100 Navaho Indians. The investment averages more than $200,000 for each of these, 7,800 families.

This investment is subsidized and inevitably the products produced must also be subsidized. In their self-interest, these farmers will seek to repay as little as possible of the allocated costs assessed to them. Due to the Federal investment, they will seek greater and

greater subsidies for their produce from the Federal Government.

We are transforming these 7,800 families from farmers producing salable products into lobbyists whose prime motive is to exert political pressures for increasing governmental subsidies.

This grandiose plan destroys the capital investment of $1,658,000,000, it wastes precious water resources, it depletes the fertile soil bank lands, it depresses all farm market prices, and it further delays the balancing of supply with market demands for farm products. The taxation of farmers, to increase farm surpluses, is adding insult to injury.

This bill is a travesty upon good commonsense.

Mr. Chairman, this bill ought to be recommitted.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the work of the gentleman who has just spoken has been outstanding in our committee. He has been very industrious. The bill before us today, however, is the House bill and not the Senate bill on which he has spent most of his time debating this afternoon. The Senate bill is not before this body. The House bill, a much more modest bill and, in my opinion, an economically feasible bill, is the one on which we are having this debate.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak for people who are not only my constituents but constituents of every Member of this House, for they are wards of the Government and they and their property are and have been under control of the Federal Government for more than a century.

New Mexico and Arizona had hardly been under the rule of the American Government a few years, when the American soldiers in 1863 under Kit Carson rounded up all the Navaho people—men, women, and children—uprooted them from the banks of the San Juan and other streams, and marched them 200 miles away to Fort Sumner. There they were held captive in a concentration camp for 5 years. By 1868 they were dying so fast, that the military marched them back and turned them loose on a very restricted area of the poorest land ever. In the treaty those Indians were forced to sign, they promised never to leave the limited reservation assigned to them.

Except for an abortive effort to rehabilitate these Indians back in 1898, which was abandoned almost before it got started, nothing of any consequence was done for them, and they endured almost a whole century of suffering, neglect, and injustice at the hands of the people who confiscated their lands. In the thirties and forties many millions of dollars finally were expended in an effort to provide hospitals and schools, but that effort was so inadequate that in 1948 there were 14,000 Navaho children who had no schooling whatsoever.

In 1950 another effort was begun, and a bill authorized the expenditure of $88 million in an effort to rehabilitate these Indians. That program expires in 1960. Over $50 million has already been expended on that program. Yet Commissioner Emmons testified before the committee that it would be between a quarter and a half a century or more before this tribe could become self-sufficient, and then only if the problem is attacked from every possible angle. Commissioner Emmons said before the Senate committee:

> From every point of view, I believe it is far better to invest in Navaho economic rehabilitation than in Navaho relief, in permanent stability than in the present ever worsening instability and frustration. The Navaho project offers us the best and largest opportunity of striking out in that direction.

It is unnecessary to enumerate in detail the innumerable injustices committed by us against a great people through almost a century since they were rounded up in 1863. What I have said has been only because we have a right to feel indignant when opponents of this bill refer to the benefits contemplated by this legislation for the Navahos as a huge gift, and an inordinately expensive one at that.

They are wrong on both counts. It is not a gift, but the discharge of an obligation which the Nation owes to the Navaho people. In fact we owe it to ourselves as a nation to do this at the very least, and at any cost, in honor and good conscience.

Nor is it as expensive as their propaganda tries to make it appear. The final plans and reports on which the irrigation project will be considered by Congress at the proper time will show that this will not be any more expensive acre for acre than similar irrigation elsewhere.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] the day before yesterday repeated a statement which has caused a great deal of confusion. When I asked him to yield so that we could advise him, as he had asked, whether it was true or false, he declined to yield.

What has occurred here to create the confusion is that a photostatic copy of 2 or 3 questions and answers taken out of context was sent to every Member of Congress, designed to show that a 100-acre farm for each Navaho Indian family, would cost $192,000.

I do not have it. But you will remember it; it was entitled "PILLION Speechless."

I was speechless at the audacity, and the unfairness of whoever was responsible for that photostatic handout.

Those questions and answers were based on a quick, off the cuff, pencil calculation by a committee member, and in good faith, I am sure. But those who distributed it knew that the conclusions asserted in their handout were as false as all the rest of the unfair, unethical, and unwarranted propaganda to which we have been subjected.

The questions and answers circulated are from page 233 of the hearings. In the same testimony at page 239 the complete cost figures were placed in the record, and clearly showed the error of the quick calculation, at page 233.

Those figures show that the $211,845,000 upon which the pencil calculation of $200,000 per family was made at the hearing included $36 million for the Navaho Dam and Reservoir; it also included 29,000 acres which are to be irrigated by non-Indians; and it included nearly $11 million for the Kutz Canyon pumping plant for non-Indian irrigation. Unwittingly, in the pencil calculation this entire total amount was charged to 110,000 acres of the Indian project, and, of course, the result was a completely erroneous and excessive figure. There are other inaccuracies which I do not have the time to enumerate, but this will suffice to illustrate the falsity and fallacy of this propaganda.

And of course, the Navaho Dam and Reservoir, as distinguished from the Navaho's irrigation project, is to serve many purposes, including the irrigation of non-Indian lands, the San Juan-Chama Transmountain Diversion, and a large amount of industrial and municipal water to be used by non-Indians, and as well to take its part in the overall purpose of providing the total storage structure to control, regulate, and distribute the waters of the entire basin. The entire cost of the dam is to be repaid to the Government from the power revenues.

In that same handout they say that because it was so expensive the Navaho irrigation project had been dropped from the bill, intimating that the Navahos will get nothing from it, when the truth of the matter is, and they know it, that the Navaho irrigation project and the south San Juan project, and the San Juan-Chama diversion project, never have been in this legislation except on a provisional authorization basis. Only the storage dam at a cost of $36 million has been in from the start.

Then they turn around and say, quite to the contrary—they are so zealous they meet themselves coming and going—that the construction of the Navaho Dam and Reservoir commits us firmly to providing the Navaho Indians with an irrigation project. To that I say amen, it does do that. This bill does authorize the Navaho Dam, which among other things will store water for an Indian irrigation project, and when this is done we are firmly committed to provide the irrigation project through which the waters of the dam so impounded may be used.

Legally and morally the Navaho Indians are entitled to a fair share of the waters of the San Juan River, their river, and the only one they have. We all know that if in the overall storage control and distribution of the upper Colorado Basin waters, no provision is made for storage of the Indian waters, so they may hold them and use them when and where it is feasible, we have taken their water away just as effectively as if we included in this bill a provision saying:

> The waters of the Navaho Indians in the San Juan River are hereby appropriated for the mainstream of the Colorado River, and shall be permitted to flow unimpeded down the Colorado River to southern California and Mexico, for the use and benefit of those who may have the influence, the finances,

and the capacity to put them to beneficial use.

I have said before, and I say now, that no Congress with any conscience is going to take these waters away from the Indians, and the only way to prevent their being taken away from the Indians is to provide the necessary storage to hold them.

Navaho families are by Government regulation allowed to pasture only 250 head of sheep per family, which barely gives them a subsistence living, if it does that. It was testified that transfer of some of those families into a farming economy, will permit an increase in the number of sheep to each family, and perhaps a better than a bare subsistence living which is now their lot.

The building of the dam itself and other irrigation works, and their operation, will provide employment for thousands of Navaho people. It was testified that the placing of 1,110 families on approximately 110,000 acres of irrigated land, would create work and provide livelihood not only for those families but for a total of 18,000 Navaho people. Many people believe that the 100-acre allotments can be cut in half, and still provide a good livelihood for twice the number of families at present contemplated.

For example the testimony is that there are now 7,669 acres farmed by 900 Navaho farm families, with about a $300,000 income from produce. That is the record. If they can do that on an average of 8½ acres, they can do so 5 times better on 40 or 50.

Of course the Navahos do not go in and will not go in for farming on a commercial scale. The farms will provide a home and land enough to raise what they need to eat and to feed their own stock, with very little to sell and that probably only for trade among their own people.

The Navaho Reservation with a population of 70,000 Navahos, consists of 24,000 square miles of territory. In total area it approximates the combined States of Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. It is twice the combined area of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Panama Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands. It is rich in natural undeveloped resources. There are small areas of timber. There are large deposits of minerals such as coal and uranium. In fact it was a Navaho Indian who discovered the largest deposit of uranium yet known. The helium in the reservation has been preempted by the Government which holds a monopoly on it. These and other resources can be developed, and industry created when and if water is impounded and stored for their use within the limits of their share, and the share of New Mexico waters under the compact, to which the Navaho waters have been charged.

Notwithstanding all these lands and these resources the Navaho Indians therein will continue to live under standards which are a discredit to this Government of ours, and notwithstanding the expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars in the years to come, unless the water necessary to develop their resources is impounded and put to beneficial use, and unless we continue a rehabilitation program that will make them self-sufficient and self-sustaining. Use of their waters to which they are justly entitled will be one big long step forward. I repeat that no Congress is going to take these waters away from the Indians and that unless these waters are impounded they will as effectively lose them as if they were taken away from them. I have confidence therefore that the Congress will meet these obligations irrespective of the cost involved.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I come from a portion of California that does not necessarily associate me with either southern California or northern California, since it happens that my home and my district are in almost the geographical center of that great State.

During some of the discussions that have gone on here, there has been some question in my mind as to whether or not the State of California or certain other Western States were on trial here with reference to some of the things they may have done in the past or some of their past performances with reference to the water of the Colorado River.

As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that considered this bill over a period of many, many weeks, I felt that we had two basic principles on which to make our determination as to whether or not we would support or oppose the legislation we have before us today. Those two basic principles, as I understood them, were with reference to the economic feasibility of this project, and whether or not the people of the upper basin States—Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico—had any rights to the water of the Colorado River.

The thing that I considered with reference to this particular principle was the statement we find throughout the legislation we have before us here today, and that is, those rights which are found in section 9 of the bill, wherein the statement is made:

> Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision—

Then we have a long list of contracts and of agreements between the State of California and the upper basin States.

I am here as a Representative from California to say that I do not desire to give away one drop of California's water, but I do believe that the upper basin States have certain rights under these compacts and that California is fully protected by the provisions of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] made the statement that he did. Much has been said here in the past 2 days with regard to the water rights problem on the Colorado River. I suspect that there are not going to be any votes changed one way or the other on that particular point. But, for the benefit of my friends from southern California who have raised the question as to southern California's water rights, with particular reference to one engineering report, the Hill report, I would like to refer them to an item I put in the RECORD of yesterday, dealing with the problem. To emphasize again what my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has said, that is, that section 14 of this bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall manage these water projects in accord with the basic pact on the river, the law of the river. If he does not do so, any State can go to the Supreme Court, and the consent of the Congress to join the Federal Government in that suit is already given. Any State that does not like the administration of these projects and says that the law of the river is not being complied with can simply step into the Supreme Court and get that matter adjudicated.

Some reference has been made here in this debate to the engineering on this project. For my own part, I am perfectly willing to leave that to the engineers. I do not believe that the men who built Hoover and who built Parker Dam and who built Davis Dam and who built Grand Coulee and who built Shasta Dam and who built many, many others of the great water and power projects in this country are going to build a dam that will float down the Colorado River.

Some reference too has been made to the question of public power. I want to say to you that this bill contains the standard provisions for transmission lines. It contains authorization for a basic transmission loop, and it contains standard provisions for preferences to municipalities, irrigation districts, and other public agencies.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. It contains, does it not, an authorization of approximately $145,332,000 to take care of what the gentleman just mentioned?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. Now we have to say because of the vast area involved, it is a difficult matter to get to these load centers, and for that reason the power has to be handled on just a little bit different basis. But as one who has consistently supported public power here in this Congress, I say that this bill does everything that we can do with regard to the maintenance of the public power system.

My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], a very able member of our committee, spent his time here discussing the Senate bill. I know some of you may say, "Oh, well, we pass half a loaf here, and get a whole loaf sent back to us from the Senate side." I want to say to you, as I said to the Committee on Rules, with respect to Echo Park: As far as I am concerned, we will either leave Echo Park out or we will kill this legislation.

If my colleagues on the conference will stay with me, we will not budge 1 inch on this legislation. We think this is a

good bill. We think it is completely adequate and we think it is a start for at least two decades for this great area, and it gets them on their way. If I have my way, as one of the conferees, I want to give the assurance that we intend to stand on the House bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am sorry I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, this project will not contribute to the surpluses of corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, wheat and tobacco, because only two of those, wheat and corn, are grown in any volume.

History shows that putting land under irrigation moves that land out of the production of wheat and corn.

Finally, the amount of new land added under irrigation, which is one twenty-eighth of 1 percent of the national cropland, is not a significant factor, and never can be, in relation to the farm surpluses of this country.

I repeat, the total new land brought under irrigation is only one twenty-eighth of 1 percent of the national cropland.

On the economics, the evidence is clear, and supported by the experts in the Interior Department and the Bureau of the Budget, that this project pays back 99 percent of the capital investment, with interest on the investment and power and municipal water.

The actual tax contribution from general taxes will be less than $14 million a year and all of that will bear interest, because the contribution from the reclamation fund more than covers the amount used for irrigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

All time having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Fla., Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, and Smith Fork, San Juan Chama, Navaho: *Provided*, That (a) no appropriation for or construction of the San Juan Chama project of the Navaho participating project shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States, including (but without limiting the generality of the foregoing) the State of Texas, pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and said projects shall have been approved and authorized by the Congress: *Provided further*, That with reference to the San Juan Chama project, it shall be limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River to be used solely for the control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River, that no power facilities shall be established, installed, or operated along the diversion or on the reservoir or dam, and such dam and reservoir shall at all times be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

Committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all of line 5 down to and including the word "and" in line 9.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, just a brief explanation of the committee amendment. It strikes out language in the bill which some Members, especially our colleague the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] thought was too broad in the preamble reciting the authority under which this project is to be authorized. Therefore the language was stricken out and the language substituted which narrowed the base of the recitation of the constitutional provisions under which projects of this character are authorized.

I say that merely by way of explanation. It is a technical amendment as are those which are offered down to the one that strikes out Echo Park—and that is one about which we have spoken in the debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the ranking minority member of the committee which has charge of this bill, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], read a statement, a press release, which advised us that the President wanted this bill passed. That raises in my mind a question of just how far the President went, just what he does want; and that doubt grows out of the fact that on another occasion it was charged that an administrative action by the Department of the Interior was influenced by the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, because of that false charge I rise to a question of the privilege of the House and have offered a resolution which was sent to the Clerk's desk.

This question raised by the resolution affects the dignity and the integrity of the proceedings of the House.

In September of 1955, a subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, joined in the investigation and subsequent hearings to "develop further facts and current information relative to problems of access to Government timber, including access roads; inadequate and outdated inventory data on Federal timber resources; increases in the allowable cut; revised timber sales practices to provide sales of a size and length that meet the needs of small and large operators alike; increased salvage sales of diseased and burned timber; and a reexamination of the effect of marketing area and other restrictions on Government timber sales."

Subsequent thereto, joint hearings were held by said subcommittees in Washington and other parts of the country. On November 25, 1955, at Portland, Oreg., a statement by Senator W. KERR SCOTT, chairman, Joint Committee on Federal Timber, was issued, concurred in by Congressman EARL CHUDOFF, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, and made a part of the record.

That statement in part reads as follows:

The subcommittee will come to order.

We will now go into a matter that is not specifically a "timber sales policy problem."

Rather, it involves the question, or questions, of how certain agencies are following the intent of the Congress, the letter and spirit of the laws of the land and the democratic processes that are demanded by the Constitution of the United States in respect to our forests and mineral resources.

The transcript of the hearing held by this Joint Committee in Roseburg, Oreg., on November 17, 1955, discloses that certain segments of the Department of Interior are in a hassle with an aged, disabled veteran over his rights under the mining laws of the United States Government.

There appears to be a concerted effort to hustle him off his three mining claims based on the allegation that the claims are not mineral in character.

In sharp contrast to this case, I am mindful of a considerable amount of talk in the past 18 months concerning what is known as the Al Sarena mining claims located in Jackson County, Oreg.

There are many Government records involving the Al Serena mining claims and their background and their value, or lack of value, as mineral lands that have been cloaked in obscurity and covered with the dust of more than 15 years.

The Congress needs to know, and the people of America are entitled to know, what the facts are in connection with this

case which was finally decided at the highest level of the Department of Interior.

This Senate subcommittee, and this House Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, and the Congress, would be derelict in its duty if it did not seek to determine the truth or falsity of the charges that have been made that, as a result of the high level interference in the Department of Interior, weasel-word legal opinions and questionable mineral sampling and assaying practices have been substituted for the dedicated judgment and experience of men trained in the art of determining which lands are, or are not, eligible for patent under the mineral laws of the land.

It is either true, or untrue, that the lands of the 15 Al Sarena disputed claims are mineral in character of just a site for a timber mining operation. It is the purpose of this inquiry to seek the answer to this question, and the one of just why and how the unprecedented step was taken of bypassing the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to accomplish what was accomplished.

Because of the serious nature of this inquiry, going, as it does, into the very fountain spring of the question of government by laws or government by influence and special privilege, all witnesses will be sworn before testifying.

It will be noted that the foregoing statements raise the question as to whether the patents therein referred to and granted on February 11, 1954, were granted because claimants were entitled to the patents, or whether the granting of the patents by the Secretary of the Interior came about because, among other things, they were the "result of high level interference in the Department of the Interior."

Frequently, throughout the hearings, it was charged that the granting of the patents was due not only to fraud, but because of influence and pressure put upon the Secretary of the Interior and his subordinates by Government officials and officeholders at a "high" administrative level.

In January 1956, hearing were held in Washington, D. C., and, on January 10, 1956, the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an article in which it was stated that "a full-dress investigation of one of the biggest timber giveaways in recent years, namely, the sale of Rogue River National Forest timber to political friends of Congressman"—of the minority party and naming him—"would be held."

This story also referred by name to another Congressman, of the majority party.

Both Congressmen by innuendo were charged with exerting influence and putting pressure upon the Department of the Interior, and further charged that because of this pressure, the patents referred to were granted.

The January 16, 1956, edition of the same publication further charged that the Department of the Interior had gone to unusual lengths to coach and shield witnesses who had been called to testify before the committee.

The January 27, 1956, issue of this publication, among other things, charged that the Secretary of the Interior had sold timber worth more than $200,000 for around $2,270.

This article further charged that the Secretary of the Interior—naming him—had been influenced to expedite the granting of the patents because of a note direct from the President of the United States. The article stated:

Buried in the Senate Interior Committee files is an interesting letter, which was picked up when the Senate subpenaed the records of Secretary McKay.

It's a letter from a friend of President Eisenhower's addressed to him, asking that the Al Sarena section of the Rogue River National Forest be released to the McDonald family.

Across the letter in his own handwriting President Eisenhower had scribbled "Dear Doug." Then followed a personal request from Ike to Doug to see what he should do about granting the Rogue River request.

On February 3, 1956, the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an article which, among other things, stated that a member of the committee, naming him, "went to Arthur Pearlman, counsel of that committee"—meaning the subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations—"and demanded":

"I want you to subpena Drew Pearson."

"What for?" asked Pearlman.

"Make him come up here and answer before the House of Representatives as to where he got that information regarding Al Sarena. Make him produce that 'Dear Doug' letter which he says Eisenhower wrote to Secretary McKay. I want a subpena issued for Pearson at once."

"Then," replied Pearlman, "we would also have to subpena Secretary McKay."

"Oh, no, no, no," replied Congressman HOFFMAN, promptly dropping the matter.

NOTE.—HOFFMAN had first demanded that the Senate Interior Committee subpena this writer.

On February 12, 1956, the same paper carried a story in which the writer commented as follows:

The charge was made in connection with a column on the Rogue River National Forest in Oregon in which I reported that when a letter arrived at the White House regarding the Al Serena mining claim in Rogue River Forest, Ike had scribbled a note across the top of the letter to "Dear Doug"—meaning Secretary of the Interior Doug McKay—and suggested that he see what he could do about the matter.

The origin of this story was as follows:

Having heard reports that such a letter was found in the files of the Interior Department during the Senate probe of the Rogue River National Forest sale, I sent my assistant to see Robert Redwine, counsel of a Senate Interior subcommittee.

Redwine said he had such a letter but that he did not intend to let me see it. He indicated, among other things, that he planned to make use of it later in the year, when it would be more effective in the presidential campaign.

I then went to a Senator who is a member of the Interior Committee and suggested that any probe of the Al Serena-Rogue River National Forest giveaway should present all the facts in an orderly manner and should not withhold any for political purposes later. He agreed and contacted Redwine.

Redwine said that he did have a letter which had been forwarded to McKay by the White House with a note addressed to "Dear Doug" scribbled across it in Ike's own handwriting, but he demurred about letting me see it and regarding the use of it.

I then went to the administrator of the Senate Interior Committee. Perhaps I was overdoing the eager beaver cub-reporter act, but having been doing that act for a good many years in Washington, it's hard to get out of the habit; and having had the first scoop on the Rogue River Forest sale over a year ago, I was juvenile enough to want to continue my batting average.

Anyway Redwine was called in and asked about the letter.

"I know why you want that letter," he bristled. "You want to show it to that guy Drew Pearson. I'm not going to let him have it."

After some further pro-ing and con-ing, continuing over several days, I finally published the report that such a "Dear Doug" letter was in the files of the Senate Interior Committee. I did not quote the text of what Ike allegedly said to "Dear Doug" since I had not seen and therefore did not know the exact text.

Following publication, the Capitol began to vibrate as if the British Navy once again was rolling barrels of tar into the Senate Chamber to set fire to the place.

Every Republican on the full Interior Committee immediately turned up at a subcommittee hearing, plus crochety Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN of Michigan, a member of the joint subcommittee, who demanded that I be subpenaed. CLARE has subpenaed me before so I was not exactly surprised by his new gyrations. Other Senators, led by GOLDWATER of Arizona, called in Redwine and wanted to know about the letter. Redwine at first stated there was such a letter.

When asked to produce it, he came back with a letter from the Interior Department acknowledging one from the White House. Obviously, it was not the "Dear Doug" letter. In brief, he did not produce. I was out on a limb and still am.

Later, he told other Senate committee staff members that he had seen such a letter and that he would swear under oath that he had seen it, but that he had searched high and low and could not find it now. He also stated that he had found his files rifled.

A check at the Sergeant at Arms office revealed the fact that Redwine had complained two weeks earlier about his files being tampered with and had asked for specially locked filing cabinets.

It was at this point that Jim Hagerty issued his White House blast.

Since I cannot produce the letter, I am now prepared to accept Hagerty's statement as being correct.

At a meeting of the committee held on January 26, 1956, the following occurred:

[Transcript of hearings, Washington, D. C., Thursday, January 26, 1956, pp 1178–1182]

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Secretary—

Under Secretary Clarence Davis was the witness—

In this morning's paper, the Washington Post and Times Herald, under the byline of Drew Pearson, appeared this statement, and I will read it to you:

"Buried in the Senate Interior Committee files is an interesting letter, which was picked up when the Senate subpenaed the records of Secretary McKay.

"It's a letter from a friend of President Eisenhower's addressed to him, asking that the Al Sarena section of the Rogue River National Forest be released to the McDonald family.

"Across the letter in his own handwriting, President Eisenhower had scribbled 'Dear Doug.' Then followed a personal request from Ike to Doug to see what he could do about granting the Rogue River request."

That is the end of the quote, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. DAVIS. I have none, Senator.

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, inasmuch as this reporter says, and I quote, "buried in the Senate Interior Committee files is an interesting letter," does the counsel have this letter?

Mr. COBURN. I do not have it.

Senator GOLDWATER. Does Mr. Redwine have this letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I do not.

Senator GOLDWATER. Do any of the counsel have this letter?

Mr. LENIGAN. Never have seen it.

Senator GOLDWATER. Have you ever seen this letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I haven't any comments on that, Senator.

Senator GOLDWATER. I think it is very important. The honesty of the President of the United States has been impugned by this person in writing his column this morning and I think it is necessary that we get this cleared up when he speaks with evidently some authority saying "buried in the Senate Interior Committee files." Have you seen this letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I have not seen the letter that is referred to there; no, sir.

The letter referred to was alleged to be a letter written before the granting of the patents.

Senator GOLDWATER. Had you ever seen a letter that the President of the United States penned a note to the Secretary of the Interior on in this particular case?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. Can you get that letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I think so.

Senator GOLDWATER. Where is it?

Mr. REDWINE. It is downstairs.

Senator GOLDWATER. In the files?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is necessary that we have that letter in these hearings.

Mr. Redwine of the staff then left the committee hearing room to get the letter.

Senator GOLDWATER. I do not want to delay the proceedings and when Mr. Redwine comes back with this letter, may I have permission to proceed a minute or two after seeing it? Why do you not go ahead with whatever questioning counsel might have?

Mr. Redwine being absent for the letter, the hearings then continued on another matter.

Page 1194:

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Redwine is back. I wonder if we might see the letter that he brought with him.

Mr. REDWINE. Mr. Chairman, Senator GOLDWATER asked me awhile ago about a letter with respect to what was in the column this morning. I said that I had not seen that letter. That is correct, I believe, Senator.

You asked me then if I had seen any letter regarding the President of the United States in respect to the Al Sarena case. I said that I had.

Note how Mr. Redwine evaded making a clear, direct answer. He had previously been asked, and I quote:

Senator GOLDWATER. Had you ever seen a letter that the President of the United States penned a note to the Secretary of the Interior on in this particular case?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

And Mr. Redwine then left the committee hearing room to get the letter which he said was downstairs in the files.

Senator GOLDWATER then continued:

Senator GOLDWATER. I think I included in my question, although I might not have, a letter that contained a personal note to Mr. McKay. Might we see that letter?

Mr. REDWINE. This letter, Senator, that I have here is addressed—I will hand it to you in just a minute—to a Mr. Powell. It is signed by Secretary McKay. The first paragraph reads:

"Your letter to President Eisenhower relating to the Rogue River National Forest mining claim allowance, has been referred to me for reply."

Mr. McKay then replied to it.

This letter of reply by Mr. McKay to Mr. Powell is dated January 5, 1955, after this [the Al Sarena] decision was over [made on February 11, 1954].

Senator GOLDWATER. Who is Mr. Powell?

Mr. REDWINE. I don't know, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. Is there scribbled on that in the President's handwriting anything that says "Dear Doug"?

Mr. REDWINE. No, sir.

Representative JONAS. Do you know whether there is in the committee files any such letter as that?

Mr. REDWINE. Not so far as I know.

Representative JONAS. Can you tell us whether you or any staff member took out of the Department of the Interior file any such letter as was referred to by Mr. Pearson in his column?

Mr. REDWINE. Not so far as I know, sir.

Representative JONAS. The inference is certainly clearly to be drawn from the column in the paper that there exists at present in the files of this committee such a letter which committee staff members obtained when they went through the file in the Department of the Interior, but you have no knowledge of any such letter or any such communication?

Mr. REDWINE. No, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. JONAS, I might comment that this letter from the contents of it seems to be in opposition to the granting of these patents. The answer to Mr. Powell would lead me to believe that Mr. Powell wrote criticizing the President.

Mr. REDWINE. I didn't evaluate the letter at all, Senator.

Senator KUCHEL. It is irrelevant to your question.

Senator GOLDWATER. It is irrelevant to my question. It is astounding to me that a member of the press of this country would constantly refer to those lies and, if there are leaks in the committee staff, I think Mr. Chairman, we should investigate it.

How would Drew Pearson know of the existence of any letter unless somebody in this committee staff were telling him these things and how can he justify his statement that was contained in his column this morning that goes to some 600 newspapers in this country, if I am not incorrectly informed, that the President of the United States had personally interceded in this case?

I made a speech on the floor the other day on this subject in which I agreed with Senator NEUBERGER on the need for freedom of the press. This man is destroying the freedom of the press.

That is all I have to comment.

Representative HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this morning's statement by Mr. Pearson seems to be to the effect that the President gave support, by a notation on a letter, to the charge that the Secretary of the Interior had participated in a steal of timber, it seems to me that Mr. Pearson should be brought before the committee and we should understand or be given an opportunity to learn where he gets his information.

Page 1198:

In this situation to which the Senator has called this morning—there it is right before us and there are those charges—should we not try to learn whether or not the President did as charged by Mr. Pearson; endorse this steal? I ask that Mr. Pearson be called, put under oath, and that the Senator or the members of the committee have an opportunity to examine him as to where he got his information.

Pages 1200–1203:

Senator GOLDWATER. I can agree with much the Senator from Oregon says, but in a column that is read by millions of American people is a statement that says that the President of the United States intervened, I feel sure that had such a letter existed it would have long ago been put in these records. I think that I am perfectly within my rights in asking whether or not such a letter existed and if my comments on what I feel to be the responsibility of all reporters and the press to report accurately do not coincide with the thoughts of the Senator from Oregon, I am sorry.

I happen to be a layman, I am not a newspaperman; but I am like Will Rogers, all I know is what I read in the newspapers, and I want to feel when I read it in the papers that it is correct. I am glad we had this opportunity to clear it up because we will further clear it up on the floor of the Senate.

Representative HOFFMAN. I make a motion that Mr. Pearson be called, Mr. Chairman, and I ask that the chairman rule that he be called by the committee as a witness. I want to know who sanctioned and approved his course in charging the President of the United States of participating or giving support to a steal, alleged to be a steal, by the Secretary of the Interior.

Senator NEUBERGER. I am just going to say that I am not going to put the motion.

Representative HOFFMAN. You are not the chairman.

Senator NEUBERGER. Senator SOTT appointed me as acting chairman when he left and on his return asked if I would continue to preside.

Representative HOFFMAN. Has the salary been turned over, together with the gavel? That may be irrelevant.

Senator SCOTT. He gets the same.

Representative HOFFMAN. You won't put the motion?

Senator NEUBERGER. Will you let me finish?

Representative HOFFMAN. Yes.

Senator NEUBERGER. You haven't.

Representative HOFFMAN. I don't care if you want to cover up for him.

Senator NEUBERGER. I am not covering up for him. I just want to say that Congressman CHUDOFF isn't here. Furthermore, I want to say this for the record: I truly believe in freedom of the press in our society. I believe if any newspaper, or journalist, or radio commentator makes a misstatement that it is within the province of those about whom the mistatement was made to correct it in a public forum.

When I ran for the Senate, over 80 percent of the newspapers in my State opposed me very vigorously, extremely vigorously at times, I might add. That was their right. Naturally, I think they were mistaken, but that was their right, and I have never suggested or hinted that because of the things they said about me, many of which were unkind, and a good many of which were grossly untrue, they ought to be hailed before any committee. I think so far as I am concerned, we have already had too much hailing of members of the press before committees, and you don't happen to like a certain newspaperman, so you want to hail him up.

It may be that those of us on the other side don't like another newspaperman of different political persuasion and we might be tempted, unwisely, I think, into calling him up and subpenaeing him. As a former journalist and as a person who is devoted to freedom of the press, I think that any suggestion that we turn this investigation and study of natural resources into an inquisition of newspapermen or journalists or commentators is out of order.

Representative HOFFMAN. All right, Mr. Chairman. I am not complaining about the printing of anything especially, but this committee is supposed to be investigating

this particular case where the charge is that this land—and this article this morning charged it—was given away here, although I notice he came down from $600,000 in value of the timber to $200,000, which is quite a shrinkage within a week, but where the charge is, and the charge has been in the previous articles all the way through, that the Secetary of the Interior participated in a timber steal—that is the way it has been characterized time and time again—if the committee is interested, and it has called many witnesses in trying to determine whether or not it was a timber steal, why logically shouldn't we call a man who professes to have evidence that it was and that they had gone to the highest level of authority to put it over?

If you want the facts, Pearson has the facts, allegedly, so why not call him?

Pages 1204–1208:

Senator GOLDWATER. * * * I don't like to see a man in this position say that in the files of this committee there is a letter from the President of the United States and I don't think the Senator from Oregon feels very happy about it, either.

Senator NEUBERGER. I think we ought to go on ahead and I don't think we ought to go off in any pursuit of the press.

Representative HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, just once more, if I may. I am not criticizing the press. I have nothing against freedom of the press or freedom of speech. I use it, so certainly I couldn't be against it. But in this article the charge is that the President himself, by the note on a letter, influenced the action of the Secretary of the Interior.

Are you not interested? The whole hearing, if I understand correctly, on this Al Sarena, ever since the 25th day of November, has been to attempt to learn why the Secretary granted these patents. We have had some testimony of both sides on that now. I notice counsel shakes his head. We have. Here is a man who professes to know that the President himself asked McKay to do it. Do you want to know whether the higher level did or didn't, or do you want to forget it?

Senator GOLDWATER. Let me pursue one other thought on this. I mentioned this earlier. Ever since I have come to Congress I have been very concerned with the leaks that go on in this building. I don't believe that any reporter would just sit down at a typewriter and dream something like this up. Possibly, Mr. HOFFMAN, we ought to suggest that we investigate our own staff to see who is leaking these things, to see who called Mr. Pearson and said, "Look, we have a letter down here that the President of the United States scribbled a note on."

Maybe we are talking, as the Senator from Oregon suggests, about the wrong side of this thing. Maybe we ought to look into our own staff and find out who is giving this information out that was completely erroneous.

Representative HOFFMAN. That was not my point. I don't care what the staff does. My point was that the chairman of the committee, Senator SCOTT, the distinguished chairman here from North Carolina, in a statement put out, said that the higher level overruled these gentlemen in the Department. We got into the highest level. We have gotten up to the top. We have gotten up to the President of the United States, and here is a newspaperman, who undoubtedly has some knowledge of what he is talking about, who says that the President in his own handwriting wrote across this letter telling the Secretary of the Interior to do that. Aren't we as a matter of fact, as a matter of proof, interested in that?

Senator GOLDWATER. We should at the same time be interested in who is putting this information out. This isn't the first instance.

Representative HOFFMAN. That is all right, but here is an issue that is squarely before this committee: Who caused tnis patent to be granted? Here is a man who says in this release published all over the country that he knows that a certain gentleman in the White House advised the Secretary to do it. Do you want to know who determined this thing for the Secretary, or don't you? There is a witness. There is a witness if you want him. Of course, you have the authority. You have the gavel over there.

Senator NEUBERGER. We have the testimony this morning that the Secretary absolutely knew nothing about it and had nothing to do with it; is that not correct?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Pardon me, but you have Mr. Pearson, who says that he knows that the other fellow—

Senator NEUBERGER. You people are so accustomed to having every single thing that appears in the press pleasing to you that what you want to do is call up anybody who prints something that you don't like. Will you let me finish?

Representative HOFFMAN. I am awfully sorry.

Senator NEUBERGER. You put a vast mass of material in the record from newspapers defending what was done. Should we ask the authors of those articles up?

Representative HOFFMAN. If you want to; I don't care.

Senator NEUBERGER. I don't believe we should enter into an inquisition or study of the press, period, whether they write something that you like or whether they write something that somebody else likes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like the grace of a minute or two. This statement was prepared before I ever saw the Pearson column. It is the truth. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that when in a column of that kind there can appear scurrilous attacks upon the President of the United States, and especially a man of the high character of President Ensenhower, and it can go unchallenged that he interferred by some method or other with this thing we are talking about, we have arrived at a serious point in these United States.

Now, I said here that Secretary McKay didn't even know about this thing except very extremely casually. I know nothing about any letter from the President of the United States. So far as I know, no such letter ever was written and I have no recollection of it, no communications with the President, not anything of the kind.

This is my decision. I will stand on it as having been my best judgment at the time. It was not interferred with by anyone except as I have told you by the letters here of Congressmen of both political parties pleading about it and that sort of thing, no other inference of any kind that I know of. I want to say that I do resent, sir, and I resent keenly, the implication that I was subjected to any pressure from the President of the United States or anyone else in connection with the opinion which was rendered in this case.

I can hardly conceive that a committee would not make an effort to inquire about a statement that their own staff had leaked a letter impugning the integrity of the President of the United States and then by-pass it on the ground of freedom of the press.

Thank you, sir.

Pages 1209–1219:

Senator KUCHEL. Mr. Chairman, may I break in for just a moment. Let's see if we can take this down a little bit. Mr. Redwine, do you have charge of the files which were subpenaed from the Department of the Interior concerning this Al Sarena matter?

Mr. REDWINE. Senator, my answer on that will have to be "yes and no." At certain times I have had; other times I have not.

Senator KUCHEL. Where are they located now?

Mr. REDWINE. Some of them in 224 and some in 2–A.

Senator KUCHEL. Have you gone over personally the files which were subpenaed from the Department?

Mr. REDWINE. Senator, there was actually no files subpenaed from the Department. I did not go over them when they first came to the committee. I will have to ask Mr. Coburn if I am right on this.

Mr. COBURN. That is right.

Senator KUCHEL. Let me ask Mr. Redwine now and then I will ask you, Mr. Coburn. Mr. Redwine, is it your answer that you have not gone over the files on the Al Sarena case which you obtained from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir; I have gone over them.

Senator KUCHEL. You have gone over all of them?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator KUCHEL. Have you found—I guess this will be the second time you have been asked this question—any letter which indicates any message of any kind or character from the President with respect to this matter?

Mr. REDWINE. No, sir. I have answered that before.

Senator KUCHEL. Mr. Coburn, let me ask you, have you gone over the records of this case as they have come to you from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. COBURN. In a rather cursory way. If you let me make a statement, I will explain it.

Senator KUCHEL. All right.

Mr. COBURN. At the request of the Chairman of the Committee made in writing to the Secretary of the Interior, these files were sent up to the committee via special messenger, I believe—I believe a lawyer from the Solicitor's department—and made available to the staff of the committee. At that time, Mr. Chambers, Ed Chambers, was on the staff and he and I looked them over cursorily and subsequently I turned them over to him. This is in the main committee office.

Senator KUCHEL. Is Mr. Chambers still a member of our staff?

Mr. COBURN. I don't know. Yes; he is.

Senator KUCHEL. Were the files delivered by a messenger from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. COBURN. That is correct, and he remained in the room all the time. He stayed with the files.

Senator KUCHEL. Then when he left did we retain the files?

Mr. COBURN. We retained certain photostatic copies, things that we wanted.

Senator KUCHEL. Did you see at any time any letter which indicated any kind of interest by the President with respect to this matter?

Mr. COBURN. The only one that I recall was the one that Mr. Redwine introduced.

Senator KUCHEL. You referred, Mr. Coburn, to this photostatic copy of the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to a man named Powell?

Mr. COBURN. I haven't seen it for a long time. I assume that is it.

Senator KUCHEL. This is the only one?

Mr. COBURN. Yes.

Senator KUCHEL. I want this letter to be placed in the record rather than try to interpret it. I think it might well be read, since it is the statement of our two counsels here that this constitutes the only time that the President's name is mentioned. This is from the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 5, 1955, and it reads as follows:

"MY DEAR MR. POWELL: Your letter to President Eisenhower relating to the Rogue River

National Forest mining claim allowance has been referred to me for reply.

"I share your concern for the preservation of the scenic grandeurs of the national parks and forests.

"The enclosed photostat from a newspaper which investigated this case, and which supported Adlai Stevenson, should clarify this matter for you.

"The decision granting this allowance to the Al Serena Mining Co. was entirely within the laws, which have been unchanged since 1876. The Secretary of the Interior is permitted no discretionary action under these laws.

"The 1876 statute provides that when minerals are discovered in paying quantities on mining claims the miner is entitled to a patent on the land, including the surface rights; and that once such minerals have been discovered the Secretary has no discretion in the matter.

"Before the Al Serena case was decided upon the legal staff of the Department made a painstaking and honest appraisal of all the facts. The decision was fully publicized several months ago through the press associations and in the major newspaper in the Pacific Northwest.

"In this Department's administration of the laws we are determined to comply with the law.

"This Department must adhere to the laws as they are written. If the laws need modernization, and in this case there appears to be that necessity, the legislative branch has the responsibility to revise them.

"I am glad to have had this opportunity to discuss this matter with you, and trust that I have reassured you that I am fully aware of my responsibility to all the citizens of this Nation.

"Sincerely yours,

"DOUGLAS MCKAY,
"Secretary of the Interior."

I ask that that be made a part of the record.

Senator KUCHEL. I think it is fair to say for the two attorneys of law who are members of this staff and who have had the primary custody of the data which has come from the Department of the Interior, that the statement in this morning's newspaper is incorrect.

Senator GOLDWATER. I would like to pursue this one a little bit further. I have before me a copy of an excerpt of Mr. Pearson's broadcast of January 21, 1956, in the course of which he spiels out the name of the Oregon Democrat who wrote the letter. There must be a little bit more to this than we know. I can't imagine that any man on the air would care to quote—"the amazing thing is that this letter was written by an Oregon Democrat, Lou Wallace."

This is an interesting excerpt. I think it should be made a part of the record. I will be glad to read it. I quote:

"Capitol Hill, exclusive. The Senate Interior Committee has been nursing one of the hottest letters in Washington. They're trying to figure out what to do with it. It pertains to the famous sale of part of the Rogue River National Forest to the McDonald family, of Mobile, Ala., and why Secretary McKay went out of his way to make this amazing sale when other Secretaries of the Interior had consistently refused. The letter is from an Oregon insurance man to Eisenhower, asking that the Rogue River National Forest be sold to the McDonalds.

"Across the top of this letter Eisenhower wrote in his own handwriting: 'Dear Doug, please see what you can do about this.' Dear Doug, of course, referred to his Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay. The Senators now figure they have the answer as to why McKay acted. The amazing thing is that this letter was written by an Oregon Democrat, Lou Wallace."

I think we ought to see if there is such a letter some place. It would have a terrific bearing on this case.

Senator NEUBERGER. You mean a letter from a Democrat?

Senator GOLDWATER. No; no; the letter from the President saying "Dear Doug" or letters to that effect.

Mr. PERLMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement on behalf of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee?

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be the staff director, I want to state that as far as the letter in question is concerned, I have never seen any such letter. I want to further state that all the files, all the letters, all the correspondence, in connection with the Al Sarena case have been in the possession of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and none of the correspondence or none of the files has ever been in the possession of the chairman or the rest of the staff of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee.

Senator GOLDWATER. I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Lou Wallace be asked if he did write such a letter. As I say, this could have a tremendous bearing on this case.

Representative HOFFMAN. I had a couple of questions I wanted to ask Mr. Redwine, Mr. Chairman, if I may. They are very brief.

Senator NEUBERGER. We are going to adjourn at 4:30 today.

Representative HOFFMAN. Mr. Redwine, who other than yourself and Mr. Coburn, and you said Mr. O'Brien——

Mr. REDWINE. Mr. Chambers.

Representative HOFFMAN. Who other than the three had access to these files?

Mr. REDWINE. So far as when they are in my office, only the two secretaries.

Representative HOFFMAN. Who are the secretaries?

Mr. REDWINE. Miss Hoban and Miss O'Connor.

Representative HOFFMAN. And no one else?

Mr. REDWINE. That is right.

Representative HOFFMAN. Do you know whether they have any business relations with Mr. Pearson?

Mr. REDWINE. Not so far as I know. I have never seen any indication of it.

Representative HOFFMAN. What do you say, Mr. Coburn?

Mr. COBURN. Do you want me to answer your specific question?

Representative HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. COBURN. My office is wide open. It isn't even locked. It is just part of a room, except for a locked file drawer where I kept the Al Sarena files when I had them. I had a key to it. Mr. Mapes had a key to it. Mr. Mapes is a staff member. I don't think Mr. Chambers had a key to it, and I believe my secretary had a key to it.

Representative HOFFMAN. Do you know whether any of these people, to ask the same question I put to Mr. Redwine, that you have known, or have you inquired to ascertain whether they gave any such information to Mr. Pearson?

Mr. COBURN. I have no reason to believe that they would give any information.

Representative HOFFMAN. I assume they won't, but he gets so much that is exclusive.

Mr. COBURN. May I make a statement on that point? We were never under any inhibition from the Department to keep these files secret. As a matter of fact, newspapermen have gone down to the Department and looked through the whole file.

Representative HOFFMAN. Do you mean that the newspapermen have gone through your office or that of Mr. Redwine, and gone to these files and gone through them?

Mr. COBURN. I say in the Department of the Interior.

Representative HOFFMAN. I understand the Department of the Interior gives them everything.

Mr. COBURN. The same file as there was in my office. It is the same file.

Representative HOFFMAN. But you gentlemen do not know anything about it, either one of you?

Mr. REDWINE. No.

Mr. Chairman, the foregoing quotations show that the integrity of the committee and of the House was challenged by the newspaper and by committee counsel.

There were but two questions involved in the granting of the mining patents.

The first was whether there was mineralization on the land sufficient to justify the granting of the patents.

The other was whether the decision had been brought about by influence and pressure exerted at high levels.

Communications addressed to the Department of the Interior by two Members of the House, by one Member of the other body, were directly challenged.

This challenge reflects not only upon the Members named, but upon the integrity of the House and of the Congress as a whole.

The statement published not only in the Washington paper, but in many papers throughout the country challenges the integrity of the President of the United States, of the Secretary of the Interior, and goes directly to the solution of one of the principal issues which was before the committee, that is, whether the decision was the result of influence and pressure exerted at a high level.

Upon this issue, there was no direct testimony until the publication of the article above referred to and the statement of the committee counsel.

Inasmuch as the integrity of the House, of its committee, is directly challenged, the current resolution is offered. It reads:

Resolved, That the Speaker appoint a committee of three to determine whether Robert Redwine, a member of the staff of the joint committee of the Senate and House which held hearings in Washington and elsewhere, has evidence to support the charge that he had seen a letter in the files of the Department of the Interior and of the committee, on which the President of the United States penned a note to the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the granting of patents in the Al Sarena mining case: *Provided,* That said committee be given the usual authority to make investigations, hold hearings, and make a report of their findings; *And provided further,* That all expenses of such investigations and the holdings of such hearings, not exceeding the sum of $1,000, shall be paid out of the funds heretofore authorized for the use of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. Chairman, overlong it has been customary for certain members of the press and certain columnists, some radio commentators, to sometimes directly, more often indirectly, challenge the integrity of the Congress as a whole, of Members of Congress, of its committees and members of its committee staff.

Overlong the Congress has been the whipping boy of certain individuals and of certain groups which make a practice of attributing unfair motives not only

to individual Members of the Congress but to the Congress as a whole.

In my judgment the Congress is itself in part to blame for this continued flow of false charges reflecting upon the integrity of individual Members of congressional committees, and of the Congress itself. We have failed to challenge these repeated charges.

Here where a joint committee is investigating the charge that because of influence at high administrative levels, timber valued at from $77 to $600 thousand was given away, that mining patents were granted, where 1 Senator and 2 Members of the House have been publicly named as having contributed to the influence which pressurized an executive department into the granting of the patents, the committee at the close of the hearings is informed through the public press and by one of its staff members that the President of the United States has improperly attempted to influence a Cabinet Member. We have the further charge through the press purporting to come from the same staff member, Mr. Redwine, that he, Mr. Redwine, told other members of the committee that he had seen a letter such as has heretofore been referred to and that he would swear under oath that he had seen it but that he had searched high and low and could not now find the letter. This same staff member, according to the newspaper reporter, added that that he had "found his file rifled."

Mr. Chairman, if charges involving the integrity of the Congress, its committees, its staff members, are to go unchallenged, then indeed there should be no complaint from any Member of the Congress of any statements which may hereafter be made and which reflect upon the integrity of the Congress for its proceeding.

Mr. Chairman, if the Congress lacks either the inclination or the courage to resent scurrilous charges, as to its own integrity, it should in my judgment have the courage and the decency, when the integrity of the President of the United States is challenged, to sift those charges and when they are found untrue, as they will be if investigation is made, to hale the offender before the bar of the House where the Speaker may administer the proper rebuke.

The question here raised has nothing to do with the right of free speech, with the freedom of the press. The sole question is whether the Congress will without rebuke permit a committee employee, acting for and on behalf of an investigating committee, to falsely and publicly charge a President of the United States with misconduct, maladministration of his functions as President.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that there is one important angle involved in this debate relative to whether or not H. R. 3383, or the substitute bill which it is stated will be offered, shall now be enacted by this Congress which, in my judgment, has not yet been adequately discussed or clarified. It is the very important case now pending in the United States Supreme Court wherein Arizona, in 1952, brought suit against California, and joined as defendants therein, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the Imperial Irrigation District, the city of Los Angeles, the Palo Verde Irrigation District, the city of San Diego, Coachella Valley Water District, county of San Diego, and others.

In that case Arizona sought to quit title to 3,800,000 acre-feet of water involved in the Colorado River compact of 1922, which involves the compact States. During this debate, we have been informed by the proponents of this bill that recently the United States Supreme Court has made a ruling that the upper basin States are not legally interested in the legal controversy involved in the case which Arizona brought against California as noted. I have not heard the decision read in this debate.

At the heart of this case in Supreme Court is how the States involved will have the 7,500,000 acre-feet of water allotted to them each year by the 1922 Colorado River compact. It was quite logical that the upper basin States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico would be fearful that this upper Colorado River project would normally be turned down by Congress if they should directly become involved in the pending suit which was filed by Arizona against California. I voted "aye" on the rule; not because I was for the bill but because I believe it important that this House have opportunity to debate this issue in all its phases.

I am sure that all of my colleagues in this great legislative body will naturally expect that we Representatives from southern California should expect to be, and will be, guided by the legal opinion of the distinguished attorney general of the State of California, Pat Brown, and by the able legal counsel of the Colorado River Association, officially representing the interests of the State of California in the Supreme Court litigation involving the rights of the State of California to any of the water rights involved in the Colorado River compact of 1922. And since both of these recognized legal authorities on water rights advise that the enactment of either H. R. 3383 or the substitute proposed would now be premature in their legal judgment, and would vitally jeopardize the substantial water rights of the water users in the State of California, I will not undertake to set myself up as knowing as much about the pending Supreme Court case as they do. The great 23d District, which I represent during this my 10th year in this legislative body, is in the very midst of the metropolitan area of Los Angeles County in the very heart of the 6 million American citizens thereabouts; in the very midst of this thickly populated area which reportedly is growing faster than any comparative area in our beloved Nation. Without adequate water the very lives of them are in jeopardy.

I have recognized this debate as so important to the State of California and to the Nation that I have been here almost constantly throughout this debate, even though both of my two committees have been sitting each day both morning and afternoon.

During my 20 years of law practice before I first came to this great legislative body 5 terms ago, I concluded that it was a wise client who followed his counsel's advice. And, when the vote comes on this bill I expect to follow the expert legal advice and opinion of the legal counsel for the State of California.

For instance, in the hearings I read from the opinion by Mr. Ely, the attorney for the special agency set up by the Legislature of the State of California to protect the State's interests, as follows:

Article III (a) of the Colorado River compact, in a single sentence, apportions from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and to the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, which it states shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist. Manifestly this one sentence must have the same meaning in both the basins to which it refers. But there is controversy over the meaning of the term "beneficial consumptive use." The question is whether it means the quantity in fact used, measured at the place of use, or whether it means the effect of that use measured in terms of stream depletion at some point hundreds of miles downstream, in this case Lee Ferry. The same question arises under the Mexican Water Treaty's so-called escape clause. This question of interpretation of the Colorado River Compact and the Mexican Water Treaty is directly at issue in the present Supreme Court case. The quantity involved in this dispute, so far as the planning of the upper basin storage project is concerned, is 300,000 to 500,000 acre-feet, according to engineers' estimates. The Reclamation Bureau assumes that the measurement is to be made in terms of diversion minus return flow, measured at the place of use, with respect to California. The Boulder Canyon Project Act defines it in the latter terms, and the Mexican Water Treaty says (art. I (j)):

"'Consumptive use' means the use of water by evaporation, plant transpiration, or other manner whereby the water is consumed and does not return to its source of supply. In general, it is measured by the amount of water diverted less the part thereof which returns to the stream."

That corresponds with California's allegation of the meaning of the term in *Arizona* v. *California* (answer to Arizona, par. 8). Arizona denies that this definition applies to her uses (reply, par. 8), and the Reclamation Bureau, in the project before you, assumes that it does not apply to the upper basin, although the projects to be built under these bills are recognized as being subject to the terms of the Mexican Water Treaty.

Article III (a): Does the apportionment of the use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum in article III (a) mean an average of that amount over a period of years, or a maximum in any one year? Manifestly, as in the interpretation of "consumptive use," the compact must be given the same interpretation in both basins.

California alleges in the pending lawsuit that the apportionment means a maximum, like a speed limit on a highway, not an average.

But if California is right, use by the upper basin in a given year of any quantity in excess of 7,500,000 acre-feet constitutes the use, to that extent, of unapportioned surplus, in competition with the appropriations of unapportioned excess or surplus waters which have been made in the lower basin, and subject to the Mexican treaty burden,

which, under article III (c) of the compact, is to be supplied first out of surplus. The amount involved in this particular issue is very large. It is more than 2 million acre-feet in extreme years, and averages about a million acre-feet in the 17 years of excess use in the upper basin shown in the Bureau's study.

And since I am advised by the legal counsel of our State that California cannot accept or recognize that the Supreme Court has made a final determination of all the important issues involved between California and the States to the compact of 1922, I cannot either feel comfortable or consistent in voting for this bill and against the legal advice of the distinguished legal counsel of my native State of California. There appears to be a substantial legal question which has not been resolved but will be in the not distant period.

In other words, gentlemen, as of this moment it is my considered position, that even though I readily recognize great merit in the natural desire of the other compact States to develop this great water resource, I take the position that until or unless the Supreme Court of the United States has first finally and fully resolved the legal rights of the State of California as compared with the other States to the compact, both the upper and lower States thereto, I cannot vote for this measure which the legal counsel of the State of California advises will jeopardize the legal rights of the State of California under the Colorado River Compact of 1922. I therefore take the further position that it would be shooting in the dark, for other Members of this great legislative body to vote approval for this important legislation until the Supreme Court of the United States has made its final determination of the meaning of the compact of 1922, as relates to quantities of water to which each of these compact States is entitled to; that vital existing compact which has been acted upon and relied upon these many years by the State of California in its water policy ever since 1922.

Therefore I must of necessity vote "no"; and if a motion to recommit this bill to the committee, pending the final decision of the Supreme Court in the premises is made, I will vote for the motion to recommit.

I not only take the position I do for the reasons already stated, but, also on account of the unanimous position, so far as I know, taken by the water users and agencies in the great 23d District, Los Angeles County, which I represent.

For instance, here is a resolution of the city of Compton, opposing the upper Colorado River Basin project:

Resolution 6878

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Compton opposing the upper Colorado River Basin projects as provided in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress

Whereas the city of Compton is vitally dependent on a water supply obtained from the Colorado River; and

Whereas California's rightful share of Colorado River water is threatened by the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress; and

Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers of this city and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than $4 billion; and

Whereas these political pump-priming schemes if authorized would furnish water to grow the kinds of crops which are already in great surplus in this country, and which are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers; and

Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Compton does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1. That the enactment of these project bills is against the interest of the city of Compton in particular and the State of California in general and should be opposed.

SEC. 2. That the city of Compton respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of the above-mentioned bills or any similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be air-mailed to our Congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources.

Adopted this 22d day of March, 1955.

FRANK G. BUSSING,
Mayor of the City of Compton.

Attest:

MRS. CLYDE J. HARLAN,
City Clerk of the City of Compton.

And, I have here a resolution by the nationally known manufacturing city of Vernon, in my Congressional District:

Resolution 1825

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Vernon opposing the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress

The City Council of the City of Vernon resolves as follows:

Whereas the city of Vernon is vitally dependent on a water supply obtained from the Colorado River; and

Whereas California's rightful share of Colorado River water is threatened by the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress; and

Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers of this city and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than $4 billion; and

Whereas these political pump-priming schemes, if authorized, would furnish water to grow the kind of crops which are already in great surplus in this country, and which are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers; and

Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

SECTION 1. That the enactment of these project bills is against the interest of the city of Vernon in particular and the State of California in general and should be opposed.

SEC. 2. That the city of Vernon respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of the above-mentioned bills or any similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be airmailed to our congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources.

SEC. 3. The city clerk of the city of Vernon shall certify to the passage of this resolution and thereupon and thereafter the same shall be in full force and effect.

Adopted and approved this 19th day of April 1955.

R. J. FURLONG,
Mayor, City of Vernon.

Attest:

G. A. ANDERSON,
City Clerk.

Also as typical of many similar ones received, I have here a telegram from one of the most distinguished of California citizens, and a resident of my district, reading as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 29, 1956.*
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As a director of the governing boards of the Central Basin Municipal Water District and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California I am of course strongly opposed to upper Colorado River project bill and am convinced it should be defeated. We note you voted for rule to bring bill up for debate. We hope this does not indicate that you favor bill itself and earnestly ask you to vote against bill and do all possible to defeat it.

MILO DELLMANN.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "and for the improvement of navigation."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before wandering into other pursuits I obtained a college degree in engineering, and in the course of securing same, I studied quite a bit of geology. One summer during my undergraduate days I worked with a scientific expedition on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona and New Mexico, and in that summer I obtained quite a bit of close personal familiarity with the geology and the economics of that particular area. Now, I knew quite a bit about Chinle shale long before most of the gentlemen who have been talking about it here ever heard of it. In fact, I had a good bit of it ground into my hide during the course of that summer.

As a part of that work I rowed a small collapsible rowboat down the San Juan and Colorado Rivers from a point a few miles below Mexican Hat to Lee Ferry, Arizona—a distance of about 150 miles.

I make these prefatory remarks merely to indicate my familiarity with the subject. And, while I am reluctant to take up the time of the Committee this late in the debate, I think that there are a few things that are pertinent to this discussion which have not been said. For one thing there is a great quantity of silt presently flowing down the Colorado River and piling up behind Hoover Dam. At the time of the completion of the Hoover Dam, the Engineers estimated,

I believe, that in 75 years if something were not done to stop that flow, Lake Mead would be completely filled up and Hoover Dam would become useless. A great part of that silt, something over half of it, I believe, comes from the Navajo Reservation. The primary reason for that dates back to the 1870's when Kit Carson rounded up the Navajo Indians and took them out to Texas as a punitive measure: and then subsequently after 5 or 6 years, returned them to the Navajo Reservation.

At the time of their return they were given sheep and goats to use as their chief source of livelihood, to substitute for the hunting and raiding type of economy that had supported them previously. These sheep and goats very quickly overgrazed the reservation. Within 10 or 15 years an area which had, in part, been an area of considerable moisture, with natural lakes, trees, other types of vegetation, was turned into a denuded barren desert. The denuding of vegetation produced a very rapid runoff of the water, reaching as high as 98 percent in many areas so that with every rain came flash floods which quickly washed out the natural dams which had created the lakes, and provided natural water conservation. Now, every time it rains floods result and silt in great quantities washes into the San Juan River—principally—and through the San Juan into the Colorado. Erection of some kind of works to stop this flow of silt is absolutely essential to keep Hoover Dam from eventually becoming worthless; making it impossible, I might add, for southern California to get the water from it which they now are so dependent upon. But to do this effectively not only the Navaho and Glen Canyon Dams are needed but also an effective program of soil conservation on the Navaho Reservation. But before any such program can be at all effective, the Navaho Indians have to be converted from a nomadic, pastoral people dependent upon sheep. Some other means for their earning their livelihood must be found. These dams will provide that means. It will take them out of their present grazing economy, upon which most of them depend for their means of support now, and put them into industrial work, mining, truck farming, and things of that sort.

There is a great deal of coal on the reservation, also a great deal of uranium ores and if power is available, a lot of the present natural resources will be exploited.

But there is one other matter I would like to discuss and that is the matter of the effect of this project on crop surpluses. I believe a number of my colleagues, particularly from the Midwest, are fearful lest the land that is irrigated by this project will somehow or other come in competition with the lands in the Midwest where we already have serious crop surpluses.

I should like to point out that a good bit of this land which will receive additional water or be placed under irrigation for the first time by this project, is already cultivated by dry land farming methods and the principal crop is wheat. Once it is irrigated, it will no longer be used for wheat. They could not possibly support the cost of irrigated land through wheat production. The main thing produced will be vegetables and fruits and things of that sort which are not in competition with crops that are now in surplus. To reassure doubtful members on this point an amendment is to be offered, as I understand it, which would absolutely prohibit the use of any of this irrigated land for the production of crops in surplus for a period of years. So that, rather than adding to the crop surpluses this will cut the crop surpluses. The experience in the Columbia basin was that wheat production within the project area was cut in half.

Furthermore, I might say to my friends from the South that this water which California is so eager to hang onto, in many instances goes to irrigated land in California which grows cotton, and I am sure that we have enough of surplus cotton already. No cotton could be grown in the high and cool lands of the Colorado Plateau. For these reasons I feel that the upper Colorado project has value to the country as a whole, as well as to the States directly affected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr., Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate the subject of uranium was brought into the debate by one of the gentlemen from the upper-basin States.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the past 10 years, I think I know something about that particular situation. I am proud to say that we are getting a lot of uranium from the Colorado Plateau and also from Utah. This is one of the great national safeguards for the continuance of the supply of uranium ore, but this ore is coming in without the benefit of the upper Colorado River Basin project. The mining of the ore does not require a great deal of water. It is being mined at this time and placed in great stockpiles at the processing centers. There has been no appearance before our Joint Committee on Atomic Energy asking that this Colorado River Basin bill be passed in order to obtain more ore from the Colorado Plateau.

I do not want to be visionary, and I have always been conservative on this subject of when we will get atomic power, but I want to give you some other people's testimony on this to back up my remarks.

Mr. Francis K. McCune, vice president and general manager of General Electric's atomic products division, had this to say in GE's progress report for May 24, 1954:

> Privately financed atomic plants will compete successfully with conventional power plants in 5 to 10 years.

He repeated this forecast in the July 12, 1954 issue of the Electric World. He discussed the feasibility and power cost of a 300,000 kilowatt boiling water reactor of a type suitable for one of our atomic facilities such as Hanford. Mr. McCune added that this boiling water type of reactor, which is a technical thing that I shall not go into, was one of the best suited for earliest and most effective competition with conventional fuel plants.

He estimated that where the coal plant production costs per kilowatt would be ordinarily about 6.90 mills, this boiling water reactor will produce power at about 6.70 mills, which is somewhat lower than steam.

This is the vice president of General Electric, whose business it is to make these reactors.

In 1954, Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, director of AEC's Division of Reactor Development, speaking before the Atomic Industrial Forum conference, urged the private companies to get moving on nuclear power, indicating that within 10 years economically priced atomic electric energy could be created. In April 1955, Dr. Hafstad's successor, Dr. Kenneth Davis, addressing the same group, stated that a thermonuclear power station built in 10 to 15 years will be as good as the best steam plant constructed today, and he estimated an installed kilowatt cost of between $125 and $140.

As to these tremendously expensive dams and generating plants in the upper Colorado Basin, it has been estimated by people who have testified before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that the installed kilowatt cost of generating plants will be from $200 to $705 capital investment, so you are getting a plant which is to the best of our knowledge and to the best of scientific knowledge an old-fashioned plant at a cost much higher than the present coal steam generating type of plant, which will cost about $150 per kilowatt capacity. The record of building cost right now at the Joppa plant down at the TVA is $190. I speak of the generating plant for the Atomic Energy facility at Joppa, Ill. Just across the river is a comparative plant that was built for $145. That is the present cost. You are talking, therefore, about electrical costs, which run from more, to as much as 3½ times as much as a regular coal generating plant would cost.

Remember, there are great coal deposits in the upper basin of the Colorado which are now being used to produce kilowatts at about 6 mills and which as generating plant's efficiency increases it will cost less. So what we are doing here is tying up a half a billion dollars in these hydroelectric generating plants on the river at a cost per kilowatt much more than it would cost to make kilowatts from uranium.

Long before these expensive projects are built cheap atomic power will be a reality. Long before these dams are built their justification will be much less than even the opponents of the bill can visualize.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, representing a district and residing in a State far removed from the Colorado River Basin, I hope I may be forgiven for asking two questions I think are important, at least to my constituents and to me and, perhaps, to

some others who are similarly situated. I realize that the President on yesterday made substantially this statement:

There was one feature of it—

Referring to this proposal, as I understand it—

that was originally controversial because of the belief on the part of some conservationists we would destroy wildlife in one section of the area. That dam, Echo Park Dam, has been eliminated.

It is my understanding that this provision remains in the bill as it passed the other body, but it is also my understanding that it has been eliminated in the bill that has been reported by our committee. I would like to ask the ranking member of the committee, if I am correct in that understanding?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct. The bill that was reported out of the committee, the new version, took out that provision unanimously. I think there is a tacit understanding on the part of the Members who are likely to be the conferees that it will stay out of the bill.

Mr. HESELTON. That was my next question. Then those who will be the conferees will stand by the House version.

So that there may be no question in the minds of my constituents who are concerned about it, may I address the same question and receive this double assurance. Am I correct in understanding that the Echo Dam feature is out of the bill, as recommended by your committee and that the conferees, so far as the chairman can guarantee it to us, and I realize that it cannot be an absolute guaranty, will stand by the version as recommended by the committee eliminating that feature?

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is correct. In addition there is an informal agreement with the Members of the Senate that Echo Park will stay out of the bill.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I have made an effort to appraise all of the evidence and the contentions one way and another, the charges and countercharges and the whole case as I see it. I am satisfied on that basis that the clear weight of the evidence is in favor of this proposal, and I intend to support it. If I needed anything more, it would be what was said yesterday by the President of the United States when he stated, "I have more than once expressed my conviction before, that I believe that water is rapidly becoming our most valuable natural resource, and here is an opportunity, at last, to treat this whole great mighty Colorado River as a single entity, to treat it on a basin basis instead of merely a local and individual basis. We should get busy and get on to it." Then, in conclusion, he emphasized, "So again I hope that we can have positive action on that as rapidly as possible."

In my judgment, those of us who come from other parts of the country, who may not be benefited immediately or directly by the passage of this legislation, can well resolve any doubts in terms of the recommendations that have been made by the majority of the committee in the House and the emphatic endorsement which has been repeated as recently as yesterday, by the President of the United States.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct about three inquiries to the chairman of this committee and to the ranking member as well. Like the gentleman who just preceded me, the district I represent will not be benefited directly by reason of the approval of this legislation. Nevertheless, as I said before, there are about three questions that I think are important in connection with the approval or disapproval of this proposed legislation. Since this legislation will cost a considerable amount of money, I would like to be informed whether any of the funds to carry out the provisions of this legislation, including the construction of the reservoirs, and whatever else is provided for in this bill, will come out of the Federal Treasury and charged to the taxpayers? May I ask the chairman of the committee whether that is so or not?

Mr. ENGLE. There is not any question about it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How much money will be used immediately from the Federal Treasury?

Mr. ENGLE. It will cost about 55 percent, I think, of the total amount.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand it, almost all of these funds will be reimbursed.

Mr. ENGLE. They will all be paid back. What we said the other day was that the reclamation fund shall put up 55 percent of this money, $760 million. The balance will come out of the general revenues of the Treasury, and that will amount to something less than $18 million a year during the construction period of this project. All of that money is repaid, except something like $8 million. In other words, this project pays back over 99 percent of the capital. That portion which is allocated—nearly two-thirds of it—to the generation of power and municipal water is paid back with interest. That portion, which is about $283 million, for the irrigation feature, pays back in 50 equal annual installments, without interest, under the half-century old precedent of the reclamation law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I believe the chairman has made it clear that the actual cost against the Federal Government, against the taxpayers of this country, finally will amount to about 1 percent, is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. I said the nonreimbursable is about 1 percent. A little over $8 million. But of course, if the gentleman wants to speak of the interest which is not being credited on the amount going into the irrigation development, of course that is an additional Federal subsidy, and that is traditional under the reclamation law as in all other projects.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The second question is this, whether or not any of the land that will be taken for irrigation purposes will be used for the purpose of producing crops in competition with crops that are presently in surplus. I have in mind especially wheat and corn, and other basic crops.

Mr. ENGLE. I have spoken on that twice.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to make sure that none of the crops produced on this land will compete either directly or indirectly with the farm crops raised or produced in the Middle West. I have been given to understand that the effect of this legislation will really reduce the production of wheat, corn, cotton, and rice in this area.

Mr. ENGLE. Putting this land under irrigation, as in dealing with all sorts of dry land, has a tendency to move in the direction away from these surpluses. I cited to the committee during the discussion an example in the Columbia Basin, where 500,000 acres had been brought under irrigation to date, and that the acreage has been cut 90 percent. The major crop products giving our farmers trouble are, as you know, wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts and tobacco.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the reason I make this inquiry.

Mr. ENGLE. Two of those are not raised in any quantity in this area. That is, corn and wheat. In my judgment, the taking of this area under water absolutely moves in the opposite direction from increased surpluses which are troubling the Commodity Credit Corporation and the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was going to try to clarify the phrase "traditional reclamation clause." When do they start paying back the $282 million for irrigation projects? Do they start paying concurrently on that or do they wait for 50 years after the dam has been paid for, and having it interest free during that period at the expense of the taxpayers? I was about to ask the gentleman if he would ask that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REES of Kansas was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The provisions of this bill provide that payment of the irrigation allocation shall start the first year immediately after the development period, whatever that may be. It cannot exceed 10 years, in accordance with the reclamation law. It will be paid annually in 50 equal installments thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have received a considerable amount of correspondence that this legislation is beneficial to the Navaho Indians. I know the gentleman from Colorado, chairman of this committee, is quite familiar with the acute situation with respect to the

Navaho Indians. It is a problem that concerns a good many of our people. A further statement from the chairman will be helpful.

Mr. ASPINALL. This legislation will be beneficial to the Navaho Indians. This legislation provides for the construction of the first facilities necessary to the ultimate irrigation of their land and the use by them of the waters to which they are entitled.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I must first yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I would just like to point out to the gentleman from Kansas that much of this fund will be repaid in 19 years from irreplaceable natural resources of these four States, oil, gas, well leases, the reclamation fund, sale of public lands; and a total of $155 million more under irrigation costing $287 million.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How much of that money—that is, $287 million or $155 million—is available for this project?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. It will be available when needed, $23.3 million that these four States will pay into the reclamation fund from natural resources.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Kansas is the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and is a very able gentleman. I wonder if the gentleman would want to ask somebody in charge of the bill, either the chairman or the ranking minority member how much this is going to increase Federal employment?

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, can the gentleman point out how it would be possible to keep off the agricultural market the additional surpluses to be grown on more than 1 million acres of lands to be irrigated, and to be irrigated as supplemental irrigation? How can that be placed in separate warehouses or kept out of the general market depressing all prices throughout the country?

Mr. REES of Kansas. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] the chairman of this committee has just explained that none of the basic products, including wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco will be in competition by reason of this project. The chairman has just stated that the production of the products I have just mentioned will be less than they are at the present time under dry farming, this for the reason that the lands will be used for growing alfalfa to feed cattle produced in that area, and most of the remainder for vegetables and fruits that will be consumed in that part of the country. So, it appears from the explanation of those who are familiar with the problem there will be no competition with crops raised in the area that either he or I represents.

I would like to say one more word with regard to the importance of providing food for the Navaho Indians. I am told that alfalfa and other feed that may be raised in this area will be used to feed livestock presently controlled for the Navaho Indians.

We are also advised that a considerable share of the vegetables and other products will be used by the Navaho Indians and thus relieve a critical situation that has existed among the Indians over a period of years. We are informed that several hundred million dollars has been spent in the last few years to relieve an acute situation in respect to food and other products in order to help the Indians who have suffered by reason of lack of rainfall in this area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, there is, to be sure, some Federal aid involved in this program—a reasonable contribution by the Government to the general welfare of the Nation. It most assuredly is not the fantastic collection of currency that has been so blithely bandied about by omnipotent opposition groups.

The simple facts are easily established although I hardly expect them to dent the tarnished armor of those who gleefully exploit their own distortions. How established? The Federal budget as submitted weighs many pounds and has hundreds of pages of figures for every sort and kind of expenditures. In this fabulous collection of numbers, reclamation, and reclamation alone, is singled out for this claptrap about the poor taxpayer absorbing ever increasing burdens of calculated interest. I defy anyone to give any commonsense explanation to this glaring inequity on the part of these taxpayer-savers other than one and one alone. This yawning gap stands out as clearly as an ink spot on a white shirt—and that is, that all logic failing to defeat reclamation, this double-dealing dodge has been concocted to do the job. Any ordinary search would find literally hundreds of items in the budget which should, or could, bear this same damning defamation if it has any logical validity. By their acts—not their protestations—may you know them.

What are these items you ask—only these: Any item which by any definition could be a capital-type expenditure; roads, bridges, ships, buildings, harbors, flood control works, levees, soil building programs, and so on ad infinitum. If sudden-death interest is to apply to one capital-type expenditure—and its evil shouted from the rooftops and worn as a badge of honor by budgeteers—then it should apply to all. The use of this calculated-compounding and confusion in only one area marks it as a handy tool for gravediggers—all others failing.

Reclamation and reclamation projects do pay their way to the Nation. Irrigation is of demonstrable value, for without irrigation, the West would be the harsh desert that Webster thought it would always be. With water, however, the desert blooms and creates wealth. No more could be asked of any program and whether private or public—and three-fourths of all irrigation development is private. It is a good investment for America.

Bypassing for a moment opposition from the nonreclamation area, there is considerable merit and enlightenment in examining the main nest of opposition and interest interpreters—namely those who seem also to have an affinity for southern California. This well-organized and well-heeled group apparently feels that age lends honor to Federal aid for no Federal aid proposed in this bill differs in concept or design from that which helped nurture and develop southern California. Let me state clearly that I think that the very growth and advancement of southern California, which rests upon basic Federal water development, is the best argument in support of this legislation. In fact in their very opposition, they have gone so far overboard that reflection and commonsense will distill from their frantic propaganda the true need and worth of this program in the upper basin area which supplies all the water.

I shall return to this unveiling in a moment, but let us finish this Federal aid, or as some would describe it, a subsidy bugbear. The House bill, H. R. 3383, proposes a total expenditure of $760 million, of which less than 1 percent is on a grant or nonreturnable basis. The balance will all be returned to the Treasury. Of this return, approximately $463 million will be returned with interest so no slick shenanigans will distort that. The balance, represented by irrigation projects, will be returned without interest. This has been the law on irrigation projects since 1902 when such free spenders as Teddy Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, and others supported this concept. It has not suddenly become evil—it just makes predetermined opposition sound more valid. The figures are broken down in the committee report on the bill and clearly show that this return will be accomplished on schedule and that even more than that, a surplus will remain for future development.

You have heard or have seen, due to the enterprise of the well-heeled opposition, all sorts of figures on the Federal aid involved. They are alike only in that they proceed from a similar distortion. Other than that, they are as elusive as a basket of eels and just as slippery. It is the hope of the digit-distorters that the shock will be enough that no examination will be made to check the validity.

I have no intention of entering this quagmire of quackery. Federal help of one form or another has been the rule and not the exception in this Nation since its first acts of funding the Continentals at par and establishing a tariff. We have such Federal aid right now in shipbuilding, in airmail, in airport construction, in agriculture, in mail service, in census service, and in rivers, harbors and flood control. If Federal assistance in such form is evil and an ever-compounding load upon the taxpayer, then let us in honesty and commonsense first make this assault upon those forms of aid which make no whit of direct return. Reclamation at least returns the principal.

I defy anyone to establish any morally sound argument that reclamation and reclamation alone should be battered by the brand of boondoggle when the very areas from which such branding comes sit in federally aided splendor.

Southern California parades its pious protest against erected evil in the upper Colorado project in complete indifference to the millions of taxpayer dollars the area has received without string or prospect of repayment for flood control, harbor improvement, and even a Federal program to let in some of its once pleasant sunshine through its own smog. Let us not be deceived by this smog blanket they are using to hide their own dependence upon help from the Federal Government as they seek to choke off legitimate development elsewhere of the very type they have heretofore supported, and will hereafter support when they are the beneficiaries. Their opposition has but one reason and purpose—one foundation. Southern California having received the manyfold benefits of grant development, like one flood-control project running to $348 millions, and reclamation development running to about $350 millions, to use water from a river to which she contributes not one drop, now trembles in terror lest this same type of valuable development occur elsewhere. They know from experience the value of basic reclamation development and they want it all for themselves and they seek by high-sounding means to prevent the fulfillment of a program they helped to conceive and supported, yes supported, until that day when its advantages were to accrue to others and not to themselves. This present dog-in-the-manger opposition runs counter to solemn agreements made by the State of California over a half-century. Small wonder that unprejudiced Californians refer to this resounding din as baloney. Inasmuch as they are receiving this same interest-free money for their development, and I, for one, am a strong supporter of their projects as Colorado Representatives have always been, I think that in good conscience they should either stop spreading propaganda or offer to amend their own projects to conform to their postulations about this one. I think also that they should honor their solemn agreements made in years gone by with the other States of the Colorado River Basin and not seek by present subterfuge to recapture what they solemnly agreed over the years was not theirs. Southern California contributes not one whit of water to the Colorado River—rather they approach it like a sponge to a puddle and seem to have a philosophy that it is better to take than to give as the States involved in this program are the source of over 90 percent of the water of the Colorado River; water divided by formal compact to the States now seeking to obtain use of their share.

Oh, it is great sport to eternally damn our dams now that all of theirs are built—now that their power turbines are spewing out electric power not unlike they spew out propaganda—now that they are able to grow and prosper from water from snow hundreds of miles and several States away. Yes, it is great sport, but how can it be squared with their own arguments over the years and their own acceptance of our support for their development. If there is an answer, I am not so constituted as to understand it. To me, agreement and understanding must remain binding.

Do not be deceived into thinking that all of this is brand new for it is all very old and the record and the facts exist for those who wish to check it. Recently, my distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, demonstrated his fairness by reviewing this record. It can be found on page 3299 of the RECORD for February 23. Some of the most able men of Colorado took part in the long negotiations which were thought to have stilled the controversy over the use of the waters of the Colorado—formalized in an interstate compact at Sante Fe in 1922. They went to their eternal reward firm in the conviction that settlement had been achieved. Perhaps it is best that they are not here to see the dog turn on the hands that fed it.

I wish I had time to bare this whole record so that this calculated cloud of confusion could be cleared away, but I have not. It would not even be necessary to bring it up had not former friends deserted the ship and, fat and sassy from Federal feeding, begun to pump out adverse propaganda. It is a case of opposition based on self-interest.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, normally I deplore the use of theatrical tactics in the consideration of a bill. However, yesterday we had such a demonstration in connection with Chinle shale.

I have here today a core taken out by a diamond drill near the proposed site of Glen Canyon Dam. It is Chinle shale, too. My colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has just told us he is a geologist of sorts, and I invite his attention to this shale sample.

When I have finished speaking I will drink the water in the glass into which I put this core and any other contents remaining in the glass.

You know, one of the really amazing things about this particular legislation——

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I do not have time; I may later.

One of the really amazing things about this particular legislation has been the showmanship displayed by the opponents of this legislation from southern California. I think we have had more humbuggery and more buncombe exhibited on this legislation than any I can remember for a long time. They have entertained us throughout and I think they will continue to do so. Of course, the great theatrical capital of the world, Hollywood, is located in southern California and I suppose it comes as second nature to our friends to put on these shows for us. In the phrase of the moment, their performance has been a "many-splendored thing."

Our southern California friends, as each of the issues has come up—whether a dam could be built, whether there were uranium deposits which would be flooded, et cetera—have had counterproposals and counterevidence, and it has been quite a diversionary show. I know you have followed it in the past year in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In their attack on the Bureau of Reclamation—a magnificent body of engineers which has built 165 dams in this country in the last 50 years and never lost one, and that is consulted all over the world today on reclamation projects, in far-off Australia and in many other countries—they have attacked these engineers throughout. We have heard, just to give you a few illustrations, of collapsible dams, sliding canyons, counterpropaganda, counterblueprints, counterdams, counterengineers, countergeologists, counterhydrologists, counteragronomists, countereconomists, countergeographers, and countercartographers. Then, we had a comic strip in the RECORD featuring satire and broad exaggeration entitled "Bananas on Pikes Peak."

Another entertaining strip was started later under the title "The Solid Gold Cadillac."

We have heard tales of boondoggling and mention of atomic reactors—of the just-around-the-corner variety—mind-reading, cloudseeding, and public-relations hypnotism. All of these things you have heard during the journey of this bill through the Congress. Then, too, there have been just plain old dead cats.

Why am I, from Arizona, here, as the southern Californians would say, betraying the lower basin States and my own State? I want to tell you why my Republican colleague from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and I have supported this bill. We regard the Colorado River Basin as a community. This community sat down many years ago to work out a development plan. Unfortunately southern California got ahead of us when work began. Why, then, are we here supporting this measure? Not because our State benefits from it but because we are keeping the agreement that our State made at that time. We are honoring it just as most of the gentlemen from northern California are honoring the agreement their State made. So we appear here and say to you: Do not break faith with these people in the upper basin of the Colorado. Let us give them the project and the development they were promised under the agreement of these seven States.

There we have the picture. Do not believe for a moment that if a dam is built anywhere above Hoover Dam, the water will deplete away, or evaporate away, or percolate away, or sneak off to some subterranean chamber as the opponents would have it. If the Bureau of Reclamation says you can build a dam at a particular place, you may rest assured that it will hold water and that it will be just as successful as the other 165 dams have been.

May I pay just two tributes which I think are well earned. I do not know of a more conscientious Member in this House, or one who works harder and longer on the business of the House, than the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. As-

PINALL]. I would like to congratulate him on the very remarkable and fair-minded job he has done on this bill. I also wish to congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], for the high degree of water statesmanship he has shown in this matter. He has done great credit to himself and to his State in the manner in which he has handled this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to section 1 appearing in the printed report be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read the amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 8, following the word "and", insert the word "for." Strike the comma following the word "power."

Page 2, line 9, following the word "purposes", strike the words "hereby authorizes."

Page 2, line 10, following the word "Interior", insert the words "is hereby authorized."

Page 2, line 14, strike the words "Echo Park,". Following the words "Flaming Gorge", insert the words ", Navajo (dam and reservoir only),

Page 3, line 10, following the word "Silt", insert the word "and". Strike the comma following the words "Smith Fork" and insert a period in lieu thereof.

Pages 3, 4, and 5, strike everything beginning on page 3, line 11, through page 5, line 7.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navaho (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Fla., Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, and Smith Fork: *Provided further*, That as part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

"SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-LaPlata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided*, That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single offstream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

"In the event that the Secretary finds that the benefits of the Curecanti unit do not exceed its costs, he shall give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper unit.

"SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument.

"SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than 50 years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the upper Colorado River Basin fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'basin fund'), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act other than section 8.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the basin fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the basin fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: *Provided*, That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project: (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the basin fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this act.

"(d) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

"(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this act, within a period of years not exceeding the expected economic life of such unit or participating project but not to exceed 100 years;

"(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

"(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

"(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding 50 years.

"(e) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the upper division in the following percentages: Colorado, 46 percent; Utah, 21.5 percent; Wyoming, 15.5 percent; and New Mexico, 17 percent: *Provided,* That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the basin fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

"Revenue so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to this requirement there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this act, (2) costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within a period prescribed in the act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

"(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

"(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the basin fund.

"SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this act) of constructing said unit, project, or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation, and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this act. Costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by any participating project, and beyond the capability of such land to repay, shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

"SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Readjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said acts without the consent of the other contracting parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of waters apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River basin.

"SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

"SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navaho initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

"SEC. 11. Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country.

"SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purpose of this act, but not to exceed $760 million.

"SEC. 13. In planning the additional development necessary to the full consumptive use in the upper basin of the waters of the Colorado River system allocated to the upper basin and in planning the use of and in using credits from net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the payout of costs of participation projects herein and hereafter authorized in the State of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of such States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River system consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

"SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

"SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to institute studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin of the effect upon the quality of water of the Colorado River, of all transmountain diversions of water of the Colorado River system and of all other storage and reclamation projects in the Colorado River Basin.

"SEC. 16. As used in this act—

"The terms 'Colorado River Basin,' 'Colorado River compact,' 'Colorado River system,' 'Lee Ferry,' 'States of the upper division,' 'upper basin,' and 'domestic use' shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the upper Colorado River Basin compact;

"The term 'States of the upper Colorado River Basin' shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

"The term 'upper Colorado River Basin' shall have the same meaning as the term 'upper basin';

"The term 'upper Colorado River Basin compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

"The term 'Rio Grande compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of

the United States of America by act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

"The term 'treaty with the United Mexican States' shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof; and

"The term 'economic life,' as used herein in relation to repayment of costs allocated to power, shall mean the period during which the unit or project is expected to continue to provide the power and energy contemplated from the design and construction of the power facilities of the unit or project, due regard being given to historical experience with similar types of works, allowances included in 'replacement costs' for replacing major items of equipment, and other pertinent factors which may affect the useful life."

Mr. ENGLE (interrupting reading of the substitute). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as having been read and open to amendment at any point, calling attention to the fact that a committee print has been made available to all Members and, in addition, the substitute amendment appears in the supplemental report filed by the committee on February 14, 1956, and has been available since that time with other explanatory matters for the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the chairman tell us what this particular parliamentary move is for? Is this a new bill instead of H. R. 3383? Is this a completely new bill?

Mr. ENGLE. If the gentleman had read the supplemental report, I think he would understand that we are trying to offer a series of committee amendments in an orderly way, and in order to do that, we have the permission of the House to file a supplemental report, which we did some 2 weeks ago, and incorporated the committee amendments in a substitute because that was the most orderly way to do it. Now, we could offer them from the floor one after another, but the way it is done here the Members of the House and of the Committee of the Whole have the whole document before them and they have the committee amendments in italics so they can identify them, and they have them all explained in the supplemental report.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They could be acted upon separately after the substitute is accepted?

Mr. ENGLE. No; except that the gentleman can offer an amendment to strike out any portion.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I see.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, will the bill then be read section by section from Committee Print No. 10?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment which the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is offering is an amendment to the bill and it is considered in its entirety as an amendment. The gentleman from California has asked unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment, which is 7 or 8 pages long, I may say, be dispensed with.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then, Mr. Chairman, would an amendment to section, let us say, 7, be considered at the time section 7 of the committee print is read?

The CHAIRMAN. After the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is read in its entirety, the amendment is then open to amendment at any point.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment is the subject matter of the supplemental report which was filed with this House February 14, 1956.

As I explained to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] the reason we adopted this procedure is because we wanted to proceed in an orderly manner. There are several of these amendments which came up with reference to this very complicated piece of legislation after the original bill was voted out of our committee in July of last year. One of them deals with the protection of certain of the recreational and scenic areas involved, and the other major amendment deals with the execution of an agreement with reference to the repayment of this project. All of these amendments would be germane if offered separately and could have been offered separately, but we felt that the House would want to know that the committee considered these amendments and took formal action upon them. However, under the rules of the House, it is not possible to refer to action taken in any committee unless that action has been reported to the House.

So, as a consequence, in order to be able to discuss here in the House the action taken by the committee with reference to these amendments, it was necessary for us to file a supplemental report reporting on our action. We came on the floor of the House and secured the unanimous consent to file a supplemental report, and the supplemental report is before you, explaining the additional amendments that have been put into the bill, with the substitute bill set forth in the supplemental report on page 6 of that report, and then commencing on page 12 of the report each one of these amendments—and there are 9 of them all together to various parts of the bill—are described in detail with reference to what they do.

In addition to that, the bill is set forth in the report with strikeouts and italics in order to show the difference. In addition, for the convenience of the Members and those who might want to amend the substitute, which, of course, is open to amendment at any point now, the committee has provided a committee print No. 10 which is available to the Members, which sets up the bill, H. R. 3383, precisely as it was voted out of the Committee on the Interior with the amendments adopted at that time. The additional amendments referred to in the supplemental report are in italics and the change of language where it does occur is shown in strikeouts. That is done in order that any Member desiring to offer an amendment to the substitute may have a clear opportunity to do so.

The amendment proposed by the committee in its supplemental report incorporates all of the amendments recommended by the committee in its report of July 8, 1955, and which are set out in the Union Calendar Print No. 317, with the exception of one amendmend adding a new section 13; and as pointed out in the supplemental report, recent actions have made the inclusion of section 13 unnecessary.

This committee print shows, as I have said, the amendments that have been incorporated in the committee-recommended amendments set out in the supplemental report in addition to the amendments recommended in the initial report.

As I said previously, the amendments are discussed at page 12. Amendment No. 1 relates to the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

Amendment No. 2 deletes a small project, the Woody Creek project in Colorado from those projects which the Secretary would be required to give priority to in planning. It is a change in the planning section and is not of any great importance.

Amendment No. 3 adds the Yellow Jacket project in northwestern Colorado to those which the Secretary would be required to give priority to in planning further developments.

The balance of these amendments have for their purpose effectuating the control agreement in the upper Colorado basin States with reference to management of their funds. It does not change the total repayment at all. It is a bookkeeping matter on which they got together and which is internal to their own problem. That subject matter is going to be discussed in more detail by the author of the bill, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Am I correct in understanding that the changes to which the gentleman has referred are in italics on pages 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the supplemental report?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the Chairman tell the members of the committee just what hearings were held on the amendments which appear there in italics?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman that this whole subject matter was the subject of days and days and days of hearings and that these amendments were not any different from any other subject matter before the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the gentleman tell the members of the committee what hearings were held on the amendments which appear in italics?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman that all the hearings that were held on this subject were on all of the amendments to this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to call the committee's attention to the fact that the amendments which you are now being asked to vote upon, particularly with reference to the division of revenues and other detailed provisions in the substitute, are amendments upon which there has been absolutely no testimony before any congressional committee. These are matters which were never considered by our committee and you are now being asked to vote upon them without their having been even discussed in the committee, except by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY to the committee amendment: At the end of the first full sentence of section 4 of the committee proposed amendment, which occurs, for reference in the committee print, at page 6, line 7, strike the period, insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That for a period of 10 years from the date of enactment of this act, no water from any participating project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. We have no objection on this side to the gentleman's amendment. I think it is an excellent amendment and in fact helps the legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I see no objection to the amendment. As I understand, it goes to surplus crops, and I think it has been shown that the wheat and corn lands are taken out of production by irrigation projects because very little wheat or corn is irrigated, less than 1 percent. I think the amendment would be acceptable.

Mr. AVERY. I thank both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Nebraska for their support of my amendment. It has been alleged on the floor of the House ever since I have been a Member that these reclamation projects do not bring new land into production of the basic commodities. I think that is basically true. That is why I have offered this amendment, only to write into the law what has been said on the floor of the House at such times as we have considered reclamation projects.

This amendment does not do all I would like to have it do. You note it only prevents the production of these basic crops for 10 years. When you get down to the fine print, we are not getting as much as I would like to have, because it will take probably 5 or 6 years to develop these projects, so actually all we have left is a 2- or 3-year guaranty. However, I think it is important that this House recognize now that we cannot promiscuously continue to bring new land into production of the basic commodities unless we give a look at what it is doing to our midwestern economy, where especially our small farmers are compelled annually to decrease their production of the crops that are so vital to them.

May I especially thank the gentleman from California, who has worked so hard on reclamation legislation for the Western States, for recognizing this problem. I appreciate his accepting the amendment.

Because of my intense interest in water conservation I want to support the legislation before the House this afternoon. However, in its present form I do not feel that in justice to the farmers in my district that I could vote in favor of the bill. As I stated before, it is always alleged when the House is considering a proposal to reclaim and furnish water to new acres of land that these acres will not be placed in competition in the production of crops that are raised in the Middle West. That contention is probably true, but if it is true we should make provision in legislation authorizing further reclamation projects that crops competing with the Middle West cannot be produced. This is especially true under present conditions when the farmers of northeast Kansas are being required to reduce their acres of wheat and corn, the two principal crops in our district. It is for this reason that I am presenting this amendment to the House this afternoon and urging its adoption. I can understand the reservations on the part of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], who has rendered great service to the irrigated sections on the western slopes of Colorado. He tells me that he feels like it is discriminating against this project to include such an amendment, when similar projects previously authorized have not had this restriction placed on them.

However, that should not preclude the adoption of this amendment this afternoon because our surplus of basic commodities is more critical than any time in our history. Just because this restriction is a few years late in being adopted by Congress in the authorization of reclamation projects does not justify the further delay of writing it into the legislation we are considering today. The farmers in my district are more in need of such protective legislation than they have been at any time in the past. As I stated earlier in my remarks, this amendment does not do all that I hoped to accomplish by its submission.

In prohibiting the production of basic crops for 10 years, the prohibition naturally would only apply to 2 or 3 years, as these projects will probably not be completed to the stage where the reclaimed acres would be placed into production until about 6 or 7 years from now. I had hoped to get agreement on a 20-year prohibition but the committee was unwilling to accept the amendment for a period of that duration. Therefore we have compromised on the 10-year provision as read by the clerk, and I am asking that it be adopted, in order that the Congress go on record as recognizing the inequity of spending public funds to bring additional land into production when the farmers of my district are faced with extremely low acreage allotments.

As I stated before I feel that water conservation is of top priority to this Nation. The Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy in its report to the President states that the water needs of this country by 1970 will be twice as great as they are today. In view of this carefully prepared report I feel it is imperative that water be stored in every instance that it is economically feasible. This program I feel is justified as it is not disrupting the social and economic conditions of the area. Practically no persons will be displaced by these reservoirs, and the land being inundated is of small value other than its scenic value. The benefits occurring from these projects will be distributed among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Arizona. Since much land in these States is still public land I feel these States are justified in their request for the authorization of this project. This is especially true in lieu of the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] that less than 1 percent of the cost of the entire project will not be reimbursable to the Federal Government. These repayments will come from water rights and power sales.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I do so for this reason. It is nugatory except as to the Paonia project. I believe it was the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] who stated yesterday or the day before that there would not be any production out of this entire group of projects until beyond 10 years from now except possibly on the Paonia project. Paonia has in part been authorized before. As I understand it, it was more or less a bringing together of new portions of it along with the old.

I think the effect of the amendment would be unfair with respect to the people in that particular area. It therefore should not be in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to understand why this amendment is before us. If basic crops cannot be grown on irrigated lands, why have the amendment at all? The fact is, of course, that you can grow basic crops on irrigated land. The fact is you can grow feed grains and compete with my part of the country. That is what I am interested in.

I do not care two hoots in a vinegar barrel about this fight between southern California and the intermountain area. I was interested to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority floor

leader, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] make their speeches yesterday morning in behalf of this bill. I did not know that Massachusetts has all the industries it wants or needs. I did not know that the State of Indiana has all the industries it wants or needs. I did not know that they do not have an agricultural problem in Indiana. We have an agricultural problem in Iowa, and we need industry in Iowa. This bill, providing the cheap power that it does, means that industry will move out to that part of the country and not into the State of Iowa. We cannot get industry in Iowa. Industry will follow this power; and agricultural production will follow irrigation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, one of the basic crops is corn, which is raised in abundance in the State of Iowa, and this amendment provides that no corn is to be raised and put into the competitive market, and the gentleman should be happy that we have the amendment and he should support it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; it makes the bill just a little less worse—that is all—just a little less worse.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is that the reason the gentleman is opposing the amendment?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that is the reason.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman know what the six basic crops are?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Let us have them.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not the gentleman tell me?

Mr. HILL. I cannot tell you.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Colorado is on the Committee on Agriculture. He ought to know the six basic crops.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that only 40 percent of the corngrowers in his own State subscribe to the agricultural program, and 60 percent of them grow their corn outside of the basic act? What have you got to bellyache on that?

Mr. GROSS. We want that market for our feed grain instead of your producing it with money that is provided by all of the taxpayers of the United States to irrigate your land.

Mr. HILL. I do not have a foot of irrigated land, but I just wanted to be sure that we know what we are talking about.

Mr. GROSS. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman, I do not recall that the gentleman from Colorado yields to me.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. Do I understand the gentleman from Iowa wants to go back to Iowa and tell his farmers that he is in favor of subsidizing all of the corn production?

Mr. GROSS. I am going to vote against the bill.

Mr. AVERY. What is the gentleman going to do about this amendment? That is the question we are debating here.

Mr. GROSS. I am going to vote against the amendment because, in my opinion, it is a subterfuge to sell this bill to the people from the Midwest. We are not only interested in agriculture. We are just as much interested in industry as anybody else. We need industry in Iowa. But you are drawing industry out of our part of the country and other parts of the country because of the power that will be generated.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. I cannot quite follow the gentleman in this discussion and understand how he twists my amendment around so as to apply it to power, which is provided by these projects.

Mr. GROSS. In the first place, your amendment is limited to 10 years.

Mr. AVERY. I so stated on the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. If Ezra Benson has his way, and I refer this to his colleagues from Utah who are here supporting this bill—if Ezra Benson has his way he will have the farmers of Iowa liquidated in 10 years, and I do not intend to let that happen. Of course, we can throw the gates open and let irrigated farms in the West produce what we ought to be producing in the State of Iowa. But I am not going to stand here and be a party to gutting Iowa farmers now or at the end of 10 years.

Mr. AVERY. Would the gentleman care to amend my amendment so that it would be extended to 20 years?

Mr. GROSS. I am not interested in amending any amendment to this bill. I am going to vote against it.

Mr. AVERY. I believe the gentleman so stated just a moment ago.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I did.

Mr. AVERY. But it seems to me that with this amendment, if the corn farmers are going to be gone in 10 years that without the amendment they might be gone in 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. I said that if Ezra Benson had his way the farmers of Iowa would be liquidated in 10 years or less.

Mr. AVERY. I do not recall that my amendment applied to Mr. Benson.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that eventually we can impress upon some people in Washington that we are in trouble and we can head off the liquidation of farmers that is now taking place in Iowa.

Mr. AVERY. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. GROSS. We stand today upon the threshold of power generation through the use of nuclear energy. Plants for the generation of electric power through the use of atomic energy need not be located in the Rocky Mountains. Plants for this purpose can and should be located in the Midwest, where we need a balance of agriculture and industry—where there are already abundant food supplies at hand to feed industry.

There is no need for further agricultural production. Existing farms and farmers are abundantly capable of supplying the Nation's needs for food and fiber, and for many years to come. There is absolutely no need at this time to spend perhaps $3 billion on such a project as this, either from the standpoint of power or agricultural production.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to the upper Colorado River project. My position on the record will show that I am convinced that his project is not economically feasible nor is it consistent with sound reclamation procedures.

There have been many cogent arguments advanced in opposition to this legislation.

Concurrent with the consideration of this legislation is the problem of vast agricultural surpluses. The President has submitted to the Congress for consideration a solution to these agricultural surpluses which I heartily endorse.

Since vast surpluses have not only burdened the economy with subsidies running into billions but have partially darkened the farm economy with a cloud of falling prices, it has been necessary for the sponsors of such reclamation projects as these to invent a means of justification based upon pure speculation of future needs.

The favorite date when they say that the grim spectre of famine will come—unless we heed their advice—is 1975. To meet the vast appetitie of 200 million people in that year, the Bureau of Reclamation asks that before 1959 there be authorized and initiated the irrigation of 1,400,000 new acres and that there be supplementary water provided for 1,711,700 acres now irrigated and in cultivation. For this the minimum construction cost would be $2,110,834,000—a per-acre cost of $700.

Reference to authorities in the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere will show the utterly groundless nature of this claim for more irrigated land, in 1975 or any other year. Here I should like to call attention to another survey made from data gathered by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, This shows that there now exists on improved farms nearly 21 million acres of good land lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States. This land is neither woodland, pasture, nor publicly owned. It is located in regions where there is plenty of rainfall and, in most States, where the growing season is much longer than in the upper Colorado region. All that might be needed to bring this land into cultivation would be an expenditure of from $50 to $150 an acre when and if there is need for more food and fiber.

The distribution of this presently existing "soil bank" is as follows:

	Acres
South	
Alabama	823,564
Arkansas	2,723,547
Kentucky	671,673
Louisiana	2,487,300
Mississippi	1,270,691
Tennessee	279,563
Total	8,256,338
Southeast	
Florida	2,037,392
Georgia	972,748
North Carolina	4,264,763
South Carolina	492,309
Virginia	919,307
Total	8,686,519
Midwest	
Illinois	627,185
Indiana	231,780
Michigan	1,761,390
Minnesota	564,702
Ohio	491,098
Wisconsin	124,133
Iowa	50,759
Missouri	143,249
Total	3,994,296
Grand total	20,937,153

This, I repeat, is a soil bank already in being. But with production bursting at the seams on the land already cultivated, this reserve need not be touched for years to come.

Indeed, the necessity now faces the Congress to put more millions into the reserve. This is what is meant by the soil-bank plan submitted by the President to Congress. That would retire 40 million acres which are now in cultivation. This will mean that between the American people and the famine portrayed by sponsors of more irrigation, these are no less than 61 million potentially productive acres.

Even to consider irrigating the 1,228,000 acres in the Colorado Basin contemplated in S. 500 while we are attempting to eliminate 40 million that we do not need is a matter so irrational as to suggest that it could only happen in the mystic land of political legislation the land in which regional and bureaucratic ambitions are paramount and the national interest is forgotten.

But the proponents of this project have apparently convinced some people, including themselves, that the crops to be raised upon these high arid slopes are a very special kind of crops—rare, exotic, never to be in surplus, and highly essential to the Nation's welfare. The reality is that the produce to be raised will be just like the crops that are raised on millions and millions of acres now in cultivation. They are mostly grains, dairy products—from the cattle which eat the forage which is to be raised on the land and which the proponents say is not in surplus—and wool from the sheep which also partake of the said forage.

Because the reclamation of these additional acres will only serve to compound the expense and proportion of the existing agricultural problem, I oppose the passage of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: On page 16, delete section 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. The impounding and use of water for the generation of electrical power and energy at all such facilities in the Colorado River Basin, shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes, and the United States shall not withhold water in storage in contravention of this mandate. In the event that any State of the Colorado River Basin seeks to maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce any of the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, the Mexican Water Treaty or of this act, consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit. Consent is hereby given to joinder of the United States as a party to any suit, action, or proceeding brought in any court of competent jurisdiction upon any cause of action arising under any contract lawfully entered into by the United States pursuant to either of the compacts or the acts named in this section."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitancy that I offer this amendment in view of the fact that in southern California we are a little bloody at this time. But the purpose of this amendment can be simply stated.

In section 7 of the committee amendment which you will find on page 12, you will find that there are certain rights that are guaranteed. However, there is no machinery set up to enforce section 7.

On page 16 you will find them more or less reiterated in section 14. My amendment is a redrafting of section 14 in order to give to the States the things which they say are provided in section 7. It seems to me that if anybody is really sincere in saying that they meant that they said in the language of section 7 and section 14, there can be absolutely no objection to the amendment which has been offered. We have simply spelled it out and we have provided the machinery and we have made it apply to the entire act instead of just to section 14.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Would the gentleman mind stating why he did not submit this amendment to the committee so that it could have been considered? These are very technical matters. The gentleman says it is a very fair and a very good amendment, but he drops it upon our desk 5 minutes before he is supposed to offer it. We do not regard that as the way to present legislation of a very technical nature. I think it goes to the question of whether or not the gentleman wanted us to have a good look at it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I did not have your substitute amendment available for consideration until the last moment yesterday. Yesterday was the first time I could get it. I discussed the amendment with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. It was available to you many days ago. It is very simple. It would take about 10 minutes to read and understand it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I note in the last line that "Consent is hereby given to joinder of the United States as a party to any suit."

Does not this point up the whole thing to a lawsuit between the Lower Basin States, which could be very complicated and be in the courts for many years?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Section 7 already directs that local contracts shall not be impaled. My language makes it possible for machinery to carry out section 7 exactly as it is worded in section 7.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Just why is this amendment necessary?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Because there is no machinery provided in section 7 to carry it out, and unless it is provided all you have done is to write in a pious hope without giving the injured parties any recourse.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. To clarify the point as to whether this committee has had this matter before it or not, it is the substance of an amendment I offered in both the subcommittee and in the full committee during the hearings on this bill with respect to enlarging the opportunities for justice in case the Secretary conducts his operations under this act in violation of the law and the contract rights of all those who are involved on the river.

As the gentleman has said, it is a very fair thing to provide machinery for the quick decision—as quick as you can get out of the courts—of what may be in issue in connection with the Secretary's activities.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Just a statement substantiating that made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], that we have had this before our committee in various forms, and each time it has been voted down by approximately a vote of 20 to 6.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then the objection of my friend from California is withdrawn, that he has not had time. I assume you have had plenty of time to consider it.

Mr. ASPINALL. I understood my chairman to say that he had not seen this particular version. That I think is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. The way these legal sharpshooters who have made a living for some 25 or 30 years out of interpreting the various acts on the Colorado River take each word and turn it endwise, edgewise, sidewise, and flatwise to see what it means or does to the basic law of the river—any change in language requires the most microscopic attention, and I regard any language that comes in as different, as new language.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman would just let me use some of my own time I would like to proceed.

Mr. ENGLE. I assure the gentleman I will be very glad to seek additional time for him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have been presented here with a substitute amendment; it is quite voluminous and is in substitution of the bill. In place of reading each one of the sections, as is ordinarily done, to give the membership a chance to look at these different sections, to scrutinize them, we are presented with them en bloc.

It seems to me that the gentleman's request is a normal request that his amendment be considered, and I would ask at this time, if the gentleman will yield for that purpose, to have the amendment reread; because, as I understand the amendment it seeks to furnish machinery to do just exactly what they claim they want to do in section 14 where it says, "Consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits."

And again the same language is used in section 7, the same identical language is used there. It seems to me that language is also the permission of a State to have access to the courts.

As I understand, the gentleman's amendment just provides explicit means by which that consent can be obtained without difficulty.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is quite right; and I want to reemphasize exactly what he said. You are asked to vote a substitute amendment today without a chance to read it, without a chance to have it read to you, but it is objected now that this amendment should not be considered merely because the chairman of the committee has only had perhaps a couple of hours to actually look at it.

Let me say also to the chairman of this committee that if these are legal questions, I would point out that this whole bill is a legal matter; and if it provides the machinery to enforce what this bill purports to say, certainly it is only fair that the machinery should be spelled out and that the parties concerned should have an equal right to protect themselves under the terms of this act; and that is all that this amendment does: Gives to the various interested parties the machinery through which they can protect themselves in case there is any violation of this act.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman has taken only part of article 4, the Colorado River compact, which is already covered in this bill. If the Colorado River compact is covered in this bill, as in sections 7 and in 14, what is the necessity for the gentleman's amendment save and except to put the State of California in a position to institute a lawsuit that it may not have at the present time?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. The gentleman quite misreads it. I emphasize a certain part of the compact in order that it can be made very clear that the Congress does not mean in any way to change the compact. So we have emphasized that. However, it applies to all of the States in the lower basin and it would apply equally, I might add, to the upper Colorado River States because, to give you an example, suppose some of this water or some of these dams that are not for agricultural purposes were being stored in dry times and that water was held behind those dams and the water was not made available for agricultural purposes, under this language it would be right and proper for the agricultural interests to insist that the storage of that water should cease and desist until the agricultural purposes have been taken care of.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I point out to the gentleman if it is in the compact at the present time and you have copied only a part of it, why does the gentleman then bring it in so that a lawsuit could be instituted only on one phase of it when, as he says, it is already in there? Why do you single out this particular one phase?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is one phase which has been in dispute between those who would build these dams solely for power and those who would feel that the consumptive rights of those for domestic and agricultural purposes must be protected in both the upper and lower basin.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Under the interpretation by the Southern California lawyers, if this language is put in the bill it would be illegal, would it not, to build Glen Canyon?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; it would not be illegal to build Glen Canyon. It would be illegal to store water in the Glen Canyon dam so that enough water would not come down the river and the people in Arizona and the other areas in the southern basin would not be able to get sufficient water for their agricultural and consumptive purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] touched on the vital point of this amendment. The purpose of the amendment is to block us from building any storage dams in the upper-basin area, particularly the Glen Canyon Dam. This amendment is very ingeniously devised to do that very thing. Those of us who have listened to the testimony of Mr. Ely and the other counsel from southern California know that their contention has always been that we cannot use this water for any other purpose than what they term beneficial consumptive use, which means we cannot store it to produce electrical energy. All we can do is drink it and irrigate our lands. We cannot store it. That is the purpose of the amendment. The gentleman in order to achieve that end is asking you to take a provision out of the Colorado River compact and write it into this act.

I want to remind you again that on page 14 of the substitute this clause is contained:

> Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act or the Colorado River compact.

So the effect of that provision is to make the Colorado River compact a part of this act. Why we should take one particular provision out of context from the compact and write it into this act is not understandable at all. If you are going to put one provision in we might as well write the whole compact into the bill. What the committee has done is to attempt to make this act subject to the provisions of the upper Colorado River compact. What the gentleman proposes to do is to pick out one part that he likes and take it out of context and make it subject to the interpretation that counsel for southern California has attempted to apply to it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to direct your attention to the fact it is part of article 4, section B, of the Colorado River compact, only part of it, but then he slides these words in front of it saying "impounding and use of the water for the generation of electrical power and energy." Now, that part is not article 4–B, because article 4–B says "subject to the provisions of this compact the waters in the Colorado River." You see, the trick is in slipping in and substituting the words "impounding and use of the water for the generation of electrical power and energy." They try to evade the provisions of the Colorado River compact itself which their signatories agreed to, and that is what it amounts to. Therefore, it should be voted down.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is absolutely right, and I further call the committee's attention to the fact that on page 16 there is this provision:

> In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply—

That is, with the provisions of the upper Colorado River compact—

> any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

So they have the right to come into court if there is a violation. There is absolutely no reason for this amendment, and I hope you vote it down.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. It is a fact, is it not, that this kind of language could be the basis of a lawsuit that would tie up and frustrate and stop the construction of this project?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Undoubtedly there would be a lawsuit the day after this bill is passed.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], has seen fit to offer his amendment, because it smokes out what I have known for a long time but have been unable to get the upper Colorado advocates to admit, that this is not a reclamation project. This is a public power project, with some incidental benefits. And, can you not see the proponents striving and screaming immediately that they do not want this amendment because it will interfere with power? If the provisions of the amendment which the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has offered are actually accepted and incorporated in this bill, it will compel the Secretary of the Interior to operate this entire project not as a power project as the folks in the upper basin want it to be, but he will have to operate it as an irrigation project. Therefore you will see the proponents unanimously united against this amendment because they are not interested so much in reclamation. They want this a power project, and that is what it is. I congratulate the gentleman from California for having offered his amendment. I think it should be put in the bill, because it at least shows just what the purpose of the upper basin is—not to provide reclamation but to provide power.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just simply say that in the reading of article 4–B of the compact, I think it can be twisted, as I think it has been twisted, but I think the words are very plain and should be read again: Subject to the provisions of this compact, which means the division of the waters, water of the Colorado River may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent the use for such dominant purposes. My amendment makes it possible to enforce that part of the section and make sure that this will not be used, and what other purpose can Echo Dam be built for except for power purposes at the expense of agriculture and consumptive uses? They just cannot answer that question.

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman is entirely correct, because the proponents have admitted, when they build Glen Canyon Dam, it will not put one drop of water on an acre of land. This is strictly a power feature and the principal part of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The language which has just been called to our attention, which was read by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is in the bill. It is the last sentence of section 7. It reads:

> Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of waters apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River basin.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say that I know that is in the amendment and if the proponents of this proposed piece of legislation really believed it, they should not object to having placed in the bill the mechanism for putting it into effect.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is redundant; that is what it amounts to. May I also say this, if the gentleman will be good enough to yield further, that the reason it is necessary to store the water, as the gentleman knows, is that the upper basin States are unable to use this water because of the erratic flow of the river; the water comes off in a very few weeks, in the late spring and early summer, and unless we are placed in a position to catch the water, the lower basin water, so that we can deliver it in conformity with the provisions of the Colorado River compact to the lower basin, then we are unable to build the necessary small reservoirs in the upper basin so that we can use the water later in the summer during the growing season. That is the reason for all of this.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that although the present bill consents to suits against the United States, it does not provide for the joinder of the United States in situations where you have suits between States of the basin. Of course, the Supreme Court decision in 1936 said it was essential for the United States to be joined in such suits and as a consequence, if it is essential, you should provide for it here. Otherwise you are preventing the disposition of proper legal questions. Likewise the amendment also provides in cases that arise in connection with power contractors—and that is where most of the litigation, if any would arise—they would have the similar privilege of coming into court, bringing the proper parties in.

I ask you gentlemen if in the United States you are going to permit people to go to court and have their rights litigated, which is a part of our Constitution, why, for goodness sake, is anybody objecting to providing the machinery for doing it? That is all that the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] seeks to do. I urge very seriously the adoption of this amendment. It has a good purpose and it should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate at this late stage in the consideration of this measure to trespass upon the time of the Committee. I think it should be said, however, that the debate on this bill has been thorough; it has been of high quality; it has been energetic and at times controversial. I think nevertheless it is fair to state that it has not been sectional and it has not been partisan. Those who have supported the bill have proceeded upon the theory that what is good for any great section of the country is good for the country as a whole.

It has been pointed out over and over again that this bill had the support of the previous administration, and it has the support of the present administration. It has passed the Senate by a sizable majority; it has wide, substantial bipartisan support in the House.

Without adding a partisan flavor to this debate, I think I can say to my colleagues on my side of the aisle that the development of the upper Colorado is consistent with the long and proud record of Democratic Congresses which have lent their support to the development of the great water and soil re-

sources of all sections of the country. In the 1952 Democratic platform, the following specific pledge was made to the American people:

The Democratic Party is dedicated to a continuation of the natural resources development policy inaugurated and carried out under the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and to the extension of that policy to all parts of the Nation—North, South, East, Midwest, West, and the Territories—to the end that the Nation and its people receive maximum benefits from these resources to which they have an inherent right.

Our party has supported the development of the Tennessee Valley, the Pacific Northwest, New England, the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys, and the great projects in the lower Colorado region. We have supported the conservation of our soil and water resources in every State in the Union. We have favored consistently the development of all of our natural resources and their full utilization for the benefit of all the people of our country.

It has been suggested that the development of the upper Colorado will add to the burdensome farm surpluses which now depress farm prices. The amendment to which the committee has agreed renders that argument moot. Personally, I doubt that any such amendment is necessary. With our expanding population and with the ever improving diet of the American people, the question of surpluses can only be a temporary one. The fact that surpluses exist today is no argument that there will be surpluses 5 years from today. Within the last 5 or 6 years we have seen surpluses come and go. It was only 5 or 6 years ago that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Defense were calling upon farmers to increase their production of wheat, cotton, corn, and other agricultural products and to reach unprecedented goals. It was only 5 or 6 years ago that the cotton supply situation was such that an embargo was placed upon the exportation of cotton from the United States. It was only 5 or 6 years ago that farmers and stockmen were being encouraged to increase their cattle production. I recall very well that at that time the Office of Price Stabilization was undertaking to roll back the price of beef. My colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture will recall that our greatest problems at the beginning of the Korean war were those which related to efforts on the part of the administration to hold down the prices of farm products and to encourage farmers to increase their harvests.

The principle of the soil bank recommended by the Department of Agriculture and many others is not simply one of reducing the surpluses of today, but of preparing for the shortages of tomorrow. The great undeveloped West is the greatest soil bank in America. The diet and health standards of future Americans require us to initiate the long-term development of the upper Colorado region now.

The committee has done an excellent job in working out the controversial features of this measure in eliminating Echo Park Dam and in strengthening and improving the bill generally. I urge my colleagues to support the committee substitute and on final passage to vote for the bill as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On Monday of this week, the Secretary of Agriculture sent to the House Committee on Agriculture the administration's farm program. It is now available as a Committee Print; that is, the administration farm program. I was able to obtain a copy of it only yesterday and I regret that I did not recall one provision in the bill when I had the floor a few moments ago. That is my reason for taking the floor now. It is to point out that in the administration farm bill, corn is removed as a basic commodity.

The amendment adopted a few minutes ago applies only to basic commodities. This simply means that if the administration's farm program becomes law, and corn is dropped from the list of basic commodities, the principal feed grain crop in Iowa will have no protection whatever under the amendment.

This administration on one hand supports legislation calling for the taking of land out of production in the Middlewest and on the other hand supports this legislation that will put vast areas into production. And adoption of this 10-year amendment is the worst kind of a sop to those who come from the great corn-growing areas.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR as a substitute for the committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in order to provide for the development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and maintain a dam in or near Glen Canyon, Ariz., together with a powerplant, incidental works, and necessary main transmission lines to load centers, hereinafter referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam project: *Provided*, That as part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument and (2) to make the net revenues collected in the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam project available to the States of the upper Colorado River basin to construct irrigation projects as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the upper Colorado River Basin fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'basin fund'), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act shall be credited to the basin fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam project shall be credited to the basin fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Glen Canyon Dam project, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts, and (2) expenditure as authorized by subsection (d) of this section.

"(d) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be made available to the States of the upper Colorado River Basin for the exclusive use in constructing whatever irrigation projects (including incidental power generating and transmission facilities) that the States may choose to construct or have constructed within their respective boundaries: *Provided*, That the revenues in the Basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River Basin, to wit: 46 percent to the State of Colorado; 17 percent to the State of New Mexico; 21.5 percent to the State of Utah; and 15.5 percent to the State of Wyoming: *Provided further*, That whenever a State of the upper Colorado River Basin no longer is able to use for the construction of irrigation projects the revenues in the Basin Fund available to it, such revenues shall be returned to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(e) The several States shall submit annual business-type budgets to the Secretary of the Interior reflecting the expenditures of revenues made available to the States from the Basin Fund for the construction of irrigation projects.

"SEC. 3. The only limitation on the use of the revenues from the basin fund by the several States of the upper Colorado River Basin shall be that the revenues must be expended for the construction of irrigation projects. The Secretary of the Interior shall have no authority to designate which irrigation projects shall be built with the use of revenues from the basin fund, nor shall he have any discretion to withhold funds for the construction of any irrigation projects that the several States of the upper Colorado River Basin or each of them may choose to construct or have constructed.

"SEC. 4. The entire cost of constructing the Glen Canyon Dam project shall be nonreimbursable, but operation and maintenance costs shall be paid from revenues from the sale of power generated by the project, as provided in section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 5. No dam, irrigation project or incidental unit thereof may be constructed pursuant to authority of this act, or with revenues made available by this act, by the Secretary of the Interior, or any State or subdivision thereof, within the boundaries of a national park or monument.

"SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the Glen Canyon Dam project, the Secretary of the Interior shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the application of the Federal reclamation laws to the construction, operation, or maintenance of irrigation projects constructed in the upper Colorado River Basin pursuant to this act.

"SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with the other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River Compact, the upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said acts without the consent of the other contracting parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Glen Canyon Dam project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law.

"SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 9. Before any money is appropriated for the construction of the storage units, powerplants or participating projects named in this act, or any construction work done or contracted for, the Secretary of the Interior shall make provision for revenues by contract, in accordance with the provisions of this act, adequate in his judgment to insure payment of all expenses of operation and maintenance of said works incurred by the United States and the repayment within 50 years from the date of the completion of said works, or all amounts advanced under this act for such works, together with interest thereon made reimbursable under this act.

"SEC. 10. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provision of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits. Consent is also given to the joinder of the United States as a party if suit is brought against any State or subdivision thereof because of the construction, operation or maintenance of any project constructed pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 11. Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country.

"SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $421,270,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, some Members on the Republican side of the aisle said yesterday that they certainly felt that, since the lower basin had been given a great many advantages in the years gone by, it was entirely unfair to vote against the improvement of the upper basin. Therefore, I have offered a substitute which, I think, will more than amply take care of the upper basin.

You have had the proponents of this legislation tell you just how good it is, just how much it will pay back, even though they have formulas which have never before been used in any reclamation project. The proponents have figures which will extend it until your great grandchildren will never see the end of it, and they try to tell you it will not cause a drain upon the United States Treasury and that it will all be paid back.

They have come up with some fantastic figures and shown you some tremendous charts indicating that all this money that is going to be used will come out of the reclamation fund, and that some of the Western States produce it. This is the first time that I have ever known that the public lands in the Western States belonged to those Western States. I certainly believe it is about time, if that is the case, that some of the folks on my right change their tune about the giveaway, because they belong to the Western States. Therefore, since they belong to the Western States, my amendment is a bigger giveaway outside of foreign aid than anybody else has ever heard tell of.

This amendment offers to the for upper basin States the sum of $421,270,000 from the United States Treasury without the upper basin States being obliged to pay back 1 penny. I do this because I do not believe this project will ever pay back 1 penny to the United States Treasury, so the cheapest thing for the United States to do is to give them an outright grant. This amendment provides that they can build without returning a cent all of the facilities that are necessary for the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam and the power facilities in conjunction with it.

This amendment further provides that you can take all of the revenues from here on into perpetuity that are to be produced by hydroelectric power, and build all of the facilities that each of the upper basin States desire until they have the full utilization of the waters allocated to the upper basin. I am willing to accept the upper basin division of the revenues. Then they can build anything in the upper basin that they want to.

The one thing my amendment provides which they will not like, and which I say tests their sincerity, is that they cannot come back to the Treasury of the United States, they cannot come back to the Congress and ask for 1 more penny to develop the upper basin.

I defy anyone here to show, outside of foreign aid, where any State or States have received for reclamation such a proposition as I now offer, but I feel certain that, as I saw in the committee when I offered this same amendment, we will find united action by the upper basin saying "they do not want it."

They do not want it because they know the upper basin project is no good. They know that the industry feature cannot pay out. They know that they cannot even build Glen Canyon Dam. They know that all of the engineering features that have been talked about and the tremendous amount of engineering that has been done has been done at a place known as Mile Four or exactly 4 miles above Lee Ferry. And what the Bureau of Reclamation discovered there at Mile Four is that the type of strata that is found in that area is not sufficient upon which to build a dam. They cannot build a dam there so they moved up the Colorado River 11 miles. Now they are up to Mile Fifteen. It was only because some of the men down at the Bureau know that this project cannot be built and that they cannot build a high dam at Glen Canyon, they came to members of the committee and gave us these facts. Then we asked the Bureau of Reclamation, and they reluctantly admitted they could not build a dam at Mile Four. So, I tell you, my amendment challenges the good faith of the people of the upper basin to accept from the taxpayers of America the biggest gift ever given, and I feel certain that within a very short time you shall hear the representatives of the Upper Basin States stand up and tell you why they should not accept this gift.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. There is no doubt but that the gentleman's proposal would be a great saving to the Federal Government, but how does the gentleman expect that his proposal will be accepted by the Western States when, for instance, there is an implied agreement to come back to the Congress to appropriate something like $5 million more for the Arizona Central irrigation project? That is all a part of this agreement. Now how do you expect the gentleman from the West to accept your very modest proposal?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am only applying this to the upper basin States. We defeated the central Arizona project a couple of years ago. I feel that if this goes through, both gentlemen from Arizona should come forward and offer a new bill because if we are going to pass this bill, and if we are going to start this giveaway, then members of the Committee, we might as well give the whole thing away in the central Arizona project and the Frying Pan-Arkansas project.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is a very distinguished lawyer and a member of the Pennsylvania bar. I would like to ask the gentleman if he really believes that his amendment is constitutional?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am satisfied that it is constitutional. If we can give money away to other nations, actually there is nothing in the Constitution that I know of that prevents the United States from giving to any four of the States of the Union amounts such as this.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Does the gentleman have any evidence, or does he really believe that Arizona has any ax to grind in this matter, or that this has anything really to do with the project in Arizona.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am satisfied that Arizona has a lot to do with it. Arizona, in my opinion, has been negligent in its position in the past and I do not base that upon the gentleman's action, but from other people who have lived in that State.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that if the Government's claim for basic water rights for the Indians is upheld that the State of Arizona has more than a million acre feet estimated allotment to be given to Arizona under the basic Indian rights in addition to that which it already has under the pact?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. So I would say to our friends from Arizona who beat their breasts and say, "We have nothing to gain from this contest," that they might be questioned on that point.

Mr. SAYLOR. I think they have a great deal to gain from this contest.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

I suggest that this is the most disagreeable thing that has been presented before this body in connection with the debate on this bill. We do not ask for any handouts. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why some of the Members do not understand our desires and motives. They do not understand that we desire to pay our own way through our contribution to the Federal economy, the same as those other regions which have been developed.

The gentleman proposes that the Federal Government would give a grant of money which, compounded by the formula used by the gentleman from southern California, would amount to $20 or $30 billion in 100 years and in 200 years to the enormous sum of $48 billion. The West is not asking for that sort of Federal help in order to develop its contribution to the Federal economy.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman agree that the sole purpose of this amendment is to make this bill so bad that he hopes someone will vote it down?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman from Utah understands the author of this bill, he will know that the author would vote against the bill if the substitute of the gentleman from Pennsylvania were adopted.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to correct one misapprehension. Several misapprehensions have been created here today. The 1 million acre-feet of water which the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] spoke about as coming to Arizona, of course he had reference to some possibility that might occur in a lawsuit of the State of Arizona versus the State of California. It was offered simply as a smokescreen. It has nothing to do with the merits of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course the gentleman knows that if the contention of Arizona is upheld it will affect the whole problem of the flow of the river, not only the water that will be impounded in the lower dam but the water that will be impounded in the upper dam, because that water will have to flow down to the Indians. It would have an effect on the compact. It would affect Arizona and all the other States involved.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman offered his previous bit of information as an effort to show there was some conspiracy between the States of the West. My only reason for taking the floor was to disabuse his mind of any possibility of that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would not use the word "conspiracy." I recognize the right of the gentleman from Arizona to press his contention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I know that the proponents and sponsors of this bill to build the Colorado River storage project are colleagues of mine who are sincere in every way. Their purpose and their integrity are unquestioned. The distinguished gentlemen from Utah [Mr. DAWSON and Dr. DIXON] and the distinguished gentlemen from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL and Mr. ROGERS] are estimable in every way. They are doing the thing they believe to be right in behalf of their own areas. I am sure that they are no less dedicated and high-minded than those who are opposed to this project.

Therefore, I trust that in these words which I am going to use, none of my colleagues will feel that I am transgressing the bounds of either friendship or legislative justification.

This House is now considering one of the most expensive but least economic water-resource projects ever acted on by any Congress. This is the proposed series of multipurpose dams and irrigation units in the upper Colorado River Basin, known as the Colorado River storage project.

The main concerted opposition to this project has come from two unrelated groups and for entirely different reasons. Water users in the lower Colorado River area, particularly those in California, oppose the project for fear it will cause a reduction in the Colorado River water supply available to them. Numerous conservation groups have voiced their opposition on the grounds that some construction would destroy the scenic beauty of Dinosaur National Monument. A part of this opposition apparently has been relieved by the elimination of a certain portion of the entire construction.

These are good reasons, I assume, why those two groups should be vitally interested in the construction of this project.

However, it seems to me that there are good reasons why people broadly as a group should question the wisdom of the Federal Government embarking on this project. These reasons are economic and I believe get broadly at the question of whether or not this is a matter in the best interests of the entire country. From all the facts I have obtained, there is no other public-power project in the history of this country that will be so expensive per unit of power as the upper Colorado.

The cost of producing current will be 4½ times as much as that produced on the Columbia River, and 3 to 4 times as much as the current produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Senate bill called for a total expenditure of $1,650,000,000. The House appropriation calls for roughly half that amount. However, even the proponents admit that the ultimate cost of this project must be approximately the outlay as set out by the Senate. It does not appear that this overall project can function without the various participating projects included in the Senate bill, but not included in the House bill. This merely means we are postponing the appropriation of approximately another $800 million until such time as the additional projects become absolutely necessary.

In reading the Senate report, I find that the entire cost of the municipal-power feature of the project, plus interest during the construction and payout period, will be returned to the Treasury. However, pursuant to reclamation law, no interest will be charged against irrigation costs. This interest will, of course, be a direct subsidy to the water users, paid for by the taxpayers. The cost of irrigation investment will be $305 million in the administration's proposed project. The Department of the Interior computed that the interest over the 60-year period would be $1,153,000,000.

This calculation is at 2½ percent compounded annually and assumes a final payoff of construction costs for irrigation in the year 2032. This amount is $335 million more than the construction cost of the entire project, including the hydroelectric and municipal water facilities as well as the irrigation, of course. If the upper Colorado project should be further expanded to include the 21 actually approved units as is contemplated in Senate 500, the construction costs of the irrigated units will be $908 million. The interest which the Government would have to pay on that amount would total at least $3,429,000,000 by the time the irrigated units are paid for by power revenues and water users.

From this you can see that the tremendous penalty is being paid for by the Federal Government in the form of interest in the ensuing 60 years.

EVENTUAL COST WILL PROBABLY BE MUCH HIGHER THAN NOW ESTIMATED

A report of a special subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee dated December 5, 1952, shows that the total cost of all Bureau of Reclamation projects, except the Missouri River Basin program, had increased 106 percent as of 1952 from the estimates originally submitted to Congress. The 1952 estimated cost of the Missouri Basin program had risen 274 percent from the figure used at the time it was approved by Congress. Similarly, the Department of the Interior figures show that 182 projects had increased in cost by 124 percent from the date they were originally considered by Congress.

Price changes accounted for about 30 percent of the increased cost of reclamation projects, while project modifications and other factors accounted for the balance.

POSSIBILITY OF PROJECT PAYING FOR ITSELF QUESTIONED

Suppose that the project can be built within the estimated cost, will this project pay for itself? If the power can be sold over the years at the relatively high cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour at the bus bar, it will take 78 years from the time construction is started to pay off all construction costs. This, of course, does not include interest.

The private electric companies in the upper Colorado River area have expressed a willingness to purchase power from the project to the extent that it is made available at costs reasonably competitive with present or future generating costs. However, in their statement, these electric companies made a reservation that says the upper Colorado River Basin "is one of the greatest sources of thermal energy production to be found anywhere in the world." Underground there are vast deposits of coal, great reservoirs of oil and natural gas, and mountains of oil shale and deposits of uranium ores.

The extent of these great resources for the production of thermal energy in the area is a sound reason in itself to question whether power from the upper Colorado project will be feasible some years hence when the development of these resources is increased.

DOES THE AGRICULTURE POTENTIAL WARRANT THE IRRIGATION EXPENSE?

The projects actually authorized in the Senate bill would provide water for 132,360 acres of new land and would supplement 250,330 acres of irrigated land for a total irrigated acreage of 382,690. The $378 million construction cost of the irrigation facilities indicates an average cost of $952 per acre. This, of course, is without interest. If the ultimate interest cost of $1,428 million on the irrigation investment is added to the construction cost, the average cost per acre becomes $2,142.

There are 12 authorized participating projects in the Colorado River storage project as passed in S. 500. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the cost per acre for irrigated land in the 12 authorized projects be printed in the RECORD:

Project	New land irrigated (acres)	Supplemental land (acres)		Total acres irrigated (2 plus 3)	Total acres irrigated equivalent new land (2 plus 4)	Construction costs allocated to irrigation (report, p. 187)	Average project cost per acre (report, p. 187)	Cost per acre on equivalent new land acre basis
		Actual	New land equivalent					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1. LaBarge	7,970			7,970	7,970	$1,673,300	$210	$210
2. Seedskadee	60,720			60,720	60,720	23,272,000	383	383
3. Lyman		40,600	13,533	40,600	13,533	10,564,000	260	780
4. Silt	1,900	5,400	1,800	7,300	3,700	3,282,400	450	887
5. Smith Fork	2,270	8,160	2,720	10,430	4,990	3,343,000	321	670
6. Paonia	2,210	14,830	4,943	17,040	7,153	6,791,600	398	949
7. Florida	6,300	12,650	4,217	18,950	10,517	6,503,600	343	618
8. Pine River project extension	15,150			15,150	15,150	5,027,000	332	332
9. Emory County	3,630	20,450	6,817	24,080	10,447	9,636,500	400	922
10. Central Utah	28,540	131,840	43,947	160,380	72,487	127,354,000	794	1,757
11. Hammond	3,670			3,670	3,670	2,302,000	627	627
12. Gooseberry		16,400	5,467	16,400	5,467	5,727,500	349	1,047
Total	132,360	250,330	83,444	382,690	215,804	205,476,900	537	952

Mr. Chairman, this is the cost without adding any interest. The interest cost which will be borne by the Federal Government should be added to the cost of principal. I am applying the ratio of 1.25 for interest in order to be as fair as possible to the sponsors of this project. The construction cost is estimated for 10 years. The period of no interest is 10, plus 10, plus 50—or 70 years. If the interest is added, the cost of the irrigation of the authorized participating projects is as follows:

For the LaBarge project, $472 an acre.

For the Seedskadee project, $861 an acre.

For the Lyman project, $1,755 an acre.

For the Silt project, $1,995 an acre.

For the Smith Fork project, $1,507 an acre.

For the Paonia project, $2,135 an acre.

For the Florida project, $1,490 an acre.

For the Pine River project extension, $747 an acre.

For the Emery County project, $2,074 an acre.

For the Central Utah project, $3,953 an acre.

For the Hammond project, $1,411 an acre.

For the Gooseberry project, $2,355 an acre.

The grand average for the 12 projects is $2,142 an acre.

Mr. Chairman, I now wish to insert a table showing the cost per acre of the irrigated land projects, including interest, in these 12 projects. I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

La Barge	$210	× $1.25 =	$262.50 +	$210 = $472.50
Seedskadee	383	× 1.25 =	478.75 +	383 = 861.75
Lyman	780	× 1.25 =	975.00 +	780 = 1,755.00
Silt	887	× 1.25 =	1,108.75 +	887 = 1,995.75
Smith Fork	670	× 1.25 =	837.50 +	670 = 1,507.50
Paonia	949	× 1.25 =	1,186.25 +	949 = 2,135.25
Florida	618	× 1.25 =	872.50 +	618 = 1,490.50
Pine River project extension	332	× 1.25 =	415.00 +	332 = 747.00
Emery County	922	× 1.25 =	1,152.50 +	922 = 2,074.50
Central Utah	1,757	× 1.25 =	2,196.25 +	1,757 = 3,953.25
Hammond	627	× 1.25 =	783.75 +	627 = 1,410.75
Gooseberry	1,047	× 1.25 =	1,308.75 +	1,047 = 2,355.75
Total	952	× 1.25 =	1,190.00 +	952 = 2,142.00

I come from the State of Illinois. This is a rich agricultural area—especially through the middle portion of the State. Some of it is the most fertile land in the world. I have not heard of any land selling for more than $700 per acre.

The national average value per acre for farm land, including farm buildings, was $78.81 in March 1955, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. The Department statistics also show that about 20 million acres of presently unused lands east of the Rocky Mountain Plateau area can be reclaimed for a fraction of what it would cost per acre in the upper Colorado River basin.

I believe that all of the proposed irrigation projects are at an altitude greater than 1 mile. The one in Wyoming is as high as 7,500 feet. The winters there are long and cold and the growing season is quite short.

Based upon the above estimates the cost of this project to the people of the State of Illinois would be $261,975,600. This would, of course, include cost of construction and interest. This would represent a cost of about $170 per family to the people of the State of Illinois. A further breakdown indicates that the cost for each 150-acre farm irrigated through this project would be about $321,300.

Mr. Chairman, I herewith insert a table showing the cost to the individual States in the Colorado River storage project as authorized and contemplated in S. 500:

Cost to the States of the Colorado River storage project as authorized and contemplated in S. 500

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated			Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation			Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Alabama	0.93	$10,164,900	$13,280,400	$15,354,300	$31,889,700	New Hampshire	0.27	$2,951,100	$3,855,600	$4,457,700	$9,258,300
Arizona	.41	4,481,300	5,854,800	6,769,100	14,058,900	New Jersey	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
Arkansas	.48	5,246,400	6,854,400	7,924,800	16,459,200	New Mexico	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
California	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,000	152,222,200	316,153,800	New York	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
Colorado	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900	North Carolina	1.38	15,083,400	19,706,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
Connecticut	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200	North Dakota	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Delaware	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000	Ohio	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,900	219,113,100
Florida	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300	Oklahoma	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Georgia	1.30	14,209,000	18,564,000	21,463,000	44,577,000	Oregon	.95	10,383,500	13,566,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Idaho	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400	Pennsylvania	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	258,203,700
Illinois	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,975,600	Rhode Island	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
Indiana	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500	South Carolina	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
Iowa	1.21	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900	South Dakota	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Kansas	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300	Tennessee	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Kentucky	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900	Texas	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Louisiana	1.09	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100	Utah	.34	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Maine	.38	4,153,400	5,426,400	6,273,800	13,030,200	Vermont	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
Maryland	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500	Virginia	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,800	50,749,200
Massachusetts	3.23	35,303,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700	Washington	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
Michigan	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,196,200	West Virginia	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Minnesota	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200	Wisconsin	2.05	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Mississippi	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400	Wyoming	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
Missouri	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200	District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc.	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Montana	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900						
Nebraska	.73	7,978,900	10,424,400	12,052,300	25,031,700						
Nevada	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400	Total	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000

You will note that in all my figures I am using the cost as allocated and set up in S. 500 rather than in the House bill. I have not found anyone yet who consistently states to me that the House project as set up will be feasible. In my opinion, if the Colorado River storage project is to be feasible and workable, it will be necessary to have the connecting projects set out in the Senate bill. This merely means we will be making supplemental appropriations for these projects until such time as the total cost reaches that set out in S. 500.

May I say to my colleagues, it is true small portions of the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming will benefit from the passage of this bill. These areas would receive 100 percent of the benefits of the proposed project. However, the four States combined would pay less than 2 percent of the added national tax burden. The taxpayers of the other 44 States would have to pay the balance, but would derive no benefits from the project itself.

The House bill which is being heard at this time will call for an expenditure of approximately one-half the amount which passed the Senate last year. However, it does not seem that any disguise of a smaller appropriation could make the project more palatable than the one passed by the Senate. This reduction alone will not transform the true character, nor revise the present cost aspects of the upper Colorado River storage project.

IS THIS PROJECT IN KEEPING WITH GOOD PUBLIC POLICY?

The policy set out by this bill appears to me to be one almost directly opposite to the present public policy of the Department of Agriculture insofar as production acres are concerned. When this irrigation project is completed there will be added approximately 400,000 acres to the productive capacity of the agricultural plant of the United States. A few days ago, the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before both the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture seeking approval of a far-reaching plan to remove somewhere between 20 and 40 million acres from the productive capacity of our agricultural plant. It is an impossibility for me to describe the opposite directions in which apparently we are going by such a plan as is proposed in the Colorado River storage project on irrigated productive acres.

In addition, how can we justify to the general public the additional acreage provided in this project at such enormous cost per acre as $2,355 an acre for the Gooseberry project, $3,593 an acre for the central Utah project, and a grand average for the 12 projects of $2,142 an acre? I realize that in many instances the Congress is forced to do things of which some people back home would not approve—all in the best interests of the entire country. However, I am asking at this time, if your people back home could have heard all of the debate thus far on this project, both for and against, how many votes do you think this project would receive from the people in your district? I believe I am conservative in saying that if all of the information were available to the general public that has been made available to me in this debate, this project would not receive the approval of 5 out of 100 people in the 22d Congressional District of Illinois. In talking with many other Congressmen, I believe their reaction has been almost the same as mine as to how people generally would feel about this project.

For the reasons which I have outlined, it appears to me that this project is not broadly in the interest of the United States, and for that reason it should not be enacted into law.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Does not the gentleman suppose the same thing would be true as to flood-control projects in Ohio in my district?

Is it not occasionally better for some of us to perhaps vote for what we consider the need of the whole country rather than that of some people in our district?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do. I think that is a fair statement of the gentleman from Utah. I will say that you gentlemen are worthy and your integrity is not in question. You stand for what you think is right. So do I. In this particular instance I do not believe this project is in the best interest of all of the country. That is just my own opinion based on the benefits to be received on the amount of money that is to be spent.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Does not the gentleman feel that the President of the United States is in a very good position to know the overall picture of this? Does not the gentleman give some credit to the President's opinion as expressed in his endorsement of yesterday?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do. It is a difficult thing to find myself at variance with my leader. I hate to have to disagree with him, on this project. I believe I have disagreed with him on three major issues in 3 years. I do disagree with him on this. I could not in good conscience support this project.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And is not the administration sponsoring a soil-fertility bank at the same time?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, but I do not know what connection that has with this.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman himself just mentioned that we were putting land into production.

Mr. SPRINGER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to the committee amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending substitute amendment and all amendments thereto end in 15 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from California advise me if that will give me at least 3 minutes?

Mr. ENGLE. I included the gentleman in my computation of time.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLE. I had included the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I will amend my request, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the substitute amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes following the time allotted to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I said in the opening days of this debate that the proponents of this legislation would show:

First. That it has bipartisan support. I am sure all of my colleagues recognize that this is now true. Incidently, it also has bipartisan opposition. That opposition in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was 20 to 5. The proponents carried the bill in the other body by a vote of almost 2 to 1.

Second. I promised to show the project had engineering feasibility. The opponents are attacking the feasibility and the capability of the engineers. The same engineers and department planned the Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams. They planned the great Imperial Irrigation District. Years of exhaustive work has shown the project to be feasible. The Chinle's rocks hoax has proven to be a Barnum & Bailey believe-it-or-not show. The Chinle's rock is 700 feet below the base of the dam. My colleague from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] demonstrated to you that the Chinle's rock as it appears in nature is no obstacle to the building of this dam. It does not dissolve in water as easily as opponents would want you to believe.

Third. I promised to show that it was economically feasible. More than two-thirds of the project repays all the money, with interest. There is a very small amount of flood control, all nonreimbursable funds. Economists have proven feasibility.

Fourth. We have shown that the so-called tax map has been a phoney. That the Tax Foundation of New York and Washington denied having anything to do with it. It was prepared by the Colorado River Association, with which the Tax Foundation has no connection. The foundation did not prepare these figures, which were prepared and published without their consent.

Fifth. Now as to surplus crops the committee will accept an amendment which handles those who worry about surplus crops. In fact very little surplus crops come from federally irrigated land.

Sixth. We have shown that the Indians will receive some direct help because it provides labor, it provides better economy.

Seventh. We have shown that the project will not cost from $4 to $8 billion as proclaimed by the opponents, but less than $800 million as indicated in this bill.

Eighth. We have shown that it does not irrigate 583,000 acres as the southern California lobby would make you believe, but approximately 132,000 acres of new land.

We have tried to show, my colleagues, that the Colorado River storage project is a well planned, economically sound water development project for a semi-desert portion of the country which needs water for various purposes. The project has been planned to reimburse through revenue from water and power which will be used and paid for by the residents of that area. Two-thirds of it at full interest and to meet the cost of operation and maintenance.

I am sure any objective legislator will recognize that the southern California water lobby stands to profit by millions of dollars if they succeed in defeating and delaying the developing of the four upper basin States water and power that was allocated to them in a solemn interstate compact effected nearly 25 years ago.

Ninth. We have shown that California will not lose one bucketful of water. In fact, it seems to me that by storing the water in these reservoirs, that the Southern States would be more assured of a water supply because the dams would hold back excess water that now runs to the Gulf of California, without being stored or used. With the water properly stored, it would assure the Southern States of the amount of water promised to them under the basin compact.

I trust, my colleagues, you will not be looking just at the effects of this project as of today, but thinking in terms of two hundred to three hundred million people who will be living in this country by the time this project is completed. They will need homes, jobs; and they will need food.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for conducting what I consider to be some of the most impartial hearings I have ever had the privilege of sitting in on. As a matter of fact, he gave the opposition equal time on every occasion. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the chairman of the subcommittee have been fair in every respect and certainly have the respect and high regard of every member of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and his committee have sold me on this bill. When this debate started I was inclined against it. Now I am supporting it.

I have been studying the voluminous material for and against this bill that has been pouring into my office. The statements of basic facts as to costs, feasibility, and so forth, have varied so widely that I have wondered whether the proponents and opponents were talking about the same project.

It turns out that this is no $4 billion project, but authorizes $760 million for a comprehensive plan for storing water for the upper basin of the Colorado River that will take many years to complete and will be 99 percent reimbursable as to principal and interest, except for the irrigation expenditure where principal alone is repayable, according to reclamation principles established since the time of President Theodore Roosevelt. Over half of the area of the four States is federally owned. The reclamation fund, during the 19 years of completion of the irrigation project, will take in from these 4 States in mineral royalties, sales, and leases, $150 million more than the $287 million to be spent on irrigation. Water is gold for these four States in the upper Colorado Basin. The lower States, especially California, have gotten their share of Colorado River water

through Hoover Dam and the other great Federal works. Under the seven-State compact, which is basic to this bill, the upper-basin States should now have a chance to store and use their share of the water.

In addition to electric power and municipal water use, irrigation will ultimately reclaim about 131,000 acres. We do not need these acres now, when we are talking of a soil bank. They will not be reclaimed now. They will be reclaimed over a period of 19 years or more. By that time our growing population will need those acres. By the amendment we adopted they cannot be used for raising crops in surplus for 10 years. By that time we will probably need whatever they can produce.

The more I learn of the possibilities of this project the more I appreciate why three Presidents and their administrations have backed it, why it is a part of President Eisenhower's program that he has urged in the last few days.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, in speaking in opposition to the substitute I want to point out that until the substitute was offered all of the revenues went into a basin fund out of which all of the expenses were paid. I want you to be sure you understand the substitute changes that situation; that all of the revenues go into a fund, the amount of moneys in the fund are split up in accordance with the allocation of water between these States, which makes a considerable difference in the ability of the projects to pay back because some of the authorized projects are not in monetary proportion to the allocation of water. Based on that, even assuming you could sell power for 6 mills for the next hundred years, I have here a calculation which shows that the deficit for Utah would amount to $82 million for the hundred years, for Wyoming the sum of $13 million, although there would be surpluses for Colorado and New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Reclamation has concluded: First, that a basin fund could be established providing Utah projects—including central Utah project—the necessary credits within its percentage allotment of 21.5 percent; and, second, credits in the basin fund would more than satisfy the requirements of the other participating projects proposed in H. R. 3383, in fact only one-third of those credits will be required to complete the repayment of all such projects. A purported detailed analysis in support of these conclusions was brought to light for the first time during debate on Tuesday.

It is my firm belief that these conclusions by the Bureau will never be proved in practice.

First. They are based on selling power at 6 mills until the year 2052 A. D., 96 years from now. I have explained elsewhere why this is an impossible assumption.

Second. Independent engineering studies by competent engineers in whom I have a great deal of confidence, based upon Bureau estimates of costs and revenues as submitted and of record in hearings on this legislation show quite to the contrary.

These studies show that under the repayment provisions and allocation of basin funds to the States as proposed in H. R. 3383, as amended:

First. The total excess revenues in the basin fund available for distribution to States for irrigation assistance over the 50-year repayment period prescribed would be $130 million.

Second. The total irrigation assistance needed for participating projects proposed for authorization would be over $170 million, indicating an overall deficit of $40 million.

Third. Colorado and New Mexico would be the only States that would have a surplus of credited basin funds under the allocation formula contained in the committee amendment.

Fourth. Utah with 21.5 percent allocation of basin funds, after allowance for additional credit of net power revenues derived from central Utah project, would have a deficit of $82 million in meeting the required 50-year repayment on projects in that State.

Fifth. If all 34 participating projects named in the bill were authorized, net revenues in the basin fund in a 50-year period would be deficient by over $400 million in meeting the irrigation assistance required and would likewise be deficient in each of the States under the proposed percentage allocation.

Sixth. Even assuming Bureau estimates of costs and revenues as set forth in an unpublished special study dated December 6, 1955—which were materially altered from those previously submitted and of record in the hearings, particularly in increasing power revenue estimates—the independent studies show (a) that the irrigation assistance available from the basin fund to Utah under the 21.5 percent allocation proposed and from central Utah project revenues would be only about three-fourths of the amount required for Utah projects authorized in the bill and (b) that there would be a deficit in each of the four States if all 34 projects named in H. R. 3383 were authorized, with an overall deficit of $167 million.

These independent studies demonstrate that the repayment provisions of H. R. 3383 as amended are unsound and unworkable and would not provide repayment as claimed. Furthermore, the companion provision in the bill for 100 year repayment of the power investment is totally unrealistic and unsound.

Even if the original construction cost of the overall project were to be repaid over a 100-year period, which is very doubtful to say the least, the hidden Federal subsidy that would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers in accumulated interest charges on the funds advanced for construction would be at least $4 billion. Such a Federal subsidy cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination.

These computations and conclusions are based upon the estimates of total power investment and net power revenues contained in the trial studies of the USBR dated December 6, 1955. Those trial studies pertain to the Senate bill, S. 500, but with the apparent modification of assuming in place of the 940,000 acre-foot Curecanti Reservoir with single powerplant, a substitute comprising not only that powerplant but three other downstream powerplants. Apparently the power investment and revenues in the December 6 trial studies were estimated on the basis of such modification.

The computations upon which I rely were based upon the estimates of total power investment and net annual power revenues heretofore used in studies by the Colorado River Board of California, a State agency. The figures apply to a project which would include the single Curecanti Reservoir of 940,000 acre-feet and the single powerplant of that unit.

The following is a breakdown of these calculations to obtain estimate net revenues from the basin fund of $130 million available for irrigation assistance:

Irrigation assistance available to upper basin States under new version of H. R. 3383, amended by committee, Feb. 8, 1956

Power investment, including interest during construction: Glen Canyon Flaming Gorge Curecanti, and Central Utah	$582,421,000
Net annual power revenues (4 units) after 8th year	$20,500,000
If all net power revenues were applied to power investment, it would be paid in years	50
If interest on power investment only was paid during irrigation repayment period, and final power payment was made in year 100, net power revenues could be applied to irrigation repayment for years	50
Net power revenues above O. M. and R. for first 50 years	$913,760,000
Simple interest on power investment for 50 years at 2½ percent	$651,360,000
Available for irrigation repayment	$262,400,000
Irrigation allocations of 4 storage units [1]	124,590,000
Available for repayment of participating projects	137,810,000
Central Utah power revenues available for CVP irrigation allocation in 50 years ($71,400,000 revenues, $62,965,000 interest) [2]	8,435,000
"Excess" revenues available for distribution to States for irrigation assistance	$129,375,000

[1] Glen Canyon, Curecanti (single dam), Flaming Gorge, Navaho. Data from House hearings on H. R. 3383 and H. Rept. No. 1087.

[2] Assuming total investment applicable for 46 years, arbitrarily.

Say $130 million.

The following is a breakdown showing how and wherein under the provision

of the committee's substitute, these revenues would be inadequate to pay for projects in Utah and Wyoming, the deficit being the total sum of $32,489,900:

Comparison of irrigation assistance needed with that available under new version of H. R. 3383 (100-year payout)

[Dollar units]

Item	Colorado	Utah	Wyoming	New Mexico	Total
1. Percentage allotment of excess revenues	46.0	21.5	15.5	17.0	100.0
2. Irrigation assistance from excess revenues	59,800,000	28,000,000	20,100,000	22,100,000	130,000,000
3. Additional irrigation assistance	0	[1] 8,000,000	0	0	8,000,000
4. Total irrigation assistance available	59,800,000	36,000,000	20,100,000	22,100,000	138,000,000
5. Total irrigation assistance needed	256,039,600	121,437,000	64,128,000	97,592,100	539,196,700
6. Irrigation assistance needed for H. R. 3383 projects	16,586,900	118,084,500	33,761,300	2,057,200	170,489,900
7. Ratio of total need to total available (5÷4)	4.28	3.37	3.19	4.42	3.91
8. Ratio of H. R. 3383 need to total available (6÷4)	0.277	3.28	1.68	0.093	1.24
9. Excess assistance for H. R. 3383 projects (4—6)	43,213,100	—82,084,500	—13,661,300	20,042,800	—32,489,900
10. Deficiency of assistance for projects listed by USBR in trial studies of Dec. 6, 1955 (5—4)	196,239,600	85,437,000	44,028,000	75,492,100	401,196,700

[1] From Central Utah project power revenues.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 3383. There have been many good reasons expressed here today why the upper Colorado bill is unsound and should not be passed. I wish to add my voice to this opposition and point out one particular phase of the legislation which is a good example of the bill's general unsoundness.

The legislation contains a provision for a project for the benefit of Navaho Indians in New Mexico. Whenever any aid is proposed for the Navahos, it is always greeted with rejoicing because of the poor conditions under which they live.

The bill we are debating would provide irrigated farms for some 1,100 Navaho Indian families at a cost per farm of $200,000 according to witnesses from the Bureau of Indian Affairs who testified on the subject. These witnesses stated that the gross income per family farm would be about $5,000 a year. It is easy to see that the interest charges alone on this invetsment of $200,000 per farm would, at 2½ percent, equal the gross farm income. It seems to me that less expensive methods could be found to provide for these Indians. We constantly urge that it is not in the best interest of Indians to hold them in a second class citizenship status but in this bill we are providing a Government dole of $200,000 per farm for which all Americans will have to pay. Testimony at the committee hearings was also adduced to the effect that there is grave doubt as to whether the Indians want to farm irrigated land or whether they could succeed as farmers of such irrigated land.

I urge all present to defeat this extravagant legislation.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, this is a fundamental question. It is a question whether we can in all good conscience pour out the taxpayers' money entrusted to us for a proposition that has never become clear.

I include in the RECORD a quotation from Raymond Moley's Case Against Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects:

A TRUE PARTNERSHIP

There is a strange claim by some proponents of the Colorado River storage project that they are supporting a partnership plan such as has been advanced as an administration policy in the Northwest. There is no resemblance at all. The party of the first part, the Federal Government, is paying for the entire project and is constructing it. The parties of the second part supply the arid land. I favor, with the President's Cabinet Committee and with the earlier report of the Hoover Commission, a true sharing of the responsibilities in this project.

I have never contended and do not contend now that the four States in the upper basin are not entitled to the share of the water of the Colorado and its tributaries which was specified in the Colorado River Compact. Nor do I deny that the Federal Government should build the means to store that water when needed. For the Federal Government by long prescription has assumed the responsibility of regulating the flow of interstate rivers. But this does not mean that the Government should build huge storage dams unless and until needed for water conservation and regulation.

Beyond that, I do not believe the Federal Government has an obligation. The power companies of the region which offered their testimony to the effect that there was a market—at a price—for the power should finance the power aspects of the storage dams themselves and dispose of the power where such storage dams can be justified. That is exactly what the Eisenhower-McKay partnership policy means, as illustrated by the proposed John Day Dam on the Columbia River.

Moreover, those cities which are in need of water for domestic purposes should provide the means of getting the water from the storage reservoirs. Finally, those industrial companies which are in the area and which are now so eagerly seeking subsidized water, should provide the means of getting the water for themselves. In short, the Federal Government should provide storage for the water as needed, and the users should go and get it. This would be true of the irrigators who are in need of supplementary supplies and those people—unnamed—who are anxious to try their fortunes on new irrigated land. This could be done through the States concerned if—and this if it is very large indeed—the bestowal of water will indeed produce the wealth which proponents of this project claim. So far as the Navaho Indians are concerned, surely a Government which has been engaged for a century or more in caring for and regulating the life of these natives can provide a less expensive way to make them self-reliant than to set them up on farms at a cost to the taxpayer of $200,000 a family.

THE ISSUE IN MORALS AND EQUITY

If the issue were a simple matter of taking from rich States and giving to poor States, there might be a case despite the financial, engineering, and economic factors which I have mentioned. But these are not needy States. Their potential wealth is considerable, and their well-being is reflected in all that they pay for the benefit of the outside world. On the basis of per-capita income, they rank with the average among the States.

There is, moreover, a final consideration. It can be shown that the propaganda of the Federal Government for reclamation has in innumerable cases imposed a cruel hoax upon the farmers who attempt to cultivate the land. Indeed, the progressive lengthening of the payment period from 10 years in 1902 to 20 years in 1914 to 40 years in 1926 to 50 years in 1939 has been in response to the cries of distress of the unfortunate farmers and their congressional representatives. Since I have been writing about this subject over the past 2 years, I have received pathetic letters from farmers whose state of affairs has progressively turned to the worse. Despite the immense amount per acre that it takes to put water on arid land, the cultivation of that land and the management of the irrigation itself is a heavy burden upon the farmer. It is time to play fair with these farmers, as well as with the taxpayers of the 44 States in whose interest this discussion of the Colorado River storage project has been written.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the committee has had a very fine debate in the last several days and quite in conformity with the historic traditions of the House. We have been debating a problem that is not new to America. There is nothing new or revolutionary about what is proposed here today.

Conservation of water, reclamation, and irrigation are all topics that have been before the American people constantly since they were strenuously advocated by Theodore Roosevelt. We have a right as a nation to conserve the water of our country; we have a right to protect the people of the country from water shortages and from damages through water. These are related functions of the Federal Government. A nation without vision perishes. We must have vision if we are going to go forward to the destiny which I believe will be that of the American Republic. This projects the vision of a people who are planning for a better future.

Now let us look at the bill that we have before us today, a bill that I believe is going to be an important factor in the upbuilding of 4 or 5 of the great States of the Union. And, may I say here that merely relying on the opposition to a proposal by a single State is not

well founded. The common good must come first. We are all citizens of this one country; we are all part of the United States of America. No part of the country can be benefited without all the rest of the country sharing in the benefits. We are all here together in America; we go up together or we will go down together. Let us plan to go up together.

This particular measure has had a great deal of opposition in the past. I want to repeat that there is no Echo Park Dam in this legislation. That legislation has been removed, and we have the promise of the managers on the part of the House they will not permit it to be reinserted. And certainly those of us who are here have the power of veto if for any reason it should be reinserted. I mean by that, to vote down that conference report when it comes here, and I am confident that would be the verdict. Therefore, we need not fear that Echo Dam will be inserted in the conference report.

The cost of this project is small when you consider the tremendous value that will come out of it. Only 1 percent of the building cost is nonreimbursable. There is no interest in the reclamation part of the bill, as is the case in all reclamation projects. There is no heavy drain upon a country. Most of the expenditure will eventually come back to the Treasury, and we will have reclaimed a great national asset.

And let me comment right here and say to those who fear the further accentuation of the problem of surpluses that this will not happen. We have written into this bill an amendment which says that no new land may be brought into cultivation within 10 years, and there are those who believe that in the normal course of events it will take at least 20 years before new land can come into cultivation. This eliminates any immediate effect upon surpluses. My friends, may I say that while we are troubled with surpluses now our country is going forward in the future with such tremendous leaps and bounds in population the time may well come when we will want more land in cultivation so that we can feed the population who dwell in the great cities. This could be farsighted planning without any immediate harm.

One word more. This is an integral part of the program of President Eisenhower. It is part of the program that is dear to his heart, a part of the essential program that he seeks for the American people. In conclusion, let us not forget that in passing this resolution we enact legislation that will be of tremendous benefit to the four States who need a little shot in the arm from the Government so that they can face the future with hope and anticipation. You hear some talk about the workingman not sharing in this investment. Why, my friends, the money that will go for the purchase of machinery, tools, and equipment is not confined to any one State of the Union. All 48 States will in some way benefit by this program. I repeat, we all benefit by the starting of this great conservation program.

To my Republican friends I want to particularly ask that you support the President of the United States. He has given a program to the American people. This is part of his program, and we should give him a fair chance to fulfill his desire. Let us give these Mountain States a chance to live, and let us uphold the proposal of the President of the United States.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of 1 of the 44 States not receiving any direct benefit from the upper Colorado River project, I want to take this opportunity to explain my vote in support of this legislation which I deem of vital importance to all America.

Although I have been elected from 1 of 23 congressional districts in Ohio, I do not believe I was sent to Washington to support projects and legislation which would be of tangible value and usefulness only to the people of my district. While the immediate needs of the people of my district are vitally important, I know that they would be anxious to support national projects which are vitally important to the Nation as a whole. The people of my community know full well that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway improvements are of direct benefit only to those States which abut the Great Lakes, and that tremendous sums of money have been appropriated over the years by Congress for the improvement of the Great Lakes Seaway system. This legislation of necessity was supported by communities remote and distant from any direct advantage.

I support the Colorado River storage project because it is an important national improvement. The legislation as now designed eliminates any damage or interference with our national park system. The improvement will open a large four-State area for agriculture, comfortable habitation, and more efficient mining and industry. True, some industry and some people may be lured from Ohio and perhaps the community which I represent to make their homes in this newly developed area, but this area is just as much America as the precincts which I represent. Water, power, and a wholly changed landscape in the four affected States will enrich and improve the American productive plant. To complain about the threat this new productive area will become to other producing areas of agricultural or industrial products would be a narrow, provincial and an un-American viewpoint.

Although it is true that the new land to be developed by the project would be high-altitude land and therefore of limited agricultural value, it would nevertheless be usable land, producing grains and forage crops. Today, in view of our agricultural surplus and the proposal to retire excessive lands in a land bank, there is considerable criticism of developing new agricultural land when the country abounds in agricultural surpluses. It is my opinion that the current agricultural surpluses are a temporary condition which could radically change, particularly in view of the drastic increase in our population and the tremendous migration of people from rural areas to urban centers.

To create an abundance of agricultural products is to be provident. To create an abundance of agricultural land in a growing Nation is to be provident. If we should risk error, it seems to me that the risk should be made on the side of providence rather than improvidence. There is a greater security in an economy of abundance than any other I know about.

Personally, I believe fresh water to be America's most prized natural resource. In this bountiful land, I believe it not only wasteful but almost sinful to permit lifegiving fresh water to evaporate on the sands of the desert or find its way to the sea. In our times we may yet see projects to accumulate, save, and distribute the tremendous fresh waters of our Great Lakes for agricultural as well as industrial production. With a proper distribution of the fresh water reserves of America, the whole face of the continent may be changed and with it the entire climate of the Nation might be affected. With the tremendous contemplated increase in human life, there must naturally be an increase in animal and vegetable life. Almost as important, there must be a comparable development of habitable space. While our people are becoming more and more urban, they have not lost their respect for open space and the average family has manifested its desire for the convenience and the comfort of urban living on a 2-acre parcel. The newly developed lands of the Colorado Basin in this project will provide space in which more Americans may have comfortable living. This new space will contribute in a great measure to lessening the pressures in our cities and urban communities. America is vast but its people have spread to all of its boundaries. The pressure of growing populations on habitable soil is increasing throughout the world. Under our democratic system and in view of the principles in which we believe, we cannot spread our people into the lands of other nations. Our only alternative in the democratic way is to make America larger by developing the land within our own boundaries.

The cost of this project is great and certainly is more costly than numerous other reclamation projects which have preceded it. It is in the recognition of this point that earlier reclamation projects have preceded this one. It is national experience that the cost of these improvement projects goes ever upward. If therefore this Colorado River project is for the good of all America, it is in the interest of economy that we undertake it at the earliest practicable date rather than defer it to a higher-cost period.

So therefore, when I support this great and important project with my vote today, I do so not only for the people who live in my district today but for their successors who may be dependent upon the resources of this great area for their national defense, for minerals, for agricultural products or perhaps for open living space. I cast this vote looking ahead for those who must follow us on this shrinking land on which we live. I support this important project not only for the food that this new land can provide or its minerals or the products of the industry that may develop, but also for the space land which people will require in comfortable modern life.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentlemen on this committee and those in charge of this bill, especially the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for their careful study of this measure. These two men have been fair, patient, honest, and very considerate in all of the hearings, not only on this important matter but all others.

These gentlemen and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and other members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee assisted us in securing passage of the Washita Basin Improvement Association project. We Oklahoma Members desiring to be helpful in this instance, have enlisted the support of several other Members for this Colorado project in appreciation of the favors extended us.

We urge a favorable vote on this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 311, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting]. One hundred and seventy-two Members are present; not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 136, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS 256

Adair	Fisher	Morrison
Addonizio	Fjare	Moss
Albert	Flood	Moulder
Andersen, H. Carl	Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.
Andresen, August H.	Forand	Natcher
Andrews	Ford	Nicholson
Arends	Forrester	Norblad
Aspinall	Frazier	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Fulton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Avery	Gathings	O'Hara, Minn.
Ayres	George	O'Neill
Baker	Gordon	Ostertag
Baldwin	Grant	Passman
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Patman
Bass, Tenn.	Griffiths	Patterson
Bates	Gubser	Pelly
Beamer	Halleck	Perkins
Becker	Harris	Pfost
Belcher	Harvey	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ark.	Pilcher
Bentley	Hayworth	Powell
Berry	Healey	Price
Blatnik	Hébert	Quigley
Boggs	Heselton	Radwan
Boland	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Bolling	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rees, Kans.
Bosch	Holland	Reuss
Brooks, La.	Holmes	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brooks, Tex.	Holtzman	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Ga.	Hope	Richards
Broyhill	Horan	Riehlman
Buckley	Hyde	Rivers
Burdick	Ikard	Roberts
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Robsion, Ky.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins	Rodino
Canfield	Jensen	Rogers, Colo.
Cannon	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Carnahan	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Tex.
Cederberg	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Celler	Judd	Rutherford
Chenoweth	Karsten	Sadlak
Chiperfield	Kearney	St. George
Christopher	Kearns	Schwengel
Chudoff	Keating	Scott
Clark	Kelly, N. Y.	Scudder
Cole	Keogh	Seely-Brown
Coon	Kilburn	Selden
Cooper	Kilday	Sheehan
Coudert	Kilgore	Shelley
Cramer	Kirwan	Short
Cretella	Krueger	Sieminski
Crumpacker	Landrum	Siler
Cunningham	Lane	Sisk
Curtis, Mass.	Lanham	Simpson, Pa.
Curtis, Mo.	Lankford	Smith, Kans.
Davidson	Latham	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Tenn.	LeCompte	Smith, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski	Steed
Dawson, Utah	Long	Sullivan
Deane	Lovre	Talle
Delaney	McCarthy	Taylor
Dempsey	McConnell	Thomas
Diggs	McCormack	Thompson, La.
Dingell	McGregor	Thompson, N. J.
Dixon	Macdonald	Thomson, Wyo.
Dodd	Machrowicz	Thornberry
Dollinger	Mack, Wash.	Trimble
Dolliver	Magnuson	Tumulty
Dondero	Marshall	Udall
Donohue	Martin	Vanik
Dorn, S. C.	Meader	Velde
Edmondson	Merrow	Vinson
Elliott	Metcalf	Vorys
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	Vursell
Engle	Miller, Md.	Wainwright
Evins	Miller, Nebr.	Walter
Feighan	Miller, N. Y.	Weaver
Fernandez	Mills	Westland
	Minshall	Wickersham
	Morano	Widnall
	Morgan	Wier
	Wigglesworth	Wolcott
	Williams, N. J.	Wolverton
	Williams, N. Y.	Wright
	Willis	Yates
	Withrow	Young
		Younger
		Zablocki
		Zelenko

NAYS 136

Abbitt	Flynt	McVey
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Mack, Ill.
Alexander	Friedel	Madden
Alger	Garmatz	Mahon
Allen, Calif.	Gary	Mailliard
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Mason
Ashley	Gentry	Matthews
Ashmore	Green, Oreg.	Mumma
Barden	Gross	Murray, Ill.
Bass, N. H.	Gwinn	Norrell
Baumhart	Hagen	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Hale	O'Konski
Betts	Haley	Osmers
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hand	Phillips
Bonner	Harden	Pillion
Bow	Hardy	Poage
Boyle	Harrison, Nebr.	Poff
Bray	Harrison, Va.	Polk
Brown, Ohio	Henderson	Prouty
Brownson	Herlong	Rabaut
Budge	Hess	Ray
Burleson	Hiestand	Riley
Bush	Hinshaw	Robeson,
Carlyle	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Fla.
Carrigg	Holifield	Roosevelt
Chase	Holt	Saylor
Chelf	Hosmer	Schenck
Church	Huddleston	Scherer
Clevenger	Hull	Sheppard
Colmer	Jackson	Shuford
Cooley	James	Sikes
Corbett	Jennings	Simpson, Ill.
Dague	Johansen	Smith, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Spence
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Mo.	Springer
Devereux	Jones, N. C.	Taber
Dies	Kean	Teague, Calif.
Dorn, N. Y.	King, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Thompson, Mich.
Doyle	Knox	Utt
Durham	Laird	Van Zandt
Fallon	Lipscomb	Williams, Miss.
Fascell	McCulloch	Wilson, Calif.
Fenton	McDonough	Wilson, Ind.
Fino	McIntire	Winstead
	McMillan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 1

Van Pelt

NOT VOTING 40

Anfuso	Gamble	Nelson
Bailey	Granahan	Preston
Bell	Gray	Priest
Blitch	Gregory	Rains
Bowler	Hays, Ohio	Scrivner
Boykin	Hillings	Staggers
Burnside	Kee	Thompson, Tex.
Byrd	Kelley, Pa.	Tollefson
Chatham	King, Pa.	Tuck
Denton	Klein	Watts
Derounian	Knutson	Wharton
Donovan	McDowell	Whitten
Eberharter	Mollohan	
Fountain	Multer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bell for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Burnside against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Byrd against.

Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Mollohan against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mrs. Knutson against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. King of Pennsylvania against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Gable.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Scrivner.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. DEROUNIAN. Were he present, he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BUDGE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, there are no justifiable reasons for rushing through the Congress, without adequate opportunity for vitally necessary major revisions, a project as obviously questionable as the upper Colorado River storage project.

The House should not be expected to rewrite this bill on the floor of this Chamber. At the very least, the bill should be recommitted to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for further study and hearings upon reports from the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget. The projects proposed to be authorized, the repayment provisions of the bill, and the economic and financial aspects of the bill have never been fully reported upon by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. There are many unresolved questions as to engineering, economic, and financial feasibility of the proposed projects which demand further study and report before Congress acts on this proposal. These unresolved questions affecting the engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the projects proposed in the upper Colorado River storage project bill should be reviewed by an impartial board of qualified engineers and experts and reported upon before Congress takes any further action. Such a board of review and procedure is recommended by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy for all water resources projects. The proposed upper Colorado River storage project has never been subjected to such a necessary thorough review.

The haste and pressure under which this whole project has been presented to the Congress has already resulted in a strange piece of legislative history. Some 7 months after a rule had been obtained on a bill which had been vigorously put forward as being a measure which would satisfy all interests and endanger none, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, on February 8, 1956, considered and approved amendments to this bill. A principal amendment carves up excess revenues expected to be produced from the power dams and apportions them among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to be used in repaying construction costs of participating projects within those States. This totally new concept constitutes in effect a new bill. It and all the other amendments had less than 2 hours before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It had no time at all before the Rules Committee. There was no executive department comment at all, with the exception of a brief letter from the Reclamation Bureau, which gave no substantiating information. This action is contrary to the orderly processes of the House.

The new H. R. 3383 contains all of the vices of the original bill, and more, such as the direct apportionment of project revenues. In addition, geological material has come to light since the end of the first session of this Congress which requires most urgent consideration by qualified people. It has received none. Furthermore, the administration's soil-bank proposal now before the Congress would require taking presently cultivated land out of production to cut down surpluses, while H. R. 3383 would put new lands into cultivation and provide more water for lands already in crops—some of which may well be placed in soil-bank reserve—to grow more surpluses. It simply does not make sense.

The upper Colorado River storage project is ill planned in part, and in other parts not planned at all.

I believe that one of the most serious faults of both the House and Senate bills is that projects are authorized subject to the submission of feasibility reports by the Secretary of the Interior and further action by Congress. This sort of legislation, while it has been done before as the result of legislative logrolling, is plainly a perversion. If a project is only vaguely justified and needs study and report by the Interior Department, why should it be named at all in a bill? The naming of additional irrigation projects and storage units in these bills establishes a moral commitment to the States and communities which believe that they would be benefited by these projects, and would make further and final action by the Department and Congress more or less a formality. These bills are and are not authorizations. They contain several different kinds of qualified authorizations. They are intended to mean whatever the interested groups happen to want them to mean at a given moment. Specifically, they are intended to tell the people in the beneficiary States that they are to have practically every "participating project" their hearts desire, while at the same time telling the anxious taxpayers in the other 44 States of the Union that the project is to cost only about a billion dollars. There can be no integrity in such legislation.

The upper Colorado project is not self-liquidating, as its proponents claim. The main cash box from which the alleged restoration to the Treasury of the money expended is to come, is the revenue from the power aspects of the project, but the bill absurdly overestimates the capacity of the power units to bear the financial load assigned to them. The upper Colorado Basin has a boundless supply of energy potential in coal, natural gas, oil shale, and uranium which are rapidly making hydroelectric power uneconomical in this area. What could be more obvious than the absurdity of any plan which must depend for its repayment not only upon the useful life of hydroelectric installations up to 100 years, but upon prices for power based upon present conditions when the power companies buying the power generated have expressly qualified their purchase commitments to purchase power only at prices comparable to the cost of power from other sources.

The project would involve an excessive and incredible cost per acre benefited. Not one single irrigation project in all of the participating projects is financially sound. Fifty years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are threatened by this project. The benefit-cost ratio concept of project justification has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics. It has been demonstrated that the lands to be serviced by the irrigation components of the project, even when fully developed under the upper Colorado bill, would be worth on the average only about $150 per acre. Yet the cost to the Nation's taxpayers to develop these lands would average $3,000 to $5,000 per acre according to figures of the Bureau of Reclamation, while, at the same time, there exist at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a small fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project. Completely aside from the fact that the benefit-cost ratio has highly dubious legal standing as a mechanism for justification of projects, proposed expenditures for such obviously negligible returns are an absurd fraud on the American taxpayers whether the groups favoring this project talk vaguely about "indirect benefits" or "public benefits" or "social benefits."

In order to manufacture a case for financial and economic feasibility, the bills embody dubious exercises in bookkeeping. One of the bookkeeping devices embodied in this plan would be a "basin account," a fund into which all revenues would be poured for use in financing additional projects whenever possible. This "basin account" scheme has never been specifically approved by Congress in an authorizing statute. This "basin account" scheme has been made necessary in the upper Colorado project because the storage units of power producing facilities would not directly serve irrigation or other water-use projects with water directly. The irrigation projects cannot pay for themselves, so some connection between such power projects as Glen Canyon and the irrigation projects had to be made in order that it could be alleged that power revenues would

pay for irrigation. Since there was little or no functional or geographic connection, the connection was made by drafting a unique statutory proposal which created a financial bond between these otherwise unrelated portions of the project. The connection between such dams as Glen Canyon and irrigation in the upper Colorado project is exclusively financial. Does this mean that in future legislation we shall tie together expenditures for guided missiles with revenues from sales of postage stamps in an attempt to make ourselves believe that necessary defense expenditures are categories of expenditures which can be converted by mere statutory language into financially "self-liquidating" projects?

The pure power aspects of the project—with the possible exception of the Glen Canyon Dam—are financially infeasible, and the possible engineering and financial feasibility of the Glen Canyon portion of the project is seriously placed in doubt by physical and geological difficulties.

(A) There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam.

As members of the committee pointed out in the report on this bill, the proposed 700-foot Glen Canyon Dam would be the second highest dam in the world, second only to Hoover Dam, which is 726 feet high. Yet the foundation rock at Hoover Dam is at least three times as strong as the sandstone formation at Glen Canyon. The sandstone formation at Glen Canyon is reported to be nothing more than a weakly cemented sand dune created geologically by the wind depositing one sand dune on top of another.

In October 1954, Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer wrote that the Bureau's design specialists were "quite concerned" as to whether or not the foundation characteristics of the Glen Canyon site were capable of safely supporting a 700-foot dam. No further tests were made by the Bureau between 1954 and March 1955. Nevertheless, Commissioner Dexheimer testified in March 1955 before the Committee's Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that a dam of 700 feet could be safely built.

Commissioner Dexheimer may be right, or he may be wrong. In any event, his final opinion should be requested together with complete supporting factual evidence.

(B) There is doubt as to the adequacy of the plans for Glen Canyon Dam upon which the Bureau's cost estimates are based.

The plans upon which costs of Glen Canyon Dam have been estimated are set forth in House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, which is the Bureau's basic planning report on the upper Colorado River project.

Members of the committee report that these plans reveal that the cross section of the dam, which would be about the same height as Hoover Dam, is materially slimmer than Hoover Dam, in spite of the fact that the foundation rock at Glen Canyon—as testified to by Bureau engineers and geologists—is only about one-fifth as strong as the rock at Hoover Dam.

It would appear, therefore, that even if a safe dam can be built at Glen Canyon, it will require a much more massive structure than the plans set forth in House Document No. 364, and that the construction cost will be substantially greater than now estimated.

Until further studies are made, neither I nor any other member of this body can safely speculate on the adequate size and possible cost of such a structure at Glen Canyon. Such studies can and should be made before this legislation is given any further consideration.

(C) The construction at Glen Canyon will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge.

Although the new bill now provides in section 1 that the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, so far there are no plans, and hence no assurance that protective measures can be provided which will be adequate, nor is there evidence that the cost of protection has been included in the cost estimates.

As presently planned, according to members of the committee, the reservoir would back up close to the foundations of the Rainbow Natural Bridge, which is a fragile structure of soft sandstone. The Bureau has indicated that a dam would be built in the canyon below the bridge to keep out the reservoir water, but water could seep through the dam and also collect from natural drainage and back up under the Rainbow arch, thus jeopardizing this national monument.

There is no reason for failing to determine that adequate protective measures can be provided before passage of this legislation.

(D) Large quantities of water may be absorbed into the formations surrounding the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

Members of the committee have informed us that geologic reports show that the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains Basins—both adjacent to the reservoir site—contain tremendous formations of pervious sandstone which have a combined capacity of 340 million acre-feet. The reports indicate that these formations at the present time are practically empty of water.

Thus, as the reservoir fills, these formations could absorb tremendous quantities of water making it impossible to accomplish the storage and regulation of water and the production of power contemplated by the project.

Since these basins are reported to have a capacity some 14 times greater than the proposed reservoir, would it not appear absolutely essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and thus free to drain water from the reservoir before proceeding with this legislation?

(E) The Chinle shale problem must be satisfactorily investigated and explained.

Chinle shale is a geologic formation which, when subjected to water, immediately disintegrates into mud.

Chinle shale is reported to immediately underlie the canyon-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstones in the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir area, and, in areas of exposure of this shale, provides the only foundation support for those overlying cliff-forming rocks. As a result, as the reservoir filled with water, the entire overburden mass of sandstone could crumple and be precipitated into the reservoir basin with untold adverse effect on the functioning of the reservoir.

The Chinle shale problem is not a new one, and it could easily be further investigated by experts before construction of the Glen Canyon Reservoir. Neglected United States Geological Survey reports show that the Chinle shale has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River, and its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the Colorado River has been reported to appear similar.

None of these engineering problems arising from physical and geological difficulties in connection with the Glen Canyon storage unit are new. Surveys of the area, now three decades old, indicated that the Glen Canyon site is an impressive one but possessed of formation difficulties needing the most exhaustive tests. If over $421 million is to be spent here, as the Bureau estimates, the record on Glen Canyon must be unassailable. Congress can and should demand a thorough evaluation by an independent board of engineers before authorizing this key structure.

I believe that proponents of the upper Colorado River storage project have not well proven their case. It may be that some individual units may be worthwhile and economically and financially feasible, but as the project is outlined at present, it is a very weak and indefinite structure indeed. There are no justifiable reasons for rushing through the Congress, without adequate opportunity for vitally necessary major revisions, a project as obviously questionable as the upper Colorado River storage project.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, sponsors and advocates of the Colorado River storage project have never fully revealed the detrimental effects upon the operation of facilities in the lower Colorado River Basin of the proposed construction, filling, and operation of large holdover reservoirs on the main stream and major tributaries above Lee Ferry. Such vague generalities as have been stated have been based primarily upon consideration of the water supply of the Colorado River during periods such as 1897 to 1943 or 1914 to 1945 which included some early years of high runoff. The water supply in the period 1930 to 1954 was considerably below the averages for these earlier periods. It is not unlikely that the pattern and average of the water supply during the period of construction and filling of the proposed upper basin holdover reservoirs would be similar to the pattern and average of

the period 1930 to 1954. Well-established principles of project planning would dictate that such a period of low historical flow be considered, as well as periods of high flow, in any study of the effects of a project on existing facilities. The 1930 to 1954 interval provides the safest basis for appraisal of the need for and effects of large additional storage capacity in the upper basin.

To demonstrate the effects of the operation of proposed upstream storage reservoirs in conjunction with the operation of Lake Mead during a period of water supply such as 1930 to 1954, a group of hypothetical studies was made by engineers of the Colorado River Board of California. These studies show that in such a period the unrestricted filling and operation of upper basin storage reservoirs, such as at Glen Canyon, would place lower basin consumptive use of water in jeopardy and would violate existing lower basin power contracts. It was shown that, in order to avoid serious detriment to users of water and power in the lower basin, some rigid limitations must be placed upon the filling and operation of the upper basin storage reservoirs.

The studies covered sufficient variety and range to circumscribe probable operating conditions and principles, including assumptions that Glen Canyon reservoir would be full or empty at the start of the period, and Lake Mead full or half full; that the reservoirs would be operated primarily to fully meet annual consumptive use requirements downstream, to generate contract firm power at Hoover, to accumulate storage at Glen Canyon, or to hold Lake Mead above minimum desirable level; and various combinations of these different assumptions. As bases for comparison, studies were made of hypothetical Lake Mead operations using the 1930 to 1954 flow data and assuming the reservoir full to spillway crest elevation initially and also assuming the initial usable content equal to the actual usable content in January 1955.

In all the studies consideration was given to the delivery obligation of the upper basin under article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact. Requirements for water from the main stream for consumptive uses in the lower basin and for delivery to Mexico, plus irrecoverable losses from the main stream in the lower basin, were estimated at 10,200,000 acre-feet a year on the basis of present uses and expected increases as shown in table I. The corresponding average annual flow required at Lee Ferry was estimated at 9,600,000 acre-feet. Required flows at Lee Ferry to provide contract firm power generation at the Hoover plant were calculated at 10,140,000 acre-feet a year assuming a 500-foot head on the plant and at 11,100,000 acre-feet a year assuming a 450-foot head, the September 1955 level. In all the studies the assumption was made that beneficial consumptive uses of water in the upper basin, estimated at present at approximately 2 million acre-feet a year, would increase during the 25-year study period at a uniform rate of 80,000 acre-feet a year.

TABLE I.—*Estimate of channel and reservoir losses and net beneficial consumptive uses of main-stream water in the lower basin of the Colorado River and in Mexico in a future period of water supply comparable with 1930–54*

[Thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	California net use [1]	Arizona net use [2]	Mexican requirement [3]	Unrecovered loss in All-American Canal to Drop No. 1 [4]	Net channel loss below Hoover Dam [5]	Evaporation losses from 6 reservoirs [6]	Nevada net use [7]	Total main stream use and loss in lower basin and Mexico (rounded) [8]
1955	4,590	1,060	1,700	200	600	1,200	23	9,400
1956	4,670	1,090	1,700	200	600	1,200	26	9,500
1957	4,750	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	29	9,600
1958	4,820	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	32	9,650
1959	4,900	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	35	9,700
1960	4,980	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	38	9,800
1961	5,050	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	41	9,900
1962	5,130	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	44	10,000
1963	5,210	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	47	10,050
1964	5,285	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	50	10,100
1965	5,360	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	53	10,200

[1] Projected from Colorado River Board monthly water reports, with Metropolitan Water District aqueduct at full capacity by 1965.
[2] Projected from Colorado River Board water reports, with Gila and Yuma projects fully developed in 1955 and Colorado River Indian Reservation at full development in 1957.
[3] Required delivery under terms of 1944 Mexican treaty, plus allowance for regulatory losses.
[4] Derived from U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers. This is the average for calendar years 1946–52, rounded.
[5] Based on data in Central Arizona Project, appendixes to report, 1947, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, and on differences in flow between Topock and Imperial Dam, taken from U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers.
[6] From Central Arizona Project, appendixes to report, 1947, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, p. B–77. The 6 dams are Hoover, Davis, Parker, Headgate Rock, Imperial, and Laguna.
[7] Estimated from U. S. Geological Survey records of diversions from Lake Mead for Nevada, 1950–54.
[8] Amounts required at Lee Ferry would be approximately 600,000 acre-feet per year less, because of average tributary inflow below Lee Ferry.

The following conclusions were drawn by the engineers from the operation studies, based on the water supply of the 1930 to 1954 period and upon the premise that such a 25-year supply may well be representative of that which can be expected during the filling of the proposed upper basin reservoirs:

First. With no accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin during such a period the water supply would be more than adequate to satisfy the lower basin main stream consumptive use requirements and the Mexican Treaty requirements with the regulation provided by Lake Mead alone; but the firm power commitments at Hoover Dam could only be met if Lake Mead were full or nearly full at the start.

Second. Obviously any accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin during such a period would further reduce the possibility of firm power production at Hoover Dam.

Third. Even if Lake Mead were full to spillway level at the start, the accumulation of storage in upper basin reservoirs in excess of about 10 million acre-feet during such a period would cause a deficit in firm power production at Hoover Dam.

Fourth. In such a period of runoff Glen Canyon Reservoir could not be filled even at a uniform rate to its total capacity without causing a damaging curtailment of about three-quarters of a million acre-feet annually in consumptive uses of water by presently existing facilities in the lower basin, in addition to serious deficits in Hoover firm power production. If Glen Canyon Reservoir were to be brought to full capacity in less than 25 years, curtailment of lower basin uses might be nearly a million acre-feet a year because of increased evaporation loss from Glen.

Fifth. If the Colorado River storage project is not to seriously damage the lower basin, the increment in holdover storage in the upper basin in any calendar year must be limited to the amount by which the actual flow at Lee Ferry would otherwise exceed 12 million acre-feet if there were no holdover storage in the upper basin.

Although the studies deal primarily with the operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir and Lake Mead, the conclusions drawn apply with equal or greater force to the effect of a group of several large holdover reservoirs as now proposed for construction in the upper basin.

THE WATER SUPPLY

As shown in table II, the estimated average annual virgin discharge of Colorado River at Lee Ferry, the compact division point, for the 25-year dry period beginning with 1930 is about 13 million acre-feet. This is only 85 percent of the estimated average of 15,600,000 acre-feet for the 1914 to 1945 period used by the Reclamation Bureau as the basis for its planning of the Colorado River storage project. The following tabulation compares the estimated average virgin flow at Lee Ferry for the 1930 to 1954 period with the estimated averages for other periods:

Period	Average virgin flow at Lee Ferry	Percent of 1930–54 average	Percent of 1914–45 average	Reference
	Acre-feet			
1914–45	15,600,000	117	100	H. Doc. 364, 83d Cong.
1930–54	13,300,000	100	85	Table III.
1914–29	18,000,000	135	115	H. Doc. 364.
1931–40 (driest decade)	11,800,000	89	76	Do.
1914–54	15,100,000	114	97	H. Doc. 364 and table III.
1934 (driest year)	5,210,000	39	33	Table III.

TABLE II.—*Water supply at Lees Ferry in the period 1930–54*

[Units in thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	Historical flow of Colorado River at Lees Ferry [1]	Historical flow of Paria River at Lees Ferry [1]	Calculated historical flow of Colorado River at Lees Ferry [2]	Estimated actual upstream depletion [3]	Estimated virgin flow at Lees Ferry [4]	Estimated virgin flow at Lees Ferry division point [5]
1930	12,390	21	12,410	1,820	14,210	14,230
1931	6,218	10	6,230	1,380	7,600	7,610
1932	15,130	38	15,170	1,960	17,090	17,130
1933	9,733	18	9,750	1,610	11,340	11,360
1934	3,948	18	3,970	1,240	5,190	5,210
1935	10,270	17	10,290	1,640	11,910	11,930
1936	12,110	37	12,150	1,830	13,940	13,980
1937	11,980	26	12,010	1,840	13,820	13,850
1938	15,640	26	15,670	2,110	17,750	17,780
1939	8,839	33	8,870	1,690	10,530	10,560
1940	7,589	28	7,620	1,520	9,110	9,140
1941	17,860	32	17,890	2,100	19,960	19,990
1942	14,790	15	14,800	2,100	16,890	16,900
1943	11,410	22	11,430	1,840	13,250	13,270
1944	13,020	14	13,030	1,930	14,950	14,960
1945	11,770	21	11,790	1,870	13,640	13,660
1946	8,751	22	8,770	1,680	10,430	10,450
1947	14,050	22	14,070	1,960	16,010	16,030
1948	12,880	16	12,900	1,930	14,810	14,830
1949	14,600	20	14,620	2,020	16,620	16,640
1950	10,800	13	10,810	1,840	12,640	12,650
1951	9,901	15	9,920	1,820	11,720	11,740
1952	17,904	17	17,920	2,180	20,080	20,100
1953	8,730	18	8,750	1,750	10,480	10,500
1954	6,162	16	6,180	1,640	7,800	7,820
Total	286,475	535	287,020	45,300	331,770	332,320
Average	11,460	21	11,480	1,810	13,270	13,290

[1] From U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers and provisional records.
[2] Sum of historical flows of Paria and Colorado Rivers at Lees Ferry, rounded off to nearest 10,000 acre-feet.
[3] From 1953 Memorandum Supplement to U. S. Bureau of Reclamation Report on Water Supply of the Lower Colorado River Basin, November 1952, p. 25. Depletions for 1952, 1953, and 1954 are estimated by assuming same transbasin diversions as 1951 and same irrigation depletions as in years of comparable flow, 1941, 1946, and 1940, respectively. Water-year depletions are assumed equal to calendar-year depletions.
[4] Colorado River above mouth of Paria River, rounded off to nearest 10,000 acre-feet.
[5] Includes flow of Paria River.

The average annual tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam for the 1930 to 1954 period was estimated at 630,000 acre-feet, comprising 20,000 acre-feet from Paria River and 610,000 acre-feet between Lees Ferry—compact division point—and Hoover Dam as is indicated by table III. On the basis of these estimates the average annual virgin flow into Lake Mead during the period would have been 13,900,000 acre-feet.

TABLE III.—*Estimated inflow to Lake Mead in addition to delivery at Lees Ferry*

[Thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	Historical flow, Colorado River at Lees Ferry	Historical flow, Colorado River at Grand Canyon	Historical flow, Little Colorado River at Grand Falls or near Cameron	Estimated net inflow between Grand Canyon and Hoover Dam	Estimated tributary inflow except Virgin River 2×(5)+(4)	Historical flow of Virgin River at Littlefield	Estimated inflow to Lake Mead in addition to flow at Lees Ferry
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1930	12,390	12,760	180	190	560	210	770
1931	6,220	6,590	200	170	540	110	650
1932	15,130	15,820	430	260	950	380	1,330
1933	9,730	10,040	160	150	460	120	580
1934	3,950	4,190	40	200	440	80	520
1935	10,270	10,620	220	130	480	160	640
1936	12,110	12,470	170	190	550	140	690
1937	11,980	12,540	340	220	780	230	1,010
1938	15,640	15,860	160	60	280	280	560
1939	8,840	9,090	80	170	420	150	570
1940	7,590	8,040	190	260	710	180	890
1941	17,860	18,790	590	340	1,270	430	1,700
1942	14,790	14,920	90	40	170	190	360
1943	11,410	11,620	100	110	320	180	500
1944	13,020	13,330	130	180	490	180	670
1945	11,770	12,110	160	180	520	180	700
1946	8,750	9,120	140	230	600	170	770
1947	14,050	14,350	170	130	430	130	560
1948	12,880	13,010	130	0	130	110	240
1949	14,600	14,620	290	[1] 0	290	160	450
1950	10,800	10,840	40	0	40	120	160
1951	9,900	9,930	60	[1] 0	60	110	170
1952	17,900	18,100	350	[1] 0	350	300	650
1953	8,730	8,800	50	20	90	100	190
1954	6,160	6,300	110	30	170	140	310
Total					11,100	4,540	15,640
Average					444	182	626

[1] Negative result assumed as zero.

Source of data: U. S. Geodetic Survey water supply papers and provisional U. S. Geodetic Survey records.
The flows in col. (5) are obtained by subtracting the values of cols. (2) and (4) from col. (3). As suggested on p. 281 of the Colorado River, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, 1946, col. (6) is based on the assumption that net minor tributary inflow between Grand Canyon and Hoover Dam equals that between Lees Ferry and Grand Canyon.

WATER REQUIREMENTS FROM MAIN STREAM IN LOWER BASIN AND MEXICO

It was estimated that annual requirements for main stream channel and reservoir losses, beneficial consumptive uses of main stream water in the lower basin, and the Mexican Treaty burden will total in the near future, say 1965, about 10,200,000 acre-feet. This estimate is shown in table I. Allowance was made for estimated evaporation losses from all existing lower basin main stream reservoirs including Lake Mead. The annual quantity of 10,200,000 acre-feet would have to be supplied by flow at Lees Ferry—and net inflow between Lees Ferry—and Hoover Dam.

CHANNEL LOSSES

The loss from the channel of the main stream below Hoover Dam, exclusive of losses from reservoirs, were estimated at approximately 600,000 acre-feet a year for the 1930–54 period. Figures in table IV, showing the computation of the 600,000 acre-feet, are mostly for the period 1930 to 1937 which is considered representative of a future period comparable with 1930 to 1954.

TABLE IV.—*Estimated lower basin channel losses main stream, 1930–54*

	Average annual acre-feet
1. Decrease in flow, Topock to Imperial Dam [1]	602,000
2. Gross diversion, Palo Verde Irrigation District [1]	(190,000)
Net, estimated 46 percent of gross	87,000
3. Gross diversion, Colorado River Indian Reservation [1]	(25,000)
Net, estimated 67 percent of gross	17,000
4. Net loss, Topock to Imperial Dam (1–2–3)	498,000
5. Inflow, Bill Williams River [1]	113,000
6. Minor tributaries above Gila River [2]	40,000
7. Gross loss, Topock to Imperial	651,000
8. Net loss, Hoover Dam to Topock (estimated 40 percent of item 7) [2]	260,000
9. Total (4+8) say	800,000
10. Evaporation, Headgate Rock and Imperial Dams [2]	68,000
11. Channel loss replaced by evaporation from Havasu and Mohave [2]	136,000
12. Estimated net channel loss, Hoover Dam to Imperial (9–10–11) say	600,000

[1] U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers.
[2] U. S. Bureau of Reclamation report on Central Arizona project.

In the calculation no allowance was made for flow from Gila River into the main stream. The water supply of the Gila Basin is already overdeveloped. It was estimated that if a water-supply period such as 1930 to 1954 were repeated in the future, the annual flows of the Gila River at the mouth would be negligible except in the calendar years corresponding to 1932, 1937, and 1941. Even the flows in these years would be unavailable practically to help satisfy Colorado River requirements, due to the infrequent, flashy nature of the runoff.

BENEFICIAL CONSUMPTIVE USES

In the calendar year 1954, net beneficial consumptive uses of mainstream Colorado River water in Arizona, California, and Nevada, according to Colorado River board monthly water reports and the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Water Log of the Colorado River, were Arizona, 961,720; California, 4,423,095; and Nevada, 19,876 acre-

feet, respectively. It is shown in table I that in the next 10 years these annual uses will increase to 1,100,000, 5,362,000, and 53,000 acre-feet, respectively. These estimates are based upon the assumptions that existing mainstream projects in Arizona will be fully developed, that the aqueduct of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California will be flowing at full capacity within the 10 years, and that uses in Nevada will increase at the same rate they have in recent years.

WATER REQUIRED FOR FIRM POWER AT HOOVER DAM

For the first calendar year of the 25-year study period, the contract requirement for firm Hoover power was taken as 4,182,000,000 kilowatt-hours, which was the 1955 requirement. The contract commitment is 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours less in each of the following years, and is therefore reduced to 3,972,000,000 kilowatt-hours in the last calendar year of the period; the 25-year average is 4,077,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

With an effective head of 500 feet and an efficiency of 80 percent at the Hoover powerplant, the required average annual flow through the plant to satisfy firm-power commitments, using 1955 to 1979 average contract requirements, would be 9,940,000 acre-feet. With a 500-foot head on the plant, the average annual evaporation loss from Lake Mead was estimated at 810,000 acre-feet. An average annual tributary inflow of 610,000 acre-feet between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam, as estimated for 1930 to 1954, would compensate for most of this loss, leaving a remainder of 200,000 acre-feet per year to be made up. Therefore, to meet firm-power requirements at a 500-foot head, and to keep Lake Mead at that operating level, yearly flow at Lee Ferry would have to be 9,940,000 acre-feet plus 200,000 acre-feet, or a total of 10,140,000 acre-feet.

As of September 1955, the effective head on the Hoover plant was only about 450 feet. With such a low head the annual flow through the Hoover turbines would have to be 11,300,000 acre-feet to meet present firm-power commitments. If the present Lake Mead water level were maintained throughout the 1955 to 1979 interval, the required average annual discharge from the Hoover powerhouse to comply with firm-power contracts would be 11,050,000 acre-feet. Average annual evaporation loss at that level is estimated at 660,000 acre-feet. Allowing for the 610,000 acre-feet of estimated tributary inflow, the average annual flow requirement at Lees Ferry would be 11,100,000 acre-feet.

OPERATION STUDIES

Studies were made on an annual basis, using 1930–54 watersupply figures, of the operation of Lake Mead alone and of the operation of Lake Mead and Glen Canyon together, under various assumptions and criteria. The results are shown in table V. The general conclusions reached in the studies are valid regardless of the number of mainstream holdover storage reservoirs that might be constructed above Lee Ferry. For the studies, the following assumptions were made:

First. In the period of operation, the water supply would be the same as in the 25-year period January 1, 1930, through December 31, 1954.

Second. Flow into Glen Canyon Reservoir during the 25-year operation period would be equal to the historical calendar-year flow at Lees Ferry, taken from United States Geological Survey Water Supply Papers, diminished by additional upstream depletions which are assumed on the basis of Reclamation Bureau estimates to increase at the rate of 80,000 acre-feet per year.

Third. Inflow to Lake Mead would equal the sum of the calculated release from Glen Canyon Reservoir, the Little Colorado River and the Virgin River, plus the estimated net yearly minor-tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam. For the study of Lake Mead alone the historical flow at Lees Ferry, modified by additional upstream depletions, was used instead of the release from Glen Canyon.

Fourth. Evaporation from Glen Canyon Reservoir is estimated at an average rate of 4.7 feet per year, deduced from United States Bureau of Reclamation data in House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, 2d session.

Fifth. Net evaporation from Lake Mead is estimated at an average rate of 7 feet per year on the basis of United States Geological Survey monthly records and studies by C. L. Patterson, August 1950.

TABLE V.—*Results of operation studies for Glen Canyon Reservoir and Lake Mead*

[Volumes in thousands of acre-feet with water supply as in period 1930–54]

Study No.	Glen Canyon			Hoover					
	Initial total storage	Final total storage	Average release	Initial usable storage	Final usable storage	Average usable storage	Average release	Average firm power deficit (million kilowatt-hours)	Average secondary power (million kilowatt-hours)
1	(1)	(1)	(1)	24,750	16,080	23,000	10,400	0	561
2	0	0	10,420	12,760	4,640	7,400	10,860	595	0
3	0	6,000	9,950	12,760	4,640	6,170	10,440	870	0
4	0	10,780	9,670	24,750	24,750	21,630	9,350	15	0
5	0	26,000	8,900	24,750	14,420	19,480	9,060	245	0
6	0	6,200	9,920	12,760	17,480	17,120	9,550	186	0
7	26,000	16,730	10,120	24,750	24,750	24,750	9,700	0	340
8	0	20,620	9,030	24,750	20,300	21,230	9,200	334	135
9	0	13,580	9,510						

[1] Glen Canyon Reservoir nonexistent.

Study No. 1, Lake Mead alone.

Start: Full to spillway.

Priorities: First, firm power; second, hold Mead full; third, secondary power.

In the first operation study, Lake Mead was assumed to be filled to spillway crest elevation at the beginning of the period, with usable storage of 24,750,000 acre-feet. Glen Canyon Reservoir was considered nonexistent. Starting with Lake Mead full an attempt was made, first, to meet firm power requirements at Hoover Dam; second, to keep Lake Mead at its initial level; and third, to generate secondary power.

The study indicates that if Lake Mead were full at the beginning of a period such as 1930–54, it could be operated to generate firm power commitments in every year, and an average of more than 500 million kilowatt-hours a year of secondary energy. Average annual release of water would be more than enough to supply downstream consumptive uses and delivery to Mexico. However, the storage would be drawn down more than 8 million acre-feet at the end of the period.

Final usable storage, 16,080,000 acre-feet.

Average usable storage, 23 million acre-feet.

Average release, 10,400,000 acre-feet per year.

Average secondary power, 561 million kilowatt-hours per year.

Study No. 2, Mead and Glen Canyon.

Start: Mead half full; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Hoover firm power; second, hold level of Lake Mead; third, fill Glen.

In the second study it was assumed that the water surface elevation in Lake Mead at the beginning of the 25-year period of study would be the same as the actual elevation on January 1, 1955, or 1,105.5 feet, corresponding to a usable storage of 12,760,000 acre-feet. Starting with this level in Lake Mead and with Glen Canyon Reservoir empty, an attempt was made, first, to supply firm power requirements at Hoover Dam; second, to hold 12,760,000 acre-feet of usable storage in Lake Mead; and third, to fill Glen Canyon Reservoir, in that order of priority. It was assumed possible to pass flows through Glen Canyon Reservoir without detention for dead storage. The minimum allowable water surface elevation in Lake Mead was taken arbitrarily as 1,000.0 feet, corresponding to a usable storage of 4,640,000 acre-feet and a powerhead of 350 feet.

Study No. 2 indicates that with Mead only half full at the start, Hoover firm power commitments could not be met and no storage could be accumulated in Glen Canyon Reservoir in the 25-year period. No secondary power could be generated at Hoover. However, the water release would more than supply downstream consumptive uses and Mexico.

This study may be considered equivalent for practical purposes to a study of Lake Mead alone. Glen Canyon would be useless. In fact, Lake Mead usable storage would drop dangerously low.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 4,640,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 7,400,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 10,860,000; Glen, 10,420,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 595 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Study No. 3, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead half full; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, bring Glen to dead-storage level; second, Hoover firm power; third, hold level of Mead; fourth, fill Glen.

In the third study, the assumptions and criteria were the same as in study No. 2, except that in No. 3 it was assumed necessary to maintain storage in Glen Canyon Reservoir above a certain minimum in order to obtain the required outflow. Accordingly, this reservoir would be brought to dead-storage level, corresponding to 6 million acre-feet of total content, in the first calendar year of the period of study. Thereafter, this level would be considered the minimum allowable.

As would be expected, study No. 3 indicates about the same limitations as No. 2, but with somewhat greater deficit in Hoover firm power and slightly less average release from Hoover, although still more than enough for downstream requirements. Again, Glen Canyon would be practically useless.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 4,640,000 usable; Glen, 6 million total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 6,170,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet, Mead, 10,440,000; Glen, 9,950,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 870 million kilowatts; Glen, none.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Study No. 4, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead full to spillway; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Glen to dead storage level; second, Hoover firm power; third, hold Mead full; fourth, fill Glen.

In the fourth study, Lake Mead was assumed to be filled to spillway crest, elevation 1,205.4, at the beginning, with usable storage of 24,750,000 acre-feet. Starting with Lake Mead at this level and with Glen Canyon Reservoir empty, it was attempted, first, to supply firm-power requirements at Hoover Dam; second, to keep Lake Mead filled to the spillway lip; and third, to fill Glen Canyon Reservoir, in that order of priority. The minimum allowable water level in Lake Mead was considered to be elevation, 1,122, at which the usable storage is 14,420,000 acre-feet and the head on the powerplant is 472 feet. Glen Canyon Reservoir contents would be increased to dead-storage level in the first year but not increased further until a surplus was available after complying with Hoover firm-power contracts and filling Lake Mead to spillway elevation.

Study No. 4 indicates that if Lake Mead were full at the start of a water-supply period such as 1930–54, and the proper operating criteria were observed, the Hoover firm power and the downstream use requirements could be substantially met, and Glen Canyon might be partly but not completely filled.

The study indicates that with the assumed starting conditions and operating criteria the firm power commitments at Hoover could be nearly, but not quite met. A shortage of 375 million kilowatt-hours is indicated in 1 year, averaging 15 million kilowatt-hours a year for the period. It would be possible to keep Mead full about half the time, and to end with it full. Average annual water release would be about equal to consumptive requirements and Mexican Treaty obligation.

According to the hypothetical study Glen Canyon would begin to accumulate usable storage in the 13th year, would reach a maximum in the 23d year, and end the period less than half full.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 24,750,000 usable; Glen, 10,780,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 21,630,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,350,000 usable; Glen, 9,670,000.

Average annual firm power deficit: Mead, 15 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Secondary power Mead, none:

Comparison of study No. 4 with study No. 1 indicates that if Lake Mead started the period at spillway level, the detention of water in Glen Canyon Reservoir would deprive the Hoover plant of an annual average of 15 million kilowatt-hours of firm power and 561 million kilowatt-hours of secondary power.

Study No. 5, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead, full to spillway; Glen, empty.

Priorities: First, fill Glen; second, Hoover firm power; third, hold Mead full.

In the fifth study, Lake Mead was assumed filled to spillway crest at the beginning of operation, with 24,750,000 acre-feet of usable storage. Glen Canyon Reservoir was assumed empty at the start. It would be filled to dead storage level in the first year, and thereafter storage would be increased at a uniform rate calculated to arrive at full capacity of 26 million acre-feet at the end of the 25th year. This study therefore gave the highest priority to the filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir, second preference to the firm-power requirements at Hoover Dam, and third to filling Lake Mead to spillway crest. The minimum allowable usable storage in Lake Mead was assumed at 14,420,000 acre-feet as in study No. 4.

Study No. 5 indicates that even with Lake Mead full at the start of a water supply period like 1930 to 1954, Glen Canyon Reservoir could not be filled without damaging curtailment of Hoover power production and downstream water uses, and substantial drawdown of Lake Mead. The study indicates an average yearly firm-power shortage of 245 million kilowatt-hours at the Hoover plant. Lake Mead would be reduced to the minimum usable storage of 14,420,000 acre-feet at the end of the 25 years and in several other years of the study period. Average yearly discharge below Hoover Dam would be insufficient for downstream requirements.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 14,420,000 usable; Glen, 26 million total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 19,480,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,060,000; Glen, 8,900,000.

Average annual power deficit, Mead, 245 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Comparison of study No. 5 with study No. 1 indicates that with Lake Mead starting full, the filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir during a 25-year period of water supply such as 1930–54, would reduce the average annual Hoover power production by about 245 million kilowatt-hours of firm and 561 million kilowatt-hours of secondary power, in addition to reducing the water supply for the lower basin and Mexico about 1,500,000 acre-feet a year.

Study No. 6, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead half full; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Mead to 500 feet head; second, Hoover firm power; third, fill Glen.

In the sixth study Lake Mead's water surface elevation at the start of the period was assumed the same as the actual elevation on January 1, 1955, corresponding to a usable storage of 12,760,000 acre-feet. Starting with this level in Lake Mead and with Glen Canyon Reservoir empty, Lake Mead usable storage would be increased as soon as possible to 17,480,000 acre-feet, corresponding to an effective head of 500 feet on the Hoover plant. The study indicated that this head probably could be maintained to the end of the period. Hoover firm-power requirements would be given priority over storage in Glen Canyon Reservoir. It was assumed possible to pass flows through Glen Canyon Reservoir without detention for dead storage.

Study No. 6 indicates that if, starting with Lake Mead at its present level, the lake were operated to attain as quickly as possible a satisfactory power head on Hoover plant, to maintain such head and meet firm power and downstream water requirements, little retention of storage could be accomplished in upper basin reservoirs during a water supply period like 1930 to 1954. The study indicates that under the above assumptions and criteria firm power production could be attained at Hoover in all years after the head had been built up to the 500-foot point. Deficits probably would occur while that head was being attained. Indicated average yearly release from Hoover would be enough for downstream requirements. Storage in Glen Canyon probably could be brought to nearly two-thirds capacity in about the 23d year, according to the study, but would have to be drawn down nearly to dead storage level at the end of the period.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 17,480,000 usable; Glen, 6,200,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 17,120,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,550,000; Glen, 9,920,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 186 million kilowatt-hours.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Study No. 7, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead full to spillway; Glen full.

Priorities: First, Hoover firm power; second, hold Mead full; third, hold Glen full; fourth, secondary power.

At the beginning of the seventh operation study, Glen Canyon Reservoir was assumed at full capacity and Lake Mead filled to spillway crest. It was attempted first, to generate contract firm power at Hoover Dam; second, to keep Lake Mead full to spillway level; third, to keep Glen Canyon Reservoir full; and fourth, to generate secondary Hoover power.

Study No. 7 indicates that if Glen Canyon Reservoir were full to capacity at the start of a water supply period like 1930 to 1954, and Lake Mead were at spillway crest, the two could be so operated that Hoover firm power commitments and downstream water requirements could be met, and some secondary power generated, at the cost of some drawdown in storage. If Lake Mead were held full to spillway level, as in the study, the drawdown at Glen would be about 9 million acre-feet.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 24,750,000 usable; Glen, 16,730,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 24,750,000 usable; Glen, 23,840,000 total.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,700,000; Glen, 10,120,000.

Firm power deficit, Mead none; Glen, none.

Average annual secondary power, Mead, 340 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Comparison of this analysis with study No. 1 shows that operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir would reduce the average annual flow past Hoover Dam by 700,000 acre-feet, and diminish Hoover secondary power generation by an average of 221,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. In both studies, firm power requirements are met.

Study No. 8, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead full to spillway; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Glen release, 7,500,000 acre-feet/year; second, fill Glen; third, Hoover firm power; fourth, fill Mead; fifth, secondary power.

At the start of the eighth operation study, Lake Mead was assumed full to spillway crest elevation and Glen Canyon Reservoir empty. The release from Glen Canyon Reservoir was never allowed to be less than 7,500,000 acre-feet per year. After meeting this requirement, preference was given to filling Glen Canyon Reservoir and keeping it full. From the water available at Lake Mead, priority was given first, to supplying firm contract power; second, to filling Lake Mead; and third, to generating secondary power. The study is like Study No. 5 except for the requirement in No. 8 that Glen Canyon release should not be less than 7,500,000 acre-feet in any year. As would be expected, the results of study No. 8 are similar to those of No. 5, and reaffirm the conclusion that, even with Lake Mead full to spillway crest at the start of a water supply period like 1930–54, Glen Canyon could not be filled without curtailment of Hoover power production and downstream water uses. Average annual water release from Hoover Dam indicated in Study No. 8 would be insufficient for downstream requirements, and Hoover firm output would be less than contract requirements. However, some secondary power would be produced in the years when both reservoirs would be full—Mead at spillway crest—and release of excess waters would be necessary.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 20,300,000 usable. Glen, 20,620,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 21,230,000 usable. Glen, 19,640,000 total.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,200,000; Glen, 9,030,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 334 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Average annual secondary power, Mead, 135 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Comparison of study No. 8 with study No. 1 shows that operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir on this basis would reduce the average annual flow past Hoover Dam by 1,200,000 acre-feet and reduce Hoover firm and secondary power annual averages by 334 million and 426 million kilowatt-hours, respectively.

Study No. 9, Glen alone.

Start: Empty.

Priorities: First, inflow to Mead, 10,200,000 acre-feet per year; second, fill Glen.

As discussed previously it was estimated that within the next 10 years reservoir and channel losses and net beneficial consumptive uses of main-stream water in the lower basin of the Colorado River plus requirements for delivery to Mexico, may total 10,200,000 acre-feet per year—see table I. In study No. 9, an attempt was made to maintain this amount as annual inflow to Lake Mead. Second preference was given to filling Glen Canyon Reservoir, starting with this reservoir empty.

Study No. 9 indicates that if Glen Canyon was to be so operated as to maintain, whenever possible, as annual inflow to Lake Mead, including tributary inflow between Glen Canyon and Hoover Dam, at least equal to the 10,200,000 acre-feet required for lower basin consumptive uses and delivery to Mexico, the Glen Canyon reservoir could not be filled during a period of water supply like that in the 25 years 1930–54. According to the study, Glen Canyon if it started empty would be only about half filled at the end of the period, despite the indication that with the 1930–54 sequence of annual flows there would be in two of the years deficits in the required inflow to Lake Mead amounting to about 7.5 percent each. Furthermore, with such operation of Glen, the contract firm power requirements at Hoover Dam could not be met unless Lake Mead were at or near spillway level at the start of the period. If Lake Mead were at the 1955 level at the beginning of such a period, even with 10,200,000 acre-feet of inflow every year there would be a continuous and considerable shortage of firm power at the Hoover plant.

Final storage, acre-feet, Glen, 13,580,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet, Glen, 11,450,000 total.

Average annual release, acre-feet, Glen, 9,510,000 total.

In summary, after allowance for the assumed rate of increase of 80,000 acre-feet a year in upper basin depletions it was calculated that the average annual modified flow at Lees Ferry in a period such as 1930 to 1954 would be only about 10,400,000 acre-feet. The average annual flow required at Lees Ferry to insure, with the tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam, a supply sufficient for lower basin consumptive uses from the main stream and for delivery to Mexico is estimated at 9,600,000 acre-feet. Average annual flows required at Lees Ferry to insure, with the tributary inflow amounts sufficient for Hoover firm power production during the period 1955 to 1979 range from 10,100,000 acre-feet with a 500-foot head on the plant to 11,100,000 acre-feet with a 450-foot head. Obviously if in a period of water supply like that of 1930 to 1954 these needs of the lower basin and Mexico were to be satisfied there would be little if any water left for accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin.

The studies I have described indicate that in a runoff period such as 1930 to 1954 the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir could not be filled without reducing the average annual Glen Canyon release below the 9,600,000 acre-feet—studies Nos. 4 and 9; and that accumulation of storage in Glen Canyon in excess of about 10 million acre-feet at the end of the 25-year study period would cause deficiencies in firm power production at Hoover Dam, even if Lake Mead were full at the start—study No. 4.

The studies I have described further show that if the upper basin is to develop additional consumptive uses of water approximately at the rate estimated by the Reclamation Bureau, and if at the same time reasonable assurance is to be given of a main stream supply adequate for lower basin requirements and Mexico, some limitation must be placed upon the retention of water in the proposed upper basin holdover reservoirs. One such criterion would be to limit the increase in holdover storage in the upper basin in any calendar year to the amount by which the actual flow at Lees Ferry would exceed a specified quantity if there were no holdover reservoirs upstream; with the specified quantity so calculated that the annual average of the residual flow at Lees Ferry, plus tributary inflow, would be adequate for lower basin requirements and Mexico.

Studies were made which show that in order to minimize damage to the lower basin, legislation authorizing construction and operation of large holdover storage reservoirs in the upper basin should include provision that the reduction in river flow due to storage increment and evaporation in any calendar year be limited to the amount by which the actual flow at Lees Ferry would exceed 12 million acre-feet if there were no hold-over storage in the upper basin. Informal discussions with my colleagues on the Interior Committee indicated it would be fruitless to propose such amendments.

Table VI shows the possible effects of such a limitation upon the residual flow at Lees Ferry and upon the operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir, during a period like 1930 to 1954. It indicates that under the limitation the accumulated storage in Glen Canyon at the end of

such a period would be only about 12 million acre-feet, and that the resultant flow at Lees Ferry would average about 9,700,000 acre-feet a year. That average flow would be sufficient, with tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam, to supply lower basin consumptive use requirements and the Mexican treaty obligation. It would be short of the flow required for Hoover firm power production, by about 4 percent if the average head on the Hoover plant were 500 feet and by about 13 percent if the average head were 450 feet.

TABLE VI.—*Flow at Lees Ferry if an amount equal to the modified historical flow (neglecting holdover storage) in excess of 12 million acre-feet annually were stored in the upper basin for holdover purposes*

[Units in thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	Historical flow at Lees Ferry	Modified historical flow at Lees Ferry minus annual increase of 80,000 acre-feet in upper basin consumptive use	Modified historical flow in excess of 12 million acre-feet at Lees Ferry	Resulting flow at Lees Ferry if excess over 12 million acre-feet is stored in upper basin	Cumulative excess over 12 million acre-feet	Glen Canyon Reservoir		
						Average gross storage for year	Evaporation at 4.7 feet	Gross storage at end of year
1930	12,410	12,330	330	12,000	330	160	10	320
1931	6,230	6,070	0	6,070	330	310	20	300
1932	15,170	14,930	2,930	12,000	3,260	1,720	80	3,150
1933	9,750	9,430	0	9,430	3,260	3,080	130	3,020
1934	3,970	3,570	0	3,570	3,260	2,960	130	2,890
1935	10,290	9,810	0	9,810	3,260	2,830	120	2,770
1936	12,150	11,590	0	11,590	3,260	2,710	120	2,650
1937	12,010	11,370	0	11,370	3,260	2,600	110	2,540
1938	15,670	14,950	2,950	12,000	6,210	3,940	160	5,330
1939	8,870	8,070	0	8,070	6,210	5,230	200	5,130
1940	7,620	6,740	0	6,740	6,210	5,030	200	4,930
1941	17,890	16,930	4,930	12,000	11,140	7,260	270	9,590
1942	14,800	13,760	1,760	12,000	12,900	10,300	350	11,000
1943	11,430	10,310	0	10,310	12,900	10,820	370	10,630
1944	13,030	11,830	0	11,830	12,900	10,450	360	10,270
1945	11,790	10,510	0	10,510	12,900	10,100	350	9,920
1946	8,770	7,410	0	7,410	12,900	9,750	340	9,580
1947	14,070	12,630	630	12,000	13,530	9,720	340	9,870
1948	12,900	11,380	0	11,380	13,530	9,700	330	9,540
1949	14,620	13,020	1,020	12,000	14,550	9,880	340	10,220
1950	10,810	9,130	0	9,130	14,550	10,050	340	9,880
1951	9,920	8,160	0	8,160	14,550	9,710	340	9,540
1952	17,920	16,080	4,080	12,000	18,630	11,390	380	13,240
1953	8,750	6,830	0	6,830	18,630	13,020	430	12,810
1954	6,180	4,180	0	4,180	18,630	12,600	420	12,390
Total	287,020	261,020	18,630	242,390	----------	----------	6,240	----------
Average	11,480	10,440	740	9,700	----------	----------	250	----------

Studies previously discussed herein and summarized on table V show that in order to maintain full production of firm power at Hoover Dam in a future 25-year period like 1930–54, little or no storage could be accumulated at Glen Canyon unless Lake Mead were full to spillway level or nearly so at the beginning. With Lake Mead at its present level, the only legislative means of providing reasonable assurance of meeting firm power commitments at Hoover would be a prohibition of any accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin in such a period, or at least until Lake Mead could be filled to spillway level.

REFERENCES

First. United States Geological Survey Water Supply Papers and provisional records were used to obtain historical flows.

Second. House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, 2d session, "Colorado River Storage Project," was used for basic data on Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

Third. For Lake Mead data, use was made of Revised Tables, Lake Mead Surface Area and Usable Capacity, Based on Survey of March 1948 to March 1949, prepared by Geological Survey, October 1949.

Fourth. Central Arizona project, appendixes to report, 1947, United States Bureau of Reclamation, was referred to in estimating channel and reservoir losses.

Fifth. United States Bureau of Reclamation 1953 memorandum supplement to Report on Water Supply of the Lower Colorado River Basin, dated November 1952, was source of and basis of estimates for upper basin depletions.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill S. 500, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the language of the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 500 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H. R. 3383, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The procedings whereby the bill H. R. 3383 was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to one-half hour, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and one-half by me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9536, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 14 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation bill containing appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 for 14 Government agencies. The total amount appropriated in this bill is $14,849,275.

This bill contains an appropriation for the salary of the President of the United States which is, by law, fixed at $150,000; for expenses necessary for the White House Office, the amount of $1,875,000; for expenses necessary to provide staff assistance for the President in connection with special projects the amount of $1,500,000.

This fund is used by the President for staff assistance on special problems which arise from time to time but cannot be considered the responsibility of an existing agency. Examples of the type of staff assistance provided during the current year are projects on disarmament, coordination of public works planning, and the coordination of foreign economic policy.

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the Executive Mansion grounds, the subcommittee has allowed $383,775. These funds provide for the care, maintenance, and operation of the Executive Mansion and the surrounding grounds.

It might be of interest to the committee to know that the electric bill for power used in the White House is $30,890 per year; that there are 72 permanent employees at the White House; that last year there were over 600,000 visitors in the White House, and during last year the White House was closed for a period of 6 weeks; that in 1954 there were 826,843 visitors and that the

White House is now open to visitors 5 days a week from 10 a. m., to 12 noon, Tuesdays through Saturdays, and that approximately 8,000 visitors per day pass through the White House.

We have appropriations in this bill of $3,550,000 for the Bureau of the Budget, which is a slight decrease of $9,000 from the budget request. The Bureau assists the President in the discharge of his budgetary, management, and other executive responsibilities. The appropriation requested for 1957, together with estimated reimbursements, will support a total of 419 positions. This is 4 less than the number estimated for 1956, 16 less than for 1955. We were told during the current fiscal year the Bureau has continued to carry a heavy workload, which is not expected to grow lighter in the coming fiscal year.

For the Council of Economic Advisers the committee has allowed $350,000, which is $15,700 less than the budget request. The Council of Economic Advisers analyzes the national economy and its various segments; advises the President on economic developments; recommends policies for economic growth and stability; appraises economic programs and policies of the Federal Government; and assists in preparation of the annual economic report of the President to Congress.

In the opinion of this committee the National Security Council is one of the most important agencies of the Government. The Council advises the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security. The Central Intelligence Agency is under the direction of the Council. The Council includes the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Other high officials attend meetings or participate in Council actions as directed by the President.

The Council staff performs analysis, review functions for the Council and otherwise assists the Council in bringing about policy coordination. For this agency this committee has appropriated the full budget request of $248,000, which is $8,000 above the amount appropriated for 1956.

Appropriations for the Office of Defense Mobilization are included in this bill. The Office of Defense Mobilization directs and plans the nonmilitary mobilization effort and coordinates all mobilization activities of the executive branch of the Government. These activities include production, manpower, stabilization, transportation, telecommunications, and the stockpiling of strategic materials. It was comforting to the members of our subcommittee to learn that our stockpile program is in excellent condition from an overall standpoint, and that only a few items remain on the critical list. For this agency the committee has appropriated $2,200,000, which is $25,000 more than the 1956 appropriation but $83,000 less than the budget request.

For the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, the committee has allowed the sum of $57,500, which is $2,500 less than the 1956 appropriations and $2,500 less than the budget request for 1957. The President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization advises the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the identification of major organizational and management problems and the development of proposed corrective actions by means of reorganization plans for submission to Congress, Executive orders, and other administrative actions.

For the Emergency Fund for the President, we have provided $1 million, which is the amount that was appropriated for this fund in 1956. These funds are to enable the President to provide for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense. As of February 15, 1956, when the Director of the Bureau of the Budget appeared before our committee to justify this request, no part of the fund appropriated for 1956 had been expended by the President.

For expenses necessary to assist the President in improving the management of executive agencies and in obtaining greater economy and efficiency through the establishment of more efficient business methods in Government operations, the committee has allowed $350,000, which is a reduction of $50,000 below the budget request. These funds enable the President to have studies conducted of the organization and operations of the executive branch and to develop and install improvements therein.

The committee allowed the full budget request of $2,140,000 for the American Battle Monuments Commission. One million one hundred forty thousand dollars of this two million one hundred forty thousand dollars is for salaries and expenses and the other $1 million is for construction of memorials and cemeteries. It was the unanimous opinion of the subcommitte that this Commission has done an outstanding job. Under the able leadership of Brig. Gen. Thomas North, who has served as Secretary to the American Battle Monuments Commission, the construction program is nearing completion at about 2 or 3 million dollars less than the cost originally estimated. General North has done a fine job. In my opinion he is one of our finest public servants, and I certainly hope he remains with the Commission until the job has been completed.

The Commission is responsible for the maintenance and operation of all permanent United States military cemeteries and memorials located in foreign countries. These include 8 World War I cemeteries, a memorial chapel in each cemetery, 11 World War I memorials outside the cemeteries, 14 World War II cemeteries, and the United States National Cemetery, Mexico City, Mexico. The higher estimate in 1957 for maintenance and operation reflects increasing requirements due to completion of various features of the construction program in World War II cemeteries and requirements for major repairs to be undertaken in the World War I cemeteries.

The estimate covers the eighth year's program requirements for construction of United States military cemeteries in foreign countries and memorials to commemorate the services of the American Armed Forces in World War II. Construction covers the development of 15 locations in foreign countries and includes permanent headstones, erection of a memorial structure at each location, and other features such as landscaping, roads and paths, drainage, water supply, caretakers' houses, and visitors' and utility buildings required for operating purposes. In 1957 construction of a memorial in the national cemetery in Hawaii, and memorials on the east and west coast of the United States will be initiated.

Again, let me say in my opinion the American Battle Monuments Commission, under the able leadership of General North, has done an outstanding job. It was my pleasure to visit many of the cemeteries in Europe last August and September, and the beauty of these cemeteries is indescribable. The relatives of those who lie buried in our cemeteries overseas can rest assured that no expense has been spared in making these cemeteries as attractive as possible.

For the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission the committee has allowed $695,000, which is a reduction of $11,905 from the 1956 bill and $5,000 less than the budget request. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is responsible for the settlement of claims authorized by the War Claims Act of 1948 and such other foreign claims as assigned. With the practical conclusion of settlement of World War II claims—the statutory deadline is August 31, 1956—the greater portion of administrative expenses must be met by appropriation, since the programs remaining do not provide for the financing of administrative expense from assets. The Chairman of the Commission indicated that, barring the passage of legislation authorizing additional claims programs, the work of the Commission should be completed by September 30, 1959.

For the Subversive Activities Control Board the Committee has allowed $350,000, which is $51,400 more than the appropriation for this agency during 1956. The volume of the workload of this Board is dependent upon the number of petitions filed by the Attorney General's office with the Board. Upon petitions being filed, the Board holds formal hearings and determines whether: First, organizations are Communist-action organizations, Communist-front organizations, or Communist-infiltrated organizations; second, individuals are officers or members of a Communist-action organization or officers of a Communist-front organization and required to register as such; third, the registration of particular Communist-action organizations or Communist-front organizations or of particular individuals should be canceled; and fourth, a particular organization has ceased to be a Communist-infiltrated organization. In each case the Board issues a report setting forth its ruling and findings as to the facts, and issues an appropriate order. The appeal by the Communist Party of the United States from the Board's order that the party register as a Communist-action organization is before the Supreme Court. Two Communist-front cases are before the United

States Court of Appeals. It is expected that hearings in about 10 front and infiltrated cases will be completed by the end of fiscal year 1956, and an additional 12 or more will be completed by the end of fiscal year 1957. Since the committee hearings of the previous year, the rate of referral cases has increased, and it is apparent that the present small staff cannot maintain a desirable rate of progress. The amount provided will allow for a modest number of additional personnel and will thus enable the Board to proceed more effectively.

In conclusion, the total amount carried in this bill for the 14 agencies of Government is $14,849,275, which is $13,067,025 less than the amount carried in the 1956 appropriation bill for these same agencies, or an appropriation decrease of nearly 50 percent. The amount included in this bill is $165,200 less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for these agencies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman may have answered this question. I should like to ask the question, however, and I propose to ask the chairman of every appropriation committee that comes in here from now on the same question. Under the terms of this bill has employment increased?

Mr. ANDREWS. No. The increases under this bill where there are increases are due to the salary increase bill that the Congress passed last year.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any super grade positions made available under this bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Not under this bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. In discussing the American Battle Monuments Commission, this bill provides for that commission $2,140,000. Is it not true that a large part of that amount will be counterpart funds?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes.

Mr. GARY. Under our present arrangement, a year or two ago the Congress directed that those funds should go through the Treasury so that they could be properly accounted for. We now appropriate the dollars for the counterpart funds and those funds are purchased from the Treasury; therefore a part of these expenditures will be paid with counterpart funds which have been purchased from the United States Treasury with the dollars we have provided here?

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there is a million dollars appropriated for disaster relief in the President's budget and that nothing has been spent? And there is an appropriation of a million dollars there this year?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is known as his emergency fund.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield, I thought that the gentleman from Alabama had misunderstood the question. The gentleman asked about disaster relief. This is for national defense emergencies There is another fund covering disaster relief.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise only to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and the other members of the committee for what I consider to be an excellent job and to tell the gentleman from Alabama that we miss him on the independent offices subcommittee.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the General Government Matters Appropriations Subcommittee, as you know, considers requests for appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and other agencies or commissions having direct bearing on the Office of the President.

In addition, it also considers the requests of the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Foreign Claims Commission, and the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The total amount sanctioned by the Bureau of the Budget for all the agencies for fiscal 1957 was $15,014,475.

The Appropriations Committee allowed $14,849,275, a reduction of $165,200.

This reduction of $165,200 is a modest decrease and will in no way affect the functioning of the agencies involved, in the opinion of the committee.

As a matter of fact, $133,000 of the $165,200 was taken from 2 of the agencies: $83,000 from the Office of Defense Mobilization and $50,000 from the item "Expenses of Management Improvement" in funds appropriated to the President.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT

With the conclusion of settlement of World War II claims—the deadline is August 31, 1956—the greater portion of administrative expenses must be met by appropriation, since the programs remaining do not provide for the financing of administrative expenses from assets.

To wind up the work of this Commission—barring any further legislation for additional claims programs—the Chairman of the Commission estimates it will take 3 more years—about September 30, 1959.

Approximately $156 million in German and Japanese World War II assets was used in administering and paying World War II claims authorized under the War Claims Act of 1948—Public Law 744, 83d Congress, authorized compensation of additional World War II claims which are also being paid out of these German and Japanese assets. A total of $225 million of such assets has been deposited in the War Claims fund to date.

On the completion of this program it is estimated that there will remain in the War Claims fund $15 million or more.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

The Office of Defense Mobilization under the directorship of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, is to my mind doing a splendid job. This office was created June 12, 1953, by Reorganization Plan No. 3 which put in 1 central agency what had previously been 3 separate agencies and parts of 2 others. Thus was created for the first time in our history a single Presidential Staff Agency responsible for assisting the President in carrying out central leadership, direction, and coordination of the Nation's current defense mobilization program, defense readiness measures such as stockpiling of strategic and critical materials and development of those programs and actions that would be needed in event of full mobilization such as distribution controls for critical materials and stabilization measures.

In addition to being the Director of Defense Mobilization, the Director [Dr. Flemming], is by law a member of the National Security Council and participates in cabinet meetings on invitation of the President.

As Chairman of the Defense Mobilization Board which consists of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor; Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration. This Board provides the means for coordinating the policies and activities of the principal departments and agencies participating in the defense program.

The Office of Defense Mobilization also requires the knowledge, cooperation, and active participation of all elements of our national life—industry, business, labor, agriculture, State and local governments and the professions for effective mobilization readiness.

The importance of this agency becomes very apparent to those of us who are privileged to hear off-the-record discussions by various members of our State and Defense Departments.

There is no way of estimating all of the fine work done by this agency.

Mr. Chairman, the many functions of the Director of Mobilization necessarily call for sufficient funds for the office to be effective. We trust that the $2,200,000 allotted in this appropriation for fiscal 1957 will suffice.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do not rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the acting majority leader if he will please inform us of the program for tomorrow, Friday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for calling this matter to our attention. On tomorrow, we have three matters before the House, to be considered in the following order.

House Resolution 356, Government Operations Committee—operating funds.

H. R. 9428, Armed Forces, Army-Navy, Public Health Services, medical officers, procurement.

H. R. 9429, Armed Forces, medical care for dependents.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a spirit of deep sadness and humility that I rise today to pay homage to a great American statesman who preceded me here for 11 years.

He was Congressman John Jennings, Jr., who passed away Monday, February 27, at 8:10 p. m. at the Baptist Hospital, Knoxville, Tenn.

Many of you here served with him in the House of Representatives and you knew, loved, and respected him.

You remember him for his great crusade for the Republican Party, for his outstanding work on the Judiciary Committee, and for his unusual ability as an orator and for his love of telling entertaining stories.

The "judge" as he is referred to by the majority of the citizens of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee, was, indeed, a colorful figure. He was forceful in his support of an issue or of a candidate in an election and he was just as vigorous in his opposition.

I know whereof I speak.

I fitted into both categories.

Judge Jennings and I, on occasions in Tennessee politics, supported each other for public offices and then we were opponents in a Republican primary election. I always respected him for his strong and zealous fight for the principles which he felt were right. I shall continue to admire and respect his memory. He was a man with an abundance of energy and who would not let up.

The judge and I again became good friends, and to show his disposition and rare expression, I quote to you from a recent note I received from him:

> Thanks for all you've done and for your good telegram of the 13th. You had your fences pig-tight, mule-high, and bull-strong.

Those words are symbolic of John Jennings' exuberant manner and of saying what he had to say.

Last summer, he sent to my wife and me a bushel of the finest tomatoes I had ever seen which he raised on his farm.

Deriving the title of "judge" from his office as chancellor of the second chancery division of Tennessee, Judge Jennings began his public career in Jellico, Campbell County, Tenn., in 1903. His first office was superintendent of the county schools there. He was Campbell County attorney from 1911 to 1918 and he was a delegate to 3 Republican national conventions—1912, 1936, and 1944. He was special assistant to the attorney general of the United States in 1918–19, and he made his first race for Congress in 1922 against the late beloved J. Will Taylor. Congressman Taylor won the Republican nomination and Judge Jennings resigned as chancellor and moved to Knoxville to practice law with the late T. Asbury Wright. The law firm was eminently successful. For many years, Judge Jennings had been the senior member of the law firm, Jennings, O'Neil and Jarvis. Congressman Taylor died November 14, 1939. Judge Jennings was chosen the Republican nominee and was elected to serve out the unexpired term of the 76th Congress, and was reelected to the 77th and to the 4 succeeding Congresses and served until January 3, 1951.

Born in Jacksboro, Campbell County, Tenn., on June 6, 1880, he attended the public schools and American Temperance University, Harriman, Tenn. He was graduated from the U. S. Grant University, Harriman, Tenn., in 1906, studied law, and was admitted to the bar of Tennessee in 1903. He began his practice of law in Jellico, Campbell County, Tenn.

Congressman Jennings was a distinguished lawyer, public servant and statesman.

On this occasion I should like to extend my genuine sympathy to his devoted wife and daughters, other members of his family, and to his thousands of friends, in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of John Jennings. During his period of service he and I developed a very close feeling of friendship, a friendship that I valued very much.

John Jennings was one of the hardest-working Members of the House, sincere in his devotion to his people, a man with a great love for our Government and its ideals and what it stands for. During his lifetime he made marked contributions toward the progress of America.

I shall miss him very much. He possessed one of the most dynamic, attractive personalities of any person I have ever met, a personality which impressed itself upon everyone who contacted him or knew him. I join my friends from Tennessee in expressing my deep sympathy to Mrs. Jennings and her loved ones.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it was with very deep regret and profound sorrow that I heard of the death of my warm friend and former distinguished colleague from Tennessee, John Jennings. It was my privilege to serve with him throughout his period of service here and to admire and respect him and cherish a warm friendship with him. He was a man of outstanding ability, a man of the very highest character and demonstrated devotion to public service. I am sure he will be greatly missed by his great host of friends. I join my colleagues in conveying my deepest sympathy to the members of his bereaved family.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was very saddened the other day on reading in the press of the death of our former colleague, John Jennings. I served with John Jennings the many years he was in Congress. He was a very outstanding and able representative of the people of Tennessee.

John Jennings was an individual you could not help but like. He was genuine, he was real; I particularly liked the many times on social occasions when we could sit down with him and he would relate as only he could in his own fashion the many incidents of interest that took place during his life. I recall the many fine stories, which were actually

true stories, that depicted the character of this man and the kind of life he had led up to the time he came to Congress.

He was outstanding in many respects. His was a life of value and service to his community and Nation. Along with his many other friends still remaining in the Congress, I express my deep sympathy to those loved ones who remain.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in all my experience here I do not think I have seen a Member of Congress who was admired and respected more greatly than John Jennings, Jr. John Jennings came from an old pioneer family of east Tennessee. His sisters and his brothers have attained positions of high respectability in Tennessee. His brother has rendered eminent service in the Department of the Interior.

John Jennings started his career early. His rise was steady and rapid. He had a great capacity for love—no one enjoyed and loved people more than John Jennings. He derived a great deal of satisfaction out of his associations with people. I think aside from his achievements and his contributions to good government, which he made during his public life and while he was a Member of the Congress, the high satisfaction he got was out of his association with friends and fellow Members here on the floor. He had the qualities of heart and mind that appealed to the confidence of people. He was, I think, universally loved and certainly as universally respected as any man who has served in public life from Tennessee during my experience. The position which he achieved and the fine qualities of heart and mind which he exhibited will long stand as a monument to all who knew him. My deepest sympathy goes out to the members of his family and those who were dear to him back home in his State of Tennessee. We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that John Jennings lived a full life and made such fine contributions to good government and to society. The world is a better place because John Jennings passed this way.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege many years ago to know Judge Jennings before I came to the House. He was recognized as one of our great lawyers in Tennessee. After coming to the House, I served with him as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and no member of that great committee ever had greater respect from other members than did Judge Jennings. During his service here in the House, he made many, many friends on both sides of the aisle. Although, as has been stated, he was a stanch Republican, yet he could always see the point of view of Members who sat on the other side of the aisle. I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our former colleague, and to express to the members of his family my deep sympathy for the great loss they have sustained.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to hear of the death of Judge Jennings. I recall when he served here in the House with us; able, astute, a fine lawyer. I recall more vividly his sharp humor and, specifically, I am mindful of the occasion that must be recorded in the RECORD, when Judge Jennings asked to strike out the necessary number of words which automatically gave him 5 minutes on an amendment then under discussion. The judge was endeavoring to put forth, as he could in his very able and rapid manner, all of the sound arguments and reasons why that particular amendment should be adopted. But when a Member asked him to yield, he said, without hesitation, "I am sorry I cannot yield now since I am like a mummy, pressed for time." John Jennings continued his argument amid laughter and applause when the House caught on to his reply which impressed me further with this fine Tennessee gentleman. Others will remember this and other incidents that exemplified the ready wit, the great humor and human understanding and vast experience which he brought to his colleagues here in the House of Representatives. At times the debate becomes very serious and very heated, yet there is always one, like Judge Jennings, who could by his gentle humor, restored the necessary coolness so necessary to the proper deliberations of this body. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues and especially our colleagues from the State of Tennessee in extending condolences to the family of Judge Jennings.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life, character, and public service of our departed colleague.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MISSISSIPPI INTERPOSES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, by a vote of 136 to none in the House and 49 to none in the Senate, the Legislature of the State of Mississippi joined those of her sister States of Virginia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia, in interposing her sovereignty between the illegal black Monday decisions of the United States Supreme Court and the people of her States. This resolution, in effect states that Mississippi will not abide by these decisions, and declares them invalid and of no force and effect within the territorial jurisdiction of Mississippi. We do not intend to submit to the tyranny of a political Supreme Court. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of this resolution, and I commend it to the reading of the House. The resolution is self-explanatory, and reads as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 125

Concurrent resolution condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States and declaring that its decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, and all similar decisions are in violation of the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and are therefore unconstitutional and of no lawful effect within the territorial limits of the State of Mississippi; declaring that a contest of powers has arisen between the State of Mississippi and said Supreme Court and invoking the historic doctrine of interposition to protect the sovereignty of this and the other States of the Union; and calling on our sister States and the Congress for redress of grievances as provided by law; and for other purposes

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Legislature of Mississippi unequivocally expresses a firm determination to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution of this State, against every attempt, whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the fundamental principles embodied in our basic law by which this Government was established, and by which the liberty of the people and the sovereignty of the States, in their proper spheres, have been long protected and guaranteed;

That the Legislature of Mississippi explicitly and preemptorily declares and maintains that the powers of the Federal Government emanate solely from the compact, to which the States are principals, as limited by the plain sense and long-recognized intention of the instrument creating that compact;

That the Legislature of Mississippi firmly asserts that the powers of the Federal Government are limited, and valid only to the extent that these powers have been conferred as enumerated in the compact to which the various States assented originally and to which the States have consented in subsequent amendments validly ratified;

That the inherent nature of this basic compact, apparent upon its face, is that the ratifying States, parties thereto, have agreed voluntarily to confer certain of their sovereign rights, but only specific sovereign rights, to a Federal Government thus constituted; and that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, have been reserved to the States respectively, or to the people;

That the State of Mississippi has at no time, through the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or in any manner whatsoever delegated to the Federal Government its right to educate and nurture its youth and its power and right of control over its schools, colleges, educational and other public institutions and facilities, and to prescribe the rules, regulations, and conditions under which they shall be conducted;

That the aggrandizement of powers by the Federal Government has grown far beyond that ever conceived by the authors of our Constitution, that the seizure and concentration therein of powers not granted by the compact under which the several States entered this Union, and particularly that by which Mississippi entered the Union on December 10, 1817, threaten to reduce these sovereign States to mere satellites, and to

subject us to the tyranny of centralized government, so rightfully abhorred by the founders, and for the prevention of which they exercised their finest genius;

That in late years the encroachment upon the reserved rights of the States and of the people has grown apace, and the proponents of the acts of encroachment have grown so emboldened that not one of the sister States and its people have escaped the oppressive hand thereof: In the destruction of their vested property rights; abridgements of their liberties; control of their institutions, habits, manners, and morals by centralized bureaucratic instrumentalities; and in fact by various wrongful and obtrusive acts, too numerous to be here documented, but so consistently characterized by an oppressive course of action so as to seriously threaten to completely destroy our constitutional processes and substitute in lieu thereof ideologies foreign to the soil of our beloved land;

That one of the noblest characteristics of our people is the reverent respect for and obedience to the courts of law and justice, and that which more than any other has enabled our institutions of government, and ought to be challenged only with the most dreadful reluctance, still it should be solemnly and firmly declared that the hand of tyranny ought to be stayed from whatsoever source it might strike;

That we profess an undying attachment to and a warm regard and respect for the sister States, and for this Union, which, through unwarranted and unconstitutional action of the Supreme Court, is fastly being dissolved by usurpation of powers reserved to the States and transferring them to an all-powerful centralized government which, unless halted, will reduce the States to impotent vassals, sheared of all rights and powers except those received at the sufferance of the Federal Government;

That a question of contested power has arisen; the Supreme Court of the United States asserts, for its part, that the States did in fact prohibit unto themselves the power to maintain racially separate public institutions, and the State of Mississippi for its part asserts that it and its sister States have never delegated such rights;

That the flagrant assertion upon the part of the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by threats of coercion and compulsion against the sovereign States of this Union, constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the Court to usurp the exercise of powers not granted to it;

That the Legislature of Mississippi asserts that whenever the Federal Government attemps to engage in the deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to it, the States who are parties to the compact have the right, and are in duty bound to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them;

That failure on the part of this State thus to assert its clear rights would be construed as acquiescence in the surrender thereof, and that such submissive acquiescence to the seizure of one right would in the end lead to the surrender of all rights, and inevitably to the consolidation of the States into one sovereignty, contrary to the sacred compact by which this Union of States was created;

That the question of contested power asserted in this resolution is not within the province of the Court to determine because the Court itself seeks to usurp the powers which have been reserved to the States, and, therefore, under these circumstances, the judgment of all of the parties to the compact must be sought to resolve the question; that the Supreme Court is not a party to this compact, but a creature of the compact, and the question of contested power cannot be settled by the creature seeking to usurp the power, but by the parties to the compact who are the people of the respective States in whom ultimate sovereignty finally reposes; be it further

Resolved, That in order that relief be obtained and the wrongs and injuries inflicted be alleviated we invite all of our sister States to join in taking such steps as are necessary to settle the grave question of contested sovereignty herein raised; the State of Mississippi declares that the Congress has the duty and authority to protect the rights of the States from the unwarranted encroachment upon their reserved powers to govern the internal and domestic affairs of the States; the State of Mississippi further asserts that the Congress has, on many occasions in the past, curbed the attempted encroachment by the judiciary upon the legislative and executive branches of government, and it is the responsibility of the Congress likewise to protect the States when their constitutional rights and privileges are endangered;

The State of Mississippi declares emphatically that the sovereign States of the Nation have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions; therefore, when an attempt is made to usurp these powers, the people of Mississippi object and refuse to be so deprived, reminding the Congress that the preservation of this Union of States, as the compact intended it to be, depends upon the preservation of the sovereignty of the States;

The compact intended ours to be a government of the people, for the people and, above all, a government by the people; if the right to govern and control the local affairs to decide questions of public health, morals, education and safety are taken from the States, then a fatal blow has been dealt State sovereignty and the States are nothing more than vassal provinces, subject to a central government;

The State of Mississippi declares that it is the duty and privilege of a State to object to the aforesaid invasion of its rights and does hereby interpose its sovereignty to protect these rights; it is the duty of the Congress to halt such practices and save these rights; and if such cannot be obtained other than by amendment to the Federal Constitution, we appeal to the Congress, in the exercise of the power granted under Article 5 of the Constitution, to initiate and submit an appropriate amendment direct to the 48 States for ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures thereof, declaring that the States have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions and facilities to the Federal Government, or any department or agency thereof, but such powers are reserved to the States; and until such time as these wrongs are righted, we do hereby declare the decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, to be a usurpation of power reserved to the several States and do declare, as a matter of right, that said decisions are in violation of the Constitution of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and therefore, are considered unconstitutional, invalid, and of no lawful effect within the confines of the State of Mississippi;

We declare, further, our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably and constitutionally available to us, to void this illegal encroachment upon our rights, and we do hereby urge our sister States to take prompt and deliberate action to check further encroachment by the Federal Government, through judicial legislation, upon the reserved powers of all States.

The Governor of Mississippi is respectfully requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Governor of each of the other States, and to the Members of Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that any of the Members of the House of Representatives is surprised at the interposition resolution of our Mississippi Legislature.

I would like to say to the membership of the House that this resolution represents the deep feelings of our people in Mississippi. We feel very strongly that the Supreme Court in the school decisions warped the meaning of the Constitution. We believe that the Court, in effect, amended the Constitution.

We know that in our State, where the two races have lived together in harmony for many, many years, that the overwhelming majority of both races believe in segregation.

We know, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has made the situation worse for all parties concerned.

I am glad to note that the Legislature of Mississippi, by unanimous vote, has let the Supreme Court and the people of the Nation know just how we feel about this act of the Supreme Court which strikes at the very foundation of our Government.

If the Supreme Court can usurp this right of the States, then there is no other right that would be beyond its reach.

THE SOIL BANK PLAN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement of Melvin P. Gehlbach.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting with my remarks the statement of Melvin P. Gehlbach, chairman of the Soil Bank Association of Lincoln, Ill., before the House Committee on Agriculture Tuesday, February 28, 1956.

Melvin Gehlbach was the originator of the soil bank plan and is a resident of my congressional district. He has been one of the most careful thinkers on agricultural problems of anyone in America.

I have been disturbed by the so-called soil bank provisions of S. 3183, which is far from the real soil bank plan as originated some years ago by Mr. Gehlbach. Many of my colleagues have asked me about Mr. Gehlbach and his plan. May I recommend to all of you a careful reading of the statement which Mr. Gehlbach made before the House Committee on Agriculture on Tuesday. It is a complete and careful analysis of the real soil bank plan. Unless the Senate bill is amended to comply substantially with the Gehlbach plan, the soil bank plan will not be able to work substantially as it was planned.

I realize that the bill which will come to this House for a vote will be written in the conference between the House and

the other body on the bill passed last year by the House and the bill that will be enacted by the other body this week.

To the conferees I am recommending that they most carefully consider Mr. Gehlbach's testimony and a true understanding had of his plan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gehlbach's statement be inserted in the RECORD immediately following these remarks.

STATEMENT OF MELVIN P. GEHLBACH, CHAIRMAN, SOIL-BANK ASSOCIATION, LINCOLN, ILL., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FEBRUARY 28, 1956

On behalf of the Soil-Bank Association I would like to express our appreciation for having this opportunity to reappear before your committee. My first testimony concerning the soil-bank approach was at the public hearing of the House Committee on Agriculture, at Bloomington, Ill., on October 17, 1953. At this time we outlined an agricultural program based on conservation incentives and unrestricted acreages of basic crops. We presented the soil-bank plan for American agriculture to this committee on April 15, 1954.

I am representing the Soil-Bank Association which was incorported to promote the original soil-bank plan. I am not representing any State or National Farm Bureau organization.

In recent months proposals of many varieties have been echoed across the country under the name of soil bank. With so many different proposals under the same name it is only natural that farmers and the general public are confused. We didn't copyright the name—maybe we should have. We were more interested in developing a workable plan. And, we still believe that the original proposal is a more workable plan.

In our opinion, the real solution to our agricultural problem does not hinge on the much debated issue of price support level. In our testimony before this committee on April 15, 1954, we stated, "Lowering farm support prices is not the solution to our agricultural problem. Lower prices require greater acreage to maintain net earnings. Farmers must be assured fair earnings in relation to other segments of the economy. This is vital. We feel that the soundest solution to the agricultural problem is to financially encourage an increased acreage of soil-building crops so that farmers will voluntarily adjust production in relation to demand."

The farm problem is more than Government-held farm surpluses. It is primarily that of protecting the net earnings of individual farmers throughout all areas of the country. Not to guarantee them a profit—but only to give them an opportunity to share fairly in the prosperity enjoyed by other segments of the economy.

Farm prices go down, you know, when we produce more than current market needs. The sad story is that farm prices go down faster than production increases. It is generally accepted that a 10 percent increase in the supply of grain is associated with a 20 percent decline in price. For livestock, a 10 percent increase in supply is associated with a 25 percent decline in price. The soil-bank plan is founded on the principle that farmers in all areas must realize that they cannot continue to overproduce market needs, depress farm prices lower and lower, and expect to end up with a fair net earning. This is especially true when farm operating costs remain high.

Allow me to again quote from my previous statement before this committee: "By properly placing incentive payments on soil-building crops we could encourage farmers to produce what is needed for current consumption, maintain farm earnings at full parity, and store fertility in the soil to be a ready reserve of productive capacity for food and fiber in any emergency. In this way we would protect our agricultural resources for future generations as well as our current farm earnings. The adjustment of our acres between soil-building and soil-depletive uses on each and every farm is the ultimate answer to our agricultural problem. More and more people are seeing the soundness of this approach."

Farmers of all agriculture areas need to cooperate in an overall adjustment of production. To give all farmers the benefit of a sound agricultural program we must adjust the diverted acres as well as the acres of our basic crops. Reducing the acreage of a crop in one agricultural region and having the acreage for that same crop expanded in another region is mere nonsense. Reducing the acreage of an individual crop in all areas merely to have it replaced by a substitute crop—a crop second best for the region—is also nonsense.

We must think beyond the production of crops in the development of a program. We must also include the livestock producer in order to protect his net income. An oversupply of feed or the untimely release of Government-held surplus at a low price could spell disaster to the livestock farmer since a 10 percent increase in supply brings a 25 percent decline in his prices.

THE SOIL-BANK ASSOCIATION PROPOSAL

The implementation of a farm program to adjust production in keeping with the soil-bank principles must be direct, simple, and extensive. We feel it should have a positive approach and should offer to farmers the opportunity to earn an incentive payment to expand his soil-building acres over and above a normal minimum base. This base should relate to the level of soil resources in the area. The incentive payment should outweigh the difference between the fertility value of such additional acres and the farmer's sacrifice of current income which he would forego by making this adjustment. Our proposal was never intended to unload Government-held surpluses onto the farmer or onto the market, but instead, to effectively adjust production below current needs to make use of present held surpluses at their full value. Surpluses are a result of overproduction in relation to market needs and their cure, if not forthcoming through markets, must come from the production side.

EXPANDED SOIL BUILDING CAN ADJUST ALL PRODUCTION

The adjustment of agricultural production would be accomplished by our being concerned with the acreage of only one class of crops—the soil-building crops. As these crops are expanded, the acreages of cash crops in surplus are reduced. An effective soil-bank plan can be just this simple. This approach could then successfully handle the diverted acres problem. It would prevent the substitution of similar crops competing with price-supported crops.

If we are going to face the issue squarely, the Corn Belt will need to adjust the production of all feed grains instead of only corn; a portion of the diverted wheat acreage now planted to feed grains will need to be in soil building; and, in the Cotton Belt a portion of the corn and soybean acres will need to be in soil building. Corn farmers need to realize that planting soybeans in lieu of corn is not an effective production adjustment program. If we choose not to face this issue squarely, the American farmer, guided by the economics of his individual farm business, may continue to overproduce only to receive lower and lower prices.

In the United States we have 142 million acres of cropland planted to hay and pasture. We also have about 30 million acres temporarily idle or land in soil improvement crops not harvested or pastured; in addition there are 24 million acres of land summer fallow and not producing a crop. We doubt the effectiveness of a program that would allow farmers to place into an acreage reserve the 54 million acres that are already retired from crop production. Are we going to reduce surplus if we merely pay farmers to place acres they are not now using for crops into an acreage or conservation reserve?

We are hopeful that title II, Soil Bank Act, of Senate bill 3183 can be amended to prevent normal summer fallow land from becoming the acreage reserve while the underplanted wheat acreage might still be diverted to the production of feed grains. We also hope that the underplanted allotted acreage of corn placed in the acreage reserve will not have as its soil conserving crop any of the present acreage now in soil improvement crops not harvested or pastured. If this were true, the reduced corn acreage may be diverted to soybeans. The farmer in noncompliance would increase corn and reduce soybeans. We believe that the acreage reserve as proposed will be ineffective in adjusting production in the Corn Belt. Only a small portion of farmers in this area would be eligible under the acreage reserve program since 60 percent of corn farmers are not in compliance with acreage allotments. A lower support price on corn together with a reduced allotment for corn, is not inducive to greater participation for cornbelt farmers.

Our hope is that the hour is not too late to get a changed approach in the implementation of the Soil Bank Act, with particular reference to subtitle A, acreage reserve program. Instead of the acreage reserve being limited to the underplanting of allotment crops, farmers should be given opportunity to expand the acreage of soil-building crops in excess of a minimum base.

The soil-bank plan as proposed by the Soil Bank Association would—

1. Establish a minimum base for hay, pasture, and soil-building crops for the various agricultural regions.

2. Offer incentive payments, for soil-building acres in excess of this minimum base.

3. Establish the soil-building base for an individual farm in relation to soil class, and it would not be tied to an individual farmer's historical acreage.

4. Give all individual farms on comparable land classes a comparable proportionate base and give opportunity to earn soil-bank incentive payments for an additional acreage of soil-building crops.

5. Provide incentive payments, that relate to the value of crops harvested per acre of cropland, to outweigh net profits and not gross profits per acre.

6. Allow level, highly productive land to receive higher incentive payments on fewer acres, while rolling and less productive land would receive somewhat lower per acre payments, but on more acres.

7. Provide commodity loans at levels adjusted to the degree of soil-building compliance on individual farms.

APPLICATION TO A FARM

The degree of success of any farm program, will depend, to a large extent, upon how it will operate on an individual farm. Let us compare the proposed acreage reserve and our soil-bank plan on a typical farm in the Corn Belt. In order to properly evaluate the application of a program, one must start with the crops grown during the year previous to the application of the plan. The following is a list of the fields and crops grown in 1955:

1. Fifty acres: Alfalfa.

2. Fifty acres: Small grain (legume seeding).

3. Fifty acres: Corn.

4. Fifty acres: 30 acres corn, 20 acres soybeans.

Land use summary

	Acres
Corn	80
Soybeans	20
Small grain	50
Total grain	150
Hay and pasture	50
Total crop acres	200

THE ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM

If we apply the proposed acreage reserve program to this 200-acre farm, I think we could expect the 1956 farm map to show as large a grain acreage as the 1955 production. In the Senate bill 3183 we do not see any provision to prevent a farmer from placing some of his present hay and pasture acreage into the acreage reserve to equal the underplanted corn acreage. After doing this he can plant the 30 acres formerly in corn into soybeans and the result is merely a shifting of crops. His continuing to have 150 acres in grain together with certificates to secure additional feed grains out of CCC stocks for the 30 acres of underplanted corn will result in a greater supply available for feed or market. The result of this can only be further depressed livestock and grain prices. Acreage reserve payments received by farmers would be offset by lower prices resulting from the failure of the program to adjust production and the untimely release of Government held surpluses.

1. Fifty acres: Corn.

2. Fifty acres: 20 acres alfalfa hay and pasture, 30 acres alfalfa acreage reserve.

3. Fifty acres: Soybeans.

4. Fifty acres: Small grain (legume seeding).

Acreage reserve program—land use summary

	Acres
Corn	50
Soybeans	50
Small grain	50
Total grain	150
Hay and pasture	20
Acreage reserve	30
Total crop acres	200

The soil-bank plan, designed to pay farmers to keep additional land in soil-building crops over and above a normal minimum base of hay and pasture crops, would adjust the acreage of grain crops downward. The crops planted, as in the acreage reserve program, must follow a rather definite rotation sequence. Field 1 would normally be planted to corn. Field 2, which was in small grain in 1955, naturally will be the alfalfa hay and pasture in 1956. Field 3 might well be corn or soybeans. Field 4 would go into small grain with a seeding of alfalfa to be used the following year.

1. Fifty acres: 20 acres corn, 30 acres alfalfa soil-bank.

2. Fifty acres: Alfalfa hay and pasture.

3. Fifty acres: 30 acres corn, 20 acres soybeans.

4. Fifty acres: Small grain (legume seeding).

Our soil-bank plan—land use summary

	Acres
Corn	50
Soybeans	20
Small grain	50
Total grain	120
Hay and pasture	50
Soil-bank acres	30
Total crop acres	200

Assuming a minimum hay and pasture base of 25 percent of the cropland, this particular farmer could comply with the soil bank by allowing possibly 30 acres of alfalfa to remain in field 1 and reduce his acreage of grain from 150 acres to 120 acres. He would not upset his livestock operations by having restrictions placed on his normal use of hay and pasture.

Prior to the application of the soil-bank plan, the grain of this farm would be produced on 150 acres of cropland. After 30 acres are shifted from grain to soil-building uses, grain production will be limited to 120 acres. Assuming a yield of 50 bushels of grain per acre we would have a total production of 7,500 bushels prior to the soil-bank program.

The summary of production both before and after the soil-bank plan would be as follows:

Normal production:	
Acres	150
Yield (bushels per acre)	50
Production (bushels)	7,500
Price	$1.00
Gross return	$7,500
Probable reduction:	
Acres	30
Yield (bushels per acre)	40
Production (bushels)	1,200
Adjusted production:	
Acres	120
Yield (bushels per acre)	52.5
Production (bushels)	6,300
Price	$1.32
Gross return	$8,316

Percent change, 20 percent fewer acres; 16 percent adjustment in production.

How does the soil-bank plan affect the individual farmer's earning?

1. By removing 30 acres from production, the farmer can save the cost of plowing, planting, cultivating, harvesting, fertilizer, and seed for the soil-bank acres.

2. He increases his average yield by taking out his lowest yielding acres.

3. His 16-percent reduction in production is associated with a 32 percent increase in price. His gross earning would compare as follows:

7,500 bushels at $1 per bushel	$7,500
6,300 bushels at $1.32 per bushel	8,316
Increase in gross return under soil-bank plan	816
Soil-bank payment (30 acres at $30 per acre)	900
Added gross return for compliance with soil bank	1,716

THE LIVESTOCK FARMER IS PROTECTED

Incentive payments should be designed so as to discourage overproduction of roughage-consuming livestock. For example, a farmer expanding his acreage of soil-building crops and using these crops for feed would be given only a first payment. If this acreage were used solely as fertility, he would be given a fertility reserve payment in addition to the first payment. A most successful way to direct America is the use of the American dollar. You can legislate laws forbidding the use for forage acres for hay and pasture, but who will drive the cows out of the forbidden area at midnight? It would seem much easier to pay for the shift in land use after the shift is made and finally make the fertility reserve payment only if the forage were not fed.

The dairy cows eating this extra forage will have to show promise of a substantial profit or a farmer may send them to market and take his dollar incentive payment today rather than milk cows and hope for a profit tomorrow. Feeder cattle profits, as well as net returns from beef cow herds, will have to be attractive before farmers will forego their final fertility reserve payment. The soil-bank plan is designated for livestock farms as well as grain farms.

FEED RESERVE FOR EMERGENCY

The increased acres of soil-building crops are more than a fertility reserve—they are a forage reserve on each and every farm. In case of drought or other emergency, this reserve can be brought into use if need outweighs incentive payment. The decision to release much needed feed to maintain cattle herds when drought, flood, or insect hazards strike, should be left with the farmer. The forage reserve is designed to meet the needs of the individual farm and have a degree of flexibility to protect farm income as well as a food supply for the Nation.

SURPLUS RELEASE CREATES PRICE PROBLEM

Now we would like to take up the handling of present surpluses. It is very important that these surpluses not be brought back onto farms or into the market until we have an effective production-adjustment program. If farmers are paid certificates that would release Government surpluses, while at the same time they merely shift crop acreages instead of reducing overall production, we might find farm market prices going to even lower levels. The quickest way to defeat the real operation of a soil bank is to have these Government surpluses at reduced prices become the soil-bank payment for land shifted but not reducing production.

TO HANDLE SURPLUS

How must we handle our Government-held surpluses? We believe we should—

1. Convert a portion of present farm surplus into a well-defined stockpile with provision for periodic replacement. This should be spelled out for national defense or emergency and not considered a surplus.

2. Adjust production below current needs to absorb the balance of the surplus into the market for use as soon as possible, not at reduced price but at full price. We are in accord with the President's proposal to "recommend legislation to permit, under proper safeguards, sales at not less than support levels, plus carrying charges."

3. Instead of taking a substantial loss on the billions of dollars of agricultural commodities held by the Government, use a part of this money for an effective soil-bank program to adjust production below current needs. Nearly everyone agrees that it is cheaper to pay a farmer an incentive to expand soil-building acres than to overproduce cash crops and have to wonder what to do with them. In addition, the farmer receives extra earning in that he saves the cost of producing the surplus.

COMPLIANCE

It may be difficult to obtain full voluntary compliance in the soil-bank or any other plan in the near future. Farmers' participation would be determined largely by their attitude toward past programs as well as present programs. As some farmers might find it advantageous not to cooperate, many farmers may wish to shift beyond their allotted soil-building acreage and receive the unused soil-bank funds available from those who think it would be better to forego payment and not adjust production. In this way we may have only two-thirds of the farmers participating but acrewise could attain effective compliance. Why not let those farmers who need it most, adjust production and build fertility?

In addition to the incentive payment inducing farmers to adjust production, we propose offering commodity loans at levels in relation to the compliance with soil-bank acres. Farmers in full compliance should be eligible for full loan value. Farmers planting all cash crops and no soil-building crops would be eligible for only 50 percent loan value. The farmer determines his own loan level by his degree of participation in production adjustment.

IMPLEMENTATION

The proposed soil-bank plan must be made effective beyond any normal program to protect price levels during the period of moving surplus stocks back into the market for consumption. An accelerated program to accomplish this would involve a vigorous approach for 2 or 3 years and then would be tempered, not ended, to keep agriculture in balance with the rest of the economy.

The money spent for incentive payments to adjust production should not be considered a direct cost to the Government, for these payments would yield returns; first, by raising the price level of Government-held stocks in addition to farm prices; and, second, reduce losses now inevitable on the vast holding of commodities deteriorating in value due to loss of quality, as well as save on the million-dollar-a-day storage cost.

We would recommend that our soil-bank plan be implemented at an early date to halt the farm price decline, reduce the cost of storing unwanted surpluses, and move commodities now held, into the market at a much earlier date than would be accomplished in a program involving only 45 million ineffective acres, acres that are already out of crop production.

Our soil-bank plan would be applied as follows:

Approximate acres (millions)

Total acres of cropland in the United States	478
Soil-building base (large part of present acreage in hay, pasture, etc.)	150
Soil-bank acres (for which farmers can receive incentive payments)	150

It can never be expected that all acreage eligible for payment will be shifted into soil-building, but we can expect near 100 million acres of land now producing cash crops at a low yield per acre and returning little or no net profit per acre to come into the soil-bank program. When surpluses are reduced and production is brought into line with market needs, the higher price will automatically shift land back into cash crops thus relieving the Governemnt of providing as much incentive payment. This plan is designed to balance agriculture with the level of the entire economy, protecting the consumer's food supply at reasonable prices; while, on the other hand, protecting the farmer against the plague of overproduction, unwanted surpluses and drastically low farm earnings.

We would like to see soil-bank payments made in two parts—a first payment to shift land use from grain to forage on the expected 100 million acres at an average payment of $8 per acre. This payment would be related to the level of production of the various agricultural regions ranging from $3 to $15 per acre. There should be no restrictions on the use of forage for this first payment. A second payment would be offered those farmers who forego feeding the forage on these soil-bank acres. This payment too would average around $8 per acre with a range similar to the first payment. A good guess is that we would have at least 75 million acres of the 100 million acres affected by the second incentive payment to place into a fertility reserve the forage grown and not harvested or fed. These payments should be enlarged for the first year or two in order to assure greater compliance. This is necessary to bring production into balance with market needs, use our accumulated surplus and protect the net earning of farmers during the period of adjustment.

SOIL-BANK PLAN CAN EARN ITS OWN WAY

By adjusting production beyond current needs, enabling the Government to move the surplus into the market earlier, and thereby saving the cost of commodity deterioration and storage, we should regain $600 million. This is based on a $6 billion storage holding, figuring a 10 percent annual reduction in value.

By adjusting production to market needs, we might well halt the farm price decline and even regain a part of the 25-percent decrease already experienced. A 10-percent reduction in production is associated with a 20-percent increase in grain prices and a 25-percent increase in livestock prices. It is quite possible to gain this much in 1 year if present surpluses are properly handled.

A quite conservative estimate of price response to an effective program of production adjustment would be at least 10 percent. If this is applied to only $6 billion of present Government stockpile, the program could earn about $600 million without using the surplus itself.

These 2 factors alone, the gaining of price and the prevention of part of the loss of commodity deterioration and storage costs, would provide $1.2 billion toward incentive payments proposed.

For the portion of farmers having earnings at levels subject to Federal income tax, the increase in earnings resulting from the program will pay all or at least a substantial part of the cost of administering the program.

NET COST

How much money will this program cost? If made effective it need not cost too much. Here are our estimates:

Payments

	Million dollars
First payment—100 million acres to forage at $8	800
Second payment—75 million acres (forage not fed) at $8	600
Total incentive payments (spending—not cost)	1,400

Soil-bank earnings

Price recovery of CCC inventory and reduction of losses (deterioration)	1,200
Net cost	200

We hope that legislation can provide farmers with the means to adjust production. When this is accomplished we will have solved the farm surplus problem. The adjustment of production in all agricultural areas is the solution to the real farm problem. An aggressive soil-bank program to adjust production to market needs and bring farm prices to full parity in the market will answer the much debated question of farm price support levels.

Thank you.

FEDERAL AIRPORT AID PROGRAM

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that yesterday the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee by unanimous action agreed to undertake an investigation of the Federal airport aid program. I urged such an investigation in a letter to the Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, chairman of the subcommittee, which I inserted in my remarks concerning Federal airport aid on the floor of the House last Thursday appearing on page 3266 and following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In announcing the committee's action the chairman issued a brief statement indicating the purpose and scope of the committee's inquiry, which I insert at this point in my remarks.

[From the office of Representative ROBERT MOLLOHAN, February 29, 1956]

Representative ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, Democrat, of West Virginia, disclosed today a subcommittee he heads will investigate Federal airport-aid allocations administered by the Commerce Department.

MOLLOHAN, chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, said his inquiry stemmed from charges of waste in allocations to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport at Romulus, Mich.

The inquiry was asked by Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, a member of MOLLOHAN'S subcommittee.

MOLLOHAN said the current Federal Airport Aid Act granting broad powers and huge amounts of money to the Civil Aeronautics Administration made it imperative that Congress maintain a check to see that it is spent economically and efficiently.

MOLLOHAN'S subcommittee monitors executive expenditures in the Commerce Department as well as the Treasury and Justice Departments and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The West Virginia lawmaker said a new airport-aid act, passed last year, binds Congress to appropriate more than $250 million for the next 4 years for United States airport development. He said his panel will try to determine whether the Commerce Department and the Civil Aeronautics Administration are building airports for the horse and buggy reciprocal-engine era, or for the vast new turbo-prop and jet age.

MOLLOHAN said he also wants to determine the extent to which the armed services, through their membership on the Air Coordinating Committee and its panels, dominates determination of civil-aviation policy.

Mr. Speaker, this prospective investigation of the Federal airport-aid program, and particularly expenditures of funds at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, have aroused a great deal of interest in the State of Michigan. The Ann Arbor News on February 27 commented favorably on the proposed inquiry in an editorial which reads as follows:

FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW—MEADER SEEKS SHOWDOWN ON WILLOW RUN DISPUTE

Representative GEORGE MEADER, vigorous champion of Willow Run in the airport fracas, has suggested a full-scale investigation in the Federal airport air program.

And the developments in the past 6 months seem to warrant one. MEADER cited the Civil Aeronautics Administration's recent allotment of $975,000 to the Wayne Major Airport as a "prime example of unconscionable waste of public funds."

The CAA made the allotment on the basis of a recommendation made by the airport use panel that the commercial airlines located at Willow Run move to Wayne Major Airport and that military air operations be concentrated at Willow Run. The appropriation by the CAA is understandable, therefore, but the air panel's recommendation in the fall has stumped almost everyone.

It is perfectly apparent even to the strongest partisans of Willow Run or Wayne Major that neither port fulfills the air requirements of the Detroit metropolitan area. A new airport to the northeast of Detroit is the ultimate answer to problems of expanded air usage. To spend huge sums of money on either other airport would be a manifest mistake. And Wayne Major can

be made acceptable for the airlines now located at Willow Run only at the expenditure of many millions of dollars. One of the airlines now located at Willow Run has indicated a willingness to move, but the spokesman for all the others has said it would be "bad business judgment" for them to consider such a thing and they will not move unless forced to.

The air panel has no power to enforce its mysterious recommendation, but the Government has requested that the university, to which the airport is leased, try the panel recommendations. President Hatcher's reply delivered to the Navy Department last week stated, however, that the university did not consider the recommendation any reason for "rescinding existing commitments to the airlines."

Last fall's panel report contains plenty of ammunition for Representative MEADER in his call for an investigation. The report shows that less than half a million dollars have been spent for improvements on Willow Run Airport—of which about $70,000 is Federal money—in recent years. Wayne Major on the other hand has received $4 million of Federal money and $13 million of county money. All this has been poured into what at best would be a stop-gap airport and isn't even that at present.

Improvements are necessary at Willow Run, but the airlines say they can finance them without any Federal aid.

MEADER has made renewed appeals for reconsideration to Louis S. Rothschild, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, and Charles G. Lowen, CAA Administrator, neither of whom held office when the air use recommendation was made last fall. To date, he has received no assurance from them that the CAA allocation will be held up, or that the total situation will be reviewed.

If he receives no satisfaction on his requests for a new assessment, MEADER will have every reason to suspect that such misuse of Government money is not uncommon. A full-scale investigation is certainly indicated if the Government persists in its determination to send good money after bad.

The Detroit Free Press has exhibited a sustained interest in Detroit's airport problems and ran a series of 13 articles by their aviation writer, Jean Pearson, which I inserted in the remarks I made last Thursday.

On February 25 the Detroit Free Press also endorsed the objectives of the investigation I have requested in an editorial which reads as follows:

MEADER'S WISH TO LOOK AT AIRPORT SPENDING

Since World War II, Willow Run has been Detroit's commercial airport.

Except from local politicians, there has been no pressure to move the airlines to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. In the main the lines have rejected invitations to go there.

While air travelers think gloomily of the miles and minutes they must travel after passing Wayne Major to reach Willow Run, there has been no ground swell of public effort toward moving commercial operations. We certainly have heard of no petitions urging it.

Yet Federal money has continued to go into Wayne Major. What the county and State elect to do with their money is another matter. But when Federal money is spent for airport development it is supposed to be done in accordance with certain rules and to meet particular needs.

For that reason we think that there is point to Representative MEADER'S call for a congressional investigation of what he calls an unconscionable waste of public funds. Unless it can explain its actions on a basis of military desirability, we're of the opinion that the Civil Aeronautics Authority may have some difficulty justifying its Wayne-Major outlays.

Fortifying this opinion are matters dealt with in the 13 airport articles by our aviation writer, Jean Pearson, which the Free Press published. These articles, indeed, sparked MEADER'S request for investigation and were inserted by him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mayor Cobo, while welcoming Meader's proposed inquiry, says he thinks Congress should have a look at Willow Run's books, too. If there is any ground for thinking that the University of Michigan has indulged in chicanery in its handling of Willow Run, his recommendation certainly should be pursued.

From surface indications, however, we would say that there is more that is questionable to be discovered at Wayne Major than at Willow Run. We don't believe it is good public policy for the CAA to have spent money on developing a field only a few miles from a going commercial airport when we so badly need an air terminal better situated than either Willow Run or Wayne Major to serve Detroit and a great many of the communities with which it is ringed about.

I also insert at this point the following telegram from William E. Brown, Jr., mayor of the city of Ann Arbor, Mich.:

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *March 1, 1956.*

Congressman GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Commend you highly for your vigorous investigation of airport expenditures. There is no sound reason, in my opinion, why Wayne Airport should be developed in view of the fact that Northeast Airport in city of Detroit is almost assured. Our district, I am sure, appreciates your active interest in our behalf.

WILLIAM E. BROWN, Jr.,
Mayor, City of Ann Arbor.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of our Legal and Monetory Affairs Subcommittee, my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, Representative MOLLOHAN, and my other colleagues on the committee for the forthright manner in which they have undertaken this very important inquiry. I want to commend especially the committee's intention to look into the airport aid program from the point of view of the national interest in the future of aviation.

The committee's inquiry is not limited to the controversy over airports in the Detroit area but seeks to assess the competence of decisions made in fostering and developing airports in the light of the rapid expansion of aviation and the prospective employment of improved planes and aviation techniques and their relationship to the location and design of airports.

I also commend the chairman's statement that he seeks to appraise the part the military have played in the decisions in the executive branch of the Government on aviation problems and whether that participation has been in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have high hopes that the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee can make a real contribution to the future of aviation through the inquiry it has today undertaken.

NEW ENGLAND BUSINESS GROUP ASKS FOR TAX RELIEF IN THE PATMAN BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee met this morning with the Smaller Business Association of New England and heard a group of New England accounting and tax experts analyze several tax measures now pending in Congress. At the conclusion of its presentation, the New England business group, through its president, went on record as favoring the provisions of H. R. 9067, introduced by me, although other Members are coauthors, and pledged to support its passage.

Mr. Daniel F. Viles, president of the association, in an opening statement said:

We are prepared to show you by the actual 5-year balance sheets of 7 different companies that tax relief for small concerns is urgently needed. Many bills for small business tax relief have been introduced. However the Patman bill, H. R. 9067, seems to be the best thought out, to be supported by the most intensive research, and to offer the best relief. We favor its provisions, as those which are adequate to insure the health and growth of small business, which is so necessary to maximum employment. The alarming number of mergers of small concerns with large firms is already a matter of deep concern to Congress, as indicated by the many bills introduced to regulate and restrict such mergers.

Mr. Viles also said:

The chairman of this Committee, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, has earned again the high esteem in which he is held by small and independent businessmen in all parts of the United States. The investigations and studies of the House Small Business Committee during the past year, and particularly those which have led to the drafting of the Patman tax bill, show a profound understanding of the economic influences which are bringing about a changing status of small business. I am grateful that the work of this Committee is awakening the Congress and the Nation to the steps which must be taken to preserve an opportunity for small business, and an opportunity for the growth of small business, in our free enterprise economy.

I was glad to praise the aggressive leadership of the Smaller Business Association of New England under Mr. Viles and said:

I am frank to say that while we had heard complaints about small business taxes, it was the New England Smaller Business Association that first dramatized to the Committee, more than a year ago, the necessity for adjusting the business taxes to give small and medium size firms more equitable treatment. The drafting of H. R. 9067 resulted from the request which your splendid association put before this Committee last year. It is generally agreed that it would be unwise to reduce Federal revenues at this time and I have therefore introduced a bill which will retain the present level of revenues but graduate the tax rate so that small and medium size firms will receive a substantial tax cut, while the largest firms—those most able to pay—will pay somewhat higher rates. Such a measure as this is immediately needed to encourage a general expansion of business, not only to provide attractive jobs for children now growing up on the farm, but to increase production of those goods and services which are relatively scarce and high priced.

You may be sure that I will do everything possible to help pass this bill.

Mr. Henry F. Griswold, a lawyer and certified public accountant of Boston, gave screen slide demonstrations analyzing the effects of present tax rates on the growth prospects of a number of smaller firms among his clients.

Mr. Archibald Peisch, a certified public accountant from Vermont, and former professor at the Amos Tuck Business School of Dartmouth College, testified that "among his smaller business clients, the application of the surtax after $25,000, of earnings has brought over 30 concerns to the brink of disaster."

ITALY

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to welcome into our midst yesterday the President of Italy, Giovanni Gronchi. I know the membership was highly impressed with the fine speech delivered by the President. A fluent speaker, he is clearly a man of intellect and integrity. He is eager to maintain the friendly spirit and cooperation between our two countries, and is proving himself an able representative of the great Republic of Italy.

Events in the past few years have proved in the most convincing manner that the friendship between Italy and the United States is one of the most vital partnerships in the free world. The cornerstone of Italy's foreign policy is the Atlantic Alliance. Her leaders, by signing the Atlantic Pact on April 4, 1949, pledged their country to place all her moral and material resources at the service of the common cause of the Western democracies. This decision was not an easy one for Italy, for she was still facing a long uphill fight both for material reconstruction and for moral recovery from the destruction of the war. Italy has made tremendous progress since that time—the Government is now devoting increasing attention to all aspects of the country's defense. Her army is well equipped, well organized and trained, and has an extremely high morale. The military task of Italy's forces is carried out within the framework of the Atlantic Alliance and Western European Union. Her participation is of paramount importance as it represents a strong territorial support for the West European group and at the same time provides essential air and naval action in the Mediterranean.

The same spirit of cooperation with the West which led Italy to join the North Atlantic Treaty countries, has also made her a vigorous and active leader in the programs for European cooperation and integration. A strong member of the OEEC, the Council of Europe and the Coal and Steel Community, Italy was one of the first signatories to ratify the recent Paris Agreements, establishing the Western European Union. Italy's allies are confident of full Italian cooperation in perfecting this organization and promoting its growth.

As President Gronchi made clear in his speech, few countries in Europe are more aware than Italy of the need for integration—both economically and militarily. At the same time, few countries have had to struggle against the enormous internal problems with which this country has been constantly faced. Certainly not the least of these problems has been the alarming strength of the Communist and leftist parties. Italy's leaders have been vigorous in their fight against this menace; and in recent years, with a substantial improvement in the economic picture, there has been no great gain made by the Communists.

Italy's large population has presented that country with a serious problem of unemployment. Since the end of World War II, the Government has worked unceasingly toward the solution of this problem. Special attention is now being given to three categories of activities, designed to alleviate unemployment. The first of these is agriculture, where modern scientific methods are being encouraged; the second is the development of public utility services; and the third is public works and here extensive work is now being carried on.

The favorable results of this program are already reflected in the land reform program. Italy's economy is fundamentally bound up with agriculture. Out of a working population of about 19 million, 8½ million are employed in agriculture. So that Italy's plan for development of the land through reclamation and irrigation works has resulted in considerable improvement in living conditions and repercussions are being felt directly or indirectly in all branches of the national economy. Our own country is gratified that through the Marshall plan we have had a part in helping Italy to make a new start. Yet the main effort has come from the ingenious and hard-working people of Italy and their leaders. The millions of Americans of Italian origin have given us all an awareness of the admirable qualities of these people from southern Europe. The Government of Italy will continue to have the encouragement and help of our country as it moves to extend land reform and other measures to promote economic well-being. President Gronchi pointed out that "freedom becomes a sham and a privilege for those who are already strong, unless it means to every man and woman freedom from the hardships of poverty and starvation."

The United States hopes to extend its partnership with Italy in many ways as it becomes more and more imperative for the Western democracies to draw together. There is certainly a promising outlook in the whole realm of economic and cultural cooperation between our two countries. As the President declared, "Italy can be trusted, because of the capacity and willingness to work of their managers, technicians and labor, and also because of her faithfulness to democratic ideals and her firm determination to defend and expand their accomplishments."

I know that yesterday as we in this body extended our warmest welcome to President Gronchi, we joined with the people of the United States in an affectionate regard and high esteem for this man and his country.

FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly apparent that the Soviet bloc has undertaken a campaign of economic subversion of the free world. This Communist strategy is aimed at breaking down the ties of mutual economic interest that bind the United States and its partners in the free world community. Its technique is to use the lure of trade offers to woo away commerce that is presently directed to the free world trading system. By so doing, the Soviets hope to break down the economic interdependence and, hence, the political interdependence of the community of democratic nations.

One clear and obvious solution presents itself: We must reaffirm our own traditional policy of lowering the barriers to trade among the free nations. By doing so, we would offer a durable and lasting solution to the fly-by-night, politically inspired trade threats and entreaties of the Soviet.

But, Mr. Speaker, have we responded with vigor? Have we drawn our inspiration from our traditional policies and forged ahead? Absolutely not. All about us are raised the timorous voices of fear and isolation. These voices are loud in the administration itself. The counsels that are proclaimed the loudest are those of men who shout that we are weak, that we are vulnerable, that we must shun our allies and confine our minds and activities to the ever-narrowing shell of our own continent. Indeed, the Tariff Commission is now packed with high tariff advocates.

Mr. Speaker, such an attitude ill-becomes a great and powerful nation that is the recognized leader of the free world. We are in the middle of the 20th century. And try as they may, the trade restrictionists will never be able to drag us back into the 18th century. The responsibilities of the 20th century call for the expansion of trade and not for its contraction; for increased trade cooperation, not isolation and trade warfare; for initiative, not feet-dragging in freeing trade. These are our responsibilities. But the proper exercise of our responsibilities will offer, as in the past, the promise of great rewards. For no other country in the world has as much to gain as the United States.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, the United States can, therefore, adopt no other course than to reaffirm and reinvigorate its traditional policy that is embodied in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program and in the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. For, it was with

enduring wisdom that Cordell Hull conceived the idea of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program. As a former member of this House, Cordell Hull had vast experience with congressional writing of detailed tariff laws. He witnessed the legislative nightmare of 1929–30 that produced the Smoot-Hawley tariff. When he became Secretary of State under Franklin D. Roosevelt, Cordell Hull conceived the idea of entering into trade agreements with friendly countries for the purpose of engaging in reciprocal tariff reductions to the mutual benefit of both countries concerned.

First enacted in 1934, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been extended 10 times by the Congress, a fact which is itself testimony to the durable values of expanding world trade by lowering the barriers to such trade.

The reciprocal trade idea was, and is, based on the enduring and irrefutable logic that "trade is a two-way street." This familiar metaphor expresses two truths: First, the gains and benefits from world trade are reciprocal; we gain in exports and in the supply of needed imports as other countries benefit from their trade with us. Second, we cannot continue to export unless we continue to import, and our exports will not grow unless our imports are permitted to expand.

This is the essence of the mutual economic interest in expanded international trade. In the 22 years since the trade agreements program was initiated, these truths have been put to work to bring great and enduring economic benefits to every sector of our economy. For wherever the genius of American production flourishes—and it has flourished in agriculture no less than in industry, in the South as well as in the North, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific—there you will find Americans employed in the production of goods for export. Correspondingly, we have availed ourselves, in return, of the products produced by the genius of foreign artisans and we have become richer because of it.

No better example of this relationship exists than in the historic trade relations between ourselves and Switzerland. It was in recognition of this trade with our sister democracy of Switzerland, that one of our first trade agreements made after the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act went into effect was concluded with Switzerland in 1936.

Spurred by that momentous agreement, our trade with Switzerland has expanded greatly. In 1936, our exports to Switzerland were valued at $7.5 million. That export trade has grown twentyfold in the years since 1936. Our exports to Switzerland are now valued at over $150 million.

It is a matter of record that Switzerland has been our best cash customer in Europe. We send her a wide variety of products, ranging from foodstuffs like meat products, grains, fruits, fats and oils, and cotton to manufactured goods such as iron and steel-mill products, electrical machinery, transportation equipment, and chemicals.

In return, Switzerland's most important exports to the United States are her fine jeweled watch movements which have a deserved reputation of excellence throughout the world. Indeed, Switzerland's watch exports to the United States account for 40 percent of her total export sales to us. One can readily see how vital these sales are to Switzerland's earning power and her ability to buy from the United States. Any decline in these sales, such as we experienced recently and which I will describe shortly, can only have a direct and adverse effect on our export sales to Switzerland. Such an unfortunate set of circumstances is certain to impair American production, employment, and incomes.

Like many regions in the United States, my native city of Detroit produces significantly for the export market. The Detroit Board of Commerce has estimated that 1 out of every 7 persons employed in manufacturing in the Detroit area owes his livelihood to export trade. In addition, many jobs depend on the import-export business which moves through the great port of Detroit which has grown to be the second most important in the Nation in terms of the dollar value of the trade handled. One can readily see how important foreign trade is in keeping people working and maintaining payrolls at high levels. The automobile industry alone, through its export markets, helps employment and payrolls in a myriad of other industries, such as rubber, steel, glass, and chemicals that are located throughout the United States.

Indeed, the maintenance and growth of our exports is vital to the well-being not only of Detroit's industries, but of other industries spread over the vast extent of our country.

Now, Switzerland alone offers a most important export market for the products of Detroit industry. Let me cite, for example, the value of our exports to Switzerland for 3 categories of products alone: automobiles, office machines, and pharmaceuticals. From Department of Commerce data, I learned that in 1955, the United States exported to Switzerland $10 million worth of automobiles, $3.5 million worth of office machines and $4 million worth of medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations. Thus, in export sales to Switzerland alone, these 3 industries that are so prominent in the economy of the Detroit region, have a market of $17.5 million, in 1955. Behind these dollar export figures are jobs, payrolls, taxes, and profits vital to the welfare of the American economy.

That is the nature of the benefits of reciprocity. To give one further illustration, I read a news report the other day which cited the fact that in January, Swissair, the Swiss airlines, announced the purchase of 2 Douglas DC–8 intercontinental jet airliners at a cost of $16.3 million. This purchase is a continuation of Swissair's long-established policy of buying American-made equipment which was begun in 1932. Reflect for a moment what the impact on our American aircraft industry and all its suppliers would be if the Swiss were to reverse this traditional policy and decided, say for reasons of national security, that all its airplanes had to be manufactured at home.

I fear that we do not often enough stop to consider the real meaning of these facts. We are all concerned about growing unemployment. There have been reports recently that unemployment in the automobile industry is approaching the 50,000 mark, and Harlow Curtice, the president of General Motors, has predicted a 14 percent decline in automobile production for 1956. But we all have the unfortunate tendency of not paying adequate attention to the strategic importance which our export trade has to high levels of employment and production at home. In particular, there is a tendency to think of exports as something separate from imports—as if there were no relation between the two—as if we could limit imports of certain products without that having an effect on exports.

But, of course, that is not true and it is very unrealistic to think that way. Our exports have a direct and vital dependence on our imports. In the case of Swiss-American trade, if we see that watch imports are imperiled, then we must at the very same time see that our exports of automobiles, phamaceuticals, office machines, aircraft—and indeed, cotton, tobacco, and textiles—that all these are likewise imperiled. And the American economy sells over $150 million worth of goods to Switzerland which fall into this category.

It is for these reasons that I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that United States imports of watches from Switzerland have suffered a serious decline over the past two years, due in no small part to actions, either taken or threatened, by this administration. In 1953, we imported $71 million worth of watches and watch movements from Switzerland; in 1954, $54 million; and in 1955, these imports were running at $42 million. It is clear that this serious falloff in our imports of Swiss watches has already affected some of our exports to Switzerland and, unless some improvement takes place, our entire export trade with Switzerland will be placed in jeopardy. Yet what has happened? Has this administration taken the positive steps necessary to restore to watch imports their rightful share in the American market. The answer is "No." We all are too familiar with the action taken in July 1954, by the President to increase the tariffs on watch imports by 50 percent under the escape clause.

But as if this were not enough, there have ensued a whole series of actions and threats of actions designed further to restrict the importation of Swiss watches. At this very moment, there are grave threats overhanging our trade relations with Switzerland that cast, like a forbidding cloud, gray doubt and uncertainty before it. This is, I submit, a most unseemly way to treat a good friend and customer.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that rather than move backward, the administration should reverse its direction and begin to do something constructive to stem the precipitous decline in our watch imports. The first thing that should be done is to review and reverse the escape-clause decision of July 1954 as provided for by law. In offering this suggestion,

I am doing no more than repeating the recommendation made by the distinguished Governor of Maryland, T. R. McKeldin, a Republican himself, who is much concerned with our foreign-trade relations.

Mr. Speaker, this is a proposal which should commend itself to all Democrats and Republicans alike. Indeed, a trade policy that seeks the freeing and expansion of world trade, that seeks the enhanced use of our own economic resources, that seeks a firmer binding of the ties of mutual interest between the nations of the free world—such a foreign-trade policy must be bipartisan in scope. Through the instrumentality of the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation and by following our now traditional guidelines, our foreign-trade policy must become an increasingly important part of our total foreign policy. Through it we can achieve a stronger community of free nations and greater economic prosperity at home.

I close, Mr. Speaker, with a plea for following with determination the enlightened course charted in the early 1930's by Cordell Hull. No less can be expected of us and, truly, we could choose no better path today.

HONORING SURVIVING VETERANS OF THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, today I offer a resolution to provide for a joint session of the Congress to honor the surviving veterans of the War Between the States, and to provide for a medal to be struck and presented to each of them.

Almost 91 years have passed since that war ended on April 9, 1865, and it is altogether remarkable that there are still a few living survivors both in the South and in the North. In their earliest youth these men knew from first-hand experience the price that had to be paid for division. But they saw the end of the conflict, and the days of reconstruction. They witnessed the healing of the wounds of war and the resurgence of a nation united in common accord. Two world wars have come and gone, and yet we remember these men who are a link with our past and a reminder of that psalm:

> Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. (Psalm cxxxiii: 1.)

It has been the practice of the Congress to commemorate special occasions by awarding medals as a symbol of a belief in an ideal. A medal is something more than a gold medallion. It is the recognition of an event, an award to a deserving person who personifies that event, and a concept of a nation's values.

To honor this handful of survivors of all those men who played a part in the Confederate and Federal armies would be to pay tribute not only to them but also to the tradition of unity that exists among our 48 States.

What I propose is a joint session of the Congress of the United States in which the veterans of the War Between the States will be the center of a ceremony symbolizing the oneness and the indivisibility of this country. I propose that the remaining survivors be cordially and wholeheartedly invited to come here for this ceremony at Government expense—both the Confederate and the Federal survivors—and that they be honored with all due courtesy. I ask, further, that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized and directed to strike off a medallion suitable for the event, and that this medal serve as a decoration on the occasion for each of the survivors.

Recognizing that age brings infirmity and that ill health may prevent actual attendance at the ceremony for one or more of the surviving veterans, my resolution also provides that the presentation may be made at the home of any surviving veteran or veterans who cannot come to the Capitol at Washington for the presentation ceremonies and the joint session.

The bestowal of this honor at such a ceremony is both timely and appropriate. It is timely because life is running out for the men on both sides who offered their last full measure of devotion to the cause in which they believed. It is timely, also, because our country is currently living in the phenomenon of a remarkable public interest in the personalities and the circumstances of the War Between the States. This may be because of that extraordinary novel, Gone With the Wind, and the wealth of American literature—fiction, biography, and history—that followed in its wake. It may, again be the result of the depth of feeling Americans recognize about a war that had such leaders in the South as Robert E. Lee and in the North as Abraham Lincoln.

It is to be expected that among sovereign and dynamic States, and among groups of Americans living in varying climates of opinion, there will be diversity amidst unity. This is similar to that concept in literature which we call unity in variety, "the principle that beauty in art, depends on the fusion of a variety of elements into an organic whole which produces a single impression." It is to be expected that in the vast continental expanse of our Nation there will be differences of opinion and that they may, from time to time, excite strong feels as various issues are debated. But we have a way of settling such matters by majority vote, and by passing laws which have—as Mr. Justice Holmes so aptly phrased it—the support of a "preponderant public opinion."

Over and above these measures, should we not emphasize the constructive forces of our society—emphasize the essential unity and oneness of the North and the South—one Nation, indivisible with liberty and justice for all?

The ceremony I propose, the awards, the very presence together, side by side, of the soldiers who still survive from the armies of the North and the armies of the South, will, under the roof of this Capitol, provide the living proof of the prophetic aims for which, in the end, both Robert E. Lee and Abraham Lincoln strove so mightily. For as we all know, General Lee and President Lincoln saw eye to eye on the future of this Nation once the guns of war had been stilled.

For decades the line of survivors has been thinning and is now threatening to disappear altogether. The opportunity is, as of this moment, held out to us, to translate a kind of final encampment of the Confederate and Federal armies into a gesture that will give us all a reborn faith in the valor and the toughness that make this country great.

For me it seems an event upon which we can all unite. It is an event we must provide for now for it cannot wait. It will give the Nation the dramatic and arresting spectacle of a force that once divided the country now uniting it. The very character of the scene will carry with it all the meaning and emphasis of history, the history that in the light of developments, binds a nation together. It will be the living testimony of a prophecy come true. The Nation will have afforded it the ultimate proof that there was, indeed, malice toward none and charity for all.

And I know of no place, more hallowed, more precisely fitting, more awe-inspiring for a ceremony symbolizing ultimate and consummated reconciliation than the Halls of the Congress of the United States.

STANDBY WHILE THEY CLOSE THE SKIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this hour's time in order that some of my colleagues and myself may speak on a subject which is very important to the Nation and important to the people of California.

Mr. Speaker, growing numbers of Americans who use air transportation are all familiar with the word "standby."

Those of us who have tried to reserve seats in a hurry out of Washington know these words very well.

The last remaining independent airline of any size—the California airline group of war veterans that introduced the first coast-to-coast aircoach flights 10 years ago is still standing by. North American Airlines of Burbank, is standing by wondering whether it is going to be allowed to enter the United States trunkline air carrier family.

The plight of North American is important to us in California. This pioneering aircoach service brings over 125,000 people to and from California every year. Its innovation of transcontinental aircoach fares sets the pace for similar economy aircoach flights to our State.

North American's management, developed the first aircoach service idea in 1945 and flew the first low-cost California-New York aircoach flights in 1946. Other airlines, who said at first, "it could not be done," did not generally offer

their passengers aircoach economy until 1952.

North American gave the public the first $99 transcontinental coach fares and saw this economy copied by other airlines in 1952. Still operating without subsidy, as they did from the very first, North American in 1952 reduced its coast-to-coast round-trip fare to $160, a rate that was not matched by the big airlines until September 1955.

But now—having led the way in giving the public the first real economies in air travel and having led the industry reluctantly to adopt the very economy flights that have given the big carriers their greatest mass passenger market, North American is told to stand by.

While celebrating the 10th anniversary of their idea that has revolutionized air travel, North American has been snarled in administrative redtape. It has been singled out on economic grounds alone, for special technical "treatment" by the Civil Aeronautics Board. And if the "treatment" works, North American would be grounded and forever forbidden by Government edict to offer any more new ideas, new economies, new "firsts" to the public and to air transportation in the years ahead.

The potency and impact of the North American economy idea has already been firmly established in its very first 10 years.

But how about the 10 years ahead? Well it is clear that if the first 10 years of struggle to implant new economy ideas in air transportation have been this difficult for North American, the next 10 years without the kind of competitive spur this kind of airline operation provides, are going to be equally difficult unless the CAB starts administering the act as Congress intended.

Because the skies—by CAB edict—have been all but closed to new airline competition on major passenger trunk routes. More recently they've been closed for all practical purposes on the high-cost, to-luxury overseas routes.

Let us look at the recent CAB record of saying "no" to new competitive ideas offered by North American to save the public money and to increase air travel for the whole industry.

My New York colleagues, who fly to and from Washington, now pay $30.14 for a first-class round trip, which, of course, usually involves trying your luck with weekend standbys. A New York-Washington coach fare of a straight $20 would now be in effect if the CAB had approved North American's application of 2 years ago to provide a continuous low-cost shuttle service between New York and Washington.

My colleagues—and their constituents—from New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Miami, Dallas, Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Chicago, Detroit, Kansas City, Denver, and other cities in a 21-city network would now be paying about 33 percent less for air-coach travel in and out of these cities if the CAB had approved North American's application to introduce true low-fare air coach of 3.2 cents a mile. But the CAB said "No" and a possible saving of $100 million a year to passengers in and out of these cities was buried.

All Americans and Europeans who have long hoped for the day when they could fly the Atlantic at fares within their means had a rude jolt last month when the CAB turned down North American's application to provide low-cost air-coach service between the United States and Europe at fares about half the lowest off-season tourist rates charged. The CAB had previously pointed with some pride to the fact that domestic coach fares of 3.2 cents per mile are now in effect between New York and California. But, under pressure again from those who said lower fares were "impossible" across the Atlantic, the Board turned down North American's application for true low-fare overseas-coach service. As a final blow to air travelers—after rejecting the North American idea—the CAB under pressure has approved a first-class-fare increase across the Atlantic. As a sop to public opinion, however, the Board still apologetically states that air-tourist fares across the ocean are too high.

The fact is that the public now pays more than double to fly over salt water. It pays twice as much to fly across the ocean in the same planes as it does to fly air coach to and from California. Why does it cost twice as much to fly over salt water? The reason is elementary. Completely controlled by an international cartel there is no independent competition over the ocean to provide the price yardstick which North American has done over land.

So these big ideas for future economy in air travel have been summarily brushed off by the CAB. All the ideas came from North American just as did the idea of low-cost domestic air coach, the idea we just celebrated.

Tuesday was a milestone in air transportation progress, the 10th birthday of the first coast-to-coast air coach economy flights. It would be tragic for the public and the industry if this milestone became a tombstone.

The sound alternative, it seems to me, is for Congress to take a new look at the fortifications which have been built by Government regulation to protect and preserve the skies from encroachment from any new major trunk line air competition. Congress wrote the Civil Aeronautics Act in 1938 and incorporated in the act the legislative intent that there should be competition in air transportation. There has been no new competition allowed by the CAB on major passenger routes for 18 long years. There has never been a comprehensive Congressional investigation of trunk line air passenger rates. This seems more than passing strange, because wherever there has been vigorous new independent air coach competition—such as between New York and California—air coach rates have been forced down. Wherever the CAB has not permitted new competition to enter route service, air coach fares of the big carriers stay at higher levels.

So it seems to be up to Congress to take a good careful look at this development of a sky monopoly, to see why no new carriers have been certified for major route competition, to see why fares have not been brought down as they could and should be on both domestic and overseas routes.

It is our Civil Aeronautics Act. And the Board should be called to account when its enforcement of the act runs contrary to the intent of Congress.

In the public interest we cannot stand by forever while they close the sky.

	All year-round 1st class	Present coach rate	Proposed North American Airline fare
Shannon	$371	$261	$125.00
London	400	290	140.00
Paris	420	310	146.50
Frankfort	438	328	156.00
Rome	487	360	175.00

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, we from California take special pride today in the fact that aircoach was launched by California veterans 10 years ago this month.

Our State has not only contributed much, but has gained much from low-cost aircoach—an idea which was first ventured by North American Airline's present management. North American flies some 60,000 passengers into California each year, and, of course, additional tens of thousands of coach passengers are brought by other air carriers which followed the footsteps of the pioneer independent company.

Ten years ago the first coach flight, a DC–3, took off with 22 passengers. This year almost half of the total air-passenger traffic will travel aircoach.

What will we be celebrating some 10 years hence? Will it be the 20th anniversary of aircoach and an age of popular air transportation, comparable with the automotive age?

Or will it be an entirely opposite situation? Today North American's continued existence hangs on the thread of a court stay, preventing temporarily the execution of the CAB's order grounding the carrier. Ten years hence it is entirely possible that there will be no independent competitor, and that, to judge by the past decade, even the present number of 12 certificated carriers will be reduced, so that there may be only 8 or even fewer domestic carriers.

Why should we be wary of such a development and do all in our power to prevent this happening? I make no special case for any one company, nor do I hold any company to blame. It is in the nature of our economic system, that where there is independent competition, the public, the consumer, profits. Where everything is closed to competition, and the industry is regulated by the Government or regulates itself, you have a monopoly situation, and scarcity breeds high prices and generally poor service.

Any reasonable person familiar with the facts knows that the elimination of North American will spell an increase

in prices for all air travelers. Here are the facts:

North American adopted $160 transcontinental round-trip fares in 1953. Three major airlines, American, TWA, and United, adopted their rate in September 1955, to run for a 6-month period, expiring on March 15 of this year.

It was expected that North American would be out of business by March 15. But, with the CAB's decision being stayed pending appeal in the courts, the major carriers have now announced that they will extend the low rates, TWA and United for 6 months, and American Airlines for 60 days.

I quote from Aviation Daily of February 15, 1956:

AA ASKS 60-DAY EXTENSION OF EXCURSION FARE

American Airlines, in contrast to 6-month proposals of competing lines, has asked CAB for a 60-day extension of the $160 round-trip transcontinental coach excursion fare. Tariffs of American, TWA, and United, filed last September, are currently scheduled to expire March 15. TWA and United have proposed extensions until September 15.

American's revised tariff would expire May 18. Spokesman for the airline said the limited extension is proposed so that a more complete picture may be obtained on which to decide whether the special low fares should apply during the peak summer travel season. The fare is available only when round trip tickets are purchased and travel, limited to Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, each week, is completed within 30 days. Normal one-way transcontinental coach fare is $99.

Interestingly enough, in the same issue of Aviation Daily appears this item, regarding the fate of North American before the courts:

COURT CONSIDERS NORTH AMERICAN'S APPEAL FROM CAB DECISION

United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, has taken under advisement the appeal of North American Airlines seeking reversal of CAB's decision revoking its nonscheduled airline operating authority. Final arguments were heard Monday by Judges Edgerton, Washington, and Danaher. The CAB decision has been stayed pending outcome of the appeal. There are no indications as to when the Court might be expected to act, although it previously served notice on the parties that it desired an expedited proceeding."

It is obvious that the major airlines plan to maintain this $160 fare only so long as North American continues in business.

And it is also obvious that as soon as transcontinental fares go up, all fares will be upgraded.

For these reasons, I feel it is imperative that the appropriate Congressional committees go to the heart of this matter immediately. Whatever the solution, it must come now, while North American is still in the air. There is nothing deader than a small business that is not operating unless it is an airline that is not flying.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLN], and the gentlemen from California [Mr. UTT and Mr. HOSMER] may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, when we are saluting the first decade of air-coach flights, a constructive advance in air transportation, my home city of Long Beach, Calif, has historic importance and significance.

Ten years ago a youthful California combat flier named Stanley Weiss, not long discharged from service as a pilot over the hazardous Hump, piloted from the Long Beach airport the first transcontinental air coach flight in this country. Like other ex-GI's, Weiss and his associate, James Fischgrund, a former Navy lieutenant commander in the Pacific, had been encouraged by our Government to get into aviation. They read official Government booklets telling them how to enter the air transportation business. These booklets were called, I believe, War Wings for Peace.

They also read Government literature instructing them how to obtain Federal loans, in order to buy Government transport aircraft for conversion into civilian service.

With their own savings and an RFC loan for $30,000, these two California veterans purchased a DC–3 aircraft. It was in this plane, converted and adapted for passenger service, that they flew that first air-coach flight from Long Beach to New York, in 18 hours, with 4 stops en route, carrying 22 passengers.

The two veterans did not make the newspapers with that flight. They were too busy handling all details of their ground and air operations to be very conscious of the fact that they were making air transportation history. But history they did make, as they were joined by two other California air-coach pioneers, J. B. Lewis and Ross R. Hart, in forming the present North American Airlines group.

So this pioneering of air coach was, in its first stages, a California development by California independent business men, who saw and met the need for a new kind of low-cost air transportation service. Later other independents—some 300 companies, in fact—joined in the mushrooming development of air coach. The North American group, which introduced the idea, has remained the largest survivor and has led the air-transportation industry to the present almost universal adoption of air-coach service.

The early Government loans have long since been paid back. For the North American idea, launched from Long Beach, has proved to be truly a billion-dollar idea in this past decade. Air coach is largely responsible for the recent record peak earnings of our airlines. Their profits, which air coach helped to swell, have helped our airlines stand on their own feet financially, without recourse to Government subsidy. And thus both airline passengers and taxpayers have been saved hundreds of millions of dollars by this amazing 10-year-old youngster—air coach.

This is an American story, story of free enterprise, functioning vigorously and competitively to bring new ideas, mass market economies and a greater volume of profits to a great American industry.

Here we see demonstrated the principle which has made the free enterprise system great. By reducing unit costs the volume of business increased enormously—so that fares were reduced and the industry grew. Today, thanks to the North American idea which was first tested in that historic flight from Long Beach in February 1946, aviation has become our fastest growing business.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about what has been said here today about the importance of preserving and perhaps reaffirming the right of entry into an American industry in which new competition has demonstrated it can make new and valuable contributions in the public interest.

With your permission I should like to quote some excerpts from a news dispatch published Sunday, January 22, in the New York Herald Tribune. This article is headed "Travel By Air Coach Has Phenomenal Rise."

It goes on to state:

Scheduled air-coach travel is a relatively recent development, with the nonscheduled (independent) lines deserving a bow for literally forcing the low-cost travel issue.

The article then points out that there was almost no air coach on the major airlines in 1948, whereas today approximately 33 percent or more of the schedule airlines' business is air coach.

"Why this spectacular growth?" the article asks. It goes further and states that our big air lines "were, in the opinion of many, slow to adopt air coach—but when they finally did, expansion was fast."

Careful investigation of the history of this phenomenal development shows that these facts are substantially correct. Air coach, launched 10 years ago this month, was the proud postwar baby of former GI fliers. They were encouraged by Government to get into the business. They nursed the baby along for 2 years with their own money and without Government subsidy payments. They met a real public need by providing the first true low-cost air fares.

But while they were trying to nurture this new mass air passenger market, the large subsidized passenger carriers looked askance at the infant. They predicted air coach would never live because it—the whole idea of lower fares for more people—was impractical and impossible. So as a result of their early reluctance to give the American people air coach, the independents had to go it alone in order to prove their point that what the United States airline industry really needed was passengers—not subsidies.

The independents—such as North American—were right. Their pioneering has helped the United States airline industry place itself in a better position to cope with a general downturn than at any time in its history, according to a recent talk by Joseph H. Fitzgerald, director of the Civil Aeronautics Board's air operations bureau. Mr. Fitzgerald stated, "improved reliability and speed,

accompanied by lower fares in relation to all other prices" has made air travel a primary means of travel between cities separated by any appreciable distance."

It is quite clear, then, that new competition—the competition of the North American air coach idea—has been good for the public and good for the industry.

Yet North American, the largest surviving independent airline of some 300 hopefully started by war veterans a decade ago, is still trying desperately on its 10th birthday to secure from the Civil Aeronautics Board a certificate to furnish broader, low-cost air coach service extending beyond its present New York-California, New York-Florida, and New York-Texas routes.

The CAB has to date turned this competitive-minded airline group down by seeking to revoke its operating authority for flying "too regularly." No question of safety is involved and no question is raised concerning the fitness of North American to operate an airline reliably and efficiently.

The CAB has denied all of this airline's applications to offer new low-fare air coach competition on major routes. It also turned down this airline's plea to fly from the United States to Europe at fares 50 percent lower than the lowest tourist fares now charged overseas.

This presents the rather appalling picture of a Government bureau valiantly determined to hold the line to protect the skies and the 12 major trunk airlines from a newcomer who only seeks to offer the kind of low-fare competition that builds mass traffic, increases profits for everyone, and saves the air traveler both travel and tax money.

The CAB has not granted its required certificate of convenience and necessity to a single new trunk passenger airline since 1938, nearly 18 years ago. Since then the original 18 big trunk carriers had shrunk to 12 through mergers and consolidations.

We are all entitled to ask today the same questions that this airline has been asking the CAB:

Are the skies permanently closed to all new competition, new ideas, new economy services on our major passenger routes? * * * Is it in the public interest for a single Federal regulatory bureau to use its powers, contrary to the intent of Congress, to bar entry of qualified new trunk carriers in air passenger transportation?

EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 2, in religious services the world over, Roman Catholics will present their spiritual leader, his holiness Pope Pius XII, a great spiritual bouquet for a happy 80th birthday. I think it fitting and proper that we, in this great Congress, wish his holiness a most happy birthday.

Without a guided missile he has pierced the most formidable forces against truth and justice. Without a single atom bomb he has established an impregnable defense to the dignity of the individual under God from the forces from an enemy who possesses every destructive method to human dignity conceived by man's mind.

I think it proper to recall briefly the history of this great man. He was born on March 2, 1876, Eugenio Maria Joseph Pacelli, in an apartment house in Rome, Italy, the son of a pious and God-fearing family. In 1899 he was ordained a Roman Catholic priest in Rome, Italy. In 1901, after several years of the type of parish work that is the duty of most ministers of God, he became a member of the diplomatic corps of the Roman Catholic Church.

In 1917 he became Titular Archbishop of Sardes. In 1929 he became a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, and in 1930 the secretary of state of the Roman Catholic faith.

On his birthday, March 2, 1939, he was selected the spiritual leader of Roman Catholics the world over. He is the first Catholic pope to have ever visited this country. He has an especial love for the people of the United States and its country. In his visit to the United States he made the following statement concerning his impression of our great men:

I have seen some of the most striking natural beauties of the United States: the Grand Canyon, the Rocky Mountains, Niagara Falls, and several other world-renowned places.

I have seen also many of the sources of the inexhaustible natural wealth of this country, vast stretches of farming and grazing lands, lakes, rivers, oil lands, mine regions, and vast forests.

Visiting industrial centers with their extensive manufacturing plants, gazing on high buildings and from them seeing great bridges and vast projects for supplying power, light, and irrigation, like Boulder Dam, over which I flew, have made a deep impression on me as eloquently indicative of the genius of the American people.

During his life to date, Pope Pius the XII has been a priest, bishop, cardinal, apostle, a cosmopolitan, a teacher, shepherd, heralder of peace, protector of law, defender of the city of Rome, benefactor of mankind, an educator, and a social reformer.

It is reputed among persons of the Catholic faith that St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh, in 1143 made prophecies concerning the various popes of the Roman Catholic faith. Although these prophecies have not always been consistent with the facts, in 1143 Pope Pius was identified as Pastor Angelicus, the Angelic Shepherd. I think none could find a better description of the life and work of this great spiritual leader than the reputed prophecy.

Most of his popely life has been devoted to working toward the world peace that this century has sought with such suffering.

I think it appropriate to recall to the Members of this House some of the statements this great spiritual leader has made concerning internal and international affairs in the hope that they might give some guidance to us in our deliberations in years to come.

On the question of domestic affairs, Pope Pius XII stated on September 1, 1944, that "a well-regulated economic and social order must rest on the solid basis of the right to private property." He said, in Quadragesimo Anno:

Private property is in a particular way the natural fruit of labor, the product of the concentrated activity of man which he acquires by his determination to develop and insure his own existence and that of his family; to create for himself and for his loved ones a free and respectable life, not only economic, but political, cultural, and religious. The Christian conscience, therefore, cannot admit as just a social order which either denies in principle or renders practically impossible or useless the natural right of property not only to commodities but also to the means of production.

Likewise, it cannot accept another system which recognizes, it is true, the natural right of property but conceives of it in an erroneous way and which therefore is opposed to a just and healthy natural law that kind of capitalism which is based upon erroneous conceptions and unduly assigns unto itself an unlimited right to property without any subordination to the common good.

With respect to employer-employee relations, he stated to Italian workmen on March 11, 1945:

We should aspire to a higher unity which will bridge the differences between management and labor; which will unite all who participate in the production, and this solidarity is based on the duty of all parties to work together for the interests and needs of society as a whole. This solidarity must embrace all the branches of production; must form the foundation of a better economic order, of a sound and just economy; it must open the roads for the working class to obtain its legitimate responsible part in the management of the national economy.

With respect to the farmer and his problems, he stated in August 1947:

One of the main causes of the disturbance and confusion in the world economy is to be found in the lamentable disregard and even contempt which people show with regard to the agriculturists and their important work. Does history not teach us that such an attitude is the forerunner of the decline of civilization? And is it not significant that precisely in the big cities the alarm is sounded to return to the land and raise a healthy, vigorous Christian peasantry, a farmer's stock which may form a strong dam against which will break the ever-higher rising tidal wave of physical and moral decay?

With respect to immigration, Pope Pius XII stated:

Causes of world tensions are, among other things, limited national territory and lack of primary materials. Some countries are really overcrowded and instead of forcing these countries to import food at great costs, why are emigration and immigration not made easier, why are families which so desire not allowed to go to countries where it will be much easier for them to make a living?

In a letter to former President Truman, on August 26, 1947, he stated with respect to civil rights:

Social injustices, racial injustices, and religious animosities exist today among men and groups who boast of Christian civilization. And they are a very useful and often effective weapon in the hands of those who are bent on destroying all the good which that civilization has brought to men. It is for all sincere lovers of the great human

family to unite in wresting those weapons from hostile hands.

He has made many statements concerning international relationships between nations designed towards the attempt to secure peace among nations.

In the United Nations Assembly, he said, in September 1948:

Shortly, as you know, the Assembly of the United Nations will resume its sessions, duly authorized to grapple with problems of world peace and security. Men of learning and experience, of high character and lofty ideals, fully conscious of their momentous responsibility to civilization and culture, will put forth their best efforts to reinsure the family of nations, and, as we fondly hope, not only save it from an unimaginable cataclysm, but put it on the road that leads to joy in justice to all, workingmen and employer alike, to morality in national and individual life that has found its only possible basis in religious faith in God. If ever an assembly of men, gathered at a critical crossroad in history, needed the help of prayer, it is this assembly of the United Nations.

He said, in a Christmas message on December 24, 1948:

A convinced Christian cannot confine himself within an easy and egotistical isolationism, when he witnesses the needs and the misery of his brothers; when pleas for help come to him from those in economic distress; when he knows the aspirations of the working classes for more normal and just conditions of life; when he is aware of the abuses of an economic system which puts money above social obligations; when he is not ignorant of the aberrations of an intransigent nationalism which denies or spurns the common bonds linking the separate nations together, and imposing on each one of them many and varied duties toward the great family of nations.

The Catholic doctrine on the state and civil society has always been based on the principle that in keeping with the will of God, the nations form together a community with a common aim and common duties. Even when the proclamation of this principle and its practical consequences gave rise to violent reactions, the church denied her assent to the erroneous concept of an absolutely autonomous sovereignty divested of all social obligations.

In a Christmas message given in 1954, on the question of our international responsibility, he urged the world to change its principle of coexistence predicated upon economic or military might or fear of the destructiveness of modern weapons, to a coexistence predicated upon divine truths.

He acknowledged coexistence predicated upon fear would produce real peace only if it developed into a fear of God.

He stated, particularly, to we Representatives in our dealings with domestic and international policy:

In both camps, there are millions in whom the imprint of Christ is preserved in a more or less active degree; they too, no less than faithful and fervent believers, should be called upon to collaborate toward a renewed basis of unity for the human race. It is true that, in one of the two camps, the voice of those who stand resolutely for truth, for love, and for the spirit, is forcibly suffocated by the public authorities, while in the other people suffer from excessive timidity in proclaiming aloud their worthy desires. It is, however, the duty of a policy of unification to encourage the former and to make heard the sentiments of the latter.

Particularly in that camp where it is not a crime to oppose error, statesmen should have greater confidence in themselves: They should give proof to others of a more firm courage in foiling the maneuvers of the obscure forces which are still trying to establish power hegemonies, and they should also show more active wisdom in preserving and swelling the ranks of men of good will, especially of believers in God, who everywhere adhere in great numbers to the cause of peace.

It would certainly be an erroneous unification policy—if not actually treachery—to sacrifice in favor of nationalistic interests the racial minorities who are without strength to defend their supreme possessions; their faith and their Christian culture. Whoever were to do this would not be worthy of confidence, nor would they be acting honorably if later, in cases where their own interests demanded it, they were to invoke religious values and respect for law.

There are many who volunteer to lay the bases of human unity. Since, however, these bases, this bridge, must be of a spiritual nature, those sceptics and cynics are certainly not qualified for the task who, in accordance with doctrines of a more or less disguised materialism, reduce even the loftiest truths and the highest spiritual values to the level of physical reactions or consider them mere ideologies.

Nor are those apt for the task who do not recognize absolute truths nor admit moral obligations in the sphere of social life. These latter have already in the past—often unknowingly, by their abuse of freedom and by their destructive and unreasonable criticism—prepared an atmosphere favorable to dictatorship and oppression; and now they push forward again to obstruct the work of social and political pacification initiated under Christian inspiration.

In some places it happens not rarely that they raise their voices against those who, conscientiously, as Christians, take a rightful active interest in political problems and in public life in general.

Now and then likewise, they disparage the assuredness and strength Christians draw from the possession of absolute truth, and, on the contrary, they spread abroad the conviction that it is to modern man's honor, and redounds to the credit of his education, that he should have no determined ideas or tendencies, nor be bound to any spiritual world. Meanwhile, they forget that it was precisely from these principles that the present confusion and disorder originated, nor will they remember that it was those very Christian forces they now oppose that succeeded in restoring, in many countries, the freedom which they themselves had dissipated.

Certainly it is not upon such men that the common spiritual foundation can be laid and the bridge of truth built. Indeed, it may well be expected that, as occasion demands, they will not find it at all unseemly to be partial to the false system of the other shore, adapting themselves even to be overcome by it in case it were momentarily to triumph.

In awaiting, therefore, with confidence in the divine mercy, that spiritual and Christian bridge, already in some way existing between the two shores, to take on a greater and more effective consistency, we would exhort primarily the Christians of the nations where the divine gift of peace is still enjoyed to do everything possible to hasten the hour of its universal reestablishment.

In his most recent message given last Christmas, he spoke upon the subject of arms and armaments control, and made this warning:

Efforts toward peace must consist not only in measures aimed at restricting the possibility of waging war, but even more in preventing, eliminating or lessening with time the quarrels between nations which might lead to war.

Many Members of Congress in effecting their congressional responsibility have visited Pope Pius and have been awed by his saintliness.

On this, his 80th birthday, I would like to add my prayers to those of Catholics everywhere, that the years ahead will be joyous for His Holiness Pope Pius the XII, and that he may in his lifetime observe the culmination of the hope he prayed for when he was coronated Pope Pius the XII:

Turning our eyes toward Him who is the Father of Light and the God of all consolation, and placing ourselves under the protection of the mother of good counsel, who was the patron of the conclave, we assume the government of the bark of Peter, in the hope of steering it as safely as possible through floods and storms to the harbor of peace.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, March 2, 1956, marks the 80th birthday of His Holiness Pope Pius XII. I am sure that all men of good will everywhere, representing all the religious faiths of mankind, hope and pray that this great leader will enjoy many more full, healthy years in the service of mankind. He became a priest in the Basilica of Saint Mary Major on April 2, 1899. In 1904 he became a monsignor, and soon an envoy on many missions abroad. On February 7, 1930, he became Papal Secretary of State, under Pope Pius XI. On March 2, 1939, Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli was elected to Peter's Chair.

Even those who do not acknowledge the Pope's religious leadership recognize in him a world leader of great significance. In every quarter of the globe he is particularly respected for his efforts in behalf of peace. In August, 1939, only a few months after his election as Pope Pius XII, he said to the leaders of nations and to their peoples,

"The danger is imminent, but there is yet time. Nothing is lost with peace; all may be lost with war. Let them begin negotiations anew, conferring with good will and respect for reciprocal rights. Then will they find that to sincere and conscientious negotiations an honorable solution is never precluded."

Pope Pius XII, styled the "Pope of Peace," persisted in his efforts to maintain peace but the demon of war was not to be stopped and war broke out on September 1, 1939. Even then he appealed to the belligerents to observe the ethical rules of combat and begged relief for the wounded and war prisoners. Mussolini defied papal pleas to keep Italy neutral and in June 1940 rushed to share in the spoils of fallen France. One year later Hitler turned on his erstwhile Communist ally. On December 7 of the same year the United States was catapulted into the war by the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor. The whole world was aflame. The holy father frequently

urged all men of good will to pray that humanity might see the folly of war and the necessity of forsaking injustice, immorality and selfishness.

Knowing communism as the enemy of peace Pope Pius XII was and is communism's first and foremost opponent. He knew that communism was the avowed enemy of Christianity and he recognized that communism was an ideology and that ideologies will never be defeated by wars, but only by sounder ideas and programs more vigorously advocated and put into practice.

On one occasion the arch atheist and materialist, Stalin, snidely asked, "How many divisions does the Pope have?" When asked what he thought about Stalin's inquiry, his holiness said: "You may tell my son Joseph he will meet my divisions in the hereafter."

Despite the fact that cardinals, bishops, priests, and the heroic laity were imprisoned, exiled, and martyred, the pope never once called for a preventive war. Instead, he incessantly appealed for a revival of virtue and love of all men. The 1955 Christmas appeal for armament control in the nuclear age was a natural follow-through of the holy father's constant concern for peace with justice.

On this anniversary of the pope's birthday the world should recall what he said at the address on the feast of St. Eugene, June 2, 1947:

> The future belongs to those who love, not to those who hate.

To his holiness the hearts of humanity everywhere extend its good wishes and congratulations. The people of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois send to the pope our wishes and prayers for many years of continued service to God and further contributions toward world peace.

Mr. MURRAY or Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues in wishing a happy birthday to his holiness, Pius XII. The world knows of his abilities as a diplomat, a teacher, a defender of freedom and a holy servant of God. If I may be permitted a small vanity, I would like to point out that March 2 is my own birthday and as a result I have always felt a particular happiness that I share the day with one who is truly a saint, and who, in my opinion, is the greatest living man in the world today. You can imagine with what joy and humility I met him this past fall when members of the committee with which I was traveling had the high honor of an audience with the holy father. It is gratifying to report from personal observation that the holy father appeared vigorous and alert. May I express the prayerful wish on behalf of the Catholics in my district and of all men and women of good will therein that the holy father continues in good health. He is needed by the world in the fight against atheism.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. TUMULTY, for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. RODINO), for 1 hour on Wednesday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, on Tuesday next, for 20 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. PATMAN and to include certain excerpts and statements at the end of today's proceedings.

Mr. ASPINALL, his remarks in general debate today on H. R. 3383 and to include additional material.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska to revise and extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole and to include certain maps and extracts.

Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole and include newspaper articles and excerpts from committee hearings.

Mr. PATTERSON and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCMILLAN.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. SHEEHAN).

Mr. ROBERTS.

Mr. MACDONALD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GREGORY (at the request of Mr. CHELF), for approximately 5 days, on account of business in home district in Kentucky.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. DEANE), for today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 2, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1586. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting the Seventh Semiannual Report of contracts, in excess of $50,000 for research, development, and experimental purposes awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1587. A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a signed report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ended December 31, 1955, made by Price Waterhouse & Co., New York City, independent certified public accountants, pursuant to section 14 (b) of Public Law 685, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1588. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the share of defense procurement which small business has been receiving, together with recommendations for further action to increase its share, pursuant to section 5 of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1589. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $3 million for the Department of the Interior and $250,000 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 352); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee of Conference. H. R. 7588. A bill for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas (Rept. No. 1842). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 9285. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve Banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury; without amendment (Rept. No. 1843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on the United States Civil Service Commission (Rept. No. 1844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9677. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington" to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the celebration of the centennial anniversary

of the birth of Booker T. Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 9678. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 9679. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam Site Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 9680. A bill to provide for accrued servicemen's indemnity payments in certain cases; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 9681. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Missouri for use of the Missouri Conservation Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 9682. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 9683. A bill to repeal section 4231 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9684. A bill to repeal the excise tax on the use of safe deposit boxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 9685. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 9686. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 9687. A bill to provide an income credit in the case of civil-service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 9688. A bill to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 9689. A bill to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 9690. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act so as to provide for elections by secret ballot of employees to determine whether to strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 9691. A bill to increase the rate of pension of certain widows of World War I veterans and the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to widows and children of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9692. A bill to amend part III of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9693. A bill to establish an additional pension program for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 9694. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 9695. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that special equipment for disabled individuals shall not be subject to the tax on automobile parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 9696. A bill to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 9697. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 9698. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 9699. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oregon of the land and improvements known as the Clackamas National Guard Target Range, at Clackamas, Oreg., to be used for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 9700. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management, and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 9701. A bill to protect members of the public against uninsured liabilities arising from hazards in peaceful utilization of atomic energy; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 9702. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 9703. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments to producers of cotton who have complied with acreage allotment programs for 1954, 1955, and 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 9704. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to eliminate reduction in annuity made for surviving spouse, if spouse does not survive; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. J. Res. 568. Joint resolution exercising the power granted to Congress by section 5 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution through a declaration that both public schools which are desegregated as to race, and public schools for the different races which are separate but equal, satisfy the requirements of such amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to provide for a joint session of the Congress to honor the surviving veterans of the War Between the States, and to provide for a medal to be struck and presented to such veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 570. Joint resolution to declare that the applicable requirements of the 14th amendment are satisfied in any State either by public schools which are desegregated as to race or by public schools for the different races which are separate but equal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. J. Res. 571. Joint resolution exercising the power granted to Congress by section 5 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution through a declaration that both public schools which are desegregated as to race, and public schools for the different races which are separate but equal, satisfy the requirements of such amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. J. Res. 572. Joint resolution designating December 1, 1956, as Civil Air Patrol Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 415. Resolution to appoint a special investigating committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. Res. 416. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study railroad accidents in the United States, giving particular attention to the accidents which have recently occurred; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the purpose of permitting juveniles to engage in productive pursuits and thereby aid in solving the problem of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to Federal old-age and survivors' insurance, and recommending that eligible age for retirement be reduced to 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security act so that total monthly benefit amounts will not be decreased upon the death of either spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 9705. A bill for the relief of Lea Kummer O'Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 9706. A bill for the relief of Elpidofor Sedljar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9707. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rita Querard, nee Mayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9708. A bill for the relief of Chan Kim Tun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9709. A bill for the relief of Michael Monak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:
H. R. 9710. A bill for the relief of Alvin Uriah Wellington and wife, Daphne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:
H. R. 9711. A bill for the relief of Marianne Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:
H. R. 9712. A bill for the relief of Diana Lightbourne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:
H. R. 9713. A bill for the relief of Grace Yu Ching Wang Li (nee Wang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:
H. R. 9714. A bill for the relief of Isidor Goldfracht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:
H. R. 9715. A bill for the relief of Julian Barber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:
H. R. 9716. A bill for the relief of Waltraud Wiche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:
H. R. 9717. A bill for the relief of Charlotte A. Ruffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:
H. R. 9718. A bill for the relief of Moses Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:
H. R. 9719. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1891, as amended, to insure that the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia will continue to have the exclusive right to occupy and use the old Union Engine House in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

602. By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York: Petition of Miss Anna M. Sweet and other residents of Herkimer, Mohawk, and Ilion, N. Y., in support of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

603. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive secretary, Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to adopt the Hoover Commission report on the use and disposal of Federal surplus property and enact legislation necessary to permit the executive agencies to use the normal channels of distribution in the disposal of surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Salute to President Gronchi and Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in closing his address before the joint meeting of the two Houses of the Congress, His Excellency the President of Italy, Giovanni Gronchi, used these words:

This is the Italy which today is before you, as a member in good standing of the great family of the Western Democracies.

These are significant words. President Gronchi employed them wisely and pointedly for he had placed before the American people and the Congress the case of the Republic of Italy. Who of us looking back over the postwar years can deny the great struggle for survival of a people imbued with the spirit of democracy? Who of us can deny that against great odds—these people have reached a point of amazing recovery. And who can deny their great and endless gratitude to the people of America for their assistance, and the strong friendship which motivates them to feel almost a kinship with the American people. And basic in all of this is the recognition by the people of Italy that "our destiny as individuals, in our family, social or political life, is safe and free only in a democracy which draws its principles from the Christian tradition."

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, as must be many of our colleagues who saw the President of Italy address the Congress, that he voiced the sentiments, aspirations, and hopes of the people of Italy who are dedicated to the ideals of democracy. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute Mr. Gronchi for his eloquent, stirring, and statesmanlike address. I am certain that the case he presented and the sincerity with which he laid it before the Congress have left a lasting and favorable impact. And I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that whatever we, as leaders of the free world, may continue to do to sustain the hopes, aims, and aspirations of these people, that we shall not find them wanting, that Italy shall prove itself a member in good standing of the great family of Western Democracies and a worthy friend and ally.

One Great Hour of Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 11, tens of thousands of churches throughout the United States will join in observing One Great Hour of Sharing in the 1956 United Appeal. Major Protestant denominations, working together for the eighth consecutive year through the Central Department of Church World Service of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, are submitting their appeal for funds with which to carry on worldwide work of relief among the millions of homeless, hungry, and destitute in overseas areas of distress. Thirty-five major denominations cooperate through the Church World Service in humanitarian programs to aid the needy abroad. The individual and joint efforts of the churches, as projected for 1956, will require nearly $11 million in cash, in addition to many millions of pounds of United States surplus commodities and other contributed food, clothing, and medicine.

The Easter season has rightly become a time of sharing with others. I am glad to note that most Catholic churches will also observe an overseas relief emphasis on Sunday, March 11, with their response to the appeal of the Bishops' Fund, coincident with the One Great Hour of Sharing observance in Protestant churches. Furthermore, most Jewish communities are engaged in their appeal for the Passover Fund of the United Jewish Appeal.

I previously have called attention to this annual One Great Hour of Sharing, in an address I delivered at the First Methodist Church in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on February 4, 1956, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two splendid statements on the subject of the One Great Hour of Sharing and the 1956 United Appeal.

The first is an article entitled "Sharing: The Key to Peace," written by our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has visited throughout the world, particularly the Far East, in studying conditions among the needy and underprivileged. This article merits the careful attention of all of us.

The second article is by Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Dr. Flemming is an eminent editor and churchman, and is ably serving the executive branch of the Government, while on leave as president of Ohio Wesleyan University. His article, entitled "Sacrificing for Freedom," is an important contribution to our thinking on the important subject of the sacrifices that we must make if freedom is to endure in the world.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHARING: THE KEY TO PEACE
(By Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey)

When we consider the enormous abundance with which our country has been blessed, through the effectiveness of our American system of production, we are challenged immediately with the thought that we could and should share with suffering people in other nations of the world.

As a member of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee

of the Senate, I personally have visited many countries, and especially the Far East, and have endeavored to find out firsthand what problems are confronting those countries.

When the problems have been defined, we have discovered from our experience that the greatest aid we can render is to help people to help themselves.

I have always maintained that it is imperative for the Members of Congress who have responsibilities in the foreign-policy field actually to visit and become acquainted with the people of the countries with which we are dealing.

In making a foreign-policy approach effective, it is my firm conviction that we must give special attention to the importance of personal contacts with the peoples of other countries. No amount of learned studies as to the economic status of other countries, and no cold-blooded analysis of their problems is comparable in importance and effectiveness to real person-to-person contacts.

In an address which I made in the Senate on March 22, 1955, in an endeavor to give an overall picture of our foreign policy, I said:

"Mr. President, in these remarks, in which I have tried to outline a future development of our foreign policy, it has been my purpose to try to present what I consider to be the true spirit of America.

"I am enthusiastic over the magnificent leadership that is being given us by the President and Secretary Dulles in interpreting to the world our determination to resist aggression and our resolve to contribute to other nations what we can of the privileges and opportunities we have enjoyed as a free country.

"This contribution is needed especially by the underdeveloped countries of the world, which are yearning for greater freedom, independence, and self-expression.

"The key emphasis of our approach is on the dignity and value of the individual human being without regard to race, creed, or color.

"In this we differ fundamentally from the communistic, atheistic, material approach in which the individual is made the slave of the state.

"I wish constantly to emphasize the importance of the individual in our whole philosophy.

"It is my conviction that this conception which the freedom-loving countries have developed comes to us directly from our spiritual heritage.

"We see today in many parts of the world, and especially in the overcrowded parts of the Middle East and the Far East, the emergence of an eager yearning for freedom.

"This same yearning motivated our forebears in coming to this great continent of ours and building a new nation 'dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.'

"We have experimented successfully with a government of, by and for the people, so checked and balanced that the danger of totalitarianism has never threatened us.

"We have fostered in our great country all those protections which have made it possible for the individual human being fully to release and express his or her creative energies.

"This gives us an enormous responsibility. It would be unthinkable that America, the hope for a century and a half of the downtrodden people in all parts of the earth, should deny a sharing of her blessing with those who are oppressed.

"This responsibility, however difficult it may be, is also our great opportunity. We can and we must accept that opportunity, because in helping to make men free we are pursuing the only course that can lead to an eventual and lasting peace."

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, I am deeply interested in the cooperation by the churches of our country in such programs of relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction as those supported by the "One Great Hour of Sharing" United Appeal, which so greatly augment and bulwark the similar efforts of our people through their Government.

In our handling of these matters in Congress, we appropriate funds to be paid out by the Government. These funds are compulsorily taken from our taxpayers. But beyond the taxpayers' contribution, we have discovered in these countries voluntary work being done by dedicated people which has emphasized this matter of personal interest and real human understanding.

I am convinced that no compulsory taxpayer money is comparable in effective results to voluntary giving from people who are personally interested in and who have a real human sympathy for those in other parts of the world.

This approach is definitely embodied in the parables of the greatest Teacher of all time. The story of the widow's mite clearly states the principle. And, of course, the well-known story of the Good Samaritan tells us who is our neighbor.

In concrete terms, it is my considered judgment that $10 million, which is approximately the objective of the United Appeal, freely given from the hearts of people who care, will do more for America herself and for the world than many, many times that amount taken from the taxpayers and allocated according to some political formula.

Sacrificing for Freedom

(By Hon. Arthur S. Flemming)

I know of nothing in the life of our day that gives us more hope, as far as the future is concerned, than the willingness of our churches to pool their resources in effort to do a more effective job in the name of the Master.

And it is particularly significant at this point in the history of the world that they are placing strong emphasis on their programs of overseas relief, reconstruction, and rehabilitation.

These programs—dedicated to the homeless and the hungry, the ill, the disaster stricken, the destitute, and orphaned—aid many millions of our needy overseas neighbors yearly with food, clothing, and medicine, through refugee aid and resettlement, through self-help and health projects, and other vital services carried on in scores of distress areas abroad.

Through this great worldwide ministry of brotherly love, made possible to the churches by the voluntary contributions of their people, Christian America shares the fruits of her freedom with those less blessed with plenty, with those less free from fear and aggression.

Our Founding Fathers had a deep concern for freedom. They had sacrificed heavily to achieve it. They had risked their lives in a wild and forbidding land, leaving behind them loved ones, possessions, the safety and warmth of familiar things.

Spiritually, they had known the truth and it had set them free. Physically, they translated this spiritual freedom into material actuality, an actuality that grew into a mighty nation, an actuality that gave the hope of true freedom to all the world.

They were truly thankful for their freedom and just as they had sacrificed much to achieve it, they sacrificed to protect it.

Dedicated to its preservation, they wrote into our basic law the principle that all men are created free and equal.

And they meant just that, all men. Not all men in the Original Thirteen States, but all men everywhere. They meant that all of the freedoms and the fruits of those freedoms were the natural rights of all peoples.

They knew that the quality of freedom was universal, that for it to exist for one, it must be shared with all.

Do we in this day and age share as deeply as did our Founding Fathers in concern for freedom? Do we share that concern to the extent that our lives are dedicated to its preservation and to its service to those who either are enslaved or are pawns of political conflict between slavery and freedom?

I believe that we share that concern only if we are truly thankful for freedom and if we are prepared to do something about it, if we are prepared to sacrifice in its behalf.

It is significant that in the Book of Common Prayer the Thanksgiving Day epistle, from the first chapter of James, says:

"Be therefore doers of the word, and not hearers only."

The dictionary defines "sacrifice" as "* * * a surrender of some desirable thing in favor of a higher object."

Are we, as Christians, expressing our thankfulness for freedom, day in and day out, by making sacrifices for it, by surrendering some of our desirable things that all may enjoy the blessings of freedom?

I know of no more important question for us to face.

In his book, Declaration of Freedom, Dr. Elton Trueblood says that the only way we can end the tragic division of the world into two camps is by "the penetration of the whole earth by the ideal of a free society."

There is no other way out of our present predicament.

What are some of the sacrifices that we, as Christians, should be willing to make as an expression of our thankfulness for freedom?

First, it seems to me we should be willing to make sacrifices to strengthen the foundation on which our form of government rests, a form of government that has provided us with freedom and that insures and preserves our freedom.

We should be willing to vote. We should be willing to participate actively in the party of our choice. Where we do not approve of our party's action we should do everything we can to improve the situation because the standards within our political parties determine the standards within the Government to which we entrust our freedom.

And we should not turn aside from accepting public office at a sacrifice to our businesses or in fear of criticism or at the cost of unsettling our personal lives.

Such refusal to sacrifice for freedom gives opportunity to the less qualified and to the less scrupulous, who may think less of serving others than serving themselves.

To succeed in penetrating the whole earth with the ideal of a free society we must have in our Government dedicated people willing to make sacrifices to serve toward such achievement.

Above all and beyond all this, we must be willing to make sacrifices to strengthen our spiritual foundations.

To me, that means that without thought of self each must give of his time, his energy, and resources in order to help his church carry the principles of Christianity throughout the world, the principle from which our freedom has sprung and upon which our freedom rests.

We must follow the teaching that the Master placed at the very heart of Christianity: To love our neighbors as ourselves. On this, He said, "rests all of the law and the prophets."

We will take advantage of every opportunity to help our neighbors, particularly those opportunities which help hungry and destitute people throughout the world as do the programs of the Department of Church World Service, of the National Council of Churches, which carries on for our major denominations the many services made possible by the forthcoming "One Great Hour of Sharing" and other overseas relief appeals.

We will see in these programs of our churches an opportunity to express our thankfulness for freedom, an opportunity to sacrifice so that the fruits of our freedom may be shared with others.

Thus as we share with them in Christian love, our actions will become so attractive to our fellow human beings that they will realize the value of our Christian principles and thus the ideal of a just and free society will have better opportunity to be understood and accepted.

Today, equally in our land as in the lands of our free neighbors across the seas, the light of freedom that God has given us is threatened by the darkness of undemocratic ideologies and there is no question which troubles and concerns all of us more than the question of war or peace.

Personally, I cannot look to the future with pessimism. I look to the future with a feeling of optimism.

I believe that as long as the United States and the other free nations of the free world continue to deal with the forces of international communism from a position of strength, we will be able to deter the aggressor.

And I believe that such a position of strength comes from the kind of spiritual leadership, among all the freedom loving nations of the world, that knows that nations as well as individuals can save their freedoms only as they are willing to give of them in intelligent and effective service to others.

And I believe that this spiritual leadership is going to flow from our individual willingness to make sacrifices for freedom.

From such convictions will come policy and support for policy that will lead us into a true pathway of peace.

To Establish a National Policy With Respect to the Management and Rehabilitation of Our Fisheries Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the Members' attention to H. R. 9700, a bill I introduced yesterday to establish a national policy with respect to the management and rehabilitation of our fisheries resources. I hardly need to remind my colleagues that this Nation's domestic commercial and sport fisheries have suffered greatly during the past few decades. The fishermen who make their livelihood by harvesting this great national resource have seen the source of their living diminish through lack of an adequate national program.

So bad is this situation, that in sheer desperation numerous expediencies have been suggested. For example, in Alaska where the total salmon pack during the past 10 years has averaged less than one-half the average yield for the previous 20 years, it is proposed the Territory manage its own resource. The record justifies some sort of change, but in view of international aspects, as well as other reasons, I fail to see the wisdom of such a move. The first step, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, in finding a solution to the problem of conservation and promotion of this resource lies in the provision in my proposed program; namely, to transfer responsibility for fisheries resources to an independent commission.

Reverting to salmon, our scientists tell us the possibilities of increasing the size of runs for harvest are astounding. For example, a decrease of only 1 percent in mortality prior to seaward migration of salmon would mean doubling the number of fish returning to reseed streams later on.

The fisherman today is paying the price of mismanagement, stupidity, and politics. Yet the fisheries can be properly recognized and a great industry restored from its almost bankrupt condition to its once prosperous situation.

The first step necessary, as I said Mr. Speaker, is to place the welfare of our fisheries under an independent commission such as is provided for in H. R. 9700.

A Bill To Amend the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I introduced today a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a much needed increase in benefits to retired railroad employees and the survivors of such employees.

The legislation which I have proposed represents the wishes of the active and retired railroad employees and their families in my Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts. I am also happy to say that my bill is being sponsored by the Railway Labor Executives' Association which is an association comprising practically all the standard railway organizations, both operating and nonoperating. The organizations representing practically 100 percent of the 1¼ million railroad employees are for my proposal.

In brief, the purpose of this bill is to provide a badly needed 15 percent increase in benefits for thousands of retired pensioners, widows and other beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act. In order to ensure these increased benefits and keep the retirement trust fund in sound financial condition, the bill would raise the additional funds in the amount of 2 percent of covered payrolls. Both the employee and the employer will pay an additional 1 percent, making their contributions 7¼ percent on the first $350 of monthly wages, instead of 6¼. Moreover, the increased tax on employees would be immediately offset by exempting the employee's tax from gross wages in the computation of his income tax. I sincerely feel that such an exemption is fair and equitable since the employers already get credit on their corporation taxes for amounts paid into the retirement fund. I also want to point out that workers in Canada and Great Britain already enjoy this exemption benefit.

It is my hope that my bill and other similar proposals now pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, will receive thorough and conscientious study. It is my further hope that the committee will recommend to the Congress legislation along the lines I have proposed so the thousands of retired pensioners, widows and other beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act may receive a substantial increase in benefits.

States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the thoughtful citizens throughout the Nation are disturbed by the trend of the Federal Government to take from the individual States jurisdiction over matters heretofore reserved to the States and the attitude of the Supreme Court which, in effect, claims the right to become an unrestricted policymaking body. The people of my State are rightfully concerned over this recent trend on the part of the Federal Government.

I am certain that every sound-thinking Member of Congress whether he comes from the North, South, East or West, or whether he is a Republican or Democrat should welcome a declaration by the Congress indicating it still believes our form of government can best be preserved by maintaining a correct division of powers between the Federal Government and the 48 sovereign States as set out in the Constitution by the framers of that great document.

Those who drafted the Federal Constitution in Philadelphia decided to leave to the States, among other things, full control over public education and that action was infallibly supported by ratification of the 10th amendment. I am certain that all students of the Constitution realize that when the 14th amendment was adopted for the protection of those who had been slaves no one in the Congress or in any of the States which ratified this amendment suggested it was intended to take from the States their control over public education.

The 14th amendment specifically states, however, that Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provision of this article. The same Congress which proposed this amendment while acting as a legislative body for the District of Columbia under provisions of the Constitution established a system of segregated public schools in the District of Columbia. It seems to me that it is perfectly clear that if the framers of the Constitution had intended that the schools be integrated they would have specifically

stated this fact when the same Congress that adopted the 14th amendment passed legislation calling for segregated public schools here in the District of Columbia which is a Federal site. The Congress certainly has the right to say, by legislation, how the civil-rights provision of the 14th amendment shall be enforced.

I am introducing a copy of a resolution that was recently introduced by Senators ROBERTSON of Virginia and JOHNSTON of South Carolina along with others and hope that this Congress will take some action on legislation of this nature before we adjourn. I think the people in this country and in the individual States are entitled to know just how much jurisdiction they have over public education within the States without interference from the Federal Government.

President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the American people received the very good news that the President is able and willing to add another 4 years to his record of distinguished service to his country. His decision has been the occasion for a general rejoicing which has again been a reminder of the affection and respect which he has won.

There is very little that can be said of Dwight D. Eisenhower which has not already been said by people of all political beliefs, not only in the United States but throughout the world. He is one of those fortunate men whose obvious merits have received in his lifetime the commendation of those he has served, and whose public service has furnished no pretext for censure. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of his public life, however, has been the degree to which his leadership has been based upon public confidence in his essential goodness.

We are in a period of history which presents problems as great as any of those which were met by our predecessors, and the closeness of communications has brought to the fore many men of unquestioned brilliance and ability. But the problems which we face will never be solved by the unaided intelligence of any man, and I believe that the President's greatest impact upon the people of all nations has been the result of his simple and sincere spiritual faith.

His first public act as President was to confess his personal dependence upon the assistance of his Creator and to remind the world that this Nation was founded upon a firm faith in God. It was well to remind himself and us that our belief in the rights of man grew out of faith in God as the Creator and source of those rights.

With this beginning, each year of his administration has brought him an increased sureness in dealing with his tremendous responsibilities, and each year has increased America's confidence in his leadership. Nothing has occurred in the past 3 years to shake the Nation's faith in the essential goodness and integrity of this man. This is the integrity which makes him the tool of no group and the servant of all groups, groups which to him are not sharply divided classes with selfish competing interests, but composed of individuals with the dignity, rights, and responsibilities which are theirs as the children of God.

It is idle to call him another Lincoln or another Washington, for he is the shadow of no man. Each generation raises up its own leaders, and in the crucial periods of American history this country has been blessed with leaders who provided inspiration to their contemporaries and to the generations which succeeded them. Beset with the problems of the atomic age, America has found a leader who at home and abroad has ennobled the office which has been entrusted to him.

In the prospect of his continued leadership, we can look with confidence to the years of trial and opportunity which lie ahead.

The Supreme Court Integration Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, although southerners may have been shocked by the recent admission of Vice President NIXON that the Supreme Court integration decision had more political aspects than it did grounds of legal soundness, I am sure they were not surprised. Many of the best legal minds have thoroughly combed the decision without finding any basis in previous decisions of the Court and have so expressed themselves. It is rather an unusual departure from accepted political effort for the Vice President of the United States to attempt to heap praise on his party as Vice President NIXON did in a recent address to a partisan audience at a Republican fund-raising dinner. He said, as follows:

> Speaking for a unanimous Supreme Court, a great Republican Chief Justice, Earl Warren, has ordered an end to racial segregation in the Nation's public schools.

David Lawrence in the Evening Star of February 20, 1956, tries to blame this inexcusable blunder, as usual, on the poor secretary or stenographer and calls it a mistake of commas. This is the same technique used to cover up Benson's insulting letter approving the Harper's magazine article which called the American farmer "our pampered tyrant."

It is a sad commentary on the Nation's political health when the Supreme Court is dragged into the arena of partisan politics in order to gather the bloc voters of the metropolitan areas for the Republican Party. This exhibition of cheap politics is one of the reasons why the decision is so deeply resented by the people of the South. I wonder how other sections of the country would feel if they were victimized by a political decision which threatens to destroy a way of life, more than a century old, when that decision is supported by the weakest kind of social philosophy in the face of legal precedents that go back to the beginning of the Republic. A great deal of progress has been made in the field of racial relations throughout the South within the past 25 or 30 years, but if the agitation of the Nixons and the NAACP continues this structure of better relations will be torn down and no responsible leader in the South today can predict the type of structure that will take its place.

This situation is so well summarized in an editorial of the Anniston Star of Sunday, February 19, 1956, that I consider it timely to be brought to the attention of the country.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial in the RECORD.

> MR. NIXON LETS CAT OUT OF THE BAG
>
> At the very time he was receiving an award for his services to the United States—and this paper believes that he has accomplished some good in his foreign trips—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON last week in New York virtually admitted that the attempt to force integration on the South was politically conceived by boasting of the fact that the nonsegregation edict by the United States Supreme Court was delivered by a Republican Chief Justice.
>
> And since both NIXON and Warren come from the same State, it may be that the Vice President had some inkling of things to come when the Grand Old Party took control of the Federal Government. And yet we had always been led to believe that the highest court in the land was presumed to be above partisan politics, in spite of Mr. Dooley's dictum that it follows the election reurns.
>
> It might be observed, too, that NIXON'S admission that the Warren pronouncement was politically conceived seems to justify the premonition of John W. Davis that the decision in the antisegregation case might not be decided in accordance with the law as laid down in Supreme Court precedents. For he said he would win the case if it should be decided on a basis of law.
>
> As we well know now, it has been contended by numerous authorities that the decision did not follow the law, but rather was clothed in the language of psychology and sociology, with an overtone of appeasement with respect to Soviet Russia, whose propaganda had been aimed at segregation practices in this country. However, Mr. Warren should have known that Russia also practices segregation.
>
> But we did not believe that even Mr. NIXON, who is nothing if not politically minded, would be so disingenuous as to make the admission that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States had saved the Grand Old Party from defeat by handing down an opinion that was calculated to capture the Negro vote, which is a balance of power in some Northern States.
>
> Hence, just as Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut and Rhode Island rebelled against the United States Court in the famous Hartford Convention of 1814, and the antislavery North as a whole were against the Dred Scott decision as handed down by Chief Justice Taney in the runaway slave case of 1852, which was regarded as having been politically dictated, even so is the South rebelling today against the Warren decision.

In the case of the Hartford Convention, which was led by George Cabot, it was affirmed that "in cases of deliberate, dangerous, and palpable infractions of the Constitution, affecting the sovereignty of the State and liberties of the people; it is not only the right but the duty of such a State to interpose its authority for their protection, in the manner best calculated to secure that end."

Several of the Southern States today, following in the precedent of the Old Dominion State of Virginia, likewise have invoked the doctrine of interposition, which was given sanction early in the history of the country by Jefferson and Madison, the latter being known as the Father of the Constitution. And now that it has been admitted that the Warren decision was political, the South's case is strengthened.

It is not known, however, whether the doctrine of interposition can be sustained in law today. But our contest will at least make for time in the fight against a decision that goes against the grain of the vast majority of the people of the South. And when the people of the country as a whole become more familiar with the background and injustice of the Warren pronouncement, it may be nullified even as was the 18th amendment, which embodied sumptuary legislation.

The United States district courts apparently feel compelled to follow the line laid down by the High Court at Washington. But they seem to do so with reservations. For instance, Judge J. Skelly Wright, in announcing the decision in the Louisiana cases last week, recognized the magnitude of the problem. He said it is not to be taken lightly and declared that it will require the utmost patience, understanding, generosity, and forbearance from all of us of whatever race.

Yet, the NAACP, which includes most Negro politicians and a good many of the politically inclined Negro preachers, are joining up with the do-gooders, and rabble rousers of the North, including many of the newspapers that know little about the problems of the South, and which close their columns to our point of view. But their attitude may be changed if we can get a few more articles like Tom Waring's that appeared in Harper's magazine last month. It stated the stark realties of our case.

Full-Time Integrity in the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while when political leaders incline to grow overzealous in their partisanship, some refreshingly sane citizen comes up with a bit of considered and sober thinking which should bring back to their senses and the solid earth those who have embraced too enthusiastically and overloyally a political campaign issue or cause.

Such a contribution toward reasonableness was called to my attention today in the form of a letter published in the Bremerton Sun. The author of the letter I believe has been a Democratic precinct committeeman for more than 40 years and is a highly respected citizen. He wrote the letter before President Eisenhower announced.

As a Republican, Mr. Speaker, I salute a good Democrat and hail him for living up to his reputation as a sincere and conscientious member of a fine community.

Those leaders who impugn the President's motives and bemoan the results of his decision should listen to this grassroots analysis. Writing before the President's announcement, this Democrat predicted the President would run. But compare this American citizen's thinking and reaction to the remarks of those who are interpreting the forthright statement of the President as being a half-time offer.

I think the American people appreciate the situation as did the writer of the letter to the Bremerton Sun—John C. Lindberg. He said he expected the President to say "Yes." But Mr. Lindberg rose above partisanship in his thinking and suggested the President would run for a second term because of spiritual motives and valor. Including the President by inference with great American leaders of high and noble stature, because of problems of humanity, the writer of this letter saw these leaders understanding the lines attributed to past President Theodore Roosevelt, which read:

> The leader for the time being, whoever he may be, is but an instrument to be used until broken and then cast aside; and if he is worth his salt he will care no more when he is broken than a soldier cares when his life is forfeited that the victory be won.

A wholesome debate over issues between political parties is good but the American people know one thing—President Eisenhower if reelected will give the Nation full-time integrity and dedicated service for our welfare and peace in the world.

To John C. Lindberg, Democrat, from this Republican public servant, my admiration and respect. I am sending the newspaper clipping of the letter to the President. I know he will appreciate its faith in human nature and sincerity.

America's Guided Missiles Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my comments on America's guided missiles program made on CBS radio network on March 1, 1956.

In the sense that we must press ahead at every turn, we have a crash program. We do not, and should not, tear our hair out and go around excitedly doing foolish things. Actually, the development nature of this job must be recognized. To a great degree the job involves the creative thinking of scientists and engineers in its present stage. This type of work is not susceptible to 3-shift or 7-day per week operation except for very short periods.

On the other hand, there are parts of the job where three-shift operation is possible. Thus, in the fabrication and testing of propulsion units, three shifts are being used. Certain building construction is also on overtime and extra shift. Actually the contractors are authorized unlimited overtime and are using a great amount of it. I feel that the Defense Department is putting full pressure of the project and as it becomes a production problem instead of a research and development project, there will be more and more overtime and three-shift work.

The guided missile programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are going full speed ahead. Honors go to the United States Army for perfecting the first successful ballistics guided missile. The recent 300-mile test of the Redstone missile furnished the essential data needed for the great breakthrough. The Army is on the verge of breaking the barrier in the great guided missile race. The 1,500-mile missile will soon become a reality.

Within 18 to 24 months the intermediate range ballistics guided missile will be in full-scale production and the antimissile automatic interceptor has definitely passed the blueprint stage and contracts will be awarded soon.

The 1,500-mile Redstone-type missile will extend the combat zones of both the Army and Navy. And these services are now jointly working on a program for the tactical employment of the new weapon, which in view of its potential for carrying fragmentation, blast, chemical, bacteriological and atomic warheads will provide both the Army and Navy accurate, reliable, all-weather fire support of tremendous flexibility, power and volume.

Missile experts say that the 1,500-mile missile can be launched from either submarines or surface carriers. Hence, vitally strategic targets within the Soviet orbit will be within easy range from highly mobile and secret launching bases. Also, it can be launched from our global network of air bases enveloping the Soviet Union and Red China.

Of course, we desire and we must maintain leadership in the technical fields which underly military weapons. We must take advantage of any technological potentialities for new weapons of this sort. But we must not let this thing get out of perspective, although we already know that the Russians have modern aircraft capable of delivering atomic weapons.

Statements have been made that the Russians have fired a 15,000-mile range missile. I deny categorically that anyone in this country has proof to back up this statement. And contrary to certain published statements, the Russians presently do not have a 1,500-mile missile according to the most reliable sources. The United States is two jumps ahead of the Soviets in both the intermediate range ballistics missile and the intercontinental ballistics missile. And there is every indication that the Defense Department officials are pushing the missile programs as rapidly as can be moved.

And I think certain people are going a mighty long way in implying that President Eisenhower, with his military background, is operating ill-advisedly or inefficiently in the military field.

Peace Through Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on February 26, 1956, the able and distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], delivered a brilliant and courageous address, entitled "Peace Through Truth," to approximately 650 North Carolinians at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Raleigh, N. C. His address carried a message of extreme importance to all Americans. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE THROUGH TRUTH

(Address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, Missouri, at Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, Raleigh, N. C., February 26, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it would not be possible for me to tell you how highly honored I am to be in the great State of North Carolina tonight, among Democrats.

My friends down here include your outstanding Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, and your superb Governor, Luther Hodges.

We in Missouri are almost as proud of them as you are.

I am proud also to be in the home State of one with whom I had the honor to serve in the Department of Defense for some years—Gordon Gray. America has no finer public servant.

Tonight I hope this talk is being listened to by one of the outstanding men of our time, my friend Lindsay Warren, a public servant with integrity and ability that has never been surpassed.

It is also a privilege and pleasure to pay my respects to my friends and colleagues, your two great Senators.

KERR SCOTT, like your Congressman, is an authority on farm problems. We in the Senate admire him more each day.

I have the rare privilege of serving on two committees with Judge ERVIN. His wit, his kindness to all, and his almost incredible capacity for plain hard work have brought him the affection and respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

To me, however, North Carolina will always be remembered as the home of Max Gardner.

My father died when I was young, and Governor Gardner, according to Miss Fay, was kind enough to say he considered me his foster son.

On a little island in the Caribbean a cable came to say the Governor had left us. I remember going out on the beach, looking up at the stars and wishing him well.

Governor Gardner was the greatest of them all—kind and generous and understanding. A granite rock of integrity.

It has always been my conviction that this would be a different world if he had lived.

You in North Carolina should be mighty proud of the almost unrivaled progress of your State in schools and roads and the development of industry.

Many issues now before the Congress and the Nation could be discussed tonight.

They would include roads and schools and taxes and trade; and every one of them is important.

We could talk about the condition of our farmers—struggling on despite the activities of the men supposed to represent them.

The farmer is now but 15 percent of the total population—yet his share of our national income has dropped to 6 percent.

We could talk about the growing giantism of our industrial structure—and the consequent plight of small business.

In the past 3 years the profits of corporations with assets of over $100 million have increased 27 percent—but profits in corporations with assets under $250,000 have decreased 39 percent.

But by far the most important question facing all countries today is how to obtain permanent world peace.

Peace can only come through a mutually agreed upon plan for universal disarmament, with a fool-proof system of inspection.

It may sound paradoxical—but it is true—that only from a position of relative military strength can we hope to win peace through disarmament.

In this air-atomic age, we must start waging peace in the future, as we have waged war in the past.

Peace is now dynamic. It is no longer a vacuum between two wars. It must be waged to be won.

Unless we have confidence in the sincerity of the leaders of communism, however, we cannot disarm unilaterally. To do so might well be national suicide.

History proves that all Communists really respect is power.

Therefore, our chance for permanent peace lies in negotiating from a position of relative strength instead of from one of relative weakness.

But that is not our policy today.

The reverse is true—because we are approving policies which are building up the Communist war machine, at the same time we continue to further reduce expenditures for our own defense.

We are approving shipments from the free world to Russia of critically needed strategic war materials.

In August 1954, this administration approved a policy permitting our allies to ship the Communists copper, aluminum, electric and electronic equipment, and latest model machine tools.

During the past 18 months, the free world has shipped over 250 million pounds of copper to the Communists.

The American taxpayer loaned many millions of dollars to help build copper mines in some of the countries now making these shipments.

And the Communists have paid for these war materials with such goods as butter, and cotton, and corn, and gold.

So, in effect, the American taxpayer is now indirectly supporting the very Communist war machine that menaces his security.

That is the record—and your great Senator, Judge ERVIN, and I have seen it nailed down in recent hearings before our committee.

A desperate effort is now being made by this administration to keep these facts away from the people.

But in the countries of our allies, information incident to these shipments is now a matter of public record.

Why should those people be given the truth—and our citizens kept in the dark?

As we approve helping the Communist war machine, with misleading statements we brush aside the growing danger of that war machine.

Perhaps the most misleading of such statements now passed around is—"The United States is stronger than ever before in its peacetime history."

Which means exactly nothing.

The vital question: What is our relative strength as against that of the possible enemy?

"Relative" is the important word.

As illustration—in a ball game would you rather have 2 runs when your opponent had none, or 6 runs when your opponent had 8?

Yes—this administration is now withholding the facts about our danger from the American people in 1956—just as Prime Minister Baldwin withheld them from the British people in 1936.

With one exception, this similarity between 1936 to 1956 is very close. That exception—who is behind us as we were behind England?

How many Americans realize that in the past 3 years some $8 billion has been cut from our national defense but the rest of the cost of government has gone up $4 billion?

We now acknowledge the almost unbelievable growth in Communist military strength, on the ground, in the air, and under the sea.

We are forced to acknowledge the recent series of diplomatic triumphs Communist aggression has achieved all over the world.

In the face of these two conditions, how many Americans know that this year this administration is further reducing our Navy over $300 million, our Army over $390 million, our Air Force over $450 million, and even our Research and Development many millions of dollars?

How do you think these reductions are received by those countries now undecided between the Iron Curtain and the free world?

How many Americans realize that our Government now admits Russia is graduating over 2½ times as many engineers and scientists as are being graduated in the United States?

How many Americans realize that this rich and prosperous Nation nevertheless ordered less than one-fourth as many combat planes in 1955 as it did in 1952?

How many Americans realize that our desire to balance the budget recently prevented American flyers facing the Communists in Korea from continuing their minimum training schedule?

Officials of this administration have been attempting to justify these unfortunate and unfair actions by saying they are taking a "calculated risk."

Yes, my friends, it is exactly that.

They calculate the budget figures.

The people take the risk.

At a press conference a few days ago, President Eisenhower was asked: "Two Democratic senators have charged in the last week, sir, that the United States lags seriously behind the Soviet Union in the production and development of guided missiles. Do you agree with that opinion, sir, and if not, could you give us your view?"

The President replied: "Well, I am always astonished at the amount of information others get that I don't."

At that point there was laughter.

Later in the same press conference, the President, referring to progress in missile weapons, said: "This thing is being researched and developed as rapidly as it can be done in this country so far as my experts and my people in the Defense Department tell me."

Who are these experts who so completely misinformed the President?

Was it the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Gardner, who just resigned in protest against the slow and inadequate program; and who only last Sunday told the American people, on a nationally televised program, that a continuation of present policies would

guarantee America an Air Force inferior to the Air Force of the Communists?

Let us recall the immortal remark of our greatest airman, the late Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold: "The American people should always remember that the second best Air Force is worth exactly as much as the second best poker hand."

We may have the second best Air Force today. If present policies continue, we are certain to have it tomorrow.

And here is the proof. In a public address only last October, one of the members of President Eisenhower's Joint Chiefs of Staff stated:

"If being ahead is related to numbers of aircraft in combat units, we are not ahead. The Communists have thousands more combat airplanes than we do.

"If being ahead is related to aircraft production, we are again only second best. The Communists are producing far more combat airplanes than we are.

"Even more important, if being ahead is related to rate of progress, we have fallen far behind."

Earlier this month, February, another top military official said:

"In airplane after airplane they (the Soviets) are approaching us in quality and surpassing us in quantity. The fact is that they have been and are outproducing us in all categories but medium jet bombers.

"One of the reasons that we are dropping behind is that the Communists are making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we."

These are official public statements put out by this administration.

Last month, this Nation produced 611,190 automobiles—for profit.

That was fine, and in accordance with the production genius of our heritage.

Now let's see what we produced for security.

Recently a Defense Secretary stated that even if Russia had developed an intermediate range 1,500-mile ballistic missile, that accomplishment would not materially affect the balance of power now existing between the East and West.

That is an extraordinary statement, and should be analyzed carefully.

What he implied was that the Communists, already possessing thousands upon thousands more modern jet bombers than any other nation, can now destroy Europe any time by means of a sudden surprise attack—so why worry about whether or not they have developed an even better weapon to do the job they can already do.

In other words, the Communists already possess the ability to kill Europe with a knife—so why worry about whether they get a gun?

What sad and sickening news for our allies.

Does it imply that NATO is a dead duck?

Not too long ago, Gen. Carl Spaatz said the danger of such a missile would be the Communists could use it to blackmail our allies.

But now a Defense Department spokesman in effect says they can destroy Europe anyway.

If that is correct, let us look at what has happened to that force which both President Eisenhower and Winston Churchill have said so often is the greatest deterrent to war—the Strategic Air Force of the United States.

Most of the combat wings of that Air Force are composed of B–47 medium-range bombers. The remaining combat wings are composed of B–36 long-range bombers.

The B–47, designed some 11 years ago, is just that—a medium bomber. Its lack of range means its effectiveness would be heavily reduced if it could not operate from foreign bases.

It could do some kind of a job flying from the United States, through the practice of refueling in the air from air tankers.

But as in other plane categories, we are badly short of tankers; and we have no modern tankers.

The other bomber in our Strategic Air Force is the B–36, an obsolescent plane designed 16 years ago, before America entered World War II.

These B–36's are becoming obsolete, to the point where their success against modern Communist fighters and Communist missiles becomes ever less probable.

These facts prove that America is in critical need of the most important weapon the free world now has in production, the B–52 modern intercontinental bomber; and many hundreds of these bombers should be produced at the earliest possible date.

Under the schedule laid down by this administration, however, we are getting but a tiny trickle of B–52 production.

Yesterday the lead editorial in a prominent and responsible Washington newspaper made the statement this country was getting 17 B–52's a month. The editorial asserted we should be getting a lot more.

This information about the number of bombers came from the Department of Defense.

But we are producing nothing like 17 B–52's a month; in fact we are making only a small fraction of that number.

The two plants working on this bomber employ over 50,000 people.

Thousands upon thousands of these people know how many B–52's were made last month.

But this administration arbitrarily classifies that information—thereby preventing it from being given to the people; and then spreads around incorrect and misleading information.

Why?

Is it fear—fear of telling the American people the truth about how important the "money firsters" of this administration think production for profit is as against production for security?

With the Communists advancing steadily in their campaign for world conquest, we are nevertheless operating the plants making our most important defense weapon on a five-day week; and the manufacturer must first obtain permission from the administration before he can allow one hour of overtime.

It is bad enough to hide the truth from the people. It is worse to misinform them.

But that is exactly what is being done.

In a recent public address, a top spokesman for this administration stated:

"Added to this increasing strength (Strategic Air Command) each month is our growing stockpile of intercontinental ballistic missiles which represents the most modern and devastating weapon of war in existence today."

The United States has no stockpile of intercontinental ballistic missiles whatever—and under present conditions won't have any for years to come.

But when worried newsmen called the office of this spokesman they were told the information was correct and that further details could not be given because they were "a military secret."

And there has been no correction of that statement to date.

Is it any wonder the people are becoming confused to the point where they are beginning to question the leadership of this administration?

The President should take prompt steps to see that policies are adopted which give the people all the truth that will not help a possible enemy.

Why doesn't the President tell us how many B–52's are being made each month?

And how many will be made in February 1957?

And how many comparable bombers it is estimated the Communists are making a month—and will make in February 1957?

If the rate of this bomber production is something to be proud of, if it takes into consideration the Communist threat, why all this reluctance to give the truth to the people?

We Americans are now being forced to follow a secret policy, never explained and never justified.

Those who demand this policy be reversed are often criticized—and sometimes ridiculed.

But there has never been a secret government that was free; or a free government that was secret.

The strength of a nation depends upon the will of the people. In a democratic form of government, that will can only function if the people are informed.

So let's elect those who want the people to be the masters of their Government, and not its ignorant servants.

It is for these reasons that I hope with all my heart you will send my friend and worthy colleague Senator SAM ERVIN back to the Senate, his return being part of a great Democratic victory in your State and throughout the Nation.

Bureau of Internal Revenue Service Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Internal Revenue is currently in the process of establishing service centers strategically located throughout the United States. These centers are to be used for the purpose of processing simple income tax returns on a mass production basis. The more complicated cases will still be handled on an individual basis and through the various district offices as at present. I am told there will eventually be five such centers throughout the country. There are two already in operation, one in Kansas City, Mo., and the other in Lawrence, Mass. The next one is scheduled for the western region, which comprises the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, and Arizona.

The authority for selecting the location of the western region center rests with the regional commissioner in San Francisco. I am told he will choose the location on the basis of availability of terminal railway mail service and finding a suitable facility with proper space, light, ventilation and heat, as well as consideration to obtaining qualified personnel. It is anticipated that the center will require from 200 to 400 employees skilled at typing, keypunch operating, and general clerical work. Information has come to my attention indicating that it is not the policy of the Internal Revenue Service to advertise for space. Its requirements generally are filled through the activities of Chambers of Commerce and other interested civic groups who submit proposals.

Representing as I do the metropolitan area of Seattle, Wash., conveniently located in the western area currently under consideration for development of

the third service center, I am pressing the advantages what Seattle has to offer as a desirable location. I am presupposing that Seattle can meet the criteria for the establishment of the western service center. If Seattle is unable to qualify, then I would hope some other city in my State would be able to meet the requirements. But I am not asking any undue favoritism.

According to information given me, the new program of Internal Revenue Service centers is working well in the two locals already in operation, expediting as it does the processing of millions of routine tax returns to the average taxpayer and, at the same time, bringing more complicated returns under closer scrutiny than was heretofore possible. I heartily endorse this program and hope the additional centers required to make it effective nationwide will be established as soon as possible. Meanwhile, it is to be hoped also that political pressures will play no part in the final determination of location, but rather that the good of the service and the economy to the taxpayer will be determining factors. Of course, I would like to have Seattle selected but only on the merit of its case. There has been altogether too much politics in such matters as locating Government facilities in the past.

Importance of Sports and Recreation in the Health and Well-Being of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the summer Olympic games are not far off. During the winter Olympic games our amateur athletes learned what it means to compete against the Russian professionals. Under the circumstances, I think our amateurs did very well. I am sure that all of us are anxious to have the best of our athletes compete in the summer games as well as a full complement of athletes taking part in every one of the events scheduled by the Olympic committee.

On January 28, I gave an address in Cleveland, Ohio, before the Cleveland Ambassadors of Sports, which bears on United States participation in the forthcoming Olympic games which I think will be of interest to other Members of Congress, and under leave granted I insert it in the RECORD:

Mr. Toastmaster, it is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity you have given me to join with you this evening in your annual banquet, especially since so many, if not the vast majority of the members and their wives, here present, are or have been my constituents. I want therefore to take this occasion to talk over with you, more or less informally, a problem to which we in Congress have been directing our attention and which I feel will be of keen interest to you.

Of course, all of us recognize the importance of sports and recreation for the health and well-being of our Nation.

The physical and mental vigor of our youth, the development of a competitive spirit in our youth, and the ability to "take it" are all lessons that can be learned with profit on the athletic field.

You and I know the importance of having constructive outlets for the leisure time activities of everyone, from our youth through to adults of every age. Good leisure time activities help to promote and develop a healthy community, a healthy city of Cleveland, and a healthy nation, and that goal surely is one that all of us have in common.

In somewhat recent years, the world in which we live has been greatly reduced over what you and I, in our youth, regarded as a vast expanse of land and sea, made up of many lands and curious places that it would take five lifetimes to see. The high speed of travel afforded us today, as well as the unbelievable means of communication which are ours, has removed all those beliefs of our youth. Today there is scarcely a place on earth that we cannot reach by air in a matter of hours, let alone days, and almost everything of importance that happens anywhere in the world is known to us within a matter of hours.

Consequently, it seems that everything we, as a nation, now do or fail to do, has a significance in the world of our day. It has been said that the American people are living in a goldfish bowl, where they are being observed by all the people of the world. Our friends, of course, point to the many good and wonderful things they see in the goldfish bowl, while our enemies, the Russian Communists, are constantly turning the spotlight on the imperfections of our way of life.

For example, let us take the forthcoming Olympic games.

In past years, the participation of our youth in the Olympic games was taken as a matter of course, and it was always taken for granted that we would win the Olympic games, but this year, the picture is considerably different. We cannot take for granted participation of our young athletes in these games because the Olympic committee does not have the funds to finance a full team. Alarm has been sounded that there is grave doubt they will be able to raise the funds to put in the field a full Olympic team. It would be foolhardy for us to take for granted that we will again win the Olympic games because the Russian Communists have served notice on the world that they intend to win the next Olympic games just as they intend to dominate every phase of life throughout the world.

I am sure some of you are already aware of the unbelievable steps the Russians have taken to prepare a team of what they call "super athletes" to take part in the next Olympic games. For the past 4 years, the Kremlin has spent a fortune in selecting and training thousands and thousands of athletes in every one of the sports connected with the Olympic games. By American standards, these athletes selected by the Kremlin are professionals.

All of them spend their full-time training and studying in their given sport. They all receive a minimum of $100 a month expenses and their keep. They are provided with the best coaches and equipment available in the Soviet Union. They even have scientific research centers which make studies of every sport and every important athlete of the world in order to gain tips and coaching knowledge to be used in their centers for developing athletes throughout the whole Russian colonial empire. In a word, the Kremlin has left no stone unturned in its preparations to win the Olympic games of 1956.

As some indication of how the U. S. S. R. will fare in the Olympic games, I point to what they have already done in preparation for the winter games. Four or five of their skaters have already established new world records; one of their skiers, in an unofficial try, broke the world's record ski jump. Story after story has leaked out from behind the Iron Curtain about the phenominal records which this new crop of so-called Soviet athletes have been making in competition among each other.

It goes without saying that the Olympic team the Russians will send to Australia this year and to the winter games, will not only be of excellent caliber, but they will have a competent athlete available there for every contest scheduled in the games. They have no problems so far as money is concerned, and consequently they will send as many athletes as permitted under Olympic committee rules.

Looking at the picture here in the United States, I am proud to say that the athletes who will represent us in Australia this summer will be amateurs in every sense of the word. None of them will be the products of a gigantic Government training program because we simply do not indulge in such practices.

None of these athletes will be subsidized by the Government. All of them, however, will be the products of our free way of life which emphasizes competitive sports and the right of all young people to equal competition in the field of sports.

I am confident that we can field a great Olympic team and that we have available excellent competitors in every field of sports authorized by the Olympic committee.

I am not confident, however, that we will be able to field such a full team of experienced competitors, because I am advised that the American Olympic Committee does not have the money to cover the necessary expenses, and is very doubtful that it will be able to raise the required funds. This, in my judgment, is a sad situation and one which should be given the attention of all the sports-loving people in our country. I think this is a matter that our sports writers and commentators ought to put before the American people. In plain words, the American people must be told that the Russian Communists are going to win the Olympic games of 1956 unless we wake up and do something to support the American Olympic Committee.

Someone might ask—What difference does it make if the Russians do win the Olympic games? Others might say that our American athletes have had a monopoly in winning the Olympic games and that maybe it would be good for sports if the Russians did win. Under normal circumstances these would be fair questions. However, when one considers that the Russian Communists are out to win these Olympic games as an indication of their superiority over the United States, the seriousness of the situation is apparent. Then, too, we must remember that the Russian Communists have the biggest propaganda machine in history and that they will pound away at all the people of the world—if they should win the 1956 Olympics, that our American democracy is decaying, that our athletic victories of the past will never again be achieved, that we are a decaying society—like the Roman Empire in its last days. Believe me, this is no exaggeration. I have studied for years the operation of the Russian Communist propaganda machine and have seen what they have been able to do to mislead many people of the world with gross lies and distortions of fact. I, therefore, will not underestimate what they could do with a situation in which they could honestly claim victory in such an important international event as the Olympic games of 1956.

Congress has been asked to look into just about everything happening in the world

today. I intend to urge the appropriate committee of Congress to look into this matter and to determine what is being done about protecting United States prestige. I am taking this step because we in Congress have found it necessary in order to protect the security and well-being of the American people to appropriate billions of dollars each year for our national defense, for economic and military assistance to our allies abroad, and for other purposes connected with our international security. It would be folly for us, as Members of Congress, on the one hand to sponsor programs which we consider absolutely necessary for the protection of the American people which cost billions of dollars, and then on the other hand, neglect to make sure that international activities such as the Olympic games have a full United States participation. There is a possibility that the President's emergency fund which Congress authorizes each year could be used to assist the American Olympic Committee in fielding a full United States Olympic team.

I am now looking into this possibility and I have made it clear that I will support the White House in any reasonable plan it presents to make sure that we field the strongest possible 1956 Olympic team.

In the meantime, I know all of you, as real ambassadors of sport, are going to continue your interest in healthy leisure and activities for youth and adults and that the good fellowship which has been so warmly demonstrated here this evening will always be the predominant spirit wherever Americans discuss or participate in athletics.

Continuing High Morale in the Armed Services Demands the Enactment of a Uniform Program of Adequate Medical Care for Families and Dependents of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there is scheduled to be shortly presented to this House a bill designed to provide a uniform improved program of medical care for the dependents of members of the armed services. The particular bill which we shall be asked to consider is titled "H. R. 9429."

My original interest in this important subject came about from observation, during my own World War II service in the Navy, of the beneficial effects upon my fellow servicemen of their knowledge that their dependents at home were receiving proper medical care in their absence, and unfortunately my observation of the demoralizing effects of the information from their dependents that they were not receiving proper medical attention and too often could not obtain it. My continuing high interest in this important subject was aroused from my experience here these past several years and my opposing efforts to the Army proposal to close the Murphy Army Hospital in my congressional district, the only general hospital in the New England region. Out of this experience, and without prejudice, I must say that I have never yet been given what I consider to be a full and sufficient reason for the Army's persistent planning toward reduction and closing of military hospitals, not only within my area, but in several other areas throughout the country. To the contrary, it seems to me that their program and attitude on this subject has been strikingly contradictory.

On the one hand, they complain about the difficulty of keeping good people in the armed services for a career and they continually ask the Congress to provide additional incentives to encourage reenlistments and to attract individuals to the military life. Most of their proposals along this line are for increases in pay, but it is remarkable how often their recommendations contain appeals for major increases for the highest officer rank and meager increases for the enlisted personnel. From the repeated stories we read of the multitudinous retirements of personages in the highest ranks at comparatively early ages and their almost immediate placements in the highest paying brackets of business and industry, it is difficult for anyone to see the need for any greater incentives for the higher military rankings. It leads one to suspect that the real purpose too often is to provide higher pension levels for early retirement.

Be that as it may, I have never heard of a single case of a ranking military officer who had any trouble getting full medical care for his dependents at military facilities. Unfortunately, I have heard of too many cases where the dependents of noncommissioned service people have had extreme difficulty, and in some instances, have been turned away. Of course, in too many areas there are no military medical facilities within a reasonable distance and they are thus deprived of proper medical attention.

It may well be that sometimes, as is, I think, sincerely stated by military authorities, the application of existing laws to the particular entitlement is vague and technical. If that is so, then this legislation we will soon act upon is a sound step toward resolving that difficulty of interpretation.

H. R. 9429 is designed to provide a uniform program of medical care for military dependents and grant them a statutory entitlement to such care on a uniform basis throughout all of the uniformed services. In other words, there will be no disparity among the types of care provided nor will there be any disparity among the types of dependents included, nor should there be any further confusion in the minds of military officials as to who is entitled to what care under what branch of the military. In short, enactment of this legislation will provide by statute a uniform program of medical care which will at last nearly fulfill the high obligation of the Federal Government to provide adequate treatment for the dependents of those who serve this Nation in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, in the President's last state of the Union message, he reiterated his previous comments upon the importance of this proposed legislation in the following language:

> This year I renew my request of last year for legislation to provide medical care for military dependents and a more equitable survivors' benefit program.

Both the Secretary of Defense and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve endorsed and enlarged upon the Presidential appeal.

Mr. Speaker, military morale is of vital concern, not only to the Defense Department, but to the Congress, in meeting our responsibilities to adequately provide for national defense. A military unit is no better than the spirit that exists among its members and the morale of their families, despite whatever powerful war weapons that may be possessed.

Assurances to military personnel that their families and dependents, and of course their own medical needs will be fully, competently, and humanely provided for is a major factor in the continuing maintenance of high spirit and morale. Such assurance is also the greatest appeal of encouragement for continuing reenlistments and desire for a military career that can be established. It is obvious, of course, that the continuously training career serviceman means the best prepared and most efficient combat force, on an economical basis, that can be had. Surely that is what we vitally need in these times of continuing tension, unrest, and ever-threatening Communist aggression. The adoption of this legislation is, then, of obvious and vital importance to the continuing safety and welfare of the American people. I earnestly hope it is accorded unanimous approval when it is presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, in the hearings on this measure before the House Armed Services Committee, it was authoritatively estimated that 40 percent of the dependents of members of the armed services do not now have medical care available to them in service facilities.

Realizing with reasonable certainty that this legislation will be enacted into law, may I further earnestly hope and trust that the Army and the Defense Department will not unwittingly continue to thwart the projected intent of the Congress contained in this legislation to provide full medical care to military dependents by perverting insistence upon closing more and more of the very military medical hospitals and facilities that must be kept in operation if the objectives of this bill are to be honestly and conscientiously carried out.

Volunteers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity, on the 60th anniversary of the Volunteers of America,

to pay a heartfelt tribute to this magnificent national social welfare organization, which in its 60 years of service has given material and spiritual aid to more than 170 million Americans without regard to race, creed, or color.

The Volunteers of America has fed the hungry, sheltered the homeless, helped and comforted prisoners and their families, aided the handicapped and the derelict, and brought solace to the aged.

Ever since its foundation in March 1896 it has answered every call of need and of duty. It has served the people of the United States in depression and disaster, in peace, and in two world wars.

The Volunteers of America has made Thanksgiving and Christmas live again for millions of the friendless and the lonely. It has rehabilitated the alcoholic, provided homes for children and the elderly. It has provided clothes and household goods for millions of the poor and useful work for millions of the unemployed.

It has brought many millions back to God in the faiths of their own choosing.

May the torch of help, faith, and hope first lit back in 1896 in my own city of New York never go out but blaze ever more brightly and strongly for the welfare of all Americans everywhere in our broad country.

H. R. 9166

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, regarding H. R. 9166 which comes up tomorrow under suspension of the rules, it is pretty obvious that corporations think a protest at its righ rate of taxation would be a waste of breath. At least, no representative of big or little business came around to my office, or have written me letters, suggesting opposition to another extension of this special levy.

Under the emotional appeal of our defense needs, it may be considered bad taste to mention that taxes take more from the American people than their food costs them. I am going to vote for H. R. 9166 because I believe lower taxes might well mean more inflation—and that would be a return to the false prosperity of a few years ago. But I want it in the record that the tax rates are too high, and to repeat the warning of old: "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Let us recall here and now that taxes on corporations actually are paid by the people. Were it not for this present tax on corporations, prices could be lowered to the people, more money could be paid to employees to buy more consumer goods. Thus, we could raise our living standards and also increase prosperity for all. Lower taxes on corporations, provided Government spending was within its income, would help labor and wage earners far more than the corporations themselves, for all taxes are channeled to consumers and wage earners.

I would like to see the Government's power to tax limited except for war emergencies.

It is not popular, maybe, to stress reducing corporation taxes but labor has a stake in this because what Government takes in taxes no collective bargaining contract can obtain for the workers.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that an excessive rate of taxation of corporation profits is the cause of capital investing in nonemployment expanding and noncreative enterprises. Wealth needs incentive to expand and make more jobs. I shall vote for this measure because overspending by the Federal Government during previous administrations caused the buying power of the workers pay check to be cut in half. Government revenue must equal Government expenditures. We must balance the budget.

But looking to the future, let us not penalize profit incentive by confiscatory taxation. Samuel Gompers said the sin against the workingman was lack of profits. I say if anyone is going to syphon off corporation profits, let it be the consumer through lower prices and the workingman through the higher purchasing power of his wages.

Floods Threaten Northeast Section of Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, spring is here again. This is a signal for all to rejoice, nature is reborn, growing things are budding, and soon the land will be green again. I dislike to strike a discordant note at this juncture, but may I call attention to a threatening peril, poised like the sword of Damocles, ready to strike.

All who read or listen know of the vast blanket of snow covering the ground of the northeastern section of our Nation as a result of the blizzards of the past week. I have just returned from Massachusetts, and I shudder to think of what would happen if spring should descend upon that region all at once with warm breezes and gentle spring showers. I am informed by competent authorities that the nightmarish experiences of the 1936 floods would be surpassed by far. Even the hurricane-caused floods of last August and October will fade into sad memory when that snow melts at one time and the water pours toward the sea, leaving death and destruction in its wake.

It is true that this might not happen, but it is a distinct possibility, in my opinion a probability, and something must be done to prevent the chance of it occurring. There are engineering plans which, when put into effect, will control these melted snow waters and/or additional rains. They would, when constructed, save many lives and untold millions of dollars of damage to property, to homes and factories, to stores and theaters, to churches and schools, to roads and bridges and railroads. This has been demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt throughout this vast land. The Corps of Engineers has estimated that of a potential annual loss due to floods of $900 million, flood-control works already in being are now preventing up to 54 percent of such damage over the Nation.

There are of course other sections of the country where the snow cover represents a threat of floods should a sudden warm period melt it in the space of a few days.

Should this occur in my New England States, and a disastrous flood result, there will be many an outraged voice raised to cry why is not something done about it? This has happened year after year, disaster strikes, a great demand for action, then inevitably memory fades, apathy sets in and little gets done. I hope the cycle does not repeat itself again this year. The memory of the floods of 1955 is still fresh in the minds of the citizens of Massachusetts and the other Northeastern States. Let us not shirk our responsibilities. Congress declared in 1936 that control of floods was a Federal responsibility and instructed the Corps of Engineers to study the problem and develop plans for countering them. The engineers have done so and within the limits of funds provided them have done a marvelous job. But the work is far from complete. Appropriations for this purpose rose to a peak of over $352 million in 1950, but due to the Korean crisis fell off progressively till 1954, when they struck bottom at $137,574,000.

The present Congress has given a ray of hope to potential flood sufferers by quickly passing the Urgent Deficiency Act which enabled the engineers to start 6 vitally needed projects in the New England States and complete detailed planning for 17 others. This is a good start. But I earnestly hope that it will not be necessary for us to be shocked into action by another disastrous flood. I cannot emphasize the urgency of this problem too much. Action, immediate and forceful, is needed.

There is now before the Appropriations Committees, requests for funds for construction of flood-control works in the amount of $214 million, an increase over 1956 fiscal year. This is still only 60 percent of the appropriation for 1950 of $352 million. Practically every State in the Union has one or more flood-control projects underway, authorized or planned. Certainly no special pleading should be needed. Floods are great levelers. These projects call for protection of areas which have experienced one or more disastrous floods in very recent years, and even now lie helpless, at the mercy of any new floods that may come.

These projects are of vital necessity. They must be carried out immediately before more thousands of lives are lost and millions, if not billions, of dollars of damages are suffered. Losses from floods cannot be entirely reckoned in terms of dollars. The economic dislocation, the human suffering, loss of loved ones, disrupted families, loss of jobs, none of these can be counted in dollars. All who have undergone such losses once know that, and look forward to the day when there will no longer be a constant threat. The Corps of Engineers has a program, the trained personnel and the responsibility to give the protection to which the Congress has pledged itself. There remains the problem of the necessary funds. To be sure, there are many demands upon the public purse, but certainly the protection of the lives and property of our people should rank near the head.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be an alarmist, but New England is in a precarious situation and, if any further floods should occur before protective measures have been completed, additional, enormous damage will be done. It is for this reason that I appeal to the Democratic and Republican leadership of both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and urge that immediate action be taken to provide the necessary funds for flood-control projects that are necessary to control raging waters of seasonal storms and spring freshets. A promise to help is a good start but it will not stop floodwaters. Something should be done, something must be done and done now. We need action, not speeches.

H. R. 7886 Is a Forward Step in Meeting Our National Obligation To Provide Adequate Security for Disabled and Unemployed Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and the able members of his most efficient unit for initiating current consideration of and hearings on the several bills pending before the committee designed to liberalize the present veterans' pension and benefits laws.

One of these bills, H. R. 7886, commonly known as the War Veterans' Security bill, has attracted wide attention and favor because of its inherent merit, more especially as it beneficially affects needy and disabled World War I veterans who have lately been too much forgotten.

Two wars have taken place since World War I, and the veterans of that great conflict, to end all wars, have unfortunately tended to disappear from public attention and appreciation. Today more than 3 million World War I veterans survive, with an average age of 62. Many of them have already passed away without experiencing benefit of the traditional old-age security which needy veterans of all previous wars were granted in recognition of their sacrificial service to their country.

This unfortunate disregard of the security of our World War I veterans, and the veterans of all our wars, must not be permitted to continue. In these days of persistent extreme tension and ever-threatening war, it is not only the honorable assumption of a high obligation, but it is indeed most practical to insure a resolute morale among present and prospective military defenders of our national safety through clear demonstration that the American people will never be miserly in repaying the debt rightfully owed to all our veterans and will be forever mindful of the substantial physical, mental, and financial sacrifices of veterans and their families during service in wartime.

In summary, this measure advocates two major changes in our current system: First, breaking up the present pension system and making two separate divisions of payments to veterans in need: (a) disability security for war veterans under 65 who need it, and (b) old-age security for war veterans over 65 who need it; second, liberalizing the ceilings and amounts of payments in both classes of security benefits.

Specifically, the suggested amendments embodied in H. R. 7886 would raise the monthly payment to $85, and after 10 years to $105 a month; the payments to the helpless would be increased to $150 a month. It is further proposed to raise the income eligibility ceiling from $2,700 to $3,000 with dependents, and from $1,400 to $1,800 without dependents.

Under modern economic conditions and practical recognition of the realities of this atomic age living, these figures certainly cannot be termed extravagant or unreasonable. To grant a needy and helpless veteran $150 a month in consideration of his patriotic sacrifice surely cannot be cited as overindulgence when we think for a moment of the costs of the required attendant, medicines and basic foods for mere existence. To raise the income eligibility ceilings to $1,800 and $3,000, respectively, is only honest admittance of the economical fact that present ceilings and perhaps even these proposed changes have too long been ignoring of and blind to the high American living standards we have established as being Christian and of which, under other circumstances, we so often boast. If we choose to disregard need, let us at least be truthful about the actual income figure even a willing, able, and employed American requires to live decently in this blessed, prosperous Nation. Let us further realize the fact that in a great many cases the Veterans' Administration interpretation of the present disability and unemployability clause disputes the right to pension payments in instances where only half of the amount now specified in the income ceilings has been earned. An additional feature of this bill, then, is to remove any conscientious administrative doubts of the Veterans Bureau because of yardstick uncertainties in the present law.

Let us finally and realistically appreciate that in this modern industrial and commercial and material age unemployability is too often not as synonymous with inability as it is, unfortunately, with the word "age." Many persons 60, 65, and over are ready, willing, and able to do some work, but the sad fact is that practically all segments of our business and industrial life are not even inclined to hire employees who are over 40 years of age. As a truth, that deplorable situation is becoming a major problem in this country and has already been made the subject of serious investigation and concern by our Labor Department and related agencies of the Federal Government. It is clear, then, how unreal the current system is in trying to carry out the intent of our existing pension law by applying the "disability and unemployability" clause to men over 65. As now applied, the "unemployability" must be due to the "disability." Probably it is closer to the truth to state that the proportion of World War I veterans in need because of age-alone unemployability is 2 to 1 over the number in need because of disability.

Mr. Speaker, a study of the proposed changes and suggested improvements included in H. R. 7886 reveals that no alteration in principle for the under-65 veteran group is urged, but merely an extension of the present principle to provide better security for the disabled and unemployable in this age group through liberalization of the present ceilings and payments consistent with modern economic conditions. Let us also note that the bill does not conflict with the social security program, since such benefits are included in income that would carry a veteran over the allowance ceilings. Let us further observe that some of the proposed benefits would serve to reduce other Government payments to the aged, such as the aid to the aged program carried jointly by the Federal and State Governments; it would displace part of many local aid programs for the aged at community and municipal levels.

In conclusion, may I simply say that it is obvious to anyone studying the subject that our present veterans payments and pension system requires sensible upward revision in recognition of the moral obligation this Nation owes to our veterans and in reasonable recognition of the plain economic facts of everyday living. It appears that we can afford to give billions of dollars for the prime purpose of attracting doubtful allies in case of Communist aggression. It would, then, seem very sensible to express a Christian measure of gratitude to those loyal Americans whose patriotic sacrifices are of record, while at the same time we demonstrated good faith to those who will be called upon to fight and die for America's safety in any future wars, God forbid. I urge every

Member of this House to carefully study the provisions of H. R. 7886, and all the other similar measures now pending before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, so they will be ready to conscientiously vote for the security of all our veterans and the continuing welfare of the Nation when this legislation is presented to us for action in the near future, I hope.

North American Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, on this 10th anniversary of air coach in this country the group which started the low-cost travel idea, North American Airlines, stands under suspended sentence of death. The next few months may determine the fate of this last surviving independent airline.

I have no wish to go into the so-called technical violations of its economic regulations with which CAB has charged North American, nor with the details of the defense which has been offered. I will confine my remarks to economic realities.

To begin with, North American Airlines has operated entirely without subsidy. Its fares must necessarily reflect its costs. Moreover, under the law fares which it has elected to charge, North American has made money. Surely this makes it a valuable yardstick against which can be measured the performance of our subsidized trunkline operators.

What does the record show? The fares North American has advocated have been consistently lower than the published fares of our certificated trunk airlines—beneficiaries over the years of many many millions in subsidies.

Joseph Adams, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, points out, in a recent opinion, that North American has provided a needed competitive spur to our certificated trunklines in offering coach service to the public at low fares.

And this, I am informed, has been done without any subsidy. Reviewing the North American record, Mr. Adams went on to say:

> Included in these benefits would obviously be the low cost air service utilized by the hundreds of thousands of passengers which these nonscheduled operators carried each year. * * * Of perhaps even greater significance, however, is North American's indirect contribution consisting of the stimulus it provided in hastening the day of general low fare air coach operation.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come to ask some questions. Do we truly protect the well-being of those major airlines eligible for subsidy by preserving them from new competition? Are the economic regulations which CAB accuses North American of violating regulations that will benefit the traveling public? Will they foster the development of civil aviation? On every route on which North American has offered its competitive spur, all the lines serving those routes have prospered.

We are not faced with a limited market which must be divided. The market has expanded every time prices are lowered. It can grow similarly in the future with true low-fare competition. North American has helped to develop a new reservoir of potential travelers by bringing the price level of air travel within the reach of constantly increasing numbers of our citizens.

Yet if the ruling of the majority of the Civil Aeronautics Board prevails, this yardstick and this spur will have been eliminated. To quote Mr. Adams again in his dissent on the North American case, "Our traveling public would undoubtedly continue to receive substantial benefits from a legal operation by these holders of letters of registration."

If the Board does not consider the public interest a sufficient justification for reviewing its action, certainly Congress should examine the problem, in the light of the economic realities, and in the public interest.

Ultimately the answer does not lie in the realm of punishing pioneers—but in certificating new enterprise.

I should like to close by commending the work of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust Matters, for its current examination of this serious problem from the point of view of the monopoly aspects.

Further, I feel most strongly that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee might well examine this entire matter without delay. The public needs a break. It is the responsibility of Congress to see that the public gets a break.

I should like to conclude these remarks by reading an extremely cogent editorial from the Tulsa Tribune, of February 3, 1956, which asks what would have happened if a Government agency had controlled the manufacture of automobiles the way the CAB controls American aviation:

[From the Tulsa Tribune of February 3, 1956]

PUBLIC NEEDS A BREAK

If a Government agency had controlled the manufacture and pricing of American automobiles we would still be paying $4,000 for jalopies with isinglass curtains and 20 horsepower motors. That way the industry could have been "stabilized," regardless of what it did to the car-buying public.

This week the Civil Aeronautics Board turned down a request by North American Airlines, a non-scheduled carrier specializing in transcontinental coach flights, for a service from New York to London. The proposed trans-Atlantic fare was to be $140, against the present aircoach rate of $290.

The CAB said that it could not grant the application without a full hearing and a Presidential order lest it "jeopardize existing basic services." This is undoubtedly gobbledegook for something. Further, said the CAB, North American has been previously cited for violation of Civil Aeronautic Administration regulations and therefore may not be fit to fly the Atlantic.

The CAA can require airlines, scheduled or not, to abide by its regulations. Therefore, this is not a matter at issue. There remains only the suspicion that the proposed North American fare is so low that it would wreck competing lines. By what evidence is this true?

There seems to be no such evidence. The scheduled American carriers will take you aircoach from New York to Los Angeles in 9 hours for $99. That's $11 a flying hour per seat. The transatlantic lines will take you from New York to London in 11 hours for $290. That's more than $26 a flying hour. North American's proposed fare would reduce that figure only to a little under $13 a flying hour, which is more than the scheduled lines charge for aircoach across America.

It seems plain that there is profiteering going on in transatlantic air travel. The scheduled lines are running close to full. They cannot get more planes as rapidly as they need them now. Therefore, they naturally do better selling high-cost transportation as long as business is so good.

But if North American wants to give the public a break why should our Government interpose?

Cheap fares will increase international travel. International travel contributes to international understanding. International understanding is what our Government is in favor of.

The Growing Confusion in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 4, I delivered an address over radio station WHK, Cleveland, on the Growing Confusion in Washington. Under leave previously granted I wish to insert my address in the RECORD:

THE GROWING CONFUSION IN WASHINGTON

A great many things have happened since my last report to you from Washington. I have singled out for my discussion today those developments which I think will be of greatest interest to you and will give you my views on them.

All of you, I am sure, were astounded at the natural-gas and oil lobby scandal that was uncovered by the Senate of the United States. From the facts now at hand, there is no doubt but that the natural-gas and oil interests are spending millions of dollars to secure for themselves the right to exploit you, the consumer. These interests are attempting to do this by escaping all control and regulations of reasonable laws enacted to prevent the exploitation of the consumer. I was very happy that President Eisenhower vetoed this bill because you will recall my stand and vote against it when the bill was before the House of Representatives. Many people felt that President Eisenhower's veto message was in fact, his declaration that he would run for a second term. I do not agree with the substance of President Eisenhower's veto message, though I agree with his veto. I would like to remind you that President Eisenhower in his veto message, stated that he was in favor of legislation which would relieve the natural-gas interests of Federal control and regulation which now protects the consumer. You may be assured that while I am in Congress, I shall vote to protect your interests against legislation which will permit the exploitation of consumers, by any group and under any slick terms.

There is a growing general confusion here in Washington which appears to result from a lack of leadership in and direction of the Federal Government. It is my opinion that this situation results from the unfortunate illness of President Eisenhower and the complexities of our Government which demand the constant and strong hand of the President. This growing confusion reached such proportions during the last several weeks as to be alarming.

For example, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, has proposed to Congress that we sell our surplus agricultural products to the Russians. As you know, the policy of this Government, up to the present, has been that to sell our surplus foods to the Russians would do nothing more than strengthen the hand of the Communist regime in its tyranny over millions of people and at the same time would increase the ability of the Communists to make war against the free world. It is also my personal judgment that the agricultural shortages in the Soviet Union and in all the nations of central Europe, enslaved by the Russians, as well as the Baltic States, results primarily from the resistance of the people to the Communist regime. It is a well-established fact that the farmers and peasants of the Communist empire have been engaged in a silent but deadly struggle against their Russian tormentors by withholding grain, failing to plant a full crop, and delaying the harvest. They have taken this action in the hope that the power of the Russian Communists can be broken and that eventually they can regain their freedom and national independence. Yet Secretary of Agriculture Benson, undoubtedly from a sense of frustration and desperation, is now recommending that we bail the Russian Communists out of their present predicament by selling them the foodstuffs which our free-enterprise system has produced. I cannot help but wonder whether Secretary Benson is aware of the fact that the American taxpayer is called upon to contribute up to $40 billion anually to provide an adequate defense system to prevent further Communist aggression, and to protect the security of the American people. His recent recommendation to sell our surplus foods to the Russians would seem to indicate he is not aware of this fact.

Another perplexing element of the general confusion was exposed by Senator McCLELLAN during Senate hearings of the past week. A Senate committee uncovered the astounding fact that tremendous quantities of critical war materials were being traded and sold to the Russians, in flagrant violation of existing laws and agreements with our allies. You will recall that Congress established a requirement that certain materials, necessary to the waging of war, should be denied the Russians by our own Government and by all governments benefiting from our mutual-security and military-assistance program. Senator McCLELLAN brought to public light the fact that flagrant violations of these laws have been going on for many months, and that no corrective action whatever has been taken by the administration. Not only have the Russians been getting copper piping and raw materials, but they have also acquired large quantities of machine tools and precision equipment. No doubt we will hear more about this in the future because Congress never will, and never should, tolerate such trade with the Russians no matter what kind of fancy name or cover is put on it.

Another major development adding to the growing confusion here in Washington was the appearance of Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to explain whether or not the Government had a policy with respect to the political crisis now developing in the Middle East. In the course of his testimony before the committee, Mr. Dulles astounded all the members of the committee, including the Republican members, when he stated that the Communists were making basic changes in their doctrine and policy and that they had decided the use of force and violence would no longer be used as a basic Russian Communist maneuver. Most of the committee members were equally shocked to hear Mr. Dulles say that the Communist change in doctrine and policy was brought about by the administration in Washington. I was very sorry to see Mr. Dulles make such a terrible error because I have felt on the whole, and with the exception of the United States participation in the so-called Geneva Conference of the Summit, he has done a creditable job as Secretary of State under most difficult circumstances. The real facts in this care are that the Communists have merely made a few tactical changes in their blueprint of world conquest, and have determined to launch an all-out propaganda offensive against all the non-Communist nations of the world. Communist Party Boss Khrushchev, speaking before the so-called 20th Congress of the Communist Party which just concluded its meeting in Moscow last Tuesday, laid down in every detail the new tactics to be used by Communist agents and operatives the world over. In that speech, Khrushchev clearly stated that the usual methods of violence will be used only in those countries where the resistance to communism is strong, and that the Communist take-over of the neutral nations could be easily accomplished by what he called parliamentary methods and the deception of the popular-front type of government. He also stated that for countries well informed on the truth about communism, there is to be an increase in internal subversion through the Communist Party cadres already organized for this purpose, in order to bring about conditions of extreme violence and lawlessness. Accordingly, the United States is marked for violent treatment by the Communist conspiracy, rather than the conciliatory and friendly approach the Kremlin leaders have been claiming so loudly of late and which it appears our Secretary of State has been taken in by.

Khrushchev, speaking for world communism, removed any hopes there may have been for an end to the cold war and certainly gave no indication whatever that the Russians had given up their goal of making every nation of the world an exploited colony of Moscow. As a consequence of making his ill-advised appraisal of the new Communist Party line, Secretary Dulles has been subjected to attack from all quarters here in Washington. I did not join in the attack on Mr. Dulles. Instead I suggested that he look back of the briefing papers which caused him to make such unfounded statements in order to examine the competence of the people around him who are preparing such papers for his guidance. I feel certain that if Mr. Dulles actually read and studied the 6-hour speech made by Communist Party Boss Khrushchev, he could not have made such unbelievable statements because I am sure he would have realized the terrible damage such statements will be doing to the cause of free people and the severe blow they will be to the hopes and aspirations of all people enslaved by the Russian Communists. I sincerely hope that Secretary of State Dulles will, in the immediate future, correct the misleading statements which he has made concerning the world Communist conspiracy.

In the face of the latest worldwide propaganda offensive launched during the past 10 days by the Russian Communists, I felt the time was overdue for our Government to stand up and tell the people of the world the truth about the United States, about the hopes and aspirations of the American people for all the people of the world, and of our determination to win a just and lasting peace. Consequently, I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee on behalf of five of my colleagues and myself to urge support for an expanded and more dynamic United States international information program. We have made a long and careful study of the Communist conspiracy, its techniques and methods, as well as its evil intentions toward the American people and all other people who desire to remain free. It was only natural that we would be alarmed at the open and flagrant challenge made by Communist Party boss Khrushchev when he declared that the Kremlin would win the world by a propaganda offensive, aimed at deluding the free world as to its real intentions, dividing and destroying the free world alliances and thus preparing the way for the final Communist assault against the United States. This is an issue which cannot be avoided. This is a challenge which we Americans must understand and face up to.

We have been required to appropriate up to $40 billion a year for our defense program while at the same time, we have been authorizing far less than $100 million a year for our information program. When it is understood that our information program is the one charged with the dual responsibility of bringing the truth about the American people to all the people of the world and exposing the big lie of Communist propaganda, it is immediately apparent that we have been attempting to win a war far more dangerous to our survival than a shooting war, on a piggy-bank budget. General Motors alone spends an estimated $100 million a year to advertise and promote its products. Last year we allocated only $83 million for the entire United States worldwide information program.

It is my considered opinion that we can prevent world war III and at the same time bring a just and lasting peace to the world. I believe we can win such a cold war by engaging in a diplomatic, economic, and political offensive against the conspiracy of communism. Such an offensive must be supported by a greatly enlarged and more dynamic United States international information program. I propose to do everything in my power to bring about such a political offensive against communism, together with an expanded and strengthened international information program.

H. R. 9777: A Bill To Amend the Davis-Bacon Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 6, I introduced H. R. 9777, a bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act. The amendments proposed in my bill would, in brief, broaden the scope of the present law, making it a mandatory provision in any federally assisted construction program. The present act is obligatory only in those projects financed entirely by Government funds. Thus, whenever a bill comes up for construction which involves Federal money, it

becomes necessary for representatives of the AFL–CIO and the building and construction trades, together with interested Members of Congress, to work toward the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision in the legislation. The remedy I propose is a simple one, involving a basic revision of the law to extend the coverage on a permanent basis instead of in piecemeal fashion as is presently the case. H. R. 9777 simply guarantees that all types of grants, loans or contributions made by the Federal Government to assist the various States and localities in needed construction must be automatically covered by the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision. In short, my bill is designed to make the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage policy uniform in its application.

In addition, H. R. 9777 requires the Secretary of Labor to predetermine not only the hourly prevailing wage, but also existing fringe benefits found to be the prevailing practice in any given area which have been established as a result of collective bargaining between employer and employee. For example, several instances have occurred in my own State of Washington, where outside contractors have met the prevailing wage provision, but failed to conform to the local prevailing fringe benefits, which obviously placed the local contractor at a great disadvantage. The bill would also require the Secretary of Labor to predetermine prevailing practices with reference to hours of work and overtime payment. H. R. 9777 points up a specific provision in regard to payment at a rate of not less than time and one-half the basic hourly wage for hours in excess of 8 hours per day, in excess of 40 hours per week, work in excess of 5 consecutive days, and work on Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays. These provisions are primarily directed at placing all Federal construction on a comparable basis, bidwise, and also to prevent the Federal Government from participating in any situation which would tend to destroy or undermine prevailing hours of work and rates of overtime pay arrived at through privately negotiated collective bargaining.

Finally, H. R. 9777 would confer the necessary authority upon the Secretary of Labor to make investigations and full enforcement power to carry out the provisions of the act.

It is my sincere hope that the distinguished Members of this House, recognizing the need for the maintenance of fair labor standards throughout the length and breadth of the Nation, will act favorably on this legislation when it comes to the floor of the House.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1956

Rev. Joseph MacCarroll, pastor of the Ewing Presbyterian Church, Trenton, N. J., national chaplain of the American Legion, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, and Father of Mankind,
Forgive our foolish ways.
Reclothe us in our rightful minds,
In purer lives Thy service find
In deeper reverence—praise.

Breathe through the heat of our desires,
Thy coolness and Thy calm,
Let sense be dumb, let flesh retire,
Speak through the earthquake, wind, and fire,
O still small voice of calm.

We commit to Thee the hours of this new day. May we never consider the daily tasks trivial, or the word of faith and consideration trite. But in all our deliberations hold before us the sacred memory of our forefathers who made possible the inheritance into which we have entered and the holy vision of this Nation, under God, launching forward to a brighter and more blessed future. Thus, may all our efforts be crowned with Thy divine favor and mellowed by our love for our fellows. In the name of the Great Friend and Companion of Life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 1, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 1, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 926) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, since the Senate meets today following an adjournment, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that any statement made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, so that a matter of reasonable urgency may be considered?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take action on the nomination on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Report."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William L. Longshore, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama, vice Frank M. Johnson, Jr., elevated, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar under "New Report."

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Capt. Ira E. Eskridge, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral, United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nomination today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF NAVAL SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of the Revised Statutes relating to physical examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS AWARDED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts, in excess of $50,000 for research, development, and experimental purposes, awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on defense procurement and small business (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, for the calendar year 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

A letter from the Secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of that Institute for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution memorializing the President, Vice President, Secretary of the Treasury, and Congress of the United States to issue commemorative centennial silver dollars celebrating Nevada's silver centennial

"Whereas during the year 1959 the people of the State of Nevada will celebrate, with creditable pageantry and commemoration, the 100th anniversary of the discovery of silver by Henry T. P. Comstock at Virginia City, Nev., which became one of the richest and most famous mining communities of all times; and

"Whereas Nevada was virgin western country and was not organized as a Territory until 1861, and was admitted to the Union as a State on October 31, 1864, at the height of the Civil War; and

"Whereas it was at the special instance and request of President Abraham Lincoln that statehood for Nevada was sought and passed, so that throughout the great conflict between the States the producing treasure of Virginia City aided mightily the cause of the North in winning ultimate victory; and

"Whereas the revenues and riches attributable to the first discovery in 1859 not only greatly enhanced the victory in the Civil War but contributed immensely to the construction of San Francisco and the enrichment of California in general; and

"Whereas the Comstock was the first silver-mining camp in the United States, and its discovery brought thousands of Americans from the East to the silver slopes of Nevada; and

"Whereas the magnificent fortitude those thousands displayed, the romance, the tragedies which befell them and their efforts—sometimes fantastic, sometimes glorious—to recreate on this western frontier the culture of the civilizations from whence they came, have blended into song and story and a saga of romance and heroism which belongs to the whole world; and

"Whereas since silver has played such an important part in the history of Nevada and our glorious country, it is the opinion of this legislative body that a commemorative silver coin of the denomination of $1 be issued, and authority be granted for its distribution in this State and elsewhere by 1959; and

"Whereas it is urged that there be reserved 40 million ounces of silver for the purpose of minting the commemorative silver dollars: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully memorializes the President, Vice President, Secretary of the Treasury, and Congress of the United States to take whatever action is necessary to issue a commemorative silver coin of the denomination of $1, commemorating the centennial silver discovery in Nevada, and to authorize its distribution in Nevada and elsewhere by 1959; and be it further

"Resolved, That if the Federal Government deems it inadvisable to issue and authorize the sale and distribution of such commemorative silver coin, the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully memoralizes the President, Vice President, Secretary of the Treasury, and Congress of the United States to take whatever action is necessary to authorize the manufacture from silver and sale to the public by 1959 of suitable commemorative souvenirs; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada shall transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President, Vice President, Secretary of the Treasury, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and the Representative from the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress and the Secretary of Defense to prevent the reduction of production and personnel at the Watertown Arsenal

"Whereas the present administration plan is to reduce the production and personnel of the $100 million ordnance plant, Watertown Arsenal, in Watertown, Mass.; and

"Whereas the members of the house of representatives believe in industrial preparedness for modern war with the most scientific weapons to maintain peace in these times; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense is giving important guided missile and new weapons work to private industrial firms which do not have the know-how, adding additional tax burden to American citizens; and

"Whereas Watertown Arsenal and the New England area is noted for its skilled artisans, technicians and scientific personnel and is the center of the world's greatest concentration of electronic educational and training facilities; and

"Whereas the loss of the $15 million annual payroll of Watertown Arsenal in this area would drastically add to the economic plight of an already injured New England economy; and

"Whereas the present and proposed future cutbacks in work at Watertown Arsenal is already harming and will further economically damage the small busines structure in New England; and

"Whereas Watertown Arsenal is capable and ready to produce guided missiles and the new family of defense weapons; and

"Whereas the skill of the scientists and technicians at the Watertown Arsenal, who have pioneered in major metallurgical and scientific developments for decades, have won national and international acclaim; and

"Whereas the dissipation of these highly skilled ordnance artisans and workers during these uncertain times will work to the detriment of the defense of the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas the house of representatives find irreconcilable an increased national defense budget request in the billions for the coming fiscal year, while being without any production planning and intelligent utilization for Watertown Arsenal's $100 million modernized plant, machine tools, foundry, assembly buildings, and laboratories with the finest scientific testing equipment staff, skills, and know-how; and

"Whereas the house of representatives find it unreasonable to all the people of the United States, who are taxpayers, the ignoring and sinking of vital ordnance plants in New England: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the reduction of production and personnel at the Watertown Arsenal; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense rescind any order or plan to reduce production and personnel at the vitally important Watertown Arsenal ordnance installation, and provide it with work in the guided missile and new weapons field from already appropriated funds of the defense budget, thus working for the best interest of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

A letter, in the nature of a memorial, from the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, New York, N. Y., signed by Gardner Osborn, secretary, remonstrating against the construction of any bridge across the Potomac River north of Arlington Memorial Bridge; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Baptist Ministers Conference, Washington, D. C., remonstrating against any movement to organize a massive resistance in the South to challenge the Supreme Court's order against segregation in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the South Carolina State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Branches, of Columbia, S. C., signed by James M. Hinton, president, relating to desegregation in the public schools of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors, International Association of Lions Clubs, District 51, San Juan, Puerto Rico, relating to the Sugar Act as it applies to Puerto Rico; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

Two resolutions of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 1

"Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act so that total monthly benefit amounts will not be decreased upon the death of either spouse

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Social Security Act relating to old-age and survivors' insurance provides in part that the wife of a beneficiary receiving monthly benefits if she is 65 years of age or older, shall receive a sum equal to one-half of her husband's benefit. In the event of his death her monthly payment is increased to a sum equaling three-fourths of the sum received by her husband, while the monthly payments of the husband terminate in the month of his death. If the wife pre-deceases her husband, her benefits terminate and the husband continues to receive his stipulated monthly payment with no increase.

"The monthly social-security payments received by a retired husband and wife are used to provide financially for the husband and wife, a basic social unit. Upon the death of either spouse, the expenses of this social unit continues almost to the same degree. Not only are additional and burdensome expenses created by the death of a member of this social unit, but many expenses continue to the same degree or with very little diminution. Consequently, upon the death of either husband or wife, the social unit not only suffers a severe emotional loss, but in addition a critical economic shock.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States pass an amendment to the Social Security Act providing that upon the death of a spouse receiving monthly payments, the surviving spouse shall receive as his or her total payment an amount which is not less than the total maximum amount received monthly by both prior to the death."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

"House Memorial 5

"Memorial relating to Federal old-age and survivors' insurance, and recommending that eligible age for retirement be reduced to 60 years

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memoralist respectfully represents:

"Under the provisions of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law, no one may retire and be eligible for any of the benefits thereof until he reaches the age of 65 years.

"Attention is called to the fact that there are many persons between the ages of 60 and 65 who, because of declining health or other legitimate reasons, desire to retire and should be enabled to do so.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress give favorable consideration to the subject of amending the old-age and survivors' insurance law so that the age of retirement may be 60 years instead of 65 years."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

"House Memorial 2

"Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the purpose of permitting juveniles to engage in productive pursuits and thereby aid in solving the problem of juvenile delinquency

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"During the past decade, and particularly since World War II, there has been gradual and steady increase in the rate of juvenile delinquency. This has been the subject of action by welfare groups, civil organizations, law-enforcement agencies, and of an accumulation of laws passed by the State and local governments. Nevertheless, despite all the discussion and remedial action, the problem continues to be serious.

"Many have agreed that one of the paramount problems is the fact that juveniles ranging in age from 14 to 18 years have little or no opportunity to become productively engaged, thereby enabling themselves to acquire the attributes of industry, thrift, and responsibility.

"In order to meet this need, the Federal Government could wisely invest in the future of our Nation by establishing an administrative agency which would have for its purpose the following:

"1. To provide all youths between the ages of 14 and 18 years an opportunity to engage in productive after-school employment.

"2. To provide for youths between the ages of 14 and 18 years who have terminated their school attendance an opportunity to live and work on a voluntary basis in established forestry camps and soil-conservation camps. These camps should be situated in as many States as possible, and youths living in such camps shall, in addition to their outdoor employment, be given an opportunity to continue their education or to be trained in a vocation or trade of their choosing.

"3. To provide all youths between the ages of 14 and 18 years an opportunity to be engaged productively during the summer school vacation period by either providing them with gainful and productive employment or the opportunity to attend a forestry or soil-conservation camp where they will have an opportunity to improve and develop themselves.

"4. To insure that in developing such programs there is no reversion to the evils of child labor in the Nation.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States, through appropriate committees, hold hearings at which interested groups may testify as to the scope and nature of the problem, with the aim of enacting legislation such as that proposed herein to assist and educate the youth of our Nation and to overcome the problem of juvenile delinquency."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, February 24, 1918, was the occasion of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Estonia. I ask unanimous consent that a resolution on behalf of the American citizens of Estonian descent and Estonian residents in this country, adopted by the Estonian national committee, be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the occasion of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Estonia on February 24, 1918, we the Americans of Estonian descent and the Estonians residing in this country have gathered here in New York in order to pay tribute to this supreme achievement of the Estonian people, for which it had tenaciously struggled and fought for centuries.

The 38th day of Estonian independence is being commemorated at a time when the country itself, and its people are suffocating in the stranglehold of unprecedented Communist terrorism following the forcible occupation of the country by the Soviet Union in 1940, in violation of all existing international treaties.

At this anniversary of the Estonian independence, we are gravely concerned by the international developments of the past year and the strongly reemerged Soviet quest for world domination. The speech by Nikita Khrushchev at the 20th congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the resolutions of the congress itself cannot be bypassed as mere bragging, they do mean strongest determination to work doggedly toward the achievement of this ultimate goal.

The Estonians know, out of their own experience what the Soviet world domination would be like, if achieved. It certainly would not mean just some slight hegemony in the world, or just domination, but total extinction of the western civilization and physical destruction of hundreds of million people, the living pillars of the free world.

We feel, therefore, dutybound to sound the warning to the peoples yet free, that the expansion of the ever-aggressive communism cannot be stemmed by just erecting defensive dams, or by patchwork. If once the balance of power in the world has become favorable to the Soviets, the free world and this country of freedom and human rights will be doomed.

It is, likewise, our deepest conviction, grown out of our experiences with the Soviet communism, that the self-defense of the free world against the Soviets cannot remain just passive, intended on their contention, but can be effective only, if it is actively and determinedly directed towards rolling back the Soviet power.

It's in the free world's awareness of the necessity to meet the Soviet quest for world domination actively, that we see hope for the liberation of the Estonians and the other East European captive peoples from the deadly grasp of Communist terrorism.

Our greatest trust lies in the generosity and enlightened self-interest of this free and powerful country, the United States of America.

AGRICULTURAL POLICIES AND PROGRAM—LETTER

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present a letter addressed to me by Miss Deborah M. Burton, secretary of the Rhode Island Agricultural Conference, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD. The letter embodies a resolution adopted by that conference, relating to the Government's agricultural policies and pending legislation, at its annual meeting February 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RHODE ISLAND AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE,
Saylesville, R. I., February 28, 1956.

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: The annual meeting of the Rhode Island Agricultural Conference, representing delegates from approximately 40 agricultural organizations throughout the State, was held in Providence on Monday, February 27, 1956, at which time the following resolution was adopted:

"RESOLUTION ON UNITED STATES AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

"Agricultural income continues to decline while total national income is rising. Per capita farm income has been increasing but has not kept pace with per capita nonfarm income.

"The primary reason for low farm prices is that the supply of agricultural products continues to exceed demand. The logical solution would be to expand our markets, both foreign and domestic, to consume this production. The expansion of markets to this extent, however, is questionable if not impossible. Our continually increasing population likewise is not consuming all the increased production.

"There probably will be a period some years in the near future when our population will require a much-increased agricultural production. We should plan now for that period. To bring about a more stable general price level as a means of providing a favorable climate for economic growth and a rising standard of living, we, the members of the Rhode Island Agricultural Conference recommend the following:

"1. That the Government call a temporary halt to Government reclamation and irrigation projects; no new projects should be started. Plans, however, for future projects could be studied, in preparation for a time when it is necessary for increased agricultural production.

"2. That we oppose any rigid high price-support program, but favor a program of medium variable price supports with the ultimate goal of eliminating all price-support programs and letting the market place determine the price.

"3. That acres taken out of production of crops in surplus should not be planted to crops that could produce surpluses in other commodities. These diverted acres should be used as a soil fertility bank that could be brought back into production when more agricultural products are needed. We oppose the Government purchase of this land. We would recommend that the landowner be paid on a cost-share basis, with a compliance grant, for the planting and maintaining of these diverted acres to soil-building crops, and that none of these crops produced on said diverted acres find their way to the market place in any form.

"4. That the problem of under-employed people in agriculture be corrected in part by providing incentives through Government training programs for other vocations.

"5. That we continue our efforts to expand our markets, both foreign and domestic. The Government should be particularly active in developing foreign markets, and our domestic market expanded by increased uses of self-help programs."

We move the adoption of this resolution and that copies of same be forwarded to our congressional delegation in Washington, and that each member of the conference send a letter to our Congressmen registering particular opposition to any price-support program calling for high rigid supports.

Very truly yours,

Miss DEBORAH M. BURTON,
Secretary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 8780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1609).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3343. A bill providing for payment by the United States of ocean or air freight charges on certain relief packages shipped to foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3344. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3345. A bill for the relief of Jose Lecue-Larrauri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3346. A bill to continue the authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 3347. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3348. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of certain surplus property to State defense forces; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3349. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Wang (Wang Kwang Hsi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 3350. A bill relating to the affairs of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim September 17 of each year General Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted, considered, and agreed to:

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. Res. 223. Resolution appointing JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. CLEMENTS, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, by request of the Department of the Interior, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as the Baranof Castle site. I ask unanimous consent that a letter requesting the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3344) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as the Baranof Castle site, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The letter, presented by Mr. ELLENDER, is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site.

It is requested that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and it is recommended that it be enacted.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to clarify the status of a small tract of land in Sitka, Alaska. The Baranof Castle site, containing approximately 1.3 acres, was the scene in 1867 of the transfer of Alaska from Russia to the United States. As such, it is an area of considerable historic significance both to Alaska and to the United States generally.

We understand that the site contains only one building, which is so dilapidated that it has been condemned as a fire hazard and is in the process of being torn down. The Governor of Alaska is anxious to develop the area as an historic site, and tentative arrangements have been made looking toward this end. The ownership of the site, however, is open to some question, and we, therefore, recommend enactment of the attached bill in an effort to remove any doubt which may now or hereafter exist.

From 1898 to 1932 the Department of Agriculture used the Baranof Castle site for purposes of an agricultural experiment station. By the Act of July 7, 1932 (Department of Agriculture Appropriations Act for 1933, 47 Stat. 609, 614), the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to transfer the site to local authorities, or to sell it at public or private sale. It appears that the first alternative was selected, and in an instrument dated November 2, 1932, the Acting Secretary of Agriculture "transferred" to the city of Sitka the area in question, subject, however, to the condition "that should said property ever be sold, assigned, transferred, leased, or used for commercial purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States of America."

By the act of July 11, 1947 (61 Stat. 310), the Congress authorized the sale of the Baranof Castle site to Sitka, but no action was taken pursuant to that authority, although the property was appraised preparatory to sale.

We understand that the city of Sitka is willing to transfer its interest in the site to the Territory, but in the circumstances above referred to, we believe there is some doubt as to the nature of the interest held by the city of Sitka. Moreover, we are concerned that the reverter quoted above might come into effect if the city of Sitka transferred its interest to the Territory. The Governor advises us that Sitka will, by quitclaim deed, convey to the Territory whatever interest the city might have in the area, but in order to insure that the Territory will have full title to the property, we believe that the attached proposed bill should be enacted.

Since the proposed conveyance by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Territory of Alaska is for a use similar to that for which conveyances may be made by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173, 43 U. S. C., Supp. II, sec. 869, et seq.), there is included in the draft bill a provision, similar to the one required by that act, that title to the tract shall revert to the United States if, within a period of 25 years from the date of the conveyance, the Territory of Alaska shall attempt to transfer title to, control over, or use of, the tract of land without obtaining the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. The proposal does not contain a reservation of mineral deposits in this small amount of land because the original conveyance to the city of Sitka did not reserve mineral deposits to the United States.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CONTINUANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR LOANS AND GRANTS UNDER HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it longer than the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to continue the authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3346) to continue the authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this bill, if enacted, would revive and strengthen our efforts to help the Nation's farmers to obtain decent housing.

The primary purpose of title V is to provide farm-housing loans for construction, remodeling, repair of farm dwellings, other farm buildings, and for other farm-improvement developments. Loans may be made to any farm owner who is without a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling for himself and his family and necessary farm labor, or for the family of an operating tenant, lessee, or sharecropper who is without other farm buildings adequate for the type of farming either presently engaged in or planned for future production. For the purpose of the act, a farm is described as a parcel or parcels of land operated as a single unit which is used for the production of one or more agricultural commodities and customarily produces, or is capable of producing, commodities for sale and home use of a gross annual value of not less than the equivalent of a gross annual value of $400 in 1944. The act provides that loans shall be made at 4 percent interest for periods not in excess of 33 years.

Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 was the first financing program in the history of agricultural legislation specifically aimed at improving farm housing. It was enacted as part of an omnibus statute that stated a policy of Federal responsibility to help all of our people—farmers as well as city folks—in their desire to live in decent homes. It started out as an experiment and very quickly proved to be a practical and successful approach to raising farm-housing standards. The repayment record of borrowers receiving farm-housing loans under this act has been unusually good. As of December 31, 1954, borrowers owing balances had paid an average of 106 percent of the cumulative total amount falling due to that date.

Since the enactment of title V, the Congress has provided more than one-half billion dollars in loan authority. But less than $100 million in loans have actually been made available to the Nation's farmers. Moreover, in the past 2 years, a very confused administration has been unable, if not unwilling, to carry out the farm-housing policy of the Congress.

Mr. President, I do not need to remind the Senate of the tragic ineptitude of this administration in administering farm policy. I shall merely say at this time that the disastrous failure of this administration in the entire field of agriculture is reflected in its administration of farm-housing policy.

In the past 2 years, despite the availability of more than $200 million in loan authority under title V, the administration has been unable, or unwilling, to make any farm-housing loans under this act. The need for these loans, as we all know only too well, is not only as great as it was when the legislation was first enacted, but is increasing rapidly. As we approach the close of the debate on this year's farm bill, I believe that we are more keenly aware than ever before of the immediate and long-term needs of our Nation's farmers.

I shall not belabor the excuses given by this administration for its failure to implement the farm-housing policy of the Congress, except to mention 1 or 2 that would be a cause for amusement if they did not result in such individual hardship. One excuse is that the job title V was meant to do should be done by another law. That law is the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. I take considerable pride in the fact that the first speech I ever made in the Congress was in favor of that act, back in 1937. I think it was one of the best pieces of legislation ever passed, and I think it has done a wonderful job. But, as any farmer and anyone else familiar with farm problems knows, farm housing under title V was written because of the inadequacy of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide housing, particularly on those farms that were not a part of the Bankhead-Jones farm-ownership program. Title V and Bankhead-Jones were meant to be like a pair of oxen pulling in unison. The effect of the administration neglect during the last 2 years has been to butcher one of the oxen.

Mr. President, in this bill I am not asking the Senate for any new loan authority. I am asking that the Congress renew the unused loan authority which has accumulated under title V since the inception of the program in 1949. This amounts to approximately half a billion dollars. I am also proposing that this loan authority be made available over a 5-year period in order that we may reaffirm our conviction that farm-housing needs are an integral part of the overall agricultural policy of this Congress, and that it is our firm intention that the program shall be carried forward. Extending the program will permit more rational planning and continuity in the administration of this program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two tables relating to the farm-housing program.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm housing loans made, by fiscal years, and from inception of program through June 30, 1954 (title V of the Housing Act of 1949)

State and Territory	Fiscal years										Inception of program through June 30, 1954	
	1950		1951		1952		1953		1954			
	Number initial loans	Amount initial and subsequent	Number initial loans	Amount initial and subsequent	Number initial loans	Amount initial and subsequent	Number initial loans	Amount initial and subsequent	Number initial loans	Amount initial and subsequent	Number initial loans	Amount initial and subsequent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
United States total	3,791	$17,229,474	5,154	$24,105,294	4,051	$20,776,854	3,274	$19,125,221	2,688	$16,067,934	18,958	$97,304,777
Alabama	226	1,150,270	232	1,184,410	208	1,170,701	219	1,357,098	177	880,020	1,062	5,742,499
Arizona	20	112,000	28	175,580	25	189,623	14	122,897	16	145,462	103	745,562
Arkansas	83	276,190	232	703,871	323	979,353	195	714,927	153	601,064	986	3,275,405
California	128	672,880	118	602,708	91	532,778	60	470,204	60	536,618	457	2,815,188
Colorado	30	139,160	67	393,555	53	303,963	46	303,646	31	190,313	227	1,330,637
Connecticut	3	6,027	9	32,490	12	37,850	9	56,970	1	8,745	34	142,082
Delaware	0	0	2	13,540	3	12,750	0	0	0	0	5	26,290
Florida	59	267,355	92	461,246	107	648,163	60	405,013	48	379,978	366	2,161,755
Georgia	260	1,042,530	329	1,496,304	267	1,347,002	168	992,231	146	874,211	1,170	5,752,278
Idaho	87	518,450	119	692,989	47	294,352	51	338,860	37	265,358	341	2,110,009
Illinois	83	293,610	87	329,168	58	253,413	64	252,044	66	293,331	358	1,421,566
Indiana	54	235,165	97	431,957	72	354,220	52	315,315	42	300,780	317	1,637,437
Iowa	43	194,915	65	260,605	115	527,870	75	389,469	67	352,001	365	1,724,860
Kansas	53	203,300	86	422,363	62	356,936	48	289,897	33	261,757	282	1,534,253
Kentucky	80	342,342	102	480,509	67	387,005	121	721,295	76	446,703	446	2,377,854
Louisiana	123	518,210	185	899,086	132	703,117	121	698,402	84	533,086	645	3,351,901
Maine	49	164,834	80	296,908	58	233,255	44	205,233	37	184,103	268	1,084,333
Maryland	35	145,475	22	97,155	34	187,981	32	201,085	24	185,325	147	817,021
Massachusetts	2	6,200	5	28,796	7	38,452	4	18,010	4	26,350	22	117,808
Michigan	85	386,069	149	705,634	69	321,214	62	322,039	66	359,937	431	2,094,893
Minnesota	53	196,667	79	299,014	70	314,913	68	305,961	53	230,049	323	1,346,604
Mississippi	151	530,750	277	1,072,109	301	1,227,004	251	1,176,620	184	958,195	1,164	4,964,678
Missouri	180	550,380	220	734,276	205	804,094	179	779,964	152	542,862	936	3,411,576
Montana	48	296,345	47	221,670	33	186,900	33	227,208	30	244,542	191	1,176,665
Nebraska	101	456,865	130	516,927	69	323,258	39	210,760	30	184,961	369	1,692,771
Nevada	6	44,300	7	49,100	6	43,295	3	19,612	2	13,147	24	169,454
New Hampshire	1	500	3	8,895	4	12,125	4	18,950	5	28,085	17	68,555
New Jersey	23	82,574	33	143,515	32	178,621	37	243,198	36	179,186	161	827,094
New Mexico	54	244,329	58	279,350	52	340,557	42	277,553	38	245,636	244	1,387,425
New York	35	128,110	47	216,857	32	171,465	27	202,859	28	218,584	169	937,875
North Carolina	115	535,565	194	947,916	167	909,275	150	1,090,111	135	883,794	761	4,366,661
North Dakota	15	67,830	64	348,241	39	239,363	46	324,694	37	294,994	201	1,275,122
Ohio	25	98,815	60	278,780	47	205,595	49	227,700	23	151,355	204	962,245
Oklahoma	256	1,165,174	303	1,385,426	208	1,084,014	121	777,766	93	571,960	981	4,984,340
Oregon	49	344,066	67	421,258	53	323,919	25	168,226	14	97,955	208	1,355,424
Pennsylvania	89	333,813	130	443,199	73	394,024	56	302,713	22	137,282	370	1,611,031
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5,570	0	0	2	5,570
South Carolina	104	552,390	177	954,967	145	845,962	94	653,090	99	641,983	619	3,648,392
South Dakota	48	237,964	70	332,401	28	140,340	39	250,524	51	301,096	236	1,262,325
Tennessee	137	606,340	192	966,182	57	323,709	106	633,334	113	626,474	605	3,156,039
Texas	338	1,567,099	309	1,647,013	234	1,506,133	147	977,685	138	1,037,416	1,166	6,735,346
Utah	75	469,012	100	574,186	40	230,649	31	226,699	23	181,268	269	1,681,814
Vermont	1	3,170	7	25,175	5	17,650	3	18,280	2	7,100	18	71,375
Virginia	80	448,484	93	518,361	64	457,670	64	480,093	47	358,083	348	2,262,691
Washington	49	371,125	64	402,954	41	265,079	34	216,529	26	206,408	214	1,462,095
West Virginia	63	347,005	76	485,689	45	262,653	35	288,717	38	270,152	257	1,654,216
Wisconsin	58	234,650	90	356,450	61	310,034	53	275,278	42	233,426	304	1,409,838
Wyoming	45	218,810	45	240,980	27	162,895	16	117,092	10	88,949	143	828,726
Alaska	0	0	1	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1,000
Hawaii	21	179,940	25	182,015	31	265,640	19	161,674	7	48,950	103	838,219
Puerto Rico	67	240,920	77	333,684	65	319,720	54	275,626	38	227,900	301	1,397,850
Virgin Islands	1	1,500	3	8,830	7	30,300	2	16,500	4	31,000	17	88,130

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Home Administration.

Farm housing: Number of borrowers, amount loaned, and payments, cumulative through Dec. 31, 1954

State and Territory	Total number of borrowers	Total amount loaned	Borrowers paid in full				Borrowers with unpaid balance as of Dec. 31, 1954					
			Number	Payments			Number	Scheduled installments	Principal and interest payments			
				Total	Principal	Interest			Total	Regular and advance payments made on scheduled installments		Extra payments and refunds
										Amount	As percent of schedule	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
United States total	18,919	$97,249,269	2,276	$9,521,830	$8,846,836	$674,994	16,643	$16,668,296	$19,385,085	$17,596,774	106	$1,788,311
Alabama	1,060	5,743,716	125	645,277	605,870	39,407	935	965,581	1,153,231	1,061,593	110	91,638
Arizona	104	746,197	17	97,590	92,389	5,201	87	121,994	127,569	122,273	100	5,296
Arkansas	988	3,276,412	113	340,312	318,647	21,665	875	544,197	660,239	584,554	107	75,685
California	455	2,816,259	82	379,230	348,819	30,411	373	461,087	494,975	460,648	100	34,327
Colorado	226	1,330,353	26	121,996	112,147	9,849	200	212,695	232,828	204,613	96	28,215
Connecticut	34	142,082	8	20,367	18,870	1,497	26	23,895	25,858	23,026	96	2,832
Delaware	5	26,290	1	9,451	8,750	701	4	3,270	2,653	2,653	81	0
Florida	365	2,161,968	44	224,108	209,382	14,726	321	375,730	420,098	386,307	103	33,791
Georgia	1,170	5,754,380	129	506,382	465,782	40,600	1,041	1,062,734	1,248,081	1,122,169	106	125,912
Idaho	340	2,110,720	38	195,270	178,267	17,003	302	385,352	421,528	388,016	101	33,512
Illinois	358	1,421,608	71	237,355	218,375	18,980	287	247,468	277,553	255,146	103	22,407
Indiana	318	1,643,959	60	210,579	196,383	14,196	258	256,082	318,951	288,531	113	30,420
Iowa	365	1,725,190	37	150,525	138,791	11,734	328	252,164	301,263	266,257	106	35,006
Kansas	281	1,535,105	42	161,636	150,374	11,262	239	241,384	267,603	236,962	98	30,641
Kentucky	447	2,378,042	32	142,578	133,771	8,807	415	397,224	507,073	448,944	113	58,129
Louisiana	644	3,352,823	58	269,937	251,624	18,313	586	674,750	783,851	725,392	108	58,459

Farm housing: Number of borrowers, amount loaned, and payments, cumulative through Dec. 31, 1954—Continued

State and Territory	Total number of borrowers	Total amount loaned	Borrowers paid in full				Borrowers with unpaid balance as of Dec. 31, 1954					
				Payments					Principal and interest payments			
			Number	Total	Principal	Interest	Number	Scheduled installments	Total	Regular and advance payments made on scheduled installments		Extra payments and refunds
										Amount	As percent of schedule	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Maine	267	$1,079,718	29	$81,684	$76,572	$5,112	238	$223,340	$246,398	$220,033	99	$26,365
Maryland	146	817,021	21	102,246	94,875	7,371	125	118,864	131,071	116,684	98	14,387
Massachusetts	22	117,808	3	12,660	11,425	1,235	19	17,879	16,683	14,921	83	1,762
Michigan	431	2,095,562	35	136,792	123,736	13,056	396	385,245	454,414	424,709	110	29,705
Minnesota	323	1,346,606	38	172,655	159,676	12,979	285	192,379	235,547	217,107	113	18,440
Mississippi	1,155	4,965,215	123	449,562	421,995	27,567	1,032	899,379	1,026,674	954,732	106	71,942
Missouri	936	3,409,563	128	375,124	349,791	25,333	808	537,287	621,680	566,492	105	55,188
Montana	190	1,166,942	25	124,650	116,742	7,908	165	185,000	219,040	192,243	104	26,797
Nebraska	369	1,698,281	58	235,414	217,108	18,306	311	299,489	316,475	287,225	96	29,250
Nevada	24	169,742	2	3,750	3,500	250	22	34,456	33,734	33,433	97	301
New Hampshire	16	65,470	2	3,883	3,585	298	14	6,927	10,144	7,794	113	2,350
New Jersey	161	827,513	23	91,849	83,946	7,903	138	133,625	144,747	132,525	99	12,222
New Mexico	242	1,372,552	35	135,679	125,112	10,567	207	231,784	245,049	225,150	97	19,899
New York	169	939,216	19	87,306	82,124	5,182	150	140,417	162,959	142,399	101	20,560
North Carolina	760	4,364,422	61	202,482	272,819	19,663	699	697,963	946,076	839,567	120	106,509
North Dakota	199	1,253,761	11	40,151	37,564	2,587	188	217,554	217,101	196,777	90	20,324
Ohio	204	963,329	48	196,856	180,453	16,403	156	138,853	160,124	141,315	102	18,809
Oklahoma	978	4,986,241	130	544,642	510,767	33,875	848	875,604	999,423	890,454	102	108,969
Oregon	208	1,355,553	35	186,218	172,640	13,578	173	237,779	274,365	245,550	103	28,815
Pennsylvania	366	1,606,556	65	189,227	174,645	14,582	301	280,911	302,507	279,039	99	23,468
Rhode Island	2	5,570	0	0	0	0	2	755	796	796	105	0
South Carolina	618	3,648,729	44	180,953	167,767	13,186	574	669,423	809,241	734,036	110	75,205
South Dakota	236	1,262,883	17	85,384	79,787	5,597	219	194,653	202,675	181,455	93	21,220
Tennessee	604	3,152,362	76	305,424	282,924	22,500	528	537,087	652,697	593,181	110	59,516
Texas	1,162	6,725,548	146	701,717	650,661	51,056	1,016	1,180,203	1,394,100	1,273,039	108	121,061
Utah	269	1,681,987	23	138,608	128,149	10,459	246	333,389	383,776	350,784	105	32,992
Vermont	18	71,375	2	9,814	8,810	1,004	16	10,101	10,103	9,430	93	673
Virginia	350	2,262,855	36	174,616	162,357	12,259	314	386,450	435,110	398,497	103	36,613
Washington	214	1,462,155	24	131,269	122,130	9,139	190	258,373	286,445	265,463	103	20,982
West Virginia	255	1,655,033	19	135,619	126,625	8,994	236	288,846	351,322	314,544	109	36,778
Wisconsin	304	1,412,990	38	131,420	120,837	10,583	266	223,463	274,144	247,773	111	26,371
Wyoming	143	828,828	23	104,699	97,927	6,772	120	146,442	142,921	139,075	95	3,846
Alaska	1	1,000	1	1,105	1,000	105	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	103	838,461	8	48,986	45,184	3,802	95	141,936	184,138	163,774	115	20,364
Puerto Rico	297	1,385,137	43	189,362	178,362	11,000	254	208,714	229,466	211,108	101	18,358
Virgin Islands	17	88,181	2	7,431	7,000	431	15	8,119	20,586	8,586	106	12,000

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Home Administration.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WELKER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ANDERSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CLEMENTS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. GORE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON HOUSING BILLS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Sucommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held on S. 1536, S. 2565, S. 2640, S. 2736, S. 2762, S. 2790, S. 2848, S. 3057, S. 3158, S. 3186, S. 3190, S. 3302, S. 3309, H. R. 7540, and related bills pertaining to housing. These hearings will begin at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, March 20, 1956, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. Jack Carter, staff director, Subcommittee on Housing, room 15–A, Senate Office Building, telephone NAtional 8–3120, extension 2179, as soon as possible.

ATTEMPTS TO REPEAL CARGO PREFERENCE ACT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, an excellent editorial entitled "Peter to Pay Paul?" appeared in the Journal of Commerce on Friday, February 24, 1956. Although one might suppose that it dealt with a religious matter, the fact is that the editorial concerns the attempts of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to repeal Public Law 664, the Cargo Preference Act.

Certainly the Journal of Commerce, a trade publication of infinite reliability, did not come lightly to the following conclusion:

> Everybody in Congress, including the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, knows and knows well that there is no possibility of the cargo-preference clause getting the study it deserves when it is brought forth suddenly as a rider in a larger measure containing the political dynamite of the farm bill.
>
> We hope the Senate, and later the House, will show more responsibility and more wisdom than the Agriculture Committee. We hope, among other things, the shipping clause will be promptly dropped. Then, at least, whatever Congress gives the farmers as an election-year bonus won't be a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. President, rather than intrude further on the time of the Senate, I ask

unanimous consent that the entire editorial appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETER TO PAY PAUL?

It may be premature to say that a scheme is afoot in Washington to throw an extra sop to the farmers at the expense of the merchant shipping industry, but that is the way things look.

The trouble lies in a provision the Senate Agriculture Committee added to the farm bill. This provision would exclude shipments of surplus agricultural commodities owned by the Government from the scope of the Cargo Preference Act, which requires that at least one-half of any cargoes financed by the United States Government must be carried in vessels of American registry, if available.

Both the State and Agriculture Departments oppose application of this so-called 50–50 rule to farm surplus shipments, and so do the farm groups as a whole. They maintain it severely restricts surplus sales to Scandinavian and other countries which balk at paying dollar freights. For this reason, the Agriculture Committee doubtless felt justified in adopting such an amendment to the farm bill.

However, there are other factors to be considered which do not put the committee's action in a very favorable light.

First, the Senate Agriculture Committee gave no hint of its plans in this respect, and signally failed to give ship operators an opportunity to make their own views known. If any supporters of the cargo-preference rule were even allowed in the committee room, we have yet to hear of it.

Second, members of the Agriculture Committee could hardly help knowing that another congressional committee—the House Committee on Merchant Marine—had been conducting an extensive inquiry into the operations of the Cargo Preference Act including, among other things, its effect on sales of surplus agricultural commodities abroad.

It is difficult, of course, to conceive that Congress as a whole would approve legislation which would restore rigid farm props at 90 percent of parity, thus virtually guaranteeing more and more production, and yet at the same time adopt a modified soil bank plan which would restrict production. Still less is it likely that the President would accept it.

So it could be reasoned that the battle over the farm bill's major provisions—the soil bank versus rigid supports—will become so intense the shipping clause will be lost in the shuffle.

This newspaper is not so sure.

For all the political opportunism reflected in the Senate's farm bill, its framers could not be completely unaware of what its effects will be. Suppose, for example, administration forces (combined, possibly, with the politically disturbing prospect of a Presidential veto) muster enough strength to knock out the provision for a return to rigid supports.

What then? Will the shipping clause disappear too? Or will Congress decide that, having deprived some farmers of the rigid supports plum, it is only logical to offer them another at the expense of the shipping industry?

And why not? There is no shipping bloc and no shipping vote as such. But there is a farm bloc and a farm vote. There is the rub.

This newspaper, though supporting the Cargo Preference Act, freely acknowledges that any statutory reservation of a certain percentage of cargoes for vessels flying the national flag is controversial, unpleasant, and apt to set bad precedents for the future.

We have supported this act (and similar proceeding regulations) only because it is a necessary evil. It was made necessary because the extraordinary movements of Government cargoes under UNRRA, the Marshall plan and other emergency programs completely upset traditional means of securing cargo. Because of dollar shortages abroad and other factors, United States shipping would have been given precious little of this business without this moderate protection, and in consequence would have virtually disappeared as a going industry, with or without subsidies.

Certainly there is good reason for reviewing the workings of this act from time to time, as the House Merchant Marine Committee has been doing.

But to review legislation of this sort carefully and exhaustively is one thing while to attach it like a tin can to the farm bill is quite another.

Everybody in Congress, including the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, knows and knows well that there is no possibility of the cargo preference clause getting the study it deserves when it is brought forth suddenly as a rider in a large measure containing the political dynamite of the farm bill.

We hope the Senate, and later the House, will show more responsibility and more wisdom than the Agriculture Committee. We hope, among other things, the shipping clause will be promptly dropped. Then, at least, whatever Congress gives the farmers as an election year bonus won't be a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF POPE PIUS XII

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, today marks the 80th birthday of Pope Pius XII.

For the past 17 years Pope Pius has been for people of all faiths a shining symbol of hope, and an inspiring leader in the fight against all forms of totalitarianism and in the struggle for a more peaceful world.

Men of all faiths are able to find strength in his example and in his moral and spiritual leadership.

We all sincerely hope that the world will continue to have the guidance of Pope Pius XII for many years to come.

It is a source of great personal gratification to me that on two occasions within the past few years, as a member of special Senate committees, I have had the high privilege of a personal audience with His Holiness. No one can meet Pope Pius XII in person without feeling the inspiration of a great spiritual leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in today's New York Times, entitled "Pope Pius at 80," be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPE PIUS AT 80

One does not need to be a Catholic to feel and to express a sense of deep pleasure in congratulating Pope Pius XII today on his 80th birthday. It is also the anniversary of his election to the papacy 17 years ago.

In these years Pope Pius has won a place in history as well as in the religious life of today which places him among the most important pontiffs of modern centuries. He had to face the travail of World War II, which began only 6 months after the then Cardinal Pacelli was elected. His first encyclical, on October 27, 1939, was a brave and outspoken condemnation of totalitarianism. At that moment he was facing the tragic destruction of Catholic Poland by the German Nazis. Any totalitarian philosophy—Fascist or Communist—is a danger to religion because all elements in society are subordinated to the state. Today it is atheistic communism which is the major enemy.

Pius XII has gone on through these 17 years with a serenity and greatheartedness that have kept the church strong and have made him, personally, the exemplification of all that is saintly to his Catholic flock. His simple goodness of character has warmed the hearts of all Christendom, for it is universal in its depth and scope. His charm has completely won those fortunate enough to meet or know him. His intelligence needs no comment, for he came to the papacy from a brilliant career as secretary of state and his vast erudition and knowledge of languages are evident in all his work. To Roman Catholics there is the added fact that he is as profoundly and sincerely religious as a man can be.

A pontiff is, by the nature of his position, a citizen of the world as well as, to Roman Catholics, the successor of St. Peter. In the case of Pius XII one must add the homage and respect due to a man who has done nothing but good in a post of great power. That he should have recovered so well from his recent desperate illness and be celebrating his 80th birthday in a state of health is something that brings deep satisfaction to many millions in many lands today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment of the time of the Senate to pay tribute to a great religious leader and a great moral force in the world today.

For six generations my ancesters were Presbyterians and elders in the Presbyterian Church. I was educated in a Methodist college; and since becoming 17 years of age, I have been a member of the Methodist Church. I have always tried to be liberal in my religious views and in my religious activities.

So, Mr. President, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity, on this day, to pay tribute to Pope Pius XII, who today is celebrating his 80th birthday anniversary and his 17th year as the head of the great Catholic Church.

There may be differences of religious opinion among our people—as there are; but there is one, great, fundamental principle to which all of our faiths adhere and seek to practice and promote, and that is a spirit of brotherhood, of understanding, and of deep sympathy in a world of confusion and frustration over the great problem which beset mankind.

During the last 17 years, Pope Pius XII has presided over the destinies of the great Catholic Church. He has done so with dignity, with sympathy, and with understanding. I do not think there has been a greater force for peace and democracy in the world than he.

On three occasions it has been my pleasure to be in Rome; and on those three occasions it has been my pleasure to have an audience with His Holiness, the Pope. I suppose I derived additional pleasure from that because he speaks

such perfect English that in having a conversation with him, the services of an interpreter are not needed. From those contacts and from my knowledge of him as a man and as a religious leader, I have developed a profound respect for him. On every occasion when he has made announcements to the world, he has sent to America what is obviously an expression of good will to all, of whatever religious denomination, in this country, for, as we know, he has visited America frequently, and on one or two occasions was a guest of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt at his home at Hyde Park, N. Y.

Mr. President, I would not want this day to pass without expressing my respect for His Holiness, my admiration for his deep faith and understanding, and my hope that he will have many more fruitful years of happiness and service.

I thank the Senate for making it possible for me to pay this tribute to a great leader.

KEEPING THE LOBBYIST WITHIN BOUNDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an outstanding article appeared in the New York Times magazine for February 19, 1956, under the byline of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The title of the article is "To Keep the Lobbyist Within Bounds."

The article clearly emphasizes the need for adequate control of lobbyist pressures on Congress, and it further underscores the happy choice made by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] when he appointed Senator KENNEDY to the special select committee now studying campaign methods and other practices.

I ask that the entire article by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO KEEP THE LOBBYIST WITHIN BOUNDS

(By JOHN F. KENNEDY)

WASHINGTON.—The hot debate over the natural-gas bill produced charges and countercharges about the gas and oil and the utility lobbies and led to demands that something be done about them. The arguments well illustrated the difficulties faced by Congress in its efforts to control lobbying.

Of course, the right to petition Congress is one of the valuable rights guaranteed to the people of the United States by the first amendment to the Constitution. Indeed, the possession of this right is one of the basic factors which distinguishes democracies from totalitarian governments. Included within the right to petition Congress is the right to lobby—that is, to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of legislation.

This constitutional right is not, however, completely unrestricted, for the legislature can outlaw certain practices deemed contrary to the public interest—for example, bribery and extortion of legislators—and it can require lobbyists to disclose sufficient information about their activities to permit the legislature to learn the identity and the motivations of those who urge particular courses of legislative action on a professional basis.

The basic problem in this field is to prescribe rules which will preserve the right to petition Congress and at the same time prevent abuses of the privilege. The need for reasonable ground rules could not be better demonstrated than by the battle over the natural-gas bill and the lobbying over the other major controversial issues which have been before the 84th Congress thus far. We have seen pitched battles of lobbyists over highway legislation; fixed versus flexible price supports, the controversial Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and public power and public housing issues. And more are yet to come.

These struggles between pressure groups are as modern as today, but the art of lobbying is as old as government itself. In fact, lobbying precedes government, since varied interests must be satisfied before a form of government can be agreed upon.

Thus we read that the representatives of New England en route to Philadelphia to attend the First Continental Congress were intercepted by wealthy merchants who urged them to oppose any dangerous ideas of independence. The delegates to the Congress were royally entertained and every effort was exerted to persuade them not to disrupt the existing colonial way of life which had been so good to many colonists.

From these early efforts of the unorganized body to the present days of what the chairman of a congressional committee which inquired into this field described as a billion-dollar-a-year business, the activities of lobbyists have made fascinating—and often fantastic—reading. The 4,000 registered lobbyists and the organizations they represent (probably no more than 1,000 of them are still active) reported spending a little over $4 million in 1954 and about the same rate in 1955, as compared with the $10 million reported by lobbyists in 1950.

A 1950 congressional survey disclosed, however, that of 173 corporations polled, only 38 had reported lobbying expenditures of $776,000, while an authoritative estimate of lobby expenditures of 150 of the corporations, based on their responses, was over $32 million. Included among the diverse interests represented in the congressional lobbies are veterans' groups, farm groups, labor organizations, business organizations, chambers of commerce, foreign countries, lawyers who represent individuals seeking private legislation, temperance groups, old-age assistance proponents, conservationists, Indians, women's clubs, and professional groups.

The top spending lobbyists during the first 6 months of 1955—at least according to reports filed by registered lobbyists—were the Transportation Association of America, $227,000; the American Tariff League, $150,000; the National Association of Electric Companies, $70,000; General Gas Committee, $67,000; CIO, $66,000; AFL, $63,000; and National Association of Real Estate Boards, $61,000.

Congress has concerned itself with the problems posed by lobbying for over a century. Perhaps the earliest demonstration of this interest was a rule adopted by the House of Representatives in 1852 providing that no newspapermen shall be entitled to a seat on the House floor (at one time in our history representatives of the press sat with our legislators—today separate galleries above the Senate and House floors are provided for newspapermen) "* * * who shall be employed as an agent to prosecute any claim pending before the Congress."

Two years later, the House investigated the efforts of Samuel Colt to secure an extension on numerous patents held by him. The investigation disclosed a "contingent fee" payment of $10,000 to a Congressman for his assistance in securing the extension. In addition, expensive and handsome Colt revolvers found their way into the willing hands of Congressmen, and food and drink flowed liberally in the finest hotels in Washington.

It is not surprising that British diplomats claimed that Senate approval of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was "floated through on waves of champagne." An important role was played by the lobbies in the creation and nurturing of the great industrial and commercial giants of the latter part of the 19th century. In the words of William Allen White, "One Senator, for instance, represented the Union Pacific Railway System, another the New York Central, still another the insurance interests * * * coal and iron owned a coterie * * * cotton had half a dozen Senators. And so it went * * * the collar of any great financial interest was worn in pride."

There were sporadic investigations of lobbying scandals—for example, the Pacific mail steamship subsidy scandal of 1872 and the shocking New York insurance investigation by Charles Evans Hughes in 1905—until during the heated controversy over the Underwood tariff bill in 1913 President Wilson took the unusual action of publicly condemning the "numerous, industrious, and insidious" lobby gathered in Washington to seek protective exemptions from the tariff bill. Shortly after President Wilson's blast, a former lobbyist for the National Association of Manufacturers, who had fallen out with his employers, sold to two newspapers a long and detailed account of his activities on behalf of the NAM.

The investigation of these lobbying activities, perhaps the most conspicuous of all lobbying investigations, revealed some techniques and practices which by no set of standards could be described as reasonable. For example, the Chief Page of the House was employed by the NAM lobbyist to advise him of what transpired in the House cloakrooms and to report personal conversations overheard on the House floor. A friendly Congressman had permitted the NAM the use of a room in the Capitol, and there was substantial evidence to the effect that the NAM controlled the appointment of members to certain congressional committees.

As a result of these revelations, the whole nature of the art of lobbying took a decided turn. For the most part, the techniques of the so-called old lobby were discarded and the era of the new lobby began. The new lobby emphasizes constructive activities designed to appeal to the judgment rather than to the personal advantage or gain of legislators, although the social lobby—cocktail parties for legislators, small gifts, tours to important sites, etc.—certainly has not been abandoned.

Included among these new lobby techniques is testifying before congressional committees. Lobbyists are in many cases expert technicians and capable of explaining complex and difficult subjects in a clear, understandable fashion. They engage in personal discussions with Members of Congress in which they can explain in detail the reasons for positions they advocate.

Lobbyists prepare briefs, memoranda, legislative analyses and draft legislation for use by committees and Members of Congress; they are necessarily masters of their subjects and, in fact, they frequently can provide useful statistics and information not otherwise available.

Competent lobbyists can present the most persuasive arguments in support of their positions. Indeed, there is no more effective manner of learning all-important arguments and facts on a controversial issue than to have the opposing lobbyists present their cases.

Concededly, each is biased; but such a procedure is not unlike the advocacy of lawyers in court which has proven so successful in resolving judicial controversies. Because our congressional representation is based on geographical boundaries, the lobbyists who speak for the various economic, commercial, and other functional interests of this country

serve a very useful purpose and have assumed an important role in the legislative process.

Opposed to these useful activities of lobbyists are actions which, though not illegal, are something less than desirable and which must be carefully watched to insure that they do not develop into obstructions to sound legislative action. Inspired letter campaigns are not inherently evil, but legislators should have some means for determining the true weight to be attached to letters from such sources—charges of inspired telegram campaigns in connection with the natural gas bill have been heard.

Everyone should have the right to contribute to the political campaigns of his favorite candidates, but the opportunity for using campaign contributions to influence legislative action, a charge made in the Senator Case incident, should be exposed to the brightest light. A lobbyist should be able to express the views of those he represents to Members of Congress, but there should be a way to insure that he really speaks for the number of persons he professes to represent and that he is accurately reflecting their views.

A lobbyist can spend as much money as he wishes to advance the legislative views he advocates, but it should be possible for the Legislature to have a realistic picture of how much is spent for lobbying and, in the interest of complete identity of the interests represented by the lobbyist, the manner in which and from whom the money was acquired.

Lawyers who assist individuals to pursue claims against the Government requiring special legislation and to secure legislative action in immigration and naturalization matters are entitled to fees, but rackets should not be permitted to flourish in which lawyers collect exorbitant fees for work done by congressional offices as a matter of routine for those who merely ask. These dangers inherent in lobbying demonstrate the need for careful surveillance of its practitioners.

Another trend in the trade is the growth of grassroots lobbying—that is, attempts to create a favorable climate in the country for basic ideas of governmental philosophy and for specific legislative proposals. There is, at best, a hazy distinction between this type of lobbying and purely educational discussion, research, and analysis; thus there is genuine doubt about whether Congress has the power to supervise this particular form of lobbying and, if it does, whether it is wise or desirable to exercise the power.

The many investigations and the public indignation over abuses by lobbyists of the right to petition Congress did not result in any Federal legislation in this field until 1946. Then a lobbying bill was adopted requiring lobbyists to register, to identify their employers, to provide quarterly reports of their expenditures for the purpose of influencing legislation, to describe the legislative actions in which they were interested, and to list those who contributed funds to them.

The rationale underlying this act, like that of the statutes enacted by 35 of the States on this subject, is that the activities of those who attempt to influence the defeat or passage of legislation are not in themselves objectionable, but that the legislature, and the public as well, has the right to know the identity of those who seek to influence legislation. This is based on the premise that the therapeutic effects of publicity will compel lobbyists to engage only in acceptable practices, those which can withstand the glare of publicity.

Unfortunately, the lobbying act now in existence was hastily thrown together and has failed to be an effective instrument for evaluating the activities of those who lobby before the Congress. The most important defect is the failure of the act to impose responsibility for the administration and enforcement of the act in any single agency or official. Until this is done, there is little hope that the act will accomplish its intended purposes.

Considerable attention must be given to the issues of coverage, who should come within the purview of the act, and the nature of the information to be supplied by registrants.

The act has been criticized by lobbyists, political scientists, the courts, and Members of Congress. Changes are long overdue and the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee proposes to examine these problems thoroughly and to recommend changes found to be necessary. Lobbying abuses of the type found in the natural-gas battle will also be thoroughly examined. It is not easy to draw legislative guidelines in this sensitive field, but if there is to be an act which the lobbyists can understand and which will provide the Congress and the public with the information necessary to identify and evaluate the lobbyists' efforts, legislative changes must be made.

The assertion of Senator Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri, more than 100 years ago, that he would aid a group of lobbyists to secure a ship subsidy only upon the condition that "when the vessels are finished they will be used to take all such damned rascals as you, sir, out of the country" stands as one of the most vigorous proposals for action in this field. It is, alas, perhaps impractical today, but nevertheless the effective supervision and surveillance of the lobbyist remains as a continuing challenge to the people and the Congress.

DISREGARD OF STATE AND FEDERAL STATUTES BY THE IDAHO POWER CO.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the irresponsibility keynoted by Interior Secretary McKay and the Federal Power Commission in the abject surrender of the Hells Canyon Dam site is now being duplicated by the recipient of their bounty—the Idaho Power Co.—through flagrant disregard of State and Federal statutes.

The company's high handedness was illustrated last fall, when construction was started on one of its dams without meeting the legal requirements of the State of Oregon. Although my home State requires that projects utilizing public waters of the State must be licensed by the Oregon Hydro-Electric Commission, the Idaho Power Co. has ignored the authority of State law by starting construction without State permission. In fact, when hearings were held in January by the State commission, an attorney for the company contended that Idaho Power was above the law of the State, and that it was not necessary for it to obtain a State license.

Not only has the authority of the State of Oregon over this State of Maine corporation been disregarded, but it has now come to my attention that the company has also proceeded with construction of a bridge across the Snake River without permission and without compliance with Federal statutes. I have been informed by the Corps of United States Army Engineers that, although the Idaho Power Co. has applied for permission to bridge the Snake River, the required Federal permit has not yet been granted. Yet, an Idaho Power Co. bridge today spans this navigable, interstate stream for which Federal approval must be granted. What is the purpose of the law if such defiance is to be tolerated?

Mr. President, why does this lawlessness reign in the Snake River Canyon? Does the Idaho Power Co. believe that, because it has been given the world's finest damsite without cost, it also has carte blanche immunity from State and Federal law? Is it above the law?

The attorney general of the State of Oregon, the Honorable Robert Y. Thornton, has moved to clarify the Oregon situation. He has requested the district attorney for Baker County, Oreg., where the dam is under construction, to take action against the company in conformity with State law. Inasmuch as the State of Oregon has thus acted to uphold its statutes, I believe the Attorney General of the United States should also proceed to require observance of Federal law. Because of the company's irresponsible and illegal acts, I am asking the Corps of Engineers to withhold any bridge permit to the Idaho Power Co. until the Attorney General has determined the consequences of its actions. This is the very minimum which must be done if our laws are to have any meaning and purpose.

In addition to these circumstances, Mr. President, I now find that on January 19, 1956, the Idaho Power Co. sent to thousands of industrialists throughout the United States an elaborate brochure defending its piecemeal program for Snake River development. That brochure baldly recommended that the Clearwater and the Salmon Rivers be blockaded, as alternatives to Hells Canyon high dam, in order to secure storage for flood control. These are streams which cannot be shut off by dams without doing incalculable harm to fisheries, wildlife, and scenic values. Yet the Idaho Power Co. is willing that the American people, both now and in the future, shall make this permanent sacrifice if the selfish plans of the Idaho Power Co. are thereby advanced.

In fact, the Idaho Power Co. brazenly pushes for the Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliff Dams on the Clearwater, dams which leading conservationists fear will destroy one of the great outdoor areas of the Nation. One can only wonder if the Idaho Power Co. would have these dams, too, constructed without receiving the necessary authorization from proper State authorities.

GIVEAWAY CHARGES MADE AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the RECORD of Wednesday, February 29, there was included a very extensive document which is supposed to refute a series of articles, written by Mr. Warren Unna, of the Washington Post and Times Herald, concerning the giveaway charges made against the present administration. The document extends from page 3541 to page 3546.

The readers of the RECORD undoubtedly will be intrigued to know what was contained in the articles to cause such an extensive research job to be done, and such an extensive answer to be printed in the RECORD. The fact that so much energy went into the preparation of the many-paged explanation of Mr. Unna's

articles indicates, of itself, that the articles were very powerful ones.

To make the RECORD complete, and because I feel that Mr. Unna's work is of itself well worth the attention which has been given it, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Unna's articles printed at this point in the RECORD.

I do not care to take further time of the Senate, or to fill the RECORD with further analysis; but I suggest to those who read the articles and reply that they will find the Wednesday insertion considerably more in the nature of explanation of Mr. Unna's findings than of contradiction, denial of his facts, or direct reply.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 8, 1956]

THE GIVEAWAY CHARGES

The political air of a political year roars with the cry of giveaway—and with angry denials of the charge.

Who is giving away what, if anything? Is the Nation's treasure of natural resources being handed over to private, profit-greedy exploiters? Or is the complaint a typical election-time shout of the political outs? What is there to that elusive word, "giveaway"?

In an effort to find out, the Washington Post and Times Herald has interviewed 51 persons, 17 of them members of the administration. The rest were career or political appointees in the previous administration, key members of Capitol Hill watch-dog committees and lawyers and conservationists close to the issues.

The critics were asked to specify their complaints; administration officials were canvassed for their comment. These views, plus a summary of the facts which can be documented, provide the first comprehensive study of the politics-laden giveaway issue.

The inquiry was confined to the Interior Department—guardian of the Nation's natural resources—and to the Agriculture Department's supervision of the national forests.

ARE THEY GIVING AWAY OUR RICHES?

(By Warren Unna)

Giveaway has come to enjoy something of the same notoriety in this administration that mink coat and deepfreeze held in the last.

It is a term which critics of the Republicans use to express what they think is being done to everything from public power sites to tax amortizations; from oil deposits to inland waterway barges; from grazing land to Government rubber plants.

The critics—Democrats by politics or conservationists by philosophy or public power advocates by economic need—have sometimes even permitted their accusations to carry a price tag. The CIO United Auto Workers, for instance, set it at $1 trillion. And the Democratic National Committee, in its monthly Digest a few issues back, named Interior Secretary Douglas McKay "the giveaway king."

To all this McKay has answered: "Purely political bunk. * * * I can tell you flatly that we have not given anything away."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT STARTED IT

Certainly neither the Democrats, the conservationists, nor the public power advocates are the traditional and exclusive guardians of the 768 million acres of public land in the continental United States and Alaska. The great protectors of natural resources, after all, were Republicans—President Theodore Roosevelt and his forestry adviser, Gifford Pinchot.

But it is also true that if any administration did start giving away the natural resources, it would be an irretrievable action, one which could not be recouped by the succeeding administration.

There is a natural curiosity to know how much substance there is behind the giveaway charge. Yet a visit to the Democratic National Committee's Washington headquarters elicits only a manila folder filled with newspaper clippings, some of them more torn than clipped. And an inquiry at the Capitol Hill office of one of the Senators most addicted to mouthing the giveaway term brings the one answer, "Hells Canyon."

Surprisingly, even one of the Interior Department's top officials under the Democrats—a man who left under front-page crossfire soon after McKay became Secretary—confesses that he really has not kept track of what the Republicans have done in the past 3 years; he has been too busy with his new job.

Some people, however, scattered inside and outside the administration, have made it their business to watch particular issues. But for the most part they have worked separately, and none has produced what purports to be a complete picture.

In this and eight succeeding stories an attempt is made to pull together a set of findings—a collection of the charges, the administration responses, and such facts as can be established. Among other things:

They show at least two very clean-cut cases which, after Congress or the courts get through with them, may very well be condemned as giveaways: The granting of a valuable stand of timber in the Rogue River National Forest to a private company under the legalism of a mining patent, and the granting to another private concern of a noncompetitive oil contract in a heretofore sanctified wildlife refuge in Louisiana, a contract dated 1 day before the regulations permitting it were even promulgated.

They show that giveaway is sometimes a matter of ideology: Should public or should private interests enjoy power revenues from the navigable rivers and their tributaries? Should the American Indian continue to be coddled as a museum piece, a status which Secretary McKay opposes? Or should he be handed full title to his land, even though he may turn around and be bested out of this inheritance by a shrewd lumberman, rancher, or oilman?

They show that the signals for disposing of natural resources may not be called by Secretary McKay at all, but possibly by Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams (at least for power matters), Interior's Under Secretary Clarence A. Davis and his predecessor, Orme Lewis, and Interior's Assistant Secretary Wesley A. D'Ewart and his predecessor, Orme Lewis. Davis is the man who, on his arrival in Washington, told a former Congressman at a dinner party: "I was amazed to find that all the lawyers in the Department think the Government is right. By heaven, I'm going to change that."

They show that most of the alleged giveaways are not done through public announcement or legislation. As one former high Democratic official who should know put it: "Half the time there is no Executive order or memorandum on a policy change; simply a signed contract. It's the contracts they sign that give you a lead to the pattern. The orders they do issue they keep covered up."

They show that the administration's proudest answer to the giveaway charges is in the appropriations, improvements, and future planning it has made for the National Park Service. Even the severest critics will let them have their day of glory in this area.

But the inquiry findings also indicate, jurisdiction by jurisdiction:

That a Bureau of Indian Affairs memorandum in May 1955, giving the individual Indian the right to sell his share of the tribal land, may have played right into the hands of private industry's lumbermen, grazers, and oil men.

That the Forest Service's Pacific Northwest preserves may be in the process of being timbered off solely by large lumber companies.

That the Fish and Wildlife Service's refuges are now open to oil exploitation as they never were before.

That the Bureau of Mines' abdication of industrial plants, sometimes through sale, sometimes not, may be enriching a few big private concerns with research and materials furnished by the taxpayers.

That the Bureau of Land Management is unquestionably disposing of the public domain at a more rapid rate than in the past—but, so far as can be determined, strictly within the laws set down by Congress.

That the offshore, or tidelands oil, which went to California, Texas, and Louisiana, so far has pretty much left the last two States shortchanged. The major oil deposits are apparently on the submerged lands farther out to sea—and still retained by the Federal Government for leasing revenue.

That the Bureau of Reclamation's power policies—regardless of ideology—raise a good many questions about under-the-table maneuvers to benefit favored private utilities.

The giveaway situation will undoubtedly get full attention from Congress this session. A hearing has been scheduled Tuesday on the Al Sarena mining case, which concerns the Rogue River National Forest timberlands, Interior Under Secretary Davis, and one of Congress' own, Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Republican, of Oregon.

Also probably due for a congressional airing is the award of an oil contract on Louisiana's Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge to the Frankfort Oil Co., of Bartlesville, Okla.

And a good amount of testimony should come forth about the new Assistant Interior Secretary D'Ewart, a former Montana Republican Congressman whom President Eisenhower has put in charge of public land management, fish and wildlife refuges, Indian affairs and Territories.

As a Congressman, D'Ewart's authorship of a grazing bill and his floor managership of a colleague's timber bill are said to have done more to formulate the so-called giveaway pattern than anything the executive branch ever conceived. As it happens, neither of the bills found their way into law.

D'Ewart also was part of a pretty violent name-calling campaign for the Senate. The victor in that race, the incumbent Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, now presides over the Interior Committee, which must approve D'Ewart's nomination.

If the nomination is not formally submitted to Congress, D'Ewart must leave office at the end of 60 days. If it is submitted and Congress fails to act, D'Ewart may continue in office through the session plus an additional 60 days.

Senator MURRAY promises that Congress will not fail to act.

Monday: "How do we know that the Secretary of the Interior is competent?"

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 9, 1956]

THE GIVEAWAY CHARGES—SELLING OF INDIANS' WEALTH BY GOVERNMENT IS ALLEGED

(Second of a series)

(By Warren Unna)

Giveaway critics of the administration's Indian lands policy contend the Interior Department is breaking up the tribal reser-

vations and leasing or selling their grazing, timber and oil wealth to private investors.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay counters that the American Indian is no longer a museum piece; it is high time to treat him as an adult and let him have the right to dispose of his own land, the same as any other citizen.

"Nobody is any good as a ward of the Government. This country is built upon hard work, thrift and sacrifice, and self-reliance. * * * Our job is to relieve the Federal Government of any responsibility for Indians, any more than they would for any other group of people," he declared in an upstate New York broadcast last month.

The Secretary estimated the Government could get out of the Indian business in 25 or 30 years.

RESERVATIONS INADEQUATE

Glenn L. Emmons, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, has said repeatedly the country's 300 reservations are not economically sufficient to maintain the 400,000 Indians now living on them. Accordingly, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is now pushing hard on a program to educate and train the younger generation and help them relocate in West Coast and Midwest urban centers where they can find jobs.

However, the giveaway critics point to Emmons' May 16, 1955, interoffice memorandum—since modified—as the key device for upsetting this Nation's conscience obligations toward its displaced first settlers.

In it, Emmons candidly declares an individual Indian's right to his share of the reservation need not be subordinated to the interests of the tribe, nor to the management of the land as a part of a timber or grazing unit.

He then decrees that if an Indian is adjudged competent and offers an explanation of how he intends to dispose of his land, he shall be given full title, plus a guiding appraisal statement from the Bureau. Emmons' subsequent modification was an order that the remaining members of the tribe be given all the help possible in reclaiming the property of its departing member.

QUESTION OF COMPETENCE

Comments Diego Abeita of the All-Pueblo Council: "In order to get our lands, they are going to declare us competent. How do we know the Secretary of the Interior is competent to declare us competent?"

Comments William Zimmerman, Jr., former Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs and now, as Washington field director of the Association of American Indian Affairs, the Bureau's most articulate critic:

"The records show that when an Indian does get a patent for his land he sells and often sells for much less than the land is worth, and very soon is relieved of the cash. The result is that the Indian's economic base is continually being diminished."

Zimmerman adds:

"The Department says, 'We're giving the Indians their rights.' But the fact is that the rights are detrimental to the tribal community and in most cases detrimental to the individual Indian as well."

Commissioner Emmons thinks his competency criterion will take care of all that. He cites the great abuses in the early 1900's when the Indians were able to claim their individual land titles without being declared competent. During World War I, some Indians were even declared incompetent, and yet allowed to withdraw their share of the tribal land.

More than 500,000 acres of the 13 million the Bureau of Indian Affairs holds in trust were withdrawn from this protectorship in 1954. This is just a little more than four times the amount in 1952, the last year of the Democrats. And this was done prior to the May 16 memorandum which makes such withdrawals far easier.

SPECIFIC CHARGES BY CRITICS

Critics of the administration's Indian program make these specific giveaway charges:

The Interior Department sponsored a 1954 congressional bill permitting Indians of the Klamath Reservation in Oregon to sell their 1 million acres of tribal timber rights now, instead of drawing income from them during the years to come.

Commissioner Emmons says a good many of the 2,000 Klamath Indians themselves asked for this right, as far back as 1949. Indian Bureau appraisers are now figuring out the individual Indian's share. He will then be given a chance to cash out sometime prior to the expiration of the program in 1958.

Interior sponsored a congressional bill to remove from Federal protection some 200,000 acres of timber on the Menominee Reservation, Wisconsin's last sizable forest land.

Explains one key department career official who is just about to retire and therefore freer with his words: "I am afraid they are going to cause serious harm to those forested areas. They didn't set it up as what they thought was a giveaway program. They thought it was justice to the Indians. I don't think it will work out that way. The individual who owns forest land has only one objective: turn it into dollars. And, of course, that's not a good national policy."

Commissioner Emmons concedes he "can't say all Indians" will transact their timber rights to best advantage. But he points out, "some white people fail, too."

FENCE BLOCKS OFF TRIBE

The Department permitted individual members of the Shoshone and Arapaho groups to sell half a dozen tracts totaling 320 acres in the Wind River Reservation of Wyoming. The land was sold to a white rancher who promptly fenced it off. The rest of the tribe was thereby blocked from reaching 200 acres of land they still owned.

Emmons recently ordered the fence taken down.

INTERIOR "INTERPRETED"

The Department released Wind River Reservation oil rights on 161,500 acres of the Riverton reclamation withdrawal area to the detriment of the Indians. Prior to 1953, the Indians were getting $1.25 an acre a year, plus $600,000 in bonuses from oil companies who were outbidding each other for the chance of a lease to prospect.

This income would have tripled by now, critics assert, had not the Department, in a 1953 eminent domain condemnation authorized by Congress, decided the Indians had sold their subsurface as well as surface rights. The matter has been interpreted by the Department under a different law. The private oil companies now lease for 20 cents an acre with no need for bonus payments.

Now they are also entitled to 46,000-acre leases, instead of 15,000. In addition, the regulations have been "streamlined" by Interior's Bureau of Land Management to omit a long-time requirement that there be no front man signing for the true applicant.

This was the one safeguard against an oil company sending up an endless stream of secretaries, each taking out the maximum acreage lease on behalf of the front office.

ASSIGNMENT PERMITTED

Explains Michael Giller, Wind River expert for the Bureau of Land Management: "Assignment is always permitted. It's your right as an American to have someone else back you."

He further points out the Indians "ceded" their land rights to the Government for $1.9 million, and yet still get 90 percent of the 20-cent-per-acre private oil company rents.

Concludes Giller: "It's debatable whether it's a giveaway to have a competitive lease or a noncompetitive lease."

The Indians have now taken the matter to Federal court in the belief that the debate can better be continued there.

The Department acted last June to turn over to a local school district 19 acres of the Nez Perce Tribe's Lapwai Reservation in central Idaho.

The Indians say this land, part of a 2,000-acre parcel, had been reserved for an Indian cemetery, schools and Indian agency purposes. If ever it was declared surplus, it was to revert to the tribe.

ADMINISTRATION'S ANSWER

The administration contends it bought a total of 500,000 acres, including this parcel, from the Nez Perce Tribe in 1893 and overrules a 1950 decision that title was still tribal. The land was sold at $3 an acre and now, because of its excellence in growing wheat, is worth $100.

This case also is now in Federal court and a restraining order has been issued to prevent the Government from changing the land's title to the local school district.

Interior tried to shut down a garment factory in Flandreau, S. Dak., which, since 1935, has been adding $28,000 a year in earnings to the submarginal existence of a group of 150 Indians. South Dakota's two Republican Senators, KARL E. MUNDT and FRANCIS CASE, intervened and kept the factory open.

Commissioner Emmons says the Public Health Service, which has taken over Bureau hospitals, found the garments unsatisfactory. Emmons adds he had to persuade PHS to continue the contract with the Indians until July.

"The thing was not a financial success, anyway," Emmons explains.

The Department gave an unpaid Interior consultant from Silver Spring, Md., a noncompetitive contract to supply school lunches in the Cherokee Reservation in North Carolina.

After public criticism and reports that the Government would lose 15 cents on each of 800 lunches, the Bureau backtracked and put the concession out for public bid. The contract was awarded to an Alabama food firm.

Emmons explains the original contract was only for a "pilot plant" to see if better food could be provided outside the Government. He said the experiment proved itself by supplying 7 school-lunch items in place of 3.

AUTO RENTAL PLAN DROPPED

The Department rented 39 automobiles from a Baltimore firm instead of using Government-owned vehicles in Bureau traveling. This project, originally scheduled for a 2-year trial, lasted only from January until June last year. The cry of "rigged contract" and a congressional investigation caused its abandonment.

Commissioner Emmons calls the giveaway charges against his Bureau not true, and adds, "Our policy is even more humane than the old policy." He cites his Bureau's efforts to improve Indian education and health (the average lifespan of a Navaho is 20 years), and to relocate Indians under supervised conditions in industrial areas.

Emmons also points out that he characterized a bill introduced into the last Congress by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, as illegal, unjust, and unethical. The bill, still pending, would require the Secretary of the Interior to sell off all tribal lands within 3 years. It would also put Emmons out of a job by, in his own words, "liquidating the Bureau at the same time."

THE GIVEAWAY CHARGES—TIMBERLANDS CAUSE DISPUTE

(Third in a series)

(By Warren Unna)

Giveaway critics of the administration's national forest policies charge that timber is being handed over to a select group of large-scale lumber companies, that timber laws are being circumvented and that pressure

has been put upon Congress to amend those laws too difficult to get around.

The charges are emphatically denied.

Says Chief Forester Richard E. McArdle, a career employee: "They haven't given away anything that I'm working with and neither did the previous administration. I haven't heard of any instance where pressure was put on me by the administration to let some individual have special consideration. I have no complaints."

The one big giveaway case in the timber business cited by the critics concerns Al Sarena Mines, Inc., of Trails, Oreg., and its owners, the McDonald family.

The company invested $8,045 in required application fees and development costs for 15 claims in Oregon's Rogue River National Forest.

The standing timber on its claims, even before cutting, is worth some $638,000—an 8,000 percent return on the company's investment.

It is extremely difficult to obtain timberland in the national forest but one way is to obtain the lumber as a mere byproduct to claims for mineral deposits beneath the soil. In the past, Interior has been exceedingly tough on such claims because the timber byproduct, being more valuable, is usually the real incentive behind the claim for a mineral deposit.

SARENA MINERAL CLAIMS

In the Al Sarena case, the company pressed its claims on the ground that subsurface gold and silver deposits justified the Government granting mineral patents. Prior applications during the Democratic administration failed to substantiate the deposits and both the Agriculture Department's Forest Service and Interior's Bureau of Land Management turned down the application.

The case was reopened at the intercession of Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Republican of Oregon. Interior Under Secretary Clarence A. Davis then assigned a Bureau of Mines engineer to the case.

An on-the-spot congressional hearing has already brought forth sworn testimony that both the engineer and the company's own attorney dumped the umpire mineral samples, vital to any future dispute, into Oregon's Rogue River. The dumping was done as soon as a favorable report had been gained from an assay firm in the senior McDonald's old home town of Mobile, Ala., 3,000 miles away from assay offices usually employed in the Oregon area.

Under Secretary Davis subsequently ordered the Al Sarena company's 15 disputed claims approved.

Senator W. KERR SCOTT, Democrat of North Carolina, chairman of a joint investigating committee, finds the Al Sarena case smacks of bottom-of-the-deck dealing by high levels within McKay's Department.

His hearing this morning is "to determine why, and upon whose orders, good judgment and normal procedures were thrown out the window in order to bestow upon the Al Sarena corporation $500,000 worth of public property."

ANOTHER CASE COMING UP

Another so-called giveaway, yet to be made public, involves a 1953–54 agreement with International Nickel Co., that its $56 million nickel and copper mining investment in northern Minnesota's Superior National Forest would be made worth while through a 50-year Government lease on 12,000 acres.

The company pressed for a 99-year lease during the Democratic years, and got nowhere. Once the administration changed, it confronted the Forest Service with a letter from Defense Mobilizer Arthur S. Flemming declaring the national welfare would be endangered if the Forest Service didn't permit the mining.

International Nickel next visited the then Assistant Interior Secretary, Orme Lewis. In the presence of a high-ranking former Bureau of Land Management official, Lewis told the company officials: "If you gentlemen draft the kind of lease you want, we'll be glad to look it over."

The 50-year option they gained is an irrevocable commitment by the Government. Yet Lewis E. Hoffman, top mineral official in Interior's Bureau of Land Management, says as far as his records go International Nickel has only a 2-year prospecting permit. He adds the memorandum of conversations with Assistant Secretary Lewis "is in the confidential file of the Secretary [McKay]."

M. A. Hanna Co., formerly headed by Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey, and Kennecott Copper have proposed to Interior agreements similar to International Nickel's.

Administration critics say it is unheard of for the Government to ever grant 50-year leases in the national forest.

Biggest giveaway threat during the current administration, according to the critics, came from a timber exchange bill introduced by Oregon Congressman ELLSWORTH and floor-managed by former Representative Wesley A. D'Ewart, Republican, of Montana, now Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management.

This bill provided that private lumber interests were entitled to a piece of public timberland equaling that which the Government might take from them, by condemnation, for public dams and reservoirs.

The Government bureau deeding over this land was to be given no control over its selection; no insurance the land it was acquiring had been maintained under sustained yield (the harvesting of an annual crop—no more—from the forest); nor any guaranty that the private operator would continue sustained yield timbering on the Government land he took over.

The unpublished transcript of a July 14, 1953, Interior subcommittee hearing shows that James L. Lanigan, at that time acting chief counsel for the Bureau of Land Management, was testifying on what was wrong with the bill.

The transcript reads: "Lanigan: 'I just had a message that I had a telephone call. They want me to answer before I finish testifying.'"

Lanigan never went back to the witness stand after that call.

Under House opposition led by Representative LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, the Ellsworth bill was recommitted in 1954 by a vote of 226 to 161.

TRADE STUMPS FOR TREES

METCALF said the bill would have permitted "big lumbermen to trade stumps for trees." He found its worst aspect was in creating a legal precedent in condemnation suits which might well have obligated the Federal Government to replace gas stations in kind to make way for highways, and the like.

Their fight in behalf of the Ellsworth bill is supposed to have had a direct effect in the defeat of Senator Guy Cordon, Republican, of Oregon, and Congressman D'Ewart when he ran for the Montana Senate seat, in the 1954 election.

OTHER TIMBERLAND CHARGES

Other timberlands giveaway charges made by the critics:

The Government has favored big companies on the O. & C. lands, 2.8 million acres of forest which checkerboard up and down western Oregon. This is Government property which was reclaimed from the old Oregon & California Railroad Co., in 1916 when the company failed to put down the rails.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, who keeps a keen eye out for natural resources, says Oregon and California timber is ending up with only the large lumber companies because the Government is selling it in large blocks; insisting on tie-in sales for roadbuilding into the forest hinterland (requiring capital outlays only the large companies can afford); and stifling competition through marketing areas where bidding is limited to companies within a given area.

Chief Forester McArdle takes definite exception to these charges. He says the Government won't offer to sell its timber unless it obtains a hauling right over private land, so everybody has a fair chance.

He adds: "The roads which are built in tie-in sales actually open up a new territory for the smaller lumbermen to enter; timber is always awarded competitively, either through sealed bid or at public auction; and the Forest Service is so decentralized most sales are concluded at the regional level.

"Nobody is under obligation to hire a 5 percenter or come to Washington," McArdle argues.

Interior disposed of timberland belonging to the Klamath Indians in Oregon and the Menominee Tribe in Wisconsin, as discussed in yesterday's article.

Conversely, the administration cites at least two instances where it performed in a manner contrary to a giveaway policy:

It prevented the Sterns Coal & Lumber Co., of Sterns, Ky., from stripping timber off 47,000 acres of land on the Cumberland Plateau at the Tennessee border.

Sterns sold the land to the Government with the understanding that it retain mineral rights. After the sale, the company contended its quest for coal entitled it to strip the surface as well as beneath the ground, particularly since only strip mining was profitable. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson turned down the plea last summer.

It prevented private lumber companies from timbering in the Olympic National Park, a huge virgin wilderness on a Puget Sound peninsula in the State of Washington.

Interior Secretary McKay says he made his opposition known to lumbermen who wanted the park's boundaries reduced. A high member of the preceding administration hopes McKay doesn't change his mind.

"The timber boys have now got their hands in," this former official declares pessimistically, "and before they get through they're going to get that red spruce forest in the Olympic National Park."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 11, 1956]

THE GIVEAWAY CHARGES—WILDLIFE SERVICE CRITICS ALLEGE LACK OF RESULTS

(Fourth in a series)

(By Warren Unna)

When pinned down, conservationist critics of the administration's Fish and Wildlife Service concede their complaint is less about what has been given away than about what has not been gotten.

Comments C. R. (Pink) Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute and one of the gadflies in chief of the Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay:

"The thing that is a giveaway is that they haven't done anything. They dont' stand up to the Bureau of the Budget in their budget requests. Where we've been able to stop it is through Congress. The administration officials are simply not discharging their duties and responsibilities to carry out their job of preserving the natural resources and the Secretary of the Interior is their godfather."

FOUR CHARGES MADE

In the main, the conservationists have leveled four giveaway charges at the administration:

It has promulgated new regulations to permit private companies to exploit oil deposits underlying the national wildlife refuges.

Secretary McKay said in Corvallis, Oreg., October 27: "I can tell you flatly that no new regulations will be authorized unless they give far more protection to our refuges

than they did before the (August 1953) stop order."

Yet, on December 2, new regulations were issued permitting private oil development on all but 12 of the 264 national wildlife refuges.

The 12 had never tolerated private oil development anyway. Neither had any of the others, save for 6 unitized contracts between the Government and private companies, 3 of them concluded during the first few months of the current administration.

(The only exceptions are situations where previous owners never did surrender their mineral rights to refuge land or where the Government entered into cooperative agreements with peripheral oil companies to prevent their sucking out all the oil from underneath the Government's land.)

LEASE ALREADY GRANTED

McKay's December 2 regulations were issued 1 day after the Fish and Wildlife Service had already granted its first lease. Interior explains the lease was actually back dated.

It went to Frankfort Oil Co., of Bartlesville, Okla., a subsidiary of Seagram Distilleries. Ellis D. Slater, a frequent guest at President Eisenhower's intimate stag dinners, is head of a corollary Seagram subsidiary, Frankfort Distilleries, and sits on an advisory committee supervising the oil company's operations. Slater says he knows no one in the Department of the Interior and had nothing to do with negotiating the lease.

Under the lease, Frankfort is permitted to seek oil on 12,000 acres of the Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge in Louisiana at minimum fee and without the competitive bidding required in areas with known deposits.

Representative LEE METCALF (Democrat, Montana) says Secretary McKay's action violates a law which prohibits incursion into refuges unless specifically ordered by the President. A congressional investigation is being considered by the Senate Interior Committee.

FUNDS REPORTED MISUSED

Duck stamp money, the $2-per-duck fees collected from sportsmen for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife refuges, has been misused.

Secretary McKay calls this charge pure politics and cites the fact that he has established 8 new refuges, totaling 80,000 acres, and is working on 3 more.

Those close to the Department in the previous administration counter that the Secretary's statistics are misleading: the 8 new refuges were all in the process of acquisition long before McKay took office and almost one-third of his 80,000-acre figure represents a mere change in nomenclature—land which the Federal Government has always allowed State fish and game departments to use for refuge purposes.

Moreover, they point out, Secretary McKay has actually disposed of six refuges and the disposition of a seventh is in the works. These, however, have gone to other Government agencies, not into private hands.

Political appointees have been substituted for the Fish and Wildlife Service's career officials, as in the case of the Fish and Wildlife Service Director, two Assistant Directors and the Chief Counsel.

Explains the Wildlife Management Institute's Gutermuth: "You throw these career administrators into political classification and they soon know they are either going to have to play ball or else get out."

When Albert M. Day, a 35-year-long career man, was replaced as Director a few months after Secretary McKay took office, he is said to have asked: "Well, was it the Alaskan salmon fisheries that got me or the California duck hunters?"

The answer supposedly came back: "It was a mixture of scales and feathers, Albert."

For reasons best known to himself, McKay's former Under Secretary, Ralph A. Tudor, wrote in the Saturday Evening Post that Day was fired because of complaints from a group of California bankers who disliked Day's duck-hunting regulations.

Since the Fish and Wildlife Service Director has sole control over issuing oil leases on refuges under the new regulations, it seems inevitable that the post will be subject to increasing political pressure.

MILITARY WITHDRAWS LAND

Land has been withdrawn from the public domain, not so much by private operators as by the military.

Gutermuth sees military encroachment on wildlife refuges as "an attempt to gain a private hunting preserve for the brass." He adds: "Every area that they get a hold of they just destroy completely. They take these special flights and these people on leave and just gut these places."

Some 15 sanctuaries in 12 States are under threat of encroachment and possible desecration. And in Alaska the Army has already claimed 20,000 acres and is requesting 137,000 more. The lands are being claimed for gunnery practice, poison-gas tests, grazing, and further cropland. A bill is now pending before Congress to restrict the Secretary of the Interior's power to relinquish refuge control.

Conservationists, however, have scored two recent victories against military encroachment.

1. The Army has long been angling to acquire 10,700 acres of the Wichita Mountains refuge in Oklahoma as part of a 36-mile long, 3-to-6-mile-wide gunnery range for Fort Sill. The Army succeeded in slipping its claim for the Wichita land through Congress in a hidden appropriation last summer.

But in October Secretary McKay announced he wasn't budging. If the Army wanted to fire its guns, he offered generously, let them fire from the Wichita refuge and into Fort Sill proper.

Commented the Secretary: "There would be a lot of noise but no game would be killed * * * any hunter can tell you there's a lot of difference in being on the butt end of the gun rather than the muzzle end."

Even conservationist Gutermuth was impelled to say: "I really feel kindly in my heart toward McKay for that."

2. The Air Force had its mind set on night-long photoflash bombing on Matagorda Island, within a mile of Aransas National Wildlife Refuge in Texas. Aransas is the only wintering ground of the world's 28 remaining whooping cranes, the largest birds on the North American Continent.

The conservationists whooped so loud at that one the Air Force hastily decided to do its photoflash bombing in some other nest.

Wildlife Management Institute President Ira N. Gabrielson, an ex-fowl and wildlife service director, and a brother of former Republican National Committee Chairman Guy George Gabrielson, says this administration has been lending an attentive ear to the "gimme boys."

He adds: "I worked under Roosevelt and Truman for 20 years and this crowd has done more in 3 years to make me a Democrat than anything the Democrats ever did."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 12, 1956]

THE GIVEAWAY CHARGES—SHARING RESULTS OF RESEARCH HELD PROPER

(Fifth in a series)

(By Warren Unna)

The Democrats charge the Department of the Interior with giving away plants for producing synthetic fuel, oilshale, zirconium, titanium, and helium, as well as giving away phosphate and titanium mining possibilities in the Hells Canyon area.

In the area of mineral resources, the charge also includes the giving away of coal mine safety regulations by passing them on to the States for supervision.

The administration replies it is divesting itself of the activities it thinks properly belong to private enterprise.

As Thomas H. Miller, a career employee and acting director of the Bureau of Mines, explains it: "We're not giving in to anybody. We're saying, 'Here is the result of public research, you take it from now on.' The Bureau of Mines undertakes research when it finds the need for developing a process is in the public interest. But we are not going to build and operate commercial-scale plants. It is a question of when is it in the public interest for us to cut off our research?"

A good amount of what Interior is doing in the minerals field was first recommended by a Bureau of Mines survey team in July 1954. The team was composed of an oil and a copper corporation executive, two coal mine operators and a mining school dean.

One very high official during the Democratic administration comments: "For some sinister reason, they are trying to make it appear that Government operation of these properties is just so poor you've got to sell them back to the private people."

Doubt on the administration's good intentions came early in 1953 with the abortive appointment of Tom Lyon as Bureau of Mines Director.

Lyon, on a $5,000 annual revocable pension from the Anaconda Copper Co., unhesitatingly declared he had no use for the Federal mine inspection laws he would be required to enforce. He explained: "Human life is becoming very cheap these days on the globe."

If there was any doubt that the Senate might refuse to confirm Lyon, this clinched it. President Eisenhower withdrew the nomination.

SUMMARY OF CHARGES

To date, here is what Interior has done in the mineral field which has provoked the charge of giveaway:

The Government's $35 million Louisiana, Mo., synthetic fuel plant, which perfected the production of oil from coal, was sold in December 1954 to the Hercules Power Co. for $5 million. Although the Democrats have been decrying this as a ratio of 25 cents on the dollar, it is actually even less—14 cents.

Hercules originally built the plant to manufacture ammonia for the Army during World War II and retained an option to meet the high bid whenever it was put on the block.

Interior Secretary Douglas McKay contends the synthetic fuel research has been transferred to Interior's other plant at Morgantown, W. Va. The Republican National Committee, says Interior, merely returned the Louisiana plant to the Army—so it was the Army which disposed of the plant, not Secretary McKay.

To this, one Democrat quipped: "That's like saying I didn't shoot my mother-in-law on Sunday. I shot her on Saturday."

The Government's $16 million Rifle, Colo., oil-shale plant has recently been shut down as not feasible on a commercial scale. The plant, long the target of oil companies, had worked its cost of producing gasoline down to 13 cents a gallon (against the 11-cent price at an ordinary refinery). Ebasco Services, Inc., New York engineering management firm, estimated the oil-shale process would have become competitive in another 2 to 3 years.

Union Oil Company of California, which owns large oil-shale deposits at Grand Valley, Colo., 10 miles away, and maintained a

cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Mines, is now spending large sums on its own oil-shale processing.

Secretary McKay, according to the Republican National Committee, "had no recourse except to comply with the instructions of Congress" when Rifle was given a $1 million appropriation last year. Accordingly, Rifle's, retorting, refining, and research facilities were put on a standby basis and only a token amount of work on mining techniques continues.

Interior claims nothing has been given away inasmuch as the land is still naval reserve territory.

ZIRCONIUM PLANT CLOSED

The Government's multi-million-dollar zirconium producing plant at Albany, Oreg., was shut down last June, dismantled and put on a standby basis when the Carborundum Metals Co., of Akron, N. Y., took over as zirconium supplier for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Albany had been the world's only zirconium production plant and, under AEC financing, produced material for the submarine reactors in the *Sea Wolf* and *Nautilus*.

Carborundum took over about half of the trained work force. "But," says the Bureau of Mines' Miller, "all we gave them was the know-how. We didn't give them any Government equipment, any Government property."

The Government's multi-million-dollar titanium plant at Boulder City, Nev., ceased production in 1953 and now has dwindled down to simply experimenting with new processes. A bill to dispose of Government housing there, owned by the Bureau of Reclamation, is now before the Congress. Boulder City had been the world's only commercial producer of titanium, filling orders from the Air Force and Navy Bureau of Ships. National Lead, du Pont, and Kennecott Copper are all now in the business.

Miller explains the Government permitted its zirconium and titanium experiments to reach commercial production only because no one else was around. Once private industry established a market, the Government saw its job as completed.

MINE INSPECTION BY STATES

Following the Bureau of Mines survey team recommendation, Interior has created a new office of education to help States get back to doing their coal mine inspecting. Already some half-dozen States are conducting joint inspection with Federal authorities.

Congressmen, on both sides of the aisle, take a dim view of ceding Federal inspection to the States. Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, of Pennsylvania, terms it a "direct defiance" of the 1952 coal mine safety law. Many believe a mine operator could look forward to greater leniency from a State inspector than from one responsible to Washington.

Secretary McKay did reject the survey team's recommendation that coal mine operators be given a 24-hour alert in order that arrangements may be made to facilitate the inspection. As one Interior official explains it, "That would have been like having a Federal bank examiner notify you he was coming to inspect the books."

The Bureau of Mines survey team also recommended that the Government yield its monopoly on helium gas by making available for purchase or operation by industry some $20 million in facilities at Shiprock, N. Mex., Otis, Kans., and Amarillo and Exell, Tex., where helium is extracted from natural gas.

The Government has been in the helium business since 1925. The late Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes guarded this enterprise carefully, refusing to sell quantities of the noninflammable gas to Nazi Germany to inflate its zeppelins.

Secretary McKay's published letter of thanks to the July 1954 survey team failed to note exception to the helium recommendation. Representative LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, couldn't resist remarking the Secretary's request for disposal seemed premature in that the administration at that moment had pending a $5 million request for a new helium production plant.

A few days later the then Interior Under Secretary, Ralph A. Tudor, declared there were no immediate plans to sell the helium plants.

DEMOCRATS WERE LEERY

Democrats were leery, however. Only a few months before Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, and Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, chairman of the Government Operations Committees, had introduced—presumably at the administration's behest—identical bills to give the Interior Secretary the right to dispose of the Government's helium properties.

Such a bill is normally procedural and rides through unnoticed. But Congressman METCALF spotted this one. After a quick phone call to the Senate Interior Committee, an amendment was added. It prescribed that the only helium properties which could be sold were those "not valuable for helium production"—thus negating the bill's original intent.

As one Capitol Hill official phrases it: "Whether or not somebody was in for a big steal, the potentiality was there. It looked so neat, you could just take over the whole thing lock, stock, and barrel—and then sell the Government back its own helium."

The giveaway charges on Hells Canyon phosphate and titanium mining are more iffy. The Idaho region adjacent to Hells Canyon contains 60 percent of the Nation's phosphate deposits and a good amount of titanium. The argument is that by ceding Hells Canyon power development to the Idaho Power Co., a private utility, power costs will now never be low enough to the 3 mills per kilowatt-hour level necessary to economically mine these deposits.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 13, 1956]

DISPOSAL OF PART OF PUBLIC LAND IS ASSAILED BY CONSERVATIONISTS

(Sixth in a series)

(By Warren Unna)

Since the Republican administration took office, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management has disposed of some 700,000 acres of the public domain.

This is six-one hundredths of 1 percent of the total land the Federal Government has divested since this Nation began.

During the entire first and second administrations of President Harry S. Truman, the land disposal to private citizens was somewhat less: 259,000 acres from 1945–48, and 659,000 acres from 1949–52.

Nevertheless, Marion Clawson declares: "Much less has been done (under the Republicans) than I feared might be done. I am sure that legal authority exists for disposing of one-third or one-half of the public land."

If there is one man who is equipped to be critical of the present administration's public-land policy, it is Clawson. For Douglas McKay dismissed Clawson as insubordinate within 3 months after becoming Secretary of the Interior.

Clawson had challenged the Secretary's use of the Civil Service procedure in demoting him from Bureau of Land Management Director to Administrator and labeled the action as one motivated by political considerations.

CHAMBER HEAD URGED SALES

Career civil servants like Clawson became alerted to warning signs immediately after the 1952 election.

On November 10, 1952, no more than 6 days after the Republican victory, Clarence F. Lee, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, openly called for selling a substantial portion of the remaining public lands to private buyers.

Losing no time, the National Lumber Manufacturers Association published figures on the proporton of federally owned land in the West and rhapsodized on the theme of how much nicer it would be if that land were sold and taxes were made available to the States.

Another career official like Clawson, but still in office, finds "selective disposal" to be the main change since Oscar L. Chapman handed over Interior's top office to Secretary McKay.

"I was just as fearful as to what might happen in 1952 as anybody else, but I'll say there is now a more realistic way of looking at these unmanageable blocks of land.

"I've seen many a letter go out to an applicant, a political friend back home," this official relates, "but they always say the law is on the books and if there is going to be any change, Congress will have to make it; and Congress hasn't."

This Interior official emphatically says he knows of "no instance in which I have been overruled by my boss or the Secretary."

THREAT IN GRAZING BILL

The major giveaway threat, so far as public lands are concerned, came in 1953 with a grazing bill sponsored by then Representative Wesley A. D'Ewart (Republican, Montana), the man who has just been named Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management.

Although D'Ewart's bill had the backing of the National Wool Growers and the American National Livestock Associations, it never was reported out of committee. Secretary McKay later called D'Ewart's Agriculture Department bill lousy. Christopher M. Granger, retired Assistant Chief Forester, called it really poisonous.

In essence, the bill proposed to raise grass to a dominant use natural resource, along with water and timber. It would have given the 17,000 ranchers now holding grazing permits in the national forest the right to will them to their heirs, or sell them as they chose.

At stake were 200 million acres of grazing lands in 14 States. Some 3½ percent of all western stockmen would have benefited from the bill. Since the Federal grazing charge is only nominal—15 cents a cow month; 3 cents a sheep or goat month; 30 cents a horse month—the advantage of possessing a grazing permit as a vested right would have been considerable.

CHIEF FORESTER PROTESTED

Richard E. McArdle, Agriculture Department's Chief Forester, protested the D'Ewart bill was "not in the public interest"—despite its original backing from the administration. The administration then switched its backing to a more moderate bill which McArdle helped prepare. This would have made grazing decisions by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior subject to review by the courts.

The conservationists really had their dander up by now and put enough pressure on Congress to defeat the McArdle-drafted bill too. Critics said even the second bill would have resulted in fencing the public off their own grazing land—unless they decided to buy it back from the private ranchers.

At the time author D'Ewart commented: "Private responsibility for protection of land is best for this country." He then added with some sarcasm: "If the Federal Government cares for natural resources it is conservation. But if private individuals seek to acquire any land now publicly owned, their object is to steal."

Currently there are bills pending in Congress to sell the unused federally owned

public domain to the States and to grant States the right to their subsurface minerals—just as the Offshore Oil Act gave Texas, Louisiana, and California the right to their close-in submerged oil deposits.

COULD STRIP GOOD STUFF

As one former Interior official puts it: "There now is a basic belief by some high Department officials that the Federal Government should divest itself of all public land by either selling it or turning it over to the States. Our fear then is that the States will just hold it long enough to strip off the good stuff—the timber, minerals, and grassland—and then dump the rest back again on the Federal Government as unprofitable to administer."

Bureau of Land Management Director Edward Woozley, says these bills haven't hit the Department yet for indorsement and he is offering no comment.

One longtime Interior career official says both former Under Secretary Ralph A. Tudor and his successor, Clarence A. Davis, are philosophically inclined toward disposing of all remaining public lands to private buyers.

Orme Lewis, D'Ewart's predecessor as Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, has been accused of nursing this philosophy.

"Probably there was some foundation to these people saying Mr. Lewis was loose. I don't think he realized the importance of the protection of the public estate," one of Lewis' assistants declares. He adds: "There was a tendency during Lewis' occupancy here to approve oil and gas leases on Federal land without too much consideration."

This official, however, believes that all such leases should be granted only under competitive bidding, even though the law fails to spell this out.

Lewis has his admirers too and one career official who worked closely with him prior to his resignation last year says he was a defender of the public interest.

TWO ACTIONS GO UNNOTICED

Two Interior actions during this administration have gone unnoticed:

Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has gained an 80-foot wide 100-mile-long Chinese wall near Barstow, Calif., a strip of public domain it uses for its natural-gas pipeline.

Pacific Gas & Electric Co. first applied for this right-of-way in 1953. When the Bureau of Land Management was slow in granting it, Pacific Gas & Electric Co. went to Congress. Congress, accordingly, decided Pacific Gas & Electric Co. was not required to wheel other companies' natural gas through its pipeline, even though the pipeline crossed over Federal land.

Until last year, Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and other private utilities were obliged to wheel Federal power from a dam site to transmission point when their power line crossed over public land.

One official said Interior simply caved in to Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in not insisting that Congress turn down the company's request for its Chinese wall right-of-way.

SMALL TRACTS RULES CHANGED

An intradepartmental action last June changed the Small Tracts Act regulations. A purchaser may now acquire land without first showing his good intent by leasing and improving it for a 3- to 5-year period.

The regulation easement is supposed to occur only in areas where local municipalities have their own power to regulate building sanitation and water supply. Interior says the new easement has so far been tried out only in the Las Vegas, Nev., area, where there was a backlog of 20,000 applications for small tracts.

Officials, incumbent and departed, see no evil per se in the Government selling off isolated small land parcels which timber and grazing trespassing and fire hazards make unmanageable. As far back as 1949, the then Democratic administration agreed some 3 to 5 million acres of small tracts could not be administered effectively.

The current administration has pushed these disposition sales: 168,013 acres during the past fiscal year, almost double the 74,540 acres of small-tract sales during fiscal 1952.

"It's land that has never been selected by anyone and in widely scattered small tracts that are uneconomical to manage," Bureau of Land Management Director Woozley explains. "We feel it's to the best interests of the country to put the money in the bank."

This coming year, the Bureau will auction off the second half of some 200,000 acres in Arkansas because they are unmanageable. A similar policy holds for the Great Lakes States and public groups there are awarded the land at 40 cents per $1 of appraised valuation if they use it for recreational purposes.

In the Great Plains States, several hundred thousand acres are being sold to stockmen at no less than appraised value—providing the stockmen previously leased this land for grazing and it abuts property they already own. Here, however, the stockmen have proved reluctant buyers because they find Federal grazing fees considerably cheaper than land taxes on their own property.

Bureau of Land Management Director Woozley sums up his philosophy this way: "What we're attempting to do is put less Government in business and more business in Government. I think there is a place for public lands and private lands, and they should be kept to their best use. We don't think it's a giveaway. We feel that the people who get them should pay what the parcels are worth * * * I guess I'm what you'd call a 'middle-of-the-roader'."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 14, 1956]

THE GIVEAWAY CHARGES—UNITED STATES GETS $250 MILLION SO FAR ON OFFSHORE OIL

(Seventh in a series)

(By Warren Unna)

Administration critics used to say the offshore oil lands (tidelands) was the first item the Republicans gave away. Now, they are divided in declaring this a giveaway.

What Congress did in 1953 was to vote the States oil rights to the close-in shore and confirm the Federal Government's right to any deposits found further out, and at greater water depths.

Those who cried "giveaway," saw the legislation as giving Texas, Louisiana, and California oil which belonged to the Nation as a whole.

They also feared that the oil companies, which had constantly pressured for State ownership (even to inventing the misnomer slogan of "tidelands"), would be able to wrangle better lease terms from State officials and legislatures than they might from Federal authorities.

But one high Interior official of the Democratic administration charitably remarks: "Perhaps it wasn't strict giveway since the Federal Government only gave its oil rights to the States. It was then up to them to deliver the oil into private hands."

ONLY CALIFORNIA PROFITS

He adds the only State really to profit was California. The precipitous drop of the Continental Shelf on the Pacific coast confines all practical oil drilling to within its 3-mile State boundary.

But Louisiana, he says, has no significant deposits within its 3-mile boundary along the gulf and the Supreme Court has yet to rule on a 10½-mile historic boundary claim the Louisiana Legislature made while the bill was before Congress.

And Texas, which was granted the 10½-mile historic boundary now supposedly finds its real oil wealth is still beyond that—on Federal submerged lands. All in all, it has been estimated that about 80 percent of the oil deposits are still beyond State jurisdiction.

A bill granting the States rights to offshore oil was vetoed by President Harry S. Truman as far back as 1946; three Supreme Court rulings confirmed him.

But the Republicans put the measure into their 1952 platform. Candidate Eisenhower declared Federal claims on offshore oil meant to him "centralized ownership and control, a trend which I have bitterly opposed."

After 26 days of almost round-the-clock debate, the Senate voted the States the right to close-in oil deposits. The vote was 56–35 with 21 Democrats and 35 Republicans for the measure and 26 Democrats and 9 Republican opposed to it. The House passed it 205–108 with a similar party split.

LEASING PROGRAM FOR UNITED STATES

In a subsequent bill, pushed by the administration, the Government was given the right to undertake a large-scale leasing program in its own deeper-water territory, the hundreds of thousands of square miles which comprise the outer Continental Shelf.

President Truman once estimated the oil reserves beyond the States' 3-mile boundaries might be worth some $265 billion. Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, put it another way: He thought they were the equivalent of 50 stacks of $1,000 bills, each higher than the 555-foot Washington Monument. More conservatively, the Geological Survey once made an estimate of $12.5 billion as the Federal Government's share. A long-standing proposal of Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, called for the revenue from the submerged oil lands to be put in a kitty for Federal grants-in-aid to education. His proposal was voted down.

Instead, the lease money on the Federal properties has been collected by Interior. Edward Woozley, director of the Bureau of Land Management, says the Government has taken in $252 million from 40 companies since the program began. This represents leases from some 900,000 acres, granted since the passage of the 1953 bill.

"We've unlocked a resource that had been locked up for years and put one-quarter billion dollars in the Treasury. That's just the opposite of give-away," Woozley declares. "Before this, companies were just not given to leasing because they didn't know who was the landlord—the State or the Federal Government."

Democrats, however, point out that if they hadn't put the proper amendment on the legislation in Congress, the 1953 Republican majority would have ceded to the States all of the offshore oil property, not just the close-in regions.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 15, 1956]

THE GIVEAWAY CHARGES—A PARTNERSHIP OR A POWER GIVEAWAY?

(Eighth in a series)

(By Warren Unna)

Far and away the loudest cry of "giveaway" against the Administration concerns the Interior Department's water resources and hydroelectric power policies.

Briefly, the critics say that the administration is hell-bent on giving away all of the country's remaining power dam sites and river basin developments—so long as they are profitable to private utilities.

In this they see a double wrong: higher power rates for the many; higher profits for the few, from a resource which belongs to all the people.

M'KAY'S ALTERNATIVE

Interior Secretary Douglas McKay dismisses the giveaway charges as "purely political bunk." He declared a year ago:

"Our political opponents proclaim that any transfer to any individual of any right

to lease, develop or acquire any of this property, even though it may be in compliance with Federal laws, is 'giveaway.'"

Were he sensitive to such criticism, the Secretary said, he would have but two alternatives: let the power site remain undeveloped in a state of "complete stagnation"; or let the Government develop it and have "collectivism and pure socialism."

Instead, McKay has put forth a "partnership" philosophy: Local interests, both public and private, should do what they want and can to satisfy their power needs; the Federal Government will attend to the large multipurpose dams which require the large capital expenditures.

Michael W. Straus, Reclamation Commissioner under the Democrats, sees this as a partnership "where power companies take the profits and taxpayers the losses."

The critics recall the words of former President Harry S. Truman as he dedicated the Hungry Horse Dam in 1952: "Take another good look at this dam, because if the Republicans win this election it will be a long time before you see another new structure of this kind."

The critics find Mr. Truman's words prophetic: not one new start has been made on a similar large Federal multipurpose dam since this administration took office.

But the more the critics look into the matter, the more they suspect that it is not McKay who is calling the power signals, but Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams and McKay's Under Secretary, Clarence A. Davis.

WHITE HOUSE LINK

Congressional testimony showed that Adams' White House office was the scene of top-level conferences on both the bitterly contested Dixon-Yates and Georgia Power Co. power contracts. And speaking in Virginia last month, Adams warned: "The concentration of the control of water in the Federal Government ultimately means the control of the land and consequently of the whole economy."

And Davis declares: "The constant endeavor of the federalizers and the socializers to paint this power problem as a contest between a beneficent Federal Government, on the one side, and a wicked monster which they call the power trust, on the other, is so much political hogwash."

Actually, Dixon-Yates, the so-called giveaway prototype, did not involve Interior at all, but the Atomic Energy Commission. Its opponents saw it as an attempt to kill off the Tennessee Valley Authority's low public power rates by making TVA dependent upon private utilities for its future power supply.

NEW NORTHWEST TIEUP

Interestingly enough, Ebasco Services, Inc., an engineering management subsidiary of the Electric Bond & Share Co. which figured prominently in the Dixon-Yates proposal, also has a prominent role in a new power controversy in the Pacific Northwest.

The administration has curtailed the Bonneville Power Administration's budget for further long-range planning in the huge Columbia River Basin. The planning function has been taken over by an ad hoc committee composed of the governors of Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and Montana—all outspoken opponents of public power. As their executive director, they have hired an Ebasco executive and permitted him to remain on the Ebasco payroll so that he may retain his retirement benefits.

Completing the interrelationship, Ebasco has been hired by the Pacific Northwest Power Co., a newly formed utility combine composed of the Washington Water Power Co., Pacific Power & Light, Portland General Electric, and Montana Power Co.

The Idaho Power Co., which does not proclaim membership in the new combine, nevertheless was billed by Ebasco, along with the other companies, in a recent statement of charges.

FIFTEEN METHODS CITED

The critics say that the administration has been helping along its partnership program—and supposedly thereby giving away power development to the private utilities—with 15 basic schemes:

Rewriting the Federal Power Act by "administrative fiat," as has been charged in the Hells Canyon controversy.

Here Secretary McKay withdrew his predecessor's objections to private development of the Snake River Gorge on the Idaho-Oregon border. He also told the Federal Power Commission that it would be nice if the Idaho Power Co. applications were approved for the project's development by private enterprise.

After 18 months of hearings, an FPC examiner said that a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon, the deepest untouched natural gorge in the United States, would maximize development of the area. But he also declared that since Congress had repeatedly refused appropriations for this, it would be practical to let the Idaho Power Co. go ahead on Brownlee, 1 of 3 proposed smaller dams downstream from Hells.

The full FPC waited until Congress went home last summer. It then not only approved its examiner's recommendation but went beyond it to recommend that the Idaho Power Co. build an additional downstream dam, Oxbow.

By "giveaway" in Hells Canyon, the critics mean "a net loss to humanity of the power that can never be developed."

Oregon's two Democratic Senators, WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, say that compared with the Federal project, the two private utility dams will result in higher power rates to consumers and less water storage, flood-control and navigation benefits, and will prevent development of Idaho's vast phosphate deposits.

McKay counters that private development not only will cost less but will save the Government a huge capital investment.

Although construction has already begun on the Idaho Power Co.'s $311 million twin project, the National Hells Canyon Association has taken the case to the United States court of appeals here. Also, the Library of Congress legal division has informed Congress that it has the constitutional right to abrogate the FPC decision, should it too decide to step in.

2. Proposed "donation" of the huge, 1.5 million kilowatt John Day Dam on Oregon and Washington's Columbia River border to three utilities in the new Pacific Northwest Power combine under the guise of "partnership."

McKay says the private utilities have offered to pay $273 million of the project's $310 million cost, leave ownership in the Government's hands require only that they be given the dam's power output over a 50-year period. This, he says, would save the Government a tremendous capital outlay.

Senator MORSE calls John Day the "real payoff." He says the private utilities composing the combine will be getting a low-cost Government loan for 50 years, will receive tax-free revenue for Federal power delivered on Federal transmission lines which the companies can market at high rates and yet will be under no obligation to put up any of their own capital in advance.

3. Abandoning dam sites, such as at Nez Perce on the Northwest's Snake River, to permit private utilities to build smaller dams elsewhere—thus allegedly forfeiting the maximum utilization of the watershed.

Interior says this dam site was abandoned several years ago because it would have prevented salmon from spawning upstream.

Critics say that the abandonment of the Hells Canyon site for two smaller dams meant a loss of 2.9 million acre-feet of water storage and 500,000 kilowatts of power. They further say that the abandonment of Nez Perce for the Pacific Northwest Power Co.'s proposed Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley Dams will mean the loss of another 4.3 million acre-feet of water storage and another 500,000 kilowatts of power.

The water acreage is considered particularly important. Engineers have said that both Hells Canyon and Nez Perce were vital to developing the full 27 million acre-feet of water storage necessary for full utilization of the Columbia River and such tributaries as the Snake and Clearwater.

Moreover, Evelyn Cooper, attorney for the National Hells Canyon Association, thinks that cutting the Pacific Northwest Power Co. into these projects may well violate the Federal Power, Antimonopoly, and Public Utilities Holding Company Acts.

4. Abrogating the traditional "wheeling" regulation. This required private power companies using Federal power to "wheel" some of this power over their transmission lines so that the public groups and cooperatives known as preference customers could get some power, too.

The House Public Works and Resources Subcommittee headed by Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, Pennsylvania, uncovered this change in policy in a theretofore unpublicized memorandum. Ten of the memorandum's 13 decrees—including the one on wheeling—were copied verbatim from a paper submitted by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s Washington lobbyist, Herman Kruse.

Two other points made by Kruse were adopted in substance. All found their way to the desk of Interior Under Secretary Davis, and were promulgated.

Commented CHUDOFF: "Pacific Gas & Electric merely picked the fruit the Interior Department was giving away."

5. Attempting to abolish preference customers altogether.

CHUDOFF'S investigation of the Clark Hill Dam on the Georgia-South Carolina border showed that Assistant Interior Secretary Fred G. Aandahl, was trying to make the Georgia Electric Membership Corp., a group of 37 municipalities and cooperatives, buy its power from the Georgia Power Co., a Dixon-Yates affiliate.

Had the group been allowed to exercise its preference rights to buy power at the Federal dam site, its costs would have been far less.

The Chudoff investigation also fished out an opinion from Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., informing Aandahl that his tactics "flout the congressional purpose." Aandahl said that the Attorney General's opinion was moot because Interior had dropped its original proposal and instead had suggested a modified wheeling agreement, giving the cooperatives their power over the Georgia Power Co.'s existing transmission line.

The cooperatives, however, contend that restrictions in the private utilities proposal make that impossible. A new plan is now being discussed.

6. Attempting to force rural electric cooperatives out of existence.

The Missouri Basin Marketing Criterion of September 1953 gave preference customers in Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa 90 days to submit their estimates of needs for the next 20 years. They were told that whatever power they didn't want would go to private utilities on 20-year contracts with no withdrawal clauses. They were also told that whatever power capacity they contracted for and failed to use would have to be paid for anyway.

Interior explained that preference groups, with the right to this power in perpetuity,

had forced private utilities to plan on a year-to-year basis for whatever power might be left.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER (Republican of North Dakota) raised such an anguished cry in Republican States using Missouri Basin power that the administration decided to press only a modified criterion.

7. In a somewhat related action, the Bonneville Power Administration is now granting 20-year commitments to private utilities for Federal power instead of the 5-year contracts with 2-year renewals offered in the past. Critics see this as a means of sewing up Bonneville's future power for the private groups.

8. Conditioning Rural Electrification Administration loans to new "g & t" (generating and transmission) cooperatives on their integration with neighboring private utilities—on the utilities' terms.

To date, the Administration has granted only two of these loans, both labeled "shotgun weddings."

The Arkansas Valley cooperative in southeast Colorado testified that it first had to buy an almost completed generator from its neighboring private utility and agree to cede the generator back to the company once it was amortized.

The Colorado Ute cooperative said that REA granted a loan only after Colorado Ute agreed to lease-operate its plant to the neighboring private utility. A secret REA report subpenaed by the Chudoff subcommittee showed that this integration will cost Colorado Ute $108,000 more a year than if it were allowed to operate independently.

9. Allowing private utilities to enjoy "dump rates" for an indefinite period.

These Federal power rates have always been cheap because the power is not firm—the Government is likely to take it away at any time. However, testimony has shown that the Georgia Power Co. enjoyed a $1.5 million discount on Clark Hill Dam power over the past few years.

Similarly, the Montana Power Co. is enjoying a $626,800 annual discount on power from the Canyon Ferry project. So long as Interior remains adamant against building a transmission line for preference groups in this area, Montana Power, as the sole outlet, will continue to enjoy firm power at dump rates.

Assistant Secretary Aandahl says that since Montana Power is charging the same rate as the Government would, there is no need for a Government transmission line.

10. Disposing of the Bonneville Power Administration's half-completed Redmond-Klamath Falls transmission line to the California-Oregon Power Co.

The Administration accepted a $2.8 million cash payment from COPCO for every cent we put into it. Bonneville claimed that the deal saved the Government money in not having to build a transmission line to an area no longer in need of its power.

Senator MORSE, however, contends that Bonneville was really giving COPCO an assist to keep a rural electric cooperative from moving into its area.

Ironically, the Senator notes, Bonneville continues to supply power to the M. A. Hanna Co.'s Nickel Mountain mine in this area. He claims that COPCO is unwilling to supply this plant at the necessary low wholesale rates.

11. Forcing breaches of contract by the Government's Southwest Power Administration.

The Administration let Congress eliminate SPA's annual continuing fund in 1953. The fund was used to repay five rural electric cooperatives in the area for steam plants SPA had contracted to buy over a 40-year period.

The cooperatives, lacking the sizable SPA repayments, faced bankruptcy. The situation should have eased last year after the Democratic-controlled Congress restored the payments and ordered the old contracts reinstated. The administration, however, has yet to comply fully with Congress' mandate.

Assistant Secretary Aandahl has asked the Comptroller General to determine if one of Congress' strictures would put the Administration in the position of giving away one of the strong points in its contract.

12. Proposing a downstream benefits bill such as the one set forth in the President's 1954 budget message.

With this bill, say the critics, the Administration would suddenly permit upstream private dams to charge the Government for storage of water on its way to a downstream Federal installation. Clay Cochran, of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, says this would enable the private utility to shift part of its costs to the Federal dam's customers.

Last summer Willard W. Gatchell, FPC General Counsel, told Congress the bill was the FPC's idea. A few months later, Kinsey Robinson, president of the Washington Water Power Co., told a reporter than the downstream benefits bill was his baby.

Assistant Secretary Aandahl says that the bill merely would compensate private utilities for storing Government water in the same way that the Government is now paid for storing utilities' water.

The bill was given such a resounding "no" by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, that the administration shifted it to the Senate Interior Committee. Its prospects there, under current leadership, are not considered much better.

13. Considering cutting the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. into California's publicly owned Central Valley project.

Pacific Gas & Electric has proposed to save the Government a $65.1 million capital outlay if it is allowed to build the power installations on the $219.2 million Trinity division of the Central Valley project. The private utility also has offered the Government $3.5 million annually for "falling water" rights.

A high Bureau of Reclamation official under the previous administration declares: "To permit P. G. & E.'s to come in there and develop the power in the Trinity would emasculate the system. It's giving away an asset and permitting dismemberment of a 20-year-old project built on public funds with PG&E opposition. If they (PG&E) could monopolize the power potential, they could pretty well call their own shots and the Central Valley project would yield its cream to the company."

Secretary McKay replies that he couldn't give away Central Valley without an act of Congress. But he adds that he knows of nothing to prevent citizens from discussing a matter of public business with him.

14. Yielding its obligation to build transmission lines to supply Federal power to preference groups.

The administration permitted the Idaho Power Co. to build a Baker-La Grande intertie transmission line in Oregon. Critics say that the utility originally opposed construction of the line by the Bonneville Power Administration and only decided to build the line itself once it had made sure that Bonneville had plenty of power during periods when its own supply was low.

Assistant Secretary Aandahl says: "That intertie is simply a good business proposition for both the Federal Government on the one hand and the private utility on the other."

In this connection, recent congressional testimony brought out that Burley, Idaho, was referred to the Idaho Power Co. when it asked for preference rights to Government power over Government transmission lines. Interior says that Burley's request was for power outside the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area.

15. Generally discouraging Federal power projects.

Byron Price, Assistant Bonneville Power Administrator, declared that private utilities must agree to any disposal of Bonneville power which might affect them, thus giving the utilities a veto over new substations and transmission lines servicing preference groups.

Interior has a feasibility test for new Federal power projects which some consider more of a birth-control device—stopping projects before they are conceived.

Critics say that there has been a general lack of enthusiasm from the Bureau of the Budget in authorizing new projects, evidenced by outright stop orders or behind-the-scenes "Dutch uncle" talks which keep Interior agencies from ever requesting funds for a desired project.

Countering these charges, Secretary McKay says that the Government is pushing at least two all-Federal power and water development projects because their broad scope and interstate nature "fall clearly within the category of those projects which are entirely a Federal responsibility."

The two are:

The four-State upper Colorado River water storage project, which will cost at least $1 billion although 97 percent of this will be repaid by its water and power users over a 50-year period.

The $156.5 million Frying Pan-Arkansas project which will shift part of the Continental Divide watershed from the West to the East.

Bills for both projects are now before Congress. With the conservationist, opposed Echo Park Dam now removed from the upper Colorado, this bill, at least, is expected to get through in the current session.

McKay bitterly resents the critics' slurs at his partnership program. He says it didn't originate with him: of the 27 Federally-built dams with leased private power privileges completed in the last half century, 15 were approved under Democratic administrations.

And regarding the administration's overall power policy, McKay comments: "it is true that we have reversed a trend toward complete Federal responsibility and consequent control and domination of water resources."

To this, his Under Secretary Clarence A. Davis, added in a September speech: "Their (the Democrats) program is the greatest giveaway that has been proposed in this generation. They propose to give away from this region (the Pacific Northwest) the right to control its own economic destiny!"

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 16, 1956]

THE GIVEAWAY CHARGES—CRITICS PASS UP PARK SERVICE

(Last in a series)

(By Warren Unna)

If there is one segment of Interior Secretary Douglas McKay's bailiwick which is free of the natural resource giveaway accusation, it is the National Park Service.

"To give the devil his due," one disgruntled former Interior official declares, "it isn't all bad. The Park Service is getting better appropriations. And he, McKay, is beginning to do something about the terrible conditions of roads, and surface them."

Secretary McKay has announced his intention of selling Congress on his mission 66 during its current session. This program aims at putting the national parks in shape to accommodate the estimated 80 million or so people who will be visiting them in 1966, the 50th anniversary year of the Park Service.

The parks haven't had much in the way of attention or funds since before World War II. Then there were 17 million visitors a year. Last year that visitor load almost tripled—to 50 million.

Secretary McKay has already added 130,000 acres to the national parks and succeeded in raising the current budget to $44 million—a $12-million boost from the previous fiscal year. When he goes back to Congress this year for an even bigger increase, the Secretary will let the legislators know the parks bring in some $120 million in annual revenue and mission 66's costs will still be under the park's earning capacity.

ONLY TWO CRITICAL NOTES

There have been only two notes of criticism of the Park Service, and these comparatively muted:

1. Secretary McKay was accused of ignoring Park Service recommendations in permitting the Dinosaur National Monument to be included in the upper Colorado River storage project. This would have meant that once an Echo Park Dam was built, the 209,000-acre monument would have become visible solely to skin divers.

Under pressure from conservationists, the House balked at the project. Accordingly, Secretary McKay, who originally had dismissed his conservationist opponents as "punks," developed a change of heart. He withdrew the request for building Echo Park Dam at the end of November. Congress is now expected to take a new look at the upper Colorado River storage project this session.

2. Conservationists are up in arms also over Interior's permitting the Navy to acquire a 25-acre tip of the 28,000-acre Cape Hatteras National Seashore Area for an absolutely essential installation.

C. J. (Pink) Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, says the matter came to light only recently when a conservationist spotted a Navy bulldozer on land which the State of North Carolina and private citizens had donated specifically for seashore recreation.

"An assistant to an assistant got in a closet with the Navy and let them tell him this is the only damn place in the Nation where their secret installation can be put," Guthermuth said acidly.

The man was identified as Harry J. Donohue, until his recent resignation, assistant to Assistant Interior Secretary Wesley A. D'Ewart.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ASKED

Last month, Secretary McKay's Advisory Committee on Conservation publicly let him know: "Proper procedure in a democracy requires that no boundary reactions of national monuments should be made by administrative or executive authority without public hearings."

The current administration has done some personnel reclassifying in the National Park Service. Director Conrad L. Wirth, along with two assistant directors and a secretary, have been changed from civil service career categories to the schedule "C" policy appointment category.

But despite the change in administration and classification, Wirth has retained his job and declares: "As far as the National Park Service is concerned, there's been nothing I know of that has been given away."

ENDORSEMENT OF 90-PERCENT PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the contention is being made that a majority of farmers are supporting the sliding scale of agricultural commodity price supports. I have just received from Mr. Leonard E. Hoffman, a farmer and seed-grower at Buckeye, Iowa, a communication giving the results of a complete survey of the farmers in his township in Hardin County, Iowa.

This survey shows that only 5 out of 132 farmers in the township refused to sign a petition stating that 90-percent supports were too high. Only eight were undecided or had no opinion. A total of 118 out of 132 signed in favor of 90-percent supports.

This very thorough canvass of an Iowa township has proved so interesting to me that I believe others will want to see it. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Mr. Hoffman's full report on the canvass of his township.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUCKEYE, IOWA.—While the debate in Congress rages over "flexible versus rigid" when it comes to price supports, 9 out of 10 farm operators in Buckeye Township, Hardin County, Iowa, went on record last week as favoring:

1. Ninety-percent price support on storable commodities.

2. Compensatory payments on perishable commodities.

3. Whatever production controls would be necessary to achieve the first two objectives.

There are 132 farmers operating farmland in Buckeye Township. Of that number, 118 signed a petition addressed to their congressional representatives endorsing those 3 major obejctives. The percentage is 89.4 in favor of the petition.

Five farm operators out of the 132 refused to sign the petition because they felt that the 90-percent supports were too high. Eight did not sign because they were either undecided or had no opinion. Three signed but said 90-percent supports were too low. One did not sign for other reasons. Only 2 farm operators in the township were not contacted; 1 of these was out of the State when the poll was taken on February 22 and 23. Some operators living outside the township but farming land within the township were included in the survey.

The survey was conducted by teams of 2 farmers in each of the 9 school districts in the township.

Leonard E. Hoffman, Ellis Township farmer and seed grower, flew into Washington, D. C., on Sunday night where he is presenting the results of the survey to various Members of the House and Senate where proposed agricultural legislation is now being debated.

The idea to poll Buckeye Township grew out of a cracker-barrel discussion among farmers congregated in the combination Buckeye post office and drug store. The poll was not sponsored by any particular farm organization and Farmers Union, Farm Bureau, and NFO members all participated. A Farm Bureau spokesman, however, said that the big majority of those taking the poll were not bureau members.

Buckeye Township has never been a strong Farm Bureau township. Wayne Halstead, Farm Bureau fieldman, said that there are 43 Farm Bureau memberships in the township at the present time and there would be more before the drive was completed. Last year there were 57.

Hoffman, who is on the State Farmers Union committee, said that there were 65 Farmers Union memberships in the township at the present time. Otis Liittschwager, Buckeye Township farmer and former member of State PMA committee, served as chairman of the informal meeting which was held to organize the poll. Myron Thomas served as secretary.

At a follow-up meeting, it was voted by the farmers attending to have Hoffman present the results of the poll to congressional representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams.

The petition circulated read as follows:

"We, the undersigned, all qualified farm operators in Buckeye Township, Hardin County, Iowa, respectfully request that all Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress who are concerned with agricultural welfare thoughtfully consider the following petition for the good of both producer and consumer:

"1. That 90 percent parity price supports be restored to all storable commodities.

"2. That there be enacted into law a program of compensatory payments for all perishable commodities selling at less than 90 percent of parity, similar to that already in effect for wool and sugar.

"3. That since the above proposals cannot be effectively administered without both production controls and a sound long-range soil-conservation program that will assure a continued abundance of food and fiber we pledge our support to such controls and conservation program."

A good many farmers made some additional comment when signing the petition. One remarked that "in addition to controls some sort of cross compliance would be necessary."

One, not signed, said that "90 percent is too high; it will hamper our foreign trade."

One farmer said that "I am not in favor of 90 percent supports, but I do favor the soil bank 100 percent."

One farmer commented that "he woudn't join the Farm Bureau because flexible price supports wouldn't work and 90 percent of parity would cost too much."

This is a breakdown of the poll by each of the nine school districts in Buckeye Township:

	Number of farmers signing	Number of farmers believing 90 percent too high	Number believing 90 percent too low, but signing	Undecided or no opinion	Other reasons
1	15	0	0	0	0
2	10	0	0	1	0
3	15	1	0	0	0
4	7	3	0	3	0
5	13	0	3	0	1
6	18	0	0	0	0
7	14	1	0	1	0
8	16	0	0	0	0
9	10	0	0	3	0
Total	118	5	3	8	1

The farmers who conducted the poll were Dale Kellogg, Bennie K. Hall, V. R. Blome, M. E. Hyland, Gus Lettow, Henry Daum, Jr., Myron L. Thoms, Orville Knutson, Cecil O. Engelson, G. C. Kinney, Carl Brockett, Darrell Sielaff, Kenneth Berndt, Robert Hoffman, and Sig Halsve.

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE NATION—LETTER FROM ALEX McKEIGNEY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently I was favored with a copy of a letter written by the Honorable Alex McKeigney, chairman of the Mississippi State Tax Commission. His letter brings into sharp focus some of the grave problems confronting those of us in the South, and, indeed, all Americans. This letter represents the sentiments of a high-minded, public-spirited citizen, one of the State's outstanding leaders; and I commend it to all Members of the Congress and all other clear-thinking persons. It is worthy of special reading and consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSON, MISS., *February 7, 1956.*

Mr. SAM BAILEY,
President, Central Lions Club,
Jackson, Miss.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: This letter is in response to your request for my views on certain current problems affecting the freedoms of all Americans.

It seems to me that at long last the forces of communism are beginning to see a realization of their dreams for destroying America—not by attack from without but through the fruition of their program of destruction from within.

For at this time when we should be most united in joint resolve and in common purpose to build our spiritual and military forces to resist the threat of international communism, we see the culmination of a long campaign to destroy the basic freedoms of all Americans through discord and disunity at home. This threat is now being waged and carried out on the vehicle of the race question, and it seems that large numbers of politicians in both major political parties and large segments of the press, entertainment world, and churches are unknowingly participating in this program which will just as certainly destroy our free institutions as the threat of communism itself. There can be no escape from the fact that the wild agitation now being leveled against the South can have but one end result unless it is curbed—and that is the destruction of these United States. And it is an indisputable truth that the various race measures now being pushed by the groups referred to were part and parcel of the Communist Party platform of 1928 and have been agitated by the Communists ever since for the sole purpose of disunifying America.

I believe in fairness and justice to all peoples, and the truth is that the Negroes of the South are on the threshold of their greatest period of progress unless their opportunities are destroyed by the agitations of those who seek to use the force of autocratic Federal Government to curb the State and local governments of the South into submission. The savage attacks which are being leveled against us do not take into consideration the long record of the Negro's progress in the South, and do not take into consideration the multiplied thousands and millions of exchanges of acts of kindness and love between the races. Rather, the agitators and all who aid and abet them by carrying their propaganda, seize upon the isolated instances of friction, play them up beyond all proportion and use them for purposes which can only promote evil. Naturally in a section where there is a high percentage of Negro population there will be more incidents of violence which involve members of the different races simply by the operation of the law of averages. These incidents occur with less frequency where the colored population is smaller by the operation of the same law of averages. Official statistics show for the year 1954 (the latest year in which figures are available) that 8 white people were killed by Negroes in Mississippi and only 6 Negroes were killed by whites, while 182 Negroes were killed by members of their own race. And since it is a fact that conditions are never perfect anywhere, it should be obvious to all who care to observe that similar incidents to those being played up by the agitators occur in all other areas of the United States, if not between white and Negro then between others. It is also apparent to those caring to see that the economic condition of the southern Negro is as good or better than the economic condition of his and many other races in other areas of the United States, and in particular in the heavily populated areas which are the centers of the current racial propaganda. The surprising thing is, and it is a credit to both races, that there is as little tension as actually exists. Therefore, when the people of a whole State or a whole section are vilified and abused simply because of the acts of individuals which do not reflect the thinking of the whole population, the end result can only be tragedy for America.

Likewise, when it is sought to use power of the Federal Government to club States, local subdivisions of government, and a people into submission, then freedom cannot long endure. The very basis of our privileges and freedoms is the separation of governmental powers, with certain powers being reserved unto the Federal Government, other powers to the States, and other powers to the local subdivisions of government and the people. Our forefathers knew from their bitter personal experiences with an all-powerful centralized Government that such concentrated power always produces tyranny, as it has down through all the years of history. Therefore in the basic instrument of our Government—the Constitution—they determined to separate governmental power so that at no one point can such powers be concentrated in such manner as to become tyrannical. The present agitators, court decisions, and proposed laws have completely upset this balance. And if the Federal Government can usurp unto itself power to direct and control State and local affairs as has been done in the decision on the school segregation cases, it can usurp power in any field of business, government, or individual living. When this is done freedom for all Americans, regardless of race, will disappear.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court in the school segregation cases is directed in point. Public education has never been a gift of the Federal Government to the people, either by Constitution, statute or Federal appropriation. It has always been solely the gift of the States and local subdivisions thereof. The established court decisions of the land have always, up until recently, recognized the rights of the States to direct their school affairs. Therefore, if the United States Supreme Court without any basis in Constitution, statute or case law can usurp power in this field it can usurp power in any field, and thereby freedom is seriously threatened from within.

It is my personal belief, therefore, that when we seek to preserve the constitutional separation of powers of Government and the integrity of the races that we are fighting to preserve freedom just as much as when we fight the cause of communism itself.

I have attempted to write this letter dispassionately in a spirit of love for all people of our great Nation and for the freedoms which all of us espouse. I write in the spirit of one whose father gave thousands of dollars of free legal service to poor Negroes and poor whites and who fought their courtroom battles, sometimes at the risk of personal criticism. I write in the spirit of my own family which has a deep personal feeling for their Negro maid, and in the spirit of my 11-year-old son who at Christmastime when he had an opportunity to earn some money immediately and without any suggestion from his parents gave it to this Negro maid to buy a Christmas tree for her family. I write in the spirit of the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, who said:

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality. I do not understand that there is any place where an alteration of the social and political relations of the Negro and the white man can be made except in the State legislature, not in the Congress of the United States."

(This is but one of Lincoln's many public utterances on this question. Yet when we say the same things that Lincoln said we are accused of being bigots, reactionaries and intolerants, this I cannot understand.)

There is no "reign of terror" in the South, as some proclaim. Rather, I would refer to such things as millions of contented Negro teachers, farmers, workers, businessmen, and professional men; to the 11-year-old Mississippi white girl who recently risked her life in the Tallahatchie River to save a Negro woman from drowning; to the 2 Jackson, Miss., white boys who only a few days ago plunged into a stream to rescue 3 trapped Negroes from a submerged vehicle; to the Mississippi white doctor's wife, who but a few days ago quickly gave her blood for transfusion to save a Negro who had been wounded by one of his own race; to the words of a distinguished Mississippi Negro educator who said: "Recently we've heard a lot about the Supreme Court and the schools. * * * Today, I passed a new Negro school building at Collins. * * * that's a better answer to our problems than all the politicians can give. * * *" I would refer to the new Negro facility, for treating Negro tubercular patients at the Mississippi State Sanitorium and to the tremendous efforts my State is making to improve school facilities for its pupils of all races. These are the type of things which will contribute to real progress as contrasted with the unwise force measures and agitators.

I have felt compelled to write this letter out of a deep love of country and the cause of liberty. If in this day the power of the Federal Government is allowed to transcend the Constitution, if racial agitation against the South sows disunity within, then the light of liberty will be extinguished in our land. Already that light is flickering, and it will grow ever dimmer unless the trends discussed are stopped. History will record our decline and fall if the present trend toward strife and statism continues.

If our free institutions are to survive, we as a people must rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles on which this Nation was founded, and must determine anew to conduct our lives on principles of Christian living. America cannot be saved by vast bureaus spending billions of dollars nor by Government agents driving and coercing our people. America can only be saved in the minds and hearts of her citizens.

Knowing within my heart that these things are true, I would have failed in my duty as a citizen if I had remained silent.

Sincerely yours,

ALEX MCKEIGNEY,
Chairman, Mississippi State Tax Commission.

OMISSION OF KENTUCKY FROM COMMERCIAL-WHEAT AREA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the pending farm bill omits the State of Kentucky from the area designated as the commercial-wheat area. I shall discuss this subject later in the consideration of the bill.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that there may be read from the desk a telegram on this subject from the vice president of the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

HOPKINSVILLE, KY., *March 1, 1956.*

Hon. ALBEN BARKLEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The wheat farmers of Kentucky, and especially those of western Kentucky, where most of the wheat in the State is grown, are very much worried about Senate bill 3183, making

Kentucky a non-commercial wheat-producing State. We know you will do everything you can to see that this doesn't happen.

It would be unfair and ruinous to thousands of already hard-pressed growers. It has been suggested that as a possible compromise that the commercial-wheat-area designation could be based on individual county production and acreage, just as the commercial corn area is now being handled, instead of on a statewide basis. You know how important wheat is to the economy of this section. Please help us all you can.

Best personal regards.

GOLLADAY LA MOTTE,
Second Vice President,
Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation.

REORGANIZATION OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made yesterday by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] relative to the reorganization of the Passport Office.

I believe Miss Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office, and all the members of the staff of the Passport Office deserve great credit for the tremendous job they have done in revising and revamping passport procedures to meet the steadily increasing workload.

Despite the 18-percent increase in 1955 alone, the time required to process applications has been reduced from several weeks to less than a week. When the American public is traveling abroad in greater numbers than ever before, this is good news, and I want to join in paying tribute to the director and staff of the Passport Office.

Further steps to improve passport office procedures can be made, and are outlined in S. 3340, which was reported by the Government Operations Committee yesterday, and in which the members of our committee are deeply interested. I hope the bill will be speedily enacted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASSIGNMENT TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY AND APPOINTMENT OF ITS CHAIRMAN

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority steering committee, I send to the desk an order and a resolution relating to the vacancy created on the Committee on the Judiciary by the passing of our late and beloved colleague, Harley M. Kilgore.

The resolution would name as chairman of the committee the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. The order would name the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to the vacancy which now exists on the committee.

The Senate majority steering committee came to its decision on both the order and the resolution without objection. They accord with the rules and precedents which govern the organization of the Senate. The senior Senator from Mississippi, of course, is the ranking majority member of the committee. The senior Senator from West Virginia is the ranking majority Member of the Senate who has applied for the vacancy.

I should like the RECORD to show that the senior Senator from West Virginia, during his earlier service in the Senate, was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. He was a member of that committee at the time he left the Senate voluntarily to return to his State to accept the responsibility of the governorship of West Virginia.

I move that there be first considered the order filling the vacancy on the Committee on the Judiciary by assigning the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to that committee; then the resolution naming the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the order for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the order, as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 223), as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, appointed chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in the organization of the Senate it is customary for the party which controls the Senate to have the responsibility of naming committee chairmen and assigning committee members representing the majority party.

I believe that is a principle and a precedent without which the organization of the Senate would become chaotic.

On the basis of the recommendation of the Democratic majority leadership and its very properly constituted steering committee, and in line with the fact that the majority party should have the opportunity of naming the chairman of the committee and assigning its members to committees, I support the action of the Democratic majority.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] to proceed to the consideration of the order assigning the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to membership on the Committee on the Judiciary. The clerk will read the order again for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the order, as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senate considering a motion to take up the order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. But the order itself is debatable, is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, is not the matter which is now before the Senate the consideration of the order which would name the Senator from West Virginia as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the order naming the Senator from West Virginia as a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I express my great satisfaction in being able to vote for the distinguished Senator from West Virginia as a member of the Judiciary Committee. I have worked very closely with the distinguished Senator for a number of years, and I have for him the highest regard, admiration, and affection. I think he will undoubtedly make a highly useful and valuable member of the committee, and I am very happy indeed to vote for him as a member of the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the order.

The order was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the resolution naming the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 223) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, appointed

chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution naming the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I feel compelled by dictates of conscience to register a protest in opposition to the appointment of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] to the chairmanship of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I have tried to resolve every doubt in favor of following in this matter the usual custom and tradition of the Senate in elevating to the chairmanship of a committee the next Senator in line in order of seniority. However, it is to be noted that the seniority practice in the Senate is a custom and a tradition and not a rule. It is also to be noted that there are a few precedents in the Senate in which the custom has not been followed.

For the purpose of the RECORD I wish to read a memorandum which I asked the Parliamentarian to prepare for me on precedents of the Senate in which the custom has not been followed. He could find but 3, and these are the 3:

On March 10, 1871, during the 1st session of the 42d Congress, the Senate proceeded to the matter of the election of the standing committees for that Congress.

An order was submitted showing the chairman and members of the various committees, among them being the name of Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. For a number of Congresses, the committee was headed by Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, as chairman, but he also was dropped as a member of the said committee.

After a somewhat lengthy debate, Senator Sumner's name, on his own motion, was stricken from the list of members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the resolution as amended was agreed to by a vote of 33 yeas, nays 9.

A reading of the debate leaves no doubt about the fact that in the Sumner case the Senate made an exception to the custom of seniority which we have come to call the rule of seniority. I suppose it can be described as an unwritten rule of the Senate.

The next exception to the custom of seniority was the Cummins case:

On December 10, 1923, the 1st session of the 68th Congress, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, submitted an order designating the members of the standing committees of the Senate for that Congress. Senator Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa, who had been chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce since 1919, when the Republicans obtained control of the Senate, was again designated as chairman of that committee. Opposition developed to his reelection, and, by unanimous consent, the committee assignments provided in the order, including chairmanships, were agreed to, with the exception of the chairmanship of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, upon which a separate rollcall was ordered.

On the first ballot Senator Cummins received 41 votes, Senator Smith, of South Carolina, the ranking Democratic member, received 39 votes, and Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., of Wisconsin, received 7 votes. No Senator having received a majority of the votes cast, which was required by the rule, there was consequently no election.

Numerous ballots were subsequently taken from time to time, and it was not until January 9, 1924, that the matter was finally determined by the election of Senator Smith. He received 39 of the 74 votes cast, the vote on each ballot being divided among 3 candidates.

Again, Mr. President, the Cummins case is an example of the custom or rule of seniority not being followed:

I now refer to the third case:

On March 10, 1924, Senator Lenroot, of Wisconsin, in a letter to the Presiding Officer of the Senate, resigned as chairman and member of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. (Senate Journal, 68th Cong., 1st sess., p. 198).

On March 13, 1924, an order was submitted by Mr. Lodge, of Massachusetts, and agreed to by unanimous consent, appointing Senator Ladd, of North Dakota, who was then the second ranking majority member, as chairman. Senator Smoot, of Utah, the ranking majority member, was chairman of the Committee on Finance. (Senate Journal, 68th Cong., 1st sess., p. 205.)

The 69th Congress came into being on March 4, 1925, and a special session of the Senate was called by the President on the same day at 12 o'clock noon.

On March 7, 1925, Senator Watson, of Indiana, submitted an order that so much of rule XXIV as provides for the appointment of the standing committees by ballot be suspended, to which an objection was made by Senator Borah, of Idaho. (Senate Journal, 69th Cong., special session, contained in Journal of 68th Cong., 2d sess., p. 301.)

On March 9, 1925, the Senate agreed unanimously to Mr. Watson's order, and he then submitted an order designating the chairman and members of the various standing committees, which the Senate proceeded to consider. Senator Stanfield, of Oregon, was named chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. Senator Norris, of Nebraska, moved to substitute Senator Ladd's name for that of Senator Stanfield. Senator Walsh, of Montana, moved to amend the latter motion so as to require a vote by rollcall, and that each Senator vote for his choice as chairman. Pending debate on this matter, a unanimous-consent agreement proposed by Senator Robinson, of Arkansas, was agreed to, permitting Members of the minority (the Democrats) to refrain from voting or to answer "present" on the question of agreeing to the Norris motion.

Vice President Dawes held that Mr. Walsh's motion was not in order as being contravention of the order by Senator Watson, previously agreed to.

A unanimous-consent request by Mr. Heflin, of Alabama, was then agreed to, providing that when the roll was called for the election of a chairman of the said committee any Senator who desired to do so could vote for the candidate of his choice.

In accordance with Mr. Heflin's order, the Senate proceeded to vote by ballot for the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. Fifty-two votes were cast, a majority being 27. Senator Stanfield received 36 votes, Senator Ladd 13, and Senator Jones, of New Mexico, 3 votes.

The President pro tempore (Mr. George H. Moses, of New Hampshire) announced that Mr. Stanfield, having received a majority of the votes cast for candidates, was elected chairman of the said committee.

Mr. Norris made the point of order that under the vote cast there was no election, Mr. Stanfield not having received a majority of the total number of Senators voting and answering "present."

The President pro tempore overruled the point of order. (Journal, p. 303.)

It is to be noted that in the third case Mr. Ladd, who had seniority to the chairmanship under the unwritten rule, was not designated to the chairmanship; instead it went to Mr. Stanfield.

I have cited these three precedents, the only ones which the Parliamentarian was able to find, because I would be the first to point out to the Senate today that the unwritten rule of seniority has been the custom followed by the Senate throughout its history in connection with the appointments of chairmen of committees, save and except for these three variances.

It is my judgment that the present vacancy in the chairmanship of the Committee on the Judiciary justifies making another exception to the seniority custom of the Senate. It is not easy for me, nor is it a pleasant duty, to discuss this matter, and I wish to assure the Senate that I do so impersonally and without rancor.

The chairman of any Senate committee in his administrative work as chairman of a given committee is the agent of the Senate. He is responsible to the Senate in carrying out his chairmanship duties, and the Senate is responsible for him. Under the rules of the Senate each Senator is entitled to assignment to two major committees as a matter of right. No Senator is entitled to assignment to the chairmanship of any committee as a matter of right. Therefore, it follows that it is entirely within the discretion and judgment of the Senate, in the absence of any rule to the contrary, to assign Senators to committee chairmanships.

As each Member of this body knows, the influence and authority exercised by the chairman of any Senate committee over the work of a committee is very great. By practice, tradition, and custom committee chairmen exercise broad powers and influence in respect to the appointment of staff committee personnel. Even though a committee goes through the formality of approving the staff personnel recommended by the chairmen, it is not customary in Senate practice to deny to a committee chairman the committee staff personnel that he wants.

Here again each of us knows of exceptions. Here again we know that in certain instances a great deal of debate and discussion takes place within committee meetings in regard to staff personnel. Of course, since the passage of the Reorganization Act, when a committee is considering the matter of the selection of a so-called professional staff, a much greater influence, in most cases, has been exercised by the members of a committee in the selection of a professional staff. But as to the so-called administrative staff of a committee, it is still, I submit, the common practice in the Senate to let the chairman of the

committee exercise, after all, the controlling discretion, influence, and decision in regard to such appointments. Also in respect to the appointments of individuals to the professional staff of a Senate committee the wishes of the chairman of the committee are usually controlling.

In a very real sense, the work of a Senate committee will not be any better than the quality, ability, and devotion to duty of the members of the committee staff.

A committee chairman exercises great authority in determining the scheduling of committee hearings or, for that matter, in determining whether or not committee hearings will be held, in many instances. His influence and authority is very great in the appointment of subcommittees of a committee. In fact, the chairman of a Senate committee can truly be said to be in the driver's seat. Long-established tradition, customs, and practice throughout the history of the Senate has made it so.

As the Members of this body know, I have recommended for many years that the so-called seniority rule of the Senate, which is not a rule at all but only a custom, should be modified. Instead of its being a controlling criterion in almost every instance for the promotion of a Senator to the chairmanship of a committee, I think it should be only one of many criteria in determining committee chairmanship selections. It is my position that members of committees should follow the democratic process of electing their committee chairmen on the basis of selecting the man who the members of the committee believe most merits the appointment when all meritorious criteria are taken into consideration.

Mr. President, about 2 years ago, I think it was, I discussed this question as a witness before a Senate committee. At that time I stated at some length my views as to why I thought the seniority system of the Senate should be changed, both in respect to committee assignments and also in respect to committee chairmanships. I have always drawn a distinction with respect to the rule of seniority within the Senate in relation to committee assignments and the application of the rule of seniority to the selection of a committee chairman. I think the transcript of that record will show that under cross-examination I said, in effect: If the committee should decide that the business of the Senate would be best transacted by the committee under the chairmanship of a member of the minority party at the time, I could see no good reason why a member of the minority party should not be elected as chairman. I have favored for a long time the election of committee chairmen either by a committee itself, or a conference of the majority party, or by the entire Senate itself. It is said by some that the election system will create more abuses than the seniority system. I do not believe it. I think we should give it a trial. I think the present system is so bad that we owe it to the country to work out an election system for selecting committee chairmen.

I want it to be distinctly understood that anything I say today in regard to the chairmanship of the Committee on the Judiciary is completely divorced from any question as to the right of the senior Senator from Mississippi to sit in this body. That matter is not under discussion at all, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned. The people of the great State of Mississippi placed upon the senior Senator from Mississippi a great trust. It was their right to place it upon his shoulders, and I certainly respect their sovereign right.

But as the chairman of a Senate committee, a Senator becomes my agent. He becomes the agent of each Member of the Senate, because I look upon committee chairmen as agents of the Senate, responsible to us as a body, and I consider the Senate to be responsible for their conduct. Therefore, briefly, my objection to the appointment now before us for consideration is that I feel the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary should be a Senator who I can assure the people to whom I am responsible is a person of complete impartiality in carrying out the duties of the Committee on the Judiciary.

It is a matter of sadness to me to say that, in my judgment, the senior Senator from Mississippi, from his own lips, has proved his own partiality in regard to a matter of great concern to the Senate and to the country in relationship to the judiciary of the Nation.

We must not overlook the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary is the committee which holds hearings on all nominations for the Federal judiciary, including the Supreme Court. I think, Mr. President, we owe it to the people of the United States, to the courts, and to the bar of the country to make it absolutely certain that when we appoint a chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, we appoint a completely impartial person in respect to the duties and the jurisdiction of the committee over which he will preside as chairman, if he be appointed.

I make these comments because I want the Senate to understand that when I ask for an exception today to the custom of seniority in the selection of committee chairmanships it is in line with a point of view I have held long before the instant case ever arose in the Senate.

Now I shall say a few words about the instant case. I wish to make it very clear again that, in my judgment, it is up to the people of each sovereign State to decide as to what man or woman shall represent them in the United States Senate. In my judgment, as I have said on the record previously in connection with another controversy in the Senate, it is, after all, the voters of the State, in the last analysis, who should determine the selection of their Senator. The Senator so selected should remain in this body, under our rules, save and except when it can be shown that he has been guilty of some conduct which, under the rules of the Senate, disqualifies him for the office. However, when we come to pass upon the qualifications of a Senator to serve as our agent in the capacity of a committee chairman, we owe it to the people of the Nation to make certain that we select an impartial chairman. It is wrong for us to knowingly select as chairman of any committee a Senator whose record raises serious doubts as to whether or not he will carry out the duties of chairman in an impartial and proper manner.

Therefore, I respectfully submit that the record of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] creates serious doubts as to his impartiality in respect to the duties and obligations which would necessarily confront him as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I look upon that post as having many of the obligations and responsibilities of a quasi-judicial position. In a sense, the chairman of the committee is a quasi-judicial officer and his ability to act judiciously on issues that come before him for administrative determinations is of paramount importance to the Senate. I do not believe that the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has made a record which assures me that he would be an impartial chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

As a lawyer, I am greatly concerned about some of the utterances of the senior Senator from Mississippi in regard to the judiciary. In particular his extreme attacks upon the United States Supreme Court shocks my sense of fairness. They show a bias which raise serious doubts in my mind as to the ability of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] to act impartially upon matters coming before the committee which may involve the Supreme Court. I do not intend to speak at length on the question, because I do not think much needs to be said about my point that there is serious question as to the impartiality of the senior Senator from Mississippi. My proof comes from the lips of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] himself. His speeches of record substantiate my fears as to his lack of impartiality and judicious qualities.

I would refer to a speech made in the Senate by the senior Senator from Mississippi on May 27, 1954, in commenting upon a very burning, serious, and critical issue, the issue of the integration of white and colored children in our schools. I do not think anyone appreciates more than I do how serious that issue is. I believe I am cognizant, too, of the great crisis which exists in our country in respect to the effects of the application of the decision of the Supreme Court on that issue.

But America has come a long way in her history. The fact that the American people recognize universally the great and glorious constitutional ideal of a government by law, not of men, and recognize also that the unity of our country, in the last analysis, is dependent upon full compliance with the decisions by the highest constitutional judicial tribunal of our country, is not even subject to debate. Government by law cannot survive in our Nation if decisions of the United States Supreme Court are ever permitted to be successfully defied. Defiance of rule by law is rebellion. Our democracy can be no stronger than our law abidance. Our Union becomes disunion if the people of any State or region secede in effect from

their patriotic duty to comply with the law of the land as laid down by the United States Supreme Court.

I am not an overnighter in the matter of race adjustments. I never have been. My record is replete with statements in which I have pointed out that a course of patience and understanding should be pursued. A waiting period for adjustment to integration is essential in the national interest for the ultimate solution of this great legal and sociological problem. But open defiance of a decision of the United States Supreme Court cannot be condoned. Neither can advocacy by Government officials of dilatory tactics and evasions of the Supreme Court decision be countenanced.

Mr. President, I have also made clear time and time again—and want to reemphasize my position—that I hold firmly to the conviction that, as a matter of constitutional law and legal right in this great Republic, there cannot be any discrimination based upon race, color, or creed, in respect to the rights of all citizens to equal treatment under the Federal Constitution. It is my view that as a matter of constitutional law any attempt on the part of any State to apply a principle of discrimination based upon race, color, or creed which denies to all citizens equal liberty is unconstitutional and is in defiance of the spirit and the burning flame of individual liberty lighted by the Constitution itself.

On the particular question at issue reasonable men and honest and sincere men have a great difference of opinion. Yet I hold to the proposition, Mr. President, that this Republic cannot survive if we permit, in our generation, a retreat to the doctrine of nullification espoused by John C. Calhoun.

Mr. President, in my judgment the doctrine of interposition is nothing but the doctrine of nullification in disguise. I mean it when I say that I have very dear friends among Senators from the South. My differences with them are entirely professional. My difference with them in regard to the question of interposition is a difference over the interpretation of our constitutional system of government.

I happen to believe that the Supreme Court of the United States, in its unanimous decision on this issue, is irrefutably right as a matter of law. If it were not sound constitutional doctrine, Mr. President, then, in my judgment, I would have no right to take the position that the South should adjust itself to this decision on integration and do so in good faith and without dilatory delay.

I believe, Mr. President, we are going to have to make this educational adjustment through the application of the rules of reason. We are going to have to rise above emotional attitudes. We are going to have to come to grips with the fact that within the Constitution, and in accordance with the rights guaranteed by the Constitution, the Supreme Court has said to 166 million American people that in our Republic there cannot be discrimination among the races in the field of public education where an attempt is made to segregate the races.

Now, having said that, Mr. President—and I do not wish to talk longer on that subject in connection with this committee chairmanship appointment, because I think the integration issue ought to be discussed at greater length at a later time—I want to say I feel that the position which has been taken by the senior Senator from Mississippi on this issue raises serious question as to his impartiality to serve as chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Please understand, Mr. President, I am not saying that if one holds a view contrary to that of the Supreme Court on integration matters, he is not qualified to serve as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. That is not my protest. That is not the basis of my objection to this appointment. My objection to the appointment goes to the language that the Senator from Mississippi has used in public utterances, which I think forces upon me the inference and the conclusion that I cannot count upon his impartiality to serve as chairman of the Judiciary Committee in respect to problems which come before that committee for determination. I think that is particularly true in respect to nominations to the Federal bench. Do not forget that all nominations to the Federal bench come before the Judiciary Committee to which it is proposed to appoint the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] as chairman.

So I turn for a few quotations from the Senator's speech of May 27, 1954, in which he was discussing the Supreme Court decision on integration. He said, in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 6, page 7251:

> Mr. President, a court cannot enforce its will in these fields. Racial instincts are normal, natural, human instincts. It is natural that persons of every race hybrids only excepted, desire to associate with their own kind, and to maintain the purity of their own race. To do the things which the Court is attempting to do is beyond the power of Government.
>
> It will justly cause—

I emphasize the words "It will justly cause"—

> in my judgment, evasion and violation of law and contempt for law, and will do this country great harm.
>
> These decisions, coming at a time of grave world crisis, when there should be unity in the United States, will cause great dissension and will weaken us internally.

The Senator's use of the language "It will justly cause" disturbs me very much. It would seem to imply an encouragement on his part to law evasion and violation.

The Senator from Mississippi further said, in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 6, page 7253:

> They consider that the requirement to integrate the white and colored children in the public schools will break down and destroy their established usages, customs, and traditions. Such a requirement does violence to the sentiment of both races. Southern people know that if the Supreme Court attempts to impose such a requirement upon them by force, stern resistance, and lawlessness will inevitably result, regardless of whether the requirement is invoked forthwith or gradually.
>
> Mr. President, the white people of the South correctly assume that they cannot be forced to integrate their children with the colored children in the same public schools. Many believe that the Supreme Court decision is applicable in only the 5 specific school districts involved in the cases now before the Supreme Court, and cannot be made applicable to the 11,173 other districts where segregation has been legal and usually practiced, until an unless individual and separate suits are brought against each district.

It is to be noted that by his language the Senator seems to consider that it is correct to assume that integration cannot be enforced.

Later the Senator from Mississippi said:

> Eminent lawyers in the South rightly predict that the Supreme Court decision will introduce the Century of Litigation in the South. They point out that the present decision differs, insofar as enforcement is concerned, from previous decisions rendered against segregation in public carriers, and other forms of alleged discrimination. Decisions against railroads gave a basis for damage suits. In land-covenant cases the Court simply refused to enforce the covenants.
>
> The Court has now held in a series of individual cases that segregation in public schools, under varied existing State laws, is unconstitutional. The Court has not, and cannot, devise a formula to prevent or prohibit the legislatures of the several States from enacting new laws. Each new law devised to maintain segregation must in turn be tested in the Court, in individual cases, to determine its constitutionality. Will the Supreme Court presume to enjoin members of a State legislature, individually or collectively, from the performance of their lawful and constitutional duties? If they attempted this absurdity and if the people resorted to the right to enact laws by referendum, will the entire electorate of a State be subjected to the alleged injunctive power of the Federal courts? Of course not. This is an absurdity.

Such language as I have just read I respectfully submit is not an inducement to law enforcement and compliance with the decision of the United States Supreme Court as the supreme law of the land.

Later in his speech the Senator from Mississippi said:

> Mr. President, I am greatly concerned about the gravity of the situation and the tragic consequences to which it may lead. The far-reaching effects of these unsound decisions should be a matter of great concern to every intelligent citizen of this Nation. In these decisions the Supreme Court has usurped the legislative powers of the Congress and of the legislatures of the separate States. It sits as a constitutional convention in judicial robes, and has arrogated unto itself the sovereign powers of the American people, speaking through their Congress and the State legislatures, to amend our Constitution.
>
> Mr. President, since 1937, the Supreme Court has overruled 33 earlier decisions. This is by the count of one of the Justices. Those decisions were the settled law of the land; decisions on which rights were vested; decisions on which the people of this country had the right to rely. This record is unprecedented in our history. In the 135 years prior to 1937, only 29 cases were overruled, compared to 33 cases in 16 years. Such a record obviously reveals an irresponsible Court. I think it shows an incompetent Court. Such a record shows that the Court legislates, and is constantly grasping additional power. It is attempting to place itself in absolute control of the country.
>
> Under such a dispensation no constitutional rights are safe; no personal rights are safe. No property rights are secure. None

of the great American rights of human liberty are secure while these men in judicial robes, many without practical legal experience or sound judgment of the law, sit as a Congress and Constitutional Convention combined.

This is strong language, Mr. President. It is language so strong in its bias against the Supreme Court that I cannot escape the conclusion that it would be difficult if not impossible for the Senator who spoke the words to be impartial on Federal judicial matters. At least it is a risk that I do not propose to run by voting for his appointment to the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee.

Later in the same speech, the Senator from Mississippi said:

Such, Mr. President, is the importance attached to the integrity and impartiality of the Supreme Court by the most famous European analyst of the American system of government. Happily for America, the highest standards of impartiality, propriety, and honesty have generally been adhered to by members of this Court.

Today, however, a trend away from traditional standards of propriety begins to be in evidence. Our Court has been indoctrinated and brainwashed by left-wing pressure groups. The Court is out of step with the American people. We see Justices of the Supreme Court banqueted and honored by left-wing Communist-front organizations militantly interested in legislation on which the Supreme Court must pass.

Later in the speech the Senator from Mississippi said:

Mr. President, the police power of the State under our system of Government is supreme and absolute to prescribe regulations to promote, secure, and maintain public order and to promote the health, morals, and education of the people. It is my judgment that when schools are not segregated because of race, but are segregated instead under the State's police power to preserve order, prevent riots, and physical harm—occurrences which in my judgment will be widespread—then the recent decision would not apply.

Mr. President, there is another angle of this matter which I will now discuss: The governor of a sovereign State can use the force at his command, both police, civil, and other, to maintain public order, and prevent crime and riots. He can use these forces to prevent racial integration of schools if this is necessary, under the police power of the State, to prevent disorder and riots. In fact, it is his duty to preserve order and prevent turmoil and strife within the State. Should he fail to perform such duty, he would be subject to impeachment. He is accountable to no one except the legislature and the people of his State. He is the governor of a sovereign State, and the Supreme Court cannot control and direct his actions, under the American system of government. If the Court do so, we would not have a dual system of government, with its division of powers. The Court could not cite him for contempt. If it did so, he certainly would ignore the summons, and ignore it with impunity.

Mr. President, the only weapon possessed by the Court is the citation for contempt, and that is an ineffective weapon. It is an impractical weapon, because the Supreme Court cannot operate the schools of the Southern States.

We desire friendly racial relations. We desire progress and racial understanding. I believe that without the intervention of northern meddlers, segregated schools would continue by mutual agreement of the leaders of both races.

The Negro will receive just treatment. His children will be educated. His standard of living has increased, and will continue to increase. But the racial questions which confront the South are social and not economic. This grave question should be settled with justice to both races.

Of course, Mr. President, without debating the matter today, I would respectfully say that I think the race problem in respect to the integration issue now is primarily a legal problem. We have the legal problems of whether we are to carry out the law of the land and whether the supreme law of the land is going to remain supreme.

These and other statements which have been made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] will, in my judgment, cause many persons to believe that if he becomes chairman of the Judiciary Committee, then, because of his own utterances, he simply will be unable to be impartial in carrying out the duties of his office, particularly as they relate to judicial nominations.

Then, too, Mr. President, I feel that under our system of separation of powers, the Senate owes a great obligation to the Supreme Court, in that I believe we owe to the Supreme Court an obligation of great respect. We owe an obligation not to appoint as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee a Senator who has expressed himself as the Senator from Mississippi has expressed himself in regard to the Federal judiciary. We should not appoint a Senator who, I believe, through such expressions shows a bias that will cause his impartiality to be questioned, and rightly so, by many persons.

For example, Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has been reported, at least in the press, as having taken a stand on the Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Sobeloff, whose nomination for appointment to the circuit court of appeals is pending. The Senator from Mississippi is reported, at least, to have said—in explaining his opposition to the nomination—that the Solicitor General strongly advocated integration in public schools. Mr. President, I hope we have not reached the point where consideration of a nomination before the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Senate will be influenced in any way at all by the fact that the nominee as a great Solicitor General of the United States holds to the same point of view that the Supreme Court has laid down as the supreme law of the land in respect to the integration issue.

There is justification for great concern—as shown by utterances such as the one to which I have just referred—as to whether such nominations will receive from this committee, if the proposed appointment to the chairmanship is approved, the impartiality of treatment that is deserved.

The last point I wish to make goes to statements alleged to have been made by the Senator from Mississippi in the midst of the campaign for his last election. It is alleged that during that campaign, the Senator from Mississippi, in speaking in Mississippi, made the following statement in the course of a speech, while speaking about the blocking of civil-rights bills in the Congress:

For several years they were filibustered, and after 1950, they were all blocked in the Civil Rights Committee. Do you know how? Why, fate gave me the opportunity to play a crucial role in that controversy. Late in 1949, Howard McGrath, Senator from Rhode Island, was appointed Attorney General of the United States, and because of seniority I was maneuvered into chairmanship of the Civil Rights Subcommittee. Yes, EASTLAND, of Mississippi, became the boss of the committee that had all the civil-rights bills. And ever since then the CIO and these organizations have been yapping and yapping that I was arrogant and high-hatted with them, and so I was; and they said that I broke the law, and so I did.

You know, the law says the committee has got to meet once a week; and there I was chairman of the committee, and there were northerners up there, Yankees, that didn't know anything about the question, who were lined up against us. Do you know what happened? Why, for the 3 years I was chairman, that committee didn't hold a meeting.

Such statements as I have just read taken from a speech which I understand the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] delivered in the midst of his last campaign in Mississippi do not instill in me any confidence that he would serve impartially as chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, there is more that I could quote in support of the conclusion and judgment I have reached, reluctantly and sadly, that the senior Senator from Mississippi would not be an impartial agent of the Senate as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Because of that conclusion I must today record my opposition to the pending resolution and vote against it. I think we owe it to the Senate and to the country to make certain that no reasonable question can be raised as to the impartiality of any man we appoint to the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee. The chairman of that very important committee has great authority and influence over legal and judicial matters falling within the purview and jurisdiction of the committee.

I sincerely hope that in these brief remarks I have demonstrated the spirit, intent, and motivation expressed at the beginning of my speech, namely, that I speak impersonally and without rancor—in fact, with great sadness. Nevertheless, as one who is driven by what he considers to be right, and what his conscience tells him is his duty, I must object to this appointment.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LEHMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to ask the Senator from Oregon a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad indeed to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am a little confused about the statement just made by my good friend from Oregon. I should like to ask him a question.

Is it the Senator's position that the affairs of the Judiciary Committee are

conducted in such a way that one man can dictate to the full committee what ought to be done? Is it the Senator's belief that the chairman has the final say-so as to the committee's activities or its recommendations?

Mr. MORSE. I did not say that.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the impression which I believe the Senator left.

Mr. MORSE. The chairman of any committee exercises great influence over the committee. I believe that when we appoint a chairman of a committee, we should appoint one with respect to whom each one of us can say to himself that he is satisfied he will perform the duties of that chairmanship impartially.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. However, it strikes me that if the chairman of a committee, or the chairman of a subcommittee, violates any rules and attempts to deny the majority of the Senators on the committee an opportunity to do what they may think is right, the majority can take appropriate action. It has been my experience that a chairman cannot overrule a majority vote of his committee. Therefore, I cannot quite understand the argument advanced by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Louisiana can speak from his experience as a member of Senate committees. The Senator from Oregon speaks from his experience. My experience has been that chairmen of committees exercise great influence and much control over the administrative business and affairs of such committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. That may be, but, if it is, that situation obtains because the majority of the committee permits the chairman to exercise such influence. Otherwise, there is no power on earth that could stop the majority, if it desired to get together and vote upon a proposal which, contrary to the views of the chairman, the majority felt should be considered. The majority of a committee is always capable of checking any action by its chairman. The majority is always in control of the committee, provided it desires to exercise that control.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think either the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from Oregon is going to change the customs and practices that have grown up in the Senate in respect to the great powers which committee chairmen have come over the years to exercise. The fact is that committees generally accede to the wishes of their chairmen in respect to the many administrative matters to which I have alluded today. Unless a chairman is impartial in carrying out his duties, great injustice can be done.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I cannot vote for the pending resolution naming the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] to the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee. I must ask that my vote be recorded in the negative.

The act of electing the Senator from Mississippi chairman of the Judiciary Committee is an act of the Senate, under the rules, making him the agent of the Senate in carrying out the duties of Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

That committee handles and disposes of more than half the legislation that is submitted to the Senate.

That committee handles all legislation dealing with the Criminal Code, with the Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, and above all, with the laws implementing the Bill of Rights of the Constitution. That committee considers proposed amendments to the Constitution. That committee authorizes appropriations for the courts, including the Supreme Court.

The Judiciary Committee also has jurisdiction of measures providing for the apportionment of Representatives to the Congress under the Constitution.

All claims against the United States which come before the Congress must be passed upon by that committee.

That committee handles all legislation dealing with immigration and citizenship.

That committee handles most legislation dealing with civil right and civil liberties.

That committee handles all nominations to positions in the Department of Justice which require the advice and consent of the Senate.

That committee handles all nominations to positions concerned with prosecutions under the laws of the United States, including United States district attorneys and United States marshals.

That committee handles all nominations to the Federal courts of the land, including, of course, and above all, the Supreme Court of the United States.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee appoints the members and chairmen of all subcommittees. The chairman establishes the agenda and determines what matters shall be brought up and what shall not be considered. The chairman controls and directs the activities of the staff, the largest staff of any committee of the Senate; and, because of the technical nature of much of the subject matter, his position is more critical to the operations of the committee, and of the Senate, than in the case of almost any other committee chairman in the Senate.

The chairman is the duly constituted and duly authorized agent of the Senate in exercising powers which are greater and more extensive, in the mass, than those enjoyed by any other Member of the Senate, in my judgment, with the possible exception of the majority leader.

How can I cast my vote, how can the Senate cast its vote, to have this position filled by the senior Senator from Mississippi?

Rule 24 of the rules of the Senate plainly calls upon the Senate to elect its committee chairmen. It is an act of authorization and agency, however automatic and routine it may usually be. The act of taking that vote and approving the designation of a particular person as chairman of a particular committee is an act of deliberation and, as any vote must be, is a conscious act of affirmation or rejection.

There is a tradition of seniority. I do not intend at this time to discuss the merits or demerits of that tradition. I am informed that it has been breached in the past on a number of occasions without destroying the tradition.

Now, if ever, there is justification for setting that tradition aside, in the special case of the senior Senator from Mississippi, and in the special case of the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee.

Every Member of the Senate, and every private individual, is entitled to his personal beliefs, political ideology, philosophy, prejudices, preferences, loves, and hates, repugnant as some of them may be to other Members of the Senate, subject to the judgment of the voters of the State he represents, and subject also to the judgment of the Senate as a whole as to his qualifications to sit as a Member of the Senate.

In considering appointments to committees, the Senate has a right, and even a duty, under the rules, to judge whether a particular Senator is qualified and entitled to sit on a particular committee.

But above all, in designating committee chairmen, the Senate has the inescapable responsibility of expressing its judgment in particular cases.

In the case of the Senator from Mississippi, in relation to the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee, I believe that his particular prejudices, views, and activities—to which he may be freely entitled as a private individual and as an American citizen—completely disqualify him from presiding as chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

I certainly will not cast my vote, regardless of any tradition of the Senate, in favor of such a designation.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has said on the floor of the Senate:

> We will protect and maintain white supremacy throughout eternity.

He has said on the floor of the Senate:

> The Negro race is an inferior race.

He has said on the floor of the Senate:

> Let me say frankly that in my judgment the CIO and the PAC are Communist organizations.

He has said on the floor of the Senate:

> New York, for all practical purposes, is a Communist State.

He has said on the floor of the Senate that the Supreme Court has become "indoctrinated and brainwashed by leftwing pressure groups."

Mr. President, these are only some of the things he has said on the floor of the Senate of the United States. They are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In addition, Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has made numerous statements to the press, whose absolute authenticity I cannot verify, but must depend upon the newspaper reporters and the newspapers concerned.

He has referred to decisions of the Supreme Court as "corrupt decisions."

He has said, in reference to the Supreme Court decision on the school segregation cases:

> The Supreme Court, in the name of law and justice, has perpetrated a monstrous crime. (New York Post, December 2, 1955.)

But the Senator from Mississippi has not confined himself to speeches on the floor of the Senate and to press statements. He has joined in establishing organizations, and is a leader of those organizations, whose purpose is to nullify provisions of the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

He has joined in urging Southern States to declare themselves in defiance of the Supreme Court decision, according to the New York Times of December 14, 1955.

He has associated himself in a leadership role with the so-called white citizens councils whose purpose is to organize defiance to the Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, and which have engaged in activities which I consider to be wholly un-American and dangerous to American democracy.

Mr. President, it is obvious that the Senator from Mississippi and I are at opposite poles in some of the most fundamental questions of social philosophy. It is, of course, his right to have his own views, just as I have a right to mine, although mine, in this case, happen to be consistent with the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the Supreme Court, and his are not.

I believe that Senator EASTLAND is a symbol of racism in America.

I believe that Senator EASTLAND is a symbol of defiance to the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

I believe that Senator EASTLAND is precluded by philosophy, conviction, and activities from presiding over the Senate Judiciary Committee as chairman in an impartial way, and from discharging the agency of the Senate in that regard.

I shall therefore vote against the pending resolution

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long on the pending question. However, I have a few words to say in response to the allegations and charges made on the floor of the Senate.

In the beginning let me say that when I heard a few days ago that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was planning to oppose my colleague being made chairman of the committee, I said that if he did do it, he would do it in an impersonal way under his concept of his responsibility as a Member of the Senate. I was certainly justified in that prediction by the way the Senator has approached this matter. I wish to commend him for it publicly, not for bringing up the subject, but for the manner in which he presented it in an impersonal and senatorial way.

I believe the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] were also entirely impersonal.

I can hardly speak on the subject in a fully impersonal way, because it involves my colleague. However, I shall try to discuss the subject briefly and as impartially as I can, merely on the points both Senators have raised.

In the beginning I wish to say that I know my colleague perhaps as well as any other Senator knows him. I know something about the travail he goes through in making hard decisions, as I know something about the travail every Senator goes through in trying to do what he believes is best for the Nation's welfare in reaching sound decisions. I know of his deep and sincere concern when trying to reach the right conclusions and in doing the right thing on broad policy questions.

That is the basis for saying further that I believe his long tenure in the Senate, both as a Senator and as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and his integrity certainly entitle him to the position of chairman. His proven ability and his consistent energy certainly entitle him to it.

However, all those things aside—they really are not in issue here today—the question involves the customs and basic principles of the Senate as it plans and transacts its business. One of the cardinal and most helpful rules of the Senate is the rule of seniority, based upon maturity, experience, seasoning, ability to work with colleagues, and an understanding of the problems which confront committees. That rule should prevail unless there are overwhelming reasons to the contrary.

I submit that there are no reasons assigned and no bill of particulars given which even begin to seriously raise the question in this case.

First, I should like to refer to the Senator from Oregon and his charges with reference to a speech he said was made in Mississippi by the senior Senator from Mississippi. I had only an hour's advance notice that this matter would be brought up on the floor of the Senate today, but I did have an opportunity to refer to a campaign speech by my colleague that I understood might be mentioned by the senior Senator from Oregon.

The charges of the Senator from Oregon were based on facts concerning the chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi of the Senate Judiciary subcommittee which handled so-called civil rights bills, and the fact that although the subcommittee was supposed to meet once a week, it had not met for the last 2 years. Those charges pertain to the 82d Congress, which convened in 1951. The senior Senator from Mississippi was chairman of the subcommittee. The records pertaining to the civil rights bills have been checked with reference to these charges.

I base my information on the official files which have been checked. Seven such bills came before the Eastland subcommittee in the period in question during the time he was chairman of the subcommittee. No request was made at any time for hearings or for consideration by the subcommittee of those bills. The files have been checked, and no record has been found of any request in writing for such hearings, and the senior Senator from Mississippi has authorized me to say that there was no request made to him personally for any hearings on the bills or for any disposition of them. They were the same old bills which had been before the Judiciary Committees for many years, both in the Senate and in the House. They had therefore been researched many times, and many hearings had been held on them over a period of many years.

They were bills which were introduced at the convening of each new Congress, as every Member knows. None of the bills was ever reported favorably or adversely because there was no request to the subcommittee. Activity on such bills during this period centered in the House. The custom here is well understood and invariably followed that subcommittees do not act on bills unless requested to do so.

During the same period of time, four bills dealing with civil rights were referred to Senate committees other than the Committee on the Judiciary. Two bills were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; one was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; one was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Only one of those bills which were referred to the other committees was ever reported, and that bill died on the Senate Calendar. The other bills were not even reported.

So, Mr. President, during that session of the Congress, at least, the RECORD shows that there were no hearings requested and no activity by these Senate committees. Only one of the bills was ever reported to the Senate, and it was not passed upon.

I now show a comparison of House committee action in the 82d Congress. The Judiciary Committee Calendar of the House shows that 7 bills dealing with civil rights were referred to the House Judiciary Committee, and of these 1 was tabled by the committee, and the other 6 were not reported.

These are detailed record facts. In view of such fact, how could the Eastland subcommittee, or the chairman of it, on the bald statement of "no activity," be condemned or be convicted of any charges of misconduct or impropriety or neglect of duty, even by implication or otherwise?

Of course, the senior Senator from Mississippi was opposed to those bills. In discussing them during that speech, he was exercising one of the highest duties and responsibilities which any Senator can exercise. It is even a higher duty than is casting a vote. He was reporting his activities to his constituents. He was going before them seeking reelection. The people had a right to call for his record, and he had a right to discuss it before them. I think his language shows moderation.

I pass on, now, Mr. President, to mention briefly 1 or 2 other things which have been said here.

The Senator from Oregon referred to the doctrine of nullification, or the doctrine of interposition. There is under way a great debate in reference to what those terms mean and as to the history of the development of those ideas. There is no charge made here that the senior Senator from Mississippi ever defended nullification of any kind. To the contrary, Mr. President, many, many times in his speeches he has cautioned, and has always counseled legal ap-

proaches, lawful procedure, and orderly conduct.

While I am on that subject, Mr. President, that is the approach of all of those of us who are opposed to the decision of the Supreme Court. We object to the method and we object to the end result because we know that in great areas our people cannot live under a straitjacket imposed in the way in which it has been imposed, and we believe it was done without constitutional authority.

With great deference to the judiciary as an organ of our Government, the Supreme Court has always been a cockpit of controversy with reference to its decisions. Abraham Lincoln and others have criticized it severely. But I shall not go into that here. I shall say much more about it later.

But Senators can scan from beginning to end the record of the senior Senator from Mississippi and the arguments he has made. They will be found to counsel legal approaches and legal matters.

I should like to say one word with reference to the charges of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] about the senior Senator from Mississippi having sponsored organizations which the Senator from New York says are organized to nullify the Supreme Court's decision. He named the citizens councils organized in large areas of this country. He said they made efforts to defy the Constitution. His charges are not founded on facts.

I may say to the Senator from New York, speaking from my own personal knowledge with reference to the citizens councils in my home State—and I ask his attention, now—on my responsibility as a Member of this body and as a citizen, I can say of my personal knowledge that in many counties in Mississippi the citizens councils which the Senator from New York condemns here today—I think, because he does not know the facts—are offering the very finest kind of high-level leadership at the local level for our colored leaders who are bewildered by the efforts of those imposing outside leadership. In many cases it is to these local citizens councils in the counties that these fine Negro leaders go—ministers, teachers, and others—for encouragement and for an answer to the problems which face them. I can further say to the Senator from New York that these councils largely represent the constructive, patient, understanding leadership of white citizens that is absolutely necessary where the two races live together in large numbers.

But, in spite of their efforts, there is now a marked deterioration of the good race relations which have been built up for almost 100 years. There is a steady deterioration week after week. After all those outside influences have run their course and have torn down the fine relations which have existed, they will finally retire from the field of their destruction. Then, as heretofore, the same patient understanding local white and colored leaders will return to the scene and start their task over again.

That is the real and only hope for the right kind of relations between the races in great areas of the South today. I base my hope on that. I do not know when that rebuilding period can start, because I do not know how long the downward trend will continue, but those who are tearing down our race relations will finally retire, and then we shall have to build again. Until that atmosphere prevails, things will probably become worse instead of better, in spite of all that can be done to meet the situation.

The citizens councils and other groups like them are offering leadership to both the colored and white races in this field, which no one can understand unless he has lived there and gotten the feel of it and understands the innermost feelings and attitudes of those who are involved in the question.

So, Mr. President, with all deference to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York—and I have already said that I appreciate their feelings with reference to their duty—I respectfully submit to this great body that there has not been a scintilla of real evidence of any strength or value which even begins to point any finger of suspicion, by proof or by implication, with reference to the real qualifications of this outstanding, hard-working Senator, my colleague, for the chairmanship of this committee.

Upon his own merit, and under the customs of this great body, I hope the Senate will forthwith confirm the appointment. I predict for the senior Senator from Mississippi with his wonderful ability, an outstanding tenure of office. When he has assumed this office, I predict for him a distinguished record of helpful service as chairman of this truly great committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier in the debate the Senate listened to a disquisition by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in which he indicated his views on some of the legal questions which are currently being discussed throughout the country. I might say to him that as I listened to him state his position on such so-called legal doctrines as interposition and nullification, I agreed with him. I am one of those who have a dedicated desire to uphold the Constitution as it may be interpreted by the Supreme Court of this land. I think the doctrines of interposition and nullification are unsound, unconstitutional, wrong, and destructive.

That, however, if I may respectfully say so, is not the issue before the Senate on this occasion. The question before us is whether the majority Members of the Senate, who sit on the other side of the aisle, shall have the right to determine what the majority membership of the committees shall be, and, under a long established custom, who the chairmen of the committees shall be. That is a part of the history of the rules and regulations and the customs of the Senate.

On many occasions, as one of the newer Members of the Senate, I have tried to indicate my belief that some of the rules of this body need to be changed. I voted with a handful of Senators—no more than that—to amend the rules so as to get rid of the filibuster. It has been rather amusing to see some Senators who voted against the filibuster participate in filibusters subsequently on the floor. I do not quarrel with that. Filibusters are still a part of the proceedings of the Senate, if any Senator wishes to engage in them. So it is perfectly proper, I suppose, to indicate opposition to filibusters, but still to engage in them when the occasion arises.

On my right is the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], with whom I sponsored a resolution a year ago to provide, for the first time in the history of the rules of the Senate, a code of fair procedure with respect to the activities of committees. Thus far, nothing has been done with respect to the resolution. I must say that I question the seniority rule or custom as it has been passed down from generation to generation in the Senate.

However, the question has been quite accurately stated earlier. The question is, Should the majority membership of the Senate have the right to present the type of resolution which is now before the Senate, and to expect that Senators on the minority side will approve it? I answer the question in the affirmative.

I want to say, rather jocularly, but not entirely so, that the situation in the Senate is such that there are 49 members of the great Democratic Party and 47 members of the great Republican Party. One of our colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], was elected 5 years ago as a Republican. He saw fit to change his registration. I do not quarrel with his decision; I merely point to it. Then he moved over to the Democratic side. Had he not done so, the Republican Party in this year of 1956 would have controlled the committees of the Senate. So I say to my friend from Oregon that I rather regret his change of registration during the last term.

Had he not undertaken to make that change, the problem which some Senators have raised today would not now be before the Senate; and we on this side of the aisle would then have the responsibility of selecting from among us the Senator who we would believe could best serve in the capacity of chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and would have his name now before the Senate for consideration and for what I am certain would be the complete majority approval of the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall support the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. To comment upon the remarks and observations made by my friend, the junior Senator from California, I am certain he is aware of the fact that frequently in life we have to make a choice among evils.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the question before the Senate seems to me to offer an opportunity to make a few observations which I have had on my mind for a long time—long before this particular situation arose—revolving around the selection of a chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I suppose the Senator from Mississippi knows as well as I know that I do not agree with him about a good many things. I have differed with him in a great many respects during our joint membership in the Senate, particularly when I was the majority leader and was seeking to obtain votes on controversial questions, in which he cooperated with other Senators to prevent a vote. I was somewhat peeved at the Senator from Mississippi and also at some of our colleagues who joined in that enterprise. I might say that those Senators were so numerous that I did not get votes on many of the propositions on which I thought the Senate should vote.

I have disagreed on many problems with Members of the Senate who were chairman of other committees. I still disagree with some of them. If it were not for the intellectual friction which is created by debate in the Senate on fundamental ideals, this body would be even duller than it is. So I think it is advantageous to the country that we should differ now and then, and that we should have the courage to express our differences.

So when I say that I have differed and now differ with the Senator from Mississippi on many problems, I am only saying what I could say about other Senators.

I think it is unfortunate and regrettable that any Member of the United States Senate should anywhere, under any circumstances, urge the people, or any considerable number of them, to nullify, disregard, or flout the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Frequently we have heard, as we still hear, that ours is a government of laws, and not of men. I have never fully agreed with that theory. Ours is a government of laws and of men. Without men, we could have no laws, because men must enact the laws. Without men, the laws could not be interpreted, because it is necessary to interpret the laws. Without men, the laws could not be enforced.

So it has always seemed to me to be inconsistent, not only in the Senate, but elsewhere, for men to urge that ours is a government of laws, and not of men, when they oppose something; and then, on another occasion, when it suits their particular ideals or convenience, to urge that ours is a government of men, and not of laws.

To advocate or to urge that the people of the United States ignore the courts and to refuse to abide by their decisions would be, in effect, to nullify the law and to create men in their individual capacities as the interpreters and the executors of our laws. So I do not, in any sense, concur in the view that ours is a government either of laws or of men, separately; I contend that it is a government of laws and of men. Men must enact the laws. Men must interpret the laws; otherwise, they would be dead letters on our statute books.

Therefore, I regret to have to observe that any Senator, especially one who occupies a position of responsibility and leadership, should advocate that people ignore the laws as interpreted by our courts, because that would ultimately and inevitably lead to chaos, lawlessness, and disorder in our country.

These remarks are not directed particularly at any Senator, but to all of us generally. Notwithstanding the fact, Mr. President, that I have disagreed, and probably will continue to disagree, in some respects, with the Senator from Mississippi, I respect his integrity. I respect his sincerity. I respect his ability. The problem before the Senate today is whether we shall follow the custom—not the law or the rule, except in an unwritten way—which has been, with 3 exceptions, adhered to by the Senate for 165 years, or whether we shall upset the method by which the Senate chooses the chairmen of its committees.

During all the history of the country and the Senate there have been arguments sincerely made by both sides and by all sides as to how the Senate should select the chairmen of its committees. The Senate has from time immemorial considered that question. The La Follette-Monroney joint committee, in 1946, in considering the Reorganization Act, considered very carefully and in detail the question of the choosing of the chairmen of committees by seniority, or by some other method. The committee was not able to find any better method than that which has been in vogue in the Senate ever since its establishment.

It has been nearly 30 years since I came to this body. For nearly 14 years I was a Member of the House. I had considered the question in the other House, and I have considered it in the Senate. Much as I admit, and I am free to admit, the imperfections of the seniority system, we have as yet been unable to devise a better system than the seniority system for the selection of chairmen of committees.

It has often been suggested that chairmen of committees be elected by the committees. In that event the element of personalities and favoritism would come into play, and there would be logrolling and electioneering for the votes of the committee members by those who wanted to be chairmen. If the Senate should adopt that method I doubt very much that it would adhere to it very long, because it would result in a very unsatisfactory situation. Jealousies, ambitions, and all the frailties of human nature would crop out in the electioneering methods of men who wanted to be chairmen of committees.

I do not believe we could have a more satisfactory method by which the Senate selects chairmen of its committees than the method which has been in vogue, with the exception of the three cases mentioned, ever since the Senate was established.

In brief, the fact is that for nearly a century and three-quarters the Senate of the United States, as well as the House of Representatives, has chosen the chairmen of its committees by seniority, with rare exceptions, where the presumption of long experience and detailed knowledge of legislation has played some part. Neither House has ever been willing to adopt another method or has found a better method of choosing the chairmen of its committees.

While, as I have said, the system has its imperfections, on the whole it has brought forth some great men, men of outstanding intellect and character in the legislative history of the United States.

So, in the absence of any better method of choosing chairmen of committees, notwithstanding the fact that every now and then someone might become chairman of a committee to whose appointment we might be opposed, or entertain a feeling that it was not appropriate, neither I nor anybody else I know of has been able to suggest a better method for choosing the chairmen of our committees; and until somebody finds a better method I myself shall not advocate or approve of any other method by which chairmen of committees shall be selected.

We could go up and down the lists of our committees and express some opposition to a chairman or to his selection, based on our agreement or disagreement with his views about public matters, but here we recognize the right of every Senator, as we recognize the right of every American, to entertain views honestly arrived at, and to express his views; for of what value is it to think unless one can also speak? We believe in freedom of speech and freedom of thought.

So, Mr. President, without further imposition upon the time and patience of the Senate, I wish to say that I shall vote for the Senator from Mississippi to be chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, notwithstanding the fact that I disagree with him about a good many things, and he knows that I do.

I felt like making these remarks in justification of our method of choosing the chairmen of Senate committees, because any other method we might adopt, so far as I know now, would result in more harm than good, and would ultimately cause greater damage to the legislative process than would be caused by adhering to the system we have adopted and followed, with the three exceptions named by the Senator from Oregon, for whom I also have the deepest affection and respect.

For the reasons I have stated, I shall vote for the resolution submitted by my colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, to name the Senator from Mississippi chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 223) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the unfinished business was not laid before the Senate at 2 o'clock, because the resolution which was then under consideration was a privileged matter.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other

purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navaho (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided,* That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Fla., Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedkadee, Silt, and Smith Fork: *Provided further,* That as part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Goosberry, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-La Plata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided,* That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single offstream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications of the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

In the event that the Secretary finds that the benefits of the Curecanti unit do not exceed its costs, he shall give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper unit.

SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument.

SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided,* That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than 50 years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564): *Provided further,* That for a period of 10 years from the date of enactment of this act, no water from any participating project authorized by this act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security. All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "basin fund"), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act other than section 8.

(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: *Provided,* That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project; (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this act.

(d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this act, within a period of years not exceeding the expected economic life of such unit or participating project but not to exceed 100 years;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding 50 years.

(e) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the upper division in the following percentages: Colorado, 46 percent; Utah, 21.5 percent; Wyoming, 15.5 percent; and New Mexico, 17 percent; *Provided,* That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the Basin Fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

Revenue so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State

to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to this requirement there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this act, (2) costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within a period prescribed in the act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this act) of constructing said unit, project, or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation, and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this act. Costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by any participating project, and beyond the capability of such land to repay, shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Readjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said acts without the consent of the other contracting parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of water apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navaho initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

SEC. 11. Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purpose of this act, but not to exceed $760 million.

SEC. 13. In planning the additional development necessary to the full consumptive use in the upper basin of the waters of the Colorado River system allocated to the upper basin and in planning the use of and in using credits from net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the payouts of costs of participating projects herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of such States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River system consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to institute studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin of the effect upon the quality of water of the Colorado River, of all transmountain diversions of water of the Colorado River system and of all other storage and reclamation projects in the Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 16. As used in this act—

The terms "Colorado River Basin," "Colorado River compact," "Colorado River system," "Lee Ferry," "States of the upper division," "upper basin," and "domestic use" shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the upper Colorado River Basin compact;

The term "States of the upper Colorado River Basin" shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

The term "upper Colorado River Basin" shall have the same meaning as the term "upper basin";

The term "upper Colorado River Basin compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

The term "Rio Grande compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof; and

The term "economic life," as used herein in relation to repayment of costs allocated to power, shall mean the period during which the unit or project is expected to continue to provide the power and energy contemplated from the design and construction of the power facilities of the unit or project, due regard being given to historical experience with similar types of works, allowances included in replacement costs for replacing major items of equipment, and other pertinent factors which may affect the useful life.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

SENATOR MILLIKIN, OF COLORADO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on the occasion of the passage of what is known as the upper Colorado River storage bill in the House of Representatives, it seems only fitting and proper that those who

have had the vision and the foresight and the courage to fight and work for years for such a project should be mentioned. It would be very difficult, of course, to name all of them.

They include the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and many others. But I wish to speak particularly of my own colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Senator MILLIKIN has always been an active participant in Colorado River problems and their solutions since he came to the Senate in 1942.

Proposals before the Congress for developments in the lower Colorado River Basin were closely related to developments throughout the basin; and, so far as Senator MILLIKIN was concerned, developments in the State of Colorado were a part of the development in the upper basin. Continuous work by the Senator brought forth the interim report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Colorado River, which was printed as House Document No. 419 in the 80th Congress. The date of this document is July 1947. The efforts of Senator MILLIKIN were most helpful in connection with the upper Colorado River Basin compact. This was printed as Senate Document No. 8, 81st Congress, January 31, 1949.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate, Senator MILLIKIN held hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 145, 80th Congress, on May 10 to 14, inclusive, 1948. This resolution also expedited action by the United States to determine water rights on the river with respect to both upper and lower basins, but particularly its purpose was to settle the dispute in the lower basin.

The Senator participated in the hearings on S. 75 and Senate Joint Resolution 4, 81st Congress, which extended over a long period, namely, March 21 to 31, inclusive; April 2, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, 30, and May 2, 1949. This was a bill to authorize the central Arizona project.

Senator MILLIKIN was chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, which held hearings in the 83d Congress on S. 1555, a bill to authorize the Colorado River storage project. These hearings extended over 6 days, June 28 to July 3, inclusive, 1954. The Senator presented the report on the bill—Senate Report No. 1983—on July 26, 1954.

In the 84th Congress, Senator MILLIKIN participated actively in the hearings on S. 500, which, like S. 1555 in the previous Congress, would authorize the Colorado River storage project. These hearings extended from February 28 to March 5, inclusive, 1955.

Early in 1953, after President Eisenhower was inaugurated, Senator MILLIKIN, with other congressional representatives of the upper basin States, consulted with the President and with important administration and Cabinet members, including the then Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Interior, and others having responsibility over the proposal. These gentlemen became proponents of the storage project for the upper basin. Undoubtedly Senator MILLIKIN, as chairman of the Republican conference committee, was instrumental in bringing to the attention of men outside of the reclamation States the great importance of land and water development to the Nation as a whole, as well as to the States affected.

It seems to me that Senator MILLIKIN expressed in a well-rounded summary his philosophy with respect to the storage project, in the closing paragraphs of his speech on the floor of the Senate on April 18, 1955. They are as follows:

> Those of us who live under water-conservation projects which irrigate arid lands and which develop power, can see every day the direct and indirect benefits of incalculable size resulting from those projects.
>
> If I may mention my own State, I can say that wherever we have operating water projects, we have prosperity among individuals in the communities affected.
>
> If it were not for its water projects which help to produce a more rounded economy, the State of Colorado would be a State of scattered grazing activities, and it would be sending to the Treasury of the United States only a small fraction of the income taxes and other revenues which now amount to about three-quarters billion dollars annually.
>
> The proposed reservoirs for water conservation, river regulation, power production, and the participating areas for watering arid lands, will be wealth-producing assets which will go far beyond the immediate benefits to those in position to share them.
>
> Communities will be founded and expanded under the operation of those projects. They will help in the production of local and national tax revenues. There will be cumulative and expanding cycles of productive weath and prosperity for the benefit of the United States and of the States involved.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that the upper Colorado River storage project bill has now been passed by both Houses of the Congress, and has been referred to a conference committee, upon which the great senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], my able colleague, has been appointed to serve as a member. Without in any way or in any sense detracting from the many great and highly valuable contributions of the other Members of the Senate and of the Members of the House, in both parties, who have worked so long and so diligently with this great ideal and this great idea for the West in their hearts, I wanted to take this opportunity to extend to Senator MILLIKIN our thanks for his able work. All of us know, of course, and I was very glad to see, that he is able to serve as a member of the conference committee which will deal with this great piece of legislation.

MODERNIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I read with considerable interest in this morning's Washington Post that President Eisenhower had at long last set in motion some degree of activity, aimed at modernizing the hopelessly obsolete and dangerous air-traffic control systems of the Nation.

I refer to the announcement of the appointment of a friend of the President, a former distinguished officer in World War II, and vice president of the Eastman Kodak Co., Mr. Edward P. Curtis. He was appointed to conduct a long-range study, to try to provide for a greater degree of air safety, through a study of air-navigation facilities in line with the report of the so-called Harding committee.

This Harding report was submitted under date of December 31, 1955, became available on January 13, 1956, to the public, and then to the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman at this time.

We are glad that at long last, that finally, someone in this administration has awakened to the fact that the overcrowding and congestion of our airways is not only limiting the expansion of a dynamic method of transportation, but is actually creating a situation that is becoming more dangerous by the hour.

TIMID-DELAYED APPROACH

In order to understand what has been going on, as a result of the timid approach to doing something about a condition which everyone concerned with civil aviation knew had been existing for a long time, we received, as I have stated, on December 31, the Harding report. This report recognizing the existence of the conditions about which many of us have complained for a long time.

In fact, I believe it would be fair to say that the Harding report recognized and verified that which the former Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Mr. Frederick B. Lee, had been telling the congressional committees, in particular, the Appropriations Committees. He had also been telling the Nation, as he often spoke at aviation meetings and dinners in many States, that the condition desperately required immediate remedial action and sufficient funds to provide modern navigation facilities.

LEE FIRED FOR STAND

Because he had the courage to speak out and tell the truth, Mr. Lee, a lifetime Republican, and a career employee who had worked up through the ranks of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, was summarily fired.

I say "fired" advisedly, because our hearings demonstrated that he was fired because he chose to carry out his duty in testifying before Senate and House committees as to the immediate, urgent, and desperate need for modernizing our air navigation and transportation facilities.

HAMSTRUNG BY COMMERCE SECRETARY

While Mr. Lee was being hamstrung, while his resignation was being demanded, while he was being treated almost as a janitor by his Commerce Department masters, the ground-minded clique of the Commerce Department, headed by Sinclair Weeks, former director of the Pullman Co., Mr. Louis Rothschild, the Under Secretary in charge of transportation, and a former Under Secretary in charge of transportation, Mr. Murray,

who since has taken a high position in one of the locomotive companies, the subject of air safety and modernization of air facilities was allowed to gather dust, and the airways became more and more dangerous.

Certainly the speed with which a remedy was undertaken leaves a considerable gap in solution in our present jet age of aviation.

The report of the Harding committee, which finally led to the appointment yesterday of Mr. Edward P. Curtis, was directed by Mr. Hughes, Budget Director, on May 4, 1955. This Harding committee was a high level and very distinguished committee, and I am glad to commend it for its study.

STUDIED TO DETERMINE HOW TO STUDY

I presume that the manner in which this program was approached was partly the responsibility of the man who is supposed to direct aviation as Secretary of Commerce. But the Secretary rarely directs it in such a way as to help aviation.

The report was asked for by Budget Director Hughes on May 4, 1955. It was set up to study how to undertake a study for the improvement of our air navigation facilities.

So, for some 8 months, while a distinguished committee was studying the question of how to undertake a study, the airways became more and more congested. Mr. Weeks, the Secretary of Commerce, fiddled, while Mr. Rothschild planned to sack an efficient career technical man in order that a deserving Republican politician might be appointed.

We have seen this air crisis grow, and this was finally admitted in the Harding committee study.

REPORT QUOTED

Let me quote the closing portion of the Harding committee report:

It is clear that a great deal of effort has been made to coordinate the activities of various Government departments and agencies in the development and operation of aviation facilities. But it is also clear that the development of the required facilities is lagging far behind the needs of aviation.

We find that none of the interdepartmental committees dealing with coordination has any independent executive authority. Their members serve only on a part-time basis and the membership changes frequently. While it was originally intended that, in addition to exercising their coordinating functions, they would be instrumentalities for the development of forward looking policies, they have, in practice, become primarily mechanisms wherein the representatives of various Federal agencies meet to debate and, whenever possible, coordinate action on pressing current problems. * * *

It is not our desire to belittle the useful functions which these organizations perform, but we do wish to note their practical limitations. We think it is abundantly clear that, because of their basic structure, they cannot be expected to provide the dynamic leadership required for origination and development of a comprehensive national aviation facilities system. Certain essential elements of effective Government action seem to be missing—full-time direction, full disclosure of departmental information and plans, closely coordinated budgetary planning and funding, and a unified approach to the Congress in matters of appropriations.

It seems evident that there is a need for forceful, high level direction of the studies leading to a national aviation facilities program. Inasmuch as the regular departments of the Government are fully occupied with heavy operating responsibilities which are diverse and sometimes conflicting, and as the interdepartmental committees are fully occupied in resolving day-to-day conflicts, it seems logical to conclude, as we have done, that the direction of the study necessary for intelligent future planning should be established elsewhere in the Government.

If there ever was a declaration of "no confidence" in the present Commerce Department's control of aviation transportation and the civilian aviation functions of this Nation, the Harding committee report, which, at long last, led to the appointment of a Presidential assistant to clean up the mess, is such a declaration.

Certainly if Mr. Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, or Mr. Rothschild, had done his job, or if they had allowed Mr. Lee, the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to do his job without crippling interference we would not be in the dangerous mess in which we are.

MUST HAVE INDEPENDENT CAA

I feel that the necessity for appointing a special assistant to the President proves without doubt that only when we divorce Civil Aeronautics control from the ground-minded leaders in the Department of Commerce, the Secretary and Under Secretaries, can aviation break the chains which have bound it to the railroad tracks of this Nation.

This action by the President, pursuant to the recommendation of a high level commission, is costly proof that the action in keeping the Civil Aeronautics Administration as a mere satellite, a dependency, a serf of the ground-minded clique in the Commerce Department, makes it impossible to modernize for the jet air age which is today upon us in civil air transportation.

I do not know how an administration could more conclusively prove the incapacity, the lack of know-how, the lack of willingness to do anything about modernizing our air facilities, than the present administration has done in emphasizing at long last the necessity for a Presidential assistant to take over the duties which Mr. Weeks and Mr. Rothschild are still insisting they should have.

They insist that they should control aviation. In some distant past reorganization they claim that practically all the transportation facilities of the Nation were coordinated and consolidated into a very well-planned transportation agency in the Department of Commerce. That assertion was in the sworn statement of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. He said, in effect: "We would be going backward if we dared remove aviation from her sister transportation agencies."

On cross-examination we asked just what transportation the Commerce Department or the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation administered. We asked him if he administered the trucklines. No; they were under the Interstate Commerce Commission. We asked him if he administered the buslines. No; they were under the Interstate Commerce Commission. We asked him if he administered the railroads. No; that was done by the Interstate Commerce Commission. We came to find out that the only other connection he had with transportation—except the liquidation of the canal barge lines now in progress—was in connection with the Maritime Commission and aviation.

AIRPLANES AND STEAMSHIPS

Will someone please tell me the great similarity between a steamship and an aircraft that flies the skies for domestic airlines and circles the seven seas?

Because of the happening of reorganizations which placed the steamship and the airplane under the Under Secretary of Commerce and under a former director of the Pullman Co., Mr. Weeks, we have seen the deplorable spectacle of the firing of a career public servant who has distinguished himself in his fight through the years for aviation.

This was done in order to make way for a purely political appointee, whose experience and technical knowledge and know-how of aviation is, to say the most, extremely limited.

RECEIVERSHIP NECESSARY

It seems to me that the finding of the White House that it was necessary to have a Presidential assistant to step into a sort of receivership for the failure of Secretary Weeks and Under Secretary Rothschild would lead the administration to find out what is wrong with the organization.

If it would do that, it would find that we need more than a study Commission to determine how to study the problems which have existed. We need more than just another study. It would find that we need some action.

Action is needed to get the dynamic and great aviation industry free from the tie that holds aviation to the ground. Our hearings have shown that aviation is a captive agency. Commerce Department leaders have said they cannot reveal to the public how much CAA has asked for of the departmental budgeteers of the Commerce Department for the improvement of navigation facilities. All that is a classified secret, Mr. President. Our hearings finally broke this foolish secrecy.

We managed to get the information. We managed to find out about the deep, cutting slashes year after year which Mr. Weeks and Mr. Rothschild have administered to the needs for a modernized traffic-control system and for modernized equipment.

Because of their dismal failure, we finally must supplant them and their thinking by an assistant to the President of the United States, who is to conduct a study to improve those facilities.

GET ON WITH TASK

Why do we not get on with the job? Why does not the administration get behind the bill I introduced, on which hearings are now being conducted by the aviation subcommittee?

Why does not the administration set up an independent Civil Aeronautics Administration?

If Mr. Curtis, who is apparently quite a leader in aviation, is competent enough to be the Presidential assistant, why not put him in charge of the independent Civil Aeronautics Administration?

Let us get on with the job. Time will not wait. It is indeed a sad commentary that every forward step that has been made in aviation had to be made by the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House over the bitter obstructionist opposition of Secretary Weeks and Under Secretary Rothschild and Under Secretary Murray.

CONGRESS OVERRIDES WEEKS

Certainly we have made a little progress with the Federal airport bill and in the feeder airline bill. We hope we will make some progress with a second commercial airport for the city of Washington.

Every witness, even the reports of the Department of Commerce, has testified to the fact that traffic conditions in Washington are among the most dangerous in the Nation. The airport and the air space are so hopelessly overcrowded that some airplanes which wish to be scheduled to land in Washington must overfly the city, because they cannot land at the airport.

The subcommittee and the full committee on July 29 of last year ordered the Secretary of Commerce and his Deputy Under Secretary for Transportation to be ready to ask for appropriations to start work on a second Washington airport when Congress reconvened on January 3.

MORE CONVERSATION

What did we get. We got more conversation. We got more talk about a tri-State authority to determine how to finance and how to build a second Washington airport. That is exactly where we were last July.

We were further back than we were in 1950, when at least the Department bought some land for the Burke airport and got ready to go ahead.

When Congress returned in January we had that wonderful "clincher" on aviation safety—that wonderful brainchild of Mr. Rothschild and Mr. Weeks—which would send 75-passenger and, very soon, 100-passenger commercial air transports to an alternate airport at Andrews Field.

Andrews Field happens to be one of the busiest jet combat bomber and fighter fields in the whole United States. The military authorities shudder to think that their own military pilots would be endangered by the diversion of civilian air traffic to their field. Consider how airline pilots would feel about those fast, "hot," tactical jet aircraft landing alongside of 50- or 100-passenger civilian transports.

MIX TRANSPORTS AND JETS

Yet that was the recommendation. That was the No. 1 recommendation that was made by these men of Commerce who have been in charge of civilian aviation and who have throttled at every opportunity the progress that aviation must make.

Certainly we will not get off the ground and be airborne in a modern commercial aviation development as long as we chain the airplane to the railroad track. It has been chained throughout the administration of Sinclair Weeks by Mr. Murray, and now by Mr. Rothschild.

Let us not wait until we have a crash of 2 planes, each carrying 75 or 80 passengers, in a fog over the Washington National Airport on a day when planes must land by instrument. Let us get busy and do the job that is required to be done. Let us do that job today.

More study merely adds to the danger. More and longer investigations and more buckpassing will lead only to holding back the dynamic progress of civil aviation. Civil aviation is necessary to our national defense. It is as necessary as military aviation.

Mr. President, it is later than we think. The President's own Harding committee proves that today we face a crisis.

We face it constantly with the men who are charged with civil aviation administration in the Commerce Department. We face it because they have been unwilling to move. We face it because they have been unwilling to let the public know what is going on. They have stifled in intradepartmental secrecy requests that have been made by Lee and CAA experts for modernized instruments, radar facilities, and other air-navigation facilities.

I certainly hope the White House or Assistant President Adams, or whoever is running it, will consider the matter. However, until we do place aviation in an important, independent agency—free from the shackles of the Commerce Department—we will never reach the great goals this Nation as a leader in aviation must some day reach.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, as I sat here and listened to the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] I felt impelled to take the floor and attempt to clarify some of the observations which my distinguished colleague has made, particularly with reference to the all-important subject of aviation safety. I hope I shall be able to do so.

Let me say that my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, who happens to be the chairman of the subcommittee on which I serve, is not alone in having deep interest in the needs of air safety or in the recognition of what a sound program for aviation means to the Nation, because that interest is shared by all the members of the committee and of the subcommittee. But let me emphasize very definitely that the interest is also reflected in the Department of Commerce, regardless of the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Oklahoma on the floor this afternoon.

There is nothing in the RECORD and there is nothing to which the Senator can point which in any way justifies the accusation that the Department of Commerce is a ground-minded Department. Directly after making that statement, the Senator stood upon the floor and went on to define the various activities with regard to control of railroads, the regulation of trucking, and other things which I have always considered were ground operations, and said they were outside the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce.

When it comes to the question of the relative merits of the former Administrator, Mr. Lee, and of the man who has been appointed by the President as the new Administrator, I think it is very unfair, very unwise, and totally incorrect to say that a career man as such—and I recognize that Fred Lee has been a career man and has devoted a long time to aviation—in the person of the man who is now to replace Mr. Lee and whose nomination is before the Senate for confirmation is a politician and has been appointed as such. That is absolutely untrue and unfounded.

Everyone who knows the record of Mr. Lowen must be aware that he has devoted a great many years to work in the field of aviation, that he is exceptionally well qualified in that respect, and is well known by those who are in that industry as being most competent. That is not to say, Mr. President, that Mr. Lee is not competent. I have no quarrel on that point, and the chairman of the subcommittee knows that I have held Mr. Lee in very high regard. But it is the right of the President of the United States to determine who is to serve in these appointive positions, and the President has seen fit to make a change in this particular office.

So far as I am personally concerned, in the absence of contrary evidence, and until someone can show that Mr. Lowen is not equally as well qualified to serve in that position and to render service in the interest of aviation and the development of a sound system of aviation, including measures which will lead to greater safety, I shall support him to the fullest extent possible.

When the statement is made that the Department of Commerce, under the present administration which has been in power a little more than 3 years, has failed to take any action or to be interested in any way, shape, or manner in connection with making funds available in order to carry out programs which some believe to be most essential, I say that if we make a searching analysis and study the facts as they exist, we shall have to admit that not only during this administration, but during administrations under Democratic control, substantial cuts in appropriations were made all the way down the line. Large reductions were made both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, through the Appropriations Committees, notwithstanding the pleas which were made on many occasions for funds in sufficient amount to provide an increased safety program in the way of navigational aids.

Mr. President, let me refer briefly to the recent appointment of General Curtis to the position for which the President has chosen him. It so happens that I know General Curtis. In World War I he served in the Air Force, with great distinction. Eddie Rickenbacker knows General Curtis very well, and knows of his capabilities, because he was with him in World War I. General Curtis also served with great distinction in the Air Force in World War II, and is well qualified from an executive standpoint, and from the standpoint of his knowledge of aviation. He is recognized throughout the United States as being a good man to have been chosen by the President to head this activity.

The record is clear that the Secretary of Commerce himself joined in and recommended to the President that this sort of activity be undertaken to try to coordinate the situation. Why coordinate it? My friend from Oklahoma knows very well indeed that we have two phases of air operations.

One is that which is carried on by the military; the other is that which is carried on by private organizations, whether they be in the transport field or in the field of other private operation.

There has developed a conflict with reference to the methods which should be employed in order to bring greater benefits to aviation, insofar as the safety factor is concerned. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma knows that to be so. It is not anything new. It has not existed only in the past 3 years; it has existed for a number of years. But now a serious effort is being made to get to the root of the matter and to work out a sound and sensible way to meet and resolve the challenge which faces the country in the air.

Mr. President, I am confident that General Curtis, with his knowledge of the subject, will be able to bring about results which I am sure even the Senator from Oklahoma will agree will be most satisfactory in the interest of aviation.

With reference to the subject of a second airport for Washington, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for the deep interest he has taken in that subject, as well as in aviation in general. Certainly no man has given more of his time and shown greater interest in this problem than has the Senator from Oklahoma. I have been happy to join with him on many, many occasions, because I, too, happen to be airminded. I cannot in any sense of the word maintain that I hold a preemptive position in that respect, for many of my colleagues and many persons throughout the Nation are better qualified and equipped than I am to take an interest in aviation and to express themselves accordingly.

In 1950, as I recall, Congress did direct that a second airport be constructed. But, again, let us make the record clear. The bill carried some language to the effect that it be constructed if—if—there could be an agreement on the part of those in control of the local government unit where the port was to be located. The Senator from Oklahoma knows as well as I do that there was not an agreement; there was strong protest raised after the land had been purchased, as I remember.

Time went on. Was any other action taken during that period of time to try to develop other ways whereby the need of a second airport could be met? No.

The present administration walked into the picture, confronted by the same identical situation. They tried to effect a compromise. They made a study of other facilities within the region—Friendship Airport, Andrews Field, and the area in Virginia which has been mentioned, namely, the Burke site, so-called. There were objections to Friendship by those in the industry. There were objections to Andrews by both those in the industry and those in the military. It comes down, now, to a question of whether or not arrangements for the site at Burke can be worked out in such a manner as will permit a second airport to be constructed in that area.

The Senator from Oklahoma, I know, wants to be realistic; he wants to be factual. So long as there is insistence that the proposed airport be established in the area which during the previous administration was selected after engineering studies and for which purpose land was purchased, there will be a strong protest against the location of the airport at that site. Unless another site for the airport can be selected and the necessary plan can be worked out—and that will involve doing further work, though I hope it can be done shortly—the establishment of the new airport will be delayed.

I agree that more than enough time has elapsed. I have been just as concerned as has the Senator from Oklahoma that the second Washington airport be gotten under way promptly.

So much for that. Let us get down to the safety program, so-called, of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. It has been stated in the Senate, and the record, if not clarified a little, would lead one to believe, that the prior Administrator of the CAA was perfect in regard to the presentation of programs which would bring about a greater degree of air safety, but that he was throttled by the Department of Commerce through its several heads.

Let me ask this question: Are the trade papers of the country, which, after all, write of their concern in aviation, and which follow these subjects day in and day out, year in and year out, all wrong? I do not know. But let me say that I have seen and have placed in the record of the hearings editorials from some of the outstanding aviation trade journals, which maintain that there was no program of a satisfactory nature; that conditions had been permitted to drag along and such delay had been encountered as to justify the belief that the situation would develop as it has developed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator favor me at this time or later, for the benefit of the RECORD, the names of the trade papers that have expressed their fear of Fred Lee? Will the Senator supply the names of the trade papers which have criticized Fred Lee? I know of but one, and it is a minor trade paper indeed.

I shall be glad to supply for the record a list of the trade papers which have gone on record commending the operations of the CAA, and supporting the methods which were used by Fred Lee to obtain larger appropriations over the years in order to try to overcome the ever-growing congestion in airports and the ever-growing danger which was developing, and which the high officials of the Department of Commerce, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, were ignoring.

The distinguished Senator from Maine is one of the most authoritative persons on the subject of aviation in the United States.

Mr. PAYNE. I am afraid the Senator from Oklahoma is being very generous in his remarks.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not. I have had the pleasure of serving with the Senator from Maine on the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I know of the work he has done and of the great interest he has manifested in all types of civil aviation.

I am confident the Senator will admit that at countless times during the hearings the finger of blame was pointed not only at the mistakes of the present administration, but also at the errors of the past administration.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are fighting a system under which civil aeronautics, with its great and dynamic possibilities, is the captive of an agency which is concerned with weather reports, the merchant marine, weights and standards, and general, ordinary manufacturing business methods, to the point where aviation has been and continues to be, with increasing acceleration, a disenfranchised satellite of a rather cruel and inefficient stepmother in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. PAYNE. I appreciate the remarks which my colleague has made. I am very happy, indeed, that he has clarified the record substantially with regard to the statement he has made on the floor, because I hope I understand the English language fairly well. The inference I drew from his remarks was that all the difficulty had developed and was being continued by the present administration, under the present Secretary of Commerce and his assistants. The Senator from Oklahoma has now very well clarified his statement.

Two wrongs do not make a right, let me say, but the Senator has now clarified the picture materially, because he now admits frankly, as it was clear from the record in our committee, that this condition is not something which has happened only today; it has been happening for some time. The Senator from Oklahoma has joined with me in that belief, and we have so expressed ourselves jointly together with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who has attended most of the hearings.

Let us get away from mere talk on this subject and get down to action; let us get under way a program which will face the future of aviation squarely, and make certain that it will be given the impetus and assistance it needs in order to provide greater safety and absolute safety wherever that is possible.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the Senator from Maine well knows my position. I

think I have said countless times in the committee hearings that we do not mind the Republican administration imitating the successes of Democratic administrations; but we do not think the Republican administration necessarily should imitate or follow the errors which the Democratic administrations may have made.

When errors can be seen to be becoming apparent, steps should be taken to correct them. I may say that, in my judgment, there has been a far greater acceleration in the number of errors being committed under Mr. Weeks and Mr. Rothschild than have occurred in the past, as the appropriation requests and the funds appropriated will show.

I shall be the last person in the world to point to a lilly white, perfect Democratic record in aviation. The problem has grown as air traffic has increased. If the Department of Commerce was not competent to deal with the situation in 1948, and did not deal with it sufficiently, then the reason can partly be ascribed to the fact that the problem was not so acute then. Perhaps it was not so obvious then as it is today, with the saturation of air space over La-Guardia, Midway in Chicago, Washington National, and many, many other airports with which the distinguished Senator from Maine is familiar. The difficulty is growing rapidly.

Mr. PAYNE. And faster with the advent of the jet age.

AN AIR "DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE"

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed. The intermixture of military jet flights and civil aircraft flying, together with the congestion over airports, might be considered to be the straw which will break the camel's back. So perhaps we had better, after the experience we have had, try to give aviation a "declaration of independence," so that it can be airborne in its own right and can serve the public in the dynamic way its destiny should permit.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not have the privilege of being a member of the subcommittee with the distinguished Senator from Maine and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I wish that were possible. However, having been a member of the Air Force for almost 4 years in the last war, and having been a private pilot for some 9 years, I believe I know a little bit about this subject.

More than that, I must say to my very good friend, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, I hope the time will never come when a friend of mine is attacked upon the floor that I shall fail to rise or rally to his good name and his assistance, particularly when I have joined in the appointment of that person to a responsible position.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to know what I said other than that in the present administration he was a Republican politician. If I disparaged him, it was in no way intentional. I said he had some degree of experience in aviation, but I did say he was a Republican politician, and I do not believe that is an opprobrious term. I have many friends who are Republican politicians, and many of them are men of the highest type; some are serving in the United States Senate, as is my distinguished friend, colleague, and fraternity brother, who has rendered distinguished service in the Senate.

Mr. ALLOTT. I might say I do not mind the Senator's calling him a Republican. I do not know that I was aware that he was a politician. I do not believe he has ever had an elective office, within my recollection, but I should like to say that the remark to which I take exception, or at least on which I wish to make the record straight, was the remark to the effect that it was doubtful if he was qualified for the office.

I wish to say, first of all, there is no agency in the United States which has been so afflicted with inability to get things done as the CAA has been, at least within my last 10 years of active interest in it. It has gone forward; it has drawn back; it has been like the proverbial old lady unwilling and unable to make up its mind. Its policies with respect to navigational assistance or systems have been uncertain and indefinite. It has gone forward; declared itself; undeclared itself; returned; and during all of that time I might say that the gentleman whose loss the Senator from Oklahoma decries was Administrator of the CAA.

Let me say for my very good friend, Charles Lowen, Senators will find that, in addition to his war record, he has had a long period of intensive interest in private and military flying.

In my opinion he is far more qualified than was the gentleman whose place he will take. If that had not been so I would not have placed myself behind his appointment.

All of us have an interest in the safety of airliners, military transports, and private planes. I may say that private flying is probably getting as little consideration as anything else in this country.

In behalf of Chuck Lowen, I venture to say that it is my opinion he will discharge the duties of his office, not only with distinction, but with the ability and efficiency which he has displayed throughout his life, particularly in the air field and in problems of aviation.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

APPROPRIATIONS REQUESTED

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point requests for appropriations made by Mr. Lee for air navigation facilities, and also the full request made by Mr. Lee for the operation to the Department of Commerce, the requests to the Bureau of the Budget as reduced by the Department of Commerce, the final figures as reported in the President's budget, and the congressional appropriations for the years 1950 through 1956.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Civil Aeronautics Administration, appropriation history, "Establishment of Air Navigation Facilities"

UNDER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	CAA request	Commerce submission to BOB	President's budget	Congressional appropriation
1950	$127.8	$67.2	$42.2	$37.5
1951	78.5	48.7	43.5	19.0
1952	39.1	39.1	24.4	10.5
1953	35.5	18.3	15.1	10.0
1954	30.0	22.0	13.0	----------

UNDER PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

	[1] $13.0	[1] $7.0	[1] $7.0	$7.0
1955	21.2	7.7	5.0	5.0
1956	26.5	26.5	23.0	16.0

[1] Revised.

Reference: Except for original 1954 figures, above figures were cited by Senator Schoeppel, Jan. 10, 1956.

Original 1954 figures from F. B. Lee's testimony of Jan. 10, 1956.

Also, F. B. Lee testified that each year's CAA requirements of over $40 million were reduced prior to CAA request in compliance with budget policy letters of Secretary of Commerce.

Civil Aeronautics Administration, appropriations history (O and R) "Operation and Regulation"

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BUDGET

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	CAA request	Commerce submission to BOB	President's budget	Congressional appropriation
1950	$123.4	$110.1	$97.4	$94.4
1951	117.9	104.4	104.3	98.5
1952	106.5	106.0	102.8	99.1
1953	111.1	112.4	109.0	105.6
1954	114.4	113.2	110.3	----------

EISENHOWER'S BUDGET

	[1] $107.0	[1] $105.5	[1] $105.5	$105.0
1955	109.3	100.6	97.3	98.1
1956	117.7	111.7	107.4	106.8

[1] Revised.

Reference: Except for original 1954 figures, above figures were cited by Senator SCHOEPPEL, Jan. 10, 1956.

Original 1954 figures from F. B. Lee's testimony of Jan. 10, 1956.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise to submit, out of order, an amendment which I intend to propose to H. R. 7225, the bill to amend the Social Security Act, a bill which is now pending before the Committee on Finance. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and referred to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may say that the whole purpose of the amendment is to extend the total disability insurance provisions of the social security revision bill, H. R. 7225, so that thousands of additional disabled persons

who have not yet reached the age of 50 will be covered.

My study of the bill has led me to the conclusion that when a person becomes totally blind, or totally disabled, whether he is 48 years old or 51 years old, he is in the same relative position. Since, according to the evidence which has been developed before the committee thus far, one-third of the totally disabled persons would not receive the benefits of the total disability provision of the act, my amendment is simply a proposal to strike the 50-year age limit from the law, so that, if eligible, and if they have earned social-security benefits, such persons will receive them as if they had reached the age of 50.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared be printed in the RECORD, because I think it will disclose that the additional cost to the system will be negligible, indeed, or relatively so, and that it will not necessitate increasing the rate to be paid over that recommended by the House committee, in order to take care of totally disabled persons who have earned benefits under social security at any age at which they have been able to earn those benefits and qualify for them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE

I send to the desk an amendment which I intend to propose to extend the total disability insurance provisions of the social security revision bill, H. R. 7225, to thousands of additional disabled persons.

The social security bill now before the Committee on Finance provides for the payment of social-security benefits to totally disabled persons beginning at the age of 50. My amendment strikes out this arbitrary age requirement and provides that an otherwise eligible disabled person can receive his monthly social-security benefit at any age.

This amendment will help many additional disabled persons who would otherwise not receive social-security benefits. I see no reason why a blind person or an individual totally disabled from sickness or disease who is 48 or 49 years old, or 38 or 39 years old, should have to wait until he or she is age 50 to draw the benefits provided. By striking out the 50-year age requirement a disabled person could draw his benefits immediately when he needed them.

Over one-third of all disabled persons are under the age of 50, all of these persons would be benefited by my amendment.

Social-security benefits are paid in relation to an individual's previous wage history. The minimum benefit is $30 per month; the maximum is $108.50 per month. These payments will help many families to stay together and will help to pay their grocery bills, rent, and doctors' bills. They will help to take the heavy financial burden off the backs of many disabled persons and their families who are carrying the double handicap of a serious disablement and loss of income. They should help to bring some relief from the worry and strain which disabled persons undergo when they are suddenly faced with the terrible calamity of permanent and total disability.

The hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance have amply demonstrated that it is essential to liberalize the social-security program to help disabled persons. The burden of disability is a crushing load on many persons. Many disabled persons can be helped to rehabilitate themselves if they have some regular income to aid them get back on their feet. My amendment will make it possible to give hope and encouragement to many additional thousands of disabled men and women who have been struck down by blindness, with crippling disease or by an accident in the prime of life through no fault of their own.

The hearings before the committee have demonstrated the administrative feasibility of paying disability insurance benefits and the financial capacity of our social-security system to be adapted to meet the costs involved. The bill provides for the referral of each disabled person to the State vocational rehabilitation agency which will assure that each disabled individual who can be rehabilitated will have every encouragement to do so. But those individuals who because of age or the nature of their disability cannot be immediately rehabilitated will be eligible to receive their regular monthly social-security benefits. This is the humanitarian course to follow; it is only fair and proper to the many hardworking Americans who have become disabled.

Many persons who become totally disabled, whether from cancer, a heart attack, or polio, use up all their savings and sooner or later become dependent on charity. Under my amendment they will be able to remain self-supporting with the aid of a regular social-security payment toward which they will have contributed during their working lifetime. Social security is not a handout; it is an earned right based upon the contributions and earnings of the individual. As an earned right the individual is eligible to receive his benefit in dignity and self-respect.

My amendment retains all the protective features incorporated in the social-security proposal regarding the medical examinations needed for determining disability. The medical profession has done an outstanding job in this matter in the administration of the disability freeze provisions of the social-security program enacted in 1954 as well as in a number of other State and Federal disability programs. The disability freeze provisions are working out very satisfactorily and we can build upon the favorable experience already gained in the making of medical determinations under the existing law. I have faith and confidence in the integrity and cooperation of the medical profession in making this proposal work successfully.

Improvement of the disability insurance proposal should help to reduce State and Federal assistance costs to the general taxpayer. Disability insurance payments are a tried and tested method of providing income to disabled persons. Congress has provided such payments under the railroad retirement program, the civil-service retirement program, and the veterans' program. Many State and local retirement systems provide for payment of disability insurance benefits.

The proposal to pay disability insurance benefits would help everyone in the community. It would help the disabled person and his family. It would help the individual pay his rent, grocery, and doctor bills and would help the individual to continue paying his life-insurance premiums and other necessities of life. This is a proposal which should merit the support of all who are interested in the welfare of the men and women who have worked to make our country strong and great.

ADMINISTRATION CONSERVATION POLICIES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 29, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] inserted in the RECORD a lengthy memorandum which purported to answer and refute a series of articles in the Washington Post and Times Herald by Mr. Warren Unna, staff reporter.

I have studied the memorandum included in the RECORD by the Senator from Arizona, and I have decided that this material, if anything, actually buttresses and affirms much of the documentation contained in the able series prepared by Mr. Unna.

While I cannot underwrite everything written by Mr. Unna—because his viewpoint on all issues is not necessarily my viewpoint—I have a very firm and fixed impression that the series by Mr. Unna in the Washington Post and Times Herald was, if anything, very kind and generous to some of the actions taken in the field of conservation by this administration. Conservation and natural resources were, of course, Mr. Unna's major topic.

Let me discuss one or two items in the memorandum which was drafted to refute Mr. Unna's series. The memorandum, in an effort to show that the administration favors multipurpose projects, declared:

The administration has supported Libby Dam in Montana.

Yet, Mr. President, this administration has so bogged down and confused our relationships with Canada in the Columbia Basin that Libby Dam, which would inundate some Canadian land, is farther away than ever today. Furthermore, bills to deauthorize Libby Dam as a Federal project actually were introduced in Congress at the urging of the administration.

The memorandum tried to defend the actions of Secretary McKay with respect to Hells Canyon on the Snake River. Yet, ironically, on the very day that the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] included this memorandum in the RECORD, the leading conservationists of America came out for a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon and against the administration's surrender of Hells Canyon for piecemeal use. Actions speak louder than words. The Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, including the foremost outdoor groups in this Nation, wholeheartedly affirmed the need for a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon in order to spare fish and wildlife sanctuaries in nearby watersheds. This action tended to uphold Mr. Warren Unna's series in the Washington Post and Times Herald. It made out of date the memorandum assailing Mr. Unna, almost before the memorandum was set in type for the RECORD.

I will not encroach further, Mr. President, upon the time of the Senate, other than to discuss briefly the memorandum in the famous Al Sarena case. The memorandum declares that the timber at Al Sarena was worth only $2 or $3 an acre at the time "these claims were filed on as mining claims." How misleading can statistics get? The company first sought patent in 1948. That was when timber values entered the picture, because the timber could not be harvested commercially until patent was granted. In 1948 the timber was worth many, many times $3 an acre, of course.

The memorandum purporting to answer Mr. Warren Unna's comments on

the Al Sarena case never once admits the fact that, although the Interior Department granted patent to these so-called mining claims over 2 years ago, not a spoonful of ore has been mined, but over 2,100,000 board-feet of timber has been cut commercially.

All these circumstances, Mr. President, support the Washington Post and Times Herald, rather than the Interior Department brochure which supposedly answers the series.

Mr. President, I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the first article by Mr. Unna in this series, which was published January 8, 1956, but I understand the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has had the whole series of articles printed in the RECORD of today, and so I shall not request that the article be duplicated.

However, Mr. President, I desire to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

CLOSING OF THE SHEPARD & MORSE LUMBER CO., OF WESTPORT, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have received word from Astoria that, after 45 years of continuous operation, the Shepard & Morse Lumber Co., of Westport, Oreg., will close permanently. Approximately 160 men will lose their jobs. These men, with their families, will have to move somewhere else. It is feared that the entire city of Westport will become a ghost town. This mill has been in operation since 1910, almost half a century. At its peak, the mill produced 225,000 board feet of lumber every 24 hours. It cut timber that measured almost 122 feet in length, for sailing ships and other impressive uses. The reason given for closing the sawmill at Westport is the fact that it has run out of logs. The forests are no longer available to provide the grist and the raw material for this mill.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the same situation is developing at other places in the State of Oregon and in the Pacific Northwest. After perhaps half a century of cutting, the old growth timber in many localities is gone. There is not sufficient second growth to keep a large mill in operation. Thus, the tragedy takes place. The mill shuts. Workers lose their jobs. They and their families must migrate to somewhere else. An economic void is left in that part of Oregon. All the nearby communities, with their shops and stores and other facilities, feel the pinch.

There exists in the Northwest only one basic resource to take up the slack in employment. That resource is hydroelectric power, generated by the Columbia River and its tributaries, as they surge off the great mountain ranges of the Northwest. There was in existence a vast program to create low-cost power in the Northwest. This power has been sold at the lowest industrial rate in North America—2.2 mills a kilowatt-hour. But, ever since the present national administration entered office, it has conducted a determined propaganda war against continuation of the low-cost public-power program. Because the administration has met with some success and some victories in this warfare, there are no further supplies of low-cost power for new payrolls in the Northwest. Thus it is that, when a mill in a town like Westport closes, we do not have new jobs in power-using industries to absorb the men who are thrown out of work.

Mr. President, as the years go by, I fear that the same story will be repeated elsewhere in my State and in the Pacific Northwest. Secretary Douglas McKay and his political allies will have to accept the responsibility for the slowing down and the choking off of our low-cost power program. What do they have to offer as a substitute source of employment in our great region?

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Mill To Shut at Westport," which was published in the Oregon Daily Journal of February 23, 1956, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILL TO SHUT AT WESTPORT—BIG TIMBER LACK LISTED AS CAUSE

ASTORIA, February 23.—After 45 years of continuous operation at its present site at Westport, the Shepard & Morse Lumber Co. will close permanently Friday. Primary reason for the closure, according to Harry L. Smith, superintendent of the mill, is that large logs are no longer available.

Smith said the sawmill was originally built to handle extremely large logs.

Some 160 men will be released from their jobs with the mill's closing, Smith said. What effect the layoffs will have on the town of Westport itself is problematical, he stated. Some 200 men are presently employed, 49 of whom will remain in the employ of Shepard & Morse to operate a remanufacturing plant.

Westport is largely a company-owned town, although there is an even distribution of privately owned homes in the town proper. However, an estimated 60 percent of the mill employees have their homes outside Westport. The company also owns a hotel, meat market, general merchandise store, and a pool hall and billiard club, all of which will be closed unless taken over by a private buyer.

Private operations include two restaurants, a movie theater, a service station, and a second general merchandise store.

Smith noted the present mill was built in 1910, and in its history has cut timber that measured almost 122 feet long for such famous structures as the frigate *Old Ironsides*. At its peak, it could produce 225,000 board-feet of lumber a day.

GODSPEED TO MR. DULLES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today the Secretary of State leaves for a trip to 10 countries in South Asia, Southeast Asia, and the Far East.

On occasion I have differed with the Secretary of State, and certainly I am not in accord with the optimistic picture he presented to the Foreign Relations Committee vis-a-vis our country and the free world on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other.

But, Mr. President, Mr. John Foster Dulles is not the Republican Secretary of State. He is the Secretary of State for the United States of America. He is embarking upon a very difficult journey. In a few days he will visit Karachi, Pakistan, where he will attend the 3-day meeting of the Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Mr. President, Pakistan has many problems which, of course, will be called to the attention of the United States Secretary of State.

Later, Mr. Dulles will visit India and Burma, where he will arrive in the wake of a triumphant visit by the leaders of the Soviet Union, Messrs. Khrushchev and Bulganin.

Thereafter, Secretary Dulles will visit Ceylon, where he will go for the first time. Ceylon is a country with which we have once again, in an economic aid sense, resumed relations.

Thereafter, Secretary Dulles will go to Saigon, where, I am sure, he will look into the situation in South Vietnam. I hope he will visit Pnom-penh, and will examine the situation in Cambodia, a country which, according to the statements appearing in the press in the last few days, is experiencing a new turn of mind, and seems to be veering not only toward neutralism, but also perhaps toward closer relations with Communist China.

The Secretary of State will go to Indonesia for the first time—a country in which elections have just been concluded, and a country in a state of flux, and having many problems.

The Secretary of State will also visit Formosa, the Philippines, Japan, and Korea. Each of the countries he will visit has its own problems and its own difficulties. In each of these countries he will confer with the recognized leaders.

Mr. President, my purpose in rising this afternoon is to wish the United States Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, Godspeed and good luck; and to assure him that insofar as we are concerned, regardless of party, we wish for him the best of everything, because what he does in South Asia, in Southeast Asia, and in the Far East will reflect upon our country for ill or for good.

So our hopes and our prayers are with him. We know he will do his best, and we hope he will be able constructively to overcome the inroads which in recent weeks have been made by the Soviet Union in that particular part of the world.

The questions he will be asked will be many; the problems will be difficult; and the answers to both will, in many instances, be hard to find.

We will be looking forward to a report by Secretary Dulles on his return so that we may, once again, refresh our knowledge of that most important area of the world—the continent of Asia.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate with a lengthy statement of my reasons for supporting the pending farm bill.

The American farmer does not need words. He has had plenty of them in the past 3 years. The American farmer

does need action—firm, positive action to bring his income to reasonable levels.

Furthermore, the American farmer needs such action now, not 1 year from now or several years from now. Help in 1958 or in 1959 will do little for the American farmer in 1956. Unless something is done in 1956, we can say goodby to farming as it has existed in our Republic since its beginning.

Mr. President, I believe time is the overriding factor in the consideration of farm legislation. It is one aspect which should be considered above all others.

I am a strong advocate of all realistic steps which will conserve our soil resources for future generations. We have witnessed the failure on the part of the people in many other areas, in many of the older countries on the globe, or we know of the failure of those who preceded them by generations, to give consideration to the conservation of their soil; and that failure on their part has brought about a condition whereby they cannot feed themselves.

I am firmly convinced of the need to spur research into production and marketing methods. I am acutely conscious that every step we take must be taken with our eyes upon the future.

But, Mr. President, the reason we are considering farm legislation now is that the farmer needs help now. If we forget that fact for a moment, the future is something that for him will never come.

Since January 1953, the Nation's agricultural policy has been based on the premise that farm prosperity is a goal that should be postponed to an indefinite and never clearly defined future.

We have faced farm crisis after farm crisis—in relation to wheat, beef cattle, cotton, and more lately, pork. In every case, the advice of the Agriculture Department to the suffering farmers has been to follow a course which can be simply paraphrased as "Hang on just a few years and if you survive, things will be a little better."

Fortunately, Mr. President, the great majority of our farmers have been able to survive. They are tough. They must be to get by under the regime of Ezra Taft Benson.

But human courage and human willpower stretch only so far. We are rapidly approaching the end of the trail—the point at which adequate assistance must come or the whole project be abandoned.

Let us consider for a moment the facts and figures—the statistics that spell approaching disaster.

In 1952—the year before this administration came into office—realized gross farm income was almost $37 billion. In 1953—the first year of Ezra Taft Benson—that figure slumped to $35 billion.

In 1954—after the present Secretary had really had a chance to take hold of the Department and put his policies into full effect—gross realized farm income fell to $33 billion. In the third year of his regime, it went down another billion.

Mr. President, the cost of 3 years of the present farm policy has been a $5 billion slump in the midst of a period which the administration claims to be one of unparalleled prosperity.

If the figures are pursued even further, the results are still the same—grim and foreboding.

In January of this year, the farmer received 27 percent less for the products of his toil than he got in the last year of the previous administration. But the prices he had to pay—in terms of interest, taxes, and wage rates—dropped only 2 percent during the same period.

I do not need to break these statistics down commodity by comodity. Every farmer knows that his prices have dropped. Every consumer knows that the cost of living has remained practically stationary.

The farmer has suffered—and practically nobody has gained. To continue such policies would put us in the classic case of the man who beat himself over the head with a hammer because it felt so good when he stopped.

Let us stop now before we, the Congress of the United States, have beaten the farmer into a state of insensibility.

When I say the Congress of the United States, I do not mean that it is Congress that has done it. It is actually those who have administered the laws which have been enacted by the Congress. I do not hesitate to say at this time that it would make little difference what legislation was passed; it would have to receive more sympathetic administration than the farm legislation on the statute books today is receiving at the hands of the present Secretary of Agriculture.

Let me make it clear that I am not blaming the present situation solely on the system of so-called flexible price supports so dearly beloved by the present Secretary. He has many other devices for lowering farm income and he has tried them all.

If the criterion of success is depressed farm income, his performance must be rated as the best since that of his Republican predecessors of the late 1920's.

Mr. President, I do not think it can be questioned that farmers throughout our country have come to look upon the present Agriculture Department as their enemy. It is a verdict which has been handed down in the wheat fields; among the small cattle producers; among our cotton and corn growers.

It is a verdict which has a certain poetic justice because it is a response to a similar verdict which this administration has promoted vigorously from the very beginning.

From the outset, this administration has looked upon the farmer as public enemy number one. And it is certainly not surprising that this feeling is reciprocated.

The basic theory upon which the present farm program has been operated is that there are too many farmers. That philosophy was enunciated by Under Secretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse, as far back as April 24, 1953.

The Department proceeded to act upon that theory. It took steps to reduce the surplus of farmers by reducing the prospects of making a living income from farming. If the same energy and ingenuity had been used to reduce our surplus farm stocks, they would have long since vanished.

True D. Morse is not the only official of the Department who has put forth that theory. Need I recall Earl D. Butz, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, who said:

> Agriculture is now big business. Too many people are trying to stay in agriculture that would do better some place else.

Those words, Mr. President, really let the cat out of the bag. This is an administration that wants farming to be "big business." It feels comfortable only when it is dealing with big business.

The administration wants farming to be big business. It feels comfortable only when it is dealing with big business. In the administration's view, a farmer who wants to be sturdy and independent, must be ruthlessly eliminated. He must move to the city, and his farm be consolidated with other farms, to be operated as a big business.

This is a process which can best be hastened by a simple device, namely, so-called flexible price supports. In reality, Mr. President, that term constitutes an open invitation to vicious price cutting, a return to the law of the jungle, whereby the small perish and the big and the strong survive.

In the pending bill we are confronted with an issue which is basic to our future. We can continue the so-called flexible price supports, a system which gives the farmers an umbrella and tells them they cannot open it when it rains, or we can return to the 90-percent concept, which assures the farmer of at least 90 percent of a fair price, when he meets certain acreage provisions which limit production.

I am glad to see on the floor of the Senate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. No one in the Senate was more considerate of the Department of Agriculture than was the chairman of the committee in his effort to afford the present law every opportunity to function in the best interest of the farmer. After that opportunity had been provided, and it became apparent to everyone that it was not working in the best interest of the farmer, the chairman of the committee took the proper leadership.

He went from one end of the Nation to the other in order to talk to the farmers at the grass roots and get their viewpoint, regardless of the particular commodities they contributed to the agricultural economy.

From those long and extended hearings, the chairman of the committee became convinced that one of the important things that had to be done in the interest of the farmer was to return to a higher support price for the commodities the farmer raised, particularly when his production was controlled.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the chairman of the committee that although he and I do not agree on all issues, as was demonstrated earlier today, I nevertheless wish to take this opportunity to commend him for the hearings the Senator from Kentucky has described. I re-

fer to the hearings the chairman held in various parts of the country. The hearings held in the State of Oregon, as I have stated from platforms in Oregon and repeat today on the floor of the Senate, were a great educational seminar on agricultural problems, and were of much benefit not only to the farmers of my State but also to other groups, particularly businessmen.

I have heard a great many small-business men, particularly in the rural communities of Oregon, comment upon the information they gained as the result of the Ellender hearings in my State with respect to the loss of purchasing power on the part of the farmers.

I am very glad the Senator from Kentucky, in his agricultural speech today, has stated—as I shall at some length in my own speech next week—that what we are confronted with is the loss of purchasing power at the farm gates by hundreds of thousands of farmers.

That is why it is so important that the Senate pass the pending bill, with such amendments as we see fit to add to it, aimed at giving the farmer increased purchasing power now.

The soil bank will not give any increase in purchasing power now. It is a sound conservation program which we have advocated for a long time. We are glad the administration has been won over to it.

However, it must be remembered that it was as recently as last September that the administration sent to Congress an adverse report on the soil bank. As a Christian, I am always glad to see conversion come to a sinner.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his observations with reference to the needs of the farmer, as well as for his comment on the fine service rendered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. No Senator is more dedicated to the interests of agriculture than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I am very happy to hear all these nice things being said about me.

As I pointed out during the course of the debate last week, the only provision in the pending bill which will give immediate relief to the farmers is the provision raising the level of price supports.

Since my remarks last week I had an estimate made of what the provision raising support levels for the basin commodities would mean to the farmers of this Nation if the bill is passed in the form we have proposed it. In that event the farmers will obtain additionally a little more than $850 million. That is the additional amount they would obtain under this 90 percent support provision. Eight hundred and fifty million dollars may not sound like a very large sum to people who spend a great deal of money, such as the amounts spent on the armed services. However, to the farmers of the Nation $850 million might be the difference between a little prosperity and bankruptcy.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is $850 million more than will accrue to the farmers if the 90 percent provision in the bill is defeated.

Mr. ELLENDER. That, may I say to the Senator from Kentucky, will be accomplished without in any manner materially increasing the cost of living of the people of this country. As has been pointed out many times, in a loaf of bread which sells for 17 to 20 cents, there is about 3 cents worth of wheat. In the cotton shirt I am wearing there is about 25 cents worth of cotton. Therefore, the increased price supports for the basic commodities provided by the bill would have no effect whatever on the cost of living.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am delighted to have the comment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana with reference to the question of the cost of living, which might be in the minds of some people.

I should like further to commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana by saying that unlike others who follow a different course in the field of agriculture and who are sponsoring a different philosophy than that sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the committee, in his support of higher rigid supports, under production controls, he has never stooped to the position of some who have tried to shift the effect of legislation to the shoulders of another segment of our economy.

No one knows better than does the distinguished chairman of the committee that except when labor receives a fair wage there is no satisfactory market for what the farmer produces. Certainly, there is no reason today, tomorrow, or any other day, to say we must have lower wages in order to benefit another segment of our economy.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield at that point?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. MORSE. With reference to what the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Kentucky have said about the cost of the program, I think we need to emphasize and reemphasize in this debate the cost of the program, because I do not have to tell the Senator from Kentucky that the consumers of the United States have had a propaganda job done on them. They have been told what is a complete untruth, namely, that the agricultural support program will cost too much money——

Mr. CLEMENTS. May I interrupt the Senator to make one observation?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would add that not only has misinformation been given, but, in my judgment, it was planned from the day it was started, and is still being disseminated according to the original plan.

Mr. MORSE. It is most unfair to the American people, because they are entitled at all times to have the facts presented to them, and it is most unfortunate that so many millions of our consumers now have the false notion that the agricultural support program has been instrumental in bringing about a very high cost of living, when the fact is that it has cost approximately $2⅓ billion, averaging a little more than $2 a year for each person in the United States. That is pretty low insurance, and it is to the benefit of the cash registers on the main streets of America.

I like to point out to chambers of commerce that in the last analysis the businessmen have been the primary benefactors of the effort to maintain a support program which has given the farmers a decent purchasing power.

We hear it said, "Oh, but it is only on certain basics."

There, again, we need to keep in mind the fact that one of the direct results of maintaining a support program on basics has been to maintain a higher price for nonbasics than otherwise would have prevailed if we did not have the basic support program.

Mr. CLEMENTS. And not only on basics, but on other commodities.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. But immediately after the present administration came into office, the Secretary of Agriculture proceeded to use his discretionary power in regard to the commodities over which the Department of Agriculture had jurisdiction by lowering supports for them.

As I have said again and again, it is not true that the flexible program has not been in operation. The administration started putting it into operation on every commodity over which the Secretary had discretionary control. With the exception of wool—we stopped it in that instance by passing the wool bill—the Secretary has applied his flexible principle to every commodity over which he had jurisdiction. Two days before the state of the Union message this year he did it with reference to rice.

We are now getting statements from the Department of Commerce on commodity prices, but they have already hurt the farmer, and they have discovered it was not good political medicine they were feeding the American people, so they are going to try some new therapy.

I am fed up with a propaganda program which is resulting in misinforming the American people both as to the cost of the program in the bill for which we are fighting and as to which the Senator from Louisiana is doing such yeoman service, but the Secretary of Agriculture has been carrying on such propaganda ever since he has been in office.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I should like to make one observation to the Senator. Has there ever been a time when the Senator has heard from the lips of the Secretary of Agriculture, or from any of those associated with him, the true reason why the great bulk of the surplus was created? The Senator knows it was created as the result of the Korean conflict in 1950 and the years immediately following that year. But has the Senator from Oregon, who is one of the most observing Members of this body—there is no Member who seeks full information to a greater extent than

does the Senator from Oregon—ever seen a single, solitary quotation attributed to the Secretary of Agriculture in which he gave the American people the facts as to what caused the surplus?

Mr. MORSE. No. It has been a shibboleth or a scare or fear argument. The Secretary has not talked in terms of need in relation to the surplus. In a period of 22 years the Government has spent approximately $2⅓ billion to maintain a support program for agriculture, which, incidentally, is only a drop in the bucket compared with the subsidies which the Government has been paying to big business over the years.

I am always amused when I go before chambers of commerce and there is an open-forum discussion on the subsidy program, and I hear people representing certain industries saying something about the subsidy benefits other industries have been enjoying.

Where would business in this country be today if we did not have what amounts to a great surplus in the whole field of production? The military goods which we are producing by the hundreds of millions of dollars in order to keep this country secure are really surpluses. If we took off the subsidy this afternoon, what would happen to business? Business would realize the kind of support prices it has been getting and which have kept certain segments of business alive by way of military production which is surplus to the civilian economy.

When there comes a little recession or depression we have a surplus labor force. What is unemployment? It is surplus labor force. Consider the millions and millions of dollars we spend to solve the problem. It is a form of subsidy, but it is a justifiable subsidy.

Let me say that the farmer gets very little assistance by way of the surplus, but the Secretary of Agriculture should talk about the need for the surplus. He should put the surplus to work in accordance with the dietary needs of the American people, and there would then be not much of a surplus. But, again, statistics have shown that during this period the total surplus, percentagewise, has been very small according to what we have actually used, not according to what we needed to use.

I am for an agricultural program which will see to it that the people of this country who do not have the income to buy for themselves a balanced diet shall have a balanced diet.

That is one of the responsibilities of a government which believes in the general-welfare clause of the Constitution. It would result in the creation of great wealth which would reflect itself in the flow of increased tax dollars into the Treasury of the United States. We must have vision, statesmanship, and courage to solve the problem—not the retreating attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture, who, in my judgment, is following a course of action which cannot be reconciled with the highest moral principles the Government should follow in serving the people under the general-welfare clause.

I shall not remain silent in the Senate on any issue involving the farmers until my Government is willing to adopt a program which will recognize that our standard of living is dependent upon maintaining a surplus food supply. If a time ever comes when we have a break-even food supply, watch out for what will happen to America, because our standard of living is dependent upon maintaining a surplus food supply.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am pleased that the Senator from Oregon referred to unemployment and the use of surplus food for people who are in need and those for whom the standard of living could be raised. I think there is no better area in which to observe the operation of the philosophy of the present Department of Agriculture than in that field.

The Senator from Oregon knows very well that there has been ample legislation on the statute books to go a long way toward directing commodity surpluses into areas of great need, provided the leadership and the vision existed in the Department of Agriculture.

I think it is well to state at this time that when an effort was made to process some of the surplus food which had not previously been processed, so that it could be used by the more unfortunate persons of this country, the effort to use both corn and wheat was consistently resisted by the Department. Only last year, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], was legislation enacted, which I thought was unnecessary, and I think some of the great lawyers in this body thought was unnecessary, providing authority which we believed was already vested in the Department. It was simply to make certain that the Department could not use lack of authority as an excuse that legislation was passed providing a reasonable sum of money to process both corn and wheat for the needy and thus enable them to raise their standard of living. I think that was the first time that was done.

I say this merely because of negative philosophy of the Department with respect to the use by the needy of commodities which are in surplus.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of my good friend from Oregon, if the Senator from Kentucky will yield for that purpose.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have been discussing the cost of the price-support program. As the Senator from Oregon has correctly stated, from November 1933, to November 1955, the entire cost of supporting all the commodities, whether basics or nonbasics, was a little more than $2⅓ billion. But we have now been speaking about basics. I was glad to hear the Senator from Oregon state that by keeping the price of basics up, it would have a healthy desired effect on the prices of nonbasics. What I wish to say to my good friend from Oregon is that I have cited the losses sustained by both basics and nonbasics. Now let us see what the picture is with respect to the basics, since some persons are concerned about placing price supports for them at 90 percent of parity.

The actual losses on basics from October 17, 1933, to November 30, 1955, a period of more than 22 years, was $473,278,879. I merely wished to make that clear. That is the cost of the support program for the basics we are speaking of and I want everyone to note that its cost is only around an eighth of the total cost of the whole price-support program.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the flexible system—the sliding scale that only slides down—the "big business" concept of agriculture will be fostered. Under the 90 percent concept, we will preserve a traditional way of life that has made us as a Nation strong and great.

Frankly, I cannot look forward with any comfort to a system of agriculture dominated by "big business." I do not like to think of an America in which consumers will be at the mercy of a few large "factory" farmers—capable of exerting all the weapons of monopoly against our people.

The issue before us involves the immediate need of our farmers for relief. But it also involves the long-range interest of all our people in a diversified agriculture.

The city consumer has been the subject of an unceasing propaganda barrage. He has been told that his interests lie in low farm income—in depressing the standards of the farmers and ranchers of this country.

But concealed behind that propaganda barrage is the long-run fact that he will soon be at the mercy of agricultural monopoly—unless we act and act now.

Mr. President, I do not question the integrity or the motives of the Secretary of Agriculture. My objections go to his philosophy—and it is a philosophy which is perfectly consistent with the philosophy of his party and his administration.

He appears to believe—quite sincerely—that "big business" is the way of the future. I do not question his right to advocate the policies that flow from his basic premise.

I do question his right to engage in playing the farmer against labor; the consumer against agriculture. I do question his right to try to divide our people by trying to convince them that one section of our economy can be prosperous only at the expense of another.

We had that example in a stark and naked form recently when he told farmers that they could blame their troubles on labor. Personally, I think that such a philosophy leads us down the road to common misery for all. I wonder just how those words were taken in the Labor Department.

The results of his farm policy have already spilled over into other sections of our country.

I ask my colleagues to tour the small farms in their States, as has the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Let them approach the merchants, the tradesmen, the farm-implement dealers. What will they say? They will say that the farmers are not buying, and they themselves are feeling the pinch.

Farm depression can start a chain reaction as dangerous as the atomic bomb. One part of our country cannot suffer without all suffering. That process is already in motion today.

Mr. President, I am not here to contend that the bill is perfect. In many respects it represents a compromise. In others it could be improved by amendment; and I am certain that many amendments will be offered, and certainly some will be adopted. Moreover, the bill may well be improved in a conference between the representatives of the two bodies.

One feature of the measure is, frankly, experimental. I am referring to the soil bank plan. When I say "experimental" I do not mean that the plan has not been in the minds of the people before, or that it has not been in operation before; I mean it has never been in operation to the extent which is contemplated by the language of the bill which is before the Senate today. The soil bank, in my judgment, will be productive of much good in the future, but it can do little to meet the problems of the immediate present.

As the chairman of the committee stated earlier, the one item of the bill which will be able to be felt in the pockets of the farmers at an early date is that which will provide higher support prices for the farmers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I observe, if my friend will permit me——

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. All of this will come about without increasing the acreage. Let us not forget that.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whether there are in effect rigid price supports or flexible price supports, the Secretary of Agriculture will use the same law to determine the number of acres which will be planted; and the amounts which will be paid for price supports will have no effect on that. It is the supply which determines whether marketing quotas are in effect, not the price support level. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas will have to be imposed regardless of what support prices are for the basic commodities; and farmers will have to keep within their acreage allotments whether price supports are at 90 percent or 75 percent of parity. Farmers will raise as much as they can on their allotted acres whether supports are at 90 or 75 percent of parity. The price support level will not make it possible for them to raise one additional bushel or one additional pound.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct. The distinguished chairman of the committee is eminently correct.

Regardless of the imperfections of the measure, it is a farm bill which is designed to help the farmer. That is something that cannot be said of the measure which is now on the statute books. This is not a bill for big business, nor is it a bill to turn farming into big business. It is drawn to help people who need help, and ultimately to promote the prosperity of our country.

It is a bill to help ranchers, planters, dairymen, and all those who make their living, directly or indirectly, from the soil. Furthermore, it is founded upon a basic concept which, regardless of its critics, has worked well in the past—a floor at 90 percent of a fair price, and under rigid acreage controls.

The criticisms of the 90 percent concept appear to be wide of the mark. It is a concept that is workable where commodities are controllable and storable. It has worked well in the case of tobacco, a product which is basic. It is basic and is of great importance in the State which I have the honor in part to represent.

In passing, I think it is fair to say that up to this date the Federal Government has not been out one dime on the tobacco program, and that program has been operating for many years.

The choice before us is clear. We can return to 90 percent price supports and bolster a way of life that is dear to us all, or we can continue the sliding scale and resign ourselves to a future of factory farming and big business.

Mr. President, I have never been opposed to big business merely just because it is big, but I believe that the day when our agriculture is merely another belt-line enterprise will be a day every friend of the farmer will regret.

We can, if we wish, delude ourselves with the concept that the sliding scale will rid us of our surpluses. We can, if we wish, delude ourselves with the idea that the so-called flexible supports will bring agriculture and industry into balance. Every fact and every statistic, in my judgment, contradicts both ideas, but facts and statistics are frequently ignored.

We cannot tell ourselves that the sliding scale will lead anywhere except to misery for farming as we have known it heretofore. I do not believe we could do any greater disservice to our country than to continue the legislation which is now on the statute books.

Mr. President, out of order, I send two amendments to the desk, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 3183, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am offering an amendment to S. 3183 which will have the effect of making a 90 percent support price for dairy products mandatory, thus putting dairy products on a par with the basic commodities. My amendment would substitute a 90-percent floor on supports for dairy prices, in place of the 80 to 90 percent discretionary range, stipulated in section 105 of the bill.

As regards general farm policy, I continue to believe that fixed price supports for farm commodities are desirable, until such time as just and sensible steps are taken to bring farm production into line with consumption of farm products. I have always felt that President Eisenhower was right when he said in Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952, that 90 percent price supports are in the nature of a moral and legal commitment which must be upheld. Over the past 15 years the farm community has been encouraged to commit maximum manpower, maximum natural resources, maximum plant and machinery, toward the objective of maximum production. Farmers have made these long-range commitments on their understanding that the Government would see to it that whatever they produced would be bought at fair prices. In legal terminology, there has been something akin to action in reliance on the part of the farmer. It seems to me that when the Government suddenly yanks out the rug, and thus defeats the farmer's expectations, it is, in effect, repudiating a moral contract with the farm community.

But enough, for the moment, of the philosophy behind fixed price supports. A majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry appear to agree with me on the philosophy, since they provided, in Senate bill 3183, for 90 percent fixed price supports on basic commodities.

What is utterly baffling to me is that the members of the committee should have decided that producers of corn, cotton, tobacco, milling wheat, and so forth, are entitled to mandatory 90 percent supports, but that producers of dairy commodities are not. Why the discrimination against dairy farmers? Certainly such discrimination cannot be justified by comparing how, let us say, corn producers have fared under the Benson flexible-support policy with how milk producers have fared under that policy. The Benson policies, to be sure, have had a disastrous effect on the net income of the producers of basic commodities; all of us know this to be a fact, and our source is nothing less than the statistics furnished by Mr. Benson's department. But the Benson flexible-support policy has had the same kind of effect on the income of dairy farmers.

In April 1954, Secretary Benson decided to reduce the support price for dairy products to 75 percent of parity. Mr. President, let me give you an idea of the effect that decision had on the income of Wisconsin farmers, who are, primarily, dairy farmers. In 1953, with a 90 percent support price, the average farm family in eastern Wisconsin earned $3,760 net. In 1954, with the Benson

low supports in effect, the average farm family in eastern Wisconsin earned $3,321, net—or a drop of 11 percent. In the same period the net income of the average western Wisconsin farmer dropped from $3,159 to $2,494—or a decrease of 21 percent. I have been unable to obtain 1955 statistics from the Department of Agriculture, but my understanding is that the same situation prevailed last year.

Tentative cash-receipt figures for 1955 are available. Although they indicate a slight rise in receipts, the dairy farmer's net income picture is no less dreary. The gross-receipts figures indicate only that the volume of production has increased, while prices have stayed low. The dairy farmer continues to suffer because his unit cost of production has stayed at the same level or has gone up. I may say, in this connection, that the Benson theory that lower price supports would decrease production has been proved false: just the opposite has occurred.

If it is true that the tragic consequences of Secretary Benson's policies are being shared by the dairy farmers—and I assure you, Mr. President, that every dairy farmer knows this to be true—then why do we deliberately single out dairy farmers as a group that deserves only half-way rehabilitation measures? I say that the effect of Senate bill 3183, as it now stands, is to treat dairy farmers as though they were second-class citizens in the farm community.

Let me address just a word to Senators who have declared themselves opposed to fixed price supports. I hope they will vote to amend Senate bill 3183 in accordance with the amendment I am recommending—if only for the reason that it would put dairy farmers on a par with other farmers. Senators then could vote fixed price supports either up or down, as they may choose; but at least they would not be a party to the present discrimination against the dairy farmer. Regardless of whether we have fixed supports, or flexible supports, or no supports, it seems to me that all farmers are entitled to the same treatment by the National Government.

I may add that the 80 percent floor applying to supports for dairy commodities, for which Senate bill 3183 now provides, is a sure guaranty that dairy prices will be supported at no higher than 80 percent of parity. Secretary Benson is now supporting dairy prices at 75 percent of parity, the minimum allowed by law; and thus he appears determined to support dairy prices at as low a level as he can get away with.

Mr. President, I am not unaware, of course, that the storage of dairy surpluses presents a special problem that does not arise in the case of nonperishable commodities. But I am also aware that the Agriculture Department is, right now, extremely slow in filling applications for dairy surpluses from charitable institutions. If these orders were filled promptly, the problem of dairy surpluses would not be as pressing as it is today. Nor do I think that the Agriculture Department has done all it might do by way of encouraging hospitals, homes for the old and needy, and other charitable institutions, to help unload dairy surpluses. The demand for butter, for example—especially among the needy—is relatively elastic. Thus, if the Department adopted more liberal policies as regards the allotment of dairy surpluses to charitable institutions, we would find that more dairy products would be consumed by the needy, without affecting the market price.

Also, it seems to me that we have not adequately exploited the opportunities for supplying our friends abroad with our excess dairy commodities. The sorely tried people of Korea, for example, would dearly like to consume dairy products that are surplus in the United States.

Mr. President, all of us recognize that the basic problem in the farm situation is the discrepancy between the present production potential and domestic consumption. This discrepancy was created many years ago by Government policies which, to meet our wartime needs, encouraged farmers to commit their resources to greater production than could be consumed domestically. I think steps must be taken to reduce the production-consumption gap; but I do not believe the whole burden of this agonizing readjustment should fall on the farmer. I think the farmer is entitled to continue to receive his fair share of the national income until there are evolved policies which will cause the burden of the needed agricultural adjustment to fall equally on all segments of our population.

As regards the amendment I am offering, I do not think it is fair or wise to try to alleviate the suffering of some farmers, and to leave others in a state of critical depression. Under our Constitution and under the American tradition, all our citizens deserve the equal protection of our laws. This, I submit includes dairy farmers.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ANDERSON ON MONDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has had some difficulty in arranging his schedule so that he can make comments on the pending measure. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning business on Monday, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] shall have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that when the Senate reconvenes on Monday next, at the conclusion of morning business the Senator from New Mexico shall have the floor?

The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think that concludes the business of the Senate for today.

In pursuance of the order heretofore agreed to, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 5, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 2, 1956:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William L. Longshore, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama for a term of 4 years, vice Frank M. Johnson, Jr., elevated.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 2, 1956:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Capt. Ira E. Eskridge for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral, United States Coast Guard, effective February 1, 1956.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, inspire us to discharge the duties and responsibilities of this day with minds that are graciously illumined by Thy divine wisdom and the light of Thy presence.

Confirm us in the faith that Thou wilt not leave us to depend upon our own finite understanding and the limitations of our human weaknesses or the expediencies and counsels of men.

Grant that we may never be troubled with doubts and fears concerning the morrow for Thou wilt always keep us in perfect peace if our minds and hearts are stayed on Thee.

May the revelations of Thy sustaining grace make us strong and valiant for truth and righteousness and fill us with the glad assurance that a blessed day is coming when the hatreds among men shall be changed into love and their enmities shall be supplanted by the spirit of good will.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a report on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1957.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 356) and ask for its immediate consideration.

I serve notice that at the proper time I shall offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $625,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees within and without the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: On page 1, line 4, strike out "$625,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000."

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. May I inquire as to the gentleman's purpose in asking me to yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. As a member of the committee, I wish to comment on the resolution as amended.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman does not wish to offer an amendment or oppose the amendment offered?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. No; I do not.

Mr. BURLESON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. If I yield the gentleman a specific amount of time, I assume I lose control of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will not lose the floor. He reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. BURLESON. I do reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman from Ohio has no intention of trying to take the time away. It is merely that I would like to make some comments on this resolution.

Mr. BURLESON. How much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Approximately 5 minutes.

Mr. BURLESON. I am glad to yield the gentleman 10 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time this afternoon to comment not only upon the amount requested by the Committee on Government Operations for its work during the remainder of this session of Congress, but also upon the broad question of the scope of the activities of the various committees of the House of Representatives.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Subcommittee on Accounts of the House Administration Committee during my two terms in the House of Representatives—under Republican leadership in the 83d Congress and under Democrat leadership in this Congress. I should like to pause at this point to pay tribute to the chairmen of these subcommittees, our former colleague, the Honorable C. W. (Runt) Bishop in the 83d Congress, and in this session the Honorable SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL. I would like to pay special tribute to Mr. FRIEDEL because of the fair and impartial manner in which he has conducted committee meetings this year, for he has had a particularly tough job. He has demonstrated in every way his desire to cooperate in all matters with those of us, his fellow committee members on both sides of the aisle, who did not always see eye to eye with him or with the position of the committee requesting funds.

Under the rules of the House, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Accounts is called upon to pass upon requests for funds by other committees of the House. To be perfectly frank, the rules place the Accounts Subcommittee in an almost impossible situation in that its members are asked to pass upon requests for funds from their colleagues who are merely trying to carry out a job which they feel is required of them under the House rules. In short, the Accounts Subcommittee is asked to judge the merits of the requests of our colleagues for funds without providing us with any real standards upon which to base that judgment.

Let me use the House Select Committee on Small Business as an example of the point I am attempting to make. In the 80th Congress, this committee was authorized $130,000 to carry on its work, and it returned a little over $2,250 at the end of the biennium. Just two Congresses later, in the 82d Congress, that committee was authorized $260,000, double the funds used 4 years earlier, and it returned slightly less than $38,000 in unspent funds. And now, in the 84th Congress, just last week, the House authorized a total of $330,000 for this committee for the 84th Congress, 2½ times the amount spent only 5 Congresses ago.

The duties of this committee, as set forth by the Congress, are to concern itself with all matters pertaining to small business. The chairman and members of the Small Business Committee appearing before our subcommittee clearly brought out that they feel this is a directive to look into all phases of our economy in an effort to act as a sort of Capitol Hill lobby on behalf of the small-business man.

Mr. Speaker, our subcommittee has been concerned for some time about the overlapping and duplication of the investigative functions of the various committees of the Congress. We have felt that there might well be time, money, and effort wasted not only by the Members of Congress but also by witnesses who are called to testify before these committees from the Government agencies, business firms, and from the professions. The point was very clearly made before our subcommittee by the members of the Small Business Committee that they felt there was no overlapping of their activities with those of other committees, because their viewpoint was different; or to put it another way, they felt they were looking at the problem from a different angle. Therefore, the members of the Small Business Committee believed there was no conflict or duplication between their investigation and the investigation of the House Judiciary Committee into monopoly practices; nor that there was anything unusual about the investigation of the aircraft industry, for example, and other big industries.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Small Business Committee went to some length to explain to us that they coordinated their investigations with other committees of the Congress and an effort was made to avoid duplication. But I am not certain this has been accomplished.

I am as much in favor of legislation for the protection of the small-business man as any Member of the House, because I happen to be a small-business man myself and know some of the problems which a small concern, with limited capacity and a limited number of employees, has in this modern day. I use the Small Business Committee only as an example to point out how the scope of some of the committee investigations has mushroomed and will continue to mushroom if the philosophy of the Committee on Small Business is followed to its logical conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, under this philosophy, this committee could well employ hundreds of economists to study every industry in the country and it could, in effect, develop into an economic surveying task force as much as a committee of the Congress.

The same may be said for the Committee on Government Operations whose request for appropriations we are considering today. In the 80th Congress, $327,500 was authorized for this committee, and a little less than $69,000 was returned unexpended. In other words, the Committee on Government Operations spent some $260,000 in that biennium. Now, just 5 Congresses later, we find that same committee, with 54 members on its staff, requesting an authorization of $1 million for this biennium.

Mr. Speaker, at first I questioned this amount as being far beyond what seemed

reasonable, but I think it well illustrates the point I am trying to emphasize, namely, the untenable position in which members of the Subcommittee on Accounts are placed by the rules or lack of rules of the House of Representatives. When we have a request for funds for a committee which almost equals the total amount expended by all committees in the 80th Congress, it seems to me we have a problem here that needs looking into. Certainly in the past 10 years our Government has not grown in scope, complexity, or in personnel to require such an increase.

But then, when members of the Committee on Government Operations testified before us and pointed out that they were given, under the Reorganization Act of 1946, the real investigatory powers of the Congress, I was forced to take another look. They pointed out also that only 34 percent of the operations of our Government are presently being audited by the Comptroller General, and except for special committees of the House or Senate set up from time to time, their committee is the only supervisory body of the Congress with the responsibility of keeping an eye on the job done by the executive department. I could not help but pause after listening at considerable length to the protestations of need of the various subcommittees and the overall committee and feel in a very curious position. For, by voting to reduce the amount of this authorization, I would be questioning the integrity of my colleagues who were merely trying to do a job as they saw fit under the rules and this I was unwilling to do on the evidence presented.

But, Mr. Speaker, this nevertheless emphasizes a point I desire to make. If the position of the members of the Committe on Government Operations as to their responsibility is logically carried to its conclusions, its staff would far exceed that of the General Accounting Office and its appropriations—monthly mind you, not biennially—would exceed a million dollars, for it considers itself the watch dog of the Congress over every branch, sphere, and activity of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, to further underline the gravity of this situation, in my opinion, let me point out that in the 80th Congress there was expended $1,355,000 by all of the committees of the Congress excluding, of course, outlays by the regularly-authorized standing committees and funds appropriated in the Legislative Appropriations Act. In the 84th Congress, it looks as if these funds will more than double this amount if the committees spend at the rate which they have stated they will.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, our hearings over these past 4 years in the Subcommittee on Accounts indicated a sufficient body of opinion among the membership of the House favoring changes to warrant reexamination of the committee system as it now operates under the Reorganization Act. At least, minority staff members should be part of all committees and, more important, perhaps, the areas of committee responsibility should be reexamined and more closely delineated. Also, consideration should be given to expanding the present activities of the General Accounting Office to take over much of the investigative work of the committees of the House, the beneficial results of which are often lost because of partisan wrangling.

Let me emphasize that I will be the first to defend the right of Congress to investigate, but that right must be wisely and judiciously used if it is to continue to command the respect of the American people. If we continue to enlarge the scope and magnitude of our investigations without coordinating them more effectively, I fear we may incur the wrath of the very citizens whose liberty we seek to secure.

To that end I am offering a resolution to establish a bipartisan committee to review the framework of the House committee system, the responsibilities and jurisdictions of the various committees, and directing this select committee to report back by December 31, 1956.

I realize this may be a futile gesture, that it takes a far greater wave of desire for action than one lone retiring Congressman can generate to overcome not only the inertia caused by the overload of work of most of us but also to overcome the traditions which have gradually developed in the House over the countless years. Nevertheless, I would not be true to myself, nor to my country, if I did not make this attempt to bring some order out of the present maze and mass of committee activities which seems to get more unmanageable each term of Congress.

I sincerely hope that the leadership on both sides of the aisle will give this matter their serious consideration.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] on the statement he has just made. I think there is no question that his proposal, the resolution which he is going to introduce, warrants and deserves most careful study and consideration.

Incidentally, may I also say, since the gentleman from Ohio is leaving the Congress, his able contributions to the Committee on House Administration will be missed. I know I express for both sides of the table of the committee our deep appreciation of him and our regret that he is leaving. At all times he has manifested a devotion to conscientious service unexcelled by anyone whom I have ever observed. I trust that as he returns to private life, he will find the fullest measure of success and happiness and he can do so, if for no other reason, by the realization that he has served well, ably, and with distinction in the Congress of the United States. He can be assured that he leaves here among us lasting friendships and feelings of highest estem for him.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to secure from the acting majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for bringing this matter to our attention. It will be our purpose to adjourn today until Monday.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] that on Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. Also on Monday, H. R. 9720, the Department of Labor, Health, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1957, will be taken up.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, and the independent offices appropriation bill for 1957 will be considered.

For Wednesday H. R. 2128, a patents extension bill has been programmed.

I know of no program at this time for the balance of the week. Of course there is the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later, and that conference reports may be called up at any time.

Mr. MARTIN. I presume we can count on the fact that the public roads bill will not be taken up next week, then?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course the program could be altered within the reservation, but I should think, and as far as I know, the road bill will not be called up for consideration next week.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House. I would like to state it. I send up a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 417

Whereas in the Washington Post and Times Herald, published in Washington,

D. C., on Friday, March 2, 1956, under the byline of Drew Pearson, there appeared the following statement:

"NOTE 2.—For years Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, has carefully scrutinized the House Ways and Means Committee which writes the tax laws to make sure nobody was put on that committee who might vote against the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance and the right of oil-gas companies to write off the total cost of drilling wells. This is one reason the special tax benefits have never been changed"; and

Whereas that statement impugns the dignity and the integrity of the proceedings of the House as well as of the Speaker of the House: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed by the Speaker pro tempore, authorized to make investigation, to hold hearings, to summon before it the writer of the statement quoted above, any and all others who may be deemed to have information relating to said charge, to ascertain the truth or the falsity of said charge, and to recommend appropriate action to be taken by the House; and be it further

Resolved, That said committee be given the usual authority to summon witnesses, administer oaths, take all necessary and proper action to accomplish the purpose for which it is created: *And provided further*, That all expenses of such investigation, the holding of such hearings, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair rules that the gentleman does not present a question of the privilege of the House.

It is perfectly all right for the Speaker or any Member to advocate a 27½ percent depletion. The resolution does not present a question which involves the privilege of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that unanimous-consent request after the business of the day is disposed of. The Chair believes the gentleman knows the custom that prevails in the House.

DREW PEARSON

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the attention of the House was called to the fact that an employee of a joint committee of the House and Senate and the gentleman referred to in the resolution and who wrote the article quoted previously charged that the President of the United States used his high office to improperly influence legislation and to cause the Secretary of the Interior to approve of a steal of from $200,000 to $600,000 worth of timber.

A resolution calling for the appointment of a subcommittee to investigate that charge was offered by me yesterday. Today this gentleman who writes for the Washington Post and Times Herald has charged that the Speaker of the House, a gentleman whose integrity and record is beyond question, has appointed members to the Ways and Means Committee who would use that committee to see to it that constituents, individuals, and corporations in the Speaker's district and in his State get the 27½ percent deduction or depletion allowance on the production of oil. If that is not a charge of official crooked misconduct, then I know not how one can be made.

Mr. Speaker, my position is this: We all know that this Congress and preceding Congresses have repeatedly been charged with improper motives, with improper actions, because of the payment of money or because of special privileges granted to Members. Now we have the charge that the Speaker has improperly influenced legislation. If the Members of the minority do not care to resent charges that the President of the United States, their President, has been guilty of official misconduct, if the Members on the majority side do not care to resent the charge made by this notorious gentleman—then there is nothing I can do about it other than to call for House action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may make the personal observation that members of the Ways and Means Committee on the Democratic side are elected in caucus by secret ballot.

PROCUREMENT OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 410 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9428) to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require and then yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for the consideration of H. R. 9428 which was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services and also by the Committee on Rules.

This legislation will correct and remedy a long-delayed and needed change in some of the considerations given the Medical Department of the Armed Forces. Heretofore the doctors and the dentists of the Armed Forces received a very much lower pro rata rate to pay than the average civilian doctor. Besides that, Mr. Speaker, the armed services have been losing almost two-thirds of their medical personnel through resignation, death, and other reasons. One of the great difficulties the armed services have had has been keeping and retaining competent medical personnel. During the last 3 fiscal years over 1,400 Regular medical and dental officers resigned or were separated from the service by reason of death, resignation, disability, or retirement, and during the same period of time only 732 medical or dental officers became Regular officers in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. The same relative decrease has been inflicted on the Dental Corps. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will not only give the leaders of the Armed Forces an opportunity to increase the Regular medical personnel up to two-thirds of the required personnel but it also will make it an easy matter to secure whatever other doctors and dentists are necessary to serve the Armed Forces through the draft. This legislation has the endorsement of the American Medical Association.

Congressman KILDAY, the chairman of the subcommittee of the Armed Services who held hearings on this bill will explain its provisions in detail when the House goes into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any important opposition to this legislation. It was approved by the Armed Services Committee unanimously.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the resolution making in order the consideration of H. R. 9428 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules after hearing testimony as to the purposes of the bill. As was so ably explained by the gentleman from Indiana, the bill would ease the way to obtain for the military services of the Nation the medical and dental doctors and specialists that are so badly needed without resorting to the draft of doctors and dentists. It is believed that the enactment of this bill, which would increase the pay of medical and dental doctors in the Armed Forces, will bring to those services the number of men that they need in those categories without resort to a draft. Of course, all of us, I think, in the House are very anxious to see that day come.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning, there is no opposition to the bill that I know of, and we have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 408 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]; and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

This resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on H. R. 9429, a bill to provide medical care for the dependents of members of the uniformed services.

The bill authorizes medical care in the medical facilities under the jurisdiction of the uniformed services, describes the dependents who will be entitled to this care, and the type of medical and dental care that will be provided. It also provides that where medical facilities are not available, dependents of military personnel will be authorized, with certain safeguards to prevent abuse, to secure medical care from civilian medical sources. This shall be accomplished by authorizing the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to contract for medical care for the wives and children of all members of the uniformed services under such insurance, medical service or health plan as he deems appropriate.

The Secretary of Defense would also be authorized, depending on the availability of funds and the type of program that can be implemented, to provide medical care in civilian facilities for dependent parents and parents-in-law, wives and children of personnel who die on active duty and retired personnel and their dependents.

It has been established that medical care is provided for only about 60 percent of the dependents of servicemen. The Committee on Armed Services has been advised that for fiscal 1957 approximately $76 million will be available to defray the costs of the program. It has been estimated that a fairly complete medical program can be devised for a total cost of less than $85 million annually.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I hope that the membership will adopt the resolution making possible the consideration of this measure.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has ably described the purpose of this resolution and the bill which the resolution would make in order to be considered.

This measure, H. R. 9429, simply provides for extension to all dependents in certain categories, of men in the Armed Forces, hospital privileges which some cannot now obtain because of lack of availability of hospital space. There is no opposition to this rule that I know of on this side of the House and no requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCUREMENT OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9428) to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9428, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all Members of the House, during recent years, have been concerned about the necessity, in the first instance, to pass the Doctor Draft Act, and later to extend its provisions. Those of us who found it necessary to bring that legislation here were frank to admit that we regarded it as being highly discriminatory and unjust, and felt that it could be defended only on the ground of the absolute necessity to procure proper medical care for those persons who were serving in our armed services.

We continue to have difficulty in attracting and retaining in the regular service physicians and dentists. We have attempted to analyze some of the things that produce this difficulty. We are forced to the conclusion that rank and pay of the dental officers and medical officers of the services is one of the principal hindrances that we have.

To give you some idea of the magnitude of the situation which confronts us, I should like to point out that during the last 3 fiscal years almost 20,000 medical and dental officers entered the military services as a result of the Doctor Draft Act. During this same period, 22,340 medical and dental officers left the military services and returned to civilian life.

In addition, during the last 3 fiscal years, 1,419 Regular medical and dental officers resigned or were separated from the service by death, resignation, disability, or retirement, while during this same period only 732 medical and dental officers became Regular officers in the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

During the past 2 fiscal years 1,000 career medical officers alone have been separated from the armed services, of whom 808 resigned. During this same period only 350 medical officers were commissioned in the Regular corps. And of the 350 who were commissioned as Regular officers, it is significant to note that a majority became Regular officers solely for the purpose of obtaining residency training and not with the intention of becoming career medical officers. In the Air Force alone, 55 percent of the medical officers who became Regular officers to take residency training, resigned their commissions upon completion of their obligated periods of service.

In the Army, during the past 2 fiscal years, of those medical officers who were eligible to resign, having completed their obligated service or otherwise, 76 percent of the medical officers serving in the grade of captain resigned, 66 percent of the majors resigned, 24 percent of the lieutenant colonels resigned, and even 2 percent of the colonels resigned.

The situation in the Navy is even more drastic. During the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, nearly 300 Regular Navy medical officers resigned their commisisons and 70 more were lost through death or retirement. To replace this staggering loss, the Navy was able to obtain only 39 new Regular medical officers.

So we do have here a very serious situation. I do not think it needs the citation of figures and statistics to sustain it. We all know there is a shortage of doctors and dentists for the civilian population as well as the military population.

At the present time under the Officer Personnel Act which is now in effect, physicians commissioned in the Regular service are granted what is known as constructive service. It is intended to compensate for that period of time which an officer spends in self-education prior to his commission.

Under the existing law a dentist entering upon active duty for the first time is credited with 3 years of constructive service, and a physician is credited with 4 years of constructive service. This action permits his commissioning in the first instance as a first lieutenant rather than as a second lieutenant. However, we all know that you cannot become a physician with only 4 years of preparation after college. The minimum time in which an individual can become a physician is 5 years after he completes an academic course; in other words, 4 years of medical school and at least 1 as an intern before he would be recognized as a practicing physician.

The law does not permit the commissioning of a man as a medical officer or physician unless he has actually spent that period of time in training to qualify in his profession. The law now permits a dentist to receive 3 years of constructive service. We all know it takes a dentist 4 years, after his college education, in order to graduate from dental school. At the present time, the American Dental

Association recognizes it as being desirable that dentists pursue an internship, but at the present time that is not required of dentists, as it is of a doctor. Therefore, what we propose here is to grant constructive service to physicians and dentists on the basis of year for year of preparation. In other words, the physician would be required to spend 4 years in medical school and 1 year in internship. We, therefore, grant him, upon entering service, 5 years of constructive service. The dentist has to spend 4 years beyond college to qualify as a dentist. This bill will grant him 4 years of constructive service. In effect, they will be commissioned an additional rank higher than has been the case in the past. They enter the service on an original commission with the rank of captain 1 year after completing medical or dental school. In addition, this bill also permits the counting of this constructive service for rank and longevity. In the past, it has been recognized for rank only and not for longevity. By granting it for longevity also, he draws increased pay upon the constructive service which he is granted. As a matter of fact, the line officers of our services, if they come out of the academies, of course, or if they come out of the college ROTC's have 4 years of college training. It is believed that this grant of additional constructive service will serve only to bring physicians and dentists up to the rank they should have had in comparison with their contempories of the line. The task force of the departments who have prepared this bill is composed of line officers. In addition, the medical personnel have always been on a separate promotion list so that we now anticipate no feeling within the services that the medical officers are getting more consideration than that to which they are entitled. That is the first portion of the bill. It is estimated to cost $8 million per year. As I said, that is the first portion of the bill. And, as I have said, there is a very strong feeling that this is no more than the medical personnel have been entitled to from the beginning, and that they are fully entitled to year for year for the years of preparation required to qualify for a commission.

The second portion of the bill has to do with special pay and it recognizes a very practical situation which exists in our country at the present time. It is a fact, and it cannot be disputed, that the average physician now earns $16,500 per year. That is net income after office expenses and not his net income after taxes. That is his income from his profession, and it averages $16,500 per year. The dentist is not quite that high and the average income of dentists after office expenses runs approximately $12,000 per year. Still, we cannot expect men to be willing to serve in the military services at this great disparity to pay. The doctor in the Veterans' Administration is paid under a special law applying to medical employees of the Veterans' Administration. At the present time there is a great disparity in the pay of military medical men as compared to those employed in the Veterans' Administration. I am not referring to the Veterans' Administration specialists, but I am referring to medical officers in the Veterans' administration. So we have brought here a proposal that would increase the present special pay. Under existing law, medical officers and dentists are now being paid $100 per month more than other officers of the service of the same rank and years of service. That applies throughout his service—$100 more per month than any other officer of the same rank and years of service.

This bill proposes that we continue the special pay for doctors or physicians and dentists at $100 per month for the first 3 years of service. For the next 3 years of service, that is up until 6 years of total service that we grant special pay of $150 a month; that after 6 years, until 10 years of service, $200 per month of special pay; and after 10 years of service and throughout the balance of his service $250 per month in special pay.

I want to emphasize that this will not bring him up to the average income of the physician or dentist in private practice. Until the military physician and surgeon has reached 20 years of service it will not bring him up to the present rate of pay of the physician and dentist in the Veterans' Administration. It brings him a little below that rate, but it makes it comparable to that service, and with the advantages which we feel can be regarded as coming with a military life and the manner of compensation, perhaps it is about in line, and the take-home pay is probably comparable.

For the Army, Navy, and Air Force this will cost an additional $8 million. The commissioned officers of the Public Health Service have always been paid under the Military Pay bill. This bill gives those commissioned personnel in the Public Health Service the same benefits I have mentioned for the others in the uniformed services. So that the overall cost of this bill will not exceed $18,800,000 for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service.

I think it is a step that is long overdue. It is one that we feel gives us a reasonable prospect of attracting and holding physicians and dentists in the military service. For each one that we can retain on a voluntary basis, of course, we eliminate the prospect of the drafting of someone in his place. As a matter of fact, it is not 1-to-1. In a period of 6 years for every one you can retain you have saved the necessity of taking in and letting out 4 individuals. So that for every one you keep voluntarily, within a period of 6 years, you have eliminated the necessity of compulsory service for 4.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. The gentleman has just said that the cost of the bill would be approximately, for the first year, $8,400,000.

Mr. KILDAY. No; not the total cost of the bill.

Mr. HESELTON. I meant for the first year, for the Department of Defense.

Mr. KILDAY. One-half of the bill for the first year for the Department of Defense would be $8 million. A little over another $8 million for the Department of Defense for the remainder of the bill. $18,500,000 total cost for the Department of Defense and the Public Heath Service.

Mr. HESELTON. Then, as I understand the report, eventually it would reach approximately $18,885,000. I am referring to page 8 of the report.

Mr. KILDAY. That is about the cost.

Mr. HESELTON. I have noticed in the report that the committee says that "the proposed legislation does not contain any provision with regard to the present ratio of physicians to active duty personnel." However, it does go ahead to discuss that matter, and if I understand the report correctly it indicates that the committee is of the opinion that the present ratio of 3.2 to 1,000 should probably be increased to 3.4 in the Air Force, 3.4 in the Army, and 3.7 in the Navy.

I have had considerable correspondence and some personal conferences with physicians and dentists who seem to feel rather strongly that the Army, Navy, and Air Force in particular have not sought to realistically appraise their needs; consequently there is a disposition on the part of responsible officers in those three departments to retain more positions than are needed.

I have not been in a position to examine those allegations sufficiently to make any determination as to their accuracy. I do, however, have in mind that sometime in recent days the Hoover Commission did go into the problem and did make certain recommendations. As I understand it, those recommendations were perhaps not entirely acceptable to the armed services. Is the gentleman in a position to advise us as to the question that I have raised?

I think it is rather important because I think that the cost figure necessarily involves what the services will ask for and what they will expect to keep in the forces in terms of positions against the medical and dental personnel available to civilians in this country.

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman, of course, that the cost figures are based upon anticipated strength.

As to this question of the ratio of doctors and dentists per thousand of military personnel, it is a question that has been raised very frequently from both sides as to whether the ratio is excessive or is too small.

I do want to point out that it has come down now from about 6 per thousand to 3.4, 3.1, and possibly 3.

Mr. HESELTON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask if that 6 per thousand is a war-combat figure?

Mr. KILDAY. It was a war-combat figure; that is correct.

The economic use of any type of personnel is a matter of administration; it is something that we cannot control other than by constant pressure upon the agency employing the personnel. To be economical in the use of that personnel supply and demand will control to a great extent.

I must point out, however, that when you have a combat organization that

is ready for combat and must be maintained on that combat basis to be of any use to us in time of necessity, it must have the medical personnel that would be required in the event it was committed to combat at very short notice, so it would be able to take care of the casualties of combat.

There is strong feeling in many quarters that the ratio should be increased above the present ratio on active duty in the service.

I realize that there are others who feel that perhaps they may not be adequately utilized.

We have attempted to do something to relieve medical officers from different types of service on boards and committees and things of that kind dealing with administration. We have created a Medical Service Corps designed to have men who are experienced in medical administration, in hospital management, drugs, and things of that kind to take over those routine duties and not require a medical man to do it. We have made every effort to assure economical use.

There was some pressure within the committee to attempt to fix a higher ratio by law. I do not believe that it is ever possible for us to put a floor under any type of personnel, because when we attempt to do that it passes out of our hands. The executive department does not have to take them or retain them, so it is never accomplished. The law now provides a ratio for the Navy of 6 : 5; still they have not anywhere reached that ratio and we cannot make them.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the bill is one that well deserves the support of the House.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman before he makes his concluding statement, yield again?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. This particular point possibly does not need any comment. I happen to be a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which for some years has been confronted with a like problem of shortages of medical, dental, and nursing personnel, not only as far as the armed services are concerned, but the general situation as far as the whole civilian population is concerned. I rather hope that some day there will be a common effort made to study the complete proposition. I respect highly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who is presenting the bill to us. If he feels that the armed services need this personnel I am sure the House will go along with him. On the other hand, there is going to come a day, unless something miraculous happens, when the civilian population in this country by force of circumstances, such as protecting its own, wives, children, other dependents and so forth, may well say to us in Congress: It is about time that you get down to brass tacks and do a job.

I am sorry that the Congress has this responsibility, I wish there was some other way to do it, but in dealing with this sort of thing we have to go a bit further, if I may say so with deference, than a paragraph in the report. That is why I asked the question. I think the gentleman's views are extremely important.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman. I am also appreciative of the fact that the gentleman's committee struggles with this question of availability of medical personnel also. It is a critical matter which has to be faced by the Congress. We must have the cooperation of the institutions which train medical personnel and those who fix qualifications, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of this bill is $18,800,000. When we consider that in relation to the total Defense budget it is merely pennies. Realizing that the highly discriminatory and unpopular doctors' draft law expires next year, and realizing, even those of us who brought the bill here in the first instance, that we want to reduce as far as possible those people who are required to serve against their will, I hope this bill will be adopted in its present form.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, not only the members of the full Committee on Armed Services but all Members of the House are deeply indebted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], chairman of this committee, and our colleagues who worked so faithfully and diligently with him to bring forth this bill. Anything that I may say would be more or less repetitious because the chairman of the subcommittee has given you a comprehensive and a clear picture of the purposes of the bill and of its provisions.

There are just a few things we must keep uppermost in mind. One is that the doctors' draft law is highly discriminatory, as every member of our committee recognized when we brought it on the floor and passed it. It is repugnant to freemen. We would like to get away from it as quickly as possible.

Second, we all know that the doctors in our armed services, all three branches, Army, Navy, and Air Force, are resigning and quitting faster than we can get new doctors to enter the service.

So the purpose of this bill is to increase the incentive and to make more attractive the services in all branches of our Department of Defense for both doctors and dentists. We hope many will make the military a career. We make it more attractive, first, by giving them increased constructive credit for promotion and pay. I happen to have been the author of the Officers Personnel Act that passed the 80th Congress.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has said, we are now under existing law paying doctors and dentists $100 a month more than the line officers of equal years' service and of rank. We propose to increase the pay of these men from $100 a month after 3 years of service to $150 a month until they serve 6 years.

From 6 to 10 years we are going to pay them at the rate of $200 a month extra, and after 10 years we will pay a doctor or a dentist $250 a month in order to hold him and retain him and prevent this quick and expensive turnover. Now, we offer him a little increase in pay which brings him up to approximately what M. D.'s and dentists get in the Veterans' Administration but not as much as in civilian life. We are going to give him this increased pay and grant him a bit of security. We are going to grant him an extra year of constructive credit, 5 years to physicians and 4 years to dentists, instead of 4 and 3 that they are now getting credit for, and also, instead of commissioning them as first lieutenants, we will commission doctors and dentists in the Army and the Air Force captains, and lieutenants in the Navy. So, we think that because of the increased constructive credit of enlisting them at a higher grade, that is, as captains, for instance, and then this increased pay, there will be definite incentives to retaining doctors and dentists in our Armed Forces.

Again I want to say that we are all grateful for the patience and the painstaking skill and perseverance of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and his subcommittee in bringing this legislation before us, which I think is long overdue.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. If I remember correctly, the gentleman from Texas said that the doctors and the dentists draft act expires, I think he said, in June.

Mr. KILDAY. Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven.

Mr. WIER. I was wondering whether it expired this year. At any rate, in connection with the expiration of the doctors and dentists draft law, what is the position of the unhappy doctors and dentists that were caught in the draft? Are they immediately separated, or is there a term of service that they have to continue?

Mr. SHORT. No. They serve a specified term of service, when they are drafted, of 2 years, but at the expiration of the law, of course, unless it is continued, they are all let out. But, whenever a doctor or a dentist is drafted, it is for 2 years, just like a man in the ranks.

Mr. WIER. Then, as I understand, this legislation here is in anticipation that the draft law will expire.

Mr. SHORT. From having to extend the draft law we want to put this legislation into effect. It may not solve the whole problem but it is certainly a step in the right direction.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This special pay, I assume, will apply to retirement.

Mr. SHORT. No; it does not apply to retired officers.

Mr. GROSS. I do not mean retired officers; I mean to their retirement pay.

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. GROSS. It will not be credited to their retirement? The special pay will not be credited to their retirement pay?

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. GROSS. Well, is it in the bill?

Mr. SHORT. No. That was my understanding, and if I am wrong, I would like for the chairman to correct me.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman from Missouri is correct. This applies while on active duty only, and no portion of it will be paid on retirement.

Mr. GROSS. Nor credited to retirement pay?

Mr. KILDAY. No.

Mr. SHORT. No. And, I want to emphasize again that the cost of this bill relating to constructive service is only $8.4 million for men in the armed services and $877,000 for those in the Public Health Service. That is just one little item that the chairman of the subcommittee failed to mention. But, you see, then with the $8.4 million increase in pay annually for the armed services there is an additional cost of $877,000 for the Public Health Service and then with another $8 million increase in pay you have a total maximum of $18.5 million, which is only a drop in the bucket or an infinitesimal sum when you think of the total Defense budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am now happy to turn over the control of the time not only on this particular bill but also on the medical care of dependents bill that will follow, which is a very important bill that our committee is wholeheartedly for, to the ranking minority member on this subcommittee [Mr. ARENDS] who sat with his colleagues and who really knows more about it than I do.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly endorse H. R. 9428, a bill to provide career incentives for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service. I consider it a most important piece of legislation.

The Congress has the responsibility to provide adequate medical care for members of the armed services. As you know, this is reflected in the regular draft law itself, which requires that adequate medical care be available before men can be brought into the armed services. This provision recognizes that adequate medical care is a basic necessity, not only to preserve the health and well-being of individual men in uniform, but also to assure that our combat forces will be ready to fight if and when the need arises.

Our active forces today are the largest ever maintained in peacetime history. The present and potential combat readiness of these forces depends upon the health of the fighting men.

Doctors to provide this essential medical care have been obtained through the impetus of the Doctor Draft Act in 2-year cycles since the beginning of the Korean conflict. In the past 5½ years, since the enactment of the doctor draft law, nearly 41,000 physicians and dentists have entered the service and over 35,000 have left the service. We have had to draft physicians and dentists up to and exceeding age 40 to meet our requirements both as to numbers and as to experienced physicians and specialists.

Our physician requirements at the height of the Korean war were about 15,000, but this has now been reduced to about 10,000 for our standing force of 2,850,000 men. To meet these requirements over 25,000 physicians have been procured since 1950 under the doctor draft law. These physicians, coming and going every 2 years, have amounted to a total turnover of nearly 50,000 gains and losses of physicians.

The total cost to the Government has been tremendous due to recurrent indoctrination and training costs, uniform allowances, extra travel costs for the doctors, their dependents and household effects, plus processing costs such as records, physical examinations, security checks, and the like. When it is realized that each career doctor replaces 4 drafted doctors every 6 years, the potential savings to the Government in dollars and wasted man-hours is obvious. Three thousand more career doctors would thus replace 12,000 drafted physicians in the next 6 years, and these doctors would not have to be dislocated from their civilian communities.

In order to provide adequate stability and experience and at the same time to eliminate the need for the special doctor draft as it is now written, it is essential to obtain a career corps of approximately two-thirds of our total needs. Our present career corps is less than one-third of our requirements. And, in the last 2 fiscal years 1,000 medical officers have been lost from the Regular services with only 350 replacements. These losses, over a 2-year period, amounted to approximately 25 percent of the Regular corps.

The proposed legislation will, in our opinion, procure more medical and dental officers for the uniformed services through increased career incentives.

The bill provides for increased constructive service credit from the presently authorized 4 years to 5 years for newly appointed medical officers in recognition of their long, self-financed professional education of 4 years in medical school plus a 1-year internship.

Dental officers would receive 4 years' constructive service instead of the presently authorized 3 years in recognition of the 4 years spent in dental school.

This, in general, places them on a par with their college graduate contemporaries as far as rank is concerned. However, the doctor, upon completion of his education, enters the service for 4 to 5 years behind his college contemporary and thus has less service creditable for pay purposes. The bill therefore authorizes the counting for pay purposes of this constructive service granted for medical or dental education.

The bill further authorizes the granting of this additional constructive service to medical and dental officers already on active duty and provides for the necessary readjustments in permanent lineal position or rank to reflect the 1-year increase in constructive service credit. Such adjustments are authorized to be provided medical and dental officers on active duty whether they are in the Regular service, in the Reserve, or are serving as temporary officers in the Army or Air Force.

Thus far the bill authorizes the adjustment and correction of a previously existing inequity in the amount of constructive service credit granted for postgraduate professional education.

The bill also authorizes the temporary promotion of medical or dental officers to the grade of captain in the Army or Air Force, or lieutenant in the Navy upon completion of 1 year of professional experience.

This action alone was not considered sufficient to solve the problem, and so a system of graduated incentives was added by the Kilday subcommittee and adopted unanimously by the full committee. This results in an increase in the present doctor's special pay for medical and dental officers to $150 monthly after 3 years of active service; to $200 monthly after 6 years of active service; and to $250 monthly after 10 years or more of active service as a medical or dental officer instead of the present $100.

These increases will bring the total pay of doctors in the uniformed services more nearly in line with that of physicians employed by the Federal Government under civil service or in the Veterans' Administration. There will still be differences of one sort or another in such factors as working conditions, night and weekend duty, frequent moves, separation from family, exposure to operational and combat hazards, retirement, and the like, which may be more or less favorable to one group or the other. However, despite these factors, the military doctors' income should at least approximate that of other Federal Government physicians.

Incomes available to civilian physicians in private practice are far higher. The majority of physicians, therefore, find civilian life far more preferable by reasons of pay as well as stability, professional opportunities, community status and family life. The military must be in a better position to compete with civilian opportunities for the services of adequate numbers of these expensively and highly trained essential professional personnel.

An adequate career-incentive program for medical and dental officers is thus not only essential to provide medical care for our servicemen, but such a program also may well provide considerable economy to the taxpayer and to the country both in dollars and in wasted professional man-hours by a stabilizing of the career medical and dental corps and the reduction of the wasteful and expensive turnover of doctors coming and going every 2 years.

In any event, an adequate incentive program is imperative, if we are to attract and retain sufficient numbers of experienced doctors and specialists to provide the necessary medical care for our servicemen and at the same time provide military readiness in the fields of aviation, submarine, and atomic medicine, medical logistics and, in fact, military medicine as a whole.

I wholeheartedly support the proposed legislation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why can the Medical Corps not be placed in a different category from the infantry or the artillery or other branches of the services in the matter of grades? We are making altogether too many generals and admirals in order to bring the pay up to where it is worth while. I do not see why a first lieutenant in the Medical Corps could not get, say, $500 more than an infantryman or an artilleryman, instead of being given a grade to which he ought not to be entitled.

Mr. ARENDS. I think we are doing exactly what the gentleman wants to do. We are giving them incentive pay according to the length of time they remain in the service, regardless of rank. We are trying to give them more pay for remaining in the service, which will in part compensate them for what we are doing.

Mr. NICHOLSON. But in order to give them more pay you have to make them captains or majors or lieutenant colonels.

Mr. ARENDS. We are trying to get away from the doctor draft law. It has been disturbing to many of us where they take a doctor out of a community for one reason or another. We are trying to get enough of the individuals in the service so they will remain there and thus obviate the necessity for the doctor draft law.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. From the gentleman's remarks, I would assume the purpose of passing this bill is to at least in part relieve a shortage of doctors and dentists in the Armed Forces. Would the gentleman comment with respect to the impact on that same problem, if we pass the accompanying legislation which is to follow this bill, which, as I read it, in a large measure increases the amount of work to be done by the doctors and dentists in the Armed Forces.

Mr. ARENDS. Of course, there is the possibility that the doctors and the dentists—let us say it in a nice way—the possibility for doctors and dentists today in these cantonments and military bases, being in a position where they can do more work than they presently can do—yes—so I do not think there would be any conflict at all should we pass the bill which is to follow this one.

Mr. BUDGE. If the accompanying bill is passed, then what would the impact be? Will we again have the problem of a shortage of doctors even though the instant legislation is passed?

Mr. ARENDS. I think the passage of this first bill will keep more doctors and dentists in the service so that we will not have to meet that kind of a problem when the time comes, in my opinion. But this bill is basically an incentive bill to attract and retain doctors and dentists in our military services, rather than any attempt to influence or control the ratio of doctors and dentists to the number of persons on active duty.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], such time as he may require.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to remedy a very serious situation involving the health and effectiveness of all the men and women in the Armed Forces. We are losing our military doctors, both physicians and dentists, at alarming rates.

While we have had this problem in varying degrees for several years, it is getting much worse instead of better. The number of doctors volunteering for service has become critically low. Career doctors now make up less than one-third of all the military doctors required on active duty. The remaining two-thirds are serving under compulsion of the special Doctor Draft Act.

Members of the House will recall that only last year we extended the life of that act until 1957. We did so with great reluctance. But there was no other choice at the time. Our responsibility to provide medical care for the Armed Forces demands that the required number of doctors be made available, one way or another.

Let me state briefly what this bill will accomplish:

First. It will authorize an additional year of constructive service to military doctors on active duty. This should be done in order to give them full credit for the years spent in acquiring their medical education. At the present time, they only receive partial credit.

Second. The same medical education period, up to 5 years, will be credited for longevity pay purposes. This will then place them on the same longevity basis with their line officer contemporaries.

Third. A higher starting rank will be authorized for military doctors. Instead of remaining as first lieutenants for the usual period, they would be promoted to captain after completing internship.

Fourth. It authorizes substantial increases in the special pay for medical and dental officers. This is necessary in order to give career military doctors an income comparable with other doctors in Government service. It will also reduce somewhat the wide gap that now exists between the incomes of a doctor in military service and one in civilian life.

During the past 3 years, it has been necessary to draft a total of 15,000 physicians and 7,000 dentists from civilian life. Almost without exception, these drafted doctors have been returning to their civilian careers as soon as they complete the required 2 years of military service.

Since July of 1953, more than 25 percent of the career physicians in the Army, Navy, and Air Force have resigned their commissions. On the other hand, less than half of these losses have been replaced with new career doctors.

Needless to say, unless this loss rate of career doctors can be checked, the career Medical Corps are faced with extinction.

Unless steps are taken to induce more doctors to remain on active duty, and to elect a medical career in military service, then the draft calls on civilian doctors must be continued at the same high rate of the previous 3 years. The only other alternative would be to tolerate inadequate medical care for the Armed Forces, and this we cannot do.

But even if we are to extend the doctors' draft act when it expires next year—and I certainly hope it will not be necessary—we would still be unable to provide enough experienced physicians. The reason for that being simply that nearly all of the eligible experienced doctors are already exempt because of previous service.

Thus, we are faced with the predicament that medical service in the Armed Forces will be rendered by very young and inexperienced drafted doctors who would serve their required time and then leave, to be replaced by others equally inexperienced.

The only answer to this difficult problem is to have an adequate number of career medical and dental officers. Career doctors can provide the clinical experience so vital to the practice of medicine. They also have the background that comes from continuity and knowledge of service life. Having volunteered for medical careers in the Armed Forces, they are the best prepared to serve them.

It is very important also to note that over a 6-year period, one career doctor replaces 4 drafted doctors. Thus, for each 1,000 career doctors gained, we can avoid having to draft 4,000 civilian doctors over the next 6 years. Not only will it reduce the waste that is always involved in excessive personnel turnover. but it will also permit more civilian doctors to remain in the communities they serve.

Present indications are that it will be necessary to procure through operation of the draft act, a total of 21,000 physicians and 13,000 dentists over the next 6-year period. This is based upon a continuation of the present military force of 2,850,000, and no change in the present loss rate among military doctors.

We can say to the Members of the House, that during the past 6 months, the situation has shown some signs of improvement. Fewer career doctors have submitted their resignations. There have also been indications that more of the Reserve doctors are becoming interested in remaining on active duty. This has undoubtedly come about because of the drastic steps taken within the Defense Department to improve career attractiveness for military doctors. Within their present authority, the service Secretaries have taken remedial measures with regard to the temporary promotion of doctors, policies affecting their duty assignments, and greater opportunity for their professional development.

These improvements, together with the prospects offered by the bill now before us, have apparently produced a "wait and see" attitude among military doctors now on active duty. They undoubtedly know that a serious effort is being made to give more recognition to the long and expensive period of their medical education, and also to reduce their marked financial disparity with their contemporaries in private practice and other Government service.

For example, the total income of a doctor holding the rank of lieutenant

colonel in the Army Medical Corps is only 75 percent of that paid to a contemporary doctor in the civil service. It is only 70 percent of the income of a doctor of the same experience in the Veterans' Administration, and less than 60 percent of the income of the average doctor in civilian life. From this, it is evident that the military doctor has a lower income than any other group of the medical profession, either in Government service or in private practice.

The principal feature of this bill is to increase the income of our military doctors, and to provide special career inducements for those who remain on active duty beyond their obligated time. This would be accomplished in the following manner: By increasing the special pay to which career medical and dental officers would be entitled; by increasing their service creditable for longevity pay purposes; by accelerating their promotion eligibility by 1 year; by authorizing a higher starting rank for young doctors entering the Medical or Dental Corps.

Since 1947, all medical and dental officers have been receiving additional special pay amounting to $100 monthly. The bill provides, as a career inducement, that this special pay be increased to $150 for military doctors who remain on active service beyond 3 years; $200 for those who remain beyond 6 years; and $250 for those remaining beyond 10 years.

Military doctors have always been at a certain disadvantage with respect to their line officer contemporaries. This is caused by the fact that a doctor must spend up to 5 years acquiring his medical education, and at his own expense. He, of course, cannot even qualify as a military doctor until he has successfully completed this long and costly education. Thus, when he is first commissioned in the Medical Corps, he is 5 years behind his line officer contemporary.

Under present law, a military doctor can be credited with up to 4 years' constructive service for promotion purposes. But this only partially compensates for the period spent in medical school and internship. He receives no longevity pay credit whatsoever for those years.

Instead of the partial credit now allowed, the bill will allow all military doctors to count for promotion purposes the entire period of professional education up to 5 years. This same period will also be fully creditable for longevity pay.

These changes will remove what the committee considers to have been inequities of long standing, and will place all military doctors on a par with their line officer contemporaries, as regards both longevity pay and promotion eligibility.

Another feature of the bill will authorize young doctors entering service to be promoted to the grade of captain in the Army and Air Force, or to full lieutenant in the Navy, upon the completion of their internship.

Thus, all doctors on active duty with less than 30 years' service will receive an increase in longevity pay of approximately $50 monthly. They will also be eligible for promotion 1 year sooner than under present law. These promotions have already been accomplished on a temporary basis.

In addition, all doctors who serve 3 years or more on active duty will be entitled to substantial increases in special pay. These increases will give to military doctors an income more closely approximating that of other doctors in Government service. We cannot expect to match the high incomes received by doctors today in private practice. But under this bill, the present wide difference will be substantially narrowed.

The additional cost of this bill, including its coverage for the doctors of the Public Health Service, is estimated to be $18,800,000.

Mr. KILDAY and the able members of his subcommittee have done a very thorough and painstaking job in their examination of this complicated and far-reaching problem. They are deserving of our thanks and commendation.

The bill they have produced, in my judgment, represents very important and necessary progress. We cannot be sure at this time whether its provisions go far enough to succeed in attracting enough doctors to a medical career in the Armed Forces. But I am confident it will bring about a substantial improvement in the present situation, and will prove an important contribution in maintaining the health and effectiveness of the Armed Forces.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume the 5 minutes. I merely want to say that we spent a long time trying to solve this perplexing question. If we are to meet the needs of our commitment of a 3 million man military force, together with their dependents, this is the only answer, saving and excepting the continuation of the draft. We are trying here to present to you something which is an answer to the practical problem confronting your committee, the Congress, and the Nation. We believe that this will in some measure relieve that great anxiety and solve that great problem which faces us in a very concrete way. Mr. Chairman, we commend this legislation to the House of Representatives and to the Congress. We believe that this is one of the soundest pieces of legislation to come before the House as an answer to this perplexing problem which confronts us.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Since I asked the questions I did of the chairman of the subcommittee and received what I believe to be a thoroughly fair and complete answer so far as the gentleman could give it to us, I have read the report further and I find the letter of President Eisenhower to Dr. Flemming of February 4. I am not going to go into that at this time. But I do want the gentleman, if he will, to comment on the questions he asked during the course of the hearings. These are questions that the gentleman asked of Dr. Rusk.

The record is as follows:

Mr. RIVERS. So now this advice that you give Dr. Berry over here, say he didn't want to listen to it, and he just says, "Well, I appreciate your advice, but I think we need more than 3.2," what would you say about that?

Dr. RUSK. Well, I say that we would discuss it, debate it together, and then—our advice hasn't always been taken, you know. We gave some advice about dentists last year, and the Department of Defense said that we don't think you are right, and they went ahead, that is all there was to it.

Mr. RIVERS. So this advice that we are talking about, if they saw fit not to heed it——

Dr. RUSK. As far as we are concerned, that is the end.

That is exactly what I am concerned about. When is the Department of Defense going to cooperate with somebody else in terms of what is a civilian need? We may pass some legislation today that is a blank check for them and permission to ignore the President of the United States and to ignore the committees that have been appointed.

Mr. RIVERS. I am ready to answer you any time you are ready to stop.

Mr. HESELTON. I have stopped.

Mr. RIVERS. I will answer you. Dr. Rusk in response said that he was not dictating to Dr. Berry and the components of the military. Dr. Berry works with the Surgeon General. Dr. Rusk is an advisory outfit. He indicated in response to my question that they were working in close harmony to provide an adequate number ratio for the military and their dependents.

Mr. HESELTON. But as you brought out, they paid no attention to the advice.

Mr. RIVERS. He pointed out that he was not dictating, and he was not required to do that, which is exactly what I wanted to get, and that is why we brought such a good bill to you. We know you are going to pass it.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. HESELTON (interrupting the count). Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-six Members are present.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. KILDAY and Mr. ARENDS to act as tellers.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 2, noes 113.

So the Committee refused to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is present.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 201 and 202 of the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 777) are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. (a) Subject to any limitation on the commissioned strength of the Army, Navy, and Air Force prescribed by law, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may make original appointments in permanent grades of first lieutenant through colonel in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, lieutenant (junior grade) through captain in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Navy, and first lieutenant through colonel for officers appointed with a view to designation as medical officers or dental officers in the Regular Air Force, in such numbers as the needs of the services may require. Such appointments shall be made only from qualified doctors of medicine and doctors of dentistry who are citizens of the United States and who have such other qualifications as the Secretary concerned may prescribe for his service.

"(b) The doctors of medicine and doctors of dentistry appointed under this act shall be credited for purposes of determining lineal position, permanent grade, position on a promotion list, seniority in permanent grade, and eligibility for promotion with the amount of service prescribed by the Secretary concerned, but not less than the minimum prescribed below. A doctor of medicine or doctor of dentistry appointed under this act upon graduation from medical or dental school may not be credited with less than 4 years' service. A doctor of medicine appointed under this act who has completed a 1-year internship, or the equivalent thereof, may not be credited with less than 5 years' service.

"(c) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force may convene boards of officers to review the records and compute the service of each officer of the Medical Corps or the Dental Corps of the Army or the Navy, and each medical or dental officer of the Air Force, appointed under any provision of law before the enactment of this amendatory act, including those Reserve or temporary officers who are on active duty on the date of this amendatory act or who enter on active duty after that date, in order to adjust the service credited to each such officer to reflect the service authorized to be credited to officers appointed under this act. When that adjustment is made, such officers shall be given precedence for promotion purposes or advanced to a lineal position in accordance with their adjusted dates of rank, except that no officer of the Navy shall be given an adjusted date of rank in the grade of captain which is earlier than July 1, 1955. All officers of the Navy with the adjusted date of rank of July 1, 1955, in the grade of captain shall retain the precedence among themselves that they held on the date of enactment of this amendatory act and shall be junior to all other officers assigned that date of rank. If, as a result of readjustment of service credit under this section—

"(1) an officer of the Army or the Air Force is made eligible for promotion, he shall be considered for promotion by the next selection board considering officers of his grade and category; and

"(2) an officer of the Navy attains lineal position equivalent to an officer who is serving in the next higher grade, or who is on a promotion list to that grade, he may be promoted thereto on the recommendation of a board of officers convened under this subsection, and, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, may be assigned a lineal position in the higher grade appropriate to his adjusted service credit.

"(d) Each officer of the Medical Corps or the Dental Corps of the Army and each officer in the Air Force appointed with a view to designation as a medical or dental officer, who is appointed as a temporary officer under the provisions of subsection 515 (e) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 907) after the enactment of this amendatory act, shall upon entering on active duty be credited with the amount of service authorized by subsection (b) of this section to be credited to officers appointed under this act."

"(e) Nothwithstanding any other provision of law, including those relating to selection for promotion, a doctor of medicine or a doctor of dentistry who is appointed under this act or any other provision of law may be temporarily promoted to the grade of captain in the Army or the Air Force, or lieutenant in the Navy, as the case may be, at any time after 1 year after completion of medical or dental school.

"(f) An officer of the Medical Corps or Dental Corps of the Navy appointed in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) shall be assigned as his running mate the junior line officer in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) with the same date of rank, or if there is none, the junior line officer of that grade with the next earlier date of rank.

"SEC. 202. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force may from time to time prescribe regulations necessary for the administration of this title within their respective departments."

SEC. 2. Section 202 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 807) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the period at the end of clause (6) thereof and inserting "; and" in lieu thereof.

(2) By adding the following new clause at the end thereof:

"(7) For each officer of the Medical Corps or the Dental Corps of the Army or Navy, each officer of the Air Force designated as a medical or dental officer, and each officer of the Public Health Service commissioned as a medical or dental officer, 4 years; and for each such officer who has completed 1 year of medical internship or the equivalent thereof, one additional year; except that the service authorized to be credited to an officer under this clause shall be reduced by the amount of any service otherwise credited under this section which covers any part of the period of the officer's professional education or internship; and the service credit authorized by this clause shall not be included in establishing eligibility for voluntary or involuntary retirement or separation from the service, under any provision of law."

SEC. 3. Any medical officer of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who—

(1) (A) was appointed to the assistant grade in the Regular Corps and whose service in such Corps has been continuous from the date of appointment or (B) may hereafter be appointed to the assistant grade in the Regular Corps, and

(2) had or will have completed a medical internship on the date of such appointment, shall be credited with 1 year for purposes of promotion and seniority in grade, except that no such credit shall be authorized if the officer has received or will receive similar credit for his internship under other provisions of law. In the case of an officer on active duty on the effective date of this section who is entitled to the credit authorized herein, the 1 year shall be added to the promotion and seniority-in-grade credits with which he is credited on such date.

SEC. 4. The Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 795) is amended as follows:

(1) By repealing so much of sections 211 (e) (1) and 311 (d) (3) as relates to officers of the Medical Corps and Dental Corps of the Navy.

(2) By striking out the following words in the second sentence of section 506 (c): "each person appointed and commissioned an officer of the Medical Corps of the Regular Army shall, at time of appointment, be credited with an amount of service equal to 4 years; each person appointed and commissioned an officer of the Dental Corps."

(3) By striking out in section 506 (e) the words "the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, and".

SEC. 5. Section 203 (b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U. S. C. 234 (b)), is further amended by striking out the words "$100 per month for each month of active service:" and inserting a dash and the following in lieu thereof:

"(1) $100 per month for each month of active service for those medical and dental officers covered by subsection (a) who have not completed 3 years of active service in a category covered by that subsection;

"(2) $100 per month for each month of active service for those officers covered by subsection (c);

"(3) $150 per month for each month of active service for those medical and dental officers covered by subsection (a) who have completed at least 3 years of active service in a category covered by subsection (a);

"(4) $200 per month for each month of active service for those medical and dental officers covered by subsection (a) who have completed at least 6 years of active service in a category covered by subsection (a); and

"(5) $250 per month for each month of active service for those medical and dental officers covered by subsection (a) who have completed at least 10 years of active service in a category covered by subsection (a):"

SEC. 6. (a) Section 504 (b) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (10 U. S. C. 506b (b)) is amended by inserting after the word "*Provided,*" the following: "That the Surgeon General of the Army, and any officer of the Air Force who is serving in the position in the Air Force corresponding to the Surgeon General of the Army, are entitled to the rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant general while so serving: *Provided further,*".

(b) Section 413 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (34 U. S. C. 211d (a)) is amended by inserting after the word "*Provided,*" the following: "That the Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery is entitled to the rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while so serving: *Provided further,*".

(c) The general and flag officers authorized by this section are in addition to any other general or flag officers authorized by law.

SEC. 7. This act shall become effective the first day of the month following the date of enactment.

Mr. KILDAY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be printed in the RECORD and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On pages 8 and 9, strike out all of section 6.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 9, line 6, strike out "SEC. 7" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 6."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask

unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, if there is any impression among any of my colleagues that I lost my temper in the course of a colloquy with another Member recently, I regret it. I respect every one of my colleagues. I respect the members of the Committee on the Armed Services. I know they in good faith are presenting legislation for our consideration and that they believe in its merits. They have a deep interest in the welfare of the armed services but I think they individually and collectively will admit that other Members of this House have just as deep an interest in that welfare.

Mr. Chairman, it is not only the right but the duty of every Member of the Congress, if he thinks there is something that needs clarification in the course of the consideration of any legislation, to try at least to assist us, particularly to ask members of the committee to help clarify for the record.

I want to pay my sincere respects to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who did his utmost, in my opinion, to try to make the record perfectly clear as to why we should pass this bill. I would have been satisfied with what I thought was a completely adequate explanation if I had not noticed later some questions asked of a doctor for whom I have the highest regard, namely, Dr. Rusk, and the answers Dr. Rusk made. I can say to my colleagues that I have, and I suspect many of you have, not only through letters in our files but through conversations with medical personnel, with dental personnel, with nurses and with others who have been and who are now in our armed services, who have asked each of us not to disclose their names, but who have said frankly to us that they had been and are being asked to do work in the armed services that could be performed by hospital orderlies, by a practical nurse or by a great many other people without the expensive and important training our professional personnel must receive.

I read the letter of the President of the United States in which he stated:

> It was with reluctance that I have recommended to the Congress the continuation of the special statute under which doctors and dentists may be drafted, realizing that every physician or dentist drafted means less service to the civilian population, and a possible curtailment of teaching, training, and research programs.

Then he said:

> However, as a defense measure, I felt such a continuation was necessary.

I respected the conclusion he reached and supported the bill.

Then the President asked the Health Resources Advisory Committee to explore all possible measures for keeping to a minimum the disruption of our civilian health needs.

Mr. Chairman, I say that is a challenge to me I will not overlook, no matter whether any member of the Committee on Armed Services sees fit to tell me on the floor of this House that "I know we are going to pass this bill, so why are you asking any questions?" As long as I have taken an oath of office here and as long as I am representing more than 300,000 people, American citizens, who are entitled to my consideration, I will ask those questions as I think proper, and I can take all the ridicule that anyone sees fit to throw at me. I simply want to say, Mr. KILDAY, that I thank you for the courtesy and the consideration you have shown me in trying to answer, and I believe you did answer, the questions I asked in good faith. I want to also pay my compliments to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. He did the same thing. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] did the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, I have never before asked for a quorum to be present because I thought I personally had been mistreated. I regret that I asked for a quorum call recently. I asked that it be withdrawn, but that definitely does not mean that I will not ask any questions my conscience leads me to ask of any committee or any Member of this House. So long as I remain here—and I do not have to stay here—I am going to try to represent all of the people in my district to the best of my ability.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts I think his questions were well taken, they were pointed, and similar questions were asked in the Committee on Armed Services about the full utilization of both doctors and dentists. I think what the gentleman is saying about the complaints on the part of many individuals, off the record, to the gentleman and many of us, is perfectly true, that they might be doing more in many cases if we only had better administration.

Mr. HESELTON. I hope we will have improved coordination, and I know the gentleman from Illinois will be the first to try to help bring that about. Certainly the American people are entitled to our best efforts in this direction.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCCORMACK] having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9428) to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 410, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9429, with Mr. FLOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to provide medical care for the dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, medical care for dependents of military personnel of our services is traditional. It grew up, no doubt, because of the fact that for many years of our existence as a Nation, our Army, particularly, was stationed on the frontier. Of course, that situation continued down for a very considerable period of time, even after our Civil War. The statutory authority for that medical care of dependents as to the Army and the Air Force is rather nebulous. It depends upon a statute adopted in 1884. It was an amendment or a legislative rider to an appropriation bill that simply provided that dependents of the members of the military should receive medical care from military doctors and contract surgeons without charge therefor. As to the Navy, it is in a more substantial form. In 1943 a bill was passed and became law setting out that the dependents of Navy personnel are entitled to medical care.

At the present time the medical care made available is not uniform. For instance, in the 1943 act for the Navy, there was no dental care provided except in case of emergency which means, of course, that they can get care only to the extent, perhaps, of relieving pain. While there is the technical entitlement in the other services, as a matter of fact it is rarely available. So this bill places them all on the same footing and the same entitlement.

The bill also grants a privilege which some Members of the House have felt over a considerable period of time should

exist, and that is the right of dependents of members of the uniformed services to receive medical care at the hospital conducted by any branch of the armed services, whether it is the one to which the individual man belongs or not.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to thank the gentleman and to congratulate him upon bringing a bill of this nature to the floor. It is my understanding that this bill will carry a provision of a bill which I introduced earlier, which would make available to Coast Guard dependents the same medical care which is now available to the other branches of the services; is that not correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. The gentleman had a bill pending for that purpose and there is a provision carrying that out. There were other bills pending for that purpose. This does permit dependents of any one of the uniformed services to enter a hospital conducted by any of the uniformed services.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, briefly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us take the case of a man who is overseas while his family lives outside of a military camp. Would this bill permit them to obtain medical care?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman has touched upon the heart of the bill. That is the great group we want to take care of. Now, I should like to proceed at this time to a further explanation of the provisions of the bill.

It develops that at the present time 40 percent of the dependents of our armed services do not have medical care available to them. That is because facilities are not available where they are located, or they are located far away from any military installation. That would apply in a very particular manner to the group mentioned by our Acting Speaker. A man may be sent overseas and his wife and children may come back to the wife's parents' home, in a town far distant from a military installation, where at present there is no possibility of any medical care being given them at Government expense.

So we have here a definite problem of providing for 40 percent of the dependents of the military who at the present time receive no care. I hope that the members of the committee will bear in mind that figure of 40 percent, because that is the number for whom we have the principal concern, the 40 percent who now receive no care or do not have Government medical care available to them. Of course, all of our cost estimates and figures are based upon that 40 percent. Unless we bear in mind clearly that we are particularly anxious concerning that 40 percent and our ability to do so must be judged upon the money available, and the money available and all of the cost estimates are based on that 40 percent, we will lose sight of the one issue that has arisen in connection with the bill.

So that is the problem that confronts us. The bill is designed for that purpose. I might say here that a program of medical care for the dependents of the military was requested by the President in his message on the state of the Union.

This bill will require that the Secretary of Defense negotiate a contract or contracts of insurance to cover the dependents of members of the military services. He may negotiate that contract either with the insurance industry in the United States which writes indemnity contracts along this line, or he may negotiate it with a medical or hospital service planning organization, such as the Blue Shield and Blue Cross or he may negotiate it partly with one and partly with the other, leaving the opportunity open to absolute competition as to who shall get that portion of this business. It requires, I have said, that he do that for the wives and the children of active duty military personnel. He must do that. He is, under this bill, granted authority to do it for other groups should he see fit to do so. Those groups would include retired personnel, the dependents of retired personnel, unmarried widows of service personnel, and dependent parents and dependent parents-in-law. The authority is granted to him to do that. He could not do it, of course, unless it could be negotiated within the amount of money made available by budget estimates and by appropriations. So that as far as the insurance portion of the bill is concerned, that is what this attempts to set up.

It does continue the right of dependents of military personnel to receive medical care at a military hospital or installation, on a space-and-facilities-available basis. That is the way it always has been and that is the way it is continued under this bill.

As I said, it makes the type of care available uniform in all of the services. It also would provide for minimum charges for outpatient care in service facilities.

I want at this time to discuss the only area of disagreement. First I want to say that the various organizations have been of great aid and assistance to the committee in understanding the very large question which is involved here. There is one area of disagreement on the part of the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association and some of those connected with the Blue Shield and the Blue Cross. I believe that that area of disagreement is rather slight, although those who bring up the point regard it as being quite serious. It applies only to one portion of one section of the bill, that is, section 201 (c). I will read the whole section and state the portion in dispute:

> The dependents covered under this section may elect to receive medical care under the terms of this act in either the facilities of a uniformed service under the conditions specified in title I of this act or in the facilities provided for under such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans, as may be provided.

This is the disputed part:

> Except that the right to such election may be limited under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for such dependents residing in areas where the member concerned is assigned to a post or installation of a uniformed service where adequate medical facilities of a uniformed service are available for such dependents.

In other words, it says simply that the Secretary may—it does not require him to do so, but he may—issue a regulation requiring that dependents of military personnel, in an area where there are adequate medical facilities available at that time for such patients to enter that military installation.

The budget at this time contains $76 million for this program. If we are to have a program of this kind, it must of course be financed, and this bill provides that it shall be paid for by the Government. I will come to the cost estimates in a minute.

This is a new undertaking. We have never had a program of this kind. There is no experience table upon which to base what may happen under this bill.

When we start on a new program of any kind which grants benefits to individuals we must bear in mind that we can never thereafter for practical purposes decrease the benefits granted. Once we grant a benefit, it is going to have to be constant. We can always expand benefits. We can always grant additional benefits under any program. But if we are to be successful with the program, we must be sure that we start it on a minimum basis and thereafter, based on experience, costs, and whatnot, we can expand.

I ask you to bear in mind that there are 40 percent who now receive no care at all.

All of our estimates, of course, are based upon what it would cost to provide this kind of medical care for that 40 percent. So that if we should lose control of the situation as to which type of hospital they went into, and the question of cost came up, I am fearful that we would kill the program.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, I yield to the ranking member of my subcommittee.

Mr. ARENDS. Along that line, the gentleman might well point out at this particular time the fact that the committee did not in any way overlook the position which the American Medical Association and the Hospital Association took on this matter. The amendment was offered so that it could be fully discussed and debated by the committee so that all avenues of approach to the problem might be pursued. We did have a thorough discussion of it at that particular time, and it was given the best thought of the committee.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for bringing that out because it brings me to this point, which I feel should be discussed. This question is reflected by two different fears. There is the fear on the part of the military medical men that all the dependents will go into the civilian hospitals. Secondly, there is the fear on the part of the civilian hospitals that all

the dependents will go into the military hospitals. Perhaps I should not say all. Perhaps I should say that an inordinate number or an inordinate proportion of them would go into those hospitals. My personal view, which I believe to be the view of the subcommittee which worked so long on this proposition, is that neither fear is justified—that there will not be any tremendous rush from one into the other. But should it be that the civilian hospital people are correct and that there should be an inordinate number going into the military hospitals, it is automatically controlled by existing policy and regulations and by the legal provision which is in this bill that they shall be admitted to military hospitals only on a space and facilities available basis. Therefore, if there should be a runaway of all these dependents into the military hospitals under the provisions here, it is automatically provided for because if space and facilities are not available, then they cannot be taken into the hospitals. On the other hand, if there should be an inordinate proportion of them attempting to go into the civilian hospitals, unless we have something of this kind, there would be no control.

Therefore, all that this provides is that the Secretary may require them to go into the military hospital if at that particular time and for that particular dependent, there is available space and facilities to treat the patient. The point is that we have hospitals in existence in the military services—I should say in the uniformed services, which are in operation and are staffed. I think it is entirely proper that we should see to it that they be utilized. Now coming to the idea of the civilian hospitals—we ought not to lose sight of the fact that this Congress some little time ago, recognizing the fact that the available hospital facilities in all portions of the United States were inadequate, passed a bill and created a program of Federal aid for hospital facilities in communities throughout the United States. The Hill-Burton Act, which we have had before us and which we passed, and under which we have appropriated funds each year as the appropriation bills have come in, was enacted because of the fact that we know and we realize that the hospital facilities available to civilians were inadequate. So, we have been building them in all States of the Union. I say that we should have this reasonable check on patients going into military hospitals on space and facilities available basis. And we should have this other check on them going into the civilian hospitals so that we can utilize as fully as possible those hospitals for which the Federal Government either paid the total cost or has shared in the building of the hospitals together with the various States or the various institutions which have built such hospitals.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I wish to congratulate the gentleman for the fine explanation he is making of this bill. Referring to the fear of the civilian hospitals that most of the civilians will go into the military facilities and in line with the gentleman's explanation of admission on a space and facilities available basis, is there any contemplation of a vast expansion of medical facilities for the military?

Mr. KILDAY. No, there is not. Of course, both questions have come up—as to whether they would be expanded or whether they would be contracted. I do not see where this bill is going to do either—either expand or contract. They will continue about as they are.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I thought at this particular point the RECORD might show clearly what the committee proposed in this report:

> The proposed legislation does not contemplate any new expansion of medical facilities for the uniformed services; nor, on the other hand, does it contemplate any reduction in the medical facilities of the uniformed services that are now in existence or now planned.

Mr. KILDAY. It has no ulterior purposes. Our overriding concern is with 40 percent of the people who get no care.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman expand on the care that is to be given to parents and parents-in-law of retired service men? What care are they now being given and what care will they be given?

Mr. KILDAY. This bill proposes no additional care at the present time for dependent parents and parents-in-law who have entitlement on a space-and-facilities-available basis. For practical purposes, this does not enlarge upon any care for them in uniformed service hospitals. It does not require the Secretary to take an insurance policy for them. It does provide that he may, in his discretion, do so. That will be controlled by the money available, whether you and I vote sufficient money to provide such insurance.

Mr. GROSS. How long have we been taking care of parents and parents-in-law of retired servicemen?

Mr. KILDAY. "Since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary," as they say in the lawbooks. It has always been the case. With reference to the care of dependents of military personnel, the question as to whether or not it should exist, it is too late to discuss, because it became traditional many, many years ago.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Would it be possible, under this legislation, for a young man to enlist in one of the armed services at the age of 17, retire at the age of 37, and obtain, not only during his 20 years of service but for the remainder of his life, full medical care for his wife, children, adopted children, stepchildren, and his father and mother and mother-in-law and father-in-law as well?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman's question is all inclusive. This bill would not create any right to any portion of any of the things the gentleman has mentioned. It would continue a right which has existed on a space-and-facilities-available basis over a long period of time, under which one retired for length of service or disability would be entitled to hospitalization for himself and for his dependents.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That includes inlaws?

Mr. KILDAY. The wife's mother and father, if dependent upon the military man for in excess of 50 percent of their support. That is the definition contained in all pay bills.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is true today, and will not be altered by this legislation?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true today and will not be altered by this legislation. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. May a serviceman in Germany or in Japan take his dependent parents or parents-in-law along with him and the Government provide facilities for these dependents?

Mr. KILDAY. On a space-and-facilities-available basis, that is true. That was true long before my time.

Mr. GROSS. Have we got a mob or an army in Japan and Europe?

Mr. KILDAY. I think we have a pretty good Army in all locations.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. WIER. The gentleman has made reference to 40 percent on a number of occasions. Will the gentleman clarify what he has reference to when he says 40 percent never have been covered?

Mr. KILDAY. I did not mean covered or entitled to coverage. I meant availability of care. We estimate there are 3 million dependents of the armed services; of all men in the armed services. Of that number roughly 60 percent now have medical care available to them in service hospitals on a space-and-facilities-available basis. Forty percent of that 3 million get no kind of care whatever. Under this bill those who can enter military hospitals will continue to receive what they have in the past. There will be an insurance policy to take care of the balance.

I do want to give you some more of the detail of the bill. When it first came up it was proposed that the individual serviceman would pay 30 percent of the cost for his wife and children and all of the cost for any other collateral relatives. We found in our hearings on the bill that we could get the same kind of coverage by requiring the individual seviceman or his dependent to pay the first $25 of each hospitalization and eliminate the tremendous overhead and cost of administration, accepting the application, enrolling him in insurance, seeing that he is carried, processing his claim, and all that. We are not interested in setting up a lot of clerks to handle a lot of paperwork like that. So we found with this

method we could get better results for less cost.

I think we must bear in mind that we may possibly have overlooked some of the reasons why it is that we have not been able to retain and hold career personnel since the last war as we did between the First World War and the second, when we held men of training and ability like President Eisenhower for a period of 16 years as a major without increase in pay or promotion. And during that same period of time Admiral Nimitz served as a captain with no increase in pay or promotion, and General Arnold of the Air Force served as a major.

Some will say that it was a period of depression, but that is not the fact, because during the period from 1919 to 1929 the United States went through a period of prosperity the likes of which had not been known up to that time, yet we were able to retain those men during that period.

Bear in mind that at the time the military had a retirement system of three-quarters base pay after 30 years of service. They had medical care for themselves and their dependents while on active duty, and after they had retired, they had adequate housing, and it was always available on the post.

As time went on we came to 1937 when the Social Security Act was passed, and then for the first time civilians started to get some of those things that had previously been enjoyed by the military and only the military up to that time, because practically no one else had a comparable retirement system or medical care and things of that kind.

After 1937 it reached the point where in collective agreements everything was not taken in pay but some things were taken in other benefits. There were retirement programs set up to supplement social security. Group life insurance policies and group health insurance and hospital insurance policies were available in practically all industries. It reached the point where the person in industry or business who did not have these privileges and these protections was the exception rather than the rule. Then it was that the military lost not only its advantage but its real competitive position with industry and business, and our highly trained personnel have since been and are now leaving the service.

There are now in the United States 105 million people who have health and hospital programs comparable to what we propose to set up for the military here—105 million. A large proportion of those benefits in industry are paid for in whole or in part by the employee. So here again we meet on a competitive basis.

Let us reflect on this. With our present military strength of 3 million men—we are going to cut it down to 2,800,000 soon, what would be the situation, where would we find ourselves if we granted them an increase in pay of $1 a month? Should we do that, we would have spent $36 million a year and would not do anybody any good. If we gave them a $2 per month increase we would have spent $72 million and still would not have done anybody any good.

But we can take this program and the budget of $76 million contained in here and with the portion that will actually be paid for the wives and children we expect it to cost $53,800,000. By this we can do so much to attract and hold people, to assure the man who goes into the service and who remains in service that his wife and children will be taken care of in time of need, that if he should be sent to Germany or Japan and his wife and children left home, they will be taken care of in sickness, or his wife will be taken care of if she were confined; and all it would cost him would be the first $25. For that he can be sure that every member of his family is going to be properly cared for. By doing this we have more closely attained a competitive position. Maybe in some respects it is a little bit better. I think we have got to be a little bit better to be competitive with business and industry in order to get people who are willing to stay on active duty and sustain the frequent moves that are required by changes of station and the separation of families in moves caused by change of station.

So we are moving along now to where we are getting something done. We have passed the reenlistment bonus bill, we have also passed the Career Incentive Act. These are reflected in our reenlistment rate. I do not mean the original reenlistment. I am talking about the fellow who is in the service, he is going out and he is going to reenlist. Overall in the Defense Department since 1955 we increased that rate to 25.2 percent from 11.3 percent. Right today our reenlistments are double what they were in the first quarter of 1955.

It is a result of these increased benefits. That is why I feel we must grant these benefits in order that we can be on a competitive basis with business and industry so that we can get the men, and train them. For every one we retain as a career man in the service on a voluntary basis we eliminate the necessity for drafting more than one. Not only the disruption of that individual and his family do we save, but also the tremendous cost. There is no longer such a thing in the Military Establishment as a man who has a minimum amount of training. There is severe and intense training in every branch of the military service. All of the latest developments in electronics, engineering and whatnot come into the military service. By the time you have trained the man it represents a very substantial investment. When I first became a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, we used to say it cost $5,000 to equip and train a recruit. The figure now is well above $7,500 and I think it would run perhaps to $10,000 before you have trained the average recruit.

So when you can attract him and retrain him in the service you are saving very substantial amounts of money and you are also saving a very substantial dislocation of families and civilian economy. This is another step and I think a very important one in the direction of the military catching up with the civilian population and one that should be passed here in its present form.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. According to title 2 of the bill, section 201 (a) it is my understanding only the wives and children of active duty personnel are included for health insurance, that the unmarried widows and dependent children of deceased personnel are not included under the hospital plan. I wonder if that is a correct statement?

Mr. KILDAY. It is made mandatory for the Secretary of Defense to provide a program of insurance for the wife and children. It is made discretionary as to the other categories that I have mentioned here.

Mr. HOSMER. My particular concern, coming from a large naval district, is the situation of the unmarried widows and dependent children who are not properly covered but only covered by way of apparently option on the part of the Secretary of Defense. I further understand there are only about 200,000 in this category throughout the country. I am wondering why the committee did not see fit to include those under the mandatory coverage.

Mr. KILDAY. I may say to the gentleman, coming from an area such as he does, and his district is similar to mine, that he is familiar with the present benefits for these categories in the service hospitals on a space-and-facilities-available basis. This does not take that away. This bill does not take that privilege away. That is preserved. From the testimony of the insurance people, the Blue Cross, the Blue Shield, we came to the conclusion there is going to be some real live competition for this business. I should think when you have $53,800,000 worth of business available that you ought to be able to get a very substantial amount of competition. But you are not going to get that much competition if you spell out to the Secretary the minimum which he must take. We are hoping to get a good many of these things thrown in for the same amount of money. This law provides that the policy shall cover 365 days of hospitalization. At the present time a normal policy covers only 121 days, and that is being increased 10 days, to 131 days. That is the Blue Cross and various other organizations. But we provide for 365 days. We asked a question of the industry how much more is it going to cost to get 365 days' coverage rather than 121, and they said the incidence of hospitalization beyond 4 months is so rare that they would throw it in for the same price. I hope we will get a lot of unremarried widows thrown in for the same price.

Mr. HOSMER. I wonder if the gentleman would discuss the matter of the retired personnel, where the Secretary is given an option.

Mr. KILDAY. The same situation exists there. That was also a very difficult situation. We do not have experience tables as to how many of them would seek hospitalization in civilian or

military hospitals, and the insurance people, in giving us estimates, estimated that 100 percent use of civilian hospitals would run the cost of treatment up considerably. Until such time as it reaches the point where we have an experience level, I think this is the best we can do. We think they are doing well for those retired people.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. In referring to the word "supplies" appearing in line 10, page 8, I would like to inquire whether that includes all types of drugs and medication.

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. It includes those things which are included at the present time under the existing program. As I said, there are 105 million people in the United States who now carry this or it is carried for them. Right here in the bill we have a program which, if you described it in straight language, would be exactly that, and under that program they would get the drugs when confined to the hospital. It is a service that is recognized and highly appreciated in value, and it is something that we want to give now to the military, because it is the proper thing to do. It will take care of the 40 percent, and as a practical proposition, we want to be on a competitive basis with industry so that we can get and hold a fair share of the available personnel.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is little that I can add to the brilliant explanations of the proposed Dependent Medical Care Act which the gentleman from Texas has so ably presented.

Obviously, we must fulfill our obligation to the dependents of our service personnel.

As a member of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings on this bill, I can assure you that the entire matter was fully explored and that the bill before you today is the result of many constructive suggestions submitted from many sources.

I support the action of the subcommittee in granting to the Secretary of Defense the right to limit the right of service dependents to elect where they will receive their hospitalization.

While I do not think it will be necessary to make use of the limitation, nevertheless I realize that it must be contained in the proposed legislation if we are to stay within the cost estimates and the amount of money that will be available to pay for this program in the next fiscal year.

Unlimited free choice could conceivably disrupt all of the cost estimates upon which this bill is based.

And now, only for the purpose of emphasizing a few points, I should like the Chairman to answer a few questions for me. I do this, I repeat, only to make the record solid in this respect. I should like to ask this question.

Is it not correct that in writing the legislation, the subcommittee completely revised the bill that was submitted by the Department of Defense and instead wrote a bill based upon the suggestions of the subcommittee, the testimony of the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Osteopathic Association, the Reserve Officers Association, the Retired Officers Association, the American Legion, the Jewish War Veterans, the Fleet Reserve Association, the Blue Cross-Blue Shield organization, commercial life insurance companies, Group Health Plan, Inc., and others witnesses who appeared before our committee?

Mr. KILDAY. It is true that we heard from all of the individuals and organizations the gentleman has mentioned. We did revise the bill that was sent to us from the Department very materially. It is a new concept. I do not criticize them. I suppose they had their difficulties in coming to agreement between the various branches, perhaps of the same service. But we did not have those limitations, so we wrote the bill as we thought it ought to be.

Mr. ARENDS. I am trying to make it clear that this subcommittee did not in any way try to preclude anyone from coming before our committee to present their views. And we tried to get what might be called, what is commonly called advice from the experts.

Am I not correct that this bill, for the first time in the history of the uniformed services, provides a uniform system of dependent medical care for all members of the uniformed services?

Mr KILDAY. That is correct. There were disparities in the kind of care available to the various services. This brings them all to the same level. It permits, for instance, a coastguardman's dependents to enter an Army hospital or Navy hospital or an Air Force hospital; a member of any one of the military services may enter a Public Health Service hospital. This was not possible in the past. Inasmuch as the Government maintains all of them, I can see no rhyme nor reason for any requirement that they have to go to the hospital maintained by the service of which they are a member.

Mr. ARENDS. Am I not correct that any insurance, Group Health, or medical-service plan entered into will contain a provision that will require the dependent to pay the first $25 of hospital expenses for each admission?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. There is a tremendous saving in premium there. That is a rather nominal amount that can be provided. Of course, the first $25 in a civilian hospital must be paid. The ration charge in the military hospital will continue, whatever it happens to be. At the present time it is $1.75 a day. So it would depend on the anticipated length of time in the hospital which would be the cheaper.

Mr. ARENDS. That provision was inserted in the bill in lieu of a voluntary contribution on the part of the members concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much is this bill going to cost?

Mr. ARENDS. There is provision in this year's budget for $76 million for this bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. For the purposes of clarification only, as I understand it, there are certain types of dependents whose coverage under insurance is discretionary with the Secretary of Defense. If he sees fit to exercise that option, must he apply it to all of these categories of dependents or to selected categories?

Mr. ARENDS. Frankly, I do not know.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. The bill is specific in that he may apply it to some or all and he may provide the extent to which they shall have coverage, what service they shall have, and whatnot.

Mr. JOHANSEN. One other question, if the gentleman will yield further. If they select certain categories to apply it to, will that be on a service-wide basis covering all of the armed services?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. This is a new beginning on something on which we are going to have to gain a great deal of experience in order to have it work out.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I direct the gentleman's attention to page 5, subsection D. Why does the bill make it discretionary on the part of the Secretary of Defense to impose minimal charges for out-patient care? Is not that pretty broad authority to leave entirely to his discretion?

Mr. ARENDS. You might interpret it as being broad authority in that respect but, as I said just a moment ago, this is something new to us. We are trying something here in which we are going to have first to gain experience before we can write what might be termed a perfect law. I do not know. We are just trying to approach this as reasonably as we can, thinking that any Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be able to work out something in the long run which will be helpful and accomplish the purposes of this legislation.

Mr. JONAS. I am just wondering what facts he would have to find in order to make the determination that such charges are necessary.

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to make clear that this out-patient care is in service hospitals, not in civilian hospitals. That entitlement presently exists without any charge being made for it. We are providing here that the Secretary may provide a minimum charge for that service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the gentleman from North Carolina had finished his inquiry. I yield myself 1 minute in order to answer his question.

Mr. JONAS. Do I correctly understand that the provision about establishing charges for outpatient care would not apply to inmates of civilian-operated hospitals?

Mr. KILDAY. There will be no outpatient service provided in civilian hospitals. It is in-hospital care similar to what you now have under the Blue Shield and the Blue Cross. It is supposed to take care of important illnesses, the thing that really requires help.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. Has it come to the committee's attention that often, or, at least, on occasion, a serviceman would prefer to have his wife or another member of his family sent to a civilian hospital instead of the regular armed services hospital?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. The bill gives him free choice, subject to the fact that the Secretary may, if he sees fit, issue a regulation under which the dependent would have to utilize first the available facilities where the member is stationed.

Mr. BEAMER. Suppose, as has been charged in some instances, that the available military facilities are not adequate, or, shall we say, not adequately staffed, or do not give the comparable medical service that is afforded in civilian hospitals. Can the man then take his choice?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. If the facilities are inadequate, yes, he can have a free choice.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, may I direct attention to page 3, line 5. The coverage applies to dependent children of a male member or retired member of a uniformed service over 21 years of age who enrolls in a full-time course of study in a college. Is there any limitation on how long the dependent may continue to be enrolled in college and receive this medical care?

Mr. KILDAY. We have taken this language from the Internal Revenue Act, where the exemption for the child continues while enrolled in college.

Mr. JONAS. There is no time limit; it continues as long as he remains in college?

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has the responsibility today of maintaining the largest peacetime military forces in the history of our country. Almost 3 million men and women are wearing the uniform of our armed services in countries throughout the free world.

More than a million of these servicemen are married and they have a total of 1,300,000 children. That is more than 5 million Americans who are subject to military orders and the instabilities and sacrifices that are inherent in military life.

More than one-third of the servicemen are serving overseas or on ships at sea. And 400,000 of their dependents are outside the United States, many of them in areas that are isolated and physically detrimental. Other wives and children are left behind to care for themselves because conditions prevent them from accompanying the serviceman to remote assignments.

Only a few years ago, traditional benefits provided by the Congress for military personnel were broader and considerably more attractive than those offered by industry. These advantages prevailed for many years and made it possible for the services to attract and hold highly qualified personnel.

This was at a time, however, when the services were much smaller than they are today, and before industry began offering the same or better benefits. The factors, which once made military service attractive, have been largely neutralized by the sharp expansion of nonwage benefits over and above already increased wage levels in industry.

These supplemental benefits have tripled in industry in the last two decades and now cost employers 20 percent of their payrolls. It is particularly significant that almost four times as many workers in industry are covered by some type of company-sponsored health insurance as were covered in 1948. But, of even greater interest, is the fact that more than 70 percent of the covered workers are also offered health insurance for their dependents. And for 38 percent of these the employer assumes the full cost for dependent coverage.

I am convinced that devoted service to our country is still the paramount motivation of the officers and men who chose military service as a life career. And I know the military services cannot match the stability and unlimited opportunities offered by many segments of civilian industry. But we can encourage more men to enter and remain in a military career if we remove existing inequities and offer them more of the benefits that have become standard in our way of life.

One of the most disturbing influences on the family man in our Armed Forces today is the frequent inability to secure proper medical treatment for his wife and children when they need it. This is particularly true when the serviceman is overseas or otherwise separated from his family.

Today, it is estimated that only about 60 percent of the dependents of our servicemen have medical care available to them in military facilities. The remaining 40 percent must shift for themselves. This is a totally unfair situation and one that has created serious morale problems in the military services. Surveys conducted by the military departments reveal that many men are leaving the service and returning to civil life because of the nonavailability of medical care for their families.

These facts I bring to your attention so that the scope of our problem will be placed in proper perspective as we consider the Kilday bill, H. R. 9429.

This bill establishes an improved and uniform program of medical care for dependents of all members of the uniformed services, including dependents of retired members and widows and children of personnel who die on active duty.

When crew members in the Strategic Air Command go to a forward base overseas for extended operations they can be certain under this bill that their wives and children are going to get medical attention if they need it. The seamen patrolling the Straits of Formosa and the soldiers and marines keeping watch on the 38th parallel in Korea will have no further cause to worry about the health and well-being of their families back home.

The medical facilities of the uniformed services would continue the present practice of providing medical care to dependents overseas and, within the limits of their capabilities, in the United States.

In addition, and this is the important new feature of the bill, provision is also made for supplementing and augmenting this program through the use of civilian medical facilities.

The bill requires the Secretary of Defense to establish an insurance, medical service or health plan or plans which will assure wives and children of active duty personnel certain minimum medical services. Entitlement to this care at civilian facilities will be without cost to the service member except that the patient will be required to pay the first $25 of whatever hospital expenses may be incurred for each admission.

It permits the Secretary of Defense to establish some form of insurance, medical service or health plan or plans for all other dependents eligible for medical care. The extent of the care to be provided and the categories of dependents to be included in such program may vary at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense. Authority is provided to permit the Secretary to also extend this program to retired personnel.

The bill gives the Secretary of Defense authority to purchase medical care for dependents located outside continental United States when medical facilities of the uniformed services are not available.

In authorizing continuation of dependent medical care at service medical facilities, the bill recognizes the obvious economies of this practice. But, in addition, there is the important fact that it would be impossible to retain and attract competent career medical personnel if service physicians are not given the opportunity to have a well-rounded practice and thus retain their professional competency.

The bill under title II requires that any program of insurance or medical service entered into for the wives and children of active-duty personnel must include but need not be limited to the following:

First. Hospitalization in semiprivate accommodations up to 365 days for each admission, including all necessary services and supplies furnished by the hospital during inpatient confinement;

Second. Medical and surgical care incident to a period of hospitalization;

Third. Complete obstetrical and maternity service, including prenatal and postnatal care;

Fourth. Required services of a physician or surgeon before and after hospitalization for a bodily injury or for a surgical operation;

Fifth. Diagnostic tests and procedures, including laboratory and X-ray examinations, accomplished or recommended by a physician incident to hospitalization; and

Sixth. Payment by the patient of the first $25 of hospital expenses.

As I have stated, no contribution will be required from the service member for this insurance or medical service coverage. Only those who actually use civilian facilities would pay the initial $25 cost. This deductible feature not only prevents abuse, but it eliminates the expense of administering premium collections and recordkeeping. The committee found that this was the best solution to the problems resulting from the many moves that military personnel make. It eliminates the problem of starts and stops and assures coverage for all dependents without requiring the serviceman to sign any kind of contract.

The fundamental purpose of this title is to establish a program which will assure medical care to those dependents who are not now receiving it at service facilities. The Secretary of Defense will be required to establish an insurance or health service plan for the wives and children of active duty personnel. The Secretary will be permitted to extend some form of insurance or health service plan to all other dependents as funds and circumstances permit.

Since this health insurance coverage is a new innovation for the military services, no one can predict with any degree of certainty how much it will cost. The bill therefore provides for a cautious beginning, requiring only that coverage be provided for wives and children of active duty personnel by permitting negotiation for coverage of other dependents and retired personnel. This will enable the Secretary to expand the program as experience is gained without generating excessive and unpredictable costs.

In addition, title III spells out the statutory entitlement of retired personnel to medical and dental care. This title also eliminates an existing inequity for retired enlisted men of the Army and Air Force and puts them on a par with retired enlisted men of the Navy. Hereafter, no retired enlisted man would be required to pay the ration allowance when hospitalized in military hospitals.

The enactment of this bill into law will eliminate much of the confusion which presently surrounds the question of entitlement to medical care. Each of the services will provide the same care to the same category of dependents under the same dependency criteria.

It will give clear cut and positive legal sanction to a service benefit which presently has at best an insecure status.

It will make dependent medical care a genuine service benefit by making it available to all military dependents regardless of circumstances.

And, finally, it will contribute immeasurably to career attractiveness by providing a benefit which can be measured in dollars and cents and a benefit which identifies the service family with the sponsoring service.

We must restore to the military career the prestige and attractions it once held. We cannot do so, however, unless we recognize the problems of the family man whose morale and fighting effectiveness are influenced so greatly by the health and well-being of his dependents. It is to this end that I urge your support of the Kilday bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, in March of last year this body wisely and justly passed the legislation which later became the Career Incentive Act of 1955. It provided for a sorely needed pay revision for service personnel. Until its enactment, we were losing highly trained officers and enlisted men at an alarming rate. We are all gratified that that critical situation has been substantially improved. But it has by no means been improved enough.

When we were considering the pay legislation, I stated here on the floor that it would also be necessary for us to give very serious attention to restoring other traditional benefits that had been steadily chipped away and removed since the end of World War II.

This afternoon we have before us a bill to provide adequate medical care to the dependents of our servicemen. Among the benefits provided to employees, in or out of Government, medical care has assumed a position of the greatest importance. This is true to a greater degree for military families than for those in other walks of life.

Medical care for the dependents of our active-duty servicemen is not new. It has been furnished in one form or another since the days of our early frontier history. It is also true that before World War II medical care for the families of servicemen was a unique benefit. Very little of this type of care was furnished to the families of employees in private business and industry. It was of such value and importance during those years that many outstanding men stayed in service who would otherwise have left.

But now we must recognize that this is no longer the case. During the past 10 years, medical care for our service families has deteriorated to the point where it is no longer available to nearly half of them. This is not only producing great hardship, but has been a principal cause for the many resignations and the low reenlistment rates.

Why have we been losing our personnel in such great numbers—men whose service we urgently need and who have been trained at such great expense?

The answer is simple. They are leaving military service to enter business and industry, where the nonwage benefits are now far in excess of those available to military personnel.

Since the end of World War II, benefits to civilian workers have been vastly increased and revolutionized to the point where they now cost employers 20 percent of payroll. The cost of these so-called fringe benefits for industrial workers is now averaging 40 cents per hour for each employee—an amount equal to the entire minimum wage in 1938.

This, of course, represents tremendous progress and improvement for which we are all deeply grateful. It is the kind of progress that marks one of the brightest pages in the American way of life.

Nearly 90 percent of the workers under negotiated labor contracts are now provided with hospitalization insurance by their employers. In the great majority of cases this coverage may also be extended to include the members of their families. This hospital coverage for dependents includes not only maternity care but necessary medical and surgical treatment as well. In approximately one-half of these cases the cost for dependent coverage is shared between employer and employee. For the remaining half the cost is borne entirely by the employers.

That is the extent to which industry and labor has moved in this vital field of medical care, which only a few years ago was seldom provided outside of military service. All Americans can well be proud of such accomplisments.

But we cannot be proud of the manner in which dependent medical care has deteriorated for those in military service. We are told by the Secretary of Defense that only 60 percent of the service dependents are able to receive medical care when they need it. It is no longer available to the remaining 40 percent. Instead they must bear the entire cost of whatever hospital care they require.

This unfortunate situation has been caused by the shortage of military doctors, overcrowding of military medical facilities, but mostly, because so many of the military dependents are located where they cannot take advantage of existing military medical care.

The Congress has not always been alert to its full responsibilities to those serving in the Armed Forces. Recently, however, and especially during the past year, we have been awakened to the very serious situation where so many of our best trained men are finding it necessary to abandon their military careers. At least we are no longer standing idly by, watching the traditional rights and benefits of the military service be constantly reduced and nibbled away. And we are showing a better appreciation of the great service being rendered by the American fighting man not only to the United States but to our allies and to the free world.

The bill before us today represents a most important forward step. It is a good bill that embodies a sound plan, and one that is urgently needed.

The Members of the House owe a debt of real gratitude to PAUL KILDAY and to each member of the outstanding subcommittee of which he is the chairman.

They have made a thorough and complete study of the many complicated problems involved in providing medical care to the families of our servicemen at thousands of stations throughout the

world. They have produced a sound and practical plan upon which can be based a greatly improved program for providing dependent medical care.

The bill provides a clear authority for the continued use of all existing medical facilities in the uniformed services for the care of dependents. This is not, however, to interfere with the primary mission of such facilities, which is to maintain our military medical readiness under any and all conditions.

It authorizes a completely new feature, and one that is absolutely essential if adequate medical care is to be available for military dependents. In addition to continuing the care of dependents in military facilities, the use of civilian medical facilities will now be authorized for the first time in providing such care.

Members of the House have already been informed as to the extent and nature of the medical services to be provided, and also the manner in which it is to be done.

The point I wish to emphasize is that for the first time since the days before World War II we can say to any man who is serving our country in the Armed Forces, "You need no longer worry that your wives and children will not receive adequate medical care. Wherever your duty takes you, your family can now be given hospital care when they need it."

We cannot expect to retain good men in the armed services if such traditional benefits as dependent medical care do not even approach those provided to employees in private industry. In passing this bill we are doing no more than paralleling the medical benefits that already exist to employees outside of military service. But I am confident that it will prove to be a most important and significant inducement in attracting good men to remain in military service.

I strongly urge its passage. We certainly owe it to these men who are carrying such a critical burden in this dangerous world.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Bow asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to find that we have before us today a bill which provides something for Americans and for our American troops. I would remind you, however, that this bill anticipates an additional expenditure of $100 million. We are advised by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, that the matter is provided for in the budget. I should also remind you that it is a balanced budget, and that it is a budget that is balanced with a surplus of $400 million. I hope that the members of the committee and the Members of Congress will remember when we come to the question of further appropriations for foreign aid that here is $100 million for Americans, and that we can pay for this very easily without it being in this budget by a small reduction in foreign aid of $100 million, and we could pay for it and increase our surplus to $500 million. There are many items of a similar nature coming along where we can take parts of that foreign-aid program and begin to pay for things for Americans and see that the people of this country begin to receive these benefits. When we think about an item of $4,900,000,000 for foreign aid, this $100 million to take care of our own seems very small. But, we can increase our surplus.

I would suggest that in this bill on line 7, we might add where we refer to medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services the words "uniformed services of the United States of America." Now that may sound a little facetious, but it is not facetious because, my colleagues, we have assigned the trial of American servicemen abroad to foreign courts. So it is very possible that we may feel that because foreign courts are now trying American servicemen that perhaps the United States should begin to take care of dependents of armed forces of foreign nations. I should like to say to those who are interested in the status of forces fight that we have been making that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has held full and complete hearings and has heard witnesses on the subject. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has kept his word to me and to the House and has conducted those hearings. He has conducted them very fully and I must say very fairly. I think, perhaps, within the week the Committee on Foreign Affairs will take some action on House Joint Resolution 309, which is the resolution directing the President to seek modification of the status of forces agreement. But I should again like to say to the Members of the House that although here we are taking care of dependents up to the point of parents-in-law, we have surrendered for the soldier himself, under the Status of Forces Treaty, his constitutional rights and the protection of the Bill of Rights of the United States.

Through the status-of-forces agreement we have denied him the right of trial by jury, the right of cross-examination of witnesses, the right to face his accusers, and the right to bail and the right to have his innocence presumed until he is proven guilty. In practically every country in which we have this status-of-forces agreement, those rights have been taken from our American servicemen. In practically every country where they may be arrested and tried by foreign courts, he is guilty until he has proven himself innocent. In most instances, he is assigned a counsel who speaks a language which he does not understand and he is tried in a court where he does not understand the proceedings, nor does he understand what he is being charged with. I urge you, my colleagues, to join in this effort to bring back to the American serviceman his constitutional rights, the protection of the Bills of Rights, and to give to him the benefit of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, of which he is deprived by these status-of-forces agreements.

I hope you will join with me in urging that the Foreign Affairs Committee will give this House a chance to act, give this House an opportunity to speak the will of the people they represent, for I know the people they represent would like to have us pass the resolution. I hope the Foreign Affairs Committee will recognize the fact that this House last year, by an overwhelming vote, supported the amendment which would have cleared up the question of status of forces. We withdrew that amendment when the Foreign Affairs Committee said they would have hearings. Now we are ready for action. I hope and I trust the committee will report a resolution on the status of forces within the next few days.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Congress declares it to be the purpose of this act to provide an improved and uniform program of medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services. The Congress believes that it is sound public policy to provide such an improved and uniform program of medical care as an important factor in the creation and maintenance of high morale throughout the uniformed services because it assures such personnel at home and overseas that the medical care of their dependents is being provided.

SEC. 102. As used in this act—

(a) The term "uniformed services" means the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service.

(b) The term "member of a uniformed service" means a person appointed, enlisted, inducted or called, ordered or conscripted in a uniformed service who has entered on active duty or active duty for training for a period in excess of 30 days.

(c) The term "retired member of a uniformed service" means a member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to retired, retirement, or retainer pay or equivalent pay as a result of service in a uniformed service, other than a member or former member entitled to retired or retirement pay under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.

(d) The term "dependent" means—

(1) in the case of any male member or retired member of a uniformed service—

(A) his unlawful wife;

(B) his unmarried legitimate children under 21 years of age, or such unmarried dependent children over 21 years of age who are incapable of self-support because of being mentally or physically incapacitated and who are in fact dependent on the member for over half of their support, and his dependent children over 21 years of age duly enrolled in a full-time course of study in an institution of higher learning as approved by the Secretary of Defense. The term "children" shall, in addition to the member's own or lawfully adopted children, include stepchildren;

(C) his parents and parents-in-law if in fact dependent on him for over half of their support;

(D) his unremarried widow, and his children as defined in (B); and

(2) in the case of any female member or retired member of a uniformed service—

(A) her lawful husband, if in fact dependent on her for over half of his support;

(B) her unmarried legitimate children under 21 years of ages or such unmarried

dependent children over 21 years of age who are incapable of self-support because of being mentally or physically incapacitated and who are in fact dependent on the member for over half of their support, and her dependent children over 21 years of age duly enrolled in a full-time course of study in an institution of higher learning as approved by the Secretary of Defense. The term "children" shall in addition to the member's own or lawfully adopted children include stepchildren;

(C) her parents and parents-in-law if in fact dependent on her for over half of their support;

(D) her unremarried widower if at the time of the member's death he was in fact dependent on her for over half of his support, and her children as defined in (B).

(e) The term "Secretary of Defense" is applicable to the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard when operating as a service with the Navy.

(f) The term "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" is applicable to the Coast Guard when not serving with the Navy, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service.

SEC. 103. (a) Whenever requested, medical care shall be given dependents of members and dependents of retired members of a uniformed service in medical facilities of the uniformed services subject to the availability of space, facilities, and the capabilities of the medical staff, and any determination made by the cognizant medical authority as to availability of space, facilities, and the capabilities of the medical staff, shall be conclusive. The medical care of such dependents provided for in medical facilities of the uniformed services shall in no way interfere with the primary mission of those facilities.

(b) In order to provide more effective utilization of medical facilities of the uniformed services the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall jointly prescribe regulations to insure that dependents entitled to medical care in a medical facility of a uniformed service under the provisions of this act shall not be denied equal opportunity for medical care because of the service affiliation of the service member.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall establish charges for any subsistence given dependents in connection with medical care in the facilities of the uniformed services, which charges shall be the same for all dependents of members and dependents of retired members of the uniformed services.

(d) As a restraint on excessive demands for medical care under this section, uniform minimal charges may be imposed for outpatient care but such charges shall be limited to such amounts, if any, as may be established by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under a special finding that such charges are necessary.

(c) Any amounts that are received in payment for subsistence and medical care rendered dependents in facilities of the uniformed services shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation of the facilities furnishing the care.

(f) Medical care under this section shall be limited to the following:

(1) Diagnosis;

(2) Treatment of acute medical and surgical conditions;

(3) Treatment of contagious diseases;

(4) Immunization; and

(5) Maternity and infant care.

(g) Hospitalization under this section is not authorized dependents for the following, except as the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may by regulation provide—

(1) domiciliary care and chronic diseases;

(2) nervous and mental disorders (except for diagnostic purposes); and

(3) elective medical and surgical treatments as determined by the cognizant physician.

(h) Dependents shall not be provided under this section—

(1) prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear, and spectacles, except that outside the continental limits of the United States and at remote stations within the continental limits of the United States where adequate civilian facilities are not available, those items, if available from Government stocks, may be provided to dependents at prices representing full cost to the Government;

(2) ambulance service, except in acute emergency;

(3) home calls, except in special cases where it is determined by the cognizant physician to be medically necessary;

(4) dental care, except—

(A) emergency care to relieve pain and suffering but not to include any permanent restorative work or dental prosthesis;

(B) care as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment; and

(C) outside the continental limits of the United States and in remote areas within the continental limits of the United States where adequate civilian dental facilities are not available.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) In order to assure the availability of medical care for the wives and children of all members of the uniformed services, the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall contract for medical care for such persons, pursuant to the provisions of this title, under such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans as he deems appropriate, which plan or plans shall include, but shall not be restricted to, the following:

(1) Hospitalization in semiprivate accommodations up to 365 days for each admission, including all necessary services and supplies furnished by the hospital during inpatient confinement;

(2) Medical and surgical care incident to a period of hospitalization;

(3) Complete obstetrical and maternity service, including prenatal and postnatal care;

(4) Required services of a physician or surgeon prior to and following hospitalization for a bodily injury or for a surgical operation;

(5) Diagnostic tests and procedures, including laboratory and X-ray examinations, accomplished or recommended by a physician incident to hospitalization;

(6) Payment by the patient of the first $25 of hospital expenses incurred under paragraph (1) of this subsection for each admission.

(b) Subsection (a) shall be subject to such reasonable limitations, additions, exclusions, definitions, and related provisions as may be provided in such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans, approved by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(c) The dependents covered under this section may elect to receive medical care under the terms of this act in either the facilities of a uniformed service under the conditions specified in title I of this act or in the facilities provided for under such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans, as may be provided, except that the right to such election may be limited under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for such dependents residing in areas where the member concerned is assigned to a post or installation of a uniformed service where adequate medical facilities of a uniformed service are available for such dependents.

SEC. 202. In order to improve the availability of medical care for retired members of a uniformed service, and their dependents, and dependents of members not included in section 201, the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may, as he deems appropriate, contract for an insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans which will provide medical care for these retired members and dependents. The extent of the medical care to be provided under such plan or plans and the retired members and dependents to be included will be as prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of Defense as approved by the President which regulations shall prescribe the payment to be made by the dependent or retired member, which payment shall not be less than the payment required of dependents under section 201.

SEC. 203. In order to improve the availability of medical care to dependents of members of the uniformed services located outside the continental limits of the United States where medical facilities of the uniformed services are not available, the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as appropriate, may contract for medical care for such dependents with acceptable local medical sources, or the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may contract for medical care for these dependents under such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans as he deems appropriate.

SEC. 204. Any insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans which may be entered into by the Secretary of Defense with respect to medical care under the provisions of this act shall contain a provision for a review, and, if necessary, an adjustment of payments by the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare not later than 120 days after the first year the plan or plans have been in effect and each year thereafter.

SEC. 205. In order to effectuate the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish insurance, medical service, and health plan advisory committees to advise, consult, and make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense, provided that the Secretary issues regulations setting forth the scope, procedures, and activities of such committees. These committees shall consist of the Secretary of Defense or his designee, who shall be chairman, and such other persons as the Secretary may appoint. Their members shall be, to the extent possible, representative of insurance, medical service, and health plan or plans, and shall serve without compensation but may be allowed transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. Under regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare: (1) Members of the uniformed services on active duty or active duty for training shall be furnished medical and dental care in any medical facility of the uniformed services. (2) Retired members of a uniformed service may be furnished required medical and dental care in any medical facility of a uniformed service, if requested, subject to the availability of space and facilities and capabilities of the medical staff, except that a retired member who has completed not less than 30 years of active service shall, upon request, be furnished required medical and dental care in a medical facility of a uniformed service subject only to availability of space, facilities,

and capabilities of the medical staff; (3) When a member or retired member of a uniformed service receives medical or dental care in a facility of another uniformed service, the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation of the medical facility furnishing the medical or dental care shall be reimbursed at rates to be established by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SEC. 302. Retired enlisted men of the Army and Air Force when hospitalized in a Federal hospital shall receive the ration allowance prescribed by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army and Air Force when so hospitalized.

SEC. 303. Where a dependent, or retired member as defined in this act, who is covered under an insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans, as provided in this act, requires hospitalization beyond the period of time provided under such plan or plans, such dependent or retired member may be transferred to a medical facility of a uniformed service for the continuation of the necessary hospitalization. Where movement to such medical facility is not feasible, the expenses for the additional hospitalization required by such dependent or retired member in a civilian facility are authorized to be paid, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may prescribe.

SEC. 304. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 305. (a) The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) So much of the act of July 5, 1884 (ch. 217, 23 Stat. 107), as is contained in the proviso under the heading "Medical Departments."

(2) The act of May 10, 1943 (ch. 95, 57 Stat. 80), except section 4 of such act, and except that part of section 5 which relates to persons outside the Naval Service mentioned in section 4 of such act.

(3) Section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, except as it relates to dependent members of families of ships' officers and members of crews of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

(4) Section 710 (a) of the act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 373, 58 Stat. 714), as amended.

(5) Public Law 108, approved June 20, 1949, to the extent it authorizes hospital benefits for dependents of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(b) All laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 306. This act shall become effective 120 days from the date of approval of this act.

Mr. KILDAY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 23, strike out the word "unlawful" and insert "lawful."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 2, line 23, after the word "his", strike out the word "lawful."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the members of the committee will look at the bill, page 2, line 23, they will note that originally section (A) read "his unlawful wife." Then the committee amendment struck out the word "unlawful" so that it would read "his lawful wife."

That has implications that should not be in any bill. I do not know about other countries abroad where our men are serving, perhaps over there under the law of the country the natives may have more than one wife, but in this country if a man has a wife she is a lawful wife. There just is no other kind in the United States of America. What other classification can you make for a wife, except that she is a lawful wife? She is a wife, whether it is by common law, priest, justice of the peace, or a judge. The implication should not be in a bill which has to do with our armed services. Nor in any other law. The fact that the bill in the first instance made provision for an "unlawful" wife shows it was not carefully written. Every time this legislation comes up for consideration anywhere along the line, some very well educated Rhodes scholar or Oxford scholar may think and waste hours of Government time and paper and stenographic services, may even consult the Library of Congress and ask the Reference Service to come up with a paper distinguishing between a wife and a lawful wife. I hope the Committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am sorry the Printing Office made a mistake in putting that word "unlawful" in there instead of "lawful," because we have heard from it at every turn since it happened.

Of course, the language in the bill is that customarily used in legislation of this type. I assume that when it first came into legislation of this type it was to settle any question as to a common-law wife, or things of that kind.

I know of no reason why we should depart from the customary style of expression that we have had in other bills.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Page 3, line 5, after the comma strike out the subsequent words down to the next period in line 8.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on this and the amendment I shall offer following this I may revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes out this language:

And his dependent children over 21 years of age duly enrolled in a full-time course of study in an institution of higher learning as approved by the Secretary of Defense.

I wish to ask the gentleman having charge of the bill, Does that language mean that where someone has been in the service, or is in the service, his dependent children are entitled to a full-time course in an institution of higher learning? For example, I have a son who was in the service, but who was mustered out. Does the language which I have asked be stricken mean that his two sons, my grandsons, would have the right to attend an institution of higher learning, assuming they are dependent children, until they have finished their studies?

Mr. KILDAY. Does the gentleman want me to answer now or when I rise in opposition to his amendment?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman is correct; that is what would be the result. As to the reasons I will be glad to state them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what I want to know, whether the children of my son who was formerly in the service but who is now retired, whether his two sons can attend an institution of learning here in the United States of America and if they can, for how long?

Mr. KILDAY. Let me understand whether the son is separated or retired. Is he retired from the career service and drawing retired pay?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I don't know. He finished his term of enlistment.

Mr. KILDAY. If he just quit he is no longer connected with the military and they would not have. Under this provision a person retired from the service; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have a grandson who is in the service. Now, what about his children? Can they go to some college until they finish?

Mr. KILDAY. If he stays in until retirement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; he is in now.

Mr. KILDAY. But if he stays until he retires for length of service or by reason of disability; yes. Because he is your grandchild I take it that investment is worth while.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Suppose he does not retire? He is still in the service and we will say he has two boys who are 21. Under this bill, assuming they are both dependent on him, can they continue to attend a university or institution of learning?

Mr. KILDAY. So long as he is in the service; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then you cannot draft them, can you?

Mr. KILDAY. Cannot draft who?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Those two great-grandsons.

Mr. KILDAY. Your great-grandchildren now?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. Your great-grandchildren?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Whom we will assume are 21.

Mr. KILDAY. So long as they successfully pursue the course of education

I assume they would get an educational deferment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure, and then if it runs on until they are 25 yon cannot draft them into the armed services.

Mr. KILDAY. If he is deferred to pursue his education he is liable until he is 35.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire recognition?

Mr. KILDAY. No.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am not satisfied with this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield before he gets into that?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman's statement indicated that I was dissatisfied. I offered an amendment. Argument on the amendment is not any indication of my dissatisfaction; I am just seeking information.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Is the gentleman satisfied?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Since the great-grandchildren are girls instead of boys, I assume they will be subject to the draft if the father remains in the service, but will be deferred as long as the father is in the service, until each has completed her education.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee why this language is in the bill?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for me to explain it at this time?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, as I stated before, is designed to make the services more attractive and put them on a competive basis with business and industry. We feel we would not be justified in spending any portion of this money unless it did accomplish some of those purposes.

The subcommittee felt that for little or no additional expense we would be able to make it that much more attractive to the man who had children in college if this type of benefit were made available to him. For that reason we included it in the bill. I realize there may be others who do not agree with the position that the subcommittee took. As one who has recently and has now children in college I can understand why it would be a very appealing thing to have greater benefits such as this at little or no additional cost so that we may be able to maintain these people in the service. The feeling of the subcommittee and the feeling of the committee as a whole was that this was worth while.

An amendment is offered to strike this out. If the feeling of the House is contrary to our belief, the amendment will prevail, but we feel it is worth while, our idea in spending this amount of money in order to make the services that much more attractive.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman what it is estimated this will cost?

Mr. KILDAY. It is within the $53,800,000.

Mr. GROSS. It is in that total amount, but I mean this specific provision.

Mr. KILDAY. There is no separate estimate.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. There seems to be some misapprehension about this. This is not to provide educational facilities to these people. This is only to provide medical treatment for someone who is pursuing a course of study in school.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. This provides who shall get this medical service while pursuing a course of study after 21. Until that time they are going to get it anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 3, line 11, after the word "parents", strike out the balance of the sentence.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if you will look at paragraph (C) on page 3 of the bill you will find it includes stepchildren. I am not offering any amendment about stepchildren because a fellow may get married, he gets a good wife, and the fact she brings a stepchild or two into the family is no reason why the stepchildren should not have this benefit. The service gets a good wife and she should not have to be worried about the stepchildren suffering from the toothache or 4 or 5 other things mentioned in the bill. I have no complaint about that.

Now, why should the parents-in-law be in there? From time immemorial some people, sometimes women who are inclined to be facetious, have indulged in these mother-in-law jokes. I do not go along with them. But is there any reason why in-laws should be in here? I would like to ask the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], to explain to me why should you take in your mother-in-law and father-in-law and if you are going to take them in, why not take in the brother-in-law and sister-in-law?

The brother-in-law and sister-in-law can be just as dependent on the gentleman in the service or the officers in the service as are the fathers-in-law.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, we have the father and the mother of the serviceman, and we have the father and the mother of the wife. Now, are you going to discriminate? Maybe the father and the mother of the serviceman would not be dependent. Now, there is a question to answer yourself.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean, to keep family harmony you want to have it cover the in-laws of both husband and wife?

Mr. ARENDS. If over 50 percent of their livelihood is derived from the serviceman, then it would apply to both the parents of the serviceman and the parents of the servicewoman, whichever the case may be.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That may be all right as long as funds can be raised by additional taxes as in this day and age many of the wives support their husbands, perhaps the amendment ought not to be adopted. If bills of this nature can be adopted eventually there may be no need for old-age assistance or social security. All may be either in the armed services or retired or veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: On page 7, line 25, after the words "wives and children", insert "and dependents described in section 102 (d) (1) (D)."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that it be read and the two be considered simultaneously.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: On page 9, line 23, after the words "education and welfare", strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I think the committee has done a tremendous job and that this is really a landmark piece of legislation, and I am very proud to be able to be a Member of this body and vote affirmatively on it. I also realize that the amendment I have offered which would bring in the unremarried widows of servicemen and the surviving children under the mandatory categories of the insurance provision, and the amendment which would bring in the retired personnel under the mandatory category of the insurance provisions, both have been carefully considered by the committee; and that in the light of the fact that the existing statistical knowledge on the cost and number concerned and so forth, is at this time not as complete as it should be, the committee has not seen fit to add these categories. I offer the amendments not hoping for their passage, as I know they will not be passed by you, but for the purpose of emphasizing that these two categories of people are worthy of consideration again after this bill is passed and experience is gathered upon it, and for that reason I merely take the opportunity to present the amendments today so that the subject matters will be in the minds of the committee during the next session of the Congress, and as time goes on it may be considered as the basis for further additional information.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that we do appreciate the claim of these groups of dependents for consideration, that is the reason that they are included in the bill, but we are operating within the funds available for this program. If

the amendment of the gentleman from California should be adopted, it would increase the amount of this bill under the estimates which we now have, by as much as $51 million or almost double the present estimated cost of the bill. So, while we do appreciate the fact that these groups of dependents are entitled to consideration to the extent that we give discretionary power to the Secretary to cover as many as he can with the money available, still if we, by law, make it mandatory, we will increase the cost to the point where I am afraid it would defeat the entire program. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, if it involves $51 million, is that per year?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman think the Congress, in the discharge of the duty of appropriating funds, should leave that to some Secretary to determine whether we spend that or not?

Mr. KILDAY. I most assuredly tell the gentleman I would not support any bill that did. This bill does not do anything of the kind. The bill would still require appropriations annually for this or any portion of the contract made. This bill does not provide any funds whatever.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. "May" then really does not mean anything.

Mr. KILDAY. "May" means everything in this instance.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have given notice of my purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of the House in this fashion. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. FLOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 408, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NAACP ACTIVITIES IN ALABAMA

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the friendly relations that have existed in Alabama between the white and Negro races have been badly strained in recent weeks. In the opinion of most Alabamians, this situation is largely a result of the determination of the NAACP, regardless of the circumstances, to force into the University of Alabama a Negro student.

Left alone, I am certain the people of Alabama and the South will continue their efforts to work out a solution satisfactory to both races. Prodded by the NAACP, an organization bitterly resented by a great majority of the people of my State, it is highly likely that the tension which now exists in the State of Alabama will increase rather than diminish.

Yesterday Autherine Lucy, the Negro student in question, was expelled from the University of Alabama as a result of the false and fantastic charges made by her, through her attorneys, against the officials of that institution. The trustees of the University of Alabama were, in my opinion, well within their authority in expelling this student, and I commend them for their action.

If, as Autherine Lucy said, she "merely wanted an education," then I urge her to discontinue her efforts to enter the University of Alabama and enroll at one of a number of schools which have invited her to attend. In doing so, I call to her attention the simple words of wisdom spoken by her aged father who said, "If it can't come to be agreeable, it won't come to anything."

If the NAACP has a sincere interest in the welfare of the Alabama Negro, rather than in the enrichment of its own treasury, I call upon that organization to cease its efforts to force down the throats of the great majority of Alabamians a social change they are unwilling to accept. To continue its present activities in my State is to invite further dissension, strife, and hatred—and these are the elements on which communism thrives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. AVERY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 5, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1590. A letter from the Deputy Director, Mutual Defense Assistance Control, International Cooperation Administration, transmitting the Sixth and Seventh Semiannual Reports of Operations of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control for the periods July to December 1954, and January through June 1955, pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1591. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the annual report of tort claims paid within the Housing and Home Finance Agency by the Office of the Administrator and the constituent agencies and units, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1592. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1593. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1594. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1595. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1596. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1597. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation entitled "A bill to amend the provisions of the Revised Statutes relating to physical examinations preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 9720. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 356. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1846). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 9739. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 419. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 9739. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1848). Rereferred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 9720. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 9721. A bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 9722. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. R. 9723. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to moving picture admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 9724. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 9725. A bill to provide for the labeling of ice cream, fluid milk, and fluid milk drinks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 9726. A bill amending paragraph 1530 (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to rubber-soled footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 9727. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 9728. A bill to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 9729. A bill relating to the transfer of Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 9730. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 9731. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 9739. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. J. Res. 573. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall not participate in any civil action except as a party to such civil action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 417. Resolution to protect the integrity of the Speaker and the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. Res. 418. Resolution to create a select committee to survey functions of committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations memorializing the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the acute need for medical research and development and to make available funds therefore; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prevent the reduction of production and personnel at the Watertown Arsenal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to issue commemorative centennial silver dollars celebrating Nevada's Silver Centennial; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the Attorney General of the United States to place the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the subversive list for reasons set forth herein; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 9732. A bill for the relief of Frieda Bergmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 9733. A bill for the relief of S. N. T. Fratelli Gondrand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 9734. A bill for the relief of Jock Lern Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 9735. A bill for the relief of An Ding Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 9736. A bill for the relief of Henry James Carne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 9737. A bill for the relief of Peter Sposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 9738. A bill for the relief of Francisco Valle de Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

604. By Mr. FOGARTY: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, Inc., submitted by Mary M. Eldridge, legislative director, and signed by approximately 160 residents of Rhode Island urging Congress to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

605. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Mr. Jeff R. Mercer, commander, and 32 other members of the American Legion Post No. 432, Mt. Vernon, Tex., urging that the Veterans' Administration hospital at McKinney, Tex., be retained in its present status; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

606. Also, petition of Mrs. Buel Moody, secretary, and 11 other members of the Junior Afflatus Club, Cooper, Tex., urging a restudy of the decision of the Veterans' Administration to close the Veterans' Administration hospital at McKinney, Tex.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

607. Also, petition of Mrs. George H. Call, president, and 22 other members of the 1933 Study Club, Jefferson, Tex., urging that the Veterans' Administration hospital at McKinney, Tex., be retained in its present status; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

608. Also, petition of Mr. Leon Ussery and 90 other citizens of Red River County, Tex., favoring the Veterans' Administration hospital at McKinney, Tex., being made a permanent institution; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

609. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted by the Cheese Producers' Marketing Association, Monroe, Wis., at annual meeting on February 18, 1956, urging amendment of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and supporting H. R. 8320, providing additional funds for the school-milk program and the brucellosis eradication program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

610. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the cabinet secretary-treasurer, International Association of Lions Clubs, District 51, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing gratitude to Hon. Herbert H. Lehman for his efforts in favor of a fair treatment in the application of the Sugar Act to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

John E. Peurifoy: Foe of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with the loss of John E. Peurifoy in a tragic accident a little over 5 months ago, the United States lost one of its most capable and colorful diplomats. First as Ambassador to Greece, then as Ambassador to Guatemala, and finally Thailand, Mr. Peurifoy was an effective on-the-spot troubleshooter in the battle against communism.

In the words of the Secretary of State, Mr. Peurifoy had—

exceptional responsibilities which he discharged with great distinction.

In Greece and Guatemala, he contributed mightily to repelling efforts of international communism to take over the governments of those countries.

At Bangkok, he served not only to cement ties with our good friend and ally, Thailand, but at this seat of the Secretariat of the Manila Council he helped to give vitality to the new treaty for the security of Southeast Asia.

Indeed, Mr. Peurifoy's career is one in which all Americans may well take pride. His meteoric climb to prominence and success is a Horatio Alger-like story in the true American tradition. Born August 9, 1907, in Walterboro, S. C., Mr. Peurifoy was a member of a family of lawyers. He, too, had aspired to becoming a lawyer, but family financial setbacks forced him to put this ambition aside. His protracted illness during his second year at West Point forced him to leave school altogether.

After a stint running a supply room of a land bank in Kansas City, and various jobs in New York, 1935 found him in Washington applying for a job with the State Department. But because of his lack of the necessary education, there was no possibility there. Undaunted, this became his goal. For 3 years he bombarded the Department of State with job applications—in the meantime holding such jobs as elevator operator in the House of Representatives, a minor post in the Treasury Department, and a job in a local department store. At the same time he atended night school at American University and George Washington University.

Finally, the turning point in his career came in 1938 when the Department of State hired him as a clerk at $2,000 a year. Eight years later he was Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State, and in 1950 received his first ambassadorial appointment.

Many qualities contributed to Mr. Peurifoy's rapid rise to the top and to his unique kind of diplomacy. One was his tenacity. As we have seen by his determination to get in the Department of State, once he had decided upon a goal, he never gave up until he succeeeded This was a particularly useful asset in his diplomatic negotiations. It is reported that during the Guatemalan crisis, though various plans fell through in efforts to establish a democratic government, Mr. Peurifoy repeatedly helped pick up the pieces and did not give up until a plan did succeed. According to one press account, three times Mr. Peurifoy saw his whole plan collapse. Everyone was exhausted from tension and lack of sleep, and three times Mr. Peurifoy ignoring personal danger and forgetting sleep picked up the pieces, and did not give up.

Another asset was his remarkable ability to get along with people both in the United States and abroad. Mr. Peurifoy was a Democrat—he once said, "You're born that way in South Carolina. It's almost like your religion"—but he was liked and admired by both Democrats and Republicans. Naturally his charm stood him in good stead as a diplomat. He was loved and respected by the Greek people, and in Guatemala, he was known as "smiling Jack."

In fact, it was this likableness, along with his capacity for efficient organization, that first brought him to the attention of then Under Secretary of State Acheson. During the United Nations Conference at San Francisco in 1945, Mr. Peurifoy's task was to make the conference arrangements, and to see that the various delegations were comfortable and happy. This he did with such tact, calm, and success he was appointed Special Assistant to the Under Secretary. A year later, upon Mr. Acheson's recommendation, he was made Assistant Secretary of State for Administration—the youngest man ever to hold such title. Soon after, he was appointed Deputy Under Secretary of State, charged with liaison relations with Congress and with the reorganization of the Department of State. His characteristic administrative ability and charm again paid off later in Greece where aside from helping an unsteady Greek Government stave off a Communist offensive, he succeeded in getting the various American diplomatic, economic and military missions to work in harmony together.

Mr. Peurifoy was an informal diplomat, particularly known for his own particular brand of down-to-earth, shirtsleeve diplomacy. He believed successful diplomacy required speaking "very frankly, very firmly, in words people cannot fail to understand" and not trying "to give them any gobbledygook." As an example of his frankness, he is reported to have said to the venerable Sophocles Venizelos: "Look, Soph, you call me Jack. Let's talk frankly about all this." That this concept of the frank approach was fundamental with Mr. Peurifoy, is apparent from the fact that again in Guatemala, Mr. Peurifoy said: "It is my rule to speak firmly and frankly and in simple language—and never give up." This method, though at times considered startling, at least as Mr. Peurifoy practiced it, brought results.

In fighting communism, Mr. Peurifoy believed in the use of essentially two implements—persuasion and force. However, he belived that by using the maximum of persuasion, the use of force might be held to a minimum or eliminated altogether. However, he was in favor of using force if necessary, considering it the lesser of the two evils in the choice between force and communism. He believed that the United States could do this while still retaining its integrity provided it admitted frankly to itself what was being done, and that the ultimate end—the welfare of individual human beings all over the world—that the United States was serving, was constantly borne in mind.

With regard to Guatemala, it is impossible to assess exactly to what degree the downfall of the first Communist-infiltrated government to become entrenched in the Western Hemisphere, was attributable to the efforts of Mr. Peurifoy. But, it is clear that his role was an important one. The United States Military Attaché at the Embassy in Guatemala said:

It was the force of one man's personality that got the job done—and that man's name is Jack Peurifoy.

Moreover, though some lives were lost in the battle for Guatemala, Mr. Peurifoy's use of the maximum of persuasion, behind which stood the impressive influence of the United States, undoubtedly contributed to the fact that no war such as that which occurred in Korea and Indochina, developed in Guatemala.

Following Mr. Peurifoy's assignment in Guatemala, and in keeping with the nature of his former diplomatic posts, he was appointed as Ambassador to Thailand. In this connection, the Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East stated that the Orient was "one of the toughest areas" for American diplomats to cope with.

Mr. Peurifoy did not fight the last battle against communism. But may his example of drive, courage, and levelheadedness in the active fight against this great danger, serve as an inspiration to all Americans in the tremendous task of rolling back the Communist menace.

President Eisenhower Endorses Civil Air Patrol and Congratulates Members of Civil Air Patrol Upon 14th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert the following endorsement of the Civil Air Patrol by Pres-

ident Eisenhower and his congratulations to the members of the Civil Air Patrol upon their 14th anniversary:

DENVER, COLO., *October 19, 1955.*

Through 14 years the volunteers of the Civil Air Patrol, by their almost daily performance of aerial search and rescue, mercy missions, and disaster relief, have added immeasurably to the safety and well-being of their fellow citizens.

Beyond that, more than 50,000 teen-age members of CAP engaged annually in its program of aviation education help answer the continuing need for alert young men and women in our Air Force and in our aviation industry.

The volunteers of the patrol by their patriotic service, their readiness for every call, their devotion to duty have earned the gratitude of the Republic.

I heartily endorse the Civil Air Patrol and urge all of our citizens to support this worthy organization. I join with my fellow Americans in congratulating the members of CAP upon their 14th anniversary.

DWIGHT. D. EISENHOWER.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, CIVIL AIR PATROL, AUXILIARY OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, D. C.

PROPOSED JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING DECEMBER 1, 1956, AS CIVIL AIR PATROL DAY

Resolved, etc., That:

Whereas the Civil Air Patrol was created on December 1, 1941, "to the end that opportunity for voluntary service by especially qualified citizens may be provided in line with the traditions of this Nation"; and

Whereas the 79th Congress did by Public Law 476 charter the Civil Air Patrol "to provide an organization to encourage and aid American citizens in the contribution of their efforts, services, and resources in the development of aviation and in the maintenance of air supremacy, and to encourage and develop by example the voluntary contributions of private citizens to the public welfare" and "to provide aviation education and training especially to its senior and cadet members; to encourage and foster civil aviation in local communities and to provide an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies"; and

Whereas the 80th Congress did by Public Law 557 make the Civil Air Patrol "the civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force"; and

Whereas the Civil Air Patrol has since its inception worked devotedly in the cause of aviation and in behalf of the people of this Nation; and

Whereas the civilian volunteers of this organization have given unstintingly of their personal resources and even of their lives in the relief of suffering and in the safeguarding of the lives and property of their fellow Americans through the performance of aerial search and rescue, mercy missions and disaster relief; and

Whereas the more than 50,000 teen-age members of CAP engaged annually in its program of aviation education help answer the continuing need for alert young men and women in our Air Force and in our aviation industry; and

Whereas these same civilian volunteers by their patriotic service, their readiness for every call, and their devotion to duty have earned the gratitude of the Republic.

December 1, 1956, is hereby proclaimed Civil Air Patrol Day and that the governments of the States and communities and all the people of the United States be urged to join in this observance.

The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all the people of the United States to join in the observance of Civil Air Patrol Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Equity and Eminent Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to call attention of the Congress to a critical problem in my district.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, an appropriation of $7,500,000 was made for the continued construction of Tuttle Creek Dam in spite of my positive opposition to it on the floor of the House on June 16, 1955. If this reservoir is completed, it will inundate 5 towns representing approximately 100 business firms, some of which have been in operation for almost 100 years.

Under present policy of the Federal agencies, established largely by court decisions, no compensation is allowable for loss of the business value of these profitably operating business establishments. These business values and losses are uually described as "consequential damages." Under existing policy, only appraised real value, plus an additional allowance of up to 25 percent for moving costs, is allowable.

I am sure that the fair judgment of this Congress cannot condone such an inequitable policy. The Presidential Advisory Committee states in its report on water-resources policy, published December 22, 1955, what can be assumed to be the recommendation of the President. Contained in that report, on page 25, is the following information:

In connection with many major projects there are equally important tangible and intangible detriments or damages associated with project development, such as the disruption of established communities, the inundation of valuable land and mineral resources, the disruption of local taxing units by the removal of land to a tax-exempt status, the destruction of scenic values, and adverse effects upon fish and wildlife resources.

The committee recognizes fully that such intangible benefits and detriments do exist, and that they must be taken into account in determining the wisdom of proceeding with many proposed projects.

In view of this stated policy and the fact that residents of my district did not want the Tuttle Creek Dam constructed in the first place, I am preparing a bill for introduction which will permit and direct the Corps of Engineers to compensate the businessmen and other special interests in the reservoir area a just and fair return for the losses they are sustaining by virtue of the exercise of the right of eminent domain by the Federal Government.

I firmly believe these damages should be commensurate with the sale of the business if the seller was a willing seller to a private purchaser.

To give the Members of Congress a first-hand account of this problem, I am including an editorial from the Blue Valley News, the edition of February 23, 1956. It is published at Randolph, Kansas, one of the five communities which will be lost to Tuttle Creek Reservoir.

The editor of this paper, Ross Campbell, is a young war veteran and has been in business about 5 years. He has been assisted by his wife, Muriel, in publishing this weekly paper and by hard work has earned a modest living for his family. I want to point out further that part of this editorial is a reprint from a neighboring newspaper, the Rossville Reporter, published by Mr. and Mrs. Bill Murray. Mr. Murray is not affected by the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam.

The editorial follows:

JUST A PASSING THOUGHT

From the Rossville Reporter down in Shawnee County we found this unsolicited editorial comment, which we pass on to the readers. Rossville was run down at the heels, but in the last year or two has made advances in modernization of the town. Business buildings have taken on a new look with modern fronts; weed patches and trash piles have been removed; the little backhouses have disappeared; and the ball park has been repaired. Mr. and Mrs. Bill Murray, editors, have been the "man behind the gun" on this clean-up, fix-up campaign. The editorial:

"Randolph, Kans., suffered a big loss last week by the $200,000 fire of the Sheldon Implement Co. there. My thoughts were that the city business district may as well be removed by fire instead of waiting for its slow death and final removal by the construction of the Tuttle Creek Dam. At least that way, if they are well covered by insurance, the businessman can get a fair price out of it. The way it's set up now, the Government will remove the town and pay only appraised value of the business, not allowing a cent for the built up business over a period of years. It seems as if the farmer will get a fair price for the land, but the merchant is the one suffering the loss. I happen to be acquainted with the editor there. Pardon the expression, but Editor Campbell has junk equipment like the rest of us small publishers. In selling this equipment it's worth about the junk price. But, Editor Campbell has that equipment in use, it's making a living for him and his family. If the Government would let him, he could continue to grow as the past few years of his history as publisher have proved. Not only is he sitting there fighting now, but I would imagine he's suffering a slow death. I would estimate he's losing subscribers, he's taking a loss on advertising because the merchants are planning to be moved and aren't in the mood to advertise for business. In my estimation, the Government had better take a look at the small-business man as well as the farmer."

Eightieth Birthday of Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today marks a most significant date in the world. It is the 80th birthday of his holiness, Pope Pius XII. It is a day for men of all faiths to unite in paying homage to the leading spokesman of our times in the cause of peace.

This man will surely live for the ages. He once described his beloved Rome as

a place whose "Christian greatness, beacon of truth, of love, and of peace, shines through the centuries." Mr. Speaker, his holiness might well have been speaking of himself. For he is truly bringing to this troubled world of ours the truth, love, grace, and kindness for which we all yearn.

Pope Pius XII belongs uniquely to the 350 million Catholics who call him holy father, but in a very real sense he belongs also to the people of the entire world. Rich and poor, famous and obscure, men of diverse faiths—all have found comfort and guidance in his words and example. More than any other single man, he has provided the intellectual and spiritual direction so sorely needed in this confused and strife-ridden world.

It was 17 years ago today that he was elevated to the papacy. Not long after that, of course, the world was plunged into the holocaust that was World War II. Throughout the war he sought for peace, searching every possible means to achieve a reconciliation among the warring powers. He denounced upon innumerable occasions the indiscriminate war against civilians, the persecution of the church, and the brutalities of concentration camps.

Two stories that emerged from wartime Rome typify to me this holy man. When the German Army surged into the Eternal City, the German Ambassador went to call on the pope. He assured his holiness that the German Army was there in the shadow of the Vatican only to protect the pope. To which the pope replied:

> My crucifix will be more protection to me than all the tanks in your army. We would be better pleased if you would take them all away.

And one winter, while his flock in Rome endured without coal, the holy father ordered the heat turned off in the Vatican, so that he, too, could suffer with his people.

With the advent of peace, Pope Pius XII assumed his natural role of spokesman for peace. To achieve that long-sought goal, he exhorted the world to work together quickly and lastingly to bind up the wounds of mankind and to prevent another conflict. In his justly famous "fatherly admonitions" he has insisted that the new world must be built on foundations of moral justice and well-being of the world's peoples.

Long before the war began he repeatedly warned that the world was basically sick, primarily because it had begun to travel far from the spirit of the Bible. He pointed out that this century has been a highly materialistic one, with much of society inclined to scoff at matters of the spirit and to measure life in terms of hard cash or what pleases the senses. These materialists talked as if it is all a myth about man being made in the image and likeness of God, and as if the sole function of life were to gratify one's self as much as possible until the inevitable end arrived.

From such a materialistic attitude it was but a step to fascism and communism. It is not for nothing, then, that the pope pleads for the Christian spirit as the indispensable ingredient in the success of the peace we now enjoy.

The pope has proven himself a man of realistic views in the struggle to attain peace. He has, on many occasions, declared himself unequivocally on the side of international organizations, "avoiding omissions and deficiencies of the past," to preserve the peace "in accordance with the principles of justice and equity."

Once, as Eugene Pacelli, he traveled the world. But now his labors in the Eternal City keep him too busy to permit him to travel. As a result, the world's teeming multitudes have journeyed by foot, by car, by train, and by plane, to visit their shepherd, the servant of the servants of God. I, for one, shall never forget my experiences when, on three occasions, I have visited Rome and been granted the privilege of an audience with his holiness. One comes away from such a meeting with an unequaled feeling of peace, of calmness, and of serene optimism for the peace of the world.

On many occasions the pope has spoken words of special significance to us as legislators. We would all do well today to recall to mind words he uttered in his Christmas message of 1944, when he said:

> To secure effective action, to win trust and esteem, every legislative body, as experience shows beyond doubt, should be composed of men of outstanding spirituality and of strong character. These men should regard themselves as the representatives of the entire people and not as the mandatories of a group, whose interests, unfortunately, often are preferred to what is really required for the general welfare. This legislative body should not be made up of any one professional or social class but should reflect every phase of the people's life. * * * True to themselves in all circumstances, they would hold to clear and sound principles, to definite and sound policies. Above all they should manifest that authority which will make them capable of leadership and guidance, particularly in time of crises which greatly disturb the citizens, and make it likely that they may be led astray and lose their way. * * * In such crucial days, legislators should feel doubly obliged to infuse into them the antidote of clear views, kindly interest, impartial and sympathetic justice, devotion to national unity and concord in a sincere spirit of brotherhood.

Mr. Speaker, as we honor today Pope Pius XII on his 80th birthday, let us take his words of wisdom to heart. We can follow his exhortation to shake off our lethargy and take decisive steps to ward off the disaster which is threatening the human race. He has said that—

> Each one of the faithful and every man of good will must reexamine, with a courage worthy of the great moments of human history, what he can and must do personally as his own contribution to the saving power of God, in order to help a world which is started, as it is today, on the road to ruin.

Abstract and metaphysical as such talk may sound, what kind of a civilization can we have if we ignore it? The fact is that everything decent in man's history up to now has been actuated by that thought. These principles are not things to be confined to Sunday church attendance. They constitute a practical, working philosophy for our everyday life. Without them it will avail us little to make elaborate plans for the peace of the world.

So let us pray, on this day, not only for his holiness, but for what he has described as "the complete restoration of the spirit of the Gospel." Our prayers will enrich his birthday spiritually, act as a birthday gift to him, and serve as an expression of gratitude to a pope whose fatherly concern for his flock and for all mankind has never been exceeded in the long and honorable history of the papacy.

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I add my tribute to the many commendations that the Boy Scouts of America received during Boy Scout Week, February 6–12.

For 46 years the high ideals, practical training and fellowship of this great organization have enriched the lives of American youth. On February 8, 1910, scouting in America began, having been incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia.

On June 21, 1910, a group of 34 men, national representatives of boys' work agencies met, started organization plans and opened a temporary national office in New York.

In 1916, 6 years after Scouting entered the United States—Congress granted a Federal charter to the Boy Scouts of America which gives special protection to the name, insignia, and limits membership to American citizens.

On this 46th anniversary some 4,100,000 boys from every State in our Nation celebrate their past achievements and look forward with eagerness to the year ahead.

Scouting is a program in which boys can learn how to do things for themselves and for other people. It is a program that develops physical fitness, skill, self-reliance, courage, and embodies high ideals of service to God and country.

A new 4-year program, Onward for God and My Country, is being launched this week by Boy Scouts and their leaders.

The Scout organization, recognizing the needs of America, will emphasize those experiences that will help today's youth to be prepared as future citizens with character.

This great volunteer organization is cognizant of the fact that such citizens must be prepared in body, in skill, in spirit, in will as members of a team.

A boy learns to understand the democratic processes of government and their values through living and practicing them.

Some phase of Scouting is open to every American boy who is 8 years of age or over, no matter where he lives or what may be his race, creed, or color.

Scouting is sponsored by churches of all faiths, by service clubs, veterans' posts, schools, and other civic institutions. Scouting can be found in prac-

tically every American village, town, and city neighborhood.

Scouting has always aimed at making the American boy physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight. The new 4-year program, Onward for God and My Country, is well adapted to the needs of this generation.

I am certain the Members of the Congress of the United States recognize Scouting as one of America's greatest assets. I trust that the adults of our land will do all in their power to promote and extend the Scout program.

It has been said that if the Scout oath is followed America will be better able to meet its full responsibility in cooperation with other nations in maintaining peace on earth.

The Scouting formula is as effective in 1956 as it was in 1900—good men of our communities sharing their life experiences and attitudes with eager boys in a program that both enjoy. Through association with wise leaders and wholesome associates, the boy finds deep satisfaction in helping and sharing.

The new 4-year program of Scouting will be a powerful tool in leading our youth into mature citizenship.

The Nation should be grateful that the Boy Scouts of America is a ready and eager partner in every community effort.

The United States enjoys a high position in world affairs today. We will hold that position just as long as our young men—the Boy Scouts of today—continue to grow into leaders and as long as we have the volunteers in Scouting to make this possible.

I offer the warmest congratulations, not only to the Boy Scouts of the 11th Congressional District of Pennsylvania but to Boy Scouts throughout our Nation. May your high principles carry you "Onward for God and My Country."

Facts About Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee which appropriated $880,660,050 to the Department of Agriculture for general farm activities for the past year, and an increase of $2 billion to the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue to buy and store farm products, I think the facts we learned and the study we have given the farm problem qualifies me, to some extent, to discuss it.

Let us start on the premise that agriculture is far too important to the welfare of the farmers and the economy of our Nation to be used as a political football in the hope of securing the farmers' vote.

You cannot solve the farm problems by waving a political wand. To solve them we must throw politics out the window, get the facts, and treat the cause of the problem.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS AND THE CAUSE?

Most farmers know the cause is overproduction; that the mountain of surplus farm products held by the Government overhanging the market is depressing farm prices and driving them down.

NINETY-PERCENT PRICE SUPPORTS

During World War II, when European nations were fighting and could not produce farm commodities, we joined as their allies and asked the farmers of this country to produce all food possible, offering them the wartime emergency incentive that the Government would buy or store all the surplus wheat, corn, and certain other products, guaranteeing them 90 percent of parity. This was strictly emergency legislation for the duration of the war. The farmers brought into production millions of acres of new land—much of it in the West—and increased production tremendously.

Mr. Speaker, the trouble arose when peace came. Instead of lowering the emergency incentive to produce, the Truman administration continued the incentive which compelled the Government to continue to buy and continue to loan on storage through the Commodity Credit Corporation until the Government now owns about $8,500,000,000 of surplus farm products. Most of the surpluses that are depressing the farmers' market today have been piled up higher each year since the close of World War II in 1945.

YEAR'S SUPPLY OF WHEAT STORED

As we approached the wheat harvest last year, the Government owned 1 billion bushels of wheat—more than enough to supply the people a year; then, we had to buy and store much of the 860-million-bushel wheat crop of last year. These surpluses have increased until it now costs the Government over $1 million a day alone for storage, or $365 million a year.

In 1954 we passed the flexible price-support law, giving Secretary Benson the right to support prices between 82½ and 90 percent on basic commodities which was not to take effect until we began to harvest the wheat crop in 1955. Notwithstanding that the flexible support law did not begin to take effect on basic commodities until the harvest of last year, there has been a constant barrage of criticism and statements that the flexible support price program has failed. The facts are the program has not had time to affect farm prices.

Those seeking to gain political advantage now charge flexible price supports with bringing about lower prices, when, in fact, they know that the over $8 billion surplus in farm commodities, piled up under high 90 percent rigid support prices, is the real cause that is depressing farm prices.

I yield to no one in my desire to help solve the farmers' problem, so that these men and women who toil long hours may at the earliest possible date fully share in the general prosperity of this country.

I speak as one Member of Congress who throughout the war supported the 90-percent-parity price for farmers. If I felt a continuation of such supports was in the best interest of the farmers, I would not hesitate to support them today. However, I have become convinced that if we continue the wartime incentive to produce billions of dollars worth of farm products that we do not now need, and build up this mountain of surpluses higher and higher; that such a course will continue to price the farmers products out of the world market, and will destroy the use of the Commodity Credit Corporation, making it unable to buy and store his products and will bring chaos to the farmers of the Nation.

FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORTS NOT NEW

Mr. Speaker, flexible farm price supports are not new. We had them before World War II. Keep this in mind. Wheat in 1940 was supported at 57 percent. In 1948 the platforms of both parties endorsed flexible price supports. President Truman then recommended flexible price supports to the 80th Congress, and this is what he said:

> Now we must look ahead to a farm price support policy geared to our improved economy. Many shifts in production will have to be made and flexible price supports will help us make them in an orderly manner.

We passed in that Congress flexible support prices for basic commodities ranging from 75 to 90 percent, and it was supported almost unanimously by Republicans and Democrats alike. However, when the Korean war broke out shortly thereafter it was decided not to make the law effective, and the 90-percent support price continued until we passed the flexible support price law in 1954.

It is fair to assume had the Korean war been averted that flexible support prices would have been continued, this mountain of surpluses would have been averted, agricultural production would have been more in line with home consumption and exports, and the farmers would have been generally prosperous, and we would not be bothered with this vexing problem today.

May I point out that every Secretary of Agriculture for 20 years, all Democrats, recommended flexible price supports. They included Henry Wallace, Clinton Anderson—who still favors such flexible supports—Claude Wickard, and Charles Brannan. Is it not strange in the face of this record such a great hue and cry has gone up against flexible price supports as if it was a complete stranger to them by men like Truman, Brannan, Kefauver, Stevenson, and Harriman? One does not have to stretch his imagination too far to conclude they are more interested in trying to take a political advantage of the farmer's present distress than they are in really helping to solve his problem.

Clinton Anderson, one of the greatest Secretaries of Agriculture this Nation has ever had, and a Democrat, with Senator AIKEN and other Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, and the House of Representatives, who are supporting the Eisenhower farm program are really trying to help solve the farmers' problem.

We realize that it will take time, because of the seriousness of the problem, but we are determined to remove the cause that is depressing the farmers and help him to really solve his problem. Our interest in the farmer will continue after this year's election and until the job is done.

WHAT WE HAVE DONE

The question has been asked, What has this administration done in the past 3 years to help the farmer? Time will permit me to point out only a few of the many things we have done.

We have disposed of $3,800,000,000 of farm surpluses held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has been depressing the farmers market.

COMMERCIAL EXPORTS

In addition to the above, through commercial exports we have disposed of $5 billion worth of farm surpluses. We are increasing our export markets year by year. That is helping to remove the cause.

Our exports for all farm products exclusive of cotton from July 1955 to January 1956 were 23 percent ahead of the past fiscal year. Our exports of grains and feeds from July to January 1 of this year were 30 percent higher than the year before.

Wheat exports continue at a higher level than normal. Coarse grains are moving out in larger volume, total exports this year are expected to amount to 8 million short tons—almost half of the world's exports. Corn is in the lead, followed by barley, grains, sorghums, and oats.

Livestock exports from July this year to January are estimated to increase 17 percent above last year; so you see, regaining export markets and increasing our exports is really doing something of real benefit to the farmer.

PUBLIC LAW 480

We passed Public Law 480 which authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell to foreign countries over a 3-year period $700 million of farm surpluses, and to accept foreign currencies as payment.

Under this law, contracts for sale were concluded for $468,800,000 of farm products to 17 foreign countries. Under this law, we bartered, or traded for strategic materials from January 1954 to May 1955 $148 million of wheat, corn, and other grain. Exports will continue to expand under this law.

BENSON DAIRY PROGRAM

The Benson dairy program, in cooperation with the milk producers of the country increased the consumption of milk by 600 million more quarts than in the previous year. We disposed of 300 million pounds of surplus butter, 170 million pounds of cheese, and 313 million pounds of dry milk.

During the past year the Benson milk program resulted in children drinking over 400 million additional half pints of milk in the schools, and we consumed 80 million more pounds of butter than in the prior year.

The consumption of milk has increased more than 20 pounds per person in the past 2 years; it is still increasing. Total consumption of milk has increased more than 10 billion pounds in the past 2 years.

In 1955, for the first time in years, America consumed more butter than it produced. The dairy farmers of America have done a splendid job in helping themselves in cooperation with the dairy associations of the Nation, and they did it under flexible price supports, which went into effect in 1954.

We will continue to help the dairy farmers until they are receiving their full share of the general prosperity of the country.

We greatly increased appropriations to carry on farm research and extension work; to find greater uses for farm products; to find ways and means for the farmer to cut his cost of production, and better markets. We improved his opportunity for more effective soil conservation.

By cutting out waste and extravagance in Government, we gave the farmer a Federal tax reduction of about 11 percent. In that tax bill we provided, for the first time, that all money spent on soil conservation could be deducted for tax purposes, and that he could step-up, for tax purposes, his depletion on all buildings and farm implements in half the time previously allowed, and in this session of Congress, President Eisenhower and the Congress are removing the 2-percent gasoline and fuel-oil tax used in agriculture production, which will, this year, save all farmers of America about $60 million, and each continuing year.

And, Mr. Speaker, of greater importance to the farmers and all of the citizens, we stopped the Korean war that was costing the taxpayers billions of dollars annually, and that had cost 147,000 casualties of American boys. Not a soldier has been killed, or wounded, in battle in the past 2½ years, and fewer farm boys have been called annually to meet the draft requirements.

And this is important—we have reverted to a peacetime economy, and avoided a depression with the result that with the exception of the farmer, we have the greatest prosperity in the history of our country.

This point I want to make:

Over 90 percent of our farm products are consumed here in the United States, with less than 10 percent going into export. This administration has handled its affairs so well in reverting from a wartime to a peacetime economy that the farmer has the greatest domestic consumer market ever in our history.

The people today are buying more bread, more meat, more dairy products and farm products generally than ever before in our history.

NINETY-PERCENT PARITY HURTS ILLINOIS FARMERS

Now, I want to show you how high support prices are, and have been penalizing the farmers of Illinois, and of the Corn Belt States, and why the cotton farmers of the South and the big wheat farmers of the West are now making the fight to continue high parity price supports.

With these high price supports in effect, we find that the thousands of diverted acres, in the South and Southwest, and West, are being planted in corn, sorghum, and other crops grown in competition with the farmers in the Corn Belt, that are hurting their grain and livestock market.

I know of one farmer from Illinois who went to Mississippi, and last year produced over 20,000 acres of corn, with a high yield. He and others compete with our market and our farmers, who have to pay taxes to the Government, to buy and store his corn.

WHEAT FARMERS IN ILLINOIS

Let me offer further proof by taking wheat as an illustration. The records in the Department of Agriculture show that 26 commercial farm organizations in the West, in 1952 and 1953, planted and harvested between 5,000 and 20,000 acres of wheat; that in 5 States alone in the Far West there were 21 individual farmers who planted 5,000 acres of wheat, or over; that in 11 States in the West there were 748 farmers who planted between 1,500 and 2,000 acres of wheat—and this does not take into account the countless thousands of farmers who planted from 400 to 1,500 acres in wheat. These are the high price support farmers who along with the big cotton farmers are selling to the Government their vast surpluses and are all now crying out for the continuation of the high 90 percent support price.

Now, compare the amount of acres the wheat farmers in Illinois are allowed to plant. I quote authentic figures taken from the Department of Agriculture records:

During 1953 there were 19,600 farmers in Illinois who were allowed to plant, and who did plant, from 26 to 50 acres in wheat; and 11,880 farmers in Illinois who were allowed to plant from 16 to 20 acres of wheat, and, of course, many others were allowed to plant from only 10 to 15 acres of wheat—yet, all of the wheat farmers in Illinois and adjoining States are taxed to help the Government buy and store the millions of bushels of wheat that depress Illinois wheat farmers' prices for the small amount they can produce.

The above figures, undoubtedly, prove that the 90 percent high support price is penalizing the wheat farmers of Illinois for the benefit of the large wheat producers of the West and the Southwest. Every farmer in Illinois ought to give serious thought to these authentic figures.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken from the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1955, and include herewith, a few names from among the thousands of big farmers that have been receiving large amounts from the Federal Government, either in loans or cash. There are four solid pages of fine print, giving the

names, the amount of the loans, and the millions of dollars either loaned or paid to these big farmers. I am officially informed that the great bulk of these loans, covering four pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1955, were forfeited, leaving the Government with millions of bushels of wheat and bales of cotton:

ARIZONA—COTTON

J. G. Boswell, Litchfield Park, Ariz	$365,646.44
Bing K. Wong Farms, Inc., Marana, Ariz	251,571.42
L. D. Ulmer, Marana, Ariz	144,623.01
Jones Ranch, Eloy, Ariz	141,080.87
Santa Cruz Ranch, Marana, Ariz	114,949.63

ARKANSAS—COTTON

J. G. Adams & Son, Hughes Ark	624,754.20
Miller Lumber Co., Marianna, Ark	358,305.75
Tillar & Co., Tillar, Ark	271,602.03
Lindsey Mercantile Co., Caldwell, Ark	142,810.66
W. M. Smith & Sons, Birdeye, Ark	113,307.58

CALIFORNIA—COTTON

Charles Schwartz Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif	385,488.77
Giffen, Inc., Box 218, Huron, Calif	317,253.08
Maricopa Farms, 325 3d Ave., Arvin, Calif	266,893.84
Buller & Neufeld, Bakersfield, Calif	248,320.03
Mirosol Co. (Buerkle Bros.), Buttonwillow, Calif	233,798.47

IDAHO—WHEAT

E. C. Hay & Sons, Tekoa, Wash	243,642.00
Wagner & Sons, Craigmont, Idaho	183,591.00
Roy Green & Sons, Grangeville, Idaho	121,536.00
Ira McIntosh & Sons, Lewiston, Idaho	109,811.00
Merritt Meacham & Sons, Culdesac, Idaho	98,973.00

NEBRASKA—WHEAT

Ramey C. Whitney, Chappell, Nebr	100,130.94
Cleo Harmon, Adams County, Nebr	96,521.91
Morrison & Quick, Hastings, Nebr	89,812.72
Hill Construction Co., Mankato, Kans	60,456.48
Grace Land & Cattle Co., Lewellen, Nebr	50,907.00

SOUTH DAKOTA—WHEAT

J. E. Cheek, Pierre, S. Dak	110,941.14
W. J. Asmussen, Agar, S. Dak	61,512.31
Orville Schwarting, Batesland, S. Dak	28,874.10
Harold Kuckartz, Denver, Colo	33,845.76
William Letellier, Belvedere, S. Dak	32,639.22

KANSAS—WHEAT

Garvey Farms, Colby, Kans	146,820.24
Iron H. Mueller, Bird City, Kans	65,015.80
H. A. Hills, Colby, Kans	55,292.46
C. Wilbur White, Goodland, Kans	48,872.74
W. D. Ferguson, Colby, Kans	41,531.52

MONTANA—WHEAT

Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin, Mont	430,691.00
H. B. and Allen Kolstad, Chester, Mont	224,003.00
Bill Frazer and H. B. Kolstad, Chester, Mont	115,649.00

MONTANA—WHEAT—Continued

McNutt Bros. (operate farm in Liberty County, Mont.), Eugene, Oreg	$100,714.00
Floyd Warren, Inc., Hardin, Mont	73,522.00

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the big wheat farmers, and the big cotton farmers, want to continue the high support price for their products they sell to the Government at the expense of all the small farmers of the Nation?

The Congress has had to appropriate to the Commodity Credit Corporation up to August 11, 1955, $12 billion to carry on these programs. I am one who insists that the Congress put a drastic limit on the amount of loans permitted to any one producer of farm products. It was the intent of the law to protect the average and small farmer. I hope Congress will take such action.

THE HOG MARKET

Let me show you, very simply, that overproduction of hogs, just as overproduction of wheat, drove down and demoralized the hog market. Here again are authentic figures:

In 1950, under the Truman administration, the yearly average price for all hogs was $18 per hundredweight; in 1951, due to the Korean war, the price went up a little, and the yearly average was $20 per hundredweight; in 1952, under the last year of the Truman administration, the yearly average price was down to $17.80 per hundredweight. Now, let us see how much better the farmers did with their hogs under the Eisenhower administration:

The yearly average price for 1953 was $21.40 per hundredweight—quite a bit higher; in 1954, the yearly average price was $21.60 per hundredweight. In fact the farmers did so well on hogs under the Eisenhower administration that too many farmers began to raise more pigs and more hogs. The farmers increased their last three pig crops, under the Eisenhower administration, over 12 percent above normal—which brought about such a surplus that in the third week of October 1955, 34 percent more hogs were shipped to the market that week than in the same week of the prior year.

Hogs have kept coming on the market at a higher rate than a year ago, and, while prices have recovered some, they will not recover sufficiently until less hogs are raised, and the consumption of pork more nearly meets production.

THE SOIL-BANK PLAN

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my closing remarks to the proposed soil-bank plan. I believe no organization in the United States from practical experience in farming has greater knowledge as to what legislation is needed to bring the greatest benefit to the farmers than does 1,600,000 members of the Farm Bureau.

No organization over the years has made such a continuous study of farm production and the farmers' problem as have the officials of the Farm Bureau, from the township and county level up to the State and national level. I am generally in favor of the program of the Farm Bureau Federation, now so ably led by its President, Charles B. Shuman, which would bring the bill now before the Senate in line with the Eisenhower farm program.

Obviously, if we are to take many millions of acres out of production by the soil-bank provision, the emergency 90-percent high-support provision, written into this Senate bill—increasing production—should be replaced with the flexible price-support program, because it is inconsistent, and would defeat what the soil-bank provision seeks to accomplish.

As an illustration: Going back to the 90 percent rigid supports which would pile up the surpluses higher and higher, is like eating more green apples to cure a stomachache caused in the first place by eating green apples.

In the soil-bank proposal, we must take out of production a sufficient number of acres to substantially cut back production of basic crops and make certain such acres cannot be used for crop production—not even for grazing. The question of compulsory compliance should be given earnest consideration. The legislation must be definitely spelled out with enough teeth in it to assure strict compliance, if we are to gain the objectives sought.

DIVERTED ACRES

Diverted acres must be properly controlled. I point this out because over 16 million acres of land diverted from wheat and cotton have been planted to feed grains competitive with corn in the last 2 years. These millions of acres have produced approximately 800 million bushels of feed grain. This production on diverted acres has resulted in controls of corn, even though corn did not increase its own planting. Corn farmers in Illinois and adjoining States have been the direct victims of these unsound Government policies that have cost the farmers millions of dollars each year.

Illinois wheat farmers, with their small acreage allotments, and Illinois corn and livestock producers have both suffered over the past few years because of the high wheat and cotton price supports.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, as all farmers do, that the farmer should have full 100 percent parity in the market place. You cannot guarantee the farmer, or anyone in any business, 100 percent of parity, as everyone must admit it would be impossible to bring such a condition about if it were attempted by law.

The farmer generally can receive 100 percent parity for his work and production if his production is kept in line with consumption demand. We want to help the farmer, by legislation, out of his present trouble until these excessive surpluses can be disposed of and until foreign export markets can again be built up and until the increase in population will make a ready demand for the farmers' products. The farmer will then be in a position to receive for his work and commodities 100 percent of parity without going to the Government for a 90-percent support-price loan.

This is the objective of the Eisenhower farm program.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1956

(Legislative day of Friday, March 2, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Shepherd of our souls, who dost neither slumber nor sleep, we come yearning that Thy completeness may flow 'round our incompleteness, and around our restlessness Thy rest. Though our faces are shadowed by the tragedies that darken the earth, we lift them in faith to the light that no darkness can put out. As we spend our years like a tale that is told, may it be to the last page a record of service well done, of duty faced without flinching, of honor unsullied, and of far horizons of progress and achievement that ever beckon, as we fare forth toward journey's end; and then when comes the twilight and the evening star, and our working day is done, grant us a safe lodging and a holy rest, and peace at the last; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 2, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9429. An act to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9429. An act to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, with the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1955, no contracts were negotiated by that Committee under the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Director, Mutual Defense Assistance Control, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth and seventh reports of that Administration, entitled "Soviet Bloc Economic Activities in the Free World," for the second half of 1954, and "Soviet Deterrents to Increased Foreign Trade," for the first half of 1955 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Vice Chairman, the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, New York, N. Y., reporting, pursuant to law, on the operations of that Commission, for the celebration in 1958 of the 100th anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF TERMINUS DAM, TULARE COUNTY, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, Department of the Army, relating to construction of the Terminus Dam, Tulare County, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the Young Republicans of California, at Palo Alto, Calif., relating to the administration's efforts to preserve peace, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, relating to the issuance of obligation bonds for the construction of certain public works; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by Olympia Council 394, Knights of Columbus, Flushing, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hold here in my hand a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 125, recently passed by the legislature of the State of Mississippi. The resolution deals with the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on the question of segregation in the public schools.

Mr. President, this resolution speaks for itself. It is a resolution of firm resolve. It is the resolve of a deeply hurt people who are hit harder than any other group of the Nation by the usurped power exercised by the Supreme Court in the school segregation cases.

This resolution represents the firm resolve of the group of people in Mississippi who now carry the main burden of public education for our white and colored people. The future of public education in Mississippi rests largely on this group and the people for whom they speak.

This is the firm resolve of the people of my State asking the Congress to submit a constitutional amendment in the

affirmative, clearly stating that the power over public education has never been surrendered by the States, and that the States still have their rights and powers to control their public schools and other State institutions of learning.

The resolution firmly declares the State will take all appropriate and constitutional measures to void the illegal encroachments on its powers, and calls on other States to join in reversing this trend of judicial legislation that usurps powers reserved to the States.

Mr. President, the people of Mississippi speak from their deep inner feelings and principles. They are not bluffing. They see a possible repetition of much that has happened there almost 90 years ago. But they are not afraid. They calmly face the days and the problems ahead.

The following words of Governor Coleman on his inauguration, January 17, 1956, addressed to those of the Nation outside Mississippi, represent the thinking of the citizens of our great State:

With the indulgence of those present, I should like now to address a word to the remainder of the Nation. I want to tell you that during the next 4 years the full weight of the government will unfailingly be used to the end that Mississippi will be a State of law and not of violence. I want to remind you that for over 90 years the white and the Negro people of Mississippi have lived side by side in peace and harmony. I would like you, our friends outside Mississippi, to know that the great overwhelming majority of the white people of Mississippi are not now guilty and never intend to be guilty of any murder, violence, or any other wrongdoing toward anyone. History shows that the first white man ever to be legally hanged in Mississippi was executed for the murder of a Negro slave. I repeat that while we, the people of Mississippi, are unalterably determined as a matter of right and justice that the necessary rules of society shall be maintained, we do not any more approve of violence and lawlessness than you do.

We ask you to remember that by reason of the numbers involved, this problem is more acute here than in any other State in the Union. It is not something which can be viewed with complacency or ignored, and if you lived in Mississippi and knew the full situation, you would look upon it as we do.

Mr. President, I commend the Mississippi Legislature for its timely efforts to protect and preserve the powers and rights of the State against usurpation by the Federal Judiciary, and for its sane and sensible appeal to other States for like action. I support them in their move.

I urge that the Congress heed the appeal of the State of Mississippi and other States to stop the encroachments of the Federal Judiciary upon the powers of the States, including the proposal of submitting an amendment to the States for ratification.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be included in the body of the RECORD at the end of my remarks, and that the resolution itself be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 125

Concurrent resolution condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States and declaring that its decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, and all similar decisions are in violation of the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and are therefore unconstitutional and of no lawful effect within the territorial limits of the State of Mississippi; declaring that a contest of powers has arisen between the State of Mississippi and said Supreme Court and invoking the historic doctrine of interposition to protect the sovereignty of this and the other States of the Union; and calling on our sister States and the Congress for redress of grievances as provided by law; and for other purposes

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Legislature of Mississippi unequivocally expresses a firm determination to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution of this State, against every attempt, whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the fundamental principles, embodied in our basic law by which this Government was established, and by which the liberty of the people and the sovereignty of the States, in their proper spheres, have been long protected and guaranteed;

That the Legislature of Mississippi explicitly and peremptorily declares and maintains that the powers of the Federal Government emanate solely from the compact, to which the States are principals, as limited by the plain sense and long recognized intention of the instrument creating that compact;

That the Legislature of Mississippi firmly asserts that the powers of the Federal Government are limited, and valid only to the extent that these powers have been conferred as enumerated in the compact to which the various States assented originally and to which the States have consented in subsequent amendments validly ratified;

That the inherent nature of this basic compact, apparent upon its face, is that the ratifying States, parties thereto, have agreed voluntarily to confer certain of their sovereign rights, but only specific sovereign rights, to a Federal Government thus constituted; and that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, have been reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

That the State of Mississippi has at no time, through the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or in any manner whatsoever delegated to the Federal Government its right to educate and nurture its youth and its power and right of control over its schools, colleges, educational and other public institutions and facilities, and to prescribe the rules, regulations and conditions under which they shall be conducted;

That the aggrandizement of powers by the Federal Government has grown far beyond that ever conceived by the authors of our Constitution, that the seizure and concentration therein of powers not granted by the compact under which the several States entered this Union, and particularly that by which Mississippi entered the Union on December 10, 1817, threaten to reduce these sovereign States to mere satellites, and to subject us to the tyranny of centralized government, so rightfully abhorred by the founders, and for the prevention of which they exercised their finest genius;

That in late years the encroachment upon the reserved rights of the States and of the people has grown apace, and the proponents of the acts of encroachment have grown so emboldened that not one of the sister States and its people have escaped the oppressive hand thereof: In the destruction of their vested property rights; abridgments of their liberties; control of their institutions, habits, manners, and morals by centralized bureaucratic instrumentalities; and in fact by various wrongful and obtrusive acts, too numerous to be here documented, but so consistently characterized by an oppressive course of action so as to seriously threaten to completely destroy our constitutional processes and substitute in lieu thereof ideologies foreign to the soil of our beloved land;

That one of the noblest characteristics of our people is the reverent respect for and obedience to the courts of law and justice, and that which more than any other has ennobled our institutions of government, and ought to be challenged only with the most dreadful reluctance, still it should be solemnly and firmly declared that the hand of tyranny ought to be stayed from whatsoever source it might strike;

That we profess an undying attachment to and a warm regard and respect for the sister States, and for this Union, which, through unwarranted and unconstitutional action of the Supreme Court, is fastly being dissolved by usurpation of powers reserved to the States and transferring them to an all-powerful centralized Government which, unless halted, will reduce the States to impotent vassals, sheared of all rights and powers except those received at the sufferance of the Federal Government;

That a question of contested power has arisen; the Supreme Court of the United States asserts, for its part, that the States did in fact prohibit unto themselves the power to maintain racially separate public institutions, and the State of Mississippi for its part asserts that it and its sister States have never delegated such rights;

That the flagrant assertion upon the part of the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by threats of coercion and compulsion against the sovereign States of this Union, constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the Court to usurp the exercise of powers not granted to it;

That the Legislature of Mississippi asserts that whenever the Federal Government attempts to engage in the deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to it, the States who are parties to the compact have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them;

That failure on the part of this State thus to assert its clear rights would be construed as acquiescence in the surrender thereof, and that such submissive acquiescence to the seizure of one right would in the end lead to the surrender of all rights, and inevitably to the consolidation of the States into one sovereignty, contrary to the sacred compact by which this Union of States was created;

That the question of contested power asserted in this resolution is not within the province of the Court to determine because the Court itself seeks to usurp the powers which have been reserved to the States, and, therefore, under these circumstances, the judgment of all of the parties to the compact must be sought to resolve the question; that the Supreme Court is not a party to this compact, but a creature of the compact, and the question of contested power cannot be settled by the creature seeking to usurp the power, but by the parties to the compact who are the people of the respective States in whom ultimate sovereignty finally reposes; be it further

Resolved, That in order that relief be obtained and the wrongs and injuries inflicted be alleviated, we invite all of our sister States to join in taking such steps as are necessary to settle the grave question of contested sovereignty herein raised; the State of Mississippi declares that the Congress has the duty and authority to protect the rights of the States from the unwarranted encroachment upon their reserved powers to govern the internal and domestic affairs of the States; the State of Mississippi further asserts that the Congress has, on many occasions in the past, curbed the attempted encroachment by the judiciary upon the legislative and executive branches of government, and it is the responsibility of the Congress likewise to protect the States when their constitutional rights and privileges are endangered.

The State of Mississippi declares emphatically that the sovereign States of the Nation have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions; therefore, when an attempt is made to usurp these powers, the people of Mississippi object and refuse to be so deprived, reminding the Congress that the preservation of this Union of States, as the compact intended it should be, depends upon the preservation of the sovereignty of the States.

The compact intended ours to be a Government of the people, for the people, and above all, a Government by the people; if the right to govern and control the local affairs to decide questions of public health, morals, education, and safety are taken from the States, then a fatal blow has been dealt State sovereignty and the States are nothing more than vassal provinces, subject to a Central Government.

The State of Mississippi declares that it is the duty and privilege of a State to object to the aforesaid invasion of its rights and does hereby interpose its sovereignty to protect these rights; it is the duty of the Congress to halt such practices and save these rights; and if such cannot be obtained other than by amendment to the Federal Constitution, we appeal to the Congress, in the exercise of the power granted under article 5 of the Constitution, to initiate and submit an appropriate amendment direct to the 48 States for ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures thereof, declaring that the States have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions and facilities to the Federal Government, or any department or agency thereof, but such powers are reserved to the States; and until such time as these wrongs are righted, we do hereby declare the decisions and order of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, to be a usurpation of power reserved to the several States and do declare, as a matter of right, that said decisions are in violation of the Constitution of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and therefore, are considered unconstitutional, invalid and of no lawful effect within the confines of the State of Mississippi.

We declare, further, our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably and constitutionally available to us, to void this illegal encroachment upon our rights, and we do hereby urge our sister States to take prompt and deliberate action to check further encroachment by the Federal Government, through judicial legislation, upon the reserved powers of all States.

The Governor of Mississippi is respectfully requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Governor of each of the other States, and to the Members of Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress and the Secretary of Defense to prevent the reduction of production and personnel at the Watertown Arsenal

"Whereas the present administration plan is to reduce the production and personnel of the $100 million ordnance plant, Watertown Arsenal, in Watertown, Mass.; and

"Whereas the members of the house of representatives believe in industrial preparedness for modern war with the most scientific weapons to maintain peace in these times; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense is giving important guided-missile and new-weapons work to private industrial firms which do not have the know-how, adding additional tax burden to American citizens; and

"Whereas Watertown Arsenal and the New England area is noted for its skilled artisans, technicians and scientific personnel and is the center of the world's greatest concentration of electronic educational and training facilities; and

"Whereas the loss of the $15 million annual payroll of Watertown Arsenal in this area would drastically add to the economic plight of an already injured New England economy; and

"Whereas the present and proposed future cutbacks in work at Watertown arsenal is already harming and will further economically damage the small-business structure in New England; and

"Whereas Watertown Arsenal is capable and ready to produce guided missiles and the new family of defense weapons; and

"Whereas the skill of the scientists and technicians at the Watertown Arsenal, who have pioneered in major metallurgical and scientific developments for decades, have won national and international acclaim; and

"Whereas the dissipation of these highly skilled ordnance artisans and workers during these uncertain times will work to the detriment of the defense of the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas the house of representatives find irreconcilable an increased national defense budget request in the billions for the coming fiscal year, while being without any production planning and intelligent utilization for Watertown Arsenal's $100 million modernized plant, machine tools, foundry, assembly buildings and laboratories with the finest scientific testing equipment, staff, skills, and know-how; and

"Whereas the house of representatives find it unreasonable to all the people of the United States, who are taxpayers, the ignoring and sinking of vital ordnance plants in New England: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the reduction of production and personnel at the Watertown Arsenal; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of Defense rescind any order or plan to reduce production and personnel at the vitally important Watertown Arsenal ordnance installation, and provide it with work in the guided-missile and new-weapons field from already appropriated funds of the defense budget, thus working for the best interest of the United States of America; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—PROCLAMATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two proclamations issued in Boston, Mass., on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the proclamations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, GOVERNOR, THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas the Lithuanian Taryba in Vilna on February 16, 1918, proclaimed to the world in the oldest living European language the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania after 120 years of Russian occupation; and

Whereas Lithuania during a score of years of independence demonstrated her ability to advance, grow and prosper, and to become an active member of the League of Nations; and

Whereas the people of Lithuanian origin or descent have helped this country to establish its independence and then contributed their share in the development of its natural resources, industry, and life; and

Whereas Lithuania with her sister republics of Latvia and Estonia were the first to disappear behind the Iron Curtain and to suffer and expose the aggressive imperialism of Soviet Russia and thus to apprize the world of the aims and technique of communism; and

Whereas this country has demonstrated our sincere devotion to freedom, liberty, and justice by not recognizing the Communist occupation of Lithuania and most recently in the message of President Eisenhower to Bulganin that the enslaved people should be freed for genuine world peace; and

Whereas the United States Government continues to recognize the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary and the consuls of the Republic of Lithuania and to assure the brave Lithuanian people that they are not alone in their struggle against communism.

Now, therefore, I, Christian A. Herter, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, being mindful of the respect and sympathy of our citizens for the people of Lithuania, do hereby designate and proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1956, as Republic of Lithuania Day in Massachusetts, and I do hereby request all people of this Commonwealth to join with our neighbors of Lithuanian ancestry and descent in the hope and prayer that liberty and freedom will again be theirs to celebrate on independence day with its complete connotation and glory.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 8th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1956, and of the independence of the United States of America, the 180th.

By His Excellency the Governor:

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.
EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PROCLAMATION—REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1956

A year ago today, it was my pleasure as mayor of the city of Boston to issue a proclamation on the occasion of the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

On that occasion I noted the tragic facts of the oppression and incorporation of Lithuania into the orbit of Soviet imperialism.

As we recall the early history of our own country, our experiences were similar. Yet, however great were the hardships of our forebears, how enduring and trying their sufferings, the knowledge that at one time

America would be free and a fine country to live in, was never lost from mind.

On this 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence there is little cause for rejoicing or celebration, but every Lithuanian may recall with pride the glories of Lithuania during the middle ages and under Vytautas, they were the foremost state of all Europe. No people in all the world have ever given more convincing evidence of their capacity for successful self-government than the people of Lithuania following their independence 38 years ago.

One may be sure that the brave people of Lithuania are determined that they shall not be subjugated. We pay deserved tribute today to these Lithuanians whose perseverance and continued resistance to communism will one day restore their homeland to the status of a free and independent nation.

Now, therefore, I, John B. Hynes, mayor of the city of Boston, do hereby proclaim the 16th day of February 1956, to be Republic of Lithuania Day and urge the citizens of the city of Boston to cooperate in the observance of this occasion.

JOHN B. HYNES,
Mayor of Boston.

Attest:

WALTER J. MALLOY,
City Clerk.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 572. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Delio A. Loo Murgas (Rept. No. 1610);

S. 1240. A bill for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky (Rept. No. 1611);

S. 1701. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Silvonen (Rept. No. 1612);

S. 1733. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Argasinski (Rept. No. 1613);

S. 1900. A bill for the relief of Helen Agnes Blais (Junko Furakawa) (Rept. No. 1616);

S. 2103. A bill for the relief of Anke Naber (Rept. No. 1617);

S. 2243. A bill for the relief of Mary Boone Lacson (Rept. No. 1618);

S. 2327. A bill for the relief of Takako Iba (Rept. No. 1619);

S. 2371. A bill for the relief of Charles Black, also known as Joseph Clark (Rept. No. 1620);

S. 2381. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mahmood Sajjadi (Rept. No. 1621);

S. 2399. A bill for the relief of Hua-Tung Lee (Gordon Lee) and his wife, Chi-Wan Mow Lee (Jane Lee) (Rept. No. 1622);

S. 2414. A bill for the relief of Lina Diaz (Rept. No. 1623); and

H. R. 3037. An act for the relief of Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass (Rept. No. 1615).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1762. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Fritz Liermann (Rept. No. 1614).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Richard H. Levet, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice John C. Knox; and

Justin C. Morgan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the western district of New York, vice John Knight.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3351. A bill for the relief of Yamato Masatsugu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. BUSH):

S. 3352. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 3353. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3354. A bill for the relief of Jelena Simicevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3355. A bill to authorize loans to owners of housing accommodations on farms for the purpose of assisting in the acquisition of adequate facilities for providing and using water in such accommodations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 3356. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy or his designee to convey a 240.55-acre tract of land situated near the city of Grand Prairie, in Dallas County, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 3357. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located at Boston Neck, Narragansett, Washington County, R. I., to the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3358. A bill for the relief of Hewey Malachi Mackey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjore Collins; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 3360. A bill to provide for the transfer of a certain tract of land to the Secretary of the Army for use as a part of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Fort Sill, Okla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3361. A bill for the relief of Egbert Carlsson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 3362. A bill to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3363. A bill for the relief of Miroslav Slovak; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3364. A bill for the relief of Roberto Mario Bettinzoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3365. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight-forwarder permit;

S. 3366. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to authorize contracts between freight forwarders and railroads for the movement of trailers on flatcars; and

S. 3367. A bill to amend section 411 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to relationships between freight forwarders and other common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

Mr. CAPEHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 224), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Senate (A) that after the date on which this resolution is agreed to, no agreement shall be entered into by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government for the rental or leasing of any lands under its jurisdiction to any private person, association, or corporation, if such lands are to be used by such person, association, or corporation for any agricultural purpose, except grazing, and (B) that when any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government has lands under its jurisdiction which are in excess to its needs and which are suitable for agricultural use, such lands should be disposed of in accordance with the existing laws providing for the disposition of federally owned real property.

FEDERAL EQUAL PAY ACT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. PURTELL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be kept on the desk until next Monday—1 week—in order that any Senator who may care to associate himself as a sponsor may have that opportunity.

This bill provides that a man and a woman who perform the same work, or comparable work, in the same establishment must be paid at the same rate, taking into consideration performance and length of service. President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message on January 5 of this year stated:

> Legislation to apply the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex is a matter of simple justice.

This bill is designed to carry out this recommendation of the President to the Congress.

Although many States, including my own, have enacted equal pay legislation, a substantial number of States have failed to do so. The establishment by the Congress of the United States of equal pay legislation would serve as a

guide to all employers throughout the country. Women workers, who constitute almost one-third of the labor force in the United States, would be the principal beneficiaries. Moreover, the provisions of this bill would not affect collective bargaining in any way, but would merely protect female employees against wage discrimination.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the text of the bill and a short explanation of its provisions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3352) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Equal Pay Act."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce of wage differentials based on sex—

(1) depresses wages and living standards of employees necessary for their health and efficiency;

(2) prevents the maximum utilization of the available labor resources;

(3) tends to cause labor disputes, thereby burdening, affecting, and obstructing commerce;

(4) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce;

(5) constitutes an unfair method of competition.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act, through the exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to correct the conditions above referred to in such industries.

PROHIBITION OF WAGE-RATE DIFFERENTIAL BASED ON SEX

SEC. 3. No employer having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce shall discriminate, in any place of employment in which his employees are so engaged, between employees on the basis of sex by paying wages to any employee at a rate less than the rate at which he pays wages to employees of the opposite sex for work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills, except where such payment is made pursuant to a seniority or merit increase system which does not discriminate on the basis of sex.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary—

(1) shall prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary and appropriate for the administration of this act, including regulations to provide standards for determining work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills; and

(2) may investigate and gather data regarding the wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment in any industry subject to this act, and may enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, and matters as he may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this act, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this act; and

(3) shall bring all actions under section 9 to restrain violations of this act. Attorneys appointed by, or under the authority of, the Secretary may appear for and represent the Secretary in any litigation but all such litigation shall be subject to the direction and control of the Attorney General.

(b) For the purpose of any hearing or investigation provided for in this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commisison Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 15, secs. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary.

WAGE RESTITUTION AND LIQUIDATED DAMAGES

SEC. 5. Any employer who violates section 3 of this act shall be liable to each employee affected in the amount of the wages of which such employee is deprived by reason of such violation, and in an additional equal amount as liquidated damages: *Provided*, That in any action brought under section 6 (a) to recover such unpaid wages, if the employer shows to the satisfaction of the court that the act or omission giving rise to such action was in good faith and that he had reasonable grounds for believing that his act or omission was not a violation of section 3, the court may, in its sound discretion, award no liquidated damages or award any amount thereof not to exceed the amount specified in this section.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) Action to recover any amount for which an employer is liable under section 5 may be maintained in any court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more affected employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated. No employee shall be a party plaintiff to any such action unless he has given his consent in writing to become such a party and such consent is filed in the court in which such action is brought. The court in such action shall, in addition to any judgment awarded to the plaintiff or plaintiffs, allow a reasonable attorney's fee to be paid by the defendant, and costs of the action.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to supervise the payment of any amounts of unpaid wages for which an employer is liable under section 5, and the agreement of any employee to accept such payment shall upon payment in full constitute a waiver by such employee of any right of action he may have under subsection (a) to recover such amounts and any additional amount as liquidated damages. When a written request is filed by any employee with the Secretary claiming any amount as unpaid wages owing under section 5, the Secretary may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction to recover such amount. The consent of any employee to the bringing of any such action by the Secretary, unless such action is dismissed without prejudice on motion of the Secretary, shall constitute a waiver by such employee of any right of action he may have with respect to the claim and any additional amount as liquidated damages under subsection (a). Any sums recovered by the Secretary on behalf of an employee in an action brought under this subsection shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee. Any such sums not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of 3 years shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) Any action commenced under this section shall be barred unless commenced within 2 years after the cause of action accrues.

POSTING

SEC. 7. A copy of this act or, if approved by the Secretary, a poster explaining its provisions shall be displayed conspicuously by every employer in each place of employment in which he employs any employees to whom this act applies.

UNLAWFUL DISCHARGE OR DISCRIMINATION; PENALTIES

SEC. 8. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to discharge or in any other manner discriminate against any employee because such employee has filed any complaint or instituted any proceeding under this act, or has testified or is about to testify in any such proceeding, or has furnished information or is about to furnish information in connection with the enforcement of this act.

(b) Any person who wilfully violates the provisions of subsection (a) shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both; but no person shall be imprisoned under this section except for an offense committed after the conviction of such person for a prior offense under this subsection.

(c) The United States district courts, together with the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the District Court of Guam, shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of this section.

INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 9. The United States district courts, together with the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of the Virgin Islands and the District Court of Guam, shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of section 3, section 7, or section 8, or any of the provisions of the regulations of the Secretary issued under section 4.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. As used in this act—

(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor.

(b) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or any organized group of persons.

(c) "Commerce" means trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or between any State and any place outside thereof.

(d) "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the outer Continental Shelf describe in Public Law 212, 83d Congress (67 Stat. 462), or any Territory or possession subject to the exercise by the United States of sovereign rights, powers, or authority.

(e) "Employer" includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of a State, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(f) "Employee" includes any individual employed by an employer.

(g) "Employ" includes to suffer or permit to work.

(h) "Goods" means goods (including ships and marine equipment), wares, products, commodities, merchandise, or articles or subjects of commerce of any character, or any part or ingredient thereof, but does not include goods after their delivery

into the actual physical possession of the ultimate consumer thereof other than a producer, manufacturer, or processor thereof.

(i) "Produced" means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this act an employer shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof, in any State.

(j) "Wage" paid to any employee includes the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary to the employer of furnishing such employee with board, lodging, or other facilities, if such board, lodging, or other facilities are customarily furnished by such employer to his employees.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 11. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect 120 days after the date of enactment.

The statement and analysis, presented by Mr. IVES, is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF PROVIDING EQUAL PAY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX IN INTERSTATE EMPLOYMENT

The purpose of this proposal is to provide a means within the scope of the Federal regulatory power to eliminate discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing comparable work for the same employer.

The proposal would apply to employers whose employees are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce. The administration of the act would be vested in the Secretary of Labor and procedures of enforcement and wage collection authorized similar to these now utilized by the Department of Labor in the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The payment of lower wage rates to workers of one sex for the same or comparable work as that performed by the other sex has an undesirable effect on the economic life of the entire Nation. Such practices tend to affect adversely the general purchasing power and the standards of living of workers. Unfair competitive advantages are enjoyed by employers who pay discriminatory wage rates based on sex. In addition to the tangible economic ills caused by discriminatory wage practices, such practices violate fundamental principles of justice and impair the prestige of the United States in international affairs.

A nondiscriminatory wage level makes possible the maximum utilization of worker skills. This, together with collateral benefits, such as morale improvement, may stimulate production and lessen the effects of unfair competition.

It is of great importance that Congress eradicate discriminatory pay practices in interstate commerce.

EQUAL PAY PROPOSAL—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1: Title of act: Establishes short title of Federal Equal Pay Act.

Section 2: Findings and declaration of policy: Enumerates undesirable conditions in interstate commerce resulting from payment of wage differentials based on sex and intention of Congress to correct such conditions.

Section 3: Prohibition of wage rate differential based on sex: Prohibits employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce from discriminating on the basis of sex, in payment of wages in any place of employment in which their employees are so engaged. The language descriptive of proposed coverage and the supporting definitions in section 10 are phrased to make available precedents established under the Fair Labor Standards Act in determining coverage under the proposed legislation.

Section 4: Administration: Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to issue rules and regulations, make investigations regarding compliance with the act, issue subpenas, and restrain violations. These provisions are largely adapted from similar provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Section 5: Wage restitution and liquidated damages: Provides that employers who violate the act shall be liable for wages for which an employee is deprived and for not more than an additional equal amount as liquidated damages. The liability in employee suits for unpaid wages and liquidated damages is like that now provided by the Fair Labor Standards Act, as modified by section 11 of the Portal-to-Portal Act.

Section 6: Enforcement: Authorizes employee suits to recover amount of employer liability under section 5. Authorizes Secretary to supervise payment of wages withheld in violation of the act and to bring suits for such wages in behalf of employees upon their request. The recovery of unpaid wages, but not liquidated damages, is authorized in suits by the Secretary of Labor or by administrative action in supervising employer payments. Establishes a 2-year period of limitation for commencing recovery action after cause accrues.

Section 7: Posting: Requires employer to post copy of act or official poster explaining its provisions in each place of employment where act applies.

Section 8: Unlawful discharge or discrimination and penalties: Makes its unlawful willfully to discharge or discriminate against any employee assisting in the enforcement of the act. Upon a second conviction for such discharge, or discrimination, imposes a criminal penalty. Provides that the United States district courts will have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violation of this section.

Section 9: Injunction proceedings: Provides that the United States district courts will have jurisdiction to restrain violations of the act or regulations issued under it.

Section 10: Definitions: Defines terms used in the act principally as defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Section 11: Appropriation: Authorizes necessary appropriations to carry out act.

Section 12: Effective date: Provides that act will take effect 120 days after passage.

SIMPLIFICATION OF FEDERAL ACCOUNTING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes. The proposed legislation implements two of the second Hoover Commission's recommendations relating to the governmental budget and accounting.

This bill would expedite the payment of delayed bills where appropriations have lapsed, and improve the Government's accounting and reporting system.

It would authorize the various agencies of Government to pay undisputed bills chargeable to expired and lapsed appropriations in precisely the same manner as bills payable from currently available appropriations. This will be accomplished by repealing existing requirements that all obligations chargeable to lapsed appropriations, shall be certified by the General Accounting Office, in advance of payment as legally due and payable from the lapsed appropriations; by permitting agencies on an indefinite basis to retain obligated balances of all appropriations made to them; and by specifically granting authority to the agencies to pay prior year obligations, from the retained balances through regular disbursing channels. These payments would be audited by the General Accounting Office.

As a result of the changes proposed by the bill, the General Accounting Office would discontinue the maintenance of approximately 35,000 detailed ledger accounts which are largely duplicative of accounting records also required to be maintained in the several agencies. Professional claims adjudicators and supporting personnel now utilized by General Accounting Office in reexamining and certifying for payment bills which previously have been examined and acknowledged by the agencies concerned, as due and payable, will be available for assignment to more productive endeavors.

Mr. President, I am assured, if enacted into law, this bill will make possible substantial savings in manpower and administrative expenses, modernize Government accounting, and effectuate the Hoover Commission recommendations in this important area.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3362) to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. COTTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY (for Mr. KEFAUVER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by Mr. KEFAUVER to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1956— ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 28, 1956,

The names of Mr. COTTON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BEALL, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DUFF, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. THYE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. WELKER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. MCCARTHY were added as cosponsors to the bill (S. 3308), to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deductions for Federal income tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and other Senators) on February 28, 1956.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate for 2 minutes, under the 2-minute rule.

Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as well as many other Members of the Senate, in sponsoring the bill (S. 3308) to strengthen our Federal election laws.

I believe it has become increasingly apparent that our existing election laws are antiquated in many respects; and the inadequacy of these laws has been of considerable concern to me. I am gratified to see in the proposed law a provision for complete accounting by Federal candidates of their campaign contributions and their expenditures, as well as a requirement that large contributors make an accurate and complete report of their contributions.

Although the campaigns in my State do not usually result in the expenditure of large sums of money, I think the provision of the bill establishing a more realistic spending limit is of very real importance to candidates seeking election from the more populous States. I believe small campaign contributors should be encouraged to aid the candidates of their choice, and I am glad to see in the bill provisions to make their help more possible.

But, Mr. President, I have noticed that there is considerable conflict between the election laws of many States and the proposed Federal election law, in respect to the expenditures made by candidates for Federal office. I hope that in the development of the hearings on this bill, some attention will be paid to these conflicts and variations. Although I realize that we cannot legislate State laws on the floor of the national Congress, I hope that before this bill is finally enacted, we may appropriately call this problem to the attention of the various State legislatures. Certainly a candidate should not be placed in the position of operating with the sanction of one set of laws, although being in jeopardy under a separate and different set of laws.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope it will be possible for the Congress to suggest the development of a uniform State law which will be more or less in conformity with whatever law the Congress passes.

For this reason and others, Mr. President, I am happy to join in sponsoring this bill.

NATIONAL CIVIL AIR PATROL DAY— ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 29, 1956,

The names of Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. POTTER, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KUCHEL were added as additional cosponsors to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day, introduced by Mr. FREAR (for himself and other Senators), on February 29, 1956.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON LAKE CHAUTAUQUA AND CHADAKOIN RIVER, JAMESTOWN, N. Y. (S. DOC. NO. 103)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 23, 1955, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River, Jamestown, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works adopted on June 17, 1942. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 102)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, earlier today the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate the report of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission for the Celebration in 1958 of the One Hundredth Anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Statement prepared by him relating to conditions in Poland.

By Mr. LANGER:

Article entitled " 'Bensonomics' Is Blasted by High-Support Senator," written by Senator ELLENDER, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 4, 1956.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address entitled 'Freedom of Choice in Public Schools," delivered by Robert B. Troutman before the Rotary Club, of Atlanta, Ga., and printed in the Christian Science Monitor of March 1, 1956.

ANCHER NELSEN, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE REA

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, on February 8 the senior Senator from Montana offered for the RECORD an article from the Nashville Tennessean purporting to show evidence of pressure on members of the resolutions committee of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

This article does a serious injustice to a Federal official, Ancher Nelsen, who, as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, is doing an outstanding job. That is not merely my opinion, but it is the opinion of many people who have had a long and close association with the REA program, and who are intimately familiar with its operations.

On February 27, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] presented evidence which bears out the fact that Mr. Nelsen was unjustly and falsely accused. I can present additional evidence that such is the case.

One of my constituents who was present and active at the meeting described in the newspaper article previously referred to has sent me a copy of a letter he has written to Mr. Nelsen. What he said in the letter is extremely illuminating. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1956.

Mr. ANCHER NELSEN,
Administrator, United States Department of Agriculture, Rural Electrification, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: As the vice chairman of the resolutions committee of the NRECA 1956 annual meeting, I cannot tell you how shocked I was to read the article that appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on January 29.

I have been a member of this committee for the past 2 years and believe I know something about the committee's way of operation and general attitudes. I must say that the picture reflected in the newspaper surprised me. It certainly does not represent what I believe to be fact.

My first reason for this belief is that it was the majority of the committee that asked you to appear before us to answer any questions any member of the committee might have. I was present, I believe, during the times you faced the resolutions committee while in session in St. Louis and know first hand what took place. It is my opinion we were after the facts, those that we could get from you

as well as those we could get from others. I feel that if in our deliberations our conclusions are not reached with proper facts, we would not be doing justice to our responsibilities.

The newspaper writer includes this quotation: "He knew some of our committee members had loan applications before him and he wished to argue with us about each issue that might come up. We didn't give him the chance. Nobody before had ever asked such a chance."

I cannot say this quotation is in error, but I can say it is far from the facts. The facts that you offered your cooperation to your fullest extent and informed the committee that you would be available any time they wished to call you back. I am sure the committee as a whole were more than pleased to have you available any time they had a problem you could assist them with.

During the 2 years I have served on the committee, it has been the policy of the committee to request anyone to appear before them to answer questions or to clarify problems the committee might have. This has been a great assistance to the committee in the past 2 years and has greatly assisted in preparing good resolutions.

I note in the above-mentioned article there is an attempt by the writer to show your appearance is unprecedented. I again say your appearance was by request of the majority of the committee not only this year but last year as well. I cannot speak as to previous years but I do wonder how this committee functioned in an intellegent manner if it did not seek information from expert authorities prior to their composition of resolutions proposed for adoption on a national scale.

Very truly yours,
WOLVERINE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
JOHN N. KEEN, *Manger.*

HIRING OF BRAUN & CO. AS CONSULTANT FOR REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, my attention has recently been called to a statement made by Mr. T. W. Braun, president of Braun & Co., a Los Angeles public-relations firm.

On the pending farm bill, there are honest differences of opinion. However, an attack was recently made on certain individuals who have rendered public service with relation to the pending legislation. For that reason, I desire that the record be correct.

In the course of debate, it was stated that Braun & Co. was under indictment in Texas. That is incorrect. The case was a conventional antitrust case, and I am informed a Department of Justice official stated that Braun & Co. was named only as an alleged conspirator in the case, and was not named as a defendant.

I am also informed that the indictment was later dismissed by the Government, and a so-called "information" was substituted.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram sent to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], by Braun & Co., signed by T. W. Braun, president.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reference your remarks about Secretary of Agriculture Benson and Braun & Co. in the Senate, March 1.

If you had checked the whole record you would have found that we have worked for the Government on a nonpartisan and public-service basis in various ways since 1941.

My last effort under a Democratic administration was as a consultant in the executive office of the President in 1950. I was a member of the staff which studied and reported to the President on foreign economic policies.

In terms of solid assistance to American farmers, we are proud to match our record against political smears and character assassinations.

For over 20 years one of our principal activities has been in the field of increasing sales and consumption of farm products, especially those in surplus.

Beginning in 1936, we played a leading part in developing the producer-consumer campaign idea. Since then about 300 promotions have been conducted on such products as citrus fruits, apples, pears, peaches, cherries, lettuce, cabbage, potatoes, dairy products, and meat. In 1954 alone, 28 farm items were given national promotion to increase consumption of foods in heavy supply.

Our client, Safeway Stores, Inc., was one of the leaders in an expenditure by food chains alone of about $12½ million advertising fresh beef in a recent drive on that product. The results in increase consumption were spectacular and in the neighborhood of 18 pounds per capita.

Similar campaigns have been undertaken to increase the consumption of the large pork supplies which began moving to market last fall. Increases in sales of over 15 percent represent further solid accomplishments.

Although our 90-day agreement with the Republican National Committee terminated Tuesday, February 28, we have not "folded our tents." We established an office in Washington, D. C., in the National Press Building, in 1943. That office is still there.

This firm and I will continue to be available for public service whenever responsible officers of the Government think there is anything which we can contribute.

BRAUN & CO.,
T. W. BRAUN, *President.*

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe that at the same time it should be noted that the Associated Press was credited with a story in the Washington Post and Times Herald of yesterday, Sunday March 4, in which it was stated that Mr. Braun said, in a statement to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], that he was a consultant in the executive office of the President in 1950 on foreign economic problems. Mr. Truman was in office at that time. So that Mr. Braun apparently has been a consultant in this field for some time.

Mr. BRIDGES. And he rendered nonpartisan service. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his information.

Mr. President, I should like to address myself to another subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

REORGANIZATION OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to express my personal observations on the reorganization of the Passport Office. This agency of the Government has a history of good public service. Over the years, the employees of the Passport Office have shown themselves to be dedicated public servants, with a highly developed sense of duty, courtesy, and patience.

With the impact of greatly increased overseas travel by American citizens, the Passport Office struggled through one of the most difficult and trying periods of its history during the summer and fall of 1955. It lacked equipment, personnel, and space. The situation would have demoralized a staff with less stamina. But with its reorganization and new quarters and improved facilities, it has been revitalized, and today I venture to say that the Passport Office is on its way to becoming one of the outstanding examples of good management and administration in the Federal Government.

I congratulate Miss Knight, and the three Federal Agencies—the General Accounting Office, the General Services Administration, and the Civil Service Commission—for a splendid example which they have established for the record to prove that a Government office, such as the Passport Office, can be modernized, reorganized, and improved without excessive costs and delays for long-winded studies, research, and conferences.

MR. PAUL BUTLER'S CAMPAIGN STRATEGY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have been amazed at the savage way that Mr. Paul Butler, Democratic National Chairman, has started the Democratic campaign. Let alone whether it is in good taste, I do not think it is smart politics for the Democratic chairman to launch his attack upon the fact that President Eisenhower had a coronary from which the doctors say he has made a good recovery—no, Mr. President, not while people still thrill to the words "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," which came from a man who, whatever one may think of his political philosophy, had gone through the fears and the crippling experience of polio, and came back, unafraid, to be President of the United States for a longer period of time than any other man in history.

Mr. President, I recall seeing Franklin D. Roosevelt, when President, grip the sides of the Speaker's stand to relieve the weight on his braced legs while he made stirring speeches to both Houses of the Congress—yes, even a speech calling for a declaration of war, to which the American people responded with everything they had.

Undeniably, Mr. Roosevelt had a severe attack of polio, crippling and limiting in its effect on the physical and nervous system. Undeniably, Mr. Eisenhower had a heart attack. But as I listened to him the other night, I thought one would not even need to be objective to say, "Here is a man completely dedicated to the service of his country and unafraid. The confidence in his voice and the candor of his words have again given the world the reassurance so much needed for the chartless days in which we live."

Mr. President, it is my prediction that the American people want the hand of this courageous but humble and devout man at the helm of the ship of state for another 4 years. It is my prediction that any campaign against Mr. Eisenhower, based on the fact that he once had a heart attack, will be as self-defeating as would have been a campaign against Mr. Roosevelt on the ground that he could only be a part-time President.

SENATOR GORE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an article entitled "Realistic Reformer From Tennessee," written by William S. White, chief congressional correspondent of the New York Times, and published in the New York Times magazine on March 4, 1956. I think the article is worthy of the consideration of every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—To one of the last Southern Puritans, a nonsmokin', noncussin', nondrinkin' Democrat called ALBERT GORE, has been entrusted in an election year an extraordinary but very real abstraction: the conscience of the United States Senate.

Senator GORE is the outstanding figure on the bipartisan Select Senate Committee of eight that is charged with making what could be the most far-reaching investigation in history into lobbying, questionable campaign contributions, and all forms of political corruption.

Will he do a good job?

Almost certainly, yes.

Will the television shriek by day and night and will the newspaper headlines howl?

Very probably, no.

Will witnesses and accused be drawn upon the rack, and will this be a kind of a kleiglit contest between the good guys and the bad guys? Will it promote the devil theory of politics?

Almost certainly, no.

Will it all produce a third presidential or vice presidential possibility from the State of Tennessee—that is, will Senator Albert Gore join Senator Estes Kefauver, and Gov. Frank G. Clement as more or less shyly available?

Probably not.

For GORE, notwithstanding his smooth, neat, pallidly handsome face and his deeply conservative blue serge suits rather suggesting a mildly worldly young deacon, is no political parson, no hot-eyed St. George wildly and blindly swinging about among the dragons. He is a profoundly realistic politician whose mind is as hard as his manner is soft and, like all sensible politicians, he knows where the reformer's spirit may sensibly go and where it may not.

He is acutely aware that he has got hold of a job here that at best will hardly win him a popularity contest among politicians inside and outside the Senate and at worst might well present him as an unopposed candidate for nomination as the most obnoxious man in that famous institution.

He has not accepted the Senate's mandate merely to preside over the liquidation of its public character. Equally, he has not signed on to run an enterprise showing that everything is simply swell in the highly sensitive areas in which now he must fish.

It is GORE'S quiet but quite firm determination, among other things, to run to cover a good deal of interstate campaign money that he deeply believes tends to subvert the essential democratic process.

In this he will express the accumulated and still accumulating wrath of many in Congress who do not at all like it when Texas or California oil millionaires, or Michigan motor millionaires—or labor's political action groups, either—find that civic duty requires them to put substantial sums not only into presidential elections and into the elections in their own States but also to range about other States with contributions against this or that Senate or House candidate.

He is not insensible to the plain if delicate fact, however, that in regard to campaign costs few men in the Senate are really islands unto themselves. He does not propose, therefore, to enter the business in the manner of Carrie Nation eagerly taking her hatchet into the saloons. He proposes not to attempt to prohibit but rather to expose, to limit and, therefore, to regulate contribution practices that cannot wholly be ended so long as Senate membership is to be open to those other than the very rich.

The personal character of the head of any Senate investigation is infinitely its most important and controlling factor, no matter what its mission, its rules, or its ultimate purpose. In this coming inquiry, going as it must into sticky matters of the Senate's relationship to lobbying, campaign spending, and all the rest, all this will be doubly true.

It thus follows that the personal character of ALBERT GORE becomes of the highest public significance. What of this character?

To begin with, he is a product of Carthage, Tenn., a community of some 2,000 citizens with a character of its own. Carthage's principal export in the commercial sense has for generations been tobacco, a world crop. And this perhaps explains why GORE, like his great idol from Carthage, Cordell Hull, a former Representative, a former Senator, and a former Secretary of State, has doggedly and always pursued the old-time Democratic ideal of something approaching free trade—low tariffs, and all that.

But Carthage's really vital export for many, many generations has been political leadership; this remote little town in the foothills of the Cumberland Mountains has sent out through the years an incredible number of Congressmen, Senators, Governors, Ambassadors, and Cabinet officers.

Where boys elsewhere want to get a job in the bank or own the furniture store and join the Rotary Club, those in Carthage consider the political career to be slightly more to be sought after than all these—or even the ministry, although in this Calvinist community the pulpit beckons strongly.

Moreover, this is a community that is Southern only in a sense; it was closely divided between pro-Yank and pro-Reb during the War Between the States and even now it is usually a 60 percent Democratic town rather than a 90 percent Democratic town.

This somewhat scrabbly hill country was and is no place of magnolia and moonlight, and GORE, unlike many of his southern colleagues, is neither attached to the past nor able to live the genteel political life of the chaps from the Delta and Tidewater South who are sometimes a bit vague about how they get elected and reelected. GORE has had to fight for his political preferment. This, as well as all the other intimate circumstances of his way of life, has made him a somewhat special kind of southern politician.

He is not a southern coalitionist, not noticeably or deeply worried over desegregation, not a conservative at all in the southern sense. Rather, he is on most issues what would be called both a liberal and truly partisan politician. He is a strong pro-public-power man, fighting with a calm remorselessness at every opportunity for the Tennessee Valley Authority and things of that sort.

It was GORE who actually prepared the bulk of the Democratic case against the Dixon-Yates private power contract that at length was canceled by the President.

It was GORE who led the liberals in a filibuster a year or so ago against legislative proposals by the administration that seemed to them to give to private power companies altogether too great an entree to atomic energy.

He is one of a score of "Mr. RAYBURN'S boys" who in their seasons have come up from the House of Representatives, so long dominated by the saturninely brilliant Speaker SAM RAYBURN of Texas, to give a new color and character to the Senate.

But, and this is a very important qualification, GORE, the liberal on many matters—as, for example, on price controls—is not a liberal on labor matters. Parenthetically, this explains the willingness of the Senate conservatives to accept him for the lobby investigation. They are in not the slightest doubt, just as most observers are not in the slightest doubt, that he will go after big labor just as he will big business.

All in all, therefore, this is the picture of basic character that emerges:

A highly correct man—although one capable of playing a fiddle to the crowd in his salad days as a campaigner for the House—but not a stuffy one. A country man, but a shrewd modern politician all the same, with rarely matched skill in sloganeering when it is needed.

A man long and truly and demonstrably devoted to the concept of clean politics who nevertheless approaches his task from a background of a strong, although personal and idealistic, machine of his own—a machine with which he defeated the tough, urban Memphis machine of the late "Boss Ed" Crump in order to come to the Senate.

A man genuinely engaged in reform—but a man prepared to acknowledge, as he did in a leisurely interview with this correspondent, that "the flush of shame," as he put it, might well fall across his own cheek if he knew the details of some of the contributions that might have been made without his knowledge to his own various campaigns.

A man prepared to challenge heiracrchy and all the entrenched political powers, in the Senate and outside—but sensibly prepared and not ready to carry any crusade so heedlessly far as to destroy it.

This latter point, indeed, is perhaps the most vital of all. A reformer's life is perhaps not easy anywhere; in the Senate it can be both bitter and fruitless, and nothing is so self-defeating as an excessive, untempered zeal.

Equally, the reformer there must so proceed and so behave as to leave no general suspicion that his motives are wholly or even predominantly those of mere self-advertisement and self-advancement. GORE called off the atomic energy filibuster after 13 days and some hours for this reason. In the Dixon-Yates fight he avoided a too constant occupancy of the spotlight for the same reason.

He bitterly resents what he believes to be a general tax policy unfairly discriminatory in favor of business, but he does not carry his challenge to the conservatives past the point of no return.

He is, in sum, a reformer who is also a generally accepted Member of the Senate, whereas others, including his colleague Senator KEFAUVER, tend to put up the senatorial back.

One recalls him during the 1954 congressional campaign politely rejecting a glass of beer in a hotel room in New Mexico as rather too alcoholic a draught. Thus, it is hardly an overstatement to say that he is not a convivial man. All the same, he is anything but a prig, even though one recalls hearing not so much as a muttered "damn" ever pass his lips.

His friendships are fast friendships, with far more urbane and sophisticated colleagues, such as Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Okla-

homa, or THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., of Missouri, whom GORE calls "HENNINS" in his invariable dropping of the final "g" in any word.

How GORE sees the coming investigation is summed up in the grave, old-fashioned, deeply courteous manner in which he speaks, on the stump as well as off:

"If we are to talk about the optimum I should hope that the end result would be to bring about basic remedies for a deplorable and dangerous situation.

"As the population has grown and as the media of communication have become better and more varied, the cost of campainin' for the Senate and the House has got beyond the financial capacity of the average man and even the richest would be sorely pressed in the most populous States.

"Therefore, the average candidate for the Senate and House is forced by these conditions to depend upon private campaign contributions. Therein lies a threat to representative government and every Member of the Senate is to one degree or another a part of the electoral process.

"If the American people knew the facts and the conditions surrounding public men there would be a sympathetic attitude toward remedial legislation.

"Many a candidate, including this one, has rationalized campaign contributions on the theory that they were offered merely to assist a good Senator—but it doesn't necessarily follow that the contributor feels the same way.

"The trouble reaches into political parties as such, too, for a platform may be trimmed to attract contributions. Most Senators have nothing to do with the campaign funds raised for them by party finance committees, and they never are sure whether strings are attached.

"And contributions to committees are more coldly calculated than contributions to an individual candidate. It may be argued that a personal contribution is simply an expression of fondness for a candidate; but nobody contributes to a campaign committee for love of that committee."

Failing the attainment of the optimum, GORE hopes simply to dry up clandestine money by disclosures concurrent with the campaign and to get public feeling behind legislation to strengthen laws dealing with contributions, lobbying, and corrupt political practices in general.

For all this he has no firm proposals as yet. "I am goin' into it," he says, "to try to find out what ought to be done and how to do it."

He has had no experience of any kind as a Senate investigator in the common and general understanding of that term. And, a rather grayish sort of man without theatrical quality, he looks a bit hesitantly upon what lies ahead.

"I dunno," he says, "whether I know how to run one of these things or not. But, I'll tell you one thing: Every witness is goin' to have his proper protection. We're not goin' to run any television theater around here."

With this, a small, neat, contained man looking covertly at an old-fashioned gold pocket watch that shows it to be 5 o'clock in the afternoon, reaches into the bottom drawer of his desk, and asks: "Have some?"

He draws forth a box of chocolates, pops one in his mouth, and announces softly: "Pretty good, you know, when you are a little tired."

POLICE COMMISSIONER STEPHEN P. KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK CITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in yesterday's magazine section of the New York Times, there is an article concerning the outstanding work which is being done by Commissioner Stephen P. Kennedy, of the New York City Police Department. It is the story of a man of great character, energy, and ability, whose broad shoulders carry responsibility for the enforcement of law in America's greatest metropolis. His competence, zeal, integrity, and devotion to the cause of rectitude in protecting both the public interest and the rights of the individual have won for him a deserved acclaim in an area where such commendation must be well-earned to be given.

Members of the Foreign Relations Committee were highly impressed with Commissioner Kennedy when hearings were held in New York City in 1954 on the International Opium Protocol for limiting the production and distribution of opium and derivative drugs such as heroin and morphine. At that time Mr. Kennedy, who was then chief inspector of the New York Police Department, gave testimony concerning the yeoman work which the narcotics squad of his department was performing in the investigation and detection of the drug traffic. Considering the numerous other duties which his office entailed, he revealed a surprising grasp and understanding of this difficult problem, a problem which the New York City authorities were meeting with much success. Mr. Kennedy was most cooperative and helpful in furnishing the committee with data which it needed to ascertain the importance of giving its approval to the narcotics treaty.

The good people of the city of New York are fortunate, indeed, in having Mr. Kennedy as their chief law enforcement officer. It is a privilege for me to bring his fine work to the attention of the Senate. I should like at this time, Mr. President, to introduce into the RECORD the article by Mr. Murray Schumach, published in Sunday's New York Times, entitled "Tough Boss of 23,000 Police," which attests the faith, the strength, and the humanity of Police Commissioner Kennedy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOUGH BOSS OF 23,000 POLICE

(By Murray Schumach)

Toward the end of 1951, Deputy Inspector Stephen Patrick Kennedy, though a vigorous 45 years of age and a muscular 200 pounds, seemed near the premature end of a very promising career in the New York City Police Department. He had been cut adrift from the challenging command of the riverfront squad to gather barnacles on an unspoiled record in the backwaters of civilian defense duties. It was widely believed in the department that his intransigeance on matters of conscience had offended some superiors. Two years later, he still had not learned to be diplomatic about infractions by policemen. He was embedded in what a top police official derided as "some damned thing, some coordinating council, a pure boondoggle."

Today, the same hard-jawed Mr. Kennedy with the furry voice, iron-gray hair and green-gray eyes chainsmokes and gulps black coffee behind a three-telephone desk on the second floor of police headquarters. The only decoration on the dark paneled wall facing him is a framed certificate from Mayor Wagner, reading: "To all to whom these presents shall come—Greetings. Know ye, that reposing special trust and confidence in the integrity, diligence, and discretion of Stephen P. Kennedy, I have appointed him police commissioner."

There are sagacious prowlers of the echoing corridors of police headquarters who say Mayor Wagner has secured this vital department against corruption by assigning a slums-born, college-educated professional policeman to rule the 22,918 protectors of some 8 million persons and more than $20 billion in property along the city's 6,033 miles of streets and 578 miles of waterfront. Others, equally knowledgeable of the fates of the 24 men who have departed from the same assignment since the post was established in 1901, say this walking book of rules will undermine the mayor's authority and destroy police morale by breeding nests of informers. One man's municipal FBI is another man's OGPU.

The commissioner's critics, in support of their contention that he is undermining morale, point to the recent examination for applicants for the force. The department had hoped that 20,000 would show up for the tests for the 5,000 additional police the commissioner has requested of the city. Less than 10,000 took the test. This, asserts the anti-Kennedy faction of the department, is the result of inhuman discipline and unrelieved tension.

"Any man who comes on the force," replies Commissioner Kennedy, "must understand you never have a personal life entirely and that you have to learn to endure constant tension and discipline and not crack."

The commissioner also cites performance figures. Felonies declined 16.5 percent in 1955, during which he was either commissioner himself or the right hand of Commissioner Francis W. H. Adams. Mr. Adams says that "a lot of the credit I got belongs to Steve Kennedy." Mr. Kennedy was subject to strong abuse when he instituted patrol by unmarked police cars to curb reckless driving. Here, too, his answer has been statistical. In the first 40 days of this year auto deaths in the city were off 20 percent against the same period last year.

Says former Commissioner Adams of the successor he rescued from conscientious obscurity: "Steve Kennedy, if he hadn't been a policeman, would have been a priest or maybe a doctor—something with a principle. His public zeal is like a flame."

Assemblyman Anthony P. Savarese, Jr., dissents strongly. He contends that Commissioner Kennedy, by refusing to turn over wiretapping data to his legislative committee, "verges on tyranny."

What are the principles that have projected Commissioner Kennedy into stormy prominence, including defiance of Mayor Wagner? How and why is he trying to change a department that set the pattern for American cities by copying the English design of Sir Robert Peel? Why is he held suspect by politicians and hated by many police officers? Is he a crusader, a fanatic, or just an inevitable type in the evolution of police work from brawn to brain? What changes occur in the personality of this music-fond ex-stevedore when he drops the frigid discipline of duty?

Recently, when a supporter suggested that his official life might be prolonged by imbibing, occasionally and moderately, the mild brew of departmental diplomacy, Commissioner Kennedy retorted with an effective summary of a code he has distilled from 27 years on the force and some 9 years of nocturnal study for high school and college diplomas and a law degree.

"A police commissioner," he explained slowly, "must not only meet the practical problems from day to day; he must be a strong moral force. He must not bow to expediency or to political considerations."

His unshakable faith in his ability to discern right from wrong made him risk his job twice when he was filling out a term before his reappointment to a 5-year term

on February 20. Despite a directive from the mayor, he refused to allow a television company to have access to the departmental files. And when the legislative committee on wiretapping angrily noted he was the only official in the State to withhold information, he replied:

"I have stood alone on issues before. I believe the position I took was the right one."

From this devotion to the cause of rectitude—his severer critics find it vaguely platitudinous—the commissioner has evolved two corollary gospels. Members of a free society, he warned his ranking subordinates one day, exercise "rights and privileges sanctioned by law" that must ever be defended by the police as sworn duty. Furthermore, he is not reluctant to add, with an almost esthetic appreciation of the symmetry of English common law, the policeman's genial lot must be to succor "the equilibrium between the rights of the individual and those of the community."

The policeman must put behind his gun and shield the tireless fidelity of the St. Bernard dog and the eager virtue of the Boy Scout, a combination many veteran police officers consider beyond the temptation-riddled life of the average policeman or detective. The commissioner, aware of this criticism, says: "The policeman's gun is his cross, and he carries it always."

To make his policemen fit the city's crime, he is determined to wipe out what he calls the coterie concept, a task perhaps unprecedented outside television serials and much more sensational than the generally overpublicized shakeups of inspectors that accompany the appointment of new commissioners.

The coterie concept, is as ingrained in the department as the policeman's memorandum book, in which he must enter all duty calls, and the station house blotter. In each of the city's 81 precincts—and in special squads—the men often develop strong friendships from sharing common problems and dangers. Generally, this esprit is a public benefaction. But often it imposes a code that requires policemen to remain silent when precinct associates succumb to what Commissioner Kennedy calls moral hazards.

To banish this tradition, Commissioner Kennedy's most drastic step has been to transfer more than 450 sergeants, ignoring the protest of their 1,500-man association that has hitherto intimidated many commissioners. Though the commissioner says transfer is no penalty, a close associate explains that he wants to smash a system whereby sergeants can be collectors or coordinators of bribes and protectors of the derelict.

"There must be no special friendship that transcends the canon of ethics in the department," the commissioner says. Consistent with this—and this is conceded even by his bitterest enemies—he does no favors for politicians, yields to no pressure groups. Finally, he is funneling younger men into the detective division and the higher echelons as quickly as possible on the theory that younger men are less likely to have been contaminated by cynical elders.

To raise departmental standards while continuing to drive down crime, the commissioner probably works longer hours than any other person in the city administration with the possible exception of the mayor. His is a 6-day week, sometimes 7, during which he may put in from 9 to 17 hours daily. By 7 a. m., he has telephoned the communications bureau at headquarters for a rundown of the night's major activities. With the radio blaring news bulletins—he continually swings the dial for fresh broadcasts to his wife's amusement or dismay—he makes phone calls on police matters and is at his desk by 9:30, having leafed through morning papers in the car. Often he makes surprise stops at precincts on the way in.

On one of these trips, at sunrise on election day, he failed to see four detective commanders where they should have been. One of the officers was demoted, the others were transferred.

After studying reports that range from a typewritten summary of the day's crime to a detailed examination of the crime situation of a precinct sector or entire precinct, he begins a series of conferences with Chief Inspector Thomas A. Nielson, commander of uniformed men. First Deputy Commissioner James R. Kennedy (no relative), Chief of Detectives James B. Leggett, and Deputy Commissioner Walter Arm, in charge of community relations.

The men sit in armchairs near his desk. He speaks softly, quickly. His language is either slangy cop talk or almost academically polysyllabic as his pointed questions run the gamut from the behavior of a particular police officer to the city's "crime incidence." His orders are blunt, but during one recent huddle he reversed himself twice when subordinates disagreed.

At least once, sometimes twice, a week he listens to complaints or requests from policemen. One may want the regular hours of a traffic assignment so he can go to college at night; another, a chance at the detective division; a third, a transfer to a precinct near his home because his wife is ill. He allots about 5 minutes to each man, and usually sees about a dozen per session.

As the policeman enters the Commissioner rises, shakes hands, sits down, waves the patrolman to a nearby chair, and asks, "What's on your mind?" While the policeman talks Kennedy riffles through the man's record, looking for commendations or criticisms. He looks up quickly to ask questions or to study the man's face. If the man falters, he neither interrupts nor helps.

Throughout the day the Commissioner has to make hurried trips. They may be for a traffic conference at city hall; to make a speech at a luncheon of the board of trade; to testify before a grand jury; to present checks to charities on behalf of police groups. Between and during these chores he keeps in touch with headquarters. Lunch is frequently at the Automat or a cafeteria. "He feels more at home there," says an acquaintance.

The afternoon brings more conferences: the police surgeon, the deputy mayor. More question-and-answer sessions with ranking officers. He rarely rolls on crimes—that is, visits the scene. Though he knows the value of this sort of publicity, he avoids it. He prefers to let each subordinate work out such problems without interference. However, after each important police job, he checks carefully on the performance to learn which men distinguished themselves or were inadequate. This information he stores away for reference in connection with promotion—or demotion.

The commissioner says he tries to leave the office by 6:30. But quite often a call from his wife after 7 is required to drag him home to dinner. This, however, does not necessarily end his working day. After dinner, he may decide to spend a few hours checking precincts.

Many officers call this an example of his snooping and spying tactics. "The trouble with a big organization," Kennedy says, by way of reply, "is that there isn't much chance for face-to-face leadership." Be that as it may, these precinct checks have not increased his unimpressive popularity rating in the department. Several days ago, when asked if he had ever felt sorry for a man he had arrested or punished, he replied: "No. A police officer must have the objectivity in his work that precludes any personal feeling, no matter how distasteful the duty."

Away from work, the police commissioner is an unpretentious man, living modestly—well below the means of his $25,000 salary—and trying to catch up with cultural pleasures he had to forego as he worked and studied his way up through the ranks.

Very few of his colleagues would recognize in him the grandfatherly type who enjoys amusing colloquies with a boy who lives on the ground floor of the two-family, semi-detached home the Kennedys own in Bayside, Queens. One night, before bedtime, the boy ran upstairs and rapped on the door. Pinned to his pajamas, as he faced the husky police commissioner, was a badge.

"Mister Kennedy," he said with characteristic directness, "I'm a commissioner, too."

Commissioner Kennedy studied the shield, nodded, and began discussing police problems.

The boy interrupted brusquely: "You're the upstairs commissioner and I'm the downstairs commissioner."

Kennedy—whose son attends St. John's University, where the commissioner obtained his law degree, though he never practiced law—is friendly with adult neighbors as well as children. In the summer, while he mows his postage-stamp front lawn and struggles with his hedge and rose bushes, he preserves his warm relationship with the people he has known since he moved into the house in 1932.

"I'm a lousy gardener," he confesses. "But I like to fool around with the roses because it relaxes me." He also paints his own apartment for the same reason.

Theater and opera are probably the only major departures from the habits he formed during boyhood and youth in the Greenpoint section of Brooklyn, where he was born on October 27, 1906. He still looks back with nostalgia on the cold-water flats and the zestful neighborliness of those days. Particularly, he remembers how, when his mother had to be away for an evening, he would eat with the family of his future wife—they were Jewish. Just as often Hortense Goldberger would be fed by the Kennedys.

"I don't think," the commissioner remarked several days ago, "that people have as much fun in neighborhoods as we used to."

As for his two newly acquired diversions, theater and opera, the Commissioner and his wife particularly enjoy the latter. "We had to miss these things when I was working and going to school nights. Now we're trying to catch up," he says. But not even this strong musical enthusiasm can entirely subdue the instincts of the policeman. Thus, Tosca was, for Commissioner Kennedy, not merely the joy of hearing Tebaldi but also a study of police methods.

"Here's this Scarpia," he later told an acquaintance. "He's having his men torture the brains out of the poor guy and he's in the next room trying to have an affair with the fellow's girl." Clearly, he indicated, a violation of police rules.

One of the simple pleasures of Greenpoint for Hortense and Steve was to browse through the public library. Later, working as a stevedore, clerk, and secretary, he continued to pore over books. "You can't learn everything from experience," he says, "and sometimes it's much less painful to learn from a book."

His bookishness helped his police career, but hurt his popularity. "In those days," he recalls, "if you liked to read, they used to say: 'He's too much in the book department.' Now people realize books can help in police work."

This ability to absorb books helped Mr. Kennedy to rise by competitive examination from patrolman in 1929 to captain in 1945. One phase of his studies—at the FBI school in Washington—made a deep impression on him and, in turn, on many of those who judge him. He thinks highly of the FBI. A large segment of the city's police force thinks this organization greatly overrated.

The resultant clash of what he calls "philosophies of police work" may have been partly responsible for his transfer into civilian defense, from which he was elevated to chief inspector by Commissioner Adams in February 1954.

One evening, recently, as he reminisced about his career, he was asked if he had ever been offered a bribe.

"Nobody ever offered me a bribe. If a man is acute he can watch the danger signals and stop it beforehand."

Had he ever, as a boy, swiped anything—say, a potatoe from a stand to be baked in a vacant lot?

"Swipe!" he exclaimed. "I'd get killed. My father'd swat me so hard I'd see stars for 48 days."

Like father, like son. And any policeman the commissioner catches in dishonesty will be swatted unforgettably with a book Commissioner Kennedy places second only to the Bible—The Rules and Regulations of the Police Department of the City of New York.

CONGRATULATIONS TO POPE PIUS XII

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity belatedly to offer my congratulations to Pope Pius XII on the anniversary of his 80th birthday. March 2, 1956, was not only the anniversary of the Pope's birthday, but was also the 17th anniversary of his ascension to the papacy.

Mr. President, no historian of Arizona could help taking note of the tremendous part the Catholic Church has played in the settlement of my native State. In 1539 Father Marcos de Niza brought the cross into what is now Arizona, and in 1687, Father Kino introduced the practice of irrigation on the then wastelands of Arizona. He brought the first cattle and the first horses into what is now the United States, and he established the chain of missions which stretches across the desert of Arizona to California.

I did not want to let pass this opportunity to pay my respects to Pope Pius XII, leader of the Catholic Church who has been throughout his life a bright light of peace in a world which has often been shrouded in darkness.

Mr. President, I desire now to make a unanimous-consent request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

"GIVEAWAY" CHARGES AGAINST SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR McKAY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I had prepared, and which I intended to deliver on the floor of the Senate pertaining to "giveaway" charges against Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I have been prevented from delivering them on the floor of the Senate by the lengthy debate on the farm bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On January 31, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] inserted in the RECORD a telegram addressed to the President of the United States and signed by Richard Case, Robert Bagby, A. B. Hatch, and Harry Whitford.

I do not know these individuals. I have never heard of them before I read their names in the RECORD. But it was apparent that they were making outrageous charges against a member of the present administration, one of our most distinguished public servants, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

I determined that for the benefit of those who might be unwittingly misled as to the true facts, Secretary McKay would be afforded a full opportunity to set forth his reply in the RECORD.

Secretary McKay has now provided me with a copy of a letter which he has sent in reply to the telegram read here on January 29.

This letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1956.

Mr. RICHARD CASE,
Director, New York Conservation Council and Chairman, State Waterfowl Committee,
Kirkville, N. Y.

DEAR MR. CASE: A telegram to the President which you signed and presumably joined in composing has been called to my attention following its insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 31. I understand that a copy of the same telegram was also placed in the RECORD on January 19.

It is with considerable interest and surprise that I have read the unfounded allegations in the message concerning my administration of the affairs of the Department of the Interior.

Your telegram states that I have made persistent efforts to foster the exploitation and destruction of our national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges by commercial interests and by the Armed Forces of the United States.

The solitary piece of evidence that you offer to support this reckless charge is this statement:

"Moreover, the latest of these acts by the custodian of our public lands, whom you appointed, namely, the leasing of the wildlife refuges to oil and gas interests, specifically violates Mineral Leasing Act, Public Law 585, section 10, of the United States Congress, which states clearly that these lands can be leased for other purposes only in time of national emergency and then only by Presidential order."

I find it difficult to believe that you and your three associates in conservation work have been so completely misled by untruthful, politically inspired propaganda that you seem to have abandoned altogether the American concept of fair play. That you have been misled is the most charitable explanation I can find for your charge which is simply not true. I assume, of course, that you did not know it was untrue at the time that you signed your name to the telegram in which the statement is made. It is, nevertheless, amazing to me that an individual who purports to speak on behalf of 40 million citizens of the United States would make the gravest possible charge against the personal integrity of a public official without at least checking the facts.

For your present information, Public Law 585, 83d Congress, section 10 (6), reads as follows:

"(b) Operations on lands belonging to the United States: The Commission is authorized, to the extent it deems necessary to effectuate the provisions of this act, to issue leases or permits for prospecting for, exploration for, mining, or removal of deposits of fissionable source materials (or for any or all of these purposes) in lands belonging to the United States: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, such leases or permits may be issued for lands administered for national park, monument, and wildlife purposes only when the President, by Executive order, finds and declares that such action is necessary in the interest of national defense."

Need I point out to you, Mr. Case, that the reference here is specifically to leasing of the lands for exploration for, mining, or removal of deposits of, fissionable source materials?

Need I add, since you so declare in your telegram, that the leasing which you question was for the purpose of oil and gas development?

Because you appear to be misinformed about this matter, permit me to cite for you the facts and the law concerning oil and gas leasing on public lands in fish and wildlife reserves.

1. Lands within fish and wildlife reserves were subject to oil and gas leasing since the passage of the original Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437). The pertinent part of section 1 of that act reads as follows:

"That deposits of * * * oil, * * * or gas, and lands containing such deposits owned by the United States, including those in national forests, but excluding lands acquired under the act known as the Appalachian Forest Act, approved March 1, 1911 (36 Statutes, p. 961) and those in national parks, and in lands withdrawn or reserved for military or naval uses or purposes, except as hereinafter provided, shall be subject to disposition in the form and manner provided by this act to citizens of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof * * *."

It will be noted from the above that the basic law itself eliminates lands owned by the United States which are not subject to oil and gas leasing, and specifically mentions such lands as those described in the Appalachian Forest Act; those in national parks, and lands withdrawn or reserved for military or naval uses or purposes. It is clear from the above, that all other lands owned by the United States are subject to mineral leasing, including lands within fish and wildlife reserves.

The act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 950), which amended section 1 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, again excluded from the operation of the Mineral Leasing Act "lands acquired under the act known as the Appalachian Forest Act, approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), and those in incorporated cities, towns, and villages and in national forests and monuments, those acquired under other acts subsequent to February 25, 1920, and lands within the naval-petroleum and oil-shale reserves." Here again, the particular lands which are not subject to oil and gas leasing are specifically stated in the law. Fish and wildlife reserves are not excepted from the operation of the law. In fact, many prospecting permits, and leases within fish and wildlife reserves have been issued on the public domain since the passage of the basic law of February 25, 1920.

On August 31, 1953, action on most pending oil and gas applications within wildlife refuges was suspended in order that a study might be made with a view of revising the existing regulations to afford greater protection to the fish and wildlife reserves and at the same time offer an opportunity for the development of the mineral resources in these reserves under sound conservation principles. After more than 2 years of such study I approved the amended regulations now embodied in Circular No. 1945, which gives full protection to fish and wildlife areas by special stipulations embodied in each lease for the protection of such reserves.

2. Since the Mineral Leasing Act provides for issuance of the right to prospect for oil and gas on Fish and Wildlife reserved land, it is unreasonable to hold that the Department should indefinitely suspend the issuance of oil and gas leases in such lands. It

was therefore intended, when the suspension order was issued, that it would be removed when revised regulations are approved, which would give added protection to Fish and Wildlife Reserves. That such added protection is embodied in the new regulations is apparent from its provisions.

(a) These regulations eliminate from the operation of the leasing act Fish and Wildlife Reserves in Alaska on certain of the Aleutian Islands; in the Okefenokee Reserve in Georgia; in the Patuxent Reserve in Maryland; in the National Bison Range and Red Rock Lakes in Montana; in Fort Niobrara Reserve in Nebraska; in the Sullys Hill Reservation in North Dakota; in the Aransas and Santa Ana Reserves in Texas, and in the National Elk Reserve in Wyoming. In the above Fish and Wildlife Reserves no leases will be issued.

(b) These new regulations provide further protection to other reserves listed in appendix B of the regulations by requiring that no leases will be issued in this category unless a complete and detailed program for the area is submitted for approval of the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service in order to insure full protection of the particular values for which the reserve was established. These areas were designated by the Fish and Wildlife Service as wilderness, recreational, water development, or marsh, with respect to which oil and gas development without rigid control and under specific conditions might seriously impair or destroy the usefulness of the lands for wildlife conservation purposes.

In every instance where a lease is issued in conformance with these regulations, such lease will contain in addition to the other requirements the following special stipulations:

1. Geological and geophysical prospecting conducted on the leased premises shall be of a type and at a time satisfactory to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

2. No drilling operations shall be conducted under the lease until such lease has been committed to an approved unit plan. However, the Secretary may, in his discretion, permit or require drilling if he determines that a unit plan including the leased area cannot be secured and that drilling is necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(a) A unit agreement which includes lands administered for wildlife conservation shall contain a provision that no drilling operations may be conducted on the unitized portion of the Government-leased lands administered for wildlife conservation without the consent and approval of the Fish and Wildlife Service as to the time, place, and nature of such operations.

(b) In every instance, a plan of development which includes lands administered for wildlife conservation shall not be approved without the concurrence of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

(c) Lessees shall observe and comply with all State and Federal laws and regulations relating to wildlife and shall take such action as is necessary to assure observance and compliance with these laws and regulations by lessees, employees, and agents.

Moreover, action has been taken on December 22, 1955, by an order of the Acting Director of the Bureau of Land Management, which agency processes these leases, to supend action on oil and gas applications within fish and wildlife refuges included in reserves not mentioned in appendixes A or B of the recent regulations in order to give the Fish and Wildlife Service a further opportunity to add other reserves to these lists, either in appendix A, which would prohibit leasing, or in appendix B, which would permit leasing only after the Fish and Wildlife Service approves a plan of operation to give complete protection to the wildlife in such reserves.

3. The objection of the Wildlife Management Institute of Washington to the issuance of leases to be operated by the Frankfort Oil Co. in the Lacassine Water Power Reserve, Cameron Parish, La., on what it terms as "ridiculously low" royalty rates, and on a noncompetitive basis, must be based on both ignorance of the law and of the facts.

The royalty rates for noncompetitive leases is established by law and the Secretary of the Interior is without authority to increase the legal rate so established.

Section 5 of the act of August 8, 1946, under the provisions of which such leases issued, provides "such leases shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of 12½ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease."

The same section provides that "when the lands to be leased are not within any known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, the person first making application for the lease who is qualified to hold a lease under this act shall be entitled to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding."

The leases issued under the new regulations in which the Frankfort Oil Co. is the operator embrace acquired lands, as distinguished from the public domain. The act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913), known as the Acquired Land Leasing Act, provides that acquired lands "may be leased by the Secretary under the same conditions as contained in the leasing provisions of the Mineral Leasing Laws, subject to the provisions hereof." Consequently the provisions of the act of August 8, 1946, cited above, as to royalty and issuing leases noncompetitively apply. The Geological Survey reported the lands embraced in the so-called Frankfort Oil Co. leases as not being on a structure of a known oil or gas field. The Frankfort Oil Co. submitted a plan of operation prior to the issuance of the leases which was approved by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service. It is apparent, therefore, that I was bound by the law and could not issue these leases competitively, nor could I prescribe a royalty other than that prescribed in the law, to wit, 12½ percent.

4. As a matter of fact, the plan of operations submitted by the Frankfort Oil Co. and approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service when put in operation will enhance the value of the Lacassine Waterfowl Refuge and not destroy the wildlife or the lands in the reserve. While the plan is a lengthy one and would not be practical to quote in full, let me call your attention to some of its basic provisions. Among the adequate provisions made to preserve the ecological conditions and to improve the refuge are:

(a) No pollution or undesirable disturbance of the condition of impounded waters will result from the operations of the company.

(b) There will be no disturbance in the use by ducks and geese on the area in question if they choose to use the area.

(c) The operating program of the company is specifically designed to improve the attractiveness of the area in question as a resting place and feeding ground for wildlife, and particularly for migratory waterfowl, which up to the present have avoided the area in question, preferring the northern section of the refuge.

The whole plan is designed so that the company assume the responsibility for undertaking a mineral-development program which will satisfy the Department that the highest standards are met in the development and conservation of mineral and wildlife resources. In every condition of the lease and of the plan of operation the primary aim has been to permit operations only under such conservation measures as will insure the adequate utilization of the lands for the primary purposes for which they have been acquired or are being administered. No one who knows the facts could make the charge of lack of conservation of wildlife areas in the issuance of such oil and gas leases. Moreover, these amended regulations will insure that all future leases likewise will contain conditions which will protect in full measure wildlife areas, and where such protection cannot be assured in certain areas, no leases will issue.

It might be of interest to note that the greater part—60 percent—of the reserve is under active mineral development by nine companies. The mineral-development activities in the refuge now include nine producing wells all outside of the area leased. This is possible because when the United States purchased these lands the oil and gas rights were reserved by the original owners. Consequently, the United States has no jurisdiction over drilling in this area. It must be assumed that since drilling operations are now being conducted in the northern part of the refuge that sooner or later wells will be drilled near the southern part of the refuge adjoining the 40 percent of the area now covered by the Frankfort leases and may cause drainage of oil and gas from the area controlled by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Consequently, it was advantageous to the United States and to the preservation of the refuge area to issue leases and control operations thereunder, under a plan approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service which would give added protection to the area, than wait until drainage of oil or gas occurs when the United States would be compelled, in order to protect its oil and gas rights, to issue leases without the protection it now has.

If I appear, Mr. Case, to write you in some detail, I trust you will understand that I want to make unquestionably clear the facts and the law about which you have been so seriously misinformed.

As I have observed your erroneous reference to leasing of wildlife refuges as contrary to law, is the only piece of evidence of any sort that you offer to support the sweeping charges that you make in your telegram. I am forced to conclude that you have no other evidence to back up your unfounded generalizations. This is understandable, I might point out, since none exists.

At such a time as you might wish to learn something of my firm policy of carrying out vigorously my assigned responsibilities for the protection and development of our national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges, I am sure you cannot fail to be impressed by the facts of record.

I am proud of the record of accomplishments which have advanced the cause of conservation since this administration took office. Files of the Department contain numerous letters of commendation from conservationists and leaders of their national organizations who have taken the time to study this record objectively. I shall cite a few instances from this record of which you do not seem to be aware.

I strongly endorsed and the Department worked for the passage of Public Law 167 which the President has described as "one of the most important conservation measures affecting public lands that has been enacted in many years." This law ended abuses of the mining laws under which claims could be filed, not for bona fide mining purposes but for the purpose of obtaining claims or title to valuable timber, summer-home sites, or grazing land and water. Public Law 167 affords infinitely greater protection to timber resources in our national forests than has ever before been known.

Under this administration the National Park Service has embarked on the most comprehensive program of protection, improvement, and development in its history. We call this Mission 66, because it is a 10-year program designed to provide the National Park Service with all it needs to protect the parks and to provide for 80 million visitors by 1966. The program has been submitted to the Congress with the strong support of President Eisenhower.

The Park Service is operating in the current fiscal year with a budget 40 percent

higher than it had when I took office. The integrity of the system has been protected by my action in rejecting numerous proposals which would have intruded upon the natural beauty of park areas.

I have announced my unalterable opposition to the proposed transfer of lands of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge to the Department of the Army. Sincere conservationists have been fit to praise generously and on frequent occasion my efforts to preserve intact the boundaries of the Wichita Refuge.

You may recall a smear attack which was made on me a few months ago because the Department granted a temporary permit to the Navy for use of 49 acres in the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Area which covers a total of 28,500 acres. The permit was granted after protracted negotiations during which the Navy certified that use of the land was essential to the national security. Yet this was labeled a "McKay giveaway." I was interested to note that Mr. Fred M. Packard, executive secretary of the National Parks Association, has now reported in the current issue of National Parks magazine that he is convinced the Navy facility at Cape Hatteras is warranted.

I greatly regret that at least some of the facts that I have set forth were not in your possession at the time that you signed your recent telegram attacking me. I have the good faith to believe that if you had known these facts you would not have been moved to make statements and allegations that were unfortunately not only unsubstantiated but at variance with the truth.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————,

Secretary of the Interior.

I point out that Secretary McKay has been very kind and generous and charitable with the gentlemen who have directed a reckless and irresponsible attack against him.

As set forth in his letter, the facts speak for themselves.

There is nothing new about oil and gas leasing on certain wildlife refuges.

It has been authorized by law since 1920.

The very refuge about which so much has been said lately, the Lacassine Refuge in Louisiana, had nine producing wells on it before this administration came into office. These wells are on land where the mineral rights were retained by the owners at the time the land was incorporated in the refuge.

Except for the making of twisted political charges by enemies of Secretary McKay and the administration, I fail to see the difference between drilling for oil on land where the mineral rights are privately held and the drilling on land where the rights are held by the Government. Certainly there is no difference as far as the wildlife is concerned.

But the smear artists do not talk of the wells already operating in the refuge. Rather, they choose to hold up their hands in horror over some purported misdeed of the Secretary. They want to convey the impression that he has let down the bars to a hitherto untouched wilderness area which has never heard the voices of men or the sound of machines before. Quite the contrary is true as any reasonable examination of the facts will show.

The first Interior Department regulation under which leases were issued was signed in 1947 by a Secretary in the previous administration.

Because he found the 1947 regulations inadequate, Secretary McKay suspended them and ordered new ones drafted which would afford greater protection of the wildlife values in the refuges.

It was the announcement that these new regulations had been signed which touched off the present storm of abuse directed at the Secretary. His political opponents leaped at the opportunity to twist and distort his action in an effort to mislead many sincere conservationists.

In his reply to the attack made on him in the telegram to the President, Secretary McKay has very patiently explained the true facts regarding his administration of the affairs of the Interior Department, with particular reference to oil and gas leasing in wildlife refuges.

The gentlemen who signed the telegram charge that Secretary McKay has made persistent efforts to foster the exploitation and destruction of our national parks, forest, and wildlife refuges.

But, as Secretary McKay makes clear, they offer only one solitary piece of evidence to support this sweeping charge. And, Mr. President, that particular piece of evidence turns out to be completely baseless.

I have read with care Secretary McKay's detailed statement of the law and the facts about the policies of his Department regarding the issuance of oil and gas leases on wildlife. I suggest my colleagues do the same. The Secretary's letter makes crystal clear that he is carrying out in every respect the intent of Congress when it passed the laws which govern these matters.

Quite recently newspapers all over this country reprinted an editorial of the Laredo Times of Texas which described Secretary McKay as one of our greatest Secretaries of the Interior. Mr. President, I want to join today in endorsing that statement. Douglas McKay is doing an outstanding job and he deserves the heartfelt thanks of all Americans who are concerned with the wise conservation and sound development of our country's natural resources.

Under ordinary circumstances, it would therefore be disturbing to find individuals, describing themselves as Republicans, asking that the President remove this official from office.

In this case, however, it is not disturbing at all since the individuals in question are a mighty peculiar breed of Republicans if, indeed, they be Republicans at all. Certainly, their unwarranted charges in this instance have a distinct ring of the official New Deal campaign line.

And they have cast a grave shadow over every sportsman and sincere conservationist in the country by their resort to crude political methods in dealing with a subject which is not political in any sense and should be kept beyond the realm of partisan politics for the greatest good of all.

Here is the arrogant threat which they have served on the President of the United States:

"We don't like McKay. Because we don't like him, you must fire him. If you don't do our bidding, we will bring about the defeat of the Republican Party, regardless of candidate, in the next election."

These four individuals, who call themselves Republicans, threaten single-handedly to bring about the defeat of the Republican Party at the next election unless the President of the United States immediately does as they direct.

Who are these political wizards? I do not know them. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who has suddenly become solicitous of the welfare of the Republican Party, knows them. He introduced their telegram into the RECORD. He has been kind enough to warn us Republicans of the tremendous vote-manipulating power of these friends of his. I suspect that the Senator from Minnesota has really not changed his viewpoint or the philosophy for which he is well known in this chamber. As far as I know, he still plans to work for the election of a Democrat candidate. I suspect, therefore, he may have had his tongue in his cheek when he joined the authors of this telegram in warning the Republican Party as to what it would have to do, if it wants to win the next election.

The junior Senator from Minnesota has come here on the floor of the Senate bearing gifts but not gifts that we Republicans want to accept. And I don't think we are going to accept his kind words of political advice now, either.

These Republican friends of the Senator from Minnesota are not pikers. They promise to defeat the Republican Party—regardless of candidate. They don't care whom we run. They don't care, I presume, whom the Democrats run. They don't care about the issues. Their vote is for sale—for the price of firing McKay. It's as simple as that.

I don't know whether the Senator from Minnesota is going to take my advice any more than I am going to take his, but I suggest to him that he introduce his friends to the Democrat National Committee. Imagine how Paul Butler would welcome these men on his staff. He could get rid of Clayton Fritchey and the rest of his expensive propaganda machinery. He could junk the Democratic Digest. If he would simply turn the campaign over to these friends of the Senator from Minnesota, his worries would be over.

If the Senator from Minnesota doubts my word about this, let me read the proof that these friends of his offer the President of the United States to prove their awesome political power. Let me read from the telegram the Senator from Minnesota introduced into the RECORD:

"If you question our ability to muster votes for conservation, witness the defeat of amendment 7 in New York State last November by a majority of over 2 to 1, despite the efforts of politicians and selfish interests over a period of 30 years. It took us only 6 weeks to do that—we have 36 weeks to organize the 40 million purchasers of hunting and fishing licenses in the United States."

There you have it.

I rise to the defense of the sportsmen and conservationists of this country. They are not going to be led meekly to the polls by a group of disgruntled individuals masquerading as conservationists. I know thousands of sportsmen and conservationists. They are fine people. They are good citizens. Before they cast their votes they want the facts. They want to hear from many others besides a few who are quick to assess blame and loud in demanding redress of an imagined grievance before they have heard the whole story.

Incidents such as this lead me to suggest to my conservationist friends that they bear in mind in the months to come that this is an election year.

We have had ample warnings by now of the lengths to which the foes of the Eisenhower administration are willing to go in their frantic efforts to achieve their ends.

The devotion and the enthusiasm of conservationists for their cause makes them the natural objects of New Deal inflammatory propaganda. Reckless charges calculated to arouse their apprehension over the handling of our natural resources have been made in the past and, I am sure, will continue to be made in the future.

But I am confident that the many sincere conservationists throughout the country will resist all such attempts to use them and the great cause they represent for brazen political purposes.

They are going to get the facts, Mr. President, and they are going to weigh them carefully, and then they are going to vote for a Republican President, just as they did in 1952.

And as they do, I am sure they will be aware of the patient and untiring efforts of Secretary Douglas McKay to carry out the many responsibilities of his office in the face of a vicious and calculated smear campaign based on sly innuendo, misrepresentation and half-truths, or no truth at all.

They will be aware, for example, of the great new program for the development of the national parks, which was prepared under his direction and transmitted to Congress with the full endorsement of the President.

The program, known as Mission 66, will cost approximately $124 million during the next 10 years. It is designed to equip the parks to handle 80 million visitors by 1966.

One of the first acts of this administration, insofar as our national parks are concerned, was to reverse the 15-year trend of neglect which was touched off by World War II and prolonged by the Korean conflict.

Today, under the administration of Secretary McKay, the national park system is larger, more adequately staffed, and more efficiently administered than it ever has been.

Since this administration entered office in January 1953, more than 130,000 acres have been added to the park system. The Park Service currently is operating on a budget approximately 40 percent higher than when this administration came into office.

Mention of this administration's record in the field of conservation would not be complete without calling attention to the manner in which the integrity of the park system has been protected under Secretary McKay.

For example, the Department rejected efforts to obtain permits to build tramways at Mount Rainier National Park, Rocky Mountain National Park, Crater Lake National Park, and Grand Canyon National Park.

The Department has rejected efforts to modify the newly extended boundaries of Olympic National Park.

The Department has rejected efforts to open Joshua Tree National Monument to mineral prospecting and mining, or to abolish it altogether. Protection of this area was strengthened when 10,000 acres inside the monument boundaries were acquired in exchange for 10,000 acres of federally owned grazing land outside the monument.

Negotiations with the Department of the Navy resulted in withdrawal of a proposal to use a considerable portion of Death Valley National Monument as an aerial gunnery range.

I believe that Mission 66 will prove to be the finest contribution to national parks since the Service was established in 1916.

The Department has also established 8 new wildlife refuges, and 3 more are in the process of being established. During the last fiscal year wildlife refuges received the largest allocation of funds ever made for acquisition, development, and maintenance.

Since this administration took office, nearly 80,000 additional acres have been acquired for wildlife preservation through purchase, lease, or transfer of federally owned lands.

Under this administration, Federal wildlife refuges have been established for the first time in Kansas and Colorado. New lands have been added to the Federal refuge program in Louisiana, North Dakota, Kentucky, Tennessee, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, Florida, Maine, Oregon, Idaho, Michigan, and New York.

In the 6 years preceding this administration, 36 wildlife refuges were abolished. The total Federal wildlife reserves were reduced by 408,527 acres during that period.

These are only a few of the facts of record regarding the work and achievements of Secretary McKay and the Interior Department in protecting our most precious heritage, the natural resources of this country. They are worthy of the attention of all members of the conservation movement and I know that when the facts have been studied, the true story will begin to emerge of how a courageous public servant has struggled to fulfill the responsibilities of his office, too often receiving smear and slander as his only reward.

THE STATUS OF FORCES TREATY—AMERICANS SUBJECT TO FOREIGN LAWS NOT COMPATIBLE WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning brings to mind a very important treaty, a treaty which vitally affects the welfare of many of our people, especially those in the Armed Forces.

GI TRIED IN FOREIGN COUNTRY

That treaty is the Status of Forces Treaty which provides that a member of our Armed Forces who is charged with a crime in a foreign country must be tried under the laws of that country where the crime is alleged to have been committed.

This treaty has been condemned by many patriotic organizations and thoughtful persons in the United States, including the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Business and Professional Women, and many others.

Under this treaty, if a GI commits a crime in one of the Middle East countries, he may have his hand amputated for stealing a loaf of bread, for example.

THE EDITORIAL

The editorial is entitled "Mr. Bow's Curved Ball." It reads in part as follows:

A dangerous move to undermine the North Atlantic Alliance is underway in the House of Representatives. Under the pretense of protecting the rights of American armed personnel abroad, Representative Bow and a number of his colleagues are pushing a resolution that would direct the President to denounce or revise the Status of Forces Treaty. Success for this venture would leave NATO in a condition of uncertainty that it might not be able to survive.

NATO: THE ATLANTIC TREATY

NATO never was in a position to survive. It was stillborn, because it guaranteed something which all the power of the United States cannot guarantee, that is, the status quo and the integrity of the colonial slavery system throughout the world.

How does it do that? Through our guaranty to go to war when the empire-minded nations of Europe, England, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium are at war. We have no control over how they get into war. How are they going to get into war? As has been amply demonstrated during the life of the treaty, by defending their colonial slavery system.

We broke away from England's colonial slavery system in 1776—the first break in the system. Yet we agree to assist holding other nations under the system.

This treaty is very dangerous to the welfare of the United States and to its citizens in our Armed Forces.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has asked me to yield to him for 20 or 25 minutes. If there is no objection on the part of the acting majority leader, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana for 25 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not wish to object, but before the Senator from Montana proceeds I should like to inform the acting majority leader that it is my intention to speak on the farm bill tomorrow. I give notice that I intend to speak on the bill tomorrow.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to have the floor tomorrow following the conclusion of the morning business, to make an address on the farm question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that he be permitted to yield to the Senator from Montana for 25 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Agricultural Act of 1956.

There are involved in any discussion of the farm bill extremely important issues beyond the field of agriculture itself.

The action taken by Congress on this measure will affect the national economy, from small town main streets to major industrial centers. It will establish precedents in the field of resources conservation. It can have a marked effect on our international relationships, and our efforts to establish peace throughout the world.

In our consideration of this measure, therefore, we need to bear in mind, in addition to the serious economic plight of the farmers, the effect that a continued agricultural depression can have on our national economy. We need to examine the sort of resources conservation policy we are establishing. And we need to measure the effect which either surplus dumping, or excessive restriction of our food production, may have on our foreign policy in a hungry world.

Although I shall support a number of amendments, I regard the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry greatly superior to the proposals made to it by the Secretary of Agriculture for the administration. The administration proposals did not provide any real net additions to farm income. Our committee, by restoring 90-percent supports and dual parity, has provided for some additional net to farmers and I congratulate them for it.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE FARM SITUATION

There is a great deal of evidence that the present deflation of farmers, and the effort to keep farm prices low regardless of consequences in agriculture, is a deliberate and positive part of overall administration economic policy.

Political capital was made in the summer and fall of 1952—although price indexes had been stable then for many months—about inflation and 50-cent dollars. Campaign promises were made that inflation would be stopped and the

purchasing power of the dollar would be stabilized.

In the spring of 1953, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in one of his reports for the now nonexistent Independent Party, warned us that deliberate deflation of agriculture could be expected.

The Senator called our attention to a study that had just been issued by the New York Clearing House Association, composed of the New York banks which were providing key officials for the new administration. The study was entitled "The Federal Reserve Reexamined." This elaborately printed study came to this conclusion:

> The major challenge * * * is the problem of resisting those forces tending to debase the value of money and combating them effectively whenever they are in the ascendant.

The study listed as "more important" inflationary factors—factors that had to be fought—Government spending and debt, loan programs, the full employment goal, demands of labor for wage increases in excess of productivity gains and "support of agricultural prices at high parity levels."

This study was a blueprint of the hard-money policy which the administration instituted in its early months. Interest rates were increased both on what the Government borrowed and on the Government lending programs, including housing loans and agricultural credit programs. In March and April 1953, a slide in farm product prices was started. The Commodity Credit Corporation reduced the price on one of its large feed holdings, cottonseed meal, from $80 per ton to $57 per ton. This caused the market price of this important feed ingredient to break $10 per ton in the Memphis, Tenn., market during the week of April 16, 1953. The Commodity Credit Corporation sold more than 700,000 tons of this meal, thereby weakening the prices of other oilmeals and feed. This was the beginning of the deliberately induced slide of farm prices, which has been kept going by reduction of dairy price supports, reduction of the various feed and oilmeal price supports, and, finally, reduction of the supports of basic commodities, which were held to 90 percent of parity through 1954 by the farm law.

The record does not bear out the contentions that the "sliding scale" did not become effective until 1955. The slide started on nonbasic commodities with the cottonseed meal deals of 1953. The low price policy for agriculture has been pursued since early 1953.

The drastic monetary and fiscal policies adopted early in 1953 by the new administration induced a recession, and those policies were moderated within a few months. Making money scarce and dear by interest boosts proved to have such serious effects in the business world that this means of achieving a stable dollar was deemphasized.

Although there have been continuing attacks on labor wage levels, such as Secretary of Agriculture Benson's frequent illusions to "soft wage increases," the administration has found it either unwise or impossible to drive labor's wages down.

The New York bankers' blueprint did not call for any limitations on profiteering or excessive business profits, and no effort to impose such limitations was to be anticipated with businessmen "here in the saddle," as Secretary of the Interior McKay put it. That area of action to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar was not even to be considered.

The result of experience with the administration application of its hard-money policy has been that farmers almost alone have been deflated—and the farmers have been bled absolutely white—to keep the administration pledge of a stable dollar. Small business has suffered as a result of the decline of purchasing power of its customers and the ruthless competition of big business. But in the area of price deflation, the farmers have been made to foot the whole bill not only of dollar stability, but the cost of higher prices and higher profits for the big-business men who are here in the saddle.

A look at the cost-of-living index, maintained by the United States Department of Labor, shows the situation.

The cost of living has gone up eight-tenths of 1 percent between 1952 and 1955. The index stood at 113.5 for the year 1952 and at 114.5 for the year 1955. The only item in the whole index which showed any decline was food. The consumer price of foods was off 3 percent. Housing, rent, medical care, transportation, electricity and gas, solid fuels and fuel oil and household operation had climbed from 1 to 11 percent.

Cost of housing was up 5 percent.

Rent was up 11 percent.

Medical care costs have gone up 8 percent.

Electricity and gas are up 6 percent.

Solid fuels and fuel oil are up 5 percent.

The cost of household operations is up 7 percent.

Whatever stability there has been in the total cost of living index has been achieved by the deduction of other rises from payments for food produced by the farmers.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a table of the changes between 1952 and 1955 in this index.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cost of living index

	1952	1955	Percent change
All items	113.5	114.5	+0.8
Food	114.6	110.9	−3
Housing	114.6	120.0	+5
Rent	117.9	130.3	+11
Medical care	117.2	128.0	+9
Transportation	126.2	126.3	+.08
Electricity and gas	104.5	110.7	+6
Solid fuels and fuel oil	118.7	125.2	+5
Household operations	111.8	119.1	+7

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the New York Times, in an article by Richard Rutter which appeared in the January 26, 1956, issue, challenged a statement in the President's Economic Report, which had just been released, contending that a record business boom had been accomplished without the accompanying specter of inflation.

The Times article continued:

> But had it?
>
> Almost daily for the past few months, news articles carried reports of significant price increases. These have occurred mainly in industrial commodities, but some consumer items have been affected.

The article then pointed out that with the single exception of food:

> Every other item in the cost-of-living yardstick—apparel, housing, gas and electricity, transportation, services, and the like—has risen substantially.

The Times concluded:

> So the apparent stability in the cost of living has been entirely due to a decline in food costs.

The cost to farmers of the consumer savings on food has been a great deal more than the 3 percent finally reflected to the housewife. Before the lower food prices reached the consumers, to offset and absorb the price increases of all other categories of consumer prices, the processors and distributors of food products took advantage of a heavy share of the farmers' losses. Farm prices have dropped from 100 percent of parity in 1952 to 80 percent at the last report. This is a decline of 20 percent in the farm price level to get through just a 3 percent decline in consumer food prices.

On February 28 the Associated Press carried a story to all the newspapers of the Nation announcing that administration economists were sticking to their claim of no inflation in spite of price increases in coal, copper, lumber, fuel oil, tin, rubber, rayon, and many others.

The press agency reported:

> Official statistics support Mr. Eisenhower's views (that there has been no inflation). Although almost all family budget items except food rose during 1955, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Index climbed only four-tenths of 1 percent for the year.

The story continues:

> Food, representing 30 percent of the index, dropped seven-tenths of 1 percent last year and almost 5 percent in the last 4 years. That movement reflects in part the 5-year, 25 percent slump in prices received by farmers. It probably has prevented living costs from moving up past the record set in October 1953.

Mr. President, a careful reading of this article will confirm the familiar fact that the farmers have had to pay the bill, both for the alleged stability of living costs and for swollen profits. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 28, 1956]

UNITED STATES SPIKES INFLATION TALK AS PRICES RISE SLIGHTLY

(By Sterling F. Green)

Government economists today stuck to their forecasts of no inflation while reporting prices still are edging up generally, with falling food costs obscuring the rise.

The consumer price index for January, issued last week, showed a slight decline for the second successive month. The drop was caused primarily by lower meat and grocery bills.

But price increases have occurred recently in many basic industries—coal, copper, lumber, fuel oil, tin, rubber, and rayon, among others. There is trade talk of possible rises in steel and aluminum.

SEEMING CONFLICT

This might seem to conflict with President Eisenhower's assertion, in the economic message to Congress a month ago, that record income and production levels were achieved in 1955 without the specious aid of price inflation.

Official statistics support Mr. Eisenhower's views. Although almost all family budget items except food rose during 1955, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Index climbed only four-tenths of 1 percent of the year.

Food, representing 30 percent of the index, dropped seven-tenths of 1 percent last year and almost 5 percent in the past 4 years.

That movement reflects in part the 5-year, 25 percent slump in prices received by farmers. It probably has prevented living costs from moving up past the record set in October, 1953. In that month the index stood at 115.4 percent of the 1947–4 average; today's index is 114.6.

The wholesale index, watched more closely by businessmen because it covers the materials of production, has risen more rapidly—about 1.5 percent in the past 12 months. Not counting farm products and processed foods, the basic industrial commodities rose more than 4 percent in 1955. Meats skidded 17 percent and processed foods dropped 5 percent.

TREND IS UPWARD

Some high-ranking Government economists report that they expect more of the same during at least the early part of 1956. They make one important exception: Farm prices, they agree, may stabilize but probably will not rise appreciably this year.

"For a time we expect a continuation of what we've been having," said one economist. "The general trend is upward and it still has momentum."

Continued rises are expected in many of the consumer costs which increased last year.

Why, then, do Government economists expect a fair degree of consumer price stability? They give these reasons among others:

Part of the higher cost will be absorbed by the manufacturers because sales competition is getting keener. Corporation profits, which in 1955 were the second highest in history, may be shaved. Retailers may be obliged to trim their margins, though many are already complaining of a profit squeeze.

RISE IN PRODUCTIVITY

Rising productivity—more goods per worker per hour—will offset another portion of the increased labor and materials expense. Investment in plant mechanization and labor-saving machinery has been at record levels, and is continuing.

Auto prices are likely to stay stable. Competition for volume sales remains keen and, as one official observed, "there are just too many cars running around." Housing costs still are rising but the industry is becoming concerned over the possibility of pricing itself out of the market.

In the household-appliance field, officials report, there is little opportunity to mark up price tags. Consumers are well stocked; they can afford to wait for bargains and react adversely to price boosts.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the deliberate nature of this policy of deflation of agriculture is reflected in every administration statement on the subject.

Secretary Benson has repeatedly contended that the low prices would be the farmers' salvation; that they would increase per capita consumption of foods and cause the farmers to reduce production. The President, in his 1954 message, offered only the reassurance that abrupt declines in farm prices would be avoided. Here in Congress, we have heard leaders praise the "graduality" of the farm deflation as the great virtue of the Eisenhower-Benson farm policy. They have never talked of maintaining or restoring farm prices. They talk only of letting them go on down—gradually.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson in recent months has attempted to turn the wrath of farmers, aroused by the deliberate deflation of their prices and income, against labor by referring to "round after round" of "soft" labor wage increases.

But the Secretary's charges in this area have made little headway, for another administration spokesman, the Commissioner of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, has publicly stated that manufacturing output per man-hour rose 10 percent from 1953 to 1955. Average hourly wages of production workers in manufacturing rose 6 percent in those years.

What has risen are the profits of the businessmen who, as Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay said in an address to the United States Chamber of Commerce, which was tape recorded, are "here in the saddle."

Corporation profits are up 18 percent before taxes and up 32 percent after taxes.

Dividends paid to stockholders are up 19 percent.

The fact is that in the third quarter last year dividends paid to stockholders passed the total net income of the Nation's farm operators. In the fourth quarter, dividends paid stockholders were at a rate of $2 billion more per annum than total net farm income.

The only time before in our national history when this situation prevailed was in the period from 1930 through 1932.

It should be unnecessary to have to describe the national economic situation in those years, but apparently some people have forgotten them. Our Nation was in the deepest economic difficulties in its history. Stock market values based on pure speculative fever, in face of declining agricultural income and purchasing power, had collapsed. There was a Farm Holiday Association spreading in the Middle West, just as there is a National Farmers Organization spreading through that area today. We were undergoing the Hoover depression.

I am aware that any effort to warn the administration and the Congress of serious economic consequences of their policies, subjects one to the risk of being described as a "prophet of gloom and doom." But someone must take that risk. I do not predict a depression. There is still time to make economic adjustments and avoid a great economic catastrophe. But adjustments must be made. The parallels between the twenties and the early thirties are too numerous to be ignored. And unless adjustments are made, including a rebuilding of the income of the farmers, serious consequences to the whole economy are inevitable.

There is immediate need for action both to raise agricultural income and also to halt profiteering by big monopolistic enterprises in this Nation which so thoroughly control basic industries that they are able to raise their prices and maintain their excessive profits in the face of surpluses even greater than those in agriculture.

An investigation by labor economists of Secretary Benson's recent allusions to soft wage increases has yielded a very significant picture of what is going on in our economy.

Mr. Donald Montgomery, director of the Washington office of the United Automobile Workers, summarized these findings in an address to the Pacific Northwest Farm Forum at Spokane, Wash., a few days ago—on February 13. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks and analysis appear at this point in the RECORD. It is an excellent showing that profiteering—not soft wage increases—is boosting prices.

There being no objection, the remarks and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY PROFITEERING IS RAISING FARMERS' COSTS

(By Donald Montgomery, director, Washington office, United Automobile Workers, at Pacific Northwest Farm Forum, Spokane, Wash., February 13, 1956)

I

They are laying workers off at automobile plants, 8,500 in December, more than 28,000 in January.

General Motors says car production will be cut 12 percent this year.

One explanation is—farmers are not buying as many cars as they would like to buy. Falling farm income is responsible.

This is one good and practical reason why organized labor does not like what is happening to farmers, and why they would like to do something about it.

Since the war, wages, profits and dividends have been going up; farm income has been going down. This sharp movement in opposite directions of two major divisions of our economy creates, as we see it, nothing less than a national emergency. Drastic action is called for. The remedy, obviously, is to get the farm economy back into line with the rest of us.

How to do that I can't tell you. That's farmers' business. My assignment here, as I interpret it, is to answer Secretary of Agriculture Benson's charge that labor's wage increases are putting the bite on farmers. As background for that, I ask you first to look at the important postwar trends within our economy.

The last 3 years (1952–55) in this postwar period show some marked differences from the first 5 (1947–52).

Postwar trends in the American economy

	Wages and salaries	Corporation profits		Corporation dividends	Net income of farm operators from farming
		Before taxes	After taxes		
1947 ..... billion dollars	125.2	29.5	18.2	6.5	17.2
1952 ..... do	190.5	35.9	[1] 16.1	9.0	14.0
1955 [2] ..... do	221.9	44.5	[1] 22.2	12.6	10.6
Change from 1947 to 1952 ..... percent	+52.2	+21.7	−11.5	+38.5	−18.6
Change from 1952 to 1955 [2] ..... do	+16.5	+24.0	+37.9	+40.0	−24.3
Change from 1947 to 1555 [2] ..... do	+77.2	+50.8	+22.0	+93.8	−38.4

[1] Excess profits tax on corporations was imposed as of July 1950 and expired Dec. 31, 1953.
[2] 1955 figures are for 4th quarter of the year, seasonally adjusted, annual rate.

Wages went up more rapidly than profits in the earlier period; profits took over the lead in the last 3 years. We were promised a business administration in the 1952 campaign, and that's what we got.

Excess profits taxes were imposed on corporations in the first period, taken off in the second.

Farm income fell $630 million a year in the earlier period, $1,150 million a year in the second. The business administration we were promised, and got, doesn't seem to treat farming as a business.

Most dramatic fact of the last 3 years is that total dividends paid out to corporation stockholders caught up to and passed the total net income of farm operators. That happened in the third quarter of last year. In the fourth quarter, dividends exceeded farm income by $2 billion, or 19 percent.

Only once before have American stockholders received more income from their shares of stock than American farmers have earned out of their land and labor. That was in the years 1930 to 1932.

We were in trouble, deep trouble, in those years. Is there a warning to us in the fact that, once again, stockholding has become a more profitable occupation than the business of providing the United States with its foods and fibers?

II

Topic of your conference this year is the farm cost-price squeeze. Secretary of Agriculture Benson has been talking about that. More than once he has said that labor's wage increases have caused the rising costs that are hurting farmers.

I welcome the opportunity to refute that charge. But, in passing, I want also to comment on Mr. Benson's attempt to make farmers believe that the rising costs of the things they buy are hurting them more than the low prices they are getting for what they have to sell.

Mr. Benson's official publications, if you examine them, will show you that falling farm prices accounted for 12 of the 14 points by which the farm parity ratio has fallen since he took office—from 94 percent of parity in January 1953 to 80 percent of parity today. Rising industrial prices knocked only 1 point off of this parity ratio. Higher taxes and interest charges knocked off the other point.

Lower prices received and higher prices paid are the 2 jaws of the vise that is squeezing farmers. Figures published by Mr. Benson's Department show how the 2 jaws bite.

Farm prices were at 94 percent of parity when Mr. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture in January 1953. They are at 80 percent of parity today.

The indexes which his Department constructs for measuring this parity ratio show that:

1. Prices received by farmers fell 15.7 percent. If the prices farmers pay had remained stationary, this fall in prices received would have brought the parity ratio down from 94 percent 3 years ago to 79 percent today.

2. The prices farmers pay did not remain stationary. Prices paid for the commodities which originate on farms—food, feed, seed and livestock—went down 10 percent. This raised the parity ratio from 79 percent to 82 percent. Thus the combined net effect of falling farm prices over the 3 years was to reduce the parity ratio by 12 points, from 94 percent to 82 percent.

3. Prices farmers pay for industrial products went up 3 percent, on the average. This brings the parity ratio down from 82 percent to 81 percent. And that, to date, has been the total net effect of the price increases which Mr. Benson has been talking about.

4. Interest and taxes paid by farmers went up, on the average, more than 20 percent over these 3 years. This knocked the parity ratio down 1 more notch, to 80 percent, and that's where it is today.

5. Wages paid by farmers to hired labor went up 1½ percent and had only slight effect (two-tenths of a point) on the parity ratio.

Changes from January 1953 to January 1956 in indexes used by Department of Agriculture for computing parity ratio

[1910-14 equals 100]

	January 1953	January 1956	Percent change
Prices received by farmers	268	226	−15.7
Prices, etc., paid by farmers	284	281	−1.1
Commodities of farm origin:			
Food and tobacco	266	260	−2.3
Feed	244	200	−18.0
Seed	264	228	−13.6
Livestock	341	270	−20.8
Weighted average			−10.0
Commodities of industrial origin:			
Automobiles (family use)	285	301	+5.6
Motor vehicles (farm use)	359	375	+4.4
Farm machinery	310	323	+4.1
Motor vehicle supplies	157	163	+3.8
Farm supplies	288	269	−6.6
Building materials and fencing	350	367	+4.9
Fertilizer	157	152	−3.2
Clothing	301	312	+3.7
Household operation	191	198	+3.7
House furnishings	275	273	−0.7
Building materials	380	398	+4.7
Weighted average			+3.0
Other costs:			
Taxes	371	432	+16.4
Interest payments	117	152	+30.0
Wages to hired labor	514	522	+1.5
Weighted average			+6.7

I don't want to make little of any increase in farmers' costs, especially under present conditions of farm income. The higher costs farmers are being forced to pay are not justifiable and I shall not try to justify them. But unjustifiable as they are, and much as they ought to be stopped, I trust Mr. Benson will not persuade farmers to accept the present low level of farm prices as normal.

Speaking at New Orleans last September, Mr. Benson said, "I am deeply disturbed by any action which adds even 1 penny to the production costs of farmers at this time."

We share that concern with Mr. Benson, even when he narrows it down to the last penny. More than that, we want to do something about it. We know, however, from figures published by his Department, that for every penny which higher prices of automobiles, trucks, and farm machinery have taken from farmers' pockets during the last 3 years, the falling prices of farm products have taken 20 pennies. We wish Mr. Benson had been deeply disturbed about that while it was going on—deeply enough to do something about it and to stop it.

Sharpest increase in all the rising costs imposed upon farmers over these 3 years was the cost of interest payments. They rose 30 percent. Mr. Benson did do something about that. He raised interest rates. To make the money supply tight and interest rates high has been an open and proud purpose of this administration. Mr. Benson has served that purpose loyally, on several occasions. He speaks with ill grace about other farm costs if he forgets what he and his administration have done to raise this one.

I propose now to refute Mr. Benson's charge.

III

For a general answer to the charge that wage increases have forced manufacturers to raise their prices, I rely on Annual Survey of Manufacturers published by the Census Bureau in the Department of Commerce, covering the years 1947 to 1953.

This survey shows that, for manufacturing as a whole, wages paid to production workers account for only 40 percent of the value added by manufacture. Value added is the difference between the sales value of manufactured products and the cost of materials, fuel, power, etc., purchased by manufacturers.

An important fact for our discussion today is that in most of the industries whose products constitute major cost items for farmers, wages took a smaller portion of this value added in 1953 than in 1947.

Value added in selected manufacturing industries and wages of production workers, 1947 and 1953

[Dollars in millions]

	1947	1953	Percent change
I. Steel works and rolling mills:			
Value added by manufacturing	$2,276	$4,626	+103.3
Wages of production workers	$1,338	$2,214	+65.5
Percent, wages to value added	58.8	47.9	
II. Motor vehicles and parts:			
Value added by manufacturing	$3,577	$6,938	+94.0
Wages of production workers	$1,688	$3,083	+82.6
Percent, wages to value added	47.2	44.4	
III. Tractors:			
Value added by manufacturing	$332	$678	+104.2
Wages of production workers	$178	$266	+49.4
Percent, wages to value added	53.6	39.2	
IV. Farm machinery (excluding tractors):			
Value added by manufacturing	$422	$582	+37.9
Wages of production workers	$204	$244	+19.6
Percent, wages to value added	48.3	41.9	

I think you will agree that when labor's share of the total manufacturing spread goes down, it cannot be accused of having forced manufacturers to raise their prices.

Perhaps the most interesting thing shown in these reports bearing on the relation of wages to prices is that labor's share of the manufacturing spread has been falling in the high-wage industries, like steel, automobiles, farm-machinery tractors and farm machinery, but it has been rising in low-wage industries like textiles, wearing apparel, paper, and leather. There are exceptions, but this is the general rule.

This may surprise you; it doesn't surprise us. High wages do not automatically translate themselves into high labor costs. On the contrary, the high-wage industries tend to hold labor costs down by using modern technology to make manpower more productive.

In any event, the broad evidence is that from 1947 to 1953 wage increases could not have been responsible for the price increases that occurred in the industries whose products figure most heavily in farm costs.

Since 1953, output per man-hour in manufacturing as a whole has been rising more rapidly than wages per man-hour. This was stated recently in a public speech by the Commissioner of Labor Statistics whose office has been studying the subject intensively. He says manufacturing output per man-hour rose 10 percent from 1953 to 1955. Average hourly wages of production workers in manufacturing rose 6 percent in these years.

These two facts together mean that although the wage per hour went up the labor cost per unit of output went down. This disproves the charge that wage increases have forced manufacturers to raise their prices.

Mr. Benson has his own opinion. He has said several times recently that our wage increases are larger than the gains in output per man-hour. As if he knew. Of course he doesn't know, but he had to say this in order to back up his unfounded charge that wage increases are compelling farmers to pay higher prices for industrial products.

IV

Now, getting down to cases, I shall be specific. Wage increases in the summer of 1955 were deliberately seized upon by important companies and industries as an opportunity to increase their prices without justification and try to make labor the scapegoat for their profiteering.

I start with the steel industry because that is where the profiteering parade started. In July 1955, the United States Steel Corp., leader of the industry, blew the whistle and the parade took off.

When United States Steel signed its 1955 wage contract, its prices were already so high that it was making profits one-third larger than in 1953, the best previous year in its history, and 73 percent above its average profits of the 7 postwar years (excluding 1952, the year of the long strike). United States Steel's profits after taxes when it signed the contract were double the average of the postwar years.

The price increase of $7.50 a ton which United States Steel put into effect upon signing the wage agreement was almost three times as much as the cost of the wage increase.

It was worth at least $95 million of increased revenue to United States Steel in the second half of 1955. Cost of the wage increase in the same period was around $34 million. That gives you an idea of the money that can be made by parlaying a wage increase into a price increase—$60 million in half a year.

United States Steel could have reduced its prices $7.50 a ton for the entire year 1955, instead of raising them $7.50 in the second half, and would have come out of the year with more profit after taxes than the $222 million it made in the best previous year of its long history, 1953.

After raising wages and prices in July, United States Steel proceeded in the second half of the year to surpass the sizzling profit record it had established in the first half year.

The indisputable fact is that United States Steel has been, and still is, using the 1955 wage contract to fatten its profits at the expense of its customers—the industries that convert steel into the things which you and I buy.

This is a repeat performance on the part of United States Steel. It did the same thing with wage increases in 1949 and 1953 and 1954. Only it did it in a bigger way this time.

The rest of the steel industry has not been far behind United States Steel in turning the wage increase into a rich source of profits at the expense of its customers. Financial reports for 1955 from 11 of the largest steel companies show that profits (after taxes) of the industry as a whole will top the best previous year, 1950, by almost 40 percent and the 7-year postwar average by 75 percent.

	Profits before taxes	Profits after taxes
United States Steel Corp. profits:		
1st half 1955	$356,878,000	$177,878,000
2d half 1955	379,320,000	192,320,000
Year 1955	736,197,625	370,197,625
Best prior year, 1953	545,087,840	222,087,840
Postwar average (1947–54) [1]	412,933,000	177,138,000
Steel-industry profits, 20 companies having 90 percent of total steel capacity):		
1955, 9 months	1,412,400,000	712,300,000
1955, full year, estimated [2]	1,996,900,000	1,007,000,000
Best prior years:		
1953	1,833,000,000	615,200,000
1950	1,500,900,000	713,000,000
Postwar average (1947–54) [1]	1,224,600,000	571,400,000

[1] Excluding the strike year, 1952.
[2] Based on full-year reports of 11 companies having 80 percent of total steel capacity, and 9-month reports of companies having 90 percent of total steel capacity.

The steel industry is private enterprise, but this kind of price gouging is no private matter. Higher steel prices become higher costs for many other industries. You and I don't often buy a piece of rolled steel as such, but whenever the price of steel goes up we pay it, again and again in hundreds of things we buy. As, for example, automobiles and farm implements.

Like United States Steel, General Motors announced last summer that its 1955 wage contract would force it to raise prices. Prices on the 1956 models were advanced about 5 percent.

This is undoubtedly the most fantastic example in the whole long history of wage-price fakery.

When General Motors signed the contract to raise wages 21 cents an hour, it was making a profit of $3.20 for every hour worked by every one of its more than 400,000 production workers in the United States.

When General Motors told the public it had to raise prices, it was saying in effect, that it could not absorb this cost of 21 cents and hour out of a profit of $3.20 an hour.

GM cracked the billion-dollar-profit barrier last year, for the first time in the history of corporations. Its profits of $1,189,000,000, after taxes gave it a return of 35 percent on its investment. Its profits before taxes—the profits it collects from its customers—exceeded $2.5 billion, 40 percent more than it had ever made in any year of its highly profitable history.

Instead of raising prices 5 percent in the fourth quarter, GM could have reduced prices 5 percent and still earn 16 percent on its investment.

Ford Motor Co. took similar advantage of the wage increase to put over higher prices on the public.

Earning $3.06 in profit for every hour worked by its production workers, it said it could not absorb 21 cents an hour of increased wages.

The first financial report ever made public by Ford Motor Co. covers the 9 months ended last September 30. It shows that a 5 percent increase would have been worth $197 million in that period, whereas a 21-cent-an-hour wage increase would have cost only $45 million.

So they exact from their customers more than four times the cost of the wage increase and then blame their higher prices on the workers.

Ford, too, could have reduced prices instead of raising them. Its 1955 profits will be more than 2½ times its annual average profits of the postwar years.

	Profits before taxes	Profits after taxes
General Motors Corp. profits:		
1955	$2,539,000,000	$1,189,000,000
Best prior year, 1950	1,812,000,000	834,000,000
Postwar average, 1947–54	1,323,000,000	586,000,000
Ford Motor Co. profits:		
1955, 9 months	689,400,000	312,200,000
1955, full year estimated [1]	896,200,000	405,900,000
Best prior year, 1950	540,600,000	260,300,000
Postwar average, 1947 to 1954	345,900,000	158,100,000

[1] Estimated as 1.3 times the reported profits for 9 months.

Ford Motor Co. not only raised car and truck prices, it took the lead in launching a 7-percent price increase on tractors, which apparently set the price pattern for the farm-machinery industry.

What is the wage-price-profit picture in farm machinery? Profits are thinner in this industry. The reason is obvious. Too many of its customers are farmers.

However, we challenge this industry, too, to prove that it could not have absorbed the 1955 wage increase without raising prices. Harvester's latest financial report shows that if a 7 percent price increase and the 1955 wage increase had been in effect for all of the year ended last October 31, its profits would have been increased by $30 to $35 million, an increase of about one-third over the profits it reported. This is true despite the fact that in September Harvester fought a strike for 4 weeks before concluding an agreement with our union.

Oliver Corp. and Deere & Co. reports show that a 7 percent price increase will bring them more than $1.50 for every $1 of added wages paid under the new contract.

What steel price increases have done to the cost and profit position of these farm machinery companies their financial reports don't reveal. It certainly is important to them. It is through them that the disgraceful profiteering of the steel industry is passed along to you, the ultimate consumers.

The president of International Harvester, your guest speaker today, wrote an open letter to Secretary Benson last September, commending him on the New Orleans speech which sought to pin the blame on labor's wage increases for the trouble farmers are in.

I bring this up here because of the questions his letter does and does not raise. Mr. McCaffrey's letter dwells right heavily on the wage increases his company has paid. It puts less emphasis on the increased prices of materials, although the latter bulk considerably larger in their total costs. While the letter is generally critical of the wage increases, I can find in it no criticism or question of profiteering with regard to higher steel prices. On the contrary it describes

these material prices as "largely payments going to labor on other companies' payrolls." So labor is to blame for everything, even the profiteering of the steel corporations.

The fact is, as I have already shown, that steel profits did not require prices to be increased $7.50 a ton, but would permit them to be reduced $7.50 a ton, and still keep profits above the highest level of all prior years.

Concluding his letter, Mr. McCaffrey suggests to Mr. Benson that the farmers' "greatest opportunity to meet the market price of farm products and maintain their profit position lies in new and improved mechanization." Moderate changes in the price of a farm machine are, he says, largely irrelevant from the farmer's standpoint if the machine reduces his costs and improves his earnings.

I don't think farmers should be expected to meet the market price of farm products at present low levels, and I doubt that even the finest machines can make these low prices profitable. Organized labor quite widely believes, I am sure, that quick and effective action to get farm prices back up, and to bring farm incomes into line, is vitally important for farmers for labor and for everyone else.

But that won't do any good if the profiteering parade that was launched last year proceeds unchecked on its dangerous course. Raise farm incomes to the point where farmers become good customers again and they, too, become a set-up for price gouging.

This is no idle question. Even as the record-breaking steel company profit reports for the year 1955 are being released from day to day, the steel industry is talking about another general price increase.

"Steel Makers Say More Price Increases Are Coming; Claim Market Is in Good Position To Absorb Them." That's a headline in the Wall Street Journal of January 30.

As a matter of fact, steel prices have been edging up steadily since last summer's big increase. More and more of the so-called "extras" which steelmakers tack on to basic prices are being increased. They have added more than a dollar a ton to steel prices in recent months, one paper reports. U. S. Steel announced higher "extras" on plates, sheets, and strips on January 27. It is expected to boost prices on iron ore before the shipping season opens on the Great Lakes. Steel leaders are talking about the need of bringing prices into line with production costs.

Further steel-price increases will be seized upon by steel-using industries for further price boosts on their products, plus, of course, an addition to their own profits.

The executive board of my union, the United Automobile Workers, spoke out immediately last July when General Motors and Ford said they were going to raise car prices. It challenged the need for raising car prices, and it asked the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report to get at the facts behind these prices, including labor costs, and to tell the people of this country what was going on.

When Ford Motor Co. in August announced higher prices on its tractors we again issued a public protest and renewed our demand for investigation.

When Secretary Benson in September charged that our wage increases are forcing farmers to pay higher prices Walter Reuther wrote a letter to Benson denying the charges and asking him to join us in asking a committee of Congress to get all the facts, including labor costs, and lay them out on the table for the people to see and judge. Mr. Benson's reply renewed the charge, but ignored the request.

With steel prices edging up constantly and with another general price increase predicted, I think you will agree that full-fledged investigation of profiteering in these major industries is urgently needed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Mr. Montgomery points out that after the United States Steel Corp. signed its 1955 wage contracts, and with its profits already one-third higher than its best previous year, the company used the wage contract as an excuse to increase steel prices three times the cost of the wage increases.

Mr. Montgomery stated, and he has not been contradicted:

United States Steel could have reduced its prices $7.50 a ton instead of raising them $7.50 in the second half, and would have come out of the year with more profits after taxes than the $222 million it made in the best previous year of its long history, 1953.

This study shows that General Motors, with its profits last year of $2.5 billions before taxes and of $1,189 million after taxes—a rate of 35 percent on its investment—could have reduced its prices last year by 5 percent instead of raising them by 5 percent and still would have earned 16 percent profit on investment after taxes.

The same sort of situation existed in other automobile concerns. Similarly, wage increases in the farm machinery concerns, which deal directly with the most depressed segment of our economy, were followed by price increases considerably in excess of any increased wage costs.

THE ECONOMIC PATTERN TODAY

Mr. President, the events that we see occurring in the economy today are frightening to those of us who can remember how past depressions have started, and how our march out of the depression of the early thirties was halted by profiteering of the great monopolistic corporations.

The pattern today is almost exactly the same as existed in 1937, when the Government was spending billions of dollars to stimulate the economy, to create employment and greater purchasing power. At that time, the big corporations moved in and began to skim the cream off the Government spending by unjustifiable price increases. All that was needed was their cooperation with the Government program, and willingness to accept reasonable profits. The spending programs had the economy so well on the way to recovery we had been able to reduce the makework appropriations some. But instead of cooperating, the big businesses started profiteering. They thereby cut purchasing power, started a new recession and forced the Government to renew its expenditures again.

We had an investigation at that time of the so-called sit-down strike of wealth against economic recovery, and its frustration of recovery efforts by profiteering.

Summarizing the findings of the investigating committee on the floor of the Senate on May 23, 1938, I said:

It will be seen from the testimony of all those representatives of finance and industry appearing before our committee that in 1936 and early 1937 business conditions and reemployment were advancing rapidly. All that was necessary for continued recovery was honest and unselfish cooperation, but unfortunately there was a lack of that necessary spirit of cooperation. Industry, in its interminable quest for profits, began to make unreasonable advances in prices and otherwise failed to observe good judgment and sound economic principles. That is exactly what caused the recession in the recovery we are experiencing.

Continuing at that time, I said:

The present recession follows the classic analysis of the 1929 depression made by Brookings Institution. The testimony presented before our committee thoroughly established the conclusion that the unbalanced prices which developed in 1936 and 1937 caused the recession.

Robert W. Irwin, furniture manufacturer of Grand Rapids, Mich., testified directly that the recession was caused by the maintenance of artificial prices * * * Here is an impartial witness from the ranks of industry frankly acknowledging the cause of the present recession. Prof. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of the University of Chicago, testified that the monopoly fixation of prices, which was clearly shown by undisputed facts, is the major cause of the present recession, as well as the 1929 depression. Prof. Alvin H. Hansen, of Harvard University, testified to the same effect.

It appears, therefore, from this general study of the testimony, that while the Government was seeking by the expenditure of billions of dollars to create purchasing power and stimulate industrial activity in the country, the leading industrial and business enterprises moved in to take advantage of the Government spending and enrich their own treasuries. Practically all of the leading industries began to raise prices shortly after the public-works program began. As prosperity began to return, wild excitement and speculation on the stock exchanges followed, and very soon, as a result of excessive prices and profits being made by the big industries of the country, the new boom began to develop.

This urge is nothing new. Adam Smith, 160 years ago, shrewdly remarks:

"People of the same trade seldom get together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices."

The parallel between what happened in the middle thirties and the price increases and excessive profits which are being taken today out of the economy—and now largely out of the farmers' pockets—is emphasized by comments which the distinguished former Senator from Indiana, Mr. Sherman Minton, made during my address to the Senate in 1938.

This colloquy occurred between Senator Minton and myself:

Mr. MINTON. Did not Mr. Knudsen, the president of General Motors Corp., appear before the committee?

Mr. MURRAY. He did.

Mr. MINTON. I think the figures show that in 1932 General Motors made $165,000; in 1936 they made $238 million; and I believe the figure was even higher in 1937.

Mr. MURRAY. That is a correct statement. * * * As a matter of fact, practically every corporation in the United States made greater profits in 1936 and 1937 than at any time since 1929. A great many of such corporations made greater profits in 1937 than they did at the highest peak of our national prosperity in 1929.

Mr. Minton then summarized his point. I quote him:

Mr. MINTON. I wonder if the Senator will agree with me in the statement that Mr. Knudsen's company, General Motors, was one of the chief beneficiaries of the spending program, and a splendid example of what

the Senator has just pointed out. The corporation took all the profits for itself. General Motors, presided over by Mr. Knudsen, paid Mr. Knudsen two-hundred-thousand-odd dollars in 1934; three-hundred-thousand-odd dollars in 1935; and five-hundred-thousand-odd dollars in 1936. The corporation did not reduce the price of commodities to the public at all. It raised wages very little, but it raised the salaries of its own officers, and paid fat dividends to stockholders.

As I have already shown, General Motors Corp. profits last year, before taxes, were $2.5 billion and, after taxes, they were more than $1.1 billion. This is 5 times the rate which helped to bring on the recession of 1937.

There are those who contend that "what is good for General Motors Corp. is good for the country," but a continuation of the excessive profit take of such big corporations, at rates like 35 percent on investment after taxes, will lead to the same sort of economic trouble as it did in 1929 and 1937.

Back in 1938, Cleveland, Ohio's outstanding spokesman for business, the banker-economist, Leonard P. Ayres, recognized that business greed was behind recession difficulties. He testified before our committee:

> Last spring (1937) there were many warnings about prices rising too far and too fast.

It is regrettable that the lesson this Clevelander learned in the experiences of 1929 and 1937 did not trickle down to those who were to succeed him in economic leadership in that community and the Nation. If it had, the present administration might be showing more concern about lower labor income, rising unemployment, and the serious deflation of the farmers.

Two answers are being made today to those of us who are concerned about the economic consequences of the present farm depression.

One is that farmers are not really in any difficulty. That is the line that Secretary of Agriculture Benson and editor John Fischer of Harper's magazine take: That farmers are still dwelling in a "clover and Cadillac heaven."

This assertion has been adequately answered here on the floor in this debate and by publications which support the administration but have too much economic intelligence to try to conceal the true situation for partisan reasons. For example, the February 10 issue of U. S. News & World Report, published by David Lawrence, portrays the agricultural situation as a very serious one. The article reveals a decline in net income per farm from $4,301 in 1952 to $3,800 last year and an estimated $3,673 this year. It shows a 20-percent decline in farm spending between 1952 and 1955. It shows farm debts up $4.3 billion in the same period and farm assets down from $155.5 billion in 1952 to $145.1 billion in 1955, a decline of more than $10 billion. It reflects also the effect of increasing industrial profits in the continuing high prices of all the nonagricultural products which farmers must buy.

Only the political apologists for the present administration stick to this claim. It was interesting that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], who made a trip to Iowa and then appeared with Agriculture Secretary Benson on a 30-minute television broadcast last week, did not endorse the Secretary's claim that conditions in agriculture are basically good.

The second argument is that farm population is down and that agriculture's importance in the national economy has declined to the point that we can have a farm depression without ultimately causing a general depression.

Dr. John Davis, director of the Harvard University Graduate School's program on agriculture and business, who was an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in the present administration, has refuted that argument. In an address on October 17, 1955, to the Boston Conference on Distribution, Mr. Davis warned that while agriculture was once a relatively larger part of the national economy than today, a drop in farmer purchasing power will be felt significantly in terms of limiting our overall national economic potential.

Mr. Davis has coined a new word, "agribusiness," to describe the total of all operations concerned with the processing, distribution, and production of farm commodities. He stated:

> Agribusiness is a major component of our national economy—employing about 40 percent of our total working force and producing about 40 percent of our gross national product. As already indicated, it currently encompasses annually some $15 billion of manufactured farm production supplies, $30 billion of commodities grown on our farms, and $90 billion of consumer products in the form of food and fiber.

Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently made a careful analysis of the farm problem. In his study he points out that farm spending in 1951 was about 7.2 percent of our total national spending. The farmers bought 8 percent of the output of the chemical industry, more steel than the entire passenger-automobile industry, rubber products enough to replace the tires on 6 million cars, and the equivalent of 16½ billion gallons of crude oil—more than any other industry. He estimates that between 2 and 3 million workers outside agriculture are engaged in supplying farmers with these basic products and others.

Then he warns us:

> The difference between a year of high prosperity and a year of substantial recession for the whole economy is represented by only a few percentage points. For example, during the 1953–54 recession, the decline in total national spending never exceeded about 3 percent. But the deficiency in market for products caused the true level of unemployment at its peak to rise to about 5 million, and our total national production to fall, at the bottom of the recession, to an annual rate nearly $30 billion below the full production level.

CURRENT EFFECT ON THE ECONOMY

The effects of the decline of farm spending are increasingly appearing today in our economy.

Small business, and especially distributors in rural areas, are particularly hard hit. But employment in the big factories is also down, and in farm-implement factories employment is still steadily declining. The trade publication Implement and Tractor for February 11 reports that tractor output the first 6 months this year, originally scheduled at 177,000 units, has been cut back to 137,000—a reduction of 20 percent this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The time allotted to the Senator from Montana has expired. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield additional time to him?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be happy to do so. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield such additional time as may be necessary to enable the Senator from Montana to conclude his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, unemployment in the automobile industry is growing; layoffs since mid-December by the major automobile producers reached more than 72,000 by mid-February. I have just seen a study of new automobile registrations comparing 1950 and 1955—the industry's 2 biggest years—classified according to percentage of farm-owned cars.

In the 12 States where farm ownership of automobiles is highest, from 17 percent to 38 percent of all cars, there was an actual decline in 1955 in new automobile registration compared with the previous record year of 1950.

In the 12 States where the percentage of farm ownership of cars was lowest, ranging from 8 percent down to 1 percent of the cars in each State, the new car registrations showed a gain of 21 percent in 1955. The clear conclusion of the study is that the farm market for cars is off and that this is a major cause of the present increase of unemployment in the automobile industry.

The farm problem, Mr. President, is the concern of every one of us, because the health of the whole national economy is involved. It is urgent to every one of us, whether we be from an industrial State or a rural State, to see to it that the deliberate deflation of agriculture be halted and reversed and that farm income be rebuilt.

It is imperative, therefore, that we not only enact but strengthen those provisions in the measure now before us that will actually add to farm income and help to build agricultural income back up to the point required for a healthy national economy.

The only provisions of the bill which will do that—the only provisions which make a net addition to farm income—are those restoring 90 percent of parity supports for the basic commodities and restoring the old parity formula.

These provisions are opposed by the administration. We are hearing threats of a veto. These threats do not surprise me. It is a fact that if we stop the process of bleeding farmers to offset inflation in every other segment of the economy, as has been done consistently for the past 3 years, then the people of the Nation can no longer be deceived about the achievement of dollar stability. The inflation that has occurred in the prices and profits of the big, monopolistic businessmen who are here in the saddle

will then become apparent to the consumers. Of course, the administration would like to avoid a disclosure of the falsity of its stability claim.

But it remains to be seen if the President has been so misguided by those around him that he will risk the soundness of the economy in order to preserve a propaganda campaign claim among consumers.

THE SOIL BANK AND TRUE CONSERVATION

The soil bank proposals—the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve—will not add to net farm income immediately, as the economic situation requires.

Farmers are to get payments for not cultivating and not producing crops on a part of their land. It is purely replacement of income they otherwise would have received from crops produced.

The most the soil bank payments to farmers can do is create a temporary illusion of added income. I understand that efforts will be made to send checks to the farmers during the summer—before the election—to pay them for taking acres out of cultivation. But in the fall of 1956, when the farmers have less produce to take to market, they will all be aware that their soil bank checks were merely prepayment of income normally received at marketing time.

I am extremely doubtful of the soundness of the acreage reserve proposal from a conservation viewpoint.

This is a proposal to take out of production 10, 20, or 30 acres—a relatively small patch—on each farm which produces one of the basic commodities on which acreage allotments are in effect. The land that really needs to be returned to grass and trees does not necessarily lie in little patches on every farm.

A sound conservation approach to shrinking the total land in cultivation in the Nation would call for the retirement from cultivation of the poorest lands—the lands unfit for the plow.

The publication Land Facts, of the Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, shows that 39 million acres of class V, VI, and VII land are in cultivation. It is too wet, too steep, too stoney, or too arid for cultivation. Much of it has severe limitations even for grazing and should be in trees.

This land ought to be taken out of cultivation, and we should move on to the additional 47 million acres of class IV land which has very severe limitations for cultivation and would be better used if planted in grass or trees.

This land is of low productivity. But I seriously doubt that it would cost more to get 50 million acres of these marginal lands back to grass and trees than 15 million acres of land in the classes which are suitable for cultivation. We might very well get as much reduction in production per dollar out of a conservation program soundly based on land capability as from this proposal to have a little patch on each farm—to cover the face of the Nation with little "corn plasters."

Certainly the amendment proposed by my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to permit farmers to participate in the soil bank with off-farm land, when it will bring about better land use or farm management, should be adopted.

Before another Congress convenes, the whole soil-bank program should be reviewed and reorganized. I would strongly favor the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry employing a competent staff to do this job, free of the partisanship over farm issues found at the Department of Agriculture.

Another very serious question about the soil-bank proposal is the extent to which it will actually shrink production and the extent to which the United States should curtail its food production in a hungry world, in which we are competing with the Communist ideology for the minds of men.

I am sure that all Senators are doubtful that reduction of cultivated acreage will actually reduce production proportionately.

This question posed itself acutely in my own mind when my attention was called to the Missouri Farm News Service, a clip sheet sent to all rural newspapers in Missouri by the College of Agriculture of the University of Missouri.

The clip sheet of articles for publication in the farm press is featured by a column-long story captioned "Intensive Cropping System May Help With Farm Problem."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, but I shall also summarize it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTENSIVE CROPPING SYSTEM MAY HELP WITH FARM PROBLEM

With higher prices for what he buys and lower prices for most everything he sells, the farmer is caught in the middle, says Stanley Spangler, University of Missouri agricultural economist. To relieve some of this pressure, farmers must cut expenses or produce more to sell.

One way a farmer may be able to produce more and at less cost for each bushel raised is by growing two grain crops in one year on the same piece of land.

In many years, a lot of corn has been planted the last of June or early in July. This late corn was usually planted as a result of a flood, a wet spring, or other delay-causing events. While late-planted crops are not always successful, in many instances they reach maturity and supply a lot of feed. In the case of corn, even immature grain can provide a lot of livestock feed as grain or silage.

Why not follow wheat, rye, or barley with corn or beans? The interest on investment, taxes, and overhead costs is no more for 2 crops than for 1. It looks like it would be a paying proposition most years, Spangler points out.

Of course, there are some drawbacks to late corn and beans. Some years, the ground is so dry following a small grain crop that corn or beans won't come up. Also, other crops may take a farmer's time and he may not have time for late plantings. Then, too, an extra-early freeze or frost may hurt a late-planted crop.

However, recent developments are making this intensive cropping idea practical as time goes by. First, there are more early seed varieties than formerly.

Second larger and better machinery speeds up field work. Combines are larger and more efficient, getting the small grain out of the field in a day or two. Tractors are more powerful and preparing a seedbed doesn't take long. Also, some farmers have crop dryers or access to them.

Third, and important in making 2 crops in 1 year possible, is the use of heavier fertilizer applications. And adequate soil treatment greatly speeds up the crop's growth and maturity and gives fall-seeded crops a boost through the winter.

As a general rule, late-planted crops don't yield as heavily as early ones. But, they require less work, Spangler points out. Ground usually works easily and the weed problem isn't as bad. One cultivation usually takes care of weeds.

Crops to plant after small grains will depend on the needs of individual farms. If silage is needed, sorghum or corn are good choices. For a strictly cash crop, the answer is probably beans, while for feed to fatten hogs or steers, corn is best unless acreage allotments are a handicap. Then, maybe combine-type grain sorghums might be a good choice.

In summing up what is needed for success in this type of double cropping, Spangler says the following points need to be considered.

1. An early-maturing small grain combined on time.

2. Enough moisture for the ground to be plowed, worked down, and to sprout the seed.

3. A highly fertile soil plus plenty of commercial fertilizer. Two crops take a lot of plant food.

4. Enough labor and machinery to harvest the grain crop and get the next crop in speedily.

5. Moisture during the growing season and an average to late killing frost or freeze.

6. Livestock to utilize the crops as silage, as soft grain or in extreme cases, as pasture.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the article is based on advice to farmers by Stanley Spangler, University of Missouri agricultural economist, who found that farmers were caught in the middle by higher prices for what they buy and lower prices for what they sell. Mr. Spangler's article then states:

One way a farmer may be able to produce more and at less cost for each bushel raised is by growing 2 grain crops in 1 year on the same piece of land.

Because of Missouri River floods in past years, farmers in that State have planted corn as late as the last of June or the first of July, the article explains. So this economist suggests that Missouri farmers plant wheat, rye, or barley in the spring and follow it with corn or soybeans. If the second crops do not always mature, he suggests that they can be used for feed.

The article defends the feasibilty and enumerates the advantages of growing 2 crops where only 1 was produced before.

Congress votes annual contributions to help maintain the State agricultural colleges. One cannot help but wonder how consistent we are to vote a billion dollars to reduce acreage and surpluses, and then appropriate several millions more for this sort of educational work.

In the early days of the Triple-A, this sort of inconsistency was avoided. Farmers in the old agricultural adjustment associations were partners in adjustment of production. It was a great mutual project to eliminate surpluses. Neighbors worked with each other across the Nation to whip the overproduction problem. But that day of farmer cooperation to meet jointly the production adjustment problem is gone. Today

Government workers encourage individual farmers to ignore the overall good of agriculture and attempt to beat the game as individuals. It is a formula, of course, to keep farmers divided and to make any farm program unworkable.

HOW FAR SHOULD REDUCTION GO?

The extent to which this Nation should reduce its production of foods and fibers, before making an all-out effort to banish want in the United States and the world, is one that should be considered thoughtfully.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] propose, by amendment of the bill, to establish a domestic food allotment or stamp plan to improve the distribution and increase the consumption of food by undernourished citizens of the United States. We should adopt such an amendment.

Although it cannot be done in connection with this bill, we should also pass Senate Resolution 65, which I introduced a year ago for myself and a large bipartisan group of Senators, to bring about the establishment of a world food and raw materials reserve.

Other free nations of the world have been attempting since immediately following World War II to achieve better international distribution of food—to combat hunger—through such a world food agency. Lord John Boyd-Orr, the first director general of the World Food and Agriculture Organization, led an international effort to establish such a world food agency. It failed because of the hesitance of the United States and Great Britain.

The nations in the World Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Federation of Agricultural Producers have continued, in effect, to petition the United States and other "have" nations—countries with surpluses that could help end hunger—to join in a world-food program.

The International Federation of Agricultural Producers, meeting at Nairoba, Kenya, in 1954, established a committee which is soon to report again on a new program for attainment of their long sought world food reserve goal.

I am deeply concerned about the effect that drastic curtailment of food production in the United States will have around the world.

Two-thirds of the world's people live in nations which have not finally made their choice between democracy and communism. These are the people of South and Central America, Southeast Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, where so-called stomach communism—the false promise of enough to eat—holds its greatest allure.

We should be doing everything we can to win these people. We should be leading—not just meeting Communist moves—in the campaign for their allegiance. But, we have not only failed to respond to the polite entreaties of these peoples to let our surpluses go into a world food reserve, although it would help to solve one of our own serious domestic problems; we are now proposing to spend vast sums of money to prevent the production of food that men, women, and children in this world desperately need.

Unless the adoption of the soil-bank proposal shall be accompanied this session by positive moves to share our potential abundance with the have-not nations of the free world, I fear that the cause of freedom from want, the cause of world democracy and world peace, will have been seriously impaired.

I shall discuss other features of this bill as appropriate amendments come before the Senate.

In view of the economic situation of agriculture and its potential effect on the whole economy, I feel the reenactment of 90-percent supports for basics and restoration of the old formula for calculating parity should be supplemented with programs to assure a better farm return on feeds, livestock and animal products and other commodities.

In spite of the administration's apparent willingness to let farm income sink further, to offset more profits for General Motors and its other big business allies, we need to rebuild farm income not merely $1 billion a year, but several billion.

I shall support amendments which have been proposed which will mean additional net farm income. Such aids to farmers will be far less costly than either a recession or a depression.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2884) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

EXCUSAL OF PAGES FOR REMAINDER OF THE DAY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief request, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am advised by some of the pages that they have an exceptional amount of studying to do, for some reason or other; and I ask unanimous consent that all but two pages on either side of the aisle may be excused for the remainder of the afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I object to that request. I should prefer that there be a quorum call. I understand why the Senator has made his unanimous-consent request, but I believe that every Member of the Senate, and particularly Members on the other side of the aisle, need a lot of education about the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, my request concerned only the pages.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I misunderstood the Senator's request.

Mr. LANGER. I referred only to the pages.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I misunderstood the request. I withdraw my objection and ask that all my remarks pertaining to the request may be deleted from the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from North Dakota is granted.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, first of all I should like to propose an amendment to the bill, S. 3183, which is in the nature of a substitute for the soil-bank provisions of the bill. Actually, this is the language submitted originally by the American Farm Bureau Federation, with some slight changes. It was offered by me in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was rejected by a vote of 9 to 6. I still think it embodies something the Senate will want to consider, because it is a mandatory soil-bank provision. Surely, if we are to have the type of price levels which have been in effect, it will not be possible to obtain a reduction in acreage on a voluntary basis. For that reason I desire to have before the Senate, when it shall consider the soil-bank question, the amendment to that provision which I desire to present.

I submit my amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, many of the things I intend to say today may not deal with the whole philosophy of the bill, but may relate only to certain isolated sections, and statements which have been made about the measure.

I have previously expressed on the floor my admiration for the way in which the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the committee, conducted the hearings. Therefore, if I refer to a statement he made on the Senate floor, I am sure he will understand I do it only for the purpose

of trying to bring out points I think should be emphasized.

The Senator from Louisiana made the following statement, which I read from page 3164 of the RECORD for February 23:

> It would not stimulate production of the basics because, as Mr. Benson well knows, he has in his hands all the tools he needs with which to control production of the basics.

I say only that the Secretary cannot bring the basics down to a matter of control. He is prohibited from bringing wheat acreage below 55 million acres. All that would be necessary next year, in the absence of that provision, would be 18,580,000 acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. When I made that statement what I had in mind was this: Whether or not there were flexible price supports, or 90 percent of parity price supports, the Secretary of Agriculture would have the same production control devices available to him. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I think that is a correct statement. All I am trying to say is that he does not have available to him the tools with which to control production.

Mr. ELLENDER. The pending bill does not propose to reduce the acreage in wheat below 55 million acres except through the soil bank. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, but it will not bring that about through the soil bank provision with 90 percent support prices, because no farmer growing wheat is going to be stupid enough to take his wheatland out of production in the soil bank and lose 90 percent support unless there is a mandatory provision commanding him to do so.

We have had indicated the desire year after year to increase the amount of wheat acreage under 90-percent price supports, and even under 85-percent price supports. It strikes me that when we know the Secretary cannot keep production under control, we have to be more careful when we start to vote on high price support levels.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator intend to propose any amendment which would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to cut wheat acreage further?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I tried that one time. I tried to have wheat acreage brought down to 55 million acres at a time when every Member of the Senate knew it ought to be brought down to 55 million acres, and that amendment was defeated. There was no desire then to bring wheat acreage realistically into control, and I would say there is no desire today. After one bumps his head into that kind of opposition a few times, he abandons such an undertaking.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have such a very high regard for the Senator from New Mexico that I hesitate to interject at this time, but it seems apropos to ask a question now. Does the Senator feel that with present 76 percent of parity for 1956, and the soil bank, there will be any reduction in wheat production this year, except as to spring wheat?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think there will be a reduction of wheat acreage as regards spring wheat, unless there is in the law a mandatory provision for a soil bank—a compulsory soil bank. The American Farm Bureau Federation, which spent 3 years studying the soil bank, came up with a pretty good answer, namely, that the farmer must be willing to make some adjustment before we consider the rates of pay he shall get for doing it.

If there is a mounting pile of surpluses, it is easy to say we have to do something about it. I have been critical of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I intend to be critical again, if we do not see the present surpluses begin to disappear; but I am trying to say, in an effort to be fair, that the Secretary of Agriculture is not in a position to handle the situation as we think it should be handled. We will have full planting of wheat this year and for many years to come, and that must be handled in one of two ways. About all the wheat land that is necessary to take care of our domestic needs for food, feed, seed, and a small amount of extra, is about 40 million acres. The rest of what we produce is to be turned into export; and the record of the International Wheat Agreement is for anyone to read. We began with 55 cents. We were told, "Only a few pennies will get this wheat into circulation." Thereafter, we came up to 65 cents. We are now an 87-cent subsidy, and still our wheat will not move in international trade. We are going to need a subsidy of $1 a bushel; and then if some other country stimulates its wheat production, we again shall face the problem of how much further to raise the subsidy.

I say again that I do not think it is wise—and I do not think the Senator from Kansas wants to have it done, either—to keep forever increasing the subsidy, in order to try to shove into world commerce the surplus wheat production which we have at the present time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, let me say that I am in thorough accord with what the Senator from New Mexico has said about our wheat problem. It is a very serious one. I have every reason to believe that it will not be long before the taxpayers of the Nation will object to paying a $1 a bushel subsidy, and I think rightfully so. It is for that reason that I favor a referendum as to whether we should have domestic parity. I wish the Senator from New Mexico would discuss that point.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall, although I promise that I shall not detain the Senate all day. Of course, once a person begins to discuss this problem, there is a great temptation to continue the discussion a long time.

But I say to the Senator from Kansas who is just as much concerned about the farm problem as I am, and just as anxious to be helpful as I am that I know very well that the day will come when the taxpayers will assert themselves, if we keep on subsidizing wheat and if we increase the subsidy to $1 a bushel. They may remember that not so long ago the price of wheat was $1 a bushel. I do not want to lose all the farm programs the United States has. I say, on the basis of experience, that I think these programs will be jeopardized if a high subsidy on wheat is to be paid.

I had the experience of dealing with the program on potatoes. No one contended that potatoes were not good food, but it was simply impossible to bring potato production in the United States under control, either at 90 percent of parity or finally at the support price of 60 percent. New areas came into potato production—not at all the old potato-growing areas. Those new areas had a perfect right to come into production.

However, one of the interesting things I remember from that experience with potatoes is that the head of a chainstore told me that at one time his store bought potatoes in only two States—Maine and Idaho; and he said, "It will interest you to know that for the next year we will not have a bushel of potatoes from either Maine or Idaho."

I say such distortion of the agricultural picture is bad.

In the case of wheat, the supply is so great that, following the established formula to make available a quantity equal to a year's domestic consumption and exports, plus 30 percent after allowing for carryover and imports, only 19 million acres could be grown in 1956. But the Secretary is required by law to issue allotments based on 55 million acres.

For upland cotton, the formula in the law to make available a normal supply, after allowing for carryover, would give something less than 7 million acres. But the Secretary is required by law to permit the planting of more than 17 million acres. I think there is some question as to whether the Secretary of Agriculture needs to use that figure; but he did have that authority this year.

For rice, the formula to produce a normal supply, after considering the carryover, would give 936,000 acres. But the Congress enacted a law requiring an acreage allotment of not less than 1,639,000 for 1956.

For peanuts, 1,454,000 acres would be needed, based on compilations specified in the law to produce the average number of tons of peanuts harvested for nuts in the preceding 5 years, adjusted for current trends and prospective demand. But the Congress has said that the Secretary must issue allotments based on 1,610,000 acres—not far out of balance in the case of that rather minor crop.

The Secretary of Agriculture has acted in good faith in imposing production controls as required by law. But the law itself has required that many more acres be kept in production than are needed to get supplies up to the so-called normal levels.

In addition, we could analyze these laws and could try to ascertain what happens under them. But as I have

pointed out, every time we come to the point where someone says, "The economy of the State simply cannot stand it," we are tempted to reply, "That is not very important. We will just pass the bill."

In July of last year we passed the rice-control law. I pointed out that it was unreasonable to cut the rice acreage more than 15 percent. But the law was passed. Of course, that law means that in 1954, when the Secretary of Agriculture saw a mountain of rice, and when the Department did not impose controls—and I think the Department acted properly; but certainly as the matter now stands, we see that it acted wrongfully—we got into all kinds of trouble.

However, I should like to say that situation is not unusual, and it is not a partisan situation. I think a Republican Secretary of Agriculture failed to put quotas on rice; I think a Democratic Secretary of Agriculture failed to put quotas on cotton. I am simply trying to say that this is a problem which arises in every administration, and it is one which is not too easily and too quickly handled.

Therefore, today I am going to suggest that we should not be too critical of some of these programs. In the past few years, and particularly in the past few weeks, I have heard a number of Democrats say much about the program of flexible price supports; they have described it as a frightful program which had been thrown on the American people by Mr. Benson. I think a word or two might be said about that. A few minutes ago the able junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in speaking on this floor, referred to a Democratic President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Senator from South Dakota said Mr. Roosevelt held office as President longer than any other man in the history of our country. Of course, time after time I have heard Democrats speak quite well of Mr. Roosevelt, and I have been one of them. I find nothing wrong in President Roosevelt's program on agriculture. Many times I have said that I thought Franklin D. Roosevelt was as fine a friend as agriculture ever had in the White House. But I can recall that it was in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt that flexible price supports first became effective. I think it is worthwhile to remember that. In the Agricultural Act of 1938 we had price supports which were flexible from 52 to 75 percent of parity. Today we tend to forget that fact. So, Mr. President, when we say that the man who at the moment is Secretary of Agriculture has given the American farmer price supports which can flex only downward, frequently we are tempted to forget the fact that there was a previous time, when there was also a provision for flexible price supports. It was when a President who was nominated 4 times by the Democratic Party and elected 4 times by the American people was in the White House.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me at this point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the Senator's reference to the situation in 1938, 1939, and 1940. Some of us remember those years very well. Is it not the history of the flexible price supports which we had at that time, that they did not reduce production?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I do not think they reduced production, because we had not reached the point where the farmer was getting parity. In that period of our agricultural existence we were only trying to give the farmer a support level so that he could have orderly marketing of his crops. It was when we arrived at the concept of paying the farmer from the United States Treasury, the concept of producing crops for the Treasury, and not for the trade, that we began arguing about levels of price supports. One of the first agricultural votes I cast in the Congress was for a 90-percent price-support level, which at that time was designed, I thought, to be a stimulant to production and a guaranty to the farmer. That was relatively late—in 1941 or 1942. But during all the previous years, when we had been dealing with this problem, we had not been trying to establish a support level which was so high that it supplanted the marketplace.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that, disregarding the question whether high or low supports increase or reduce production—and I believe that high supports do increase production, although I am not so sure that low supports decrease it, because every farmer likes to raise as big a crop as he can—when prices are made realistic, consumption and disposal increase tremendously?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is true.

Mr. AIKEN. The situation relating to dairy products is one of our most recent examples. When the price of butter was such that the consumer had to pay 80 cents or more a pound, the consumer went on strike. The dairymen lost 500 million pounds of our butter market. When the price was reduced 8 cents a pound, in 2 years time they recovered 300 million pounds of the 500 million pounds of lost markets. So realistic prices do increase sales and consumption, whether or not they decrease production.

I may also say that so far as high prices are concerned, they do definitely increase production. We had a little experience in New England last fall. Following the very hot weather in August when milk became scarce, the price went up, and it looked as though the price of milk would hit $5 a hundred in September. The dairy farmers increased their production so much to take advantage of the $5 price, that the expected increase did not materialize at all. Instead of an increase of 66 cents a hundred, they got an increase of about 4 cents a hundred. Through the fall, when milk was selling at $5 a hundred or more, the farmers fed extra allotments of grain to their cows. They went into Canada and bought a great many more cows than usual, and brought them in and milked them. Some of the cows which were brought in in September were probably paid for by the first of February. However, the upshot was that production was increased, and they had to take a lower price this spring. Now the price is dropping. The dairy producers are disposing of their cull cows. They are selling something that should have been sold some months ago.

Consequently, it looks as though next fall the price would be back up to a very satisfactory level. I hope the experience of last fall will not be repeated. I hope that dairy farmers will not have more cows producing more milk, bringing about a lower price a few months later.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that when we were holding hearings on the general farm program for 1954 I asked about this very question, as appears on page 1258 of the hearings. I pointed out at that time that the announcement of a high price level meant that the total number of milk cows had jumped from 35,270,000 to 37 million in a period of about 4 years.

At that hearing, 2 pages later, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] asked the Secretary of Agriculture this question:

> Senator THYE. Mr. Secretary, last year you announced the support price at 90 percent on dairy products and we wound up by enjoying about 82 to 84 percent of parity. What is going to be the situation this year with a 75 percent support level? What are we going to wind up receiving?

Testimony was given before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a few days ago that the level had reached 86 percent. So it is not the stated level that counts. It is what actually finally happens to the farmer.

The Senator from Vermont and I joined in a resolution in an effort to make sure that the farmer received the full amount of parity—not merely the dairyman who sold his product to the United States Treasury. The resolution did not pass. He and I know why it did not pass. There was a great deal of opposition to it from people who had a stake in keeping agricultural prices from being reflected to the farmer.

The statement was made by the junior Senator from Minnesota a day or two ago to the effect that no one had ever proved very conclusively that high price supports actually stimulate production. I do not intend to deal with that question at very great length, because it is very difficult to trace the relationship between price and production. If, as in the rice industry, for example, there is an enormous expansion in commodity because of a high price level and the absence of controls the producers continue to produce even if the price level drops suddenly. They have to. They have bought new types of rice harvesting machinery. Collectively they have invested millions of dollars in new machinery. So it requires a long time for the effect to display itself. I have some figures which might be of interest. In the year 1946 we had a very great shortage in linseed oil. Manufacturers of linoleum came to the Department of Agriculture and said, "Our industry will virtually have to close down, and the paint and varnish industry will be in trouble, unless you can find us some linseed oil. There is plenty in the Argentine, but there is none in the United

States, and we cannot get a supply sufficient to take care of our needs."

In 1946 the planted acreage of flax was 2,641,000 acres. The price during that year was $4.04. The then Secretary of Agriculture asked the producers what price would be required to stimulate production. Telegrams were sent to farmers in Minnesota, the Dakotas, and other areas where there is usually a large flax production. The producers said that a price of about $5.75 a bushel would do it. That was a jump from 115 percent of parity to 160 percent of parity.

What was the result? The acreage jumped from 2,600,000 to 4,200,000 acres. The next year it was 5,100,000 acres, and the following year 5,348,000 acres. The next year prices came down a little, and flax production was somewhat less.

I do not know how we can trace the effects much better than that. Those figures are available, as are figures on a great many other products. The table with respect to dairy products is very interesting. If I have the time I should like to insert a great many such figures in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator spoke about flaxseed. I invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to the fact that between 1942 and 1946 the average price of flaxseed was $3.01 a bushel. The price went down, and there was a shortage of linseed oil. In 1947 the price was $6.15 a bushel, and soon there was plenty of flaxseed. The shortage was undoubtedly caused by the fact that the price was only $3 a bushel over a period of several years.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator is correct, then everyone who surveyed the situation was wrong. Those who came into the office of the Secretary of Agriculture all told the same story: "If you increase the support level on flax you will get an outpouring of flax that will take care of our situation."

I established a level which was far beyond what we had ever had. We got increased plantings of flax immediately, and as soon as we got the figures as to the plantings, we proceeded to buy oil from the Argentine, because the Argentine realized that it was up against a real competitor.

Mr. AIKEN. In 1947 the average price was $6.15 a bushel. In 1948 the price was $5.71. There was a tremendous production. We obtained enough flaxseed to last for several years. That has now been disposed of, and the price of flaxseed is again going up this year. The support price is going up. I think flax is an excellent example of how variations in the support price do cause production to go up or down. Flax is probably one of the best examples.

Mr. ANDERSON. The only difficulty is this: If we try to trace the relationship between price and production with respect to one commodity, we must take into consideration what is happening to some other commodity. When the acreage of cotton and wheat was reduced, there was, of course, an expansion into grain sorghums, rice, and many other products, which did not bear a relationship to the price, but bore a relationship to whether the commodity was or was not under control, and whether the acreage was such that it could be diverted from the production of crops which had been normally grown on those acres to the production of other crops.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not care to enter into a discussion with respect to flax. I am not familiar with that crop. However, I wonder if the Senator will agree with me that when there is a reduction in the price of a farm commodity, the farmer must have a certain amount of income in order to have economic operation of his unit, or at least to live, based upon the cost of labor, machinery, taxes, and so forth. As the price goes down, is there not a tendency on the part of the farmer to try to increase his production, instead of decrease it?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. The point is that we try to regulate enormous swings, enormous transfers of acreage. After World War I there was a great reduction in wheat acreage, because the price went down to a ridiculously low figure. For a long time those lands went back to pasture. When wheat prices again rose, we experienced a long-term swing which produced many millions of acres of wheat. Once land is planted to wheat, it is not quickly taken out of wheat production.

The question of agricultural income is one I have worried about for a long time. I have referred many times to the chart which has been placed at the rear of the Chamber, and I shall continue to refer to it, because it illustrates, I believe, that the farm problem is somewhat complex, and cannot be easily solved. Indicated on the chart is the period which follows the base period. Then there will be noted a sharp increase in farm income, as there was also in national income. This point on the chart—indicating the years 1914–20—refers to the First World War, when very high prices for foodstuffs were paid to us by foreign countries.

When World War I was over, immediately there was a terrific down-plunge in farm income—indicating 1920–21. Then we had a period during which banks were closing all over the country, and all through the farm areas. Everywhere we turned we saw banks closing, including banks that had always been regarded as very sound institutions—indicating 1921–24.

At that time I was living in a farming community in which 5 of the 6 banks closed. The sixth bank was kept open by nothing short of brute strength, because the people of the community realized that they had to have some place in which they could do business.

Then there was a long period of years in which farm income and national income stayed fairly parallel—indicating 1924–48.

Then they declined together in the period to which I am now pointing on the chart—1930–32.

Then we had—as is shown on the chart for years 1942–45—a level farm income, because it was easier to control farm prices than industrial prices. At that point it was realized that some adjustment had to be made in all other prices.

Farm prices stayed down. Once the war was over it was possible for farm prices to catch up again with industrial prices, and they stayed together until the end of 1948.

In 1948 we had a tremendous corn crop. At that time there was much of discussion about storage facilities, and much of uncertainty attended the market. Then there was a sharp drop in prices, as is shown by the chart to which I am referring—1948–49.

During the year 1950—beginning in June—we were in the Korean war. The prices of agricultural commodities turned up by the end of the year.

In 1951, because of demands for additional supplies, prices turned sharply up. In 1952 they started down again. Then they went very sharply down and have continued downward.

What I hope the friends of farmers will realize is that most of the drops I have shown on the chart came about under 90-percent price supports.

If 90-percent price supports are the absolute guaranty that some people think they are, why did farm income drop away so drastically from all other income? In the recent drop only two commodities were below 90-percent support levels; whereas the great bulk of the commodities were at 90-percent support levels.

The very least one can say is that 2 big drops came under the 90-percent level, and 1 drop came in part under flexible price supports.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. During which of these years was the Senator the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a loaded question. During this period shown on the chart—1945–48.

Mr. LANGER. Did prices go up or down?

Mr. ANDERSON. They went up. However, I must say to the Senator from North Dakota that the prices went up because we removed controls, and because we had enormous requests for agricultural commodities from other countries. Those factors simplified the problems of the Secretary of Agriculture at that time. In other words, it was not hard to be Secretary of Agriculture at these points—1914 and 1947—on the chart, but it is very hard over here—1952–56.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from New Mexico explain what the policy was between 1930 and 1940, when the farm percentagewise income twice reached the same level as the national income?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it was due to a brief attempt to reenact something to take the place of the old farm bill——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The McNary-Haugen bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, but I am thinking primarily of the Federal Farm Board.

That came into effect along about here—1931—on the chart, and it had something to do with trying to stabilize the market. It did not work. The Farm Board could not buy enough to keep track of it, and prices went down materially.

In 1933 and 1934, the farmers insisted upon some kind of agricultural control. Many people at home and in Washington were clamoring for something, and there was enacted the Agricultural Adjustment Act, with a processing tax. The Supreme Court knocked it out. Down came agricultural income. Then there was some strong testimony in 1936 and 1937 in behalf of a new farm program. I am happy to say that there was bipartisan support for the movement on both sides of the aisle, and there was some assurance that a good farm bill would be enacted. It was enacted in 1938.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was that the Soil Conservation Act?

Mr. ANDERSON. It involved soil conservation; yes. It was the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. ELLENDER. With price supports. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. It involved price supports of from 52 to 75 percent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How does that program, which was so successful, differ from the program which is now being offered?

Mr. ANDERSON. The supply of cotton in the United States reached almost a record peak in these years—1936–38—on the chart, and it was not possible, apparently, to find markets for it, and for a great many other agricultural commodities.

At that time Henry Wallace went before the American farmers and to Congress and asked for a soil bank. His thesis was that when the ever-normal granary begins to overflow, we should store the grain in the soil. In that period Henry Wallace steadily contended that Congress had to do something about the establishment of a program which would allow the Government of the United States to pay a man not to produce something.

Of course, the Senator from Wyoming may remember that in that period there was a good deal of discussion of Henry Wallace's proposal to plow under every third row of cotton, and there was a great deal of discussion about what he wanted to do to little pigs.

Interestingly enough, when the present Secretary of Agriculture recently testified on the soil-bank proposal, someone asked him what he intended to do about wheat already planted. He said it could be plowed under and used as green manure.

Henry Wallace said cotton could be plowed under.

Strangely enough, the same persons who criticized Henry Wallace for suggesting the plowing under of cotton are not now so critical about plowing under wheat.

At that time Henry Wallace recognized the fact that we would reach the point where we would not be able to control agricultural production merely by levels of price supports or anything of that nature, but that it would be necessary to enforce acreage allotments, and he also proposed that there be established something that is almost identical with what we now call the soil bank.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was not adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was not adopted. It ran into vigorous opposition because Mr. Wallace was associated with the program of milk for Hottentots, and things of that nature. Of course, I do not know the difference between sending whole milk to Hottentots and sending condensed milk to Hottentots. It all goes to the same "tummy." But, as the Senator will remember, Mr. Wallace was under considerable fire at that time because of his proposals.

If I had the time I could deal with what he said about acreage and point out that excess acreage is still a problem. This country is faced with an excess of from 10 million to 25 million acres of crop land, which should be left idle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was dealing with the Senator's graph more than with the history of the Wallace proposals. About 1939 the line of the farmer's income began to turn up again, did it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because of contracts, when we were rebuilding our war plants.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We were beginning to be drawn into World War II at that time.

Mr. ANDERSON. We were beginning to construct airbases and factories.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that it was necessary to get more production from the farms at that time, rather than to restrict production, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That started the curve of national income going upward. One of the things we have learned is that the best market the farmer has is probably his domestic market. When workers are earning good pay they purchase more agricultural products. There is nothing in the world in this respect that takes the place of a good paycheck. When the Department of Agriculture sent a team to England in 1939 or 1940 to try to make a study of what happened to England when it got into the war, the group brought back a little pamphlet entitled "The Theory of Underconsumption." It dealt with the problem which arose in England as soon as workers began to receive good salaries.

The first thing a worker does when he is put on a good salary basis is to stop eating only flour and potatoes; he begins to buy other types of nourishing food, foods which are not only nourishing to him, but are beneficial to his family.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then increased consumption by the American worker has nothing to do with the present plight of agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. But in the period I have referred to we began to see an extra quart of milk at each door. Two quarts of milk instead of one quart were consumed.

I should like to remind the Senator from Florida that when the worker reaches his highest point of financial return he makes the greatest demands on extra nutritious fruits, such as citrus fruits and other commodities of that nature which are produced so abundantly in the Senator's State of Florida. It depends upon the level of income. When the American workingman reached that level he realized that the things he had to discard when he was short of money were the very things his children should have had.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed the Senator from Wyoming stated that the increased standard of living had nothing to do with the present plight of agriculture. I would say that the increased standards of the American consumer are going to have a great deal to do with relieving the plight of the American farmer. For instance, when the price of hogs dropped to about 12 cents a pound the consumption of pork started upward, and in the past 2 months, whereas consumption had been approximately 64 pounds per person, it has gone up to 80 pounds. But even though we produce as many hogs as we did last year, it is rather unlikely there will be a better price in the market because of the increase in the consumption. It may not have an immediate effect on the price paid the farmer, but in the course of a few months or a year it should have considerable effect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A beneficial effect.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator knows, the consumption of beef increased very rapidly after the decrease in the number of cattle which was anticipated did not materialize.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Increased consumption, by and large, is beneficial to the farmer.

Mr. AIKEN. There can be no question about that.

Mr. ANDERSON. We can all agree on that. It is the one great market the farmer has. We cannot blame the plight of the farmer upon what happens in an individual case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Before the Senator leaves the point he has been discussing, I wonder if he would answer a question or so as to the effect about which he has been speaking. We have noticed that around 1940 and 1941 there was a slight rise in the income of the farmer. Necessarily that was because of the fact that people bought more and ate more.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what does the Senator attribute the rise up to the highest point in, say, 1948?

Mr. ANDERSON. I said, frankly, that I attributed it to the fact that there was a tremendous demand for agricultural products, and price controls had been taken off.

Mr. ELLENDER. Consumption was at high levels both at home and abroad; was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is quite correct. As a matter of fact, we had to export 500 million bushels of wheat during that period, and the Government paid more than $2 a bushel for it—in some instances as much as $3 a bushel.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us at what period, from 1940 on, price supports were imposed which tended to increase production?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have felt many times that the imposition of 90 percent supports in that period of years helped to increase production. If it did not, then Congress wasn't very wise, because Congress passed a 90-percent support resolution, and stated the purpose at the beginning of the resolution to be "to increase production immediately."

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest to the Senator from New Mexico that I placed in the RECORD last week some excerpts from speeches made by those who asked for higher price supports, and they were asked not only on the assumption that they would encourage production, but in order that the farmer might receive his fair share of the national income. Does the Senator disagree with that?

Mr. ANDERSON. If I can find the so-called Steagall amendment——

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was it not initiated with the idea of an immediate increase in production?

Mr. ELLENDER. It dealt with nonbasics.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from Louisiana does not feel that the chart I have here relates only to basic commodities, which represent a very small portion of the national income and farm income.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that the Senator is trying to demonstrate that high price supports had a great deal to do with the ups and downs in agricultural income, particularly after 1948, about which he has been speaking.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I tried to show that the drop in 1948 came about when there were 90 percent supports, and the later drop, theoretically, was when flexible price supports were operative, but the support price was nearly always 90 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator not agree that in 1947 there was no limitation on what a farmer could plant?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I cannot agree with that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. There were practically no allotment programs until 1950, as I recall. The sky was the limit on production. And prices were up. As a matter of fact, the 90 percent support law meant little to the farmer, because nonbasics, as well as basics, were selling at over 90 percent.

Mr. ANDERSON. I realize that most commodities were not under control, but it is my impression that tobacco remained under control a good deal of that time. I think some other commodities remained under control, but most of them were uncontrolled. I grant that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was the drop in 1948, to which the Senator has referred, not due to the fact that large surpluses had been accumulated during the war, and that sales had diminished to the point where surpluses were unmanageable? Would the Senator not agree to that?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I would not, because at the end of 1947, if the Senator will look at his statistics, we had swept the cupboard clean so far as wheat was concerned. We went down to the lowest carryover of wheat the country has ever known—to 87 million or 89 million bushels. That was true as to a great many other commodities.

If the Senator wants my explanation of the 1948 situation, it is rather simple.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have it. The Senator indicated it was due to the 90-percent supports, or had something to do with the 90-percent supports.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I did not blame it on 90-percent supports in the slightest.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what did the Senator attribute the condition?

Mr. ANDERSON. I said these things happened when there were 90-percent supports, and they happened when there were flexible price supports.

I blame it on the large corn carryover. Of course, I am speaking only from memory; I do not spend as much time on the statistics today as I once did. But there was a corn crop of 3,600,000,000 bushels, when we had had 3 billion bushels the year before. We had the greatest outpouring of agricultural commodities, and as a result there was a rumor throughout the land that agricultural prices needed to be shaken down.

I shall not go into all the details, but a former Governor of New York and former Governor Stassen emerged from a conference, and the Republican candidate for President made the statement that agricultural prices needed to be shaken down. Shortly thereafter the Secretary of Agriculture dropped out of the market and did not do much buying. I do not know who ought to be blamed, or whether anyone should be blamed.

Certain persons have said that if the Secretary of Agriculture had continued to buy corn when the corn crop was harvested the situation which ensued might not have resulted.

But between politics on one side and agricultural economics on the other it was not possible to determine who was responsible. However, the farm program became squarely involved in a national election, and there was a great deal of comment about whether farm prices should be shaken down or not shaken down, and the farmer got blamed for what happened.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator is not blaming what happened on price supports, is he?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I am not.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I notice that farm income as shown on the chart has dropped very rapidly from 1951, when it was more than $19 billion, to $11 billion in 1955.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think in 1952 it was actually $17 billion, and net farm income was down to $10.6 billion at the end of 1955.

Mr. CARLSON. I was simply trying to picture the figures at the distance I am standing from the chair.

I should like to inquire about the millions of acres which farmers took out of allotment acreages. For instance, with respect to wheat, it was 23 million acres. We find that 16 million acres of other crops—corn, oats, barley, and sorghum—did not bring a greatly increased production of livestock, which would have seriously affected the income of the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it did exactly that. The interesting thing is that it produced a shift in the spot where livestock production might be expected to have been the highest. I am not referring now to the range country. But back in the period to which we are referring it could safely be said that more beef would be made—fattened beef at least—in the State of Iowa than in any other State. Yet the average number of cattle on feed on an Iowa farm was 10. That was not our concept of large feeding operations at all.

Yet when other crops and other commodities were developed in other areas of the country, agricultural production and beef production began to shift into new locations; and the people who had been in business for a long time found themselves with a whole new crop of competitors. The result is that a very bad livestock situation exists.

I do not think it was possible for feeders to make any money until the last year or so because of that factor. In my opinion, so long as the problem of diverted acres stares us in the face—and I look now at the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has proposed that something be done about diverted acres—we shall continue to have all sorts of agricultural distress and loss of agricultural income.

Mr. CARLSON. On that very point, is it not reasonable to assume that it makes no difference whether there is rigid parity or flexible supports, when a situation of that type arises, and the production of commodities or crops is shifted from one area to another area?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have said, time after time, that no agricultural program will work with the kind of surplus situation that exists at present. I do not care what kind of program is in force; it will not work.

I was about to refer to rice.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In August 1952, I think, the parity level of farm income was about 113 percent. I am not certain whether the month was August, but, at any rate, the figure has dropped from 113 percent to 80 percent in December 1955 and January 1956. Now it is up to 81 percent.

I do not know if we can point specifically to any month when the flexible price supports took effect, but let us say it was about the middle of last summer.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was only to a very minor extent.

Mr. AIKEN. Of the 33 points drop in farm income, approximately 29 or 30 points took place when the 90 percent supports were in effect. The drop since that time has been due largely to the drop in feed grain and hog prices.

The drop in feed grain and hog prices is due primarily to the fact that the wheat producer was required to cut out

some 24 million acres which he used for producing wheat and plant it in feed grains, which broke the price of feed grains and the hog market. One can trace that directly, without having to do much tracing, either. It is due directly to the high rigid supports which induced overproduction of wheat.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I particularly appreciate the Senator's reference to the amendments which I have offered in the past seeking to provide compulsory handling of diverted acreage so as to prevent the happening of what has happened recently. Diverted acreage has brought headaches to the producers of other crops—both to the producers of allotted crops and the producers of unallotted crops. One result has been the production of so much feed grain, for instance, as to greatly increase the supply of cattle and other livestock, which has brought headaches all the way down the line in the field of agriculture.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico if it is not true that one of the reasons for objecting to some of the provisions of the pending bill is that, along with the proposed restoration of 90 percent price supports, which is the greatest possible inducement to overproduction, the bill does not propose a strict across-the-line compliance which would do away with the very abuses to which the Senator has so properly adverted.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree completely with that statement. I say to the Senator that one of the difficulties with the farm program is that while practically everybody says he is in favor of putting controls on agricultural prices, actually that will not be done, because when we get down to the question of whether or not we will stand for a program, Congress may adopt one, and the President may sign the bill, but the program will be kicked out before adequate opportunity is afforded to see whether it will work. It is not possible to have enormous overproduction year after year and not have a drop in farm income. That is why, unless we decide to do something effective and stick to our plan, we shall not get rid of the problem. We must get rid of the farm surpluses and bring production under control. When that is done, we shall have a price range which will be above parity, where it was before we were confronted with the problem of surpluses.

We cannot refer to the surplus question and say it is due to the piling up of commodities under a previous administration.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator believe the soil bank can be made operative in this calendar year so as to affect to any great extent the surpluses, or potential surpluses, should weather conditions be favorable?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know whether it can be effective now, but with a fairly high range of supports, no soil bank will become operative. The only way a soil bank can be made operative is to make it mandatory, and then it will work only if the temptation to evade all controls is not too great.

If we are going to try to trim down, we must do it on some sort of mandatory basis, and in order to make it work, we must expect that the farmer will profit from it. That is why I say it cannot be made operative unless something is done about the surplus situation. If we allow the storage of rice without some disposition being made of it, and then establish a soil bank for rice, the farmer is not going to be interested.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator believe that farm prices will correct themselves in this calendar year, and not drop lower? Will a lower price not go into effect as the first application for a wheat loan or corn loan is made in the calendar year 1956?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. It will depend on what the Department of Agriculture decides to do on two fronts. If it decides to dispose of surpluses, and really attempts to do so, and not merely sweep them under the rug, then I think farm prices will improve.

As the Senator probably knows, I was the only Senator who voted against the set-aside when it was put into the last law. I do not believe a set-aside which pushes the surplus away, but leaves it in existence, is going to have a good effect. People who are smart enough to trade in grain stocks know that, so long as 29 million hundredweight of rice are on hand, establishing a soil bank is not going to give good results.

Mr. THYE. I heartily agree with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. There cannot be any question that surpluses are an overhanging threat to our markets. The Senator from New Mexico and I are in full agreement that this is the serious problem with which we are now confronted. My only concern is that we in the Midwest are in a surplus producing area, and we do not have a vast population which is able to consume our production, as is true in the East and in other areas. Therefore, the farmers in our area are immediately confronted with the problem that a price drop of 27 cents a bushel for wheat and a price drop of 18 cents a bushel for corn this year will be reflected in price reductions of feed grains.

Until there is a reduction in overall production, prices are going to continue to drop. That is the reason I believe that in this crop year of 1956 we need the so-called 90-percent price supports to keep prices from going lower.

My good friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] felt that I should not be advocating a 1-year extension of 90-percent price supports. He said I might be accused of doing so for political reasons if I suggested it be done for only 1 year. Well, the Senator from Florida was kind to me. He was trying to do me a service, so I would not be accused of making a move for political reasons, and he cautioned me against suggesting that it be done for only 1 year. Consequently, the provision for 2 years was written into the proposed legislation, so as not to bring a political question before us.

The Senator from New Mexico and I know positively that it is the surpluses burdening our national markets which have weakened prices, in the face of the Nation's prospering economy, with record-breaking wholesale and retail sales, and the greatest purchasing power on the part of the consumer which has ever been seen. Therefore, if we could erase the surpluses, our agricultural commodities would reflect, I am sure, 100 percent in the market place.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the Senator says that, he strikes a very responsive chord, if we could just erase the surpluses. On the first day the Senate was open for business I introduced a resolution, in the hope of providing a definite plan for the disposition of surpluses. It contained a provision that the Secretary should report 60 days after a certain law became effective. But by that time we would be through another crop year.

What I wanted to do was to have a program adopted which would pledge the Secretary not to allow one bale of cotton over a certain good housekeeping level to flow into the markets; to take away everything above 3 million bales and agree to move it into other markets, as we are starting to do now. If he would do that, and see to it that in 4 or 5 years of proper disposal we got rid of surpluses, we would find it the greatest stimulant for better prices we ever experienced.

I read what the Senator said about dairy support prices, to the effect that, although the level was fixed at 90 percent, the price received was about 83 or 84 percent. That is correct. I am prepared to say that even trying to fix a high level will, in the end, work against the farmers. I think the best thing we can do for the farmers at the present time is to make a pledge to get rid of the surpluses, and require the Secretary to try to get rid of them within a period of not more than 5 years, and preferably within 4 years. True, it will mean enormous losses, but the very large loss today is being taken out of the hide of the farmers. I think the very first thing we need to do is get rid of the surpluses, and the second thing is adopt a mandatory soil bank that would absolutely shrink acreage and give the farmers payments for it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I share the conviction of the need for a mandatory soil-bank program. I advocated it 3 years ago, and I was ridiculed by some and accused by others of trying to regiment agriculture. But everyone who has any commonsense and who applies it in connection with farm operations and farm production, knows that our farm plant has been too large, and that there is only one way to bring production down, namely, by decreasing the number of acres which are tilled. If that is done, of course, many of the young couples whom we would like to keep on the farms will have to stop farming.

They will be eliminated because their credit is limited, for one thing.

But I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico—who probably is one of the best informed persons on agriculture in the United States—whether he believes that the 90 percent supports are a factor in the development of the surplus.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not like to start debates, but I think that is so.

Mr. THYE. Then I should like to ask this question: In the 1920's, we did not have any kind of farm program. At that time we did not have price supports; we did not have acreage allotments; we did not have any mandatory provisions. During those years we had very little knowledge of the use of commercial fertilizer. At that time our corn planters were still set at 42-inch rows, and some of them were set at 44-inch rows. At that time we did not have any modern machinery, such as the efficient combines which are in use today. Yet, if we read the debates which occurred on this floor in 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, and 1928, we find that they are almost identical with the debates we are having today as we discuss the question of why the surplus must be controlled, and what has caused the low prices in the marketplace. At that time there was no farm program; yet that was the question which was before the Congress. I know the Senator from New Mexico is aware of that fact.

That is why today I am in complete accord with the soil-bank provision, and that is why I am in complete accord with the provision for $250 million to move the surpluses, and that is why I am in complete accord with what the Senator from New Mexico says, namely, that we must get rid of the surpluses, and that we should make it mandatory for the Department of Agriculture to take steps to get rid of them. I share the view of the Senator from New Mexico.

However, knowing that in the 1920's and early 1930's we accumulated surpluses, although at that time we did not have a farm program, I am at a loss to know how anyone can say that 90 percent supports were the incentive which brought on the surpluses with which we are confronted today.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say to the Senator from Minnesota that I have tried to keep from bringing that question too firmly into consideration here. I have a conviction about it, and so does he. I have been trying to say that I do not believe we shall solve the farm problem by trying to tie a tag to one particular thing or by necessarily adopting one particular recommendation.

We have four large farm organizations. I am sure all of them try to help the farmer. In their recommendations, they are split apart as far as they possibly can be. The Farmers Union favors 100 percent of parity and unlimited acreage, and so forth. The Farm Bureau wants a mandatory soil bank and flexible price supports. Under those circumstances, I do not know how to expect the Members of the Senate or the Members of the House of Representatives to know what is best.

In the second place, I wish to point out that in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—as the Senator from Minnesota knows—we had more splinter parties than does the Republic of France. In the committee we were dividing almost entirely on every vote—showing that it is very hard, and I say it sincerely, to come into agreement on many of these matters.

However, there must be a few fundamental things upon which we agree. I do not object to the level of price supports the farmer gets, if we give him a chance to help solve the problem. But we shall never give him a chance to do that if we do not get rid of the surpluses, in the first place; and, second, if we do not have machinery by means of which to keep production under control.

In the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy we have heard testimony to the effect that by means of the use of atomic energy it will be possible to increase tremendously our agricultural production from the same number of acres now under cultivation. Under these circumstances, are we going to allow our agricultural production to go higher and higher? Furthermore, I understand that the Department of Agriculture has made studies which show that there is enough known technology, now unused, to boost the national average yield of cotton up to 700 pounds to the acre. If that happens, and if at that time we still have 18 million acres of cotton under production, and if each of those acres produces an average of 700 pounds, what shall we do with the surplus then?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is bringing out some very pertinent points in connection with the agricultural problem.

I know, and I realize the distinguished Senator from New Mexico also knows very well, that today's dairy animal is the result of intensified breeding. At first that animal was intended by the Creator to furnish sufficient milk only to feed its offspring. But today we are aware of the much greater production that has been accomplished by means of scientific breeding. Similarly, we know that tomorrow our experiment stations will develop new varieties of grains, and will increase the production of grain. There is no question about it. Furthermore, the atomic-energy era will further expand our production.

But the point is that so long as the farm plant has the potential of producing more than we can consume domestically or more than we can barter or dispose of in the international field, then in some manner we must assist the producer in an orderly way to bring the farm plant to a proper size. Congress must assist in that work, because no individual farmer can accomplish that. The Senator from New Mexico may have gone out of the dairy business, as I think he has—

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I have.

Mr. THYE. But his going out of the dairy business did not limit dairy production in his vicinity.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, indeed.

Mr. THYE. Another farmer may have gone out of the pork-production busines, but that does not limit the Nation's production of pork. There must be a national program, and the Government is the only one that can initiate it and assist in its formulation.

The soil bank and the other provisions of the pending bill constitute the first sound, intelligent approach I have seen to solving the farm problem. I say that in all sincerity, and this is my 10th year of service here. Furthermore, I know something about farming, even though I have been classified as a chicken farmer. Nevertheless, I do know something about general farming.

I know that the farm plant will not be reduced in size sufficiently until we retire from production some of the acreage now under cultivation, and that must be done even before the atomic era comes into application in connection with farming.

The Senator from New Mexico and I know the farm problem. He is a former Secretary of Agriculture; and not only does he have a basic knowledge of the Department of Agriculture and of agricultural production and research activities, as carried on through the Extension Service and the experiment stations, but he also has had broad experience in practical operations in these fields. He and I differ on two points. I favor 90 percent of parity for 2 years, until the surplus is disposed of. He favors flexible price supports at once, to be applied in 1956, by means of announced supports on wheat, corn, rice, cotton, and so forth. So he and I differ only in regard to what might amount to 3 or 4 percentage points in the case of supports. Otherwise, he and I are in complete accord in regard to the fundamentals of the pending farm bill.

I criticized Secretary Brannan when he was Secretary of Agriculture because he did not dispose of pork when we had a surplus of it in 1951 and 1952. We have already noted the criticism of the past year. We know what the pork situation is at the present time. The Department has bought pork, and it has disposed of or assisted in disposing of surplus pork. Today for the first time we are making an intelligent approach to bringing the farm plant into balance with domestic needs. If we bring it into balance we can throw price supports out the window, because we shall never need them.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator that if we do those two things we shall never have to worry thereafter about the level of price supports.

Mr. THYE. Positively not, because they would be a forgotten factor if it were not for the surpluses which are depressing the national markets.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. When the colloquy started between the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Minnesota the Senator from Minnesota asked a question, and I should like to go back and ask the converse of it. The question, in substance, was this: Does the Senator from New Mexico believe that if the bill were passed with flexible price supports, it would permit the acreage to be reduced, and would have some force and effect on farm prices this year?

I should like to ask the reverse of that question. I am well aware of the interest of the Senator from New Mexico in the farm problem, and his great knowledge of the subject. In the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico, if the bill were passed with rigid high supports, would that in any way tend to diminish the surplus? Does the Senator know of any way in which it could diminish the surplus?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I know of no way in which it could.

Mr. ALLOTT. Second, does the Senator know of any possible way that the adoption of such a policy could strengthen the income from farm products?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I think not, because I believe we would run into exactly the same situation in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. ALLOTT. So we have a choice of two methods of proceeding. I think we are all pretty well agreed as to the surpluses. We can call them reserves for the well-being of the country, or anything else. Nevertheless, they are still stacked up, and they are still depressing the agricultural economy. So we have two choices. If we go one way, there is no chance of helping either the price of farm products or the surplus situation; and if we go the other way, there is a chance of helping both.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it was pointed out in the hearings that the corn price-support level was $1.34 or $1.35 in one of the counties of Minnesota. Someone asked what the market price was. The price was $1.10. I do not know what good the support price did, so long as the farmer was receiving $1.10.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but I wish to continue to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THYE. The Senator referred to Minnesota. I thought I probably could add to the discussion by saying that the man who complied with an acreage quota could obtain $1.51 as a commodity loan on every bushel of corn that qualified for sealing. That is a long way from $1.05 or 85 cents a bushel.

The man who did not qualify, the man who planted as many acres as his land would permit him to plant, was not qualified to get a commodity loan. He had to take what the cash market offered him. He figured that he could gamble, and probably get more money at the end of the year by staying out of the program than by going into it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I remind the Senator from Minnesota that the Secretary of Agriculture testified that 76 percent of the farmers did not comply. Noncompliance was not limited to some casual farmer down the road. Three-fourths of the farmers would not go under the program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, had there been a soil-bank program in 1955, through which the farmer could have had some place to put his diverted acreage and receive some return with which to pay his taxes, interest, and overhead, he would have been in compliance. But with no soil-bank program, he could not afford to comply, and therefore he did not. Consequently, I say that we must have a realistic approach to this whole question in order to resolve the surplus problem. The soil-bank plan is that approach.

Mr. ANDERSON. By the same token, if Congress had adopted the realistic farm program passed by the Senate in 1948 and allowed it to become law, we would not be in the fix we are in today. We start on these programs, and abandon them halfway down the road.

Mr. THYE. The soil-bank feature was not in the 1948 act. I say that as a practical approach, if we deny a farmer the right to grow an acre of corn, an acre of wheat, or an acre of cotton, and do not establish penalties with respect to the use of such diverted acreage, he will shift into sorghum grains in the Southwest, into barley and oats in the Northwest, and into either soybeans or corn in the southern cotton area. The result will be that we shall be only shifting the responsibility for surpluses from one area to another. When the agricultural plant is too big, it can be reduced in size only by intelligently controlling acreage and the production of farm commodities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Many of the things involved in the soil bank can be done under existing law. Very little additional law is needed to make it work.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the point I wished to make has been pretty well covered, but I desire to repeat it. With the present support price on corn, under the present situation there is only 76 percent compliance.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is only 24 percent compliance.

Mr. ALLOTT. Seventy-six percent of the farmers are out of compliance, which accounts for the low price of corn.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is as I remember the testimony.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I concur in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. I think he very accurately described the problem which confronts a great many farmers of South Dakota. His statement expressed the real problem.

I am informed that there will be less compliance with respect to corn planting next year than there was last year. A 15-percent acreage reduction has been announced.

Mr. ANDERSON. The allotment is 43 million acres; and the least we can expect is that 55 or 56 million acres will be planted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That creates a terrific problem for the man who has an investment in a corn picker and other equipment. I think the percentage of compliance in South Dakota in 1954 was 40 percent. In 1955, it was possibly 50 percent. This year, however, it may not be as much as 10 percent. The farmer simply cannot get enough income to meet his fixed expenses. That is where he is caught.

Let me pose one question to the Senator from New Mexico. I heard the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] speaking of the soil bank plan as something to assist in making the transition. He was in favor of a 2-year continuation of the 90 percent program, in order to provide a period of transition. I recall hearing the Senator from New Mexico state—or perhaps I read a statement to that effect attributed to him—that for once he would like to see a farm bill passed before the farmer has his crops already in the ground.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have said that, and I agree with the Senator, I say that if the soil bank is ever adopted by the Congress, it will be a voluntary plan, under which I may announce that I am going to reduce my acreage; and when my neighbors reduce theirs, I go ahead and plant as much as I can.

Every farmer will think he will outfox his neighbor. We cannot blame them for it, either, because they are all in the same situation the Senator is talking about. If we do not get the law passed before the first of April, then of course it will be too late to have it do any good, because crops are being planted in many areas of the country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With respect to wheat, in some sections of our country winter wheat is raised, and in other sections spring wheat is raised, and it is impossible to fix the exact date. Therefore, it seems to me that there is a sound basis for a provision in the bill which will assure the farmer a cash income which will help him meet the price squeeze in which he finds himself. Whether it should be a program of 1 year or 2 years, or for a different period of time, I do not know. However, it seems to me that a transitional period is necessary.

Mr. ANDERSON. We went all through that in 1948. At that time, the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] introduced a bill on a bipartisan basis, because it was sent to him by the then President of the United States, and the President had received it from the Department of Agriculture. A great many persons thought it was a sensible proposal. We got all the farm organizations together, and they all agreed to a modernized parity and flexible price support program. Of course some of them changed their minds later on but all of them at that time were in agreement. The Senate passed the bill. However, in conference, the House said, "Give us 1 more year. Give us 1 more year. We will not ask for an extension again."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recall being called to a conference at 3 o'clock in the morning on one day.

Mr. ANDERSON. They said, "Give us just 1 more year. We will never ask for it again." We gave them 1 more year.

Then in 1949 the Senate passed another bill. The House had adopted the Gore amendment. Again we went to conference. In conference it was said, "Just give us 1 more year. Only 1 more year. We will never ask for it again. Just give us 1 more year. Just one. Give us just 1 more year."

When that year ran out——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Korean war broke out.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then when that year ran out, we were asked, "Give us just 2 more years. Give us only 2 more years. We will never ask for it again." When we got through that period we were asked, "Just give us 1 more year. We will never ask for it again."

Now we are in the 2-year cycle again. We are being asked to extend it for just 2 more years.

Mr. President, I have no faith in any such proposal. I believe we had better meet the question before all the farmers see their farm income go down to zero.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say that I cannot too strongly commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for the various points he is making. They are all keyed to the principal point, that the surpluses overhanging the market are the principal problems with which we must deal.

The Senator is absolutely correct in his statement that an artificial set-aside or anything of that nature is nothing more than a shell game which both the farmer and the trade who handle agricultural products are much too smart to be taken in by. It is the old shell game of "Now you see it; now you don't. Now you have it under your hand; now you don't." Both the farmer and the men in the trade know that a set-aside does not do away with the menace.

Therefore I join the Senator from New Mexico, first, in his insistence on a quicker handling of surpluses, and that that be made the first undertaking, and the first problem to be met.

Second, I join with him in insisting that the first approach to that problem is through the soil bank. I join with him in believing that it should be on a compulsory basis, rather than on a voluntary basis.

The third point is this. Am I correct in understanding that the distinguished Senator feels that instead of assisting in doing away with surpluses, the restoration of 90 percent price supports for the basic crops for 2 years would do the exact opposite, in that it would give the maximum inducement and the greatest possible incentive for the farmer to produce just as much as he could produce from his acreage, and to overproduce, in the same way that the potato farmers did once when we were confronted with the same problem?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but I do not believe what the Senator has said applies only to the basic crops. I do not believe that we will be able to get rid of an amendment to take care of lightweight hogs, oats, rye, barley, grain, sorghums, and other crops.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from New Mexico. However, am I correct in my understanding that the Senator feels that restoration of 90-percent price supports for 2 years would do the exact opposite from what it is claimed it would do, and that it would not attack the surplus problem at all, or dispose of it, but would, instead, tend to restore and enlarge the surplus crops to which the 90-percent formula applies?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I believe that to be the case. However, I wish to remind the Senate once more that there is a problem which is far more important than the problem of worrying about price supports, and that is the problem of what we will do with the surpluses.

I had hoped that the Senate would adopt the resolution I had presented to the Senate, so that we could have the Secretary's reply when we took up the debate on the farm bill. We did not do so. However, if we do nothing more than adopt a resolution which requires the Secretary of Agriculture to come back in 60 days to tell us what he will do about the disposition of the surpluses, I do not believe that action alone will affect farm prices supportable by 90 percent. A great many people believe that it would raise farm prices. However, what will we do with 29 million hundredweight of rice—unless we start to give it away?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I especially wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico for calling our attention to the fact that the basics are by no means all the agricultural production. They constitute only about 23 percent of the total cash marketings of agricultural production in this country. After taking out tobacco, which is not in argument in this particular debate, only 19 percent is affected when we talk about basics going back to 90-percent price supports.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico if he believes it is not merely a coincidence that most of the prosperity in agriculture at this time—and there is a great deal of it in particular places and in particular commodities—is in large part derived from agriculture crops which do not fall under the head of basics, but do fall under the head of production in which the farmer still uses some intelligence and still is trying to shape his planting against needs, and is using his ingenuity in marketing and distributing his products and in creating byproducts for which there are new demands?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not correct to say that the agricultural industries which show high prosperity at this time fall entirely outside the range of basic commodities, and that there are a considerable number of agricultural industries which are showing high prosperity because they are still planning, thinking, and working for themselves?

Mr. ANDERSON. I submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day a table showing the citrus fruit situation, with respect to which the State of the Senator from Florida is a very good example. I pointed out that although the citrus production had greatly increased, the producer was not in trouble, because he had found other and new uses for his product. When the domestic consumption of table fruit, or fruit eaten at the table, did not increase, the producer increased greatly the amount of fruit which went into packages, cans, and jars, as well as the sales to other parts of the world. He had to do it because the price support was below 50 percent, and he could not depend on the price-support program. Therefore, he had to find markets.

Of course, it is not so simple as that with some other commodities. I will say that now before my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] calls it to my attention. I do say, however, that if we would take care, when bills come to the floor, not to pass apparently little provisions which put us in trouble each time, we might have a better chance later of avoiding difficulties of the kind we are now facing. A short time ago we passed three little tobacco bills. They were signed the other day. I ask Senators to wait and see what those little bills will do. We will soon see what the effect of some of those little bills will be.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his reference to the citrus industry. I admit that our citrus growers were hard pressed. They have accomplished much for themselves. I am happy, also, to say that theirs is not the only industry which has done much for itself. There are numerous other fruit industries—deciduous fruit and dried fruit, for example—and also other industries like the dairy industry in most parts of the country, which have done much for themselves. Incidentally, the dairy problem is confined largely to about seven States. The other States of the Nation are taking care of their dairy situation.

Mr. THYE. Under Federal orders. Under virtual monopolies. It would not be possible to carry so much as a gallon of milk into certain areas if it were not for Federal orders.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the Senator from New Mexico had yielded to me, but apparently I have been laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. THYE. I am sorry.

Mr. HOLLAND. I see on the floor the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS.] He represents an area which has helped itself to solve its problems. Other agricultural areas which have helped themselves are those of poultry, dairy, small-fruit production, vegetables, garden crops, and others. That has been true in California, Florida, and in numerous other States where garden crops and small fruits and tree fruits and tree nuts constitute the largest agricultural industries.

I recall that in a recent colloquy my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] remarked on the fact that my comment in committee was somewhat persuasive to him in getting him to drop his demand for a 1-year continuance of 90-percent price support on the ground that it was so apparently and translucently political that it would show itself.

Mr. ANDERSON. No member of the Committee on Agriculture would be political in any way.

Mr. HOLLAND. I approve of that afterthought statement of the Senator from New Mexico. But I wish to ask this question: Admitting that holding out the prospect of supports at 90 percent of parity for 1 year is a tremendous political bait in certain areas for certain people, does the Senator think that doubling the bait and making it applicable

for 2 years, not only for this year but for next year, and saying, "We who are fighting for you are going to put your business on a basis of 90 percent price supports," is any less political or less persuasive as a political argument in those areas to those people who, I think, are very few in number, but who are susceptible of political persuasion in this field?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I do not. I think the only solution is to come to grips with the question. It would be better for us to come to grips with the question of what we are going to do with our surplus products and our expanding agricultural production.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I regret that I interrupted the Senator from Florida. He is always a gentleman, and I want to treat him as such. But I should like to say, with reference to the market situation, that we in the Midwest are a surplus-producing area. Unfortunately Florida is getting many of our citizens who have the financial means to retire and who leave us and go to Florida. So the population of Florida is increasing, and therefore the State has increased numbers of consumers at the expense of those of us who live in northern regions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we in Florida are happy to have people from Minnesota come to our State. They are as fine citizens as can be found anywhere.

Mr. THYE. And we regret to lose them. But when the Senator's State enjoys a large fluid-milk consuming market he is not faced with the question of disposing of surplus dairy products. We cannot, however, ship our fine grade A milk to Washington or New York—milk which meets the standards of the Food and Drug Administration—because there is a regulation against it.

But what I want to say is simply this: The soil-bank plan is the first realistic approach to governing the number of acres to be placed in production and to controlling that acreage which has been diverted. We will not be able to get production down to reasonable proportions until we cease to till, or curtail the number of acres which are presently in production annually. Until such time as the soil bank is operating and we can fully retire acreage from production, we are going to have surpluses. In the 1920's and early 1930's, we had no farm program on the statute books; we had no price supports of any kind. Yet, men like Senator McNary and Representative Haugen, the sponsors of the McNary-Haugen bills, and even President Coolidge and those who assisted in writing his veto message, referred to the surplus as the only major factor which was then creating a depression in American agriculture.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is in this Chamber, and I believe he could draw upon his memory and recall the debates which took place on the floor of the Senate with reference to the surpluses which were then destroying the farmer's markets.

No price-support factors were involved in the problem then. Therefore, I think those who say that 90 percent price supports are responsible for the present surpluses are not drawing upon the experience of yesterday, because in the 1920's and early 1930's there were neither supports of any kind, nor any kind of a farm program, yet surpluses existed as the number one problem. Then, as now, there were surpluses that destroyed the farmer's market. The soil bank is a realistic approach to the problem, but we cannot accomplish a surplus reduction this year that will substantially solve the problem. We shall go well into 1957 before we can accomplish it. That is why I wish to keep the price-support program until the soil-bank plan can become wholly operative and effect a reduction in the surpluses.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is an interesting point—that the soil bank is the first new approach. I was interested a few weeks ago to pick up a copy of an agricultural publication which referred to the soil bank as a crisp, new approach to this problem. I have here a press release from the United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Information, press service, dated March 10, 1937, headed "Secretary Wallace Defines the 'Ever-Normal Granary.'"

I read:

> The phrase "ever-normal granary" is defined by Secretary Wallace in an article in the March issue of the Agricultural Situation, published monthly by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.
>
> By the ever-normal granary, Secretary Wallace means "a definite system whereby supplies following years of drought or other great calamity would be large enough to take care of the consumer, but under which the farmer would not be unduly penalized in years of favorable weather."

Let me read the last paragraph:

> "I call this part of the ever-normal granary program storing the grain in the soil," the Secretary explains, "instead of storing it in the bin." After the consumer is adequately taken care of by the building up of certain supplies, it is cheaper for the farmer, consumer, and Government alike to store additional quantities in the soil rather than in the bin.

So, if we want to find out how new it is, it is as new as 1937. The Senate and the House did not pay any attention to it then. Even though it is Henry Wallace's program, I still think it is a good program, and I think the Senate should adopt it.

Mr. THYE. If the Lord gives us rain at the proper time, and gives us the proper amount of sunlight, and if the farmer does not have to combat either drought or grasshoppers, we still, oftentimes, produce more than can be consumed domestically. Henry Wallace was right when he said that the only proper way was to build a fertile soil bank that could produce sufficiently if and when the need developed. Congress did not accept the proposal at that time. I hope it will now be accepted. It is too bad that a majority did not see fit to put that sort of program on the statute books in 1937. It is too bad that they did not do it then, but it is certainly going to be too bad if we do not do it now.

The only argument I have with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is this: Shall we reduce supports while these surpluses cause our markets to be so weak that the farmer cannot receive 80 percent of parity although the national economy is enjoying prosperity in its other segments?

I say that we should not do so with these surpluses hanging over our markets. It is for this reason that I have the courage—although I must say it is not pleasant, but embarrassing—to stand against some of my colleagues and against the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture.

But I disagree on the question of how to provide a better farm economy and bring it into balance at this time. I say that if the support price on wheat is to be reduced 27 cents a bushel this year and the support price on corn 18 cents a bushel this year, this will reflect on the prices of barley, oats, and the sorghums grown in the Southwest, as well as on the prices of other grains grown elsewhere in the Nation. If that should be the effect, the prices received by farmers will drop lower than they are today.

It is with this conviction that I speak as I do in favor of the 90-percent price supports, even though I may be criticized by some in my own State, who ask why I will not stand with my administration.

The Senator's proposal for flexible price supports, as is provided in the 1954 act, will further lower the income of farmers this year and they have already suffered severely. Therefore, until the soil bank program becomes effective, there will not be any stiffening of prices in the marketplace. That will not happen this year, and that is why I take the stand I do today.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for yielding to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to have done so. I know how energetic and aggressive my friend, the senior Senator from Minnesota, is with respect to the farm problem. He understands the needs of the farmers.

At a dinner I was attending not long ago, a very amiable lady came up and asked me about the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. She said, "How do you get along with each other?"

I said, "Fine, fine. We get along very well."

She said, "How can you say that? You disagree with him on every issue."

I said, "No, no. We are not together on price supports; but we are absolutely together—just like that—and I put my two fingers together.

She said, "On what are you together?"

I replied, "On trying to do something for the American farmer. We simply consider the situation along different lines."

I am certain the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota is no more embarrassed in his opposition to his President and his opposition to his Secretary of Agriculture than I am in supporting their views. We both have our crosses to bear.

Mr. THYE. The fact of the matter is that I wish the Senator were not stand-

ing with them, because it makes it more difficult for me.

It is sometimes said to me, "I cannot understand your not being in step with your President or your Secretary of Agriculture. If the Senator from New Mexico, CLINT ANDERSON, himself a rancher and a former Secretary of Agriculture, sees it as the President and the Secretary of Agriculture see it, you must be wrong."

My reply is, "No, I am not wrong; I am sorry the Senator from New Mexico sees conditions that way."

The Senator from New Mexico and I are both caught on the horns of a dilemma.

Mr. ANDERSON. No doubt I regret the dereliction of the senior Senator from Minnesota as much as does the President. I can only say that I think agricultural matters should not to be questions of partisan politics.

In 1947 we tried to find a basis upon which the problem might be solved. We did not succeed in doing so. I have felt many times that the matter had been plunged too deeply into politics in the 1948 election. I have regretted that it was a matter on which we divided along such strong political lines.

I would only say to the Senator from Minnesota that many of these matters are not new. The Senator from Minnesota speaks about the flexible price-support program in the 1954 act. Of course, there is nothing relating to flexible price supports in the 1954 act; it was in the act of 1948, which was sponsored by the Republican Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and it is in the Agricultural Act of 1949, sponsored by Democrats.

So these difficulties are not so easy to adjust on the basis of party loyalty.

I was deeply appreciative—I have said this before, and I am glad to do so again—when the Department of Agriculture, at the time I was the Secretary, presented the findings of a group of persons inside the Department and outside the Department as a permanent program of agricultural relief to the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who said he would introduce it in Congress. I thought that was a proper demonstration of nonpartisan administration.

As a result, when the President decides to stand by a program of flexible price supports, it ought not to seem very remarkable to anyone that I shall support that program, because I feel deeply about it. But in doing so, I am sure everyone understands that I shall not criticize my friends who may feel otherwise about the question, and who feel deeply about the agricultural situation in their own States.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has pointed out that the price-support program was not an issue in the 1948 campaign, but that both major parties took the same position at that time. Agriculture generally did not become an issue until after the distinguished Senator from New Mexico left the office of Secretary of Agriculture, which I think was in May 1949.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it was 1948. I was not in the Department of Agriculture when the subject became a red hot political issue. When I was in the Department of Agriculture, I may say to my friend from Vermont, which was during the 80th Congress, I needed all the Republican support I could muster, day by day, on the matter of hog prices. The Senator from North Dakota can testify to that.

Mr. AIKEN. Although the question of grain storage got into the campaign of 1948, it was not until the spring of 1949 that the farm program really became a matter of politics in this country. From the spring of 1949 until the present time, agriculture has been involved politically. I still insist that the farm programs should not be partisan matters; that they, like our foreign relations and foreign policies, should be above partisanship; and that anyone who attempts to make farm programs partisan questions is performing no service at all for the farm population of the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for being so generous with his time in permitting Senators to have a little discussion of the bill.

I was in full support of the 1948 farm bill. I was with the committee when they conducted nationwide hearings in order to get opinions from the producers. Those hearings afforded the producers in various sections of the Nation a convenient opportunity to meet with the committee. Otherwise they would not have been able to present their views to the committee, because most of them could not actually have afforded to come to Washington.

I was in full support of the flexible provisions in the 1948 act. I did object to the omission of dairy provisions. However, a provision was included in the bill making it mandatory to support milk between 75 and 90 percent of parity, thus leaving the Secretary of Agriculture with some discretion in the establishment of price-support levels.

At that time—and this is the reason I wished to make a comment—an embargo was placed on the exportation of fats and oils, which were in short supply in the United States. Other commodities and products also were in short supply.

It was for that reason that flexibility was written into the act.

I do not say or agree that that was wholly correct; but I, who came from the Midwest, knew how surpluses could affect the farmers in that area, so I felt that the flexible price supports were proper, because they would bring about a diversion from the production of some crops to other crops, such as flax for linseed oil, and soy beans because of the shortage of oil. Therefore, I voted for flexibility in the program in order to permit shifting from a crop which was in long supply to a product that was in short supply. I never embraced the theory that a price reduction would compel reduced production, because I believed, as had others, that only through such a program as is now envisioned in the soil-bank program could we curtail production and ultimately manage the surpluses.

Any man who is familiar with the productive capacity of land knows that it is necessary to retire acres if production is to be reduced. No farmer, if he is a true farmer at heart, is going to neglect either his livestock or his crops. He will, with every effort, produce the maximum of which the land is capable. He will produce the maximum on his dairy farm, in his poultry houses, or on his pig lot. Therefore, the feed supply must be affected if there is to be a reduction in meat supply. Availability of feed grains will invariably encourage feeding of livestock or poultry, and result in an increase in dairy products. There can be no question about that.

It is for these reasons that I must stand here before the Senate and plead my case. If supports are dropped before the soil bank has become administratively operative, a reduction in farm income will result. Farm income has already slipped from $17.2 billion in the late 1940's down to $10.2 billion at this time. The farm income is threatening to go lower. Such a drop in income cannot be suffered by the farm segment of our economy without eventually endangering and adversely affecting industry, because the farmer is a big user of machinery, whether it be a combine, a tractor, a truck, a plow, or any of the other equipment necessary to the farmer's operations. If the farmer buys less from the local merchants, industrial plants will ultimately feel the result of the reduced purchases of the farmer. Finally, industrial plants will feel the pinch and men and women will be laid off and there will be unemployment.

That is why I am pleading my case today. There will be a chain reaction which will start in the grassroots and be reflected in the industrial centers.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota I am going to try to refer to several things to which I have already made reference. He is going to speak tomorrow——

Mr. THYE. I am very sorry I interrupted.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I am very happy to have yielded to the Senator, and I have already so indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an extract from the statement of Henry Wallace before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on March 7, 1935, a quotation from a radio address given by Henry A. Wallace over the National Farm and Home Hour on Tuesday, January 26, 1937, and a short quotation from Agricultural Price Policy, written by Geoffrey S. Shepherd, which again refers to those needs.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HENRY A. WALLACE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, UNITED STATES SENATE, MARCH 7, 1935, DURING THE COURSE OF HEARING ON S. 1807, A BILL TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, PAGES 6–7

Coordination of commodity loans with production programs:

"Part of the amendments apply primarily to the production adjustment programs affecting the basic commodities. These would

coordinate commodity loans with production programs. * * *

"Coordinating commodity loans with production programs would be a step in the direction of the ever-normal granary plan which I suggested and have repeatedly advocated. The proposal provides for Government acquisition of commodities pledged by farmers as security for loans, and their repayment at the option of producers as benefit payments in kind. In my opinion, the inauguration of this method in the Smith cotton-option plan, sponsored by the chairman of your committee, worked out to the decided advantage of the farmers. Both our cotton and our corn loans have been very materially helpful to producers. This plan can be used to assure farmers the benefits of price improvements which otherwise would go to speculators; and also to build up and maintain reserve supplies of food, which can be handled through the benefit payment-in-kind method without depressing the farmers' markets. I believe this proposal is wholly sound and I hope it will be written into the Adjustment Act."

FROM RADIO ADDRESS GIVEN BY HENRY A. WALLACE OVER THE NATIONAL FARM AND HOME HOUR, JANUARY 26, 1937

"The ever-normal granary above and below the ground: Another way of approaching the problem of the ever-normal granary is through crop insurance, with premiums paid in grain and benefits paid in grain.

"No matter whether the ever-normal granary is established through governmental purchases, as in the case of the Farm Board, through commodity loans, or through crop insurance, there inevitably comes a time when favorable weather several years in succession results in large supplies—large supplies which bring unfairly low prices to the farmer and positive damage to the consumer from unemployment, which is a certain consequence of unfair prices to farmers. When more than a certain quantity of food is in storage the result is not abundance but waste.

"To prevent such consequences of years of favorable weather farmers must have the power to control their production. After adequate storage supplies of wheat, corn, and other grains have been established, it becomes the part of wisdom to conduct further storage operations in the soil rather than in the grain bin.

"We should, of course, divert a certain amount of corn and cotton acreage to soil-conserving crops because that will make for greater long-time productivity of our farm land. But for the most part, let's fill up the storage bins this year. It is good policy to vary the plans for storage of crops in the soil according to the state of supplies in the granary above ground."

FROM AGRICULTURAL PRICE POLICY, BY GEOFFREY S. SHEPHERD, 1947 EDITION, PAGE 40, WHICH CITED ABOVE STATEMENT FROM THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION, BAE, USDA, VOLUME 20, NO. 1, JANUARY 1, 1936

A program of practical adjustment:

"To keep the Government from committing a farm board it will be necessary after supplies under the loan program have reached a certain point to keep the granary from running over by some practical program of production adjustment. I call this part of the ever-normal granary program 'storing the grain in the soil' instead of 'storing it in the bin.' After the consumer is adequately taken care of by the building up of certain supplies, it is cheaper for the farmer, consumer, and Government alike to store additional quantities in the soil rather than in the bin. If the weather is going to be unusually violent in its swings, it is necessary for man to be unusually intelligent in meeting the problem. I believe the ever-normal granary is a start."

STATEMENTS BY SECRETARY WALLACE BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HOLDING HEARINGS ON GENERAL FARM LEGISLATION, MAY 27, 1937, REFERRED TO THE EVER-NORMAL GRANARY BUT MADE NO SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO THE STORING OF RESERVES IN THE SOIL

"I am appearing before your committee today in support of the bill which is entitled 'The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937.' I am strongly in favor of the principles and purposes of this bill. It is deserving of immediate consideration in Congress and I hope that legislation to carry out the aims of this measure will be enacted at the earliest possible date. The two fundamental purposes of this bill are first to safeguard the Nation's food supply and second to protect farm income. Under the terms of the bill, its aims would be attained through a system of loans to farmers to protect their prices and storage of reserve supplies against years of short crops, coupled with supplementary means to guard against accumulation of ruinous surpluses.

"The most vital parts of this bill are those calling for the establishment of an ever-normal granary in the great food crops of corn and wheat" (p. 135).

The necessity for stiff penalties for noncompliance was questioned by the chairman, and the Secretary replied (p. 143):

"The Farm Board experience, it seems to me, indicates that some penalty provision would be necessary. Suppose we had a few years of unusual production and the ever-normal granary was filled and overflowing, there would be a danger of finding ourselves in the same position the Farm Board was in where the Federal Treasury was not sufficient to protect the farmers and the Nation from the collapse which ensued."

The relation of the dairy industry to an ever-normal granary was stated by Secretary Wallace in response to a statement by Congressman Boileau (p. 153, same hearings):

"Let me suggest that we have been operating, in which I believe to be a practical way, the ever-normal granary for the dairy. If this bill were enacted the stabilizing of feed supplies of corn from year to year, would reduce the wide fluctuations in butter production, and the western cream production. There would be no sudden rush from hog farming into dairying such as took place during the early thirties. Moreover, we have diversion programs which enable us to purchase butter and cheese when the price is too low. We distribute this butter and cheese by the relief agencies in the various States.

"Now it seems to me that this is the practical way to perfect an ever-normal granary for dairying. It is not feasible to store dairy products for a great length of time."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, to a degree an attempt was made to meet the recommendations of a soil bank by conservation payments. Our soil-conservation payments were a step in that direction. They constituted an effort to persuade the farmers to use the conservation policies which promised to bring production somewhat under control. But that did not supply the answer and the job could not be done.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish to comment on what the distinguished Senator had to say about the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. What he said is absolutely true. We see much in the press about the political angles involved in farm legislation. I have always thought that was an unjust accusation of the committee. Every member of the committee approaches the subject in a completely bipartisan manner, and everyone is just as sincere as he can be.

As the Senator knows, I supported the flexible program of 1948. If the economy of this country had returned to normal, as was expected, then the program would have worked out. I changed my views because I felt the farmers of my area could not exist under that program, when labor was making gains and agriculture was paying higher prices for the things it had to buy and was receiving lower prices for everything it has to sell. Every member of the committee certainly approaches the problem in a most sincere way.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota, and I agree with his opinion. That is why I should like to bring to the Senate's attention the next item. I refer to a speech in which the Secretary of Agriculture said that farm surpluses have been accumulating for years and that we had been accumulating them long before this administration came into office. I think it perhaps would be more correct to say that the circumstances which led to their accumulation had been developing over a long period of years.

I cited the case of rice, and I made the point that the Secretary of Agriculture could not control the carryover of 1,515,000 hundredweight of rice. Next year that amount increased by 6,031,000 hundredweight. Then it jumped up to 29,900,000 hundredweight of rice. There is no way in the world in which this rice situation can be shaken loose or rectified or brought under control. That is why I said we need to be very careful when we come to the rice question and not dismiss it lightly.

The Senator from Louisiana knows I am not in favor, generally, of a two-price system. I do not know how I am going to vote on the two-price system on rice, when I get to that, but I said many times in the committee that this is a situation which has arisen not primarily as a result of the fault of the rice farmer. Therefore, I think Congress must be very careful in making an appraisal of it. The rice carryovers which accumulated in all the years the Democrats were in office were only 9,822,000 hundredweight. So it would not be quite fair for us to blame it on another political party. Nor would it be quite fair to blame it all on the present Secretary, because there was in existence a law of Congress which provided that the rice acreage could not be reduced more than 15 percent the next year.

I am not saying it was an unwise piece of legislation. The country's rice growers would have been in for pretty rough treatment if that legislation had not been enacted. Therefore, all agricultural legislation has to be tempered a little bit in accordance with what the situation may be in respect to one par-

ticular commodity. Rice certainly is no exception to that rule.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will recall that during the Korean war every effort was made by the Department of Agriculture to increase the production of rice. The Department did so because there was no rice production worth mentioning in South Korea and because the other countries which produced most of the rice for that area were unable to produce rice. Indochina, Burma, Thailand, and other countries could not fill the demand. The Senator remembers that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because of that situlation the rice farmers of this Nation were asked to expand their production The Senator recalls that in 1950 we had acreage controls on the production of rice. That year 1,632,000 acres were planted; a production of 38,689,000 hundredweight of rice was achieved.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Korean war started, the rice acreage allotments established for 1951 were withdrawn, and they remained withdrawn until 1955. That is why we have such an accumulation of rice. It was thought by our planners that we should have a large amount of rice on hand in case it should be needed. The war ended, and the rice was not needed. We must not blame the farmers for that situation.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is exactly what I was trying to say to the Senator from Louisiana.

I hold in my hand the hearings on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. There were only seven pages of hearings, and those pages are not all full. In those seven pages the representative of the Department of Agriculture said it turned out we should have imposed acreage allotments on the 1954 crop. Of course, in the absence of such allotments the result was about a 17 percent increase in acreage in 1954, with unprecedented yields, so that we built up a tremendous supply.

The point I wish to make is that the problem is not one which can be easily solved. We will have to find a way to bring the situation under control. We will have to find ways of getting rid of the surpluses.

I hold in my hand a newspaper article under date of March 4, from Formosa, which reads, in part:

> The Sino-American Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction has made great strides in increasing agricultural production and improving farmers' livelihood in Formosa.

Then the article points out that the rice output in Formosa has gone up from 1,210,000 metric tons 5 years ago to 1,900,000 metric tons today. So by the stimulus of our own Government there has been built up in Formosa a situation that makes it impossible for us to get rid of our 29 million hundredweight of rice by any normal system.

That is why I say that sometimes I worry whether we have correctly considered the situation, whether first we should worry about the level of prices, or whether first we should consider a program which we know will take care of the enormous surpluses; and then, having done that, see what we can do in the case of the individual commodities.

Cotton has a similar history. In 1952 we had a modest carryover of 5,600,000 bales. The first year Secretary Benson was in office, the figure increased to 9 million bales. If one were anxious to avoid telling the truth, he could say that Mr. Benson was responsible for that increase. But he was not. Actually, controls should have been imposed on the 1953 crop, but Congress did not provide for that. Therefore, the production increased to 9 million bales. Thereafter, it increased to 10 million bales, and then to 13,300,000 bales, or approximately that.

I say that at the first point, something should have been done about moving the surplus. The fact that that was not done is not necessarily the fault of the Secretary of Agriculture. I am not too familiar with negotiations between the State Department and the Department of Agriculture; but I should guess that every time the Secretary of Agriculture came forward with a program for getting rid of the surplus of cotton, he found himself in difficulties with the Secretary of State. I think we should provide that if the Secretary of Agriculture wishes to do something to get rid of the surplus, he shall have a chance to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Mexico has stated that acreage controls should have been imposed in 1953.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. But in 1953 we were still at war. Quotas would have to have been announced and voted on by the middle of December 1952, in order to become effective upon the 1953 crop. Controls were not imposed at that time, or later, because we were still at war in Korea.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thought the announcement was made some time in October, but it does not matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. The announcement is made by the middle of October and the referendum must be held by the middle of December of the preceding year.

Mr. ANDERSON. While it is true that we were still in some sort or semblance of war, in that particular year we actually increased our carryover by approximately 3 million bales.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the farmers were asked to produce in order to win the war. Our planners told them that "the lid is off"; farmers were asked to produce, and they did so.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not blaming the farmers at all. Neither am I critical of the Secretary of Agriculture in that connection any more than I am in the case of rice. I merely say that in such a situation it is necessary to get rid of the surplus as quickly as possible.

In the case of wheat, in 1952 we had what was regarded as a normal carryover, namely, 256 million bushels. It can be said that 225 million or 210 million bushels is ideal. Certainly approximately that much is correct. But in 1953 the carryover was 562 million bushels; in 1954 the carryover was 902 million bushels; in 1955 the carryover was 1,021,000,000 bushels; and in 1956 the carryover is 1,043,000,000 bushels. I do not say it is wrong to have such amounts; but when the carryovers reach such proportions, something must be done to get rid of the surplus.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, again, surpluses were permitted to build up because of the war. The farmers were begged to increase their production, and they responded.

Mr. ANDERSON. Except that when there is so great a carryover, probably it is not necessary to make a special adjustment because of the war.

It also should be remembered that when we tried to bring wheat under controls, and when a restriction to 55 million acres was proposed, the House voted for 66 million acres, as I recall, and the Senate reduced the figure to approximately 61 million acres. Then the bill went to conference, and came out with a figure of approximately 62 million acres. I do not say there is anything very wrong about that; but having done it, every effort must be made to achieve elimination of the surplus stock and to eliminate it as rapidly as possible.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. In 1952 the carryover of wheat was approximately 252 million or 256 million bushels, which I agree is probably too large for the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, that is about right.

Mr. CARLSON. However, in my opinion controls should have been imposed in 1952 on wheat as well as on cotton, as the Senator from New Mexico has said. But controls were not imposed then. Had they been imposed then, I do not think we would have gotten into the present situation, or at least we would not be so deeply involved as we are. Certainly we have no right to criticize the Secretary of Agriculture for that situation; I am in thorough accord with what the Senator from New Mexico has said on that score.

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly we should bring this surplus situation under control now. If we do so, that will take care of some of the price problems we have. I am not too much worried about price; but I hope we will try to bring the surpluses under control and give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority he needs to do so.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am in thorough accord with the statement the Senator from New Mexico has made, namely, that the surplus problem is the one with which we must deal.

The Senator from New Mexico knows that we exported approximately 315 million bushels of wheat in 1952. But at the present time, and even with the very large subsidy, we have difficulty in disposing of approximately 200 million bushels.

Mr. ANDERSON. And that amount has been decreasing.

Mr. CARLSON. Then what shall we say of a State Department that refuses—and I used the word respectfully—to cooperate with us in disposing of some of the surpluses?

In the case of cotton, I do not know whether the State Department has approved the present plan. The last statement was that 5 million bales of cotton are to be exported. I do not know whether the State Department has approved that or not. If it does approve, perhaps that will be the breaking point so that we can start to move some of the surplus.

Mr. ANDERSON. A day or two ago I saw in the newspapers a statement in regard to the cotton situation. It said that India was greatly outraged because the United States was going to make certain exports of cotton.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me point out to the Senator from New Mexico that it was Egypt, not India.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I stand corrected by my friend, the Senator from Louisiana. The newspaper account stated that Egypt was reassured about the United States cotton plan, and that Egypt's ambassador had a cordial chat with our State Department's representative, and came out of the meeting reassured.

I look at that account, on the one hand; and then I look at the figure of 5 million bales, on the other hand; and I say, "Who is kidding whom?" I know that the Secretary of Agriculture wants to move 5 million bales of cotton. I know when I was Secretary of Agriculture I tried to move 7 million bales of cotton, and I ran into the same buzzsaw. But the Secretary of Agriculture must insist, and I know he will insist, on moving 5 million bales of cotton. Unless we give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to move in this field, he cannot succeed in the way we know he must succeed.

For instance, Mr. President, does the State Department attempt to tell the Department of Labor whether it can or cannot approve a mediation in connection with the Westinghouse strike? I hope not. The Department of Labor is supposed to move in that field, and it does move in it. Mr. President, is it not the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture to represent the farmers of the United States to the same degree that it is the responsibility of the Department of Labor to represent the laboring groups?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in thorough accord with the statement of the Senator from New Mexico. For 2 years—not merely at the present time—the Secretary of Agriculture has been trying to handle this problem and to solve it. It is time for us to be realistic about it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

I recognize that these agreements are necessary. But the question is, how can the problem be solved? The Secretary of Agriculture will have to battle if he is to be successful. Otherwise the farmers will never get a fair price schedule.

Mr. AIKEN rose.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. We seem to have lost sight of what the historic United States export trade in cotton has been. We speak now of recovering our 5-million bale export market, as though that were the traditional amount of cotton exported. As a matter of fact, if we go back 22 or 23 years we find that in those years the United States was exporting about 10 million bales of cotton, not the 5 million bales which we talk of at this time. About that time, of course, a worldwide depression struck. The use of cotton dropped. Synthetics began to come into the picture; and we have dropped from an export, not of 5 million bales to 2 million bales this year, but from 10 million bales or more down to 2 million bales this year. If we do not do anything about it and continue to allow foreign countries to dictate the amount we export, in another 2 years we may not be exporting anything.

I think we have turned the tide. I do not believe we are going to hurt the other cotton-producing countries at all, because they, too, have been pricing cotton out of the market, when there are more than 2 billion people in the world today who probably would be using more cotton if they could get it at a more realistic world price than what they have had to pay. We have not only held a price umbrella over our own cotton producers, but we have encouraged producers in other countries to charge more for cotton than the market would bear.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Vermont is correct in that statement. By doing so we have also helped to build the synthetics industry. When the big argument was in progress at the conclusion of World War II as to whether or not the American surplus stocks of cotton would be moved into commerce or disposed of at home in some fashion, it was contended that if we moved the cotton into Japan, China, and other places, we would take away the market which traditionally belonged to other countries.

All we did was to preserve the cotton market for other countries against the inroads of synthetics. Had we accepted their dictation and refused to ship any cotton, we would have seen the expansion of synthetics in Japan very rapidly. But because cotton was moved into Japan and China, today there exists a cotton market which those countries would not otherwise have. If we were to move our cotton into that area now as rapidly as the demands of the world build up, I think we would be doing a favor to the cotton industry throughout the world, as well as helping ourselves.

Mr. AIKEN. As cotton is put on the market at competitive prices, not only the United States, but Egypt and other countries, will find their market for cotton expanded.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so.

Mr. President, there are many things which I should like to discuss this afternoon at great length. I come back to the place where I started many months ago. Unless we can come forward with some sort of program for the disposition of surpluses rapidly, vigorously, and in an orderly fashion, so that the grain exchanges and cotton exchanges of the country will know that those commodities are not coming back to harass them, and will not be used to break world markets, we shall be in real trouble.

The American farmer has suffered enough from the accumulation of surpluses. I have tried to point that out in some instances—and probably in all—the surpluses have developed innocently. They have developed because we were in a war situation which seemed to make it wise. No war situation makes it wise now. Regardless of the explanation, I think this is the time to move and make disposition of these surpluses, if we expect any farm program to work.

There are Members of this body who firmly believe that one system of price supports is perfect and another system is not perfect. A great many people subscribe to a still different philosophy about price supports. That situation will continue so long as we have a Senate and a House and differing opinions. However, there is one thing upon which we can count. If we do not make complete disposition of the surpluses hanging over the market at this time, no system will produce any great degree of success so far as the American farmer is concerned.

I close where I started the other day. I compliment the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for taking his committee around the country. If that did anything for me, it was to prove that we were not agreed upon any particular route to salvation. One group of farmers believes one thing, and another group believes another.

Under those circumstances, it is very difficult indeed for the Senate to come to a final decision. I think we are all agreed that the surplus problem is very difficult. I think we all believe that some sort of soil bank needs to be established.

Personally I shall support the idea of a mandatory bank, because I believe it is the only useful tool which the Secretary of Agriculture can use so late in the season. If he goes to the American farmer now with a plan for a voluntary bank, he will get very little response, and the soil bank idea will receive very little support. I hope we may have a mandatory bank. I hope the Senate will agree to such a provision and let us take it to conference and see what the House conferees think about it.

I hope that in some manner, by suggestion of the Secretary or otherwise, we may then, or soon after, find a program for the disposition of surpluses which

the Congress can accept and support, and that the Secretary of Agriculture will then be able to carry it out.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is with some hesitation that I rise to speak on the farm program, coming as I do from an eastern State generally characterized as urban and industrial. I would speak on this subject, however—not only because Massachusetts has some of the Nation's finest farmlands, most modern methods, and most famous products—not only because farming is a vital Massachusetts industry, pumping more than $200 million of cash farm income into our State's economy every year—but also because the agricultural policies of our Nation, while they may appear to affect more directly more farmers in other parts of the country, are of real significance to Massachusetts and her farmers, industries, consumers, and taxpayers; and, more importantly, because all of us in the Senate have a responsibility to the Nation as well as our own State and region.

My position on the pending amendment to eliminate rigid 90 percent price supports from the bill, in order to continue the new flexible program, is a position which I realize to be at variance with that held by the great majority of my fellow Democrats. I do not take pleasure from such disagreements—but I do regret that the long hours spent in debate over relatively minor differences in method have obscured the much larger and much more important area of agreement within our party—and, for the most part, within the entire Nation.

Both within our party and Nation, I think most of us would agree that agriculture needs some protection from the distress that results from violent downswings in farm prices. I think most of us want to prevent an agricultural depression that could wreck the Nation's economic health; and we want to prevent inequitable treatment of farmers at the hands of a Government discriminating in favor of other segments of the economy. I think most of us would agree that the national interest requires a long-range program adjusting production to demand, and enabling our farmers to move high-quality food and fibers at reasonable prices to consumers at home and abroad, without wasting our soil resources. And I think most of us would agree that the fixed price-support program provided a helpful cushion during the serious decline in farm prices and farm exports which has taken place in recent years, and during the general economic decline of 1954.

But, Mr. President, I am opposed at this time to any farm program calling for high price supports fixed at 90 percent of parity until such time as the flexible support program and the new soil-bank program have had a sufficient opportunity to prove themselves. To those of my colleagues who call upon me to support the 90-percent program, despite its shortcomings, as a means of stabilizing farm income during the current farm recession, I can only point to the decline in farm prices and income which has taken place during the operation of that 90-percent program, a decline which has been intensified by the ever-present threat posed by the huge surpluses acquired by the Government under that program. I am not an expert on farm economics. But it appears to me that—due at least in part to the stimulation of high support prices—the productive capacity of our food and fiber industry is overexpanded while its markets are shrinking—not so much in terms of actual and potential need, which will continue to increase here and in the poorer areas of the world, but in terms of distribution and purchasing power. Price supports at 90 percent of parity will not solve that problem; price supports at a lower or flexible level will not solve it either—but at least they will not accentuate it so badly. And though I am distressed by my colleagues' statistical data on falling farm income, I would remind them that like most subsidies, our farm programs have tended to help the well to do more than the poor. It has been estimated that less than 2 percent of the Nation's farmers receive more than 25 percent of the price-support program's benefits. Those who heavily weigh these statistics—the farm families at the bottom of the economic ladder, the Negro and Mexican tenant farmers of the South and Southwest, and others—will on the whole receive all too little of the benefits to be passed out under any support program.

But let me make clear, Mr. President, my belief that neither fixed nor sliding price supports offers a perfect, comprehensive, permanent answer to all the ills of agriculture. Neither program is free of the faults for which its own adherents condemn the other. The flexibility of the present compromise program is certainly very slight indeed, and it is doubtful that it will save the taxpayers any money. Both the old and the new programs depend upon the storage of surpluses too big to handle, too expensive to store. Both old and new offer support to some farmers in some parts of the country that hurts other farmers in other parts of the country. Both concentrate more on the farmer's price than on his net income, more on his guaranteed security than on his independence. Both programs require the farmer to accept various controls, particularly acreage restrictions which—being invariably followed by more intensive fertilization and production on the remaining acres—have in the past had little effect, except as a nuisance, in mose instances. Neither program diminishes appreciably the production of surplus commodities or increases appreciably their markets, thus facilitating neither the end of the storage burden nor the adoption of sound soil conservation practices. Both subsidize the inefficient farmers while giving little help to those who most need it. Neither program enables our farmers to sell in the world market at normal competitive prices; and both require restrictions on agricultural imports—which would otherwise take advantage of our support program—thus restricting still further the market for farm exports. Neither of the present alternatives offers substantially lower prices to consumers and industry.

In short, Mr. President, while I shall vote against 90 percent of parity, I do not deny its past benefits or reject its basic purpose; and while I shall support flexible parity, I do not look upon it as a final answer to the farm situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I trust the Senator from Massachusetts will remain to listen to a few remarks I have to make that deal specifically with a portion of what he has just now said.

Mr. KENNEDY. I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that some of my remarks may have the effect of showing him that he has stated the problem in exactly the reverse order. If the soil-bank program is adopted, it will take more than a year to get it into operation. If, at the same time, as the Senator from Minnesota stated earlier this afternoon, we adopt flexible supports, we will drive many of the small farmers out of their farms and into the cities. We shall create a greater problem in the factory than we shall cure on the farm.

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF THE FAMILY FARM

One of the most amazing things to me about the farm situation is not generally known to the public. It is a fact which explains why for almost 30 years the farm problem has been an unsettled dilemma before Congress and in the executive branch of the Government.

There were fewer farms in the United States in 1955 than at any time since 1890. The Senator from Massachusetts was not born in 1890. At that time there were some 4 million farms in the United States. The exact number, obtained from the United States Census Bureau, was 4,564,641. That was in 1890.

In 1954 there were 4,782,933. There were 600,000 fewer farms in this country in 1954 than there were in 1950. The reduction of farms has become accelerated, and in the period from 1950 to 1954 there was the largest decrease of farms in the United States of any period of which the Bureau of the Census has any record.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Even though that may be true, in spite of the reduction in the number of farms, our productive capacity has steadily increased.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. The fact is that——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We have had a Department of Agriculture which has been researching and discovering ways and means of increasing production. We have better methods of production and better methods of planting, and we live in the machine age, with new reapers and new tractors, new milling machines, and the like, all of which do the work that was formerly done by laborers upon the farm. Of course, the land has been made more productive.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Are we not trying very hard to develop a program which

will ease the transference from agriculture of those who are living a marginal existence on farms?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but the problem has not been solved. I am saying that the 90 percent of parity program is urged by the supporters of that program on the ground that without it we will create more disaster among the farmers. Let us wait until the soil-bank program can succeed, if it can, before we destroy the family size farm. That is my argument in just one sentence. This is a human problem as well as an economic one.

This afternoon, while the debate was going on, the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] a former very successful Secretary of Agriculture, was describing his point of view. During that time while listening to him I also read the bill——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves that point?

EXTRAORDINARY DELEGATION OF POWER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield very shortly. I should like to state first that I read exactly 18 pages of the bill during the debate this afternoon. I had read the bill before. However, the reading of it this afternoon was to determine how many times Congress had delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture its power to legislate—to fix rates, to determine goals, and, in short, to say how the program shall be carried on.

Much to my amazement, I found that in the 18 pages which I was able to read while the debate was going on, there were 21 instances in which Congress had delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture the power it ought to exercise itself.

I am very fearful that because of these weaknesses—amazing weaknesses, as the Senator, I am sure, will agree when I read some of them to him—the soil-bank program presented to us now is destined to fail.

It is a 4-year program, costing about $750 million a year and affecting the whole country.

Let me read, first, one of the most startling provisions in the bill. I read from page 10, line 14:

> Compensation under this section shall be at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for deducing their acreage of the commodity, taking into consideration the loss of production of the commodity on the reserve acreage, any savings in cost which result from not planting the commodity on the reserve acreage, and the incentive necessary to achieve the reserve acreage goal.

What are these powers? They are the powers of Congress. They are the power to fix rates, to determine what a fair and reasonable return shall be, to determine what the incentive shall be to induce farmers to keep their lands idle.

Here we turn over to the Secretary of Agriculture complete authority without any supervision on the part of Congress to provide the incentives which he deems necessary to achieve the reserve-acreage goal.

Then the second part of this particular section reads thus:

> (b) The total compensation paid producers for participating in the acreage-reserve program with respect to any year's crops shall not exceed $750 million.

Thus, in just a few words in the bill, we hand over to the Secretary of Agriculture complete discretionary power to name the rate and rates and incentives necessary to promote the program, with only one limitation, namely, that he shall not spend more than $750 million in a single year. Oh, yes; there is another limitation: he shall not pay more than $100 an acre for retired tobacco land.

There was a time when Members of Congress believed that Congress was the source of the manner and authority of spending the public funds, but here we turn it over to the Secretary of Agriculture. There was a time when I used to hear this Chamber ring with the denunciation of bureaucracy, but in this bill we find a grant of bureaucratic power that exceeds anything I have ever read in all the bills we have ever passed from time to time delegating away the power of Congress.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I advert to the matter as to which I have asked permission to intervene, I may say that the question just raised by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is something which addressed itself with compelling force to each and every member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure it must have.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are 15 members of that committee, 8 from one party and 7 from the other party, coming from all parts of the Nation. We realized that if we could ourselves prescribe the exact price to be paid for the exact acreage, that would be preferable, but we found, for instance, when we came to a general program for the elimination of 12 million acres of one crop, the production of wheat, in 1 year, we were dealing with a commodity in which the ground was so different, the productivity so different in various parts of the Nation, that it was simply impossible to have 1 standard or 1 fixed measure apply to all. When it came to cotton, we could not apply the same standards to both the fertile reclaimed lands of the West which can produce as much as 3 bales to the acre or more, and marginal lands, if we wish to call them that, in the old cotton-producing part of the South, which produce only 250 to 275 pounds to the acre.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Florida permit me to make a remark now?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me to complete my statement, I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

It became completely evident that we would spend a whole summer in trying to work out details which would probably be unworkable in the end, because of the immense variety of lands in crops throughout the Nation; then we would have no program at all. So the members of our committee, I think, without a dissenting voice, decided that the best thing the committee could do would be to state, as it is stated in the report, possible goals of the number of acres to be eliminated in the first year. We also imposed a maximum limitation on how much could be spent and we named factors which the Secretary must consider in establishing a program to accomplish a reduction in the acreage on each of the different classes of land which produce the same commodity.

If the Senator from Wyoming has a better program, speaking only as 1 member of a committee of 15, all I can say is that I shall welcome him and it with open arms and be glad to support its incorporation in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida realizes that I have the floor, does he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do, and I apologize. If the Senator wishes to take the floor from me——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to respond to what the Senator from Florida has said. I invite attention to page 17 of the bill. The Senator from Florida and every other Senator in this body, after this bill has been enacted into law, will have to go to the people of his State and say that by subsection (b) of section 208, the Senate has given to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to distribute the national acreage reserve goal among the States. The subsection to which I have referred reads as follows:

> In distributing the national acreage goal among the various States and major crop-production regions, the Secretary shall give due regard to the respective needs of the various States—

Senators under this bill cannot do that—

> and regions for flood control—

The regions are not specifically described. Sometimes these regions involve several States—

> the respective needs of the various States and regions for flood control, drought control, and other conservation benefits; the desires of producers in particular States or regions to participate in the conservation program; the diversion of acreage from crops under acreage allotments or marketing quotas; and the need to assure adequate production of agricultural commodities and products not in surplus and to discourage the production of agricultural commodities and products in surplus.

I say to the very able Senator from Florida whose legal mind I have learned to respect from the time he first entered this body——

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

DO WE NEED TO GRANT THIS POWER?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This language, to my mind, grants to the Secretary of Agriculture almost the powers of a dictator over the farmlands of America. I really think that there are brains enough on the Committee on Agriculture and brains enough in the Senate of the

United States to draw a soil-bank proposal which will not place the Secretary of Agriculture and his experts, able though they may be, in complete control. No Member of this body, after this measure has been passed, can go back to his State and tell his people what land in that State will be set aside, because the Secretary will have to make the goals. There is an appeal in the bill to the Secretary that he fix the goals for 1956 at the earliest possible moment.

Now the Senator from Florida may proceed. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Wyoming, and I again extend that warm and unlimited welcome which I have tried to extend to any suggestion which the Senator may have——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am working on some suggestions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Which will clear up this whole matter and enable us to apply a standard which will be equally applicable to an area such as his own State, where the customary size of a farm may be in hundreds and thousands of acres, and, at the same time, apply to the Delta of Mississippi or the rich garden lands of New Jersey or to other lands equally rich.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The great areas of our farms in Wyoming are due to the fact that they are grazing lands, and much of the area is not in any way comparable to the rich soils of the delta on which large crops can be grown on small areas.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator makes my point more briefly and in better words than I have made it, that the farms of this Nation are so diversified that they offer us a challenge, indeed, to work out some formula that would be equally applicable to all.

Again I say, and I am sure I may speak for my distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], in this matter, that our committee would welcome any suggestion which would spell out in figures and letters the specific program which the Secretary of Agriculture must use in every case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I do not think it is necessary to do that. The Senator is making the job too difficult. Not in every case.

Mr. HOLLAND. There was no unity in our committee on this subject. It was not the desire on the part of all the members of the committee to give the Secretary this heavy responsibility and this very great power to carry it out. But the more we studied the problem—and we have been studying it for over a year, and we studied it very assiduously, and I believe the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has been kind enough to compliment the chairman of the committee and the committee members for their visits which were made to many places throughout the Nation to try to get the thinking of our people—the more convinced we became that it was undesirable to attempt to include administrative details in the legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the committee has worked diligently on the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the committee has not yet brought up an answer to this question, and it is for that reason that I, speaking as one of the junior members of the committee, hope my able and beloved friend, from his great experience, will suggest a formula so simple and complete that we can incorporate it in this bill, and then not need to worry about passing on responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture who is greatly admired by many Members, including myself, but who is not equally admired by every Member of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Despite the smile in the Senator's eyes, I assure him that I shall do my best to present amendments which will remove some of the defects which I find in the bill, one of which, by the way, is on page 15, beginning in line 2, and having to do with rates of compensation:

> Such rate or rates may be determined on an individual farm basis, a county or area basis, or such other basis as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program.

THE SECRETARY'S POWER EXTENDS TO INDIVIDUAL FARMS

That language gives to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to run the entire gamut of agriculture in the United States, from the region, the State, the area, the county, down to the individual farm. In my recollection, no such power has ever before been granted by the Government of the United States to any official.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida. It is always interesting to debate with the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly am comforted to know that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming intends to offer amendments which he thinks will meet the various questions which he has mentioned.

But to advert to the situation presented by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I had the honor to be one member of the committee to whose lot fell the pleasant duty of hearing, among other witnesses, witnesses from the great State of Massachusetts. We met, not in Massachusetts, but at Montpelier, Vt., where there were present, I should say, some 15 or 20 quite vocal, expressive witnesses from the State of Massachusetts. Perhaps there were more; the record will show.

I must say that, in my judgment, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in setting forth his position stated the position—I believe it was unanimously; and if not that, then almost unanimously—stated for him by the witnesses from his State representing the various agricultural industries of Massachusetts.

I was comforted at the Montpelier meeting, after hearing not only the witnesses from Massachusetts, but also witnesses from all the States of New England, to discover that there are large segments of our agricultural industry, including those from that particular section of the Nation, who still believe that the law of supply and demand has some potentiality, and who still think that any agricultural program which must be evolved should be evolved against a sound dovetailing with the law of supply and demand.

I was comforted to find in that area, and in others where the insidious results of the operation of the high price-support formulas has not affected the thinking of the farm people, that there came forth expressions which I thought were sound and showed a continuance of the soundness and conservatism which we have always expected from our agricultural people, which has been traditional up to this time, but which has vanished, I am sorry to say, in some areas of the Nation.

I shall address myself at greater length to that point of view, which I regret to have discovered, in the course of the hearings, as having made itself so clearly seen in some other industries, some other commodities, and some other areas of our Nation. But certainly in old New England there is still the individuality, the independence, and the willingness to plan for oneself and for one's industry; the willingness to measure one's productive capacity against the active needs of the people who use the product, which is what we expect of agriculture.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts—and I compliment him upon setting forth the contentions of his own agricultural people in stating his position upon this particular amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. On behalf of the agricultural people of Massachusetts, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his kind statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I compliment the individualist farmers of New England, and especially of Massachusetts, but I should like the Senator to glance at the section of the bill I have just read into the RECORD and tell the individualistic agriculturalists of Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, that under the soil bank proposal the Secretary may determine the rates upon the basis of even individual farms; so that the rate paid to Farmer Jones and the rate paid to Farmer Smith, his neighbor, may be different. I do not say that they will be; but the power will be granted by the bill, and it will apply to the farmers of New England just as it will apply to the farmers of Wyoming, and those of the other Rocky Mountain States, those of Oklahoma, Louisiana, and all the other States of the Union.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend from Wyoming that the power which the committee bill would give to the Secretary of Agriculture is, in my opinion, necessary.

THIS IS A SURRENDER TO BUREAUCRACY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt about that. What I am trying to point out is that if we have come to such a pass in this country that the Senate thinks

necessity compels the setting up of a public czar of agriculture, we had better stop talking about bureaucracies in political campaigns.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator well knows that this country is vast in area and that different kinds of crops are grown in every part of the Nation. Whereas the size of a small farm in Wyoming might be 3,200 acres, in Louisiana it would be less than 80 acres.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are many farms in Wyoming which are as small as 80 acres, 120 acres, or 160 acres.

The Senator need not worry. There are small farms which will grow agricultural crops, and many of the small farmers and small cattle ranchers are today fearful that they will be driven out of agriculture completely unless the Senator's provision for 90 percent of parity is included in the bill. I am behind the Senator on that point.

I am simply trying to make the record clear, so that the country as well as the Senate may know that the extent of the discretionary power over legislative matters which we are proposing to grant in the bill. No wonder there are empty seats in the Chamber. We are passing our powers away.

Mr. ELLENDER. This discretionary provision sets no precedent. It is nothing new.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, it is nothing new; but where will it end?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know, but the committee had no alternative. We set no precedent, however. Let me call the Senator's attention to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936. Congress granted full discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture in that act to apportion among the States the conservation funds which Congress might appropriate. I read section 7 (g), as follows:

> On or before November 1 of each year the Secretary shall apportion among the several States the funds which will be available for carrying out State plans during the next calendar year, and in determining the amount to be apportioned to each State, the Secretary shall take into consideration the acreage and value of the major soil depleting and major export crops produced in the respective States during a representative period and the acreage and productivity of land devoted to agricultural production (including dairy products) in the respective States during a representative period: *Provided, however*, That any such apportionment or funds available for carrying out State plans during any year prior to 1942 may be made at any time prior to or during the year to which such plans relate. Notwithstanding the making of an apportionment to any State for any calendar year, the funds apportioned to any State for which no plan has been approved for such year, and any amount apportioned to any State which is not required to carry out an approved plan for such State for such year, shall be available for carrying out the provisions of sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this act.

That act gave the Secretary of Agriculture almost complete administrative power. I am free to confess to my good friend from Wyoming that the pending bill does give the Secretary wide power with respect to the soil bank and other programs, but I wish the Senator would tell us how it would be possible for us to write into the law a yardstick, a standard, which would be applicable to every farm, every county, and every area in our country, and still carry out the act as it should be carried out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it would be utterly impossible to devise one formula which would be applicable to every area, just as in the bill the Senator's committee has found it impossible to deal with all the commodities alike. There is a different program for rice from that which has been provided for wheat. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a 2-price program for rice, on a trial basis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it is in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. The Senator from Kansas is going to submit an amendment for a 2-price system for wheat.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot read the minds of the various Senators who intend to offer amendments. I am talking about the bill as I see it. I am glad the Senator is going to offer such an amendment. It only bears out the contention I made, that amendments are needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are 63 amendments pending. Some of them undoubtedly will be adopted.

TWENTY-ONE GRANTS OF DISCRETIONARY POWER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the opportunity to present the entire list of these discretionary powers which are granted to the Secretary in the bill. In order that they may appear in the RECORD in consecutive order, where those who wish to read the RECORD may find them, I hope that I may be able to give them 1 by 1 without interruption. After I have read them into the RECORD I shall, of course, be happy to answer any questions that may be addressed to me.

The first I have marked down appears on page 3 of the bill, section 203, which reads:

> Whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported under this act, the price of the other shall be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market.

That is, subject to the determination of the Secretary.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I state to the Senator that the Secretary does that now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator please withhold his comments? I shall later come back to the items, and we may go over them one by one.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Number 2 appears on page 7 of the bill:

> To be eligible for such compensation—

That is, the soil bank compensation, and I am reading from page 7, beginning on line 15—

> To be eligible for such compensation the producer (a) shall reduce his acreage of the commodity below his farm acreage allotment within such limits as the Secretary may prescribe, (b) shall specifically designate the acreage so withdrawn from the production of such commodity * * * and (c)—

And here comes discretionary delegation No. 3—

> shall not harvest any crop from, or graze, the reserve acreage unless the Secretary, after certication by the governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for grazing on such acreage, determines—

That is, the Secretary—

> that it is necessary to permit grazing thereon in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, and consents to such grazing.

The Secretary of Agriculture and he alone may decide when damage or hardship may be relieved. How simple it would have been, Mr. President, to have written into that paragraph that, in the case of severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secretary shall consent. But instead of that, the Secretary, and he alone, is the person who must grant the consent.

When we delegate these powers, Mr. President, we must remember that the Secretary is only human. He has only 24 hours in the day, as all the rest of us have, and most of the work he does must be delegated to someone else. So nobody knows who actually will carry on this discretionary power.

Now we come to No. 4 on the list of delegations of legislative power, on page 8, beginning on line 6:

> In the formulation and administration of the acreage-reserve program the Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers—

That is a wholly laudable objective, but it is the Secretary who is to protect the sharecroppers and tenants in the manner that pleases him—not the Congress. This protection, on line 11, reads—

> and including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm.

What sort of a program is this? How can it be enforced? Who is going to make the determination whether the tenant or the sharecropper will be forced off the farm? The Secretary. What are the factors that go into the shaping of his decision? They do not appear here.

Now we come to No. 5 on our list; on the same page 8, beginning in line 13:

> The acreage reserve program may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds on the reserve acreage, as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act.

Nobody but the Secretary can determine whether the elimination of noxious weeds shall be desirable and sufficient to "facilitate the practical administration of the acreage reserve program."

Here is No. 6, section 204:

> SEC. 204. For purposes of the acreage reserve program the Secretary shall establish a national reserve acreage goal for the 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, and cigar binder tobacco types 51, 52, 54, and 55, respectively.

Who establishes the goal? The Congress? No. The Secretary. Who says

how many acres in the United States shall be set aside in the soil bank? The House? No. The Senate? No. The Agriculture Committee of the Senate? No. The Agriculture Committee of the House? No. The Secretary. He gives the word. His is the power.

Who tells the farmers of the land what the goal shall be? The Secretary, and he alone.

This is No. 7, on page 9, beginning on line 1:

The limits within which individual farms may participate in the acreage reserve program shall be established in such manner as the Secretary determines is reasonably calculated to achieve the national reserve acreage goal and give producers a fair and equitable opportunity to participate in the acreage reserve program.

Let me repeat:

The limits within which individual farms may participate in the acreage reserve program shall be established in such manner as the Secretary determines.

Mr. President, did the constitutional fathers ever in their dreams imagine that the time could come when a Congress of the United States would be asked to give away to a Cabinet officer such great control over the farmlands of the United States? They sought to establish a government of the people, by representatives of the people, and not a bureaucratic dictatorship which would extend to the determination of all the details of an agricultural program affecting individual farms throughout the land.

Here is the eighth instance of legislative delegation:

COMPENSATION OF PRODUCERS

SEC. 205. (a) Producers shall be compensated for participating in the acreage reserve program for any commodity through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary—

Does the Congress provide the regulations? No. Of course, I realize that for 30 years or more Congress, in the progress of the delegation of its powers, has been setting up boards and commissions, and has been giving them power to write rules and regulations. But heretofore the Congress has endeavored to set up standards which would control the exercise of the discretion of the Executive or of the board or of the Commission. However, we search this bill in vain to find standards to guide the discretion of the Secretary. Instead, he is given the power—almost in words of one syllable—to do what? Here is the ninth instance. I have previously read this provision; but in order to have it fall in its consecutive place, I read it again:

Compensation under this section shall be at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide puroducers with a fair and reasonable return for reducing their acreage of the commodity, taking into consideration the loss of production of the commodity on the reserve acreage, any savings in cost which result from not planting the commodity on the reserve acreage, and the incentive necessary to achieve the reserve acreage goal.

THE SECRETARY AND THE INCENTIVES

Mr. President, what does the word "incentive" mean, as used in that provision? It means, it seems to me, that if $1 does not suffice, the Secretary should try $2; and if $2 does not suffice, he should try $5; or perhaps he should fall into the practice which we see on the television, these days—in which case we shall have a $64,000 program or a $100,000 program, and the Secretary shall see which will be the best in order to provide the necessary incentive.

Mr. President, does that seem to be a wild suggestion on my part? If any Senator or any other reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD thinks so, then I ask him to turn to page 15 of the bill and read subsection (c) of section 207:

(c) In determining the lands in any area to be covered by contracts entered into under this section, the Secretary may use advertising and bid procedure if he determines that such action will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the conservation reserve program.

We set up a huge fund—amounting to millions of dollars—for the payment of benefits. We allow the Secretary to fix the rates; and then we allow him—in order that he may provide a proper incentive to induce farmers to set aside their lands, to place them in the soil bank—to resort to advertising and bidding, which means "bid it up, bid it up, bid it up."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason for that provision is——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I admit it needs explanation.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was a proposal submitted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and we heard a special witness in that regard. The object of the provision is to get the farmers to bid their acres in; and the one who bids the least money to bring about the desired amount of reduced production will be permitted to participate in the conservation reserve. It is not a question of the farmer getting more money. Instead, it is a question of the Government getting the reduction with the least amount of cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then let us amend this section so as to make sure that the advertising and bid feature is for the purpose of getting more acres set aside, and not for the purpose of having more money paid. Such an amendment would be an excellent one to this provision of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps the Senator from Wyoming will prepare the amendment. What I have stated is the purpose of the present provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I accept the Senator's explanation. I say such an amendment should be written into the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Furthermore, the Senator from Wyoming should bear in mind that the program is entirely voluntary; there is no compulsion of any sort or in any manner.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I realize that. But it is designed to get land out of production, and is designed to authorize the Secretary to provide the incentives.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now I come to the 10th instance; it appears on pages 11 and 12:

SUBTITLE B—CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

SEC. 207. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this act the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for periods of not less than 3 years with producers determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms covered by the contract wherein the producer shall agree—

Here is a determination to be made by the Secretary, under the authorization of the bill, by which he may select by his own decision the farmers whom he deems to have control of the land to be covered in the contracts.

Now we go to the 10th instance, which appears on page 13; it is subparagraph (5), of section 207 (a)—one of the provisions regarding what shall be written into the contract. I read:

The producer shall agree:

* * * * *

(5) Not to adopt any practice, or divert lands on the farm from conservation, woods, pasture, or other use to any use, specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice or use which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract.

Any practice specified by the Secretary. Can delegation of power of Congress go further?

This is the 12th instance; and, again, this is to be a part of the producer's contract:

(6) To forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make such refunds or accept such payment adjustments, or forfeit such price-support benefits, as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract.

Then we come to instance No. 13, on page 13, beginning in line 20 with subparagraph (7):

(7) To such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of this act and to facilitate the practical administration of the conservation-reserve program, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds.

In other words, here we have the power granted to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine what additional provisions, not mentioned in the bill, must go into the contract which the producer must sign.

No. 14, beginning in line 3 on page 14, subparagraph (1) of subsection (b) of

the same section, addressed to the obligations of the Secretary, reads as follows:

(b) In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree:

(1) To bear such part of the cost (including labor) of establishing and maintaining vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses, on the designated acreage as the Secretary determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, but not to exceed a maximum amount per acre or facility prescribed by the Secretary for the county or area in which the farm is situated;

Additional power and discretion are conferred upon the Secretary. Congress passes. The Secretary decides.

Instance No. 15 is subparagraph (2) of the same subsection. Again it refers to the rates. Beginning in line 14 on page 14:

The rate or rates of the annual payment to be provided for in the contracts shall be established on such basis as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable annual return.

Surely there is nothing more important than fixing the rates, nothing more clearly a function of Congress, but we toss it away to the Secretary. Are we not deliberately breaking down the constitutional separation of powers?

The Secretary determines not only what the rate or rates shall be, but he determines what the fair and reasonable return on the land established in protective vegetative cover or water storage facilities shall be.

Instance No. 16, beginning in line 2, on page 15:

Such rate or rates may be determined on an individual farm basis, a county or area basis, or such other basis as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program.

Under this provision the Secretary may go from the smallest family-sized farm to the largest ranch and deal with them all on an individual basis.

Instance No. 17 in this continuous surrender of legislative duty is found beginning in line 6 on page 15:

(c) In determining the lands in any area to be covered by contracts entered into under this section, the Secretary may use advertising and bid procedure if he determines that such action will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the conservation reserve program.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has already indicated that that provision may be considered for amendment.

Instance No. 18 is found on page 15, beginning in line 14:

Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that there has been a violation which would warrant termination of a contract he shall give the producer written notice thereof and the producer shall, if he requests such an opportunity within 30 days after mailing or serving of such notice, be given an opportunity to show cause, in a formal or informal proceeding under regulations promulgated by the Secretary, why the contract should not be terminated. If the Secretary determines that the contract shall be terminated the producer shall be given written notice of such determination. If the producer feels aggrieved by such determination, he may within 90 days after the mailing or service of such notice appeal to the United States district court, for the district in which the land covered by the contract is located, for a determination of the facts in the case and judicial relief with respect thereto. If the producer does not request an opportunity to show cause why the contract should not be terminated, within such 30-day period, or appeal from the Secretary's determination within such 90-day period, the Secretary's determination shall be final and conclusive.

I should like to have the opinion of any lawyer in the Department of Agriculture as to the ability of any producer to get into court with a justiciable issue, considering all the discretionary power proposed to be granted to the Secretary by this bill.

Instance No. 19 is section 208 (a). It deals with the establishment of a national conservation reserve goal:

CONSERVATION RESERVE GOAL

SEC. 208. (a) The Secretary shall not later than February 1 of each year determine and announce the national conservation reserve goal for such year. Such goal shall be that percentage which the Secretary determines it is practicable to cover by contracts during such year of the number of acres, if any, by which (1) the acreage used for the production of agricultural commodities during the year preceding the year for which such determination is made, plus any acreage then in the acreage or conservation reserve program or retired from production as a result of acreage allotments or marketing quotas, exceeds (2) the acreage needed during the year for which such determination is made for the production of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and export and an adequate allowance for carry-over. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act the Secretary shall determine the national conservation acreage goal for 1956.

THE GIGANTIC TASK OF REGIMENTING THE FARMERS

I do not wonder that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said that the committee found the task of regimenting the farmers of America so great that it was unable to devise any formula with which to do it, and so it sought to establish a czar.

Why should not Congress determine what the goal should be each year, and save the Secretary and his staff all these decisions? It is within the power of Congress to do it.

The next instance, No. 20, is found on page 17, beginning in line 3. It is subsection (b) of section 208. It reads as follows:

(b) In distributing the national acreage goal among the various States and major crop production regions, the Secretary shall give due regard to the respective needs of the various States and regions for flood control, drought control, and other conservation benefits; the desires of producers in particular States or regions to participate in the conservation program; the diversion of acreage from crops under acreage allotments or marketing quotas; and the need to assure adequate production of agricultural commodities and products not in surplus and to discourage the production of agricultural commodities and products in surplus.

I stated that I had begun reading the bill while listening to the speech of the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and that, having covered 18 pages, I had found 20 or more instances of the delegation of legislative power to the Executive.

I believe this to be the most expansive grant of discretionary authority to legislate for the people of America that has ever been given to any Executive in this country. Oh, I know that during the depression, after the McNary-Haugen Act had been repeatedly vetoed, and the prices of farm commodities had sunk to an all-time low, when farmers were gathered in many courthouses to protest the foreclosure of mortgages, and sometimes threatened to haul the judge from the bench——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. What the distinguished Senator from Wyoming speaks of in connection with the terrible hardship years the farmers experienced is what has caused me to pay as much attention to farm legislation as I have. During the early thirties I appraised many farms for the Federal land bank. At that time Congress enacted what was known as the Commissioner's loan. It was enacted for the purpose of creating a fund to be used for second mortgages. It was realized that land-bank loans must be conservative, because the laws regarding them were so intended. Consequently, there was not sufficient lending ability available to the Federal land banks to make all necessary loans. Therefore, Congress enacted the Commissioner's loan, to create a fund for use as second mortgages to the land-bank loan.

That saved the farmer. I am fully acquainted with that situation as I worked directly under it. In the winter of 1934, in order to keep ahead of the sheriffs' sales, I appraised lands in the Midwest, when the ground was not only frozen, but oftentimes covered with several inches to a foot or more of snow.

We could determine the value of land only by knowing the area or by judging the quality of the grain and hay grown on it.

Normally, we did not appraise in the dead of winter in a northern region. Appraisers want to see the condition of the ground and determine the depth of the top soil. However, we had to do it in the winter in order to keep ahead of the sheriff's sales.

I shall never forget that experience. Therefore, I shall never be a party, in Congress or in private life, to a program which will bring about a return to such disastrous economic conditions in the farm areas of the Nation.

Because of my experiences, I am compelled to stand here today and urge continuance of the 90-percent program until such time as the soil-bank program can operate and take some of our acreage out of cropping, and thus effect a reduction in the overall surpluses we are confronted with today.

I wish to commend the Senator from Wyoming for referring to a time in the history of our Nation of which all of us should be constantly reminded. We must

be mindful of the fact that we may some day return to those terrible conditions if we are not careful.

THE CYNICS AND THE SMALL FARM

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has stated his experience in that connection.

I was in Wyoming in those days. I had occasion to travel through the State of Iowa and I remember occasions in that State when, because of the low price of milk, milk trucks delivering milk to the cities were being overturned by the farmers because the Government had not done anything to aid the depreciation of farm prices.

We are facing the same situation today. However, we are facing it when there are cynics in the land who say without hesitation that the time has gone for the family-sized farm and that agriculture is big business and that we must let the farmer and his wife and his children give up the hope of settling upon a farm.

The other day I called up the Bureau of Reclamation to find out if there were still applications being made for reclamation farms. There are. The popularity of farms of limited acreage—80 acres, 100 acres, or 120 acres—is indicated by the fact that since 1946 there have been 49 land openings in the reclamation States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me first state the facts. There were 49 land openings. Two thousand one hundred and sixty-seven farm units were available for distribution. Only 2,167, Mr. President. In recent days several hundred veterans have applied for admission to small farms.

It is only a few years ago since the close of the war that I stood in a motion picture theater in the city of Powell, Wyo., when the Heart Mountain project was opened. There were so few small units for the many veterans who had applied that the names of the applicants were written upon small tablets and poured into a huge glass bowl, 3 feet in depth and 18 inches in diameter, or approximately that. That bowl was turned by hand. Then the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Deputy Commissioner and the Governor of the State and the Senator from the State—which was I—had the opportunity of drawing those names.

The Commissioner of Reclamation drew five names. The Deputy Commissioner drew five names. That was 10 so far. The Governor of the State then drew 3. That was 13. Not a single name of a citizen of Wyoming had been drawn up to that moment. Then I was called upon to draw, and I am happy to report that I had the good luck to draw two Wyoming names.

Mr. ELLENDER. Out of three?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Out of three. What I wish to point out is that the veterans of the country still believe in the agricultural way of life. However, business leaders do not believe that way.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to join in the comment that the veterans of America still desire farms and oftentimes do go into farming. The only reason I wish to comment at this point is to call attention to the fact that when some people speak of a farm that is too small to be efficient, it is an idle statement and frequently an inaccurate one.

I have seen most efficient farmers operating on 80-acre farms in southern Minnesota, I have seen many times farmers on 80-acre farms prove to be highly efficient farmers, with an excellent net return in a year. I have seen such a farmer able to provide for his children just as well as a larger operator.

It is utterly impossible to measure what is a profitable and efficient farm, and many times all the theories which may be applied in trying to determine what is a profitable and efficient farm go out the window.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does not the Senator agree that that question is bound inevitably to enter into the determinations and decisions of those who will be in charge of writing the rules and regulations and in carrying out the soil bank provision?

Mr. THYE. That is correct. Time after time I have seen a small family unit of 80 or even 40 acres, lying among other farms of 3 or 4 times that size, become the most efficient and most profitable farm in returns to the operator. It is a way of life for the family. The children attend school, aiding and assisting with the chores mornings and evenings, and they are at home during the summer recess and do some of the field work. When I hear it said that the family farm is an inefficient unit and it has to be supplemented, it is almost laughable when practical experience is applied.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read to the Senator from an editorial published in the Journal of Commerce.

Mr. J. Roger Wallace was speaking on Tuesday, February 21, at a luncheon meeting of the Commodity Club of New York. The speech was entitled "What Is Wrong With Our Agricultural Policy?" Let me read just a few extracts from it:

If agriculture were permitted to become truly efficient, there would be no place at all in agriculture for the hundreds of thousands of small, inefficient farmers who at best can make no more than a miserable living from the soil.

The political angle is disguised under the slogans of "agriculture as a way of life" and "perpetuating the family farm." Actually, what is being perpetuated in many instances is no more than farm slums.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if in this country we ever reach the time when there are nothing but large farm units and farm-management operations, we will have not only organized farm workers, but we will have what has been experienced in the pineapple farm operations in the Hawaiian Islands, where lands are owned by corporations and the farms operated by the owners of sugar-mill companies. In order that the workers could eke out a bare existence, they were compelled, oftentimes, to go on strike to force wages up. If the corporation-type farm ever becomes the basis of agriculture in this Nation, that which our forefathers willed us will be lost to future generations. There will not be families residing on small independent farm units across the Nation. There will be great estates, with overseers, and with small houses for the field workers to return to at night. There will be neither opportunity nor a sense of ownership or initiative given to the individual who loves the soil and wants to farm.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And those who buy the farms will offset their farm losses against the huge profits they make in industry.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator pardon me just a moment?

Mr. President, instead of reading the entire statement, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text as printed in the New York Journal of Commerce of Thursday, February 23, 1956, be made a part of my speech at this point.

I think I made a mistake and referred to Mr. Wallace as Mr. Rogers. The name is J. Roger Wallace. In order to make it clear that he is not the Henry Wallace who once was Secretary of Agriculture, who did work for the small farmer and who did originate the theory of the soil bank, I wish to call attention to the fact that this Wallace is J. Roger Wallace.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BLAMED FOR CHAOTIC AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

Incorrect diagnosis by the Federal Government of the true nature of the farm problem is primarily responsible for the present chaotic agricultural situation. In the mistaken belief that artificial elevation of prices is the solution, the Government has accumulated billions of dollars worth of farm products that cannot be liquidated except at tremendous loss.

As a result of this misguided emphasis on prices, the American consumer has been forced to pay more for practically everything he buys, both farm products and non-farm products.

RELIEF PROVES COSTLY

During the past two decades, some $20 billion of taxpayers' money have gone down the drain of farm "relief." A huge bureaucracy has been created to administer the various phases of a succession of bungling farm programs.

As surpluses have accounted, owing to the willful destruction of both domestic and export markets, restrictions have been imposed on production of certain crops only to turn farmers to other crops and resultant new surpluses.

There is no evading the fact that the Government farm program, as presently conceived, is a complete failure. It was obvious some 25 years ago, when Washington first undertook to elevate farm products prices, that such attempts to nullify the law of supply and demand could only result in failure and a chaotic agricultural situation.

PATCHWORK CONTINUING

However Congress still is attempting to patch up the farm program wreck rather than junk it. But, nothing can save American agriculture from further chaos except

abandonment of price controls and restoration of free markets. Even though it may not be possible to do this in one fell swoop, we can make a start, with a definite time goal for the termination of all price supports.

During the early days of the industrial revolution in England, the displaced workers mobbed the factories and smashed the machines, trying to turn the clock back. In essence, that is what the Government has been trying to do to the agricultural revolution.

This is implicit in the parity price concept, deliberately set up to ignor the sharp increases in agricultural productivity and improved methods of agricultural production that should be benefitting consumers as well as farmers.

RIDES BOTH MULE, TRACTOR

The Government, with its misguided and bungling farm policies, is trying at one and the same time to ride both the mule and the tractor, with each moving in opposite directions. Through the application of machinery and scientific methods, agricultural productivity per man-hour has doubled since prewar and still is rising rapidly.

On highly mechanized farms, the gains in productivity have been much greater.

Washington, not content with acreage restrictions that stifle efficiency and put premiums on inefficiency, now is talking of putting chains on productivity through rigid production quotas. This, of course, would be a deliberate step backward.

One does not have to be particularly cynical to conclude that the primary objective of governmental agricultural policy is political rather than economic or social. If agriculture were permitted to become truly efficient, there would be no place at all in agriculture for the hundreds of thousands of small, inefficient farmers who at best can make no more than a miserable living from the soil.

Although they produce little, they count heavily in the election returns.

DISGUISED UNDER SLOGANS

The political angle is disguised under the slogans of "agriculture as a way of life" and "perpetuating the family farm." Actually, what is being perpetuated in many instances is no more than farm slums. If these people were to pick up and leave for more gainful occupations, many politicians would have no constituents left to vote for them.

There are approximately 5 million farms in the United States. Of these, 3 million or 60 percent account for only 15 percent or even less of total farm output. These farms range in size from a few acres to just under 100 acres.

The average cropland harvested is only 18 acres per farm, altogether too little for any amount of mechanization. Efficient production is impossible on these tiny farms.

On these 18 acres, with average yields per-acre and current prices, a farmer could raise a cotton crop worth about $1,500 or a wheat crop worth about $600 or a corn crop worth about $750. This is the gross value of the average output of these 3 million farms, assuming that the entire 18 acres were planted in one of the 3 crops noted.

Actually, some of the 18 acres has to be planted in food for the family and feed for animals. Taxes, seed, fertilizer, insecticides, and so on, have to come out of the few hundred dollars received for sale of crops.

SCANT AID RECEIVED

Production on these farms is so small that price supports can add very little to family income. Some of these small farmers supplement their income through part-time jobs in industry, but this is not an altogether practical solution owing to transportation and distance difficulties.

Actually the Government has done a disservice to many of these small farmers by encouraging them to stay on their farms. The politicians have done them a disservice by encouraging them to believe that Washington somehow can stimulate prices of farm products sufficiently to make a real difference in their income.

Business has been crying for more workers, and there is no doubt that the great majority of these very low-income farm families would fare better in the business world than by trying to grub out a bare living from the soil.

TRANSITION POSES PROBLEMS

There are numerous problems involved in such a transition, but many farmers already have solved them as indicated by the declines in farm population during the past 20 years or so. Some governmental assistance might be needed. This is too much of a problem for the Department of Agriculture alone.

The solution probably would require the joint efforts of three governmental Departments, Agriculture, Labor, and Commerce.

The soil-bank plan might be used to pay farmers for taking these numerous small, inefficient farms out of production, although it probably would be much cheaper for the Government to buy these farms outright than to pay rent on them for a prolonged period.

LARGER FARMS NEEDED

There is no particular merit in bigness itself, but it is a fact that a farm has to be rather big today to warrant the necessary mechanization to make it efficient. The gasoline engine and rural electrification have altered the pattern of agricultural production just as much as James Watt's steam engine altered the pattern of industrial production.

The trend is definitely toward larger farms where the use of large mechanized equipment is practicable.

Agricultural economists state that, for maximum efficiency under present-day best farm practices, the size of a farm should range from 600 acres to 3,000 acres.

The 1950 census showed 304,000 farms ranging from 500 acres to over 1,000 acres. These represented only 5.7 percent of the total number of all farms at that time, but accounted for over 50 percent of all farmland and 30 percent of cropland harvested.

There are some 2 million medium and large scale farm operators whose farms range from 100 acres to over 1,000 acres. Representing 40 percent of all farmers, they account for 85 percent or more of total cropland harvested and contribute correspondingly to total farm output.

The average cropland harvested per farm is between 125 and 150 acres, as compared with only 18 acres for the 3 million small farms.

BURDENED WITH CURBS

Many of these medium and large farms are not able to operate at maximum efficiency since they are burdened with restrictions in the form of Government acreage allotments.

Price supports and restrictions on production go hand in hand, of course. The majority of these farmers are equipped to produce profitably at prices well below current levels for the price-supported crops, and they are irked at acreage controls. They need no price supports.

Undoubtedly, these 2 million farms can produce all the farm products needed for domestic consumption plus export requirements. Increased efficiency should result in lower production costs and lower prices for consumers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator is familiar with this little book which is entitled "Full Prosperity for Agriculture," which is published at 1001 Connecticut Avenue by the Conference on Economic Progress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I must confess to the Senator from Vermont that I have been so busy reading the bill which came from the committee that I have not had the time to read Mr. Keyserling's booklet. I have it, but I have not had an opportunity to read it.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a very complete work of the National Committee of the Conference on Economic Progress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that the author of that booklet, in whom I have a good deal of confidence, is not yet the czar of agriculture, as the present Secretary of Agriculture will be made if this bill shall pass.

Mr. AIKEN. This is the first time I have known that Mr. Keyserling wrote this book. It was sent to me by Mr. James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am looking across the aisle to the Senator. He may not have in hand the book which I thought he had.

Mr. AIKEN. It is the same one, I am sure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it is, the name is on it.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator agree with the proposal—and I am referring now to page 99 of the book—that it would require "the exodus from the farm population of about 2 million people by 1960" to lift the standard of living of the farmers?

In other words, does the Senator agree with Mr. Keyserling—and I am glad to know who wrote this book—that we should liquidate about 950,000 of the smallest farms in the United States within the next 4 years as proposed on page 108 of the book?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not agree with any proposal to liquidate any of the farmers of America.

Mr. AIKEN. The book is sponsored by a very distinguished group, including Mr. Keyserling, Mr. Patton, Mr. Reuther, and Mr. M. W. Thatcher.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are distinguished gentlemen, but I speak for myself.

Mr. AIKEN. This is quite an interesting book, and I commend it to the Senator's reading. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall tell Mr. Keyserling that the Senator from Vermont has endorsed his book upon the floor of the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. AIKEN. I have not met anyone who knew the authorship until now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to add a few more points for the record.

Early last week the Secretary of Agriculture was testifying before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I was a member of that committee, and it was a very interesting session.

SECRETARY BENSON'S LETTER

The Secretary answered fully and frankly the questions propounded to him

by members of the committee. Later, on the floor of the Senate, I told the Senate what some of the questions were which I had requested the Secretary to answer, regarding what he felt about some of the issues. I have in my hand Secretary Benson's letter of March 1, 1956, responding to some of the questions which were raised at the hearing and which were mentioned by me on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 1, 1956.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In the hearing on February 28 before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and again that same day on the floor of the Senate, you requested certain information from me.

One item was mentioned by you on page 3459 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "I requested Secretary Benson to have prepared an amendment which would prevent abuse of the sale of our surplus food commodities in Russia."

As Senator AIKEN responded, such an amendment was offered in his bill, S. 2949. The amendment appears on page 20, lines 8 and 9 of that bill, and reads as follows:

"Section 304 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress (68 Stat. 454), is hereby repealed."

The enactment of this amendment would permit CCC-owned agricultural commodities to be used in barter transactions with other than friendly countries.

The other item you requested appears on page 3460 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"The other question I asked the Secretary of Agriculture was this: Inasmuch as the President has expressed sympathy toward the family-sized farm, would the Secretary consider an amendment to the bill which would provide that the full 90-percent supports would be extended to the production from family-sized farms, farms operated by families, and that the flexible supports should be confined solely to corporate farms and farms of a thousand acres or more?"

First of all, the President's intent was not identical with the objective you have indicated. The President said:

"The average size of farms in American agriculture, as measured by capital or by acres, has rapidly increased. To the degree that this trend is associated with the development of more economic and more efficient farm units it is in the interest of farm families and of the Nation. To the degree, however, that it has resulted in the removal of risk for large farm businesses by reasons of price supports, it is much less wholesome and constitutes a threat to the traditional family farm.

"Under the price support machinery as it has been functioning, price support loans of tremendous size have occasionally occurred. It is not sound Government policy to underwrite at public expense such formidable competition with family-operated farms, which are the bulwark of our agriculture.

"I ask the Congress to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price-support loans to any one individual or farming unit. The limit should be sufficiently high to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms."

Various bills have been offered which have the objective mentioned in your question. Among them are S. 2776 and S. 3027. Each of these bills is addressed to the objective indicated by your question.

The Department of Agriculture has undertaken thorough study of the approach embodied in these bills. The National Agricultural Advisory Commission studied the problem and advised against this approach for the following reasons:

1. Providing price supports for family farms at a high and rigid level would result in giving effective support for the entire crop at that level, since by far most of our farm products are produced on family farms. The family farms would hold a price umbrella for the other farms.

2. The purpose of the legislation could be defeated, in part, by producers which would divide a large farm from a legalistic standpoint but preserve it as an operating unit.

3. Inefficiency would be encouraged and perpetuated by subsidizing farm units of uneconomic size.

Two years ago Senator DWORSHAK invited our comments on a proposal of the type you mention. We advised against this approach, as indicated in the attached copy of a letter to Senator AIKEN.

As Senator THYE indicated in his colloquy with you, legislation of the type you have in mind has been before the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me. The need for prompt enactment of the administration's farm proposals is urgent. The President said: "I urge the Congress to pass this program with maximum speed."

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in addition to that, I made request of the Secretary of Agriculture for some information with respect to the number of farms by tenure of operator in the United States. This morning, at my office, with a memorandum dated March 2, I found two tables relating to farm tenancy and farm employment. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum and the tables be printed at length in the RECORD.

First, however, I wish to call attention to 1 or 2 of the very interesting figures which appear.

All the farm operators in the United States in 1900 numbered 5,737,000. There was a rather general increase, which was impeded a little in 1925 and 1930, but continued until 1935. The period between 1925 and 1930 was the time of the agricultural depression, when farmers were leaving the farms.

The year 1935 was after some relief legislation had been passed. The number of farms in 1935 was 6,812,000, according to the table sent to me by the Secretary of Agriculture. That was the high point. From that time onward, the decline has been continuous.

In 1954, there were 4,782,000 farms.

In a table showing the percentage of distribution, I find these very interesting facts:

In 1900, the number of part owners was 7.9 percent of the total number of owners. In 1910, the percentage of part owners increased to 9.3 percent. In 1920 and 1925, the number was static at 8.7 percent. In 1930, the number of part owners rose to 10.4 percent. In 1935 and 1940, the number was static at 10.1 percent. In 1945, the number of part owners was 11.3 percent of the total number of owners. In 1950, it was 15.3 percent. In 1954, it was 17.9 percent.

Those are the figures which I have received from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator state what is meant by "part owners"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Part owners are those who are not the full operators.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does that mean ownership by the operator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. The listings are "owners," "full owners," "part owners," "managers," and "tenants."

The number of family workers has been declining steadily.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has not the percentage of tenants dropped?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, the percentage of tenants has dropped.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator would read the figures as to tenants.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In 1900 the percentage of tenants was 35.3; in 1954 it was 24.4 percent. That was because of the decrease in the number of farms, and because wealthier persons are buying small farms to make larger farms. They are buying the land of the family-size farms from farmers who cannot subsist upon low prices and who are, therefore, being driven from the farms.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator have the figure of the percentage of tenants in 1950, for instance?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. In 1940 it was 38.7 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. There has been quite a drop.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, there has been quite a drop. The number of family workers also has dropped. In 1940, for example, the number of family workers on the farms were 8,300,000.

In 1955, the number was 6,341,000.

The number of hired workers has dropped also because of the coming of the machines.

The farm problem with which we are dealing is the farm problem which has been brought about by mechanized farming and by the increasing amount of production on the larger farms.

I have no doubt that is why the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], together with other Senators, have been suggesting the adoption of an amendment by which the payment would be scaled down as the farm size increases.

SAVE THE FAMILY FARM

The corporate farm and the large farm with huge production do not need the support which the family-sized farm needs. In my opinion, from the facts which have been developed in the debate so far, the conclusion is clear that,

unless we want to see more family farms abandoned and sold out, we had better support the 90-percent-of-parity provisions of the bill reported by the committee, whatever we may do with the soil-bank proposal, which I think ought to be eliminated, because I think it needs more study. I think it was proposed in 1956 because there was a realization that there is a farm problem in the United States which has not been solved.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The lowering of price supports certainly would accelerate the liquidation of smaller farmers, would it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. YOUNG. I was impressed by the testimony of one of the witnesses at the hearings in Louisiana. I think he described the farm situation about as well as any of the many witnesses we heard throughout the country. He said that when the smaller cotton farmer of the South goes out of business, the bigger operator comes along and takes over the same farm. He produces much more per acre than the smaller farmer did; and thereby helps to create even larger surpluses.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that. Not only is that true, but the large operator creates surpluses in other commodities.

There is a greater surplus of cattle in the country today than at any other time. The cattle population of the United States today is so large that there is 1 head for about every 1½ persons in the entire population.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is familiar with agriculture in the Great Plains area. Does he not agree that as the number of large farms increases, and the smaller farms are disappearing, the small towns and cities are affected? If the trend toward bigger farms by the big farm operators continues, the little towns and cities will soon cease to exist.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The small-business men will be injured; small banks will be closed; the support for rural schools will be reduced. Unmeasured damage will be done to the social system which now exists.

I think the question of creating a soil bank by the provisions of this bill, should be treated with much greater consideration than has been given to it to date by either the Department of Agriculture or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I say that without in any degree discounting the amount of work which the committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has done. I compliment him highly for the time he has spent in traveling all over the country and in getting the information from the people in the various States.

It is unquestioned that the family sized farm is disappearing, and that the industrial leaders want the family sized farms to disappear. When they shall have disappeared, the land will be taken over by the big mechanized farmers.

It is clear that the President in his agriculture message to Congress declared his sympathy with the family sized farm. But if it had not been for the action of the committee in reporting a bill providing for 90-percent supports, there would be nothing in the bill which would help the small farmer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the two tables to which I have referred and the accompanying memorandum from Mr. Koenig.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
March 2, 1956.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Attached are two tables relating to farm tenancy and farm employment. Assistant Secretary Butz asked me to have these tables prepared and send them to you in response to the request which you made of him earlier this week at the hearing before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Sincerely,

NATHAN KOENIG.

Number of farms by tenure of operator

Tenure of operator	Number of farms (thousands)									
	1900	1910	1920	1925	1930	1935	1940	1945	1950	1954
Owners	3,653	3,949	3,925	3,868	3,568	3,899	3,699	3,962	3,915	3,594
Full owners	3,202	3,355	3,367	3,313	2,912	3,210	3,084	3,301	3,090	2,737
Part owners	451	594	559	555	657	689	615	661	825	857
Managers	59	58	68	41	56	48	36	39	24	21
Tenants	2,025	2,355	2,455	2,463	2,664	2,865	2,361	1,858	1,444	1,168
All farm operators	5,737	6,362	6,448	6,372	6,289	6,812	6,097	5,859	5,382	4,782
	Percent distribution									
Owners	63.7	62.1	60.9	60.7	56.7	57.2	60.7	67.6	72.7	75.2
Full owners	55.8	52.7	52.2	52.0	46.3	47.1	50.6	56.3	57.4	57.3
Part owners	7.9	9.3	8.7	8.7	10.4	10.1	10.1	11.3	15.3	17.9
Managers	1.0	.9	1.1	.6	.9	.7	.6	.7	.4	.4
Tenants	35.3	37.0	38.1	38.6	42.4	42.1	38.7	31.7	26.8	24.4
All farm operators	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service. Compiled from reports of the Census of Agriculture. Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Farm employment: Annual averages and indexes of total, family and hired, employment, United States, 1910–55

Year	Total employment		Family workers		Hired workers	
	Average number of persons	Index, 1910–14=100	Average number of persons	Index, 1910–14=100	Average number of persons	Index, 1910–14=100
	Thousands		*Thousands*		*Thousands*	
1910	13,555	100	10,174	100	3,381	100
1911	13,539	100	10,169	100	3,370	99
1912	13,559	100	10,162	100	3,397	100
1913	13,572	100	10,158	100	3,414	100
1914	13,580	100	10,147	100	3,433	101
1915	13,592	100	10,140	100	3,452	102
1916	13,632	101	10,144	100	3,488	103
1917	13,568	100	10,121	100	3,447	101
1918	13,391	99	10,053	99	3,338	98
1919	13,243	98	9,968	98	3,275	96
1920	13,432	99	10,041	99	3,391	100
1921	13,398	99	10,001	98	3,397	100
1922	13,337	98	9,936	98	3,401	100
1923	13,162	97	9,798	96	3,364	99
1924	13,031	96	9,705	96	3,326	98
1925	13,036	96	9,715	96	3,321	98
1926	12,976	96	9,526	94	3,450	102
1927	12,642	93	9,278	91	3,364	99
1928	12,691	94	9,340	92	3,351	99
1929	12,763	94	9,360	92	3,403	100
1930	12,497	92	9,307	92	3,190	94
1931	12,745	94	9,642	95	3,103	91
1932	12,816	95	9,922	98	2,894	85
1933	12,739	94	9,874	97	2,865	84
1934	12,627	93	9,765	96	2,862	84
1935	12,733	94	9,855	97	2,878	85
1936	12,331	91	9,350	92	2,981	88
1937	11,978	88	9,054	89	2,924	86
1938	11,622	86	8,815	87	2,807	83
1939	11,338	84	8,611	85	2,727	80
1940	10,979	81	8,300	82	2,679	79
1941	10,669	79	8,017	79	2,652	78
1942	10,504	77	7,949	78	2,555	75
1943	10,446	77	8,010	79	2,436	72
1944	10,219	75	7,988	79	2,231	66
1945	10,000	74	7,881	78	2,119	62
1946	10,295	76	8,106	80	2,189	64
1947	10,382	77	8,115	80	2,267	67
1948	10,363	76	8,026	79	2,337	69
1949	9,964	73	7,712	76	2,252	66
1950	9,342	69	7,252	71	2,090	61
1951	8,985	66	6,997	69	1,988	58
1952	8,669	64	6,748	66	1,921	57
1953	8,580	63	6,645	65	1,935	57
1954	8,451	62	6,521	64	1,930	57
1955	8,237	61	6,341	62	1,896	56

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service.

ANCHER NELSEN, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, ever since the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration as an integral part of the Department of Agriculture, there has been genuine bipartisan support for its program. We are all aware of the great achievements of REA. No one knows better than I that the electrification of the Nation's farms is one of the greatest benefits that has come to the rural home. It has provided a modern home attractive to the farm youth. But above all, it has given the farm family the element of safety and added security by eliminating the kerosene lamp.

It is because of the bipartisan support for REA in the past that I am deeply disturbed and shocked by an apparent attempt to discredit the REA and its present Administrator, Ancher Nelsen. I am convinced that the attack is political, and sponsored by a certain organization not directly connected with the REA, but in a position to influence consumers of electric cooperatives who benefit from the progress made by REA.

I feel that the record should be straightened out before it becomes distorted any further. I was gratified that my distinguished colleagues from South Dakota revealed the truth about certain statements attributed to Ancher Nelsen at a meeting in St. Louis on January 8, 1956, where some of their constituents were present. Their clear and pointed statements, plus the letters from their constituents, formed an effective rebuttal to the charges made by a reporter of a Nashville, Tenn., paper on January 29, 1956.

I regret that the distinguished senior Senator from Montana saw fit to insert that article in the RECORD without verifying the facts as reported.

The charge was made that Ancher Nelsen, at a meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis in January, forced his way into a meeting of the resolutions committee, and that he then proceeded to threaten that if they did not cooperate fully with him they would have a difficult time getting loans from REA.

This charge is pure politics, and submitted for purely political purposes. I have read letters from those present at the meeting in question. They read the newspaper account and found it to be so distorted and false that they took it upon themselves to report the true facts.

It is most regrettable that a member of the press, who is charged with reporting the facts accurately, would use this great medium of communication in such a fashion. It is also regrettable that any organization would reprint thousands of copies of the article, knowing it to be false, and circulate it nationally. This not only performs a disservice to those who are conscientiously administering the REA program, but it does a grave disservice to the patrons of REA and to the American public.

These two charges—the newspaper charge and the verbal charges in Minnesota—do not stand up in the light of the facts.

I happen to know Ancher Nelsen, REA Administrator, very well. He is one of Minnesota's most distinguished citizens. He happens to be a farmer from Hutchinson, Minn. He knows what telephones and electricity have meant to the American farmer. He remembers the day when the kerosene lamp and the wood stove furnished the light and warmth for every American farm home.

He served for many years in the Minnesota State Senate. While in that capacity he played a prominent part in drafting legislation designed to assist our rural population and the rural cooperatives in Minnesota.

Ancher Nelsen was Lieutenant Governor of Minnesota before he came to Washington in the spring of 1953. He is a man of real dedication to duty. Ancher Nelsen has never in his career used strong-arm tactics or threats. I worked closely with him when I served as Governor of Minnesota and while he was a State senator. I am in a position to vouch for his integrity and his honesty. However, many of my colleagues are not as well acquainted with him as I. Because of that I am going to briefly give them the facts concerning the progress of REA under his leadership.

These facts are well known to all, including those who have launched this political attack upon him.

First. Between July 1, 1953, and July 1, 1955, REA borrowers connected an additional 133,000 farms. These farms were getting electricity for the first time. It should be pointed out that the best areas of this Nation's farms received the benefits of REA's program in the period before Ancher Nelsen became Administrator. He is now picking up the loose ends of isolated areas.

This fact makes the accomplishments which have been mentioned even more important, because it must be remembered that the areas which have been alluded to have been passed over many times as questionable areas, because of doubt as to whether there would be enough subscribers to make a loan possible. It is for that reason that any loans made now would be to areas on the fringe or edge of those eligible, which have been passed over.

Second. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, REA made 349 electrification loans, totaling $167.5 million. Does this reflect an insidious attack upon the REA loan program?

Third. REA loans for 1952 totaled $165.7 million; for 1953 the figure was $165 million; for 1954, $167 million. Does this indicate that the REA program is being stifled?

Fourth. Because of REA assistance to cooperatives in working out power contracts, the cost of wholesale power has been reduced from 1 cent in 1941 to 7.4 mills in 1955. Can it be said that this saving of millions of dollars indicates the administration's lack of interest in rural electrification?

Fifth. In 1951, farmers on REA financed lines paid 3.6 cents a kilowatt-hour at retail for their electricity. In 1955 they paid 3 cents per kilowatt-hour. That is the lowest figure in history.

Sixth. In fiscal 1955, REA made loans for generating plants and transmission systems in the amount of $41 million. This will provide 10 new generating units and about 1,700 miles of transmission line.

Seventh. The amount of money on loan to REA borrowers at the present time is $3.1 billion. The 1,026 borrowers serve over 4 million customers.

Eighth. At the end of the 1955 fiscal year, the backlog of electrification loans amounted to $97 million, the lowest since 1945. When Ancher Nelsen took office this backlog totaled $220 million.

Ninth. The amount of unadvanced funds for REA borrowers at the end of 1955 came to $448 million. This represents money which has been loaned, but which borrowers do not yet need.

Tenth. REA has long had a contingency fund available. Prior to this administration, it was used but once. In fiscal 1954, $39 million was used from the reserve; in fiscal 1955, $35 million was used. Does this show a reluctance to finance rural-electrification systems? Of course it does not, Mr. President.

Eleventh. REA regularly conducts a survey of its borrowers, asking them to specify the loan needs in the year ahead. This provides the basis for the annual budget request for loan funds. For fiscal 1957, REA estimates such borrowers' loan needs at $185 million, which will be met in full on the basis of the budget now before Congress. This is the highest since 1951.

Twelfth. Approximately 756 REA borrowers have made payments in advance of due date on their loans, in the amount of $91 million.

The points I have just covered go to the heart of the rural-electrification program. It is obvious, when one looks at the facts, that the charges I have referred to are false and are intended to mislead the public. I, for one, will never play politics with the REA program. I hope that those who are attacking the program without presenting facts will consider the harm they can do to the many consumers and patrons of REA. These false charges serve to undermine public confidence in the REA program, and this must not happen for the good of REA. Rather than condemn Ancher Nelsen and the REA program, these critics would do better by coming out in the open and offering to cooperate and assist in the bipartisan spirit which should prevail—as it always has, up to now—in this great program. The record shows that Ancher Nelsen and his department are doing an effective and outstanding job.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR CARLSON TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, immediately following the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who has been granted unanimous consent to address the Senate immediately after the conclusion of morning business tomorrow. the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WITHDRAWALS OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES IN THE 11 WESTERN PUBLIC LAND STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, as one of the 11 public land States, my State of Nevada has been subjected to land withdrawals for public purposes over the last half century. During the past 15 years, large withdrawals have been made by the armed services, for use in the training of military personnel. The more than 60 million acres of unappropriated and unreserved public land, and, in addition, the approximately 5 million acres of forest-reserve land, have been completely utilized by the residents of Nevada for almost a century.

NEVADANS MAKE EFFICIENT USE OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. President, in our State, the livestock interests, the mining interests, and, more recently, the developing industries, are making very efficient use of this entire acreage.

Probably very few persons, except the folks in the livestock country, the public land area—realize what the livestock units are based upon. There are three parts to a livestock unit. The first is the home range, where there is enough water for irrigation, so that the feed, the hay, the grain—whatever is necessary to winter the stock—can be raised.

Then there are the water rights for irrigation and stock watering. They are water rights on the range as filed under State law over a period of nearly a century in time. If not filed in the early days they have been adjudicated so that the time of use was established.

HAY VITAL TO LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Then there is the public range—where, for example, at the mouth of a canyon there may be enough water to irrigate, let us say, 100 acres. In the case of ordinary hay—prairie hay, it is called in the Midwest—probably anywhere from three-quarters of a ton to 1½ tons per acre would be harvested. For the purpose of this debate, let us say that 1 ton is harvested to the acre. With 100 acres, that would amount to 100 tons of hay.

In an area north of Ely, Nev., or Tonopah, Nev., which is a little south of the central part of the State, the general estimate—in order to be safe with a herd of cattle for the average winter—would be a ton of hay per cow and calf. Sometimes during an open winter that much hay is not used. But in that event, the extra amount is saved, so that during a hard winter—which can require two tons per unit—there will be sufficient hay. If the stockmen do not have enough hay, they lose the cattle. The cattle are run on the open range. That has been the practice for almost a century. The water rights have been filed on the springs and the small stock watering places throughout the open range, under State law; and the water rights have been filed and adjudicated, for the most part, on the stream or streams that furnish the water for irrigation.

FEED ON PUBLIC RANGE HARVESTED ONLY THROUGH THE LIVESTOCK

So those three parts are necessary for a livestock unit, whether for cattle or for sheep. That is the only way the feed on the public range can be harvested—namely, through the livestock. Over that period of time the ranchers have worked it out.

Mr. President, there are approximately 110,000 square miles in the State of Nevada—or approximately 70,600,000 acres. Approximately 60 million acres of it are unappropriated and unreserved.

WORLD WAR II BROUGHT SHRINKAGE OF PUBLIC RANGE WITH LITTLE OBJECTION

During World War II, an area of approximately 90 miles by 100 miles in size was withdrawn for a bombing range near Tonopah, Nev. The Tonopah Airbase was established. No one thought very much about it; certainly there was not very much objection. Only the stock raisers and miners in the area objected. But that was during wartime, and no one took that withdrawal very seriously. The Government was supposed to compensate the property owners; and I think that in the main that was done. There is still considerable argument about it, but that is something that a court can always settle.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AFFECTS SECOND HUGE WITHDRAWAL

Then, following the war, the Atomic Energy Commission occupied a large part of the public land area—part of it already appropriated—in this square of 90 miles by 100 miles. All of us are familiar with the newspaper reports about the bombing range for the atomic energy bombs. That area is being completely utilized.

NAVY DEPARTMENT ACQUIRES NEVADA AREA

Then, Mr. President, considerably later, the Navy Air Corps came to Fallon, Nev., and withdrew several areas for their operations. That included the purchase of privately-owned tracts of land. All that was with the consent of the people in the area, and presumably all of the land was to be used for a good purpose.

Then a large area was withdrawn in the Black Rock Desert, in the northern part of Nevada, for an additional large bombing range.

Mr. President, all of us know that the faster the jet planes fly, the larger the bombing areas they require. When they were flying only 250 or 300 miles an hour, that was one thing. Now they are going 4 or 5 hundred miles an hour, and looking forward to supersonic speed. As they speed up, they need more land.

NAVY SEEKS ADDITIONAL PUBLIC LANDS

Recently a request was made by the Navy for additional lands bordering upon the Black Rock Desert, located in the northern part of our State, the northern part of Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties.

There is a reason for the large areas of public land. Eighty-seven percent of the land in the State of Nevada is public land. There is reason for large areas of public lands in the other western public land States. There is a small amount of public land in the Dakotas, but not very much, not enough to cause very much of a problem. Nevada has the largest percentage of public land. The reason for such large areas of public land is the lower rainfall. There has never been any public land in that area which would fit into the program of placing it in private ownership and putting it on the tax rolls.

EARLY LAND-SETTLEMENT ACTS HIGHLIGHTED

About 100 years ago the Homestead Act was passed. Previous to that, the Predemption Act was passed, about 140 years ago. Those acts were calculated to put lands into private ownership, and therefore on the tax roll.

The program started with the Homestead Act, in the corn land States of Iowa and Indiana, immediately after the Civil War, and moved from there west. One hundred and sixty acres of land was given in return for a filing fee of $16. That situation lasted until the program got out into western Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. The rainfall was much lighter in the western part of Kansas, the State of the present Presiding Officer [Mr. CARLSON]. One hundred and sixty acres was not enough for a farmer or a rancher to make a living. There used to be a sort of joke in this connection. The homesteaders would tell each other that the Government was betting 160 acres against $16 that they could not make a go of it, and the Government began to win all the bets.

HOMESTEAD ACREAGE EXPANDED

So the Congress enacted what was called an additional Homestead Act, providing for 160 additional acres. That made 320 acres that could be taken up. That program lasted through western Kansas and into the short-grass country in Colorado. When it reached the mesas, 320 acres was not enough. Then there was enacted the Grazing Homestead Act. Under certain conditions an additional section of land could be acquired. Making a total of 960 acres, which would take the homesteaders across the short-grass country into a part of what was called the great American desert of Utah, Nevada, and other intermountain States.

SENATOR RECALLS PUBLIC LAND SURVEY EXPERIENCE

No further attempt was made to pass a public lands bill, so that the people utilizing the land could take up enough land to make a living. I have spent a great deal of time on those ranges. As early as 1911 I was on public land surveys in my State of Nevada, and beginning in 1914 I carried a transit over a good part of it. We were sleeping out on the desert. No one thought very much about it. We were surveying that land.

In the 1850's—that is a long time ago—people started coming into Nevada, particularly into the Virginia City area. They needed food, and feed for livestock. The ranchers began to do well, and they began to take up the land, as I have previously described.

PIONEER RANCHERS DEVELOPED COOPERATIVE UNDERSTANDINGS

In the canyons where there was enough water for a small ranch, the cattle would use the unappropriated range, the open range; and as more people came in, there began to be cooperative understandings with respect to the ridges, the canyons, and the valleys.

A man who had a hundred head of cattle would pasture them on a certain

area of the lands. Another rancher might have 150 head, or 25. In any event, there was a very amicable arrangement, until the range began to be overappropriated.

WATER RIGHTS PROTECTED

The State of Nevada then entered the picture, and passed a stock water law. I shall make it a part of the RECORD later. It was provided that when anyone filed an appropriation for stock water on a range, the State engineer could refuse the application if the range was already substantially utilized under a subsisting right. All this was done under the police power of the State. The Supreme Court of Nevada held it to be constitutional. I have no doubt that it is constitutional. Certainly it worked very well.

MINERS AND RANCHERS THRIVED AMICABLY

Mining, of course, went on during all of that time. Mining does not interfere with cattle or sheep on the ranges. Whenever a mine was discovered, operations proceeded, and everyone was cooperative. At least, there was no interference. That is the way the taxable property in the State of Nevada and other public land States developed, with the exception, of course, of the States on the Pacific Coast, which had other resources, such as harbors, shipping, and other things. However, the mining States were largely developed in that manner.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF NEVADA MORE RECENT

In recent years industries have started to come into the State. They will come whenever there are power, water, and other favorable factors affecting the feasibility of the industry. Industry in our State, of course, had a great boost when the Hoover Dam was constructed. I was State engineer from 1927 to 1935, and administered the Stock Water Act, which I have just described, and which I shall place in the RECORD later.

I cooperated with the Department of the Interior while Hoover Dam was being constructed. In the division of power and water, I represented my State.

NEVADA INDUSTRIES EXPANDING

That is not the only industry. There are smaller industries scattered throughout the State of Nevada, in the population centers, especially large mining operations such as the Anaconda Mining Co., which has gone into Yerington, Nev., 100 miles southeast of Reno. One of the largest copper pits in the world is located in Ely, Nev., where the Kennicott Copper Co. is located. There are many smaller investments.

PROSPECTORS BEING RUINED BY IMPORTS FROM LOW-WAGE COUNTRIES

Those mines, of course, are discovered by prospectors who used to be present all the time when we had a policy which protected the investor and the working man in their standard of living. We have just about chased the prospectors out, because even when a prospector finds a mineral outcrop today, it develops that that mineral can be shipped into the United States from some lower wage-standard-of-living country cheaper than it can be mined in this country.

LARGE LAND WITHDRAWALS NEW THREAT TO NEVADA'S ECONOMY

Now come these large land withdrawals. As I have said, large land withdrawals were accentuated during World War II. There is pending an application for a large additional area, consisting of several million acres on public lands.

I have had experience in the State since 1911, especially since 1927, when I became the State engineer. My experience also includes private engineering practice, and my experience as a United States Senator. I have been aware all the time that at some time there would have to be a State policy; there would have to be some method of determining what lands, if any, should be withdrawn, and what would be in the best interests of the State of Nevada, the State of Utah, and other public-land States, in the utilization of these lands.

SENATOR ADDRESSES NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE ON PROBLEM

So, Mr. President, I took occasion, following the time when I was in Chicago delivering an address before the Abraham Lincoln Club on the 11th of February, to go home. I started in the eastern part of my State and traveled throughout the northern, western, and southern parts of the State. I conferred with many people. While I was there, the legislature was in special session, and I addressed the Senate and the assembly on this particular question.

I said there was little use in asking me in Washington to do something for a certain area or to prevent something from being done in another area, with one being dependent upon another, if the State did not have a policy. I said the State must adopt a policy. If the State adopted such a policy, I said I would be willing to do whatever the State wanted to be done.

CONFERS WITH GOVERNOR

I also had two conferences with our Governor, Charles Russell, who previously served one term in the House of Representatives. He now is the governor of our State.

Governor Russell agreed with me that a State policy must be adopted, and that it was too much to expect us to sit still while a Government department comes into a particular part of our State to withdraw large areas of land and destroy the livestock industry, the mining industry, or any other industry, without having some rhyme or reason or policy to go by.

EARLY CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR AND GOVERNOR ON NAVY EFFORT MADE PUBLIC

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Governor of Nevada and a telegraphic enclosure, dated July 27, 1955, together with my answer.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, July 27, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: Attached is a copy of a telegram I sent to the Secretary of the Navy protesting the withdrawal of 2,026,800 acres Nevada territory in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties by the Navy for use as bombing range.

Anything you can do to assist in blocking this withdrawal will be greatly appreciated.

With every best wish,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES,
Charles H. Russell,
Governor.

CARSON CITY, NEV., *July 27, 1955.*

Hon. CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.:

Heartily join with Nevada Fish and Game Commission in opposing withdrawal 2,026,800 acres in northern Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties of Nevada by Navy for use as bombing range. Majority that area comprises some Nevada's best wildlife habitat for chukars, sagehen, mule deer, and antelope. Further, some Nevada's largest ranches and mining operations involved, which, if eliminated will have adverse effect economy of State.

CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
Governor of Nevada.

AUGUST 6, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
Governor of the State of Nevada,
Carson City, Nev.

DEAR CHARLIE: I had your letter of July 27, requesting my assistance in blocking the withdrawal of 2,026,800 acres of Nevada territory in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties by the Navy for use as a bombing range.

You may know that I attended a meeting of the people of Lovelock and heard the difficulties they were having with the Navy, and the Administration of Defense officials, and that I did arrange for the top Navy officials from San Francisco to come to Lovelock and meet with them.

I understood that out of this meeting came a very clear understanding of the areas desired by the Navy, and how the private property would be appraised and paid for, and my impression has been from the communications from citizens of that area who attended the meeting, including Paul Gardner, that it was well on the way to a settlement.

When I received your letter, I immediately communicated with the Administration of National Defense top officials, apprised them of my interest in the situation, and asked them to let me know exactly how the situation stood at this moment, and just what interest they had in this land, and what the overall effect would be if they were denied its use. I am attaching a copy of their August 4 letter to me, which is self-explanatory, signed by Thomas A. Callaghan, Jr., Special Assistant for Facilities, Department of the Navy.

I then visited Mr. Callaghan in his office at the Pentagon, who is in complete charge of the situation, and he was very clear in his explanation that while additional large future expenditures were contemplated in building up the Fallon Air Base, that probably it would be necessary to abandon the field if they were unable to secure the additional range.

Due to the extreme importance and the far-reaching consequences of the decision in this matter, I thought it best for Mr. Callaghan to write you direct about it since I have already assured him that my position will be governed by the position of the State administraton and the people of my State.

Due to the extreme importance of this decision, I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of the correspondence to Mr. Paul Gardner, of Lovelock, who has spearheaded the investigation there, and to Mr. Claude Smith, and Mr. Calvin Sunderland, at Fallon.

I am leaving today for Russia and the satellite countries on a trip that has been long planned in connection with the work of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I cannot now fix the exact date of my return, but Jock Taylor, my executive secretary here will follow through on any plan that you may decide upon in connection with the Fallon and Lovelock people.

I will look forward to hearing from you, and will, of course, be home as soon as I return from Russia. The plan at this time is to proceed through Europe, through the satellite countries of Russia, Siberia, Kamchatka, and home.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

SENATOR'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE NAVY DEPARTMENT REPORTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between the Special Assistant for Facilities, Navy Department, and myself, and a letter sent to me on September 26, 1955, by the Assistant Chief of Naval Operations with reference to the Navy's position at that time by the Navy of Air Force ranges in Nevada.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 6, 1955.

Mr. THOMAS A. CALLAGHAN, Jr.,
Special Assistant for Facilities,
Office of the Secretary,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CALLAGHAN: I have received your letters of August 4, and that of Thomas S. Gates, Acting Secretary of the Navy. Your explanation seems to be very clear that the continued development of the Fallon area depends upon securing adequate range, and at the moment the only range available is that described in your letter.

I am communicating with Gov. Charles H. Russell relative to the situation in connection with his wire to Charles S. Thomas, the Secretary of the Navy, voicing his "opposition to the withdrawal of 2,026,800 acres Nevada territory in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties by the Navy for use as a bombing range."

I understand from our visit, and from your letter of August 4, that the Navy would very probably lose interest in building up the Fallon Air Base if they were unable to secure proper range. The seriousness to our people in Nevada cannot be overestimated.

The employment of the Fallon Air Base is very much appreciated by all the citizens of Nevada, and I know that there would be great reluctance to do anything that would jeopardize the success of the base. On the other hand, the withdrawal of large acres of land in our State for bombing use where taxable property is or has been, or is being developed, is also a serious matter.

In view of the extreme importance of the decision to be made by the people of my State, I am enclosing copy of my letter to Governor Russell and if, in accordance with your letter, it is a matter of deciding whether to withdraw the land in the three counties mentioned for a bombing range, or ceasing the development of the Fallon Air Base, the decision is indeed a serious and far-reaching one and must be made by our own people.

Will you please keep me apprised of your decision in the matter and if anything further may be done on my part to assist you.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 4, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONE: This is in response to your request for the latest information concerning the proposed Sahwave Mountain and Black Rock Desert air-to-air gunnery ranges for the naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev.

The area to be acquired for these ranges totals 2,629,760 acres. These ranges are needed to provide adequate areas for our pilots to conduct simulated combat air-to-air gunnery practice in high-speed jet planes.

At the present time, the only area available to the Navy for these operations is the 272,000-acre Black Rock Desert air-to-air gunnery range. This range is so small that the Navy cannot provide adequate gunnery training for our carrier pilots based in the San Francisco Bay area. It is proposed, therefore, to acquire the following additional area:

(a) Basic Sahwave Mountain air-to-air gunnery range (602,880 acres);

(b) Proposed extension to Sahwave Mountain air-to-air gunnery range (654,720 acres);

(c) Proposed extension to Black Rock Desert air-to-air gunnery range (1,372,160 acres).

Action to acquire 602,880 acres in the basic Sahwave Mountain air-to-air gunnery range (area (a) above) is currently nearing completion. The basic Sahwave Mountain range includes 547,906 acres withdrawn from the public domain and 54,974 acres of private land currently leased from three separate owners.

There are nine known mining claims or groups of claims within the basic range, and leases have been negotiated with six of these. A condemnation proceeding has heretofore been instituted with regard to one of the claims. Negotiations are still continuing with respect to the other two claims with reasonable prospects of success.

There are six parties having grazing rights, and satisfactory agreements have been negotiated with these six interests which will permit them to continue using the ranges for grazing purposes on a year-round basis. During two months of the year, air-to-air target gunnery operations will be stopped, and the ranges will be shut down for round-up purposes.

The ranges will not be used for bombing purposes. Instead, as I indicated above, they will be used for air-to-air gunnery practice. Expended bullets or rocket cases might occasionally hit cattle in the area. These agreements also provide, therefore, that the Government will reimburse the cattlemen for any cattle that may be killed as a result of our operations.

It will be necessary, however, to institute condemnation proceedings for the basic Sahwave Mountain range, excepting those interests as to which voluntarily leases have already been negotiated, in order to provide a vehicle for the settlement of interests or claims which are presently unknown and for the ejectment of trespassers without the need of commencing separate actions in each instance.

Virtually all of the proposed extension of the Sahwave Mountain range (654,720 acres) and the proposed extension to the Black Rock Desert range (1,372,160 acres) is public domain land. On June 24, 1955, the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, issued a temporary withdrawal order at Navy's request, covering the 2,026,880 acres in the two areas. Surveys of the precise areas ultimately to be withdrawn are currently in progress, and appraisals of the various mineral claims are being made. It will probably be a year before complete withdrawal action can be concluded.

Ultimately, of course, we intend to acquire possession, title, and interest to all outstanding rights in these ranges, subject, however, to grazing rights. Thus, our present leasing action is only interim in nature, and six of our leases do contain purchase options. In any event, grazing will be permitted to continue in these areas, and we propose to negotiate grazing agreements similar to those outlined above.

The areas to be used for actual gunnery purposes will not extend to the outermost boundaries of the ranges. Instead, safety corridors, varying in width to as much as 5 to 7 miles from the boundaries of the range, will surround the entire area. Thus, while one corner of the proposed range comes to within 6 miles of Lovelock, the actual gunnery area will be approximately 14 miles from Lovelock, and all firing will be directed into the range—thus eliminating any possible danger to Lovelock.

All approaches to both the Sahwave Mountain and the Black Rock Desert ranges will be adequately posted to warn off any prospectors, casual visitors, etc.

I am advised that there now appears to be a general understanding of the Navy's need for these areas and that the public reaction is generally favorable.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. CALLAGHAN, Jr.,
Special Assistant for Facilities
(For the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material).)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., September 26, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I regret the delay in replying to your letter of July 1, 1955, which was referred to me by the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, enclosing a letter from Mr. Paul K. Gardner, secretary of the Pershing County Chamber of Commerce, Lovelock, Nev., regarding the Navy's acquisition of land for the Sahwave Mountain-Black Rock Desert Air-to-Air Gunnery Range in Nevada. This delay was necessary in order to assemble the information on which this reply is based.

The survey referred to in Mr. Gardner's letter was a mineral survey conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission and was not for the purpose of including any additional land in the proposed weapons training area.

Aerial gunnery can be confined to offshore areas in localities off the main shipping lanes where the weather is suitable. However, the prevalent low-lying stratus clouds in the west coast offshore areas and the extensive shipping encountered there have so restricted and reduced the gunnery training which can be accomplished that the squadrons must deploy to uninhabited inland areas for such training or be deficient in this vital phase.

The Naval Auxiliary Air Station at Fallon, Nev., is the gunnery satellite field for all fleet squadrons based in the San Francisco area. The sole purpose of this multi-million-dollar installation is to provide training facilities for these units. With the advent of faster, higher flying aircraft and new aircraft weapons, the existing 272,000-acre Black Rock Desert Gunnery Range has become inadequate for the Navy's requirements. Therefore, unless adequate ranges are provided, the combat training of our pilots will be severely curtailed.

The possibility of joint use with the Air Force of their existing ranges has been fully explored. The Air Force ranges in this region are saturated by their own sortie rate and are unable to accommodate our requirements.

In view of the aforementioned requirements, the Navy is in the process of acquiring

an additional area of 602,880 acres for an air-to-air gunnery range designated as the Basic Sahwave Mountain Gunnery Range. It is our intention to acquire an additional 1,372,160 acres for the expansion of the existing Black Rock Desert Gunnery Range and 654,720 acres for the expansion of the Basic Sahwave Mountain Gunnery Range. This would provide a weapons training area approximately 100 miles long and 40 miles wide containing a total of 2,901,760 acres, or approximately 4,534 square miles. Of this 4,534-square-mile area, about half is located in Pershing County. The Seven Troughs Range and a portion of the Trinity Range would be included in the area; however, the town of Sulphur would not.

On June 24, 1955, the Navy requested the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior to withdraw 2,026,880 acres from the public domain in order to provide the area needed for these two extensions. While this would indicate that all of the area consists of public-domain lands, actually in the proposed extension to the Black Rock Desert Gunnery Range, there are 10,200 acres of Indian reservation land and 32,000 acres of privately owned lands.

The acquisition of public-domain land would be without cost to the Navy, and it is our intention to acquire ownership of all privately owned tracts in the Sahwave Mountain-Black Rock Desert Gunnery Range, as extended, upon receipt of authorization and appropriation from Congress. The Navy will pay fair value for all interests acquired. The cost of this is estimated to be $7 million.

Your interest in this project is greatly appreciated, and I hope that this information will give you a better understanding of the Navy's position.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. REES,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Air) by Direction.

GOVERNOR THANKS SENATOR FOR WORK ON WITHDRAWAL PROBLEM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Governor of Nevada dated August 15, 1955, which is in line with the requested withdrawal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,
CARSON CITY, *August 15, 1955.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: Thank you for your cooperation in the problem connected with the Navy's announced intention of withdrawing large sections of territory in Washoe, Pershing and Humboldt counties.

I appreciated your thoughtfulness in sending me a copy of the letter your received from Thomas A. Callaghan, Jr., Special Assistant for Facilities to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

I shall look forward to your promised visit when you return from Russia.

With every best wish,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES.
Charles H. Russell,
Governor of Nevada.

NEVADA LEGISLATURE ASSEMBLY ASKS END TO "NAVY LAND GRABS"

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on February 16, 1956, I received a letter from Mr. John Koontz, secretary of state of Nevada, together with a copy of assembly resolution No. 5, relative to this important subject. In short, the resolution requests that there be no further withdrawals in the area. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Carson City, Nev., February 10, 1956.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I enclose herewith certified copy of assembly resolution No. 5 as required by said resolution.

With kindest regards I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN KOONTZ,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEVADA,,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, John Koontz, the duly elected, qualified and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true, full and correct copy of the original assembly resolution No. 5 now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand affixed the great seal of State, at my office, in Carson City, Nev., this 10th day of February A. D. 1956.

[SEAL] JOHN KOONTZ,
Secretary of State.

Resolution memorializing the Nevada congressional delegation and the Honorable CLAIRE ENGLE, Congressman from California, to oppose the Navy land grab

Whereas a large and extensive area of Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties is in extreme danger of being removed from the tax rolls of this State by the acquisition of the same by the United States Navy for use as a bombing range; and

Whereas if the proposed Navy acquisition becomes a fact great damage may be done to the mining and ranching industries, to the fish and game resources, and to the tax structures of these several counties; and

Whereas the United States Navy has already acquired the Black Rock Desert, extending roughly over 90 miles long from Gerlach to Winnemucca, and if their practice bombs cannot hit the Black Rock Desert now, what good would they be in wartime; and

Whereas there is in existence at the present time the bombing range near Tonopah, consisting of an area of nearly 4 million acres: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Nevada congressional delegation and the Honorable CLAIRE ENGLE, Congressman from the State of California, are hereby memorialized by this legislature assembled in special session to oppose vigorously the Navy land grab proposed in the State of Nevada; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of State to each of our Senators and to our Representative in the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable CLAIRE ENGLE, Congressman from the State of California.

CONCURRENT NEVADA RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on February 21, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 was introduced by Senators Black and Cord. The concurrent resolution was later sidetracked in favor of another one. However, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, at a matter of information.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Nevada congressional representatives to use their best offices to halt the acquisition of public domain and resources in Nevada by the United States Navy

Whereas existing withdrawals from the public domain inventory by the Federal defense agencies exceed in area the combined acreage of the States of Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Delaware; and

Whereas if present applications for similar withdrawals in Nevada, California, New Mexico, and Arizona are approved, an additional land mass equal in size to the States of New Jersey and Rhode Island, plus 50 Districts of Columbia, will have also been taken for exclusive use; and

Whereas present withdrawals by the Federal defense agencies are equivalent to a strip of land 11 miles wide extending from New York City to San Francisco, and pending applications, if approved, will increase the width of such corridor to 14 miles; and

Whereas many such withdrawals duplicate each other; and

Whereas there is pending an application by the United States Navy to obtain exclusive use of approximately 3 million acres of Federal and private acreage in Washoe, Humboldt, and Pershing Counties, State of Nevada; and

Whereas there is also pending an application by the United States Navy to obtain exclusive use of approximately 1 million acres in Esmeralda County, Nev., and Inyo County, Calif.; and

Whereas the State of Nevada has heretofore contributed to the national defense more acres of public domain and resources thereof than any other State in the Union, the total of which being in excess of 4 million acres; and

Whereas the Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American National Cattlemen's Association, and other economic and citizens' groups including numerous conservation organizations in California and Nevada, and the Nevada Fish and Game Commission, and approximately 150 citizens have already joined in protest against the aforementioned applications now pending in this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada (the Assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada, in special session assembled, does hereby memorialize the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, and the Honorable CLIFTON YOUNG, Nevada's Senators and Representative in the Congress of the United States, to use their best efforts and offices to halt and forbid the United States Navy from acquiring the aforementioned acreage in Washoe, Humboldt, Pershing, and Esmeralda, Counties, State of Nevada; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to each of our congressional representatives named above.

FURTHER RESOLUTIONS REPORTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Mr. Charles Hendel, assemblyman from Mineral County, also introduced a resolution on this subject. It was passed by the assembly and later passed out of the committe of the senate, by a vote of 8 to 1. It did not pass the senate because attention was called to the fact that in a special session a joint resolution would have to be sent up by the Governor. This has not been sent up by the Governor. It was considered in the closing hours

of the session, and therefore it was not passed. It was passed by the assembly, and it was approved by the senate committee. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the Governor to appoint Federal lands legislative commission

Whereas the United States Navy has declared that it is necessary for it to acquire approximately 2,800,000 acres of additional gunnery range in Humboldt, Pershing, and Washoe Counties for jet-plane gunnery practice; and

Whereas the precarious Nevada State and local tax situation is a matter of great concern to the people of the State, being aggravated by the imposition of Federal restrictions on the development of the State's principle asset, its mining industry, which, though stimulated in part by Federal defense purchase of strategic minerals, is yet—nevertheless inadequate to meet the increased needs of State and local funds for our greatly expanded educational program which our rapidly growing student population requires; and

Whereas as a consequence of our growing population it has been necessary for our legislators to enact a sales tax and increased gambling tax laws to support this newly expanded education program; and

Whereas, due to the restrictions placed on the development of our mining industry and the prohibitions placed on the production and free-market sale of gold, the principal cost-carrying metal in many of our strategic metal mines, for which there is a vast peacetime and national defense need, many millions of dollars worth of valuable mining properties now lie idle, and once prosperous mining camps, once prosperous communities, and the mines and reduction plants therein lie in wreck and ruin—and millions of dollars of the State and Nation's taxpayers' private enterprise investments have already been lost to the investors, and as many more millions of dollars in properties yet intact are threatened with the same fate; and

Whereas there are now before Congress measures which would provide for the rehabilitation of the mining industry in an effort to restore the sound economy of the mining States of the West; and

Whereas the restoration of free enterprise as it may apply to mining in all of its phases, including the return to the free production and marketing of gold would, as far as the State of Nevada is concerned, restore that sound economy, and assure a stabilized operation and certain, dependable employment, both of which must be developed and maintained if a sound economy and a dependable tax structure are to be gained and maintained; and

Whereas since the education of our children is paramount, not only in the State of Nevada but throughout the Nation, and our actual survival depends upon the degree of education the State and the Nation can provide for students, especially the sciences which have developed the advance types of materials of offense and defense, and the multitude of peacetime applications of these and other hitherto unknown great forces of nature, it does not seem unreasonable to the people of Nevada that they should be so deeply concerned over what the inroads will be on their already established, expanded educational program if this additional penalty which is now planned to be imposed upon the State is exacted by the further withdrawal of millions of additional acres of our State's public domain, unless substantial reimbursement to the affected counties and the State is made; and

Whereas a stalemate seems to have been reached between the State of Nevada and the Federal Government in the land of further land withdrawals, and it is felt imperative that the Governor of the State should continually be kept advised of any action taken or proposed which may, in any way or manner, be, or be thought to be, detrimental to the best interests of the people of the State, directly or indirectly, or where such withdrawals threaten to adversely affect the Nevada State and local tax structures; and

Whereas it is expressly set forth herewith that no final acceptance of any plan of public withdrawal of public lands within the State of Nevada shall be approved except with the approval of the senate and assembly of the State of Nevada in session, and that further, any release by the State of Nevada of any of its valued public lands, whatever the consideration therefor, must include a sum sufficient to meet 50 percent of the Nevada State public school costs, with no centralized Federal Government strings attached, since this acquisition of millions of acres of additional lands by the Government, and a further continuation of federally imposed mining restrictions only constricts free enterprise in its privately financed steps toward the full and final development of the mines of the State, upon which potential—the legislature depends for the major portions of funds which our extended school program will require, and, unless sustained—not only our school program but our entire State and local tax structure will fail: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada (the Senate concurring), That the Governor appoint a Federal lands legislative committee, consisting of the legislative commission, the attorney general, the surveyor general, the inspector of mines, and five private citizens qualified to represent the interest of parties adversely affected in case of the continuation of such withdrawals, and such committee shall function in the matter of Federal withdrawal of public lands in Nevada as the Governor may direct.

PROTESTS BY COUNTIES, FARM ORGANIZATIONS, AND CITIZENS CITED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have received several resolutions and communications from the county commissioners of the three counties I have named, Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt, and from farm bureaus and other organizations, and from individuals in those areas, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNEMUCCA, NEV., *February 3, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senator from Nevada,
Washington, D. C:

Wish to remind you that Humboldt County Farm Bureau has gone on record as being opposed to withdrawal from production and tax rolls of our ranching, mineral, and recreational resources for gunnery range use.

LESLIE J. STEWART,
President, Humboldt County Farm Bureau.

WASHOE COUNTY
GAME MANAGEMENT BOARD,
Reno, Nev., August 18, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We wish at this time to advise you of our concern in regard to the proposed withdrawal of land in Pershing, Humboldt, and Washoe Counties in the State of Nevada for the use of the Navy as a bombing area.

First, from the standpoint of the State tax structure, this most definitely would be a detriment to the smaller counties who depend upon mining and livestock raising for a great portion of their tax money.

Secondly, as we understand the provisions of some of the agreements with existing livestock units, there is a possibility that, in addition to loss of tax on real property, multiple use now enjoyed on all federally owned lands would be eliminated.

Thirdly, as already voiced by our State Fish and Game Commission, many thousands of acres of our better big game and upland bird areas would be taken from the people of the State of Nevada. This Board, which is established by law for the purpose of advising the State Fish and Game Commission and other governmental agencies of the needs of the county game management, feels that requirements of the Navy can be handled without this withdrawal.

We respectfully suggest that in lieu of such withdrawal our Government considers consolidating use of such lands already withdrawn and in possession of the Air Corps, Navy, and AEC within the borders of the State of Nevada.

Very truly yours,

LEE M. BURGE, *Chairman.*

VAUGHAN SADDLE SHOP,
Reno, Nev., August 1, 1955.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding proposed bombing range in northern Washoe County, I think it would be a crime to use that area for bombing or gunnery because it is the last decent area for hunting within reasonable driving range of Reno. At present, it is an excellent range for deer, antelope, sagehen, and Chukkar partridge and several thousand cattle. Saddest part is that the range would be ruined permanently due to duds—unexploded bombs.

Will appreciate any attention you can give to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

R. C. VAUGHAN.

PERSHING COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Lovelock, Nev., June 27, 1955.

United States Senator GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Congressman CLIFF YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIENDS: We have it on reliable reports that Army engineers are surveying a large, new slice of Pershing County with the evident purpose of including it in the Naval Aerial Gunnery Range.

Included are the Seven Troughs and Trinity Range regions.

This is going too far. These are recognized mining districts. The present range under contest takes in about one-third of our county—almost 9,000 square miles. We do not want to have the rest eliminated from mining life of this county. We understand they are including Sulphur.

How they can avoid shooting up the Western Pacific, we don't know.

Before things get along too far, we would like to receive your aid in calling a halt to this program.

Quicksilver and antimony interest are picking up here. A number of outside interests are prospecting prospective properties. The guaranteed quicksilver price has bolstered one of our most dangerous and abused mining industries.

Thanks for your help.

In haste,

PAUL K. GARDNER,
Secretary.

ORMSBY SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Carson City, Nev., August 3, 1955.
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: With reference to the proposed expanded Navy bombing and gunnery range planned for the northwestern part of Nevada, the members of the Ormsby Sportsmen's Association wish to prevail upon you to prevent, if possible, the annexation of the wildlife habitat for antelope, deer, sagehen, and chukkar, so that this area will remain available to Nevada hunters.

As you well know, the regions open to public hunting are being restricted more and more each year or lost entirely for one reason or another, and for the type game mentioned above the areas in Nevada are presently limited and few.

We realize the importance of national defense and the need for military installations, but it is difficult to understand why such a large area is to be restricted. Already there is a tremendous area used for the same purposes by another branch of the Armed Services in southern Nevada.

The 250 members of this organization, and other interested parties, wish to go on record opposing the additional annexation that will include this wildlife area, and solicit your aid.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. BAWDEN,
President,
Ormsby Sportsmen's Association.

Edmond C. Gubler, S. B. Ceodras, N. L. Knowten, O. W. Walker, Max E. Lamb, Charles H. Mathiesen, Robert Sharp, Herbert Gillie, Robert Johnson, Jr., R. N. Coates, L. M. Pears, H. J. Christie, D. J. Jolley, Donald J. Crosby, Harold B. Wright, Ernest R. McKerham, Stanley W. Springmeyers, Ralph D. Barrett, Harold E. Hansen, Pete DePrat, J. B. Nauman, Harry E. Jweetpauth, Harry M. Ogan, Jr., A. M. Woodgate, H. N. Shene, John F. Smales, Chester T. Wooder, William L. Nagel, Drauk B. Mcought, Jack R. Cooney, Ardean M. Fields, Wals Gauggi, D. E. Beming, W. R. Hann, A. Payge, Glen Stevens, Paul R. Sargant, Frank E. Clock, R. G. Terry, William A. Penkin, B. S. Gregory, Louis K. Koontz, Frank W. Wilson, Jr., Carl A. Springmeyer, Nelson H. Jacques, C. H. Carstens, D. K. Jewett, E. F. DoRicco, C. E. Mex, Edmond Muth, W. E. Norton, W. C. Wilson, John J. Haffey, Forrest L. Larmenter, Wm. V. Bowman, Russel C. Hill, Wallace Hesse, Albert T. Lavid, Thomas S. Morrison, Stanley F. Pochop, Eugene Pierett, R. Huantin, Charles Z. Hill, Jr., L. O. Gingles, R. E. Whitford, J. A. Lindsey, V. H. Stafford, Hugh E. Brinson, Abie Riehl, Charles S. Peters, C. H. Meyers, Charles Felesina, Jack G. Bird, Roy O. Sease, S. H. Anderson, Ed Springmeyers, M. Lamb, Jud Lamb, Henry S. Coleman, Raymond H. Eblers, Paul J. Dube, Joseph L. Jones, W. H. Gibson, H. G. Dorsey, G. B. Westenhoefer, Roy B. Wise, Roy M. Whitacer, Jr., R. E. Eldredge, J. H. Sullivan, L. W. Little, R. G. Whittemore, Geo. J. Allison, Robert List, F. A. Davis, D. W. Fletcher, Paul Rubin, Richard L. Menzier, James E. Pomeroy, James C. Hodge, Harold G. Kispect, Norman D. Noleware, William H. Shewan.

PERSHING ROD AND GAME CLUB,
Lovelock, Nev., September 1, 1955.
Mr. E. R. GREENSLET,
Bureau of Land Management,
Department of Interior,
Federal Building, Reno, Nev.

DEAR SIR: The Pershing Rod and Gun Club, recognized officially as representing the sportsmen of Pershing County, hereby goes on record as opposing the proposed withdrawal of land in Pershing County under application Serial No. Nevada 040230.

The proposed closing of land to civilian use in the areas designated would mean the loss of a large part of sporting opportunities for our hunters. In the proposed withdrawal in this county are areas we have especially propagated Chukar partridges. Besides, this area is one of the most important for sagehen hunting. In addition, is has antelope and deer.

The club also regrets to see this area taken because of its economic value to its members, many of whom depend upon ranching and mining for a living. You are taking one of our oldest, yet newest, mining areas away from civilian use. Where our members are not employers, they are employees and work in this area for 50 years has helped support them, their fathers and their families.

Copies of this protest are being sent to our delegation in Congress, in Washington, D. C.

Yours very truly,

EDNA VAN REED,
Secretary.

THE REVIEW-MINER,
Lovelock, Nev., March 3, 1956.

DEAR GEORGE: Your announcement of opposition sent a thrill around Lovelock.

Thanks for your valiant fight, for unlocking secrecy of the Navy last summer and helping us with a difficult task for fighting for Nevada's basic industries.

Good luck.

Sincerely,

PAUL K. GARDNER,
Publisher.

CONCERNING THE UNITED STATES NAVY'S PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE 3,100,000 ACRES OF NORTHWESTERN NEVADA, INCLUDING PUBLIC DOMAIN AND PRIVATE LANDS, AND INTERESTS IN MINING PROPERTIES ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Objection is made to this plan by the Pershing County Chamber of Commerce, an organization consisting of practically all businessmen in Pershing County. Approximately three-eighths of this county would be taken out of civilian use under the Navy's plan.

In addition, the following groups have protested against the plan:

1. The Pershing County Board of Commissioners.
2. The Humboldt County Board of Commissioners.
3. The Washoe County Board of Commissioners.
4. The Governor of Nevada, who has a delay in this and similar acquisitions until a study can be made.
5. The Nevada Legislative Assembly.
6. A senate committee, consisting of committees on livestock, agriculture, and mining, by a vote of 8 to 1.
7. The Nevada State Mining Association.
8. The Nevada State Advisory Council, Roy Hardy, chairman.
9. The Western Mining Council.
10. The Nevada Fish and Game Commission.
11. The Pershing Rod and Gun Club.
12. The Humboldt County Sportsmen's Club.
13. Fifty-four livestockmen, owning ranching interests in the area, organized into a protesting association, with Attorney Forrest Cooper their representative.
14. The Pershing County Farm Bureau.
15. The Nevada State Farm Bureau.
16. The Humboldt Chamber of Commerce.
17. The Wells Chamber of Commerce.

It is exceedingly difficult to oppose the Navy's plan, for that organization has huge resources, large numbers of specialists working on the project, available witnesses in Washington, D. C., at Government expense, and the advantage of working secretly on the plan for 2 years.

Only our representatives in Congress can properly represent us. We are delighted that Senator GEORGE W. MALONE has volunteered to champion this fight on our behalf.

A survey shows that the largest element wanting to cut into Nevada's basic industry—mining, agriculture, and livestock—are the spendthrift groups—the gambling and liquor people.

We are reliably advised that even the community of Fallon, Nev., is evenly divided pro and con on the subject. A private telephone conversation with Mayor Dan Evans should confirm this.

ELIMINATION OF THE MINING INDUSTRY

Pershing County's mineral development will be permanently reduced by the Navy's plan.

This region has just been opened up through access road into it with a revelation of vast mineral resources—speaking of the Sahwave Range, situated in the western part of Pershing County. It can be considered virgin mining territory, much as the Colorado has proven to be with uranium.

In addition to the Sahwave region, sometime referred to as the "lava bad region," there is the north and eastern part of the county which is rich in mineral resources.

In the Rosebud area Robert Chandler has 4 claims of 3.95 percent titanium with an estimated tonnage of 4 million in sight. This coming strategic metal will be eliminated.

South and west of this area, in the Cow Creek district, there are several square miles of perlite ore, with an estimated 50 million tons. This new insulating ore would be eliminated from our mining future.

In the Sahwave region there are unknown riches in tungsten, the war metal, and fast-machinery alloying metal. The Cooney families have 30 claims of rich ore in this region's very heart in addition to claims around the edge. One of their mining operations, which would have brought a sale of over $1 million, has been canceled out by the Navy's threat.

Eagle-Picher Co. has 6 square miles of diatomaceous earth it had been working on for several years. It was included by the Navy in its plan, although its men claim to have worked over the entire region with trucks, jeeps, and helicopters. Nevada and Pershing County cannot afford to lose this industry. Navy has said it will release it, but the Bureau of Land Management has stopped all action. We have no assurance that it will be done. This mine would have 2,000 carloads of earth processed in a mill near Lovelock and would ship it for the filtering of antibiotics, beer, wine, sirups, sugar, and petroleum products.

Navy has leased 12 claims of mica (estimated) from Ira Stanley, a Lovelock miner, although 2 years of rental remain unpaid. This strategic mineral is lost to our mining industry.

The gold regions of Seven Troughs, Rosebud, Rabbit Hole, and the Trinity Range will be lost. They only await the revaluation of gold to become contributors to our creative wealth.

The effect on our livestock industry will be presented by Attorney Forrest Cooper. This is another of our basic industries, whose cattle are fed in Lovelock Valley during the winer, making use of our product—alfalfa hay.

The statement of a naval admiral to the effect that they would require 15 more properties in the rich Fallon Agricultural Valley, and additional land, such as Dixie Valley, in the Stillwater Range, indicates the danger of future expansion should the Navy increase its holdings in Nevada.

Dixie Valley is contiguous to Lovelock. It is in its trading area. It is in the southwest of Pershing County and northern part of Churchill County.

In this area are located the following:

One of the few nickel-cobalt areas in the United States. One of the largest potential copper areas left undeveloped in continental America. Large iron ore deposits that are now being mined and shipped to Detroit,

western points, and Japan. Large uranium deposits now under development.

ELIMINATION OF THE CATTLE INDUSTRY

Navy's plan to allow cattlemen to take their livestock into the grazing areas in the spring and take them off in the fall, ignores the facts of raising livestock on arid grazing lands.

Cattle and sheep must be constantly tended by cowboys. Daily or weekly attention is necessary to see that: (1) There is a water supply, (2) that feed does not give out through grazing or adverse weather, (3) that disease has not infected the herd, (4) to see that predators are not at work, (5) to guard against poaching or rustling.

On a few ranches in Pershing County, but on more in the adjoining Washoe County and Humboldt County areas that would be acquired under Navy's plans, the home ranches would be taken. The people would be evicted from their homes either through voluntary or forced sale. The raising of crops for winter feeding would stop. Ranching could not continue.

In the Navy's plan of acquisition, should grazing prove impossible and grazing rights be lost, there would be no way of repaying the livestockman for the loss of his grazing rights. Grazing is on the public domain, but a rancher must have rights on that domain to stay in business. So while no value would be placed on grazing rights, the grazing rights would be the most valuable asset of the rancher.

Roy G. Bankofier, leading rancher of Fernley stated before the Joint Legislative Committee on Livestock, Agriculture, and Mining, "The livestock industry and military cannot exist together. I have tried it."

DANGERS OF EXPANSION

Not only do present plans endanger the economy of Pershing County and adjoining regions, but the probability of expansion is as great or greater danger.

The office of Navy (understood over telephone from Senator MALONE's office on March 2, 1956) reported that it would have to look into the expansion possibilities of the Tonopah gunnery, turned loose by the Air Force on that date.

It must be concluded that if the speed of an airplane is doubled, it will take 4 times as much territory for its gunning. With the Navy having an unrelenting grip on northern Nevada, it is only logical to expect them to demand expansion there. The expansion would come east and west, since the policy is to avoid main railroads (Western Pacific and Southern Pacific). With great expenditures at Fallon completed, the argument for further expansion at the expense of basic industries would be inevitable.

IS NAVY OVERREACHING?

In asking for two separate gunnery areas—one north and one south of the Western Pacific tracks in northwestern Nevada—can it be that the Navy is asking for twice as much tow line as it really needs?

According to Capt. Harry Cook of the Navy, it can have five separate targets being towed around either of these areas at once with planes darting in from the outside to shoot.

It has been published that the plan is to have 1,000 sorties a day.

Targets would be towed at the rate of 180 miles per hour at the end of 2,000 foot cables, and would take long to get at gunnery height.

Incidentally, these sorties and towings would be made across the trans-continental airline between San Francisco and Salt Lake City, over United States Route 40, and over the Southern Pacific and Western Pacific main lines. No investigation of liabilities of these passages has been reported.

Lovelock is put within 5 miles of the gunnery and within 12 miles of the "towline." This is too near for safety. Assertions have been made that the line would be moved over, but there is no assurance that this will be done—just words.

THE TONOPAH GUNNERY

On Friday, March 2, 1956, the Air Force made available to the Navy the 1 million acres of the Tonopah bombing area.

This area has 6 airstrips on it.

The Tonopah base could be used for basing planes and tow targets that would take long to get at the proper gunnery height.

This would relieve the great congestion that is bound to arise if Navy's plans are carried out at Fallon.

Navy reports this would cost $14 million more per year than flying over the northwestern Nevada territory. It would take 10 more minutes to make the distance.

There is no scientific information to combat any figures the Navy offers, thereby putting all considering their claims at a disadvantage.

But when one considers that Navy spent over $200 million on 1 plane motor that failed, one wonders if there could be miscalculation here.

GUNNERY AT SEA

Consideration should be given to practice of gunning at sea.

The planes will fly off the flattops and fight off the flattops.

They will fly in or above the clouds, of which Navy complains.

Why is it necessary for planes to be thus used to fly off desert airfields in desert sunshine.

Navy says that 50 percent of the days are cloudy. They will also be cloudy during warfare.

What percent of the time are the flattops sending out their planes for gunnery. Surely not 50 percent of the time.

Is not practice at sea the real way of training naval airmen to fight at sea?

Should costs alone be considered?

Is the plan for a land-based vacation in Nevada?

The Navy's argument against gunnery at sea is not convincing.

CONCLUSION

We businessmen of Pershing County join with the 16 other groups listed on page 1, in asking that the Navy's application for money to take over private property interests in Pershing County, Washoe County and Humboldt County be denied.

It is our opinion that the future prosperity of our area is threatened and will be permanently set back by such acquisition. We have invested in the future of this area and there will be no remuneration for the losses we will suffer.

We see no way of stopping the Navy's expansion once they acquire the foothold they are seeking.

We believe they would utilize the Tonopah area just released by the Air Force and would thereby benefit that area, as it did in World War II. The vast expenditures on that base could partially be recovered.

We believe the Navy has not answered why it should not practice gunnery at sea.

As American citizens we ask that you withhold permission for the Navy to ruin our future.

Sincerely yours,

PERSHING COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By PAUL K. GARDNER, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF PERSHING COUNTY

Whereas the United States Government by and through the Department of the Navy and the Bureau of Land Management has taken and is undertaking steps to appropriate large and vast areas within the county of Pershing, State of Nevada, for the purpose of establishing an air to air gunnery range; and

Whereas numerous protests have been filed with the office of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Reno, Nev., by owners of mining claims situate in said areas; and

Whereas each of said protestants has requested the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to hold a hearing concerning said appropriations and said withdrawals; and

Whereas in addition to the many valuable mines and mining claims situate in said areas, said areas comprise a large portion of the grazing lands available to the ranchers of Pershing County, for the purpose of grazing thereon their cattle, sheep and other livestock; and

Whereas the withdrawal of said areas would certainly work an extreme hardship upon said ranchers, by depriving them from the use of valuable range and rangelands, and would result in severe losses to them should they continue to graze their livestock in said areas; and

Whereas the county of Pershing has heretofore constructed and maintained roads and highways in said areas at considerable expense to said county; and

Whereas neither the Department of the Navy nor the Department of the Interior through its Bureau of Land Management have offered or proposed to compensate the said county of Pershing for the loss and deprivation of the use of the aforesaid roads and highways; and

Whereas the areas proposed to be withdrawn are in a close proximity to the city of Lovelock, to the towns of Oreana, Humboldt, Tungsten, and Mill City, all of which are situate in the county of Pershing, State of Nevada, and the undersigned board feels a marked concern for the safety of the people residing in said city and in said towns, and

Whereas the entire procedure of withdrawing and of proposing to withdraw said areas was certainly most ill-advised and has been undergone in a manner which was and remains clothed with a veil of secrecy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the undersigned board of county commissioners intends to, and hereby does protest most strenuously to the withdrawal or the proposed withdrawal of any and all areas situate in the county of Pershing by either the Department of the Navy or the Department of the Interior by and through its Bureau of Land Management for the Department of the Navy; be it further

Resolved, That the undersigned board of county commissioners intends to and hereby does demand that it be advised of any and all withdrawals or proposed withdrawals, so that at least the governing body and the officers thereof and those with whom is entrusted the welfare of the residents of the county of Pershing will know and be fully informed of the facts and circumstances surrounding such withdrawals; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith to the following named persons:

1. Commandant, 12th Naval District, San Francisco, Calif.

2. Mr. E. R. Greenslet, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Reno, Nev.

3. United States Senator "MOLLY" MALONE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

4. United States Senator ALAN BIBLE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

5. Congressman CLIFTON YOUNG, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dated at Lovelock, Nev., this 16th day of August A. D. 1955.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF PERSHING, STATE OF NEVADA,
By CECIL G. CAMPBELL,
Chairman.

Attest:

HENRY ANDERSON,
Clerk of the Board.

PERSHING COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Lovelock, Nev., August 10, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: On August 5, 1955, the Pershing County Farm Bureau met with the Pershing County commissioners regarding a protest on the proposed expansion by the Navy for the aerial gunnery range. The commissioners stated they had already protested and they suggested that all organizations and individuals write their Congressmen.

It is felt that this expansion would harm the livestock industry, the mining industry, and in general hurt the well-being of the county. The farm bureau feels that the lost revenue from the land would eventually mean higher taxes for the county. The range rights and management of this area in the public domain should at all times be protected and not be lost. We feel that every consideration should be given property owners in this area. Wildlife should be protected and not driven away from their natural habitat. Should there be outbreaks of weed infestation, insects, rodents, and predatory animals and livestock disease how would they be able to control them if this area was closed?

These are just a few points that have been brought out in regards to the expansion of the naval aerial gunnery range. We would appreciate your cooperation and help on this matter so important to Pershing County.

Very truly yours,

ERIC SEBBAS,
President, Pershing County Farm Bureau.

NEVADA FARM BUREAU,
Reno, Nev., February 16, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: After reviewing Senate bill 3183 we have found that a number of the provisions of the bill are in conflict with the policies developed by our membership.

Sections 101 and 102 providing for fixed 90 percent price supports have been universally opposed by our people, and section 105 reestablishing price supports on dairy products at 90 percent would be opposed by the majority of our membership.

The dual parity formula as set forth in 106 is in opposition to our thinking.

We would appreciate your favorable support in opposing these sections.

There are several other problems that have come to our attention during the past week, primarily, legislation concerning social security. Our delegates favor an optional inclusion under the Social Security Act and many of them have contacted us in regard to soliciting your support for this change if and when it comes upon the Senate floor.

Our State predator committee met in Reno a short time ago and after considerable discussion reached the conclusion that if our program were to be more effective and more satisfactory in the State that additional funds could be used to advantage in our State.

Of course the bombing range acquisition by the Navy has been definitely opposed by majority of the groups in our area. We feel that withdrawal of these lands would be a severe blow to the economy of our State.

Your support and help in opposing this withdrawal will certainly win favor with a great many of our people and will be greatly appreciated by us.

Thanking you for your cooperation in the past and with best regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOE WILLIAMS,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF HUMBOLDT COUNTY FARM BUREAU

The Humboldt County Farm Bureau does hereby protest the proposed withdrawal of approximately 2,026,880 acres of land in northern Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties for use by the Navy as a bombing range and air-to-air gunnery range. The County of Humboldt is adversely affected by loss of industry, ranch, mining, and assessed value of property within Humboldt County.

The entire county farm bureau is of the opinion that such withdrawal will be extremely detrimental to Humboldt County, Nev., and it is the entire unanimity of opinion of all the people of the County of Humboldt to the same effect.

The Twelfth Naval District, the Bureau of Land Management, and the congressional delegation of the State of Nevada are herewith respectfully requested to prevent the withdrawal of land hereinabove described for said bombing range.

The secretary of the Humboldt County Farm Bureau is authorized and directed to forward a certified copy of this protest to the Commandant, 12th Naval District, E. R. Greenslet, Nevada Supervisor of Bureau of Land Management, Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, Hon. ALAN BIBLE, and Hon. CLIFTON YOUNG.

Passed and adopted this 3d day of September 1955.

TRACY BOGGIO,
Secretary.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct copy.

GEO. S. HOSKINS.

PERSHING COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Lovelock, Nev., May 13, 1955.

United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: At a special tourist meeting of our motel owners and others directly dependent upon the users of U. S. Route 40, concern was expressed over the plan to construct national highways across the country that would bypass most if not all Nevada towns.

The motel owner who brought this up was Cecil Gerst, operator of the Sage Motel. He said he had seen the plan and that it would be carried through in the next 10 years, if Federal Bureau of Roads people had their way.

It was brought out that a bureaucrat from that agency had refused to approve the route leading into Lovelock from the east saying it was not 200 feet wide and that the State of Nevada would have to pay for construction on it.

Such construction would ruin about 50 businesses in Lovelock. So you can see what danger there is to this community.

Our people would consider it a great favor as well as duty for you to oppose any such ruinous plans.

Thanks for your prompt attention to our various requests.

Cordially yours,

PAUL K. GARDNER,
Secretary.

HUMBOLDT COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Winnemucca, Nev., February 6, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We have this date written to Congressman VINSON and Congressman SHEPPARD and Senator CHAVEZ and Senator STENNIS, requesting that they take no action on those items in the President's budget relative to condemnation or purchase of additional land in Humboldt County, Nev., for the Navy gunnery range until they have received recommendations from the Senate and House Interior Affairs Committee.

We are sure you are cognizant of the strong feeling in this county to this additional land grab by the Navy Department and the extreme hardship it would cause to the tax structure of this county. We ask that you assist us in this matter and assure you that anything done on our behalf and on behalf of everyone in Humboldt County will be deeply appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF HUMBOLDT COUNTY, NEV.
FRANK SANDERS, *Chairman.*
CLETO BENGOA, *Member.*
GEORGE D. MELODY, *Member.*

RENO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Reno, Nev., August 12, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Whereas the United States Navy, for the benefit of the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, at Fallon, Nev., proposes to withdraw approximately 2 million additional acres of Federal and privately owned lands in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties, State of Nevada; and

Whereas the withdrawal of the above lands will seriously affect the economy of the State of Nevada and will be detrimental to the agricultural, grazing, and mining industries of the State of Nevada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Reno Chamber of Commerce, Washoe County, Nev., urge the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator for Nevada, to endeavor to delay said action until the real potential value of agricultural, grazing, and mining properties in the above area be determined and a public hearing be granted representatives of all of the said agricultural, grazing, mining, and recreational interests affected by the withdrawal of Federal and privately owned lands in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties, State of Nevada.

The above resolution was passed unanimously by the board of directors of the Reno Chamber of Commerce at a regular meeting held on Tuesday, August 9, 1955.

WILLIAM BRUSSARD,
Secretary-Manager.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
SPARKS LODGE NO. 705,
Sparks, Nev., August 21, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a regular meeting of Local 705, I. A. of M., held August 10, 1955, I was instructed to write you regarding the withdrawal of land in Humboldt, Pershing, and Washoe Counties of Nevada to be used by the Navy as an aerial gunnery range.

A majority of our membership are sportsmen who do a good deal of hunting in this area and claim it to be one of the best areas in Nevada for hunting.

We hope that you will do all that is possible to retain this large acreage for the benefit of the miners, livestockmen, and sportsmen who have used it freely up to this time.

With the best personal regards, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

PHILIP S. DRURY,
Recording Secretary.

RENO, NEV., *July 20, 1955.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Suggest you investigate proposed land condemnation in Washoe and Pershing Counties of area approximately 100 by 50 miles for use as naval gunnery range, with thought in mind of destruction of deer, antelope, and upland game range and inaccessibility by Nevada sportsmen.

WASHOE ROD AND GUN
CLUB,
DUANE M. RAMSEY,
President.

AUGUST 5, 1955.

Mr. JOHN SANFORD,
Reno, Nev.

DEAR JOHN: I am enclosing copies of the complete file on the withdrawal of the 2,026,800 acres Nevada territory in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties by the Navy for use as bombing range.

John, a prevention of the Navy withdrawal of this land will put an end to the Fallon Naval Air Station expansion. Governor Russell, and others, including the fish and game commission are opposing this land withdrawal. This matter is of such serious and extreme importance, that I believe the decision should rest with the State administration and the people of Nevada.

When the arguments have been weighed pro and con, and the decision has been made by the people of the State, I will go along with them and assist in any way that I can.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

AUGUST 5, 1955.

Mr. FRANK W. GROVES,
Director, State of Nevada Fish and Game Commission, Reno, Nev.

DEAR FRANK: Relative to the proposed withdrawal of 2,026,800 acres of Nevada territory in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties by the Navy for use as a bombing range, I am enclosing copies of the correspondence with Governor Russell and Mr. Callaghan, which are self-explanatory.

The situation is of such importance to the Lovelock and Fallon areas that I consider it best to put the cards on the table so that a decision for the best interest of the State of Nevada may be reached by the State administration and the people themselves. I will assist in any way possible in carrying out the program decided upon.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

RENO, NEV., *July 26, 1955.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Nevada commission strongly opposes proposed Navy withdrawal consisting of 2,026,880 acres in northern Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties. Majority of area consists of some of Nevada's best wildlife habitat for antelope, mule deer, sage hen, and chuckars. Also some of Nevada's largest ranches and mining operations which, if eliminated, will adversely affect the economy of this part of Nevada. Commission respectfully urges that every effort be made to prevent said proposed withdrawal from being consummated.

FRANK W. GROVES,
Director.

SENATOR DECLARES OPPOSITION TO NAVY PLAN IN OFFICIAL PRESS RELEASE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a release issued by my office dated March 2, 1956.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 2, 1956.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE today informed Department of Defense and Navy officials of his opposition to the proposed acquisition of 3 million acres in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt counties.

During a recent special trip to the State MALONE appeared before both Houses of the legislature to urge the formulation and expression of State policy in regards to Government land withdrawals.

"With the Government owning 87 percent of the land in Nevada," said MALONE, "a realistic policy for the future is mandatory."

MALONE told his State Legislature that he was prepared to go either way on the issue but that he could not go both ways and stated, "Nevada must make up its mind whether or not it wants continued large withdrawals for military installations or development of its taxable property through its livestock, ranching, mining, and industries.

"Since this time the State of Nevada has expressed its policy through resolutions by both the State assembly and a special State senate committee, the latter by an overwhelming 8 to 1 vote.

"The decision, which has weighed in favor of Nevada's future growth in mining, ranching, and industry against immediate plans for increased military payrolls and other expenditures, has now been made and I will further this policy with every means at my disposal.

"However, these two important economic policies in the immediate case at hand, are not incompatible and I am working with Navy, Air, and Defense Departments to provide an equitable solution."

MALONE stated: "Governor Charles Russell has joined me in requesting the Air Corps, Navy, and the Army to coordinate their aerial training operations in the utilization of the areas already withdrawn for such operations.

"Particularly I have requested the coordinated Navy and Air Corps use of the huge Nellis-Tonopah bombing range, one of the largest and finest air facilities of this kind in the world.

"I have demanded reports on possible coordinated Navy and Air Corps utilization of this range, which is larger than most eastern States and am convinced that both branches can be adequately served from this area.

"Although joint Air and Navy reports indicate that in combined flight use, supporting Nellis Air Field would be saturated, I have pointed out this could readily be overcome by the reactivation of the huge Tonopah Airbase for Navy use, at the northwest end of that range which would be used for refueling and temporary personnel quartering. I have long urged the Defense Department to utilize this base to effect a maximum realization of the huge wartime expenditures to develop this field.

"I am happy to report that in working with the Department of Air in this matter, I have just been informed by General Twining that this Department would make available for Navy use at least 1 million acres in the northwest Nellis-Tonopah Range nearest the Tonopah and Fallon airfields."

MALONE followed this up with a meeting with Assistant Secretary of Navy, Raymond H. Fogler; his assistant, Thomas Callaghan; Adm. T. S. Comb, Deputy Chief, Naval Operations for Air; Capt. W. L. Davison, Aviation, Shore Establishment Branch; and Roger Fulling, Director of the Defense Department Office of Construction.

"I have been informed by this group," continued MALONE, "that the Navy will now study this area to determine if this area which has been made available will lend itself to the training programs planned for the Washoe, Humboldt, and Pershing County area.

"Since 1947 congressional policy has favored a coordination of service facilities and a future unification. The combined use of the Nellis-Tonopah Range will be a positive step in this direction and will evidence good faith on the part of the services involved.

"I will keep the people of the State of Nevada informed on this latest development and course of action."

JOHN TOM ROSS,
Executive Secretary to Senator George W. Malone.

TAX VALUES GIVEN IN AREA NAVY SOUGHT FOR GUNNERY RANGE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the present tax valuation by county in the proposed naval gunnery range.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENT TAX VALUATION BY COUNTY IN PROPOSED NAVAL GUNNERY RANGE

Washoe County: $800,000 to $10 million tax evaluation; $40,000 (based on $800,000) actual taxes annually.

Pershing County: $360,000 tax evaluation; $10,000 actual taxes annually.

Humboldt County: $500,000 tax evaluation; $12,200 actual taxes annually.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS PASSED LAW TO UNIFY ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in 1947, which was my first year in the Senate, Congress passed Public Law 253 of the 80th Congress, which attempted to unify the armed services of the United States. We all know that for many years the armed services had grown like Topsy.

We had the First World War, which was my particular war so far as military service was concerned. Then we had World War II, during which I served as a special consultant to the Military Affairs Committee and to the Secretary of War on the subject of military establishments and on strategic and critical minerals and materials. Then we had the third world war, or the Korean police action, during which I served in the Senate.

I liked very little I saw done during those two wars, but that is another subject.

EACH SERVICE HAS SEPARATE AIR ARM

We did make an earnest attempt in 1947 to consolidate the armed services. They had worked at cross purposes, each one of them having its own various units within it. Each one, for example, had its own air unit. The Army had its own air unit and the Navy had its own air unit. Now I understand that there is an air unit in the Marine Corps. I am all for those services, but there are things that are just out of this world and that should not happen to any country.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

World War II demonstrated with startling clarity that the demands of modern warfare called for a far tighter integration of all phases of national effort than was the case in World War I. In no field of our prodigious wartime endeavor had this need for unity of effort been more apparent than in the operations of the Armed Forces themselves. The solution to this very complex problem lay in a plan of voluntary coordination among the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In the face of such widely differing opinions, it is not strange that over 3 years elapsed before an acceptable solution was formulated, and the National Security Act of 1947 was enacted into law. This act was admittedly a compromise between the two extremes of opinion, but it was regarded at the time as the most suitable basis upon which to build for the future. The declaration of policy which appears in section 2 of that

act is so fundamental to the basic concept of the statute as to merit quoting it at this point. It reads:

In enacting this legislation, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide for the establishment of integrated policies and procedures for the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security; to provide three military departments for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps), and the Air Force, with their assigned combat and service components; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control but not to merge them; to provide for the effective strategic direction of the Armed Forces and for their operation under unified control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces.

An explanation of the National Security Act of 1947 is readily available to anyone who is interested. I merely wish to emphasize at this time that the emphasis was on unification and cooperation.

NEED ONE STRONG AIR CORPS, NOT FOUR

When I say this, Mr. President, it is with the most kindly approach to the 3 services, but they have 3 or 4 Air Corps in the Armed Services. We have to have air strength in order to hit fast, accurately, and hard enough to stop an enemy. But we do not need 4 Air Corps; we need 1 Air Corps.

I hope Congress will get around to this business before very long.

The reason I have brought it up today is that we were on the verge of having a complete naval air unit in Nevada. There is no doubt in the world that we needed it, if they are going to operate separately from the Air Corps.

AIR CORPS HOLDS VAST AREA

But the Air Corps already had an area 90 by 100 miles in extent, nearly 100 miles square. In Nevada we could put several States of the Union, and the only way they could be found would be if a prospector happened to run onto them some day. My State is 600 miles by 400 miles in extent. In my effort to coordinate the work, so far as my State is concerned, I do not intend to enter individually into any quarrel about who should do this or do that, but we have to have our feet on the ground, and I have introduced into the RECORD enough information for the Senate to understand that it is a serious matter in the public lands States.

AIR CORPS URGED TO SHARE HUGE AREA WITH NAVY

Therefore, I suggested to the Air Corps, knowing that they were not using all of its area, that it might set aside a million or more acres for the Navy, allowing the Navy to keep what they had in the Black Rock Desert and in the area north of Fallon and the smaller areas, and that the Air Corps and the Atomic Energy Commission keep what they had in the Tonepah bombing range.

The Atomic Energy Commission was utilizing its area, and the Air Corps was not. I am sure there is more land if the Navy has to have it.

SENATOR DISCUSSES PROBLEM WITH AIR CORPS AND NAVY OFFICERS

I invited Air Corps and Navy Department representatives to my office to talk the matter over.

When the representatives of the Air Corps and representatives of the Navy, all fine men and all for this country, left my office, they agreed to sit down and try to work out the problem. In doing that, they will be working together in the area, and it might be the start of their working together elsewhere in coordinating their bombing operations.

Mr. President, reactivation of the huge Tonopah Air Base for Navy use will certainly enlarge the use of that important field and will relieve the need for further withdrawal of valuable rangeland.

Mr. President, in connection with the ranges, the cattle and sheep ranges, in my State and the mining operations there, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point excerpts from my report as State engineer, in June of 1932, as marked on pages 71 to 82.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE RANGE COMMISSION

The proper control and utilization of the public lands within our State have been problems of major importance for at least 30 years, or since the number of livestock on the open range reached the point where all of the available feed thereon was completely utilized.

Public domain areas

	Forest reserves	Area	Unreserved public land	Unsurveyed
Arizona	11,466,626	72,838,400	16,911,367	7,846,000
California	19,026,819	99,808,880	20,209,421	5,749,684
Colorado	13,309,549	66,341,120	8,218,875	1,136,694
Idaho	19,300,773	53,346,560	10,734,420	1,882,805
Montana	16,170,658	93,296,640	6,900,144	78,320
Nevada	4,978,198	70,285,440	53,410,938	21,915,318
New Mexico	8,491,831	78,401,920	16,282,582	1,164,627
Oregon	13,297,838	61,188,480	13,227,141	92,411
Utah	7,475,762	52,597,760	25,147,867	11,955,734
Washington	9,598,372	42,775,040	951,903	14,202
Wyoming	8,460,755	62,460,160	17,035,537	617,501

The legislature created what is known as the State range commission in 1929 for the purpose of determining and reporting to the 1931 legislature the "principles, laws or policies that should apply to the grazing user of the natural range forage resources of the publicly owned lands within Nevada * * * that should prevail for the best public interest." The State engineer was made a member of that body by law. The report of this commission, dated March 4, 1931, to the legislature of the State of Nevada follows:

"The commission: Hon. F. B. Balzar, Governor, chairman; Hon. J. F. Shaughnessy, secretary; Hon. George W. Malone, State engineer, member.

"CONCLUSIONS

"1. That the highest development of the livestock industry of the State is dependent upon the proper use of the public lands for grazing purposes.

"2. That such proper use is only possible to the extent that a user or users can be assured of the benefits from his or their particular range.

"3. That the present economic setup, including existing equities and investments, must not be disturbed.

"4. That future prospecting and mining, and water development for irrigation purposes must not be disturbed.

"5. That any method of range unit control must provide like protection to all rightful users, regardless of the size of such units.

"6. That the taxable value of the outlying ranches used for livestock purposes is directly dependent upon the range units.

"7. That if protection is afforded such range units, agreements will be made, in the case of more than one user entitled to the same range, and that the result will be the building up of the range values in accordance with good practice.

"8. That if encroachments upon the legitimate user or users are prevented, then further improvements will be made upon the ranges, particularly the development of water for stock-watering purposes upon the winter ranges, where large investments for this purpose are necessary.

"9. That if a method can be found for the protection of range units by legislative action, allowing the economic trends of the industry to develop, it would be unsound to invite supervision of the ranges by either the Federal Government or State, necessitating large expenditures by these agencies and a corresponding tax upon the livestock industry.

"RECOMMENDATIONS

"That the present legislature should enact such legislation pointing to ultimate control of range units by the user or users of such range as can properly be enforced under the police powers of the State.

"It would then follow that if Congress acts favorably on the public domain committee report to the President in the matter of Federal recognition of the State's method of control of the range, the State legislature could then properly exercise such control, beyond the police powers of the State, to regulate the movement of livestock on the public domain.

"REPORT

"Report to the Legislature of the State of Nevada, March 4, 1931, pursuant to an act passed on March 26, 1929, creating the State range commission for the purpose of investigating range conditions. Section 2 of the act follows:

" 'SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the commission to conduct a study and investigation to determine the principles, laws, or policies that should apply to the grazing use of the natural range forage resource of the publicly owned lands within Nevada; for the purpose of facilitating that relationship between that resource and the economic structure of Nevada, and particularly its proper contribution to the revenues thereof, that should prevail for the best public interest, as well as to make public from time to time its findings, and to foster and promote such steps as in its judgment are required for the best public interests in this connection.'

"Organizations appearing before the commission during the hearings held include the following:

"United States Forest Service.
"Agricultural Extension Service.
"Nevada Land and Livestock Association.
"Mine Operators' Association of Nevada.
"Bureau of Mines.
"Bankers' Association of Nevada.
"Nevada Taxpayers' Association.
"Southern Pacific Co.
"Western Pacific Railroad Co.
"Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railway Co.
"Chambers of commerce of various towns.
"Other civic organizations.

"These organizations were practically unanimous in declaring that some form of range unit control is necessary, the Forest Service indicating that if turned over to them, they would immediately devise some method of allocating it to individuals.

"BASIS OF POLICY

"It is concluded, however, that any method adopted must provide a system or policy that will, over a period of years, develop along the following general lines:

"1. That the maximum taxable property and business revenues may be developed in the State through this natural resource, pending the time that the public lands may be taken up under the regular land or mining laws, with due regard to the expense and efficiency of such system.

"2. That due to the requirements of the industry upon these lands of little value, requiring as they do in most cases balanced winter, summer, spring, and fall ranges and ranch units, these economic units developed over a long period of years must not be upset, and that any method adopted must encourage development along the natural trends of the industry.

"3. That prospecting and mining for minerals, nonmetallic products, and other resources, or legitimate homesteading of lands where water may be developed, either surface or underground, for irrigation purposes must not be interfered with in any manner.

"4. That any method adopted must provide the same protection for all livestock units, regardless of the size of such units.

"There are approximately 55 million acres of unreserved, unappropriated public domain in Nevada, in addition to approximately 5 million acres within the forest reserve boundaries and of the unreserved area, Government reports show that an average of 40 acres for a sheep unit and 140 acres for a cow unit are required for grazing purposes. The low feed value of these areas creates a unique condition on the Nevada public domain that must be met.

"The maximum of taxable property and business revenues can only be developed through the natural conditions surrounding the industry. It has been demonstrated in this State that a livestock unit must consist of a balanced summer, winter, fall, and spring range. The winter range may consist all or in part of ranching property where sufficient feed can be raised to take care of the stock through the winter season. These ranches must be balanced against the range units.

"The value of the outlying ranches, where transportation conditions make it infeasible to raise agricultural products for the market, is dependent upon the range units. It is well known that the taxable value of the ranches is directly dependent upon the value of such range unit, and that when any of the range is lost, the carrying capacity of the unit is decreased without a decrease in the investment, the value of the whole unit thus being impaired.

"The present economic setup has been brought about through development over a long period of years, and the heavy general losses incident to any sudden change are to be avoided.

"The development of the industry for more than 50 years has followed natural economic trends and shaped itself to the natural conditions encountered, and this must be recognized in any system that may be adopted.

"The mining industry is very well satisfied with the present condition, and is one of the principal industries of the State, and any system adopted must not interfere in any manner with prospecting or mining development; or legitimate homesteading of such lands where either underground or surface water can be developed in sufficient quantities for irrigation purposes. Therefore, any system adopted along the lines of providing control of the use of such lands for grazing purposes should be such that it can be supplanted by more valuable uses, such as mining or irrigation.

"The livestock industry, following its natural economic trends, has developed various sized units, from a few head of stock up to several thousand sheep or cattle in one unit, dependent upon the number of topographic and economic conditions. Any method adopted must take this situation into account.

"EVIDENCE CONSIDERED

"All of this evidence has been carefully considered, together with the experience of the various State departments having to do with range management, in order to arrive at a proper policy with reference to the use of the public lands of the State.

"RANGE POLICY

"The first use made of the public lands for the ranging of livestock was begun more than 60 years ago, and at that time no particular system of acquiring either the lands or the control of their use was available, and none was needed, since there was enough range for all purposes; but as time went on and greater numbers of livestock were brought into the country, it became increasingly evident that some control was necessary for the established user. This was attempted in various ways by the users of the range in accordance with existing laws, which were improved or added to from time to time, but in general hinged around two methods:

"1. Acquiring ownership of all of the available land or enough thereof to control strategic points, so that any other user, to make efficient use of the range, must become a trespasser, with the usual penalty.

"2. Owning or controlling the use of all of the available water for livestock purposes.

"Acquiring ownership of land did not prove successful for two reasons. In the first instance the land laws were not sufficiently broad to allow land to be acquired in all of the necessary points, and in the second place too large an investment was required. The feed value of the average public land was in no way commensurate with the cost of such land, and the taxes were too great to be supported by the livestock industry if all or any great amount of the land to be used for grazing purposes had to be owned.

"Controlling the use of all of the available water was not feasible for the reason that on the majority of the lands there was enough water to take care of considerably more livestock than the range could support, therefore rights could be acquired on the same watering hole or spring by different livestock organizations, and this could be continued even after there was no available range, and therefore led to overgrazing and range fights.

"THE STOCKWATERING ACT

"This condition caused the livestock industry to cast about for ways and means to better control range units, and in 1925 led to the enactment of what is known as the Nevada Stockwatering Act, which provides in general that the amount of feed available is the criterion for the granting of further stockwatering rights instead of the amount of water, and makes it mandatory for the State engineer to discontinue granting of further stockwatering rights when all of the available feed is being utilized from the subsisting rights, regardless of the amount of unappropriated water that might be available, and further provides a penalty for watering more than 50 head of livestock more than once a season at or within 3 miles of such subsisting right without the right so to do.

"ALL RANGE UTILIZED

"It is well known that all of the range has been utilized in Nevada for at least 25 years, and for that length of time any new stock that has been brought into the State have merely displaced, on an average, a like number that were already here and have not, therefore, increased the taxable wealth of the State. The Stockwatering Act, however, made it possible to prevent a continuation of this practice in the case of all ranges where grazing requires the use of watering places.

"PROTECTION POLICY AND RANGE MAPS

"Early in 1927 the State engineer's office announced a policy of protection for the user or users of any range to the extent that they would be notified directly when new applications were made for stockwatering rights within the limits of the range claimed by them, so that protests might be filed by them; and, also, that in the hearing of such protests the burden of proof was on the new applicant to show that there was range in that area not being utilized from subsisting rights. This policy is still in effect and, together with a system of range maps covering most of the State, has gone a long way toward stabilizing range values.

"RIGHT TO THE USE OF RANGE

"It is evident that where such large areas are required to support livestock units some method must be found that will eventually lead to a control of the range use in such manner that it is not necessary for the users to make large investments in lands of little value in order that the highest beneficial use of these values may be secured. This has led to a very careful investigation and study to determine whether or not it is possible to provide a system whereby control of the use of the range may be acquired in the same manner as the right to the use of water, retaining the control just so long as it is put to beneficial use, and could be lost by nonuse the same as the right to the use of water.

"CONTROL NECESSARY

"From the evidence gathered at the various hearings of the commission from widely varied interests, and from experience gained through long association with the industry, it is practically a unanimous conclusion that some form of control must be exercised and that range units must be controlled and their use limited to certain users so that there is no incentive to overgraze the lands, but that on the other hand the range values will be built up and developed in accordance with good range practice for the benefit of the industry, the State, and the Nation.

"METHODS OF CONTROL

"There are several methods by which such control can be obtained, which warrant consideration on their merits as to their efficiency and economy of operation in the management of these lands of little value, until such time as they may be taken up under the regular land or mining laws:

"1. Private ownership.

"2. Leasing system.

"3. Federal supervision.

"4. Range unit control through State legislation along the lines of the Stockwatering Act to establish control over range units without supervision by any agency.

"Private ownership would be the ideal system if the lands had sufficient value and earning power to justify such ownership. In the first place, however, it appears that to bring about such ownership it would be necessary to reorganize the entire tax structure of the State so that lands could be assessed at a very low value, instead of a minimum of $1.25 per acre as exists at this time, and also that it would be almost, if not entirely, impossible to set a price on such lands low enough that the livestock industry could stand the extra investment. Further, some of the public lands have very great mineral value, far in excess of their value for grazing purposes, and it seemed questionable whether large areas of such low grazing value should be allowed to pass into private ownership for that purpose alone, with the danger that prospecting for minerals might be retarded and, even when such minerals were found, the owners of the property might prevent development or make it so expensive that the incentive therefor would be impaired.

"The leasing system seemed to provide a logical method to determine who would be

entitled to the use of the grazing areas. However, that also seems to be inadvisable, since any leasing system must be predicated on the value of the lands for grazing purposes, and it would seem that on lands of so little value it might provide an extra load that might become very burdensome. Leasing would also require some kind of supervision, and it seems doubtful whether the earnings from such system would pay the supervision costs.

"Federal supervision along the lines the forest reserve now follows is a very efficient method. Some of the objectionable practices now followed could probably be ironed out and made entirely satisfactory, except that the fees charged must again be on a basis of what the feed is worth, and the grazing values are so small that it is difficult to fix a price low enough not to be burdensome. Further, such charges rarely cover the cost of supervision, so that the Government, then, is subjected to a continued expense beyond the return, and the stockmen are subjected to a continued charge which they are little able to bear at this time in addition to the necessary expenses already incident to their industry.

"It has never been the policy of the Government to charge for the grazing use of the unreserved public domain, even through the Middle West, but the practice has been to get it taken up for private use.

"PUBLIC DOMAIN POLICY

"The Government's policy for more than 100 years, relative to the public domain, has been to meet the situation with proper land and mining laws, so that patents may issue when the land is valuable enough for either agriculture or mining purposes to make it desirable, allowing the public use of such land and necessary regulation by the State until it has been taken up under the regular land or mining laws, or been reserved for some specific purpose.

"The policy of range unit control through State legislation along the lines of the Stock Watering Act to establish private control over range units, without supervision by any public agency or making necessary ownership of the land, seems to be the most feasible method, if it can be properly worked out so that the range users may have controlled use of the public lands for grazing purposes until such time as the land may be taken up for mining, homesteading, or other legitimate purposes. Under such a plan the users would only be putting out such expense as considered necessary by them, and providing ways and means of regulating the movement of livestock to make the most of the existing possibilities.

"STOCK WATER RIGHTS

"Control in the use of the range through stock water rights, as provided in the stock watering law, may now be held in either of two ways:

"1. Vested stock watering rights.

"2. Stock watering permits from the State.

"It is concluded by the commission that it would be unwise to initiate any legislation that would upset the established situation of range control as established in this connection, and which has received the approval of our State supreme court.

"SUPERVISION NOT NEEDED

"It is thought that it would not be necessary or advisable to project legislation beyond providing a method of establishing range control in the user or users of such range. This would protect such user or users from encroachment by others upon their range units without the need for supervision by any agency, and give them the opportunity to work out their own range problems in accordance with the most feasible method of range development possible in our circumstances.

"RANGE AGREEMENTS OR DISTRICTS

"It is not the fact that a range user must deal with other legitimate users of such range units or make arrangements to cooperate with such users that makes our range livestock industry uncertain—it is the fact that after adjustments have been settled, as between the rightful users, and agreements can be made or grazing districts formed between users to prevent overgrazing, an entirely new user may come in under certain conditions, upset the arrangement and cause improper use of such range, forcing the legitimate users to overgraze the range to gain any use for themselves. Range agreements between users are therefore rendered useless until some form of legislation can be had to prevent their subsequent upsetting.

"PROPERTY INVESTMENTS

"Property investments are the important thing in the State. Therefore, any legislation pointing toward range unit control by the users should take into account and encourage property investment.

"WATER DEVELOPMENT

"If control can be had over individual range units, it is believed that investments will be made on the range, especially in water development on the winter ranges, thereby causing a more efficient use of that area with a subsequent increase in the total range values of the State.

"The 1931 legislature, after considering the report of the Commission, passed what has since become known as the 1931 Range Act, which conforms to the recommendation of the Commission that: 'Legislation should be enacted pointing to ultimate control of range units by the user or users of such range as can properly be enforced under the police powers of the State.'

"Section 1 of the act provides:

" 'SECTION 1. It shall be unlawful to graze livestock on any part of the unreserved and unappropriated public lands of the United States in the State of Nevada, when such grazing will or does prevent, restrict or interfere with the customary use of such land for grazing livestock by any person who, by himself or his grantors or predecessors, shall have become established, either exclusively or in common with others, in the grazing use of such lands by operation of law or under and in accordance with the customs of the graziers of the region involved: *Provided*, That this act shall not prohibit the grazing on any part of such public lands of livestock owned, kept or used for work or milking purposes by any ranch owner or bona fide settler, for his domestic use, as distinguished from commercial use, nor prohibit the grazing of any livestock necessary for and used in connection with any mining or construction work or other lawful work of similar character. Customary or established use as graziers, otherwise than under the operation of law, as herein used, shall be deemed to include the continuous, open, notorious, peaceable and public use of such range seasonally for a period of 5 years or longer immediately prior to the approval of this act by the person or his grantors and/or predecessors in interest except in cases where initiated without protest or conflict to prior use or occupancy thereof. It is further provided that any change in such customary use so established shall not be made hereafter so as to prevent, restrict or interfere with the customary or established use of any other person or persons.'

"A penalty is provided for violation of this act.

"This act has since been held constitutional by the Fourth Judicial District Court in a well-written decision by Hon. L. O. Hawkins, in which he says in part:

" 'The legislature when enacting the 1931 grazing law no doubt had in mind the decisions of our Supreme Court upon the acts of 1919 (as well as the 1925 Stock Grazing law). And by the passage of such measure exercised its police powers to preserve the peace upon the public domain within its borders, hoping thereby to bring stability to a great industry of our people. Their efforts should not be set at naught, unless it clearly appears they exceeded their constitutional authority, or that the act is clearly in conflict with Federal laws upon the same matter.

" 'As hereinbefore stated, every legislative act is presumed to be constitutional and within legislative powers. That presumption should be allowed full weight in considering the constitutionality of the act now before court, for we all know and realize the magnitude of the evil sought to be created by the passage of that act. In addition to the hundreds of breaches of the peace committed because of controversies over range rights on the public domain, some of which have caused loss of human lives, and many prosperous ranch holdings have been rendered almost valueless by unrestricated grazing the nearby public domain; which deplorable state of affairs will continue if the act is held void, and most of which, if not all, will be avoided in the future by sustaining and enforcing the said law.

" 'There is no doubt that if the lands in question belong to the State the legislature could pass the Grazing Act of 1931, and although it is not the owner thereof, the people of this State, as well as those of our neighboring States, are entitled to protection in their use and enjoyment of the grasses growing upon those lands. The Federal Government has not yet seen fit to exercise any control over such lands, thereby assuring to said users peace and protection. Congress not having so acted, it seems to me not only the right but the duty of the States to regulate, and in proper cases prohibit, the use of such lands to the end they may be of the greatest benefit to the most people possible; ever having in mind the supreme duty of the State to preserve the peace within its borders.

" 'Believing the act constitutional, as being a reasonable exercise of the police powers of the State, that it creates no right in or grants no privilege to those individuals coming within the definition of "established graziers," that provision IV of the act grants unto plaintiff the right to injunctive relief, and that the complaint states facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against defendant, it is ordered that the demurrer of defendant be, and the same is, overruled.'

"The 1931 Range Act, in the opinion of livestock men familiar with its operation, dovetails with the 1925 Nevada Stock Water Act in that it provides for the control of the range by the customary users where ownership of the right to use the water for stock-watering purposes does not furnish such control. There is very little, if any, water available on the winter ranges. Snow is utilized as a substitute, and there is no provision for acquiring rights to its use.

"In 1925 the Nevada Stock Water Act was passed, and sections 2 and 3 of this act provide that:

" 'SEC. 2. Whenever one or more persons shall have a substitute right to water range livestock at a particular place, and in sufficient numbers to utilize substantially all that portion of the public range readily available to livestock watering at that place, no appropriation of water from either the same or a different source shall subsequently be made by another for the purpose of watering range livestock in such numbers, and in such proximity to the watering place first mentioned, as to enable the proposed appropriator to deprive the owner or owners of the existing water right of the grazing use of said portion of the public range, or to substantially interfere with or impair the value of such grazing use and of such water right.

" 'SEC. 3. Before approving any application for the right to use water for watering livestock, the State engineer shall determine, by examination on the ground or otherwise, that the right and use applied for will not contravene the policy of section 2 of this act. If he shall determine that the right applied for will contravene such policy, he must reject the application. If the water applied for shall be along the course of or in the immediate vicinity of an established or customary driving route for moving livestock from one range to another, the State engineer may reject the application even if no previous right shall exist for any portion of such water, if he shall determine that such water will best subserve the public interests by being reserved for the watering of livestock while so being driven along such customary driving route.'

"A penalty is provided for violation of this act.

"The Supreme Court of Nevada has held this act constitutional.

"The Range Act, the Stock Water Act, and the work of this office, in connection with range control, are aimed at control of the range by the customary users without additional expense to the State, the Federal Governmental, or the users of such range.

"The Colorado law goes much further and provides for adjudication of the range, first as between sheep and cattle, and second in designating the number of either kind of livestock that any one user may have on any range used in common. Legislation of this character may very well form another step in our progress in range control when our legislature may judge that we ready for it. This may be done in the same manner as our water adjudications are now handled, through the State engineer's office, at a minimum of expense, and the decisions made subject to appeal to the district court for review, as in the case of applications for permit to appropriate water.

"The State engineer, acting also as a member of the State range commission, has assisted in organizing several range districts, as suggested in the report of the range commission to the 1931 legislature, which are located for the most part in the winter range in the southeastern part of the State, where water does not control the range and where they must rely in a large measure on the 1931 act.

"H. R. 11816, known as the Colton bill, provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall take over at his discretion any or all of the unreserved and unappropriated lands, provide for their supervision, and charge what he considers the feed is worth for range purposes under leases. This bill was introduced by Hon. Don Colton, Congressman from Utah.

"The State engineer appeared before the Public Lands Committee in Washington, D. C., May 17, 1932, and testified in regard to Nevada's position on any national legislation relative to control of the public domain, and later submitted a brief which is included in the published hearings (on p. 32) on H. R. 11816, May 3 to June 2, 1932.

"The conclusions and recommendations made to the Committee on Public Lands at that time follow:

" 'CONCLUSIONS

" '1. That of the 180 million acres of unappropriated unreserved public domain in the 11 Western States, 55 million acres, or 30 percent, are included in Nevada; and that of the 52 million acres of the remaining unsurveyed territory in this area, 22 million acres, or 42 percent, are located within Nevada; and that 90 percent of the area of the State is drained into lakes and "sinks" located entirely within the State.

" '2. That Nevada being the sixth largest State in the Union (70 million acres), has less population (91,000) and the least taxable property ($208 million) of any State.

" '3. That due to such widely varied conditions, from absolutely barren areas in the Great American Desert through Nevada to the short-grass country in States of greater rainfall, with elevations ranging from below sea level to more than 10,000 feet above, with climate ranging from 50° below zero in winter to 130° above in summer in different areas, that no one method of range control will fit all conditions, making it absolutely essential to follow long adopted policies in local areas.

" '4. That some regulation is both necessary and desirable.

" '5. That such regulation can be brought about by "operation of law" protecting the "customary user," through the policy adopted by the Nevada statutes, without additional expense to the Government, and very little to the range user, and that any system adopted must recognize agreements made in associations or districts composed of actual users of such rangelands.

" '6. That the long-established policy of the Government in relation to the public lands should be continued, passing the lands into the hands of the legitimate users of such lands, on the payment of nominal filing fees.

" '7. That on lands such as those included in the Nevada area, where Government records show that it requires 140 acres to support a "cow unit" 1 year, and 40 acres for a "sheep unit," any charge made comparable with the value of the feed upon such lands would not pay for its supervision.

" '8. That adequate watershed protection will be had when the "customary user" of the range is allowed to protect such range by "operation of law," and can build up and protect his range in accordance with good practice. Where the range is protected the watershed protection is automatically taken care of.

" '9. That the Stock Grazing Act, allowing the location of 640 acres where no water is found, should be repealed, since that amount of acreage is of no practical value, and only allows unscrupulous individuals to locate such homesteads inside of range units already established and built up, thereby forcing the "customary user" to buy the homesteads.

" '10. That principles and policies of "range control" adopted by law, by any State, regulating the movement of livestock upon the public lands for the protection by law of the users of such lands must be recognized, then such laws are not discriminatory between the States, thereby recognizing associations or districts made up of owners of established "units," operating at no expense to the Government and very little to themselves. It is concluded that any method setting up a new system of charges in this connection at this time would be unwise.

" 'RECOMMENDATIONS

" '1. That any public-land legislation passed by the Congress of the United States should recognize policies and methods adopted by State law regulating the movement of livestock on the public domain that are not discriminatory between the States.

" '2. That the operation of any method inaugurated by the Congress, providing for supervision of such public lands, should be made optional with the State involved or with associations or districts made up of the "established users" of such rangelands.' "

ISSUE OF WITHDRAWING PUBLIC LANDS COULD REACH WIDE SCOPE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wanted to put this matter before the Senate because it may be that the withdrawal of large areas from public-lands States on the theory that most of the areas were not heretofore utilized, could develop into more than a local situation.

That is the reason why I emphasize that the people of Nevada for approximately a century have utilized every acre of public lands, and if there were any way in the world to obtain a patent to those lands, they would have done so.

Mr. President, on my recent return to Nevada, I rode for a week with cattlemen in southeastern Nevada. Every once in a while I get away from Washington. I have a little quarter horse, and I ride with a man who runs 700 or 800 head of cattle. A cow unit requires 140 acres. A person can ride 30 miles and if he finds 20 head of cattle he is doing pretty well. That is the way feed is utilized in the public lands of the 11 Western States. There is no other way of harvesting feed. Therefore, Mr. President, I thought the question was serious enough to take it to the Senate to explain it.

NAACP AND LUCY CASE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the New Orleans Item of March 4, 1956, entitled "NAACP and Lucy Case."

The New Orleans Item is one of the most liberal newspapers in the South.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TACTICS ROUSE RESENTMENT—NAACP AND LUCY CASE

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has proved a poor stage manager in the Autherine Lucy case.

What sympathy Autherine Lucy might have had as an individual seeking better educational opportunities has been largely lost for Autherine Lucy, the NAACP's pawn in its Alabama court campaign.

From the moment this 26-year-old Birmingham woman was escorted by NAACP officials to register at Alabama University, her every act has seemed plainly contrived to fit this organization's tactics.

And the NAACP's tactics have been arrogant enough to anger even those Southerners like William Faulkner, Mississippi's Nobel prize-winning author, who has long pleaded the Negro's case against discrimination.

"I was against compulsory segregation. I am just as strongly against compulsory integration," Faulkner said Thursday. "Firstly, of course, from principle. Secondly, because I don't believe compulsion will work."

The NAACP gave the university trustees ground for expelling Miss Lucy when it filed in her name a suit containing the ridiculous charge that the university officials had conspired against her.

Though evidently they realized their error and withdrew the accusation that President Carmichael and the university administration "intentionally permitted persons to mill about on the campus" to simulate "an air of riot, disorder and rebellion" as an excuse for refusing to allow her to attend classes, the damage was done.

The charge was simply absurd in the light of Dr. Carmichael's statements and actions throughout the whole affair, and its insincerity showed too plainly.

The NAACP's next action—whisking their controversial student away to New York by the next plane—was another affront to Southerners who bitterly resent Northern masterminding.

Not only has the NAACP outsmarted itself in this case, by its own intolerance and unreasonableness it has endangered the very cause of tolerance it professes to serve.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time. Therefore I move, Mr. President, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 6, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 5 (legislative day of March 2), 1956:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Stanley N. Barnes, of California, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice William E. Orr, retired.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Leonard Andrew Scheele, of Michigan, to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. R. Paul Caudill, First Baptist Church, Memphis, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we thank Thee for our Nation, and for those used of Thee to make our land a goodly heritage. Bless, we pray Thee, the people of these United States, and those who represent us in Congress and in other places of public trust.

Help us to distinguish between the things that differ, and to know that the perils that confront the world are the result of the scourge of materialism that has invaded every realm of our existence.

Forgive us of our failure to live in accord with the teachings of Thy word, and so transform our lives, we beseech Thee, in all their ways, that we may become effective instruments of freedom and peace for all mankind. Through Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 2, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 500) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. WATKINS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to formally thank each Member of this honorable body who last Thursday supported by his vote the legislation authorizing the upper Colorado River project. I am sure that while expressing my personal appreciation I also express the thanks of the other Members of the House who represent the States of the upper Colorado River Basin, several of whom sponsored similar bills. Also, I am happy to convey the gratitude of the people of this area, many of whom have sent messages of appreciation to me since the House passage of this bill.

In particular I desire to express to the leadership on both sides of the aisle the gratitude of those of us representing the upper Colorado River Basin States. We understand fully that it was their support and cooperative helpfulness that meant so much in the successful outcome of this struggle.

It is my understanding that H. R. 3383, the upper Colorado River project bill, received the strongest bipartisan support ever given to so large a reclamation project—this particular project, according to my information, being one of the largest if not the largest single reclamation authorizing bill to ever come before this body.

The vote on the legislation is indicative of this bipartisan support, as well as the universality of the nationwide approval of this program. On the Democratic side of the aisle, 136 voted for passage, 11 paired for passage, 63 voted against passage, 9 paired against passage, and 12 were absent and not recorded. Thus, 67 percent of the Democrats voted or paired in support of the measure and 33 percent were opposed. If consideration is given to total House membership, then 64 percent of the Democrats were shown to be favorable.

On the Republican side of the aisle 120 Republicans voted for passage, 1 paired for passage, 73 voted against passage, 3 paired against passage, and 5 were absent and not recorded. Thus, 61 percent of the Republicans voted or paired in support of the measure and 39 percent were opposed. If consideration is given to total House membership, then 60 percent of the Republicans were shown to be favorable.

As stated in the beginning, this is an outstanding example of a successful bipartisan approach to one of our most important domestic problems—reclamation and water-resource development.

Again, my sincere personal thanks to those who were able to support the bill.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first day of the 32d year in the Congress for our distinguished minority leader. I know not only Republicans but Members on both sides of the aisle will heartily endorse what our President has written to our dear friend, JOE MARTIN, when he said:

> You have come to represent the truly American character of the two-party system—party integrity, responsibility and loyalty, on the one hand; on the other, an earnest recognition that in all matters concerning the security of the Republic and of all Americans, there must be a bipartisan unity which in its spirit and expression overrides all party differences.

We all salute our dear friend, the minority leader on this happy occasion and wish him many, many years of health, happiness and continued useful service to his beloved country.

The complete text of President Eisenhower's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 3, 1956.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: Tomorrow you celebrate your 31st anniversary as a Member of Congress. With all your friends and associates, with all who know you as citizen and legislator, I join in warm congratulations.

Through your years of national service, you have come to represent the truly American character of the two-party system—party integrity, responsibility, and loyalty, on the one hand; on the other, an earnest recognition that in all matters concerning the security of the Republic and of all Americans, there must be a bipartisan unity which in its spirit and expression overrides all party differences.

On this occasion I should like to add a deeply personal wish which, I am sure, is shared by millions—that for many years to come you will continue greatly to serve your district, your party, and all America.

As ever,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the reelection of a Member of Congress again and again is a great tribute, the significance of which he rarely understands but one which is fully understood by the electorate. The people whom JOE MARTIN represents appreciate his honesty, his character, his Americanism, and his faithfulness to duty, and it is natural that they demand his continued service in their interest. That is why our beloved colleague has served so many years with little likelihood that he will cease to be reelected for years to come.

We in the House of Representatives who know him love him and are proud to

be associated with him. He has the qualities which win men to him and command the respect of all, regardless of politics. He is straightforward in his dealings, he is without malice or vindictiveness, he is kindly and at the same time firm, he is a man with vision and possesses a political sense that has rarely been matched by anyone.

Such a public servant is an inspiration to all who work with him and rouses a determination in each of us to serve our constituents with more zeal and fidelity than ever before; it promotes loyalty to our own convictions as Americans doing our best to serve our country. We salute JOE MARTIN on this anniversary of his 31 years of service, and with grateful hearts wish him well in the days to come and many more years of continued service in the cause of good government and the fight for the standards of Americanism we are all so proud to defend.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, as the Member who carries the greatest weight in the Congress, I would like to extend my congratulations to the minority leader, and to the Speaker on their respective anniversaries. There are about 30 years and over 100 pounds separating us, but nonetheless I would like to record as one of the, shall I say, "baby" Members of the House, my gratitude and appreciation for the many courtesies and kindnesses which JOE MARTIN has extended to me, although I am of the opposite party. I know I speak the feeling of all of our younger Members who are very grateful to him. We felicitate him on this occasion although I am sorry we cannot wish his party success.

Turning now to our beloved Speaker, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, may I throw my bulk into words of affection and gratitude for his 44 years of service to the House and the country.

Both the present Speaker and the former Speaker stand as preeminent examples of patriotism.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, for myself personally, and I am sure I speak for all Members on my side of the aisle, I want to join in the words of greeting that are being extended to the distinguished minority leader and friend, who today begins his 32d year in the Congress.

Also on behalf of myself, and I am sure all Members, I want to extend my greetings and congratulations for his long service to our distinguished Speaker who today begins his 44th year of outstanding service in this body.

Mr. RAYBURN came to the Congress on March 4, 1913, as a young man. He has served continually in this body since that time. He is the dean of the Congress. He has served as Speaker longer than any man in history. If I am correctly informed, only two other Members in the history of this House, Joe Cannon and Adolph Sabath, have held membership in this great body longer than he. We salute today SAM RAYBURN and JOE MARTIN, two of the greatest living Americans. I am sure that I speak the sentiments of all Members of the House when I wish for them many more happy and useful years among us.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, until I arrived here today I did not realize that our very able minority leader and twice Speaker had reached the 32d milestone in his service in the House of Representatives; all of which, I suppose, is simply to say that time does fly and the years slip by.

I well recall coming here as a much younger man. Twenty-two years ago does seem like a long time, yet Joe was here 10 years before I arrived. There were not very many of us on our side of the aisle when I got here, and I learned very early to look to him for guidance, assistance, and advice. Like others, I found I had a good counselor and friend, one always seeking to be helpful.

So, Joe, I want to speak my word of commendation for your magnificent record here and wish you many more happy years of service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to felicitate my colleague from Massachusetts, twice our distinguished Speaker, now our floor leader—and Speaker again probably.

I have served with him longer than all but a very few Members of the House. I always have been impressed with his tremendous love of country, his love and respect for people who have served their country and their State in politics. I have a great respect for his great ability as a legislator, a parliamentarian, and his power of accomplishment.

I watched him here in the House go step by step up to the position of Speaker. One thing that has always impressed me is that members of the press publicly and privately have always said that JOE MARTIN is absolutely incorruptible.

I wish for him many, many happy years of service in the Congress or serving the country in any capacity he wishes. He has many friends on both sides of the aisle, and he is just as fond of the Democrats as he is of the Republicans. I include the following citation presented at the big Republican dinner at Boston last year of nearly 5,000 people:

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Your life story is the American story:

A newsboy at 7, you became the owner of the newspaper before you were 25.

As a young man, chosen by your neighbors to represent them in the general court of our Commonwealth; 6 years later elected by your district to the Congress of the United States, where you have continuously served since 1925—a shining record of one prophet who was honored and trusted by those who knew him best.

Minority leader of our party in the House of Representatives, and twice, when our party came to power, Speaker of the House; in both these high offices discharging your duties with a sure and skilled mastery.

Chosen by Wendell Willkie to manage his gallant campaign for the Presidency in 1940.

With force, fairness, and dignity, you have presided over every Republican National Convention since 1940.

Mr. Speaker, for by this title we shall always think of you, you are, indeed, our Republican rock—let the tempest rage and the waves dash high, you stand firm, unshaken, and foursquare.

To young men your career will always tell the American story at its best: the avenue to public service at the highest level is always open to those whose greatest assets lie within themselves.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, is celebrating the completion of 31 consecutive years in the House of Representatives. There is no need to recount here his outstanding record of accomplishment over the years.

All of us—his colleagues—are familiar with the distinguished service he has rendered to the people of his district and to the Nation. The voters of the 14th Massachusetts Congressional District certainly recognize that they have an outstanding man as their Representative in Washington. Not many of us stay in the good graces of our home folks for as long as Joe has.

The American people regard JOE MARTIN as one of their most illustrious statesmen. He has devoted most of his adult life to the work of this House, and has been instrumental in enabling us to discharge our responsibilities as Members with the maximum of efficiency. It is well known that our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, considers JOE MARTIN to be one of the most able and astute men with whom he has come in contact in the field of public affairs. All of us will echo that sentiment.

No higher tribute can we pay to a man than that he contributes mightily to the betterment of his country, and at the same time maintains the esteem in which he is held by his colleagues, and many friends and acquaintances. May JOE MARTIN continue to be with us for many years to come.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my congratulations to our minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], on the beginning of his 32d year of distinguished service in this House. It is particularly appropriate for one of his own delegation to express these sentiments and to say also how proud we people of Massachusetts are of JOE MARTIN. I want to thank him personally for the many courtesies he has shown to me as a recent Member of that delegation.

I may also add, Mr. Speaker, that Massachusetts is proud to have in its delegation both the majority leader and the minority leader of this House of Representatives. Massachusetts reveres both of these gentlemen, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., and the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. We wish them both many years of happiness and service.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I have the great privilege and high honor to represent the Third Congressional District of Ohio. This morning we have a very fine group of ladies beginning their visit with us in Washington. They are here because they are deeply interested in the affairs of their Federal Government. They want to know how it works and how we as Members of Congress are doing our job. Along with my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from the Seventh District of Ohio [Mr. BROWN], it was our privilege to have 76 of these fine people at breakfast. These folks will attend a number of important meetings. They will see the Congress in action. They will see many places of special and historic interest. And when they go back home they cannot help but be more interested in our national affairs and they will be determined to do their job as citizens.

At our breakfast, our very able and distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], made very fine remarks and was appropriately honored by our group at the beginning of his 32d year of outstanding service in the Congress of the United States.

So we of Ohio, and particularly these 76 individuals who were at breakfast together this morning, want to add our congratulations and best wishes for many more years of good health, happiness, and service to our great, distinguished, and beloved minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I was motoring through New England. I stopped to refuel at a gas station near Fall River, Mass. As the attendant performed, I engaged him in conversation.

"I am from Washington," I said, "I bet you know Speaker JOE MARTIN."

"Yes, siree," replied the attendant with a big smile. "Hereabouts, nearly everybody knows Joe. I am a Democrat but I always vote for him."

Before I could say another word, the attendant continued:

"And I will tell you, mister, what makes Joe click. He is honest, he is friendly, he knows the score, and he is just as plain as an old shoe."

This testimony registered with me and it comes to mind forcefully today as we salute JOE MARTIN on his 32d anniversary as a Member of this House.

My good friend and able colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] told us a few minutes ago of his admiration and respect for Joe because of his many kindnesses to him, a new Member. Joe is that way with everybody. He has been my loyal friend and wise counselor ever since I came to Capitol Hill, a young secretary, during Joe's first year as a Member. I first ran for the House in 1940 and he came to my district to plead for my election. Ever since he has been sort of a congressional father and day after day in my service in the House his encouraging words of cheer have been more helpful and uplifting than he will ever know.

To me JOE MARTIN stands out like a rock for all that is decent and good in our American Government. Not only in Massachusetts but throughout the 48 States his name has become sort of a symbol for constancy. Like Disraeli, he believes that "life is too short to be little." And the Washington all of us here know is so much better because JOE MARTIN has become so much a part of it.

May Joe continue in that healthful happiness he has enjoyed for so many years in the service of the people he loves.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BRISTOL, VA.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. I wish to call the attention of the House to an observance today in the largest city in my district, Bristol, Va. The Virginia portion of the famed Twin City—Bristol, Va.-Tenn.—is today celebrating the 100th anniversary of its incorporation.

Local and State officials, including former mayors of Bristol, have gathered today to give appropriate attention to this important event in the history of this fine city. It was on March 5, 1856, that the Virginia General Assembly incorporated the town of Goodson. Later, in 1890, the name was changed to Bristol as a new charter was granted and the corporate limits extended. My good friend and Bristol's present capable mayor, George W. Summerson, will preside over the ceremonies today. Another close friend and the dean of the former mayors of Bristol and a distinguished Virginian, State Senator George M. Warren, will speak. Other former mayors and councilmen will be introduced and the minutes of the first council meeting will be read.

The Bristol schools, which are making the study of Bristol history a project during this centennial year, will observe the city's 100th anniversary with special birthday cakes.

This observance of the granting of Bristol's first charter is a continuation of a year-long centennial celebration that has been planned for 1956. This celebration will touch every facet of community life—schools, churches, civic organizations, industry, and labor. The residents of the two Bristols—Tennessee and Virginia—are joining to make this 100th anniversary a memorable one in Bristol history.

I am honored to represent Bristol, Va., in the House. I would like to take this opportunity to invite each Member of this body to accompany me to Bristol at some time during this centennial year to enjoy the events that have been scheduled and to partake of Bristol's famed hospitality. In the late summer, a historical pageant entitled "A Tale of Two Cities" will review the events of the past that are interwoven in Bristol's proud and colorful history. I am certain, knowing the people of this progressive city, that attention will also be given to plans for future growth and community accomplishment.

Bristol has its share of outstanding historical events that have been recorded as the city reached the eminent position it holds in the area today. Probably two of the most significant occurrences were the coming of the railroad in 1856 and the opening of the rich coalfields in nearby counties of southwest Virginia in the 1880's. Bristol became a center of trade and commerce as the southwest Virginia area developed. Today, Bristol is a city of diversified industry; it is the shopping center of the eastern Tennessee-southwest Virginia area. Located on each side of the city are excellent farming regions. A large cattle market serves the area cattle producers and the city has also become a dairy center. It has a splendid public school system, three colleges, churches of practically every denomination, recreation facilities, and many fine civic organizations.

I would like to mention today, and recommend for reading a recently published book Double Destiny. This book was authored by Robert Loving, a Bristol newspaperman, and provides a most interesting account of Bristol's history.

And so today, Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to Bristol, Va. I am certain that if you, or any of our colleagues, visit Bristol that you will agree with the city's slogan, "Bristol: A Good Place To Live."

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES VISIT OREGON

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in November of last year there appeared in Oregon a congressional committee which consisted of a subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives and a subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate. The group conducted hearings in 5 cities in Oregon—1 in Klamath Falls, in the Second Congressional District, 3 in the Fourth District, which I represent, and 1 in Portland.

As a matter of fact, the group to which I refer consisted mainly of majority party staff members. There were five of them. The minority had no staff assistance. Members of Congress present for the first two hearings in Oregon were Hon. EARL CHUDOFF, chairman of the House subcommittee, and Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN, a minority member of the committee. One Senator joined the group at Roseburg and two Senators were in attendance for a part of the time in Portland.

The announced purposes of the western trip of the joint committee were as follows:

> Develop facts and current information relative to problems of access to Government timber, including access roads; inadequate and out-dated inventory data on Federal timber resources; increases in the allowable cut; revised timber sales practices to provide sales of a size and length that meet the needs of small and large operators alike; increased salvage sales of diseased and burned timber; and a reexamination of the effect of marketing area and other restrictions on Government timber sales.

In Oregon, and particularly in the congressional district which I represent, logging and the manufacture of wood products is our principal payroll industry. Most of the raw material—the timber used by that industry—is owned by the Federal Government. I was pleased, therefore, when I learned that a joint congresisonal committee would come to the State and hear on-the-ground testimony about our problems, many of which are quite controversial locally.

Congressional committees have conducted hearings in Oregon several times since I have been a Member of Congress. In every instance, when I could be present, I was invited to sit with the committee and take part in the hearing. It was considered, and I believe rightly, that my knowledge of the area and its problems could be used to assist the committee in writing a complete and balanced record.

I assumed, therefore, that the same courtesy would be shown me by the committee, at least, with respect to the hearings conducted in the Fourth Congressional District. But in his opening statement at the Medford hearings, the first of the series in my district, Chairman CHUDOFF noted my presence and announced that I would not be permitted to take part in the proceedings.

My wonderment at this unusual treatment was not for long. It soon became clear, indeed, that the real purpose of the committee trip to Oregon was not, as we had thought, to gather a record of facts with complete and fair testimony on both sides of controversial timber-management questions which would be valuable to the administrating agencies and to Congress. No. This was to be a sort of witch hunt for the purpose of gathering political thunder with which to smear and discredit Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay and other executives in the Eisenhower administration. That was the reason for the presence of the five majority staff employees, some of whom had been Interior Department employees in the previous administration.

As it turned out, however, and in spite of sometimes amusing and obvious efforts of the majority members and their staff, the hearings did develop a considerable volume of worthwhile and useful information.

The credit for frustrating, and to a considerable extent blunting, the political result of the western trip of the joint subcommittee goes to the lone Republican minority member, Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN, our colleague from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

In spite of the fact that Mr. HOFFMAN had no staff assistance, in spite of attempts to silence him, and in spite of the fact that he was repeatedly denied information as to the schedule of witnesses and other details of the proceedings, Congressman HOFFMAN publicly exposed unfair methods in the hearing as they developed, pointed out the political implications and intent of questions, and otherwise acted to compel the writing of a record that contains at least some value so far as the timber portion of the hearings is concerned.

The service rendered to the House, and particularly to the people of Oregon and Washington, by our colleague from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, by going west to take part in these hearings was at considerable personal sacrifice to him. I want him and the Members of the House to know that we deeply appreciate his efforts. His unceasing devotion to the highest ideals of Government are, I know, admired and respected by all of us.

SPONSORS OF EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on the 15th of February I spoke on the floor of this House and mentioned the names of all the sponsors of the so-called equal-rights amendment, H. R. 82. Since that date I am very happy now to be able to inform the House that we have two new sponsors for that resolution, and they are both from the great State of Arkansas: One, the Honorable JAMES W. TRIMBLE, the other our good friend, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS. We are certainly happy to have them swell our ranks to a grand total of 221 sponsors.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

DISPOSAL OF LANDS ACQUIRED UNDER TITLE III OF THE BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

The Clerk called the first bill (H. R. 6815) to provide for the orderly disposition of property acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING NATIONAL FARM-CITY WEEK

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 317) designating the last week in October of each year as National Farm-City Week.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 317 be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

INCREASING CERTAIN PATENT AND TRADEMARK FEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7416) to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and for other purposes.

Messrs. SAYLOR, HIESTAND, ROGERS of Texas, PRESTON, and Mrs. CHURCH objected, and, under the rule, the bill was stricken from the Consent Calendar.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ON THE AINSWORTH UNIT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9132) to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill came out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs without a dissenting vote. I do not know whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania was there or not. I understand he intends to object to all three of the reclamation bills on the Consent Calendar, and if he has some good reasons for objecting to them, I will be glad to have them go over to find out what objections he might have.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GALLUP-DURANGO HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6374) to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 7, 1924 (ch. 318, 43 Stat. 606), as amended by the act of May 28, 1941 (ch. 137, 55 Stat. 207), is hereby repealed, and the tribal funds of the Navaho Indians are relieved of all reimbursable obligations incurred under such act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "obligations", insert "if any."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO QUIET TITLE TO PROPERTY IN PENSACOLA, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5310) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby releases, remises, and quitclaims all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described tract of land situated in the city of Pensacola, Fla., to the person or persons who would, except for any claim of right, title, and interest in and to such land on the part of the United States, be entitled thereto under the laws of the State of Florida:

The west 39 feet of the north 132 feet of Arpent lot 47; the south 60 feet of Arpent lot 47, and the east 77 feet of the north 132 feet of Arpent lot 47, Old City Tract in the city of Pensacola, Fla., according to the map of such city copyrighted by Thomas C. Watson in 1906.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF DRAINAGE WORKS ON FEDERAL RECLAMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That funds appropriated for the construction of irrigation works authorized to be undertaken pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended, or other acts of Congress may, insofar as such funds are available for the construction of drainage facilities and other minor items, be utilized by the Secretary of the Interior to accomplish such work by contract, by force account or, notwithstanding any other law and subject only to such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary shall deem appropriate for the protection of the United States, by contract entered into with the repayment organization concerned whereby said organization shall perform such work.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1529) to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands are hereby made a part of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto: Beginning at a point in block 11 of the village of Medora, N. Dak., said point being on the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue a distance of 160 feet westerly from the northwest corner of the intersection of Third Avenue and Main Street; thence northly a distance of 140 feet to a point on a line parallel to and 160 feet westerly of the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street; thence easterly 10 feet along a line parallel to and 140 feet northerly of the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue to a point 150 feet westerly of the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street; thence northerly 20 feet along a line parallel to and 150 feet westerly of the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street to a point on a line parallel to and 160 feet northerly of the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue; thence easterly along said line a distance of 150 feet to a point on the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street; thence northerly a distance of 40 feet along said westerly right-of-way line of Main Street to a point 200 feet northerly from the northwest corner of the intersection of Third Avenue and Main Street; thence easterly along a line parallel to and 200 feet northerly of the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue a distance of 970 feet to the northwesterly corner of lot 3 in block 8; thence southerly along the westerly line of lots 3 to 10, inclusive, in block 8 a distance of 200 feet to a point on the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue; thence along the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue extended easterly to a point on the west sixteenth line of section 26; thence northerly along said sixteenth line to a point on the section line common to sections 23 and 26; thence westerly along said section line to a point which is 600 feet easterly of the section corner common to sections 22, 23, 26, and 27; thence northerly along a line parallel to and 600 feet easterly from the section line common to sections 22 and 23 to a point on the south sixteenth line of section 23; thence westerly along said sixteenth line a distance of 600 feet to a point on the section line common to sections 22 and 23; thence southerly along said section line to the section corner common to sections 22, 23, 26, and 27; thence southerly along the section line common to sections 26 and 27 a distance of 390.5 feet; thence westerly a distance of 421.7 feet to a point on a line parallel to and 390.5 feet southerly from the section line common to sections 22 and 27; thence southerly a distance of 360 feet to a point in block 4 on a line parallel to and 150 feet westerly from the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street extended northerly; thence southwesterly on a straight line through the southwesterly corner of block 4 to a point on the southerly right-of-way line of Second Avenue extended westerly; thence westerly along said westerly extension of the southerly right-of-way line of Second Avenue to a point on the northeasterly right-of-way line of United States Highway No. 10; thence southeasterly along said northeasterly right-of-way line of United States Highway No. 10 to the intersection or juncture of said right-of-way line with the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue; thence easterly to the point of beginning; and all of that part of block 12 in the village of Medora that lies westerly of a line parallel to and westerly a distance of 140 feet from the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street; all in township 140 north, range 102 west, fifth principal meridian.

Also, that part of section 4 lying south of the north bank of the Little Missouri River, section 7, section 8, and northwest quarter northwest quarter section 9, township 147 north, range 99 west; section 12, township 147 north, range 100 west; northeast quarter section 20 and section 21, township 148 north, range 99 west; and east half section 20, north half section 21, and southwest quarter, south half northwest quarter, and north half northeast quarter section 29, township 148 north, range 100 west, fifth principal meridian, North Dakota.

SEC. 2. The following area is hereby excluded from the park: That portion of section 8 lying southwest of a line between the common corner of sections 8, 9, 16, and 17 and the northwest corner of the southwest quarter section 8; that portion of section 16 lying southwest of a line between the southeast corner southwest quarter and the northwest corner southwest quarter section 16; and section 17, township 147 north, range 100 west, fifth principal meridan, North Dakota.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make further adjustments in the boundaries of the park along United States Highways Nos. 10 and 85 as he deems advisable and in the public interest if and when the alinement of these highways is changed: *Provided,* That not to exceed 500 acres may be added to the park and not to exceed 2,000 acres may be excluded from the park by such adjustments. Boundary adjustments made pursuant to this section shall be effective upon publication thereof in the Federal Register and all Federal land excluded from the park pursuant to this Act shall be administered in accordance with the public land laws of the United States.

SEC. 4. The land exchange authority relating to Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park prescribed by section 3 of the Act of April 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 52), and by section 2 of the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 384), shall be applicable also to the lands described in section 1 of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 6, change the period to a colon and add the words "*Provided*, That the lands and improvements thereon located in block 6 in the village of Medora now administered and used by the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, shall not become a part of the park pursuant to this section until such time as they are transferred to the Department of the Interior by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Page 4, strike all of lines 7 through 16.

Page 5, lines 11, 12, and 13, strike the words "administered in accordance with the public land laws of the United States." and insert the words "transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration or disposition in accordance with title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8728) to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That burial in national cemeteries of the remains of commissioned officers of the United States Public Health Service who were detailed for duty with the Army or Navy during World War I pursuant to the Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 712, 713), as amended, and Executive Order No. 2571 dated April 3, 1917, and of the wife, widow, minor child and, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, unmarried adult child of these officers is authorized: *Provided*, That the remains of the wife, widow, and children may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, be removed from a national cemetery proper and interred in the post section of a national cemetery if, upon death, the related officer is not buried in the same or an adjoining gravesite.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANDPOINT, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2423) for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the city of Sandpoint, Idaho, the sum of $98,200, in full satisfaction of all claims of such city against the United States for additional costs to the city in the operation and maintenance of sewage-disposal facilities to be constructed by the city, the construction of these facilities being occasioned by the construction and operation by the Corps of Engineers of a hydroelectric and storage dam at Albeni Falls on the Pend Oreille River, Idaho: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7062) providing for payment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State of Washington the sum of $581,721.91. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the State of Washington against the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion, 28 miles in length, of secondary highway No. 11A of the State which was condemned and taken by the United States in 1943 for use in connection with the construction and operation of the Hanford atomic energy project.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2884) to amend the wheat-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 334 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1334), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Secretary shall increase the farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1956 crop of wheat for farms located in counties in the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, South Dakota, and California, designated by the Secretary as counties which (1) are capable of producing durum wheat (class II) and (2) have produced such wheat for commercial food products during 1 or more of the 5 years 1951 through 1955. The increase in the wheat acreage allotment for any farm shall be conditioned upon the production of durum wheat (class II) on such increased acreage. The increased allotment shall be determined by adding to the allotment established without regard to this subsection (hereinafter referred to as the 'original allotment') an acreage equal to two times the acreage by which the original allotment exceeds the 1956 acreage on the farm of classes of wheat other than durum wheat (class II) (hereinafter referred to as 'other wheat'), but such increased allotment shall not exceed the smaller of the cropland on the farm well suited to wheat or the wheat acreage on the farm: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this subsection (1) the original allotment for each farm shall be not less than 15 acres, and (2) varieties of class II (durum wheat) known as 'Golden Ball' and 'Peliss' shall be regarded as 'other wheat.' Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, no acreage allotment shall be increased under this subsection for any farm on which the producer knowingly devotes to the production of other wheat an acreage in excess of the acreage allotment established without regard to this subsection (and particularly without regard to clause (1) of the foregoing proviso).

"The increases in wheat acreage allotments authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to the National, State, and county wheat acreage allotments, and the acreage of durum wheat (class II) on such increased allotments shall not be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

"The provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, 77th Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), and section 326 (b) of this act, relating to the reduction of the storage amount of wheat shall apply to the allotment for the farm established without regard to this subsection and not to the increased allotment under this subsection."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAPANESE-AMERICAN EVACUATION CLAIMS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7763) to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1231), as amended, is further amended as follows:

That section 1 of the act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) The Attorney General shall have jurisdiction to compromise and settle and make an award as hereinafter provided on any claim by a person of Japanese ancestry against the United States arising on or after December 7, 1941, when such claim is not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, for damage to or loss of real or personal property (including without limitation as to amount damage to or loss of personal property bailed to or in the custody of the Government or any agent thereof), that is a reasonable and natural consequence of the evacuation or exclusion of any person of Japanese ancestry by the appropriate military commander from a military area in Arizona, California, Oregon, or Washington; or from the Territory of Alaska, or the Territory of Hawaii; under authority of Executive Order No. 9066, dated February 19, 1942 (3 C. F. R. Cum. Supp. 1092), section 67 of the act of April 30, 1900 (48 U. S. C. 532), or Executive Order No. 9489, dated October 18, 1944 (3 C. F. R. 1944 Supp. 45).

"(b) As used herein—

"(1) 'Evacuation' shall include voluntary departure from a military area prior to but in anticipation of an order of exclusion therefrom.

"(2) 'Claim by a person of Japanese ancestry' shall include claims timely filed by corporations, partnerships, associations, societies, and other organizations, profit and nonprofit, the majority of whose stock was owned by, or the majority of whose stockholders or members on December 7, 1941, were, persons of Japanese ancestry. The legal entity of the organization shall be disregarded, if necessary, to do equity and justice in achieving the purposes of this act, including the payment of any award directly to the

stockholders or members of Japanese ancestry. Such claims shall not be barred by awards or disallowances heretofore made.

"(3) 'Claim by a person of Japanese ancestry' shall also include claims which have been timely filed for such damage or loss as heretofore defined incurred by persons of Japanese ancestry detained, interned, or paroled, and subsequently released pursuant to Revised Statutes, sections 4067–4070, as amended (relating to alien enemies). Any such person shall be deemed to have been excluded from such military areas and territories as of the date he would have been evacuated had he not been detained or interned. The claim of or on behalf of such persons shall not be barred by any award or disallowance made prior to this amendment.

"(4) 'Damage to or loss of real or personal property,' notwithstanding the limitations provided by section 2 (b) (5) hereof, shall hereafter include business expenses or expenditures actually incurred by claimants that would not have been incurred but for the evacuation or exclusion of persons of Japanese ancestry, including management expenses and conservation costs actually paid.

"(5) 'Damage to or loss of real or personal property,' notwithstanding the limitations provided by section 2 (b) (5) hereof, shall include loss of reasonably ascertainable fair rental value when included in claims timely filed.

"(6) 'Damage to or loss of real or personal property,' notwithstanding the limitations provided by section 2 (b) (5) hereof, shall include loss of reasonably ascertainable crop losses, including perennial crops, measured by the market value of the particular claimant's crop at the time of maturity and marketing less the estimated cost of producing and marketing the crops."

That section 2 (a) of the act, as amended, is amended as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Attorney General shall receive claims for a period of 18 months from the date of the original enactment of this act. All claims not presented within that time shall be forever barred: *Provided, however,* That any claim received by the Attorney General bearing a postmark prior to midnight, January 3, 1950, shall be considered to be timely filed within the said 18 months. Any claim, timely filed, may be amended at any time prior to its final determination in order to include then compensable items of claim prior to its final determination in order to which, by the provisions of this act as they existed when the claim was filed, the Attorney General was not authorized to determine or consider."

That section 2 (b) of the act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Except as provided in section 1 (b) (3), for damage or loss arising out of action taken by any Federal agency pursuant to sections 4067, 4068, 4069, and 4070 (relating to alien enemies) of the Revised Statutes, as amended (50 U. S. C. 21–24), or pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 U. S. C., App., and Supp., 1–31, 616)."

That section 4 (a) of the act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Attorney General is authorized to compromise and settle and make an award on any claim timely filed under this act, as amended, on the basis of affidavits, available Government records, and other information satisfactory to him."

That section 4 (b) of the act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to determine any claim timely filed under this act. A petition for the determination of a claim by the Court of Claims shall be filed with the clerk of the said court and a copy of the petition shall be served upon the Attorney General by registered mail. Such a petition may be filed at any time after enactment of this subsection and must be filed within 90 days after the date of a notice by the Attorney General served on the claimant by registered mail that no further consideration will be given to the compromise of the claim. Upon the timely filing and serving of such petition, the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine said claim in the same manner and under the same rules as any other cause properly before it and applying rules of equity and justice. Upon being served with a copy of such petition, the Attorney General shall forthwith certify and transmit to the clerk of the Court of Claims the original statement of the claim and any requested amendments thereto for filing with the said clerk as a preliminary record in the case. Such petition shall, to the fullest practicable extent, be treated for docketing, hearing, and determination as if the petition had been filed with the Court of Claims on the date the original claim was received by the Attorney General: *Provided, however,* That no such petition shall have precedence by reason hereof over petitions involving interest-bearing obligations of the United States."

That section 4 (c) of the act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) On the first day of each regular session of Congress the Attorney General shall transmit to Congress a full and complete statement of all compromise settlements effected by the Attorney General under this act, as amended, during the previous year, stating the name and address of each claimant, the amount claimed, and the amount awarded. All awards shall be paid in like manner as are final judgments of the Court of Claims."

That section 4 (d) of the act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Except as herein provided, the payment of an award shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, and shall be a full discharge of the United States and all of its officers, agents, servants, and employees with respect to all claims arising out of the same subject matter."

That section 7 of the act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. In lieu of the determination and award of preevacuation and postevacuation expenses, including costs of transportation, actually incurred by or on behalf of evacuees or excludees, there is hereby awarded to each person of Japanese ancestry evacuated or excluded from any such military area or territory who files a claim therefor with the Attorney General within 6 months after the enactment of this section the sum of $150 in the case of persons who were 12 years of age on or before February 19, 1942, and the sum of $50 in the case of persons who were less than 12 years of age on February 19, 1942: *Provided, however,* That such excludees were heads of families who were evacuated.

"SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, after "that is", insert "(except as is otherwise provided by subsections 1 (b) (2) and 1 (b) (3))."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "any person of Japanese ancestry" and substitute "such person."

Page 2, line 20, strike out the paragraph numbered "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(2) "Claims by a person of Japanese ancestry" shall include claims that were filed by any profit or nonprofit organization, corporate or otherwise, the majority of whose stock was owned by, or the majority of whose stockholders or members were, on December 7, 1941, and on the date of the filing of the claim, persons of Japanese ancestry actually residing within the continental limits of the United States or its Territories: *Provided, however,* that the losses sustained by the particular organization were the result (1) of the evacuation and exclusion of its stockholders or members, or (2) of the evacuation and exclusion of persons of Japanese ancestry upon whom the organization depended for its business or support. Such claims shall not be barred by awards or disallowances heretofore made.' "

Page 3, lines 10 and 11, insert a comma after "paroled" and after "released".

Page 3, line 12, after "(relating to alien enemies)." insert the following sentence:

"Such claims shall also include losses due to the exclusion of the families and relatives of such persons during their detention or internment."

Page 3, line 17, strike out "made prior to this amendment" and substitute "heretofore made".

Page 3, line 18, strike out all of paragraph numbered "(4)."

Page 3, line 25, strike out all of paragraph numbered "(5)."

Page 4, line 4, strike out all of paragraph numbered "(6)."

Page 6, line 1, strike out "and" and insert in lieu thereof "except that it".

Pages 7 and 8, strike out all of the language after line 14 on page 7 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

That section 7 of the act is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.' "

Subsection 3 (a) of the act is amended by striking out "to be heard and".

Subsection 3 (b) of the act is amended by striking out "hearing or".

Subsection 3 (c) of the act is amended by striking out "written" and "hearings and".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSE OWNERS OF LANDS FOR MOVING EXPENSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5975) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired under the Federal reclamation laws for their moving expenses, and for other purposes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMEND SECTION 1 OF THE ACT OF MARCH 4, 1915

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8226) to amend section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353), is further amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first paragraph thereof a colon and the following language: "*Provided,* That the existence of a

mineral lease or permit, or application therefor, shall not prevent the reservation of land under this section, and such leases, permits, and applications shall be administered as hereinafter provided. The rights of the Territory to any lands under this act shall not be denied on the sole grounds that such lands were at the time of the acceptance of the survey subject to a reservation, application, claim, or right and that that reservation, application, claim, or right was extinguished, relinquished, or canceled prior to March 5, 1952."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL MILITARY AID IN AN EMERGENCY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6623) to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of July 1, 1952 (66 Stat. 318), is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(b) Without submission thereof, the Congress consents to the entering into a compact identical in terms with the compact set forth in section 1 of this act, between the State of New York or the State of New Jersey, and any State, or contiguous States, sharing a common boundary with either New York or New Jersey."

SEC. 2. Insert "(a)" before the words "Without further" at the beginning of the paragraph in section 2.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF IRRIGATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8535) to amend the act of July 4, 1955, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 443) to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 964), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $100,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out lines 9 and 10 and insert in the place thereof the following: "in addition to sums previously appropriated to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution a sum not to exceed $48,500'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 444) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 964), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation, as soon as practicable in the year 1956, inviting the people of the United States to observe the centennial anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson with appropriate ceremonies and activities during that year."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9257) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 752 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the word "escape" in line 2 thereof the phrase ", or attempt to escape."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That completes the bills on the Consent Calendar.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committe of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9720, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the privilege once again to bring to you for your consideration the annual appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. This is the sixth year I have had the honor and the privilege of being chairman of this committee in the past 10 years that I have been a member of it.

I think it is one of the most interesting committees in the Congress on which to serve. It has to deal with the health and welfare of the people of this Nation. It is one of the most difficult bills in the Congress to cut and it is one of the most difficult, but one of the most interesting bills to work on.

As I said a year ago, I have enjoyed working with the other members of my subcommittee. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] have given me every bit of support and cooperation that I could expect from a group of Members of Congress and I appreciate the cooperation and support they have given me this year. The minority side of the committee is headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who, with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], have given me, too, all the support and cooperation that any chairman could expect, and more, I believe.

This job has been made easier for me because of the services of the clerk to our subcommittee, Robert Moyer. He has made the job much easier for the chairman and I believe for the rest of the committee because of his continuing contact with these departments during the year, so that he has been able to keep all of us informed on what changes are made from day to day. He has been a real asset not only to me as chairman but to all members of the committee.

As was the case last year, we bring to you a unanimous report of this subcommittee.

A year ago we appropriated $2,412,000,000 to run these departments. This year the budget request was for $2,363,000,000. The committee brings in a recommendation of $2,296,000,000, which is $116 million less than was made available in the 1956 appropriation and $66,800,000 less than was asked for in 1957.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much will this bill increase the employment in the Federal Government?

Mr. FOGARTY. The number of positions?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, by the number of positions, numerically speaking.

Mr. FOGARTY. It will increase the number of positions in the Department of Labor by 74. They asked for 175; we disallowed 101, and gave them 74. In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we added about 1,500 positions.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman for what purpose?

Mr. FOGARTY. The largest group of these would be in the National Institutes of Health, which is a growing organization at the present time. It has taken about 3 years for us to get this agency to full operation. It will not be until this next fiscal year that they will even be staffed sufficiently to make full utilization of the clinical-center facility. Six hundred and eleven of those new positions are for the National Institutes of Health.

In the Food and Drug Administration because of the recommendations that agency made, and the recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Committee to increase this part of our Government by about 20 percent, we added 134.

In the Indian health activities, which is a new section in this bill that we have taken over from the Department of the Interior, and which is now under the Public Health Service, we have added 186.

In the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance we added 330 positions.

That amounts to about 83 percent of the amount allowed.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will permit, and I do not want to transgress upon his time, we on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were of the understanding that in bringing the Indian Health Services over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare there would be a reduction since we were bringing these people over from the Department of the Interior into an organization which has already established medical and health facilities for the Indians. I do not understand why there is an increase of more than 100 in the number of persons. In my opinion, there should have been a decrease in the employment.

Mr. FOGARTY. The principal reason is that we found the health conditions of the Indians in such a bad state of affairs that we think we may have to add even more next year if we are ever going to give to the Indians the health services we think they should have at the present time. We have appropriated more than I think was anticipated because of the conditions we found to exist on the reservations.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows that we now have 1 Federal employee having to do with Indian affairs for every 28 Indians. This simply means by indirection a further increase in that number.

May I ask the gentleman one other question: Are there any supergrades in this bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. There are no supergrades provided in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. We cut the Department of Labor by over $40 million. There are three principal reductions in the grants to States area. We cut the appropriation for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment services administration by $15 million; unemployment compensation for veterans by $20 million and unemployment compensation for Federal employees by $5 million. That accounts for the large reductions in the Department of Labor, which amounted to $40,700,000.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we have a few increases and a few decreases. The major part of the decreases occurs in just 2 or 3 items. We have decreased the hospital construction appropriation by $19 million on the basis that they will not be able to use that amount of money in the coming fiscal year. As you know, the Hospital Construction Act, as it was passed by both Houses, allows appropriations to be available for a 2-year period. Certain amendments were made to this act 2 or 3 years ago, bringing in four other categories, nursing centers, diagnostic centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, and rehabilitation centers. We allowed $21 million for these new features in 1955, $21 million in 1956, and we are allowing $21 million for 1957. They still have not spent all of the funds appropriated for 1955 and don't expect to be able to by the end of this fiscal year. Therefore, all of the $21 million appropriated for 1956 will carry forward to 1957. This means they will have $42 million available for expenditure in these particular categories during 1957. That is the reason for the $19 million cut at the present time.

The next cut of any amount was in the Office of Education where they asked for an increase of $2,950,000 for salaries and expenses. We allowed them about half of that increase or $1,450,000 and cut them $1,500,000. For vocational rehabilitation, we reduced that amount by $2 million, which would give them $35 million or $1,250,000 more than they have available this year.

In the grants to States for public assistance, we cut that amount by $15 million. So, these are the large reductions we made in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As to the increases we made, the first one was in vocational education. We have had a great demand by Members of the Congress to increase the appropriation for vocational education up to the authorized amount of $29 million plus. So, the committee this year raised the budget request by $2,760,000 to bring it up to the authorized amount of $29 million plus, for vocational education grants. We find that this Government operation is working out to the advantage of the young people of this country and has been universally accepted. That is why we raised that item.

We raised, by $4 million, the Childrens' Bureau grants for child and maternal health, $2 million of which will be put into the field of mental retardation and cerebral palsy, and the rest will be put into the school systems of this country to see to it that the children going to school will get better health examinations.

In the Institutes of Health, we have raised the various categorical grants by $10 million. In heart research, we raised the Budget recommendations this year by $3 million. We have raised the budget recommendations for the Cancer Institute by $2 million. We have raised the amount requested for the Neurological Institute by $2 million. We increased the Mental Health Institute by $2 million, the Institute on Arthritis and Rheumatism by $500,000, and we raised the Institute for Dental Research $500,000, making a total increase of $10 million in Institutes of Health. We cut $1 million out of the request for Microbiology Institute because we thought the increase they requested was more than could be wisely utilized in this field. I would like to point out that, considering transfers of work from this appropriation to other appropriations, the allowance made by the committe is still an increase of almost 40 percent over the current year's appropriation.

These recommendations have the unanimous support of our committee. We think that these Institutes of Health are doing a fine job. We believe we are making headway in the fight on heart disease and cancer, mental health and other diseases the Institutes are working on. Many discoveries have been made in recent years, which lead us to believe that human misery and suffering will be greatly alleviated by the constant progress that is being made possible by the Federal Government appropriating funds for research into these health needs of our country. That is the reason we have increased these appropriations by $10 million.

After we hear Government witnesses on these appropriations—the top people from the United States Public Health Service and the doctors that we have working in the Institutes of Health—it is then generally customary at the conclusion of the hearings to invite some of the outstanding doctors in the medical field in our country to come in and tell us how they think these funds are being expended and what the program for the future should be.

We have had men come before our committee, private physicians, some of the outstanding men in these fields in the country and in the world. We have had

the benefit of the advice of men in the heart field, like Dr. Paul Dudley White, of Boston; in cancer, men like Dr. Sidney Farber, of Boston, and Dr. Cornelius Rhoads, of the Memorial Hospital in New York. We have had outstanding neurologists, like Dr. Treager, from New York. In the past we have had outstanding psychiatrists like Dr. Menninger, who conducts the Menninger Institute in Topeka, Kans. So we have had the benefit of the advice of some of the leaders of the medical profession, not only in our country but men who are recognized as leaders in their particular fields in the entire world.

We have the recommendations made by our people at the National Institutes of Health, and these outstanding doctors, and it is on the basis of their testimony that we have increased these appropriations.

We have at Bethesda a building which I think every Member of Congress should take the time to see. It is a 500-bed research hospital. We expect it to be completed and in full operation by the end of next fiscal year when the 500 beds will be occupied. In addition to the 500-bed area we have double that amount of space in this building for research activities and laboratory space. It is now considered to be the outstanding medical research operation, not only in this country but in the world. There is nothing like it anywhere. We have been fortunate in getting some outstanding doctors and medical scientists and other personnel to work at this institute and they are accomplishing results out there at the present time.

This building was started 10 years ago by this committee and by the Congress of the United States. It has cost us $60 million to buy the land, to draw the plans and to construct the buildings and to equip them. How much it is going to cost on an annual basis to operate we do not know because we have not yet had a full year's operation. But if one of the discoveries that have already been made at the Institutes of Health is responsible for saving human lives, I for one, think that the $60 million we have spent is a cheap investment and we know that some of their discoveries have saved lives. We feel sure that the work conducted there will pay dividends a hundred times the cost of the particular building—the clinical center—that I am speaking of now.

Another reason we have made increases in the medical research program this year is because this committee over the past 10 years, to my knowledge, whenever it has been brought to our attention that we should appropriate funds for a specific thing, we have gone ahead and done so, whether there happened to be a budget request or not. I remember 10 years ago, my first year on the committee. It was brought to our attention that a new drug had just been discovered, called streptomycin, which was very effective in arresting tuberculosis. At that time, because of the newness of the drug, it was impossible for the average person to buy it because of the prohibitive cost of manufacturing streptomycin. Our committee appropriated $2 million over the request of the Bureau of the Budget to find some synthetic means of producing streptomycin, and within 2 years we had the price down so that the average person afflicted with tuberculosis could take advantage of it. You will notice X-ray machines all around the country today, taking pictures of the chests of people attacked by tuberculosis. When we found out about this new technique 9 years ago this committee made a recommendation to the Congress at that time that you appropriate about $3 million over the Bureau of the Budget request to make available to all the States the demonstration teams that are still active in every community of the country.

You were told of the discovery of the effect of the addition of sodium fluoride to water 7 years ago. At that time it was being topically applied to the teeth of children. This committee recommended to you, and you agreed to, an increase of $3 million to send demonstration teams into every State of the Union to show how sodium fluoride could be applied properly to children's teeth. We were told at that time it would decrease caries in the teeth of children up to 12 years of age by 40 percent. Since that time, as you know, it has become standard practice in the various cities of the country to add sodium fluoride to the water supply, and we are told that as a result we can expect that dental caries in children will be reduced 60 percent.

What we have already accomplished through this one program in just one of the institutes will mean a saving to the American people, not of millions of dollars, but of billions.

A couple of years ago because of a new discovery that was made at the National Institutes of Health in operating on a young man who suffered epilepsy, a great step forward was made in the treatment of this malady. The young man was sent here from Virginia to the Institute of Neurology. This young man was 29 years of age. From the time he was 5 he had averaged 5 epileptic seizures a day.

Following the operation they were able to keep alive some of the damaged brain tissue and from working with it they found that the damage was caused by a lack of glutamic acid. When they found what caused it they were able to develop a remedy, that is, they could supply the glutamic acid, but at a prohibitive price. It cost $330 a day for this treatment. So 2 years ago we asked you through the committee to appropriate $750,000 to find a cheaper way to create this substance they call glutamine. We were told this year that the cost has come down from $330 a day to $14 a day.

Those are some of the results that we have been achieving as a result of the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health.

It was testified this year that we have made great strides in the fight on cancer through new surgical techniques and new detection methods that have been developed with the result that there are at least 15,000 people walking around alive toward who would be dead except for the progress that has been made in the past 10 years.

We were informed 2 years ago, when we were asked to supply funds for a demonstration clinic in Memphis, Tenn., that the second leading cause of death from cancer in women is cancer of the cervix. This demonstration in Memphis has since shown that in the first 100,000 women who were examined by a simple smear technique which was developed only 4 or 5 years ago, that 750 in round numbers were in the first stages of this type of cancer. Five hundred of the 750 could be operated on and could be cured because of that early detection of cancer of the cervix.

On the basis of the demonstration at Memphis, we gave the National Institutes of Health, last year, additional funds to set up in 7 or 8 other States throughout the country these demonstration clinics similar to the one we had in Memphis; and this year we allocated more money to set up additional demonstration clinics, and to solve some of the questions that still remain to be answered before this can be recommended for general application by the States as has been done in the case of the mass X-ray technique for detection of tuberculosis.

As a result of the discovery by this doctor of a simple smear technique that he developed, we are able now to detect cancer of the cervix in women soon enough to cure it. Some of the doctors tell us that we can look forward to the day, in the not too distant future when cancer of the cervix in women can be controlled because of the smear technique that has been developed only in the last 2 years.

For mental health this year we allowed additional money largely because of the discovery of two new drugs, reserpine and thorazine. Because of the discovery of these drugs and the use of them in the State of Kansas the intake of mental patients has started to decrease. Maybe that is in part because of the Menninger Institute at Topeka and because of the advanced knowledge and better facilities they have. However, for the first time the upsurge is not only being held down because of the use of these new drugs but the trend is actually being reversed. We have given the National Institute of Mental Health $2 million, of which about half is specifically earmarked to develop and evaluate these new drugs that have come on the market in the past 2 years. We think, on the basis of the information that has been given to us, an additional expenditure of funds in this particular institute will mean a great savings in human life and human misery for millions of people. We hope, also that it will reduce the tax burden of our communities and States so far as mental institutions are concerned.

On the matter of the Dental Health Institute, many Members have received letters from all over the country asking for an increase of $3 million in dental research this year. I asked the specific question this year, of some of our doctors of dentistry, and they inform us that they have today on hand about $500,000 worth of approved applications for research in dentistry that they do not have funds to cover. The committee has recommended an increase of $500,000 to be appropriated for dental research this year, which will take care of all of the

approved applications for dental research at the present time.

Last year I asked the committee and the Congress to consider a new program for the mentally retarded children of this country. As you know, the Congress unanimously adopted that recommendation and we appropriated $750,000 last year to start a new program of medical research on retarded children. In addition we told the Office of Education to present a program for education of the mentally retarderd when they came before the committee this year.

We have 4½ to 5 million mentally retarded at the present time. A million and a half to 2 million of those are children. About 300 are born every day who will become mentally retarded.

Because of the start that we made last year we have in this bill an increase over the $750,000 to continue the medical research program on the mentally retarded. The Office of Education came up with a program, as we requested last year, and we have allowed the full amount of $675,000 for a program in the education of these mentally retarded children. The Department also has pending before the Congress legislation that will authorize an additional $500,000 for training teachers in the field of mental retardation. We have allowed $80,000 this year more than last year in the budget of the Children's Bureau for a program in mental retardation. Again in the Children's Bureau on the item of maternal and child health we have allowed an additional $2 million for a program covering epilepsy and mental retardation.

This program is presently in operation and it is one of the most followed programs in the country at the present time. We think it will increase. These are some of the positive results of our efforts to stimulate action in this vital and neglected field.

There were 1 or 2 things we did find fault with in our report. The first was that in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we have been attempting to get a good program covering the problem of the aging. For 4 or 5 years now we have been insisting that the Department come up with a good program to take care of the problems of the aging in this country. I was a little bit disappointed this year to find they had not gone ahead much further than last year. It seems to me that a lot of conferences and a lot of meetings are taking place but no definite action is coming out of the meetings. In our report we did find some fault with that operation.

Also we have been told for 4 or 5 years now that we have a tremendous shortage of nurses in this country. I criticized the Department for not doing more about alleviating the shortage of nurses within the framework of this appropriation bill than they have done up to the present time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the gentleman's comments on the lack of any good done by the Department with respect to the problems of the aged and aging, I want to commend the gentleman for what he has done over the last 5 or 6 years in seeking to push the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its predecessor agency into taking some action dealing with the problem of the aged. The gentleman will recall that when Mrs. Hobby appeared before the committee last year she said:

> I think in some way we have to establish the role of leadership in the Federal Government in this whole program. It is really upon us now. We have delayed too long. We are 10 years behind where we should have been in this thing.

With what the Department has not done last year, would not the gentleman say it is now 11 years of do nothing in connection with this problem?

Mr. FOGARTY. I said in the report that I find fault with the progress they have made, and the committee expects that next year they will come up with a positive program in this particular field.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I wish to commend the gentleman for his very able presentation of this very important matter. I think the committee has done an excellent job. On examination of the report, the Budget Bureau recommended $23,749,000 for the National Institutes of Health, and the committee has approved $2 million more than the budget has recommended. I want to ask the gentleman specifically about the item of $1.4 million for the development of tranquilizing drugs. The gentleman knows I spoke to him earlier about it, but since the committee report was printed I received a letter from the governor of my State, Honorable Frank G. Clement, of Tennessee, in which he speaks of the work of Dr. Kline and Dr. Brill of New York. I would like to have the gentleman's comment, if he will, further, about the use of tranquilizing drugs for which funds are made available.

Mr. FOGARTY. We were very much impressed by the testimony of Dr. Kline and Dr. Brill, and their testimony was a contributing factor in the committee deciding to increase the appropriation by $2 million. In the report we spell out that about $1 million of it shall be applied to the development and evaluation of these tranquilizing drugs. They are the two most universally used at the present time, reserpine and thorazine.

Mr. EVINS. I want to again commend the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I want to preface my question by saying that I do not think there is anybody in all the Congress, in either body, who deserves the gratitude of the American people to the extent that the gentleman does for his deep interest and constructive action over the years in terms of this very vital problem of health. He certainly has made contributions that will last for many, many years, and I know he is laying the foundation for still further contributions.

One of the problems I have been interested in particularly is this problem of the aged to which the gentleman has referred. Certainly, there are many, many thousands of people who recognize that problem and who are attempting to do something about it. Many of our States have undertaken worthwhile programs. However, I must say that in reading the report and in attempting to analyze the appropriation items I cannot see where there is anything more than an admonition to the Department to try to do something about it. Is there any particular person in the Department or, rather, people in the Department who, during the course of your hearings, appeared to have taken it upon themselves as their own responsibility to develop a Federal program that will compare at all with the State programs and that will actually bring about something in the next year that this Congress can be proud of?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Perkins, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is charged with this responsibility. I think he is trying to do something about it. He has been in contact with individual agencies in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such as Education and Vocational Rehabilitation and Public Health, in order to come up with some kind of a program. But as I told him during the hearings, we were not satisfied with what is being done. We recognize that something is being done, but not enough is being done. We said in the report that we are disappointed in the advances that are being made, that we expect them to come up with some definite program when they come up for next year's appropriation, so that we may be able to get some results.

Mr. HESELTON. As the gentleman phrased it, something substantial.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. HESELTON. But what I am interested in is this. When something is as big as this, making due allowance for the good intentions of the people concerned, what someone is trying to do gets lost; they have so many other things to do. Is there any way to pinpoint the responsibility?

Mr. FOGARTY. We are not going to permit it to get lost. Once we make a statement in our report, such as this recommendation to the Department, we expect them to live up to it because these reports are reports of the Congress. To my knowledge, I must say, that they have responded to these recommendations in the past and I have no doubt that they will in the future.

Mr. HESELTON. I hope that that is true.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman on the very fine work he has done. In fact, I have been listening to the gentleman for 10 years and every time he has had something to say, I found that I agreed with him and tried to go along and help him. The gentleman was kind enough to give me a letter

of introduction to the doctor who is administering this institution. He was kind enough to take me through the entire institution. As the gentleman mentioned a while ago, I wish every Member of Congress could go up there and take a look at the National Institutes of Health and see what a remarkable institution it is.

Also, I have a sort of personal interest in that institution now, because a young man, Dr. Francis Abinanti, and his wife and children were sent over to Cambridge, England, to do work on behalf of the Institutes of Health and bring back a report. They have now been recalled, and this young doctor is working there now, doing very important research work and has his family with him.

Again I want to say that I do not know anybody who has done more for the health and welfare of the American people than our friend from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Every time he has discussed the Institutes of Health he has given us something constructive and helpful for our unfortunate citizens who are in need of help to solve their health problems so they may enjoy living like those of us who are fortunate enough to be healthy.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the explanation of the increases for the various activities. With other Members, I have received letters from dentists about increasing their appropriation. I think it should be pointed out that the committee, as I interpret their report, has recommended an increase of more than 60 percent over what they had last year and, incidentally, that is the largest increase given to any of the activities. So I feel that the dentists should feel that they have been adequately taken care of.

Mr. FOGARTY. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $800,000-plus more than they had a year ago. The committee recommended an additional $500,000, making $1,300,000-plus more than they had last year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Percentagewise it is more than was allowed any other activity, as I interpret the figures in the report.

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot say as to that. However, that is certainly true so far as the other categorical Institutes of Health are concerned.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman and his committee for the magnificent work they have done in the field of public health. Specifically I direct my remarks to that section of the report dealing with retarded children and note that for the first time, I believe, in the history of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare last year it came up with a real program on this very important subject. It represents a problem, of course, that affects every section and almost every segment of the population of this Nation. I recognize the fact that this committee has handled this problem in a very excellent way and I commend them for the work they have done.

Last year the Appropriations Committee allotted $750,000 for the beginning of a program to effectively deal with mental retardation. As a member of that committee, I take some measure of pride in the committee's efforts to direct a start in this most important program. An excellent beginning was made last year. This year, the Congress is asked to implement the department's program by approving $650,000 for a specific research program in the field of education of the mentally retarded; $80,000 for the Children's Bureau to work with the States and communities with respect to preschool children; $750,000 for continued research at the National Institutes of Health on the medical aspects of the problem. Additional funds will be made available by the committee for teacher training provided proposed legislation is enacted.

Mr. Chairman, the magnitude of the problem of the mentally retarded is dawning upon the people of the country. And with this dawning is the growing desire of our people to help solve or at least, to alleviate the burden that courageous families and dedicated persons are carrying. The problem is too big and too severe for individuals or groups to master. Clearly there is a responsibility upon the Government to shoulder the bulk of the program. Harken to the words of Dr. Grover F. Powers, one of America's outstanding leaders in the field of pediatricians wherein he said:

> Assuming 2 parents and 2 siblings for the family unit of each retarded child, there are thus between 5 and 10 million persons blighted to a great or small degree by the direct impact on their lives of these unfortunate children. And then one must add to family sorrow, vast contingent sociological, economic, educational, and legal disturbances, responsibilities, and dislocations. Only the problems of mental illness are commensurate in size with those of mental retardation in respect to toal population. It seems to me, therefore, that the major importance to biologic and social science, to medicine, to economics, to public policy of retarded children is all too obvious.

Congressman FOGARTY and his committee have recognized the problem and have effectively taken steps to meet it with some dynamic steps. I urge the Congress to accept the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee with respect to this matter.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL HEALTH

Mr. Chairman, when H. R. 9720 was considered by the full Appropriations Committee last Friday, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] gave an excellent explanation of his subcommittee's action relative to dental research. It appears to me that the committee was on sound ground in requesting that training grants of this institute be increased by $500,000. This amount plus that of $800,000 recommended in the President's budget as submitted to the Congress makes a total of $1,300,000 allocated to dental research grants. These grants go to non-Federal institutions and are administered by the National Institute of Dental Research. The $500,000 increase will enable the institute to honor all of the approved applications for research in dentistry. These grants are necessary when one considers the testimony offered in the hearings indicating that the 43 dental schools and 7 dental research centers are practically without endowment and are already heavily burdened with their effort to increase and support facilities urgently needed to train an adequate supply of dentists and dental hygienists. The dentists themselves have joined in contributing some quarter of a million dollars a year to help meet the need for research. The amount asked is small indeed when compared with the benefits that are bound to be realized. The people of this country spend a billion and a half dollars yearly in the care of teeth and yet, less than one-half of the population receives adequate dental care. To meet the growing cost and assist in a more effective campaign of dental hygiene and care, dental research is an absolute necessity. The oral diseases that result from failure to properly care for the teeth have been, can be, and will be better arrested through dental research. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, but that the willingness to appropriate money in this field now will return huge dividends in the not too distant future.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman for the work he has done. I would like to inquire whether the appropriation recommended for the Food and Drug Administration will put additional inspectors in the field?

Mr. FOGARTY. We are adding 130 to 140 employees to the Food and Drug Administration this year—I believe the exact figure is 134, which is an increase of almost 20 percent. This was recommended by the Citizens Advisory Committee which made a survey last year of the Food and Drug Administration.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman very much. I found that in Detroit they inspected food processing plants once every 10 years and the drug concerns once every 5 years.

Mr. FOGARTY. We have allowed the full amount that was recommended. That was the amount suggested by the National Citizens Advisory Committee, which made their recommendations last year.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish to join in commending the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island for the outstanding job he has done and to assure him that among my constituents including distinguished physicians and

scientists of the University of Chicago, there is entertained a deep feeling of admiration for the gentleman and appreciation for his work. The increased appropriation for cancer research, for which we are beholden to the great statesman from Rhode Island and the members of his subcommittee, will be most heartening to the University of Chicago Research Foundation, so liberally supported by generous Chicagoans, and to its chairman, Maurice Goldblatt, who for so long has given unstintingly of his time and money to the war on cancer. We are eternally grateful to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman must be extremely happy to have accomplished what he has accomplished during these years. I only hope he does not work too hard himself.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman about the grants for construction of hospitals? How is that done?

Mr. FOGARTY. The grants are made to the States. Every State has a State agency that is responsible for approval of the individual application for funds available under this act. It is really a States rights program all the way through. The State agency, and it may be the State health department, for instance, approve the applications of the local communities for the type of hospital and the amount that is to be expended in each area.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Do you give them as much as they have asked for in this bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. We have given them under the old Hill-Burton Act every dime they asked for. Under the new act, because they have not been able to expend the money—they are going to turn back $3 or $4 millions this year—we have cut that $19 million, but they will still have available $42 million for that section of the Hospital Construction Act for 1957.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Do you have any difficulty in securing your doctors? Can you secure all the doctors you wish for the Public Health Service?

Mr. FOGARTY. We are experiencing some difficulty in recruiting doctors and nurses at the institutes at the present time. Much of it is because of the salary scale. As the activities of the institutes get better known we are getting better people there, because some of these people, knowing that we have, at the clinical center, the best facilities in the world to work with, want to work there if they are research scientists.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I would like to compliment the gentleman on the work he has done on this subject. It is bringing to many people a life that is longer, more creative, and less wasteful. I think the gentleman is doing in the health, education, and welfare field what we did in the Manhattan project when we were in war. I wish the gentleman the best. Does he believe there are enough funds here for the Conciliation and Mediation Service?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] I think is going to speak to that point. He is the chairman for related agencies, and I think he has something to offer when he takes the floor later.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. All in all, it is a wonderful bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I also join the other Members of the House in their commendation on the fine work done by this committee and the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. May I say, too, that I think the thoroughness of the work done by the committee is shown by the fact that you have gone further than the Bureau has recommended to show that these funds can be used. Does the gentleman feel that we are allocating sufficient funds to do as much research on the heart, cancer, and mental health problems as possibly could be done with the personnel on hand?

Mr. FOGARTY. We believe that with the personnel we have at the present time, the research scientists and doctors, and the facilities we have, this budget will give us a sound medical research program. That is why we have agreed on those specific amounts that we have before the House at the present time. They are based on the knowledge that we have of the available personnel and the available facilities we have for research now. On the personnel side, the committee recognized the fact that more medical research personnel must be trained, and recommended that the budget for training medical scientists be increased by about $4 million over the request for the next fiscal year.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. In other words, a crash program would not necessarily bring about the results because of the limited personnel and facilities?

Mr. FOGARTY. In some areas that is correct; yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. TUMULTY. I compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island for his remarkable address. I want to state I thoroughly appreciate it. If I were the president of a university, I would confer upon the gentleman an LL. D. degree.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. May I extend my congratulations to the gentleman from Rhode Island for the magnificent work he has done on this committee as exemplified in the end results as they appear in this appropriation bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I congratulate the committee and its chairman on the fine work they have done, particularly with reference to the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped. However, I would like to ask one question which concerns the appropriation for the Office of Education in reference to a law which was passed in the 83d Congress concerning the cooperative research between the Office of Education and educational institutions throughout the country. It is my understanding that the Department asked for $1,500,000 to institute this program which had not been instituted as yet. I wonder if the chairman could give me some reason why this is not included or when it might be included?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Office of Education asked for an increase this year in salary expenses of almost 100 percent. They went from about $3 million to $6 million. The committee has agreed to give them about a 50-percent increase, an increase of $1,500,000. Out of that $1,500,000 there is $675,000 for the program for mentally retarded children, and then there is about $700,000 in addition which can be used for cooperative research and these other programs that they asked for. There were two specific things which we said in our committee report we did not think they should spend any money for. One was to establish a library in the Office of Education and the other was the National Advisory Committee on Education. But they have $700,000 available for the work the gentleman is talking about, and other increases not specifically mentioned in the report.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. McVEY. The gentleman mentioned during the course of his very fine address that there was an increase in funds allocated to the vocational education program. May I inquire whether the gentleman meant vocational rehabilitation or vocational education?

Mr. FOGARTY. We have allowed in this bill $2,767,000 over the budget for vocational education, which will bring it up to the maximum authorized under the law for vocational education.

Mr. McVEY. Will the gentleman give me that figure again, please.

Mr. FOGARTY. We raised that $2,767,000 which brings it up to $29 million plus, which is the total authorization under the law for vocational education.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island and to compliment him on a job well done.

Mr. FOGARTY. Thank you, Doctor.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I want to express my appreciation, together with my colleagues, not only for the excellent work the gentleman from Rhode Island has performed for us in leading the Nation toward providing adequate funds for medical research, but also for his excellent elucidation in the committee report of the medical problems of the country, which I think will be of real service to the people.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman mentioned a while ago in his remarks regarding the insufficient salaries for doctors and medical attendants. Last week, the Committee on Armed Services presented a bill which was before the Committee on Rules and passed the House, which substantially increased the salaries for medical personnel in the armed services. Have any steps been made regarding a similar bill with regard to these hospitals for medical research?

Mr. FOGARTY. At the time our hearings were being held that bill had not passed the Congress. I presumed from the answers that we received from Dr. Scheele that some consideration was being given at the time to include the public health commissioned officers also. There has been some improvement because we raised this question a year ago, and a year ago we established 30 additional supergrade positions, which allowed them to raise the salaries of some of their better trained personnel. That has helped to some extent.

Mr. MADDEN. I believe it is highly important that the salaries of the doctors, medical attendants, and people working in hospitals doing medical research should be increased, as well as the armed services. I commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for the outstanding job he has done and in his past in connection with this matter.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I may be mistaken but it was my impression that the bill we passed the other day did include doctors in the Public Health Service.

Mr. FOGARTY. At the time of the hearings we were told it would include them, although we were told that would not fully meet the problem because scientists as well as physicians are involved.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I want to join the other Members in the words of commendation to our chairman. I want to commend him for the excellent presentation he has made as chairman of the subcommittee, as he always does, and also for his very fair and excellent conduct of the hearings covering many weeks. It has been a joy and a privilege to serve with him as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. I too want to congratulate the gentleman from Rhode Island both with regard to the way he has presented this bill before the House today and for the way he conducted the hearings. The gentleman has detailed knowledge of every item in this bill and he has a heart for human welfare. I predict that the work he has done in advancing the cause of medical research will be remembered long after we have left this Hall and this world behind. He has made and is continuing to make an outstanding contribution in that respect.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. I, too, want to commend the gentleman and his subcommittee on the fine job he has done in presenting this bill to the House. I was particularly interested in the gentleman's report on the shortage of nurses now facing the Nation. Just what did the committee find is being done toward correcting this problem?

Mr. FOGARTY. We have not found that much is being done. It seems that we have been talking about this shortage of nurses for 3 or 4 years and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not come up with a program to stimulate the training of nurses or develop a program that would give us more nurses. So I wrote into the report—and I take the responsibility for it—we expect that they will come up with some definite program next year that will result in training additional nurses to fill the shortage that exists. I am told there is not a city in this country where the hospitals are fully manned at the present time with all the nurses they need.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I refer to that portion of the bill making appropriations for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I want to take this opportunity to compliment the chairman on the proposed financial plan for support of the expanding Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program. As I understand it the committee desires to have Federal appropriations for grants to States which will be adequate to match all of the funds made available by the States as well as support for the training of professional personnel.

The restoration of disabled persons to self-support is in my opinion a sound investment in the conservation of our human resources. There are both humanitarian as well as economic values to this program. It is an expanding program which we all must support.

I do wish to express my concern for the amount recommended for grants for rehabilitation research and demonstration under section 4. As I understand it $2 million was requested but only $1 million has been recommended. According to page 275 of the hearings before the subcommittee, it was stated that a minimum of $1.2 million will be required during 1957 to continue support of projects which were initiated in 1955 and 1956.

As I see it, therefore, some of these research activities will have to be dropped during 1957 before they have been completed. Equally important, no funds will be available for any new research projects during the year regardless of how meritorious they may be.

This curtailment comes at a crucial time in this new research effort. The nonprofit groups who have recently agreed to conduct research in rehabilitation problems now face the prospect of canceling projects which are just getting underway. There will be little encouragement for research groups to undertake new projects in the future.

Research is important to the advancement of rehabilitation as it is in medical science, health, and other fields. This year the committee has given unprecedent support of research in many different fields. I wish the committee might have found it possible to also support in greater measure this request for research in rehabilitation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I have been reading on yonder wall the statement made by Daniel Webster some years ago, closing with these words:

> Let us see whether we in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

That is just what the chairman of this subcommittee and the members of his committee are doing today. I do not know when we have had a finer piece of humanitarian legislation before us.

I was so happy to read in the daily press last Friday Dr. Paul Dudley White's statement about the heart of JOHN FOGARTY. All of us know something about his heart. It is a big heart. It is a stout heart. We know of his dedication to promoting the welfare of mankind, not only in the United States of America but for people everywhere. I cannot think of better publicity flowing from this Chamber than from the enactment of this bill. I salute JOHN FOGARTY and his colleagues on the committee reporting this bill to make new and reinforced attacks on the worst of human killers—battles to be waged in hospitals and laboratories for people everywhere, not in the United States alone.

I do not know how many of my colleagues have been out to visit the National Institutes of Health in nearby Maryland. I have been out there, and within recent days. It is a wonderful picture; it is an amazing picture to see so many doctors and nurses, young and old, all intensely dedicated persons, working for stipends that most of you and I would not work for. I hope all of

you will take occasion to go out there and see that great human enterprise in action. It is America at its best.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins will he allow me to say a word of appreciation of his work and of those on this side on this very fine bill? Because I know he is supposed to be a watchdog of the Treasury, yet it was his firm conviction and help that made the National Institutes possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. TABER. I have yielded.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is brought before you with the unanimous approval of the members of the committee. The gentleman from Rhode Island has explained the bill probably better than I could. I do wish, however, to call attention to one item which I believe the committee has not paid quite as much attention to as perhaps it should relative to the actual situation and the things the Department has done. This relates to the problems of the aged.

In the time that has gone by since the last bill an increase in the number of people taking educational rehabilitation and training has gone up so that the percentage of those over 45 years of age is over 25 percent of the total. In addition to that all sorts of health and rehabilitation services have been extended to them; their income from governmental allowances and pensions has been improved, and research into the causes of illness has been promoted. On top of that social security has been extended to 10 million additional people and benefits have been increased.

The thing that bothers me with reference to the situation is something that I do not believe the Federal Government can itself overcome, and that is the refusal of industry to employ people over 45 years of age, very largely because of the proneness of people of that age to become injured or diseased. I am afraid that problem cannot be reached by the Federal Government but must be taken care of by the legislatures of the various States.

I am glad to say that we have made progress in our report and in the bill that has been reported toward the finding of a cure for some of the diseases that have resulted in the loss of human life. For instance, the spread of tuberculosis has been reduced, therefore there is not the trouble from that disease today that there used to be. A treatment has been found so that the disease can be completely arrested.

The ravages of cancer are not on the decline but much progress has been made in connection with this medical problem. Most of the treatment today is operational rather than medical until something is found that will help it from the medical standpoint. Until that time there is not going to be a final solution to that problem.

With reference to the heart situation, because of the fact more people are living to an older age heart diseases have increased in percentage of causes of death. There are improved conditions in connection with many of the other items.

There seems to have been a little progress made in the mental-health situation. On the other hand, more and more institutions are being created and filled with people who are disturbed mentally.

Mr. Chairman, for my own part, the bill presented today is about as good as we can do. Although it is, overall, $66 million below the budget last year and below last year's appropriation, in my opinion, we have taken care as well as can be done of almost everything that it was our responsibility to cover.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me from what I have heard on the floor today that most of the Members of the House are well satisfied with the work that has been done by the subcommittee and by the full Committee on Appropriations in connection with this bill. Of course, members of the Appropriations Committee always have a rather peculiar feeling when we hear applause and words of congratulation from other Members, because we are not used to that. We are not too certain, when everybody congratulates us, that the bill is not overly generous. But I think what happened in this bill is that we have deliberately planned, Mr. Chairman, if we were going to err at all in a bill of this kind, a bill which carries the subjects this bill covers, we should err on the side of generosity.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished chairman has gone into detail on the appropriations made for various National Institutes of Health, for example, but I do not suppose it would hurt to reemphasize what we have done there. In the operating expense field of the whole Institute we have increased last year's appropriation by over $6 million. I hate to boast about increasing appropriations, but this is something that we have got to take proper care of. In the National Cancer Institute our figures are more than $9 million over the 1956 appropriation and more than $2 million over the President's budget. Mental health activities is almost $6 million over 1956 and some $2 million over the President's budget. In the National Heart Institute we have increased the fund by $6,328,000 as against 1956 and increased the President's budget, which was a generous one, by some $3 million. So, it goes down the line, including neurology and blindness activities, where a very substantial increase was allowed, some $4 million or more, and $2 million over the President's budget.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who just preceded me, has properly achieved a national reputation for trying to guard the dollars in the Federal Treasury, and in my very small way I have tried to follow somewhat in his path, and I am not too proud to increase appropriations for 1957, but in this health field—of course, this is only a small part of this bill; I think we have some 50 to 60 separate divisions in it—but in this particular field, research for health, a study of the great killers of mankind, heart disease, cancer, and all the other ailments which are distressing and fatal to so much of our population, the committee unanimously felt that if we were going to make any mistakes at all, we were going to make them on the side of generosity. The progress in these fields and the progress in our research has been, I should say, slow and in some respects disappointing, but on the other hand there is always presented to us a very substantial amount of hope that we are on the verge of something really big. In the meantime we are making encouraging and steady progress. I think the committee as a whole has done all that it properly could to encourage the dedicated men in these institutes to continue the work in their field.

Mr. Chairman, there are many items in the bill which might be referred to, but I think as a whole the bill has been received by the House with approval, and I see no point in laboring the details.

In other sections of the bill, we found opportunities for saving, and the whole bill is actually down by $116 million.

I urge the House to support this bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am intensely interested in the subject matter of the appropriations bill now under consideration. It deals with the different health programs that have been inaugurated by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. During my long service on this committee I have been identified with the different research activities that have been adopted. I confess that notwithstanding the wide and varied jurisdiction of the committee, there has been no part of it that has appealed to me so much as that which relates to the establishment of facilities and studies to improve the health of our people, provide the necessary care of them in time of illness and promote research programs to find ways and means of alleviating the pain and suffering of those who are ill, as well as to discover preventive means to curtail the cause of illness, with particular reference to that class of illnesses that produce the greatest number of patients.

The several research activities to which we have given special consideration are as follows: National Cancer Institute, mental health activities, National Heart Institute, dental health activities, arthritis and metabolic disease activities, microbiology activities, neurology and blindness activities. It will be recognized that these programs, which are all included in the National Institutes of Health, cover those diseases and illnesses that are commonly recognized as our greatest killers, or causing the greatest degree of individual pain and suffering.

In addition to the appropriations to carry on the research activities to which I have referred, amounting to $135,525,000, there is also being appropriated by this bill approximately $35 million by way of general assistance to States for venereal diseases, tuberculosis, communicable diseases, sanitary engineering and hospital construction grants of $111 million. And, this is only a partial statement of what is being done. There is much more than could be enumerated, but that which I have mentioned is sufficient to give an idea of the worthwhile work that is being done to promote the health of our people. It is gratifying to me to realize that over a period of years I have had the opportunity of participating in this fine work, and particularly gratifying to me that much of it was done when I had the honor of being chairman of the committee, when there was a Republican majority in the House.

It is my hope, as I look into the future, that there will be a continual expanding of the health program so that even greater good can be achieved in promoting the health of our people. We take pride in the fact that our Nation stands first, among the nations of the world, in many worthwhile activities, now, notwithstanding the interest we have taken as a Nation in matters affecting the health of our people, yet, there is much more than can and should be done.

That which the present administration recommends to be done was set forth in a comprehensive message of President Eisenhower addressed to the Congress on Thursday, January 26, 1956.

In presenting his recommendations to the Congress, the President very appropriately called attention to the fact that in the decade since World War II, the average life span has increased about 5½ years, mainly as a result of the control of childhood infections and the major communicable diseases. Meanwhile the chronic diseases, afflicting predominantly older people, have become a critical problem. The two leading killers combined, heart disease and cancer, caused about 60 percent of United States deaths in 1945 and nearly 70 percent in 1955.

The increased life span has brought new and additional problems, specifically affecting our aged. This is in addition to the need for increased facilities created by a continually increasing population. The difficulties in properly caring for the sick in our midst has reached proportions that call for serious consideration and relief. The increasing expense incident to such has not only become a burden upon government—Federal, State, and local—but also a heavy burden upon individuals and families.

It is to meet this situation that Congress has provided an expanded program for Federal assistance in providing facilities for prevention, diagnosis, treatment, extended care, and rehabilitation. Today it also includes aid for the construction of hospitals for general use, hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, nursing homes, diagnostic centers or diagnostic and treatment centers, and rehabilitation facilities. As a result of Federal assistance there have been 2,650 projects benefited. This aid, together with that which has come from State, local, and private sources, has given an increase of 123,000 beds and 580 health centers. All of this has been an addition to the Nation's health plan.

There is much more to be said in support of the present program and that which comes within the President's recommendation. It is my purpose to deal with it in more detail as the session progresses and additional legislation comes before us for consideration with respect to a further expansion of our health program.

The bill now before us is entitled to have the support of the entire Congress.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with other Members of the House who have spoken on the excellent work done by this subcommittee. It is one of the very hard working subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee and one from which many blessings flow. Under the vital leadership of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] this subcommittee has done much to foster the magnificent advances and contributions which medical science has made to the health and welfare of mankind. Mr. FOGARTY has a firm grasp, not only of the cold figures which make up appropriations budgets, but as well of the human problems which can only be solved through expenditures of proper amounts of money.

Like the gentleman from Rhode Island, I am very much interested in the problems of the aging. The aging find themselves victims, not so much of infectious diseases as of chronic diseases such as cancer and heart disease; and if there is any discovery of the causes or cures for cancer or heart disease, thus eliminating the killers and cripplers of so many of our people, much credit can go to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

When the committee brings in such a fine bill, it is difficult to say that it erred in any respect. Yet I cannot escape the conclusion that it failed to grant a sufficient appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to deal with the problems of the aging. Perhaps the fault is that of the Department itself, for the subcommittee granted all the funds it requested for this purpose. Regardless of that fact, however, the amount allowed, approximately $65,000, is woefully inadequate. In requesting this amount, the Department bids fair to continue to neglect the health, education, and welfare of the older persons of our country for the next year, as it has done in the years gone by. Our older people have special problems which require special attention. If the amount is not increased, it means that the Federal Government will continue along the road of negligence and postponement until it can no longer evade its responsibility.

According to the Council of State Governments, our older people are particularly subject to unequal opportunity for employment, inferior housing, separation from family and friends, widowhood for more than one-half of the older women, inadequate medical care, lack of insurance against hospitalization, tremendous increase in placement in mental hospitals, loneliness, underrepresentation in programs of rehabilitation and education, lack of personnel especially trained for helping older persons with their problems.

What has the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare done about these problems? Practically nothing. The Social Security Administration deals with certain aspects, the Public Health Service deals with others, the National Institutes of Health deal with others, but there is no firm hand or group coordinating their activities or correlating the work which they turn out.

Last year the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] asked Secretary Hobby why additional progress was not being made. Mrs. Hobby, in reply, confessed that the Federal Government was 10 years behind the position it should have been in for dealing with the problem. And yet this year, the Department asked the committee for an appropriation of only $65,000, a totally inadequate sum.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the other gentlemen on the committee have sought to press the Department into taking a greater interest in the problems of the aging, to no avail.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment when the time comes for reading the bill, which will increase the amount appropriated to that portion of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare which is concerned with the problems of our people aged 65 and over. My amendment is directed to carrying out the recommendations of the Council of State Governments and proposes to achieve the objectives that they have in mind.

I think it is about time we strengthened our old-age and survivors insurance, which is not a part of this bill, except in the appropriations made. We need better housing. We need more sufficient medical care for our older people. We need greater opportunities for their employment. We need a more intensive rehabilitation and recreation service. But these objectives will never be achieved if the indifference which seems to be exhibited by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare continues.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] may revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in considering H. R. 9720, the bill which appropriates money for the operation of the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, I hope my colleagues will recognize the wisdom of the appropriation for research included in the bill.

A segment of our population has too long been neglected, and I commend our

colleague the gentleman from Rhode Island, Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, for his untiring efforts to make money available for research projects which will improve the health of our citizens.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, in coming to the floor this afternoon, I do so with a very real sense of pleasure and sincere gratitude to the members of this committee for the unusually fine work they have done on this appropriation bill.

It is not easy, when one's efforts must be always under the shadow of the need for economy in Government, to bring to this Chamber a bill which increases rather than reduces the amounts requested. But our committee has gone into the requests of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with vision and a real understanding of the vital matters it contains and has brought to us a well-considered liberal program we can all happily support.

May I thank the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and the distinguished ranking minority Member from New York [Mr. TABER], as well as every member of the committee for the care with which their study of our needs has been made and the courage with which they have brought their conclusions to us. In doing so I am but expressing the gratitude of millions of our own people who anticipate most especially the continuing and additional research to which we all look for release from the devastation of diseases for which currently we have no cure.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not just for our own people alone that we continue and increase the research work in the broad health field. This work is for all mankind, for just as illness in one country or in one area eventually affects the health of all the world, so improved health conditions and cures for the terrible scourges flesh is heir to, are for all men everywhere.

Nothing this Congress could do could be more far reaching than these more liberal provisions for research and for the general program in health. It will slip past the Iron Curtain as few things could. It will demonstrate to men and women everywhere that the United States, the greatest constitutional Republic the world has ever seen, cares about the individual and brings its wisdom and its financial capacity to bear to relieve his suffering and increase his well-being.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to express appreciation once again for the selfless bipartisanship with which this subcommittee of our great Appropriations Committee performs its duties. We in our turn can do no less than to pass the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the accomplishments of medical science since the days of Drs. Harvey and Pasteur are among the brightest pages of history, but there remains much to be done. The two dreaded killers, cancer and heart disease, remain among the mysteries of medical problems with neither a preventive nor a cure being known. Our own ranks, our friends, and our families, are no strangers to either the stark tragedy of a torturing death from cancer or the sudden shocking stroke of the grim reaper through heart diseases. Medical science can do little in either case and there is little if any warning in the approach of the latter.

The success of medical research in other fields gives us every reason to believe that it will eventually conquer these two great plagues which between them account for 2 of every 3 deaths in this country. Such research requires both dedicated scientists and money. Our schools, given time and opportunity, will develop the scientists, but the financial requirements are so great that there is no hope of obtaining adequate funds for the job unless this body takes the lead and becomes the major contributor. The National Institutes of Health are doing yeoman work in this field but it is necessary that they be given additional support if we expect them to both intensify and expand their activities. Progress in their efforts must not be halted or developments lost in the name of economy. There is another major field, mental health, in which much research remains to be done. Many, altogether too many, able-bodied individuals are slipping into that category now known as the mentally ill each year. Once considered victims of evil spirits, these individuals are now recognized as suffering from diseases of the mind but neither the cause nor a cure is known. They are our living "dead" and no effort to discover the cause or a cure for such illness should be spared.

I do not know how much can be economically invested in these and allied causes each year, but I am ready and willing to be guided by the advice of the specialists who best know the scope of these problems. The National Advisory Councils of each of these Institutes make annual reports advising us as to the minimum amount required to maintain progress in these all important research fields. They are my guide, and I can think of no better one. Each year we have failed to reach, or remotely approach these minimum requirements. In 1952 President Truman recommended a total of $54 million for these three research programs, but his successor in the name of economy reduced these recommendations in a document usually known as the revised budget for 1954 by more than 30 percent to $36.6 million. Some $4 million of this cut was restored by the Members of this body, and I take pride in believing that my efforts had some effect in this action. By 1955 the appropriations for these three programs had been increased to $43 million. The 1957 recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget is a respectable $53 million, but the Advisory Councils recommended $78 million as the minimum necessary to continue these programs. Nothing less should suffice. The three separate items in millions are as follows:

Institutes	Truman budget, 1954	Revised budget, 1954	1956 appropriation	Budget Bureau, 1957	National Advisory Council's 1957 recommendation
Cancer Institute	$22.0	$15.8	$16.2	$20.3	$30.8
Heart Institute	16.5	11.0	13.7	16.4	22.6
Mental Institute	15.5	9.8	13.1	16.2	24.5
Total	54.0	35.0	43.0	52.9	77.9

In a year during which we are increasing appropriations for interest payments by $200 million following a $500 million increase this year, with no increase in the national debt limit, must we admit that this Congress is more concerned with the financial health of our bondholders than we are in the mental and physical health of our individual citizens?

The interest cost for the fiscal year of 1955 was $6.5 billion. The 1957 estimate is $7.1 billion without a change in the national debt limit. Only $3 of each $100 of this 2-year increase would be required to meet the recommendations of the advisory councils.

The Appropriations Committee has increased the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget by $10 million. This will increase the research funds for each of these institutes by $1 million. This is real progress in the right direction which I heartily endorse, but I hope the recommendations of the national advisory councils headed by outstanding authorities such as Dr. Paul White will be given more consideration in the future.

The funds for vocational education authorized by the George-Barden Act in the present budget recommendation total $26,500,000, the same as was appropriated last year. These funds are matched by local and State funds at a variable ratio which in the fiscal year ending 1955 was $4.43 of State and local funds for each dollar of Federal appropriations. The Appropriations Committee has increased this recommendation to $29,267,000 which approximates the full authorization of $29,300,000 under the George-Barden Act. Each dollar of this two and three-quarter million dollar increase means more than $5 for vocational education when matched by State and local funds. The approval of this increase will mean much to the future of this country. The Budget Bureau recommended that grants to States and other agencies for vocational rehabilitation be increased by three and one-quarter million dollars to a total of $37 million.

The Appropriations Committee has seen fit to decrease this amount to $35 million. I feel that the committee was in error in this action. This is a 50-percent

reduction in the funds for research. Mr. E. B. Whitten, of the National Vocational Rehabilitation Association, says that this reduction means two things:

First, that research now underway on disabling conditions and rehabilitation methods will have to be cut back or some projects discontinued entirely.

Second, it means a complete halt to any new research during the coming fiscal year.

I think we should recognize him as an authority on the subject and give his statement full consideration.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address a few remarks concerning the report of the Committee on Appropriations for the Office of Education. I note with approval that increased funds are recommended, but it is with regret that I notice the amount is not up to the full amount requested by the President.

The need for improving education in this Nation is so great and the problems of providing more education are so pressing that I need not elaborate on that point before this body. I would call attention to the fact that more than half a million citizens in every State and Territory of this Nation took active part in educational conferences this past year which led up to the White House Conference in this city. Here, representatives from all parts of the Nation, after careful study and discussion, came to important conclusions. I should like to quote from their statements concerning the United States Office of Education:

The United States Office of Education should be adequately staffed to perform the functions it is now performing in making reports on the progress of education throughout the Nation, in carrying on essential research activities, and for providing promptly needed statistical information.

Consideration should be given to the strengthening of the position of the Office of Education in keeping with the importance of education to the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I read that passage, and then I see that the Appropriations Committee has reduced the modest request of $6 million for the Office of Education by $1½ million. That request included less than $2 million for educational research and for gathering and processing of educational statistics. I feel compelled to express extreme regret that the full amount was not recommended. It is gratifying to see the approval of the full requested amount for research on problems of educating the mentally retarded. But, Mr. Chairman, I would call to your attention that with the reduced total proposed for the Office of Education, when allowance is made for the full amount for research on the education of the mentally retarded, there is very, very little for research in these problem areas for which a total of about $1¼ million had been proposed. Here are the problems on which research is proposed besides the problems of educating the mentally retarded:

(a) Development of special abilities of students, that is, research to discover ways of getting the most efficient education for the ablest youth.

(b) School problems of preventing and dealing with juvenile delinquency.

(c) Factors in student retention and withdrawal in schools and colleges, so that we may reduce the loss of able students who fail to prepare themselves for some of our shortage fields.

(d) Securing and retaining adequate staff for the Nation's schools.

(e) Planning and costs of school construction.

(f) Educational problems due to our expanding educational program.

It is high time, I suggest, that we supported fully and significantly research on these problems that are essential to the advancement of efficiency of the education of the Nation's greatest asset, its youth.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that if we were to question the wisdom of the Office of Education in its proposed budget request for research on these problems it should be because it has not moved boldly enough. The committee has proposed that funds for medical research in the National Institutes of Health be increased by $10 million over the $126,525,000 that was requested. I think that is fine. But when I look at this action I find it difficult to see the justification for not approving at least in full the small amount requested for research in education. Here the Federal Government would be providing an educational service to the Nation through making available the findings of research to improve education without in any way providing Federal control.

I should like to clarify one point in the committee report which implies that the Office of Education proposes to establish a new library. I quote from the appropriation justification:

Advice from educational experts brought in to counsel on office research, and experience of the office professional staff, indicated that the present library is inadequate and should be supplemented by additional facilities and services essential to our research program. The lack of research reference services was also considered a deterrent to present studies, a barrier to the larger-scale research plan for fiscal year 1957, and a handicap to research planning by educators who need such service and are unable to secure it in their institutions.

It is essential to provide funds to enable the Office to supplement existing service of the Central Departmental Library, to develop a source for research information and also a clearinghouse for research in the field of education.

Just to keep the record straight I would note that the proposed amount is to supplement the existing library and to reinstitute a research clearinghouse service which was given up by the Office of Education several years ago when its budget was reduced and which persons engaged in educational research have recommended be reinstituted and expanded.

Once more may I express my gratification that the committee has seen fit to recommend increased funds for the Office of Education, and to suggest that I hope our colleagues in the Senate, upon further study of the request of the President will see fit to ask us to concur in appropriating the full amount of $6 million.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, earlier in my praise of the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], I mentioned the funds to be appropriated for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. It is, of course, inadequate to grant this outstanding and distinguished Service, a boon to management, labor, government, and consumer, the slash contemplated. The cut contemplated must be restored; $266,000 must be put back in the bill. Here is why:

Though some in the land have cried peace, progress, and prosperity, strikes on the American scene appear to indicate a mounting tide of ill-will toward men and management. Else, how does one explain the long, drawn-out Westinghouse strike, the Capital Transit strike of last summer here in Washington, and the strike of Southern Bell Telephone Co.? Clearly, there is need in these, as there has been, fullest funds for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. This Service faces a 7½-percent increase in operating costs in salaries and wages. Its costs for travel and hotel and per diem factors have risen exceedingly sharp. To cut the bill now before us from $3,390,000 to $3,124,000 or $266,000 in this Service is, in effect, to cut its heart out, with layoffs amidst skilled personnel, just when they are needed.

I trust that the cut will be restored and that the $266,000 is put back into the bill to accommodate the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, a crackerjack if ever there is one.

ADEQUATE FUNDS FOR THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION TO PROTECT THE HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the item of $6,779,000 in this appropriation bill for the Food and Drug Administration, while a substantial increase over last year's budget request—is not nearly enough to cover the needs of the Food and Drug Administration in protecting the health of our people.

It does not begin to go far enough in carrying out the recommendations of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, which called for a threefold to fourfold increase in the funds and facilities of the Food and Drug Administration. The Citizens' Advisory Committee suggested that such an expansion take place over a period of 5 to 10 years. But a whole year has gone by without having added a single cent to the budget for this Agency in carrying out the Citizens' Advisory Committee's recommendations. We are a full year late in getting started on that.

When the subcommittee was conducting hearings on this bill, I urged a figure of $8 million for the Food and Drug Administration, rather than the $6,779,000 in the budget. I believe $8 million would be more realistic. I do not intend to try to amend the bill here on the House floor, because I am advised such an amendment

would not be agreed to by the committee, and would be defeated. If the Senate increases the amount for the Food and Drug Administration, I would not want to have an adverse House vote on record to be used against the higher figure in the conference committee. So I shall not submit an amendment.

But I do want the RECORD to show my feelings on this, and, under permission of the House, I submit for printing in the RECORD at this point the statement which I made to the subcommittee, as follows:

ADEQUATE FUNDS FOR THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION TO PROTECT THE HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Statement by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, before House Appropriations Subcommittee on Funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

I very much appreciate the courtesy of Chairman FOGARTY in permitting me to bring to the attention of the subcommittee the urgent necessity for increased funds for the Food and Drug Administration for the administration of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, and thus for the protection of the health of every American—every man, woman, and child in our country.

As the members of the subcommittee know, I have been seeking ever since coming to Congress to obtain more adequate funds for the Food and Drug Administration, an agency of Government which I think in the last few years has been treated rather shabbily. Over a period of years from 1939 to 1951, there was a steady growth in the appropriations for this agency, and in fiscal 1952 and 1953, the appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration reached their highest level. Then an almost incredible thing happened.

Instead of maintaining this essential growth and expansion in the funds of the Food and Drug Administration to take into account the constantly expanding responsibilities of this agency in coping with the expanded use of frozen and processed foods and so many new drugs and cosmetics, we saw the funds of the Food and Drug Administration actually cut for 2 years in a row—first by $400,000 and then by $500,000 respectively below the levels of 1952 and 1953.

RECENT BUDGET CUTS WERE BAD MISTAKES

I was among those who opposed those cuts. I think they were mistakes. Those cuts meant a 15-percent reduction in personnel, and also the curtailment of field travel by inspectors and also a slowing down in the processing of complaints and prosecutions.

When I complained of these reductions in funds and urged an increase in appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration rather than the series of reductions in funds which took place in both the 1st and 2d sessions of the 83d Congress, I was informed that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare thought there should be a comprehensive restudy of the work of the agency to see whether it was doing a good job or whether it was just interfering with and persecuting and annoying legitimate business. So we had the funds appropriated for a study by an advisory committee.

That advisory committee reported last year. It reported that the Food and Drug Administration did one of the most important jobs of any Government agency. It reported that in contrast to the action of the new administration in 1953 and 1954 in reducing funds by $400,000 and $500,000 respectively below the levels of President Truman's budget recommendations for the Food and Drug Administration, we should begin immediately on a tremendous expansion of the work of this agency and of the funds for its work so that over a 5- to 10-year period there should be a threefold to fourfold increase. This would mean a budget of from $16,800,000 to $22,400,000, rather than the $5 million or so we had been appropriating for this agency under Mrs. Hobby.

VAST EXPANSION RECOMMENDED

The committee recommended an increase of from 10 to 20 percent in the first year of such an expansion program. Consequently, I introduced last July H. R. 7287 to do the following:

"That in order to make possible on an efficient organizational basis an immediate start on a fourfold expansion of the personnel and facilities of the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare within a period of 5 to 10 years, as recommended by the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration, appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a report to the Secretary dated June 30, 1955, an additional sum of $1,096,800 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to be used by that agency in employing additional inspectors, chemists, and other scientific experts, for a substantially enlarged educational and informational program, and otherwise to begin to put into effect the recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration thus assisting the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate steps necessary to overcome the present serious deficiency because of lack of funds in its ability to meet its essential responsibility of protecting the public health."

NO ACTION IN 1956 FISCAL YEAR

Unfortunately, even though the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, had before her this report from her own advisory committee on the urgent necessity of an immediate 10- to 20-percent increase in funds for the Food and Drug Administration to begin a 5- to 10-year program leading to a three- to four-fold increase in funds of the agency, I could not get any support for my bill last year to carry through an immediate increase as recommended by the advisory committee. The Food and Drug Administration could have been engaged during this entire fiscal year in the expanded program recommended by the advisory committee. Instead it had to get along on less money than was provided under the Truman administration.

Now for the coming fiscal year, the administration is recommending an increase in funds of about $1 million for the Food and Drug Administration beginning next July 1. A whole year will have gone by following the report of the Advisory Committee before a single additional dollar will have been provided. I think this is tragic.

REALISTIC FIGURE NOW WOULD BE $8 MILLION

Of course I support the increase recommended in the President's budget for the Food and Drug Administration—it is almost the identical figure contained in the bill I introduced last year for an increase which could have been in effect now since last July. I would urge this subcommittee not only to accept the amount suggested by the President and his advisers which works out to about $1 million more for regular continuing operations; I would urge that you add much more to that amount. I cannot tell you exactly how much the Food and Drug Administration could use advantageously in this coming fiscal year; but I am sure that an $8 million figure would not be out of line. In other words, over and above the additional $1 million for regular continuing work of the agency as recommended by the President, I would suggest an additional $1,220,000 for a round figure of $8 million.

And I would urge that the committee provide that this additional money be used for a substantial strengthening of the inspection staff, as well as for a strengthening of the headquarters staff.

According to one of the top officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the additional $1 million recommended in the Budget for the Food and Drug Administration will hardly do any more than bring the personnel up to the level of the agency's staff in 1952 under President Truman, before the new administration came in and began slashing the agency. And if this budget item is finally approved by Congress as recommended by the President we would still have only about 300 inspectors on the rolls 16 months from now—by June 30, 1957—in contrast to the 250 on the rolls at the present time and in contrast to the goal of 1,000 inspectors recommended by the advisory committee.

BUDGET BREAKDOWN RAISES QUESTIONS

In analyzing, or in trying to analyze the breakdown submitted by the President on the Detail of Personal Services accompanying the Budget, it struck me that most of the additional money for personal services for the Food and Drug Administration provided for in the President's budget seems to be for the very low-paying jobs with just a very few additional persons provided for in the upper salary ranges. Thus, it would mean adding only 2 or 3 people above $10,000 a year, and only a handful in the grade 13 range which goes from $8,990 to $10,065. It seems to me also that a good number of the grade 12 jobs from $7,570 to $8,645 which are added under the new budget seem to be mostly upgrading of existing jobs rather than addition of new jobs in this vital field of inspector and food and drug officer in the field. I would like to see far more people added in the upper grades applying to food and drug inspectors and officers than in the GS–3, GS–4, GS–5, and GS–7 grades where so much of the additional personnel apparently will be added under this increased amount recommended by the President. I am sure the Food and Drug Administration can train these experts and get them into the field where they are needed if you will just provide the funds.

THE NEED IS URGENT

In conclusion I would like to say that I appreciate the interest of this subcommittee in the very important area of food and drug inspection. I know that if the administration were to ask for more adequate funds, you would give such a request your sympathetic consideration. I know that you are reluctant to recommend more money for any Government agency than the amount the President asks for. I nevertheless feel I must in this case ask you to do just that—that is, provide not only the additional $1 million or so recommended by the President in the funds of the Food and Drug Administration but an additional $1,220,000 beyond that to make the total for salaries and expenses of the Food and Drug Administration $8 million rather than $6,779,000.

We already know that the inspectors can only get around to about 11,000 establishments a year out of the 96,000 or so which should be covered. Even under the proposed budget of $6,779,000 they could inspect only about 13,800 establishments. I don't think that is good enough.

I am pleased that even if it took it a year to do so, the administration has finally come around to asking for an increase of Food and Drug Administration funds of $1 million over the amount appropriated last year. But a whole year has gone by. The needs are greater. The Food and Drug Administration has had this entire year to work out a plan for expanding its facilities and its work as recommended by the advisory committee.

Let us give it the funds to do the job, to do it right.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, no Member of the House could wish for a better committee assignment than that of serving on the subcommittee which makes appropriations for labor, health, education, and welfare, and which has reported the bill now being considered.

In the first place, our chairman, JOHN FOGARTY, is always courteous, cooperative and thoughtful of the members of the subcommittee. Moreover, there is a spirit of harmony and good will among the members of the committee both Democratic and Republican.

Hearings are always interesting and highly informative, dealing as they do with the very human problems of health, education, and welfare. Before us come the Nation's outstanding physicians, scientists, and experts in medical matters to tell us of progress in the arts of healing and the diagnosis and treatment of the diseases that afflict mankind. This year has proven no exception but has rather increased our admiration for our chairman, our respect for each other and our interest in the human problems and their solutions.

I am especially happy to know that there is an ever increasing interest in the problem of our aged and an ever growing determination on the part of the subcommittee to see that something is done to solve these problems. Then too the increased interest in maternal and child welfare with a special emphasis on the problem of the retarded or exceptional child is noteworthy and encouraging.

In the field of education, we have been successful in agreeing upon ever increasing appropriations for vocational education so vital in this day of technical and engineering advances when the need for skilled workers grows apace.

In the field of medical research, we have been as generous as we thought proper consistent with the programs of research and training which the National Institutes of Health have ready for launching. We have actually appropriated more than they requested knowing that they were, no doubt, acting under wraps imposed by the Bureau of the Budget. There was ample authority for the increases we have made as a result of the testimony of experts in the field of heart disease, cancer, arthritis and metabolic diseases, neurological diseases and mental disorders as well as other vital health fields.

I am sure we have come up with a well balanced bill and one that all of you can afford to support.

Again I want to express my appreciation to the chairman for his never-failing kindness and courtesy, for the way he has expedited the hearings without denying anyone a chance to be heard and to the other members of the committee for the good feeling and fellowship that has existed and the cooperative spirit with which every member has taken part in our investigations and the marking up of the bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, in February we celebrated the birthdates of two immortal Americans—Abraham Lincoln and George Washington. We keep the memory of their births as beginning lives full of service to their country which made each a hero in the crisis of his time.

One left his Virginia farm to rally and lead the forces of the American Revolution against all odds at Valley Forge, Trenton, Monmouth, and Yorktown to make our country free. The other emerged from a Hoosier boyhood to become the Great Emancipator, the humble prophet of American destiny, preserving our Union in the dread upheaval of a century ago and committing to the ages his eloquence at Gettysburg.

One never thinks of Lincoln without remembering also that his life was snuffed out by violence; he was cut down by the bullet of an assassin.

But probably no more than a handful of people can recount how Washington died—how his death chamber was the scene of violence done to him at the hands of men. These circumstances which hastened Washington's death are so amazing to hear in our own times that I think the contrast points a challenge to us for action today.

In December 1799, General Washington returned from a horseback ride in the rain and suffered an attack of laryngitis. First one physician, and then two more were called in to treat him. We can assume the physicians were competent ones for their time, as Washington was one of the wealthiest and most famous men in the country.

The records tell us, at any rate, that Washington received the kind of treatment that was characteristic of medicine at the time: he was bled heavily four times; he received a gargle of molasses, butter, and vinegar; and a blister of crushed beetles was placed at his throat and on his feet. Apparently no one looked inside his throat.

It is no surprise to us, 150 years later, that, with this, Washington soon weakened, lapsed, and died. Such treatment given a national figure in our day and age would, in fact, be regarded as assassination. In those times it was the accepted practice, and we may be most astonished, perhaps, that so many patients lived in spite of their medical care.

But we must not belittle those doctors of earlier times, nor should we feel too complacent or self-satisfied because of the progress we have made over their methods. Anyone who studies American history, or examines the Constitution which was written by contemporaries of Washington's doctors, will realize that the men of Washington's generation had wisdom and intelligence. The brains of the doctors in Washington's time were as good as the brains of our doctors are today.

Washington died from a minor ailment, but not because men had lesser minds than men have today. Washington died because his doctors could only draw on a reservoir of knowledge and medical understanding which was extremely limited. Conditions were such in those days that it had not been possible to do any extensive medical research, and a doctor had to work on a hit-or-miss basis, with little to depend upon but his own best judgment.

Today, if we are ill, our doctor can use materials and knowledge and carefully recorded experience which others before him have placed at his disposal. We need a doctor with a good mind and a good education, but unless research and study have created a sufficient reservoir of knowledge and materials from which he may draw, then even the most brilliant physician is powerless.

Yes, we have come a long way since Washington's time. In some primitive parts of the world, the sick are still leeched, administered concoctions of herbs, and wrapped in wet sheets and girdles: but not here—not in this country. At our disposal is the modern physician, armed with all the skills, techniques, instruments and drugs of modern medicine.

We may well be grateful to him, for because of his art, our average span of life is more than 68 years—about twice that in Washington's time, and 21 more years of life than could be expected by people who were born at the beginning of this century.

We take our long life span for granted; indeed, children born in the next decade can expect to live much longer than the Biblical three-score years and ten. We are more likely to forget what we owe to science; and if we remember, on occasion, we think of scientific progress as a series of spontaneous discoveries made by great men. We think of names which have been made popular through newspapers, books, and films: Pasteur, Ehrlich, Koch, and—only recently—Dr. Jonas Salk. We do not take time to remember that the conquest of disease has come about as the slow, sometimes tedious march of many men, steadily proceeding at their tasks over a period of many years.

The great discoverers themselves know this, however. This year the Congress paid tribute to Dr. Jonas Salk on behalf of the American people by awarding him a gold medal. In his acceptance of that medal, Dr. Salk said that the Congress was really paying homage to the thousands of other scientists whose contributions over a period of 40 years had made the development of the poliomyelitis vaccine possible.

We have seen many diseases conquered without truly realizing it. Years ago, smallpox was a terrible scourge; today, it is almost impossible to find a case of smallpox to demonstrate to medical students. Today, most of our children are receiving preventive drugs for typhus, diphtheria and many other infectious diseases, and these have also become a rarity. New methods of sanitation have virtually abolished typhoid as a killer in the United States, and the scourge of yellow fever is but a memory in the history books of our country. Indeed, for both of these disorders, we also have vaccines for those persons, civilian or military, who may have to enter epidemic areas.

If we can prevent many diseases, we can treat even more of them. During the past decade, medical science has brought to wide application the sulfa drugs, the antibiotics, and finally the steroid hormones such as cortisone and related agents.

The record of successful treatment with these materials has been extraor-

dinary: the death rate from pneumonia cut 50 percent; influenza, 77 percent; acute rheumatic fever, 66 percent; syphilis, 56 percent, and tuberculosis deaths reduced 50 percent. And while there are no complete records yet on the beneficial effects of the steroid hormones, we know that arthritis is no longer the crippler it once was, and that many eye disorders no longer blind their victims because of the great healing power of these agents.

The new drugs especially dramatize the new science, but we should not forget other products of medical research—X-rays and cobalt rays, blood transfusions and blood substitutes, the artificial heart and the artificial kidney, anesthetics and the pain-killing drugs. Let us remember gratefully that the surgical patient once faced the knife in full consciousness, a wooden block between his lips. Let us remember that a hundred years ago the hospitals were called "pest houses" and that to enter them was virtually a death sentence.

While we are grateful we are also immediately concerned with the many diseases which still plague us. We have paid a price for longer life, for it is in later life that the chronic diseases begin to take their toll. No average family in this Nation, rich or poor, has not lost one member because of premature death by cancer or heart disease, or suffered crippling by a mental, rheumatic or neurological disease. On the whole country still lies a vast burden of physical suffering and poverty brought on by chronic disease.

In this year, 1956, we have come far since Washington's time, but we still have far to go.

Let us look at some of the facts:

More than 2,100 persons die each day from heart diseases, causing 53 percent of all deaths in the United States. Almost 10 million persons presently have heart disease, causing the loss of 176 million man-days of work each year.

More than 200,000 persons will die of cancer this year, and one out of every 7 Americans will die of this disease unless new methods of treatment are found. Because of cancer, 113,000 man-years are lost each year.

More than half of the country's hospital beds are occupied by mental patients—700,000 of them—the majority in tax-supported hospitals. More than 2½ million men were rejected by the Army or discharged from it for reasons of mental illness during World War II, a larger number than our total forces in the Pacific theater of operations.

There are more than 10 million sufferers from arthritis and other rheumatic diseases, 1 million of whom are gravely disabled. Another 10 million are affected by the neurological diseases—cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy and muscular dystrophy—and half of these are gravely disabled.

And these are only some of the facts.

The facts are discouraging, but the lessons of the past are hopeful. In Washington's day, no one could have envisioned the conquest of disease as we have known it. But we are fortunate in knowing that by looking at progress in the past, we can foresee what the future holds—a time when medical science will have found the means for controlling most of the chronic diseases. We cannot know when that time will come, but we can have faith that it will happen.

Faith alone, of course, is not an adequate stimulus to medical progress; medical progress comes through the efforts of men. We have realized that in this country during the past decade, industry, labor, and government have increasingly lent their support to medical research. Through the efforts of the public alone, the great voluntary health associations have arisen and grown—such organizations as the National Cancer Society, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, the American Heart Association, the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, United Cerebral Palsy, and the National Foundation for Crippled Children and Adults. Through such agencies as these the ill have been rendered assistance and human illness challenged by scientific investigation.

The Government, too, through the Congress, has long recognized its responsibility for support of medical research and research training. One of the major expressions of this responsibility was the creation and support of the National Institutes of Health, the main research arm of the United States Public Health Service. Through these Institutes, the Government maintains and operates its own research laboratories and hospital in Bethesda, Md., just outside Washington. And through these Institutes, grants of funds are made to universities and scientists to conduct worthwhile medical research in laboratories throughout the country.

During the past 10 years, the Congress has constantly raised the Institutes' appropriations for support of research into cancer, heart disease, mental and neurological diseases, arthritis and diabetes, and many other disorders. In 1946, the Federal appropriation for medical research totaled $3,414,700. This figure has been increased many times over, until last year $97,573,000 was appropriated for that purpose. The sum which the Appropriations Committee recommends be appropriated this year totals approximately $136 million.

As a member of the subcommittee which deals with this appropriation, I think the Congress may well be proud of this. We may well be proud that this program has always had the support and approval of both political parties. It has also had the approval of the Nation's physicians, the deans of medical schools, and the executives of the voluntary health organizations. Each year, representing the public, these men and women come to Washington and appear before our subcommittee to testify for significant increases in the Health Institutes' appropriations.

In spite of this unanimous support of medical research, however—in spite of its meaning to the Nation's health and welfare—the total national research effort last year, from both public and private sources, was only about $250 million, and this figure was at its alltime high.

Last year, $1,407,933,000 was appropriated for research activities of the Department of Defense. But our appropriation last year for medical research was a mere $97.6 million.

That medical research appropriation does not loom very large when compared with our total national defense budget of some $35 billion. And let me make some more detailed comparisons: Recently, we spent more than $260 million in a year to develop and test atomic weapons. But we appropriated less than $19 million last year for heart-disease research. We spend $216 million to build one aircraft carrier. We appropriated last year less than $25 million for cancer research.

In the fiscal year 1955, the Navy Department, alone, spent more than $61 million for research and development of guided missiles and related equipment, while the 1956 appropriation for mental-health research was less than $18 million. One Air Force bomber costs $9 million, and last year we appropriated barely more than that for research in neurology and blindness. One atomic submarine cost $40 million to build, but the appropriation last year for research in arthritis and metabolic diseases was less than $11 million.

These sums spent for military equipment and research are all worthwhile expenditures, and they are necessary. But I mention them to bring out some idea of how very little, in comparison, we spend on programs to save human lives.

In hearing the testimony presented this year, I felt more encouraged by the reports of Government witnesses and people of the medical profession than at any other time while I have been a member of this subcommittee. I feel that great progress has been made since 1951, when I first became closely concerned with this appropriation and had occasion to study the research programs. However, there is still much to be done.

Research progress, of course, is not bought by money itself. Money, however, supports the investigator: it buys time for research. Money provides the researcher with the facilities, the equipment and the instruments for research. Money will provide for the training of other investigators, and it is well to point out that under present research training programs the investigators of today will be barely replaced by the investigator of tomorrow. Money, therefore, while no guaranty of research progress, is a guaranty of the research effort from which we have benefited so much in the past.

There is no choice, it seems to me, but to assemble a research attack on the chronic diseases to fit our need. I believe that the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health proposed by the Committee on Appropriations meet that need within the present limits of available research manpower and facilities. We cannot sensibly withhold our support of this proposal. We will measure its benefits for years to come.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as I have said over the past several years when this annual appropriation bill for the Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments has come before us, there is perhaps, no measure upon

which we act here that more vitally affects the lives of so many of our American citizens.

The appropriation we grant under this measure and the regulatory provisions governing the spending of the appropriation are designed to improve continuously the Christian, civilized working conditions of our people and to protect and advance the health of all our citizens, particularly children, women, and the aged. It is obvious, therefore, that this appropriations bill is of the greatest importance to the progress of our national welfare and that is why each of us has the highest obligation to devote the most conscientious attention to it.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, my colleague from Rhode Island, is one of the foremost experts on this subject in the country, and I am certain he enjoys the fullest confidence of this body and appreciation for the superlative manner in which he has presented and explained it to us for the past 6 years.

I am in thorough agreement with the positive necessity for practicing wise economy in every Government expenditure and the most careful scrutiny to insure against the temptations of waste and extravagance. However, I also submit that it is very dangerous to try to measure the health and happiness of human beings by the mere material yardstick of cold currency. It would, indeed, be economic folly to take a chance on lowering our national standards of productive working conditions and health protection for the mere sake of bookkeeping figures. It is, therefore, with the utmost conscientious conviction I urge you to support the full appropriation figures unanimously recommended by the subcommittee and, indeed, under some items, I would be inclined to favor greater increases, for instance, in the appropriation of State grants for unemployment compensation, their employment services administration, and unemployment compensation for veterans.

In our consideration here, it might be well to emphasize the identification of some of the unit agencies affected by this appropriation bill and almost by their very names, which unfortunately are not as widely publicized for general appreciation as they should be, we realize their beneficial impact upon the country's welfare. First, let me mention just a few that come under the Department of Labor. There are the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Bureau of Employment Security, Bureau of Labor Standards, Bureau of Veterans' Employment Rights, the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, and the Women's Bureau. The value of these bureaus and their divisions to the country in maintaining and encouraging constant improvement in labor conditions and relations in the most productive country in the world is incalculable, both for domestic prosperity and tranquillity, as well as in providing adequate defense against any possible aggressor.

Some of the more vitally important units of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are, the Social Security Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, the United States Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the United States Public Health Service, the Bureau of Medical Services, and the National Institutes of Health. In their various functions these agencies regulate and inspect the distribution and sale of food and drug products to protect the American public from unscrupulous dealers; vocational rehabilitation, a national necessity, is promoted by the Office of Education; the Children's Bureau insures better child and maternal health examination. Under the Institutes of Health, we have the various research programs for continuing work toward the cures for such devastating diseases as heart, cancer, arthritis, rheumatism, as well as mental and dental. These research institutes have been doing and are doing most encouraging work in the fight against the ravages of these terrible afflictions causing, annually, tremendous losses in our economic productivity, not to mention the suffering and unhappiness they visit upon individual lives and families. Progressive discoveries have been made in these recent years prompting us to reasonably feel that a great part of this human misery and economic loss will continue to be greatly alleviated by the wise use of these appropriation funds for persevering research into the health problems of the Nation and that is the chief reason why I am solidly in favor of increasing these particular appropriations by as much, or even more than $10 million.

Last, but not least, I should like to mention the Hill-Burton hospital construction program and the importance of insuring that it is kept in full operation in accord with the original intent of the Congress when it first enacted this measure by unanimous bipartisan vote. The chairman assures us that the appropriations previously made, which as we know are to be available for a 2-year period, are sufficient and they would be unable to spend what they presently still have by the end of this fiscal year. This means that all of the $21 million we appropriated for 1956 will carry forth to 1957, and that should be enough to keep the program going until next year, including the additional four categories of nursing centers, diagnostic centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, and rehabilitation centers. Nevertheless, I exhort you to ever keep this most beneficial program in mind as it has more than proved its value in helping to provide the additional health and hospital facilities so urgently needed to adequately care for our people. I also want to commend the chairman for the increases he has recommended in the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance as well as his advocation of continuing attention and constant planning to aid in the problems of our older people who find it so difficult, and too often impossible, to obtain any employment at all under our current industrial system and practices.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to intrude unnecessarily long upon the time and attention of this body. However, may I repeat that we are acting upon a piece of legislation of fundamental significance to the health and welfare of our country. In our consideration of adequate appropriation to carry out the full objectives of these two major governmental Departments, let us not retreat from or abandon the civilized Christian progress we have steadily maintained since the Good Lord blessed us with an independent and bountiful existence.

At a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies, let us not be neglectful of our own citizens. At a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist barbarism, let us not dangerously reduce any of these public services whose contributions to national progress have been universally acknowledged. At a time when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the curse of communism, let us take no unwise chances of disrupting the high morale of our own good people. In conscience, let us vote in support of the continuing and full functioning of these units and agencies whose services are, indeed, in the national interest and emphatically good for all Americans.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for hospital construction: For payments under parts C and G, title VI, of the act, as amended, to remain available until expended, $111 million, of which $88,800,000 shall be for payments for hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C, $1,200,000 shall be for the purposes authorized in section 636 of the act, and $21 million shall be for payments for facilities pursuant to part G, as follows: $6,500,000 for diagnostic or treatment centers, $6,500,000 for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, $4 million for rehabilitation facilities, and $4 million for nursing homes: *Provided*, That allotments under such parts C and G to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of amounts equal to the limitations specified herein.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, there is one item in the report of the Appropriations Committee with respect to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to which I would like to call special attention.

If you will look on page 28 of the report, you will notice that the committee has recommended a reduction of $19 million in the amount contained in the President's budget for hospital construction grants. This reduction, as is explained in the committee report on page 12, is in the four new categories of construction created under the amendments to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act enacted in 1954. These four categories of much-needed health facility construction are: First, hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired; second, nursing homes; third, diagnostic and treatment

center; and, fourth, rehabilitation facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which reported favorably in 1954 a bill embodying the administration's recommendations creating these categories of construction. I recall very well the testmony on the bill and the thinking of our committee. The philosophy of the 1954 amendments was to give greater emphasis to the kinds of health facility construction we need for the present and particularly for the future. It is well known that, in the past, the emphasis under the Federal-State hospital construction program has been on the building of general hospitals, designed primarily to take care of the acutely ill patient. But, as is also well known, the character of our health facility needs is changing rapidly. Our successes in combating infectious and other diseases have resulted in a greatly lengthened life span. Our population of aged persons has quadrupled in the last half century and is increasing tremendously. The incidence of chronic disease is rising. We therefore need many more facilities designed for patients who may need care over a long period of time, although they may not be acutely ill. We need facilities in which care can be given at a lower cost per patient-day than in the general hospital. In brief, we need a special emphasis at this time on hospitals for the chronically ill and on nursing homes.

Similarly, for patients who can remain at home, it is imperative that we provide outpatient wings to hospitals or separate diagnostic and treatment centers, where they can go for comprehensive diagnostic services and such treatment as can be properly and beneficially provided without hospitalization. This type of service for ambulatory patients is taking on increasing importance, and will be a significant factor in combating the increasing costs of health care.

Finally, we need more facilities designed especially for the restorative services of rehabilitation, as distinct from purely ameliorative treatment. Hand in hand with the expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program, we need more comprehensive rehabilitation centers, in which trained personnel will work to help individuals with physical impairments to achieve self-sufficiency and independence.

I am giving this background in order that we may understand the purpose of the 1954 amendments to the hospital construction program. Specifically, these amendments authorized an additional $60 million of Federal grants to States for construction in the four categories I have referred to. These amendments gave a new focus and a new emphasis to the hospital construction program; they looked ahead rather than back; they encouraged the States to plan their health facility construction in the light of the new needs emerging—as the trends in the composition of our population and in the incidence of various types of diseases became apparent.

The States have moved somewhat slowly in meeting the needs in the areas delineated by the 1954 amendments, and this is the rationale set forth in the committee report for cutting by nearly 50 percent the administration's request for $40 million in grants to States for building in the four categories created by the 1954 amendments. Time was required to develop the regulations under the 1954 amendments and then the States had to conduct the comprehensive inventory of their needs required by the law. In spite of this, there will be substantially no lapse, if any at all, in the funds voted by the Congress in the first year of the program.

The program is now beginning to pick up greater momentum. Applications have increased greatly in recent months. It seems to me essential that this program be given the fullest support at the Federal level during the coming fiscal year. Unless the Federal Government demonstrates its willingness to hold out more funds to the States for the support of this program than the $21 million which the committee has recommended, I sincerely believe that we will fall far short of our objectives in meeting our needs for health facility construction—particularly facilities for our aged and chronically ill.

If you take the $21 million which the committee has recommended and divide it up among 48 States and the Territories, it comes out to a small sum indeed for each State. Take a typical State such as Colorado—it would get only $50,000 for nursing home construction—roughly the cost of only 5 or 6 nursing home beds, and $100,000 for chronic-disease hospitals—or roughly the cost of 6 chronic-disease hospital beds. Obviously the amount recommended by the committee will provide Colorado with little incentive to move forward vigorously.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the committee report indicates that $21 million of fiscal 1956 funds will carry over to fiscal 1957, making a total of $42 million available in fiscal 1957. However, this is still only two-thirds of the annual authorization of $60 million voted by the Congress in 1954. The $21 million for fiscal 1956, if it carries over, should be added to the $40 million requested by the administration. This would then give the States assurance of a sum in fiscal 1957 approximating the full annual authorization under the law, would clearly demonstrate the Federal Government's desire to move ahead vigorously, and would result in a major new impetus to much-needed construction.

I also feel constrained to point out, Mr. Chairman, a glaring inconsistency in the committee report. In one place it charges the Department with not presenting a big enough program in the field of aging. But in another place it recommends we cut in half the funds for health facilities designed largely for the aged and chronically ill person. The reduction by $19 million of the Department's request for the chronically ill, for nursing homes, and for other types of facilities which would help our aged population, is undercutting rather than supporting the Department's program in aging.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to offer an amendment to the committee bill. However, I wished to state my views on the floor of this House and to express my strong hope that the Senate will see fit to restore the $19 million of the administration request under the hospital-construction program.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, $1,588,000, together with not to exceed $225,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows :

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 33 line 7, strike the figure "$1,588,000" and insert in lieu thereof, the figure "$1,728,000"; and on line 9, after the word "fund", strike the period and insert a colon, and the following: *"Provided,* That of said appropriation, the sum of $200,000, shall be used to establish a Bureau of Older Persons to deal with matters affecting the health, education and welfare of persons age 65 and over, which bureau shall cooperate with and aid the States so far as possible, in helping them solve the problems of such older persons through projects which will help:

"(1) to assure to older persons an equal opportunity with others to engage in gainful employment which they are physically and mentally able to perform;

"(2) to enable older persons to achieve a retirement income sufficient for health and for participation in community life as self-respecting citizens;

"(3) to provide older persons, so far as possible, with the opportunity of living in their own homes or, when this is not feasible, in suitable substitute private homes; and in the case of such persons who need care that cannot be given them in their own or other private homes, to provide them with the opportunity to live in institutions that are as homelike as possible and have high standards of care;

"(4) older persons to receive adequate nutrition, preventive medicine, and medical care adapted to the conditions of their years;

"(5) to rehabilitate and to restore to independent, useful lives in their homes, to the fullest extent possible, older persons who are chronically ill, physically disabled, mentally disturbed, or incapacitated for other reasons;

"(6) to assist older persons to have access to social groups and to participate with those of other ages in recreational, educational, cultural, religious, and civil activities;

"(7) to assure that older persons, in planning for retirement and in meeting the crises of their later years, will have the benefits of such services as counseling, information, vocational retraining, and social casework; and

"(8) to relieve the problems of older persons through an increase of research on the various aspects of aging and the development of special courses in schools and departments of medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and social work to train professional workers in the field of aging;

"Provided further, That in the projects referred to in this section, there shall be emphasis upon the right and obligation of such older persons for free choice, self-help, and planning their own futures."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have checked the amendment with the Parliamentarian and I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 33, line 7, strike out the figure "1,588,000" and insert the figure "1,728,000".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the bill I called attention to the fact that the sum allocated to the Office of the Secretary to deal with the problems of people 65 and over is totally inadequate. Only $65,515 has been allowed for the purpose. That is why I have offered an amendment to increase this amount by approximately $140,000—to $200,000—a sum which may still be inadequate to deal with this immense problem.

While it is true that primary responsibility for dealing with the problems of our older people lies with the States, the Federal Government has an important role to play in the matter, one which will coordinate State activities in the field and give leadership and recognition to efforts made to alleviate their difficulties. Sixty-five thousand dollars to deal with this huge matter. The fastest growing segment of our population today is the group of people 65 years of age and over. We have approximately 13½ million today, and it is anticipated we will have about 20 million in 1975. The hearings show that 1,000 people per day join the ranks of those who are 65 or over.

A study recently completed by the Twentieth Century Fund reveals that nearly three-quarters of Americans over age 65 have no income of their own or get less than $1,000 per year.

Over one-third—or 36 percent—have no income of their own whatsoever.

About 4 out of every 10—or 38 percent—have a yearly income of under $1,000.

About 1 in every 10, or 11 percent, have annual incomes of between $1,000 and $2,000.

Fifteen percent have incomes amounting to $2,000 or more for an entire year.

We have heard much about the problems of discrimination in new employment and compulsory retirement at age 65. Thousands of healthy citizens are consigned by these unfair practices to the scrap heap and to early physical and mental breakdowns. Compounding the problem is the fact that with compulsory retirement, so many of our older people lose the health insurance and medical benefits they enjoyed while they were employed. This is the time when chronic diseases are most apt to hit them. When they need income to deal with the menace of illness, they run out of money.

This is the time, too, when they need care, attention and rehabilitation rather than being shunted to mental hospital beds, as so many are, just to get rid of them. Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is only $65,000 in this budget to deal with the entire problem. I do not think it is the fault of the committee, because the committee gave the Department all the money it requested. Mr. Fogarty has been trying to push the Secretary into asking for more funds, but the Department has refused to do so.

On page 24 of the hearings the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] stated to Mr. Perkins, an Assistant Secretary:

One thing I know, Mr. Perkins, is that people are demanding that something be done for the aging. In my opinion, it is not a problem that has been with us for years and years, but it is coming upon us because of the increase in life span and because of the progress in medical research. People are living longer. It is a problem that has been coming upon us in just the last 15 or 20 years.

Now, you may have worked on this for 2 years and you have your opinions, but I think you can do a lot more than you are doing.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] was exactly right because Mr. Perkins had requested no increases of personnel over his present inadequate staff. He has nine people—only nine people—of which four are clerk typists, one is a research assistant, and the remainder are in higher grades.

I say that it is time for the Federal Government to take an interest in the problems of the older people by creating an organization capable of handling the problem. Nine people cannot handle this problem. We need an agency in the nature of a Children's Bureau with comparable responsibilities for this segment of our population.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] states that he has given the Department a mandate in the report of the committee, one which will require observance by the Department. In my judgment, it is unrealistic to tell the Department that we expect reasonable inroads to be made toward a solution of the problems of our older people and then not give them any more money with which to do it.

A nine person organization will accomplish little or nothing this next year.

I do not share Mr. FOGARTY's optimism that because the report contains a paragraph directing certain things to be done, that they will be done. You cannot cope with this problem without additional appropriations.

The amount of money in this bill is $65,000, of which a goodly share is going for the payment of four secretaries. How can it possibly be said that there is enough money in this bill to deal with the problems of the aging? I think the only way to do it is to provide enough money to the Department so that it can carry out the recommendation of Mr. FOGARTY and his committee, that they can render tangible and effective assistance to the States in solving the problems of the older people. We must begin now to give the older people equal opportunity for employment, to provide them with some means of obtaining sufficient retirement income in order that they may participate in community life as dignified and self-respecting citizens; which will provide them with decent housing and with proper medical care; which will permit them to be rehabilitated and restored to health.

This bill says $65,000 is enough money for that purpose. I say it is not. It is totally inadequate. Even the amount of my amendment will do little to take care of the problem, but at least it will furnish the first step for laying a reasonable base. Two hundred thousand dollars is a minimal amount for establishing an organization to cope with the problems of our older people.

I urge that my amendment be accepted.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes, the last 3 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the debate I attempted to express what I believe to be the universal respect this Congress has for the work done by this subcommittee and particularly by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Certainly no one is more keenly aware than he is of the problems confronting people of this country in terms of age.

But it occurs to me that more progress might be made if an amendment of this kind could be adopted which might be taken to conference with a view to having more consideration given to this problem of the aged.

I am sure all of us are aware of the very great and increasing importance of this problem in our communities and our congressional districts. I am not going to argue that a Federal department or bureau necessarily holds the answers, but I know and you know that there are many proposals being presented to us, being urged upon us by well-meaning people which cannot possibly be accepted, which cannot possibly become law; and yet, day by day we seem to be ignoring the very real problems that confront people not 90 years of age, not 80, not 70, not 60, but even 50 and 45, people who should be considered in the prime of life. These people, however, through no fault of their own are perhaps not able to carry on the work they used to carry on successfully and have either lost their positions or are forced to retire; yet day by day in the newspapers or in the employment agencies they find themselves disqualified for one reason alone and that is that they happen to be reaching the age of 35, 40, 45, or 50.

I do not know whether 6 people, or 9 people, or 11 people working constructively in the Federal Government can contribute adequately toward the solution of this problem; yet the Department itself says it is trying to do something. But it has not done anything, as far as I can determine over the years. Many of our States have done far more. Is it not

high time for us to exercise some real leadership? This is the real challenge. The committee has very properly criticized the Department because it has not done anything worthwhile. I think this is an opportunity for those of us who feel that something should be done to give them some money and next year we can see whether they do the job or not. But why delay and delay. The people concerned are growing older. Scores of thousands are reaching these ages every month. Surely some sound and sensible solutions can be found of the perplexing and heartbreaking problems they have to face.

I know that if the committee feels compelled to oppose this amendment it will not be accepted. But I feel certain the committee will continue its interest in the problem and will not be willing to permit a situation to continue in the next 12 months which it regards as such a poor showing. Certainly we can all share the committee's hope that in another year something substantial in the way of a program will be developed. I wish that the committee had chosen stronger language to express its hope. But the sheer fact that it led the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to offer this amendment is to his everlasting credit. I hope the lesson will not be lost by the Department but I predict that if the Department misinterprets the decision of this amendment this afternoon as any indication of a general indifference in this body to these problems it will be very ill advised indeed. If it lacked the funds or personnel, it should have made that clear to the committee. It must operate now for the next year within the limits of the funds and personnel it requested. And I rather suspect it can look for more than a mild reproof next year if its unhappy record of lack of accomplishment is as lacking as it is today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be standing here opposing amendments like this, because for 4 or 5 years I have been trying to do something about this problem. We have a very sympathetic committee. I think our report points up the problem. I read from the report:

> The committee was likewise again disappointed this year that the Department made such a poor showing so far as any accomplishments are concerned with respect to the problems of the aging. Since it is well recognized that this is a growing problem with the steady increase in the number of older people in our population, it has been a source of considerable concern on the part of the committee that so little in the way of a program in this field could be presented by the Department or its many constituents whose activities naturally come in contact with this problem. It is certainly to be hoped that in another year something substantial, in the way of a program, will be developed.

I do not think I should allow the impression to remain that nothing is being done. We do have only these few people in the Office of the Secretary, but they are coordinating a program being carried out by the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, in the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation and, in the Social Security Administration. They are trying to get those constituents of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department active, and are trying to get these constituents to really get started as far as the program for the aging is concerned. I believe that the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Folsom, is sympathetic to this problem. And when we mention in the report that we expect the Department to come up with a real program next year, I believe we will get it. Then we can hold adequate hearings and get a real substantial program started in this field in an orderly manner. That is the way to approach the problem, in my opinion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Rhode Island has properly stated the situation that we are confronted with. I believe that the method of procedure he recommends is the right way to approach this problem.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman talks about a paragraph in this report. This may be an impetus to a change on the part of the Department. But has not the gentleman, as is shown by the hearings before the committee, for years been trying to press the Department into taking some action, and each year has not the gentleman found disappointing results comparatively to what he observed this year?

Mr. FOGARTY. To some extent, we have, but I must be fair about this. This is the first time we have written anything like this in the report regarding this program. I am pretty sure that they will come up with a program, as they have in connection with recommendations of this committee on other programs.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for his farsighted leadership in pointing out that the needs of America's older people are not being adequately met today. The gentleman's amendment to increase the funds available to the Committee on Aging is an important step in developing a realization of the increasing national responsibility toward our senior citizens. Despite our social-security system, too many men and women, as they move into their sixties, find life dreary and unhappy. Many are still willing and able to work but cannot find jobs—despite the fact that their years of experience make them better, more dependable employees. Their incomes are frequently so low that it is impossible to live decently. Housing to suit their special requirements is rare, recreational opportunities are still too meager, and medical care for the illnesses of old age is limited.

For these reasons, I urge adoption of the amendment presented by our distinguished colleague from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 9, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> This title may be cited as the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1957."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned and the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, on which I have the honor to serve as chairman, is also concerned over the demands of the department and agencies for increased personnel.

I want the Members of the House to know that our subcommittee has started and is continuing an aggressive program to assure that Federal employees are effectively utilized. Needless to say, congressional approval of funds for increased employment makes our job doubly difficult.

In its preliminary report dated February 2, 1956, the subcommittee was pleased to report a decrease of over 38,000 in the Federal payroll during the last 4 months of 1955. This was a real accomplishment of our subcommittee which initiated its manpower utilization program last September. This reduction was achieved in cooperation with the departments and agencies.

The civil-service report for January shows an increase of over 3,900. This is very disturbing as it may well be the signal for a reversal of the downward trend.

In that connection, my attention was recently directed to evidence that there is currently a drive on by some departments and agencies to fill existing vacancies. This is a condition that those of us who have been here in the Congress for a few terms have observed. When appropriations are available to the departments and agencies along toward the end of a fiscal year, they put on a drive to hire more employees.

Why these additional people are needed is not easy to uncover. The availability of funds certainly does not necessarily create a need for additional employees.

I can think of no better time to direct the attention of the Members of the House to this very serious problem than right now, when we are discussing the appropriation bill for the Labor Department.

Last session when the House approved an increase of 25 cents in the minimum hourly wage, I am sure the Members did not contemplate that this would mean a 10-percent increase in the payroll in the Department of Labor; nor did they contemplate that this would mean a 50-percent increase in the enforcement staff. I am not speaking of the force that goes around to follow complaints. I am talking about the army of snoopers that has been collected by the Department of Labor for what is really a "make-work" program. This program is not one of

educating employers as to what their responsibilities are under the law. Instead, these investigators are going around to find out how they can generate complaints and discover minor infractions of the law.

The Federal Government is already conducting some very important programs by means of informing our citizens of what is expected of them and how they can do it. I would like to point out that the Labor Department was not willing to conduct their educational and enforcement program on a basis of questionnaires. They prefer to enforce it by means of an army of 1,500 enforcement agents.

I am sure the Members of this House had no idea, when they were voting for an hourly increase of 25 cents to the employees, that this was going to create an additional work force costing $2½ million annually.

Let me give you a few of the details how this was worked out. The Labor Department, following the approval of the increase in the minimum wages in the House, requested and received a supplemental appropriation to hire 550 additional employees. The Department is presently in the process of recruiting and training these employees.

I was pleased to note that some members of the Appropriations Committee in recent hearings were aware of this situation and questioned the Department with respect to the validity of this program. However, I was very unhappy over the response and the unwillingness on the part of the Department to seek other methods of carrying out their enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. Chairman, I think that an amendment striking $2½ million from the Department of Labor's appropriation would be completely justified. However, I do not propose to offer such an amendment, despite the Department's unwillingness to enforce the Fair Labor Act in a less expensive manner.

Instead, I want to state at this point that our subcommittee intends to make a very careful study of the utilization of this increased number of personnel. I believe that we can come up with something which will be helpful both to the Department and to those Members of Congress who are concerned over the increasing size of the Federal payroll. Any help in the form of suggestions or support of our objectives will be greatly appreciated.

In order to avoid a similar situation in the future, I have sponsored legislation requiring the departments and agencies to disclose the personnel implications of substantive legislation. This data would be available for consideration by the House when acting upon legislation such as the minimum wage laws. I, for one, want to know what I am voting for or against when I cast my vote. I do not consider this an unreasonable attitude.

My bill is scheduled for consideration by our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service this week. I hope that when it comes before the House, it will have the united support of the entire membership.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of $75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $3,124,000.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: page 38, line 18, strike out the figure "$3,124,000" and insert in lieu thereof $3,295,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I will say that the amendment is satisfactory to this side of the aisle.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

I have also conferred with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and it is satisfactory with him. I want to say this, though, that this increase does not give a single, solitary additional employee to the Department. It is merely an increase to take care of the pay increase, which has been overlooked.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 29, 1956, the Committee on Ways and Means ordered favorably reported with amendments H. R. 9075, the Highway Revenue Act of 1956.

The chairman of the committee, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, issued an analysis describing the committee's action in regard to this important legislation. For the information of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States and for the interested public, I would like, as author of the bill, to insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of the analysis of the bill issued by the committee chairman:

Chairman JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, Committee on Ways and Means, previously announced that the committee had unanimously ordered favorably reported H. R. 9075, the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, introduced by Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana. This bill was amended by the committee by striking out all after the enacting clause and rewriting the provisions of the bill to reflect the decisions of the committee as described below.

The bill would raise additional revenues from taxes on motor fuels, tires, trucks, trailers, and buses to finance the Federal highway program envisioned in H. R. 8836, the Federal Highway Act of 1956, introduced by the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, Democrat, of Maryland. A table of present and proposed rates follows:

Tax rate schedule

[Rate changes are effective for the 16-year period, July 1, 1956, through June 30, 1972]

Item	Basis	Rate		
		Present	Increase	Total
Gasoline	Per gallon	2 cents	1 cent	3 cents.
Diesel fuel	do	do	do	Do.
Special motor fuels	do	do	do	Do.
Tires	Per pound	5 cents	3 cents	8 cents.
Camelback (tread rubber)	do		do	3 cents.
Trucks, buses, and trailers	Manufacturer's price	8 percent	2 percent	10 percent.
Special taxes on vehicles over 26,000 pounds	Per 1,000 pounds		$1.50	$1.50.

A general explanation of H. R. 9075, as amended by the committee, follows:

DIESEL AND SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS

The rate of the tax imposed upon diesel and special motor fuels would be increased from 2 to 3 cents a gallon.

The tax on diesel fuel already applies only in the case of diesel-powered highway vehicles. The bill makes no change in this. The tax on special motor fuels at the present time applies in the case of fuel used for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats, airplanes. This bill provides that the new 3-cent tax is to apply only to fuel used in the propulsion of motor vehicles. The tax on special motor fuel used in the propulsion of motorboats or airplanes remains at 2 cents. The effect of these provisions is to relieve nonhighway vehicles from the additional 1-cent-a-gallon tax.

Under the bill these tax rates would revert to 1½ cents a gallon on July 1, 1972, the same rates which the present law provides are to be effective as of April 1, 1956.

TRUCKS, BUSES, TRAILERS, ETC.

(a) Manufacturers tax: At the present time the ad valorem tax on trucks, buses, and truck trailers is 8 percent on the sales price of the manufacturer. The bill raises this rate to 10 percent for the period June 30, 1956, to July 1, 1972, when a 5-percent rate becomes effective. This 5-percent rate is the rate which under present law becomes effective April 1, 1956.

(b) Special tax on heavy highway vehicles: A new tax would be imposed by way of an annual fee on vehicles over 26,000 pounds in weight at the rate of $1.50 per thousand pounds. (The technical details of this provision are yet to be worked out.)

TIRES AND TREAD RUBBER

The present tax on tires is 5 cents a pound and that on inner tubes is 9 cents a pound. The bill divides tires into two groups: (1) Those of the type used on highway vehicles which would be taxed at the rate of 8 cents a pound, and (2) other tires used on nonhighway vehicles (such as those used for tractors) which will continue to be taxed at 5 cents a pound. No change is made in the 9-cents-a-pound rate on inner tubes.

A new tax on tread rubber would be levied at 3 cents a pound, with an exemption provided in the case of tread rubber sold for use otherwise than in the retreading of tires of the type used on highway-type vehicles.

Tread rubber is defined as materially commonly or commercially known as tread rubber or camelback or substitutes for such material which are used for recapping or retreading tires.

The increased tax rates in the case of highway vehicle tires and the tax on tread rubber are to be effective until July 1, 1972. After that time the tax on highway vehicle tires will be the same as that on other tires, now 5 cents a pound, and the new tax on tread rubber will become inapplicable.

GASOLINE

The bill increases the tax on gasoline from 2 cents to 3 cents a gallon. This 3-cent rate is to be applicable, however, only in the case of fuel for use in highway vehicles. The present tax of 2 cents a gallon is to continue for gasoline used in other vehicles.

Farmers will pay the full 3 cents a gallon tax, but as would be provided in H. R. 8780, which passed the House on January 31, 1956, they will receive a refund once a year directly from the Government. This refund will be for the full 3 cents a gallon tax and will be made pursuant to a claim for refund filed with the Government.

The 3 cents a gallon tax on gasoline is to be applicable until July 1, 1972, at which time the rate will revert to 1½ cents a gallon, the rate which otherwise would become effective as of April 1, 1956, under present law.

FLOOR STOCK TAXES

Floor stock taxes are provided with respect to the additional taxes and the new tax on tread rubber. They apply to inventories of dealers on hand on July 1, 1956, in the case of—

(1) trucks, truck trailers, buses, etc. (2 percent);

(2) tires of the type used on highway vehicles (3 cents a pound);

(3) tread rubber (3 cents a pound); and

(4) gasoline (1 cent a gallon but not applicable to retail inventories).

The floor stock tax imposed on tread rubber will not apply to tread rubber used otherwise than in the retreading of tires of the type used on highway vehicles.

FLOOR STOCK REFUNDS AND CERTAIN SPECIAL REFUND

Both floor stock refunds and certain special refunds are provided in the bill. The floor stock refunds are to become effective on July 1, 1972, the rate reduction date, and apply to the same items upon which floor stock taxes are imposed by the bill. The technical error in the 1954 code which inadvertently provided a floor stock refund for automobile parts is correct.

The special refunds or credits provided include refunds and credits—

(1) where special motor fuel taxed at 3 cents a gallon (on the assumption that it would be used in motor vehicles) is used or resold for use in a motorboat or airplane (which, therefore, should be taxed at 2 cents a gallon);

(2) where gasoline taxed at 3 cents a gallon (on the assumption it would be used in a highway vehicle) is used or resold for use in other than a highway vehicle (which, therefore, should be taxed at 2 cents a gallon);

(3) where diesel fuel, special motor fuel or gasoline taxed at 3 cents a gallon is used or resold for use by a local transit system if at least 60 percent of the total passenger-fare revenue (excluding tax) is derived from fares which are exempt from the transportation tax under the exemption granted by section 4262 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (commutation, season ticket and 25-cent single fare). The refund or credit thus allowed will be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount, computed at 1 cent per gallon, as passenger-fare revenue exempt from tax bears to the total passenger-car revenue; and

(4) where tread rubber taxed at 3 cents per pound is used or resold for use otherwise than in retreading tires of the type used on highway vehicles.

In the first three cases described above the refunds or credits are limited to the increase in the fuels tax which is 1 cent a gallon. In the fourth case the refund or credit is limited to 3 cents. In addition, in the case of gasoline used in a nonhighway vehicle the refund or credit is not to be available in the case of gasoline used on a farm for farming purposes for which an annual refund would be provided by H. R. 8780. The refunds or credits provided here differ from those for gasoline used on a farm for farming purposes in that they are to be made through the person who paid the tax.

The special refunds or credits enumerated above, with the exception of that dealing with transit companies, do not apply in the case of highway vehicles. A highway vehicle is a vehicle suitable for use on the public highways whether in fact it is used on the public highways or not. Therefore, a vehicle suitable for use on the public highways which may be used off highways such as those used in a mining, forest, construction project, and so forth, would not qualify for the special refunds or credits provided in the bill. Tractors, earth-moving equipment, and trucks more than 96 inches in width are not now characterized for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code as vehicles suitable for use on the public highways.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

The bill creates a fund to be known as the highway trust fund to consist of such amounts as may be appropriated to or deposited in the fund as provided in the bill from the effective date of the bill as provided below and through June 30, 1972. The amounts to be deposited in the fund are as follows (for tax rates, see above):

1. One hundred percent of the taxes on diesel fuel, special motor fuels, gasoline, and tread rubber received after June 30, 1956, and attributable to liabilities incurred after that date.

2. Twenty percent of the ad valorem tax imposed on trucks, buses, etc., which is received after June 30, 1956, and attributable to liabilities incurred after that date and 50 percent of such tax received after June 30, 1957.

3. Thirty-seven and one-half percent of the tax on tires of the type used on highway vehicles which is received after June 30, 1956, and attributable to liabilities incurred after that date, and 100 percent of the tax on tires and inner tubes received after June 30, 1957.

4. One hundred percent of the special tax on heavy highway vehicles.

5. One hundred percent of the floor stock taxes imposed by the bill (see above for rates).

The bill further provides that funds may be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund, as repayable advances, when required to meet the expenditures incurred under the highway program proposed in H. R. 8836. Similarly provision is made for the repayment of such advances out of the trust fund to the general funds at such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that moneys are available in the trust fund for such purpose. Excess funds in the trust fund are to be invested in Government obligations at interest and advances are to be repaid with interest.

The bill charges the Secretary of the Treasury with the duty of holding the trust fund and requires reports to the Congress not later than the 1st day of March of each year on the financial condition and operations of the trust fund. The bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall consult with the Secretary of Commerce with respect to such reports.

The bill contains a declaration of policy to the effect that it is the intent of Congress that legislation be enacted to bring about a balance of receipts and expenditures over the 16-year period.

STUDIES

For the purpose of obtaining the information to furnish a basis on which Congress may determine the most equitable distribution of taxes among classes of highway users, the bill requires the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with other Federal agencies such as the Interstate Commerce Commission and with the State highway departments, to make a study of the effects of highway use by the various classes of users; and based on such effects, the proportionate share of construction and maintenance costs properly attributable to each of the various classes of road users together with the direct and indirect benefits accrued to each class of user is to be contained in the study. It is further provided that such study will be coordinated with other studies and investigations to be made under the provisions of H. R. 8836, introduced by the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON on January 26, 1956.

The final report on such studies is required to be made to the Congress not later

than March 1, 1959, and progress reports on or before March 1, 1957, and 1958.

SUBCOMMITTEE

In connection with the trust fund contemplated by the bill, the Committee on Ways and Means has unanimously agreed to the establishment of a subcommittee which will be charged with the duty of examining the year-to-year condition of the trust fund, overseeing its operations, and making recommendations to the full Committee on Ways and Means concerning necessary improvements or changes therein. In addition, the subcommittee will have jurisdiction to examine the studies required under the provisions of the bill and to make recommendations to the full committee concerning such adjustments in the distribution and rate of the various taxes levied by the bill as may be necessary.

REVENUE ESTIMATES

H. R. 9075, as amended, would be designed to provide sufficient revenues with which to finance the highway building program envisioned in H. R. 8836, the Federal Highway Act of 1956. Estimates of the taxes to be collected under the provisions of H. R. 9075 and deposited in the highway trust fund during the 16-year period from 1957 to 1972 are as follows:

Estimated collections to be deposited in highway fund in 16 years

[In billions of dollars]

Excise taxes:	Deposits fiscal years 1957–72
1. Gasoline:	
(a) Present law tax [1]	19.954
(b) Increase under the bill	9.473
2. Diesel fuel and special motor fuels:	
(a) Present law tax	.605
(b) Increase under the bill	.282
3. Tires:	
(a) Present law tax [2]	3.199
(b) Increase under the bill	1.820
4. Tubes	.41
5. Trucks, buses, and trailers:	
Increase under the bill (2 points)	.887
3 points (extended) [2]	1.257
6. Camelback	.222
7. Special tax on heavy vehicles	.900
Total	38.740

[1] Adjusted for refunds to farmers.

[2] Collections of this tax are to be deposited in the fund beginning in fiscal 1958.

The foregoing revenue figures may be compared with Federal expenditure authorizations, existing and proposed, for primary, secondary, urban, and interstate highways of $38.273 billion for fiscal years 1957–71 (Department of Commerce estimate) on the basis of proposals in H. R. 8836. These estimates include a projection of expenditures beyond the provisions of H. R. 8836 for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 under the Federal aid program of $1.025 billion and $1.050 billion, respectively, in arriving at the total of $38.273 billion. The estimates do not include a projection for fiscal 1972. Should a similar projection be made it would amount to $1.075 billion and make the total estimate of expenditures $39.348 billion. Of course, should the Federal aid program be cut down, the total expenditures would be reduced accordingly.

ALBERT JOHNSON

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to extend a brief message of congratulations and good wishes to a friend and predecessor, Albert Johnson, a former Member of the Congress who, today, observes his 87th birthday. In the 20 years, 1913 to 1933, that Mr. Johnson was in Congress he was one of its most widely known, distinguished, and effective Members, and also one of its most colorful.

Albert Johnson, whether lawmaking in Congress or campaigning in his home district, always went about in a swallow-tailed coat, a spotless Fedora hat and highly polished shoes. His was the only long-tailed coat in all his western Washington district where most voters were loggers, lumber-mill workers, and dairy farmers. Albert's friends told him that no workman ever would vote for a candidate who was so elegantly dressed. But Albert Johnson, nonetheless, in his long-tailed coat and highly polished shoes went about the logging camps, millyards, and into the cow barns seeking votes and got them. Workers somehow sensed that here was a man who wore what he wanted to wear and would be himself and vote as he believed right without humbug or hypocrisy. They voted for him.

In his time Albert Johnson was one of the most widely known personalities in the House or Senate. Sunday supplements in the large city newspapers, and the Saturday Evening Post, also, on two occasions carried featured articles, with pictures, about him—about his unusual dress, about his colorful salmon and crab feeds for colleagues, about important legislative bills he sponsored and about his speeches. Often, Albert Johnson was referred to as "The man from Hoquiam," the word Hoquiam being the name of the town from which Albert Johnson came.

In the years Albert Johnson served in Congress he was one of its most celebrated Members. But fame is short-lived and temporary. Although Albert Johnson retired from Congress only 23 years ago, there are few here today who know the name or who recall what Albert Johnson was or what he did. Of the 96 Senators and 435 Representatives who were Members of Congress in Albert Johnson's last year here—1932—only 3 Senators and 13 Representatives still remain Members of the Congress. These few, however, who still remember Albert Johnson, his lovable personality and his great work will be happy to know that he, today, at 87 still enjoys reasonably good health for a man of that age and still remains keenly interested in everything Congress does.

Albert Johnson, in early manhood, was a reporter on Kansas and Missouri daily newspapers. When he was 29 years old, he became news editor on what is now the Washington Post and Times Herald. In 1898 he went west to become managing editor of Tacoma and Seattle newspapers. In 1907, he purchased and became the publisher of the Hoquiam Daily Washingtonian and retained that ownership until 1934 when he sold that newspaper to me.

Albert Johnson was elected to Congress in 1913. As a Member of Congress he participated in all the eventful legislation of the war years under Wilson and the equally important post-war years under Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, except for a brief period when, resigning from Congress, he served in the chemical warfare division of the Army as a captain.

The restricted Immigration Act which is still the law of the Nation was a Johnson achievement and is known as the Johnson immigration law which, still, is frequently discussed in debates on the floor of Congress.

Of all the men I have known, during a long life as newspaperman and Congressman, I truthfull say, "Albert Johnson is one of the most kindly, lovable and interesting men I have ever known." For myself, and I know for you also, I wish many more years of health and happiness for this great and good man.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], who is recovering from an operation, had expected to be present today to pay a tribute to Albert Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] who had intended to be present, but who is recovering from an operation, be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately following mine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that during the 1st session of the 84th Congress a bill, H. R. 4808, was enacted into Public Law 238 by the President's approval on August 4, 1955. It provided for transmission through the mails of certain keys, identification devices, and small articles. The law was promoted principally by the disabled veterans organization, which has developed an excellent automobile license plate identification system through which over 100,000 automobile keys have been returned to their owners in 1 year.

Behind this law is a story very closely related to my own district and quite directly to Mr. RUSSELL MACK'S district, adjacent to mine in the great State of Washington, which, at the time I am about to refer to, was represented by the Honorable Albert Johnson, who celebrates his 87th birthday today in Tacoma, where he now makes his home.

In 1926, when Mr. Johnson was a popular and honored Member of this body, where he served for 20 years, from 1913 to 1933, he introduced an earlier law, section 302, title 39, United States Code, which actually was the father of the one to which I have just referred. The first law of its kind, it provided for c. o. d. postage on hotel and steamship room keys inadvertently carried away by hotel patrons and steamship passengers. The new law, enacted last year, merely extends its provisions to authorize such collect postage on these keys, and also on identification devices, such as automobile plate license tags as designed by the disabled veterans.

Suggestion for the earlier bill, which became law in July 1926, came to Mr. Johnson from the late A. C. A. (Al) Gamer, who at that time was the owner-

manager of the Olympus Hotel in Tacoma, Wash., in my home district, where his widow still resides. After the bill was drafted by Mr. Johnson it went to the Post Office Department for a report, and an adverse recommendation came back to the House Committee on Post Office and Post Roads. However, the bill went to the subcommittee of which the late Clyde Kelly, of Pennsylvania, was chairman. Congressman Johnson insisted on a hearing, at which the counsel for American Hotel Men's Association, Frank Boland, appeared. An Assistant Solicitor for the Post Office Department appeared in opposition to the bill. But it was nevertheless reported and passed and became law. During this period Mr. Gamer was very active in interesting hotelkeepers all over the country in throwing their weight and influence behind the legislation.

Thus, out of the activity of and upon the insistence of a hotelman of Tacoma, Wash., and the Honorable Albert Johnson, came not only this bill which has proved so very valuable to hotelmen and steamship companies throughout the country but also legislation passed 2 years later providing for reply cards and letters to be posted without prepayment and collected for upon delivery.

Mr. Speaker, in paying homage to the Honorable Albert Johnson on his 87th birthday, I should like also to pay my respects to the memory of Mr. A. C. C. Gamer, an every day citizen living in what was then a small community, running a small hotel, who not only had an idea but the imagination, the confidence, and the belief in himself to see that it was carried through to fruition. I include with my remarks a letter from the American Hotel Association in which the association joins me in extending a message of gratitude and birthday greetings to Albert Johnson.

DEAR MR. TOLLEFSON: Let us take this opportunity to applaud warmly your efforts in observing the 87th birthday anniversary of the Honorable Albert Johnson on March 5. We want to be counted among those persons who remember well the contribution he made to the hotel industry of America.

It is one of the rich traditions of our hotels today that a guest, who unwittingly carries away a hotel key, may merely drop that key in the mailbox anywhere, and send it back, postage due, to the hotel. Not only has this proven a great convenience to the guests, but it has saved the hotels of the country substantial sums which would otherwise have been required for the replacement of lost keys.

It is significant that this was the very first measure ever enacted by the Congress of the United States at the suggestion of the American Hotel Association. Our long-time president, Tom Green, generally regarded as having been most responsible for founding the association, and A. C. C. Gamer, Olympus Hotel, Tacoma, Wash., discussed the problem with Representative Johnson. He then introduced a bill to permit this practice. In spite of the fact that the Post Office Department opposed the measure, the Congress enacted it in 1926, and it has since been law.

We hope you and the other fine people of the State of Washington will long remember Representative Johnson for this and other instances of leadership which he revealed throughout the 20 years that he served in the Congress.

Sincerely,

M. O. RYAN.

MEL MAAS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who served in the House with Mel Maas, the story covering a very small part of his career, written by Richard and Gladys Harkness and carried in the March issue of the Reader's Digest, is just a reminder of the stature of the colleague we all knew.

Of unquestioned ability, intensely patriotic, ever active, ever on guard to protect the interests of his country and its constitutional government, Mel was always on the job. That was a few years ago.

More recently, when on two occasions it was my privilege to meet him when we were both temporarily at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, notwithstanding his inability to see, he was still the intensely active, cheerful Mel of old. Visiting other patients who were suffering from far less physical disability than was he, his visits were always an inspiration, a reminder that many of us had far more to be thankful for than we were willing to admit.

We can all join in the tribute paid to him in this article which reads:

ONE MORE CAREER FOR GENERAL MAAS

(By Richard and Gladys Harkness)

On August 1, 1952, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas of the United States Marine Corps Reserve stood at attention on the parade grounds of the historic marine barracks in Washington, D. C. A picked ceremonial battalion snapped to "present arms." The band played the national anthem. In this traditional sundown review the Marine Corps was honoring the two-star general upon his retirement after serving his country in 3 wars.

As the last note echoed in the quadrangle, Maas turned to the Marine commandant, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, and said: "Sir, the Marines have never looked finer."

Shepherd stared at the ground in embarrassed silence, groping for a reply. For since August of the year before, Maas had been blind.

With such a handicap Maas might reasonably have welcomed retirement and rest. He already had crammed 3 careers into his 54 years. In his early twenties he had organized a successful insurance business. He had spent 16 crusading years in Congress. And as a Marine he bore two treasured combat decorations—the Silver Star and Legion of Merit—as well as the Purple Heart.

But the thought of retreating into dark loneliness after that final review in 1952 never entered Maas' mind. Instead, he threw himself into a load of assignments in behalf of disabled servicemen. In the last 2 years he had logged a quarter of a million miles of travel, "brailling" his way alone on planes and in hotel rooms in all 48 States, Hawaii, and Europe. He makes 300 speeches a year urging greater opportunities for the halt, the lame, and blind before State legislatures, service clubs, labor and employer organizations.

The straightforward speeches citing facts and figures to support his argument that "hiring the handicapped is good business" are leavened with humor. He says, for example: "When I speak of the physically handicapped filling skilled jobs, I know what I'm talking about. I'm handicapped, too—I have false teeth." Or, "It's wonderful to be blind. Now all women are beautiful."

General Maas was born of German and Irish forebears in Duluth, Minn., in 1898. Educated in St. Paul, where his father founded a prosperous bakery-supply firm, young Mel won an appointment to West Point at 18. But that was the year the United States entered World War I, and the boy enlisted at once in the Marine Corps to become a pilot.

After the war Maas finished college, prospected for oil, and finally settled in insurance in St. Paul. But his mind churned with two civic worries, the growing disrespect for law and order resulting from prohibition, and the slashing of national defense. An old friend of his says, "That's all Mel talked about, repeal and defense. We would kid him and ask why he didn't get on a stump and run as the Republican candidate for Congress."

That always drew a laugh, because St. Paul's political patron saint at the time was Andrew J. Volstead, author of prohibition, and the city's Fourth Congressional District sent only dry, pacifist Democrats to the House.

Maas decided to give it a try.

His announcement got prompt attention. Volstead challenged him to a debate, promising publicly to "cut that young whippersnapper down to size." Maas, trained as a debater at college, marshaled data on bootlegging and racketeering. There was no formal decision by judges, but the newspapers and most of the audience in the jammed city auditorium agreed that Maas had won. He woke up the morning after election, a surprised young man of 27, to find himself "the baby Congressman."

In Congress, Maas broke the cardinal rule for rookies—he was heard as well as seen. When his years of railing against reduced defense appropriations fell on deaf ears, he chose President Hoover's address to the 1929 session of Congress as the occasion to dramatize the need. "Look," he said, buttonholing fellow Congressmen, "this is stupid. The Chief Executive, the Vice President, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and both branches of Congress will all be under one roof. One bomb dropped on the Capitol and the Government would be out of business." His colleagues came back: "Come off it, Mel, you're nuts."

Whereupon Maas, a Reserve flier, checked out an antiquated pursuit biplane from Bolling Field and circled Washington. At the stroke of noon, when House Members had just assembled, Maas put his plane in a dive and pulled out only as his wheels skimmed the House skylight. Inside, the noise was deafening, the scene pandemonium. After that, he received respectful attention when he spoke for defense appropriations.

In 1932, while Maas was speaking in the House, a demented youth flourished a gun from the gallery. Fellow Members dashed for the exits. Maas strolled across the Chamber and stood below the gunman, who demanded to make a speech on the depression. "Of course you can speak," Maas said soothingly. "But we have rules in the House. You can't make a speech with a gun in your hand. Here, toss it down."

The deranged man held the gun on Maas for a moment, and then dropped it into his outstretched hands. The incident won for Maas the Carnegie Silver Medal for bravery.

Maas' years in the House were productive. He uncovered a postoffice scandal by which taxpayers had been bilked of $150 million. He wrote the first comprehensive naval-manpower-reserve bill. He proposed military contingents of women, and gave nurses

military rank. He was 2 years ahead of the admirals in advocating a two-ocean Navy.

Right after Pearl Harbor, Maas flew to the Pacific to join the battle, the youngest marine colonel in uniform. Though the President wanted Congressmen to stay in Washington, Maas managed for 4 months to stay a jump ahead of the White House come-home order. It caught up with him on a Guadalcanal airstrip along with a Silver Star from General MacArthur for gallantry in action, accompanied, according to Maas, by a reprimand. The medal was for shooting down two Japanese Zeros. The censure was for engaging in aerial combat when assigned to the mission solely as an observer, and for endangering Government property by using a medium bomber as a dive bomber to strafe an enemy airfield.

Maas returned to Washington charging that President Roosevelt had known of Japanese plans for their sneak attack 30 days in advance, and that we were losing the war in the Pacific by concentrating our armed might in Europe. He staked his 1944 reelection campaign on Pearl Harbor, telling his constituents: "Don't vote for me if you're for a fourth term for Roosevelt." Maas lost by 3,000 votes, headed for the Pacific again to command a Marine airbase on Okinawa. The Purple Heart he came home with at war's end was for the wounds he received in his face and legs from a Japanese bomb.

When Korea broke, Maas, then with the Sperry Gyroscope Co., donned a uniform for his third war, and was assigned to put order and justice into a badly muddled recruiting program. Suffering from severe stomach cramps, Maas testified day after day before congressional committees in behalf of new manpower legislation. Only when the measure passed the House would he go to the Bethesda (Md.) Naval Hospital to seek relief from ulcers and diabetic retinitis. Two-thirds of his stomach was removed and, an agonizing blow to any man so active, his eyesight dimmed to total darkness.

"I'd have felt sorry for myself," Maas recalls, "but I was too damn busy. We had our bill to get through the Senate, so I had a phone brought to my bed and worked from there." For a year he remained on active duty.

All of which takes us back to that farewell review at Marine Barracks. General Shepherd broke his silence by remarking that Maas was probably the only general to serve a year while blind. Maas grinned. "Not quite," he said, with typical jauntiness, "I'm just the first general to admit it."

Retired, Maas declined attractive offers from private industry in order to serve on the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. He became its chairman in 1954. His own sightless eyes dramatize the purpose of the Committee. His traveling schedule, which sometimes calls for 2 speeches plus 5 radio and television interviews a day, is proof of his contention that physical disability need not cut short a man's productivity.

"In the past 10 years we have placed more than 2 million of our supposedly handicapped in jobs," he says. "There are 2 million more who should be employed, and they are being added to by 275,000 annually. It costs the public $800 a year to maintain a handicapped person. The average cost of rehabilitation is $666, a nonrecurring expense, and if there is a willing employer the person becomes a taxpayer. In the last year employed handicapped earned $106 million and paid an estimated tax of $9 million.

"Statistics prove the attendance and safety records of handicapped workers are as high as those of normal workmen, and their production records are above average in almost every industry."

Maas traveled at first with a companion, but he says, "Our plane bounced around a little and I spent the whole trip taking care of the fellow who was supposed to take care of me. Since then I've gone alone."

When he is not met at the airport a skycap puts him and his bags into a taxi. At the hotel, the bellboy shows him about his room by guiding him to the bureau, the bed, and the bathroom door.

It was hard to realize, watching Maas in the office he has built into his comfortable, rambling home in suburban Washington, that he was blind. He sipped coffee, spilling not a drop. He flipped ashes from his cigar into an ash tray with unerring aim. When someone spoke, he turned his head as if to look into the speaker's face.

"What I like," he said, "is that people think I don't act like a blind man. I get a real kick when I sit down in a restaurant and the waitress hands me a menu."

Maas conducts much of his work by phone. He has attached a small piece of adhesive tape to No. 5 on the dial so he can make his own calls, and he has memorized some 200 numbers of the telephone book he has compiled in Braille. A U-shaped desk covers one end of his office. He can sit in his chair equipped with casters and scoot from the phone to his Braille transcriber, or to the electric typewriter (necessary because he has arthritic fingers).

"Here is where I read evenings," he said, pointing to the nearby table stacked with albums of records—"talking books" distributed by the Library of Congress. "I never read so much when I had my eyes. I've read some 500 books since I've been blind." And he showed us his talking edition of the latest Reader's Digest. "That gives me 6 hours of good reading and keeps me up on things."

Maas walked briskly to the other end of the room, lounged back in his big easy chair and said, "The Lord intended it to be this way. That is how I can contribute the most."

REDUCTION IN MINIMUM RETIREMENT AGE FOR SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will benefit all the people of this great country. This bill proposed a reduction in the minimum retirement age for social-security benefits from 65 to 60 for men, and from 65 to 55 for women.

Reduction in the minimum-retirement age is a crying need today, in view of increased pressure by much of industry to drop older workers from employment rolls. Many who are approaching compulsory retirement under union contracts or company practice are laid off by employers to save money either by reducing insurance costs, which are higher for older workers, or to avoid payment of pensions. There are increasing signs also that it is becoming extremely difficult if not impossible for persons over 50 to find new employment after they are dropped or forced out of their employment. Such pressures exist mostly in kind of employment where physical and not mental aptitudes are important, such as in the laboring and semiskilled trades. In the automobile industry, for example, as automation takes over part of the assembly line, workers are very often shuffled along the line to drop out those who represent the greatest cost in anticipated retirement benefits or the greatest risk to insurance or other costs.

No adequate general criteria for establishing a fixed age of retirement is available, nor is it possible to fix such age. There are not only individual differences, but also constantly changing environmental factors which make certainty as to a suitable retirement age an impossibility. There is no evidence that the minimum retirement age of 65 in the act of 1939 was inserted in the law for any overriding reason. Much of the opinion offered on this subject at many of the hearings on the 1939 act and at other hearings on the several bills which have been considered by the Ways and Means Committee since 1939 tends to indicate that this age was not dictated by any compelling reasons. Indeed, much testimony at those early hearings favored fixing the minimum retirement age at 60 years.

Proposals to reduce the minimum retirement age have been offered in seven sessions of Congress since 1939. Such proposals stem from the awareness of the people that the benefits of the act should be available to as many persons as possible, and at times when they are most needed.

Regardless of whether a person is retired at a specific age or is dropped for other reasons and cannot find other employment because of age, his need is the same. The answer to it must fall within the purposes of the act. Selection of a suitable minimum retirement age thus must be made with considerable emphasis given to the attitude of employers in their handling of aged persons.

In proposing this reduction in the minimum retirement age to 60 and 55 protection is sought for a greater number of the persons who face unemployment because of age. The ages, 60 and 55, are not magic figures which may not be changed for the benefit of the people. No statistical data can be offered which will tend to prove that assistance is needed more by the people affected by the proposed change than by others not so affected.

This change will have a moderate impact on the old-age and survivors insurance fund and the cost increases which result from the change can be balanced with a moderate increase in level premium rates.

There is adequate further indication that no great voluntary exodus from employment will be caused by the lowering of the retirement age. Quite the contrary, wide past experience indicates that a very small percentage of persons who are receiving benefits quit their employment voluntarily. In 1950, for example, the greatest number of persons receiving the retirement benefits of the social-security law did so because they were dismissed for some reason which was without fault on their part, usually their age. The next greatest number were retired on social security because poor health made work impossible.

It seems reasonable to expect that very few persons will leave their employment in order to receive benefits under the act

in view of the amount paid as an average monthly benefit. During 1952 the average benefit received by single workers ranged from $27.50 to $85 per month for average monthly wages of from $50 to $300. Such benefits are clearly not sufficient to sustain our senior citizens nor will they reduce retirement. For married workers with wives the benefits received during the same period ranged from $41.30 to $127.55 per month for average monthly wages ranging from $50 to $300.

The average monthly benefit received as of July, 1954 by a retired worker and his wife both of whom receive benefits was $86.30. The average monthly benefit received by retired workers without dependents as of the same date was $49.40. Aged widows received a monthly average of $41 as of that date.

The cost of living today is such that those who have only social-security benefits to rely on for their living face grim, dire want. Even those retirees who have some additional income source, such as provided by company retirement plans, or small savings, have grave problems of living within their slender incomes.

I repeat that the scale of benefits under the law can be and must be raised. The good of our old people, and indeed of our young people who will one day need retirement benefits, demands that we all continue to work to see that those inadequate benefits are raised to a scale which will provide a decent living for our retirees.

The purpose of a lowering of the minimum retirement age is not to encourage persons to retire at an earlier age. Our people should be encouraged to continue employment as long as they are productive. Rather, as stated before, the purpose of this bill is only to serve as a crutch to those, who, by reason of early layoff, loss of employment due to age, or other adversity, must retire before the time at which social-security benefits are now available.

As of July 1, 1955, the male population of the United States over 60 was 9.8 million. Of this number 5.8 million were employed. The female population over 55 as of July 1, 1955, was 15 million. Of this number 3 million were employed. Thus 12 million of the women over 55 are dependent upon other persons for their support or upon sources of income other than their own employment. Plainly this problem is most severe to women above age 40, growing more acute with each passing year, until most women by 55 find it almost impossible to find employment.

The report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Fund to the 84th Congress based on a retirement age for men of 65 anticipated that 5,190,000 persons would be eligible for benefits. They further predicted that 73 percent of those eligible received benefits. Of persons over 70, 86 percent of those eligible received benefits. It can be anticipated for the extended coverage less than 50 percent of those below 65 who are eligible will receive benefits.

Cost of the proposed changes on a level premium basis would be 3 percent of payroll or an annual average of $6.75 billion. This cost adds 1.5 percent to the contributions of the employer and employee, respectively. These figures are conservative and allow a substantial amount toward maintaining the financial integrity of the trust fund unimpaired. Factors in this estimate which are somewhat speculative are the effect on employer retirement practices and the retirement desires of employees of reduced minimum retirement age. It seems clear that only the most ruthless employer would use this as a device to retire his employees at an earlier date than that provided by existing retirement plans. It is equally clear that there is the greatest need to protect workers from such tactics by this very change I propose.

I urge the passage of this bill into law at a very early date. It is clear to me that the great merit of this bill is such that it will commend itself most highly without any words from me.

AMENDMENT TO PATENT EXTENSION BILL, H. R. 2128, PROGRAMED FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to bring to the attention of the Members an amendment to the patent extension bill, H. R. 2128, which will be offered when it is before the House next Wednesday. I speak as a member of the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary which heard this bill.

The purpose of the amendment will be to strike out one of the three separate and distinct provisions of the bill, the one relating to patents whose exploitation was interfered with by wartime production controls.

In form the amendment will be to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H. R. 8534. That bill is in every respect the same as H. R. 2128, except that it omits the above-mentioned provision. This form of amendment avoids the necessity of offering several other minor amendments which would be necessary if the motion were in form to strike out the provision.

In further explanation of this amendment, I point out that the patent extension bill, H. R. 2128, contains the three following separate and distinct provisions extending patents beyond their usual term of 17 years:

First. On account of the military service of the owner in World War II or the Korean war.

Second. Whose exploitation was interfered with by wartime production controls during those wars.

Third. Where the owner had granted a royalty-free license to the United States in order to help the war effort.

The amendment to be offered will seek to strike out the second of these provisions for the following reasons:

First. The Department of Justice has reported adversely on this bill.

Second. The Bureau of the Budget has voiced objections.

Third. The National Organization of Patent Lawyers is opposed.

Fourth. The National Association of Manufacturers is opposed.

Fifth. Now is not the time to reverse the decision previously made by the last four Congresses, which have refused similar legislation. The passage of time has merely served to increase the administrative difficulties. War production controls were in effect back in 1941. Applicants for extension will be offering evidence as to administrative regulations and as to their own manufacturing situation 10 and 15 years ago. They will be trying to unscramble eggs which are 15 years old.

Sixth. It singles out patent owners as a preferred class for relief from losses due to wartime controls, which is unfair to others who suffered equally from the same cause, such as filling stations which could not get gasoline and steak houses which could not get steak.

Seventh. Proponents seek to answer the preceding charge by claiming that patent owners are in a special class. The claim is that the Government, by granting them a patent, had assured them that they would have 17 years in which to use and exploit their patents. That contention is not good law.

A patent contained no guaranty that the patent owner will not suffer along with others from war controls of a general nature affecting all alike. A patent does not give the patent owner any right to use his invention. It merely gives him the right to exclude others from using it, a right which was not taken away by war controls.

The Supreme Court has said, quoting with approval from one of its previous decisions:

> The Court held that the Government did not confer on the patentee the right himself to make, use, or vend his own invention, that such right was a right under the common law not arising under the Federal patent laws and not within the grant of power to Congress to enact such laws * * * The Court further held that in its essence all that the Government conferred by the patent was the right to exclude others from making, using, or vending his invention.

Eighth. It opens up for extension thousands of patents, throws a heavy burden on the Patent Office which must pass on each application for extension, and sets up such a vague standard that it leaves too wide an administrative discretion. It gives a right of appeal to the courts to any applicant dissatisfied with the decision of the Patent Office. That Office recently had a backlog of more than 200,000 patent applications. It creates an administrative nightmare.

Ninth. It even attempts to extend patents which have already expired. People might buy machinery to manufacture an object covered by a patent which had expired, only to find, if this bill is passed, that the patent had been resurrected and brought to life again, and that they might be liable to pay royalties. The bill would result in uncertainty as to the expiration dates of patents, a matter of great importance to

manufacturers who are planning new products.

Tenth. Business losses resulting from general acts of the Government undertaken for the defense of the country and affecting all alike have never been recognized as a basis for a claim for relief. They are not a proper basis for the relief here sought.

Eleventh. The proposed relief, by patent extension, is costly to the public. A patent has some of the aspects of a bargain. In return for the 17-year patent monopoly, the inventor agrees that the public shall have free access to the invention at the expiration of 17 years. To extend that period is to take away rights from the public.

Twelth. This provision, if approved, will be a bonanza for the big industrial concerns which are the large holders of patents, while the Department of Justice has been voicing objections to the concentration of patent holdings.

There was serious opposition in the Judiciary Committee to the second provision of the bill. A motion to strike it out was made and carried by a show of hands, 10 to 9. The bill would then have been disposed of had not the committee had to adjourn due to the House being in session. Two weeks later, after great activity on behalf of the proponents, the above decision was reversed.

The following seven members of the House Committee on the Judiciary dissented from the favorable report of this bill and filed minority views: JACK B. BROOKS, Texas; USHER L. BURDICK, North Dakota; LAURENCE CURTIS, Massachusetts; E. L. FORRESTER, Georgia; DEWITT S. HYDE, Maryland; WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Ohio; RUTH THOMPSON, Michigan.

I respectfully suggest that the provision of this bill which I have been discussing is not in the public interest, and that the amendment to strike it out should receive the favorable action of the Members.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOPE.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. PELLY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY, his remarks in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD, his remarks in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. KEATING.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 6, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1598. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, relative to reporting that during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1955, no contracts were negotiated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, pursuant to sections 2 (c) (11) and (16) of Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1599. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1600. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1601. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1602. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'an act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes' " to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1603. A letter from the Chairman, the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, the report of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission for the celebration in 1958 of the 100th anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt, pursuant to Public Law 183, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1604. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the fifth semiannual report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 203, 83d Congress, as amended by Public Law 751, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1605. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 24, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on waterway from Columbus, Ga., to Pensacola, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1606. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 23, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Tolchester Beach area, Kent County, Md., with a view to providing a harbor for small boats, made in response to an authorization in the River and Harbor Act approved June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY (by request):

H. R. 9740. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for the payment thereunder of certain medical expenses of retired railroad workers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 9741. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce the age on the basis of which benefits are payable in various cases, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, to increase benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H. R. 9742. A bill to provide for the protection of the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga., against damage from fire and drought; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 9743. A bill to encourage maximum development of atomic energy reactors for the generation of low-cost electric power and the production, utilization, and treatment of special nuclear and other materials, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 9744. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, and the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1264), as amended, to eliminate the requirement of certain notices thereunder and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 9745. A bill to provide for approval under title X of the Social Security Act of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other programs of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9746. A bill to reduce retirement age under title II of the Social Security Act from 65 to 60 in the case of men and from 65 to 55 in the case of women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 9747. A bill to amend section 23 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, and to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to tax treatment of certain casualty losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 9748. A bill to provide an income tax deduction for taxes paid by an employer on the wages of an employee who performs domestic or other personal or nonbusiness services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 9749. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for certain hearings before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission at locations convenient to claimants; to provide that claimants shall be afforded the right to examine evidence in the possession of the Commission, and to examine and cross-examine witnesses; to provide judicial review of certain actions of the Commission; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 9750. A bill to amend Public Law 894, 81st Congress to extend vocational rehabilitation benefits to persons disabled in the service between the termination of World War II and the beginning of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 9751. A bill to provide that the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall hold the rank of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9752. A bill to amend section 302 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 9753. A bill for a periodic health report on the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. J. Res. 574. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish and construct certain facilities at San Diego County, Calif., for the purpose of conducting research in methods of converting saline water to potable water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the acute need for medical research and development and to make available funds therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress and the Secretary of Defense to prevent the reduction of production and personnel at the Watertown Arsenal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to implement the Tri-Partite Declaration of the United States, Great Britain and France guaranteeing the borders of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN: Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to implement the Tri-Partite Declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the borders of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to implement the Tri-Partite Declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the borders of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 9754. A bill for the relief of Cecilia Ruth and Cecile May Dequine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 9755. A bill for the relief of Elmer L. Henderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 9756. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Augustine Hessenius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 9757. A bill for the relief of Stephen and Harriet Watt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 9758. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward J. Steichen, United States Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 9759. A bill for the relief of Roberto C. Bargas and Rosenda C. Bargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 9760. A bill for the relief of Robert Henry Hansen, Robert Keith Dawson, and Ronald Bernard Brindley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 9761. A bill for the relief of Nikola Nedeljkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

611. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Mrs. Henry A. Eldridge, legislative director of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, Inc., and 39 others from Rhode Island, urging enactment of legislation to remove alcoholic-beverage advertising from the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

612. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

613. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of the City Council of Schenectady, N. Y., requesting the Congress to work for the achievement of peace among the nations of the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

614. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the grand knight, Olympia Council, No. 394, Knights of Columbus, Flushing, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

615. Also, petition of the secretary, American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a congressional committee on administrative procedure; to the Committee on Rules.

616. Also, petition of the city and county clerk, Honolulu, T. H., with reference to the general bond indebtedness of the city and county of Honolulu; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

What Is Ahead for Wheatgrowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a copy of a speech which I made at the sixth annual convention of the National Association of Wheatgrowers on February 1, 1956, at Portland, Oreg.:

WHAT IS AHEAD FOR WHEATGROWERS

It is a great honor to be invited to address the sixth annual convention of the National Association of Wheatgrowers.

I can well remember some of the preliminary steps which were taken a few years ago to breathe the breath of life into this organization, including the meeting in Denver in the fall of 1949, where an organizing committee was appointed and the meeting in Kansas City early in 1950 when the organization was actually set up. Some of you who are present now were at both of these meetings. Since that time much has happened.

I am one who believes in organization. I know there are many who think the country is overorganized now, at least until we can find some way to crowd more days and nights into a week. But I feel sure that the need for a strong national organization of wheatgrowers and for strong State wheatgrowers associations as well was never greater than it is now.

This year with so many important questions confronting the wheatgrowers of this country, I think it is particularly important that we are meeting in this great, progressive, and beautiful western city with its many important business enterprises dependent on wheat and in a State which for many years has had a most effective organization of wheat growers. If every important wheat-producing State had an organization with the active membership and the able leadership of the Oregon Wheat League, the wheat producers of this country would be able to speak with the strong voice to which their importance entitles them. I am also convinced that in that case we would be much further along the road to a settlement of the problems affecting the production and marketing of wheat than we are at the present time.

I am sure that all of us from other States who are here today can learn much from what you have done in Oregon and I am sure also that the strength of the national association will be in direct ratio to the effectiveness and strength of the State wheat organizations.

Before I go any further I want, with your permission, to change the title of my remarks. On your program they are called

What Is Ahead for Wheatgrowers. That's a good subject as well as an interesting question. I selected it myself, but after thinking it over I believe that what I am going to say to you could be more aptly described as What Can We Do About Wheat?

That assumes we intend to do something about it, and I hope that we do because all of us, I am sure, will agree that in many respects wheat is in a bad way.

What and how much we can do in solving the many problems of wheat depends not only on the strength and effectiveness of our organization, but upon our method of approach. Of course this organization has many objectives; legislation is only one of them, but let me speak on that point first.

After almost 30 years in Washington in the House of Representatives and on the Committee on Agriculture of that House, I am convinced that from the standpoint of price and marketing legislation the individual commodity approach is the most effective. Of course we have much general farm legislation on such subjects as credit, education, research, and conservation, all of it working well, but the price-support programs which have worked most effectively, such as those on sugar, fluid milk, and tobacco, have been programs which were tailored particularly to the commodity in question. More recently, as all of you know, we have put into effect a special program for wool.

The necessity for adapting our farm program to the needs of the various commodities was clearly recognized by President Eisenhower in his comprehensive message on agriculture which he sent to the 83d Congress on January 11, 1954. The statement to which I refer is found on page 3 of the message and reads as follows:

"No single program can apply uniformly to the whole farm industry. Some farm products are perishable, some are not; some farms consume the products of other farms, some foods and fibers we export, some we import. A comprehensive farm program must be adaptable to these and other differences, and yet not penalize one group of farmers in order to benefit another."

Recognition of the principles stated by President Eisenhower has been widespread among farmers and farm organizations. This is indicated by the large number of organizations which have been set up to deal with the problems of specific farm commodities. There are dozens of these organizations.

One of the great general farm organizations, the National Grange, has come out strongly for the commodity approach to farm programs. Other general farm organizations have directly or tacitly approved that approach by supporting special methods of dealing with such commodities as sugar, tobacco, wool, and corn as well as those susceptible to the use of marketing agreements and orders.

Wheat is an agricultural commodity different from almost all others in both its production and marketing aspects. While no crop covers a wider geographic area since there is wheat production in every State in the Union, a large proportion of this production is concentrated in a comparatively small number of States. In these particular States and parts of States there are usually few other alternatives to wheat production. Hence it has assumed a dominant position in the agriculture of these areas. Throughout the country it is produced under widely varying conditions. In some areas it is sown in the fall, in others the spring. Almost everywhere its production has become entirely mechanized. Large areas in which wheat is produced are subject to wide climatic and rainfall changes, thus resulting in a considerable variation in acre yields from year to year. In some areas production is increased by the use of fertilizer. In other areas this is impractical. Summer fallowing is a practice in some areas, in others it is not necessary, in still others it is not practicable. There is just as wide a diversity in the marketing and use of wheat as there is in its production. More of our production is consumed domestically for human food than for any other purpose, but considerable quantities have always been used for livestock feed. Over the years we have exported substantial quantities of wheat. In fact, we have been the world's largest exporter. During World War II large quantities of wheat went into industrial uses and there are possibilities for some industrial use in peacetime. As far as domestic human consumption is concerned, the price which the grower receives has little or no effect upon the qauntity consumed. In the case of other uses price is an important factor in relation to consumption.

Thus it can readily be seen that wheat is a commodity which very definitely has its own problems and one which cannot be effectively served by Government programs designed to cover crops and commodities produced and marketed under entirely different conditions. It was a recognition of this situation which led to the establishment of this organization in the first place.

It shall be my purpose today to discuss various proposals which I believe hold the promise of meeting some of the present problems of wheat producers. Some of these proposals relate to Government programs, others are entirely outside the province of Government. But before doing this let me briefly run down the present situation in Washington relative to general farm legislation. As all of you know the House last year passed the bill H. R. 12 which provided for 90-percent price supports on the basic commodities for 3 years. No action was taken on that bill by the Senate Committee on Agriculture during that session. However the committee held some hearings on general farm legislation late in the session, and also held extensive field hearings in many parts of the country during October and November.

On January 9 the President sent to the Congress a special message on agriculture dealing with many aspects of the matter. As might be expected, however, the message dealt mainly with the surplus of agriculture commodities and ways of dealing with it. In addition to urging that surplus disposal measures be stepped up the President suggested the enactment of legislation setting up a soil bank program under which inducements would be offered to farmers to take perhaps 45 or 50 million acres of land out of production. The President indicated that of this 40 or 50 million acres perhaps 12 million acres should be land allotted wheat under the existing wheat program.

The Senate committee has held and concluded hearings on the proposals embodied in the President's message and is now holding executive sessions for the purpose of bringing out legislation for the consideration of the Senate.

As the vehicle for this legislation the committee will use H. R. 12, the 90-percent price-support bill. To it will be added such provisions as the committee may want to offer taken from the President's message or elsewhere. It is uncertain at this time whether the 90-percent provisions will be retained or eliminated.

What I want to point out is that the bill which passes the Senate will be the House bill as amended. It will not be necessary therefore for the House to reconsider it except to send it to conference where conferees from the Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate will work out the final form of the bill.

In the Senate committee and in the Senate it will be in order to offer an amendment embodying the domestic parity plan and if this amendment is adopted it will be in the bill for the conferees to consider. In that case we would hope to keep it in the final form of the bill.

Now to get back to a discussion of wheat problems. I think everyone will agree that the greatest of these is that of markets, both at home and abroad. The question of markets involves matters of international trade, including the question of whether the International Wheat Agreement should be renewed. It involves our general foreign policies; it is tied in with the question of whether we will continue economic aid to other countries; it is concerned with surplus disposal, much of which if effective must be done abroad. It involves the matter of export subsidies; it is tied in with domestic legislation, of which the most important item is the domestic parity plan.

At the recent hearings held by the Senate Committee on Agriculture on general farm legislation, representatives of the National Association of Wheat Growers, of some of the State associations of wheatgrowers, and of the National Grange appeared before the committee and made most effective presentations urging the enactment of the domestic parity plan. Similar presentations were made at meetings of the House and Senate Agricultural committees in the last session of Congress and in the course of the field hearings which the Senate committee held throughout the country during last October and November.

The most significant circumstance in connection with these presentations has been that as the plan is more fully explained and understood the opposition to it disintegrates. One of the great problems which we have been up against in our efforts to present this program has been the reluctance of tentative opponents to carefully study the legislation with a view of ascertaining its effects. My experience has been that as this legislation becomes better understood the opposition to it melts away like snow under a July sun.

No one who is familiar with the problems of wheat can fail to see after careful study of this proposal that it has many advantages, not only over the present program, but over any other program which thus far has been brought forward for consideration.

It is time wasted to preach salvation to those who are already saved and I shall not take much time today to dwell upon the advantages of this program to those of you who are so familiar with it and are cognizant of its merits. However let me take just a moment to point out a few of its more obvious advantages:

One. Returns to the farmer will be somewhat greater than under the present program and there is a good prospect that expanded outlets will further increase these returns in the future.

Two. Marketing quotas and penalties will be eliminated and acreage controls greatly minimized and possibly entirely eliminated in the course of time.

Three. Relief to taxpayers will be afforded through an immediate substantial reduction and eventual elimination of practically all the costs of the present program under which export subsidies and storage costs amount in the aggregate to over $400 million per year.

Four. To a large extent it will take the Government out of the warehousing and merchandising of wheat and in the end probably do away with such activities altogether.

Five. Wheat would be produced for market instead of for sale to the Government and would be sold on the basis of quality thus encouraging good farming and the production of superior varieties.

Six. Producers of livestock and poultry wherever situated would be able to produce wheat for feed or buy wheat at feed prices.

Seven. There would be some expansion of wheat exports through the elimination of redtape, delays, and other obstacles existing at present.

Eight. It would result in moving wheat into its natural outlets and market channels.

Nine. It will fit in perfectly with the soil bank proposals recently submitted by the President.

Ten. It will return to the farmer greater freedom and control over the operation of his own farm.

If time permitted this list of advantages could be extended considerably further, but I am sure it isn't necessary for me to go into further detail with this group.

Let me call attention also to the fact that the changes which the adoption of this program would make with respect to the marketing and disposal of wheat are directly in line with what I understand Secretary Benson desires to achieve in securing more freedom for the farmer in the marketing and distribution of agricultural commodities and in bringing about production for consumption instead of storage.

They are also in line with changes which good and substantial farmers everywhere have been saying they wanted to see made in connection with the farm program.

They are in line with recommendations which have frequently been made by representatives of wheat producers, the grain trade, and the millers. To be more specific, let me point out that at a meeting held on April 14 and 15, 1953, the Wheat Advisory Committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and composed of all elements engaged in the production, marketing, and distribution of wheat, unanimously recommended the domestic parity plan. At a meeting held on August 14, 1953, the same committee again unanimously recommended this plan. Both of these meetings were held in Washington. On October 13 and 14, 1953, the Secretary's Wheat Advisory Committee and his Corn Advisory Committee held a joint meeting in Chicago. At this meeting it was recommended that the domestic parity plan be adopted for wheat. This vote was not unanimous, but I understand it was by a substantial majority.

I have already commented upon the fact that the opposition to this program has melted away as it has been more widely discussed and explained. However, those of us who have advocated it have apparently failed as yet to do as good a job as we should in explaining its merits because we all know there is opposition to this program. I am sure that this opposition is based entirely upon a misunderstanding of the purpose and effect of the legislation.

Let me deal briefly with some of the objections which have been made. One objection which comes from the Corn Belt is that this program will increase the supply of feed grains to the detriment of the producers of corn and other feed grains. I know that this opposition is sincere and I am sure that I am speaking for the wheat growers of this country when I say that they do not want a wheat program which will be unfair to the producers of other agricultural commodities or which will result in increasing the problem of the producers of feed grains. They are realistic enough also to know that if legislation is to be enacted by Congress it must be fair to all phases of agriculture and that we cannot expect to help the wheat grower at the expense of the corngrower. What I want to point out specifically and in all sincerity to the corn producers of this country is that the enactment of this legislation will decrease rather than increase the supply of feed grains. This is because the present program has diverted and will continue to divert wheat acreage to the production of other feed grains, such as sorghums, barley, and oats, and that the production so diverted to these feed grains has produced more feed than would have been the case if the land had been planted to wheat and the wheat used for livestock feed. Any increase in wheat acreage which may take place under this bill will result in a decrease in the acreage of other feed grains and in the production of less feed than will be the case if we keep our present program. For this reason, those who are disturbed about the present feed grain situation should be the strongest supporters of this program.

The contention is made by some who have not had the opportunity to thoroughly study the domestic parity program that it will result in opposition from other countries on the ground that exports under this program would constitute dumping. There is no reason at all for believing that this would be the case. What we are doing now and have been doing for several years in paying direct subsidies on all wheat exports does constitute dumping under any definition I have ever seen. What is proposed under this legislation is to restore to United States wheat producers freedom to compete with other exporting countries in the world market. No subsidies or dumping are involved and similar plans have not been considered as dumping under the definitions embodied in international trade agreements and proposed agreements. Such inquiries as I have made indicate that the policy embodied in the domestic parity plan would be far more acceptable to both wheat exporting and importing countries than our present system.

I have dealt with the most important objections which have been made to the domestic parity plan. Of course, there are others, but examination of them indicates they are not substantial and are based upon a misunderstanding of the plan and its provisions. The perfect farm plan has not yet been invented, but I believe a study of this plan will show that it meets the situation which it is designed to cover with fewer legitimate objections than any other plan which has been considered by Congress, at least in our time.

There are other legislative proposals affecting wheat now before Congress, but I shall not go into them at this time because the passage of the domestic parity plan will take care of most of the situations which these proposals are designed to meet and will do it in a more effective way.

But legislation cannot solve all the problems of the wheat farmer. We all recognize that. There are many things which those engaged in the production of wheat, including farmers, grain dealers, and millers must do for themselves in dealing with the problems confronting the wheat industry. I am going to mention a few of them. I know that you are actively working on some of these matters. I can only urge that they be given prompt consideration and early action.

In the first place, we must give more attention to quality. Quality production will be encouraged by the enactment of the domestic parity plan, but this is fundamentally a problem which must be met by producers themselves. The requirements of both the foreign and domestic market make a constantly improved quality a necessity and no one doubts we have the technical knowledge and the skill to do the job. Continued research is of course an important element in this situation.

Second, we need to revise and improve our methods of grading wheat so as to make grades reflect more nearly the qualities which are desired for bread production. We can never deal adequately with quality until we improve our grading system.

Third, we need to develop better marketing methods and engage in more marketing research in both domestic and foreign markets. This is most important and this organization can do much in the way of furnishing competent and adequate leadership along that line.

Fourth, continued and persistent research must be carried on in finding further industrial uses for wheat, its products and by-products.

Fifth, I believe the time has come when we can successfully wage a campaign to increase the consumption of wheat as human food. You are all familiar with what has happened. In 1909 our per capita consumption of wheat for food was 310 pounds. In 1955 it was 173 pounds. I don't need to tell you that if our per capita consumption was 310 pounds today our wheat problem would be considerably less than it is now. But the most serious part of the matter is that if present trends continue consumption in 1956 will be less than 173 pounds and still less in 1957. There have been reasons, perhaps some of them good reasons, for this change in our dietary habits. For one thing we use our muscles much less and we don't need as much of the energy foods as we did a generation or two ago. Furthermore, the medical profession and the nutrition experts have urged a shift from starch to protein in our diets. Medical research indicates that overweight is an important factor in causing several serious diseases, particularly in people past middle age. But the time has now come when medical and nutrition experts themselves feel that we have gone far enough and perhaps too far in reducing our consumption of cereals. Some of them feel we are not using them to the extent we ought to as energy building foods and that we are also using other food sources for energy which are inferior to cereals and in some cases deleterious to health. Not to be forgotten also is that wheat is an excellent source of protein.

We have seen that the producers of other foods such as fruits and vegetables as well as meat animals and dairy products have had marked success in increasing consumption of their products. Of course, they have had the advantage of going with the trend. The very fact that producers of other food commodities are carrying on aggressive campaigns indicates how highly competitive the food market is today. Statistics show that year after year consumers spend about the same proportion of their income for food. That hasn't changed, the change has taken place in the shift from some foods to others. Certainly there is plenty to be said about wheat, its healthful qualities and its value as food.

I haven't felt until recently that there was much which could be done to reverse the trend in cereal consumption, but I am now convinced that a concerted effort by farmers, the grain trade, millers, and bakers in producing a better product and in bringing it to the attention of the people in an effective way can result in a greater per capita consumption of wheat. Even if we just held the consumption for food where it is now, our increase in population will result in some increased consumption. This is something on which we can all work, but the leadership must be taken by organizations like this one.

Sixth. Another thing that we need to do as farmers is in the establishment of better public relations. This applies to wheat farmers as much as anyone, because of the fact that our surpluses of wheat and the cost of the price support program have been magnified and advertised out of all proportion. I am afraid many people place the blame for this on wheat farmers. Well, we do have a lot of wheat, but no one familiar with the facts can truthfully say that it's the fault of wheat farmers. It's simply the result of an expansion of our agricultural plant which took place at the request of our Government during and following World War II and including the Korean war period. The fact of the matter is that our wheat surplus has been entirely built up during the past 3 years. Until that time every bushel we produced was needed. On July 1, 1952, our wheat carryover was 256 million bushels, less than normal. Our surplus has all accumulated since then. I will not go into detail as to why; I think you are all familiar with the

reasons. Our Government should have put marketing quotas into effect at least as early as the 1953 crop, but didn't do so. Wheat farmers have consistently voted controls upon themselves in order to adjust production every time they have the opportunity.

We expanded in a good many other ways than wheat production under the stress of war and war demands. When the need for war materials declined following the war the Federal Government made contract settlements with those who were overproducing which enabled them to shut down their plants and reduce their capacity without loss to themselves. I don't recall, however, that this fact was widely advertised to the public or that there was any criticism of the manufacturers because they had surplus capacity or were producing surplus goods and were subsidized for closing their plants.

We produced a lot of ships at that time which are now in surplus. We are storing wheat in some of them. In the papers we read a lot about the surplus wheat stored in these ships, but not one word about the surplus ships.

The farmers' side of the story has never been told adequately and it behooves all of us to take every opportunity to see that it is presented fairly and that those engaged in other occupations understand fully the peculiar problems that confront the farmer. This, too, must be done through organization. Some valuable things along that line are being done. Last fall through the cooperation of Kiwanis International and other civic organizations and with the help of those engaged in some of the industries which deal with farming and through the efforts of some of the farm organizations there was observed what is known as Farm-City Week. This is a most gratifying move and it is planned to make it an annual occasion. There is legislation pending in Congress directing the President to issue a proclamation to this effect each year. We hope to enact this legislation during the present session.

Now I come to a subject which I have discussed on other occasions and which I feel can bear discussion again. That is setting up an organization of all of those who deal with the production and distribution of wheat. I have in mind something like the cotton council with which most of you are familiar. Over the years the cotton council has achieved much in bringing about more efficient production, improved quality and better distribution. This has been particularly important in meeting the competition of synthetic commodities, a problem which wheat producers fortunately do not have.

No doubt there are a few situations in the cotton industry where there are conflicts of interest between producers and distributors, but for every point of conflict there are many where their interests are mutual and identical. The same is true of wheat. The interests of producers may occasionally conflict with the interests of the grain trade or the millers or bakers, but in the main their interests are the same and what is good for the wheat producer is also good for the grain dealer, the miller, the baker, and everyone along the line. One thing is certain: We are all interested in producing and selling more wheat and wheat products and there are plenty of opportunities for cooperation in doing that.

I know that the officers and leaders of this organization have given thought to this idea of an overall organization of the wheat industry. I do not want to let this opportunity go by to urge with the utmost seriousness that these efforts be renewed and intensified.

Wheat is the world's most important food product. More people are consuming it today than ever before in history. More would consume it if they could get it because it is at the same time the cheapest and most nutritious of all foods. Bread, now as always, is the staff of life.

Here in this country we have the greatest wheat-producing area in the world. We can produce every type, kind, and quality of wheat which may be desired. Perhaps some may think we have overdone it, but I do not agree as long as there are hungry stomachs to be filled, and there are.

The producers of wheat are important people in the world's economy. In the years since World War II, American wheat has been more than a food. It has been an instrument for building and rebuilding the strength of the free world. Wheat produced by American farmers has gone to every corner of the earth. It has gone to those who were our allies during the war and to those who were once our enemies, but are now alined on the side of freedom. We have not sought to buy friendship. We know friendship cannot be bought, but we have sought to strengthen those nations where free government prevails and in this we have succeeded. When the history of the world for the decade from 1945 to 1955 is finally written in its true perspective, the part played by American wheat producers will constitute an important chapter.

But the very fact that wheat is such an important item in world commerce, the fact that it has played such a great part in the struggle for a free world in the years since the war, poses a danger for wheat producers. For these very reasons too many are apt to take wheat for granted and to overlook the important fact that wheat is grown by people and that their economic and social well-being is the most important factor in determining whether American wheat is going to continue to be the dominant world force which it has been in recent years.

The people who grow wheat must have a voice. This organization should be that voice. This does not rule out other voices and other organizations. We want their help, but one of the problems with agriculture today is that there are too many discordant voices. The great national farm organizations are headed by sincere and dedicated leaders. But in many things they do not agree and because there is division, no matter how honest, there is weakness when the interests of farmers are involved. But if this organization receives the support from wheat producers which it deserves and has earned, then no one can say that the million and more American wheat producers are without a strong and effective voice.

Conditions in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared about conditions in Poland, which are of the utmost importance to the United States, which has maintained always the closest ties with the Polish people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

The main issue of our times is the struggle of freedom and democracy against slavery and tyranny. It is, therefore, appropriate to recall a document which 38 years ago became the foundation for the liberation of enslaved nations. This document is the Fourteen points message of President Woodrow Wilson, whose 100th birthday anniversary we will celebrate this year.

The soldiers of the great Western Democracies were fighting and dying on the battlefields in defense of the ideals of freedom, when President Wilson, in his world famous statement to Congress in 1918, defined the aims of war and the conditions of peace. The main core of this statement was liberation for enslaved nations. Few statements have made such a great contribution to the cause of freedom. It breathed life into yet unborn states in Europe. New, free nations arose from foreign enslavement: Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Finland, and Yugoslavia.

The 13th point of President Wilson's message concerned Poland, which had been enslaved since the end of the 18th century. The 13th point reads as follows: "An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant."

Not quite a year passed after President Wilson's message when Poland joined the family of free nations, united and independent. Boundary lines which partitioned the country went down; Poland shook off the chains and a Polish nation rose to independence. All the dreams of generations of Polish fighters for freedom, all the visions of the great poet and prophet, Mickiewicz, came true.

At the very dawn of her independence, Poland generously repayed her debt of gratitude to the cause of freedom. Near Warsaw, in the famous battle called by Lord d'Abernon the 18th most important battle of the world, the heroic army of reborn Poland defeated and destroyed the armies of the Bolsheviks who were then seeking to overrun the heart of Europe.

On this occasion, I shall limit myself to the subject of Poland as being the symbol of all European nations liberated following the presentation of the 14-point program. Let us examine the Poland which rose after the First World War in consonance with the American ideal of freedom, and let us see what became of Poland occupied by the Soviet Army in 1945–55.

Whatever test we may use to evaluate the reality of Poland's 20 years of independence, in fulfillment of the 13th point of President Wilson's message, there is one undeniable fact: Poland regained the right of self-government, the right to rule according to her own, unrestricted will. Poland became independent. She had her difficulties and her crises. But whatever occurred in Poland, it was purely a Polish matter, done by Poles, Poles exclusively, without foreign influence. The Polish Government was Polish. Its tradition and culture were Polish. The Polish Sejm was a Polish Diet. The Polish economy served the aims of the Polish Nation, and the Polish Army was headed by Polish marshals. Political parties, although not seeing eye to eye on Poland's historical tasks, did not serve a foreign power but the Polish nation.

The United States has always maintained the most cordial relations with the Polish people. As a matter of fact, those friendly relations go back as far as the history of the United States. Millions of former sons of Poland became outstanding citizens of the United States. Kosciuszko and Pulaski are treasured names in American history. Their

fight for American independence is cherished in the mind of every schoolchild.

We knew Poland, reborn to independence in cooperation with the 13th point of Woodrow Wilson's message. What do we know of this proud nation now?

In the new struggle for freedom, Poland was the first European country to voice a courageous "No" against Hitlerite aggression. Because of her refusal to submit, Poland was invaded by Hitler's army. Seventeen days later a Poland fighting for its life was attacked from the rear by Soviet Russia. Shortly thereafter, the U. S. S. R. and Hitler's Germany carried out their secret agreement partitioning Poland. That was early in World War II. Later both of these aggressors, Soviet Russia and Hitler's Germany, became enemies. Toward the end of the war Polish territory was completely occupied by the Soviet Army. What happened at that time is known only too well. May I mention only the heroic Warsaw uprising against the Nazi forces, while the Soviet Army stood at the very gates of Warsaw? We all know that Soviet Russia made it impossible for the Western Powers to send more help to the desperate and heroic fighters of Warsaw. We all know that the Soviet Army stood motionless on the right bank of the Vistula River watching the burning of Warsaw by Hitler's SS-men. We all remember the previous Soviet crime at Katyn, the treacherous murder by the NKVD of thousands of Polish war prisoners. We remember how Soviet Russia broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in exile, because the latter insisted upon an impartial International Red Cross investigation of the Katyn massacre.

Soviet Russia violated all international agreements and fulfilled its plan for the expansion of Communist doctrine and imperialism—it established a puppet government in Warsaw. Only false appearances were left of the freedom granted to Poland by the 13th point of President Wilson's message. Poland is independent in name only. Her political, economic, and cultural life is completely controlled by Soviet Russia.

For many years the President of Poland was Boleslaw Bierut, now the first secretary of the Polish Communist Party. Formerly, Mr. Bierut was a Soviet citizen and professional officer of the NKVD. Many prominent refugees from Poland have testified under oath before congressional committees that Boleslaw Bierut is devoted, body and soul, to Soviet Russia. This testimony was confirmed by several former high officials of the Communist Party, who had access to the most confidential secrets of the Politburo. Actually, the Politburo of the Polish Communist Party rules the country. Although officially its members are elected by the Central Committee, they are really appointed by the Soviet authorities. One basic qualification of membership is blind and strict obedience to Soviet Russia. These puppets, along with so-called Soviet counselors are held accountable by Moscow for events in Poland. It is not surprising, therefore, that all political institutions, including the Polish constitution, are molded on the Soviet pattern. The 1947 elections were fraudulent, although international agreement provided that they should be free and unfettered. The second elections in 1952 were conducted in Soviet fashion with only one list of Communist candidates available. All this happened despite the fact that Poland is overwhelmingly anti-Communist. Civil rights do not exist in Poland. There is no freedom of speech or of association. All forms of social activity must serve the Communist purpose. There are no opposition parties. The so-called Democratic Party and the United Peasant Party are dominated by Communist stooges. All writers have orders to choose their subjects and to adapt their way of writing to Soviet patterns. The security police with its army of secret agents and informants spreads fear of denunciation among the people, who are afraid to express their thoughts, even to their closest friends or relatives.

Polish Communist propaganda, especially that designed to impress foreigners, makes much of so-called religious freedom in Poland. What is the real situation? The churches in Poland are open, and filled to overflowing. Church attendance is one safe way of showing opposition to Communist propaganda. But the open churches do not mean that the Communist Party has changed its antireligious doctrine but rather only that it is taking into account the deep religious feeling of the Poles. Religious faith, and particularly that of the Roman Catholic Church (95 percent of Poland is Roman Catholic), has traditionally been closely linked with Polish patriotism and national survival. A frontal attack on the church would therefore be a tactical mistake from the Communist point of view. But while the churches remain open, the pressure on the church and its representatives is strong and unremitting. The Communist Party is clearly engaged in a struggle to take over the church in Poland. Hundreds of priests have been thrown in jail. Many bishops have been compelled to abandon their religious functions. Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski was arrested, and is still held by the Communist police because he refused to give in to Moscow's will. The Communist campaign continues. On February 10, 1953, a Communist decree stipulated that all nominations for the Catholic Church must be approved by the regime. And of course the main target of Communist antireligious propaganda is the youth,.

Poland's economic life is completely subordinated to the interests of Soviet Russia. Prominent refugees from Poland testify that even her 5-year plan was devised by Soviet experts. Notwithstanding the reconstruction and the development of Polish industry, the life of the Polish worker, peasant, and intelligentsia has not improved because the Polish economy is exploited by the Soviets. The Communists force the peasants to collectivize against their will. Fear of collectivization and inefficient management on collective farms has produced food shortages. Poland was an exporter of grain before the war; now, she has to import grain. These are only a few facts about Poland under the Communist regime. What a drastic difference between the prewar state of this country, allowed to stand freely as a consequence of the 13th point of President Wilson's message, and the Poland now under Soviet control.

In this connection, I should like to draw attention to one interesting aspect of Soviet rule in Poland. Faced as they are with the damning evidence of history, and with a population which is overwhelmingly anti-Communist, the Moscow-appointed rulers of Poland find it hard indeed to produce any pro-Soviet and anti-American propaganda themes. Therefore, they must resort to the most absurd and grotesque maneuvers. For example, if a visitor to Poland sees through the Communist camouflage and does not echo the obvious lies of Communist propaganda, he is accused of failing to pay tribute to the achievements of the Polish people. Actually, of course, the real state of affairs is quite clear. The Polish people are famous for their hard work and vigor. They have made tremendous sacrifices since the end of World War II, and they have achieved notable successes in industry and reconstruction. But these successes were achieved not because of Communist domination, but in spite of it—not because Poland is a Soviet satellite, but in spite of it. I have only the greatest admiration for a people who can do what the Polish people have done during the last 10 years, while enduring the worst kind of Communist oppression and Russian colonialism.

A second, even more fantastic, lie that the Polish Communist propaganda machine is peddling is the portrayal of this country as an ally of Nazism against Poland, aiming at the destruction of Polish independence and of the reconstruction achieved at such great cost by the Polish people. In this connection, I cannot imagine a more glaring contrast than that between this country and the Soviet Union. The U. S. S. R. made a pact with Hitler. America did not. Soviet troops invaded Poland. America fought only as an ally of Poland. The U. S. S. R. occupied, and still occupies, Poland, and dictates, to the smallest detail, the political and economic life of the Poles. America has only one aim as regards the Polish people, to help them achieve independence so that they may choose and build whatever political and economic society they wish. I have no doubt but that an independent Poland would be a loyal and useful member of the free world. and would maintain the tradition of close friendship between the Poles and the Americans.

The United States participated in the Geneva Conferences to further the American people's aspirations for an enduring peace and to support the principles upon which they conceive such a peace to be based. Among these principles is the right of a people to national independence and to a government and institutions of their own choosing. This concept of self-determination is deeply rooted in American tradition and thinking. Throughout history, it has been a prime factor in the American's approach to international affairs and a rudiment of the foreign policy of the United States.

President Eisenhower's words embodied the deep concern of the American people for the welfare of the populations of Eastern Europe and over their inability to exercise their sovereign right to conduct their national affairs in freedom when he stated on August 24, 1955: "There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of a status quo, in which we find injustice to many nations, repression of human beings on a gigantic scale and with constructive effort paralyzed in many areas by fear." He has defined American foreign policy aims with regard to the once proud countries now under Soviet domination many times. These aims are based upon the concept of freedom. On December 30, 1955, President Eisenhower again declared: "The peaceful liberation of the captive peoples has been, is, and, until success is achieved, will continue to be a major goal of United States foreign policy."

Freedom of Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, there is no newspaper published in the United States that I enjoy reading more than the Christian Science Monitor, because of all the great metropolitan dailies, it has been the most objective through the years. It is owned and published by a charitable foundation, and does not have to trim its sails in response to any pressure group.

On January 26, 1950, the Christian Science Monitor said editorially of the pending FEPC bill:

The Constitution expressly reserved to the people and the States powers not granted to the Federal Government. Such legal rights are supported by practical political wisdom and real questions of justice. * * * The FEPC bill would infringe the right of employers and union members to choose their associates. It may be argued that they should be willing to choose their associates without regard to race or religion. But there is a vital difierence between should and must. When the State tells the individual how he must choose his associates it is interfering with a peculiarly intimate freedom. To correct one injustice it is commiting another.

Mr. Donald R. Richberg was for many years the leading advocate in this country of the basic rights of the laboring man, and appeared in a number of cases as chief counsel for national labor organizations. On October 10, 1947, Mr. Richberg said, when testifying before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with respect to the FEPC bill:

I venture to point out that the dominant objective of the bill is to prohibit and to prevent by governmental action any freedom to choose one's associates or coworkers in business, if that choice is based on considerations of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry, yet freedom to choose one's associates because of personal liking and confidence, or individual judgment, whether rational or irrational (in the opinion of others), is one of the most essential freedoms of a free citizen which has been for decades guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

The same theme was the keynote of a recent address delivered to the Rotary Club of Atlanta, Ga., by Mr. Robert B. Troutman, a distinguished Atlanta attorney. His speech, entitled "Freedom of Choice in Public Schools," was published on the editorial page of the Christian Science Monitor of March 1, 1956.

I wish to emphasize this statement by Mr. Troutman:

The choice of associates among members of the races is in practice throughout the entire country. There is practically no mixing of the races in the churches, in offices or in clubs, or social gatherings, or in the homes, in any place in America. So by voluntary choice the right of selection of associates is being practiced by both races in America. The same process makes it desirable in the schools.

Naturally I was pleased that Mr. Troutman in that same speech said:

The Southern States might well adopt the solution which has been suggested by Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia.

That statement referred to Senate Joint Resolution 137, which I introduced on February 6, 1956, and which has as cosponsors Senators JOHNSTON, THURMOND, ERVIN, MCCLELLAN, RUSSELL, and GEORGE.

Before the introduction of that resolution, I had the opinion of one of the best constitutional lawyers of the Nation that the Congress had the legal right to enact such a law, and other good constitutional lawyers have since concurred in that view. A simple majority of the Congress, with the approval of the President, could write that resolution into law. With respect to the operation of schools, it would provide complete freedom of choice of associates, because authority would be granted to each individual State, which in turn could delegate to separate school units the privilege of operating desegregated schools, segregated schools, or a combination of the two.

A plan to permit the choice of associates was proposed by Virginia's Gray Commission, which recommended that the Virginia constitution be changed in such a way as to enable school units which wanted to operate desegregated schools to do so, while others would have the right to operate a combination of desegregated public and segregated private schools. Families in a mixed school area who wished to send their children to a segregated, nonsectarian private school would be eligible for State tuition grants.

Since that report was submitted and ratified by an overwhelming majority of the voters of Virginia in an election called to authorize a convention to amend the State constitution, Virginia and other States have adopted resolutions of interposition. Some have gone to the point of nullification; but others, as was done by Virginia by resolution, merely declared that the action of the Supreme Court, in effect writing a new provision into our Constitution, was an illegal method of amending the Constitution, and that those States, including Virginia, would adopt all legal means to avoid compliance with such unjustified action.

All Southern States now seek a legal remedy for this deplorable situation. The attorney general of Virginia has ruled that a resolution of interposition falls short of being a legal remedy. While there are various legal means of delaying compliance, constitutional authorities are agreed that there are but two legal means for permanent relief. One is to amend the Constitution, which would require, first, a two-thirds vote of the Congress to propose the amendment, and then ratification by three-fourths of the States. The other is the legal remedy I have proposed, which, as indicated, can be adopted by a simple majority of the Congress.

It is, of course, true that at the moment the Congress is unwilling to divorce politics from the consideration of this serious constitutional issue. That issue is one which involves not only the historic right of States to operate their own public school systems as they see fit, provided their school facilities for the races are equal, but also the broader aspects of the protection of rights of States and individuals guaranteed by the 10th amendment. But the time may come, and I sincerely believe it will come, when the broader aspects of the southern school situation will become a matter of national concern. Naturally, I hope that time will come before a system of public education has been wrecked in the South, the efforts in the South during the past decade to provide equal facilities for the races have been destroyed, and bitter animosities have been engendered in areas where heretofore peace and harmony have characterized racial relations.

There definitely is a legal remedy under which Southern States may continue to enjoy their constitutional right of a choice of associates, and I have pointed out to my colleagues in the Senate how it can be provided.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the address by Mr. Troutman, which was published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 1, 1956, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(By Robert B. Troutman)

The Southern States might well adopt the solution which has been suggested by Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, in a proposed resolution to be introduced in Congress. Alabama is now considering a constitutional amendment embracing the same plan. It should receive the support of all people in the country. Even the Federal Constitution might be amended to authorize it if necessary. I do not believe it is necessary.

It is a simple plan, giving the parents a freedom of choice in the matter.

The Southern States are contending that, no matter what the future may hold, the present view of the best thinking on the part of both races is that white and colored children should not be compelled to attend the same schools. Certainly, the overwhelming majority of the parents of the white children in the South hold that conviction. While we deplore the disorder on the campus at the University of Alabama, it shows how deeply the white people feel on the subject.

We believe that among our most valued freedoms is the right to choose one's associates. It is as basic as the right of free speech, free worship and free press. No government has the power to compel us to associate with anyone else.

Every Southern State has compulsory school attendance laws. The parents, under threat of punishment by fine and imprisonment, must send their children to school. In most communities no private schools exist. Most parents are financially unable to send their children to private schools, even if such schools are available. So only the public schools can be available to meet these compulsory education laws. Unless, therefore, there can be separate schools for the races, children are forced to associate with those of another race contrary to the fundamental constitutional right of freedom of choice in selecting one's associates.

The Supreme Court's decision in the segregation cases did not hold that children could not be separated on a voluntary basis. It held only that a Negro child could not be denied admission to a school merely on the grounds of race.

The States, therefore, should be permitted to establish three types of schools. First, a school to which children of both or all races are admitted, if they desire to attend school together. Second, a school where only white children are admitted, for those who desire to attend such a school. Third, a school where only Negro children are admitted, for those who desire to attend such a school.

I believe it will be within the boundaries of the Constitution, even as interpreted by the Court as now constituted. It is reasonable. Recent surveys in the schools of the

District of Columbia reveal that since integration has been ordered, the children have fallen below the national average in grading their qualifications to be in their respective classes. The Negro children are now far below the whites in intelligence and culture. Obviously, white parents should have a choice to avoid the holding back of their children in their schoolwork due to inferior-equipped associates.

The choice of associates among members of the races is in practice throughout the entire country. There is practically no mixing of the races in the churches, in offices or in clubs, or social gatherings, or in the homes, in any place in America. So by voluntary choice the right of selection of associates is being practiced by both races in America. The same process makes it desirable in the schools.

For this reason I believe that in the South a number of mixed schools on this voluntary plan will be negligible. The majority of both races, on a voluntary basis, will choose segregation.

I believe it is a sensible way out. It may be more expensive. However, so deep is the conviction of our people on the desirability of separation of the races, I think they will pay the price, if necessary. I believe it will save our public school system.

Emotions and feelings are running high. But we must live under law. To do so we must have courts. We must have independent judges. Without them our rights are nil. So we won't solve our problems by defying either the Federal Government or the courts of the land. They must be solved according to law or we will have anarchy.

We cannot get support on any emotional plea of "down with the Court" or the Federal Government. We may incite riots and bloodshed for a while, but ultimately law and order will triumph. That is what happened thus far in every nullification case. The Federal Government won out in the final test of strength.

The "freedom of choice" plan is legal and within any reasonable interpretation which can be placed on the language of the Constitution. No one can complain if he is allowed to choose whether he wishes his child to go to a school solely with members of his own race or with members of both races.

If the courts of the United States strike down such a plan, then, indeed, they will establish themselves as superboards of education. They will confirm what the Southern States say they have already assumed in the school cases, by holding in this highly emotional area of race relations, the States and the local school boards are not authorized to segregate the races, although in their private lives and occupations the members of both races now practice voluntary segregation throughout the Nation.

Action on the Sugar Bill Should Be Completed Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, quite a few people in my State are upset by the failure of Congress to complete action on the sugar bill which the House approved last year and which the Senate acted upon in February. House and Senate conferees have been appointed but have adjourned without arriving at any agreement upon the measure. Now the House has taken a recess until after Easter and it begins to look as if the farmers who plant sugar beets in my State may not know until too late in the season whether sugar quotas will be increased. The party in control of Congress must bear the responsibility of failure to act in the matter.

As all the Members know from last year's discussion of the bill, it seeks to give American producers a fair share of the increased sugar consumption in this country. Under existing law, which fixes quotas on the amount of sugar produced in this country, all the benefits resulting from our rapidly increasing United States population with its increasing sugar consumption goes to other countries and not to our own. Other countries may put additional acreage into production and produce more sugar to take advantage of our growing markets, but our own people cannot do so. The bill which was approved by the House last year sought only to give a fair share of increased markets in the United States to our own people. Is that asking too much? The majority of the members of the House did not think so. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate, and perhaps the leadership of both bodies, have a responsibility to domestic producers to exert every effort to bring a conference report to both Houses so that we may let our farm people know at the earliest possible date what they may expect. I firmly believe that our domestic producers are entitled to increased quotas.

If the farmers in my State could plant additional sugar beet acreage, then the total sugar beet production in central Washington could be increased to the point where a new sugar refinery could be built. This refinery would furnish employment to a considerable number of people.

Defeat H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement I submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee on Tuesday, March 6, 1956, registering my opposition against H. R. 5550:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I asked for time to appear before you in order to make known to you my great concern over H. R. 5550 which provides for United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, usually referred to as OTC.

I don't have to acquaint you with the connection between the OTC and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. As H. R. 5550 is written, its approval by Congress would carry with it the approval of the purposes and objectives of GATT, since OTC is proposed specifically to administer GATT and to work toward the fulfillment of its purposes and objectives.

Whether I am for or against GATT is beside the point. What is of the greatest significance is that Congress is being asked to approve this very complicated 8-year-old agreement by a backdoor approach. The actual agreement, that is, GATT has never been submitted to Congress and is not now before us. Yet we are asked to take a step that would represent an acceptance of the agreement, whether we like the agreement or not, whether or not we believe that the State Department went beyond its authority in signing GATT in 1947 or whether we think that Congress should surrender its power in this field or not.

Speaking as one Member of Congress I can assure you that I have no intention of resigning my authority, or my responsibility to my constituents, to the State Department and much less to an organization that would sit in Geneva and in which the voice of the United States would be reduced to one vote.

Not only would I be letting down the people who elected me and who look to me to speak for them in the Congress and who expect Congress in turn to speak for the United States in questions of foreign trade and tariff policies, but I would be giving my assent to the virtual disfranchisement of my constituents in this field of national activity, should I support the OTC.

In this bill the State Department has contrived a well-hidden snare, preconceived as a means of taking out of the hands of Congress the power lodged there by the Constitution, without Congress discovering the stratagem until it was too late. By that time the word of the United States would be so pledged and cross-pledged in international agreements that in all good honor we could not withdraw. Our freedom of action in Congress would then be a mockery and that would be made all the worse because we would have no one to blame but ourselves. Our constituents would soon realize that their representatives in Congress had lost their power and that a vote in congressional elections was a vote wasted, so far as influence in our foreign-trade policy is concerned.

I am sorry that my feeling toward the State Department is marked by such a high degree of distrust. The distrust has, however, been of their own making. Why do they not come forward with a bill proposing that the executive and not the legislative branch should regulate our foreign commerce? That is their desire and their objective in this bill. I would respect them for it even though I would not agree with them. As it is I neither agree with them nor can I respect them for their tactics.

The reasons advanced for seeking the OTC, short of the real purpose that I have outlined, do not add up to good sense. For 7 or 8 years GATT has functioned without OTC, and has transacted much business. It has sponsored four international tariff-cutting conferences and has disposed of a considerable agenda at each of its annual sessions.

So, why is OTC necessary? If OTC is to be no more than the State Department claims for it, its existence would add little or nothing to what GATT already provides. It would be nothing more than an international sewing circle, offering tax-free jobs to an ever-growing list of international bureaucrats.

The logic of this reinforces my conviction that the State Department is after something far more meaningful than its repeated disclaimers suggest. The OTC proposal is

nothing less than further prosecution of the Department's tireless quest for control of all of our foreign trade policy, including both its determination and its execution. It seeks the OTC as the stamp of approval of Congress itself for State Department management of our foreign commerce through GATT.

In my opinion we cannot consent to such a renunciation of responsibility; in fact, we should roundly condemn any scheme that seeks such an end by indirection. I deplore the State Department's attempt; I denounce it as an unworthy assault by one branch of the Government upon another and resent the method of it as a reflection upon the intelligence of Congress.

I strongly urge this committee to give the State Department the answer it deserves by defeating H. R. 5550 outright.

In Order To Meet Communism's Stepped-Up Emphasis on Propaganda and Economic Programs, the United States and the Free World Must Reassess National Programs and Utilize Facilities of the United Nations' Technical Assistance Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpt from the remarks I made at a meeting of the Association for the United Nations on February 26, 1956:

I am convinced that the United States must find an effective way to help meet the aspirations of the less developed countries for economic development. We are now engaged in a fierce competition with the Soviet Union and we should welcome the emphasis which the Communists seem to be placing upon economic and educational phases of the world struggle since we have a proven superiority in these fields. Without abandoning the bilateral programs for economic aid and technical assistance by which we contributed much to raising living standards of other nations we should channel an increased percentage of our aid through the United Nations. We can avoid some of the misunderstandings and misinterpretations by taking this course, and will be more effective in working toward economic goals that are essential to world stability. It is obvious that whether the underdeveloped countries are right about it or not they would prefer in most instances to be helped through the United Nations and we must take this attitude into account.

I am not prepared to say that there should be any increase in the amounts being expended in economic aid, but I am convinced that we can relate our economic programs more effectively to our foreign policy objectives by taking a greater interest in the multilateral assistance programs which are working so well with their modest budgets. I am particularly anxious for us to present an alternative to the proposals for an international fund for economic development (SUNFED), and I fear that unless we can produce a better plan than is currently being considered by the member nations we would be virtually forced by world opinion to join an organization which does not conform to our standards or allow the hopes of millions of poor peoples to be frustrated.

The Soviet Union has put on a smiling mask of assumed generosity. I believe that many of the countries to which their blandishments are directed are aware that danger lurks in these overtures, but in the absence of help from us some might turn to the Soviets, deluding themselves with the thought that they can accept Soviet aid while resisting Soviet penetration. The best way to meet this threat is to move as Americans are capable of moving—with boldness and imagination into the new arena.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we all know that during the war it was necessary for the farmers to go all out in order to produce the food to sustain our Armed Forces and those of our allies. The Government not only appealed to the farmers' patriotism, but guaranteed that, if they would buy new machinery and increase production, a guaranteed price would be paid for what was grown over and above our ordinary needs.

Relying upon those promises, older men and women who had retired went back on the farms. Others borrowed to purchase what would otherwise have been unneeded equipment and, because they were patriotic and millions of them had sons or relatives in the service, the farmers did go all out and produced all that was needed.

The war over, the legislation which guaranteed a subsidy was still in effect, many farmers still indebted. But surpluses of certain basic crops continued to pile up until today, as of February 15, 1956, we have $5,335,348,000 worth of farm produce in storage, costing us more than $750,000 a day—$786,887 a day as of February 15, 1956, $23,606,610 a month—for storage alone, and the end is not in sight.

To avoid being buried under an avalanche of food, the Government has found it necessary to limit the acreage which a farmer may plant to a specified crop. We now find farmers fined or threatened with jail because they have fed their own poultry or livestock a few bushels of wheat grown on their own land in excess of the quota fixed by the Agriculture Department.

Here in the United States of America, even though your greatgrandpappy homesteaded the land before the Civil War, cleared it, he, your grandpappy, or you paid taxes on it ever since, you cannot sow and from it harvest as you wish, as did our ancestors who fought for and established our independence and the right to own and enjoy property.

To lift the restrictions so that wheat growers may feed their overquota bushels to their livestock and poultry, a bill has passed the Senate and similar legislation has been introduced in the House. It is pigeonholed by the Democratic majority on the Agricultural Committee. We are trying to blast it out.

What about the farm problem? We have it, we know what it is. What can we do about it? If we continue to buy surplus crops, the result is obvious. Paying farmers to withdraw fertile acres from production may lessen the surplus, if increased fertilization and more intensive cultivation do not increase the yield per acre. But again the question of paying the millions or billions necessary to retire land from production arises.

In short, one can readily see there is no quick, just, adequate legislative answer to the farm problem. Our Democratic friends wish to continue to pay subsidies at 90-percent of parity, though they know that such payments cannot long continue to be met.

The only solution I can see is a gradual tapering off of subsidy payments, a gradual return to the law of supply and demand—which should be made to apply not only to farmers but to workers, industries, and private enterprise in all fields. Any loss that might be incurred by the lowering of subsidies below 90-percent will be minimized to some extent by the adoption of the administration's soil-bank program.

The solution is not a palatable one, but if someone has something better to offer, let's have it.

"Bensonomics" Is Blasted by High-Support Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "'Bensonomics' Is Blasted by High-Support Senator," written by Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Senator from Louisiana, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 4, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BENSONOMICS" IS BLASTED BY HIGH-SUPPORT SENATOR

(By ALLEN J. ELLENDER)

The present battle in the United States Senate over farm legislation has centered on the effect of restoring 90 percent of parity price supports for four of the basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, and peanuts—as part of our immediate farm policy.

Opponents of the Senate bill—from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson on down the line—have attacked the return to 90 percent of parity as a backward step. The Secretary of Agriculture termed it an at-

tempt to move in two directions at once, and declared that the proposed soil bank would empty Commodity Credit Corporation warehouses and that 90 percent of parity supports would fill them again.

This negative approach ignores the fact that 90 percent of parity supports, as adopted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, would not increase the number of acres planted; they would only increase farm income.

Among the basics, the production of wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts has been restricted since 1954. Barring some unforeseen emergency, which would vastly increase overnight the consumption of stored farm commodities, extremely tight production controls will continue to be in effect on these basics for at least another 2 years, which is the period presently proposed for 90 percent support prices.

It is therefore fallacious to argue that increased support levels on the basics will result in increased agricultural production; whether price supports are at 90 percent of parity or 75 percent of parity, the acreage planted to the basic crops will be heavily restricted—allotted acres would remain the same with weather the sole variable factor. Thus, the only effect of the 90 percent of parity provisions in the Agriculture Committee's bill would be to increase the net returns a farmer can expect from his land during the next 2 years.

A TYPICAL EXAMPLE

This can be best illustrated by taking a specific crop as an example. Let us assume that Farmer A, a Kansas wheatgrower, has been allotted a total of 200 acres of his 1,200-acre farm which he can plant to wheat during the 1956 crop year. The present support level on wheat is about 76 percent of parity. The Senate bill would increase this support level to 90 percent of parity. Note that the increase does not carry with it a relaxation of acreage controls; they would still apply. The only effect would be to give Farmer A an immediate increase in his income from the wheat produced on his allotted acreage of about 14 percent—the difference between 76 and 90 percent of parity.

To this, critics of our bill reply there will be more incentive for a farmer to plant his total allotment if support levels are increased; they argue further that Farmer A will be less inclined to place his land in the acreage reserve phase of the soil bank.

Do these criticisms hold up under examination?

The thory that a farmer tends to plant less of his allotted acreage as the support level declines has been thoroughly discredited. USDA statistics irrefutably show that as prices decline, a farmer plants right up to his allotted acreage in an attempt to insure himself against a drop in his gross farm income. This thinking is not difficult to understand; a farmer, just as any other American, has certain fixed obligations to meet. His land must yield him a minimum income if he is to avoid bankruptcy. He cannot turn his production on and off like a faucet; he must continue to plant, in the hope that prices will stabilize by harvest time.

"BENSONOMICS"

A careful analysis of the farm bill will also show that there is no justification for the second argument advanced by "Bensonomics" advocates; i. e., that 90 percent of parity for another 2 years will result in lessened incentive for farmers to participate in the soil bank by underplanting their allotted acres. Under the acreage reserve feature of the soil bank, farmers can choose not to plant their full acreage allotments of rice, cotton, corn, wheat, and certain types of tobacco. They can place a portion of their land in the soil bank and receive as rental the equivalent of a slight profit on the production which the retired land would otherwise have yielded.

This operation, of course, would result in no real gain to farmers as far as total 1956 and 1957 income is concerned, for a farmer would wind up at the end of the year with approximately the same income if he planted his entire acreage. However, with 90 percent of parity price supports, a farmer will receive in 1956 and 1957 (1) higher prices on the products of the allotted acres he actually plants, plus (2) necessarily higher incentive payments on the allotted acres he does not plant but places instead in the soil bank.

Since the main purpose of the bill is to increase farm income immediately, it becomes obvious that the soil bank, coupled with flexible price supports, would not achieve this goal. It is obvious that unless farm prices are raised substantially a farmer would receive no more net income from placing part of his allotted acres in the soil bank than he would if he planted the entire acreage allotment. It is no doubt true that some incidental relief would flow to him by virtue of slight price rises in some of the feed grains, prompted by an artificial shortage of supply, but these market increases are highly theoretical; at best they would not nearly approximate anything like a real "shot in the arm" to falling farm income. Without 90-percent price supports, rises in the market price of the basics cannot be expected for at least 2 years because of the large surpluses of these commodities that we now have on hand.

I repeat: The sole purpose of reinstating 90 percent of parity price supports on the basics for 2 years is to raise the prices of these staple farm commodities and thus raise farm income during the adjustment period required for the soil bank to take effect. The American farmer needs an immediate increase in income; he has seen his net return from farming fall from a national total of roughly $14.8 billion in 1951 to a rate of $10 billion in the third quarter of 1955. Meanwhile corporate and labor income have reached new highs; while prices received by farmers have plummeted, the prices paid by farmers for the things they need have at best remained steady. In many cases they have increased. Thus the parity ratio—which measures the relationship between prices paid and prices received by farmers—has fallen from 107 in 1951 to 80 in December of 1955.

It should be clear that unless something is done to increase farm income, and increase it immediately, the present price squeeze will force thousands of farmers out of business. The only way to increase farm income immediately, short of paying outright farm subsidies, is to raise the prices of farm commodities. This must be done by raising support levels, for while the soil bank—by reducing production and shortening supply—would achieve the same goal over the long pull, our farmers cannot wait.

Beach Erosion, H. R. 4470 and H. R. 5363

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, after listening attentively to the testimony of all witnesses before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittees of the Public Works Committee, I am more thoroughly convinced than ever before that a more realistic approach to Federal participation in beach erosion control projects is essential if the admitted objective and purpose of such control is to be accomplished. Previous acts—as has been clearly demonstrated by the testimony before the committee—provide no protection for private property and clearly do not provide adequate protection for public property, the latter being a well-accepted duty of the Federal Government.

The vast majority of the witnesses appearing before the committee urgently requested a favorable report on H. R. 4470, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey, which provides in effect for Federal aid to the present matching formula of one-third Federal contribution for any approved beach erosion control project and that the contribution should apply to private as well as public lands.

The Army engineers in their testimony indicated that it was their belief that any contribution should have some connection, either directly or indirectly, with the protection of public property.

Prior to this time I had introduced H. R. 5363 entitled "An act to provide for the protection of public property near the shores of the United States from damage by waves and currents," which has as its purpose what I believe to be a realistic and reasonable compromise approach, if such a compromise becomes necessary, to one of the most serious problems facing many areas of our country where beach erosion, or the threat thereof, exists.

Under recent legislation concerning this subject matter of beach erosion, including Public Law 520, 71st Congress, 1930; Public Law 409, 74th Congress, 1935; Public Law 166, 79th Congress, 1945; and Public Law 727, 79th Congress, 1946, the Federal Government participates, upon a finding by the Beach Erosion Board of public interest being involved, to the extent of one-third of that portion of the cost of the project allocable solely to the protection of Federal, State, municipal and other publicly owned property that abut immediately upon the water. The result of the present legislation is, therefore, that in many instances the Federal participation is inconsequential and obviously does not accomplish the purpose intended by Congress, that is, that the Federal Government should make reasonable contributions in beach-erosion projects where public property is involved, in threatened beach erosion areas. For instance, to take a specific example, there was approved by the Beach Erosion Board, and the United States Army engineers, and by the last session of Congress, the Pinellas County, Fla., project, at a total estimated cost of $717,350, of which the Federal share is $34,300, and which is unquestionably justified in that the cost benefit ratio of the total $25 million project is 4.2. Due to the minimal amount of publicly owned property that immediately fronts on the shore, it is seen

that the Federal contribution is only approximately 5 percent.

To further substantiate the fact that there is no question of justification of this project, from the standpoint of the existence of a storm and erosion threat, the report to the Public Works Committee shows that 19 storms struck the general area between 1901 and 1950, inclusive, resulting in an average loss by annual erosion damage of $112,400. During the last 4-year period the area involved has increased tremendously in value, in that millions of dollars in improvements have taken place.

Thus, under the present formula and existing legislation, and with the Pinellas County project as a specific example, the contribution of the Federal Government is very minimal despite the fact that substantial municipal, county, and State property that does not directly abut the shore, is constantly subject to the threat of storm damage and erosion. This is true because the 25-mile string of islands involved is rather narrow and there is a road extending in most instances within the erosion damage range of the entire coastline. Presently the Federal Government has no authority to participate through Federal contribution in the protection of any of this publicly owned property, simply because it does not actually abut on the water, although it is subject to the storm and erosion damage action of the water. This is only one of the examples of which many could be cited, where publicly owned property is affected by erosion for which there is no protection whatsoever under existing legislation, is not being reasonably carried out, and the object of my bill is to some degree to bring the Federal participation realistically in line with the existing threat to publicly owned property. Without this bill many needed beach erosion projects have not been undertaken, partially due to the unfair percentage of participation required of local interests. Under my bill it is estimated in this instance that Federal participation would exceed $100,000. Under the Auchincloss bill the contribution from Federal Government would be $299,118.33.

It will be noted that my bill is in no sense a windfall to the intervening private property between the publicly owned property and the shore, in that the formula for participation has been reduced to one-sixth in determining public interest that there may be a substantial benefit resulting to the public property as compared to the benefit which might conceivably be derived by private property.

This bill is the result of lengthy conferences with the United States Army Engineers and a representative of the Beach Erosion Board, and it is hoped that it is a sufficiently realistic approach to a very serious national problem that will merit the favorable consideration of the Public Works Committee and the Congress.

I want to state in conclusion that I obviously prefer and favor the Auchincloss bill and submit this proposal only in the event that a compromise becomes necessary and in the event the subcommittee should decide that it is not willing to accept the fundamental theory of Federal participation for the protection of private and public property combined, or, in the alternative, of private property only. I believe it essential that some clarifying beach-erosion control legislation be reported out of this subcommittee in that experience has proven beyond a doubt that the present formula for Federal participation, because the amount of money involved is so nominal in most instances, results in the defeat rather than the accomplishment of the admitted conservation purpose let alone the more specific purpose of protecting public lands from erosion action. I urge immediate consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee.

Nationalities Division Honors Maj. Mario G. Remo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, March 4, an outstanding citizen from Brooklyn was paid homage at a dinner at the Plaza Hotel in New York, tendered in his honor by the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee. His name is Maj. Mario G. Remo, vice president of J. W. May's, Inc., in Brooklyn. May's is the department store made famous by Mr. Joe Weinstein, noted humanitarian and philanthropist.

The dinner in honor of Major Remo was tendered for his services to the Democratic Party and on the occasion of his appointment as finance chairman of the nationalities division. Actually, it transcended politics. It brought together national and international figures, governors, mayors, Members of Congress, judges, business executives, social and civic leaders from various parts of the country, irrespective of party affiliation, with one purpose in mind—to give due recognition to the foreign-born and the descendants of all immigrants who helped to make America what it is today.

Major Remo came to this country as an immigrant from Italy when he was only 8 years old. He received the usual education and later worked as a newspaperman for about 13 years on one of the leading newspapers in New York. Shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor, he enlisted in the United States Army as a private and was assigned to the Public Relations Division of the War Department. He was serving with the Army Intelligence and Security Division as an agent, when he was given command of the Special Assignments Branch in which capacity he performed special assignments for the White House and the State Department.

In 1943 he was sent to Europe for about 7 months of duty, and early in 1944 he was transferred to the Pacific. He was stationed in Saipan, where he was chief of intelligence for the 55th port. He returned to the United States in 1945. He has since then been associated with Mays' where he carved out a most successful career as an able business executive.

Among those who paid personal tribute to Major Remo at the dinner were Gov. Averell Harriman of New York, Gov. G. Mennen Williams of Michigan, the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York City, and Maj Gen. Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, who was chairman at the dinner. Executive cochairmen of the dinner committee were the Honorable Angier B. Duke, Hon. Sylvester J. Garamella, and Mrs. Louise S. Stewart. The Honorable Michel Cieplinski is the director of the nationalities division.

I should like to quote a few brief remarks from some of the addresses, which I consider of general interest. After lauding the business capabilities of Major Remo, Governor Harriman touched on the world situation and said:

> On the economic side, we must take the lead in promoting free world economic growth. This requires technical assistance, aid, and long-term capital and investment in the underdeveloped countries. It calls for leadership on our part in bringing together the productive capacity of the industrial countries—Western Europe and Japan—with the resources of the less developed countries. The present American approach to these problems is, I regret to say, limited and rigid.

Governor Williams of Michigan, who is chairman of the nationalities division, extolled the virtues of Major Remo whom he has known for a long time and worked with him closely in the past. He then made the following observations:

> While we are working for liberalization of our immigration law, let us work also for a corollary goal—a vast expansion of our present program of exchanging visitors with other nations. * * *
>
> It seems to me that we should be constantly bringing to America large numbers of people from foreign lands, to see for themselves what democracy is like; and we should be sending forth from America large numbers of our own people, particularly young people, to learn the aspirations and ways of other nations, and to carry the gospel of democracy to those lands. * * *
>
> Not only would such programs help to counteract the lies of Soviet propaganda, but they would also help to make clear why the American Nation can bear no ill will to the other peoples of the world, because the American people are the people of the whole world. America is England, it is France, it is China, it is Poland, it is Africa, it is every nation of the earth, because the blood and culture of all races have been blended here into a people whose ties are to the whole human race.

The Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, secretary of state for the State of New York, had this to say about Major Remo:

> He was born in Italy, and was brought to this country as a child. He worked as a reporter on one of our great newspapers. He joined the Army and rose to the rank of major in the Intelligence Service, and now he is executive vice president of one of our city's great department stores. He has set an example of political responsibility which all of us might well follow, for he has accepted one of the most difficult responsibilities in any political organization, that of finance director.

By his example, Major Remo renders not only an extraordinary service to the Democratic Party, but also to all of the people of the United States. His is an inspiring story. His is the story of America.

And Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York said:

It is a very special honor for me, to be allowed to address tonight this most distinguished gathering of men and women from various parts of these United States. * * * The man whom we honor tonight, Maj. Mario G. Remo, had a distinguished record of service to our country in World War II. He has also had a distinguished record of service to our party, as head of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee.

It is peculiarly appropriate that a dinner honoring him should be held in New York. The original melting pot of the world, and still despite restrictive immigration laws, in which we can have no pride, the gateway to America for countless men and women seeking a better way of life.

And to all this I should like to add: Continue your good work, Major Remo. We are all very proud of you and your achievements.

Address of the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Before the City Club of Rochester, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a most timely and illuminating speech by the very able Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom. Secretary Folsom delivered this address last Saturday before the City Club of Rochester. I commend for your attention the careful and frank approach to problems he outlines in his speech.

The words of Secretary Folsom are typical of the man. His directness, clarity, and comprehensiveness have made a deep impression on all who have come in contact with him. He emphasizes that his Department is primarily concerned with attaining a richer, fuller life for all Americans. To achieve that goal, they are working to make a life free of disease, to enlarge the opportunities of our children through better education, and to advance the economic security of all segments of our population. There is nothing paternalistic, dictatorial, or socialistic about his approach to problems. This is the proper American concept of government.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY MARION B. FOLSOM, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Thank you for giving me this excuse to get out of Washington and to come home. Seriously, it is a special pleasure to meet with you again and to talk to so many old friends.

The City Club is one of the features that has made life in this community so attractive through the years. I think that most people seek something that the club helps to provide—new knowledge and understanding of the world today. Certainly this is a quest of profound meaning to each of us personally and to all of us as a Nation.

The world today is incredibly different from the world of almost 50 years ago—when this club was formed. We cannot fail to be impressed by the great change all about us.

Because the world is changing more rapidly than ever, because the world is more complex than ever, it is axiomatic—if we are to progress—that we must keep one eye on today's operation and the other eye on tomorrow's problem. We must not let the tide of changing conditions and new problems sweep over and beyond us. We must plan in the present to keep abreast of the future and meet new problems as they arise. In short, we must make a larger investment in those measures which give us vision and help us build for tomorrow.

This is true for the individual, for a business, for a community. As businessmen, many of you would not hesitate to invest in a new plant, or in research, or a new process, if the investment carried good promise of rewards in the future.

This concept is no less applicable to government. We must emphasize the investment of time, energy, and funds with thought to the future. It is wiser to spend to solve a problem than to continue to bear the cost of the problem. It is wiser to spend for prevention of a problem than for correction. In these ways, we build for the future.

And this is the approach we are emphasizing in the new Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We are trying to design programs that will be investments—investments to help make life more free of disease, enlarge the opportunities for our children through better education, and advance the economic security of the American people. These investments have a personal meaning for every man, woman, and child in America. For health, education, and welfare are intimate factors in our daily activities and in the course of our whole lives.

One of the best examples of a constructive, forward-looking program in this Department is in the field of economic security, of protection against want, for the American family. This program is built on a simple but firm principle: to relieve poverty is good, but to prevent poverty is better.

On this principle, during the past 20 years, we have developed the Federal system of old-age and survivors insurance, one of the strongest bulwarks today against human distress. I recall, as many of you do, that many people, including many businessmen, voiced fears that the social-security system would bog down in staggering administrative costs and redtape. But today the administrative costs are remarkably low—less than 2 percent of the contributions. Fears were expressed that the social-security system would dampen individual initiative, industry, and thrift. But today, after 20 years of social security, individuals on the whole have built more economic security for themselves—through private means—than ever before.

I recall the fear that political pressures would increase social-security benefits all out of line with a sound program. But the fact is that when this administration took office we found benefits were too low. They had failed to keep pace with wage increases and living costs. And so President Eisenhower recommended, and Congress approved, in 1954 a far-reaching series of improvements. Protection was made available for an additional 10 million workers, and benefits were increased. Today 9 out of 10 American workers can look forward to social-security benefits when they retire in old age. If death should take the family breadwinner the mothers and children in 9 out of 10 American families are protected with survivors' benefits.

This is a constructive program for America. It provides economic protection as a matter of right—a right earned through tax contributions of workers and employers over the years. If it were not for this system millions of additional persons would be forced to turn today to the public-assistance programs to meet their essential human needs.

Despite the great contributions of old-age and survivors insurance, and of unemployment insurance and private welfare, and despite our prolonged and unprecedented prosperity, more than 5 million Americans are today receiving public assistance. These are the needy aged, children deprived of parental support, the needy blind, and the totally disabled. Under our system of government and the concept of Christian ethics, this assistance should be provided—efficiently, equitably, and with warm consideration for the individual.

But we have a deeper duty to those receiving public assistance than the mere payment of funds to relieve distress. For those who can benefit we have a duty to provide services that will help them build toward independence and a fuller and richer life—and these are the services on which the administration is now placing new emphasis.

We are proposing amendments to the welfare laws which will remove any doubt that their purpose is to provide services designed to increase self-support and self-care. We are proposing Federal financial assistance to help relieve a critical shortage of professional personnel trained to deal effectively with the problems found among needy people. And we are proposing to support new research and demonstration projects to bring more light to the causes of dependency and to show in actual practice effective ways of helping individuals overcome dependency.

Already there are some examples which give promise of significant progress. In Salt Lake City recently, over a 6-month period, half the applicants for public assistance whose need was due to a father's desertion were handled by a trained social worker who stressed the services that would help cure the problem. The other half were handled routinely—their need was established and payments were made, but no special help was given in eliminating the cause of need. At the end of 6 months, assistance payments to the families who had received professional self-help services was 41 percent less than assistance payments to the other families.

In New York City, over a period of 3 years, a skilled welfare staff focused on a direct effort to return persons to self-support. Of a total of 2,700 cases, involving persons who had been unemployed from 1 to 19 years, 616 were restored to independence as a result of services provided by social workers. The savings in the actual cost of assistance has been $616,000 per year. But far more important than the saving of tax dollars is the promise of a richer life for human beings.

Another example of a Government investment that brings rich humanitarian and economic rewards for the future is vocational rehabilitation. This Federal-State partnership program helps provide the treatment and training that enables disabled persons to make their way in life through their own efforts. It means pride renewed, hope justified, and the Nation strengthened in its human resources.

In New York State alone, 3,600 disabled persons were returned to employment and a self-sustaining life through vocational rehabilitation last year. These people were earning less than one and a half million dollars a year when they started on the road to self-support. The first year after their rehabilitation, their earnings were estimated at more than $8 million—almost a sixfold increase.

In the Nation as a whole, more than 11,000 of those rehabilitated last year had been receiving public-assistance payments. It cost

about $8 million to rehabilitate this group—but in just 1 year it would have cost almost $10 million to maintain them on relief. Relief costs generally were stopped and earnings and tax payments were started, but the richest reward from this program is the conversion of misery and despair into hope, dignity, and a productive life.

Despite so many obvious advantages in this program, when this administration came into office we found it had been lagging. And so new legislation was proposed and adopted to provide for an expansion and improvement over many years ahead. Today, the downtrend in the number of handicapped persons restored to useful life has been reversed. The number of persons rehabilitated is now expected to increase from 56,000 in 1954 to about 80,000 next year.

Daily reminders of the remarkable process of change are the foods we eat and the medicine we take. In 1939 the average grocery super market carried about 1,000 items in stock. Today the same store would carry more than 5,000 items. In the drug field, over half the medicine used today by physicians and hospitals were unknown 15 years ago.

The tremendous increase in the volume, variety, and complexity of processed foods and in the number of new drugs and antibiotic medicines has meant a corresponding increase in the workload of the Department's Food and Drug Administration. More than $60 billion of these products are moving in interstate commerce each year, through some 96,000 factories and warehouses which are subject to inspection by the Food and Drug Administration.

Despite the great growth in the industries regulated by the Food and Drug Administration and despite the great importance of these products to our health, the budget and staff of this unit of the Department were, until recently, virtually the same as in 1940. Last year an increase in funds was voted by Congress. This year the President has asked for an increase of 17 percent as a major step toward the goal of providing the inspectors and scientific staff needed to protect the American consumer in these modern times.

Notable as the 20th century has been for its remarkable scientific achievements, perhaps none will ultimately outrank in benefits to mankind the dramatic strides of medical science. Since the beginning of the century, for instance, 21 years have been added to American life expectancy.

The decline in our death rates has been brought about, in part, by progress in medical research. The recently developed sulfa drugs and antibiotics have helped conquer or greatly subdue a number of serious diseases. Influenza deaths alone, for example, declined 90 percent in the past 10 years.

Since the end of World War II, we Americans have been carrying on the most intensive and widespread research attack on human disease the world has ever seen. It is a cooperative effort, involving a close partnership between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and the medical, research and related professions, the universities and medical schools, and numerous national citizens' organizations, on the other hand.

Despite this ever-increasing assault on disease, the problems still confronting medical research are many and complex. Medical science is still seeking answers to the mysteries of such disease as cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and, for that matter, the common cold.

In his request to Congress for appropriations for the coming fiscal year, the President has urged a major increase in Federal funds for medical research. He has requested an increase of $27.5 million—or 28 percent—in the funds provided to the National Institutes of Health, the research arm of the Public Health Service. The great bulk of this increase would be distributed in grants for research by medical schools, hospitals, health agencies, and scientists throughout the country. The number of research projects would be increased from 3,400 to an estimated 5,000. The number ot research fellowships to help train promising young scientists would be increased from about 900 this fiscal year to an estimated 1,600 during the coming fiscal year.

As the Nation continues to expand and improve medical research, it is essential, of course, to provide the laboratories and the scientists to do the job. And yet there is already a serious shortage today of medical research and teaching facilities. And so the President has proposed to Congress a 5-year program of Federal assistance on a matching basis for the construction of these facilities for medical schools and other institutions. There would be no interference in operation of these institutions. This program simply would provide more research laboratories—critically needed—and it would help provide more medical scientists and doctors.

And so in these health programs—as in welfare—we are proposing Federal actions which reflect rapidly changing needs and conditions—programs which emphasize benefits for the future.

In the field of education, too, the process of change is at work in ever increasing breadth and scope. It is difficult to realize today that a little over four score years only about half the Nation's children attended school—and those who did so averaged less than 4 months of schooling each year. Within the past 40 years, the proportion of children who graduate from high school has increased more than five times; and the proportion who finish college has increased 2½ times. And of course the changes in curriculum, and in our school buildings, and in many other aspects of education have been equally remarkable.

In the light of such changes in education, and in view of the fundamental importance of education in our free society, it is shocking to realize how little the Federal Government has been investing in education research. For research in education—just as research in medicine, agriculture, industry and many other fields—holds bright promise for helping to solve difficult and persistent problems. One out of every four Americans is a student in school or college. We have invested approximately $30 billion in the physical plant for their education. We spend $14 billion a year to operate our educational system, from kindergarten to college. And yet the Federal Government is investing annually less than half of $1 million in research in education, to find ways of improving education so that more children can get a better start in life.

And so this year the administration is asking Congress for a major increase in funds for operating the Office of Education—from $3 million this year to almost $6 million next year. While also increasing other services, this would provide a comprehensive program of educational research for the first time in history.

One of the problems we hope to study, for example, is a tragic waste of the Nation's young talent. It has been estimated that each year about 60,000 students of high ability drop out of high school before graduation. And of those who do graduate, half of the students in the upper fourth of their class do not go on to college. And so we have proposed, as one of the essential areas for educational research, the problem of retaining students in school until they have achieved their highest potential. We want to study how our schools, having a direct daily contact with every child, can render greater service in detecting and preventing juvenile delinquency. We hope to explore how best to meet educational needs of families which remain in low-income status despite the unprecedented national prosperity. We propose an inventory of existing college facilities and of anticipated needs over the next 15 years, as the surge of pupils now moving through elementary and secondary schools advances into higher education. Through these and other projects for educational research, we may invest in a brighter future for education and for the Nation.

Our examination of educational needs should include, of course, education beyond the high-school level. Although our population has doubled since 1900, the number of men and women in the major professional fields has quadrupled. Yet we need many more in some fields. Colleges shortly will be called upon to meet the needs of increasingly larger student bodies. Within 10 years we shall have at least 3 students in our colleges and universities for every 2 who are there today.

Higher education is the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions, but comprehensive planning on a Nationwide basis is needed. To encourage a broad scale attack on the problems of education beyond high school, the President will shortly appoint a group of outstanding educators and citizens to develop proposals in this field.

In looking to the future in education, our vision would be limited unless we also considered the physical facilities in whch our children pursue learning. For it is undeniable that the Nation faces a serious shortage of classrooms in many communities, and it is undeniable that this shortage bears grave protents for our children and for the country if it is allowed to continue indefinitely.

In a world of increasing complexity and change, our children face a larger learning assignment than ever before to prepare for their future responsibilities as citizens and to enlarge their opportunities in life. But today, our schools are overflowing with 2¼ million children beyond the normal capacity of classroom space. In many communities, this means overcrowding, half-day or doubled-up school sessions, and the pressing into service of makeshift buildings never designed for schools, And in other schools where mere classroom space is sufficient, the buildings are too old, obsolete, shabby, or unsafe. They need to be replaced if our children are to receive the opportunities they deserve. In addition to this accumulation of classroom needs from past years, today we are in the midst of the most rapid, continuing enrollment increase in history. Every 5 minutes, day and night, a new classroom of children reaches school age.

Certainly the primary responsibility for providing school classrooms rests with the States and communities, and they have already increased their school construction efforts in heartening fashion. Six years ago they spent about $1 billion to build 36,000 new classrooms. This year they are spending about $2½ billion to build about 67,000 classrooms.

But the fact remains that even if this commendable rate of increase is continued, many children will lack needed classrooms for many years to come. Many communities simply do not have the available resources to cope at the same time with a vast backlog of need and with major increases in enrollment each year. And this is a concern not only to these communities, but to the Nation as a whole. For our national security, our expanding economy, our progress in self-government, our freedom itself, all demand educated and skilled citizens. A weakness in education anywhere in the country is, therefore, a weakness to that extent in our combined national strength.

And so this administration is urging Federal assistance to help the needy communities provide adequate classrooms for our children. We have designed this program to distribute Federal aid where the needs are great; to encourage a continued increase in the essential efforts of States and commu-

nities; and to avoid any Federal interference whatsoever with State and local control of education.

We are earnestly seeking the early enactment of this program at this session of Congress. To this end we have the full support and sponsorship of the President of the United States. In acting to help build more schools—and acting now—we keep faith with our children and with the future of our Republic.

These are some of the major activities in health, in education, and in welfare in which your Federal government has some responsibilities. These are the directions in which the national administration is pointing these activities.

Our health, our education, and our economic welfare cannot be static elements of our national life. They are, in fact, always on the move—in one direction or the other. Obviously, the direction must be forward. For if we fail to move ahead, our problems only multiply; one unanswered problem begets many others. And so there is great prudence in a sufficient investment that looks to the future.

In the course we have set in health, education, and welfare, we are investing in our most priceless asset—the individual human being, for whom life is enlarged and through whom our society is enriched.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, before ever our yearning needs have broken into speech Thou hearest even the secret sigh of our fainting spirits. We acknowledge that every virtue we possess, every moral victory we win, every thought of holiness which shames our uncleanness, is Thine alone. Forgive us that we have sought with material things to build the habitation of our souls on foundations which in these testing days the whelming floods have revealed as but sinking sand. Now rich in things and poor in soul we stand in our inadequacy unable to cope with volcanic forces that challenge all that men have counted fixed and final. We humbly pray that through the sincere expression of differing appraisals the final wisdom that charts the Nation's course in these perilous days may be higher than our own—so that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in all the earth. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 5, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1529) to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2423. An act for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho;

H. R. 5310. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

H. R. 6268. An act to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 7062. An act providing for payment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States;

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8226. An act to amend section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 8728. An act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service;

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody;

H. R. 9720. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; and

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2884) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2423. An act for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 7062. An act providing for payment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States;

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody;

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; and

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5310. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation;

H. R. 8226. An act to amend section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353); and

H. R. 8728. An act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9720. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour statements made by Senators be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Herbert V. Prochnow, of Illinois, to be United States alternate governor of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the term of 5 years.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Thruston B. Morton, resigned;

Fletcher Warren, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Turkey; and

James Clement Dunn, of New York, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the foreign and diplomatic service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of William E. Dowling and James Weldon Jones, to be members of the United States Tariff Commission, be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be passed over.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard H. Levet, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Justin C. Morgan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the western district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of certain aliens from lists heretofore transmitted to the Senate, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to implement the tripartite declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the borders of Israel

"Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations resolved upon the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine, on November 29, 1947; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States, by its immediate recognition of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948, was the first sovereign government so to do; and

"Whereas the armies of six Arab States, directly flouting the said United Nations Resolution, invaded the borders of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948; and

"Whereas the State of Israel, by force of her own arms and in conformity with the aforesaid resolution, expelled the invading, aggressor Arab States and secured her sovereignty within the present borders; and

"Whereas, on May 25, 1950, the United States, Great Britain and France guaranteed these established borders by a tripartite declaration; and

"Whereas the Government of Egypt, by accepting arms from Communist countries, has provided the Soviet Union with the means for injecting Communist influence into the Middle East; and

"Whereas the acceptance of said arms by Egypt creates an imbalance of power, threatening the peace of the Middle East, and thereby the precipitation of global conflict; and

"Whereas the State of Israel has requested from the Department of State of the United States the permission to purchase specified arms to meet this threat, and this request remains pending: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts calls upon the Representatives of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to implement the spirit of this resolution, and to urge upon the Department of State:

"1. That the Government of the United States make available to the State of Israel, for purchase, such arms as she requires to guarantee her security, and to be an effective bulwark against Communist inroads in the Middle East; and

"2. That the Government of the United States negotiate a mutual-security pact with the State of Israel, to the end that peace be secured in the Middle East, and the existence of Israel, as a bastion of democracy, be assured; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., relating to the establishment of a congressional Committee on Administrative Procedure; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Abraham Lincoln National Republican Club, Chicago, Ill., favoring action by the Senate to rescind its resolution of censure of Senator McCARTHY; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to pass the bill introduced therein authorizing a flood-insurance program

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the General Assembly of South Carolina that a bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States to authorize a flood-insurance program to help cover losses from hurricanes and other storms; and

"Whereas certain areas of South Carolina have suffered severely from floods, storms, and hurricanes within the past few years imposing tremendous hardships upon the citizens of our State; and

"Whereas it appears that the bill introduced into Congress provides a method of alleviating the tremendous losses from such floods, hurricanes, and other natural disasters; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina desires to express to the Congress of the United States its strong feeling for the urgency for such remedial legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress is memorialized to enact with all considered haste a bill authorizing a flood-insurance program to help cover losses from hurricanes and other storms; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to each of the United States Senators from South Carolina and to each

Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina and to the clerks of the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

ALASKA STATEHOOD—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I received from Mr. William A. Egan, president of the Alaska Constitutional Convention, and a resolution relative to statehood, which was adopted by the Convention.

I had intended to ask that the proposed constitution be printed also, but I find it was inserted in the proceedings of the House on February 14, and appears at page 2247 of the RECORD of that date; but I ask that the names of those who signed the proposed constitution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution, together with the signatures of the delegates who signed the proposed constitution, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, 1955-56,
February 24, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: The Alaska Constitutional Convention recently completed framing a document which has been acclaimed by political science researchers as one of the finest constitutions ever written. This document claims an important niche in American history because very probably it is the last constitution that will be written under the American flag. Forty-eight States and Hawaii have completed their constitutions, and Alaska is the last candidate for statehood.

The 55 delegates who drew up this constitution feel that it is an excellent foundation for the future State of Alaska.

Believing that you might be interested in this document, we are enclosing a special section of the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner which contains the full text of the constitution together with information concerning the manner in which it was written.

We send you this special section with a great deal of pride, and we earnestly hope that you will find time to evaluate what we believe is an outstanding constitution.

Sincerely,

WM. A. EGAN,
President of the Convention.

VALDEZ, ALASKA.

RESOLUTION ON IMMEDIATE STATEHOOD

Whereas the preparation of a constitution is one of the tests of the capacity of a people to govern themselves; and

Whereas the delegates to the Alaska Constitutional Convention firmly believe that the constitution agreed upon provides a sound basis for State government; and

Whereas the adoption of the constitution of the state of Alaska by the people will demonstrate undeniably both the desire of Alaskans for statehood and the assurance that a government so established will embody the ideals upon which our Nation is founded; and

Whereas the basic principle of the American democracy, government by consent of the governed, has too long been denied the people of Alaska; and

Whereas at a time when colonial peoples throughout the world are striving to attain full self-government and are attaining it with the aid and encouragement of the United States, it is indefensible that American citizens in Alaska are denied the rights of American citizens elsewhere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Alaska Constitutional Convention, That the President of the United States and the Congress are requested to review of constitution of the state of Alaska to the end that, as soon as possible after this constitution is ratified by the people of Alaska, adequate enabling legislation will be enacted for the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and all Members of the Congress of the United States.

Done at College, Alaska, this 5th day of February 1956 by direction of the convention.

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
President.

The names of the delegates signing the proposed constitution are as follows:

Wm. A. Egan, president of the convention; Thomas B. Stewart, secretary of the convention; R. Rolland Armstrong, Dorothy J. Awes, Frank Barr, John C. Boswell, Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr., John B. Coghill, E. B. Collins, George D. Cooper, John M. Cross, Edward V. Davis, James P. Doogan, Truman C. Emberg, Helen Fischer, Victor Fischer, Douglas Gray, Thomas C. Harris, John S. Hellenthal, Mildred R. Hermann, Herb Hilscher, Jack Hinckel, James J. Hurley, Maurice T. Johnson, Yule F. Kilcher, Leonard H. King, William W. Knight, W. W. Laws, Eldor R. Lee, Maynard D. Londborg, Steve McCutcheon, George W. McLaughlin, Robert J. McNealy, John A. McNees, M. R. Marston, Irwin L. Metcalfe, Leslie Nerland, James Nolan, Katherine D. Nordale, Frank Peratrovich, Chris Poulsen, Peter L. Reader, Burke Riley, Ralph J. Rivers, Victor C. Rivers, John H. Rosswog, W. O. Smith, B. D. Stewart, George Sundborg, Dora M. Sweeney, Warren A. Taylor, H. R. Vanderleest, M. J. Walsh, Barrie M. White, Ada B. Wien.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. O. E. Dawalt, of Carrington, N. Dak., relating to the Republican Party.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARRINGTON, N. DAK.,
February 6, 1956.

Senator LANGER:

What will become of the Republican Party?

The common talk among farmers is, "Vote for as many Democrats as possible."

Sure, we all dislike Benson for his childish remarks, and Harper's article also, because he always belittles those he represents, while approving profits for packers and manufacturers of farm supplies, with no consideration for the farmers' dilemma.

They well know that the President is the boss, Benson the hired man, and the President need not approve his wrongdoing. Nor do the farmers appreciate our representatives approving and upholding the President, even though they do criticize Benson. The President may have been a wonderful Army man, but failed miserably to fulfill his campaign promises to the farmers.

Our lawmakers and law enforcers, the Representatives and Senators, why have they not curbed Benson with new legislation, if all else has failed? Where there is a will there is a way.

Lifelong Republicans say, "Here is an elephant starting to bray, awaiting the day to have my say—with an X."

It's about time someone wakes up and takes a stand.

A lifetime Republican, born June 16, 1896,

Yours truly,

Mrs. O. E. (ANN) DAWALT.

RESOLUTIONS OF GRANT COUNTY (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the Grant County, N. Dak., Farmers Union, relating to wheat acreage allotments, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the members of the Grant County Farmers Union, in convention assembled in Elgin this 22d day of October 1955, are deeply concerned with present farming conditions which are causing many family-type farms to sell their holding to larger farmers; and realize that with fewer farms, local businessmen and local institutions, the schools and churches, will suffer hardship: Be it

Resolved:

1. That no farm with a historic seeded wheat acreage of 100 acres or less be compelled to make any reduction on wheat acreage;

2. That the products of small, family-type farms be assured 100 percent of parity;

3. That, in addition to A. C. P. payments, any compensatory payments under any and all types of farm programs be limited to $5,000 for any farm unit; be it further

Resolved:

1. That the County Board send letters to all members showing the advantages and savings that can be had by them by patronizing their Farmers Union Co-ops; and that a similar statement be published by the County Board in the paper.

2. That the County Board contact the proper authorities and agencies to ask that more boxcars be made available, and that they be distributed according to the business done; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen.

3. That Congress be asked to increase personal income tax exemptions to $1,000; and be it further

Resolved:

1. That all members stand in silence to honor the memory of all deceased members of the Grant County Farmers Union; and that a special letter be sent to Mrs. Frank Markow, as Mr. Markow was the first secretary of the Grant County Farmers Union.

GRANT COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
GODFREY SCHRIOCK,
President.
JULIUS WEGNER,
Secretary.

NINETY PERCENT PARITY FOR FARM PRODUCTS—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter in the nature of a petition relating to 90 percent of parity, signed by Neal T. Hargan, and sundry other citizens, of Max, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the petition, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAX, N. DAK., *February 23, 1956.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: It is the wish of our organization to write you at this time to commend you on your efforts in regard to the

present farm program. Also to keep in mind our need for 90-percent parity. Needless to say the Benson viewpoint is not in accord with our needs in this area.

Sincerely yours,

NEAL T. HARGAN,
Endres Local Farmers Union.

THE FUR INDUSTRY—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by me from Paul Herrmann, of New York, N. Y., relating to the condition of the fur industry.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRAGEDY IN THE MIDST OF OUR PROSPERITY

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 17, 1955.*

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER.

DEAR SIR: While according to a recent address by the Secretary of Commerce, Sinclair Weeks, that business was never better, the fur industry, with the exception of mink and Alaska seal, is in the worst slump it ever experienced.

The industry has never recovered from the consumer's resistance to the 20-percent excise tax. The Government collected $85 million excise tax in 1947 and only $49 million in 1953. The greatest part in 1953 was through sales of mink which, by comparison, constituted only a small percentage in 1947. It has been estimated that nonmink sales have dropped as much as 75 percent since then.

According to Fur Age Weekly there were 560 mink manufacturers in 1949 and 957 in 1955 while the number of Persian manufacturers during that period dropped from 828 to 472, muskrat from 489 to 319, mouton from 260 to 102 and rabbit from 147 to 47.

There are no substitutes for any of the other articles subject to 10-percent excise tax. Therefore there is no competition in jewelry, cosmetics, handbags—but why should a woman buy a fur coat when she can obtain a nontaxed cloth coat, untrimmed, trimmed with fur or even furlined instead.

To make matters worse, cloth coat manufacturers actually capitalize on furs when they advertise in fashion magazines "fabulous fabric rivals nature's most precious furs" "looks more like fur than fur itself."

Due to the continuous decline the fur industry has experienced during the last 8 years, there is no question that the Government is actually losing money by keeping this discriminating tax in force through the heavy loss of business and income taxes and paying out unemployment benefits.

Every week fur concerns are failing and if we do not get immediate relief this industry is just going to collapse. Eliminating the excise tax would also help the many farmers who depend for additional income on trapping.

Yours very truly,

PAUL HERRMANN.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by J. Herbert Peel and sundry other citizens of Alton, Ill., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 923) to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the petition, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

(Signed by J. Herbert Peel and 22 other citizens of Alton, Ill.)

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA COOPERATIVE WOOL MARKETING ASSOCIATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at the 36th annual convention of the North Dakota Cooperative Wool Marketing Association, held in Fargo, N. Dak., on February 15, 1956.

The North Dakota Wool Marketing Association, Mr. President, is one of the finest organizations of its kind in the United States. In my opinion, they have always approached the problems of the woolgrowers in a sound and sensible way.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas agricultural products in general have suffered severe price declines for the past several years, while industrial prices and services have increased; and

Whereas it has been necessary for the Government of the United States to support farm commodities, and that additional assistance will be needed by agriculture to meet rising costs of operation; and

Whereas there is before the Interstate Commerce Commission a petition by United States railroads seeking to increase freight rates by 7 percent: be it

Resolved, That in view of the fact that farm income has declined approximately 30 percent since 1951, we, the members of the North Dakota Cooperative Wool Marketing Association, assembled here on the 15th day of February 1956 in annual convention, do respectfully request that the Public Service Commission of the State of North Dakota, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the Interstate Commerce Commission use every reasonable means to prevent further freight rate increases on farm commodities and farm supplies at this time.

Whereas the United States wool-growing industry has for a great many years been supported by Government purchase or wool-loan programs, necessitated by more liberal application of our tariff laws and reciprocal trade agreements with friendly nations; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has through these operations accumulated large supplies of domestic wool, and which have in the past constituted serious threats to domestic wool values, mainly for the reason that no definite policy with regard to their liquidation had been adopted; and

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture has now adopted an orderly liquidation plan on the basis of approximately 6,250,000 pounds per month for a term of 2 years, the announcement which has had a very beneficial effect on the domestic wool market, enabling a high percentage of the 1955 clip to be marketed in an orderly manner: be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the North Dakota Cooperative Wool Marketing Association, assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., for our 36th annual meeting desire to compliment the United States Department of Agriculture for the orderly and business-like manner in which the Government-owned stockpile is being marketed; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request the United States Department of Agriculture to continue its present program of liquidating wool stocks, and that it refrain from increasing its monthly sales allotments of approximately 6,250,000 pounds per month.

Whereas it appears that Uruguayan exporters of wool tops to the United States are receiving bounties or grants from the Uruguayan Government on such exports; and

Whereas tariff laws of the United States require that certain duties be assessed on dutiable imports, and in addition thereto, countervailing duties shall be imposed when any country shall pay or bestow, directly or indirectly, any bounty or grant on a dutiable article exported to the United States; and

Whereas it is known that the Uruguayan Government has requested the Government of the United States to lower or eliminate the countervailing duty on wool tops; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is currently supporting wool prices on the domestic clip in order to encourage the production of domestic wool in an amount to more nearly meet the needs of our country, and that imports of any articles contrary to the tariff laws of this country will prove injurious to domestic wool producers and our present support program: be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the North Dakota Cooperative Wool Marketing Association, assembled in the city of Fargo, N. Dak., this 15th day of February 1956, for our 36th annual meeting, do respectfully request the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to continue the present countervailing duty of 6 percent on wool tops exported from Uruguay until such time that it can be definitely determined the amount or rate of bounty or grants Uruguayan exporters of wool tops are receiving from that country.

Whereas the North Dakota congressional delegation have worked diligently and faithfully for the betterment of agriculture in general, and that such efforts have been productive of improvement in living conditions for our people: be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the North Dakota Cooperative Wool Marketing Association, assembled in the city of Fargo, N. Dak., for our 36th annual meeting, desire to express our sincere thanks and appreciation to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER and the Honorable MILTON R. YOUNG, United States Senators from North Dakota, and the Honorable USHER L. BURDICK and the Honorable OTTO KRUEGER, Members of the House of Representatives from North Dakota for the valuable assistance they have given on wool and general agricultural matters during the past year.

Whereas production costs of producing wool and wool textiles in the United States are considerably higher than in foreign countries, and that the growth, prosperity and preservation of the domestic sheep and wool industry of the United States is dependent upon adequate protective tariffs to enable it to compete favorably with foreign-produced wool and wool textiles where general costs of operation and rates of pay for labor are very low: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the North Dakota Cooperative Wool Marketing Association, assembled in the city of Fargo, N. Dak., for our 36th annual meeting, do respectfully request the North Dakota congressional delegation to do all in their power to resist further attempts to reduce tariffs on raw wool, wool cloth, wool fabrics, and

woolen articles in general which are being imported from foreign countries; and be it further

Resolved, That our congressional delegation study carefully the provisions of H. R. 8954, introduced in the House of Representatives on January 31, 1956, which is a bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions and for other purposes, and that they use their considered judgment as to the effects this bill may have on the domestic wool industry before voting on the measure.

Whereas the roving habits of wild predatory animals is well known, and harborage on public lands contributes to the abundance of these predatory animals: be it

Resolved, That we support the National Wool Growers Association in their recommendations to the Congress, asking an appropriation for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, sufficient to restore effective control of predators and rodents on public lands.

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Northwest Chapter of the American Society of Civil Engineers expressing their support for highway legislation during this session of Congress with special emphasis to the highest engineering standards.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF NORTHWESTERN SECTION, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS

To Members of the Congress From Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota:

Whereas the President, the Congress, and the majority of the people of this Nation are agreed that the condition of our highways is inadequate and demands immediate attention in order to protect the lives of road users and to avoid further great economic losses; and

Whereas an adequate highway system is vital to the national defense; and

Whereas it is essential that early action be taken by the Congress, not only to permit the States to develop their plans and get the work underway, but also for the reason that delay will cause greatly increased expense in obtaining rights-of-way; and

Whereas the present highway construction level throughout the Nation clearly has been proven insufficient in general for making significant reduction in the accumulated highway deficiencies; and

Whereas the Congress which is now resuming consideration of Federal highway legislation and is entitled to know what organizations such as ours, which are in a position to know the overall situation, do recommend as general policy in the matter: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Northwestern Section, American Society of Civil Engineers, having a membership of 575 civil engineers in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, at regular meeting in Minneapolis, Minn., on February 6, 1956:

1. That the Congress of the United States enact legislation for an expanded long-range highway program, covering a period between 10 and 15 years, including provisions for complete construction of the National System of Interstate Highways.

2. That, in determining the details of this program and its financing, the problem be weighed in terms of the broad public interest, without regard to partisanship or self-seeking special interests, but rather boldly and with the knowledge that a direct and far-seeing approach is vital if a fair and equitable solution is to be found in the interest of all.

3. That a definite program of financing be enacted to permit orderly advanced planning, preparation of necessary rights-of-way, and construction.

4. That on determining the Federal highway program, special emphasis be given to the necessity of developing the National System of Interstate Highways to the highest engineering standards with full control of access to insure utmost transportation efficiency.

ROTC CADET FLIGHT-TRAINING PROGRAM—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Airport Operators Association urging support of the ROTC cadet flight-training program and any effort to divorce the CAA from the Department of Commerce.

There being no objections, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Administration has outgrown its original planning; and

Whereas the CAA has numerous departments in all phases of the aviation field; and

Whereas the CAA could function more efficiently as a unit of its own: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Minnesota Airport Operators Association, at their annual convention held in Minneapolis, Minn., January 26–27, 1956, That the association go on record as being in favor of divorcing the CAA from the Department of Commerce.

Adopted January 27, 1956.

RAYMOND G. GLUMACK, *President.*

Attest:

JOHN L. RICE, *Secretary.*

ROTC LEGISLATION

Resolved, That the Minnesota Airport Operators Association endorses the effort to secure congressional approval of the ROTC cadet flight-training program and hereby directs its secretary to send letters to Senators EDWARD J. THYE and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY urging their active support of this legislation; and further, that members of Minnesota Airport Operators' Association lend their support by individual letters to the abovenamed Senators in support of this bill.

Adopted January 27, 1956.

RAYMOND G. GLUMACK, *President.*

Attest:

JOHN L. RICE, *Secretary.*

PRESERVATION OF WILDERNESS AREA OF SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Ely Rod and Gun Club, of Ely, Minn., in support of the Thye-Humphrey bill, S. 2967, and the companion House bills, H. R. 8657 and H. R. 8785, to preserve the wilderness area of the Superior National Forest.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELY ROD AND GUN CLUB, INC.,
Ely, Minn., February 20, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: By unanimous vote our club has passed a resolution supporting your Thye-Humphrey bill S. 2967 and the companion House bills H. R. 8657 and H. R. 8785.

This club represents over 400 sportsmen and conservationists in the Ely area who are vitally interested in preserving the wilderness area of the Superior National Forest. We have maintained this policy since 1948, and more so since the airplane ban, including our active support on all actions to create a true wilderness area.

The club wishes to compliment you on your stand and we appreciate your personal interest and action on this very important program.

Most sincerely yours,

ARTHUR W. ANDERSON, *President.*

FRANK J. CHERNIVEC, *Secretary.*

INCREASED POSTAL RATES—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Shevlin Copley Farmers Union Local opposing any increase in postal rates on first-class mail.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF SHEVLIN COPLEY FARMERS UNION LOCAL

Resolved, That we of the Shevlin Copley Farmers Union Local assembled this 19th day of February 1956 go on record as opposing ing any increase in postal rates on first-mail.

Whereas first-class mail has always paid its way; if any increase is necessary, we recommend it be applied on second- and third-class mail.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 9064. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1624).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 7927. An act to extend the time within which the State of Louisiana may make the initial payment on the purchase of certain property from the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1625).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer

of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1626).

BANK HOLDING COMPANIES—ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (PART 2 OF S. REPT. NO. 1095)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, which heretofore considered and reported, with an amendment, the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests, I report additional amendments, and submit a report thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed; and the amendments will lie on the table and be printed.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on Federal employment and pay for the month of January 1956. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JANUARY 1956 AND DECEMBER 1955, AND PAY, DECEMBER AND NOVEMBER 1955

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for January 1956 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In January numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In December was—	In November was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,346,691	2,343,227	+3,464	$950,429	$868,576	+$81,853
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,181,949	1,176,468	+5,481	517,148	438,686	+78,462
Department of Defense	1,164,742	1,166,759	−2,017	433,281	429,890	+3,391
Inside continental United States	2,142,396	2,139,185	+3,211			
Outside continental United States	204,295	204,042	+253			
Industrial employment	697,805	701,865	−4,060			
Foreign nationals	302,408	303,896	−1,488	28,669	29,890	−1,221

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States for agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1956, and comparison with December 1955, and pay for December 1955, and comparison with November 1955*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	77,566	76,405	1,161		$25,856	$27,064		$1,208
Commerce [2]	43,127	42,876	251		19,146	19,070	$76	
Health, Education, and Welfare	44,840	44,881		41	17,379	17,409		30
Interior	47,163	46,504	659		19,595	19,507	88	
Justice	30,590	30,432	158		14,757	14,451	306	
Labor	5,376	5,259	117		2,428	2,417	11	
Post Office	511,245	509,722	1,523		257,068	179,086	77,982	
State [3]	29,276	29,080	196		10,995	11,080		85
Treasury	79,634	78,318	1,316		33,858	34,512		654
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	365	369		4	210	213		3
Bureau of the Budget	417	422		5	277	276	1	
Council of Economic Advisers	33	33			23	24		1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	69	68	1		23	23		
National Security Council [4]	28	27	1		18	18		
Office of Defense Mobilization	279	300		21	170	167	3	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	5	1		3	3		
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions	37	38		1	36	16	20	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	16	19		3	6	7		1
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	8	7	1		3	4		1
American Battle Monuments Commission	693	696		3	105	102	$3	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,307	6,234	73		3,272	3,290		18
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	561	562		1	282	276	6	
Boston National Historical Sites Commission	1	1						
Civil Aeronautics Board	573	574		1	324	320	4	
Civil Service Commission	3,992	3,950	42		1,805	1,807		2
Commission of Fine Arts	9	9			1	1		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	171	166	5		100	103		3
Farm Credit Administration	1,057	1,048	9		519	516	3	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,014	946	68		506	484	22	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8			4	5		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,111	1,100	11		589	594		5
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,139	1,127	12		547	560		13
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	638	627	11		303	296	7	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	346	343	3		237	238		1
Federal Power Commission	678	675	3		364	365		1
Federal Trade Commission	610	607	3		354	348	6	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	150	152		2	72	71	1	
General Accounting Office	5,589	5,616		27	2,510	2,588		78
General Services Administration	25,975	25,894	81		9,009	9,240		231
Government Contract Committee	15	15			7	8		1
Government Printing Office	6,674	6,658	16		2,827	2,853		26

[2] January figure includes 345 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[3] January figure includes 7,581 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 7,442 in December, and their pay.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1956, and comparison with December 1955, and pay for December 1955, and comparison with November 1955*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Independnt agencies—Continued								
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,172	10,300		128	$4,885	$4,878	$7	
Indian Claims Commission	13	13			10	10		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,920	[1] 1,917	3		967	972		$5
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3			2	2		
John Marshall Bicentennial Celebration Commission					1	1		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,614	7,548	66		3,543	3,541	2	
National Capital Housing Authority	265	268		3	99	97	2	
National Capital Planning Commission	32	32			16	14	2	
National Gallery of Art	323	325		2	106	107		1
National Labor Relations Board	1,115	1,121		6	635	628	7	
National Mediation Board	106	104	2		60	77		17
National Science Foundation	241	238	3		114	115		1
National Security Training Commission	4	4			2	2		
Panama Canal	15,676	15,274	402		4,704	3,477	1,227	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,267	2,230	37		856	854	2	
Renegotiation Board	479	480		1	302	310		8
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	9	9			5	5		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	26	26			20	19	1	
Securities and Exchange Commission	704	701	3		400	400		
Selective Service System	6,830	6,856		26	1,696	1,696		
Small Business Administration	779	760	19		432	434		2
Smithsonian Institution	686	681	5		262	262		
Soldiers' Home	1,008	996	12		232	233		1
Subversive Activities Control Board	31	33		2	25	22	3	
Tariff Commission	205	200	5		115	117		2
Tax Court of the United States	143	141	2		93	95		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,405	16,374		969	6,963	[1] 7,370		407
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission [3]	2		2					
United States Information Agency	10,600	10,500	100		2,805	2,787	18	
Veterans' Administration	177,903	177,559	344		62,210	60,749	1,461	
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	2	2						
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,181,949	1,176,468	6,727	1,246	517,148	438,686	81,271	2,809
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			5,481				78,462	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,918	1,904	14		1,150	1,122	28	
Department of the Army	434,492	437,009		2,517	155,297	155,368		71
Department of the Navy	400,107	402,148		2,041	160,934	[1] 158,436	2,498	
Department of the Air Force	328,225	[1] 325,698	2,527		115,900	114,964	936	
Total, Department of Defense	1,164,742	1,166,759	2,541	4,558	433,281	429,890	3,462	71
Net change, Department of Defense			2,017				3,391	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,346,691	2,343,227	9,268	5,804	950,429	868,576	84,733	2,880
Net increase, including Department of Defense			3,464				81,853	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[3] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 183, 84th Cong.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1956, and comparison with December 1955*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	76,328	75,235	1,093	
Commerce [1]	40,188	39,923	265	
Health, Education, and Welfare	43,070	43,115		45
Interior	42,476	42,219	257	
Justice	30,061	29,897	164	
Labor	5,255	5,135	120	
Post Office	508,744	507,221	1,523	
State [2]	7,698	7,642	56	
Treasury	78,660	77,348	1,312	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	365	369		4
Bureau of the Budget	417	422		5
Council of Economic Advisers	33	33		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	69	68	1	
National Security Council [2]	28	27	1	
Office of Defense Mobilization	279	300		21
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	5	1	
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions	37	38		1
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	16	19		3
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	8	7	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	15	15		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,290	6,218	72	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	561	562		1
Boston National Historical Sites Commission	1	1		
Civil Aeronautics Board	569	570		1
Civil Service Commission	3,975	3,934	41	
Commission of Fine Arts	9	9		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	171	166	5	
Farm Credit Administration	1,045	1,036	9	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,014	946	68	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	1,083	1,073	10	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,138	[4] 1,126	12	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	638	627	11	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	346	343	3	
Federal Power Commission	678	675	3	
Federal Trade Commission	610	607	3	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	150	152		2
General Accounting Office	5,541	5,568		27
General Services Administration	25,870	25,788	82	
Government Contract Committee	15	15		
Government Printing Office	6,674	6,658	16	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,021	10,149		128
Indian Claims Commission	13	13		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,920	[4] 1,917	3	
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,614	7,548	66	
National Capital Housing Authority	265	268		3
National Capital Planning Commission	32	32		
National Gallery of Art	323	325		2
National Labor Relations Board	1,094	1,100		6
National Mediation Board	106	104	2	
National Science Foundation	241	238	3	
National Security Training Commission	4	4		
Panama Canal	550	550		
Railroad Retirement Board	2,267	2,230	37	
Renegotiation Board	479	480		1
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	9	9		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	26	26		
Securities and Exchange Commission	704	701	3	
Selective Service System	6,638	6,663		25
Small Business Administration	779	760	19	
Smithsonian Institution	685	680	5	
Soldiers' Home	1,008	996	12	
Subversive Activities Control Board	31	33		2
Tariff Commission	205	200	5	
Tax Court of the United States	143	141	2	

[1] January figure includes 345 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

[2] January figure includes 1,596 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,620 in December.

[3] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1956, and comparison with December 1955*—Continued

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,405	16,374		969
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission [3]	2		2	
United States Information Agency	2,391	2,382	9	
Veterans' Administration	176,634	176,306	328	
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	2	2		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,119,733	1,115,354	5,625	1,246
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			4,379	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,855	1,843	12	
Department of the Army	366,439	368,355		1,916
Department of the Navy	368,078	370,026		1,948
Department of the Air Force	286,291	283,607	2,684	
Total, Department of Defense	1,022,663	1,023,831	2,696	3,864
Net decrease, Department of Defense				1,168
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,142,396	2,139,185	8,321	5,110
Net increase, including Department of Defense			3,211	

[3] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 183, 84th Cong.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1956, and comparison with December 1955*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,238	1,170	68	
Commerce	2,939	2,953		14
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,770	1,766	4	
Interior	4,687	4,285	402	
Justice	529	535		6
Labor	121	124		3
Post Office	2,501	2,501		
State [1]	21,578	21,438	140	
Treasury	974	970	4	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	678	681		3
Atomic Energy Commission	17	16	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4		
Civil Service Commission	17	16	1	
Farm Credit Administration	12	12		
Federal Communications Commission	28	27	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
General Accounting Office	48	48		
General Services Administration	105	106		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	151	151		
National Labor Relations Board	21	21		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Panama Canal	15,126	14,724	402	
Selective Service System	192	193		1
Smithsonian Institution	1	1		
United States Information Agency	8,209	8,118	91	
Veterans' Administration	1,269	1,253	16	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	62,216	61,114	1,130	28
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			1,102	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	63	61	2	
Department of the Army	[2] 68,053	68,654		601
Department of the Navy	32,029	32,122		93
Department of the Air Force	41,934	[2] 42,091		157
Total, Department of Defense	142,079	142,928	2	851
Net decrease, Department of Defense			849	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	204,295	204,042	1,132	879
Net increase, including Department of Defense			253	

[1] January figure includes 5,985 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 5,822 in December.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1956, and comparison with December 1955*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	2,837	2,829	8	
Commerce	2,274	2,424		150
Interior	8,142	7,543	599	
Treasury	5,690	5,639	51	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	146	146		
Federal Communications Commission	14	13	1	
General Services Administration	971	971		
Government Printing Office	6,674	6,658	16	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,614	7,548	66	
Panama Canal	7,944	7,454	490	
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,617	13,532		915
Total, excluding Department of Defense	54,923	54,757	1,231	1,065
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			166	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[1] 203,183	[2] 204,274		1,091
Outside continental United States	[1] 35,428	[2] 35,746		318
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	228,538	230,650		2,112
Outside continental United States	6,406	6,452		46
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	163,876	164,173		297
Outside continental United States	5,451	5,813		362
Total, Department of Defense	642,882	647,108		4,226
Net decrease, Department of Defense			4,226	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	697,805	701,865	1,231	5,291
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			4,060	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of January 1956 and comparison with December 1955*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	January	December	January	December	January	December	January	December
Denmark	6	2					6	2
England	6,755	7,092			30	30	6,725	7,062
France	24,513	24,912	17,068	17,281			7,445	7,631
French Morocco	6,233	6,160	232	239	977	1,006	5,024	4,915
Germany	110,348	111,421	86,687	87,880	1,990	2,014	21,671	21,527
Japan	146,974	147,012	85,317	[1] 85,317	18,531	18,440	43,126	[1] 43,255
Korea	6,373	6,059	6,373	6,059				
Libya	211	210					211	210
Netherlands	43	47					43	47
Norway	17	17					17	17
Saudi Arabia	438	463					438	463
Trinidad	497	501			497	501		
Total	302,408	303,896	195,677	196,776	22,025	21,991	84,706	85,129

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French and English reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personnel services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of January totaling 2,346,691. This was a net increase of 3,464 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of December. This was the first monthly increase since August 1955.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1956, which began July 1, 1955, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,384,595	307	
August	2,385,043	448	
September	2,366,069		18,974
October	2,365,183		886
November	2,362,158		3,025
December	2,343,227		18,931
January 1956	2,346,691	3,464	

Total civilian employment in civilian agencies during the month of January was 1,181,949 an increase of 5,481 as compared with the December total of 1,176,468. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in January was 1,164,742. This was a decrease of 2,017 as compared with 1,166,759 in December.

Civilian agencies reporting the major increases were: the Post Office Department with an increase of 1,523, the Department of the Treasury with an increase of 1,316, the Department of Agriculture with an increase of 1,161, and the Department of the Interior with an increase of 659. A decrease of 969 was reported by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In the Department of Defense decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with a decrease of 2,517 and the Department of the Navy with a decrease of 2,041. The Department of the Air Force reported an increase in civilian employment of 2,527. This was the ninth consecutive monthly increase in civilian employment by the Air Force. The total cumulative increase for these 9 months was 21,838. The Office of the Secretary of Defense reported an increase of 14 in civilian employment.

Inside continental United States civilian employment increased 3,211 and outside continental United States civilian employment increased 253. Industrial employment by the Federal agencies in January totaled 697,805, a decrease of 4,060.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,346,691 civilian employees certified to the committee by the executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 302,408 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies during January who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in December was 303,896. A breakdown of this employment for January follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Denmark	6			6
England	6,755		30	6,725
France	24,513	17,068		7,445
French Morocco	6,233	232	977	5,024
Germany	110,348	86,687	1,990	21,671
Japan	146,974	85,317	18,531	43,126
Korea	6,373	6,373		
Libya	211			211
Netherlands	43			43
Norway	17			17
Saudi Arabia	438			438
Trinidad	497		497	
Total	302,408	195,677	22,025	84,706

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3368. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ruff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 3369. A bill for the relief of Anarbal Contreras-Cueaves; and

S. 3370. A bill for the relief of Paul Yen-Hsiung Feng and his wife, Mary Stella Pao-Ching Feng, and their minor child, Joseph Shao-Ying Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 3371. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3372. A bill for the relief of certain survivors of Private James Walter Milroy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3373. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 3374. A bill to amend title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to increase existing limitations on terms and amounts of production and subsistence loans under such title; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3375. A bill to provide parking space for the automobiles of patrons and postal employees at postal installations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3376. A bill to provide for suspension of foreign economic aid expenditures until personal exemptions for income tax purposes have been increased to $700; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3377. A bill to amend section 803 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to certain employment of subsidiary or affiliated companies by contractors receiving an operating differential subsidy under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3378. A bill for the relief of Manuel S. Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to provide for a report to the Congress suitable for distribution to interested private organizations of data presently available on the requirements for the repair of atomic powered ships; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. BEALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. Res. 225. Resolution amending Senate Resolution 219, to investigate campaign expenditures, lobbying, and certain other activities affecting the Senate or any Member thereof; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. McNAMARA, which appears under a separate heading.)

PARKING FACILITIES AT POSTAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, rapid population growths in metropolitan areas of our Nation have brought demands for new and larger postal facilities.

In large measure the demand for services and buildings to house the postal function have been met. But too often the planning has encompassed only the postal function itself. It has not provided off-street parking facilities to those who work so that the Nation might receive its mail on time.

Because of this ever-worsening situation, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would require the Post Office Department to plan off-street parking facilities in conjunction with planned expansion in the postal plant itself. In other words, when architects go to the drawing board to start new post-office buildings they likewise would plan parking facilities adequate to care for the staff which will man the new structure.

My home city of Seattle provides a prime example of what happened when a new post-office annex is built in the congested downtown business district without provision for either the postal worker or the patron who will use the postal facility.

I hesitated for a considerable length of time to approach this problem with legislation. My hope, and I know the postal employees of Seattle as well as city officials, shared that hope, was that the postal department had ample authority to proceed with this in an orderly way and provide parking facilities for the employees and the patrons. But every attempt to work this matter out without legislation has met with failure. Conference after conference was held. City officials and postal employees have met with many assistant postmasters general. They have gone to the top in the Department, but without avail.

Legislation seems to provide the only answer to this perplexing problem. I know if it is true in Seattle, it must be true in many other large cities of the Nation.

Under this measure, future postal installations would be required to have adequate off-street parking within a 2-block radius. This is vitally needed not only in Seattle but in many other cities across the Nation for the same problem has arisen and will arise in the future.

In my opinion, this is only sound planning on the part of the Post Office Department which has such a unique and great obligation to both the people who staff it so well and those who are served through its everyday function.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3375) to provide parking space for the automobiles of patrons and

postal employees at postal installations, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 803 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to certain employment of subsidiary or affiliated companies by contractors receiving an operating differential subsidy under such act.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by me, explaining the purpose of this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3377) to amend section 803 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to certain employment of subsidiary or affiliated companies by contractors receiving an operating differential subsidy under such act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Section 803 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, makes it unlawful for the holder of an operating-differential subsidy contract to employ any subsidiary or affiliated company to perform or supply stevedoring, ship-repair, ship-chandler, towboat, or kindred services to its subsidized vessels, except that the Maritime Administrator, under powers delegated by the Secretary of Commerce, may grant an exemption from the provisions of this section upon such terms and conditions and for such period of time as he deems appropriate, where he finds that the restriction is not necessary to safeguard the economical and fair application of subsidies paid under the act, and that the exemption will promote economy or efficiency of service.

Subsection (b) of section 803 goes on to provide that, even when the Maritime Administrator has granted such an exemption, the supplier must agree to pay over to the subsidized operator any profits that result from the supply or service contract. This would seem to be more protection than is necessary, in view of the findings the Administrator must make before granting an exemption. It is argued that the provision has served to defeat the very purpose for which an exemption was provided, i. e., the promotion of economy or efficiency of service. It seems obvious that no subsidiary or affiliate would be willing to serve or supply a vessel if it could not make some reasonable profit. Furthermore, it is argued, such a no-profit provision might well prevent the subsidized operator from obtaining necessary services or supplies from a subsidiary or affiliate at less than normal cost. Since the subsidized operator exercises some control over its subsidiary or affiliate, it may be able to obtain just a little better service than otherwise.

This bill proposes to eliminate subsection (b) in its entirety, as unduly restrictive and unnecessary.

In its place, however, there would be inserted a proviso, to the effect that the Maritime Administrator shall include as a condition to any exemption he may grant that the cost of performing the services or supplying the facilities by a subsidiary or affiliate shall not exceed the market price thereof if ascertainable, or, if there are competitive bids, that the cost shall not exceed the lowest bid. This will prevent the funneling off of assets by a subsidized line to a subsidiary or affiliate, which might reduce the possibility of recapture. That, so I understand, is what this section was initially designed to prevent, and its underlying purpose will remain unimpaired by this amendment. It will permit, however, taking advantage of the interrelationship to seek a lower cost or a more efficient service.

REPORT ON DATA AVAILABLE ON REQUIREMENTS FOR REPAIR OF ATOMIC POWERED SHIPS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in the midst of all the glamour and fanfare which surround current plans for the construction of atomic-powered ships, we must not forget that any nuclear fleet of the future will be only as good as our ability to keep it sailing.

That means that our repair yards must plan now, even as our shipyards are doing, for the day when naval and private vessels will ply the seas under atomic power.

When nuclear ships start slipping down the ways, the ports of this Nation must be ready to service them.

New facilities and trained personnel will be needed. They cannot be obtained overnight.

Therefore, it is essential that the maritime repair yards keep pace with the builders.

To help them do so, I introduced a joint resolution on February 23 calling for a survey of ports to see which ones will be able to handle the repair and maintenance of atomic-powered vessels.

I will admit that I felt a more-than-usual interest in the proposed legislation because of my personal connection with the great port of Baltimore, and I was additionally gratified when other far-sighted cities—such as the port of Beaumont, Tex.—immediately expressed their approval of the measure.

I am introducing today a joint resolution, which is a companion piece to the other measure.

I realize fully that the Government and private industry are each preparing men for work on atomic ships, but it seems that such training could be coordinated more closely to the benefit of all concerned.

Consequently, I prepared this joint resolution in an effort to have a public report prepared on the repair facilities, personnel requirements and safety and health provisions which will have to be considered in revamping our shipyards.

The report would be made by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Army, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and would be available to any private concerns interested in the subject.

Such a comprehensive study, I believe, would bring private industry up to date on what the Government anticipates for the future and would save much of the uncertainty and confusion which might possibly result otherwise from initial efforts in this relatively new field.

I introduce the joint resolution, and ask for its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 154) to provide for a report to the Congress suitable for distribution to interested private organizations of data presently available on the requirements for the repair of atomic-powered ships, introduced by Mr. BEALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 219, RELATING TO INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, ETC.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to amend Senate Resolution 219, agreed to by the Senate on February 22, 1956, creating a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures, lobbying, and other matters.

I voted for that resolution, Mr. President. But I had a few reservations when I did so, and I have even more now.

My amendment would change section 2 of the resolution to provide that the special committee, now composed of 8 members—4 each from the majority and minority parties of the Senate—be changed to provide for 9 members, of whom 5 would be majority members. I am not proposing that the present membership of the committee be changed; merely that an additional member be selected from the majority party.

I thought this provision—giving the majority of members to the majority party—should be in the resolution from the start. But I deferred to the wishes of the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] when he spoke of "the rigid standards of fair play which we should apply to an incident that concerned the entire membership of the Senate." That was a nice theory, Mr. President, but that was all—only a theory.

I shall not dwell on the present membership of the special committee, except to say that I am afraid that this committee may stretch itself too far and waste its time investigating the 'phone-book listings and some organizations which obviously have no money even for postage.

The junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who startled some of my colleagues out of their lethargy with his disclosure of high-handed lobbying on the natural gas bill, brought up a situation which should be investigated to the core. I agree that other pressure groups may be found to be as bad as, if not worse than, the gas and oil lobby. But I do not want to see any member of this committee throw away the taxpayers' money and time by urging the committee to in-

vestigate his pet lobbying peeve. I am not accusing any member of the committee of attempting to steer the investigation away from its original purpose, but there is danger of this happening if the committee goes off chasing will-o'-the-wisps.

But aside from this aspect, Mr. President, my amendment is designed to cure a more basic fault of this committee structure. The distinguished majority leader stressed fair play in having equal representation from the majority and minority parties and from those who voted for and those who voted against the natural gas bill.

While his emphasis on fair play is laudable, he overlooked, I am afraid, the responsibility and authority that rest with him and the other members of the majority party.

When the voters of this Nation saw fit, in 1954, to make the Democratic Party the majority party, they gave the Democratic Party the authority and responsibility for all actions taken by Congress. Thus, the Democratic Party must answer to the people for the actions of Congress; and no amount of giving equal representation to the minority party will result in equal responsibility for this committee's actions in the long run.

From the very first meeting of the special committee, according to reports, it was plunged into discord over the chairmanship, committee counsel, and other matters of procedure. If there is discord on these relatively minor matters, Mr. President, what will happen when the committee starts to dig into lobbying—if it ever does? This is a penalty of the majority leader's fair-play theory. In dividing this committee equally, he has, in effect, given each member equal authority. What we have is eight chairmen, it seems.

I say this, Mr. President: The Democratic Party is responsible for this Congress. My amendment gives to the Democratic Party—as the majority party—that responsibility and authority in this investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 225) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That section 2 (a) of Senate Resolution 219, agreed to on February 22, 1956, to investigate campaign expenditures, lobbying, and certain other activities affecting the Senate or any Member thereof, be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) The special committee shall consist of 9 members to be appointed by the Vice President, 5 from the majority Members of the Senate and 4 from the minority Members of the Senate, and shall, at a meeting to be called by the Vice President, select a chairman and a vice chairman."

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. KERR) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. CURTIS) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ELLENDER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, MR. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WELKER) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. JENNER, and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HOLLAND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment (designated as 2–24–56—H) intended to be proposed by Mr. LONG (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECTS IN CERTAIN AREAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the bill (S. 3273) to provide authorization for emergency flood-protection projects in areas of the United States where such projects are needed for the protection of life and property, is next printed, I may be included as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be added as cosponsors of Senate bill 3308, proposing amendments to the Federal election laws, the next time it is printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Statement prepared by him relating to the stake of southern Illinois in legislation for depressed areas.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Letter addressed to the Washington Post and Times Herald, written by the Honorable EDITH S. GREEN, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon, with reference to the Al Sarena case.

AGRICULTURAL ACT, 1956—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared with regard to the bill presently under consideration by the Senate, S. 3183.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE ON THE REFORESTATION PROVISIONS OF S. 3183, THE FARM BILL

The debate on S. 3183 so far has been primarily concerned, and justifiably so, with the central provisions of the bill which will have such an enormous effect on the future of United States agriculture. I feel that it is appropriate at this time to point out that there is a section of the forestry provisions of S. 3183 which is of particular merit and worthy of special comment.

This section is of particular interest to me because the Maine woodpulp and forest-products industries are the largest industries in our State. They employ nearly one-third of all the people engaged in manufacturing industries. The forests which supply these industries cover 85 percent of Maine's land area. The wood-using industries are the biggest customers of Maine's freight carriers. Pulp and paper mills are located in 24 Maine towns and 350 Maine communities have some form of wood-using industry. Veneers, lumber, plywood, and building board produced in Maine supply an important part of the raw materials used by more than 2 million people engaged in the building and construction trades throughout the United States. Maine's newsprint accounts for 60 percent of the Nation's entire production. Maine forests supply material for everything from napkins to deepwater ships. The importance of Maine's forests to the State and to the Nation cannot be overemphasized. Nor can the importance of preserving forest lands and providing a continuing supply of timber,

not only in Maine but throughout the Nation, be stressed too strongly.

According to a recent report published by the Forestry Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Nation's timber requirements are expected to be so high by the year 2000 that timber growth will have to be from 70 to 120 percent higher than it is now. However, current rates of progress indicate that there will be a definite imbalance between cut and growth of timber resources by the end of the century. Although there is every evidence for encouragement, particularly in the reforestation of commercial timber holdings and on public lands, the future of our timber resources rests primarily on the supplies which can be provided by small private holdings. Well over half of the Nation's timber resources are in the form of farm and other private ownerships and 85 percent of these holdings are of less than 100 acres. It is this area of small private holdings where reforestation is decidedly lagging.

What is the future of these small holdings? What can be done to insure an adequate reforestation program which will encourage planting on these small holdings?

Before I attempt to answer these questions, let me describe what is happening to the small timber holdings in Maine. Most of these small holdings are in the form of a few acres of woodlands on small farms. In recent years there has been a steady decline in the number of farms in Maine. This has not meant, as it has in some other areas, that the small farms are being absorbed by larger units. On the contrary, it has meant that many of the small farms are now idle.

In 1954, there were 7,000 less farms in Maine than there had been in 1950. Some of these farms were, of course, absorbed. The average size of farms increased from 137.7 acres to 154.7 acres in the same period. But the total number of farm acres declined by approximately 500,000 acres which represents a drop of about 12 percent. What is happening to this land which has been removed from agriculture? It is for the most part idle land. The fields are not cultivated and, more significant, the woodlands on these holdings are not being reforested, although cutting continues.

With this situation in Maine as a background, let us now consider what kind of a program is needed to insure adequate reforestation on these small holdings which constitute over half of the Nation's timber resources. In the legislation now before us, there is the modest beginning of a program which will move in the direction of a solution of the small landowner's reforestation problems.

Section 601 is designed to broaden the scope of Federal participation in the reforestation program. The primary basis of the program would still be one of close cooperation between the States and the Federal Government. In the past the Federal Government has contributed to the cost of purchasing planting stock. Through contributions to the State governments for the purchase of trees, the planting stock can be sold to individual planters at reduced cost. There is no doubt that this financial assistance has been of great value in encouraging individual farmers and landowners to plant their idle lands in forests and to reforest depleted woodlands.

In the fiscal year 1955, according to a report published by the Department of Agriculture Forestry Service, 812,588 acres were planted in trees in the United States. This acreage figure represents all the planting done on Federal lands, non-Federal public lands, and private lands and includes all wind-barrier and reforestation planting.

For the most part the program which the Federal Government has undertaken in the past has been successful. Recently, the program has been hampered by a shortage in the supply of planting stock. The production of planting stock is a long-term proposition and it has been traditionally difficult for the Forest Service or the State nurseries to estimate what supply will be needed in the future. The Forest Service is aware of this problem and is making every effort to insure future supplies of planting stock equal to the increasing demand.

One persistent problem which has discouraged many small farmers and landowners from participating in the tree-planting programs is the cost of planting. Tree planting even on a small scale requires a great deal of labor. The holder of a relatively small piece of land ordinarily operates that land alone. To plant, say, 5 acres of his land in seedlings is a time-consuming and backbreaking task beyond the capability of one man who is engaged in the full-time job of farming or is employed off the farm. To hire extra labor to plant the 5 acres is beyond his financial means. As a result he is able to participate in the program only to the extent that he can physically plant trees himself.

This is largely the problem in Maine. In the year 1955, only 713 acres of privately owned land were planted in trees. The Federal Government has very generously aided the State of Maine with its reforestation program. But where the need is the greatest, existing legislation has not empowered the Federal Government to help. The State of Maine cannot undertake the vigorous and extensive reforestation program which it would like to, unless it can help the individual planters in the actual work of planting. To date, this kind of aid has been beyond the financial capacity of the State government. On a shared-cost basis, it would be feasible for Maine to expand its reforestation program so that it would provide the kind of planting Maine needs on its small farms and semi-idle privately owned lands. This would undoubtedly be true in other States also.

Under the terms of paragraph (c) of section 601, the Department of Agriculture would be authorized to give financial, advisory, and technical assistance to the States in carrying out their reforestation programs. Previously, financial aid had been in the form of contributions for purchase of planting stocks. Under the extension of the Department of Agriculture's participation in the State's programs, the Department of Agriculture would be authorized to give assistance, both financial and technical, to the actual process of planting the trees. And it is this type of aid which will insure a reforestation program adequate to meet the ever-increasing demands upon our forests.

In an age when there are increasing demands being placed on all our natural resources and particularly on our timber supply, it is essential that we do everything we can to insure the preservation and conservation of our resources for the continued growth and expansion of our national economy.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for including section 601 in S. 3183. This expanded cooperative Federal-State reforestation program has my wholehearted support.

ADDRESS BY GENERAL RIDGWAY AT DEDICATION OF VIRGINIA WAR MEMORIAL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an exceedingly fine address delivered by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway on the occasion of the dedication of the Virginia War Memorial at Richmond, Va., on February 29, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY

Governor Stanley, Senator Wicker, distinguished representatives of allied nations, of our Federal Government and of the Commonwealth of Virginia, fellow Virginians, no greater honor could be accorded any man than that of being a participant in these memorial ceremonies today. I stand here before you on this occasion in great humbleness of soul.

Each thing we do in the present has its causes in the past, its effects in the future. Our every important act today links up the deeds of years gone by with the action of other years ahead. So this dedication tonight has its origins in the past history of this region and of the people it cradled, in the historical record of their achievements and in the principles and faith by which they lived.

In the richness of that history, in the annals of the people of this region, there is a wealth of heritage second to that of no other part of our land. This abundance of historical precedents has here generated a profound feeling of esteem and honor for valor, wisdom, skill, and, above all, for integrity.

From one single section of this Commonwealth, from the Potomac to the James, sprang many of the giants of our Revolutionary period. They and their forebears had been major participants for 175 formative years of the colonial period preceding our birth as an independent Nation. They had been instrumentalities in a great political laboratory. They served as agents for crystallizing and utilizing effectively the political and social wisdom patiently gathered by their ancestors. They exercised a dominant influence in recognizing and defining, and then in insuring that other men recognized, the fundamental truths and rules later to be embodied in our Federal Constitution.

But they did more than this. They gave form and substance to certain concepts of personal conduct, of duty and accountability to the state, and of civic and social responsibility. They codified these concepts, and the code became the hallmark of the society they created, the spiritual backing behind the bond these people underwrote. They were characterized by a high sense of personal honor, a sacred conception of responsibility to the community, an ingrained instinct of obligation guided by reason—all these derived from their primary faith in God and their supreme trust in Divine Providence.

The list of their names is long and even better known to you than to me. In the tribute we wish to render tonight to those in whose memory we meet, the naming of many others could but detract, even though slightly, from the homage which is rightfully theirs. So in these brief remarks, the names of only two will appear. Those two, however, have imperishable laurels, and their contributions to the objectives we sought and still seek are unsurpassed, and I believe unequaled. The standard of duty, the measure of individual responsibility to others, was expressed in Washington's words, "Though I prize the good opinion of my fellow citizens, I would not seek to retain popularity at the expense of one social or moral duty." Duty was never more forthrightly identified as entirely distinct from all aspects of self-interest.

These references to history help us span the long gap from our rich past in Virginia, through the present, to our future in the Nation. They help us to understand, and by understanding, to convey more fully to all present-day citizens, the traditions we hope to pass on to those into whose hands the future of our people will be entrusted. They bring us through the many generations from pre-Revolutionary times up to the impressive

activities of this afternoon at the Virginia War Memorial on the banks of the James in this city.

There, in a simple ceremony of reverent remembrance, was begun an act of solemn dedication which here tonight we seek to consummate.

The torch of liberty was lighted. The flame of the eternal light was kindled. The names of 10,342 Virginians who gave their lives in World War II and Korea were unveiled. Mementos were deposited for permanent preservation from the farflung "battlefields and battleseas hallowed by their blood." Now we meet to dedicate formally the Shrine of Memory which the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia have grandly conceived and proudly erected.

While the edifice is built of cold marble, warm spirit diffuses throughout the whole structure. The torch, the flame, the memories which the names now engraved on that marble evoke, are manifestations of that zeal, of that courage of heart, that nobility of soul and fearlessness of mind, that willingness to sacrifice self in the service of others, which the entire memorial itself so eloquently expresses.

The most enduring things in man's life are not the material, but the spiritual. The values of the material ultimately fade. The values of the spiritual remain, unchanged and unchanging. They are the values by which generations of Virginians tested the principles on which our Nation was built, our liberty secured, our Federal Constitution made the basic law of the land. They are the values which in our evolving society have made our people ever ready in great crisis to sacrifice their material possessions, and even their very lives. They are the values symbolized by what we saw and deeply felt this afternoon at the memorial itself—the torch of liberty, the flame of memory, and the inspiration they engendered in our hearts and minds. This, I think, is what another of Virginia's great leaders, Thomas Jefferson, had in mind when he wrote:

"I shall not die without the hope that light and liberty are on a steady advance * * * the flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished."

This same flame, this same light, which Jefferson felt would never be extinguished, was made to burn brighter this afternoon. It symbolizes by its warmth and light the lives of those whose names the marble bears. It is a consecrating expression of homage to all those noble women who courageously shared in the sacrifices made by their husbands, sons, and brothers. It is fittingly represented by that beautiful monument to memory—dedicated to Virginia womanhood—inspiration of Virginia manhood.

There seems to me to be some special significance in the warmth and comfort of the surroundings we here enjoy. They do indeed betoken our protected and contented life, abundantly rich in material blessings on a bit of God's earth, which many other persons in other lands, likewise formed in His image, do not enjoy. This warmth and this comfort contrast in human values with the chronic shortage of the basic necessities of life—food, clothing, shelter—the chronic lack of medical attention for the body, and of spiritual solicitude for the soul, which so many other peoples have to endure.

In one way, it would have been better had we been out there this evening under God's open sky, as were so many of those we memorialize when they made their sacrifices for us; in one way, it would have been better had we been there in lashing rain, or in dark and zero weather than here in this warm, well-lighted hall. But there were sound reasons why we met here; and in any event it signifies little if the meeting reminds us of the discipline so necessary to us all, lest we forget the things which really count and cling to those which do not matter.

Today we harvest the fruits these honored men planted, we enjoy them in an abundance beyond their powers to imagine. But in life there is a responsibility coequal with every privilege, and, great as is our privilege today, our responsibility is no less. Let us remember that it requires discipline to bear responsibility.

We are living in a historical era—one of the greatest, I think, through which mankind has passed in modern times. We do not know when or how it will end and a new one begin. We do not know what will characterize the new, but we certainly do know, unless we willfully close our minds, the essential nature of the era in which we live. We do know we face an implacably hostile, secret and murderous conspiracy that has but one basic objective—to snuff out the light of liberty, to extinguish the flame of freedom. We do know that we have a responsibility to stand ready with all our strength to keep that "torch of liberty" before every American eye, the love of freedom aflame in every American heart. The imperative, ceaseless need for such readiness could not be more appropriately indicated than by the motto, "Sic Semper Tyrannis," on the Virginia State seal.

Let us now and in the future draw on the great reservoir of faith in God, which is America's greatest strength. Let us keep alive the knowledge of the proud traditions of this Commonwealth; let us, and all who follow us, catch through the stately beauty of this magnificent memorial the warm and living spirit of those whose passing brought it forth. Then, in reverent and humble pride, we shall have dedicated this shrine in the sublime spirit and for the lofty purpose for which it was conceived—an enduring stimulus to all that is finest in human nature in the lives of succeeding Virginians and Americans.

May God grant we succeed.

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, yesterday I had the honor to be invited to speak before the second annual legislative conference, building and construction trades department, AFL–CIO, at the Sheraton Park Hotel, in Washington, D. C. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL, SECOND ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT, AFL–CIO, MARCH 5, 1956

Mr. President and gentlemen, I am honored by your wish that I speak with you on this occasion.

You are meeting here today to consider the special and serious problems which confront your great industry—the construction industry—and your strong and stable unions which supply the lifeblood of labor to it. It is no exaggeration to say that you are the heart of an industry which sustains the economic sinews, and promotes the continuing prosperity and economic good of our entire country.

Yet, while we are gathered here to consider these important industrial matters of domestic concern, I cannot resist the desire to lift up our eyes and hearts to the broad problems facing our Nation both at home and throughout the world. History has thrust upon us the role of leadership in the free world today. Prosperity has favored us at home. Our strength—our great natural resources—our talent for production—our unparalleled living standards have all prepared us to bear with greater ease the burdens of international responsibilities.

These responsibilities, of course, spring from an enlightened self-interest—the best kind of selfishness. They flow from a natural desire to retain for ourselves and our posterity the great bounty with which we and our institutions have been blessed. For example, I firmly believe that the protection and advancement of our own way of life will ultimately depend upon the success of other nations in attaining and preserving economic and political freedom for their own citizens, as well.

I speak as an American, grateful for what free America has given to each of us, and thoroughly dedicated to do what I can to preserve it for all time. It is a unique era through which we are passing and, indeed, a unique one which we are about to enter. This is an era of new energy—unbelievable energy—which leads us into the thermonuclear age. Unhappily, the secrets of it, for good or for evil, are known to free nations and Communist nations alike. These secrets may be used to bring mankind to an almost undreamed of state of happiness and abundance, or, to the contrary, they can obliterate mankind and the whole globe.

It is the responsibility of this country to work for a just and an enduring peace, and, in the process, to deter aggression and, if necessary to combat it. This is not, and cannot be, a matter of partisanship or politics. It must ever be an American concern of all American people with, as I say, an enlightened self-interest.

In the discharge of that responsibility, America must continue working, in good comradeship, with freedom-loving nations everywhere. Standing together, the free world will constitute the strongest kind of a deterrent to aggression. Communist or otherwise. Mutual security and mutual assistance are an indispensable part of American policy. And while I believe they will be carried on under any national administration, they deserve and require the patient and zealous support of our people. As leading citizens in your own community, you have the highest duty of accepting the sober facts of these eventful days through which we pass, and, having accepted them, of supporting our efforts toward international peace—above politics, above partisanship, as citizens and patriots, with the interests of our own beloved America close to our hearts.

My own efforts will constantly be directed toward these very international goals which I have outlined to you. Our continuing greatness as a nation depends upon reaching these goals. History has taught us that we cannot stand still. We will improve and prosper as a nation and as individuals or we will falter and fall back. Certainly, mature and effective acceptance of the role of international leadership will be a key to our own prosperity under freedom in the years which lie ahead.

Now to turn toward the problems at home—particularly the problems which face you as trade unionists—as the leaders of skilled craftsmen and seasoned workers who are a bulwark of our Nation's economy. Not everyone realizes the tremendous size and economic influence of the construction industry. Last year the dollar amount of new construction put in place both public and private, residential and nonresidential, totaled more than $42 billion. This is new construction. When we include alterations and repairs, the total volume of work is presently in the neighborhood of $60 billion. On contract construction alone last year, more than 2½ million craftsmen and laborers were employed. Let's just stop and think for a minute about the meaning of these figures in

terms of production, of employment and payrolls, in the mines and mills, the shops and factories of the Nation. I won't burden you with figures—in fact no really accurate figures are available to demonstrate the immense impact of the construction industry upon the Nation's welfare. It is enough to say that prosperity or depression in the construction industry can make the difference between prosperity and depression for our national economy as a whole.

Particularly, however, as respects the areas in which you are facing problems today, let us take a look at construction aided or assisted by the Federal Government. In 1954 the Federal Government assisted some $14 billion worth of new construction. During the past year, roughly the same amount was assisted by the same kind of Federal financing. In round figures, the Federal Government has recently followed a policy of supporting, aiding, or promoting at least a third of the total dollar volume of new construction put in place each year. Far from getting smaller, this tremendous volume of federally assisted construction promises to increase in the years to come.

I know you are well aware that the interstate highways of the country are out of date and that legislation now in the mill will provide billions of dollars for a new network of super highways and feeder roads to serve the peacetime and emergency transportation needs of a Nation which moves on wheels. I may say that as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I have done my vigorous best to push this much needed legislation.

I know you are aware of the fact that our school-age population has snowballed on us at a rate far exceeding the capacity of our school buildings. Right now our grade schools have burst at the seams. Tomorrow our high schools will follow the same route. Congress has before it recommendations of the President on this vital subject. We need to face up to that problem now.

Public works, hospitals, Government buildings, airports, and other necessary structures are being and will be built to expand or replace the structures and facilities of the past. Our new construction must ever keep in pace with the astounding growth and expansion of our needs as a Nation.

Due to these varied demands, not only does the future look bright for public and private construction but more than that: The Federal Government is going to have a very large place in the construction of the future, as it has in the recent past.

The role of the Federal Government in the construction industry carries with it a heavy burden of responsibility. Any person or agency promoting or assisting at least a third of all new construction put in place each year—year after year—has what amounts to a public duty to insure the use of this enormous economic power in the best interests of all segments of our economy. A false or misguided step here or there can help to undermine the very standards which have been an important part of our prosperity and growth.

Here is where the matter of prevailing wages comes in. In 1954 there were around 900,000 craftsmen employed on work assisted by the Federal Government. About the same number were employed last year. The payrolls on this work run annually into the billions of dollars. Now these dollars are not only put to work to provide the journeyman and his family with the necessities and some of the modest luxuries of life. They do much more than that. They help to buy the products of the farmer, the merchant and the manufacturer. They help these businessmen support their families and meet their payrolls and thus, in turn, to support even more workers in other lines of work and to meet their modest demands.

We can easily see the serious hidden effects that can follow any serious cut in wages on federally assisted construction. Unless the Government makes sure that wages on this construction are in line with the going rates and practices, the contracts for construction can easily go to the firm whose labor costs are below the standard set in the particular area.

These cut rates present ruthless competition for contractors who pay the going or prevailing rate. Inevitably, they serve to undermine the going rate. They bring about a gradual collapse of the entire wage structure, not only on Government work but on all construction in any community where this kind of unfair competition is allowed to exist. Then there can follow a kind of chain reaction—a broad downward movement of wages and prices in the community, a slowing down in the business of all who depend upon the construction worker for making a living.

The exact effects are hard to measure but easy to describe. I think I have said enough to give you the idea, namely, that wage-cutting practices on Government construction, can, in my judgment, provide the opening wedge for a full-blown depression.

We Californians have long recognized the disastrous effects upon any community which inevitably flow from bypassing the prevailing wage on public construction. In California we have what I believe to be a very good prevailing wage statute covering all important types of public construction on a broad basis. As a lawyer, in both private and public practice in my home State, I had come to accept this prevailing wage principle as one of the basic requirements which must govern the performance of publicly supported contracts.

Last year the Senate passed a bill—known as the Gore bill—authorizing a multi-billion-dollar highway program. The proposed legislation was first referred to the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member. Upon studying the bill I was amazed to discover that no standard prevailing wage requirements would apply to this legislation unless we added a special provision extending the Federal prevailing wage statute, the Davis-Bacon Act, to cover this type of construction. You may be sure that I gave bipartisan support to just such a special provision in committee and I think the record of Senate debates on this measure will clearly show that afterward I stood firmly in opposition to the unwise and unfortunate motion on the floor which regrettably removed this special provision from the bill.

I strongly believe in the prevailing wage principle. It represents good and decent government. It prevents the great purchasing power of the public purse from being used to destroy stable labor standards voluntarily established by management and labor. The prevailing wage principle merely seeks to preserve and maintain the going rates already established in every community of the country. This is certainly common sense. It is certainly common justice and I'm for it 100 percent.

I would like to say that in 1954, I had the responsibility, as a subcommittee chairman, of handling the lease purchase legislation, under which the Federal Government is empowered to buy needed public buildings on a "time payment plan." I am glad to tell you that that legislation which is now the law, and which is being used all across our land in new public construction, is subject to the Davis-Bacon Act.

In this session of the Congress highway legislation is now being considered in the House of Representatives. At the same time the House has pending bills to provide Federal aid in the construction of schoolhouses for our children. I hope that, when any of these measures are approved by the House they will contain the special provisions necessary to extend the Davis-Bacon Act to cover the public construction provided for in them. You may be sure that, when these measures are referred to the Senate for further action, I shall be a strong supporter of these fair and equitable provisions.

But the problem is much more serious than that presented by the highway and school bills themselves. These bills seem to point up this deeper and more basic problem of the present ineffectiveness of the Davis-Bacon Act itself. These bills immediately bring to my mind the question: "Why must we act time after time to extend the Davis-Bacon Act on a piecemeal hit-or-miss basis to each new type of federally assisted construction as is comes before the Congress?"

Upon looking into the matter I have learned that the Davis-Bacon Act covers only about one-third of all federally assisted construction currently authorized by law. I have found that there is some serious question as to the adequacy of the statutory standards for determining what are the prevailing wage rates. There have come to my attention many complaints about the ineffectiveness of enforcement provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. I have heard that these provisions stand in the way of forthright, clear-cut action securing compliance with the law.

All of these circumstances point toward soft spots in the present law. Wherever these soft spots exist, they certainly need to be corrected by appropriate action of the Congress. They suggest to me the need for a thorough study and review of the Davis-Bacon Act with the objective of strengthening it. I understand that these are the objectives of one part of your legislative program and let me say that I am wholeheartedly in agreement with these general objectives.

Perhaps at this point it is well for us to remind ourselves that the Davis-Bacon Act was not only a sound measure when it was originally enacted. It has also become a bipartisan measure. It was introduced as early as 1926 by Congressman Robert Low Bacon—a Republican Representative from a congressional district on Long Island, New York, just outside New York City. It was sponsored in the Senate by Senator James J. Davis, the late "Puddler Jim" Davis, a distinguished Republican Secretary of Labor under three Presidents and an early trade-union leader of the steel industry.

The Davis-Bacon Act became law in 1931 under a Republican administration. It was affirmed and strengthened in 1935 under a Democratic administration. The reasons for its original enactment and subsequent retention were ably explained by Congressman Bacon on the floor of the House of Representatives. He pointed out how an out-of-State contractor underbid all New York State contractors on a Government hospital in his congressional district. This low bid was possible because the out-of-State contractor could ignore the high labor standards prevailing in the area of construction but the New York contractors could not. What was the result? The successful bidder brought in some thousand laborers at low wage rates crowding out the local labor supply. Local conditions were entirely disrupted. I am told that these out-of-State laborers were later cast off by the contractor at the end of the job. They became a relief burden in the New York area and a continuing threat to the jobs of craftsmen in the locality.

This type of situation strikes me as being quite beyond the area of political partisanship. Indeed, it has the same nonpartisan dimensions as a closely connected economic problem created by agricultural surpluses for which we must also find effective solutions. Just as in agriculture the huge Government-owned crop surpluses can act as a heavy weight depressing the price which the farmer gets for his crops, the great financial resources of the Federal Government can also act as a weight to depress the wages of the construction worker. In both areas the

Government has a duty to act responsibly and effectively to protect very large and important groups of its citizens. The "soft spots" in the Davis-Bacon Act tend once again to recreate the very conditions which that act sought to prevent. This certainly calls for a careful overhauling of the act on a permanent basis.

I have seen from your program that your problems are not confined to the Davis-Bacon Act. They seem to cover the entire field of Government action as it affects labor-management relations in the construction industry. I want to be first to admit I am no expert in these delicate matters. I have, however, gradually become convinced of one thing: The present law, that is, the original Wagner Act as amended by the Taft-Hartley Act simply is not geared to the needs nor to the realities of both contractors and labor unions in construction work.

I think the trouble may basically lie in the provisions of the Wagner Act—incidentally a Democratic measure—which was pretty much directed solely toward manufacturing and production industries, involving going plants and continuing employment opportunities with the same employer. This act cannot realistically be applied to the construction industry where employment is casual and changing all the time. For one thing, I have noticed that your contracts must be made before any workers are employed, whereas the law has in mind that contracts must only be made by the representative of employed workers. I am told that this and other provisions of the law can have a very disruptive effect upon industrial relations in your industry.

Whatever the situation, however, I firmly believe that these industrial relations matters must be thoroughly examined, and changes must be made in the law wherever we find unfairness or unworkability.

These are same of the comments which I am glad to make to you at this great convention: America has her full share of modern-day problems, governmental and otherwise, as, indeed, does every corner of our globe. Complex and many sided as they are, we are, I am sure, as well equipped to find solutions to them as your forebears and mine in other days were able to overcome the perplexities which beset them in their time.

The point is that in the processes of evolution, great achievements for mankind have been attained. And I dare say that with all our easily recognizable difficulties, we here in America have more for which to be thankful in our times than any other generation before us. Excesses have, unfortunately, come upon us in the past. They will again. But they have always been and always will be temporary. Our ship of state may, upon occasion, bear to the right or to the left. But in the main she continues on her course to the attainment of the goal which each of us hopes for in our hearts: A free America, a strong America, a secure and happy America in a world which enjoys a just and enduring peace.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

TAXATION OF INCOME OF INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of considering two bills to which there is no objection. I also ask that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who has the floor, be not displaced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I shall not object—this subject was called to my attention yesterday. I understand that the two bills, Calendar No. 1596, House bill 7201, and Calendar No. 1631, House bill 8780, were both reported unanimously from the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1596, House bill 7201, relating to taxation of income of insurance companies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7201) relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "of" and insert "for"; on page 6, line 3, to strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)"; on page 7, line 5, after the numerals "804", to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; in line 9, after the numerals "804", to strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)"; on page 8, line 15, after the numerals "804", to strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)"; in line 16, after the numerals "804", to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; in line 23, after the numerals "804", to strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)"; on page 9, line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "this paragraph" and insert "paragraph (1) of this subsection"; on page 14, after line 2, to strike out:

(a) General rule: Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), for purposes of this subpart the term "reserve and other policy liability deduction" means the sum of the following:

(1) 100 percent of the amount of the net investment income allocable to pension plan reserves (determined under subsection (e));

(2) 95 percent of the amount of the net investment income allocable to reserves for annuity contracts and deposits (determined under subsection (f)); and

(3) 85 percent of the amount by which the net investment income exceeds the sum of—

(A) the amount of the net investment income allocable to pension plan reserves,

(B) the amount of the net investment income allocable to reserves for annuity contracts and deposits, and

(C) the amount of the net investment income allocable to non-life-insurance reserves (determined under subsection (g)).

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(a) General rule: Except as provided in subsection (b), for purposes of this subpart the term "reserve and other policy liability deduction" means the sum of the amounts determined by applying the following percentages to the excess of the net investment income over the net investment income allocable to non-life-insurance reserves (determined under subsection (d)):

(1) 87.5 percent of so much of such excess as does not exceed $1,000,000; and

(2) 85 percent of so much of such excess as exceeds $1,000,000.

On page 15, after line 8, to strike out:

(b) Reduced percentages during initial period: In the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1960, the reserve and other policy liability deduction shall be computed by substituting for the percentages stated in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) the percentages determined from the following table:

If the taxable year begins in—	The percentage shall be—	
	Paragraph (1)	Paragraph (2)
	Percent	Percent
1955	92.5	90
1956	94	91
1957	95.5	92
1958	97	93
1959	98.5	94

In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1956, 1957, 1958, or 1959, this subsection shall apply only if the tax imposed by section 802 shall have been made applicable with respect to such a taxable year.

On page 15, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; on page 16, line 11, after the letter "(d)", to strike out "and"; in line 14, after the word "of", to strike out "section 804 (g) (2) (A))," and insert "subsection (d) (2) (A))"; and

"(E) in the case of a mutual assessment life insurance company or association, the amount equal to 2 times whichever of the following is the lesser: (i) the amount of the net investment income on life insurance reserves described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 801 (b) (3), or (ii) 3 percent of the life insurance reserves so described," on page 17, line 18 after the word "sum", to strike out "of the means described in" and insert "obtained under"; on page 18, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; on page 19, line 7, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)"; on page 20, line 6, after the word "this", to strike out "subsection, or in applying subsection (a)," and insert "subsection"; after line 11, to strike out:

(e) Allocation of net investment income to pension plan reserves:

(1) Allocation ratio. For purposes of this subpart, the amount of the net investment income allocable to pension plan reserves is that amount which bears the same ratio to—

(A) the net investment income, as

(B) the amount of such reserves bears to the mean (as of the beginning and end of the taxable year) of the book value of all the assets, other than real property occupied by the insurance company and furniture, fixtures, and equipment (to the extent such real or personal property is used in carrying on the insurance business).

(2) Pension plan reserves defined: For purposes of this section, the term 'pension plan reserves' means that portion of the qualified reserves (other than items described in paragraph (2), (4), (5), or (6) of subsection (d)) which is allocable to contracts—

(A) purchased under contracts entered into with trusts which (as of the time the contracts were entered into) were deemed to be (i) trusts described in section 401 (a) and exempt from tax under section 501 (a), or (ii) trusts exempt from tax under section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or

the corresponding provisions of prior revenue laws;

(B) purchased under contracts entered into under plans which (as of the time the contracts were entered into) were deemed to be plans meeting the requirements of section 401 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6), or the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; or

(C) provided for employees of the life insurance company under a plan which, for the taxable year, meets the requirements of section 401 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6).

(f) Net investment income allocable to reserves for annuity contracts and deposits:

(1) Allocation ratio: For purposes of this subpart, the amount of the net investment income allocable to reserves for annuity contracts and deposits is that amount which bears the same ratio to the net investment income as such reserves bear to the qualified reserves (as defined in subsection (d)).

(2) Reserves for annuity contracts and deposits:

(A) In general: For purposes of this subpart, the amount of the reserves for annuity contracts and deposits is the sum of the following:

(i) that portion of the qualified reserves which is allocable to annuity contracts; and

(ii) the amounts described in subsection (d) (5).

(B) Certain items excluded: Any item which (but for this subparagraph) would be within the application of subparagraph (A) shall be excluded from such application—

(i) if it is allocable to a pension plan reserve,

(ii) if it is an amount described in paragraph (2), (4), or (6) of subsection (d), or

(iii) if it is allocable to a contract entered into before July 1, 1955, or to a contract the terms of which are dependent on terms of a contract entered into before July 1, 1955. This clause shall not apply if (as of July 1, 1955) such contract (or the predecessor contract in effect on such date) provided for participation in surplus earnings of the insurance company.

(3) Annuity contract defined: For purposes of paragraph (2) (A) (i), the term "annuity contract" means any agreement (whether arising under a life insurance, annuity, or endowment contract, or a contract supplementary thereto) if (as of the time the computation is being made under this subsection)—

(A) such agreement provides for payments in installments and during the life of one or more annuitants or for a period certain;

(B) in case any amount (other than dividends) is payable other than as described in subparagraph (A), the value of such amount, computed as of the earliest time when such amount (or any portion thereof) may become payable, cannot exceed the excess of (i) the sum of the consideration theretofore paid for such agreement (or the amount otherwise invested in such agreement) plus accrued interest, over (ii) the aggregate of the amounts (other than dividends) theretofore received under such agreements; and

(C) in the case of an agreement arising under a life insurance or endowment contract, or a contract supplementary thereto, payments described in subparagraph (A) have become due and payable under such agreement.

On page 24, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)"; on page 28, line 3, after the numerals "804", to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; on page 29, line 5, after the numerals "1955", to strike out "(other than taxable years with respect to which a tax is imposed by section 802)"; on page 30, line 2, after the word "this", to strike out "section, in lieu of the reduction for the net investment income allocable to non-life insurance reserves provided in paragraphs (3) (A) and (4) (A) of section 805 (a), and in paragraph (2) of section 805 (b), the net investment income shall be reduced by an amount which equals the amount of the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 813." and insert "section—

(1) in lieu of the reduction of the net investment income provided in paragraphs (3) (A) and (4) (A) of section 805 (a), the net investment income shall be reduced by the amount of the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 813, and

(2) in lieu of subtracting the amount provided in paragraph (2) of section 805 (b), subtract 50 percent of the amount of the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 813.

On page 31, line 21, after the numerals "804", to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; on page 32, line 18, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; on page 34, line 9, after the word "If", to strike out "the taxpayer was authorized to do business in any State or Territory as an insurance company before July 1, 1955, and if"; in line 13, after the word "do", to strike out "such"; and in the same line, after the word "business", to insert "as an insurance company"; in line 18, after the letter "(B)", to insert "(i)"; in line 19, after the word "reserves", to insert "and (ii) the special reduction for dividends received provided by subsection (c)"; in line 23, after the word "exceed", to insert "(A)"; on page 35, line 1, after the word "policyholders", to insert "reduced by (B) the special reduction for dividends received provided by subsection (c)."; in line 14, after the numerals "804", to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; after line 14, to strike out:

(c) Special rule for additional dividends received deduction: If the taxpayer's tax for the taxable year is reduced by subsection (a), and if the limitation contained in subsection (b) does not apply, then the maximum limitation referred to in section 804 (c) (b) (3) (B) (ii) shall be—

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

(c) Special rule for dividends received: The reduction referred to in paragraph (1) (B) (ii) and in paragraph (2) (B) of subsection (a) shall be an amount computed under section 804 (b) (3), except that, for purposes of such computation, the maximum limitation referred to in section 804 (b) (3) (B) (ii) shall be—

On page 36, line 8, after the word "income", to insert "(computed without regard to the reduction provided by this subsection)"; in line 15, after the word "income", to insert "(computed without regard to the reduction provided by this subsection)"; and on page 43, after line 3, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 7. Savings provisions.

In the case of any taxpayer subject to tax under section 802 or 807 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as such sections were in effect before the enactment of this act), no addition to the tax shall be made under section 6655 of such code (relating to failure by corporation to pay estimated tax) with respect to estimated tax for a taxable year beginning in 1955. In the case of any taxpayer subject to tax under section 821 of such code (imposing a tax on certain mutual insurance companies), any addition to the tax under section 6655 of such code with respect to estimated tax for a taxable year beginning in 1955 shall in no case be larger than such addition would have been if this act had not been enacted.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, House bill 7201 relates to the taxation of life insurance companies. This bill applies only to the year 1955, for which income tax returns are due on March 15, 1956. The bill passed the House in late July of 1955 and the Finance Committee held hearings thereon last year. Action on the bill was postponed pending a study by the Treasury Department of a permanent method for taxing life insurance companies. It was hoped at that time that the Treasury would find a permanent solution for the taxation of life insurance companies in time for it to be applied to the year 1955. However, the Treasury advised the committee that it would not be possible to have such a permanent plan ready for the insurance companies to file their returns on March 15, 1956. As a result of this information, the committee was faced with a problem of proposing immediate legislation for the year 1955.

In reaching a decision on this matter, the committee had three possible choices. One was to continue the 6½-percent stopgap provision which expired at the end of 1954. If this stopgap provision had applied to the year 1955, it would have resulted in the Government collecting $197 million from the life insurance companies for that year. Another proposal which was studied by the committee was to permit the 1942 formula which was suspended for the period 1951 to 1954 to come back into operation. While the 1942 formula would produce $275 million for the year 1955, its arbitrariness is shown by the fact that it yielded practically no revenue in 1947 and 1948. This formula was not adopted by the Finance Committee because it was found that it had many inequities and would be particularly harsh on small companies. The third alternative was for the committee to accept the House bill or the House bill with amendments. The House bill constituted a decided improvement over the two suggestions already discussed. It closed many loopholes in the existing life-insurance provisions and made certain other improvements in the law. However, there were some objections by some insurance companies to certain features of the House bill. These features, which will be discussed later, were eliminated by the committee. H. R. 7201, as it passed the House, would have resulted in the Government collecting $220 million for the year 1955. As amended by the Finance Committee, the bill will yield $247.5 million for the year 1955.

The House bill granted life insurance companies a deduction against investment income in lieu of specific deductions. Under the House bill, the deduction depended upon the type of insurance business done. For 1955, which was the only year covered by the House bill, the deductions allowed from investment income were as follows: 92½ percent of

the investment income on reserves held for qualified employees' pension and profit-sharing plans; 90 percent of the investment income on reserves held for individual annuity policies and for certain policyholder deposits; 85 percent of the investment income attributable to the remaining life insurance business.

It was this differential in the deduction allowed for these different classes of life insurance reserves that caused some life insurance companies to oppose the House bill. These companies protested to the committee that such a differential would result in a serious competitive handicap to many companies not conducting this type of business and that additional hearings ought to be held before such a provision was approved. In view of the necessity for action on the bill before March 15, 1956, the committee felt that it could not take time for an extended investigation of this matter and your committee amendment eliminates from the bill provisions for special treatment of pension and annuity business. The insurance company groups agreed to the action taken by the committee. The action was taken without prejudice to this proposal of the House bill, but merely for the purpose of conducting a further study into the matter.

The 6½-percent tax on investment income of life insurance companies under the stop-gap formula which expired in 1954 is equivalent to an 87½-percent deduction on investment income taxed at the regular 52-percent rate. Under the committee bill, it is provided that the first million dollars of total investment income will be entitled to a deduction of 87½ percent before applying the regular corporate rate and the balance of the investment income will be entitled to a deduction of 85 percent. Thus the small life insurance companies—except for loophole provisions—will find that their tax will not be increased over the 1954 stop-gap provision. The larger companies' tax will be increased with respect to that part of their investment income in excess of $1 million. In addition, the bill, as I have said before, closes various loopholes which have developed over the years.

The bill broadens the definition of investment income which in the past covered only interest, dividends, and rents. The broadening will include as taxable income royalty income, income from a noninsurance business usually acquired under a mortgage foreclosure, and charges equivalent to interest or rent paid for terminating a mortgage before maturity.

Under the bill it is provided for the first time there will be a ceiling on the deduction that a company can be allowed under the 85-percent formula. This ceiling is, broadly speaking, two times the contractual commitments to add interest to policyholder reserves; in other words, it is limited to two times the amount needed for reserves as shown by the corporation's books. It was thought desirable to use the multiple two times in order to avoid any difficulty with the fact that at particular times a company's books show only an approximation of the original interest commitment. The committee does not intend that this limitation of two times should serve to interfere with the growth of a bona fide insurance company. It is, therefore, provided that in the first 5 years of its operation a company can pay tax on the basis of its total income as an alternative to the tax provided under the bill. The total income will take into account both the life-insurance premiums received and the life-insurance expenses incurred. This will be an advantage only to the extent that the company does in these early years have an excess of expenses over premiums, and this, of course, would occur only if the company were using its investment income in order to really establish life-insurance business. Under the House bill this relief was only granted to companies organized before July 1, 1955. The committee grants similar relief in cases in which the company was organized after July 1, 1955. In addition your committee made a slight change in the House bill to bring it in line with respect to certain mutual assessment companies which must keep a deposit with the State insurance department. This deposit is a life-insurance reserve and it earns interest but the policy does not specify any required interest on reserves. The Finance Committee has adopted a statutory presumption of required interest at 3 percent in this case so that the relief of two times the contractual commitments to add interest to policyholder reserves will apply.

An important provision continued from the House bill is the elimination of the dividends received credit for life-insurance companies. Since these companies already deduct 85 percent of any investment income, it is believed that this one deduction substantially eliminates double taxation in the case of dividends received on stock of other companies held by the life-insurance companies.

The bill makes considerable change in the treatment of accident and health insurance sold by a life-insurance company. Broadly speaking, this income in the past has been taxed under an arbitrary formula which produces somewhat less than would be imposed on the same business conducted by a casualty insurance company. The bill modifies the taxation of this business in the hands of the life-insurance company so as to make it identical with the taxation of the same business in the hands of a mutual casualty-insurance company.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. At the request of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is unable to be present during the consideration of this bill, I wish to ask the following question in connection with section 843 of the pending bill. Is it correct to state that section 843 of the bill is not intended to apply to life insurance departments of mutual savings banks required by State law, as, for example, the State of Massachusetts, to use a specified fiscal year as their accounting period?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; that is correct. Section 843 does not apply to mutual savings banks.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments. Is there objection to considering the committee amendments en bloc?

Mr. BYRD. We have no objection to that procedure. No objection has been raised to any of the amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 34, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the figure "4" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "9."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, section 818 of the bill provides a formula of equity with reference to a certain group of small life insurance companies. The bill as it is before the Senate would provide relief only to companies in that category who have been in operation for 4 years or less. The bill as now before the Senate affects the taxes of insurance companies only for the year 1955, and then ceases to be effective.

In view of the fact that the bill is intended to provide relief to this group of companies, and in order that all companies that fall within that category may be covered by the bill, the amendment I propose is necessary. Therefore, I urge the chairman of the committee to accept the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I accept the amendment on behalf of the committee. I have consulted with a majority of the committee in that regard, and we consider the amendment to be a meritorious one. It also has the approval of the Treasury Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the chairman of the Committee on Finance for bringing this measure before the Senate at this time. It is a bill which must be enacted so that insurance companies may know how properly to work out their tax returns for the past years. It would have been very helpful if such legislation had been given approval earlier.

The committee amendments which have been adopted are very helpful, at least so far as they will take care of a situation which would prevail if we should not enact legislation at this session of Congress. That situation would extend back to 1942, which I believe would be very unfair.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] will be

very helpful to the small insurance companies, at least for those on whose behalf we tried to include some amendments in the bill as we were considering it in committee. I am very happy that the proposed legislation is about to be acted on by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7201) was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF FARMERS FROM PAYMENT OF EXCISE TAXES IN THE CASE OF GASOLINE AND SPECIAL FUELS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under the previous order, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 8780.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, before describing the bill I would like to read into the RECORD the following table showing the estimated gallons of gasoline, diesel, and special motor fuels purchased in the fiscal year 1956 and the estimated tax collected thereon:

	Estimated tax collections under present rates	Number of gallons (billions)
Gasoline, diesel, and special motor fuels	$1,000,000,000	50
Fuel for nonhighway use (10 percent)	100,000,000	5
Fuel for nonhighway agricultural use (6 percent)	60,000,000	3

It will be seen from the foregoing table that of the total gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels purchased during the fiscal year 1956, 3 billion gallons were used on the farm. Thus, at the present rate of tax on these fuels, the relief for the farmers will approximate $60 million.

The committee added an amendment which eliminated custom operators from the bill which will reduce the loss under the bill to approximately $59 million. Because of the depressed condition of agriculture it is believed that this bill will provide a needed relief to the farmer. In order to be sure that the farmer will receive relief promptly, the bill provides that refund of the gasoline tax will be made direct to him although the tax is actually paid by the manufacturer. In adopting a refund procedure for this relief, the bill follows the practice in practically all the States with respect to relief to farmers. There are two States, Vermont and Utah, which give no relief to the farmer from State motor fuel taxes. Wyoming exempts only tractor fuel from its tax, and Oklahoma has a complete exemption from the State motor fuel taxes in the case of farmers. All the other States provide relief for the farmers by way of a refund for which the farmer must submit data and file a claim. From the experience of the States in administering relief to the farmer, it is believed that the refund method affords the most practical way of providing relief. Such a method will make it easier for the Government to verify the claim submitted by the farmer as to the amount of gasoline used on the farm.

It is hoped that the Federal Government in administering the law will lean heavily upon the experience already gained by the States in administering State taxes. The bill provides that refunds are to be made on an annual period ending on June 30. The claim is to be made before September 30 of each year and is to be filed by the farmer directly with the appropriate office of the Internal Revenue Service. The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate will prescribe by regulations the type of records the farmer will be required to keep and the evidence necessary to support the farmer's claim.

This bill will apply only with respect to gasoline purchased by the ultimate purchaser after December 31, 1955. Gasoline which is purchased by a farmer before January 1, 1956, but which is used on or after such date will not receive relief under the bill. The relief under the bill is limited to gasoline used on a farm in the United States for farming purposes in carrying on a trade or business.

The definition of a farm is the same as that used in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. It includes stock, dairy, poultry, fruit, fur-bearing animal, and truck farms, plantations, ranches, nurseries, ranges, greenhouses, or other similar structures used primarily for the raising of agricultural or horticultural commodities, and orchards. The term "farming purposes" is also defined in the bill. The bill as passed by the House included use by any person in connection with cultivation of the soil, or the raising or harvesting of agricultural or horticultural commodities, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife. As a result, gasoline used by custom operators or other independent contractors performing a service on a farm in connection with cultivating the soil or raising or harvesting agricultural or horticultural commodities would be eligible for a refund claim under the House-passed bill. Under the committee's bill, the term "farming purposes" includes the above-described type of operations, but generally only with respect to the operations of an owner, tenant, or operator on his own farm. Operations of a farmer other than on his own farm are included only where the gasoline so used is less than one-half of all of the gasoline used by the farmer for the prescribed type of operations.

The term "farming purposes" also includes the handling, drying, packing, grading, or storing of agricultural or horticultural commodities. However, the work must be done by the owner, tenant, or operator and only if such owner, tenant, or operator produced more than half of the commodities receiving this treatment during the year.

The committee amendment eliminating from the benefits of the bill custom operators or other independent contractors performing services on the farm was made by the committee because there is no assurance that the custom operators will pass the benefits of the refund on to the farmers. However, where farmers perform similar services for their neighbors refunds may be claimed if these operations for neighbors constitute less than half of the total of these operations of the farmer.

The bill also provides relief in the case of fuels used in the planting, cultivating, caring for, or cutting of trees, as well as the preparation, other than sawing logs into lumber, chipping, and other milling operations of trees for market; but the work must be performed by the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm and must be incidental to farming operations. The farmer is also entitled to a refund if he or his tenant or operator uses gasoline in connection with the operation, management, improvement or maintenance of the farm, including farm buildings, tools and equipment.

In the case of diesel fuel the present law provides that the tax is to apply only when such fuel is used in highway vehicles. The bill would exempt diesel fuel used in highway vehicles where such vehicles are used on a farm for farming purposes.

With respect to special motor fuels such as propane, butane, and hot tractor fuel used for farming purposes, relief is granted by way of exemption. I might point out that under present law, diesel fuel and special motor fuels are exempt from tax when used on a farm tractor since farm tractors are not classed as motor vehicles under existing law. The bill also provides a special ad valorem penalty, to be collected as a tax, where an excessive claim for refund is made and where the claiming of such excessive amount is not due to reasonable cause. The penalty consists of two times the excessive amount claimed or $10, whichever is the gerater.

Mr. President, this bill has been unanimously reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to commend the chairman of the Finance Committee for reporting this bill, and I also wish to compliment the committee as a whole. This particular bill came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and our committee, through its chairman, who is present on the floor at this

time, had it referred to the Committee on Finance because it dealt with taxes.

We all know that at the present time farmers need whatever help we can possibly give them, and the bill provides one way in which we can help the farmers. The States have been helping the farmers in this manner. The Federal tax, up until recent years, was not so high as the State taxes. For that reason, it did not amount to so much, but in recent years the Federal tax has increased, and this bill will help to a very large extent.

I again commend the committee for its action.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I also wish to join in commendations of the Committee on Finance and its chairman.

I should like to ask one question with reference to page 5 of the report. If I have read the paragraph correctly, apparently, the request for refund can apply to gasoline which is used in a farm truck to the extent that the gasoline is used in connection with the cultivating and harvesting of agricultural commodities.

Mr. BYRD. To the extent that the truck is used on the farm for farm purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Some States, including my own, I think, do not permit a claim for refund to be filed for gasoline used in any vehicle which is licensed for use on the highway, so in that respect this would appear to be somewhat more liberal than the State refund provision.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. The committee has considered it carefully and thinks that the definition in the committee bill is the proper one.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the equities are all in favor of the provision reported by the Committee on Finance. It seems to me that if the gasoline is used in a farming operation, regardless of whether it is used in a jeep which may also be used for highway purposes and agricultural purposes, the claim for a refund should be allowed.

I may say, Mr. President, that the matter of refunding the Federal tax on gasoline for agricultural purposes has increased the equities, in view of the prospective increase of the Federal tax with the idea of providing the fund, so to speak, from which an expanded highway program may be financed. During 1954, when the Senate Committee on Public Works, through the Subcommittee on Roads, conducted hearings, we encountered the question of the increase of the tax beyond the 2-cent level. In view of the recommendation of 1955 that an additional expansion of the interstate road system be undertaken, and that it be financed by a dedication of the Federal gasoline revenue, it seemed to me and to other members of the Committee on Public Works that justice required a refund provision. The distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and some other Senators and myself introduced last March a bill which embodied this very proposal. We were very happy, therefore, when the President included it among his recommendations for a farm relief program, and we are very happy that the committee has recognized it.

In my study of the matter, it came to my attention that gasoline which was used in yachts and pleasure boats could be exempt from the collection of the Federal gasoline tax. It seemed to me to be most anomalous, to say the least, that the Federal tax law could exempt pleasure yachts from the payment of a Federal gasoline tax, but did not exempt vehicles used in farm operations. Therefore, I think the proposal before the Senate has much to commend it, and I appreciate the prompt action which the Committee on Finance has given to it.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I, too, commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance and the committee itself for the excellent work it has done on the bill. While I was Governor of South Carolina, the gasoline tax was removed from gasoline used on the farms. That action was a big help to the farmers.

No segment of the population in America today is receiving so little for their efforts as are the farmers. I feel that the bill is a just bill, and should be passed. I am in hearty accord with the bill and with the reasons for its passage, as they were so ably presented by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the Committee on Finance, of which he is the chairman, for reporting this most important measure.

As was called to the attention of the Senate a moment ago by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in its wisdom and judgment thought the measure should be acted upon promptly. Therefore, I commend the Senator from Virginia and the other members of his committee for acting as quickly as they have in this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first committee amendment was on page 3, after line 4, to strike out:

(A) by any person in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife.

And insert:

(A) by the owner, tenant, or operator of a farm, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife—

(i) on a farm of which he is the owner, tenant, or operator, or

(ii) on any other farm, but only if the gasoline used by him on other farms is less than one-half of all gasoline used by him on all farms for the purposes enumerated in this subparagraph during the period with respect to which claim is filed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the bill pending before the Senate. It was my privilege on March 8, 1955, to introduce Senate bill 1336, which was cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The bill provided for a refund or credit for taxes on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment.

I have always felt that the taxation of non-highway-used gasoline and the use of the proceeds from such taxes to build highways is inequitable, illogical, and discriminatory.

Mr. President, on March 8 I called to the attention of the Senate the fact that the bill I had introduced would provide for a refund or credit of taxes on non-highway-used gasoline, and made a short statement on the bill. At that time I included, as a part of my statement, a letter I had received from Mr. Matt Triggs, Assistant Legislative Director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, urging the repeal of the tax.

I think today the American Farm Bureau Federation and their associate farm bureaus in the different States throughout the Nation should feel very happy and pleased that the Senate, and I trust the House of Representatives, will complete action on a bill which will eliminate the tax. That organization has for years urged the removal of the tax.

I also included in my statement a letter from the Kansas Farm Bureau, dated February 8, 1955, signed by W. I. Boone, President of the Kansas Farm Bureau, urging that action be taken to eliminate the tax.

Again I say I am pleased that we have been able to reach this point in the enactment of the proposed legislation, and trust that without further delay the tax will be removed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I made on March 8, together with the letters I have just mentioned, be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFUND OR CREDIT FOR TAX ON GASOLINE USED FOR CERTAIN FARM EQUIPMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a refund or credit on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment.

The Congress originally enacted the Federal gasoline tax in 1932 for purposes of general revenue. Despite this fact the concept has gradually evolved that the purpose of the tax is to finance highway construction.

This concept was crystallized by the enactment of the 1954 Federal Aid to Highway Act. The message from the President, the hearings in the Public Works Committees of both Houses, and the debate on the floor of both Houses, include numerous references to the effect that the amount appropriated for highways by the Federal Government should be equal to the amount estimated to be available from the Federal gasoline tax. The amount that was authorized by the 1954

act was in fact equal to the estimate of the revenue from the Federal gasoline tax.

The Congress has, therefore, for all practical purposes, established the principle that the Federal gasoline tax is to provide revenue to build highways. Even though the money collected from the gasoline tax is not formally earmarked for this purpose, the net effect is the same.

Since the Federal gasoline tax is considered as a use tax, that is, a tax for using the highways, then it is clearly inconsistent to collect the tax on gasoline used for nonhighway purposes.

The major form of nonhighway use of gasoline is on farms. Gasoline used on a farm is one of a number of farm production supplies—gasoline, farm machinery, insecticides, feed, fertilizer, and so on. There is no relationship whatsoever between these production supplies and the use of highways. It would be just as illogical to tax fertilizer and to use the tax for building highways as it would be to tax gasoline used on the farm for this purpose. I do not know of any other industry in which a production supply is taxed to build highways.

Looked at in another way, gasoline used on a farm is a source of power. If power used on the farm is to be taxed to build highways, it would be just as equitable to tax power used in other industries to build highways. We might, for example, tax coal, or electricity, or oil, or natural gas, or diesel fuel, and use the money thus acquired to build highways. But it would not be logical to tax these sources of power for this purpose. Nor is it equitable or logical to tax gasoline used on the farm to build highways.

The taxation of non-highway-used gasoline to build highways is, in my opinion, inequitable, illogical, and discriminatory.

Many of us who have served in various capacities in State government will remember that the same issue has been fought over in the State legislatures. In most States non-highway-used gasoline is exempt from the State gasoline tax. The only States in which the State tax is not refunded for non-highway-used gasoline are Vermont, Utah, and Wyoming. I understand that in two of these States, Utah and Wyoming, there is a considerable likelihood that nonhighway use of gasoline may be exempted from the State gasoline tax in the near future.

The reasons which have impelled 45 State legislatures to exempt nonhighway use of gasoline from the State gasoline tax, are the same as the reasons which should cause the Congress to exempt nonhighway use of gasoline from the Federal gasoline tax, that is, that it is plainly discriminatory to place on one class of citizens a tax for building highways that is not placed on other classes of citizens.

Farmers should pay their fair share of the cost of building highways, as measured by their use of the highways. They should pay both the State and Federal gasoline tax on gasoline used on the highways. But merely because gasoline happens to be the major source of power for farm production is no reason why farmers should pay the gasoline tax on gasoline that is not used on the highways.

It does not seem to me that the administration of this exemption represents any particular problem. There is no reason why the farmer, in applying for his refund of the State gasoline tax used for nonhighway purposes, should not, at the same time and on the same form, apply for a refund of the Federal tax paid for non-highway-used gasoline. The State agencies administering this program could merely act as fiscal agents for the Federal Government in this connection. I see no particular difficulty in the State and Federal tax administrators entering into arrangements whereby this could be accomplished without particular difficulty. And even if some difficulties were involved, this is no reason why the Congress should continue this inequitable tax treatment.

I expect some of my colleagues will want to ask, What is to prevent the farmer from including in his application for a refund a portion of his gasoline purchases used for highway purposes? The State governments have, over the years, developed techniques for auditing applications for refunds to prevent such abuse. Even if a few farmers do apply for more refund than they should have on the basis of nonhighway use, this is far more than offset by the fact that during many months of the year farmers do not buy enough gasoline to go to the trouble of applying for a refund on that portion of such gasoline used for nonhighway purposes. Thus, farmers as a group will continue to pay their fair share of the cost of building highways.

I am surprised at the fact that farmers have been fairly quiet over this inequitable situation in years past. I expect that the reason this is so is that most farmers have considered the Federal gasoline tax to be a temporary tax, and, since it would be terminated eventually, there was no purpose in becoming too concerned about the situation. But now that the Congress has extended the Federal gasoline tax year after year, increasing interest in correcting the inequity is developing. In the past few months I have received many letters from farmers on this situation. It appears to me that their case is fully justified and that the Congress has a responsibility to take action to eliminate this discrimination at the earliest feasible date.

Some of my colleagues may agree that nonhighway use of gasoline should be exempted from the Federal gasoline tax, but argue that this is not the time to reduce taxes. I would say to them that this is not a tax reduction, but, rather is a correction of an obvious inequity that the Congress should have corrected many years ago.

For these reasons, I am introducing a bill to provide for the exemption of gasoline used for nonhighway purposes from the Federal gasoline tax. Similar bills have been introduced in the House. I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee will give such bills their early consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, and that, in addition, a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation on this subject, and a letter from the Kansas Farm Bureau at Manhattan, Kans., be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The letters, presented by Mr. CARLSON, are as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1955.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The American Farm Bureau Federation has long favored termination of the Federal gasoline tax, thus leaving this source of revenue available to the States.

Until such time as the Federal gasoline tax is terminated, we recommend an exemption from taxation for gasoline used for nonhighway purposes.

Although the Federal gasoline tax was originally adopted to provide general revenues, the concept has been gradually adopted that the purpose of the tax is to finance highway construction. Current discussions of the Clay committee report and other proposals for an expanded highway construction program, all involve the idea that gasoline tax revenues are the source of highway financing.

We submit that to continue to tax gasoline used for nonhighway purposes to build highways is inequitable. Gasoline used for nonhighway purposes is no more related to the use of highways than fuel oil or coal used for heating buildings.

The American Farm Bureau Federation respectfully recommends that at an early date in the current Congress that hearings be held by the Senate Finance Committee on the proposal that nonhighway used gasoline be exempt from the Fedweral gasoline tax.

Very sincerely,

MATT TRIGGS,
Assistant Legislative Director.

KANSAS FARM BUREAU,
Manhattan, Kans., February 8, 1956.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: Since the Federal gasoline tax at the 2-cent rate will expire April 1, 1955, legislation to provide for extension will undoubtedly be considered in the near future.

Kansas Farm Bureau was willing to go along with the Federal gasoline tax at the time it was originally adopted as a means of financing necessary war effort with the idea that it would be only a temporary measure used not only for road purposes but other activities as well. The thinking is that a gasoline tax should be left to the State legislatures as a method of financing road construction and maintenance by the States and counties.

It now appears that Federal financing of roads with some of the funds raised by a gasoline tax is to be a permanent policy of our National Government. If this policy is to continue, and so long as it does continue, that part of our gasoline consumption which is used for nonhighway purposes should be exempt from a Federal tax.

To impose a special tax on nonhighway gasoline for building roads is as unrealistic as it would be to impose a special tax on any other material used in the production of any commodity including agriculture commodities. Some method of exempting nonhighway gasoline from this tax must be found. This might be done by exemption or by a refund system as now practiced by many States. Arrangements could be made with the States, whereby a refund of the Federal tax might be applied for and paid along with the State.

We know that none of our Kansas congressional delegation are on the House Ways and Means Committee where the extension of the gasoline tax will first be considered. But we also know that you may be in a position to exert some influence with the House committee. With your knowledge of the history of gasoline taxes in Kansas, you realize that Kansas farmers are very much opposed to taxing gasoline which is not used on roads, regardless of whether the tax is State or Federal. To do otherwise is to burden farmers with an added heavy production cost to further aggravate the cost-price squeeze. Kansas stands near the top in the use of gasoline for agriculture production.

Many Congressmen will not have the direct interest in this issue that you have. We must depend on our representation from agricultural areas to explain the discrimination effected through a special tax on nonhighway gasoline used for road purposes.

Sincerely yours,

W. I. BOONE,
President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, after line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 6, line 7, under subparagraph "(h)," in the

next to the last line, after the word "to", to strike out "claims" and insert "crimes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 11, after line 11, to strike out:

(i) sections 7603 (relating to service of summons), 7604 (relating to enforcement of summons) and 7605 (relating to time and place of examination) of such code are each amended by striking out "section 7602" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "section 6420 (e) (2) or 7602."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(i) Sections 7603 (relating to service of summons) and 7604 (relating to enforcement of summons) and the first sentence of section 7605 (relating to time and place of examination) of such code are each amended by striking out "section 7602" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "section 6420 (e) (2) or 7602." The second sentence of section 7605 of such code is amended by striking out "section 7602" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 7602, or under the corresponding authority of section 6420 (e) (2)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be offered?

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 8780) was read the third time and passed.

IMPENDING RESIGNATION FROM THE SENATE OF SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of an announcement I made in Columbia, S. C., the capital of my State, on March 3, 1956.

The announcement explains a promise I made to the people of South Carolina in the fall of 1954, when I entered the campaign for election to the Senate. It also explains why I have submitted my resignation to the Governor of South Carolina and will give up my Senate seat on April 4, in spite of the fact that more than 4 years remain of the 6-year term to which I was elected.

In the Democratic primary in South Carolina on June 12, I will be a candidate for the nomination of my party to enter the November general election to seek the approval of the voters of my State to succeed myself in the Senate for the remainder of my term.

Although the press has published my reasons for taking this action, I believe it appropriate that I should present this explanation to my distinguished colleagues. Many courtesies and kindnesses have been extended to me by the Members of this great deliberative body. I deeply appreciate the friendship of the Members of the Senate, and I hope to renew my membership in this body if it be the will of the people of South Carolina that I shall do so.

There being no objection, Mr. THURMOND's announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, IN COLUMBIA, S. C., MARCH 3, 1956, ANNOUNCING HIS RESIGNATION FROM THE UNITED STATES SENATE

The untimely death of Senator Burnet R. Maybank came on September 1, 1954, just over 2 months before the General Election on November 2 of that year. Senator Maybank had been renominated in the Democratic primary without opposition.

If a special Democratic primary had been held to nominate a successor to Senator Maybank, the voters in that primary would have been bound by South Carolina law and by oath under State Democratic Party rules to support the nominee. A special primary was not held. Therefore, the Democrats of South Carolina were free to vote for the person of their choice for the full 6-year term in the 1954 general election.

Democrats in every county called on me to lead a write-in campaign as their candidate for the Senate. The view of many political observers was that such a campaign would be hopeless because of the difficulties of write-in balloting.

I believed the people themselves had a right to vote for a candidate of their choice to fill an office, especially since the term of office was for 6 years. I agreed to become a Democratic write-in candidate for the Senate seat left vacant for the term beginning in January 1955.

In the 1954 campaign I stated:

"This is a fight for principle. * * * To make the principle at stake crystal clear, I pledge to the people of South Carolina that if I am elected in the general election on November 2, I will tender my resignation in 1956 in sufficient time to let the Democrats of South Carolina nominate a United States Senator in the regular Democratic primary election that year, which is the earliest regular primary to be held."

On March 21 the State Democratic Convention will be held. One of its functions is to provide for a primary to nominate Democrats for the various offices which will be filled by the voters in November in the general election. Candidates who enter the primary must qualify between noon on March 22 and noon on April 5.

The time has come for me to fulfill my promise to the people of South Carolina.

I have tried to choose a course that will be as crystal clear as the principle I upheld in the 1954 campaign.

Today I have delivered my letter of resignation to Governor Timmerman.

The text of the letter states:

"In keeping with the pledge which I made to the people of South Carolina during the 1954 campaign, and in order that the State Democratic convention can place the office in this summer's primary, I hereby resign as United States Senator effective on and as of April 4, 1956, and I respectfully request that you accept this resignation effective on that date."

The State convention can provide for a primary to nominate a candidate for the remaining 4 years of the 6-year term to which I was elected. The Democrats of South Carolina can have the opportunity of nominating the person of their choice on June 12. Any person who desires to enter the primary as a candidate has sufficient notice.

I shall be a candidate for nomination in the primary to succeed myself in the Senate.

My resignation was made effective April 4, the day before the closing of the books for qualification and before the campaign opens. Because of the unprecedented circumstances of the 1954 senatorial election, I would not want to have any advantage which might result from my holding office during this primary campaign.

My resignation will guarantee a free and open primary election for South Carolina Democrats. I believe the course I have taken in resigning, and in making this announcement a month before the effective date, fulfills to the utmost the pledge I made to the people in 1954.

The trust reposed in me by the people has been deeply appreciated, and I have tried at all times to reward this trust by exerting my best efforts on behalf of the State and the Nation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have just listened with much regret to the announcement just made by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina.

First, I commend him for keeping and carrying out the promise to which he referred, which he made to the people of his State during the campaign in 1954 when he was elected. I think that is most commendable.

I think also it is appropriate for me, as the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, on which committee the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina has served since he became a Member of the Senate, to say that he is to be commended for the splendid work he has done as a member of that committee. I cannot say I was surprised, but I was highly gratified, when Senator Thurmond was assigned to the Committee on Government Operations. He immediately evidenced a clear grasp of the legislative process. He has proved to be a most valuable member of that committee.

Furthermore, we who have observed him—and all of us have observed his fine work here in the Senate—are fully convinced that the junior Senator from South Carolina has the capacity and qualities essential to become a great Senator, an able representative of the sovereign State of South Carolina. It is my hope, which I take the liberty to express, since the Senator has announced that he will be a candidate to succeed himself in the coming election, that he will be successful in his campaign, and that the people of the great State of South Carolina will return him to this body, at which time he will have the opportunity to continue his distinguished career as a Member of the United States Senate.

I shall miss the junior Senator from South Carolina during what I trust will be only a brief absence from the Senate. It would be my desire when he returns that he should again be assigned as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, if I should still be serving as the chairman of that committee. The junior Senator from South Carolina has been a valuable member of the committee. If he is returned by his people and shall be so assigned, I know he will continue to make a splendid contribution to the work of the committee, and above all, to the deliberations of the Senate, as well.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I deeply regret that our colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], has thought it proper to resign from the Senate; but I am consoled by the fact that I believe his absence will be only temporary, and I express the hope that it will be.

During my service in the Senate, I do not know of any Senator who has won for himself a more enviable position in the respect and confidence of his colleagues than has the junior Senator from South Carolina.

He has been extremely diligent in his senatorial duties, has shown a wide range of knowledge of governmental affairs, and has contributed in a most substantial way to steps looking to a better government, and, especially, to the preservation of the fundamental principles of our Government.

I knew Senator THURMOND when he was Governor of South Carolina, where he made a very notable record.

Personally, I regret very much his resignation, but I hope he will soon be back among us to continue the splendid work he is so ably performing.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I, too, deeply regret that the junior Senator from South Carolina, because of the circumstances he has related, will not be with us for a while. I have found him to be a very active Senator. Although he has been a Member of the Senate for only a little more than a year, he has taken a very active part in the consideration of many of the major bills and other matters pending before Congress.

I have found the junior Senator from South Carolina to be a man of great sincerity. He is what I would call an effective Senator. That, after all, is the ultimate test.

I know of his great interest in military affairs, and especially of his wonderful knowledge of the Reserve program, and in the promotion of that program he has been active before the Committee on Armed Services. In his own State, also, he has been interested in the Reserve program and in other major aspects of the military program. He has been most helpful to the members of the Committee on Armed Services.

I trust that in the course of a few months he will be reelected to the Senate, so that he may continue his excellent service, and add new luster to the distinguished record he has already made.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I certainly regret the resignation of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], but I am most happy that he will be back with us in a few months. I have never known a Senator in so short a time to make greater progress or to rise higher than has the Senator from South Carolina.

As my colleague [Mr. STENNIS] stated, the Senator from South Carolina has been a very effective Senator. He is one of the most popular Members of this body. He is conscientious, his character is above reproach, and he certainly is a great asset to the State of South Carolina.

I was privileged at one time, a few years ago, to support him for President of the United States, and I believe he would have made a very fine President, as he has made an outstanding record as a Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should not like the opportunity to pass without saying a word in reference to the statement just made by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. I assume we on the minority side could well say that we would welcome having a Republican Senator from the State of South Carolina, but if such a hope cannot be realized, I sincerely trust the people of South Carolina, in their good judgment, will return to the Senate the present junior Senator from that State.

I had the privilege of serving as Governor of the State of Kansas while the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina was Governor of the great State of South Carolina. It was a pleasure to work with him then. It has been a pleasure to be associated with him and to work with him as a Senator. He is not only an able Senator but has been an asset to his great State and to the United States of America.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Arkansas, the junior Senator and the senior Senator from Mississippi, and the Senator from Kansas, for their kind remarks about my resignation. Again, I should like to say it has been a great pleasure to be a Member of the Senate with those gentlemen and the other Members of the Senate, and I shall greatly miss them.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 578. An act for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe; and

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Irfan Kawar.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7588) for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as we debate the various provisions of the farm bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, all of us must realize that we are dealing with a problem which has been before the Senate for many years. We are confronted with 2 primary problems as we seek to enact legislation which will be of benefit to the farmer and to the entire Nation. These 2 problems are: First, surpluses; and, second, declining farm prices. Senate bill 3183 deals with both problems.

For the past 3 years we have been engaged in a national debate over what measures or what action by the Federal Government should be taken to bring our agriculture economy into balance with the high prosperity enjoyed by the other segments of society. Unfortunately, the spotlight of debate has been placed primarily upon the issue of fixed price supports versus flexible price supports as the solution. During this time, I have maintained that neither type of price supports is the answer to our problem, which is how to arrange for the efficient disposal of the surpluses. I have consistently taken the position that an orderly and effective reduction and elimination of surplus products would have the effect of bringing the farmer full parity in the market place, and that if that happened the issue of fixed price supports versus flexible price supports would become academic.

On January 21, 1954, I addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture a letter in which I outlined my views. In the letter I said:

> Our number one problem is to manage this surplus.

I also observed that—

> Farmers will agree to put these acres into clover, alfalfa, or some type of legume crop that will be soil-building, bringing a higher fertility in the land that will give greater assurance of production in the future if the need arises. With the use of such soil-building practices, farmers would be prepared to take such surplus acres out of production entirely.

In other words, at that time, I recognized that a soil-bank plan was needed to reduce surpluses. It is regrettable that such a proposal was not written into law at that time. However, on January 9, 1956, the President sent his farm message to Congress, and came out in support of a soil bank and other provisions designated to cut down our surpluses. I am in whole-hearted support of this portion of the bill we are now considering. I also believe it is the first realistic approach to the surplus problem to come before the Senate for debate.

II. GROWTH OF SURPLUSES

Before going into a discussion of the soil bank, it might be well for us to review for a moment the factors which caused the accumulation of the surplus products. Fourteen years ago our Nation found itself engaged in World War II. At that time we called upon business, labor, and agriculture for an all-out productive effort for the purpose of winning the war. All three segments of

the economy responded beyond all expectations. Starting in 1946, we moved into a phase of international relations known as the cold war. During the period from 1946 to 1950, no major effort was made to launch a drastic cut in production. We were following a cautious path of preparedness. Then, in 1950, we were plunged into the Korean conflict. It lasted until 1953. During all those years we called upon agriculture and industry to produce at high levels. Various incentives were adopted to achieve this goal.

When the Korean war was terminated, there was an orderly and planned reduction along certain lines in industrial output. Defense production of needed items continued, but the manufacture of unnecessary or obsolete items was stopped. War-surplus goods were disposed of by sale, sometimes at a high cost to the Government. However, it had the effect of cutting down and eliminating unneeded inventories, and it enabled industry to readjust itself to present-day needs.

In agriculture, we did not employ the same type of approach. We allowed high agricultural production to continue. As a Nation, we were tilling too many acres. With the end of the Korean conflict, the need for agricultural products declined. As a result, we have now moved into a period where continued high production has given us an unmanageable surplus which has depressed the agriculture economy, and farm prices have declined. The price decline in agriculture has continued since 1952.

I look upon the soil-bank provisions and other surplus-disposal provisions as being of the type of the orderly and effective plans which we used in cutting down industrial inventories and surplus. Some may say we have tried these methods before, and that they have not done the job. That type of argument should not be applied to the discussion of the soil bank. It is true that previous attempts have been made to cut down on acreage production. However, under prior legislation, producers, when faced with restricted acreage on certain crops, were allowed to "shift" into the production of other crops, which aggravated, rather than reduced, the surpluses. That is the point of distinction which must be made when we consider the merits of the soil bank that is proposed in the pending bill.

III. SOIL BANK

Under the soil-bank provisions, we would have an acreage-reserve program for the years 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 on wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. An annual appropriation of $750 million is authorized to finance it. Under this plan, the producers would be compensated for reducing their acreage of these crops below their farm-acreage allotments under the support program. This plan provides that such reserve acreage shall not be used for cropping or grazing, unless a national disaster requires such use. This means that acres diverted from these crops cannot be used for the production of competitive feed crops. This will serve to prohibit the "shifting" of production which in the past took place under different acreage-restriction proposals.

As an incentive to farmers to cooperate the plan provides that any farmer complying shall be compensated in negotiable certificates which can be redeemed in cash, grains, or cotton.

Another feature of the soil bank is the establishment of a conservation-reserve program with annual payments limited to a total appropriation of $350 million. This will involve long-term contracts entered into for periods of not less than 3 years, during which time the farmer must agree to utilize the acreage under the program in soil, water, wildlife, and forest practices. This part of the program also requires that the Secretary of Agriculture announce, not later than February 1, of each year, a national conservation-reserve goal for that year.

This bill calls for a proposed schedule of payments under both sections of the soil bank, which will make farmer cooperation attractive.

IV. OTHER SURPLUS DISPOSAL PROVISIONS

Now let us proceed to a discussion of the other surplus disposal provisions in the pending bill.

The bill we are considering makes a further attack upon surpluses through the following measures:

First. We have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to add an additional 250 million bushels of corn to be set aside.

Second. We have directed the Commodity Credit Corporation to move to encourage sales of export cotton and restore to the United States its historical share of the world cotton market.

Third. We have asked the Secretary of Agriculture to provide incentives to insure domestic use of a minimum of 30,000 bales annually of extra long staple cotton.

Fourth. We have have asked the Secretary to give this Congress a detailed program for the disposition of surplus commodities within 60 days after the passage of the bill.

Fifth. We have authorized the appropriation annually, beginning in 1957, of $250 million to supplement section 32 funds.

Sixth. To encourage disposal of surpluses abroad we have eliminated the requirement that 50 percent of commodities so sold must move in American bottoms.

Seventh. To provide the Secretary with the expert help he needs in carrying out this program, we have authorized him to appoint a surplus disposal administrator at a salary not exceeding $15,000 annually.

Eighth. We have authorized the use of surplus commodities to barter or exchange for strategic materials abroad, with the stipulation that any materials so received be placed in the supplementary stockpile established under the Agricultural Trade, Development, and Assistance Act of 1954.

It should become apparent that all of these provisions, together with the authorities and powers already in hand, should afford the machinery necessary to dispose of surpluses.

V. TIME—A KEY FACTOR

The question has arisen as to how soon this machinery can become operative and effective in dealing with the surplus problem. Some say that the program will become effective almost immediately after the bill is passed and signed by the President. Others say that just the psychological effect will reflect an increase in farm prices. Still others say that it will take a year or perhaps 2 years before results will begin to show.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator will recall that when the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry approved 90-percent supports, prices on the grain markets moved upward. They moved downward again when it was indicated, in a letter from the President to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that the bill would be vetoed. Certainly that is ample proof of the effect which a 90-percent price-support program would have on cash prices. Does the Senator recall any fluctuation in market prices when announcement was made of the soil-bank program?

Mr. THYE. There was no substantial fluctuation. First, the soil-bank features were not thoroughly understood. Secondly, no one could foresee when these provisions would be enacted and the program initiated. It must be borne in mind also that it will take time to acquaint the State committees with the provisions of the act, and, they, in turn, must inform their county committees in the respective States, and the county committees, which deal with their local township units, must acquaint the producer with what is required of him to qualify for contracting with the Government on his reduced acreage placed into the soil-bank program.

All these steps are necessary. However, some crops, such as winter wheat in Oregon and Washington and in the area extending down to Southwestern United States, have been planted already. Some of them were planted last fall. Now we are progressing toward spring. Some cotton has been planted in the South and in the Southwest.

All these factors are involved in the soil bank. I believe that the student of the agricultural question knows that the surpluses can be reduced by only a very slight percentage during this particular calendar year. Therefore, until there is a demonstration that a reduction in surpluses is being effected by the soil-bank program, the market will not necessarily reflect firmness.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not generally agreed among those familiar with agricultural legislation that this program could have little or no effect on cash prices this year? It can have beneficial results next year or the year after, but certainly it would have little or no effect on cash prices this year. Is that not correct?

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct. That has been my concern. That was my concern in the committee. The Senator from North Dakota knows very well

what was discussed in committee, because he was present at all the hearings. He is fully acquainted with all the studies respecting the type of legislation we were endeavoring to incorporate in the bill. We discussed the problems in committee. We knew that the soil bank proposal in the bill would not have an immediate effect in this calendar year. We knew that the so-called flexible version of price supports would be in effect this calendar year and what the Secretary had announced as the support prices on wheat and corn, as well as cotton. If we consider the crops normally grown in the northern region the Secretary's announcement means that wheat will be reduced 27 cents a bushel this calendar year, and corn will feel the effect of a reduction of 18 cents per bushel. Corn and wheat are two of the basic crops. We cannot reduce the supports on corn and wheat without the result being reflected in the prices of other feed grains, such as oats, barley, rye, and other grains normally grown in the Northwest.

Mr. YOUNG. Everyone knows that under the present price support program, support prices for corn, wheat, and other basic farm commodities would be reduced next year and the year after, under the modernized parity program.

Mr. THYE. Under the modernized parity formula they would be reduced. However, the psychological effect of reduced support prices on wheat and corn will be an adverse one on the prices of other feed grains. Most certainly the adverse effect on other feed grains would be immediate as soon as the full effect of the lowered supports on wheat and corn was felt when the 1956 crop went to the national markets. The producer, endeavoring to obtain a loan on his wheat crop would find that the support price was down by 27 cents. Cash prices in the market place would reflect a downward trend. So the entire farm economy would suffer the reduction in the support prices on wheat and corn.

Those of us who recognize this voted for a continuation of 90 percent supports for this calendar year and for the calendar year of 1957. Personally I thought we would be safe in voting for a continuation of the 90 percent mandatory supports for the basic crops for only the calendar year 1956. Then we could take a further look at 1957. With a good educational program in connection with the initiation and introduction of the soil bank program, we could hope that a firmness would be reflected in the general market situation of the Nation.

It is impossible now to predict with any degree of certainty the exact time when results from the soil-bank program will become apparent. I seriously doubt whether much progress will be made in the crop year of 1956. We know that winter wheat has already been planted in the Southwest and in the West, as I have said already in my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

We also know that planting has been completed in some of the regions in the South. As I have previously mentioned, it should also be recognized that a certain period of time must be spent in educating the producers not only on the provisions of the bill, but the workability of the soil bank and other features of the program. Administrative details and regulations will also have to be written and set down by the Department of Agriculture. These factors must be reckoned with. Personally I feel that it will be well into the crop year of 1957 before concrete results will be forthcoming from this surplus-disposal program.

VI. DECLINING FARM PRICES

At this point we are faced with the second major problem which I mentioned before—that of declining farm prices. Farm prices have declined steadily since the calendar year 1951. In fact, since 1947 the farmers' net income has shrunk from $17.2 billion to $10.2 billion. This drop in net farm income has come at a time when the balance of our economy has been rising to new heights.

It is for this reason that the committee voted to restore higher price supports for the basic crops. This return to higher supports would serve two important purposes. It would immediately bolster the farm economy, and halt declining prices. It would also serve as a temporary or emergency measure to bridge the gap between now and when the soil bank and other surplus-disposal provisions become operative and effective.

I believe that such action is not only necessary at this time, but is mandatory if we are to maintain a sound and prosperous economy for all groups in our society.

We have heard Government officials, organized groups, and various individual citizens attack the restoration of higher supports on the grounds that it would be inconsistent with the soil bank and would destroy its effectiveness.

I do not agree with this line of reasoning. In the first place, the bill prevents a farmer who exceeds his acreage allotments from receiving payments under the soil-bank program. This, in effect, means that any farmer who qualified under the 90-percent support program would be qualified to participate in the soil-bank program. Farmers traditionally have been known to make the best use of all their land. Therefore, if they cooperate under the acreage restrictions of the price-support program, they will see the advantage in the soil-bank program and will use their excess acres for soil-building practices. History has shown us that farmers use the best soil and cropping practices when they are reasonably well off financially.

In the 1920's and 1930's they exploited their land in order to prevent foreclosure actions. Once they reached a certain degree of financial security in the forties they immediately began to install conservation and soil-building practices. In view of this it would seem logical to assume that if the farmer were to receive higher prices for his products he would do a better job with the soil-bank program than he would do with declining prices.

It has also been charged that a temporary return to 90 percent during the readjustment period would be a blank check to farmers to go ahead and produce all they can in a guaranteed market supported by taxpayer's money.

I deny this charge. Anyone who has read this bill knows that is not true, because we have written safeguards against such a thing ever happening.

In the case of wheat, we would give 90-percent support only to millable varieties. The support level on inferior grades of wheat could go as low as 75 percent at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

In the case of cotton, by repealing the existing provision of the law which designates middling 7/8-inch cotton as the standard grade, we have achieved a more realistic approach in determining the average grade and staple of cotton. The actual result will be slightly lower support prices than have existed under the present provision.

For rice we have specified 90-percent support for the years 1956 and 1957, but have provided for a two-price sale program.

To the Nation's dairy farmers we have extended the bill and called for a support range from 80 to 90 percent of parity and provided that the support level be based on a parity equivalent figured from the period of 1946 through 1949.

We have also asked the Secretary of Agriculture to make a thorough study to improve the entire parity formula and report back to Congress in 6 months.

Two important conclusions should be obvious from a reading of these and other provisions in the bill. First, precautions have been taken in advocating higher supports to guard against the destruction of the soil-bank and other surplus-disposal features. Second, that the return to 90-percent supports is an emergency or stopgap measure, and that we are not talking about 90-percent supports in the terms we previously used. We are dealing with refinements in the 90-percent supports and with specific application to particular crops and products. In addition, these provisions are established for only the calendar years 1956 and 1957.

VII. MISPLACED EMPHASIS

I stated in the beginning of my speech that I regretted two things:

First, that the entire farm problem had not been approached 2 years ago from the standpoint of disposing of surpluses, and,

Second, that we have all become involved in a debate over fixed versus flexible price supports.

I regret that this has happened because we have lost valuable time in arriving at a solution. I think it has become apparent to everyone that no one man or group has all the answers to the farm problem. I think it is also apparent that neither type of supports taken alone is an answer to this problem.

I tried to point this out in debate on the Senate floor in 1954. At that time I opposed provisions of a bill which would have given the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to reduce Government supports. I opposed it because it was not accompanied by the type of realistic legislation we have before us at this time. In 1954 the soil bank and other features of the present bill were flatly rejected

by the Secretary of Agriculture. I cannot help but feel that if we had passed similar legislation in 1954 to what we are considering today, our farm economy would be on the way up today, not on the way down, as we have noted in the past year and as it was officially announced in a Department of Agriculture release today.

In my remarks to the Senate in 1954, I pointed out that the mere cutting of Government support prices and resulting reduction in farm income would not serve to reduce surpluses. I cited figures to prove that the opposite would occur—that when farm prices were down production would go up. This was borne out in the case of dairy supports which were dropped on April 1, 1954, from 90 percent to 75 percent. Since that time the production of milk has increased from 121 billion pounds to 124½ billion pounds. It is now estimated that it will go above the 125 billion pound mark during the current year.

We were also told in 1954 that a reduction in support prices would result in a drop in consumer prices. This has not happened. In fact the consuming public is now asking the question—why have not retail prices gone down during the period when support prices have gone down? It is a good question. The farmer in the year of 1947 received 54 cents of the consumer food dollar spent. The farmer now receives 38 cents.

The consumer has the right to ask what is happening when the farmer has suffered reduced prices on his commodities, and yet the consumer has not benefited. It is a question which requires very careful attention and study.

I have not been able to find an instance in all of history where lower support prices have served to reduce production. I bring this up in this discussion to illustrate again that we need something more than price supports—whether fixed or flexible—to solve the problem of surpluses. It is my firm conviction that the bill which we have before us gives us the added factors which will enable us to move ahead toward a solution and a more prosperous farm economy.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In summary, as I see it, we have before us a twofold problem:

First. Surpluses which must be reduced to manageable size in order for the farmer to receive full parity in the market place.

Second. Declining farm prices which have reached a serious stage and which demand immediate action.

I believe that the bill we are debating deals effectively with both phases of the question. One part would set in motion a sweeping program to reduce and eliminate surpluses. The other part would institute stopgap or emergency higher price supports. This would serve to halt declining prices and would hold prices stable until the other portion of the program has a chance to deal with the surpluses. The two-pronged attack is designed to solve a twofold problem. The provisions are not inconsistent but are intended and written to implement each other.

The problem we are attempting to solve by this legislation belongs to every thinking citizen in the United States. It is the problem of all farm groups and organizations. It is the problem of the administration and the Congress. It is the problem of the farmer, the laborer, and the businessman. It is of deep concern to the consuming public.

Because it is a problem which we all must live with, it calls for judgments based upon facts, understanding, and logic, not emotion, selfishness, or demagogery.

I, for one, can tell the American public that I am sincerely trying to solve a problem in a manner which will eventually find the American farmer joining with labor and business in an unprecedented peacetime prosperity.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I have some rather startling figures which I received from the Department of Agriculture a few days ago. I find they estimate that the average income of farmers is less than 71 cents an hour. We wrote the minimum-wage law for labor last year, increasing the minimum from 75 cents an hour to $1 an hour, and it became effective on March 1 of this year. It involves an increased income to labor of approximately $560 million. Yet the farmers have an investment of approximately $130 billion, and when we deduct from that the Federal land bank rate of 4 percent interest on the investment, we find that farmers earn only 71 cents an hour, on the average.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in reply to the statement of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and the facts he has furnished the Senate, I would say on the minimum-wage question that probably not many jobs now pay less than a dollar an hour. Most wages are above the dollar minimum. Therefore, I think it was a sound and competent adjustment which we made in the wage scale. Be that as it may, the Senator's statement points up the difference between the farmer's economic condition and the economic condition of everyone else.

Our Nation has been blessed with good weather. We have had a high production of all agricultural commodities. We have advanced in agricultural techniques and know-how to a point where an individual acre produces more. Livestock production is greater than it has been normally. We have geared ourselves to a higher degree of production because of the needs during World War II. It is utterly impossible for the individual farmer now to cut production down materially by himself. It must be undertaken through a farm program. That is what we are endeavoring here to do, but I am afraid we are a little late in our approach to the problem.

Mr. YOUNG. It is difficult to understand why the Secretary of Agriculture would be proposing a farm price-support program which he and everyone else knows will reduce farm income further at a time when the average wage that a farmer receives is only 71 cents an hour. It is inconceivable how that kind of a program could be proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. THYE. Many an argument has been advanced to the effect that the 90 percent support program was the principal factor which acted as an incentive to increase production of agricultural commodities. On the first examination of the question we might concur in that view; but in order to check my own thinking on the question I have undertaken to acquaint myself with some of the earlier discussions of farm problems and particularly the debates in Congress at the time the McNary-Haugen bills were being considered. This was during the years 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, and 1928. The bill was passed in the spring of 1928, but was vetoed in May of that year. In reading the floor debates and the discussion which took place almost 30 years ago, I find that strikingly similar arguments were used then as they are being used in these recent weeks.

I have in my hand a statement which is part of President Coolidge's message to Congress on December 6, 1927. I shall read a few lines from that message:

> The most effective means of dealing with surplus crops is to reduce the surplus acreage.

President Coolidge said that in 1927. He also said:

> It cannot be sound for all the people to hire some of the people to produce a crop which neither the producer nor the rest of the people want.

Bear in mind that President Coolidge so advised Congress on December 6, 1927.

I read now from the veto message of President Coolidge on the McNary-Haugen bill:

> The recurring problem of surpluses in farm products has long been the subject of deep concern to the entire Nation, and any economically sound, workable solution of it would command not only the approval but the profound gratitude of our people.

That was what President Coolidge said in his message vetoing the McNary-Haugen bill.

I have before me other statements taken from the debate on the floor of the Senate when the McNary-Haugen bill was being considered. What was said then is almost identical with what is being said today.

During the whole period when the McNary-Haugen proposals were under discussion, there were neither price supports, acreage allotments, acreage controls, nor any type of farm program on the statute books. In that earlier era, the farmer had responded to the needs of his Nation during World War I and had geared his production to an all-time high. Farm production was in excess of domestic needs and in excess of export possibilities. The fact that must be emphasized, however, is that surpluses existed at that time without price supports. Today we have the same problem of surpluses and some persons have tried to place the responsibility on the farmer because of the price-support program. I disagree with that, because the facts and history do not bear out any such arguments or contentions.

Mr. YOUNG. Those who argue in that way totally ignore many important facts. One of them is that when the

switch was made to mechanized farming, about 45 million acres of land were released for the production of food for human beings. That land had previously been used to produce feed for horses and mules. During the period of the 1920's and the 1930's, the senior Senator from Minnesota and the junior Senator from North Dakota were farmers.

Mr. THYE. And we were rather happy, at that, were we not?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; and in bad shape financially as most farmers were. I think both of us will recall that exactly the same type of propaganda as is being used today against the 90-percent supports was being used at that time—almost word for word. In fact, I think some persons have gone back to the language used in that day and have just copied it. They have not used their own ingenuity to create a new version. They have used the same propaganda for 30 years.

Farm prices were a great issue in the 1920's and the 1930's. That factor later had a great effect upon the national elections. I think we are practically back to the same situation again, and that farm prices and farm programs will become just as important an issue as they were back in those days. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. THYE. There can be no question about that. If one segment of the Nation's population is receiving only about 80 percent of parity in relation to the income of the Nation, while another segment is receiving 100 percent, the group which is in the unfavorable position may be kidded for a few months, but it cannot be kidded for long, because Americans do their own thinking.

If the farmer today thought the problem and the responsibility were exclusively his and that he could resolve his difficulties by himself, he would not for 1 minute ask for either Government assistance or Government formulation of a program; he would solve the problem himself.

But the farm question is such that the farmer cannot solve his problems alone. He cannot reduce surpluses by the mere efforts he puts forth.

One producer may reduce his acreage of corn, but another producer will expand his production. One farmer may reduce the size of his dairy herd, while another one will expand. The farmer has no knowledge of what will happen in an adjoining county, or even on an adjoining farm, to say nothing about the State as a whole.

The Senator from North Dakota and I, with our colleagues in Congress, must formulate a program which will, in an orderly manner, reduce the surpluses. Once the surpluses have been brought into manageable proportions the entire debate on the question of whether to have 90 percent price supports or flexible price supports can be laid aside, because with a prospering national economy, with full employment, and with high purchasing power on the part of the consumer, the market place will reflect full parity for the producer. It is the problem of surplus commodities, which is depressing the market.

Mr. YOUNG. Will not the Senator agree that farm price supports and farm prices were great issues in the election of 1948, and that, as a result, the Republicans lost the farming areas of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and even as far west as California?

I think anyone who will check the record will find that it was the loss of the farm vote which caused the Republicans to lose the Presidency in 1948.

I know the senior Senator from Minnesota and I want two things very much. We want a prosperous agriculture, and we want a strong Republican Party. I think we are moving absolutely in the wrong direction. I hope I am wrong.

Before resuming my seat, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Minnesota for a most excellent speech. I wish there were more Members of the Senate who understood agriculture, and who have had as much practical experience in the business of farming as has the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his kind remarks.

Mr. President, let us not forget yesterday, and let us not becloud our observations to the point where we begin to think that this present farm problem is solely the result of the price support program. As I have said already, there were surpluses and depressed farm markets in the 1920's, but it could not be charged that this was the result of a farm program. There was none then.

Let me read another statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1928. I would like to quote the remarks of Senator McNary, of Oregon. He was one of the distinguished senior Members of this body, a Member highly respected, and one who was chosen by the Republican Party as its candidate for Vice President to run with Wendell Willkie in 1940. This is what Senator MCNARY said:

> I shall not discuss the general question of agricultural depression. That subject has been discussed every year we have had this bill up for consideration. It is a condition which now obtains and is universally recognized. The President, in various messages and speeches, has declared that there is a farm problem. * * * I think, Mr. President, all agree that the one great problem is the problem of the surplus and how to deal with it.

That is a quotation from a speech by Senator McNary on April 2, 1928. Bear in mind that there was no farm program whatever. There were no price support factors to be held responsible for surpluses. But there was a farm problem in the United States. The farmer was producing more than could be consumed domestically or could be disposed of through export channels.

The Nation is confronted with the same problem today. For the first time, however, we are approaching the problem in an intelligent manner by providing in the pending bill for the retirement of acres from actual production. After the acres have been retired and placed in the soil bank, nothing will be harvested from them. They can be kept in good, fertile condition for a future need, whether it be an emergency or simply because an increase in population may require greater production of agricultural commodities. Whatever the need might be, the land will be there and will be fertile for the use of future generations.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I say we are approaching the problem in a sound, intelligent manner. But, good as the soil bank program promises to be, it cannot become fully operative in this calendar year. In this year, it will only show us its promises for the future control of surpluses. The program, therefore, will not this year have a major effect upon national markets. I am confident that next year it will commence to demonstrate that surpluses are being brought under control. When that happens, we shall find that the national markets will reflect strength. With such strength reflected, there will be parity for the producer in the marketplace, and the support factor will be dropped as an issue since it will be unimportant.

The support factor itself will not affect surpluses, however, because there must be a program to retire acreage from production. So long as there is an abundance of feed which will promise the farmer a greater return through use in livestock feeding, the feed supply will be channeled in that direction. It may result in such an bundance of pork, as occurred last year, that it will ruin the market. It may activate dairy production by such an excessive amount that fluid milk will flood the market, and thereby ruin it. Or the use of feed may result in overproduction of livestock, and depress the price of beef. Poultry production can be increased in less than 6 months. If the producer sees an opportunity of getting a better return for his feed grain by increasing his poultry production, the grain will be channeled to poultry feed. So, in turn, the result will be a constant weakening of the livestock market, or of the dairy market, or of the poultry market. That will occur until the feed supply is brought into balance with domestic needs.

The provision for the soil bank is the first real approach we have taken in that direction. Under the soil-bank section of the bill, so long as it remains operative, the prices the farmers receive will improve. In the meantime, however, I know we are going to need 90 percent support prices on the basic commodities. If we shall fail in our purpose, and flexible support prices shall remain in effect, we shall be instrumental in reducing the price of wheat by 27 cents a bushel this year and reducing the price of corn by 18 cents a bushel. The other feed grains then will reflect a price reduction, because there cannot be a drop of 27 cents a bushel in the price of wheat without the price of barley going lower, and the price of sorghum grains in the Southwest declining, and the price of oats falling. If that happens, it will affect the whole farm economy.

We cannot expect that farmers can experience a further drop in their economy and still remain solvent. If they cannot remain solvent, it will be the young men on the farms who will be forced off. The farmers of relatively good financial means will buy their equipment and livestock at sacrifice

prices, and will produce from the same acres of land just as if the young chaps had not been forced off the farms.

I constantly am aware of all these problems in my State, as well as in all of the other States. I am determined, and I hope my colleagues will join me, that support prices are maintained at a level which will assure that a price squeeze will not be applied to the young farm families. Most of the farmers in that class are World War II veterans, who did not enjoy higher incomes as a result of inflationary war earnings. Those men came back from the war, took their uniforms off, and went into debt to acquire farms, equipment, and necessary home furnishings at inflated prices which existed following World War II and through the early 1950's. Those farmers bought the property necessary to enable them to operate their farms, whether that property was farm machinery or the first year's feed supply. They assumed heavy obligations.

If we put a price squeeze on such farmers by lowering further their income, we will not stop production on those acres of land. Somebody else will operate the land, and somebody else will continue to produce on the land. Yet, we have forced that young farm family off their farm. As I have said, the soil bank is the first intelligent step we have taken to bring production down, but the price squeeze threatens to drive the younger men, including veterans of the war, off the farms if we do not now assist them in maintaining a reasonable financial return for their farm operations.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for a very sound and practical analysis of our present farm problem. I think it was very timely that he brought to our attention some of the past history, going back to the time when we started dealing with farm legislation. As a matter of fact, the farm problem has been with us for many years, and I have no doubt it will be with us for years to come; but at the present time we are facing a critical period, so far as the farm industry is concerned, due to the fact that the farmer's share of the national income is being reduced greatly out of proportion to what other segments of the economy receive.

I merely desired to commend the Senator. I am in thorough support of his view that rigid price supports or flexible price supports will not permanently solve the problem. Such measures are palliative, and are meant to carry us through difficult times, as in periods of depression. I believe that if we can handle the situation for a year or two, we shall be on the way to a good, sound farm program.

I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. I firmly believe that flexible or rigid price supports are not the answer. I shall follow the Senator from Minnesota and discuss parity for wheat.

I have personally come to the conclusion that we shall have to handle the farm problem commodity by commodity, and not by an across-the-board formula for all farm products. It seems to me to be as absurd to handle farm legislation by such a formula as it would be to handle tariffs in that manner. After all, we have a tariff, which has been in operation for many years, which provides preferential treatment for certain products. I think we will have to come to that so far as farm commodities are concerned and the sooner we do, the sooner we shall get our agricultural economy on a prosperous basis.

I thank the Senator for his very fine speech.

Mr. THYE. I certainly thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks. The Senator from Kansas knows agricultural problems. Because of his keen understanding, he knows, as I know, that if we reduce supports in the immediate future, with present huge surpluses threatening our national markets, the only result will be lowered farm income.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to join my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in commending the Senator from Minnesota for the very fine and illuminating statement he has made. I was particularly interested in the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota when he mentioned the effect of the national elections a few years ago. It was a Republican President who vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill, for which farmers all over the Nation were clamoring. It was vetoed by a Republican President, and the results were disastrous.

I am sure my colleague from North Dakota will agree with me when I say that in 1932 more than half the people of North Dakota were on relief. I make the prediction today that unless a good farm bill shall be passed, farm areas all over the country will suffer. Perhaps history will repeat itself, and once more the Republican Party will be blamed, as my distinguished colleague from North Dakota has said. If that happens, I want the Senate to know that the two Senators from North Dakota have given ample warning regarding the situation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, never in the history of the United States has the national income approached the present figure. It is the highest national income our Nation has ever experienced. At the present time we have the high employment, high wages, and the highest purchasing power on the part of consumers we have ever experienced.

Yet this one segment of our economy, agriculture, is operating at a low economic level, principally due to the burden of surpluses. Because of those surpluses, the farmers' markets have been shattered. Momentarily that is serious only to the farmer who is caught in a particular price squeeze; but if we analyze the situation and consider the history of the Nation, we find that when the farmer ceases to be a real purchaser, that reflects on the manufacturers of farm machinery, trucks, automobiles, and other articles; and when that effect is felt in the industrial centers, it is not long until the national economy begins to decline. For that reason, I am most anxious to bring about—and I have endeavored to do so during the past 3 years—a realistic approach to the production of agricultural commodities and to the control of surpluses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The reference by the Senator from North Dakota to the McNary-Haugen bill, which was one of the first efforts made by Congress to solve the farm problem, reminds me of the fact that, as a Member of the United States Senate, I voted for that bill. All of us were groping in the dark, in a sense, for a remedy for the farm ills which beset our country. That bill was vetoed by the President at that time in office.

From that time until now I have, as the Senator from Minnesota may know, always supported farm legislation, because I have realized, as I do today, that notwithstanding the gradual decline in the farm population, the condition of the farmer has not been such as to put him on a basis of equality in the economic picture with other groups of our people.

It is a strange anomally that, notwithstanding the gradual decrease of the farm population of the Nation, along with that decrease—which ordinarily would cause us to presume that there would be a decline in production and, therefore, in the available farm products with which to feed and clothe the American people—the condition of the farmer has declined economically percentagewise.

It is because of that fact that the Government had to interfere, to help stabilize agriculture, as the Government had done, although under a different name, in the case of many other industries and many other occupations.

I am one of those who do not believe that the farmers of the United States—as has been charged against them by some very prominent persons—can meet together and can conspire to overproduce in order to gouge the Treasury of the United States, through a high price-support program. The farmer is the victim of the weather; he is the victim of the seasons. When he plants a crop, he never knows how much he will reap; and he never knows how much help or support he will need until he has reaped his crop. When he plants his crop, he cannot know that.

It is largely for that reason, among others, that I have always felt that a rigid, high-support program, which the farmer would understand when he planted his crop—rather than to wait until he reaped it—was a wise, statesmanlike approach to the farm problem of the United States, until we could find a better remedy, which in my judgment we have not yet found.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the sake of a correct record, and let me say that I may be mistaken about this matter, for the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was a Member of the Senate at that time, and I was not—is it not a fact that the McNary-Haugen bill was vetoed by President Coolidge in the spring of 1928, and that the Republicans carried the election in November of 1928?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will permit me to reply, let me say that is true; but my recollection is that the McNary-Haugen bill was vetoed by President Coolidge; and later in the year Mr. Hoover was elected President of the United States, but not on that issue. His election had no relationship to that issue. It had relationship to issues or situations entirely divorced from the farm problem, as I am sure the Senator from California knows.

I do not wish to encroach too much on the time of the Senator from Minnesota. I desire to congratulate him upon his work in the committee and on the floor of the Senate. I am very happy to say to him, if it is worth anything to him, that there is not a Senator on this floor, on either side of the aisle, for whose intellectual integrity I have greater respect, and for whose personality I have greater admiration than I have in both respects for the Senator from Minnesota. I appreciate fully the great labor he has rendered on the committee, and the great labor he is rendering on the floor. When the voting occurs on the pending farm bill, I think the Senator from Minnesota and I will not be very far apart in our attitude on it.

As all of us know, it is unfortunate that the Government has to interfere or has to provide a program for stabilizing agriculture. But that must be done; and we must meet that situation face to face.

I am one of those who do not believe there is any inconsistency between 90 percent supports for agriculture and the soil-bank provision which is included in the pending bill. I think they complement each other, rather than conflict with each other—which I hope to show in a very brief address I expect to make a little later, during the further consideration of this entire question.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his very, very high praise.

Mr. President, let me say, further, that in addition to voting for the McNary-Haugen bill, the Senator from Kentucky has had a long, glorious, and bright legislative career over the years. He has been Vice President of our great Nation, as well as more recently having returned to the Senate, since the conclusion of his services as Vice President.

To my distinguished friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]—for whom I have the greatest respect; he is an intelligent courageous person, and he is an excellent minority leader—let me say that I had the same thought that he has expressed, namely, that although President Coolidge vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill, later in the same year the Republican candidate for the presidency carried the Nation.

Mr. President, I have before me excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing some of the debate in 1928 including statements of Senator McNary, Senator Mayfield, of Texas, Senator Brookhart, of Iowa, and several others. I could read them if I desired to take the time required for that purpose, but I shall not do so. However, I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from California, that I examined this question, because I, too, wished to ascertain why it was that, after President Coolidge vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill, a Republican President was elected the following November. I wished to ascertain how that happened, for I knew that the farmer was disappointed over the veto of the McNary-Haugen bill. I knew that because when the message came that President Coolidge had vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill, I happened to be in a gathering of farmers in Minnesota, and I saw many a farmer shake his head, and heard him say, "I do not believe it. I cannot understand the President vetoing that bill, when the farm economy is at an extreme low."

However, during that period, the Nation's economy seemed to be in a healthy state—all except agriculture. Now, I invite the attention of Senators to the chart at the rear of the Chamber. I am not responsible for that chart. I think the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is responsible for bringing the chart into the Chamber. Let us go back over the years. The chart goes back only to 1930. But if we were to go back to 1928, we would find that there was an economic lift in the Nation. There was only a slight reflection of that condition in the farm economy, but there were what appeared to be generally good economic conditions prevailing in the economy as a whole. That carried President Hoover into office. However, the farm economy was on the rocks. At that time it was on the verge of being shattered, as it was finally shattered in the early 1930's.

If anyone doubts the accuracy of my references to the hardships which were imposed on the farmers of the United States, let him go back and check the record of foreclosures which took place. One need not take my word for it. The records exist. They show the cold facts.

It will be found that in the 1930's the farm income had dropped to an extreme low. I fear that we are confronted with a parallel. That is what caused me to search into the old records of almost 30 years ago. Those records show that at that time the farm economy had dropped in almost the same relation to the national economy as the farm economy has dropped in relation to the national income in this era, about 30 years later.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall those years. The Senator will, of course, recall that, notwithstanding the fact that in certain phases of our economy there was a constant rise—as in the stock market—at that very time the farm economy was on the decline to such an extent that farmers burned their grain for fuel, because it was cheaper than coal or wood. In some sections of our country farmers forcibly resisted the efforts of the sheriff to carry out orders of the court to foreclose mortgages. At that time there was a rise in other segments of our economy.

I do not compare the situation today with what happened in those days. However, it is a rather strange anomaly that at the very time when other segments of our economy throughout the country are enjoying prosperity, the farm economy is still going down. It shows an artificial situation. It shows that something is wrong with our economy. It is because of the imbalance between the farmer and the rest of the country that Congress is called upon to enact legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment or two. First, I wish to concur in what the distinguished Senato from Kentucky has just stated. In the early 1930's farmers were known to have used corn as fuel in their kitchen ranges, heating stoves, and furnaces, because a bushel of corn produced more heat units than it would have bought if the corn had been sold and cash used to purchase fuels such as coal or wood.

I do not in any sense wish to cast a reflection upon our Nation's economy or raise doubts about its future. We have never known as high an economy on a national scale as we have today. We have never experienced a better employment situation for the worker than we have today. But when we examine events of the past we find that in the years 1929 to 1932 farm income dropped from $11,900,000,000 to $5,300,000,000. Compare that period with the period from 1947 to the present. We find that farm income has dropped from $17,200,000,000 to $10,200,000,000. If the flexible version of the farm support program is permitted to remain on the statute books and be operative in this calendar year, the price of wheat will go down 27 cents a bushel, and that of corn, 18 cents a bushel. The prices of other related feed grains will go down in relationship to the prices of wheat and corn.

If that happens in this machine age, the situation will be extremely serious. Today the farmer must pay cash for fuel and oil to operate the power machinery on his farm. The situation today is different from what it was when the farmer grew oats, hay, and other feeds with which, through his farm animals, he produced the power necessary to till the land. Today, when the farmer purchases fuel for his tractor or oil to lubricate it, the transaction represents a cash outlay.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the press this morning it was stated that either today or yesterday the Department of Agriculture, through the Secretary, had announced that the income of the American farmer declined $1 billion last year, and that while his income was declining his expenses of operation were increas-

ing. I do not know whether the Senator saw that item in this morning's newspapers, but I happened to observe the fact that the income of the farmers of the United States, in this era of great prosperity, had declined $1 billion last year.

Mr. THYE. I not only read the article, but I heard the announcement this morning by a radio news commentator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rose to ask the Senator to yield because I was prompted to make the same remark which the Senator from Kentucky has just made. I heard the announcement on the radio this morning.

There was another fact mentioned in the Secretary's press release which I think is of even greater significance than the huge drop in the income of farmers. That was that the farmer's share of the consumer dollar, according to the latest figures from the Department, has declined to 38 cents. That is the lowest figure which has been reached since 1939. Since 1953 the farmer's share in the consumer's dollar has dropped from 45 cents to 38 cents. This drop continues, notwithstanding all the talk about flexible supports and the soil bank program.

What we are overlooking, I am persuaded, is the fact that between the farmer and the consumer there is the processor, whose share of the consumer's dollar is steadily increasing, and we do nothing about it.

Comparatively recently the Federal Trade Commission reported upon the number of mergers in the dairy industry. Notwithstanding the attitude of Congress and of the people against mergers, the big national dairy companies are steadily gobbling up more and more local dairy firms. From 1950 to 1954 the huge national dairy companies have absorbed 75 smaller companies in their mergers.

What is more local than the grazing of cows and the milking of cows and the distribution of the product? It is only necessary to examine the record of cases investigated by the Federal Trade Commission and other agencies to know that a national dairy company, when it seeks to bring about a merger, will go into an area it seeks to absorb and sell products at a price lower than it does in its own territory. It undersells the competitor with whom it wishes to merge.

We permit that to go on. I marvel at the fact that the Department of Agriculture seems to remain silent while this monopolistic trend continues to make it difficult for the farmer to earn his income.

There is a place where we can legislate with vigor in support of competition and in support of free enterprise to save the farmer.

If we do not do it, we must be prepared to see the farm continue to disappear as a family operation. We must be prepared to see the huge farms continue to grow.

We hear that the cost of farmland is higher than it has ever been. That is only because in most instances those with great wealth, the larger producers, are able to buy the small places.

It was only yesterday, after I had spoken on this question that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] came to me and remarked that in his State, where cotton is the principal crop, the small farmers are being bought up. The large farmer moves in and burns the dwelling which was occupied by the small farmer, takes all improvements off the farm, and continues to raise cotton in greater quantity.

Such conditions prevail because we have not been willing to come face to face with the problem of the monopolistic national processors who stand between the farmer and the consumers, and who continue to take more and more of the dollar the farmer should have.

In thanking the Senator from Minnesota for permitting me to say a word at this point, I, like other Senators who have listened to him, appreciate and applaud the attitude he takes.

I do not believe, of course, that he will find any help for the farmer in the soil-bank plan, which may be called a plan to let the Secretary determine what the revenue will be while we neglect to decide what it ought to be. We merely say, "soil bank," and everyone believes that the Secretary will wave a wand, and in that way the problem will be solved. It will not be solved, I assure the Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not share the same fear that has been expressed by the Senator from Wyoming. A very extensive study was made of the general subject before the soil-bank section was written into the bill. Some interpretation is left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture and to his advisors, because we could not write a blueprint specifying how the Secretary should administer it.

During my service in Congress, there have been three different Secretaries of Agriculture. I am confident that the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture will properly interpret the section and put it into practical administrative operation. We have already had testimony before the committee assuring us that that will be done. I am sure we will have a soil-bank program that will be administratively workable and that will be properly administered. The soil-bank section represents the only intelligent and sound approach to reducing our farm plant and bringing production of agricultural commodities into balance with our domestic needs and our export possibilities.

Once we bring that situation into balance, the farmer will receive 100 percent of parity in the marketplace, because there has never been such a favorable economy as we have today.

If it were not for the present surpluses, I sincerely believe that the farmer would be on economic parity with every other segment of our Nation's economy.

In order to dispel the fear that it was 90-percent price supports which brought about the surpluses, and the fear that if we restore 90-percent price supports we will destroy the soil-bank program, I wish to remind Senators that in the late twenties and early thirties we had no farm support program and no parity payments. Nevertheless, surpluses were breaking the national markets, and destroying the income of the farmer.

In order to take an argument from yesterday's pages of history and bring it into today's debate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain excerpts from remarks made by Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives when the McNary-Haugen bill was before the Congress in the spring of 1928.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 2, 1928, Senate:

"Mr. MCNARY (Oregon). I shall not discuss the general question of agricultural depression. That subject has been discussed every year we have had this bill up for consideration. It is a condition which now obtains and is universally recognized. The President, in various messages and speeches, has declared that there is a farm problem. * * * I think, Mr. President, all agree that the one great problem is the problem of the surplus and how to deal with it."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 3, 1928, Senate:

"Mr. MAYFIELD (Texas). Mr. President, no Senator can longer doubt that a new determination of the Nation's policy toward agriculture is the most important task that has confronted the country in the past decade. The men and women who produce the raw materials on which our industrial existence and, indeed, the very life of the Nation depend, are operating at a great disadvantage compared with the more closely knit economic groups in industry, commerce, and finance. We can neither avoid nor efface the evidences of the disparity. The greatest problem before the American people today is the restoration of agriculture to a permanent, remunerative basis. * * * It is of this last form of farm relief—the development of an effective system of surplus control in agriculture—that I speak more particularly at this time * * * they (the farmers) must be helped into position to demand for their cotton and other crops prices that cover the cost of producing these crops, plus a reasonable profit on their investment, just as industry would receive if the American cotton crop were the product of an organized industry."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 3, 1928, Senate:

"Mr. BROOKHART (Iowa). First, I want to describe something of the size and magnitude of this proposition. I think we are all agreed that, so far as marketing farm products is concerned, the control of the surplus in the United States is the important proposition. That is not all of the farmer's troubles, by any means. That is only a fraction of the cause of the present agricultural situation. But I will confine my discussion to that proposition, and that alone. First, I look upon that proposition as if it were one big American farm. As far as Congress is concerned it is our farm, and we are producing a surplus, and that surplus is depressing our domestic market. The problem for us is to control that surplus, so that we can get our cost of production plus a reasonable margin of profit, to which all business is entitled. * * * A great argument is made here against any bill that contains a provision for Government price fixing. I want no Government price fixing, but I do want price fixing according to the honest and fair cost of production, and every business in the United States, every successful business in the world, fixes its prices in that way. * * * I am not frightened, however, by this subsidy argument. We have

had some experience with subsidies in the United States before. This is not the first time that we have had talks of subsidy. I remember a railroad bill in 1920—the Transportation Act. There are a number of Senators here who voted for that bill. That bill provided that for the first 6 months we should guarantee out of the Treasury of the United States the operating expenses and the war-time return, as the railroads had received that return during Government operation. Yesterday I asked the Interstate Commerce Commission for the figures as to how much subsidy we had paid to the railroads on that guaranty, and I have it here. It is $529,278,911.51, and we still owe them $250,000."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 3, 1928, Senate:

"Mr. BLAINE (Wisconsin). But I am not speaking politically. I do think, however, that the Republican Party owes it to the agricultural interests of Americans to carry out its pledges. It has too long delayed those pledges, and had there been any greater hope or trust in the Democratic Party, there might have been a different complexion politically in the administration at Washington."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 6, 1928, Senate:

"Mr. GOODING (Idaho). The farmer, Mr. Presdent, is not asking to tear down the present high standards of wages in America. His hope is that if this legislation passes he will be able to meet the present standard of wages in America and have something left at the end of the year to keep the wolf from the door. * * * It is a simple story, and it seems to me that anyone with an open mind who studies the legislation that has been passed in the last few years, and the increased cost of production, can understand why there is a farm problem. The farmer is not responsible for the farm problem. * * * It has been a great disappointment to me that all of the New England and the other industrial States, almost without exception, are opposed to this bill. * * * Mr. President, those opposing the bill say we can not legislate prosperity to the farmer. We have legislated prosperity to the railroads by giving them practically a guaranty of 5¾ percent on their investment, and the railroads today are enjoying the greatest prosperity in their history. We have legislated prosperity to the laboring man by giving him shorter hours and increased pay. We have legislated prosperity to the manufacturer by giving him, in the Fordney-McCumber Act, the highest protection that he has ever enjoyed. On different occasions I have placed in the RECORD the cost of farm implements and the prices the farmer pays for the things he uses in the home and on the farm. In round numbers, it means 100 percent of increase. The only way the farmers can be helped is to increase the price of their products upon the market.

"Mr. FRAZIER (North Dakota). A great deal is said about the prosperity of our country. This does not apply, however, to the farmers. Will Rogers, the cowboy humorist, says: 'The country, as a whole, is prosperous; but that does not mean that it is prosperous as a whole.' * * * Prosperity certainly has not reached the producers of food products and of other necessities that are raised upon the farms of this country."

"Mr. COPELAND (New York). The President may perhaps veto the pending bill on the ground that it violates economic law. Of course it violates economic law. Anything that interferes with the law of supply and demand, with the free flow of things throughout the world, is uneconomic. But, Mr. President, is there anything more violative of economic law than the protective-tariff system? The very nature of the law, the very intent of the law, is to do away with the law of supply and demand. * * * I spoke a little while ago about the labor unions. When the labor unions fix the price of labor, that violates the economic law, but they do it to the advantage of those who labor."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 25, 1928, Senate (on overriding veto):

"Mr. MCNARY. I exceedingly regret the action of the President on account of the very earnest desire of the membership of Congress favorably to report and to enact some legislation that Congress thought would be beneficial to the farmers in their depressed condition. At this late hour it does not seem possible that any legislation can be had of this nature, or legislation of any kind that will tend to benefit agriculture.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 26, 1928, House of Representatives:

"Mr. HAUGEN. I believe all are agreed as to the important place which our basic industry, agriculture, holds in the economic life of the Nation, also all who have given it due consideration also agree that it will require the united and best efforts of all regardless of their political affiliation or personal interests to overcome the continued economic depression, to encourage, to restore normal and better conditions in agriculture, to thus promote progress, prosperity, and happiness, not only to agriculture but to labor and all activities, in order that we may have the fullest development of every worthy and legitimate enterprise.

"Shall due consideration be given to the important place agriculture holds in the economic life of the Nation, and the continued depression in agriculture and the party platform pledges? Have the producers the right to ask the Republican Party to redeem its national party pledges made at Cleveland?

"The Republican Party at its national convention held at Cleveland solemnly declared: 'We recognize that agricultural activities are still struggling with adverse conditions that have brought deep distress. We pledge the party to take whatever steps are necessary to bring back the balanced conditions between agriculture, industry, and labor.'

"There the farmers have the party's acknowledgment of the adverse conditions that have brought deep despair. In it they have the pledge to bring back a balanced condition between agriculture, industry, and labor.

"The Democratic Party at its national convention held at New York pledged itself to 'stimulate by every proper Government activity the progress of the cooperative marketing movement and to the establishment of an export marketing corporation or commission in order that the exportable surplus may not establish the price of the whole crop.'

"Have they the right to ask the Democratic Party to redeem its party platform pledges, to promote the cooperative movement, and the pledge to establish an export marketing corporation or commission in order that the exportable surplus may not establish the price of the whole crop?

"President Coolidge, in his message at the opening of the last session of the 69th Congress, said in part: 'The important place which agriculture holds in the economic and social life of the Nation cannot be overestimated. The National Government is justified in putting forth every effort to make the open country a desirable place to live. No condition meets this requirement which fails to supply a fair return on labor expended and capital invested.'

"The question to all is, Shall it be done?"

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 30, 1928, House of Representatives:

"Mr. PURNELL. I think we are all agreed that the one great problem is our agricultural surplus and how to deal with it."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 30, 1928, House of Representatives:

"Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. The farmers have been continually encouraged by the Government to raise a surplus, and therefore this legislation seeks to bring about the readjustment so that the American producer will have his proper place in our economic life.

"Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa. The absolute necessity of a change in the agricultural situation seems to be admitted by all—any difference of opinion is regarding the methods to be adopted. * * * It has been all too easy to feel and think that the severe depression in agriculture is entirely a farmer's problem, and to permit him to bear the burden of it, and to work out his own salvation or to perish in the attempt and go down and out and let others take his place."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CARLSON obtained the floor.

PROGRAM FOR CONSIDERATION OF FARM BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate, I wonder if the distinguished acting majority leader can inform the Senate as to the program for Thursday and Friday. As Senators know, our unanimous-consent agreement, pursuant to which we shall be operating under controlled time, goes into effect on Thursday. Is it the intention of the acting majority leader, who is handling the agricultural bill as chairman of the committee, that there shall be a night session of the Senate on Thursday? Also, assuming that action on the bill is not completed on Thursday, is it the intention, if necessary, to hold a night session on Friday? If so, realizing that there must be some flexibility in the arrangement, can the Senator say how late he would anticipate holding the Senate in session on those two evenings?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my hope that the Senate will meet at noon on Thursday and remain in session until, say 9:30 or 10 o'clock. On Friday the Senate might meet at 10:30 a. m. and remain in session until action on the bill is completed, if possible. If it is necessary, in order to complete action on the bill, that the Senate remain in session until 11 o'clock, it is the intention to keep the Senate in session until that hour.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wished to develop this information in order that all Senators might be advised that it would be unwise to have dinner engagements on either Thursday or Friday.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest that such engagements be canceled. The Senate ought to remain in session long enough on Thursday and Friday to complete consideration of the bill, if at all possible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the acting majority leader given any consideration to the possibility of the Senate meeting at an earlier hour than 12 o'clock noon on Thursday?

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggested the hour of 12 o'clock Thursday for the reason that certain Senators will not reach the city until probably 1 o'clock. All Senators have been informed that the Senate is expected to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday. Under the unani-

mous-consent agreement, the first vote could not take place until 2 p. m.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the Senator given any thought to the possibility of a Saturday session, in the event consideration of the pending bill is not completed by, say 10 or 11 o'clock Friday evening?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I have. The majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] will be present on Thursday. I have not discussed the question with him personally, but I shall be in touch with him. I shall be able to inform the Senate, probably before it takes a recess this evening, as to what is planned in that connection. However, it is my hope that Senators will be on hand at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday and remain in attendance. It ought to be possible to conclude consideration of the bill Friday evening, which would make a Saturday session unnecessary. None of likes a Saturday session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the Senator knows, a number of committees of the Senate must meet to transact business during the afternoon, while the Senate is in session.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the reason why a number of our colleagues are not present in the Chamber today. They are in attendance upon meetings of the Committee on Appropriations, and other committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. That should not be the case on Thursday or Friday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope committees will avoid afternoon meetings on those 2 days, except in an emergency type of situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I doubt whether it will be necessary for the Senate to meet on Saturday. If the Senate can begin work at noon on Thursday and remain in session until 10 o'clock Thursday night, and perhaps 11 or 11:30 Friday night, consideration of the bill can be completed.

Mr. President——

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the past week in the debate we have heard many statements about the plight of the American farmer; therefore I do not expect to labor that point.

I think it is well to mention, however, that business, finance, and government underscore the opinion that odds heavily favor a continuation of an expanding prosperity in 1956 and also in years ahead, with minor hesitation in our American economy, except in agriculture.

National income rose approximately 7 percent in 1955. A smaller rise, but an increased total income is anticipated in years ahead. Farm products fell about 5 percent from 1954 to 1955. Nationwide realized net farm income fell 10 percent in 1955.

In the face of rising national income, net farm income has fallen 32 percent in the past 4 years. Despite the strong demand for farm products, the farmer is caught in his own quicksand of surplus production.

Much of the debate last week was on the terms of rigid or flexible parity. It is my opinion that neither rigid nor flexible party is the solution to the farm problem. We have tried both. It is my opinion that we must begin to take a new look at the entire farm picture, with a view of securing for the farmer his fair share of the national income, based on domestic consumption.

As our population increases, there will, of course, be greater demand for our farm products, but on the other hand, we shall continue to get increased production as a result of new and higher producing farm crops, as a result of research. We shall continue to increase our farm production as we learn how to store and conserve water in our soil and as we, through soil studies, learn the full use of fertilizer.

The soil bank proposal in this legislation is not only timely legislation, but has great possibilities for the future. I strongly favor it. On the other hand, I do not see how it can be effective in getting needed financial relief out into the farming areas this year.

Nor can I see any reduction in wheat production in 1956. That is especially true of the winter wheat areas.

President Eisenhower recognizes that agriculture is our basic industry and that legislation must be enacted which will assure the farmer of his fair share of the national income.

The President, in his special farm message to Congress, stated:

> Although agriculture is our basic industry, farm families find their prices and incomes depressed amid the Nation's greatest prosperity.
>
> An oversupply of commodities drives down prices as mounting costs force up from below, generating a severe price-cost squeeze.
>
> Remedies are needed now, and it is up to the administration and the Congress to provide them swiftly. As we seek to go forward, we must not go back to old programs that have failed utterly to protect farm families.

In the pending measure the administration is requesting authority of Congresss to spend more than $1.3 billion in payments to farmers for a soil-bank program. In addition to this, it is recommending a continuation of the present parity program and an expenditure of vast sums of money for the disposal of surplus farm commodities.

Mr. President, the situation confronting wheat farmers today is certainly proof enough that the present wheat program is a failure.

Under the existing wheat program:

First. Farmers are compelled to operate under rigid marketing controls.

Second. Wheat acreage has been cut from 78 million acres in 1953 to 55 million acres, the minimum acreage permitted by law. The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that were it not for that minimum, the current supply situation would force a cutback to about 18.6 million acres.

I say, in all sincerity, Mr. President, that I do not believe anyone is going to suggest that wheat production be cut to 18.6 million acres. In Kansas we have taken a very severe cut in our wheat production. Wheat acreage in Kansas has been reduced from approximately 18 million acres in 1951 to 10,800,000 acres at present. I should say that is a very severe cut. I would not say our farmers are taking it cheerfully, but they are complying with the law. So I do not feel there can be a much greater reduction in the acreage of wheat.

Third. The parity price under the new parity formula will be reduced from $2.51 per bushel to $2.19 per bushel.

Fourth. The support price for wheat has already been reduced from 90 percent of parity to 76 percent of parity.

Fifth. Export markets have all but declined to the vanishing point despite subsidy payments totaling $200 million last year.

Sixth. The Government now has more than $2½ billion invested in wheat, and is paying an annual storage bill of about $200 million.

It is apparent from facts such as I have just related that there must be a change in the wheat program. If we continue to do nothing and attempt to hold fast to out-of-date programs which no longer fit present-day conditions, or which have been clearly shown to be inadequate, or if we continue to attempt to apply blindly a single program to the problems of every commodity, whether it fits or not, wheat farmers may rightfully insist upon their rights to have something to say about the future of those holding high places as Government officials and us as lawmakers.

There has been a tremendous change in the wheat situation in the last few years. During the war and up until the crop year 1954, farmers were urged to produce wheat in unlimted quantities. Now we have on hand a recordbreaking surplus which has brought about the application of stringent production controls.

Actually, this surplus has accumulated only since the harvesting of the 1952 crop. On July 1, 1952, our wheat carryover was only 256 million bushels, which is substantially less than a normal and desirable carryover in these times. Looking backward, it now appears that it would have been the wiser course of action to have imposed acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the 1953 crop. But controls were not invoked until 1954, and, of course, have been continued since then.

Had it not been for the application of the acreage limitations, the surplus situation today would have been even more serious. Through the application of these controls, wheat acreage has been cut from 78 million acres in 1953 to 55 million acres in 1955, the minimum permitted by law. This represents a reduction of 30 percent in 2 years. Even with this harsh cutback in acreage, we are still producing more wheat than we are marketing, even though we spent last

year about 200 million dollars on export subsidies.

As I have heretofore indicated, the Secretary of Agriculture has stated that if it were not for the 55 million acre minimum provision in the law, the current supply situation would force a cutback in acreage to 18.6 million acres.

Our exports of wheat have continued to decline sharply despite heavy subsidy payments. The hard fact is that the United States today is virtually a residual supplier in the wheat markets of the world. Unless we develop a program which will permit American wheat to enter the markets of the world competitively on both price and quality bases, there will be no alternative but to force the wheat farmer to take even more severe cutbacks in production.

The income of wheat farmers is suffering because of reduced acreage and lower prices. The price support level has been reduced from 90 percent of old parity, the rate in effect for 1954 and preceding years, to 82½ percent of old parity in 1955. It is to be further reduced to 76 percent of transitional parity for 1956.

In dollars and cents computed on the basis of average price support, this represents a reduction from $2.24 a bushel in 1954 to $1.81 a bushel in 1956. With the size of the current wheat stocks, farmers, under the flexible price-support program, cannot expect any more than 75 percent of transitional parity for 1957 and 1958. This is estimated to be the equivalent of $1.70 a bushel in 1957 and $1.60 a bushel in 1958.

It is the matter of the continuing decline in the income to farmers, when everything else is booming, that should cause all of us to pause and to take a good look to see if there is actually in the bill anything which proposes to offer any real solution to the problem of wheat. To check this undesirable trend in wheat will require decisions which must not be characterized either by timidity or shortsightedness. One thing is certain, and that is that the decline in the wheat farmers' income certainly cannot be checked by a continued blind adherence to the present flexible price-support formula.

I, for one, believe that a sound program for American agriculture must be built upon a commodity-by-commodity approach. In other words, we must fashion a weapon to meet the problems and the needs of each commodity.

Since the close of the war, there has been a continuing debate in the Senate and elsewhere over the method and level of price supports. The issue has been publicized in the public eye as a battle between the advocates of high rigid support on the one hand and flexible support on the other. Actually neither position will meet the long-time fundamental needs of wheat growers. I have searched the committee bill and the report in vain to find any hope of a solution for wheat, but again, insofar as the matter of price support is concerned, the report seems to indicate a continuation of the controversy between the advocates of rigid and flexible supports, with the exception of the willingness of the committee to attempt a new program for rice.

The so-called high rigid level of supports is predicated on the objective of reducing supplies to a level at which they can be moved into consumption at 90 percent of parity. That program completely ignores and fails to recognize that the potential market outlets for wheat at this price level are limited to domestic uses for food. When this level of support is applied to total production, it immediately prices American wheat out of all other markets, including the world market. A complete loss of our export markets would be caused if heavy export subsidies were not made available by Congress. Wheat farmers, I believe, realize that the American people will not continue forever to tax themselves to pay export subsidies on wheat at the rate of anything like $200 million a year.

There are others who will say that flexible price supports will solve the problem—that all we have to do is to wait. I am confident that that is not the solution for wheat. Actually, there is little flexibility under such a program. But for the 82½ percent minimum level of support established by law for the year 1955, the flexible support program for wheat means nothing but a straight drop to a rigid 75 percent. With a 75 percent price support level for wheat, nothing will have been accomplished except to further reduce farmers' income from wheat and to bring about some reduction in the amount of export subsidies. Consumption will not be increased. New markets will not be opened. And it will be necessary to keep in effect all the controls which are now in operation. Every complaint that has been made against the 90 percent rigid level of support can be made with equal validity against the flexible price support program when it is applied to wheat.

So long as we pursue the policy of fixing prices as we do under the present wheat support program, we will be caught on the horns of a dilemma. We will either have to fix prices so high as to price wheat out of many of its natural markets, and make the Government itself the principal market, or we will have to fix prices low enough to permit the entry of wheat into the markets of the world. If the latter course were followed, wheat farmers would be compelled to sacrifice a fair return on that portion of the crop which was sold domestically for food, in order to have access to the world market. Wheat farmers are entitled to a program which will not force them to do that.

The only sound program for wheat is one which will return to wheatgrowers their historic right to compete fairly in the markets of the world, without having to sacrifice their domestic food market at home.

The only effective means I know of to accomplish that objective is the domestic parity plan. Certainly no better plan has been advanced, and the committee states that it has traveled far and wide, and that it has heard from practically everyone who has claimed to have any solution of the farm problem.

The plan to which I refer has the active and vigorous support of the National Association of Wheat Growers and they are supported in this position by the National Grange. This program has frequently been referred to as the two-price plan, but the term "two price" is a misnomer. The reference to it as a two-price plan actually has been the cause of some misunderstanding. It has resulted in the domestic parity plan being confused with other and more complicated proposals. It is a misnomer because, under the domestic parity plan, there are not two prices. Under the domestic parity plan, all wheat will be sold freely in the market, at competitive market prices. Prices will be established freely by the forces of competition, and not by Government edict.

The domestic parity plan actually is nothing but a system of marketing which enables producers to obtain a return equal to parity for that portion of the crop which is consumed domestically for human food, and to receive competitive market prices for the portion used for feed or for export. Wheat used for human food domestically should obviously bring a higher return than should wheat used for animal feed. An important factor of my proposal is that all wheat is to be permitted unrestricted movement, and is to be sold at competitive market prices through all channels of trade and at all stages of marketing through to the miller and exporter.

Under this proposal, there would not be any Government subsidy or price support in the market place, after the plan became fully operative. The plan would be self-financing through the use of marketing certificates. Consumers of bread and other wheat food products would continue to pay in the market place, as they do now, only a fair price. But once the plan was fully operative, unlike conditions under the present program, there would no longer be any necessity for consumers and taxpayers making a second payment in the form of taxes for export subsidies or for storage costs or for losses because of spoilage.

The domestic parity plan is particularly suitable for wheat, because the demand for wheat for food uses is highly inelastic. By that, the economists mean that about the same amount of wheat will be consumed for food uses whether the price goes up or down. Thus, it does not help to cut the cost of wheat which goes into bread.

On the other hand, the demand for wheat for feed and export is relatively elastic. By letting wheat again be sold at competitive market prices, the chances of expanding outlets and increasing demand are excellent. There have been a number of instances in the past where export sales have been lost by as little as one-eighth of a cent or less because of the rigidity of our prices, which are fixed by the Government through the amount of the export subsidy. Grain merchants or millers, under the present system, cannot merchandise wheat and wheat products. All they can do is to call up the Department of Agriculture and find out what subsidy is being paid. That establishes the price, and it is well known to both buyers and sellers alike. If foreign buyers cannot buy cheaper anywhere else, then the United States

may make the sale. Is it any wonder that our export markets are dwindling under such a system?

One of the most hopeful things about the domestic parity plan, however, from the standpoint of wheatgrowers and for our national economy, is that returns to farmers will be higher under it than under the present program, even if the plan does not result in any increase in consumption, which, of course, it is almost certain to do. According to the best estimates available, wheat producers in 1954 would have received, on the same volume of wheat, about the same return under the domestic parity plan as they did under the rigid 90 percent of parity program. If, however, an allowance were made for some increased use for feed or export, as certainly could reasonably be expected, there would have been an income difference in favor of the domestic parity plan.

In 1955, with the support level under the present plan reduced to 82½ percent of parity, a minimum of 7 percent more income would have been received under the domestic parity plan on the same 55 million acre national allotment. In 1956, it is estimated that the return would be 9 to 10 percent greater.

The domestic parity plan should be of great interest to poultry producers and dairymen in the eastern section of our country. Poultrymen, for example, have been having to purchase feed wheat, which has been supported at bread price levels, feed it to their poultry, and then market their poultry in a free market. Under this plan, poultrymen would be able to fill their feed wheat requirements at feed wheat prices, or could, if they preferred, raise their own wheat without fear of being hit with marketing penalties.

During the first session of this Congress, there were a number of proposals to exempt farmers from wheat marketing penalties, if they produced wheat solely for feed, for use solely on their own farms, for feeding their own livestock and poultry. One of these bills, S. 46, passed the Senate.

Proposed legislation such as this clearly points up the inadequacies of the present program, and illustrates how the domestic parity plan is far better adapted to the needs of livestock and poultry producers. Under my amendment, all livestock and poultry producers would be treated equitably. Every livestock and poultry producer, wherever situated, would be able to buy all the wheat needed at feed wheat prices, or they could raise it themselves, without being subject to marketing penalties. They would no longer need be concerned about Government regulations, exemptions, penalties, or what have you.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The opponents of rigid price supports have always claimed this kind of support program would price wheat out of domestic and foreign markets. Is it not true that the domestic parity program, which the Senator has excellently explained, is the only kind of price support program which would make it possible for domestic wheat to compete with wheat produced in other countries?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from North Dakota is absolutely correct, and, in my opinion, it is the only program which will put the wheat-growing sections of the Nation on a parity with other sections. I think we must be practical in enacting a farm program. It is idle to talk about wanting to do something, and then undertake to write a program which does not fit the actualities as they are on the farm.

Mr. YOUNG. Under the present flexible program, the price of wheat is set at the start of each year, and that becomes the price for a whole year. The foreign competitor can set his price just under the price that is set in this country. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The foreign competitor not only can do it, but he does it. That is what has taken away our world market.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish to commend the Senator for giving the best analysis of the domestic parity program I have ever heard. I have always thought it had a great deal of merit. I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Kansas for two reasons.

One reason is that I think the conferees should have an opportunity to consider the proposal. The second reason is that I think the wheat farmers of this Nation should have the right to vote on whether or not they would approve this kind of program.

Before I take my seat, I wish to commend the Senator for the excellent job he has been doing for the farmers of the Nation. Ever since he came to the Senate, the position he has taken has always been commendable. I think the Senator has a knowledge of farm matters which is unexcelled by that of any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his very kind personal remarks. There has been much misinformation about the domestic parity program. In fact, when it is analyzed, it is a very simple program, but much confusion has been spread to the effect that it is so complicated it would not be operative. The truth is that it is the most simple program for the wheat areas.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to commend the Senator for his excellent presentation of the domestic parity program for wheat. I believe I am a cosponsor of the amendment which the Senator proposes to offer.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to say he is not only a cosponsor, but one whose name I am very proud to have on the amendment.

In sponsoring the amendment, I am joined by Senators from various of the wheat-producing States. After all, who would know more about the production of wheat than do those who represent the States which produce the majority of the wheat grown in the United States?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas certainly understands the wheat problem, as it affects the entire Great Plains area.

There are two things which, it seems to me, make this matter worthy of presentation in the form the Senator from Kansas has provided. One is that his amendment places upon the industry, so to speak, or upon the wheat market, the cost of the plan. It relieves the United States Treasury of any suggestion of cost for support loans or anything of the sort. The amendment really gets the price out of the market.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Government wishes to get out of the wheat business, this is the way to do it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the second place, in principle the amendment seems to me to be on all fours with the principle of the minimum wage.

In that connection, I wish to recount to the Senator from Kansas and to the other Senators present an experience I had last fall in discussing this subject with a miller. I went into one of the largest mills and elevator systems in South Dakota, and talked with the president of the company. I said to him, "Of course you pay a minimum wage to everyone who works in the mill, processing wheat, don't you?"

He said, "That's correct, and of course most of them are paid above the minimum."

I said, "In other words, the men who help process the wheat get at least the minimum wage, which is as near parity as we can establish by law, or at least it is a basic wage; and many of them get more, don't they?"

He said, "That's correct."

Then I asked, "Would you object to legislation which would require that you pay the producer of the wheat a fair price for his labor, just as you seek to pay a fair price to the man who does the processing in your plant?"

He thought for a moment, and then said, "I certainly would not object to it, if my competitors were on the same basis."

Growing out of that experience and that discussion, when the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry conducted its hearings at Brookings, S. Dak., in the latter part of October, I carried that suggestion there, and said at the time that I hoped the committee would give consideration to establishing a legal parity price for wheat of milling grade.

I have not thought through the mechanics of it as fully as has the Senator from Kansas. I had thought we might do it merely by means of a legal requirement for receipts and such other records as would enable the miller or elevator man to show that he had paid a legal parity price for the wheat, or that he had paid an amount equivalent to the amount paid for wheat which went into domestic milling consumption.

But I think the plan the Senator from Kansas has in mind handles the mechanics of it better than even a straight legal requirement—through the ceritficate plan which I understand the Senator from Kansas envisions.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not see anything which can be simpler than to use certificates which would have to be purchased by the miller on the basis of the average price for the wheat, as that price was set by the Secretary—which is what our amendment does; and the value of the certificates would be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price—which would be set by the Secretary of Agriculture—would exceed the estimated farm price, as also determined by the Secretary.

It seems to me that is a simple program which would operate with great satisfaction and would give the farmer his fair share of the domestic price paid for the consumption of a commodity on which today we are not only taking losses, as regards the price, but with respect to which we are requiring the Federal Government to contribute hundreds of millions of dollars in price supports and export subsidies.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, with the logic of the Senator from Kansas, it is hard to disagree.

Mr. CARLSON. I sincerely hope that when the amendment is before the Senate, for consideration in connection with the pending farm bill, not only the Senator from South Dakota but many other Senators will see the logic of the amendment and will try somehow, in some way, to help not only the wheatgrowers of the Nation, and agriculture generally, but also the Government itself. It seems to me we have a great opportunity here to be of service.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in concluding, I wish to say that I think the Senator from Kansas should also be commended for the approach he suggests, namely, that we give the farmers this opportunity either to accept or reject the certificate plan.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; as the Senator from South Dakota knows, the amendment provides for a referendum. The farmers, themselves, will determine whether they wish to accept this kind of program. I think we can safely abide by their judgment. Personally, I am willing to do so. We should permit the farmers to vote on the question of whether they wish to participate in such a program.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And in voting on that question, the farmers will have an understanding of just what the plan is, will they not?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to interfere with the presentation the Senator from Kansas is making.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to finish this statement, of course I shall be glad to yield for questions when I have concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are several questions I should like to ask. One of them is: Does the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Kansas fix a minimum price, or floor, under which wheat cannot be sold, and at which point the Government will step in and will offer loans?

Mr. CARLSON. My amendment does that, and it does it for a definite reason. I know the wheatgrowers of the Nation would not want to be unfair to the corn producers or the producers of other feed crops. Therefore, we include in the amendment a provision which will protect those who produce corn and other feed crops.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is that floor?

Mr. CARLSON. I do not happen to have the amendment in my hand at the moment, but I shall get a copy of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Kansas intend to discuss the amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. I now have a copy of it before me, and I shall be glad to read the amendment into the RECORD. The minimum level of support would be determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration the factors specified in the amendment, paragraph (b) of section 380k.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the amendment, as now proposed to be submitted, is adopted, and assuming that the world market price for wheat is, let us say, $1.50 per bushel, what would be the loan basis?

Mr. CARLSON. The section dealing with price supports provides—and again it goes back to the beginning of section 380k, which begins with the words "Notwithstanding any other provision of law"—In fact, I shall read, beginning with the first line of the section, as follows:

PRICE SUPPORT

SEC. 380k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

Then subsection (b) follows—and I now read it:

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available, through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign trade policies of friendly wheat exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

I interpret that to mean that the Secretary of Agriculture would set a rate that would not be so low as to disrupt the entire world market. That is not the idea.

Mr. ELLENDER. But under that language the Secretary could fix the price of wheat, which would be used for feed, in line with the price of corn.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; but he should not make it so low as to wreck the price support for corn, or the corn market. That is very definitely protected, and I would have it no other way.

Mr. ELLENDER. What about acreage controls or marketing quotas? Would the farmers vote for them, as such, or could they plant all the wheat they might desire?

Mr. CARLSON. The amendment is so drawn that the farmers would cooperate, under acreage controls as they do now. However, until this program is underway it would not disrupt the present acreage-control and marketing-quota program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same machinery would be used?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. As I see the future of this legislation, when and if it is enacted, we should be able to eliminate that feature, but we cannot do it with the present surpluses, and the situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would be the normal difference in price, as between wheat used for human consumption and wheat used for feed?

Mr. CARLSON. The price in the market place would be the same—namely, the price fixed by the law of supply and demand. But farmers would receive on their proportionate share of the wheat used for human food in addition to the market price certificates having a value equal to the difference between the average market price and 100 percent of parity, so that their total returns on wheat used for human food would approximate 100 percent of parity.

That would be the basis for the figure which the farmer would receive for his share of domestically-consumed wheat. Also the Secretary could set a support level for all wheat, and that might, in effect, be the market price, generally speaking, for wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, wheat now consumed domestically for food amounts to about 575 million bushels a year.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is correct. My figures are somewhat more than 500 million. The figure is rather consistent. It is interesting to note that it does not change very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would that amount of wheat be apportioned among the wheat growers? Would it be apportioned on the historic basis of their past plantings?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. It would be apportioned on the present State basis, county basis, and individual farm basis, with about 1 percent available for allocation, for various reasons.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to that, as I understand the Senator's amendment, the farmer would receive the equivalent of 100 percent of parity.

Mr. CARLSON. Based upon what the Secretary determines is 100 percent of parity; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certificates would be issued to wheat growers in the amount of the difference between the market price of wheat and 100 percent of parity?

Mr. CARLSON. Certificates would be offered to the wheat grower for his share of the domestic allotment in an amount to equal the difference between the aver-

age price of wheat and 100 percent of parity.

I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for bringing into the bill domestic parity for rice. It is a very wholesome situation to find that there are others who begin to believe that we must solve the farm problem on a commodity-to-commodity basis. It may not be what we want to do, but I am convinced that wheat, for example, must be handled as a commodity. I think as we study the problems and advance into the future we shall find that our foreign markets will be even more limited than they are now unless we do something constructive. We must work out a commodity program. I commend the Senator for suggesting a program for rice. I expect to support that program.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator. I might say that wheat would have been included in a two-price structure, except for the violent opposition to the plan from the administration. Certain members of the administration were opposed to the rice program. I felt that inasmuch as the rice program affects so few farmers, and rice is grown in only 4 or 5 States, we could at least make a start in that direction by giving the two-price plan a trial run on rice.

Mr. CARLSON. I sincerely hope that we can eliminate some of the opposition from those in Government who deal with this problem, because I think what has been proposed is the solution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator intend to discuss the effect this program would have on the wheat agreement now in existence?

Mr. CARLSON. I expect to go into that subject.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield very briefly?

Mr. CARLSON. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In the first place, I realize that the Senator from Kansas knows that the great eastern portion of the State which I in part represent is largely a wheat-growing section in the agricultural areas. I am also sure that the Senator from Kansas knows that the wheat growers on those vast areas are very predominantly supporters of the domestic parity plan. While I cannot presume to speak for them, I feel that they are very appreciative of the leadership which the distinguished Senator from Kansas has demonstrated in sponsoring this amendment to the agricultural bill.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to have the RECORD show that the junior Senator from Oregon represents a great wheat-growing State. We in Kansas not only are aware of it, but also appreciate it, because it gives us some real competition in wheat production. The wheat farmers of Oregon are very ably represented in the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. So that I may give one brief boost to our wheat growers in Oregon, I should like to say that recently I heard from a man who had visited Europe. He is an expert on cooking, and writes cook books. He said Oregon wheat was in great demand in Europe for cakes and fine pastries, and that some of the finest pastry cooks of Europe prefer Oregon wheat.

Mr. CARLSON. Of course we in Kansas like to say that Kansas grows the best wheat in the world.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We will not argue that interesting point. I do know that we agree on many points already. I should like to ask the Senator a question on one phase of the issue which he is so ably sponsoring on the floor of the Senate. Is it not accurate to say that today, in very large measure, the farm program has reached what might be called a crisis? In other words, because of the dropping of farm income because of the fact that certain families have had to leave the farm, and because of other critical situations confronting agriculture in general, is it not correct to say that perhaps the time has come for a certain amount of experimentation with respect to farm legislation?

We realize that all legislation which is adopted for the first time is more or less experimental. I care not whether it is social security legislation, national forest legislation, or Federal Reserve legislation, to name a few. That is true regardless of what type of legislation we have in mind. I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not particularly true that the time has come to give the domestic parity plan a full and fair trial.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator from Oregon will permit me, I should like to say that he makes a very interesting suggestion when he says it is time to experiment. I am in thorough accord with him. I do not understand how anyone can reach any other conclusion if he studies the wheat situation. We have a billion bushels of surplus wheat, and in order to export any wheat at all we must subsidize its export to the extent of from 60 to 80 cents a bushel. There is some question as to whether there will be another international wheat agreement or an extension of the present one.

Our farmers have taken very serious acreage reductions and a reduction in price support to 76 percent.

It seems to me that that situation presents a picture which requires not only rather drastic action, but also some imaginative action.

Mr. NEUBERGER. For example the soil-bank proposal is to some degree an experiment also; is that not correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Such a program would also be an experiment to some extent; would it not?

Mr. CARLSON. It would.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If it should be adopted, some parts of it might not work out very well and might have to be dealt with in future legislation. Is that not true?

Mr. CARLSON. The junior Senator from Kansas, in introducing his proposal originally, which is now being cosponsored by the junior Senator from Oregon, never felt it was a perfect bill. However, it affords some ground work for legislation which we hope will be helpful.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not also true that of almost all the various farm plans which have been proposed the domestic parity plan has been proposed longer than any other plan? If I am not mistaken, this plan had its genesis in the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe it was adopted twice by Congress and vetoed twice. We in Oregon are particularly conscious of the McNary-Haugen bill because one of the most illustrious men ever to represent the State of Oregon was the principal sponsor of the bill. He was the Honorable Charles L. McNary, whom I believe the Senator from Kansas knew.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; I did know the Honorable Charles McNary. I appreciate his service to the Nation, particularly in behalf of agriculture.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Perhaps the Senator from Kansas will concur in this statement: The wheat growers are to be commended for being willing to take the lead in urging upon Congress and the Nation a program which very largely will get them out from under any program of Government support, certainly in its later stages.

Mr. CARLSON. The amendment, if approved by Congress, will permit the Government to get out from under the program of subsidies and relieve it of growing expenditures. Moreover, it will get the farmers out from under a program of controls and marketing quotas.

Again I say that all that cannot happen immediately. It will take some time to work it out in view of the surpluses which have accumulated and because of some other problems in the national farm picture.

Mr. NEUBERGER. There can be no question that the problem will have to start slowly. In the beginning, undoubtedly there will be some very strict controls. There will have to be. There will have to be acreage controls. However, I know that the people in both our great grain-growing States appreciate that fact when they urge upon us this program.

In conclusion I wish again to thank the Senator from Kansas, who is one of the most fairminded men in the Senate, and to assure him that when his amendment comes to a vote I shall be very happy to serve in the ranks behind his leadership and do all I can to help secure the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas for having given us a very thorough explanation of the proposed legislation. I also wish to commend him for his interest and intelligent support of the ranchers and farmers of his State.

We had an example of his splendid service this afternoon, when the Senate considered the bill to refund the tax on gasoline used on the farm. It was the Senator from Kansas who introduced the proposed legislation in the first session of

this Congress. It became a part of the 9-point farm program. In the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry we voted it out of committee early this year because we felt we should try to have such legislation adopted immediately in order to give the farmers the benefit of the tax refund during the coming cropping season.

I wish again to commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his intelligent and courageous service on behalf of ranchers and farmers.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the Senator's kind remarks. It was on March 5, 1955, that I introduced a bill for the removal of the tax on farm-used gasoline. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota was a co-sponsor of that measure. Today that bill was passed by the Senate. I am very happy about it.

Mr. President, continuing with my remarks on the domestic parity plan, I should like to say that the domestic parity plan is simple and its administration would be easy. I would like to review it briefly because apparently there has been some confusion or lack of understanding as to its operation, particularly in high places of Government and by some farm leaders.

First. At the beginning of each marketing year, the Secretary of Agriculture would determine the portion of the wheat crop which would go into consumption as human food. This amount, which for years has been about 500 million bushels, would be the domestic food quota.

Second. The domestic food quota would then be allotted among the wheat farms of the Nation, substantially on the same basis as acreage allotments are now made, except that in this case the acreage would be translated into bushels and the share of each farm would be in bushels.

Third. Each farmer would receive a certificate stating in bushels his share of the estimated domestic consumption of wheat for food.

Fourth. The certificate would have a value in dollars and cents representing the difference between the average market price of wheat—as estimated in advance by the Secretary of Agriculture—and 100 percent of parity.

For purposes of illustration, let us assume that the domestic food quota for a farm—represented by marketing certificates—is 1,000 bushels and that the difference between the estimated market price of wheat and full parity is 75 cents per bushel. In that case, the certificate would be worth $750.

The marketing certificates would be negotiable drafts on the Commodity Credit Corporation. They could be issued to farmers ahead of harvesting time, thereby helping them to finance farm operations during the high-expense season. The certificates could also serve to some extent as insurance against low crop yields.

Fifth. The domestic parity plan is self-financing. Each miller or processor of wheat into human food would be required to purchase from the Commodity Credit Corporation certificates covering the total amount of wheat processed for domestic consumption as human food. It would not be necessary for farmers to deal directly with the millers, or millers directly with the farmers, because the millers could obtain the certificates directly from or through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Sixth. The value of the certificate received by the farmer, plus the price received in the market place for his wheat, will return to the grower the equivalent of full parity on that portion of the crop consumed domestically as food and the competitive market price for that portion of the crop used for feed or export.

The very important advantage that the domestic parity plan has over the present support program is that there will be a real incentive for producers to produce quality wheat—of the type that is in demand in the market place. This incentive would arise from the fact that the value of the certificates would be based on the average price of all wheat. The wheat would actually sell in the market place at competitive prices. Producers with higher quality wheat would naturally receive higher or better than average prices. Thus, unlike the present program or the present bill, quality production would be rewarded according to the value of the wheat determined competitively in the market instead of by Government edict.

I know of no sound opposition which has been raised against the domestic parity plan for wheat. Some corn belt farm spokesmen have expressed the fear that this plan might result in an increase in the total quantity of livestock feed, and thereby adversely affect the price of corn. They contend that if wheat producers are able to get a return equivalent to parity on the part of the crop consumed as food, it will increase their average return and therefore they will expand production and put more wheat into the feed market in competition with corn.

I would be the first to agree that whatever benefits accrue to wheat must not be at the expense of corn or any other crop. And vice versa. To give double assurance that the domestic parity plan will not adversely affect the interests of corn and feed grain producers, authority is contained in my amendment to give the Secretary discretionary power to support the price of all wheat in line with the support price for corn, and that he also have discretionary authority to impose acreage allotments. This authority is also necessary so long as we have the continued large surplus stocks on hand.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. This domestic parity plan for wheat has some similarity to the program for some other commodities, in that it is self-financing and has the commodity approach.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to commend the Senator for his remarks, and, as he knows, I am in favor of his amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Nebraska represents an increasingly large wheat growing section which produces a fine quality of milling wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. During the past 2 weeks I have received several communications from wheatgrowers in the State of Kansas who apparently believe that if this amendment is adopted they can immediately plant as much wheat as they wish to without restrictions. The Senator does not understand that to be the fact, does he?

Mr. CARLSON. No. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that my amendment provides for operation under acreage restrictions. I think that must be done until some of the surpluses have been eliminated or at least reduced. I hope the time will come when the wheat farmers can operate without such restrictions.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure but that perhaps under the language of the amendment they could plant all the wheat they wanted to, but they could not get any certificates.

Mr. CARLSON. Or price support.

Mr. AIKEN. I mention this because the letters which I have received on the subject have come from persons in the State of Kansas, and, without commenting particularly on the merits of the proposal, I have simply informed them that they would still remain under the acreage restrictions.

Mr. CARLSON. The amendment I am offering provides for a referendum.

Mr. AIKEN. The penalty is a little different for exceeding acreage allotments.

Mr. CARLSON. A rather severe penalty is provided for violating marketing quotas. For that reason I think it is a program from which the farmers themselves will receive benefit.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the Senator from Vermont concluded?

Mr. AIKEN. I am through. I was simply trying to clear up the point, and my question was prompted by half a dozen letters which I have received from persons in the State of Kansas in the past 2 weeks.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas a question. It is one of the questions which I am sure is causing a great deal of concern to everyone who is giving serious consideration to the Senator's amendment.

If a farmer has an allotment which is already settled by law, and he is then assigned a quota, as would be done under the Senator's amendment, will not the general effect be that the farmer will receive a certificate or certificates for wheat under the quota, for the difference between the amount the wheat is sold for in the market place and the parity? Will not the general tendency be to dump wheat on the market and create a glut in the feed market and thereby cause, perhaps, an increase in the production of livestock, which will, in reality, accentuate other agricultural production?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad the Senator has brought up that point. I expect to go into it as I proceed. It is a very important point, and involves one of the complaints we hear against the program. It is said that instead of planting, as at present, 55 million acres of wheat, it is hoped to go back to 78 million acres. We have taken 23 million acres out of wheat-growing and are growing, instead, corn, forage, milo, oats, and barley. I am confident that we would have had millions of tons less feed had the land produced only wheat.

It is one of the problems which confront us. The corn producer is greatly concerned about the competition from other feed crops and has suffered seriously, as have cattle and hog producers because of lower prices for livestock. It has resulted in a terrific drop in the farmers' national income. It was shown yesterday that they had lost several billion dollars from 1951 to 1955.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is my understanding—and I think I understand the proposal—that there will not be a return to 70 million acres for wheat, and that there will be no increase in the allotments. We have found that it is very difficult to make adjustments in the agricultural field without doing so at the expense of someone else. The instance cited by the Senator from Kansas was with respect to wheat acreage. The bottom fell out of the cattle market in August or September 1952, and nothing, apparently, was done about it. Yet with a cattle population of 93 million in 1953 and with the price not improving in the meantime, we have a cattle population today of 97 million, which means that the cattle population has increased 1 million head, on an average, each one of the years since that time. So, we have found that the various branches of agriculture are interrelated, and it is a very difficult thing to pick out one grower at the expense of some other grower. I am certain the Senator from Kansas has that in mind. That is why I propounded the question. I have that fear.

Mr. CARLSON. The junior Senator from Colorado has touched on a point which concerns all of us. I am confident that what he has said is the view of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. The minute we begin to tinker with the agricultural problem, and attempt to improve conditions in one sector we run into difficulties in other sectors. This is not an easy problem. I sympathize with all those who have worked on the problem, because it is not an easy one to solve.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wondered if the Senator from Kansas had any consultation with the State Department on the possible effects of the two-price system upon our international relations. I realize that we have in effect now a two-price system for the exportation of wheat. I believe the subsidization has gone to as high as 87 cents a bushel, with the average being about 75 cents a bushel under the International Wheat Agreement. I wondered if the State Department had expressed any opinion as to what the effect would be, psychologically as well as economically, because in these days the psychological effect is sometimes even greater than the economic effect.

Mr. CARLSON. I have a letter from the State Department which I shall read. I think the present arrangement is certainly a dumping program. I do not think the program under the domestic parity could be so classified.

Mr. AIKEN. The present program, even if it be called a dumping program, is orderly, and is followed after consultation with other wheat-producing countries. The United States has worked very closely with Canada in the sale of wheat. We refuse to sell wheat to Canada and Russia. Canada sells wheat to Russia. We sell our wheat somewhere else.

The Foreign Agricultural Administration has done a tremendous job. In the past few days they have really taken hold. I think that sales to foreign countries in the past few days have been in the neighborhood of $200 million. At that rate, we shall reduce our surpluses.

At the same time, there is a little difference between quietly selling at the world market price, and advertising that we are going to unload at a price which the highest bidder will pay. There is a little difference there.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not know that I can agree with the last statement by the Senator from Vermont. It occurs to me that if we sell on the world market and do not try to undercut that market—if we sell at the world wheat trade price—we are not dumping our wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. We are selling and subsidizing under the International Wheat Agreement. I believe we are selling somewhat more wheat this year than we sold last year.

It looks as if the International Wheat Agreement may be on its way out. It has been in existence for some years, and I think it has done some good. But if the United Kingdom and other countries intend to refuse to take part in it, it probably will not continue in existence. The only reason why those countries intend to refuse to go into the wheat agreement is that they think the price of wheat will come down, and that they can buy wheat competitively at a lower price than the price they must pay under the wheat agreement.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand, Great Britain did not participate in the International Wheat Agreement the last time the United States took part in it.

Mr. AIKEN. She did not; and that made it more difficult for the other participating nations. Great Britain 2 years ago thought $1.50 a bushel was plenty for anyone to pay for wheat. The minimum price, as I recall, was $1.55. We have not sold any wheat as low as that. I think the price today is about $1.75 on the world market, and that seems to be low enough. Even at that, it is necessary for the United States Government to subsidize substantially.

Mr. CARLSON. I had hoped some of the subsidization of wheat at high prices might be eliminated. I do not believe this Nation will long permit the export of wheat at a subsidy which runs to 87 cents a bushel. Some persons are talking about a subsidy of $1 a bushel.

Mr. AIKEN. No; I don't doubt if such a program could be maintained very long. I think Great Britain was willing to go along with the agreement while she thought some progress might have been made on the open market. We have been holding an umbrella over our prices on wheat, and also other prices, as well, such as on cotton.

Egypt, by selling cotton, which is under our price umbrella, has been cutting down on her own market, because there is a level above which either people do not buy as much, or substitutes move in. That has been true of cotton. I am certain. I do not know what substitute there might be for wheat, other than rice and some of the other grains.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not have the figures available, but if my information is not incorrect, there are foreign countries which are subsidizing their wheat at a higher percentage in dollars than we are.

Mr. AIKEN. There are many foreign countries which are subsidizing wheat, and that is partly the result of a fear of war. They do not want to get caught again. They want to step up the production of wheat, which is a very important war grain. On the other hand, I think they have subsidized in an effort to become independent of higher prices which have been charged throughout the world, and we have taken the lead in that program. Some producing countries have subsidized, but they have ways of manipulating the subsidization so that no one knows—at least, I do not know—what it costs them to do it. Some countries subsidize their programs at very high prices. I think some of them have engaged in uneconomic subsidization.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in accord with the Senator's statement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Vermont have at his tongue point the amounts of wheat, if any, which came into this country from Canada in the last 2 or 3 years?

Mr. AIKEN. There has been very little in the last 2 or 3 years. Some wheat goes back and forth across the border. There was a 3-year period when 66 million bushels came into the United States as feed wheat, but which actually was misused. The importation of wheat to the United States has dropped to a low point. The importation of oats has dropped now to a negligible point. In my section of the country, where formerly large quantities of oats were imported from Canada, oats are now coming from Ohio, and even from as far west as Iowa. Oats have become plentiful in the United States, and the tendency is to buy them in this country. Furthermore, we are now producing better oats in this country. One reason why we went to Canada for oats a few years ago

was that heavy oats, which were worth more, could be obtained there.

Mr. CARLSON. On February 24, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] placed in the RECORD a table entitled "Wheat: Production, Stocks, Markets." In view of the question asked by the senior Senator from Oregon, I note the following:

The imports of wheat for the years 1935 to 1939, average, were 14.2 million bushels. The 1945 to 1949 average imports were 1.2 million bushels. The 1950 to 1954 average imports 15 million bushels. The imports in 1953 were 5.5 million bushels. The imports in 1954 were 4.4 bushels. The estimated imports of wheat for 1955 were 4 million bushels.

I think those, without doubt are official figures, and should clear up the Senator's question.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe a large amount of that wheat is feed grain, which moves close to the border.

Mr. YOUNG. A little of it is seed wheat. Canada has sent about 2 million bushels of this wheat, much of which we didn't need, into North Dakota alone. It is Selkirk seed wheat. We have plenty of it ourselves. It can be treated and sent over the border as wheat unfit for human consumption, and thus get by our import regulations.

North Dakota farmers are selling their seed wheat and are buying wheat all cleaned and treated for less than they can produce it.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the importation is down to a minimum for what we need in trading back and forth.

Mr. CARLSON. The table to which I have referred, which appears in the RECORD of February 24, 1956, is an excellent one and contains figures on the imports and exports of wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the importation of good wheat for milling purposes has been practically prohibited ever since about 1942. I believe President Roosevelt placed that ban into effect. The only wheat which now comes into this country is supposed to be either for feed or for seed, except for a very small quantity.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table which appears on page 3338 of the RECORD, and which was inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wheat: Production, stocks, markets

[Million bushels, except as otherwise indicated]

Crop year beginning July 1	1935–39 average	1945–49 average	1950–54 average	1953	1954	1955 estimate
Carry-in	154.5	193.2	508.3	562.5	902.4	1,020.6
Production	758.6	1,202.4	1,090.7	1,169.5	984.8	938.2
Imports	14.2	1.2	15.0	5.5	4.4	4.0
Total supply	927.3	1,396.9	1,614.0	1,737.5	1,891.6	1,962.8
Domestic consumption [1]	692.7	759.1	656.6	618.6	597.3	623
Exports	53.3	415.4	329.9	216.5	273.7	275
Total disappearance	746.0	1,174.5	986.5	835.1	871.0	898
Carry-out	181.3	222.4	627.5	902.4	1,020.6	1,064.8
United States exports as a percentage of world trade (percent)	8.8	47.6	34.3	24.7	29.1	[2] 29
	Calendar year					
Per capita civilian consumption of wheat flour (pounds)	157	144	129	126	124	121
Per capita civilian consumption of wheat breakfast cereals (pounds)	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1

[1] This is a residual figure.

[2] Based on the following statement: "World wheat trade in 1955–56 may approximate that of 1954–55."—The Wheat Situation, WS 146, Oct. 31, 1955, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

"Practically all our wheat and flour exports now move only under direct subsidy or under special export programs."—Economic Report of the President, January 1956.

United States quota under International Wheat Agreement, 1955–56 (million bushels) 196.5

Total export quota under International Wheat Agreement, 1955–56 (million bushels) 395.0

United States quota as a percentage of tota. quota (percent) 49.8

Cost of Wheat Agreement subsidies to United States:

	Total cost	Cents per bushel
1950–51	$178,179,517	67.0
1951–52	166,928,526	65.5
1952–53	138,990,015	54.3
1953–54	55,893,000	47.0
1954–55	98,482,076	74.8
1955–56 estimate	(a)	(a)

[a] Subsidy rates on Jan. 30, 1956, were 66 to 87 cents per bushel, depending on port, type of wheat, and destination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator that I highly commend him for the statement he is making in support of the amendment. As he knows, I am one of the cosponsors of the amendment, and he and I each have pending before the Senate a separate bill on this subject matter. The bills are almost identical, the differences being only in the administrative procedural provisions.

Tomorrow I shall make my major speech on the farm legislative program, a section of which will be in support of the proposal of the Senator from Kansas for the so-called two-price system for wheat.

I have been very much interested in the questions put to the Senator from Kansas by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Nebraska, and also in the remarks of our friend, the Senator from Vermont. I think this afternoon the Senator from Kansas is entitled to this very brief sentence or two from me in support of his position, because the record ought to bear out what he says, that the wheatgrowers are desirous of cooperating in every possible way in working out a procedure which will not do what the Senator from Colorado pointed out we must be on guard against, namely, simply moving a problem from one segment of agriculture to another segment of agriculture. The wheat farmers have no desire to put their problems on the backs of corngrowers, for example. They only take the position that their segment of agriculture should not be forced to carry an unfair load.

What we are fighting for, in the proposal of the Senator from Kansas, is really the application of one of the provisions of the old McNary-Haugen bill. There are some who believe that if, years ago, we had adopted some of the major provisions of the McNary-Haugen bill, we might not be in the farm trouble we are now experiencing.

As the Senator from Kansas has pointed out, the wheat producers are perfectly willing to go along with any reasonable allotment program, which is a pretty reliable test of their good faith. They are not asking to be allowed to do anything they want to do with respect to production. They will go along with acreage allotments, but what they are trying to point out is that if we continue the program we are now following, we may very well wake up, in the not too distant future, in a time of great crisis, and find we have no breadbasket.

We hear much, as I shall point out tomorrow, said about our having excess wheat, but that situation has been exaggerated out of all proportion. If we should get into serious international difficulties we would find in a few months that we did not have enough wheat.

The proposal of the Senator from Kansas is a very fair and reasonable one. Something has to be done to stop the economic depression which the wheat farmers are now suffering. When we deal with that segment of our agricul-

tural economy, we deal with a farm operation which requires a terrifically high capital outlay. Take the cost of producing wheat in the dry farming areas, with which the Senator from Kansas is very familiar. There is required an extremely high investment in machinery alone, for which the wheat producer has to put himself in debt. We cannot expect producers to continue to run the risks we ask them to undertake, with the present falling scale of income from wheat production.

I wish to commend the Senator from Kansas. The Senate has before it a program which is workable. The Senator from Kansas and I did not draft it; it was drafted by experts in the field of wheat production. In my State it is a program which is strongly recommended by the Oregon Wheat League. I did not endorse it until I was satisfied it was a sound proposal. I commend the Senator for what he is doing, and say to him that I am very proud to be associated with him in his attempt to do justice to the wheat producers.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the comments which the Senator from Oregon has just made. He represents a great wheatgrowing State in his own right. We folks in Kansas look to Oregon as not only one of the great wheat-producing States, but one which gives us stiff competition. We appreciate the problems not only of the State of Oregon and of the State of Kansas, but of all the wheat-producing sections of the country.

I am personally convinced we will not solve the wheat problem until we deal with the entire agricultural problem on a commodity basis. We have to handle it on the basis of each farm commodity. We have been trying to deal with the problem on an across-the-board basis by fixing parity prices, acreage allotments, or marketing quotas on all commodities. We are going to have to proceed on a commodity basis.

I was pleased to note that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry wrote into the bill a provision treating rice as an individual commodity. I think that is the proper way to begin such a program.

I am sure the Senator from Oregon will agree with me when I say that we do not regard the program we propose as being perfect. We have presented a program prepared by men who are familiar with wheatgrowing and with the processing and exporting of this crop, which is one of our great agricultural commodities.

For instance, in the State of Kansas, the Kansas Wheat Growers Association favored the program at their State convention. The National Grange has favored it. The Kansas State Farm Bureau at its State meeting endorsed it. So we have support for the proposal from persons who are really interested in agriculture

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. It is also my understanding that the Secretary of Agriculture has changed his position somewhat with regard to the proposal we have submitted. Whereas until recently the Department of Agriculture filed adverse reports on it, the Secretary of Agriculture said, at a meeting of the Oregon Wheat League some days ago, in effect—I do not quote him verbatim, but I am sure I paraphrase his remarks accurately—that he thought there was considerable merit in the proposal made, and he suggested there be a postponement of its consideration for a year, until the Department could give it more study and until there could be a fuller understanding and greater support of the proposal. I think that indicated a considerable shift of position on his part.

My only response now is what it was at that time, that the wheat farmers should not be asked to wait a year, because the need is immediate, and if we have before the Senate a proposition which is sound in principle, we think it ought to be made part of farm legislation this year.

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad the Senator from Oregon made that statement. I have not tried to quote the Secretary of Agriculture on this matter as I have interpreted what he said in previous meetings regarding the plan we have submitted. I think the Senator from Oregon has stated the position of the Secretary of Agriculture accurately, to the effect that the Department at least is sympathetic toward its consideration and has some hope it may secure approval in a year or so.

The amendment we shall offer could not become operative until 1957. Then it would go into effect on the basis of a referendum, in which I believe the wheat growers should be permitted to vote.

Mr. President, before I yielded, I was stating, in regard to corn, that certainly we did not want to do anything which would adversely affect the corn and feed producers.

If they will but thoroughly analyze the situation, corn producers actually have no reason to fear the domestic parity plan for wheat, because if the domestic parity plan did result in expanded wheat acreage, it would reduce rather than increase the total supply of feed grain. This is because an acre of wheat produces less feed than it does when it is planted to corn or other feed grains.

In 1954, we produced approximately 37 percent more feed on acres diverted from wheat than would have been produced had the same acres been used for feed-wheat production. Feed-grain tonnage in the form of oats, barley, and grain sorghums in 1955, on the land taken out of wheat, was over 50 percent greater than it would have been if the acreage had remained in wheat.

On the basis of last August 1 figures, the increase in production of oats, barley, and grain sorghums in 1955, over the 10-year average—1944 to 1953—was 558 million bushels, or 11.1 million tons, while the reduction in wheat production in the same period was only 243 million bushels, or 7.3 million tons. I know that figures such as these are hard to grasp; but in essence these figures show that as acreage is taken out of wheat, which is required under the present program, it actually results in increasing the total supply of feed grains, whereas, increases in wheat acreages decrease total feed grain supplies, even if all the wheat produced on the increased acreage is used for livestock feed.

If corn producers wish to reduce or prevent surplus feed supplies, they would be well advised to advocate and support the domestic-parity plan for wheat.

Some who have attempted to oppose the domestic-parity plan for wheat have charged that in some way it would result in dumping wheat in the world market, and thereby offend our international friends. Charges of this character appear to be based on emotion, rather than on fact. The word "dump" is an ugly word. It is calculated to stir up unwarranted fears.

The domestic-parity plan, which will enable American farmers to obtain from American consumers fair compensation for the wheat consumed as food, can in no way constitute dumping. Wheat will move into the domestic market and into the world market at competitive market prices. There will be no export subsidies, under the domestic-parity plan, as there is now under the current program, unless some stop-loss price support is required under the whole program because of the huge surplus stocks on hand.

Actually, the domestic-parity plan will provide the means for the eventual elimination of the program of dumping, which is currently going on and which is inherent in either the present flexible or the rigid support program, as both of those programs require millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to subsidize American wheat into export markets of the world.

During the last 6 years we have expended $771 million on wheat-export subsidies. Under the operation of the domestic-parity plan, all export dumping would be completely eliminated, since public funds would not be used or required for subsidizing exports, once the plan is fully under operation.

If there is any better plan than the domestic-parity plan for meeting the problems confronting the wheat producers today, I certainly do not know of it, and it certainly has not been presented to the Senate for action.

In summary, the domestic-parity plan would result in the following advantages to wheat farmers, other agricultural producers, the grain trade, the Government, and the general public:

First. Wheat farmers would regain their historic right to compete fairly and on a quality basis in the markets of the world, without being compelled to sacrifice their income protection in the domestic market; they would be relieved of otherwise unavoidable pressure for future curtailment of acreage, and, at the same time, the declining trends of their income would be halted; they would no longer have to rely upon the appropriation of public funds for subsidizing exports, whether under international agreements or otherwise; the elimination of marketing quotas would restore greater freedom of initiative in the planning of farm operations in accordance with changing production and market conditions; producers of varieties and types of wheat not wanted in the market place would no longer be receiving the same price protection as

that received by the producers of quality wheat—the types of wheat demanded by mills and preferred by exporters; there would be greater reward for quality production than under present programs; and the resulting incentives for raising the overall quality of the United States wheat crop would put back the United States into international wheat trade as a historic competitor on a quality basis.

Second. Other agricultural producers would be relieved of the pressure of acreage diversion from wheat to other crops for which price supports are available for unlimited production; and since as a direct result of the stringent acreage and marketing controls imposed on wheat under present legislation, the acreage and production of feed grains other than corn increased to all-time record proportions, and extensive displacement of corn in livestock feeding by oats, barley, and grain sorghums, has made corn price supports ineffective; and since excessive supplies and depressed prices of feed grains are substantially responsible for the present low levels of livestock prices; and since an acre of wheat produces less feed than an acre planted to corn, oats, barley, or grain sorghums, any increase in wheat acreage such as may result under the operation of the domestic parity plan, would reduce the total supply of feed grains, even if all the wheat produced on the increased acreage were used for livestock feed and, by so checking the tendency of feed grain supplies to increase at a faster rate than livestock production is capable of expansion, would impart greater stability to all segments of agriculture directly or indirectly affected by the present plight of producers of corn and livestock products.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Kansas has made a very important point, because we have heard considerable objection to the use of a two-price wheat program, and it has been stated that such a program will have a disastrous effect on corn. But, on the basis of the acreage allotment system which already has been put into effect in respect to other farm commodities, the corn producers have seen a tremendous increase in the production of barley, oats, and the other competing grains.

On tomorrow, I shall state for the RECORD the figures in connection with that situation, and I shall comment on it at some length. But at this time I say, most respectfully, that I think the corn producers are really crying before they are hurt, insofar as wheat is concerned, because the corn producers have already been very badly hurt from the standpoint of the production of oats, barley, rye, and the other competing grains. Under this program we really shall have an acreage allotment plan or program which will protect the corn producers from the wheat producers, in that as wheat acreage is taken out of production, the corn producers will not find that acreage being used for the production of competing grains.

That is a point which needs to be stressed during this debate, because it is a point which is very much overlooked. If the corn producers wish to protect themselves, in my judgment they should favor this program, rather than the present program, because the present program has resulted in increasing the production of competing grains.

Mr. CARLSON. There can be no question about that. The corn producers will be much better off under the program we propose. If the acreage devoted to other feed crops or grains is increased, such increased production must be fed to livestock. In that way the market for feed grains in the great feed-grain-producing States will really be destroyed.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Third. The grain trade would directly benefit from the large-scale withdrawal of the Government from the marketing functions it now performs in buying, warehousing, and merchandising an ever increasing portion of the wheat crop in direct competition and interference with private enterprise; and the reestablishment of one open market price and the unrestricted movement of all wheat through all stages of marketing, domestic and export, would restore to the wheat trade its traditional marketing functions on a free and competitive basis.

Fourth. The Government would be relieved of appropriating large amounts of public funds for operating a subsidy system under which the entire wheat crop is supported domestically at prices substantially above export and world prices, and subsidized into the export market at lower prices; marketing quotas would be dispensed with, thus obviating the need for special legislation to exempt for marketing quotas, producers who wish to grow wheat for feed; and the Government could withdraw from the extensive purchasing, warehousing, and selling activities in which it is now engaged.

Fifth. The general public would be relieved of the burden of wheat export subsidies, amounting to $200 million, annually under the present program, and of the cost of aimless, excessive and wasteful storage operations, amounting to another $200 million annually.

Under my amendment, the domestic parity plan would not be forced on wheat farmers against their will. My amendment merely provides that wheat farmers have the opportunity of putting the domestic parity plan in operation through a majority vote of the wheat farmers of the Nation.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much the opportunity I have had to present this matter to the Senate. I believe our proposal is important, not only for the wheatgrowers, but also for agriculture generally.

When my amendment comes up for debate and for vote, beginning Thursday of this week, I shall solicit the support of other Senators for the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further comment?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Again I commend the Senator for what I think is a very able argument in support of the amendment. I think the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER], in bringing before the Senate a bill containing, with respect to rice, the principle of the amendment, has honored us by at least recognizing the economic soundness of our position. I hope before the debate is over to win over my friend from Louisiana to the point of applying the principle to wheat, as well as rice. I think it is sound for rice. I think it is equally sound for wheat.

The last point I wish to make is with regard to the observation the Senator from Kansas made concerning the subsidy payments we are now making to producers of wheat. Under the proposed program we would eliminate such payments. In my judgment we would do something else. I shall discuss this point further tomorrow. I think we would strengthen our position in international relations. In my opinion one of the long-time results will be to get wheat into certain sections of the world which need wheat, and where wheat is not now being sold.

I know the old argument that if we follow a program of foreign trade in respect to wheat under some such proposal, whereby we may get wheat into sections where it is not now used, at some sort of so-called dump price, we will upset the world-wheat market. I think that is plain nonsense. We are not going to upset the world wheat market by getting wheat into an area where mouths are not being adequately fed at this time. What we need to do with surplus wheat is to get it into those areas of the world where wheat is not now used, where millions of people get no wheat at all.

I do not find myself weeping any crocodile tears over Canada, Australia, and the British Empire, with their argument that if we follow a sound foreign shipment program with respect to wheat we are going to upset the world wheat market. The test is, Is wheat getting to those people at all? The answer is that it is not. From the standpoint of a peace offensive, and from the standpoint of winning some badly needed good will in certain sections of the world, I think it is time to get some of our surplus wheat into those sections. If we could have our amendment adopted, and place wheat production on the sound basis provided for in the amendment, it would not be long before we would find some of the surplus wheat having a better chance to get to those areas of the world where no wheat is going at the present time.

I cannot reconcile with the great moral obligations which we owe as a Christian Nation our failure to put wheat where people can use it, and prevent the starvation and bad nutrition now prevalent in those parts of the world where we must win the fight for freedom.

Mr. CARLSON. I cannot conceive that this would be a dumping program. If we sell wheat on the world market, at the world market price, we are not dumping wheat. At the present time we are dumping wheat. The only way we can sell any wheat is to pay a subsidy as high as 87 cents a bushel, probably averaging 61 cents. We have already spent $751 million in getting wheat into foreign markets. If that is not dumping, I do not know what dumping is.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated March 5, 1956, addressed to me by the State Department, with relation to my amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 5, 1956.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: I have received your letter of February 28 and thank you very much for forwarding the report made by the group participating in the recent special meeting on wheat programs.

The statement of the group and the recommendations reflect a great deal of thought. I have read the study with much interest.

I am sure that you and the others who have devoted so much attention to the serious problems in wheat have taken full account of the relationships and interaction in the world wheat situation which have a prominent place in the thinking I can bring to the overall problem.

As you know, there is a general correlation between the price of United States wheat and other wheat competing in international trade. This general relationship will probably be reestablished in the event of a reduction of the export price by a major supplying country such as the United States or Canada. The total of world export does not seem likely to respond substantially to reductions in price unless the reductions are very large.

If action should be taken to place the support price for United States wheat at a level below the then prevailing level of prices in international trade, the volume of production in the United States could be expected to be the full amount of remunerative production which could be marketed at the support level, subject to whatever acreage allotments or marketing quotas might be in effect. The prospective results in the international trade would be that the United States and the exporting countries in the aggregate would then be exporting approximately the same quantities but at lower prices.

I thank you again for forwarding the material concerning the amendment under consideration.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. NICHOLS,
Chief, International Resources Division.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the pending farm bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR AMERICAN FARMERS—1956

(Statement by Senator POTTER)

If there has been an occasion in the history of our country when all men of good intentions must rally together for the common good * * * this is it. The freedom and liberty of the American farmer is endangered. The entire way of life of the farmer is being challenged. The keystone of our individuality and free-enterprise system is being pried from its place. Perhaps some might think that this is too dramatic a way in which to speak of our farm problem today. But I am confident that you will agree as we carefully analyze the symptoms, causes, and cure of the illness of our farm economy.

I am sure we know—and all right thinking people will readily agree—that our American economy cannot prosper in the fields of business, and industry while it is at the same time wasting away in agriculture. The different segments of our economy are like the ingredients of a loaf of bread. They are all blended together and the loaf will be either all good—or all bad. We recognize that the problem of the farmer is also the problem of the businessman, the laboring man, and of legislators who represent all those people.

Not only is the current farm problem one which should concern us for reasons of our own internal welfare, but it is of international concern. As in the fields of political philosophy and in armaments—yes, even in sports—so are the Communist countries of the world now challenging our economic system. This is the race we cannot afford to lose.

So let us squarely face the issue. Basically, our farm problem is very simple—a demand for farm products which is swamped beneath mountainous oversupply. The solution to the problem is also basically simple—bring supply into balance with demand. The means of doing this is not simple and requires hard and honest effort by all of us.

This problem should not be political and the solution should not be political. The farmers will be hurt if this problem is treated in a political way rather than in a straight economic way. The problem belongs to all of us. Working together calmly and intelligently this problem of oversupply can be brought under control and the farmer can again enjoy a healthy, normal market for his products.

Let us not kid ourselves. We cannot travel in opposite directions at the same time. We cannot continue to artificially stimulate gross overproduction with 90-percent rigid supports on basic commodities and at the same time eliminate Government surpluses and restore a normal market. Remember: "A Government storehouse is not a market."

In tracing the history of high rigid supports we see that they were created for a purpose. They served a need. But that was a need created by a wartime economy. The war is gone. That need is gone. Rigid supports should have gone too, but they were retained through the 1955 harvest. The instrument of rigid supports which was created to be of assistance to the farmer ran amuck and turned against the farmer. Like the broom of the sorcerer's apprentice, it threatened to drown the one whom it was supposed to help. It is proposed now to reinstate them. If this is done, they will drown our farmers economically—drive them from their lands—bring chaos into our economic system and threaten our American freedoms.

The great majority of people—and especially the farmers themselves—realize that continued high rigid supports on basic commodities will literally swamp us. The terrible surpluses will continue to grow and grow, plunging the market deeper all the time for wheat and corn, tobacco, cotton, and peanuts. And that's only half the story. As the grain surpluses flow unchecked into the feed market, more and more livestock is raised—meat, milk, poultry, and eggs are produced in oversupply and that market too is ruined.

I would like to use my own State of Michigan as an example of the hardship and injustice created by high rigid supports of the basic commodities.

Legislation calling for restoration of 90 percent rigid supports on basic commodities mean that the folks of Michigan are getting scalped with a two-bladed hatchet. First, we are paying for such supports for other States which are the major producers of the basic commodities and not realizing the benefits ourselves. Only about one-eighth of Michigan's farm income is derived from the high rigidly supported basic commodities. As taxpayers, Michigan farmers are paying for the high rigid supports but as farmers we don't get much of it.

Secondly, with huge surpluses of grains being dumped into the livestock feed market more and more meat, milk, poultry, and eggs are produced—and, as I said—surpluses again are created and prices go down here. That is where the farmers of Michigan are really hurt for almost 60 percent of Michigan's farm income is derived from livestock, poultry, and dairy products—which do not have high rigid supports.

Now, lest anyone should believe that I am thinking only of the interest of my own State let me point out that Michigan is typical of most States rather than being the exception.

Look at the facts:

Of the 48 States in the Union—43 of them receive over 30 percent of their farm income from livestock and allied products * * * without the high rigid supports.

Yet only 3 States receive over 30 percent of their farm income from wheat, only 6 States receive over 30 percent of their farm income from cotton, only 6 States receive over 10 percent of their farm income from corn, only 2 States receive over 25 percent of their farm income from tobacco, only 4 States receive over 2 percent of their farm income from peanuts, and these would be supported at 90 percent under the Ellender bill.

Those are the facts taken directly from the United States Department of Agriculture report of 1954. I do not state these facts as a means of setting one State's interest against another. That would be a selfish and narrow approach. And it would be most unseemly for us to consider this problem in such a way when our American farmers themselves look at this problem in its broadest aspects. Certainly there is the highest measure of statesmanship and national interest displayed by the great majority of our farmers. I believe that the attitude of our American farmers is well summed up in these words from the 1956 policies of the Michigan Farm Bureau: "Far more than our own selfish interests are involved. We are not merely farmers. We are citizens with a deep and abiding concern for the general welfare and for the preservation of those precious liberties which constitute our American heritage."

Last fall I spent several months going from one end of Michigan to the other. I talked to folks from all walks of life, laboring men, businessmen, professional people, and of course to many, many farmers. And I was impressed with two things.

First of all, what we call the farm problem is not a problem, not one problem. It is more than that. It is a composite state of affairs which involves a certain field of business, a way of life, and, most importantly, our national welfare. Our true farmer's business is not just a place to which he reports for work. It is his home, his work, his life. He doesn't produce just a single product but a number of interdependent products. Unlike many other businesses he cannot directly control either the price he pays for his needs nor the price he can get for his products. What happens to our farm econ-

omy will have its effect on everyone else's economy. History has shown that economic trouble for the farmer means trouble for the whole country. It's all tied together. It's a big and complex situation—and it's our problem—it does not involve just the farmer—but all of us.

Secondly, I have been constantly heartened and cheered by the wonderful attitude of our farmers. They are honest—with themselves and with others. They are realistic. They are looking the problem squarely in the eye. They are not asking for a magic solution. Our farmers are not greedy or lazy. They know that the job of restoring a free and normal farm market is going to be a hard and perhaps long job. They are willing to tackle it and to see it through in order to accomplish the objective.

My mail from Michigan farmers is almost unanimously against 90 percent rigid price supports. Let's listen to what these farmers themselves have to say:

A farmer from Albion, Mich., writes:

"It has been brought to my attention that flexible price supports of from 75 to 90 percent of parity for dairy products are in danger of being replaced with higher and more rigid support in the pending farm bill, S. 3183, now being debated in the United States Senate. We have had the high, rigid price supports and find that they do not work out. We would like to have the bill that President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson are in favor of."

From Fennville, Mich., this farmer tells me:

"I have never seen a Government subsidy or support program that didn't turn out to be a bonanza to the big farmer who didn't need it and did very little for the poor little farmer who is supposed to need it. * * * I, for one, don't believe that farmers are going to sell themselves to the highest bidder. * * * There have been a lot of lives sacrificed and hardships suffered for the freedom we have in this country of ours and I know a lot of farmers that realize this are ready to fight for the preservation of that freedom."

A letter from Caledonia, Mich.:

"I believe the bill the President wants is by far the best. There is no need to pass a bill with the land bank and also the 90 percent of parity. Leave off the support section. If left alone, the farmer will make out all right. * * * Let's get the Government out of farming and storage as soon as possible."

A Kalamazoo man writes:

"I thought that you might be interested in knowing that in all the farmer meetings there seems to be a feeling that any program which would add to the holdings of farm products by the Federal Government would not be helpful, and that the 90 percent parity support was not the best way to get the Government out of the farm-storage business. The feeling seems to be that this rate of support would wreck any good coming from the soil-bank program."

From Saginaw this writer says:

"As a practical farmer and professional agronomist, I should like to take this opportunity to endorse the Eisenhower Republican nine-point farm program. I strongly urge that the 90-percent parity features be stricken from any pending legislation. I should also like to express my full confidence in Secretary Ezra Taft Benson."

These are the farmers who live on their land and work that land and give the Nation its food and clothing. Their interest is not just for today * * * but for the years to come. They are preserving an important heritage for all of us. We must work with them to help them. We cannot fail to recognize the squeeze in which our farmer now finds himself. Each day he goes out to buy machinery, fertilizers, and the hundreds of commercial items which he needs to run his modern farming plant he finds the cost goes up and up and there's nothing he can do about it. At the same time when he takes the products which he is producing on his farm into the market place he finds that the price which he can receive for those is going down and down. It would be a very pleasant thing if 90-percent rigid supports would provide the answer to our problems. My own position has long been that farmers should receive 100 percent of parity or more than that, but he should receive his 100 percent or more of parity in the market place rather than from the Government. In reality, we find then that a 90-percent rigid support is not a floor under the farmer but a lid over his head. We want and need our citizen-farmers who live on their land. We must not injure them in order to bestow rich rewards on huge corporation-type farms and wealthy storage terminals.

It is no secret that whenever Government money and influence is extended into a field of private enterprise Government control goes with it. The spreading imposition of production and marketing curbs necessitated by the rigid price supports legislation has brought many farmers and processors face to face with the hard economic fact that high rigid price supports and rigid controls are the Siamese twins of agricultural policy. If you drink that brew, you must endure the hangover.

When production and marketing controls are imposed, they always strike hard at the small farmer. It is true we have minimum acreage allotments below which a farmer will not be reduced. Under this system the biggest relative cuts are taken by the large producers. On the other hand, the minimum acreage allotments established are usually so low that an individual farmer finds it impossible to make a decent living for himself and his family on his minimum acreages.

For example, how can a wheat farmer ever look to an opportunity for adequate living when he is guaranteed only 15 acres of wheat base? Or how can a burley tobacco farmer in Kentucky ever look forward to anything for himself and his family on his five-tenths of an acre allotment? A cotton farmer who is throttled down to 2 acres of cotton finds it impossible to make a decent living regardless of the level of price supports. For these people we can set the level of price supports at 150 percent of parity and still not guarantee them an adequate living. They need an opportunity to produce, they need to know that if they are efficient and ambitious they can expand their production and therefore increase their income.

A high price guaranteed by the Government means nothing if that same Government removes from them the right to produce. Their incomes fall. Living standards suffer and disillusionment follows. What do these small farmers do then? They are forced either to resign themselves to a miserable level of living or to seek employment off the farm. Now, if they seek employment off the farm many of them would drive anywhere from 25 to 50 miles each way daily for off-farm employment, and then do their farming operations on weekends and evenings. After a while their principal source of income may be off the farm and farming operations become more or less incidental. But at that point their production begins to compete with the farmer who is spending all his time on the farm and whose farm is his principal source of income. Then, the farm situation is still further complicated. And still more small-sized farmers are forced either into liquidation or into seeking additional off-farm employment. And so this vicious cycle goes on and on with large numbers of our farmers being forced to either take up outside occupations or leave their farms completely.

All this being the result of a system that sets out initially to improve our farmers' income. It is this small farmer who needs the most help. But does the small farmer get the most help from high rigid supports? The answer to that is: "No; definitely not." The great bulk of price-support assistance by the Government goes not to the small farmer but to the large farms and often the corporation-type farms, absentee owned. For example, a year ago of all Government loans made on wheat, just 1 percent of such loans received 12 percent of those dollars. Of all loans on cotton 1 percent of those loans received 15 percent of those dollars. On corn 1 percent of the loans took 6 percent of the dollars. On oats 1 percent of the loans got 11 percent of the dollars. On barley 1 percent of the loans received 24 percent of the dollars. And so it goes—1 percent getting 8 percent of the money on flaxseed—1 percent of the loans taking 11 percent of the money on grain sorghums—1 percent of the loans getting 8 percent of the money on soybeans. These figures are indicative of the extent to which Government price assistance goes to the big farms. It is obvious why this is so. A small farmer limited to a couple acres of cotton, 10 acres of wheat, or 15 acres of corn has insufficient total production to benefit very much from any Government program guaranteeing price.

One major difficulty with the rigid price-support program is that too much of the benefits have gone to large farmers. This is one question on which there appears to be almost unanimous agreement in the debate on the farm program.

This undesirable condition is due to two factors:

One factor is that the size of our farms has increased rapidly in recent years.

The other factor is that there has been no limit on the amount of price support that any one farmer can obtain if he complies with any acreage allotments which may be in effect. Large farmers usually have large allotments. As a result, acreage allotments do not prevent large farmers from getting big price-support loans.

Under these conditions, it is not surprising that the Government has made some relatively large loans to individual farmers and that these loans have represented a significant portion of our total price-support activity. These large loans have been fully in accordance with the provisions of the law which gives the Secretary of Agriculture no discretion in the matter. This law was inherited by this administration. The Secretary of Agriculture must make these loans, regardless of their size, if all other eligibility conditions are met.

The Department of Agriculture has made some studies of the size of individual loans. These studies show these startling facts about the way in which big farmers have benefited unduly from the 1953 crop wheat and cotton programs:

Wheat: There were 27 CCC loans in wheat which exceeded $100,000 apiece. Of these, 3 exceeded $300,000, with the largest loan to any individual producer amounting to $350,000. Altogether in 1953, the largest 1 percent of the loans made used up 12 percent of all the dollars loaned on wheat. The largest 5 percent of all loans used up 31 percent of all the dollars loaned on wheat. At the very bottom of the loan scale by size, the smallest 33 percent of loans took up only 8 percent of the funds used.

Cotton: There were 34 cotton loans which exceeded $100,000 apiece, 6 loans which exceeded $500,000, and 2 loans in excess of $1 million. The biggest single cotton loan amounted to $1.3 million. It is pertinent to

note that the largest loan in 1954 again was $1.3 million. Altogether, it is estimated that the largest 1 percent of the loans made required 18 percent of the total funds used.

Owner-operated family size farms have always been the cornerstone of American agriculture. Historically we have sought to stimulate their growth. We must continue to have a strong family-size farm if we are to have a strong agriculture.

It, thus, clearly is not in the public interest to underwrite at public expense any farm or other program which operates to threaten the very existence of family-size farms.

There is action that can be taken to correct this situation. This action is to amend existing law to place a limit on the amount of price-support loans to any individual farmer.

I have many small farmers in my State. I do not want to see them liquidated. I do not want to see their opportunity to expand and to become more efficient prevented by the very Government that sets out to help them. I do not want to see them progressively throttled down and down until they are forced to abandon their farming operations because the Government would not permit them to make an income sufficiently large to support self and family at a decent level.

Without further delay, then, let us get to the task before us. Let us give our farmers the attention they deserve. The present situation is the result of the extension of Government influence and control into a historically free business. We can restore that freedom by instituting an orderly withdrawal of Government regulation from the business and lives of our farmers.

President Eisenhower's nine-point farm program will accomplish this. But it must not be warped and distorted into a useless and false tool. We cannot ask the American farmers to accept a plan which calls for the reduction of surpluses by a soil-bank plan and other measures and at the same time restores 90 percent rigid supports on basic commodities which cancels out the good effects of the soil-bank plan. We cannot travel in two directions at one time. What an insult to the intelligence of our farmers. Such a proposal—whatever the motives—is indeed a shameful thing.

I call for all to cast aside personal or selfish interest and support this nine-point plan which President Eisenhower has proposed and which points the best path toward the restoration of a normal and healthy farm market.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, some question has been raised as to what the amount of compensation to farmers under the acreage reserve program of the proposed soil bank would be. The general impression seems to be that it would be 50 percent of the support price for the average yield of the commodity on the land.

I have asked the Secretary for a statement as to what the position of the Department is on that subject. I have received the following communication:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY BENSON REGARDING COMPENSATION TO FARMERS IN THE ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM OF THE PROPOSED SOIL BANK

Questions have been raised as to whether farmers will voluntarily participate in the acreage reserve program of the soil bank with compensation at 50 percent of the expected gross return on the reserve acres. Fifty percent has been mentioned tentatively by the Department in discussions with farmers and with the Congress.

The right figure is one which will attract the necessary participation. We do not know whether 50 percent is the right figure or not.

The President said: "This percentage will be set at an incentive level sufficiently high to assure success of the program."

The 50 percent figure was suggested on a strictly preliminary basis. We are studying the whole matter now, in the field. The President has said, and I have said, that the compensation must be sufficient to attract the necessary participation. The Senate bill, S. 3183, gives sufficient latitude. If we find for any crops that 50 percent will not get participation, we are prepared to offer a greater amount—as much more as is fair to farmers.

I read this statement merely to show that the amount of compensation for participation in the acreage-reserve program with respect to the various crops has not yet been determined, because the men working in the field have been asked to find out what level would be necessary.

There is one provision in the bill to the effect that the Secretary, if he so desires, may call for bids as to what farmers will accept in return for taking some land out of production and placing it in the conservation reserve. I would not expect this method to be used on a very large scale. That provision is included in the bill in order that there may be opportunity for some experimentation in this field if it is felt desirable. In such cases I assume that the final decision as to what land would be taken out of production and what bids would be accepted would rest with the local committee, because many factors would have to be taken into consideration besides merely getting the land out of cultivation. The effect on the community, and other factors, would have to be considered.

I am placing this statement in the RECORD at this time to show that, although 50 percent is the tentative figure which was used, it was used only because we had to start from somewhere. The figure may turn out to be 55, 60 or 65 percent. No one knows at present what it will be, but under the terms of the bill it must be enough to obtain the desired reduction in production.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a fact that the statement just made is in line with the report.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. I am making this statement merely to correct any rumors that 50 percent is the amount that has been definitely decided upon.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is my wish this afternoon to discuss the pending farm legislation, and particularly to discuss it with respect to how it might affect a typical State. For my purposes, I have used, of course, my own great State of Colorado.

It seems to me that, above all, we must approach the farm problem in a nonpartisan spirit. I have previously spoken on this subject on the floor of the Senate. I hope that in the consideration of the pending bill, and of any amendments which may be offered, no partisan considerations will ever cause me to act either for or against any proposition that is offered on the floor of the Senate.

I have lived for 26 years in the center of a great agricultural section, the Arkansas Valley, in the southeastern corner of Colorado. I have watched its agriculture, which is by far its most important industry, grow and develop during my adult years.

Water is literally liquid gold to the inhabitants of Colorado. Without irrigation, and without the impounding of waters, there would be no such thing as our great farm productiveness. It has led to the development of numerous great farms along the Arkansas River, along the Platte River, along the Gunnison River, along the Colorado River, along the Animas and San Juan Rivers, the Rio Grande and the Republican River. By the way, most of that development has been through private initiative and with private capital and out of it all has come the present great agricultural progress of my State.

I am concerned about the plight of the farmer and with what is known as the farm problem. Those of us who have lived with it and have seen the developments in the agricultural economy of our country, cannot close our eyes to the situation. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the farm population is steadily decreasing in numbers, but not, as I propose to show, for some of the reasons which have been stated by certain people.

We cannot close our eyes to the fact that only 13 percent of our people now reside on the farms. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that farms are becoming larger. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that, generally speaking, the agricultural economy is not well. In fact, it is one of my firm beliefs that the economy of this country can never be completely healthy with a sick agricultural community.

Therefore, in a spirit of nonpartisanship, and in an attempt to determine how the proposed legislation might affect my own State, I wish to discuss the subject this afternoon, and divide it into two main parts. It seems to me the first proposition we should discuss is what can be done to help farm income. After all, there is nothing wrong with the farm economy that income will not help. Second, since we are in this period of transition, what can be done to help the farmer by way of credit? It is to these two main propositions I wish to address myself today.

First of all, I wish to discuss this matter so far as my own State of Colorado is concerned, with relation to the diminishing size of the farms. My figures are taken from the Colorado Yearbook, 1951 to 1955. These figures show that in 1930 the number of farms in Colorado was, in round figures, 60,000. By 1940 the number had diminished to 51,500. By 1950 it had further fallen to 45,500.

The area of farm lands actually being farmed had increased since 1930 from 29 million acres to 38 million in 1950, or an increase of almost 25 percent.

The average size of the farms in 1930 was 481 acres. By 1950 the average size had increased to 832 acres.

The cropland harvested in 1930 amounted to 6¾ million acres. The cropland harvested in 1950 was in excess of that by about 200,000 acres.

I ask unanimous consent that the chart to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number, area, and average size of Colorado farms and cropland harvested, by counties 1950, 1940, and 1930

	Number of farms	Land in farms		Average size of farms (acres)	Cropland harvested	
		Area (acres)	Percent all land		Area (acres)	Percent of land in farms
State total:						
1950	45,578	37,953,099	57.1	832.7	6,892,904	18.1
1940	51,436	31,527,240	47.4	612.9	4,769,671	15.1
1930	59,956	28,876,171	43.5	481.6	6,750,398	23.3

Source: Bureau of the Census, 1950, the latest year for which figures are available. Colorado Year Book 1951-55, p. 350.

Mr. ALLOTT. My reason for quoting these figures is, first of all, to kill the bugaboo that the administration, or its Secretary of Agriculture, is somehow fomenting a great exodus from the farmland. The figures I have read clearly show that in Colorado, between 1930 and 1950, the number of farms decreased by 25 percent. They show also that during this period the area, in acres, increased by almost exactly the same percentage.

I do not have the complete figures for 1955, because they are not yet available through the Department of Agriculture. However, the figures pretty well show that the exodus from the farm and the increase in the size of the farm is not something that has arisen in the past 3 years, since 1952, but, rather, is a condition which has gradually developed during the past 25 years.

My first acquaintance with the rural areas of the Arkansas Valley as a resident was in 1930. Pioneers had gone there. They had developed this area, built irrigation ditches with slips and shovels, in many instances by hand, and there were still many farms which were 40 acres in size.

In fact, as a lawyer, in examining abstracts in that section of the country today, I have found that most of the abstracts are made of 40-acre tracts, indicating that originally, when work was done by hand, people felt that a 40-acre tract, in an irrigated section, could be an economic unit.

By 1930 that had changed. The irrigated farms had already increased to about 80 acres. The people recognized that it was impossible for a 40-acre tract to be an economic unit from the standpoint of trying to make a living.

As farm equipment became mechanized in the area comprising Colorado we have seen that the acreage of land farmed, which would constitute an economic unit, has gradually increased through the years.

In the great State of Colorado, 77.6 percent of the farms are operated by owners and the remaining 22.4 percent by tenants. There are 22,354 irrigated farms, and 17,395 nonirrigated farms, or a total of 40,749. The irrigated acreage for the average-size farm in 1950 was 106 acres, which shows how the size had increased. I am sure it will be recognized that not all of an irrigated farm can always be irrigated. The average size farm in Colorado was 630 acres in the same year. That indicates the general trend, and, I think, is indicative of the point I am trying to make, that the exodus from the farms had started, and that farms were becoming larger all the time, both trends becoming clear prior to 1950.

While my figures relate to years prior to 1950, I concede readily that the continuance of the trend would be shown if accurate figures were available for succeeding years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the situation with respect to Colorado farms may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Colorado farms

	Average size of farms (acres)	Number of farms	Total acreage
1930	482	59,956	28,876,000
1935	471	63,644	29,976,000
1940	612	51,436	31,479,000
1945	760	47,618	36,166,000
1950	832	45,578	37,921,000
1955	942	40,749	38,385,000

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the average size of farms, which in 1930 was 482 acres, had jumped by 1955 to 942 acres.

The number of farms in 1930 was 59,956, and in 1955 the figure was 40,749. I have already indicated the total acreage.

Mr. President, what is the situation with respect to wheat in Colorado? In 1953 and 1954 there was a great falling off of cash income from sales of wheat. In 1953, the total income was $89 million. In 1954, it had fallen off to $35 million.

Even the most ardent advocate of the rigid price-support system will not contend that our section has not been quite seriously afflicted in the past 5 years with the drought which has prevailed. So, when we talk about farm income, we must remember that, at least so far as the State of Colorado is concerned, it has suffered during the past 5 years so severely from drought that it is impossible to place a line and determine how much of the depreciation in farm income is due to drought, and how much is due to a decline in the price of farm crops.

I do not propose to discuss the other problems which afflict the farmer at this time, for they have already been discussed by numerous Senators. They are, of course, the rising cost of labor, the rising taxes, the rising costs of operation, and the rising costs of the machinery which the farmer has to purchase.

I was very much interested in listening to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on TV the other evening. While the prices of trucks and tractors were shown on his chart to have risen only 4 percent during the period the chart covered, which was from 1952 on, the fact is that the cost of farm machinery in general increased in the preceding 8 years prior to 1952 an average of approximately 86 percent.

So, Mr. President, it is easy to understand why the farmer has been caught in a squeeze of farm prices and why he is in the situation in which he finds himself today.

In 1953, the acreage of wheat harvested in Colorado was 39 percent less than that planted, and in 1954, only 50 percent of our wheat was harvested; indicating the general situation with respect to drought affecting the farming areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table on Colorado wheat statistics.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Colorado wheat statistics

1953

	Winter wheat		Spring wheat		Tota
	Irrigated	Nonirrigated	Irrigated	Nonirrigated	
Acreage:					
Planted ..... acres	3,902,000		101,000		4,003,000
Harvested ..... do	50,020	2,671,000	30,000	60,800	2,812,520
Production:					
Volume ..... bushels	1,450,000	41,149,000	900,000	793,000	44,292,000
Average per acre ..... do	15.5		18.5		15.7
Value: Cash income	$86,070,000		$3,301,000		$89,371,000

1954

Acreage:					
Planted ..... acres	3,005,000		71,000		3,076,000
Harvested ..... do	32,000	1,547,000	10,000	24,000	1,622,000
Production:					
Volume ..... bushels	672,000	15,470,000	475,000	228,000	16,845,000
Average per acre ..... do	21.0	10.0	25.0	9.5	10.4
Value: Cash income	$33,948,000		$1,456,000		$35,404,000

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in discussing the farm program generally it seems to me that we can have about as many opinions as there are people. There are four major farm organizations in this country. Unfortunately, it seems to me that there is not sufficient unanimity of opinion to enable us to embark on a program which will receive the support of all farmers. I desire, therefore, to discuss briefly the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, S. 3183, and particularly with respect to how it might affect the State of Colorado.

I have great respect for the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and for all the members of that committee. It is very easy to tear apart any proposition. It is much harder to build something constructive and workable. In what these gentlemen have done and what they have labored for, no matter what part or parts of it we may individually disagree with, there can be no question that they have done a monumental work, and they should be congratulated for their foresight, intelligence, and devotion to this job.

What concerns me about the particular bill pending now is based upon the figures which I have just given for the State of Colorado.

A typical irrigated farm of 160 acres might, perhaps, have an allotment to wheat of from 15 to 20 acres. In other words, under the allotment system the farmer might be permitted to grow between 15 and 20 acres of wheat. Of the five so-called basic commodities, wheat is the only one which affects the State of Colorado. Colorado is not engaged in commercial corn production. Therefore, it does not come under the so-called basic commodities classification. If 15 to 20 acres on an average irrigated farm are allotted to wheat, it is very easy to see that no system of supports on basic commodities is ever going to help the farmers of Colorado. The balance of a typical 160-acre irrigated farm in Colorado might consist of, perhaps, 30 or 40 acres of hay, which is not supported; perhaps 40 acres of sorghum, or some other feed crop; perhaps 10 or 15 or 20 acres of feed. Of course, not only in the Arkansas Valley but in the Platte Valley, on the western slope, and all over Colorado, many, many thousands of acres of various kinds of fruits and melons are grown.

I cannot see how any bill set up as is the pending bill will be of any immediate help to the farmer of irrigated land in Colorado, since he devotes only about one-tenth of his acreage to wheat. It is obvious that he is not going to benefit from the support of a basic commodity to any considerable degree.

Therefore, if the farmer in Colorado is to benefit from the bill, he will have to benefit from its soil-bank provisions.

The first part of the bill, however, devotes itself only to wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. Of those products, only wheat affects the interests of Colorado. How, then, will anyone in Colorado, or a State similarly situated—be assisted by the so-called acreage reserve program, which is available only to those who produce the so-called basic commodities? I am certain the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA and Mr. CURTIS], who have great irrigated acres in the western portions of their States, can see the same picture. The answer is simple. They cannot take advantage of it, and they will not be able to put into or take out of acreage any of the so-called basic commodities produced, because they produce so little of them. They might take out a little wheat. Otherwise, subtitle A, on page 7 of the bill, entitled "Acreage Reserve Program," means nothing to them.

Going to another part of the bill, it will be noted that $750 million is devoted to the acreage reserve, and only $350 million is devoted to the conservation reserve. I will support, and if necessary will offer, an amendment that the amounts be adjusted equally, so that the farmers who do not grow basic commodities in large quantities will be able to share on an equal basis in the benefits of the conservation reserve program with those who do grow large quantities.

I am told that the production of basic commodities affects only 23 percent of the farm income of the United States. It has been estimated that this means from 40 to 50 percent of the farmers of the Nation. Nevertheless, the fact remains that $750 million is devoted to supporting acreage reserves which apply only to basic commodities, and only $350 million is devoted to the conservation reserve, which affects a far greater number of farmers, and also affects a greater portion of the farm income.

I turn now to the conservation reserve. The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana is on the floor, so I hope he will perhaps be able to answer 1 or 2 of the questions which I propose to ask, if he will be kind enough to do so.

On page 14 of the bill the following provision is made for the Secretary:

> To bear such part of the cost (including labor) of establishing and maintaining vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses, on the designated acreage as the Secretary determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, but not to exceed a maximum amount per acre or facility prescribed by the Secretary for the county or area in which the farm is situated.

In order to make the conservation acreage program work, the acreage must be set aside. It cannot be, as the colloquy with the junior Senator from Kansas developed, diverted to other uses. If it is intended to be diverted to the feeding of livestock or to the growing of other products, then naturally no headway will be made in the overall agricultural picture. There is now a glut of pork on the market. The same situation exists with respect to heavy beef. We are having a hard time in this Nation consuming enough beef and pork to keep the prices of those commodities up. Therefore, I pose this question to the Senator from Louisiana:

Was any consideration given by the committee as to who would be responsible for the fencing off of the diverted acres, in the event a farmer enters the conservation reserve program?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think that question was pretty well covered last week in the colloquy on the floor. The Secretary could offer as an inducement, either to pay part or all of the cost of the fencing. The authority given to the Secretary in the pending bill is so broad that he undoubtedly has the right to make that expenditure so as to get the required number of acres into the soil bank in order to carry out the program as contemplated by the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. I am sorry I did not hear that particular colloquy. I have made a determined effort, as the Senator knows, to be present throughout most of the debate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand, and appreciate the continued interest the Senator has shown in the pending bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I apparently missed that part of the debate.

I am certain the Senator understands that in the practical application of the bill, in many instances, the cost of fencing would equal, probably, the benefits which could be paid under the conservation reserve program. Therefore, it may become a very important matter as to who is to pay for the fencing. If the farmer himself is to pay for the fencing, under the conservation reserve program, the cost may absorb all the cash benefits which he receives under the conservation reserve program. He may end up on a treadmill without actually getting anywhere in terms of his net income.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking now of the building, not of political fences, but of farm fences, I wish to assure the Senator that the cost of building a fence will take all—it will more than take all—of any benefit which a farmer would get under the bill in respect to the soil bank, if he has any substantial amount of fencing to build. The cost of building fences these days is simply terrific, and I think anyone who contemplates fencing should take into consideration what it will cost to build the fences and who will pay for them.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very happy to have the thoughts of the Senator from Oregon on that point. In the parts of the country in which both he and I live, where farm acreage has sometimes achieved very large proportions, not only is the cost of fencing high, but the extent of the fencing which would have to be built in order to take part in the conservation reserve program would be tremendous.

I wish to refer particularly to subsection (c) on page 15 of the bill, which reads:

> In determining the lands in any area to be covered by contracts entered into under this section, the Secretary may use advertising and bid procedure if he determines that such action will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the conservation reserve program.

I must confess that this provision balks my imagination. I am unable to determine what that language possibly could mean. Surely it cannot mean

what it says, which is that the Secretary may advertise and ask for bids on the land which is to be set aside in the conservation reserve. May I direct that question to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I stated yesterday in debate with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the bidding will be among farmers, and the farmer who offers to reduce production at the least cost to the Government through diversion of acreage, will get the contract. In order to carry out the purposes of the conservation reserve program, he will be entitled to participate in preference to his neighbor who might bid a higher price to the Government. It is not a question of the highest bidder getting into the program, but rather the lowest bidder for the production in question.

While the bill was being considered, we took occasion to hear a witness, at the suggestion of my good friend, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who made this proposal, but we already had in a draft bill the language to which the Senator from Colorado now refers. The suggestion had been made in our field hearings. It was almost on all fours with what our recent witness had in mind. It is merely a method of getting farmers interested in trying to assist the Government to put as much land as possible, as cheaply as possible, in the reserve. That is really the reason for it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator for his explanation, but it seems completely incomprehensible to me that this provision could possibly mean what it says. In other words, I think the legislative record should be made clear that what we are going to ask farmers to do, under the conservation reserve, is to bid against each other for the opportunity of taking land out of cultivation, and the man who bids the lowest is the man who is going to take his acreage out of cultivation. I am not sure the farmers understand that is the situation, and, speaking for myself, I must say I extremely disapprove of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to refer to page 3907 of yesterday's RECORD. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] raised the same question which the distinguished Senator from Colorado has just raised. My answer was:

> It was a proposal submitted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and we heard a special witness in that regard. The object of the provision is to get the farmers to bid their acres in; and the one who bids the least money to bring about the desired amount of reduced production will be permitted to participate in the conservation reserve. It is not a question of the farmer getting more money. Instead, it is a question of the Government getting the reduction with the least amount of cost.

That is only one of the features of the bill which attempts to get land in the program. Let us not forget that this proposal is on a voluntary basis, and the Secretary of Agriculture is given wide discretion in order to be able to obtain the number of acres he might consider necessary to carry out the conservation acreage program.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator. I must say I am somewhat chagrined to find that the language means exactly what it says. I was present yesterday when the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Louisiana were discussing this matter, and I heard the objection of the Senator from Wyoming to the effect that too much discretion is left in the hands of the Secretary. Of course, we come back again to the proposition that sometimes it is easy to criticize but hard to offer a constructive substitute for the proposals which have been made.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr AIKEN. I might point out that the inclusion of a provision for taking land out of production on bids is not the recommendation of the Secretary or the administration. As the Senator from Louisiana has said, it was put in the bill purely at the request of certain persons in Iowa who got the idea it might work. It was intriguing. A member of the committee proposed that the provision be included. It is not compulsory. I cannot imagine its being used to any extent, if at all. However, it is in the bill. If the Secretary desires to try it out in a particular county or in half a dozen counties, he has the discretion to do so. The idea is to see what price farmers would actually take for reducing their production. That was the purpose of the provision. Also, its promoter felt that if that method were used, then there could be no criticism of the Department for paying too much for taking land out of production if low bids were accepted, provided the other features for taking land offered at the lowest price were not harmful.

Between the Senator from Louisiana and myself, I think we have explained how the provision got in the bill. I would not expect that the present Secretary of Agriculture, at least, would go very wild in using that provision.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. AIKEN. It might not work at all.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am genuinely concerned with the present condition of agriculture and with the fact that I can see no opportunity, or very small opportunity, for those who practice irrigated farming in Colorado to benefit under subtitle A, the acreage reserve program of the bill, since they must look entirely to subtitle B. I am very much concerned with those provisions. I question the advisability of placing farmers in a position where they would be bidding against each other to make the lowest bid to take acreage out of production in the conservation reserve.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. That plan would not have to be followed, I may say to the Senator. Its application could be one that might be useful in some sections of the country and might not apply at all to Colorado.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The farmers in the State of the Senator from Colorado are about in the same position as are the farmers in New England. They could not benefit directly from the acreage reserve program. In New England we have tobacco growers who could benefit. In Colorado there are some wheatgrowers who could benefit. The principal benefits from the acreage reserve would be indirect benefits. It is hoped the program will keep those who take land out of wheat and cotton, to be entered in the conservation reserve, from producing crops such as potatoes, cabbage, and other commodities which come in direct competition with those who have irrigated farms. The benefits from the acreage reserve would be almost wholly indirect, although they might be material.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

I wish to make clear that I understand, and our people understand, that our wheat farmers can participate in the acreage-reserve program, but since the greater number of them are irrigated land farmers, and since so little of their own crops are basic commodities, I feel it is incumbent upon me to point out what the bill will do and will not do for the farmers of the State of Colorado.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will yield, I might point out one other thing. The cattle raisers in the State of Colorado are already in some difficulties because of competition with feeders in Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, and some eastern States where use is being made of diverted acres to produce more cattle. Also, in my opinion, the cattle raisers of Colorado suffer somewhat from the present method of grading beef. It was hoped that excessive feeding of livestock and production of dairy products could be cut down in those areas which would directly participate in the acreage-reserve program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition to what the Senator from Vermont has just stated, the people of Colorado will no doubt profit from passage of the bill in another way. There is a big tourist trade in Colorado, is there not?

Mr. ALLOTT. We have a considerable tourist trade, and we are proud of our State which attracts so many friends.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we can bring prosperity to the whole country, Colorado will benefit from it. My good friend from Colorado has been examining only the direct benefits that will flow to Colorado, insofar as wheat growers are concerned. He seems to be somewhat disappointed that the bill does not offer more direct assistance to all the farmers of his State; but, as my good friend from Vermont has just pointed out, the fact that cattle are raised in abundance in Colorado—and I believe some poultry is raised there, too——

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. It follows that if the production of feed grains can be curtailed, that in turn will stabilize cattle and poultry production and make it more profitable. If these and other farmers make a little more money, they can visit the beautiful mountains and valleys of

Colorado and in that way Colorado's economy will be benefited substantially.

Mr. ALLOTT. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that his words are an invitation to me to extol the virtues of Colorado—its high mountains, its fine air, and its wonderful people. I should like to do so at great length. However, I feel that we must proceed with our discussion of the pending bill.

In respect to the comment made by the Senator from Louisiana, I merely say that, regardless of how we consider this matter, I feel that it is my obligation to call the attention of the Senate, as well as the attention of the people of Colorado, to what the bill actually will or will not do in its effect upon them. Although it may be true that we in Colorado will receive an indirect benefit from all these provisions, as portrayed in such glowing words by the Senator from Louisiana, yet I must say that a great many of our farmers are going to be disappointed if they expect to receive any immediate aid as a result of the enactment of this measure. The soil bank will help them in the long run; but I know it will not be possible to eliminate the surpluses immediately. We cannot obtain a reasonable return from farm operations until the surpluses are reduced.

I may say that in connection with the first part of the bill, I shall support an amendment, which will be offered, to tighten the provisions of the bill with respect to the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve which is to be withdrawn.

The second point I wish to discuss briefly this afternoon is one in which I myself have been interested greatly during the past few years. That is the question of farm credit. This phase or facet of the farm situation is not dealt with in the pending bill, but it needs very speedy attention.

At this point I should like to read a letter to the Senate. I shall not read the name of the person writing the letter, because I have not had time to contact him, to ascertain whether he desires that I publish his name. However, I am sure he will not object to my reading the text of the letter:

FEBRUARY 25, 1956.

United States Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE MR. ALLOTT: Your idea to simplify and prolong farm loans as stated in an article in the Rocky Mountain News, Thursday, February 23, 1956, sounds as if it is what the hard-hit farmers in this drought area need to help them.

If there isn't some kind of help in the near future all of the small farmers will be wiped out, with only the big farmer, with other income to help out, left as he can get so much more subsidy and crop insurance.

Inasmuch as I am renting one section of ground on which I get to plant 225 acres of wheat, I own 1 section, with 97 acres under cultivation, the rest in grass.

With only 225 acres of wheat on this much ground you can see that I have been cut down to such an extent that it is impossible to make a go of it, even if we had some rain.

I would like to know in what way the President's soil-bank plan would benefit me.

From where I sit it looks as though most of the men sent to Washington are trying to eliminate the small farmer that has no income from other sources and keep the big suitcase farmer in production.

You know some factories built out here and not all in the cities would really help.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

P. S.—We would all rather work for what we get than have it given to us.

At this point I should like to read another letter:

FEBRUARY 23, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: So help me, Senator, I don't know if I will be able to start farming this spring or not. Mine must be one of those 200 farm families in Colorado that's pretty hard up.

My Government does not owe me a living or need it necessarily guarantee me a profit. I think it does owe me an opportunity to try and recoup some of the catastrophic losses sustained on this farm the last few years due to hail, drought, reduced prices, increased costs, and the general readjustment taking place in agriculture.

You, I think, are sponsoring the most urgently needed legislation to benefit the family sized farm in the Nation today. I think the Government should work hard at bringing supply and demand more into balance and when that is done get out of the picture.

If the Government would establish adequate credit to the sound, economical family farmer for a period of 5 years, at least, and at a low rate of interest, he will be able to work out of his present difficulties I am sure. Stop subsidizing the farmer. Very little of the subsidy gets to the ones who really need it anyhow. The ones that do need it, if I am any criterion, would like to borrow it—with the idea and belief that farming won't always be in its present plight. Those that do not need it accept it anyhow on the theory "Never look a gift horse in the mouth."

We have shown a loss on this farm the last 4 years, but I maintain this is still an ideal family sized stock farm. This 800-acre combination irrigated and dry-land farm comprises the following acres: 400 acres dry cropland; 260 acres native pasture; 125 acres irrigated cropland; 15 acres farmstead and wasteland.

A little about myself. I am 47 years old, a graduate of Colorado A. & M., and have engaged in farming and ranching most of my adult life. I am trying hard to support a wife, three children, and my father on this stock farm.

Sincerely and respectfully yours.

Then I should like to read a letter I received this morning from a county agricultural agent:

MARCH 1, 1956.

The Honorable GORDON C. ALLOTT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: A meeting of our agricultural planning committee was held February 28. Twenty of our county farm leaders were present. Among other farm problems discussed was your proposed bill regarding the broadening of loans made under the Bankhead-Jones Act. Many favorable comments were given and urgent requests made to hasten action thereon.

We, as you know, have had several successive years of severe drought conditions and received cost of production or lower prices for our main crop, namely, potatoes. This has resulted in placing many of our good farmers in a critical financial position. This condition can be readily seen from figures recently obtained from official records. At the present time our total land valuation amounts to slightly less than $6 million. In 1952 total real-estate mortgages amounted to $651,000; by January 1, 1955, they had jumped to $1,825,000. January 1, 1956, figures are not yet complete, but the indebtedness will increase to considerably more than $2 million. This condition is alarming to say the least.

This group expressed themselves as being very favorable toward your bill's intention in increasing the limit to $30,000 and extending the time to 15 years. They criticized, as well, the time required to process applications, but felt the proposed bill would, to a certain extent at least, simplify and expedite the obstacles existing in the present law.

Any assistance you might require from this end will, if possible, be gladly extended.

To conclude with respect to the credit bill, let me say that in the past 6 months I have talked with thousands of farmers and have met with innumerable local farm credit agencies. I find that the types of credit offered through the Farm and Home Administration—and it is not the fault of either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party—are often, and usually, so complex that neither the farmer himself nor the FHA supervisors, in many instances, are able to understand the limits and abilities of any particular type of loan.

We have seen situations in which farmers were lined up for 50 yards waiting for an opportunity to get into an FHA office in order to make a loan to finance their operation.

The matter of adequate farm financing is one of the most important things we must consider. I request my very able and distinguished friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to schedule the subject for early consideration by the committee.

In letters which I received from farmers I find that a great preponderance of such correspondence comes from people who do not want doles or handouts from the Government. I find a willingness and a desire expressed by them, as shown by the letters which I have just read, to do their own job and to make their own way. But one of the things they must have is an opportunity to borrow enough money to continue until the present depression in prices, and also the present drought situation in our part of the country, have improved.

Let me make it clear again that these farmers are not asking for a handout. They have no such thing in mind. They have never had such a thing in mind. However, if they are to continue, they must have an opportunity to finance themselves. Only a clearing out of all the rubbish of patchwork laws under the FHA and a substitution therefor of one clear-cut credit law would do the job and handle farm credit during the coming months.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to give assurances to my good friend from Colorado. The bill to which he has alluded has been referred to our committee. It will be my purpose to appoint a special subcommittee to consider the bill, as soon as the pending bill is out of the way.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the assurances of the Senator. I am sure we all understand why it would be impossible at the present time for him to give any consideration to this bill, until the pending legislation is out of the way.

In conclusion, let me say that I am fully aware that, as a Member of this body, I have an obligation to all the States of the Union, and to all our people. However, it seems to me that, as a representative of the State of Colorado, it is incumbent upon me to explain upon the floor of the Senate how the proposed legislation would affect the people of my State.

It is my intention, in the main, to support the pending bill, but not so far as concerns the high rigid parity portions. I believe that with the soil-bank proposal, and with the flexible provision in conjunction with the soil-bank proposal, we can more quickly bring our agricultural economy into balance.

It is not merely a question of trying to determine whether or not a certain amount of money would stimulate the agricultural economy and put the farmer back on his feet. If it were that simple, I am sure we could all resolve the question pretty well. We have placed floors under wages, and we have done many other things which, in effect, operate as subsidies. It would be a simple and just thing to apply the same principles in behalf of our farmers.

But it is not so simple to look forward to a long-term solution of this problem. I cannot see a solution in a high, rigid support, which, at least, has contributed to, if it has not been directly responsible for, the situation of surpluses in which we find ourselves with respect to some of our basic commodities. I think we must not, by reverting to a high rigid support, place our farmer in a position in which, like an auger, he digs himself farther and farther into a hole, from which he will find it very difficult, as time goes by, to extricate himself.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EQUALITY IN CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS IS PARALLEL WITH EQUALITY IN VOTING

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the bill introduced by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] and many other Senators, S. 3308, to modernize the Federal election and corrupt practices laws, includes several forward-looking provisions. Among them is a proposal which has recently gained rather wide attention and favor—a proposal to permit political contributions up to the amount of $100 to be taken as income tax deductions in any one tax year. In other words, Mr. President, the proposal is that each individual taxpayer who contributes toward the election campaign of a candidate for a Federal elective office may deduct the amount of his contribution from his income in computing his Federal income tax up to $100 in any one year.

The objective of this provision is to offer encouragement to more people to make political contributions, on a modest scale, to the election campaigns of the candidates of their choice. The sponsors of S. 3308 are to be commended for the recognition which their bill gives to that objective. However, Mr. President, I cannot support the method proposed in that bill for providing a tax incentive for campaign contributions. Analysis of the proposal shows that its actual application would be unfair and discriminatory, and that it would, in effect, introduce class legislation into the laws governing our political processes.

This result, Mr. President, follows very simply from the fact that the higher a taxpayer's income is, the more a deduction of $100 saves him in taxes. As the scale of annual income rises, less and less of the deductible $100 contribution would be made by the taxpayer, and more and more of it would, in effect, be borne by the Government—that is to say, by other taxpayers.

I have prepared a chart, from United States Treasury sources, which illustrates this effect of our progressive income tax rates, if the proposed $100 deduction for campaign contributions had been the law prior to the 1952 presidential election campaign, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD, so that I may refer to it in my further remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Illustration of proposed income tax deduction for $100 political contributions

[Applied to 1952 elections, estimated 1951 figures]

Highest applicable income tax rate (percent)	Net taxable income bracket	Taxpayer's share of deductible $100 campaign contribution	Government's share of deductible $100 campaign contribution	Number of taxpayers filing return by income brackets	Percentage of taxpayers filing return by income brackets	Collections from income taxpayers, by income brackets	Percentage of total collections from income taxpayers
	Total			*Thousands* [1] 84,000.0	100.00	*Millions* $22,372.7	100.0
0	None, but income exceeds $600	$100.00	0	[1] 17,639.3	21.00	0	0
20.4	0 to $2,000	79.60	$20.40	56,919.6	67.76	8,938.6	40.0
22.4	$2,000 to $4,000	77.60	22.40	6,389.4	7.61	3,585.4	16.0
27.0	$4,000 to $6,000	73.00	27.00	1,458.3	1.74	1,558.4	7.0
30.0	$6,000 to $8,000	70.00	30.00	504.8	.60	852.0	3.8
35.0	$8,000 to $10,000	65.00	35.00	329.8	.39	750.2	3.4
39.0	$10,000 to $12,000	61.00	39.00	223.2	.27	680.6	3.0
43.0	$12,000 to $14,000	57.00	43.00	112.3	.14	441.9	2.0
48.0	$14,000 to $16,000	52.00	48.00	83.6	.10	399.2	1.8
51.0	$16,000 to $18,000	49.00	51.00	50.4	.06	282.7	1.3
54.0	$18,000 to $20,000	46.00	54.00	61.3	.07	404.6	1.8
57.0	$20,000 to $22,000	43.00	57.00	44.5	.05	346.1	1.5
61.0	$22,000 to $26,000	39.00	61.00	55.9	.07	541.5	2.4
63.0	$26,000 to $32,000	37.00	63.00	47.7	.06	618.9	2.8
66.0	$32,000 to $38,000	34.00	66.00	22.7	.03	387.9	1.7
69.0	$38,000 to $44,000	31.00	69.00	13.0	.02	268.7	1.2
73.0	$44,000 to $50,000	27.00	73.00	13.5	.02	350.7	1.6
75.0	$50,000 to $60,000	25.00	75.00	5.8	.01	171.2	.8
78.0	$60,000 to $70,000	22.00	78.00	9.2	.01	338.2	1.5
82.0	$70,000 to $80,000	18.00	82.00	4.0	[2]	179.7	.8
84.0	$80,000 to $90,000	16.00	84.00	3.1	[2]	165.0	.7
87.0	$90,000 to $100,000	13.00	87.00	2.2	[2]	144.0	.6
89.0	$100,000 to $150,000	11.00	89.00	3.5	[2]	286.5	1.3
90.0	$150,000 to $200,000	10.00	90.00	1.7	[2]	223.4	1.0
91.0	$200,000 plus	9.00	91.00	1.2	[2]	457.3	2.0

[1] Approximate. [2] Less than 0.01 percent.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, even a cursory examination of the chart shows the inequities which would have resulted if, for the 1952 elections, the $100 deduction now proposed had been applied under the 1951 tax code. In that year, the lowest tax bracket—for those who had any net taxable income at all—was 20.4 percent. If a man's net taxable income were in that bracket—less than $2,000—a $100 tax deductible campaign contribution would save him $20.40 in taxes. It would therefore cost him $79.60 to contribute $100 to the candidate of his choice.

But his neighbor with a net income of $6,000 to $8,000 would save $30; for if he reported the $100 as income instead of contributing it to a political campaign, it would increase his taxes by $30. And if the president of his firm has a net taxable income of $50,000 to $60,000, he actually would pay only $25 of his own $100 contribution, while the Government would be contributing $75 to the campaign of the candidate he favors.

Does that look like a fair program of encouraging individual contributions, Mr. President? Is it consistent with our fundamental principle of political equal-

ity—of one man, one vote—for the United States Government to offer to pay three-fourths or more of a $100 campaign contribution made by a wealthy individual, and 20 percent of the same contribution made by a person of modest income—or zero percent, if the individual has no net taxable income?

STRANGE WAY TO ENCOURAGE SMALL INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

If this plan is designed to encourage the making of large masses of small, individual contributions to election campaigns, it is a curious way to go about it, Mr. President. For let us look at the chart to ascertain the numbers of taxpayers involved.

Over 17½ million people—21 percent—who filed returns in 1951 owed no taxes whatever; their deductions were already more than their taxable income. The proposed $100 deduction, if they could make a campaign contribution of that size, would save them not one nickel. Fifty-seven million taxpayers—67 percent—were in the 20.4 percent bracket. Adding the next two brackets, we find that more than 98 percent of all taxpayers filing returns would save $27 or less if they could deduct a $100 campaign contribution from their taxable income. As a practical matter, few of them would save that much—first, because the great majority of our men and women cannot afford a $100 political contribution from their family budgets, even if it costs them "only" $80; and second, because they would not be permitted to take the proposed deduction in addition to the standard deduction on our income tax forms. In 1951, about 78 percent of all tax returns—almost all in the lowest brackets—took this standard deduction. Only the minority in the higher brackets, who itemize their deductions, would thus benefit at all from the proposed deduction for campaign gifts.

But the wealthiest 2 percent of our population, Mr. President—and I might add, the 2 percent most able today to make substantial campaign contributions—would have the first $100 of their political donations subsidized by the Government to the tune of $40 or $60 or $80, as shown in columns 3 and 4 of the chart.

POLITICAL ABSURDITY IN "ALWAYS-ALWAYS" LAND

Mr. President, I am confident that upon study and reflection, the proponents of the $100 deduction for political campaign gifts will themselves see the inequity of this proposition. But the plan is not only unjust and undemocratic—it is also a political absurdity.

A brief, wholly hypothetical illustration will demonstrate my point.

J. M. Barrie wrote of Never-Never Land. This was in his Peter Pan tales. Let us suppose, Mr. President, that there is an "always-always land," in which elections of the Government are contested by two political parties. Suppose that one party espouses conservative economic, fiscal, and social policies desired by the owners of business enterprise, and opposes Government spending for social programs and public works. Suppose that this political party always has the support of individuals of great wealth, of the owners and managers of banks and businesses and industrial corporations. Suppose that the other political party—which espouses liberal and humanitarian social legislation, and Government investment in the continued growth of the national economy—generally has the support of the average, working men and women of "always-always land."

Let us suppose, then, that the Government of this hypothetical country—which has income-tax rates such as those of the United States—were to give each of its citizens the privilege to deduct $100 gifts to political candidates from his income for tax purposes—$200 for a husband and wife.

What would be the effect? Which political party would benefit?

WHICH PARTY GETS THE $100 CONTRIBUTIONS?

We have seen that millions and millions of men and women, with the kind of income earned from working in shops and factories or teaching or operating a small family farm, would not be helped one bit in supporting the political party of their choice. Many of them have no net income, after their other deductions, on which to pay taxes, and the majority of the others use the standard tax deduction and would therefore not qualify for the special deduction for campaign contributions. In any case, Mr. President, men and women who work from 1 to 2 weeks to earn $100 are not likely to donate that amount to a political campaign.

The few remaining individuals of moderate income who could give $100, and who would come within the conditions of the special deduction for campaign gifts, would save about $20 from the special deduction.

I ask, Mr. President, how much in campaign funds will the party of the common people in "always-always land" receive by virtue of the special $100 deduction?

But, Mr. President, let us look at the political party which already always receives, from those wealthier groups whose policies it espouses, 2 and 3 and 4 times the contributions of its competitor, in support of the election campaigns of its candidates for the government of "always-always land."

The $100 tax deduction device offers meaningful tax assistance to the campaign contributions of about 2 percent of the citizens—the top 2 percent whose annual net taxable income exceeds $6,000. If these citizens—who can afford it—give $100 to a political candidate, the Government offers to forgive their taxes in amounts ranging from $30 to $80 or more. Which of the parties in the mythical "always-always land" would get most of these contributions?

In other words, Mr. President, under the $100 deduction plan, the Government offers to the political candidates of the wealthiest 2 percent of the Nation, sums ranging from $30 on up in Government tax funds. But that is not all. The tax which is forgiven, and not collected from the $100 contributors, will have to be made up from somewhere else. I do not know, Mr. President, whether the total sum of campaign deductions, and of the resulting lost revenue, will be small or large. But whatever it is, this lost revenue will come from the remaining sources, and what are they? Why, they are largely the income taxes of the less wealthy 98 percent of the citizens—the citizens who, as the chart shows, pay between them 63 percent of all the income taxes collected.

GREAT MAJORITY WOULD HELP PAY CAMPAIGN GIFTS OF WEALTHY MINORITY

There we see the ultimate inequity of the $100 deduction plan, Mr. President. The Government helps pay campaign contributions to the candidates of the wealthier party—which does not need the help—and gets most of the revenue back from the less wealthy supporters of the other party, whose candidates for office are already heavily outfinanced in every campaign. If there ever has been a better device than this proposed tax deduction for making the supporters of the poorer party finance the campaigns of the richer, I should like to hear about it.

Let us return, Mr. President, from our trip to "always-always land" and summarize the arguments I have presented against the proposed $100 tax deduction for campaign contributions. They are the following:

First. It is unjust and undemocratic; for the greater a taxpayer's income is, the greater would be the Government's share of a deductible $100 political contribution made by the taxpayer.

Second. It is unrealistic, for the great majority of American citizens could not benefit from it, either because they elect the standard deduction, or because they have no net taxable income after deductions.

Third. It is further unrealistic and undemocratic, because only a small minority of taxpayers of moderate income can make a $100 campaign contribution in any case, even if they can save $20 in taxes by itemizing the campaign gift as a deduction, so that it only costs them $80—while the wealthier taxpayers who already now contribute $100 or more would have a substantial proportion of their $100 political gift—and that of their wives—paid for by the Government.

Fourth. Finally, it is doubly inequitable, because the revenue loss due to the deductions of these wealthier contributors would, to the extent of 63 percent, be borne by the 98 percent of the people whose modest incomes place them in a top tax bracket of 27 percent or less.

WHOLE NATION SHOULD UNDERWRITE HEAVIEST ELECTION COSTS

Mr. President, I believe in the principle of having the whole Nation share in carrying some of the terribly heavy costs of modern election campaigns. I have introduced a bill to that end, S. 3242, which is cosponsored by half a dozen other Senators. I hope it will be considered by the Senate elections subcommittee, along with S. 3308. But if we are to accomplish this indirectly by tax devices, rather than directly, at least the tax device ought to be fair and democratic and equitable for all taxpayers, without respect to their income bracket.

One such tax device, Mr. President, would be to give every individual a tax credit for the full amount of a contribution to the campaign of a candidate for Federal elective office, up to $10 per taxpayer in one taxable year. In other words, instead of granting taxpayers a deduction for a large contribution of $100—a deduction which may be worth $80 to some taxpayers, $20 to many more, and nothing at all to most—let us grant every taxpayer a credit against his taxes for truly small contributions of $10 each, a credit which will be worth the same to every small campaign contributor, no matter what his income bracket.

I have had an amendment drafted to substitute this device for the $100 deduction provided in title II of the present bill, and I ask that it be printed at this point in my remarks. I am offering the amendment for myself and for the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, ferred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY) is as follows:

Strike out title II of the bill, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"TITLE II. INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

"SEC. 201. (a) Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by renumbering section 38 as 39, and by inserting after section 37 the following new section:

"'SEC. 38. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office

"'(a) General rule: In the case of an individual over 18 years of age, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the political contributions made by such individual during the taxable year to the extent that such political contributions do not exceed $10.

"'(b) Limitations:

"'(1) Application with other credits.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), section 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), section 35 (relating to partially tax exempt interest), and section 37 (relating to retirement income).

"'(2) Verification.—The credit allowable under subsection (a) shall be allowed only if the political contribution or contributions with respect to which such credit is allowable are verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"'(c) Definition of political contribution.—For purposes of this section, the term "political contribution" means a contribution or gift to—

"'(1) an individual whose name is presented for election as President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, an elector for President or Vice President of the United States, a Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate to the House of Representatives) in a general or special election, in a primary election, or in a convention of a political party, for use by such individual to further his candidacy for any such office; or

"'(2) a committee acting in behalf of an individual described in paragraph (1), for use by such committee to further the candidacy of such individual.'

"(b) The table of sections to part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out:

"'SEC. 38. Overpayments of tax.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'SEC. 38. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"'SEC. 39. Overpayments of tax.'

"(c) Section 642 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax for estates and trusts) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"'(4) Political contributions.—An estate or trust shall not be allowed the credit against tax for political contributions to candidates for elective Federal office provided by section 38.'

"(d) Section 6014 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income tax return where tax is not computed by the taxpayer) is amended by striking out 'section 34 or 37' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 34, 37, or 38.'

"SEC. 202. The amendments made by this title shall apply only to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this act, but only with respect to contributions or gifts made on or after such date."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, if we are to use tax incentives to encourage small, individual campaign contributions from the largest possible number of men and women, my amendment will really permit that to be done, without discrimination among individuals of different income brackets. Note also, Mr. President, that my amendment would expressly exclude trusts, estates, and such fiduciaries, and minors under the age of 18 years from taking advantage of this tax credit.

The substitution of this amendment for the unfair and undemocratic $100 deduction in the present S. 3308 is one of the conditions under which I shall be able to support enactment of that bill. There is another condition, Mr. President, concerning which I hope to address the Senate in the early future.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of its work today the Senate today stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 6, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States, the enrolled bill (S. 2884) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

TAX WRITEOFFS FOR IDAHO POWER CO. DAMS IN HELLS CANYON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain letters to the Office of Defense Mobilization, in regard to quick tax writeoffs in the case of two Idaho Power Co. dams in the Hells Canyon part of the Snake River:

Letters to the Office of Defense Mobilization re quick tax writeoff of two Idaho Power Co. dams in Hells Canyon stretch.

First. Letter of February 6, 1956, from Senators MORSE, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, NEUBERGER, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, and Representatives PFOST, METCALF, MAGNUSON, and GREEN;

Second. Individual letters of protest from Senators ANDERSON, DOUGLAS, FULBRIGHT, GORE, GREEN, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, KERR, LANGER, MCNAMARA, and NEELY;

Third. Letter of protest from Clyde T. Ellis, general manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, to the Office of Defense Mobilization; and

Fourth. Letter of protest from Alex Radin, general manager, American Public Power Association, to the Office of Defense Mobilization.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1956.

Re TA-26407, TA-26500.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: In August 1955 Senator MORSE wrote to you urging denial of the above-designated applications for quick tax writeoff certificates by the Idaho Power Co. The National Hells Canyon Association also submitted a letter in opposition. On January 18 you wrote to Senators MORSE and MAGNUSON and the association submitting an ODM staff memorandum for comment.

This letter and the attached detailed comments constitute a joint statement to register with your office the most forcible opposition to the issuance of the two Idhao Power Co. applications.

In outline, our reasons in opposition to the granting of these applications are:

1. Contrary to the staff paper, Brownlee and Oxbow power will not contribute to present or attract future defense loads in its own service area because of its high cost, and unfavorable competitive position against Bonneville power on the Columbia at one-third the Idaho Power wholesale rate. No showing has been made to document the nature and extent of the company plan contribution to national defense of the two projects. We ask your office to determine and furnish us with a detailed breakdown of each defense load, if any, claimed to be served by Brownlee and Oxbow power and how many kilowatts of power will be required by each load.

2. Contrary to the staff paper, surplus power at three times the Bonneville rate will not be marketable in the area of the West group utilities of the Northwest Power Pool. The transmission interconnection between Idaho Power and the Federal Power system is an arrangement to import power into southern Idaho, not export it downstream. Therefore, no substantial contribution from Brownlee and Oxbow at-site generation can be expected to aid in alleviating the lower Columbia power shortage.

3. Contrary to the staff paper, no finding was made, either by the FPC examiner or the Commission, that storage release from Brownlee Reservoir will add to downstream generation at Federal dams in operation and under construction.

4. Contrary to the staff paper, there has been no showing that either Oxbow or Brownlee Dams can or will be in operation by the ODM deadline for the program of December 31, 1958. In fact, there is serious doubt on this matter.

5. Contrary to the staff paper, no rapid amortization incentive is required by Idaho Power Co. to construct its two projects. The

company has asserted for the Federal Power Commission record that it is fully capable of carrying out its own financial arrangements at no cost to taxpayers, and has publicly boasted that it is ready, willing, and able to build its projects without any cost to taxpayers.

6. Comprising potential additions by Brownlee and Oxbow to the backlog of potential capacity in the reserve goal for 1958 is illusory, and will inhibit ODM from processing applications for other projects which can demonstrate assurance of being in operation by the time of the ODM deadline.

7. The question of necessity of continuing the quick writeoff program to private power companies is raised. Their financial soundness, the continuous increase in demand for electric energy for normal peacetime purposes, their utility responsibility to meet demand, all reduce the financial risk of investment in new generation to a minimum.

8. The quick writeoff certificate, in our opinion is a subsidy provided by the American people—one that has reached monumental proportions involving billions of dollars in the few years of its history.

9. Reliance on the Department of the Interior as an unbiased recommending agency in the processing of necessity certificate applications is open to serious doubt. Its allegations of fact in this proceeding, are misleading and irreconcilable with the FPC record, the FPC examiner's findings and the FPC decision. It presents assumptions that are unfounded and are, on their face, out of date. The Interior report demonstrates bias and special pleading on behalf of the Idaho Power Co.

We also take this opportunity to make known our opinion that the manner by which you have apparently arrived at a conclusion concerning the certifiability of the Brownlee and Oxbow accelerated amortization applications raises serious question whether the disposition of vast sums of Federal funds is subject to meaningful and carefully scruitinized criteria.

The instant applications constitute another example of the bias of the Department of the Interior toward the Idaho Power Co., in spite of its many times expressed policy of impartiality on the issue of proper development in the public interest of the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River.

The recommendations of Interior that the Idaho Power Co. applications for rapid amortization certificates, in our judgment are basically in defiance of fact and, in addition, present assumptions concerning the use of Brownlee and Oxbow power production for both defense and nondefense needs which are completely unsubstantiated.

We have seen no data brought forward by applicant which would sustain the burden of proof it must assume to become eligible for necessity certificates under Defense Goal 55—Electric Power. The record of the Federal Power Commission proceedings, and the findings and conclusions of both the presiding examiner and the full Commission, itself, do not in any fashion give aid and comfort to Interior's assertion that the applicant's two projects would in any substantial way contribute to national defense.

The serious power stringency into which the Pacific Northwest is now passing will not be adequately met, either short or long range, by projects which would deprive this region of the full use of hydroelectric power at low cost. ODM generating goals will not be served adequately by the sacrifice of some 600,000 prime kilowatts of power from the intermediate system envisaged in the Main Control Plan of the Army Corps of Engineers, and probably more than 800,000 kilowatts in the Corps' ultimate system of dams downstream from Hells Canyon, if the private scheme is substituted for the Federal Hells Canyon project.

Your office should, therefore, disengage itself from a narrow concept of what constitutes the necessity for the national defense to provide more generating capacity, and view this goal very carefully with respect to which of contending mutually exclusive projects will do the most toward carrying out the policy. A solution of expediency is no solution at all. The energy loss implicit in the private proposal for Middle Snake River development will not only curtail optimum energy output in the Columbia region, but seriously affect the rate of economic growth of this great region which depends upon its economic-hydro potential as its primary energy base, for farms, domestic, regular industry and defense purposes.

As the more detailed attached memorandum shows, there are serious questions of fact and policy involved in these applications. Under our system of government such questions are resolved best when there is full notice and hearings in which all interested parties may participate and make a public record. We, therefore, request that the Office of Defense Mobilization hold full public hearings on applications TA-26407 and TA-26500.

Moreover, the Department of Interior should adduce proper showing, other than the sketchy data which it submitted to your office, as to why these two applications should be approved, and its witness or witnesses should be subject to cross-examination. It seems clear that the Idaho Power Co. has not sustained the burden of proof which in all justice it should be required to do, and therefore, adequate substantiating material and exhibits from the Idaho Power Co. through appropriate witnesses, also subject to cross-examination, should be required for these proceedings by your office.

We shall appreciate being advised by you regarding public hearings on the applications, and we assume that adequate notice will be sent to all interested groups, as well as to applicant and the Department of the Interior.

Sincerely,

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Representative GRACIE PFOST, Representative LEE METCALF, Representative EDITH GREEN, Representative DON MAGNUSON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
February 16, 1956.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: This is to advise you that I have reviewed several of the aspects involved in the application of the Idaho Power Company for quick tax write-off certificates for the proposed Oxbow and Brownlee projects and that I have concluded that the granting of such certificates by your office will not be in the public interest.

I find that, in general, I concur in the stand previously expressed to you by Senators MORSE, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, NEUBERGER, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, DOUGLAS, AND GREEN; and by Representatives PFOST, METCALF, GREEN, AND MAGNUSON.

I respectfully request that my opposition to the granting of these certificates to the Idaho Power Company be noted and that I be notified of your decisions in this matter, together with the reasons therefor.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

FEBRUARY 14, 1956.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Senator WAYNE MORSE and the other Senators and Congressmen from Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho who have joined in formal objections to the granting of quick tax write-off certificates to the Idaho Power Company (TA-26407 and TA-26500), have kindly made a copy of their protest dated February 3, 1956 available to me.

After reviewing the grounds for their objections, I want you to know that I associate myself fully with their position and endorse their requests to you to deny the applications in question.

The faulty justifications of the Department of Interior should be scrutinized by you with great care and compared with the more authoritative findings of the FPC Examiner. The extravagantly high cost of the proposed power, the failure to make maximum development of the Snake River's power potential under the proposed plan, the improbability that this new Idaho Power Company power will substantially serve downstream utilities and defense industries, the lack of integration with other downstream power operations, the absence of assurance that construction can be completed by the December 31, 1958 deadline, these and other basic deficiencies should not now be glossed over by the granting of a necessity certificate by ODM.

If maximum development of power resources is necessary for national defense, ODM should not allow its discretion and authority to be utilized to give a blessing in the nature of special tax advantages—in the name of defense— to a minimum power development. Whatever mistakes other agencies or departments may have made in this matter, these are no reason for ODM to abdicate the separate discretion and responsibility entrusted to it by law.

At the very least, a public hearing should be granted as requested by these Members of Congress, and the various matters in doubt and in conflict should be cleared up before your final action is taken.

I therefore join in urging you to grant the fullest consideration and appropriate public hearings to these objections.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

FEBRUARY 16, 1956.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. FLEMMING: My attention has been called to the applications of the Idaho Power Co. (TA-26407; TA-26500) for accelerated tax amortization privileges under section 168 of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code (former sec. 124A), in connection with the dams which that company proposes to build at Brownlee and Oxbow in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River.

In your most recent annual report to the Joint Committee on Defense Production, you discussed this tax program as one of the financial incentives available to you to expand the Nation's production capacity and supply to meet defense requirements. While you took the position that the extent of the financial incentive was not entirely clear, at least it clearly included the interest on the funds the Government would have to borrow to replace the income taxes deferred by reason of the accelerated amortization.

I do not think it is necessary to discuss in this connection the merits of the Hells Canyon Dam controversy. But I think these applications for financial incentive must be considered in the context of this background. As you know, many Members of Congress thought that the Hells Canyon potential capacity should be developed by the Federal Government, with a high dam having an at-site output of over 600,000 kilowatts and contributing substantially to downstream generating capability. Instead, the administration is supporting the construction of the two privately owned dams covered by these applications, at a loss of 300,000 kilowatts to the existing system of Federal dams,

and a loss of 880,000 kilowatts from the ultimate Federal system of dams. The decision to permit these dams to go ahead, instead of the Federal development, was, as I understand it, based principally, if not entirely, on the argument that they did not involve Federal financing.

In fact, I understand that the Idaho Power Co. took the position before the Federal Power Commission, when its application was pending there, that it was fully capable of carrying out its own financial arrangements at no cost to the taxpayer.

I find it impossible to imagine your approving the company's request for a financial incentive, and financial assistance, to build these dams under such circumstances.

Accepting your position that an increase in electric-power capacity is needed for the national defense and security, I should have expected ODM would have supported the high dam on the ground that the greater increase in capacity would have provided greater assurance to the national security. Certainly, it is entirely inconsistent with the purpose of section 168, to provide a financial incentive to reduce the potential capacity.

I also find it difficult to understand the position of the applicant. As I understand it, Idaho Power went before one Federal agency, and argued, successfully, that it should carry out its project, instead of the high dam, on the ground that this will cost the taxpayer nothing. Now it is arguing that it needs a financial incentive, financial assistance, from the Government, in order to induce it to undertake the job.

These factors appear to me to be so conclusive as to compel a flat denial of the applications, without further consideration of the details of the proposals.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
February 22, 1956.

Re TA–26407, TA–26500.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Reference is made to the letter, together with its enclosures, signed by Senator WAYNE MORSE and other Members of Congress, under date of February 3, 1956, urging denial of the above-designated applications for tax-amortization certificates as filed by the Idaho Power Co. A copy of this letter and its enclosures have been forwarded to me.

I concur in the conclusion reached by the signers of the letter referred to, that the applicant has failed to establish its case sufficiently to warrant issuance of such certificates in the light of criteria established by the Congress in the enactment of the law pertinent to such cases. Accordingly, I urge that your office deny such applications, unless and until adequate justification therefor shall have been presented.

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE.

FEBRUARY 14, 1956.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FLEMMING: It has been called to my attention that the Office of Defense Mobilization has under consideration applications for quick tax writeoff certificates by the Idaho Power Co. and that objections to the granting of these applications have been registered by certain Senators.

I concur with the objections of Senator WAYNE MORSE and the other Senators who have registered such objections.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

FEBRUARY 24, 1956.

Re TA–26407, TA–26500.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: On February 3, 1956, a joint letter was directed to you in forcible opposition to the issuance of quick tax writeoff certificates to the Idaho Power Co., and asking for full public hearings on applications TA–26407 and TA–26500.

I wish to associate myself fully with this letter which was signed by Senators MORSE, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, NEUBERGER, MURRAY, and MANSFIELD, and by Congresswomen PFOST and GREEN, and Congressmen METCALF and MAGNUSON. I am in full accord with the opinions expressed and the actions urged by these Senators and Members of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

FEBRUARY 24, 1956.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Reference is made to the Idaho Power Co.'s application for quick tax writeoff certificates.

I have received a copy of Senator WAYNE MORSE's letter and joint statement to you objecting to granting of the company's request for these quick writeoff certificates.

I concur in these objections and want to urge you to deny this application.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

FEBRUARY 14, 1956.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: I am advised that you are presently considering certain tax amortization applications of the Idaho Power Co. in connection with the construction of small hydroelectric plants on the Snake River in Idaho.

As a result of studies that I have made, I am convinced that the construction of these low-head hydroelectric plants is much less desirable than the construction of the Hells Canyon project.

I am advised that certain of my colleagues have set forth many of the objections to the construction of the low dams as compared to the Hells Canyon project and have asked you to refrain from issuing the tax amortization certificates to the Idaho Power Co.

In the interest of developing the resources of this great country of ours, I hope that you will take into consideration the fact that to limit the development of Snake River by the construction of small projects will forever preclude the full development of this great river by the construction of the Hells Canyon project. It seems to me that this matter should be of great importance to every citizen of the United States.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT S. KERR.

FEBRUARY 21, 1956.

Re TA–26407, TA–26500.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: I wish to associate myself with the memorandum of February 6, 1956, sent to you by Senators MORSE, JACKSON, NEUBERGER, MURRAY, and MANSFIELD, and Congressmen PFOST, METCALF, MAGNUSON, and GREEN. I join in their analysis of the ODM staff memorandum and the DEPA report. In the light of the issues raised by the detailed comments of February 6, I believe that it would be improper to act upon the Idaho Power Co. applications without a public hearing in which all interested parties and agencies would present evidence and have their contentions subjected to cross-examination.

These applications involve substantial funds and represent a potential burden upon the taxpayers of the country. Any decision by ODM not based upon proven facts would cast doubt upon the methods used to grant millions of dollars of tax relief to other applicants.

With my very kindest regards and just every good wish, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR
AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
February 16, 1956.

Re TA–26407, TA–26500.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Accumulation of other business urgently requiring my attention has prevented me from considering, within the time limit set by you, the ODM Staff Memorandum concerning the above-designated applications by the Idaho Power Co. for accelerated amortization certificates.

Having studied the issues involved, I would like to inform you that I wholeheartedly concur in the objections to the Idaho Power's request for quick tax writeoff certificates expressed in the letter sent to you by Senators WAYNE MORSE, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, and others.

I would particularly like to call to your attention the fact that prior to the FPC's granting of a license to Idaho Power to develop the Oxbow-Brownlee project, the company repeatedly insisted that its plans for the project do not call for rapid amortization of its investments, and that it is ready, willing, and able to proceed with the plan without Federal assistance and thus save the Federal Government the cost of building the proposed high dam in the Middle Snake.

The company's reversal now in asking for a quick tax writeoff, as well as the Department of Interior's complicity in supporting such a request, is extremely repugnant to me.

I wish to register with you my sharpest opposition to the issuance of the requested accelerated amortization certificates to the Idaho Power Co.

Sincerely,

PAT MCNAMARA,
United States Senator.

FEBRUARY 20, 1956.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DIRECTOR: Please permit me to inform you of my complete concurrence in the letter of the 3d of February 1956 (Re TA–26407, TA–26500), which was written by Senators MORSE, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, NEUBERGER, MURRAY, and MANSFIELD; and Representatives PFOST, METCALF, GREEN, and MAGNUSON.

Very sincerely yours,

M. M. NEELY.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1956.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Reference is made to the pending applications of the Idaho Power Co. for accelerated tax amortization certificates for the Brownlee and Oxbow dams on the Snake River.

I wish to call to your attention the propaganda campaign now several years old in which the Idaho Power Co. has told the Nation repeatedly, either on its own or

through one of the power company propaganda fronts, that it was ready, willing and able to build the dams on the middle Snake and urging that taxpayers not throw hundreds of millions of dollars into a "hole" on the Snake.

I wish further to call your attention to the statement which appears in the brief of this power company, filed with the Federal Power Commission, in which it says (p. 107): "Over the license period, Idaho Power's investment in the three projects will provide in taxes, to the Federal government alone, an estimated $289,506,300—approximately twice the amount of the entire project cost—and this without a single dollar of investment of public funds."

This organization is firmly opposed to this program of subsidy to private monopoly, and we are particularly opposed to tax write-offs being used to promote a subsidized "partnership" program with private monopoly. And we are particularly opposed to the use of subsidy in promoting the tragic, wasteful and absolutely unjustifiable scheme of the Idaho Power Co. to develop half the potential of the middle Snake to sell at a rate almost three times as high as the power could be produced by the Federal Hells Canyon project.

Our calculations indicate that although the power company propaganda poured out seas of alligator tears about the "cost" of a Federal self-liquidating project, that the granting of the certificates in question would in fact amount to a subsidy greater than the total cost of the Federal project. This would be an almost incredible misuse of Federal funds.

Although, as we stated above, we are opposed to the subsidies being poured out to private monopoly, we would be willing to bow to defense necessity—as long as the Congress permits these subsidies and provides no alternative in promoting essential defense plant production. In other words, if ODM felt that the Idaho Power Co. dams were essential to defense, and had no alternative means for getting them built, and if they would not be built otherwise, we could understand and sympathize with you in your present position if you granted tax subsidies. But in this case, the power company is repeatedly on record (see pp. 8732–5 of the FPC hearing on Hells Canyon) as saying that they will and can build these plants without Federal subsidy. Consequently, there is absolutely no justification for the granting of a certificate in the name of "defense." I think the ODM admitted this when the Staff Paper refused to relate the contribution of the Idaho Power projects to defense needs in the area.

Tax subsidies are already under attack, and we believe that if the Idaho Power certificates are granted, if, in other words, ODM authorizes subsidies in excess of the total cost of a Federal self-liquidating project which would produce twice the power at slightly over one-third the cost per kilowatt-hour, that the people will be sickened with the whole arrangement and demand that this kind of flagrant waste of the peoples' money to subsidize monopoly be stopped once and for all. Such action, however, could not undo the injustice and waste which would result from your granting these certificates.

We urge you to deny any subsidy to the Idaho Power Co. for the purpose of underdeveloping power on the Snake River.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1956.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: I understand that the staff of the Office of Defense Mobilization has recommended issuance of fast tax write-off certificates to the Idaho Power Co. for the Oxbow and Brownlee projects, two of the company's three proposed low dams which would prevent construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River. It is also my understanding that you presently are considering action on this staff recommendation.

Our association, representing more than 800 local publicly owned electric utilities in 40 States, Puerto Rico and Alaska, would like to take this means of registering an emphatic protest against the granting of such certificates. It is tragic enough that the Federal Power Commission has chosen to grant this company a license to exploit these sites in piecemeal development, thereby forever depriving the people of the Northwest and of the Nation of the full benefits of maximum, comprehensive development of the Hells Canyon site. To give this company a Federal tax subsidy of tremendous proportions to carry out this scheme is to compound this travesty.

Perhaps one of the best indications of the doubtful justification for a tax subsidy for these projects is found in the testimony of Mr. Tom Roach, president of Idaho Power Co., before the Federal Power Commission on December 8, 1953. In the hearing before a presiding examiner of the FPC in connection with the company's application for a license for the three low dams, Mr. Roach, in response to questions from counsel for the National Hells Canyon Association, admitted (see pp. 8732–8735 of transcript) that he had "faint hope" that the company's applications for the fast tax writeoff certificates would be granted. In fact, he said that no provision for the company's receipt of fast tax writeoffs had been made in the company's projection of an exhibit showing cash generation from 1948–52. It was the projection of this exhibit which was used as the basis for the company's financing plans for the three-dam project.

It is my understanding that the purpose of the accelerated tax amortization program is to provide an incentive for the production of materials and services needed for national defense goals. In this connection, may I point out that the Idaho Power Co. first made application for a preliminary permit for the Oxbow Dam in 1947, approximately 3 years before the Korean war. That fact, plus testimony at the FPC hearing, makes it abundantly clear that these projects are needed to meet the company's normal load growth, and not for defense requirements. In fact, the presiding examiner found that, despite an urgent need for more power in the Pacific Northwest, power from the company's three-dam plan would not be marketed outside of the company's service area, because of the high price for this power as compared with the prevailing price for power in the Pacific Northwest. The Commission itself did not make a contrary finding, but, in effect, corroborated the finding of the examiner by providing for a 9-year construction period for the 3 projects. The Commission also recognized that one of the projects (low Hells Canyon) might not even be built within the 9-year period, because of insufficient demand for the power.

Moreover, I submit that the Commission granted the license for these projects on the assumption that there would be no Government tax aid. In this connection, I direct your attention to the following statement which appears on page 17 of the Commission's opinon (No. 283) covering issuance of licenses to Idaho Power Co.: "Whether development of the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River be by a Federal or non-Federal entity, the public purposes to be served by either alternative plan would include flood control, navigation, power generation, recreation, and conservation of fish and wildlife resources, but neither plan of development would supply water for irrigation of lands. We have indicated the extent to which these public purposes would be served under either plan. However, under existing law, these public purposes will be realized without expense to the United States to the extent that the projects are constructed by a non-Federal entity."

Again, in the next paragraph of its Opinion No. 283, the Commission states, "Development by applicant of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River would provide 1 million acre-feet of flood-control storage and the required stream flow regulation in aid of navigation on the lower river at no cost to the United States."

Now, only some 6 months later, your staff is recommending issuing of fast tax write-off certificates for these projects—certificates which the Commission itself, in an earlier opinion, referred to as "having the precise effect of a grant by our Government to a certificate holder of an interest-free loan." These certificates have also been described by a congressional committee as "the biggest bonanza that ever came down the Government pike."

It is my understanding that Idaho Power Co. has asked the Government to approve rapid tax write-off on $103 million of the estimated $126 million cost of the Oxbow and Brownlee projects.

If your agency allows rapid tax amortization of 65 percent of the $103 million (a percentage which has been commonly applied to other similar projects) Idaho Power Co. would be able to deduct $31 million more than the company's normal depreciation from its Federal income taxes over a 5-year period. This $31 million is what the FPC referred to as having the effect of an "interest-free loan." By reinvesting this "interest-free loan" at a 6 percent rate of return, over a 50-year period of the license for these projects the company would receive an estimated total subsidy of $338,406,063—even after repayment during a 45-year period of the taxes withheld during the initial 5 years.

I cannot refrain from pointing out that this subsidy is about equal to the estimated cost of the high Hells Canyon Dam. In other words, if these fast tax write-off certificates are granted to Idaho Power Co., the Government will be providing a subsidy in an amount which would be more than enough for the Government to build high Hells Canyon Dam. The essential difference, however, is that if the Government were to build high Hells Canyon Dam (instead of subsidizing Idaho Power Co.'s low dams), all of the Government's investment in power facilities would be repaid in full, with interest, and the people would receive the benefit of almost 3 million acre-feet additional usable flood storage and 444,000 kilowatts of additional power than would be provided by the company's 3 low dams.

And from a national defense standpoint, which is of primary concern to your agency, the High Hells Canyon Dam would be important not only because of the additional power capacity it would make available, but also because the substantially lower-cost power from high Hells Canyon would provide an attractive supply of power for the vital electrometallurgical and electrochemical industries. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether these defense industries, which require such large quantities of electric power, would find it feasible to use the higher-cost power to be produced at the low dams.

To say therefore that the issuance of these tax subsidies to Idaho Power Co. compounds a travesty is to describe the situation mildly.

We urge your prompt rejection of the application for these tax certificates.

Sincerely,

ALEX RADIN.

BRAUN & CO.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield to the Senator for that purpose, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield for that purpose?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield, if I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last Thursday I raised the question on this floor about the propriety of Secretary Benson using the services of a public relations firm named as a coconspirator in a criminal information filed by another Cabinet officer, Attorney General Brownell.

From the wire I have since received from T. W. Braun, president of Braun & Co., he is apparently upset at this being brought out into the open. He goes so far as to talk about political smears and character assassinations.

Now, Mr. President, I want the RECORD quite clear once more that I have brought no charges against Mr. Braun. The Attorney General has. If Mr. Braun thinks those charges unfair or unjust, the place to send his protest is to the Attorney General.

Rather than reflect upon the Braun agency, I believe I made it quite clear Thursday that they had been doing an outstanding job. Is it political smear and character assassination to commend a firm for the excellence of its work, when assigned a most difficult task?

I invite Mr. Braun to again read that RECORD, rather than just press stories. I invite him to show me where there was any criticism of him or his agency.

I must say, Mr. President, that the press stories were most fair.

My criticism was directed solely at the Republican National Committee and Secretary Benson—the place where criticism belongs.

If Mr. Braun had not seen fit to cloud the issue with his own reply carried by the Associated Press and other wire services, I would have been glad to let the record rest with my commendation of the good job the Braun agency was doing in the most difficult task of popularizing the Secretary of Agriculture—and I digress to say that is a rather formidable assignment—along with my questioning the propriety of his firm being used by the Republican National Committee until two Republican Cabinet members had time to agree on whether or not he had coconspired to break the law.

I repeat, Mr. President, that all I did was to read into the RECORD the charges which had been filed by the Justice Department.

Now, however, I feel compelled to comment further on Mr. Braun's statement.

Mr. Braun wires me protesting that his firm has worked "for the Government on a nonpartisan and public service basis in various ways since 1941," and cited the fact he was a staff member assigned to study foreign economic policies for a report to President Truman. I commend him for this fine service to his country.

I wish to say that at no time have I been critical of his voluntary civic services to the Government of the United States.

The Associated Press dispatch appearing in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on March 3 is headlined "Braun Aids Dems, Too, He Tells HUMPHREY."

Well, Mr. President, perhaps Mr. Braun needs a little lesson in civics. He seems to draw no distinction between being engaged by the Republican National Committee, and serving in an official Government position.

The Associated Press story goes on to say that Mr. Braun had informed me "that he had served Democrats as well as Republicans, on a nonpartisan and public service basis."

I am a bit amazed to learn that employment by the Republican National Committee now comes under the heading of nonpartisan public service.

Mr. Braun's message to me went on to cite the great service he has performed for agriculture by campaigns to increase sales and consumption of farm products, especially those in surplus.

Fine; I am glad he has been so interested in the farmer. But what does that have to do at all with the issue I raised? That issue was not about Mr. Braun's personal qualifications, but about the propriety of Secretary Benson and the Republican National Committee selecting a firm facing charges made by another Cabinet officer.

I think it is a very legitimate concern on my part, in view of the fact that the Justice Department has named Mr. Braun's agency as one of the defendants in a suit.

Mr. Braun assures me his firm and he will continue to be "available for public service whenever responsible officers of the Government think there is anything which we can contribute."

I am glad to hear of his patriotic interest in Government. But once again, I am surprised to think that the experienced head of such an outstanding public relations firm thinks the Republican National Committee is the Government.

Of course, from the tone of his reply, perhaps I am mistaken in thinking the Republican National Committee originated the idea of using him to glamorize Secretary Benson. In view of Mr. Braun's laboring the point about being "available for public service whenever responsible officers of the Government" think there is anything he can contribute, can it be possible that his "call to public service" came from Secretary Benson himself, rather than the Republican National Committee—with the latter group only taking care of the payroll?

Mr. Braun objects to my saying he had apparently "folded the tents" of his Operation Benson, pointing out that his agency still has offices downtown in the Press Building. If Mr. Braun will check the record, I am sure he will find that I referred to his agency's operations publicizing Benson being suddenly shut down, not to the Braun company going out of business with their many other clients. And if I was mistaken in understanding that Jennings Phillips, the man Mr. Braun brought from Salt Lake to handle Operation Benson, had suddenly completed his work and left town—so were all the members of the press who checked later at the Republican National Committee and had that fact confirmed.

No; I do not think Mr. Braun has anything to complain about from my comments about him, his firm, or his clients. His complaints are going in the wrong direction. I suggest he send them to Mr. Brownell.

Furthermore, perhaps Mr. Braun will really find out it is better in the long run that he is not representing Mr. Benson and the Safeway Co. at the same time.

I am sure he would prefer not getting Secretary Benson involved in any possible conflict of interest case over the $74,000 the Comptroller General has ruled that the Secretary of Agriculture should not have paid Safeway in a CCC cheese purchase and resale "deal" during the lowering of dairy-price supports in 1954. Apparently, it is now Secretary Benson's responsibility to negotiate return of this improperly paid windfall. I do not know what he is doing about collecting it. But I suggest it might have been awkward for Secretary Benson to press for return of those funds if he and Safeway continued to have the same public-relations agency.

In fairness to Mr. Braun, Mr. President, and so that the record can be clear on his interest in nonpartisan public service, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the copy of the telegram I received from him last Friday afternoon.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 2, 1956.*

Hon. HUBERT M. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building:

Reference your remarks about Secretary of Agriculture Benson and Braun & Co. in the Senate, March 1.

If you had checked the whole record you would have found that we have worked for the Government on a nonpartisan and public-service basis in various ways since 1941.

My last effort under a Democratic administration was as a consultant in the Executive Office of the President in 1950. I was a member of the staff which studied and reported to the President on foreign economic policies.

In terms of solid assistance to American farmers, we are proud to match our record against political smears and character assassinations.

For over 20 years one of our principal activities has been in the field of increasing sales and consumption of farm products, especially those in surplus.

Beginning in 1936 we played a leading part in developing the producer-consumer campaign idea. Since then about 300 promotions have been conducted on such products as citrus fruits, apples, pears, peaches, cherries, lettuce, cabbage, potatoes, dairy products and meat. In 1954 alone, 28 farm items were given national promotion to increase

consumption of foods in heavy supply. Our client, Safeway Stores, Inc., was one of the leaders in an expenditure by food chains alone of about $12½ million advertising fresh beef in a recent drive on that product. The results in increased consumption were spectacular and in the neighborhood of 18 pounds per capita.

Similar campaigns have been undertaken to increase the consumption of the large pork supplies which began moving to market last fall. Increases in sales of over 15 percent represent further solid accomplishments.

Although our 90-day agreement with the Republican National Committee terminated Tuesday, February 28, we have not "folded our tents." We established an office in Washington, D. C., in the National Press Building in 1943. That office is still there.

This firm and I will continue to be available for public service whenever responsible officers of the Government think there is anything which we can contribute.

BRAUN & CO.
T. W. BRAUN, *President.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Furthermore, Mr. President, I wish to suggest that Mr. Braun, if he is as smart a public relations man as I am advised he is, should be happy to be out of his Benson promotion contract.

No successful firm likes to fail in an undertaking, but all do now and then. Mr. Braun, I am afraid, bit off more than he could chew in trying to make Secretary Benson's policies popular with farmers. That is no reflection on Mr. Braun. That is a reflection on this administration.

Now that he is out of a hopeless assignment, I suggest that Mr. Braun should be happy to leave well enough alone, and return to promoting consumption of food products, which he has apparently done so well for his private clients.

The Braun agency has done an outstanding job in terms of advertising and public relations efforts, which have been made to promote a greater consumption of food products. That, of course, has been service to the American economy. I felt that he had taken on an assignment which was somewhat difficult to complete successfully, and, furthermore, that he found himself in a rather unusual situation, being the public relations officer for a member of the Cabinet, on the one hand, and at the same time being named in an indictment brought by another Cabinet officer, namely, the Attorney General.

It appears to me that this was not very sound policy. Therefore, I felt my remarks not only were appropriate, but should have been made, and I trust they are of immediate interest and concern to the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Braun Aids Dems, Too, He Tells HUMPHREY," published in the St. Paul Pioneer Dispatch of March 3, to which I alluded earlier in my comments, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAUN AIDS DEMS, TOO, HE TELLS HUMPHREY

WASHINGTON.—T. W. Braun, president of a Los Angeles public relations firm, informed Senator HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota) Friday that he had served Democrats as well as Republicans "on a nonpartisan and public service basis."

During debate on the farm bill Thursday, HUMPHREY criticized the Republican National Committee for hiring Braun & Co. as a consultant. HUMPHREY said its assignment was "to popularize" Secretary of Agriculture Benson and the GOP farm program.

Braun replied Friday with a statement to HUMPHREY in which he said he was "a consultant in the executive office of the President in 1950" on foreign economic problems. President Truman was in office then.

"In terms of solid assistance to American farmers, we are proud to match our record against political smears and character assassinations," Braun told the Senator.

"For over 20 years one of our principal activities has been in the field of increasing sales and consumption of farm products, especially those in surplus."

HUMPHREY had linked the Braun firm and Safeway Stores, Inc., in his speech, saying they were named together in an antitrust indictment at Fort Worth, Tex., charging attempts to monopolize the retail grocery business.

A Justice Department official said Braun & Co. was named as an alleged coconspirator in the case, but was not made a defendant. This official said also that the indictment later was dismissed by the Government and an information substituted.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when I left the Senate on Thursday last, I told the Senate I was about to return to Minnesota, where I had been invited to address what I hoped would be a rather large meeting at Benson, Minn., on Saturday night. I did address that meeting, and my expectations as to the size of the crowd were more than realized. Actually, there were considerably more than 2,200 farmers in the audience; and that is a most conservative estimate. The entire auditorium and gymnasium of Benson High School was filled—jam packed.

While I was there, I asked the farmers questions. I told them I would be returning to the Senate to discuss the farm bill and the whole farm situation in more detail. When I asked, for example, how many in the audience would like to have the junior Senator from Minnesota vote for 90 percent of parity price supports on the basic commodities, a sea of arms went up.

I can honestly say that when I asked, "How many would like to have me support the Eisenhower-Benson program?" the number of hands which went up were so few that they were almost indiscernible.

There were present farmers from the 12 counties surrounding Benson, Minn., which is in Swift County. The farmers came with their wives and children to listen to a report by one of their Senators. Those farmers, in no uncertain words, and in no uncertain terms, directed me, by their show of hands and by their personal expressions to me following the meeting, to stand firm for the 90 percent of parity crop support loans, as advocated and outlined in the bill before the Senate.

I talked to them also about other matters in the bill, including the soil-bank proposal. I talked to them in reference to the farm credit situation. I discussed with them problems relating to feed grain. I shall cosponsor with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] an amendment on feed grains. I am happy to say that the same farmers indicated their approval of the proposal intended to be offered by the Senator from Texas.

The farmers also indicated their desire that my amendment to provide premium payments on lightweight hogs be given active and wholehearted support.

It was my privilege also to attend other meetings in Minnesota, meetings primarily attended by farm families. I was at Big Lake, Minn. I was at Waverly, Minn. I was at Elk River, Minn., for a very brief visit with some of the people of that community. I was at Litchfield, Minn. I was at Marshall, Minn. I was at Montevideo, Minn. I was at Sauk Center, Minn. I was at Williams, Minn. I was at Nashua, Minn. I was at Cokato, Minn. I was at Duluth, Minn. In other words, Mr. President, I had a busy weekend.

While I was in Minnesota, I discussed the pending legislation with hundreds and hundreds of persons. I also asked, at practically every one of the meetings, the question relating to the price support level upon agricultural commodities.

These were audiences which had come to hear Mr. Adlai Stevenson speak to them. They were citizens who were interested in the political developments of our day. It was my privilege, however, to report to them at those meetings on the subject of the pending legislation.

I support, in the main, the provisions of S. 3183. I took with me mimeographed statements explaining the different titles of the bill. I am happy to say that the overwhelming body of opinion, as expressed by personal word, by a show of hands, and by conference, was in support of the 90-percent-of-parity payments. Every public opinion poll in the State of Minnesota indicates the same attitude.

The Benson-Eisenhower farm program is not popular. The Benson-Eisenhower farm program is not wanted. As I indicated to the farm families in Minnesota, the great advertising campaign which has been carried on, relating to the so-called Eisenhower farm program, is directed, apparently, toward some theoretical concept, rather than toward a legislative policy, because there is no Eisenhower farm program before the United States Senate. There may be such a program in the form of an amendment. If there is, we shall have the privilege to vote upon it; and I am of the opinion that we will vote it down.

I discussed in detail the paid advertisements of the Republican senatorial and congressional campaign committees. Those advertisements are well known to the Members of the Senate. I went down the nine points and discussed each and every one of them. I pointed out, for example, that the soil-bank feature, which is one of the nine points, was included in the Senate bill—with modifica-

tions, however, which we believe improve the bill.

I discussed the commodities which are included in the farm bill. I discussed the matter of farm credit.

It was my privilege to talk to more than 25,000 farmers and their wives during my 2½ or 3 days' stay in Minnesota. I can assure the Senate that I came back to Washington reassured and confident as to the views and attitudes of our people.

So I speak today with considerable pride and strength in terms of the bill which I support, because it is a bill which is well understood by the vast majority of the farm families, and also by all others who are interested in agriculture.

I wish that Members of the Senate could have been with me to see the demonstrations of interest on the part of the farmers. I can honestly say that those who attended the meetings on behalf of the press and the radio were very much interested. Correspondents from all the great national and international wire services and correspondents from some of the leading periodicals and newspapers were present. Time after time, reporters would say to me that they had never quite appreciated how strong the feeling in a rural area was with respect to the subject of agriculture.

There has been much loose talk to the effect that possibly some of us have exaggerated or overstated the significance of the so-called farm problem. I say again for the record that we have underestimated it. No matter how the Senate may vote, the vote will be watched, scrutinized, analyzed, and evaluated. Those who vote to reduce farm income, as apparently some of the pronouncements would indicate may happen, will have to be brought to task under the established processes of American democracy, namely, in the election.

While I was away from the Senate over the week end, I was pleased to note press reports concerning the statement by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I recall that the Senator from Louisiana said the adoption of a 90 percent price-support schedule would mean approximately an additional $850 million in farm income during the coming year. Farmers understand that, Mr. President. The farmers know the trouble they are in. Farmers read in the newspapers, and city people read also, that farm income in 1955 was down $1 billion from 1954. That news story, Mr. President, was highly significant, because it pointed out exactly what we had been saying as to the growing depression in agriculture.

I think I commented last week on the fact that short-term loans in agriculture were up 17 percent in the Federal Reserve District of Minneapolis, where one of the Federal Reserve banks is located. I wish to read a news story from the Washington Star of today, Tuesday, March 6, on page 2, a feature story by Mr. Ovid A. Martin, one of the most capable and able of all agricultural writers. He is an Associated Press staff writer. I wish to pay proper tribute to Mr. Martin. I have read his stories with considerable interest. They are factual, and they have presented to the American people an overall understandable report of what is transpiring here in the Congress with regard to agricultural legislation. Furthermore, the stories have been well documented as to the economic facts of the present agricultural difficulties.

The story reads as follows:

NINETEEN FIFTY-FIVE FARM INCOME FELL $1 BILLION, UNITED STATES REPORTS

Total farmer income fell nearly a billion dollars last year, the Agriculture Department said today.

While this was happening, a Department report said, the income of the nonfarm segment of the Nation's economy was rising above 1954 levels.

The Department said the income of the Nation's farm population, from all sources, last year totaled a little more than $19 billion for an individual average of $860. This compared with just under $20 billion received in 1954 for an individual average of $913.

In other words, the per capita income of farmers and farm families dropped approximately $53 last year.

I continue to read from the news story:

The nonfarm population was said to have received total income of $275 billion last year for an individual average of $1,922—more than double the farm average. The previous year the nonfarm total was $258 billion for an individual average of $1,837.

So it will be noted, Mr. President, that the individual income of nonfarm people rose approximately $85, while the individual income of farm people dropped approximately $53.

That is the situation which prevails throughout the Nation. I wish we could have automobile dealers come to the Senate and testify to what is going on in rural areas. One of the best known and most active automobile dealers in southern Minnesota told me, over the weekend, he had not sold one new car to a farmer in 3 months, and he is in one of the great agricultural areas of the Nation, in southern Minnesota, in Cottonwood County. He sold some second-hand cars, but not many of those.

I talked to businessmen over the weekend. They told me what was happening in terms of their sales, and the difficulty that petroleum dealers, for example, were having in collecting accounts. The same thing could be developed in county after county and State after State.

The economics of agriculture ought to be pretty well known. I regret that the administration's proposals have failed to take into consideration the urgent need of immediate income-producing measures on the part of the Congress of the United States.

Whatever one may think of 90 percent price supports, there is one thing sure, Mr. President—they will mean more income; and, if controls on production are used, they will not mean more production.

I began the debate by trying to dissipate some of the myths which have become part and parcel of the public information on the agricultural situation. One of those myths was, and is, that the payment of 90 percent of parity price supports has been responsible for the surpluses and for increased production. The interesting part of that myth is that while it is stated again and again, there are few, if any, facts to support it. Indeed, Mr. President, the facts are to the contrary. The facts point out that when we had 90 percent price supports with effective production controls, with an effective county and township committee system working with farmers, encouraging farmers to cooperate with the production program and the control program, there were much better cash prices in the market for grain and other farm commodities. Furthermore, there was much better control over production itself.

I desire to emphasize again that no farm program can work unless there is farmer participation. I wish to reemphasize that a Secretary of Agriculture cannot, nor can the entire Department of Agriculture, make a farm program work effectively unless there is an understanding of that program at the grassroots level, at the farm level, at the township level, at the county level, and at the State level.

I think the greatest single mistake of this administration has been, and will be recorded to be, the manipulation of, the weakening of, and the outright politicking of the farmer elected-committee system. The farmer-elected committee system, which has been a part of our agricultural program for almost 25 years, has been weakened to such a point that throughout the Nation, particularly in the Midwest, in the great breadbasket of America, there is no longer faith and confidence in its efficacy or in its policies and proposals.

I regret to have to say this, but it is true. I have yet to go to a single State where a delegation of farmers has not called upon me and asked me, as a Member of the Senate, what could be done to restore again the integrity and the autonomy of the county committees. They were formerly called PMA committees. They are now called ASC committees.

When Mr. Benson, by regulation—and I emphasize, by regulation—decided that no individual member of a farmer-elected committee could serve for more than 3 years, he literally kicked out of office the trusted, tried, and experienced farmers of the Nation. But, worse than that, after changing the ground rules as to the period of service members of the county and township committees could have, he proceeded to change the rules as to their function. He put those farmers in an advisory capacity, and then he proceeded to limit the amount of advice they could give, the number of days they could serve, and the amount of time a day they could give to the program.

Mr. President, by the slow process of attrition—slow, but also determined—the Department of Agriculture is wrecking the entire administrative framework of an effective farm program.

As soon as this bill is completed, Mr. President, I am going to proceed with further hearings on the farmer-elected committee system. I have held hearings in the field, and I have held hearings

here in Washington; and I shall proceed further. I want the Secretary of Agriculture to come before our committee and testify. I do not want some 33d assistant to do so. I want to hear from the man who is supposed to be running this program; and I want the representatives of the Secretary of Agriculture who will read this RECORD to take it to him—as I have written to him—and point out to him what I have had to say here about the mismanagement of the farmer-elected committee system.

Mr. President, weeks ago I wrote about this matter to the Secretary of Agriculture. I pointed out some of the testimony we received and some of the charges which have been made, and I pointed out what I believe to be some of the outright violations of law which this Department is condoning. I repeat that this Department is condoning outright violations of law; it is paying people, and keeping them on the payroll, after they have been fired.

In Missouri, I found case after case where the county manager of a farmer-elected committee at the county level had been duly dismissed under all the rules and procedures of the Department of Agriculture; he had been fired by the county commission which has jurisdiction over that county manager. But the county manager is still on the job. Why? Because the political boss at the top said, "Stay there." I repeat, Mr. President, that the political boss at the top said that to the county manager, who had been fired; and that manager is still running the program in the county.

Mr. President, these State committee members are not appointed by the State; instead, they are selected by the Secretary of Agriculture. In all too many instances the State committees are denying authority and responsibility to the local committees. The State committees are removing elected officials—officials elected by their own neighbors; and they are being removed on the ground that they do not agree with the State chairmen. That sounds more like Russia than the United States, Mr. President.

All these matters have been brought to the attention of the Department of Agriculture. Everything I am saying is a matter of documented evidence. Every witness testified under oath.

Furthermore, in the Missouri hearings, members of the State committees openly admitted that they had been dismissing such officials simply because the persons dismissed refused to take dictation from the top, even though the rules and regulations did not require the local county committee to take such dictation.

Mr. President, at this time I shall not proceed further to discuss this matter; I shall discuss it later. However, I wish to repeat that no matter what kind of law the Congress may write, it will be no better than its administration. One point which needs to be emphasized—and I am very happy to know that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], in his very fine statement over the Columbia Broadcasting System, on last Thursday, cited the weakness of the administration—is that the administration of this farm program has gotten so out of hand that, today, there is no confidence in the rural areas, on the part of those who are supposed to be participants.

Mr. President, later in the debate, no doubt, some Senator will say—for example, in regard to corn—that the corn farmers do not participate, and do not utilize the crop loans, and simply do not comply. Mr. President, they used to comply. The reason why they do not comply now is that there is no incentive for compliance. What is more, there is incentive for noncompliance. The record of participation by farmers in the Benson-Eisenhower farm program is the lowest in the history of the agricultural program since 1933.

If there is one word in the Republican dictionary that really has a sort of holy and sacred tone or atmosphere about it, it is the word "efficiency." As I have said many times before, that word is not to be found in either the Old Testament or the New Testament or the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United States or the Magna Carta or the Emancipation Proclamation or the Atlantic Charter. But all at once that word has become the great symbol of Government—"efficiency." Mr. President, even if we were to agree that efficiency is as important as the businessminded administrators would like to make it appear to be, I charge that the present administration is grossly inefficient; in the operation of the farm program, it is guilty of the worst kind of inefficiency. Even today, in the other House, Members of the party of the Senator who now is presiding in this Chamber [Mr. CASE of South Dakota] have had to call the Commodity Credit Corporation, to prevent it from taking barley out of the storage bins in country elevators, and dumping it into the big warehouses, thereby bringing that great volume of grain into central points, and having a very depressing effect upon the market. I am sure that in recent days every Senator from the farm States has received telegrams from grain operators and grain markets and country elevator operators and farmers, saying that again the Commodity Credit Corporation is engaged in one of the operations which is having a price-depressing effect upon the market.

Mr. President, what the Department of Agriculture needs is some farmers to help run it. The first thing the administration did was to drive the farmers out of the Department of Agriculture. Now the administration is driving the farmers off the land. Today, the job of finding a farmer in the Department of Agriculture is like the job of finding a needle in a haystack. I regret to say that the Department of Agriculture has become the haven for processors, speculators, and financiers. What is more, Mr. President, they are running through the Department as if they were on a 6-week seminar. They come there, and spend a few weeks or a few months, and then return to the private trade. While they are in the Department, they learn the tricks and get the information; and then they are gone.

There was a time when the Department of Agriculture had room for farmers. Of course, I know it will be possible to point out that there are still a few farmers in the Department of Agriculture. There is no doubt about that. I wish to say for the man who came into the Department to take over some of the duties of the farmer committee system—Mr. Hughes—that he has made some improvements. The first improvement he made was to reverse everything Secretary Benson had done in March and April of 1953. In other words, after the Secretary of Agriculture had pulled his political coup, had made his master political stroke of preventing farmers from serving on committees if they had ever been elected for more than 3 terms of 1 year each, after Mr. Benson had disrupted the whole program, now, a year and one-half or 2 years later, they say, "I think we made a mistake. Senator HUMPHREY, you were right."

Mr. President, I got in touch with them immediately when they began to upset this program. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture testified before my subcommittee that they did make a mistake, but they have not remedied or repaired all the damage they committed. Furthermore, they cannot repair it, because farmers no longer have faith in them; and when the farmers lose faith and trust, we lose the heart of the program.

Mr. President, I wish Members of the Senate would consult the grain merchants who are trying to operate in the private grain business, as to their attitude toward some of the Commodity Credit Corporation operations in recent years. Those grain merchants were always somewhat critical of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That surely is a matter of record. Under the Democratic administration they had justifiable complaints about the way the Commodity Credit Corporation was operating. But one of the largest grain markets in the world is at Minneapolis, Minn. A little more than 2 months ago I was at home for a special meeting with members of the Grain Exchange. They wanted to tell me about some of their complaints. I thought possibly they were going to scold me or admonish me about my position with respect to price supports. They did not do that. As a matter of fact, some of them agreed with my position.

They told me that the present operations of the Department of Agriculture are making it practically impossible for them to do business. They are beginning to think now that the Democrats were the real apostles of free enterprise—as we always have been. Senators should hear their comments about the present so-called free-enterprise administration. We did not even get around to discussing Khrushchev and Bulganin. They came in second on the popularity totem pole. The main reason is that the Department of Agriculture does not know what it is doing, where it is going, or how it is going to get there.

It has upset normal markets time after time; and, as I have said in committee, in public, and on the floor of the Senate, it has played loose and free with the grains and commodities in its hands, frequently at the expense of the producers and often the sellers in the free market.

What I find most interesting in our discussions over agricultural policy is the fact that this Department and this administration seem to be unconcerned with the complaints which are registered day after day by farmers and industries engaged in farm marketing operations.

I also find it rather difficult to know why the reports of advisory committees in the Department of Agriculture are not made available to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I want to know why it is easier to get a report from the Department of Defense as to the location of American forces and the strength of American arms than it is to get a report from an advisory committee to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Atomic Energy Commission is declassifying so-called secret material day after day, week after week, and month after month; but the Department of Agriculture refuses to declassify reports of advisory committees with respect to particular commodities, and other matters relating to the Department of Agriculture.

The only way I can get any information is to find the advisers, develop some friendship and understanding with them, and then ask them for the information. This I have done; and, as I have previously indicated, I am shocked when I find out what advice has been given to the Department, and how seldom it has been followed. I am equally shocked when I find out that the Department is unwilling to share these advisory reports with Members of Congress.

Our appointive officials should be made to realize that they are appointed. They are servants, every bit as much as are those of us who are elected. The experts are supposed to be on tap, and not on top. These so-called experts are frequently called from private industry and private walks of life. Once they are appointed they begin to feel that they are really the bosses. The Congress of the United States is supposed to establish policy, and the Congress of the United States has the right to expect the administration to carry out that policy.

To give a good example of what I am talking about, when we had before us for consideration the Agricultural Act of 1954, we amended that measure in the Senate so as to provide for the restoration of the farmer-elected committees, on the basis on which they had been operating prior to 1953. That was my amendment. The amendment I offered would have restored the farmer-elected committees to the same position that they held up to January 1953, namely, with the right of local farmers to elect their committeemen without restraint from the Secretary of Agriculture.

There was a great debate in the Senate over that proposal. The vote was very close, but the majority vote was for the amendment.

The amendment was preserved in conference. Then the legal advisers to the Department of Agriculture explained it away. The lawyers said it did not mean what it said, despite the record, despite the legislative history, despite the words of the amendment.

We cannot beat a system like that so long as the officials in the Department have the final word in interpretation. It is because of my feelings on this subject that I believe we must write into these bills specific language. One of the complaints I have with respect to the proposed legislation is that it would confer great discretionary powers upon the Secretary. We reconciled our doubts and our differences by giving the Secretary broad authority to pay rather substantial benefits to the participants in the soil-bank program.

I must say, in all candor, that I am receiving hundreds of letters from farmers asking me, "How do you know that the Department of Agriculture will pay the benefits which have been indicated in the newspapers?" The writers of such letters ask me, "Senator HUMPHREY, how can you be sure that the Department of Agriculture will keep its word?" I am compelled to write back and say that I cannot be sure. We had no information before us which would afford the basis for a firm formula. Therefore, we had to give discretionary authority to the Secretary for the payment of soil-bank benefits.

It is interesting to note that the so-called Eisenhower soil-bank program, which is heralded so widely by the propagandists, was so late in preparation by the administration, so recent in its acceptance, that representatives of the Department of Agriculture, when they came before our committee, were unable to give us any specific information as to how it would work. I ask anyone to go to the files of the committee to see if what I have said is not true. The great Eisenhower farm program, which has been heralded in paid advertisements, was so indefinite, so ambiguous, and so uncertain that the officials of the Department of Agriculture, when they were asked by the committee about it, were unable to testify in detail as to what it meant, how it would operate, and what the benefits would be.

To be sure, they worked feverishly day and night until they prepared some kind of bulletin explaining how the benefits might work or may work. I wish to underscore the words "might work" and "may work."

The memorandum to which I have referred is a part of the report on the pending bill.

I repeat that this great, bold new concept of agriculture whch the administration now heralds, known as the soil bank, was so discredited, so opposed, and so objected to by the administration until December that its spokesmen did not have time, when they became converted or changed their attitude, even to develop detailed testimony as to how it would work.

I am happy to say that before all the hearings were completed, we did get some idea of what they thought might be involved. I believe the RECORD ought to be clear that the reason the soil bank proposal is as broad and wide in its scope as it is in the pending bill, particularly in the acreage reserve section, which is the administration's proposal, is that the administrative officials of the Department of Agriculture were unable to give us a formula which we could use and to which they were willing to firmly affix their name and be held committed to.

I hope the public will clearly understand that there are two aspects of the soil bank. One is the acreage reserve section, and the other is the conservation reserve.

The acreage reserve provision is the administration's special product. It is the one which, according to the mail I have received, is objected to the most. It is the proposal which will help the small farmer practically not at all. It will give the small farmer little or no help.

I shall discuss the acreage reserve section at the time it comes up for a vote. However, I wish to make it crystal clear that the acreage reserve section contained in the bill is designed primarily to get the administration out of its own mess.

The administration has accumulated surpluses. The administration has refused to apply the necessary production controls. The administration has built its own trouble, and now it is asking the Congress to appropriate $750 million to get it out of its own mess.

Let us not forget that the acreage reserve section in the bill applies to allotted acres. The allotted acres for the crops under allotment are supposed to be equal to the amount of domestic production which is needed, taking into consideration the reserves and the surpluses.

Let me restate it. The allotted acres represent the judgment of the specialists in the Department of Agriculture as to the maximum amount of production which ought to come on the market in any one year.

The acreage reserve provision merely says to the farmer: "We would like to have you take out another 10 percent of the allotted acres," or perhaps 15 percent or 8 percent, or whatever they can get the farmers to take out of production.

Why is that, Mr. President? It is because the administration's program in agriculture has been so fouled up, so mismanaged, and so misdirected that we find ourselves with huge stockpiles of food and fiber.

Furthermore, the administration has so built up its so-called monstrous surplus concept that it is stuck with it. The administration has been using propaganda about the so-called mounting, monstrous surpluses to such an extent that they have convinced the public that the surpluses are uncontrollable. They have almost convinced themselves. At least they have convinced the public to such an extent that they must do something about getting out of a mess they themselves have created.

Let me put it succinctly, Mr. President. They have so misrepresented the situation, and have engaged in such distortion of the amount of surplus commodities, that the only way in which they can possibly face the public in an election year is to pay and pay and pay, with taxpayers' money, to feed the surpluses back into the normal markets and back to the farmers.

If they had been running the program efficiently, we would not need the

acreage reserve section. We could be concentrating our attention on the conservation reserve section in connection with long-term reforestation and with taking some of the semiarid land out of production, as well as building ponds, terracing, and putting some of the less productive land back into grassland.

All that would have been good for the Nation, it would have been a long-term good.

I should like to have my colleagues note, and I want the RECORD to show that the administration recommended $350 million for this area, for the long term. It was much more interested in the short term, to get itself out of its own trouble, than it was in long-term benefits for this great Republic.

I am supporting the soil-bank provisions, because, even though I should like to see the administration have to face up to its own mismanagement, as it will in this election year, I do not wish to have farmers punished any more and discriminated against any longer because of the administrative stupidity and the colossal administrative mismanagement of the Eisenhower-Benson farm program.

The Minneapolis Star published an editorial on Saturday of last week, in which it discussed at some length the appearance of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself on a CBS program, in our reply to Secretary Benson. The editorial noted that the Senator from New Mexico supported flexible price supports and that I supported 90 percent of parity. The editorial said we made strange bedfellows.

There is nothing strange about it at all. There is an honest difference of opinion about price-support levels. I do not impugn anyone's integrity or motives because he feels the price-support structure should be different from the one I support.

However, there is one thing that both the Senator from New Mexico and I are agreed on, and that is that the present administration of the Department of Agriculture is inexcusable and that it is a monument to mismanagement.

I should like to point out again for the record that in one paragraph of the editorial published in the Minneapolis Star, there was a misstatement of fact. That misstatement was that while the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture his administration of the Department of Agriculture was carried on very much along the line of the administration of that Department by Secretary Benson, and that the Senator from New Mexico, as Secretary of Agriculture, administered the same kind of program that is now being administered by Secretary Benson.

Of course, that is not true. The Secretary of Agriculture in 1945, 1946, and 1947, was administering a 90 percent of parity price-support program. Mr. Benson is not administering such a program. He is administering a flexible price-support program.

I merely state this for the record, Mr. President, because I commented upon it many times in Minnesota over the weekend.

During my discussion of the agricultural situation, Mr. President, we have looked at the present plight of agriculture and how it got into such a fix in the past 2 years.

Before we proceed with discussing what can and must be done to correct this situation, it should be helpful to review the background history of our farm programs, to look again at the objectives we seek to achieve, and then set up some guideposts for measuring how well our legislative proposals approach those objectives.

One of the regrettable and unfair circumstances of our time is the way many newspapers and periodicals have singled out agriculture as the lone whipping boy for criticism of Government intervention to soften the peaks and valleys of free-market risks.

Looking back into history, the truth becomes apparent that agriculture has always been last and latest rather than first in getting public policy shaped toward a climate for favorable economic opportunity.

There is a public interest responsibility toward agriculture that cannot be ignored under our constitutional mandate to promote the general welfare.

Our Government early recognized the public's interest and the Nation's welfare in a strong agriculture—in a family-farm type of agriculture—by opening up vast public lands to homesteading in order to encourage agricultural expansion and farm ownership.

By making such opportunities available the Nation was repaid many times the value of its investment in agriculture's future.

And, if I may be pardoned an aside, I very much doubt if the moral fiber of our pioneering fathers was corrupted by accepting that homestead subsidy of free land.

As our Nation embarked upon its industrial development it was business and industry, not agriculture, that first shunned the risks of the free market and asked for aid and protection by law—the tariffs, the grants and subsidies, the power of regulating production and competition—to assure reasonable profits.

As a new aristocracy of industrial barons developed in our country, their influence upon Government resulted in public policy being designed more and more to serve their own ends, at the expense of American agriculture and the American workingman.

Our economy grew out of balance, and weaker became the foundation upon which it was all based.

The rich grew richer and the poor grew poorer, until the bubble had to burst.

I need not, I am sure, remind the Senate at length of the great depression.

The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has described the situation in detail in his presentation of the farm bill.

Most of us remember all too well that tragic period in our economic and political history.

Agriculture, as usual felt its impact first, longest, and hardest.

Agriculture was and is today the bellwether of our economy.

Yes, Mr. President, if agricultural income had been kept up even at the levels of 1952, General Motors and Chrysler would not have to be laying off workers. They would still be able to sell automobiles which they planned to sell.

I should like to make the prophecy that if the decline in agricultural income continues, some of the great industries of this country, particularly the automotive industry, will feel the impact. I am not saying their profits will be less, because they have ways of being able to maintain profits, but their production will be less and they will be laying off workers.

It has been in agriculture that the first symptoms of trouble have developed in every great economic crisis this country has ever faced. That is where the symptoms first strike, and then spread to the main streets, the factories, and the homes of all America, rural and city alike.

Mr. President, no matter what the public may think has been the cost of the farm programs, let the record be crystal clear, that the cost of the American economy caused by the drop in farm income in the past few years has been many, many times greater than the cost of any aid or assistance the Government may have given to agriculture. How foolish can we be? We have permitted a great segment of our economy to become depressed, thereby denying the total economy billions of dollars of untold wealth, yes, thereby denying the Federal Treasury tax revenues which could have been obtained. If agriculture had been prosperous; if we had done a little better job; if this administration had been willing to do a better job, willing to move quickly when there was need to move, we could have maintained many billions of dollars of assets which have now been liquidated. We could have continued to maintain billions of dollars of gross and net income which have been lost and which can never be reclaimed.

Out of that depression of the 1920's and 1930's we learned that the cost of depression is far greater, in money and human misery, than is any cost of maintaining a sound and prosperous nation.

From the despair of the great depression agriculture united in a historic fight for rightful recognition of the importance of its role in American life.

It brought forth a great concept so in keeping with the principles of American democracy that it has earned a permanent place in America's economic life—the parity concept of equality for agriculture.

All of the efforts down through the years by our great organizations of farmers became solidly pinpointed toward one major purpose: The clear declaration of public policy that prices and income of farmers should be maintained on a basis of parity with industrial wages and industrial prices.

None of us should ever forget the fight it took to establish the parity concept of equality for agriculture as the law of our land.

The great voices of that earlier historic battle for farm parity—the voices of the agricultural statesmen of that day—Ed O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Louis Taber, of the Grange; and, yes, the great voice of the Midwest's own hard-hitting Bill

Thatcher. These voices refused to be silenced.

They knew they were right.

They knew they were not only fighting for farmers.

They knew they were fighting for the sound economic welfare of America—for the country they loved.

It was not an easy fight.

Powerful forces were arrayed against them.

A strange coalition of the uninformed, the ill-advised, the men of little faith and little vision, looking backward instead of ahead, was molded together and manipulated as a "front" against agriculture.

Let me make myself clear: Fair-minded Americans—and I think most Americans are fair-minded—have never been against decent prices and fair and equal treatment for agriculture or for anyone else.

But always in any society there are a few who refuse to look beyond their own money-counting tables, regardless of the public interest that may be involved.

It is always these vocal few who raise the entirely false cry of government interference with "free enterprise," when their own toes are stepped upon in order to assure the benefits and blessings of free enterprise to all the rest of us.

But all the misleading attempts to distort agriculture's just plea for equality failed.

We became realists about our economy, and the world in which we live.

We recognized that there no longer existed a complete free exchange of goods and services—a complete free market.

Instead, we faced up to the fact that we work and live in the midst of protective regulations by government—firm prices administered by business—fixed costs established by accepted standards of fair wages and reasonable profits in other segments of our economy.

Federal reserve regulations—utility and transportation rate fixing—tariffs to protect industry—minimum wage laws—the Fair Trade Practices Act to eliminate unfair price cutting—and subsidies to shipping firms, airlines, and newspapers are but a few of many examples of what I call built-in protections.

The farmer has never lost his spirit of independence—his willingness to work—and to work hard.

But the world about him has changed.

The ways of farming have changed.

The world in which he must compete for survival has changed.

Man-made changes have hemmed him in on all sides by a complex—legislated economy—in which he has too often become the forgotten man.

None of us can thwart the tide of change.

The hands of time can never be turned backward.

Our task is to keep abreast of change—to keep pace with the progress and the problems it creates—and to look to the future.

All the talk about a free market is mere talk, talk, talk. It is good conversation for the classroom, but every man of any maturity, judgment, and experience knows that the free market is only partly free. Every businessman knows that there are a number of built-in protections and restraints on the part of government and of industry itself which condition the so-called free market.

I have often wondered what the rest of the American economy would be like if every morning when a businessman woke up he had to depend upon the open market for the price of his goods. The farmer, when he gets ready to sell his grain, has to depend on the prices of the day—the prices of oats, wheat, corn, cotton, eggs, pork, beef. Those prices are never the same 2 days in a row. Every day there is a fluctuation of prices.

I should like to be able to bid for an automobile in that manner. Perhaps if we are to have farmers operate on the free market, the automobile manufacturers ought to be put on a free market. Let General Motors take bids every day on what we Americans will be willing to pay for their cars—and not at the dealer level. There is much bidding at the dealer level. Let us have the bidding at the manufacturer's level. The farmer is affected at the producer's level.

Let the General Motors factories produce the maximum output of cars, and then let us would-be car buyers simply bid, and see what price we can get. How long do Senators think General Motors would remain in business? Oh, perhaps a month or two. They surely would not last much longer.

But the newspapers, periodicals, and so-called experts tell the farmer every day that he should be on the free market. The farmer never knows whether eggs will be 12 cents a dozen or 50 cents a dozen. He never knows whether hogs will sell for $20 a hundredweight or $9 a hundredweight. He has no way of knowing. He is the only member of the economy who is in that situation.

The workingman has a collective bargaining agreement or contract with his employer. He knows that if he goes to work he will receive so much an hour. Members of the Senate and the staff of the Senate know how much they will receive every month. But a farmer does not have the slightest idea what he will get for his commodity, and he has no control over its price. He cannot say, "I want 50 cents a dozen for my eggs." The Ford Motor Co. can say, "The price of this car is $1,700," or "$2,100;" and that will be the price. But Mr. Farmer must take what the market will give on the basis of open, competitive bidding.

I say to those who have been critical of the price support programs and agricultural programs that before they become too critical, they should ask themselves the question: "Am I willing to accept the same market conditions which a farm producer has to live with?"

My family operated a small business. I would have hated to see the day when we had to have the prices of commodities on our shelves determined by open, competitive bidding every day.

No; Mr. Farmer is the one who is left out in the cold, so to speak. He has a free market. Everyone else has a fixed market, a legislated market, and administered market. The farmer cannot win under those conditions.

It was because he knew that he could not win, it was because Mr. Farmer knew he was the victim of the gyrations, the ups and downs, of the so-called free market, that he came to his Members of Congress, and said, "Give us some legislation. Give us some marketing programs. Permit us to develop farmer cooperatives and producer cooperatives. Give us commodity loans, so that we can hold our grain and our produce for the best available market."

What the commodity loan does is to permit a farmer to obtain a loan of money upon a commodity which has been produced and which has a certain value, and thereby to be able to hold that commodity until it can be sold under the most favorable conditions in the so-called free market. The whole price-support program is another form of orderly marketing. Without orderly marketing, there can be no economic hope for a farm producer.

If the farmer must compete in a legislated economy, to ask him alone to exist by the simple standards of a bygone generation is like asking our superhighways of today be governed by traffic rules of the horse-and-buggy days.

Only confusion and tragedy can result.

In a democracy dedicated to serving all the people, what is wrong with farmers asking the Government, their Government, to remember that they, too, must be able to keep pace with the times and must have traffic rules that do not leave them by the wayside as everyone else zooms past on the highway of modern life and modern living?

Government, our Government, has the obligation, under our Constitution, to promote the general welfare—not the welfare of the few at the expense of the many.

Congress recognized that obligation in declaring it to be the policy of our country that prices and incomes of farmers should be maintained on a basis of parity with other segments of our economy.

With full parity as its goal, our Government launched a courageous and historic series of national farm programs aimed at achieving that objective.

From time to time those programs have been changed, improved, and adapted to agriculture's changing needs; but always the same objective has been spelled out—the objective of parity prices and parity income.

Let me say right now that it has taken nonpartisan support from the great farm States of our Nation to maintain our strides toward that objective, and to withstand the powerful pressure that would divert us.

It has taken the wholehearted support of men who know and understand agriculture—and men with plenty of gumption to stand up and be counted—sometimes against their own colleagues and against their own administration.

We have made progress—tremendous progress—under the stabilizing influence of our national farm programs.

Hand in hand with the concept of fair returns for agriculture came other great strides forward in American farm

life—reasonable credit, sound conservation, rural electrification.

We have tossed out the kerosene lanterns and have brightened the rural countryside with electricity.

We have eased the drudgery of farm life by bringing the blessings of modern conveniences and modern power to the farm. How much more of this can be done? A great market is yet to be explored and developed if agriculture can obtain its just share of the national income.

We have checked the depletion and waste of America's potential productivity by lifting the face of the rural countryside through sound conservation farming. Here again there is so much more that needs to be done. No wiser investment ever could be made than in conservation.

Up to 1952, we had breathed new life—and new hope—new opportunity—into a prostrate rural America. And with it we breathed new strength and new stability into the entire American economy.

We did it by keeping our eyes on a common goal—equality and justice for agriculture, comparable to what we provide for other segments of our economy.

Yet, in a few short years, our drive forward has not only been halted, it has been turned backward.

We are still far from our goal—far from the original objective of equality which agriculture started out to achieve.

There are still forces at work to divert us from that objective, both through misguided differences of opinion over methods of achieving it, and deliberate intent to keep us from achieving it.

Together they make a formidable foe. By devious means, they seek to divide and divert the farm unity of this country.

They try to turn consumers against farmers, to turn farmers against labor, and labor against farmers, and even to turn farmers against farmers; they try to split the farmer's own household against him, commodity by commodity.

Now let me say, Mr. President, that one of the most unbelievable, outrageous maneuvers I have ever witnessed has been taking place here in the past couple of weeks. The Secretary of Agriculture is playing off one commodity against another, playing politics with the farm program—proposing a corn program for some Senators in some areas, a cotton program for other Senators in other areas, or a rice program, or a tobacco program. He has been trying to play one off against the other. I warn my colleagues that if this subtle, insidious bait is swallowed, the whole farm program will suffer.

The Secretary of Agriculture, and his advisers from the White House, or his superiors, have engaged in the most flagrant and blatant kind of politics with the farm program. First, they misrepresented the farm programs of the past. Second, they exaggerated the proportions of surpluses. Third, they tried to divide the farm population and the farmers from city folk, and to spread distrust and engender outright antagonism between farmers and workers. This is unbelievable.

By the way, Mr. President, there is in Minneapolis, Minn., now a farm forum, sponsored by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. I should like to commend to the reading of the Members of the Senate a speech which was delivered there yesterday, relating to labor costs in agricultural production; in other words, labor costs in the production of processed farm goods, such as meat products.

Mr. Benson has made some rather serious charges in his political tours around the country. He has stated that labor is the cause of the farmer's plight; that it is labor costs which have brought about the trouble. Those are rather broad and all-embracing charges; but, as usual, there are few, if any, facts to support them.

Representatives of the American Federation of Labor and representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations have released statistical tables and economic reports to point out the inaccuracy of and the outright distortion in Mr. Benson's comments.

Tomorrow I shall bring to the Senate copies of the speeches, and ask that at least those sections which are pertinent to this particular problem of labor costs be made a part of the RECORD.

I am happy to note, however, Mr. President, that at least in the State of Minnesota farmers are not being misled. No, Mr. President; our farmers know what is wrong. There are two things wrong. Farm prices have gone down, which situation has brought about a decline in farm income. They know that. Secondly, they know that the Eisenhower-Benson farm policies are wrong. If both those situations can be corrected, a laboring man will still have a good wage and earn a good living for his family, and a businessman will still be able to make a fair and reasonable profit.

Our farmers know that well paid workers eat food, and high quality food, and more of it. Our farmers know that a businessman is entitled to a fair return on investment and sales. And our farmers are not buying or believing Mr. Benson's statements to the effect that the way to cure the agricultural problem is to attack other groups in our society.

Mr. Benson's thesis is that since agriculture is down in the ditch, the way to help agriculture is to get everybody else down in the ditch; then they will all be at the same level. Mr. Benson has made that crystal clear in two speeches, one delivered in San Francisco and one in New Orleans.

In San Francisco he said it was labor costs that were contributing very greatly to the farmer's price squeeze. In New Orleans he pointed out that it was the profits of industry that were responsible.

I wonder if the Secretary of Agriculture and the President, for whom the Secretary works, have ever thought it might be their fault. I wonder if they have ever given thought to the fact that possibly it was the programs, the policies of the Eisenhower-Benson farm programs, and the administration of those programs and policies, that have caused the trouble. I suggest, most politely and respectfully, that they look into that particular observation.

Mr. President, I have commented on the fact that there have been efforts to turn consumers against farmers, farmers against labor, labor against farmers, and even farmers against farmers; but I am happy to report that those who have engaged in those efforts are failing, and failing miserably.

American labor is still the farmer's best friend, and American labor is supporting 90 percent of parity. American labor is supporting an expanded farm credit program, an expanded soil conservation program, a rural electrification program, a farm marketing program, a farm research program.

Farmers know that laboring people are the farmer's customers, and laborers also know that farmers are their customers. In other words, American labor has not forgotten the grim lessons of the past. The American farmers, above all groups, are worried about the danger symptoms of the present, and the symptoms of the present are strangely similar to those of that period of peace and prosperity of 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933.

Then, too, there were people in high places who were giving out soothing syrup. Then, too, there were people in high places in Government telling us that all was well. Yes, then, too, there were people in Government who were apparently unconcerned, or who exercised too little concern, about the troubles in rural America. Then, too, there were men who said, "Look at the stock market. Look at the all-time high."

There were others who were trying to remind those same spokesmen that they ought to look at the farm market. But no one paid very much attention. I repeat, Mr. President, there seems to be a sort of a repeat performance both in Government and throughout the Nation.

Then, as now, we had a popular President. Then, as now, we had an administration farm program. Mr. Hoover had a farm program. Of course, it was no good; it did not work. But he had a farm program, and it was much advertised. It had the support of almost all the editors, although it had little or no support from farmers. But there was a great ballyhoo about it, and people were led to believe that it was the last word in agricultural policy. The so-called experts were in favor of it. The only thing wrong with it was that it did not do anything to help farm income.

Today, the situation is almost identical with that one. Today, we have a popular President. Today, the New York stock market is at an all-time high. Peace and prosperity are with us now, as they were in 1929 and 1930. Today, we have a farm program which was at least suggested by the administration; and even though it did not see the light of day in Congress, it has seen the light of day in newsprint. It is being ballyhooed. It is being described in terms which are befitting a Hollywood extravaganza. One would almost think there was a new movie production called the Eisenhower farm program, starring such great farmers as Marilyn Monroe, Clark Gable, and other talented actors and actresses.

Mr. President, it is somewhat disturbing to me to note that this administration can proceed along the same lines followed by one of its predecessors, and not be concerned. Of course I know the administration has political concern. I have never seen so much sudden concern over a problem as the concern the administration now seems to have in regard to agriculture. Every 4 years the Republicans get the agricultural itch. Every 4 years the rural blood surges through their city veins, and they indicate to the American people that the GOP is the great friend of the farmer.

Mr. President, I wish to be very fair about this matter. There are many Members of Congress of the Republican persuasion who are friends of the farmer and friends of small business. I regret to say, however, that those Members of Congress have little or no influence upon the policymakers. The most able Members of this body in the field of agriculture are in opposition to the present administration's policies. Republican Senators who should be listened to are told that they should support the Eisenhower farm program.

Mr. President, if Eisenhower's farm program would apply only to his farm at Gettysburg, I would support it. But I do not want it to be applied to any farms in Minnesota. If Benson's farm program would apply only to whatever farm he may have in Utah, then I would support it. I want to be charitable. But I do not want his program applied to any of the farms in Minnesota. What is more, Mr. President, none of the farmers seem to want it, either.

If we can help this administration get a program for Eisenhower's farm and Benson's farm, so they can have a farm program, I will vote for it—anything to please them, so long as my vote to please them does not do disservice to the great constituency of the United States of America.

Mr. President, it is strange, to me, that with all the experience and talent available in the House of Representatives and in the Senate from the great farm areas, men such as the two Senators from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER and Mr. YOUNG], the two Senators from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT and Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the distinguished Representative from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and others of whom I can think, are ignored, in so far as their advice is concerned. It is amazing to me to note that their advice is not followed, instead of the advice of some advertising agency.

I wish to say that if their advice had been followed, this administration would have a farm program of which it could be proud. I wish to say with equal candor that in that event the Democrats would surely be in hot water politically, because then every farmer would be so appreciative of the program of the administration that there would not be a chance for a Democratic candidate in very many of the precincts. But, Mr. President, you can always depend upon the old guard of the GOP not to follow the right advice.

I have never claimed that the Democratic Party was particularly shrewd or possessed unusual talent. I merely claim that one can always depend upon the inside leadership of the Republican Party to create situations which are so intolerable that even the small mistakes of the Democrats are excusable, and become almost like virtues.

I should like to recommend to the President and to Mr. Benson that they call in the talented, experienced Members of the House and the Senate from the great farm States, where farm production is the vital business, take their advice, and follow their advice. If that were done, if the President and the Secretary of Agriculture would do that, I would say they would have plenty of bipartisan support for their farm program.

But instead of doing that, every conceivable pressure is being applied to get Midwestern Republican Senators and Representatives to vote for the Eisenhower-Benson farm program. Many a Member of Congress has had to stand up again and again and say to the Republican committees in his home State that he simply cannot vote for the Eisenhower-Benson farm program. Why? I am sure none of my colleagues would say he could not vote for it simply because of the danger of losing votes. I am sure all of us are principled. I am sure the reason why Members of Congress cannot vote for the Eisenhower-Benson program is that it does not make any sense.

But, Mr. President, the administration has advisers; it calls in some of the investment bankers and asks them, "What do you think we should have for a farm program?" The administration also calls in some of the chain-store operators, some of the supermarket operators, and asks them, "What do you think we should have for a farm program?"

Mr. President, if such procedure is to be followed in respect to agriculture, I suggest that the next time the administration wants to design a policy for the banks of the country, for the financial community, it call in members of the trade unions and farmers, and let them formulate the credit policy.

It would be a little different from the one we now have. Of course, it would be as foolish—or as unwise—to do that as it would be to let the administration design the farm program under the present advice it is willing to receive and honor. I should like to have some of my friends on the other side of the aisle explain to me why the administration is so adament, and why it is so unwilling to accept their advice and counsel.

I was talking about how those in the labor movement understood the situation, and wanted farmers to have decent prices and decent incomes, just as they want such goals for themselves.

They are the farmer's customers, yet they know the farmers are their customers, too. They, too, have not forgotten grim lessons of the past; and they are worried about dangerous symptoms of the present.

They want farmers to have decent prices and decent incomes, just as they want such goals for themselves.

They know that only in a well-balanced expanding economy can higher living standards be maintained for all. Farmers need more of such understanding among consumers. But the forces historically alined against farmers have gained on another front. They have split the ranks of agriculture itself.

At a time when unity of purpose is needed in agriculture as never before since the great crusade of 1933—new leadership of some major farm groups has wavered from the very objectives upon which their own organizations grew great and powerful.

In the heat of controversy over how such objectives can best be achieved, willingly or unwillingly they have allowed themselves to be diverted from the objectives themselves.

Where now are the voices of Ed O'Neal and Louis Taber—forceful voices crying out for full parity, for full equality of economic opportunity for agriculture?

Mr. President, the unity of purpose which has been so important for agriculture should be restored at once. I am very much pleased to see at least two of our great farm organizations working pretty much together in harness; and I must say that I am more and more pleased, as the days go by, to see one of the other large farm organizations agreeing more and more, in principle and detail, on the objectives which have been the historical objectives in the fight for parity.

Thank God the great voice of Bill Thatcher has never been stilled, has never wavered, has never been sidetracked from the main line of agriculture's fight for full economic equality. Agriculture needs such vigorous champions today. Agriculture would do well today to harken back to the wise words of Ed O'Neal in 1941, when he prophetically said:

> The issue raised is very clear * * * that issue is whether the parity objective is to be a reality for American farmers—or whether it is to be merely an illusive mirage—constantly dangled before the eyes of farmers but which they are never permitted to attain.

Now, as then, that is the issue. The issue is joined; the battle lines are being drawn.

On the one hand, we have those lacking faith in democracy—men of little vision and less confidence in America's ability to maintain a dynamic, expanding economy. Apparently they fail to understand the necessity of maintaining a dynamic and expanding economy. I hesitate to use the term, but they are frequently called the "flexers." They hold to a philosophy of scarcity, and an outmoded philosophy of survival by jungle laws alone.

On the other hand, we have those holding firm to the conviction that Government in a democracy must promote the general welfare with equality of economic growth and progress.

Between these groups is a large segment of the American population which unfortunately fails fully to realize how much everyone is involved. They have taken our abundance for granted. America has never suffered scarcity.

As a result, many have not stopped to realize, perhaps, how our abundance

has kept prices to consumers reasonable.

A smaller percentage of our income is required to purchase food and clothes in America than anywhere else on earth, freeing more money for the purchase of homes, automobiles, television sets, and other products, keeping the wheels of industry and commerce spinning.

All of us should be concerned about what makes that abundance of food possible.

We should be looking ahead, too, at our population growth of 2,700,000 a year—new people who have to be fed and clothed and provided with jobs. They, too, have a stake in this struggle.

The issue is not whether the past, present, or proposed farm programs are perfect. It is whether we hold firm to the basic objective of those farm programs—the right of farmers to equal economic opportunity, while seeking to improve our means of achieving it.

People who talk about 90 percent of parity being only a wartime incentive either forget or ignore that it was far more than that.

It was one more step toward the objective of equality which we set up in our Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and have since repeatedly reaffirmed.

The declaration of policy in that act declared it to be the policy of Congress to assist farmers to obtain, insofar as practicable, parity prices for their commodities and parity of income.

We have tried to keep our eye on that historic goal in the past. Every time we have changed our laws to meet changing conditions, we have endeavored to move closer to that goal, until 1954.

I point out that during this debate there have been some who have said that the law of 1938 had as its price-support levels 52 to 75 percent of parity. That law, they say, was passed under a Democratic administration. All that is true. But what those critics seem to forget is that the law of 1938 was but the first step toward the objective of making available and bringing into fulfillment true parity, full parity for the American agricultural economy. What those who point back to the Agricultural Act of 1938 and its price-support schedule of 52 to 75 percent of parity fail to remember is the fact that in 1938 that was a sizable step forward. But each year and each action of Congress since 1938 has been designed for and directed toward a higher parity, a better relationship between the farmers' prices and industrial prices.

I was rather disturbed when I heard, in the debate in the Senate, Members of the Senate saying that even back in the days when there was full Democratic control in the Congress and in the White House, the goal was never 90 percent of parity. Comments such as those apparently indicate an attitude that when we enact a law, that is the final act, and that from then on nothing more can be done.

If that had been the case, we would have had no highways to speak of. The original Highway Aid Act surely would not have built many roads for this modern day and age. But we expanded it. We set as the goal in the original Federal Highway Assistance Act a broad network of highways adequate to meet the transportation and commercial needs of the Nation; and year after year we have broadened the program to fulfill that goal. The same is true of unemployment compensation, social security, and minimum wages. In the beginning those programs were modest, indeed. They were only beginnings. They were the basic minimums. But as we have gone on we have added to those programs, broadening and extending their coverage, and increasing their benefits. That is as it should be. The same philosophy and the same sort of thinking should apply to agriculture.

So, since 1938 we have been moving forward, until 1954. I think it is quite important to note that the first time we started to move back in 20 years was after the Government got into the hands of the Republican administration.

I say again that many of my Republican colleagues and friends do not agree with this philosophy. There are substantial numbers of Members of Republican persuasion in the House of Representatives, as well as in the Senate, who have tried to resist this backward movement; but they are a minority in their party, now as in the past.

It was out of such a minority that the Bull Moose movement grew. It was such a minority of Republicans that walked out of the convention in Kansas City back in the 1930's. It was out of such a minority that even the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota was born. It had its antecedents in the Republican Party.

Adoption of 90 percent supports was part of the progress toward that goal, not just some wartime bonus.

Nothing in the policy declarations of this Congress has ever said farmers are entitled to parity prices and parity income only in wartime.

Yet the critical press of today wants us to ignore all this past history of purpose behind farm legislation, and distort the meaning of what Congress has been trying to do.

What is more, Mr. President, our Government asked industry and labor to undertake certain goals and objectives in war time. We have not reduced wages. We have not reduced prices. Since the war they have grown and have increased. What is all this nonsense about saying that farmers should be the ones who should go back to prewar days and the wartime incentive of 90 percent of parity? Prices and wages today are far beyond any wartime incentive prices or wages, and far beyond anything in the wartime period.

Does it not seem to be the fair thing to assume or to say that farmers should not be asked to go back to prewar days? Apparently the argument of those who are opposed to 90 percent of parity, on the theory that 90 percent of parity price supports were wartime incentives, is to bring the program of agriculture back to the act of 1938, the prewar act, or at least to a modification of it.

I want the American farmers to know that there are some Members of Congress, and many persons in the administration, who feel that the farmer should go back to prewar conditions. At least they feel that he should not have the same kind of conditions that he had economically during wartime.

Mr. President, if we are going to apply that principle to farmers, I ask that it be made possible for me to buy a house at prewar prices, a car at prewar prices, a suit of clothing or a pair of shoes at prewar prices, and I also want to be able to buy a sandwich at prewar prices, as well as a haircut.

The wartime incentives have become the basic minimum standards for peacetime survival.

Mr. President, as we are about to embark on critical decisions on a new farm act, it would be well for all of us to look seriously at the objectives we seek to meet, instead of devoting all our arguments to the technical methods by which we seek to achieve them.

Oh, I know some of my friends with conflicting farm views will hasten to assure me that they seek the same objectives, but just feel different methods are preferable in achieving them.

Yet, it is a strange thing that ranked solidly behind them are all the forces that, historically and now, vigorously oppose even the objective of public policy designed to provide opportunity for equality of economic opportunity in agriculture.

I suggest that some of my colleagues whose good faith I do not question examine their bedfellows a bit more closely, in weighing whether or not the methods they propose can both serve the objectives of equality for agriculture, and the objectives of those opposed to equality for agriculture.

The truth is that the action taken by this Congress in 1954 was the first taken by Congress since 1932 that went directly contrary to the historic goal of agriculture, and the events that have transpired since prove it has had that result.

Let us get back to our original objectives, to see if at least we cannot agree on objectives before quarreling about method.

All the legislative history behind the development of farm programs in America confirms that our objective and purpose has really been threefold:

First. To assure the American people continued abundance of food and fiber;

Second. To offer America's farmers an opportunity of achieving economic equality with other segments of our citizens;

Third. To preserve and protect America's traditional pattern of family-owned, family-operated farms as the type of agriculture best adapted to our democratic way of life.

Repeatedly the Congress of the United States has restated its intent to uphold these objectives, in one way or another, ever since the days of the homestead law.

Yet, unfortunately, the objectives sometimes appear forgotten in the development and administration of farm legislation.

We have heard our blessings of abundance criticized as a curse.

We have heard that even 90 percent of equality—let alone full equality—is more than farmers are entitled to in our economy.

We have heard disturbing yet increasing talk of encouraging a complete change in our historic pattern of farming, to put more emphasis on mere bigness and so-called efficiency, less on human values and social problems of rural living. We have heard less and less concern about perpetuating our family-farming pattern, and more and more about giving way to the pressures of mass operations—about farmers who cannot survive giving way to make room for the few who can.

None of us wants to perpetuate inefficiency, or tie farmers to units too small to be economically practical. Yet there is a distinct line between improving the efficiency of family farmers and increasing their opportunities to make family farming profitable, on the one hand, and abandoning the family-operated farm concept to be replaced by large-scale industrialized farming operations with absentee-ownership and hired labor on the other.

Serious questions of public policy are involved, if we are to cross that line.

It is not a change of direction toward which we should be allowed to drift or be pushed, without knowing fully the consequences.

If America is in the midst of changing objectives of farm policy; if deliberate efforts are under way to redesign America's pattern of family farming into the mold of big business; should it not be brought out in the open for examination and review, to see if such a change is desirable?

For my part, my faith is still strong in the pattern of agriculture which has made America strong, and my faith remains unchanged in the objectives under which American agriculture has contributed so much to our country.

America's farm policies must be geared to social objectives as well as economic objectives. And foremost among such social objectives, in my opinion, should always remain the encouragement and preservation of our traditional rural pattern of the family-farm type of agriculture that has long been accepted as essential to a strong democracy.

It is easy to understand why.

A large number of prospering farm families on family farms is a strong balancing force within the Nation, against the political and social extremes of economic class warfare.

On the family farm, the economic functions of capital ownership, of arranging for financial needs, of managing the productive enterprise, and of working are all performed by the farm operator and his family, thus eliminating controversy and tension along economic class lines.

Our family farm pattern of agriculture has been the basis of all our agricultural progress and good community life. It builds in farm family members attitudes of self-reliance, social responsibility, individual initiative, tolerance, and self-government—the attitudes that made for a sound democracy.

The family farm builds strong families, and the family farm builds strong social communities, with good schools and active churches.

Our pattern of family farming has become an example to the world of democracy's answer to Soviet collective farming.

Unrest in many parts of the world today results from insecure and inequitable farm land tenure, creating hopelessness among those who work the soil and making them an easy prey for communism's glittering false lures.

The restless peasants of the world can find the ray of hope they seek in America's pattern of family farming, and family farm ownership that enables the Nation's farmers to farm efficiently, conserve soil and water resources, provide adequately for their family needs, and participate fully in civic, community and public affairs.

Can we risk destroying that ray of hope ourselves?

There is ample precedent for our country to gear its legislative policies toward preserving our family farm pattern in agriculture.

We adopt antitrust laws, and take other steps to protect independent business, because we know America's real strength rests in many prospering business firms—not in just a few huge monopolistic corporations. We take such a course because we feel it is in the Nation's best interests to maintain continued opportunity for small business.

Is it not just as wise to make sure, in the Nation's interest, that we maintain continued opportunity for family farming?

Price supports, farm credit, consideration assistance—all of these vital farm programs are but means to an end, not the end itself. The end objective must be the kind of agricultural pattern we want in this country.

As we consider changes in these means to an end, from time to time, let us make sure we measure such changes carefully against the end we seek to achieve, and let us make sure that we are agreed on those end objectives.

American agriculture—at long last—has come of age.

It accepts responsibility to be concerned about the well-being of all the American people.

Farmers do not ask for special privilege.

Farmers ask only what is rightfully theirs—by their heritage as American citizens: The right of equal treatment and equal respect, under the law of our land.

I know that is a deep conviction among farm people.

I know it is a conviction I fully share, and have shared for a long time.

But it is time that all the American people recognized and accepted that right of equality for agriculture.

It is time they accepted it as in the best interest of the entire Nation—and not just for the benefit of farmers alone.

Mr. President, as evidence of the national interest in a prospering agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two tables—one showing that national depressions are farm led and farm fed, and the other showing how fair farm prices actually lower food costs to city consumers.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL DEPRESSIONS ARE FARM LED AND FARM FED

Farm depression led the panic of 1830; the even worse depression of 1844; the big recession from 1858 to 1860; and each of 12 depressions between 1870 and 1914. Falling farm prices led the drop from 1919 to 1922. They led again in 1929–32, 1937–38, in 1949, and preceded the 1954 depression.

Drops in farm income lead the way down

	Cash receipts from farmers' marketings (per farm)	Industrial production index 1947–49=100	Average weekly earnings, industrial worker	Steel production percent of capacity	Percentage of unemployed
1919	$2,239	39	$22.08	64	----------
1920	1,934	41	26.30	76	----------
1921	1,246	31	22.18	34	----------
1922	----------	39	21.51	61	----------
1929	1,735	59	25.03	88	3.2
1930	1,383	49	23.25	62	8.7
1931	964	40	20.87	38	15.9
1932	708	31	17.05	20	23.6
1933	----------	37	16.73	33	24.9
1951	5,861	120	64.71	101	3.0
1952	5,906	124	67.97	86	2.7
1953	5,730	135	71.69	95	2.5
1954 [1]	----------	123	70.92	71	5.1

[1] July.

When farm prices are below 100 percent of parity unemployment is high: Wages and industrial production low the next year

Parity ratio	Number of years since 1928	Average for years next following those shown—	
		Percent unemployed	Industrial production
Below 100 percent	[1] 16	13.9	59
100 percent above	[2] 11	3.2	113

[1] 1928 through 1941 and 1953 and 1954.
[2] 1942 through 1952.

FAIR FARM PRICES LOWER FOOD COSTS TO CITY CONSUMERS

1. Largely as a result of the high level of production of United States farms, workers can now buy substantially more food with an hour's labor than in any earlier period in history.

An hour of factory labor would buy the following foods in 1910–14, in 1929, and in June 1953:

	1910–14	1929	1953	Percent more—	
				1953 than 1929	1953 than 1910–14
Bread.....pounds	3.5	6.4	10.8	69	300
Steak.....do	.9	1.2	2.0	67	122
Pork chops.....do	1.0	1.5	2.0	33	100
Bacon.....do	----------	1.3	2.1	62	----------
Milk, delivered.....quarts	----------	3.9	7.8	100	----------
Butter.....pounds	.6	1.0	2.3	130	280
Cheese.....do	----------	1.4	2.9	107	----------
Eggs.....dozen	.6	1.1	2.6	136	333
Potatoes.....pounds	12.8	17.7	32.6	84	154
Oranges.....dozen	----------	1.3	3.3	153	----------
Tomatoes.....No. 2 cans	----------	4.4	10.2	132	----------

Source: From a staff report prepared for House Committee on Agriculture and speech by Congressman Clifford Hope (Kansas), chairman, Committee on Agriculture.

2. Percent of income, after taxes, needed to be spent to buy same market basket of food:

	Percent
1929	23
1933	27
1941	21
1953	18

(Figures from U. S. Department of Agriculture—Marketing and Transportation Situation.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have mentioned the conviction of rural people that under our Constitution they are entitled to equal treatment and equal respect.

Three years ago, on the 162d anniversary of our Nation's Bill of Rights, I addressed a group of 5,000 Midwest farmers discussing some of these issues I am outlining here.

In commenting on the great Bill of Rights, I said:

As a nation we are dedicated to preservation of these rights of all the people—rights we hold to be inalienable.

We guard and protect these rights zealously.

They are the very cornerstone of our democracy.

But perhaps it is time that we, as a nation, also dedicate ourselves to preservation of certain rights for the American farmer—as the custodian of the very basis of our national life.

At that time I proposed a farmer's bill of rights, from which I suggested agriculture should never retreat.

I would like to set forth that farmer's bill of rights today as guidelines against which to measure our new farm legislation.

These, I believe, are fair and reasonable rights to which rural people of America should be entitled:

First. The right to full equality of economic opportunity.

Second. The right for improved standards of rural living.

Third. The right of reasonable protection against natural hazards.

Fourth. The right to extend agricultural free enterprise through cooperative action.

Fifth. The right to public cooperation and assistance in saving the soil.

Sixth. The right to preserve the social and human values of family farming.

Seventh. The right to decent land tenure which would encourage the desirable goal of farm ownership.

Eighth. The right to a democratic voice in his own farm program.

Ninth. The right to benefits of an expanding world trade.

Tenth. The right to a long-term program of food storage to encourage abundance.

Much could be said about each of these fundamental rights for agriculture.

They involve the right to a fair share of the national income for agriculture through more reasonable assurance of fair rewards and adequate incentives for those who efficiently and abundantly provide for the food and fiber needs of the Nation.

They mean modern schools, roads, housing, and health facilities and services in rural areas equal to those afforded city folks.

They mean protection against forces beyond agriculture's own control, through adequate farm credit facilities geared to agriculture's needs; through crop insurance, within the farmer's ability to participate, through disaster aid when needed to protect both the public and the individual interest; and through price support programs designed to contribute stability to our entire economy, and to protect the farmer from being left at the mercy of speculators.

The bill of rights for agriculture means the right of farmers to self-help through forming cooperatives for marketing farm products, purchasing farm supplies, and providing essential services such as extending the benefits of electricity and telephones in rural areas, with legal protection against efforts to curtail the effective functioning of such farm cooperatives.

They mean the right of aid in conserving the nation's agricultural resources—our productive lands, water supplies, and forests—so that these resources will be permanently useful for the benefit of generations to come.

They mean adequate landlord-tenant arrangements for sharing the income that the soil produces, with adequate opportunity for tenants to advance up the ladder toward farm ownership.

They mean an effective voice for the farmer in his own destiny such as farmer-participation in both administration and development of farm programs through democratically-elected farmer committeemen, and self-determination of the needs of adjusting production to a reasonable balance with demand through voluntary farmer-referendums.

They mean facilitating the flow of farm exports to broaden the base of our farm economy.

The farmer's bill of rights means greater public recognition of the wisdom and necessity for maintaining at adequate levels our storage "food banks" of feed and food reserves safeguarding the Nation from any eventuality.

They mean public policies making more effective use of the abundance farmers are capable of producing, policies enabling the farmer to see his food used wisely rather than be wasted; to see the output of his land and his toil make its utmost contribution toward stamping out hunger and deprivation at home and abroad—and serving as the humanitarian arm of the Nation's foreign policy—in our efforts to create a better and more peaceful world.

These, I believe, are basic rights of American agriculture.

They are not new rights.

They are not rights of special privilege gained through misuse or abuse of tremendous power over the lifelines of the Nation's food supply.

Rather, they are rights of historic precedent earned by the great and continuing contribution of agriculture to American life, the fulfillment of the Nation's needs in peace or war, in good times or bad, at personal profit or personal loss.

They are rights set forth as public policy, time after time, in the objectives of legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States.

They need reiterating now only as a guiding beacon of light cast upon the darkness of confusion surrounding current controversy over America's farm policy.

They must be just as zealously guarded against forces which seek to destroy them, as we guard other historic rights, privileges, and responsibilities of freedom in our democracy.

That, I believe, should be American agriculture's rallying point for unity today and the Nation's challenge fully to exemplify the meaning of democracy as equal opportunity for all.

A year later, in 1954, in another major farm address in the Midwest I suggested perhaps the air of confusion surrounding America's farm policy fight in and out of Congress could be clarified by two actions by Congress:

First, by adopting a joint resolution setting forth an American family farm policy, declaring the intent of Congress as to the purpose of all farm programs in preserving this historic American pattern of agriculture, and providing a yardstick for measuring the effectiveness of present and future programs in meeting that objective.

Second, by adopting a joint resolution setting forth a national food and fiber policy, declaring the intent of Congress to maintain abundance and see that

abundance wisely used, both for America's own people and people in need throughout the world.

Last spring, I introduced two such resolutions in this body. They are still before it. Their purpose was not to substitute for an effective farm program. Their purpose was to chart a course of direction for an effective farm program.

While such resolutions would only in effect be a reaffirmation of already established purposes and objectives, it was my hope they would add new emphasis by bringing them together in a positive statement of national policy.

Establishment of such national policies in a positive form would provide some consistency in developing proper and workable programs aimed at achieving the accepted objectives, and revising our programs whenever necessary to make sure they serve such objectives. We have ample precedent for such declaration of national policy in the Full Employment Act, designed to chart America's course of economic growth and progress.

It was the purpose of my family farm policy resolution to direct attention of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report under the Employment Act to our farming pattern and conditions, requiring closer annual examination of agriculture's contribution toward the Nation's economic progress—and closer appraisal of agriculture's needs to maintain its most effective contribution toward such progress, as supporting evidence to substantive legislative action taken by our proper Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

While nothing has happened to those resolutions, perhaps they have already had some beneficial influence. At least it was not until after the resolution was introduced—and opposed by this administration—that the President added new emphasis to concern over the family farmer in his message to this Congress.

This is the background of the broad goals I seek for agriculture—the goals I believe agriculture itself seeks and is entitled to.

With our attention focused on these proper objectives of farm policy, we are in a better position to determine effective legislation directed toward achieving such objectives—the specifics, to implement our goals.

It is to such specifics, within the framework of goals I have outlined, that I shall now direct my remarks.

WHAT WE CAN AND MUST DO

As we turn our attention to what we can and must do to make better progress toward the goal of improved income for people in agriculture, I want to make clear two points:

First, the reasons experience has proven for mandatory policies determined by the Congress rather than too wide discretion left in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Opposition to widespread discretionary authority is no reflection upon any Secretary of Agriculture. It is just a recognition of realities. Farmers should not be left to the discretionary whims of any Secretary of Agriculture, or have their future subjected to the pressures that can be placed upon any Secretary of Agriculture.

While certainly a good and valid case can be made for the need of a Secretary to have flexibility of movement and decision, Congress cannot escape its responsibility on basic policies by transferring such decisions to a Secretary of Agriculture. Any Secretary facing the pressures a Cabinet officer must should welcome Congress facing up to these problems and making basic policy decisions for him.

But in Agriculture it is more important perhaps than in some other departments of Government. There is always speculation in agricultural commodities by traders who are not farmers. I certainly do not argue that the commodity exchanges do not perform a legitimate and necessary function in the farm-marketing process. But we must face the reality that it is the judgment of buyers or speculators in these commodity markets that either bid farm prices up or break them downward.

It should be obvious that any uncertainty as to future Government policy under discretionary authority leads to gambling on what a Secretary of Agriculture may or may not do, to the detriment of the farmer.

When traders all know in advance that firm policies have been established by the Congress, they are all competing on equal terms in the marketplace above that firm floor, competing against each other, instead of trying to outguess the Government. It is only in such a climate of certainty rather than a climate of uncertainty that the free market can best operate for agriculture, and most legitimate traders will tell you so. Of course, there are always some speculators who would prefer to keep the commodity markets as a gambling game without any house rules.

Discretionary authority will always mean indecision and uncertainty; mandatory protection under the law means certainty and stability.

We should always keep that in mind, and realize the effect uncertainty has on farm markets under any legislation.

Next, I want to label as an outright lie the idea that the only thing the Democratic Party stands for in agriculture is 90 percent of parity price supports, and that it puts full dependence on price supports alone to rectify all the troubles in agriculture. Our Reublican friends have tried to make it appear that they want a broader approach, a many-pronged attack.

Let us examine the record.

Ever since 1932 the Democratic Party has moved vigorously to improve conditions in agriculture on many, many fronts. It has been our party which developed, made effective, and has protected our great conservation programs. It was our party that electrified rural America under the REA, over the vigorous objection of Republicans who said farmers liked kerosene lamps, and would never use electricity, an almost unbelievable comment.

It has been our party that has developed every new approach in the last 20 years to improving conditions in agriculture. And always we have emphasized the necessity of a many-pronged approach to farm problems, rather than full reliance upon price supports alone.

Our platforms for the past 20 years prove that. Our record proves it. Our platform for 1952 makes it amply clear.

We outlined therein a comprehensive program of resource conservation, grassroots administration, price supports, research, marketing aid, farm credit, crop insurance, rural electrification, aid to and encouragement of cooperatives, and many other objectives. We have not lost sight of any of them in our efforts here in the Congress. We have not turned our back on any of our pledges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the agricultural section of the Democratic Party's 1952 platform.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN FARMER AND AGRICULTURE

We know that national prosperity depends upon a vigorous, productive, and expanding agriculture.

We take great pride in our party's record of performance and in the impressive gains made by American agriculture in the last 2 decades. Under programs of Democratic administrations the net agricultural income has increased from less than $2 billion to almost $15 billion. These programs must be continued and improved.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION

The soil resources of our country have been conserved and strengthened through the Soil Conservation Service, the agricultural conservation program, the forestry and research programs, with their incentives to increased production through sound conservation farming.

These programs have revolutionized American agriculture and must be continued and expanded. We will accelerate programs of upstream flood prevention, watershed protection, and soil, forest and water conservation in all parts of the country. These conservation measures are a national necessity; they are invaluable to our farmers and add greatly to the welfare of all Americans and of generations yet unborn.

GRASSROOTS ADMINISTRATION

We will continue the widest possible farmer participation through referenda, farmer-elected committees, local soil conservation districts, and self-governing agencies in the conduct and administration of these truly democratic programs, initiated and developed under Democratic administrations.

PRICE SUPPORTS

Under the present farm program, our farmers have performed magnificently and have achieved unprecedented production. We applaud the recent congressional action in setting aside the sliding scale for price support through 1954, and we will continue to protect the producers of basic agricultural commodities under the terms of a mandatory price-support program at not less than 90 percent of parity.

We continue to advocate practical methods for extending price supports to other storables and to the producers of perishable commodities, which account for three-fourths of all farm income.

ABUNDANT PRODUCTION

We will continue to assist farmers in providing abundant and stable supplies of agricultural commodities for the consumers at reasonable prices, and in assuring the farmer the opportunity to earn a fair return com-

mensurate with that enjoyed by other segments of the American economy.

The agricultural adjustment programs encourage the production of abundant supplies while enabling producers to keep supply in line with consumer demand, preventing wide fluctuations and bringing stability to the agricultural income of the Nation. We pledge retention of such programs.

We pledge continued efforts to provide adequate storage facilities for grain and other farm products with sufficient capacity for needed reserves for defense, and other emergency requirements, in order to protect the integrity of the farm price-support programs.

RESEARCH

We are justly proud of the outstanding achievements of our agricultural research. We favor a greatly expanded research and education program for American agriculture in order that both production and distribution may more effectively serve consumers and producers alike, and thus meet the needs of the modern world. We favor especial emphasis on the development of new crops and varieties, on crop and livestock disease and pest control, and on agricultural statistics and marketing services.

MARKETING

We must find profitable markets for the products of our farms, and we should produce all that these markets will absorb. To this end we will continue our efforts to reduce trade barriers, both at home and abroad, to provide better marketing and inspection facilities, and to find new uses and outlets for our foods and fibers both in domestic and foreign markets.

FARM CREDIT

We have provided credit facilities for all agriculture, including means by which young men, veterans of military service, and farm tenants have been encouraged to become farmers and farm home-owners, and through which low-income farmers have been assisted in establishing self-sustaining and fully productive farm units. We will not waver in our efforts to provide such incentives.

CROP INSURANCE

Crop insurance to protect farmers against loss from destruction of their crops by natural causes has been created and developed under Democratic administrations into a sound business operation. This program should be expanded as rapidly as experience justifies, in order that its benefits may be made available to every farmer.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Democratic administrations have established the great rural electrification program, which has brought light and power to the rural homes of our Nation. In 1935, only 10 percent of the farm homes of America had the benefits of electricity. Today 85 percent of our rural homes enjoy the benefits of electric light and power.

We will continue to fight to make electricity available to all rural homes, with adequate facilities for the generation and transmission of power. Through the rural telephone program, inaugurated by the Democratic 81st Congress, we will provide the opportunity for every farm home to have this modern essential service. We pledge support of these self-liquidating farm programs.

COOPERATIVES

We will continue to support the sound development and growth of bona fide farm cooperatives and to protect them from punitive taxation.

DEFENSE NEEDS

We will continue to recognize agriculture as an essential defense industry, and to assist in providing all the necessary tools, machinery, fertilizer, and manpower needed by farmers in meeting production goals.

FAMILY FARMING

The family farm is the keystone of American agriculture. We will strive unceasingly to make the farm homes of our country healthier and happier places in which to live. We must see that our youth continues to find attractive opportunity in the field of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Republican Party platform is loud in its criticism of our great farm programs. We challenge the Republicans and other enemies of farm progress to justify their opposition to the program now in operation, to oppose the improvements here proposed, or to advocate repeal of a single vital part of our program.

Mr. President, I have always maintained and still maintain that price protection is but part of a good farm program, and that we must always be looking ahead for new and better ways of achieving more equality for American agriculture.

Let me quote briefly from an address before the great Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul back in 1953, when I said:

Effective price protection, of course, is just a foundation.

We need to develop new outlets and uses for our food and fiber.

We need to learn to live with abundance—and use it wisely for the greatest good of humanity.

To protect and expand areas of freedom in this world we must think of full stomachs as well as full cartridge belts.

We need adequate incentive premiums to convert diverted acres under production restrictions to soil-building conservation practices—rather than to other competing and soil-depleting crops.

We must make greater progress in conservation.

We must harness the destructive force of excess water and convert it to constructive use.

We must extend rural telephone service to farm homes of America just as we have extended electric lights and power.

We must continue our progress in research and marketing efficiency.

Obviously, there is much that can be done to improve our farm legislation without taking away any of the advantages it now offers.

It is in that spirit Congress must approach its task of writing firm, constructive, long-range farm legislation at its forthcoming session.

That was my advice back in 1953—to raise our sights and vision, to look ahead instead of looking back.

Again in 1954 I addressed the same group, a gathering of 5,000 farmers from 6 Midwest States.

Did I say that all agriculture needed was 90-percent price supports? Of course not.

Let me quote from that talk, very briefly. Here is part of what I said:

It is my hope that the new Congress will do more than reexamine price-support levels and take a serious look at the purpose of our price-support legislation, and of all farm legislation.

Perhaps we will find that the time has come to take more positive action toward directing Government administrative policies more specifically to serving family farmers, through some form of limitations channeling assistance to family farm operators falling within reasonable bounds of desirable production patterns.

Perhaps we will find that the time has come to take more positive steps toward raising the economic opportunities of low-income farmers, through expanded operations of supervised credit under the Farmers Home Administration.

Perhaps we will find that the time has come to reappraise all our farm-credit operations to see how well they are geared to modern needs, particularly to providing opportunities for young beginning farmers to get a sound start in agriculture.

Perhaps we will find, too, that America's soundest approach to peaceful international relations rests in greater use of our productive know-how and abundance to help eliminate hunger and deprivation throughout the world—using food and fiber as weapons of peace in the battle against the encroachments of communism in the world.

America's food abundance can be a powerful force for good in the world, a real weapon of freedom.

But linked with greater overseas use of our food abundance must be provision for assuring every American an opportunity to have a minimum adequate diet of basic foods, particularly of milk and butter. Issuance of food stamps to supplement meager public-assistance allowances to the aged, the widows, and dependent children and the handicapped would go a long way toward that objective, and at the same time make wiser use than now provided for our temporary surpluses of food products.

Let me quote further, from an address given last December 13, again before more than 5,000 farmers filling the St. Paul Auditorium, to emphasize what our approach is and always has been.

Here is what I said at that time:

Many of us have been calling for new and broader approaches to our farm program, and offering concrete proposals to achieve our objects. We have not been just critics and obstructionists. We have continually matched our objection to what was going on with constructive suggestions of what could and should be done.

Two years ago, and last year, before this same organization, were outlined many of these new and constructive suggestions for improving our farm program. We have insisted upon, and still insist upon, more adequate income protection for agriculture. We have not wavered from our conviction that to be effective, such protection must be based upon 90 percent of parity—and cover more commodities.

We have insisted that the relationship between our various feed grains must be kept in better balance, by support levels based upon a feed value ratio equivalent to corn. We have repeatedly recognized that an effective farm program must offer protection to producers of end products like beef and hogs, and eggs and milk, as well as to the producers of feed that goes into such products.

Our goal has been, and still is, broader income protection for a broader segment of agriculture. But we have sought more workable methods of achieving it, including combinations of compensatory payments along with crop loans and purchases. The need for such alternative methods of income protection is more apparent than ever today. It is flexibility of methods we need in our farm program, not flexibility of income levels and flexibility of prices.

We have sought and will seek to eliminate excessive aid to mass producers least needing it, through limiting income and price assistance to some fair family farm standard. We have sought to support and encourage cooperative action by farmers themselves, for more orderly marketing and improved marketing facilities. We cannot permit undermining of our great system of service, supply and marketing cooperatives, as a bona fide extension of the free enterprise system.

We have sought, and still seek, expanded foreign trade—and greater use of our food and fiber abundance as a constructive arm of our foreign policy. We have urged and supported greater participation of voluntary agencies such as CARE, Church World Service, and other religious groups in overseas distribution of food. We have proposed that the United States take the initiative toward establishment of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve, under the United Nations.

We have sought, and still seek, expanded domestic consumption of food—through stepping up our school lunch program, expanding the special milk program, and establishing a food stamp program to supplement the food purchasing power of our aged and underprivileged low-income groups.

We have sought, and still seek, an expansion and liberalization of farm credit geared to modern agricultural production. We have sought, and still seek, a more realistic way of obtaining production adjustments through creation of a conservation acreage reserve, with incentives for taking land out of production and diverting it to soil-building practices to preserve its fertility.

America's rural economy must not be expected to absorb alone the hardship and loss of any production adjustments required for the good of the entire Nation's economy.

Just as the entire Nation shared in the financial burden of converting industry from wartime to peacetime production, and then again back into defense production, the entire Nation has a moral obligation to aid agriculture in achieving adjustments from excessive production resulting from the Nation's wartime and defense needs.

We did not penalize munitions manufacturers for the production of shells we did not have to fire. Neither should we penalize farmers for the production of food the world might have urgently needed if the war in Korea had burst into the threatened world-wide struggle.

Instead of trying to achieve production balance by deliberately putting a price and income squeeze on farmers, it is time we give more thought to achieving better production balance by making it possible for farmers to make a decent living out of less acres, and less production.

I welcome the presence of the present Presiding Officer, the able junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who has shown such great interest in the farm program debate. I was about to discuss some of the goals which I had outlined in the past, and to explain that the Democratic farm program has been a broad, comprehensive one, exhibiting flexibility of method and of approach.

The Democratic Party has continuously emphasized that there was more to an effective farm program than simply the price-support level, at whatever that support might be.

I have gone into this question in some detail, because there have been those who have tried to get the American people to believe that the whole argument about agriculture was nothing more or less than an argument over price supports.

I want the record to be clear that if there is a choice as between the Bensonized version of 75 to 90 percent of parity—the flexible method—and the 90-percent price supports, the choice is quite obvious—namely, 90 percent.

But this is not merely an argument over price supports. As I said in the beginning of my discussion today, the greatest mistake of this administration is not simply the difference in arithmetic; it is not the fact that it is a slippery, sliding, flexible scale—and that is what it is—the greatest mistake of this administration is its poor administering. This highly vaunted, well-publicized, supposedly efficient Republican administration is simply miserably inefficient. It is having difficulty running a foreign policy—if we can ever find out what the policy is. It is having difficulty running a defense policy. It surely is having difficulty in carrying on a farm policy.

The greatest single weakness of the Eisenhower-Benson farm program is in the way it is managed. The reason why it is poorly managed is that there is no will to manage it. The philosophy and the attitude of the administration is that of big business. It did not take the administration 2 months to be able to revise the credit structure, to increase interest rates, and to give price supports for money.

But the administration has spent 3½ years pretending it had a farm program, and pretending it wanted to make a farm program work. It has taken step after step to wreck that program. If the farm bill as it is before the Senate shall be passed with many of the amendments which are to be offered, such as the amendment intended to be offered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] on feed grains, there is no assurance that the program will work, because those who are to administer the program do not have the will to make it work.

The program is like an automobile. One can design the finest mechanical engine, install the finest equipment, including the most powerful motor, the most efficient power steering apparatus and power brakes, and all other modern devices; but if the driver of the car is one who does not believe in automobiles, but is still worshiping at the horse and buggy shrine, if he is someone who does not even know the road he is going to travel, and, what is more, thinks it is wrong, even, to be driving a car, the passengers will not have a very safe trip.

That is what is wrong with the administration. The Department of Agriculture has in it too many persons who are fundamentally opposed to having the Government help the American farmer obtain equality of opportunity. The Department of Agriculture has too many officials who do not really believe in a price support program. They have said so, publicly and privately.

Some Department of Agriculture officials have said that price supports are socialism, and then have gone into a tirade about socialism. That kind of person obviously cannot evince any great desire to make a price support program work.

I respect the right of anyone to be opposed to price supports, but I do not think such a one ought to be hired to administer a price support program. I can respect the right of a person to feel that the farm processors are getting too much, when the farm processors really are getting too little. While I do not agree with such views I respect the right of a person to hold those views. But I do not think such a person should be running a farm program or having anything to do with it.

Alcoholics are not placed in charge of a temperance movement. Similarly, confirmed opponents of price supports and a workable farm program should not be placed in charge of those very programs.

Mr. President, I have outlined the goals which I believed were essential for an effective, comprehensive farm policy. At the series of meetings to which I referred, I had something else to say, something which needs repeating now in the context of events which have since transpired.

Remember, this was before the President's message and the great campaign to glorify the soil bank.

Here is what I said at St. Paul, in December of 1955:

Let me voice a word of caution, a note of warning. Some people are suddenly seizing upon this soil-bank idea as a cure-all, a way out by itself from failures of the present farm program. It would be wrong to be deceived into such assumptions. As author of the bill, I know it was never intended as such. It was never intended to be more than part of a comprehensive farm program. It was intended to supplement other phases of that program, not in any sense be a substitute for them.

I think the conservation acreage reserve makes sense, it can further our necessary consideration adjustments, and encourage wiser land use. But it cannot, and will not alone solve all of our farm price and income problems.

A successful farm program must include many interlocking programs, each contributing toward the total objective. That has always been my approach to farm legislation, and will continue to be. All the objectives I have outlined tonight are spelled out in legislation now before the Congress. These are the objectives I will fight for in Congress next month, both in the Senate committee and on the Senate floor.

We have a full farm program, ready to go. That farm program could have been passed long ago, had we been able to get help, instead of hindrance, from those temporarily responsible for administration of our Agricultural Department.

Does that sound like our only concern is price supports, as our critics suggest?

And let me assure you I have not only encouraged and talked new ideas, new approaches, broader approaches, to farm legislation; I have done something about it.

I have always endeavored to match my words with deeds and with action toward the goals in which I deeply believe.

The legislative records of this body will show that I have consistently presented legislation and supported legislation covering a far broader approach than price supports alone.

Many of the new suggestions I first proposed have been adopted by even this administration, in one form or another, and used as their very own.

It was my proposed amendment to the Mutual Security Act, offered in the Foreign Relations Committee, which led to the program we now have of making better use of our abundance as an arm of our foreign policy. Of course, this administration rushed up the same bill, under another name, to make sure HUBERT HUMPHREY did not get the credit. That is all right with me, so long as the job is done.

This is the most partisan administration that has ever come to Washington, anyway, and we can expect it to act in that way.

Long before the administration was willing to wax so eloquently about its soil bank, the Senator from Minnesota had introduced legislation in this Senate calling for such an approach under the name of a Conservation Acreage Reserve.

Many more constructive suggestions which we have advanced or joined others in advancing have still lacked acceptance by this administration. Yet I am happy to be able to say we are making progress on several of them despite the administration's reluctance, or outright opposition.

For several years this Senator has supported the food stamp idea to stimulate consumption of our food abundance among low income groups, joining with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and others in pushing for such a program.

When even the persuasive Senator from Vermont was unable to get the Department of Agriculture's cooperation in starting a food-stamp program while he was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I joined with the Senator from Oklahoma in a new approach before the Senate Finance Committee, seeking to adopt the plan as a supplement to our social-security legislation.

I wish to make clear, Mr. President, that no man in the Senate has been more loyal to this administration than has the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. The Senator from Vermont, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the 83d Congress, was unable to get the Department of Agriculture to give him even as much as a little help with the food-stamp plan. As a cosponsor of the food-stamp plan, I can say we even sought to have put into operation a pilot plan for the food-stamp program in 1 or 2 cities. The Department of Agriculture said, "No; no; no." The Department of Agriculture has been barren of any imaginative ideas. The Department of Agriculture would rather be an anchor than a propeller. The Department of Agriculture would rather drag its feet than lift its head.

This administration has had no foresight in agricultural areas. This administration looks upon agriculture as a problem rather than as an opportunity. This administration has let the farmers down. This administration has betrayed the farmers, and, what is more, it has betrayed the great history of America by being so negative in its attitudes.

I should like to have someone point out to me one single new proposal this administration has made in the field of agriculture. I can well imagine that someone is going to jump up and say, "The soil bank." As author of the soil-bank proposal, I do not even claim it is new. It has been with us ever since the 1930's.

The only thing this administration has done that is new in agriculture is to hire public relations firms. The most amazing development in government is the use of gimmicks, the use of slogans, the use of public relations experts, the use of a kind of a synthetic approach to government rather than a substantive approach: "Sell the people. Sell the people on this and that." What the administration has done is sell out the people.

Government is not a commodity, Mr. President, and one does not sell government. If this administration had brought into its councils persons who are deeply concerned about agriculture, rather than advertising agents, TV experts, and public relations counselors, we would have had some progress.

I cannot help but chuckle when I see how futile the administration's efforts to "sell" the Eisenhower farm program are. The administration may be selling it to a few people on the 44th floor of some office building, but it is not selling it to good, red-blooded American farmers, or at least it is not selling it to the majority of the farmers.

Going back to the food-stamp plan, I remind my colleagues that we tried to get some help on the food-stamp plan from the Department of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this year. No help, no assistance, from the Department was available. But the Department is willing to tell the American people, through its Secretary and other spokesmen, that we have terrible surplus problems. Well, let me tell the Department that 1 out of every 6 families in America is now on a subsistence diet. Let me tell the Department 1 out of every 6 families in America has an income below $2,500 a year. If the Department would quit bellyaching about the surpluses and get down to business and use the surpluses for needy people, we would have a much healthier America and a much better attitude about our Government and about this Nation in the eyes and the minds of other peoples throughout the world.

It is an amazing thing to me that this Government, which is a readily available client for every public relations outfit in the country, cannot understand what poor public relations it is, internationally, to advertise that the No. 1 American problem is a surplus of food and fiber. We advertise it in a world of poor and hungry. We advertise it to nations in the world to which we are sending economic aid and military assistance. Is it any wonder that we are sometimes in difficulty with the underdeveloped and the underprivileged peoples of the world, and with the uncommitted areas of the world?

Mr. President, I am happy to be able to report we seem to be making more progress in that direction. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma will have more to say about that himself. None of us contend the food-stamp plan alone will solve all our problems, any more than we say price supports alone will solve them. But we think expanding domestic consumption will certainly help farmers, as well as help a lot of other people who need help at the same time.

The food-stamp plan to which I have referred is in the Committee on Finance, and it may well be proposed as an amendment to the Social Security Act. I am happy to be a cosponsor of the amendment. I am happy to have worked with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] as cosponsor, and to have consulted with him in his office.

I told the Senator from Oklahoma, at the time we were working on it, he could expect no assitance from the administration; that he could expect officials of the administration to resist; that he could expect them to oppose him. But, thank goodness, the Senator from Oklahoma is a scrapper. He will fight for it. And thank goodness that in the Committee on Finance there seems to be a friendly reception.

What does the Department of Agriculture say about all these efforts? Let me read a letter expressing the Department's views. I shall read a line or two, and shall ask to have the entire letter embodied in the RECORD:

> Although food-stamp programs present possibilities for increasing the consumption of foods, we sincerely feel that a program of the broad scope of a stamp plan cannot be justified in the United States under current economic conditions.

Later in the letter, objection is made to the food-stamp plan.

In the letter, which is dated February 17, 1956, the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse, says:

> We would strongly recommend that it be initially restricted to a few areas on an experimental basis.

That statement finally comes out, after again and again, ever since the 83d Congress, requests have been made for some action in this field.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is in reply to your letter of January 24, in which you request information as to what consideration is being given in the Department to the possibility of using a food stamp plan to increase potential consumption among low-income families and persons now receiving public assistance.

Although food stamp programs present possibilities for increasing the consumption of foods, we sincerely feel that a program of the broad scope of a stamp plan cannot be justified in the United States under current economic conditions. Further, according to Department records, previous experience with similar programs indicated that they were complex and costly to administer and considerably more effective for some commodities than for others. It should be mentioned also that while such programs act to prevent the accumulation of inventories of surplus foods, they are not primarily designed for the purpose of moving commodities out of government inventories, which is our immediate problem.

Considering these factors, if a food stamp plan were again authorized by Congress, we would strongly recommend that it be initially restricted to a few areas on an experimental basis. We have not undertaken a detailed study of specific areas in which experimental operations could take place, but selection of such areas could best be determined after any decisions were made concerning the desirability of such experimental operations, their scope, and the

amount of funds available for such purpose. In selecting sites for experimental programs, consideration would be given to food items that might be included, to employment and income situations, and to the acceptability of the experimental program from the viewpoint of State and local public officials.

Thank you for your interest in this program.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was interested to note that the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse, who signed the letter for the Department, stated that "we sincerely feel that * * * a stamp plan cannot be justified in the United States under current economic conditions." I would suggest that some of those in the Department of Agriculture visit some of the old people's homes and look over the level of old-age pensions and old-age assistance being given to hundreds of thousands of our elder citizens. I would suggest that they look at the budgets of some of the needy families, and I would suggest that they ask themselves whether they can justify selling powdered milk for 3 cents a pound for hog feed and cattle feed—and they sold 15 million pounds of it, or more, at that price, after having paid for it over 12 cents a pound in the market. I would also suggest that they ask themselves whether that is normally defensible, when they refuse to cooperate with the Congress in the establishment of a food-stamp plan for the senior citizens of our country, the elderly people, who could use this food to such good advantage, or for the children in underprivileged families.

Mr. President, is it not amazing that the Department of Agriculture says it is not interested because such a plan would only stimulate consumption and would tend to prevent new surpluses piling up, and would not do anything about getting rid of the surpluses they now have on their hands. How narrow can their minds be? How limited can their vision be? Is it their only approach to agricultural legislation ways to get rid of an administrative problem on their hands because they do not know how to manage the surplus? Do they not care at all about building future consumption, so they will not get more surplus? This is just one of many examples of their limited approach.

It is the Department of Agriculture and this administration—not HUBERT HUMPHREY and the Democratic Party—that have a fixation on one goal alone, and refuse to consider anything new.

This administration came into power with one fixed idea about what to do to our farm program, and it has refused to budge one inch. It is on the side of the fence that is occupied by those who have closed minds, and it is taking the limited approach. It has repeatedly refused even to give fair consideration to suggestions from others.

Mr. President, let me cite another example. It is the business of the Congress to be concerned with the plight of our people. Agriculture is not the private province of the Secretary of Agriculture alone. We have a right and a duty to speak out when we think the farmers are being neglected, or when we think programs are not being administered properly. We are entitled to respectful consideration.

The Secretary of Agriculture is entirely within his rights if he disagrees with us on policy; but we, as Members of the Senate, are entitled to respect. He has been glorified in the press as a great and honorable man; and it has been said that it is a shame to pick on him, even when he makes mistakes.

Mr. President, I wonder how many Secretaries of Agriculture in our history have ever insulted the Senate as flagrantly as Mr. Benson does? Let me give one illustration:

At the year's end, 13 Senators, concerned about falling hog prices and cattle prices, wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture expressing their concern and advancing some suggestions about action he might take to remedy the situation. We did not receive the courtesy of an answer until after I took the floor of the Senate to protest his refusal to even acknowledge our letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the answer Secretary Benson finally sent to me, after learning of my protests on the Senate floor. Mr. President, please note the date of the Secretary's letter—February 20, 1956. That letter was in reply to a communication sent by me and 12 other Senators to the Secretary of Agriculture on December 30, 1955.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 20, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I note your repeated requests for a reply to a letter dated December 30, 1955 and signed by you and 12 other Senators.

The fact that such a communication had been addressed to me first came to my attention through the newspapers on January 2, 1956. The letter was not received in the Department until January 3, 1956.

It appears from the foregoing that your primary purpose in writing the letter was to publicize your point of view, to which you are certainly entitled. I therefore feel that a reply in detail is not indicated in this instance.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, to make the RECORD complete I also ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the original letter we sent the Secretary; and I ask to have the letter printed along with the signatures of the 13 Senators who joined in sending it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 30, 1955.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On the eve of another session of the Congress, and a critical new year for American agriculture, the undersigned unite in directing your attention to the increasingly serious economic problem confronting America's producers of beef, pork, milk, eggs, and other animal products.

During the campaign of 1952, General Eisenhower repeatedly pledged to our farmers that such perishable commodities would be treated the same as other commodities designated by law as "basic."

Those pledges have not been kept. Hog producers and beef producers are both in serious trouble. The responsibility for recommending a means of protecting them is yours. For 3 years we have waited in vain for any constructive recommendation aimed at carrying out the campaign promises held out to producers of these commodities.

It is generally recognized that these perishable products make up a great proportion of our country's total farm income, and account for a substantial share of the dangerous loss in that farm income.

You have personally said on many occasions that one of the flaws of the past and present programs was that they were designed to protect only certain limited farm commodities. Yet we have seen no action on your part to extend that protection, as promised, to these other perishable commodities.

Now we call upon you and the administration to present such recommendations in the President's forthcoming farm message to the Congress.

While awaiting your legislative recommendations for effective protection to our producers of all forms of livestock and animal products, we call upon you to exercise the authority you already possess to alleviate the hardship conditions of depressed prices and income that now exist.

You have invited suggestions. We offer you the following:

We respectfully suggest that you immediately embark upon an expanded purchase program of animal products for school lunch and relief distribution out of funds available to you for that purpose. Such an expanded program should be geared to increasing the returns to farmers rather than increasing the profits to meatpackers and processors.

We recommend that you immediately reorganize your purchase programs for these products to require bidders submitting offers to the Government to certify that they are buying an equivalent amount of the same product in the open market at prices reflecting to the farmer at least the level of parity authorized by law for the basic commodities.

Ample evidence is now available that your present hog buying program is failing to bolster effectively hog prices to the farmers. Instead, its benefits are going primarily to meatpackers whose profits have already soared during the past year as farm prices declined. The same valid objection was raised to your past beef buying program. We respectfully suggest that such programs should provide some assurance of increased returns to producers, not just more profit for packers.

Rather than having your own Department contribute to downward pressures in a falling market by trying to buy cheaply while expressing the hope prices will improve, we call upon you to take specific action toward stabilizing the livestock market at a level fair and reasonable to farm producers, by insisting that your suppliers certify they are basing their sales offers to the Government upon purchases reflecting a fair price to producers, according to the minimum standard we have suggested.

Ample outlets exist for a far greater distribution of meat and animal products in the school-lunch program, through relief and welfare groups, and through voluntary agencies cooperating in overseas rehabilitation work, than you have so far been will-

ing to undertake, despite availability of funds within your Department earmarked for such purposes.

If seriously undertaken with a will to make it work, such an expanded purchase program conditioned upon requiring certification of prices paid to producers will surely help turn the tide of the existing economic depression in many of the major areas of agricultural enterprise.

If, at this late date, it proves to be a case of too little assistance too late, we in the Congress will face the task of providing whatever additional authority may be needed for more direct assistance.

Before we take such steps, it seems reasonable to exhaust every means available under present law to relieve the economic distress caused by depressed prices. We respectfully urge your full and determined action.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., ESTES KEFAUVER, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, MIKE MANSFIELD, MIKE MONRONEY, WAYNE MORSE, DENNIS CHAVEZ, W. KERR SCOTT, JAMES E. MURRAY, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, ROBERT S. KERR, PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want my colleagues who signed that letter, and did not get an answer, to read the belated answer I finally forced out of Secretary Benson.

Is that the answer of an honorable man, seriously considering suggestions to improve conditions in agriculture?

Just listen to the letter, Mr. President:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I note your repeated requests for a reply to a letter dated December 30, 1955, and signed by you and 12 other Senators.

The fact that such a communication had been addressed to me first came to my attention through the newspapers on January 2, 1956. The letter was not received in the Department until January 3, 1956.

It appears from the foregoing that your primary purpose in writing the letter was to publicize your point of view, to which you are certainly entitled. I therefore feel that a reply in detail is not indicated in this instance.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. President, the letter was mailed on the morning of December 30. The letter could have been put on the back of a rheumatic turtle and could have gotten to the Department of Agriculture before January 3. Apparently what the Secretary of Agriculture was saying was that the Postmaster General does not have a functioning Post Office Department. The letter was mailed on December 30. So it had all day of the 30th, all day of the 31st, all day of the 1st, and all day of the 2d of January to reach the Department of Agriculture. Am I to believe that it took 4 days to transport the letter from the Senate Office Building a distance of approximately 20 blocks to the Department of Agriculture? If that is the record of this administration in the field of post office management, I wish to know about it. I am also of the opinion—I have been so told—that congressional mail receives rather prompt handling. I notice that the Secretary of Agriculture was able to read in the newspapers about my letter. Let me say, by the way, that the letter was signed by me and 12 other Senators—a total of 13 Senators.

Even if the Secretary of Agriculture was a bit miffed over the fact that he read about the letter in the newspapers on January 2, it seems to me that a reply was still called for, because in the letter were embodied some very important proposals which we made. For instance, we offered some proposals regarding "an expanded purchase program of animal products for school lunch and relief distribution." We asked that proposals for purchase be directed more to the benefit of the producer rather than the processsor, and so forth. I ask my colleagues if this is a reply which is calculated to be really helpful in improving conditions in agriculture. Or is it the answer of an angry partisan, refusing to believe that anybody else could have any ideas better than his own? I shall let my colleagues judge for themselves.

The Secretary makes quite a fetish of the fact that the letter was released before he read his mail.

Mr. President, it is not my fault if Senators are concerned enough about their duties to be working on the Saturday before the year-end holiday, and the Secretary is not. The letter was sent to the Department of Agriculture on the last Saturday of the year.

It was not made public until after it had been delivered. Whether or not it was made public is none of Secretary Benson's business. If 13 United States Senators write an appeal to him, they are entitled to the courtesy of a reply—and not the kind of a reply finally obtained.

I wonder how many Senators Mr. Benson would require to sign a request, before he would ultimately consider answering it. I would like to know. If 13 is not enough, perhaps we can sign up 50. If 50 is not enough, perhaps we can sign up more.

As one United States Senator, I do not like such arrogance on the part of any officer in the executive branch of this Government, regardless of the party in power. We are elected. We are chosen by the people, to represent them. Secretary Benson is an appointed officeholder. He should remember that.

I should also like to clear the air about partisanship in connection with farm policies. No one has tried harder than I have to get action on a farm bill before we were in an election year climate. No one has tried harder than I have to examine carefully every suggestion on its merit, whether it originated with a Democrat or a Republican.

That is why I have cosponsored a food-stamp plan with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. His plan was good, and deserved support, regardless of the fact that he usually disagrees with me and seems to be assigned the partisan task of continually taking on HUBERT HUMPHREY.

We have always had bipartisan support for farm legislation down through the years of Democratic administrations, and we have always been happy to give credit to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who stood with us for the farmers.

Today, despite all the public appeals of Secretary Benson about avoiding partisan politics in farm policy, more politics has been injected into it under this administration than ever before.

Who is injecting politics into this farm debate, when the Republican Party earmarks $250,000 for a campaign of newspaper advertising and radio spot announcements throughout rural areas of the country asking farmers to "help Eisenhower pass the new farm program."

What farm program? The program we are voting on? The program developed out of bipartisan support in our Committee on Agriculture?

Oh, no. They ask support for the "Eisenhower-Benson farm program," outlining nine points, some of which are not even in legislation; yet they provide a coupon for farmers to mail to their Senators asking them to vote for the "Eisenhower farm program."

The name "Eisenhower" may be magic, but it does not produce farm policies, and it has not brought up farm prices. It may get votes, but it does not bring about farm prosperity.

Mr. President, we have been doing a great deal of talking on this floor about attempts to influence legislation. Quite an attempt is going on right now.

Can anyone show me a time when an administration has conducted such a campaign, including coupons for people to sign and send to Members of Congress, to influence their votes.

That is not all. There is too much talk going around of "deals" being offered by the Department of Agriculture to certain commodity groups and certain Senators in return for vote switches. Apparently, they are willing to pay any price to win a symbolic victory. When I say "they" I mean the administration.

Perhaps our new Committee on Lobbying might want to look at lobbying by this administration itself.

Ample opportunity has been given the Administration to present its views and its testimony. Officials of the Department of Agriculture were extended every courtesy by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. They sat in on all executive sessions. They had every opportunity to present and argue for their views.

I think it is about time for the executive branch to attend to its own business, instead of devoting so much time to lobbying, and let Congress make up its own mind on farm policy. Let the executive branch spend a little more time on foreign policy.

I think I have made it clear that we as Democrats are interested in far more than mere price supports.

I wish also to make it clear that we recognize price and income protection as a vitally important cog in any farm program. We will insist that it be not brushed aside for any substitute "package" intended for entirely different purposes, no matter how attractively it is wrapped up in Madison Avenue sales-promotion techniques.

If we fight hardest now on the price-support issue, it is because those who would neglect agriculture are fighting hardest against us on that issue. They are making that the target of their attack, and we are only meeting them head on.

We had to fight just as hard for REA, but most of our critics joined us after we finally won.

We have fought just as hard for conservation, and still will the minute anybody tries to undermine the gains we have made.

So our fight for effective price and income protection does not mean that we are abandoning any other goals, or are less interested in any other goals. It means that this is the current battleground, where our foes are trying to undermine agriculture's progress.

Our current fight for agriculture has very properly been an economic one, for most of us have long realized that all progress in rural America—and, yes, in all America—really stems from an adequate opportunity for diligent farm people to earn a decent living.

Without adequate opportunity, little social progress can be made in agriculture. We cannot have adequate rural schools, rural housing, and rural health facilities until farmers themselves can get a decent return for their toil. We cannot do the job we should be doing in conserving our heritage of productive soil unless farmers have the opportunity of providing properly for their families without having to mine that soil.

We cannot preserve our family pattern of agriculture unless economic opportunity continues to exist for young people to stay on the farm.

That is why so many of us have made the fight for an effective price-support program the focal point in our efforts toward greater progress in every realm for rural America. We know that most of such progress must eventually stem from the pocketbooks; and empty pocketbooks mean unfilled hopes and aspirations for our farmers and their families, dwindling business for rural communities, and stagnation for rural institutions such as schools and churches.

We have had a setback, under this administration, for the kind of economic protection most farmers feel is essential to agriculture's continued stability and prosperity. We are determined to regain that lost ground.

Mr. President, at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair would inquire of the Senator from Minnesota how long the Senator estimates his remarks will extend?

Mr. HUMPHREY. About half an hour, Mr. President.

Let us get down, Mr. President, to specifics of the bill before us.

Title I pertains to price supports, primarily restoring 90 percent of parity on basic commodities.

Let us be honest enough to face the truth that without this title to the bill, nothing in it is going to raise farm prices and farm income to any degree this year.

Title I of the bill provides an increase in farm income of approximately $850 million. If the Senate wishes to go on record to reduce that sum of $850 million, the thing to do is to vote against title I as now written in the bill. If it wishes to add some farm income and, at the same time, curb any excess production because of the equities and allotments which are included in the 90 percent provision, it can vote to sustain the title I language in the bill.

This is the big economic issue in the bill, Mr. President, and I hope that the American people will recognize it as such. The one thing that can be done for agriculture by this Congress is to enact title I and, by so doing, give a shot in the arm, so to speak, to the rather weak and faltering agricultural economy existing under present policies.

I would not mind it if our Republican friends who believe so strongly in lowering support levels, and will obviously fight so vigorously to save face by knocking out this provision to raise them, would stand up to farmers of the country and say:

> Look, we ask you to go along with lower prices for another year or so.
>
> We ask you to hang on and to cooperate in cutting down production still further while we are trying to get rid of supplies on our hands. We want you to quit producing so we can sell what we have. We think it is more important for the Government to sell its supplies than for you to sell yours.

That is what they are really asking farmers to do in the Eisenhower-Republican farm program, as the advertising experts have proclaimed it.

I would not even mind if they went further and said:

> Mr. Farmer, if you will go without any more income this year, we hope—and think—that your prices may go up in the future after we get our own problems taken care of by selling our commodities.

They would be honest if they told farmers that. Secretary Benson would be honest, and honorable, if he made that presentation.

But they are not satisfied with that. They know that farmers are "hurting," as the Senator from Iowa said when he was Secretary Benson's guest on television—when he used and abused free time granted by CBS to answer Edward R. Murrow, as a sales effort instead for the Eisenhower farm program.

Mr. Benson never answered Mr. Murrow. He never even referred to what Mr. Murrow had to say. Mr. Benson used his CBS time to advertise, propagandize, and would-be popularize the Eisenhower farm program—that is, the one which is in the newspaper advertisements.

They know farmers are hurting, and need help now. They also know an election is approaching, and that seems to make more impression on them than the fact that farmers are hurting. At least it has spurred more attention to farm problems, even if it is dubious attention, on their part.

They know American agriculture wants to see some substantial boost to its economy this year.

So instead of being honest and saying they can only offer, once more, some vague hope for the future, they are trying to convince farmers they have some bold new plan of pouring a billion dollars more into their pockets.

They are spending a small fortune telling that story all over the country.

Even the coupon the Republican senatorial and congressional campaign committees have so conveniently made available to farmers to send their Senators and Congressmen as part of the current lobbying drive says:

> I am in favor of the Eisenhower farm program. Let's get it passed before spring planting time so we can start getting our prices and income up this crop year.

Mr. President, I challenge the sponsors of this advertising campaign to tell us how the Eisenhower-Republican farm program it outlines is going to get prices and income up this crop year.

Oh, I know they claim that their soil bank and its curtailed production will give new buoyancy in the market place.

Mr. President, farmers know it is wishful thinking. However good it may be in the long run, curtailed production this year is not going to firm up prices this year so long as the Department of Agriculture is begging the trade to buy its own supplies of commodities.

The trade keeps its eye on total available supply, not merely the amount the farmer is producing each year, in determining market prices. Notice I say total available supply, not simply total supply.

If the Department wants to see some buoyancy in the market place, it could just suddenly decide its commodities were not for sale.

I see no hope for buoyancy in the market place until this administration shifts to a determination to force prices up, instead of plunging headlong along paths aimed at bringing prices down.

I direct my remarks to the point that if the administration refused to sell any of its surplus supplies and relied upon current production, farm prices would go up. I challenge the administration to prove to the contrary.

The administration, however, is more interested in dumping its commodities than it is in administering a successful farm program. The administration is so interested in disposing of its so-called surpluses that it is disposing of the farmers.

I said earlier tonight that the administration have built up such a straw man, such, as they put it, a monstrous image of a surplus, that they are now caught in their own propaganda. The facts are that if the administration locked up the surpluses now—tonight—and said to those in the free market that none of those supplies were available, the free market traders would have to deal in the current supply, in the pipeline of the free and open market. In so doing, there would be some buoyancy in prices.

Another of the pet arguments of our critics is to say that prices started falling and continued falling under 90 percent of parity programs.

Earlier in my remarks, I documented the fact that the fall in farm prices prior to the election in November 1952 was only down to 100 percent of parity.

I asked several thousand farmers in Minnesota over the weekend if they

would be satisfied with less than 90 percent price supports. I did not hear any farmer say he would be satisfied with anything less. There is quite a difference between that and a decline to 80 percent of parity. Mr. Benson never is quite honorable enough to make that distinction when he talks about how much of the price decline occurred before he took office. Nor is he willing to recognize that the decline sharpened right after the election, before he took office, as the trade recognized a new philosophy was coming into the Department of Agriculture.

I merely wish to underscore for the record that those engaged in the trading of grain futures bid on futures. They knew when the Republican administration came into power that the future meant lower farm prices. That is exactly why the farm-price structure started to drop.

I have also documented earlier in my remarks how the 90-percent programs cushioned the declines even since then, with less percentage declines for such commodities than for those under the flexible support program or no support program at all.

Let me add that I am convinced the 90-percent program could have been a lot more effective in checking the decline during 1953 and 1954, if the program had been administered by those in sympathy with it rather than those whose avowed aim was to get rid of it.

Do not quote as convincing evidence to me failure of a 90-percent program when it was being administered by people trying to prove it would not work.

Some people do not even know how our farm support program is supposed to work. Sometimes I wonder if even our present Department of Agriculture does—at least the front office.

It is not simply a matter of making loans available to farmers at a certain percentage of parity, if they want to use them.

The entire idea is to provide a vehicle for farmers to work together in controlling their marketing so as to force prices up to the support level.

When we have a support program in effect, whether it be at 90 percent or 75 percent, if enough farmers hold their commodities off the market and put them under loan they can force the market to bid up to the support level and above, to draw those commodities into the market at prices permitting farmers to repay their loans.

But to make such programs effective takes organized cooperation among farmers, with leadership of the farmer-elected committees in townships and counties.

I have gone into some detail in my discussion as to what has happened to the farmer-elected committees. I repeat that what has happened in terms of destroying the effectiveness and undermining the morale of the farmer-elected committees is in great part responsible for the decline in farm income. This situation could be corrected if there was a will to correct it. But the will is lacking.

If the Department of Agriculture, during the past 3 years, had ever really embarked upon a campaign to encourage farmers to make use of the program Congress had provided for their benefit, and had used effectively farmer committees to explain how it could work for all farmers, we could have checked these price declines, reversed the market, and in the long run avoided the Government having to take over as great a quantity of commodities to add to its surplus.

If the administration is so afraid of a surplus it should set out to really make these programs work.

When commodities are placed under loan, they are going to end up in Government hands unless the Department can effectively manage its program to stimulate the market up above the loan level. Once the market gets up there, all the Government eventually has to acquire is the real surplus of amount above effective demand rather than having to take over far more than is actually surplus, simply because some of it is under loan that farmers cannot repay at going prices.

In other words, the private grain trade today has no inventory or substantially no inventory. All the inventory, with very few exceptions, is in the hands of the Government. Why? Because no businessman in his right mind would want to hold commodities at any price, when he knew that the attitude of the administration would cause a further decline in prices. The private grain trade business would be rubbed out on that basis.

So the private grain trader today, the man who is engaged in trading in flax, soybeans, corn, wheat, or feed grains, says, "Let the Government own it. We will buy from the Government's stocks. Let the Government have the inventory. The Government is juggling the prices. Let the Government take the losses."

The reason for that attitude on the part of the private grain traders or the traders in agricultural commodities is quite obvious. It is that no businessman can long survive in the private grain trade under the policies pursued by this administration. This administration has come mighty close to socializing agriculture. The administration has come mighty close to providing incentives for collectivizing agriculture. It has done so in the name of being the party of free enterprise. Never in its history has the United States Government been more deeply involved in the grain business than it is now under the Republican administration, the free-enterprise administration.

I have seen no evidence of an effort by this administration to encourage a mass seal-up to bolster prices, such as has been done in past years to turn a downward trend in the cotton market. Instead, I have seen just the reverse.

It was to this very fact that the Senator from New Mexico was referring a few nights ago on a television broadcast, when he said that we had surpluses before, but we had Secretaries of Agriculture who used their authority, not to depress prices, but to bolster them.

The attitude has been: "Well, the loans are there; if a farmer wants them, let him come in and ask." The great educational impact of the farmer-committee system, with its intended potential of mobilizing farmers to work together for orderly marketing, has been deliberately abandoned. In fact, efforts have been made to deemphasize use of these committees, and leave everything up to clerks in county offices.

Mr. President, that was told to me on Saturday of this past week by members of county committees in Minnesota. Members of the county committees told me, as their Senator, that under this administration the program of trying to encourage farmers to participate was practically at a standstill. Members of county committees told me, as their Senator, that there was not any real educational program to get farmers to sign up for acreage controls and acreage compliance.

Is it any wonder the program is bogging down?

I charge on the floor of the Senate that this is a deliberate plan on the part of this administration. The administration has never believed in a price-support program, and one way to get rid of a price-support program is to make it a disgrace.

There has been a constant barrage of propaganda going forth from Government sources as to the evil of a price-support program. I would note for the record that it is this administration which has the responsibility to make the program a success. The administration has been against the Democratic program of 90 percent of parity, and it cannot make its own program work.

Why? Because it has taken the heart out of the whole farmer-elected committee system, and no agricultural program can work from Washington. It has got to be at the county and township level. The administrative structure at the county and township level is in a shambles.

Mr. President, do you know what farmers tell me? They say they do not want to go into an office and have a 22-year-old girl tell them all about the farm program.

In my part of the country, farmers are accustomed to having their neighbors come to their farms and measure their land for acreage reductions and work with them on soil conservation programs. The farmers in the great Midwest have been accustomed, since 1933, to working with their own fellow farmers, their own neighbors, in directing and administering the great agricultural conservation program and the price-support program.

All of this is now changed. Now in the office of a county committee there are a county manager and a clerk-typist. Under the rules and regulations, that county manager is supposed to be hired by the county committee. In actual practice, if the county committee hires anyone the State chairman does not like, the State chairman fires him. And if the county committee insists on hiring its own selected county manager, then the State chairman fires the county committee, even though the county committee is elected.

This is the first administration that has openly defied the election process, and I repeat on the floor of the Senate, with evidence gained and obtained under oath, that this administration persists in

condoning and supporting State committees—State ASC committees—that remove summarily the elected township and county committeemen, when those elected township and county committeemen refuse to take the political hacks and the political appointees of the State committee and the Republican Party. There is plenty of evidence to that effect, and that evidence has been turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture.

If the 90 percent program has been less effective than it should have been under the Benson administration, it is the fault of the administrators, not of the program. It is the fault of administrators who have publicly disapproved of the program they are administering right from the start.

Mr. President, you cannot put confidence in a market when a Secretary of Agriculture or his assistants publicly announce they think farm prices are too high, that downward adjustments are necessary. Yet that is just what they have done, time after time.

Give back to the farmers a law establishing support levels at 90 percent, and farmers will give us an administration next year that will make it work.

Keep the 90 percent provision in the bill, if we really mean to help agricultural income this year.

Certainly we cannot bolster farm income with policies that have permitted and encouraged farm income drops of 26 percent in 3 years and 12 percent in the last year, with another 5 to 10 percent drop already predicted for this year by the Department of Agriculture itself.

I say this prediction of a further drop in agricultural income is a confession of utter failure on the part of the administration, a monument to its gross inadequacies and inefficiency.

The only action that will solve the problem now before us is legislation that will stop the fall in farm family income, and raise it to a level commensurate with a fair opportunity for farmers in an otherwise expanding national economy.

Existing law permits and authorizes, in general, but does not require, the executive branch to take the necessary actions required to protect and improve farm income.

I wish to underscore this: The law which is now on the books could be used to boost farm income. There is plenty of law on the books now to enable the Secretary of Agriculture and the President to take affirmative, positive action, but they will not do it, so we are going to have to direct them to do it. Then if they fail, under the mandatory provisions of the law, there is only one thing to do, and that is remove them. We have ways to remove secretaries, and we can remove presidents by elections.

There is a lot more authority already on the books than most people realize. There is even authority for direct parity payments, but the administration has never asked Congress to provide funds for them. I shall have more to say about that later in discussing some of the amendments I shall propose.

However, the executive branch has not used the authority it has. On the record, there is no reason to believe or hope that the executive will extend more nearly adequate farm income protection programs than the Congress actually directs it to establish and carry out.

That is why we must take the responsibility, if farm income is to be increased this year.

That is why 90 percent of parity must be restored, as a majority of our committee has agreed.

If title I is left in the bill intact, approximately 800 million bushels of milling wheat would be eligible for support loans at $2.25 per bushel, instead of $1.79. That means adding $368 million to national farm income. Voting against 90 percent support means taking $368 million away from wheat farmers.

Milling wheat is under severe acreage restrictions. Voting for 90 percent supports would not mean surpluses. It would mean that the farmer would get a fair price for what he produces, and at the same time production would be very severely limited.

If title I is left intact in the bill, approximately 7.3 billion pounds of cotton will be eligible for price-support loans at 28 cents per pound, instead of 26 cents. That means adding $146 million more to national farm income of cotton farmers. To vote against 90-percent support will mean to take $146 million from the pockets of the cotton producers.

If title I is left intact in the bill, approximately 1.6 billion pounds of peanuts will be eligible for support loans at 12 cents per pound, instead of 10 cents. That will mean an increased income of $32 million to peanut growers. To vote against 90-percent support would mean to take $32 million away from the peanut producers.

If title I is left intact in the bill, approximately 900 million bushels of corn sold from the farms where it was produced will be eligible for support loans at $1.64 per bushel, instead of $1.40. That would raise farm income by $216 million. To vote against 90-percent support will mean to take $216 million out of the pockets of the corn producers and out of the business and trade channels of the Corn Belt.

If title I is left intact, approximately 61 billion pounds of manufactured milk will be supported at $3.26 per hundredweight instead of at $3.07, adding about $121 million more to the gross and net national farm-family income. To vote against title I will mean to take $121 million out of the pockets of the dairy farmers.

Mr. President, I am not ready to let that happen. Enough money has already been taken out of the income of our dairy farmers. I want this record clear, namely, that the administration's farm program means reduced farm income. I want every dairy farmer in Minnesota, Wisconsin, New York, Ohio, Mississippi, and Florida to know that the administration's farm plan means taking $121 million out of their pockets. I can think of very few pieces of legislation in the Congress, except the Eisenhower-Benson farm program, that were purposely designed to take money away from people.

The pending bill, reported by the chairman of our committee and the majority of the committee—S. 3183—will add to farm income in the crop year 1956.

If we keep administration pressure and propaganda from stampeding this body into knocking out the only income-raising sections of this bill, national net farm-family income might be in the neighborhood of $11.2 billion this year, instead of the $10.2 billion to which the Department of Agriculture now expects farm income to fall, based on farm price and income policies now in force.

That $11.2 billion income will still be far below the 1952 farm income of $14.9 billion, but we cannot undo in 1 year all the damage that has been caused in 3½ years. At least it is a step upward, instead of slipping further behind. Even with this added-income portion of the bill, the level of farm income in 1956 will be only 2 percent better than the very low status of 1955. That is asking mighty little of the Congress; yet it would be welcomed by the farm people as a welcome change from the skids they have had put under them.

Recently, I read with considerable interest how a big mass meeting of farmers in Illinois opposed 90 percent of parity; and I suppose we shall be hearing more about it during this debate. But just let me reassure my colleagues that if they wish to judge this issue by farmer demonstrations, I will match them with two farmers for every one who can be assembled in the opposition's propaganda campaign; and it will not have to be as "forced" a meeting as I understand the well-publicized Illinois gathering organized by supporters of the administration was.

I should like to know more about that meeting, and how each paid truckdriver who delivers fuel and supplies to farmers is required, as part of his job, to bring an automobile-load of farm people to attend the meeting I should like to know how much freedom of expression there was at the meeting, or whether it is true, as some of the radio correspondents who were present say, that the meeting was abruptly terminated when it threatened to get off the well-planned advance schedule of action.

I do not want "stunts" to determine our legislative policy. But if we are entering an era of guiding public policy by public-relations gimmicks and demonstrations, I have no doubt at all that it would take no more effort than a call broadcast over our radio waves, and carried by our wire services at a given signal, to mobilize farmers' mass meetings in every county seat of the Midwest, to tell the Congress in no uncertain terms that they want increased income this year, and they want restoration of 90 percent price supports.

Mr. President, I advocate just that. I advocate that before the votes are taken on this bill and the amendments to it, the farmers have some mass meetings at the county seats. I should like to see the farmers of the great Midwest and the South and the East and the Far West march to their county courthouses and,

in good old American fashion, get up and speak their minds and prepare resolutions, and petition their Government for action. I think the only way the farmers are going to be able to shock the Congress into a realization of what needs to be done is by dynamic, militant, vigorous, political action.

If our press and wire services would like to do something for the country, the one thing they could do would be to broadcast this appeal for the farmers really to mobilize, to gather around the courthouses and in the public squares, and let their voices be heard, and speak their minds, and then petition the Members of Congress, one by one, name by name, and let their Members of Congress know they are determined to get some concrete and positive results. I say, Mr. Farmer, unless you do this, you are licked.

Mr. President, tonight I want to say to the farm people of America, from the forum of the United States Senate, "Unless something happens in the next 48 hours, you are going to take a licking in the Senate."

Mr. President, I have been counting the votes that seem to be available here. I am not a pessimist, but I think I am sufficiently realistic to know that the Members of Congress who favor 90 percent of parity are fighting with their backs to the wall; and unless the farmers of America speak out unmistakably, with vigor and determination, they are going to take another licking; they are going to get another economic blow that may very well lay them low.

Yes, Mr. President, I wish the farmers could move on Washington, could come to Washington in the way many other groups have done—come to Washington by the hundreds and, yes, the thousands, to fill these galleries, and to go into every office, and say to the Members of Congress, "All we ask is justice. All we ask is equity."

Mr. President, the American farmers are asking for no special privilege, but they are asking for equal treatment.

One of the discouraging things in this whole farm bill debate has been the lack of participation. I wish the farmers of America could see how little attention is really being paid on the floor of the Senate to their predicament. To be sure, some Members of this body have been most steadfast, determined, and persevering. But again I say to the farmers of America, "Unless you make your voice heard like the clarion call of Paul Revere, you are going to get another raw deal." This time, it will not be the British who will be coming; but it will be the publicists, the propagandists, and the hucksters who have been coming and going and filling the minds of the American people with misinformation, to a point where the Congress may very well be stampeded into taking a position which will bring economic havoc to American agriculture.

Mr. President, I have advised the farmers in the State of Minnesota as to what is afoot here. I should have stayed in Minnesota today, to attend another 10 farm meetings that were scheduled. But, instead, I returned here, to do just what I am doing tonight, because, Mr. President, regardless of whether any of my colleagues listen to this debate, at least it will be in the RECORD.

I want the farm people of my State to know that their Senator was concerned about their plight. I want the farm people of America to know that there are members of this body who will never quit fighting for them. I want this administration to know, too, that I will not quit battling with them. They may win a temporary victory, but there will be plenty of fur flying between now and November. There will be many amendments offered in the Senate, and there will be yea-and-nay votes. When we have yea-and-nay votes on amendments pertaining to hogs, cattle, and other live stock, the farmers of America will know who voted for them and who voted against them. The farmers of America are going to know, too, who voted for and who voted against effective price supports.

I say again that the one hope the farmers have is to mobilize. I hope that within the next 48 hours, in every county seat in every rural area in the United States, the farmers will march forward, proclaiming their just demand for fair treatment by the Congress and the administration.

Mr. Farmer, forget your politics, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. Keep track of how we vote. Mr. Farmer, forget your politics. Think about what this administration does, and how it acts. This is the one sure way to protect your economic and social life.

Mr. President, because I have mentioned the situation in Illinois, I ask unanimous consent to have apprear at this point in the RECORD a letter from Howard O. Miller, farm director of the Mattoon Broadcasting Co., of Mattoon, Ill., which speaks very effectively and dramatically for itself.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTOON BROADCASTING CO.,
Mattoon, Ill., February 16, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Agriculture Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have never taken the time out to congratulate you and your splendid committee for the restoration of 90 percent parity. It's the only salvation for those of us who are farmers at the present time.

Our own American Farm Bureau Federation has sold us down the river. Hundreds of farmers are refusing to renew their affiliation with them and I happen to be one of them. Why should I support an organization when it refuses to listen to the farmer? The big moneyed interest has taken over. So don't let anyone from their organization tell you that they represent the thinking of 1,600,000 farm families. They do not. Besides, they have a lot of bankers, lawyers, doctors, and school teachers listed as farm families.

The only reason the present program hasn't worked is because only one-half of the farmers have complied. We need our program mandatory. Restore our corn and wheat prices to at least 90 percent of parity. Then I'm certain we will come out O. K. Sixteen cents a bushel on corn and 33 cents on wheat will help pay the bankers and at the same time get rid of surpluses.

I have talked to a lot of farmers personally and of course I talk to a lot of them daily, and I'm positive, with my connections and contacts, that you will have at least 90 percent of the farmers in accord with the 90 percent or better parity supports. Keep up the good work.

With kindest personal regards.
Sincerely,

HOWARD O. MILLER,
Farm Director, Mattoon Broadcasting Co.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is only one typical letter out of thousands I have received carrying the same appeal.

At the conclusion of my remarks I should like to present some of the telegrams showing how farmers out my way feel, and what their reaction is to the Benson-Eisenhower-Republican propaganda drive against them. A few days ago I presented many telegrams, but my office is filled with them.

But let us get back to the farm bill itself once more.

The increased income from wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts provided by the bill would result from two features: extension of 90 percent of parity price support levels for these commodities in section 101 and section 102, and extension of the old parity formula by section 106.

Let me emphasize that both these features are needed to achieve an income advance this year. One without the other will not do it.

I have endeavored to make a case for return to 90 percent of parity price supports, which I believe is supported by fact, and fully justified.

I wish now to turn to the parity formula, section 106 of the bill.

PARITY FORMULA (SEC. 106)

Mr. President, we come now to the other half of the committee's action to stop the sliding scale of price supports.

This section will continue the use of full parity as farmers have known it for nearly a quarter of a century, on the great basic crops of corn, wheat, and cotton, as well as on peanuts. This section also instructs the Secretary to "make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and report thereon, with his recommendations, to Congress within 6 months after the enactment of this act."

Mr. President, those who believed that the answer to the farmers' problems was the sliding scale of lower and lower prices did not stop with abolishing supports on some products and hoping to abolish them on still more.

They did not stop with a vicious campaign to vilify the farmer before his city customers.

They did not stop with the sliding scale of supports which deliberately hurts farmers just when they need help, and which forces farmers to produce more to make ends meet.

They did not stop with all these measures. They went beyond them to tamper with the parity formula itself, in the efforts to still further depress prices. By lowering parity for corn, wheat, and cotton, which are the backbone of our farm programs, the income for all of agriculture would be cut down.

Fortunately, this assault upon the whole principle of parity made by the 80th Congress was turned aside and postponed until this very year, by action of the 81st Congress. Efforts in the 83d Congress during consideration of the Agricultural Act of 1954 failed to extend the postponement beyond January 1, 1956.

If the so-called modernized parity for these great crops had taken effect when the 80th Congress leaders wanted it to, back in 1949 or 1950, the troubles of agriculture would be multiplied beyond what they are today, for reasons I shall soon explain.

If the 83d Congress, back in 1954, had listened to what we then said, farmers would not now be faced with the price cut which this section aims to retract and prevent.

The new so-called modernized formula for wheat, corn, and cotton makes such a drastic cut in income that even the sponsors of this measure felt obliged to soften its terrible blow by providing for applying the reduction in smaller yearly installments. Thus they provided for an annual 5 percent reduction in parity and named this "transitional" parity, with this operation to begin with 1956.

This transitional parity is much like trimming a dog's tail inch by inch, instead of chopping it all off at once.

The drop in parity provided by this year's 5-percent cut amounts to about $450 million on the production of corn, wheat, cotton, and peanuts. In other words, if we maintain 90 percent of parity, with the use of the so-called transitional formula, there will be a drop of $450 million in farm income.

There are two ways to bolster farm income in the bill. One is by maintaining the old parity formula until the Secretary of Agriculture can make a complete study; and he is requested to do so within 6 months. The other is by getting the price-support level up to 90 percent. If either of those sections is knocked out, farm income will take a tailspin.

If loans are made at 90 percent, as proposed by this bill, the loss under this 5-percent cut will be over $400 million directly to producers of the 4 crops I have mentioned.

But the indirect cost to agriculture will be far greater. The corn loan is a basic factor in the price of all feeds, and the support level for corn thus affects the prices received by other feed producers, regardless of their loan levels for their feeds. Still greater, the support level for feeds is the greatest influence upon the output of livestock, poultry, and dairy products, and therefore affects the prices for those products.

Cheap feed based upon a loan rate for corn which is low leads to cheap livestock, dairy, and poultry products. So the loss will be far greater than $400 million if what we call the standard or old parity is discarded and the 5-percent cut made actual this year.

That 5 percent represents 13 cents in the case of wheat, 9 cents for corn, $14 per ton on peanuts, and nearly $2 a bale on cotton. So when we hear the words "transitional parity" what we are really hearing is, "This is another way to cut prices."

With a 90-percent loan rate, the difference in loans would be 12 cents on every bushel of wheat, 8 cents on the corn crop, $12.20 a ton on peanuts, and one-third of a cent a pound on cotton. The cut in cotton is not so great the first year, but more will come later.

But this is not the end of the trouble that is in store for American farmers if section 106 as now written does not prevail.

Next year will see another 5-percent cut for wheat and peanuts, nearly that much for corn, and preparations for greater reductions for cotton. With 90-percent loans, the difference in 1957 will be 23 cents for wheat, 15 cents for corn, $25.20 per ton for peanuts, and one-fourth cent for cotton. If the transitional parity goes into effect, if section 106, as written into the bill is defeated, the change for wheat will be 23 cents a bushel down, and so forth.

Assuming that Congress will not yet have acted, by 1958 these reductions in 90-percent loans will progress further, to 29 cents for wheat, 20 cents for corn, $34.20 a ton for peanuts, and over a half cent a pound on cotton.

If we look as far ahead as 1959, the results will be still worse, always assuming Congress has not acted to give farmers a full and fair parity.

In that year the difference between 90-percent loans at the parity level farmers have been using since 1933 and the one now hanging over their heads is 32 cents a bushel on wheat, 26 cents a bushel on corn, $34.20 a ton on peanuts, and nearly a cent a pound on cotton.

Mr. President, these drastic cuts in the income of our farmers must not be allowed to take place.

Consider what will happen to a corngrower with some 5,000 bushels for sale. Because of this 5-percent cut hanging over his head, in 1956 he stands to lose 8 cents per bushel or some $400, just at a time when he can stand to lose it least. The 15-cent lower rate for 1957 would mean $750 less, the 20-cent cut in 1958, a full $1,000 less, and the 26-cent cut by 1959 would mean $1,300 that year.

That would be a total loss for the 4 years of some $3,450, in many cases equal to a year or more of net income with today's conditions. That is what so-called modernized parity would do to the corn producer, even with 90 percent loans.

The wheatgrower would lose, if he had 3,000 bushels for market, similar amounts. Nineteen hundred and fifty-six would see a cut of $360 due to the 12 cents a bushel lower rate. In 1957 the 23-cent cut would add up to $690 for that year. By 1958 the 29-cent lower support would mean $870 less, and in 1959, the 32-cent difference would come to $960. That would be a total of $2,880 for the 4 crops, again equal to a year or more of net income.

The loss for peanutgrowers would be as great, proportionately, as for the corn and wheat raiser. For the cottongrower, the losses would not be as heavy within this 4-year period but there could be much more to come later.

Mr. President, that is the sorriest aspect of this attempt to trim our farmers by shortening their parity yardstick. As if it were not enough to make drastic cuts in parity for these important crops that are at the very base of our farm program, this scheme may well lead to digging the grave of the whole parity idea, by continually lowering parity.

It would take more time and patience than we have at this hour to fully explain all the involved calculations upon which this misnamed modernized parity rests, but I must take time to indicate that it is a true "time bomb" for farmers, and one which Secretary Benson should have been concerned about deactivating before it ever started to blow up.

This modernized formula does not put agriculture upon an up-to-date base in measuring what is a fair price, a parity price.

It actually still uses the 1910-14 basis, but tinkers with it in such a way as to have the result of cutting agriculture even below the levels of that period. It further does nothing to insure that present-day farming costs are accurately measured, such costs being still estimated on the basis of what farmers bought before World War II. All it really does is to "adjust" downward the principal products which are supported, and to provide a means whereby this downward adjustment might go on and on, if support prices on these products were kept at low levels. Thus eventually the parity yardstick for corn or wheat or cotton might be only 2 feet long or even only 18 inches long, and the income of agriculture could shrink accordingly.

This process of cutting price supports by cutting parity is based on a 10-year moving average as the means for "adjusting" parity. Nothing is changed from the 1910 to 1914 basis for figuring parity except that the relationship between the various farm products that has prevailed in the most recent 10 years is substituted for that which prevailed back in 1910 to 1914.

Thus any product which has had a below-average return for the past 10 years, as measured by what all farm commodities have been bringing, gets a new, lowered "adjusted base" and consequently a lower parity.

I digress to point out that every proposal the administration makes has something to do with an adjustment. Every adjustment the administration suggests is an adjustment downward. They have their foot in the back of the farmer and they are pushing his spine through the front wall of his stomach. This is the most adjusting administration the country has ever known. It is constantly adjusting things downward. Price supports, down. Parity formula, down. Parity base, down. Everything down.

On January 15, the lower parity was substantial for most crops except tobacco, rice, soybeans, and cottonseed, which at present show a slightly higher parity. Parity was also lower for chickens, turkeys, eggs, butterfat, and most fruits and vegetables. There was a slightly higher parity for milk and hogs, but only for four products was there any really large increase: Beef cattle, veal calves, lambs, and wool.

The following table gives the percentage change from old parity to new parity as of January 15:

Commodity:	Percent change
Hay	−31
Potatoes	−30
Eggs	−26
Grain sorghums	−25
Oats	−25
Barley	−24
Rye	−19
Peanuts	−16
Wheat	−13
Chickens	−13
Turkeys	−12
Corn	−10
Flaxseed	−8
Dry beans	−5
Butterfat	−4
Cotton	−1
Milk	2
Hogs	2
Burley tobacco	3
Rice	5
Soybeans	5
Cottonseed	8
Wool	15
Veal calves	21
Beef cattle	38
Lambs	40

Mr. President, I want to repeat that this reshuffling for the different farm commodities does not result in anything more than the lowering of farm income.

The measurement of parity returns for agriculture are still made against the standard of 1910–14. The pie that agriculture is to divide is not made any larger than it was then. The pieces of pie, so to speak, going to the different commodities, are just altered in size, most being made smaller while a few are much bigger.

And it is because the cuts are made precisely in the product upon which our price support programs rest, that this can spell progressive disaster for farmers. What good does it do if we, for instance, greatly increase parity for cattle or hogs but provide no price supports for them, while at the same time we lower parity for corn and thereby insure lower prices for livestock?

We could have parity on hogs at $50 a hundredweight, but if we do nothing to help hog producers directly it is the corn loan which counts.

And if the price of corn is lowered by lowering parity for corn, then what matters to the hog producer as well as the corn producer is what is done to parity for corn. The combination of sliding, flexible loans and modernized parity could have resulted in corn support prices dropping way below $1 per bushel. The modernized parity stands today 18 cents lower than what farmers have had, at $1.64 instead of $1.82, and it can drop and drop below this figure.

Mr. President, we have had during these last few years mandatory supports on only a few key products, plus some that are less important. As our farm law stands today, supports are sure only on the six basic products, plus the manufactured milk and butterfat products, wool, mohair, tung nuts, and honey. Disregarding the last 3, please note that the modernized parity is 16 percent lower for peanuts, 13 percent lower for wheat, 10 percent lower for corn, 4 percent lower for butterfat, 1 percent lower for cotton, 2 percent higher for milk, 3 percent higher for burley tobacco, 5 percent higher for rice, and 15 percent higher for wool. Only for wool can it be said that a substantial gain is made.

For milk products another part of this bill aims to prevent further cuts in the comparable parity price at which products are actually supported, which cuts have far offset this trifling increase in the parity price.

For the corn crop, backbone of the entire livestock, dairy, and poultry industry, a 10-percent cut is provided. For wheat, the largest cash crop over the years, a 13-percent cut. For cotton, only a small cut to begin with, but the possibility of large cuts as years go by.

That is why we say that unless and until we have an adequate support price under all our livestock products, such a modernizing of parity actually can do nothing but lower income for American agriculture.

We are in a low-income period for agriculture, which, if not corrected, will continue to lower the parities of those products which we are supporting.

This becomes a vicious circle, in which a low price results in a lowering of parity, a lower support, a still lower price, and a still lower parity.

If uncorrected, this very means of tampering with parity could become the principal means for permanently keeping agriculture far below parity, while the shorter yardstick would make it appear to city people that farmers were doing all right.

Now is the time to stop this vicious circle, before it goes any further.

That is the purpose of this section 106, to prevent automatic cuts in prices of principal products which would in turn bring further automatic cuts in the years ahead.

We make it mandatory for the Secretary of Agriculture to renew the study of what should be done to provide a truly modern and fair parity formula. Such a formula no doubt would use a more recent relationship between farm and city industry than 1910–14, but it would not overlook the tremendous change in the requirements for farming, such as our present formula does with its weightings for things farmers buy still based on the 1937–41 period.

Thanks to action by Congress, the Department of Agriculture is now at work gathering the facts upon which an up-to-date weighting of commodities can be carried out. That in itself makes this a favorable time to review the whole question of the adequacy of the parity formula. We ask in this bill that the Secretary devote the next half year to study of this important factor in farm prosperity. After studying so many subjects over so many years, we think it high time that this key subject be properly studied by him, so that we can act before agriculture falls further and further behind the rest of the Nation.

I think we can be confident that Congress will not again adopt a new parity formula with as little knowledge of what it may do to harm farmers as was the case in 1948 when this so-called "modernized" formula was adopted.

Perhaps it was the natural result of a desire for cheap feed on the part of those dairy and poultrymen who buy most of their feed, after having gone through 1947 when a corn crop failure on top of emptying our ever-normal granary to feed Europe brought the highest grain prices in history in early 1948.

That was a natural desire, although I should point out that those producers with the advantage of protected milksheds and firm Federal marketing orders suffered far less than farmers elsewhere from the corn crop failure.

But, whatever the reasons and hopes, it is a fact that not until long after it was passed was it recognized that a 10-year moving average could greatly depress agriculture, and to this hour no sponsor of this "modernized" parity has to my knowledge yet acknowledged this imminent danger. Maybe it is because they do not recognize that what makes for cheap food makes in the long run for cheap livestock, poultry, and dairy products.

Maybe that is why Governor Dewey, anticipating a great victory in November of 1948, cracked the whip and got this sliding-scale, cheapened-parity law passed in the first place in the early morning hours of Sunday before convention back in 1948. As a gentleman farmer with a blue serge suit, it no doubt appealed to him, but ever since then it has hung over the heads of farmers everywhere. Mr. President, beware of the gentlemen farmers with their well-groomed appearance and nicely trimmed mustaches, in blue serge suits, on their crew-cut green lawns.

It is time we act decisively to remove this threat.

We have done so in this bill.

We have restored 90-percent supports.

We should not be taking back with one hand what the other gives, by using a cheapened parity on which to base the 90 percent.

This section will help to restore agriculture to its rightful position, and will prepare the ground for Congress to provide a new parity formula that is truly modern.

This section will put dollars into farmers' pockets that they should have, and it will aid in reducing surpluses by helping to eliminate cheap feed, the major cause of our present difficulty.

I, for one, do not want to have to answer to the voters this fall, if Congress should decide to cut parity at the very time farmers are in such difficulties.

Let others take the responsibility for such a step, if it is taken.

Let others rise to explain how a farmer, caught as he is between low prices for what he sells, and higher and higher prices for what he must buy, should be required by act of Congress to take a still lower price for his products.

If we mean parity for agriculture, we had better not shorten the yardstick by which we are measuring that parity, especially not in a time of distress.

This section is a necessary part of any effort that sincerely wants to go even part of the way to make good on the harm done farmers these past few years.

This section 106, along with the 90-percent supports, must have the full support of the Congress.

Let others tell farmers they should take less.

Mr. President, I would like the record to show at this point what failure

to pass this section can do to the corn and wheat grower during the next 4 years, in dollars and cents for a typical producer. I should also like the record to show what happens to parity under this "modernized" formula for the basic products of corn, wheat, cotton, and peanuts in the next 4 years.

These figures are based on today's costs, and on the assumption that the loan price will influence returns to farmers about as it has in the past.

They are based on the further assumption that 1956 prices for all farm products will decline no further but will average the same as 1955, and that in 1957 and 1958 we will see a 15 percent and 20 percent increase, respectively. These are generous assumptions to make regarding farm prices. Further, these calculations assume 90 percent loans during the next 3 years. If loan rates are lower, then parity will be lowered further than here indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tabulations mentioned appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Direct effect on gross receipts of reducing parity for typical corn and wheat growers, 1956–59

Year	Corngrower (5,000 bushels)			Wheatgrower (3,000 bushels)		
	Loss per—		Cumulative loss	Bushels	5,000 bushels	Cumulative loss
	Bushels	5,000 bushels				
1956	−$0.08	−$500	−$400	−$0.12	−$360	−$360
1957	−.15	−750	−1,150	−.23	−690	−1,050
1958	−.20	−1,000	−2,150	−.29	−870	−1,920
1959	−.26	−1,300	−3,450	−.32	−960	−2,880

NOTE.—Assumes 90 percent of parity loans.

Estimated effect of using transitional and "modernized" parity for wheat and corn for 1956–59" [1]

	Corn		Wheat	
	Old parity	New parity	Old parity	New parity
	I. Parity price			
1956	$1.82	[2] $1.73	$2.51	[2] $2.38
1957	1.82	1.65	2.51	[2] 2.26
1958	1.82	1.60	2.51	2.19
1959	1.82	1.53	2.51	2.16
	II. 90-percent loan			
1956	[3] $1.64	[3] $1.56	[3] $2.26	[3] $2.14
1957	1.64	1.49	2.26	2.03
1958	1.64	1.44	2.26	1.97
1959	1.64	1.38	2.26	1.94
	III. Difference in loans, in cents per bushel and percent			
	Cents	*Percent*	*Cents*	*Percent*
1956	−8	−5	−12	−5
1957	−15	−9	−23	−10
1958	−20	−12	−29	−13
1959	−26	−16	−32	−14

[1] Assumes 90 percent loans for 1956-58; average farm prices for 1956 unchanged from 1955, up 15 percent for 1957, up 20 percent for 1958; and present parity index of costs.
[2] Transitional parity.
[3] Actual minimum loans already announced: Corn, $1.40; wheat, $1.81.

Estimated effect of using transitional and "modernized" parity for cotton and peanuts for 1956–59 [1]

	Cotton		Peanuts			
			Per pound		Per ton	
	Old parity	New parity	Old parity	New parity	Old parity	New parity
	I. Parity prices					
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*		
1956	35.22	34.84	13.6	[2] 12.9	$272.00	[2] $258.00
1957	35.22	34.96	13.6	[2] 12.2	272.00	[2] 244.00
1958	35.22	34.62	13.6	11.7	272.00	234.00
1959	35.22	34.31	13.6	11.7	272.00	234.00
	II. 90-percent loan [3]					
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*		
1956	29.58	29.24	12.24	11.63	$244.80	$232.60
1957	29.58	29.34	12.24	10.98	244.80	219.60
1958	29.58	29.04	12.24	10.53	244.80	210.60
1959	29.58	28.76	12.24	10.53	244.80	210.60
	III. Difference in loans, in cents and percent					
	Cents	*Percent*	*Cents*	*Percent*		*Percent*
1956	−0.34	−1	−0.61	−5	−$12.20	−5
1957	−.24	−1	−1.26	−10	−25.20	−10
1958	−.54	−2	−1.71	−14	−34.20	−14
1959	−.82	−3	−1.71	−14	−34.20	−14

[1] Assumes 90-percent loans for 1956–58; average farm prices for 1956 for all commodities unchanged from 1955, up 15 percent for 1957, up 20 percent for 1958; and present parity index of costs.
[2] Transitional parity.
[3] Assumes change in loan to new basis as projected by bill, with 2½ cents lower loan due to this change, for cotton. If this change not made, difference in loan rates would be slightly different, with less drop in new parity.

Income significance of extending old parity formula—comparison of old formula and 1956 transitional prices

	Unit	Old formula	Basis Jan. 15, 1956	
			Transitional parity prices	Difference
Corn	Bushel	$1.82	$1.73	$0.09
Wheat	do	2.51	2.38	.13
Peanuts	Pound	.136	.129	.007
Cotton, upland	do	.3522	.3484	.0038

The equivalent farm income loss in 1956 resulting from application of transitional parity prices in 1956 for the several commodities is:

	Unit	Price cut per unit	Billion units, 1955 production	Equivalent income loss
				Million
Corn	Bushel	$0.09	3.2	$288
Wheat	do	.13	.9	122
Peanuts	Pound	.007	1.6	11
Cotton, upland	do	.0038	7.3	28
Total				449

Drop in parity prices from old to new formula

	Unit	Drop		Old formula	New formula
		Dollars	Percent		
Wheat	Bushel	$0.32	13	$2.51	$2.19
Corn	do	.18	10	1.82	1.64
Peanuts	Pound	.022	16	.136	.114
Cotton, upland	do	.0038	1	.3522	.3484

NOTE.—Approximately a half-billion dollars of farm family income will be lost in 1956 from operation of transitional parity, as compared with extending old parity formula.

The income loss in 1957 and later years would be greater as the transitional parity prices drop toward the figures calculated by the new parity formula.

DAIRYING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, increased dairy-farm income provided by the new farm bill, over existing policies results from section 105, which raises the support level for milk for manufacturing purposes from 75 percent of the lower Benson parity equivalent price to 80 percent of the higher pre-Benson parity equivalent price.

Mr. President, too little consideration is given to dairying by the Congress in view of its total importance to our economy, our total farm income, and our health.

Over 2 million farm families in the United States derive all or a major part of their income from dairy cows.

Milk produces more cash farm income than any other farm product.

Dairy products supply 30 percent of the Nation's diet of animal proteins, and produce 15 percent of total retail food sales.

Dairying provides the greatest single food which contributes to making the United States the best fed Nation on earth. Dollar for dollar, it is the best buy in the housewife's daily food basket.

The dairy industry is the world's largest user of motor trucks.

According to the National Milk Producers Federation, dairying—from producer to consumer—produces 19 percent of the gross national income, or more gross income than any other productive enterprise.

Dairying is vitally important in every State.

It ranks first in producing farm income in Wisconsin, Vermont, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, and Michigan.

It ranks second in producing farm income in Minnesota, Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, Missouri, Delaware, and Maryland.

It ranks third in producing farm income in West Virginia, Kentucky, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, Washington, and Oregon.

In no State of the Union does it rank lower than sixth as the major producer of farm income.

Is it any wonder that I say we in the Congress certainly cannot do justice to farmers in any farm bill, if we neglect dairying?

Cash receipts from marketing milk and cream have dropped from $4,566,000,000 in 1952, the last year the Democratic Party was in power in the executive branch of this Government, to $4,200,000,000 in 1955, a loss of $366,000,000 out of the pockets of our dairy farmers.

If any of my colleagues are interested in knowing just how much 3 years of Republican Bensonism has cost dairy farmers of their individual States, I will be glad to show them the figures.

There has been so much misleading propaganda about the dairy situation in an attempt to justify what Secretary Benson and his supporters said would happen when he slashed price supports, nobody seems to take the trouble to look at what really did happen.

Let us take a look at where we left off in 1952.

Milk production in 1952 was 114.6 billion pounds. Our estimated population was 157 million people, our total national income was $289.5 billion.

During that year, under 90 percent supports, we had per capita consumption of milk or its equivalent in other dairy products of 688 pounds per person—and cash receipts from marketing of milk and cream of $4,566 million.

Now we have just finished 1955 after Eisenhower and Benson have shown us how things should be run.

What do we have?

We have our population up to 165.2 million, a gain of 8.2 million people.

We have our national income up to $321 billion, a gain of $31.5 billion more of income out of which people could buy dairy products.

Our dairy farmers produced 123.4 billion pounds of milk, and got only $4.2 billion for it—with per capita consumption down to 682 pounds of milk or its equivalent per person.

That means our dairy farmers had to produce 8 billion more pounds of milk than in 1952, yet still got $366 million less income than in 1952.

Yet they are brazen enough to try and tell the dairy farmer he is better off, under lower support prices.

Now, my friends across the aisle will probably object to my making comparisons with the Democratic year, because dairy farmers still had 90 percent of parity, thanks to us Democrats in 1953. Secretary Benson had not quite convinced President Eisenhower to tear up his Kasson speech by that time.

Well, I am glad to make some comparisons with 1953—but once more I want to assure my colleagues that 90 percent of parity under a Democratic administration wanting to make it work is quite a different thing from a 90 percent of parity program under a Republican administration openly trying to prove it unworkable.

Secretary Benson took over at the start of 1953 and started his great crusade of speeches telling farmers they had to expect downward adjustments, and made it clear he was going to seek lower levels for support prices. When he maintained the same support level in April 1953, he made clear he was doing it with great hesitancy and doubted dairy prices should be kept that high.

My friends, our prudent farmers tried what any good businessman would do when confronted with the same circumstances—they tried to make some money while they could, recognizing the Benson handwriting on the wall. They had favorable weather conditions to help them. And they slowed down on culling, because of collapsing prices on beef.

The result was production in 1953 stepped up to 120.1 billion pounds. Yet that year, as Secretary Benson preached about more emphasis on marketing and less on income protection, per capita milk consumption fell to 674 pounds per person—the lowest in our Nation's history.

It is that low figure, reached under Secretary Benson, that our Republican friends now like to use in trying to show some improvement in consumption now. Well, if they push things down far enough they are bound to bounce back a little, I suppose.

However, for purposes of debate, we will accept the comparison between 1953 and now, instead of the comparison between 1952 and the present which I have previously outlined.

We will take them on their own terms, and still prove their arguments have been false and their policies have been a failure.

The dairy industry was the first major segment of agriculture to feel the lowering of the boom on prices under Secretary Benson.

The support level on manufacturing milk was dropped from $3.74 to $3.15 per hundredweight on April 1, 1954.

How well I remember that "black Thursday," when farmers mourned around the country as some of us fought here in the Senate to stave off this deliberate blow at dairy income.

Dairy income had started dropping in 1953, so Secretary Benson, as he has consistently done on other commodities, decided to give it a helping shove downward.

He certainly succeeded.

But what has happened to all the justifications advanced at that time for lowering dairy price supports? What has happened to all the glowing predictions that milk production would drop by lowering the "incentive," that consumptions would greatly increase, and that dairy farmers would be much better off.

Dairying was going to be the great Benson advance experiment, to show that his flexible price support theory worked.

Are they still willing to rest their case on dairying, when it comes to the use of lower price supports as a means of curtailing production?

Now let us really face these facts. I am tired and sick of hearing Benson and others talk in generalities about 90 percent of parity being an incentive to overproduction, and his lower support levels helping to keep down production.

So they cut dairy price supports, cut them all the way to 75 percent of parity.

What did farmers do? They milked more cows, and produced more milk, to try and break even on their fixed overhead costs, even if they got less total income from the bigger production than they had before.

Secretary Benson may have these theories all worked out fine on paper, and they may look good. But he better remember there is a human element that enters into whether or not these theories work as planned.

The idea was supposed to be that lower milk prices would result in farmers shifting to other commodities.

As a practical matter, most dairy farmers had little opportunity to switch from production of milk to other commodities. They had their investment in dairy facilities, and had to do the best they could to offset lower unit prices by higher volume.

Sure, many of them realized the industry as a whole would be better off with less total production. But that does not solve the problem of each individual facing certain bills to pay. In many cases, dairy farmers' creditors would not permit them to decrease production.

As a result many were caught on this treadmill of having to increase production to make up for lower prices, only to have the increased production force prices down still further.

And it has not ended.

Production was at 120.1 billion pounds when Secretary Benson started taking away income in the hope of cutting production. It went up to 122 billion pounds in 1954. It went up to 124.5 billion pounds in 1955. And the Department of Agriculture itself now predicts a total milk production in excess of 126 billion pounds for 1956.

That will mean a five billion pound annual increase in production, since Secretary Benson introduced a new policy to curb production.

Can anybody argue any longer that Secretary Benson was right, as far as effect on production was concerned? The facts are there to prove otherwise.

Lower prices did not decrease milk production. Lower prices were an incentive to increasing milk production.

I just hope that sinks in deep enough so some of our friends in the press will not be quite so reckless about continuing to bite on the false assumption that higher price supports are automatically an incentive to increased production, and lower support levels are designed to curb surpluses. The facts prove otherwise.

Now that we have buried that ghost of lower prices supposedly curbing milk production, let us look at what else they were supposed to be.

The possibilities of expanding outlets for dairy products in foreign markets were not improved when the support prices were reduced. A butter price of 58¼ cents, for instance, is no more competitive than a price of 66½ cents f. o. b. New York, when sales are to be made in the world market where butter is sold at prices ranging from 37 to 41 cents per pound, and most of that under bilateral trade agreements.

Nor were per capita sales expanded in the domestic market, as had been predicted.

In 1952, as I have mentioned, domestic per capita sales of milk and dairy products were 688 pounds.

In 1953, per capita sales declined 2 percent to 674 pounds.

Since 1953, we have recouped about half this loss. Compared to 1953, consumers in 1955 increased their per capita purchases of dairy products by 1 percent.

Now, I am not even willing to give Secretary Benson's lower price policies credit for that 1 percent gain from our lowest per capita consumption in history.

The credit goes to the dairy industry itself, through more vigorous sales promotion.

Dairy farmers, despite drastically falling income, set aside $4 million of their own funds in 1954, and $5 million in 1955 for sales promotion and advertising campaigns to increase consumption.

An aggressive sales campaign has been carried on by dairymen themselves

through the American Dairy Association, spending double what they spent in 1952 in a desperate bid to stimulate consumption.

Now, I happen to think that has helped. I would hate to think it had not.

Secretary Benson has agreed farmers should do more of such self-help promotion. He has praised the ADA program.

Now, is he willing to give the millions spent by dairy farmers themselves credit for that little 1 percent boost in consumption since 1953, or does he contend none of that advertising helped—that it was his action in lowering price supports that brought about a very slight regaining of lost ground in per capita consumption?

If my Republican colleagues intend arguing this dairy consumption issue, I would be glad to have them answer that question.

For my part, it was the efforts of the dairymen, not the efforts of Benson, that brought whatever increase we were able to get in consumption.

Sometimes the public is a bit misled about dairy figures, when they see announcements about how much more total disappearance of dairy products there has been in the last year.

That is right. Actually, total domestic use of dairy products was 7.9 billion pounds greater in 1955 than in 1953. But that is only half of the story.

Increased population accounted for 4.2 billion pounds of that amount, and the special school-milk program, domestic donations to charitable institutions, and Government disposal sales at reduced prices accounted for another 2.4 billion pounds.

That leaves only 1.3 billion pounds of increase in real purchases, the 1 percent gain in per capita purchases I have been talking about.

We certainly welcome special disposition efforts like donations, for relief purposes at home and abroad, and these and other efforts to move milk and dairy products at less than full market prices have melted the visible stocks of dairy products.

But consumption caused by population gains and by giveaway programs at home and abroad were not the results of low prices paid to farmers for their milk. It is elemental, then, that this consumption should not be used to prove that low prices solved the dairy problem.

Not only have the consumption trends in the industry been misinterpreted, but there also has been confusion in the minds of many regarding the economic position of dairy farmers when compared to other segments of the agricultural economy.

It is because of a hocus-pocus way of showing that the dairy farmer is better off, without him getting any more income.

For example, they say that while dairy product prices were dropped to 75 percent of parity April 1, 1954, that the price of manufacturing milk actually paid farmers in 1955 represented 81 percent of parity, and that the price of all milk sold wholesale was 86 percent of parity.

These figures are not very comforting to dairy farmers, who realize that their price level has not advanced at all—and that their supposed improved position is just a statistical illusion resulting from an administrative change in the formula used by the Department of Agriculture for computing the parity equivalent price of manufacturing milk. That is one of the gimmicks we are correcting in the dairy section of this bill.

Contrary to many of the claims that have been advanced, the dairy situation proves the failure of trying to correct either production or income problems by lowering support prices.

We are trying to reverse that trend on this bill. Not as far as I would like to see, but a step in the right direction. It is a moderate change, to avoid the kind of sharp disruption in the market caused when Benson abruptly dropped prices from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent.

All we ask is lifting the support minimum to 80 percent. Yet it will mean $121 million more income to our dairy farmers.

Instead of stimulating production, it will allow our dairy farmers to exist without having to step up production to pay current living costs.

While dairy farmers have not yet evolved the type of production control methods more readily adaptable to other commodities getting higher levels of price support, they are still doing their part to help themselves, through such activities as the millions they are contributing to dairy product advertising by the American Dairy Association.

They are working on other self-help approaches. They want to cooperate in getting the dairy industry back on a sound footing. They are willing to do their part. But they need help now—they need a decent income to survive.

Give them a chance to make a decent return on less production, and more of them will step up their culling programs.

Dairy groups have consistently supported other commodity groups in working for good general farm legislation. They feel they have a right to ask for cooperation in return.

It was my privilege to offer the amendment in committee adding this dairy section to our bill. It should stay in the bill. Dairymen are entitled to it, after the beating they have taken for the past 2 years.

SOIL BANK

Mr. President, more has been heard about the soil bank than any other part of this bill—and I regret to say much of it has been far too misleading to farmers and nonfarmers alike.

As now written, the soil bank portion of the act consists of two distinct sections.

The first section is the Eisenhower-Benson acreage reserve proposal for the sole purpose of cutting production to less than our annual need.

The second section is the longer-range conservation reserve idea which I originally proposed in this chamber, and which most farmers thought soil bank meant until the administration borrowed the popular name to inject a new purpose.

Let me make one thing clear at the very outset:

Neither section adds anything to farm income this year, nor was intended to—despite administration efforts to make it appear as an added income program.

The original soil bank idea was to provide rental payment incentives of some form to take diverted acres, beyond allotments, out of competing production and devote them to soil-conserving practices.

It was designed to encourage greater compliance with production allotments by incentive rather than penalty, and to preserve the fertility of unused and unneeded soil resources for future demand as our population grows.

That was the objective of my legislation introduced a year ago under the title "Conservation Acreage Reserve"—and opposed by this administration as late as last October.

It was aimed at meeting the long-felt need for strengthening our farm production by providing an incentive for wiser use of our diverted acres—to put them into conservation practices, instead of into additional competing cash crops.

Yet the whole idea was to gear our agricultural plant down to our actual annual needs, for domestic, export, and safety reserve purposes—not to cut our producing plant far below that figure.

The original objective is preserved in the second portion of the Soil Bank Act, preserved and improved by broadening the conservation objectives to include more emphasis on forestry, water, and wildlife conservation as well as soil conservation.

But the cart is put somewhat before the horse in this bill, through the earmarking of most of the funds made available for an entirely different purpose in the first section of the bill.

Under the administration's recommendations accepted by the committee in this first portion, farmers are called upon to make still further reductions within their allotments, cutting our producing plant below our annual needs in the hope of using up more of our reserves.

The bill seeks to encourage farmers not to plant acres they would otherwise be entitled to plant, in return for payments based on about 50 percent of parity for the average production that would have been produced.

These are larger payments than allowed under the longer-range conservation reserve, on the ground that more productive land may be involved.

Both portions of the soil bank aim at adjustment of our production downward.

The difference is this:

The conservation reserve aims at reducing it only to the level of our annual needs.

The acreage reserve calls for cutting it below our annual needs.

Let me emphasize once more, that any funds provided farmers under this soil bank is in no sense added farm income.

Both portions of the soil bank provide only partially replaced income, for income farmers would otherwise receive

from crops grown on either the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve.

It is misleading, and wrong, to infer that the billion dollars authorized means any additional income to farmers.

It is misleading for the advertising campaign sponsored by the National Republican Senatorial and Congressional committees to indicate that this is the answer to all the farmers' troubles, and that "hundreds of millions of dollars in payments to farmers can be made this year under the soil-bank plan alone if passage is not delayed."

Such statements appear to nonfarm people that we are giving quite a handout to our hard pressed farmers.

Why does not the Republican campaign committees tell the truth—that they are offering to give back part of what they ask the farmer not to produce, so they can find an easy way to get rid of the surplus stocks they themselves have accumulated through bad administration of poor policies?

The public should be told that this is just replacement income, not additional income.

They should know it is no different than telling a workingman, in a period of unemployment, that he should lay off several days a week and go on unemployment compensation so some others can earn some money.

Sure, they would be getting Governmen assistance through unemployment compensation—but less than they would earn through their own efforts if they could work full time.

It is time we were honest about what we are doing. Instead of aiding farm income, by the first portion of the soil bank, we are just providing another way of financing surplus disposal by shrinking our production plant below normal annual needs.

Because the administration has asked for that authority, the Senate Committee on Agriculture has provided it. It has given the President all the authority he asked for in the soil bank, despite some doubts as to how the administration's key portion of the bill will work.

But in doing so, we tried to protect farmers' income and encourage farmer participation by raising support levels so as to provide a fair price on the more limited amount of commodities that farmers will be able to grow.

It is absurd for administration spokesmen to contend that a decent price for the smaller amount a farmer is permitted to produce works contrary to the objectives of the soil bank.

The truth is just the opposite.

Without an opportunity to earn a decent income on his more limited acres, the average farmer just cannot afford the luxury of going into the Government's new production control scheme.

If you want the soil bank to work at all, the best assurance you can provide is to maintain prices of the products the farmer raises on the rest of his acreage at decent, fair levels—levels not less than 90 percent of parity.

I have noted considerable sentiment growing for abolishing the first part of the soil bank, and putting the entire emphasis and funds upon the conservation reserve section of the bill. There are strong indications the House Agriculture Committee may yet insist upon that approach. Personally, I feel it would be a wiser approach. It is always a calculated risk to cut our producing plant below annual needs, perhaps facing us with the necessity 5 years from now of suddenly calling upon farmers to double their production.

However, I have gone along on the administration's request on one premise: that I am willing to let them try their new production control scheme if they are willing to let farmers have decent prices on the rest of their production.

I regret that the administration has not been as willing to compromise. It insists in having things all its own way, or not at all. It wants the soil bank alone, without any price or income protection.

I want to voice a warning to be remembered by this body. In view of the bipartisan cooperation of this body to develop and pass a compromise farm bill containing both some of the administration's ideas and our own improvements, farmers of this country are going to place the burden squarely upon the shoulders of the Eisenhower administration if the full measure is not allowed to be signed into law.

The record on this soil bank program would not be complete without recounting what the administration really tried to do.

When the administration suddenly blossomed overnight with its acreage reserve idea of cutting production, it thought it had uncorked some great magic—how to make the farmer think he had a farm program, and still not spend any money.

From long experience, I have learned to read the fine print in anything Republicans offer.

We accepted with a grain of salt all the glowing phrases and generalities administration messages contained about its farm program.

We wanted to see the legislative language.

We look at that language carefully, more carefully, apparently, than did even the Republican sponsors who attached their names to it.

Yes, we found what we were looking for—the joker in the deck, the joker usually found buried in any Republican deal.

An innocent-appearing section of the administration's original proposal called for financing the soil bank by dumping surplus commodities on the market and selling them at any price they would bring—underselling the rest of the farmers' production, and forcing all farm prices still further down.

That was the administration's masterpiece of no-cost farm program—what Secretary Benson still talks about when he says he wants to "use the surplus to get rid of the surplus."

Mr. President, if that section had prevailed, all of the market would have been taken over by the Government—and the Government, in turn, would then have to take over all the farmers' production under loan because of the prices it had depressed below support levels. It would have been a vicious cycle of perpetuating surpluses, rather than getting rid of surpluses, and perpetuating lower farm prices. It would have destroyed the free market operations entirely, and further depressed farm income.

It is amazing to see such a brazen scheme unwrapped and slipped up here quietly by an administration supposedly dedicated to preserving the free market and free enterprise. I do not know of a single free market trader who could not take one look at that section and say, "Oho, the Government wants to take over the market, and force the farmer out of it."

Fortunately, after I exposed this "joker in the deck" even the Republican sponsors of the Eisenhower-Benson farm program, one by one, repudiated this portion of it—really, the heart of it.

And Secretary Benson, after he no longer had any sponsors willing to stand up for his rash proposal, very graciously decided he was against it, too—now.

That is what Secretary Benson tried to slip over on this Congress. That is what the Eisenhower administration cooked up to get a farm program without paying the bill, just making the farmer pay the bill.

Yet the Republican Campaign Committee says it wants to help pass the Eisenhower farm program.

Is this the section they want enacted?

Is this the scheme they would like to put back in the bill?

When some of my letter writers ask me to support the Eisenhower farm program, I am going to take considerable delight in letting them know just what the Eisenhower administration really tried to slip over on us. Oh, they do not mention these things in those fancy advertisements. When you are selling soap, you talk about the nice fragrance; you do not mention the messy ingredients that may have gone into it before it was packaged for the public to see.

Mr. President, our Senate committee made some significant improvements in the soil-bank bill that I feel should not be overlooked in this discussion.

We endeavored to put a truly broad definition on conservation in developing the soil bank, expanding the purposes of the program to cover all soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses.

I am convinced this is a more significant step forward than some may realize, correlating our agricultural conservation efforts with all of our other great resource-conservation objectives.

Conservationists of the country have already hailed these improvements we made in the administration draft.

Dr. Spencer M. Smith, secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, has called me to express the appreciation of his organization for the improvements we made in the bill to promote the causes of conservation.

Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, in testimony submitted to the House Committee on Agriculture on February 22, declared:

We are pleased that the authorizing language of S. 3183 is broad enough to permit a conservation program that is truly comprehensive. We endorse the language that

provides for practices to conserve and manage the timber and wildlife resources along with the soil and water.

Forestry and wildlife management practices will not add to any crop surpluses, but they can produce supplementary cash income on many farms.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks for this evening at this point. When I obtain the floor again I shall direct my attention to some of the amendments which I have submitted, along with concluding comments on the proper and appropriate use of our so-called surplus commodities.

It is my intention tomorrow to bring to the attention of the Senate proposals for the use of food and fiber supplies which have been before the Department of Agriculture and have been recommended by technical experts, but which have never so much as seen the light of day in terms of public policy, or by way of suggesting a public policy.

If the Department of Agriculture does not listen to its advisers, I am perfectly willing to give it the benefit of the messages which come to me. Apparently the Secretary of Agriculture is kept too busy going to Des Moines and St. Paul and San Francisco and New Orleans and to other cities to speak on great political issues. Apparently everyone in the White House is so busy that no one has any time to get these advisory reports. Therefore I shall bring to the attention of the Senate some good, sound advice which has been presented on occasion.

Since certain people have been called upon by our Government to give of their valuable time and services, at least we should have their recommendations called to the attention of Congress. It will be my intention to do so.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 7, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 6, 1956:

GOVERNOR OF THE CANAL ZONE

Brig. Gen. William E. Potter, Corps of Engineers, O17098, for appointment as Governor of the Canal Zone, under the provisions of section 6, chapter 1, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, vice Maj. Gen. John S. Seybold, United States Army, retired.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of section 413 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, Rear Adm. Walter F. Boone, United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of admiral while so serving.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of section 413 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, Rear Adm. Robert L. Dennison, United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving.

Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6, 1956:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Richard H. Levet, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

Justin C. Morgan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the western district of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Holy Spirit of the living God, may our character and conduct this day come under the influence of Thy gracious ministry, elevating and charging us with courage and power and making us serene and trustful.

Kindle within our minds and hearts those impulses and desires which are pure and holy and those attitudes toward our fellow men which are kind and sympathetic.

May there be among all the members of the human family a sense of spiritual kinship and brotherhood, inspiring them to seek one another's welfare and to break down every superficial manmade barrier.

Show us how we may be partners with Thee in the glorious enterprise of bringing in the day of peace and good will.

In Christ's name we offer our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will authorize the appointment of regular substitutes in the postal field service by selection from temporary substitutes who have performed duties satisfactorily on not less than one-half the workdays in 2 consecutive years after having been selected from a register of eligible applicants.

Public Law 380, enacted by this Congress, provides for the granting of competitive status to indefinite employees who meet certain requirements. The postal field service was excepted from this law due to peculiarities in the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to appointments and advancements in the postal service.

One such peculiarity pertains to the practice of open continuous examinations held by the Civil Service Commission for clerks and carriers. Through this practice an applicant who has passed the examination is placed on the register and may be selected for a temporary substitute appointment. Others who have failed may take the examination again and again until they have passed. Once an applicant has passed the examination he is not allowed to take it again so as to better his grade. New applicants who pass the open continuous examination are placed in position on the register in accordance with their grade. These activities result in a continual change in an individual's standing on the register.

Another peculiarity has to do with the selection of an individual for appointment as regular substitute with competitive status. At present the selection is made from the register existing at the time of appointment. Thus a temporary substitute who has served satisfactorily for a period of years may be passed over due to the fact that others, with no job experience, have taken or retaken the open continuous examination and received a grade which placed them higher on the register. There are other such peculiarities which create injustices.

My bill will authorize the Post Office Department to give recognition to the temporary substitute who has performed satisfactorily and grant him a competitive appointment without recourse to the register for a second time. It will correct many of the inequities and injustices and bring the postal field service more closely into alinement with the benefits provided for other Federal employees by Public Law 380.

COMMUNIST PARTY URGES ALL-OUT UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID—WHY?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party has its hand in our pockets. We are on notice of this brazen move.

Less than 95 days ago the National Conference of the Communist Party, in Chicago, advised its members and fellow travelers to "press for all-out foreign aid." Political Affairs, the Communist propaganda magazine, states this party line in its January issue, page 18—and I quote:

This requires that we single out for major attention and activity the following:

The fight for disarmament.

The fight to restore normal trade relations between our country and the Socialist world (Socialist here meaning Communist).

The fight for a policy of large-scale economic aid, without strings, to the so-called underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America (this is where the Communists dip into your pockets and mine).

Lastly, the fight to get the trade unions of our country to send a labor delegation to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote the next sentence of this Communist directive:

The Communist Party has a vital and decisive role to play in helping these movements unfold and reach their objectives.

The Communist high command has laid down the line firmly and clearly. And it is: "Press for all-out foreign aid."

Why? It fits the Soviet pattern of bleeding capitalism to death. It conforms to the Kremlin's scheme of undermining the economy of the free world. When that is achieved, there will be chaos, anarchy, and turmoil. Communism will step in like a political vulture and devour the world. We will then become the victim of this ideological struggle which seeks the destruction of Christianity and human dignity.

The pattern is all too clear. The worldwide web of communism has placed top priority on the bankruptcy of the American economy. It is now officially on record as determined to bleed us of every last dollar.

For many years, the Communist high command has warned us of their intentions. Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and now Khrushchev—they all have written that capitalism will spend itself into ruin. So now it is the order of the day: "Work to plunge capitalism into bankruptcy. Then the world will be ours."

I say to the advocates of huge-scale foreign-aid spending—listen to what the Communists are saying. They plead, nay, beg us, even, to embark on this program on a vast scale. Note the emphases on "large-scale economic aid." Note, too, that the Communists want us to pour money into areas where governments are weak and unsteady. They want us to build up the economies of these so-called underdeveloped countries, so that after the American taxpayer has financed these remote areas, after we have fattened their economies with our dollars, they can move in. When American capitalism is overextended and ready to collapse, when dollar diplomacy hits the bottom of the barrel, then, world communism will be in the driver's seat ready to move in everywhere—by force, by intrigue, by any and every diabolical scheme conceivable.

The United States—the free world's great hope—will be too weak to halt this treacherous conspiracy. What happens then? Will it be war in this atomic age?

Let us not be caught by this Communist trap. We can meet this threat by reasonable technical assistance and self help programs, on a modest scale, but not by spending billions of dollars.

I say to you—We must not do the bidding of the Communist Party. We must not permit them to use us to achieve their objectives.

Let me remind you again—the Communists have singled out our foreign-aid program for major attention and action in 1956. They stated it in unmistakable terms. They plan to "fight for a policy of large-scale economic aid, without strings, to the so-called underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, the American people and our allies in other parts of the world are now on notice as to the intentions of this Communist conspiracy. The choice between liberty and freedom or a Communist slave state is up to us.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S CONFERENCE

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning has been a very thrilling one to the Republican women of this country. There are gathered here in conference several thousand women who have come all the way from Alaska and the four corners of the country. They are getting information, stimulation, and challenge from the party here. They are giving to the Republicans in government a challenge and a stimulus that is quite wonderful.

This morning we were gathered in the presidential room of the Statler Hotel when, at 10:30, to the amazement of everybody and to their utter delight, the President appeared happy, gay, color in cheeks, thrillingly alive. He welcomed us with his rare understanding, expressing his appreciation of the work done by women in the last election. Then in a few simple sentences he gave us his sense of what a political party is. As I did not take down his words with complete certainty, I give you a careful paraphrase of them: "A political party must be based upon strong moral and spiritual values, otherwise it is a conspiracy."

The response of the delegates—several thousand of them—was immediate and heartfelt. It was a rare moment of understanding, Mr. Speaker—one which every woman there will never forget.

APPRECIATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, all over the country primary elections are soon to be held to nominate candidates for county and State offices and for United States Representatives and Senators. In Ohio the primary election will be held on May 8. The time for filing petitions closed on February 8.

In our congressional district, which comprises eight counties, no Democrat filed as a candidate for Representative to Congress. That is a very unusual situation. So far as I know this never happened before in our congressional district.

I would like to think the people of my district, including the Democrats, are pleased with my efforts to be of service to them and that the Democrats did not wish to run anyone against me. I am very grateful for this and I hope that my Republican friends will go to the polls on May 8 and again give me their support as they have done so loyally in the past.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., AND HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to join in the congratulations which have been extended to our minority leader, Mr. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., upon the beginning of his 32d year of service in the House of Representatives. We all, of course, are cognizant of the very wonderful record he has made as a legislator, and as the leader of our party in this body.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that another distinguished Member is embarking upon his 32d year of service in the Congress of the United States in the person of the chairman of our great Ohio delegation, Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS. On behalf of the delegation, I desire to extend to him our felicitations and greetings on the beginning of his 32d year of national service, and to express the hope he will continue to serve the State of Ohio and the country here in Congress for another 32 years.

ENDORSEMENT OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER BY GENERAL NASSER

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, according to the New York Herald Tribune Sunday, General Nasser has endorsed the President for reelection. The Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Hoover, told the Foreign Affairs Committee, not asked us but told us, that they were going to build a dam in Egypt at a cost of $1,200,000,000, and I wondered what we were getting in return for it. If it is this political endorsement I would like to point out that from recent experiences of the British you cannot buy the Arab leaders. They will not stay bought. Judging from what happened in Jordan you cannot even rent them any more.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JANE EDITH THOMAS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7588) for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas, and I ask unanmous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1842)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7588) for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered to have been and to be applicable to a child born outside of the United States and its outlying possessions after January 12, 1941, and before December 24, 1952, of parents one of whom is a citizen of the United States who has served in the Armed Forces of the United States after December 31, 1946, and before December 24, 1952, and whose case does not come within the provisions of section 201 (g) or (i) of the Nationality Act of 1940."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "Granting the benefits of section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to certain children of United States Citizens"; and the Senate agree to the same.

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
FRANK CHELF,
RUTH THOMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

H. M. KILGORE,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7588) for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the House would make the nationality laws presently in effect applicable in the case of Jane Edith Thomas, a 4-year-old child born in Italy in 1951. Her father, a native-born United States citizen, was then stationed abroad in the service of the United States Armed Forces, having entered on duty in January 1948. Her mother was a national of Italy. The child would not acquire United States citizenship at birth because she was born in 1951, when the now repealed Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, was still in effect.

Under the Immigration and Nationality Act enacted in 1952, and commonly referred to as the McCarran-Walter Act, Jane Edith Thomas would have acquired United States citizenship at birth because that law, taking into account the fact that this country has been drafting and sending overseas younger men, has changed requirements pertaining to the bestowing of United States citizenship upon children born abroad of one alien parent where the other parent is a United States citizen.

The Senate amended the bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting language which would grant the benefit of the law presently in effect, to wit section 301 (a) (7) of the McCarran-Walter Act, not only to Jane Edith Thomas but to all children born abroad of one American citizen parent who served in the Armed Forces between December 31, 1946, and December 24, 1952. The full effect of the Senate amendment is set forth in the following report:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, January 19, 1956.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the further views of the Department of Justice concerning the bill (H. R. 7588) for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas, in the form in which the measure was passed by the Senate.

As passed by the Senate the bill reads as follows: "That section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be held and considered to be applicable to Jane Edith Thomas, the daughter of Leslie F. Thomas, a United States citizen, and provided that section 301 (a) (7) of said act shall be considered to have been and to be applicable to a child born outside the United States and its outlying possessions of parents one of whom is a citizen of the United States who has served in the Armed Forces of the United States after December 31, 1946, and before December 24, 1952, and whose case does not come within the provisions of section 210 (g) or (i) of the Nationality Act of 1940."

The apparent purpose of the bill is not only to confer United States citizenship upon Jane Edith Thomas as of the date of her birth by making applicable to her case the provisions of section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, but also to extend the provisions of that section to all cases involving children born to an alien parent and to a parent who is a citizen of this country who served in the Armed Forces after December 31, 1946, and before December 24, 1952, under circumstances which did not confer citizenship upon the child at birth by reason of the provisions of either subsections (g) or (i) of the Nationality Act of 1940. The latter act took effect on January 13, 1941, and remained in effect until December 24, 1952.

Under date of July 28, 1955, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization transmitted to your committee the report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service concerning an earlier form of the bill which merely proposed to grant to the beneficiary the status of a lawful permanent resident of the United States as of the date of enactment, upon payment of the required visa fee. From the facts as related in that report you will note that at the time of her birth in Italy on February 7, 1951, the beneficiary did not acquire citizenship under either of the subsections of the 1940 act mentioned above. Subsection (g) did not apply because her citizen father (who was less than 20 years old at the time of her birth) had not resided in the United States for at least 5 years after attaining the age of 16 years. Subsection (i) did not apply because the father's service in the Armed Forces did not take place between December 7, 1941, and December 31, 1946. Had the child been born after December 24, 1952, however, she would have been a citizen at birth under section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The bill here under consideration would confer that status upon her. It would likewise extend similar benefits to all other children of members of our Armed Forces who may have been born abroad during the time that the Nationality Act of 1940 was in effect.

The bill as amended by the Senate does not specify that its provisions are to apply only to children who were born during the period when the Nationality Act of 1940 was in effect. It is suggested, therefore, that the bill be amended by adding after the words "outlying possessions" the language "after January 12, 1941, and before December 24, 1952." If the bill is amended as suggested the Department of Justice would have no objection to its enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Deputy Attorney General.

In the opinion of the conferees there is no need for the enactment of private legislation for the relief of one child, Jane Edith Thomas, if the enactment of the second part of the bill as amended by the Senate would apply to her.

Pertinent parts of section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act read as follows:

SEC. 301. (a) The following shall be nationals and citizens of the United States at birth:

* * * * * *

"(7) a person born outside the geographical limits of the United States and its outlying possessions of parents one of whom is an alien, and the other a citizen of the United States, who prior to the birth of such person, was physically present in the United States or its outlying possessions for a period or periods totalling not less than 10 years, at least 5 of which were after attaining the age of fourteen years: *Provided*, That any periods of honorable service in the Armed Forces of the United States by such citizen parent may be included in computing the physical presence requirements of this paragraph."

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
FRANK CHELF,
RUTH THOMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he will explain this bill. I might say that I had the great privilege of introducing this bill at the last session to correct a situation that gained a great deal of national publicity because of the fact that this little girl was treated in such a way. I would appreciate an explanation of the bill.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 7588, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK], as now reported by the conferees, was originally a private bill introduced for the relief of one Jane Edith Thomas, a 4-year-old child, who

was born in Italy in 1951 of a United States citizen father, a soldier stationed abroad with the United States Armed Forces. The mother of the child was a national of Italy, and due to the fact that a wartime statute had expired before the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, the child did not acquire citizenship at birth. This bill would apply not only to Jane Edith Thomas but to all children born under identical circumstances to an alien parent and to a parent who is a citizen of the United States and served in the United States Armed Forces after December 31, 1946, and before December 24, 1952. As of that latter date, the present law takes care of the situation.

The new law, taking into consideration the fact that the United States has been drafting and sending overseas younger men, has changed requirements pertaining to the bestowing of United States citizenship upon children born abroad to servicemen who happen to marry aliens. A similar provision was in effect during World War II and up to December 31, 1946. It expired at that date and until the present law was enacted, there was a hiatus during which certain children born to servicemen abroad did not acquire United States citizenship at birth. This legislation would correct this deficiency. It is unanimously recommended by the conferees.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I shall be happy to.

Mr. SCHENCK. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation now recommended by the conference committee applies to all children under similar circumstances who are the children of our service personnel. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks immediately following action on this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. DOWDY. Is this bill so worded as to apply only to the issue of marriages or does it apply to illegitimate children as well?

Mr. FEIGHAN. It applies only to legitimate children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the conference report we have before us today is the result of careful study and a sincere effort to iron out a technical difficulty that arose during the closing hours of the past session when the Senate amended my private bill, H. R. 7588, for little Jane Thomas, of Dayton, Ohio. I want to express my gratitude and indebtedness to the distinguished chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER, and my fellow Ohioan, the Honorable MICHAEL FEIGHAN, chairman of the House conference committee, for their sympathetic concern and good work in connection with this bill.

I am not going to take the time from our busy schedule today to relate again all the circumstances which make the passage of this bill so necessary, as I fully recounted all the details in my statement before the House last July 30, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 10, page 12460. This conference report, worked out in a truly American humanitarian spirit, is wise and much-needed legislation. It achieves even better results than my private bill would have done. While I was, of course, very disappointed for the sake of the Thomas family in Dayton, and all their warm-hearted friends, that the bill did not pass last year and relieve them of the anxiety and the uncertainty experienced during these past 7 months, I think it has all worked out for the best.

These good people in my congressional district may take comfort, and even some pride, in knowing that the widespread concern expressed by them personally in their many letters, telegrams, and telephone calls, and in their behalf by sympathetic, alert news and radio reporters throughout the Nation, has brought about this good result. By adopting this conference report, we will give the same relief to the children of other servicemen whose misfortune it was to bear children in a foreign country before the 1940 Immigration and Nationality Act was amended in 1952. I earnestly urge the adoption of this conference report.

PRIVATE CALENDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

CERTAIN PATENTS IN FEE TO LANDS WITHIN THE BLACKFEET INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the first bill (H. R. 4604) relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to each of the persons named in the following table, respectively, a patent in fee to the lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., set forth and described after his or her name: *Provided, however*, That all oil, gas, coal, and other mineral rights therein shall be reserved for the use and benefit of the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont.:

Wayne W. Welch, northwest quarter southwest quarter section 25, township 33 north, range 8 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

Paul Calflooking, southwest quarter northwest quarter section 36, township 33 north, range 8 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

Ray E. Momberg, east half southeast quarter section 11, southwest quarter southwest quarter section 12, northeast quarter southeast quarter section 15, township 33 north, range 7 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 160 acres.

Guy Williamson, southeast quarter southwest quarter, lot 4, section 7, township 32 north, range 11 west; south half southeast quarter section 12; northeast quarter section 13; township 32 north, range 12 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 313.66 acres.

Harvey Williamson, west half northwest quarter northeast quarter, east half northeast quarter northwest quarter section 20, township 33 north, range 11 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

Lorraine Dennis Crawford (now Woods), lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, south, half north half section 2, township 36 north, range 9 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 351.36 acres.

Stephen Afterbuffalo, east half northeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, south half southeast quarter section 34; north half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, section 35, township 36 north, range 11 west, Montana principal meridian; southwest quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, section 34, township 36 north, range 11 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 400 acres.

Celena Wren O'Brien, southeast quarter section 13, township 37 north, range 8 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 160 acres.

Nellie Henault Paul, northeast quarter northwest quarter section 29, township 33 north, range 7 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

Greengrassbull, northeast quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 14, township 34 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 80 acres.

Millie Bird Momberg, southwest quarter southeast quarter section 26, township 33 north, range 11 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

Louis J. Momberg, southeast quarter southwest quarter section 26, township 33 north, range 11 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, on application therefor, to issue to each holder of an exchange assignment on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., a patent to the lands that are covered by such exchange assignment. The patent shall include all oil, gas, coal, and other minerals in the land unless the Indian to whom the patent is issued reserved the right to such minerals in the land that was transferred by him to the tribe, or unless he did not have the right to such minerals in the land so transferred. The patent shall be a patent in fee if in the judgment of the Secretary the applicant is able to manage his own affairs without governmental assistance, and shall be a trust patent if the Secretary determines that the applicant needs governmental assistance in handling his affairs. Any trust created by such patent may be terminated by the Secretary when in his judgment the need therefor has ended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDMUND LOWE AND RICHARD LOWE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 578) for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe shall be held and considered to be the minor children of their mother, Mrs. Sam Lee Jue, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM T. COLLINS (VASILIOS T. BUZUNIS)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 663) for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William T. Collins, also known as Vasilios Buzunis, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1242) for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Purita Rodriguez Adiarte, Irene Grace Adiarte, Patrick Robert Adiarte, Katharina Steinbach, Joseph G. Ferrara, Clorinda Perri Sturino, Yee Loy Foo (also known as Loy Foo Yee or Ted Yee), Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis, Rosita A. Jocson, Young Hi Yun, Cheuk Wa Leung, Camilla Ying Ling Leung, Panagiotis Nicolas Lalos, Antyro Panagiotis Lalos, Myra Louise Dew, and George Poulio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hain Cohen (Haim Braun) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon payment of the required visa fee.

"SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have been issued in the case of Antonio Domenico Narciso Bianchi. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Antonio Domenico Narciso Bianchi shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRFAN KAWAR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1483) for the relief of Irfan Kawar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Irfan Kawar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for a permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to this alien, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WINSTON BROS. CO., ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1905) for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and the J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Winston Brothers Co. and the Utah Construction Co., jointly, the sum of $102,475.41, and to J. A. Terteling and Sons, Incorporated the sum of $24,666.41. The payment of such sums shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of Winston Brothers Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc., against the United States for compensation for increased costs incurred as the result of the disruption or delay in performing certain construction work for the Bureau of Reclamation on the Columbia Basin project under contracts numbered 12r–16197, dated June 28, 1946, 12r–16796, dated October 25, 1946, and 12r–16745, dated October 25, 1946. Such disruption or delay was caused by insufficient appropriations by the Congress to continue payment for the normal construction schedules for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948. The sums appropriated by this act are the amounts of damages found by the Court of Claims, acting pursuant to Senate Resolution 343, 82d Congress, to have been suffered by the said construction firms because of such disruption or delay.

SEC. 2. No part of the amounts appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Brothers" and insert "Bros."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "and" and insert "&" and strike out "Incorporated" and insert "Inc."

Page 2, line 16, after the word "act", insert "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and the J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER E. DURHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1065) for the relief of Walter E. Durham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter E. Durham, Venice, Calif., the sum of $9,746.67. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Walter E. Durham against the United States under the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended (42 U. S. C., secs. 1701–1717), and section 4 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2003 (a)), for additional benefits computed on the basis of an alleged contract of employment between the said Walter E. Durham and a contractor with the United States calling for an increase in wages to $250 per month, subsistence of $70 per month, and bonus of $45 per month, to be effective January 1, 1942, which claims have been denied on the ground that such contract was not in effect at the time he was taken prisoner by the Japanese. The said Walter E. Durham has

been paid benefits computed on the basis of a contract calling for wages of $150 per month only: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after "United States", insert "for additional detention benefits."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "and", insert "for additional payments under."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "for additional benefits."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES F. BRICKELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1500) for the relief of Charles F. Brickell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $1,835.71 to Charles F. Brickell, of 2250 East Chapman, Fullerton, Calif. Said sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Charles F. Brickell for personal property which was lost in a fire which occurred on December 25, 1953, at Telford's Warehouse in Sun Valley, Calif., for which he has not been heretofore compensated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$1,835.71" and insert "$862.22."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "claims" insert "against the United States."

Page 2, after the word "act" strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH BINGHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2473) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham, Bushnell, Fla., the sum of $10,335.25. Such sum represents the amount which remains equitably due the said Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham from the United States as compensation for damage inflicted upon property owned by her in Sumter County, Fla., by personnel of the United States Army. Such damage, which included the total or partial destruction of five houses, the destruction of timber, the destruction or loss of personal belongings, and the construction of an airfield which rendered large parts of the property unusable, occurred between April 10, 1943, and December 31, 1946, while the property was leased and occupied by the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,335.25" and insert "$2,700."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA DEL CARMEN GAGO SANTANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3960) for the relief of Maria del Carmen Gago Santana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Maria del Carmen Gago Santana, who was admitted to the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment.

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria del Carmen Gago Santana shall be deemed to have been born in Cuba."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MYRTLE F. BROCKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4504) for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle F. Brocki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the national service life insurance in the amount of $10,000 (N13737854, N8474357, N7162728) granted to the late Anselm C. Brocki, who died on April 30, 1949, shall be held and considered to have been in effect at the time of his death. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay such insurance in accordance with the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, except that any payments made as a result of enactment of this act shall be made directly from the national service life insurance appropriation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELMUT KLESTADT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4899) for the relief of Helmut Klestadt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of Helmut Klestadt for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as a civilian intelligence officer in the Department of the Army, in December 1946, and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits except medical expenses shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. C. SHEPHERD, TRADING AS W. C. SHEPHERD CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6126) for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co., Atlanta, Ga., the sum of $102,958.07. The payment of such sum (1) shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States for losses or damages incurred under contract No. W–257–eng–2286, dated April 22, 1943, with the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, for the construction of the Cumberland Oil Field protective levees, and (2) represents the payment of the difference between the damages of $214,253.88 actually incurred by the company, as found by the United States Court of Claims in its decision in the case of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co., against the United States, filed July 13, 1953, and the amount of $111,295.81 allowed such company by the court, the court having held that the company's recovery was limited by a release which it had executed shortly after the completion of the work: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of

a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EDITH POPWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6321) for the relief of Mrs. Edith Popwell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Edith Popwell, of Miami, Fla., the sum of $7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Edith Popwell against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Spencer W. Popwell, Jr., sustained as the result of a collision on March 19, 1943, between the automobile which he was driving and a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof, shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS F. MILTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7403) for the relief of Thomas F. Milton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas F. Milton, 88 Violet Avenue, Hillingdon, Middlesex, England, the sum of $11,197.60 in full satisfaction of all claims of Thomas F. Milton against the United States for damages resulting from injuries sustained in an incident involving United States Air Force personnel in Uxbridge, Middlesex, England, on May 10, 1952, while exercising his duties as a constable in the London Metropolitan Police: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRMGARD S. KING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7487) for the relief of Irmgard S. King.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Irmgard S. King, of Colton, Calif., and her claim for compensation benefits by reason of the act of July 15, 1939 (5 U. S. C., secs. 797, 797a), arising out of the death of her husband, who died on November 3, 1948, while serving on active duty as an officer of the United States Air Force, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF BRIG. GEN. EDWIN B. HOWARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1271) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. WIER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1272) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. WIER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

GILBERT HENKENS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5488) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Gilbert Henkens, Jr., star route, Mile 17½, Anchorage, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Gilbert Henkens, Jr., star route, Mile 17½, Anchorage, Alaska, is hereby authorized, for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act, to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to Gilbert Henkens, Jr., for homestead purposes, the following described land situated in Alaska: Lots 34 and 39 of section 30, township 15 north, range 1 west, Seward meridian, Alaska, a total of five acres.

SEC. 2. That the conveyance shall be made upon the payment by said Gilbert Henkens, Jr., for the land at its reasonable appraised price of not less than $1.25 per acre, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public-land laws.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 11, inclusive, and insert: "That Gilbert Henkens, Jr., star route, Mile 17½, Anchorage, Alaska, shall have the right to purchase under the act of June 1, 1938, as amended (43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), lots 34 and 39, section 30, township 15 north, range 1 west, Seward meridian, Alaska, within one year after the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "reasonable appraised price" and insert "fair market value."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 533) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kazuo Zajiki (Thurston Eugene Wood), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lt. Harold D. Wood, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ng May Ngon, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Ng Ten Bow, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Saturnina M. August, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Martin August, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Teresa Langone Venafra, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Antonia Maria Venafra (also known as Maria Menafro), a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Irenka Petranovic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Otto Mayer, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Paul Skuntz, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of M. Sgt. Thomas Skuntz, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Elizabeth Legere, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Robert Henry Legere, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 8. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yoshiko (Clara) Oe, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Justin Gill, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 9. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lynton John Band, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Eugene Austin, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 10. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Judy Anne Marie Burton, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. Henry Paglione, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 11. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Erminio Cobbe, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Clifton Lenins, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 12. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, William Everett George Reid, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Augusta Reid, citizen of the United States.

SEC. 13. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Danica Stevoff shall be held and considered to be the minor child of Kime Stevoff, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 14. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mitsuko Miyaoka shall be held and considered to be the minor child of Shikataro Miyaoka, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 15. For the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugenia Gierik shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Konstantin Gierik and Theodora Gierik, permanent residents of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "Act" strike out ", the."

On page 1, line 10, strike out the first two words "minor child."

On page 1, line 10, after "Ngon" strike out the comma.

On page 2, line 1, after the words "to be the" insert the word "minor."

On page 3, beginning on line 19, through line 23, strike out all of section 11.

On page 3, line 24, after "SEC." strike out "12." and substitute "11."

On page 4, line 4, after "SEC." strike out "13." and substitute "12."

On page 4, line 8, after "SEC." strike out "14." and substitute "13."

On page 4, line 12, after "SEC." strike out "15." and substitute "14."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 534) to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary Ann Wilkinson may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Margaretha Gooden, Vittorio Adinolfi, Vincenzo Ciacio, Mrs. Hanum Nigogoshian, Waltraud Muller Tournay, Walter Oppenheim, Giuseppe Greco, Mrs. Ingeborg Lee, Maria (Henriette) Zagrabowicz, Elli Anna Maria Cirillo, Anthony Barbato, Colin D. Burgess, Meir Tinowitz, Eleonore Blackburn (nee Brenner), and Jill (Wiggett) Varga, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Else Widdel, the fiancée of Technical Sergeant George W. Alvey, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Miss Else Widdel is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Technical Sergeant George W. Alvey and that she is found admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, other than section 212 (a) (9) thereof: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Miss Else Widdel, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Miss Else Widdel, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Miss Else Widdel as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Simone Sakey may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 535) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eric Joseph, Ezra Chitayat, Violet Chitayat, Georgette Chitayat, Linda Chitayat, Constantin Phedon Manoli, Magda Manoli, Panagiotes Roumeliotis, and Kalman Blady, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alfred Johann Hoinski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the case of Androniki Kalafatides. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Androniki Kalafatides shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

SEC. 4. Within 6 months immediately following the effective date of this act, Dominick Lechich may file an application for adjustment of his immigration status under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1045), notwithstanding his status at the time of entry into the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the name "Panagiotes" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Panagiotis."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIE RAILROAD CO. AND ATLANTIC MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 402) providing for sending the bill H. R. 5918 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5918) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Erie Railroad Co. and Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co. et al.", together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MACO WAREHOUSE CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 406) providing that the bill H. R. 7176 and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 7176) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Maco Warehouse Co.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORTON J. KRAKOW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2267) for the relief of Morton J. Krakow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, to Morton J. Krakow, of Arlington, Va., the sum of $190. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Morton J. Krakow against the United States arising when, by reason of error on the part of the Army, the award of the Combat Infantryman's Badge to him was delayed for 9 years. Even though the award thereof was made retroactive, the act authorizing additional pay for holders of the badge had been repealed before award to him was actually made, thus depriving him of the additional compensation he would otherwise have received: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Infantryman's", and insert "Infantryman."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK E. GALLAGHER, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2900) for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of the United States Government life insurance fund to Frank E. Gallagher, Jr., Alexandria, Va., total disability benefits for the period from March 1, 1942, through November 28, 1945, under the terms of his United States Government life insurance policy, and to refund the premiums paid on such insurance through allotments from his active duty pay for such period. The said Frank E. Gallagher, Jr., was totally disabled during such period by malnutrition and dysentery incurred as a result of inhumane treatment by the Japanese Government while a prisoner of war: *Provided*, That no part of any benefits or refund received by reason of this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "March", and insert "July."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "policy", and insert "policies."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "such period", and insert "the period from August 1, 1942, through November 28, 1945."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUANITA GIBSON LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5580) for the relief of Juanita Gibson Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the national service life insurance, represented by the certificate No. N-195-931-199, issued to Harvey C. Lewis (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC-4-143-457), shall be held and considered to have been in full force and effect at the time of the death of the said Harvey C. Lewis on June 11, 1945, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay such insurance (from the national service life insurance appropriation) to Juanita Gibson Lewis, widow of the said Harvey C. Lewis and designated beneficiary of such insurance: *Provided, however*, That the total amount of the premiums unpaid on such insurance for the period beginning January 23 and ending on June 11, 1945, both dates inclusive, shall be deducted from the amounts payable to the said Juanita Gibson Lewis as principal beneficiary of such insurance.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. CHARLES H. PAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7074) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page, of Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of $25,000. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claims of the said Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page against the United States for compensation for the death of their son, Charles H. Page, Jr., who was fatally shot on the night of July 4, 1954, while on duty as a member of a motorized patrol at Killeen Army Base, Killeen, Tex., while serving as a member of the United States Army, and for medical and other expenses incurred by the said Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page as a result of the death of their son: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$14,430.88."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUNGE CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7075) for the relief of Bunge Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bunge Corp., New York, N. Y., the sum of $1,087.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Bunge Corp. against the United States on account of the erroneous liquidation of New York Consumption Entry No. 702540 of July 7, 1952, which entry incorrectly classified the merchandise involved, resulting in excessive customs duties being charged against such merchandise.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORRESTER: On page 1, line 6, strike out the figure "$1,087.50" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,196.25."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DONALD W. BAKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7377) for the relief of Donald W. Baker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Donald W. Baker in the sum of $167. Such sum represents mileage allowance made to him from Oakland, Calif., to Albany, N. Y., upon his reenlistment contract for 2 years

in the United States Navy, and he elected mileage allowance to his home of record, Albany, N. Y.; such allowance should have read from Bainbridge, Md., to Albany, N. Y.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DORA THELMA ANDREE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7703) for the relief of Dora Thelma Andree.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dora Thelma Andree, Honolulu, T. H., the sum of $246. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Dora Thelma Andree against the United States arising out of her capture and detention by the Imperial Japanese Government in Korea during World War II. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after "act" strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN CASES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

T–647943, Aguiar, Atanasio Roldan or Atanasio Roldan.
A–1402427, Ali, Hassan.
A–3597006, Almanza, Avelina (nee Valdivia).
A–9610412, Alonzo, Michael.
A–3481902, Ambrosino, Michael or Michele Ambrosino.
A–9537473, Andersen, Ingvald Andrew.
A–6093625, Arellano-Moreno, Sabino.
A–6323176, Arellano, Carmen Torres De.
A–2930860, Aronis, George Bernard.
E–085904, Asensio-Torrado, Jose or Jose Asensio.
T–303938, Najara-Ochoa, Pedro.
A–2552572, Barajas, Maximiliano.
E–41852, Benavides-Torres, Samuel.
E–086225, Bertuzzi, Galliano Fortunato or Galliano Bertuzzi.
1610–8546, Bilbao, Adolfo or Adolph B. Bow.
A–9625368, Boussoulas, Demetrios Aroyriou.
A–4178923, Burcea, Ioan.
A–4115087, Burgos, Santo Enrique.
A–7983091, Cairo, Olga Ann.
A–6859579, Castillo, Gonzalo Mena y.
A–4596763, Chavarria-Reyes, Epimenio.
A–6026500, Chen, Ho Mei.
A–7539202, Chen, Phoebe Shu Heng.
A–6779241, Christmas, Blossom Lucille Cann.
0900–37577, Chung, Louis Wei Shan.
0900–38790, Chung, Marie Catherine Lu.
0900–64703, Correa, Adan Martinez.
A–9831140, Cristo, Giordano.
A–7241577, Csiszar, Michael.
A–1822412, Daniels, Edmund Siegfried Douglass.
A–1845873, Davis, Helen George.
A–9764736, Dean, Benedetto.
A–3320341, Espiritu, Teofilo Primero.
A–5374217, Fiss, Walter Willy.
T–1143538, Flores, Virginia Acosta Matamobos De.
T–1892843, Foo, Ling King.
A–4946176, Foster, William Herbert.
A–7999529, Fried, Lee Mow.
0900/54609, Galvan-Lopez, Felix.
A–6472266, Gamponia, Maria Aquilizan.
T–2760978, Gandara, Joaquin.
A–6986666, Garcia-Pulido, Benito.
E–40664, Garcia-Rojas, Enrique.
E–40665, Garcia, Evangelina Gonzalez De.
A–5657167, Goni, Mario Vincente.
A–5961424, Grafi, Karl Charles.
A–5978398, Green-Ruiz, Alejandro.
A–6978157, Griffith, Eustace.
0900/65211, Guerrero, Maria del Refugio Solorio de.
0900/65195, Guerrero-Rios, Juan.
A–6523158, Gusman, Guadalupe Alatorre De.
0900–47522, Gutierrez, Oscar Roberto Argumosa.
A–7351304, Gutierrez-Padilla, Enrique.
T–2782084, Guzman, Candelario.
A–3344028, Hardalau, Petru.
E–093674, Henriksen, Niels Peter.
A–2264112, Hess, Walter Conrad Raimond.
A–5981990, Higashide, Seiichi.
A–6143940, Higashide, Angelica Yoshinaga.
A–6143935, Higashide, Elsa Yukiko.
A–6143936, Higashide, Carlos Shuichi.
A–6143937, Higashide, Irma Setsuko.
A–6143938, Higashide, Arturo Hideki.
A–6143939, Higashide, Marta Yoko.
A–9559825, Ho, Chiu or Chin Ho.
A–5945075, Jennings, Honora.
A–5780243, Ito, Kesemi.
A–2581013, Kaltnisch, Raphael.
A–6857817, King, Philip.
A–3556556, Kocipak, Andrew.
0300–71008, Kow, How.
A–9510993, Kwan, Tong Bun.
A–9649805, Lee, Ah Moe.
0900–65341, Ledesma, Maria Lopez de.
E–25266, Lehmann, Arno Alfred.
A–5719563, Lehmann, Emil.
A–6067650, Levkovich, Ramona.
0900–51281, Ling, Mary.
A–5122500, Litiner, Jacobo.
A–7082575, Louie, Shea Wing.
0900–61320, Luna, Jose Francisco Gonzales.
E–4859, Magr, Frank.
0900–62107, Mariscal-Guillen, Selina.
A–6748458, Mathur, Prem Narain.
A–4914354, McLaughlin, Peter.
A–4914352, McLaughlin, Evelyn Holmes.
0900/58304, Medina, Israel Miguel Cervantes.
A–6886827, Meisels, Brandel.
0300–400058, Messina, Michele.
0900–64069, Miranda, Maria Pineda Garcia de.
0900–64155, Miranda-Acosta, Jose Luis.
A–4260072, Molvar, Alfred.
A–9831027, Moro, Cosimo.
A–5977619, Noda, Yasuki.
A–6214509, O'Neill, Amy Frances nee Rumsey.
0900–64982, Pallares-Sanchez, Jesus.
T–1495420, Park, Gee Tung.
T–1495421, Pung, Li Shau.
0300–89977, Pegoraro, Stefano.
A–3469402, Ramirez-Banderas, Jose.
1409–14325, Rangel-Soto, Tomas.
E–061673, Reyes-Magana, Mauricio.
090–59670, Rodriguez, Juan Garza.
0900/63968, Rodriguez-Rangel, Jose.
T–2760400, Rodriguez-Razo, Aurelio.
A–7457191, Santillan-Cedeno, Leopoldo.
A–5046381, Savitzky, George.
0300–398756, Sheck, Yuen.
A–7809014, Siao, George John.
A–5924765, Silva-Rodriguez, Felix.
0900/64920, Sobrevilla, Manuel Rodriguez.
0900–64921, Rodriguez, Maria Reynalda Vera de.
A–7544370, Soong, Eugene You-Chi.
A–6370045, Soong, Nancy.
A–3585245, Suey, Marh.
A–6446669, Szewczyk, Stefania.
0901–18372, Tejeda, Jose Narcisco.
0901–17201, Tejeda-Vallalpando, Leonor.
0901–17203, Tejeda-Vallalpando, Ruben.
0901–17202, Tejeda-Vallalpando, Jose Roberto.
0901–17205, Tejeda-Vallalpando, Manuel.
A–6953070, Tsien, Siu Hwa.
0901–17204, Vasquez, Francisca.
A–5030257, Venezia, Giovanni.
0935/10084, Villa-Ramirez, Jose.
E–39942, Villarreal, Celia San Martin.
0900/47468, Watanabe, Kenzo.
E–096771, Williams Leslie C.
0900/53576, Wing, Chin.
0300–292427, Won, Leung Cheung.
A–9507805, Wong, Hung.
A–5624176, Wong, King Sun.
0900–61245, Zamora, Felipe Acosta.
A–5359958, Zermo, Christiano.
A–6739608, Zivolich, Marina.
A–5977417, Arashiro, Seisun.
E–050460, Bolivar, Reynaldo Manalili.
A–4726934, Buyund, Dolla Bin.
0900/58315, Cervantes-Ortega, Candido.
A–7890082, Chen, Lincoln Chih-Ho.
A–7890083, Chen, Victor Chih-Chia.
A–4037840, Cohen, Louis.
0300–258672, Cohn, Frida.
A–9748470, Cuder-Blanco, Rafael.
A–5659527, Den, Chin.
0803–7557, Esquibel-Caberra, Guadalupe.
V–850206, Ferguson, Alfred George.
0300–26803, Fernandez, Dorothea.
0900–27719, Figueroa, Conrado.
0900/64599, Flores-Robles, Adejandro.
A–5367611, Frankelis, Dorothy.
A–9684338, Fung, Fat.
0900–64859, Gallegos-Gallegos Cruz.
A–2856825, Garcia-Garcia Severo.
E–094509, Hamoy, Elena Saile.
A–6955158, Herrera-Comde, Matias.
A–7137125, Jimenez, Santos.
A–9150248T, Kai, Leo Chin.
A–6203207, Klare, Morris.
A–7898192, Kortus, Titiania Louisa.
V–1445496, Ledezma-Baiza, Gloria Manuela.
0300–286525, Lee, Kum Pui.
0300–286526, Lee, Lydialoo.
T–303877, Lira, Enriqueta, Herrera de.
A–6748499, Liu, David Tun Yuan.
A–6848622, Liu, Nai-Wen Chou.
A–4172684, Lohser, Erich Paul.
A–6342294, Mennis, Robert Gordon.
A–6528033, Montes, Cirilo Reverianc Salgado.
1600–94086, Negreta-Irigoyen, Laureano Lopez.
E–082824, Nepomuceno, Clara Anta Alvares de.
A–3421695, O'Brien, Emily Elizabeth.
A–4792740, Oomen, Anthony Ferdinand.
E–42699, Orozco-Medina, Virginia.
E–42700, Orozco-Medina, Jose Luis.
A–6638788, Pardo-Nigueruelo, Manuel.
A–7450424, Pardo, Petronila.
A–5088326, Pateh, Ahmat Ben.
A–5263554, Patti, Carmella Rizzo.
A–4322699, Petruch, Methodius Cirylius.
A–1435925, Polidoro, Agostino.
0900/59065, Reyna-Zamora, Juanita.
A–7849297T, Robertson, Aubrey.
A–6745338, Saavedra, Jose.

A-4829244, Schmidt, Arthur Friedrich.
A-7809034, Schwarzenberg, Isabella Eleonora.
0300-397874, Shell, Wong.
0900-58157, Silva, Jose Merced.
A-7190622, Sison, Juana Opana.
A-3062660, Soares, Obed Minto.
A-6634629, Soulas, Eleni.
T-1496810, Suzuki, Matsuzo.
A-5015106, Sviridoff, Anatole Karloff.
A-5884953, Tobolsky, Rose.
A-6703117, Tsikinias, Ifigenia.
A-1345676, Ulyshen, Anna.
0900-64967, Valle-Cerda, Concepcion.
A-2979044, Veloudos, Anthony.
A-2783888, Vinchesi, Joseph.
A-5588203, Wong, Kie.
0300-422302, Wong, Yen.
T-1892407, Wong, York.
E-079820, Wu, Ling Sen.
A-3406051, Yankovic, John Michael.
A-4468852, Banks, Max.
A-6444637, Chang, Albert Chiang.
A-6703483, Chang, Lita Wou.
0900-63964, Hess, Cleopatra Prokos.
A-1649371, Kulikowski, Tadeusz.
A-2365630, Sakamaki, Sueharu Francis.
A-2727597, Sakamaki, Rosa Teru.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

E-066633, Armijo, Margarita Avalos De.
A-3125109, Avalos-Rodriguez, Eugenio.
0900/86012, Barbose, Maria De Los Angeles Gomez de.
0900/45063, Barbose-Herrera, Salvador.
A-5013464, Chin, Sam.
A-7298517, Choy, Jim.
A-2610295, Coelho, Antonio Rodrigues.
E-074295, Corona, Fernando Villanueva.
E-057216, Drinkwaard, Marinus.
A-5070792, Frassetto, John.
T-2760454, Garcia-Guerrero, Prudencio.
A-4638865, Hannemann, Kurt Emil Walter.
0900/06230, Hernandez-Cuellar, Augustin.
A-8078870, Johnson, Therese Yvonne Myers.
0800-65443, Jow, Yee.
A-2416308, Kurosaka, Sato.
A-3568273, Lauman, Selma.
A-3070354, Leibovitz, Hyman.
A-1442074, Loboff, Peter Andrevitch.
A-7186334, Lo Piccolo, Giuseppe.
0300-354972, Notaro, Vincent.
A-6096828, Ohashi, Yasuriko.
A-6153223, Ohashi, Asa.
A-6153228, Ohashi, Ayano.
A-2760828, Ordaz, Sophie (nee Lopez).
A-1624208, Prigodina, Julia Lvovna.
A-9512765, Robstad, Trygve.
A-3542341, Elias, Josef.
0900-55600, Escobarete, Guadalupe, Sanchez de.
A-2734878, Kennedy, William Thomas.
A-6428095, Wang, Dee Kwok.
A-6428094, Wang, Derek H. T.
A-6340941, Calban, Maria Calban.
A-5231878, Chin, Ching.
A-3325280, Flores-Aguilar, Luis.
0900-65065, De Gutierrez, Maria Alverado.
1607-18271, Gutierrez-Garcia, Ruben.
0900-59772, Limon-Guzman, Santos.
0900-59944, De Limon, Socorro Rivera.
0900-59945, Limon-Rivera, Cristina.
0300-430883, De Marco, Elsie Maria.
0300-123659, Muscat, Giuseppe.
T-2760154, Roca, Silveria.
T-1497427, Roman, Josefina Roca.
E-094532, Rozenberg, Abraham.
A-7140456, Ruiz-Carmona, Jesus.
A-7145523, De Ruiz, Maria Guadalupe Guerrero.
A-7083042, Wilson, Matilda Emily.
A-5928409, Yung, Woo Yu.
A-6741749, Brown, Naomi Ruth Rahim-Lewis.
A-2113785, De Cantu, Marcelina Riojas.
0900-58064, De Dias, Maria Louisa Anzaldua.
A-6526070, Garcia-Alvarez, Alfonso.
A-5097415, Julio, Antonio Fernandez.
0300-406032, King, Chin.
A-9519622, Lun, Jet.
1612-2059, Palacios-Guillen, Narcisco.
A-1515457, Szabados, Benedek.
T-2671953, Villanueva-Esparza, Rosa.
A-7995747, Villanueva-Esparza, Daniel.
A-7388735, Silva-Guerrero, Cruz.
A-7388837, De Silva, Rafela Morales.
0300-182833, Giancontieri, Melchiore.
A-7115268, Kiang, Nan.
A-5930175, Lam, Kwai.
0900-65622, Moreno-Hernandez, Arnulfo.
A-5657580, Reyes, Nicolas.
A-7057909, Sanchez, Carmen Rodriguez Hierra y.
0300-310218, Scott, Clinton Joslyn Howard.
A-1270077, Smith, Joseph Nathaniel.
A-6161491, Suzuki, Kin.
A-6185239, Suzuki, Kane.
A-6161487, Hamahashi, Masumi Felicia (nee Suzuki).
A-6161488, Suzuki, Chieko Rosalie.
E-084333, Syrak, Charles.
A-7366045, Yioras, Eleftherios.
E-086060, Alexis, Joseph Nathaniel.
A-5016627, Barca, Amilcare.
E-119230, Ching, Ho Bo.
T-1143398, Estrada-Cardona, Jose Luz.
A-7463023, Guerrero-Lopez, Alfonso.
A-7469428, Guerrero, Maria de Jesus Gonzalez de.
0900-61528, Marquez-Gracia, Jose Tiburcio.
A-7450925, Montelongo-Jaramillo, Remigio.
A-4800019, Top, Todor.
A-9652030, Wah, Chan Chin.
A-4171996, Wong, Wing Hem.
A-7476835, Aldana-Garcia, Carlos.
A-5388868, Amato, Antonio.
A-5769833, Balogh, Geza Stefan.
A-6087502, Erebia-De Garza, Maria.
A-6465708, Cagnazzi, Giuseppe.
A-6354161, Cajudoy, Teodora Gampong.
A-3174507, De Solis, Elvira Moncada.
T-2760153, Diaz-Garcia, Elena.
A-6165371, Flores, Domingo.
0900-65627, Gonzalez-Vargas, Rafael.
A-7955360, Lukac, Suzanne Anna Marie.
A-6957100, Joannides, Johnny.
A-6957101, Joannides, Vanda Chiesa.
A-6373370, Panoussis, Dimitrios Ioannis.
A-6373369, Panoussis, Maria Spanou.
A-3418700, Rakulich, Ante Jure.
A-6492285, Salbosa, Conrado.
A-6492286, Salbosa, Antonia.
A-3423289, Schrage, Ben.
A-5619669, Suykerbuyck, James Pol.
A-6687259, Vandable, Regina.
T-1496196, Vargas-Rosas, Remegio.
A-2127885, Vojas, Vladimir.
A-6585976, Archundia-Garduno, Luis.
A-6732157, Andal, Manuel Catapang.
A-4664251, Gulston, Frederick Thomas.
T-2672151, Lunkeit, Henry Johannes.
A-5453516, Stahl, Ernst Heinrich.
A-7181915, Butte, Nelly Tong.
T-1496797, Caspillo, Victoriano.
A-6403025, Furlong, Louise Kathleen.
A-3150948, Gasparovich, Stepan.
A-5978834, Greenberg, Benjamin Maurice.
A-2787968, Leong, Wing Jip.
A-7841862, Ling, Chuey.
A-8282823, Man, Ching.
0300-248739, Pappas, Stavroula, Antoine.
A-7266318, Quong, Lee Chuen.
A-6954778, Richardson, Iris May.
A-7351172, Rogacki, Witold.
A-5407827, Wisplaar, Tobios.
A-6095314, Zacharatos, Efrosine.
E-050427, Galano, Margarita Acierto.
E-119210, Yong, Chung Ti.
A-3676218, Bramer, Theodore.
A-5977838, Esquibias, Petra Sanchez.
A-6836324, Gottlieb, Istvan.
A-6836339, Gottlieb, Leonie Marie.
A-6828858, Gottlieb, Istvan.
A-6171044, Hermosillo-Davalos, Jose.
A-7491666, Manon, Luis.
A-9765151, Pao, Sun Ah.
A-2353968, Piedra, Joaquin.
E-075916, Brewer, Maria Paula.
A-7459742, Brewer, Susanna.
A-2659069, Dot, Wong.
A-2893527, Kulisich, Vincent Jerry.
0300-409149, Lee, Fay Fay.
A-6145874, Mashal, Menashi Moshi.
A-3518687, Nava, Pasquale Giovanni Nava.
A-6432316, Pittillo, Richard.
A-6340936, Ramos, Luisa Ordonez.
A-6340928, Montero, Charita.
A-6340926, Montero, Marcelino.
A-6340927, Montero, Leonar.
A-5210884, Reiss, Magdalena.
0300-380913, Schenone, Gio-Batta.
A-7874982, Schenone, Rose Ferrera.
A-7284772, Sulliban, Leoncia Claridad.
A-5479090, Healey, William Farquhar.
A-4222108, Sancho-Portoles, Miguel.
A-6458971, Torres-Alvarado, Jose Carmen.
A-7250943, Tsou, Tang.
A-6161466, Yamashiro, Alberto Isamu.
A-6303559, Zaniewski, Maximilian.
A-4108465, Salazar, Simon.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 6, line 18, after the name "Stavroula" strike out the comma.

On page 8, at the end of the concurrent resolution, add the following names:

"A-7439286, Alth, Laura nee Gallegra.
"A-6929633, Alth, Aurel Joseph."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEFORTATION IN THE CASES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U. S. C. 1254 (c)):

A-1518753, Alexsandrovsky, Haeme.
A-2521036, Babiasz, Ludwik.
A-3152204, Bassiuk, Berl.
A-3151508, Block, Meyer.
A-1935641, Boguszewski, Stanislaw.
A-1570711, Calffe, Michael.
A-6432266, Coons, Florence Elizabeth.
A-2299257, Duszczyk, John.
A-1504456, Garcia-Garcia, Emeterio.
A-3112331, Grubstein, Joseph.
A-5520577, Macavei, Theodore.
A-5877015, Otterpohl, Johannes.
A-4424294, Said, Hasan.
A-5950523, Vecchio, Frederick.
A-4548147, Weker, August Franz.

A–5401183, Nadler, Benjamin.
A–6268870, Psket, Frank.
A–5012003, De Rocco, Guadalupe Garcia.
A–5953621, Graztis, Charles Kazimes.
A–3363786, Hanacki, Alexi.
A–1972550, Keri, Imre.
A–3758152, Kubo, Ryukichi.
2530–P–111999, Romond, Victor.
A–2192737, Saleba, Harry K.
A–5050186, Schlam, Max.
A–5722106, Steinberg, Morris.
A–5481658, Vence, Julia Ghislaine Victoria.
A–3748814, Bizub, Jan.
E–096633, Karpany, Michael.
A–1029615, Manuela, Vincenzo.
A–4472520, Marino, Phillip John.
A–2432814, Pessin, Joseph.
2774–P–150818, Dadasovich, Trivan.
A–5481160, Maniscalco, Bernardo.
A–2996201, Memcevic, Mato.
A–4897523, Chmiel, Mary Georjk.
A–2499495, Karlsson, Per August Elis.
A–3223867, Lasczsesten, Andras.
A–5283964, Muszinski, Stephen Joseph.
A–2413009, Mykkanen, Waino John.
A–2664328, Ozdoba, Sylvester.
A–1290504, Pitkowski, John.
A–1292775, Reiss, Jack.
A–3080509, Sherman, Abraham.
A–1517262, Silverman, Rebecca.
A–4529980, Veccirkas, Antanas.
A–5413225, Wisniewski, Paul.
A–5940963, Armedio, Carmine.
A–1913728, Boolen, Leona Margaret (nee Toews).
A–5094529, Greenberg, Leon Levine.
A–4165058, Kozinski, Peter.
A–1970246, Lefcovitz, Leopold.
A–1049318, Milligan, Clarence Reynolds.
A–5334014, Ragni, Louis.
A–4911237, Urasik, George.
A–5773002, Valey, Stephen Francis.
A–3468884, Castillo, Armando.
A–5208250, Fagan, Nathan.
A–5486663, Navarro-Hernandez, Pedro.
A–2173393, Rogalski, Stanislaw.
A–5976758, Stoka, Dominick.
A–3561023, Tomkowsky, Edward Joseph.
A–4158186, Volpi, Umberto.
A–1288760, Erblick, Max.
A–2214247, Mauch, Erhard.
A–1679210, Podkoscielny, Thomas.
E–093853, Prestia, Giuseppe.
A–4963684, Rodriguez, Jose.
A–4374868, Spinack, Charles.
A–1755527, Zawadski, Eliasz.
A–1526573, Carlo, John.
A–1859088, Cekovich, John.
A–4073697, Crnogarac, Paul.
A–8847111, Herman, Andrew.
A–4506868, Kleinberg, Harry.
A–4387639, Nemo, Al.
A–5017732, Szabelski, Frank.
A–4843933, Vilim, Josephine (nee Hubek).
A–3997690, Eisenstein, Sam.
0300–428551, Galvano, Alberto.
A–1071707, Isakowitsch, Alfred.
A–1309588, Kidder, Kako.
A–4567843, Nemirowsky, Jacob Charles.
A–2750348, Szalay, Joseph.
E–79714, Hong, Yen.
A–5809281, Aszoni, Istvan.
A–1009222, Fewskes, Oscar Charles.
A–4364776, Albano, Lawrence.
0300–422308, Becker, Hyman.
A–5208729, Bombas, Joseph John.
A–3450971, Glasgow, Joseph.
A–3430836, Koll, Cornelius.
A–2608347, Marchuk, Peter.
A–1590661, Schwartz, Alexander.
A–5643340, Shiojuk, Michael.
A–5093622, Fischer, Arnold P..ul.
A–5920401, Hanson, Melvin Frank.
A–3623036, Kalousek, Mathilda.
A–4924351, Miller, Frank Louis.
A–6441524, Perez-Negrete, Concepcion.
A–5648276, Raczynski, Alexander.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, strike out all of line 3.

On page 3, line 16, strike out the name "Veccirkas" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Vecoirkas."

On page 6, at the end of the concurrent resolution, add the following names:

"T–303059, Bartolini, Alberto.
"8511–A–1274, Caramanlau, Gheorghe.
"E–053084, Cepeda-Teran, Aurelio.
"A–3042474, Chaykowski, Michael.
"A–1427387, Chervinski, Charles.
"E–89265, Chillemi, Giovanni.
"A–5934786, Cimino, Jean.
"0800–106472, Cobos, Tomas.
"A–1459543, Cowart, Harry Fuller.
"E–069328, Dem, Louise.
"A–2888771, Drewnowski, Czeslaw.
"A–1847251, Elber, Isadore.
"A–5524604, Feldman, Pal.
"A–4724104, Ferro, Pete.
"A–2174885, Figiolia, Louis Jack.
"A–3740609, Grado, Luigi Di.
"A–4705290, Gutstein, Albert.
"A–5343594, Holody, Martin.
"A–2194350, Honkamaa, Charles.
"A–3155214, Irla, Anthony Stanley.
"A–3237162, Kalinovik, Alexander Paul.
"A–1028748, Kaplan, Abraham.
"A–2518778, Kashigian, Artin.
"A–5918920, Kauth, Kurt Max.
"A–3132325, Knowles, Ann Eirwen.
"A–7858221, Kryczka, John.
"A–5402770, Lamars, Pete.
"A–3623367, Latarski, Sigmund.
"A–4963675, Lukac, John.
"A–2941249, Maneniskis, Joseph.
"A–5151675, Matheson, Wilfred Laurier (William Matheson).
"A–3017074, Medoway, Sam.
"A–5987784, Napolitano, Giovanni Antonio.
"E–070997, Novak, Bela.
"A–5720885, Nowak, John.
"A–3818026, Ostrashelski, Constantine.
"E–083290, Pong, Soon.
"A–8116357, Reed, John David.
"A–4755643, Richter, Walter.
"A–5753580, Rocco, Louis.
"A–2671145, Rucienski, Aleksander.
"2770–P–142631, Sandler, Josel David.
"A–1853190, Sandor, Victor.
"E–086512, Schwar, Klara.
"0800–84629, Simon, Aurif.
"A–5862381, Slater, Frank.
"E–47365, Sosa-Paz, Luz.
"2310–P–15457, Stagliano, Maria Calogera nee La Forte.
"A–1840646, Torres, Jose Buenaventura.
"A–1815668, Tuchet, Frank.
"A–5490012, Veilleux, Joseph Charles.
"A–4967148, Walonce, Stanley Francis.
"A–2935138, Wilkas, Julius.
"A–1704536, Ziegenhirt, Joseph Francisco.
"A–3122325, Forsbacka, Johannes Alfred.
"A–5967839, Hovanec, John.
"A–1985254, Jurlin, Daniel D.
"A–7485159, Keefe, Everett Vernon.
"E–057815, Moreno-Aguilar, Conrado.
"A–4727339, Proch, John Alexander."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOY KULIS AND JANET ARLINE KULIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6635) for the relief of Joy Kulis and Janet Arline Kulis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joy Kulis and to Janet Arline Kulis, the minor children of Joseph E. Kulis (Veterans' Administration Claim No. XC–3059647), a sum equal to the amount which would have been paid to, or on behalf of, each such child for the period beginning on the date of the said veteran's death and ending on the date of the enactment of this act, if a claim for pension by or on behalf of each such child had been filed with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs within 1 year after the death of the said Joseph E. Kulis, and had been allowed. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Joy Kulis and Janet Arline Kulis against the United States for payment of pension to them as the minor children of the said Joseph E. Kulis for the period beginning on the date of the said veteran's death and ending on the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the sum which is to be paid to Joy Kulis and to Janet Arline Kulis under the first section of this act. If, prior to the date of the enactment of this act, the Administrator has allowed any claim filed by or on behalf of either or both such minor children, the amount paid to each such child under such claim prior to such date of enactment, shall be deducted from any amount found to be payable under this act to such child.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,004.20 to Joy Kulis and to pay the sum of $4,345.90 to Janet Arline Kulis, of Richmond, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sums represent the amounts due as compensation from the death of their father, Joseph E. Kulis, for a period beginning June 5, 1942, and ending on August 18, 1953, for Joy Kulis, and ending September 17, 1954, for Janet Arline Kulis, the day preceding the 18th birthday of each child: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit while the House is in session during the balance of the week during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED RULES CONCERNING EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I make these observations about a resolution I have just introduced.

I have been concerned for some time about the manner in which the permission to revise and extend remarks for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been utilized.

Of course, it is necessary to have the privilege of revising one's remarks in order to correct transcription errors or to make grammatical and clear what one has said. However, this privilege should be restricted so that no new overtones or new thoughts which were not spoken and therefore not subjected to possible rebuttal or questioning from the other Members are included.

The rule which permits extension of one's remarks is likewise a good rule inasmuch as time is saved in floor debate and the considered thoughts of a Member more lengthily presented are valuable to colleagues and others reading the RECORD. Nonetheless, the presentation of facts and arguments in an extension have not been subjected to the possible rebuttal or questioning of the other Members of the House and must therefore be viewed in a different light from remarks which have been actually spoken on the floor and so been subjected to rebuttal and questioning.

I think it is quite important that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be an accurate transcription of what occurs on the floor of the House and that therefore remarks not made on the floor appear in the RECORD in a manner that makes this clear to the reader.

This matter is more than one of academic interest in accuracy. The courts have on many occasions cited the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to determine congressional intent in attempting to interpret legislation. I cite just a few cases which happened to come to my attention: *U. S.* v. *Universal CIT Credit Corporation* (73 Supreme Court 227, 344 U. S. 218); *U. S.* v. *Great Northern Railway Company* (53 Supreme Court 28, 287, U. S. 144); *Guesseseldt* v. *McGrath* (72 Supreme Court 338, 342 U. S. 308); *Apex Hosiery Company* v. *Leader* (60 Supreme Court 982, 310 U. S. 469); *Amalgamated Association* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* (340 U. S. 383, 396, 71 Supreme Court 359, 366, February 1951); *Algoma Plywood Company* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* (336 U. S. 301–309); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Raladam* (283 U. S. 643).

On July 18, 1955, H. R. 7225, a bill to amend the Federal social-security program came on the floor of the House under suspension of the rules with 40 minutes for debate. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, reporting what little debate there was, contains so many extensions of remarks that it would have taken 10 hours, not 40 minutes, to have presented these views. One of the basic arguments advanced against the adoption of H. R. 7225 was the lack of proper consideration and debate given the bill. Yet the voluminous remarks appearing in the RECORD seem to negative this point.

Furthermore, the press and other public relation media in checking the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to determine what was and was not said on the floor has no way of distinguishing between material subjected to rebuttal and questioning and material not so submitted. This is particularly important in accurately reporting matters to the public involving partisan political issues.

I have today introduced a resolution to change the House rules so that extensions of remarks be printed in such manner that it will be clear to the reader that this material, though of value being the considered views of the Representative, were not spoken on the floor and so subjected to rebuttal or questioning by the other Members.

The remarks I have set forth were not spoken on the floor of the House. I raise these points for the considered judgment of my colleagues and an insertion in the RECORD is sufficient to accomplish this purpose.

TAXATION OF COOPERATIVES

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in July last year, the Secretary of the Treasury wrote to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, reviewing the failure of the attempt which was made by Congress in 1951 to impose some tax on the earnings of cooperatives, and proposing methods whereby the situation could be corrected.

The Secretary stated that the 1951 law intended that—

> Cooperative income should be taxable as it was earned either to the cooperative itself, or to its members. Such income was to be taxable to the cooperative as a corporation unless paid in cash or otherwise allocated as patronage refunds, in which cases it was assumed to be taxable to the patrons or members.

However, several courts have held that when allocation certificates issued to cooperative patron members have no fair market value they are not properly includible in the taxable income of patron-members.

Thus—

Says the Secretary—

> the 1951 act has failed to accomplish its purpose and, contrary to congressional intent, in at least some instances cooperatives may retain earnings with no tax imposed either on them or their members.

The Secretary suggests that the general intent of the 1951 legislation might be made effective by appropriate action of Congress in the following manner:

> It could be provided that cooperatives could take deductions in computing their taxable income only for (a) cash distributions and (b) noncash allocations issued in such form or under such circumstances as would make them currently taxable to the patron-members receiving them, and (c) the amount deductible by the cooperative itself should not exceed the amount so currently taxable to patron-members.

Recognizing the fact that if the member of a cooperative gets no cash as his patronage dividend he may not have funds to pay the tax imposed upon him, Mr. Humphrey proposes a withholding system, like that now in force on wages and salaries. He says:

> The tax could be withheld at the bottom rate for individuals, now 20 percent. As in the case of wages and salaries, refunds automatically would be made to those entitled to them and additional taxes paid by those subject to higher tax rates. Withholding at source would help both patron-members in payment of their taxes and the Treasury in its enforcement and administration problems.

It is a method of collecting some tax from cooperatives that I have advocated for several years. I have been particularly interested in it from the standpoint of the co-op member, particularly the farmer, who does not have a great deal of cash at his disposal. It is only through a withholding device like this that he will not have his personal cash position burdened with a tax payment as the result of a noncash patronage dividend. In 1952, I first introduced a bill providing for the "deduction and withholding on patronage dividends of a tax equal to 20 percent of the amount of each patronage dividend paid," and providing further that the amount witheld "shall be allowed to the recipient of the income as a credit against the tax imposed."

Mr. Speaker, that bill has been reintroduced at each succeeding session of the Congress. It is before the Ways and Means Committee at this time as H. R. 3892.

However, I have now revised it so that it is, I believe, directly in line with the suggestions made by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey.

Since it appears to be the intent of the Secretary that only noncash patronage dividends should be subject to the withholding tax, I have changed my previous bill to limit the withholding to patronage dividends paid in a form other than coin, currency, or current check.

Further, I have added a new section which would prohibit the deduction of patronage dividends under the circumstances set forth in the Secretary's letter and thus, I believe, would overcome the objections that were raised to the 1951 law.

I am sending my new bill to the desk for proper reference. It is, I fully believe, a very gentle method of imposing a minimum of Federal income tax on the large and growing earnings of cooperatives. Evidently the Secretary thought

so too, for he wrote that under the terms proposed by him:

Cooperatives still would be able to retain for their business use the entire amount of their earnings, subject only to the 20 percent withheld and paid on the tax liabilities of patron members, by allocating all earnings to their patron members in the form of taxable certificates.

It is estimated that full taxation of cooperative earnings would bring into the Treasury between $300 million and $400 million a year. The Secretary's plan will produce much less than that, of course, but it will nonetheless add an appreciable amount of money and, what is more, it will bring about a highly desirable equality of taxation among various types of business, some of which are now suffering quite unduly from the competition of the untaxed cooperatives.

Finally, I would say this: There has been considerable talk about corporations paying a withholding type of tax on dividends they declare, to their stockholders. Estimates have been made indicating that in this area also there has been a loss of legal revenue to the Federal Government. This principle seems to have bearing on this present situation. With that in mind, I am preparing a bill to accomplish this further purpose and, if it seems in order that its subject matter is sufficiently similar to that set forth in this bill, I would agree to join the two bills together.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 419) waiving all points of order against the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and at this time yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 419 waives all points of order against H. R. 9739, the independent offices appropriations bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

The total recommended in appropriations is $6,005,157,260 for the 18 independent offices covered in the bill.

In general, H. R. 9739 contains the same provisions that were carried in the bill last year.

Certain legislative provisions are carried in this bill. What appears to be the most significant one is contained in section 302 which states that restrictions on employment by the Government based solely on age, including the mandatory retirement from the competitive civil service at age 70, shall not be effective, but that other more reasonable standards shall be the governing considerations.

The Committee on Rules was informed that the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service had been apprised of this proposal and that in like manner each chairman of the appropriate legislative committee had been made aware of the other items of legislation which are included in this appropriation bill. No objection to the granting of this rule was made in the hearing before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman as one member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I had no knowledge that points of order were going to be waived on this bill. There was no notification to the members of the committee that points of order were to be waived. I am at a loss to understand why the Committee on Rules granted a rule providing for the waiving of points of order on any such legislative matter.

Mr. BOLLING. Let me say to the gentleman that there was an open hearing before the Committee on Rules at which, of course, there was opportunity to protest and no one appeared who was opposed to the granting of the rule.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Iowa, of course, understands that this rule only waives the right to make points of order, but amendments can still be offered and amendments are in order. The rule makes it possible to have debate on subjects which would not otherwise be possible.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman from California is correct. An amendment to strike out a provision would certainly be in order under this rule.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Not many appropriation bills come before the House under a rule waiving points of order; is that correct?

Mr. BOLLING. My memory tells me that there have been a number of appropriation bills reported to the House under a similar rule.

Mr. GROSS. But only yesterday we considered an appropriation bill that did not come in under a rule.

Mr. BOLLING. Some do and some do not, as the gentleman knows, of course.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Missouri if he does not think in view of the fact that the House is looking for legislation to keep it busy, this is not an inopportune time to rush a bill through the House without adequate debate. What the Committee on Rules has done here is to force a gag rule waiving points of order.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman from Missouri would reply that he does not see that this rule in any way limits debate.

The rule simply provides for waiving points of order against legislative provisions which are contained in the appropriation bill. There will be adequate and ample time under general debate and under the 5-minute rule for discussion of any amendments offered to the legislation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Do I understand from the gentleman that under the 5-minute rule anyone can offer an amendment to strike out any portion of the bill?

Mr. BOLLING. That is my understanding. This rule only provides for waiving points of order. It is not a closed rule.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. What this rule does is to make possible debate which would not otherwise be allowed.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has stated the case very clearly. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 420) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designate Monday, April 16, 1956, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, may I see if we can arrange for time for general debate? I would suggest 2 hours possibly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have had requests, which I have already granted, which requires between 50 and 55 minutes.

If the gentleman would make it 2 hours and 20 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2½ hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9739, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 75 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] will be recognized for 75 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I want again to pay tribute to the magnificent manner in which the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], has performed his task on the bill now brought to the floor. In the 5 years in which I have served on this committee I have been impressed more and more by the gentleman's complete grasp of the items that make up the independent offices appropriation bill, by the facility and ability with which the gentleman from Texas is able to analyze them and dispose of them. Occasionally, the gentleman and I have differed on a few of the things. We are in agreement on this bill. There is nothing in here which is in substantial dispute.

In prior years when this bill came to the floor we have had heated and prolonged disputes on public housing; but inasmuch as the administration had made no recommendation at the time of our hearings this year respecting the number of units of public housing that should be constructed, there is no appropriation in this bill for the public-housing program. I assume that after the Banking and Currency Committee completes its hearings and the House comes to a decision as to the number of units that should be authorized for construction there will be a supplemental appropriation to supply the funds necessary for that purpose.

There is some controversy respecting the amendment which removes the mandatory retirement age. I do not think there is any controversy respecting the amendment which was a part of the bill last year which prohibited the Civil Service Commission from using age as a factor in Federal employment. It eliminated the use of age as a factor of employment in the Federal Government. In doing this the Federal Government took a major step in eradicating the much too prevalent practice of using the birth certificate as the basis for employment. Throughout the country today we still find men who are 45 and women who are 35 being denied an opportunity to work for no other reason than age. That cannot happen in the Federal Government today, and it will not happen if this provision is approved again. It was applicable last year only to the appropriation bill for independent offices in force and effect for only 1 year. When the Civil Service Commission representatives appeared before our subcommittee and were interrogated respecting that provision we were told that it worked out very well indeed. As a matter of fact they extended it throughout the Federal Government, not just to the agencies in the independent offices bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What hearings did the Appropriations Committee hold on this legislative proposal?

Mr. YATES. The hearings appear in the section pertaining to the Civil Service Commission. I do not have that volume with me and I cannot refer the gentleman to the exact page, but I am sure if he addresses his inquiry to the clerk of the committee the clerk will tell him.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. YATES. Certainly.

Mr. GROSS. Who appeared before the gentleman's committee on this legislative proposal?

Mr. YATES. The Civil Service Commission appeared before our subcommittee requesting funds for their operations.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee hear any representatives of employee groups?

Mr. YATES. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought.

Mr. YATES. I must confess I was ill at the time, but I do not see anything in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will say that all the hearings are represented in this volume, I take it?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my attention to the appropriation for the Federal Power Commission. If the consumers of this Nation believe they are protected by the President's veto of the Natural Gas Act, they are sadly mistaken. Whatever good may have accrued from Mr. Eisenhower's rejection of that bill is being destroyed by either the inaction or refusal of the Federal Power Commission to regulate the natural-gas companies. Perhaps the Commission is waiting until next year, hoping for passage again of the Harris-Fulbright bill before it takes the action it is required to take under the Natural Gas Act. Perhaps it is just opposed to the concept of regulating natural-gas companies. But whatever the reason is, the fact remains that the Commission is not doing the job it is supposed to do, and that is to protect the American consumers from unreasonable and extortionate rates now charged by the natural-gas companies.

During the debates on the Harris bill at the time it was before the House, it was asserted again and again that there were 8,000 or more independent natural-gas producers which would have to be regulated if the Harris bill was not passed. The Commission testified for the Harris bill when it was before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is reasonable to assume that if the Commission did not want the task of regulating the independent producers it would have included the greatest possible number of producers who would be subject to regulation, rather than minimizing the number, to show the difficulties of enforcement. But what the Commission told our subcommittee was most surprising. It came to us and asked for funds to regulate 2,300 independent natural producers—not 8,000, not 9,000, not 10,000 such as you heard around here during the gas-bill debate, but 2,300 of them. If anybody knows the number of independent gas producers subject to regulation, it should be the Commission. Yet they appeared before our committee and stated there were only 2,300 subject to regulation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is aware of the fact that there are thousands of applications pending before the Federal Power Commission for certificates of convenience and necessity. In my own State of West Virginia I have several hundred small gas producers, including producers that have only 1, 2 or 3 small gas wells. Some of them have been unable to put their gas into pipelines running in interstate commerce for 8 or 9 months. In a number of cases, probably 15 or 20, I have had them come here to Washington and appear before the Federal Power Commission. They talked these producers out of granting a temporary certificate of convenience because they were doing irreparable damage to the individual. There are still hundreds of applications from small producers in West Virginia pending down there and they have been there for a year or more.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman on the point he makes. Last year when the Commission appeared before us we asked how much money they would need in order to clean up the backlog of applications for natural gas certificates and which would permit them to do a reasonable and decent job of regulating the companies that have to be regulated.

Mr. BAILEY. Are they asking for additional funds for that purpose?

Mr. YATES. We have given them in this bill all the money they have requested, because we want them to do the job. We told them when they appeared before our committee: We want you to do this job, we want you to clean up the backlog. That appears in our report, and we gave them all the money they asked for. We hope they will do the job, but I am not optimistic. I think they are not willing to do the job. It is because they have not wiped out certificate backlogs, they have not established any rate policy, they are floating in the air at the present time and do not know

what they are going to do with respect to establishing procedures for dealing with the certificates or establishing a basis for regulating the rates of these companies.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for that information.

Mr. YATES. During the debates on the Harris bill you will remember, too, that those of us who opposed the bill were threatened with the loss of gas to our cities. We were told if the bill were not passed, the natural gas companies would refuse to continue to furnish gas to our metropolitan areas. When the Commission appeared before our subcommittee I asked them about it. They said that this service could not be discontinued; that once a certificate had been granted or once a company had engaged in transporting or selling natural gas in interstate commerce under section 7, it could not abandon that service without the approval of the Federal Power Commission.

At the present time, although it is almost 2 years since the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the Phillips case, the Commission has come to no decision as to how it should proceed to regulate the rates of the natural gas companies. I tried to find out how they proposed to do it. Time and again I asked the Commission how it proposed to regulate the rates of the natural gas companies.

For instance, on page 1684 of the record, I asked Commissioner Digby.

What are you going to do? I must confess I am up in the air. As I understand the Natural Gas Act, the Commission is required to fix the rates to be charged by the independent producers. How do you propose to do it?

Then Mr. Digby replied:

We have made no definite policy determination.

But, Mr. Chairman, prior to the Commission's decision in the Panhandle Eastern Gas Co. case last June the Commission did know what it was doing—it did have a method of dealing with the valuation of the gas reserves of production companies. The pipeline companies and they own their own reserves, had their rates fixed on the basis of a valuation of original cost depreciated. But the Commission in the Panhandle Eastern case, in spite of the fact that the method of valuation had been approved by the Supreme Court in at least 4 different cases, changed this method and undertook to value the properties on the basis of weighted fair value, whatever that may mean. An appeal from the Commission's decision in the Panhandle Eastern case to the Circuit Court of Appeals resulted in a reversal of the Commission's order. The Commission was told by the court that they had to use original cost depreciated as one of the methods of valuation. Commissioner Digby and Mr. Kuykendall, Chairman of the Commission, stated to our committee that they did not want to use original cost depreciated. They said this was a method of valuation that they could not use with natural gas companies and indicated they might refuse to do so. I do not know why. I think they just made up their minds that they are not going to follow this method of valuation. They spoke about the complicated division of costs because of the different contract prices emanating from the same gas field. Nevertheless, this is not the first time that a regulatory commission has to deal with the problem of the allocation of joint costs. The Commission was created for the purpose of dealing with highly technical problems and this one should not be insuperable.

The protest was also made that so many of the independent producers do not have good books and records and cannot furnish the Commission with the information to establish their original cost or investment—in the words of Commissioner Digby, "they have their offices in their hip pockets." Yet Commissioner Digby agreed with me that this certainly was not true of the Phillips Co. or of the approximately 100 large companies who own the greatest portion of the known reserves of gas throughout the country.

The Commission is dragging its feet. The problems it raises about the difficulties inherent in establishing a rate base for independent natural gas producers are not well founded because prior to its recent decision in the Panhandle Eastern case they had been valuing the gas reserves owned by the pipeline companies on the basis of original cost, depreciated. When I asked the Commission whether there was a distinction to be made between valuation of the reserves of pipeline companies and those of independent producers, they could not find any.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I am wrong in believing that the Commission does not intend to protect the consumers of this country. If their present attitude continues, we have no assurance that consumers are going to be protected from exorbitant and extortionate rates.

The Commission seems to be tending again to take the position of fair field value, the position it took in the Panhandle Eastern case. If it continues to follow this position, if it does not take into consideration original cost depreciated as a method of valuation, the consumers of this country will suffer. As a matter of fact, if it continues to follow the Panhadle Eastern case, as is indicated it proposes to do in the hearings before our committee, I do not see any need for passing the Harris bill; I do not see any need for passing the Kerr bill or bills of that type. The Commission will have placed into effect the fundamental purpose of those acts—to increase the rates. Freedom from regulation for the so-called independent producer is really secondary to the fixing of gas rates at market value. If the Commission can do this by adopting an appropriate theory of ratemaking, the need for passage of bills like the Harris-Fulbright bill will have ceased to exist.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee, in bringing this bill to the floor this year, brings in as nearly a noncontroversial bill, I think, as it is possible to bring when we consider that we have some 18 agencies each one of which has its own problems. I think that the general discussion which has been suggested in the preliminary debate, especially in the debate on the rule, may hinge more on interpretation than on actual controversy over the intent of the committee. I think, therefore, except upon one particular subject, I shall ask the Members of the House to permit me to speak in a general way on the bill and yield to questions, if there are any, regarding specific agencies.

As I said, there are 18 agencies included in the bill. This is the tenth annual bill, from this subcommittee, in which I have had a part, and since it is the last one with which I shall have anything to do, I should like to take the opportunity to say that I think a great deal of the credit for bringing in a bill like this goes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], with whom it has been a pleasure to work for all these years. The coordination and cooperation among the Members, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], and my own two colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] have made it possible for us to work in continuous and successful harmony.

There are one or two items I should like to mention, Mr. Chairman; over a period of 4 years the Veterans' Administration has been able to work out a policy which is increasingly successful. The policies of the Veterans' Administration will never please everyone. They certainly will not please that citizen of the United States who wants all veterans to be treated in federally owned and supported hospitals, irrespective of the remoteness of his condition to his service in the Armed Forces. If we did that we would go, as I have said many times, into socialized medicine by the back door. On the other hand, the policies would not please the citizen of the United States who desires that service to the veterans be confined exclusively to those areas of physical conditions which arose directly from war service.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman say what particular groups are pushing that extension of aid through hospitalization to the veterans?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would say that some individuals, rather than groups, in some of the veterans' organizations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is there such a move on the part of veterans' organizations or any one of the veterans' organizations?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not to my knowledge; nor is it confined strictly to any one of them. There are individuals or small groups inside all of the veterans' organizations whose views I would say are not agreed to by a majority of the members of those veterans' organizations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are there any of the national veterans' organizations pushing such demands?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not this year, certainly; I am not aware of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. So that I think that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs today is to be commended for attempting to work out the problem. I think that perhaps the Congress, through the Committee on Appropriations, may take some credit for an assist, and that the legislative committee has, of course, taken the leadership in this field from the very beginning and should be commended for it. I think all of us who are veterans feel that this problem is very close to us because we know the situation, know the demands, and are trying to work out something.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would yield, but I do not want to interrupt him.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was about to take up this matter of the money that was put into the civil-service retirement fund.

Mr. HALLECK. That is the item about which I should like to inquire. Many of us through the years have understood that probably something of a bookkeeping deficit builds up in the Civil Service Retirement Fund, or has through the years. As I understand, the budget requested a contribution of $295 million for the contribution to the fund.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. On page 5 of the bill it appears that that has been raised to $600 million.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Am I correct in saying that of course that fund represents an asset of the Government, but likewise there is represented a liability of the Government. Is that correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. So that in a way it is a bookkeeping transaction to take it from one pocket and put it into another?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will permit me to explain it, I think I will prove it is more than a bookkeeping transaction, and much more important.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not want to interrupt except that I should like it clarified in my own mind. Certainly the figure raised from the $295 million which was requested to the $600 million represents an obligation against the budget of $305 million.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. The thing that has seemed to me slightly unusual about it at this particular time is that the Federal contribution in 1945 was $195 million; in 1946, $246 million; in 1947, $221 million; in 1948, $245 million; in 1949, $226 million; in 1950, $304 million; in 1951, $307 million; in 1952, $312 million; and in 1953, $325 million.

In other words, through those years the contribution was running along substantially at the figure requested by the budget this time. Now, all at once in this year it is raised to about double what it had been before. Of course, as I say, that does have an impact on the overall budget and the balancing of the budget.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct in his figures. It has an impact upon the budget. It has an impact upon the national debt of the United States. But to my mind, more seriously, it has an impact approaching an attempt to let the people of the United States think that this fund is in balance when it actually is not. How serious it is, that is another matter.

I should like to express my own personal feelings on this subject, which I have explained every time, I think, this bill has come up, and about which I feel very strongly. I believe that a trust fund should be actuarially in good condition. If this were a State agency, a State government, if there were something in which we could put the money in the funds of some other agency, the securities of some other government or other agency, I would feel that we should put this trust fund immediately into actuarial condition.

We cannot do this. We hold the highest securities in the United States. The only ones into which we could put this money would be specifically indicated bonds representing this trust fund or group of trust funds. It is the same kind of bond as any bond issued by the Federal Government. If we continue deficit financing, what we are actually doing is taking the money which the people pay in, to pay the deficit in the operating expenses of the Government. I have contended that that, in effect, deceived the people of the United States; and until we reach the point where we are balancing the budget every year and where this money being paid into this trust fund would be used to pay off the national debt and cut down the annual interest upon the national debt that we should not put this money in and spend it for the deficit financing of the Government. It is a very simple argument. Actually, we are $13 billion behind on this. But, nobody contends, neither I, nor any other member of the committee, that it will not have to be paid. Of course, it will have to be paid. But at the present time the demands upon the fund are less than the amount of money being paid in from the employees. Consequently, it is my feeling that we should wait and pay in every year from the Federal Treasury exactly the amount necessary to make up any immediate deficit in the benefit payments, until such time as our finances are in balance. It should not be necessary for us to go out and borrow the money to put it into the fund to bring it up to an academic actuarially sound condition. Now it may sound complicated, but I do not think it is very complicated. This $305 million which the gentleman from Indiana mentions, or the entire $13 billion—where would we get it? We would simply go out and borrow it from the people of the United States and pay interest upon it and put it into the fund and use it to pay the deficit expenses of the Government until such time as we are actually balancing the budget and paying off on the national debt. I am not in favor of any payment into the civil service retirement fund until the time that we can actually pay the money in, put bonds in a trust fund and pay the money on an unnecessary high national debt such as we have today. I hope that answers the gentleman from Indiana. I do not know how the gentleman feels about it. There are people who think the amount put in should be much higher, and there are people who think it should be much less. I hold to the opinion that we should not have to put any more money than is necessary to meet the demands from the beneficiaries until such time as the national accounts are in balance.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will permit me, I think it would have been much better to continue for this coming year as we have in the past at substantially the figure recommended by the budget. As the gentleman has pointed out, this increase in respect to the fund itself is a matter of realism, and is not particularly consequential. But insofar as it has to do with the balancing of the budget for the coming year, of course, it is a substantial amount. I also agree with the gentleman that obviously in any year when these obligations are created, whatever the arrangement is, so far as the bookkeeping is concerned, and whatever the Government must pay out in the way of benefits during any year, necessarily comes out of the production of the people as a whole for that particular year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct. I only ask the gentleman to remember that I am a member of the minority side of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I certainly appreciate that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thought the gentleman from Indiana would appreciate that fact.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Was there a division in the subcommittee on this item?

Mr. PHILLIPS. We do not operate in the subcommittee by vote. We agree or disagree—we take reservations when we do not fully agree. I took a reservation upon this.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity personally to thank our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for the selfless service he has rendered on this committee during the years he has served in this body. There is not a Member in the House who will not miss the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question to the gentleman from California. I notice in the committee report on page 19 there is reference to a veterans' hospital in Cleveland where there is provision for a general medical hospital. Would my distinguished colleague tell me what, in his opinion, would be the effect of this paragraph on the building of this general medical and surgical hospital for the Ohio veterans.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would hope it would be so definite that the Veterans' Administration would understand that it is the

unanimous feeling of the subcommittee, supported by the full Committee on Appropriations where the bill was heard, that the idea of building a 500-bed hospital for general medical and surgery patients simply invites a request next year to double it. Therefore, the economical thing is to put up a hospital at once, large enough for the demands of the area.

I might say this is not entirely academic with me. I spent seven of the happiest years of my life in Cleveland. I am thoroughly familiar with the site that was selected. I know the conditions in the hospital. I know that when the committee put in the money for the Brecksville Hospital it was to be a neuropsychiatric hospital; that that was the greatest need in the United States at that time. Even including southern California with all our influx of veterans, Cleveland had the greatest need. Four years ago this general medical and surgical hospital was to be built, but it has not been built yet. It is because there are two arguments going on; one, whether it shall be built on a spot selected by the Civil Defense Administration, or one selected by the Veterans' Administration. The other argument is whether it shall be 500 beds or more. You cannot squeeze 850 patients into a hospital with 500 beds. The committee says this hospital should be built on the park site, which is adjacent to the hospital; and, second, that the total number of general medical and surgical beds in both hospitals shall be not less than 1,000. I think I have made it clear not only to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] but also to the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very, very earnestly, and would say again how much we shall miss him in the 85th Congress.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would like to return to the discussion with respect to this retirement fund in which the gentleman is interested as am I.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Very much.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Millions of people who have investments in this fund are entitled to know that the amount, if it were actuarially sound, would be $13 billion and not $4 billion.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I can assure the gentleman they know it very well. I have discussed this each year with men who are interested in this fund. I think we all believe the time will come shortly when the fund should either be put into an actuarially sound condition at a time when the money will not have to be borrowed and interest paid on it, or that we should face this matter frankly, and his committee would naturally take the lead, and say that we do not have to keep an actuarially sound fund, and that the Government should obligate itself every year to pay the amount of money that would be required to pay the Government's share. As soon as some of these older civil service employees reach retirement, who did not pay the retirement money out of their own funds, the Government takes over and pays the deficit every year. I hope the gentleman's committee will in the near future decide which policy they should adopt. Personally, I would prefer the latter policy, but I would accept any policy defined by the gentleman's committee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree there should be a policy adopted, but I assumed a policy had been adopted but had not been followed, that is to provide sufficient funds.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There are sufficient funds. There are more than sufficient funds, but there is no actuarially sound fund as might be established in an industry or in a State, which could put the money into Federal bonds.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the way it ought to be. If it is to continue in unsound position, then those affected should know it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman certainly would not want us to put billions into this fund and then go and borrow from the very people whom we are supposed to be helping, and pay interest on it, so that they have a double payment of both money and interest.

Why should they use that money for the deficit expenses of the Government and then come back and tax the people again for the money they thought they were paying this year?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the great State of California, the 29th District especially, the whole Nation, and this Congress is going to lose a good man, a fair man, an outstanding Member of this body in the person of our beloved friend, JOHN PHILLIPS.

He is only "39" years of age and I must confess that I have worked on him long and hard as a good many of our other friends have in an effort to get him to change his mind. He wants to go back to the great State he is from and for the next 45 years do as he pleases.

He is going to retire, and he is retiring voluntarily. As I said, the whole Nation is going to lose a good man and a fine, outstanding public servant.

To the gentleman from California may I say with a great feeling of warm affection that we wish you well, and we hope the next 45 or 50 years will bring you a lot of happiness.

Good luck to you, and when you come back next year to visit us you be certain to come around to the Independent Offices Committee. You will always be welcome.

A lot of good luck to you and your family.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What are some Members on this side who do not know too much about these appropriation bills going to do when you are away?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Michigan will still be here.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He does not know anything about appropriation bills.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the retirement of JOHN PHILLIPS is going to leave a very serious vacancy on this side of the aisle on the Appropriations Committee. He has been with us for a long time. With his outstanding ability as an accountant, his yen for research activities and that sort of thing, he has made a record of which any man can be proud, and that has been of great and lasting advantage to the people of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Well said, I will say to the gentleman from New York and it is true.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield myself about a minute and a half or two minutes more, if I may, to make a few observations about this retirement fund.

In the first place, and I want to address a few of my remarks to my distinguished friend the assistant minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana, I do not think there is anything partisan in the activities of this committee about this matter; and there ought not to be. We had no politics in mind and politics in fact does not belong anywhere in this fund and I hope it never gets in.

Here are some 2,200,000 Federal employees paying their 6 percent every 30 days into this fund.

The fund is insolvent to the tune of $13,500,000,000. Think about it. There is less than $7 billion in the fund and it is short $13,500,000,000. That is the reverse of the proposition.

And why is it short? The Federal employees have been paying their part, but the Federal Government has not been paying its part.

My distinguished friend from Indiana cited some figures and those figures are true. The administration appointed that famous commission known as the Kaplan committee to study the retirement system and to bring in some light and information on the requirements of the fund. They did. Prior to that time there was too much guesswork involved in this fund. We now know what is required and we give you full credit for doing it. The Kaplan committee did it. While the studies were going on for 2 years the Bureau of the Budget did not recommend that the Federal Government pay anything to this fund. That is perhaps right because the Kaplan committee was studying it. Now they have made their report and what did the Kaplan committee recommend? Not $295 million that the Bureau of the Budget put in there this year, but $843 million. Under their recommendation we should have appropriated in round figures $850 million. So, if the committee erred, and we must admit that we did, we erred to the tune of not appropriating $850 million instead of $600 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been much concerned and much interested in the veterans' housing program that is due to expire next year. I notice in the hearings that the Appropriations

Subcommittee also expressed much interest in the housing program. Would the gentleman comment as to the accuracy of the appropriations to the Veterans' Administration for the Loan and Guaranty Section of the Veterans' Administration this year?

Mr. EVINS. I may say to the gentleman that the committee has provided what the officials of the Veterans' Administration have said is adequate.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman of the committee who have preceded me have fully covered the major items in the pending appropriations bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, has furnished the committee with a clear, concise, and informative statement of the contents of the measure under consideration. It should be added that when Chairman THOMAS has completed his statement, there is little further than can be added, or needs to be added, by way of explanation of an appropriations bill coming from the committee of which he serves as chairman. Chairman THOMAS, as we all recognize, is an able and hard-working chairman. Our chairman has performed an excellent service in this instance, as is his usual custom.

It has been a privilege to be associated with him in the work of the subcommittee. It has also been a privilege to work with the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and all of my colleagues on the committee.

It is a refreshing and stimulating experience to serve on this committee and I should like to take this opportunity to again express my thanks and appreciation to all of the members of the committee for their kindness and helpfulness. The fine spirit of cooperation which prevails in the work of the committee is unexcelled.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, which the committee has brought before the House, represents months of study and extended consideration of the needs and requirements of some 18 agencies of the Government comprising the category of independent offices.

It is readily apparent that the work of this committee is very important and certainly carries with it great responsibility when we consider that the committee has been asked to look into, analyze, and evaluate the budget estimates of 18 agencies for the fiscal year 1957 with total budget requests of $5,793,704,000. The overall amount recommended by the committee in the bill totals some $6,004,722,260.

I am certainly not going to discuss all the items of appropriations included in this bill as other members have spoken and given an explanation of the principal items involved in the independent offices category. But I shall confine my remarks, during the time allotted, to a few items relating to some of the regulatory agencies and important commissions, principally the Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, General Services Administration, and the Veterans' Administration.

The committee has given much study to the civil service retirement and disability fund which the Civil Service Commission administers. As previously pointed out, this fund is delinquent as far as Federal Government contributions are concerned, in an amount calculated at $13 billion. Federal employees are paying 6 percent of their wages into this fund, but the Federal Government is not matching their contributions on the basis required.

A special study of this situation, concerning the actual soundness or lack of soundness of this fund, has developed that there should be appropriated into the fund about $850 million annually to represent the normal Government cost, plus interest, to keep the civil service retirement and disability fund on a current pay-as-you-go basis.

In addition to this amount, some payments could and should be made on the $13 billion deficit of this fund.

The Budget Bureau has not included either of these in its recommendations. The bookkeeping juggling of this item alone demonstrates clearly that the so-called surplus in the budget or balanced budget is pure fantasy. The administration's claim of a balanced budget, thus, is most inaccurate.

The committee has recommended that $600 million be appropriated to this fund in 1957 in an effort to put it more nearly on a current basis.

The Federal Government must keep faith with its employees in the matter of this retirement fund. Our Federal employees are dependent on this system and Congress should make certain that the fund's stability is assured.

Concerning our regulatory commissions—which serve as an arm of the Congress—the committee has given close attention to the needs of these agencies for an effective and vigorous prosecution of the law imposed upon them by the Congress.

The committee has approved $5,400,000 for the Federal Trade Commission, which is $1,137,000 more than was appropriated for this agency last year, but $100,000 less than the Budget Bureau's estimates for 1957.

The committee received testimony from the Chairman of this Commission that FTC plans an extensive investigation of mergers and consolidation of business and corporate interests throughout the Nation. The committee feels that the antimerger work of this Commission is highly important and urgently needed. The country is experiencing a third wave of corporate mergers. The increased funds recommended should greatly accelerate this work by the Commission. The antimonopoly work of the Commission is also of major importance and should not be diminished.

For the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has the duty of protecting the public against fraudulent sale and offerings of sales of stocks and securities on the open market, the committee has recommended an appropriation of $5,700,000.

The committee received a great deal of testimony from members of this Commission concerning increased business activity in connection with uranium stocks. This activity has created the need of additional personnel in certain areas of the country. To assist the Commission in its role of protecting the public interest, the committee has recommended an increase in appropriations of $745,000 more than was allocated in 1956.

It is recommended in the bill that $5,200,000 be appropriated for the Federal Power Commission. This Commission has accumulated a backlog of work in connection with power studies and license franchise applications.

In addition, the Federal Power Commission will have or should have an expanded work program because of its responsibility in regulating the natural-gas industry in the public interest. The Commission, in my opinion, has for many months failed in its full duty and responsibility in proceeding to effectively investigate and prosecute segments of the natural-gas industry. The Commission simply has just delayed proceeding in this field awaiting action of the Congress to relieve its workload or reduce its jurisdiction. The Commission, recently, however, has assured the committee that since the veto of the gas bill it will now proceed to vigorously enforce the law. The committee understands that some 25 orders recently have been issued by the Commission calling for investigation of the rate structure of major producing companies.

These investigations are to determine whether or not their rates are unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory or preferential. I want to take this opportunity to commend the Commission for this important action.

The committee has approved funds totaling $211,340,900 for the operation of the General Services Administration for the next year. The GSA is the "housekeeping" agency of our Government and its work and progress must be effectively continued.

One program of this agency with which members are interested is the Federal buildings construction program, authorized under the Lease-Purchase Act, approved during the second session of the 83d Congress. The committee last year urged the agency to move forward in the overall building and renovation program which was begun in 1954.

While, actually, little noticeable progress has been made in this direction, there has been a modest beginning by GSA. The committee this year has approved the budget estimate of $5 million for financing the acquisition of sites, drawings, and architectural work in this connection. This program has been delayed too long. A great need exists for new and improved and additional Federal buildings in many areas throughout the Nation. This program should be expedited with the greatest dispatch possible.

In this connection, I would like to point out that the committee's recommendations include funds for acquisition of sites and architectural work on three new Federal buildings in the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee—in towns recommended by GSA on its

priority work schedule—these include Carthage, Smithville, and Lafayette. There are other towns and cities, not only in the district which I have the honor to represent, but in other districts throughout the Nation, that are deserving of this agency giving early attention to their Federal building needs.

Concerning the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Chairman, since World War II, as many of the Members will recall, there has been a reduction in several items of appropriations for various veterans' benefit programs. This has occurred as the veterans' educational and training program and other programs have tapered off or declined.

This year—I am pleased to report—your committee has recommended an overall increase of $253,402,860 over last year's appropriation, and $785,860 over the budget estimate for all phases of veterans' programs. This action was taken by the committee in an effort to continue and improve the veterans' programs of the Nation.

We have, as we all recognize, the greatest veterans' program of any nation in the world, which includes the program of education and training, insurance, housing, compensation and pension, hospital and medical care and other great benefit programs for veterans and their dependents.

These programs have been continued at a level recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. The committee has approved $2,907,000,000 for compensation and pensions which is an item made firm by statute and for which appropriations are required.

With respect to funds for the hospital and domiciliary facilities program, the committee has increased the budget recommendations by $3,500,000 for this item bringing the total amount recommended for this purpose to $50,500,000. This appropriation provides for technical services for, previously approved, G. M. and S. hospitals needed and some of the more urgently needed replacements of VA hospitals which consist of temporary, obsolete or hazardous structures. The VA proposes to replace such hospitals over a period of several years.

The veterans' hospitals of the Nation represent an investment of more than $2,500,000,000. Many of these buildings are the old Army cantonment type and badly in need of repair. The failure to make needed repairs and replacements of this huge investment would certainly represent false economy of a major degree.

In view of the huge investment in veterans' hospitals, the number of contonment-type hospitals in use, some of which have been described as "firetraps," I feel that the amount appropriated for this purpose is more than justified and that additional funds will be needed in the future when the Veterans' Administration replacement program gets fully under way. The funds here recommended are adequate for next year's needs by the Veterans' Administration.

In this connection, the Veterans' Administration and the committee are deserving of commendation for their action in recommending and approving funds for several projects of first priority importance. Worthy of mention in this group are the veterans' hospitals at Cleveland, Ohio; Oakland, Calif.; Jackson, Miss.; and Chicago, Ill. The projects at Murfreesboro and Nashville, Tenn., are equally important with those of other areas of our Nation to which the Veterans' Administration is directing its attention.

I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has reported a meritorious bill, and I trust and urge that the Members will affirm the work of the committee and give this bill its unanimous approval.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, one of the great programs of the Veterans' Administration is its hospital and medical program. This is the greatest single medical undertaking by any government in the world. I have always thought that this program is of great importance as a veterans' benefit, since I believe that there is nothing we can do for a veteran which is more important than to help him during a period of illness when he needs help most.

Our hospital program is designed for the care of service-connected veterans and veterans who are unable to pay for their care. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the committee realizes that in any big undertaking there will be some abuse; therefore we have conducted an investigation to determine how many veterans are abusing the privilege of obtaining free hospitalization when in fact they are able to obtain hospitalization elsewhere. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs will make a report on this soon, but it is my impression that the abuse is not extensive so far as numbers are concerned. On the other hand, I think we should do everything possible to get rid of the relatively few veterans who take advantage of the program, since this type of case is obnoxious to the public and gives the entire program a black eye.

I have visited a great many Veterans' Administration hospitals and find that, generally speaking, the quality of medical care is excellent and the attitude toward the patient is good. If we are to maintain this high standard of care, it will take continued vigilance on the part of the Veterans' Administration medical staff, the Bureau of the Budget, the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the members of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee for their work, particularly as it relates to the veterans' medical and hospital program. They have cooperated to the fullest. About a year ago the Committee on Veterans' Affairs made a survey of the needs of the Veterans' Administration hospital program, with particular regard to replacement of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and major repair and renovation on others. This study was accomplished through the joint efforts of the Veterans' Administration, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has been particularly helpful and spent a great deal of time last summer in completing this study.

The Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee initiated the program of replacement and repair last year and in doing so pointed out that no purpose could be served by undue delay. They have again this year provided funds for the continuation of the replacement and repair program. When the committee began this program, it was laid out as a long-range program which should be approved and followed by the committees and agencies responsible for its operation. Such an approval and agreement has now been obtained for the repair and replacement program and the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee is performing its function of making moneys available for the current fiscal year.

I wish to express my personal appreciation and the appreciation of the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the fine cooperation shown by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and the members of his subcommittee.

Medical services for the care of eligible veterans are provided through the facilities of 173 hospitals and 70 outpatient clinics. As of January 31, 1956, there were 121,163 hospital beds in operation, an increase of 4,131 beds since July 1, 1954. The average daily patient load in Veterans' Administration hospitals during January 1956 was 112,450, an increase of 5,963. The average daily patient load has increased from an average of 103,491 for fiscal year 1954 to an average of 109,909 for fiscal year 1956, an increase of 6,418.

The Veterans' Administration has expanded and improved upon the medical services made available to eligible veterans during this period. Three new Veterans' Administration hospitals—a neuropsychiatric hospital and two general medical and surgical hospitals—were opened, and an existing general medical and surgical hospital was converted to a neuropsychiatric hospital. In order to provide for the maximum number of veterans, the hospitals are currently operating at a bed occupancy rate of 93 percent, a high ratio in terms of accepted hospital practice. This compares to a occupancy of 89 percent as of June 1954.

CARE AND TREATMENT OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC PATIENTS

The most critical problem in the medical program is the care of the mentally ill. The Veterans' Administration approach to this problem has been vigorous and progressive. The effect of these efforts is demonstrated by the decrease in the number of veterans awaiting admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals, with neuropsychiatric disabilities, from a peak of 17,454 as of May 31, 1955, to 15,546 on January 31, 1956, despite a continually increasing number of veterans who require neuropsychiatric care. From the period July 31, 1954,

to January 31, 1956, an additional 4,762 neuropsychiatric beds were staffed and placed in operation.

Staffing neuropsychiatric beds with qualified professional people is a difficult task. To assist in solving this problem, the Veterans' Administration has established a program for training career physicians in the specialty of neuropsychiatry. Currently, approximately 200 physicians are undergoing a 3-year period of training. Each physician upon completion of this 3-year period of training is obligated by contract to serve with the Veterans' Administration for a period of 2 years. There are currently 20 physicians who have completed their training and are employed as psychiatrists in Veterans' Administration hospitals. In addition, there are training programs for psychologists and social workers concerned with the care of mental patients. These training programs are all affiliated with accredited teaching institutions.

To facilitate the integration of mental patients into their home communities, there is a trial-visit program and a foster-home program. In the trial-visit program, patients are released to their homes temporarily and supervision is maintained by the hospital through social workers in outpatient clinics and hospitals. Over 6,000 neuropsychiatric patients are in a trial-visit status. The foster-home program provides family and community life for selected patients without homes of their own. During calendar year 1955, approximately 800 psychotic patients were placed in foster homes. A large percentage of the patients placed in the foster-home program and the trial-visit program will eventually be discharged from the hospital.

Another important aspect of the program for the care of the mentally ill is the mental hygiene clinics which operate through the outpatient clinics. There are currently 63 of these clinics in operation. During the period July 1, 1954, through July 31, 1955, over 437,000 treatments were administered to 123,000 patients through the facilities of these clinics, eliminating the necessity of hospitalization for many of these patients.

To increase the number of beds available in neuropsychiatric hospitals for the treatment of acute neuropsychiatric patients, over 1,600 long-term chronic patients were transferred from neuropsychiatric hospitals to general medical and surgical hospitals.

Within the last 3 years, two drugs, chlorpromazine, and reserpine, have been used to advantage in the treatment of psychotic patients. The Veterans' Administration has undertaken a series of studies to determine the effectiveness of these tranquilizing drugs in the treatment of the mentally ill. Studies have also resulted in important advances in knowledge with respect to the effect of prefrontal lobotomy. In addition, there has been initiated a study to evaluate the effectiveness of the various forms and techniques of psychotherapy. This study is concerned with the relative effectiveness of various factors such as hospital design, staffing patterns, and therapeutic programs.

CARE AND TREATMENT OF TUBERCULOUS PATIENTS

In 1946 the Veterans' Administration, in conjunction with the Army and the Navy, initiated a program of study on the effectiveness of various drugs and antibiotics in the treatment of tuberculosis, working in close conjunction with the various professional societies and pharmaceutical companies. The Veterans' Administration played a most important part in clinically evaluating the effectiveness of chemotherapy in the treatment of tuberculosis. Impressive results have been obtained. This is in part demonstrated by the fact that the waiting list, as of January 31, 1956, for veterans awaiting admission for tuberculosis was 367 as compared to a peak of 2,600 in February 1953. During this same period, the number of patients hospitalized for tuberculosis decreased from approximately 16,000 to a current level of 14,000.

There is a constant search for improved methods in the treatment of tuberculosis. For example, there is currently under study a program which, if successful, would greatly reduce the length of time a tuberculous patient must remain in the hospital. This will be accomplished by hospitalizing the patient for the acute period of his illness and treating and maintaining controls on an outpatient basis, using the various antibiotics and other drugs.

INTERMEDIATE PROGRAM

The care of the long-term chronically ill and aging patient is a problem of increasing importance. A program to care for such patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals has been developed and is being expanded as rapidly as facilities and personnel are made available. More than 30 Veterans' Administration hospitals are participating in the intermediate program for long-term patients. In most cases these patients are in separate wards and in 5 hospitals there have been established formal intermediate services totaling approximately 600 beds.

DOMICILIARY PROGRAM

Improved concepts in the handling of the problems of the handicapped and disabled veterans have been inaugurated in the domiciliary program. These improved concepts involve:

(a) A program of bettering physical and living arrangements including new furniture, wide use of color, improved lighting, adequate sanitary facilities, modern floor coverings, increased space allocation, and items such as drapes and pictures which assist in providing a homelike atmosphere. To date this phase has been on a modest scale. However, the next several years will result in major improvement.

(b) Medical care for domiciliary members is receiving new emphasis through the establishment of domiciliary clinics to provide specialized medical skills for the maintenance of a system of medical evaluation and preventive medicine for these members.

(c) The institution of individually planned activity programs for members of the domiciliary with increased emphasis on the development of the member-employee program in such a way as to attain the maximum in rehabilitation and adjustment with a resultant increase in usefulness and happiness for each domiciliary member.

The objective of these new concepts is to prepare the veteran for return to his community, or, where this is not possible, to function at maximum capacity in a domiciliary status.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Medical research within the Veterans' Administration hospital system has contributed much to maintaining and improving the present high standards of care. The conduct of research is to a large extent based on the medical and surgical problems of the veteran patients. Emphasis on research in the fields of neurology, psychiatry, and tuberculosis has been accompanied by a wholesome increase in the quantity and quality of research activities dealing with these diseases. Cooperative as well as individual research is now under way in the 101 Veterans' Administration hospitals. During the recent calendar year there were approximately 2,200 research projects performed by Veterans' Administration personnel in Veterans' Administration hospitals. The major portions of these studies deal with heart disease, cancer, diseases of the digestive system, metabolic and nutritional diseases, diseases of the nervous system, tuberculosis and psychiatric disorders. Although research is specifically directed toward the problems associated with the care of veteran patients, the results of this research contribute to the health and welfare of the Nation as a whole.

REPLACEMENT, MODERNIZATION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES

During the past year the Veterans' Administration has developed a long-range replacement program which should, if carried to completion as scheduled, result in permanent hospital buildings in lieu of converted hotels, schools, and wartime cantonment type construction. It will also enable the Veterans' Administration to eventually deactivate obsolete domiciliary buildings.

This program covers 10 hospitals with a timetable for completion extending from fiscal year 1956 through fiscal year 1962:

Tentative scheduling of VA for replacement construction

	Estimated cost (millions)
Technical services:	
Fiscal year 1956: Downey, Ill	$2.9
Fiscal year 1957:	
Cleveland, Ohio	5.066
Jackson, Miss	
Oakland, Calif	
Washington, D. C	
Fiscal year 1958:	
Nashville, Tenn	3.75
Wood, Wis	
Fiscal year 1959:	
Long Beach, Calif. (2d phase)	3.5
Memphis, Tenn	
Fiscal year 1960:	
Downey, Ill. (2d phase)	1.7
Temple, Tex	
Fiscal year 1961: Wood, Wis. (2d phase)	.8
Total	17.716

Tentative scheduling of VA for replacement construction—continued

Construction:	*Estimated cost (millions)*
Fiscal year 1957: Downey, Ill	$21.2
Fiscal year 1958:	
Cleveland, Ohio	43.559
Jackson, Miss	
Oakland, Calif	
Washington, D. C	
Fiscal year 1959:	
Nashville, Tenn	34.75
Wood, Wis. (1st phase)	
Fiscal year 1960:	
Long Beach, Calif. (2d phase)	32.5
Memphis, Tenn	
Fiscal year 1961:	
Downey, Ill. (2d phase)	20.3
Temple, Tex	
Fiscal year 1962: Wood, Wis. (2d phase)	8.0
Total	160.309

The estimated cost of this program is $17.7 million for technical services and $160.3 million for construction.

There was provided in fiscal year 1956, $2.9 million for technical services to start this program—Downey. The fiscal year 1957 Veterans' Administration construction appropriation request covers $4.353 million for technical services and $21.2 million for construction, in order to continue this very much needed program.

In addition, the large-scale modernization of some 58 existing hospitals has been given a tentative long-range schedule with a request of $20.552 million for the fiscal year 1957 portion of this program. This represents a continuation of the program developed in fiscal year 1956, as well as the start of additional projects. These projects are executed by phases in order to continue the hospital in as nearly normal operation as possible while improvements are being made.

Under the category of modernization for fiscal year 1956, approved projects are either in the architect-engineering design state or under construction at 15 of the 58 hospitals presently considered in greatest need of modernization improvements.

In addition to this program, minor improvements are being accomplished at some 16 other hospitals in this group. In other words, some improvements are scheduled at approximately 53 percent of these 58 hospitals in contrast to approximately 26 percent in fiscal year 1955.

For fiscal year 1957, the appropriations request asks for approximately $20.5 million for projects affecting 55 percent of this group. This indicates a progressive program which, if continued until the tentative long-range plan is completed, will result in the modernization of some 58 older hospitals.

Dependent upon available funds, the tentative plan contemplates the completion of this program about fiscal year 1966 or fiscal year 1967. It is well to recognize that during this 10-year period, additional hospitals will have reached an age where they will require extensive modernization. This, coupled with the final phases of the present tentative plan, could well carry this program into fiscal year 1970, based on the present rate of accomplishment.

In addition to the above, the fiscal year 1957 request asks for $4,447,000 for minor improvements in various categories, all of which provide much-needed improvements in our hospital operations. Projects of this sort are planned at some 37 hospitals, plus the continuation of the program for correcting fire and safety hazards. Although this amount represents but a small part of the total program, dollarwise, it is essential that these minor projects be accomplished in order that we may improve our operations for the care and treatment of veterans.

The many projects in these minor categories range from a few thousand dollars to $250,000 each. It is hoped that this group of unprogramed projects may be brought current within a reasonable time, along the lines presented in the fiscal year 1957 request. However, each year brings new developments in the field of hospital operations which require alterations and improvements, as well as replacement of obsolete techniques in the medical field.

There follows a listing of the hospitals included in the Veterans' Administration's request for appropriations for fiscal year 1957 for major rehabilitation and modernization, and the alterations, improvements, and repairs program:

Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary facilities appropriation, fiscal year 1957, major rehabilitation and modernization program request

(1) Project location	(2) Hospital type and number of constructed beds, June 30, 1955		(3) Total estimated cost	(4) Project title [1]
	Number	Type		
Grand total			*Thousands* [2] $20,552.7	
1. Bedford, Mass	1,636	NP	2,141.9	Modernization program, phase II (new physical medical rehabilitation building, chapel building, canteen and theater building, and alterations to recreation building No. 10).
2. Bronx, N. Y	1,482	GM	620.5	Modernization program, phase IV (alterations to buildings Nos. 1 and 21; provide adequate canteen facilities and replace elevators Nos. 4 and 10 in building No. 1).
3. Chillicothe, Ohio	2,116	NP	646.2	New therapeutic exercise clinic building (to augment existing small scattered therapeutic areas which are inadequate in size).
4. Columbia, S. C	600	GM	510.5	Modernization program, phase II (alterations to buildings Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 5).
5. Danville, Ill	1,719	NP	532.0	New theater building (to replace unsafe, nonfireproof existing theater building No. 47, which is badly deteriorated).
6. Dayton, Ohio	1,275	GM		
	2,138	DOM	2,789.2	Modernization program, phase II (alterations and addition to GMS building D, Brown Hospital).
7. Fort Howard, Md	389	GM	430.5	Modernization program, phase I (new warehouse building, utility building, pump and transformer house, and extend central heating to buildings Nos. 18, 20, 22, 23, 30, 43, 57, 59, and 70).
8. Hines, Ill	3,092	GM	500.0	Replace 2 elevators, unit F, and provide a new electrical distribution system, building No. 1.
9. Kecoughtan, Va	604	GM		
	1,621	DOM	3,391.3	Modernization program, phase II (new administration wing, building No. 110, and new intermediate hospital building).
10. Kerrville, Tex	449	TB	290.9	Replace 3 boilers and modernize outside utilities.
11. Lake City, Fla	381	GM	662.0	Modernization program, phase I (alterations to buildings Nos. 15, 16, 17, 19, 38, and 64; new incinerator building).
12. Mountain Home, Tenn	605	GM		
	1,781	DOM	938.0	Modernization program, phase I (alterations to buildings Nos. 2, 26, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 78).
13. Murfreesboro, Tenn	1,307	NP	2,261.4	Modernization program, phase I (new therapeutic exercise clinic and special services building).
14. Oteen, N. C	1,996	TB	694.4	Modernize patients feeding facilities in 7 buildings, and alterations to provide small dining rooms in buildings Nos. 1, 19, and 20.
15. Portland, Oreg	415	GM		
	155	TB	1,889.9	Modernization program, phase I (alterations to buildings Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, and 25 and connecting corridor, general site work and outside utilities).
16. Tomah, Wis	1,176	NP	1,230.0	New dining hall and kitchen and connecting corridors (to replace existing nonfireproof dining hall and kitchen building).
17. Tuscaloosa, Ala	964	NP	313.9	Expand and modernize present laundry facilities.
18. Waco, Tex	2,040	NP	613.7	Do.
19. Wood, Wis	1,340	GM		
	1,661	DOM	313.9	Modernize electrical distribution system, convert to alternating current, and replace elevators in buildings Nos. 20 and 43.

[1] In addition to specific items listed above, each project covers any necessary adjustments and related work to permit the rehabilitated or modernized facilities to tie in with and function as an integral part of existing plants. Even after all projects in this proposed program are completed, standards of affected hospitals though improved will still in most cases be below those approved for our new hospitals.

[2] Total estimated cost rounded off to $20,552.7.

Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1957 major alterations, improvements and repairs program request

(1) Project location	(2) Hospital type and number of constructed beds, June 30, 1955		(3) Total estimated cost	(4) Brief project description [1]
	Number	Type		
			Thousands	
Grand total			[2] $4,447.0	
1. Various stations			300.0	Administrator's discretionary project funds.
2. Various stations			927.0	Correction of fire and safety hazards (phase V of interim patients protection program).
3. Albuquerque, N. Mex	500	GM	131.3	Addition and alterations to building No. 1 to expand present inadequate central sterile supply service.
4. Alexandria, La	913	GM	149.3	Modernization program, phase III (alterations, building No. 1; replace elevator, building No. 2; addition to corridor between buildings Nos. 2 and 3).
5. Amarillo, Tex	156	GM	38.6	Manager's quarters and single garage.
6. American Lake, Wash	904	NP	241.5	New chapel building.
7. Augusta, Ga	1,632	NP	95.2	Detention screens for buildings Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (to replace existing diamond mesh grilles which are in a deteriorated condition).
8. Bath, N. Y	400	GM		
	1,478	DOM	165.4	Alterations and addition to building No. 14 (to provide garage, guardhouse, and fire station).
9. Boise, Idaho	250	GM	142.2	Underground electrical distribution system.
10. Boston, Mass	941	GM	39.2	Relocate and expand research laboratory (to provide adequate space for medical research).
11. Danville, Ill	1,719	NP	62.1	Air condition operating suite, building No. 58.
12. Fort Harrison, Mont	262	GM	28.3	Elevator, building No. 47 (to eliminate hand carrying of supplies to 2d floor of warehouse, and to permit better utilization of storage space).
13. Hines, Ill	3,092	GM	12.6	Surface drainage and resurface roads.
14. Indianapolis, Ind	486	GM	39.8	Enlarge parking facilities (to alleviate critical shortage of parking space).
15. Iowa City, Iowa	484	GM	14.8	Additional parking facilities (to alleviate critical shortage of parking space).
16. Lexington, Ky	1,216	NP	30.7	Regrading and paving parking areas.
17. Los Angeles, Calif	1,842	NP		
	1,403	GM		
	2,370	DOM	218.0	New incinerator (of suitable size to handle station refuse and eliminate smoke nuisance).
18. Louisville, Ky	494	GM	18.9	Additional parking space (to alleviate critical shortage of parking space).
19. Louisville, Ky. (VARO)		RO	55.5	Air cool 5th floor.
20. Marion, Ind	1,650	NP	133.8	Replace worn elevator, buildings Nos. 16, 20, and 25 (with new elevators capable of safe and efficient handling of traffic).
21. Montrose, N. Y	1,965	NP	100.0	Water-connection charge.
22. Northampton, Mass	933	NP	38.6	Detention screens, building No. 4 (to eliminate future injuries to patients from broken glass in suicide attempts; and to reduce extensive maintenance from glass breakage and insect screen damage).
23. Outwood, Ky	316	TB	119.9	Boiler-plant improvements (replace and improve existing boilers and auxiliary equipment which is badly deteriorated).
24. Phoenix, Ariz	192	GM	57.4	Addition to building No. 1 (to provide adequate space for receipt and storage of supplies).
25. Providence, R. I	393	GM	36.7	Additional parking area (to alleviate critical shortage of parking space).
26. Reno, Nev	166	GM	19.9	Alterations to isolation ward, building No. 1 (to provide aseptic technique facilities for entire isolation ward and increase capacity from 5 to 6 beds).
27. Roanoke, Va	2,000	NP	163.8	Addition and alterations to warehouse building No. 15 (to provide adequate storage space for items other than subsistence, and consolidate supply activities located in 5 buildings into 2 buildings).
28. Rutland Heights, Mass	615	TB	210.4	Boiler-plant improvements, building No. 22 (replace present worn-out boilers with 3 new boilers equipped with automatic controls and modernize boiler plant electric system).
29. San Juan, P. R	200	GM	27.8	Shelter for Government vehicles (to protect vehicles from heavy winds, rains, temperatures, and corrosive effect of salt air).
30. Shreveport, La	449	GM	39.2	Alterations for mycology and TB laboratory; isolate electric circuits to operating room, building No. 1, and install explosion-proof electrical outlets and emergency generator.
31. Somerville, N. J. (VASD)		SD	19.5	Alterations and automatic fire-sprinkler system, building No. T-83 (for inflammatory storage, etc.).
32. St. Cloud, Minn	1,379	NP	105.8	Electrical changes, building No. 1 (and install explosion-proof electrical outlets and emergency generator; sewer-connection charge).
33. Syracuse, N. Y	488	GM	153.3	Animal laboratory (new building to provide animal quarters and laboratory facilities for station medical research and training program).
34. Temple, Tex	100	GM		
	350	DOM	32.9	Hydraulic elevator for surgical service (to eliminate the hazard of transporting surgical patients up and down long ramps or stairs).
35. Togus, Maine	851	NP	33.8	Construct 300,000-gallon water tank to supplement present water supply and provide adequate storage to eliminate intermittent danger due to insufficient water pressure for normal hospital use on 6th floor of building or for use in case of fire.
36. Wadsworth, Kans	1,082	GM		
	1,221	DOM	190.0	Modernize inadequate refrigeration systems and facilities and improve inadequate street lighting.
37. West Haven, Conn	872	GM	158.3	Animal laboratory (new building to provide animal quarters and laboratory facilities for station medical research and training program).
38. West Roxbury, Mass	304	GM	49.7	Addition and alterations to garage, building No. 10 (to provide adequate space for housing and servicing station vehicles, i. e., stock and parts room, wash rack, grease rack, etc.).
39. Wilmington, Del	320	GM	22.8	Construct minor addition adjacent to main hospital building to provide adequate and safe storage space for hydrocarbon and oxidizing gases, and trash.

[1] In addition to the specific items listed above, each project covers any necessary adjustments and related work to permit the altered, improved, or repaired facilities to tie in with and function as an integral part of existing plants. Some substitutions of projects may be anticipated as a result of changing conditions during the year. Experience has shown that there will be emergencies and changes in requirements that can neither be forecast nor reasonably estimated in advance. However, before any major alterations, improvements or repairs (nonbed) project is started, it will be subjected to a thorough screening to establish the priority and the fact that it is necessary. Even after all projects in the proposed programs are completed, standards of affected hospitals though improved, will still, in most cases, be below those approved for our new hospitals.

[2] Total estimated cost rounded off to $4,447.0.

ECONOMY IN OPERATION

Along with emphasis on improved care for veteran patients, the Veterans' Administration has directed attention toward a better utilization of available funds and manpower. Examples of this are as follows:

(a) The number of employees per 1,000 patients has decreased from 1,090 for fiscal year 1954 to 1,077 for fiscal year 1955, and to 1,062 for fiscal year 1956. This decrease of 28 employees per 1,000 patients or a total of 3,092 employees below the fiscal year 1954 ratio is equivalent to an economy of $12,700,000 in annual operating costs. This economy was accomplished through a continuous evaluation of costs and manpower utilization through studies conducted to enable management to evaluate the economy and effectiveness of individual medical facilities. In future years these economies will offset the cost of increased staffing in neuropsychiatric hospitals which is necessary to secure the therapeutic advantage gained by the use of tranquilizing drugs.

In addition to the studies referred to, there is a continuous review of organization and methods to improve manpower use and costs. Examples of organizational changes are:

(a) Consolidation of administrative functions of certain adjacent hospitals and the consolidation under a single management. Such consolidations are on a test basis. Final evaluation of effectiveness has not been made.

(b) Consolidation of outpatient clinics with hospitals.

Examples of changes in methods are:

(a) Utilization of electric accounting machines in the supply and financial accounting activities.

(b) Utilization of addressograph equipment of the hospital patient administration activities.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been very interested in the operation of the veterans' loan guaranty program. We have been doing a series of investigations and conducting hearings throughout the country and in Washington in an effort to improve the

veterans' housing program. We had officials of the Veterans' Administration before our committee and asked them if the budget which they have requested for loan-guaranty purposes is adequate and they stated that the funds requested would be sufficient to provide good supervision of construction of houses being approved for veterans under the loan guaranty program. In reading the hearings of the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee I noted that committee was interested in the loan guaranty program and also asked the Veterans' Administration whether the funds requested were adequate and the subcommittee was advised that the appropriations requested would be sufficient. I wish to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], has been very interested in the loan guaranty program and last year earmarked certain funds in the Veterans' Administration's appropriation to assure that the loan guaranty program would have adequate funds. Now that the Veterans' Administration has said that their funds are adequate, I think that we can expect improvement in the quality of supervision of the Veterans' Administration regional offices, the processing of applications by veterans and builders, and most important of all, increased efficiency in the supervision of construction and the handling of complaints of veterans growing out of poor construction.

The program for World War II veterans is scheduled to expire on July 25, 1957, and the level of building activities will continue to be high. It has been the experience of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that construction failures lie dormant until the house has been occupied one winter season and that the complaints become serious after the homeowner has lived in his house for 6 months to a year and has become acquainted with the house. It is apparent, therefore, that if we do not do something to improve Veterans' Administration's supervision of construction for the remaining part of the program, Congress will continue to have many serious complaints brought to its attention for the next several years. A subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, headed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], has just completed an extensive investigation of the veterans' housing program and has made a number of recommendations for improvement. This report has been made available to the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration has advised me that they are giving special study to the problems of the loan guaranty program and are developing plans which will intensify supervision of the loan guaranty program, particularly the quality of construction being obtained.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the section in this bill devoted to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to point out that in the appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission are included, of course, funds for the Car Service Section and the Bureau of Safety and Service of that Commission. This Bureau of the Commission has responsibility of administering section 1, paragraphs 10 to 17 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act which comprises the car service provisions and the emergency powers of the Commission with respect to car service.

The purpose of my discussion today is to point out that the economy of the United States has undergone severe shocks in the last 2 years, last year in particular, as the result of the inadequacy of the supply of railroad freight cars, boxcars on the lines of the railroads of this country, and that this condition, this shortage of boxcars has been not only a blow to the commerce and shipping necessary to keep this country running, but it has resulted in a condition that has caused commodities which we all have to buy to go up in price. Shortages in building materials for example, caused by the car shortage has caused the market price of such materials to go up.

A few thousand dollars added to this bill to give the Interstate Commerce Commission enough field employees so that the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the car service section can be administered would many times be saved as the result of keeping more cars moving and avoiding this loss from car shortages.

We had last year at the peak of the shortage season a shortage of 22,659 freight cars per day during the week ending October 29, 1955, and the shortage was nearly that high for several weeks.

In addition there were shortages of high-grade boxcars and the wide-door 40- and 50-foot types in all sections of the country throughout the year. Severe shortages of freight cars in the Northwest lumber territory were experienced during the spring and continued until the middle of November. Freight-car shortages occurred in the grain territories during the summer and fall, and all sections of the country experienced shortages of all classes of freight equipment during the heavy fall loading season. That, Mr. Chairman, is a direct drain on the economy of this country which certainly is unnecessary.

What causes this car shortage annually? There is one basic reason, and that is that the class A railroads of the United States do not own enough cars. I am told by a source that I think is entirely reliable that at this moment we have 85,000 fewer boxcars on the rails of the United States than we had at this time last year, yet everybody knows that the economy has expanded. The car loading figures prove that. For the week ending February 25 the figures show an increase of 8.9 percent over the same period of 1955 and a 15.5 percent increase over the same week of 1954 in the loading of freight cars.

In the face of the expanding traffic on the railroads, the expanding need for shipping, the railroads do not have as many cars on the road as they had last year. I am told that they do have 140,000 cars on order, but those cars will probably not be delivered in time for use this year.

What is the answer? What can we do about it? Mr. Chairman, we can do something very tangible and very helpful. The law gives the Interstate Commerce Commission ample power to correct many abuses that are now prevalent in the railroads and which result in delay in the movement and in the loading and unloading of boxcars, but the Interstate Commerce Commission must have personnel with which to administer that law and to enforce the rules and regulations. Do they have that personnel? I will let you judge for yourself.

The Interstate Commerce Commission field staff, which represents the men who are out in the field to check on the violations and to keep these cars moving throughout the entire United States to serve all of the 48 States, has only 30 men. Only 30 persons are employed in that field work. It is perfectly obvious that this nationwide job cannot be done with so few men. The Commission obviously is very timid in going to the Budget Bureau and asking for more money, because this year, recognizing the fact that they do not have field service employees enough, they have requested an increase of only 10. They want to increase from 30 to only 40 men. Those 40 men scattered throughout the United States certainly cannot do enough to alleviate this car-shortage problem.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, under the 5-minute rule I am going to suggest that the Committee increase the amount of money for the car service section of the Interstate Commerce Commission by enough to employ some more men. I am not going to offer an amendment which would raise the total sum in the bill for the Interstate Commerce Commission above the budget request, I am going to offer an amendment to add $100,000 to the Interstate Commerce Commission appropriation, which would bring the sum up to that requested by the Bureau of the Budget for that Commission. One hundred thousand dollars was deducted by the committee from some other of the Commission's activities. So I am going to let this Committee, as a whole, decide whether or not we should give the total budget request to the Interstate Commerce Commission and put the $100,000, which the committee deducted, in the place where it will do some good and help to alleviate the car shortage which I warn all of you will begin soon. It usually starts in the spring and this year there is no question about it, there is going to be the most disastrous car shortage in the history of America. With an additional 20 men in the field service the Interstate Commerce Commission could help that situation. I urge the members of the Committee to give consideration to this problem. I do hope that the amendment which I shall offer will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been adequately covered by those who have preceded me—by my colleagues

on the Democratic side and on the Republican side. I rise merely to make one or two observations. My first observation is to express my regret, as has been done by my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, and by those on the Republican side, over the loss of the ranking minority member of this committee, JOHN PHILLIPS. JOHN PHILLIPS has served seven terms in this body. He is now completing his 14th year. He came to this Congress in the 78th and he has stayed and been reelected ever since. He came to the Committee on Appropriations and was assigned to the Agricultural and Independent Offices Subcommittees back in the 80th Congress. So, for 10 years, he served on the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations. It was my pleasure to have served with him last year and this year. I want the membership of the House to know that it is an education to serve with one whose skill in questioning whose penetrating mind and knowledge of accounting have caused the Department heads of this Government, who come before our committee, to respect the membership on the committee. So I join with my colleagues on the committee, and with all of those in Congress, in expressing my regret that he is going to leave us at the end of this year. Of course, together with the rest of my colleagues, I wish his family and him happiness and health in the years to come. He has been a great Member of this Congress. The country has a right to be proud of him. His district has a right to be proud of him for the service he has given to the Congress over the past 14 years and the service he has given to our country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I recall the splendid years of service that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] gave to the farmers of the United States as a member of my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture. He was just as good a man there as he has been on your subcommittee, Mr. BOLAND, and I regret that the rules of the Committee on Appropriations made it inappropriate for the gentleman from California to serve on both subcommittees.

Mr. BOLAND. We only hope that we can get a man—or a woman—as good as the gentleman to succeed him from his district.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I dislike to horn in on something which appears to be exclusively a matter of the Committee on Appropriations, but I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without expressing my personal regret that JOHN PHILLIPS feels that he should retire from the Congress. He has been one of the bulwarks of strength here in this body. We all admire and respect him and have the deepest affection for him. We wish him all the success and prosperity and happiness to go with him in the future.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries approximately $6 billion to cover the budget requests of some 18 independent agencies and offices. A reading of the report accompanying the bill, I think, explains pretty emphatically the reasons why the committee came to its decisions on the requests that have been made by these various agencies and offices. In most instances the committee has recommended increases as compared with budget items for fiscal 1956. In many instances those items have been increased because of the increase in employees in many of the departments. That increase, the committee felt was justified because many departments had suffered backlogs in a great deal of the work. It was the feeling of the committee that those backlogs ought to be cleared up. The committee recommends to this Committee the adoption of our committee report so that the agencies and offices that are included in this bill can clean up many backlogs that have occurred in those departments. I specifically refer to the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission. When the Federal Communications Commission was before the Independent Offices Subcommittee I expressed some concern over the policy of the Federal communications system in relation to the treatment of home-town television stations. There is need for the Federal Communications Commission to adopt a policy which will protect home-town television stations. In the hearings before our committee the Commission indicated that it was looking into that matter.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to report to the Congress that the budget estimate for the Interstate Commerce Commission carries an increase of $1,779,000 over last year. All of us are concerned with the number of accidents that have recently occurred on some of the major railroads of the Nation. Your committee has earmarked specific funds for railroad safety and locomotive inspection work. It has granted the full amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for safety and has, in fact, increased the amount by $39,000.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the Members will be pleased with the action of the committee in a new item that appears in this year's budget. The amount of $435,000 has been allotted to accelerate in 1957 the program for the construction of chapel facilities at VA hospitals. This is a program that was delayed by the war and emergencies. Your committee feels that it is now time to start a planned program of providing adequate chapel buildings. At the present time, there are some 30 VA hospitals of all types that do not have separate and adequate facilities, 18 neuropsychiatric, 2 tuberculosis, 10 general medical and service.

In last year's hearings on this item, Administrator Higley and his staff indicated willingness to go forward with this program and have now come up with a planned program.

The great need for chapels in VA hospitals has been emphasized and reemphasized. In my judgment, the greatest need occurs in the neuropsychiatric hospitals. The vast majority of those confined are unable to get to any religious services in the churches in the towns where the hospitals are located. And, Mr. Chairman, there are few who will question the therapeutic value of religion. As has been noted by interested parties, psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers are doing a wonderful job in meeting the challenges of the mentally ill. But these people by themselves are not the answer. These people, plus religion, are the best answer we have today. I quote from a wonderful little brochure put out by the Committee for the Northampton Veterans' Hospital Memorial Chapel Fund:

> These patients must be given new ideals, new objectives, new motives, and new reasons. They must be given the opportunity to go to the Divine Psychiatrist, the Divine Physician. He must be given the opportunity to come to them. The human must be supplemented with the divine, a power greater than themselves. The natural must be supernaturalized. They must be given a new trust, a greater confidence, a real belief in God. They must be given a change of heart, a spiritual awakening, the explosive power of a new affection, a love of serving man—of serving God.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to pay tribute to the dedicated men and women in my locality who have joined with the many veterans organizations in Massachusetts in the common effort of presenting a planned program for a new chapel at the Northampton Veterans Hospital. The committee under the direction of Maj. Gen. Lunsford E. Oliver, Oscar Grife, Richard S. Holden, and Col. Leon Lavallee, officers of the campaign fund, and a host of volunteer workers have done a magnificent job in keeping the needed chapel before the public of western Massachusetts. Their endeavors resulted in the raising of more than $50,000 toward its construction. This committee by its action today clearly indicates its desire that the Veterans' Administration commence construction as soon as feasible. The ministers, rabbis, and priests that administer to the people in these hospitals have been laboring under a heavy load for many years without the necessary atmosphere or facilities for proper spiritual guidance. They are to be commended for the great work they have done and this committee is to be congratulated for providing the tools to lighten their load. I take some pride, too, Mr. Chairman, in assisting in getting this great new program started.

In conclusion, let me say it has been a pleasure for me to serve upon this committee. I respect the committee members. I have great respect for the chairman of this subcommittee, because almost always, upon the chairman of the subcommittee devolves the hard work. So it has devolved upon the strong and stalwart shoulders of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. He has handled the job magnificently, and I commend him for it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if this bill passes without amendment, the

House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may well begin to give consideration to disbanding and passing out of existence. There are a couple of legislative proposals in this appropriation bill that I would like to call attention to and I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a few questions concerning those proposals.

On page 18, line 14, we find this language:

> The Administrator is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place 10 positions, in addition to those otherwise authorized, in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by said act, and the salary of the Comptroller shall be at the salary rate of grade GS–18 so long as such position is occupied by the present incumbent.

I should like to ask the chairman why this language is in the bill?

Mr. THOMAS. That is a good question. We think it properly belongs in there for these reasons. The language provides for the allocation of 10 grade 16's and one 18 to the General Services Administration. The people to receive them are in charge of spending anywhere from $500 million to a billion dollars a year. The Civil Service Commission has positions in supergrades. I am not picking them out particularly, and I have no fault to find with them. But they have people over there who are 16's who do not handle 1 red cent of anybody's money. They are allocating the grades to these men who are spending $60, or $70, or $80 million a year. Perhaps they will give the General Services Administration some grades, but it was testified the GSA has been trying to work something out for over a year and the committee thought that was long enough.

In other words, it may go right back to that old proposition that the Civil Service Commission wanted left in this year, that a man's compensation, a man's earning capacity ought to be judged by the number of people working under him rather than the responsibility he carries. There is more to it than the mere number of people working under him.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman another question before he uses all my time.

Mr. THOMAS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. He asked me a question.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman if he does not think the General Services Administration should come to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the proper legislative committee, to get these additional supergrades?

Mr. THOMAS. No, because this committee has the responsibility for fund requirements in this field, and your committee has authorized positions and has the Civil Service Commission allocate the grades.

Mr. GROSS. But the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service should pass upon these supergrade positions that you are seeking here. Only last week our committee had a bill from the Pentagon asking for supergrades. They did not come to your committee, which has no legislative authority to grant these supergrades. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee is the proper committee for the General Services Administration to go to for an increase in supergrades, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. THOMAS. They have asked the Civil Service Commission for these grades time and time again and the Civil Service Commission did not grant them.

Mr. GROSS. It is possible the Civil Service Commission did not think they were entitled to get them.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be, but we disagree with them.

Mr. GROSS. All right; the gentleman has a right to disagree but this is the wrong way and the wrong place to settle his disagreement. An amendment will be introduced to knock it out, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the gentleman think that a grade 16 classification is too high for a man who is spending fifty, sixty, seventy, or one hundred millions of the taxpayers' money? If he does, I disagree with him.

Mr. GROSS. By the same token the Civil Service Commission has a responsibility in this matter, and the Civil Service Commission is in a position to assess the grades for different classfications of work and responsibility.

The net effect of this action by the gentleman's committee is to add 10 supergrade positions to those spaces already available to the Civil Service Commission. These supergrades should be taken out of the spaces the Civil Service now has available.

Mr. THOMAS. We did not tell them where to take them. They have 74 over there and they could certainly have taken them out of the 74.

Mr. GROSS. But you are getting them in this bill without regard to the allotment to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. THOMAS. They do not have to go beyond the 74 that have not been used.

Mr. GROSS. You are trying to add 10 more. The gentleman cannot deny that he is adding 10 more supergrades to the 74 presently available to the Civil Service Commission.

Now I want to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will yield first——

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. What we are doing is the sensible business-like thing. Here is a group of men who spend from two hundred to four or five hundred millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money of this country. We think it is good business to pay men with such responsibility a sufficient amount so that there is not going to be any question of defalcation. Does the gentleman get the point?

Mr. GROSS. But I remind the gentleman that this agency did not come to the House Civil Service and Post Office Committee for authority to increase the number of supergrades.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to ask the gentleman—or rather I want to say something to the gentleman and then ask him if he does not agree: This is really not new, this addition of grades. You see, we have a problem in the adjustment of grades between agencies. What we are trying to do is to equalize, rather than have people being paid less for greater responsibility and more work.

I think the serious thing, if I may say so to the gentleman from Iowa, is that we are losing some of our valuable top-grade people because of a little difference in grade, people in Agriculture, in General Services Administration, and other agencies. So the desire of this committee was not gratuitously to add grades but to make adjustments coincide with existing administrations, in order that we may keep people who are performing valuable services for us.

I have taken quite a lot of the gentleman's time. I will yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from California a question. Why is it that this agency did not come to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House and ask for these supergrades?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I suspect the people who would have had to come would have been the members of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices because it is the Subcommittee on Independent Offices that has been trying to work out this adjustment. It may surprise the gentleman when I say that this originated in our committee as a matter of justice and of economy and not on a request from somebody to have a salary raised.

Mr. GROSS. I question the economy part of it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas, who is the ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think it is interesting to note that a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee would talk about going before the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service of the House. It would seem to me if there are additional classifications needed or these new employees are required the agency itself ought to know where to go to ask for these additional employees at a higher salary.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is still one more reason why this thing ought to be knocked out.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am going to ask another question if I may. With all respect to the committee, and I have great respect for the committee, why did you not do it? Why did you not make these adjustments that are in the bill?

Mr. GROSS. So far as I know, the agency never asked for an increase in the number of supergrades.

Mr. PHILLIPS. You only adjust agencies to protect the Government when somebody comes up and asks you for a raise in salary?

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that you increase appropriations in your committee without any request on the part of any agency or department of Government?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think we could.

Mr. GROSS. There is no question about that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If we think it is to the best interest of the Government.

Mr. GROSS. Is that the ordinary procedure of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, it is not the ordinary procedure of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think it is the ordinary procedure of any committee of Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are a little far afield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. We sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do. The gentleman is a level-headed Member; he is for economy, and we are agreeing with him. Look at pages 835, 836, 837, and 838 of the hearings. You will find it was testified that they asked the Civil Service Commission to allocate these grades and the Civil Service Commission did not do it, yet they have 74 unallocated positions right at this very moment. I mean they did at 10 o'clock this morning because that is the last time I talked with them. So we think we are saving money by protecting the taxpayers. These men spend tremendous sums. Think of that. In connection with stockpiling, they get into the billions of dollars. It makes sense, and I think my friend is going to agree with us.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say that my information this morning from the staff of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House is that the Civil Service Commission never has had a request that a GS–18 grade be established for the Comptroller. The information was given to me this morning that the General Services Administration never has made a request.

Mr. THOMAS. I was not present when any conversations took place or when any letters were written, so it is hearsay. But if the gentleman will turn to the pages in the hearings on the Independent Offices bill I mentioned he will find the testimony is in there that they have been working with the Civil Service Commisison for over a year and have not been making much progress, but maybe I am imposing too much on the gentleman's time.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee another question. Why is this language in the bill, and I refer to line 24, page 43, which is part of section 302. The pertinent language is as follows:

Provided, That any requirement of law for compulsory retirement from the competitive civil service solely because of age shall not be effective.

Why do you want to wipe out the 70-year limit in civil service, if I may ask the chairman?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman asked a good question, and I think he is entitled to a good answer. It has been testified by the medical world that since 1900 the longevity of men has increased 20 years; that of women has increased 22 years; that in 1950 there were 12.5 million men and women in this country over 65 years of age, and in 1970 there will be around 20 to 22 million. So, we think that age ought not to be a bar to employment for the man or woman who is mentally able and physically able to carry on.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman hold any hearings on this proposal? Was any representative of any employee group, that would be vitally affected by this proposal, given an opportunity to present his views?

Mr. THOMAS. Everybody is vitally affected by it.

Mr. GROSS. Well, did you hold any hearings on this proposal?

Mr. THOMAS. We have talked about it. The distinguished gentleman from Kansas objected to this language last year, or similar language, when it was not protected by a rule and it was stricken from the bill. It was later inserted as a general provision in the form of a limitation on the expenditure of funds. You are not plowing in any virgin field by any means.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say I was, but it is in this bill, and the record shows that you did not hold any hearings on this very important proposition. You held no hearings at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been explained and discussed to the point where I feel that I probably cannot make any real contribution. However, I would just like to point out that it covers a great deal of money that will be paid by the taxpayers. The Veterans' Administration will get something close to $5 billion, $4,720,715,800, to be exact. Of course, it renders a very great service in the Nation and it is a very great responsibility that this committee and the Congress has in providing appropriations for the millions of veterans and their dependents. I think it ought to be said at this time that this committee over the past number of years, has struggled with the question of veterans' benefits and pensions in cooperation with those in the executive departments of the Government, particularly the head of the Veterans' Administration, to the point where I believe a better understanding has grown up between the veterans and the committee and the Members of this Congress that appropriated the funds. I think it is the consensus of the opinion of the members of this committee that due to the efforts of Mr. Higley and those in charge of the veterans organizations, men who are dedicated to the service of a very big and difficult job that Mr. Higley and Mr. Patterson and others working with him are doing just about as good a job as they can do under the laws that the Congress has written, considering the great responsibility they have before them. I make mention of this because it may be some comfort to the veterans and their dependents throughout the Nation that their affairs are being so well administered, and that those who are administering the affairs of the veterans have the humanitarian touch, and sympathy for the veteran in this great work.

There was a matter of some little controversy before our committee, one in which we were not all in complete agreement. However, being a junior member of this committee, I have tried not to make myself obnoxious by opposing the views of some of the leaders of this committee. It is this: We have in this bill an increase to the civil service retirement fund, above the request of the Bureau of the Budget, of $305 million. Having just listened to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the ranking minority member of this committee, I believe from his explanation, that it would be just as well, and in my judgment better for the taxpayers of the Nation, if we did not increase that fund by $305 million above the request of the Bureau of the Budget. I must agree with his very persuasive argument that about all we should do now, without regard to the good work of the Kaplan committee which simply told us how we could and should do it if we wanted to get it done more quickly, is to provide the increase submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, until we get the budget balanced to the point where we have a few billion dollars ahead, that we could set aside in a trust fund a certain amount to pay more rapidly our obligation into the civil service retirement fund.

I rather have the hope when this bill goes over to the other body, that they will take into consideration the fact that this item will impose upon the taxpayers an additional $305 million obligation, and I am sure they will carefully weigh that fact to the point where I hope in their wisdom they will strike out the $305 million of excess above the budget request.

Out of the 17 agencies of Government for which this bill appropriates funds, with respect to 15 of them, we made either a slight or a very substantial reduction below the request submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. I was glad to see our chairman take the lead on that, because I think we have been too complacent in the matter of spending. I think we ought to be more watchful and try to reduce the cost of every department of the Government where it can be done without doing violence to the service that department is supposed to render to the people.

As I say, in 15 instances we made reductions, so that, were it not for the excessive increase to the civil-service retirement fund, your committee would have brought a bill to this House which would have reflected a reduction under the request of the Bureau of the Budget by about $84 million.

I think we must be a little more careful than we have been as Members of Congress to be on the economy side of these appropriations.

Now a word about our genial and able colleague, Mr. PHILLIPS. I would like to say that I think no one regrets more than I do—and that feeling is shared, I am sure, by all Members of this Congress who have known our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]—that this will be his last term as a Mem-

ber of the Congress. He came here when I did in the 78th Congress. He came here with a background of accountancy and research and business experience that equipped him splendidly for the tremendous task and the excellent service he has rendered to this Congress and to the Government.

He is a gentleman of the highest integrity, pleasant, always calmly doing his day's work with a friendly smile for everyone, always willing to give one the best advice he can when the younger Members come to him, or some of us older Members. He has rendered a great service and made a lasting contribution to our Government. His place will be hard to fill, and he will be missed by all of us.

With the other Members who have spoken with reference to his concluding his work in this Congress, may I say that it has been a rare privilege to know him and work with him and to have gained, I hope, his lasting friendship, so that as we here will have pleasant memories of him in the future, he will think pleasantly of us, and days he served with us, in this, the greatest legislative body in the world.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, at the time I spoke earlier in the debate, I inadvertently omitted stating the pleasure and satisfaction I have found in serving with the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for these many years on this subcommittee. I know few people in the House with the ability and the capacity to analyze the intricate problems of the Appropriations Committee as the gentleman from California. I want at this time to extend to him my feeling of gratitude for the privilege and pleasure of having served on the committee with him. I wish him well, I wish him good health for many more years to come, and I hope he will come back and visit us frequently.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF].

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article from the Des Moines (Iowa) Register.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I recently had occasion to give some attention to governmental problems in the Virgin Islands. I found that there were a number of very serious matters which deserve congressional attention. Among them are a severe water shortage, costly and inequitable deficiencies in the real estate assessment program, inadequacies in tax collections, and uncertainties arising from the approaching termination of the charter of the Virgin Islands Corporation. A sound and diversified agriculture, accompanied by an adequate loan program, is also sorely needed.

A considerable amount of unrest and confusion arose as the result of President Eisenhower's selection of an outside political appointee, Mr. Archie A. Alexander, to fill the position of the island's Governor. Everyone seems to agree that this gentleman, who had made an enviable reputation in business, unfortunately did not have the temperament or governmental experience to gain, from the citizens of the islands the confidence and support he needed. His resignation was accepted in August 1955. In happy contrast, the present Governor, Mr. Walter A. Gordon, has had long experience in government and in working with people. He strikes me as being exceptionally able, and I believe he will have the confidence and cooperation of the islanders. I certainly wish him the best of success in working out the difficult problems which face him.

Some very serious charges were made against former Governor Alexander in connection with the bidding for a construction contract on the island of St. Thomas. An article which appeared in the Des Moines Register for February 26, 1956, now alleges that the high officials in the Interior Department not only failed to have the charges investigated thoroughly but also that they diverted the FBI from investigating them. It is said that the Interior Department's top officials quietly eased Mr. Alexander out under the guise of a resignation for health reasons. The true reasons were concealed from the public.

I must say that this action is completely typical of President Eisenhower's top Interior Department appointees. These are the same men who issued 54 oil and gas leases on fish and wildlife reserves while they told the public that a stop order was in effect; who changed their electric power line regulations in accordance with an anonymous document, quietly delivered by a registered lobbyist for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.; and who hid a vital Attorney General's opinion in a safe, while they tried to trick a group of rural electric cooperatives into voluntarily accepting a utility company contract condemned in the suppressed opinion.

Obviously, such activities are very harmful to the public interest and are destroying public confidence in the Department of the Interior. Unfortunately for Mr. Alexander, who merely, and perhaps mistakenly, followed the suggestions of those officials, when such concealments are uncovered, as they inevitably must be, all persons involved become suspect, even though this may or may not have been avoided by a full disclosure of the facts at the time.

The Des Moines Register article follows:

STUDY ALEXANDER'S ROLE IN VIRGIN ISLANDS ROAD PROJECT

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The handling of a Government road construction contract by Archie A. Alexander, former Governor of the Virgin Islands, is under study by a House Government operations subcommittee.

Some Virgin Islands officials are pressing for a public hearing on circumstances surrounding a bid submitted on the Virgin Island waterfront roadway by a firm that included some former business associates of Alexander from Iowa.

Alexander, a Des Moines contractor, resigned last August 10.

Clarence R. Davis, Under Secretary of the Interior, said an investigation involving serious accusations was under study by him at the time Alexander resigned.

CALLED TO WASHINGTON

Davis said he called Alexander to Washington last August 9, and questioned him about the bidding on the road contract.

"He was never asked to resign in so many words," Davis said. "I told him he was in trouble public relationswise down there."

Alexander said Saturday the accusations involve wild stories and rumors. He said he himself instigated the rejection of the disputed contract.

Davis, D. Oatis Beasley, administrative assistant to Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, and Anthony T. Lausi, director of the office of Territories, all handled some aspect of the case.

DISCOUNT CHARGES

They said they had a tendency to discount some of the charges because of the general dislike of Alexander among the Virgin Islands people.

Beasley said that if Alexander had not resigned, the Interior Department would have conducted a thorough investigation.

The matter was called to the attention of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee headed by Senator Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas.

Beasley said he assured both of these groups that the Interior Department was looking into the matter, and that the Department was allowed to handle it in its own way.

"This matter was never thoroughly investigated," Beasley said. "We decided no useful purpose would be served. The contracts had been canceled, so no one profited. It didn't appear that anything could be accomplished."

DES MOINES MEN

Beasley said "friends of Alexander from Des Moines" formed the Caribbean Heavy Construction & Equipment Co. of the Virgin Islands in January 1955.

According to the files of the Interior Department, the president of the firm is G. G. Herrick. He and E. A. Kramme, also of Des Moines, owned all but one share of stock in the firm.

The one share was owned by James W. Hall, of Des Moines, secretary of the corporation.

Davis said Kramme and Herrick both said they were former business associates of Alexander.

Kramme is vice president and treasurer of the Bridge Co., and also operates the E. A. Kramme Co., Inc., both located at 5770 Second Avenue, Des Moines.

Herrick has been out of the active construction business for several years. He is president of the G. G. Herrick Paving Co., 303 New York Avenue, Des Moines.

DENIES COLLUSION

Davis said Alexander denied any collusive arrangements with them in connection with their low bid of $445,000 on nearly a mile of waterfront roadway behind a newly constructed seawall at Charlotte Amalie on the island of St. Thomas.

Some officials on the Virgin Islands have been pressing for public hearings on the road contract and other matters in Alexander's regime.

Leader of this group is Senator Earle B. Ottley. He headed a citizens' committee that was highly critical of Alexander throughout his 16 months as governor.

Last December, Ottley appeared in Washington at an informal hearing before Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of a House Government Operations subcommittee. He complained about the waterfront roadway contract and other matters. These are now under study by CHUDOFF'S staff.

THE PROJECT

Interior Department spokesmen and records give these details on the waterfront roadway affair:

On March 14, 1955, the Virgin Islands government asked for bids on the road construction project.

There were two bidders: The firm operated by Alexander's former associates, and Caribbean Engineering Co., headed by Robert E. Newlin of Puerto Rico.

On May 18 the bids were opened. Newlin's bid was $495,000, the Des Moines group's $445,000.

HEARS COMPLAINT

Lausi was in the islands at that time. Newlin complained to him that there were irregularities in the bid submitted by Caribbean Heavy Construction & Equipment Co.

Newlin related that he had sought to get authority to purchase native crushed rock through the Virgin Islands government and that both Alexander and the public works commissioner had turned down his request.

Newlin said his bid was therefore submitted on the theory that the crushed rock would have to be brought in from the outside.

However, he said he learned later that Alexander's former associates had been given assurance that they could obtain crushed rock through the Virgin Islands government.

GOVERNMENT MACHINES

Another charge by Newlin was that his competitor was to be allowed to rent government equipment to perform the contract. He charged this was an unfair advantage.

He added that Alexander asked him if he would be interested in a subcontract "if my friends" got the roadway contract.

Newlin contended he could have underbid the midwestern group if he had been granted the same concessions.

He claimed there were sufficient irregularities in the bids submitted by the Des Moines group to warrant disqualifying that group.

On May 31, Lausi wired Alexander, asking that all information connected with the contract be forwarded to Washington immediately.

UNUSUAL ANGLES

Lausi and Beasley said the bid by the Des Moines group showed the following discrepancies from approved contract procedure:

The bid had figures crossed out and changed, and there were no initials to indicate whether this took place before or after the bid was submitted.

The required affidavit that there was no collusion in the contract was not notarized.

There were no statements on the qualifications of the contractors, nor was there a financial statement.

The bid failed to carry a total figure as required. The big guaranty was by a bonding company not registered to do business in the Virgin Islands.

Nine of the itemized bid figures were identical with figures used by the firm drawing the specifications. The Newlin bid had only one figure that was identical.

On June 13, Herrick, as president of Caribbean Heavy Construction & Equipment Co., executed an affidavit stating that "such bid is genuine and not collusive." This affidavit was notarized.

TEN THOUSAND, TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS IN BANK

Herrick also executed a financial statement which said the corporation had $10,250 in the Virgin Islands National Bank, and that he and Kramme were pledged to put up $50,000 each to carry out the contract.

The Interior Department, however, decided that all bids should be discarded because of irregularities.

Lausi said Newlin's bid was a little higher than the amount authorized for the project.

At the hearings on his nomination, Alexander was questioned about his business interests in the Caribbean area.

He related that he had helped organize American Caribbean Contracting Co., and added:

"It is our intent not to bid on any work in that vicinity during my incumbency of office, if I am confirmed."

Davis said Saturday that the law dealing with the Virgin Islands was changed after Alexander became governor early in 1954.

The change in the law increased the power of the governor, and gave him final authority in awarding contracts except for such cases where protests were filed with the Department of the Interior.

Beasley said the problems involving the waterfront road-way bids were not called to the attention of Secretary of the Interior McKay until after Alexander's resignation.

ALEXANDER IN CAPITAL

Alexander said Saturday that he has now returned to active management in the firm of Alexander & Repass, and is at work in Washington, D. C., on two large contracts—a $2-million contract to widen Key Bridge and construction of a water reservoir for the Corps of Army Engineers.

The 67-year-old contractor stated that he was associated with Herrick and Kramme in the American Caribbean Contracting Co., but is not associated with them in any business ventures at the present time.

He stated that American Caribbean Contracting Co. was dissolved "about 2 or 3 years ago," and that he has had no business connections with Herrick or Kramme since then.

Alexander said he had urged Herrick and Kramme to make bids on Virgin Islands contracts when he was governor.

However, he stated that Caribbean Heavy Construction was only 1 of 81 firms he had asked to go into the Virgin Islands, and that only 2 firms responded to his request.

"I wanted to get a lot of firms in there to bid, and I wanted to do something to build up that country," Alexander said.

"LOT OF WILD STORIES"

Alexander characterized Newlin's accusations as "not worth denying."

"There were a lot of wild stories flying around down there, just because some friends of mine came down and made a low bid," Alexander said. "I never saw such a place for rumors."

Alexander said "the bids were rejected for irregularities and I was the instigator of that rejection."

Alexander stated that Newlin had never talked to him to get authority to obtain native crushed rock through the government to use on the waterfront roadway.

Asked if the Virgin Islands government had given the Des Moines group the right to purchase crushed rock through the government, Alexander said: "Not to my knowledge. They never talked to me about it."

"This thing is all over and I don't think I want to make any further comment about it," he concluded.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] 5 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, certainly I want to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to JOHN PHILLIPS. He is a man who has exercised sound and good judgment in the problems concerning the finances of his country at all times, and we are going to miss him.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great committee. I do not know the total amount of this bill, but it covers practically every phase of the economic life of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the floor to speak for a few moments about the stockpiling program about which I have been a little bit concerned recently.

Public Law 520 requires the submission of a stockpiling report to the Congress semiannually—presumably in January and June of each year.

The January 1–June 1, 1955, stockpile report was submitted to the Committee on Armed Services in November of 1955. The June 1955–January 1956 report has not yet been submitted to the Congress. The classified portion of the report is prepared by the General Services Administration and it is now at the printers. After the classified report has been prepared by General Services Administration, it is referred to the Office of Defense Mobilization for transmittal to the Congress. In the meantime the Office of Defense Mobilization prepares the unclassified portion of the report. That is now in the process of being prepared and checked by the Office of Defense Mobilization, but has not yet been submitted to the printers. It is now in its final form, however, and should go to the printers in the very near future.

The classified portion will probably be available to the Congress within the next 2 weeks, and the unclassified portion should be available in about the same period of time.

I want to speak just to this particular part of the problem. In reading the questioning of the great chairman of this committee on the matter of stockpiling, we have carried out what is called a support program for 4 or 5 different items in the stockpile. Of course, questions might arise as to what we are paying for commodities; whether it is tungsten or magnesium or whatever it is. Based on world markets, our support prices for some of these strategic metals look out of line, but here is what you are facing in the West particularly. I am much concerned with it, but you people in the West should be concerned with it. If you will go into these things in detail you will find a tremendous sum of money obligated for the next 10 or 15 or 20 years for contracts we have with people offshore; and here we sit and will not give any domestic producer of metals in this country anything beyond a 5-year contract. Now, as of today, there is a restriction in the Department, the Air Force, that only 7 percent of tungsten can be used in the propulsion of a jet engine. That is perfectly ridiculous, because Russia today has no limitation on it, and I am told on good authority that 50 percent of their propulsion jet engines is composed of tungsten, the highest temperature-resisting metal known in the world. Why should we have such things as that I cannot see, because it should not be true.

We are moving into these metals, titanium, cobalt, molybdenum, and they have to be in our stockpiles. They say your stockpile is full one day and empty the next, and that does not make sense. Whenever they want to adjust it up or down somebody says, "The stockpile is full." I think this Congress has a right

to know some of these things and the reasons for it.

We are moving into an age where it is going to require every high-resisting metal we have got in this world, and to put ourselves in a position where we are giving 5-, 10-, and 20-year contracts to outsiders—I do not like to be called an isolationist, and I am not, but I am calling attention to the fact that we have got to be very careful because every program we have got goes out of existence in the next 6 months. We have got to do something about these things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, my first criticism as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House is one I have pointed out before on similar legislation. It is that this Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to legislate in an appropriation bill. Not only that, but its leadership has gone before the Rules Committee and secured a rule waiving all points of order. I do not say it has no right to do it. I say it is not, in my opinion, the proper way in which to propose legislation of this kind. I feel this great Committee on Appropriations for which I have great respect is going out of the bounds of its jurisdiction.

The committee knows quite well that some of these provisions would be subject to a point of order except for the rule I have mentioned.

The Appropriations Committee of the House does not hold public hearings on any of the legislation before it. This is a further reason why you ought not to legislate on this kind of a bill. Amendments will be submitted, striking out certain portions of this bill. I am asking you to give those amendments the consideration to which they are entitled. I think you will agree that both of them ought to be accepted.

If accepted they will strike out provisions that do not belong in this proposed measure.

The gentleman from Iowa has just called your attention to the proposal on page 18, line 14, of the bill, where this agency is being provided with additional supergrades. The fact of the matter is, so far as I know—and I have not missed any committee hearings—so far as I know there has never been any request from this agency to our committee for these additional grades.

The testimony referred to today was taken about 60 days ago. We have a new administrator of that agency now. I believe if the chairman of this committee would talk to the new head of the agency he would be advised that he is in no hurry about these supergrades. I think he would find that there are presently in the control of the Civil Service Commission some unfilled positions. Furthermore, the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has recently approved legislation that grants a number of additional supergrades.

For these reasons this particular feature ought to be taken out of the bill.

The other matter to which the gentleman from Iowa directed attention is found on page 43, section 302, and has to do with the question of continuing employees in service after they reach age 70. A good deal was said in this report about how unfortunate it is today that these people have to be separated from the service when they reach age 70. The fact of the matter is there are but few people who are separated from the service because they reach age 70.

An amendment will be offered to strike that provision from the bill.

I think the Members know that mandatory dismissal applies to those who have had at least 15 years' service and are 70 years of age.

Incidentally this measure provides the only people included are those under civil-service control. There are a number of Government employees not included: The FBI, for example, is not in the bill, and the CIA is also left out. There are a number of others.

There is no great emergency for including these provisions in the bill we are considering today. Both these matters are being considered or will be considered by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I feel sure the House does not want to follow the policy of permitting the Committee on Appropriations to propose legislation that has never been considered by a legislative committee.

I appreciate the very deep interest of the members of this great committee in these problems; I appreciate the interest of the Members of the House, but I do think these two items especially ought to be stricken from the bill and let them be taken care of in the regular order of legislation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In spite of my regard and respect for the gentleman I hope such action is not taken. These matters were put in the bill for practical reasons. We had no desire to assume legislative powers, but we have tried to meet some exceedingly difficult problems.

If the gentleman will direct his mind to the fact we are not creating new jobs, that we are adjusting jobs between agencies of Government, so that there is a fairness in the same kind of work being done in different agencies, and more than that, the agencies which were deficient in their higher categories are those which have the greatest responsibility and spend the greatest money. I say to the gentleman from Kansas, this is not strictly a new idea. The gentleman will agree that there would not have been a possibility of doing it rapidly enough to get it in effect before this appropriation bill. Does the gentleman see what I mean? So, perhaps, the gentleman will be tolerant and agree that the best interests of the United States and the best interests of the taxpayers are served if we let it go and have it done this way. We dislike just as much as he does the idea of legislation in an appropriation bill, but sometimes that seems to be the best way to do it from the standpoint of both the employees and the taxpayers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas wants to be just as tolerant as the very distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. He is a great legislator. However, if this were an emergency and necessary, as has been suggested, then the least this particular agency could have done was to come before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. But that has not occurred. Yet our committee has been holding hearings on this subject matter within the last week or 2 weeks where any agency could come before it and express its views in regard to this matter or any other problem that had to do with a need for additional employees at higher rates. They had that opportunity. They have not been there. No such request has been made before our committee. I do not criticize any agency for not making its wants known. I do say if there was such emergency as has been described today, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service would have been glad to hear such agency. If they could justify the need, I am sure our committee would have approved their request.

I would like to add there is no occasion for going around the Civil Service Commission, as you would do if you pass this legislation without amendment. My experience is that the Civil Service Commission has always been fair in dealing with allocations in supergrades.

Mr. Chairman, all we ask you to do is to permit the legislation to come on the floor of the House in its regular order where it may be debated and considered to find out whether we need these additional grades. Maybe you will decide after you hear the testimony and the arguments that you do not want them. You may decide you may want more. But do not say, we are not going to consider the Civil Service Commission, we are not going to permit this matter to be heard by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Let us not get a little too far afield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not want to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We cannot say, if we wanted to, that we are going to do so. All we can say is that this is a recommendation to the Congress of the United States in this bill, this is what we think ought to be done, and let me say to the gentleman from Kansas maybe both committees were a little bit to blame. Maybe we should have called on you, although I do not recall the gentleman having come to us and saying that we were doing anything about a situation which he says we should have known about. Let us not penalize the employee for the fault of either the gentleman's committee or my committee. Let us put this through, then let the gentleman's committee offer some legislation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is no occasion for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House to appear before the Appropriations Committee on matters of this kind. Here is the place to try out the issue. If this committee says, in this case, we are going to go around the Civil Service Commission, we will approve this legislation, we are going around the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, let us make plain what we are doing. I do not think it is the best way to do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the House in all good faith and humility that certainly I have nothing but the greatest admiration for my distinguished friend from Kansas. He has done a tremendous job in this House. He is the ranking minority member on this distinguished committee. When he is chairman he does a fine job, and when he is the ranking minority member he still does a fine job.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman. He is more than kind.

Mr. THOMAS. We need more men like him. May I remind my distinguished friend of just one fact? In that great committee that he is privileged of being the chairman quite often, you do not allocate certain numbers of jobs to an agency. Of course you do not. You put a ceiling on the number of jobs that the Civil Service Commission can allocate—the Commission, not your committee. You do not want to get mixed up in all of that. You say to the Civil Service Commission, "We are going to give you 1,000 jobs. Now, you allocate them." That is your function, is it not? So, you do not expect X agency to come to your distinguished committee and say "I want 10 jobs or 14 or 15 or 16." You say "Go to the Civil Service Commission. They do the allocating." Is not that the way it works?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, excepting this——

Mr. THOMAS. Well, then, where is the argument?

Mr. REES of Kansas. But it is the Civil Service Commission that ought to know where these jobs should be allocated.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise today to offer criticism of the distinguished subcommittee which brings this bill before the House. That is a great committee; they do a great job, and I appreciate their fine work this year, as I do every year. But, in this bill they have placed two provisions which do invade the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and these two provisions should not be in this bill. I am asking this House now and this Committee of the Whole to favorably vote upon the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] which will be offered on page 18 so far as these supergrade positions are concerned and the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] which will be offered on page 43 of the bill to strike out that provision which would eliminate the mandatory retirement provision at the age of 70.

Now, I am sure, and I appreciate the fact that this subcommittee has acted in good faith in both of these instances, but so far as these supergrade positions are concerned, they are mistaken about some of the statements that have been made. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], who is the ranking minority member, have said that this does not create new positions. Well, they do create new positions. The language of the bill itself on page 18 provides that—

> The Administrator is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place 10 positions, in addition to those otherwise authorized, in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by said act,

Now, he has referred to the fact that on page 836 the claim was made that this agency had gone before the Civil Service Commission and had been told that they did not have the positions to allocate. Well, that is true. That is found on page 837. So, it is obvious that these positions will not be charged against the number that have already been authorized for the Civil Service Commission, and you might as well forget about the statement that this will not create new positions. It will.

Now, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is the committee to hold hearings on this and to determine whether or not these additional positions are needed. That is where the study should be made. As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] so eloquently pointed out, the Appropriations Committee does not hold public hearings and in both these instances, nobody, no witness had an opportunity to be heard on either side of these questions. They say they do not have the time to come before our committee. There is not nearly so great an emergency, not nearly so great a need for supergrade positions in the General Services Administration as there is in the Department of Defense; and yet last week our committee, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held hearings at the request of the Department of Defense and granted new supergrade positions in the number of 285. And certainly no one could say that there is a greater emergency in the General Services Administration for supergrade positions than there is in the Department of Defense. But yet, as I say, at the request of the Department of Defense we held hearings, the bill has already been passed out by the committee and is on the way to the floor of the House granting those positions. Our committee would be glad to follow the same procedure with respect to the General Services Administration or any other agency of the Government that really needs new supergrade positions.

Do not tie our hands with this sort of thing. I wish I had more time to discuss in greater detail these questions. I am sure I could convince the Members that there is no need to bypass the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and to take this roundabout method of creating new positions. That is our jurisdiction. Let us have it until we prove unfaithful to our responsibility. Then take it away from us.

With reference to this provision on page 43 respecting mandatory retirement at age 70, our committee has been waiting for some time for the Kaplan Committee report dealing with all phases of retirement, so that we could hold proper hearings and take whatever action the facts justified. The Senate committee is now holding hearings on the subject of retirement. Why follow this hurry-up method when, if you look at pages 141, 142 and 143 of the hearings you will see that the only questions which were asked during the hearings of this committee were in closed session and with no witnesses subpenaed to talk on the subject of retirement; they were simply incidental questions when the subject came up incidentally. It is an important subject. People want to be heard on both sides of it. Why not leave it open and let the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service hold open hearings, invite interested people there to testify on both sides of this question and then give the proper committee the opportunity to come up with the answer, whatever the facts show the answer should be.

Those are the questions, Mr. Chairman; and I join my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. REES] and my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] in asking that the House simply give to our committee the jurisdiction that belongs to it as long as we are here and willing to perform those services to the best of our ability.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, as a junior member of this distinguished subcommittee, I should like first of all to pay tribute to the members of the committee, particularly the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

I have been in legislative work for a good many years, but I know of no work and no association that has been more pleasant than my work as a member of this subcommittee on appropriations for the independent offices, first by virtue of the importance of the work and the variety of agencies with which we deal, but also because of the pleasant associations and the spirit and determination of each and every member. I may say that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has been very courteous and very helpful. He has been diligent and untiring in his effort in connection with the development of important facts and background essentials to the proper consideration of the budget covering all of these agencies.

I want to take just a moment to join all of you in your tribute to that distinguished member of this committee who has announced his retirement. I am referring to our colleague and my

good friend, Mr. PHILLIPS, of California. I might say in a personal way that I knew JOHN PHILLIPS before he came to Congress. I knew him as a State legislator. I knew him when he was in the California legislature and represented that State as I did New York in the work of the Councils of State Governments and in the associations among the States. He was a devoted public servant then and made an enviable contribution to State government. I am sure we will miss him here in Washington and in the Congress.

I can say to you that no Member of this House has been more helpful to me during my membership in this House than has JOHN PHILLIPS. Since I have been on the Independent Offices Subcommittee, Mr. PHILLIPS has gone out of his way to coach me, so as to give me a better insight into the history of these agencies and their general functions. He has been very understanding, and above all he has been very patient. I am indebted to JOHN PHILLIPS, and shall always respect his fine principles and his contribution to good government here in Washington and in our Nation.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I say that we people of Pennsylvania like JOHN PHILLIPS, and are sorry to lose him. We have not forgotten the kind help he has given and the interest he has shown in the redevelopment of our city of Pittsburgh.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this independent offices appropriation bill embraces some 17 important agencies of our Government. These agencies cut across many facets and many functions of our Government, functions which directly affect our American people. Association on this subcommittee gives you a slight insight into the tremendous operations that go on within the Government of the United States. For example, we have within this appropriation the important agency known as the Veterans' Administration.

Just what does this bill do? It provides some $6 billion for all of these functions and all of these agencies as compared with $5,898,000,000 last year, an increase of $107 million. Actually the total increase, I believe, is $221 million, but that $221 million carries with it the payment of $600 million which is an increase of $305 million for the civil-service retirement fund. All in all, the agencies have been reasonably economical and have not requested any substantial increases.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The money for the disability fund is something that has to be spent because it has been authorized. That is not an increase but is merely paying a debt.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is true. Of course, it is an obligation and the money has to be paid when it is due.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, it has to be paid when it is due.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I think what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has in mind is veterans' disability. I was referring to the retirement fund for civil service employees.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was under the impression that the gentleman was discussing the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. OSTERTAG. No, I was speaking primarily of $305 million increase in the payments to the civil service retirement and disability fund. Perhaps, I should have said the retirement and disability fund rather than just disability fund.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am very glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand the Veterans' Administration is fairly well satisfied with the appropriation. Can the gentleman inform me about that? I thought that this bill was coming up tomorrow and I have not had a chance to study it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield so that I may answer the gentlewoman, may I say that this has nothing to do with compensation for veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, I know but you have an appropriation for that in this bill.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentlewoman was asking about the provisions for the Veterans' Administration. I think you will be interested to know, for example, that there is an increase of some $20 million in hospital and domiciliary facilities. There is an increase of $147 million for readjustment benefits. There is an increase of $43,900,000 in inpatient care as compared to previous years. Most of the money going into the Veterans' Administration are obligations which have to be met depending upon the estimated amount needed to meet the obligation of the Government in connection with veterans' benefits and services.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In other words, the money is committed.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I believe it is fair to state that of the $4.720 billion for veterans most of that amount covers statutory obligations. The committee has providing everything requested by the VA. May I say that I believe the Veterans' Administration has done an excellent job in reorganizing and reestablishing the Administration. The Veterans' Administration has been fair and equitable in its figures as to what the needs will be. I believe the committee can say to you with some degree of assurance that these adjustments are in good order and should provide a balanced program this year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We are having a great many complaints about some of the cuts in some of the offices. But, I will take that up with the Veterans' Administration and ask some questions about that later, if I may.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I should like in the remaining moments to make reference to the civil defense program. I think the membership of the House might be interested in the fact that the Civil Defense Administration requested $123,200,000. The committee has allowed $86,100,000. But, that increase is about $17,425,000 over the amount appropriated a year ago. There is much that might be said about our civil defense program. There is much that might be said about what their requirements might be. Funds have been made available for disaster relief through the emergency program of the President. I am confident that these new funds available to the Civil Defense Administration will be sufficient to meet their needs in recognizing that we have long since passed the time for carrying on our civil defense activities on a World War I or World War II basis. I hope that these general recommendations of the committee without regard to the civil service and retirement features will receive the hearty approval of the membership.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DORN of New York. The gentleman mentioned that there was an increase in funds for the domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Was any of that money earmarked for a particular hospital or is it just a general increase?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I believe, if the gentleman will refer to the report of the committee, the gentleman will find there certain information.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is the gentleman talking about construction?

Mr. DORN of New York. I was talking about the statement made by the gentleman with reference to the increase in funds for the domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration hospitals in reply to a question asked of the gentleman by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I do not believe the gentlewoman from Massachusetts inquired as to any specific funds.

Mr. DORN of New York. She did not but in answer the gentleman did mention that there were additional hospital funds, domiciliary care funds, for the Veterans' Administration hospitals. I wonder if the gentleman could enlarge on that subject?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Perhaps this will answer the gentleman from New York by referring to page 19 of the committee's report under subsection "Hospital and domiciliary facilities":

> The committee has approved the budget estimate of $47 million for the program of construction, replacement, rehabilitation, and modernization of veterans' hospitals. In addition to the budget program the committee has added $2 million for technical services to start the complete renovation of the hospital at McKinney, Tex., and has included $1,500,000 for technical services to rehabilitate the hospital at Nashville, Tenn., which would otherwise be the first project to be started in the 1958 rehabilitation program.

Mr. DORN of New York. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman, but in the conversation he had with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], I understood that a large increase in domiciliary funds was being

awarded to the Veterans' Administration, and I was particularly interested in it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is true. There is a substantial increase. Under "Hospital and domiciliary facilities," we have provided in this bill $50,935,000, which is $20,935,000 over a year ago, and $3,935,000 more than the budget request.

Mr. DORN of New York. The question I originally asked now comes to the fore again. Are any of these funds particularly allocated to individual hospitals or is it to the overall general hospital program?

Mr. OSTERTAG. It is the overall general program, except as I specified in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take up the time of the Committee, but in view of some of the statements that are made in the report, and my concern with reference to the housing program, both so far as the Federal Housing Administration is concerned, as well as the Veterans' Housing program, I was particularly anxious to ask a couple of questions of members of the committee.

For the past several months in my area on the west coast we have had a considerable backlog of work, apparently in the office of the FHA in San Francisco. I believe in October or November the figure was some 6,000 cases in backlog. I note where testimony was given before the committee that the workload at present is current. Unfortunately, that is not the story that the FHA gives us on the coast. On that basis I am particularly interested with reference to the appropriation for the administration of that agency. I notice there is an increase of $180,000 over 1956, although it is some $250,000 short of the request, apparently.

If I might, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] just what the Housing Administration has proposed to use these increased funds for, or whether or not we are going to get a kick in the face because of the cut of $250,000, or be told that is the reason they cannot give us the service we have been requesting.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me state to my distinguished friend from California, we want to cooperate with him because he is living in a very vastly expanded area. I think you will find that the committee is urging the Federal Housing Administrator to keep up with that backlog. We are going to help those that are behind. You call the committee and let us join you in having the FHA or the Veterans' Administration get you current. There is no earthly reason for your people in that fast-growing area which you so ably represent having to wait 2, 3, or 4 months, and I do not think you have to wait that long, and you are not waiting that long, and we are going to do our best to see that you do not have to wait that long.

Now, let us take the Veterans' Administration. Last year they asked for $14 million. The committee investigated. When they had got through using their transferability power they had spent around $17 million, and this year we increased their funds. We are going to have to keep them current.

FHA requested $2½ or $3 million more than they had last year, and we gave them practically 85 or 90 percent of the increase more than they had last year; but by no stretch of the imagination do I think they are going to spend within 10 or 15 percent of what they did last year. Whereas in the gentleman's area they may be a little behind, yet in my area they are current and in everybody else's area they are current. So if they do not get you fixed up you come back over to our committee and let us try to help you. We want to be sure that they have the money to do it.

Mr. SISK. Let me say first of all that I appreciate the attitude of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas. Certainly I appreciate the attitude of the committee and I thank the chairman for the type of cooperation he offers.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. Just for the gentleman's information, while the FHA office in San Francisco was behind in October they brought in additional personnel in November; and in December the office was current and has been current ever since in servicing them, and 2 weeks is considered current.

Mr. SISK. I may say to the gentleman that that is not the situation in my district. I have some wires on my desk I would like to have the gentleman answer for me.

Mr. YOUNGER. I will be happy to do that.

Mr. SISK. I do appreciate the attitude of the committee. I feel sure that with this type of cooperation we will see some improvement in the service.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question to the chairman of the committee concerning the Veterans' Administration hospital at Lincoln, Nebr. To date I have not been able to find out anything that would indicate that funds are included within this appropriation bill for the continued operation of this VA hospital during the fiscal year 1957. I wonder if the gentleman can substantiate or confirm that statement.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to my colleague from the good old State of Nebraska that we have discussed it on this side and we found nothing to make us doubt it. We did not find where they were trying to close this hospital. I wonder if the gentleman from California found anything different in the hearings.

Mr. WEAVER. Can the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] enlighten me?

Mr. THOMAS. There is nothing in our hearings to indicate that they were going to close the hospital.

Mr. WEAVER. There was nothing to indicate that the hospital was going to be closed, but there has been a rather concentrated effort by the Air Force to take over the hospital.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman's problem is not one that would be in our hearings. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that there is nothing in the hearings, but I understand there is a fear on the part of his constituents that this is to be taken away from the Veterans' Administration and assigned to the Air Force.

My suggestion is that an inquiry be directed to the Director of the Veterans' Administration. We will be glad to give the gentleman any help necessary.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. If they come before this subcommittee and say they are going to close that hospital or ask authority to close it I assure the gentleman we will call him to the hearing and give him an opportunity to express himself and do some arguing.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any appropriation in this act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for the use of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: On page 8, after line 4, insert the following:

"FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"Disaster relief

"For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 875), as amended, authorizing asistance to States and local governments in major disasters, $5,386,030, to remain available until expended."

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, in 1954 and 1955 there occurred in North Carolina 4 storms. The total damage to the State was $292,554,730. These statistics were gathered by the Civil Defense Soil Conservation Service and by a special group set up by the Governor of North Carolina to estimate the loss.

The Red Cross immediately came to the aid of the area. There were disaster meetings held throughout the area, which Federal representatives representing all branches of the Federal Government attended, making firm statements, assuring aid of every nature—rehabilitation—FHA loans, and so forth.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman's State and that coastline, it has been testified before another subcommittee dealing with the Weather Bureau, has suffered for the last 50 or 60 years from these terrible hurricanes on the Atlantic coast that originate within a couple hundred miles of his State, around Cape Hatteras.

Mr. BONNER. They originate about 100 miles away from the mainland.

Mr. THOMAS. The record shows that in the last 2 years the gentleman's State has suffered a tremendous damage from these horrible things. The civil-defense fund has unobligated $13 million. We realize that this amendment is subject to a point of order, but I hope my friends on the other side will not object to the amendment. I give them my assurance on this. There should not be anything partisan about this and I am not fussing at anybody about this damage, this misery, this suffering. I believe we can get together and help these people and I hope there will be no objection. If there is anything that is needed by those gentlemen on the other side of the aisle you can depend on the folks on this side of the table to help you. I think there is no objection to it. These people need this money. There is $13 million in the fund, and as far as I am concerned, if they need $25, $30, or $40 million more to put in that fund to take care of these people, I want to give it to them.

Mr. BONNER. I certainly thank the gentleman from Texas.

We raise no question of the necessity of civil defense nor what it has done elsewhere nor what it may do elsewhere. We are all in favor of it. But in the light of the amount that the State suffered, there has been in the first storm contributed $1,495,000 for relief and in the second instance, the three storms, there has been contributed $1,743,000.

Now, the items for the amounts here are documented. They are compiled by the engineers of the Soil Conservation Service. It is acute. It is for the purpose of opening up the natural drainage that is close to the rivers, and each item is estimated, and unless something is done immediately, when the warm weather comes on there will be a pestilence of malarial fever in the swamps back from the rivers due to the clogging up of the natural drainage by everything that floated down the stream. There was an 8-foot tidal wave that came over eastern North Carolina, and everything that was not anchored, not nailed down or tied down, began to float, and when the water went out it naturally took the logs and stumps and everything in the way of debris to these natural drainages and clogged them up.

Now, in addition to that there was salt water that covered in one county or the area 38,000 acres of land. It is hard to imagine a deposit of a maximum of 11 tons per acre of salt on the land, and the average deposit on the land was from 2 to 3 tons of salt per acre. We are not asking for anything to relieve us from that. The only thing that will relieve us in that is chemicals and proper drainage where the rain comes down and filters the soil and then flows off through the drainage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. I am completely sympathetic with the gentleman's amendment, but I wish he would explain why he needs $5 million.

Mr. BONNER. I am glad the gentleman asked the question. This was all itemized by the Department of Agriculture in conjunction with the Corps of Engineers and in conjunction with a special corps of employed people by the Government who went through the various areas, precincts and small units and so forth, and made up the list. I am going to picture to you one situation.

Mr. SADLAK. May I ask another question?

Mr. BONNER. Yes.

Mr. SADLAK. Does the gentleman desire these funds just for cleaning up this debris and providing drainage in North Carolina? Is it confined to the State of North Carolina?

Mr. BONNER. Well, there is where the storm hit, and it hit from the South Carolina coast to the Virginia coast. I happen to live in the middle of the area.

Mr. SADLAK. I say again I am completely sympathetic with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BONNER. I would like to see the same thing apply elsewhere. The amounts I have listed here, $3 million plus, have gone to municipalities for utility purposes, sewers and things of that kind. Now, the majority of the people in this area live in rural communities. Certainly the Congress intended to help those people just as much as it intended to help people in cities and towns. It has been a question whether the funds would be applied to this purpose. We do not raise the issue against any other area but the engineers' report clearly shows that hundreds of miles of river clearance snagging, and so forth, was carried on in other areas.

Mr. SADLAK. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SADLAK. Again I want to emphasize that I am completely sympathetic and want to be helpful. The chairman of the subcommittee mentioned that there was presently available some $13 million. Has the gentleman made application to utilize some of that $13 million and was he turned down and is that the reason for his amendment?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. The full North Carolina delegation met yesterday with Mr. Peterson. He stated that he had $13 million. The delegation offered to go before the committee and did go before the committee and presented their case. We received very sympathetic consideration. The bill had not been drawn at the time. But Mr. Peterson would not say to us he would allocate any funds for this purpose. Certainly I do not think Congress meant to help people in cities and not help people in the rural areas.

The Public Health Service has reviewed this matter. There will be an epidemic of malaria; there will be the breeding of mosquitoes the like of which has never been seen, unless these drainages are opened.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. This storm not only stopped up the streams in an area only a few miles from the coast, but I should like to say that I live 160 miles from the coast, and the storm came up through the State and stopped up streams all across the State from one end to the other. The people in our community cleaned out their own places, did not expect any help, because their damage was not so serious. But the great problem is in eastern North Carolina where the terrain is almost at sea level 60 miles from the coast; is not that true?

Mr. BONNER. That is correct.

Mr. DURHAM. That is flat country and the water hardly ever washes out. When you have four storms like that, you have no drainage whatsoever. I believe the estimated cost by the Engineers and the Civil Defense people was $19 million; is that right?

Mr. BONNER. That is the estimated cost of what should be done for all things. But we are only asking for this part of it as an emergency because of the danger to health and the damage to agriculture, as I have just explained.

Mr. DURHAM. This is only an emergency measure.

Mr. BONNER. This is strictly an emergency measure.

Mr. DURHAM. And the matter is entirely in the hands of the Administrator?

Mr. BONNER. That is correct.

Mr. DURHAM. This is an amendment to Public Law 850.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CRETELLA. I wonder if any hearing was held on the subject of this amendment providing $5 million to the State of North Carolina. We of Connecticut and New England have been just as hard hit as any section of the country.

Mr. BONNER. Yes, sir; and I voted for the $25 million appropriation to the gentleman's section of the country just a few days ago.

Mr. CRETELLA. If this amendment were approved then I suppose every State or every community that has been affected would be here with similar amendments and apparently there would be no end to it.

Mr. BONNER. Let me say to the gentleman that I do not want to make any

comparison with what took place in New England or what took place in California. I favor the Federal Government helping California and helping New England. Forty-three million dollars-plus was spent from other funds in the New England area, I will say, since the gentleman raised the question. I have the figures here. I have the Engineers' report. But I did not want to raise that question. I have asked only for this small amount.

Mr. CRETELLA. I subscribe to the gentleman's sentiments and to his feelings, but I do not appreciate, and I do not believe that the State of North Carolina should be the recipient of $5 million as against any other State that has the same problem.

Mr. BONNER. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. But there has been only $3 million plus spent in North Carolina as compared with a total loss or damage of $229 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has expired.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. My purpose in inquiring was to ascertain whether or not the gentleman and his colleague perhaps had difficulty in getting funds under Public Law 875 because of the interpretations made on the removal of the debris, and so on, because particularly in my colleague's district we had the same question whether moneys could be provided for that purpose under Public Law 875.

Mr. BONNER. The engineers' report showed they cleared hundreds of miles of rivers in the New England States and provided drainage in those States. I can quote you that from the engineers' reports.

Mr. CRETELLA. What I was trying to do was to help the gentleman in his locality, based on our experience.

Mr. BONNER. I certainly do appreciate that.

Mr. CRETELLA. The further thing was to ascertain whether the gentleman was asking for sufficient funds to do this job properly.

Mr. BONNER. To do this job and to avoid a pestilence of malaria and mosquito trouble.

Mr. CRETELLA. I reiterate, I am in complete accord with the gentleman and want to help him.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Permit me to say to the gentleman that in making the point of order against his amendment I want him to know I am not out of sympathy with his problem and his desire to meet it. Perhaps it has already been said that we are faced here with a question of approach and a question of comparative needs, recognizing, as the gentleman must, that there is money in the Emergency Disaster Fund for the very purpose he seeks financial assistance for his State. North Carolina has received in the fiscal year 1955, according to the report and in the records, $1,500,000.

Mr. BONNER. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In the fiscal year 1956 North Carolina received $2,500,000. Perhaps the $5 million is needed in comparison with others, but it would seem to me that if you have need for disaster relief funds there is an orderly way of getting it. I think the gentleman will agree that if he is not able to get it in an orderly way, then I am sure the Congress will consider the needs in an orderly fashion, not only for his area but all other stricken areas of our country.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate the gentleman's generosity. This has been done before. I understand that things that are done twice do not make things right, but this same thing has been done before. I do hope the gentleman will not insist upon the point of order against the amendment. I agree that the point of order will prevail against the amendment.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. I want to picture one situation. There is a creek with the peculiar name of Cucklers Creek that drains 68,000 acres of beautiful farmland. In addition to the storm we had 3 days of incessant rain. The salt water from the ocean came in and the rain water came in from the land. It was a catastrophe of the greatest magnitude. I sat through it and watched it. The mouth of this creek, Cucklers Creek, for about 2 miles, is just a gully filed with logs and stumps. There is no way of getting drainage through it. That is listed in this list of items. We want to go along with this whole program. We are in sympathy with the program.

When my immediate section was in the throes of this disaster the Red Cross sent out a notice asking for an additional sum to go to the New England States. My county subscribed its quota in 1 day.

I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York still reserve his point of order against the amendment?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think I have been here long enough to recognize that most proposals to add to an appropriation bill from the floor are subject to a point of order. We must operate in the main under the rules. This may be a little out of the customary rules of the House, but you know after having three horrible hurricanes hit us right square in the face, and two of them within about 30 or 40 days, we began to think that they were out of order too. I surely thought it was out of order when I had to come out through the top of my boathouse and swim ashore when about 10 feet of water flooded the place. Let me say this. We bring up discussions of what is right and how many dollars are involved, and so forth. Ever since I have been in this body, I have never voted against my Government doing the humane thing in helping people where the elements have visited destruction upon them. I want to say this now, whether or not somebody wants to criticize him, President Eisenhower with his great heart when he saw the trouble in New England said, "Turn to and help with everything you have." And they did just that. Now, it is not a question of the few dollars that they spent. Did they help those people? Sympathy goes out for them, of course. I will go just a little bit further with our visit with Mr. Peterson. This request came upon us—we did not know the situation was quite as it was. We thought these requests for help had been taken care of in an orderly way. I do not think I would be talking out of turn when I tell you this. Mr. Peterson gave us a very fine reception. I have no criticism of him. But he was a little worried about whether the law under which he is operating would, in the absence of some history, give him the authority to take care of the health and agricultural conditions as left by the hurricanes. The way it was done elsewhere was because the engineers did it and the funds were replaced. Mr. Peterson did not do it and he is sincerely disturbed about our people and so are our people disturbed about it. But nobody did anything wrong. Everybody was prompted by the highest motives on earth, and that was to help people who were in distress. I have not a bit of criticism about that. Whatever befalls the West or the East or the South where there are human beings, I say a great Government with a great heart will react kindly, considerately, and quickly.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman, of course, is making a good case for action on the part of the National Government in extending relief to these disaster areas including your own good State. I do not feel in raising the point of order as to this method that I can be regarded as out of sympathy with your problem.

Mr. BARDEN. Just let me say this, certainly I do not feel that way. I know the gentleman too well and you not only have very fine reactions but you are delightfully human. But we are just up against the gun, my friend. It is either a question of working it out this way and letting it go through the other body or it is a question of forgetting it. Because you know and I know it is totally and thoroughly impractical to expect the Army engineers to initiate a project, and then 2 or 3 years from now do it. It is totally and utterly impractical to work it out through the Agriculture and the Health Departments. So, we are up against a gun and my honest and frank opinion is that we will either work it out

this way or someone else will have the responsibility for it not being done, and that will not be me.

My only purpose in this move is to write some legislative history that will give the Administrator justification for taking care of the emergency situations that now confront the people of eastern North Carolina in the fields of agriculture and health, the salt in the land drainage, and so forth. There would be no purpose in just adding $5 million to Mr. Peterson's appropriation for emergencies, for he already has $13 million, unless we make it clearly understood why we are doing this. I certainly feel that the Administrator will recognize this and respect the intent of Congress, certainly to the extent of this approximately $5 million.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Suppose this amendment is amended to reduce that amount to $3 million, then they could clean out these logs. The Public Health Service will have to spend $10 or $15 million over there in malaria work just as sure as I am sitting here. Let us amend that down to $3 million and let it go through.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In response to my good chairman, I can only say that the disturbing factor of this approach is not the question of amount.

Mr. THOMAS. But there is no other area complaining for lack of money. If they do, let them come forward and put it in here now. This is the only area that is suffering. Let us give them $3 million. If you have an area in your section that is complaining, let us put it in also.

Mr. OSTERTAG. If it is the will of the House that we increase this Independent Offices appropriation bill to provide an additional amount of money for disaster relief under Public Law 875 as amended for distribution as it is needed——

Mr. THOMAS. You do not have to do that. There is $13½ million unobligated in there now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BARDEN was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. In order that we might make clear the difference, I would like to say that the disaster relief appropriation under the Deficiency Appropriation Act has a balance of some $14 or $15 million.

Mr. BARDEN. Will the gentleman let me interrupt? I have missed making the point clear. These funds will be spent under the same supervision of agencies that all of the rest of them are; but Mr. Peterson now has $13 million.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is my point. Funds are already available. Why not use a part of that $13 million or a part of the unobligated balance.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me tell you this: Mr. Peterson doubts that as the law is now written it gives him authority to clean these streams and to do this health protective work. It is not a question that it has not been done elsewhere. It has been done. But it was done in another way. The funds came through the Engineers. We voted the money to pay back the Engineers. In that way the technicality was not an obstruction. We are not trying any monkey business here. It is a very practical situation that will either work out or we close the door. That is all there is to it, because under a strict construction of the law I doubt that he is going to change his mind about it and let me say this is no criticism of Mr. Peterson. I think he is trying to be fair, honest, and carry out the intent of Congress as he sees it. But the history of this kind of an appropriation, the background and the debate, he will have some legislative history that will give him the right to do what we seek the $5 million to do. When you talk of destruction, you just cannot imagine what happened down there in eastern North Carolina which is from 2 feet to 15 feet above sea level, with 10 feet of water over the whole area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has again expired.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] insist upon his point of order?

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether it is possible for this bill to be amended to increase the funds for disaster relief? Would it be in order insofar as Public Law 875 is concerned?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me make this suggestion to my friend; I see what he is trying to do; he is trying to find a way to help out and we appreciate that.

As I understand, this amendment does not take any money from the $13 million that the Administrator now has.

It appears to me as a practical matter that we are going to have to supplement the $13 million sometime before this fiscal year is out; so why not let this stand as it is and then when we get to the point of having to make a supplemental appropriation to meet the necessities of the agency, increase it?

If the gentleman insists on the wording of this amendment and on taking it out of disaster funds now, that is all right, too, and I am sure these gentlemen from North Carolina will not object. I think it is just about as broad as it is long.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Would it be possible to add additional funds to the Presidential emergency disaster fund within this appropriation bill?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may again read the amendment for our information.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I inquire as to whether this amendment increases the disaster relief fund by some $5 million under conditions and terms as provided in Public Law 875?

Mr. BONNER. That is, of course, what it does. But the object in urging this amendment as we are doing is to earmark by legislative history so that the administration can provide the help we need.

Mr. BARDEN. That is the ultimate effect, but I hope the gentleman gets the significance of its going through this way, as I understand it a strict construction of 875 might rule out the relief we seek, that is why we seek to add $5 million to the $13 million he has now. We expect a little more liberal handling of this $5 million in the light of this legislative history. There is not a thing in the world that is not proper about it; and I think, most modestly, that where there has been $300 million damage done and we pulled ourselves up by our own bootstraps to this point, the gentleman really wants to see it go through in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his point of order?

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORANO. As I understand the reading of the amendment I do not think a point of order can be made against it, because it does not authorize the changing of the language of Public Law 875.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut, in the opinion of the Chair, has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I would like to say to the Chair if I understand the amendment correctly that it increases the appropriation to the President's disaster relief fund.

Mr. BONNER. That is what it does.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And in no way takes it out of funds for any other specific purpose as provided in this bill and provided by law.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. BONNER. That is what it does, except I think all of us including the gentleman understand that unless the $5 million was going to be used to relieve eastern North Carolina under proper supervision as in other cases, there would be no point in adding it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York withdraws his point of order.

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including newspapers (not to exceed $175), land and structures (not to exceed $4,200), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed $15,000), services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only, in the event adequate vehicles cannot be obtained by transfer from other departments or

agencies, and not to exceed $118,000 for expenses of travel, $7,800,000, of which $141,000 shall be available for such expenses as are necessary to make a study of radio and television network broadcasting.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, the action of the Mutual Broadcasting System, on reconsideration, in recognizing that the Democrats are entitled to equal free time over its system for the time recently given President Eisenhower is commendable. The reason because of public service considerations is a sound and correct one. There was no claim of a legal obligation on our part, but we do claim that there was an obligation based on fair play and decency. Apparently, upon reflection, the officials of the Mutual Broadcasting System recognized this fact.

The action of the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting System in refusing the free time equal to that granted last Wednesday night to President Eisenhower is unjustified. The reason given is untenable. For President Eisenhower's speech last Wednesday night was obviously political in result, as well as purpose.

We all recall that on the following day every newspaper bannered screaming headlines that the President had started his political campaign and many Members on the other side of the aisle blossomed forth in smiles for the first time in a long time and carried large buttons.

There is no criticism on our part of the networks giving the President time. Our criticism is the failure to give to anyone selected by the Democratic National Committee chairman equal free time. The failure to give equal free time creates the impression that these network systems, through their officials, are playing partisan politics. As individuals, they have a right to be partisan, but they are not justified in making their network systems partisan when they obtained the great privilege to conduct these systems without payment of any kind.

This is a powerful piece of evidence justifying the passage of pending legislation to require radio and television networks and stations in election years because of public service considerations to give a certain percentage of time to the two major political parties. My mind was open on such legislation until this refusal. As a result of this unwise and unjustified refusal, I find myself favorably disposed to such legislation. If for no other reason than decency, equal time should have been granted.

This incident shows what the Democratic Party is up against in getting its story to the people. The indisputable fact remains that the Democratic Party, which by no means is a weak political party, has been refused this equal time to what was obviously a political speech. The officials of the other two networks would use good judgment if they followed, in this matter, the leadership of the officials of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

As best evidence I can give you is the individual now looking at you. I might add that if we vote by pounds there would be no contest as to who would win.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. How much has the gentleman gained in the last 3½ years?

Mr. TUMULTY. Up to this year I have gained about 20 pounds, but I have been feasting my eyes on the Republican carcass. I must say I lost some weight on whether Peron would be thrown out down in Panama or not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman spoke about eating on the Republican carcass. Is that good enough to eat?

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes; in this case it is. In these times we eat lean meat, mostly fish. The Republican carcass is edible, but never on feast day.

I may say it is not just a question of being unfair to the Democratic Party. It is being unfair to the people of the United States who have a right to hear from both parties on the major issues of the day.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words this afternoon about civil defense in our Nation. In the appropriation bill before us today the request of the Federal Civil Defense Administration is cut by $37 million. The Congress has been doing that year after year ever since the Civil Defense Administration was first established. In the report describing this cut, the committee is critical of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, holding that it is engaging in too rapid expansion. I am one Member of this body who cannot see that expansion. In my considered judgment, civil defense in our United States is deficient in all areas: on the Federal level, on the State level, and on the local level. I believe there are too many Americans, including Members of the Congress, who believe, one, it just cannot happen here; who believe, two, if it does happen, nothing can be done about it.

Now, it so happens that I was in London for some weeks during the robot blitz of June and July 1944, and I saw with my own eyes that something could be done about it. I saw how the British people reacted to that awful bombing. No hysteria; no panic. They knew what to do, and they did it.

Mr. Chairman, currently the military in our country is adverse to taking over this job of civil defense in the United States. They say their job is the military protection of our country, and they want nothing to do with civil defense. They hold that it is strictly a State and local undertaking. But, in the States and in our cities very little is being done about this realistically. You cannot get enough ground observers for the volunteer ground observe corps. People are not responding to the appeals of our national and State leadership in that respect. Now, the situation in the Soviet Union is entirely different. Over there, where the people are regimented, they have 20 million plus civil defense workers. I am informed that the Holifield committee is looking into this situation. It is reported that the suggestion has been made by the American Legion that there be a new Cabinet post, that of Secretary of Civil Defense. There may be much merit in that, inasmuch as the military will not do this job. And, I hope in the days to come we will not continue to neglect this challenge. This so-called rapid expansion simply does not show. We are missing the boat.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have some sympathy for what the gentleman has said, but in driving along the highways I see these signs "This highway restricted to civil defense traffic in the event of an attack" or "This highway will be closed in the event of attack." I think Civil Defense has engaged in a lot of boondoggling in erecting these signs. Who knows what highways will be open or what highways will be closed following an attack?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not agree with my friend from Iowa. Those signs were not put there without the approval of the local authorities in his State.

Mr. GROSS. Surely the gentleman will not say that the military will not take over any gravel road or any secondary road or main highway or any other thoroughfare that they want if this country is attacked.

Mr. CANFIELD. The military undoubtedly would have to get through; but, on the other hand, they are telling the Members of Congress they want nothing to do with this job. I am glad that we have a legislative committee exploring the situation now today. Again I want to say—and I want to emphasize it—I do not think we are meeting this challenge. The Soviet Union is doing it in their way, but we are not doing it in our way, which we hold is the winning way.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Administrator is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place ten positions, in addition to those otherwise authorized, in grade GS–16 in the general schedule established by said act, and the salary of the comptroller shall be at the salary rate of grade GS–18 so long as such position is occupied by the present incumbent.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 18 strike out lines 14 through 20.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree upon some time lim-

itation. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that would leave only 5 minutes to some half dozen Members and, therefore, I object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much time does that give each Member who has indicated he wishes to speak to this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would rule that each of the 6 Members other than the chairman of the subcommittee would be recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, incidentally, before starting on this amendment, I might call attention to the fact that today is the 120th anniversary of a great battle; the Battle of the Alamo was fought in 1836.

This bill, H. R. 9739, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations, proposes to grant 11 supergrade positions to the General Services Administration. Ten of these proposed positions are in grade 16 and one in grade 18. This grade 18 is specifically identified as for the Comptroller. This language appears on page 18, lines 14 through 20. It is reported on page 11, House Report No. 1847.

Section 12 of Public Law 94, enacted in the first session of this Congress, provides for 1,200 positions in the supergrades on a governmentwide basis under the control of the Civil Service Commission. This section of the law also repealed the then existing special laws and riders such as the one proposed now. In recommending the bill which became Public Law 94, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service felt that it was highly desirable and necessary for the Congress to look to one law and one agency of the executive branch for the authorization, allocation and control of supergrade positions.

The committee felt that if there is any valid reason for an individual or an agency to have supergrades, the validity of the request should be justified before the Civil Service Commission in relationship to the requests of all other individuals and agencies and that any change in the total authorization for such positions should be handled by the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives or the Senate.

Under date of August 9, 1955, Mr. MURRAY, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, wrote to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and stated the position of the committee with respect to special law and appropriation riders which provide for the granting of additional supergrade jobs without consideration by the Civil Service Commission and by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Under date of August 12, 1955, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON acknowledged the letter of August 9 and congratulated Chairman MURRAY on the actions of his committee.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House has completed action on House bill 9560 which provides 660 additional top-grade positions for the Federal Government as a whole. Two hundred and eighty-five of these additional positions are supergrade positions while 375 are scientific and technical positions with a salary range of $10,000 to $15,000. The Civil Service Commission reports that 74 positions out of the 1,200 authorized under Public Law 94 have not been allocated to the agencies and are available for use by the General Services Administration if the agency can fully justify its request. If H. R. 9560, which as recommended by the committee becomes public law, there will be a total of 310 supergrade jobs available for distribution to agencies outside of the Defense Department. If the General Services Administration, or any other department or agency, has justifiable need for the additional supergrade positions as proposed in the rider to this appropriation bill, I feel that their request should be directed to the Civil Service Commission as provided by Public Law 94 enacted by this Congress.

It is my understanding that the 10 positions this bill proposes to raise to supergrade GS–16 are now GS–15 positions which the Civil Service Commission had a difficult time in justifying. In fact, a number of these 10 jobs could compare with some classified as GS–14. If the language as proposed in this bill becomes law, it will give special consideration to one very small group of Government employees and be entirely unfair and discriminatory to literally thousands of other employees in grade GS–15 through the Government who, in general, have more responsibilities.

I am sure that the Appropriations Committee in considering this language had little opportunity to go into the classification of these positions in their relationship to other similar positions in the Government.

Under these conditions, I believe that the language of this bill, H. R. 9739, granting the additional 11 supergrades to the General Services Administration, is unnecessary, undesirable, and not keeping faith, and if enacted into law will be the opening wedge which will again allow the granting of innumerable supergrade positions to individuals and agencies without full consideration by the responsible committee of Congress and without requiring justification by the agencies requesting such positions.

We have checked with the United States Civil Service Commission on the 1 grade 18 and the 10 grade 16 jobs which the Appropriations Committee proposes to grant to the General Services Administration and were advised that not only had these jobs not been requested of the Civil Service Commission but that the new Administrator of the General Services Administration had asked the Civil Service Commission to hold up on the consideration of any supergrade jobs until such time as he could personally review their needs.

The Civil Service Commission has no information of any kind as to where the 10 GS–16 jobs are to go. They have never had a request for the placing of the position of Comptroller in GS–18, either from the Administrator or from Mr. Medley.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Texas. By way of repetition, I call the attention of the Members to the fact that here is the great Committee on Appropriations, for whom we all have the deepest respect and regard, again proposing to take over legislation that rightfully is under the jurisdiction of another committee. So, in the first place, this amendment ought to be supported on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. So, I join in asking your support of the proposed amendment. The gentleman from Texas has very well explained that there is no very great demand for the immediate consideration of this matter. Let the legislative committee handle it. Then go before the Civil Service Commission and if the Civil Service Commission decides that they ought to have these jobs, they will be allocated by the Commission. But, do not do it this way because if we are going to start upsetting the authority and prerogatives of the Civil Service Committee on this proposal, other agencies will follow a similar pattern. There would be no need of open hearings at all with regard to whether those jobs are needed. This matter should go before a committee of the House where hearings may be held and where the jobs may be justified.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CRETELLA].

Mr. CRETELLA. Is it not strange, Mr. Chairman, that while we are discussing this very legislation here today that todays newspaper states that the committee of which the distinguished gentleman from Kansas has been chairman—and a very fine chairman, has authorized and approved to the Department of Defense 275 people; it has given to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics an additional 50 people; has given to the Department of Defense an additional 49 superjobs—all of which was done properly before the committee which is delegated to do this job. Yet, today in this bill we are subverting that process by including it in an appropriation bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And we did that only after testimony had been received justifying these allocations to which the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut has referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be given to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, let us follow the regular procedure here. These matters can come before the legislative committee where testimony can be taken and where these jobs may be justified—if they are justified. Let us not go around our Civil Service Commission in dealing with this problem because the Civil Service Commission, after all, is the agency that finally determines the allocation of these superjobs.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I must yield to my distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I know that the gentleman from Kansas would like to have this thing explained to the king's taste. Now, let us try to get this straight.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; that is what I am trying to do.

Mr. THOMAS. When the great Civil Service Committee allocates these supergrades, then you rely on the Civil Service Commission to allocate the jobs; is that not correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well——

Mr. THOMAS. There is no "well" about it. It is either "Yes" or "No."

Mr. REES of Kansas. But the bill——

Mr. THOMAS. Does your committee allocate any jobs?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes. That is exactly what we did in our bill at the last session for most agencies where needed. Then authorized the Commission to allocate others.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, when you have done that, you write it up in one figure, so many supergrades, 150 14's, and so on, and then you depend upon the Civil Service Commission to allocate them? You do not write into the law how many each one is going to get.

Mr. DOWDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DOWDY. We reported out a bill from our committee last week in which 285 supergrade positions were allocated to the Defense Department.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, that was last week. Last year you reported out 1,200, and you did not earmark a single one of them.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. If the General Services Commission comes before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and makes a case for 10 additional supergrades, they will get them; will they not?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, you are changing the picture altogether.

Mr. GROSS. No; I am not. You are usurping the function of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. If you will turn to the hearings you will find several pages, pages 835, 836, and 837, where the General Services Commission testified they went to the Civil Service Commission, the body that this great committee authorized to allocate these super jobs, and they will not give them to them. Yet they have 74 unallocated jobs over there now. We are not asking necessarily to create any extra super grades. We say the Civil Service Commission shall give these people 10. They have 74. All we are asking for is 10. Those people spend a billion dollars a year.

Mr. GROSS. So you are creating 10 additional grades.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, may I attempt to put this in possibly simpler language. I certainly hope the House will vote "No" on this amendment. We are not attempting to revise the Civil Service. Any idea that these people come up and ask for super grades, or anything like that, is completely apart from anything that has to do with this picture. To say that we shall do nothing in the Congress and see a situation continue which is unfair to the people employed in any agency that comes before us, I still say that the determination should be made by Congress and not wait for some agency downtown to act. The chairman is entirely correct. The Civil Service Commission votes a certain number of super grades. We have nothing to do with that. This has nothing to do with it. All I can say is that this is a reasonable and an honest and a deserving attempt on the part of this subcommittee to adjust the super grades among 18 agencies that come before us, to see that one man who is doing a more responsible job than are the men in other agencies holding comparable jobs is entitled to the same salary that other people get who are doing a less responsible job. I think that is within the power of the Congress to take action, and that that was the right thing to do. We have not tried to hurt the feelings of any committee. My friend from Kansas [Mr. REES] I am sure knows that. Here is a question now coming before the Congress of the United States:

Do you believe that an employee of the Government holding one of the most responsible jobs in the Government should be paid an equivalent amount paid for the same job in other agencies of the Government which do less responsible work? That is all there is to it.

I ask for a "No" vote on the amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; I cannot yield. My time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized to close the debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing difficult about this, and I doubt if I can add anything other than what our distinguished friend from California said; but bear this one thing in mind, get the distinction which you well know between this great committee of the House, the Civil Service Committee, and the Civil Service Commission. It is the Civil Service Commission which is given the authority to allocate these jobs by the Civil Service Committee of the House, and that distinction is just as plain as ABC.

Turn to the printed hearings, and I have enumerated those pages 2 or 3 times. The General Services Admintration says time and time again:

> We have gone down to the Civil Service Commission who allocate these jobs and we have asked for them but the Commission disagrees with us.

I was not present when they asked them for these jobs, but I certainly believe that those gentlemen at General Services are not going to misrepresent when they say they asked for them.

Those people spend a great deal of money, a billion dollars a year, and I venture to say that the gentleman over at the Civil Service Commission who allocate those jobs and who says he is not entitled to grade 16, I expect, is a grade 16 himself and does not have authority to spend one nickel of your money.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. DOWDY. How does the gentleman reconcile that statement that the General Services Administration has at numerous times requested the Civil Service Commission for these higher grades?

Mr. THOMAS. It is there in black and white in the hearings at pages 836 and 837. If they misrepresented it that is one thing, but I am not going to say they misrepresented it.

Mr. DOWDY. I am not saying anybody misrepresented.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the argument about, then?

Mr. DOWDY. The Civil Service Commission was quite to the contrary.

Mr. THOMAS. Maybe they should have written an application on white linen paper, but instead General Services may have written it on just plain paper.

The Civil Service Commission has 74 of those jobs over there unallocated, but they, frankly, told us at 10:30 this morning that there are 600 applicants throughout the Government for the 74.

In our judgment I think this committee is doing the right thing in protecting the membership of this House. You put the responsibility on this subcommittee to provide the funds for this agency. We are merely trying to follow these funds so that you get your money's worth. That is all we are trying to do.

We think we have taken the business-like approach. These people spend millions and millions of dollars. Is it right to have a man given authority to spend $50 million or $100 million and put him on a little bit of a salary? You want to keep him honest, do you not?

We are trying to protect these appropriations, Mr. Chairman. This makes sense. We are doing for this agency the right thing.

I think this amendment ought to be voted down and you ought to grant these

people higher pay. Do you think it is a reasonable, sensible thing to expose a man to temptation because he is not paid adequately? You may wake up some day to find that somebody who had the awarding of a big contract cheated on it.

These are some of the considerations that led us to take the action we did.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas who attempted to get the gentleman to yield a moment ago.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I was trying to get across to this great Committee of the Whole the fact that after all this is the Appropriations Committee and if it performs its duty it appropriates for all agencies of Government. I have great respect and great regard for my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], but what I was trying to get across to him is the least the General Services Administration could have done was to come before the legislative committee and make a case, which they did not do. The fact of the matter is that the General Services Administration is not in such a great hurry about the allocation of these new jobs. We have a new General Services Administrator and while I am not in position to talk much about it, I am informed he is not in any hurry concerning this matter, because he wants to look the situation over.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to say to the gentleman from Texas that if these salaries must be raised in order to protect $150 million that these people apparently are spending, then why stop at grade 16? Why not make them all grade 18's instead of 16's if high pay is necessary to the proper handling and protection in the expenditure of $150 million? There is no evidence anywhere that this one individual you are boosting to grade 18 ever applied to the Civil Service Commission for a grade 18 job. I do not know on what basis he comes in and asks for a grade 18 and why you specify he shall be a grade 18 in the bill.

What the Appropriations Committee is doing, as the gentleman from Kansas has said, is to completely usurp the functions of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House. If the Appropriations Committee is going to be permitted to come in here today, next year, and the year after that and set up supergrade jobs throughout the Government, we might as well disband the legislative committees and turn the whole business of legislation over to the gentleman's committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is not the only place where they have come in with legislation. I would like to have the gentleman from Texas tell us why he put in these several legislative provisions, then got a rule from the Rules Committee waiving points of order. Does the Committee on Appropriations want to legislate? Is that the purpose?

Mr. GROSS. I cannot answer that. Apparently they do. Silence, apparently, acquiesces in the gentleman's charge.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including not to exceed $5,000 for the employment of special counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; newspapers (not to exceed $200); purchase of not to exceed 45 passenger motor vehicles, of which 19 shall be for replacement only; and expenses of travel; $13,900,000 of which (a) not less than $1,939,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety and locomotive inspection activities, and (b) $100,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out such defense mobilization functions as may be delegated pursuant to law: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLSWORTH: On page 21, line 4, strike out the figure "$13,900,000" and insert "$14,000,000"; and on line 9, after the word "law" and before the colon, insert a comma and the following: "and (c) not less than $424,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Car Service Section of the Bureau of Safety and Service."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered does not increase the budget request contained in the President's annual budget for the Interstate Commerce Commission. The total budget request was $14 million. The Committee on apropriations decided to eliminate $100,000 from the budget request and reported the bill with the figure of $13.9 million.

Now, the $100,000, I assume, was eliminated with ample reason and good judgment by the committee, but I now propose in this amendment that the entire budget request be restored; in other words, that the additional $100,000 be restored, and that the $100,000 be added to the amount of money which will be available to the Section of Car Service for the Bureau of Safety and Service. That is the bureau of the Interstate Commerce Commission which has the field staff of investigators and service people who are scattered all over the United States for the purpose of enforcing the Commission's rules and regulations regarding the movement of freight cars and looking after the service as required under the Interstate Commerce Act.

At the present time, as I have pointed out to the committee in general debate, the Interstate Commerce Commission's field staff for this purpose, the ICC men who keep the cars rolling and help prevent disastrous car shortages in this country, is only 30 people for the entire 48 States. The Commission in its budget request was very timid, indeed. They submitted a request for an increase in that Bureau, but asked only for an additional 10 men, making the total field staff for the entire 48 States only 40 men. One of the Commission's people told me that the staff now, in his opinion—and he is one of the executives—is totally inadequate. He said in a memorandum to me that with its limited field staff and office staff, the Car Service Section of the Bureau of Safety and Service strives constantly for an equitable distribution of available car supply. However, a thorough job cannot be done with the few people it has in its organization at this time.

That was in connection with a request for 10 additional men. But 10 additional men will still not be a large enough staff. We all know that we had the most disastrous car shortage in all the history of our economy last year. I know that there are 85,000 fewer freight cars on the railroads today than at this time last year. We know, therefore, that we are going to have again a very serious and very destructive car shortage in America this coming summer and fall; and it will probably begin in the spring.

I suggest to the committee that this is one small thing we can do. It will not mean an increase in the President's budget, it will not put the budget out of balance. But we can take this $100,000 and restore the budget figure for the Interstate Commerce Commission, give that $100,000 to the Car Service and Safety Bureau so that they can put maybe 10 more men in the field and help to work out this car shortage problem.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the committee will see the wisdom of taking this action and will adopt this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes, the last 5 minutes being reserved to the committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to request 2 minutes of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: I do not think this is the time to give the Interstate Commerce Commission a single dime additional in view of what they did to the farmers of the Nation last week when they approved an increase of 5 percent in freight rates on agricultural commodities, against the opposition of

Secretary Benson and every farm organization of this Nation.

I wrote them the following letter on February 3, 1956:

You have before you a petition for a 7-percent increase in freight rates. As you know, the railroads have had a total of 11 general freight-rate increases since early 1946 which represented a total increase of 63 percent on agricultural products.

The Secretary of Agriculture has petitioned you to suspend this application for a 7-percent increase with respect to raw- and processed-farm products, farm supplies, and fish. I fully concur in the Secretary's petition, and will not repeat the economic need for such suspension as this has been well stated by the Secretary.

In addition, I would respectfully call to your attention the fact that retail businesses in the major farm areas of the Nation, my own congressional district in southwestern Minnesota is a good example, are faced with reduced sales volume because of the lower income of their farm customers. The petitioned increase of 7 percent in freight rates would, if approved by you, represent an added squeeze on many small-business men in rural areas who can ill afford any increase in overhead or stock costs.

It is urgently recommended that you give full consideration to these important factors in your study of the railroad petition.

The Interstate Commerce Commission apparently gave scant consideration either to the merits of these protests or the adverse effect freight-rate increases at this time will have on already hard-pressed farm- and rural-business-community economies.

I think if that is the best job they can do for us, to give the railroads on a silver platter, so to speak, a handout of many millions of dollars as an additional charge against farm produce going to market, I have very little sympathy for them.

While the rest of the Nation feels compassion for our farmers caught as they are in a price-cost squeeze not of their own making and over which they have no control, and while the Congress moves to develop new farm programs which we hope will help alleviate those conditions, we find the Interstate Commerce Commission condoning a further grab for scarce farm-income dollars.

As to this specific matter affected by this amendment, I do not think this amendment will provide any cure to the boxcar shortage. The Interstate Commerce Commission has obviously become the instrument of the railroads, which leaves us no reason to believe they would use any additional funds we gave them for the benefit of the public.

The boxcar-shortage situation, which is at times a very serious problem, can only be remedied in two ways as I see it. First, of course, by the construction of additional boxcars which is a responsibility of the railroads and would not be accomplished by an appropriation to the Interstate Commerce Commission. But even if this was done, there would still be the question of proper utilization which leads to the second solution—namely, the charging of a proper rental for those boxcars which are held idle by railroads which do not own them.

If the Interstate Commerce Commission is genuinely concerned, in the public interest, with this boxcar shortage, it should give immediate consideration to raising this rental on idle cars to a more realistic figure and then it should use all its regulatory powers to bring about the maximum use of all available boxcars for the use for which they are intended—the hauling of freight in the public interest.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 5 minutes to close the debate on this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to rise in opposition to the amendment of my friend from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. If someone in the Commission—and I do not doubt my friend's word in the slightest—thought that this was not enough money, he should have made that presentation to the committee, because we asked them if they had enough money.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think the statement was made to the committee in that form in the justification for the 10 additional men they asked for. I saw in my notes as I ceased speaking that the reference that I made was, in fact, part of the justification for the increase of the 10, which the committee did grant. The committee granted that increase.

Mr. THOMAS. We granted the entire budget request. Let us bear in mind that this is a part of the new Bureau of Safety. This Bureau has $200,000 more than they had last year. We granted them every penny they asked for. Can we do any better than that?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hospital and domiciliary facilities: For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1 and 2 of the act approved March 4, 1931 (38 U. S. C. 438j–k) or in section 101 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 693a), to remain available until expended, $50,935,000, of which $2 million shall be used for technical services for the major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Tex., and $1,500,000 shall be available for technical services for rehabilitation of the general medical and surgical hospital at Nashville, Tenn.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORN of New York: Page 30, line 7, after "Tennessee", insert "provided, that $150,000 of the money appropriated for construction shall be used for construction of a chapel at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Brooklyn, N. Y."

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should like the Committee to note that on page 19 of the committee report on the independent offices appropriations bill it is stated that—

The bill also includes $435,000 to accelerate in 1957 the program for the construction of chapel facilities at hospitals. All VA hospitals include provisions for religious services, but there are locations where the need for improved chapel facilities has existed for a long time.

That is the reason I offer this amendment. Most particularly the veterans' hospital in Brooklyn, N. Y., know as the Fort Hamilton Veterans' Administration Hospital has had a need for a chapel existing for a long time. The Veterans' Administration hospital there, a 1,000-bed hospital serving the needs of almost 3 million people, is in dire need of a chapel. It is impossible in the small room where they now have religious services to hold such services properly. There are only 3 or 4 benches in that small room. No adequate prayer room is available.

If we are to construct chapel facilities, among the first should be the Veterans' Administration hospital in Brooklyn, N. Y. I do not think there is any need to express the reasons for the need of chapels in all veterans' hospitals. Chapels should be in every hospital, but more particularly in veterans' hospitals.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. We want to help our friend from New York. There are a good many hospitals throughout the country without chapels. There is $435,000 in here for the beginning of some chapel construction. May I ask the gentleman this question with an idea of trying to help him, and I think the Committee will be unanimous in that regard. Does the Veterans' Administration think well of the idea of erecting a chapel at this particular hospital in Brooklyn? Has the gentleman contacted them?

Mr. DORN of New York. The Veterans' Administration has been contacted with reference to this but not by me. A chapel has been under consideration to be constructed with private funds, but sufficient private funds have not been raised.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the gentleman's understanding as to the attitude of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. DORN of New York. My understanding is that they would welcome it.

Mr. THOMAS. That they would welcome it and would be willing to spend Veterans' Administration funds to construct it?

Mr. DORN of New York. If we had the funds appropriated, yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I suggest to the gentleman that if he will be good enough to withdraw his amendment, I think I can say on behalf of the committee, we will contact the Veterans' Administration and ask them to get busy and see if they can build you a chapel. If you earmark this in the bill, there are 18 others, and we cannot very well deny the other people who want chapels. I am sure the gentleman understands our point of view. We will try to work out something for you.

Mr. DORN of New York. I thank the chairman very much and, naturally, I trust him.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN] is withdrawn.

The was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to ask the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill how long it is anticipated the Committee will sit this evening. Apparently, a number of Members have commitments for tonight.

Mr. THOMAS. I believe that we could finish by 5 o'clock. I understand there is only one other amendment and that is on the Veterans' Administration. If we can reach some agreement as to time on the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Kansas, perhaps we can complete our business quickly.

Mr. MARTIN. That is the crux of the problem. A good many Members want to speak on the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Could the Committee not rise now and finish the bill tomorrow?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, if the Members on the other side have commitments, we would be the last to stand in the way.

Mr. MARTIN. As the gentleman knows, there are several thousand people in the District of Columbia and there are a number of dinners and meetings, and the Members on this side would like to attend those meetings.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, directed him to report it had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE—THE NEED FOR UNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, much talk has occurred with respect to the subject of bipartisanship in our foreign policy. Many have suggested that the bipartisan cooperation necessary for the maintenance of a sound foreign policy will be difficult if not impossible in this election year. Yet it must be clear to all that the maintenance of a solid front of bipartisan support for needed efforts in the foreign policy field is vital if the great new massive offensive being mounted by the Soviet Union is to be offset.

Bipartisanship, however, does not include the acceptance of whatever is handed down by the opposing party.

I note that a great many Democrats have a record of 100 percent support of the President in foreign policy—including myself according to the Congressional Quarterly.

I believe that in the foreign policy field we must lean over backward in an effort to cooperate and resolve every reasonable doubt in favor of the President if the difficult and intricate problems of foreign policy are to be resolved in favor of the interests of freedom. This does not mean to lean backward so far as to fall off the platform of sound policy.

Certainly most will agree, I am sure, that the steady policy of building strength and indicating clear purpose to resist aggression—a policy initiated in 1947 with the Truman doctrine and subsequently strengthened by such efforts as the Marshall plan, NATO and SEATO—has been successful. It has deterred Soviet military aggression in many areas of the world. This successfully argues for maintenance and improvement of our military alliances.

However, the Soviets have now mounted a massive campaign of smiling aggression, designed to nurture antagonisms; to split the free world where they can; build fires of neutralism; and pull neutral nations within the Soviet sphere of influence.

Relaxed optimism in the face of this new massive Communist onslaught not only overlooks adverse developments to the cause of freedom from Iceland to Japan but also could have very serious consequences to the cause of freedom in the world.

There are many signs of growing Communist influence in the free world: Communist strength has increased in Iceland, the location of a strategically important base; the moderate forces in France have dwindled; in Germany the reversals which Chancellor Adenauer has suffered indicate Germany is moving in the direction of rapprochement with Russia. We have also seen the growing Communist strength in Greece in the recent election. The growth of neutralist sentiment particularly in Asia and Africa is so obvious as to need no elaboration.

This brief recital of new challenges we face does not suggest that these reversals could have been avoided in any easy fashion. They are listed to point up a very threatening situation we face and to suggest that what is needed now is imaginative thinking to meet this new, more subtle and perhaps more dangerous Communist foreign policy.

I hope in a small way to contribute to the thinking on this subject by offering some observations regarding the new nature of the threat and submitting some proposals regarding the means of meeting it. I am submitting these proposals in the form of a concurrent resolution.

I have no illusions about the complexities of the problem we face. The proposals which are put forward in the resolution are put forward with the hope that they may be fully discussed to see if they hold any potential for improving the security of the free world.

THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE—MEANS OF STRENGTHENING

I am sure we all can agree that the NATO Treaty binding western powers is at the core of free world security. Indeed, many refer to NATO as the anchor in the defense of freedom in the entire world. The NATO alliance came into being as a result of a direct armed threat from the Soviet Union. This threat became painfully obvious with the Czech coup in 1948 and NATO came into full bloom as a result of the direct aggression in Korea in 1950. I think it is clear to all that the developing strength and unity which resulted from NATO played a large part in the Soviet Union's recent shift in its emphasis from overt belligerence to its emphasis on economic and political penetration of the free world. The fact that NATO has been so successful in deterring Communist aggression in Europe argues strongly for its continuance and improvement as the real manifestation of the unity of purpose of the West. The fact that one of the primary goals of the Soviet foreign policy today is to disintegrate NATO indicates how successful it has been.

Yet we see many signs today which point to a deterioration in the NATO structure. Pressures are building in all European NATO partners, including the United States to reduce military commitments to NATO. The struggle between Turkey and Greece over Cyprus has divided two of the southern anchors of NATO power. France, as a result of her difficulties in North Africa, has diverted sizable numbers of their NATO troops from Continental Europe to North Africa. The hesitation and delay in Germany in developing its forces which are committed to the joint NATO effort is another sign of the deterioration of NATO as a symbol and a reality of western strength.

Perhaps it is difficult in a period when no overt warfare is occurring any place on the globe to face up to the challenge that this deteriorating situation presents. It is particularly difficult in this country since we are in an election year. Yet, I firmly believe that the situation is so serious and so challenging that we must face it now. The Soviet Union's goal of

dividing NATO is upon us. Too little and too late in terms of our foreign policy in this trying period could well be as disastrous as too little and too late in wartime.

The effects of procrastination and delay in foreign-policy decisions frequently do not manifest themselves for many years. Clearly our delay and inability to meet the Japanese challenge in Manchuria in 1931 was the beginning of the end for free China. Never after 1931 did the Nationalist forces obtain control over all of China. The repercussions resulting from Japanese occupation of vast parts of China contributed in a heavy degree to the situation which permitted the Communists to eventually move in and take control.

So, today, delay and indecision about what to do in the new challenge we face may not have immediate effects in terms of the immediate issue of war and peace; but, clearly, it will have an effect on the great issue of freedom versus tyranny in the years to come.

Now, what to do. I make no pretense at being an expert. But, as an elected Representative and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I feel compelled to suggest a few broad ideas on some possibilities of what we can do.

If history teaches anything, it teaches that pure military alliances tend to disintegrate once the immediate military threat moves into the background. The design on the part of the Soviet Union today is, obviously, to convince the uncommitted areas of the world and the peoples in Europe that there is no imminent military threat from Russia. In this situation it will be difficult to convince the members of the Atlantic Alliance that the need for the maintenance of a purely military alliance is great. Internal pressures which divert attention to domestic problems have already increased and will undoubtedly continue to increase. Yet we all recognize the need to maintain the military side of the Atlantic Alliance. But more is required. Our goal should be to pool the strength of Europe with our own in meeting the Communist threat in the have-not nations of the world. My resolution is in part directed toward this end.

It seems clear to me that what is needed is new cooperative endeavors of a nonmilitary nature jointly undertaken by the NATO Atlantic allies. NATO needs a new nonmilitary reason for being if it is to survive as a strong unifying force. This nonmilitary cooperative endeavor could take many forms. Some have suggested that article 2 of the NATO treaty which pledges the signatories to political and economic cooperation should be utilized to develop stronger economic cooperation between the NATO allies. This presents problems of a tremendously complex nature since many organizations are already in being to pursue economic and political forms of cooperation between the Atlantic alliance, particularly the European members of it. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation—OEEC—occupies a large part of this sphere. The Community of Six have entered into the coal-steel plan. The proposal for European cooperation in the development of atomic power for peaceful purposes is already moving forward, however precariously, and a mail-wire pool for cooperation in the communications field has also been proposed. The overlapping jurisdiction between NATO and these groups already in existence or proposed would cause tremendous problems in any effort aimed at intra-NATO cooperative economic programs.

This does not mean that the various proposals for closer economic collaboration under the NATO structure should not be pursued but it does indicate some of the difficulties involved in this type of undertaking. But let us look for a moment at the NATO treaty. One of the goals stated in the treaty is that the signatories indicate they are "determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law" and have also "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security."

There is no statement that the goal of preserving the peace is limited to the European area. Quite clearly the threat of communism poses to the so-called have-not nations is, in the strategy of the Communist empire today, an equal—if not greater—threat to the security than the poised knife of the Soviet military machine aimed at the heart of Europe.

Let me be specific.

I do not believe that the giant task of providing the have-not nations with their dire needs for development capital should be undertaken by the United States alone. The immense progress Europe has made, partially as a result of our assistance, has brought her to a position where she can and should join with us in this urgently needed endeavor. One part of my resolution urges the President to look into the possibility of developing "a jointly planned, jointly financed, and jointly executed program for economic and technical assistance to non-Atlantic areas for the purpose of accelerating the economic and social programs for the peoples of these areas, assisting them to understand and resist the pressures and enticements of Communist imperialism and facilitating their evolution toward self-government under conditions of freedom, strength, and stability.

My resolution goes on to state:

> It is desirable that such a program to be developed in a manner which will provide for the most equitable sharing among the Atlantic allies of the burdens which the United States has already assumed in providing assistance to such areas.

In the resolution I do not propose any specific form such a plan might take. However, it is entirely possible that it would take the form of a development bank. The have-not nations in most instances do not require the type of assistance Europe required after World War II to get back on its feet. What they need, and in many instances need desperately, if they are to maintain free forms of development, is capital.

It is entirely possible that such a plan could take the form of establishment of a development bank, the initial capital to be contributed jointly by some or all of the Atlantic allies. Through this bank we could offer to the uncommitted areas of the world the opportunity for obtaining low interest rate, long-term loans for development projects. I would think that in all such projects part of the necessary capital should be provided by the recipient country which would give the recipient a stake in the project. Also, I would think that the countries desiring to participate in such a plan should have a joint responsibility in administering such a bank. In my view this plan would have several advantages:

First. It would give the less developed areas of the world the investment capital that all desperately need to move ahead in meeting the people's legitimate rising levels of expectation. The private investment capital of the United States does not seek the risky areas of the world where Communist aggression remains a dire possibility—where illiteracy, disease, and primitive living conditions offer little hope for economic success—where the chance for profit is much less than the investment opportunities offered in the United States, Canada, and the advanced nations of Western Europe. A development bank would fill this most crucial need in the best possible fashion.

Second. It could give to the underdeveloped areas a share in administering this fund. They would share responsibility for determining the most desirable and the most beneficial projects.

Third. It would, in terms of United States interest, involve a plan that shares the cost of maintaining freedom in the great area of the world that has been referred to as the "middle world."

Fourth. The development bank would not be a handout. It would be a fund which the uncommitted and underdeveloped areas of the world would be responsible for administering among themselves and at the same time it would be a fund where all would be dependent upon the other's repaying since it would be a revolving fund. The repayment by one would make possible the development of another. Finally, this proposal would in my view provide a dramatic new departure in the policy of the free nations to offset the economic and political advances being made by Soviet Russia at the present time. In addition, it would show to the great uncommitted areas of the world our sincere and tangible desire to assist them to achieve their legitimate goals within the framework of freedom.

Many desirable projects could be undertaken by such a bank. Among them could be projects to realize the great potentials of peaceful uses of atomic power. The atomic power sharing plan proposed by President Eisenhower could easily be integrated with the development capital made available by a jointly sponsored development bank. This is but one of the many potentials.

THE CHALLENGE IN SCIENCE—OUR LONG-TERM HOPE

On February of this year, the distinguished junior Senator from Washing-

ton, Senator JACKSON, in a careful and statesmanlike statement pointed up the challenge we face in the field of scientific research. He particularly emphasized the challenge in the field of ballistic missiles. To paraphrase the Senator, he pointed out that the Communist world has changed its tactics but not its goal. He quoted Khrushchev in India only last November saying, "We can wait. The wind is blowing in our faces. We can wait for better weather."

He went on to point out the four bases of military power, namely, land, people, natural resources, and industrial capacity. The Communist land mass is six times as large as the United States; there are 800 million people in the Red empire and there are only 170 million Americans. The Soviet Union also has the largest land army in the world. Red China has the second largest. The American Army is third. In the sphere of natural resources, the Communists have vast resources, most of which are unexploited. However, in industrial capacity, America still outstrips the Communist world. This has resulted in our superiority in the field of air-atomic strength, which is the most important deterrents to the Soviets starting a major war.

But what is happening to our advantage in the industrial and scientific spheres? Russia developed the atom and hydrogen bomb years before they were expected to. Their development of jet aircraft occurred long before predicted. To quote Senator JACKSON:

> Seven years ago we had a monopoly of both atomic bombs and planes for delivering them against distant targets. Today both monopolies are gone. Furthermore today we cannot even be confident that we are ahead of Moscow in long-range airpower.

In addition, Senator JACKSON went on to join with many others who have predicted that we may well lose the race for developing the ballistic missile.

It is not necessary to point out the serious challenge with which we would be faced should the Soviets develop the ultimate in potential destruction, the hydrogen-equipped ballistics missile. I am sure we all recognize that such a tool in the hands of the Soviets before we achieve its development would for the first time in the cold war give the Soviets an upper hand in the means of mass destruction. I doubt if any of us feel confident that the power-mad rulers of Communist imperialism would decline to use this advantage if they were sure they had it.

But my purpose in raising this subject was not to develop the need for ballistic missile research per se, a need which was eloquently stated in the address by the junior Senator from Washington. Rather, it was to point up a broader subject of the need for continued advance in scientific research and development, including the field of missiles. I think one of the deterrents to western advance in this field is the compartmentalization of science which has occurred as a result of the lack of systematic efforts to bring the great scientific reservoir of knowledge in Western Europe into constant contact with our own scientists.

Of course, the great problem of maintaining superiority in the field of nuclear weapons and our ability to deliver them is of paramount importance to our survival. But what may be more important is the general level of scientific advance in new, as yet unheard of, fields. We have come so far in scientific development so rapidly that it would be foolish to think that we are at the end of the line, foolish to think that no new concepts, even revolutionary concepts, are possible. While this is in the field of pure speculation, the day may arrive when effective means of deterring hydrogen attacks are developed. Perhaps the day may arrive when the hydrogen bomb itself may be susperseded by a weapon of even greater destruction. It is imperative that the free world maintain scientific superiority. We know the great resources the Soviets are devoting to this field. I believe we also know of the great contributions Europe has made to scientific advance. Indeed we may have lost the race for nuclear development if it were not for an Einstein from Germany and a Fermi from Italy. The Atlantic Alliance has a joint interest in maintaining freedom's advantage.

My resolution proposes that the President explore the possibility of developing "a joint program with common financing for more effective realization, exploitation and combination of the potential scientific and technological resources of the Atlantic nations, so as to insure through common effort an overall level of scientific and technological advancement, which will be sufficient to maintain for the indefinite future the scientific and technological superiority of the free world over the Communist bloc, and to assure to all the peoples of the participating Atlantic nations the multiplied scientific and technical advances accruing from this combination of efforts and resources."

The resolution goes on to suggest that "as an initial step it is recommended that NATO establish a committee of scientific experts representing the member nations for the purpose of examining their common scientific and technological needs, their actual and potential facilities and resources, the rate of advancement required to maintain superiority over the Communist bloc and the areas and methods of common action among the Atlantic allies best calculated to insure maximum progress."

I believe this type of program would not only assist in assuring that the West stays ahead in the technological and scientific race but, in addition, would provide the Atlantic alliance with a new source of strength and another tangible and important reason for being.

SELLING DEMOCRACY

There is a saying in sales circles that the most successful salesman is the one who knows he has the best product. However, I am sure that all would agree that in the competition between ideas as in the competition between products the victory will not accrue to the one who sits complacently by with the best product but does not undertake necessary efforts to make others aware that it is the best.

Clearly, in the field of ideas, we have the advantage. Our goals are peace, freedom, and a better life for all. These real and legitimate goals are the ends that all the peoples of the world are seeking.

I fear that to some extent we have been guilty of a lack of aggressiveness in explaining the potentials and opportunities that a free political and economic society offers. Clearly all of the western nations have a stake in this endeavor.

We, of course, have our information program and exchange of persons programs designed to explain the truth of the democratic way of life. Some of our allies, principally Great Britain, also have information efforts of their own. Yet, despite these efforts, the Communists have been able to perpetuate myths regarding the democratic way of life and the motives which underlie our foreign policy. Unfortunately, one of the myths they have succeeded in selling to a great many people is that the NATO alliance constitutes a danger to world peace. This idea is particularly dangerous in view of the fact that NATO is truly the anchor of preserving peace and maintaining freedom in the world. For this reason as well as the more fundamental reason that all the Western Allies have a joint stake in an information program which explains democracy, my resolution proposes that the President explore the possibility of developing a "jointly financed and jointly operated program of information designed to make better use of the combined psychological skills and facilities of the Atlantic allies in exposing the falsity of Communist propaganda and in creating throughout the world better public understanding and support of the fundamental principles and values of free civilization."

Another valuable part of our efforts to create understanding regarding our motives as well as an understanding of the nature of the free democratic way of life is the educational and cultural exchange program. I believe the President should also explore the possibility of developing a "jointly financed and jointly operated program of educational and cultural exchange designed to secure active allied participation in an equitable allied contribution to exchange projects of the same general character as those currently conducted and financed unilaterally by the United States Government under the Information and Exchange Act of 1948."

Most of these proposals would not only bring our western allies into close collaboration with us in the necessary efforts to explain freedom to the world and, at the same time, explain our peaceful intentions but would also have the advantage of sharing the cost for these necessary undertakings. Finally they would provide the Atlantic alliance with additional reasons for being, with additional motivating and cementing forces in our common effort to preserve and extend the areas of freedom in the world.

The unilateral financing of all of the efforts I have mentioned or the provision of the lion's share of these necessary efforts on the part of the United States has been necessary in the past due to the

poor economic position of our European allies. This, however, is no longer totally true. The motivation for developing the types of jointly planned and jointly financed programs is also a crying need because the Atlantic alliance is in urgent need of new nonmilitary cementing forces.

I think proposals such as outlined in my resolution or ones similar to them should be completely explored by the administration as early as possible. With this in mind, I have sponsored the resolution in the hope that it may prevail in the Congress after careful review and scrutiny, and thereby serve to indicate to the President programs that the Congress is prepared to support.

One area of cooperation not mentioned in my resolution is the NATO Parliamentary Union. Our distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. WAYNE HAYS, has already sponsored a resolution to continue this vital cooperation between parliamentarians of the Atlantic alliance. The distinguished service Congressman HAYS has performed in the Atlantic alliance is known in the Congress and his efforts to make this cooperation permanent has already moved forward. It was therefore felt unnecessary to restate the need for this program in the resolution I have submitted.

Recently the White House released a summary of the Eisenhower-Eden conference. This summary said in part:

> We reaffirm that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is essential to our common security. We regard this association as far more than a military alliance. We welcome the increasing range of consultations in the Council on political and other problems.

I fully agree with this sentiment but it must take on more substance than a mere statement of purpose. We must put some meat on the bones of consultation. The nonmilitary activities of NATO must take concrete form if NATO is to survive through the zigs and zags of Communist treachery.

CONCLUSION

I am sure that we all recognize that the fight with communism is primarily a fight of ideas and here I think we hold the upper hand but I do not think we have been particularly forceful in the explanation of why we hold the upper hand. Let us recall that our great revolutionary ancestors had a burning faith in liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This faith is still good for us and this faith is still good for our friends around the world. Our problem is that we have not been particularly forceful in explaining why we have the highest standard of living on the face of the earth and while having it we continue to be the citadel of liberty and the embodiment of the possibility of the pursuit of happiness.

We are now the leaders of the free world. Leadership for us must mean more than the showing of our muscle, more than being the policeman, more than holding the line. Leadership must mean for us to strive to achieve the revolutionary promises of the Declaration of Independence—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These goals are fine for us. Likewise they are fine for our friends in the have-not and uncommitted nations of the world. Extending these advantages throughout the world is not only a most rewarding contribution to mankind but it is the only sure way to peace.

I am convinced that our system of political and economic freedom can work wonders for the other parts of the world. This is not to suggest that we are to export American capitalism in the precise form it has taken in the historical development of this country. Paul Hoffman in the Marshall plan days had a phrase which I think is most appropriate. He said, "Adapt, not adopt."

I think that, by encouraging adaptation, we hold the potential for doing much more about assisting those who want to help themselves toward economic advancement within the framework of freedom and I think we can do more with less cost to ourselves in the long run.

We have come along way toward winning the peoples of the world to democratic ideas. We cannot now tire in these efforts because they mean so much to those we help. We cannot tire in our imaginative genius to meet new situations with new ideas. The challenges we face today are not the same as those of 1950 or 1948.

This is not to suggest that the United States should outbid the Soviets in every one of their economic maneuvers. Clearly, our program must be solidly based on our own goals. On the other hand, I do not believe we can afford the gamble that some suggest when they say that the Soviets are not serious about their new economic offensive. I doubt if we dare gamble with freedom and our national survival to that extent.

The NATO alliance between the Atlantic Powers is the anchor of the defense of freedom and democracy in the world. It is in need of sustenance today. Sustenance of a nonmilitary nature. Fortunately this need coincides with the opportunity to develop joint programs along the lines I have suggested but we dare not put off this job too long. Since the United States is clearly the most powerful member of the alliance, I think it is incumbent upon us to come forth with proposals. I believe the action of the Congress in adopting a resolution of the type suggested would serve a great purpose. Clearly, it would indicate to the President and the responsible members of the administration the areas in which the Congress is prepared to support new joint endeavors. In a more important sense, it would indicate to the world the firm bipartisan intent of the American people that they are in the fight for freedom to stay and to win.

So long as democracy offers any superior means of overcoming our enemy, communism, we cannot afford war. Clearly, if the contest between tyranny and freedom is to be conducted on a nonmilitary basis; if it is to be conducted primarily on the economic, diplomatic, and cultural realms, I think we have the advantage. Our system of political freedom and expanding economy which benefits all is superior to the Soviet system of regimentation and forced economic advance. But this advantage is ours only if we use it and use it effectively. The proposals I have made are intended, in some measure, as a contribution to developing new and more vigorous means of pursuing our goal of peace and freedom in the world.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think these other countries will share equally with the United States in any such world bank as the gentleman is proposing here?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I did not suggest that I anticipated an equal sharing; but we have every indication from many of the members that they would share in the undertaking.

As I say, the NATO structure is deteriorating and they are looking for ways to strengthen it as the President of Italy suggested when he was here last week. As the President of Italy suggested when he was here last week, he is looking for new ways to strengthen NATO.

Mr. GROSS. There is no question but what it is deteriorating. It has been deteriorating for a long, long time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Would the gentleman agree that we ought to do something to strengthen NATO?

Mr. GROSS. I want to keep the United States strong; I want to keep the North and South American continents strong. I have lost faith in these so-called free-world friends in Europe, doing their share toward keeping peace and security in the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have the feeling they are partners in the defense of freedom together with us and I want to take those measures that will strengthen this partnership.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on the question of willingness of other countries to join in an aid program, is the gentleman from New Jersey aware of the recent statement made by West Germany's Foreign Minister Heinrich Von Brentano, which is reported in the U. S. News & World Report of February 10, 1956, in which, in answer to a question whether Germany intended to participate in helping underdeveloped countries, the German Foreign Minister said:

> A joint aid for the so-called underdeveloped countries is a task of various international organizations of which Germany is a member. I am thinking in this respect as much of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation as of the World Bank, but also of NATO.
>
> At the last NATO meeting these questions were taken up in connection with concrete suggestions from Canada and Italy regarding the realization of article 2 of the NATO Charter. The federal government certainly will participate in such joint actions, according to its capabilities. Moreover, I consider this task as a real political problem; every initiative in this field will help to counteract the economic and political offensive of the Soviet Union which has been seen at various points of the world during recent months.

Does not the gentleman from New Jersey think there have been many hopeful expressions from our allies in NATO that they would welcome the opportunity to join in the sacrifice necessary to defend the free world?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do see these hopeful signs. This is a statement from the Prime Minister of a nation that does not feel the military situation sufficiently severe now that they are contributing in full measure to the military strength of the NATO group.

I will go on to another point raised in the resolution that provides for the pooling of scientific knowledge in an effort to realize the maximum among the free countries in the development and keeping pace in scientific knowledge. It seems to me there has been so much departmentalization among countries and the lack of pooling of knowledge that there is a real threat when we know that the Soviets are moving ahead in scientific and engineering knowledge. This would allow through NATO a joint pooling and appraisal of the scientific and engineering situation and bring together the best thoughts. Certainly no one can disagree that the European countries have a great scientific and engineering talent.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is it not true that Foreign Minister Pinaud of France made some of the most critical statements regarding western policies which have been made by any French Prime Minister since 1942?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think that is certainly true, particularly within the last week.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman feel that the Communist propaganda has made great headway in Asia and Europe by picturing the Atlantic pact as purely a military alliance which drains the economic resources of the opportunities of providing a better life and which exists at best for negative purposes only?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I understand that is true. While in one sense negative, at least, solely a military alliance and is often pictured as an aggressive alliance, and in part, I think, if we infuse new life into NATO, we will certainly meet that propaganda threat and, in addition, we will strengthen our important anchor for free world survival.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I feel that my able colleague from New Jersey deserves our heartiest commendation for his timely and thoughtful remarks. At a moment when our country is becoming more and more uneasy about the new face which the Communists are presenting to the world and when the turbulent pace of events in Asia and the Near East seems to have hypnotized our foreign-policy makers, it is important that a Member of this House has retained the perspective and imagination which Congressman WILLIAMS has demonstrated in proposing his concurrent resolution.

Even though the recent congress of the Communist Party in Moscow was the occasion for considerable downgrading of the thought and writings of Joseph Stalin, I think the Western World would do well not to forget the last thesis of the departed dictator delivered at the party congress preceding his death. He predicted that the Western Powers would fall from their positions of strength because of falling out among themselves. The present leaders of the Soviet world have surely not relegated this bit of Stalinist philosophy to the trash pile—at least, not in private. They have taken precisely those steps which are best calculated to make Stalin's promise come true by ostentatiously pretending to diminish the immediate military threat to Europe. The fear and paralysis which the North Atlantic Treaty was so brilliantly designed to overcome in 1949 has been reduced both by the success of NATO itself and also by the shrewd, new, conciliatory tone adopted by the Communist leadership in place of Stalin's threats and pressure.

It is time now for our own policymakers to show again the vision and determination, and the bold innovation which characterized our steps to build a military bulwark in Europe. These qualities have lately been preempted from us by the Communists. Actually, the North Atlantic Treaty made provision in article II for the economic and political collaboration which is now needed in addition to its military structure. So the four specific proposals embodied in Mr. Williams' resolution are not radical new departures but merely the fulfillment of the original purposes of the treaty. President Gronchi reminded the House only last week of article II of the treaty, and called for its implementation.

It seems to me that the four projects proposed in this resolution are of almost equal merit. I have myself been interested in strengthening the administration and financial support of our exchange of persons programs and our projects for sending abroad outstanding representatives of American culture; and one of my bills, H. R. 8920, has been under consideration by the Foreign Affairs Committee at hearings held this morning. There is nothing incompatible between my proposals for strengthening our informational and cultural programs and my colleague's ideas for developing jointly financed and operated programs of this type as part of the efforts of the Atlantic allies to propagate their common ideals and heritage. Our American objective of influencing the former colonial peoples of the world to recognize the priceless benefits of the democratic system and the perils of the communistic authoritarian approach to solving their problems is the same as the NATO objective would be under this proposed program, and the consolidated efforts of the Atlantic allies could be even more effective than our present separate programs. The uncommitted countries of the world would see an impressive demonstration of the conviction of the NATO nations in the rightness of their political philosophy and the fundamentally spiritual basis of their alliance. At the same time our Government would not need to abandon our existing national information programs, and many thousands of exchanges of persons would continue to be carried out by private American organizations.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel these proposals have great merit both intrinsically and in further cementing the Atlantic alliance. It is most heartening to see our colleague providing the kind of original thinking which our country needs at this turning point in world affairs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] for his contribution and for his support of the resolution. I certainly look forward to working with him in our joint efforts, together with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], to strengthen the NATO alliance and bring new life and new substance to it.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey has hold of a most constructive suggestion when he recommends that this country take the lead in developing a nonmilitary content to our NATO undertaking.

NATO was conceived as a method of building up large western ground forces capable of deterring a Russian attack without necessarily engaging in atomic war.

But NATO is not working out as planned. Only some 20 western divisions face some 160 Russian and satellite divisions in Central Europe. French preoccupation with their overseas territories has kept down her participation. German rearmament has been much slower than expected. NATO is consequently committed to the use of atomic weapons. At the same time, the morale of our European allies has been weakened by the knowledge that Russia probably has an 800 mile ballistic missile capable of annihilating them.

Precisely because the military side of NATO has become less promising, it is necessary that we find new economic, political, and social possibilities for NATO. Nowhere is the need for a change in emphasis greater than in the case of Germany. Today Germany is bound to NATO mainly by military ties. Yet even that bond depends far too much on the fragile health of a great but aged statesman, Chancellor Adenauer. Powerful forces in Germany are already pressing for withdrawal from NATO in favor of a heavily armed and ostensibly neutral Germany, capable of playing East against West. With shallow roots in the western economic and social community, Germany may well turn toward the East.

But a German drift toward the East can be avoided. Germany belongs to the Atlantic community in far more than a military sense. She is Atlantic economically, socially, and spiritually,

if we will have the wisdom to welcome her on these terms.

In welcoming Germany to a full role in the Atlantic community, we can bring new vigor to NATO, new strength to American policy, and new resources to the aid of underdeveloped countries. Specifically, we can invite Germany to join with all of us, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in a common program of help to the less fortunate nations of the world. German resources and skills, German leadership have a great deal to contribute to this program. Certainly the needs of underdeveloped countries are so great that we should no longer exclude a country with so much of value to offer from a share in this work. And just as important, in calling on German help, we encourage the Germans themselves to rejoin, in the fullest sense, the spiritual and economic community of the West. In such a program of common effort, Germany will by her own action sink her roots deeper into the West, so that her future will not turn as precariously as it now does on the life of one man.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from New Jersey will press his resolution with vigor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I assure the gentleman I will, and I thank him, too, for bringing some very worthwhile thought to the discussion on the resolution I have introduced.

TWELVE MOST POWERFUL MEN IN THE WORLD—FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE CONTRARY TO INTENTIONS OF ORIGINAL FEDERAL RESERVE ACT—SPEECH DELIVERED BEFORE WOMEN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB ON CREDIT CONTROLS AND INSTALLMENT BUYING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by me before the Women's National Democratic Club.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, before inserting the talk that I made before the Women's National Democratic Club in Washington, D. C., on yesterday, March 5, 1956, I desire to comment on the Federal Open Market Committee because it is appropriate in connection with the talk.

President Woodrow Wilson strongly and vigorously opposed private bankers being allowed to determine monetary policy, fix interest rates, and otherwise determine the volume of credit and currency.

Senator Carter Glass, when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, was coauthor of the Glass-Owen bill, to create the Federal Reserve System. Later Mr. Glass was elected to the United States Senate and continued to have great influence over amendments to the Federal Reserve Act. In 1926 Mr. Glass published a book on Adventure in Constructive Finance. In this book he gives the history of the Federal Reserve Act. Commencing at page 114 in the book, the following appears:

> You will note that the bill requires the three members selected by the banks to sever all bank connections before qualifying. Might it not be well at least to take Mr. McAdoo's suggestion and have the President select these men from a list proposed by the banks? With high esteem, etc.
>
> The President was adamant; and, if there was ever a lapse, I soon was to revive the conviction that Mr. Wilson knew more about these matters than I did. As anticipated, when the bill was introduced in Congress, bankers raised an uproar about this provision. With scarcely suppressed satisfaction, I headed a delegation of them to the White House to convince the President he was wrong. Forgan and Wade, Sol Wexler and Perrin, Howe and other members of the currency commission of the American Bankers Association constituted the party. The first two, peremptory and arbitrary, used to having their own way, did not mince matters. They evidently were not awed by titled consequence, for they spoke with force and even bitterness. Sol Wexler and Perrin were suave and conciliatory. The President was courteous and contained. These great bankers, arbiters for years of the country's credits, were grouped about the President's desk in the Executive Office adjoining the Cabinet room. I sat outside the circle, having already voiced my own dissent from the President's attitude. President Wilson faced the group across the desk; and as these men drove home what seemed to me good reason after good reason for banker representation on the central board, I actually experienced a sense of regret that I had a part in subjecting Mr. Wilson to such an ordeal. When they had ended their arguments, Mr. Wilson, turning more particularly to Forgan and Wade, said quietly: "Will one of you gentlemen tell me in what civilized country of the earth there are important government boards of control on which private interests are represented?" There was painful silence for the longest single moment I ever spent; and before it was broken Mr. Wilson further inquired: "Which of you gentlemen thinks the railroads should select members of the Interstate Commerce Commission?" There could be no convincing reply to either question, so the discussion turned to other points of the currency bill; and, notwithstanding a desperate effort was made in the Senate to give the banks minority representation on the Reserve Board, the proposition did not prevail.

So that was the original Federal Reserve Act as sponsored and approved by President Woodrow Wilson. It became a law December 23, 1913.

In 1935, as an emergency measure—doubtless, never intended as permanent law—the act was amended to provide a Federal Open Market Committee, composed of 12 members, with almost unlimited power and control over the printing, issuance, and distribution of our money with power to determine whether or not we have good times or hard times, whether interest rates will be high or low, and whether we will have sound money or hard money.

This Board, under the 1935 act, is composed of the 7 members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the 5 presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks—there being 12 Federal Reserve banks and 24 branches.

Later, the act was amended to make the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York a permanent member of the Board; the other four presidents alternate annually. Mr. Allan Sproul is president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. He is elected by the directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Six of the nine directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York are elected by the banks of that Federal Reserve District. All presidents of Federal Reserve banks are selected the same way.

The open-market account is operated under Mr. Sproul, of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and he selects the manager and the employees. Mr. Sproul is paid by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and so are all the employees under him, including those operating the Federal open-market account.

Recently, when Mr. Marriner S. Eccles was testifying before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I asked him if the open-market account could be operated as well in Washington as in New York, and his answer was in the affirmative. Mr. Eccles was Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board longer than any other person.

Yet, we permit the private bankers of New York to not only run the biggest bank in the Federal Reserve System, but also to operate, supposedly in the public interest, the open-market account.

This open-market manager in carrying out policies adopted by the open-market committee can buy United States Government bonds by taking our Federal Reserve notes from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and paying for them. In other words, he receives, free of charge, from the Government our printed money, a noninterest-bearing obligation, and exchanges it for United States Government bonds, an interest-bearing obligation. He divides these bonds among the 12 banks, and these banks hold the bonds and collect interest on them as the interest becomes due. It is very much like an agent of a corporation giving a check on the corporation to pay for a bond that is owed by the corporation, keep the bond, and then require the corporation to pay him interest on it and claim it as his own.

Be that as it may—it is our system. The more important point is, should it be operated by persons who have selfish interests and who have an ax to grind? Our capitalistic system is the best. Our commercial banking system is fine. However, we must make sure they are being operated in the public interest and not permit abuses. We want the banks to make a fair profit, otherwise they cannot render the services the people properly demand and need.

The purchase and sale of Government securities can be very profitable to the manipulators of and the speculators in United States Government securities. In one year, certain big banks made enormous windfall profits running into millions of dollars each buying and selling Government securities in an unregulated market. If traders can judge what this open-market committee is going to do, they can make a killing in the market. Congress is taking a great responsibility in permitting the people's credit to be abused in this manner and through a market that is in no way regulated. There has never been an independent audit or an audit by the Comptroller

General of the Federal Reserve Board, Federal Reserve banks, or the open-market committee.

I have a bill providing for the abolishment of the open-market committee as it is now constituted and to set up a new Federal Reserve Board of 12 members instead of 7 and make the members of this Board one from each Federal Reserve district, the open-market committee to be operated in Washington, D. C., instead of New York City under direction of representatives of the private banks.

The speech delivered before the Democratic Club is as follows:

A DISCUSSION OF CREDIT CONTROLS AND INSTALLMENT BUYING

(Address by WRIGHT PATMAN, before the Woman's National Democratic Club luncheon, Washington, D. C., March 5, 1956)

Madam President, members of the Woman's National Democratic Club, and guests, my talk is about credit controls, and consumer credit controls in particular. This is a subject, which is very much in the news today.

I recall that monetary controls were quite stylish in the 1920's too. Bankers occupied important public offices then. Their prestige in the community was enormous.

After 1929, monetary and credit controls fell into disfavor. Bankers were not regarded with as much awe in the 1930's as they had been in the 1920's.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was set up to bail out the banks.

By 1936 some of them felt strong enough to try to regain their previous position of influence. A cry of inflation went up. Credit control was urged. It was tried. After the 1937 recession, it seemed as if credit controls were dead for good. But bankers, like old soldiers, never die—they fade away temporarily.

Monetary and credit controls are the major tools of national economic policy today. While the spadework to cultivate a climate of public opinion favorable to the return of credit control began in early 1946 and the first implementing steps were taken in 1951 under cover of the Korean emergency, credit control did not begin to be operated in a vigorous way until January 2, 1953. It has worked wonders for the bankers.

Listen to this account of the atmosphere at the American Bankers Association's convention last September in Chicago. It appeared in a column by J. A. Livingston, a nationally syndicated financial columnist. He wrote:

"Not in more than a quarter of a century, not since the booming twenties, have the bankers of the United States felt so important, so in demand * * * bankers have become rationers of credit."

Long years of study have convinced me that money and credit policies can be effectively used to promote an expanding economy for the benefit of all the people—farmers, workers, businessmen, and consumers.

There are certain groups in our economy who are afraid of abundance, who prefer scarcity. There are groups who want credit regulated so that it can be kept scarce and costly.

One of the best examples of the value of installment credit is its use by customers of the REA. Rural powerlines brought to farm people one of the greatest blessings of mankind. It is said that the four greatest evils are poverty, ignorance, disease, and crime. Another could very well be added—drudgery. With the great convenience of electricity being afforded farm families and through the use of installment credit, more than $15 billion of electrical appliances were purchased by them. Washing machines and milking machines to remove much of the back-breaking duties were among the first purchases of every farm family. Now, the average farm home has every convenience enjoyed by the guests of the finest hotel in the land. Good, hard-surface, all-weather roads, purchased on the installment plan, are available to the farm family as a farm-to-market, to-church, to-school highway; it makes possible prompt mail delivery service and places the farm family within a few minutes of a town or city.

If the Federal Reserve had been regulating installment credit, I doubt that the people in rural or urban life today would be enjoying so many useful and luxurious appliances for their needs and entertainment.

After some extensive experience in politics and as a close observer of banking as well as other businesses, I can also tell you that elected Representatives either represent their constituents or else they know they will ultimately be replaced by men who will.

It seems to me that we have to bear this in mind when we appraise the renewed stylishness of credit controls and the current proposals to establish permanent controls over consumer credit. This sounds like another OPA dressed up differently to me.

Let me say that I was terribly shocked when I heard about President Eisenhower's attack. All Americans are overjoyed at the remarkable recovery, which has led him to decide to stand for a second term. But contrast the sense of grief and the thoughts you must have had when you heard of the President's attack with this account of its impact on the American Bankers Association Convention. This is from J. A. Livington's column of Monday, September 26:

"President Eisenhower's heart attack hung like crape over the American Bankers Association Convention starting at the Conrad Hilton Hotel today.

"The dominant thinking went like this:

"'Ike won't run in 1956. If a Democrat wins, the whole character of the Government will change—the people running it, the policies, the method, and the legislation.'" (Marshall (Tex.) Messenger, September 26, 1955.)

Now I mention this with no particular feeling of malice toward bankers. They are a fine, patriotic group, who think their policies are best for the country. Naturally, they want policies that will also help their business. It's just like Mr. Wilson. He honestly believes that what's good for General Motors is good for you and all the rest of the American people. Bankers probably feel the same way. What's good for banking is good for the country.

A while ago, I noted that elected Representatives are expected to represent their constituents.

Mr. Allan Sproul is the president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank. He is elected by representatives of the private commercial banks in the New York Federal Reserve District. Mr. Sproul, who is no doubt an honorable man and sincere in his convictions, has been the prime mover in the campaign to establish permanent control over consumer credit and assign that authority to the Federal Reserve. Mr. Sproul made the first public statement proposing this last December and was immediately followed by President Eisenhower's recommendation that the matter be studied.

Earlier in 1955, during the summer, it was Mr. Sproul who started the runaway inflation scare and initiated the campaign to make mortgage and consumer installment credit scarcer and costlier.

Mr. Sproul notified banks to stop the warehousing of home mortgages, a practice which relieves temporary periods of tightness in the mortgage market.

I heard of many veterans and other home buyers, who were later being charged discounts as high as 10 percent on Government underwritten home mortgages. These discounts, which added more than $1,000 to the cost of a $12,000 home, have enabled mortgage bankers to reap a golden harvest.

On a 25-year loan purchased by a banker at a discount of only 8 points, the rate of return is 5½ percent. Think of it, a 5½ percent return on what is practically a risk-less investment, backed up by the full faith and credit of the United States Government. Of course, many veterans were denied the opportunity to acquire homes, due to the stiffer terms and the funds scarcity.

In the field of consumer credit, Mr. Sproul's open-mouth policy was a signal to bankers to boost their charges on installment loans. Charges on installment loans to finance such items as autos, TV sets, home appliances, and other durable goods were boosted.

New York's First National City Bank, whose former executive committee chairman, W. Randolph Burgess, is now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of credit and debt-management policies, led the way.

This bank, which dominates commercial banks in the consumer loan field, raised its personal loan charges from $3.83 per $100 to $4.25 per $100. On FHA insured modernization loans, its rates were raised from $3.50 to $4.25 per $100. On these loans, the bank deducts the charges it makes in advance and then the borrower repays the full amount. This means that the new discount of $4.25 on personal loans actually costs the borrower 8.2 percent simple interest a year compared with the previous rate of 7.36 percent.

Speaking of the First National City Bank of New York and Mr. Burgess, who together with Mr. Sproul so greatly influences our present national credit policies, reminds me of a speech the former made in 1951. He was then executive committee chairman at National City, and having in mind the benefits of the newly establishd "independence" of the Federal Reserve stated:

"Money was kept too cheap too long for the benefit of the Treasury."

Curiously in this speech, entitled "Money Is an Instrument of Democracy," Mr. Burgess explained why it was necessary to establish the independence of the Federal Reserve. He said:

"Making money scarcer and costlier takes courage and judgment. That is the reason why it can't be done safely or well by politicians. The usefulness of the central bank is exactly in doing unpopular things at the right time. The wise government knows this and leaves these unpopular jobs to the Federal Reserve. The foolish sovereign interferes and tries to use money for political ends."

I have perhaps gone far afield in this discussion, which was supposed to be about installment credit controls, nevertheless, I think it is essential that we do not lose sight of the philosophy, the politics, and the economic interests of the people, who have made credit controls stylish once more.

Now if you will permit me, I'll discuss some of the issues regarding consumer credit. Let me start out by saying that a defender of consumer credit, like myself, usually finds himself in a difficult position. The advocates of control are constantly shifting ground. You never quite know from day to day what you're supposed to be defending.

I recall, for example, that in an interview with U. S. News & World Report about a year ago, Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors, took a Calvinist view of easy credit. He feared that it was undermining the moral fiber of our young people in particular. Well, I don't know how to answer that except to say that our young people have a strong urge to maintain and improve their living standards and are not going to be restricted socially or economically by strait-laced concepts of finance.

Indeed the President's Council of Economic Advisers in the January 1956 Annual

Report regard this characteristic optimistically. They say:

"The urge to maintain and improve living standards is so strong nowadays that continuation of a high level of consumer spending can be reasonably anticipated" (p. 49).

In fairness to Chairman Martin I must point out that sometime between the early part of 1955 and last October, he had some second thoughts on the subject. In a speech before the New York group of the Investment Bankers Association, Chairman Martin said:

"Time was when a man who financed luxury expenditures on credit was considered stupid and unreliable; but now one who refuses to capitalize on his potential and confines himself to financial actuality is the unusual case.

"The typical installment borrower today is not an improvident man with small income. He is chiefly an urban or suburban dweller, is generally above 25 years of age, is married and has children to support, has an average income of about $5,000, and often has sizable financial assets.

"He has committed himself to a regimen of small monthly payments for the purpose of aquiring an equity. To him these payments are essentially savings. And when you stop to think about it, what mor sensible use of savings is there than their purposeful application to an improved standard of living for the saver himself and his family? This is an investment in life itself."

Martin pointed out that about 60 percent of American families use consumer installment credit. The total of such credit, he added, approximates $26 billion as compared with $84 billion for housing and $30 billion for commercial bank business loans.

"I venture the thought," he said, "that this $26 billion of consumer credit has a more influential impact on the overall credit structure today than any other form, both as an indicator of its soundness and as a forecaster of future commercial activity.

"Its importance to industry is apparent from the fact that about 65 percent of all automobiles and about half of all major appliances are now sold on credit; and installment credit alone provides about $20 billion a year for these purchases."

Another reason the controllers give for regulating consumer credit is that it is too high. Well, how high is too high? What standards do you use to measure it?

Usually they relate consumer debt to income. But notice that they are comparing a total of debt outstanding, which may last not 1 year but 2 or even 3 years, to income in the current year only. This doesn't yield meaningful results. In order to tell whether debt, which doesn't have to be paid off until next year or year after, is too high in relation to income, we need to know something about future income. We don't. Now suppose we do take the ratio of debt to income in the current year and it is higher than last year, does this prove it is too high? I think it proves nothing.

I recently asked Mr. Martin whether he thought consumer debt was too high. He said he didn't know.

There are many who believe as I do that consumer credit is probably the healthiest part of our total debt structure and far from being too high—may not be high enough.

Let me quote from the New York Times, February 12, 1956:

"Retailers are making their most extensive efforts to get the public to buy more merchandise 'on the cuff.'

"Denying contentions that the public is oversold on credit, department and specialty stores are, in fact, promoting charge account and installment buying more heavily than ever before. The practice, they maintain, is completely sound. They recognize that consumer debt is now at a new high—more than $36 billion for the Nation at the end of 1955. But, they argue, the level of consumer debt is not out of line with the consumer's ability to spend.

"Furthermore, the public is paying its bills promptly. Bad-debt losses of stores are less than one-half of 1 percent of all credit sales—about the same as they were before the war, when credit buying was much lower in volume.

"Stores are actually finding it easier to collect from their customers today. In the average month last year they collected 49.55 percent of the money owed them on the first of the month. In 1939 they collected only 47.86 percent of their outstanding debt with such punctuality.

"Retailers are promoting more credit because it brings them more sales and because they are convinced the public wants to buy and can afford to buy on credit.

"At a meeting of credit men last week, Howard P. Abrahams, retail sales promotion consultant, dramatized the amazing growth of credit in the last 15 years.

"He told how he had lived on credit that day. He drove to the railroad station, stopping to buy gas for his car and charging it to his credit card. He bought his train ticket with a railroad credit card. He needed cash when he arrived in the city, so he went to a hotel and cashed a check with his hotel credit card. He charged his lunch to a restaurant charge plan. He didn't say how he found room in his pocket for all the credit cards.

"If his wife was shopping that day, she probably did it without benefit of cash, using her 'charga-plate.' Even if she lacked a charge account at a store, she would have found that she could open one simply by signing her name to an application card.

"Today, Mr. Abrahams says, there are few things that cannot be bought on credit. Round-the-world trips, dancing lessons, college educations, even wedding receptions are on a buy-now-pay-later basis.

"Federated Department Stores, one of the country's largest department-store groups, reported last week that almost 60 percent of its sales are on one form of credit or another. The figure is probably about average for department stores.

"And the stores are not satisfied. They want to increase this percentage, because they regard credit as an important selling tool."

I have read that a leading economist, Mr. Arno H. Johnson, director of research, J. Walter Thompson Agency, estimates that consumer credit could expand 60 percent over the high 1955 level without becoming overextended in relation to uncommitted consumer incomes.

Mr. Johnson also points out that credit will have to grow faster to get the level of personal consumption needed to support a $500 billion gross national production in 1965.

Some advocates of control say consumer credit has expanded at too rapid a rate. However, Federal Reserve Board figures show the following change between the first quarter and fourth quarter of 1955:

Total installment credit

[Billions]

First quarter:	
Extended	$2.9
Repaid	2.5
Fourth quarter:	
Extended	3.1
Repaid	2.8

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin, February 1956, p. 162.

In brief, the average monthly rate of repayment rose by $100 million more than the average monthly rate of new credit extended between the first and fourth quarters of 1955.

Some critics say that consumer credit is inflationary. Actually, much of the financing of consumer credit does little to increase the money supply. Of the total $28 billion of installment credit outstanding, less than half, or $10 billion is held by commercial banks.

Sales finance companies and credit unions, which account for $10.5 billion of consumer installment credit, go to sources of real savings for their funds in periods of expansion.

Sales finance companies, which hold $8.9 billion of installment credit, raise their money in the commercial paper market. Their paper is privately placed with corporations or individuals, who have savings to invest.

Department stores, which hold $1.5 billion of installment credit, finance their paper out of their own savings and do not draw on commercial bank credit.

In other words, sales finance companies and department stores do not contribute to inflation by increasing the money supply when they expand consumer credit.

What is there that the advocates of consumer credit control are worried about? As near as I can tell, after all the charges are reubtted, we are left with warnings about dire consequences at some distant unnamed date in the future.

I recall that in the twenties when commercial banks wouldn't touch consumer credit, we heard about dire consequences too. The record shows that in 1931–32, about 85 percent of outstanding debt was liquidated in 1 year, the balance shortly afterwards and little loss of equity was involved.

The consumer is his own best credit regulator. He is honest and he is anxious to hold onto what he has bought, even if it means foregoing other purchases.

Similarly, I trust the good judgment of our businessman in peacetime to determine the terms and volume of credit he wishes to extend. They are particularly alert to limit the extension of credit if it is felt that the risk of loss is increasing.

Consumer credit represents only one part of the total debt problem. I think it is the healthiest part. The other forms, such as business debt, loans on stocks and bonds, State and local government debt and the biggest single debtor of all—the Federal Government—need to be subjected to just as careful study, if not more, than consumer credit.

I happen to believe that the fact that commercial banks are relying more heavily each year for their net profits upon their installment credit business is not unrelated to the campaign launched by New York Federal Reserve Bank President Allan Sproul for legislation to give the Federal Reserve System permanent control over consumer credit.

Mr. Sproul is elected by representatives of the private commercial bankers of the New York Federal Reserve District. As Vice Chairman of the powerful Open Market Committee, he is already in a strategic position to influence the degree to which commercial banks and noncommercial banking institutions shall share the installment credit business. With the power to control consumer credit given to the Federal Reserve Board, commercial bankers, who never welcomed the new consumer credit industry, would be able to dominate the business.

There are other implications in the proposal to revive regulation W and give the Board permanent authority over consumer credit. Standardization of credit terms could be used against independent retailers by eliminating one of the methods they now employ to compete with their giant rivals for sales. If an independent merchant is willing to use his judgment and risk his capital on more liberal credit terms as a means of competing with his conservative giant chainstore rival across the street, I think he should have the opportunity to do so. But if regulation W is restored, he

will be denied that opportunity of competing.

I should like to conclude by stating that the reimposition of regulation W would give rise to a bootleg black market in credit with the worst type of credit abuses. The low-income families, those who rely on credit most to get many of today's necessities, would be the main victims. Businessmen would be faced with the necessity for delaying decisions for months to see what the statistics on consumer credit reveal.

Millions of Americans, who meet their credit obligations promptly, would greet with deserved resentment any attempt to curb the exercise of their free choice and good judgment.

We want credit to serve the needs of all the people—not to be used to advance the interest of a few, who want to be the people's masters.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DURHAM, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. DIGGS (at the request of Mrs. GRIFFITHS), for 1 hour, on Thursday next.

Mr. BAILEY, for 20 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. GRANT (at the request of Mr. BASS of Tennessee), on tomorrow, for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, on Thursday next, for 20 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.

Mr. PILLION and to include some statements.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2884. An act to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 7, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of the rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1607. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend certain provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, relating to educational exchange and other cultural programs under such act"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1608. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to the case of Erwin Gozdek, 0300–412484, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1609. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to the cases of Fajwel Goldblat (Felix Fibich), 0300–466850 (A–10054867), as well as that of his wife, Judyta Berg Goldblat (Judich Fibich), 0300–466849 (A–8282366), involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refuge Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1610. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1194. An act to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project; with amendment (Rept. No. 1849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1855. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1856. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 380. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 8572, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6955. A bill for the relief of Chaim Grade and Inna Hekker Grade; with amendment (Rept. No. 1851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 963. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb; with amendment (Rept. No. 1853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri; without amendment (Rept. No. 1854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 9762. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to declare the primacy of free enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 9763. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 9764. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 9765. A bill to protect farmers and other persons who are required to treat patronage dividends as income for Federal income tax purposes by providing for the collection of income tax at source on such dividends and to provide tax equity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 9766. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina (by request):

H. R. 9767. A bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability and death payable under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 9768. A bill relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii, amending Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889, and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892), and ratifying certain provisions of Act 273, Session Laws of Hawaii 1955, which authorizes issuance of public improvement bonds for schools in the city and county of Honolulu and the county of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9769. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 9770. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 9771. A bill to amend section 411 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to relationships between freight forwarders and other common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9772. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended,

to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 9773. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Board of Public Instruction of Brevard County, Fla.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 9774. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of Volusia County, Fla.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 9775. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 9776. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 9777. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 9778. A bill to provide an income-tax deduction for taxes paid by an employer on the wages of an employee who performs domestic or other personal or nonbusiness services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 9779. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9780. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9781. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit certain bank mergers, and provide for more effective enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9782. A bill to continue the authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 9783. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9784. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9785. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 9786. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, in order to provide a permanent program of assistance for school construction under the provisions of titles III and IV of such law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9787. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to establish a permanent program of financial assistance for local educational agencies under the provisions of such law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 9788. A bill to amend title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to increase existing limitations on terms and amounts of production and subsistence loans under such title; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9789. A bill to amend section 104 (c) and (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. Res. 421. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the printing of remarks of Members of the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the passage of legislation authorizing a flood-insurance program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 9790. A bill for the relief of Ludmilla Jungbauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 9791. A bill for the relief of Stefanos M. Kalogeras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9792. A bill for the relief of Tak Wa Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 9793. A bill for the relief of Pearl (Pik Chun) Ma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9794. A bill for the relief of Maria Maver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 9795. A bill for the relief of Clayton M. Jones and Aimee Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 9796. A bill for the relief of Michael D. Ovens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (by request):

H. R. 9797. A bill for the relief of Ana Da Conceicao Goncalves Roleira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9798. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Bertoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

617. By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia: Petition of 165 citizens of the city of Harrisonburg and the counties of Shenandoah and Rockingham, Va., urging passage of the Langer bill (S. 923) and the Siler bill (H. R. 4627) to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

618. Also, petition of 36 citizens of the city of Waynesboro and the county of Augusta, Va., urging passage of the Langer bill (S. 923) and the Siler bill (H. R. 4627) to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

619. Also, petition of 26 members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of Front Royal Methodist Church urging passage of the Langer bill (S. 923) and the Siler bill (H. R. 4627) to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interestate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

620. Also, petition of 74 members of the Christian Social Relations Committee of the Evangelical United Bretheran Church urging passage of the Langer bill (S. 923) and the Siler bill (H. R. 4627) to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

621. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the Kenosha (Wis.) Typographical Union No. 116, on February 24, 1956, urging a bold, long-range program for highway construction with costs equitably distributed among all segments of our population; to the Committee on Public Works.

622. Also, resolution adopted by the Kenosha Federation of Musicians, at Kenosha, Wis., on February 21, 1956, urging a bold, long-range program for highway construction with costs equitably distributed among all segments of our population; to the Committee on Public Works.

623. Also, resolution adopted by the Council of the State Medical Society of Wisconsin on February 26, 1956, protesting H. R. 7225 which would amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

624. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Reverend E. L. Miller and other citizens urging passage of S. 923 and H. R. 4627, legislation banning the transportation of alcoholic beverages advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

New Air Terminals Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention in the past few days that one of the major airlines has applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for the addition of Baltimore and Washington as coterminals with New York City on its route from Buenos Aires via the east coast of South America to San Juan, Puerto Rico.

The convenience of the service which would thus be provided to residents of the Washington-Baltimore area is, of course, great and it would, I feel, give additional assurance to South America that we in the United States are eager to develop closer and closer trade and cultural ties with those countries. It would undoubtedly stimulate travel between South America and the United States and it seems to me is a step in the right direction of trying to make interchange of people and goods between the United States and the rest of the world as easy as possible, for only through such interchange do we provide part of the answers

to the battle against communism—a communism which is making ever-increasing efforts throughout South America.

Correspondence on Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I recently had a most interesting exchange of letters with the Honorable Ernest Gruening, who served as Governor of Alaska from 1939 to 1953. On February 6, 1956, I had the statement in the daily RECORD, page A1137, entitled "There Are No Frontier Barriers for Free Men," in which I discussed American traditional opposition to colonialism and the expansion of Soviet colonialism in Europe and Asia since the end of World War II.

On February 20, Governor Gruening sent me a very informative letter in which he took issue with our policy regarding Alaska. That began our exchange of correspondence, which I am inserting into the RECORD because I believe it has general interest. May I add that I subscribe to the views expressed in Governor Gruening's two letters.

I am of the opinion that justice and fairness demand that statehood be granted to Alaska. The people living in Alaska are entitled to their full share of freedom, they have waited long enough, and they have shown that they are capable of self-government as a State in the family of the other 48 States. Statehood to Alaska would serve as a great boon to the economic development of that Territory, it would attract many people, and it would also be an economic boon to those States in the northwestern part of the country which lie closest to Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting two letters by Governor Gruening and my reply of February 23:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 20, 1956.*
Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANFUSO: I have read with much approval and sympathy your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, entitled "There Are No Frontier Barriers For Free Men." I wish to call one important matter, however, to your attention. Your address emphasizes the opposition of the United States throughout our history to colonialism and you say, among other things:

"In its essence the issue of colonialism is simply a question of the inherent right of peoples to exist in freedom from external domination and control. On this question, I am happy that the history of our country over the past 180 years has been a flaming testimonial of the opposition of the American people to the evils of colonialism."

If you will take the time to read the enclosed copy of my keynote address to the Alaska Constitutional Convention you will see that there is one regrettable exception to our Nation's otherwise superb record in this regard.

It is, of course, not surprising that even Members of Congress, like yourself, have been unaware of this. It is in fact the first time that the charge of colonialism has been publicly leveled at Uncle Sam, where, unfortunately, in the case of Alaska, it belongs. Indeed, instead of diminishing, in accord with a worldwide trend, Alaska's colonialism has been intensified under the present administration. The address gives several contemporary examples thereof.

While it was obviously not possible in a 1-hour address to give all the documentation that would have been desirable for those who unlike the delegates to the Convention were not familiar with the underlying facts, such substantiation is found fully in my book The State of Alaska, recently published by Random House.

Wholly applicable in a recent statement by Father William J. Kenealy, S. J., dean of the Boston College Law School, who in a stirring address delivered recently on Bill of Rights Day, pointed out that "totalitarianism can only be defeated by a total dedication to the American philosophy of life and and liberty."

America's position in the world will be greatly strengthened if we practice what we preach.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST GRUENING.

FEBRUARY 23, 1956.
Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR GRUENING: I am in receipt of your letter of February 20 and the enclosed copy of your address to the Alaska Constitutional Convention.

Both the letter and the address are extremely interesting. The point you raise about colonialism regarding Alaska is well taken. Somehow, we never think of Alaska in terms of a colony. Perhaps it is because of the widespread feeling that in due time that Territory will attain statehood and become an integral part of our Nation.

Nevertheless, when we think of colonialism we picture a subjugated people who are denied inherent rights of freedom and are oppressed politically and in every other way. In my address published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I was particularly interested in exposing Soviet colonialism. I believe you will agree with me that the people of Alaska have much more freedom than any of the Communist-dominated satellite states. This, of course, is no excuse for even the minutest form of colonialism which we may practice in Alaska. The people of that Territory should be granted their full freedom along the lines you indicate in your address.

I am glad to have your views and your comments in the matter.

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 24, 1956.*
The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANFUSO: Thanks for your nice reply to my letter of February 20.

Of course, I agree with you that Soviet colonialism is as oppressive as any found on earth today. And it is aggravated by the hypocrisy of the Kremlin which pretends to the world that the Russian satellites are free. But actually the people of Russia itself suffer a police state oppression and tyranny only slightly less than the people of the satellites. But it is excellent strategy for the free countries to call attention to the disparity between the Soviets' denunciation of Western colonialism and their own action.

However, the Russian tyranny and hypocrisy do not diminish America's need to put its own house in order. Of course, Alaskans have more freedom than not merely the people of Russia's satellite colonies, but more freedom than all the people of Russia.

Nevertheless, we are oppressed economically and discriminated against as a direct consequence of our Territorial status. We are a colony, and Uncle Sam is guilty of colonialism in its past and present relations to Alaska.

In contrast, Great Britain, long the arch-colonial power, is proceeding to grant the maximum of autonomy under its system to its former colonies. India and Ceylon have been elevated to full dominion status. Other colonies, such as Nigeria, etc., are being given vastly increased power of self-government. But Alaska has not gained one iota of increased self-government since the highly restictive organic act of 44 years ago. Do not think that our Delegates haven't tried in every session since then to secure some measures to that end. But all in vain.

You put your finger on the very reason why "we never think of Alaska as a colony." It is on the assumption that Alaska will attain statehood. Well, we hope so. But it won't be under this administration. Eisenhower has gone back on his own preelection pledge and on his party's platform plank. The reason? Alaskans attribute his sudden change and his espousal of statehood for Hawaii only—also a valid cause—to the influence of his buddy and trusted confidant, Gen. Lucius Clay. In private life since his retirement, General Clay is chairman of the board of the Continental Can Co., one whose principal customers is the Alaska canned salmon industry of the Puget Sound area. It has opposed every increase in Alaska's autonomy and is bitterly opposed to statehood. It is the chief economic interest which profits by Alaska's colonialism—but to the detriment not only of Alaskans but of all Americans. It contributed heavily to the Eisenhower campaign—before Chicago.

But why, while we are waiting for statehood for a President who will not renege on his solemn pledge, cannot the Congress diminish some of the burdens of colonialism?

Why cannot we either be included in the pending Federal highway legislation or excluded from its special proposed tax levies?

Why cannot we have the fisheries transferred to Alaska?

Why cannot the discriminations against Alaska in maritime law be lifted?

All these and other discriminations impose heavy economic burdens on Alaskans, and on Alaskans only, for the benefit of special interests in the mother country.

That is why it is time that the fact that Alaska is a colony be called to the attention of a Congress that sincerely opposes colonialism.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING.

New Hampshire Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the results of a questionnaire I recently mailed to approximately 14,000 people in my district. Nearly 4,100 replies were received.

I asked only 6 questions, the first 4 dealing with what I consider to be the most important issues before this session

of the Congress. Generally speaking the answers indicate an overwhelming support of President Eisenhower's position on these issues. It is particularly interesting to note that nearly 74 percent of those replying favored retirement of the national debt before tax reduction, assuming a modest surplus in the national budget.

The tabulated results follow:

	Number	Percent
1. Do you favor immediate legislative action granting Federal funds to the States for school construction:		
Yes	2,564	63.9
No	1,208	30.1
No opinion	241	6.0
2. Which of the following policies do you think the Federal Government should pursue with regard to the farm problem:		
(a) Return to a program of high price supports at 90 percent of parity	182	4.5
(b) Adopt the Eisenhower program, the main features of which are continuation of flexible price supports and the so-called soil-bank plan	3,204	79.9
(c) No opinion	627	15.6
3. Assuming a surplus in the national budget this year, would you favor applying this surplus toward—		
(a) Retirement of the national debt with no tax reduction	2,960	73.8
(b) Reduction of individual income taxes with no national debt retirement	880	21.9
(c) No opinion	173	4.3
4. Expenditures for military and economic aid to friendly nations for this fiscal year should be—		
(a) Increased	452	11.3
(b) Decreased	1,029	25.6
(c) Kept at present levels	1,899	47.3
(d) Stopped	344	8.6
(e) No opinion	289	7.2
5. If President Eisenhower does not run for reelection, whom do you prefer as the Republican nominee for President?		
Nixon	848	21.1
Warren	621	15.5
Knowland	508	12.6
Herter	285	7.1
Bridges	187	4.6
Adams	162	4.0
Eisenhower (Milton)	117	2.9
Dewey	65	1.6
Lodge	18	.6
Other than above	216	5.4
No opinion	986	24.6
6. Whom do you prefer to see the Democratic Party nominate as its nominee for President?		
Stevenson	865	21.6
Kefauver	795	19.8
Lausche	253	6.3
Harriman	126	3.1
Byrd	79	2.0
George	28	.7
Other than above	133	3.3
No opinion	1,720	42.9

Statement by Hon. James A. Haley Following Passage of H. R. 3383

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Representative JAMES A. HALEY, Democrat, of Florida, following passage of H. R. 3383:

By far one of the most inspiring figures in the battle of the Colorado was the leader of the defeated forces. Regardless of the side of the issue on which a Member may have alined himself, he cannot but admire Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR for his dedicated, unselfish and courageous efforts in defense of a position he believes to be in the best interest of America—not in the interest of just a few people or of a section of the country, but of the majority of the people and of the Nation as a whole.

I have seen some gallant battles on the floor of the House for projects in behalf of a constituency, but none could surpass the work of Congressman SAYLOR in the cause of a principle for which he can expect little recognition in his own district. Congressman SAYLOR was fighting for his constituents and for 150 million other Americans who would not be beneficiaries of the project under consideration, yet the area involved is so far from Pennsylvania that I question whether his effort will be applauded at home, except perhaps by a relatively few who have followed the issue over the years. Too they alone will be cognizant of the fact that their Congressman's unyielding position was responsible for the revision which deleted the Echo Park provision from the project—a deletion which cut the overall cost by 50 percent and will save the Federal Government at least three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Congressman SAYLOR was unarmed throughout the conflict. He had no deals to offer, no projects to exchange, no pressure to exert. Principle was his only weapon, and this he has refused to relinquish even in this hour of defeat. He lost the battle—or at least he did not win a complete victory—but he has won the admiration and respect of even the most aggressive of his foes.

Congressman Dollinger's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, I shall prepare and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my report to my constituents in the 23d District of New York. I make this statement now so that the people I represent may know that the report will reach them within a short time after the close of the session, and that they will be advised of the record made by the Congress and the status of legislation of interest to them.

The Al Sarena Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a most illuminating letter on the Al Sarena case from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 6, 1956, written by the Honorable EDITH S. GREEN, who represents the Third Oregon Congressional District where Mrs. Neuberger and I are proud to make our residence.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHADES OF TEAPOT DOME

A recent apology for the Interior Department's record in the Al Sarena mining claims case by E. C. Finney recalls forcibly to my mind the parallel between this and the Teapot Dome scandal of the 1920's. At the time of Teapot Dome, Mr. Finney was First Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Now he is only the unofficial apologist for the Department.

I have no desire to raise what must be painful memories for an honorable man with a long and eminent career behind him. But if Mr. Finney feels compelled to venture again into defense of the indefensible on behalf of the Interior Department, reply is unavoidable. His apology for Al Sarena is untenable. But he throws some light on the unfortunate kind of thinking that permits and justifies the Teapot Domes and the Al Sarenas.

At the time of Teapot Dome Mr. Finney seemed willing to obey almost blindly the orders of his superior, Secretary Fall, even when he knew them to be wrong. He testifies, "I think it is my duty to obey his orders unless I am so shocked with what he is doing that I conceive it my duty to resign. I think if I had known that there was an actual theft being committed or an actual bribery or something of that sort I should have either protested or should have gotten out of the office, but I didn't know that then and I don't know now."

Are actual theft and actual bribery, then, the only grounds for protest against the policies of politicians who are destroying the achievements of years of sound conservation policy? When a satchel of money changed hands, Teapot Dome became a crime, but it was already, and clearly, bad public policy and bad administration by the Interior Department with or without bribery.

Nor does the absence of bribery make Al Sarena any less a bad and wrong act of the Interior Department. Teapot Dome, to be sure, involved many millions, Al Sarena only a few hundred thousands—and, Mr. Finney implies, why all this fuss about giving away a few thousands of public money? But the wrong is there quite apart from bribery and quite apart from the amount of money involved.

Are the Al Sarenas and their like, which are now coming to light, to be blindly accepted? Are the career officials to be shunted aside or driven into line in unquestioning obedience to the special interest philosophy of the politicians now dispensing public property so freely to private interests? I do not believe it, and I do not accept this as a defense of Al Sarena.

I do not know where Mr. Finney got his figures and his arguments, but they certainly follow the official Interior Department line—once again. In any case, it is interesting to

see, as unofficial apologist for the Department, a man who sat on top of the Teapot Dome and could not discern the impropriety and corruption all around him. His integrity is unchallenged; but his demonstated difficulties in recognizing impropriety and unsound public policy make him a singularly poor defender of Al Sarena.

EDITH GREEN,
Member of Congress from Oregon.
WASHINGTON.

Principle of Campaign Contributions by the Federal Government Supported by Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and David Lawrence

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the intense publicity focused upon the role of lobbyists in making contributions to election campaign funds of those seeking Federal office has placed the Congress on the defensive. Therefore, I hope that both Houses of Congress will take positions on this matter which positively reflect the best interests of the country as a whole.

President Theodore Roosevelt saw that limits on campaign contributions, and complete disclosure of contributions and expenditures were necessary but were not enough. In a message to the 60th Congress on December 3, 1907, he said in part:

Under our form of government voting is not merely a right but a duty, and moreover, a fundamental and necessary duty if a man is to be a good citizen. It is well to provide that corporations shall not contribute to presidential or national campaigns, and furthermore to provide for the publication of both contributions and expenditures. There is, however, always danger in laws of this kind, which from their very nature are difficult of enforcement; the danger being lest they be obeyed only by the honest, and disobeyed by the unscrupulous, so as to act only as a penalty upon honest men. Moreover, no such law would hamper an unscrupulous man of unlimited means from buying his own way into office. There is a very radical measure which would, I believe, work a substantial improvement in our system of conducting a campaign, although I am well aware that it will take some time for people so to familiarize themselves with such a proposal as to be willing to consider its adoption. The need for collecting large campaign funds would vanish if Congress provided an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties, an appropriation ample enough to meet the necessity for thorough organization and machinery, which requires a large expenditure of money, Then the stipulation should be made that no party receiving campaign funds from the Treasury should accept more than a fixed amount from any individual subscriber or donor; and the necessary publicity for receipts and expenditures could without difficulty be provided.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER—S. 3342—and I—H. R. 9488—have introduced legislation which can appropriately, enough, I think, be called the Theodore Roosevelt Campaign Contributions Act of 1956. This bill is really very simple and short and I am including it at the conclusion of my remarks.

It is interesting to note the support that the principle expressed in the Neuberger-Thompson measure has received through the years since President Theodore Roosevelt first recommended it to the Congress in 1907.

May I call your attention to Senate Resolution 132 introduced by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., on July 6, 1949. The text of this interesting measure was as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of obtaining such information with respect to the problems involved in financing with governmental funds presidential election campaigns in the United States as may be necessary to enable the committee to formulate and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date a bill providing for such method of financing presidential election campaigns.

The explanatory statement presented by Senator Lodge for introducing his measure is a classic marshalling of some of the many reasons why legislation such as Senator NEUBERGER and I are sponsoring is necessary. Among other things he said:

All this talk of an "office market," and of putting high executive and diplomatic positions on the auction block—all this breeding of suspicion and cynicism would disappear, I believe, overnight if the primary cause of the evil were obliterated at its roots.

If no private individual or officer of a corporation were permitted by statute to contribute one cent to a presidential campaign, there would be a far cleaner atmosphere surrounding political appointments, and this would encourage public-spirited men holding public office.

If there are no bidders, there can be no auction.

David Lawrence, well-known columnist, writing in the Washington Evening Star of May 25, 1949, urged the enactment of a law forbidding individuals or organizations of any kind, including corporations, to make contributions to the campaign funds expended to elect a President or Vice President of the United States. He said:

Congress should appropriate at least $3 million every 4 years to each of the major parties, and a proportionate sum to the minor parties, so that each political party could state its case to the people. * * *

With the United States holding such an important responsibility in world affairs today, pressure upon ambassadors and ministers for campaign money is not conducive to nonpolitical service.

The text of the Neuberger-Thompson bill follows:

A bill to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SECTION 1. Congress finds that it is in the national interest to prevent the dominance of large political campaign contributions in elections for Federal office.

Free and untrammeled representation of the public is possible only when men and women in high office are not indebted to special interests for financial donations.

Disproportionate inequality among parties and candidates, with respect to campaign financing, is a peril to democracy—particularly during an era when access to the most compelling media of public information is increasingly decisive and costly.

Government financing of the major political parties, as recommended in 1907 by the then President of the United States, offers the most practical and effective remedy for preventing private persons and groups with great wealth from influencing unduly the decisions of the ballot box.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(1) The term "major political party" means any political party whose candidate for the presidency in the election next preceding polled at least 10 percent of the total popular vote, or whose candidates for Senator, Representative, or Delegate to Congress polled at least 10 percent of the total popular vote for all of those officers in such election.

(2) Terms defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, shall, unless the context otherwise indicates, have the meaning assigned to them in that act.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Board to be known as the Federal Campaign Contributions Board (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Board") to be composed of one member of each major political party, appointed from private life by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members of the Board shall each receive compensation at a rate not in excess of $50 per diem when engaged in the business of the Board, and while away from their homes or regular places of business shall be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

(b) The Board shall without regard to the civil-service laws appoint an Administrator, who shall be the chief executive officer of the Board and shall have such functions as are herein prescribed in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Board shall provide for the appointment by the Administrator, in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 as amended, and for the compensation of such other officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized to make payments to the national committee of each major political party in the manner and subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth.

AMOUNT AND CONDITIONS OF PAYMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Payments authorized by this act shall be made to the national committee of each major political party in a total amount for each such committee in any 2-year period, beginning April 1 following a national election—

(1) if during that 2-year period presidential electors are to be elected, not to exceed the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the average total number of votes cast for all candidates for the offices of presidential elector and Delegates to Congress in the last two elections for those offices; and

(2) if during that 2-year period presidential electors are not to be elected, not to exceed the amount obtained by multiplying 15 cents by the average total number of votes cast for all candidates for Representative and Delegate, in the last two nonpresidential national elections.

(b) Such payments are authorized for the purpose of enabling major political parties to make legitimate campaign expenditures,

and shall be made from time to time upon application therefor accompanied by a certification of the chairman and treasurer of the national committee that they will be used to discharge lawful obligations incurred for past or future expenditures during the 2-year period in which application is made, in support of the candidacy of such party's nominees for Federal elective office. Payments shall not be made in the case of any candidate on account of obligations incurred prior to the date the candidate has been nominated.

(c) The nature and extent of such obligations shall be stated in such detail as regulations under this act may prescribe.

(d) Not more than two-thirds of the amount authorized to be allocated to any national committee during any 2-year period shall be paid prior to the national election which occurs during that 2-year period. The balance shall be payable upon completion and review of all reports required by law or regulation on all expenditures made on behalf of all candidates of that political party in connection with that election.

LIMITATION ON FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION

SEC. 6. (a) To receive any payment authorized under this act, the chairman and the treasurer of a national committee shall certify that no individual has contributed more than a total of $100 to the campaign of one or more candidates for Federal office of that major political party.

(b) If the total expenditures in any 2-year period from contributions from private sources for all candidates for Federal office of a major political party, as shown by reports required by law or regulation, exceed the amount authorized by this act to be paid to the national committee of that political party during such 2-year period, payments to that national committee under this act shall be reduced by the amount of the excess.

PENALTIES

SEC. 7. (a) No committee shall apply for or use any part of the payments authorized under this act except on the conditions and for the purpose authorized hereby.

(b) Any violation of this section by any committee shall be deemed also to be a violation by the chairman and the treasurer of such committee and by any other person responsible for such violation and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both; and, if the violation was willful, by a fine of not more than $20,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 8. The Administrator is authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Southern Illinois Stake in Legislation for Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to the stake of southern Illinois in legislation for depressed areas.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS STAKE IN LEGISLATION FOR DEPRESSED AREAS

(Statement by Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois)

On January 9, I appeared before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which had scheduled a hearing on the general subject of depressed areas. This was the same day on which Senate 2892 was introduced by Senator SMITH of New Jersey, for himself and for Senators BRIDGES, BUSH, DIRKSEN, ALLOTT, DUFF, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, POTTER, PURTELL, COTTON, PAYNE, BENDER, THYE, BUTLER, SMITH of Maine, SALTONSTALL, FLANDERS, CARLSON, AIKEN, IVES, CASE of New Jersey, BEALL, CAPEHART, KUCHEL, WATKINS, and BENNETT. The title of this bill is "A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes."

An earlier bill, namely, Senate 2663, was introduced July 28, 1955 by Senator Douglas for himself and for Senators Kilgore, Kefauver, McNamara, Humphrey, Neely, Murray, and Kennedy. The title of that bill is "A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas."

This bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, whereas the bill introduced on January 9 was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

While I am recorded as a cosponsor of the bill introduced on January 9, I shall let no pride of sponsorship stand in the way of any effort to secure reasonable legislation to deal with this problem.

It appears that there are roughly 190 counties or parts of counties throughout the Nation which are located in so-called depressed areas. The areas are divided into 10 major and 74 minor areas. I note, however, that 7 States contain 123 of these counties so it is fair to assume that the greater proportion of this problem will be found in those 7 States.

They include West Virginia with 23 depressed counties, Pennsylvania with 23, Kentucky with 17, and Illinois with 19. It is quite evident from the names of the States where these counties are located and the nature of their activities and industries that coal has been a contributing factor to the problem, because southern Illinois, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky are among the foremost coal-producing States in the Nation.

The abandonment of coal mines, the increased efficiency in coal mining, the competition from other fuels and still other factors have doubtless had an impact upon the coal industry, and the abandonment of many mines in those counties particularly, become the hard core of the problem which is before us.

I am quite aware of the fact that under the classification which is carried by the Department of Labor, the decrease of employment in these areas does shift from one class to another from time to time. In some cases there is an improvement in the condition and in other cases the condition becomes more aggravated. I believe, however, it is fair to assume that this is a hard core problem with which the Congress should deal and it should not be a half-hearted approach. To provide a program which is too limited or too restrictive in nature might prove entirely fruitless and abortive, and I for one am anxious that a real broad-gauge effort be made to find a sound and durable remedy for the problem.

When one recalls that we have been quite generous in the field of economic aid to foreign nations as a part of our overall security program, surely we will be equally generous with Federal funds, Federal loaning power and Federal authority to meet the problem which is on our own doorstep. As I recall, the aggregate of loans and grants in the foreign-aid field last year was in excess of $500 million, and we would be wanting indeed in our solicitude for our own people if we did not take an equally generous approach with respect to the problems at home, even though the foreign-aid program is essentially geared to national security.

Let me emphasize the opinion that any solution worthy of the name must be durable. Merely to scratch the surface and to provide temporary employment in these depressed areas will not meet the problem.

At this point I might mention the interest which has been manifested in this problem by the Eisenhower administration. In all candor it must be said that the prior administration was not unmindful of this problem. As early as 1946 an area development organization in the Department of Commerce in the Business and Defense Services Administration was created to make surveys and suggest remedies which would alleviate these depressed conditions in certain areas. Efforts were made to direct defense industries to these areas and also defense contracts. As I recall, 25 or more defense facilities at a cost of $210 million were established in different depressed areas and accounted for some 10,000 jobs.

Last year the Department of Commerce requested of Congress $370,000 for its Business and Defense Services Administration to further explore and deal with the problem in depressed areas. Unfortunately this request was sharply pared and when it was finally approved, it was reduced to the same figure which obtained in the prior year, and as a result the Commerce Department had but $120,000 to deal with this problem. It appears to me from such figures as I have seen, that in southern Illinois there are somewhere between 15,000 and 20,000 jobless people. The relief load has been extremely heavy. In a consideration of a measure of this kind we should keep that fact in mind because the amount that might be saved if jobs can be substituted for relief would over a period of time go far to offset whatever funds might be required, whether in the form of loans or grants to carry out a depressed area program. I am quite familiar with the pending bill and my principal purpose in suggesting a number of amendments was to make it a broader and more wholehearted approach to the problem. Let me, therefore, outline suggestions which I firmly believe would improve the legislation to deal with the depressed areas problem.

1. Instead of creating an independent agency to administer a depressed area program, I would suggest that the agency be placed under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce. You will recall that much of the time and energy of the Hoover Commission was devoted to the general scheme of relieving the President of the responsibility of receiving a direct accounting from so many Federal agencies. The hope has been to minimize the number that would report directly to him. If, therefore, the Depressed Areas Administration were placed in the Department of Commerce, it would be just as effective, provide for a better line of responsibility, and be in keeping with the general theme of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

2. These bills are predicated on the creation of community committees or organizations which would do the development work, provide the plans and seek to attract industries. I can, however, foresee some problems in this field because there doubtless will be instances where a committee covering a larger area might be more effective and more

useful. I suggest, therefore, that the measure also include a provision for regional committees with authority to cooperate with the administrator and with the State authorities and be clothed with the same authority as the local committees. In this connection I think of the possible necessity for developing power and water resources in certain areas. To do so might prove quite costly and would have to cover a much wider area than a single community if it were to be effective. I can think of a number of areas where water is a real problem and as such it embraces a considerable number of communities. Obviously such a problem could not be handled on a strictly local or community basis and hence the need as I see is for regional committees as well.

3. In general, the measure now before this committee contemplates Federal loans for the construction of industrial plants and other industrial and commercial facilities. I, for one, am not at all sure that this language would cover the machinery and equipment necessary to establish an industrial plant. From my own industrial experience, I know that quite often machinery and equipment is a far larger, more costly, and more important item than the construction of a plant. It would, therefore, seem advisable that the bill clearly state that a Federal loan might be obtained to cover machinery and equipment as well as plant construction. This is no novel departure, because we followed a pattern of that kind during the war in connection with war plants.

4. The bill should contain a provision under which the administrator of the act would have authority to make loans and grants for the construction of laboratories and pilot plants for the processing of the resources which are native to these depressed areas. Perhaps an example will suffice to make this clear.

In the last session of Congress I offered an amendment to the Interior Department appropriations bill to provide funds for the construction and maintenance of a pilot plant and other appurtenances and for payment of technical and scientific personnel to make extended researches in the field of coal utilization.

This proposal should be of particular interest to West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and other coal States. A great deal of work has already been done in this field. What it contemplates is the distillation of coal in the hope that the char and the heavy oil which would result from such a process could be broken down and utilized in industry.

I am advised that from a single ton of coal, one could derive about 40 gallons of heavy oil or distillate and perhaps 1,500 pounds of char or residue.

The distillate would become the raw material for the manufacture of many items, including pharmaceuticals, perfumes, alcohols and a host of other things so widely used in industry. The real problem is the use of the resulting char, and I know from the expressions of interest by a good many people identified with the steel industry that this char might have practical use in the reduction of low grade iron ores which are found in considerable abundance in Middle Western States. If these pilot plant operations could be carried to a practical and commercial conclusion the results would be the answer to the problems of depression which presently confront the coal areas of the country.

One might say as much for the utilization of timber resources. It has been my good fortune to work closely with Southern Illinois University and to procure a modest amount of money in the agricultural appropriation bill during the last several years for the pilot operations which they are conducting in the utilization of timber and forest products which are native to southern Illinois. Excellent work has already been done in this field but progress would be faster if out of the funds made available under this bill the Administrator were authorized to make additional grants for these purposes because they contain the hope of a real and durable remedy for the problem before us.

I regret extremely that the proposal which I had incorporated in the Interior Department appropriation bill was not finally approved. No comparable provision was inserted in the House of Representatives and the members of the conference committee of the House of Representatives refused to concur in this proposal. I am persuaded that it has great merit and that it must be pushed with all diligence.

5. I understand that adverse freight rates have had a retarding effect on industrial development in certain areas like southern Illinois. To what extent this is true I cannot at the moment say without further exploration. I am authentically advised, however, that not too long ago a Chicago manufacturer was attracted to a city in southern Illinois and was prepared to establish a plant only to discover that an adverse freight rate on his particular product made it quite difficult to compete with producers of that same product in other areas. Wherever such a condition arises the administrator should be clothed with power not only to make an application to the Interstate Commerce Commission for a more favorable freight rate but should, in fact, have the benefit of prior consideration of such an application by the Commission so that wherever possible reasonably advantageous rates could be established to make the job easier in meeting the problems in these depressed areas. Obviously to establish a plant by means of local and Federal funds and then discover that it would have difficulty competing in the commercial market because of adverse freight rates would be indeed a fruitless undertaking.

6. The same general approach should be taken with respect to areas in which the depressed condition has in whole or in part resulted from the importation of competitive commodities from foreign countries which can sell in our market at a price below the cost of production in our own country.

The one example that readily comes to mind is fluorspar. This mineral is mined in southern Illinois and particularly at Rosiclare. I know something of the problems which have confronted the fluorspar industry and have for a period of 3 years worked steadily with the representatives of the industry in securing more favorable treatment by the United States Tariff Commission with respect to the duties imposed on imported fluorspar. It is a fact that imports of fluorspar from Mexico, Spain, and elsewhere, mined with cheap labor, have in large measure contributed to the distress of this industry. We have been moderately successful in securing some amelioration of this condition. It would appear, however, to be the part of wisdom to give the administrator of the Depressed Areas Act authority to appear before the United States Tariff Commission and present the case for increased duties and to require the Tariff Commission to give priority to such a petition. If in the case of southern Illinois the fluorspar mines could be placed on a sound basis so that the men might have steady employment this would go far toward alleviating the distress which now exists and prove durable indeed in assuring the communities where these mines are located that the jobs are secure.

In this connection perhaps I should point out that these mines were developed with private capital and in the utmost of good faith over a long period of time. Could we do better than to recreate the jobs which were lost or placed on a slender part-time basis by crushing imports by bringing the matter very forcefully to the attention of the Tariff Commission with a request for relief.

7. The instant bill calls for the appointment of a local industrial development committee which shall prepare plans for the construction of industrial plants and facilities and then be authorized to borrow not to exceed two-thirds of the cost if and when the plans have the approval of the administrator. I believe it would be well to extend the same rights and privileges to private industrial enterprisers who are willing to locate industrial plants in such depressed areas. This would save the time and energy of many people in the community and at the same time achieve the very objectives and purposes which the bill has in mind. In fact, it would be highly desirable if such incentives could be made available to private enterprisers as well as to communities because it is fair to assume that men who are willing to risk their own capital and energies in the location of a plant would be thinking in terms of a plant which would be continuously in operation and thereby bring assurance that the jobs would be continuing instead of temporary. Provision should also be made for aid in the expansion of industries which already exist.

8. Under certain circumstances I believe that the loan provisions in any bill should be made more generous. The bill on which hearings were held provides for a loan not in excess of 66⅔ percent of the cost of construction of the project. Naturally this would mean that the community where the plant is located would have to subscribe the other one-third. Since we are dealing with depressed areas, for such a community to subscribe one way or another one-third of the cost of a plant might become a truly difficult burden. For example, to build a plant of some consequence might cost a million dollars. If the project were approved it would mean that $333,000 would have to be raised locally. In many communities this is not an easy undertaking. It is entirely possible, however, that a plant operator of character, background and experience would be willing to operate a plant in a community and give adequate assurances that it would continue in operation for 5 or 10 years or even longer. If such an operator were willing to enter into a legal and enforceable contract to that effect and gave the necessary guarantees it would occur to me that a substantially larger loan might be made out of Federal funds in order to achieve the construction and location of such a plant. It would be within the province of the administrator to determine the effects and to be satisfied that such was the case before a loan of as much as 80 or 85 percent of the construction cost might be made.

9. With reference to the funds made available in the bill for industrial-loan purposes, there is no limitation on the amount which the administrator might loan to any one depressed area in any given State. It has been the custom in connection with so many other measures approved by Congress that in the interest of equity and fairness, such funds be allotted on a percentage basis so that every area could be sure of completely fair treatment. We have done this in connection with farm tenant loans under the Farmers Home Administration. We have done this in connection with Rural Electrification loans. It is, therefore, my suggestion that the funds made available under the bill be set up so that 75 percent of the whole fund be allotted to the respective States on the basis of the number of unemployed in the distressed area in that State bears to the whole number of unemployed in all of the depressed areas throughout the country. This would simply mean that if there were 20,000 unemployed in the depressed area in Illinois and the whole number of unemployed in all of the depressed areas now catalogued by the Department of Labor totaled 200,000, that 10 percent of 75 percent would be earmarked

for Illinois. Since provision is made for $100 million in loan funds and if $75 million were placed under allotment, 10 percent of the $75 million would mean that $7,500,000 would be assured to the State. The remaining 25 percent could be dispersed within the discretion of the administrator. This would supply sufficient latitude for the administrator and at the same time assure every depressed area that funds up to a given amount would be available for the purposes of the bill.

10. The same formula could be used with respect to that provision in the bill which provides for assistance to public facilities. There is a provision under which $100 million would be made available for loans and grants to depressed communities for the construction of such facilities. This would, of course, include schools, airports, hospitals, and similar facilities, and to them the same apportionment formula could be applied.

11. One of the great institutions in Illinois is the University of Southern Illinois, which has made great progress under the capable leadership of President Delyte Morris, and I envision the day when it will be one of the truly great institutions of learning in the United States. It is growing year by year. I have found particular delight in working with different people from the faculty, including the president of the university. All of them have a keen sense of appreciation of their particular responsibility to the area where the university is located. At this institution there is a wealth of brains and talent for utilization in connection with this problem if Congress will but make it possible. I know of nothing that would pay greater dividends than to authorize the administrator of the Depressed Areas Act to make grants of funds available to the university so that this talent can be utilized in finding an adequate solution for the problem in that particular area. Already in the case of the University of Southern Illinois they have done notable work in the forestry and timber utilization field. I am confident they can do equally good work in still other fields, and especially where the natural resources of the particular area are involved. This hope deserves every encouragement and consequently some of these funds should be made available for that purpose.

12. It may also be necessary to make some provision for housing in the communities where new plants might be constructed. One of the first things which a plant locator explores in addition to water, fuel, transportation, and other resources is the availability of housing. Already workers in the lower reaches of the State are driving a great many miles to their places of employment but when an industry is brought to a town it must be possible to provide housing for the workers and a provision would be supplementary to provisions already carried in general housing legislation which is now on the statute books.

I have some other suggestions in mind and have already reduced all of these to amendment form so that they might be ready for consideration when the committee has completed its hearings and is prepared to take action on the pending bill. I am deeply interested in the pending proposals and want to be sure that if legislation is reported to the Senate floor that we will have a bill which represents a determined and wholehearted approach to this problem of depressed areas.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1956

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 6, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, amid the earthquake, wind, and fire of this violent world, for this hallowed moment we would be still and know that Thou art God. In the fierce fight to maintain our own liberty and everywhere to make men free we pray that, earthen vessels though we are, we may be the channels of Thy holy purpose to break all slavish shackles which bind Thy children and degrade their dignity.

Here today let some revelation of Thy light fall upon our darkness, some guidance from Thy wisdom lead us out of our bewilderment, some power from Thy infinite resource strengthen us with might in the inner man. In this supreme battle of the ages, as we wrestle with the powers of darkness, open Thou our eyes that we may see not only the encircling battalions of evil but also on the hills about us the chariots of God and the horsemen thereof. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. PATRICK V. MCNAMARA, a Senator from the State of Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MCNAMARA thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 6, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 663) for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis), with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1242. An act for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte; and

S. 1905. An act for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and the J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. DAWSON of Utah, and Mr. SAYLOR were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of Walter E. Durham;

H. R. 1500. An act for the relief of Charles F. Brickell;

H. R. 2267. An act for the relief of Morton J. Krakow;

H. R. 2473. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham;

H. R. 2900. An act for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.;

H. R. 3960. An act for the relief of Maria del Carmen Gago Santana;

H. R. 4504. An act for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle F. Brocki;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Montana.

H. R. 4899. An act for the relief of Helmut Klestadt;

H. R. 5488. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Gilbert Henkens, Jr., star route, Mile 17½, Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 5580. An act for the relief of Juanita Gibson Lewis;

H. R. 6126. An act for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.;

H. R. 6321. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edith Popwell;

H. R. 6635. An act for the relief of Joy Kulis and Janet Arline Kulis;

H. R. 7074. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page;

H. R. 7075. An act for the relief of Bunge Corp.;

H. R. 7377. An act for the relief of Donald W. Baker;

H. R. 7403. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Milton;

H. R. 7487. An act for the relief of Irmgard S. King;

H. R. 7703. An act for the relief of Dora Thelma Andree;

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his sig-

nature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 578. An act for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe;

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Irfan Dawar; and

H. R. 7588. An act granting the benefits of section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to certain children of United States citizens.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of Walter E. Durham;

H. R. 1500. An act for the relief of Charles F. Brickell;

H. R. 2267. An act for the relief of Morton J. Krakow;

H. R. 2473. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham;

H. R. 3960. An act for the relief of Maria del Carmen Gago Santana;

H. R. 6126. An act for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.;

H. R. 6321. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edith Popwell;

H. R. 6635. An act for the relief of Joy Kulis and Janet Arline Kulis;

H. R. 7074. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page;

H. R. 7075. An act for the relief of Bunge Corp.;

H. R. 7377. An act for the relief of Donald W. Baker;

H. R. 7403. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Milton;

H. R. 7703. An act for the relief of Dora Thelma Andree;

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2900. An act for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.;

H. R. 4504. An act for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle F. Brocki; and

H. R. 5580. An act for the relief of Juanita Gibson Lewis; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4899. An act for the relief of Helmut Klestadt, and

H. R. 7487. An act for the relief of Irmgard S. King; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Montana; and

H. R. 5488. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Gilbert Henkens, Jr., star route, Mile 17½, Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF SENATE

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, be permitted to sit on tomorrow, Thursday, until 1 o'clock; and also on Friday until 1 o'clock, during the sessions of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, consent of the Senate is given.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, and that statements of Senators be limited to 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO CERTAIN DONATIONS TO BUREAU OF PRISONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the donation to the Bureau of Prisons of commodities acquired through price support operations which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Westchester, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 9332) providing for the inclusion in the Federal-aid highway system of certain parkways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress to implement the Tripartite Declaration of the United States, Great Britain and France, guaranteeing the borders of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on March 6, 1956, p. 3972, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

NINETY PERCENT OF PARITY FOR FARM COMMODITIES — LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Fred L. Krause, Jr., of Bismarck, N. Dak., transmitting a resolution adopted at the Grant County, N. Dak., convention of the Republican Party.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *March 3, 1956.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Herewith I am forwarding to you, a resolution which was adopted by a group meeting at Carson, Grant County, and which is self-explanatory. It is the wish of this group that you will support the 90-percent parity farm program.

This convention group consisted of both Leaguers and L. O. C.'s. Unity was the main topic of the convention, and apparently everyone at the meeting was unity minded.

Sincerely yours,

FRED L. KRAUSE, Jr.

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is before the Senate of the United States a farm bill carrying 90-percent price support for the basic commodities; and

Whereas it is the unanimous sentiment of the group here assembled that said bill do pass, especially with the 90 percent of parity provisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this group here assembled, That the Senators from the State of North Dakota be urged to do all in their power to have said farm bill passed and that the 90 percent of parity provision be retained therein.

Done at open meeting at the county convention of the Republican Party in Grant County, N. Dak., held at Carson, N. Dak., this 2d day of March, A. D. 1956.

JOHN J. BADER,
Chairman,
DWIGHT KAMRATH,
Secretary.

PROHIBITION OF SERVICE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON COMMERCIAL OR MILITARY AIRCRAFT—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a petition signed by Mrs. Eliner Sandager, and sundry other citizens of the city of Lisbon, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2845, to prohibit service or consumption of alcoholic beverages on commercial or military aircraft.

There being no objection, the petition, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned, do favor passage of the Thurmond bill No. S. 2845, which prohibits service or consumption of alcoholic beverages on commercial or military aircraft.

It is our sincere desire and prayer this bill will receive favorable consideration in order that many lives may be spared.

Mrs. ELINER SANDAGER
(And 15 other citizens of Lisbon, N. Dak.).

REGULATION OF RATES OF COMMON CARRIERS—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition, signed by John Morton, and sundry other citizens of the city of Moffit, N. Dak., relating to rates for services charged by common carriers.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned, wish for you, our Senator, to act in favor of the President's Cabinet Committee regarding regulations of the common carriers. We want the common carriers permitted to reduce their rates for services as low as they wish, short of actual loss.

We believe this will help the farmers in our own State and the Nation.

JOHN MORTON

(And 15 other citizens of the city of Moffit, N. Dak.).

THE MIDDLE EAST—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, of Washington, D. C., signed by Mrs. Alexander Stewart, legislative secretary, transmitting a resolution adopted by that organization, relating to the Middle East. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1956.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have been asked to forward to you the enclosed resolution adopted by the national board of the United States Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., February 3–5, 1956.

This resolution concerns the Middle East.

Respectfully yours,

ANNALEE STEWART,
Mrs. Alexander Stewart,
Legislative Secretary.

THE MIDDLE EAST

The national board of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., February 3–5, 1956, wishes to register its concern over the crisis in the Middle East and for the role of the United States in that crisis.

We must also protest our part along with that of others, in the race to establish military blocs, a race that has greatly aggravated the fear and anxiety of the Arab States and Israel, until war has become a real threat.

We are opposed to the sale or shipment of arms to any government by any government for whatever stated purpose. We cannot accept the view that they insure peace or deter aggression, but believe, rather, that they tend to increase fear, suspicion, and tension.

We urge you to use your good offices to encourage and support an embargo on arms, to any of the countries of the Middle East, to be established and made effective by and through the United Nations.

We recommend an expanded program of economic and social assistance by our own Government and, to the largest extent possible, through the United Nations. We encourage you to use your good offices to promote a serious effort through the United Nations to provide both the opportunity and the necessary machinery for direct Arab-Israeli peace negotiations and toward some final solution of the problem of Arab refugees.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION AND LETTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Americans of Portland, Oreg., on February 11, 1956, and a copy of my greeting sent to the Lithuanian American Information Center, in New York City, on the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 11, 1956, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF PORTLAND, OREG., GATHERED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LOCAL KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA, COUNCIL 137, FOR THE COMMEMORATION OF THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Whereas Lithuania, together with her neighbors Latvia and Estonia have wholeheartedly and sincerely defended the principles of Western democracy; and

Whereas the Baltic democratic republics, these past 16 years enslaved by Nazi-Kremlin conspirators, have been subjected to torture and cruel persecution; and

Whereas the citizens of Lithuania today face a dreadful tragedy and wholesale massacre by the thousands and also deportations to the slave-labor camps of Siberia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lithuanian Americans, being most concerned over the fate of their nation, pledge all possible support to the Government of the United States in its efforts to achieve the principles of justice and freedom for all the nations.

That they ask the Government of the United States to hold further the subjugation of the Baltic States as an act of aggression, to support Lithuania's resistance movement by due information and organization, to help carry on and conclude the testimony of Committee on Communist Aggression, to recognize the Genocide Convention, to accept Kersten's committee findings as a sharp weapon against Communist propaganda and to propagate the enslaved peoples' plea through the press so that the leaders of the free world would realize the dangers of communism; finally, be it

Resolved, That they express their deepest gratitude to the Federal Government and both Houses of the Congress of the United States for their support constantly extended to the cause of independence of Lithuania.

PIUS ALEKSA,
Chairman.

PORTLAND, OREG.

THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

(Statement by Senator MORSE)

Mr. President, on February 16 Lithuanians throughout the world will mark the 38th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It is a tragedy of our age that there is no actual Lithuanian independence at present and that the people of Lithuania will not be permitted by their Communist overlords to commemorate this day. These two factors make it doubly important for us in the free world to dedicate a few moments to make known to the captive people of Lithuania that their plight is not forgotten and that hopes for the restored independence of their country are shared by the entire free world.

Lithuania declared its independence on February 16, 1918, after centuries of subjugation, sometimes German, mostly Slavic. Never during those years of struggle did the Lithuanian people lose sight of their ultimate goal of self-determination. In 1940 Lithuania lost its independence when the Soviet Union annexed it and its Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, and made these three sovereign states republics of the U. S. S. R. This act was in such callous disregard of the sovereign and human rights of the Lithuanian people and in complete violation of international law that it has never been recognized by the United States.

The people of Lithuania are now enduring in effect another occupation. I am sure that their unflagging spirit and steadfast determination to restore their sovereignty will prevail in the end. In the meantime, it is important that we mark this day to keep alive the spirit of independence and freedom of all Lithuanians, those exiled and those under the Soviet yoke. This is the time to reiterate the words of Senate Resolution 127, agreed to by an overwhelming vote of 89 to 0 in the Senate on July 14, 1955, in which we resolved:

"That the Senate proclaim the hope that the peoples who have been subjected to the captivity of alien despotisms shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that the sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter."

INCOME TAX OF PROFESSIONAL WRITERS—PETITION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition to Congress of the Oregon Free-Lancers Club, the president of which is Don James.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION UNTO THE CONGRESS

Whereas the present tax structure discriminates against professional writers; and

Whereas professional writers desire the same equitable treatment as is now enjoyed by members of other professions; and

Whereas H. R. 7837, 84th Congress, by Representative CURTIS, of Missouri, would provide, in essence, that when a person's income exceeds his 5-year average by more than 50 percent, the amount above that may be spread over the 5 preceding years; therefore be it

Resolved by the Oregon Free-Lance Writers Club, meeting in Portland, Oreg., on January 18, 1956, That it petition Congress to enact into law H. R. 7837, and that copies of this petition shall be sent to Representative JERE COOPER, Representative EDITH GREEN of Oregon, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, and Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon.

OREGON FREE-LANCERS CLUB,
DON JAMES, *President.*

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by sundry organizations in the State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA DISTRICT COUNCIL NO. 13, INTERNATIONAL WOODWORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO

RESOLUTION NO. 4—RESIGNATION OF DOUGLAS M'KAY

Whereas the Secretary of Interior, Douglas McKay, has clearly demonstrated that he is

out of sympathy with the policies of natural resources conservation as laid down 50 years ago by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, honest members of his own party; and

Whereas Secretary McKay has sought by every handy subterfuge, to turn over the hydroelectric, flood control, soil conservation and recreation potential of Hells Canyon, on the Snake River, to a private utility instead of protecting the interest of the people of the United States, as he is sworn to do; and

Whereas for the first time in our national history a member of the President's Cabinet was recruiting strikebreakers through the advertising pages of a daily newspaper on Labor Day for his strike bound General Motors Sales Agency in Salem, Oreg., after attempting to take away the key provisions of a long-established contract such as seniority, the 40-hour workweek, and overtime on Saturdays; and

Whereas Secretary McKay has been generally regarded by a large majority of the citizens of his own State as the most corrupt Secretary of the Interior since the late Albert Fall; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That this semiannual convention of Northern California District Council No. 13, convened at the Vance Hotel, on September 10 and 11, in Eureka, Calif., forthwith request the resignation of Secretary McKay; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, with the request that the President require Mr. McKay's resignation, if it is not offered; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, and RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrats of Oregon, with the request that this resolution be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

E. CUMBUSS,
ELMER CIRBY,
ROBERT P. CRIMMINS,
ELVIN L. BARNUM,
M. L. FORREST,
Resolutions committee.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE OREGON STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas the 20 percent Federal amusement tax was imposed upon the entertainment industry as a wartime emergency measure; and

Whereas the reasons for its continuance no longer obtain; and

Whereas tens of thousands of workers in this industry are jobless because of this ruinous tax, among them musicians, waiters, cooks, bartenders, and other service employees; and

Whereas all comparable excise taxes imposed as wartime and emergency levies have either been repealed or substantially reduced while the amusement tax continues at its discriminatory level of 20 percent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in session assembled go on record as protesting the continuance of this ruinous amusement tax and urging its repeal by the Congress; and that the secretary be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the personal attention of our Senators, WAYNE MORSE, DICK NEUBERGER, and Representatives EDITH GREEN, NORBLAD, COON, and ELLSWORTH in Congress.

RESOLUTION NO. 12

Whereas one of the most important sections of the Lloyd-LaFollette antigag law guarantees the right of postal and Federal employees to join unions of their own choice, provided such unions do not impose an obligation to strike; but does not guarantee that the executive branch of the Government shall recognize and deal with such unions; and

Whereas collective bargaining and proper machinery to settle grievances are considered proper and essential in private industry, and certainly the same rule should apply equally to all employers and employees whether public or private; and

Whereas H. R. 697, a personnel management relations bill, has been introduced in the Congress by the Honorable GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania, which would require by law that the executive branch of the Federal Government recognize and deal with employee unions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 1955 convention of the Oregon State Federation of Labor go on record as favoring H. R. 697, a personnel management relations bill, by Congressman RHODES, which requires the executive branch of the Federal Government to recognize and deal with unions of postal and Federal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive secretary-treasurer of the Oregon State Federation of Labor notify the members of the Oregon delegation in Congress of this action and request their active support of this legislation.

RESOLUTION NO. 13

Whereas working people who are nearing retirement age are prone to infirmities and often lose much time due to sickness in the last few years of their employment; and

Whereas unemployment is a more likely hazard in later earning years; and

Whereas the consequent lost time under the act as now written, causes the person who falls within the above conditions to have their social-security retirement benefits cut down; and

Whereas this does not show a true picture of the contribution made by the individual over his earning years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in convention assembled at Medford, Oreg., this July 25 to 29, 1955, go on record favoring amendment of the Social Security Act for the purpose of basing social-security payments upon a worker's most productive years; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of Congress be petitioned to initiate a bill effecting such an amendment of the Social Security Act; and be it still further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTION NO. 14

Whereas workers today are having difficulty finding employment after reaching age 50; and

Whereas most union workers at age 60 have already worked 40 years or over: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in convention assembled at Medford, Oreg., this July 25 to 29, 1955, go on record favoring amendment of the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act for the purpose of lowering the age limit for old-age benefits from 65 to 60 years; and be it still further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of Congress be petitioned to initiate a bill effecting such an amendment of the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act; and be it still further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTION NO. 15

Whereas disabled workers are finding it impossible to keep up with the American standard of living during disability: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in convention assembled at Medford, Oreg., this July 25 to 29, 1955, go on record favoring amendment of the Social Security Act, so that benefits may be paid to workers who have been disabled; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of Congress be petitioned to initiate a bill effecting such an amendment of the Social Security Act; and be it still further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTION NO. 16

Whereas Japanese-made plywood is being imported into this country with little, if any, duty, and due to the low wages paid Japanese labor, the product is being offered on the American market for much less than what American manufacturers would have to charge; and

Whereas the manufacture of plywood is a major industry in the State of Oregon with the livelihood of a great number of our workmen depending on the industry; and

Whereas this practice is a great threat to our American standard of living and working conditions and our national economy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That our legislators in the United States Congress be asked to work for amendments to the existing trade agreements which will protect our American workmen and American industries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to neighboring State federations of labor for concurrence.

RESOLUTION NO. 18

Whereas the social-security laws, as presently enacted, tend to work an economic hardship on women over the age of 60 years; and

Whereas women over the age of 60 years are offered only limited opportunities of employment; and

Whereas the retirement of women from employment at the age of 60 years would, if they were then entitled to social-security benefits, afford a suitable income to their household; and

Whereas such retirement of women at the age of 60 would increase job opportunities for men of advanced years; and

Whereas the members of organized labor are aware of the hardships created by the present social-security law with regard to women 60 years of age and older: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the existing social-security law is partially inadequate and that the following changes and amendments are recommended and endorsed by the Oregon State Federation of Labor as essential to the economic well-being of our Nation:

1. That the social-security laws of the United States be changed to offer benefits to women retiring from work at the age of 60 years, instead of the present 65 years of age.

2. That the aforesaid benefits be made available by appropriate changes in the social-security laws at the earliest available opportunity; therefore be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives from Oregon, with the request that they give it their urgent consideration.

RESOLUTION NO. 20

Whereas Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, and Congressman JOHN DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, and Congressman RHODES, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, have introduced amendments to the National Labor Relations Act that would restore to employers and employees in industry their right to bargain, without fear of interference, on any lawful matter mutually affecting them in normal labor-management relations;

Whereas these new bills are identical to the Murray-Dingell-Rhodes bill introduced in 1952 which was endorsed by the board of governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association and cleared by the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor; and

Whereas the proposed amendments would eliminate to a considerable degree four evils in the Taft-Hartley Act which have been most damaging to trade unions; namely, abolition of the closed shop, outlawing all forms

of secondary action, interference with collective bargaining as traditionally practiced in industry, and the injunction: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor at its annual convention at Medford, Oreg., go on record as endorsing the Murray-Dingell-Rhodes bill and urge our Senators and Congressmen to vote for its passage: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Oregon Senators and Representatives in Congress with the request that they give this resolution their most favorable consideration.

RESOLUTION NO. 21

Whereas the Nation's Government at that time seemed unable to cope with the many urgent needs of the people; and

Whereas on taking office, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, by his own show of courage and faith, reawakened the hope of a despairing American citizenry as evidenced by the 99-day session of the 73d Congress that witnessed the most daring Presidential leadership in American history; and

Whereas his program of social-economic legislation gave the common people of America the chance for security and self-respect; and

Whereas in the words of Hugo Ernst, recently deceased general president of the Hotel, Restaurant, and Bartenders' International Union, "Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the symbol and patron of the most hopeful ideas that ordinary citizens in a democratic society could build together a productive peaceful way of life, marked by the four freedoms: freedom of speech, freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom of worship"; and

Whereas when America was plunged into the worst war in her history, Franklin Delano Roosevelt led this country to victory and the world to peace; and

Whereas on March 7, 1955, the Portland Central Labor Council concurred in Local 664's resolution for observance of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday as a legal holiday; and

Whereas Congresswoman EDITH GREEN and Senator DICK NEUBERGER have indicated their support of proposals asking the President of the United States to proclaim Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday a legal national holiday; and

Whereas there have already been introduced into the United States Senate and into the House of Representatives, joint resolutions asking the President of the United States to proclaim Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday a legal national holiday: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor petition the Governor of the State of Oregon to proclaim January 30 of each year a legal holiday in Oregon in commemoration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the Oregon delegation in Congress to support this recommendation with suitable legislation.

RESOLUTION NO. 34

(Adopted by the State building trades convention July 24, 1955, and referred to the Oregon State Federation of Labor convention July 25–29)

Whereas the forces opposed to public ownership of power are endeavoring to foist upon the people a partnership plan where the Government will pay the major portion of the cost of building the dam but the private power people will receive the revenue accruing from the sale of power; and

Whereas this is another sample of the giveaway program which has been inaugurated by the present administration in Washington; and

Whereas publicly owned power is the greatest asset that the Northwest has and is the best method of procuring jobs for the workers and prosperity for the region; and

Whereas the private power advocates have put their greatest effort on the construction of low head dams on the Hells Canyon site for the benefit of the private power monopoly; and

Whereas the fight in Oregon for the Hells Canyon project has been led by Senators WAYNE MORSE, RICHARD NEUBERGER, and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council, at its 35th semiannual convention, again reiterate its stand in favor of an all-purpose Government constructed high dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, and Representative EDITH GREEN for their efforts on behalf of an all-purpose dam at Hells Canyon and publicly owned power generally; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER and Representative EDITH GREEN.

RESOLUTION NO. 38

Whereas the retirement pay of most Federal employees is inadequate to the point where only the bare necessities for existence can be acquired by such pay; and

Whereas large numbers of retired employees are forced into the labor market at part or full-time work in order to maintain a decent standard of living; and

Whereas Federal employees contribute 6 percent of their salary during their productive years toward retirement pay which amount is several times the amount contributed by donors to social security with no appreciable increase in benefits; and

Whereas there are hundreds of millions of dollars that have piled up in reserve over the past years due to the parsimonious hoarding of the Federal employees' own moneys by the Government; and

Whereas the proposed liberalization of the retired employees' annuities would not cost the Government any additional money beyond its present obligations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor convening in Medford, Oreg., July 25, 1955, go on record as favoring the Morrison bill H. R. 3791 which provides for the liberalization of the Federal employee's annuity by basing the annuity on 2½ percent of the average wage multiplied by years of service with optional retirement at the age of 60; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive secretary be directed to notify the Oregon delegation in Congress of this action with a request to work for the enactment of this legislation into law.

RESOLUTION NO. 60

Whereas the National Government is now planning a $10 billion or more Federal highway improvement construction program; and

Whereas the coast Highway 101 has not been designated to receive Federal aid in this projected program; and

Whereas Highway 101 being an important north and south link in the coast highway system; and

Whereas the northwest area of the United States is classed as a critical military area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Oregon State Federation of Labor do go on record as urging the United States Bureau of Federal Roads to designate Highway 101 to be included in the projected Federal aid highway-improvement program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Bureau of Federal Roads system and the congressional delegations of the States of Oregon, Washington, and California.

RESOLUTION NO. 61

Whereas the Columbia River at Astoria, Oreg., and Megler, Wash., being the last link on Highway 101 not connected by a bridge and much delay resulting in the use of a ferry system, etc.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor do go on record as urging the United States Bureau of Federal Roads to construct the Trans-Columbia Bridge at Astoria, Oreg., and Megler, Wash., with the use of Federal funds thus completing the last link in this much traveled north and south highway; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Bureau of Federal Roads System and the congressional delegations of the States of Oregon, Washington, and California, and the Governors of Oregon, Washington, and California.

RESOLUTION OF CLARK COUNTY (WASH.) GRANGE

RAPID TAX AMORTIZATION FOR ELECTRIC-POWER FACILITIES

Whereas the purpose of the rapid tax-amortization program is to encourage and make possible investment in facilities needed for national defense; and

Whereas the original purpose of the program has been perverted in its application to the electric-power industry, where it has been used in the majority of cases to grant benefits for facilities which are essentially part of normal, peacetime expansion, rather than of a defense nature; and

Whereas as a result of this a few private power company stock manipulators have received tremendous subsidies from the Federal Government at the expense of the general public; and

Whereas these subsidies which are being granted to the private power company stockholders by the Government could better be directly invested in power developments like Grand Coulee and Bonneville, and the other Federal projects in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere about the Nation, which would then be owned by the people and which could repay the investment from the Federal Treasury—with interest—out of revenues from power sales; and

Whereas the rapid tax amortization for electric-power facilities which had been suspended on August 11 has now been reinstated by the Office of Defense Mobilization: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Clark County Pomona Grange urge the ODM to immediately again suspend the rapid-amortization program as it pertains to electric power; and that the Congress be urged to rewrite the law to exclude all subsidy to private electric-power facilities from rapid amortization; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be addressed to ODM Director Flemming, and to all members of the Congress from our State, and to Senators MORSE, NEUBERGER, LANGER, and YOUNG.

Adopted by Clark County Pomona Grange No. 1, meeting in regular session at Fern Prairie, this 14th day of December 1955.

ALBERT OST, *Master*.
GLADYS CARLSON,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 3650. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Eilef Rue of certain real property situated in Cassia County, Idaho (Rept. No. 1627);

H. R. 6022. A bill to provide for the relocation of the Trenton Massacre Canyon

Monument presently located near Trenton, Nebr. (Rept. No. 1628);

H. R. 6112. A bill to authorize the construction of a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1629);

H. R. 6618. A bill for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson (Rept. No. 1630); and

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to designate the General Grant tree (known as the Nation's Christmas tree) in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., as a national shrine (Rept. No. 1631).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2210. A bill to modify the project for the St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal, in order to repeal the authorization for the alteration of the International Bridge as part of such project, and to authorize the Secretary of the Army to accomplish such alteration (Rept. No. 1632);

S. 2755. A bill to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa (Rept. No. 1633);

S. 2861. A bill to authorize an increase of emergency relief highway funds from $10 million to $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956 (Rept. No. 1634);

H. R. 2552. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie (Rept. No. 1635);

H. R. 5556. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of McGirts Creek, Fla., for flood control (Rept. No. 1636);

H. R. 6309. A bill to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet (Rept. No. 1637); and

H. R. 6961. A bill to designate the lake created by Buford Dam in the State of Georgia as "Lake Sidney Lanier" (Rept. No. 1638).

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO TREATYMAKING POWER—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary, to report favorably, with an amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements. In connection therewith, I should say it is understood that a reasonable time will be available for the filing of both the majority report and the minority views. I anticipate that within a week those documents will be ready and will be filed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 1, which I reported a moment ago, I ask unanimous consent that the minority have not to exceed 10 days in which to file minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I believe the understanding was that 2 weeks would be allowed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought it was 1 week.

Mr. LANGER. The understanding was 2 weeks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I amend my request. I ask unanimous consent that the minority have not to exceed 2 weeks in which to file minority views.

Mr. LANGER. I want the RECORD to show that I am in favor of the joint resolution. However, I wish to protect the rights of the minority.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We discussed the suggestion of a week, 10 days, or 2 weeks. I thought 10 days was agreed upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 3379. A bill to provide for the maintenance of essential production of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3380. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Sobota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3381. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain from the condemnation by the United States of real property held by a person 60 years of age or older and to provide special treatment for such gain in the case of real property held by a person under 60 years of age; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 3382. A bill to provide for certain increases in the amounts paid under the provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, for school construction purposes for the period from July 1, 1951, through June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3383. A bill to require that Federal judgments for the condemnation of land by the United States be registered, recorded, docketed, indexed, and cross-indexed in conformity with the law of the State in which such property is situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 3384. A bill to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to certain land conveyed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo. by the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3385. A bill to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 3386. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3387. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRINTING OF PRAYERS BY SENATE CHAPLAIN

Mr. MORSE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 226), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That 3,000 copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, doctor of divinity, Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the 84th Congress be printed and bound for the use of the Senate.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE relating to the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

MAINTENANCE OF ESSENTIAL PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN ORES AND CONCENTRATES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the maintenance of essential production of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes.

I believe this bill, if enacted, will play an important part in avoiding world war III, or should world war III eventuate will assure an adequate supply of one of the most strategic and greatly needed materials in the development of more rugged turbojet engines and higher-speed planes and long-range ballistic missiles, as well as nuclear powerplants, which are required if our country is to control the airways and survive the anticipated all-out attacks of the greatest enemy of civilization the world has ever known.

This is a simple bill, and embodies the recommendations of the Tungsten Industry Advisory Committee made to the

Office of Minerals Mobilization of the Department of the Interior at its meeting on December 14, 1955. The material involved is tungsten—the metal with the highest melting point—over 6,100° Fahrenheit—and greatest hardness in the minerals field.

The characteristics of tungsten are well known in the field of metallurgy. In anticipation of the need for developing the greatest heat-resistant alloy, scientists and engineers have been striving diligently to develop such an alloy for more than 20 years. But during practically all of that time tungsten has been classified by the Pentagon as a metal in short supply. The exploration and development programs of the Department of the Interior and the Government buying programs under DMPA and GSA of domestic and foreign tungsten have nullified the theory of scarcity of this indispensable metal. We are fortunate in knowing that we have the resources of our domestic tungsten mining industry.

Our Government entered into contracts with producers in foreign lands for the acquisition of more than 6 million short-ton units of tungsten, and with domestic producers for 3 million short-ton units. Some of the foreign contracts will have extended over a maximum period of 9 years before they terminate, while the domestic purchases will terminate in 5 years when they end in June or July of this year, unless the domestic program is extended. This bill provides for the acquisition of an additional 3 million units of tungsten from domestic mines and extends the life of this important segment of the domestic mining industry 3 additional years, or until June 30, 1959. If the present program should terminate this summer—as it surely will unless it is extended—all of the domestic tungsten mines will close and our country will be deprived of this continuing source of supply.

On March 26, 1954, the President authorized the Office of Defense Mobilization to establish immediately new long-term mineral stockpile objectives. The press release that carried this message stated that the action was based on a preliminary study submitted by the President's Minerals Policy Committee, which was unanimously endorsed by the Cabinet, and that the complete report of the President's Committee would be submitted to the Cabinet at an early date with recommendations for a long-range program designed to strengthen the domestic mineral industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the text of this release.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 26, 1954.

The President today authorized the Office of Defense Mobilization to establish immediately new long-term mineral stockpile objectives.

The action was based on a preliminary study submitted last Friday by the President's Minerals Policy Committee, which was unanimously endorsed by the Cabinet. The complete report of the President's Committee will be submitted to the Cabinet at an early date with recommendations for a long-range program designed to strengthen the domestic mineral industry.

A careful review of stockpile objectives in the light of the new concept will be made by the Office of Defense Mobilization before specific purchase directives are given to the General Services Administration. It is estimated that the new program will result in additional Government acquisitions of from 35 to 40 metals and minerals to be purchased, wherever possible, from domestic producers, and to be spread out over a considerable period of time. In acquiring the additional amounts to be purchased under the new program, preference will be given to newly mined metals and minerals of domestic origin.

The following considerations will enter into the development of the new long-term stockpile objectives:

1. It will be assumed, for the purpose of calculating long-term stockpile objectives, that, in the event of war, supplies will not be available from foreign sources except in the case of that limited group of countries to which wartime access can be had with the same degree of reliance as afforded by sources within our country.

It is recognized that, at such a time, some of these foreign sources of supply will be available to the United States. It is impossible, however, to predict with accuracy just what areas will be accessible for obtaining large quantities of strategic and critical materials. Under the circumstances, therefore, the Government has decided to follow a policy which, when consummated, will mean that the risk of strategic and critical metals and minerals becoming a bottleneck will be virtually eliminated.

2. It will be assumed that in the event of an emergency some supplies from domestic sources may not be available, in view of the fact that the Soviets now have the capability of attack on the United States.

3. Wherever possible, strategic and critical metals and minerals in the stockpile will be upgraded and refined to the point at which they will be more readily usable in the event of an emergency.

Policies now in effect covering speedy acquisition of metals and minerals to meet the present minimum stockpile objectives will be continued.

Acquisition of metals and minerals to meet the difference between the present minimum and new long-term objectives will take place ordinarily at such times as the Government decides that purchases will help to reactivate productive capacity and in other ways to alleviate distressed conditions in connection with domestic mineral industries that are an important element of the Nation's mobilization base.

This means that the Government will be acquiring metals and minerals for the stockpile over and above its minimum needs at times when it will be advantageous to do so rather than waiting until emergency conditions force it to pay premium prices. Such a policy will make it possible to make steady progress toward the goal of eliminating the possibility of metals and minerals becoming a bottleneck in the event of general mobilization.

In addition, in building from the minimum to the new long-term stockpile objectives, the Government will continue to utilize fully the following methods:

1. Obtaining whenever such action will be consistent with the Nation's overall trade policy, strategic and critical metals and minerals in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities;

2. Transferring to the stockpile surplus metals and minerals obtained under the Defense Production Act or the Federal Property Act.

All materials acquired under the new program will be held under the safeguards provided by the present Stockpile Act.

Mr. MURRAY. On December 1, 1954, another statement in the form of a press release came from the White House, which stated that the President on that day had received the final report of the Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy—a report designed to provide the basis for national policies affecting the production and use of metals and minerals, and that the report was approved by the President after discussion by members of the Cabinet at several recent Cabinet meetings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, the texts of the release and the report, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the release and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 1, 1954.

The President today received the final report of the Cabinet Committee on Mineral Policy—a report designed to provide the basis for national policies affecting the production and use of metals and minerals. The report was approved by the President after discussion by members of the Cabinet at several recent Cabinet meetings.

The report contains 11 recommendations. Three are designed primarily to enhance the security of the Nation; 1 is intended to bring about closer Government-industry relations in the mining field; and 7 are directed toward the encouragement of an orderly and vigorous development of domestic mineral resources.

The three recommendations dealing with security which the Committee termed "overriding in importance" are:

1. That a complete review be undertaken of all stockpile objectives for strategic and critical metals and minerals, and the establishment of new long-term objectives to assure, over a period of time, the acquisition of adequate stocks of these materials, and thereby reduce—and where possible eliminate—foreseeable wartime shortages.

2. That the supply-demand situation for each of the metals and minerals be evaluated periodically on a case-by-case basis to establish the proper level of efficient domestic production required as an adequate component of the mobilization base.

3. That the Office of Defense Mobilization review with the Departments of Interior and Commerce, and other agencies concerned, the tasks which need to be carried on to build and maintain the mobilization base for metals and minerals; and issue necessary delegations of authority to assure full coverage of mobilization planning for metals and minerals within the policy framework and criteria established by ODM.

In addition to security considerations, the Committee gave attention to the development of domestic mineral resources.

"A major objective of mineral policy," the report stated, "is a full and orderly program for the development and conservation of the country's mineral resources. An orderly development and wise use of the Nation's resources is an essential element in a strong and sound economy."

The Committee, in its report and in discussions with the Cabinet and the President, emphasized that the development of mineral resources is primarily a function of private enterprise and that actions of Government in this field should be limited to those which are in the national interest but not likely to be undertaken by private industry.

The Committee's recommendations relating to domestic resources are:

4. That the tax structure as it affects the discovery and production of minerals should be periodically reviewed in order to eliminate, where possible, such deterrents as may be found to exist to the sound development of the Nation's mineral resources.

5. That the program of financial assistance to private industry for exploration such as that now administered by the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration be strengthened and continued.

6. That the Department of the Interior—the Federal agency with major responsibility in this field—accelerate those activities which must precede or supplement private exploration such as topographic and geologic mapping, geologic research, and the development of geochemical and geophysical theories and techniques.

7. That the Department of the Interior expand and direct exploration activities aimed at the discovery of new mineralized areas or critically short materials essential to security but that work in this field be confined to that which provides data as to the probable location and general potential of mineral deposits; and, further, that this type of search be undertaken by the Federal Government only when it clearly is in the national interest and when it is reasonably certain that the work will not be done by private industry.

8. That the Secretary of the Interior develop recommendations for such revisions of the mining laws as may be desirable to recognize and thus encourage the use of newer methods of explorations.

9. That the Secretary of the Interior take such steps as may be necessary to strengthen and coordinate the collection and dissemination of facts concerning the Nation's mineral resources and factors pertaining to their production and utilization.

10. That the Department of the Interior intensify its program of mineral and metal research aimed at the development of latent resources, new mineral raw materials, and improved utilization of existing raw materials, and coordinate its minerals and metal research with that of other Federal agencies, and as practicable with research in industry.

In offering a final recommendation, the Committee expressed the belief that the objectives sought by mineral policy can be more effectively achieved if closer cooperation can be developed between Government and the mineral industries. The Committee, therefore, recommended:

11. That the Secretary of the Interior develop ways and means of establishing and maintaining through some workable body the contacts between the mining industry and Government necessary to give force and effect to the recommended policies.

The Committee was appointed by the President on October 26, 1953. In addition to Secretary McKay as Chairman, the Committee is composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget served as consultants.

In their letter of transmittal, the members of the Committee pointed out that during the interim since the submission of a preliminary report in March of this year, a number of actions have been taken implementing recommendations made at that time.

The recommendation that the strategic stockpile be expanded in the interests of national security became effective by the President's announcement of March 26, 1954.

The delegation of authority by ODM covering mobilization planning for metals and minerals became effective November 12.

Action has been taken by ODM to continue and strengthen the program of the Defense Mineral Exploration Administration.

Substantial progress along the lines of the recommendation regarding the elimination of tax deterrents has been made in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

In his appointment of the Committee in October 1953, the President called attention to the depressed conditions in segments of the mining industry existing at that time and specifically referred to the situation in lead and zinc producers. The Committee gave particular attention to this problem as a representative test case.

Announcement of the stockpile policy last March resulted in a firming up the lead and zinc market, the letter of transmittal noted, and when a purchase program was inaugurated under the new policy, the market prices of both commodities rose substantially.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET COMMITTEE ON MINERALS POLICY, NOVEMBER 30, 1954

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., November 30, 1954.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have the honor to transmit to you the attached report which embodies the recommendations of the Cabinet Committee named by you on October 26, 1953, to inquire into national policies affecting the production and utilization of metals and minerals.

You will recall that the basic proposals of the Committee were discussed with you and members of the Cabinet during the month of March of this year.

The Committee's recommendation that the strategic stockpile be expanded in the interest of national security was put into effect by your announcement of March 26, 1954. We are gratified by the general approval which this policy has received at home and abroad.

In your letter requesting us to undertake this assignment, you referred to depressed conditions in segments of the mining industry and specifically to the situation of the lead and zinc producers. The Committee, therefore, gave particular attention to this problem as a representative test case.

When long-term stockpile objectives were established for these commodities, it was evident that additional purchases were necessary. It was obvious, also, that some steps had to be taken to maintain domestic production at a reasonable level.

The very announcement of the new stockpile policy gave a firmness to the lead and zinc markets. When a purchase program was inaugurated under this new policy, the market prices of both commodities rose substantially. The price for lead is now approximately 20 percent above the low point of February, 1954, and for zinc approximately 24 percent higher.

These increased prices should assist substantially in maintaining the domestic component of the mobilization base.

You will note, however, that our recommendations provide for a periodic review of these two commodities, as well as others, and should the program now in effect prove inadequate other measures will be promptly recommended.

As an essential concomitant of the new long-term stockpile policy, the Committee recommends the preparation of studies on a case-by-case basis, to determine the proper levels of domestic mineral production for each mineral commodity on which to base mobilization plans. These studies are being made by the Department of the Interior in line with the Committee's recommendation that the Office of Defense Mobilization delegate to that Department certain responsibilities for detailed mobilization planning for the production of metals and minerals. The delegation of authority became effective November 12, 1954.

Your Committee makes a series of recommendations designed to encourage an orderly but vigorous development of domestic mineral resources.

One of these calls for elimination from the tax structure of as many deterrents to the discovery and production of minerals as possible without impairing the fairness and adequacy of the tax system.

Great progress in this direction has already been made in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Another recommendation proposes the strengthening and continuation of the program of the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration. Action by ODM has given substantial effect to this recommendation.

Other recommendations advocate the reinforcing and broadening of the factfinding, exploration, and research activities of the Department of the Interior. As you know, management surveys by outstanding independent citizens have been made of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, and the recommendations are already being implemented. Reorganizations of these two agencies along the lines recommended by the surveys will increase the effectiveness of the Department of the Interior in these fields. Additional funds may be needed, however, fully to implement these recommendations of the Cabinet Committee.

The past 6 months have, we believe, provided sufficient time and experience to test some of the recommendations of the Committee. We believe that the progress that has been made toward their full implementation has been excellent. We are confident that continued progress will be made.

The members of the Committee would like to extend their thanks to the Assistant Secretaries who served as alternates and to staff members of each of the agencies of the Committee who contributed significantly to the conclusions and recommendations of the report.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as consultants to the Committee, were most helpful and cooperative.

A copy of our policy statement is enclosed.

Very sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior, Chairman.
JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.
SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization.

REPORT OF THE CABINET COMMITTEE ON MINERALS POLICY

INTRODUCTION

The President, by letter of October 26, 1953, appointed us as a committee to study the problems relating to the production and utilization of metals and minerals and to make recommendations for national policies in this field.

The guidelines of our work as laid down in this letter were:

1. To make sure that we have available mineral raw materials to meet any contingency during the uncertain years ahead.

2. To make sure that we can meet the ever-growing mineral requirements of an expanding economy.

3. To preserve the added economic strength represented by recent expansion of facilities by the domestic mining industry, through policies that would be consistent with our other national and international policies.

It was suggested, also, that the prudent use and development of domestic mineral resources and assured access to necessary

sources abroad are indispensable to the operation of an active economy and a sound defense.

In response to these instructions, the members of the Committee have examined existing policies affecting the production and utilization of minerals. We have reviewed the various acts of Congress and programs pursuant thereto as well as the relevant statements that the President has made from time to time on domestic and foreign economic policy. We have drawn freely upon the many studies made in this and related fields and upon the knowledge and experience of Federal agencies concerned with minerals.

Overriding in importance in any consideration of policies relating to mineral production and utilization is the security of the Nation. The lack of available metals and minerals has in the past proved to be a weak link in American security. The members of the Committee have, therefore, examined with care the existing status and progress of mobilization planning and the stockpile of strategic minerals, and have developed recommendations designed to strengthen this aspect of our defense.

We recognize also that the domestic mineral industry must contribute in varying degrees to the mineral raw material base for any future mobilization effort and propose ways and means of maintaining or achieving proper levels of efficient domestic production required as an adequate component of mobilization base.

Finally, the Committee offers a number of recommendations which it believes will foster a full and orderly program for the development and conservation of our national resources.

The recommendations of the Committee do not attempt to deal with specific commodities. The Committee reached an early finding that courses of action must be tailored to meet mineral commodity problems upon a case-by-case basis. The unequal geographical distribution of mineral deposits, the widely varying factors affecting the exploration and development of ore bodies, and the political and economic complexities surrounding their production, utilization, and flow in trade combine to make generalizations exceedingly difficult. We believe, however, that the guidelines laid down by the Committee will prove helpful in the working out of day-to-day problems and flexible enough to meet changing national and international conditions.

I. THE PROBLEM OF SECURITY

A. The strategic stockpile

Twice within the last 15 years, the United States has been drawn into international conflicts with almost no stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The absence of an adequate stockpile required the Nation in 1942–44 and again in 1950–52, to undertake costly and disruptive expansion programs to obtain materials which a stockpile, accumulated in advance, could have supplied. It was necessary at a most difficult time to divert scarce machinery and equipment, manpower, and military forces to obtain these materials.

The Committee believes that these tragic experiences point up the need for an adequate stockpile of strategic and critical materials to meet the tremendous surges of demand that come with war.

To the degree that minerals are stockpiled within the United States prior to the start of a war, there will be less need, or no need at all, for forced-draft wartime expansion of raw materials production involving unreasonable increases in prices or substantial Government investment. Likewise, there will be less need for stringent wartime allocations, ceiling prices, and limitation orders on raw materials. In addition, stockpiling can greatly reduce the need for diversion of naval, air, and military efforts to the secondary task of protecting overseas sources of materials and supply lanes when they should be employed in the primary task of fighting the war.

Minimum objectives

Stockpiling of strategic and critical materials was authorized by the act of June 7, 1939, as amended by the act of July 23, 1946. Acquisitions pursuant to these acts have for the most part been based upon "minimum" objectives, intended to make up for anticipated loss of, or serious interference with, foreign sources of strategic materials in a 5-year war period. In general, estimates were made of the wartime requirements (consisting of military, AEC, industrial, essential civilian, and essential exports) and estimates were also made of the supplies expected to be available in wartime from domestic production and from strategically accessible foreign sources. Safety factors made some provision for estimated shipping losses, political instability in foreign countries, and the danger of relying on concentrated sources. Where anticipated wartime supplies for a commodity did not meet projected requirements, the indicated deficit was generally established as the stockpile objective. These "minimum" objectives, however, still assumed substantial wartime imports, as well as stringent conservation measures.

As of June 30, 1954, minimum stockpile objectives for all materials were valued at approximately $7 billion and approximately $4.3 billion worth of materials were physically on hand. A total of 75 materials are being stockpiled and of these 55 are metals and minerals. Dollarwise, about 80 percent are metals and minerals. It is Government policy to acquire these minimum objectives as rapidly as feasible. When an objective is largely on hand, the Government gradually reduces the rate of procurement to withdraw from the market with a minimum unsettling effect.

Under the Defense Production Act commitments of over $6 billion have been made to expand supplies of materials to meet defense purposes including stockpiling. Accelerated tax amortization is also used where appropriate. Assisted materials expansion is preferably located within the United States, or alternatively, in strategically accessible foreign sources.

Long-term objectives

1. The Committee recommends a complete review of all stockpile objectives for strategic and critical metals and minerals and the establishment of new long-term objectives that will assure, over a period of time, the acquisition of adequate stocks of these materials, and thereby reduce and where possible eliminate foreseeable wartime shortages.

Long-term objectives are calculated further to reduce dangerous and costly dependence on sources of minerals outside of the United States and accessible areas as defined by the National Security Council as well as to eliminate in wartime production programs the necessity for conservation measures so stringent as to jeopardize essential war-supporting activities.

In calculating these long-term stockpile objectives, particular attention must be given to the large bulk items which in wartime would require great tonnages of ocean shipping. In addition, the possibilities of destruction of key metal and mineral producing facilities in the United States of America and in strategically accessible sources must be assessed in view of the development of atomic weapons, and appropriate provision made for additional stockpiling where required.

Policies now in effect covering acquisitions to meet minimum stockpile objectives should be continued, but acquisition of minerals to meet the increment between minimum and long-term objectives should go forward under limitations hereinafter stated.

Acquisitions beyond the existing minimum stockpile objectives to achieve the long-term objectives should be made only under comprehensive acquisition plans developed by the Office of Defense Mobilization. Such acquisitions should take place ordinarily at such times as the Government decides that purchases will help to reactivate productive capacity and in other ways to alleviate distressed conditions in connection with domestic mineral industries that are an important element of the Nation's mobilization base. Accordingly, in making purchases preference should be given to newly mined metals and minerals of domestic origin. Acquisitions will also continue to be made by obtaining strategic and critical metals and minerals in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities (which have already been paid for by the Government); and by transferring to the stockpile surplus metals and minerals generated under the Defense Production Act, the Federal Property Act, and other legislation.

In acquiring metals and minerals for the long-term stockpile objective, care should be exercised to avoid interfering with the normal relationships of regular trade in the United States and in friendly foreign countries. Where more than one agency of the Government is involved in these transactions close coordination by ODM will be required.

Materials in the stockpile should also be upgraded to the point at which they are more readily usable in the economy—whereby electric power, transportation, manpower, facilities, and time—all of which will be short in time of war—are also stockpiled.

Upgrading of stockpile materials should normally be done only when it can be accomplished at favorable prices and in periods of lowered economic activity, thus providing both domestic employment opportunities and the maintenance of plants and facilities which are essential elements of the mobilization base.

All materials acquired must be held under all of the safeguards provided by the present Stockpile Act.

B. Maintaining domestic production for the mobilization base

The Cabinet Mineral Policy Committee recognizes that a strong, vigorous, and efficient domestic mineral industry is essential to the long-term economic development of the United States. The domestic mineral industry must contribute in varying degrees to the mineral raw material base for any future mobilization effort.

In addition to our need for domestic mineral production, it must be recognized that there are many important minerals where efficient domestic production is entirely lacking or inadequate to meet industrial and defense needs and where, as a consequence, stockpiling and accessible foreign sources must be relied upon.

2. The committee recommends that the supply-demand situation for each of the metals and minerals be evaluated periodically on a case-by-case basis to establish the proper level of efficient domestic production required as an adequate component of the mobilization base. When it is found that the level of such production in the case of any particular mineral is, or is likely to become, insufficient to serve as an adequate component of the mobilization base, a comprehensive program involving the best use of all of the various existing authorities of the Government should be developed to maintain or to achieve that level of domestic production. In the event that the present authorities of the Government are inadequate to accomplish the desired objective, appropriate legislative recommendations should be prepared. The programs that are developed as a result of these case-by-case studies must be consistent with the basic foreign and domestic economic policies of the Government.

C. Mobilization planning for minerals

Mobilization planning for the mineral producing industries involves preparation of

basic information on present and future mineral producing capacity in the United States of America and in foreign countries, including assessment of the extent of mineral reserves. The level of production that must be maintained in peacetime for each mineral must be established in order to insure an adequate mobilization base for war. Industry must frequently be consulted so that it is aware of Government mobilization requirements, and, conversely, the Government must make plans that will enable the mineral industry to retain essential technical and skilled personnel and to obtain during time of war necessary machinery, power, transportation and maintenance, repair, and operating supplies. Even where stockpile objectives are achieved there is still a need for detailed mineral mobilization planning since stockpile objectives assume certain levels of production in wartime. Moreover, there are many important minerals for which no stockpiling is presently being attempted.

Prior to World War II there was almost no mobilization planning for minerals, although the War Industries Board of World War I had clearly pointed out the need for such planning. During World War II the War Production Board—a temporary agency—handled most of the allocation and expansion activities. After the start of the Korean war, responsibility for the mobilization program was divided among several regular Government agencies.

The Office of Defense Mobilization (ODM) is responsible for overall mobilization planning activities of the Government but those activities relating to minerals have been reduced to a bare skeleton basis and divided among several agencies.

3. The committee recommends that the ODM review with the Departments of Interior and Commerce, and other agencies concerned, the tasks which need to be carried on to build and maintain the mobilization base for metals and minerals; and issue necessary delegations of authority to assure full coverage of mobilization planning for metals and minerals within the policy framework and criteria established by ODM.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC MINERAL RESOURCES

In addition to security considerations, the committee believes that an orderly development and wise use of the Nation's resources is an essential element in a strong and sound economy.

A major objective of mineral policy is a full and orderly program for the development and conservation of the country's mineral resources.

Mineral resources are wasting assets. True conservation calls for wise and full use to achieve the utmost value and to assure future supply. Although ore extracted from the earth does not renew itself, conservation cannot be achieved by locking up our resources for some indefinite use in the indefinite future. Thus, intensive search for new deposits and development of new properties are required to maintain prudent levels of reserves.

Successful mining usually requires long-range planning and substantial investment. Today's mines are the result of exploration, development, and risk-taking over a period of many years. Exploration for mineral deposits often requires substantial venture capital—much of it a total loss. Development of new deposits requires heavy auxiliary investment in housing, transportation and other facilities in remote areas, and frequently the perfection of new technologies for mining and treatment of ores.

Mines of the future must be planned today—not a decade hence.

The committee believes that the Government has an obligation to assure that the mineral resources of the Nation be developed, conserved, and utilized in the best possible manner over the longest possible period in order to enhance its security and commerce. Development of mineral resources is, of course, primarily a function of private enterprise. The Government must, however, continue to assist in many ways.

The committee believes that the search for new sources of mineral wealth within the United States needs to be pressed more vigorously. Evidence obtained through geologic investigations suggests that abundant mineral wealth awaits discovery.

A more adequate appraisal of the Nation's mineral assets would enable Government and industry more wisely to plan to meet security requirements. A greater knowledge of mineral resources made available to industry would tend to stimulate greater investment in development and production.

To encourage the optimum economic development of domestic mineral resources, the committee offers the following recommendations:

4. That the tax structure as it affects the discovery and production of minerals should be periodically reviewed in order to eliminate, where possible, such deterrents as may be found to exist to the sound development of the Nation's mineral resources.

5. That the program of financial assistance to private industry for exploration such as that now administered by the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration be strengthened and continued.

6. That the Department of the Interior, the Federal agency with major responsibilities in this field, accelerate those activities which must precede or supplement private exploration such as topographic and geologic mapping, geologic research and the development of geochemical and geophysical theories and techniques.

7. That the Department of the Interior expand direct exploration activities aimed at the discovery of new mineralized areas or critically short materials essential to security but that work in this field be confined to that which provides data as to the probable location and general potential of mineral deposits, and, further, that this type of search be undertaken by the Federal Government only when it clearly is in the national interest and when it is reasonably certain that the work will not be done by private industry.

8. That the Secretary of the Interior develop recommendations for such revisions of the mining laws as may be desirable to recognize and thus encourage the use of newer methods of exploration.

9. That the Secretary of the Interior take such steps as may be necessary to strengthen and coordinate the collection and dissemination of facts concerning the Nation's mineral resources and factors pertaining to their production and utilization.

10. That the Department of the Interior intensify its program of mineral and metal research aimed at the development of latent resources, new mineral raw materials and improved utilization of existing raw materials, and coordinate its mineral and metal research with that of other Federal agencies, and as practicable, with research by industry.

Implementation of recommendations pursuant to 4 and 8 may require additional legislation. Authority for No. 5 is contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. Adequate authority exists for the implementation of the remaining recommendations.

III. GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY RELATIONS

The committee believes that the objectives sought by mineral policy can be more effectively achieved if closer cooperation can be developed between Government and the mineral industries.

11. It is recommended that the Secretary of the Interior develop ways and means of establishing and maintaining through some workable body the contacts between the mining industry and Government necessary to give force and effect to policies recommended herein.

Mr. MURRAY. With respect to this report let me point out that the primary question involved in the purchase of domestically mined tungsten is whether our mines could produce this metal in sufficient quantities to meet the needs of the consuming industries in times of emergency. I wish to advise the Senate that the domestic production of tungsten in 1954 exceeded domestic consumption by more than 3 to 1, and that in 1955, while domestic production showed a substantial increase over consumption the ratio was reduced to 1.66 to 1. This was due to a considerable rise in the rate of consumption. It is estimated by economists in this field that by the end of three years, or by June 30, 1959, the domestic consumption of tungsten will be sufficient to absorb all of the tungsten imports plus a substantial portion of the domestic production at the present rates of production and consumption, thus bringing into balance for the first time the supply-demand situation with respect to tungsten. The bill I am introducing is a compromise measure. It provides for the purchase of 3 million units of tungsten at the prices fixed in the present Government price support program.

Tungsten is the most heat resistant metal known to man. Tungsten's quality characteristics are not equalled by those of any other metal. Its greatest virtue, the quality that makes it indispensable in today's world, is that it retains its strength at high temperatures. Tungsten has the highest melting point of any metal—over 6,100° Fahrenheit.

The importance of tungsten in internatoinal conflicts first was illustrated in World War I. Germany's top-secret then was the use of tungsten high-speed steel in cutting tools.

With this impetus, due to demands of military might, world production of tungsten had leaped by 1916 to 23,104 short tons of concentrates. Only 9 years before it had been 6,135 short tons, an amount in those days considered surplus.

Almost immediately an international scramble for tungsten was on, and the price shot up to almost $100 a short ton unit—20 pounds WO_3—in the United States.

After World War I all stocks of tungsten concentrates held by the United States Government were—most unwisely—sold. Industry bought up this supply of the metal for about $1.50 per unit.

All domestic tungsten mines ceased operations. In 1922 a duty of 45 cents a pound of contained tungsten was put in effect. In 1930 with the signing of the Tariff Act the duty was increased to 50 cents per pound and has remained at that level since, with the exception of the brief period 1948 to 1950 when it was cut to 38 cents during the existence of a trade agreement with China which was later abrogated. It is far from adequate, but I am not discussing tariff today.

Although some attempt had been made to resume mining of tungsten in this country during the thirties still in 1939 we had no considerable domestic tungsten production.

In the meantime in Europe, as the shadow of war again appeared, Italy, France, Russia, and Germany began placing extraordinary orders for tungsten concentrates. Before World War II was started Germany had bought up virtually the entire world supply of offgrade tungsten ore. In a barter agreement with China in 1936 Germany obtained directly about 45 percent of China's rich tungsten-ore production. And from every other available source large quantities of Chinese ore were imported, as well as ore from Bolivia, Argentina, Peru, Mexico, and even the United States—all bought through her Axis partner, Japan, then considered neutral by the Americas.

It was Germany's use of high-velocity, armor-piercing projectiles with the tungsten carbide core that almost made the north African campaign a successful one.

Tungsten production in China began in 1914, and it has been the largest tungsten producer. During the Sino-Japanese War its flow of tungsten was disrupted and stockpiles accumulated in Indochina. One of the great coups of the rearmament race was made by the United States when it purchased this entire stock and delivered it to this country just prior to Pearl Harbor. In the race for tungsten hung the balance between victory and defeat. Germany was paying Portugal and Spain $50,000 a ton for the critical metal. The "preclusive" buying policy of the Allied Nations to keep Germany from obtaining this critical metal rendered it necessary for the United States to pay as high as $1,000 a unit for WO_3.

But to obtain enough tungsten for our military program was another race. Domestic mines were reopened and new explorations were made. It was then that the Yellow Pine deposit was found in Idaho.

The Government invested millions to build access roads and open up this mine. The Yellow Pine deposit was a lifesaver for this country, but it was geologically a strange phenomenon, like a bowl of soup, and the rich ore was soon exhausted.

In the opinion of the Munitions Board, the discovery of that tungsten mine at Stibnite, Idaho, in 1942 shortened World War II by at least 1 year and saved the lives of a million American soldiers.

Fortuitously other large domestic deposits were discovered; one of them, the largest producing mine today, is located in North Carolina.

At this time I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that Government directives issued over the past 14 years have restricted the uses of tungsten so drastically that research laboratories, until recently, have almost completely designed tungsten out of their projects. They stated that the scarcity of this metal was so acute and the need so great that there was no purpose in experimenting further with tungsten because it was virtually unobtainable. The result of these restrictions was to limit and discourage the use of tungsten and thereby deprive the researchers of this vitally important mineral and require them to seek substitutes.

There is no substitute for tungsten in the heat-resistant alloys field, and the laboratories are now proceeding with their research projects in an effort to develop an alloy that will give longer life and greater speed to our turbojet planes. However, if the domestic purchase program is discontinued, our mines will cease production and there will be no assurance of an adequate supply of tungsten in the event of an emergency.

Here is what is said by Dr. R. H. Thielemann, the metallurgist who developed the X–40 alloy in 1942, which is still the best alloy in use since that year in our turbojet planes:

> With the advent of the turbojet engine in 1942, new requirements for superior, high-temperature alloys were introduced, and research work in the field of high temperature metallurgy was greatly expanded. Because tungsten was in short supply, the major effort was directed toward the development of alloys which contained molybdenum as the major strengthening element, and many thousands of tons of such well-known jet-engine alloys as Timken's 16–25–6, vitallium, and the Hastelloys were produced. All of these alloys contained six or more percent of molybdenum and no tungsten. However, during World War II, two outstanding tungsten-bearing alloys were developed. One of these was the Allegheny ludlum SO816 composition—containing 4 percent tungsten and the other was the X–40 cast alloy which contains 7.5 percent tungsten. As the requirements for better jet-engine blading materials increased, these two alloys were universally adopted by the jet-engine builders and were in production when the Korean war started. It wasn't long, however, before tungsten was once more in short supply and the Air Force set up specifications limiting the use of tungsten in jet engines to 2 pounds of tungsten per 1,000 pounds of engine thrust. The only metal that was considered more critical was columbium. Effort was again directed toward the development of superior high-temperature alloys that contained, along with other limitations, as little tungsten as possible.
>
> During the Korean war, Pratt and Whitney Aircraft was working on the development of its now famous J–57 turbojet engine. In order to be successful, certain high-temperature components in this engine required the best high-temperature alloys that were available. The writer happened to be in charge of the metallurgical work on this engine, and it was decided to choose alloys that best fit the application regardless of composition or critical-alloy content. As a result, several tungsten-bearing alloys were adopted and something like 100 pounds of tungsten is required to build every J-57 engine. The use of tungsten in the new Pratt and Whitney J–57 engine is even higher. Since these two engines will be the backbone of American's air might for many years to come, a substantial and continued use of tungsten appears assured.
>
> In the aircraft industry, nothing is ever good enough. If alloys could be developed which would let engines run at higher temperatures, they would be used. The X–40 alloy, which the writer developed in 1942, is used for turbine blades and vanes in the most advanced jet engines that we have today. The fact that a better alloy has not been developed in the intervening 13 years is almost a discredit to our American ingenuity—but one reason is that very little effort has been expended toward developing alloys which contain substantial amounts of the critical alloying elements.

Mr. President, in order that you may know more about this outstanding metallurgist, who is now in charge of a research program at Stanford Research Institute sponsored by the domestic tungsten mining industry designed to develop a better heat-resistant alloy for turbojet engines, I wish to give you a brief biography showing some of his excellent background of experience and wide knowledge of the subject matter I am discussing:

Mr. R. H. Thielemann has been involved with the development and application of high-temperature materials for steam turbines, jet engines, mercury-boiler plants, turbine superchargers, and atomic reactors for the past 18 years. From 1936 to 1944 he was a research engineer in the General Electric research laboratory and was in charge of the company's research program on high-temperature materials. In 1944 he joined the Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. as development engineer and was involved in the development of new processing techniques for melting and fabricating new high-temperature alloys. From 1945 until joining the Stanford Research Institute in July of 1955, he was associated with Pratt and Whitney Aircraft as development metallurgist and chief metallurgist. He has been a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics Subcommittee on Power Plant Materials since 1947, and has served on several of the National Research Council's Minerals and Metals Advisory Board panels dealing with metal problems.

Mr. President, I have before me a clipping from the February 29 issue of American Metal Market which is captioned "Russia Planning Major Expansion in Metals Output." This article states that the sixth 5-year plan as outlined by Soviet Premier N. A. Bulganin before the 20th party congress recently requires that—

> The average annual increase in production of nonferrous metals must be many times higher than the increase in the previous plans. * * * Mr. Bulganian told the party congress that the Soviet Union leads the world in prospected deposits of iron and manganese ores, copper, lead, bauxite, nickel, wolfram (which is tungsten), potassium salts, and phosphate raw materials. * * * Mr. Bulganin read the blueprint for an increase in the production of nickel, wolfram, molybdenum, niobium, and other nonferrous and rare metals essential for the production of alloy steels and heat-resistant alloys used for making high-pressure steam turbines, gas turbines, and other machines.

Mr. President, it would be absurd for the Congress to permit the tungsten program to terminate in the next 3 or 4 months. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has waited in vain for an announcement from the Office of Defense Mobilization of an extension of the program, and since such an announcement has not been forthcoming, I introduce this bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for speedy consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3379) to provide for the maintenance of essential production of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes, introduced

by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO CAPITAL GAIN ON CERTAIN PROPERTY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for many months I have been concerned about an injustice to our citizens who, through no desire of their own, are forced to sell their homes and other property as a result of construction of Federal projects. This problem becomes especially acute for those citizens who have spent practically an entire lifetime in a community, and then through forced sale or eminent domain are required to dispose of their farms or their homes, and at the same time are required to pay a capital-gains tax on their sale.

Our existing tax statutes have a provision for the involuntary conversion of real property; that is, if a citizen is required, through forced sale, to sell his property because of the construction of a Federal project, he is given 12 months in which to invest the proceeds of the sale in a similar farm or business. Needless to state, even though such a transfer of property can be made, it causes much anguish and real hardship.

Many of our citizens who are forced to dispose of their property have lived on the same farm for a generation, or have operated a business for an entire generation. In many instances such persons should not be required to make an involuntary conversion of their real property because of age and many other personal circumstances.

This matter has been forcefully called to my attention by the dislocation of a large number of people in the Tuttle Creek Reservoir area, which is a Federal project. It is for that reason, Mr. President, I am introducing a bill which will bring forth needed equities with respect to the capital-gains tax on real property.

First, my proposal would eliminate the capital-gains tax in the case of persons who are forced to sell their property as a result of the construction of a Federal project and are 60 years of age or over.

In my opinion, there is no justification for requiring these people to take advantage of our involuntary transfer tax statute in order to protect their holdings, or require them to pay a capital-gains tax of 25 percent on their farms, homes, or businesses which they have held for many years. It is simply not normal for people of this age to start farming operations or businesses in a new community.

Second, my bill would reduce the present application of the capital-gains tax on property taken by the Federal Government from the present 25-percent rate to a rate of 10 percent where the property owner has not attained the age of 60.

My bill is not only applicable to the Tuttle Creek property, but is general in its application. Every member of the Senate is familiar with some of the hardships and problems that arise from the taking of land by the Federal Government for Federal projects.

This is one thing this session of Congress can do; and I know it would be gratefully received by every citizen of our Nation who has had this problem to deal with. I urge the Committee on Finance to give early consideration to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain from the condemnation by the United States of real property held by a person 60 years of age or older and to provide special treatment for such gain in the case of real property held by a person under 60 years of age, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS FOR CERTAIN SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). As a Senator, the Chair introduces, for appropriate reference, a bill providing certain retroactive payments to local educational agencies under Public Law 815, 81st Congress. It is the Chair's belief that this bill will fit in closely with measures recently introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], to improve the laws providing aid to schools in federally impacted areas. The present occupant of the chair was a cosponsor with the Senator from Arkansas of those measures.

The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3382) to provide for certain increases in the amounts paid under the provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, for school construction purposes for the period from July 1, 1951, through June 30, 1957, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO KANOSH TRIBE OF INDIANS, UTAH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to transfer 600 acres of public domain land, within the boundaries of the Kanosh reservation in southern Utah, to the members of the Kanosh band of the Piute Indian tribe.

During the 83d Congress a bill was passed providing for the termination of Federal supervision over these Indians. The provisions of that bill included a transfer to them of title to their reservation. It has now been determined that by error or inadvertence, a block of 600 acres lying within the exterior boundaries of the reservation had never been actually conveyed to these Indians, though from the circumstances it is completely clear that that was the intention when the reservation was created. This public domain is almost entirely surrounded by the tribal and allotted lands of the Indians. It has been used by them for many years.

This band, composed of 42 persons, owns some 1,840 acres of allotted land and 5,890 acres of tribal land. They would be seriously handicapped if they were deprived of this block lying within their reservation which they have been using.

Were this land made available to non-Indian use, serious trespass problems would arise, and it would require the fencing of this 600 acres. Full Federal supervision over this band will be terminated by September 1, 1956, and the enactment of this bill would place the Indians in a more favorable position to carry out their responsibilities under the termination legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3385) to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh band of Indians, Utah, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. DOUGLAS) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BRICKER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, explaining the purposes of the amendment, may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

This amendment would require the Secretary of Agriculture to make a thorough study of the Federal meat grading system as it applies to beef, veal, mutton, and lamb. The purpose of the study would be to determine whether the present system serves the best interests of consumer and producer.

The study would be made in such a manner that it would give attention to the problems of various regions. The Secretary would also utilize the services of land-grant colleges wherever practicable in this study. Parenthetically, several land-grant colleges have already done some excellent work in this field. The Secretary would report to Congress at the earliest practicable date the results and recommendations of this study.

Incidentally, the National Cattlemen's Association is conducting its own study into this matter.

The thing which has struck me about the debate on S. 3183 so far has been the attention given to the so-called basics. I believe we should not ignore our livestock producers and their problems. After all, in 1955, livestock and livestock products accounted for 54 percent of the total cash receipts received by our Nation's farmers. In my own State of Utah, the so-called basics constitute only about 7 percent of the receipts, whereas, cattle and sheep comprise one-third of the receipts of Utah farmers.

Cattlemen do not want price supports. Their historic stand against price supports is one of the most encuraging facts on the American agricultural scene. They are in trouble, however. The cattle population for 1956 is estimated at about 97,500,000, nearly 2 million more than in 1954 and over 900,000 more than last year. Cattle prices have fallen as much as 29 percent in some grades during the last year. Much of this price decline is attributable to the increased production of meat from feed grain grown on diverted acres.

One of the frustrating features of the present cattle situation is that our present beef grading system may be adding to the cattleman's difficulties, in addition to not reflecting accurately consumer preferences. If that is true, it is most unfortunate.

Out of past studies of Federal grading have come some intriguing facts and further questions which the proposed study should give attention to.

For instance, are the wide and arbitrary price spreads between the wholesale beef and the live cattle market warranted? Do they result from consumer preference, supply and demand, or are they solely a representation of retail merchandising methods and pressures applied at the wholesale level? Is grading based on the theory of consumer protection or is it merely a market mechanism?

Studies which have been made indicate some interesting patterns and paradoxes. A University of Arizona survey in Phoenix found that consumers selected the "good" and "commercial" grades of beef because they preferred a limited amount of fat. Fifty-nine percent of the people selected the "commercial" cut of beef—the ones with the least marbling. The tests indicated that people were generally poorly acquainted with the United States grades of beef.

A University of Missouri survey found that St. Louis housewives were also relatively unacquainted with United States grade terms of beef. The same housewives picked "good" or "commercial" nearly half the time. As the Farm Journal for January 1956, noted, "The little woman just isn't picking out what we've long thought of as premium beef cuts." The Farm Journal reports a test in Denver in which 500 homemakers expressed a decided preference for "good" cuts, then "commercial" with "choice" and "prime" running last. Apparently, most people just aren't interested in excessive fat.

An article in Successful Farming for March of 1956 discusses the trend to new meat types in beef. Already, hog producers are striving for a leaner hog in keeping with consumer trends.

Basically, the housewife or consumer wants leanness and tenderness more than anything else in meat. Most housewives would prefer boiling beef which comes from "good" beef rather than from "choice" because of the higher proportion of lean to fat.

Since the housewife has just as much preference for the cuts from the lower grades, can she reflect this preference in terms of price? Is the housewife preference carried back to the wholesaler and to the live cattle market? Or is she "forced" to buy a higher grade than she might otherwise prefer? How much opportunity does she have to reflect her preferences back to the primary producer in dollars and cents? Does the producer get a fair price for the kind of beef that consumers really want to buy?

Most of what I have said with reference to beef and veal is true of lamb and mutton. Sheepmen want to sell their lambs, not "grades." They know the consumer prefers tenderness which is determined basically by the youth of the animals. Excess fat is too hard to sell to the consumer.

These and many more intriguing questions should be considered in such a study as I have proposed.

In other words, "choice" and "prime" have achieved a sort of symbolic status which may not accord with real consumer preferences. It is ironical to think that these terms may be acting as artificial consumer deterrents—keeping the consumer from buying the type of meat actually preferred and depressing the market for the producer of the type of meat which the consumer really wants. Certainly, we do not want cattlemen to have to hold their cattle in order to bring them up to "choice" when at any time after a certain point these animals could find ready markets with consumers who do not want the added fat which holding them would bring.

According to the Department of Agriculture, about 46 percent of our total commerical production of beef in 1955 was federally graded. About 21 percent of the veal production was graded; and 33 percent of the lamb and mutton production was graded.

This study should be objective. I have full confidence that if the study is approved, the Secretary will do an excellent job. I have discussed the problem of grading with him, and while the Department has under current consideration plans for a study of grading, I believe Congress should indicate its interest in this matter and thereby assure the Secretary of its cooperation.

The real question we would be asking in the study would be, "Does the present grading system help or hinder the operations of our free market?"—which is, of course, the best insurance of balancing the interests of consumers and producers.

I feel such a study would be of great value to the consumer, the producer, the Department of Agriculture, and Congress. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I submit an amendment to H. R. 5265; to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons.

I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment printed in the RECORD, together with a very brief statement, prepared by me, in explanation of the amendment. I shall read only a paragraph of the explanation at this time:

As passed by the House of Representatives on July 30, 1955, H. R. 5265 contained a section providing for a partial exemption from the transportation tax for travel between the mainland of the United States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

The Senate Finance Committee in reporting this bill on February 24, 1956, removed this partial exemption. The attached amendment has only one purpose and that is to restore this partial exemption to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 6, at line 4, redesignate paragraph (2) ("Transportation outside the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere") paragraph (3), and insert at the end of paragraph (1) on page 6, at line 4, the following:

"(2) Transportation to or from Alaska or Hawaii.—The term 'taxable transportation of persons' does not include that portion of transportation to or from the Territory of Alaska or the Territory of Hawaii which—

"(A) is outside the United States,

"(B) is not transportation between ports or stations within the continental United States or that portion of Canada or Mexico within 225 miles of the continental United States, and

"(C) is not transportation between ports or stations within the Territory of Alaska or the Territory of Hawaii."

The statement presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

As passed by the House of Representatives on July 30, 1955, H. R. 5265 contained a section providing for a partial exemption from the transportation tax for travel between the mainland of the United States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

The Senate Finance Committee in reporting this bill on February 24, 1956, removed this partial exemption. The attached amendment has only one purpose and that is to restore this partial exemption to the bill. The reasons supporting this amendment can be summarized as follows:

1. The partial exemption for travel to the Territories was added to the original version of the bill by the House Ways and Means Committee, and approved by the House of Representatives, as a means of lessening to some extent the handicap which the Territories suffer because of their distance from the mainland of the United States. Both Territories are completely dependent on commerce with the United States, which requires a substantial volume of business travel between the Territories and the mainland. In addition, the partial exemption provided in the House bill would stimulate tourist travel to the Territories, and revenue from this source is important to both Territories, particularly so in the case of Hawaii.

2. The fact that the Territories may someday become States is no argument against this partial exemption. Their becoming States will not change their geographical location, and the transportation tax handicap resulting therefrom. The effect of the exemption would simply be that, for transportation-tax purposes, both Territories would be moved in space so that their boundaries become contiguous with the United States.

3. Both the House and Senate Finance Committee bills remove the tax from travel to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. It

would be inequitable not to give at least a partial exemption to Alaska and Hawaii.

4. The partial exemption for travel to the Territories is needed to correct a tax-evasion practice which the present law encourages. For example, if a passenger travels from Seattle to Honolulu, he must pay tax on the entire trip. If, however, he crosses the border into Canada and buys his ticket in Vancouver for travel from Vancouver to Honolulu, the entire trip is tax free. This evasion practice diverts traffic from American-flag carriers to foreign-flag carriers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my judgment the amendment is only fair and equitable, not only to the economic interests of Hawaii and Alaska, but also to those of the people in our own country who travel to Hawaii and Alaska. I believe it would be unfair and discriminatory, in relation to other Territories, if we did not adopt at least the principle of the House bill.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

EDWARD NEAL FISHER — DISCHARGE OF A COMMITTEE—REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on August 1, 1955, the bill (H. R. 4602) for the relief of Edward Neal Fisher, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The bill relates to the military service of this person, and appears to be in the nature of a private relief measure. In the other body, the bill was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

Statement prepared by him on 150th anniversary of the Graham School at Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

Address delivered by him before the second legislative conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department (AFL-CIO), at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., March 5, 1956.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Address delivered by Senator GOLDWATER at The Citadel, South Carolina, on March 3, 1956.

NOTICE CONCERNING H. R. 7049, AN ACT TO REVISE, CODIFY, AND ENACT INTO LAW TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE ENTITLED "ARMED FORCES," AND TITLE 32 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE ENTITLED "NATIONAL GUARD"

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the subcommittee now has under consideration H. R. 7049, 84th Congress, 1st session, and the accompanying report thereon, House Report No. 970, regarding the revision and codification of laws relating to Armed Forces, having passed the House of Representatives on August 1, 1955. Such revision deals with title 10, United States code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32, United States Code, entitled "National Guard."

The purpose of this notice is to advise any and all interested parties of the consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee, and that the subcommittee desires to have any statements or comments relating to the proposed legislation. The subcommittee realizes that the enactment of such a codification is a project of great magnitude, and that a codification is limited to the revision and codification of existing law only, so that there will be no change in the statutes under discussion, as they now exist. The statements or comments requested are for the purpose of allowing any and all persons to express their views as to whether in the proposed legislation, H. R. 7049, there has been a change in existing law.

The subcommittee desires that such statements or comments be forwarded to the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, room 424, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., on or before March 28, 1956.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and myself, as chairman.

TRIBUTE TO REV. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, D. D., CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today again, as has happened each day at 12 o'clock noon, the Senate has been lifted to the highest planes of spiritual values, by the great Chaplain of the Senate.

I think we sometimes get into the habit of taking for granted this moment of worship at the beginning of each day of our sessions. I know that I speak the views of each Member of the Senate without exception when I express our deep appreciation and thanks to the Chaplain for the spiritual leadership he extends to us, not only to the Senate as a body, but to each one of us individually, as from time to time we sit down with him, as a great religious teacher and leader, and discuss some of the moral and ethical problems which are involved in the performance of our duties as Senators.

So, Mr. President, as a token or symbol of appreciation for the work of this great man, I am having drafted a resolution which seeks to provide that the prayers of the Chaplain for each session of the Senate be published as a Senate document. When I think of the many Government bulletins and documents we cause to have printed each year, though questioning not their value to those interested in receiving them, and then think of the great value a Senate document such as I have mentioned would have to constituents who are very much interested in the beautiful prayers of the Chaplain, I feel that no argument could be made in opposition to my resolution.

I know that other Senators have received a great many letters, as I have, asking where a collection of the Chaplain's prayers may be obtained.

I shall offer the resolution later today.

(Subsequently, Mr. MORSE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 226) providing for the printing of the Chaplain's prayers, a notation of which appears earlier in today's RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR THE CHAPLAIN AND PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE SENATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I am on the subject of the Senate Chaplain, let me say that the Senate also has some unfinished business to consider in relation to the Chaplain, and also the Parliamentarian, of the Senate, in that we have a clear duty to see to it that appropriate legislation is enacted forthwith to insure that they are treated with equality and justice, in comparison with the treatment of the Chaplain of the House and the Parliamentarian of the House, both of whom also are very fine public servants.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join in the remarks made by the Senator from Oregon relative to the inspirational work done by the Chaplain of the Senate, and also the justice of increasing the compensation of both the Chaplain and the Parliamentarian of the Senate.

VETERANS' PENSION AND COMPENSATION LAWS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not an Unwelcome Burden," from the Stars and Stripes of December 15, 1955, as well as a press story entitled "Changes in Pension Roll by Classes for Third Quarter of 1955."

I desire to say, in connection with the insertion, that, in my opinion, here is something which should receive the legislative attention of the Congress, because I believe the time has come when we ought to proceed to see to it that justice and equity are shown to our veterans in connection with very much needed

veterans' legislation, as referred to in the material I have requested to have printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the editorial and news article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT AN UNWELCOME BURDEN

A week ago we devoted this column to a discussion of probable reasons which lie behind the anticipated long delay in the reporting of recommendations by the President's Commission that is studying the entire scope of veterans' pension and compensation laws, and we pointed out that regardless of what might or might not be anticipated when the Bradley group shall have completed its months-long investigations, the Congress has the duty to attend to those legislative functions relating to the veteran class that the Constitution and congressional rules dictate it must perform. In that connection we quoted from General Eisenhower's letter when he issued his Executive order setting up the Commission. We would like to use that quotation again, this time for a different but closely related reason.

On last March 5, when defining the mission of the seven-man investigative body and when explaining the procedure it must follow, the Chief Executive added: "It is our duty to arrange our affairs so that future generations will inherit an economic and social structure which is fundamentally sound and in which obligations, including those owed to veterans and their survivors, are distributed equitably and not as an unwelcome burden." It is White House philosophy that while recognizing a great debt is owed to the men and women who have preserved this Nation and its institutions in war, their lot differs little, if any, from that of all other citizens; that advances in social legislation are such that they should embrace relief for the veteran class; that need must be the principal yardstick applied to payments, and that whatever is allowed in the nature of war compensation or pensions, it must contemplate the overall income of the beneficiary. Costs of any future legislation are, of course, another consideration, and a vital one, and this motive for the inquiry was reflected in the President's message to the Congress last January when he spoke of the Veteran' Administration budget and said that 21 million veterans were already in civil life and that 3 million more were to come out of the Korean war, intimating that the future expense was so horrifying we must reappraise the entire situation and line up veterans' grants with other humanitarian programs.

Thinking in terms of the national economy, nobody with a modicum of knowledge of the veteran problem would disagree in the slightest with President Eisenhower that something must be done about it, but certainly we see no reason to become panicky over the situation and under no circumstances can we accept the thought that veterans and their dependents must look into the future and worry so much about what future generations will inherit as a result of past wars. It is a commonly accepted rule of thumb that first things must come first. While nobody to our knowledge seeks to wish bankruptcy upon their sons or upon their sons' and daughters' progeny, the policy of this country in caring for its patriots who have donned the uniform in times of war, and for the dependents of their dead, is to attend to their needs as occasion arises. It is they who made the sacrifices in war, and it is incumbent upon those future generations who benefit from them to help share the burden. It is our belief, therefore, that too much concern is shown in this matter for the coming generations and too little for those who are presently suffering for want of proper attention.

Nearly a year ago when General Eisenhower and his White House and other advisers submitted to the Congress the thinly veiled proposal that pretty soon almost everybody would be a veteran and that, with the shooting over, the thing to do was to reward valor with indecency and place the Nation's saviors in the same relief pot with all other unfortunate poor, we paid our respects to the misinformation that was released to the public. It bears repeating because the inference that all, or most, of those 21 million or more veterans are entitled to costly benefits and will seek them is a lot of hogwash and there is not one iota of truth in the assertion that they will be an uneasy burden upon either this or upon future generations. Even those 3,125,000 surviving World War I veterans whom the Chief Executive said were nearing age 65 and are in line for pensions are no great burden and whoever told that one to the general was stretching the truth beyond recognition. To foist that sort of a hoax upon the public is only an effort to fool the people and cause the prolific writers among them to carry on an unrelenting attack against the fundamental rights of those who have given most to save this Republic.

As of now there are presumed to be approximately 1,450,000 veterans of World War I who have passed age 60 and a few over a half million whose ages range between 65 and 69. There is to be presented to the next session of the Congress a bill asking that those aged 65 or over be considered unemployable for pension purposes. Included would be some 9,000 or 10,000 World War II veterans who have also reached that age, but most of them saw service in both wars and need not be considered seriously. Lest that with its cost seem to be a frightening aspect, we hasten to add that the peak of World War I veteran claimants will have been passed within 5 years and that of World War II veterans will not be reached before the year 1990. So let's go a little further with these statistics because they are even less frightening to the fearful once they are fully analyzed.

Death takes no holiday. More than 90,000 veterans of 1917–18 meet their Maker annually and the rate increases as each year passes; we can scratch off a half million potential beneficiaries by 1960. Nearly 750,000 are already on the compensation and pension rolls, and there is a large number on retired status. Hundreds of thousands more require no assistance and will never apply for it; experience has so indicated throughout the ages. What applies to the one veterans' group applies equally to others. So long as income limitations apply to the payment of pensions—and it looks as if they will for many years to come—and so long as employability and other existing restrictions continue in force, the Veterans' Administration can be depended upon to be as tight as it presently is in allowing claims, and with all such factors in operation, we cannot anticipate national bankruptcy within the foreseeable future, nor can we understand why such fear is expressed by the administration. Instead, if any serious effort is made to put into effect the shortsighted philosophy which seems to obtain in White House circles, we can see an unfortunate lessening of the patriotic fervor that has given to this country the stature it now possesses, and that would really reflect something to be feared.

That economic and social structure breakdown which the President anticipates may be visited upon coming generations does not come through the veteran class. The cost of their benefits, and they have applied principally to the veterans of World War II and Korea, has declined by half in the last 8 years. Through one system of aid or another far greater handouts have gone to farm and business elements, and something like $40 billion in nonmilitary help have been passed out to 50-odd nations during the past 10 years alone in a vain attempt to buy friends abroad, some of them being those former enemies who caused directly the distress suffered by this country's veterans. Because we are up to our ears in foreign aid, it will continue for years to come. Those who protest most loudly assistance to the veterans of America and to their dependents, and those who project wildly into the future unsound reflections of the costs of veterans' legislation, call the most forcifully upon the Nation to step up appropriations to every Tom, Dick, and Harry elsewhere in the world. There is little virtue in that sort of inconsistency.

Regardless of absurd assertions that soon everybody will be a veteran, when the facts show that from less than 1 percent up to fewer than 10 percent of our citizens ever saw war service, the percentages ranging up to the top figure only as a result of the awful holocaust of World War II, it is undeniable truth that a very small minority of our people have ever fought in war. We believe in aiding allies who have the courage to defend themselves. We do not quarrel with other means of assisting the weak and afflicted of our own land. We do protest when those who have protected the country in its uniform and who have made possible its prosperity are pointed to as the ones who are throwing it out of economic balance, because that is simply not true, and we cannot state too strongly that proper care for those who have borne the battle and for their widows and orphans will never be an unwelcome burden upon future generations.

CHANGES IN PENSION ROLL BY CLASSES FOR THIRD QUARTER OF 1955

As heretofore announced, the changes in the pension roll, which have been available monthly for many years, will be collated hereafter by the Veterans' Administration quarterly. Therefore, the information will be published in the Tribune each 3 months as soon after the end of each calendar quarter as the VA furnishes it.—EDITOR.

CIVIL WAR	
Veterans: On rolls Sept. 30, 1955	1
Widows, etc.:	
On rolls June 30, 1955	6,020
Added during quarter	0
Losses during quarter	98
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955	5,922
WAR WITH SPAIN	
Veterans:	
On rolls June 30, 1955	60,125
Added during quarter	38
Losses during quarter	2,445
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955	57,718
Widows, etc.:	
On rolls June 30, 1955	81,883
Added during quarter	820
Losses during quarter	729
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955	81,974
WAR WITH MEXICO	
Widows, etc.:	
On rolls June 30, 1955	9
Losses during quarter	0
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955	9
INDIAN WARS	
Veterans:	
On rolls June 30, 1955	188
Added during quarter	0
Losses during quarter	12
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955	176
Widows, etc.:	
On rolls June 30, 1955	1,234
Added during quarter	4
Losses during quarter	17
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955	1,221

WORLD WAR I

Veterans:	
On rolls June 30, 1955:	
Compensation	239,416
Pension	474,760
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955:	
Compensation	236,355
Pension	492,201
Widows, etc.:	
On rolls June 30, 1955:	
Compensation	60,151
Pension	386,377
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955:	
Compensation	59,463
Pension	387,157

WORLD WAR II

Veterans:	
On rolls June 30, 1955:	
Compensation	1,619,498
Pension	54,436
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955:	
Compensation	1,616,457
Pension	56,254
Widows, etc.:	
On rolls June 30, 1955:	
Compensation	457,267
Pension	63,468
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955:	
Compensation	455,574
Pension	68,575

KOREAN WAR

Veterans:	
On rolls June 30, 1955:	
Compensation	153,831
Pension	1,526
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955:	
Compensation	162,692
Pension	1,681
Widows, etc.:	
On rolls June 30, 1955:	
Compensation	64,359
Pension	832
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955:	
Compensation	65,016
Pension	913

REGULAR ESTABLISHMENT

On rolls June 30, 1955:	
Veterans	62,881
Dependents	27,454
On rolls Sept. 30, 1955:	
Veterans	62,929
Dependents	27,931

TO APPEAL FOR ORPHANS' BILL ON EDUCATIONAL AID

EDITOR, NATIONAL TRIBUNE:

The War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1955, H. R. 588, introduced by Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, will be coming up for consideration when the Congress reconvenes in January. This legislation will mean higher education for the boys and girls whose dads made the supreme sacrifice in World War II and Korea and will afford them the same opportunity for education after high school that they might have had if their dads had come home.

We would appreciate it very much if you would say something in behalf of this bill in one of the future issues of the National Tribune, for it is most important that your readers in the various veterans' organizations back us on this legislation.

Thank you again for all your wonderful cooperation in the past.

LARUE L. YESSEN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

NASEBY RHINEHART AND MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Sunday, March 4, 1956, issue of the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., there appeared an editorial entitled "Negro on Democracy at Work." The editorial is worthy of the attention of every Member of the Senate because of its commendatory references to 3 men who have made their mark in 3 different areas of our Nation. The first is Hulan E. Jack, who is now president of the Borough of Manhattan. Second is James Dorsey, who holds a degree of bachelor of arts and also bachelor of law from Montana State University; and the third is Naseby Rhinehart, who holds a bachelor of arts degree from Montana State University.

Jim Dorsey is a highly respected citizen of the State of Wisconsin, and has achieved great success in the city of Milwaukee. Down through the years he has retained an active interest in Montana State University, where he is still remembered not only as a good student, but an outstanding athlete, and a fine American. Jim Dorsey, after returning to Milwaukee from Montana, became interested in Naseby Rhinehart, a high-school athlete of great promise. Jim was instrumental in helping Naseby enroll as a freshman in Montana State University in 1931, while I was a student there. Naseby Rhinehart was outstanding in basketball, track, and football. He was a good student, and had the respect and admiration of all of us who had the privilege of getting to know him. We were delighted that Naseby remained at the university after receiving his degree. He has, as the Missoulian puts it, "become a local tradition in good citizenship, as well as in athletics."

My only regret is that I was unable to be in Missoula last Saturday to show my deep appreciation of and my friendship for Naseby, because he has contributed greatly to our university and to the cause of mutual understanding. I am happy, indeed, to rise in the Senate today to pay my respects to Naseby Rhinehart, his devoted wife, and his fine family. Let me say, in conclusion, Mr. President, that I am delighted that Montana State University saw fit to honor one of its outstanding graduates in the person of Naseby Rhinehart, and I am happy to note that people came from all over Montana to join the crowd of approximately 7,000 who participated in the honor conferred on my fellow alumnus.

Incidentally, Montana State University closed its basketball season that night with a 63–62 win over Colorado A. and M. It was a fitting climax to a memorable occasion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the editorial referred to, which appeared in the Daily Missoulian, Missoula, Mont.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO ON DEMOCRACY AT WORK

A fine testimonial on what he called an example of American democracy at work was voiced last Sunday in New Orleans by Hulan E. Jack, a Negro.

He is a native of the West Indies who arrived in New York as an immigrant at the age of 16. Now he is president of the Borough of Manhattan, the first member of his race to be elected to that position.

Jack, with understandable pride, told a nonsegregated church-sponsored gathering he estimated that 83 percent of the voters who elected him, in November 1953, were not members of his race.

That vote, he declaimed, was a practical demonstration of democracy in action which the Communists can never challenge.

Better understanding and greater mutual respect between the races have been gaining ground rapidly in this country in recent years. So much so, in fact, that a flareup like the Autherine Lucy episode at the University of Alabama becomes a widely publicized incident because of its unusualness.

A respected Negro leader said the other day that members of his race are more cordially received today at most southern colleges than they were on northern campuses only a quarter of a century ago.

How well one Negro was treated on the Montana State University campus just after World War I had a happy aftermath last night when the Grizzlies closed their basketball season with a Naseby Rhinehart Night at the fieldhouse.

In the years immediately after the First World War the only Negro on the MSU campus was gentlemanly James W. Dorsey, like Rhinehart of later days, an athlete.

Jim was always deferential. He was treated as an equal by his fellows, but invariably he left it to them to make the advances.

With a major in psychology, Jim received a bachelor of arts degree in 1922. But his thoughts soon turned to law. He returned to the campus, and received the degree of bachelor of laws in 1927. Shortly thereafter he went to Milwaukee, where he has since practiced his profession. In his early days there he became interested in Rhinehart, a high school athlete of promise. MSU had been good to Dorsey, he reflected, so he saw to it that Rhinehart came here as a freshman in the fall of 1931.

After 4 years as a student, Rhinehart was so established in the school's athletic system that he stayed on as a trainer. He and his family have become a local tradition, in good citizenship as well as athletics.

Jim Dorsey, proud as ever of his part in the Rhinehart story, came out from Milwaukee for Naseby Rhinehart Night.

A lot of other predominantly white schools, in every part of the United States, have had and do have respected Negro students like Dorsey and Rhinehart.

Their experiences, no less than those of Manhattan Borough President Jack, are a part of the gratifying and ever expanding example of American racial democracy in action.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, today, March 7, marks the 106th anniversary of the birth of the great Czech leader, Thomas G. Masaryk.

It is, indeed, fitting for all dedicated to the principles by which freemen live to pay our loftiest respects to the memory of this outstanding patriot. This esteemed humanitarian is forever enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen and in the hearts of all people who value freedom above servitude.

Thomas G. Masaryk was truly a world leader. His democratic faith and ideals continue to give courage and inspiration to all who are engaged in the struggle to overcome Soviet aggression. On this anniversary of Masaryk's birth, I pray

that the day of liberation for his beloved land of Czechoslovakia is close at hand.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, today marks the 106th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk.

Dr. Masaryk was, in my opinion, one of the great statesmen and fighters for liberty in world history.

He saw his dream of an independent, free Czechoslovakia come true in 1918. His vision and leadership inspired literally the entire area of Central Europe. Together with his successor, Dr. Eduard Benes, Dr. Masaryk established and brought into the family of nations a new and successfully democratic state, which flourished until taken over by Hitler in World War II.

Since the end of the Second World War the freedom and democracy which once were so typical of Czechoslovakia have been cruelly suppressed, if not actually wiped out, by the totalitarian forces of communism.

Now a determined effort is being made in Czechoslovakia to wipe out the cherished memories of these two great men. No matter how hard the Communist tyrants may try, they will not succeed. All Americans join the efforts of Americans of Czechoslovakian descent to prevent the scurrilous campaign from succeeding.

I join them in praying that in the near future freedom and democracy will again flourish in Czechoslovakia.

TRUMAN FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Democrat Party is having a difficult time coming up with any issues in this campaign year; one after the other, squirrels, Mamie's health, Ike's religion, and Ike's health have fallen by the wayside. It is difficult for the Democrats to realize that the people of America are satisfied with honest and good government, with peace and prosperity, although this should be perfectly obvious to them from the fact that the people have constantly rejected the phony Democrat issues.

The Democrats are also having difficulty in determining who their candidate for President will be. It should be clear to them that their only candidate is Harry Truman. I know they would rather have him stay home and build his library and quit embarrassing the party, but he is bound and determined to continue his barnstorming; and, as a Republican, I am all for it.

Harry Truman is the logical candidate. The Democrats ran for 20 years telling lies about Herbert Hoover. All we Republicans have to do is tell the truth about Harry Truman. If we do that, I have a feeling the issue will still be unexhausted a hundred years from now. He is the architect of the modern New Deal, and it is not right to hide his New Deal philosophy under a Stevenson wisecrack or a Harriman homburg. I have made this suggestion repeatedly across the country, and I am happy to see that one of our outstanding Southwestern editors agrees. I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Brewery Gulch Gazette, of Bisbee, Ariz., be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Those of us who are in the advertising business and in the handling of publicity realize how effective it is; we know that it accomplishes results for politicians and others who are in the public eye and for those who are trying to push their way in, and how well the smart publicity grabbers know it. Take the case of ex-President Harry Truman, the man from Independence, the head and shoulders of the New Deal-Fair Deal Party, the successor of the Great Humanitarian, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. When Harry took over, following the death of his illustrious predecessor, he said that he humbly hoped that he could be the President of all the people, not of any 1 party or any 1 group, and that with the help of God he would do his best for the country. He said that he felt inadequate for the job with which he was faced but that it would be done to the best of his ability. But that feeling didn't last long, and before very much water had flowed under the bridge he became Harry the ward heeler, the follower of Tom Pendergast, the boss of Kansas City and Jackson County, Mo., and he lost no time in trying to out-New Deal the inventor of that political philosophy. He refused after 8 years to run for another term against Eisenhower, telling the boys, "I'm too old and I've been in politics for over 30 years and that's long enough."

Then he sold his life story for more than half a million; he gave his ghost writer the material to make it a good one. The scribe did such a good job of polishing it up for public consumption that Harry was delighted; more than that, after reading the story, he began to believe that he really was and is the great guy that the story indicates. The writer gave credit to Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt for being great statesmen, to Eisenhower for being a great military leader, to MacArthur for having a lot on the ball, and to Stalin and Hitler for being big figures in their own countries * * * they were all pretty good. But, after all, says Harry's able story, who is that man at the head of the greatest nation on earth in 8 years of strife and tribulation all over the world who outshone them all? No one can read Harry's life story without realizing who that great man is.

But now comes another crisis in the affairs of men. This is election year. The Democrat candidates are mere pigmies in comparison with you know who. Who else can lambast the Republicans, can "give-em hell" like Harry can? Who else can save the country from another 4 years of Republican administration? Is it going to be necessary for a modest man like Harry to come right out and say that he is available? Cannot the Democrats see the handwriting on the wall, cannot they realize that there is only one who can be elected? Cannot they see that there is only one man who can save the party and the country from the results of all the mistakes (if there are any and whatever they are) that the Republicans have made?

The money that Harry received for his life story was all right as far as it goes, but the additional publicity that its publication brought him should have, by all manner of means, put him on top of the Democrat-New Deal-Fair Deal heap. If it doesn't result in his nomination after all that build-up it will be a terrible disappointment to the great man from Independence who is willing to sacrifice himself on the altar of duty for his party and for his country.

REORGANIZATION OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to express my personal observations relative to the report recently issued by the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member, relative to the reorganization of the Passport Office. A number of Members have already expressed themselves on this subject, and I urge every Member of the Senate to take time to read the report, which to me points out very vividly that any agency of Government, can through usage of existing Government knowledge, reorganize itself into an efficient bureau for servicing the taxpayer, without incurring the cost of management surveys by private organizations.

The report of our committee presents a clear picture as to how the Passport Office under the able administration of Miss Frances Knight, in cooperation with the General Services Administration, the General Accounting Office, and the Civil Service Commission, made a complete study of the operations of the Passport Office and, through their joint studies, revamped the operations of the Office, to promote greater efficiency and to bring more expeditious service to Americans making application for passports.

The Passport Office has been located in a new building and in a new office; and I urge all Members of the Senate, whenever they have an opportunity to do so, to visit these new quarters.

I should like to conclude by pointing out that we are confronting one of the largest tourist groups going from our country abroad, in the history of the United States. The Passport Office presently requires about $10,000 for new equipment, in order to process these passport applications as promptly as possible. I trust that the State Department will find a way to make this money available. I am sure the Appropriations Committee, of which I am also a member, will be happy to reimburse the State Department for any advances of funds it can make, so that the Passport Office may be able to meet the great demands now being made upon it by thousands of Americans who desire to visit abroad during the current touring season.

MR. TRUMAN'S MEMOIRS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am particularly pleased to make the next insertion in the RECORD on the same day when the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] indulged in very sharp criticism of a former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman.

During his tenure as President of the United States, Harry Truman was often vilified and slandered. Yet, since he left the White House, more and more people have come to appreciate his qualities of courage, decisiveness, and liberalism.

It is a pleasure to note the way in which outstanding reviewers are welcoming Mr. Truman's memoirs. The latest volume, which is No. II, has been

praised highly. For example, Allan Nevins, Pulitzer-prize historian, has said of Harry Truman in the New York Times Book Review of March 4:

Because of his firm grasp of principle, he made these 6 years as lustrous as they were stormy, raised not only America but the free West to a new level of strength, and placed civilization forever in his debt.

. . . Placed civilization forever in his debt. That is the judgment of a great historian on Harry S. Truman. It contrasts sharply, Mr. President, with many of the biased, slanted, and partisan denunciations of Mr. Truman, some on this Senate floor. I prefer to believe that Mr. Nevins' calm appraisal will endure through the annals of time, while the calumny and infamy hurled against Harry Truman will be remembered only for its lack of wisdom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the book review by Allan Nevins of ex-Senator Harry Truman's new book Years of Trial and Hope, as printed in the New York Times of March 4, 1956, under the title "Cold War, Hot War, and H. S. T.," be included at this point in the body of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Harry S. Truman's second volume is even more important than the first. Covering 6 years instead of 1, and a wide variety of topics from the hydrogen bomb to Adlai Stevenson's 1952 campaign, it is less tightly organized and hence less absorbing; but again it is the record of a series of crises courageously faced, and its scope adds to its impressiveness. Most of the crises have one center—the cold war. The first volume (Year of Decisions) was the story of Mr. Truman's realization that when Russia and the West (as Churchill puts it) lost in their common foe their sole bond, the Soviet Union became our implacable enemy. This larger volume (which with the first makes up the Book-of-the-Month choice for March) tells how he dealt with the enmity. That is, it relates how he, with manful helpers, created a bipartisan foreign policy, put the Marshall plan into effect, built up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, foiled the Berlin blockade, and finally met the Korean invasion with instant action—knowing that "if this were allowed to go unchallenged it would mean a third world war."

Once more decision-making is the keynote of Harry Truman's memoirs. He may well go down in history as the man of decision. In assuming one terrible responsibility after another he never struck an uncertain note; and "once a decision was made, I did not worry about it afterwards." He differed from his predecessor, who sometimes made judgments casually, in giving intensive study to his problems. As he said in his first volume, he brought to them everything he had. He also differed from Roosevelt in his use of expert advisers. The buoyant F. D. R. leaned heavily on court favorites like Harry L. Hopkins; Truman relied on the counsel of hard-headed experts—but, never overawed, he always kept the final word for himself.

Next to his power of decision, the trait that impresses most is his simple-minded honesty; a type of honesty that makes him unique among our Presidents. It is so uncomplicated, so two-dimensional, so lacking in overtones. Some of his other qualities remind us of greater or lesser statesmen. His rapid, combative, hard-hitting approach to isues is reminiscent of the more versatile T. R. His conscientious examination of public questions and grinding hard work recall Grover Cleveland. Even his capacity for decision had a counterpart in Polk's and Jackson's. But his ingenuous sincerity is all his own. Perhaps it was because he did not see the subtle intricacy of great issues as Woodrow Wilson saw it, because he lacked the sense of political complexity so marked in F. D. R., that he marched straight ahead. He had no evasions, no maneuvers, and almost no reticences. He said what he thought, and acted as he spoke. This single-minded honesty, whatever his limitations, gives his career a real loftiness of tone.

By the end of his hectic first year, Mr. Truman had no illusion that still greater storms did not lie ahead. Germany and Japan were defeated, the United Nations had been established, the American economy had been converted to peace. But the Red Star, rising fast, threw its baleful rays over all Europe and Asia. Stalin had used Yalta and Potsdam to draw a line from the Baltic to the Adriatic, to seize nearly everything east of that furrow and to menace everything west of it. He threatened Greece, Turkey, and Iran. China was divided between Communists and Nationalists, each so intransigent that even without the abundant allied bungling, the quarrels between our China Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley and State Department agents, and the Russian gift of Manchuria to Communist forces, all efforts to unify the country would probably have failed. Western Europe was near collapse. The atomic bomb offered a pressing world problem. At home Truman's Fair Deal program brought all reactionary elements into the battleline, and the election of the Republican-controlled 80th Congress presaged a deadlock in Government.

Altogether, Truman had reason to recall Wilson's remark that the Presidency is an office where a man must put on his war paint. Sometimes he needed all his belligerent resiliency. He notes, for example, that at one and the same time he had to cope with the problem of aid to Greece and Turkey; a difference with British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin over Palestine policy; cuts by the economy bloc of the 80th Congress that threatened vital services; Gen. George C. Marshall's attendance at his first Foreign Ministers' Conference; events in Indonesia, Argentina, and China; Senator Kenneth McKellar's obstruction of the atomic energy program by his opposition to the appointment of David E. Lilienthal to head the program; the bill for the unification of the armed services; and his own plans for the 1948 campaign. But he was never overwhelmed, and always kept his eyes on the one paramount matter: American leadership of the free nations of Europe and Asia.

In foreign affairs he was far more successful than in his domestic program. For one reason, American sentiment became almost a unit in antagonism to Russia; it rose to the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan, point 4, and the Berlin airlift not only with resolution but with enthusiasm. Like Truman, the people saw that Stalin had betrayed them and civilization, and were deeply angered. For another reason, Truman had abler coadjutors in foreign affairs and put more energy, planning, and imagination into them. Probably the suppression of partisanship beyond the ocean edge heightened it at home. At any rate Mr. Truman laments repeated defeats in his battle "to improve the lot of the general public in working conditions, health risks, and long-range social security." That the 80th Congress was not much worse than the Southern Democrat-Republican coalition in the 79th he does not mention. Nor does he note how great a political windfall the 80th Congress finally became to the Truman Democrats.

Because his domestic policies had so checkered a history, Mr. Truman's chief omissions occur in this field. He steers warily around any account of the battle between Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson and the rebellious admirals, or the events leading to Johnson's resignation. In his courageous discussion of civil liberties he does not discuss his "red herring" remarks on the Hiss case. He is silent about an unhappy choice he made for the Attorney Generalship and the ensuing difficulties. The unfortunate Pauley report on Japanese reparations—which called for the virtual elimination of Japan's heavy industry—he passes over. Mr. Truman was the greatest "veto President" since Cleveland, and his vetoes were much to his credit. But we are left wondering why a man of his long senatorial experience was unable to do more to influence legislation in its gestative stages.

These omissions, however, do not matter much; the great story is that of emergent American leadership in the world debate, and Mr. Truman tells it with novel facts and touches of quiet drama. Often he gives the tale real gusto. With good reason, he is proud of his part in bringing Israel into existence, and gives that chapter three times the space allotted the Berlin blockade. At moments he lost patience with the Zionist extremists, as with the Arabs, the State Department, and the British Foreign Office. But he never relinquished his demand for "a solution that would give the Jews a homeland in which they might safely build their future." With equal reason, he is proud of his part in the crucial decision of February 1946 to rescue Greece and Turkey from the Russian maw. He was vindicating our basic "ideals and traditions."

Most of all he is proud of the Korean story, to which he gives almost one-third of this book. Word of the North Korean attack came June 24, 1950. That was a Saturday; Truman was in Independence. By Monday night Secretary of State Acheson's suggestion of a special meeting of the U. N. Security Council had been carried out; Truman, back in Washington, had determined to throw American forces into the struggle and sent instructions to Gen. Douglas MacArthur; he was ready to present his decision to congressional leaders Tuesday morning. All his advisers had shared his own conviction. This was that "whatever had to be done to meet this aggression had to be done." Within a few days every nation was informed that America considered resistance vital as a symbol of the strength and determination of the West. Acheson pointed out that the unanimity first evinced in Washington could hardly last, and he was right. But it lasted long enough.

When later a group of bitter enemies called this conflict "Mr. Truman's War," he could accept the name as a badge of honor. The time came when the war had to be kept within limits. Had MacArthur had his way, American strength might have been so embogged in a desperate Asiatic struggle that we would have been powerless to help Europe. (Obviously, General MacArthur thinks differently, and has said so more than once.) A deep resentment runs through Mr. Truman's story of how the general tried to force his hand, and how, by relieving the general of his commands on April 11, 1951, he replied with a smashing vindication of the supremacy of the civil power over the military arm. "Who does Truman think he is—the President?" was the caption a sympathetic cartoonist used. That was precisely what Mr. Truman thought.

Strong conviction, indeed, runs through the whole book. Mr. Truman's reading of history has helped give him a set of principles, elementary but clear, which he applies without flinching. When he likes people he likes them very much, when he dislikes them he detests them. But most of all he stands for principle. Whatever one's feelings are on particular issues, no matter

how much one may disagree with some of his decisions and methods, it would be difficult to deny Mr. Truman principles. Because of his firm grasp of principle, he made these 6 years as lustrous as they were stormy, raised not only America but the free West to a new level of strength, and placed civilization forever in his debt.

THE DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN FOR WHEAT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, because the Senate is about to vote on the agricultural bill and the many amendments proposed thereto, I should like permission to include in the body of the RECORD a most illuminating letter which I have received from Mr. Kenneth Fridley, president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League.

This letter details some of the positions of the Oregon Wheat Growers League on major issues before the Congress—particularly the domestic parity plan for wheat which I support and which will be before the Senate in the next 24 or 48 hours in the form of an amendment proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and other Senators.

I should also like to state my emphatic support of the stand which the Oregon Wheat Growers League has taken in opposing the backward Hoover Commission recommendation that so-called user charges be imposed on the access to inland waterways in the United States.

The letter from Mr. Kenneth Fridley is dated March 1, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Oreg., March 1, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The Oregon Wheat Growers League recently completed their 28th annual meeting. Among the resolutions which were passed by this convention we should like to call your attention and request your support for the following:

"TOLLS OR USERS CHARGES

"Whereas the (Hoover) Commission, an organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, recommended that user charges or tolls be assessed on an inland waterways; and

"Whereas free use of our inland waterways dates back to one of the first acts of the first Congress of the United States on June 13, 1787; and

"Whereas, every President of the United States from George Washington down to President Eisenhower has advocated and supported the National Policy of free waterways: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Oregon Wheat Growers League does vigorously oppose the enactment of any legislation that would impose tolls or user charges for the transport of persons or property on our domestic waterways.

"CABINET COMMITTEE REPORT

"Whereas in April 1955, the Report and Recommendations of the Cabinet Committee on Transport Policy and Organization was issued; and

"Whereas Senate bill 1920 to implement the recommendations was introduced in May 1955; and

"Whereas said legislation among other matters would change the existing national transportation policy to 'encourage and preserve the inherent advantages of each form of transportation to the proposed policy to encourage and promote full competition between modes of transportation at charges not less than reasonable minimum charges'; and

"Whereas said legislation would repeal the bulk commodity exemption clause, eliminate the protective features of the 'long and short haul clause,' and amend the agriculture exemption provisions, along with other objectionable provisions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Oregon Wheat Growers League register its opposition to the enactment of any such legislation.

"MODERNIZED PARITY

"We realize a shift to modernized parity adversely affects the price a farmer receives for his wheat as much as any other factor. Therefore, we request the Oregon Wheat Growers League take immediate steps to secure postponement of the modernized parity formula as it applies to wheat, until such time as a study can be made of the mechanics of determining an equitable parity formula for wheat. It is further requested that the league expend necessary funds to encourage such a study.

"DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN

"Recognizing the need for a realistic pricing and marketing program for wheat, the Oregon Wheat Growers League will continue to support the domestic parity plan as a simple amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948.

"Because the possibility of securing the domestic parity plan appears better than ever before, we recommend that maximum emphasis be placed upon the enactment of this plan during the coming year."

We realize that Congress is extremely concerned with the decline in farm income during a time in which farm expenses are continuing to rise. We appreciate the complexity of the farm problem and the conflicting requests that come to all Congressmen from various commodity groups. However, we feel that the Oregon Wheat Growers League, through its long history, has approached all problems in a deliberate and nonpartisan manner thinking only of the best interests of the wheat growers in the State of Oregon.

We would appreciate your consideration of these recommendations.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH FRIDLEY,
President.

SMALL-BUSINESS BANKRUPTCIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday's financial papers carry the very distressing news that business failures for the week ending March 1 reached a new postwar high. As chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I have been particularly concerned about the high business mortality rate during a period when the Nation is nominally experiencing "prosperity." Something is wrong, Mr. President, when the two most numerous segments of our economy, the farmers and small-business men, are depressed at the very time that the stock markets are booming and the giant industrial corporations are reporting record high and ever-growing profits.

The sixth annual report of our committee was submitted to the Senate on January 12, and in the introduction to that report, the committee told the Senate it was vitally concerned over the sad fact that "more of the bloom of 1955's industrial bonanza did not rub off on small business," and asked "why, in a period characterized by three-shift industrial activity, tremendous sales volume, and record-making profits, do we find such a high rate of small-business bankruptcies?"

The New York Journal of Commerce of March 6 reports that the Dun & Bradstreet compilations on business failures show that 293 business firms went under during the week ending on March 1. This figure was up from 222 in the same week of 1955 and 223 in the same week of 1954. Even more ominously, the 1956 business death rate is the highest it has been for any week since March 1941, and as a matter of fact is 15 percent higher than the 1939 failure rate.

While there is no breakdown furnished by Dun & Bradstreet to segregate between large and small business, we are safe in assuming that all but a handful of these bankrupt firms are small, since the failure of any large firm would have been accompanied by extensive press coverage.

We in the Senate must pay attention to this warning signal. We must take steps during this session of Congress to buttress the economic position of the more than four million small firms; we must assure ourselves that Federal laws are completely fair as between small firms and their larger competitors. We must study the tax laws to lessen the impact of high Federal taxes on small business. We must guarantee that antitrust and antimonopoly laws are adequate and that they are administered vigorously and effectively.

At this point, I also wish to point out another development to my colleagues in the Senate. The present Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust activities has been nominated to a Federal judgeship. I here publicly call upon the President and the Attorney General to find a vigorous, courageous, far-sighted replacement, since small business cannot compete against giant corporations without prompt and effective enforcement of the antitrust laws. Congress should appropriate sufficient funds for these activities, but even more important is the manner in which the agency is led by its Assistant Attorney General.

It is readily apparent that the much-vaunted prosperity the Nation is enjoying is not being spread around very evenly. It is up to us in the Senate to take wise and hard-hitting action to bring our free enterprise economy back into focus so that it can distribute its dividends to all the people, all the businesses, and all the farmers of the United States, and not just to a favored few.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive

business, for action on nominations beginning with new reports.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Col. John L. Person, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Herbert V. Prochnow to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert C. Hill to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations just confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEOPOLD DIAZ SILBERSTEIN

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, several weeks ago I announced that I was asking the Senate Judiciary Committee to have either the Internal Security or Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee, of both of which I am a member, to look into the matter of how a man, Leopold Diaz Silberstein, entered this country.

It resulted from a simple request by me to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to give me the number of Mr. Silberstein's original Portuguese passport. The Service refused my request, and so I requested an investigation.

I hold in my hand, Mr. President, hundreds of telegrams and letters from all over the United States, including South Carolina, which all support the investigation into the case of Mr. Silberstein. These telegrams and letters are from persons in 34 States, including South Carolina.

I make this statement to bring the Senate up to date regarding the matter concerning Silberstein.

The volume of the correspondence concerning Silberstein and the support it gives to the investigation indicates clearly the interest of the public in this matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question at all with regard to the high motives of the Senator from South Carolina in looking into the so-called Silberstein matter after he received the communications to which he has referred. I think it was a clear duty which he owed to his constituents and others to look into the case.

The question which I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina is whether he knows if it is true that most of the telegrams he has received are from stockholders in the Fairbanks, Morse Co.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It would be difficult for me to answer that question now, because the communications are from some 34 States, but I assume that probably a great number of them are from stockholders of that corporation. I am receiving communications from presidents of banks and various other sources. The president of a bank in my own State said he wanted the matter looked into for the purpose of the protection of his clients.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is aware that there is a proxy fight going on within the Fairbanks, Morse Corp.; is he not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know that.

Mr. MORSE. I think he is entitled to have this statement from me, because I should have in the RECORD what we have said in the cloakroom, that he and I are not in controversy, but as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and as one very much interested in possible needed legislation in the matter of the proxy situation in American corporations, let me say that I have received a great many communications in regard to what was considered to be an unwarranted attack upon Mr. Silberstein. My interest is to increase the democracy of American corporations. We hear so much these days about the so-called lack of democratic procedures within American trade unions, when the evidence is that the overwhelming majority—in fact, the exception is a matter of comment—of American trade unions are so much more democratic in their processes and procedures that we of the Banking and Currency Committee ought to take steps to see to it that the democratic processes of American corporations are increased for the protection of minority stockholders.

On the basis of what I consider to be a prima facie case that has been presented on the Silberstein matter, it is a part of the old fight between majority and minority stockholders and managements.

I certainly welcome the investigation which the Senator has proposed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Unions, employees, and other organizations and citizens have also telegraphed me concerning this matter. Also, a question has arisen as to how this man Silberstein was made a Portuguese citizen. There is a great deal of interest in it. I am on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, which might deal with the question, and I am also a member of the Subcommittee on Internal Security, and we wish to be sure about persons who are dealing with our Government at the present time. The corporation to which the Senator from Oregon has referred is manufacturing top secret products for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make it clear to the Senator that I do not at all question his good purposes. I wish to say, however, that on the basis of any evidence of which I know, what we are dealing with here is a Jewish refugee who fled the cruel Nazi regime, and his entrance into the United States I understand was perfectly legal. There are those within corporate bodies, among whom I do not include the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who do not like to see anyone representing a minority group come in and who apparently do not want a Jewish refugee on their board.

As the Senator from South Carolina knows, I take the position that in this country every man stands on his own feet. When the evidence was submitted to me, I made the insertions in the RECORD; and I shall make further insertions in the RECORD on the basis of whatever I believe the facts to be, because if there is the slightest indication that in part the drive against Mr. Silberstein by those within the corporation is an anti-Semitic drive, I shall do my best to make certain that the RECORD is replete with an answer.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I assure the Senator this is not a minority group matter, but one dealing with the facts as I have outlined them.

FEDERAL ELECTION PROCEDURES

Mr. AIKEN. The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] had prepared a short statement which he had planned to make on the floor of the Senate this

afternoon. He was unexpectedly called away. He requested that I get permission to have his remarks printed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY

I was pleased to add my name to the list of cosponsors of the elections bill introduced by the distinguished majority leader.

The proposed legislation appears to be a major step in the right direction in clarifying, redefining, and amending our outdated Federal election procedures and our corrupt practices statute. At the same time, it encourages a broader base of political contributions by permitting individuals income-tax reductions up to $100.

Because I believe that this bill would inject a new note of realism into general election campaigns, I think it appropriate to point out at this beginning point that our State legislatures have a duty to modernize their own election laws in keeping with this new Federal proposal.

If we are to follow through completely in the same spirit of realism which this legislation suggests, amendments to the Johnson bill may well be in order.

A highly desirable feature of this bill is its provision to make the candidate, in effect, responsible for the campaign expenditures of all committees or groups set up to promote his candidacy.

In order to render this provision truly effective, in order to have the whole pattern of legally increasing the present limits make sense, I urge action at the State level as well. Unless changes are made there, this splendid provision could make honest and realistic campaign efforts actually more difficult to realize than before. That is why I would like to see our own State legislature in New Jersey take action consonant with the Johnson bill. I am not intimately acquainted with the election laws of other States, but I believe that the same kind of problem exists in at least some of them.

Under New Jersey law, the ceiling for a general election campaign for United States Senator is $50,000. In this day and age of television, says the Johnson bill, such a figure is unrealistic. This fact is made abundantly clear in the bill which proposes a Federal minimum of $75,000 and a maximum of many thousands more based on a formula of 20 cents per vote cast in any State election held in the preceding 4 years. Thus, the new total would apply in aggregate to the senatorial candidate and all his committees.

If the multiple committee practice is, in effect, abolished, the practical effect in New Jersey, for one example, will be to limit the grand total expended for a United States Senate campaign to just exactly $50,000, regardless of the higher limits set by the Johnson bill. Thus, without State legislative action to raise the State-imposed limit as well as the Federal, the effect of this bill will be exactly the opposite of the one sought by its sponsors. Instead of sense and logic, we will have an even more unrealistic attitude than prevails at present.

The appropriate committee will, I know, take a close look at any possible imperfections in this bill. It may well prove desirable to amend the proposals so as to insure State legislatures an adequate opportunity to revise their own laws for national elections and those Federal offices covered by this bill.

Some State legislatures are not in session this year; others do not meet in 1957. It may prove necessary to make certain provisions of the Johnson bill inoperable until after the first session of the next meeting of each State legislature.

Basically this bill is sound as far as it goes. Obviously, it does not preclude new ideas, nor is it foolproof in its present form. Early hearings are in order so that we may get a truly good bill through before the presidential elections.

Among important matters which should be further explored is the absence of regulation of primary expenditures under the Johnson bill. Surely, the possibility of including primaries in the context of this bill should be fully considered. It is too vital an aspect of the whole picture to be wholly ignored.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that a request has been made for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1646, House bill 9064, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States. I am informed that the Committee on Appropriations voted unanimously to report the bill, and that there is no opposition of any kind to it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the bill carries a total appropriation of $3,639,579,000. The House reduced the amount called for by the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget by $30 million. The Senate Committee on Appropriations restored $20 million for two items, one of which is $10 million for operations of the Post Office Department, and another $10 million was added for transportation. The bill contains only two amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall not object if the consideration of the bill takes less than 15 minutes, which I understand it will; but if it takes more than 15 minutes, I shall ask that the Senate return to the regular order.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure that it will not take more than 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Finance Committee with amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title II—Post Office Department—Current Authorizations Out of Postal Fund—Operations," on page 12, line 13, after the word "law", to strike out "$2,108,000,000" and insert "$2,118,880,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], is ill and cannot be present this morning. We all know that he has very properly taken the position that there should be an enforcement of the Senate rule, and that a committee report on an appropriation bill should lie on the table for 1 day, in order to enable the Members of the Senate to familiarize themselves with what is in the bill before it is taken up for action.

I explained to the Senator from Illinois that the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill is slightly different from the average appropriation bill, because there are two separate agencies involved, and they must continue to carry on their work. It does not involve a number of options so far as policy is concerned. We have to finance the operations of these Departments.

I also pointed out to the Senator from Illinois that we were rapidly approaching the hour when the unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the very vital farm bill, would become effective, and we could not then ask to break in on those proceedings.

So, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has authorized me to say to the Senate that, with the very definite understanding that this action shall not set any precedent for waiving the right to have an appropriation bill lie on the table for 1 day, as required by the rule, he has no objection to the Senate considering the bill today, in view of the desire of the majority leadership, concurred in fully, of course, by the Republican leadership, to get the bill behind us and into conference, because, after all, it is not controversial.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I wish to thank the members of the subcommittee and of the full committee for their fine cooperation in the hearings and in marking up this bill. Of all who gave that help, I would single out for especial commendation our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who attended all the hearings, and he and I saw eye to eye on what we are doing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a 1-page statement concerning the figures in this appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The total of the Treasury, Post Office, and the Tax Court appropriation bill for 1957 is $3,639,579,000, which is an increase of $20,880,000 over the amount of $3,618,699,000 allowed by the House. This is a reduction

from the estimates of $10,293,000 and $307,077,500 over the 1956 appropriation.

For the Treasury Department the bill recommends an appropriation of $643,434,000, which is the amount recommended by the House and a decrease of $5,073,000 under the budget estimates for 1957 of $648,507,000.

For the Post Office Department, the bill recommends an appropriation of $2,994,780,000, which is an increase of $20,880,000 over the amount of $2,973,900,000, recommended by the House and a decrease of $5,220,000 under the budget estimates for 1957 of $3 billion.

For the Tax Court of the United States, the bill recommends an appropriation of $1,365,000, the budget estimate for 1957, and the amount recommended by the House.

The bill contains two amendments, both of which are for the Post Office Department. These restore to the budget estimates the appropriations recommended for "Operations," and "Transportation." The first amendment restores $10,880,000 to the House allowance of $2,108,000,000, making a total of $2,118,880,000.

The second amendment restores $10 million to the House allowance of $645 million, making a total of 655 million.

The mail volume is increasing: the number of pieces now estimated for 1956 exceeds the actual volume in 1955 by 2.8 percent. There is an estimated increase of 2.64 percent in mail volume in 1957 over the current estimate for 1956. In other words, the estimated 56.8 billion pieces of mail to be handled in 1956 is expected to increase to 58.3 billion pieces in 1957.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I summarize the figures merely by saying that this bill is $10 million below the budget estimates. We made no restoration for the Treasury Department. We were a little concerned when it was reported to us that perhaps since we cut the funds for the Coast Guard $900,000 it might prevent them from carrying out their 20-year retirement plan. We were assured by the Treasury that that would not be the case, but if it should appear that the Coast Guard had been cut too much, a supplemental request would be made next year.

We restored none of the House cuts in the Treasury Department appropriation, but we went quite extensively into the costs of the Post Office Department for carrying the mail. That is something we must pay for.

The other matter is operations, namely, handling and distributing the mail. We were convinced, upon the independent testimony of three witnesses from the Budget Bureau who made an independent survey of the volume of mail, that the amount in the budget estimate for transportation and operations was the minimum and that it would perhaps not be sufficient.

So, Mr. President, we have brought to the Senate a bill which restores those two items and which makes our bill $20,880,000 above the House bill, and, yet, $10 million below the budget estimates.

As the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has stated, we are in full accord in what is involved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to pay my tribute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and to bring to the attention of the Senate one paragraph in the committee report which relates to the postal deficit.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1624) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE II. POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

POSTAL DEFICIT

The committee wishes to endorse and amplify the observations in the report of the House committee with respect to the postal deficit. In the last 55 years postal operations have shown a surplus in 10 years during that period and a deficit in the remaining 45 years. This deficit exceeded the $100-million mark for the first time in 1921, when it reached $157,517,688. Following that year it dropped very sharply until 1931 when it again went to $146,066,190. After 1933 it again dropped very substantially until 1946. From then on the deficit has been of huge dimensions, reaching the sum of $719,544,091 in the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1952.

Two principal factors have contributed to this state of affairs. The first is that the Post Office Department has been doing business at an increasing cost level with revenues at the level of 1932. The second factor is the series of wage increases which have aggregated more than a billion dollars in the last few years. It is quite evident that if the Post Office Department is to provide a high level of service to the public it must have adequate and modern facilities and equipment, high morale among the employees and adequate compensation. Congress has approved the various pay increases, and these, together with the needs of the Department for modernization and new buildings presents the need for additional revenues if the Department is expected to hold down the recurring deficits quite aside from any effort that might be made to develop revenues which are adequate for this program and for the complete elimination of the deficit.

The Postmaster General has summarized his needs in a letter to the President which was transmitted to the Congress. Regardless of any additional economies which might be effected in the operation of the Department, there will still be a need for additional revenues and this committee urges the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the Members of the Senate to give diligent attention to this problem of increased postal revenues if the Department is to be placed on a sound fiscal basis while carrying out its service responsibilities to the people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the time has come to emphasize to the Senate that we must deal with the postal deficit. Action is long overdue, and I trust that before the present Congress adjourns we shall have taken action on that question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation," on page 13, line 9, after the word "mail", to strike out "$645,000,000" and insert "$655,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 9, line 6, to strike out the period after the word "depreciation" and insert in lieu thereof a comma. The amendment is to correct a printing error only, and removes a period at a place where a comma should have been inserted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 9 to strike out line 5, and after line 4 to insert the following: "of Federal Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual." This amendment also corrects a Printing Office error.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. DIRKSEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

INJECTION OF POLITICS BY ADLAI STEVENSON INTO FLOOD RELIEF AND FLOOD PREVENTION IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on Monday, March 5, I took the floor briefly to express my regret because of an ill-advised attempt on the part of Adlai Stevenson to inject politics into the question of flood relief and flood prevention in Connecticut.

As predicted at that time, Governor Stevenson's unfounded attack upon President Eisenhower in this connection aroused considerable resentment in my State. As evidence of public opinion in Connecticut on this subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Flood Politics," published in the Naugatuck Daily News of March 1; an editorial entitled "The Flood Issue," published in the March 3 issue of the Stamford Advocate; an editorial entitled "Mr. Stevenson and Flood Control," published in the Hartford Courant of February 28; an article captioned "Stevenson Ignores Facts in Speech Here on Flood," written by Mr. Keith Schonrock, and published in the Hartford Courant of March 4.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of Federal assistance to Connecticut in the floods of August and October 1955, which has been submitted to me by the Federal Civil Defense Administration. The tabulation, showing

figures as of March 1, shows that $72,666,622 in Federal funds have been disbursed, or obligated for expenditure, in Connecticut as a result of our two flood disasters.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Naugatuck Daily News of March 1, 1956]

MORE FLOOD POLITICS

Connecticut's flood control program continues to be a prime topic of political cannonading, despite what appears to be a sincere effort on the part of most upper echelon State officials of both parties to keep it bipartisan.

Possibly both parties are haunted by the ghosts of the failures of past administrations, Republican and Democrat, to recognize the warnings of the Army Engineers. But the boat that sank was rocked by public as well as political disinterest.

Not so with Adlai Stevenson, Democratic candidate for nomination for President. He contended Saturday night in a talk at Hartford, his major New England appearance to date, that "the Eisenhower administration has actually weakened our defenses against floods."

Either Mr. Stevenson doesn't know, or he forgot, that the Thomaston Dam project, vital to the Naugatuck Valley flood-control program, was recommended by the Engineers in 1940, authorized by the Congress in 1944, but rejected until after the flood of August 1955.

And it would still be a dead duck if bipartisan effort on the part of New Englanders had not succeeded in overriding a sabotage effort on the part of the Democratic-controlled House Appropriations Committee.

Enough mistakes have been made by both parties, and flood-conscious residents are aware that words and name-calling do not build dikes or dams.

If Adlai Stevenson, or any other politician, starts throwing stones in the direction of those who have "weakened our defenses against floods," let him and the rest of us look to our own conduct.

It wasn't a Republican flood or a Democratic flood that opened our eyes to the risks of our rivers. But it will take something other than a flood of Republican-Democrat antagonism, criticism and Monday-morning quarterbacking to eliminate future hazards.

[From the Stamford Advocate of March 3, 1956]

THE FLOOD ISSUE

We have the utmost sympathy with the attempts of Adlai Stevenson to campaign violently without an issue. Having spoken for and against 90 percent parity payments for farmers, having discovered that the Taft-Hartley bills were not and then were slave-labor laws, and, more recently having been twisting and turning torturously on the touchy segregation issue, he is becoming more and more limited. Because it is in the tradition of politicians to blame the weather on the party in power, Adlai could hardly be blamed for placing the blame for the floods on the Eisenhower administration. This type of attack may show lack of imagination and, certainly, it is hardly an intellectual approach to politics, but, like kissing babies, it has traditional appeal.

But Mr. Stevenson, as so often happens when he speaks, failed to let well enough alone. As Senator BUSH told the Senate, Mr. Stevenson found it politically necessary to misstate the facts regarding flood-relief and flood-prevention actions taken by the administration.

Senator BUSH then pointed out that the Federal Civil Defense Administration estimates that Federal agencies have spent or assumed obligations of $66.5 million in Connecticut. This is nearly twice the amount appropriated by the general assembly in special session. The Senator suggested that Mr. Stevenson was less than fully candid when he failed to mention that lack of consent by the States to flood-control projects was a factor which delayed flood-prevention work in the past. Nor did he think the administration was to blame for action taken by the Democratic-controlled Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives which would have sabotaged the President's flood-prevention program of $135.5 million if a bipartisan revolt on the House floor had not corrected the committee's blunder.

Senator BUSH said that he found in the Senate a complete willingness on the part of a great majority of Senators on the other side of the aisle to approach flood problems in a spirit of cooperation and bipartisanship. He has extensive evidence to support this statement.

There is much evidence in Connecticut that the people of the State and State officials of both parties are thankful for the effectiveness of Federal agencies in helping to rehabilitate the flood-stricken communities. This aid was given by the Federal Government to the citizens of the State.

There was no thought of politics. Senator BUSH was undoubtedly right when he stated that many Democrats in Mr. Stevenson's audience shrank in distaste on hearing such misstatements and distortions from the Democratic candidate for the presidential nomination in a State where so much has been accomplished by nonpartisan cooperation in a tragic period.

[From the Hartford Courant of February 28, 1956]

MR. STEVENSON AND FLOOD CONTROL

One must grant a certain amount of latitude to a man who is running for a political nomination. On such occasions the pursuing candidate is likely to choose subjects and say things that will bring delight to the hearts of his listeners even though it is necessary to sing several different tunes to different groups. Adlai Stevenson's criticism last Saturday of the Eisenhower administration for allegedly weakening our flood defenses here in New England comes under that general heading of political oratory.

In a way it is a little disappointing that Mr. Stevenson sounded so much like a run-of-the-mill politician saying things that the pros wanted said, and so little like the statesman Mr. Stevenson has been described as being by his admirers. Thus he is for greater flood control, disaster insurance, and a great many other things.

Unfortunately Mr. Stevenson assumed that flood control was a matter that was launched some 3 years ago when Mr. Eisenhower took office. The record shows that a long, disheartening period of years went by under Democratic Presidents as well as Republican Presidents with some, but not enough progress of flood control. Such matters involved regional interests, interstate compacts, cooperation between local, State, and Federal authorities.

Some communities, like Hartford, under strong local leadership built bulwarks against floods such as ravaged this city too often in the spring. But we do not remember that when the city of Hartford went forward to build its dikes, that it did so in terms of building Democratic or Republican dikes. The people merely wanted to stay dry.

Mr. Stevenson will have a tough job trying to sell the bill of goods that Mr. Eisenhower is not interested in flood control; that he is crippling it in New England. We would be surprised if Democratic Gov. A. A. Ribicoff would make that charge.

[From the Hartford Courant of March 4, 1956]

THE CAPITOL SCENE: STEVENSON IGNORES FACTS IN SPEECH HERE ON FLOOD

(By Keith Schonrock)

Adlai E. Stevenson's attempt last week to blame the recent Connecticut floods on the Eisenhower administration and also to deride postflood activities of the Federal Government as "words instead of deeds" was feeble at best.

In his speech to the annual Jefferson-Jackson Democratic fund-raising dinner, Stevenson said: "Of words, about floods and their awfulness, there have been plenty from Washington and elsewhere; and conferences and airplane inspections by high officials over the flooded areas and promises of multimillion dollar relief funds and local programs. But of deeds, of steps actually taken to meet this problem, there have been mighty few."

Stevenson's analysis of the Eisenhower administration's flood activities is not borne out by the facts as witnessed by most Connecticut citizens and State officials.

Even Governor Ribicoff, also a leading Democrat, has had nothing but praise for the present Washington administration for its work after the flood disasters struck.

STEVENSON IGNORES FACTS

Stevenson chose to ignore, in his eagerness to indict the Eisenhower administration, that every possible Federal assistance was thrown into the battle to help Connecticut and other flood-struck areas recover as speedily as possible. He also chose to ignore the fact that President Eisenhower, in his recent budget message to Congress, has asked for major flood control works in this area.

The Federal Government, largely through the offices of the United States Corps of Army Engineers, poured about $20 million into Connecticut to help repair flooded-out roads, bridges and streets; waterlines, utility installations and other essential facilities of modern living. One need only travel around the State to see even now the Bailey bridges and other emergency installations put there by the Federal Government.

The Federal Small Business Administration made loans to thousands of persons in Connecticut to help them recover from the flood effects. Other agencies of the Federal Government also made available all of their programs and funds to help flood-stricken people.

RIBICOFF PRAISES FEDERAL AID

After the flood emergency was over Governor Ribicoff said, not once but several times, that he received the utmost cooperation from the Federal Government. He has said that not a single request had been turned down. Federal Civil Defense Administrator Val Peterson came to Connecticut at the height of the emergency and personally directed recovery operations. Peterson's only worry during that time, to use his own words, was that he would stretch the emergency aid laws so far that he would end up in jail.

The big airplane inspection trip of the flood areas was that made by President Eisenhower who came here at the request of Governor Ribicoff. While in the State the President personally gave other Federal officials the green light and he personally authorized the clearing away of as much bureaucratic red tape as possible.

All this happened after the floods had struck. In his speech Stevenson tried to blame the floods themselves and the conditions which led to them to a failure of the Eisenhower administration to supply adequate flood-control works in the upper New England area.

PICKS POOR ISSUE

It is true that many flood-control projects have long been authorized for this area but

over the years, through more Democratic than Republican national administrations, no money has been appropriated to start construction.

The incidence of the floods last year both on the east and west coasts will give the necessary impetus to Congress, whether it be Democratic or Republican, to get these flood-control projects in the works. The flood experience in Connecticut for example has already eliminated local opposition to the Thomaston flood-control dam, which was blocked for years by local landowners and industrialists. It will also be a factor to help weaken local opposition to similar flood-control projects in Vermont and New Hampshire and Massachusetts.

Stevenson, in his speech, was obviously trying to take advantage of the ravages of the flood to make a little political hay in Connecticut. Judging from the work the Federal Government has already done and has planned, Stevenson did not pick a really good issue.

Connecticut: Tabulation of Federal assistance in floods of August and October 1955 as of March 1, 1956

Corps of Engineers	$20,546,255
Department of Agriculture (includes loans amounting to 21,338)	3,934,338
Small Business Administration (loans)	18,956,878
FCDA allocation	1,000,000
HEW (salaries, per diem, travel, telephones, etc., over and above normal administrative expenses only and in no way represents an evaluation of the services performed)	34,280
Bureau of Public Roads	6,571,150
GSA	2,213,500
Department of Defense (also channeled 560 procurement actions to Connecticut with a total of $642,316,773 from August 1955 through February 11, 1956. Not all of these, of course, were channeled into the area solely because of the flood)	5,000,000
H&HFA	539,221
Community facilities	20,300
Urban planning grants approved	155,709
Urban renewal advances approved	363,212
Treasury Department (defense loans)	13,871,000
Total Federal	72,666,622

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now ask for the regular order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in his message to the Congress on the problems of our agriculture, President Eisenhower stressed his concern over the increasingly difficult paradox of our farm families. He stated that "Although agriculture is our basic industry, they find their prices and incomes depressed amid the Nation's greatest prosperity." It is indeed a deplorable fact that the farmers have not shared the prosperity which has blessed this country during the last few years.

It is therefore of prime importance that means be adopted which will foster the development of a healthy American agriculture. We are faced with the necessity of attempting to establish the basis for such a long-range development, rather than a hasty patchwork which will merely postpone to another day the inevitable reckoning caused by overproduction and the accumulation of surpluses.

There is no doubt that the tremendous surpluses which hang over the farmer's markets are serious depressants upon his income. The steady accumulation of ever larger surpluses, which has continued despite unprecedented disposal efforts by the Department of Agriculture, must be halted, and the surpluses must be drastically reduced before any sound, long-term basis can be laid for the improvement of agricultural prices.

This is what the President recommended in his message to Congress. The soil bank, which he proposed, and which the bill establishes, is aimed directly at providing for the reduction of production and surpluses without loss of income to the farmer. By eliminating millions of acres from production through farmer participation in the acreage and conservation reserves, supply can be reduced to approach demand, and surpluses reduced toward the point where the squeeze on the farmer will be alleviated.

In addition, the retiring of these acres will be of considerable assistance to the farmers of other crops whose markets have suffered from the diversion of many acres from basic commodities to the production of feed grains, vegetables, and potatoes. The diversion of acres from the production of basic commodities has seriously endangered the income of farmers who neither have nor seek price supports. The use of the soil bank to retire acres from production will reduce the amount of future diversion to other crops, and will be welcome news to the vegetable and potato producers, such as those in my State of New Jersey, where we have about 175,000 acres producing vegetables and potatoes worth well over $40 million a year. Thus the soil bank should have a beneficial effect throughout our agriculture, as well as directly attacking overproduction and surpluses of basic commodities.

Yet this bill also paradoxically embodies provisions which will obviously generate forces for further overproduction and surpluses. I refer, of course, to high rigid price supports for the basic commodities. How can the Senate possibly reconcile the basic inconsistency of a bill which on the one hand establishes a billion-dollar program for the reduction of farm surpluses and overproduction, and on the other hand turns around and encourages production and surpluses through the restoration of high rigid price supports?

The restoration of price supports to the level of 90 percent of parity will not only encourage and stimulate production at a time when we are actively trying to reduce production, but will react in other ways to further increase the surpluses held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Rigid high price supports cannot help but reduce consumption to a certain degree as the high price supports are carried to the consumers in high prices for their purchases. Any reduction in consumption adds to the quantities of commodities placed in the Government surpluses. Furthermore, high fixed price supports will continue to price American agricultural commodities out of the world market and reduce the agricultural exports of such items. Any reduction in agricultural exports adds to the quantities of commodities placed in Government surpluses.

The restoration of fixed price supports at 90 percent of parity is a complete contradiction to the soil-bank program which holds so much promise of reducing Government surpluses to the point where farm income can be restored to appropriate levels and the basis of a stable agricultural economy established. The President's program has shown the way; we should not encumber a long-run solution to this problem with self-defeating provisions for the restoration of rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity as this bill proposes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote in favor of the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and other Senators, which will strike out the section of the bill restoring high rigid price supports to 90 percent of parity.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to speak on an amendment I will offer at the appropriate time to the agricultural bill. My amendment is identical with a bill already introduced, S. 2940. Eighteen other Senators joined me in the introduction of that bill.

We are today considering an agricultural bill which appears to carry some new features. Actually, we are proceeding upon the same plan and outline that has been followed for at least the last 20 years. It is a plan of reduced production. It is a negative approach. It has many limitations. While I expect to vote for the bill, it is exceedingly important that we find a less costly and permanent solution.

As I travel up and down the great State of Nebraska, I find that one of the most frequent complaints made against the farm program is the reduced acreage imposed upon the farmers. The small- and middle-sized farmers have had their production cut and cut and cut. The number of acres they are permitted to plant does not leave enough to enable them to run a sound and efficient operation.

In support of this contention I wish to read a few brief excerpts from some of the many letters that I have recently received.

A Gosper County farmer writes to me as follows:

> I was wondering if there was any way to help us small farmers. I have 420 acres of which 152 are farmland and they allow me 32 acres wheat and 8 acres of corn. Mr. CURTIS, do you think you could make a living on this amount of acres?

A Nuckolls County farmer writes:

> This acreage allotment is a joke. Never did work and never will work. To tell a small farmer that he can sow 20 or 30 acres

of wheat on 160 acres and maybe 40 acres of corn. Then he has a short crop.

And a Furnas County farmer writes to me, his Senator, and among other things, he says:

The program dictates who can profit and who can't. The history for allotments was based on a 2-year history which is very unsound. Men who are dishonest profit most. Honesty is penalized.

Listen to what an Otoe County farmer has to say and what he did about acreage allotments:

I am what may be termed a family-sized-farm farmer. I farm 180 acrs of Otoe County land. The acreage allotments of the past few years were ruining me so I took to raising hogs. I have for several years fed around 300 head of hogs and in doing so have fed several times as much grain as I raised. But I am in trouble now.

A Red Willow County farmer writes:

I definitely think that 30 to 50 percent increase in the land price which we have experienced in the last 4 years is a direct result of acreage allotments.

A farm couple in Seward County have this to say:

Our most serious problem is how to stay on this farm and we believe your most serious problem is how to keep us here. We still maintain the only way anyone farming under 200 acres can stay on the farm is to plant all his acres and then receive a fair price for these products.

We have seriously considered buying more land to secure additional allotments; many are doing just that. But we question a debt of $40,000. How many farm families can do this—go broke with adverse weather conditions and not affect the whole economy?

An Adams County farmer puts his finger on the problem and says:

There is no simple solution to this crisis. The answer will be found only by careful analysis of the entire farming industry and the present and potential market for the products of the farm.

Let us consider the situation of the American farmer. Is it wrong for him to follow the best direction and instruction that he can receive in an agricultural college to improve the quantity and the quality of his production? Has it been a mistake to encourage 4–H Clubs and the work they are doing? Is it wrong for a man to try to produce more and better cotton, or potatoes, or wheat, or corn, or any other farm product?

If this negative approach to agriculture is a good thing, then why should we not idolize and honor the sloven and careless man whose production is poor?

In my State we are blessed with a great natural resource in our underground water. We perhaps have the greatest supply of underground water that exists anywhere in the world. Is it wrong for a man who owns some broad fertile acres, which were perhaps owned and farmed by his father and his grandfather, to use some of that underground water to increase his production? That increased production may be absolutely necessary in order for him to remain on that land and to protect himself from the ravages of drought. I say that if that is wrong, then it is wrong for other farmers located elsewhere to use the sunshine which a beneficent providence sends upon us all, in order to make crops grow.

The productivity capacity of our farmers is increasing rapidly. This is as it should be, and the market for the surpluses can only come from profitable, industrial uses of these surpluses here at home. After all, surpluses of agricultural products should be a blessing and not a burden.

Mr. President, the potential capacity of American agriculture is almost unlimited. The high costs of operating a farm are such that we cannot solve this problem merely by asking a further and further reduction of acreage or bushels on the part of the farmers. Such a program is particularly hard on the small and family size farm, which is already so restricted that its unit becomes a costly operation. Such a program has not worked satisfactorily in the past. We have controlled the farmer, we have even harassed him and dealt with him rather harshly, but we have not controlled the overall national production. Nature and the elements are still factors. The basic natural and economic laws have not been repealed.

What shall we do with the present surpluses? There are those who suggest that we expand our foreign markets. I would not say that we cannot make some little gain in increasing our foreign trade. I do say the picture has changed a great deal in recent years. Many nations that were deficit food areas are now self-sufficient. Many other nations that were deficit food areas are now troubled with a surplus. There is no reasonable hope that we can solve our agricultural problems through increased foreign exports. Actually our exports are below what they were 5 years ago.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing our exports for the last 5 crop years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States exports of agricultural products, crop year July 1–June 30

[In millions of dollars]

	1950–51	1951–52	1952–53	1953–54	1954–55
Total agricultural	3,411	4,053	2,817	2,936	3,143
Wheat	646	976	588	375	404
Wheat flour	83	85	81	75	89
Corn	205	160	227	186	129
Cotton	934	1,189	571	674	684
Tobacco:					
Flue cured	273	327	285	256	260
Burley				16	14
Dark fired				10	11
Soybeans	81	49	93	126	145

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield at this point?

Mr. CURTIS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the Senator from Nebraska have any figures showing the imports of agricultural commodities during the same 5-year period?

Mr. CURTIS. I am sorry to say that I do not.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Nebraska would find, on checking them, that imports of agricultural commodities have increased during the same 5-year period.

Mr. CURTIS. There is no question about that. Certainly we cannot maintain the more-or-less artificial market for farm products in the United States, and do so effectively, without shutting out the imports. It is just as necessary to shut off the imports as it has been, under the theory followed, to reduce production in the United States.

Mr. President, the ultimate and the long-time solution of our agricultural problems is not to be found in the negative philosophy involved in paying the farmer not to produce, or in destroying that which has already been produced, as has been unsuccessfully tried in the past. We should continue to increase production and to improve production; and we should find new and profitable uses in industry, through research. Most of this knowledge is already available from scientists of our past generation, and has simply not been applied to industry.

In industry, there are many uses for our agricultural production. At the present time the Government of the United States is buying large quantities of industrial alcohol. Think of it, Mr. President. We complain that the storage bins of the country are overflowing with grain, some of it spoiling; and we sit idly by, and hope, and let it spoil. A great deal of this grain belongs to the United States Government. It could be turned into industrial alcohol, and thus could make a distinct contribution to our national defense program. Instead of that, we buy industrial alcohol from other sources.

I am told that alcohol is used in considerable quantities as fuel for rockets, guided missiles, turbojets, and reciprocating engines. I am also told that the alcohol that the taxpayers of America are buying for our defense program has come in the past from two principal sources. One of those sources is blackstrap molasses produced outside the continental United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the importation of blackstrap molasses in the last 5 years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Importation of blackstrap molasses, industrial (not fit for human consumption)

[Millions of gallons]

Country	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
Cuba	130	186	291	203	260
Mexico	25	22	32	38	35
Dominican Republic	17	28	26	24	30
All other	56	60	61	76	60
Total	228	296	410	341	385

Mr. CURTIS. The other source of this alcohol is petroleum, a resource that can be, and is being, depleted. Yet this alcohol can be supplied from our surplus farm crops. It can be made from the products of our soil which can be reproduced year after year, and with wise

husbandry and conservation our soil at the same time can grow richer and richer. Such a program can be the dominant factor in bringing stability and prosperity to agriculture, and, along with it, can restore freedom to the American farmers.

A study of broader industrial uses of agricultural products points to many areas which it is feasible to examine.

In recent years the Department of Agriculture has carried on rather extensive research into the use of industrial alcohol as fuel for combustion engines. In a report published in 1954, the Department stated:

> Alcohol motor fuels constitute the largest single industrial market in the United States that could theoretically absorb a grain product in almost any available quantity. On the basis of 2½ gallons of alcohol per bushel of grain, each 100 million bushels of grain would yield 250 million gallons of alcohol. This amount of alcohol is equivalent to but one-half of 1 percent of the annual domestic gasoline consumption.

Mr. President, certain foreign countries have used alcohol for motor fuel both solely and as a blend with gasoline. Under our current operations, alcohol could be used most successfully by mixing anhydrous alcohol with gasoline to improve its octane quotient.

It is estimated that in the year 1955 the motorcars in the United States consumed over 55 billion gallons of gasoline. The consumption of gasoline in the United States is rapidly increasing every year.

Were we to blend alcohol in this gasoline to the extent of 5 percent, it would require 2,775,000,000 gallons of alcohol.

Each bushel of grain will produce 2½ gallons of alcohol. In other words, to produce enough alcohol from grain to put 5 percent alcohol in the gasoline we consume would require more than 1 billion bushels of grain. Just think of a potential order for a billion bushels of grain. A 3 percent blend of alcohol in the gasoline sold in the United States would require surplus grains to the extent of over 650 million bushels.

The United States Department of Agriculture, in its report, based on the work of the agricultural research service at Peoria, Ill., said on June 9, 1954:

> Because of extensive practical experience in the use of alcohol-gasoline blends in foreign countries and laboratory and road studies made in this country, it is evident that the use of alcohol as a fuel for internal combustion engines is practical from the technological standpoint.

We are aware that this subject also involves a question of national policy. It involves questions of economics, marketing, and fuel technology. Time is needed to prepare legislation. That is why my proposal calls for a commission.

Congress should have an opportunity later to pass upon the proposals of the commission. There should be appropriate hearings, and the necessary legislation should be prepared.

The same report from the Department of Agriculture continues:

> When considered in relation to other possible alternatives for the disposal of grain, there are additional advantages that would accrue from the fermentation of grain into alcohol. Not the least of these is the production, as a by-product, of 800,000 tons of high value protein feed from each 100 million bushels of grain fermented. Benefits would also accrue from the saving of various charges now incurred in the storage of grain.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I am greatly interested in the proposal the Senator is making. It seems to me to make sense. This would be one way to dispose of agricultural surpluses and put them to good use.

Is it not true that just as much alcohol could be made from poor quality grain as from good wheat, and sometimes more?

Mr. CURTIS. That is very true. The same amount of alcohol could be made from grain which is spoiling or deteriorating, or from potatoes which have spoiled, as can be made from the choicest grain.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to speak of a little experience we had in North Dakota. Early in the war—I believe it was 1943—we had a great deal of sprouted wheat. It was being discounted on the market, up to 50 cents a bushel. There was an alcohol plant in operation at Omaha at that time. It was found that the sprouted wheat actually produced more alcohol per bushel than top quality, No. 1 wheat. As a result, the price of sprouted wheat immediately went up to as high a level as the price of the best wheat.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me ask the Senator what would have happened with respect to finding a market for that wheat if the outlet to which he refers had not existed?

Mr. YOUNG. A terrific loss would have been taken. At least 30 percent of it was badly sprouted.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Can the Senator tell us what has happened to the alcohol plant at Omaha and the alcohol plant at Muscatine, Iowa?

Mr. CURTIS. They are closed at the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator know why they were closed?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I have been engaged in that controversy for many years. Senators will hear something on that subject on this floor in the near future. There will be a discussion concerning the proposed reopening of the plant at Omaha.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say to the Senator that at the time the plants were closed, our supply of wheat had gone down, and we had begun to scrape the bottom of the barrel with respect to wheat. We got down to a carryover of 87 million or 89 million bushels. People all over the country said, "We shall never have another surplus bushel of wheat as long as we live." If those alcohol plants could only have been retained in some sort of standby condition, it is my thought that they could have taken care in large measure of the very serious surpluses which have occurred during the past few years.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is so right.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have steadily maintained that one of the obligations of the Department of Agriculture is to see that we have enough production. We had better sin on the plentiful side rather than the slack side. Every time there is a scarcity, we have extremely high prices. Then there is a slacking off of demand, and we get into trouble.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, a man can wait for someone to make him an overcoat or an automobile, but he must have food now.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. I have always contended that the calculation should be a little on the liberal side, but that the farmer should not pay for it. A similar situation exists in connection with an insurance policy. One does not expect to have a fire in his dwelling every year. Insurance rates are based upon the calculation that a fire will occur in a dwelling, on the average, once every 400 years. That is the calculation upon which the rate is based. One does not expect to have a fire every year. Neither do we expect a shortage of grain every year. It is my contention that if we were to sin a little on the side of being overly liberal, we could feed the surpluses immediately into consumption. The Omaha alcohol plant is not the only method. Under such a plan as I envision the farmer would always start with a fairly satisfactory market, but there would be a capacity which could be quickly expanded to take care of any emergency.

I had to contend with those who were headed in the direction of economy, and who insisted that these great alcohol plants be closed. However, I thought then, and I think now, that such action was unfortunate.

I do not know whether I agree with the Senator that we need a commission to decide this question. Perhaps we could decide it in Congress. But if we cannot, I think it would be very wise if, on our agricultural planning, we were not only to look at the existing alcohol plants, but consider other measures. Let us put a floor under the consumption of agricultural commodities, as well as some sort of floor under production, so that we shall always have enough.

The food-stamp plan advocated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is a floor under consumption. The distribution of surplus agricultural commodities to people on relief, and to the aged and infirm, represents a floor under consumption. There are many methods that could be used. The alcohol plant is one of the quickest and easiest of all. We feed grain into it and take out industrial alcohol. Whenever we buy insurance, we must pay a little premium for it, if it is any good.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I am especially indebted to him because I know of the long experience he has had in the agricultural

field and his distinguished service as Secretary of Agriculture.

Let me state at this point the reason why I am suggesting a commission. I shall discuss that question at greater length a little later.

It is conceivable that a plan might be devised which would affect competitive motor fuels. It might involve our policy as to taxes, or other things. I do not know what might be proposed. However, I believe there is sufficient merit to this proposal to warrant asking those best qualified to give their ideas, to draft suitable legislation, and to submit it to the Congress a year from now. I do not believe it could be done at this time, or during this session of Congress. I do not believe the Department of Agriculture or the Congress could make an adequate study in the limited time left.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. We are now starting an export program under a very good law, Public Law 480, which I have supported, and which other members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has supported. It involves the disposition of surplus commodities. I am sure the Senator from Nebraska must have read in the press that as soon as the announcements were made of the disposition of some cotton, India made a protest. Egypt made a protest. Protests were made on every side.

If we were to begin tomorrow to dispose of all our surplus wheat, Canada would enter a protest. Australia would protest. Argentina would protest. But if we were to feed it into an alcohol plant, we would not have protests from abroad. I do not believe it would cost much more to operate these plants. I know a little about the cost of operating such plants, because I operated five of them. It might cost a little more to operate them, but I do not think it would cost quite as much as it costs to make some of the dispositions we now have to make under Public Law 480, a law which I vigorously supported.

A few days ago we made a deal with Pakistan. We made another with Indonesia. As I understand—I may be mistaken, but I do not think I am far wrong—all the money from Indonesia was to be in their soft currency, and a large portion of it was to remain in Indonesia, for public works for the benefit of Indonesia. That does not return much money to the United States Treasury. If we are to lose that much money, it might be a great deal better to lose it in an operation of the character described by the Senator than in an operation which seems to cost us some of our friends abroad.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. He is absolutely right. I hope he will bear with me a little longer. I should like to state some facts with respect to the petroleum industry, with reference to how it might be affected if we were to bring about a program for blending a small amount of alcohol with motor fuel.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to concur in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] a moment ago. While I have favored and have urged various departments of Government to conclude agreements to dispose of the surpluses to Israel, to Pakistan, and to other countries—and I have also asked them to give consideration to the possibility of furnishing a considerable amount of beef to the South Koreans—nevertheless it has occurred to me that we could very well afford to give the same consideration to the people of our own country who are in distress and who could use a like amount of surplus commodities, perhaps at reduced prices, or even on a grant basis.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that he is certainly to be commended for bringing the subject to the attention of the Senate and the country. I come from a State which is one of the largest oil producers in the United States. I believe we are sixth in oil production. Ordinarily one would imagine that I would be very much opposed to the production of any fuel which would be in competition with our crude oil.

By the same token, we have in our State and in Colorado the largest deposit of oil shale in the whole world. A few days ago I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations to urge appropriations for research work, so that when the time came when we needed oil from oil shale, we would be in a position to furnish it to the American people. That is in the nature of an insurance policy. It guarantees us for the next thousand years sufficient fuel for our country.

It seems to me the Senator from Nebraska has brought up a very important matter for the consideration of the Senate, namely, the use of a small part of our production of grains in the manufacture of alcohol for blending with crude oil.

I remember that about 17 years ago the Secretary of the Interior said we would be running out of crude oil in about 15 or 20 years. We now have every reason to believe that our reserves are greater than they have been at any time.

I am not one who believes that the country will run out of crude oil at any time in the foreseeable future. However, I can say that 40 years ago to drill a hole 2,500 or 3,000 feet deep was a tremendous undertaking. At that time it took them from 6 to 9 months to drill that kind of hole. We were then searching for shallow production. Today we drill holes 5,000 feet deep in a matter of 3 days. A good many wells are drilled as deep as 15,000 or even 20,000 feet.

That shows that we must go deeper and deeper all the time to get oil. The time will come in this country when we will need to use blends of some kind in the production of motor fuel.

Mr. CURTIS. I am deeply indebted to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. He is well versed in the economies of the petroleum industry. Am I not correct in understanding that it is to the interest and advantage of the petroleum industry to have a sound and prosperous agriculture in this country?

Mr. BARRETT. It certainly is; there can be no question about that.

Mr. CURTIS. Taking the industry in its entirety—wholesale, retail, production, refining, and so on—it represents a sizable group of taxpayers. Is that correct?

Mr. BARRETT. There can be no question about that.

Mr. CURTIS. Therefore, a farm program which can be operated at a reasonable cost to their advantage. Is that not correct?

Mr. BARRETT. That is undoubtedly true. For that reason, we believe it is altogether proper to develop for the immediate future and for a long time to come a policy under which our country will have fuel with which to protect itself under all conditions.

I might say that I have always marveled at the way the people of Germany under Hitler were able to carry on their operations during World War II with synthetic fuel. Of course we had available to us the highest grade of crude oil in the world, and we were able to supply that fuel not only to our own fighting forces but to our associates in that war period. Yet our enemies were able to carry on very successfully with synthetic fuels. That shows that we ought to prepare ourselves for the day which may come, some time in the future, when we may have to rely on synthetic fuels.

Mr. CURTIS. In this industrial age agriculture must share in the industrial market, or it will always be a crippled industry and at a disadvantage with relation to other industries.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask one more question, if my friend from Nebraska will bear with me a few moments. As I understand, the Senator in his discussion stated that the grains which are not suitable for human consumption can be used for the production of alcohol. Is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. I believe that is very important. Such production will at least provide an outlet for a good many of the grains which are produced but which are not desirable in the markets of this country.

Mr. CURTIS. Alcohol can be stored indefinitely, although that is not necessary, because uses can be found for it immediately.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to thank the Senator for his very fine presentation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who has been for so many years a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and has served as the committee's chairman.

Mr. AIKEN. The subject which the Senator from Nebraska is discussing should be of great interest to every Member of Congress. It is true that we are now struggling with the problem of surpluses, but we are making considerable progress in disposing of them.

As the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has pointed out, our Foreign

Agricultural Service has sold about $200 million worth of surpluses in the last week. I understand the prospects are very good for disposing of more.

Nevertheless, the objective of all of us should be able to get back to a reasonably full agricultural production just as soon as possible. Certainly we do not wish to restrict production sharply, because that is repugnant not only to our farm people but to all Americans.

The Senator from Nebraska is suggesting that a study be made to determine what best use may be made of the surpluses which we may anticipate for some years to come. As I say, we want full production or nearly full production in this country. It makes for full prosperity when we have full production on the farms.

While there may be some opposition even to a study being made of other uses for the surplus grains, particularly with respect to alcohol, I believe we must realize that we are nowhere near the limit of expansion of our economy. We are rapidly developing air travel, and if I am correctly informed alcohol plays an important part in the fuels of our airplanes of today, not only those designed for national security purposes, but for ordinary commercial purposes as well.

I do not know what the Commission which the Senator from Nebraska is proposing would find. I do not know whether it would find it feasible to use grain for alcohol. Certainly it would find it feasible to use deteriorated grain for alcohol.

Mr. CURTIS. My proposal to have a Commission draft proposed legislation would not empower the Commission to place in operation any program without further action by the Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course not.

Mr. CURTIS. A vote for my amendment certainly would not imply that any Senator should approve in advance what the Commission might recommend. A Senator might wish to oppose its recommendations.

Mr. AIKEN. Unless we are willing to concede that we have reached the limits of our expansion, we had better be looking into the adequate and proper use of all our resources, and certainly we must be looking into every possible use of our surplus grain. In some years there is a great deal of wet grain which we have to use in some way or other. I understand such grain makes good alcohol. I for one, am not willing to concede that as a nation we are anywhere near the limit of the expansion of our economy.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate what the Senator has said. As proof of the fact that we have an expanding economy, a few weeks ago when I started this program anew, although I have been interested in it for years, I was using the figure of 36 billion gallons of gasoline a year. We now have a fairly accurate estimate for 1955, which is 55 billion gallons of gasoline a year. As we have greater need for more motor fuel, there is no reason why the American farmers should not have a part in this expansion without taking it away from some other interest.

Mr. AIKEN. It would take only a small part of the funds which the Congress is appropriating for the myriad of investigating committees to carry on the work proposed by the Senator from Nebraska. I am satisfied in my own mind that that would do the country more good.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Vermont very much.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska, my good colleague, is aware, I am certain, of the important work being done by the various colleges of agriculture in the Middle West in the fields of chemurgy and the industrial uses of agricultural products. In addition to the work done by the colleges themselves in their research departments, there are research foundations of all kinds which also have entered that general field.

I should like to ask my colleague if it is not true that all the efforts which have been made and which are being made afford the basis upon which the Commission which he proposes will found its activities and continue its work from that point.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct. The results of the research of the past 35 years are at hand and are available. We have had the practical experience of other countries to draw upon, in addition to the great contribution by our own colleges, universities, and experiment stations. We have had field tests and road tests. All that knowledge is at hand. What is needed now is to have someone to translate that knowledge into legislation so that appropriate action may be taken.

Mr. HRUSKA. So far as the Senator knows, is there any place where a coordination or a collation of the information which specifically refers to the adaptation of farm products to industrial uses on a large scale has heretofore been made?

Mr. CURTIS. Only during the war was that done. At that time alcohol was produced for industrial purposes. From the alcohol, rubber and other articles were made. But since the war period that has not been done.

My senior colleague from Nebraska is so right when he says there needs to be a collating of all available information and the working out of a program and the writing of a bill, or bills, so as to give Congress an opportunity to pass legislation on the subject.

Mr. HRUSKA. On another point which has already been raised by my colleague from Nebraska the figures given of the consumption of gasoline in this country are astounding. Certainly the comparative figures which were used, namely, 36 billion gallons of gasoline consumed in recent years, and the present estimate of in excess of 55 billion gallons, demonstrate the dynamic growth of the petroleum industry, and also demonstrate to a large degree the drain on oil which is being made by the petroleum industry.

I am wondering if it is not true that a large part of the great consumption of gasoline is not accounted for by its use in running the farm industry itself; and if a blend of industrial alcohol were injected into the gasoline which is used in operating tractors and other farm machinery, would that not have a historical precedent, in that prior to the use of the tractor on an almost exclusive scale the feed and motive power were raised right on the farm? Therefore, the use of industrial alcohol would be a means of returning to the same source, in part, at least, for fuel on the farms, which used to produce it in toto.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator has a very good point. It is a subject about which I shall have something to say a little further in my statement.

SUPPORT PRICE FEED VERSUS LIVESTOCK PRICES—CHEMURGY OUTLETS FOR SURPLUS GRAIN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The situation described by the senior Senator from Nebraska is not new at all, but it is a very practical one. It remains for such a committee to coordinate the information and the costs with the existing costs of fuel, rubber, and other material to determine if there may be ways and means to encourage the production through chemurgy processes to use the surplus grain.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct. In that connection, it must be borne in mind that many infant industries have had to have some help. At present, the United States Government is assisting civil aviation. The history of Government assistance in the development of railroads is well known. The same is true of many other industries. Some Government direction and help will be needed in order to get such a program as I have proposed under way.

THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. In that connection, so far as any help to agriculture, mining, or textiles is concerned, the contrary has been true. The Congress since 1934 has made our own markets in the United States available to cheap-labor countries through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended last year for 3 years. Instead of helping our own industries, we are destroying them. My bill, S. 2926, introduced on January 12, would return to the constitutional processes in the regulations of foreign trade and the national economy.

CHEMURGY INDUSTRIAL FOUNDATION REPORT

In 1944, the Western States Industrial Foundation report was published. I was managing director of that organization. The report covered the subject of chemurgy and the possibilities of utilizing farm products in the manufacture of industrial products.

It seems to me that the Senator from Nebraska is entirely correct. There is a great field available to us.

SUPPORT PRICES VERSUS LIVESTOCK PRICES.

Is it not true that our support price for corn and other feed grains for livestock is supported by the Government at such a point now that it is impossible to feed the grain to the steers and hogs and break even selling such livestock on the open market?

Mr. CURTIS. I cannot answer the Senator's question. I realize that he

points up a problem which is very real. The Senator's State of Nevada is located a considerable distance from the great Grain Belt. I represent, in part, a State which produces a large amount of corn. But this year we experienced a terrible drought. Stockmen, feeders, and others engaged in the livestock business who wanted corn had to buy it at about 105 percent of parity, plus the carrying charges. That is a very real problem. I do not know the answer to it.

Mr. MALONE. I want to help all I consistently can in the field which the Senator is now covering. After all, he is now really referring to the surplus of grain. The surplus of grain has resulted, in large part, at least, from the fact that the livestock feeders in our country are losing anywhere from $20 to $100 a head on the steers in the feed lots. If one pays $60 a ton or $3 a hundredweight for corn, and he gets 18 cents a hundred for the steers or cows, he will lose about 50 cents a day even if they make the usual gains.

So the feeders have taken the rap. They are very wary now. When they stop buying cattle and feed, that means the feed is stored at Government expense, and the stock raisers are without a market for their livestock.

EUROPEAN OUTLET

Another outlet for grain has been Europe. Grain has been going to Europe to a large extent, either at the world price or less. Secretary Benson has said that when he supplies foreign markets with low cost or free feed that the nations formerly supplying such markets are irritated about it and opposed to it.

GRAIN FOR MINERALS

Another point is that we are trading grain for minerals, thus shutting down our mines. We are simply shifting the weight around.

The suggestion which the Senator from Nebraska is making would result in a new outlet.

Mr. CURTIS. The greatest market for anything is right here in the United States. That is why the whole world wants our market.

GUMPTION NEEDED IN CONGRESS

Mr. MALONE. If we only had the gumption to maintain fair and reasonable competition through a flexible duty making up the difference between the wage, standard of living, taxes, and the costs of doing business here and in the chief competitive country on each product we could maintain at least equal access to their own markets here for our workingmen and investors. I think the Senator is correct. The problem is to find new uses for the grain, in addition to the usual uses and to allow the price of grain to come within reach of the livestock men. Is not that the problem?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I think that is true.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, before I yielded, I was making reference to the fact that in the manufacture of industrial alcohol from surplus farm products, for every 100 million bushels of grain converted into alcohol, there would be a by-product of 800 tons of hard protein feed for livestock. I am reliably informed that the value of those protein byproducts would equal the manufacturing cost of the alcohol.

In the same report from the Department of Agriculture we find this very significant statement:

> For more than 30 years Sweden has used a 25-percent alcohol-gasoline blend successfully. Prewar Germany, too, had an alcohol-motor-fuel program, using blends of varying composition to establish its agricultural economy. Excess sugar production resulted in the use of 10-percent blends in Queensland, Australia. From these and other large-scale experiences it appears that alcohol-motor-fuel program is practical from a technological standpoint.

I do not believe that such a program would be adverse to the petroleum industry. Let us consider that situation. We must always be mindful that whenever we use petroleum products, we use a depletable resource.

On the other hand, if there is a crop that is grown on the surface of the land, and manage the land as good husbandry dictates, that product can be produced, and produced year after year, for all the years to come. From the standpoint of conservation, it is important that we conserve that which we cannot replace, and use that which we can replace.

We must also keep in mind that the farmers of America have a right to produce part of their own fuel for power. Many years ago, when all farming and local transportation was done with horses and mules, it required the production of many millions of acres to produce the hay, alfalfa, and grain needed to supply the animals that provided the power. The farmer has a just right to ask: "Why cannot we produce, on these same acres, part of the fuels needed for the power to operate farms and for transportation?"

Mr. President, I would also call attention to the fact that if a program were instituted whereby alcohol were blended in our gasoline, the great wholesale and retail outlets of the petroleum industry, as well as refining and processing activities, would still handle the same total volume of motor fuels. It could not hurt those branches of the industry.

It is also well to note that the motor fuel market in the United States has not been enjoyed solely by the producers of petroleum products in this country. We have imported vast amounts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, certain figures and statistics on the importation of petroleum products.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Petroleum, United States imports, 1950–54

[Thousands of barrels and thousands of dollars]

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955 (11 months)
Crude	173,950	177,356	207,492	237,908	242,215	264,590
Value	$369,208	$374,869	$438,972	$509,850	$544,176	$593,024
Residual	123,037	121,969	132,192	134,824	132,283	137,321
Value	$198,340	$200,087	$220,461	$225,876	$240,395	$264,941

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, certainly the American farmers have as much right to a tiny part of the motor-fuel market in this country as have the foreign producers of petroleum.

I believe that the wise leaders in the petroleum industry will not seriously oppose a program of the kind proposed. I believe that when they are given all the facts, and have an opportunity to weigh them, any resistance which they may have will greatly diminish. After all, the petroleum industry, in all of its branches and phases, is quite an aggregation of taxpayers. They should be, and I am sure they are, interested in a farm program that is not so costly. I am sure that every filling-station operator, every driver of a tank wagon that supplies motor fuels to our farmers, and everyone engaged in wholesaling or transporting motor fuels, have a stake in American agriculture. It is to their advantage to have a prosperous and stable agriculture. If a program of blending alcohol with our motor fuels can provide material assistance to a sound and permanent solution to our farm problem, every business in the United States will be benefited by it, including the producers of petroleum.

As a Nebraskan, I take great pride in the contribution of our State in the supplying of synthetic rubber in World War II. I refer to the rubber czar, Mr. William Jeffreys, who was appointed to that task. It was not a job that called for pious wishing; it was one that called for action. Mr. Jeffreys arbitrarily ordered the construction of industrial alcohol and synthetic-rubber plants, which successfully produced synthetic rubber for our war effort. It is too bad that we did not continue those rubber plants in full production, which used, as a base material, butadiene made from alcohol produced from crops not needed for human or animal consumption.

We can use great quantities of grain in the production of synthetic rubber. The alcohol from 1 bushel of grain will produce about 6 pounds of butadiene, and this, in turn, will produce about 6 pounds of synthetic rubber. It takes 350 bushels of grain to produce 1 long ton of synthetic rubber.

In 1955 the synthetic-rubber production in the United States amounted to almost 879,000 long tons. Had this synthetic rubber been made from alcohol extracted from surplus grains, it would have required 307 million bushels of grain. This is a sizable amount. If we manufactured synthetic rubber from this source, it would make a very material contribution to the surplus problem the Nation faces.

In 1955 we used 632,000 long tons of natural rubber. Had this natural rubber been displaced by synthetic rubber

made from alcohol made from surplus grain, it would have taken approximately 220 million bushels of grain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the imports of natural rubber for the past 6 years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rubber, United States imports, 1950–55

[Long tons]

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955 (11 months)
Dry	747,848	678,085	757,769	572,104	522,365	457,328
Latex	54,401	54,963	48,228	75,511	74,483	79,305

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the rubber market in the United States, and the increased rubber market that will develop, can provide a market for great quantities of the products of our farms.

Domestic cotton producers face a shrinking market, due to increased foreign production and increased domestic use of cotton substitutes. While cotton my not afford the wide opportunity for chemurgical research that is present in surplus grain, there are important objectives to be studied.

Chemical additives to cotton fabric result in materials which are flame-resistant, water-resistant, and wrinkle-proof. Cotton can conceivably be used in many end products now supplied by imported jute and hemp. Rug backing, twine, and bale coverings are ready examples.

There is the acute problem, also, of imported textiles which displace domestic production. This must be carefully studied.

A commission such as the one I propose can bring material benefits to every cotton farmer in America.

We have an opportunity to find a market for the surpluses with which we are plagued. Here in the United States there is a potential market. There is a way that we can legislate so that the farmers can once more be free of harsh controls, restrictions, limitations, and penalties. In that way we can permit the small family-sized farmers to make use of all of their acres, and find a market for the products of those acres in the United States. This is the only way that we can preserve the small and medium-sized farms.

Mr. President, the amendment that I offer is one which would call for a commission to prepare proposed legislation and present it next year for the consideration of Congress. This proposed legislation would carry the best recommendations the Commission could make for industrial uses of farm products. I do not know what the Commission would propose. I do know that there are many, many opportunities and many alternatives to which the Commission could turn. The duties of the Commission are set forth in section 2 of my amendment, which reads as follows:

> It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and present to the Congress, not later than January 15, 1957, the necessary draft, or drafts, of legislation which in its opinion will bring about the greatest practical use for industrial purposes of agricultural products not needed for human or animal consumption, including, but not limited to, use in the manufacture of rubber, industrial alcohol, motor fuels, plastics, and other products.

It might develop that in order to get an infant industry started in the use of these products, which plague us now, but should be a blessing to this Nation, such an industry would have to have some Government help. I remind the Senate that other American industries have gotten their start in a similar way. I need not call attention to how the great railroads of the country were established. The chemical industry and many other industries received protection and subsidies in order to get started. We have been, and are, subsidizing civil aviation in this country. The time has come when the Government of the United States must direct and lend a hand, so that the research already accomplished can be applied to industrial uses of farm products.

It is my opinion that such a program can be set into operation within the framework of our private-enterprise system. By the very nature of the situation relating to agricultural controls, agricultural supports, Government purchases, Government fixed standards for motor-vehicle fuel, and by the Federal taxing power, Federal legislation is necessary to set such a program in operation and to give the stability upon which farmers and businessmen can rely.

Such a program would be much less costly than our present methods of dealing with surpluses, wherein we are spending a million dollars a day on storage alone. Other nations have used with great success such a program.

Mr. President, in the short time that this proposal has been pending, I have received many encouraging and informative letters. I want the Senate to have the benefit of a few of the expressions I have received. Mr. Jack Hart, one of Nebraska's informed farm writers, has this to say:

> I am taking the unprecedented step (for me) of writing a Member of Congress to commend rather than to criticize. I am referring to your introduction of a bill to develop increased industrial uses of surplus farm products. This is to express my personal congratulations and appreciation for this action.
>
> In watching the farm situation in Nebraska deteriorate at an alarming rate, I have become convinced that one of the few real, long-range contributions the Federal Government can make is the very thing embodied in your bill. To me, it is folly to assume that human consumption can be raised to the incredibly productive level our farmers have reached or that production can long be curbed to meet present demands. It is only natural and correct then that efforts should be stepped up many times to utilize these products to replace some of our exhaustible resources that are dwindling rapidly.
>
> For Nebraska, this would seem to offer not only the prospect of a market for products but also the possibility of locating processing plants here to transform the raw material into usable industrial material. Nebraska now needs, as much as anything, a source of employment for farmers whom, I find, are leaving the farms at a disturbingly fast rate.
>
> Here's wishing you Godspeed in pushing the bill which, I think, could be the session's most vital legislation to the long-range welfare of Nebraska. We'll anxiously be awaiting its development.

Mr. Charles Marshall, president of the Nebraska Farm Bureau, in a conference in my office a short time ago, had high praise for the bill which now is offered as an amendment to the pending farm bill. Other farm leaders have expressed themselves. I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter received by me from Mr. Clyde Filley, master of the Nebraska State Grange:

> Congratulations for introducing a bill providing for the development of increased industrial uses of surplus farm products. This idea is in line with a Nebraska State Grange resolution and presents a practical solution to an important problem.
>
> I hope that you will succeed in getting favorable consideration to this important measure.

Mr. President, the interest in this proposal spreads over a wide area. I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter I received from Mr. A. G. Taylor, of Washington, Kans., in which he states:

> I have just heard your talk over the radio concerning the farm-surplus problem. I would like to let you know I endorse your idea 100 percent. I am writing our Kansas Senators urging them to go along with your plan in converting our surplus crops into car and tractor fuel. * * * Under this plan, the farmer could consume and regulate his own surplus, relieving the Government of this burden. Keep up the good fight.

I also include part of a letter I received from Mr. C. O. Hendrickson, of Fort Dodge, Iowa, in which he states:

> I read with much interest an article written in my local daily paper stating you offered a farm bill amendment bill that would set up a commission to recommend industrial use of agriculture products. Thanks to you, Senator. I believe it would be a blessing to agriculture welfare. I could write you a long letter along these lines.

Mr. W. A. Thomson, Jr., of Louisville, Ky., writes me as follows:

> Concerning your bill, S. 2940: This, of course, is the most intelligent approach to the farm-surplus problem which has yet been brought before the Senate and the House. If you were able to get such a bill passed you would forever dispose of the farm-surplus problem. It happens that I have been working on this for 40 years, and that I spent 10 years in the 1920 period actually making a gasoline fuel which had a 20-percent alcohol content, and for many years it worked perfectly. I further refer you to Alco gasoline made and put out around Baltimore by the United States Industrial Alcohol Co. which, also had a long and excellent experience introducing alcohol into gasoline for the purpose of running internal-combustion engines. I should appreciate the opportunity of being of help to you in this matter, if that becomes possible. You might ask Senator EARLE CLEMENTS, who is my close friend, for any information you may want concerning me.

Mr. President, I believe that when we once more permit the farmers of America

to manage and farm all of their acres, it will be better for everyone. Then we shall make wiser use of our land; and once more the farmer can be a free citizen, unhampered by rules, restrictions, penalties, and forfeitures, as he develops and uses the great resources that God has given us. The answer is greater use of our farm products.

Mr. President, that can be done. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, a 5-percent blend of alcohol in our motor fuel would consume 1 billion bushels of grain.

I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY NEEDS A FARMER'S FARM BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this afternoon I wish to make a few remarks on the farm bill which now is under consideration. But before I do so, I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the very able chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for his unrelenting efforts and the tremendous amount of work he has devoted to the solution of one of our most complex problems, namely, that of bolstering the declining income of the Nation's farmers. Personally, I am very well aware of the long hours the Senator from Louisiana has devoted to the work of his committee, and I can assure him that I join a large host of colleagues in the Senate in expressing sincere thanks for his steadfast devotion to duty.

Mr. President, the feelings of appreciation for his efforts are not limited to those of us who are his associates. Residents of my home State have reported to me in instance after instance that the chairman of the committee made lasting impressions on those who attended the Senate Agriculture Committee hearings in Pendleton, Oreg., last October. Those who participated in those hearings had the highest praise for the chairman and for the manner in which he gave them a full and fair hearing in the truest sense of those terms.

Furthermore, Mr. President, before I turn to a discussion of the issues I wish to raise this afternoon, let me say that I desire to commend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] for the presentation he has just made in support of his amendment. On the basis of the argument he has made, I find myself in agreement with him; and I expect to support his amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator very much. I hope my amendment will be adopted. I cannot urge too often that we must make a start on this program. No program for industrial uses of farm products could be set in motion unless the Congress had an opportunity to act. I think the amendment should be included in the pending bill.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is a very important proposal. Let me say for the benefit of the Senator that when the agricultural hearings were held in Pendleton, Oreg., last fall, I conferred with a group of grain producers in my State who asked me to give consideration to greater industrial use, not only of wheat, but of other grains as well. I think there is a great deal of merit in the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

FALLING FARM INCOME—A PROBLEM OF NATIONAL CONCERN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, not only the Nation's farmers but also the American economy needs a farmer's farm bill. We have had the sad experience of drastic reductions in farm income which have followed in the wake of the administration's flexible price support program and its "do nothing" policy with respect to the American farmers' financial plight. To date the administration has given us a farm program that has hurt rather than helped our farmers. It is high time for Congress to enact a farmer's farm bill to correct this situation.

The administration's farm program has been a sequence of fatherly advice to the farmers, falling farm prices, and forecasts of good things to come. For example, in February 1953 Secretary of Agriculture Benson said:

> In the administration of this Department, the guiding purpose will be to strengthen the individual integrity, freedom, and the very moral fiber of each citizen.

These words of wisdom were followed by 3 years of severe declines in farm prices and farm income. Then, with an eye cast toward the month of November, 1956, the administration suddenly realized that the farmer is not a commodity, but a human being—a person of importance. This rude awakening called for an about-face. It necessitated promises of a rosy future. Thus, Secretary Benson, after consulting his clouded crystal ball, announced in Portland, Oreg., on February 2, 1956:

> A new buoyancy in the market place, a new hope, a new vigor and zest, can be anticipated * * * surely it should be reflected promptly in prices and incomes.

By this statement, the Secretary assured him of a niche in the Wilson-Dulles-McKay "foot-in-mouth" hall of fame.

In fact, he almost outdid a Republican of 1929, who was promising prosperity "just around the corner" before the country was thrown into the most devastating depression in all its history.

For several days, my colleagues in the Senate have supplied an abundance of statistics to demonstrate the seriously depressed state of farm prices and farm income. For that reason, I shall not go deeply into these figures, but shall confine myself to a few examples of farm price declines that have caused s many hardships for farmers in Oregon and elsewhere.

The latest figures available show that the parity ratio, as of February 15, 1956, was 81 percent. This makes grim reading for the farmers.

I checked into the situation relative to some of Oregon's principal cash crops because I wanted to find out what they were doing in the market place. An analysis showed that farmers in my State are not getting close to 90 percent of parity for their most important cash commodities.

As of February 15, 1956, cattle and calves were bringing 66 and 73 percent of parity, respectively.

I digress to say that about 3 weeks ago I sold prime-to-choice steers on the Baltimore market for 17½ cents. They cannot be fed for that amount. I lost at least 6 cents a pound on the cost of production of those steers. That is the plight of cattle raisers across the country; yet when we go into the market place and buy beef at retail, we find that the farmer is not getting his fair share of the cost of beef across the counter.

Wheat was bringing 82 percent of parity on the national average. Dairy products ranged from 79 percent of parity for butterfat to 87 percent for all wholesale milk. Turkeys were at 88 percent, hogs at 57 percent, sheep at 61 percent, and lambs at 76 percent of parity. Potatoes brought 83 percent, barley 69 percent, and oats 74 percent of parity, according to the February 15, 1956, figures.

With reference to the hog market, I speak with some practical knowledge of the sorry conditions which confront the farmer. Three weeks ago I sold hogs on the Baltimore market for 12½ cents. They cannot be fed for that price. On those hogs I lost at least 3 cents a pound on feed costs alone. That is typical of the situation across the country.

This year the farm producers of Iowa are receiving, in round numbers, 50 percent or less of what they received a year ago for hogs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from a Mr. Raymond, of Iowa. He is a man 79 years of age. His wife is 76. They are still operating their farm in Iowa. Their principal cash product is hogs. They set forth in that letter a very sad story of what has happened to them in the hog market in 1 year.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARRISON, IOWA, *December 22, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am Paul Raymond's father. I know you and he are great friends and in regard to this: I feel that you and I are friends too. So I am writing you not only as Senator but as a friend to friend.

Paul's mother and I while we are 74 and 79 years old respectively, are still on the farm (only 92 acres) actually engaged in farming doing almost all the work ourselves and enjoy it. We are in the best of health and try to keep some of our youthful spirits by church and other community activities. It seems to work well.

We received the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until Senator Gillette was defeated last year. It stopped coming when his term ended. I enjoyed reading it very much. The material was very informative and interesting and I surely miss it.

When the Agricultural Act was passed August 9, 1954. I followed the arguments in the Senate very closely and I wish to compliment you on the stand you took on that issue. You deserve the praise and support of all farmers, as I find on the questions of prices and economic equality for farmers

you have always fought for their interests. Many thanks.

I have always thought that flexible price supports were the wrong approach and time is proving and will prove this contention, I believe.

I know from experience that when farm prices are low the farmer in order to keep up his income so as to meet necessary expenditures must raise more products as price times products equals his income. Even if produced at the same cost.

The farmers of Iowa are very much distressed at the present time by the low prices being received for hogs and cattle, especially hogs.

We sold 117 head of hogs this fall around December 1 at an average of approximately 10 cents and they brought $2,920.63; if we had received the same price that we received 1 year earlier 18.5 cents, we would have received $5,343.72, a difference of $2,422.09. This difference added to the difference of those we still have makes quite a shrinkage for small farmers like us.

There are approximately 2,500 farm families in our county, Benton, and as we are small farmers I suspect the difference we sustained was about the average sustained by these 2,500 families and so would approximate about $7,500,000 on hogs alone in this county. Is it any wonder that farmers are distressed when 80 or 90 percent of our income is derived from livestock?

We were always of the opinion that if the basics were supported at 90 percent of parity this would take care of livestock prices, but present distressed prices prove the fallacy of such an opinion.

I am not fully informed as to what methods Secretary Benson could use in respect to the emergency now existing with hog prices cut in two.

Are there any laws or measures passed by Congress whereby he could relieve this situation?

If there is I wish you would give me this information.

A few days ago I wrote an article for our county paper, Cedar Valley Times, which I am enclosing. Of course I wouldn't expect a law in this regard. My point as you will know when you read the article was to get the idea across to our community that while a lot of industry and labor was on a war footing, people were expecting farm prices to be on a peace basis.

We spent the last two winters in Florida with Paul but will stay in Iowa this winter. We expected to buy a new car and drive to Florida this winter but with prices such as they are, this is out of the window.

I would be very glad to hear from you.

Your friend,

SAM RAYMOND.

FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS AND FLEXIBLE PROPAGANDA

Mr. MORSE. Secretary Benson and other Department of Agriculture spokesmen would have the American people believe that there has not been time enough since the passage of the administration's flexible support program on basic crops to really test the effects of the flexible support program. What Benson has failed to make clear to the American people is that ever since he has been Secretary of Agriculture he has had the discretionary power to impose reductions in price supports on many farm commodities, and he proceeded immediately to do just that, as the figures I am about to read will show.

In fact, since Benson has been Secretary of Agriculture, he has reduced price supports on commodity after commodity over which the Department of Agriculture has had jurisdiction, except for wool.

I offer these figures in further support of the argument I made on the floor of the Senate earlier this afternoon in rebuttal to the propaganda which Secretary Benson has been feeding the consumers of the country for a long time. He has been feeding them the false propaganda that he has not yet had the opportunity to place his flexible price-support program in operation. He started to put it into operation shortly after he took the oath of office. He proceeded at once to exercise the discretionary power he has over farm supports and prices by reducing the parity on farm commodity after farm commodity. He reduced the parity on every commodity over which he had jurisdiction, save and except wool. He did not do it on wool, because we passed a wool bill which stopped him.

In that wool bill we adopted the basic principle of the Brannan plan. Senators will recall that it was recommended by spokesmen for the administration, but it was not so long ago that they were telling us what an awful thing it would be for this country if the principle of the Brannan plan should ever be introduced in connection with agricultural legislation.

I wish to document my charge that Benson proceeded immediately after taking office to reduce farm prices by the exercise of his own discretionary powers as Secretary of Agriculture. The record shows that he reduced price supports on one farm commodity after another to the great detriment of our farm economy.

In February 1953 Benson announced that he would support dairy products at 90 percent, then permitted them to fall to an average of 83 percent for the year. In March and April 1953 he cut the Commodity Credit Corporation price on cottonseed meal—an important protein feed—from $80 to $57 per ton, weakening all feed prices. In October 1953 he cut supports for tung nuts from $63.38 to $54.96. During the same month he cut supports for barley from $1.24 to $1.15; in October he cut oats from 80 cents to 75 cents; grain sorghum from $2.43 to $2.28 per hundred; cottonseed from $54.20 to $54 per ton.

During 1954 Benson continued to use his discretionary power to destroy farm prices. In January he cut soybean supports from $2.56 to $2.22 per bushel. In February he cut butter supports from 67 cents to 56 cents per pound and manufacturing milk from $3.74 to $3.14. In March he cut dry edible beans from $7.79 to $7.24. In April he cut flaxseed from $3.79 to $3.14. In September he cut 1955-crop wheat from $2.24 to $2.08; in December 1954 he cut 1955-crop grain sorghum from $2.28 per hundredweight to $1.78; barley from $1.15 to 84 cents; oats from 75 cents to 65 cents per bushel; rye from $1.43 to $1.18; soybeans from $2.22 to $2.04 per bushel; and cottonseed from $54 to $46 a ton.

In 1955 he continued the discretionary slash of farm prices. What this means, Mr. President, is that he, more than anyone else, is responsible for the sorry condition in which the farmer finds his purchasing power at the farm gate. If I should say nothing else in my speech today, Mr. President, I would stress the fact that the problem which confronts the Senate in regard to the farm program is the problem of returning to the farm gates of America a decent purchasing power on the part of the farmers. If they do not have it today it is principally because of America's No. 1 economic enemy since this administration has been in office, namely, the Secretary of Agriculture, for whom the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, is 100 percent responsible. I place the responsibility right where it belongs, namely, on the porch of the White House itself.

I have given the record of this man in the Department of Agriculture. Yet we hear the Republican propaganda that the administration has not had a chance to put its flexible support program into operation. The sad thing is that they have put too much into operation. The farmer has suffered because of what they have done already with their collapsible support program.

What the farmers need today is relief from this sliding scale of the administration, and a return to a high purchasing power at the gates of the farms, so that the rest of the country's economy can be assured of a continued high level of purchasing power on the part of the other consumers of our Nation.

We cannot continue the present course for long. Oh, the administration can broadcast all the economic propaganda it wishes. However, this administration, or a Democratic administration, or any other group, cannot repeal the operation of economic laws. We cannot have millions of American farmers continuing to suffer declines in their purchasing power and at the same time have a high level of economic prosperity for all the other people of our country.

Earlier today we listened to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am happy to be a member under his able leadership, read the latest statistics showing what is happening to small business from the standpoint of skyrocketing bankruptcy figures.

We do not find prosperity on the main streets of America. Let anyone talk to the small-business men. Let anyone listen to small-business men testify before our committee. If he does, he will learn that the alleged prosperity of which the administration boasts is a very spotty prosperity, and is primarily a prosperity for the rich, not for the people of low income. The small-business men and the farmers, whose case we are pleading today, are now fighting a depression.

Mr. President, it is not pleasant to discuss a problem on the basis of the facts I am presenting. However, the Eisenhower administration cannot erase the facts. The facts are written indelibly into the economic history of our country, and they are having a devastating effect on the economic welfare of America's farmers.

As I pointed out, in 1953 and 1954 Benson continued to slash the prices. Let us take a look at what he did in 1955.

In 1955, Secretary Benson still continued to hack away at farm prices. He

cut price supports on corn from $1.62 to $1.58 in March; in April he cut the price of dried beans from $7.24 to $6.36; in May he cut the price of rice from $4.66 to $4.03; in June he cut the price support for the 1956 crop of wheat from $2.08 to $1.81; and in October he cut tung nuts from $54.90 to $51.06 per ton.

THE FARMER'S LOSS MEANS NO GAIN FOR THE CONSUMER

Lower farm prices have not resulted in lower food prices for the consumer.

While the farmer has been on a Benson toboggan without brakes, the consumer has continued to pay high prices for food. Yet this administration and its Secretary of Agriculture have attempted to justify the present farm program to city consumers by propaganda that rigid price supports were being paid by them. Later he directed this type of misleading propaganda against labor.

The farmer is receiving a declining share of the retail price of the consumer's food basket. That conclusion is based on USDA data. A more searching inquiry of the distribution of the consumer's dollar, directed by President Truman before he left office, was prohibited by a rider to an appropriation bill—by vote of the 83d Republican Congress.

I have here a table which is very instructive in showing what the Eisenhower administration has done to farmers and consumers. It shows price index figures taken from different pages of the report of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. The only change I have made is to put the several series next to each other so we can more easily see what has happened.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table entitled "Food and Farm Prices, 1952–55."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Food and farm prices, 1952–55

[1947–49=100]

	1952	1953	1954	1955
Consumer prices paid for food	115	113	113	111
Wholesale price of processed foods	109	105	105	102
Wholesale price of farm products	107	97	96	90
Prices received by farmers	106	95	92	88

	Percent
Change in consumer prices, 1952–55	3
Change in wholesale prices of processed food, 1952–55	6
Change in wholesale price of farm products, 1952–55	16
Change in prices received by farmers, 1952–55	17

Source: Economic Indicators, published by President's Council of Economic Advisors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these figures show several points that are very revealing as to what kind of administration we have in the executive branch.

Look at the bottom line in the table. Prices received by farmers have been shoved down by 17 percent from 1952 to 1955, annual averages. The farmers have been injured grievously.

Look at the top line. American consumers did not benefit from the treatment given to farmers. Retail prices of food have dropped only 3 percent. Look at the second line. The small-business men, grocers, and others who buy and sell processed foods, have not benefited. The drop in the wholesale prices of processed foods is down only 6 percent, only slightly more than retail prices.

Look at the third line. The small-business man and others who buy from the farmers and sell to processors, benefited very, very little from falling farm prices. The wholesale price of farm products, at which these brokers and buyers must sell to the processors, dropped 16 percent, almost as much as the prices received by farmers.

It was the food-processing industries, not the little ones, but the big monopolistic-type corporations, who benefited from the sliding-scale policies of the past 3 years. The prices at which processors buy farm commodities dropped by 16 percent. But the prices they charged to retail grocers dropped by 6 percent. This is an administration of the big gouge, and everywhere you look it is the big gouge for big industry.

It is no accident that dollar for dollar as farm income has fallen the past 3 years, corporation profits after taxes have increased. Here in the United States, in 1956, for the first time in any nation in the entire history of the world, dividends paid to a few corporation-stock holders are greater than the total farm net income of all the 5 million farm-operator families in the Nation.

Altogether the total cumulative cut in family income in the past 3 years has amounted to $8.6 billion. Even though farm operators have reduced their farm-production expenses by greater efficiency, going without, and other means, net farm income dropped from $14.9 billion in 1952 to $11 billion in 1956. And farm gross income dropped from $37.8 billion to $33.3 billion.

THE BENSON FARM EXODUS

Farm population as a percentage of the total population has declined from 16.6 million to 13.5 million. But this does not tell the whole story. The average age of the American farmer is almost 60 years. It is apparent that the Eisenhower policies are driving the farmers off the land.

Mr. President, this morning I had breakfast with about 15 persons from my State, including farmers and their wives, and they stressed the point which I have just made. They expressed great concern over what is happening to the young farmer, what is happening to the young veteran who came out of World War II and the Korean war, and who invested heavily in a modern farm, only to discover that with the falling farm prices he is either going to lose his farm or have to mortgage it for many years in the future; that the farm does not offer him the standard of living and the happiness in life he contemplated when he went on the farm.

These were older farmers, for the most part, the overwhelming majority of them being near the 60-year average which I have cited as a vital statistic. Their concern was not about themselves, but about their sons and daughters who they had hoped would carry on in the family tradition, on the farm. Those sons and daughters, as one mother said to me at breakfast this morning, have been brought up on 4–H and Future Farmer programs and had come to understand the great, happy horizons that farm life might offer them, only now to be disillusioned by a farm program which has produced this terrible decline in farm prices and in farm income.

One thing for which I am going to fight hard, Mr. President, is to see to it that there is left in this bill at least something which will provide immediate financial returns to those farmers. They need the relief now, not 2 or 3 years from now. I serve notice that I am not going to sit here and vote for any amendment or to strike from this bill anything which seeks to take away from the farmers who live on family farms, the relief they need through an increase in their purchasing power.

Several of the farmers spoke to me this morning concerning the soil bank. I am in favor of a soil bank, and I shall say something about it later in my speech. Several farmers said to me, "Senator, what will the soil bank do in the Willamette Valley in Oregon to meet the need for purchasing power now?"

The fact is that it would do very little, if anything, Mr. President. In Oregon we are dealing with diversified farming, and it is almost impossible to cite a product which can be grown in that particular climate that is not produced in the farm areas of the Willamette Valley—orchards, grain, grasses, livestock, poultry, and right down the gamut of diversified farming. But the farmers are confronted with the serious problem of declining prices for their products. They must have a farm bill, in my judgment, which will restore purchasing power to them. In my opinion, there is nothing in this bill which will be of substantial assistance immediately to the farmers, except the 90-percent-of-parity program. I do not intend to vote against it, because, Mr. President, I am not misled by the propaganda about surpluses, either. I happen to believe that the agricultural surpluses are among our greatest national assets.

THE BLESSINGS OF SURPLUSES

I believe it would be dangerous for America if we did not have the surpluses. I do not know how so many million Americans, off the farms and in the cities, can fall for the advertising propaganda—and that is what it has been—put out by a group of political advertisers, that these surpluses are something to be feared. They are a great asset. They are essential to our security. They are vital to the maintenance of a high standard of living in this country.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. President, we should watch out for the day when America does not have a surplus of food. Read history. Whenever a civilization reaches the break-even point of food supply it starts to stand still, and when it drops below a break-even food supply it begins to decay.

So, the consumers in the industrial areas of America, as I like to point out to

labor audiences as I talk to them across the country, should know that the wage scale is more dependent upon a surplus food supply in America than most people appreciate. The wage scale in America would soon toboggan if we did not have a surplus food supply.

Take a look at these surpluses. One might get the idea that they are so enormous that they are wrecking our economy, and, yet, for the 22 years we have had a support program we have produced, even during wartime, only a slight percentage over and above the food we have used. Mark my language. I said "used", not "needed." There is a great deal of difference.

As the Senator from North Dakota in his heroic utterances on the floor of the Senate has pointed out so many times, as has the Senator from Kansas, there is a great difference between the food we need and the food we use.

Mr. President, we boast of our Nation's high moral principles and practices in respect to seeing to it that not a person in this country goes hungry.

Until there is not a boy or girl in America who is undernourished, until there is not a needy fellow citizen in America who is eating below a standard of nutritious diet, until there is not in this great Nation of ours an aged person, domiciled in a charitable institution or in a place where he or she requires special care, who does not get the food needed to maintain a healthy body—not until then will the senior Senator from Oregon stop his fight for a greater use of our surplus food in accordance with the needs of the American people.

Not until we change the statistic which, I understand, shows that still less than half the schools of America supply a free lunch to the school children, will I stop my fight to expand the lunch program for America's school children. They happen to be our greatest wealth. They happen to be the greatest wealth we have because our wealth is in our people; our wealth is in our human beings.

I take the position, and my record is clear in this regard, that when we consider the enactment of legislation in the Senate, the guiding star ought to be the general-welfare clause of the Constitution. When I talk about expanding the school-lunch program, when I talk about using our present food surpluses to make certain that the needy aged are permitted to live out their lives in decency, with ample food of a nutritious nature, I am fighting for the general-welfare clause of the Constitution. I am keeping faith with the Constitutional Fathers who formed this Republic, and made clear at the time of its formation that its purpose was to promote the general welfare of the people through the processes of the economic and political freedom of choice of the individual citizen.

What we must do today is to take a legislative problem such as this and translate it into moral values. That is the function of statesmanship. We in the Senate have an opportunity to do that.

Yet there are in this country those who talk about the importance of a balanced budget as against human welfare. I say shame on them. I am not one who thinks a balanced budget should be substituted for the welfare of the people of my country. I happen to know also that if the budget should be unbalanced in order to protect and promote great moral values, there would result the strongest and most desirable balance our society and our Republic could enjoy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for his remarks. I thoroughly agree with him that our surplus foods constitute one of the best deterrents to war. The Senator from Oregon served on the Committee on Armed Services for a number of years. From his activities as a member of that committee, he knows that any nation, before it goes to war, certainly must determine whether it has the necessities of life, such as food.

Soviet Russia today is looking at us and especially at our surplus food. Soviet Russia knows approximately what surpluses we have. Does not the Senator from Oregon think that if Soviet Russia had all the surpluses we have, and if we had the meager amount which Russia now has, a different situation might exist in the world today?

Mr. MORSE. What the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out was also pointed out the other day by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], namely, that if Russia had our surpluses, she would be giving us an even worse licking on the economic front than we are getting in those areas of the world where the fight for freedom has to be won. Russia would not be making the mistake we are making of letting the people starve in those areas of the world which we should be bringing over to the side of freedom. Russia would not be letting corn rot in Government storage bins.

That practice cannot be justified in terms of history, and historians will not justify it. Historians will write a black page against our country because of our failure to use our surpluses of food in this generation to strengthen freedom in the nations of the world where stomachs are empty and will have to be filled before the people can be won over to the cause of freedom.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As the Senator from Oregon brought out a few moments ago, the surplus food is needed and can be used at home, especially in programs such as the school lunch program. Our surpluses are not being used to the fullest extent by a long shot.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the figures over a 22-year period run somewhere between 1.6 percent and 3.5 percent of overproduction beyond use each year. That is not much, especially when we have the job of changing the amount we have used into the amount we need, and making certain that all who need food get it.

We hear the charge made that if we stand for a stamp plan in the use of surplus food, we are some sort of creeping socialists. Of course, we become accustomed in the Senate, when we stand for the general welfare of the people, to being called creeping socialists, or worse. But I point out that the food stamp program is a pretty good private enterprise principle when it is put to work, because the food gets into the mouths of those who need it, and the grocer gets his money.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Oregon. As he knows, I am one of the coauthors of a bill which would put a food stamp plan into effect in the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I am pleased to be one of the cosponsors of the bill with the Senator from South Carolina.

The question of surpluses has been raised. Let me make an observation as to what we do with other surpluses. The poor farmer has been abused and kicked around and made the victim of much political advertising because of the food surpluses. The farm surplus is slight, and the cost of taking care of the farm surpluses is slight compared with what is spent in the form of the American people's tax dollars to take care of other surpluses.

Before I name some of the other surpluses, let the RECORD show again, as has been stated before in the debate, what the net cost of the support program has been to the farmers of the country for 22 years.

As the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] knows, because I have heard him use this figure in his remarks, the total net cost for 22 years has been $2.3 billion; that is all. The cost has been less than $1 a person a year. As I have said on other occasions, that is a pretty cheap insurance premium to pay for the high purchasing power of the American farmers, who have been ringing the cash registers frequently on the Main Streets of America.

That is why, when I talk to the chambers of commerce throughout the country, I say to them, politely and respectfully, "What is the matter with you businessmen? Do you not see a direct relationship between the tingling of your cash registers and the purchasing power of the farmers in this area of your State?"

Too many businessmen have fallen for the political buncombe of the opponents of a rigid-support program, who are trying to convince them that it will lead to some sort of national bankruptcy.

Let us consider what we do with other surpluses. What do we do when there is a surplus of labor? That is all unemployment is. Unemployment is a surplus of labor, so far as the needs of the economy are concerned at the time the unemployment occurs. Do we say, "It is too bad. Just let the law of supply and demand operate"?

There was a time in the earlier days of our country when exploiters were in complete control of our Government, when that was the labor policy of America.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. A moment ago the Senator was talking about the income of farmers. According to the Department

of Agriculture, the farmers last year, after taking a deduction of 4 percent interest on their investments, earned an average of 71 cents an hour. The Department yesterday revealed that farm income had dropped another billion dollars. So I think it is a safe guess that farm income in the next year will be considerably below 70 cents an hour. That will make farmers second-class citizens of the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Second-class citizens is a pretty high economic rating for them. With that kind of farm income, I think the present farm program has put them down to third class or below. I hold in my hand the latest release by the Department of Agriculture, dated March 6. It says:

> Farmers' realized net income in 1955 is now estimated at $10.8 billion, down a billion dollars or 9 percent from 1954, on the basis of more complete information on farm marketings and farm production costs last year. The decline was due to lower average prices of farm products accompanied by a slight increase in farm expenses.
>
> The value of changes in crop and livestock inventories is included, the decline in net income from 1954 to 1955 was $1.3 billion, or 11 percent. Farmers as a whole built up their inventories in both years, but the increase was smaller in 1955 than in 1954.

Now, I call this to the attention of the Senator from North Dakota:

> Net income after the adjustment for inventory change was $11 billion in 1955. Adding farm wages of $2 billion and $6 billion of income from nonfarm sources gives $19 billion as the total income of the farm population.

But that includes wages the farmer gets if he works in the neighboring sawmill, or wages he receives on his part-time job at the neighboring creamery, or wages he receives from any other part-time job.

I read further:

> This was 5 percent below 1954. With the farm population increasing 1 percent, per capita income declined 6 percent to $860. Per capita income of the nonfarm population increased almost 5 percent.

But what figures are we talking about? We are talking about figures below $1,000 a year. When there occurs, for a short period of time, a little increase in per capita income, the Department of Agriculture headlines that fact, but it forgets it is telling the people about net incomes of less than $1,000 a year.

It is a terrible thing. It spawns second-class citizenship. In my judgment, we cannot call such a citizen even a second-class citizen if his net income is less than $1,000 and he is willing to work as the farmers of this country are willing to work and do work.

Let us get back to the question of labor surplus. What do we do when we have a labor surplus, represented by unemployment? We see to it—and we ought to see to it—that there is unemployment compensation provided. And the great effort today—and it is entirely proper—is to increase the amount of such unemployment compensation and provide for an extension of unemployment compensation coverage. That is what we do when we have a labor surplus.

Let us look at the question of the great industrial surplus in America today. There is unbounded prosperity on the part of some companies, and on the part of some powerful companies in America, which are producing defense materials. But what would happen if we would jerk the rug out from under them and stop having defense materials produced?

From the standpoint of civilian production, Mr. President, large military production is surplus production. Certainly, we need it for defense, and that is why WAYNE MORSE, on the floor of the Senate, has not voted yet, and does not intend to in the immediate future, for reduction in defense appropriations. He is cognizant of the dangers that will confront free men in the decades ahead. He does not believe the Russian objectives have changed merely because their tactics have changed from military to economic. I happen to believe Russia still plans to try to override and rule the world. But the fact remains that when we undertake an analysis of our economy today, we learn it is not a civilian economy. It is a mixed defense and civilian economy, and the production of war goods really is surplus to our civilian economy.

If one could turn a switch here this afternoon and shut off the production of war goods, what kind of legislation would we have on the floor of the Senate seeking to come to the assistance of the civilian economy? We would have tax writeoffs. We would have tax amortization schemes. We would have one proposal after another for American industry. We should have them, and no Member of the Senate is ever going to work any harder than I will work to keep American industry strong. It is a part of our general welfare objectives.

I cite that example because we know that some industrial and business leaders are crying to high heaven about farm surpluses, forgetting that the great income they are receiving because of war production is in itself a farm of industrial surplus.

What does that illustrate? I think it illustrates a great economic fact, namely, that is we are all in the same boat. Farmers, businessmen, workers, teachers, professional men, consumers all and producers all, are in this economic boat together. If we punch a hole in the bow or punch a hole in the stern, or start weakening the boat in any way, we had better watch out or we shall all drown economically in a pool of economic depression.

Figures of speech are dangerous in debate, because they can be applied only to a limited extent. Arguments by analogy in debate are dangerous because, after all, their application is restricted.

I use that figure of speech to stress something which I do not think has been stressed sufficiently in the debate on the farm bill, and that is that all of us are in the same economic boat, and we can not afford, from the standpoint of the standard of living of all of us, to let the low purchasing power of the American farmer continue to decline. That is why I take that position. There is nothing inconsistent about it. I have taken the same position when, on the floor of the Senate, I have fought for legislation to benefit labor under the general welfare philosophy. I have taken the same position when I have fought for workmen's compensation legislation. I have taken the same position when I have fought for legislation which seeks to keep for industry its legitimate economic rights. We can not follow a discriminatory policy by which only some are going to be the favored few. We must protect the best interests of that group in the long run. Even though a certain group may have a plush period, even velvet wears, and what is more shabby than worn velvet?

Many of the big interests in America today are wearing velvet, but many farmers are wearing rags, and it is about time we did something to raise their standard of living and see that they can clothe themselves properly, economically. When I use that figure of speech I do not limit it to the raiment of the body.

Mr. President, a few moments ago, before the interruptions, which are appreciated, I was talking about what is happening to the farm population of America. What is happening to the farm population of America?

According to the Bureau of the Census, between 1950 and 1954 industrialized farms increased 26 percent, and the number of small-sized farms declined by 11 percent. This trend is not unwelcome to the administration. Here is what Secretary Benson said in Portland, Oreg., just recently:

> In the long run, the continued downtrend of our farm population and the strong uptrend of our whole population will contribute to larger per capita incomes of our farmers.

If that was intended to reassure the farmers of my section of the country, let me say it put them deeper in the doldrums.

Despite the downward spiral of farm income, farm-land values are going up.

In a recent briefing by that staff before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the Reserve Board economists were asked to explain this apparently contradictory development. They explained that corporate farm operators were anxious to expand their holdings and hence were offering high land prices to smaller farmers. This is an unwholesome trend.

It supports the oft-repeated statement that Benson is culling farmers.

This elimination of small farms and the growth of corporate farms is regrettable. Some argue that corporate farms are more efficient. That is the same argument advanced for the Soviet-style collective farms. Both are equally soulless and destructive of individualism.

A PROGRAM FOR FARMERS AND CONSUMERS

It is apparent to me, and undoubtedly is apparent to all other Members of the Senate, that the national self-interest will be served if future food supplies are safeguarded for a rapidly growing population. The only way to safeguard our food supply is to move rapidly to increase farm income. The only solution of the problem of farm income is to repeal the sliding scale, and to substitute for it a full, adequate level of farm-income protection and price supports.

In my view it is idle to think that this administration will do anything to serve the best interests of the farmers, even though given authority to do so by the

Congress. The only available remedy at this time is to enact specific, mandatory legislation which will require Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower to maintain the return on all the basic farm commodities at 90 percent of a fair parity price. Many commodities not now classified as basic farm commodities should be considered as such.

Mr. President, at this point let me say, in regard to the question of farm population, that we had better relate it to the population trends in the entire country, because the population trends in the United States are dramatic. The rate at which our population is increasing is astounding. The population experts point out that they see no reason for a decline in the population increase rate. And it is related to surplus food. Of course, I happen to believe that if we would make proper use of our surplus food, today, both domestically and in connection with foreign policy, we would not have any quantity worth talking about in Government bins.

But I wish to emphasize the point I made earlier, namely, that our entire civilization is dependent in a very real sense on surplus food. I have said before, and I desire to repeat now, that when we study history, we find that civilization after civilization became decadent when it failed to produce a surplus food supply. China of ancient times was the greatest civilization on the face of the earth, but it was a surplus food nation. It was not a deforested China; it was not an eroded China; it was not a China with thousands and thousands and thousands of square miles of land without topsoil. It was a China that produced more food than its people could eat, and it was a China of great civilization—as great for its time as we are for ours, comparatively speaking.

Similarly, we might refer to Persia, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, or the Roman Empire. We can go on down the casualty list of fallen civilizations; and what do we find? We find that they fell when they failed to produce surplus food.

One of the great duties of statesmanship, I respectfully submit, is to raise our sights, so as to see into the future, decades ahead. We do not have to look very far into the future, insofar as our country is concerned, and in connection with the population problem, to see what is going to happen in 20 years; 1976 is only 20 years away. We should examine the population trends in America.

There is a statistic which I like to use in that connection, and I do not think it can be repeated too frequently, in order to illustrate to the American people why we, as Senators, have an obligation of statesmanship in 1956, in connection with our consideration of a farm bill, to think about American boys and girls in 1976.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to remind the Senator from Oregon that for the past 20 years we have reduced our horse and mule population from approximately 19 million head to something less than 5 million head at the present time. That decrease has released approximately 43 million acres of land for the production of food for human consumption, whereas we used to use that land to produce feed for horses and mules. Without that additional 43 million acres, today we would actually have a shortage of food.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. In addition, we are losing approximately 1 million acres of land a year because of bad soil practices, erosion, the construction of additional military installations, the expansion of cities, and so forth.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from North Dakota is entirely correct; and I appreciate the contribution he has made to my speech, by his reference to what is happening to us because of our failure to operate a soil-conservation program and a flood-control program—and all in the name of a balanced budget, although such projects will return to the Treasury of the United States many times their cost.

For instance, let us consider the situation in Oregon—to say nothing of what has been happening in the East, and, in particular, in North Carolina, as well as in some of the other eastern areas. Let us consider the situation in my State of Oregon as a result of the failure to build great dams for flood control—dams which are needed. Great expanses of rich topsoil by the thousands of tons have been washed into our rivers, never to be replaced, but gone forever, although there is no question that the building of the needed flood-control dams would not only have prevented the loss of that land, but would also have prevented floods. I can take any of my colleagues to my State and can show them areas where farms are protected by dams which already have been constructed; and then I can take them a few miles farther, and can show them where farms have been washed away because of our failure to provide appropriations for the building of such dams.

Such dams are nonpartisan projects, Mr. President. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is a great Republican, and I know no one who has stood more firmly shoulder to shoulder with us in urging that these dams be built. This is a nonpartisan proposition. I say we cannot justify on the basis of dollars and cents the penny-wise, pound-foolish policy which has been followed by the Congress in connection with flood control; and the Senator from North Dakota is correct in the statement he has made in regard to what has happened to us as a result of the loss of fertile land because of erosion and floods.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish to express my appreciation of the kind remarks of the Senator from Oregon.

Let me say that it has always seemed to me that the propaganda that high price supports are responsible for our agricultural surpluses is very silly. I have yet to know of a case where a Member of Congress who made the claim that high price supports are responsible for our surpluses could substantiate it by statistics. If we study all the statistics in regard to agriculture, we find more often than not that when prices declined, production rose. Certainly that is true of the situation since 1951.

Since then, we have had a price decline of approximately 28 percent; and, in addition, we have had flexible price supports in operation for 1 year and longer for dairy products. Despite that drastic drop in prices, last year—1955—witnessed the greatest agricultural production in the history of the United States. That, alone, proves the fallacy of the argument that 90 percent supports are responsible for all of the surpluses.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from North Dakota is correct.

I wish to say that, year after year, the Senator from North Dakota has been fighting for greater use of our surplus foods, in keeping with the needs of those in the United States who are not getting enough food, and who could use it very well, indeed. That is what I am fighting for; and I think we should make use of that situation in the interest of many values, including, for example, the value of national health, which happens to be a great national asset.

If I were to ask the Senator from North Dakota to put a dollar sign on such a program, he would have to reply, "A price cannot be put on it." If I were to submit to him the hypothetical question, "How much would we in the Congress be willing to pay, by way of appropriations, for a program which it could be demonstrated would raise the standard of health of the American people, as a population, by 10 percent," the answer would have to be, "It is impossible to put a dollar value on it." That fact shows what happens when we engage in such a program. When we look at it from the standpoint of a cold problem, we recognize immediately that we ought to do it.

I point out that if we used our surplus food in accordance with the needs of our people who are not now getting the food they need, it would have a tremendous effect on the standard of health in America.

I happen to be one who is satisfied with the testimony I have heard since I have been in the Senate, to the effect that a universal school-lunch program in America, instead of a program which reaches less than half of our schools, would have a tremendous effect in improving the health of the oncoming generation of American boys and girls.

What are we waiting for? Is poor old Uncle Sam "busted"? Is the poor old fellow in such a position that we must weep crocodile tears over him while corporations make enormous profits after taxes, ranging from 30 to 110 percent in some instances?

What has happened to our social values? What has happened to our sense of public decency? We hesitate on a farm program which seeks to assure us a surplus of food, and seeks to implement the use of that food by getting it into the

mouths of American boys and girls who need it.

Critics will say, "What he talks about is theoretical, and idealistic. He is not practical." I have just proposed what I think is one of the most practical programs the Congress of the United States could adopt. Also it is an ideal put to work. That is all practicality ever can be. In my opinion we, as Senators, cannot morally justify the failure to put that kind of program to work—not if we have a conscience. I also think that imbedded in the problem before us today is a problem of national conscience. I will never put the dollar sign ahead of my Nation's obligations to conscience.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I commend the Senator for a great fighting speech on behalf of the farmers of Oregon, as well as the farmers of this Nation. It was a pleasure to attend many of the agricultural hearings held last fall. We visited practically all parts of the Nation. I found that everywhere farmers were dissatisfied with the present farm program, particularly the flexible price supports. In the great State of Oregon, at Pendleton, we found as much dissatisfaction among farmers as we found in any other place. We found the same thing everywhere. It disturbs me to have Senators and others purporting to represent farm sentiment to say, "We want this," or "We want that." Obviously those people do not go out and talk with farmers themselves. Otherwise they would never make so many foolish statements.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. The contribution which the Senator from North Dakota made to our discussion at Pendleton is still being talked about. As I talk with our wheat growers, dairymen, and fruit growers who testified at that hearing, I learn that the assistance which the Senator from North Dakota rendered, the questions he asked, and the comments he made, were very much appreciated. I thank him very much.

The Senator from North Dakota kindly referred to my position on the farm issue. As he knows very well, since he and I first came to the Senate no farm issue has ever arisen in the Senate upon which I did not consult him before reaching a final conclusion. The Senator from North Dakota, along with three other Members of this body, are, in my judgment, our farm experts.

No one needs to praise the record of the Senator from North Dakota. It speaks for itself. It is a great record in support of the best interests, not only of the farmers, but of a sound national economy, because when one fights for a sound farm economy, he fights for a sound national economy. I appreciate the remarks which the Senator has made. Let me say good naturedly—because the Senator is held in such high esteem in my State—that I am delighted to be able to point to the record he has made.

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to have the Senator point to my record.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was about to refer to what the Library of Congress has given me as a statistic on the trend of America's population in the next 20 years. By 1976 the population of this country will have increased by a number equal to the number of people at present living in the following Western States: Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Arizona, Nevada, Colorado, Missouri, and the great State of Texas.

That is a great many people. What does that mean? It means that in 20 years we will have increased our national population by a number equal to the number of people now living in practically the entire West.

We talk about surplus food, and about greatly reducing the number of farm families. What should we, as Senators, be doing in the year 1956? We ought to be looking into the question of what the facts are going to be in 1976, with respect to the food supply of America. No one wants to believe it now; no one seems to want to think that far ahead, but I say that if we do not watch out, by the year 2000 we shall not have enough food in this country to feed our population. We shall not have enough food if we do not adopt sound farm legislation in our generation which will guarantee to future generations of American boys and girls a continuation of an abundance of food.

Theory? I am talking about a hard, cold fact, Mr. President. We had better come to grips with it. We shall not come to grips with it if we support a farm program which will make farming unprofitable, which will drive young veterans off the farms, as they are leaving the farms today, by the thousands. We shall not have enough food in the future if we discourage the 4–H Future Farmer boys.

I do not have to rely on my farming activities for a living, but it so happens that at the present time I am showing a herd of cattle at Baton Rouge, La. I have in charge of that herd a young boy 19 years of age, a Future Farmer boy from Poolesville, Md. He is exceedingly able and competent. He will become a great farmer and a great farm manager. But he is discouraged because, as he talks with other young men engaged in farming activities or in preparation for farm life, he is disturbed. So when I flew to Baton Rouge over the weekend to help him show those cattle, he talked with me as to whether or not he should consider the advisability of preparing himself for another mode of living.

We need such young men in farming. We need that type of trained farmer. Here is a young, scientific farmer, but he is discouraged. I say that the people of the United States have a stake in seeing to it that we do not follow a farm program which discourages and drives off the farms young men such as the one I have just described. They are filled with discouragement these days. When we make the fight for a restoration of the purchasing power of the American farmer, we are not only fighting for the oncoming generation of American farmers, but we are also fighting for the best economic welfare of oncoming generations of all Americans.

I close this segment of my speech by saying we should take a look at the hard, cold facts about population. We cannot justify a flexible support program, leading to discouragement, leading to an exodus from the farms, and undercutting the purchasing power of the American farmer, which, if undercut sufficiently, will bring down the purchasing power of all the rest of us.

I was talking about the need for a return to high purchasing power as represented by a 90-percent-of-parity program. There should not be discrimination between crops. Some may not be adapted to a fixed support program. But aid can and should be rendered by vigorous purchase programs to bolster farm income and provide more adequate diets to millions of our citizens who are in need.

We are living in an age of plenty. We should not, and we need not, allow a condition to continue wherever 6 million families and 2 million individuals, unattached to a family, are unable because of lack of income to buy all the food they need for good nutrition or enough fiber products for an adequate standard of well-being.

To remedy this situation and to augment the money demand for farm commodities, the Senator from Oregon strongly urges the adoption of the following direct-action consumption-expanding programs:

Adoption of a nationwide food-allotment-stamp plan along the lines of a pending amendment to S. 3183.

Extension to all schools of the national school-lunch program, now serving less than one-third of the schools, and doubling of the average Federal contribution per pupil per day.

Improvement and expansion of the fluid milk for school children program to provide free with Federal financing at least two half pints of milk per child per day.

Adequate nutrition standards for the Armed Forces and veterans' hospitals, penal institutions, hospitals, and other public and private nonprofit agencies by means of commodity donation or food grants.

UNEMPLOYMENT HURTS FARMERS

The population is growing at the rate of almost 2 million people a year, but farm product consumption and industrial employment are not growing at the same rate. The administration has boasted of the fact that some 64 million people are employed—a new record they say. The plain fact is that employment has not increased in anything like the proportion of population increase.

For example, in 1952 unemployment was 2.5 percent of the labor force. In November and December of 1955—usually high employment periods nationally because of Christmas employment—the administration estimated unemployment at 3.6 percent. Nor do those figures give the full picture because this administration has consistently underestimated actual unemployment.

Wage earners are the principal consumers of farm products. Additional net income of factory workers, and white collar workers goes primarily into purchases of necessities. It stands to rea-

son that families with an income of over $7,500 or $10,000 a year will not use extra income to buy food—they do not have the need. But lower income families need more food and a better balanced diet than they now have. When they earn more and keep more money after taxes, they buy more food.

There has been an enormous increase between 1929 and 1953 of the percent of income spent for food by families earning between $4,000 and $7,500 a year. There is the same dramatic increase in percent purchases of food by lower income families between 1941 and 1953. So, for example, families earning below $2,000—in constant 1953 prices—increased food purchases in those 12 years from 46 percent to 59.4 percent.

I wish to stress for the RECORD that the statistics I am using in this analysis of the purchase of food are based upon constant 1953 prices.

BIG BUSINESS FAVORITISM HURTS CONSUMER PURCHASING POWER

Since 1953 the policies of the administration have favored upper income groups. Large corporations have increased their profits enormously. Small corporations have suffered decreases in profits and small business failures have increased. Wages have risen, but only slightly.

During the 1953–54 recession profits after taxes of large manufacturing corporations rose 8 percent.

What is important is not the increase in the hourly wage, but the increase in the take-home wage. What has happened in the past few years is that overtime has been greatly decreased. There has been some increase in the hourly wage, but not a substantial increase in the take-home pay. There has been some increase, but not a commensurate one compared to the profits after taxes received by the industries in which the workers labor.

As I said, during the 1953–54 recession, profits after taxes of large manufacturing corporations rose 8 percent. They did not go down during the recession. This was during the period when manufacturing unemployment frequently increased at a rate of 100,000 a month. In other words, unemployment increased, but the income for the corporations during that period of recession rose 8 percent after taxes.

Despite the 1953–54 economic recession, the net income after taxes of manufacturing corporations with assets of more than $100 million rose from $6.1 billion in 1952 to almost $6.9 billion in 1953, and to $7.4 billion in 1954. During the same years, the next income after taxes of manufacturing corporations with assets between a quarter of a million dollars and a million dollars declined steadily from $479 million in 1952 to $400 million in 1954. During that recession period stock prices increased 19 percent and dividends 5 percent. In 1954, banks lent less money, but made greater profits because of the high interest rate policies of the administration. Farm income was down 3 percent.

Since that time the gap and contrast have become even greater. In 1954 corporate profits after taxes were $17 billion. In the third quarter of 1955, corporate profits after taxes were at the rate of $22.2 billion. Corporate stock prices rose from an index figure of 229 in 1954 to an index figure of 335 in the last week of December 1955.

From 1954 to the third quarter of 1955—the latest figures available to me—farm income declined $2 billion.

What did the administration do during the 1953–54 recession? It resisted decreases in excise taxes, which are nothing more than national sales taxes. Let us not "kid" ourselves about what they are. They are regressive national sales taxes.

In Congress, we were successful in reducing a few taxes, but it took a lot of hard work and I am proud that I was one who joined in that battle on the side of those who sought to reduce excises.

While fighting decreases in national sales taxes, which sales taxes hurt consumers and discourage buying, the administration was also fighting modest increases in the personal and dependency exemption which would have increased food purchasing power for low-income groups. It also fought and defeated a $20 tax credit for individuals.

I wish to say to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that when the administration fought him on his tax proposals, it fought the farmers of America. The administration fought the farmers of America when it fought the Senator from Georgia, because it fought tax exemptions, proposed by the Senator from Georgia, which would have resulted in the consumers of America buying more food from the farmers of America.

The trouble with the political propagandists is that they feel the American people will not move from the major premise to the minor premise to the conclusion of the syllogism. They insult the intelligence of the American people by presuming that the American people will not think through the premises.

Let me point out that the opposition of the administration to a reduction of excise taxes and to the proposals of the Senator from Georgia with regard to the tax exemptions constituted opposition to the best interests of the farmers of America, because the tax saving for which the Senator from Georgia so heroically fought would have gone, in large measure, into food purchases, and thereby helped to increase the purchasing power of the farmer. In my judgment, it would have had a beneficial effect on prices, and the farmer would have been able to get some increase in his income.

What the administration did was to put across a multibillion—yes, billion—tax-cut bill for large corporations, stockholders, and large estates.

One tax amendment I fought was one which sought to change the rules on depreciation. That amendment, which unfortunately was agreed to, is estimated to cost the United States Treasury $19 billion in the first 17 years of operation. Randolph Paul, a great student of taxes—who died while testifying before a congressional committee—pointed out that under the new depreciation scheme large corporations would be the principal beneficiaries, and would permanently avoid millions of dollars of corporate income taxes.

Stockholders were given generous tax cuts. Bear in mind that only about 8 percent of our people own stock, and the lion's share is in the hands of a tiny percentage of the people.

What did this administration tax bill mean to farmers? I want the farmers of America not to forget that in the historic campaign which is about to get under way this administration, in my judgment, will go about the country making the same sort of promises it has always made. What I wish the farmers to do is to read right into the teeth of the spokesmen of the administration this sorry record of taxes since it has been in office. This is what the tax bill of this administration has done to cheat the American farmers out of the decent standard of living to which they are entitled.

This meant that cash was put into the pockets of upper-income earners, who do not proportionately increase purchases for necessities with their tax savings. It meant that low- and middle-income families did not get tax relief, did not get needed cash in their pockets. If they had been granted tax relief, a great deal of it would have gone into food purchases.

SMALL BUSINESS HURT BY SAME POLICIES

When I talk to small-business men at their meetings, and when they come before our committee, I sometimes josh them about their tendency to think they are big capitalists and stand somewhat on the same economic footing with General Motors, United States Steel, and other great monopolistic combines. I say, "Do you know where your interest really lies? It is to be found with the farmers and the workers, the teachers and the professional people, and with the great bulk of consumers."

Many of them went along with the tax giveaway to big business during the historical tax fight in the early days of this administration.

The merchants on Main Street suffer from the loss of farm family purchasing power. Business people in farm communities are directly dependent upon their farm neighbors for sales. They are caught in the same economic pinch as the farmer and that pinch is felt first by small-business men in farm communities. This is a vicious circle because for many farm products the best market is the nearest market and loss of income in nearby towns and cities reduced local purchases of produce.

The farm market for consumer products has a long way to go before it catches up with the conveniences that are standard in city homes. The yet untapped market for consumer goods on the farms is huge. That market will remain untapped until farm family purchasing power is restored.

Only 78 percent of farm families have electric lights compared to 99 percent of nonfarm families. Only 43 percent of farm families have running water, compared to a nonfarm percentage of 96 percent. Inside flush toilets 28 percent to 93 percent; telephones 38 percent to 82 percent; inside tub or shower 30 percent compared to 89 percent; 55 percent

of farm wives have kitchen sinks, 95 percent of other wives have sinks.

Industry also suffers when farm purchasing power suffers because it is losing one of the largest sources of sales for its products.

Let me quote from a speech by the president of Inland Steel. On December 3, 1954, Clarence Randall said:

> You remember the prosperity the farmer had shortly after the war? That prosperity was transferred to the agricultural implement companies. Some of you here tonight wish you had that prosperity back. It was transferred to the steel companies from the implement companies. The farmer was buying every piece of equipment he had ever heard of.
>
> * * * What would happen to the businesses represented in this room if the farmer were cut back 12 percent? We would have hard work to get together for this meeting because it is from that 12 percent that the farmer buys our products.

During the past 2 years farm income has gone down drastically, as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] just pointed out. With it the percentage of farm income spent for capital goods like tractors has also declined. Farmers are probably the largest mass purchasers of petroleum products, and many other mass produced goods.

No economy can long stand the strain of falling purchases of manufactured goods by a large segment of the population.

Industry is losing income it needs when farm purchasing power is weakened. The big corporations need earnings before they can save on taxes. The tax handouts will last only so long.

Unemployment grows as a result of loss of farm purchasing power. A direct result is loss of sales and loss of revenue in the service trades in the cities. This leads in turn to curtailed food buying in the cities—and the vicious cycle feeds upon itself.

Despite the claims of high employment, unemployment during the last 3 years nationally has been too high. During "good" periods it has consistently remained at over 2 million, and frequently exceeded 5 million. At the end of 1955, the unemployed numbered at least 3.6 percent of those seeking work.

Those unemployed are more than a statistic—they are millions of human beings who need work and want to work. No effort should be spared to stimulate the economy so that they can lead productive lives and provide their families with the necessities and decencies of existence.

Their unemployment is a drag upon the economy because they do not have purchasing power and many require community assistance.

The free enterprise system is capable of providing them with work and maintaining their purchasing power in the interest of all other groups in the economy.

However complacent some may be about national figures, there is no excuse for complacency about Oregon employment.

Every winter our State experiences high unemployment. If the weather is severe our unemployment is very bad. If it is relatively mild, unemployment is fairly bad. But, either way—it is bad. The figures show Oregon unemployment is among the highest in the country in winter—and usually we have the highest or second or third highest rate of joblessness. For the week ending January 21, the Oregon rate of unemployment was the highest in the country—9.6 percent of covered employment. This is a distinction we could well do without. We need and can have and should have an economy that is better balanced and not so heavily dependent upon seasonal industry.

NEEDED: A FARM PROGRAM FOR A BALANCED GROWING ECONOMY

Just as we need to adopt programs to expand purchasing power of American consumers so that they may buy all of the food and fiber they need for adequate standards, we also need to make maximum use of the abundance of which American family farmers are so efficiently capable of producing to back up and buttress an intelligent foreign economic policy and a foreign policy that will lead the world to ultimate permanent peace with honor, and expanded democratic free governments.

Many United States produced farm commodities, up to 10 percent of total production, must in normal years find a market outside our national boundaries. This market can and should be expanded. Additional agricultural attachés and improved advertising and merchandising will help some. But just as in the case of domestic market, the really big increases in market demand for United States produced farm commodities can come only from increased purchasing power in foreign countries, or from United States Government purchases designed for foreign shipment. This total can be raised from the current annual export sales of $2½ billion to at least $4 billion by the combined and coordinated use by our Nation of certain measures. We shall be protecting our farmers at the same time, by intelligent methods, rather than restricting ones, against the ill effects of imports that compete with United States farm products. To do this the Senator from Oregon has proposed and continues to urge the adoption of measures such as the following:

Negotiation and establishment of additional international commodity agreements, such as the International Wheat Agreement, for all raw materials that enter importantly into international trade, which will bring into agreement all of the importing nations as well as all of the exporting nations for each commodity.

Negotiation and establishment of an international food and raw materials reserve or clearing house, to stabilize supplies, relieve famines, and stabilize prices of all food and other raw material commodities that enter importantly in international trade.

Expand the authorizations of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act to provide for $1.3 billion per year of donations and sales for soft currencies of United States farm commodities instead of the $600 million per year now authorized, and expand the purposes for which donated commodities and loans of soft currency may be used to include establishment and operation of systems of universal free general and vocational education in nations of the free world, where such do not now exist.

Continuation and intelligent expansion of the Point 4 program of United States aid to economic development of other free nations in a way that will increase coordinated economic growth of the nations of the free world without imperiling markets for American agriculture.

Continuation of the reciprocal trade agreements providing for worldwide tariff reductions and customs simplification.

Inauguration of full parity compensatory domestic income deficiency payments as primary reliance in supporting farmers' returns on farm commodities that are imported or exported as part of a nationwide program of trade adjustment aids to United States industries, communities, workers, and farmers injured by tariff reductions and elimination of import quotas.

Vastly increased domestic consumer and export demand for United States farm commodities would be insured by adoption of the programs mentioned in my remarks earlier.

In combination with the domestic consumption-expansion programs, these special export programs would mean for the foreseeable future that demand for farm products and expanding full employment economy would be sufficient to absorb full farm production at prices approximating 90 or 100 percent of parity, although some would constantly be in danger of falling below parity in the absence of a support program.

WINNING THE PEACE WITH FOOD

I may say that I intend to continue to urge, as I have been urging for many years on the floor of the Senate, and also as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that the United States proceed to enter into international economic treaties with governments in the backward areas of the world, where there is need for food. I happen to believe that one of the greatest weapons we have for winning the peace is American food. I happen to believe that our greatest export need is the exportation of economic freedom—and we call it enlightened capitalism.

What we need to do in the decades ahead is to export American investments into the backward areas, to help build up their economic productive power, so that they can enjoy a decent standard of living. With a decent standard of living maintained, communism cannot make any headway in the backward areas of the world.

To implement my theory, as some call it—to put into practice the ideal I urge as a great instrumentality of business as a part of our foreign policy program—I happen to believe that the people will have to stand back of the American investors in the areas of the world where the investments are needed. I care not what country be named, whether it be India, Burma, Indonesia, Indochina, or some South American country that needs help or relief—the fight for freedom must be won.

I say the greatest weapon we have against Russia is the proved ability of capitalism to give to the people a decent standard of living. We shall have to export capitalism. The backward countries of the world do not have a capitalistic system; most of them have a feudal system. They need factories, they need roads, they need power facilities, they need great production producing agencies of a capitalistic order.

Why are we not making those investments? There are many reasons. Some of our investors say, "We cannot take a chance. If we go into those countries, our investments are likely to be confiscated or nationalized. In our own country, we know that our Government is behind us and will back us up."

Mr. President, my colleagues have heard me say this before, but I want to say it again in this speech: What we need to do is to change our foreign economic policy of the flag following the dollar, to a policy under which the dollar will follow the flag. What a difference. What a difference between dollar diplomacy and a policy under which the countries in which we will make investments will become our friends. It is the difference between the economic exploitation of weaker peoples and the building up of the economic productive power of weaker peoples.

Of course, the American investors should make a fair profit. But if the Government will back them up, on the basis of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation principle, under which the Government backs up the depositors in the banks, so that they will know they will be backed up, and that the people of the United States will make them economically whole in case there is confiscation—and I think such treaties should provide that in case of a violation by a country in which an investment is made under the economic treaty, the countries concerned will agree to take the case into the juridical process of the United Nations—I believe we would have a procedure which would give us some hope of exporting economic freedom.

What is the application of that principle to our problem today? It is a very direct one, because the kind of program which I think should be tried offers a great source for the use of surplus food which we do not need for ourselves. I am not afraid of the word "dumping." Dumping is a good capitalistic practice. Our merchants practice it, if they are in the retail business, at least once a year, and sometimes twice. They call it "clearance sales." They make ready the surplus inventory and sell it for the best prices they can get. So under my program proposal—and I shall apply it to a foreign-aid bill in a moment—American investors and businessmen who intended to invest in foreign countries would pay into the United States Treasury a dump price for some of the surplus food, which, under the economic treaty that would be made, would be used in exchange for services, products, easements, rights-of-way, and equipment which can be obtained only in the foreign countries. At least, the United States Treasury would receive something for the surplus food, because the foreign countries would not have any money to pay for it.

Theory? Yes. But it is a pretty sound theory if only we will try it and put it into practice.

What has the State Department said every time I have urged this kind of approach? "We are afraid it would be upsetting to the world market, whether it be in wheat or any other surplus product."

I asked the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] in a speech on the floor of the Senate the other day, "How can the world market be upset one iota by the sending of wheat, for example, into an area of the world which does not get a bushel of wheat today?" The argument of the State Department is simply nonsense. In the areas of the world which cannot get any wheat at all, the people are starving. Under the arrangement I am proposing, I would be willing to trade tens of thousands of tons of surplus food now in this country at a dump price to build up the economic productive power of the people of India. As I said earlier in my remarks, let us raise our sights 50 or 100 years. Let us listen to what the experts tell us. What would happen if we could raise the standard of living of the people of India only 5 percent in 25 years? We in this country would enjoy prosperity of a much higher level than any we have even dreamed about yet. We are now living in a world in which economics can no longer be bound by national boundaries. We are living in a world in which we have to look at economic laws as they operate on a worldwide basis. We cannot solve the problem overnight; and I am not an "overnighter" on this issue, either.

I say, let us make a start. Instead of talking about a restrictive farm program, let us talk about a farm program which can be used as a great weapon in our fight against communism, by using our surplus food as an export—not merely as an export alone, but as an instrumentality in export that will help build up the economic productive power of weaker people.

Mr. President, I said I would make a brief comment on the relationship of the program I have just suggested to foreign aid. Last year, in the Committee on Foreign Relations, I voted against the foreign aid bill, knowing I would receive a certain amount of abuse and castigation from people who did not take the time to find out my reasons. I gave my reasons at the time. I gave them in a press release from the committee. I gave them on the same day on the floor of the Senate. I said I voted against the foreign aid bill in committee, although I would vote for the best foreign aid bill we could get on the floor of the Senate, because in committee I did not want to sanction a bill which provided for such a large percentage of foreign aid in grants, and such a low percentage in loans.

I happen to believe that the grant proposal, the giving of money to countries by way of grants, is not building up their economic productive power. I happen to believe that the idea of loans for investment in capitalism in those areas of the world is the approach which must be made if we are to win this fight for freedom. So I said I would make a fight on the floor of the Senate, as the RECORD shows I did, for an increase in loans.

We were not so successful as I hoped to be, but we were successful, in small part, in attaining our objective by offering certain amendments. I believe we laid a basis in the RECORD which can be used this year in the foreign aid debate, because this year I shall fight again for a greater increase in loans and a decrease in grants, and I shall relate it again, in part, to the farm surplus program. I think here again we can use some of the farm surpluses as a part of the foreign trade program which, in broad, brush strokes, I have outlined this afternoon.

Neither President Eisenhower's message on agriculture nor the pending farm bill makes provision to meet any of these needs to expand domestic and foreign demand for American farm products. I think we ought to get busy in the Foregin Relations Committee and see if we cannot help in that respect.

THE SENATE FARM BILL MOVES IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

For many years, I have taken the position that the Congress should insulate our farm economy from the devastating effects of the present administration's farm program, and I have urged that the farmers be placed as nearly as possible in a status comparable to that which prevailed when the present administration took over. If we do this, we can then debate the various issues in the calm atmosphere of economic safety rather than in the tempestuous atmosphere of threatened farm depression.

As I study the Senate farm bill, I am more and more convinced that the bill does something that the administration's farm proposals failed utterly to attempt. S. 3183 endeavors to restore some of our farm prices to decent levels. It restores 90 percent supports for basics. It raises minimum support of milk to 80 percent of parity, and restores the old 30-month base for calculating manufacturing milk parity. I intend to lend support to its income-bolstering provisions, and whenever strengthening amendments designed to improve farm income further appear to be reasonable and warranted, they shall have my support.

With this in mind, I was particularly pleased when the majority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry voted to restore 90 percent supports on our basic farm crops. These committee members demonstrated that they understand the wisdom of legislating adequate and fair farm prices to the end that we may have a sound farm economy.

FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS NO CURE FOR FARM SURPLUSES

The administration would have us believe that if our farmers endure the sliding scale support program a little longer, the disappearance of our farm surpluses will be "just around the corner."

Experience on commodities which have been flexed by Benson simply does not bear out this assertion. The advocates of flexible supports do not give ample consideration to the extremely important

item of the farmer's fixed costs. If returns per bushel drop, the farmer intensifies his production. If his money income from crops becomes smaller, the farmer tries to produce more bushels to pay the banker his interest and to pay his tax bill and other unyielding costs.

Here are a few examples of tremendous increases in production which have occurred on crops which were given the Benson downward-support treatment:

Benson has cut price supports on oats 22 percent since 1952. Production has gone up 25 percent.

Soybean supports were cut 20 percent during the same period and production has gone up 30 percent.

Barley supports were cut 23 percent. Production went up 73 percent.

Rye supports were cut 17 percent. Production climbed 81 percent.

Grain sorghum supports were cut 25 percent. Production has gone up an amazing 180 percent.

Some of these increases in production result from acreage allotments on the basic crops, but it is equally clear that where the return per bushel dropped, the farmer produced more in order to recoup his lost income.

Using wheat as a good illustration, let us go into a bit of history to find out what happened to production, under flexible supports, between 1938 and 1940. According to the Department of Agriculture, the price support level of wheat—in percentages—was 52 for 1938, 56 for 1939, and 57 for 1940. However, during the same period our wheat carryover increased almost 83 percent—from 153 million bushels to 280 million bushels. During those years the farmers tried to make up for income losses and to meet fixed costs by expanding production.

Flexible supports traditionally operate in see-saw fashion. As prices are flexed downward, a resulting upward pressure of production is bound to occur. The farmers do not want to play Benson's see-saw game, because it offers no offset for their income losses.

Marketing quotas and resulting wheat allotments kept wheat production from reaching new heights following the administration's reduction of wheat price supports for the 1955 crop. The fact that a new production record was not reached was probably attributable to reductions in wheat acreage and excellent compliance by farmers with their acreage allotments. In 1954, with a 62 million acre allotment, farmers cut their plantings more than 16 million acres to 62,569,000 acres. In 1955, despite lower price supports, acreage was further cut to 58,284,000 acres.

Because of the cooperation of the farmers under the allotment program, our wheat production in 1954 was 984 million bushels, compared to a 900 million bushel total usage. In 1955 production was cut to 938 million bushels, compared to a 914 million bushel total usage. The Department of Agriculture is estimating, on the basis of existing law, a production of 925 million bushels in 1956 and a 928 million bushel total usage.

Acreage allotments are bringing production and total usage of wheat into balance. The sliding scale did not do this job.

The flexible support program has not proved itself to be a magic formula under which farm surpluses will disappear. In effect, the administration confesses this, when it proposes the new soil bank approach.

BASIC DECISION: SHALL THE FARMERS BEAR THE WHOLE IMPACT OF OUR SURPLUS DISPOSAL PROBLEM?

It is high time that the Members of the Senate face a fundamental issue concerning our surpluses. These surpluses must be reduced, and the process of making such reduction is going to be expensive. Someone must bear that cost. Apparently the administration feels that the farmers should bear the burden, and their "flexible support—income reducing" program for the farmers constitutes convincing evidence of this intention.

I am firmly of the opinion that no economic group in our country, such as the farmers, should be singled out to bear the brunt of the cost of reducing our surpluses. If it costs money to reduce surpluses to a reasonable level, I think the people as a whole should share in that cost. I am firmly of the opinion that the surplus disposal problem is national in scope.

We can cut surpluses by various programs, but I think we make a tremendous mistake if we permit full play to be given to the theory that downward flexing of farm commodity support prices will eliminate our surpluses.

Because there is such a close relationship between farm income and the income of the rest of us, I urge that we support the provisions of the Senate bill which would restore price supports on our basic crops; and then, at the earliest possible moment, I think we should give thorough consideration to the price structure of other farm commodities.

As I have said many times, I do not believe our surpluses constitute a burden. I believe they are a blessing for which we, as Americans, should be humbly thankful. As our population trends continue upward, we shall be more and more thankful for the fact that we have high productivity on our farms. In the not too distant future, I suspect we shall be dealing with problems of how to increase production of our existing facilities, rather than how to dispose of surpluses. Future generations will thank us for having kept our farm economy strong today.

A SOUND LONG-RANGE WHEAT PROGRAM

The 90-percent price-support for wheat, as set forth in the new farm bill, will be of immense help to the Nation's wheat farmers because it will deal effectively with the immediate problem—that of stopping the decline in income of the wheat farmers under the administration's flexible or "toboggan slide" program. The situation has been aggravated by the downward pressures of the so-called modernized parity formula which went into effect with respect to the 1956 crop.

Oregon wheat farmers as a group have a deep interest in the future of our farm economy. They view the wheat program from a long-range standpoint, rather than on a year-to-year basis. They realize that we must do something about our wheat surpluses, and they wish to cooperate with the Government in bringing these surpluses down to reasonable limits. However, they are understandably reluctant to solve the problem through a system which would result in bankruptcy for wheat farmers; and they know that the administration's flexible price-support program will do just that, if it is permitted to continue.

The 90-percent-support program will work for wheat, because wheat farmers have demonstrated, not only by their overwhelming votes in favor of marketing quotas, but by a high degree of compliance with their acreage allotments, that they will keep wheat production and total usage in balance at 90 percent of parity.

THE DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN FOR WHEAT

A number of farm organizations in my State, including the Oregon Wheat Growers League—a member of the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, and the Grange, have proposed a solution to the wheat surplus problem in the form of the domestic parity plan.

This plan in its broadest outlines is one which is designed to put the farmers on the same plane as that of other segments of our American economy. It assures them a return equal to parity for the portion of our Nation's wheat production which is used domestically for human consumption. In recent years, this has totaled approximately 500 million bushels. The balance, about 400 million bushels, would be available for other uses, including export, feed, and industrial purposes.

The special feature of the plan which should have particular appeal to the Congress is the fact that if the plan became fully operative, the Government would no longer have the burden of price support in the market place, Government export subsidies, storage, deterioration, and handling costs. That burden would be eliminated.

Under the domestic parity plan, wheat raised in this country would be sold on the market at a price which would allow the wheat to move into all channels of use. The farmers would be assured 100 percent of parity on the portion of their production reflected in domestic human consumption of wheat. I do not believe it is necessary at this time to go into a full explanation of how this plan would operate, because that subject has been covered in detail in previous comments made on the floor of the Senate, as well as in committee. On yesterday afternoon, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] discussed the program at length. At that time I associated myself with his remarks, and assured him that I was giving complete support to his amendment, of which I am one of the cosponsors, along with my distinguished colleague who now is presiding over the Senate [Mr. NEUBERGER].

The following broad outline, however, will provide a brief résumé of how the plan works:

First. The farmer would sell all of his wheat to the grain dealer at the prevailing market price. The grain dealer would, in turn, sell to the miller, ex-

porter, feed dealer, and industrial user, as the case might be, at a competitive price. Incidentally this demonstrates that the label "two-price" is a misnomer for this plan, because, as a matter of fact, the wheat would move into all channels of trade at one competitive price level.

Second. The farmer would be guaranteed 100 percent of parity on the portion which would be used for domestic food consumption, through a certificate issued to him by the Secretary. In other words, the price he received from the sale in the market, plus the value of his certificate, would bring him 100 percent of parity.

Third. After the Secretary of Agriculture had determined, for each marketing year, the portion of the wheat crop which would go into domestic human-food consumption, he would allocate this quota to the farmers, in the farm of negotiable wheat certificates representing the farmer's share of total production in bushels, rather than in acres. These certificates would be allocated to the farmers on the basis and under the same mechanics that apply to present acreage allotments.

Fourth. The domestic parity plan would stimulate the production of higher quality wheat, because the premium for quality would be determined in the market place, and the farmer would be inclined to supply the market with the best quality possible in order to receive the premium price for all of his production.

Fifth. Returning to our millers and processors mentioned in a preceding paragraph, under the domestic parity plan they would buy all their wheat on the open market. Before they moved their products into the consumer market, they would purchase from the Commodity Credit Corporation certificates covering the total amount of wheat processed by them for consumption as human food. This would make the domestic parity plan self-financing, and would not raise the price of wheat products to the consumer, because, today, the miller has to pay above the market price for the quality of wheat he needs for processing, which is about the same as 100 percent of parity.

Mr. President, some apprehension has been expressed by farmers in the corn belt concerning the possible adverse effects of the domestic parity plan on their price structure. I am of the opinion that these fears are unfounded. The fact is that under the acreage-allotment system and crop diversion, corn producers have observed tremendous increases in the production of barley, oats, rye, and other competing grains. For example, in the 1954 crop year the acres diverted from wheat, produced almost 37 percent more feed grains than would have been produced if feed wheat had been planted on these diverted acres. In 1955, the same diverted acres produced 50 percent more feed grains than they would have produced in the form of feed wheat.

The figures for August 1, 1955, show that in 1955 the production of oats, barley, and grain sorghums increased 558 million bushels above the 10-year average, while the 1955 production of wheat was 243 million bushels below the 10-year average. This demonstrates that our present efforts to reduce wheat production have resulted in the creation of another problem, namely, excessive increases in feed grains.

That is a point which needs to be stressed during this debate, because it is a point which is very much overlooked. If the corn producers wish to protect themselves, in my judgment they should favor this program, rather than the present program, because the present program has resulted in increasing the production of competing grains.

Mr. President, one of the many desirable features of the domestic parity plan is its assurance of fair and reasonable returns for the wheat farmers. Along with the savings that will result to the Government under this program, the farmers will receive an increase in income.

Mr. President, by way of summary, let me list the many advantages of the domestic parity plan as they relate to the various segments of our economy:

First. The public would be saved the expense of subsidizing wheat into export markets to the extent of about $200 million annually.

Second. The Government could withdraw from the wheat business and permit it to be handled by American businessmen—our grain dealers, millers, exporters, and others in the wheat and wheat products business.

Third. The wheat farmer could plan a long-range program for his farm which would encourage the planning of farm operations in accordance with changing production and market conditions.

Fourth. The grain trade would be free to operate without Government restrictions, since the reestablishment of one open market price would restore to the wheat trader his traditional marketing functions on a free and competitive basis.

Fifth. Other agricultural producers would not have to compete with all the lands diverted from wheat production because, as mentioned before, an increase in wheat acres decreases oats, barley, corn, and other feed-grain production.

The domestic parity plan is compatible with the soil-bank plan now being considered by the Senate. The soil-bank payments to producers would not have to be as large as under present price-support programs, because of the fact that the attractiveness of the soil-bank payments would be measured against profits from sales at free market prices. Therefore, the soil-bank approach could be expected to be more effective than if operated in conjunction with present price-support and adjustment programs. I have joined with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and six other Senate colleagues, including my junior colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], in a bipartisan cosponsorship of an amendment to provide by referendum the domestic parity plan for wheat.

The domestic parity amendment, if adopted, would supplement the wheat-support provision just mentioned by becoming effective on the 1957 crop—and not sooner—provided the farmers vote favorably on the domestic parity plan under a referendum held pursuant to provisions of the amendment.

We are not forcing this on the wheat farmers. In fact, we have introduced the proposal, as the present Presiding Officer knows, because the wheat farmers themselves—the Oregon Wheat Growers League, in our case—asked, in the first instance, that a bill be introduced. We introduced the bill. Hearings were held on the bill, and I am sure my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] joins me in saying that we became completely convinced that this is a sound economic program for the benefit, not only of wheat farmers, but the agricultural economy generally.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will act favorably on the domestic parity amendment, thereby opening the way to a realistic long-range marketing program for wheat.

THE PARITY FORMULA

The committee is to be commended for its inclusion of section 106 of the bill now under consideration. This section provides that the Secretary shall use either the old parity price or modernized parity, whichever is higher, in determining price supports on basic products.

Section 106 tends to ease the pressure of falling farm prices. In this respect it, too, deals directly with the problem of falling farm income. It deserves our support.

ASSISTANCE FOR LIVESTOCK RAISERS

The Senate farm bill offers some hope for hard-pressed livestock raisers. Section 305 of the bill would authorize an annual appropriation of $250 million for so-called section 32 purchases. The $250 million so authorized would not be subjected to the existing 25-percent limitation on the expenditure of funds with respect to any one agricultural commodity.

The section 32 program, if implemented with funds authorized under the new bill, could be utilized to good advantage in the purchase of meat and meat products. Such a meat purchase program would exert upward pressures on our present sagging prices of livestock. However, it is my opinion that this part of the farm bill could be strengthened in three respects. First, the amount authorized should be increased if it is to have substantial effects on products that are in surplus and depressed in price. I shall support amendments designed to increase substantially the $250 million figure now included in this section.

Second, I believe that if the bill is to be really effective in coping with the problems of depressed farm income, it must be supplemented by a provision calling for certifications, by processors and others similarly situated, that the producers of the commodities purchased by the Secretary have received not less than the equivalent of fair support prices. In the case of livestock purchases, this would avoid the regrettable situation whereby such purchases result in profits for packers, rather than fair prices for producers, as in the case of the recent pork purchase program carried on by Secretary Benson.

Third, I think we should make the use of these funds mandatory at some

point. Secretary of Agriculture Benson has failed to institute effective purchase programs for hogs, although they fell to 50 percent of parity, or any program at all for cattle, which dropped to 63 percent of parity. While such a mandatory provision is difficult to write, I do not see, in face of the record, how we can rely on the Secretary to exercise his discretion on when to use these funds.

PREMIUM PAYMENTS FOR LIGHTWEIGHT LIVESTOCK

I am one of the cosponsors of the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], dealing with the plan for a premium price to be paid for livestock which is to be sold in the market at so-called light weights—but at weights which, we all know, really produce the best meat. Very frequently the American consumer overlooks the fact that it is not the heaviest animal that puts the best meat on his table. If what we wanted to do was to put on the table the best of meat, we sometimes would send to the slaughterhouse the lighter carcasses. However, it is only natural for the livestock producer to make the animal as heavy as he can in order to get the largest total price for the carcass.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] originally introduced a bill. I understand he is now proposing an amendment, to provide for a premium support program, by way of payments for sending into the market place lighter animals. The plan would have many advantages. It would not only give to the livestock producer some boost in income, which he sorely needs these days—particularly the small producer—but it would also help to solve the surplus problem.

I will go along at any time with a program which provides premium payments in connection with the sale of breeding females in the livestock industry. If we really desire to handle the surplus problem we must go into the production end of it and reduce production.

I have sat in livestock meetings and listened to a great deal of talk with respect to all the plans as to what we should do in order to reduce the number of breeding females in the various breeds of livestock. I think we should give consideration to some premium payments which would go to the farmer who puts into the slaughterhouse a surplus of breeding female livestock.

I have said that such proposals would be of assistance particularly to the small livestock producer. Today the large producers are also hurt. Let no one think for a moment that the big livestock producers are not badly hurt. So far they are in a little better condition to ride out the storm. The small producer is not. I am very much concerned about the small livestock producer, because I know him well. I associate with him a great deal in connection with my agricultural interests. I know something about his plight. He is not buying new farm machinery. If he can hold it together with baling wire, he is using baling wire to hold it together. That shows what is happening to his purchasing power.

So I hope, before the debate is concluded on this bill, and before the bill is finally passed, we shall give very careful and favorable consideration to some of the amendments which will be proposed in connection with the livestock producer.

I expect to support a proposed amendment to pay bonuses of $1 to $3 per hundredweight to get hogs and cattle marketed at lighter weights when there is an oversupply of meat.

It will shorten supply at times of high production and firm the market. That will be advantageous to the Government if a support program is in effect, or to the farmers if it is not.

THE STATE SHOULD NOT BE COMPELLED TO CONTRIBUTE TO FEED AND SEED DISASTER RELIEF

One section of the Senate farm bill that impresses me as being very unfair toward the States, such as my own State of Oregon, is section 309 of the present bill. If this section were to become law, it would require Oregon, beginning in March 1957, to contribute 15 percent of the cost of disaster feed and seed supplied by the Government to hard pressed farmers.

At the present time, the Federal Government is providing such feed and seed without the necessity for State contributions to the cost of the program.

It seems to me that if there is any occasion upon which a State should not be required to contribute to a Federal disaster relief program, it is when the State is in the throes of battling a disaster. When a disaster hits, the State has enormous problems and extremely heavy demands upon their treasuries, and this 15-percent contribution requirement would simply be an added burden.

Mr. President, let me make perfectly clear for the RECORD that I am not at all in favor of a State contribution program, because our States, on a State basis, spend a great amount of money for flood disaster relief on behalf of people who suffer from such disasters. I believe the Federal Government has a great responsibility in connection with these disasters, but I do not believe that we can work out a program of State contributions that is fair. It is certainly not fair to Connecticut and to the other States in the northeastern part of the country, who have suffered great disaster losses in recent months. It is not fair to my State. I believe the Federal contribution ought to be on a national basis, without the requirement of a contribution from the States.

Section 309 further complicates the issue because we have no assurance that the affected States will have funds on hand to contribute a 15 percent share of the cost of emergency feed and seed grants. Furthermore, since most State legislatures meet every 2 years for relatively short periods, a State not having emergency funds on hand would have to await the next meeting of the legislature or, if necessary, might have to call a special session to provide the requisite 15-percent contribution. This would be procedurally prohibitive and in many cases economically inadvisable, because a special session of the legislature might well cost more than the contribution the Federal Government might make to the feed and seed program within the State.

Therefore, I am opposed to section 309, and with the cosponsorship of Senators NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, and MURRAY, I have offered an amendment to strike this section so as to relieve the States of an additional disaster burden.

THE SOIL BANK

Mr. President, there are 39 million acres of land under cultivation which the Soil Conservation Service classifies as totally unfit for cultivation—much of it even too poor to make grazing land. We ought to get this out of production.

There are also 47 million acres of class 4 agricultural land which have very limited capability for cultivation and might be better used for grass and trees. Much of this should be retired from cultivation.

These acres are not on every farm in the Nation, and taking a few acres out of cultivation on each farm will not necessarily establish the land practices we need. If we are going to adopt the soil bank, we should also institute immediate studies to make the conservation practices which result from the program coincide with our conservation needs.

The soil bank program will not add any net increase to the farmers in the coming year. It is apparently planned to get soil bank checks out this summer, which will be before the elections, but it will be painfully apparent to farmers in the fall, when they have less produce to take to market, that the preelection checks were only an advance payment on what they otherwise would have gotten in the fall.

I am going along with this proposal so the farmers may see what the administration was willing to do for them—which is nothing in the way of an increase in net income—and in the hope that Eisenhower will let the farmers have 90 percent supports in order to get his soil bank plan.

It seems to me that the time is at hand for a very thorough consideration by the Congress of a long-range plan for the retirement of our less productive farmlands under a Bankhead-Jones type of program, including the relocation and rehabilitation aspects of that program for small farmers.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I repeat that our most pressing work at hand is to restore income to our farmers, so that they may again enjoy the economic status they so richly deserve as our Nation's providers of the food and fiber that is absolutely essential to our economy.

Our watchword in this debate, as we come to face each amendment, must be: What will be the effect of this amendment upon increasing the purchasing power of American farmers?

It is now that the American farmers need to have their net income increased. I shall support amendments which will have the effect of increasing the purchasing power of American farmers, so that greater assurance of a high standard of living can be given not only to them, but to all the people of our country.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, before I begin my statement I should like to commend the Senator from Oregon for the wonderful speech he has made. We always find him fighting for the people who need help. I know he will agree with me that the farmers of the United States certainly need much help.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, for weeks now farm legislation has been on the tips of most of our tongues in the Senate. For weeks the plight of the farmer has been under discussion.

A constant hammering of the administration for its program with every force at its command, including threats of Presidential veto, has been going on for months. The President, Mr. Benson, leaders of the administration everywhere have been working away busily trying to discredit the work of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. All I have heard is that we must back the administration's program—Mr. Benson's program—but not once have I really heard any representative of the administration speak in terms of the farmers' program. The members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry spent months in the field last year holding hearings to find out from the farmers, not from Mr. Benson or experts sitting on their soft leather cushions in Washington, what they thought the trouble was with their own problems. Overwhelmingly and with rare dissent, through the great farm areas of the Nation came the cry for a return to 90-percent supports, with rigid controls, on the basic commodities.

So much has been said here in the past couple of weeks that I am afraid some of us are missing the point of the farmer's case. So much has been threatened by the administration and so much has been promised that I am afraid some of us may be getting off base and into a forest of propaganda and hysteria so thick that we cannot see the trees. It might be said we cannot see the farmers' problem for the maze of juggled figures and propaganda.

We set out on a track with a good view of where we were going. The track was built for us by the testimony of thousands of farmers given last fall. But the administration has laid so many spurs and sidetracks here in recent weeks that I am afraid we are all trying to go down a different one, and will wind up on the junk heap.

Mr. President, for that reason today I wish to cite a cross-section of the testimony given the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by farmers in my State concerning the farmers problems and how they think they ought to be solved.

Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate some of the statements which were made at Columbia, in the State of South Carolina. The first statement is that of George D. Bell, of Callison, S. C., from which I read, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is George D. Bell. I own and operate a farm at Callison in the lower section of Greenwood County, within 2 miles of where my father and grandfather owned and operated farms. For five generations or more my people have been farmers.

Our farmers are generally unorganized. What little organization they have is loosely knit, usually with no united and often divergent purposes. The farmers have no high-priced public relations men to tell their true story to Congress as have other organizations.

We have no way of informing the people that our net income, countrywide, has dropped 27.5 percent since 1948, and has rapidly fallen since the spring of this year; while, during the same period, wages have increased and business profits have reached an all-time high. We have no way of telling the people the consumer pays a small percentage of his income for food and the farmer receives a smaller part of each dollar paid than ever before in history.

We constantly hear a howl about the large farm surpluses the Government has in warehouses over the country. I honestly believe the few hundred million dollars invested in cotton, under the price-support program, is just as essential to the security of our country as the more than $100 billion invested in war material, about which we hear nothing. It looks like it depends on whose foot the shoe fits.

The manufacturers and their labor are making more than they have ever made before and the farmer is making less. And these manufacturers generally receive cost-plus contracts, while the farmers get well under 100 percent of parity.

About the only time the farmer's side gets presented to the public is when some Congressman or Senator with the moral fortitude to espouse an unpopular but just cause uses the congressional forum to speak the truth. These courageous men may never hear from us, but you can rest assured that we are grateful and won't forget you. We don't have the opportunity of appearing at your hearings in Washington, and we do appreciate especially your coming here to give us an opportunity to tell our story. We feel honored that a Senator from South Carolina is one of your committee.

Many of our farmers have been forced away from the farms to seek other employment. There cannot be a further acreage reduction without affecting those still operating a family-sized farm. The further reduction of the cotton acreage in my county will make it imperative to unite these small farms into big operations, thus destroying altogether the family-sized farmers who have contributed so much to the stability of America. I tell you, gentlemen, that the family-sized farm is just as American as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and the Constitution, and should not be allowed to pass from the American scene.

Gentlemen, our rural schools have gone, the post offices and churches are going. They are taking away our fourth-class post offices and that will affect our churches and finally the people are going to have to move out of the country and you won't have the family-sized farms and it will all be, as you might say, kind of similar to these collective farms in Russia. That is what seems to me to be the trend.

That is the statement of one of my farmers in South Carolina.

The next statement is that of E. H. Agnew, president, South Carolina Farm Bureau, Columbia, S. C. He also is a farmer in the county of which I am a native—Anderson County. This is his statement:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am E. H. Agnew, a general farmer from Anderson County, S. C. I farm 266 acres as a combination cotton and small grain and beef cattle farm.

I am here in sympathy with our avowed intention of hearing primarily from individual farmers in South Carolina as to what they want with respect to the future farm support price program. I ask your permission to tender a statement that I have prepared on behalf of the South Carolina Farm Bureau Federation of which I am president.

This statement is made on behalf of the officers and directors and the more than 19,000 farm families in South Carolina who are members of the Farm Bureau. We are grateful for this opportunity. We wish to commend you for making known the fact that you did not want this hearing to be used as a sounding board for farm organizations, but rather that you wanted to hear from as great a number as possible of individual farmers in South Carolina as to what they desire by way of improvement in farm-program legislation, particularly with respect to support prices for farm commodities.

The primary interests of farm people aside from overall national problems, have to do with maintaining abundant production of foods and fibers without loss of opportunity and freedom to participate fully in development, maintenance, and expansion of a sound and prosperous economy. We pledge our vigorous support of every part of a program to accomplish this objective.

We join heartily in widespread support of the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and we shall just as heartily join in defense of its basic provisions if need be. We favor 90 percent of parity support price for all basic commodities, and that producers earn such supports by voluntarily adjusting production to consumption. We favor 90 percent of parity support price on any basic crop when growers, by a two-thirds majority vote, impose marketing quotas upon themselves.

We do not favor any two-price system.

We vigorously support rural electrification and REA telephone service to the point that American agriculture be adequately serviced, and we shall vigorously oppose any move designed to cripple these services or to hinder expansion to the point that American farmers be not completely and economically serviced.

We believe that the prime responsibility for recommendations pertaining to the development of a sound national farm program, including acreage control and support-price features of such a program, rests upon the individual producers of each separate commodity, and that recommendations of such producer groups should prevail if and when such recommendation can be justified and proven not to be contrary to the public interest or the overall farm program.

I should like to state that the president of the South Carolina Farm Bureau spoke contrary to the stand of the American Farm Bureau. That organization is against some of the things for which Mr. Agnew spoke. But I admire him for expressing his views concerning the beliefs of the farmers of South Carolina.

Another statement from which I should like to quote is that of Ed B. Baskin, president of the State Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, Bishopville, S. C. Mr. Baskin said:

I will summarize, sir. I would like to say that I have been farming 10 years. I came out of the Army in 1945. I farmed 600 acres of land. This 600 acres of land was formerly in four farms. Those four farms at one time grew over 400 acres of cotton. Today the allotment on the four farms is down to 140 acres of cotton, and I believe we face a 10 or 12 percent additional cut when I am willing to take, I want to point that out. On these farms at one time there were more

than 20 families and I would say at that time those families averaged as many as 10 people per family.

This shows, Mr. President, how we are drifting. I continue to read:

Today with the present cotton allotment we are down to five families. We have mechanized, don't have a mule on the 600 acres that used to be considered approximately a 25-horse farm. I want to point out that the farmers of South Carolina have never failed to vote overwhelmingly to place acreage controls on both cotton and tobacco.

I would like to substantiate the statements made earlier today that we are not only willing but we are anxious at all times to control ourselves to the very maximum extent that will bring our production in line with the produce that is required by our Nation.

Now, if a man of Mr. Benson's qualifications could be elected President of the United States, I would almost be inclined to go along with it, on the basis that he would put everybody back on the basis of good Christian, honest, hard times. I think probably some hard times would be good for all of us, but there is utterly no hope of doing anything about the dollar-an-hour minimum wage with the comparative scale of high prosperity the rest of this Nation is enjoying today.

So the only answer is to do something to help the farmer. I think it is purely a matter of simple economic justice.

Now, I had some figures here I would like to quote verbatim, but since I am only on ad lib basis, I will quote them as best I can.

The United States has given away since World War I to foreign nations $130 billion. We have given away $45 billion to foreign nations since the end of World War II, with $11 billion sitting in the Treasury yet to be given away. It seems they are having trouble giving it away. Yet our Department of Agriculture less than a month ago comes out with a well-planned propaganda announcement they had lost $800 million on the farm program within the past year: $800 million. When you stop to think that in the last 10 years we have given away $45 billion to foreign nations. The whole thing was set up as a propaganda trap to turn the general public against the farmer and his parity program with a very completely satisfactory and successful result up to the present time.

I think it is most tragic that our Secretary of Agriculture has busied himself in all seriousness, I assume, going up and down the country making speeches which have turned the consuming public and there is where your votes are, against the farmer of our Nation.

I say $800 million. I think there is a lot of poor business on the part of the Department of Agriculture that more profit was not realized.

Gentlemen, that in my opinion calls for drastic action. I don't know what we are going to do about a Secretary of Agriculture who is fundamentally opposed, in my opinion, to the programs which we all advocate. I recognize and I repeat I think he is a fine Christian gentleman, one of the finest gentlemen in Government service in my time, which makes him hard to attack, but the main thing is he is fundamentally opposed to what we farmers must have. I think that is the biggest problem.

You gentlemen will have to force our Department and the man who heads it at the present time to take objection on behalf of our farmers. There are many other things I would like to say but you want concrete recommendations here today, and I have them and I would like to read that much to you.

The first recommendation I would like to make is for the immediate abandonment of flexible price supports with return to rigid price supports and basic storable commodities. I stress basic storable commodities and I endorse the statements made here this morning that I don't think that any group of producers is entitled to support prices on their commodities unless they are willing to cut their production and bring it in line with the demands of the Nation.

Secondly, I think that rigid acreage allotments which are realistically related to the probable requirements, regardless of severity of cut, should be made.

I think we should require that all acreage retired from cash-crop production be placed in soil-building and soil-conserving crops which will not be marketed from the farm as such.

Mind you, Mr. President, these are recommendations the committee received in the field. I continue to read from Mr. Baskin's statement:

Now, I realize that has been a debatable question this morning, and I would like to discuss that further if you would like to.

Fourth, I think that steps should be taken to see that all regulations are complied with in a uniform manner in all States. I would like to emphasize that by saying it is difficult for me to believe that the astronomical yields being reported in some States are being produced on standard-sized acres. I think sometimes we have king-sized acres. That is a matter on which there is considerable variation from State to State. That is my opinion and it certainly is not substantiated by any evidence, that I could give you here today.

I have a statement from another gentleman, whom I have known for many, many years, Houston Manning, of Latta, S. C., which I now read:

I am Houston Manning, Latta, S. C.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am 62 years old, and have been farming all my life. I am only familiar with the problems facing tobacco and cotton farmers. I would not attempt to suggest any way on earth you could help the food crops because they are not imperishable like cotton and tobacco.

Cotton and tobacco are the two most imperishable crops we have and therefore can be considered separately from these other crops. As far as the tobacco program, I don't know one thing I could say to improve it except leave it like it is and cut the production where you can sustain the price at approximately where it is.

In other words, he thinks that should be left alone. He says to leave it as it is at the present time.

Quoting further:

I want to say that I have been a very proud man all my life and am no part of Communist or Socialist. A man informed me the other day I could get $1,500 to $1,600 soil conservation. That has been in force for 10 years. I never have qualified for one dime of it and didn't ever want it but 4 years ago I had 1,500 acres of land paid for and today I got $30,000 in mortgages on it.

Mr. President, that gives you an idea of what has happened.

I read further:

Now I am not saying that it is because of prices of goods, but because of the weather I haven't been able to make one dime in 4 years.

I put $70,000 cash outlay every year besides all my land and 25 to 30 tenants, used to be 50, in the mule day, my work and all the farming implements. I haven't made $5 in 4 years.

Now, that is not due to prices of products, it is due to rain and sunshine. The weather has cut me over $60,000 a year income annually—the weather. I am bringing this out to show you that farmers cannot plan a certain production in pounds, in bales, and maintain it because it depends on the weather sent by the Lord. Farming is the most hazardous business in the world.

Usually I make good money on the farm. I have as fine land as there is in South Carolina. My father ahead of me was a large planter. I lost that prosperity in the last 4 years.

Four years of bad weather capped last year by Hurricane Hazel. Hazel cost me 12 to 14 thousand dollars in buildings last year. Having gotten in pretty tight circumstances, I wanted some of that money that President Ike put out for the relief of the storm sufferers. I went to the man who is supposed to handle it. He referred me to the Small Business Administration in Wilmington, N. C. I wrote them and they answered back that they were very sorry, there was no provision made for the farmer to get any of that money.

A man who makes cotton, tobacco, foods, no provision for him to get a cent of that money. That was written to me.

The storm damaged most every tobacco barn I had, blew down one house entirely, and damaged dozens of houses and pack houses. The storm cost me around, I spent 8 or 9 thousand this year repairing and have to spend 3 to 5 more to get where I was on repairs. Farming is such a hazardous business. It will take 2 to 3 years of good income now to make back what I lost in 1954.

I want you all to remember I am stressing the fact that cotton can be handled different from these perishable products. A bale of cotton in storage, Senator, in a dry place, I have no doubt will keep a hundred years without deterioration. There is a man up here near Senator JOHNSTON'S county has a bale of cotton made in the 1800's and is apparently in as good condition as it was then. No deterioration in stored cotton in a dry place, approximately none, might be some technical deterioration. You can handle our cotton situation a whole lot better with a whole lot more assurance than perishables.

You could set this 10 million bales aside. Don't forget that cotton is wealth, cotton is not like money, a medium of exchange, cotton is pure wealth. It turns into 78 times its value, 10 million bales of cotton is worth a billion and a half dollars today. But at interest it is worth 10 to 12 billion dollars. You can take a long-term use and do something for it.

There are 3 or 4 things you could do to help our cotton farmers. The first is you get together and put somebody like you and Senator JOHNSTON—

He means the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]—

on the committee that reaches a parity price. Anybody that has an ounce of brains knows that the parity price that they have set is not fair to us, which is now around 33 or 34 cents, doesn't give any American his just share of our national income, as President Eisenhower said on the statehouse steps. Any man that thinks cotton at 33 cents a pound gives the farmer his just share of the national income ought to be put in the insane asylum, or else he is a man with an impure heart. I am talking from 40 years' experience.

So you get a parity concept that takes into account the labor of producing cotton and put that labor down just like the preacher, the teacher, the lawyer, doctor, the labor-union men, all the railroad employees, everybody in America, a clerk in the store, everybody, and be sure they get that $1 minimum that you put for everybody.

So that is all you have got to consider, consider the condition we are in. We are in the way of bankruptcy as fast as we can go. We would have been there this year if

it had not been for support prices, under cotton and tobacco in South Carolina.

We would have made the grade this year if it had not been for support prices. In 1951, I bought a Buick Roadmaster for $3,124.26. I was getting 45.39 for cotton. That was the limit that Chester Bowles put on it. We were the only people in the world getting under 75 cents then. Everybody in the world was getting 75 cents except the Americans, and we were getting 45.39. A bale of cotton, the seed alone, would give me a check for ginning for $25 above ginning in 1951. Today, due to stormy weather, most of mine I pay $3 a bale to get it ginned today. They bill me $3 a bale out of it. I pay $3 a bale to get it ginned today. They bill me $3 for every bale. And I went down and asked the boy what the Buicks were, and he said $4,200. It is up 35 percent and all farming, so the U. S. News and World Report says, is down 34 percent. I am certain my cotton is down from 45.39 to 30 cents on the Exchange in New York, yet that Buick is up 35 percent, as is all other implements for the farm, trucks, tractors, every implement you can name, household goods and appliances, everything in the world we use.

The doctor's bill is us just as much and the hospitals have doubled, quadrupled, and quintupled. If you have a tenant that makes cotton alone and let him have a spell of sickness for 30 days, there is not a farm in South Carolina on the average that can make the bill. Thirty days in the hospital, it will range from $50 to $500 a week doctors' bills and hospital.

Everything, it is not just one thing up on us, everything in the world is up except the price of cotton, and it is down 34 percent.

Let me pay my respects to our Secretary of Agriculture. When he was first appointed, I went to Darlington, S. C., to hear him make a talk. I thought he was as sweet and fine a Christian gentleman as ever lived, just to hear him talk. I wasn't so much impressed with his brain, but I did give him that. But when he went all over the country as every one of you gentlemen know, and tried to make it appear to all the housewives and all the consumers of farmers' goods that the supporting prices at 90-percent parity was breaking the Government of the United States, I knew he was a liar and the truth was not in him.

That couldn't be so because—that isn't all he did. When he got in that cheese deal the President of the United States should have fired him that day; the first inkling he got of it he ought to have fired Ezra. You know with Ezra coaching him, not you, gentlemen, because everyone of you voted for 90-percent parity, with Ezra coaching the Congress joined with him on price supports. Ninety percent is not right; 75 percent will cure you. Has any greater fallacy ever been put before the people since the world began? His system would work, but after my farm is transferred to someone else. It will work, but it will put the present out and give it to some man who made some money manufacturing—it will work in time.

You all have done a lot of good things for us that will help us. Give us 25 to 30 years and they will come along, but today it will take price advances to hold cotton farmers in the business. That is all there is to it.

You all know that Mr. Benson tried to make it appear that it cost nearly $20 billion to support the price of our commodities for 10 years. When he got under his oath where the prejury law would get him he came out that it cost $1 billion in 20 years, or the sum of $55 million a year. That is what he understood his oath had to come out with. The man that said $20 billion all over America. Now $55 million seems like a lot of money but when you are appropriating $70 billion a year and donating $10 billion down to $4.5 billion abroad, $55 million will serve to relieve the cotton farmers and the farmers of America of that charge that we are bankrupting the Government.

The Government may be bankrupt, but it is not the $55 million a year that is doing it, as you well know.

Gentleman, in 1952 a candidate for President of the United States, Ike Eisenhower, spoke on our statehouse steps right over there. I don't pretend to tell you what the President said in Dakota or Minnesota. I read about it. I heard with my own ears. He spoke of his attitude toward the farming situation. These are his words, not part of what he said. He said:

"There are no ifs, ands, or buts about it. I am for 90-percent parity for our farmers, and more too, if necessary, to give them their just share of our national income."

Those are his words. And the saddest thing of my life, gentleman, except I was sending our boys to Korea, but with that exception the saddest thing is to see a fine man like Ike Eisenhower, a man I put up $750 to elect—

Mr. President, let me add that I do not think he ever sent it back, either—

I want to say, Senator, I didn't do that following James F. Byrnes, as fine a man as lived, I put it up before I knew how Byrnes was going to be. I didn't put it up because Eisenhower made that speech, gentlemen. That was made long after I put it up. But I went home and said to the boys, "Ike is not only going to be elected, he is going to be favorable to us farmers."

Think about as good a man as Eisenhower is, we all know he is a good man, his political enemies would say that, would let Ezra Taft Benson influence him to go back on his word made before 60,000 or 75,000 South Carolinians, gentlemen, it is almost unbelievable that it could have taken place. That is right, almost unbelievable. It is sad to me that a man with the love and esteem of Eisenhower would fall to follow Ezra to that degree.

I regret it most exceedingly.

Mr. President, at this time I desire to read a statement by another gentleman, Mr. B. F. Williamson, of Darlington, S. C.:

I am B. F. Williamson, farmer in Darlington County, farming being my sole occupation.

I farmed since 1924. A good deal of the ground has been covered and I know you haven't too much time left.

On the subject of a long-range program, I believe that we are entitled to 90 percent of price support where we effectively control production. I would like to have my income from farming come from the marketplace rather than through subsidy payments.

I think it works, where it is done with the right spirit, with the rick backing. I think you all have given some excellent laws for price-support programs and in some instances they worked well and in some the purpose has been defeated.

On cotton, much of the ground has been covered. One thing that hasn't been mentioned that I like and I think South Carolina farmers want is a continuous acreage-control program. Even in the years when we are short on supply and can grow all we want, we still want to grow that within the program. That way we will keep our history and know where we stand on it.

Now let me read the statement of another gentleman, Mr. Charles N. Plowden, a banker and farmer of Summerton, S. C.:

Senator, I will be as brief as possible, and highlight it. I am from a small rural county, lower South Carolina, Clarendon County. We have a small group of farmers there, a very small group, only a few large ones in the county. Our trouble has been caused by first a 90 percent of parity whereas I believe that if we were to maintain an average standard of living commensurate with other groups it should have been 100 percent. However, that 90 percent in the early days when the South and the Southwest had a great deal of the cotton acreage was much easier to get along with than 90 percent now on the small amount of acreage that we have since a great part of the cotton quota has shifted to California, Arizona, in New Mexico, and the Western States. We could gradually reach a place where we would have 90 percent of nothing and it would be nothing. That is one phase that has come about.

The next in our section has been because of the weather. The Government could not cause that. While many people sold cotton this year at 37 cents, we get 29½ to 30 cents, good cotton. Cottonseed was selling 3 years ago at $70 to $72. We are getting $30 and have been getting $30 during this season for cottonseed. Our seed has gone from $70 to $30.

However, in fairness I would say the last break in cottonseed came from 1942 which was the high for the year, to $30 after the bad weather. So they tell us they graded off to that extent.

The next condition that came about was, as I say, reduced acreage, and that was with the parity applying that has hurt. We have many families who have a good many children that are unable to plant enough crops that if they made a full crop they couldn't pay their debts at the end of the year and survive. I want to touch on one phase of financing that affects them.

What would be the solution? I don't know except for this: If we are going to protect and keep prices up to 90 percent of parity in this country, when the Government makes a loan on oats or wheat or cotton this year, it is of little consequence to us if next year just when we go to gather they undermine you and sell to the grain mills, the textile mills, and everything, cotton 5, 10 cents lower than they can buy in the market.

For instance, 90 percent on 200 acres, if you are able to produce 200 acres of cotton you can have a better chance of surviving at 90 percent on the 200 than 90 percent on a hundred acres, say, if you are cut because you can reduce your cost of production as you produce more units. You have to have the same combine for so much work, same tractor power and same operators that you can reach maximum production and reduce your unit cost. That is where with the program we have been curtailed it has hurt. I operate a large farm of more than 1,000 acres. I have been able to get by, personally. The weather has caused us to take some terrible losses. I have had to subsidize that farm. We have 15 families, many of them born and raised there who we are trying to carry on until we can hit better times or something works out.

Now what is worrying me if you let me change to a country banker position, we have deposits of about a million and a half. There are only two banks in our entire county. The Farmers' Home Administration has done a wonderful work in Clarendon County. I think that they have done wonderful work in the South generally. They have been able to finance people that our banks who are insured under FDIC cannot touch. We have to stay liquid. We can't tie up money. We have farmers coming right now begging me. I try to stay on the farm and leave it up to the cashier. I hate to face them, many of them begging us to lend them $300 or $600 on a tractor note or they will lose it. They financed it with a tractor company last year or the year before. Those people have nowhere to go today. There is nowhere to turn. We can't handle them. Yet we are seeing many of them right now, that is why they need action, they are

having to give up their farming operations. They are caught in the squeeze. They have no secondary or subsidiary income to help them.

Now, I noticed a statement from some of the agricultural officials several months ago that they should go out and get extra work. Well, if there is no industry around and no available work a man is helpless and that is the condition we have in lower South Carolina.

Now, we hear rumors, it is not an official rumor and I could not prove it, but I have heard rumors in the last few weeks that our office of the Farmers' Home Administration is going to be curtailed in their lending another year to the smaller farmers because they are too small to be a profitable farmer, so to speak. They are expendable and can be cast off. Our estimate is where they have been financing approximately 800 farm families, it is true some of them only have 5 acres and a good many are colored farmers that have their own little units and they are the ones with 8 and 10 children to support, and somebody has to feed them or take care of them.

If they leave the farm, where will they go? Right into the cities to your relief rolls. They are going to pile up. Crime will increase. Some of them argue you will lose something on these farm programs. You may lose 5 or 10 percent, but that is the greatest insurance this country can ever pay to keep down communism and communistic thinking because you have a father and mother with hungry children and they are liable to listen to any kind of preaching on any isms.

You may loan them $500, cover them with a crop mortgage and chattel. They may bring back only $450. You have kept them going and kept the economy as we know it in lower South Carolina moving along. If they are allowed to cut that from 800 families to approximately 200 families it is going to be a major disaster in our county. The program won't affect much of South Carolina or the Nation, but as to those individual families it will be a major disaster for those people.

Turning to the statement of another good farmer in South Carolina, formerly a State senator, Alfred Scarborough, Sumter, S. C.:

For several years the farmers of America have been pictured by some groups as living off of Government handouts, and always asking for more aid, assistance, and relief. Newspaper and magazine articles portray the farm program as costing the taxpayer billions of dollars. Many have been led to the false impression that the farmer is sitting back, drawing a large Government check each month, and living high. Nothing could be further removed from the truth. In the face of the recent announced increase of the cost of living figure, the farmer's income for the past year dropped 6 percent. The farmer's gross share of the consumer's agriculture dollar has dropped to the alarming figure of 41 cents.

The farmers asked for 90 percent parity, and that was 10 percent less than the justified 100 percent. It worked to produce a step nearer equity. Prices have always followed support levels. Now, with the flexible formula all prices have fallen to the new low levels. The farmers did not want a subsidy, but loans on a 90-percent parity basis to enable orderly handling and marketing of its products in the hands of both the individuals and the Government. It is presupposed as necessary to the program, putting controls on in such time and manner as to try to prevent surpluses. It also contemplated that strenuous effort be applied toward increasing of export sales, and orderly selling of accumulated Government holdings. An essential of the many-sided picture was utilization of any apparent surpluses by sales or gifts on the Marshall plan program and on the lunch programs. It was important to have an extensive research program in finding new uses and increasing consumption at home and abroad.

Agriculture has never wanted a direct subsidy, even though with the high protection afforded others it would be thoroughly justified. The losses on the agricultural program have been much less than the expenditure on other lines of endeavor by subsidy. I would like to have in your record what has recently been quoted from one of your fellow Senators, Senator SCOTT, of North Carolina.

"1. The Tariff Act of 1789 had been in effect more than 50 years, when in 1845 the Congress authorized special subsidies to steamship lines carrying overseas mail.

"2. Then a few years later the Federal Government—the taxpayers, if you please—started giving the railroads huge blocks of public land. This was the first incentive payment for expansion and production or service. Before this direct subsidy ended, the Federal Government had given away, to the transcontinental railroads more than 183 million acres of the taxpayers' land with a value in excess of a billion and a quarter dollars.

"3. In World War II, for example, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation paid, through direct subsidies, more than $3 billion for the processing of such commodities as meat, petroleum, zinc, lead, copper, wood pulp, and nitrate of soda, to mention only a part of the list.

"4. The railroads are granted subsidy benefits of various forms, including low-interest-rate loans, special freight-rate concessions, and quick equipment-purchase tax amortizations.

"5. The aluminum producers of America alone received $26 million from the RFC in direct subsidies, for reimbursement of so-called excessive-power costs they had paid.

"6. In setting up the subsidy pattern, the Government has not neglected the ocean shipping lines. This industry for a long time has been receiving a most substantial subsidy. In fact, it receives two direct subsidies. First of all, the Government pays up to 50 percent of the cost of constructing all major merchant marine ships and, this year alone, the ship-construction subsidy will cost the American taxpayers more than $48 million. This is money the Government never hopes or expects to get back.

"7. In addition to its construction subsidy the shipping industry receives an operating subsidy which is costing the Government this year slightly more than $100 million. This operating subsidy is to reimburse the shipping lines for the higher wages they pay American seamen, and at the same time keep them in a competitive position with foreign lines."

I would like to insert here, I wish it were possible for us to get 100 percent parity and even be able to pay our employees on the farm the equivalent of what other lines of industry get.

"8. The airlines also come in for a whack at the subsidy dollar. Last fiscal year they were paid at least $56 million for carrying this country's mail. This was a liberal fee for services rendered. But, in addition, the airlines were handed $73 million, as a direct subsidy, with no strings of any kind attached, plus the benefits of free use of Government airport installations, weather service, beacon lights, and other navigation aids which annually cost the taxpayers some $75 million.

"9. Then, there is the Post Office Department. For many years the annual deficit of the Department has been considered a subsidy of a sort, particularly in view of the fact that some divisions of the Department pay their own way, or even produce a profit.

"10. In the fiscal year 1953, a typical year, the total postal deficit amounted to $663 million. Of this total, the largest single item—$230 million—was lost in second-class mail deficit represents a type of subsidy to newspapers, magazines, and other publications that depend upon the mail as a cheap method of distribution.

"11. Then there is the rapid tax write-off certificate subsidy that permits industry and big business to hold back from the United States Treasury billions of dollars of accrued income taxes and use this money, without payment of any interest, for a period of years. In many instances it even becomes an outright gift."

As of July 1 of this year, such tax certificates had been granted to the tune of slightly over $31 billion with an effective tax writeoff, deferred payment or gift amounting to an excess of $18 billion. Such Government expenditures in the fiscal years 1949 through 1955, inclusive, have totaled $3.773 million for agriculture, and $5.880 million for business. The figure for agriculture covers storage costs, spoilage, nonrecoverable items because other expenditures under the agricultural program on recoverable direct subsidies made to business and industry almost 100 percent greater; however, are dead losses. Yes, subsidies in the world in which we live today have become just about universal.

These things have been cited to show the precedent for assistance and for the purpose of two deductions. One is the lack of justification of withdrawing the 90-percent parity and jeopardizing our agriculture and national economy as though agriculture's program would bankrupt the Nation, putting out justifiable propaganda. The loss to agriculture and to the purchasing power of our country could have been prevented until necessary amendments to the act could have been made to the need of the respective commodity before such drastic changes in the present program.

But other costs are shooting up while farm prices go down, farmers now pay 72 percent more in interest on money owed on land. Taxes on farmland are 51 percent higher today than in base period. Farm wage rates have increased 20 percent following city wages up. Trucks, tractors, other farm motor vehicles have jumped 25 percent. Gasoline, oil, diesel fuel, and so forth, are 16 percent more expensive now.

Farm machinery has increased by 34 percent over the 1947–49 average. Building and fencing materials are up by 23 percent over base period. Farmers' costs are still rising.

I have tried to show, from quoted figures, the lack of justification for any policy on the part of the administration being advocated that would bring the farmer down to the level of his present income in the midst of advancing prices to all other segments of the Nation's and that would apparently indicate an attempt to destroy agriculture's present program without having anything effective to offer in lieu thereof. I have also tried to indicate the actual seriousness from statistics of the farmer's present position in the national economy. It is our belief that the prosperity of the Nation is geared closely to the economic well-being of our farmers. These farmers constitute our tremendous market for the industrial output of our highly mechanized productive system.

When prosperity comes to the farmer it is reflected in business establishments all over the length and breadth of the land. It is apparent that we cannot treat the economic life of the farmer as an isolated factor to be viewed in and of itself. It must be considered in light of its relationship to our whole economy and that relationship is close and inseparable.

This is the thing in a nutshell. The program has been so handled as to bring disrepute upon it. This thing has many gadgets. It is a well-rounded picture like the solution to any of the problems. You have to see the whole picture. The fact is, it had to have the encouragement of exports, orderly

marketing of domestic and foreign. They have had these surpluses. They missed Brazil sales and things of that kind. Red-tape. Similarly, in cotton. Likewise, it has to have a heavy amount of expense for research, new increased uses, new markets.

What I mean to imply is this: Something is needed and needed quickly. Why in the name of commonsense couldn't the administration have held to this program? Because under the 1948 act he was authorized to raise these things. He did it on wool, did it on sugar, could have done it under these things. Under an emergency he could have done it. My thought is that maybe you had better amend these laws and make them minimums and things in requisite, or make them mandatory.

I think, if this program can get back and we can get going, you will have time for amendments and make any change, not after the house is destroyed but while the fire is burning. The national welfare demands it. The last thing is this: Inconsistencies in administration. Your Japanese importations coming in. Bringing in European raw cotton to compete with American cotton because the American manufactured items are not sold and he can't buy our stuff, practically paralyzing, throwing out 25,000 workers this fall from the textile industries and cutting down on our industry.

Vast inconsistencies. Absolute unwillingness to see moneys that are thrown away and the fallacy followed. The method indicates an attempt, almost a conspiracy to scuttle our program.

Mr. President, although the persons whose statements I have read were not all who appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the other witnesses who appeared before the committee testified along similar lines. Not one of the persons from South Carolina, to whose testimony I have referred, said he did not want 90 percent of parity. Every one of them said he wanted 90 percent of parity, or more.

The statements I have read show something else, too. They show that the farmers are keeping up with what is going on in the Nation. They see how they are being made to lag behind while we are pushing forward all other segments of our economy in America. Therefore it is time for us to do everything within our power to help the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. President, I believe these facts and this testimony speak for themselves.

The major points are these:

First. The farmers' incomes are in terrible condition, and reports issued just yesterday show they are getting worse.

Second. The farmers want an immediate return to 90 percent of parity, and are willing to accept rigid controls with this parity.

Third. The farmers were given promises by the present administration of 90 percent and 100 percent of parity. These promises of 1952 were broken, and as a result the farmers as a whole have no trust in any promises the administration may make in 1956.

Fourth. We in the Senate should take the idle promises of the administration in 1952 as a lesson well learned and write our own bill, and in that way keep faith with the farmers, and not be blackjacked into going along with Mr. Benson's program of let-downism.

Fifth. We should pass 90-percent price supports despite the threats of the administration.

It is a standing joke on Capitol Hill that the reason Mr. Eisenhower decided to run again is that after staying at Gettysburg for a while and visiting Mr. Humphrey's farm in Georgia he knew that so long as Mr. Benson was Secretary of Agriculture, he could not make a living at farming.

Well, with me and the farmers of my State, it is not a joke. It is the awful truth.

Mr. President, I for one am not going to be bullied around by the administration, the National Farm Bureau, or any of the pressure groups who no more represent the little farmers of the Nation than does some man from outer space.

Mr. President, I hope that every Member of the Senate will closely read the testimony of the farmers in their respective States, as I have done, and follow their advice and thinking. If we all were to do that I know we would pass 90 percent of parity with little difficulty.

Mr. President, if we neglect to provide 90 percent of parity, every Member of the Senate who votes against 90 percent of parity will have on his hands the bankruptcy of every farmer who fails in the coming year or years and winds up on relief and wandering the city streets. That will happen.

Mr. President, unless we exchange Mr. Benson's sliding-parity schedules for rigid 90-percent supports, this Nation will not long have need for the so-called soil-bank program, for it will not be long before the banks will own all the soil.

Surely in the past few years we have learned enough from actions of the Republican administration to know better than to depend on anything it promises the farmers.

Surely we remember that it promised to keep, and then after election day knocked out, 90-percent supports. Surely we know the administration has preached easier credit and practiced tighter credit for the farmers. Surely we have not forgotten the great soil conservationist Eisenhower and how he O. K.'d Mr. Benson's plan to choke the conservation program by cutting off funds. Surely we know that sliding incomes have resulted from sliding parity.

Mr. President, if we do not pass a decent farm bill that contains 90 percent of parity and rigid controls, I would not blame the good farmers of America if they marched on the Capitol. Likewise, should Mr. Eisenhower veto a bill because it contains 90 percent supports, I would not blame the farmers if they similarly marched on the White House. In fact, I would be tempted to help them.

There is little choice for us in the Senate when the pending bill comes up for passage. Either we approve 90 percent of parity in order to save the farmers of today or we sign the death warrant of thousands of little farmers all over the Nation.

Mr. President, there is no poll, no official, no Secretary of Agriculture, no expert alive in America today that knows better what is best for the farmers of this Nation than the farmers themselves. Let us today sober our judgment of the situation before we vote, using the testimony of thousands of farmers, such as that which I have quoted today.

Mr. President, in closing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Orangeburg County Farm Bureau, which has a membership of more than 1,500 families. It is signed by the president, Mr. F. Mitchell Ott.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION FOR 90 PERCENT PARITY

Whereas the economic position of the Orangeburg County farmers is in jeopardy as a result of continuously falling farm prices and increasing farm costs; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture is predicting even further price declines and increased costs in 1956; and

Whereas the sliding scale of farm price supports holds no promise of correcting the situation; and

Whereas that the so-called modern parity formula will tend to lower parity prices on most basic crops: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the farmers here in Orangeburg, S. C., strongly recommend support prices to be restored to parity on all basic crops and that the so-called modern parity formula be discarded: Be it further

Resolved, That we support a minimum 90 percent of parity price-support program for any basic commodity when an acreage allotment and marketing quota program is in effect on that commodity.

RESOLUTION FOR SOIL BANK ACT

Be it resolved, That soil-bank plan as proposed in the present Congress gives little promise of fair prices, and must not be accepted as of much help as to prices this year but only as a long-term measure.

Whereas we favor the development of a sound soil fertility bank program as a supplement to, and not as a substitute for, present farm programs.

RESOLUTION FOR IMPORTS

Resolved, That this assembled group of farmers go on record in opposition to any importation of farm products that are being produced in surplus in the United States.

Whereas we oppose changing basis for support price on cotton from ⅞-inch middling to 1-inch middling. We support ⅞-inch middling as basis.

Whereas we recommend the establishment of lower grades than presently provided for cotton eligible for price supports. We also urge price support commensurate with grade be given on all split grades of cotton.

RESOLUTION FOR EXPANDED SCHOOL LUNCH

Whereas the health of our young people of these great United States should be of paramount concern; and

Whereas the surpluses of our country merit the consideration of a stamp plan to get surplus commodities into the hands of the needy, underprivileged, and tax-supported institutions, such as mental hospitals, schools for the blind, and the like: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge immediate adoption of a stamp plan for increasing the amount of surplus commodities for use of our school-lunch program, to the needy, aged, and the underprivileged when in tax-supported institutions.

We urge you to do all in your power to get legislation passed before planting time of our basic crops in the South.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, briefly I should like to discuss the farm bill as it came from the committee, discuss its particular application to the corn belt, and also to discuss for a few minutes an amendment which I have submitted along with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], my colleague from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senators from Indiana [Mr. JENNER and Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. President, as reported by the committee, Senate bill 3183 would drastically limit participation of the commercial corn area in the proposed soil bank program, which includes the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve.

In its present form, the bill fails to meet the need of the Midwest livestock-feed economy by failing to recognize the fundamental fact that there is an important difference between corn and the other so-called basic commodities.

Corn is produced primarily for the purpose of feeding livestock. On the average, an estimated 85 percent of the total crop is used as feed—largely on the farms where it is produced. Thus, the average corn farmer gets his cash returns from the sale of livestock, poultry, and dairy products, and not from the sale of corn.

I say "average." There is a very small percentage of corn actually sold on the open market, but in the end very little of it goes into any kind of commercial use, except for feed. The overwhelming bulk of it goes into feed for livestock and poultry.

Marketing quotas never have been applied to corn because no one has been able to figure out how to enforce quotas on a feed crop that is largely consumed on farms. Congress recognized two years ago that quotas would not work on corn by repealing the authority for corn quotas when it enacted the Agricultural Act of 1954.

I may say parenthetically that for approximately 20 years efforts were made to figure out a way to make quotas work with reference to corn, which is a crop consumed almost entirely by animals, but no one was able to figure out a way successfully to apply quotas to corn.

Acreage allotments have been in effect in the corn area for the last 2 years, but compliance has been low. This is understandable when we look first at the fact that corn is produced primarily for feed and second at the fact that the reduction of corn acreage in the commercial corn area would merely mean the surrender of corn's traditional livestock feed market to other areas and other commodities. Even the farmers who do comply with their allotments in order to qualify for price support often have to buy "free" corn from their neighbors to replace the corn they have placed under loan.

While asking commercial area corn producers to reduce corn acreage, the Government has permitted the unlimited expansion of competitive feed production on land which has been forced out of cotton, wheat, peanuts, rice, and tobacco production under marketing quota programs.

The counties which were in the commercial area in 1953 planted, in 1955, 56,342,000 acres to corn.

In 1955, when the commercial area allotment was 49,843,000 acres, commercial area plantings were 56,047,000 acres. For 1956, a somewhat enlarged commercial area has been alloted only 43,281,000 acres. This means an average cut of 15 percent from 1955 allotments for counties that were in the commercial area last year, and a cut of 24 percent from the acreage which was actually grown in the present commercial area last year.

Mr. President, I may say, and I must continue to emphasize that, regardless of what the allotments under the law may be for the purpose of price supports, which, as has been pointed out, were, in 1955, 49 million acres, nevertheless, in excess of 56 million acres were actually planted in the commercial corn area, and that figure sticks, year in and year out.

The commercial area producers who have been cooperating with the program in the main producing areas have seen their efforts to make the program work largely offset by increased acreage of other areas both within and outside the commercial area. Iowa, Minnesota, and Nebraska reduced their corn plantings by 1,232,000 acres from 1953 to 1954. At the same time, 7 other Corn Belt States increased plantings by a total of 1,201,000 acres, and 21 minor corn-producing States increased plantings by a total of 1,091,000 acres.

Iowa, Illinois, and Nebraska reduced corn plantings 1,150,000 acres from 1953 to 1955, while 7 other Corn Belt States increased corn plantings 1,519,000 acres and 15 minor corn-producing States increased plantings 921,000 acres. California alone increased corn acreage 110 percent from 1953 to 1954 and 233 percent from 1953 and 1955. California also has increased her corn yields from 36 bushels per acre on the average in 1953 to 48 bushels per acre in 1954 and 56 bushels per acre in 1955. Most of California's increased acreage came on irrigated land diverted from cotton production. As a result, corn production in California increased 181 percent from 1953 to 1954 and 418 percent from 1953 to 1955. I do not mention this to criticize California farmers in any way. Instead, I state these as facts that farmers in the commercial corn area and livestock producers and feeders everywhere have to recognize.

Mr. President, I have before me a table which sets forth the shifts in corn acreage from 1953 to 1955 in selected major and minor corn-producing States. I shall not burden Senators with a reading of the statistics for each State. The table verifies the general conclusions and statements I have just made. I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Shifts in corn acreage from 1953 to 1955 in selected major and minor corn-producing States

[Thousands of acres]

State	Counties in commercial area, 1955	Planted acres		Net change	Percentage change
		1953	1955		
Major corn-producing States reducing acreage:					
Iowa	99 (all counties)	11,213	10,799	−414	−3.7
Illinois	101 out of 102	9,377	9,366	−11	−0.1
Nebraska	61 out of 93	7,434	6,709	−725	−9.8
Total		28,024	26,874	−1,150	−4.1
Corn Belt States not reducing acreage:					
Minnesota	58 out of 87	5,706	5,850	+144	+2.5
Indiana	89 out of 92	4,712	4,941	+229	+4.9
Missouri	69 out of 115	4,113	4,291	+178	+4.3
South Dakota	32 out of 69	3,982	4,224	+242	+6.1
Ohio	68 out of 88	3,545	3,788	+243	+6.9
Wisconsin	36 out of 71	2,563	2,842	+279	+10.9
Michigan	29 out of 83	1,768	1,972	+204	+11.5
Total		26,389	27,908	+1,519	+5.8
Minor corn-producing States increasing acreage:					
Texas	None	2,102	2,194	+92	+4.4
North Dakota	1 out of 53	1,150	1,404	+254	+22.1
New York	None	669	708	+39	+5.8
Louisiana	do	591	638	+47	+8.0
Maryland	14 out of 24	455	470	+15	+3.3
Colorado	None	422	553	+131	+31.0
California	do	76	253	+177	+232.3
New Jersey	7 out of 21	191	207	+16	+8.4
Montana	None	170	215	+45	+26.5
Wyoming	do	56	74	+18	+32.1
Idaho	do	50	61	+11	+22.0
Pennsylvania	30 out of 67	1,372	1,400	+28	+2.0
Arizona	None	35	51	+16	+45.7
Washington	do	21	37	+16	+76.2
Oregon	do	24	40	+16	+66.7
Total		7,384	8,305	+921	+12.5

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the production of oats, barley, and grain sorghums on so-called diverted acres is, at the moment, an even more serious threat to the livestock economy of the commercial corn area than is the expansion of corn production in other areas.

From 1953 to 1955 approximately 17 million acres of land have been taken out of wheat and cotton and shifted into the production of other crops, mainly oats, barley, and grain sorghums. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that, in terms of feeding value equivalent to corn, the production in 1954 and 1955 on the diverted acres of oats, barley, and grain sorghums amounts to over 800 million bushels. Livestock producers mainly outside the commercial corn area have been using oats, barley, and grain sorghums in place of corn as feed. Thus corn stocks have skyrocketed to the highest point in history.

As I have indicated previously, the formula in the production-adjustment laws for determining the acreage of corn has forced allotments down from approximately 57 million planted acres to approximately 50 million acres in 1955, and now for 1956 down to only approximately 43 million acres. Congress has permitted wheat and cotton growers to obtain the benefits of price support and still at the same time to shift their problems to the regular feed-grain producers. Not only has this been unfair to producers in the Corn Belt, but it has also been unfair to the traditional producers of oats, barley, and grain sorghums. Regular corn farmers have contributed very little to the problem, since most of them have disregarded price supports and have continued to plant what was economically sound on their own farms and have taken their chances on what the free market would pay them for their corn. As a matter of fact, about 60 percent of the corn produced last year throughout the entire Corn Belt was produced without regard to price support.

By way of comparison, the 1955 corn program called for a reduction of 6.5 million acres from 1953 plantings in the commercial area. Yields are somewhat above the United States average in the commercial area; but if commercial area corn producers had complied with their corn allotments 100 percent, the effects of the corn program on total feed grain supply clearly would have been offset by the increased production of feed grains on land diverted from crops under marketing controls plus the additional oats, barley, and grain sorghums that undoubtedly would have been produced on land diverted from corn.

Corn producers also have been operating under the constant threat that surplus wheat would be dumped into the feed market to offset any adjustment that may be made in corn production. Even now, when feed grain supplies are at an all-time high, proposals are being made that wheat be dumped into the corn market either through CCC sales or through the adoption of a multiple-price program for wheat.

The large stocks of livestock feed that have been accumulated under past Government programs are, to a great extent, responsible for the present depressed prices of cattle and hogs. Despite the present unsatisfactory level of cattle and hog prices, the availability of large supplies of feed grain produced on diverted acres is resulting in a further expansion of livestock production in some noncommercial corn areas. For example, the December 1955 report on farmers' intentions for spring farrowings indicated a 2-percent reduction in spring pig production for the United States as a whole in 1956. The same report, however, indicated that farrowings in 11 south central States will be 11 percent larger this spring than a year earlier. These States are largely outside the commercial corn area and therefore are largely free from corn allotments. Incidentally, in these same States, corn production increased 57 percent in terms of bushels from 1954 to 1955.

In the face of the critical situation which rising feed supplies are creating for livestock, poultry, and dairy producers, S. 3183 contains provisions which will drastically limit participation in the soil bank program in the commercial corn area. Section 215 provides that no person shall be eligible for payments under the soil bank program with respect to any farm for any year in which the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment under Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended, or the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage under such Title or 15 acres.

Corn producers overplanted their 1955 allotments at an average of 12 percent in 1955. In view of the low level of corn and livestock prices that has prevailed in recent months, it is to be anticipated that more farmers would be willing to reduce acreage to the level of their 1955 allotments this year. It is completely unrealistic, however, to expect any widespread compliance with allotments which are being cut 15 percent from 1955 allotments and an average of 24 percent from the acreage actually grown in 1955.

Yet, if we are going to make any real progress toward adjusting our total agricultural plant to effective market demand, and if we are going to bring about desirable improvements in cattle and hog prices, something must be done about our present excessive supply of feed grain.

We have, in the soil bank idea, a means whereby an effective program can be developed for corn. Since corn is not a marketing quota crop, it should be allowed to participate in the proposed acreage reserve program on a different basis than the marketing quota crops. We should start from where we are and give the corn producers a program which can be expected to work.

To have a workable program for the livestock-feed economy, we need legislative action that will provide:

First. An effective substitute in 1956 for the presently ineffective corn allotment program. The distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has offered an amendment which will get at the diverted acre problem generally and provide a satisfactory substitute for corn allotments in 1956. I shall support his amendment.

Second. The opportunity for corn producers to vote in a referendum as to whether they prefer to return to corn allotments in 1957 or whether they prefer to continue the type of program which would be operative in 1956. Several Senators from the Corn Belt are joining with me on a nonpartisan basis in proposing an amendment which will accomplish this purpose as well as those stated in points 3 and 4 below.

Third. A workable soil-bank program. In order to get participation in the Corn Belt—an objective in which all areas have a vital stake because of the impact of production there on the livestock-feed economy throughout the country—we need to have a realistic acreage base from which to start under the acreage reserve program. I think the facts I have presented in this statement most certainly prove this.

Fourth. A practical alternative program of cash or payment in kind which will facilitate using our present surpluses to implement the soil-bank program, and do so in a way which will contain safeguards against market price depressing effects.

Some question has been raised as to the equity of allowing corn producers to use their base allotments rather than their 1956 allotments for purposes of complying with the acreage reserve program. In this connection I should like to submit a table prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, this is a very important table. Bear in mind that, under the law, there are six basic commodities, excluding tobacco, because it is not in the program we are discussing, and is not eligible, for various reasons, to the formula under which we are operating.

I wish to point out that under the law as it exists a formula is prescribed for determining the number of acres for the ensuing crop year which should be planted to various basic crops, in order to maintain what is termed and defined as a normal supply, and the formula has to be announced by the Secretary by the first of February.

However, as to basics except corn there has been written into the law a floor below which the acreage cannot go.

For instance, the minimum acreage which, under the law, the Secretary is required to support for wheat is 55 million acres. If the formula which is applied to corn acreage were applied to wheat acreage, in determining the number of acres to be supported, the formula would provide for only 18,580,645 acres of wheat. The floor protects the wheat-grower at 55 million acres, or almost 36½ million acres more than are allotted to corn under the formula. But in the case of wheat the Secretary cannot go below the floor, which is set at 55 million acres.

For rice, the legal floor is 1,639,084 acres. Under the formula which is applicable to corn, there would be needed only 936,302 acres of rice to maintain

a normal supply. The floor protects rice plantings to the extent of 702,782 excess acres in order to maintain what is called a normal supply.

With respect to upland cotton, the floor is 17,391,304 acres, and the Secretary cannot go below that. Under the formula which applies to corn, there would be required only 6,690,195 acres of upland cotton for this year in order to maintain a normal supply of upland cotton.

With regard to extra long staple cotton, which is not moving at all, the minimum under the law is 45,305 acres. That class of cotton is not moving. I understand it is all in storage. There would be no acres in extra long staple cotton this year, if the same formula were applied to it that is applied to corn.

The floor for peanuts is 1,610,000 acres, below which the Secretary cannot go in his supports. Yet the formula would give peanut growers 1,454,139 acres, or they have 155,861 excess acres. That is not badly out of line.

There is no floor below which the Secretary cannot go with regard to corn; there is no bottom. Therefore, in applying the formula for 1956, there would be 43,300,000 supported acres for corn in the supported corn area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have been referring be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1956 minimum allotments and what they would have been if no minimum was applicable[1]

Date of determination	Commodity	Minimum under the law	Formula under the law (exclusive of minimum)	Excess acreage
June 1955	Wheat	55,000,000	18,580,645	36,419,355
December 1955	Rice	1,639,084	936,302	702,782
	Upland cotton	17,391,304	6,690,195	10,701,109
	Extra long staple cotton	45,305	None	45,305
	Peanuts	1,610,000	1,454,139	155,861
	Corn	None	43,300,000	None
Total excess acreage				47,979,112

NOTE.—Using 3-year average for Upland cotton (1952, 1953, and 1954) planted acreage yields, allotment would have been 16,382,253. Using the 1954 planted acreage average yield, the allotment would have been 14,678,899.

[1] This is calculated on the basis of the facts at the time the allotments for 1956 were established.

Source: USDA Commodity Stabilization Service, Feb. 23, 1956.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the figures very clearly show the floors fixed in the law with respect to various commodities. In many ways I have not objected to the floors, because I realize thoroughly the economic problems in various areas. The floors fixed may be too large or they may be too small, but I know we must be realistic about these things for the various areas have their own economic problems.

I am only pointing out that there has been an unrealistic approach to the question so far as other basics are concerned, and that corn has not had the floor protection, but has been subject to the formula, with respect to acreage, as contained in the law.

As clearly shown in the table, for this crop year there must be supported, under the formula, 47,979,112 acres of basic crops in this country in excess of what the formula provides should be planted in order to maintain a normal supply.

I point out that at the bottom of the table which I have had printed in the RECORD there appears an explanatory note, together with the source of the information, which is the United States Department of Agriculture, under date of February 23, 1956.

Mr. President, it should be noted that minimum national allotments set by the Congress prevent the reduction in allotments for those crops comparable to those scheduled for corn producers in 1956. If 1956 allotments for cotton and wheat were set on a basis comparable to that provided by law for corn, and recently announced by the Secretary of Agriculture—as he had to do under the law—the allotments for cotton would be 6,690,195 acres, a further cut of 10,701,109 acres below the 1956 allotment, and the allotment for wheat would be 18,580,645 acres, a further cut of 36,419,355 acres below the 1956 allotment.

I would not propose such a cut for these two crops. As I said, it would be an unrealistic reduction as a requirement for price supports, and it would make the soil bank unworkable for these crops. Yet, the bill before the Senate contains provisions with respect to corn that are as incredible as these cuts for cotton and wheat would be.

American agriculture needs a realistic livestock-feed program. I sincerely hope this Congress will provide it.

Mr. President, the amendments I have proposed, along with my Senate colleagues whom I named at the outset of my remarks, may appear to be rather complicated; but, in fact, they are not.

As the bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Corn Belt found itself in the following situation: with mandatory acreage allotments year by year; and with no floor to protect the corn farmers; and bearing in mind that last year, when the formula prescribed that only 49 million acres, roughly, could be supported, less than 50 percent, approximately, of the farmers of corn acreage in the commercial corn area accepted their allotments or were in compliance; in my own State, approximately 23 percent of the 1954 corn crop actually went to seal. In other States, the percentage was lower than that. The manifest reason for that, as is understood by anyone in the Corn Belt, is that corn is a feed crop, and the farmers have to have a certain amount of corn if they are to operate their plants; and if the acreage is cut too low, they will disregard the allotments, and will not be able to take advantage of any loan or support, but will elect to go on the free market.

Under the formula for this year, the acreage is cut further to 43 million, in the case of the supported acres. Last year, with a 49 million acre support limit, we still had 56½ million acres, or about that many, in the commercial corn area. The year before, we had 56 million acres-plus. The year before, we had about the same acreage; there was comparatively little compliance—that is to say, less than 50 percent compliance in the 1954–55 crop years.

With this cut of approximately 15 percent more in the supported corn acres this year, there will be far less compliance. That is agreed to by everyone I know, regardless of his position on other phases of the pending bill. Every corn farmer I know will freely admit that a further reduction to 46 million acres of supported corn this year, will result in far less acceptance of corn allocations.

Mr. President, bear in mind that in order to participate in the soil bank, a farmer must be in compliance; and if substantially less than 50 percent of the farmers in the corn area are in compliance, then substantially less than 50 percent of the farmers will be eligible to participate in the soil bank, even if they elect to do so.

As the matter now stands, with greatly reduced acres, if they accept their allotments, they will not have any acres devoted to corn which they can put in the soil bank, or which they can retire from production, because at the 49 million acre level, they were running so low that they could hardly operate their plants, and many of them could not do so even with their previous acreage allocations.

The bill as reported from the Senate committee simply will not operate for the Corn Belt, and make it realistically possible for the corn farmers generally to participate in the soil bank and reduce the tillable acres.

That is why I have prepared these amendments, and that is why I offer them. I wish to state briefly what they mean.

At the outset, I said that when one considers the number of sections which the amendments propose to change, the amendments may appear a little complicated. But I shall point out, in more or less chronological order, what this amendment does—because it is really just one amendment. In the amendment, I propose that for the year 1956—this year—instead of having the so-called acreage allotments in the Corn Belt for corn acres, we substitute for it a farm-base acreage. Many persons will say, "That will increase corn production." Mr. President, it will not do that at all, because the farm-base acreage will be the average of the acreage which has been planted for the last several years, and that will be the base.

In order to be eligible for price supports in 1956, corn farmers in the commercial corn area must (1) stay within the farm-base acreage, and (2) must put into the soil bank an acreage of tillable cropland equal to 15 percent of their farm-base acreage.

Mr. President, bear in mind that in the case of cotton and in the case of wheat and in the case of peanuts, we do not require contributions to the soil bank. There is very good reason for that. I would favor compulsory contributions to the soil bank, except that the farmers who voted on the wheat quotas and the farmers who voted on the cotton quotas and the farmers who voted on the peanut quotas, for instance, did not consider the question of compulsory contributions to the soil bank; that question was not considered in connection with the votes they cast. Therefore, if at this time we were to attempt—after they have voted on their programs for this year—to change the rules of the game on them, that would not be fair; certainly we do not think it would be fair. I think the committee was unanimous in taking that view. In other words, one does not change the rules of baseball while a runner is between second base and third base.

For that reason, the program has been left on a voluntary basis, insofar as other crop areas are concerned. But in this case the corn farmers would be required to contribute to the soil bank program, in order to be eligible for price supports, and therby would make a contribution of productive field-crop land to the soil bank, for which, of course, they would be adequately and properly compensated. But they would be required to make that contribution in order to be eligible for price supports.

I wish to refer specifically—because this is very important to all of us, and particularly to the farmers—to the provisions appearing on page 5 of my amendment. I propose to insert section 406, to read as follows:

SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in lieu of corn acreage allotments for 1956 (which shall be inoperative for 1956)—

Let me say parenthetically, Mr. President, that we are attempting to substitute a farm base acreage for the so-called acreage allotment program—

the Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on corn, that the producer agree to devote an acreage of cropland (tilled in normal rotation), at the option of the producer, to either the acreage reserve program or the conservation reserve program, equal to 15 per centum of such producer's farm base acreage for corn. The producer by electing to participate in the acreage reserve program, underplanting his farm base acreage for corn, and otherwise complying with the provisions of section 203 hereof, shall earn a payment under subtitle A of this title. The producer by electing to participate in the conservation reserve program and otherwise complying with the provisions of section 207 hereof shall earn a conservation reserve payment under subtitle B of this title.

A little later I shall explain how we arrive at the farm base acreage which will not increase the total acreage of corn produced under this program. This is what the provision means, and what I intend it to mean: It means that if a farmer's farm base acreage of corn, as shown by historic plantings, is roughly 100 acres, as the law now stands, before he could go into the soil bank or before he could get price supports, he would have to cut that acreage this year down to 73 or 75 acres. He could plant his other crops as he pleased, or he could plant competing crops on the acres he reduced. He would not thereby be really reducing the total feed production supply of tillable acres.

Let us use the illustration that the historic average corn base on a certain farm, considering normal rotations and plantings, is 100 acres. Bear in mind that under the law as it now exists, and under the terms of the bill as it came to the Senate, before he would be eligible, his acreage would have to be cut down to somewhere around 73 or 75 acres. But he would receive that base.

However, in order to get price support on his corn, or just compensation, he would be required to contribute an amount equal to 15 percent of his farm base acreage, which would be 100 acres. He would have to contribute 15 acres of his tillable crop producing land into the soil bank. Such acreage would be retired and neither grazed nor cropped.

In that way we would obtain a reduction of the feed-producing acres and still leave the farmer free to plan. For example, under the provisions of this amendment, as I intend, he might elect to take 5 acres out of the cornland, or he could take 15 acres out of the cornland. He might take 5 acres out of corn, 5 acres out of beans, and 5 acres out of oats, so long as he took out 15 percent of 100 acres from his tillable acres. It would give him great latitude in the planning of his operations and in the conduct of his farm. It would not require him to take all those acres out of any one crop, and I think it would stabilize the agricultural program and the crop-reduction program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator made it clear that if the farmer has a 100-acre base for corn, he is required to put 15 acres in the soil bank?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not of cornland alone.

Mr. AIKEN. I was getting to the method of payment. If he chooses to put in 5 acres of his cornland, he is paid for that on the basis of the acreage reserve payments. That is, he is paid for taking out 5 acres of corn.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. If he takes the other 10 acres out of oats, alfalfa, beans, or some other crop, under the conservation reserve program, he is paid somewhat less than he would receive if he took it all out of corn.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not want the RECORD to show that he could take out clover or oats land and receive the same payment as though he took it out of corn.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator for reminding me. I have a note on the subject. The Senator is correct. A farmer might elect to take whatever amount he wanted to take out of his cornland, and he would be paid under the acreage reserve payment for that acreage. If he elected to take none out of cornland, but took it out of other croplands which are not producing basic commodities, he would be paid under the conservation reserve program, according to the formula. There is a formula based on the general value of the land, and its value as productive acreage. But that would be under the conservation reserve program.

I also provide in this amendment for a referendum to be held by the Secretary before the 15th of December 1956, of corn farmers in the commercial corn area, to determine two things: First, whether they want to return to acreage allotments and mandatory price supports, such as would be the situation as the law now stands, or whether they want to have a program without acreage allotments and a price support at a level that would assist them in marketing their corn, but not at a level that would encourage the uneconomic production of corn.

Two-thirds of the farmers voting must favor the proposal before it goes into effect.

The fourth item was covered by the question of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. Under that provision the corn farmers who underplant their corn farm base acreage will be eligible for payments under the acreage reserve subtitle of the soil-bank proposals. Second, corn farmers who elect to put other crop land in the soil bank will be eligible for payment under the conservation reserve if they make their contracts and agreements in accordance with the provisions of the law.

I think I have made it amply clear that the farmer has leeway and discretion as to whether he will take the 15 percent, or any part of it, out of his farm base acreage of corn, or whether he will take it out of other cropland which is competitive land producing soil-depleting feed crops.

Another item in the amendment provides for a workable payment to the farmer in cash, or in grain, for the diverted acres. In other words, for retiring his land into the soil bank a farmer may take his payment in the form of a certificate which he can cash anywhere. He can cash it at a bank or grocery store, or anywhere else, so long as it is eventually presented in due course.

Let me read the exact provisions of the amendment, so they will appear clearly in the RECORD at this point. So far as the payment is concerned, the provisions are as follows:

Producers shall be compensated for participating in the acreage reserve program through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary—(1) in cash upon presentation by the producer or by any holder in due course or (2) at the option of the producer in the case of certificates issued with respect to grains and upon presentation by him, in grains (such grains to be valued by the Secretary at such levels as he determines will not materially impair

the market price for such grain yet will, to the maximum extent practicable encourage acceptance of payment in grains in lieu of cash): *Provided*, That disposition of quantities of stocks hereunder in any 1 year shall be limited to not more than two-thirds of such quantities of such commodities as the Secretary determines would be a reasonable estimate of what would have been produced for marketing during such marketing year on the acreage withheld from production under the provisions of this act: *And provided further*, That such stocks shall not be released prior to the end of the normal harvesting season for the particular commodity being released.

Under this provision a farmer who complies—and under this amendment, so long as a farmer stays within his farm base acreage he could be in compliance—will not depress the market but will be able to acquire grain in return for the certificate which he has received in payment for his compliance.

In that way, the theory is, much of the grain on hand would be used to supplement the added grain the farmer would have used in his operations, and thereby the surplus would actually be used to reduce the surplus.

Under another provision of the amendment the Secretary is authorized to arrange the terms and the amounts of the payments for participation in the soil-bank program, so as to encourage producers to underplant their base acreage for more than 1 year.

A farmer may use the method of graduated payments, if he wishes, or such other method of inducements as will encourage him to underplant his base acreage for more than 1 year. The details will have to be left to regulation by the Department, but the mandate is in the amendment.

Some question has been raised about the probability that this provision may increase the corn acreage in the commercial corn area. It will not increase the corn acreage in the commercial corn area, because the supported acres will remain at the average of the acres planted in the commercial corn area for the years 1955, 1954, and 1953.

It is that average which would be used in the commercial corn area to establish the normal farm base acreage. That is what would be supported, and that is the total acreage which could be supported.

Anyone who overplanted his farm base acreage, as so established, would not be eligible for supports and would not be eligible to go into the soil bank program.

Mr. President, it adds up to this: As I said at the outset of my remarks, corn is in a peculiar position so far as the basic commodities are concerned. At least 85 percent of it is fed on the farm to animals. It is a feed crop. It is not generally a crop thrown on the market for other purposes than animal feed.

I should like to call attention to the fact that in 1953, for instance, there were no acreage allotments at all in the country. However, the acreage planted in the commercial corn area—and these facts are contained in my individual views in the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—in 1953 was 56,342,000. In 1954, with 46,996,000 acres in the commercial corn area under allotment there were still 56,861,000 acres of corn planted in the commercial corn area. In 1955, with 49,843,000 acres under allotment, there were still 56,047,000 acres of corn planted in the commercial corn area.

My prediction is that next year, regardless of what the formula or the allotment was this year, about 56 million-plus acres will be planted in the commercial corn area.

It is the nature of the corn and feed operations that that is about the number of acres which are planted year in and year out. That is shown by the records for recent years. I propose to be realistic about it, and extend a realistic support base program to those acres which have been consistently planted in the commercial corn area as needed for operations. I would extend a realistic support base program to those acres, but would make certain that we did not extend it beyond the average. The reason for using the average of 1953, 1954, and 1955 is to establish the corn base.

I again emphasize and point out to the Senate that in proposing the amendment I wish to show that the corn farmers are the only ones who are required to make a contribution to the soil bank. I explained a while ago that in committee we discussed this subject. We did not believe it was fair this year to compel the cottongrowers to contribute, or to compel the wheatgrowers to contribute, because they had had their elections based on a premise which did not include compulsory contributions.

As I said earlier, we did not believe it was fair to change the rules between 2d and 3d base. Therefore, during this year we would leave it on a voluntary contribution basis so far as they were concerned. However, corngrowers did not vote. Corngrowers did not have an election. I have discussed this subject with hundreds of corn farmers, and they are willing to go along, and they believe it should be mandatory that they make a reasonable contribution, on a sufficiently attractive basis, on which they would be fairly treated.

So far as the support prices are concerned, I call attention to the fact that as the situation now stands, if a farmer wishes to go into the program this year, under the bill as it was reported from the committee and under the law which now exists—taking the 100-acre base as the normal farm base—he would be cut probably below 75 acres. That is all he could plant.

If he produced corn on the 75 acres and obtained 50 bushels an acre, which is a fair production per acre—and it would work just as well if we assumed a production of 60 or 80 bushels per acre—he would produce 3,750 bushels of corn on the 75 acres. On a 90 percent mandatory support basis—which would be roughly $1.50, taking the average all the way through—he would get a support price of $5,625. That is what he would get if he sealed his corn and complied with his acreage allotment. We could use 73 or 74 acres, in this calculation but I am using 75 acres because it is easier to figure.

Under my amendment, if we establish the historic farm acreage base and assume that it is 100 acres, we may say that of the 100 acres the farmer would put 10 acres into the acreage reserve. That would leave him 90 acres to farm. If he wanted to go into the acreage reserve he could put 5, 10, or 15 acres into corn, if he took 5 acres out of corn and 5 acres out of something else. Assuming 50 bushels to the acre, he would raise 4,500 bushels on that land; and the price support, which has been already announced and which will be maintained this year, I am assured, at 81 percent of parity, would give the farmer slightly over $1.40 a bushel; but let us call it $1.40 a bushel. He would receive as his support price $6,330. That would be the ceiling price in his corn program.

In addition to that, for the 10 acres of 50-bushel an acre corn he took out of production and put into the acreage reserve, he would get $350 at the acreage limit for those 10 acres; so that he would get $6,330, plus $350, which makes $6,680, or $1,000 more for taking out 10 acres of corn and 5 acres of some other crop. He would get $1,000 more than if he went into this program and complied. Of course, Mr. President, 90 acres is 90 acres. But if he complied, he would have to cut down to about 73 acres.

In this way he has leeway, latitude, to program his farm, and, also, he must contribute to the soil bank and thereby cut down the total production of feed.

We hope that in other areas the voluntary program will work. I believe it will be attractive enough to induce millions of acres to come into the reserve, but I again wish to call attention to the fact that the corn farmers are willing to have a mandatory provision in the law that they shall make a contribution this year in order to be eligible for price supports on a realistic basis, on the historic farm-base acreage.

I shall further discuss my amendment, Mr. President, when it is called up for consideration by the Senate, within the limits of the unanimous-consent agreement. I presume there are Senators who will have questions to ask at that time. I request that they study the amendment, that they discuss it with the farmers of the Corn Belt, and familiarize themselves with it. I feel confident that whether a Senator comes from the Corn Belt, or from some other area, he will be convinced of the absolute equities of the amendment and of the benefits which it will afford in connection with a realistic overall reduction of the total supply of feeds without injuring any one crop, and thereby bringing the feed supplies and the animal supplies more nearly into balance.

I believe that upon reflection, examination, and study, there will be agreement that this is an equitable provision, one which makes it as realistic as is possible for the Corn Belt farmers to participate, without any undue advantage or any undue or unusual treatment of the Corn Belt farmers, except that the farmers are willing to contribute to the soil bank as one of the quid pro quos of being eligible on a realistic basis for price supports.

Mr. President, I apologize for taking so much of the time of the Senate this

evening, but I did wish to discuss my amendment prior to beginning of the voting tomorrow. As I have stated, I shall discuss it again when the amendment is called up for action by the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have been following the debate on the pending measure very closely and with a great deal of interest, both on the floor of the Senate and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Some of the facts which have been brought out in this debate cannot, in my estimation, be overemphasized. I do not suggest that the American farmer need be reminded again and again of his present economic condition; he is well aware of it.

A study of conditions shows that our farmers are in trouble, that our agricultural economy is sick, and when this segment of our economy is ailing, the effect will surely be felt by each and every one of us. For that reason, I think it is absolutely essential that during debate on the pending bill the American people be fully informed as to just how desperate the farmers' situation has become.

With that purpose in mind, I should like to review briefly some of the things which have occurred in our farm economy in recent years.

In 1952 the farmers' total net income, according to the figures of the Department of Agriculture, was $14.9 billion. Since that time farm net income has been falling at an alarmingly rapid rate.

In 1953 farm net income had dropped to $12.8 billion—a 14 percent decline in 1 year. In 1954 there was another 3 percent drop, which brought farm net income for that year to $12.3 billion, and in 1955 net income of farmers had fallen to an estimated $10.9 billion—a 28 percent decline in the 3-year period from 1952 through 1955. In actual dollars, farmers' net income in 1955 was the lowest it has been in the 13 years since 1942.

These facts are even more astounding when we compare what is happening to the farmers with what is happening to other parts of our economy. While the farmers' net income was dropping 28 percent in the 3-year period from 1952 through 1955, corporations' profits—after taxes—were up 39 percent. Income from dividends rose 36 percent. Rental income was up 32 percent; interest, 36 percent; business and professional proprietors' income increased 9 percent; employees wages, 20 percent; and weekly earnings of manufacturing workers went up 14 percent.

In only 1 year, from 1954 to 1955, corporations profits were up 20 percent. Profits of United States Steel were up 115 percent; of ALCOA, up 74 percent; of General Motors, up 49 percent. The average worker's income was up 7 percent. Stockholders' income rose 10 percent. But farmers' income was down 11 percent.

So, in a period when most of the people of our country are enjoying some degree of prosperity, there is a wide and growing gap between farm and nonfarm income. In the year 1952 the per capita income of farm persons was $949 and for nonfarm persons it was $1,832—a difference of $883. But an estimate for 1955 reveals that the per capita income of farm persons is down to $896, and perhaps lower, while the per capita income of nonfarm persons is up to $1,960, a difference of $1,064.

Also, in speaking of farm income, it is interesting to note that farm people make up nearly one-seventh—13.4 percent—of the national population; but income from farming is nowhere near one-seventh of the total national income. In 1952 the farmer received 8.7 percent of the national income, but in 1955 it is estimated that farmers received only 6 percent. Even in 1932, a depression year, farm income averaged 7.6 percent of the national income.

PARITY RATIO COMPARISONS

Mr. President, a recent publication released by the Department of Agriculture shows that the farm parity ratio in mid-January, 1956, stood at 80 percent, the lowest monthly ratio in any year since 1941. As a matter of fact, the parity ratio has been steadily declining over the past 3 years.

The parity ratio figure of 80 percent for mid-January of this year compared with a ratio of 104 percent in mid-January, 1952; 94 percent in mid-January, 1953; 92 percent in mid-January, 1954; and 86 percent in mid-January, 1955.

There has been a steady drop in prices received by farmers for farm products since 1952, as shown by Department of Agriculture statistics.

For example, corn prices are down 26 percent, rice 20 percent, oats 29 percent, butterfat 23 percent, cotton 12 percent, cottonseed 39 percent; in fact, average prices received by farmers for all farm products have fallen 19 percent, according to the commodity price index.

On the other hand, prices paid by farmers have risen steadily. Taxes were up 16 percent, interest 27 percent, farm machinery up 4 percent, building and fencing up 4 percent, motor supplies up 4 percent.

All these figures which I have presented may make dull reading, but they paint a graphic and realistic picture of why we have a farm problem.

The recently issued report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1956 Economic Report of the President contains some figures demonstrating what happened to our farm people in 1955.

I quote from page 17 of that report:

The record is clear. In 1955:

Income of the farm population from all sources fell $1 billion, reaching the lowest level since 1945.

Gross income of farm operators from farming fell $1.2 billion and net income declined by $1.4 billion.

Farm wages fell $46 million.

Total income from agricultural sources declined by $1.4 billion.

Per capita income of the farm population fell from $913 in 1954 to $856 in 1955, the lowest level since 1950.

The index of all farm prices received by farmers fell from 249 in 1954 to 237 in 1955; at the end of 1955 the index stood at 223.

The parity ratio has declined steadily, from 100 in 1952 to 84 in 1955; at the end of 1955, it stood at 80, a 6-point decline since December 1954.

The index of feed grain prices fell 16 percent.

Prices of oil crops declined 17 percent.

Meat prices dropped 21 percent with hog prices falling by 38 percent.

Farm real-estate debt went up 10 percent.

Farm real-estate taxes rose by 5 percent.

Farm interest payments increased by 8 percent.

These data demonstrate that the administration's so-called attack on fundamental weaknesses in the farm economy has, in fact, operated against the farmer. The lack of an appropriate concern by top Cabinet officers for the distressed situation of agriculture is exemplified by the attitude of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey. He stated that he regarded the fall in farm prices as "undesirable," but "not alarming."

Mr. President, I have four press releases relating to the question of farm indebtedness and interest rates which are consistent with that statement. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM INDEBTEDNESS GETS BIGGER AND INTEREST RATES GET HIGHER

"Farmers in 1955 borrowed $1.4 billion to help finance their farm operations from their 498 production credit associations. This was the largest for any year since these credit cooperatives began operation in 1933 and 1934," Harold A. Miles, Deputy Governor and Director of Short-Term Credit Service of the Farm Credit Administration stated today.

The $653 million in loans outstanding on December 31, was also the largest amount outstanding for any year end since organization. (Press release, February 6, 1956, Farm Credit Administration.)

Farmers in 1955 obtained 61,000 farm-mortgage loans for a total of $487 million from the 12 Federal land banks through the 1,100 national farm loan associations in the continental United States and Puerto Rico. This was an increase of 21 percent in number and 59 percent in amount of loans over the preceding year, and higher than any year except 1934, according to a statement made today by Thomas A. Maxwell, Deputy Governor and Director of the Land Bank Service, Farm Credit Administration.

Of the $487 million, $338 million was new money borrowed, an increase of 50 percent in the amount of new money compared with 1954. The remainder was balances on old loans farmers refinanced in their new loans. (Press release, January 23, 1956, Farm Credit Administration.)

"The needs for agricultural credit are increasing but lending is becoming more difficult," Governor [R. B. Tootell, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration] Tootell explained. "This situation arises from the fact that the prices farmers receive for their products and hence their incomes are falling at a time when the rest of the economy is booming and holding up the cost of most things that farmers buy. The accompanying tight money market is also causing higher interest rates on funds needed to finance agriculture," he continued. (Press release, January 17, 1956, Farm Credit Administration.)

New mortgage debt secured by farm real estate and recorded in the first half of 1955 totaled $1.3 billion, 29 percent more than during the same period of 1954. This was the largest dollar volume for any 6-month period since records were started in 1934. The greater part of this increase resulted from a rise of 18 percent in the average size of farm-mortgage loans made but the number of loans made also was up by 9 percent. (Current Developments in the Farm Real

Estate Market, July 1955, Agricultural Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, whenever and wherever our present farm problems are discussed, the blame is always placed on overproduction—on the so-called market-depressing surpluses. I have never subscribed to the theory that a surplus of agricultural commodities in inherently and necssarily bad.

In that connection, I should like to call attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of February 19, 1956. The article, written by Earl H. Voss, is entitled "Surpluses May Be Vital If Nuclear War Comes." The article presents these questions: "Are we wise in trying too hard to peddle our farm surpluses?" and "As a matter of fact, do we have any surplus at all?"

Mr. Voss attempts in the article to demonstrate how quickly our surpluses could be depleted in the event of an all-out nuclear war, or in the event of natural disasters resulting in crop failures.

I think the article is timely and should receive wide publication because of the questions raised and the problems presented regarding our farm surpluses. Certainly in this period of grave world tensions, the problems presented by the article should not be overlooked by Congress. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPLUSES MAY BE VITAL IF NUCLEAR WAR COMES

(By Earl H. Voss)

Force yourself to imagine, for a ghastly few minutes, that the unthinkable has happened. The all-out nuclear war has begun. Almost immediately both sides could be expected to leap to a perilous conclusion:

Chemical and biological warfare are no more inhumane than H-bombs. The time would have come to shoot the works.

What would this mean?

Almost certainly it would mean contamination of our food supply. Grain fields in the Middle West would become battlefields. Government surplus stocks would become targets. Air bursts from guided missiles, from balloons, from Soviet bombers' droppings, deliberate dispersion of radioactive waste materials—all of these could contaminate our bread basket with a deadly poison.

America, the land of milk and honey and plenty could overnight be faced with starvation.

Which brings up more questions.

Are we wise in trying so hard to peddle our farm surplus? As a matter of fact, do we have any surplus at all?

How long would it take to deplete these huge, depressing surpluses overhanging the market in case of all-out war?

OUR STANDBY STOCKS

Here are some answers, supplied by the National Farmers Union and based on Agriculture Department statistics (American consumption and exports assumed to be the same as in 1952, the last year no surpluses were accumulated):

We have corn for only 3 months and 19 days—barely enough to keep the distribution pipeline filled.

We have enough wheat for 13 months and 11 days.

We have enough cotton for 13 months and 10 days.

Enough rice for 7 months and 8 days.

Enough butter for 1 month and 14 days.

Enough rye for 7 months and 25 days.

Enough barley for 4 months and 14 days.

Enough oats for 24 days.

Enough soybeans for 29 days.

The list goes on, but there is no important crop in which our surpluses exceed 14 months' supply. Of course, fallout with long-term persistence, like strontium or cesium, could contaminate our farmlands for many years.

Today, even the meager stocks we have on hand could be contaminated in the first days of an all-out war. We have made no preparations to protect them or anything else against radioactive fallout or chemical attack.

Despite these inadequacies of our food and fiber stocks for a nuclear-war situation, both Democratic and Republican administrations have sought to reduce them in two ways, by selling them or giving them away abroad, and by discouraging farm production.

TWO VOICES

At least two Democrats in the Senate are now awakening to the political as well as nonpolitical advantages in setting up a strategic reserve of food and fibers. They are Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of farm-State Minnesota, and HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington.

Senator HUMPHREY has called on the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Department of Agriculture to say, "What level of reserves are necessary for defense purposes?"

There is an apparent inconsistency in the Nation's attitude toward food on the one hand and inedible strategic materials on the other.

"Here we are," Senator HUMPHREY points out, "putting $6 billion into stockpiles of strategic minerals and other materials to make sure we have enough on hand in event of a defense emergency, building additional stockpiles of A-bombs, planes, and other weapons of warfare, yet the administration asks us to liquidate all of our food and fiber holdings without thinking about how we could even start to defend our Nation in event of such an emergency without assurance of ample food and fiber."

TWO SOLUTIONS

Generally, there are two main ideas about how to use our food surplus as a strategic reserve:

First, stockpile it in protected sites, dispersed in the vicinity of metropolitan areas most likely to be attacked in an all-out nuclear war.

Second, send some of the surplus abroad to our allies for similar stockpiling in case of war.

It has been suggested that the food and fiber raw materials might even be processed before they are stockpiled, put into individual rations ready for distribution. Big cities could be ringed with strategically located warehouses—underground. Stocks could be rotated, if necessary, to provide a permanent "safety reserve."

The advantages cited by proponents of the plan are these:

1. American strength in the "broken-back" phase of a nuclear war would be greatly increased; the Soviet Union, it will be remembered, has no comparable agricultural surpluses.

2. Our allies would be stiffened against Soviet intimidation and would have new evidence of the United States long-term interest in their survival.

3. Properly insulated from world and domestic markets in this manner, American surpluses would lose their depressive effects and farm prices might head back toward that 100 percent in the market place which President Eisenhower seeks.

Before any concrete action on these proposals is possible, however, two questions must be answered.

TWO QUESTIONS

First, what levels of supply should be maintained for emergencies, such as wars or famines? Second, what is a normal inventory of farm commodities—needed to keep the pipeline filled from farmer to consumer?

The Office of Defense Mobilization, which is now stockpiling strategic materials, works on the assumption that a 6-month supply of hard goods must be kept on hand. Shouldn't there be at least a comparable supply of foods and fibers?

Our meat supply, of course, depends on feed grains for the cattle, poultry, and hogs.

One prominent nuclear scientist familiar with fallout effects believes that:

"Food would be the most essential thing in case of nuclear attack. We should take advantage of our surpluses and produce balanced rations for storage in safe sites near metropolitan areas, so that our people will be assured of the most important item for our survival following an attack—uncontaminated food."

It is entirely conceivable, of course, that America's efficient farmers would soon produce enough to fill our strategic food reserve requirements as well as those of our allies and soon begin piling up new surpluses. But until we have the security of adequate food reserves, there is room to wonder whether we are overemphasizing the present need for regulating production.

Nuclear war, of course, is not the only phenomenon which could threaten the American food supply. Famines and other natural disasters are still possible.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a table showing how long the present supply of CCC-owned stocks of agricultural commodities would last, based on 1952 consumption requirements, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordred to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How long would supply last? Quantity of commodities pledged for CCC loans and owned by CCC as of Dec. 31, 1955 [1]

[All figures in thousands]

Commodity	Pledged for loans	Owned by CCC	Total quantity	Domestic disappearance plus gross exports 1952	Months and days present supply will last based on 1952 requirements
Corn—bushels	180,159	757,612	937,771	[2] 3,152,920	3 months 19 days.
Cotton, upland—bales	5,422	7,921	13,343	12,190	13 months 10 days.
Peanuts, farmers' stock—pounds	290,746	6,033	296,779	[2] 607,449	5 months 28 days.
Rice—hundredweight	12,115	15,387	27,502	46,103	7 months 8 days.
Tobacco—pounds	1,053,976	231	1,054,207	2,043,012	6 months 3 days.
Wheat—bushels	221,241	888,542	1,109,783	1,009,284	13 months 11 days.
Butter—pounds	----------	166,399	166,399	1,389,000	1 month 14 days.
Cheese—do	----------	333,002	333,002	1,227,000	3 months 9 days.
Milk, dried—do	----------	161,714	161,714	1,035,000	1 month 27 days.

[1] Figures from financial report of Commodity Credit Corporation, Dec. 31, 1955.
[2] 1951.

How long would supply last? Quantity of commodities pledged for CCC loans and owned by CCC as of Dec. 31, 1955—Continued

[All figures in thousands]

Commodity	Pledged for loans	Owned by CCC	Total quantity	Domestic disappearance plus gross exports 1952	Months and days present supply will last based on 1952 requirements
Honey—pounds	986		986	281,254	1 day.
Tung oil—do		22,988	22,988	51,295	5 months 14 days.
Barley—bushels	69,152	31,261	100,413	273,956	4 months 14 days.
Cottonseed meal—pounds		53	53	5,290,000	None.
Cottonseed oil—do		17,878	17,878	1,359,000	5 days.
Flaxseed—bushels	6,685	438	7,123	35,465	2 months 13 days.
Grain sorghum—hundredweight	43,483	26,452	69,935	188,357	4 months 16 days.
Linseed oil—pounds		57,256	57,256	553,000	1 month 8 days.
Oats—bushels	56,237	35,258	91,495	1,364,441	24 days.
Rye—do	8,988	3,306	12,294	19,112	7 months 25 days.
Soybeans—do	22,342	410	22,752	[2] 283,001	29 days.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in speaking of surpluses as a part of our farm problem, I should like also to call to the attention of the Senate an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post and Times Herald. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

WHAT IS THE FARM PROBLEM?

In a preceding article I discussed the fallacy of supposing that the problem of the farm surpluses can be solved in any serious measure by dumping the surpluses abroad. We are left with the task of managing the farm problem at home.

Needless to say, I do not know how to solve the farm problem. I know just enough about it, however, to be reasonably certain that no solution of the problem is now in sight, and that the best we can hope for from the measures being debated in Congress is that the aggrieved farmers will get some degree of temporary relief.

It cannot do any harm, and it might possibly lead to something useful, to ask ourselves—as if we had just arrived from Mars—what it is that we are trying to do. It transpires, I believe, that we do not usually, if ever, say directly what it is that we are trying to do.

What we are trying to do is to provide the farm population with incomes which keep pace with the incomes of the industrial population. It is now an accepted rule, which no public man disputes, that the income of farmers must not stand still, much less may it fall, in relation to industrial income. That is the meaning of what is called parity.

Now the fact is that during this century—at least since the First World War—farmers' incomes if left to themselves have tended to fall away from parity. To prevent this falling away from parity is the object of all the farm plans. They are at bottom of two kinds. One is to restore parity directly, the other is to restore it indirectly.

The direct way would be to vote the farmers a Federal subsidy to cover the deficit between the income they earn and the income which under the principle of parity they ought to receive.

A direct subsidy system would work out something like this. In the case of cotton, for example—where there is one of our largest and most stubborn surpluses—total market requirements, both domestic and foreign, would be estimated for the crop year. Farmers would be assigned production quotas in terms of bales. Cotton would be sold at market prices and would no longer be supported at noncompetitive levels. Subsidies would be paid directly to the farmer to make up the difference between the price he sells his cotton for and the amount he should receive to maintain his income in parity with the economy as a whole. Production limitations would be compulsory for those farmers who elect to receive the subsidy.

This system would have many advantages over the present system. At prices which are competitive and meet the actual conditions of supply and demand, cotton sales could probably be increased. In any event they would not pile up in unused surpluses which are not only wasteful but by their very existence exert a depressing influence on cotton prices and markets. The cost of the subsidy to the Government and the taxpayer would probably be lower through the elimination of storage and insurance costs and a reduction in administrative expenses. And finally, what is perhaps most important, the long-run adjustment of production and consumption would be improved. For such a subsidy system would rely on market prices to allocate the farmers' productive efforts more realistically.

But the fact is, of course, that almost all farm plans rely on indirect devices for covering the deficits from parity. They use Federal money and the Federal regulating power to manipulate supply and demand in a rigidly protected domestic market; the aim of the manipulation is to create artificially high prices which will bring farmers' incomes up to parity.

Neither method is easy to administer in our kind of free society. For both involve massive interference by the Government in the affairs of the farmer. The direct method, that of outright payments to supplement incomes, might well be the easier and cheaper to administer. Yet almost certainly it would be the more unpopular. For it reveals quite baldly the fact that the operation is at bottom a subsidy by the Nation to a part of the Nation.

Our people do not like to pay or to be paid their subsidies openly. They prefer, having become used to them, the indirect forms of subsidy. Of these the tariff is the biggest example of all though not the only one. Practically all the farm plans are devices, like the tariff, for replacing the free and open market with an artificial market.

It seems to me that if the direct method is the easier to work effectively, we should not to be squeamish about recognizing openly the fact that it is national policy to subsidize agriculture. There is nothing to be ashamed of about that. The maintenance of a contented agricultural population is a national interest of the first order. That agriculture requires protection and help is a fact which cannot be doubted, and therefore it would be mere political prudery to try to hide the reality, which is that agriculture must be a protected and subsidized occupation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Lippmann, in his article, states that the problem with which we are now struggling is one of planning a workable way to provide our farm population with incomes which keep pace with the incomes of the industrial population. Mr. Lippmann goes on to say that there are two ways to achieve parity for agriculture—the direct and the indirect way. Almost all present farm plans, he correctly states, rely on the indirect method of making up deficits from parity—that is, the use of Federal money and Federal regulatory power to manipulate supply and demand in a rigidly protected domestic market, the aim being the creation of artificially high prices designed to bring farmers' incomes up to parity.

The alternative to the indirect method is one which I have advocated in the past, the payment of a direct subsidy, a Federal subsidy to farmers to cover the deficit between the income they actually receive and the income which they should have under the parity principle.

Mr. Lippmann suggests that this direct method may be easier and cheaper to administer, but that it would be unpopular, because the people of this country do not like to be paid their subsidies openly.

I happen to agree with the idea that it is about time we stop kidding ourselves about the facts, stop being "squeamish," as the article states, about the fact that it is our national policy to subsidize agriculture. I, for one, have no qualms about admitting this, nor do I think we need apologize for it.

We subsidize shipping. We subsidize airlines. We subsidize magazines. We provide fast writeoffs for industry. We grant depletion allowances. We provide subsidies for research. Why should we be reluctant to admit that we must provide aids to agriculture?

Mr. Lippmann also, in the article to which I am referring, gives an example of the operation of the direct subsidy as it could be applied in the case of cotton. I was very much interested in this illustration, because, as some of my colleagues will remember, I introduced on January 23 of this year Senate bill 3008, which I felt was a possible solution to our cotton problem. I regret that this proposal was not favorably considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in connection with the farm bill presently before the Senate.

The example given by Mr. Lippmann in his article, is a good illustration of how my bill, S. 3008, would operate:

> Total market requirements, both domestic and foreign, would be estimated for the crop year. Farmers would be assigned quotas in terms of bales. Cotton would be sold at market prices and would no longer be supported at noncompetitive levels. Subsidies would be paid directly to the farmer to make up the difference between the price he sells his cotton for and the amount he should receive to maintain his income in parity with the economy as a whole. Production limitations would be compulsory for those farmers who elect to receive the subsidies.

I agree with Mr. Lippmann that the plan presented by the bill would result in increased cotton sales, diminished surpluses, lower costs for storage, interest, and administration expenses. Also production and consumption would be

more realistically alined; and the income of the cotton farmer would reach a true parity level.

SOIL BANK

Mr. President, I wish now to discuss briefly the pending measure, particularly with reference to the soil-bank provision. If, as has been stated, the main purpose of the bill now before the Senate is to raise farm income immediately, I should like to ask how the soil-bank provision of the bill would achieve that result.

I understand that the acreage reserve provision of the soil bank would allow a cotton farmer, for instance, to participate in the soil bank by underplanting his allotted acreage. The portion of the allotted acreage which is not planted would be placed in the soil bank. For these acres placed in the bank the farmer would receive a Government payment, based on the profit he would have received had he planted the acreage and harvested and marketed his crop. I am unable to see how such an arrangement will result in an increase in farm income, for, actually, the farmer merely arrives at the same destination over a different route. At the end of the year he ends up with approximately the same income, paid by the Government, which he would have received by planting his entire acreage allotment. His income is not increased, but is merely replaced by the Government at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers of the country. So, while the farmer of the country will be blamed for receiving a huge Government handout, he will not have bettered his economic position a bit. It may be true that in the long run the soil-bank provision of the bill will achieve the goal of reduced surpluses, but I fail to see how it can possibly result in immediate income increases to the farmer.

Mr. President, last spring the Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings on a study of the stock market. One of the reasons for those hearings was to draw the attention of the administration, the business community, and the people to the contrast between the serious condition of the farm economy and the remarkable boom in the stock market reflecting the profits of the industrial giants.

I am of the opinion that it is not simply the welfare of the farmers which is involved in the proposed legislation, but that the stability of our entire economy is threatened by a continued decline in the prices and income received by the farmers.

In my opinion, it is all important that a better bill and a better program be adopted by Congress at this session than the bill and program which are now under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in my discussion of the farm bill yesterday, I stated that I wished to proceed with a further discussion of some of the titles in the bill and with some amendments which I intend to propose and call up. I wish to call particular attention to a portion of the bill about which little has been said so far. Yet it is a significant and important section. I am referring to title VI, covering forestry provisions.

Timber farming is directly related to other agriculture in many of our States. The Forest Service is an important unit of our Department of Agriculture. Our Senate committee is designated as the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is appropriate that we have further recognized that tie in this measure by including forestry provisions in our farm bill.

They are good provisions, and bipartisan provisions.

The forestry title includes section 601, providing assistance to States for tree planting and reforestation, and section 602, providing for price reporting on wood products and further marketing research.

I wish to make it clear that I am talking about price quotation reporting and not about price supports.

Section 601 has been taken from a bill introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It was my pleasure and privilege to move the addition of his bill to the omnibus farm bill. I think its provisions are excellent. I support it wholeheartedly and feel he has made a constructive contribution in offering it. Section 602, providing price reporting and marketing research, was taken from a bill introduced last spring by myself.

The objective of section 601 is to step up, nationwide, the present rate of reforestation on all land in need of such planting, irrespective of ownership, by providing assistance to the States for tree planting. It would be accomplished through a cooperative plan of action between the individual States and the Secretary of Agriculture, originating in the States through the State foresters or equivalent State officials.

Section 602 would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a price reporting service for basic forest products, such as standing timber, saw logs, and pulpwood, to conduct and stimulate research aimed at developing the efficiency of marketing forest products, and to study price trends and relationships for basic forest products and within 2 years report thereon to Congress.

Mr. President, this is a very moderate provision, long overdue for our timber farmers.

For years we have provided marketing guidance to farmers through gathering and publishing of agricultural prices paid at various market centers, first through the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and later through the Agricultural Marketing Service. Such service has never existed on wood products. There is no reason why timber farmers should not be provided with the same marketing information for their guidance.

I would suggest that any of my colleagues pick up the Wall Street Journal, or the financial section of any daily paper or business magazine, and run down the commodity-price quotations.

They will find prices reported on wheat, lead, cotton linters, hogs, hides, and even burlap bags. But they will not find a mention of pulpwood, saw logs, or any other primary forest products.

Yet pulpwood worth a half billion dollars is bought and sold every year, and sawlogs and rough lumber amounting to several times this figure change hands regularly. Is there any justification for producers of timber products being kept in the dark about current price trends?

I would like to quote from an article written by H. R. Josephson, in Research in the Economics of Forestry, edited by William A. Duerr and H. J. Vaux, and published by the Charles Lathrop Pack Forestry Foundation in Washington, D. C., in 1953. Mr. Josephson has this to say about the importance of current and past price information:

> Widespread application of good forestry practices on private lands depends in large measure upon the profitability of growing and harvesting timber. It is evident that profits in turn depend partly upon prices received for timber products. In spite of the importance of prices to forest owners and also to operators of wood-using plants, price information for timber products is generally not available in organized form. Sellers of small quantities of timber products are typically in an unsatisfactory bargaining position; numerous sellers, having little knowledge of timber values, must generally bargain with comparatively few purchasers, who are relatively well informed. * * *
>
> Factual information on prices is of direct usefulness, also, to a variety of other parties engaged in producing, buying, selling, and using timber products. In addition, reliable data on prices are basic to the analysis of marketing problems, to research on such subjects as the economics of timber growing and to such public programs as price control.

We cannot preserve free enterprise and free market choice in this country without providing a more complete knowledge of market conditions. We have recognized that in agriculture. It is time we recognized it in forestry.

Current forest products price reporting has been carried on systematically only in Wisconsin, Illinois, Oregon, New Hampshire, and Georgia. I understand it has been discontinued under pressure in the latter State. These spotty efforts, even with recognized limitations, are the only body of information we have on forest product prices.

On the other hand, farmers and agricultural economists have had consistent price data for well over a half century, which has made possible a far clearer understanding of the farm economy than foresters have of their own sector.

My original bill for this purpose was co-sponsored by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

I am sure this measure will be a significant step forward in improving marketing of forest products throughout the country.

Mr. President, my suggestions for an improvement of this kind were first outlined in a public address at Grand Rapids, Minn., on October 17, 1954. That talk was entitled "Our Resources—and Your Future." Because this measure brings a step closer to realization the goals outlined in that address, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RESOURCES AND YOUR FUTURE

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at northern Minnesota resources development rally, Grand Rapids, October 17, 1954)

It is a real pleasure for me to have the opportunity today to speak to my fellow Minnesotans in an area so economically important to all of Minnesota, yet an area confronted with many economic problems beyond any one man's control.

It is more of a pleasure to be talking about a subject close to my heart—conservation and development of our natural resources—because of my deep conviction that only in such an approach lies the answer to this area's economic future.

This part of Minnesota has made a great contribution to the past progress and economic development of our State.

It need not be relegated to the economic ash heap, just because riches have been taken away from it in the past.

It has a great future, a great potential yet unexploited.

Our problem is to make sure that potential is exploited wiser in the future than the past, exploited for the benefit of all the people, and for generations to come—rather than exploited solely for the private gain of a powerful few with little or no concern for the people who must remain to eke out an existence after the richness of our resource heritages are gone.

Minnesota is indeed a fortunate State in many ways, but especially in its natural resources.

In Minnesota, we have more than twice as much forest land owned by the people as in any other State in the Union.

We own 8 million acres of county and State forests—largely built up from the wreckage of the old logging days. In addition we have 3 million acres more in our 2 great national forests—the Chippewa and the Superior. Altogether, that's 11 million acres of timber in which you and I, as citizen-stockholders, each hold a share—2½ acres for every man, woman, and child in the State of Minnesota.

How many of us have ever stopped to realize the tremendous value of that possession? It's a valuable possession, which we must guard well, and manage wisely—both for our own generation and for those who will follow us.

We have greatly productive farming resources, too. Yet we must be just as concerned about conserving the productive capacity of our topsoil, so that future generations may share in the abundance of food and fiber we now enjoy as no other peoples of the world have ever known.

We have great recreational advantages and attractions, which are not only an economic asset but a contribution to a happier, healthier life for our people. Yet much of the economic value of our resort regions hinges upon preservation and propagation of our wildlife, and can quickly be wiped out unless we are vigilant and far-sighted.

Is it any wonder that as a Senator from Minnesota I am concerned about national policies concerning conservation and development of our natural resources?

Is it any wonder that I have been disturbed at growing national indications of a reversal of the Nation's 70-year-old policy for protecting our natural resources—a nonpartisan policy for the public good?

All America must be awakened to the facts that exist. Without intending in any way to create a partisan issue out of something that should be the deep concern of all of us, I must regretfully report to you today that a devious campaign is underway against America's forests, waterpower, parks, public lands, and soil conservation program.

All the denials to the contrary do no good when you examine the record of the weakening to the pressures of selfish interests that have been going on in Washington. Every American conservationist is concerned—and should be concerned. The public's heritage is being raided, and the raiding has just begun. The handwriting on the wall of what lies ahead should be enough to awaken every American concerned about resource conservation.

I could devote my entire talk today to what is happening to America's conservation policies, and what some of us in the Congress of the United States have attempted to do toward stopping the unwise tide of exploitation.

But most conservationists now know that story.

Anyone reading any conservation publication, any sportsman's magazine, knows it. They know courageous and dedicated women like Mrs. Gifford Pinchot would not be concerned and alarmed unless there was just cause. They realize that Bernard DeVoto knows what he is talking about when he writes in Harper's magazine that "conservation is down and on the way out." Every one of our major national conservation and sportsmen's groups have pleaded with Congress to halt its reckless trend away from the traditions of Teddy Roosevelt.

So I am not going to talk today just about what this Administration has done to endanger conservation in America, or what it has failed to do to protect our resources. Nor am I going to spend my time telling you of my own fight in behalf of sound conservation policies.

If you are interested enough in conservation to care about our resources, you probably followed the recent session of Congress closely enough to know why such publications as Sports Afield commended my vigorous fight for the public's interest. If you haven't paid any attention to what is happening, then you must be regarded as among those people letting it happen—to the detriment of our State and Nation.

What I want to do today is approach this problem from the constructive side, and talk about what we can and should do. I want to emphasize especially the stake of this area, in developing for itself forward looking objectives based on wise use of our resources.

More is at stake than just preservation of our forests and wildlife for future enjoyment.

It means dollars and cents—and another kind of sense—to this region.

Northern Minnesota's prosperity, outside of the mining areas, depends heavily on farming and recreation and forest products. I want to outline suggestions for improving conditions in all 3 today, and I want to encourage you to start thinking about suggestions of your own to send along to your elected public officials.

In this area, farming and recreation and forest products are far from unrelated. Instead, they go hand in hand.

Thousands of our farmers who produce milk, beef, or mutton must find work in the forests of the north during the long winter months, in order to make a decent standard of living. And the recreation trade of our sportsmen coming into this area add needed new sources of economic stability for the entire region, summer and winter.

My farm views should be well understood by now, after my vigorous battle in behalf of agriculture in the last session of the Senate. Agriculture is basic to our economy, and I feel keenly the dangers of letting the income of farm people totter to subsistence levels. I resent implications that little family farmers without substantial capital must just get out of business, if they can't stand the economic squeeze. Such an attitude completely ignores farming as a way of life, completely ignores the years of toil that go into clearing cutover land of stumps to turn it into pasture. And to those who so callously say we must get rid of marginal farmers, I ask what do you propose doing about marginal towns and communities that exist to serve those farmers? What do you do about the marginal businessman on rural Main Street, trying to make both ends meet? Are they being relegated to economic discard too?

I want something better for family farming areas of northern Minnesota. I want to see a decent chance of economic survival for families who work the land by choice and tradition, because they love the land. I want to see the American pattern of family farm ownership preserved, where Americans can be free and independent citizens, participating in their community—not peasant laborers on some corporation farm owned by absentee landlords with no concern about the churches and schools of your community, or the business houses on Main Street.

That's why I intend asking the new Congress, to restore dairy support prices to at least 85 percent of parity—at least to a livable level, while we seek other outlets for our dairy abundance. That's why I intend pressing my fight to break down milk marketing barriers invoked by eastern milksheds against Midwest milk, and insist upon increased use of health-giving milk and butter and other dairy products in our Armed Forces and veterans hospitals.

That's why I intend pressing ahead on my proposals for food stamp plans offering dairy products as a supplement to the meager financial allowances now permitted to our aged needy, our widows and underprivileged children.

That's why I intend asking Congress to expand the Farmers Home Administration program of liberalized credit to small farm operators, and seek revision of existing regulations to better adapt availability of such loans to farmers having to work part-time in other vocations.

That's why I also intend seeking new credit provisions to enable young farmers to get a start on their own, to stay on the land worked by their fathers before them or strike out in new enterprises of their own.

But agriculture is so closely geared to timber in this region, we must go further toward a sound program for improvement of economic opportunities in timber farming, to assure economic stability of this area of Minnesota.

All of us are aware of the tremendous regrowth of our forests since the days when you could look out over miles of cutover stump land.

These new forests have come about through reforestation efforts of President Roosevelt's CCC programs, and through our improved fire-protection program which was greatly increased under the New Deal. And now these 19 million acres of Minnesota forest land are once more beginning to produce large quantities of timber for pulpwood, sawlogs, railroad ties, posts and poles, and a whole new wood cellulose industry which is just beginning to emerge.

We don't have the fine old stands of big white and Norway pine, but in their places balsam, spruce, jack pine, popple, and birch are emerging in abundance. And many young pine plantings are getting into thinning stages, ready to produce an intermediate crop of pulpwood.

Now is the time to examine what is going to happen to these resources. How they are controlled will determine how they are used, and who will benefit from them.

Our communities in northern Minnesota and our people are very heavily dependent upon an abundant forest production.

Work in the woods—logging and sawmilling—and our industries in the towns could not exist but for our newer concept of timber farming. Cash spent in the stores of our merchants by farmer-loggers during the long winter months spell prosperity. And our summer-tourist trade wouldn't be possible but for the attractions of our woods, lakes, and wildlife.

How well are we assuring continuation of such opportunities?

A sound conservation program is essential to the economy of this area—a program of reforestation, selective cutting, thinning, fire protection, insect and disease control, and all the other forest-management activities so much a part of our 1954 timber picture.

Within all of our memories, it hasn't always been so.

Few of us today remember the great fights that Teddy Roosevelt, Grover Cleveland, and Gifford Pinchot put up to save a small part of our great public forested domain in our national forest.

These great fights were continued by Franklin Roosevelt from Washington, and in our own State by Floyd B. Olson—to save a part of this great forest wealth for the people, from the plunderers and self-seekers.

For conservation not only means good management of our resources—it always has meant, and it means today—that a part of our forest, wildlife, water and soil resources belong to all of us—and not to a privileged few.

It's easy to understand how publicly owned forest are one of the great keystones to prosperity of northern Minnesota.

They are the guarantee that free and independent farmers will continue to have a source of timber for winter logging, which they can sell on the open market. It is private enterprise in the best tradition.

But I warn you today to guard your publicly owned forests carefully, for as your forest and mine grows more valuable through the years, special-interest groups will try to get control of them by fair means or foul—and thus deprive the local residents of the very forests upon which they depend.

Perhaps I need not remind you that I have in mind especially the so-called long-term timber bill which nearly slipped through the legislature a few years ago. And I also have in mind an action which the present administration in Washington almost slipped through the last session of Congress—all wrapped up in conservation language—which would have transferred special rights in your national forests to a few big stockmen and timber companies.

It was only by the combined efforts of outraged conservationists that your Superior and the Chippewa National Forests are not now being carved up into special estates for the privileged few.

Eternal vigilance is the watchword of liberty, and of conservation, too.

In recent years we have been fighting defensive skirmishes, to try and save our conservation programs and the resources owned by all the people from the special seekers with their well-paid lobbyists and smooth public-relations operators. Don't be fooled—these people are out for more than they already have—even though they are already wealthy from cashing in on America's resources in the past.

But we are through fighting rear-guard actions.

We're going on the offensive. We are going forward with a Democratic majority in Congress next year to build more effective and useful natural resource conservation programs than ever before. And we are going to make sure that these resources will benefit the people as a whole.

As a first step in that direction I call upon organized sportsmen and conservationists of Minnesota and the Nation to support my resolution providing for the creation of a Joint Committee on Natural Resources in the Congress, as a watchdog of the public interest on all resource legislation.

But that is only a start, to this area's specific needs.

We want and need an expansion of the timber industry, to meet the housing needs and other requirements of our rapidly growing population.

Here in Minnesota, we are beginning to grow more timber such as popple and balsam than we are now using. Industry—especially small industry—needs to be encouraged to explore these opportunities. For that reason I am exploring the possibilities of Federal guaranties of credit to make small capital loans available for businessmen and cooperatives, to make possible new wood-using plants for our northern communities.

Such new outlets are vital to your area. But we want mills and industries buying from independent producers of this area, such as the Grand Rapids mill, rather than vast industries supplying themselves from their own holdings and shutting out or forcing down prices to private producers.

But even with such expanded outlets the small logger needs to have a program helpful to him in the financing and marketing of his winter's cut of timber. All of you know only too well how difficult it is to find markets and outlets for many grades and kinds of timber.

Market-price quotations on sawlogs, rough lumber, pulpwood, and other timber products are not to be found, but seem to be only in the possession of a few people.

A free market, in a free-enterprise system, can best be served and preserved with open market pricing.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I intend to ask that the present price-reporting program for farm products be extended to include forest products, so that at least once a month you men who are in the timber business will at least know what the market situation is. I hope to obtain publication of parity prices on timber products, too, as a guidepost to you in your sales.

Furthermore, among my goals for next year is extension and widening of the farm-credit program to include credit for small loggers and marketing cooperatives, so that it will be easier to finance logging during the long winter months before the timber is sold.

These are some of my specific aims, to meet the problems I see confronting your area. All of them are tied in with broader conservation objectives to which I am dedicated—the preservation, protection, and improvement of all our State and National parks and forests; the expansion and speedup of our soil-conservation program; the adoption of sound land and water use policies, both National and State; more extensive propagation of fish and wildlife. All of these are objectives that must remain in the forefront for the future of this area.

Let me close on just one final suggestion. We need to conserve human resources, too—especially the youth of our land.

Conservation of resources is important only as it relates to people, and benefits the people, because it means conservation of our material welfare, and the prosperity of future generations under freedom.

It's time we thought about conservation in terms of today's youth, as well as today's natural resources.

Every day we read in the papers of many of our big cities about how the teen-age gang problem is growing more and more serious. Now, nobody will convince me such youths are inherently bad—they just haven't anything to do but get into trouble.

You never hear of that kind of gang problems among farm or small-town youngsters. They have chores and outdoor recreation which enables them to find all sorts of outlets, for their bursting energy.

Adverse economic conditions threaten to make this problem even more serious in our cities, as job opportunities for boys become more limited.

The truth is, big cities are just no place for young, energetic boys—especially when summertime comes.

During the worst of our depression years, President Roosevelt solved this problem with the CCC camps which conserved both our natural and human resources. Most of these boys who grew up into men in the CCC camps formed the toughest fighting army in the world.

Is it wrong to be thinking today about again looking for some way to turn American youth out-of-doors, to convert teen-age gang energy into hunting and fishing and healthful outdoor work?

I'm not suggesting revival of the CCC program, but I am suggesting the combination of teen-age problems in major cities and growing pressures of unemployment may make it wise for all of us to be thinking in terms of finding some way to provide the character-building and health-building influences of outdoor work and recreation for America's youth—even if it is no more than getting city youngsters out on the farms where they would be under the influence of our good farm families for a summer.

Some such outdoor program could give many American youths who never had a chance a real opportunity to develop a set of values firmly grounded in an appreciation of the beauty of the forest, the magnificence of a lake at sunset, the music of a waterfall, and the tingling thrill that comes with the whir of partridge wings along a logging road.

And for city youths to be able to tell the difference between wheat and oats, or a Holstein from a whiteface, and to be able to run a tractor instead of a hotrod, are all important goals in the building of future American citizens who have an understanding of what our country really means.

I leave you with that thought as a challenge, and invite your own suggestions as to how it can best be achieved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the forestry sections of the bill, because I have long believed that a greater effort needs to be made in our reforestation program and, in general, toward better marketing and marketing conditions for forest products.

I warn the Senate that one of these lobbies is at work again. This time it is the lumbermen's lobby that wants to strike the sections from the bill. Report after report reaches my office to the effect that there is a concerted drive under way by the large timber interests to strike both sections 601 and 602 from the bill. Why, I cannot imagine. Why any timber lobby would want to restrain, restrict, and limit more reforestation is beyond me. But they do, and I am beginning to get telegrams from people who have heard this report.

I have in my hand, for example, a telegram from the chairman of the Minnesota Emergency Conservation Committee, Mr. Charles L. Horn, one of the great conservationists of America, and one of the most able and efficient business managers of this Nation. He is the president of the Federal Cartridge Corp., and presently operates the Twin Cities Arsenal, one of the great arsenals of our country.

Mr. Horn wrote the following telegram:

We are informed, and we believe reliably, that there is an endeavor on the part of a lumbermen's group to eliminate from the soil bank, all references and protection to forestry and wildlife. This is an unthink-

able thing because of the relationship of plants, cover, soil stability, water flow, and other interrelated resources. Please give this your attention and advise us what action, if any, can be taken. Will you please help us protect these vital interests.

Not only does this timber and lumbermen's lobby want to strike out sections 601 and 602, but also any reference in the bill to reforestation and forest products as included in the soil-bank provisions.

I want to make this record tonight because I now serve warning on this lobby that its actions are not in the public interest, that it represents the worst kind of selfishness, that its actions are against the long-term good of the Nation in terms of the proper utilization and development of our resources.

We have had too many years in America when we did not take care of our natural resources. We put a stop to that, and we had better make sure we do not retreat.

I have another telegram from Howard Zahnisher, of the Wilderness Society of America, one of the great conservation organizations. The telegram was sent from New Orleans, where there is being held a convention or conference of conservation groups. The telegram reads:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have just sent Senator ELLENDER the following telegram:

"The Wilderness Society joins other conservation groups in commending the agriculture bill's proposal to help protect wildlife and other natural resources and in urging that its proposed authorization to carry out a program of soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation be enacted."

I have sent this from New Orleans, where I am attending the 21st North American Wildlife Conference. Incidentaly, I have heard many commendations of your interest in the proposed wilderness preservation system. Your remarks on this in the Senate of February 29 are deeply appreciated.

The conservation groups are beginning to get news of what is going on around Washington, and that the lobby is at work.

I have a telegram from Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, who is also attending the conference at New Orleans. The telegram is addressed to me at the Senate Office Building and reads as follows:

Millions of conservationists urge your support in retaining forestry and wildlife provisions in soil bank bill, S. 3183.

I have another telegram from Sigurd F. Olson, president of the National Parks Association. I ask unanimous consent that the body of the telegram, which is to the same effect—and to the very strong effect—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The National Parks Association has telegraphed Senator ELLENDER its views that retention of the provisions of farm bill protecting wildlife and forest soil and water conversation program is essential to the national welfare and to an effective and sound agricultural program. Your assistance in ensuring these provisions are held will be appreciated.

SIGURD F. OLSON,
President, National Parks Association.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have another telegram, from Dr. Spencer M. Smith, secretary of the Citizens Committee on National Resources, at Washington, D. C., which reads:

Conservationists urgently request the retention of conservation measures contained in the farm bill now before the Senate. We steadfastly endorse section 6 of S. 3183. There is strong bipartisan support for tree planting and other conservation measures that are now contained in the bill. Conservationists strongly oppose any attempts to delete or significantly modify these measures to a lesser status.

I have a telegram from Carl O. Gustavson, secretary of the North American Wildlife Conference, which reads:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have sent Senator ELLENDER the following telegram:

"The executive committee of the Council of Conservationists meeting here in New Orleans in connection with the North American Wildlife Conference, including David R. Brower, Ira N. Gabrielson, Joseph W. Penfold and Howard Zahniser urges you to make sure that the farm bill's provision for protecting wildlife resources are maintained and that enactment of the bill include authorization of a program of soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation."

Mr. President, I am very proud to have received these telegrams from some very fine officials of organizations which are dedicated to the long-term good of the great natural resources of the United States.

I again say, and I predict, that a determined effort will be made on the floor of the Senate to knock those provisions out of the bill. I say, with equal vigor, a determined effort will be made to meet that effort head on and knock it down.

If there is one part of the bill for which I will fight with the last ounce of energy in my body, it is the provisions of the bill which seek to maintain conservation.

Mr. President, we welcome support from the administration on this. According to the press reports of this morning, I understand the President has been calling up Senators, asking them to vote against title I. May I suggest that in any further calls, the President ask for support of the conservation sections of the bill.

I have read that determined efforts are being made by the Secretary of Agriculture to knock out title I of the bill. I respectfully suggest to Mr. Benson that, when he makes those telephone calls, he at least ask for support for the conservation items of the bill.

I said last night that I felt those of us who are fighting for an effective price-support program and provisions in the proposed legislation relating to it had our backs against the wall. I repeat, that is the situation. I am a congenital optimist. I generally see what I think are the happy and the good and the pleasant things in life. But I must confess tonight that I am somewhat discouraged, and I am going to say what I said last night. If the farmers of America do not rise now in righteous indignation and demand of their Government that something be done about the income-stimulating devices in the bill, such as the 90-percent-of-parity provision, they are going to have a sad and unhappy future.

I call upon the farmers of the Nation to go to their courthouses and call upon their county commissioners and call upon their governors and call upon their commissioners or secretaries of agriculture at the State level, and have those public officials let the Members of the Senate know the desire of the farm population regarding this bill. I hope the farmers will literally organize demonstrations in town after town and city after city, to let the Government—particularly the Senate—know the deep concern they have over the possibility of a defeat of the income-protecting sections of the pending bill, S. 3183.

What we need now is someone to spread the alarm. We need a modern Paul Revere. But I suggest that he not use a horse, because it would not go fast enough. Instead, he had better use the telephone, the radio, the television, and all other modern forms of rapid communication, to spread the message that the agents of divide and conquer are working their subtle and devious program so that we may very well lose the income-protecting and income-increasing provisions from the pending bill.

Mr. President, I have to compliment the Republican propagandists on their newspaper advertisements and spot announcements. They now have sufficiently confused the situation so that some divisions are occurring in the ranks of those of us who for years have stood together in support of the 90 percent of parity program.

Mr. President, it is very discouraging to have proposals made for 1 year, in the case of commodities such as cotton, and to have 1-year proposals made for commodities such as corn. No farm program can be based on 1 year. A 1-year farm-commodity program is nothing more or less than an election package; it is just an effort to get votes. Such an election package will bring increased trouble to the Government and increased trouble to the farmers. No farmer can plan his farm operations on the basis of a 1-year extension or a 1-year proposal. That is not the way to write an agricultural program.

Instead, it is the way to write a campaign speech, or the way to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a campaign promise—one which will be repudiated next year.

I do not think the farmers are going to be fooled. There may be in the Government some persons who are being fooled; but the farmers know that a one-year extension is no program at all, and that it is nothing more or less than an expedient measure to use in an effort to get past the election. The farmers know that a one-year program for cotton or a one-year program for corn is nothing more or less than an attempt to bridge over the problem during an election year—and then will come 1957, and then the cotton farmers and the corn farmers will be at the mercy of a merciless administrative program; they will be at the

mercy of those who have not wanted to have an effective price-support program.

Mr. President, I am registering my protest over the kind of political maneuvering that is going on, when proposals are being made in regard to commodity after commodity, in an attempt to separate them from the great basic crop structure—in an effort to do what? In an effort to see to it that 90 percent of parity will not be provided in this bill.

I serve warning upon the administration that if it continues to use the method of divide and conquer, and if it continues to make proposals for separate treatment for individual commodities, it will open up a Pandora's box of economic trouble.

Furthermore, if the Members of the Senate who have stood together for years in regard to agricultural legislation and agricultural policy are willing to be weaned away for a one-year program in an election year, they are going to be part and parcel of an effort that ultimately will wreck any responsible and constructive agricultural policy.

The American farmer needs to be heard in the Congress; he needs to be heard tonight in such clear and unmistakable tones and language that not one Member of the United States Senate will be in doubt. I know of no better way for the American farmer to make his voice heard than to start the chain reaction from the grass roots to the court houses, then to the State houses, and then to the White House, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Senate. If the American farmers will do that, if they will literally march in the streets, requesting simple justice—going to the court houses, and thence to the State houses, and will lay their just plea for economic justice before their duly-elected local officials, and then will ask those local officials as their agents to lay that plea before the Congress and the President and the Secretary of Agriculture—we shall get favorable legislation, and Senate bill 3183 will be passed.

Mr. President, this bill is the result of months of testimony. The distinguished Senator now presiding over the Senate—the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]—heard all that testimony. I think it is fair to say that the bill embodies the overwhelming majority of views and expressions of opinion gathered throughout the great agricultural States of our land. People by the hundreds were heard, statements were filed, farm organization officials were heard, Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were heard, and officials of the Department of Agriculture were heard. Then a majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry prepared the proposed legislation which now is before us. It is the result of hard work; it is the result of methodical hearings, testimony, analysis, and study. It proposes a comprehensive farm program.

To weaken what we have here is to court economic and political disaster. Nothing would be better for this country right now than for the Senate to take a recess for a couple of days, and for every Senator to go home and talk with his constituents—not merely the constituents who first gather around us when we go home, but the people generally. A Senator should go out among the people.

There is a political fire in the Great Plains, Mr. President. There is more than smoke. There is a blaze. The farmers are demanding action. They are not demanding the synthetic, halfhearted, weak-kneed program known as the Eisenhower-Benson program. That program could not get enough votes out in the rural areas even to make a 2-inch, 1-column news story. The American farmer wants more than that.

Mr. President, I noted with some interest a news bulletin which has just been issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Stabilization Service. It has just been released. It is being sent to all ASC State and county committees. It deals with the proposed soil-bank program. It is signed by Walter C. Berger, Acting Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service. It is identified as "Notice General, 348."

On page 3 of the bulletin there are suggestions to the county committees as to how benefits will be paid, and the amounts to be paid under the soil-bank program for acreage reserve. The bulletin shows, for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and tobacco, the national average yield per acre, the acres which might come under the acreage-reserve program, the rate of payment, based upon normal yield, the approximate cost per acre, and the total cost in millions of dollars. Those are the categories.

Under "rate of payment based on normal yield" we find the figure of 50 percent of the loan value. Let me point out the meaning of that. The Department of Agriculture representatives stated before our committee, in expressing the desire of the Department for a voluntary soil bank program, that the way they would get farmers to participate was by having a greater incentive, a very good incentive payment, large benefits, which would provide an incentive for voluntary participation. It will be noted from this bulletin, which has just gone out, that the Commodity Stabilization Service has, as the rate of payment based upon normal yield, 50 percent of the loan value. So if a crop is being supported at 75 percent of parity, this means that the rate of benefit payment under the soil bank acreage reserve plan will be 37½ percent of parity. If a crop is being supported at 90 percent of parity, the benefit payment will be 45 percent, or one-half of 90.

To translate this into much simpler terms, it means that as we reduce the price-support level on any commodity we reduce the amount of the payment per bushel, per pound, or per acre.

This administration has talked a great deal about wanting to get some money into the agricultural economy. Let me say to the President and the Secretary that the one good way to get some money into the agricultural economy is to have 90 percent of parity price supports on the basic commodities, and to have 90 percent price supports as a rate of payment, divided by 2, or one-half of 90 percent as the rate of payment for the soil-bank benefits.

There are no cut-rate prices in this program. There is no bargain counter, sale-price structure to afford an answer to our agricultural difficulties. I want every Member of Congress to understand that when we vote to reduce price supports on basic commodities, we also vote to reduce benefit payments under the soil bank; and when we vote to reduce benefit payments under the soil-bank provisions, we thereby make it all the more difficult for farmers to participate, because farmers will not take cropland out of production, under the allotted acreage, which acreage is already reduced, unless they are adequately rewarded for those acres under the soil bank benefit payments.

So when we vote on title I, we are not only voting for or against 90 percent of parity on the production of the acres, but we are voting for or against 90 percent of parity as a base rate for soil-bank benefits.

One of the main arguments for having 90 percent of parity in this bill is that it makes possible a greater incentive for farmer participation in acreage cutbacks. Ninety percent of parity will make acreage allotments work, and 90 percent of parity will provide a base formula for benefit payments under a soil bank which will invite participation.

I want our farm people to understand what this problem is all about. When we are through voting, they will know who are their friends and who are not. If we lose this 90 percent of parity argument, if we lose this particular part of the farm bill, when Mr. Farmer gets his soil bank benefit check for cutting back his acreage and sees how little it is, I want him to hold strictly accountable every Member of Congress who voted to cut that check by reducing the price supports.

After all, it was the administration's idea to have the acreage reserve. That acreage reserve affects the allotted acres, which are already reduced acres. The administration came before our committee, through the Secretary and the Under Secretary, and asked for a voluntary soil bank program. They wanted no compulsory cross-compliance. They wanted no compulsion upon persons coming into the program. We agreed with the voluntary principle, but it was clearly understood in the committee that the only way the voluntary principle could work would be to have the benefit payments for acreage removed from production, over and above the allotted acres, sufficiently high to encourage participation.

To reduce price supports is to write the doom of and, to prematurely kill, bury, and put away the acreage reserve section of the bill. I do not believe the administration wants the acreage reserve section to work. Perhaps this is some more of the Eisenhower philosophy—liberal in philosophy, but conservative in economics. It is like the saying that a man loves his wife, but he never buys her a new hat or a new dress. The acreage reserve section is supposed to cut the surplus, to use the surplus.

The only way the acreage reserve section under the soil-bank provision will ever work is to make the benefit pay-

ments sufficiently large so that when a farmer cuts out acres, he will get as much net income from not planting as he would for planting.

No farmer in his right mind, in view of the present economic conditions in agriculture, and in view of the reduced income he has suffered in the past 3½ years, is going to further cut his acreage on allotted crops, which crops have already suffered a cut, unless for the acreage taken out of production, he is so generously rewarded that it is better for him to remove it from production than it is to plant it.

I remind the Senate that the rate of pay for benefits on the acreage reserve acres is based entirely upon the price support schedule.

SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Mr. President, I want to turn my attention to what this administration terms "surplus disposal," but which for the past 3 years I have constantly called the need for wiser use of our abundance.

A country's productive ability should be put to good use, not curtailed. To be sure, temporary production adjustments are needed to protect producers and assure them an opportunity to make a decent living, so that they can continue producing for our future needs.

Yet we have done a disservice to allow the berating of surpluses to become such an accepted practice that they are almost regarded as a curse, rather than a blessing.

How much more concerned we in the Senate would be, if we were confronted with a serious food shortage, and debating how to provide enough food for our people?

It is time we were thankful for our abundance, and applied our good judgment to using it more wisely, instead of using it as a whipping boy with which to punish farmers.

Any surplus we may have is only an excess supply above effective market demand at prices for which farmers can afford to sell, not a "real" surplus in the sense of supply above actual need in the world.

Let us remember that. Our task, then, is a temporary one of making good use of our abundance until market demand fully catches up with our supply, through population growth and constantly improving living standards throughout the world.

It always amazes me to see the short range vision of many when they consider farm policy.

What is an "alarming surplus" one year may easily become a "dangerous shortage" a few years later when we get involved in an international crisis, or suffer natural disasters, such as a flood or a drought, or severe winter weather, such as is being experienced in western Europe this year.

Earlier in this talk, I mentioned my conviction that this administration has frightened itself by its own propaganda about surpluses. I believe their panic about having any abundance existing in this country is ample proof of that fact.

If we are going to discuss surpluses at all, or surplus disposal—and that is what the President has asked us to do—the first thing this Congress should know is just what is surplus and what is a normal safe reserve to keep the pipelines of our food and textile industries filled.

Do Senators know any store that does not carry a reserve inventory in the warehouse, to replace the stocks on its shelves as they are sold?

Do they regard that as surplus, or do they think is is prudent business judgment to always carry a reserve inventory?

In terms of the short-range look, perhaps our current stocks on hand can be painted into an alarming picture to the American people. But why look ahead a few years, and anticipate any of the emergencies that might develop?

Why do we not measure the surpluses in terms of our population, both human and animal?

Does anyone in this Chamber know for sure we will not have several years of drought, disease, or other crop failure in the next decade?

Does anyone in this Chamber know for sure we might not find ourselves plunged into a war not of our making or desire, with a suddenly stepped-up demand for more food and fiber than we are even now producing?

How can we soundly legislate without taking such factors into consideration?

When surplus disposal was being considered by our Senate Committee on Agriculture, I urged the administration to tell Congress and tell the American people what is surplus and what is not in the Government's holdings of farm commodities.

In other words, I asked them to differentiate, on the one hand, between a normal inventory reserve for our American market and international and emergency needs and surpluses over and above supplies, on the other hand.

I urged that the National Security Council determine what level of supply of various major commodities should be maintained as available, in the public interest, for immediate needs and potential emergency needs.

I further urged that the Department of Agriculture make known to what extent its present holdings are normal inventory of the commodity trade, rather than real surplus beyond total domestic requirements, export needs, and safe reserves.

What are the answers to these vital questions?

We did not get them in the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a press statement issued January 22 regarding my questions posed in the Agriculture Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY ASKS FACTS ON SURPLUS VERSUS INVENTORY FOR NATION'S NEEDS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, called upon the administration yesterday to "tell the Congress and tell the American people what is surplus and what is not in the Government's holding of farm commodities."

He urged the Senate Agriculture Committee of which he is a member to:

1. Ask the National Security Council to determine what level of supply of various major commodities should be maintained as available, in the public interest, for immediate needs and potential emergency needs.

2. Ask the Department of Agriculture to make known to what extent its present holdings are normal inventory of the commodity trade rather than real surplus beyond total domestic requirements, export needs, and safe reserves.

"Here we are in Congress, asked in the President's message to get rid of our surplus and cut back our agricultural production plant, without the slightest guidance from the administration as to what they mean by 'surplus,' or what level of supply they believe should be retained in the public's interest to protect consumers against a future shortage," Senator HUMPHREY said.

"Instead of all the prattle about 'surplus' to hide the failure of its farm program, it is time the administration gave us some facts about where it believes we should draw the line between safe supplies and surplus production.

"Instead of embarking recklessly on a 'get-rid-of-it-at-any-cost' campaign, let us first find out what the Nation's needs are in terms of our growing population, our increased cattle numbers, and our possible emergency needs on the international scene."

If by "surplus" the administration means everything in the Government's hands, Senator HUMPHREY warned, "it is recklessly misleading the American people at the risk of stampeding us into shortages."

"The truth is that much of the Government's present commodity holdings are the normal inventory of the private commodity trade," Senator HUMPHREY said.

Senater HUMPHREY challenged the administration to reveal the decrease in inventories normally carried in private hands "since it first announced its intention to lower price-support levels."

Much of the so-called "surplus problem," Senator HUMPHREY said, is merely getting the private trade to "carry its own inventory, instead of having it carried at Government expense.

"Ever since this administration started lowering price supports and adopting other price-depressant policies, private commodity dealers have reduced their own normal inventories because they knew they could buy back all they wanted whenever they needed it later at lower prices from the Government.

"You cannot expect the trade to carry large inventories of its own as long as it thinks the Government might come along and lower prices. As a result, any surplus disposal program based upon domestic dumping at lower prices means the trade will be even less inclined to increase its own inventories, and our surplus will grow rather than dwindle."

The most effective surplus disposal policy that could be adopted right now, Senator HUMPHREY said, would be "for Secretary Benson to announce he was going to ask Congress to restore 90 percent of parity for next fall's crop, but that the trade would have 90 days in which it could still buy from the Government at present support levels.

"Private traders would start rebuilding their inventories to normal levels overnight, greatly reducing the stocks in Government hands and drastically cutting Government storage costs," Senator HUMPHREY said.

"If an auto dealer were overstocked, he could not stimulate much business by publicly announcing prices would be lower 6 months from now. But he could attract business now, by revealing prices were going to be raised 6 months from now."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, again I say that we did not get any answers to guide our committee's judgment.

When we could not get answers from the Department of Agriculture, we

called the Deputy Administrator of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

It is an amazing thing to reveal to the American people that as far as top officials of these two agencies were willing to reveal to us, no thinking at all has been given by this administration to the potential needs of food and fiber in event of emergency.

Or, we have some $6 billion worth of other critical materials tied up in stockpiles for defense emergency purposes, to make sure industry can keep operating in event of attack. But we have not made sure we will have food to feed the people manning the wheels of industry.

It is also rather interesting, Mr. President, in view of all the propaganda about how much the farm surplus costs for storage, that no one in the press or among the lay public seems to even think of asking what it costs a day to store these other critical materials in our national stockpile.

It would be very interesting to get a full report of the cost of storing critical materials under so-called strategic requirements.

I recognize, of course, that these materials are necessary. They are our inventory for defense needs. But so are food and fiber. This administration refuses to recognize them as such. This is a more serious situation than may appear on the surface. I am afraid that unless it is steel or aluminum or oil or manganese or cobalt or nickel, the administration does not regard it as important to defense. It must almost have a General Motors label on it to take on any importance at all.

Here we are, in the Congress, asked by the President of the United States to enact legislation cutting our farm production plant down below our annual needs, without being told how far these supplies should be liquidated, or how much we should hold in reserve for possible emergency use.

Mr. President, after failing to get any answers from administration officials during our hearings, I issued another press statement headed "Congress Asked to Liquidate Surplus Without Knowing Defense Needs." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS ASKED TO LIQUIDATE SURPLUS WITHOUT KNOWING DEFENSE NEEDS

Congress has been asked to liquidate the Government's food and fiber inventories "without any guidance as to the Nation's reserve requirements for national defense or other emergencies," Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, declared today.

"It seems incredible to me that this administration has apparently ignored entirely consideration of food and fiber reserve requirements necessary for protecting the public's interest in an emergency, in its request to Congress to liquidate the Government's present commodity holdings," Senator HUMPHREY said.

"Before Congress determines how far it should go in getting rid of this abundance we hear so much complaining about, we certainly should be entitled to know how much the administration feels should be retained on hand for any defense emergency.

"We have not that information today. We have not been able to get it so far. Apparently, the administration regards everything in its hands as surplus. They have asked us to get rid of the surplus. Are they prepared to assure the American people that no shortages would result in event of a defense emergency, if we take them at their word now and empty our bins and warehouses of cotton and wheat and other commodities and at the same time cut back our producing plant of farm acreage?" Senator HUMPHREY asked.

"Neither officials of the Office of Defense Mobilization nor the Department of Agriculture, appearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, indicated any determination had been made as to what level of reserves were necessary for defense purposes.

"Here we are putting $6 billion into stockpiles of strategic minerals and other materials to make sure we have enough on hand in event of a defense emergency, building additional stockpiles of A-bombs, planes, and other weapons of warfare, yet the administration asks us to liquidate all of our food and fiber holdings without even thinking about how we could even start to defend our Nation in event of such an emergency without assurance of ample food and fiber.

"Agricultural products are vital to many industrial needs during periods of defense emergencies. We used up far more than we could produce during the Korean crisis, and were saved from acute shortages by the safety reserves we had accumulated.

"Is it not reasonable to assume some officials of our Government would take a careful look at the situation from a defense and national security standpoint today, before asking us blindly to liquidate all of our reserves?"

Senator HUMPHREY said members of the Senate committee strongly favored setting aside a strategic reserve of food and fiber for such purposes, but had been unable to get any guidance from the administration as to what level of requirements might be anticipated in event of an attack.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the absence of any willingness of this administration to tell us what we might or might not need, any Senator's guess may be as good as mine. But I believe it casts a strange shadow of doubt over this administration's propaganda barrage about the surplus when it is unwilling, or unable, to give us any real picture of what we might need and what we might not need out of the stocks on hand.

I have previously indicated by official figures that those stocks were far from excessive in 1952 when the Democratic administration ended its regime in the executive branch. In fact, at that time Korean defense needs made it prudent to seek expanding production, instead of curtailing it.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a year before 1950, Congress was concerned about what we thought were surpluses. A year later, with a military action taking place in Korea—even though it was a limited war—we were calling upon our farmers to greatly expand their productive planting. We were eating into our reserves, and we were actually operating on a deficit so far as the feed grains in the country were concerned.

As I have indicated, stocks on hand have grown under this administration's poor handling of the farm program, and its lower price policies.

Yet in most instances the supplies on hand are still far from excessive, in light of possible emergency needs. They are certainly nothing to get so panicky about.

Even now, we have on hand, both owned by the CCC and pledged by farmers for loans that may yet be redeemed, only 3 months and 19 days supply of corn.

The American people have been led to believe over the past months that we have so much corn that it poses a major problem. The truth is that we have a supply of corn amounting to 3 months and 19 days. Would that be enough to protect our supply if we had one bad crop year? I think the answer is quite obvious. We would not have a surplus of corn if we had any imagination and were taking into consideration the real needs of the Nation. We would actually say we were in short supply.

In fact, Mr. President, we were in such short supply that when this Senator asked that corn be included in the mandatory set-aside—in other words, to have 350 million bushels set aside—the Department of Agriculture said, "Oh, we cannot do that. That would be too much. That would tighten the market too much."

But to the press the Department of Agriculture says that the 90-percent price supports have caused a great surplus of corn. They become very pontifical about these things.

Mr. President, we cannot have it both ways. We cannot be out in the countryside reading headlines and editorial columns complaining about the terrible, monstrous, burdensome surplus of corn, due, of course, to 90 percent of parity, and then come before a committee where legislation is to be written and deny it and say that the Department cannot support a set-aside of corn to the amount of 350 million bushels.

We have on hand a reserve supply of butter enough to last only 1 month and 14 days.

In soybeans, we have only 29 days' supply—with only 410,000 bushels of soybeans actually owned by CCC, out of an annual domestic disappearance plus gross exports of some 283 million bushels. Is that excessive?

In oats, we have only 24 days' supply, both owned by the CCC and still owed by farmers but under loan.

Where, then, is this tremendous unmanageable surplus they keep talking about?

Surely, Mr. President, it is not in corn; it is not in soybeans; it is not in oats; it is not in flax; it is not in butter.

We do have a supply of wheat that could last us 12 months and 11 days, and a supply of cotton that could last us 13 months and 10 days. But a fourth of the wheat and two-thirds of the cotton are still owned by farmers, only pledged as collateral for loans.

All of these figures I have used pertaining to the amount of days our supply would last are based on 1952 domestic disappearance plus gross exports—and our population has risen considerably since then. So has our animal population, which is dependent upon feed grains.

So, Mr. President, if we were to relate the amount of supplies in the Commodity Credit Corporation to the amount pro-

duced, there would be a much shorter supply than that which I have indicated today.

These are official Government figures from the financial report of the Commodity Credit Corporation on December 21, 1955. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a tabulation of how long the supply of our various stocks of commodities would last.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How long would supply last?—Quantity of commodities pledged for CCC loans and owned by CCC as of Dec. 31, 1955 [1]

[All figures in thousands]

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Pledged for loans	Owned by CCC	Total quantity	Domestic disappearance plus gross exports, 1952	Period present supply will last based on 1952 requirements	
						Months	Days
Corn	Bushels	180,159	757,612	937,771	[2] 3,152,920	3	19
Cotton, upland	Bales	5,422	7,921	13,343	12,190	13	10
Peanuts, farmers' stock	Pounds	290,746	6,033	296,779	[2] 607,449	5	28
Rice	Hundredweight	12,115	15,387	27,502	46,103	7	8
Tobacco	Pounds	1,053,976	231	1,054,207	2,043,012	6	3
Wheat	Bushels	221,241	888,542	1,109,783	1,009,284	13	11
Butter	Pounds		166,399	166,399	1,389,000	1	14
Cheese	do		333,002	333,002	1,227,000	3	9
Milk, dried	do		161,714	161,714	1,035,000	1	27
Honey	do	986		986	281,254		1
Tung oil	do		22,988	22,988	51,295	5	14
Barley	Bushel	69,152	31,261	100,413	273,956	4	14
Cottonseed meal	Pound		53	53	5,290,000		
Cottonseed oil	do		17,878	17,878	1,359,000		5
Flaxseed	Bushel	6,685	438	7,123	35,465	2	13
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	43,483	26,452	69,935	188,357	4	16
Linseed oil	Pound		57,256	57,256	553,000	1	8
Oats	Bushel	56,237	35,258	91,495	1,364,441		24
Rye	do	8,988	3,306	12,294	19,112	7	25
Soybeans	do	22,342	410	22,752	[2] 283,001		29

[1] Figures from Financial Report of Commodity Credit Corporation, Dec. 31, 1955.
[2] 1951.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wonder how many editorials will be written tomorrow morning concerning the available supplies of agricultural commodities. Every editor in America could get the facts, and it is the duty of the Department to see that they get the facts. One of the first obligations of the Secretary of Agriculture, under the congressional enactment establishing that office, is to provide information to farmers, to the public, and to the sources of communications. One of two things has happened: either the Department of Agriculture has not furnished its information to the newspapers and the commentators, or the journalists, publishers, and commentators are already prejudiced and refuse to read the information which they receive. Both are inexcusable.

If the Department of Agriculture has not supplied the information, then it is derelict in its duty. If it has supplied the information and the American press has not accurately reported it, then it is guilty of gross irresponsibility.

I assume they did not get the information. Of course, I assume there is no editor or publisher or commentator in America who would want to say in his columns that 410,000 bushels of soybeans would constitute a burdensome surplus. I do not think there is any editor who would want to say that 24 days' supply of oats in the hands of farmers and the Government would be a monstrous, burdensome amount. I cannot imagine any editor saying that a 3 months' supply of corn is a burdensome surplus.

Of course, the administration says that the reason why prices are down is that we have such a tremendous surplus. That is not exactly the truth. The reason why prices are down is the way in which the administration handles its supplies.

Mr. President, I received a letter from a wheatgrowers' association in the Midwest. I do not identify for the RECORD this letter and its point of origin, because I have a copy of the letter which was sent to one of my colleagues in the Senate, and it would be inappropriate for me to name that colleague. However, I may say that if anyone is interested, the letter will be on file in my office, and I have it in my hand.

I think it would be interesting to note 1 or 2 paragraphs of the letter, and I shall read the first one:

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to know who is the Republican senatorial and congressional committee and who furnished the money for the full-page ad and the radio publicity program urging the passage of this so-called President's program.

Mr. President, I wish it known that this letter was sent to a Republican Senator. The letter goes on to say:

The ad, in my opinion, is about as childish an accumulation of false statements or vague and meaningless assertion as I have seen put together in political propaganda.

As I stated in my letter yesterday, there are some good things in the bill. If properly administered after it is passed with the soil bank and the 90-percent support and old parity, it could be the best program that any Republican administration has ever offered to the farmer or farming communities.

The childish statement introducing the ad with Dwight Eisenhower's name signed to it, is a pathetic admission of failure on the part of the present administration and a childish attempt to hang that responsibility on the previous administration, and it certainly is not going to get across or impress anyone with the mentality above that of a 10-year-old with anything other than it is a false assertion.

The assertion that great stocks of commodities is driving the prices of those commodities down is not even remotely near the truth.

If thought through it exposes the one expressing it to a pathetic ignorance or deliberate deception in an intent to create a more dangerous position than the one we have.

Plainly the situation is this, if we had a hundred billion bushels of surplus and no support program, the price will drop to world level normally.

Therefore, with any appreciable surplus, we either have a support program or prices at world market levels in competition with the Chinese coolie and the Russian peasant.

What are the planners of this scarcity program building for? If they eliminate entirely the surplus and put us on an import basis, then we could have the world market plus the tariff protection. Is that their idea of stock piling an intelligent supply of war needs in the event of war?

If that is not their idea, then why not stop the nonsensical argument that stock piles are pushing our prices down.

All that is pushing our prices down is a disposition on the part of the administration to force prices down so as to harvest wealth off of the farm which has been a Republican policy as long as there has been a Republican Party or very nearly that.

We staggered through that policy in the 1920's. Then when the feeble fumbling attempt of the Farm Board failed, the entire economy collapsed as a result of the unsound policy.

Personally, I have never been disposed to charge either President Eisenhower or Benson with the initial responsibility for this program. It is for the advisers back of those who picked both of these men, not because they were qualified, but because they were not qualified and consequently could be handled and misled into the present program that contemplates funnelling the wealth into the industrial centers and harvesting it off the farms. Just as this was done in the 1920's. These men are aggravated because the Democratic farm program of the previous administration has blocked them in this accomplishment to a degree to date. The failure of the farm program that we have had for the past 10 years, to the extent that it has failed, has been 100 percent due to Republican manipulation.

The 80th Congress started the whittling with a sliding parity. The next time the Republican Party got control, we have sliding support plus sliding parity.

The present program offered is the first move the Republican Party has ever made offering anything worth mentioning and the Secretary of Agriculture and the President both, due to bad advice from their backers oppose the only feature in this bill that contemplates giving the farmer more nearly a fair share of the Nation's wealth, that is the return to 90 percent and old parity. There is not the slightest reason to believe that they would be doing that if there were not an election in November and in the background, the bill is only a 2-year measure. What grounds do we have to believe that we would have any program left 1 year after election with promises that are not even equal to the promises that the President gave us as head of his party prior to his previous election?

If I were a candidate, as you are this fall—

Mr. President, I digress to point out that the Senator to whom the letter was sent will be a candidate for reelection, and his friend says to him:

If I were a candidate, as you are this fall, I would not attempt to defend that

record and I would be very cautious about condemning the previous administration that in cold facts was head and shoulders above the present administration from the farmers' point of view and I think from the Nation's welfare as well.

I would pick out a few things of value that the present bill does offer and I would concede the weaknesses and the economically unsound policy that the administration has otherwise followed which is a repetition of what they followed in the 1920's, leading to the 1929 and 1930 harvest of world bankruptcy, the fruits of their effort.

This may sound a little rough—

I leave out the name, Mr. President—

but I think it's cold hard facts that we better give serious consideration.

Mr. President, that letter is not from a Democrat; it is a letter from a real, 100 percent, thoroughbred Republican. But he knows what is going on.

Now I want to read, in part, what the man wrote to me, so that the RECORD may be clear. The letter, addressed to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, reads:

DEAR SENATOR: Normally I am a Republican, but I am first an American citizen and a farmer, and from that standpoint, I have not been able to support Republican candidates very frequently.

Mr. President, I shall not read the remainder of the letter because the man was writing a personal communication.

This gentleman attended some of the hearings which the committee conducted. His letter is indicative of the kind of mail which is being received from the Midwest. It comes from a State which is so Republican that the hope of a Democratic victory is always somewhat down the road.

Mr. President, it is about time somebody looked seriously at these figures in relation to what they might mean to our civilian defense, and to our war production in event of an emergency. Surely, we might get crops increased in a year or so. But a lot of people could go hungry waiting.

Many thinking people have expressed similar concern. Recently Bernard Baruch, the senior statesman, in a series of articles appearing in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, voiced the urgent need for such an emergency stockpile of food and fiber.

I might suggest that Mr. Bernard Baruch is not an idle dreamer. He is considered to be one of the shrewdest men in America, one of the most able statesman who ever participated in the affairs of government.

Again, more recently, Earl H. Voss, military writer for the Washington Star, wrote an article published in the February 19 issue of the Star headed "Surplus May Be Vital if Nuclear War Comes."

Let me read just his opening paragraphs:

Force yourself to imagine, for a ghastly few minutes, that the unthinkable has happened. The all-out nuclear war has begun. Almost immediately both sides could be expected to leap to a perilous conclusion:

Chemical and biological warfare are no more inhumane than H-bombs. The time would have come to shoot the works.

And what would this mean?

Almost certainly, it would mean contamination of our food supply. Grain fields in the Middle West would become battlefields. Government surplus stocks would become targets. Air bursts from guided missiles, from balloons, from Soviet bombers' droppings, deliberate dispersion of radioactive waste materials—all of these could contaminate our breadbasket with a deadly poison.

America, the land of milk and honey and plenty, could overnight be faced with starvation.

Which brings up more questions:

Are we wise in trying so hard to peddle our farm surplus? As a matter of fact, do we have any surplus at all?

Mr. President, I have been quoting from an article in the Washington Star. I concur wholeheartedly in the concern expressed. If we think nuclear warfare is enough of a threat on which to spend billions for defense, is it not time that we even consider what our food and fiber problems might be?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire Star article to which I have referred printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPLUSES MAY BE VITAL IF NUCLEAR WAR COMES

(By Earl H. Voss)

Force yourself to imagine, for a ghastly few minutes, that the unthinkable has happened. The all-out nuclear war has begun. Almost immediately both sides could be expected to leap to a perilous conclusion:

Chemical and biological warfare are no more inhumane than H-bombs. The time would have come to shoot the works.

What would this mean?

Almost certainly it would mean contamination of our food supply. Grain fields in the Middle West would become battlefields. Government surplus stocks would become targets. Air bursts from guided missiles, from balloons, from Soviet bombers' droppings, deliberate dispersion of radioactive waste materials—all of these could contaminate our breadbasket with a deadly poison.

America, the land of milk and honey and plenty could overnight be faced with starvation.

Which brings up more questions:

Are we wise in trying so hard to peddle our farm surplus? As a matter of fact, do we have any "surplus" at all?

How long would it take to deplete these "huge, depressing surpluses overhanging the market" in case of all-out war?

OUR STANDBY STOCKS

Here are some answers, supplied by the National Farmers Union and based on Agriculture Department statistics (American consumption and exports assumed to be the same as in 1952, the last year no surpluses were accumulated):

"We have corn for only 3 months and 19 days—barely enough to keep the distribution pipeline filled.

"We have enough wheat for 13 months and 11 days.

"We have enough cotton for 13 months and 10 days.

"Enough rice for 7 months and 8 days.

"Enough butter for 1 month and 14 days.

"Enough rye for 7 months and 25 days.

"Enough barley for 4 months and 14 days.

"Enough oats for 24 days.

"Enough soybeans for 29 days."

The list goes on, but there is no important crop in which our surpluses exceed 14 months' supply. Of course, fallout with long-term persistence, like strontium or cesium, could contaminate our farmlands for many years.

Today, even the meager stocks we have on hand could be contaminated in the first days of an all-out war. We have made no preparations to protect them (or anything else) against radioactive fallout or chemical attack.

Despite these inadequacies of our food and fiber stocks for a nuclear war situation, both Democratic and Republican administrations have sought to reduce them in two ways, by selling them or giving them away abroad, and by discouraging farm production.

TWO VOICES

At least two Democrats in the Senate are now awakening to the political as well as nonpolitical advantages in setting up a strategic reserve of food and fibers. They are Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of farm-State Minnesota, and HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington.

Senator HUMPHREY has called on the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Department of Agriculture to say "what level of reserves are necessary for defense purposes."

There is an apparent inconsistency in the Nation's attitude toward food on the one hand and inedible strategic materials on the other.

"Here we are," Senator HUMPHREY points out, "putting $6 billion into stockpiles of strategic minerals and other materials to make sure we have enough on hand in event of a defense emergency, building additional stockpiles of A-bombs, planes, and other weapons of warfare, yet the administration asks us to liquidate all of our food and fiber holdings without thinking about how we could even start to defend our Nation in event of such an emergency without assurance of ample food and fiber."

TWO SOLUTIONS

Generally, there are two main ideas about how to use our food surplus as a strategic reserve:

First, stockpile it in protected sites, dispersed in the vicinity of metropolitan areas most likely to be attacked in an all-out nuclear war.

Second, send some of the surplus abroad to our allies for similar stockpiling in case of war.

It has been suggested that the food and fiber raw materials might even be processed before they are stockpiled, put into individual rations ready for distribution. Big cities could be ringed with strategically located warehouses—underground. Stocks could be rotated, if necessary, to provide a permanent safety reserve.

The advantages cited by proponents of the plan are these:

1. American strength in the broken-back phase of a nuclear war would be greatly increased; the Soviet Union, it will be remembered, has no comparable agricultural surpluses.

2. Our allies would be stiffened against Soviet intimidation and would have new evidence of the United States long-term interest in their survival.

3. Properly insulated from world and domestic markets in this manner. American surpluses would lose their depressive effects and farm prices might head back toward that 100 percent in the marketplace which President Eisenhower seeks.

Before any concrete action on these proposals is possible, however, two questions must be answered.

TWO QUESTIONS

First, what levels of supply should be maintained for emergencies, such as wars or famines? Second, what is a normal inventory of farm commodities—needed to keep the pipeline filled from farmer to consumer?

The Office of Defense Mobilization, which is now stockpiling strategic materials, works on the assumption that a 6-month supply of hard goods must be kept on hand. Shouldn't there be at least a comparable supply of foods and fibers?

Our meat supply, of course, depends on feed grains for the cattle, poultry, and hogs.

One prominent nuclear scientist familiar with fallout effects believes that:

"Food would be the most essential thing in case of nuclear attack. We should take advantage of our surpluses and produce balanced rations for storage in safe sites near metropolitan areas, so that our people will be assured of the most important item for our survival following an attack—uncontaminated food."

It is entirely conceivable, of course, that America's efficient farmers would soon produce enough to fill our strategic food reserve requirements as well as those of our allies and soon begin piling up new surpluses. But until we have the security of adequate food reserves, there is room to wonder whether we are overemphasizing the present need for regulating production.

Nuclear war, of course, is not the only phenomenon which could threaten the American food supply. Famines and other natural disasters are still possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that countries such as the Scandinavian countries—yes; and Germany prior to World War II, and also the Soviet Union—realy stockpiled food. Some of those countries now stockpile food. But not America. No. Food to us is a problem, so says the administration. No wonder some of us are concerned about the administration's defense program. It is a defense program which is based upon inadequate defense supplies, inadequate power, and no concern over food and fiber. Yet one of the greatest military geniuses of all time, Napoleon Bonaparte, in speaking about the importance of food, said that an army travels on its stomach. What he meant was that without food, no military power is possible.

I do not want Congress ever to say it was not warned of what might occur. I want it to consider carefully when it rushes pell mell to enact legislation predicated on a propaganda barrage about surpluses.

Why can we not lift our sights and look further ahead?

I do not know of a business that confines its planning to 1, 2, or 3 years. When a corporation or a utility issues bonds, it plans on 25 to 50 years ahead, taking into consideration population growth, needs, and potential demand that far in advance. Why can we not do that with agriculture?

Mr. President, I wish to refer to an article appearing in the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press on Wednesday, May 18, last year, headed "U"—meaning University of Minnesota—"Expert Warns of Population Growth—Hungry Future Seen for Man."

The lead paragraph in that article says:

One of the world's top authorities on cereal grain diseases stated Tuesday night that mankind is at the crossroads of starvation, groping for the right road.

Further down in the article it says:

The population of the world is exploding in our faces. It is now about two-fifths of a billion, and it is increasing at the rate of about 1 percent a year—25 million new mouths to feed each year.

At this rate, there is another Australia to feed every 4 months, and another Canada every 7 months—another United States every 6 years. In 40 years, at the present rate of increase, the world will have to feed 3.5 billion people.

Authority for these remarks quoted above is Dr. E. C. Stakman, professor emeritus of the University of Minnesota plant pathology and botany department, one of the truly great scientists in the field of agriculture in the history of this Nation. When Dr. Stakman can be concerned, it appears to me somebody in the Department of Agriculture ought to be concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Saint Paul Pioneer Press article be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY EXPERT WARNS OF POPULATION GROWTH—HUNGRY FUTURE SEEN FOR MAN

(By Reub Monson)

One of the world's top authorities on cereal grain diseases stated Tuesday night that mankind is at the crossroads of starvation, groping for the right road.

In a "Centennial Year Symposium at Michigan State College, East Lansing, Dr. E. C. Stakman, professor emeritus of the University of Minnesota plant pathology and botany department, said:

"Man is menacing himself with two tremendous powers, the power of atomic energy and the power of human reproduction."

Emphasizing the problem, he stated, "The population of the world is exploding in our faces. It is now about 2.5 billion and it is increasing at the rate of about 1 percent a year—25 million new mouths to feed each year.

"At this rate there is another Australia to feed every 4 months and another Canada every 7 months—another United States every 6 years. In 40 years, at the present rate of increase, the world will have to feed 3.5 billion people."

ASIA GAINING

Dr. Stakman pointed to densely populated Asia as an example:

"Despite a high death rate, the population of India and Pakistan increased by 48 million in the decade 1931–41.

"Despite the death of 100 million from starvation in China during the past century, estimates are that the population will reach 950 million by the year 2000."

Then he asked, "Is there enough land and water in the world to feed and clothe the products of man's prolifigacy?"

He said that "man is one of the most difficult animals in his own biological environment" who has "not always acted wisely, but his constructive accomplishments in general have been greater than his destructive mistakes.

"He has learned how to feed more people and how to keep them alive longer. And thus he has created a problem for himself. Can he increase food production fast enough to keep pace with the increase of his own numbers? Can man provide food for all or must two-thirds of the world go hungry as it does now?"

MORE LAND NEEDED

The answer, he pointed out, is difficult. "It is evident that we must try to get more land for cultivation or cultivate better what we now have—or invent a way of getting food energy from some source other than plants," the scientist explained.

"Unfortunately, land, unlike population, is not expansible. Most of the best land is already in use, and some is deteriorating."

Dr. Stakman said that the answer lies in science. "Science must serve society, but society must enable science to function in its service by providing adequate facilities."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, why can we not heed these warnings?

Farmers themselves are ahead of the rest of the country in thinking along these lines. They have learned the hard way of the need to make sure they have plenty of reserve feed for their livestock.

Many, many of my letters from farmers indicate this concern.

For example, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a letter from Theodore A. Marks, of Wendmere Farm in New Market, N. J., warning that when surplus ends, scarcity begins.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WENDMERE FARM,
New Market, N. J., February 20, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Abundance. Surplus. No reserve. Scarcity. When surplus ends, scarcity begins.

Because farmers need cash to run their business, the food and feed inventories of the farms at the present time are the lowest, proportionate to the population, in the history of the Nation.

However, the food manufacturers and the Commodity Credit Corporation are fairly well stocked with food and feed, exactly how much no one knows; we should have available certified inventories (quantity and quality) of all commodities in our warehouses (Government and private) and on all farms.

But it will be 6 long months before we start to harvest the new crops. During that time we will be feeding, 2 and 3 times a day, over 168 million humans and over 2 billion animals.

Will our supplies be enough? Suppose we are visited with a drought during the months of May, June, and July (the growing and moisture months), what would happen? Horrors. Every cupboard a Mother Hubbard's.

We are spending over $45 billion yearly for all-out defense and over $3 billion for foreign aid. Are these projects solely to make work for the people, or are they intended for necessary protection against an enemy?

If this be the case, how can we plan without food reserves? We won two world wars because we had enough food; our enemies lost because they had none.

The farmers have been liquidated. Is the United States next?

Truly,

THEODORE A. MARKS.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, more and more of our farm journals are emphasizing this need to prepare now for times of emergency.

I have here an advance proof of pages 2 and 3 of the Minnesota Farmer published in Minneapolis, of which Hilding W. Silverston is publisher-editor.

One page is devoted to an article entitled "Survival Food: A Place for Farm Surplus." The other is devoted primarily to an editorial entitled "Farm Surplus for Defense."

The article and editorial raise a question all of us should be thinking about: Why do we have a farm surplus on one hand, and a food for defense shortage on the other?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have both the article and editorial referred to printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVIVAL FOOD: A PLACE FOR FARM SURPLUS

Emergency "food banks" or food kits for use by civil defense could help solve the farm surplus problem.

Surplus farm commodities could be processed into food and located in relief areas for use by evacuees of a "target city." Specially processed survival kits could be distributed as part of civil-defense preparations for the families who would be evacuated from target areas in an emergency. Such advance preparations would ease the problem of feeding a population displaced by real or threatened enemy attack.

Would feeding emergency evacuees be a problem? Suppose the metropolitan Minneapolis-St. Paul area were evacuated in the face of enemy attack? Evacuation would displace some 1 million persons into relief areas in the State. Food stocks of these rural communities would soon evaporate. Hope it never happens, but if the Twin City area were actually destroyed, with the cities would go a major food processing center and large stocks of basic food. Other great commercial food warehouses and processing plants of America are in critical target areas.

The unpleasant truth is that today's farm surplus in its present form, is not today's emergency food. If war comes to the world again, the fact must be faced that American cities will be subject to attack with weapons of obliteration. The stocks of farm commodities, the raw material of food, which served well in other wars, cannot be counted on as long as it is possible in an instant to wipe out food processing centers.

America has great stocks of farm commodities which are being blamed for low farm prices. But much of this large surplus is not food that can be readily eaten. Some surplus could never be made into food. Some stored grain for example, has deteriorated in storage to the point where it is not fit to make into food. The storage bill for farm surplus is running a good $1 million a day.

THERE IS A NEED

True, even specially packaged survival food might in time, become unfit, but the cost of maintaining usable supplies could be split between civil defense and the farm program. Providing survival kits to families in designated target areas would ease the necessity for large food warehouses.

Based on appeals by American leaders, providing survival food stocks or kits would not be overemphasizing the threat of war or surprise attack. In his appeal to Congress for a stepped up civil defense program, Administrator Val Peterson charged that some of his work "has been starved," and that the "small amount of money we have spent for research to save the lives of American people is shameful to contemplate."

The Civil Defense Administration has named 70 critical target areas in the United States and there are nearly 68 million people in those areas. If they become evacuees they will be moved to relief areas where they must be sheltered and fed under emergency conditions.

President Eisenhower has said that this is an age of peril. There is a constant threat of death and destruction because of the rapid development of atomic and hydrogen bombs and of planes and missiles to deliver them. Defense leaders have asked the Nation to prepare for emergencies. A ground observer warning net is being set up to supplement radar in watching the skies.

"Peace" statements by Russia's leaders cannot be taken seriously because of the basic conflict between democracy and communism.

IT CAN BE DONE

Complete plans for emergency food can and should be part of overall civil defense plans. The red-tape can be cut. The administrative machinery exists to distribute surplus food to distressed areas. This country stands ready to make surplus supplies available to peoples of Western Europe, suffering from the worst winter in decades. The United States Department of Agriculture has been delegated authority to provide food for civil defense. Under Secretary of Agriculture True Morse represents his Department on the Civil Defense Board. Farm surpluses can be released for processing into survival food stocks or food kits if the agencies act.

Because of their experience in packaging emergency foods during World War II, this publication asked executives of Doughboy Industries, New Richmond, Wis., about the possibilities of food preparation for civil defense use.

E. J. Cashman, Doughboy president, confirmed that such a plan was feasible. His firm set up processing, packaging and shipping procedures for rations and emergency food during World War II. Dehydrated soups and other foods packaged by Doughboy were distributed to Allies of the United States through the United Relief Administration. The firm also packaged survival kits for men in the Air Force. Today, Doughboy engineers and manufactures heat sealing units and packaging equipment used by the Government. Mr. Cashman believes that a survival food plan woud be frankly facing facts. "The farm surplus problem is a serious one and so is the question of emergency food supplies for our defense program," he said. "This plan could ease pressure for both civil defense and the farm surplus problem."

The Minnesota Farmer also asked Val Peterson, Federal Civil Defense Administrator, to comment on the idea of converting some farm surplus commodities into emergency food. He believes a year's supply of basic foods, stored properly as a wartime emergency measure, makes sense from a civil defense standpoint. "The need is more apparent," he said, "when one considers that the great commercial food warehouses and processing plants of America are generally in critical target areas. These warehouses would be gone if an attack should occur and then it would not be long before the shelves of all the grocery stores would be completely bare. Bulk food supplies that are on hand now represent a valuable asset, but it would be ideal to store processed foods or something in the nature of armed forces C or K rations."

What about costs of preparing emergency food and storing it properly or distributing it as family survival kits? First, if civil defense plans are to be complete in face of what is known about atomic war, some processed food must be stored in relief areas as insurance. Second, processing farm commodities would reduce costs of storing them. Third, it could be even more costly to try and transport large supplies of emergency food through the terrible confusion of evacuation. Moving the population from designated target areas will be probably the biggest mass transportation job ever undertaken in America. It may have to be done with facilities crippled by destruction of transportation centers.

Because turning farm surplus into survival food would help solve two major economic and social problems faced by America today, the long-range cost could very well be small.

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

The Minnesota Farmer is presenting the survival food idea in the belief that free discussion leads to more correct solution of problems. Readers are invited to comment for publication on all aspects of this proposal. Address your letters to the Editor, Minnesota Farmer, Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis 1, Minn. A selection of letters received by March 20 will be published in the April issue.

FARM SURPLUS FOR DEFENSE

We think farm surplus stockpiles could be reduced and civil defense plans made more complete by the adoption of the "survival food kits or food banks" idea presented on the facing page.

If the warnings of Russia's ability to deliver a surprise attack on this country are taken seriously, then certainly civil defense plans and preparations must be taken more seriously.

In asking for additional civil defense funds, Val Peterson charged that his work so far "has been starved" and that the country faces a real crisis unless steps are taken immediately to correct the situation. He said that with the expected advent of intercontinental-ballistic missiles, warning time could be eliminated and persons in target areas would have no alternative but to "go underground." If there is adequate warning and the population of target cities is evacuated, it appears that their presence in relief areas would soon pose an urgent what-are-they-going-to-eat question.

True, there are stocks of grain in the country and in some cases, processed food. But there apparently are no clearcut plans for distributing food to evacuees. In fact, evacuees may be asked to make their own food from raw material stocks, following instructions passed out by civil defense. We think a bulletin on making cornpone, or cracked wheat cereal from Government bin stocks would be decidedly unrealistic in an emergency. And what kind of food is stored where? Is all the orange juice in one place and the dried milk in another? Just how is this food to be made available in an emergency?

In his appeal to Congress, Val Peterson asked for a broader scattering of millions of people all over the Nation to prevent disaster from an attack. He asked for $123 million for civil defense work in the 12 months starting July 1, compared to $69 million allowed this year. There are already some indications that the funds will not be forthcoming.

We believe the civil defense problem generally and the food question particularly is one that people should discuss freely. It must be taken seriously. Just a few days before Mr. Peterson discussed his needs, three Russian leaders warned that "horrors of war worse than anything yet experienced by mankind would descend on the United States if the West starts a new war." Of course, they added that they are for peace, but the threat remains.

Survival steps have never been as important as they are now. Families have been told to lay in enough food and water for a week. Wouldn't a kit packaged for the purpose, or "survival banks" of such kits in relief areas be more practical?

Converting certain surplus farm products into emergency food supplies would give civil defense something it needs, and at least help relieve farm surplus headaches.

President Eisenhower has already stated that surplus farm commodities can be made available to peoples of Western Europe suffering from one of the coldest winters in decades. It is well to relieve distress in friendly nations. The surpluses should also be used to prevent distress from an emergency in this country.

Replying to a letter from us, Civil Defense Administrator, Val Peterson, indicated that the Department of Agriculture has been delegated authority to provide food for civil defense use. Let's not wait for distress to appear before action is taken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am happy to note that some people in this country are thinking about these matters.

Mr. President, these are ideas stirring out in our farm areas. Yet we have an administration down here in Washington that says it does not know what to do with our abundance. For shame.

For more than 3 years we have been calling attention of this administration to sound proposals for using our abundance. We have put them in legislative form. Yet always these people who say they do not know what to do with our surpluses oppose every suggestion that anyone makes except themselves.

Yet by their outcries against surpluses they have created a serious problem for agriculture, more serious than at all necessary.

We now have a chance to deal with that problem, and we should deal with it soundly, basing our action on facts instead of fantasy.

This problem of so-called surpluses is not only one that has come to have considerable bearing upon our agricultural policy in general; it also has a bearing upon our foreign policy.

Nations around the world contemplate our plans and actions with hope as well as fear.

We can do a tremendous amount of good in our international relations with wise use of our abundance. We can do a tremendous amount of harm by plunging headlong into a hysteria of dumping in any form, even to make deals for votes.

Because of this international concern about what we do with our abundance, whether we use it constructively or negatively; whether we show the world we are concerned about people everywhere, or only concerned about dollars, it is of the utmost importance that we approach the problem with statesmanship and through careful analysis of the facts.

I have already mentioned that we should be grateful that our supply problem with respect to some agricultural products is one of abundance rather than one of scarcity. That needs to be reemphasized. I do not think that there will be many people who would wish to quarrel with this view. Other countries would think we are mighty lucky. Russia would think it had a tremendous asset at its disposal, if it owned our food and fiber stocks. Yet, we want to get rid of them, even recklessly.

Second, I consider it unlikely that, in the long run, American farm products will really be in excessive supply.

Perhaps we will be hard put to feed Americans properly in the years ahead—to say nothing of filling the import requirements of other countries.

Hence, what we now have is not absolute surplus production, but production not well distributed over time.

Viewed in this light, I am quite sure that we should contemplate the surplus situation with much less alarm and uneasiness than have recently characterized public discussion of this problem.

We can turn our supposed surplus problem into a national asset and greatly ease the farm problem at the same time by four simple steps:

First. Lock up at least a minimum amount of key commodities in a national security reserve to protect us against any future emergency, really isolating such commodities from the market by specifically requiring they can only be released under Presidential proclamation that such an emergency exists.

Second. Making the most of creating additional domestic consumption through adoption of a food-stamp plan or food-certificate plan to supplement the purchasing power for specified commodities of our aged, our dependent children, our blind and disabled, our unemployed, and our needy now existing on meager public assistance.

Third. Use our remaining expendable surpluses for the purpose of financing economic improvement and expansion abroad, or at least supplement our economic aid to raise levels of consumption and to relieve misery, thereby making our abundance an effective arm of our foreign policy.

I wish to point out that the State Department, in its requests for foreign economic aid, has yet to come before the Congress with a program encompassing needs of food and fiber to buttress the foreign aid. Actually, economic aid to some countries can be more harmful than helpful unless there is food and fiber to go along with the economic aid, because the economic aid would provide only a greater amount of purchasing power in that country to buy a static amount of food and fiber. Thereby the purchasers will compete with one another for the existing supplies of food and fiber, causing inflation and great economic trouble.

In this country we are apparently contemplating a 5-year program of aid to India. I want to say now that if we give economic aid to India and do not at the same time make available to India, under long-term credits, wheat and other foods, the Indian people will be in worse trouble after they get the aid than they were before they received it. Today the people of India have a subsistence level diet. It is contemplated that under the 5-year program, there will be employed 9 million more persons in India. These 9 million Indians employed on construction projects will be paid in Indian currency in the form of rupees. We are evidently going to make contributions to the cost of those construction projects, but if the 9 million Indians who are presently unemployed are to be paid wages in the form of rupees, and if they use those rupees to buy food and fiber, there will be a bidding up of the price of available food and fiber under present production, unless we couple our economic aid with a substantial amount of wheat, cotton, and other needed commodities. I think we need some economic planning on the part of our State Department, rather than some economic giving.

In view of the possibilities of crop failure anywhere in the world and of the dangers of the international situation, this country would be justified in setting aside large carryover reserves to be held securely for release in specific emergency situations only.

I again call attention to the disastrous winter suffered by Western Europe, and now the disastrous floods. So food and fiber are going to be extremely useful.

That should take care of some of the threat that now overhangs some of the markets. As for the rest, surplus disposal for additional consumption, at home and abroad, offers possibilities that have by no means been fully explored.

In fact, we have to this day been extremely unimaginative in the exploration of such possibilities.

The reason for this regrettable fact, apparently, is that in our surplus disposal activities we have proceeded without prior clear-cut analysis of the problem. Had such an analysis been given a chance, even the most enraged partisans of private enterprise and of business as usual would have understood that normal commercial demand can hardly be counted upon for substantial surplus disposal.

If we want to have genuine surplus disposal, we must seek to dispose of surpluses for additional consumption, at home or abroad—not just displacement by the Government of marketings that would otherwise be fully utilized by private enterprise.

It is characteristic that, in the administration's new farm program, the only suggestion relating to increased surplus disposal is to appoint a new administrator and to seek expanded opportunities to barter agricultural commodities for strategic materials, and to seek authority for selling Government stocks behind the Iron Curtain.

We can and must raise our sights higher.

Furthermore, I noticed the timidity of the administration with respect to the suggestion that we sell our Government stocks behind the Iron Curtain. The administration tossed that suggestion out and did not have the courage to press it. Why did the administration suggest it if it was not going to press it?

I want to discuss in further detail each of the three points I have enumerated as the basis for surplus disposal that would work without upsetting existing markets, and further depress farm prices.

The first point I mentioned was locking up at least a minimum amount of key commodities for national emergency. I have introduced a national security reserve amendment to provide for this purpose.

It is a moderate amendment, calling for starting out only with the amount of commodities already specified in the bill for inclusion in the so-called set-aside.

When the President's message of 1954 outlined the "set aside" idea, everyone thought its intended purpose was to really isolate some of our commodities from the market. That has not been done. The set-aside as it now exists is merely a bookkeeping device to avoid counting some of our commodities when we compute parity prices. It was a political device, not an economic device. The supply in the set-aside still has the same depressing effect on market prices as if no set-aside exists.

We must effectively neutralize a portion of our carryover stocks, to be held securely for release in specified situations only, genuine emergencies at

home or abroad. The release of these commodities should be contingent upon a Presidential determination of the conditions that alone would permit such release. That is what my amendment provides.

Further, it requires the administration—any administration—to do what it should be doing anyway: to take an annual look at our national security needs, and inform the Congress at least once a year what level of supplies should be earmarked to be kept in the national security reserve, in the public's interest. Congress can then act upon that annual recommendation as it sees fit, but at least it will have some determinations upon which to base its action. We lack that today.

Really "locking up" our security reserves would effectively remove a sizable amount of our surpluses from the position in which they now overhang the markets of the world. It would be a real set-aside, not just a bookkeeping set-aside. Such security reserves would have an immediate effect upon the market, an effect which, by later disposal for only truly additional consumption or emergency use, could come only gradually over months or years, if and as success in such disposal becomes apparent.

The neutralization action would be a cornerstone for immediate relief in important markets.

It would leave the door open for any promising surplus disposal in the future that means additional consumption rather than displaced marketings, and impose no financial burden that we would not have to carry in any case.

I hope my national security reserve amendment can be adopted, to improve and strengthen the bill. I am convinced it is thoroughly justified by the facts we face.

The next point I mentioned in a sound surplus disposal plan was some form of stimulating additional domestic consumption, through a food-stamp plan. Note that I have said "additional consumption," not just displacing other marketings for existing consumption, as the administration seemed determined to do with its own surplus disposal ideas.

We are making progress along these lines with a food-stamp amendment to the social-security bill now before the Senate Finance Committee, as a supplement to any other small increase in cash assistance that may be provided our unfortunates. I am hopeful that amendment will be reported with an improved social-security bill. Hearings on it were held starting on Monday.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I have great confidence that the Finance Committee will report the so-called food-stamp program. There is nothing new about my support of a food-stamp plan. In fact, I am a cosponsor, with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], of the program now before the Senate Finance Committee; and I am also a cosponsor, along with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], of such a plan which now is before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Because the Finance Committee has jurisdiction over social security legislation, and has taken jurisdiction over this amendment, I feel that is the correct place for it, rather than to have it added as an amendment to this farm bill, without proper hearings.

There is nothing new about my support of a food-stamp plan. I have been advocating and supporting it for years—because it means additional consumption, among people who needed improved diets. It will bolster our economy, and will be an investment in public health.

Mr. President, as evidence of my continuing interest in the food-stamp idea for creating additional domestic consumption, I ask unanimous consent that my statement of testimony presented to the Senate Finance Committee on Monday be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON FOOD-STAMP PLAN AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY BILL (H. R. 7225)

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend you for calling hearings on this vitally important amendment. Action by Congress has been too long delayed on some form of the food-stamp approach supplementing the diets of low-income families, both from the humanitarian standpoint of proper care for our citizens and from the standpoint of the economic sense it makes in view of some of our current farm problems.

It is strange, indeed, for a great democracy like ours to be complaining about having too much food we don't know what to do with—and yet at the same time have problems of lack of adequate diet in our midst, as a result of lack of purchasing power.

It must look more than strange, to other countries of the world. It must raise serious questions about our wisdom, our leadership, our ability to use the blessings bestowed upon us.

We should be mighty thankful that the age of nature-imposed scarcity is past. Mankind need not be doomed by nature to starvation for a part of its people every year, if mankind is wise enough to make proper use of its resources and its productive know-how.

In the United States, the farm productive power is abundantly and efficiently available to easily provide a fully adequate diet every day for every person within our borders.

Yet we are talking in Congress about cutting down that productive power, while unfortunate people in our midst are going without the necessities of life.

Conscience calls for a better answer.

For years I have advocated use of a food-stamp plan, both in periods of seriously depressed income and in periods of excess food production.

Along with Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, I have been cosponsoring for several years a domestic food-allotment plan still pending before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with little chance of action because of the opposition of the Department of Agriculture.

That opposition is strange indeed. It is not based on the fact use of food stamps would not stimulate consumption, and mean greater total markets for farm products. It is based entirely on the selfish fact that the Department would prefer trying to physically move the commodities it owns, rather than stimulate consumption to the point it won't have to take over as much surplus in the future.

Certainly, the Department is endeavoring to move surplus to meet human suffering and need by making some of its supplies available to local welfare boards and groups that request them.

But the truth is that most county welfare agencies are not adequately equipped to handle physical stocks of foodstuffs, and welfare workers who understand the psychological as well as the physical needs of unfortunate people on public assistance know the advantage of trying to place such assistance programs on a better basis than a charitable handout of a package of beans or a sack of flour.

That's why we have developed social-security programs, to replace breadlines and soup kitchens of the depression years.

Both from a standpoint of operating efficiency and morale of people being assisted, use of food stamps as proposed in this amendment is far simpler, far easier to administer, and far more effective than bulk distribution of food supplies. And do not underestimate the importance of trying to preserve the self-respect and bolster the morale of people finding it necessary to turn to public assistance. It is only by so doing that we maintain a chance to get them back on their feet as productive and self-supporting members of our society.

When people are subjected to extreme hardship through no fault of their own—widows, suddenly left with a houseful of children to take care of; orphans, with no means of support other than the public's conscience; the blind, the aged, and the unemployed willing to work if work is available—it is morally wrong for any society to condemn them to the degradation of begging for a handout, or place a stigma upon them for accepting public assistance. It is even more morally wrong for that to happen in this great United States of America, which so proudly boasts of being a Government with a heart, a Government interested in its people, a Government we parade before the rest of the world as an example of how the individual dignity of man should be respected.

Remember, the Constitution assigns as a duty to our Congress the responsibility to "promote the general welfare."

In caring for the less privileged in our midst, we are not only performing a humanitarian act but promoting the general welfare of our country.

When it appeared little action could be achieved in approaching this food-stamp idea entirely from the standpoint of its benefits to agriculture—and I personally believe they can and will be tremendous—I was proud and privileged to join with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] in developing and sponsoring the alternate legislation upon which this amendment is based. Many of our colleagues joined us as cosponsors.

While the original domestic food allotment plan was designed to be a more comprehensive plan of assuring adequate nutrition to all low-income families, our new approach was a more modified form of simply supplementing the aid being given those already certified as eligible for public assistance under the laws of our land through distribution of food certificates good for a specified amount of food products which have been designated as in surplus supply by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In a period of severely depressed national income, I believe the former approach would have reached more people and been more effective. In a period such as the present, where we enjoy a relatively high prosperity yet have unfortunate people in our midst unable to share in that prosperity and at the same time are confronted with a related problem of excess food production, I believe the approach now before this committee is the soundest and wisest course.

We need no new certification of who is eligible and who is not.

We need no new administrative machinery. Every State and county already have estab-

lished welfare departments through which the certificates would be issued.

The recipients would merely turn them in at the food stores of their choice, which in turn would deposit them with their own bank for redemption by the Government.

We would be making use of normal channels of trade for our food distribution, instead of trying to undertake the more costly procedures of physically handling bulk supplies of relief food stocks for direct distribution.

Every welfare official with whom I have consulted has expressed preference for the food stamp approach.

Welfare boards in counties of Minnesota have overwhelmingly gone on record in favor of such a program as this amendment would make possible.

No one can contend that the meager pittances made available to persons on public assistance today are fully adequate to provide them with proper living standards in accordance with conditions and living costs prevailing generally in our economy.

It is not and never has been my contention that use of food stamps should replace any of the cash assistance provided by law for designated categories of unfortunates. In fact, I want to emphasize that we should carefully guard against that happening. What our purpose has been, and still remains, is supplementing that minimum assistance with food certificates to make some better use of the abundant food supplies for which we do not now have a market in this country.

We must pay the bill one way or another. It makes sense to me to stimulate consumption of products in oversupply, at public expense, rather than later be compelled to have that same or more public expense involved in removing that surplus and storing it in warehouses.

Let's use our abundance to feed people, and at the same time to protect our agricultural economy. We can achieve both objectives without excessive costs. Most of the cost of any food stamp plan would eventually be costs diverted from other farm surplus diversion programs.

I know that some may argue the benefits to agriculture may appear more indirect than unloading surplus supplies from our warehouses, yet I am convinced the benefits would be very real and more lasting by increasing purchase demands of the normal food trade, in the long run reducing the necessity for the Government to accumulate surpluses.

The food-stamp idea is particularly adaptable to stimulating consumption of perishable products like pork, beef, and dairy products, for which existing farm programs provide inadequate protection.

The country has been ahead of the Congress in accepting this idea. It just does not make good sense to most people to have shouts about "too much food," on one hand, then see problems of hardship among underprivileged people unable to buy adequate amounts of food in their own communities.

I believe that farm families overwhelmingly support enactment of the food-stamp or similar program. They are convinced of its desirability not only because of the influence it would have in increased farm incomes. Farmers are convinced that food subsidies to low-income consumers are morally right on two counts:

First. Farmers believe that to allow farm productive capacity or produced food to be idle or go to waste if there are hungry people who need it is morally wrong if this can be prevented in some manner that will not bankrupt farmers in the process.

Second. Farmers believe that everybody in America ought to have enough to eat, even though they are unable for some reason to earn enough income to pay for it.

Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead has conducted a series of scientific opinion polls on this subject among farmers of Iowa, 2 of which were reported in the May 1, 1954, issue. In 1953 a scientific sample of Iowa farm people were asked the following question:

"A dairy committee is recommending the following method of getting rid of Government supplies of butter and cheese. Issue stamps worth 50 cents on a pound of butter and 25 cents on a pound of cheese. Give stamps to folks on relief rolls, to hospitals, and to other institutions. What do you think of the proposal?"

On this the vote was:

Good idea:	Percent
Republicans	65
Democrats	69
Total	66
Bad idea:	
Republicans	21
Democrats	17
Total	20
Undecided:	
Republicans	14
Democrats	14
Total	14

In 1954 the following question was asked of Iowa farmers:

"Congress is considering a food-stamp program which would turn food surpluses over to the unemployed and those now getting public assistance. Do you think this is a good idea or a poor idea?"

Good idea:	Percent
Republicans	76
Democrats	76
Total	76
Poor idea:	
Republicans	19
Democrats	19
Total	19
Undecided:	
Republicans	5
Democrats	6
Total	5

The article concludes: "Farmers are apparently more interested in food stamps now than last year."

I would also like to present for the record a copy of an editorial from the March 6, 1954, issue of Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead. Remember, this was 2 years ago. Headed, "Hungry Old People," it said:

"Too many old people go hungry—even in the United States. Too many children don't get nearly enough milk or meat.

"The Nation really has no surplus problem in meat and dairy products, even though warehouses are full of canned beef, butter, cheese, and dried milk.

"The only problem is to get this food to people who need it and should have it.

"Remember that we know the names and addresses of about 8 million people in the United States who can't buy as much of this food as they need. These are the people who have no income except what they get from Federal social security, or from Federal-State old-age pensions, or from local relief.

"Many of these are older people. Older folks, to keep healthy, need more meat, fish, cheese, milk, eggs than a lot of them are now getting. More protein and more calcium.

"What can be done about it? One easy step would be for Congress to adopt a part-way food-stamp plan. This could add a few dollars in stamps to the income of everybody now getting public assistance. These stamps could be used for dairy products, eggs, meat, fruit—the foods most needed.

"Such a step would cost more than the present storage problem, but it would put the food where it is needed. And it would stop the present nonsense of stacking up butter, cheese, and canned meats without knowing what to do with it."

Two years ago, when this bill was introduced in its original form as S. 627, I presented on the floor of the Senate and had referred to this committee letters of approval and endorsement from the county welfare boards in Pope County, Cass County, Roseau County, Washington County, Hubbard County, Mille Lacs County, Anoka County, Nicollet County, Becker County, Hennepin County, Koochiching County, Freeborn County, Yellow Medicine County, Cottonwood County, and Sherburne County, Minn.

Mr. Chairman, a comprehensive study of Federal, State, and local government relations and responsibilities was completed last year by a Presidential commission, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Commission was the outgrowth of a proposal I introduced in the Congress. I had the privilege of serving on it. It was ably headed by Meyer Kestnbaum, now assigned to the White House staff in the hope of implementing some of its recommendations.

In its report to the President, that Commission recommended use of the food-stamp plan by our Government for handling distribution of surplus foods through normal commercial channels.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to place in your hearing record that official recommendation of a Commission appointed by President Eisenhower, taken from page 164 of its report, with the heading, "Commercial Handling of Food Surplus Donations."

"It is recommended that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare jointly explore the possibility of distributing surplus agricultural commodities through commercial instead of governmental channels.

"The Commission has not examined the agricultural price-support operations of the National Government. However, the Commission believes that so long as large stocks of foodstuffs continue to be acquired as a result of these operations, such foodstuffs should be made available for human consumption in preference to letting them go to waste. The Commission further believes that such donations and distributions should be accomplished with a minimum of complexity at all levels of government. At present, National, State, and local governments are deeply involved in the physical handling of these foodstuffs, with accompanying complex intergovernmental fiscal and administrative relationships.

"The Commission is of the opinion that intergovernmental relationships in this area would be greatly simplified if distribution of foodstuffs destined for donation to individual recipients could be effected through commercial channels, through some such device as a locally operated certificate plan. Such a device would replace present complicated and expensive intergovernmental transactions in physical foodstuffs with a system of clerical and accounting transactions confined to certificates and funds; in other words, it would substitute a 'fiscal' system for a 'physical' system."

Mr. President, we are quite rightly sending surplus food abroad to help the underfed and starving of other lands. We should be doing more of it, as an important arm of our foreign policy—an effective way of showing that our democracy is concerned with people, not just power.

We are going to be doing more with this weapon for peace, in our foreign relations.

But I believe first of all we must explore new outlets at home, among our own people.

We must seek to get the food needed to people who cannot afford to buy it. We must

make food distribution part of our farm programs to assure outlets for the abundance we are capable of producing, and the abundance that we will need in years to come. And we should make food certificate or stamp distribution part of our welfare program, to supplement the ability of public-assistance recipients to achieve adequate diets.

All this amendment provides is certificates valued at $10 per month for use in purchasing such supplies as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate as being in surplus supply.

Yet that can create a tremendous new market.

Eligible to participate would be present recipients of minimum assistance provided under the programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled, plus those certified within their States as eligible for unemployment compensation benefits and others certified by State or local welfare or public assistance agencies as eligible for assistance provided for the needy by laws of such State and local political subdivisions.

Let me emphasize what this would do to our economy, contrasted to other surplus disposal plans.

The $10 added purchasing power for food would be provided for some 2,555,000 people now on old-age assistance, for 2,173,000 dependent children, for 105,000 blind, for 242,000 permanently disabled.

It would also be made available for the recipients of unemployment benefits, averaging 685,000 per week last year.

It would also be made available to an additional 297,000 persons now receiving State or local public assistance as needy persons, without Federal participation.

That means an added food purchasing power each month for some 6 million of our citizens.

Think what that will mean to our economy.

Stimulated consumption through normal trade channels would bolster farm income and add materially to our gross national product.

It would greatly expand the volume of business handled by our food stores, adding more growth to our national economy.

But most of all it would add immeasurably to the health and well-being of people—of the aged, the orphans, and the blind.

No one contends that a permanent answer to the farm problem is giving away food. This is a temporary situation. Our growing population itself will use up all the food we can produce if we keep our economy prosperous and expanding.

Yet it is an opportunity to both make wiser use of our abundance, and to help our underprivileged at the same time.

We cannot pass this opportunity.

We need action now, and this is the kind of action that will help.

We need this food distribution program not just for the sake of farmers, but for the sake of the aged, the needy children, and the disabled. We need it to assure adequate diets for the less fortunate in our midst.

Can we long maintain our position as an example, holding forth our shining light to the rest of the world, if we complain about abundance while letting our own people go hungry?

Let us show that we care about people's stomachs. Let us be just as interested in full stomachs as we are interested in full cartridge belts. Let us take the constructive course of putting our food to use, rather than upsetting our farm economy by trying to make farmers quit producing while people in our own country lack enough to eat.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, now I turn to the third point, one which I believe is perhaps the most important of all.

Just as real surplus-disposal domestically must be through additional consumption, rather than displaced consumption, so must sound disposal through export be in addition to what we could otherwise export for dollars. It must not "impair the traditional competitive position of friendly countries," as the President said in his policy statement of September 9, 1954. The truly "additional consumption" that is required to meet the two conditions I have mentioned must therefore be a function of any surplus disposal action that we take in regard to exports.

How can additional consumption abroad be brought about? The possibilities are these: First, by expansion of real incomes in importing countries, beyond what they would be without our surplus disposal for export. Second, by displacement of other countries marketings or by displacement of other commodities in consumer expenditures. Third, through expansion of wholesale demand abroad for long-term stockpiling.

If our foreign relations means anything at all—and in these critical times they mean survival—we should dismiss entirely the idea of displacement as a goal for surplus disposal. We cannot keep friendly allies, if we deliberately aim to displace marketings of friendly countries. We might displace marketings of the Soviet bloc countries; but these are mostly small, in so far as the commodities in surplus are concerned. So for the purposes of this discussion, the idea of "displacement" can be ruled out.

We shall look, instead, at the other two possibilities: Expansion in real incomes abroad, and expansion of wholesale demand for stockpiling. Both offer interesting opportunities.

The President has called for prolonging and extending economic aid, and many of us want to support him. Others are seriously concerned about continually pouring dollars into such efforts. Our food abundance can be the answer. And it can provide the best answers in the areas most needing economic assistance, in the least prosperous and less-developed countries.

With respect to expansion in real incomes, we should note that, in the more prosperous countries, the income elasticity of demand for surplus-type agricultural products is very low, which means that, even if a donation of surpluses to such countries were to create additional income, this additional income would only to a small extent be spent on surplus-type agricultural products.

The situation is quite different in the case of underdeveloped countries. If real surplus disposal is possible only through truly additional consumption, it follows that surplus disposal must largely concentrate on poor countries. In poor countries, consumption of surplus-type products will increase if real incomes are raised. Of course, such an increase in real incomes can be brought about by exports from other countries only if these supplies can be used as capital in the sense of a "subsistence fund" for new investment, that is, if the proceeds of these exports are made available, by loan or by grant, for income-generating or income-development purposes.

How can exports of surplus-type commodities be used to raise real income in underdeveloped importing countries? In the overpopulated, underdeveloped areas, where unemployment and underemployment are widespread, increases in employment through investment schemes will raise incomes; most of the increase in incomes in those poor areas must go into increased expenditure for food, clothing, and shelter. Hence demand, especially for food and clothing, will rise, and can to some extent be satisfied by the imports of commodities whose local currency proceeds will go into financing the very investment schemes that are the source of this additional demand.

It is true, of course, that the additional incomes generated by the use of the local currency counterpart for additional investment cannot all be expended in the wholesale demand for wheat, fats, and cotton; not even all of the additional retail demand will be spent on bread, fats, and clothing. But it is highly probable that the development assistance thus provided by a surplus-disposal scheme would make possible additional financing, from other sources, of investment projects which otherwise would not have been undertaken at all.

In regard to expansion of wholesale demand for stockpiling, we should note that the construction of storage facilities and the accumulation of reserve stocks in "cropcycle" or "famine" areas would also be an essential step toward economic development. Surplus funds from the United States would not only go a long way toward financing the cost of the construction of strategically situated storage space, but they could also make an important direct contribution to providing the stocks which should be held as an emergency reserve in other areas. Moreover, if storage space were available, the local government's task of dealing with domestic surpluses in years of good crops would be vastly facilitated, and in years of abundance our surpluses would become the blessing they should be, instead of an embarrassment, such as they are now.

Somehow, it would seem only logical to have some of the world's surplus holdings shifted to areas where the failure of a crop means famine, and where people live on the brink of disaster from one harvest to the next. Aside from stocks such as these, the question of strategic security reserves of food located and firmly held abroad, for our own use, should also deserve our attention.

The idea of world stockpiles against famine is neither new nor unrealistic. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has long looked with favor on some such approach.

We have before the Senate two measures—and I am privileged to be a cosponsor of one of them—calling for the United States to assert its leadership in the creation of an international food and fiber reserve through the United Nations, or a world food bank. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, for which I have been named chairman, intends to hold hear-

ings on these proposals later this year. I hope we can serve notice to the world that we want to use our abundance for the world's good, as a powerful weapon for peace.

Perhaps the Soviet has taken the initiative from us on its new "economic offensive" around the world. But what could its answer be if we walked into the United Nations and said, "Look, there are a lot of hungry people in the world. We in the United States are concerned about them. Our efficient democracy is able to produce enough food to help them. We will do our part by making some of our food abundance available. Will Soviet Russia, after all its propaganda about concern for underprivileged people, meet us halfway?"

Mr. President, I think that would be a great day—when our country really took hold of something, and when our representatives walked into the United Nations and challenged the Soviet Union to meet us halfway. We have the goods with which to do that, Mr. President. The trouble is that the administration does not have the necessary determination.

Who do you think would have the initiative then, Mr. President? Who do you think would be winning the greatest respect among swaying peoples in neutral nations of the world, the uncertain pawns who may yet decide this battle of ideologies one way or the other?

That is the kind of vision I should like to see displayed in connection with our surplus-disposal thinking. But there is even more that could be done on our own in further strengthening our foreign policy.

I should like to give a few concrete examples of the kind of action we should explore.

Some concrete illustrative projects are discussed in a recent study by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations on the uses of surpluses for economic development. This Pilot Study on India was commended as an example of preparatory work by the eighth session of the FAO Conference; and the Conference called the attention of member governments to the possibility of using surpluses of farm products to assist the financing of development additional to that which would otherwise be undertaken.

Labor-intensive projects of road construction, irrigation, reforestation, and erosion control, and the provision of storage space for the very much needed larger food reserves in crop-cycle areas, above all, deserve attention.

If there is one line of investment suitable, par excellence, for foreign assistance through grant or long-term low-interest loans, it is the type of social overhead investment as represented by transport facilities, such as roads and canals, and by reforestation and erosion control, especially in drainage basins and watersheds. Social overhead investment cannot be expected to be self-liquidating in the sense of private business accounting; yet, its social productivity is of prime importance, and goes far in making other investment profitable, opening up the growing economic development to an era of increasing returns.

It is the great need for expenditure on the social overhead type of investment which, in an underdeveloped country, keeps the capital-output ratio down, if aggregate investment in the economy is compared with aggregate returns over the years. Assistance for social overhead investment is, therefore, of especial significance. And it so happens that the high labor intensity of projects of this type and the resultant great possibility for domestic credit financing of the residual investment costs make them particularly suited to financing of the basic major costs through foreign surplus foods.

The possibilities of surplus disposal for economic development and economic betterment in underdeveloped countries are by no means negligible—always provided that we set our minds to it and are determined to put into operation a bold new program.

Mr. President, consider only the real situation in the less developed countries. A very large share of the populace lives in hunger, ill-health, and misery. Although governments make valiant efforts at improvement of these conditions, their means are limited. They are anxious to employ idle peoples' energies and thoughts in productive activities that create and solidify society.

If such governments were sure to have the means of paying for the needed labor and equipment, they would formulate work projects for community development on which those idle people could find useful employment. Much of the people in those areas live in an appalling physical environment. The average village lacks roads, wells for drinking water, schools, community rooms, and decent dwellings. What are needed are, for the most part, labor and the food and clothing that the workers must have if they are to do the work.

This is why surpluses of agricultural products can finance much of the cost of projects of this kind. As for the rest, our economic aid in terms of cash or industrial equipment, or private investment policy, and the financing activities of the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, and other international and national finance and aid operations could be coordinated with our aid in terms of surplus farm products.

Or let us consider another area of action which might be explored. In large-scale population transfers, people are being uprooted, and they cannot produce until they are firmly settled in their new environment. In some parts of the world, such large-scale transfers of population are very much needed. Large-scale population transfers, for example, from overpopulated Java to Sumatra, Borneo, and Celebes, are an absolute necessity for the survival of the 50 million people of Java and for the accelerated economic development of the other islands.

Such a transfer has been on the agenda of every government in that part of the world since the early part of the century; and today that is also true of the government of now independent Indonesia. There are, of course, problems; but the scheme could be gotten under way if surplus food were made available to finance it. During the first year or two, the settlers would produce no food. An investment in 1 or 2 years' consumption would be fully justified for a large-scale transmigration program. Present programs for moving 2 million people from Java within 5 years are ultraconservative, and could be liberalized if finance through surplus food were available. Within a few years, 10 million people might be involved.

The above schemes will require mainly food, but also some cotton to make the work clothes of the vast development armies that could be mobilized. Over and above that, special cotton programs might also be explored for the benefit of millions and millions of people in those areas. A cotton-stuffed mattress for those who most urgently need one is not so absurd a scheme as it has been made out to be, nor is it so fantastic to assume that much could still be done to provide more adequate hospital supplies—hospital mattresses, hospital linen, hospital clothes for doctors, nurses, and patients—in many countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

If we mobilize the ingenuity of our and other countries' charitable organizations, and if we pursue our purpose with fervor and earnestness, we shall set an example of how to tackle the paradox of poverty amidst plenty.

What is holding us back?

Using our expendable surpluses for grains or loans as emergency reserves in crop-cycle areas, for aid to economic development projects in poor countries, and for outright charity, could contribute measurably to the liquidation of our so-called surplus stocks. At the same time, the assistance thus given to other countries could bring valuable benefits for our foreign policy and security.

This is precisely what our existing surplus legislation contemplated: if we cannot market the surpluses for an economic-resource return, we should use them in some other way for the good of our country.

The preamble to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—Public Law 480—and the President's policy statement of September 9, 1954, make that perfectly clear.

As to the pure economics of the process of surplus giveaway, let me add a note: While the American economy would profit if we could suddenly sell our surpluses abroad for things we need, it would not lose anything if the surpluses were to be given away, for the costs of these surpluses were incurred in their production—in the expenditures for land, labor, equipment, fertilizer, and the other elements of production—at the time when they were produced.

Since physical output can never be borrowed from the future, and therefore cannot encumber our future work or standard of living—contrary to the myths that have been built around the significance of the public debt that is owed by one part of our society to another—the sacrifice has already been

made, and no additional sacrifice is implied in the giveaway.

As a result, any return in terms of foreign policy, security, and international tranquillity will, for the United States, be a net gain in present circumstances.

These are the insights that our bureaucrats must get through their heads before they can successfully administer a disposal program that makes sense. Had they not clung to a narrow-minded, unrealistic, and utterly unimaginative interpretation of existing legislation, we would not be faced with the need of having to do their homework right here in the Congress.

At every turn of the road, our bureaucrats had to be pushed into taking the curve.

By liberalizing their actions "too little and too late," by granting reluctantly and belatedly what was bound to be granted in the end, they deprived the people of the United States of the foreign policy benefits of its generosity.

This is the attitude that has cost us dearly in our foreign relations.

A grant of $1 million by the shrewd Soviets, with no strings attached, has counted heavily in their favor—a grant of 1 billion by the United States is received with indifference because we have acted as if our aid were the cake and we wanted the other country to eat but at the same time wanted to have ourselves.

The attitude of a grocery clerk is ill-suited for world leadership, and there can be no penny-pinching approach to the great and historic role that fate has cast for this powerful country.

In conclusion of this portion of my remarks, let me outline the steps that should be taken to realize greater benefits from export surplus disposal than have so far been provided.

First, we should solemnly declare our determination to use expendable surpluses for the purpose of financing economic improvement and expansion abroad—to raise levels of consumption and to relieve misery. Since such help would mobilize additional consuming power, it would not disturb the commercial interest of our friends and neighbors. We should declare our readiness to assist underdeveloped countries to put into operation projects of economic development and community betterment—to help finance such projects with surplus food for additional consumption and to coordinate this aid with our other grants and loans, with those of international bodies, and with the aid forthcoming from other nations. We should solemnly declare that any project that meets the requirements of FAO's Pilot Study in India will have our sympathetic consideration. We need not be afraid of being overrun with projects; on the contrary, our fear must be that foreign governments will be too conservative in their proposals. We should declare that we stand ready to relieve food needs in countries hit by crop failure, and to finance with food supplies the transfers, when realistically contemplated, of populations from overpopulated areas to areas of greater resource scope.

Second, we should declare that we stand ready to use our surplus of cotton for the relief of distress and misery if realistic projects of improvements in living standards, sanitation, and hospitalization can be devised.

Third, and last, the Congress should require that our aid and disposal programs be administered in the realization that surplus disposal is foreign policy, not business that will yield an immediate economic return. On policy matters of this scope we cannot afford to take a subaltern and pedestrian approach, or one of narrow-minded sectional interests, since they concern issues of the greatest importance to the security and welfare of this Nation.

If we move promptly and with unequivocal intent along the line that I have indicated, there will be an immediate improvement in the markets of agricultural products.

There will be no need for panicky measures that frighten our friends, elate our enemies, and damage our own interest in stable markets for agricultural products.

Let us not magnify the problem of surpluses accumulated in the past as if they were the essence of our farm problem.

Let us use these surpluses, from which we can derive no other benefits, as a cushion for possible future adversity and, in consultation with our friends, for the advancement and security of less fortunate peoples.

Let it not be said that a nation of great power and great heart was found wanting in vision, in clear thinking and in courage.

HOG-MARKETING PREMIUM PAYMENTS

Mr. President, I wish now to discuss some of the amendments which I intend to offer. Let me refer first to the hog-marketing premium-payments amendment.

Mr. President, I have mentioned the lack of any effective assistance in this bill to aid hard-pressed hog producers, and my intention to seek amending it for that purpose.

Let me discuss the hog situation.

Hog prices received by farmers during December were $10.60 or 50 percent of parity.

That is one-half what it costs for the hog farmer to live and produce those hogs and show a return for his efforts.

Prices rallied very slightly in January, and only moderately in February.

The lull between marketing peaks is now over, and some of the fall pig crop is beginning to move into the markets.

With large hog numbers on our farms and large supplies of cheap feed, it is difficult to foresee any major improvement in the market prices this year unless we in the Congress take some action.

Any legislative program which we adopt should aim at certain desirable objectives and aim to avoid certain undesirable features.

Let me explain what the program I have proposed attempts to do, and what it specifically does not do.

A sound hog stabilization program should aim at these objectives which are included in my amendment:

First. To avoid "boom and bust" cycles in production and prices.

Second. Assure stable returns for the hog producer.

Third. Assure stable supplies at fair prices for the consumer.

Fourth. Encourage the raising and marketing of leaner, more desirable pork and thereby promote greater consumption of pork products.

Fifth. Maintain the productive capacity of our hog industry.

Sixth. Encourage the marketing of supplies in line with probable demand.

Seventh. Accomplish this stabilization at a moderate annual cost.

Eighth. Make the incentive payments only to the producer who has cooperated in keeping supplies in line with demand.

Let me also explain what the amendment I have offered does not propose to do, lest anyone be inclined, as the Department of Agriculture was the other day, to criticize the plan for features which it does not even contain.

First. This plan contains no provision for quotas, controls, or regimentation of the individual producer, and it makes any such controls unnecessary. It is a preventive plan to cutback production through incentives—it does not wait until it is too late and then invoke quotas or allotments.

Second. It avoids pegging of the market prices.

Third. It avoids reducing our national hog plant by such methods as killing brood sows or little pigs.

Fourth. It avoids Government processing, packing, or storing of pork products.

RETURNS TO THE HOG PRODUCER

The long-run effect of the incentive payment plan would be to assure that prices received by farmers for hogs would be at or near 90 percent of parity.

The incentive payment plan provides for payments of from $1 to $3 per hundredweight.

Of course, if prices were badly depressed at the time the incentive program was launched, it would take some time to cut down the volume sufficiently to rally the price.

However, in 1955, we had a surplus of only 6 percent when measured by hog marketings and only 2 percent by actual volume of dressed pork produced. Therefore, only a relatively small cutback would be needed to rectify the overrun.

It is estimated that a cut of 800 million pounds of pork volume would have rallied the price to 90 percent of parity.

To do this a sufficient incentive payment would have been needed to attract 33 million hogs to market at 200 pounds or less. Had all 74 million head of hogs come to market at less than 200 pounds, the pork volume would have been cut by 16 percent, which shows to what extent volume could be reduced by incentives, voluntarily and without controls.

Once the major adjustment in supply had been made, the program would tend

to regulate itself, for if too many pigs were being raised, or if the price weakened below 90 percent of parity, the incentive payments would continuously be cutting back the pork volume.

The farmer would find it advisable to cooperate because the market price, together with the incentive payment would tend to give him a return in the neighborhood of 90 to 100 percent of parity. When supply and price were in order, then the premium plan would not be needed.

These projections are on the conservative side since no evaluation is placed upon the effect which the leaner pork may have in increasing consumer demand and farmer's prices. This effect may be very substantial, and, if so, it would reduce the cost of the incentive payment program.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

We do not have a great surplus of pork at the present time. However, even a small surplus can break the market price, just as with other commodities where a surplus as small as 5 percent can break the market.

For perishable products, which do not lend themselves very well to long-time storage, the problem is to develop a self-regulating plan which will determine the amount of the commodity placed on the market without invoking any controls upon the individual producer.

The plan for incentive payments to encourage marketing of hogs at prime weights is such a plan. It depends for its effectiveness upon incentives instead of controls.

As proposed, the plan would require the Secretary of Agriculture to put into effect the incentive-payment plan whenever either of two conditions are found to exist: First, whenever the annual pig crop exceeds the average annual pig crop for the preceding 10-year period; or, second, whenever the national average price received by farmers falls below 90 percent of parity.

Once launched, the program would remain in effect for as long as the surplus threat or low prices continued to exist.

The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized and directed to offer premium payments of not less than $1 per hundredweight and not more than $3 per hundredweight on hogs marketed at 200 pounds or less. While he would have discretionary authority to offer the full $3 per hundredweight incentive at any time he deemed proper, it would be mandatory that he maintain at least $1 per hundredweight premium payment when farmers' prices are between 85 and 89 percent of parity; at least $2 per hundredweight when farmers' prices are between 80 and 84 percent of parity; at least $3 when farmers' prices are below 80 percent of parity.

HOW IT WOULD REGULATE PORK VOLUME

In 1955, the average hog went to market at 240 pounds, producing a total volume of dressed pork of 10.8 billion pounds.

If the average hog had gone to market at 200 pounds, the 40 pounds less of live weight would have meant 24 less pounds of pork meat per animal. Had this been true, the total pork production would have been 9.1 billion pounds, well below the amount necessary to have moved at above 90 percent of parity prices.

An analysis of pork production and prices during the period from 1920 to 1940 shows the sensitiveness of the market to even a small surplus. Several things are apparent from such a study:

First. Prices suffer disastrously when there is even a moderate increase of marketings.

Second. Prices are weak when supply is about equal to demand.

Third. Prices begin to approach 90 percent of parity when supply is about 4 percent short of the total disappearance of pork products during the preceding 5-year period.

Fourth. Prices do not reach 100 percent of parity until the supply is about 10 to 12 percent short of average marketings in preceding 5 years.

Since the total disappearance of pork products from 1950–54 averaged 10.4 billion pounds, it is apparent that the 1955 production was somewhat above average marketings.

Using the rule, found to be accurate above, the 1955 production would have needed to have been cut back to a point about 4 percent below the base period average in order to bring about 90 percent of parity prices in the open market.

Expectations would be, that farmers would have received 90 percent of parity market prices if the pork volume had been some 800 million pounds smaller or about a total of 10 billion pounds.

A cut of 800 million pounds of pork could be achieved in 1 of 2 ways:

First. By a system of hog controls or quotas to reduce the marketings by some 6 million hogs. This would make it necessary to regiment farmers and tell them they would have to cut their marketings by 8 percent.

Second. By a system of incentive payments to bring hogs to market at 200 pounds. There would be no controls, no dictation to the farmer—he would receive the incentive payment if he cooperated, but he would not be forced to cooperate.

The latter alternative seems far more sensible, and it is what I propose.

In judging the need for this hog marketing premium payment plan, we first need to size up the problem that is facing us.

Somewhere between 75 to 77 million hogs are coming to market in 1956. During 1955, we had 74 million hogs come to market from a fall and spring pig crop of 91 millions.

The pig crop from last fall and the farrowings this spring are expected to result in a total pig crop of 94 million from which the marketings will run larger than last year.

In dollars and cents, hog prices in December and January were the lowest on record since 1941. In terms of parity, they have not been lower since the great depression.

Starting the year as we have with these low prices, and with large numbers of hogs and plentiful feed on hand, we are facing a continued, serious hog price situation.

I do not think we should sit idly by, leaving the hog producers in this situation, and excusing our inaction by saying that any aid would tend to encourage production.

It is clear to me that the Secretary feels we have too many hogs and too many people in the hog business and that the way to make the adjustment is through hardship and bankruptcy—that any real aid to farmers has to be avoided because it might keep someone in the hog business who is just about ready to give up.

I do not subscribe to the policy of production adjustments through bankruptcy and hardship.

The pork surplus is not unmanageable. It can be remedied through hog marketing premium payments in a way that will encourage better pork quality and act as a preventative against recurrence of such oversupplies.

Let me give the picture of the hog cycles and the price extremes we have had during the past 10 years.

During this period prices have ranged from as high as 127 percent of parity to as low as 50 percent of parity. We have had three complete "boom-and-bust" cycles in that 10-year period—and it took only about 20 months to go from the $27 figure in 1954 to the $10 figure in 1955.

In the boom-and-bust cycles, the price always swings in a wider arc than the production. From 1945 to the present day, pork production has not been more than 8 percent above normal in any year and not more than 6 percent below normal in any year, yet the prices have run all the way up to 127 percent of parity and all the way down to 50 percent of parity.

Since the surplus is not unmanageable, we ought to have the intelligence to devise ways to level off these price fluctuations. That is what we are trying to do in this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of production and prices during the cycles to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hog cycles and price extremes

Year	National pork production	Percent above or below normal [1]	Price extremes in cycles	
			Month	Price
	Million pounds			
1945	10.6	+1	January	13.80
1946	11.1	+4	do	14.10
1947	10.5	−1	October	27.10
1948	10.0	−4	September	27.40
1949	10.2	−3	December	14.80
1950	10.7	+1	August	21.70
1951	11.4	+7	October	20.20
1952	11.5	+8	December	16.10
1953	10.0	−4	September	23.90
1954	9.9	−6	April	26.50
1955	10.8	+2	December	10.60

[1] 10-year average production from 1945 through 1954: 10.6 million pounds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is no satisfaction to the hog producer to have $27 hogs at one time, if he knows that $9 hogs will follow in another year as sure as night follows the day.

And certainly the wide fluctuations in price and supply repel the consumer and prevent a gain in the consumption of this very important and healthful food product.

It is no consolation to the hog raiser to be told this year that if he perseveres long enough under $10 to $12 hog prices, eventually enough other producers will be bankrupted or discouraged so that we will swing over to the shortage end of the cycle and he can again briefly enjoy above-parity prices.

PREVENTION OR CURE

Considering the small variation which we have had in pork supplies along with the wide swings in hog prices, would it not be wiser to seek to avoid the moderate overrun rather than try to remedy its consequences after it happens?

The preventive is always cheaper than the cure.

We can make the adjustment in oversupply this year by attracting some 25 to 30 million hogs to market at 200 pounds instead of coming to market at the normal 240 pounds.

This would cost the Government somewhere between $150 and $200 million.

With supply in closer relation to probable demand, the market level would strengthen appreciably.

Contrast this with waiting until the damage has been done to the markets and then coming along, after the farmers have marketed many of their hogs, and take the cheap hogs off the packer's hand through a surplus-removal program.

Senators need not be reminded what has been accomplished so far by the administration's pork-buying program. They have heard that it is to be expanded. What is holding back the expansion? Nothing at all. Secretary Benson does not need authorization of more funds. He had more than $400 million during the past year which he could have used, but he chose only to use a part of the $85 million during the most critical part of the market break.

It is estimated that it would take more than $400 million in surplus removal operations to achieve the same effect which we would accomplish with hog marketing premium payments for about $150 to $200 million.

And the hog raiser would get the benefit of the program, where he shares in the benefits of the surplus removal very sparingly if at all.

What caused hog prices to go down? Some of us have been warning ever since the chiseling began on feed grain prices and later when corn was put on the sliding scale, that cheap feed would result eventually in cheap livestock.

Apparently, the Department of Agriculture did not believe in that well-known axiom, and perhaps it still does not, because it is recommending policies which would result in still more cheap feed.

But it does admit here and there that there is a connection between cheap grain and cheap livestock.

In his appearance February 1 at Austin in my home State, Secretary Benson asked, "What caused hog prices to go down?" His own reply was "heavy feed grain production." Yet his own policy of lowering prices on feed grains has forced production up.

We have seen oat prices drop 32 percent since August 1952, with production going up 28 percent. We have seen rye prices go down 33 percent since 1952 while production is up 75 percent. Barley prices are down 36 percent while production is up 70 percent. Soybean prices are down 28 percent while production is up 32 percent.

With production going up 1 or 2 percent for every percent of drop in price, it should be very simple for someone to calculate how long it will take for surpluses to melt away under present policies.

What happens if we get too many hogs at 200 pounds?

When I proposed this plan as an amendment in the Senate Committee, the Department of Agriculture opposed it on the grounds that it would stimulate hog production far beyond our needs.

It is difficult for me to visualize how a plan which has the main objective of cutting back the pork volume is going to result in too much pork.

I agree that it is possible that if hog prices were to be stabilized at 90 percent of parity while everything else was allowed to drift along at disaster levels, we might find many farmers shifting over into hogs.

Keep corn at 67 percent of parity as it now is in the market, oats at 74 percent, barley at 69 percent, and beef cattle at 66 percent while you are keeping hogs at 90 percent and you will attract some farmers into the hog business.

Put fair prices on one item and Benson prices on everything else and there is only one result to expect.

However, I am not proposing this hog plan as a component of a bankruptcy-level flexible support plan.

I am proposing it as an amendment to a 90 percent of parity bill under which we have some chance to achieve balanced production in this country.

If we have a balanced system of supports, keeping corn at a mandatory 90 percent level based on old parity with proportionate supports on the feed grains and increased supports on such alternative commodities as dairy products, then we are going to have balanced production. Hogs at 90 percent of parity will not stimulate production out of proportion to the historic patterns.

One other factor will be at work under the hog plan which will tend to prevent a surplus of hogs at the light weights. That factor is the increase which we will gain by having a better pork product on the market. Pork consumption per capita is well below the rate at which it has been in some recent years.

Secretary Benson, in an appearance at Austin, Minn., on February 1, asked an audience—

> What would your guess be as to the price of pork today if all hog producers were giving the housewives exactly the kind of pork they want?

Then he went on later to say:

> The percentage of consumer income spent for pork has declined from 2.5 percent in 1949 to 1.9 percent in 1955, that is a drop of 25 percent. If all producers had moved more rapidly to the meat-type hog * * * this need not have happened.

If we believe in the quality theory about pork consumption, then we must agree that the hog marketing premium payments plan is going to help in a very substantial way to build new markets. So the plan would do two things—it would reduce the oversupply and it assures that what is on the market is of good quality.

Can we afford to do nothing? I ask my colleagues—if we could have such a dislocation of market prices last fall and winter with only a 2 percent greater supply of dressed pork than normal, what are we going to have when the extra 4 million hogs from last fall's pig crop hits the market?

We are starting the year with the lowest hog prices we have had since 1941. The spring marketings, from the fall pig crop, will be 4 percent greater than a year ago, the marketings for this year will still be 3 percent greater even if the spring farrowings drop slightly as is now expected. We have a large supply of cheap feed.

All of this points to more trouble on hog prices unless we in the Congress take action.

I think it is very optimistic to hope that we can attain an average of $15 per hundred in the open market for the year.

On January 15th, the average price received by farmers for hogs was $10.90, or 51 percent of parity. The February 15 average price may perhaps run $12 to $12.50. If so, it would be about 57 to 59 percent of parity.

With more hogs and cheap feed, is any Senator willing to predict anything but $13 to $15 hogs at best for the year? If we do nothing that is the best we can expect.

Are we going to leave the hog producers of this country in such a situation when the remedy is so simple, so sure and so economical as compared with our present fruitless surplus removal measures?

I say today that we can accept the low prices and the theory of production adjustment by bankruptcy, but we do not have to accept it. There is an alternative in the hog marketing premium payments and it is an alternative that can do some real good at once.

Some of my colleagues may have listened to Secretary Benson, perhaps they have listened to some of his hand-picked processor advisers saying that nothing should be done about the low prices because it might interfere with a needed adjustment.

Maybe they are content to tell their farmers that it is too bad, but hog prices will have to stay at $13 to $15.

I am not, because I know the oversupply is small. I know the adjustment can be made within a few months through the incentive payments for marketing light weights.

I know that it will really mean something in Minnesota to get the supply situation straightened out and get the prices on the way up.

It will mean at least $4 a hundredweight on some 5 million hogs—it will mean $30 million more income for Minnesota hog raisers and a much sounder market condition with better quality pork on the market.

I can imagine what it will mean in Iowa, which has three times as many hogs as Minnesota.

I can see that it would be important in Illinois, which has twice as many hogs as Minnesota, and in Indiana, which has about 10 percent more hogs than Minnesota.

I know that it would be tremendously helpful in Missouri and Ohio which have almost as many hogs as my State.

The Senate can act as it sees fit on this matter, but it cannot say there was not a workable and economical plan at hand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have two more tabulations inserted in the RECORD at this point, 1 on expected results of this program in 10 leading hog States and the other on per capita consumption of pork.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBABLE PROGRAM RESULTS IN 10 LEADING HOG STATES

[In millions]

State	Probable marketings 1956 (head)	Gain to farmers through increase of dollars per hundredweight in market prices	Hog marketing premium payments to farmers	Total gain for State
Iowa	17.5	$140	$33	$173
Illinois	9.1	72	18	90
Indiana	6.6	52	13	65
Minnesota	5.0	40	10	50
Missouri	5.0	40	10	50
Ohio	4.6	36	9	45
Nebraska	3.2	26	6	32
Wisconsin	2.5	20	4	24
South Dakota	1.9	15	3	18
Georgia	1.4	11	2	13
United States	75.0	600	150	750

Consumption of pork (excluding lard), per capita

	Pounds
1945	65.7
1946	74.9
1947	68.6
1948	66.8
1949	66.8
1950	68.1
1951	70.6
1952	71.6
1953	62.9
1954	59.7
1955 [1]	66
10-year average (1945–54)	67.5

[1] Preliminary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This table is based upon the probable marketings from the several States. Assuming, in accordance with the United States Department of Agriculture outlook report, that hogs would average about $15 per hundred in the open market for 1956, farmers would have an income slightly lower than in 1955 from the hog marketings. However, under the hog marketing premium payment plan, it is estimated that if one-third of the Nation's hogs were attracted to market at 200 pounds instead of 240 pounds, we would have a sufficient cutback in pork volume to bring market prices up to $19 or 90 percent of parity.

In the table, column 2 shows the net gain to farmers in each State by having $19 average prices instead of $15 average prices.

Column 3 shows the amount of premium payments going to each State assuming that such payments will be made upon about one-third of the hogs marketed.

Column 4 shows the total gains to farmers in the States through operation of the hog marketing premium payment plan in 1956 if it can be put into operation at once.

Mr. President, in all good faith I have attempted to get a realistic analysis of this proposal from the Department of Agriculture.

My proposal was submitted to the Under Secretary and other aides from the Department of Agriculture the day I outlined it to our Senate committee. We asked for the Department's views.

Instead of getting an analysis, we got an opinionated statement showing complete ignorance of what was in the proposed amendment.

Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent at this time to have placed at this point in the RECORD the statement the Department of Agriculture gave to our committee opposing this amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT CONCERNING PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON HOG MARKETING PREMIUM PAYMENTS

The Department is in sympathy with the overall objective of better incomes for hog producers during periods of depressed prices.

However, we cannot concur in the proposed legislation for the following principal reasons:

Permitting prices of hogs to seek their own levels in the market with the taxpayers then making up the difference to producers between the market price and the specified levels in the proposed legislation would have several undesirable effects which would tend to outweigh the advantages to be gained.

Compensatory or incentive payments if applied to one segment of agriculture, such as the hog industry, would probably lead to similar requests from other segments of agriculture and possibly nonagricultural segments of the economy.

The added income poured into the hog industry would likely stimulate hog production far beyond our needs and tend to result in a self-perpetuating condition.

Making payments above the market level for hogs of limited weight ranges, as provided for, could lead to the need for annual production quotas, down even to individual producers. It is difficult for us to foresee how the direct payment program could be put into effect without having these results.

A direct payment program such as suggested would tend to make the hog business a closed business since the rights to produce under such a program would have to be restricted to avoid upsetting the annual quota which could be marketed. An additional factor adverse to such a program would be the likelihood that the windfall earnings resulting from payments above the market price would to a considerable extent be capitalized into farm values.

Of course, these serious consequences for farmers would not show up immediately, but their probable effects would nevertheless face agriculture over the longer period.

The cost of undertaking the proposed compensatory payment program to hog producers would be high even with the limitations provided for. The cost of the program, for example, under price and production conditions of this season would be in the order of approximately $6.00 per head of hogs on which the payments would be made. The payment program would provide a strong incentive for producers to market hogs at weights under 200 pounds and, therefore, the volume of hogs usually marketed at the lighter weights is not an appropriate guide to measure such costs. If, say, 50 percent of the hogs expected to be slaughtered in commercial establishments this year would be in the lighter weight range provided for, the costs of the program payments during one season would amount to 200 to 240 million dollars.

We feel that farmers should be encouraged to market their hogs at lighter weights than under recent conditions, but we should not wish to recommend that hogs be marketed for slaughter at less than 180 pounds. Moreover, there would be serious administrative difficulties of enforcing the weight limitations under such a program.

The provision authorizing funds to conduct the proposed program would not appear to be in keeping with the objectives of legislation providing for section 32 programs, particularly inasmuch as the direct payments would utilize much if not all of the section 32 funds available, thus leaving little or no section 32 funds for any other commodities.

The proposed legislation not only authorizes but directs the Secretary to make payments to hog producers under certain conditions. It would be undesirable to require such a payment program especially under the limited conditions outlined. Other conditions affect the welfare of hog producers to a considerable extent and the Secretary of Agriculture needs administrative latitude as to the undertaking of a program such as this.

This proposal would, during a period of seasonally and cyclically heavy marketings, bring additional supplies to an overburdened market by encouraging marketing of hogs earlier than normal (at lighter weight).

Mr. HUMPHREY. I repeat, that is a completely misleading report that objects to things that are not even in the amendment. Yet it served the Department's purpose, by confusing the committee enough to defer action on this proposal.

Subsequently, Mr. President, I made a new try to get some fair consideration from the Department of Agriculture.

All I asked was an objective analysis of my amendment, not their views on what they think are my views, not something dreamed up out of their own limited imaginations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a copy of a letter I sent the Secretary of Agriculture on February 14, calling attention to this misleading report and asking that somebody read the amendment before commenting upon it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1956.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to call your attention to the report submitted by your Department to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, entitled "Statement Concerning Proposed Legislation on Hog Marketing Premium Payments."

This report was submitted in response to an amendment I proposed to the new farm bill, copies of which were available to your representatives present at the committee meeting at which it was outlined in detail.

Mr. Secretary, do you stand on that report as a proper analysis of the proposal?

I must say to you, as I said to your representatives at the committee meeting, that I am shocked by such careless treatment of so important a subject. Any fair reading of both my proposal and my supporting statement, then your Department report, would raise a serious question as to whether or not the authors of this report even read the proposal—let alone gave it any serious consideration.

Your report, Mr. Secretary, creates fictitious questions not in any way involved in this proposal.

Let me quote from the third paragraph of that report, which you cited as a principal reason for opposing the proposal:

"Permitting prices of hogs to seek their own levels in the market with the taxpayers then making up the difference to producers between the market price and the specified levels in the proposed legislation would have several undersirable effects which would tend to outweigh the advantages to be gained."

Mr. Secretary, I challenge you to show me any place in the proposed amendment which would permit "prices of hogs to seek their own levels in the market with the taxpayers then making up the difference to producers between the market price and the specified levels" etc.

It is a sad state of affairs when a Senate committee, considering important legislation, gets such distorted reports from the executive branch of our Government.

The rest of your report is as irrelevant to the facts of the proposal as this first false assumption. You talk at great length about the need for "controls," without even recognizing that a simple dollar limitation was proposed as the means of control.

You arbitrarily estimate that premiums would be needed on 50 percent of the hogs expected to be slaughtered next year in arriving at your cost estimate, without apparently even considering what poundage of meat that would eliminate from the market and what effect that reduction in supply would have on market prices, thereby lowering the incentive payments under terms of the bill.

In my opinion, any department of our Government should be ashamed of submitting such a legislative report. Regardless of whether or not you approve of the suggestion, any committee of the Senate is entitled to factual guidance instead of pure hogwash.

My own detailed explanation of the proposal was printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and was available for your Department's review and comment. If you lacked time to do so, do you not think it would have been more honorable to honestly say so and ask for such time, instead of blindly opposing the measure on completely false and misleading assumptions?

I regret the necessity to say these things. In all probability, you never saw the report as submitted. Yet I feel it is evidence of the slipshod approach of your Department to suggestions from others.

I have reintroduced the proposal in the Senate, both as a separate bill and as an amendment to S. 3183.

I would appreciate knowing whether your Department still stands on its original report on this measure, or is willing to admit its shortcomings and come forth with a serious analysis of this proposal.

I would regret to have to tell hog farmers of my State the Department of Agriculture gave so little consideration to what was intended as a constructive suggestion that its officials refused to even find out what was actually proposed.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want the Senate to know the reply I have since received, dated February 20. I ask unanimous consent to have that letter inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 20, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: On my return from the west coast I find your letter of February 14. It will receive the attention it deserves.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA T. BENSON.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not read that reply to the Senate, because it will be before the Senate for observation, and I shall attempt to quote from it when my amendment is called up tomorrow or Friday.

That was not much help to the Senate, when we are in the midst of making critical decisions on a farm bill.

It was not much cooperation, from an administration that says it wants to cooperate in bipartisan efforts to help farmers.

I am placing these letters in the RECORD, Mr. President, to make clear my attempt to get an honest appraisal from the Department of Agriculture—and their utter refusal to provide one when it was needed.

It was amazing to me that the Secretary had time to go out to California to attack organized labor, had time to go up to St. Paul to make a Republican rally peptalk, had time to carry on quite a campaign against the recommendations of our Senate committee, yet either had no time, or would not take the time, to have some of his experts answer a rush request for official information on pending business of the Senate.

When I started my farm address last week, I thought that perhaps if I took long enough discussing this bill and the problems of America's farmers, Secretary Benson might have time to catch up on his work and have a better analysis of the hog proposal available for us.

Sure enough, his Under Secretary finally did.

Mr. President, I did receive a letter March 2, which admitted the Department had made some errors in their first hasty appraisal of the bill, but added little more factual help for guidance of this body. All it did was to reaffirm the fact the Department of Agriculture is opposed to helping hog producers in this way.

They say it is only a temporary expedient. They say they want farmers to have freedom.

Well, I will let them explain that to midwest hog producers. The Department certainly has not convinced me, and I am sure they will not be able to convince hog farmers.

Mr. President, to make the record complete, and give the Department its belated due of finally sending me what is intended to pass for a report on the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have the March 1 letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1596.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is in reply to your letter of February 15, discussing the Department's report to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, concerning your proposal for hog marketing premium payments.

As you may recall, the request for our report on the proposed hog marketing payment legislation was complied with overnight. Within the time available to us for submission of the requested report, the proposal was given very serious and concentrated consideration. Despite the time limits, the report we furnished adequately reflects our overall thinking with respect to the hog marketing premium payment approach.

The proposal permitted an open-end payment program on lighter weight hogs when hog prices were at or below 90 percent of parity. The proposal provided for a maximum payment to any one producer in any one calendar year, and it is regretted that our report did not mention that feature of the proposal. But, as we indicated, the proposal would permit hog prices to fluctuate in accordance with supply and demand conditions, and the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to make payments to those producers selling hogs of the permitted weights whenever the market price for hogs was below the specified levels in the proposed legislation.

We recognize the problems of the hog producers and have been seeking earnestly and constructively to do everything that is fair, realistic, and economically sound to improve the situation. We do not believe the approach of making incentive payments for the marketing of lighter weight hogs is the answer in solving the hog problem. Such a program would likely retard and, in the long run, even prevent needed adjustments in production and marketing. The objective for farmers to have freedom to operate efficiently and to adjust their production to

changing consumer demands would not be assured or encouraged by this kind of a Government program.

The proposal essentially is only a temporary expedient and, as you know, the real solution to the livestock problem is producing right and marketing right.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

DOLLAR LIMIT ON PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, among the other improvements I am proposing in this farm bill is a limitation on amount of price support loans to any one farmer.

I am most happy to have the endorsement of the President of the United States in my objective.

Mr. President, for several years I have been urging a limitation on the amount of price supports to any one farmer. It is in my own price-support bill introduced before this body last spring. The administration was not interested in it then.

Quite frankly, one of my purposes in proposing such a cutoff was to end the overused and abused argument of this administration that all of the benefits of price supports went to "big operators."

It always seemed strange to me, if such were the case, why most of these "big operators" actually opposed effective price supports and supported the administration's survival-of-the-fittest theory of take your chances in the market place." It has been the average family farmer who has been the stanchest supporter of effective price and income protection programs.

While the administration has always waved around figures about huge million-dollar support loans, until someone else suggested doing something about it they never came to this Congress to ask for any limit. They seemed to prefer keeping such loans as a whipping boy to help destroy the rest of the farm program.

At last, however, in an election year, the President saw the light, and agreed with me.

In his message to the Senate he said:

I ask the Congress to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price-support loans to any one individual or farming unit. The limit should be sufficiently high to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms.

Those are the words of our President, in his special message on agriculture, which he sent to the Congress on January 9, 1956.

I support the President's recommendation. In fact, I introduced a bill before the recommendation was made.

However, I looked in vain to find the legislative language recommended by the President's Agriculture Department or his spokesmen on the Hill to spell out this item.

In all fairness to our Senate Committee on Agriculture, I must say that the idea was considered as the President suggested, but with little or no supporting evidence or push from the Department of Agriculture. What we got instead was an outline of the problems it might present, the difficulties it might create.

In other words, objection was made to it.

It is understandable that some members of our committee may well have felt that the President was not serious about this recommendation—that he and his Department of Agriculture did not really intend for us to take this family farm cutoff recommendation seriously, even though the recommendation occupies a great deal of space in the Republican-sponsored advertisements.

However, I am willing to take it seriously. I want to support the President of the United States, when he belatedly accepts an idea I have advanced. If his own people will not press for his recommendation, the Senator from Minnesota will. Particularly when the Republican advertising agencies, despite the fact no Republican bill was introduced before our committee to carry it out, are placing large paid ads in rural newspapers of the country urging farmers to write their Senators or Congressmen to "help Eisenhower pass the new farm program," including this item.

I have here a copy of one of these ads, from the Thorp Courier of Thorp, Wis. I may have more to say later about this nonpolitical approach to our farm program, after all of Secretary Benson's high-sounding words about a nonpartisan approach.

The GOP's idea of nonpartisanship, on farm policy as well as on foreign policy, seems to be that we must agree everything they suggest is right, and anything anybody else suggests is all wrong.

In any event, let me read point 4 of the "Eisenhower-Republican" farm program outlined in that ad, which they ask help in getting passed:

Protect family-type farms by limiting the size of price support loans made to large corporate-type farms.

All right, we will help.

Republicans seemed unwilling to take the lead, so I shall. And any Republican who votes against my amendment will be voting against the "Eisenhower-Republican" farm program as presented to the Nation by this barrage of high-pressure advertising.

But let us adopt the amendment proposing a limitation of $25,000 on price support loans with full knowledge of how limited the bigger loans are, instead of preserving the misconceptions the Department of Agriculture has deliberately created.

The Department of Agriculture made an extensive scientific statistical study during 1955 of the size of grain loans.

The report was distributed several weeks ago in the routine mailing of Secretary Benson's press releases, and you may have missed noting it. At least not so much clamoring was done about it as has been done about releases listing the "ten biggest loans" in various categories.

Here is what this study showed about the size distribution of support loans in 1953:

Out of 296,000 corn loans, only 104—less than three-tenths of 1 percent—were larger than $25,000.

Out of 43,000 oat loans, only 10—1 in each 4,000—were larger than $25,000.

Out of 61,000 soybean price support loans, only 5 were larger than $25,000.

Out of 34,000 barley loans, only 66 were over $25,000.

Out of 33,000 grain sorghum loans, only 25 were larger than $25,000.

Out of 58,000 flaxseed loans, only 18 were over $25,000.

Out of 591,000 wheat loans, only 1,400, or about one-fifth of 1 percent, were larger than $25,000.

I regret that later figures are not available, or more figures of a similar nature for other commodities. If they are available, they were not made available by the Department of Agriculture to our Senate committee while we were considering the President's recommendations along with other recommendations in drafting a new farm bill.

However, it appears obvious from this partial study that a very large percentage of price support loans have been made to family-size farmers—contrary to some impressions that have been stimulated and perpetuated.

Furthermore, it also appears obvious that a dollar limit on price support loans at $25,000, as proposed in my amendment—or, at the highest, $50,000—would provide complete support to practically all family farmers, and would reduce support eligibility of but a very few farmers in the Nation.

Not nearly all commodities in any one year are covered by price support loans.

But even if they were, such a limitation as I have proposed would affect less than 4 percent of all the commercial farms in the United States—and even they would have eligibility up to the $25,000 level.

Census data reveals that only 3.7 percent of the farms in our country have gross sales above the $25,000 figure.

Such bigger farming operators produce and sell about 27 percent of the total volume of farm production, despite their small size in numbers.

Even under this limitation, about half of that production would still be fully eligible for supports, leaving unsupported less than 15 percent of the total supply.

In other words, 85 percent of the total commodity supply would be eligible under a $25,000 limitation for price support loans.

If there is any validity at all to arguments that lower price support helps restrict production—and I have repeatedly challenged that contention as far as the average family farmer is concerned—it would exist in this area of bigger operators farming more as a speculative enterprise, and not solely dependent upon one operation for their income. It is these bigger operators who might have capital and resources to shift to different ventures, whereas the average farmer has little choice, in time of lower unit prices, than to try and increase his income by increasing his production.

If, for the purposes of argument, we should concede the premise of those who

say price supports are an incentive to increased production—this cutoff would eliminate any such incentive from 15 percent of our national production while only affecting some 3.7 percent of the farm operators.

If the dollar limitations on price-support loans were set at $50,000, and all farm commodities were covered by support loans, probably less than 1 percent of the farm units and less than 10 percent of farm production would be excluded from eligibility for price-support loans. The total production of all but the very largest factories in the field would be covered.

Yet we would eliminate the embarrassment of 1 or 2 huge loans that critics of the farm program always delight in parading before the public, regardless of whether or not those loans were fully repaid to the Government without loss.

In my own State of Minnesota, only about 2 percent of our commercial farms had gross sales in excess of $25,000 in 1954, according to the United States Census Bureau. Probably not more than one-half of 1 percent of Minnesota farms had gross sales of more than $50,000, although figures on farms of this size are not reported by the census.

Enactment of this amendment would help to reverse the current trend toward an increase in the number of industrialized agricultural units.

As President Eisenhower stated in his farm message, over-large price support loans "constitute a threat to the traditional family size farm," and also a threat to continuation of our farm programs due to the unfair blackeye they give these programs.

"Under price-support machinery as it has been functioning, price-support loans of tremendous size have occasionally occurred," the President told us in his message. And the President added: "It is not sound Government policy to underwrite at public expense such formidable competition with family-operated farms, which are the bulwarks of our agriculture."

The Senator from Minnesota agrees most heartily with the President. His remarks sound very familiar to me, almost echoing what I have said time and time again. The only difference is that when HUBERT HUMPHREY suggests it, the press says I want to "penalize efficiency." When the President says it, they all applaud.

Well, now we have both said it, and I am doing something about it.

I agree most strongly with the President that there is something uniquely desirable and important to the preservation of democracy and strong rural communities in maintenance of the family farm pattern of American agriculture. I agree so strongly that I introduced a resolution in the Senate a year ahead of the President's message, asking that we make such a proclamation of public policy.

Yet the Department of Agriculture opposed the family farm resolution I proposed in 1955, proposed as a means of redefining our objectives of public policy right along the lines the President's message has since picked up and echoed.

My resolution was introduced because I felt convinced the current trend is against the family farm. Perhaps others will harken to that warning, now that the President ads his voice to mine when we say the family farm is losing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a series of statistical tables supporting my claim that family farms are losing out.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY FARMS ARE LOSING

Family farms lost ground to industrialized agricultural production units between 1950 and 1954 according to the 1955 census of agriculture. Industrialized farming units increased by 26 percent in numbers. The number of family farms dropped by 11 percent. (See table 1.)

The ratio of the number of family farms to the number of industrialized units dropped from 34 to 1 in 1950, to 24 to 1 in 1954.

TABLE 1

	Thousands		Change	
	1954	1950	Number	Percent
Commercial family farms [1]	3,193	3,598	−405	−11
Industrialized factory farms [2]	134	106	+28	+26
Ratio family farms to factory farms	24:1	34:1		
All commercial farms	3,327	3,704	−377	−10

[1] Gross sales of products less than $25,000.
[2] Gross sales of products more than $25,000.

BOTH TENANTS AND OWNERS LOST OUT

There was a drop of 353,000 in the number of full owner-operated farms, a drop of 276,000 in the number of tenant-operated farms and an increase of 32,000 in the number of part-owner operated farms.

TABLE 2

	Thousands		Change from 1950 to 1954	
	1954	1950	Thousands	Percent
Full-owner operators	2,737	3,090	−353	−11
Part-owner operators	857	825	+32	+4
Tenant operators	1,168	1,444	−276	−19

FIRM PRICE SUPPORTS SAVED FAMILY FARMS

The strengths and weaknesses of the 1950–54 price support programs are mirrored in what happened to numbers of different types of farms.

TABLE 3

	Thousands		Change	
	1954	1950	Number	Percent
Cash grain farms	538	433	+105	+24
Dairy farms	549	601	−52	−9
Livestock farms	695	808	−113	−14
General farms	348	496	−148	−30

Cash grain farms with income protected by firm price supports during the 4 years, increased in numbers by 24 percent. Dairy farmers, placed on the sliding scale in 1954, decreased in numbers by 9 percent, while livestock farmers (hogs, cattle, and sheep) without price supports dropped by 14 percent in numbers. Hardest hit were general diversified farms whose numbers dropped by almost one-third (30 percent). This situation was widespread and general in nearly all States.

The big drops in numbers of family farms came in the below $5,000 gross cash income groups.

If the numbers of these low income farm families had dropped because they had moved up the income scale this would be a happy situation. But, obviously, that did not happen. The big drop in numbers of low income farm operator families reflects the fact that these families quit farming entirely.

LOWEST INCOME FARM FAMILIES NOT HELPED BY OFF-FARM WORK

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has stated that drops in farm income have not hurt farm families because they have been able to obtain remunerative and attractive off-farm work. However, Census figures reveal that the lowest income farm families able to obtain at least 100 days of more of off-farm work did not increase, but rather decreased, from 1950 to 1954. The number of farms the Census calls part-time farms (which might be better named "part-time farms with very low farm income") actually decreased by 67,000 during the 4 years.

Nationwide, the numbers of farmers with gross farm incomes who worked off the farm for 100 days or more increased by 118,000. The number of farmers who worked off the farm between 1 and 99 days per year increased by 159,000.

TABLE 4

Group	Thousands		Change	
	1954	1950	Thousands	Percent
Worked 100 days or more off farm:				
Gross farm income less than $2,000	575	642	−67	−10
Gross farm income more than $2,000	759	641	+118	+18
Total	1,334	1,283	+51	+4
Worked 1 to 99 days off farm	820	661	+159	+24
Total who worked off farm	2,154	1,944	+210	+11

Proportion of farmers in different groups who worked off farm 100 days or more

Group	1954	1950
Gross farm income less than $2,000	55	48
Gross farm income more than $2,000	29	22

The proportion of all farmers who worked off the farm between 1 and 99 days increased from 15 percent in 1950 to 21 percent in 1954. The proportion of all farmers who worked off-farm 1 or more days increased from 45 percent in 1950 to 55 percent in 1954.

To put this another, and somewhat more meaningful way, there was a 4-percent increase in the number of part-time farmers—those who worked more than 100 days off the farm per year regardless of income—and a 24-percent increase in the number of approximately full-time farmers who worked off their farm for 1 to 99 days during the year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point tables I, II, III, and IV.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE I

[Thousands]

State	Family farms (gross sales, $250 to $25,000)				Industrialized agricultural production units (gross sales, $25,000 and more)			
	1954	1950	Change		1954	1950	Change	
			Number	Percent			Number	Percent
Arkansas	85.5	111.2	−25.7	−23	3.3	1.7	+1.6	+94
Colorado	28.8	32.8	−4.0	−12	2.7	3.5	−.8	−23
Idaho	28.9	30.7	−1.8	−6	2.3	1.7	+.6	+35
Illinois	138.2	153.8	−15.6	−10	9.6	6.9	+2.7	+39
Indiana	110.6	120.6	−10.0	−8	4.5	2.3	+2.2	+96
Iowa	167.9	180.4	−12.5	−7	10.3	7.3	+3.0	+41
Kansas	98.8	108.8	−10.0	−9	3.6	3.6	0	0
Kentucky	122.0	133.6	−11.6	−9	.8	1.0	−.2	−20
Michigan	96.7	105.8	−9.1	−9	1.5	1.0	+.5	+50
Minnesota	143.6	154.9	−11.3	−7	3.0	2.2	+.8	+36
Montana	25.1	28.2	−3.1	−11	2.6	1.8	+.8	+44
Nebraska	89.8	96.4	−6.6	−7	4.2	3.5	+.7	+20
New Mexico	10.6	12.8	−2.2	−17	1.5	1.3	+.2	+15
North Carolina	80.2	193.0	−12.8	−6	1.0	.5	+.5	+100
North Dakota	58.5	61.6	−3.1	−5	1.1	1.0	+.1	+10
Ohio	120.5	132.7	−12.2	−9	3.0	1.8	+1.2	+67
Oklahoma	72.6	80.8	−8.2	−10	1.5	1.8	−.3	−17
Oregon	29.1	32.2	−3.1	−10	3.1	2.2	+.9	+41
Pennsylvania	79.6	86.1	−6.6	−8	2.8	2.1	+.7	+33
South Dakota	58.4	61.2	−2.8	−5	1.5	1.6	−.1	−6
Tennessee	123.9	151.8	−27.9	−18	.6	.7	−.1	−14
Texas	169.1	213.3	−44.2	−21	13.2	12.9	+.3	+2
Utah	14.3	16.1	−1.8	−11	.8	.9	−.1	−11
Virginia	69.5	76.5	−7.0	−9	1.9	1.6	+.3	+19
Washington	30.7	37.3	−6.6	−17	5.7	3.1	+2.6	+84
Wisconsin	133.6	144.7	−11.1	−8	1.5	1.1	+.4	+36
Wyoming	8.7	9.5	−.8	−8	.9	1.0	−.1	−10
The West	254.2	290.9	−36.7	−13	40.2	31.6	+8.6	+27
The North	1,569.1	1,726.0	−156.9	−9	58.7	44.8	+13.9	+31
The South	1,369.4	1,581.6	−212.2	−13	35.1	29.1	+6.0	+21

TABLE II

[Thousands of farm units]

State	Cash grain		Dairy		Livestock		General	
	1954	1950	1954	1950	1954	1950	1954	1950
Arkansas	5	4	7	7	11	13	[illegible]	[illegible]
Colorado	5	9	3	3	13	12	5	6
Idaho	8	7	7	6	5	6	7	8
Illinois	69	60	13	16	44	51	16	25
Indiana	39	25	12	16	36	46	18	28
Iowa	40	26	9	8	105	120	21	28
Kansas	54	41	8	9	25	37	13	22
Kentucky	5	2	8	9	16	27	14	24
Michigan	21	15	38	46	10	11	15	19
Minnesota	34	25	50	50	28	36	28	38
Montana	12	10	2	2	11	13	3	3
Nebraska	35	33	3	3	42	43	13	18
Nevada	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
New Mexico	1	2	1	1	6	6	1	1
North Carolina	5	3	[illegible]	5	7	6	10	12
North Dakota	39	39	3	3	8	10	8	10
Ohio	36	22	26	33	29	34	21	31
Oklahoma	20	20	7	8	22	25	11	17
Oregon	4	4	6	7	6	6	5	6
Pennsylvania	3	7	38	44	9	8	11	12
South Dakota	18	14	2	2	28	35	11	12
Tennessee	3	2	15	15	17	23	14	22
Texas	14	17	8	9	48	48	17	23
Utah	1	2	4	4	5	4	3	4
Virginia	3	2	8	8	13	14	7	9
Washington	7	6	9	11	4	5	3	3
Wisconsin	4	2	107	116	10	11	7	9
Wyoming	1	2	1	1	6	6	1	1
The North	422	320	413	461	440	526	204	282
The South	71	63	90	93	186	211	111	174

TABLE III

[Thousands of farms]

State	Relatively adequate family farms (sales, $5,000 to $24,999)			Inadequate family farms (sales of less than $5,000)		
	1954	1950	Change	1954	1950	Change
Arkansas	18.1	13.7	+4.4	67.2	97.5	−30.3
Colorado	14.1	16.6	−2.5	14.7	16.2	−1.5
Idaho	15.9	14.8	+1.1	13.0	15.9	−2.9
Illinois	83.6	85.9	−2.6	54.6	67.9	−13.3
Indiana	52.6	47.9	+4.7	58.0	72.7	−14.7
Iowa	112.0	112.1	−.1	55.9	68.3	−12.4
Kansas	48.6	43.2	+5.4	50.2	65.4	−14.8
Kentucky	19.5	18.0	+1.5	102.4	115.6	−13.2
Michigan	33.4	27.3	+6.1	63.3	78.6	−15.3
Minnesota	70.5	73.5	−3.0	73.1	81.4	−8.3
Montana	14.7	14.4	+.3	11.4	13.8	−2.4
Nebraska	50.8	48.4	+2.4	39.0	48.0	−9.0
New Mexico	4.3	5.3	−1.0	6.3	7.5	−1.2
North Carolina	33.4	19.9	+13.5	146.8	173.1	−26.3
North Dakota	25.8	29.2	−3.4	32.7	32.4	+.3
Ohio	52.2	45.6	+6.6	68.2	87.2	−19.0
Oklahoma	23.1	25.5	−2.4	49.5	65.3	−15.8
Oregon	13.4	12.6	+.8	15.7	19.6	−3.9
Pennsylvania	34.8	33.4	+1.4	44.8	52.7	−7.9
South Dakota	30.5	30.5	0	27.9	30.7	−2.8
Tennessee	12.2	11.0	+1.2	111.7	126.5	−14.8
Texas	57.1	72.5	−15.4	112.0	140.8	−28.8
Utah	5.8	6.2	−.4	8.5	9.9	−1.4
Virginia	12.3	11.4	+.9	57.3	65.1	−8.2
Washington	14.8	14.8	0	15.9	22.5	−5.6
Wisconsin	58.2	56.1	+2.1	75.4	88.6	−13.2
Wyoming	4.5	4.8	−.3	4.2	4.7	−.5
The West	129.5	133.5	−4.0	124.6	157.4	−32.8
The North	765.2	745.8	+19.4	803.9	980.3	−176.4
The South	260.7	233.1	+73.4	1,108.7	1,348.6	−239.9

TABLE IV

[Thousands]

State	Working off farm		100 days or more work off farm		Part-time farms		Higher income part-time farms			
							Off farm		100 days off	
	1954	1949	1954	1949	1954	1950	1954	1949	1954	1949
Arkansas	68	73	40	38	20	27	48	46	20	11
Colorado	18	17	10	9	4	4	14	13	6	5
Idaho	20	18	11	9	3	4	17	14	8	5
Illinois	65	64	33	34	13	16	52	48	20	18
Indiana	75	69	51	46	18	21	57	48	33	25
Iowa	61	51	21	19	7	8	54	43	14	11
Kansas	52	60	25	29	9	9	43	51	16	20
Kentucky	79	77	45	46	24	26	55	51	21	20
Michigan	76	71	55	48	21	24	55	47	34	24
Minnesota	60	53	25	22	10	11	50	42	15	11
Montana	11	12	6	5	2	2	9	10	4	3
Nebraska	30	25	9	8	3	4	27	21	6	4
Nevada	1	1	1	1	------	------	1	1	1	1
New Mexico	10	10	7	6	3	3	7	7	4	3
North Carolina	111	97	67	60	28	28	83	69	39	31
North Dakota	15	15	4	5	1	1	14	14	3	2
Ohio	91	89	66	63	25	28	66	61	41	34
Oklahoma	62	61	41	33	20	20	42	41	21	15
Oregon	32	34	23	24	9	10	23	24	14	13
Pennsylvania	69	72	50	54	20	23	49	49	30	34
South Dakota	17	16	4	5	1	2	16	14	3	1
Tennessee	94	86	58	52	34	35	60	51	24	13
Texas	143	135	93	105	46	40	97	89	47	67
Utah	15	13	10	9	4	4	11	9	6	5
Virginia	69	67	49	48	22	21	47	46	27	25
Washington	39	38	30	28	10	12	29	26	20	17
Wisconsin	61	58	31	27	9	11	52	47	22	16
Wyoming	5	4	2	2	1	1	4	3	1	6

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when my amendment is called up for vote, it will be interesting to see how well my Republican colleagues join and support my effort to carry out the President's program, a program that he belatedly associated himself with.

OTHER AMENDMENTS

I may seek other amendments to improve this farm bill, but I shall only mention two others briefly.

I have earlier indicated my conviction that the drastic cutback in corn acreage to 43 million acres this year in the commercial corn area was unjustified. It becomes even more so, when we take out 250 million bushels of corn for our set-aside, as provided in the bill, or the national security reserve as proposed in my amendment.

Secretary Benson has indicated his willingness to break his own crackdown, by his offers to let growers produce on virtually unlimited acres as long as he keeps control over the price they can get. The deals being talked about run around 56 to 57 million acres.

I still believe in controls on corn, but reasonable controls. I still believe corngrowers will comply with controls, if they are reasonable, justified, properly administered, and if they get a decent price for what they can produce.

For that reason I am proposing an amendment requiring that the corn acreage allotment for this year be not less than 49 million acres—more than Secretary Benson is willing to give farmers voluntarily under their present allotments, yet less than he is willing to offer as a price for votes to defeat 90 percent of parity.

In view of the small corn carryover, the amount being moved into set-aside, I think the 49-million-acre allotment would be reasonable and effective. I think we would get compliance with it.

There is more incentive for the corngrower to comply this year, because there is a chance to use his diverted acres in other forms, both in the conservation acreage reserve and in soybeans, which are in short supply and bringing a fair price.

My second corn amendment will be an added incentive to compliance.

It would reward those who complied with allotments last year, and be an incentive to comply this year.

For the purposes of the acreage reserve, it would allow corngrowers who had complied with allotments to use their preceding year's allotment as the acreage basis on which they might participate.

In other words, if a corngrower complied with acreage allotments last year, and has a smaller allotment this year, he could put the difference into the acreage reserve.

That privilege would not be provided for the grower who overplanted last year.

PARITY PAYMENTS

Among the improvements I would still like to see made in this bill is more specific authority for use of compensatory payments, or parity payments, to farmers as a method of protecting their income.

I shall call up an amendment for that purpose.

Mr. President, we are wrong to think there is anything bad about direct payments to farmers as a means of accomplishing legislative goals for agriculture. It is certainly no more wrong than making parity payments to shipping interests, to make up the difference between levels of foreign labor and our own.

I have always believed the authority should rest with the Secretary of Agriculture to use direct payments whenever they prove a more effective means of achieving established support levels. I believe they are an efficient way of accomplishing social objectives and at the same time allowing products to compete in the world markets and go to our own people at lower levels than would possibly otherwise exist.

Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article by Walter Lippman, commenting on such direct payments, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald yesterday, March 6.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS THE FARM PROBLEM?

(By Walter Lippmann)

In a preceding article I discussed the fallacy of supposing that the problem of the farm surpluses can be solved in any serious measure by dumping the surpluses abroad. We are left with the task of managing the farm problem at home.

Needless to say, I do not know how to solve the farm problem. I know just enough about it, however, to be reasonably certain that no solution of the problem is now in sight, and that the best we can hope for from the measures being debated in Congress is that the aggrieved farmers will get some degree of temporary relief.

It cannot do any harm, and it might possibly lead to something useful, to ask ourselves—as if we had just arrived from Mars—what it is that we are trying to do. It transpires, I believe, that we do not usually, if ever, say directly what it is that we are trying to do.

What we are trying to do is to provide the farm population with incomes which keep pace with the incomes of the industrial population. It is now an accepted rule, which no public man disputes, that the income of farmers must not stand still, much less may it fall, in relation to industrial income. That is the meaning of what is called parity.

Now the fact is that during this century—at least since World War I—farmers' incomes if left to themselves have tended to fall away from parity. To prevent this falling away from parity is the object of all the farm plans. They are at bottom of two kinds. One is to restore parity directly, the other is to restore it indirectly.

The direct way would be to vote the farmers a Federal subsidy to cover the deficit between the income they earn and the income which under the principle of parity they ought to receive.

A direct subsidy system would work out something like this: In the case of cotton, for example—where there is one of our largest and most stubborn surpluses—total market requirements, both domestic and foreign, would be estimated for the crop year. Farmers would be assigned production quotas in terms of bales. Cotton would be sold at market prices and would no longer be supported at noncompetitive levels. Subsidies would be paid directly to the farmer to make up the difference between the price he sells his cotton for and the amount he should receive to maintain his income in parity with the economy as a whole. Production limitations would be compulsory for those farmers who elect to receive the subsidy.

This system would have many advantages over the present system. At prices which are competitive and meet the actual conditions of supply and demand, cotton sales could probably be increased. In any event they would not pile up in unused surpluses which are not only wasteful but by their very existence exert a depressing influence on cotton prices and markets. The cost of the subsidy to the Government and the taxpayer would probably be lower through the elimination of storage and insurance costs and a reduction in administrative expenses. And finally, what is perhaps most important, the long-run adjustment of production and consumption would be improved. For such a subsidy system would rely on market prices to allocate the farmers' productive efforts more realistically.

But the fact is, of course, that almost all farm plans rely on indirect devices for covering the deficits from parity. They use Federal money and the Federal regulating power to manipulate supply and demand in a rigidly protected domestic market; the aim of the manipulation is to create artificially high prices which will bring farmers' incomes up to parity.

Neither method is easy to administer in our kind of free society. For both involve massive interference by the Government in the affairs of the farmer. The direct method, that of outright payments to supplement incomes, might well be the easier and cheaper to administer. Yet almost certainly it would be the more unpopular. For it reveals quite baldly the fact that the operation is at bottom a subsidy by the Nation to a part of the Nation.

Our people do not like to pay or to be paid their subsidies openly. They prefer, having become used to them, the indirect forms of subsidy. Of these the tariff is the biggest example of all though not the only one. Practically all the farm plans are devices, like the tariff, for replacing the free and open market with an artificial market.

It seems to me that if the direct method is the easier to work effectively, we should not be too squeamish about recognizing openly the fact that it is national policy to subsidize agriculture. There is nothing to be ashamed of about that. The maintenance of a contented agricultural population is a national interest of the first order. That agriculture requires protection and help is a fact which cannot be doubted, and therefore it would be mere political prudery to try to hide the reality—which is that agriculture must be a protected and subsidized occupation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me read the last paragraph.

Mr. Lippmann says in regard to direct payments:

It seems to me that if the direct method is the easier to work effectively, we should not be too squeamish about recognizing openly the fact that it is national policy to subsidize agriculture. There is nothing to be ashamed about that. The maintenance of a contented agricultural population is a national interest of the first order. That agriculture requires protection and help is a fact which cannot be doubted, and therefore it would be mere political prudery to try and hide the reality—which is that agriculture must be a protected and subsidized occupation.

I can agree with what Mr. Lippmann says, but I wish he had said more. I wish he had pointed out how much of

the rest of our economy is protected and subsidized in one form or another, to an even greater extent than is agriculture.

Mr. President, it would be far wiser to make direct payments to hog and cattle producers to avoid the loss they are suffering than to help increase the profits of meat packers in the name of helping farmers.

For some reason, it seems to have been a well-guarded secret that much more authority exists for such payments than is ever brought out into the open. It has not been used. It will not be used, apparently, unless this Congress demonstrates a desire and a willingness for such methods to be used.

Let me quote from section 32 of Public Law No. 320 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, providing for use of receipts from customs duties to aid agriculture. More funds have existed in the section 32 account in the Department of Agriculture than have been used in any of the recent 3 years of falling farm prices. A surplus of funds still exists there. It is from these funds that the Secretary is hesitantly spending some $85 million to purchase pork products from packers.

But let me read you a section of that law. It outlines three uses to which the Secretary may put the section 32 funds. The first is to encourage exportation of agricultural commodities, providing for payments of benefits in connection with any losses sustained on such exports. That is how we have authority to subsidize exports, such as wheat. The second use outlined is to encourage diversion of agricultural products from normal channels of trade into byproducts, again authorizing payments of benefits or indemnities to cover losses.

It is the third use to which I want to particularly refer. The act reads: "reestablish farmers purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption."

The act further says that the sums appropriated under this section shall be devoted principally to the perishable nonbasic agricultural commodities other than those receiving price support benefits.

It was for just such purposes as helping hog producers, cattle producers, and poultry producers, when they were in trouble, that this provision was made in the act.

It is not now being used in that manner.

There is another portion of our agricultural law many people seem to forget.

It is section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, still on our statute books and still in full force and effect.

Let me read that section.

It says:

SEC. 303. If and when appropriations are made therefor, the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to producers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, or tobacco, on their normal production of such commodities, in amounts which, together with the proceeds thereof, will provide a return to such producers which is as nearly equal to parity price as the funds so made available will permit.

That is the section in our basic agricultural law called "Parity Payments." It recognizes our goal of equality. It has not been used, because no funds have been provided to implement it. Yet may I emphasize that this administration at no time has asked for funds to implement it, or to take advantage of this authority in any way as an alternative means of checking falling farm income.

This administration has said one of its objections to 90 percent price supports has been that they force prices too high for effective competition in world markets, or too high for competition with synthetic substitutes.

May I just point out, in passing, if this was their primary concern—rather than just bringing down farm prices—they could at any time have solved that problem they raise by making use of the parity payments authority in this section, by asking Congress for funds to use it as an alternative to achieving support levels through loans alone.

It is this section I propose amending, both to make it more workable and to direct attention of the Department of Agriculture to using it.

My amendment would simply add livestock and dairy products to the commodities for which such payments are authorized.

Then, rather than making such payments contingent only on appropriated funds, my amendment adds a new section specifically saying that section 32 funds may be used for this purpose.

To my reading of the law, that is already provided in section 32 itself. But by relating the section 32 funds to this parity payment section, I think we can make clear the authority to use compensatory payments, particularly for perishable commodities.

I might just add that farmers' polls in Iowa, a great Republican farm State, have been overwhelmingly in favor of such compensatory payments as a method of helping the hog producers.

Mr. President, I now come to the concluding portion of my remarks.

At the outset I declared it was my intention to take advantage of the opportunity this debate afforded to correct much of the misinformation that is still being spewed out across the countryside.

I have endeavored to do so, with facts. The record speaks for itself.

I promised to explode a lot of myths.

I promised to get rid of, once and for all, these unfounded assumptions:

First. The myth that 90-percent price supports were responsible for our surpluses, and that lower sliding-scale supports advocated by this administration would curtail production with less controls.

Second. The myth that most of Secretary Benson's troubles have been "the mess he inherited" from the past Democratic administration.

Third. The myth that farmers are not really hurting, that talk of economic hardship is just political talk.

Fourth. The myth that the Democratic Party has advocated nothing for agriculture but 90-percent price supports.

Fifth. The myth that we have never offered any constructive suggestions and have no answer as to what to do about our current temporary surplus supplies.

Sixth. The myth that 90 percent of parity is either high or rigid.

In documented portions of my address, extended over some 5 days on the Senate floor, I believe I have provided evidence refuting these myths. When I started, I invited study of the facts I presented as against claims so often echoed in the press by opponents of the Democratic farm program.

Now, as I near my conclusion, I again invite that comparison.

I invite that comparison with any evidence that has been presented in this debate to the contrary.

None of the facts and figures I presented have been disproven. They stand as answers this administration is unwilling to face, preferring to deal in vague generalities and nice-sounding slogans.

There is just one of them that I would like to expand upon slightly in this conclusion. That is the false premise that 90 percent of parity is high or rigid.

Parity itself is a fluctuating scale. It is a measuring device that goes up and down as costs go up and down. It reflects other changes in our economy. It is flexible.

I defy anybody to prove how a percentage of a flexible measurement can of itself be rigid.

The word "high" has different meanings to different people. It has been used in the context of indicating "too high." Of course 90 percent is higher than 75 percent. So is 75 percent higher than 50 percent.

But as long as parity is our accepted measurement of how the prices a farmer receives compare to prices the farmer must pay, that moving parity figure is intended to mean equality—like a scales in balance.

Certainly it is unfair to call 90 percent of equality "high," when it is 10 percent below equality, 10 percent out of balance.

One hundred percent would be full equality. One hundred and ten percent could probably be called "high." But 90 percent of parity cannot properly be called "high," any more than a 30-inch yardstick could be called "long." It would be longer than a 24-inch yardstick but still less than a full yardstick—still less than the measurement of a full yard. It would be short, not long. And 90 percent of parity is no different.

Mr. President, this entire situation was described in a nutshell by Adlai Stevenson recently when he said:

Our objective for agriculture is equality with other parts of our economy.

Our yardstick for measuring this equality is parity—a formula for fairness based on relating what a farmer gets for what he sells to what he must pay for what he buys. And 90 percent of what is fair is certainly not unfair, or too high. Support by Government loans at 90 percent of parity for basic commodities is all the more necessary at the present time when farmers' income is falling and we are moving further away from the goal of equality.

Adlai Stevenson made that statement in a message sent to the Democratic Midwest conference in Des Moines, October 21 and 22, before he was an announced candidate for President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place Mr. Stevenson's entire statement in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON TO THE DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST CONFERENCE IN DES MOINES, OCTOBER 21 AND 22, 1955

There could be no more important meeting in America today than this Midwest Democratic Farm Conference. A constructive farm program has become the Nation's No. 1 need: And it becomes more apparent with every passing day that this need will be met only through leadership of the Democratic Party.

I join with you at Des Moines in your purpose to make clear our united resolve to take the steps necessary to insure a healthy farm economy. For farming is much more than an essential industry: It is a way of life that must be preserved and encouraged. In much of the free world land reform and tenure by the many instead of the few is a major goal. Let us not go in the opposite direction in the United States and plow under the family farmer.

Our objective for agriculture is equality with the other parts of our economy.

Our yardstick for measuring this equality is parity—a formula for fairness based on relating what a farmer gets for what he sells to what he must pay for what he buys. And 90 percent of what is fair is certainly not unfair or too high. Support by Government loans at 90 percent of parity for basic commodities is all the more necessary at the present time when farmers' income is falling and we are moving further away from the goal of equality.

But such price supports do not by themselves constitute a complete farm program. The debate should not be limited to the issue, important as it is, of flexible against firm price supports. We must face the realities of surpluses and unbalanced production. There is much more to be done to accomplish a farm program which is fair to everyone.

For some commodities, especially perishables, direct production payments, for example, may avoid surplus accumulation and work better than loan and storage arrangements.

And a constructive farm policy must include incentives for the transfer of unneeded grain acreage into conservation uses. It means encouraging a shift to greater livestock and less cereal production, and building up our soil resources for tomorrow's 200 million Americans.

It means using our abundance as an instrument of our foreign policy abroad and a weapon against hunger at home.

It means creating larger markets and more purchasing power for farm products.

It means a new look at the farmers' credit needs.

And it means recognizing our abundance as a passing problem in this growing country, and as a blessing, not a curse. For the problems of abundance are part of the price of America's strength—a strength which it is our obligation to use, to conserve, to improve.

This conference is a happy reminder of the long record of the Democratic Party in building that strength, and in doing for the American farmer what needs to be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Adlai Stevenson is for 90 percent of parity. He was for 90 percent of parity in 1952 and he is for 90 percent of parity today. A deliberate attempt has been made to deceive farmers about his position on agriculture. Fortunately, farmers recognize a man of truth when they see one. I have just returned from attending farm meetings with Adlai Stevenson. I know how he stands. Anyone who says otherwise is not facing the facts. Adlai Stevenson is for 90 percent of parity. And, gentlemen, Adlai Stevenson does not make up his mind lightly, on shallow or surface knowledge of all that is involved. It is his carefully considered judgment that we are right in fighting for 90 percent of parity, to get agricultural income nearer its goal of full equality.

It is amazing how the press can distort plain, simple language to give it their own meaning. It is amazing how they can continue to make it appear that 90 percent of parity for farmers is something high to which he is really not entitled.

It still amazes me that we can apply such discriminating tactics to agriculture, but not to any other segment of our economy.

We provide 90 percent mortgage guaranties for our home loans, to protect bankers from loss. We guarantee the loan on 90 percent of the appraised value of the house. Yet nobody calls that guaranty high or rigid.

We now offer the same thing to the farmer. We offer to loan him 90 percent of the appraised value of his commodity, with that appraisal determined by the parity computations authorized by Congress as our measuring device. The farmer's commodities are his collateral, just as the house is collateral. Both have to be taken over by the Government if the borrower cannot repay his loan. Either can be sold out earlier if the borrower finds a buyer at a higher figure, and can sell at enough to repay his loan and still make a profit. Each pays interest on the loans.

Why the fuss about 90 percent of parity loans to farmers, and no mention of the 90-percent loan guaranties to bankers?

Please do not misunderstand me. I approve such housing loan guaranties I think they are in the national interest to stimulate home ownership and the building industry. But I feel the same way about such loans to the farmers. Again, they are in the national interest—to assure diligent farmers, working hard, that they will not face disastrous prices if they can outwit the other natural hazards that always confront farming.

It does not guarantee them any set income. It does not assure them any profit. It is just a floor under their attempt to achieve even better prices so they can come closer to the full equality to which everybody pays lip service.

The question before us is whether we place that safety net high enough to avoid any serious injury to the farmer, or whether we let him fall so far before catching him so that he only breaks a couple of legs, rather than his neck.

If you are going to provide, in the public interest, a safety net or floor under agriculture, let us put it where it will do some good—and let us not take it away when he needs it most.

There is one other myth that keeps cropping up which I have not touched upon in these remarks. Perhaps now is a good time to do so.

Our Republican friends take great delight in trying to interpret the 1948 Democratic platform for us, telling us over and over that the Democrats were for flexible supports then, what made them change?

Mr. President, as I have said before, the difference between Democrats and Republicans is that we are willing to learn, and to put our learning to good advantage. We are willing to change, when change is needed. We realize that there is some value in being stubborn, but there is no value in being just plain, confounded stubborn.

However, there is more to that 1948 platform promise than our Republican friends would have us think. All they talk about is that the Democrats said they were for a flexible price-support system. But what kind of a flexible system? Let us look at the platform itself.

Here is what it said:

> We favor a permanent system of flexible price supports for agricultural products to maintain farm income on a parity with farm operating costs.

Is that the kind of a program the Republicans are offering? Have they shown us that their flexible system would maintain farm income on a parity with farm operating costs?

The record flatly and loudly says "No."

Perhaps if they came to us with a flexible system from 90 percent to 110 percent of parity, making sure we were aimed at the parity of farm income falling in between we could share some interest in their suggestions.

And there is nothing in the platform language which means we confined flexibility to a sliding scale downward.

We were interested in flexibility of methods, to maintain farm income on a parity with farm operating costs.

I was on that platform committee. Perhaps I am in a better position to know our objectives than some of our Republican critics are.

During the Truman administration we proposed such flexibility of methods, aimed at maintaining farm income on a parity with farm operating costs. We proposed using production payments as well as loans and purchases as an alternative method of support, to put some proper flexibility into the methods of achieving full parity of farm income. We proposed shifting our standard of measurement from farm prices to farm income to come closer to the goal we set in that platform.

But such suggestions were recklessly crucified by one of the most brutal political attacks in history against Secretary of Agriculture Brannan. If it were not for the political bugaboo they have built up about his suggestions, the Republicans would be happy to have some of them to lean upon today. Use of direct payments as a means of support rather than just withholding commodities under loan or storing them after purchase had been held to be a far more efficient way of achieving our social and economic objectives by many economists and observers who have given careful study to farm policy. Some of Secretary Benson's own consultants,

with years of experience in the grain trade, made that very recommendation to him. They got rid of the consultants. They did not want people around honest enough to admit that nobody had really given serious consideration to Secretary Brannan's recommendations on their merits. Instead, they just became political footballs to be kicked around.

Just the other day, Walter Lippmann, discussing the impact of our agricultural policy on foreign policy, said we should be more honest about achieving our social objectives and turn to such direct payments.

I shall offer an amendment to this bill to achieve that purpose. Perhaps it is unlikely it will be accepted. I am offering it, however, because I believe it is right and sound. And the time will come when future students of agricultural policy will say many of our troubles today could have been avoided if we had turned to this course several years ago when a Democratic administration suggested it.

I have called attention to the real meaning of the 1948 platform to kill off one more myth. I hope it silences those who like to prate about the Democrats being inconsistent. It is the Republicans who have been inconsistent, and are still being inconsistent.

In the 1952 campaign, they were for anything to win the farm vote.

After they were elected, they were ready to throw our farm program into the discard.

Now that another election year has rolled around again, once more they seem willing to do almost anything to try and convince farmers they are not as bad as most farmers know they have been.

I say "almost anything." They still insist on trying to win a symbolic victory by defeating 90 percent supports, no matter what they have to promise or do to get that hollow victory—a victory for them at the expense of farmers.

They cry and shout about "surpluses" then they offer southern Senators not to cut acreage allotments and keep price supports at a reasonably high level, if they will only help them save face by defeating "90 percent of parity."

They cry and shout about surpluses, they they offer Midwest Republicans to keep the same present support level on corn for election year while lifting allotments and letting growers produce all the corn they want—just so they can still say they defeated "90 percent of parity."

Let me point out, of course, that all of these golden promises are only for one year. They will do anything now to win, just so authority is in their hands to give farmers a worse beating next year after elections are over. If the President's promise at Kasson meant nothing, what do Secretary Benson's promises now mean?

Let me voice this warning to those tempted by Secretary Benson's lobbying bait:

For every extra acre of corn he offers to let farmers produce above last year's allotments during this election year he will cut back twice as hard next year.

For every extra acre of cotton he offers the South to try and win votes to keep discretionary power in his own hands—he will cut back twice as hard next year. And he will make that after-the-election cutback in both acreage and price, you can be sure.

Those who may be urging the farmers to accept this bait today will be the first to howl next year when they are firmly implanted on Benson's fishing hook.

Inconsistent? What could be more inconsistent than Secretary Benson's election-year policies? He opposes the soil-bank idea in October; he hails it as the cure for all evils in January. He invokes the tightest curb in history on corn by announcing it is necessary to cut back acreage allotments in the commercial corn area to 43 million acres, then he agrees to letting production be stepped up to fifty-six or fifty-seven million acres as long as he can say he won on the farm bill.

Mr. President, that drastic corn allotment was unjustified in the face of our limited corn reserves. I am convinced that it was part of political manipulation to stir an outcry among corn producers for lifting all controls—which he was willing to do if he could have his own way on prices.

Well, Mr. President, some farmers have taken the bait. But more thoughtful ones have taken a second look and have informed me that they want no part of Secretary Benson's schemes. They would rather take their chance on a program that lets them know what is also going to happen next year than to have election-year bait dangled in front of them with no assurance for the future.

Mr. President, I know how strongly farmers feel about this issue before us. I could bring mail into this Chamber by the bushel basket. I have presented a few random samples for the RECORD.

Last Monday night, a farmer out in Iowa whom I had never met or heard of before picked up his telephone and called me long distance to say they were desperate—that they simply must have a farm bill that raises their income, not just the Eisenhower-Benson public relations program.

He was Joe Coleman, of Clare, Iowa.

I learned some interesting things from him. It appears he was one of five panel discussion leaders on the annual panel of the National Farm Institute at Des Moines recently. This is one of our great annual farm forums.

Every effort is made to have it present all viewpoints. Yet its own sponsors were surprised to find, according to Mr. Coleman, that every member of the panel insisted farmers must have at least 90 percent of parity.

We have not seen much about that in the papers. But you can rest assured we would have read reams about it if even 3 out of the 5 discussion leaders decided we did not need 90 percent of parity.

When farmers way out in the Midwest, in sheer desperation, call long distance to ask Senators from other States for help, I think it is convincing evidence of how strongly they feel.

Mr. President, I have presented some of the telegrams I have received for the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some more selected at random to show the sentiment in the area from which I come.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AITKIN, MINN., *March 7, 1956.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you stand firm 90 percent parity, particularly dairy.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, NORTH STAR CO-OP SOCIETY.

HERMAN, MINN., *March 7, 1956.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Ninety percent support urgently needed for welfare of national economy.

LAWRENCE DREIS, *Chokio, Minn.*

CAMBRIDGE, MINN., *March 5, 1956.*

Senator HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

Expressing sentiment of 400 families of the Isanti County Farmers Union we are proud to have you working for us as you have on this farm bill. Provide family farm cut off $25,000 a must.

ALDEN ANDERSON, *President.*
STACY, MINN.

FORMAN, N. DAK., *March 6, 1956.*

Senator HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you strongly to vote for 90 percent parity income bill. We demand action for relief of our distress now or there may be a national farmers holiday association in the making. We have been Bensonized long enough.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS FARMERS UNION OIL CO.

OGEMA, MINN., *February 20, 1956.*

Senator HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

Wish to express our sincere thanks for your good work for farmers. We are back of you 100 percent. Keep up the good work. Give us a good farm program of not less than 90 percent of parity.

OGEMA FARMERS UNION,
JEROME KIRVA, *President.*

ALEXANDRIA, MINN., *March 3, 1956*

Honorable Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

To express our sincere appreciation for gallant efforts you are putting forth in fight for farm parity, may God give you continued strength and wisdom.

FORADAY FARMERS UNION,
JOHN C. BARTOS.

AITKIN, MINN., *March 1, 1956.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY:
Washington, D. C.:

We believe that the soil-bank program will not be of any help to Aitkin County or any county in this part of the State. We do however believe 90 percent of parity on butterfat in milk will help the few farmers who are trying to stay on their farms.

AITKIN COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION,
BARNEY JANZEN, *Secretary and Treasurer.*

MOLINE, ILL., *February 29, 1956.*

Senator HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations your speech of February 27. We the small family farmer need more

men like you to represent us in our Government.

Sincerely,

Rock Island County Farmers Union; James C. Bennett, Chester D. Skeel, William A. Layer, John H. Layer, Jr., Gero Hoskins, Robt. Kroeger, Joseph Smolenski, Richard Dewitte, Julius de Baillie, Virgil Vaimsright, Walter Kilby, Watter H. Siever, Clifford Killey, Marion Kelley, Ruby McChurch.

LATTA, S. C., *March 7, 1956.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,

Washington, D. C.:

Your speech on farm bill in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is one of the finest things that a Senator has ever said on Senate floor. Greatly appreciate all you are trying to do for us and our America.

HOUSTON MANNING.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the day President Eisenhower sent his state of the Union message to the Congress, the famous CBS commentator Edward R. Murrow was out in the Midwest. He was out where he could sense for himself and see for himself what was happening, and how concerned farm people were.

Ed Murrow made his broadcast of January 5, from 7:45 to 8 p. m., from St. Paul, Minn. He had big news to cover—comment on the President's state of the Union message. Yet he had even bigger news—the upset feeling in Midwest agriculture.

Conditions he found impressed him so deeply that he devoted at least half of his news report to what he found out by visiting among farmers.

Let me quote from his remarks. Here is what he said:

The past 2 days, and much of the nights, have been spent talking with farmers and small-business men in southwest Iowa, around Corning, and in western Wisconsin, in Baron County. In Iowa it costs more to feed a hog than the hog will bring at market—talked with three medium sized farmers—none expected to show a profit this year—bankers are refusing loans on smaller farms—the trend is toward bigness. A considerable number of younger men, those who started farming after the war, are giving up, leaving the farm.

Purchasers at the general store are down, credit is tight. Sales of farm machinery have declined, some implement manufacturers are beginning to lay off men. There is nothing approaching panic and not much bitterness, but some old line Republicans are saying, "There's got to be a change." If there is anyone in that part of the country who supports Secretary Benson's policies, he is mighty hard to find.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the full portion of Mr. Murrow's broadcast dealing with agriculture.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The past 2 days and much of the nights have been spent talking with farmers and small-business men in southwest Iowa, around Corning, and in western Wisconsin, in Baron County. In Iowa it costs more to feed a hog than the hog will bring at market—talked with three medium-size farmers—none expected to show a profit this year—bankers are refusing loans on smaller farms—the trend is toward bigness. A considerable number of younger men, those who started farming after the war are giving up, leaving the farm.

Purchases at the general store are down, credit is tight. Sales of farm machinery have declined, some implement manufacturers are beginning to lay off men. There is nothing approaching panic and not much bitterness, but some old-line Republicans are saying, "There's got to be a change." If there is anyone in that part of the country who supports Secretary Benson's policies, he's mighty hard to find.

Up in Wisconsin the dairy farmers, those of the family-size farm, don't seem to be hurting quite so much as the corn and hog men in Iowa. But their net income is down and good observers who spend all their time with them say a whole lot of Republicans are "thinking of changing their votes." In neither place was there any enthusiasm for the soil-bank proposal. The general opinion seems to be that it won't help the small farmer, and it won't work anyway, because more intensive cultivation and improved fertilizers will keep production about where it is. President Eisenhower didn't give the farmers any news when he told the Nation today, that "our farm people are not sharing as they should, in the general prosperity" they know that all too well, and there are many of them who predict that it won't be long before other segments of the economy will begin to feel the loss of the farmers' purchasing power. One interesting aspect of the farmers' discontent is the criticism, and indeed abuse of Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and the lack of criticism of President Eisenhower. They blame him for Benson, but not for their condition. Many of them say Ike doesn't know anything about farming anyway. Insofar as they blame the President, it is rather like the sadness of neighbors when a father turns the prosperous home place over to an incompetent son, who doesn't farm it well.

But the thing that interested me about these farmers wasn't their politics. It was the men themselves. The sober and informed manner in which they will discuss the state of the Nation's agriculture, not just their personal problems.

Their concern about what is happening to this country in terms of bigness, not just bigger farms, but bigger everything. They care, in almost desperate terms about the individual. They worry, and they have a conscience, and a community sense when the young ex-GI can't make it and has to hold a closing-out sale, and go to town to look for a job. Down in Iowa the ground is brown and dry and cracked, they want moisture, but they also want to know what is going to be the result of the political mess in France. They argue about subsidies and price supports, and then wonder out loud if some way can't be found to use the wheat and corn we have in storage as an instrument of national policy in the struggle against communism. There is a quiet dignity and directness about these men that is both refreshing and encouraging to this weekend farmer. There are places in Wisconsin where the television aerials are as high as the windmills. The rich land lies under 16 inches of snow—towns are far apart—a low-flying plane shows you the tracks of manure spreaders in the snow. You tell the lakes from the land by the fact that there are a few men fishing through the ice—tiny black puppets on a huge white sheet—and flying in to Minneapolis, where this report is originating, I thought back over the 2 days and nights of conversation.

I don't know the answer to the farm problem. The farmers can't agree, they are divided, but they are thinking. I heard them discuss it with less heat and more concern and information than I have heard from their elected representatives, and they are listening and looking. I heard more intelligent, incisive comment and criticism of radio and television in 2 days than I have heard along Madison Avenue in many moons. People who plan radio and television programs, when they don't like a proposal dismiss it with the phrase, "But will they like it in Iowa, or Minnesota?" At least I found the answer to that one—if it's good, they will. The program planners ought to think a little more about those small houses and big barns, with the television aerial as high as a windmill."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Murrow is a good reporter. He calls his shots as he sees them. His graphic description of Midwest agriculture is something for all of us to think about seriously.

Mr. President, any good farm program is going to cost money, just as any other program to bolster our economy costs money. But costs are relative things, and they should not be distorted out of proportion.

We are inclined to create a national crisis over investing a billion dollars to save our agricultural economy, yet how many people even bother to know that our economic aid to Indochina alone, during fiscal years 1954 and 1955, totaled $1,666,551,000?

That is what it is listed at in the ICA Operation Report of November 16, 1955.

For the same 2 years, we provided $587,600,000 in economic aid to Korea, and $249,275,000 in economic aid to Formosa.

Now, I am not complaining about these expenditures. They were made because it was felt necessary in the national interest to make them. I supported them.

But I certainly think if we can spend billions to lift the economy of other countries in far corners of the earth, it is mighty petty of us to be quibbling about costs of a farm program for our own American people.

In my opinion, funds used in our farm program are not really costs. Funds used to bring agriculture back into proper balance with the rest of our economy are an investment—not a loss. Such expenditures would be an investment in the greatest potential market available for our entire economy today.

Restoring the present 25 percent loss in farm purchasing power could and should be only the start toward developing the untapped markets for the products of American industry right at our own rural backdoor.

We expend vast sums for economic development of underdeveloped and underprivileged areas of the world, in the hope of creating new future markets for expansion of American business and industry.

Yet we are overlooking far greater potential markets among our own people in lower income brackets, who could more rapidly put increased purchasing power back into the economic stream of our own Nation.

Facts and figures I have previously presented to the Senate from the Grain Terminal Association's Family Farm Survey strongly support this contention—facts and figures obtained from farmers themselves, as to their needs for immediate purchases.

Before American industry and business alines itself too far against effective action for economic recovery in agriculture, whatever the temporary price may seem to be, let it weigh carefully the vast potential contribution a prospering

agriculture can and will make to the future of business and industry itself—and the loss business and industry must face if it lets that market continue to dwindle.

I want to conclude this comprehensive summary of farm policy and farm legislative debate with one theme.

We are making vital decisions starting tomorrow.

They are not just political decisions.

They are decisions affecting the lives of people—of American people.

Quite frankly, at this stage, despite all the public predictions, I think no one can safely say the outcome. It is up to each Senator's individual conscience.

It is not a decision to be made recklessly or lightly. I have devoted a great deal of my time and energy to try and present a complete record of the facts and figures involved in this argument. They are all there in the RECORD to read, if Senators will take time to check them.

I have devoted a great deal of time to going among farm people, and working with farm people.

Quite frankly, I am so convinced they are being wrongly treated that I have put aside other vital issues of keen interest to me—to fight for what I believe is justice.

I ask my colleagues to consider this issue in that light.

Underlying all our considerations of agricultural policy in this country must be continued recognition of the human elements involved, the human and social values that are far more important than material values.

America is not just efficiency and bigness. America is people—people with needs and wants. People with hopes and aspirations. American agriculture is more than just efficient production. It is family living. It is church on Sunday. It is the family picnic, and the rural school.

The moral level of American social and political institutions is due in no small part to the wholesome atmosphere created by men and women and their families who live on our family farms. That contribution to America's strength must never be ignored, nor its preservation neglected.

The strength of America is in its people—its people at work in gainful employment, its farmers producing at fair prices, its merchants selling their foods and services in sufficient volume to maintain a profit.

The strength of America is to be found in the children in good schools, its old people cared for in dignity in the twilight years of their lives.

The strength of America is found in the fulfillment and practice of the great spiritual and moral principles that have guided us throughout our history. Yes, the strength of America is found in a faith in God, and a trust in the people.

It is this kind of America I believe in, and it is to this kind of an America that I dedicate my life and whatever talents God may have given me.

And it is for this kind of America that I believe it is essential we maintain a strong and prospering agriculture, solidly based upon family farms.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, each major segment of our population depends for its prosperity on the continued health and vigor of the other major segments. Today we have the spectacle of agriculture, a vital partner in the national economy, being faced with the most serious crisis in years, while the other two partners—industry and labor—enjoy record prosperity. How long can this paradox continue?

Remembering that every depression in our history has been preceded by a break in farm income, all Americans should ponder this question well, and we here in Congress who have the responsibility for doing something about it, must take prompt and forthright action to help agriculture regain its fair share of the national income.

My purpose in making these remarks today will be threefold: First, to analyze the situation as I see it; second, to point out what I consider to be some of the basic weaknesses of the measures being taken and others being proposed; and third, to offer a few suggestions which I hope will help to achieve a workable and effective farm program.

To diagnose just how serious the ills of agriculture have become, let us examine, first, the decline in farm income; second, the shift in our rural population away from the farms and into the urban centers; third, the tendency of larger farms to "gobble up" the smaller ones; and fourth, the continued increase in farm production despite acreage cutbacks, declining foreign market, and ever-mounting surpluses of farm commodities.

Net farm income in the United States declined 28 percent between 1952 and 1955, according to a report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. This reduction was more than 10 percent for the 1 year from 1954 to 1955 alone. On the other hand, during the same 3-year period between 1952 and 1955, corporation profits after taxes increased 39 percent.

The decline in farm income is not reflected in lower prices to the consumer. For farm products as a whole, the shrinkage of that portion of the housewife's dollar going to the farmer has been 14 cents in the 9 years following the postwar year of 1946. The farmer at that time got 52 cents of each dollar spent by the housewife on food, but now he gets only 38 cents. A preliminary estimate by Department of Agriculture economists shows that United States consumers spent $46.3 billion on domestic farm food products in 1955. This is based on retail cost at the grocery store level and does not include that spent in restaurants. Of this amount, the farmers received $18.3 billion, and the handling costs totaled $28 billion. Significantly, the profits going to food processors were up 17 percent during 1955 over 1954.

With reference to the shift in farm population, according to an estimate prepared by the Bureau of the Census in cooperation with the Agricultural Marketing Service, the number of persons living on farms decreased 3.2 million from April 1950 to April 1954, or a total of 12.6 percent during those 4 years.

I have watched this development in my own State of Texas with deep concern. The farm population in Texas is the lowest it has been since the 1870's, and nearly a fifth of the population left in the last 4 years, a survey by Dr. R. L. Skranbanek, agricultural economics professor at Texas A & M College, reveals. This survey showed 1,126,000 persons living on Texas farms and ranches in 1954 compared with 1,387,000 in 1950—a drop of 18.8 percent in 4 years. As of the time of the survey in 1954, only 13 percent of the State's population lived on farms and ranches, compared to more than 40 percent 25 years ago.

As our farm population declined, the number of farms has gone down, and those that remain have grown larger. This is graphically illustrated by figures from the 1954 Census of Agriculture, for which a preliminary report has only recently been issued by the Census Bureau. This report shows that there were 600,000 fewer farms in the United States in 1954 than in 1950, and the percentage decrease of 11.1 was greater than for any other census period for which there are census records. The number of farms in 1954 was smaller than for any year since 1890.

Contrasting this overall picture with what is happening among the larger farms, we find that the number of farms of 1,000 acres and over has doubled during the last 30 years and has gone up 7.5 percent from 1950 to 1954 alone. Farms of 500 to 999 acres have increased by 55.5 percent in the last 30 years and 5.1 percent since 1950.

Most of the decrease in the number of farms from 1950 to 1954 occurred among those of from 10 to 100 acres, which declined 17.8 percent. Some will point out that mechanization has enabled our farmers to cultivate larger tracts, and that farms of 10 to 100 acres are no longer representative of family-size operations. Granting this to be true for the sake of argument, census records show that farms of from 10 to 220 acres, which would cover family-operated farms in most areas, also declined 15.8 percent from 1950 to 1954, or nearly 1 out of every 6.

Taking my home State of Texas as an example, the Census Bureau reports that there were 39,000 fewer farms in 1954 than in 1950, and the average size of farms in Texas increased by 60 acres from 438 to 498 acres. Particularly important is the fact that family-size farms of from 10 to 220 acres showed a decline in number of 18.7 percent, or about 3 percent more than the national average.

While the larger farms represent only a small percentage of the total number, they account for a considerable portion of our total agricultural production. In the case of cotton, 7.4 percent of the growers—those with allotments of 50 acres and over—account for 46 percent of the cotton grown in this country. In the case of wheat, farmers having allotments of 150 acres or more represent only 8.9 percent of the total number but account for 57.8 percent of the total national production.

Perhaps even more striking is the size of certain Government loans for price-support purposes. For instance, one big land company in Mississippi got a cotton support loan in 1954 of nearly $1.3 million. The largest wheat loan that year went to a Montana grower for $430,691, while a Louisiana farmer obtained the largest rice loan for $486,726. It is interesting to note that the average wheat loan in Montana for 1954 was $4,926, and the average rice loan in Louisiana was $5,107.

Despite reduced acreage and other control measures, crop production in 1955 almost equaled the 1948 record and considerably surpassed the total for any of the past 6 years. According to the Department of Agriculture Annual Crop Summary for 1955, the combined acreage of principal crops harvested was the smallest since 1940, but generally high yields per acre more than offset acreage reductions.

Production of corn for all purposes last year was estimated at 175 million bushels more than in 1954. A 1955 cotton crop of 14,663,000 bales exceeded the crop of a year earlier by a million bales and the 1944–53 average by 1,671,000 bales. Peanuts, picked and threshed, totalled 57 percent above 1954. Production of oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghum—spurred on by reduction of acreages in allotment crops—reached 2,228,530,000 bushels, some 120 million more than in 1954.

Meanwhile, the Government's investment in farm products has climbed to $8,666,309,000 or about $1.5 billion over a year ago. Present holdings would be even higher except that the Government has donated more than a billion dollars worth of these commodities for needy persons at home and abroad during the past year.

Now I should like to point out a number of defects which I believe exist in the measures presently being taken to alleviate this situation and others which have been proposed.

First, flexible price supports reduce farm income but not production. This was amply illustrated by the Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in his opening address on the bill presently before us. To reemphasize the point, however, I will call attention to our sad experience with dairy products, over which there are no production controls and for which the beneficial results from lower supports, if any, should be readily apparent. In 1953 with a support level of 90 percent of parity, total milk production on all farms amounted to 121,149,000,000 pounds.

One year later, after Secretary Benson had dropped the support level to 75 percent of parity, total production climbed to a new record high of 123,502 million pounds. The same situation prevailed in 1955, with dairy farmers reaching another new record of 124,500 million pounds.

The reason is simply this: A farmer has certain fixed costs—interest and principal on his farm mortgage, installment payments on farm equipment, living expenses for himself and his family. These cannot be reduced, at least not for a sustained period, and in order to make up for his loss in price on the commodities produced, he is forced to increase production. He cannot turn his production on and off like a faucet; he must continue to produce in the hope that prices will stabilize by harvest time.

Second, acreage controls also do not necessarily control production. One of the best examples of this is cotton. In 1954, American farmers harvested 19,251,000 acres and produced 13,696,000 bales. A year later, with estimated harvested acreage down to 16,882,000, production was up nearly a million bales to 14,663,000. Of course, the answer is that through the increased use of fertilizer and other good farming practices, the yield per acre was increased from 341 pounds of lint in 1954 to an estimated 416 pounds per acre in 1955.

Third, production controls are not the only, or even the best, solution to this problem. It stands to reason that no matter how high a price the farmer obtains for the products he raises, he will not be able to meet his fixed costs if his production is cut back to a negligible amount. Excessive production controls will also in time remove the American farmer from the world market for agricultural products, since farmers in other countries will certainly jump to fill the vacuum caused by withdrawal of United States exports. In a world desperately in need of food and clothing, the only real and permanent answer is to expand the market for agricultural commodities raised in this country.

Fourth, our export program up to now has been totally inadequate to maintain our historic share of the world market, much less to enlarge it as a further outlet for growing domestic production. Secretary of Agriculture Benson has had and now has plenty of authority to sell American-grown commodities in world trade through normal channels. Until recent months, he would not sell at competitive prices, but has made the support price the offering price in world trade. As a result, we have deliberately promoted increased world production in foreign countries for export by holding an umbrella over prices which foreign producers can demand for their commodities. This course is an open invitation for foreign expansion in the same commodities which are in trouble in the United States, and foreign production has increased at approximately the same rate that we have decreased our farmers production.

After 3 years of vigorous prodding by the Congress, its committees, and individual Members, the Department of Agriculture has only recently started to offer United States commodities in world trade on a competitive basis. Significantly, this came only after 62 Senators, including the junior Senator from Texas, had joined in the introduction of S. 2702, to require the Commodity Credit Corporation "to use its existing powers and authorities to encourage sales for exports of such quantities of cotton as will reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton." This language is also contained in section 303 of S. 3183, the bill we are presently debating.

Fifth, American foreign aid has built up agricultural production in other countries to compete with our farmers for the export market. During the 7 years between 1948 and 1955, United States foreign aid provided nearly a billion dollars to promote agriculture in other countries and created $710 million of counterpart funds for the furtherance of agriculture abroad. The International Cooperation Administration and its predecessor agencies granted a total of $476,819,000 for agricultural machinery, tractors, and equipment for foreign countries. Last year 738 United States agricultural technicians, whose salaries were paid by American taxpayers, were on duty overseas, helping to increase farm production. While we certainly want to help to build up the economy of underdeveloped countries, that assistance should be limited to their own needs for domestic purposes and they should not be encouraged to compete with American farmers for the world market. It is high time that the State Department should give a little consideration to the people back home who must pay the bill for foreign aid and who do not want to cut their own throats in the process.

Sixth, only 40 percent of the cultivated land in the United States is planted to so-called basic commodities and would receive the benefit of 90 percent of parity price supports. Other protective measures are provided for the nonbasics—discretionary support levels for feed grains other than corn, section 32 funds for the purchase of pork products, vegetables, and other perishables—but these measures have not given the same assistance as they have for basic commodities. As to the 60 percent of his land, the farmer in general is either losing money or is barely meeting expenses. This has a direct and serious effect on the basic commodities, particularly the competition which oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums have given to corn in the feed market.

Seventh, the soil bank plan will have only a very limited benefit and will not adequately protect tenant farmers. While soil conservation is always a worthy objective, I believe it is a mistake to assume that paying the farmer for taking land out of production will have any lasting effect in restoring to him his fair share of the national income. Since our Government continues to increase foreign production and withholds American commodities from sales in world markets on a truly competitive basis, this dose of aspirin is just another move toward limiting production to domestic consumption.

This program will be dependent on the whims of succeeding administrations and Congresses, and it is well worth remembering that election year comes only once every 4 years. If our farmers and the public in general are led to expect a bonanza from the soil bank, they will soon wake up to find that it has not been the cure-all it has been recommended to be for solving the real problems of agriculture.

As to the protection of tenants and sharecroppers, I note that the bill leaves this entirely up to the Secretary of Agriculture. Remembering the present Secretary's view that many of these farmers would be better off by moving

to the city, I wonder how effective will be the regulations he will promulgate under this authority. With the prospect of receiving attractive pay for permitting their land to lie idle, it appears to me that unless the Secretary's rules and the penalties for violation are very specific, landlords will find some way to make it convenient for the tenant to move.

Eighth, a change in the loan basis on cotton from middling ⅞-inch cotton to the average grade and staple, as proposed in the pending bill, will work a hardship and loss to all cotton farmers. Government loans on cotton have for years been made on the basis of ⅞-inch staple, which has become known as "the bread and butter" cotton raised and produced by the average American farm family. Relatively speaking, there is not an excessive amount of short staple cotton in Government-held stocks, and there is no reason why producers of the shorter staples should be discriminated against. I am told by the proponents of the bill that it also will reduce the price paid for all other cotton, and that leads me to object even more to this provision. I hope this proposal will be deleted by the Senate.

Ninth, minimum cotton allotments for the small farmers are desperately needed, but the proposal in the committee bill would take 54,000 acres away from Texas and give it to other States for this purpose. Under the plan for the establishment of a national 1-percent reserve to provide minimum allotments of 4 acres or the highest acreage planted in the preceding 3 years, Texas would be forced to contribute 74,109 acres and would receive a State allocation of only 20,400 acres.

Tenth, new or modernized parity in most cases simply means lower parity, lower support levels, and lower farm income. The original farm program, as I understand it, envisioned that price supports should be a percentage of the comparative purchasing power which the farmer had in 1909–14, and determined by Congress to be a fair base. Under that formula, the price guaranteed the farmer was based on a parity which rose with increasing costs the farmer paid and fell with decreasing costs. Under the new or modern parity, it appears to me that price supports are based not so much on maintaining the average purchasing power of the farmer but largely on the average price the farmer has received for the past 10 years. This, of course, was during a period when farm prices were falling and farm costs were rising. Thus, rather than relieving the price-cost squeeze, the new or modern parity would further aggravate the situation. For that reason, I heartily commend the provision in the committee bill to require the Secretary in the case of basic commodities to use the old parity price or the modernized parity, whichever is higher, but this measure should also be extended to the non-basic commodities.

Eleventh, farmers in the drought area have not received the assistance they need under present agricultural programs and stand to lose more by the operation of the soil bank plan. With all of the legislation passed by Congress to provide emergency credit, feed, and other assistance, farmers hit by the drouth are finding that when these programs reach the county and farm level, they are hedged about with conditions and restrictions so as to become practically worthless. Let us take the much-publicized Great Plains program as an example. I have before me a telegram from Mr. H. L. King of Brownfield, Tex., a State director of the Texas Farm Bureau. Mr. King's telegram reads in part as follows:

> Reference to the Great Plains emergency loan. This loan is not working. Apparently the spirit of the law has been misinterpreted by the heads of FHA in Washington. The directives to the local offices from Washington make this loan unusable to the farmers for which it was intended. As you know this area is a portion of the special area which was designated as being in a disaster condition because of the 5-year drought. We feel that the intent of the law is good and if properly applied would be the salvation to the farmers in this area. * * * Long term loans are a must for the farmers in this area. Because of the urgency of this matter, hope you will give it your earliest consideration as time is running out.

As to the soil-bank plan, I note on page 10 of the committee bill that compensation to farmers for taking their land out of production "shall be at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return" and that several factors are listed for his consideration. On pages 15 to 18 of the committee report, I note that tentative proposals are outlined for implementing the soil bank. If I understand these proposals correctly, the rate of compensation will depend on a normal yield for each county and community based on average production over the last 3 years, 5 years, or some such period.

That being the case, I point out that average production over the past few years has been well below normal production in the drought areas. However, I find nothing in the bill which would exclude those years. This, like so many other things, is left to the discretion of the Secretary. At least some of the farmers in the drought area would like to participate in the soil-bank program, but they will be penalized further if their return is figured on average production in recent years. They have already suffered a great deal from the reduction in acreage allotments and need some means to recoup their losses in income. I shall offer an amendment on this subject.

Mr. President, it takes no expert to see that the present farm situation is deadly serious and that there is no simple panacea for solving the problems which confront us. Certainly I do not claim to have the answer, or even a full appreciation of the obstacles which must be overcome to achieve the answer. However, I wish to point out a few basic principles which I believe should be included in any effective and workable farm program.

First and foremost, whatever plan is finally adopted should be designed primarily to assist the full-time farmer who, with his family, operates a comparatively small farm and has little or no income from outside sources. After all, despite the increase in the average size of farms and the number of large farms, this is still predominately a nation of small farms. The 1954 census of agriculture reveals that 82.5 percent of all farms in the country produced commodities having a value of less than $10,000 each, and 61.2 percent produced less than $5,000 each. Only 4 percent had gross individual production valued at $25,000 or more.

The entire farm program suffers when we have cases, exceptional as they are, such as the price support loan of $1.3 million to a Mississippi cotton-growing corporation. On the other extreme, it is not a healthy condition for our country when family farmers who have followed this occupation for generations are forced to leave their farms, not because they can make more money or prefer life in the city, but because the crops they are permitted to produce have been reduced so drastically that they can no longer make a decent living.

For this reason, it appears to me that there should be some point at which price support benefits will be cut off, either at a gross-income figure or at a net-profit figure. Consideration should also be given to graduated price supports, beginning at 100 percent of parity for the small farmers with decreasing support levels as the rate of production increases. The same principle might be applied to acreage allotments, if production controls must be based on acreage at all. In any event, there should be some minimum allotments below which farmers would not have to suffer the same cutback as those cultivating thousands of acres. Another proposal, which I believe was sponsored by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the Senator from Louisiana, would deny price supports to anyone who customarily derives more than 50 percent of his income from nonagricultural occupations, and I think some such amendment would be advisable.

Second, provision should be made to assist farmers on that portion of their cultivated land which is not devoted to the basic crops. When acreage allotments are so greatly decreased on the basics, farmers turn to feed grains and other nonbasic commodities in the hope that some small benefit will come to them.

To remedy this situation, I have offered an amendment to establish price supports of 90 percent of parity on barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums, provided that 20 percent of the total cultivated acreage on each participating farm is taken out of production. This will give the farmers another cash crop on which to make a fair return, and it will also cut down on the surplus of feed grains and other commodities.

Third, serious thought should be given to production controls expressed in pounds, bushels, or bales, rather than in acreage allotments. Some farmers differ with this approach, knowing that under acreage allotments, they can use fertilizer and other chemicals to produce just as much as they ever did. However, whenever they do this, they suffer another acreage reduction the next year and with the same or increased overhead costs. Small farmers cannot afford this reverse pyramid indefinitely.

Fourth, some way must be found to sell more American farm products in the world market at competitive prices. With the provision in the committee bill for a mandatory export sales program on cotton and in view of the recent efforts of the Agriculture Department, it apears this commodity is belatedly receiving the attention needed so badly. I am also pleased that the bill contains authority for a two-price plan on rice, which will move more of that crop into world trade. The National Association of Wheat Growers, whose president is Kenneth Kendrick of Stratford, Tex., has recommended a similar program for wheat. I understand this proposal will be offered in the form of an amendment to the committee bill, and a two-price plan for cotton may also be offered.

Fifth, added caution must be taken to assure that the foreign aid program does not destroy the world market for the crops grown in the United States. A continuation of the present policy, coupled with tax concessions for Americans who invest abroad, could well wreck the farm program now in effect or the one we aprove in the Senate this year or in any other year. Foreign aid to place backward nations on a self-sustaining basis is a generous move, but charity begins at home, and it is going too far to deprive our own farmers of their historic markets and relegate them to a permanent Government dole.

Sixth, the return to the higher of old or modernized parity on basic commodities should be extended as well to nonbasic crops. With Secretary Benson "flexing" support levels downward, particularly for nonbasics, where he has absolute discretion, the farmers need this added protection. Also, feed grains specially have a direct relation to corn, one of the basics, and it is discriminatory to have corn on old parity and feed grains on new or modernized parity.

Seventh, greater assistance should be provided to those areas of general crop failure, whether from drought, flood, hail, or some other natural disaster. We have heard much about flood insurance, disaster assistance to relieve flood conditions in the Northeast, and Federal assistance to areas of serious unemployment. I realize the bill deals primarily with price supports, acreage controls, and the like, but I hope we will have the support of other Senators for legislation, if needed, to liberalize emergency credit to farmers in the drought area. I have also prepared an amendment to the present bill to spell out that "average production" under drought conditions in recent years does not mean "normal production" within the purview of the soil-bank plan, and that such years will be excluded from consideration.

As pointed out at the beginning of these remarks, American agriculture stands today at the crossroads. The question facing Congress, the farmers, and the American people is whether this vital segment of our national economy will continue to deteriorate, or whether we shall help it rise up and march in step with the prosperity of industry and labor to a greater future. I hope and pray it will be the latter.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its work this evening, it stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have the honor to be one of the Senators from the State which derives from cotton a higher percentage of its agricultural income than does any other State in the Union. Even though Mississippi is smaller in geographical area that the great State of Texas, we are second only to Texas in the total production of cotton. Sixty-nine percent of the farm income of my State for a recent year was represented by cotton and cottonseed products. In a more recent year, 1954, the percentage was 61 percent.

We have the large farm, the intermediate size farm, the small farm, and the very small farm. We have the large operator, we have rich delta land, we have prairie land, and the very small farm in the hill sections.

Cotton is the only major basic crop in my State which has a price support. Rice is grown in Mississippi, and that commodity also is supported; but the production of rice is relatively small.

I am certainly not indifferent to the fate of other commodities, such as wheat and corn, but I mention cotton to emphasize that it is the big income-producing agricultural commodity of my State. Our cotton economy effects to a great extent our total economy. If the cotton program is sound, we benefit greatly. If it is unsound, we suffer more than does any other State in the Union.

Tonight I intend to discuss briefly, in order to get the matter before the Senate, one amendment which is already in the bill. I wish especially to thank the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the consideration of what I call a very small farm amendment. It relates only to those farms which have 4 acres or less. That size farm would be doing exceedingly well to produce 3 bales of cotton. On the average, such farms will not produce that much cotton. Many of the farms about which I have been talking comprise less than 4 acres. In many instances the farms have been reduced to 2 acres, some to 2½ acres, some to 3, and some to 3½ acres. The small farm that produces 3 bales of cotton would be doing exceedingly well to make a cash profit of $150. That is equal to only 150 hours of work a year, at a minimum wage of $1 an hour, which means that a man would be working less than 4 weeks a year, at 40 hours a week, in order to earn $150.

I use that illustration to show how reduction of acreage affects a small operator. There is in effect a minimum below which wheat farmers, tobacco farmers, and peanut farmers cannot be cut. They all have a protective minimum acreage. Cotton farmers also had that protection until a few years ago.

Mr. President, the amendment is based purely on social reasons. The purpose is not to take acreage away from one State or from one group and give it to another, but it is based solely on the social question involved in the problems of small farms. The amendment proposes to set up a national reserve of 1 percent and a State reserve of 3 percent of the State acreage, or so much thereof as may be necessary to build up enough acreage so that no person's acreage is cut below the smaller of 4 acres, or the highest planted acreage in 3 previous years.

I think it is of great interest to note that by the adoption of a small measure of that kind, 407,748 farms throughout the Cotton Belt would be affected to the extent of receiving one-tenth of an acre and up. It means that an estimated 2,038,740 people would be affected by such a small amendment. It does not mean so very much in acres, and it does not mean so very much in dollars, but for a small farmer's year's planting and his year's work and his year's net income, or what he may realize, it certainly means a great deal.

Continued acreage reductions will hit the small farmer harder than it will hit any other group. Under the present law, the scheduled acreage reduction for cotton in 1957 would liquidate many of our small farms.

Mr. President, I plan to offer an amendment which will prevent further reduction for 1957 and 1958. We must not permit our cotton farm to be subjected to continued acreage reduction. Acreage has already been reduced to the point that the small farmer cannot efficiently utilize his family labor and other resources. Most of the little farms supply their own labor, and do not have to pay any out-of-pocket money. That is the reason it means so much to them.

There is another amendment, Mr. President, which has been drawn, and which will be offered, which tries to carry out the idea that the national reserve for small farms will not change the historical record of a State. That will be presented at the appropriate time.

I should like to have the RECORD contain a few more figures as to the number of farms in the various States which would be affected by the minimum small-farm amendment.

In the State of Alabama 64,274 farms would be affected.

In the State of Georgia 48,594 farms would be affected.

In the State of Mississippi 53,645 farms would be affected.

In the State of North Carolina 59,167 farms would be affected.

In the State of Texas 43,963 farms would be affected.

I proceed now to discuss another amendment which I shall offer on the floor at the proper time. Briefly, it would put a floor under cotton acreage for the calendar year 1957 and 1958.

One of the primary reasons for offering that amendment is to try to stop continued acreage reductions. We in Mississippi have gone just as far as we can go. That is especially true with

reference to what I shall call the homestead farm, the acreage of which is larger than the acreage of farms I have just talked about. I refer particularly to the 5-, 10-, 15-, 20-, 25-, and 30-acre farms.

In 1953 we had a planted acreage in Mississippi of 2,671,000.

I am speaking now only of my own State, but it is typical of most of the southern area.

In 1954 we had an acreage reduction of 26 percent.

In 1955 the total reduction from the 1953 level was 36 percent.

In 1956 the acreage is down to 1,600,000 acres, which means a 40.1 percent reduction from the 1853 level.

I have figures based on best possible estimates available which show that in 1957 the national cotton acreage allotment will be reduced by 1,549,720 acres. This reduction, applied to Mississippi, will give an allotment of only 1,395,000 acres. This means a total reduction in acreage from the 1953 level amounting to 48 percent.

As applied to my State of Mississippi, that amounts to a reduction of 11.4 percent in 1957 from the 1956 allotment.

The reduction will be 9.8 percent for the Nation.

When we apply that 11.4 percent reduction to the counties in my State, those in charge of the program at the State level tell me that in many of the counties that reduction will be as high as 15 percent for 1957.

Those are the very counties that have been hit the hardest in the reductions I have been enumerating, which reductions totaled 40.1 percent in 1956 from the 1953 level. So these figures were really alarming and surprising to me, and made me realize that one of the great threats to my State is the continued acreage reduction.

Mr. President, our farm economy cannot stand this continued reduction in acreage. Already in the Cotton Belt, through acreage reductions, 55,348 tenant farmers have had to leave the land; I refer to tenant farmers, not landowners. My State of Mississippi had the highest number of that unfortunate total, namely, 11,981. These figures apply only to the calendar year 1955. I repeat that the total in the Nation's cotton areas was 55,348; and 11,981 of that number were in Mississippi. More than 300 of those tenants were from my home county—a relatively small rural county in eastern Mississippi. The total displacement for that county alone, because of acreage reductions in only 1 year, was approximately 300 tenants—according to the estimate by the authorities; and in that 1 year, approximately 200 persons left the land they owned in that county, because the acreage reductions were so great.

People I know personally, who have lived on land owned by their families for more than 100 years, have been forced to abandon the land insofar as cotton farming is concerned, and in some cases have been forced to abandon the land altogether, because of the reduced acreage allotments. That situation is not confined to the very, very small farms; the continual decrease in the acreage allotments has severed the life vein of the 15-acre, 20-acre, and 25-acre farmers, in the same way. They have their own family labor, and they own the land, and they have the facilities with which to work the land. But they do not have a sufficient number of acres to work to enable them to make even a bare living from the crops produced on those acres.

In great areas of my State—and this has been going on for a long time, not only during the past 2 years—the land is being bought up and fenced in. A great deal of that is being done with what I call war-profit money. Persons who made a great deal of money during the war are coming into the area and buying the land and fencing it and even burning the old houses, and pushing over with bulldozers anything that will not burn. The people who live there have gone. That is occurring from year to year. When the people go, the little crossroads stores go; the churches go, and the schools go; and when those go, the smalltown merchants go.

Something must be done. I know we cannot stop all such developments, and I do not expect that to happen. A great adjustment is occurring. But something must be done by means of this program, so as to give the farmers I have described—those who have 10 acres or 20 acres or 25 acres—a chance to make a living of a kind on their own land, a chance to diversify, a chance to rebuild and improve. However, if their acreage allotments are reduced below the minimum absolutely necessary in order to obtain sufficient income from their farms, and if they do not have a chance to till the soil and to grow the products they must grow if they are to make a living, then they are waging an impossible battle, and they are bound to lose.

Mr. President, I have before me a table for the cotton acreage allotments, based on the calculations for 1957. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cotton acreage allotments

State	1956 allotment	Estimated 1957 acreage allotment	Indicated percent reduction, 1957
Alabama	1,025,141	905,503	11.7
Arizona	343,640	328,995	4.3
Arkansas	1,424,511	1,271,412	10.7
California	782,405	737,294	5.8
Florida	36,974	34,111	7.7
Georgia	903,221	805,369	10.8
Illinois	3,110	3,110	----------
Kansas	29	29	----------
Kentucky	7,799	6,841	12.3
Louisiana	610,891	543,435	11.0
Maryland	25	25	----------
Mississippi	1,646,562	1,458,671	11.4
Missouri	378,055	341,192	9.8
Nevada	2,324	2,324	----------
New Mexico	179,378	167,373	6.7
North Carolina	483,932	428,152	11.5
Oklahoma	845,616	755,397	10.7
South Carolina	726,193	649,484	10.6
Tennessee	563,491	510,886	9.3
Texas	7,410,893	6,877,025	7.2
Virginia	17,114	14,956	12.6
United States	17,391,304	15,841,584	8.9

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me present a few more figures regarding the effect of acreage allotment reductions on farm income in Mississippi, alone. I have before me the figures for the cotton acreage for Mississippi in 1956, which show the estimated decrease in gross income since 1953 resulting from decrease in acreage. These figures are based on 90 percent of parity. The figures show that, based on the 1953 level of income for cotton as an index, farmers will receive only 55 percent of parity in 1956, on a dollar equivalent because of the loss of over 1 million acres during this period. For 1957, with the indicated acreage, that percentage will decline to 49. That is the inevitable trend as a result of continued acreage reduction.

In my State and, I believe, in many other States, if it had not been for the most unusual yield—the highest yield of cotton per acre, last year—the distress and the pinch and the suffering would have been far greater than have yet been experienced. However, the level of production was better than normally would have been the case—due in part to better methods, but also due in part to one of the most unusual growing seasons. Men who have grown cotton for more than 60 consecutive cotton crops have never seen the equal to that high yield.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand, and shall refer to only a part of it, a very fine article which was published in the Wall Street Journal under date of March 5, 1956. The article was written by Jerry Bishop, a reporter for that publication. He was reporting from Waxahachie, Tex. I now read from the article:

WAXAHACHIE, TEX.—Cotton farmer Lloyd Adams was turned down the other day for a $1,200 loan by the Citizens National Bank here. It was the first time in 25 years the bank had refused Mr. Adams, who needs the money to pay farming expenses until his crop comes in next fall.

"You just wouldn't be able to raise enough cotton on 25 acres to pay it back, Lloyd," explained E. M. Wallace, the bank's vice president.

* * * * *

IMPORT OF ACREAGE CUTS

A good part of Mr. Adams' difficulty stems from acreage cutbacks he has had to make to qualify for price supports. Federal allotments for 1956 are 30 percent below 1953, the last year cotton was grown without acreage restrictions. The Smiths have had to curb their plantings, too, but the economic pinch has hurt less on their sprawling acres.

In addition to cutbacks, farmers like Mr. Adams have been getting less for the cotton they did grow. In mid-December, prices received by cotton farmers averaged about 31 cents a pound, down nearly a cent and a half from a year earlier and only about three-quarters of the peak 1950 price.

The price decline, nowise limited to cotton farmers, is reflected in the skidding national farm income, which in 1955 dropped to an estimated $11 billion, down $1.3 billion from 1954 and off a whopping 26 percent from 1951.

THE BIG SURPLUS

Hovering over the cotton market is, of course, the 11-million-bale surplus stacked up in Government warehouses. This lofty pile is expected to rise even taller—to a record 14 million bales by next August.

Mr. Adams, 49 years old and graying, is typical of the small farmer who has cultivated much of the cotton-producing South since the end of the 19th century. His farm is the traditional small family farm. In the 1920's he and his father helped make

their home county, Ellis, one of the top cotton producing counties in the Nation.

But in 1954, Mr. Adams, which isn't his real name, turned up in the farm census as 1 of the 936 Ellis County farmers each of whom had total produce valued at less than $2,500. The number of such low-income farms in the county increased 50 percent from 1950 to 1954, mostly because of acreage cutbacks that left farmers with less cotton to sell.

I hasten to say that I know that a great many "Mr. Adamses" are going out of business because of the change in times. I do not make any plea that we should try to save them all, or provide a cushion for everyone. My plea in connection with these amendments is to stop the downward trend toward a continual reduction of acreage. The program is draining the life blood out of some of our finest family units, and many of our sound economic units. Whatever the cost of stopping this acreage reduction, it is a cost which this program will have to bear. Whatever adjustments are necessary are adjustments which should be made in this bill.

I was attracted to figures which were presented today by a Senator who was speaking with reference to the wheat situation. With respect to wheat, there is a floor to prevent continual acreage reduction, year after year, the minimum being 55 million acres. If it were not for that floor, under the formula now in the law, that acreage would have been reduced 18.6 million acres—an unthinkable situation. It would depopulate the great Midwest, and the wheat-growing territory.

The same thing is happening with respect to cotton. The situation has already reached such a point that, in order to make this program sound for a great number of the very finest citizens in the very finest units, we shall have to insure that the acreage reduction will not continue.

I shall not go into that subject further at this time. Later I shall have an opportunity to present the amendments.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, and request that it lie on the table and be printed. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. STENNIS, for himself and Mr. EASTLAND, is as follows:

On page 32, before the quotation marks at the end of line 8, insert the following:

"Where the acreage contributed by a State to the national acreage reserve is in excess of the acreage received from such reserve for any year, an acreage equal to the product of such excess multiplied by the per centum which the cotton acreage history otherwise determined for the State for such year bears to the State acreage allotment for such year shall be added to the cotton acreage history otherwise determined for the State for such year for purposes of apportioning the national acreage allotment to States under this subsection for any subsequent year; and where the acreage received by a State from the national acreage reserve is in excess of the acreage contributed to such reserve for any year, an acreage equal to the product of such excess multiplied by the per centum which the cotton acreage history otherwise determined for the State bears to the State acreage allotment shall be deducted from the cotton acreage history otherwise determined for the State for such year for purposes of apportioning the national acreage allotment to States under this subsection for any subsequent year."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program. I request that the amendment be received, printed, and lie on the table. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. STENNIS, for himself and other Senators, is, as follows:

On page 31, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

"ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR COTTON FOR 1957 AND 1958

"Sec. 403. Sec. 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the national marketing quota for cotton for 1957 and 1958 shall be not less than the number of bales required to provide a national acreage allotment for 1957 and 1958 equal to the national acreage allotment for 1956.'"

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the announcement of the Department of Agriculture that income from farm operations dropped another $1,014,000,000 in 1955 places an exclamation mark on the necessity for passage of the farm bill now being considered by this Senate.

Farm income has declined each year since 1951. Last year's estimated $10,770,000,000 in farm income for 1955 was 9 percent below the previous year.

We must take action to halt the downward trend and employ new approaches to push our great agricultural industry upward. I believe some of the provisions of S. 3183, which was reported by the Committee on Agriculture, will serve to accomplish this objective.

Any problem of the farmer is a problem of all the people of this Nation. We cannot separate the well-being and prosperity of the people on the land from the well-being and prosperity of all our people.

The farmers of this country not only clothe and feed our own people, they also provide the sustenance for a large part of the world. In fact they feed 60 percent of the entire world from food produced on 20 percent of the land. Food and fiber enter into the consideration of almost every economic, social, and political problem which we have to face.

Proof that action is vital to the well-being of the farmer and the Nation is contained in a further statement of the Department of Agriculture. This statement is that nonfarm per capita income climbed 5 percent last year, but farm per capita income dropped 6 percent.

Average per capita farm income last year amounted to only $860. Nonfarm income averaged $1,922 during the same period.

Mr. President, while Congress was in recess, I had the privilege of meeting with a number of farm groups in South Carolina. Everywhere I went and listened to the people tell of their problems, from one border to another in my State, there was one inescapable conclusion to be drawn: Not only are our farmers dangling over the precipice of severely declining farm income, they are also hanging by a thin economic thread over the chasm of rising production costs.

Prosperity is bypassing the farmer as he swings precariously between the fearful depths of higher costs and lower income.

Farm prices were at a record high in early 1951. Since that time, farm prices have fallen off as much as 25 percent. Ten percent of this decline took place during the past year. At the same time the items essential to farm operations have been increasing in price.

The Government price index of wholesale commodities illustrates my point. Calculated on the base of 1947–49, the index in December for industrials was 119.4 percent. The index for agriculture was only 83.3 percent, the lowest since June 1946. But in June 1946 when farm prices were low, they were still 2.8 points above industrials instead of 36.1 points below industrials as they were in December.

The first months of this year have given the farmer no hope for relief under the present situation. It is the duty of the Congress to find a means of providing relief to this vital segment of our national economy—a segment which cannot be separated from the economy of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, I commend the Senate Agriculture Committee for reporting S. 3183, which I believe is generally a good bill. I believe the enactment of this bill, with a few amendments, will be a good start toward rescuing our farmers from the brink of disaster.

The committee has acted especially wisely in approving a return to 90 percent of parity for crop loans on the basic commodities and in approving an increase in dairy support prices. These provisions, plus the application of a dual parity, as proposed by the committee, will help to insure that our farmers will receive a fair share of the total national income.

Advocates of flexible price supports argue that high price supports will create larger surpluses and that lower price

supports would make our surpluses disappear. Such an argument simply is not valid. As the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee has stated previously on the floor, the advocates of flexible supports overlook the fact that the basic commodities are under strict acreage controls and marketing quotas. The level of price supports will not affect the quantities of basic crops produced on the acres allotted to the farmers for such crops. The records show that lower price supports do not bring about a reduction in the number of bales of cotton or bushels of wheat produced on a certain acreage allotment. At the same time, the facts and figures of the Department of Agriculture show that high price supports do not increase the total production from a certain acreage allotment.

Opponents of high price supports have tried to make the people believe that farmers have been living off Government bounty. The truth is that payments to agriculture have cost little compared with the Government assistance given to industry since World War II.

Data prepared by a House Appropriations Subcommittee in 1954 showed that industry had received approximately $45 billion since the war, most of these payments being in the form of reconversion grants.

On the other hand, the Commodity Credit Corporation program in support of basic crops cost only $21 million during the first 21 years of operation. The support program on basic crops actually showed a profit of $13 million through 1951; and over the entire 21 years through fiscal 1954, the CCC cotton and tobacco programs earned a profit of more than a quarter of a billion dollars.

A guaranty of 90 percent of parity to our farmers will not provide them with any special treatment. Labor's income is protected by minimum wage and collective bargaining laws. Some protection is given industry through tariffs. Rate fixing by Government guards utilities with the assurance of profits; and business has fair-trade laws.

Anything we can do for the farmer will be in keeping with the established practices of protection to the other major segments of the national economy. And that is not to mention the billions of dollars we are spending overseas to prop up the economy of foreign countries.

The committee's proposal for the soil bank and conservation reserve is excellent. We must offer a plan for voluntary reduction of planting and I believe the soil bank is the right approach. The conservation provision also provides an important guaranty that our soil will be ready for future use in the event emergency demands for production should arise.

I approve also of the committee presentation of a plan for regaining this Nation's historic share of the world cotton market. Some of our surpluses must be sold and I believe the sale overseas of cotton is the right direction for the alleviation of this problem.

Such a program also should help to force the State Department to recognize the reasonableness of the requests made for the negotiation of quotas on the importation of textile goods.

Wisely provided for in the bill is an acreage protection plan for our small cotton farmers. However, I would like to see 2 percent instead of 1 percent of the national allotment of cotton set aside to guarantee the small-acreage cotton growers a minimum of not less than 4 acres or 100 percent of their acreage for the 3 prior years. I was cosponsor of such a bill last year.

I hope the Senate will support the Stennis amendment to prevent further reductions in cotton acreage in 1957 and 1958.

Many small farmers in the South depend on cotton as their money crop. Without adequate acreage to make a livelihood, they cannot continue to operate. I hope the Senate will support the amendment to accomplish this purpose.

In order to preserve our small farms and prevent acreage restrictions from driving more so-called little farmers off the land and many others into marginal operations, large corporation farms should be required to absorb more of the cutbacks. These larger farms can take greater percentage reductions of acreage and continue successful operations than the small farms can.

The loss of a single acre of a cotton allotment spells the difference between staying on the farm and being forced to seek other ways of making a living to many of our little farmers. I want to see those who want to stay on the farm be protected to the extent that they are not forced to give up.

I regret that the Agriculture Committee did not approve the request to place a dollar limit on the price-support system. This would have given further protection to the family-size farm.

Mr. President, the farm family was a basic unit in the development of our great country. I believe it will be just as basic in the preservation of the American way of life as it was in the establishment of the Nation. Strong moral, spiritual, and physical qualities—so essential to a great nation—are learned early in the farm family.

I hope the Senate will take such action on this bill now before us which will preserve this vital element in American life. I plan to support most of the provisions of S. 3183 and I believe it to be in the best interests of the Nation that the bill be enacted into law with minor alterations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point resolutions adopted by the Orangeburg County Farm Bureau, which has been sent to me by its president, Mr. F. Mitchell Ott. The Orangeburg County Farm Bureau has more than 1,500 member families.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION FOR 90-PERCENT PARITY

Whereas the economic position of the Orangeburg County farmers is in jeopardy as a result of continuously falling farm prices and increasing farm costs; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture is predicting even further price declines and increased costs in 1956; and

Whereas the sliding scale of farm-price supports holds no promise of correcting the situation; and

Whereas that the so-called modern parity formula will tend to lower parity prices on most basic crops: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the farmers here in Orangeburg, S. C., strongly recommend support prices to be restored to parity on all basic crops and that the so-called modern parity formula be discarded; be it further

Resolved, That we support a minimum 90 percent of parity support price program for any basic commodity when an acreage allotment and marketing quota program is in effect on that commodity.

RESOLUTION FOR SOIL BANK ACT

Be it resolved, That soil bank plan as proposed in the present Congress gives little promise of fair prices, and must not be accepted as of much help as to prices this year but only as a long-term measure.

Whereas we favor the development of a sound soil fertility bank program as a supplement to, and not as a substitute for, present farm programs.

RESOLUTION FOR IMPORTS

Resolved, That this assembled group of farmers go on record in opposition to any importation of farm products that are being produced in surplus in the United States.

Whereas we oppose changing basis for support price on cotton from ⅞-inch middling to 1-inch middling. We support ⅞-inch middling as basis.

Whereas we recommend the establishment of lower grades than presently provided for cotton eligible for price supports. We also urge price support commensurate with grade be given on all split grades of cotton.

RESOLUTION FOR EXPANDED SCHOOL LUNCH

Whereas the health of our young people of these great United States should be of paramount concern; and

Whereas the surpluses of our country merit the consideration of a stamp plan to get surplus commodities into the hands of the needy, underprivileged and tax-supported institutions, such as mental hospitals, schools for the blind, and the like: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge immediate adoption of a stamp plan for increasing the amount of surplus commodities for use of our school-lunch program, to the needy, aged, and the underprivileged when in tax-supported institutions.

We urge you to do all in your power to get legislation passed before planting time of our basic crops in the South.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the debate on the pending measure has developed the largest number of queer inconsistencies I have ever seen with reference to any one measure debated on this floor since I have been a Member of the Senate.

In the first place, with reference to the cotton problem, which has just been mentioned by my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], it is being seriously urged by a group of Senators that cotton be restored to 90 percent high, rigid price supports, when the Members of the Senate who know most about the cotton industry—and I am referring particularly to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]—and when large organizations in the cotton industry, without any exception, say that it is simply committing hara-kiri of the most

complete sort for the cotton industry to continue to force itself to the high level price supports which have already priced cotton out of the foreign markets of the world and, in addition, have opened the door to the much more serious competition from synthetic products here at home.

It sounds almost as if people had not read the RECORD, when such a position is taken with reference to the cotton industry.

Mr. President, the same thing might be said with reference to each of the other industries involved in this program. However, I shall particularly mention corn.

Corn is the industry which has shown the queerest group of inconsistencies in the program of any large commodity which is covered by high price supports. It is the commodity which has not had to observe the requirement of allotments, but, instead, has been permitted to ignore allotments, bringing about such a queer state of affairs that the record is full of statements by corn producers such as, "Yes, we took our allotment when we could sell our crop and seal it with Uncle Sam, because we knew our neighbors were not accepting their allotments and had overplanted, and we could therefore buy corn from them and feed our stock at prices much below the price for which we sold our corn to Uncle Sam."

Mr. President, that is not honest. It is not decent.

I see no excuse in the world for anyone seriously to contend on the floor of the Senate that it would be thinkable to restore high 90 percent rigid price supports to corn, the largest single grain industry we have and the backbone of our livestock and meat industries.

Mr. President, I could continue making comments with reference to various industries, but I prefer not to do so tonight, because the hour is so late.

The entire bill as reported by a scant majority of the committee, 8 to 7, evidences a complete inconsistency in that it has two main programs pulling directly in opposition to each other.

The soil-bank program is very fine. I shall have more to say about it later on in the debate. It is designed to take out of production a large productive acreage, and, thereby, to cut down our surpluses.

And then there is the suggestion seriously made by some that we restore the 90 percent high rigid price supports which everyone knows have been a heavy contributing factor to the production of the surpluses we have and will have again, because it will force production on every acre that is planted when the farmer knows that by forcing production he can get a 90 percent price support, and that he can gain by tightening up the rows, pouring on more fertilizer, and doing everything he can to increase production to the highest possible level. We are going to see happen in every area where that can be done exactly what happened in the potato industry a few years ago.

How short is our memory, Mr. President? Can we forget quickly that with the potato industry cut to 60 percent and with acreage reduced, nevertheless, the farmers contracted their rows, planted more hills in a row, and fertilized to the point where they produced a great quantity of potatoes to be sold to Uncle Sam, many of which were later burned, costing the United States practically half a billion dollars in the 2 or 3 years of its operation?

To me, Mr. President, it is sort of a crazy-quilt bill which offers as its 2 main programs 2 things so inconsistent as the soil bank and the 90 percent rigid price supports. I said the other day that it was exactly like putting a cart on the top of a hill, hitching 1 strong horse to it so that he could go in 1 direction, and hitching another strong horse to pull it in the opposite direction, whipping both horses into a frenzy and expecting to get somewhere in a hurry. It simply does not make sense.

The next inconsistency is the part of the bill which seriously pretends that the 90 percent rigid price support can with impunity be returned to that part of the industry which has had it heretofore, which happens to be the only part of agriculture which has suffered severely under present conditions.

Mr. President, there are a few other commodities which suffer to some extent, but most of the other agricultural industries are prosperous, as, for example, the tree-fruit industries, which are a very large group. By their own efforts, their own advertising, their own salesmanship, and their own expertness, they have brought themselves back since the Korean episode was over until almost everyone of them is prosperous. That is true of the production of small fruits, and of the production of watermelons, strawberries, nuts, and a great part of the dairy industry which is not in the few States, about seven of them, where more milk is produced than can be consumed in the local area. All the rest of the dairy industry is prosperous.

Mr. President, we cannot go into Virginia or Maryland, near Washington, without being acutely conscious of the fact that some of the most prosperous farm homes and farmsteads we have ever seen are those which are occupied—and I am happy that it is so—by people who produce such excellent milk for the million and a half persons who are served by them in the greater Washington area.

The same thing can be said of Richmond, Atlanta, Louisville, Miami, Jacksonville, New Orleans, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Houston, Dallas, Denver, and I do not know how many other places.

The record shows that dairy products sold to Uncle Sam came almost entirely from seven States, and that the dairy industry in the United States as a whole is prosperous. Why? Because it is attending to its business; because it recognizes the immutable law of supply and demand; because it advertises its products; because it sells a good product; because it has gained in its distribution machinery. It is a very competent, very fine, and very successful industry.

Mr. President, it does not make sense for this bill to provide that the part of the agricultural industry to which we are going to restore 90 percent high, rigid price supports is the only part which has had them heretofore and the only part which is badly sick in the Nation, when almost everyone who checks the facts knows that that very structure was one of the most compelling reasons why those industries are sick at this time.

So, there is another startling inconsistency in this proposed legislation.

I am sorry that my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is not present. Probably he has become exhausted by much speaking in the course of this debate. But I thought he would enjoy my observations with reference to his bringing into the RECORD and relying very heavily in his long and exhaustive debate upon the survey made by the Grain Terminal Association covering a certain number of counties in 5 States—Minnesota, Wisconsin, the 2 Dakotas, and Montana.

I have read that survey very carefully. I have even read the debate of the Senator from Minnesota with reference to it. The outstanding facts about the survey itself, and about the Senator's comments concerning it, are that the survey itself presents the most compelling sort of a case against the arguments of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, because the 4 years covered by that survey are the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954. They show a progressive decline in the farming prosperity in the areas covered.

It is remarked at one place in the survey that the commodities raised during those 4 years were under 90 percent price supports, and the survey clearly shows that producers were getting sicker and sicker and less and less prosperous all the time; more and more of them were going out of business, and more and more farms were being concentrated into larger farms in the hands of others who were more efficient.

Mr. President, here is another one of the inconsistencies in this bill. The distinguished Senator seriously offers a survey made over a period of time during which in every year of the period the 90 percent rigid price supports prevailed, and with a long face he told us of the results of the bad conditions which prevailed, and that the industries in the area covered by the survey were drifting down to less and less prosperity and to bankruptcy, seriously contending that they do not have the 90-percent price supports any more and they must have them right back—presumably to continue the decline which they sustained during the years shown by the survey.

There are many other inconsistencies which I would be happy to point out, but time does not permit me to do so. The thing which has disturbed me most in the course of the debate, and I have been following it carefully, as the distinguished Senator who occupies the chair knows—and I have been following the hearings carefully for more than a year, although I was not able to attend some of the hearings last summer, but I did attend hearings in the great Northwest and in the great Northeast—and the thing which disturbed me most in the course of the hearings was the completely clear showing that the system under which agriculture has been

living, the high, rigid price support system, has been doing terrible things to the people who have been relying upon that support structure rather than upon themselves and their own thinking, their own planning, their own curtailing of production, and their considering of the quality of their product so they could meet the demands of the market which they were serving.

Mr. President, what I am about to say will not be a reflection upon any area. Certainly, it will not be a reflection upon any of the individuals whom I shall mention, because certainly, if anyone ever received kind and courteous treatment in the course of the hearings, I did; and I am certain that is true of every member of the committee.

I would be negligent and derelict in my duty if I did not show affirmatively in the RECORD that the very people who have had 90 percent price supports, and are now "hollering," many of them, for 100 percent price supports, have been sustained by their crutches so long that they do not know how to take an independent step. The distinguished chairman of the committee, who is now the Presiding Officer of the Senate, knows that to be true. We heard more pleas for 100 percent price supports in the areas where 90 percent has been the rule heretofore—and I make special mention of the States of Minnesota and the two Dakotas—than we did for 90 percent or for any other fixed kind of support in other areas.

There are so many instances of them in the RECORD that it would take the rest of the night for me to put them all into the debate. But I wish to put just a few instances in the RECORD to evidence what I am saying here with all seriousness, and that is that I think we are a party to taking away from agricultural people that fine independence, that splendid conservativeness, that fine willingness to stand up and fight for themselves, for which American agriculture has always been noted, if we continue to give them this crutch. I think that was so clearly demonstrated that it should be shown in the RECORD.

I first call attention to the testimony of Harold Golseth, vice president of the South Dakota Farmers Union, Irwin, S. Dak., which appears at pages 951 and following of the printed hearings. This is part of his statement:

> We urge the enactment into law of House Resolution 12 at the earliest possible time in this next session of Congress, as a short-range policy. But as a long-range farm policy, we recommend a farm program based on 100 parity price supports for family farm or ranch production.

Mr. Golseth continues at great length to justify the case for 100 percent parity price supports. Dozens and dozens and dozens of witnesses throughout the whole area did the same thing. Their program was not confined to 100 percent price supports for the basics, but it included 100 percent price supports for all kinds of agricultural commodities, both perishable and otherwise. That fact was reiterated again and again, in spite of the fact that the members of the committee, of whom I was one, reminded the witnesses that there were many elements in our farm economy which did not want price supports, which were not asking for price supports, and which were more prosperous than those elements in agriculture which were leaning on price supports.

Nevertheless, the witnesses came back with the statement that they must have 100 percent price supports on everything the farmer produced, provided it was produced on a family-unit farm.

That is the next item on which I wish to comment, because to my mind the idea of picking out a family-unit farm—and I think it was defined for us in about 20 different ways—and asking the Government to uphold a certain limited type of production, while not doing so for the more prosperous, more efficient farmers, who are larger operators because they have earned the right to a bigger place in the farm economy, and the idea of simply pleading as the witnesses did, over and over again, for a redistribution of the land and a better division of the profits of the land, is not, in my opinion, sound Americanism. I think it is socialism of the rankest kind. I do not find it existing anywhere in United States agriculture except in those places where the high, rigid price support system has sapped the morale and taken over the independence and fine qualities of our farm people to a degree which I certainly do not like to see exist.

The next comment I make is with reference to the testimony of a fine gentleman, Mr. R. A. Englehorn, of Menno, S. Dak., which appears on page 1074 of the printed hearings.

I shall not ask that all of his statement be placed in the RECORD, but I ask unanimous consent that the part which I have indicated be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> We feel that American agriculture is an important and necessary segment of the total American society and is, therefore, entitled to its fair share of the national wealth, demanding that in such a society all farm operators are entitled to 100 percent of parity.
>
> First and foremost is a Federal program operated and supervised at the grassroots level by the farmers which has for its goal 100-percent parity.
>
> The first step in attaining that goal, we ask for 100 percent of parity support prices on nonperishable farm products and on perishable goods, where possible.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to read a few sentences from Mr. Englehorn's testimony:

> We feel that American agriculture is an important and necessary segment of the total American society and is, therefore, entitled to its fair share of the national wealth, demanding that in such a society all farm operators are entitled to 100 percent of parity.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The first step in attaining that goal, we ask for 100 percent of parity support prices on nonperishable farm products and on perishable goods, where possible.

That was repeated over and over again.

I next come to the statement of Mr. Einar G. Grande, legislative director of the Towner Country Farmers Union, Bisbee, N. Dak., which begins on page 1147 of the printed hearings. I refer to a portion of Mr. Grande's statement on page 1152.

Mr. Grande said:

> Get me straight, I want a guaranteed price, 100 percent parity—100 percent parity is the man I am. One hundred percent parity for those 2,000 bushels. And any time I go to work and market over those 2,000 bushels, I want to be penalized, and penalized so heavy it will discourage me to keep it on the farm.

Two thousand bushels was his figure of of a family-unit production. He actually wants discouragement of production over a meager measure of living. He continued:

> There is no man that can make any program work unless you control every item we have on the farm. You might say it is regimentation. I just say that is all hooey, for this reason. If you are going to help us, you have got to help us all out or not.

There was more of the same thing.

Mr. President, I do not want the Senate to think of those witnesses as being irresponsible or weak persons. They were not. I talked to many of them. Many of them were of fine, sturdy Scandinavian stock. They had come into the areas of Minnesota and the Dakotas when the going was rough. They had carved out their farmsteads against all kinds of difficulties interposed by nature.

To me, it was a pitiful thing to see that they had lost that courage, that fine independence, that willingness to stand alone.

I want the Senate to know that the demands for higher price supports will not be ended if the Senate should vote for 90 percent price supports. To the contrary, because the demand for 100 percent price supports came from many persons whose independence has been sapped by too much reliance upon a benevolent Government.

I next quote briefly from the statement of Mr. Morris Nelson, president of the Bowman County Farmers Union, Bowman, N. Dak., appearing at page 1244 of the hearings. Mr. Bowman also was a very fine gentlemen, but his testimony was of the same nature. He was reporting for the whole convention of the farmers of his county who belonged to the Farmers Union, which had been held, as he said, only on the Saturday previous to the date of his testimony. Mr. Nelson said:

> The folks were very positive in their demand for 100 percent of real parity on the farm for all farm commodities, which is only establishing economic justice for farmers with other segments of our society.

There was more of the same.

The next statement on which I wish to comment is that of a very fine old fellow, Rudolph A. Reinpold, legislative director of the Stutsman County Farmers Union. This would be almost humorous, if we wanted to regard it so; but to me it is quite the opposite. In his direct testimony Reinpold said something about wanting to be restored to the gravy train days of the 90 percent price supports. So I questioned him.

I said:

I must have misunderstood you.

This was later in the testimony.

I understood you to say, so long as the gravy train ran, you were in good shape. And you wanted the gravy train to start running again, is that it?

He did not understand the question, so I repeated it. This was his answer:

Positively. The gravy train—what I had in mind all of those years when we had billions of dollars, all of us in the Nation, we all got our share out of those billions, it was out to win the Second World War, and also the Korean war, and now just to compare, within 3 years, then and now, a plow was $5, now almost $10. Everything else accordingly.

This gravy train that we accumulated during the other years is depleted now. There is none left any more. Our surplus uses it up.

Mr. President, it is sort of pitiful to see reduced to a philosophy of that kind persons of the fine sturdiness of character and quality which was exemplified by that fine gentleman and by others.

Mr. President, I am sorry to say that there was a tremendous contrast between the testimony we heard in that part of the country where there had been these high rigid price supports, and that which we heard in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. We had only two hearings in that area, one at Montpelier and one at Utica, but we had witnesses from nine States.

There was only one witness from the nine States who took a position of far-reaching import, a witness named Wright, and his testimony is to be found on page 3172 of the hearings.

Here is his thinking on the matter. Incidentally, he belonged to a different kind of farmers union. It had the same name, but he made it clear he was not identified with the Farmers Union.

Mr. President, I shall not read all his statement. I shall ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD, but here are some of the things he said when we asked him about 100 percent. He said:

Probably, the original advocates of the Brannan plan had in mind 100 percent of parity. Personally, I think that eventually this country is going to have to go beyond 100 percent of parity to bring about anything like equitable individual farm income.

And so on. Much more of the same was said.

This same witness was one of those who said he was for redistribution of the land and redivision of the land income so as to better take care of the farming population.

I cannot read all of his statement, but I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, so that it may appear in the RECORD tomorrow.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HOLLAND. Well, now, the Brannan plan involved 100-percent price supports; did it not?

Mr. WRIGHT. No; not my understanding of it. The selling price of the product was in a free market, and the compensatory payments to the farmers would be at some level above that, presumably determined by the Congress. Probably, the original advocates of the Brannan plan had in mind 100 percent of parity. Personally, I think that eventually this country is going to have to go beyond 100 percent of parity to bring about anything like equitable individual farm income.

Senator HOLLAND. Then you think that this program should be aimed at more than 100 percent of parity?

Mr. WRIGHT. I can see no prosperity for the farmers in price returns to them around 100 percent of parity.

Senator HOLLAND. You remember that the Brannan plan also covered perishables; do you not?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. Fruits, vegetables, and the like?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Senator HOLLAND. Is that your recommendation also?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir; I think that it should be an across-the-board program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I notice there is no question about this position being taken seriously by the national officers of the National Farmers Union. On pages 3422 and following of the record appears the testimony of Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union. I shall not further weary the already weary Members of the Senate by quoting from much of his statement, but there is one thing which shows so well how impractical these people are, and how thoroughly they are agreeing to live off the public body and out of public taxation, that I want to quote a little colloquy I had with him on his suggestion that he thought 100-percent price supports should be made retroactive and effective for the 1955 crop. I was questioning the president of the National Farmers Union and he was answering the questions:

Senator HOLLAND. Now, let us come to this question that you raise, that I have not heard raised before—maybe it has been raised by someone—that you propose to have the Treasury go out of balance by devoting several billion dollars for 100 percent price-support payments for 1955, which is already behind them.

Do you know how much that would cost?

Mr. PATTON. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. How much?

Mr. PATTON. We were talking before you came in. Somewhere between four and five billion dollars.

Senator HOLLAND. Then you propose by this one recommendation, if you found that you could have it passed through the Congress and approved by the President, to disturb the balanced budget to the tune of between four and five billion dollars; is that correct?

Mr. PATTON. It would not be disturbed by anywhere near that much because it would put a tremendous amount of purchasing power into circulation. It would enable farmers to pay taxes who were not going to be paying any income taxes this year.

So he claims the amount of the deficit would be less than that total, and I think that is sound.

I asked him again:

Senator HOLLAND. And you are making that request for all producers, although you have conceded, as I understand, that a large number of the producers as shown by their commodity organizations are not only asking for this 1955 handout, but are not supporting your program for the future?

Mr. PATTON. I do not think it is a handout, in the first place. In the second place, I doubt that there would be as many as 1 percent who would refuse the check. I know they did not when the benefit payments were going. Some of those who talked loudest against it were always willing to cash the checks.

In other words, it is completely all right if the citizen is willing to take and cash the check which the Government offered him.

Senator HOLLAND. How would you propose to make up the deficit in the budget, which is a very large deficit in the budget, which you would inflict on the country if this particular provision were adopted?

Mr. PATTON. You asked me that question. I personally think that it would be good fiscal policy to unbalance the budget for this purpose. We have unbalanced it for a lot of other purposes that probably did not have as much validity as this.

Senator HOLLAND. You are one, then, who feels that an unbalanced budget is nothing to be concerned about?

Mr. PATTON. I do not think it is a major concern as long as you have full employment and as long as you have long range fiscal plans for balancing it. We should not have reduced taxes when we did.

In other words, because he thought a mistake was made some years ago in the reduction of taxes, he was perfectly willing to be a party to a handout now of between $4 billion and $5 billion and unbalancing the budget by a large part of that amount. More to the same effect follows.

Mr. President, there are various statements in the record with respect to the question of redistribution, which I shall not read in their entirety at this time.

I ask unanimous consent that quotations from the statement of Mr. Glenn J. Talbott, vice president of the National Farmers Union, appearing at page 245 of the 1949 hearings, which are marked in red, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. TALBOTT. Going back beyond the point that you mentioned, I should like to have our position completely clear, my own and that of the organization. We should like to see the kind of farm program legislation, call it what you will, sufficiently punitive on the industrialized type of agriculture to make it unprofitable for the 90,000-acre Tom Campbell farms in wheat, with hired men for 30 days in the spring and another 30 days in the fall. That land then would be available to hundreds of family-type farmers who might find a home and a way to make a living on that land.

We are seeking there to deal with the problem of population pressure on the land which is probably not going to get better, because geographically and physically we cannot make more land available. I want our position to be perfectly clear about that. That is what we seek.

We do not like that type of agriculture. We want those kinds of land resources available. We want the men and women and children who are willing to work on them to be able to make a home on them and to become a part of a good sound rural community in America.

Senator ANDERSON. Would you want it to be sufficiently punitive to clean out Mr. Kleberg's situation and Russell Gifford's as well?

Mr. TALBOTT. Yes; clear across the board, whether it is cotton, dairy products, chickens, or whatever it is.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. L. O. Grasdalen, which appears at page 450 of this year's record, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HOLLAND. I recall that the national officer of one of the large farm organizations, who advanced that same idea in one of our hearings sometime ago, coupled with that statement a statement that he favored redistribution of land as well as redistribution of profits of the land as made by the farmers. Is that your idea?

Mr. GRASDALEN. Right.

Senator HOLLAND. That is your idea?

Mr. GRASDALEN. It could be, yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Oswald K. Ophaug, of the Nelson County Farmers Union, of Petersburg, N. Dak., be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. OPHAUG. All right. You know, we had a Homestead Act here. The Homestead Act was to establish—by the Homestead Act we established the traditional family farm.

What I think we have to do in the United States is to get back to this traditional family farm. And by so doing, I think we will get back to the place where land is more equally distributed among the people.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Farmers Union plan. We had it here this morning. Several of these witnesses testified to that.

Mr. OPHAUG. Why, certainly, the Farmers Union is for the family-sized farm.

The CHAIRMAN. That is their plan. So that is nothing new. We have had it, not only here, but in every State we have been.

Mr. OPHAUG. What I consider new, Mr. Chairman, is that we have in order that any farm program will be successful, we have to more equally distribute the land among the people. No matter how good the farm program is that we have, it will never be successful unless that happens.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in each case the witness makes it very clear that he and his organization stand seriously for redistribution of the land and redistribution of the wealth of the land.

There is one statement made by Mr. Helge E. Nygren, president of the Morton County Farmers Union, of Flasher, N. Dak., from which it may be worthwhile to quote a word or two. It is to the same general effect, but he did testify under considerable questioning from me. He said it was, in his judgment, necessarily a part of any program to restore prosperity to farmers and farming that there be redivision of the land. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] who was present and wanted to be sure he was protecting a citizen of his State, since the witness was a citizen of North Dakota, asked this question:

Senator YOUNG. I would like to ask you one question. I am wondering if you want to leave the record stand as you made it. Do you believe steps should be taken to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few or do you believe in the redistribution of the land?

He had said he did believe in the redistribution of the land. This was his answer:

Mr. NYGREN. I believe this: It is not necessary as yet to take any drastic measures, but I believe there should be a start made toward redistributing the land wherever it is necessary. And I think these people that have to work on these factories in the field should be consulted to that extent. If it is their wish to have a boss, to tell them when they must come and go, if that is the kind of a life they want, let those have it, but those that object, and want a place of their own, they should have a right and a chance to buy one.

That is the kind of thinking which is taking place. It seems to me that socialism pure and simple, and of the rankest sort, is prevailing in that area where rigid high price supports have taken away the independence and the sturdiness of quality of men, many of whom were, as I have said, of Scandinavian ancestry.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has very ably pointed out the course and its result, but does he not think in the long run the really bad effect to the farmer of rigid high supports will be to place the farmer further and further in a hole from which he will have a hard time getting out?

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly do. I thank the distinguished Senator for his statement.

I am happy to report that in that area where they have had high price supports all of the people have not given evidence of the abjectly low morale which has been indicated in the quotations I have given.

For instance, here is the testimony of a full-blooded American Indian from Lake Park, Minn. He was of fine appearance, and has had a college education. He made a fine impression on all of us. I remember that the distinguished chairman of the committee had a colloquy with him; and here is what that witness had to say:

To me, we as farmers have been whitewashed so many times and taught and encouraged to depend on our Government so far—

Mr. President, I glory in the words of this young Indian—

That it is only a matter of time that we will be in the position of the early American Indian. This only means one thing to me, which is slavery or bondage. There is no other end when you become a ward of a government.

Another misleading phrase is the family-sized farm. That statement is as camouflaged as a horned toad.

Mr. President, that witness was a young man who is a pure-blooded American Indian.

I read further from his statement to the committee:

I have seen families go broke on an 80-acre farm. I have seen a family move on the same farm and prosper through all economic conditions.

In other words, his point is that the difference is in the quality of the individual and the way he goes at it. He gave other testimony of the same sort.

I read further from his testimony:

I believe a good farm program would be one without manmade controls and Government prices. We can make it; my father did, and he raised 12 children. We had no Government relief; we did not need it.

It is a good American program; let's get back to it, Mr. Senator and farm leader. Let's get back to believing in doing what you want and how you want to do and can best do freely. Above all, let's trust in God for guidance and security. We will win.

Mr. President, I thought it was a valuable commentary on what America has been drifting into to have that young, pure-blooded American Indian, who has had the benefit of a college training, however, and of the prosperity which he has attained on his farm, come before the committee and tell that group of Senators, representing a very, very distinguished committee—and I am always very happy to claim membership on the committee, where all my colleagues are so distinguished—what is the real essence of Americanism, whether on the farm or anywhere else. I am proud of that witness, and I wanted to make that portion of his testimony a part of the record here.

Mr. President, I was never more proud than I was when the committee was taking testimony in New England, of the steadfastness and sturdy character of those who have difficulty making a living from land which does not have the fertility or the wide-open spaces or the great acreage available to those of us who live in other parts of the country. From the mouths of the witnesses who came from six New England States, we did not hear any testimony which indicated that they want to be dependent on the Government, that they want 100 percent price supports or any other kind of hand-out from the Government. On the contrary, those people of New England—and I gloried in the testimony we heard from them all day long, while the committee was at Montpelier, Vt.—were simply asking that we give them the tools with which to work, such as marketing agreements, cooperative plans, and information from research departments, such as market reports and similar things, so as to let them handle their own plants and breeding operations—most of them are dairy farmers—and let them handle their markets and their increased distribution. They brag as much as a New Englander can brag—of course New Englanders cannot brag as much as some of us from other parts of the country can; but very quietly and very modestly they spoke of how they have greatly improved their position during the past few years by advertising heavily in the two areas or milksheds where they supply a large part of their milk, and in that way have increased the area of their operations.

For instance, Mr. President, let me read only a small part of the statement the committee received from Donald L. Smith, executive secretary of the Vermont Cooperative Council, of Barre, Vt. I read now from page 3030 of the hearings. I shall read only a small part of the statement he made. At the point

from which I shall read, he was answering a question which I asked him. He said, in part:

We would like to have the cooperatives, the farmers, solve their problems through cooperatives wherever possible, instead of turning to the Government.

That indicates the thinking and the character and the position taken by those who testified before the committee, coming from the Granite State and from the other New England States.

Next, Mr. President, let me read from a statement by Mr. Stacey W. Cole, of West Swanzey, N. H. I read now from page 3106 of the hearings:

Flexible price supports will work if given a chance. They are already beginning to prove their worth. High, rigid price supports are a menace to agriculture under usual conditions. To me as a poultryman they often force me to pay higher prices than necessary for grain—

And so forth. A little later he said:

Personally, I feel that such procedures as I have outlined—

He talked about cooperatives and all the other tools producers can use—

are as far as Government should go in helping stabilize prices. To go further is to take from the hands of the farmer his right to make major decisions as to how he shall operate. Personally, if Congress is going to make laws to take away my right to decide how I operate my farm, I'd definitely rather not farm.

We received similar testimony from Mr. Evans H. Barrett, of Keene, N. H.; and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his statement, as marked by me in a copy of the hearings, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EVANS H. BARRETT, KEENE, N. H.

Mr. BARRETT. My name is Evans H. Barrett of Keene, N. H., dairy farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything new to add to what has already been said?

Mr. BARRETT. I do not know as I have anything new. I just feel that the quicker Government gets out of business, and gets out of farming, the better off the farming industry is going to be.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you want us to go to Washington next year and cancel out the law that now gives you the right to get into these marketing agreements and get a pretty good price?

Mr. BARRETT. So far as I am concerned, I wish they would cancel everything they have given to the farmers. I can pay my own bills. And when I cannot pay them, I can drive nails or I can nail on shingles. I have not got to farm.

Every farmer in the United States has the opportunity to farm or not farm as he sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not all carpenters, you are.

Mr. BARRETT. I am not a carpenter, but you do not have to be a carpenter to get $2 an hour. And all of these farmers are working for 50 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. So you would be satisfied if we could arrange for everybody to start from scratch?

Mr. BARRETT. They do not have to start from scratch. This forever ladling out from Washington, I believe that the administration of the benefits we get on the farms cost three times the benefits we finally derive from the tax money that is taken from the people and ultimately gets back to the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything else?

Mr. BARRETT. I just want to go on record as saying that these people that are looking for payments and subsidies want to run and look at Russia. If they want socialized farming, let them go to Russia. We have got a free country, and we have got free enterprise. And everybody is his own master here in these United States. It just seems too bad to me that these people get right up and look at Rusisa and sit right here and tell you they want to be paid to farm. [Applause.]

Senator HOLLAND. I wish the gentleman would stop long enough to say one thing more for the record. Just what do you produce? You say that you are a dairy farmer?

Mr. BARRETT. I milk 100 cows. I set 5,000 sap buckets, cut a little cord wood, and in spare time I am a city counselor.

Mr. HOLLAND. The committee received similar testimony from Dean K. Webster, Jr., president of H. K. Webster Co., of Lawrence, Mass.; and I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from his statement to the committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The year 1954 for the poultry industry was one of overproduction, low prices, and general losses to most producers, disaster to many. Without price supports, and with the free play of supply and demand, the pressure of low prices has caused the adjustment of production which was necessary, and 1955 finds the poultrymen again in a healthy condition—production more in line with demand and satisfactory prices prevailing. Efficient producers have weathered the storm and marginal producers have had to drop out. Picture if we may what might have taken place had a price-support program been undertaken for eggs and poultry meat in 1954 (if such indeed were actually responsible to carry out). Temporary price benefits would have kept marginal producers in business and encourage efficient producers to expand. The adjustment of production to fit demand would have been postponed, a period of unregulated excess production would very soon compel Government controls, and the poultry industry would be sick for a long time to come.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. You mean that the poultry people by their own initiative have put their house in order?

Mr. WEBSTER. Yes, sir, by staying out of price supports the natural sources of supply and demand have brought them back into shape.

Senator HOLLAND. The poultry industry can bring its house into order in a relatively quicker time than almost any other agricultural industry, can it not?

Mr. WEBSTER. That is probably true, but that is a matter of degree. When you make it profitable enough by price supports to keep all of these marginal producers in business they will stay in business, and they will not be eliminated until there is an economic pressure. I do not advocate throwing the whole thing over by any means. I advocate a flexible program of reducing the thing gradually until finally you have enough free markets again.

The New England poultrymen and dairymen have looked upon the Federal Government's price support programs for basic commodities with much skepticism and have generally adhered to the basic economic philosophy of free markets. We believe that in the long run any attempt to hold prices at a level above cost of production on efficient farms tends to continue and extend production of marginal inefficient producers and postpone, not prevent, adjustment which eventually must take place; and it is highly probable that the immediate benefits under artificial price support are illusory in that the overall long-range economic effects are distinctly harmful. In support of this reasoning we quote a few case histories.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that even some of the old and conservative agencies in the Dakotas were shocked by the disclosures made by the testimony taken by the committee there. In one case a newspaper which editorially was supporting, in large part, the farmers' request, had not realized what was going to take place that day at the hearings. So when the hearing was held, the Bismarck Tribune, in its issue of Saturday, October 29, came out with streaming headlines, across the top of the page, "Land Redistribution Asked"; and that newspaper proceeded to quote some of the witnesses who stated some of the difficulties I have mentioned here today; and that was the feeling everywhere.

I have confidence that if we stand our ground and give agriculture a chance to regain the essential character of independence it has had, by tapering off some of these programs, and by giving the farmers a chance to determine what the market will take, as we do under the flexible program, we shall see speedy results and speedy resumption of sanity in agricultural thinking throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, there is one other thing I shall say. It is quite unpleasant for me to say it, but I think it should be said here. Before I say it, I wish to state that I do not have the faintest idea that either the officers or the members of the National Farmers Union are Communists or communistic, or that they have the slightest idea that their program is as close to the program announced by the American Communist Party as it is. But, Mr. President, the announced program of the American Communist Party happens to be pegged on exactly the same provision as that stated in the National Farmers Union program, and as testified to us at numerous times in our hearings, and as filed with us in resolutions, time after time, making as their first request 100 percent of parity on all agricultural commodities, whether perishable or storable.

Now I shall quote from the pamphlet issued by the national farm commission of the Communist Party of the United States of America, 832 Broadway, New York 3, published last year. It gives the Communist program for agriculture. It begins on page 9. I shall not quote all of it; but in justice to the Senators who now are on the floor, I think I should read the first plank in that platform or program, which is identical with that of the National Farmers Union. I doubt if more than 1 percent of the membership and officers of the National Farmers Union know that that is the case.

1. Halt the drop in farm prices. Guarantee full 100 percent parity for all farm products.

I continue:

Production payments should be made directly to the farmers, sharecroppers, and

tenants to guarantee at least 100-percent parity on all farm commodities. Such payments would make up the difference between what the farmers get in the market and the full parity level, thereby benefiting both consumers and growers. Support levels to be announced well in advance of planting.

To encourage small and family-type farming, payments under this program should be limited to $15,000 worth of production per year (equivalent to 1,000 units under the Brannan program of price supports).

That is the second plank in the Farmers Union program.

Every farm would be eligible for this coverage, but large-scale farms would not take the lion's share of payments, as at present.

Under no circumstances should small and family-sized farms be required to reduce their production.

Not only is the idea similar, but that program is completely identical with the key program of the National Farmers Union. The record should very clearly show that such is the case, because I think there are tens of thousands of good farmers throughout the country who are supporting the leadership of the National Farmers Union and the program announced by that organization, who have not the faintest idea that they are treading as closely as they are to the Communist line.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am a little surprised to hear, although the Senator absolved the leadership of the Farmers Union, of the alleged strange similarity between the Farmers Union program for the family-sized farm, calling for 100-percent support prices, and that of the Communist Party.

Mr. HOLLAND. One hundred percent for both storables and perishables—for everything produced.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator has been in this body long enough to know that about 80 percent of the progressive legislation advocated by the Democratic Party has been copied and aped by the Communist Party. About 75 or 80 percent of the progressive programs of the CIO and the AFL have been aped and copied by the Communist Party. There is a continual process of aping and copying such programs in an effort to obtain an opportunity to claim that the Communists are liberal and progressive because they select certain specific social programs which are advocated by the political parties, by farm organizations, by labor organizations, and other organizations. I suppose there may be imitation or aping even of the National Association of Manufacturers on some points. The Communists ape or imitate anything that looks good, in an effort to deceive the people of America into thinking that communism is not a despicable totalitarianism. They are glad to put on false faces.

I am a little surprised to hear the distinguished Senator from Florida, who is so able and capable in his discussion of issues, use the fact that the Communists happen to ape a part of the Farmers Union program in assembling their own program as a basis for saying that we who support this program may inadvertently be supporting the Communist-endorsed program.

The same situation obtains with respect to every piece of progressive legislation we have enacted during the past 20 years, including social security, unemployment insurance, wage and hour legislation, old-age assistance, and many fine programs which the Senator has vigorously supported. Most of those programs have been aped by the Communist Party.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for his comments, many of which are entirely correct. However, I do not think he was present in the Chamber earlier when I remarked that in my judgment this program is the essence of socialism. I repeat that statement. I do not think it is any diminution of the proof of that statement when we find the Communist Party announcing it as the first plank in its farm program. To me it is the essence of socialism, and the exact contradiction of sound Americanism, to talk about a program under which the Government is held to owe its people who happen to be farmers 100 percent price support for everything they raise, whether storable or perishable. Also, there is the proviso that the farm must not exceed the value of a 1-family farm.

The announcement of the program makes it very clear that the objective which the organization has in mind is the redistribution of the land and a more equitable division of the products of the soil.

If the Senator wishes to say that this program, whether it be the same as that of the Communists or not, is not socialism, if he wishes to say that it is good sound Americanism, all I can say, with much respect, is that I differ completely with him. My feeling is that this is a program which has demonstrated, above everything else, the loss of sturdiness, the loss of independence, and the loss of ability to stand up and take it and plan for themselves, which has been the glory of American farming people through all the years. That is where we looked for our conservative, best quality, finest thinking people. I am depressed and distressed to find such thinking prevailing in areas of the United States where high price supports have apparently undermined the character of our people.

I think I am justified in making that statement, because we have not found such a situation to exist in other areas. One cannot find a citrus grower in Florida or California who will take that position, or an apple grower anywhere in the United States who will take that position. One cannot find a dairyman in any State, except possibly in the seven States where they have allowed a critical problem to react upon them, who will take such a position. One cannot find a vegetable farmer in the Nation who will take such a position. The poultrymen, who went through terrible times a few years ago, tightened their belts and brought themselves back into better condition.

I am simply saying to the Senator that to my mind this is a red flag. The Senator may not so regard it. To my mind it shows that we have done something weakening and debilitating to the character of some of the finest people we have. That is what depresses and distresses me; and I would be less than true to my trust if I did not say to the Senate what I thought so profoundly as I listened to those good people—and they are good people—give their testimony on these questions, testimony which seemed to me to be so alien to sound thinking.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a clarification?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that if this be not a part of the Communist program, it certainly is socialism? By that does he mean that the program in which we have engaged for the past 22 years, in connection with rigid price supports, is socialism? Does he mean that the demand for redistribution of land, and other things which were testified to by a few farmers who appeared before the committee, are socialism? I should like to define what we are talking about.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was testified to by the vice president of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. MONRONEY. The vice president of the National Farmers Union is entitled to testify to anything he wishes, but certainly those of us who have consistently, through the years, supported rigid price supports—and I happen to be one who has supported rigid price supports for 18 years—consider that such a program is no more socialistic than minimum-wage legislation or any similar program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator think it is not socialistic to advocate a program of 100 percent price supports for everything produced, both storables and perishables?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is not in the bill. The Senator is arguing about something testified to by some witness during the course of the hearings. I happen to represent in part, the State of Oklahoma, which is dedicated to supporting the 90 percent of parity program for basic storable, usable commodities. That is a program which even the American Farm Bureau Federation, the ultimate in conservative, rugged individualism, of which the Senator speaks so feelingly, voted by more than 2 to 1 to support. It voted to support the rigid 90 percent of parity supports, despite its national leadership. I hardly think those 40,000 members of the American Farm Bureau Federation would like to be called advocates of socialism.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator, of course, is putting words in my mouth which I have not uttered. What I said was that the 100 percent parity program, sponsored alike by the National Farmers Union and by the Communist Party, which program is applicable not only to storable products but also to perishable products, is in my judgment the essence of socialism. In my judgment the demand is proceeding only from those areas which have benefited from the 90 percent high price support program. That, of course, is borne out clearly by the record.

I am merely pointing out to the Senator—and he does not have to regard it as a red flag, if he does not wish to so

regard it, although I do—that it is a sad commentary that that has apparently been the result of furnishing a crutch to people who have become so debilitated by the use of the crutch that they either cannot walk alone or are unwilling to walk alone and are unwilling to solve their own problems.

It is disheartening; it is almost frightening, Mr. President. It is disheartening and frightening to see good people, who are so deeply rooted in the American soil, come to that kind of thinking. I regard that type of thinking socialism of the rankest kind.

I have deemed it to be my duty to call the Senator's attention and the attention of other Senators to my belief that 90 percent is not all that we are confronted with here. It is merely a stepping stone, and that fact is equally clearly stated time after time in the record.

Although the Senator and I may be in disagreement on some details, I do not believe the Senator from Oklahoma will be heard to deny that such thinking as that, which demands 100 percent price supports for storable and perishable commodities is socialism, and socialism of the rankest kind.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator from Florida tell me whether there is a 100 percent parity provision with reference to perishables and storables in the bill before us?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have made no such statement at all.

Mr. MONRONEY. But we are hearing a great deal of debate about the evils of 100 percent of parity on storables and perishables. We are hearing about the redistribution of land as being a great evil. I cannot find any such provision in the pending bill. Such provisions, of course, could not be passed by the vice president of the National Farmers Union. They would have to be passed by Congress, and would first have to go through the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Florida is a member. Such provisions would have to become law by act of Congress.

Therefore, I believe it to be rather futile, on the last day of general debate on the pending bill, to discuss the socialistic evil, real or presumed, of 100 percent price supports on perishables and storables, or the redistribution of land, because I do not find any sentiment in the Senate or in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or in the distinguished chairman to do anything other than what we have been trying to do, by trial and error, over a period of approximately 22 years, which endeavors have brought the farmer from the depths of the worst agricultural depression he has ever known into the longest sustained period of profitable farm operation he has ever known in the history of the United States. If that be socialism, then the American Congress stands convicted. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Florida does not feel that that program is socialism.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not said that. I have simply held out a red flag of warning. If the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma does not wish to regard it as such, and does not want to realize that what we are dealing with is a general demand for 100 percent price supports, and that the demand for 90 percent is merely the first step, or if he does not wish to recognize the fact that that kind of thinking has developed only in those areas where high price supports have been in force, and has not been found anywhere in the areas of the country where the people have not had a crutch furnished to them by the Government, that is the Senator's privilege. If he believes those are matters which should not be called to the attention of the United States Senate, he need not so regard them.

The Senator from Florida has not made any misstatement with reference to what is contained in the bill. He has been very careful to state what he has been worried about, and that is the destroyed independence of some of the finest farming people in our Nation. I am equally disturbed to find my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, insisting that the restoration of 90 percent of parity is going to be the answer, when the very survey put into the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to sustain his position, in large part shows that during the 4 years covered by that survey, 1951 to 1954, all years of 90 percent rigid price supports, the farmers, for whom he now pleads were going downhill toward bankruptcy and many of them did go through bankruptcy. Nevertheless the Senator from Minnesota feels that it is a good remedy to offer to the people who are in that deplorable position the same cup they tasted to their great hurt in the years that have passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. There is one point to which I should like to invite the distinguished Senator's attention. I was a Member of the Congress which passed the rigid price supports, and a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency which authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to advance loans to 90 percent of parity. The demand then was for 100 percent or for 110 percent. The demand came often and loud and strong from distinguished United States Senators, like the late Senator Bankhead and the late Senator "Cotton Ed" Smith, against whom no thought of socialism could be raised, although they cried loudly for 100 percent of parity. I am sure if those distinguished men were Members of the Senate today, and if they knew the situation of the cotton farmers of America today, they would still be crying out for 100 percent of parity. The demand for 100 percent of parity is not generated after 90 percent of parity is obtained. The demand was there before the 90 percent of parity provision was enacted. It will be there long after the 90-percent provision becomes the law again.

Certainly there is no difference in the trend toward 100 percent of parity whether the supports are 75 percent or 90 percent. The demand will always be for the farmer to be paid in 100-cent dollars. He is now being paid in 75-cent dollars, at the same time we are cutting acres from his allotted production. I do not believe that a 75-cent dollar is satisfactory to a segment of America which has to work so hard for its income. Seventy-five percent of parity means a 75-cent commodity dollar to the farmer. That is what we are giving him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I repeat, if the Senator finds no reason for alarm and no reason for reconsideration of his own conclusions in this matter as a result of the points I have raised, that is his privilege.

So far as I am concerned, it is cause for alarm. It is cause for alarm to the American people. I am immensely impressed when I find those segments of agriculture which have not been visited with the high price support program, and at the same time have not suffered because of a lack of prosperity, a condition which is found in areas where high price supports have prevailed, are free from the socialistic thinking which we find elsewhere.

Mr. President, I close by quoting one more Communist pamphlet, although I am not much given to quoting from Communist pamphlets. I quote from the program of the Communist Party, printed in November 1954. This is the suggestion by the Communist Party to their faithful members relative to the farm program. I quote only the portion of the recommendation that relates to the farm program:

> We urge support for the progressive farm demands of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. President, some of what I have had to say has not been pleasant to say. However, it has been necessary for me to say it, or else I would feel that I had looked into a window in parts of our Nation and had seen things which I felt I should report to the American people and to my brethren in the Senate, and then had been silent when I was under a duty to tell them what I had seen there.

I believe it is cause for alarm for every one of us, and for the American people to find prevalent thinking so wild and thinking so highly socialistic as I have indicated in the places where high, rigid farm price supports have apparently destroyed much of the backbone of some of our finest agricultural people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I gratefully appreciate the courtesy which the Senator from Florida has extended to me in permitting me to interrupt his address. I would not have interrupted him had it not been for the confidence I have in the Farmers Union as well as the National Grange and in the other great farm organizations. They cannot help it if the Communist Party apes or imitates their programs. Certainly, the fact that the Communist Party seizes on one of the planks of their program cannot in any way lead me to believe that in their loyalty and their sincerity anything but a true and beneficial program for America is the desire of the respective farm organizations.

I doubt that we have ever been so far away from communism on the American farm as we are today as a result of the continued high-level support prices for agriculture at 90 percent. I rather feel that communism made its greatest gains in the era of 30-cent wheat, 5-cent cotton, and nickel hogs, in the days when tragedy stalked American farmers and when even they were putting out picket lines to prevent fellow farmers from marketing their products at giveaway prices, and were taking the law into their own hands to prevent the sheriff from foreclosing and moving their fellow farmers off their farms. That was when the great constitutional system was in jeopardy, and not during the period when we have supported farm prices at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. President, I wish to refer for a moment to Mr. "Wrong Way" Corrigan, who stated that he was going to fly to the Pacific coast and the next we heard of him he was in England. He had gone in the wrong direction. We are now witnessing the antics of "Wrong Way" Benson, who has announced that he is for flexible support prices, for three reasons: First, that they will reduce production and oversupply. He is for flexible supports, which mean lower supports, because they will reduce the cost of the farm program. He is for lower supports because they will reduce the cost to the consumer.

Let us look at that a little bit and see whether he has not lost his bearings completely and has wound up at exactly the opposite pole from that for which he started.

It might be interesting to note, Mr. President, that, taking his own Bureau of Agricultural Economics report on crop reduction for 1955, while the support levels on wheat were reduced by 6 percent, production declined 28 percent, but acreage was down 29½ percent. It was not the reduction of 6 percent in the support levels that reduced the production of wheat, but the reduction of 29½ percent in the acreage.

The support levels on rice were reduced by 8 percent. The production was increased by 10 percent, although the acreage was down 4 percent.

So the flexible supports did not reduce the supply of wheat, although they were cut by 8 percent.

The support level on cotton remained unchanged at 90 percent, and the production declined by 3 percent on acreage that was down 33 percent.

The support level on corn was reduced by 1 percent, and the production increased 7 percent on acreage that was down 1 percent.

But to get a clear idea of whether the lowering of supports reduces production, as Mr. Wrong-Way Benson intended, we must consider how flexible supports have been operating under the program of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Whereas the support levels under Mr. Benson were reduced anywhere from 17 to 25 percent, as in the case of oats, grain sorghums, barley, flaxseed, and rye, and production was greatly increased, regardless of the support prices.

On oats production was raised by 25 percent at a lower support.

As to grain sorghums which enjoyed, perhaps, the lowest supports of all under the optional provision of the act, the increase in production was 180 percent.

On soybeans, although the support was greatly lowered, the production increased by 30 percent.

On barley the support was greatly lowered and the production was increased by 73 percent.

On flaxseed, when the supports were cut materially, the production increased by 37 percent.

On rye, which had almost a vanishing or no support, the production increased by 81 percent.

Does it make sense, Mr. President, to argue in this great Chamber, that a reduction in support prices will mean a reduction of surpluses? Anyone who witnessed the overproduction in the 1930's, when 30-cent wheat was the rule, must know that the farmer grew a greater supply of wheat at those low prices in an effort to get enough cash income to sustain his family until he could plant at higher prices.

So Mr. President, the argument so often advanced and foisted on the American people that the only way to control overproduction is by flexible or collapsible support prices which Mr. Benson has advocated makes no sense; it makes no logic.

Let us look at point No. 2. Mr. Benson said, "If you lower the support prices you will reduce the cost of the program."

That does not make sense, because the program under Mr. Benson is costing far more than it cost when we had a 90-percent program.

It will be found in the whole history of the price-support program from October 17, 1933, through December 31, 1955, that the cost of supporting basic commodities amounted to only 18 percent of the total cost of the program. In fact, until the end of 1952, when Mr. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture, the average cost per person of supporting basic commodities was less than 1 cent. And, actually, Mr. President, there was a realized gain of $25 million.

It is true that the administration's handling of the program since 1952 has resulted in some expense to the taxpayer for supporting basics, but even this runs only about 87 cents per person a year.

On the other hand, the cost per person a year for supporting the nonbasics has risen from an average 33 cents for the years 1933 to 1952 to $1.80 for the years 1953 through 1955.

As supports were lowered the cost went up.

On the basis of these figures, it would seem to me to be a little ridiculous to blame high price supports for the cost of the program.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who is now presiding over the Senate, pointed out that on the basis of the Stabilization Service Report the amount of Commodity Credit Corporation losses from October 17, 1933, to April 30, 1955, a period of nearly 22 years, on basic commodities, was $353,675,738, or an average of $16,450,034 a year.

It would seem to me that the present investment in farm commodities is being raised rather than lowered by Mr. Wrong-Way Benson's flexible supports. I feel sure that when the figures are all in for the amount of grain, cotton, and fiber now in storage, under the change wrought by Mr. Benson's flexible price-support program, it will be found that the farmer has put far more of his production into loans and into Government storage than he did when he had 90-percent supports.

The reason is obvious. Mr. Benson has advertised to all the processors of cotton and of wheat, and said, "Wait a while; stick around; and farm prices will be lowered."

They are being lowered about 7½ percent each year. Mr. Benson says, in effect, and has published it in neon lights, that it would be foolish for the processors to invest in their own inventories, but to wait a year and buy at the new low prices Mr. Benson has brought about.

Consequently, instead of private industry carrying the stocks in their inventory, the burden has been placed upon the Government to carry surpluses. The cotton and wheat move into loan and do not go into commercial channels, because they are unnoticed by Mr. Benson, and the farmers' profits will be lower if we wait until Mr. Benson has had another year to lower further the income of farmers.

It would seem to me, on the third point, namely, that by paying lower price supports we can reduce the cost of food and fiber to the consumer, nothing has proved to be so erroneous. While the farm income has gone down, down, and down, the cost of food to the consumer has remained near an alltime high. The average loss of farm income per farm since 1952 has been $529. The percentage in change has been a decline of 21 percent. There are 3 percent fewer farmers on farms.

At the same time, the cost of food to the consumer has remained high. The farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar has gone down. When the Democrats turned over the administration of the Department of Agriculture to Mr. Benson, the farmer was getting an average of about 47 cents from the consumer's food dollar. Now the farmer is receiving about 37 cents of the consumer's food dollar. Yet the same amount of food costs the consumer a dollar.

But Mr. Benson has managed to take the profit out of farming. He has managed to increase to almost record levels the profits of the middleman and the processor. But the consumer catches it on the high end, and the farmer catches it on the low end of his production. That is prosperity, Benson style—higher prices to the consumer, lower prices to the farmer, and fatter and wider margins to the middleman.

It seems to me it is only fair that the Government which is concerned with all segments of our economic activity, should make certain that the farmer receives a 90-cent dollar, which certainly is not too much to ask. Ninety percent of parity represents what would be the equivalent of 90 percent of a minimum wage, or 90 cents out of a commodity

dollar, because that is the amount on which parity is figured.

But by lowering the parity to 75 percent, and at the same time exacting the maximum reduction and take-out in planted acres, the Government is legislatively decreasing the farmer's income.

I wonder why Mr. Benson ignores the value of the stockpile of food and fiber in our overall strategic stockpile, which amounts to $4,893,000,000. These are usable, edible farm commodities. They will be available in case of disaster, drought, or atomic attack. I think food is just as valuable as lead, zinc, copper, magnesium, and all the other things we have in our stockpile, costing some $5 billion. But it seems to Mr. Benson to be a great sin that we have some groceries in the pantry against the day of disaster. He has told the people of the country that the farm program has cost some seven or eight billion dollars, but he has ignored the value of usable inventories in the stockpile, which represent the major part of that cost.

A large part of the rest of the cost has been a decline in the inventory values which Mr. Benson himself has legislated, so to speak. It is a loss on the book value of those inventories, as we have had to write down stocks to follow Mr. Benson's flexible support prices downward, because the market follows Mr. Benson's flexible formula. When his formula is 82½ percent of parity, the market is at 82½ percent. When it reaches 75 percent, unless the committee bill shall be passed, the market will follow it to 75 percent of parity supports. We shall again write down our inventory to the tune of a half billion dollars. But to hear the representatives of many States decry support prices at 90 percent of parity to the farmer, while they ignore the vast subsidies which have been poured into big business by this administration, is more than I can understand.

On direct action by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey the cost of carrying the public debt has increased $1,100,000,000 during the 3½ years of the present administration. That is $1,100,000,000 more on which to pay the interest on practically the same amount of debt on which the Government was paying interest under a Democratic administration.

Who increased the parity value of investment cash? It was done by the Secretary of the Treasury by a direct policy instituted by the Government in advancing rate on the "Humphrey-Dumphrey" bonds. He took it out of the Federal Reserve open-market operations, which brought about a high interest rate for Government bonds.

The Government says it is bad business to help the farmers get 90 percent price supports for two bales of cotton or a thousand bushels of wheat, but that it is all right to help the National City Bank of New York or the Bank of America or any of the other great financial institutions to get $1,100,000,000 more as interest for the handling of the public debt, and that is done by direct Government mandate.

I think we might well support the farmers in their efforts to get fair prices, just as we try to help the barefoot boys of Wall Street get a little bit better interest rate on the money they have in the bank and invested in the safest securities in the world—United States Government bonds.

Everyone in the big cities looks askance because the farmer has got, over the years, about $6,500,000,000 in what is called a subsidy, if we wish to call it that. That has been the cost of the farm price support program during the 22 years from 1933 to 1955, according to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

But it is all right to have a Federal Housing Administration program, which has underwritten more than $35 billion in mortgages for housing; $35 billion underwritten to guarantee to the homebuilders of America their most prosperous years of profit in the building of houses, with 90 percent or 85 percent Government insurance, and a 30-year pay-out.

That is all right, because all those houses are built on nice paved streets in the cities. None of them have been built in the country, where the houses are so urgently needed by the farmers.

Thirty-five billion dollars is not the cost of the program, but it is the Government's liability for underwriting the mortgages to help make prosperous the homebuilding economy and to make it possible for the city people to have the housing they need. I am for that program. But I do not know why we should talk in such big terms for the city and in such small terms for the country.

We provide $250 million a year to subsidize the giant, fine, slick-paper magazines with cheap mailing costs, so that they can distribute millions of copies of heavily advertising-laden magazines to millions of people throughout the country. That is a heavy subsidy. Two hundred and fifty million dollars would practically pay the cost of the farm program for about 17 years. That is the amount we are paying out every year as a subsidy to the magazine publishers.

We pay a subsidy of about $80 million to the airlines, for the benefit of those who like to fly and reach their destinations in a hurry or to travel abroad or to enjoy the comfort above the clouds, so that we may have a great aviation system. I favor the aviation system. But I do not believe the very people who enjoy such a system should look down upon us because we provide the farm economy with some degree of protection against bankruptcy, just as we subsidize a program for the airlines.

We have a multi-million-dollar program of subsidies for the merchant marine. We provide an accelerated depreciation program for thousands and thousands of manufacturing concerns, which saves them hundreds of millions of dollars a year in taxes, which otherwise would be exacted. That, in fact, is a subsidy for industry.

Then there is the greatest subsidy of all, the subsidy afforded by the high protective tariff to the industries of America. It is strange that most of the industrialists who have enjoyed the protection blanket of the high protective tariff throughout the years should shudder because the farmer is being given some protection against world competition when he raises farm products; because the Government is giving the farmer a chance to come somewhere near reaching a minimum wage in the production of his goods.

It seems to me Mr. Benson has failed in all three directions in which he has sought to move under the flexible program.

I wish to compliment the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate, and supporting the position of the House on 90-percent rigid supports for basic commodities under acreage restrictions, which are aimed at cutting down the growing surpluses we have.

I feel any agricultural program can work only as long as we start with a basic program of 90 percent of parity. When we depart from that, we invite disaster. I care not how much money Mr. Benson wishes to spend on research. The only program for which he has asked greater amounts of money is for research. No matter how much he spends on research, he still cannot teach the farmers to live without income. Yet, under his program, farmers have found themselves to be in dire necessity, because each succeeding year under Mr. Benson, the farmer's position, both capital goodswise and incomewise, has deteriorated. When the farmer's income deteriorates to the breaking point, we shall find small businesses in small towns having difficulty, then big businesses, and then big manufacturers will sooner or later feel the pangs of economic disaster born of a farm depression legislated by the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, and brought about as a result of the failure of the flexible price-support program.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 7, 1956, he presented the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 578. An act for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe; and

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Irfan Kawar.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 8, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 7 (legislative day, March 6), 1956:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Herbert V. Prochnow, of Illinois, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the term of 5 years.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Fletcher Warren, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from the class of career Minister to the class of career Ambassador:

James Clement Dunn, of New York.
Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado.
H. Freeman Matthews, of the District of Columbia.
Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career Minister:

Don C. Bliss, of New Jersey.
James C. H. Bonbright, of New York.
Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia.
Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., of Virginia.
Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia.
Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire.
James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas.
William J. Sebald, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Robert G. Miner, of New York.
Barr V. Washburn, of Utah.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William H. Bray, Jr., of Missouri.
Harry H. Schwartz, of Ohio.

Paul C. Hutton, of Colorado, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Benjamin Bock, of Texas.
Frank M. Bryan, of Washington.
John Pryor Furman, of Virginia.
George O. Gray, of New Mexico.
George R. Jacobs, of Illinois.
Edward R. Kelley, of New York.
Robert Klaber, of Maryland.
Guy A. Lee, of Indiana.
Donald H. Nichols, of New Mexico.
R. Douglas Smith, of Virginia.
Miss Rebecca G. Wellington, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joseph A. Angotti, of West Virginia.
Miss Elizabeth R. Balmer, of Massachusetts.
Clifford O. Barker, of Virginia.
Raymond E. Chapman, of Michigan.
Frank A. Ecker, of Maryland.
John L. Hagan, of Virginia.
Earl T. Hart, of North Carolina.
Mrs. Mary S. Johnston, of Massachusetts.
Dallas L. Jones, Jr., of Louisiana.
Charles J. Kolinski, of Wisconsin.
Miss Lillie Levine, of Iowa.
Floyd W. McCoy, of Ohio.
Vernon L. Merrill, of West Virginia.
Walter L. Nelson, of Wisconsin.
Douglas B. O'Connell, of New York.
W. Angie Smith III, of Texas.
Eldridge A. Snight, of Virginia.
Richard Straus, of Maryland.
Casimir L. Sutula, of Connecticut.
Mrs. Kathleen Clifton Taylor, of Washington.
Karl F. Weygand, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Raymond Bastianello, of Texas.
Miss Virginia Whitfield Collins, of Florida.
William J. Drew, of Massachusetts.
Robert D. Hodgson, of Michigan.
William C. Kinsey, of Virginia.
Waldemar A. Olson, of Wisconsin.
Joel Orlen, of Massachusetts.
Muneo Sakaue, of California.
Peter Simon, of New York.
Thomas E. Tait, of New Jersey.
Miss Marion M. Whinery, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Paul J. Aylward, Jr., of Kansas.
Curtis B. Brooks, of Vermont.
Don T. Christensen, of California.
Robert S. Dillon, of Virginia.
Guido C. Fenzi, of California.
Myles L. Greene, of Florida.
Harry W. Jacobs, of Kentucky.
James A. Klemstine, of Pennsylvania.
Albert A. Lakeland, Jr., of New York.
Jay R. Nussbaum, of New York.
Gerald A. Pinsky, of New York.
Miss Mary A. Roughan, of New Jersey.
Edward H. Springer, of Oregon.
Richard L. Springer, of Ohio.
Charles R. Stout, of California.
Frank G. Trinka, of New Jersey.
Frank M. Tucker, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Frontis B. Wiggins, Jr., of Georgia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Alice C. Mahoney, of Arizona.
Eugene D. Sawyer, of New York.

Edmund R. Murphy, of Maryland, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

Harold G. Williams, of Washington, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Dean J. Almy, Jr., of Maryland.
Thomas R. Craig, Jr., of West Virginia.
Wesley L. Laybourne, of Virginia.
Frederick U. Wells, of Maryland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast made us the heirs and beneficiaries of Thy divine bounty, grant that in all the hours of this day we may have the inspiration of Thy companionship and sustaining grace.

May our plans and purposes always reflect the spirit of our blessed Lord and may our whole life be in tune with the true, the beautiful, and the good.

Emancipate us from all fears and worries and may our vision of the highest and noblest never become dimmed or eclipsed by worldly compromise and petty ambitions.

Make us more confident of Thy greatness and goodness and more assured of Thy faithfulness as we strive to follow in the way of Thy commandments.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7201. An act relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies; and

H. R. 8780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes.

COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, ASPINALL, O'BRIEN of New York, DAWSON of Utah, and SAYLOR.

NATIONAL PEANUT WEEK

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, this is National Peanut Week. More people each year are realizing the wonderful food value of peanuts. They are wholesome and nutritious, full of energy-giving vitamins, and delicious to eat. They are good for young and old alike.

Many people look upon the peanut as just something you buy at the ball park or the circus. Children and many adults are familiar with the delectable flavor of peanut butter and peanut candy bars. However, there are also many, many recipes calling for the use of peanuts. For

cooking purposes there is no better fat than peanut oil. For frying fish, chicken, and other meats, it cannot be excelled.

Last week our colleague WATT ABBITT, from Virginia, placed a supply of roasted peanuts in the cloakrooms. Let us hope that he will do this again this week.

Have you ever eaten boiled peanuts? If not, you have really missed something.

So let us upon this occasion of National Peanut Week salute Mr. Peanut.

GEORGIA GIRL MADE TEXAS' FIRST LONE STAR FLAG OUT OF OWN SILK DRESSES

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Margaret Shannon appearing in the Atlanta Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, under permission to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD an article written by the very able reporter, Miss Margaret Shannon, in the Atlanta Journal on February 12, 1956. The title of the article is "Georgia Girl Made Texas' First Lone Star Flag Out of Own Silk Dresses."

Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, March 2, the State of Texas celebrated its Independence Day. All of us rejoice with Texas in its glorious history, and I think that it will be agreed that one of the reasons Texas has so much to be proud of is the fact that it is made up of people whose ancestors were so attracted to Texas that they left most every section of the Union and went to Texas to make their home.

Texas and her cause so caught the imagination of the people of this country that even those who did not move to Texas sought to contribute to the spirit that moved Texas to become first a republic and then one of our greatest States. One of those people was a young Georgia girl whose name was Joanna Troutman. The following article tells the story of her great contribution to Texas history, and the high regard with which Texas holds her.

The article follows:

GEORGIA GIRL MADE TEXAS' FIRST LONE-STAR FLAG OUT OF OWN SILK DRESSES

(By Margaret Shannon)

The suggestion that Georgia adopt a new State flag seems to have generated interest in the subject of State flags.

As I've related before, there's a monument in Knoxville, Ga., to Joanna Troutman, the Georgia girl who designed the Lone-Star flag of Texas.

She made the banner for Georgia volunteers to use when they went to Texas to fight in its war of independence against Mexico in the 1830's. The Republic of Texas adopted the design, and the State of Texas later continued to use it.

Now comes an Atlantan, Mrs. V. A. Wilson, 2066 Evergreen Lane NW., to relate that her mother's efforts brought posthumous recognition for the Betsy Ross of Texas.

HANDMADE

"I remember hearing my mother tell about this young girl who used the silk from two of her own dresses to make the flag," Mrs. Wilson says.

Her mother was Mrs. Louis L. Brown, of Fort Valley. About 45 years ago, she interested the then Governor of Texas, O. B. Colquitt, in seeing that something be done in honor of the memory of Joanna Troutman.

As a result of Mrs. Brown's and Governor Colquitt's interest, a monument was erected in Austin, the Texas capital, and Miss Troutman's body was moved there.

"Mother was invited to be the guest of the State of Texas and escort the body to Austin," Mrs. Wilson related. "She declined the honor because her youngest child was a baby at the time and she felt her first duties were at home."

Mrs. Wilson has many souvenirs connected with the matter, including the executive order which Governor Colquitt sent to the Texas Senate and House of Representatives on February 26, 1913.

But Mrs. Wilson tells another interesting story which shows that Texas did not wait nearly 100 years to honor the girl who designed the flag.

While Texas still was a republic, its first Minister to the United States stopped by Milledgeville, Ga., on his way to Washington to assume his diplomatic post. Milledgeville was the Georgia capital at the time.

The diplomat called on the Governor of Georgia, and left with him several pieces of a silver service that had belonged to Santa Anna, the Mexican general who was captured by the Texans in the war for independence.

The diplomat specified that the silver was to be sent to Miss Troutman in appreciation for the flag that she had made—a big blue star on a field of white. According to Mrs. Wilson, some of the silver still is in the possession of Miss Troutman's family.

Texas has had the same flag ever since Joanna Troutman's day. The only change in 125 years has been to reverse the colors to make the star white and the background blue.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Texas delegation, I wish to express our very deep appreciation to the lady from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH] for her very kind words.

In addition to the contribution mentioned by the lady, Georgia has had a great influence on the State of Texas. She sent men who fought with Houston at San Jacinto and from that time on, Georgia's citizens came to the new West to develop her frontiers and materially contributed to the great progress which has steadily gone forward to the present. There is a close affinity between our two great States and we in Texas are appreciative of that association.

RESERVE RECRUITMENT

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I know that we all are interested in figures on our Reserve recruitment. These figures are available from week to week, and I am pleased to tell you that the latest weekly figures show the enlistment of 1,082 people in the 6 months Reserve training program, which, you know, became the law with the passage of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. This is the third week for which figures on enlistments exceeded the 1,000 mark for a single week. Our overall Army program shows enlistments of 1,804 persons for last week. Since the Army goal for the year is limited by law to 90,000 spaces, it is entirely within the realm of probability that the Army will reach this goal.

Enlistments are climbing from week to week, and at the current rate of increase there may be yet a real fight on the part of enlistees to avail themselves of vacancies under the 6 months training program, with 7½ years in the Reserve.

I am further pleased to say that the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force programs are proceeding much more satisfactorily. The National Guard recruited 20,000 persons for the month of February, which is a record in recruitment. Both the guard and the Reserve are now beginning to furnish heavy enlistments into the regular services from those recruits who, having tasted of military service, wish to enlist and become a part of the Regular Establishment.

LIBERALIZATION OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which proposes three principal ways of liberalizing railroad retirement benefits, which I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House.

Several different bills have been introduced, and one bill along this line, H. R. 9065, is now before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I favor the provisions of H. R. 9065, as far as they go, but, in my judgment, the benefits do not extend far enough to bring aid to railroad pensioners who are in the most serious need at the present time.

There are now many thousands of retired railroadmen, and their widows, who have paid into the retirement fund—many of them 18 years. When they were paying their dollars to this pension fund, and when they finally retired, for one reason or another, the amount they could draw was based on the normal wage scale at that time, when we were not living in an inflationary period. Now, these particular pensioners, their wives and dependents, due to the fact that the cost of living has practically doubled since the time their pensions were established, find themselves in a condition where a great

many of them are in serious want, because their pensions are so small they cannot nearly meet the present high cost of living.

Now, the bill I have introduced proposes three ways of liberalizing railroad retirement benefits. First, it reduces the age providing for earlier retirement at age 60 with 30 years of service, or with 35 years of service regardless of age.

Second, and this is very important, it provides for computation of credit for service performed prior to 1937, which today is based on the average earnings for the period 1924–31, which has no relation to our present economy, and substitutes in lieu thereof the five highest years of the employees' working career.

The reduction of the retirement age after many years of service is needed to care for those who lose their railroad positions at advanced ages, but before they have reached 65. Thousands of former railroad employees whose positions were abolished through changes in transportation, through no fault of their own, find themselves at an age when they can no longer find other employment. We are now living in an age when a man over 50, and many men younger, who are in splendid physical condition cannot secure employment because of their age, so you can see the impossible situation an older retired railroad man faces at the present time in securing employment.

When a railroad man finds himself in that position, who needs work and cannot get it, he also cannot draw his pension benefits because of the present rigid retirement age that forces him to wait until he reaches the age of 65.

There are a lot of railroad men today, after years of service, who find themselves in ill health and not physically able to hold jobs, and yet they cannot qualify for disability pension benefits, but have to wait until they are 65 years of age.

If they could begin their pension benefits at 60 years of age, it would help out this considerable group of former railroad employees.

It does seem that Congress should attempt to give some relief to these employees referred to, who, without fault of their own, lost their positions a few years before reaching that age.

Third, my bill provides a 15 percent increase in annuities and pensions, which will help all people now retired. While the provisions discussed above are designed to ease hardships on special classes of annuitants, all annuitants would be benefited by the 15 percent increase. There is a general economic problem shared by all annuitants, which would be greatly improved by enactment of this 15 percent increase.

I hope that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee may widen the scope of its legislation, and give consideration to and embody in whatever bill they report the provisions I refer to in this proposed legislation.

There are many retired railroad men and their widows who need these benefits, and who are interested in this legislation, living in my district, at Centralia, Salem, Bluford, Hillsboro, and Mount Carmel, Ill.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9739, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through line 6 on page 32.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anything controversial left in the bill, with the exception of 1 paragraph, section 302, on page 43. I have an understanding with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and we have a committee amendment that meets his objections, which is on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. Chairman, so the record will be clear, it should be pointed out that similar language lifting age restrictions on Federal employment was objected to by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] in the independent offices bill last year, and the language was stricken because it was not protected by a rule.

This year in the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill for 1957 the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], all members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, objected again to similar language in section 302 which, among other things, repeals the 70-year compulsory retirement provision. The language in the bill was as follows:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation hereafter contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officers or employees who establish a requirement of maximum age for entrance into positions in the competitive civil service: *Provided*, That any requirement of law for compulsory retirement from the competitive civil service solely because of age shall not be effective: *Provided further*, That no person who has reached his 70th birthday shall be appointed in the competitive civil service on other than a temporary basis.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has had all the past 12 months to consider the matter, but on page 4081 of the RECORD of Tuesday, March 6, the gentleman from Kansas states in connection with the language in the bill:

There is no great emergency for including these provisions in the bill we are considering today. Both these matters are being considered or will be considered by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The gentleman from Georgia also states on page 4082 of the RECORD that the committee on which he serves plans to go into the matter:

With reference to this provision on page 43 respecting mandatory retirement at age 70, our committee has been waiting for some time for the Kaplan Committee report dealing with all phases of retirement, so that we could hold proper hearings and take whatever action the facts justified.

In view of the interest expressed by members of the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and their desire to go into the matter thoroughly, the Independent Offices Subcommittee moved to strike out the provision relating to compulsory retirement and permit consideration of other matters in the bill to proceed. This will give the Civil Service Committee another year to consider the matter.

I firmly believe, as a member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, that the provision recommended makes good sense. If a person is physically fit and mentally qualified to do a job the sole fact that he is 70 years of age should be no bar for employment. Performance should be the test.

In the last 50 years the age of men has increased by 20 years, and the average life expectancy of women has increased by 22 years. It is estimated that there are now 14 million people over 65 and that in the next 20 years the number will increase to over 21 million. This spectacular advance calls for the Government to reappraise its restrictions on employment which deprive the Nation of the benefits that can come from such longer lives. It is up to the Government to assume responsibility and lead the way in removing unreasonable restrictions on employment for mature people, and industry will follow.

Many of the outstanding leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives are 70 years of age or are approaching that age. Look at the loss that would happen to the Nation if they were forced to retire on account of age. Yet there are many people at 50 to 60 today who are well qualified to work but simply cannot get jobs on account of age. They are told they are too old. They should not be forced to retire, but an opportunity for employment should be open.

Under our law no person can be forced to work if he does not want to, and he can elect to quit work or continue. The amendment in question gives to that man or woman who is physically and mentally able to work, and wants to work, that opportunity. It is denied them now. In so denying to the active, energetic elderly person who is able to work and wants to, we will be ruining his health mentally and physically. Many such individuals wind up in hospitals and mental institutions and become burdens on their families and the State. This could be easily avoided by permitting them to work.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and now open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, the amendment the gentleman proposes is similar to the one that the gentleman from Kansas submitted.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. The gentleman intiated it. I give him credit for it.

Mr. Chairman, on the part of the committee, we offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 43, line 24, after *"Provided"* strike out "That any requirement of law for compulsory retirement from the competitive civil service solely because of age shall not be effective: *Provided further"*.

Mr. THOMAS. The amendment speaks for itself, Mr. Chairman, and we ask for a vote on it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address my remarks to the committee amendment, adopted by the Committee of the Whole. As the bill was reported it would have eliminated a provision in the present Retirement Act which is one of long standing. The Retirement Act at present provides that when an employee reaches the age of 70 years and has 15 years or more service, he is subject to mandatory retirement, except there are provisions for continuing needed employees on the rolls, either on a temporary basis, or from year to year under Executive order of the President.

Yesterday I discussed with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]—in charge of this legislation—the need for striking this legislative provision out of the appropriations measure. If this provision were permitted to remain in the bill, it would almost completely upset many of the employees' organizations. I would like to call your attention to telegrams I received from two of the big employee organizations, one of them from the National Association of Letter Carriers wherein they state they are much disturbed over the amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill to eliminate the 70-year compulsory provision in the retirement law. They state this amendment should not be adopted without full hearings and that the elimination of compulsory retirement at 70 would open the door to favoritism. They say this is not a theoretical objection and the law permitted employees to work after 70. They further state that many employees instead of retiring with honors at 70 would be forced out through disability retirement resulting in considerable heartbreak. Instead of being kind to the aged, we believe this amendment would be cruel. They further state that the situation in civilian Federal service is different than it is with Congressmen who are selected by their constituents every 2 years. They also say that many executives in Government could continue on their own authority long after it would be well for their own health, while others without authority would be forced out. They also say that present uniform procedure is preferable and they request that the provisions of the bill be opposed. This message is signed by Mr. William C. Doherty, president, and Mr. Jerome J. Keating, vice president, of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

I also have a further telegram that calls attention to my amendment. It is from the great organization of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks of which E. C. Hallbeck is legislative director. Mr. Hallbeck also calls attention to the provisions of section 302 in the independent offices appropriation bill. He says that the provisions of this particular section for amending mandatory retirement age are too far-reaching and important to be considered on the appropriation measure without adequate public hearing and consideration. He also requested our support of the motion to strike this provision from the bill.

Here are two great employee organizations who are outspoken and support the amendment I have just submitted which now has the support of the chairman of this committee. Of course, it is my contention that this committee should not have included this provision in the bill in the first place. It is, as I said yesterday, legislation on an appropriation bill. This demonstrates that legislation handled in this manner is really out of order. I have great respect for the Appropriations Committee of the House, but when it attempts to legislate on an appropriation bill it goes too far afield. This is a matter that ought to have extremely careful study so that all the facts and circumstances may be considered. It is legislation that would have possible effect on thousands of employees in Government service.

I would like, briefly, to submit some rather significant statistics which I think in themselves will clearly demonstrate the fallacy of this position. In the first place, the amendment is completely unnecessary since out of 2¼ million Federal employees, only 2,462 were separated last year because they had reached the age of 70 years. This is substantially less than 10 percent of the total number who were separated by retirement and is certainly a very small number when taking into consideration the fact that most employees are not eligible for retirement until they reach age 60 or 62.

It is an even smaller figure when one considers that it is only about one-half of the number of employees reaching 70 who are presently employed and continued on the rolls after reaching that age.

Having in mind these statistics, you can come to only one conclusion, it seems to me. That conclusion is that those who retired because of age were in the main employees who normally would have been separated anyway. Many of them were undoubtedly tolerated or continued on in recognition of the fact that the mandatory retirement age was approaching.

Now out of that 2,462, and I say that it is unfortunate that we cannot make a specific case study of these employees, most of them undoubtedly had the 70-year age limit as a goal and would not, under any circumstances, want to continue to work longer.

I venture to say that not more than a few hundred of those who were retired really wanted to continue to work past the age of 70. Now for that few hundred, less than one to a congressional district, you are proposing by a legislative rider on an appropriation act, without adequate consideration, without any reference to the legislative committee that is mostly concerned with the retirement problem, to eliminate that provision of law.

As ranking member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I know of no expressed desire on the part of anyone to have this age limit changed. I do know this, that the door of our committee is always open to any member of the Appropriations Committee who feels that there are some particular features of any legislation that should be considered for change.

I hope that I will have the support of the House in turning down this proposal. I hope that you will support my amendment to strike out this first proviso and I will assure you at the same time that when we are considering retirement legislation this year I will direct the committee's attention to this very proposal and give the House an expression of our committee's views. Further than that, if my amendment succeeds, I will start immediately to collect together the necessary statistics upon which our committee can act and I will personally report to the House the situation with respect to those mandatorily retired last year and those who will retire in the immediate years succeeding, as it relates to their desire to have the 70-year limit changed.

I realize the acceptance of my amendment by the Appropriations Committee makes a further statement unnecessary. I felt, however, it was my duty to inform the membership concerning some of the background and hazards to our retirement system and to the Federal personnel policies had this provision, which, in my opinion, was not carefully considered, been permitted to remain in the bill.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with the position taken by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] in opposing the proviso in section 302 of the appropriation bill for independent offices, which provides that any requirement of law for compulsory retirement from the competitive civil service solely because of age shall not become effective.

To my way of thinking this proviso has no place in an appropriation bill and should certainly be stricken from it, and

therefore the amendment which was to be offered to strike it out should have been supported.

However, the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] in his wisdom thought it best to offer the amendment himself on behalf of the committee. The opposition to it was indeed tremendous and rightly so.

It certainly would appear to me that this is legislation that should have been fully deliberated by the appropriate committee, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee—before the House was asked to vote on such vital legislation.

I am in receipt of some telegrams in which the opposition to this proviso is emphasized, and I want to include them as part of the record and as part of my statement.

I am delighted to know that the particular objectionable provision is now deleted from the bill, and if in the future any action is to be taken on such legislation it should follow the normal course of legislation by deliberation by the appropriate House committee and then by action on it by the House.

Definitely, it never should have been included in an appropriation bill.

(The telegrams follow:)

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *March 7, 1956.*

Hon. ALBERT W. CRETELLA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Branch 3, National Association of Postal Supervisors, request you to vote in opposition to section 302, independent office appropriation bill, which extends mandatory retirement beyond 70 years.

WILLIAM H. MURRAY,
Secretary.

HARTFORD, CONN., *March 7, 1956.*

Hon. ALBERT CRETELLA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We join with all thinking Federal employees in voicing opposition to section 302, independent offices appropriation bill, which extends mandatory retirement beyond 70 years. Your voting support of our position is enjoined.

MRS. R. T. WILLYS,
Legislative Chairman to Local 147, NFIOC, Hartford, Conn.

BRISTOL, CONN., *March 7, 1956.*

Congressman CRETELLA,
Washington, D. C.:

Please support Congressman REES' amendment to strike out the portion of section 302 that would eliminate compulsory retirement at 70. This is part of independent offices appropriation bill.

ANDREW JOHNSON,
President, Connecticut State Association of Letter Carriers.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *March 7, 1956.*

Congressman ALBERT W. CRETELLA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Local 237 would like you to oppose section 302, independent offices appropriation bill, which extends mandatory retirement beyond 70 years. House votes today. Kindly give your consideration.

JOSEPH VIGLIOTTI,
Legislative Chairman, Local 237, NFPOC, New Haven Post Office.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a person's birth certificate should not be the exclusive test of his ability to work.

Believing implicitly and sincerely in this principle as we do, this Appropriations Subcommittee drafted section 302 for this appropriation bill. The first part pertains to hiring for the Federal service and prohibits the use of a person's age in measuring his qualifications to handle a particular job. The second part, namely, the proviso which sought to eliminate compulsory retirement at age 70, extended the same principle. It was the committee's belief that many people at 70 can perform their tasks in a better manner than younger people and that it was grossly unfair to establish arbitrarily a limitation based solely on age, which would require their retirement.

We do agree, however, that insofar as the Federal civil service is concerned, this falls within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and that committee, having voiced objection, it is right that the members of that committee should be given the opportunity to deal with the problem. It is my understanding that the agreement between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], which resulted in striking the proviso respecting compulsory retirement, contains also the understanding that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will undertake hearings promptly to determine whether compulsory retirement based on age should be continued in the Federal service.

Our population is getting older. It is time that our attitudes toward our aging people matured, too.

Since 1900 the total population of the United States has doubled. In the same period the number of persons 65 years of age and over has quadrupled. Today over 14 million people—8.5 percent of our population—are over 65. By 1975 this is expected to rise to 21 million—over 12.5 percent. People over age 65 represent the single largest segment of our population.

Some time ago, Dr. Edward Bortz, associate professor of medicine of the University of Pennsylvania, and past president of the American Medical Association, predicted that within the next 20 to 25 years our average life span may well be increased to 100 to 120 years. He points out that the average life span of people in George Washington's time was 25 years. In 1900 it had advanced to 49 years. Today it is 68 years. Tomorrow we may find that Dr. Bortz is right.

With the tremendous research efforts being made throughout the Nation today, how long will it be when cancer and heart disease are placed in the same category of curable diseases as smallpox, tuberculosis, diphtheria, and some of the others which only a few years ago were leading contributors to our mortality tables?

But our attitudes are wrong. There is too much emphasis on youth and youthful ability, to the unfair detriment of older persons. There is today general acceptance of the principle that a person's productive years must end at a specific age without regard to his strength or mental capacity. It is common practice today to compel a person to retire at a certain age—usually 65—regardless of whether he is still able to work or not. And, of course, at that age it is almost impossible for him to get a job. As a result, we consign healthy, mentally alert men and women by the hundreds to the scrap heap and to an early spiritual and physical deterioration and decay. We refuse to recognize the very obvious truth that a large portion of our older people want to work and can work, We overlook the fact that a job is the best guaranty of their status and independence. If Dr. Bortz' prediction comes true, and if the prevailing employment attitudes continue, our people will spend half of their lives in retirement.

We hear many persons say that a person can always find a job if he is willing to work. That is not true. One of the major problems of our older citizens is their inability to obtain employment for no other reason than their age. Jobs for which they are completely qualified in every respect, which they can do well, which will permit them to continue to hold their heads up as decent, self-respecting citizens in our communities, are now barred to them—in the case of men when they reach the age of 45 years; in the case of women when they reach the age of 35 years.

Men and women lying about their age today to get jobs—like the Irishman who burst into the recruiting office the day after Pearl Harbor and said he wanted to enlist. "How old are you?" asked the recruiting sergeant. "Forty-one," replied the applicant. "I'm sorry, I can't use you," said the sergeant, "we can't take people who are older than 38."

The Irishman sadly walked out. On the next day he was back. "Sergeant," he said, "I made a mistake yesterday. My age is 38. Sure, it's my old mother what's 41."

A short time ago I made a speech to the House in which I pointed out that if the same discriminatory hiring practices were applied to congressional elections to bar candidates because of their age, 17 Members of the Senate, including the chairmen of the Appropriations Committee, Foreign Relations Committee, Finance Committee, and 55 Members of the House of Representatives who are 65 years and over, would be ineligible to serve. Perhaps that would be a good thhing for some of them, but there are many of that golden age who are making major contributions to the welfare of the Nation today. If the age limit were set at 45, more than half of the Congress would be ineligible. Speaker SAM RAYBURN has just celebrated his 74th birthday; Minority Leader JOE MARTIN is 71. During the first 40 years of this century the average age of Speakers of the House was 67. In the executive branch—President Truman was 68 when he left office; President Eisenhower, Secretary Humphrey, and Secretary Wilson are 65; in the Supreme Court Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, Burton, and Minton are all

over age 65, while Chief Justice Warren is 64.

Henry Ford once said, "If you take all the experience and judgment of men over 50 out of the world, there wouldn't be enough left to run it."

And Henry Ford was right. At the age of 78 Benjamin Franklin invented bifocal glasses; Miguel Cervantes was 68 when he wrote Don Quixote; William Cullen finished his classic textbooks on medicine at the ages of 67 and 79. Sigmund Freud made some of his most significant discoveries in his sixties and seventies.

These are just a few of the many magnificent personalities whose major contributions to the world occurred after they had reached mature years.

Three years ago I tried to remedy the Civil Service Commission's evil practice of using age as one of the qualifications for employment, but the Commission found a loophole in the bill I filed. It continued to use ridiculous age limitations to bar applicants otherwise qualified.

They kept telling me they were making progress.

Then, last year, I learned of a case of a man in St. Louis, 36 years of age, who had been laid off when his plant closed. While looking around for a job, he learned of an opening as a tax collector for the Federal Government. He filed his application, only to have it sent back to him with the notation that he was ineligible because the Commission had fixed the maximum age for such employment at 35. Thirty-six years of age—and ineligible to be a tax collector.

When the Civil Service Commission appeared before my appropriations subcommittee for its funds I asked them what possible reason there could be for ruling out a person who was completely qualified for the job in every respect, except that he was 36 instead of 35. The Commissioners could give no reasonable answer. It was standard practice, they said.

It is no longer standard practice.

I put an amendment to our appropriation bill last year which prohibits the Civil Service Commission from using the factor of age as a qualification for any job in the Federal Government. The Commission fought the amendment to the bitter end, tried to get it knocked out in the Senate, but failed. A person's age is no longer a barrier to employment with the Federal Government.

This year they came before our subcommittee and admitted that the amendment had worked very well indeed. That principle is continued in section 302 and is made permanent law.

This is a constructive step. It is the step which should have been taken long ago. But it is not the entire answer. Private industry must do the same. But progress here is woefully slow.

The Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor has pointed out that the odds of persons 45 years or over—not 65, mind you, but 45—of finding a new job are 6 to 1 against them.

Our people want to work as long as they can. Work is not only a way of earning a livelihood. It is the way of keeping one's self respect. It is the way to avoid the frustration and discouragement which is seeping into the lives of so many of our older people today. It is the means of keeping alive within them the spark of life, of preserving their feeling that they belong—that they have importance.

At age 65 comes the culminating blow. If a person has been lucky enough to work until he reaches that age, compulsory retirement takes him out of his job, regardless of his capabilities. A few years ago I received a letter from a toolmaker in Detroit, in which he said:

> I was getting along fine at my job, feeling good and doing my work well. I had worked there for 30 years and I was 64. Along came my birthday and I was out of work. I was good enough at 64; I was not good enough at 65. And yet I was the same man.

Older people are like other people in the respect that they need enough money to live on and to take care of themselves. Obviously this must come from work, savings, social security, or from some kind of public assistance. It is difficult to accumulate enough savings to retire. Most people who reach age 65 will live another 13 years, and if they want to retire on their savings, they will have to have accumulated about $17,000 in order to have an income of $100 a month for the rest of their lives. For most American families who are trying to get along on less than $3,000 per year, this amount is unattainable.

Social-security benefits, even with the increase in recent years, are still inadequate to provide a minimum standard of living. The law itself denies to beneficiaries the right to supplement their benefits by earnings of more than $100 per month, a provision which seems most unreasonable because it permits only a minimum standard of living. Until such time as social-security benefits allow a decent standard of living, beneficiaries should not be prohibited from supplementing their benefits with adequate earnings to permit them to live with independence and dignity.

That is why it is so important, too, that inflexible compulsory retirement schemes be eliminated as promptly as possible.

That is why I have filed a bill to amend the work clause of the social-security law—to raise the amount people may earn and which will permit them to still draw their benefits. It will permit beneficiaries to continue to work and to earn $2,000 a year.

But our older people have many more problems than that of financing, although that is of the highest importance. Nearly 3 out of 5 people over age 65 are chronically ill. Their ability to pay for their health costs, however, is considerably under that of persons below age 65. This can be traced in great measure, too, to compulsory-retirement practices which not only terminate employment but end the employee's medical and hospital benefits as well.

Without funds to help themselves, more older people today seek refuge in general and medical hospitals. Between 1900 and 1950 the total United States population doubled and the population of those over 65 quadrupled. In the same period of time the number of all persons of all ages in mental hospitals increased about three times. But the number of patients over 65 increased 10 times. The Council of State Governments believes that this shows that public mental hospitals are being burdened by many who should be and could be cared for elsewhere—in nursing homes, in their own homes with custodial care, in homes for aging persons.

Last week I filed a bill in Congress to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to deal with the needs of persons over age 65; a bill which provides for grants-in-aid to the States to stimulate their activity in training personnel and modernizing their institutions for research, rehabilitation, and training. The job is that of the States and the local communities. The Federal Government can only help.

These are the purposes of the bill:

> SEC. 102. (a) The primary responsibility for caring for and working out the problems of our older persons is that of the States; however, it is the policy of this act to aid the States, so far as practicable, in helping solve the problems of older persons through projects consistent with subsection (b) of this section which will help—
>
> (1) to assure to older persons an equal opportunity with others to engage in gainful employment which they are physically and mentally able to perform;
>
> (2) to enable older persons to achieve a retirement income sufficient for health and for participation in community life as self-respecting citizens;
>
> (3) to provide older persons, so far as possible, with the opportunity of living in their own homes or, when this is not feasible, in suitable substitute private homes; and in the case of such persons who need care that cannot be given them in their own or other private homes, to provide them with the opportunity to live in institutions that are as homelike as possible and have high standards of care;
>
> (4) older persons to receive adequate nutrition, preventive medicine, and medical care adapted to the conditions of their years;
>
> (5) to rehabilitate and to restore to independent useful lives in their homes, to the fullest extent possible, older persons who are chronically ill, physically disabled, mentally disturbed, or incapacitated for other reasons;
>
> (6) to assist older persons to have access to social groups and to participate with those of other ages in recreational, educational, cultural, religious, and civic activities;
>
> (7) to assure that older persons, in planning for retirement and in meeting the crises of their later years, will have the benefits of such services as counseling, information, vocational retraining, and social casework; and
>
> (8) to relieve the problems of older persons through an increase of research on the various aspects of aging and the development of special courses in schools and departments of medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and social work to train professional workers in the field of aging.
>
> (b) It is further declared to be the policy of this act that in the projects referred to in this section there should be emphasis upon the right and obligation of such older persons to free choice, self-help, and planning their own futures.

Mr. Chairman, my bill incorporates the objectives for older people listed in the report of the Council of State Governments recently issued, entitled "The States and Their Older Citizens." It is to be hoped that the Congress will un-

dertake as promptly as possible, to carry this program into effect.

In his book the Challenge of Longer Life, Dr. Bortz says this:

My belief is that a human life should rise to a majestic climax in the important mature years. As a literary masterpiece, or a great symphony rises to a majestic climax, so should a human life at the summit of the years enjoy its period of greatest color. The entire attitude of modern society toward all old people must be given a thorough housecleaning. Ofttimes old people feel old and act that way just because society thinks they should. The time has come when a man's faith in himself at maturity should be strengthened. His resources should be given optimal opportunity for utilization.

The challenge of living longer, it seems to me, is not only of maintaining good physical fitness. It consists even more in maintaining the ability to enjoy new experiences and new insights into the ways of man and the world today.

We have learned to conserve our natural resources. We can do no less with our human resources, the men and women of this Nation.

Grow old with me—

Said Rabbi Ben Ezra in Robert Browning's poem—

Grow old with me, the best is yet to be.

The golden years can be glorious years, if our older people have enough to live on, good housing accommodations, something to keep them active, and the feeling that they belong—that the community has not discarded them. We are still far from that goal, but it is one toward which we must strive.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK, having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Dowdy amendment which struck out the language on line 14 through line 20 on page 18.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, strike out lines 14 through 20.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were ayes 17, noes 31.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it too late to request that that amendment be read to the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the amendment was read to the House.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in all frankness, I do not believe that many Members knew what they were voting on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment was read. The Chair assumes every Member present was aware of the content of the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman's point comes too late. There was a parliamentary inquiry submitted since the division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] addressed the Chair on a point of order. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] was justified in waiting until that point of order had been determined by the Chair. Immediately upon that determination the gentleman from Iowa made the point of order that a quorum was not present and objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present. The Chair feels that the gentleman from Iowa exercised his rights under the rules in such manner that a point of order against his point of order would not lie.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were yeas 151, nays 231, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—151

Abbitt	Bennett, Fla.	Church
Abernethy	Bentley	Clark
Adair	Blitch	Cole
Alexander	Bolling	Colmer
Allen, Calif.	Boykin	Corbett
Andersen, H. Carl	Boyle	Cretella
Ashmore	Bray	Cunningham
Aspinall	Brooks, Tex.	Davis, Ga.
Auchincloss	Brown, Ga.	Davis, Tenn.
Avery	Brownson	Dies
Bailey	Broyhill	Dingell
Bass, N. H.	Budge	Dondero
Bass, Tenn.	Canfield	Dorn, S. C.
Baumhart	Cederberg	Dowdy
Bell	Chenoweth	Elliott
	Chudoff	Engle
Fascell	King, Calif.	Robeson, Va.
Fisher	King, Pa.	Rogers, Colo.
Flynt	Landrum	Rogers, Fla.
Forrester	Lanham	Rogers, Mass.
Frazier	LeCompte	Rogers, Tex.
Frelinghuysen	Lesinski	Rutherford
Gathings	McCulloch	Sadlak
George	McDowell	Seely-Brown
Granahan	McGregor	Selden
Grant	McVey	Sisk
Gross	Mack, Wash.	Smith, Kans.
Hagen	Mailliard	Smith, Va.
Hale	Mason	Smith, Wis.
Haley	Matthews	Taylor
Harden	Merrow	Teague, Tex.
Hardy	Metcalf	Thompson, Mich.
Hayworth	Minshall	Tuck
Henderson	Moss	Tumulty
Heselton	Moulder	Udall
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Hara, Minn.	Van Pelt
Holland	Osmers	Vinson
Holmes	Pelly	Westland
Hope	Pfost	Wharton
Huddleston	Pilcher	Whitten
Hull	Poage	Widnall
Jarman	Poff	Wier
Jenkins	Polk	Williams, Miss.
Jennings	Quigley	Williams, N. Y.
Johansen	Rees, Kans.	Winstead
Johnson, Wis.	Reuss	Withrow
Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.	Wright
Jones, Mo.	Richards	Young
Jones, N. C.	Riley	Younger
Kearns	Rivers	Zablocki
Kilgore	Roberts	

NAYS—231

Addonizio	Edmondson	Lovre
Albert	Ellsworth	McConnell
Alger	Evins	McCormack
Allen, Ill.	Fallon	McDonough
Andresen, August H.	Feighan	McIntire
Andrews	Fenton	McMillan
Anfuso	Fernandez	Macdonald
Arends	Fino	Machrowicz
Ashley	Fjare	Mack, Ill.
Ayres	Flood	Madden
Baker	Fogarty	Magnuson
Baldwin	Forand	Mahon
Barden	Ford	Marshall
Bates	Friedel	Martin
Beamer	Fulton	Meader
Becker	Garmatz	Miller, Calif.
Belcher	Gavin	Miller, Md.
Bennett, Mich.	Gentry	Miller, Nebr.
Berry	Gordon	Miller, N. Y.
Betts	Gray	Mills
Boggs	Green, Oreg.	Morano
Boland	Griffiths	Morgan
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gwinn	Multer
Bonner	Halleck	Mumma
Brooks, La.	Hand	Murray, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Harris	Natcher
Buckley	Harrison, Nebr.	Nelson
Burdick	Harrison, Va.	Nicholson
Burleson	Harvey	Norrell
Burnside	Hays, Ark.	O'Brien, Ill.
Bush	Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, N. Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Healey	O'Hara, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	O'Konski
Carnahan	Herlong	O'Neill
Carrigg	Hess	Ostertag
Celler	Hiestand	Patman
Chelf	Hill	Patterson
Chiperfield	Hillings	Perkins
Christopher	Hinshaw	Phillips
Clevenger	Hoeven	Pillion
Cooley	Holifield	Powell
Coon	Holt	Preston
Coudert	Holtzman	Price
Cramer	Horan	Prouty
Crumpacker	Hyde	Rabaut
Curtis, Mass.	Ikard	Ray
Curtis, Mo.	Jackson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dague	James	Riehlman
Davidson	Jensen	Robsion, Ky.
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
Dawson, Ill.	Jonas	Rooney
Dawson, Utah	Judd	Roosevelt
Deane	Karsten	Saylor
Delaney	Kean	Schenck
Dempsey	Kearney	Scherer
Denton	Keating	Scott
Derounian	Kee	Scrivner
Devereux	Kelley, Pa.	Scudder
Dixon	Keogh	Sheehan
Dodd	Kilburn	Shelley
Dollinger	Klein	Shuford
Dolliver	Kluczynski	Sieminski
Donovan	Knox	Siler
Dorn, N. Y.	Krueger	Simpson, Ill.
Doyle	Laird	Simpson, Pa.
Durham	Latham	Smith, Miss.
	Lipscomb	Spence
	Long	Springer

Staggers	Thornberry	Wickersham
Steed	Utt	Wigglesworth
Sullivan	Vanik	Williams, N. J.
Taber	Van Zandt	Willis
Talle	Velde	Wilson, Calif.
Teague, Calif.	Vorys	Wilson, Ind.
Thomas	Vursell	Wolcott
Thompson, N. J	Wainwright	Wolverton
Thompson, Tex.	Walter	Yates
Thomson, Wyo.	Weaver	

NOT VOTING—51

Barrett	Gary	Philbin
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Priest
Bolton,	Gregory	Radwan
Frances P.	Gubser	Rains
Bosch	Hoffman, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Bow	Hosmer	Reed, N. Y.
Bowler	Kelly, N. Y.	St. George
Byrd	Kilday	Schwengel
Cannon	Kirwan	Sheppard
Carlyle	Knutson	Short
Chase	Lane	Sikes
Chatham	Lankford	Thompson, La.
Cooper	McCarthy	Tollefson
Diggs	Mollohan	Trimble
Donohue	Morrison	Watts
Eberharter	Murray, Tenn.	Zelenko
Fountain	Norblad	
Gamble	Passman	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Reed.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Priest with Mr. Short.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Gary with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Byrd with Mr. Bosch.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Morrison with Mrs. Francis P. Bolton.

Mr. ENGLE and Miss THOMPSON of Michigan changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. WOLVERTON and BALDWIN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to meet yesterday with the New Jersey delegates to the Assembly for Civil Rights. These citizens exercised their constitutional right to petition Congress for prompt civil-rights legislation, and I join my voice with theirs in urging immediate action on this fundamental issue. As was pointed out at the assembly, upon the action of this body may hang the fate of our country as a free nation. It is unthinkable that the resources of our Government are not sufficient to turn back the southwide campaign to terrorize citizens seeking equal rights for all. Civil rights are the cornerstone of our way of life; their protection constitutes one of the very purposes for which our Government was formed. Let us never forget the immortal words of the Declaration of Independence—words that all of us have heard but some deny by their actions:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

That is the American creed. That is the philosophy on which our Government is based. That is a doctrine that none of us can repudiate without violating the fundamental premises of our democracy.

Government is instituted in order to protect the right of every one of us to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that not everyone receives that protection from his Government. The Declaration does not speak of the rights of whites or Negroes, Jews, or Christians, foreign born or native born, but of the rights of men as men.

The words are unmistakably clear, yet some continue to misunderstand and misinterpret them. And if the Declaration of Independence be not sufficient authority for what I am going to say, it may not be superfluous to recall to your attention some of the provisions of our Constitution—the fundamental law of the land. What does it say in the Bill of Rights? "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and the 14th amendment makes the obligation of the States even more specific by requiring that "nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any persons within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

These are not pious phrases—they are the law of the land. The law of the land—but is that law alive or is it just a dead letter? Let us ask ourselves again what exactly our fundamental law and the philosophy behind it require of the citizen and of the State.

Every man has his rights. These rights are not exercised at the pleasure either of his neighbors or of his Government. In fact, the very reason for the existence of Government is to insure that no one violates his rights—and if anyone does, to take effective steps to prevent the continuation or repetition of the offense.

It is with regret that I must say that that philosophy is not understood by some of our fellow citizens. There are those in this country who seem to believe that the right to liberty, indeed the very right to life itself, is a right limited to certain classes of citizens. Others, they hold, have no rights at all—just privileges which may be withdrawn at will at any time our superior citizens feel fit.

That is a philosophy that is repugnant to me and incompatible with everything I believe about the American way of life. I wish that it could be shown that I was wrong; I wish that there were no men so misguided as to call themselves American while denying the fundamental doctrine of our Declaration of Independence and of our Constitution.

Certain States have denied to many of its citizens the right to vote, the right to a decent education, the right to economic opportunity, and the right freely to express their opinions on subjects of the most intimate concern to them. These States have made clear that if a Negro citizen exercises the rights that are his or hers, he or she will be deprived of the very possibility of exercising any rights at all. While life is insecure, no rights can be won and while a section of this country is determined to deprive others of their rights, the outrages that have occurred in Mississippi and in Alabama and elsewhere in the South will continue to be committed. The genteel exponents of white supremacy in its more toned-down forms may deplore these outrages—but that will not exculpate them. Given the determination "to keep the Negro in his place" by fair means or foul, foul means will be used because there are no fair ones. The only way to deprive men of their legal rights is by illegal action and those who espouse the former can not disavow responsibility for the latter.

The reign of terror must be stopped. It is intolerable that life will continue to be granted to the Negro only on condition that he continue to accept a status that was supposed to have been ended by the Emancipation Proclamation.

The bigots must not prevail. The conscience of the Nation must be aroused to the enormity of the crimes that have been committed—and condoned by the States. It is clearly the duty of the Federal Government to protect American citizens, wherever they live, and to uphold constitutional guaranties. I urge immediate action on my omnibus civil rights bill, H. R. 51, and similar measures designed to end this reign of terror in Mississippi, Alabama, and elsewhere in the South and to insure constitutionally guaranteed rights to all citizens. This is no time for the counsel of inaction or indifference that the administration unfortunately has seen fit to adopt in this crisis. Rather, let us wage a courageous fight against rabid prejudice,

against the tragic invasions of civil rights that the Declaration of Independence tells us governments are instituted to defend.

PATENT EXTENSION

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 409 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2128) to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, at the conclusion of which I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 409 provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate on H. R. 2128.

The Constitution of the United States provides:

The Congress shall have power * * * to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries—

This is from article I, section 8, clause 8.

To give effect to the constitutional purpose of promoting "the progress of science and useful arts" by encouraging inventions and their immediate disclosure as well as their ultimate dedication to the public, Congress long ago enacted laws which secured to inventors the exclusive right to the full use and control of their inventions for a period of 17 years.

An invention is the personal property of the inventor. He has no compulsion to turn it over to be used by the general public if he does not so desire. Consequently Congress made a contract with him, that if he would turn over useful inventions, Congress would protect him for a period of 17 years.

This bill would authorize the extension of the terms of certain patents, the normal use, exploitation, promotion, or development of which was prevented or substantially curtailed for various reasons: First, because of the service of the owner in the Armed Forces—this provision is, in effect, identical with that contained in the act of June 30, 1950; second, because of an order by an agency of the Government which limited or prohibited production; and third, because of the grant of royalty-free licenses to the United States or the grant at a nominal royalty in order to promote any program for national defense.

The length of time that such extensions of patents may be granted is outlined in the bill and depends on the reason why the normal use of the patent was prevented or curtailed.

Under the provisions of the bill the owners of such patents would be permitted to file an application with the Commissioner of Patents who would take action either granting or refusing the requested extension. Fees to be paid by the applicants and opponents to an extension would be determined by the work required and the cost of such work to the Patent Office, but would not exceed $150 in the case of an applicant or $50 in the case of an opponent.

The bill also provides for appeal processes to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or to the District Court for the District of Columbia in the event an applicant is dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioner of Patents.

The bill actually costs the Government of the United States no money.

I may also add that in the 83d Congress this bill went through the Congress on the unanimous-consent calendar.

I urge the adoption of the resolution so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2128.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as always, the able gentleman from Massachusetts has clearly defined the rule and the main provisions of the bill. I do not know of anyone who is against the rule, although it is my understanding there is a little controversy in regard to section 2 of the bill itself. Personally, I urge the adoption of the rule as well as the passage of the bill.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2128) to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2128, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the general purpose of the bill before the House today, H. R. 2128, is to extend the terms of patents falling within certain categories whose normal 17-year duration was shortened as the result of the Second World War and the Korean conflict.

I wish to outline the broad objectives of the legislation. The details and the technical aspects will be discussed by others, and particularly by the author of the measure, our capable colleague, Mr. CRUMPACKER, of Indiana.

The Constitution of the United States provides:

The Congress shall have power * * * to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

Watch the words "limited times." The Constitution permits Congress to promote the progress of science and useful arts by giving the inventors exclusive use and control of the fruits of their ingenuity, but for a limited time only. Accordingly, many years ago, Congress limited the life of a patent to 17 years. After 17 years the invention goes into the public domain. That means that anyone can use the invention and manufacture and sell the patented device after 17 years. Obviously, therefore, an inventor must develop and exploit his patent with all possible haste, consistent with good business practice.

Now as a result of the Second World War and the Korean conflict the lives of certain patents were shortened by action of the Federal Government.

For example, certain veterans who owned patents were prevented from exploiting and developing their discoveries while in the service. Section 1 of the bill deals with that situation and would extend the term of such patents to compensate for the time lost during service.

Similarly, the use of patents owned by certain civilians was substantially curtailed or even prevented as the result of the war. For example, stop orders and restrictions imposed by the Government itself on the use of machines, articles, materials, or processes prevented patent owners from developing and exploiting their patents during the normal term of 17 years. Section 2 of the bill deals with patents in that category.

Finally, many patriotic citizens desiring to promote the war effort or defense programs granted free licenses to the Government to use their patents. The grant of the license to the Government without payment of royalties, of course, was made for the duration of the war. The patent owners who granted such free licenses had in mind that the duration of the war meant the shooting war. As a matter of fact, the patent owners who had good lawyers provided in the contract of assignment itself that the grant would last during the period of hostilities plus 6 months. But many patent owners who were motivated by sheer patriotism signed rather blanket licenses providing for a during-the-war grant. The Presidential proclamation officially declaring the war at an end was not issued until April 25, 1952. Accordingly, the patent owners who did not provide for the grant to expire 6 months after hostilities have been discriminated against. Therefore, section 3 would remove this discrimination and would

equalize the effective period of free license assignments to the Government.

Quite a number of bills were introduced to grant relief to patent owners, the lives of whose patents were shortened as the result of the war. The bills had the same purpose in mind but approached the problem in different ways. The members of the committee, therefore, delegated to our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] the tremendous task of putting all of the bills in one package. Mr. CRUMPACKER devoted a great deal of time and study to the problem and the bill now before the House is his handiwork; and as I said before, I will leave to him and the several authors of the private bills the burden of explaining the details and technical aspects of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation would seek to correct an inequity which arose out of wartime conditions during World War II and the Korean emergency. What it seeks to do is to permit the extension of the term patents where their normal use and exploitation was restricted or banned by wartime regulations. There are three main provisions of the bill, as the very capable chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], has explained. The first subparagraph deals with veterans were were called into the military service and thereby were unable to exploit their patent rights. This bill merely extends to the veterans of the Korean war the same rights we have already granted to veterans of World War II.

The main provision of the bill, the real heart of the legislation, is the second provision. That is the paragraph that deals with patents, the exploitation of which was interfered with or completely prohibited by action of the Federal Government during either war emergency. There are many arguments made against this provision. In the first place, patent extensions are not favorably viewed by most of the patent bar, and, generally speaking, this Subcommittee on Patents and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary has always maintained a consistent policy of refusing individual patent extensions, and has passed very little in the way of general extension legislation. The argument is that once a patent expires it goes into the public domain, and to extend one beyond the statutory period of 17 years might infringe on rights already accrued or soon to accrue, in the general public, to the use of the patent.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not true that when the Government gives an exclusive franchise to a patentee that is in the nature of a contract?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It partakes of the nature of a contract.

Mr. CELLER. And anything which interferes with the operation of that contract certainly should entitle the patentee to be able to recoup that loss because of Government interference?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is exactly right.

Mr. CELLER. And that is exactly what this bill does?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. The argument that other people lost during the operation of the war and therefore you should not take this particular class of the population and give them relief has been made. Is there any distinction between patentees and the owners of ordinary business which may have been injured by the Government?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There very definitely is.

Mr. CELLER. Will you give us the reasons why you distinguish between the two?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. By the very nature of a patent right, while it is not, technically speaking, a contract between the Government and the patent holder, still, in an equitable sense, it is a contract, in that the Government undertakes to guarantee the patent holder exclusive right to the use of his invention for a period of 17 years. There has been quite a bit of discussion in connection with this legislation over the actual nature of a patent right. Some say that it is merely a monopoly, the right to exclude others from the use of the invention, but actually a patent is two things: In the first place, it is the common-law right of the inventor to the use of his invention; and, secondly, it is the right given by the Constitution and the laws of the United States to exclude others from the use of the invention.

A patent has most of the same characteristics of other property rights. Among these are the right to make use of it and to exclude others from its use. A patent right can be sold; it can be licensed. The monetary remuneration from an invention usually comes in the form of royalties where the right to use is simply sold to a particular manufacturer or manufacturers; and it is an extremely valuable right.

When the Government steps in and tells the patent holder that because of the war emergency he cannot use or cannot permit others to use it, cannot in any way exploit it or obtain remuneration for it, they are interfering with a very valuable right in the patent holder and he suffers very great monetary loss because of this.

But the one thing that makes patents a separate class from other property rights is that a patent runs for a limited period of time. The owner has 17 years in which to realize a profit from his invention. It was the thinking of the framers of the Constitution and of the many Congresses that have passed patent legislation since that time that the public benefits through encouraging invention by granting the inventor this exclusive right for a definite period of years. I do not think I need dwell upon the very important role inventors and inventions have played in the development of this country.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. Getting away from generalities, can the gentleman give us one clear example or quote a particular case of injustice which this legislation is designed to adjust?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I can cite one for the gentleman. It is on a patent which has already expired and expired long enough ago so that this legislation will not directly affect it, but it is an example of what can and did happen in these cases. It is the case of a patented steel alloy known by the trade name of corten. It is an alloy which has many of the attributes of stainless steel but which is much cheaper to manufacture. This alloy was developed in the thirties and was just coming to the point of profitable exploitation when the war came along and the Government by decree banned its further manufacture because it used certain critical materials. After the war, a considerable market for this alloy was developed. But just at the time when it had reached the point where the invention was producing considerable income, the patent expired and the patent holder had been able to enjoy only a few short profitable years out of his total period of 17.

Mr. DONOVAN. And does this bill revive the patentor's right for the period during which he was excluded from enjoying this right in the case the gentleman cited?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The bill provides that the patent shall be extended for a period equal to the time during which production was banned or curtailed during the war.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman from New York asked for specific instances of injustice which have occurred. In the hearings before the Judiciary Committee there are a number of instances such as the gentleman recited. They can be found in the record. I think a very good case in point was presented before the Rules Committee by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] when he referred to a case at Jacksonville, Fla.; and since we are mentioning names, the man there adversely affected was Mr. R. W. Shannon, of Jacksonville, whose concern manufactures an improved style chair under a patent. The useful life of his company's patents was greatly shortened because the company was forced to completely suspend its operations from 1941 to 1945, and to limit production during the Korean emergency steel shortage. As a result, Mr. Shannon estimates that his company has lost about the equivalent of one-third of his patent's useful life. Two of his patents will expire in 1957 and 1959, unless extended by enactment of H. R. 2128. Thereafter, larger competitors who have greater resources will be able to manufacture articles under the expired patents, and Mr. Shannon has expressed the fear that he will

not be able to compete with their superior economic resources.

As he puts it:

My two remaining patents are all that keep my business alive, because as soon as they expire, giant manufacturing companies with which I cannot compete, will be free to make our products. Some are "breathing down my neck" already.

I think that is a very good case of small-business men, and it can be multiplied hundreds of times all over the Nation, who have been adversely affected by a stop order on the part of the Government, as a result of which their 17 years have been reduced to 14 or 13 years.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The purpose of this bill is quite obvious. It is a fair and equitable bill and I hope the House approves it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this bill does not propose to have the Government pay patent holders in any way. This is not an attempt to have the taxpayers reimburse anybody for their war losses. In that connection I think there is a very definite distinction from some other categories of war losses that may occur to anyone who stops to think about it.

A great deal has been said about the case of the filling station operator and other groups of businessmen who suffered business losses because of wartime conditions. This is not an attempt to have the Federal Government reimburse anyone. All this is is an attempt to give the patent holder an opportunity to go out and recoup in private business the losses suffered during the war.

Some mention has been made of these patent holders being a special class. In a sense they are a very special class. They are one of a few groups damaged during the war who have not been taken care of in one way or the other since.

I would like to cite as an example a somewhat similar loss that was suffered by gold mine operators. The Government during the war decided that gold mining was not essential and, therefore, issued a decree which rather effectively banned all gold mining. A number of gold mine owners came into the United States Court of Claims and filed claims against the Government for the very considerable losses they suffered during the war as a result of this order. The Court of Claims handed down an opinion on February 20, 1956, holding that the Government was liable and, with your permission, I should like to read the conclusion of their opinion:

We conclude that L–208—

Which was the order which closed them down—

by prohibiting the carrying on of otherwise lawful mining operations placed a servitude on plaintiffs' profitable or beneficial use of their mines and thus amounted to a temporary taking of that property right in the case of those mine owners and operators who were forced to close their mines by virtue of their compliance with those provisions of L–208 which prohibited them from using their materials, facilities, and equipment to mine gold and which ordered them to close down their mines. Such mine owners and operators are entitled to be paid just compensation within the meaning of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

The court said that this was a taking of property without due process of law contrary to the Constitution. Well, if it is a taking of property without due process of law to ban gold mining, why is it not the same thing to ban the use of patent rights and the obtaining of patent royalties?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I would like to get one or two matters of principle straightened out. As I understand, a patent gives the patentee the right to exclude others from using the patent. Through these emergencies there, of course, was nothing to prevent the patentee from excluding anybody from the use of the patent. He could have proceeded in the courts. But, is it not true that that is only one side of the shield? He has, in addition to the right to exclude the common law right to use and to exploit and to make. If, for example, he could not get the materials because of controls of one sort or another, he therefore could not make. If, for example, the Government exploited the patent, he had sort of an empty right. He could not sell the patent; he had nothing to sell, really; he had nothing to exploit. Would it not be unfair, therefore, to allow that situation to continue without giving some sort of remedy, some sort of recoupment, and if we do not do that, it strikes me that we are doing the patentee an injustice and soiling the good name of the United States because by its action it interfered with the operation of his patent.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is true.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose a part of this bill, and when the proper time comes shall move to strike out subsection 2, the subsection that has been discussed here, providing for the extension of patents whose exploitation was interfered with by war-production controls.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that it is logical that this debate should be largely taken part in by those of us who happen to sit on the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary which deals with patents and which heard all the testimony.

I may add that I am sorry to find myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Louisiana, the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee. I think I can say that 99 percent of the time we agree. I also point out that there is nothing partisan in this disagreement. You will find that in the committee itself there was a large measure of disagreement, as is shown by the minority views which were filed, and with people from both sides of the aisle taking either one position or the other.

There are some very important bodies and organizations that are strongly opposed to this legislation and especially to this section. I call your attention to the fact that the Department of Justice has given an adverse report to our committee on this bill. That report and the opposition of others will be found in the report of the committee. I call attention to the minority reports.

The Bureau of the Budget has voiced strong objections to this legislation. Those objections will be found quoted in a letter from the Department of Commerce to our committee.

The organized patent bar, the American Patent Law Association, has come out against this bill; and I point out, Mr. Chairman, that that is a self-denying position for the patent bar to take. Under this law every application for extension will have to be given a hearing before the Patent Office. That presents a wide opportunity for practice for members of the patent bar, and so I say that their opposition to this legislation has particular significance.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I should like to read a letter and a telegram voicing other opposition. This is a telegram to me of June 30 of last year:

The National Association of Manufacturers opposes enactment of H. R. 2128 or any other general legislation providing for extension of the 17-year term of patents. We believe such legislation would adversely affect our American patent system and would, therefore, be contrary to the public interest. Uncertainty as to the expiration date of patents would cause difficulties for business enterprises in planning future activities. Actually, the patent right is only the right to exclude others, and this right was not, in fact, suspended by war legislation.

HENRY G. RITTER III,
President, National Association of Manufacturers.

There again it is significant that that association should oppose this legislation, Mr. Chairman, because everybody knows that members of that association are large holders of patents.

I have also a letter from the representative of the American Bar Association, dated March 7, 1956:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I wish to call to your attention the following resolution passed by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association at their midwinter meeting in February 1944, and which still stands as the official position of the American Bar Association:

"The association disapproves in principle S. 890 and S. 1012 providing for the extension of the life of patents whose substantial use or prospective use was prevented by shortages of materials, labor, or transportation caused by war."

JAMES E. TOOMEY,
Chairman of Committee on Legislation; Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Section, American Bar Association.

The two bills there referred to were previous bills to the same effect as the bill now before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, we must take note of the difficulty in administration and the

confusion that would be caused by this proposed legislation. Thousands of patents would be extended, depending on facts which took place 12 and 15 years ago. This is no time to reverse the position taken on this legislation by the last four Congresses which failed to enact similar legislation which was before them.

Subsection 2 of this bill has to do with the prevention or the curtailment of manufacturing operations on patented articles due to war-production controls. Those events took place in 1941, 1942, and 1943. The evidence is cold; witnesses will be unavailable. This is no time, after this long lapse, to take up this subject and cause this confusion.

Already the Patent Office has a block of nearly 200,000 back applications for patents. Each one of the applications for patent extensions pursuant to this bill will have to be heard by the Patent Office; and if applicants are dissatisfied, there is an appeal to the courts. Who can say at this late date whether someone's operations relating to a patent were curtailed or interfered with by war-production orders of some kind or other?

Mr. Chairman, this will create an administrative nightmare in my opinion. But even so, if justice required it, I would be for it. That is the question. Is there justice back of this bill sufficient to justify these difficulties and the confusion which would be caused by the administration of the law?

Let us look at the law. You have been told that there has been a taking of property because some wartime production order of the Government issued for the protection of the Nation, and affecting all persons alike, may have interfered with the exploitation of a patent.

We are referred to a gold-mining case where the Government put out a stop order prohibiting those people from continuing their occupation of gold mining. The decision of the Court of Claims to which reference has been made gave relief on the ground that there had been the taking of a property right.

Mr. Chairman, let us see what the Supreme Court has told us about the rights involved in a patent:

In *Bloomer* v. *McQuevan et al.* (14 How. (55 U. S.) 539, 549, (1852)), the Court said:

> The franchise which the patent grants consists altogether in the right to exclude everyone from making, using, or vending the thing patented, without the permission of the patentee. This is all that he obtains by the patent.

In *Continental Paper Bag Co.* v. *Eastern Paper Bag Co.* (210 U. S. 405, 424 (1907)), the Court said:

> Those cases declare that he [an inventor] receives nothing from the law that he did not have before, and that the only effect of the patent is to restrain others from manufacturing and using that which he has invented.

In *Bauer* v. *O'Donnell* (229 U. S. 1, 10 (1912)), the Court said:

> The right to make, use, and sell an invented article is not derived from the patent law. This right existed before and without the passage of the law and was always the right of an inventor. The act secured to the inventor the exclusive right to make, use, and vend the thing patented, and consequently to prevent others from exercising like privileges without the consent of the patentee.

In *U. S.* v. *United Shoe Machinery Co.* (247 U. S. 32, 57 (1917)), the Court said:

> We must keep in mind the quality of the right we are considering and that the inventor gets nothing from the law that he did not have before and that the only effect of his patent is to restrain others from dealing with or using its device.

In *Crown Co.* v. *Nye Tool Works* (261 U. S. 24, 35 (1922)), the Court said:

> The Court held that the Government did not confer on the patentee the right himself to make, use, or vend his own invention, that such right was a right under the common law not arising under the Federal patent laws and not within the grant of power to Congress to enact such laws * * *. The Court further held that in its essence all that the Government conferred by the patent was the right to exclude others from making, using, or vending his invention.

As a result of the above and other decisions, the Patent Act of 1952 changed the wording of the statute defining the patent grant. Before 1952 the words of the grant were "of the exclusive right to make, use, and vend the invention or discovery"—title 35, United States Code, 1946 edition, section 40. The 1952 act changed these words to read "of the right to exclude others from making, using, or selling the invention"—title 35, United States Code, 1952 edition, section 154.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether 2 years ago the Committee on the Judiciary did not unanimously support the basic principle incorporated in the bill which we are now considering, and was not the gentleman a member of that committee? Is not his position today a complete reversal of the position of the Judiciary Committee 2 years ago?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I am very glad to answer that. I was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary 2 years ago, but I was not a member that year of the Subcommittee on Patents. There was no opposition voiced anywhere.

Mr. Chairman, of course there were hardships suffered by the owners of patents owing to war controls. There were business hardships suffered by everybody. Consider the automobile dealer who had a showroom engaged and a staff of salesmen on his payroll. Because of the war he could not get automobiles to sell. Think of the people who had invested their money in gasoline filling stations and could not operate due to war controls. Consider the restaurants which could not get the proper meats and other things to sell. Why should we pick out patent owners and give them relief while all these other people are allowed to suffer without any governmental relief?

The argument is that patents are in a special class; that there was some sort of contract by the Government. But, Mr. Chairman, the law is otherwise. There is nothing in the grant of a patent that guarantees to the patent holder that he shall be immune from loss because of general war production control orders which affect all alike.

It is perfectly clear that all the patent grants to the holder is the right to exclude others from the use of the invention, something that he still had despite the incidence of those war controls.

It has been said that the relief granted by this bill does not cost the Government anything. Yes, but it costs the public something. A patent is in the nature of a bargain. The inventor gets his 17-year patent monopoly, but he agrees that at the expiration of 17 years other manufacturers and the public can have the use of his invention. To extend that patent beyond the 17 years is to take away those rights from the general public and from other manufacturers. It is costly to them. It throws doubt upon the expiration date of patents.

This bill even seeks to revive and extend patents which have already expired after 17 years. A person might know that a patent was about to expire and make preparations to manufacture the article covered by the patent, and then find that there has been an order under this law extending that patent, and that claims for royalties might be pressed against him. To be sure, the law has some provision about the protection of vested rights, but there will be a lot of litigation as to that.

We can all feel sympathy for the small-business man who had patents. As I say, they suffered hardship along with others who suffered from the wartime controls, but I think the greatest advantage from this law would go to those large industries that had tremendous investments in patents. Do we want to increase that situation, Mr. Chairman? Already the Department of Justice has been taking steps seeking to control the large concentration of patents.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Is it not a fact that the National Association of Manufacturers, who are large holders of patents, oppose this?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. That is correct. Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out, there are a great many manufacturers who are small holders of patents and who would like to use some of these patents now in the possession of these large holders, which patents are expiring or which will shortly expire.

Mr. Chairman, it seemed to me that it was the duty of some member of our subcommittee to point out the objections to and dangers of this legislation. It is going to be costly to the public. It is going to be difficult and dangerous to administer. It will create large amounts of litigation. I believe that it is in the public interest that the House accept the amendment which will be offered to strike out subsection 2. That will leave intact the relief for veterans, and the relief for other special situations where royalty-free licenses were granted.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge the membership to take such action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, quite a bit has been said about the history of this legislation—its purposes and how it happens to be here on this occasion. I think it might be interesting briefly to review what has been said in that connection. The bill has been before the House one time—not four times as has been stated. It has been before this House one time in the past.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that other bills to the same general effect have been before the last four Congresses?

Mr. FISHER. I will ask the gentleman if he will tell me the occasion when section 2 of this bill has been voted upon by this House, except in 1954, and, if so, when it was and what bill he is talking about?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. They were not voted upon by the House because they did not get that far.

Mr. FISHER. All right, then, there were a number of bills.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] who is an authority on this, and I will ask him to enlighten the gentleman from Massachusetts as to the number of times this legislation has been up before.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think I can say accurately that in the 6 years that I have been here, this particular measure has only been before the House once, and at that time it passed the House.

Mr. FISHER. Can the gentleman recall how the issue was determined in the Committee on the Judiciary at that time?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. As I recall, the matter never came to a vote.

Mr. FISHER. Was there any opposing vote in the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. On the occasion that it passed I think it passed the committee unanimously.

Mr. FISHER. As I understand from reading the RECORD of 2 years ago, this same bill, word for word, with section 2, was reported out one time and one time only, and that was in 1954. It came here after extended hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, at which time the NAM opposition was made, and it was reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary one time only, and that was in 1954, and reported out unanimously, and it came before this House and was taken up and explained in detail. It was not on the Consent Calendar. It was explained in some detail by Mr. Fine and by Mr. KEATING, just as it has been explained today. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] was here at that time and did not oppose it. It may be that he overlooked it.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I call attention to H. R. 4155 in the 81st Congress, H. R. 323 in the 82d Congress, H. R. 1301 in the 83d Congress.

Mr. FISHER. Is the gentleman stating that those bills were before the House and voted upon?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Those bills were before the Congress.

Mr. FISHER. I am talking about the House.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. No. They did not get to the House.

Mr. FISHER. They were never voted upon before this House?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. No.

Mr. FISHER. That is what I wanted to clear up, because the gentleman said that four different Congresses had refused to enact this legislation, when only one Congress considered it, and that was in 1954. It was passed unanimously at that time, and the gentleman was here at that time. But that is beside the point. I would not have mentioned that except he made much of the fact that this had been up four time before. Some Members might think if it had been voted down that many times there must be something wrong with it. It went to the other body and they held hearings and reported the bill out, and on the last day of the session in the other body, when an attempt was made to bring it up by unanimous consent, one Senator objected because he wanted to look into it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is it not also true that all major countries, with the exception of the Soviet Union, have comparable patent extension legislation?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has made a very good point. Every country in the world that grants contracts to patent holders have long since passed this same legislation or legislation to this effect. In some instances it is more generous, especially in England. Every other country except the Soviet Union.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I would like to point out that the patent law is different in all of those countries. I would like to read four lines from the British law, which provides "that if upon application made by the patentee in accordance with this section the court is satisfied that the patentee has not been adequately remunerated by the patent, the court may by order extend the term of the patent." Those matters are handled differently in other countries.

Mr. FISHER. That means the English system is much more liberal than what we are proposing here today.

Let me address myself to this alleged confusion that the gentleman refers to in the Patent Office.

There are not going to be many cases come up if this bill is passed. In the British experience only 3⅓ percent of the total that could have been affected came in for relief under their statute, a similar statute to this. Using the same standard you can say there will be only a few thousand in this country at the most that would have to be processed and adjudicated by the Commissioner of Patents.

Let us see what the Patent Office says about this confusion about which the gentleman is so concerned; for, after all, the Patent Office should know better than anyone else whether it is administratively feasible or not.

The Patent Office says it is administratively feasible; it is no big problem; they can handle it very readily; it will cost the taxpayers nothing, not even an administrative cost, because provision is made for an increase in fees which will more than take care of it. I think we can safely say they will take care of any increase of cost due to administration.

Here is what the Patent Office says; and this, I think, ought to settle this matter of administrative confusion that the gentleman makes so much of. Here is their statement at page 45 of the hearings by Mr. P. J. Federico, Examiner-in-Chief of the United States Patent Office. Speaking to the question of their ability to handle this, here is what he says, referring to the agency's report to the committee:

> It speaks for itself, so I do not need to elaborate on it except to say that basically the Department merely states that on the policy question involved in a bill of this kind, they consider it a matter primarily for determination of the Congress as a policy matter and the Department interposes no objection if the Congress or the committee decides to approve the bill.

That he emphasizes, and then he continues:

> We do comment on some administrative defects or possibilities which might not be good, but they are minor matters of detail which could be taken up with the committee staff at any time.

Most of them were corrected, most of them I am sure of this character, to meet the Patent Office objections; so that eliminates this monstrosity that has been described and I think takes care of the argument that you would have an administrative nightmare and a lot of confusion down in the Department.

It is administratively feasible.

It has been administered in other countries successfully.

The Patent Office should be the last authority on the matter of its administrative feasibility.

A lot has been said about the so-called exclusive rights and that that is all a patent is good for: Just to give a man exclusive rights for 17 years whether it is rain or shine, whether it is war or peace, 17 years comes and goes and the Government has fulfilled its obligations.

That is the substance of a telegram the gentleman from Massachusetts read a moment ago from the President of the National Association of Manufacturers. In effect he says the statute should work inexorably in war or in peace against civilians, veterans, anybody, that it should run continuously for the 17-year period and then it is all over, that no exception should be taken into consideration. But we have ample precedent

for granting extensions to protect equitable rights so far as veterans are concerned. It was done after World War I; it was done after World War II; there is plenty of precedent for it, and there is no reason for not doing it now.

Mr. Chairman, let me cite I think the best answer to that which I could find anywhere, and it is in this report of the House Committee on the Judiciary which with its very fine staff I think did a very good job in reporting this bill. Here is what they say on that subject:

> It is true that the only statutory grant a patentee receives on the issuance of the patent is the right to exclude others.

That is true.

> However, the right to exclude others includes, among other things, the right on the part of the patent owner to waive exclusion and to grant a license on his patent to others, or to assign or sell the patent to others. If Government stop orders prohibit the using of the patent or prevent the exploitation, promotion or development of the patent so that it cannot be licensed to others, then it interferes with the patentee's exclusive use.

In addition, the committee goes on to say:

> While a patentee has a statutory grant to exclude others, he also has, coupled with that grant, the common-law right to make, use and exploit his invention as he sees fit.

They cite the opinion of Chief Justice Taft of the Supreme Court in a decision on that subject.

So the Government's obligation includes two things. No. 1, the exclusive right to exploit it for 17 years, not 12 or 13 years but for 17 years, and that includes the right, a very valuable right, of waiving that exclusive use by licensing it to somebody else, or vending it so that it can be developed during the time they actually have the right to the exclusive use of it. That is a valuable right, as valuable as any other part of it, and it cannot be separated from the exclusive right for 17 years.

They say a patentee is like a filling station operator, he is like an automobile dealer, they have all been victims of the war, their products were cut off, they could not exploit them, so why pick out the patentee and say we are going to do something for him and not do something for the filling-station operators?

The answer to that is too simple even to talk about it. It is very obvious. There is no analogy or no basis for comparison whatever. You cannot compare things like that. It is difficult to even discuss it seriously. Why? Because there is no 17-year guaranty by the Government to the filling-station operator that he will have the exclusive right to engage in the filling-station business for 17 years, and then at the end of 17 years he will turn his business over to the wide-open public and everybody can get into it. There is no situation of that kind here. So it is a little bit annoying in a way to even talk about that sort of analogy. It is not applicable. There is an implied, in effect, contract, existing as a result of the issuance of a patent, whereby the Government says: "You have this thing for 17 years. During that time you have the exclusive use of it, during that time you can exploit it, you can vend it, you can lease it, you can sell it." It is a property right in that respect. But at the end of that time in consideration of the Government doing this for you, at the end of that 17 years, you have to turn it over to the whole world and let the public have it. It becomes public domain, as the expression is used in patent circles. That is not true with filling-station operators.

So, therefore, the man has a just and proper complaint. Those adversely affected have a good complaint. I can understand how big business opposes this, or certain elements of it at least. I think it is unfair to say all of them do. The reason is obviously selfishness. I do not think they would seriously contend otherwise. The Patent Equity Association is solidly for it. Whom do they represent? That organization is made up of the individual patentees, principally the small-business men who have that interest all over the country. Big business comes along and says: "No, we do not want this thing." That is understandable. They do not need patents. They can take care of themselves without them. Besides, a lot of them have been paying royalty checks to these patent holders of 5 or 6 percent for the life of the patent and the quicker the time expires the quicker they get a free ride. Then they do not have to send out these royalty checks any more. It is understandable, therefore, why big business, the only opposition I can find in the record to this, objects to this bill. It is understandable why they would find some objection to the extension of this law. I think we have to admit it is purely on a selfish basis and not on the matter of merit or the question of right or wrong that is involved.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather complicated bill. The reason I am interested in it is because I am a member of the Patents Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and, as such, have participated in the discussions and hearings before the subcommittee, before the full committee and before the Committee on Rules. I do not want anybody to think that it is a unanimous report of either the subcommittee or the full Committee on the Judiciary. The subcommittee was split and the full committee was split, and at one time we defeated this bill in the full committee, and later, after some very active efforts by the proponents, the bill finally did come out.

Now, the matter is essentially a bipartisan matter. We are not trying to inject politics into it. The bill provides for certain benefits for veterans, which we are all for, I believe. It provides certain provisions for those people who granted the United States Government royalty-free use of certain patents during the war.

I think the position taken by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS], reflects a great deal of intensive study and an honest, genuine, and well-reasoned discussion of this matter. I think he is a good lawyer.

I would like to point out now just what has been said about patent rights as reflected very clearly in what the United States courts have held. In Crown Co. against Nye Tool Works, the Court said this:

> The Court held that the Government did not confer on the patentee the right himself to make, use, or vend his own invention, that such right was a right under the common law not arising under the Federal patent laws and not within the grant of power to Congress to enact such laws. * * *
>
> The Court further held that in its essence all that the Government conferred by the patent was the right to exclude others from making, using, or vending his invention.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The next sentence after the quotation the gentleman has just read reads as follows:

> The Government is not granting the common law right to make, use, and vend, but it is granting the incident of exclusive ownership of that common law right, which cannot be enjoyed save with the common-law right.

I think that must be read in connection with the other.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I think that is fine. But this is not any common law right that we are trying to invoke here.

Mr. FISHER. But the Chief Justice said that the common law right was involved in it.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. We are discussing what the right of Congress is and not what is common law.

I think it is very clear, that when we talk about which group of people is for this section or against it, we are talking about big business and small business. It seems very obvious that there are a great number of small manufacturing concerns which need the use of these patents. I think it is definitely against the public interest to extend in this manner large blocks of patents.

This section is not good law; it is not just to give special consideration to a very special group of holders of patents. I would like to commend to you the possibility that we strike from this bill subsection 2 on page 2 which does extend en masse large numbers of patents which should be released to public use so that the small-business men and manufacturers of this country can enjoy the right that should go to them and pass the benefits on to the people of this country.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. It was my impression, listening to the debate, that essentially the persons who would be relieved by this bill would be the persons whose genius and brains enabled these patents to come into being. By and large, most of them are individuals. Consequently, in effect, those who would get the benefit of the bill are the little fellows, whereas those who would gain by the action you have mentioned are more or less the large corporations. I notice in the minority report you say the National

Association of Manufacturers are opposed to it. I did not think they were composed of little fellows. Will you discuss that?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I will do my best to discuss that. The people who are going to be covered by this are veterans in section 1. In section 3 we are talking about royalty-free groups.

Section 2, which is the controversial section, would extend to all people who held those inventions—and you must consider that most of the inventions of commercial importance are held by large corporations and large holders of such patents. I should like my distinguished friend from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] to consider for a moment the fact that, as a devoted Democrat all of my life, I have not been accustomed to supporting the NAM policies in toto. This is rather an unusual circumstance for me. I was rather pleased to see that we agree in this instance. But this same question occurred to me. Apparently the National Association of Manufacturers is opposed to this because most of the members of the National Association of Manufacturers, according to my information, are not especially large corporations. Most of the members, the rank and file of the National Association of Manufacturers, are relatively small, but substantial, businessmen who use these patents, and they would like very much to continue using these patents and maintain their position in business. So apparently the biggest companies who hold most of the patents did not win in the vote before the NAM.

Mr. TUMULTY. If the gentleman would yield further, without going into the question of the size of the businesses of the members of the NAM, in effect, however, those who are opposing the bill are interested in their own finances. Actually what the Government has done is this. It has induced these inventors to come forward with their brain-children, which they did not have to do in the first place, telling them that if they brought out their invention, the result of their genius, they would have 17 years in which to get the fruit from their genius. Now because of public service to the country they are deprived of that, and these men who are financially big come in now and protest on the theory that they are performing a public service, and want to make a profit out of the genius of others.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Obviously there is a financial gain to the people who are relying on the expiration of these patents. Of course, they are interested in those patents expiring. But the fact that others are interested does not mean that the public will not ultimately benefit, because the sooner patents are released to public use, the sooner others can use them. Also, if you increase the cost to those people who are now using these patents, that will undoubtedly raise the cost of whatever product they are manufacturing.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I am happy to yield to my colleague from my own State of Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Just to throw a little more light on the question of the NAM.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Let me say that I am not an authority on that. The organization probably has never supported me in my life, although I am privileged to have the friendship and support of many businessmen in my district.

Mr. FISHER. I should like to cite to the gentleman the testimony of Mr. Frank P. Scully, president, Scully Signal Co., Melrose, Mass., a small company employing approximately 75 people. Mr. Scully represented the Patent Equity Association and was also a member of the patent committee of the NAM. He is a small operator. He, of course, is for this bill and against the amendment. Here is what he says about it.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Is the gentleman about to ask me a question?

Mr. FISHER. I am going to ask if the gentleman recalls this testimony, He says:

I do not know whether there is any brief here from the National Association of Manufacturers. If there were and it were possible, I would like the opportunity to be heard, because I have been intimately associated with all that has happened in the NAM in the last 2 years. It certainly does not take into consideration the smaller company.

Then he adds:

Of the 176 members, 136 represent the biggest companies in the country. There are only two members from companies rated less than $125,000.

That is out of 176 members.

If there is any brief from them, I would appreciate an opportunity to make some comments.

I do not understand that NAM as such has taken a formal stand on this, although the patent committee did do so.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I think that reflects the best knowledge we have on the subject. The Department of Justice, the Bureau of the Budget, and the National Organization of Patent Lawyers are also very clearly opposed to it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the fundamental merits of this bill are so obvious that we need not labor the question any longer. The basic question is, Do we recognize the importance of providing adequate inducements for our inventors? The Constitution specifically provides that Congress shall have the power "to promote the progress of science." This bill is a reasonable one, and this extension should be provided to these inventors.

The arguments against this bill are narrowly legalistic. They are fundamentally attacks on our well-established patent laws. We have long recognized the importance of encouraging inventions. Today especially adequate inducements should be provided to encourage inventive genius. Our patent laws are sound and should not be whittled away.

This extension of patent rights is not, as has been claimed, unduly costly to the public. Traditionally inventors have been granted certain benefits to encourage their talents. The public stands to benefit substantially thereby.

Even if this extension increases the workload of the Patent Office, as has been argued here today, we should not for that reason deny this legitimate relief. The alternative to a general bill of this type would be a flood of private patent relief bills.

The basic issue presented by this bill is whether the Government has fully discharged its obligations unless these specific extensions are granted. It seems clear that a moral obligation at least still exists. If the proposed relief were not granted, the Government would not be fully discharging the obligations which it recognized at the time these patents were issued.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WILLIS. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) if at any time during any of the periods specified in subsection (d) of this section—

(1) the term of any patent of the United States including time during which any individual or individuals, owning solely or jointly with his spouse or their spouses the entire interest in such patent, was or were performing honorable service on active duty in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, which service prevented or substantially curtailed the normal use, exploitation, promotion, or development of the patent; or

(2) the normal use, exploitation, promotion, or development of the inventions described and claimed in any patent of the United States was presented or substantially curtailed by any order of an agency of the Government prohibiting or limiting the production or use of any class of machines, articles, or materials, or the use of any class of processes or formulas; or

(3) to further the interests of the United States of America, the owner of such patent has heretofore granted a license thereunder to the United States, or to manufacturers, producers, or contractors authorizing them to produce or furnish goods or services for or to the United States, without payment of royalty, or at a nominal royalty, such license having been granted by such owner to promote any war effort, or any program of rearmament or preparation for the national defense, in which the United States has been engaged since the invasion of Poland by Germany on September 1, 1939; and since September 1, 1939, under the authority of such license, the United States, or manufacturers, producers, or contractors furnishing goods or services to the United States, have made substantial use of the invention embodied in such patent in the production or furnishing of goods or services for or to the United States, such use of said invention having been of material assistance and benefit to the United States in connection with any war effort, or any program of rearmament or preparation for the national defense, which granting of a license prevented or substantially curtailed the normal use, exploitation, promotion, or development of the patent;

then the terms of such patent may be extended in accordance with the provisions of this act.

(b) The period of extension of a patent under this act shall be a further term from

the expiration of the original term as follows:

(1) In cases where the only grounds for extension are those described in subsection (a) (1) of this section, the further term shall equal twice the length of the active service during the applicable period or periods specified in subsection (d).

(2) In cases where the only grounds for extension are those described in subsection (a) (2), the further term shall equal the time for which (during the applicable period or periods specified in subsection (d)) the practice of the inventions described and claimed in the patent was prevented or substantially curtailed as set forth in subsection (a).

(3) In cases where the only grounds for extension are those described in subsection (a) (3), the further term shall equal the period during which the initial license granted by the owner of such patent, without payment of royalty, or at a nominal royalty, was in effect after September 1, 1939: *Provided, however,* That in no event shall the period of extension hereunder be greater than the period during which the normal use, exploitation or development of the patent was prevented or substantially curtailed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 8, after "in effect" strike out "after September 1, 1939: *Provided, however,* That in" and insert the following: "between September 2, 1945, and April 29, 1952, for licenses granted during the national emergency of 1939 (proclamation No. 2352) or between July 26, 1953, and the effective date of this act for licenses granted during the national emergency of 1950 (proclamation No. 2914). In".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a) if at any time during any of the periods specified in subsection (d) of this section—

"(1) the term of any patent of the United States including time during which any individual or individuals, owning solely or jointly with his spouse or their spouses the entire interest in such patent, was or were performing honorable service on active duty in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, which service prevented or substantially curtailed the normal use, exploitation, promotion, or development of the patent; or

"(2) to further the interest of the United States of America, the owner of such patent has heretofore granted a license thereunder to the United States, or to manufacturers, producers, or contractors authorizing them to produce or furnish goods or services for or to the United States, without payment of royalty, or at a nominal royalty, such license having been granted by such owner to promote any war effort, or any program or rearmament or preparation for the national defense, in which the United States has been engaged since the invasion of Poland by Germany on September 1, 1939; and since September 1, 1939, under the authority of such license, the United States, or manufacturers, producers, or contractors furnishing goods or services to the United States, have made substantial use of the invention embodied in such patent in the production or furnishing of goods or services for or to the United States, such use of said invention having been of material assistance and benefit to the United States in connection with any war effort, or any program of rearmament or preparation for the national defense, which granting of a license prevented or substantially curtailed the normal use, exploitation, promotion, or development of the patent;

then the term of such patent may be extended in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"(b) The period of extension of a patent under this act shall be a further term from the expiration of the original term as follows:

"(1) In cases where the only grounds for extension are those described in subsection (a) (1) of this section, the further term shall equal twice the length of the active service during the applicable period or periods specified in subsection (d).

"(2) In cases where the only grounds for extension are those described in subsection (a) (2), the further term shall equal the period during which the initial license granted by the owner of such patent, without payment of royalty, or at a nominal royalty, was in effect between September 2, 1945, and April 29, 1952, for licenses granted during the national emergency of 1939 (proclamation No. 2352) or between July 26, 1953, and the effective date of this act for licenses granted during the national emergency of 1950 (proclamation No. 2914). In no event shall the period of extension hereunder be greater than the period during which the normal use, exploitation, or development of the patent was prevented or substantially curtailed.

"(3) In cases where grounds for extension exist under more than one paragraph of subsection (a), the further terms designated in this subsection (b) shall not be cumulative but shall be determined under the applicable paragraph of this subsection (b) which results in the longest extension.

"(c) If the ownership of the patent at the time the circumstances, described in subsection (a), which qualify the patent for extension, first arose, is different from the ownership at the time of the filing of the application for extension under this act, such application shall be acted upon only if the owner or owners at the time such circumstances first arose (or their legal representatives) have joined in such application.

"(d) The periods during which one or more of the circumstances described in subsection (a) (1) must have occurred in order to qualify a patent for extension under this act are as follows:

"(1) The period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945.

"(2) The period beginning June 26, 1950, and ending July 26, 1953.

"(e) For the purposes of this section, a reissue patent shall be considered to be the same patent as that which it supersedes.

"SEC. 2. (a) On the filing of an application for extension of the term of a patent hereunder, together with such information as may be required by the Commissioner, and upon payment of such initial fees as the Commissioner may from time to time prescribe, the Commissioner shall publish a notice thereof in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office. Within 60 days from such publication any person may oppose an application for extension by filing with the Commissioner a notice of opposition thereto stating the grounds therefor, which shall not include any charge that the patent is invalid. If a proper notice of opposition is filed and payment is made by the opponent of such initial fees as the Commissioner may from time to time prescribe, the Commissioner shall set a day for hearing and shall give not less than 30 days' notice of such hearing to the parties in interest. Upon the hearing the parties in interest shall present such evidence as they believe is relevant and such other pertinent evidence as may be required by the Commissioner. If, from all the evidence presented before him, the Commissioner is satisfied that a patent should be extended in accordance with this act, he shall grant such extension. The Commissioner shall fix the total fees (not exceeding $150) to be paid by each applicant for extension of the term of a patent hereunder and the total fees (not exceeding $50) to be paid by each opponent to an application, the specific amount of all such fees to be determined according to the work of the Patent Office required in processing the application or in hearing an opponent thereto, as the case may be, and the estimated cost thereof to the Patent Office.

"(b) The Commissioner may establish rules and regulations for the conduct of proceedings under this act.

"SEC. 3. Any application for the extension of the term of a patent hereunder shall be filed within 1 year from the effective date of this act except for applications which are filed under subsection (a) (1) of section 1, which applications shall be filed within 1 year from the effective date of this act or within 1 year from the date of the applicant's honorable discharge from service.

"SEC. 4. The Commissioner shall issue a certificate evidencing the granting of an extension hereunder. A notice of the granting of an extension shall appear in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office.

"SEC. 5. Upon the issuance of the certificate of extension, said patent shall have the same force and effect in law as though it had been originally granted for 17 years plus the term of such extension, except as otherwise provided herein.

"SEC. 6. Except where the owner of a patent extended hereunder was entitled to royalties under said patent (whether or not such royalties were received or waived) for any class of machines, articles, or materials, or for the use of any class of processes or formulas, produced or furnished exclusively to or for the benefit of the United States, or used exclusively by or for the benefit of the United States, no patent extended under the provisions of this act shall serve as a basis for any claim by reason of manufacture, use, or sale by or for the United States during the period of extension, and the rights of the United States shall remain in all respects as if such patent had not been extended.

"SEC. 7. In the event that an extension is not issued until after the date of expiration of the original term of a patent or reissue thereof, the extension order shall provide that any vested rights arising out of the actual manufacture, use, or sale of the invention covered by the patent so extended, which took place after the said expiration and before the issuance of the extension order may continue during the remainder, if any, of the period of the extension upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe, including the payment of reasonable royalties, providing the person or persons claiming such vested rights establish such rights to the satisfaction of the Commissioner upon a hearing.

"SEC. 8. In any action for infringement after the expiration of 17 years from the grant of the patent and during the period of such extension, the defendant may plead and prove that any material statement of the application for extension required by this act is not true in fact; and if any one or more of such statements shall be found untrue in fact, judgment shall be rendered for the defendant, with costs.

"SEC. 9. If any party in interest for an extension is dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioner or of any board established by the Commissioner for the determination of applications for extension, he shall have an appeal to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or suit in the District Court for the District of Columbia, as provided in the case of applications for patent."

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the form of this

amendment, it was drafted by the counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary to be exactly the same as the bill H. R. 2128 except that it omits subsection 2. The form of this amendment is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof these provisions, which are taken from another bill, H. R. 8534, which was introduced for that purpose.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. Is it correct to say that the gentleman's amendment really has the effect of striking out section 2 of the bill presently before us?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. That is subsection 2. That is the only effect, Mr. Chairman, it is offered in this form to avoid the necessity of making other minor amendments as we go along.

Mr. FISHER. It would retain sections 1 and 3, which have been referred to, but would delete section 2; is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, as we have already argued this question in length, I see no reason for going into it much further. I would just like to pick up a few pieces left from the preceding argument.

It has been stated that there would not be many applications under subsection 2 if this bill were passed. In answer to that, I point out page 6 of the committee report which states:

> The United States Patent Office estimates that there could be about 13,000 applications in this class. This is a top estimate.

That is a great many applications to be added to the 200,000 backlog of patent applications which were recently before that office.

It has also been suggested that the people who would benefit from this legislation would be the inventors themselves. That is not generally the fact. These inventions when they are made, if they are valuable, usually are sold to some large business enterprise. The people who would benefit from this legislation are the big business enterprises who are the large holders of patents.

One final point—it has been urged that the war production orders which interfered with the exploitation of patents violated the common law rights of patent owners. Mr. Chairman, that is just the point. These war production orders violated the common law rights of all kinds of people who had a right to engage in business.

The only reason the proponents of this legislation seek to differentiate patent owners from others is because they had special rights above and beyond common law rights. But the Supreme Court has said again and again that the granting of a patent gives to the patent owner nothing that he did not have before. It restrains others from the use of his invention. It grants him the right to prevent others from using his invention. It does not give him any right to use his invention because that is something he had anyway. We all have the right to use our own property.

I respectfully call the attention of the members to my remarks printed at page 3957 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 5, 1956 in which appear some further arguments against subsection 2 of the bill.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there has been brought to my attention a letter from the American Patent Law Association. As I mentioned before, it is an association composed of gentlemen who would undoubtedly get a lot of business if this bill is enacted into a law. I read the letter which is as follows:

AMERICAN PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1956.

IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 2128, PATENT EXTENSION (SCHEDULED FOR DEBATE ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7)

To the Members of the House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This association is a national organization, founded in 1897, and having a present membership of 2,000 lawyers specializing in patent practice. We represent patent owners and, because we do, it might be thought that we would favor patent extension generally. But we are opposed to it because we feel that it is contrary to the welfare of the patent system, with which we are vitally concerned.

We are firmly opposed in principle to the extension of the terms of patents where the normal use, exploitation, promotion, or development of the invention was prevented or curtailed by shortages of materials, Government regulations, or the like resulting from the existence of a state of war or national emergency.

In our judgment this would constitute class legislation without any real justification.

The wartime controls in question were not controls especially directed toward patents or patent owners, but were controls on production and materials which affected patent owners no differently from many other enterprises not involving patents. The right to manufacture, use, or sell an invention is not a right obtained by a patent, as a patent grants only the right to exclude others from the use of the invention. Any wartime curtailment of the right to manufacture, use, or sell an invention was not a curtailment of a right obtained by a patent. To the extent that such curtailment shortened the period that a patentee might enjoy and profit from his monopoly, his loss was no different in kind or degree from countless other similar losses suffered by many nonpatent owners during the war. There is no reason that the purchasing public, and it is they and not the Government who would pay for the proposed extension, should reimburse patent owners any more than others who suffered similar losses.

We also oppose the ground of extension that the owners of patents granted royalty-free licenses to the United States during wartime and, therefore, received less reward for governmental use of their inventions than might otherwise have been the case. Many patentees during the war, for patriotic or other reasons, granted royalty-free licenses to the Government. In many cases the patentees were given production orders to the extent of their capacity to produce and the licenses were desired by the Government for freedom to obtain secondary sources of supply without patent liability. In all cases the patents remained in force against the public insofar as production other than for the Government was concerned so that the general public was not relieved from liability for infringement of such licensed patents.

To extend the term of any patent on this ground as now proposed would result in extending the term of potential liability for infringement by the public for an additional period, whereas the public has never been relieved of that liability for a commensurate period.

This association opposes class legislation directed to patents because it believes there is strength in that position as a fundamental policy to avoid unwarranted attacks on the patent system. We realize that some patent owners would like to extend their patents at the expense of the particular segment of industry which would be affected by the extension. But, as a matter of overall policy, we have consistently opposed such class legislation and we respectfully urge that this bill be defeated.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION,
By RICHARD WHITING,
Chairman, Committee on Patent Legislation.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The substitute amendment offered by the gentleman in effect strikes out the heart of the bill and retains in it the first subsection and the third subsection, both of which are of minor importance and would affect only a relatively few number of patents. The heart of the bill is section 2, which he seeks by his substitute to strike out. What the gentleman is seeking to do is to deny to those patent holders, many of whom are small individual operators with limited resources, working in basement or garage workshops, struggling to produce something of value not only to themselves but to society generally, the rewards of their inventions for a period of time. Time is of the essence in patents, because, unlike other rights, other property rights which exist in perpetuity, patents exist for only a limited period of time, an extremely brief period, 17 years. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS], would seek to deny a substantial portion of this period to the patent holders.

A great deal has been made of the position of the National Association of Manufacturers with respect to this legislation. Actually, the big manufacturers have pursued a rather consistent policy in opposing patents in many ways, and sometimes almost seeming to try to completely undermine the patent system by continually tying up in litigation any inventor who seeks to prevent infringement of his patent; by trying to destroy the small individual inventors. That attitude is clearly reflected by the position that the National Association of Manufacturers has taken on this legislation. They are opposed to it. By and large they are the patent users. The patent owners, the individuals who invent the devices are the ones who favor this legislation. But since the Court of Claims has held that individuals are entitled to compensation where private property was taken without due process of law through these Government stop orders, why should an inventor not be entitled to some relief where the normal use and exploitation of and profit from an invention was denied to the inventor by one of these Government stop orders? I submit that it was the taking of property without due process of law just as much as was the case of the gold mine operators. To deny these patent owners

full enjoyment of their full 17-year period under their patents is the taking of their rights without due process of law. Therefore I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has stated the case very clearly. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] likewise stated very clearly just what the issue is. This is an attempt to strike out section 2, which is the heart of this bill. I do not think the committee would have bothered to report it or bring it in here if section 2 had not been in the bill. So, if you vote for the pending amendment, you might just as well vote against the bill as far as I am concerned.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has very properly emphasized the time element that is involved in this issue. Seventeen years is not a very long period of time during which to exploit and do something about a new idea or a new process. By the time you set up the machinery for the production of it and an organization to get it distributed, one-third or one-half the time is gone. Then, if somebody infringes on it, particularly some large company which always has lawyers at its beck and call, 17 years is a short period of time as far as the maximum use and exploitation is concerned. When 5 or 6 years are taken out by arbitrary action on the part of the Government, necessary under emergency conditions, but which stops the clock from moving as far as the owner of the patent is concerned, the patentee finds himself, instead of having 17 years for use and exploitation, with perhaps only 12 years.

The Government promised him 17 years, but if this amendment is adopted you are saying to him, "You are not going to have 17 years, you are going to have 12 or 13 or 14."

Can we in good faith say that the United States Government should not stand upon its promise, its commitment to give the holder of a patent 17 years of use instead of 12, when the reduction came about through no fault of the patentholders themselves?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Is this section not broad enough to include a lot of patents that were seized by the Government in World War II? I was on the Patents Committee at the end of World War II and I know a lot of valuable patents were divided and alloted out to industry in this country. A lot of those patents were not authorized. They belong to the Government.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is entitled to his views.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no point in pursuing this thing. As I see it the Patent Office says this is administratively feasible, it does not cost the taxpayers anything, it does not restore anything to patentholders except the time that was taken from them by an arbitrary act of Government, a stop order that they could not use the patent for the duration of the emergency.

This simply restores what the Government took away from them so they will have 17 years instead of 12, 13, or 10, as would be the case should the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts be approved. All it does is to give them the 17 years' use they were promised by the Government of the United States.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up much of the Committee's time, but this bill is one that has some merit. I believe section 1 is desirable. We are trying to help our veterans, and most of us here are veterans.

I think section 3, the relief provision, is desirable.

Section 2, however, is one part of the bill which, I believe, is most undesirable. I believe it is unfair, and unjust to the American people to impose upon them these proposed limitations and the tribute that they would pay to the holders of most of the major patents in this country if this section were approved. I think that section 2 is the only part of this bill that is in controversy.

I think that when this bill goes over to the Senate we are going to have another problem over there. If we just eliminate section 2 from the bill I think the people who should be helped will be helped.

I would like to ask you to give very serious consideration to the Curtis amendment which will, in effect, strike section 2 from this bill and leave in those provisions concerning veterans and those who should be granted relief under section 3.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas what the effect of striking section 2 would be. As I read section 2 it sets up procedures for appeal or contest in the event that an application for extension is filed. It appears that if section 2 is taken out the Commissioner of Patents would have no recourse in the event an extension request is filed except to grant it. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. No; that is not my understanding.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I think the reference there, Mr. Chairman, should be to subsection 2 on page 2, not to section 2.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and to speak in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

It is my considered opinion that those patentees who by reason of their service with the Armed Forces or because of the shortage of materials caused by the war were unable to exploit their patents, deserve to enjoy the profits of their labor and ingenuity.

There have been some objections raised to section 2 in the bill, and I well realize that Members who have made such objections have some reason certainly for so doing; however, the weight of the argument for the retention of section 2 is, in my opinion, with the proponents.

I have been advised that in the past and at the present time all expired patents, except a few which bear the label "supersecret" are placed in the public domain of the United States Patent Office. These patents, therefore, not only become available to American citizens but to citizens of other countries as well. I believe that inventive ability and ingenuity of the American people is far greater than that of any foreign nation. While it is true that we do have reciprocal relations in this field with practically every nation in the world in the exchange of information and expired patent rights, we get from foreign countries a lot less than we give them.

The passage of this bill will restore to patentees in the three classifications their patent rights for a period of years and by virtue thereof will make those patents unavailable for use by citizens of foreign lands.

I hope the bill passes by an overwhelming majority.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 17, noes 32.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

(4) In cases where grounds for extension exist under more than one paragraph of subsection (a), the further terms designated in this subsection (b) shall not be cumulative but shall be determined under the applicable paragraph of this subsection (b) which results in the longest extension.

(c) If the ownership of the patent at the time the circumstances, described in subsection (a), which qualify the patent for extension, first arose, is different from the ownership at the time of the filing of the application for extension under this act, such application shall be acted upon only if the owner or owners at the time such circumstances first arose (or their legal representatives) have joined in such application.

(d) The periods during which one or more of the circumstances described in subsection (a) (1) or subsection (a) (2) must have occurred in order to qualify a patent for extension under this act are as follows:

(1) The period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945.

(2) The period beginning June 26, 1950, and ending July 26, 1953.

(e) For the purposes of this section, a reissue patent shall be considered to be the same patent as that which it supersedes.

SEC. 2. (a) On the filing of an application for extension of the term of a patent hereunder, together with such information as may be required by the Commissioner, and upon payment of such initial fees as the Commissioner may from time to time prescribe, the Commissioner shall publish a notice thereof in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office. Within 60 days from such publication any person may oppose an application for extension by filing with the Commissioner a notice of opposition thereto stating the grounds therefor, which shall not include any charge that the patent is invalid. If a proper notice of opposition is filed and payment is made by the opponent of such initial fees as the Commissioner may from time to time prescribe, the Commissioner shall set a day for hearing which shall be within 45

days of the date of the filing of such notice of opposition, and shall give not less than 30 days' notice of such hearing to the parties in interest. Upon the hearing the parties in interest shall present such evidence as they believe is revelant and such other pertinent evidence as may be required by the Commissioner. If, from all the evidence presented before him, the Commissioner is satisfied that a patent should be extended in accordance with this act, he shall grant such extension. The Commissioner shall take action granting or denying an extension within 6 months after the filing of an application for extension. The Commissioner shall fix the total fees (not exceeding $150) to be paid by each applicant for extension of the term of a patent hereunder and the total fees (not exceeding $50) to be paid by each opponent to an application, the specific amount of all such fees to be determined according to the work of the Patent Office required in processing the application or in hearing an opponent thereto, as the case may be, and the estimated cost thereof to the Patent Office.

SEC. 3. If any applicant for an extension is dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioner or of any board established by the Commissioner for the determination of applications for extensions, he shall have the same remedy by appeal to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or suit in the District Court for the District of Columbia, as provided in the case of applications for patent.

SEC. 4. The Commissioner shall issue a certificate evidencing the granting of an extension hereunder. A notice of the granting of an extension shall appear in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office.

SEC. 5. Upon the issuance of the certificate of extension, said patent shall have the same force and effect in law as though it had been originally granted for 17 years plus the term of such extension, except as otherwise provided herein.

SEC. 6. Except where the owner of a patent extended hereunder was entitled to royalties under said patent (whether or not such royalties were received or waived) for any class of machines, articles, or materials, or for the use of any class of processes or formulas, produced or furnished exclusively to or for the benefit of the United States, or used exclusively by or for the benefit of the United States, no patent extended under the provisions of this act shall serve as a basis for any claim by reason of manufacture, use, or sale by or for the United States during the period of extension, and the rights of the United States shall remain in all respects as if such patent had not been extended.

SEC. 7. In the event that an extension is not issued until after the date of expiration of the original term of a patent or reissue thereof, the extension order shall provide that any vested rights arising out of the actual manufacture, use, or sale of the invention covered by the patent so extended, which took place after the said expiration and before the issuance of the extension order may continue during the remainder, if any, of the period of the extension upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe, including the payment of reasonable royalties, providing the person or persons claiming such vested rights establish such rights to the satisfaction of the Commissioner upon a hearing.

SEC. 8. In any action for infringement after the expiration of 17 years from the grant of the patent and during the period of such extension, the defendant may plead and prove that any material statement of the application for extension required by this act is not true in fact; and if any one or more of such statements shall be found untrue in fact, judgment shall be rendered for the defendant, with costs.

SEC. 9. Any application for the extension of the term of a patent hereunder shall be filed within 1 year from the effective date of this act except for applications which are filed under subsection (a) (1) of section 1, which applications shall be filed within 1 year from the effective date of this act or within 1 year from the date of the applicant's honorable discharge from service.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct a grammatical error.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIS: Page 2, line 8, strike out the word "presented" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "prevented".

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 18, after "2." insert "(a)".

Page 6, line 7, after the word "hearing" strike out the balance of the line and line 8 down to and including the word "opposition," in line 9.

Page 6, line 16, after the period, strike out the balance of the line down to and including the word "extension." in line 18.

Page 7, line 3, insert: "(b) The Commissioner may establish rules and regulations for the conduct of proceedings under this act."

Page 7, strike out lines 5 to 11, inclusive, and insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Any application for the extension of the term of a patent hereunder shall be filed within 1 year from the effective date of this act except for applications which are filed under subsection (a) (1) of section 1, which applications shall be filed within 1 year from the effective date of this act or within 1 year from the date of the applicant's honorable discharge from service."

Page 9, strike out lines 11 to 17 and insert the following:

"SEC. 9. If any party in interest for an extension is dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioner or of any board established by the Commissioner for the determination of applications for extensions, he shall have an appeal to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or suit in the District Court for the District of Columbia, as provided in the case of applications for patent."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK) having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2128) to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls, pursuant to House Resolution 409, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF ROGUE RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES (OREGON)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the famous Rogue River and its tributaries in the State of Oregon. The bill directs the Secretary of the Army through the Corps of Army Engineers to study this river basin with a view to developing comprehensive multiple-purpose and integrated plans for flood control, reclamation and irrigation, and other beneficial development and utilization of water resources including recreational uses. It will be necessary in such a survey, of course, to take into consideration conservation of soil and the conservation and protection of forest, fish, and wildlife resources.

Such a complete, comprehensive and carefully integrated survey of the marvelous Rogue River Basin is desperately needed. It is obvious, I think, that the responsibility for making such a study should be placed in one agency which would, of course, incorporate the original survey work done by all other Federal agencies and by State and local agencies so far as such material was usable in making its final report to Congress.

It seems logical that the appropriate agency to make such a comprehensive study of this river valley is the Corps of Engineers. The Army engineers have had wide experience in making such river-basin surveys and I believe it is generally considered that the Army engineers do a very thorough and competent job in making such surveys.

Also, since disastrous floods have occurred in the Rogue River Valley during the past few months involving a total loss and damage of more than $3 million, extraordinary attention is therefore focused on the need for flood control in the valley. Since the making of flood-control surveys and the construction of flood-control projects is primarily a function of the Army engineers it will be necessary for considerable emphasis to be placed on that subject when a survey is made. That is another reason for assigning this responsibility to the Army.

Several surveys based on other congressional authorizations have been undertaken in the Rogue basin during the

past 20 years. At least two such studies are now in the partially completed stage. The Army engineers have started to make a preliminary flood-control survey which was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1936. I believe that it is now about 65 percent complete. The Bureau of Reclamation in 1950 completed a report on a study of the potentialities of the Rogue River basin to which study the Army engineers contributed some data on the subject of flood control. A comprehensive reclamation plan was submitted to former Secretary Chapman in 1950 but he refused to consider it further until other Bureaus of the Department of Interior could complete their investigations and report on other aspects of the basin such as scenic, recreational, and fish and wildlife values. It was quite apparent as that study was in progress that irrigation and flood-control development could not be the only factors to be considered.

Later, after the Honorable Douglas McKay became Secretary of the Interior in 1953, one segment of the total plan which was completed in 1950 was forwarded to Congress in 1954—this being known as the talent division of the Rogue River project which was authorized by Congress in August 1954.

Subsequently, in early 1955, the National Park Service completed its report entitled "Recreational Resources of the Rogue River Basin, Oregon." At the present time the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior is working on a report which may be released soon regarding the fish and wildlife resources of the basin.

In a letter to the Honorable Elmo Smith, Governor of Oregon, under date of February 17, 1956, the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Douglas McKay, states the case briefly but completely in one paragraph as follows:

> The recent floods in the basin have again demonstrated the need for coordinated planning. The Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy on which I was privileged to serve as chairman, pointed this out quite clearly in stating: "To achieve the maximum beneficial utilization of water resources, planning for their use must be a cooperative effort participated in by all of the Federal agencies involved, with States, local governments, and private citizens included within the area under consideration."

Had such close planning existed when the Rogue River report was in the early stages of planning, there would, I believe, have been evolved a plan which could have had the support of all local interests and its implementation could have gone far toward reducing the heavy destruction resulting from the last flood.

It is precisely that type of cooperative and coordinated planning which will be made possible if the bill I have introduced is enacted into law.

This new survey authorization is necessary for several good reasons:

First. The existing flood-control survey authorization contained in the Flood Control Act of 1936 is too limited in its scope to permit the Army engineers to make a comprehensive and all-inclusive report.

Second. Other agencies such as the Bureau of Reclamation, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service may make studies in their own respective fields but again there is no existing congressional authority for the integration of such reports in an overall plan including flood control.

Third. It is essential if the desired result, namely a complete comprehensive plan is developed, that the responsibility for gathering together the reports and information available from all other agencies, Federal, State, and local, be placed in the hands of one agency.

The local interests in the valley of the Rogue River are many and varied. The Rogue, for example, is a world famous trout fishing stream and certainly that great natural resource should not be destroyed or impaired. The valley is a rich agricultural area. The crops grown there are wanted products and are not in surplus. It is desirable to bring new land into production and to provide supplemental water for existing irrigated areas. As population and industry increase, and both are increasing rapidly, additional hydroelectric power should be generated. The Rogue River Valley has a marvelous year-round climate and its streams and mountains offer splendid recreation opportunities in addition to hunting and fishing. Obviously, any plan for the development of the water resources of the Rogue River must be very carefully developed so that all values will be protected and enhanced, and none destroyed.

The only way that the views, the objections and the desires of all local interests can be fully considered and evaluated is to first develop a survey under the authorization I have proposed. Then, when all of the facts, figures, and maps are on paper and can be spread out on a conference table, the whole matter can be studied by the State and local people. With the facts in front of them it should be possible to develop a plan for the construction of necessary beneficial works which will represent the best possible utilization of all the natural resources in the Rogue River Basin, and to which those with presently divergent viewpoints could agree.

THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 106th anniversary of the birth of the founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic, Thomas G. Masaryk, a man whose democratic ideals spark the hopes of Czechoslovakians everywhere that their native land might once more be free—free from the subjugation of Communist rule.

It is not surprising then that the Communists would have us forget the memory of Thomas G. Masaryk. It, therefore, is our solemn duty here in the Congress to pay tribute to this man whose name has already been engraved on the great slate in the annals of time beside those revered statesmen of the free world—the names of those who have in a never-ceasing way fought to establish and maintain justice, decency, and honor that man could think, speak, and pray as he desired without state tyranny.

The life of Thomas G. Masaryk is more than an inspiration to his fellow nationals. Indeed, his life exemplifies the very hopes and desires of everyone who has or will throw off the shackles of totalitarianism and dictatorship.

In his tradition, we of the democracies espouse a policy of liberation and a goal that all men shall enjoy the freedoms for which he fought, and by this same tradition, Czechoslovakia shall once again be free.

RAVENSWOOD, W. VA.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House an article which appeared in the February 1956 issue of the magazine Town Journal. The article is about a small town which I am happy to say is in my district. The town is Ravenswood, W. Va., the site of the new $216 million Kaiser aluminum ore reduction and rolling mill installation. Ravenswood folks give an annual dinner for which everyone pays $5 whether he comes to eat, to sing, to dance, to cook, to wash dishes, of if he is the honored speaker. This year, the ninth annual dinner will have as its speaker Mr. Philip Sporn, the engineering genius who has realized the fantastic energy of West Virginia's black diamond by exploding coal rather than just burning it. He is the president of the American Gas & Electric Co. Mr. Sporn will come to address the 2,000 or so people who will attend—probably more than the entire population of Ravenswood itself—and he will pay his $5.

I would like to invite the distinguished Members of this House to come to Ravenswood on Monday evening, April 23. This illustrious body will be received with great honor and enthusiastic welcome. Do not forget to bring $5 for your meal.

LITTLE TOWN WHERE "BIG SHOTS" PAY TO TALK

(By Ronald Sanford)

HENRY KAISER CAME TO DINNER IN RAVENSWOOD, W. VA., AND STAYED TO BUILD A FACTORY—THE DINNER COST HIM $5

Ravenswood, W. Va., is a mere pinpoint on the map, a country town of old-fashioned stores and weatherbeaten frame houses. Its population, according to the 1950 census, is just 1,175. Yet, to this little place, off any main highway, come the great of the Nation—just for the privilege of making a speech at the annual dinner of the Ravenswood Schools Improvement Association.

Not only do they receive no pay for speaking; they must also—along with every diner, volunteer waitress, cook, entertainer and visiting member of the press—pay $5 for the

meal. In 8 years of $5 dinners, nobody has ever eaten free.

"Well, that's different, at least," you may say. But does the Ravenswood dinner result in anything more than an unusual social event? Decidedly, yes. Last year, for instance, it yielded $6,000 net profit for new equipment for the schools. It has kindled community spirit because every group in town gets together on it. And it helped bring Ravenswood a new plant of the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. which may well turn this little village into a modern city of 5,000 to 10,000 people.

Four years ago, a busy ALBEN BARKLEY left the highly remunerative lecture circuit long enough to speak at Ravenswood's dinner. "I just had to see a town with nerve enough to make the speaker pay to talk," the Veep chuckled as he handed his $5 bill to the toastmaster.

The same "pay or don't come" audacious approach in 1954 lured President Howard E. Simpson, of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad; and last year industrialist Henry J. Kaiser, United States Senator Harley M. Kilgore, Representative M. G. (Bernie) Burnside, and West Virginia's Gov. William C. Marland. A spare ex-Congressman served as toastmaster.

With all this—plus top-flight entertainment (40 men from the B. & O. Glee Club last year)—the $5 dinner draws more people than the town has population—1,200 guests altogether in 1955.

Net profit always equals gross receipts, since—with the whole town and many out-of-towners donating labor and food—there are never any expenses. Every penny goes to buy new school equipment.

Ravenswood's idea got started back in 1948. Nine of the town's businessmen and the high-school coach had gathered over coffee around the battered table at Hupp's Restaurant where most of Ravenswood's community decisions are made. They debated how to raise $500 to keep the high school football team from breaking up; it had only enough tattered jerseys and pants for nine men.

"People are tired of being hit for donations," somebody said, "let's give them something for their money—like a dinner." From the start, it was decided to count mostly on the speeches and entertainment to keep diners satisfied with an easy-to-prepare meal.

Joe Short, editor of the Ravenswood News, got his friend, President Irvin Stewart, of West Virginia University, to speak. Grocer Kelley Somerville asked his suppliers in nearby cities to give food; they did, and in return got mentioned in the printed program plus the privilege of attending the dinner (for $5 each, of course). Townspeople cooked food in homes and churches. On the night of the first dinner, 190 people showed up—and the high school team played that fall.

Each year, the dinner grew and grew. Soon to handle the crowds, local trucks had to travel as far as 60 miles to pick up chairs from schools, churches and undertakers who didn't happen to have a funeral that day.

Temporary tables had to be erected each year, using lumber borrowed from the local lumber yard. "One little hole didn't keep it from being sold later as new."

Silverware, the sponsors obtained mostly from churches; serving dishes, from individual homes. Plates, cups, and saucers they got by intercepting truckloads of china made in the small local factory (after the dinner shipping the dishes to out-of-State customers).

Nearly every family in town ultimately got into the act. More than 130 women and girls now help prepare and serve each dinner. They have a committee to wash dishes, two candied yam committees, an apple chairman, a water detail, a ham committee and even a committee for relish and one for succotash. Boy Scouts, the chamber of commerce, the Lions Club, the churches—everybody helps.

Ravenswood's businessmen sell the tickets. It's easy. "If we'd asked business acquaintances in nearby big cities for $5 donations, they might have given grudgingly 'just this once'," one Ravenswood retailer put it. "But with our dinner, we tell them, 'We don't want a donation—we want you to come and have a good time.' An out-of-town firm may buy 15 tickets for its executives; and 15 men show up. Folks are offended if they're not asked."

Grocer Somerville recently suggested to his suppliers that he might bring in other food donors, now that the dinner uses at one sitting 550 pounds of yams, 540 pounds of ham, 2 bushels of radishes and 11 of apples, 240 pounds of frozen succotash, 48 bottles of olives and 96 of pickles, 2 crates of celery, 38 pounds of coffee, 144 packages of mints and gallons of ice cream. But Somerville's suppliers refused help, saying "no, we're caught up in the spirit of the thing now."

What's Ravenswood's secret? Why has its $5 dinner succeeded where other towns, seeking to emulate it, have failed? Here are the reasons:

The various clubs and organizations concentrate on this one big project every year, rather than dissipating energy on little ones.

A small nucleus of a dozen or so men and women "make a hobby out of the dinner," keep its expenses at zero by unselfishly giving their time and paying—out of pocket—for incidentals like gasoline for errand running.

Nobody will settle for less than a top-name speaker; and Ravenswood gets them ingeniously.

"Take the time we got BARKLEY," says undertaker Chambers. "I don't know him. And nobody else does. But I've always admired him as a speaker. So I put in a person-to-person call to Washington. I was shaking so hard I could hardly talk. His wife said BARKLEY was asleep but to call back in an hour. We figured that was just a brush-off—but it wasn't.

"There he was on the phone, nice as could be. We told him we were just some small-town boys who wanted to talk to him about a 'community matter.' Could we come to Washington to do it?"

Sure, said the Veep, and Chambers, hardware merchant Walter J. Purdy, and Postmaster Wayne Myers drove to Washington, 337 miles away. The nervous threesome expected BARKLEY to dismiss them in 10 or 15 minutes. Instead, he kept them nearly 2 hours. BARKLEY sympathized with anyone who'd drive half the night to see him. Yes, he'd come.

"I reckon he remembered he's just a small-town fellow himself," Purdy said later.

Purdy's scrapbook reached thick proportions with BARKLEY's coming—and that was just what he wanted. To each speaker he sought, he could now say, "Look at this scrapbook—and see how many other distinguished persons have spoken at our dinner."

Purdy believes the direct approach—the person-to-person call followed up by a visit—is best. "These round-about approaches through a friend of a friend seldom pay off."

The dinners have made Ravenswood's high school one of the best equipped in the State. There's fun for kids in every entry in the school improvement association's account book: $71.91 for two record players; $461.07 for 12 basketball uniforms; $653.72 for 10 band uniforms, 3 plumes and citation cords; $396.90 for one projector and screen; also lights and bleachers for the football field, a new basketball court, and paving for the tennis court.

Perhaps not coincidentally, other nice things are happening to Ravenswood as dignitaries take note of the town. "We badly need extension of Route 2, hard surfaced, to Ravenswood," then-Governor Okey Patteson was told when he spoke; and now route 2 is being extended. New industry is another need for this farm trading center and the B. & O. Railroad, whose president paid $5 to speak, proved instrumental in bringing a huge new Kaiser aluminum plant to Ravenswood.

Kaiser explained why he chose Ravenswood: "We liked the location, the transportation facilities, the wealth of natural resources, and the geographical relationship to vital eastern markets. But most of all, we liked the people there, the spirit of cooperation." A spirit best exemplified by the $5 dinner.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to transfer the special order I had for today until Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TUNGSTEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, unless something is done to prevent it, every tungsten mine in the United States will this summer be shut down once again. Knowing as I do the increasing need for this unique metal in the fields of jet aircraft engines, and ballistic missiles, and in our atomic energy and thermonuclear programs, I do not feel free to stand by and do nothing to prevent this tragedy.

I have, therefore, today introduced a bill, which if enacted will extend Government price support to domestic tungsten production until July 1, 1959—3 more years. This is a simple bill and embodies the recommendations of the domestic tungsten miners on the Tungsten Industry Advisory Committee to the Office of Minerals Mobilization, which recommendations were presented at a meeting in the Office of Minerals Mobilization on December 15 last. Since then no action has been taken by the Office of Minerals Mobilization and I do not think the Congress of the United States can wait longer in the hope that some remedial affirmative action will be recommended by the Office of Minerals Mobilization and put into effect by the Government agencies. The paralyzing hand of those in control, whose supreme idea it seems is to balance the budget at all costs, will apparently effectively prevent any action until it is too late. It, therefore, seems to me that the Congress should act and awaken the administration to the acute need for continuing tungsten production in this country.

The use of tungsten in any considerable quantity first came about in this country during World War I. It was then searched for frantically and obtained anywhere it could be gotten at whatever price was required, and its price soared. After World War I ended, the Government sold its supply of tungsten at whatever price it could get. As a result the price of tungsten went to almost nothing, the few mines which had been

opened in this country closed and all production here ceased for some years.

Large reserves of tungsten ore had been discovered in China through the search by us and our allies in World War I and these properties were developed and put into production and China became the principal supplier of tungsten to the world. It continued to play that role until communism succeeded in that vast country and its tungsten was diverted to Russia where it is being used to the fullest advantage today.

When this unfortunate development came about and shortly thereafter the Korean war developed, we found ourselves in a desperate position again for tungsten and set about developing new sources of supply both at home and abroad; and happily today we have been able to accumulate considerable quantities of tungsten in our national stockpile of strategic materials. I am confident, however, that we do not have enough and that we will not have too much by any means if we extend the Government price support program as provided in the bill which I have introduced. The bill provides that the Government will between the expiration of the present program and June 30, 1959, buy not to exceed 3 million short tons units of tungsten of domestic origin at a price of not less than $63 a unit, which is the price provided in the Government price-support program which will soon expire. A short ton unit means 20 pounds of tungsten trioxide and of this 20 pounds, 15.86 pounds is contained tungsten metal. Therefore, when we speak of 3 million units, we mean slightly less than 24,000 tons of tungsten, and at $63 a unit, 3 million units will cost the Government $189 million if all of it is bought. Neither the amount of metal nor of money involved here is large relatively.

In 1930 a tariff of 50 cents a pound on the contained tungsten imported concentrates was enacted and this amounts to $7.93 a unit. Under the protection of this tariff which afforded a real measure of protection in 1930, some tungsten production was resumed in the United States. But imports from China and elsewhere in the world were too much for the infant industry to face, and by 1939 when Hitler went on the move we were once more on the edge of a great world war without any tungsten stocks in the hands of our Government and without any considerable domestic production. Again, we set about frantically to obtain supplies of tungsten and were most fortunate in that we were able to get a large amount of Chinese tungsten through French Indochina just before we became involved in the world cataclysm. After Pearl Harbor luck was once more on our side in the fortuitous discovery of the Yellow Pine tungsten mine in Idaho, which came into production at the crucial moment and gave us the additional supplies of tungsten which were needed for munitions. In the opinion of the Munitions Board, this additional tungsten from the Yellow Pine mine shortened the war by at least a year and saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of our men. I remember most vividly the meetings we had when we were authorizing building of the roads to this tungsten mine in Idaho and the building of the large mill there and how important we knew it was to get it at once into quick and full production.

Right after the conclusion of World War II the tariff on tungsten, through a trade treaty with China, was unwisely cut, and again by 1949 every tungsten mine in this country save one stopped mining, and the one that ran stockpiled its production itself since it could not sell it except at a tremendous loss in competition with low-price imports coming in under the altogether inadequate tariff. At that time I had a conference with General Spaulding, who was then Chairman of the Munitions Board, and got him to agree to buy a year's production from the domestic tungsten mines so that they could reopen. This was done in the form of individual contracts negotiated with the various mines and as a result, when the Korean war developed, we did have a few of our tungsten properties in operation. By the end of 1950 we were back once more in a frantic search for tungsten and in the spring of 1951, after world prices had soared to $100 a unit and we had put a price ceiling of $65 a unit on tungsten in this country, the 5-year program which will soon expire was set up by the General Services Administration under the direction of the Defense Minerals Production Administration. This program involved the purchase at a minimum price of $63 a unit of 3 million units of tungsten of domestic origin. As a result of this, our domestic tungsten industry has expanded until last year it produced about 15 million pounds of tungsten, some 3 or 4 times what used to be considered the maximum that this country could produce. I do not wish to see this productive capacity destroyed. Notwithstanding anything anyone else may say, I know that it is one of the greatest potential sources of our total national strength both economic and military, and I cannot stand by and hold the clothes of those who would unwisely stone it to death in the name of balancing the budget.

If plenty of tungsten is available, we can build infinitely better jet engines and ballistic missiles and develop much more surely our atomic energy and thermonuclear programs, and in this tragic era in the world's history we cannot shortsightedly fail to keep at hand in even more than ample quantities the sinews of our strength—in this high temperature era, we cannot have too much of the most heat resistant metal—tungsten, the melting point of which is 6,170° Fahrenheit, and whose recrystallization temperature is 2,300° Fahrenheit, far higher than that of any other metal. The hardest of the metals in the form of carbide, the most heat resistant and possessing the most desirable recrystallization temperature of any of the metals—that is tungsten, and standing as we are on the very threshold of the high temperature era in engineering, we cannot consider letting our domestic tungsten mines close, the waters rise, the timbers rot, the walls cave, and desolation and decay reign where the roar of the drills should instead be heard as we harvest nature's provision of the strength that we need to preserve freedom, now so severely threatened in this distressed world.

Although the Office of Defense Mobilization says we have an adequate supply of tungsten in our stockpile, nonetheless the Department of Defense has in force a directive or instruction limiting its use to a restrictive target in jet engines for aircraft and so far the tungsten mining industry has been unable to get this restriction removed. It should be removed in the light of the amount of tungsten that is available and our designers should be told to design the best conceivable jet engines for aircraft regardless of how much tungsten is used.

In 1950 and 1951 while we were setting up this domestic tungsten program to provide for the purchase from our own people of three million units, we stimulated production also all over the world by entering into long-term contracts at high prices for tungsten and by making loans to develop mines and build mills. Our foreign commitments for tungsten were manyfold those made at home, and as I speak to you today and our domestic program comes soon to its end, we have still some 14 contracts with tungsten operations in foreign countries under which deliveries are still being made and under which millions of units are yet to be delivered. The last of these contracts to expire will come to its end on December 11, 1959. Some will expire this year, some next year, some in 1958, and then they will all finally end when the last one expires in December 1959.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not asking you to do for the domestic tungsten miner anything more than we have done and are doing for the tungsten miner in Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Belgian Congo, Peru, Portugal, Spain, South Africa, and Thailand, from all of which countries tungsten deliveries are being made now under contracts still in force which have already run over many years.

While we can be proud of the 15 million pounds of tungsten our domestic mines produced in 1955, we must remember that only about half of that production came from the four or five mines that have any likelihood of long life. Most of the mines are small and few have any hope of developing into big ore bodies with long life ahead. The Yellow Pine mine in Idaho which served us so well in 1943, 1944, and 1945 was all worked out—most of them are just like bowls full of soup, some larger, some smaller, but easily emptied and then there is no more in them and their productivity ceases. We must not let those large ore bodies we have developed be destroyed by abandonment. Our tariff protection is inadequate and our mines just cannot compete under our labor costs with those abroad where wages are so much lower.

In 1953, we were told that the administration favored a sound and healthy mining industry in this country, and would develop policies to bring about and sustain that desired end. In early 1954, the administration announced that a policy of expanded stockpile goals would be the instrument of sustaining a healthy strategic metals mining industry, and then they cut the stockpile goal for tungsten. Late in 1954, the much

heralded national minerals policy was announced and approved by the Cabinet. It stated that it was essential that we keep domestic mining continued in a healthy condition as a mobilization base. Then in 1955, the Office of Minerals Mobilization was set up and it was said that it would devise and recommend programs for each of the minerals to preserve a going mining industry in this country as a mobilization base capable of rapid expansion in the event of war. But, Mr. Speaker, nothing has been done, nothing has even been recommended, and therefore I am offering this simple modest bill dealing only with tungsten. I hope others will introduce needed bills dealing with the other strategic minerals, and that out of them all the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs will after consulting with the administration report out a bill or a series of bills which will deal adequately with the situation and keep strategic mineral mining alive in this country and not meet with a veto like the one which nullified congressional action in this respect at the first session of this Congress.

I am activated in this matter by no thought of partisanship. I have never given that a moment's thought in connection with any matter affecting, as this does, the national defense. It so happens that, fortunately, a large tungsten-ore body was found in my State in 1942 and that it has developed into the largest single producing tungsten mine in this country, but it is not in my district and while I love my State, I am just as much interested in preserving the tungsten mines in California, Idaho, Nevada, and elsewhere.

The tungsten producers of this country through the Tungsten Institute, which is their trade association, are engaged in a cooperative research effort at Stanford Research Institute in California to develop new uses for tungsten in the form of alloys involving greater quantities of tungsten for higher temperature applications such as those in the hotspots of jet engines and in other fields where even more temperature and recrystallization resistance is required. It is hoped and believed that through this cooperative industry effort, and research by others as well, that the demand for tungsten will so increase that all the resources for its production in the free world will be continually employed and the law of supply and demand will take care of the price. But whether this is done or not, I say to you that at this time, we cannot afford to be without our domestic tungsten production, and I, for one, am not willing to stand by and see it unwisely permitted to go by the board for the fourth time since World War I.

THE FARM SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I request the indulgence of the House while I speak briefly upon the desperate circumstances of agriculture. I want to bring emphasis upon the responsibility that challenges us.

First, let me call your attention to the fact that my own State, Alabama, in 1955 had the highest dollar income from agriculture in all its history.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the economic position of most farmers in my State continued to deteriorate. Our small farmers especially are hard pressed, as costs of things they must buy for production purposes continue to soar out of all proportion to levels of farm income, and our farmers are entering a new crop year confronted by deeper cuts in their allotted acreages for major crops. The overall trend is reflected in a disturbing movement of good farm people away from the land and into the cities.

In view of the hardships now being experienced by the farmers of Alabama, despite a record level of income last year, I am in an exceptional position to comprehend the magnitude of the hard times that again have returned to farms all over America.

The prosperity enjoyed by other great segments of the Nation's economy has passed the farmer by. Agriculture is caught in a cost-price squeeze that is forcing many small farmers from the land and has brought heavy hardships to our middle and larger farmers.

I have been in touch with the Department of Agriculture for the exact information on the disparity of this condition. I learned this:

First. Net farm income in 1955, for the whole Nation, was 37 percent below 1947.

Second. Hourly earnings of factory workers, during this period, increased by 52 percent.

Third. Dividend payments to stockholders are up 71 percent.

I cite these facts to emphasize that farmers are not sharing in the high-level prosperity now enjoyed by other segments of our economy.

But, Mr. Speaker, before entering further into a discussion of the general situation in agriculture, I should like this record to show what has occurred in Alabama agriculture in the relatively short span of years since it has been my privilege to serve in Congress, beginning at midyear in 1938.

In 1939 the cash receipts from farm marketings in Alabama amounted to $86,665,000. By 1951 these marketings had increased to $444,185,000. In 1953 the sales of Alabama farmers dropped to $422,662,000, and in 1954 they were down to $396,662,000.

But in 1955, with a munificent providence giving us the best growing season in our memory, especially for cotton, our farmers produced phenomenal crops and they sold $463,458,000 in the market places—which is the highest income from agriculture our State ever has experienced. This return was made possible by 90 percent price supports on two of our major crops—cotton and peanuts—firm supports on which we no longer can depend.

Here are the year-to-year cash receipts from marketings by Alabama beginning in 1939:

Cash receipts from farm marketings

[Thousands of dollars]

Year:	
1939	86,665
1940	87,298
1941	136,400
1942	191,297
1943	235,604
1944	277,076
1945	277,568
1946	308,781
1947	393,659
1948	431,580
1949	345,822
1950	363,236
1951	444,185
1952	443,013
1953	422,662
1954 [1]	396,662
1955 [1]	463,458

[1] Preliminary.

Mr. Speaker, since Alabama is in the rather singular position of having shown a record dollar income in 1955 when the cost-price vise fastened itself so tightly on our agricultural economy, I think my colleagues may be interested in further detail on the nature of the agriculture in my State.

Therefore, I am submitting a table showing the cash receipts from farm marketings, by commodities, for Alabama, 1939 and 1954, the last year in which such detailed information is available. The table, compiled by the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, follows:

Cash receipts from farm marketings, by commodities, Alabama, 1939 and 1954

Commodity	1939		1954	
	Actual	As percent of total	Actual	As percent of total
	Thousands		*Thousands*	
Livestock and products	$27,016	31.2	$187,114	47.2
Cattle and calves	6,800	7.8	51,448	13.0
Hogs	6,591	7.6	49,453	12.5
Chickens	1,633	1.9	1,914	.5
Broilers			32,653	8.2
Dairy products	7,721	8.9	30,423	7.7
Eggs	3,938	4.5	18,297	4.6
Other poultry	333	.4	2,926	.7
Crops	59,649	68.8	209,166	52.8
Cotton lint	35,582	41.1	126,058	31.8
Cottonseed	3,923	4.5	13,769	3.5
Peanuts	3,336	3.8	11,535	2.9
Corn	2,384	2.8	6,471	1.6
Potatoes	2,051	2.4	5,012	1.3
Soybeans			2,821	.7
Pecans	274	.3	2,338	.6
Peaches	872	1.0	2,328	.6
Sweetpotatoes	1,238	1.4	461	.1
Watermelons			1,538	.4
Hay	551	.6	1,471	.4
Forest products	3,255	3.8	15,396	3.9
Greenhouse nursery	907	1.0	6,689	1.7
All commodities	86,665	100.0	396,280	100.0

Mr. Speaker, our farm program was born 23 years ago when the country, in the midst of the depression came—belatedly—to a realization of the importance of the prosperity of agriculture to the strength and health of the whole economy. It took a near fatal catastrophe to bring this to pass.

We all know what this program accomplished. Of course farm prices have

been influenced by war and postwar demands. Nevertheless during the lifetime of the farm program cash receipts of all farmers have increased from $4,735 million in 1932 to more than $30 billion.

This improvement in farm income created a great market for things produced in the towns and cities. This made jobs and kept factory wheels turning. Rural people were able to buy the conveniences and comforts that previously had been within the reach only of city and town people. Farmers were able to mechanize their farms and apply the new sciences and more and improved plant foods. Farmers, with the means to do it, used their new resources and their energies to restore and conserve the soil.

But now hard times have returned again to our farms.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize to my colleagues here that these new strains and hardships in our agricultural economy have come about through no fault of the farmer, or any basic faults in our farm laws as they operated through the war and postwar years. They have resulted primarily from a constantly shifting international situation that at the period of the Korean conflict made extremely hazardous the application of any crop restrictions, and from a lessening of foreign demands for the products of our farms. The truth is that the abundant supplies—now blamed for our troubles—derive directly from the policy of our Government which, at the outbreak of the Korean conflict, suspended crop controls and called for all-out production.

The Government has a responsibility in this.

I think the Government is morally bound to aid our farmers as it already has aided industry, in the transition from emergency production to a normal output pattern. How can we explain the cost-plus payments to industry, the enormous tax considerations, and industry's reconversion payments, while our farmers are being forced to carry virtually the whole burden of the costly changeover from a wartime to a normal economy?

In this transition our cotton farmers in the South right now are feeling the major impact, in terms of reduced acreages for their 1956 crop.

Mr. Speaker, I have sought to ease the severe hardships of our cotton farmers by the introduction of H. R. 9703. This measure was approved March 5 by the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

This bill would authorize direct payments in cash to cotton producers who have complied with acreage allotments for 1954, 1955, and 1956.

This is an emergency program. Our small farmers are being forced out of agriculture. I have traveled some 3,000 miles with our Subcommittee on Family Farms and we have found that these family-operated farms have borne the brunt of the postwar decline in farm income.

Cotton acreage allotments have been cut, in many instances, to levels where farmers no longer can earn a living for their families.

The soil bank legislation now being considered in Congress would remunerate farmers for surrendering a part of their small acreage that has been allotted for 1956. This would be of little, if any, benefit to small farmers. I propose to relieve the severe hardships of cotton farmers caused by the sharp acreage reductions that heretofore have been imposed.

Long-range programs will be of no benefit to thousands of small farmers, unless they can hold on until such a long-range program begins to work. This bill I have introduced will help many small farmers continue in agriculture.

This is what I propose in H. R. 9703:

First. Every cotton producer who has substantially complied with acreage reductions in 1954, 1955, and 1956 would be eligible for a payment in 1956 on the acres that have been taken out of production on his farm under the Government program since 1953.

Second. The rate of payment would be computed by multiplying the price support rate applicable to cotton by 25 percent of the normal yield per acre for the county; then the total payment per farm would be determined by multiplying the rate of payment by the number of acres on the farm eligible for payment.

Mr. Speaker, this measure should be of great assistance to our cotton farmers, but it is not the complete answer. Therefore, I am working for various other measures introduced by my colleagues that deal with other aspects of the problems of cotton. One bill that I am supporting was presented by Representative ROBERT E. JONES and several other Members from Alabama and neighboring States. This would provide that no State could receive a cotton allotment in 1956 less than its 1955 allotment.

I am intensely interested also in the bills which propose to limit the importations of cotton textiles that tend to depress the production and sales of our domestic textile mills.

Moreover, I am hopeful that the Congress will approve a bill directing the Secretary of Agriculture to sell our cotton at competitive prices in the world market.

The cotton textile industry in Alabama and throughout the Nation is alarmed at the competition of Japanese textiles in our own American home market, and justly so.

We must impose reasonable and equitable import restrictions against cheap foreign textiles.

Sharply lowered tariff rates on cotton-textile imports went into effect last fall, these new rates being agreed to by the State Department apparently for the purpose of building up the Japanese economy, although Japan already possesses a competitive cost advantage over our domestic mills because of access to lower priced cotton and cheap textile-mill labor. Imports are increasing rapidly and Japanese cotton goods are entering this country to be sold at prices under levels which can be met by our mills.

I want to impress upon the House the seriousness of the situation and urge immediate action to assure a fair return to our cotton farmers, to regain and hold a fair share of the world cotton trade, and to give necessary protection to our domestic mills.

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed briefly my position and what I think needs to be done for our cotton economy. This currently is our most pressing farm problem in the South. We who are interested in a parity of income for agriculture are busying ourselves equally with the problems of other crops.

We know that we have got to stop the growing depression in agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture only on Tuesday reported that farmers' realized net income in 1955 dropped to $10,800,000,000—down a billion dollars or 9 percent from 1954.

This report set forth that the per capita income of people living on farms dropped another 6 percent in 1955, to $360, while the per capita income of the nonfarm population increased 5 percent, to $1,922. Take note that the per capita income of farm people already is less than half the income of nonfarm people, and the farm income continues to drop and the income of others continues to rise. Take note, also, that, of the $860 per capita income of farm people, only $584 was from farm sources; the remainder came from nonfarm sources, as many thousands of our farm people found it necessary to take part-time work in town.

I am particularly disturbed by the severe decline in the number of farms. Many of our small farmers are finding the going too rough, and are moving to jobs in town. The number of farms in the United States declined from 5,967,000 in 1945 to 5 million in 1955. In my own State the number of farms decreased from 211,512 in 1950 to 176,956 in 1954. In 1930 Alabama had 257,395 farms and 50 percent of our population lived on these farms. Now only about one-third of our population lives on farms.

The farm population of the United States dropped from 27,124,000 in 1947 to 22,158,000 while the total population increased from 144,126,000 to 165,248,000. The loss in farm population from 1947 to 1954 was greater than in all the previous 37 years since the census reported 32,077,000 people living on farms in 1910. In 1910 approximately 35 percent of the people of the United States lived on farms. Today the farm population is only 13.4 percent of the total.

Mr. Speaker, I have here reviewed briefly the agriculture of my own State and I have cited the critical aspects of our farm economy as a whole, in the hope of focusing attention to and understanding of the plight of our great farm population. I have placed especial emphasis on cotton, since this is so important to my home State and to the South.

The Congress now is considering major agricultural legislation. I personally fear that, in the great diversity of proposals and the pressures being exerted, that Congress cannot bring forth in haste at this time any program that will be of substantial long-range benefit to the farmers of America.

We, of course, must exert all of our energies to do what can be done at this time. The suffering of our farmers cannot wait.

But, much will remain to be done, to assure our farm families an equitable share in the national income and in the Nation's prosperity. This is going to require the best effort of all of us who are interested in Agriculture.

To bring about any great advancement in the cause of Agriculture, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, two important things must happen:

First. The conflicts between farmers themselves, in different crops and in different regions, must be dispelled. A rather successful attempt has been made in recent years to divide our farmers, so that it is difficult for the Congress to bring together their conflicting views into one dynamic program for the good of all. Farmers have got to get together. In unity they will find strength.

Second. We must convince the people in the towns and cities that it is only simple justice and good commonsense that our farmers should have a fair share of the fruits of our free-enterprise system. We must impress upon them the interdependence of all segments of our economy, that it is in their own self-interest that agriculture, too, should be prosperous—for a continuation of the decline in agriculture most surely will pull down the prosperity of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, more than anything, if we ever are to achieve economic equality of opportunity for farmers and their families, we must have understanding between farmers and city people, and among farmers themselves. I close these remarks with an appeal for this understanding. This is the force and the help needed in the work the Congress is doing today, and in the work it must do tomorrow, to bring justice to the American farmer.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I should like to compliment the gentleman on his very fine statement and the contribution he has made to the American farmer and especially the farmers in his district. I should like to ask the gentleman a question in connection with this situation. My State, too, is a cotton-producing State. Some of our farmers are becoming alarmed over the fact that so much of the cotton market is being lost to other fibers, some synthetic fibers, because of the high price of cotton.

I am wondering if the gentleman does not feel that perhaps we have a two-edged situation here. Perhaps the more we support this crop, the less market we have for the crop. I am wondering if the gentleman would care to comment and further enlighten me on that point?

Mr. GRANT. I thank my colleague from Arizona for his contribution. I think most of the people of the Nation realize that cotton is the best fabric they can buy. However, we certainly do have a problem with synthetic fibers. This problem is not easily worked out. It is something that all groups and all segments of the cotton industry must work together on here in Congress to try to solve.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I should like to compliment the gentleman again and state that I have also found it to be true that the farmers particularly in the cotton industry are getting together more and more in a united front. I hope that with that kind of help we in the Congress will also be able to be as helpful as we possibly can be in solving the problem that the American farmers now face.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I have listened to the gentleman's presentation with a great deal of interest and appreciation. May I say, as chairman of the Family Farm Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, of which the gentleman was a participating member last fall, that the gentleman may perhaps not realize that his presence on that committee was a greater inspiration not only to the committee members but to the farmers whom we visited on our 3,000-mile trip than that of perhaps any other member of that committee. Of course we on the Committee on Agriculture know and appreciate his very deep interest in all the affairs of agriculture, particularly those relating to the family farm. As I listened to his presentation today I found in it inspiration for myself, and I am sure other Members who read it will feel similarly inspired. I thank the gentleman for bringing to us this statement, and I thank the people who have sent him here to us.

Mr. GRANT. I thank my colleague from Texas. It was a pleasure for me to be a member of this small family farm group of which he so ably acted as chairman. I want again to thank him for bringing this group to Alabama and seeing at first hand our problems, particularly the problems in my own district.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. I also commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT], on the very fine statement he has just made. The people of our State of Alabama know of his deep and sincere interest in the farmers, not only of Alabama, but of the entire Nation. We in our State realize how very fortunate we are to have as the third ranking member of the House Committee on Agriculture the distinguished gentleman who has just spoken to us.

Cotton farmers in our State, as well as in other areas where cotton is grown, are beset by serious and complex problems that result directly from increasing surpluses, continuing acreage reduction, and falling income. These farmers, of course, look to the House Committee on Agriculture and to the Congress, not only for a long-range solution to their problems, but also for immediate assistance.

Although I realize the task we face is a difficult one, the remarks just made by my colleague from Alabama indicate that the House Committee on Agriculture will report remedial legislation at an early date that can be considered by the Congress.

I again commend my colleague from Alabama for his statement and assure him his work in behalf of the farmer, especially the small farmer, is recognized and appreciated by the people of our State.

Mr. GRANT. I thank my colleague from Alabama. No one here is more interested in agriculture than he. I recall that one of the cotton bills companion to the bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] and others was introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN]. I know he is greatly interested in that subject.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I commend my colleague on his fine statement and his contribution to this subject which concerns so many of us. His position as the No. 3 Democrat on the House Committee on Agriculture makes him one of the key individuals in the Congress and the Nation in the matter of the solution of our agricultural problems now and in the years to come. He is an outstanding and highly respected member of the Committee on Agriculture on which I am proud to serve. I am pleased indeed to join with him in his remarks and with his colleagues from our committee and from his State in commending him upon his fine statement.

Mr. GRANT. I thank my colleague from Oklahoma, who has so ably served as Democratic whip.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. I, too, congratulate the gentleman on the fine message he has brought to this House. It shows he has a profound knowledge of the great subject of agriculture, a subject on which he has worked diligently for 18 years, the whole time he has been in the House of Representatives. He is the third ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Agriculture and is recognized throughout this Nation as being one of the great leaders in agricultural legislation. Those of us in the Alabama delegation have for years looked to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] for leadership in matters of agricultural legislation. Not only has my colleague from Alabama been a great friend of the cotton farmer, he has been a great friend of the peanut farmer. His district and mine adjoin in the State of Alabama and in both districts peanuts are a big money crop. Peanuts have posed many problems in the Congress from year to year. There has been an effort made over the last few years to destroy our peanut program. This fight against the peanut program has been led by the candy manufacturers of America. They have sought several times to remove peanuts from the list of basic crops, which are supported at 90 percent of parity. My colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] has been one of the leaders

in the fight to defeat that effort. May I say again I know of no greater friend in the House of Representatives or, indeed, in either branch of the Congress of the United States that the little farmer has than the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. I have enjoyed his speech this afternoon, and I am sure it reflects the years of hard work that the gentleman has devoted to legislation dealing with the problems of agriculture.

Mr. GRANT. I certainly wish to thank my colleague from Alabama, and particularly for bringing up the subject of peanuts. I wish I had sufficient time to go into the matter of peanuts. What the gentleman has said is particularly significant at this time because this is National Peanut Week and everyone who does not know about peanuts should know that it is a fine food and can be used in a good many recipes. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] comes from one of the great peanut producing areas of the Nation. His work for the peanut farmers has been outstanding. I have worked shoulder to shoulder with him since he has been a Member of the Congress. The peanut farmers and all the farmers of his district owe much to the gentleman.

SOMETHING NEW IN AIR DEFENSE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, at the jet age conference recently held in Washington under the sponsorship of the Air Force Association, an interesting development in air defense was announced by Maj. Gen. William E. Hall, Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces, United States Air Force.

It gives me special pride that General Hall tied his announcement to my home town of Muskogee.

General Hall is not the only Air Force leader who emphasized the fact that the strength of the Air Force program depends to a great extent upon the cooperation of American communities. Community cooperation is necessary if we are to encourage men in making a career of service in the Air Force. Community cooperation is necessary in solving the problems of airbase location and jet noise. Community cooperation is especially important in providing personnel for the Reserve units which are important to the overall plan of a ready Air Force.

The new detached squadron plan which has been put into effect at Davis Field at Muskogee is a plan that promises a considerable increase to our air defense capability. This plan, although requiring many more actual sites than the wing plan, does permit the use of airports in smaller communities and it thereby reduces overcrowding and traffic congestion. Furthermore, it makes it possible for personnel to participate more easily and with less disturbance to their business and personal affairs.

Last November, the 713th Fighter Bomber Squadron was activated at Davis Field, Muskogee. By Christmas, our progressive mayor, my good friend Lyman Beard, was able to report to General Hall that the goal of 100 officers and airmen had been passed and that the 713th was a going concern.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to General Hall for the compliment he paid Muskogee and Muskogeans. As one of the latter, I want to thank him and express our appreciation for his action in making Muskogee a synonym for quick action, community enterprise, and military readiness. As General Hall said, "We have our troubles. We are going to have a lot more, but I think we also have our Muskogees." Yes, Mr. Speaker, America has its Muskogees and I am happy to be a native son of Oklahoma's own Muskogee.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of General Hall, the cooperation of the Air Force Association, and the consent of my colleagues, I wish to insert the extemporaneous remarks of General Hall at the jet age conference in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

I think if I were to make a list of the top 10 items which most profoundly affect the future of the Air Reserve forces, I would certainly include in that list base congestion, airlane congestion, runway extension, jet noise, and certainly the most important, public reaction to all of these factors. The three primary elements of any program, be it military, commercial, Regular or Reserve, are personnel, equipment, and facilities.

With respect to the first two elements, personnel and equipment, we feel that the Air Reserve has made and can continue to make very gratifying progress, but our aim is a combat-ready Reserve, and people and airplanes alone do not provide a combat force. We must have facilities from which to train, and we must have facilities from which to operate should that need arise. This is the weak link in our chain, and with increasing jet operations I'm afraid it will get a lot weaker before it gets stronger unless we find the key to public understanding and acceptance of these facts.

I am sure I do not need to tell this gathering that Reserve facilities requirements differ to a degree from those of the active establishment. An active bomber base, for example, can be located at a considerable distance from any sizable city. This may not be the most desirable solution but, nonetheless, it can be done.

A Reserve unit, on the other hand, has no alternative. It must be reasonably accessible to the people who are going to man the unit.

Just recently, we completed a study of the Air Force use problem faced by the Air Force Reserve. The results, though not a bit startling, are quite convincing. In general, some communities have given the Air Force Reserve a very heart-warming welcome. On the other hand, a disturbing number of others have opposed and will oppose us to the last ditch. I will try to present both sides of this coin.

Since 1951, we have had 14 gravely serious problem areas in major cities due to official and/or public opposition. Each of these sites had already been selected by the Air Force for its excellent Reserve population potential. Some had been selected in accordance with air defense requirements. All had been selected because the Air Force not only wanted but felt that it needed to establish Reserve flying units at these locations. In 6 of them, Reserve units were already operating. Yet, in 3 of these 14 sites, the outcome is still unresolved and unpredictable. The problem in the remaining 11 has been resolved, but more than 50 percent of these resolutions is most disappointing. Six of these 11 cities have denied the Air Force Reserve use of their local airports. The result is that we are now engaged in a long and drawn out, expensive procedure of finding new sites in these general areas in which we have a requirement.

When you consider the tremendous number of reservists in such places as Cleveland, for example, and Tampa, which are 2 of the 6 areas I mentioned, you can begin to realize the extent of damage that can accrue to the program.

In summary, then, in all of the 14 problem areas we have been able so far to locate only a firm basis in only 5, and that is since 1951. Even in these 5, success has been achieved by some very narrow margins; and even in these 5, successful negotiations have been extremely time-consuming with resultant delays in combat readiness of Reserve units. In 1 location, talks and negotiations consumed more than 3½ years.

When we examine the avowed reasons for public opposition in these 14 problem areas, we find the following: noise nuisance; jet aircraft a hazard to civilian carriers; jet aircraft decrease value of neighboring properties; space and facilities needed by Air Force Reserve involves loss of taxable property to State and municipality; fear the Air Force intends to take over entire airport; heavy commercial operations need further development; jet aircraft greatly increase danger of accidents; and heavy congestion already exists in area, especially in bad weather.

Whether or not we in the Air Force consider these as valid reasons is, in my opinion, not of too much importance right now. The fact is that a large segment of the American population does consider these reasons valid. Then our job is to convince this segment of the population that some other things are valid also, maybe even overriding. I refer to protection of homes, industries, and the Nation. That is all on the black side of the coin. There is definitely a brighter side.

In the first place, to correct some of these deficiencies, the Air Force today is being extremely select in its choice of sites for Reserve flying units. We are giving as much thought as possible to public receptions with respect to the Reserve manning potential in a particular area. In addition to that, we have gone to the detached squadron plan. This plan, although requiring many more actual sites in number, does permit the use of airports in smaller communities and thereby reduces overcrowding and traffic congestion.

Operationally, which is the principal reason for the detached squadron plan, this holds tremendous promise. Just recently, I received a letter from General Partridge, the Commander in Chief of the Continental Air Defense Command, in which he said, in part, "From the Air Defense standpoint, the detached squadron plan proposed by the Continental Air Command is much more desirable than the present concentration of Reserve fighter-bomber squadrons in large population areas. We believe that when these Reserve fighter-bomber units become separate squadrons operating independently, they will add considerably to our air defense capability."

This brings me to what I refer to as the Muskogee story. Muskogee, Okla., has a population of 37,000. It is in the eastern part of Oklahoma, 59 miles southeast of Tulsa. Its main industries are oil supplies, manufacturing, and I think certainly enterprise. The city-owned Davis Field, which had been an Army airbase in World War II, was later returned to Muskogee. Muskogee's mayor and city councilmen are progressive, wide-

awake, and patriotic. They decided to do something about Davis Field and, to that end, visited headquarters, 14th Air Force, to submit a proposal. There were naturally certain needful negotiations. It was decided that Muskogee would have to make repairs to the runway, aprons, electrical, and water installations and secure additional labor. All this was undertaken by the city with the enthusiastic support of the mayor and councilmen, the newspaper, businessmen, and plain John Q.

On last November 8, the 713th Fighter-Bomber Squadron was activated at Davis Field.

At Christmas, I received a telegram from Muskogee's able mayor, Lyman Beard. I would like to read that telegram to you:

"Our self-imposed goal of 100 officers and airmen in the 713th by January 1 has already been accomplished. We have 104 men either in the squadron or with applications pending as of today and I feel even more confident in the future. We may be applying for a second Reserve squadron. Best wishes for a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, and be sure we are keeping faith with you.

"LYMAN."

We have our troubles. I have tried to pinpoint some of them for you this morning. We are going to have a lot more, but I think we also have our Muskogees.

PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members, with whom I engaged in colloquy during the time I had the floor this afternoon, may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Second District of Illinois has very personal reasons for joining in the celebration today of the 106th birthday of Thomas G. Masaryk, the first President of the Czechoslovakian Republic.

Next to Prague, Chicago has the largest Czech population of any city in the world. The man who became the leader of independence for the Czech and Slovak peoples came to the University of Chicago in 1902 to deliver a series of lectures on Slavonic subjects. His fame as a scholar and philosopher attracted the admiration of Charles R. Crane, a Chicago industrialist, who traveled to Prague to induce Masaryk to share with Chicago his rich store of knowledge. A statue dedicated to the memory of Thomas Masaryk stands on the Midway in the Second District, symbolizing our recognition of the contribution which he and his people have made to the culture and the greatness of our city.

All nations have their patriots who are responsible for shaping their destiny and whose names enrich the history of mankind.

In Czechoslovakia, it was chiefly through the efforts of Thomas Masaryk that independence for the Czech and Slovak peoples was fulfilled. Thomas Masaryk was a teacher, philosopher, and statesman. He was a seeker and defender of the truth. His philosophy emphasized humanitarianism, democracy, and the elimination of violence or terror in social or political life. He was critical of Marxist ideology and wrote a book denouncing its theories. He taught the Czech people to accept democracy; for in his opinion it was the only system which could achieve political, economic, and social justice. It was principally due to his labor that the Czech nation was ready and mature enough to fight for its independence, when the opportunity came during World War I.

Masaryk always believed that the Hapsburg monarchy was incompatible with democratic self-government and he constantly struggled for a free and independent Czechoslovakia. During the war, he traveled extensively in Europe and the United States to gain support for the liberation of Czechoslovakia from Hapsburg rule. It was therefore only natural for him to be made President of the Czech National Council, an organization of Czechs living in foreign lands, which was striving for independence. It was in that capacity that he returned to Chicago in May 1918. At that time the United States by the Lansing declaration expressed sympathy for the Czech cause and by June 1918, the Allied Powers recognized the Czech National Council as the de facto Government of the future Czechoslovak state. A provisional government was set up and the declaration of independence signed on October 18, 1918. On November 14, 1918, Thomas Masaryk was elected President of the Czechoslovakian Republic.

The new state, which Masaryk founded, was based on democratic freedom and recognized the rights and duties of the individual. The preamble to their constitution was very similar to our own.

Under the presidency of Masaryk, Czechoslovakia became a strong democratic state. As trade and industry flourished, economically and financially Czechoslovakia became one of the soundest states in Central Europe. Great strides were also made in education and in the social and cultural fields. In foreign relations this progressive Republic established friendly relations with all her neighbors and was an enthusiastic supporter of the League of Nations. Indicative of the popularity of Masaryk's administration was his reelection as President in 1920, 1927, and 1934. He was forced to resign due to ill health in 1935 and died in 1937.

Masaryk's ideals are invincible. He was mercifully spared from seeing his beloved Republic destroyed by the Nazis, and later captured by the Communists. However, his spirit still lives in Czechoslovakia and despite Communist attempts to destroy his memory, he remains the symbol of true democracy.

Today on the 106th anniversary of his birth we in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, pause in our deliberations to pay the tribute of affection and of appreciation to the memory of one of the immortals of democratic government. His statue, standing majestically in the district I have the honor to represent in this body, will continue through the years to give inspiration to the thoughts and efforts of oncoming generations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GRAY, for 15 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. BASS of Tennessee), for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RABAUT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and include extraneous material.

Mr. MUMMA.

Mr. COLMER.

Mr. DAVIDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS.

McDONOUGH

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. CELLER) in two instances.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. CELLER) in three instances.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. BASS of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in 2 instances and to include in 1 a letter from the Governor of the State of California.

Mr. FULTON and to include a speech by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. KEATING.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 7588. An act granting the benefits of section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to certain children of United States citizens.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 578. An act for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe; and

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Irfan Dawar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 8, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1611. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 56th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Boston, Mass., August 28 to September 2, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 354); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1612. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 353); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1613. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "An act to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the donation to the Bureau of Prisons of commodities acquired through price support operations"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1614. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war risk insurance for an additional 5 years"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 9560. A bill to promote the interests of national defense through the advancement of the scientific and professional research and development program of the Department of Defense, to improve the management and administration of the activities of such department, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 1585. An act to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans' hospital and which is no longer needed for such purpose; without amendment (Rept. No. 1858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 1992. An act to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association; without amendment (Rept. No. 1859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 9799. A bill to amend section 803 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 9800. A bill to provide for the maintenance of essential production of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 9801. A bill to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 9802. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 9803. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Ellis Island to the State of New York for use as a clinic for the rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics and narcotic addicts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 9804. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amounts payable thereunder by the Federal Government to States having approved plans for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9805. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of single persons, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 9806. A bill to provide for the maintenance of essential production of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 9807. A bill relating to the closing or transfer of Veterans' Administration hospitals and regional offices; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 9808. A bill authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control on the Rogue River, Oreg., and its tributaries, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 9809. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 9810. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 9811. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 9812. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 9813. A bill to provide for the maintenance of essential production of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 9814. A bill relating to the transfer of Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 9815. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 9816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 9817. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 9818. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9819. A bill providing for payment by the United States of ocean or air freight charges on certain relief packages shipped to foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 9820. A bill to provide for the maintenance of essential production of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9821. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a) to establish an effective date of awards of pension in the case of certain veterans permanently and totally disabled from active pulmonary tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9822. A bill to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 9823. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import

tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 9824. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 9825. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 9826. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 9827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain from the condemnation by the United States of real property held by a person 60 years of age or older and to provide special treatment for such gain in the case of real property held by a person under 60 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 9828. A bill to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 9829. A bill to provide for the maintenance of essential production of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 9830. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Commitee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 9831. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. J. Res. 575. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R 9832. A bill for the relief of Yang Sin Djen Dao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9833. A bill for the relief of Letterio Versace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 9834. A bill for the relief of Irma Kochendorfer Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 9835. A bill for the relief of Krste Fantulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

625. By Mr. BRAY: petition of 82 members of Loogootee (Ind.) Post 120, the American Legion, in favor of H. R. 7886; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

626. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Mrs. A. D. Shaffer and other residents of South Bend, Ind., in support of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

627. By Mrs. HARDEN: Petition of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Arcadia, Ind., submitted by Mrs. Paul H. Teal, president, and signed by 156 residents of Hamilton County, Ind., urging Congress to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 106th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Thomas Masaryk was a scholar, a statesman, and a philosopher. He believed firmly that the State must be based on the ideals of Christian democracy, and that sound education is a prerequisite of a well-functioning, healthy democracy. He infused his convictions into the socio-political fabric of the Czechoslovak Republic, and they became an integral part of the heritage of that nation.

Since the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia, the Reds have exerted tremendous efforts to destroy the imprint which Masaryk's principles—the principles of our Western Christian civilization—have left upon the people and the institutions of Czechoslovakia.

They revised the entire educational system of Czechoslovakia, basing it upon the philosophy of atheistic, materialistic communism—which is the very antithesis of everything that Masaryk stood for.

They attempted to destroy the social and political institutions which grew out of the Christian, democratic tradition of the Czechoslovak Republic. They tried to kill the spirit of liberty, the love of freedom, which endure in the hearts of the Czechoslovak people.

Needless to say, their efforts did not meet with great success. The Communist masters were able to change the structure of the educational system, and its operations. They had the power to alter many political and social institutions. But they could never kill the flame of liberty which burns brightly in the hearts of the Czechoslovak people.

On this anniversary of Masaryk's birth, let us rededicate ourselves to the principles of Christian democracy which constitute a basic part of our western tradition—the very same principles which he cherished so highly, and supported so vigorously.

It is in these principles that the strength and the durability of our civilization is substantially embodied.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Graham School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on March 15 will occur the 150th anniversary of the Graham School, at Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y. In the years since its founding, this school has performed an outstanding service in a vital field of American life.

In this connection, I have prepared a statement pertinent to the significant occasion of the school's 150th anniversary, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES ON THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF GRAHAM SCHOOL, HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, N. Y.

On March 15 the citizens of my State of New York will pay tribute to a most worthy institution—the Graham School at Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.—which this year is celebrating its 150th anniversary. The school, first known as the Orphan's Asylum Society in the City of New York, was the first orphans' home in the Nation, and through its years of service to children of all races and nationalities, has provided a pattern for other child-care institutions in all 48 States.

It was on March 15, 1806, that Mrs. Isabella Graham called together 10 influential ladies of New York City, including Mrs. Alexander Hamilton, to discuss the fate of six small children whose widowed mothers had died, leaving the children desperate and homeless, with no place to go but the almshouse. Determined these little ones must not face such a fate, the women founded the Orphan Asylum Society in the city of New York and set it up in a small house on Raisin Street, in Greenwich Village.

Early records, kept faithfully since the founding, carry acknowledgments of "a lot

of beef, six pairs of shoes, a quantity of vegetables, and dozens of other gifts through which the public supported the new venture. In less than a year the house on Raisin Street was too small. The present site at Hastings-on-Hudson is the fourth home for Graham, the entire populace having been moved up-river to the new buildings in 1902, when Graham became the first child-care institution in the country to house children in cottages, rather than barnlike dormitories.

Under the care of trained cottage mothers, social workers, teachers, staff, more than 6,000 children have grown up at Graham. For most it is the only real home they ever knew. Today the school's best testimonies come from the men and women who have banded themselves into the Graham School Alumni Association, with more than 500 members in the New York City area alone. It is they who are the first to speak of the job Graham does in preventing juvenile delinquency—in providing love and security and guidance in the formative years.

It is with genuine pride that I commend the Graham School on its 150th anniversary. May its good work go on, providing hope and home for homeless children.

Address by Hon. Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona, at The Citadel, South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last Saturday, March 3, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] delivered a very able address at The Citadel, the military college of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by this great American be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It would be impossible for me to tell you the depth of the feeling that is in my heart this morning as I stand here in this historic school in South Carolina. I am honored to be here, and I am happy to be here. Happy for several reasons. One, I attended a military school in Virginia, Staunton Military Academy, for 4 years, and all of the instructors were graduates of The Citadel. I have often wanted to visit this school to see the place that produced that splendid type of individual. Then I am honored as any of the 165 million Americans would be to stand here on this rostrum in the presence of Gen. Mark Clark and have the opportunity, as a citizen of this country, to thank him for the invaluable services that he gave this country during the occasion of his long life of devoted service to it. He was the architect of much of the victory in Europe. He was the architect of the victory that should have been ours in Korea. He is a man as devoted to you and your futures as he has for his whole life been devoted to America, its basic concepts and its future. Then, for a third reason, I have great happiness at being here this morning, and that is the opportunity to stand here and congratulate the people of South Carolina for their wisdom in sending STROM THURMOND to the United States Senate. You might think it strange that a Republican would travel to one of the great strongholds of the Democrat Party, South Carolina, and avail himself of the opportunity to extol the virtues of a Democratic Senator. This morning, however, I am speaking as an American, not as a Republican, and I say to you people of South Carolina that STROM THURMOND is one of the great men of the United States Senate. His feelings are dictated entirely by his basic sound beliefs in the American system, and I hope that he graces the Halls of Congress for many many years in the future.

You can well imagine the difficulty that a speaker faces in selecting a subject, especially for such an important occasion as this. I pondered long on what I would speak about this morning, and I finally came up with what to you might seem to be a very simple subject. I want to speak to you this morning about freedom, because I feel that freedom has been spoken of too seldom in the schools of this country in the past. I hope that my thoughts provoke some comment from you as you gather in your rooms, as you gather in your classes, because if we don't speak out on this great subject of freedom, freedom itself may die.

Despite the fact that our country is now at peace, and our people enjoying the greatest material progress and prosperity in all history, there is a danger confronting us today which, if not effectively combatted, can and will destroy those essentials of American life for which wars have been fought and won and by which our present greatness has been achieved.

In pointing up this peril, I have no desire to speak as an alarmist or in a partisan, political sense; for the issue is a real and vital one and is no respecter of party lines. Indeed, its very existence threatens the future of our two-party political system and should therefore, inspire united action under our common allegiance as Americans.

This danger of which I speak is the threat to the individual rights, dignities, and liberties of man. It concerns the popularly defined contest between the liberal and conservatives of today. It challenges freedom with socialism, spirituality with materialism, God with man.

It is not a new issue. It has raged beneath the surface throughout the decades of our national existence. Only during the past 20 or 25 years, however, have events and circumstances been such as to prompt it to bolder and more violent attacks upon the consciousness of our country until, today, it is poised to strike with decisive peril upon the American system.

The full depth and significance of this danger is reflected in the confusion of terminology by which it is currently described. Its deceit is likewise apparent through the distortions of its propaganda which is daily foisted upon the American people in an effort to persuade them against the convictions of their heritage.

A liberal, by proper definition, is one who believes in liberty, who craves the freedom to live his own life, to follow his own pursuits, to exercise his own will, and to retain the products of his own labors. He believes in limited government and in the maximum rights of individuals so long as they do not infringe upon the equivalent freedoms of others.

The self-styled liberals of today, however, do not measure up to these standards. Quite to the contrary, they condemn such concepts as being only the rantings of reaction, and urge the dependence of individuals upon the restraints and regulations of a powerful, central government. They are liberal with the materialisms of life as these may be administered and doled out by the State, but they deny to man his rightful spiritual, ideological, and moral independence.

Unlike the liberals of yesteryear, those sturdy idealists who braved the unknown and untried frontiers of new world opportunities to found a Nation of freedom and justice and law, today's pseudo-liberals thrive only in an atmosphere of regimentation and control. They abhor initiative on the part of individuals, and they scorn as barbarian the competitive system of economy which has brought America to its present greatness.

Hence, the new liberalism of this country is nothing more than a revolutionary attempt to reject the concepts of freedom as these were enunciated by true liberals of the past. The modern liberals have taken "charity" from the Bible and the "general welfare" from the Constitution, and they have perpetrated upon this philosophical prostitution a gigantic hoax dedicated to the destruction of every principle of decency and human freedom which is rightly evolved from these two immutable theses of man's progress.

Today's liberal—the modern liberal—holds a general contempt for tradition and argues that the only progress possible for mankind is through the indiscriminate enforcement of change upon the past and the present. He forgets, of course, that the gifts of the present have come from the experiences of the past, and that one of these blessings is the very right of expression which he seeks to destroy by his immodest addiction to the bitter nectar of collectivism.

So, then, what is it that the new liberals propose as an alternative to America's present greatness, fortified as it is by a tradition of free enterprise and constitutional government? They offer bigger government, strict controls, a regimented economy—in short, less freedom. Their only promise is of a return to the system from which our forebears fled, the system of tyranny and slavery, the system for which man's hatred inspired him to conceive, here in America, this new Nation, in freedom, with justice, under God.

It is the liberals of today, and not the conservatives, who are the true reactionaries—indeed, the revolutionists, who aspire to the overthrow of order and justice and freedom. It is the liberals who sneer at patriotism, mock the Constitution, and make light of man's inherent devotion to his spiritual traditions. It is these pseudoliberals who condemn our Nation's fundamental aim of providing to our people sound, constructive government, and progress that is steady and in conformity with the American heritage and the dream of liberty.

Now who are these liberals? Where are they? How do they work? Not the real liberals, mind you, but the modern, pseudo-liberals, who disavow America for what it is and has been, and desire to fashion it anew after the pattern of their utopian schemes. Some of them are purposeful members of the worldwide conspiracy to destroy the genius of American freedom. Others are unwitting dupes in a pattern of human betrayal. But all of them, whether through plan or accident, are adherents to the theory that it is better to follow than to lead—easier to be slave than to be free.

This, of course, is true; for freedom has its obligations. Bondage requires no incentive, no talent other than the ability to obey. It is said, in fact, that the man who does only what he is told is a slave—but that the moment he does more, he is a freeman. So freedom does have its hazards—if they can be called that—and a man free to do anything is also free to do nothing. Or, if his sense of rebellion is strong enough, if he is so incapable of responding to freedom's challenge, he is also free to destroy that freedom.

The liberal of today employs devious devices to gain his goal. He appeals to human emotions. He sings the siren song of socialism, but he calls it "human progress." His revolution is not by force; it aims, instead, at the mind of man. He works in the school, in the political party, in the labor union, in the church, in the professions, and in the legislative forums of our Nation. You can-

not see him. He carries no card. He pretends a fervent allegiance to his country. But his real philosophy is the antithesis of everything that is American.

The pseudoliberals wear many disguises and have many names. They are such misnamed groups as the Americans for Democratic Action, the Committee for an Effective Congress. They work in public and in private. But all are intellectually dishonest, and all contribute to the socialization of America.

Yet, our citizens have an alternative to this conspiracy against their Constitution, their liberty, and their Free Enterprise Economy. This alternative is called conservativism, but it embraces far more than a mere philosophical opposition to the liberalism of today. Indeed, a conservative is also a liberal in that he derives his ideals of liberty and progress from a cautious and constructive application of past traditions to present problems for future advancement and well-being.

Until the beginning of the 20th century, practically all American statesmen struggled to be conservatives. They did so, not in rebellion against liberalism, for the ideals of these United States are, in themselves liberal. Rather, they believed that the fundamentals of our country's heritage should be conserved—not rigidly on a premise of ancient requirements, but reasonably and honestly in respect for their application to the tenets of human liberty in all times and all places.

Actually, the so-called conservative and liberal distinctions have never been clear in America; but it is a curious phenomenon that, while conservatives have long been criticized for their devotion to stability, the modern liberals are almost frenzied in their idolization of security, stability, and the guaranteed welfare. Certainly, as conservative thinkers have long pointed out, whatever may be the blessings of security, it is possible to buy security at too high a price. Change—or progress, as it is often misconstrued—merely for the sake of change, holds many inherent evils. The conservative recognizes this; the liberal, blinded by the desire to impose change in the name of progress and to institute a challenge to the individual rights and freedoms of men, has only contempt for the tried and true American way.

Today's liberal employs the tactic of division and disunity. He appeals to the lingering prejudices of a system of ranks and class which pure freedom does not recognize. When he speaks, he speaks not to all Americans as Americans, but rather he pits labor against management, farmer against worker, black against white, Jew against gentile, Catholic against Protestant, rich against poor.

He seeks only to magnify the differences among men. He is never positive and constructive. He is negative and divisive. He does not suggest to the less fortunate that, in America, they have the opportunity to grow and prosper under a free, competitive system. He only hurls abuse upon success and ability, and incites revolt against the established order. His goal, like that of the Fabian Socialist in England, is the measurement of man's equality in terms of the lowest standard, thus stifling initiative and incentive, and dissipating the hopes of our citizenry.

We ask ourselves—those of us who are conservative and, hence, the strongest force against this pseudoliberalism—how such a purpose can survive in the traditional American climate of opportunity. Ours is, after all, a Nation where the dreams of men come true—the dreams of liberty and justice and self-improvement. America is the land which urges us to "hitch our wagon to a star," to plan and to build on the rich foundations of our freedom and the heritage of those who came before us and provided for us, and for the generations of Americans yet to come, the opportunities we have had, as well as inspiration to move ahead to yet undiscovered frontiers in this sanctuary of freedom.

We who are conservative cannot believe, with the pseudoliberal of today, that the blessings of liberty or the free-enterprise system of America have run their course. We cannot accept the thesis of the Socialist planner that we have reached the zenith of freedom's opportunities and must now revert to an antiquated system of slavery or be forever paralyzed in a state of ideological stagnation.

Yet, however much these defeatists, these so-called liberals, may err in their philosophy, if they are able to persuade a sufficiently large number of our countrymen—to bend the minds of men against their inherent moral and spiritual convictions—they will succeed in suffocating the freedom of America.

This is the danger which lingers around and among us. This is the great challenge to Americans—the roadfork in the march of freedom. We must defy the revolutionary liberals of this hour. We must restore the concept of liberalism to the vocabulary of liberty and to the language of individual rights and freedom. We must resist the philosophical fashions created by the Socialists.

In our schools, our churches, our offices, our factories, our clubs, and in the legislative halls of this Nation, we must practice and preach the constitutional precepts of individual freedom—a freedom which comes from God to man, a freedom which God alone has the power to grant. The laws that we enact must carry with them the principle that the Government is the product of the people and that its authority derives from the consent of the governed. Nothing that the people or the States can do for themselves should be delegated to the Federal Government; for the Government gives nothing to its citizens that it does not first take from them.

In the fact that man can determine his own freedom lies both its greatest danger and purest beauty. An enforced freedom would be no freedom at all. Yet, because we have the capacity to overthrow it, to accept a substitute of slavery, we are committed to the judgment of God from whose eternal strength this freedom is derived. Once we trade any part of it for the false security of the modern liberals, we endanger the whole; and there is a point of no return whereafter the destiny of man is forever committed to the shackles of slavery.

We are approaching that line of decision now. We have gradually permitted our liberties to be consumed in the philosophy of big government until, today, the statutes of America weigh heavy with precedent for even greater violations of individual rights and freedoms. And if we become intoxicated by the tempting lures of the socialist-liberals, we will find that what freedoms are not taken from us we will give away because, under the spell of paternalism, it will seem easier to be led than to lead.

As for me, I am a conservative. Yet, in the true, historic sense of the word, I am also a liberal, for I will never, either in private or in public life, accept the terrifying philosophy that the dark shadows of regimentation and control must inevitably blot out the sunlight of freedom. I believe that the only progress befitting this Nation is the progress which recognizes the sources of our present greatness and subscribes to these tenets as the basis for future achievements.

I want no Federal regulation of any segment of our free economy, or of any aspect of the lives of our citizens. I have not fathered my children to grow up in a world devoid of the opportunities which I have known or of the freedom which I have cherished.

I know, too, that I am not alone in these beliefs. Americans are fundamentally conservative—that is our tradition, that is the quality and character of our respect for our liberty and our gratitude to the God who has charted our course. Let us, then, not be insensible to our obligations to freedom. Let us not allow the Socialists to outshout us.

Surely, if they can be so fanatic in their devotion to so backward and decadent a philosophy, we can be even more zealous in our allegiance to the ideals of human dignity and justice and right.

Ours is a cause of proven goodness, but it can only remain good if we remain watchful against its enemies, lest, despite our wish to enjoy the blessings of liberty, we fail to do the work and stand the fatigue of supporting it.

Subscription Television: The Camel's Nose Under the Tent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most hotly discussed issues before the American people today is pay-as-you-go television. The pros and cons have been argued at great length in press releases, brochures, radio programs, and so forth. There has been a great deal of heat and very little light.

The question that comes to my mind is not which electronic approach is superior but rather how are the countless TV owners throughout the Nation going to be affected. I believe the American people, while not organized, or having access to the propaganda media available to the large radio companies, are nevertheless asking the question: "Is it going to hurt us?" The answer is definitely "Yes."

In a sense, subscription television is a betrayal of those to whom the television industry owes its very existence. The people in this country have invested millions of hard-earned dollars in TV sets in the last 10 years. They have through the purchase of these sets created thousands of new jobs in a field that was virtually unknown in 1945. They rightly expect a great deal of enjoyment for the money spent. Has the television industry in return given the customer the entertainment they deserve? It has not. Now when it is an acknowledged fact that a great many shows produced are not worth watching, permission is sought to charge for the work of other groups, that is, sports, legitimate stage, and movies. In other words, certain leaders in the television field feel this is the way to get off the hook. How much thought are these same people giving to improvement in script writing and production of the conventional presentations?

Now, let us just suppose that subscription television were incorporated into the existing facilities. Would the quality of shows be materially improved? Not necessarily. We have been assured that first-run shows and special sport

events would comprise the bulk of taxed time. Conceivably, the net effect of the proposed system would be to take the small percentage of decent shows now on the air and sell them, leaving no free entertainment worthy of the name. Who will govern the amount or type of shows for which a fee shall be levied?

It is my feeling that pay as you go television is to the detriment of the American people as a whole; the extent to which it can be abused is easily imagined. The idea should be regarded as "the camel's nose under the tent" and stopped before it gets started.

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, March 7, 1956, marked the 106th anniversary of the birth of the great Czech leader, Thomas G. Masaryk.

It is said that with the birth of every human being a new star is lighted in the sky. Some few shine very brightly, and upon them are concentrated all the hopes and prayers of humankind who anxiously wait for a new era of everlasting peace. Most stars in this human firmament have a very dim luminosity, or are from the beginning destined to invisibility and obscurity. Often, it is only at the time of death that the greatness of a man appears in its full and complete splendor when his disappearance serves to make brighter his achievements and his glory in the eyes of future generations.

Such a man was Thomas G. Masaryk. Through his leadership Czechoslovakia became a free, democratic, and independent country. We do not err by saying that the mark of his greatness went beyond country boundaries. The entire world has known and has considered him a symbol—a man who made the achievement of lofty ideals the sole purpose and mission of his life.

From the ashes of a chaotic past he founded a new country, free and independent, which remains a symbol of liberty even though it is again temporarily forced to forego the practice of her sacred ideals while suffering under the enslaving fangs of a tyrannic neighbor. But history is never at a standstill. Tyrants and oppressors of freedom have a short existence and sooner or later they pay for their nefarious actions. A country can be, and may remain, morally free even if her people are bound in chains, because, in their oppression, in their torture, and in their suffering they can lift their eyes to the still pure and free skies of their country. Then in the depth of long nights, even through the bars of a prison, they will suddenly see the brightness of a star, and they will remember their leader, Thomas G. Masaryk.

The Russians know this. They feel the spiritual presence of an immortal giant who still sustains the bleeding strength and the moral unity of his people. They are haunted by a ghost that suddenly reappears in every sneer, in every silent gesture or rabid expression of scorn.

No wonder, therefore, that they try to crush the memory of Thomas G. Masaryk in the minds of his people; to erase his name from the streets and from the marble structures erected in his honor; to accuse and belittle his memory in the books of the younger generation. In all this the Communists will fail, however, because for every monument that falls, for every book that is destroyed, for every truth that is trammeled, deeper and deeper in the hearts of his countrymen will be engraved his teachings and his ideals. They will be handed down from generation to generation, until the day when freedom will rise again in Czechoslovakia.

This is not the first time that Czechoslovakia has suffered at the hands of an oppressor. She was enslaved for three long centuries before Masaryk came, but never did her people lose faith—even when they were forbidden to pray, to worship, and, even, to speak their language. Then the country's long night suddenly fell apart, the enemy's castle crumbled, and a man rose with the dawn of a new country. In gratitude they called him the Awakener. He led them; he freed them; he built a new nation for them. He was their first beloved president.

Such men as Thomas G. Masaryk do not live in vain, and their memory will continue beyond their death as long as the sun shines upon human miseries. We in the United States are fully confident that, in spite of all oppression, the inherent democratic strength of these fine people will eventually throw off their tyrants, and Czechoslovakia will finally enjoy the freedom and independence which Thomas G. Masaryk once secured for her.

NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, along, I believe, with every Member of Congress of the United States, I have received a certified copy of a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina requesting the Attorney General of the United States to place the NAACP on the subversive list.

The right of that legislative body to such action is not questioned. The reasons, however, set forth for this action should not only be questioned but should be very vigorously deplored. This is un-Americanism at its worst. When such people as the Honorable Ralph Bunche, the late Mary McLeod Bethune, Judge William H. Hastie, Oscar Hammerstein, II, A. Philip Randolph, the Reverend John Haynes Holmes, and others are listed as subversive merely because their names appear on the record of the House Un-American Activities Committee on unproven and irresponsible charges is no reason for any organization to be listed as subversive.

Furthermore, to cite these or any other individuals who have never been convicted of un-American activities in such a resolution is the worst kind of demagogery and can only be classified as a smear and in itself thoroughly un-American.

The Legislature of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina owes an apology to these outstanding Americans, and I trust the Attorney General of the United States will give the resolution the wastebasket treatment it deserves.

Thomas G. Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's "George Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, marks the 106th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, who is sometimes described as the "George Washington" of Czechoslovakia. On the occasion of the anniversary of the founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic, which flourished so successfully as a democracy in Central Europe until it was crushed by the Communists, I send my greetings and sincerest wishes for the early liberation of Czechoslovakia and its people from the oppressive yoke of communism.

Democratic Czechoslovakia was the masterwork of this great statesman and philosopher, Thomas G. Masaryk, who undoubtedly ranks among the greatest of men in the first half of the 20th century. Masaryk nurtured the idea of an independent and democratic Czechoslovakia in the years prior and during the First World War, until its creation in the years following that war. The Czechoslovak state which flourished until a few years ago was a great monument to his ideals. It exemplified the finest ideals of a true democracy and the best traditions of the Czechoslovak people.

After about a quarter of a century of independent existence, the Republic of Czechoslovakia was destroyed by a ruthless tyranny which enslaved its people and robbed them of their freedom. But the indomitable spirit and the memory of Thomas G. Masaryk cannot be destroyed. These will live forever in the minds and hearts of the Czechoslovak people and of all those yearning to see Czechoslovakia rise once again to take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

As we pay tribute to the memory of Masaryk, we in America must dedicate ourselves to give full moral and spiritual support to the people of Czechoslovakia in their struggle for freedom. Their struggle is our struggle, too, for a free Czechoslovakia will enhance the forces of the free world.

The New York Times recently published an article from its Prague correspondent, Sydney Gruson, which shows how the Communists are trying to eradicate the memory of Masaryk from the minds of the Czechoslovak people. The article reads as follows:

CZECHS PORTRAY MASARYK AS FOE—STUDENTS NOW BEING TAUGHT HE WAS A REACTIONARY—BENES ALSO BELITTLED

PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, January 24.—A new historical portrait of Thomas Masaryk, the "George Washington" of Czechoslovakia, is being drawn for this country's high-school students.

At Public School 16 today the history lesson for the 11th grade, which is the equivalent of the senior class in an American high school, gave the visitor a glimpse of the new official picture: Dr. Masaryk was portrayed as a reactionary Socialist, the guiding spirit of a struggle in Czechoslovakia against workers' and peasants' demands for nationalization of banks and factories and for dividing the land.

Since the Communists seized power in 1948, there has been a vigorous campaign to deprecate the role portrayed by Dr. Masaryk and his successor in the Presidency, Dr. Edouard Benes. The campaign starts in the schools, but it is also conducted at other levels. The names of Masaryk and Benes have been removed from schools, streets, and hospitals and replaced by others more in keeping with the times.

To the American visitor, the swiftness and eagerness of the 11th-grade students during their lessons was impressive. The school director described them as the top class, all members of the official youth organization and mostly candidates for a university. The class was made up of 40 boys and girls, 15 to 17 years old.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The official picture being drawn of Masaryk began to emerge toward the end of a question-and-answer period. Following are some typical exchanges:

Question. What was the real cause of the First World War?

Answer. It was the struggle for colonies among all the imperialist powers.

Question. The German imperialists said they could not pay reparations after the First World War. How did France react?

Answer. By occupying the Ruhr. The German imperialists replied by devaluing the mark. The Americans took advantage of the resulting crisis to offer Germany a loan.

Question. What were the politics of the Czechoslovak Government in the First Republic?

Answer. The same as the French. Our armies were misused in fighting for imperialist aims.

Question. Why the Western orientation?

Answer. It was good for the bourgeoisie, which wanted to lean on the West because of fear of the workers' revolutionary demands.

Question. What did the Red army's victory against the Polish intervention in 1920 mean for the struggle here?

Answer. The revolutionary movement was strengthened. That was the time when the Socialists could have taken the leadership in their own hands.

Question. Who was against it?

Answer. Masaryk. He advised the Rightists to bide their time. He tried to postpone the Socialist congress because he was afraid the delegates would vote to join the third international.

There was never any hesitation in the students' answers and, so far as could be judged, no doubts in their minds about the historical truth of what they were learning.

A Communist Party teacher was taking one literature class and a non-Communist teacher another.

"The quality of our teachers is not even," the school director remarked. "The non-Communist teacher taking this literature lesson is the better of the two. She teaches so well her pupils love the books. The Communist teacher has made her pupils detest the books."

The director, Mme. Josefa Klancikova, said 11 of the school's 40 teachers were non-Communist.

She displayed a notebook that is kept by all members of the 9th, 10th, and 11th grades. In front of the book was the student pledge of allegiance to the country's "progress, defense, and Socialist future." In addition, the students also pledged:

"I shall always love Soviet Russia, the protector of freedom, progress, and peace and I shall stand firmly in the ranks of the workers of the whole world in their fight against oppression and against imperialism."

Proposed Amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the need for sound, constructive amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act is becoming increasingly more apparent. On Monday of this week I had the privilege of speaking on this vital matter, with particular reference to S. 1269, which I sponsor, before the second legislative conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO. I ask unanimous consent to have my address on that occasion printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. PAT MCNAMARA, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE SECOND LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 5, 1956

We are nearing the close of the ninth year following the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, more popularly known as the Taft-Hartley Act. This Labor-Management Relations Act, passed by the 80th Congress in 1947, became law despite President Truman's veto. This period of almost a decade is more than sufficient time for the American people to call for a balancing of accounts to see what has happened and what should be done.

The law was enacted in the midst of great controversy and passion. The opponents of the act claimed that its object was to weaken or to destroy the trade unions which have become an indispensable support of the living standards of the working population of the United States. The supporters of the law claimed that the law would establish a fair balance between labor and management.

The passage of the years has transferred the issue to this latter question of whether the law does indeed strike a fair balance between labor and management.

The belief of the opponents of the law that it is unfair and unworkable has not waned or diminished. On the contrary, the movement to secure substantial changes in the law has increased and become strengthened. There is perhaps no better evidence of the intensity of the opinion that the law must be changed than this great assemblage of the representatives of the Building Trades Unions of America here in this hall.

The grievous results of the Taft-Hartley Act on labor relations in the building and construction industry have caused the building trades department, under the leadership of your esteemed president, Dick Grey, to convene these national legislative conferences for the first time in the history of trade unions which include the oldest labor organizations in the United States.

And I can add, from my personal experience in this industry, that many of the most responsible building and construction employers share the view of labor that this law is unfair, unworkable, and should be changed.

The ironic fact in all this is that even supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act have come to realize that glaring inequities exist—thus conceding the truth of charges responsible labor leaders have been making from the very outset.

This is not just wishful thinking. It is a fact—and it can be proved from the voluminous hearings that have been held on Taft-Hartley. During my talk this morning I will illustrate this.

Yet—what has happened? In almost 9 years, there have been only 2 amendments. One was designed to take care of a particular situation regarding the non-Communist affidavit. (Of this affidavit I will have more to say later.) The other amendment removed the necessity for balloting on the union shop, after this whole procedure was shown to be patently ridiculous and worthless.

Labor wants the law changed. Taft-Hartley supporters say it should be changed. It is clearly time for action.

Once the joint need for revision is realized, the argument moves to the changes necessary. But even on these, there is a growing area of agreement—as I will show.

As you know, I have joined a number of my colleagues in the Senate of the United States in sponsoring S. 1269. It is my view that the significant merit of this bill is that it builds upon this measure of agreement regarding the changes which should be made in the Taft-Hartley Act. The bill also includes certain items which continue to be the subject of wide difference of opinion. But these matters, such as the repeal of section 14 (b) which would invalidate the misnamed right-to-work laws of the States in the field of interstate commerce are, in my judgment, an absolutely vital and indispensable part of any minimum program for relief from the Taft-Hartley Act.

In reviewing the amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act which would be achieved by the enactment of S. 1269, let us turn first to those amendments on which there is substantial agreement.

Sections (a) and (b) of S. 1269 would reverse the rule of the Denver Building Trades case.

Organized labor has objected to the provisions of sections 8 (b) (4) (A) and (B) of the act, which were the basis for the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Denver Building Trades case holding that the picketing of an unfair job constituted an illegal secondary boycott. These provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are unjust. They destroy the immemorial right of union men to refuse to work by the side of nonunion men. Their destructive effect on union wage scales is evidenced by the fact that the nonunion employers protected by the Taft-Hartley Act were paying 42½ cents under the union scale.

The justice of labor's complaint in this regard has been recognized.

President Eisenhower in his message to the Congress of January 11, 1954, stated:

"The prohibitions in the act against secondary boycotts are designed to protect innocent third parties from being injured in labor disputes that are not their concern.

The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted. The act must not, however, prohibit legitimate concerted activities against other than innocent parties. I recommend that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against * * * an employer on a construction project, who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott."

The Senate Labor Committee of the 83d Congress, which was organized by the Republican Party, also admitted and conceded the justice of Labor's complaint against the Taft-Hartley Act in this regard.

The report of that committee, dated April 15, 1954, stated, among other things, that—

"Where two or more employers are engaged in operations on the site of a single construction project, each performing some phase of the work necessary for the completion of the project, be it a building a bridge, a tunnel, or some other structure, it cannot be justifiably maintained that they stand in a strictly neutral relationship to each other. Rather, despite their existence as legally independent entities, they must be regarded realistically as partners in a single joint or common enterprise in which the individual interests of each are necessarily dependent on the success of the undertaking as a whole. In such a situation the committee believes that a labor dispute originating between one of these employers and his employees in fact constitutes a dispute with all of the employers just as if all were copartners in the legal sense in a single business enterprise. It, therefore, approved an amendment permitting the union representing the employees of the employer primarily engaged in the dispute to extend its economic pressure to any or all of the other employers working on the same project at the common site without thereby violating the provisions of the act's ban on secondary boycotts, provided that the union involved in the primary dispute was not otherwise acting unlawfully or in violation of the terms of an existing valid collective bargaining agreement. The effect of this amendment would be to overrule the holding of the United States Supreme Court in *N. L. R. B.* v. *Denver Building and Construction Trades Council et al.* (341 U. S. 675, 71 Sup. Ct. 943, June 1951.)"

Although these expressions in favor of this and other amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act were uttered about 2 years ago, they were not carried into action in the form of amendments enacted into laws.

It was the purpose of the sponsors of S. 1269, which was introduced last year, and which will be before the Congress this year, to provide the means for putting into actual effect the expressions which have been made in favor of this and other amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Section (C) of S. 1269, which we are sponsoring, would validate the prehire contract in the building and construction industry and cut down the 30-day grace period in union-shop agreements to 7 days.

The justice of labor's complaints on these matters in the present law again cannot be denied.

An examination of the report of the Senate Labor Committee in the 83d Congress, 2d session, to which I have previously referred, and which, as you will recall, was organized by the Republican Party, contains the following interesting language admitting labor's contention of inequitable treatment of the building and construction unions:

"Although the average length of individual employment with a single employer for all such industries (including one building and construction industry) is unknown, it is universally admitted that a large number of employees in certain industries average less than 30 days of continuous employment with a single employer. As a result, the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits employers and unions to enter into collective-bargaining agreements requiring membership in the union within 30 days is utterly ineffective with respect to such employees. This means that the unions which represent them, although still subject to all the sanctions which flow from a violation of the Taft-Hartley Act, are nevertheless denied one of the substantial benefits which the act confers on labor unions generally."

In connection with the building and construction industry particularly, there are other disadvantages which the unions in that industry suffer without any compensating relief from the act's sanctions. For example, the possession by a union of a board certification as to the exclusive bargaining representative of all the employees in an appropriate unit confers advantages and protections which recognition without a certification does not confer. A union enjoying a certification is protected against certain forms of raiding by rival unions which an uncertified union, even when recognized by the employer, is not.

"But experience has shown that it is virtually impossible for unions in the building and construction industry to secure certification by the Board."

The Senate Labor Committee of the 83d Congress also conceded the unworkability of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in connection with prehire contracts:

"There is a further aspect of the building and construction industry, peculiar to it, which received much of the committee's attention. Both employers and employees in the industry are highly organized into association and unions. Numerous employers utilize the unions as the only source of skilled labor in many of the areas in which they operate. Each employer obtains contracts on the basis of competitive bidding. It is obvious that before a bid is submitted the employer must estimate his cost, including his labor costs, if his bid is to be realistic. Uncertainty leads either to overestimation and hence higher construction costs, or to improperly low bids which result in losses instead of profits, and frequently in unfulfilled contracts.

"The only way in which many employers can properly estimate their labor costs in the building and construction industry is to enter into collective-bargaining agreements with the appropriate craft unions before the work is begun or a single employee has been hired. But under the act's requirement that exclusive collective-bargaining contracts can lawfully be concluded only if the union represents a majority of the employees in an appropriate unit, employers in the industry are precluded from entering into such necessary prehire agreements. (*Chicago Freight Car & Parts Company* (83 NLRB 1163, June 1949); *Guy F. Atkinson Co.* (90 NLRB 143, June 1950))."

President Eisenhower's message of January 11, 1954, also recommended relief with respect to the 30-day grace period and prehire contracts. Again, I wish to emphasize that S. 1269 furnishes the opportunity to translate these words into action.

Section (d) of S. 1269 would delete the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act providing for mandatory injunctions against labor. This is a matter which affects all of labor including the building trades.

Labor has complained that the Taft-Hartley Act is one-sided and unfair in providing that an injunction must be sought against trade unions whenever a complaint issues alleging violation of the secondary boycott provisions of the act, but no similar provision is made for mandatory injunctions against employers.

This inequity was conceded by the Senate Labor Committee of the 83d Congress to be deserving of relief. The committee statement on this point reads as follows:

"It therefore seemed to the committee entirely equitable that the disparity in treatment of unions and employers in connection with the issuance of injunctions be eliminated by repealing section 10 (l) of the National Labor Relations Act which requires the Board to seek an injunction wherever it issues a complaint alleging a violation of the secondary boycott provisions of the act, but retaining the provisions of section 10 (j) which gives the Board discretion to seek an injunction in any unfair labor practice allegedly committed by either an employer or a union."

There remained for consideration two important and necessary amendments in S. 1269 as to which the supporters of the law should agree, but as to which the record of their position is, to put it mildly, somewhat unclear.

I refer to section (c) of S. 1269 which would, among other things, validate job referrals in the building industry, and authorize provisions in building agreements providing for minimum training, apprenticeship, or experience qualifications for employment, and also providing for priorities in employment based upon objective factors. I also refer to section (e) of S. 1269 which would invalidate the misnamed right-to-work laws in the field of interstate commerce.

With respect to the matter of job referrals, employment qualifications and priority in opportunities for employment, it was the position of the late Martin P. Durkin, a great Secretary of Labor and my good friend, that he had the agreement of President Eisenhower on these proposed amendments, as well as a number of other substantial changes in the act. It would do little good to revive the controversy over whether the President did agree or did not agree to the contents of the draft message which was published in the Wall Street Journal on August 3, 1953.

It is an established fact that the present provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act relating to union security are completely unworkable in the building and construction industry. They constitute a prolific source of unfair labor practice charges and back pay awards against both employers and labor organizations in the industry. The amendments proposed in section (C) of S. 1269 represent a modest effort to introduce a more practical and realistic approach in resolving this problem.

I would now like to turn to the question of State right-to-work laws and the Taft-Hartley Act.

You know that 18 States have enacted laws under the misleading slogan of right to work which actually are intended to weaken or destroy the collective bargaining power of trade unions. You also know that these laws can operate in the field of interstate commerce only because of the language of section 4 (b) of the act, which makes State laws prohibiting or regulating union security superior to the Federal law on this subject.

These State laws have been condemned by the present Secretary of Labor who has urged their repeal by the State legislatures. The Secretary has not lent his support, however, to the effort of the labor movement to repeal section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and thus invalidate State right-to-work laws in the field of interstate commerce.

The record shows, moreover, that in 1952 the late Senator Taft himself was not silent on this subject. He sponsored and pushed through to passage in the Senate S. 1973 which contained a provision repealing section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act insofar as the building and construction industry is concerned. This bill, however, was not reached for a vote by the House. You will be interested to know that RICHARD NIXON, then Senator from California, also sponsored S. 1973 which would have repealed section 14 (b) in the building trades.

Now S. 1269 furnishes a real opportunity for those who sponsored and voted for the repeal of section 14 (b) in 1952 to reaffirm their position in 1956. If enough Senators and Representatives can be persuaded to

follow in the footsteps of the sponsors of S. 1973, the great evils of the so-called right-to-work laws can be corrected by the enactment of S. 1269.

Before leaving the Taft-Hartley Act, I would like to mention another bill, S. 3187, which I introduced last month. This bill would repeal the section of the act requiring labor officials to sign non-Communist affidavits. This section, I admit, whether it is in or out of the act, has no material effect on unions and their members. But it has long been infuriating to me that union officials must be singled out and made, in effect, second-class citizens.

Here, again, we have this same strange lip service that supporters of Taft-Hartley pay to proposed amendments—and again no action. In the same proposed amendments of Martin Durkin, which apparently had Eisenhower approval, the affidavit was called, "not only discriminatory, but also ineffective." Later still, the President thought he could temper the effect on union leaders by requiring employers also to sign such affidavits.

I also wish to make a brief comment on S. 1285, which proposes amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act. This bill, which I have joined in sponsoring, will be discussed in detail by subsequent speakers. It is my view that if the Davis-Bacon Act is not to become obsolete and ineffective, the amendments proposed by S. 1285 are necessary to bring this law, which was first enacted in 1931, up to date with the economic conditions of 1956.

Repeated references here to the quotes of the Republican members of the administration and of the Senate Labor Committee are called to your attention at this time because I am hopeful that when you make your visits to the Hill you will remind them or their successors in the 84th Congress of these longstanding promises. I can give you assurance that the members of my party on the labor committee will do more than a fair share in passing your bills at this session, and with a reasonable amount of support from the other side of the aisle, this legislation will pass.

It has been a real pleasure to speak with my friends in the building trades. And I wish to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the quiet, effective, and continuous work of the president of the Building Trades Department and his colleagues on the executive council in explaining your problems to Members of Congress.

Arab Refugees and the Refugee Relief Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we are well acquainted with the plight of the Arab refugees who left Palestine 7 years ago. Today they are still encamped on the same squalid sites that were made available to them as temporary quarters. The Arab leaders have continuously obstructed any plans to find permanent quarters for these refugees. It is plain that they have no intention of relieving the situation of these homeless persons, for the simple reason that the elimination of this issue would remove most of the emotionalism from the Arabs' campaign against Israel. As evidence of this fact, I wish to call attention to figures recently released by the Office of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

As of February 10, 1956, only 1,889 Arab refugees applied for visas to come to the United States under the refugee relief program. These applications were filed on the part of refugees in just two Arab countries—1,021 applications being from Jordan and 868 from Lebanon. There have been no applications from any of the other Arab countries. Moreover, certain of the Arab countries remain outside the operative scope of the refugee relief program because they have been unwilling to sign readmission certificate agreements as required under the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act. Those countries are Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Bahrein, Oman, and Yemen.

Certainly if the Arab leaders were sincere in their protestations of sympathy for their refugee brothers, many more thousands of applications would have been filed on behalf of Arab refugees. In my opinion, the figures show convincingly that the Arab leaders have no interest in the resettlement of these refugees but, rather, intend to exploit the situation as an excuse for their incursions into Israel.

Thomas Masaryk, Czechoslovakian Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Czechoslovakian origin, and the Czechoslovak people in all parts of the world today celebrate the 106th anniversary of the birth of the great Czechoslovakian patriot, T. G. Masaryk.

Thomas Masaryk as a true patriot dedicated his life to the realization of freedom, democracy, and independence for his country, Czechoslovakia, and he lived to see the establishment of the Republic of Czechoslovakia in fulfillment of his crusade for freedom.

In 1937, after his passing, Czechoslovakia lost its independence with the Nazi invasion. At the close of the war, this freedom-loving nation regained its independence briefly, only to lose it to Communist domination.

In spite of all the efforts of the Communists to dominate the people of Czechoslovakia, the Communists have been unable to root out the ideals of liberty and democracy instilled in the Czechoslovakian people. The example of Thomas Masaryk still inspires his people, his words are remembered, and the Czechoslovakian people courageously stand against the Communist tyranny.

Thomas Masaryk by word and deed brought a message of courage, hope, and faith not only to the people of his own native land but to all people seeking freedom and democracy throughout the world. He is an inspiration to all mankind to continue the unceasing struggle for liberty.

United States Fishing Industry Alarmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an action taken by our South American sister countries late last month which could affect this country most adversely if finally adopted and implemented. When its full implications are understood by our people and particularly by the fishing industry of this country, I am sure that the reaction will be tremendous in its scope. The Inter-American Council of Jurists, meeting in Mexico City, adopted by a vote of 15 to 1 with 5 abstentions a resolution dealing with the legal extent of territorial waters and related matters to which the United States was compelled to take strong exception. Indeed, ours was the only vote cast against this resolution, although several of our neighbor states in Latin America who voted for it also felt compelled to enter serious reservations. The resolution in question asserted the right of states to lay claim to large stretches of the open sea off their coasts. Some of these states already claim an area 200 miles wide.

The United States regards this action as unsound in substance, and also objects to the procedures followed in putting it over without the deliberation and careful study which such a highly complex subject deserves.

In the first place, the jurists exceeded the instructions of their parent body, the Organization of American States. They had been requested specifically to conduct preparatory studies on the question of the high-seas regime, fisheries conservation and related matters, for the use of the hemispheric conference on Conservation of Natural Resources, the Continental Shelf and Oceanic Waters, which convenes at Ciudad Trujillo the 15th of this month. They went far beyond these terms of reference in attempting to assert a set of principles which ignore existing international law on this subject, and set aside the traditional doctrine of freedom of the seas which the United States and other maritime nations have supported for many years.

I do not think it is profitable to dwell on the Mexico City action any further now, because it is water over the dam, and while we may regret what was done there, it is much more constructive to look ahead.

At the Ciudad Trujillo conference the American Republics will have before them a heavy agenda for discussion, ranging through a number of economic, legal, and scientific questions related to the regime of the high seas and the continental shelf. Of particular interest will be the discussions which are scheduled on the subject of fisheries conservation in the Western Hemisphere. I am informed that the United States delegation is going to the conference prepared to sit down with our

sister republics and discuss ways in which we can improve and strengthen our conservation programs in this field, for the benefit not just of any one country, but for all the peoples of the Americas.

United States cooperation in these programs is of course nothing new. The record will show that over the years we have taken leadership in many ways to protect the resources of the seas in such a way that they are exploited so as to yield the greatest benefit to the greatest possible number of people. However, we should make it clear at Ciudad Trujillo that exclusive claims to ownership of these resources do not contribute to effective conservation. We are not impressed by arguments that it is necessary for a country to claim ownership of 200 miles of ocean off its coast in order to prevent over-fishing. The way to good conservation lies through international agreements based on sound, scientific findings and strictly enforced.

Nor do we consider it practical for countries to lay claim in these times to large areas of the sea which they are not in a position to police, or to defend from possible aggression. Such policies endanger the security not alone of the countries which support them, but of the entire community of free nations.

Indeed, the entire question of the rights and obligations of nations in this field is too broad in its full, total implications to be settled at a regional meeting. It is a world problem, and deserves to be considered at that level.

Nevertheless, the United States delegation at Ciudad Trujillo will, I am certain, sit down with the other nations of our hemisphere to seek just and reasonable solutions to these complex problems in a friendly and cooperative spirit.

We do not intend to impose our will on others, nor do we intend to be imposed on ourselves. The record of the United States in the field of inter-American cooperation and mutual assistance is a clear one. Our sister nations to the south are aware of this, and I am sure that they will wish to reconsider in the light of more careful and broader study the ill-advised and impetuous action which was taken at Mexico City. They can count on our friendly collaboration in working out solutions to these common problems of our community of nations, and I am sure we can count on theirs no less.

Religious Persecution Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, March 10, marks the 5th anniversary of the imprisonment of Archbishop Josef Beran, the archbishop of Prague, by the Communist regime of Czechoslovakia.

This sad anniversary brings to our mind the sufferings and privations of other members of the clergy behind the Iron Curtain. We recall the arrest and persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Cardinal Wyszynski, of the many other clergymen who have been imprisoned, tortured, and submitted to indignities by the atheistic pawns of the Kremlin. We reflect upon the denial of the freedom of worship to the once-free peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and of other nations presently dominated by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is fitting and proper for our Nation, which believes in the dignity of man and in his origin at the hands of the divine Creator, to once again raise its voice in protest against the denial, by the Communists, of the basic human rights to the people living behind the Iron Curtain.

I feel that we should stand up and again condemn the brutal treatment of the suffering laity, of priests and ministers, of bishops and cardinals, by the godless Communist legions. We should raise our voice and cry for the release of those valiant men who because of their religious beliefs, are today rotting in Communist prisons, in violation of every rule of decency and every international convention on the rights of man.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that Archbishop Josef Beran and the other imprisoned members of the clergy behind the Iron Curtain, will be released from prison without further delay.

Ellis Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the conveyance of Ellis Island to the State of New York, its original owner, so that the existing facilities consisting of real and personal property may be put to a sane and sensible as well as a constructive and needed use, namely, as a clinic to provide for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics and narcotic addicts. As I am sure you know, facilities of this nature are in short supply, and the need for them in the New York City area is especially great.

Some weeks ago, a dispute relating to the ownership of Ellis Island as between the States of New York and New Jersey developed into a jocular siege by New Jersey partisans who formed a landing party that traveled from the nearby New Jersey shore to the island in the hope of establishing jurisdiction over the island. Their attempt at least highlighted the importance of the island; the only remaining question is where the paramount interest lies.

Ellis Island has been abandoned by the Immigration Service and is now in the hands of the General Services Administration, to be disposed of as surplus Government property. For this disposition to take place properly, it is necessary to glean from the history of my State, New York, and from the laws of the States of New York and New Jersey, each of which has manifested a desire to utilize this property, all the facts relating to the original ownership of the island.

Ellis Island, which has at various times been known as Oyster Island, Bucking Island, and Gibbet Island, acquired its present name from an owner, Samuel Ellis, a New Yorker.

The charter of the city of New York, granted in 1730, used two of the above names in describing the limits of the city, to wit, "and from thence to run a line across the North River so as to include Nutten Island, Bedlow's Island, Bucking Island, and the Oyster Island."

In 1800 the New York Legislature passed an act which ceded jurisdiction over Oyster, Bedloe's, and Governors Islands to the United States—Laws of New York, 23d session, chapter 6—and in 1808 a further act was passed authorizing the Governor of New York to purchase Ellis Island from its owners in order to cede jurisdiction over it, along with other islands and territories in the same area, to the United States for the purpose of erecting fortifications for the defense of the port of New York—Laws of New York, 31st session, chapter 51. This cession of the island is evidenced in McKinney's Consolidated Laws, State Laws, section 22–3:

> Title and jurisdiction to the following described tracts or parcels of land have been ceded to the United States by this State:
> Three islands in New York Harbor: Three certain islands in and about the harbor of New York, viz. Bedloe's Island, and Ellis or Oyster Island, bounded on all sides by the waters of the Hudson River.

In addition to these evidences of ownership by New York, a board of commissioners was appointed by the States of New York and New Jersey in 1833 to establish the jurisdiction and territorial limits of the two States. Their agreement, which was affirmed by Congress under the compact clause—act of June 28, 1834, Fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 709—states the general boundary in its first article and in the second article declares:

> The State of New York shall retain its present jurisdiction of and over Bedloe's and Ellis Islands; and shall also retain exclusive jurisdiction of and over islands lying in the waters above mentioned and now under the jurisdiction of that State.

This identical language is contained in the present laws of both New York—McKinney's Consolidated Laws, State Laws, section 7—and New Jersey—New Jersey Statutes Annotated, section 52: 28–3. Prior ownership by New York would therefore appear to be conclusively established.

Should this bill become law, a great humanitarian service will be rendered. Facilities will be made available to aid in the fight against narcotic addiction and alcoholism. That fight will, under this bill, have an appropriate battlefield. Surely the Congress can lend its support to help combat these diseases when such a golden opportunity has arisen. All

that is sought is the return of this property to the State which originally saw fit to donate it to the Federal Government. I hope that this legislation will commend itself to the House of Representatives.

Baltimore's Stake in the Pan American Application

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months there have been hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board as to which commercial air carrier shall provide additional service to Miami in the so-called Northeast-Florida proceedings.

I have been advised by the Civil Aeronautics Board this morning that they certainly hope to reach a decision in the matter in the next month and a half, or possibly earlier. Now that we are coming down toward the wire in these proceedings, it appears that the decision rests between two airlines—Northeast and Pan American World Airways.

Baltimore and the State of Maryland have unqualifiedly endorsed the Pan American application for a variety of reasons. But one of the big reasons is that Pan American, if certified, has indicated its willingness to serve Washington and Baltimore through Friendship Airport. Northeast, if certified, proposes to serve the Baltimore-Washington area out of Washington National Airport. As everybody knows, the facilities at the Washington National Airport are now dangerously overcrowded. We are all familiar with this situation and, as you know, various sites have been presented in the past to the Congress as the locations for the construction of a new airport. I have particularly in mind the serious consideration that was given to Burke, Va., which was effectively blocked by the Congress chiefly because it was a nonessential expenditure of the taxpayers' money considering the fact we have excellent facilities at Friendship Airport ready and available to serve Washington's overflow traffic. This project, despite its previous defeat and the strong objections to it by the residents of the Burke area, has recently been revived and appears to be making some headway on the Senate side.

With respect to air transportation, Baltimore has a peculiar problem. Considered in its own right, its size and economic importance, would justify an air service to and from its airport many times greater than that which it now receives. However, the prestige and the political importance of the National Capital, together with Baltimore's proximity to it, results in Baltimore's legitimate needs for air transportation being disregarded to a great extent, with corresponding loss to Baltimore's economic and cultural development. An opportunity has now presented itself with the application of Pan American World Airways, whereby Baltimore can make a start toward the correction of this situation. Further, other than expending so many millions of dollars for an airport at Burke which may be obsolete in 5 or 6 years, or making use of one of the military airports located between Washington and Baltimore, as has been suggested and which would be very dangerous, I believe sincerely the only reasonable solution to this situation is one which I have long advocated. This would be to have the Civil Aeronautics Board and other interested agencies consider Washington and Baltimore as a common area so far as air transportation is concerned with Friendship Airport placed on the same basis as National Airport for the purpose of serving this common area and with a logical division of airline schedules between the two.

The Baltimore Sun of March 6 carried a forceful editorial entitled "Baltimore's Stake in the Pan American Application," which I invite every Member of this body to read carefully. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

BALTIMORE'S STAKE IN THE PAN AMERICAN APPLICATION

Mayor D'Alesandro and Governor McKeldin have recently endorsed the application of Pan American World Airways in the so-called Northeast-Florida proceedings. But it must be said that their endorsement did scant justice to the merits of the Pan American application.

These proceedings, before the Civil Aeronautics Board, have to do with the certification of another carrier for service between the Northeast and certain Florida points. This is the most heavily traveled air service in the world, and is at present the monopoly of two carriers. A third is needed. The question is who the third carrier should be, the principal contenders being Northeast Airlines and Pan American.

Northeast proposes to serve the Baltimore-Washington area out of Washington Airport. It would add nothing to the flying schedule now available out of Friendship. Pan American proposes to serve the Washington-Baltimore area from Friendship Field. It would thus provide substantial additions to present Friendship services. For that reason, the Pan American application has a special interest for Baltimore and Maryland—the point which the mayor and the Governor chiefly emphasized.

But the Pan American application has other merits that have so far not had very much emphasis.

Pan American is this country's pioneer overseas carrier. For its overseas service it has terminals already established at Miami, in the South; at Boston, in the Northeast; and at New York. What it proposes to do, if certified, is to link these already established terminals. Its service would be not only an Atlantic coast service from the Northeast to Florida, but would become an integral part of the extensive Pan American network of flights to Latin America in one direction and Europe in the other.

The advantages of such an integrated domestic and international service are many. For one thing, Baltimore for the first time would have truly international flights both to Latin American points and to Europe originating at Friendship Field. The starting service would consist of one through flight to Europe daily and another through flight to Latin America actually originating in Baltimore, plus four additional flights originating north of Baltimore or south of Baltimore but taking on through passengers at Friendship. Pan American has stated that within a year this international through service would be doubled.

There are other immense advantages. For the first time, industrial Baltimore would have the advantage of through air cargo service from Friendship Field to both European and Latin American points. At present there is no such service. Studies have shown that a large foreign air cargo business does originate in Baltimore—but must first be shipped by surface to New York or Miami before taking to the air.

Another argument for the Pan American application is that, since its European traffic is at peak in the summer months, it has already available both the aircraft and the flying personnel to provide ample service during the Northeast-Florida peak period in the winter months.

A final and not inconsiderable advantage is that by rounding out its operations by certification for the Northeast-Florida run, Pan American could develop operating economies sufficient to reduce its Federal Government subsidy by around $8 million a year. Profit on its Northeast-Florida service would under the law be applied directly to a reduction of subsidy.

The provision of more Friendship-to-Florida flights is important, of course. But the Pan American case for certification as the third Northeast-Florida carrier rests on a great deal more than that.

One Hundred and Sixth Anniversary of Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on this day, the free world pauses to commemorate the 106th anniversary of the birth of the great historian and statesman, Thomas G. Masaryk. He was a man of great faith and believer in both the ideals of humanitarianism and of democracy.

T. G. Masaryk never thought of himself as a man of destiny, and yet his every dream, his every act and his achievements were open acknowledgements that he was a person who inspired and led his people to the richer goals in life.

On October 28, 1918, when Czechoslovakia became an independent republic, T. G. Masaryk became its first President. Although his vision for an independent Czechoslovakia reached the culmination of his aspirations only briefly, because of foreign oppression and war, his view of life still guides the true lovers of humanity and liberty.

He remains a source of courage everywhere, for his forthright stand against alien domination and foreign aggression. The hope of the world and of the real representatives of national interests is that finally T. G. Masaryk's convictions will triumph over those of tyranny in justice, and that his aim for national freedom for his country shall prevail once again so that both peoples of Czechoslovakia will enjoy freedom according to their own choice.

Federal Aid to the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from the Governor of California is of importance to all of our States and is therefore included for information:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 28, 1956.*
Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On October 1, 1952, section 3a of title I of the Social Security Act was amended relative to the formula for reimbursing the States for old-age assistance. Other sections pertaining to children and blind were amended at the same time. These amendments provide that the Federal Government should give each State up to $35 as the Federal share of the State's maximum expenditure.

The 1952 amendment also carried a provision that the increased Federal grants should terminate as of September 30, 1954; but Congress extended the increased formula to September 30, 1956. This means, of course, that unless legislation is enacted by the present Congress, the Federal grants will again revert to the maximum of $30. Old-age assistance to the 263,000 recipients in California will correspondingly drop from a maximum of $85 for each recipient to a maximum of $80. A similar $5 drop will occur with respect to payments to the 12,800 blind recipients.

During the 20-year history of the Social Security Act, California has matched Federal increases with a like amount of State funds. As you know, there has been no reduction in the cost of living which would justify any reduction in grants to recipients of aid to aged, blind, or children. If, as the result of a reduction in Federal grants, the State is forced to replace this possible loss of Federal reimbursement, the State and the counties of California would be required to levy an additional $16 million in State and county taxes.

It is my earnest hope that you will exert every effort during the present session of Congress to assure the enactment of Federal legislation which will continue beyond September 30, 1956, the present formula pursuant to which the Federal Government reimburses the State for aid to aged, aid to blind, and aid to needy children.

With kindest personal regards,
Cordially,
GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Governor.

MARCH 7, 1956.
The Honorable GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
The Governor of California,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR GOVERNOR KNIGHT: Thank you for your letter of February 28 urging the Congress to enact Federal legislation to continue beyond September 30, 1956, the present formula pursuant to which the Federal Government reimburses the State for aid to the aged, aid to the blind, and aid to needy children.

I have consistently, in the past, and will continue to not only try to see such aid continue but to see it increased in order that the States may, in turn, raise the inadequate grants presently being made. I trust we will be successful as this session of the 84th Congress.

With kind personal regards to you.
Sincerely yours,
JAMES ROOSEVELT.

Report to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report which I made to my constituents through the medium of a newspaper published in my congressional district, Town and Village, under date of February 16, 1956:

It is, I hope, generally known that a Congressman representing a district as large as mine, has an enormous list of duties and responsibilities, of help to his constituents, the fullest participation in legislative requirements, and detailed activities in committees. Heavy as are these duties, we still, Congressmen as well as private citizens, have the primary duty to think about national issues. The President's state of the Union message gave me an occasion to review my thoughts on the issues dealt with in that document.

My thoughts took the form of questions; and I feel that I will be sharing an important process in the mental life of a Congressman if I review these questions with the readers of Town and Village.

I was struck, in the first instance, by a statement by President Eisenhower as to our national income. His exact words were "virtually all sections of our society are sharing in these good times." Is it, however, an equal sharing? Is the prosperity one in which all American people have a full and proportionate part? Is it not significant that corporation profits have gone up 26 percent in 1955 as compared with a comparable period in 1954; whereas the average worker's income has gone up only 7 percent? Is it not significant that stockholders' income has gone up 10 percent while farmers' income has gone down 11 percent? That big business failures have declined 15 percent, while small business failures have increased 21 percent?

"Our defenses", the message stated, "have been reinforced." Yet, is it not significant that General Ridgway should have stated unequivocally that defense appropriations have been subordinated to fiscal and political considerations? This, mind you, is revealed in a magazine which has steadily been a supporter of the policies of the Republican administration.

"Taxes have been substantially reduced", the state of the Union message pointed out. Is it without significance that the only tax cut which the Republican Party initiated was the tax bill of 1954, whereby for every dollar of long run tax relief, corporations will get 73 cents, families with over $5,000 income will get 18 cents relief, and families under $5,000 income will get 9 cents relief?

The message went on to say "that the long-standing and deep-seated problems of agriculture have been forthrightly attacked." Attacked may be the right word, but have the problems been solved when there has been an almost $3 billion drop in net farm income over a period of 3 years?

The message went on to speak warmly of the economic ties desirable in a free world partnership. But has this been anything more than a high-sounding statement which has been steadily refuted by actions?

There was much that the message dealt with on the state of the world affairs. How, however, can that be appraised when there was the almost simultaneous appearance of an article by the Secretary of State, in a partisan national magazine which refuted the appraisals in that message?

There was a noble statement about deficit financing, but the facts are that the administration's deficits ran in the billions during 3 peacetime years. And this, in contrast with the record of President Truman who built up a surplus of 4.3 billion over 4 peacetime years.

And how, I ask, can the kind words about the farmer be squared with the many cold-hearted statements by the Secretary of Agriculture and other Republican political figures? For surely it must be clear that whatever the words, there has been a sharp decline in farm income and the encouragement of a sentiment hurtful to the farmer?

What shall we think of the statement in the message that "I shall propose measures to remove controls wherever possible" • • • when, according to the New York Times, "the Eisenhower administration set up the most rigorous controls in the history of Federal price supports today."

Then there is the matter of help to small business, and the important consideration of preventing and limiting monopoly. For all that may be said about them in the state of the Union message, it is still true that small-business profits are down some 66 percent since the last half of 1952, and that small-business failures are very much on the increase; and that in 1 year alone, the share that small business had in the defense procurement program shrank from 25 percent to 20 percent.

It is very pleasant to hear genial words about the importance of medical research. Nevertheless, is it not significant that we are now 1 year further away from the realization of the objectives of medical research because of the administration's cuts in the funds last year?

I could ask, too, about the public housing, where the administration proposes authority to contract for 35,000 additional public housing units; at a time when the Democratically controlled Senate in 1955 provided for 135,000 units.

These are some, by no means all, of the many questions that arise in my mind and that I think are properly to be asked also by every voter and by every American. For the way I see it, the wholesome development of our country and its safety depend upon our ability to pierce the cloud of words that are agreeable in themselves, but that obscure realities quite different from what the words seem to convey.

I can think of no service that the American voter can do for himself that can be more effective than asking himself or herself such questions; and trying, as I am trying, to find the realistic answers.

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, to the free world the name of Masaryk is an inspiring symbol. It must be a source of real strength to valiant Czechoslovakians today, lost in the darkness of tyranny, to look back to the origins of their once free Republic and the great work of its founder, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk. It is a privilege to join with free men throughout the world in commemorating this March 7 the 106th anniversary of the birth of this great leader.

The people of Hungary as well as those of Czechoslovakia have special occasion

this month to lift their minds and hearts to the remembrance of freedom, even though they now find themselves bowed under the relentless hand of communism. On March 15 the Hungarian people will mark the 107th anniversary of Hungarian independence from Hapsburg rule.

It is our hope that the people of Hungary and Czechoslovakia will look back to the origins of their freedom, now lost, and renew their resolve to once more attain independence and a rightful place among the free nations of the world.

I have great faith in the spirit and resolve of these captive peoples. During my work with Radio Free Europe I saw, over and over again, evidences of it. And I saw, too, how these courageous people look to the United States for help and encouragement.

Birthday of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today is a notable date in the history of the struggle of man for freedom. It is the anniversary of the birth of that great world statesman and patriot of Czechoslovakia, Thomas G. Masaryk. It is a pleasure to join with the thousands of Americans of Czech and Slovak ancestry who are today honoring the memory of this staunch fighter for freedom.

It is fitting to pay tribute to this man, that we may take heart from his deeds and words. In a world still torn by strife, the democratic faith and ideals of Masaryk give courage and inspiration to those now locked behind the Iron Curtain.

Free Czechoslovakia was, in large part, the result of the work of Thomas Masaryk. He was a patriot who lived to see his dreams and labors to establish a democracy in his homeland come true. Between 1918 and 1937, when he died, he helped build Czechoslovakia into a vigorous and flourishing state. All Americans can be proud of the fact that during World War I, we contributed decisively to the rebirth of independence in this country by our support of Thomas Masaryk's democratic conception. We may also be happy that during World War II we gave much effective aid toward the liberation of Czechoslovakia from Nazi oppression. And since the war we have stood firm in our opposition to the encroaching forces of communism.

Thomas Masaryk was more than the liberator of his people. He was also a world leader, and in that role was one of the principal shapers of the concept we know as collective security. He was a sincere and stanch advocate of democracy everywhere and a great practitioner of love and respect for his fellow man.

Thomas Masaryk died before his land was assaulted by the evil henchmen of tyrannical imperialism. But he knew the nature of these powers and fought against them all his life. They are not dead yet, as we know. They are to be found today in the forces of communism which swept over Czechoslovakia in 1947.

Of all the tragedies of recent years, none is more keen than the loss of freedom in liberty-loving Czechoslovakia. The work of Masaryk and his compatriots has been temporarily blotted out by the intrigues and pressures of the Soviet invaders.

Though freedom for the moment is banished, the work of Thomas Masaryk cannot die. When any beacon light is snuffed out—and Thomas Masaryk was such a light—the world sustains a loss. Yet, we must remember that the light shed by such men during their lifetime carries on in the hearts and minds of men, enabling them to live in accordance with the principles of liberty and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of Thomas Masaryk lives on. Czechoslovakia will rise again. It is my fervent hope that the day when she will be restored to the family of free nations is not too far distant. It cannot be too long delayed if we would be true to the spirit of Thomas Masaryk.

Thomas G. Masaryk: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, is the 106th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and first president of the democratic Republic of Czechoslovakia, and I would like to join the Czechoslovak people in paying tribute to their great leader on this memorable occasion.

Like our beloved President Lincoln, Thomas Masaryk was marked with the sign of greatness. He opposed violence of any kind, as did Lincoln, but at the same time his purpose was to achieve freedom for his people. He answered the call of destiny and with his leadership inspired his people to victory and finally to independence.

On a foundation of the principles of liberty, tolerance and truth, Masaryk established a modern democracy, devoted to Christian ideals. The people of his democratic Republic made much progress in making their new nation strong, but this growth was cut short by foreign invaders—first Nazi Germany and then the Communists. The Reds continue their domination over this nation which is hungry for liberty once again. The Communists have initiated a campaign to wipe from the memory of the Czechoslovak people everything for which Masaryk stood. They do this because Masaryk, while living, was opposed to communism and all of its aims and purposes. Masaryk knew there was no salvation to be had from communism and for this reason joined forces with the Allies.

The people of Czechoslovakia who are living in exile and those suffering under Communist domination in their homeland will never forget the work and leadership and inspiration that Thomas Masaryk gave. His name, despite all the efforts of the Communists, will live forever. His life exemplified the highest ideals and traditions of free people.

I sincerely hope and pray that the brave people of Czechoslovakia will in the very near future again see the flag of freedom waving over their homeland and a return to the traditions that existed under their great leader whom we honor today—Thomas G. Masaryk.

Would a Nationwide Tree-Planting Program Help Solve Our Newsprint Shortage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, along with several other Pennsylvanians, I was recently asked by the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association to submit my views on the Benson soil bank and reserve acreage program and, more specifically, on whether a nationwide tree-planting program would provide relief for the present newsprint shortage and the terrifically high price now being paid for this product.

In response to this request, I prepared an article for the March issue of the PNPA Press Bulletin, the official trade journal of the Pennsylvania newspapers. Pursuant to the privilege granted me, I include that article in these remarks. It is as follows:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the suggestion that the Government should initiate a nationwide tree planting program as a method of ending the newsprint shortage and, at the same time, furnish a means of helping solve the present farm problem.

I am all for tree planting—of the right kind in the right place, and believe me we must get busy on this to meet the increased demand for newsprint. However, I feel some proposals are too long-range, generally speaking, to bring the immediate relief the farmers desire, and is not feasible in certain respects. One of the most talked-of objections to the Benson soil-bank program is that it is too long range. The farmers want action, and fast. Forestry has certainly never been a short-range proposition.

Our country has not been newsprint conscious until the last few years. Canada, with her vast, untouched virgin stands of spruce had the production to control the market. Our output of this type paper has been negligible. Now, Canada can no longer meet the increasing demand for newsprint, and we face a situation that calls for immediate action. The sooner we get at the tree planting the better—but it must be done in the right way, and results cannot be obtained overnight. I was pleased to learn the other day that the construction of two large newsprint mills is under way in Alaska and, with the virgin timber available there, they should greatly ease the newsprint situation in the United States when completed.

During the past years of agricultural unrest, it has been my hope that research in

this field would develop a crop which, in a single growing season, could be converted into newsprint. This has not been realized to date, so we must increase our timber growing. Under the most favorable conditions, in most instances it takes 20 years for an economical, merchantable crop to materialize. A check of actual planting results in Pennsylvania will show that even 30 to 40 years are desirable, when ratio of bark and growth to diameter is resolved. Bark in all newsprint processes as of today is undesirable.

Unquestionably, forestry will play a very important part in the soil-bank program proposed by Secretary Benson. It is not by any means a one-step program. However, our soil, topography, and weather conditions vary greatly throughout the United States. Our forest-management plans must be set up accordingly. How these plans function is the all-important and controlling factor. Extreme care will have to be used in the selection of land to be planted in trees. There is the question whether marginal lands should be planted with trees or conserved for agriculture. In Pennsylvania we have a million and a half acres of commercial forest land available. Since 1930 New York State has been buying submarginal farmland and has planted a half million acres of it in trees. In short, it will be much more difficult to execute this tree-planting assignment than it is to write concerning it.

There is a matter of availability of paper mills. In Pennsylvania we have a number of these mills scattered throughout the State. None of them makes, or is designed to make, newsprint. They produce various types of paper from Kraft, wallpaper, coated, to postage stamps—but no newsprint—and no newsprint process for the use of our present plentiful supply of hardwood has been developed.

In addition, recent checkups show that for various reasons our forest plantings in Pennsylvania, mostly of the evergreen species, have not been too successful, so far as sites, spacing, species, thinning, etc., are concerned. There has also been much foraging by deer. An example of this is found in a CCC program near Emporium and Phillipsburg, Pa., where plantings were made inside a 2-mile square fenced area. During the winter, when the ground is covered with snow, the deer eat the tender foliage on the small, 2-to-3-foot trees. The terminal buds are destroyed and, although the trees are living, they have a greatly depreciated commercial value.

For quick newsprint supplies, of course the South and Southwest offer the best prospects. In the South, three newsprint mills are now operating, since processes have been developed and perfected to make use of the pine in that area. Here you also have the best possible conditions under which to practice forest management with sustained annual yield as the objective—ease of reforestation, a longer growing season, quick-growing species, cheap labor, and the most desirable short rotation. In these sections, too, the overproduction of cotton offers a wonderful ready-to-use acreage of good land. And, remember, they have newsprint mills operating nearby.

Bagasse, the sugarcane residue, has been found suitable for newsprint production. Considerable tonnage can result if this process is found practical for quantity production. This would be most helpful to the Southern States where sugarcane is one of the main crops.

Certain sections of the West also have great possibilities. I have in mind one in Colorado. Here you have hundreds of thousands of acres—mostly Engleman spruce of wonderful size and quality—killed by the spruce bark beetle and standing there like tombstones in a graveyard. Several years ago an engineering study was made with the idea of erecting a newsprint mill to use this dead timber. The price was held too high, newsprint not having then reached its current price level. Now, with newsprint at $140 per ton and very little in sight, a reevaluation should be made and these waste trees used up. No doubt there are other similar stands with mill sites readily available. A major factor in such locations is a never-failing water supply. The cost of these mills may be high—but newsprint is too.

Each section of the country has a different problem. You cannot erect a newsprint mill except where a large and continuous supply of raw material is foreseeable. This would not hold true where available timber would only come from small taken-out-of-production acres, as in the Middle West. In such sections, it might be possible to produce trees from which wood chips could be obtained through the use of small, readily portable chipping plants erected at central locations. The chips could then be baled and shipped to plants that make use of them. In the processing of rayon, for instance, large amounts of these wood chips are required. Would that this process could be changed so that the basic source of supply could be obtained from cotton or some other plant, using agricultural acreage, rather than a forest-land product.

A further word on research. At Beltsville, Md., the Agricultural Experiment Station has developed a hybrid poplar cutting that produces a tree in 6 growing seasons 6 feet 1 inch in diameter and 40-feet high. There are many areas in our country suitable for such species—the Middle West for instance—but we would have to make sure that mills to use this type pulpwood are available at an economical distance.

In regions having the necessary factors for use, and particularly the shorter rotation, there is already much activity so far as forest tree planting is concerned. As an example I give you the tree-planting programs of four States:

	Year	Acres planted	Nursery stocks
			Million
South Carolina	1955	46,000	35
Georgia	1955	99,000	115
North Carolina [1]	1955	24,000	29
Pennsylvania [2]	1955	60,000	12

[1] Aiming at 500 million yearly nursery output.
[2] Available figures for Pennsylvania show planting cost per acre: Stock, $12; labor, $16.

In short, there are many sections of our country where, with proper planning and administration to fit local conditions, forestry will fit into the Benson soil-bank program. However, I just don't believe that this tree planting would mean much to the average farmer for many, many years—if ever. I think any incentive plan for such farmers would be money wasted.

To my mind, the need of the hour is the production on our farms of crops to be used in our industries, such as soybeans—annual crops, subject to change or revision every year. Even specialization will help in some sections—witness the enormous broiler industry in our own Lebanon County, Pa., and our local canneries for tomatoes and peas. Increased centralized areas of alfalfa or similar nitrogenous soil-building crops, with a commercial dryer to produce meal, as used and required in our dairy industry, should also be given consideration. I know of one individual endeavoring to develop something along this line in one of our Pennsylvania counties.

Ever since I have been in Congress, I have periodically brought to official attention the desirability of using part of our tremendous wheat surplus in the production of artificial rubber. At one time the Government even owned plants equipped to produce grain alcohol, which is necessary in the manufacture of this product. The Department of Agriculture has always held that the use of surplus wheat for this purpose would be dumping. Dumping or not, it seems to me that using surplus wheat to produce artificial rubber would be preferable to paying out millions of dollars per day for storage.

We are using up our good farmland and depleting our soil to produce surplus crops. Pending the day when research finds new uses for farm crops in industry, it seems to me it might be more sensible to pay the farmers for turning under the cover crops on the proposed reserve acreage rather than to go into an enormous tree-planting program "willy-nilly."

In the end the only 100-percent solution of our agricultural problem is the utilization of the soil for crops on which the supply and demand are more closely related. We hear continually that shortage of food will be our major problem within 25 years. Even now, many of our people need more food to insure a proper diet and the physical development of our children. The $64 question is how to get food from the farmers to these people at a price they can afford to pay—and I think the sooner we recognize this the better.

We have a tremendous challenge in working out ways to use our land to the best advantage. Let us not economize on funds for research, which I feel is vital. Through discovery of new uses for agricultural products, our savings over this soil bank span can run into millions of dollars.

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a great and worthy man whose very life exemplified the highest ideals and traditions. March 7 marks the 106th anniversary of the birth of the statesman and philosopher, founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Former President of the Czechoslovak Republic, Dr. Eduard Benes, very aptly described the universal character of Masaryk's life when he said:

Eighty-seven years of a completely full life, more than seventy of which he devoted to a struggle for the comprehension of man; reflected how to master the metaphysical problem of life and the world, how to interpret all the questions of spiritual, intellectual, political and social life, how to triumph over all the difficulties of the practical life of a nation and daily organize and lead the state, how to attain practical knowledge of self, of nation, of state, of Europe, of all other nations and their problems; and at the same time daily for more than fifty years he entered upon grave political struggles in concrete questions and undertook all the detailed work of political practice, first within his own nation, then in the old empire, in the European crisis and the great war, and then bounded and consolidated the state, and all the time steadily prepared for us who are left behind a legacy, and paths along which it now falls to us to carry Masaryk's torch, the torch which so splendidly shone forth into the world.

Masaryk is regarded by his countrymen as the man who completed the ideological, intellectual, and cultural rebirth of his nation—the last national, spir-

itual, and moral pioneer and awakener. Masaryk was, and is, in a very real sense a world hero. Though he has passed, he is still amongst us as the model of great faith in man, of which there is a great need in the world today.

A Tribute to a Great and Worthy Man, Thomas G. Masaryk, Whose Life Exemplified the Highest Ideals and Traditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today we observe here in America the 106th anniversary of the birth of the founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic, Thomas G. Masaryk.

At intervals in history, time and circumstance seem to call for men of unusually great stature to be leaders of other men. The Czechoslovak people were fortunate in having a great philosopher-statesman—Thomas G. Masaryk—as their leader at a critical moment in their history. Through his relentless efforts the Czechoslovak nation was able to declare its independence shortly after World War I and to lay the foundation for a new democratic state. In the national consciousness of the Czech people and the consciousness of free men everywhere, Thomas Masaryk was a man of great ideals who had the courage to act on his convictions.

The story of the Czechoslovakian people reveals an inherent democratic outlook. They suffered for three long centuries the yoke of alien oppressors. Their faith had been condemned, their lands confiscated, and the use of their native language forbidden. In spite of these hardships, they never ceased throughout this long period to struggle against their oppressors. Constantly and consciously they looked to the day when they would be strong enough to throw off the heavy burden of tyranny.

That day finally came. It was Thomas Masaryk who sensed that the time was ripe for his people to win their freedom. The Czechs call him the "Awakener." He led the historic movement which freed his country and welded it into one of the most thoroughly democratic states in Europe. He became the new nation's first president.

Today, his great work is temporarily under the dark shadow of the hammer and sickle. Czechoslovakia is a Communist satellite of Soviet Russia. All her industries are nationalized, her farms collectivized; the economy of the country is geared to that of the Soviet Union. The regime maintains itself by its dreaded and efficient secret police. All traces of freedom are eliminated and contact with the free world is forbidden.

In spite of all this we are confident that the inherent democratic strength of the Czech people will eventually throw off this shadow and human freedom will again flourish in Czechoslovakia. It is heartening that in spite of the almost unbelievable restrictions and the rigidity of the life of these people, thousands of anti-Communists have succeeded in finding their way to the West. Within Czechoslovakia we know that there is relentless resistance to the Communist regime. By means of organized underground movements, brave and patriotic Czechoslovakians are risking their lives daily in the struggle to regain freedom. We know that the day will come when the Czech people will again enjoy that same freedom and independence to which Thomas Masaryk, that giant of human freedom, once had led them.

Flatbush Democratic Club Joins With Citizens' Committee for the Security of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in November 1955, the Citizens Committee for the Security of Israel was formed in Brooklyn with headquarters at 2267 Church Avenue, for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the Secretary of State for the United States the thoughts and desires of many of our citizens concerning the sale of Communist arms to the Arab countries. Hon. Alexander G. Hesterberg, Democratic State committeeman of the 21st assembly district, was named as chairman, and Mr. Edward S. Silver, the district attorney of Kings County, was named as secretary.

On February 15, 1956, representatives of the committee called upon Assistant Secretary of State George V. Allen and presented to him some 10,000 signed petitions urging the Secretary of State—

to take action to settle the present controversy existing between Israel and the Arab States either by supplying arms to Israel or a mutual security pact or such other means as may be circumspect and necessary.

On February 23, 1956, the Flatbush Democratic Club unanimously adopted the resolution offered by its executive member, Alexander G. Hesterberg, urging President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles to prevent the spread of communism and Arab aggression by supplying arms to Israel for her defense, and to enter into mutual security pacts with each of the countries in the Middle East willing to do so.

On the occasion of our visit to the Secretary of State's office we were privileged to be honored with the distinguished company of JOHN J. ROONEY of New York who also expressed his support of the petition presented by Mr. Hesterberg. We were authorized and did state to Assistant Secretary of State George V. Allen that our distinguished colleague EDNA F. KELLY had intended to be present with us and join us in supporting the petition but unfortunately had been delayed at an important committee meeting.

A Great Democrat—Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute today to a great democrat, a man who drew strength from America for his historic task of building a democratic Czechoslovakia, and from whom we Americans can draw inspiration today in the continuing struggle to defend and extend human freedom.

That man is Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the liberator, the founder, and the first president of Czechoslovakia. As we pause tomorrow to mark the anniversary of his birth, we recall how his faith and dedication carried him forward in the long effort to create an independent and liberty-loving Czechoslovakia. A philosopher as well as a statesman, Masaryk was a close friend of Woodrow Wilson, and it was in Washington, D. C., on October 18, 1918, that the Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence was formally published.

Today Masaryk's land is again under the tyrant's heel. Freedom is extinguished. But the spirit of Masaryk lives on. It lives on in the hearts of all those who admire and revere Thomas Masaryk. Americans of Czech descent, who have contributed so greatly to the building of our Nation, join their fellow citizens of all national origins in paying homage to a great leader of all humanity.

Fort Berthold Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Senate bill 2151 provides for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose.

This bill, pertaining to payments to individual Indians on the reservation from money belonging to them, does not do the job that is necessary now. In the long run, after certain rolls are prepared and approved by the Indian Bureau, the money will get to the individual Indians, but on the face of this plan it becomes apparent that these payments will be long delayed.

The Indians on the Fort Berthold Reservation are in dire circumstances, arising from the taking of their valuable

agricultural lands along the Missouri River for a reservoir at the Garrison Dam. They have been compelled to move off these lands, as the flooding has already started. The only place they could move was up on the hills, and the chances of success on high rocky pinnacles are not good unless they have money to put into operation the different methods that are necessary there, and the Indians are not as secure as when occupying lands on the rich river bottoms. Their relocation has brought about a situation where the Indians on the hills are in dire circumstances, and they want some of their money now while they need it.

This Senate bill should be amended so as to permit immediate payment to the Indians who are facing this situation. Those who are asking that these payments be made at once have lived for the whole period of their lives on the river bottom lands, and if the Indian Bureau knows anything at all, it must know who these Indians are, without waiting for the official roll report, which may take several months and even years to prepare. Such delay will reduce the Indians who now need their money to further poverty and hardship.

These Indians do not ask for all their money now, but they do ask for a portion of it now while they are in distress. As soon as they can establish themselves on the high land and learn more about cultivating it they will be less in need of help.

And remember, it is not money that the Government is giving them. It is their own money, held in trust for them by the Indian Bureau.

Ford Foundation: We Need a New Word for Philanthropy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States seems to me quite properly the sounding board for applauding the most recent of the great gestures of the Ford Foundation on behalf of the people of the United States. It is for this reason that I rise to add my voice to the paean of praise from everywhere that met the Ford grant of half a billion dollars for the Nation's private hospitals, colleges, and medical schools.

This bold impact of business largess on American life is giving a new dimension to philanthropy.

Philanthropy on this grand scale calls for some new word, and that word has not yet been coined. For what we have here is not philanthropy in the old accepted sense. What we have here is, indeed, philanthropy and social consciousness in its noblest form, joined with business and financial statesmanship of a high order. What we have is vast wealth in full and potent recognition of its responsibilities and financial resources employed in the public interest on an enlightened plane. The grant of $500 million views the current pattern of American life and seeks to give it the infusion of strength and stability where strength and stability are most needed and may produce the greatest good for the greatest number over the longest period.

The weakest spot in American life at this hour is education, in terms of financial need.

With precision, intelligence, and the most careful kind of planning, the Ford Foundation aimed at this most embarrassing phase of our generation and with a single blow lifted it out of the doldrums. The problem is too overwhelming to suggest that this donation brought with it total solution. But it made an extraordinary dent.

When in the history of American philanthropy—or philanthropy anywhere—has there been a comparable donation?

After the weak spot in American life which we have for long identified as the inadequate schoolroom, the underpaid teacher, and the lack of teaching personnel, came the Nation's other great need. This was the need for the support of the Nation's private hospitals. Thus the grant includes $200 million in outright gifts to some 3,500 voluntary, nonprofit hospitals. It means that each hospital listed will get from $10,000 to $250,000 to improve its services.

What do we have, then, in just money terms?

We have of this half billion dollars, $210 million to be disbursed for endowment grants, the annual incomes from which are to be used to increase faculty salaries at each of the Nation's 615 regionally accredited privately supported liberal arts and sciences colleges and universities. The grants range from $31,000 to $5 million. Secondly, we have $200 million for hospitals. And finally we have $90 million for privately supported medical schools.

Beneath this simple itemization what I would call modern, scientific philanthropy, rests a certain goodness of heart, and a policy of high-level executive planning which is—as I see it—without precedent in the history of our society. It is the American story reflected from a new angle of vision and it does us all proud for it involves the essential characteristics of the American tradition. The story of Henry Ford, both the generation that gave us the Model T and the generation that gave us the Thunderbird, is in a very concrete sense and on a large canvas the story of the American people. Here is invention. Here is enterprise. Here is success. Here is faith. Here is above all the brilliant spirit of the pioneer. It is achievement in which, under the American system, everyone seems to share and in which untold millions of us were participants.

It is the story of the individual thriving in a climate of freedom and opportunity and joining with all America, and having all America join him, in the fabulous success of a fabulous life.

For me this $500 million gesture is the crowning touch of a philosophy of free enterprise and private finance capital and to the progress and the good fortune that it has produced. It is the finest example possible of great wealth being used beautifully and effectively—as a trust, for the benefit of mankind. In the great modern theater of the world's business there are few industries comparable to Ford. And in the great modern theater of vast accumulations of wealth we have here the profoundest example yet of huge finances, segregated in a mighty fund, and expended in a manner that without eccentricity has captured the imagination of the American people.

For what has been done has been done wisely.

What has been done has been done under the ablest counsel.

Each problem this fund sought to attack has been first carefully studied by experts. What we have is first the means, then the heart, then the wisdom.

The end result is a type of philanthropy for which I insist we need a new word.

Ford is a name woven deep into American industrial history. In the smaller forms of business it has been repeated time without number. Every businessman is a potential Ford. For what conditions did he have that were not available to other Americans? In 1903, the Ford Motor Co. began with a total cash investment of $28,000. Since 1919 the Ford empire has been a Ford family enterprise. Today three of Henry Ford's grandsons are the operating heads of the company.

All that I have been saying about this $500 million grant stems from the organization of the Ford Foundation by the original Henry Ford and his late son, Edsel. It is now the largest philanthropy in the United States. Our laws and Ford wisdom are to be lauded for the fact that the establishment of this foundation made it possible to prevent what would have amounted to the liquidation of this magnificent business enterprise because of inheritance and other taxes.

The American people gain as a result and all of us become the beneficiaries of Mr. Henry Ford's will.

It may be that the great gift of all to evolve from this Ford adventure in philanthropy is yet to come. For there are other great business enterprises and there is financial talent and goodness of heart in great abundance among our 165 million people. I can see in it an object lesson to legislation itself. Henry Ford, more perhaps than any other individual of his time, brought manufacturing to bear spectacularly on the history of American industrial progress. His grandsons are following in his footsteps to their great credit. Just as other manufacturers have followed where Ford has led, may our world not hope that other masters of vast accumulations of property may emulate him and his kith and kin in the world of enlightened philanthropy? Meanwhile, should Congress not take heart from this princely bequest? Ought we not reappraise our problems? Is it not for us to adopt an attitude, legislatively, toward education and medicine that will at long last bring us to the goal toward which Ford has so brilliantly advanced us? That goal is the betterment of life for all mankind by the intelligent use of the people's wealth for the people.

Plan for a 10-Year Atomic Race for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 1955, on the eve of my departure for Paris to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference as a member of the United States congressional delegation, I proposed the idea of a 10-year moratorium on war. In my statement issued at that time, I suggested that the effects of a moratorium on war "would be almost limitless in their benefits to all mankind." I cited specifically that it would allow scientists of all countries to concentrate more fully on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Again today I feel the necessity of reiterating that plea in connection with another project which would make a moratorium, once an accomplished fact, not an end in itself but rather a beginning. In essence the proposal is as follows:

First, a 10-year moratorium on war.

Second, a nuclear race for development of atomic energy for peaceful uses in which all nations would participate in a uniform and coordinated manner.

Third, a traveling atomic world's fair showing the benefits to all the world.

Fourth, a provisional International Atomic Energy Commission to supervise these projects, preventing duplication of research and using bilateral agreements as a foundation.

Fifth, an open letter to the Soviet Union giving her a last opportunity to share in this peaceful project.

At the present time, right here in the United States, 12 nations, including Soviet Russia, are meeting in Washington to further discuss the creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency. More than 2 years ago President Eisenhower originated this proposal, and yet discussion is still at the embryonic stage. At least 24 nations, not willing to wait further, have signed bilateral agreements of cooperation with the United States, so that work on peaceful nuclear development has already begun.

Can we not use these instruments to create a provisional commission until a permanent agency becomes a reality? In that way an interchange of ideas can continue, initial costs for nuclear research be greatly reduced, and a substantially greater output of nuclear ideas be realized. Furthermore, such a commission could commence work on an unveiling of these miracles through the medium of an atomic world's fair. A project of this nature would provide immeasurable incentive to nonstrategic atomic developments, appealing to the competitive spirit of all nations, including the Soviet bloc.

The impending threat of hostility would be removed for at least a decade, allowing the great minds of our era to concentrate on more humane developments to make this a better world in which to live, not to perish. The President in his atoms-for-peace speech in 1953 included Russia as an essential party to any plan for permanent peace. Let us contemplate the problems which mankind faces today.

Never in the history of civilization has the world situation been so complex and so fraught with danger as it is now. Two of the most powerful nations on earth, the United States and the Soviet Union, are in the midst of a nuclear arms race which reaches more staggering proportions with each passing day. The time is rapidly approaching when a devastating atomic attack launched against one country will be instantly met with an equally devastating retaliatory attack against the aggressor. The result for both would be total destruction. In short, it would be a war with no victor.

This is a terrible thing to contemplate. But the consolation is that we are still able to contemplate this whole dire prospect in the hope of finding a more reasonable and humane course of action. We can seek to rechannel the thinking and the attitudes of the peoples of the world along more hopeful and constructive ways. We can also seek to adjust our international relations to the changing situation in the world and to develop more concrete and positive approaches toward greater amity and better understanding.

Unfortunately, at the present time our international relations are nothing more than a tangled mess of meaningless words, endless debate, and cold hostility, which lead nowhere. In the meantime, however, Soviet Russia continues to chip away at the free world, knocking off a piece here and a corner there, gradually spreading its tentacles to encircle and eventually crush pivotal nations—not by revolutionary means, but by exploiting parliamentary and democratic methods which serve her purposes best. France and Italy are examples of such exploitation.

The Communists are now concentrating primarily on the 800 million people in the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations, making up 27 percent of the world's population and about 40 percent of its land area. Hunger and privation still constitute a very serious problem in these and other countries, notwithstanding the fact that more than a decade has passed since the end of World War II. The Communists are constantly inciting these people by pointing the finger of guilt at us, by seeking to convince the peoples of Asia and Africa that we and our allies stand in the way of human progress.

How do we answer this problem? By outright grants of money and other material gifts, which surprisingly enough is being resented by many of the beneficiaries in various countries. They regard it as charity, hence their resentment. Little or nothing is being done by us or any of the nations we are aiding to keep step with expanding populations, the growing requirements for food, development of resources, raising the standard of living, and expanding economies. Instead, all emphasis is being placed on war, on the development of bigger and more terrible weapons, and on preparing for a colossal war to end all wars by destroying the earth and all its inhabitants.

All of this adds up to a tremendous waste of money, material resources, manpower and energy. We are wasting many billions of dollars and irreplaceable resources. We are wasting the talents and the time of the greatest minds of our era. We are also wasting the precious knowledge which we have acquired about the atom and its unlimited uses for peaceful means.

Surely our people and the peoples of the entire world deserve a better outlook for the future. With the imprint of a great war still fresh in their minds, the yearning for peace is paramount and universal. This is the bond that transcends even the iron curtain. Ironically, the key to that man-made curtain is the atom.

Ever since that fateful day at Hiroshima more than a decade ago, scientists and leaders of nations have discussed the peaceful application and uses of this great force. Various peaceful projects have been suggested. On December 8, 1953, President Eisenhower delivered his atoms-for-peace address before the United Nations General Assembly in which he proposed the creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency, whose task it would be "to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

At the atoms-for-peace conference in Geneva in August 1955, in which 73 nations participated, it was emphasized that huge sums of money would be needed for research, development, and capital investment. The United States expressed the hope "that the initial costs can be reduced by countries sharing with one another what they have learned and developed" at future technical conferences.

A meeting of the representatives of 12 nations began in Washington on February 27 and will last for approximately 2 weeks. Its purpose is to continue in the preparation of a draft statute acceptable to all nations regarding the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency. The 12 nations are Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, India, Portugal, Union of South Africa, United States, and the U. S. S. R. This setting might provide an excellent opportunity for presenting some specific plan or suggestion which will speed creation of this new agency.

The proposals that follow are not meant as a panacea, for permanent and lasting peace cannot come from men's minds but rather from their hearts. But, if nothing else, it will guarantee a temporary truce and give this tension-filled world a chance to collect its thoughts and attain some semblance of normalcy.

The following tentative plan is suggested as an outline for further development:

First, a provisional board or commission is to be set up to regulate nuclear projects for peaceful purposes, using the bilateral agreements as a basis or foundation until a final draft statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency is

drawn up and accepted by the participating nations.

Second, the bilateral agreements for cooperation are uniform in content; hence, they can be distributed to all member nations of the U. N. or to any other nation for early acceptance.

Third, nations that have the resources to conduct their own nuclear development, should be given an added incentive to join the provisional body.

Fourth, the provisional body, therefore, should be provided with a concrete plan to start immediate work on projects capable of creating still unimaginable miracles for the betterment of mankind. Four stages of development are necessary:

(a) Instead of waiting 3 years before another technical conference takes place, as is now planned, one should be scheduled within the coming 12 months with all nations invited. An interchange of ideas can then continue so that all nations will have the opportunity to compete equally with those who have already commenced nonstrategic nuclear research. The initial costs of atomic research would be greatly diminished since nations would be sharing the knowledge already acquired and developed.

Estimated time, 1 year.

(b) Following the initial stage, all countries would be permitted to branch out from this common foundation. The provisional body would draw up a list of nuclear projects from which each country could choose one or more, depending on its capabilities, but avoiding duplication of research. A supply of fissionable material and financial aid should be made available to the provisional body by nations more generously endowed for distribution to all nations. Annual reports can be submitted to the provisional commission by each participating nation. Information can be codified and made available to all members. Yearly visits can be arranged between scientific groups for a further interchange of ideas and a friendly check that fissionable material obtained is being used for peaceful purposes. Among projects suggested are atomic propulsion, therapeutic atomic radiation, nuclear-generated electricity, food preservation through radiation, atomic agricultural techniques, and so forth.

Estimated time, 4 to 5 years.

(c) After research and development will have been completed, the International Atomic Energy Agency—by this time the provisional body will have given way to a permanent agency—is to arrange a traveling "Atomic World's Fair" throughout the world in which each country will unveil its discoveries and inventions for the benefit of mankind, and by the same token instill hope in the hearts of millions.

Estimated time, 3 to 5 years.

(d) The wonders of the atomic age are now ready for production. Each country will have approximately a 10-year lead in its specific project and the resulting products, which it will make available to mankind.

Stage 3 and 4 can occur simultaneously.

In order to set this plan into motion, a 10-year "atoms for peace" moratorium should be set aside, commencing in 1957, during which all nations will be able to concentrate on a nuclear race for peace instead of war. Let me emphasize that there can be no objections to this general plan since nothing of a strategic nature will be under scrutiny, nor will the encroachment of the sovereign rights of any nation be a question. Certainly, this would seem to be more palatable than the so-called open skies inspection proposal. Indeed, the beneficial result of such a project would most certainly compensate for the outlay of money, time, and resources.

Here are some of the obvious benefits or advantages to be derived:

First, nuclear developments would become a reality much before the tedious deliberations of today could bear fruit.

Second, this plan could be effectuated regardless of the existing world situation. It could be implemented either through a 10-year moratorium on war, through disarmament, or even under the difficult and trying conditions of a continuing arms race. The first two obviously are preferable.

Third, in any event, the thoughts of the peoples and nations would be diverted from thoughts of nuclear war, total war, guided missile war, and so forth, and channeled toward the possibilities uncovered by nuclear developments for a better and more peaceful world.

Fourth, all nations would stand to benefit economically since their industry would boom as the products of their own atomic developments would reach the commercial markets of the world.

Fifth, a feeling of national pride would be fostered since scientists, who previously might have been hindered in nuclear research through lack of material or other resources, will help their nation take its place alongside others in the nuclear field.

Sixth, the standard of living of all nations would be greatly improved as new ideas and developments are put into production, and more jobs and conveniences for living are created.

Seventh. All nations will have a greater degree of dependence on one another since the developments of one would be in demand by the others. This would result in better understanding and a feeling of harmony among them.

Eighth. Since economic stress and privation in all parts of the world would be greatly alleviated, the Communist propaganda and its false promises would lose much of its luster and appeal.

In the light of the present international situation, the United States as the leader of the free nations should take the initiative in suggesting worthwhile proposals to divert the nations from their emphasis on nuclear weapons. The great minds of our time should be occupied with more humane developments, concentrating on making this a better world in which to live, not to perish.

Insofar as Soviet Russia is concerned, I would suggest that we write a strong letter to her but in plain and simple language embodying this thought:

Since World War II you have continuously conducted first a cold war and later a peace propaganda, while at the same time you have annexed more territory and subjugated more nations than was acquired in any war in the history of mankind.

If you really want peace for your people and are not talking just for propaganda purposes, then we are prepared to meet with you to discuss the above plan in a closed session without fanfare or publicity of any kind and to continue talking until we have completed a plan for peace which we can both honorably present to the peoples of the world.

I plan to submit copies of this outline of my plan to the President, the members of his Cabinet, the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, to the President's adviser on disarmament problems, to our representative in the United Nations, and to other interested officials. I shall, of course, call it to the attention of all my colleagues in Congress and will welcome any comment or views on the subject.

Address by Hon. Richard M. Simpson, of Pennsylvania, Before the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, February 23, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, before the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce on February 23, 1956:

Federal finances which make up the spending, taxing, and debt policies of our National Government have been the subject of considerable misrepresentation these past 3 years. Those in Government and out who are dedicated to the principle of free Federal spending and inequitable Federal taxation as a panacea for all of our public and private problems would have you believe that the present administration is running a government of and for special interests.

Of course, it is not so. And I welcome this opportunity to set the record straight on what this administration and the Congress have accomplished in restoring fiscal responsibility at the national level and in making more equitable our burden of Federal taxes.

The Eisenhower administration took office on a platform which called for reduced Government spending, reduced taxes, and the achievement of a balanced budget. After I have cited the record of accomplishment toward these goals I think you will agree that the administration has lived up to its promises.

Let me describe some of the steps this administration has taken to regain financial stability while maintaining a balance between desirable fiscal and budgetary management, a sound and effective program of national security, and a strong and expanding economy.

The principal goals of the administration's fiscal and budgetary management have been and continue to be reductions in Government spending and taxes and the achievement of a balanced budget which is now expected both in 1956 and 1957.

The administration believes—and I certainly concur—that the Government should spend no more of the people's money than is necessary to discharge its responsibility

to the people. We do not believe that the way to strengthen the Nation is to spend the people's money for them.

We do believe that more progress and sounder progress will result from leaving the largest possible share of our national income in the hands of individuals to make their own countless decisions as to what they will spend, what they will save, and what they will invest. And we are going to need greater and greater amounts in the hands of those who are willing to make risk investments if we are to continue our historic rate of growth.

For the coming fiscal year the administration expects expenditures to rise about $1½ billion with most of the increase being for the Department of Defense. I believe, however, that we shall be able to make enough reductions in the Congress to keep 1957 spending at the 1956 level.

Let me take a minute to examine with you the deficit picture over the past 3 years. It also shows the progress which was made possible by the administration's fiscal policies.

The prior administration incurred a $9½ billion deficit in 1953 and estimated a deficit for the fiscal year 1954 of approximately $10 billion. I am proud to be able to point out that this deficit was reduced to $3 billion.

On the basis of the previous administration's planned spending programs, the deficit in 1955 would have been about $15 billion. The actual 1955 deficit was $4.2 billion. But, note this: without the tax reductions which the Congress provided for the people in 1954, the budget would have shown a surplus.

NOW A BUDGET SURPLUS

Now the goal of a balanced budget is being reached. By the end of the present fiscal year next June 30 a surplus of $200 million is expected. I am inclined to think this is a minimum. It could be quite a lot more. And another surplus is budgeted for 1957. This—I am pleased to remind you—will be the first time two consecutive surpluses will be attained since 1947 and 1948.

The reductions in Federal expenditures of the size I have described do not just happen. They are the result—and I think it is fair to say—of a constant emphasis on thrift and frugality and on costs as an issue.

While much progress has been made in cutting out waste and in finding less costly ways of doing things, I am told that there is still much that remains to be done and that will be done. In one department alone last year, the Department of Defense, almost 170,000 separate suggestions for improvement of operations were studied. Other agencies are also making continued studies for elimination of waste and inefficiency.

To understand the scope of what the Government is doing, it is necessary to summarize into general categories. Let's look at the three principal categories of spending, classified from the point of view of their controllability. The three categories are:

1. Major national security.
2. Relatively uncontrollable major programs.
3. All other Government programs.

In the coming year national security programs will require a little more than 61 percent of all Government spending; the relatively uncontrollable programs require about 25 percent; and all other Government activities 14 percent.

Take the middle 25 percent category first. It consists of those programs which cannot be readily controlled through the appropriation process. Such items as farm price supports, veterans' pensions, interest on the public debt, and grants to States for various programs are typical items in this category. Expenditures for them depend on factors outside the usual control of the budget makers and appropriating committees. The only way Congress can adjust their costs is by changing basic legislation which authorizes the programs.

You can understand that certain of these programs also involve great difficulties in forecasting expenditures when I tell you that in 4 of the last 6 years, for example, spending estimates for agricultural price supports have been in error by at least a billion dollars—in 3 instances by over a billion and a half dollars. Last fiscal year the original estimate for crop price supports was $1.2 billion. During the summer the estimate was raised to $1.6 billion. By midwinter it was increased to $2.2 billion, and at the end of the year actual expenditures were $3.4 billion, largest in our history and nearly 3 times the initial estimate.

For the most part the only appreciable change downward which could be brought about in this category of mandatory expenditures would result from revision of the basic legislation.

Expenditures for major national security programs currently account for three-fifths of the budget. These include military functions of the Department of Defense, military assistance to our allies, atomic energy, and stockpiling of strategic materials. Any way that you analyze the budget, you come up with the fact that its final status in dollars depends largely on these four security programs.

More will be spent on continental defense and on guided missiles than in any year in our history. Research and development activities in the Department of Defense will continue at a level which utilizes the services of about half the research scientists and engineers in America.

I think it is important—and a testimonial to President Eisenhower—that we have been able to grow in military strength while still reducing total defense spending over the last 3 years. The explanation lies in a number of things.

The President has, for example, set aside the former concept of the "fixed date of maximum danger" which was moved forward from time to time and under which planning was designed to achieve maximum readiness for each such date. This was not only an extremely costly process, but made it impossible for the services to plan realistically on a stable long-term basis.

Spending reductions have also been made possible by the introduction of new weapons and techniques in our military planning which enables us to make maximum use of science and technology and minimum use of numbers of men.

Other reductions in military spending reflect the growing strength of our allies, the termination of active hostilities in Korea, and the increased emphasis on our Reserve forces.

You will also be interested to know that more business-like procedures have also played their part: substantial reductions have resulted from more orderly and better balanced procurement, from improved organization and management, from curtailment of unnecessary personnel movements, and from the elimination of duplication, overstaffing, and activities of marginal value.

Coordinated with the reduction in the total number of military and civilian personnel in the Department of Defense, a determined effort has been made by this administration to improve the percentage of total personnel in the operating forces. You will not that I stress the term "operating forces."

Latest estimates indicate that the proportion of total military personnel assigned to the operating forces will have been increased from slightly over half on June 30, 1952, to nearly two-thirds by June 30, 1956. Typical of program modifications is the fact that by reducing from 39 to 30 weeks the time required for inducting, training, and shipping a recruit to and from overseas, the Army has been able without loss of effectiveness in our operations forces to avail itself of an additional 60,000 man-years.

There is a factor that should be borne in mind in considering military expenditures. In the case of the military budget President Eisenhower's decisions have been made not only on the basis of his position as Commander in Chief, but as well on the basis of his experience gained during a long and distinguished career in the military service.

We can all take comfort in the fact that President Eisenhower has given such close personal attention to the military sections of recent budgets. The ultimate decisions have been his and I believe they deserve to be accepted as authoritative.

The keystone of the administration's fiscal policy is keeping our economy strong and growing. It is based on confidence in the private enterprise system and that the establishment of a healthy economic climate for free competitive enterprise is the best way to encourage sustained economic growth and productivity.

I submit that this confidence has been justified by the record of the past 3 years. The administration's first year, 1953, saw business activity in America at an alltime high. Despite the fact that our economy was adjusting from war to peace in 1954, that year was still our best peacetime year. Last year, of course, was one of unprecedented prosperity.

Americans are producing, earning and spending, and hold more jobs today than ever before.

These records have been achieved, mind you, in the face of sharply curtailed Federal spending.

TAXES

Now let's turn to the tax field which is an area of particular interest to me and one in which I'm sure all of you are equally interested.

First, I would like to review briefly the record on taxation of the administration and the 83d Congress.

With the termination of the Korean war in 1953, the opportunity was at hand to make some much-needed changes in our then existing tax laws. But before changes could be made wisely, it was essential that those in the administration and the Congress who develop our tax laws have definite objectives of tax policy in mind. The policy that was adopted by the administration and the majority in the 83d Congress was pointed to three basic objectives. They are:

1. Creation of a climate conducive to economic growth;
2. Provision of relief from excessively high tax rates; and
3. Removal of inequities in existing tax laws to the extent practicable.

The need for changes in the tax laws leading to these objectives was obvious. Deterrents to economic growth included such tax features as the excess profits tax, restrictive regulations on depreciation, double taxation of dividends, the tax penalty on accumulation of surplus, and others. Tax rates on incomes of individuals and corporations and on some excises were excessively high. And there were many provisions in the law which caused unusual hardship to taxpayers in special circumstances. Some of these conditions still exist and should be corrected.

The first move by the Congress in the direction of these objectives was in permitting the excess profits tax to expire December 31, 1953, and allowing the 10-percent reduction of individual income taxes at the same time. This meant that $5 billion which would otherwise have been collected by Uncle Sam was now permitted to remain in the hands of individuals and businesses for such use as they saw fit. Of this $5 billion tax reduction, $3 billion went to individuals and $2 billion to corporations.

The next congressional move toward these goals was the billion-dollar cut in excise taxes on April 1, 1954. This cut was intended to serve two purposes—to relieve consumers of part of the tax on some of the things they buy and to help producers by

reducing excessively high and in some cases discriminatory tax rates on their products.

The third and most difficult action in line with the newly established tax policy was the revision of the Internal Revenue Code in 1954. While this revision was not concerned with tax rates as such, it was designed to serve three very important purposes—namely, clarification and simplification of the tax laws, removal or alleviation of restrictions to economic growth, and removal or reduction of inequities. In recommending revision of the tax laws in his budget message of January 21, 1954, President Eisenhower summarized its purposes in these words:

"Revision of the tax system is needed to make tax burdens fairer for millions of individual taxpayers. It is needed to restore normal incentives for sustained production and economic growth. The country's economy has continued to grow during recent years with artificial support from recurring inflation. This is not a solid foundation for prosperity. We must restore conditions which will permit traditional American initiative and production genius to push on to ever higher standards of living and employment. Among these conditions, a fair tax system with minimum restraints on small and growing business is especially important."

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954—as the result of our tax revision efforts in 1954 is known—was the product of many months of continuous study by members of the tax writing committees in Congress with the help of tax experts from within and outside the Government. I know some of its important sections are not satisfactory to many of you. And some of them are not satisfactory to me either. The code, as finally written, includes by necessity many provisions which were the result of compromise. Accordingly, the revisions did not accomplish as much in some respects as many of us who worked on them had hoped they would.

Among the provisions designed to reduce tax deterrents to business expansion are these:

Greater latitude is now allowed taxpayers in the selection of depreciation methods and more rapid depreciation of new assets is possible. Taxpayers can now compute depreciation under the declining-balance method at twice the straight-line rate. By this method two-thirds of the cost can be written off during the first half of asset life. The sum-of-the-digits method, which is a bit more liberal than the declining-balance formula, is also permissible, as is any other method that does not produce larger deductions than the declining-balance during the first two-thirds of asset service life.

Some relief, albeit modest, is provided from the double taxation of dividends. The Ways and Means Committee, you may recall, proposed a credit against tax of 5 percent of dividends after excluding $100 dividends from gross income in joint returns. That was for the first year. In subsequent years the exclusion would have been $200 and the credit against tax 10 percent. As you know, the dividend exclusion from gross income is now $50 and the credit is 4 percent in the revised code.

Clarification of the law now makes it possible for all taxpayers to deduct research and experimental expenses currently instead of having to capitalize them without assurance of being able to amortize them.

Extension of the operating loss carryback from 1 to 2 years now gives a total span of 8 years for absorbing a loss.

Minimizing of the threat of a penalty tax for unreasonable accumulation of surplus constitutes, in my mind, removal of one of the serious deterrents to growth of small business.

These revisions are some of the more obvious improvements in the tax laws. There are many others, too numerous to detail in these remarks.

On the other hand, the benefits to business from the changes in the Revenue Code were more than offset by the extension of the 52 percent corporate tax rate and, additionally for the larger companies, by the accelerated tax payments provision.

TAX POLICY IN 1956

Speculation was rife a few months ago about possible tax reductions in 1956. It has quieted down since Congress returned to Washington last month, but it may very well flare up again before this session is over.

I suspect that the President's messages on the state of the Union and on the budget had quite a bit to do with quieting the tax reduction talk. In both messages, he stressed the importance of setting wise fiscal priorities in this period of record prosperity. The priorities he recommended are these:

First, a balanced budget;

Second, at least a modest payment on the public debt; and

Third, such tax cuts as can be made after the first two have been taken care of.

For me, at least, it would be awfully hard to disagree with the fiscal priorities set by the President. Certainly, we ought to balance the budget in the present boom period. If we don't do it now, what are the hopes for ever doing it? The alternative to balancing the budget now is a return, and possibly for many years, to the inflation of the 1940's. It seems to me that budget balance is the first order of business if we are to protect the country from another cycle of inflation.

And I believe we should begin to pay something on the debt too, even though it may be only little more than a token payment. I believe it is important to the millions who have invested in Government bonds that some assurance is given that there is a serious intention that the bonds will be redeemed—and that they will be redeemed in dollars of stable value.

On the basis of the President's budget plus the assumption that Congress will accept his fiscal priorities, it would seem that discussion of possible tax reductions this year is only academic. Such discussion is not academic, however, because the budget situation may change considerably before Congress finishes its business for this session.

First of all, the Congress has barely begun action on appropriating money for carrying on the Government's activities in the fiscal year beginning next July 1. It can, and often does, reduce some of the appropriations requested and that means less expenditures in the coming year than were budgeted.

Second, the administration can, and I believe it will, continue to find less expensive ways of carrying on the functions that Congress has charged it with doing. This, of course, will also mean less spending than estimated in the budget.

Third, revenues may be greater than estimated in the budget. I'm inclined to think they will be greater. There is a normal tendency for Treasury Secretaries to underestimate revenues and I would not be the least bit surprised if the estimate of receipts in the budget turns out to be quite a bit too low.

If all three of these factors affecting the budget are favorable—that is, if Congress cuts appropriations appreciably and if the executive branch makes additional savings and if revenues are greater than expected—then we are likely to cut taxes. That raises the question of what taxes should be cut.

With 1956 an election year, I don't think there is much doubt that the major portion, if not all, of the reduction will go to individuals.

I think the present 52-percent corporate income-tax rate is too high. I think the present normal and surtax rates are conducive to inefficiency and restrict business growth and creation of new job opportunities. They restrict the ability of many corporations to pay enough dividends to attract investments by shareholders or to reserve funds for financing growth. In my opinion the corporate rates should be reduced as soon as possible, but I see little chance of reduction this year.

Some of the excise-tax rates are too high and in certain cases may be discriminatory. I would like to see some adjustments in the rates, but I do not believe there should be a reduction in the relative importance of excises as revenue producers. Reduction of rates in some cases would, therefore, require upward revisions in some others or the imposition of excise taxes on some things now free of tax. In any case, I do not see much chance of excise-tax reductions this year.

As the situation now stands, the Ways and Means Committee must consider not only continuing present excise-tax rates after March 31, but also proposed increases in gasoline and some other highway use taxes. These increases seem to have been agreed upon by the majority party in the House for the purpose of financing a new and much larger Federal-aid highway program. The proposed increase includes a 1-cent hike per gallon to 3 cents on motor fuels, a rise from 8 percent to 10 percent on trucks, buses, and trailers and from 5 percent to 8 percent on tires, and a new 3-cents-per-pound tax on camelback or retread rubber. The proponents of these increases say they will raise $12 billion in the next 15 years.

Let's get back to the matter of possible tax reductions this year. As I indicated earlier, whatever tax reductions may be made this year will go to individuals. How the cuts will be made is another question. Last year, you will recall, the House majority voted a $20 tax reduction for each taxpayer and for each dependent. It would have removed over 5 million taxpayers from the rolls entirely and would have cost about $2.2 billion. More recently, they have been talking about increasing exemptions from $600 to $700 which is much the same thing as the $20 reduction except that it gives slight additional relief for taxpayers in the tax brackets above 20 percent. The $100 increase in exemptions would cost about $2.5 billion in revenues.

I, too, feel that it would be desirable to raise exemptions, but I question whether now is the appropriate time to do it. The argument is made that a reduction of this type is needed because it will place the money directly in the hands of consumers and thus will create demand for more goods and services. But how significant would $2.5 billion more in the hands of consumers be in maintaining the present level of economy? Actually, it would add only 1 percent to present annual consumer expenditures of about $250 billion.

I contend that, if the same $2.5 billion could be added to investment in production facilities, where it would mean a 9-percent addition, it would do far more good to the economy. I realize that is not politically possible, but certainly a reasonable part of any tax reduction for individuals should go into the hands of prospective investors. That's why I say that taxes should be taken off as they were put on. That would indicate an across-the-board percentage cut. If the cut were 10 percent, it would cost $3 billion in revenues; if 5 percent, it would cost half that amount.

In conclusion, I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to discuss these budget and tax matters with you. The budget story of the past few years is one that deserves being told and I feel it is worth reviewing the record of the past few years on taxes, too. I only wish I could give you some assurance that there will be further tax reductions this year and tell you where and how they are likely to be made. But decisions on that will have to await further developments with respect to expenditures and revenues.